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The idea of producing a dictionary of Byzantine studies was formulated by the late Gyula Moravcsik in an article published in 1949 (Byzantinoslavica 10 [1949] 7). Several years later, Johannes Irmscher developed this proposal during a visit to Moscow, and plans were made to prepare such a dictionary as a joint German-Soviet enterprise; however, the project was never launched. In 1968 Peter Wirth in Munich began publication of an ambitious work, entitled Reallexikon der Byzantinistik, rivaling Pauly-Wissowa's Real-Encyklopädie in scope; this dictionary collapsed after the appearance of a few fascicles.

In America plans for the preparation of a dictionary of Byzantium began to materialize at Dumbarton Oaks in 1980 in conversations among Alexander Kazhdan, Anthony Cutler, Speros Vryonis, and Jelisaveta Allen. With the encouragement and support of Giles Constable, then director of Dumbarton Oaks, editorial and advisory boards were established, a preliminary list of entries was drawn up, and in 1982 an initial application was made to the National Endowment for the Humanities. After the receipt of NEH funding, the project formally commenced in November 1983; in 1984 an office was established at Dumbarton Oaks and a contract was signed with Oxford University Press.

A number of existing encyclopedias deal to a limited extent with Byzantine history and culture. In some of them Byzantium is considered as an integral part—but only a part—of the subject matter; to this category belong, first and foremost, the Lexikon des Mittelalters (as yet unfinished) and the recently completed Dictionary of the Middle Ages. Other encyclopedias include separate fields of Byzantine studies, limited chronologically (thus Pauly-Wissowa's Real-Encyklopädie elucidates the history of the late Roman Empire and also treats later authors relevant for ancient history) or topically (there are numerous patristic, theological, liturgical, and church historical dictionaries and encyclopedias as well as reference books on prosopography, topography, art, and iconography, including the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, the Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit, the Tabula Imperii Byzantini, and the Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst). Ours is, however, the first attempt to collect within a single work data concerning all fields of Byzantine studies.

Encyclopedias differ in that some of them (such as the Real-Encyklopädie or the Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques—the latter still in progress) claim comprehensiveness of both information and bibliography, while others are selective and therefore more concise (e.g., the three-volume Dizionario patristico di antichità cristiane). The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium (hereafter ODB) was from the outset planned as a selective dictionary following the model of other Oxford dictionaries.
As a result it was necessary to make choices in three areas: the number of entries, their length, and the bibliographical references.

From the very beginning we limited the ODB to approximately five thousand entries. It goes without saying that this is a number insufficient to include all Byzantine names and terms; thus we had to decide who and what would be treated, who and what would be excluded. Only one category, that of the Byzantine emperors, is complete, while a selection has been made among saints, patriarchs, writers, places, fiscal and administrative concepts, and so forth. The decision process was long and painful: we started it before the editorial board was fully operative, we consulted with members of the Dumbarton Oaks community, in 1986 we published the preliminary Working Lists of entries and distributed this pamphlet to leading Byzantinists. We continued to make changes in the list right up to the time of galley proofs, thanks to the understanding of the Oxford University Press. The final result is comprehensive coverage of all aspects of Byzantine history and civilization, with special depth in subjects such as bureaucratic titles and fiscal terms, urban life, and rural economy.

Our original goal was to create a work of approximately 1.1 million words, exclusive of bibliographies. We established the average length of an entry as two hundred words and of a major article as one thousand words, but we did grant our contributors some latitude. We restricted bibliographical references: we requested that only one edition of a text (the best) be indicated and that the “literature” section include no more than four or five items. As a consequence, however, of adding new entries in the course of our work, of increasing the wordage of many entries in order to permit adequate coverage of the subject matter, and of expanding the bibliographies to incorporate the most recent scholarship, the completed product is considerably longer than anticipated, a three-volume work of approximately two million words, including bibliographies. We were able to keep revising the bibliographies until June 1989; in only a few instances was it feasible to add references to new editions, articles, and monographs that appeared in 1989 and 1990.

We decided to divide the subject matter into about 135 “clusters” of entries and invited certain contributors to serve as cluster leaders responsible for a particular topic such as fiscal system or geography of Asia Minor. In most instances, the cluster leader was asked to write both a general survey article on his or her topic of specialization as well as the related shorter entries. Our reasoning was that the system of clusters would permit more coherence within the group of entries and more flexibility for these contributors who, in the course of work, were to decide which person or object was more and which less significant; we also expected thereby to lessen repetitions and inconsistencies. Certainly, the system had its shortcomings: often it was impossible to make a strict separation between different clusters, and some topics appeared in different clusters, even under different names. Some cluster leaders subcontracted a part of their entries, thus multiplying the legion of contributors. It is our judgment nevertheless that this system helped to
produce a certain uniformity and to avoid unnecessary duplication of information.

It was difficult to impose a consistent structure on the entries and especially difficult to decide whether an entry should merely state facts or should also include source references, scholarly discussions, and scholarly doubts. Thus many entries have no scientific scaffolding and supports, while others are heavily loaded with scholarly apparatus. This difference in treatment has been determined both by the preference of individual contributors and by the controversial nature of certain topics. In any case, we tried to avoid unilateral solutions and sometimes presented in the running text, or at least in bibliographical references, conclusions we or our contributors do not share.

We also faced the difficult question of to what extent a dictionary should summarize already established data and to what extent authors should go beyond the déjà connu and suggest new viewpoints and new solutions. At the beginning, we set as our goal the summation of elementary knowledge about Byzantium; it turned out, however, that there are many questions that have not even been asked and many traditional views that are not substantiated by the sources. We found ourselves obliged to touch upon topics developed by western medievalists but not yet studied by Byzantinists and to question a number of traditional perceptions and dates.

Preparation of the ODB was the joint effort of more than a hundred contributors, dozens of cluster leaders, and a handful of editors. Could such an assemblage reach a unified approach and work as a team? We tried to achieve such a goal but were not always successful. Over a seven-year period we had long discussions, both at meetings and in correspondence; the editorial board insisted, surrendered, and insisted again, and frequently was unable to find unity within its own ranks. Nevertheless we hope that in the end we managed to develop certain general principles, even though they could not be uniformly applied, partly owing to the lack of data, partly to the strength of traditional approaches.

First of all, we addressed issues of chronology and geography. The chronological scope of the dictionary was defined as the period from the 4th to the 15th century; classical authors such as Euripides and Plato are included, but discussion of them is focused on the transmission and knowledge of their writings in Byzantium. The post-Byzantine tradition (Byzance après Byzance) was deliberately omitted. It proved much more difficult to set geographical limits for the ODB because of the constant fluctuation in the borders of the empire and the far-ranging impact of Byzantine culture and its contacts with distant lands. All regions that at any time formed part of the Byzantine Empire are covered, as are sites outside the empire's borders that had significant connections with Byzantium. In entries treating areas bordering on the empire, the emphasis is on relations with Byzantium or Byzantine culture. Thus, the ODB entries on the Qur'an and Muhammad differ greatly from their counterparts in the Encyclopedia of Islam, in that they focus on Byzantine perceptions of the Holy Book and Prophet of Islam. To
take another example, in the realm of art and architecture, only those churches of medieval Serbia have been emphasized for which it can be demonstrated that Byzantine artists or architects were primarily responsible.

The second principle we followed was to make the entries in the ODB interdisciplinary in nature. We wanted to have entries in which history, philology, art, and liturgy were interwoven and combined; even short entries were sometimes written by three professionals so that a person or an event is viewed from several vantage points. This approach is closely linked to our belief that elements of Byzantine culture did not exist in isolation.

This brings us to the very complex problem of whether Byzantium was a living, developing organism or only a guardian of ancient and patristic traditions. The question is complex since so much in Byzantium imitated the past and the sources themselves gloss over changes and alterations, but in the words of Paul Lemerle “to represent Byzantium as immutable over a period of eleven centuries is to fall into a trap set by Byzantium itself” (Lemerle, Cinq études 251). In fields as disparate as literature, military strategy and organization, science, medicine, law, and philosophy, the editorial board has taken the position that Byzantium did not merely transmit the traditions of antiquity but developed its own models and worldview.

A final point is that the ODB includes many topics not normally found in traditional encyclopedias and dictionaries. The editors have made a deliberate attempt to emphasize realia and the man in the street (homo byzantinus), with special focus on subjects such as the family, diet, emotions, and everyday life.

It is our hope that the ODB will provide its reader with a body of knowledge about Byzantium. We also expect it to demonstrate many areas of study that are still underdeveloped, unclear, and confused, and by so doing to stimulate the further evolution of our discipline.

NOTE TO THE READER

Entries in the ODB are arranged in alphabetical order, strictly letter by letter, not word by word. A space between words is thus ignored, so that Leo Grammatikos precedes Leonard of Chios, but Leo of Catania follows Leontios Scholastikos. Entries on emperors, popes, patriarchs, and others with identical names are arranged in chronological order. Cross-references, indicated by small capitals (e.g., FARMS, IRENE), will guide the reader to other entries that should offer pertinent related information. We recommend that the reader doing research on a topic also consult the major survey article; thus, someone interested in farms might also read the article on agriculture, where numerous other relevant entries will be mentioned.

Some monuments are subjects of independent entries made under the name of the specific church or monastery (this is the case for the
monuments and monasteries of Constantinople, Athos, and Thessalonike), while others are discussed in entries under the name of the site (as for Mistra, Venice, Rome, etc.). Many artists and architects who are not subjects of separate entries are discussed in the major articles on artists and architects, respectively. Toponyms are generally listed under the form of the name commonly used in the Byzantine period, for example, Ankyra instead of modern Turkish Ankara. Modern names are used for sites for which the medieval name is unknown or uncertain, for example, Alahan Manastiri, Umm el-Jimal.

References to primary sources are given in two different ways: either the work is cited in the form of a bibliographic abbreviation (e.g., Theop. or De cer.), which can be found in the list of bibliographic abbreviations, or the name of the author or text is printed in small capitals, to indicate that the cross-referenced entry will provide information on editions of the works.

Greek terms and the names of most people and places have been strictly transliterated, but in many instances a traditional latinized or anglicized form (e.g., Homer, Aeschylus, Thebes, Nicaea) was used. We have also adopted the anglicized form of Greek first names that are common in English, for example, John, Nicholas, Peter. Armenian has been transliterated in accordance with the guidelines of the Revue des études arméniennes, Arabic and Ottoman according to the rules of the International Journal of Middle East Studies. For Slavic languages we have followed the “modified Harvard system,” employed in Byzantinische Zeitschrift. In Latin we have used the initial form jv-, rather than iv-, for example, jugum, jus; we also distinguish between v and u.

The bibliographies are selective and emphasize monographs on a given subject; they are supplemented by bibliographical citations in the running text. Usually the most important item is listed first, but in some cases a recent book or article was added at the end. In order to avoid repetition, some works have been omitted from the bibliography of an entry if they are listed in the bibliography of another entry cross-referenced in the text. For the sake of simplicity, many articles are cited in the reprint edition of a scholar’s articles (such as Variorum Reprints), with the date of original publication indicated in parentheses. For books, reprint information is given wherever known. When possible, we have tried to emphasize works in western European languages (especially English), but where appropriate a conscious decision was made to include numerous works in Greek, in Slavic and other eastern European languages, and in languages of the Middle East.

Among the challenges faced by the editorial board was that of reconciling our contributors’ differing definitions of the term Byzantine and their often conflicting terminology for the successive stages of Byzantine history. In early drafts of entries the period from the 4th to 7th century was variously termed late antique, early Christian, late Roman, early Byzantine, proto-Byzantine, and even late Byzantine (by scholars dealing with the history of Syro-Palestine and Egypt). The term Middle Byzantine was used by different contributors to refer to the 8th to 11th century, the 9th to 12th century, etc. Because of the lack of precision
and confusion engendered by Byzantinists' inconsistent terminology for the periodization of Byzantine history, the editors have tried to substitute exact centuries wherever possible. In general, the ODB has chosen to use the term *late Roman* or *late antique* for the period of the 4th to the early or mid-7th century and to employ *Byzantine* for phenomena of the 7th century and later, but inevitably there are inconsistencies in our usage.
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### List of Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Map Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa, Prefecture of</strong></td>
<td>North Africa in the Late Roman Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia Minor</strong></td>
<td>Cities and Regions of Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athens</strong></td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athos, Mount</strong></td>
<td>Monasteries of Mount Athos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balkans</strong></td>
<td>Regions of the Balkans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Sea</strong></td>
<td>The Black Sea Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulgaria</strong></td>
<td>Cities of Bulgaria, Serbia, and Neighboring Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Byzantium, History of</strong></td>
<td>The Roman Empire in the Fourth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Byzantine Empire in the Sixth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Byzantine Empire circa 1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Byzantine Empire under the Komnenoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Balkans and Anatolia circa 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Byzantine Empire and Its Neighbors circa 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caucasus</strong></td>
<td>The Caucasus Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constantinople</strong></td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crusades</strong></td>
<td>Routes of the First Four Crusades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyprus</strong></td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egypt</strong></td>
<td>Egypt and the Sinai Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greece</strong></td>
<td>Cities and Regions of Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong></td>
<td>Cities and Regions of Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syria</strong></td>
<td>Cities of Syro-Palestine and Neighboring Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td>Themes of Asia Minor in the Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later Themes and Regions of Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thessalonike</strong></td>
<td>Thessalonike in the Fourteenth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF GENEALOGICAL TABLES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aaronios</strong></td>
<td>Genealogy of the Aaronios Family in the Eleventh Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amorian or Phrygian Dynasty</strong></td>
<td>Genealogy of the Amorian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Angelos</strong></td>
<td>Selected Genealogy of the Angelos Dynasty (1185–1204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asan</strong></td>
<td>Genealogy of the Asan Family in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brynnios</strong></td>
<td>Genealogy of the Brynnios Family in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constantine I the Great</strong></td>
<td>Selected Genealogy of the Family of Constantine I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doukas</strong></td>
<td>Selected Genealogy of the Doukas Family in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gattilusio</strong></td>
<td>Selected Genealogy of the Gattilusio Family in the Levant in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Herakleios</strong></td>
<td>Selected Genealogy of the Family of Herakleios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isaurian Dynasty</strong></td>
<td>Genealogy of the Isaurian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justinian I</strong></td>
<td>Selected Genealogy of the Family of Justinian I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kantakouzenos</strong></td>
<td>Selected Genealogy of the Kantakouzenos Family in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Komnenos</strong></td>
<td>Genealogy of the Komnenos Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris</strong></td>
<td>Genealogy of the Laskaris Dynasty of Nicæa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lekapenos</strong></td>
<td>Genealogy of the Lekapenos Family in the Tenth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leo I</strong></td>
<td>The House of Leo I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macedonian Dynasty</strong></td>
<td>Selected Genealogy of the Macedonian Dynasty, 867–1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nemanjic Dynasty</strong></td>
<td>Genealogy of the Nemanjic Dynasty (ca.1167–1371)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palaiologos</strong></td>
<td>Selected Genealogy of the Palaiologos Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEODOSIOS I

TOCCO

ZACCARIA

Selected Genealogy of the Theodosian Dynasty

The Tocco Family in the Ionian Islands and Epiros in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries

Selected Genealogy of the Zaccaaria Family in the Levant
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J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu Hymapante
Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Gregory of Nazianzos; John Klimax (MS illustration)
Ingeborg Limmer Silk
Lincoln College, University of Oxford Bebaiais Elpidos Nunnery; Nun; Portraits and Portraiture: An Overview
Marburg/Art Resource, New York Diptychs; Staro Nagoricino; Templon
Thomas Mathews Column Churches
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York David Plates
Michigan-Princeton-Alexandria Expedition to Mount Sinai, Ann Arbor Annunciation; John Klimax (icon); Nicholas of Myra; Transfiguration
Monastery of St. John, Patmos Headpiece
National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne Canon Tables
Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna Anicia Juliana
Photo Lykides, Thessaloniki Cana, Marriage at
Josephine Powell Daphni; Mosaic; Ohrid
Rijksmuseum Het Catharijneconvent, Utrecht Virgin Hodegetria
Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden Papyrus
Ihor Svechenko Bryas; Singers
State Historical Museum, Moscow Iconoclasm
Trinity College, Cambridge Column, Honorific
Trustees of the British Museum, London Theodore Psalter; Triumph of Orthodoxy
Victoria and Albert Museum, London Caskets and Boxes Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond Enkolpion
J. Wayman Williams Constantinople; Dome; Gallery; Hagia Sophia: Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (exterior view)
ABBREVIATIONS

GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS

a. anno
acc. according
acq. no. acquisition number
A.D. anno/annis Domini
add. additions by
adj. adjective
A.H. in the year of the Hijra
a.k.a. also known as
alt. altitude
anc. ancient
anon. anonymous
app. appendix
Apr. April
Ar. Arabic
Arm. Armenian
Att. Attic
Aug. August
approx. approximately
Archbp. Archbishop
B.C. Before Christ
Bibl. Bibliotheque, Bibliothek, Bibliotheca, Biblioteca, etc.
(bibl.) bibliography
bk(s). book(s)
Bp. Bishop
Byz. Byzantium, Byzantine (adj.), Byzantines (n.)
C. century, centuries
cia. circa
cf. compare
ch(s). chapter(s)
cm centimeter(s)
cod(d). codex (codices)
col(s). column(s)
Comm. Commentary in/on [thela], Commentarium in idem
corr. corrected by
Dec. December
diam. diameter
dim. diminutive
diss. dissertation
ed(s). edited by, edition(s), editor(s)
e.g. for example
Emp. Emperor
Eng. English
ep(s). epistle(s)
esp. especially
et al. et alia, et allii
etc. et cetera
f' the following page
fac. facsimile
Feb. February
fem. feminine
fig(s). figure(s)
fol(s). folio(s)
fl. floruit
fr. fragment
Fr. French
ft foot, feet
gram
Georg. Georgian
Germ. German
Gr. Greek
ha hecatae(s)
HE Historia ecclesiastica
Hebr. Hebrew
Hilbld. Halband
ibid. ibidem, in the same place
i.e. that is
(ill.) work cited only because of its illustrations
inf. inferior(e)
inscr. inscription
intr. introduction, introduction by
It. Italian
Jan. January
kg kilogram
km kilometer(s)
Lat. Latin
Lib. Library
lit. literally
Lit. Literature
m meter(s)
m. married
Mar. March
masc. masculine
Mel. Melanges
Metr. Metropolitan
mm millimeter(s)
mod. modern
MS(S) manuscript(s)
Mt. Mount
n(n). note(s)
n.d. no date (of publication)
neut. neuter
no(s). number(s)
nov. novella
Nov. November
n.s. new series
Oct. October
OE Old English
or. oratio(nes)
os. old series
p(p). page(s)
par(s). paragraph(s)
Patr. Patriarch
Pers. Persian
pic. picture
pl. plural
pl(s). plate(s)
pr. proem
pt(s). part(s)
r recto
r. ruled, reigned
R. Reihe (series)
republ. republished
rev. review, reviewed by
rp. reprint
Russ. Russian
S. San, Santo, Santa
sc. scilicet, namely
Sept. September
ser. series
sing. singular
sq. square
SS. Santi
St(s). Saint(s)
sup. superior(e)
supp. supplement, supplemented by
sv. sub voce, sub verbo
Syr. Syriac
tr. translated by, translation
Turk. Turkish, Turkic
Univ. University
unpub. unpublished
v. verso
viz. videlicet
v(erso). verse(s)
(with bibl.) with bibliography
## Abbreviations of Biblical Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>Amos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apoc</td>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr</td>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr</td>
<td>2 Chronicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Colossians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor</td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ec</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>Ezra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab</td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hag</td>
<td>Haggai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos</td>
<td>Hosea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jl</td>
<td>Joel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kg</td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kg</td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic</td>
<td>Micah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nah</td>
<td>Nahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh</td>
<td>Nchemiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet</td>
<td>1 Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pet</td>
<td>2 Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philem</td>
<td>Philemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>2 Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S of S</td>
<td>Song of Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>2 Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tit</td>
<td>Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeph</td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Abbreviations of Manuscript Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library/City</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, Benaki</td>
<td>Athens, Benaki Museum (Mouseion Benaki)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, Byz. Mus.</td>
<td>Athens, Byzantine Museum (Byzantine Mouseion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, Nat. Lib.</td>
<td>Athens, National Library (Ethnike Bibliothek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athos</td>
<td>Mt. Athos, followed by abbrev. for individual monastery:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chil.</td>
<td>Chilandari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion.</td>
<td>Dionysiou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doch.</td>
<td>Docheiariou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espig.</td>
<td>Esphigmenou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg.</td>
<td>Gregoriou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iver.</td>
<td>Iveron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koutl.</td>
<td>Koutloumousiou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantel.</td>
<td>Panteleemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantok.</td>
<td>Pantokrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philoth.</td>
<td>Philothoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simop.</td>
<td>Simopetra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stavr.</td>
<td>Stavroniketa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatop.</td>
<td>Vatopedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenoph.</td>
<td>Xenophontos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerop.</td>
<td>Xeropotamou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Walters</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin, Kupferstickkab.</td>
<td>Berlin-Dahlem, Staatliche Museum, Kupferstickkabinett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin, Staatsbibl.</td>
<td>Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna, Bibl. Com.</td>
<td>Bologna, Biblioteca Comunale dell'Archiginnasio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna, Bibl. Univ.</td>
<td>Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brescia, Bibl. Querin.</td>
<td>Brescia, Biblioteca Queriniana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Harvard</td>
<td>Cambridge, Mass., Harvard College Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Univ. Lib.</td>
<td>University of Chicago Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cividale, Mus. Archeol.</td>
<td>Cividale, Museo Archeologico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Mus.</td>
<td>Cleveland Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen, Royal Lib.</td>
<td>Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erevan, Mat.</td>
<td>Erevan, Matenadaran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escorial</td>
<td>Biblioteca de El Escorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence, Laur.</td>
<td>Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa, Bibl. Franz.</td>
<td>Genoa, Biblioteca Franzoniana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotth, Landesbibl.</td>
<td>Gotth, Thüringische Landesbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grottaferrata</td>
<td>Grottaferrata, Biblioteca della Badia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul, Gr. Patr.</td>
<td>Istanbul, Greek Patriarchate (Patriarchie Bibliothek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul, Süleymaniye</td>
<td>Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapi</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapi Sarayi Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem, Arm. Patr.</td>
<td>Jerusalem, Armenian Patriarchate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem, Gr. Patr.</td>
<td>Jerusalem, Greek Patriarchate (Patriarchie Bibliothek)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leipzig, Univ. Lib. = Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek
Leningrad, Publ. Lib. = Leningrad, Gosudarstvennaja
Publičnaja Biblioteka imeni M.F. Saltykova-Schedrina
London, B.L. = London, British Library
Madrid, Bibl. Nac. = Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional
Megaspelaion = Mone Megalou Spelaion, Kalabryta
Melbourne, Nat. Gall. = Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria
Messina, Bibl. Univ. = Messina, Biblioteca Universitaria
Metorea, Metamorph. = Metreta, Mone Metamorphoseos
Milan, Ambros. = Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana
Moscow, Hist. Mus. = Moscow, Gosudarstvennyj Istoričeskij Muzej
Moscow, Lenin Lib. = Moscow, Publičnaja Biblioteka SSSR
imeni V.I. Lenina
Moscow, Univ. Lib. = Moscow, Naučnaja Biblioteka imeni
Gos'kogo Moskovskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta
Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl. = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek
Mytilene = Mytilene (Lesbos), Gymnasion
New York, Kraus = New York City, H.P. Kraus
New York, Morgan Lib. = New York City, Pierpont Morgan Library
Paris, Arsenal = Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal
Paris, B.N. = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale
Parma, Bibl. Pal. = Parma, Biblioteca Palatina
Patmos = Patmos, Monastery of St. John
Princeton, Theol. Sem. = Princeton Theological Seminary,
Speer Library
Princeton, Univ. Lib. = Princeton University Library
Rossano = Rossano, Curia Arcivescovile
Serres = Serres, Monastery of St. John the Baptist
(Mone tou Prodromou)
Sinai = Mt. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catherine
Tbilisi = Tbilisi, Georgian Academy of Sciences, Institut Rukopisej
Thessalonike, Blatadon = Thessalonike, Monastery ton
Blatadon
Turin, Bibl. Naz. = Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale
Vat. = Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
Venice, Ist. Ellen. = Venice, Istituto Ellenico (San Giorgio
dei Greci)
Venice, Marc. = Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale di S. Marco
Venice, San Lazzaro = Venice, Biblioteca di San Lazzaro
Vienna, ÖNB = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek
Zaborda = Zaborda, Monastery of St. Nikanor
(Mone tou Hagiu Nikanoros)

Note: Greek papyri are cited according to the abbreviations in J.F. Oates, R.S. Bagnall, W.H. Willis, Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraca² (Missoula, Mont., 1978).

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ABBREVIATIONS

Note: A superscript number following an abbreviation indicates the edition number if it is other than the first.

AA = Archäologischer Anzeiger
AAPA = Artistes, artisans et production artistique au moyen âge,
AB = Analecta Bollandiana
ABAW = Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
Abel, Géographie = F.-M. Abel, Géographie de la Palestine, 2
vols. (Paris 1933–38)
Åberg, Occident & Orient = N.F. Åberg, The Occident and
the Orient in the Art of the Seventh Century, 3 vols.
(Stockholm 1943–47)
ABME = Archion ton Byzantinon Mnemeion tes Hellados
Abramea, Thessalia = A.P. Abramea, He Byzantine Thessalia
mechi tou 1204 (Athens 1974)
ACO = Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, 4 vols. in 27 pts.
(Berlin-Leipzig 1922–74)
ActaAniHung = Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungarianae

ActaArchHung = Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum
Hungaricae
ActaHistHung = Acta Historia Academiae Scientiarum
Hungaricae
ActaNorv = Acta ad Archaeologiam et Artium Historiam pertinientia, Instituta Romanum Norvegicae
Adhémar, "Trésor" = J. Adhémar, "Le trésor d’argenterie
donné par Saint Didier aux églises d’Auxerre (VIIe siècle)," RA¹ 4 (1934) 44–54
Adontz, Études = N. Adontz, Études arméno-byzantines (Lisbon 1965)
ADSV = Antičnaja drevnost' i srednie veka (Sverdlovsk)
AFP = Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum
Agath = Agathias, Historiarum librum quinque, ed. R. Keydell
(Berlin 1967)
Age of Spirit. = Age of Spirituality: Late Antique and Early
Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century, ed. K. Weitzmann
(New York 1979)
AHR = The American Historical Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahrweiler, Idéologie = H. Ahrweiler, L'idéologie politique de l'empire byzantin (Paris 1975)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahrweiler, Mer = H. Ahrweiler, Byzance et la mer: La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe-XVe siècles (Paris 1966)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIHS = Archives Internationales d'histoire des sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIPHOS = Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves (Université libre de Bruxelles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA = American Journal of Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJPh = American Journal of Philology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AkadAthPr = Akademia Athenon: Praktika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, History = P.J. Alexander, Religious and Political History and Thought in the Byzantine Empire (London 1978)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre, Pléthon = C. Alexandre, Pléthon: Traité des lois (Paris 1858; rp. Amsterdam 1966)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAM B = Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin (Oberlin College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnatSt = Anatolian Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Castles = K. Andrews, Castles of the Morea (Princeton 1953)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelide, Biós tou Basileiou = Ch. Angelide, Ho Biós tou basileiou Basileiou tou Neou (Ioannina 1980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankori, Karaïtes = Z. Ankori, Karaïtes in the Byzantine Empire; The Formative Years, 970-1100 (New York-Jerusalem 1959)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales DH = Annales de démographie historique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales ESC = Annales: Économies—sociétés—civilisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnnArchSy = Les annales archéologiques de Syrie (from vol. 16 onward, title changed to Annales archéologiques arabes syriennes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnnEPHE = Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnnHistCon = Annuarium historiae conciliorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnnPisa = Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANRW = Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntAa = Antichità Alloatridiaca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntAb = Antike und Abendland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntAfr = Antiquités africaines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntCI = L'Antiquité classique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnthGr = Anthologia graeca 2, ed. H. Beckby, 4 vols. (Munich 1965) with Germ. tr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant. Nov. = Antony of Novgorod, Kniga palomnik, ed. Ch. Loparev (St. Petersburg 1899)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC = Archives de l'Orient Chrétien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphironema Svoronos = Aphironema ston Niko Svoronos, ed. V. Kremmydas, Ch. Maltezou, N.M. Panagiotakes, 2 vols. (Rethymno 1986)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchDel = Archaeologikon Delton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchEph = Archaeologische Ephemeris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchHistPont = Archivum historiae pontificiae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchOtt = Archivum Ottomanicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchPont = Archiepont Pontou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arg. rom. et byz. = Argenterie romaine et byzantine, ed. F. Baratte (Pariss 1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnakis, Othonomai = G.G. Arnakis, Hoi protoi Othonomai (Athens 1947)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranz, Typicon = M. Arranz, Le typicon du monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine (Rome 1969)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArtB = The Art Bulletin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art et société = Art et société à Byzance sous les Paléologues (Venice 1971)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIFAO = Bulletin de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale (Cairo)

Binon, Xéropotamou = S. Binon, Les origines légendaires et l’histoire de Xéropotamou et de Saint-Paul de l’Athos (Louvain 1942)


BjB = Bonner Jahrbücher

BK = Bedi Kartlisa

Bk. of Eparch = Vizantijskaja kniga eparcha, ed. M. Ja. Sjuzjumov (Moscow 1962)


BMGS = Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies

BMQ = The British Museum Quarterly

BNJbb = Byzantinisich-neugriechische Jahrbücher

Boak-Dunlop, Two Studies = A.E.R. Boak, J.E. Dunlop, Two Studies in Later Roman and Byzantine Administration (New York 1924)


den Boer, Historians = W. den Boer, Some Minor Roman Historians (Leiden 1972)


BollBadGr = Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata

BollClass = Bollettino dei classici [Note: BollClass is a continuation of BollCom]

BollCom = Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione dell’Edizione Nazionale dei Classici Greci e Latini

Bombaci, Lett.turca = A. Bombaci, La letteratura turca (Milan 1969)


Bon, Morée franque = A. Bon, La Morée franque, 2 vols. (Paris 1969)

Bon, Peloponnèse = A. Bon, Le Peloponnèse byzantin jusqu’en 1204 (Paris 1951)

Bonner, Studies = C. Bonner, Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian (Ann Arbor–London 1950)

Books & Bookmen = Byzantine Books and Bookmen (Washington, D.C., 1975)


Brand, Byzantium = C.M. Brand, Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204 (Cambridge, Mass., 1968)
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BYZANTIUM
AARON ('Ααρών), brother of Moses and first high priest of the Israelites, plays a significant supporting role in a number of events in Moses' life, notably those illustrated in the extensive cycle (between Ex 4:14 and Num 20:29) in the Octateuchs. An attempt to show Aaron in the priestly vestments described at length in Exodus 28 is also made in the illustrated MSS of Kosmas Indikopleustes, in the text of which their symbolism is considered (Kosm. Ind. 2:74–81). Usually Aaron is identified merely by the priestly diadem. He occasionally appears among the Prophets in monumental art as a companion to Moses, or as the bearer of the rod, considered one of the prefigurations of the Virgin. In Palaiologan churches more complex Marian connections with Aaron were derived from the liturgy (G. Engberg, DOP 21 [1967] 279–83).

Lit. H. Dienst, LCI 1:2–4.  
—J.H.L.

AARONIOS ('Ααρώνios, 'Ααρών), Byz. noble family descended from the last Bulgarian tsar, JOHN VLADISLAV, whose wife Maria was granted the title ZOSTE PATRIKIA soon after 1018 and settled in Constantinople. Her older sons were involved in plots and rebellions: Presianos ca.1029, Alousianos in 1040. The third son, Aaron, who gave the name to the lineage, was governor of Iberia (ca.1047), Mesopotamia (ca.1059), and perhaps of Ani and Edessa; his son Theodore, governor of Tarōn, fell in battle against the Turks in 1055/6. Another Aaron governed Mesopotamia in 1112. Seals of Radomir Aaron, strategos and doux, are preserved, but his identification remains problematic; he probably belonged to the family, since Radomir was also the name of Maria's fifth son. The Aaronioi were in double affinity with the KOMNENOI: Isaac I married Maria's daughter, Catherine, and Alexios I married the granddaughter of Ttioan, IRENE DOUKAINA. In 1107, however, the Aaronioi were exiled for participation in a plot against Alexios I. THEOPHYLAKTOS of Ohrid dedicated two epigrams to a certain Aaron whose relationship with the lineage remains unclear. After Alexios I's reign, the family became obscure; Isaac Aaron from Corinth, interpreter at Manuel I's court, apparently did not belong to the aristocracy. In 1393 Alexios Aaron went as ambassador to Russia. The Alousianoi belonged to this lineage. (See genealogical table.)


---

**GENEALOGY OF THE AARONIOS FAMILY IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presianos</td>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prousianos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alousianos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governor of Iberia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radomir,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son (Clement?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>m. ISAAC I KOMNENOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five more daughters, one of whom</td>
<td>m. Romanos Kourkous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basil,</td>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governor of Edessa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alousianos</td>
<td>m. ROMANOS IV DIIOGENES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governor of Tarōn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radomir,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron (?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>m. Andronikos Doukas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRENE DOUKAINA</td>
<td>m. ALEXIOS I KOMNENOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Based on Zlatarski, Ist. 535.
vanija v pamet na akademik Stojan Romanski (Sofia 1960) 479–82. PLP, nos. 3–7. –A.K.

ABASGIA. See ABCHASIA.

`ABBĀSID CALIPHATE (750–1258), ruled by a dynasty whose members were descendants of the uncle of Muḥammad, al-`Abbās ibn `Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Ḥāshim. His great-grandson Muḥammad and his son Ibrāhīm prepared the revolt in Khurāsān against the Umayyad Caliphate. Although the Umayyads captured Ibrāhīm, his brothers Abū`l-`Abbās and Abū Ja`far energetically continued the struggle. Proclaimed caliph in 749, Abū`l-`Abbās became known as al-Saffāh, “the Bloody.” His brother, Abū Ja`far al-Manṣūr, made Baghdad his residence. The `Abbāsid dynasty counted among its most illustrious caliphs Harūn al-Rashīd. The dynasty weakened after Turkish mercenaries became important in the caliphate of Mu`tāsīm in the 830s, and the Mongols under Hulagu destroyed it at Baghdad in 1258. (See [table for a list of `Abbāsid caliphs of Baghdad.] A few of the `Abbāsid family escaped to Egypt, where one became nominal caliph under the name of al-Mustanṣir. The last `Abbāsid caliph was al-Mutanawakkil, who surrendered all civil and religious authority to the Ottoman sultan Selim I in 1517 and died in 1538.

The early `Abbāsid caliphs, culminating in Harūn, showed zeal in fighting the Byz. The last major campaign by an `Abbāsid caliph against Byz. occurred under al-Mu`tāsīm in 838. Yet there were important cultural contacts, including embassies in which such scholars as Photius and John (VII) Grammatikos participated. These contacts led to exchanges of information and copying of MSS on mathematics, astronomy, astrology (esp. in the caliphate of al-Ma`mūn), literature, and music (and probably musical instruments, such as water organs). This intercourse probably reached its zenith in the 9th-C. Muslim geographers (see Arab Geographers) who wrote important descriptions of Byz. during the `Abbāsid caliphate. The deterioration of central authority in Baghdad reduced Byz. diplomatic contact with Baghdad and increased it with the border emirs.


ABBREVIATIONS (sometimes called compendia), found in inscriptions, papyri, and MSS, were frequently substituted for words, syllables, or the ending of words or single letters to save time and space. Sometimes the abbreviations include recognizable Greek letters, usually in ligature; more commonly they are composed of a variety of strokes and dots, similar to modern shorthand. The breathings and accents are often included. A particular kind of abbreviation is the nomina sacra, first used for Christian sacred names in papyri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>`Abbāsid Caliphs of Baghdad</th>
<th>Date of Accession (A.D./A.H.)</th>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Date of Accession (A.D./A.H.)</th>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Date of Accession (A.D./A.H.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Saffāh</td>
<td>750/132</td>
<td>al-Muhtadi</td>
<td>869/255</td>
<td>al-Muṣṭaḥir</td>
<td>1094/487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Manṣūr</td>
<td>754/136</td>
<td>al-Muṭṭamid</td>
<td>870/256</td>
<td>al-Muṭṣarṣid</td>
<td>1011/512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mahdi</td>
<td>775/158</td>
<td>al-Muṭṭaqqid</td>
<td>892/279</td>
<td>al-Muṣṭāf</td>
<td>1035/529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hādī</td>
<td>785/169</td>
<td>al-Muṭṭafi</td>
<td>902/289</td>
<td>al-Muṣṭafl</td>
<td>1136/530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Rashid</td>
<td>786/170</td>
<td>al-Muṭṭadīr</td>
<td>908/295</td>
<td>al-Muṣṭafl</td>
<td>1136/530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Amin</td>
<td>809/193</td>
<td>al-Kāḥir</td>
<td>932/320</td>
<td>al-Muṣṭafl</td>
<td>1160/555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ma`mūn</td>
<td>824/198</td>
<td>al-Rādī</td>
<td>934/322</td>
<td>al-Muṣṭafl</td>
<td>1170/566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mu`tāsīm</td>
<td>833/218</td>
<td>al-Muṭṭafik</td>
<td>940/329</td>
<td>al-Nāṣir</td>
<td>1180/575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Wāṭik</td>
<td>842/227</td>
<td>al-Muṣṭafik</td>
<td>944/333</td>
<td>al-Zāhir</td>
<td>1225/622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mutanawakkil</td>
<td>847/232</td>
<td>al-Muṭṭafi</td>
<td>946/334</td>
<td>al-Muṣṭa`ṣīr</td>
<td>1226/623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Muṭanṣir</td>
<td>861/247</td>
<td>al-Tā’ī</td>
<td>974/363</td>
<td>al-Muṣṭa`ṣim</td>
<td>1242/640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and uncial MSS, for example, XC for Χριστός.
In minuscule MSS from the 9th C. onward, the
nominia sacra occur in nonbiblical contexts also
(e.g., anthropos, pater), even for compounds like
patrarches or philanthropia. The abbreviations for
endings in book script are sometimes identical
with elements from tachygraphy. Monograms
sometimes use an abbreviated form of a name.

E.G., A.M.T.

ABCHASIA (Ἀβσάργια), northern portion of an-
cient Colchis bordering on the eastern shore of
the Black Sea. In the 4th C. Abchasia became part
of the kingdom of Lazika; it probably developed
only in the 6th C., even though Theodoret of Cytthus mentioned its existence in 423. Similarly,
though the Arabic version of Agathangelos claims
that Abchasia was Christianized at the order of St.
Gregory the Illuminator, the surviving Armeni-
ian version lacks this information, pointing again
to a post-6th C. date.

Byz. became familiar with Abchasia during the
Lazic wars of the 6th C. when they built the
fortresses of Sebastopolis and Pitiunt (mod. Pitzunda); a large proportion of Byz. eunuchs were
said to have come from this region. The empire
maintained some sovereignty over this area from
the period of Justinian I to that of Herakleios and
of the Arab invasions, when power passed to the
native Anch'abadze eristavi, who assumed the title
of kings of Abchasia late in the 8th C. They
expanded their territories toward western Iberia
(K'art'li) until checked by the Bagratids of Tao
in the 10th C. In 989 Bagrat III, son of Gurjan,
Kouropalates of K'art'li, inherited Abchasia through
his mother Guranduxt Anch'abadze. Although
Basil II prevented his inheriting from his adoptive
father David of Tayk/Tao in 1000/1, Bagrat received the title of Kouropalates from Byz. His
inheritance of K'art'li from his natural father in
1008 joined the crowns of Abchasia and K'art'li
to form the first united kingdom of Georgia.

N.G.G.

'ABD AL-MALIK, son of Marwan I; Umayyad
caliph (685–705); born 646/7, died 9 Oct. 705.
Campaigning already at 16 under Mu'awiyah, 'Abd
al-Malik was a determined foe of Byz. through-
out his reign. He particularly aimed at eliminating
Byz. influence in the caliphate: Arabs replaced
bureaucrats of Greek descent, Arabic became the
official language, and coins were minted without
Greek inscriptions or Byz. images. After his acces-
sion, internal opposition, the invasion of Armenia
by Leonios, and raids by the Mardaites compel-
el him to renew the agreement that had been
made between Constantine IV and Mu'awiyah. The
ten-year treaty, signed most likely in 688, required
Justinian II to withdraw the Mardaites from Leb-
anon and 'Abd al-Malik to pay a weekly tribute
of 1,000 solidi, one horse, and one slave, and
stipulated that the revenues from Cyprus, Arme-
nia, and Georgia be shared equally. During
this period 'Abd al-Malik probably received Byz.
help in building the Dome of the Rock in Jeru-
salem.

In the early 690s hostilities flared. Although
Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 365,8–21) blames Justinian for attempting to resettle Cyprus and
refusing to accept 'Abd al-Malik's new coinage,
the aggressor was likely 'Abd al-Malik, who
eliminated his final domestic rival in 692 and may
have resented the appearance of Christ's image
on Justinian's own coinage. His brother Muham-
mad defeated Justinian in 693 as a result of the
desertion from the Byz. ranks of Nebonos and
his Slavic troops. 'Abd al-Malik's son, 'Ubayd Al-
lah, invaded Armenia and captured Theodosiou-
polis in 700, and in 702 Muhammad attacked
Armenia IV and took Martyropolis. Despite a Byz.
invasion of Syria, 'Abd al-Malik had effectively
subdued Armenia by 703. During a lull in the
fighting the caliph reportedly allowed Tiberios II
to repatriate Cypriot captives and repopulate Cyprus with them. He also attacked Byz. lands in the West; armies sent from Egypt in 694–98 captured Carthage (see John Patrikios) and ended Byz. control of North Africa.


‘ABDISHÔ BAR BERIKÂ, or Ebedjesus, a polymath monk, Nestorian metropolitan of Šobá (Nisibis) and Armenia, and prolific writer in Syriac; died 1318. ‘Abdishô composed influential works of biblical commentary, theology, and liturgical poetry. For the Byzantinist, his most important writings are the List of all the Ecclesiastical Writers and the Collection of the Synodical Canons. The former is a bibliography of church books, metrically composed and arranged in four parts: books of the Old Testament, books of the New Testament, books of the Greek fathers, and books of the Syrian fathers. The Collection of the Synodical Canons, in the form that goes back to ‘Abdishô, bears the name Nomokanon and is a systematic presentation of the church laws: the first division gives laws affecting lay persons; it is followed by a second part containing laws dealing with church organization and the clergy. Some MSS also include a Syriac version of the Apostolic Canons, and the canons of the synod of the Nestorian katholikos Timothy I (760–823).


ABEL. See Cain and Abel.

ABGAR. See Mandylion.

ABINNAEUS ARCHIVE, the papyri of Flavius Abinnaeus, Roman praefectus alae of Dionysias in the Fayyûm, covering the years 340/1–351. The documents, 80 in Greek and two in Latin, probably came from Philadelphia in the Fayûm and were acquired in 1893 by the British Museum and the University of Geneva. They include letters, petitions, contracts, accounts, and Abinnaeus’s narrative of his appearance before Constantius II and Constans at Constantinople in 337/8. He had accompanied envoys from the Blemmyes to the capital and later was stationed among them for three years. He served as garrison commander at Dionysias, was dismissed, but sought successfully to be reinstated. He married Aurelia Nonna, an Alexandrian. His papers illustrate the extent to which 4th-C. civilians in Egypt appealed to the military power for justice. His correspondents include Christian clerics and lay people, soldiers, and ordinary inhabitants of his district. His archive forms a small but rich source for provincial administration in the post-Constantinian period.


ABIOTIKION (ἀβωτικίον, from abiotos, lit. “unlivable”), a charge on the transfer of the property of an individual who died intestate and without children. Andronikos II’s novel of May 1306 (Reg 4, no.2295) states that in this case the property of the deceased should not be divided solely between the fisc and “those churches or monasteries that held [the person] as paroikos” (Zepos, Jus 1:534–31–32), but a third part must go to the surviving spouse. It is unclear from the novel whether the ecclesiastical institution was granted its share as the paroikos’s lord or for memorial rites (mnemosyne). A charter of 1311 shows that the lord could replace the fisc: a certain Doukopoulos confirmed the transfer to the Docheiarious monastery of two-thirds of the property of “his inherited paroikos” (i.e., the mnemosyne and the lord’s share) and transmitted to the monastery another third part (meridikon triton) that he had received from another paroikos who had died without children (Docheiar., no.11.1–8). The term abiotikion is known from 1259 on (Lawra 2, no.71.80) as a tax on the childless recipients of an inheritance: thus an act of 1400 (?) mentions the collectors of abiotikion (MM 2:342.28) who demanded that a widow display “the hyperpyra listed in the will.” Abiotikion is mentioned in several chrysobulls, usually together with the phonikon and parthenophthoria. In 1440 the abiotikion in Monemvasia was used for the repair of the fortifications (E. Vranoussi, EIBalk 14 [1978] no.4:83–85).

The right of the state and the church to inherit the property of a person who died intestate was
recognized by Byz. law: Constantine VII enjoined that in such a case two-thirds of the hypostasis be given to the relatives or the fisc and one-third to God for the salvation of the soul of the deceased (Zepos, *Jus* 1:237.3–6). The novel of 1306 prescribed that after the death of a child who had only one parent his property was to be divided between the surviving parent, the parents of the deceased parent, and the church. This regulation, dubbed trimoira by modern legal historians, probably originated from local customs (N. Matzes, *BNJ* 21 [1971–74] 177–92). (See also INTESTATE SUCCESSION.)


—A.K.

**ABLAHIUS** (Ἀβλάβως), an influential family in the eastern part of the later Roman Empire. The family founder was Flavius Ablabius, a Cretan. A man of humble origin, he served under the governor of Crete, then went to Constantinople where he amassed a fortune. He became a member of the senate under Constantine I and was praetorian prefect from 329 to 337 (*PLRE* 1:3) or after 326 (O. Seeck, *RE* 1 [1894] 109). Constantius II dismissed Ablabius and banished him to his estates in Bithynia; he was eventually executed. In 354 his daughter Olympias married Aršak III, king of Armenia. Flavius’s son Seleukos, a pagan, supported Julian, but Seleukos’s daughter Olympias became the staunchest ally of John Chryso- stom. The family was still influential at court in 431 when Cyril of Alexandria proposed to bribe Ablabius, *domestikos* of the quaestor.

The Ablabii were an educated and intelligent family: although none of their works survives, it is known that Flavius wrote verses on Constantine; Seleukos reportedly composed a history of Julian’s Persian campaign; a certain Ablabius compiled a history of the Goths based on Gothic legends; and the death of a physician Ablabius was lamented by Theosebia, a poet of the 5th/6th C. (*AnthGr*, bk.7, no.559). The Ablabii are a rare example of a relatively stable aristocratic family in the East.


—A.K.

**ABORTION** (άμβλασις), usually motivated by illegitimate conception, was practiced in Byz. but condemned by both imperial legislation and church canons. Justinian’s Digest included excerpts of early Roman law that frowned on the practice; both those who concocted abortifacient potions and the women who underwent the abortion were punished. Especially among prostitutes, however, the use of abortifacients persisted; according to the scurrilous account of the young Theodora by Prokopios (*SH* 17.16), ingredients for these drugs were well known and easily available in the 6th C. Abortion spikes are preserved in collections of Roman surgical instruments; Aetios of Amida records recipes for abortifacient drugs in his 16th *Sermo* (ed. S. Zervos, *Aetios: Peri tou en metra pathous* [Leipzig 1901] 18–22). Zonaras mentions the use of a weight to compress the abdomen (Rhalles-Potles, *Syntagma* 3:63f). In the 14th C. the price of an abortifacient drug was five hyperpyra, a cloak, and a glass vase (MM 1:548.25–26). Significantly, 6th-C. Byz. medical thought held that abortion was impossible after the fetus had taken on “human form.” Aetios writes that abortifacients were to be used only in the third month of pregnancy. Civil and canon law, however, and lay opinion equated abortion with murder, notwithstanding the age of the embryo. (See also CONTRACEPTION.)


—J.S., A.M.T.

**ABRAHA** (Ἀβραὰμος), Axumite ruler of ḤIMYAR in South Arabia, from 535–58 (Lundin, *infra* 86). According to Prokopios (*Wars* 1.20.4), Abraha was a Christian, the slave of a Roman trader in ADULIS in Ethiopia. A soldier or officer in the Axumite army occupying Ḥimyar, he led a revolt against Esimphaios (probably Sumayfa Ashwa’), the representative of ELESOAM in South Arabia. He assumed power but acknowledged vassalage to Axum by paying tribute. Abraha consolidated Ḥimyar and in 547 carried out a successful expedition in central Arabia.

Abraha maintained an alliance with the Roman Empire, and Justinian I attempted to use him in military operations against Iran; although the emperor sent several embassies to Ḥimyar, he could not persuade Abraha to act. Abraha possibly shifted South Arabia from Monophysitism to Orthodoxy;
he built a pilgrimage church (al-Qalîs, from ekkle-
sia) at Ṣan‘ā’ (I. Shahid, DOP 33 [1979] 27, 81f).

LIT. A. Lundin, Južnaja Aravija v VI veke (Moscow-
Leningrad 1961) 61–87; S. Smith, “Events in Arabia in
the 6th c.,” BSOS 16 (1954) 431–41.

- A.K.

ABRAHAM (אִבְרָאָם), Old Testament patriarch
(Gen 11–25). In patristic literature Abraham
was interpreted as an ideal of asceticism and
obedience to God: his departure from Canaan
indicated the necessity of purification in order
to achieve the Promised Land. He is said to have
lived 175 years in hesychia, prætes, and justice,
and his demise is described in an apocryphal Testa-
ment of Abraham.

From the early period, Abraham appears in
a number of scenes, such as the Philoxenia. The
most popular seems to have been the Sacrifice of
Isaac (Gen 22), found already in the Synagogue
at Dura Europos and included in the Commen-
datio animae. The dramatic nature of this scene
was explored, for example, by Gregory of Nyssa,
in terms that imply familiarity with an image (PG
46:572CD). This text was cited in support of holy
images at the Second Council of Nicaea (Mansi
433.8) and others emphasized that Christ was
both the beloved son (like Isaac) and the sacrificial
lamb. These eucharistic connotations were some-
times exploited visually, as at S. Vitale in Ravenna.

Narrative cycles of Abraham’s life are found, no-
tably at S. Maria Maggiore in Rome (432–49), in
5th/6th-C. Genesis MSS, and in the later Kosmas
Indikopleustes and Octateuch MSS, which may
derive from earlier sources. Christ’s parable of
the rich man and of Lazarus in Abraham’s bosom
(Lk 16:19–31) provided Abraham with a place in
New Testament illustration, notably in the icono-
graphy of the Last Judgment. On the basis of
his appearance, St. David of Thessalonike was
described by his 8th-C. biographer as a new Abra-

SOURCE. Le Testament grec d’Abraham, ed. F. Schmidt
(Tübingen 1986).

LIT. K. Wessel, RBK 1:11–22. E. Lucchesi-Palli, LCI
1:20–35. F. Cocchini, F. Bisconti, DPAC 1:12–16.

- J.H.L.

ABRAMIOS, JOHN, astrologer and astronomer;
fl. Constantinople and Mytilene, 1370–90. Abra-
mios (אֶבְרָעִים) practiced magic and cast hor-
oscopes on behalf of Andronikos IV and his son
John VII, in their quarrels with John V and
Manuel II. His most important role was as the
editor of texts of classical astrology, the author
of treatises on astronomy (opposed to the Pto-
lemaic tradition of Theodore Metochites, Ni-
kephoros Gregorias, and Isaac Argyros, Abra-
mios followed the Islamic tradition of Gregory
Choniaides, George Chrysokokkes, and Theo-
dore Meliteniotes), and as the founder of a
school in which these activities were continued
until ca.1410. His successors were Eleutherios Ze-
slenos, also known as Eleutherios Elias (born
1343), and Dionysov (PLP, nos. 6012, 5441).

A number of MSS of astronomical, astrological,
medical, magical, and rhetorical content pro-
duced by Abramios and his school survive. They
produced editions of Ptolemy, pseudo-Ptolemy,
Hephaestion of Thebes, Olympiodorus of Al-
exandria, and Rhetorios of Egypt. These edi-
tions are characterized by changes in both the
grammar and the order of the presentation of
the technical material of the original texts, and by
the insertion of extraneous material into them.
These MSS also contain some examples of Greek
translations of Arabic astronomical texts, notably
the Mysteriae of Abū Ma‘ṣhar and the Introduction
of Aḥmad the Persian.

In 1376 Abramios wrote a treatise on the con-
junctions and oppositions of the sun and moon
based on the New Tables of Isaac Argyros, but
then criticized his source because he followed Ptolemy
rather than the Persian Tables popularized by
Chrysokokkes. This led to the computation by
both sets of tables of the dates, and sometimes
the details, of 39 lunar and solar eclipses between
1376 and 1408, and an inept attempt to prove
that the Islamic value for the rate of precession
of the equinoxes is superior to that of Ptolemy.

Horoscope of CP,” in Prismata 305–15. PLP, no.57.

- D.P.

ABRITUS (אָבְרִיטָס), late Roman city at Hisar-
lük near Razgrad in northeastern Bulgaria, where
in 251 Decius was defeated and killed. The city
continued to exist despite successive invasions un-
til the end of the 6th C., when the Avars destroyed
it. In the 7th or 8th C. a Bulgarian settlement was
established on the ruins of the Roman city, but it
was abandoned in the late 10th C. as a result of an attack by the Pechenegs or Rus’.

Excavations since 1953 have revealed a city built on the typical Roman grid pattern, with Ionic colonnades along the principal streets. Many statues, reliefs, mosaics, and inscriptions bear witness to the prosperity and culture of Abritus in Roman times, but little is known of the Bulgarian site.


—R.B.

ABÚ AL-FIDÁ‘, more fully Iṣmā‘īl ibn ‘Ali Abū al-Fidá‘, Syrian scholar-prince related to the Ayyūbid rulers of Hamāh; born Damascus Nov./Dec. 1273, died Hamāh (EIPHANEIA) 27 Oct. 1311. A man of wide-ranging military and political experience, he participated in the campaigns against the Franks and established a political position in Hamāh (1299), becoming governor in 1310. Invested as sultan of Hamāh in 1320, he retained the title until his death. A generous patron, he was also esteemed for his poetry and learning. He may have known some Greek; he was certainly interested in Byz. affairs and Greek culture, about which he sought information from travelers and pilgrims.

His two extant Arabic works, though largely derivative, remain useful. The Concise History of Mankind, a universal history based on Ibn al-Athfr, ends with the memoirs of Abū al-Fidā‘ (1285–1329). Though preoccupied with the Franks and Mongols, he discusses developments in Armenia and Cappadocia in the Palaiologan period, provides valuable details on the social relations between Christians and Muslims in Asia Minor, and recounts the fall of Rhodes to the Hospitallers in 1308. In his descriptive geography, Survey of the Countries (written in 1321), material on Syria includes well-informed personal observations. For Byz. lands, he relies on eyewitnesses for the topography and monuments of Constantinople, the cities of Asia Minor, and possibly details on Byz. administrative geography.


—L.I.C.

ABŪ BAKR (‘Abūbēlēchos, ‘Apōtákērs), first caliph and successor of Muhammad from 8 June 632; born shortly after 570, died Madīna 22/3 Aug. 634. After crushing rebels in the Riddah Wars following the death of Muḥammad, Abu Bakr’s armies scored major early successes against the Byz., including the battles in the ‘Arabah (May 633) and at al-Fustār or the camp of Areopolis (Ar. Māb, mod. Rabba), and at Dathin and Ajnādayn (July 634), as well as the occupation of much of the land east of the Dead Sea; in his lifetime the Muslims seized Transjordania and southern Palestine from the Byz. Abu Bakr skillfully selected his generals and directed them from Madīna, but did not personally fight against Byz. armies or visit conquered Byz. territories or towns. He possessed great leadership qualities, which contributed significantly to the consolidation and advance of Islam. He also showed a sense for military strategy and operations, although Hera kleios and contemporary Byz. commanders probably did not consider him a serious opponent. His motives and calculations concerning Byz. can only be inferred, for no contemporary source details his decision to invade Byz. Syria. The invasion of Iraq also took much of his attention. Most scholars now accept the historicity of his caliphate, which Crone and others had challenged (P. Crone, M. Cook, Hagarism [Cambridge 1977] 28, 178, n.72, partly retracted in P. Crone, M. Hinds, God’s Caliph [Cambridge 1986] 111–13).


—W.E.K.

ABŪ FIRĀS, more fully al-Ḥārith ibn Saʿīd ibn Hamdān al-Ṭaghlibī, Arab prince, warrior, and poet; born Iraq 932, died Syria 4 Apr. 968. His mother was of Byz. origin, and after his father’s death in 935 he grew up under her care and the patronage of his Ḥamānīd cousin Sayf al-Dawla at Aleppo. He participated in several expeditions against Byz. and in 962 was wounded and captured by Theodosios Phokas. Kept in chains at Charsianon, he later enjoyed princely treatment in Constantinople, was focal in negotiating a general exchange of prisoners, and was finally released in 966. Legend credits him with a spectacular escape from an alleged earlier imprisonment. While governor of Manbij, he was killed during his unsuccessful revolt against Sayf al-Dawla’s son.
As poet-warrior Abū Firās reflected the ideal of Arab chivalry and sincerity; spontaneity and verve characterize his poetry. He is most esteemed for his Byzantine Poems (Rūmiyyāt) composed during his captivity, expressing defiance in adversity, yearning for loved ones, and reproach to Sayf al-Dawla for delay in ransoming him. His poems, often with his own illuminating historical notes, provide important information on expeditions, frontier toponymy, Byz. prosopography (e.g., the Phokas and Maleinos families), conditions of prisoners, and Byz.-Arab mutual perceptions, as in his debate with Nikephoros Phokas on the fighting abilities of Byz. and Arabs.

ABŪ MĪNĀ, famous Early Christian settlement (the ancient name is unknown) and pilgrimage center in Mareotis, west of Alexandria, where the underground tomb of St. Menas was venerated from the late 4th C. onward. The inner core consists of a large square, with xenodochia on the north and churches on the south. The martyrion over the saint's tomb is the most important of the churches. Its earliest foundations date from the late 4th C.; enlarged several times, it was rebuilt under Justinian I as a tetraconch. To the east is a large transept basilica (early 6th C.), to the west a baptistery. At the south rear lies an unusual semicircular structure which probably held incubation rooms for sick pilgrims. There are also two baths within the town, colonnaded streets, and many private houses. Other churches have been found in the environs of Abū Minā. A basilica to the north is a very regular building extra muros, closely connected with a residential quarter that perhaps served as the residence for non-Chalcedonians. A church to the east, another tetraconch, is surrounded by several houses for anachoretes. All churches and official buildings were built of local limestone. For their decoration extensive use was made of marble spolia from destroyed buildings in Alexandria. The famous Menas flasks were produced as pilgrim souvenirs at Abū Minā from the early 6th C. onward.

During the Persian invasions of 616–20 Abū Minā was almost totally destroyed, and it was rebuilt only modestly afterwards. After the Arab conquest (639–42) the town, which was formerly Chalcedonian, came into the hands of the Coptic Monophysite church, and presumably about the time of the Coptic patriarch Michael I (744–68) the martyrion was rebuilt as a five-aisled basilica. The site was finally abandoned after the 10th C.


ABYDIKOS (άβδικος), an official in control of navigation. The name is evidently derived from Abydos and originally designated the inspector of sea traffic through the Hellespont. Ahrweiler suggests that he was a successor to the archon or komes of the Straits (ion Stenon) or of Abydos, known from an edict of Anastasios I, from Procopios, and other sources. The term later acquired a generic meaning; abydikoi of Thessalonike, Amisos, Chrepos, and Euphras are mentioned on seals. His function could be combined with that of kommerkarios. A military rank on the staff of the Drungarios tou Ploimou, abydikos was equivalent to, and commonly replaced, the rank of komes. It remains under discussion whether the abydikos was the same official as the paraphylax of Abydos mentioned frequently on seals. Abydikoi are attested until the early 11th C.


ABYDOS ("Αβύδος), city on the Hellespont, near modern Çanakkale. Abydos and Hieron were the two customs posts where taxes were assessed on shipping to and from Constantinople. Abydos was administered by an archon or komes ton Stenon who commanded a small fleet, stopped illegal transport of weapons, checked travel documents, and collected taxes. The amounts were fixed by a decree of Anastasios I that forbade excessive charges (J. Durliat, A. Guillou, BCH 108 [1984] 581–98). Justinian I replaced this system with a customs house (demostion telometion) under a komes with a fixed salary. Abydos long retained its function: its archon or komes is attested through the
10th C. Taxes collected there were reduced by Empress Irene in 801; the Venetians won a special reduction in 992. This function was so important that the name Abydos was applied to similar officials throughout the empire. Abydos was a strategic naval base subordinate to the theme of the Aegean Sea; it later became a separate command under its own strategos (or katepano, mentioned in 1086: LaVra 1, no.48.3). Its role and location made Abydos the frequent target of foreign and domestic enemies from the 7th through the 12th C. It was taken by the Venetians in 1204 and remained Latin until its reconquest by John III Vatatzes. By that time it had yielded in importance to Callipolis; the last period of its history is obscure. Originally a suffragan bishopric of Kyzikos, Abydos became a metropolis in 1084. No remains have been reported.


—C.F.

ACADemy OF ATHENS, a school of higher education, claiming descent from Plato’s Academy, which preserved the traditions of Neoplatonism. It flourished in the 4th C. and attracted both pagan and Christian students, including Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzos, and Julian the Apostate. Students formed close groups around their teachers, and fights between different groups were common. By the end of the 4th C. and in the 5th C. the Academy had acquired a predominantly pagan character with such teachers as Plutarchos, Syrianos, and the philosopher Proklos. The teachers emphasized the importance of ancient traditions and the role of the “divine philosopher” as opposed to the “tyrant.” After the death of Proklos (485), Alexandria briefly evolved into the leading center of philosophical study, but at the beginning of the 6th C., under Damaskios, the Academy again became the most influential pagan school. Malalas (Malal. 451.16–18) records that in 529 Justinian I forbade the teaching of philosophy and law in Athens, but some teaching continued there. Circa 532 leading philosophers from Athens emigrated to Persia; disappointed in Chosroes I, who turned out not to be an ideal philosopher-king, they came back to the Byz. Empire. Damaskios, however, returned not to Athens but to Emesa in his native Syria. The Academy continued to function and, despite confiscations, still possessed substantial funds in the 560s. According to the autobiography of Ananias of Sirak, an anonymous “doctor from Athens” was a famous teacher in Constantinople at the beginning of the 7th C. (Lemerle, Humanism 92f).

The commentaries on Plato and Aristotle by such teachers as Proklos and Simplikios provide an idea of the range and quality of teaching in Athens. The Life of Proklos by Marinos and the Life of Isidore by Damaskios give a picture of the activity and attitudes of teachers at the Academy.


—A.K., R.B.

ACANTHUS (ακάνθος), classical Greek term for a perennial plant, common to the Mediterranean, whose leaf form inspired decorative motifs in architectural sculpture, particularly the Corinthian capital. In the 5th and 6th C., the traditional, naturalistic form of the acanthus was modified by flattening the leaves against a deeply undercut ground and creating a lacy texture of light and dark, solid and void, punctuated by deeply drilled points (Grabar, Sculptures 1, pls. XIX–XX). The organic Roman form thus became an abstract motif used as an element of overall pattern. “Wind-blown” capitals of the 5th C. preserve the naturalistic treatment of the individual leaves but twist the entire form, denying its mass. The motif was further applied to a wide range of architectural features—impost blocks, capitals, architraves, and archivolts. The acanthus remained an abiding decorative feature in sculpture and other media. Delicate, lacy friezes decorated arcades and marked interior divisions between domes, drums, and bodies of churches. Acanthus motifs were also used on icon frames, arcosolia, and templen barriers, as at Hosios Loukas and the Chora (Grabar, Sculptures II, pls. XVII–XX, CVII).


—K.M.K.

ACCIAJUOLI (Ατζαιώλης), name of a Florentine banking family, one branch of which rose to
prominence in 14th-15th-C. Greece; etym. Ital. acciaio ("steel"). The Acciajoli first made their fortune in Italy in the 12th C. through the operation of a steel foundry; they then turned to banking. By the 14th C. they had amassed considerable wealth and were closely linked with the Angevins of Naples. In addition to holdings in Italy, Niccolò Acciajoli (died 8 Nov. 1365) acquired extensive lands in Greece, particularly in Elis, Messenia, and Kephalenia (P. Topping, Studies on Latin Greece A.D. 1205–1715 [London 1977] pts. V, VI). In 1358 he was granted the Corinth region by Robert II, son of Catherine of Valois. He undertook the repair of fortifications at the Isthmus of Corinth.

The family reached its height in Greece during the reign of Nerio I Acciajoli (died 25 Sept. 1394), lord of Corinth (1371–94), who took Athens from the Catalans on 2 May 1388 and founded a Florentine duchy of Athens (which included Thessaly). Nerio I was succeeded as duke of Athens by his illegitimate son Antonio I, who enjoyed a lengthy and relatively peaceful reign (1403–35). The Acciajoli family maintained its rule over Athens until 4 June 1456, when the city fell to the Turks. Franco Acciajoli, the last duke of Athens (1455–56), spent his final years as lord of Thessaly (1456–60) until he was murdered at the command of Mehmed II. The Greek branch of the family intermarried with the Palaiologos and Tocco families.

The Acciajoli property in the Morea, known from acts of donation, included fields, vineyards, meadows, forestland, etc. The documents list the paroi who were attached to the land, as well as their animals, and enumerate the rental payment owed by each peasant, usually in cash.


—A.M.T.

ACCIDIE. See Akedia.

ACCLAMATIONS (sing. ευθημία, πολυχρόνιον). Cadenced unison shouts, which applauded or criticized magnates and esp. emperors, characterized Byz. public life. Against the silence attending the emperor’s appearances or the reading of his words, acclamations manifested public reaction. Thus, acclamations by the army and people formed the key consensual act in an imperial CORONATION. Acclamations at public meetings (e.g., church councils) were increasingly written down, painted, or inscribed in public places in the 4th–5th C. and developed their own iconography. Chants or loyal petitions improvised at the circus offered Byz. crowds a rare channel of communication with their rulers; acclamations concerning provincial officials were forwarded to the prince as evidence of public opinion (Cod. Theod. I 16.6).

Acclamations grew more complex and formalized as the factions orchestrated their performance. The 9th- and 10th-C. acclamations of De ceremoniis show uniformly obscure texts performed at every ceremony by imperial employees under the præpositos (McCormick, Eternal Victory 223–25). This elaborateness and professional performance pushed acclamations toward political poetry and culminated, for example, in Theodore Prodomos. The army and public continued to voice shorter, more formulaic shouts, like those appearing on coins (e.g., DOC 3.1:177), as responses to the factions’ acclamations and esp. to demonstrate loyalty in crises. Usurpers supposedly extorted them by force (John Mauroposium, no.186.25, ed. Lagarde, p.189) and their potential insincerity fooled no one (Themistios, Orationes 8, 1:156.1–3). At 9th- and 10th-C. state banquets and audiences, organs gave the cue for all to stand and join the factions in acclaiming the emperor (Oikonomides, Lists 203,31–34).

In all periods legitiMcy, divine support, orthodoxy, victory, and long life were favorite themes. Acclamations often observed a responsorial pattern, whereby persons were acclaimed, starting with God or the emperor and proceeding in order of precedence, followed by specific praises or requests. Acclamations’ content thereby illuminates the ceremonies they accompanied. Late Roman acclamations mixed Greek and Latin, but gave way to overwhelmingly Greek texts by the 10th C.; a few fossilized Latin acclamations continued to be performed on special occasions. Rough isosyllab and rhythm of stress accent determined the metrical structure of acclamations (P. Maas, BZ 21 [1912] 28–51; Cameron, Circus Factions 329–33) and anticipated developments of Byz. prosody like POLITICAL VERSE.
ACCLAMATIONS, APOTROPAIC, words or phrases expressing religious conviction in brief, exclamatory form, often found on amulets. At first simple utterances of shared religious feeling, such acclamations lent themselves naturally—because of the frequency with which they invoke the power of the deity—to eventual apotropaic use; for instance, praise of God invokes his aid against demons. Some (e.g., Hygieia, “health”) are little more than banal expressions of good luck, while others (e.g., Heis Theos ho nikon ta kaka, “One God conquering evil”) are more specifically directed against evil spirits. The roots of Christian apotropaic acclamations lie in the ceremonial protocol of the Hellenistic and Roman imperial courts, for example, the Trisagon (Hagios, Hagios, Hagios), which appears frequently on amulets of the 5th through 7th C.

Lit. E. Peterson, Heis Theos (Göttingen 1926). —G.V.

ACHAIA (Ἀχαία). The toponym Achaia has several meanings in the Byz. period.

1. It was a late Roman province embracing the Peloponneseos and central Greece south of Thermopylae, identified by Hierokles with Hellas and credited with 79 cities. The capital was Corinth. Under Diocletian, Achaia was part of the diocese of Moesia, but it was later transferred to Macedonia under the praetorian prefect of Illyricum. Most of the province (with the exception of its western parts) was eventually included in the theme of Hellas. The ecclesiastical province of Achaia survived, but presumably designated only the Peloponneseos; Patras is listed as its metropolitan see from the 8th or 9th C.

2. In a general geographic sense, the term refers to the northwestern Peloponneseos, whose main city was Patras. Aside from a narrow coastal strip along the Gulf of Corinth, Achaia is mountainous and sparsely populated. Among the churches of the region is the Panagia at Mentzaina, a timber-roofed basilica, dated to the mid-10th C. (A.G. Moutzale, Archaiologika Analetka Athenon 17 [1984] 21-42).

3. Achaia was also the name of a Frankish principality founded in southern Greece after the Fourth Crusade (see Achaia, Principality of).

—T.E.G.
Princes of Achaia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM I OF CHAMPLITTE</td>
<td>1205-1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOFFREY I VILLEHARDOUIN</td>
<td>1209-1226/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOFFREY II VILLEHARDOUIN</td>
<td>1226/31-1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM II VILLEHARDOUIN</td>
<td>1246-1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES I OF ANJOU</td>
<td>1278-1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles II of Anjou</td>
<td>1285-1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florent of Hainaut</td>
<td>1289-1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabau de Villehardouin</td>
<td>1297-1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip of Savoy</td>
<td>1301-1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP I OF TARANTO</td>
<td>1307-1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis of Burgundy</td>
<td>1313-1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahaut de Hainaut</td>
<td>1316-1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Gravina</td>
<td>1322-1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert of Taranto</td>
<td>1333-1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip II of Taranto in rivalry with Marie de Bourbon</td>
<td>1364-1370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip II of Taranto</td>
<td>1370-1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne of Naples</td>
<td>1373-1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques de Baux</td>
<td>1381-1383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of competition between Marie de Bretagne, Hospitallers, Louis II of Clermont, Pope Urban VI, Amadeo of Savoy, and Mahiot de Coquerel</td>
<td>1383-1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre de Saint-Superan (NAVARESE COMPANY)</td>
<td>1396-1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Zaccaria</td>
<td>1402-1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centurione II ZACCARIA</td>
<td>1404-1430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Bon, Morée franque 696.

Paul (2 Cor 5:1) to describe metaphorically the resurrected body of Christ, the term *acheiropoietain* was applied to images of sacred persons that came into existence miraculously, usually at the will of that person. The most famous *acheiropoietain* not only appeared miraculously, they could also replicate themselves miraculously. *Acheiropoietai* are cited first and most often in the period between Justinian I and Iconoclasm, the most important of them emerging in the context of the Persian Wars: the MANDYLION, the KERAMION, and the images of the KAMOULIANAI Christ, which Herakleios carried into battle like a new LABARUM. The same period yields reports of other *acheiropoietai*: the imprint of Christ’s face on a cloth in Memphis, his imprint on the column of his flagellation in Jerusalem, and an *acheiropoieton* of the Virgin Mary at Lydda (Diospolis). Several of these are described in the LETTER OF THE THREE PAPIARCHS, but only the Mandylion and Keramion continued to be represented after Iconoclasm. Few other *acheiropoietai* are known. With rare exceptions they represent either Christ or Mary. It is no longer possible to associate the shroud described by Nicholas MESARITES in 12th-C. Constantinople with that most enigmatic of *acheiropoietai*, the imprinted linen cloth known as the Shroud of Turin.


**ACHEIROPONETOSCH**. The Church of the Acheiropoietos (*"Αχειροποιηστός*, lit. "not-made-by-hands") in Thessalonike is so named because it housed a miraculous icon (see **ACHEIROPONETOS**) of the Virgin Hodgetria (A. Xyngopoulos, Helenika 13 [1954] 256-62). Dedicated to the Virgin, the Acheiropoietos was a wooden-roofed, three-aisled basilica, approximately 28 m wide and 36.5 m long (nave alone). The aisles are screened from the nave by high stylobates, there are galleries above the two side aisles, and the outer narthex was flanked by towers. Perhaps the earliest of the churches still standing in the city, it was probably built between 450 and 470; bricks from the fabric of the building have been dated to ca.450 (M. Vickers, BSA 68 [1973] 285-94) and the mosaics of birds, chalices, and crosses in the soffits of the nave arcade in the church are assigned to the period 450-60 (Ch. Bakirtzes in Aphieroma ste
ACHILEUS (Ἀχέλευς), a river (or, according to Skyl. 203.95, a fortress) near ACHILALOS where SYMEON OF BULGARIA won a decisive victory over the Byz. on 20 Aug. 917 (in Skyl., 6 Aug.). The Byz. army, commanded by Leo PHOKAS, domesticos ton scholon, was accompanied by the fleet under ROMANOS I LEKAPENOS. Romanos headed for the mouth of the Danube, where he expected to find Pecheneg auxiliaries; the Serbian prince Peter was also expected to join the Byz. Symeon launched his attack before these forces could unite. Skylitzes (Skyl. 203.94–204.37) provides two explanations of the defeat. According to the first version, Leo Phokas's horse bolted and returned riderless to camp, causing the soldiers to think that Leo had fallen in battle. The second version recounts that Leo was pursuing the Bulgarians when he heard a rumor that Romanos Lekapenos had diverted to Constantinople in order to seize the imperial power; immediately Leo headed for camp to learn the truth. Whatever the cause, the Byz. were routed, many commanders were killed (including Constantine Lips), and Leo barely escaped to MESEMBRIA.

-A.K.

ACHILLES, the principal Greek hero of the Iliad. Achilles retained his popularity well beyond late antiquity. This popularity can be explained by the search for the ideal warrior, still as apparent in the 11th-C. Kynegetika (Weitzmann, Gr. Myth., fig. 103) as in the 5th-C. illustrated Iliad in Milan (Ambros. F 205 inf.). The education (PAIDEIA) of Achilles by the centaur Cheiron was contrasted with Christian principles of upbringing (M. Hengel, Achilles in Jerusalem [Heidelberg 1982] 45–47), but still literally depicted on bone caskets and in MSS of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos (Weitzmann, Gr. Myth. 165–68). Later, Christian rhetoricians (e.g., Prokopios of Gaza) tried to adapt the theme of the paideia of Achilles to their own moralistic ideas; it appears as an exemplary education in many Byz. writers.

The Byz. gradually divested Achilles of his military prowess: in similes of Niketas Choniates, in the Histories of Tzetzes, even in the commentary of Eustathios of Thessalonike on the Iliad, Achilles is primarily a physician, a musician, a sober man. In his commentary on the Odyssey (Eust. Comm. Od. 1696.65, vol. 1:431), Eustathios critically notes that Homer was pany philachilus, “too pro-Achil-
lean." Already in Homer, Achilles had some features of a semibarbarian prince; Leo the Deacon (Leo Diac. 150.4–20) developed the idea that Achilles was "Tauruscythian," endowed with the typical cruelty of the Rus'.


ACHILLES TATIUS (Ἀχιλλεύς Τάτιος), author of the novel *Leukippe and Kleitophon* and, according to the *Souda*, other works of varied scope; born Alexandria, fl. end of 2nd C. The *Souda* also states, almost certainly incorrectly, that he became a Christian and a bishop. The romance, in carefully wrought prose with many *epiteleseis*, is narrated throughout in the first person; it relates the lurid adventures and dramatic separations (by pirates, shipwrecks, false deaths, and so on) of the hero and heroine before they can be reunited and married. A papyrus roll of the 3rd to 4th C. containing the romance is being edited at the university libraries of Duke and Cologne (W.H. Willis in *XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* [Naples 1984] 1:163-66). Despite reservations about the romance's moral qualities (see, e.g., Photios, *Bibl.*, cod.87; Psellos, *De Chariclea et Leukippe iudicium*), the novel seems to have maintained an intermittent readership, perhaps because of its potential for allegorical interpretation in terms of the salvation of a Christian soul as well as its Atticist prose style. When in the 12th C. novels began to be written once more, that of Achilles was taken as a model by Eustathios Makrembolites, used by Theodore Prodromos, and quoted in the Grottaferrata version of *Digenes Akritas*.


ACHMET BEN SIRIN (Ἀχμῆτ ὁ νῖος Σηρείμ), author of the longest and most important Byz. tract on dreams. Achmet is the pseudonym of a Christian Greek who used in his *Oneirokritikon* widely divergent sources: Arabic (N. Bland, *JRAS* 16 [1856] 118–71; M. Steinschneider, *ZDMG* 17 [1863] 227–44). Byz. (dream books of *Astrapychos* and the prophet *Daniel*), late Roman (Artemidoros, 2nd C.), and his own dream material. The pagan material, particularly in the first 14 chapters, has been reworked to conform to Christian orthodoxy. The treatise is dedicated to "the *protosymboulos* Ma'mûn," the caliph of "Babylon," whose dream interpreter Achmet purports to be, and contains the interpretations of hundreds of dream symbols attributed to Persian, Egyptian, and Indian seers. These attributions, patently false, are a scheme to project cosmopolitan erudition. The date of composition lies somewhere between 813 (the year of ascent of Caliph Ma'mûn) and the early 11th C., when the dream book appears in the marginalia and text of two MSS (D. Gigli, *Prometheus* 4 [1978] 65–86, 173–88; S.M. Oberhelman, *BZ* 74 [1981] 326f). The name Achmet also appears as the author of an astrological treatise, datable to the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 9th C. (E. Riess, *RE* 1 [1894] 248).


ACHYRAOUS (Ἀχυραός, Lat. Eseron), fortress of Mysia overlooking the Makestos River in northeastern Anatolia, near modern Balikesir. First mentioned in 812 as a village by *Theodore of Studios*, Achyraous became important only in 1139, when John II Komnenos made it a powerful and strategic fortified city to assure control of the region and its roads. Achyraous was then made a bishopric, under Kyzikos, and, in the late 12th C., an ecclesiastical metropolis. At that time, it apparently became the center of a separate civil province. After Latin occupation in 1204–20, Achyraous was a major Laskarid fortress. Although strengthened by Michael VIII in 1282, it barely survived a Turkish attack in 1302, was temporarily rescued by the Catalans in 1304, but fell to the Turks of Karaman soon after. The well-preserved fortress is built in a distinctive masonry with much brick decoration. Mt. Kyminas in the immediate vicinity contained important monastic settlements in the 9th–10th C.


-C.F.
ACOLYTE (ἀκόλουθος), the “follower” in a funerar cortège. Justinian’s novel 59, regulating the payment of funeral expenses out of the endowments of the Great Church, mentions akolouthoi among the various corporations that specialized in the performance of the necessary obsequies. There were to be three akolouthoi per cortège (asketron). The acolytes who constituted the lowest clerical order in the Roman church (H. Leclercq in DACL 1:348–56) apparently did not have a counterpart in Byz.

-P.M.

ACQUISITION. The most common legal means of obtaining property were transfer (Lat. traditio; Gr. paradosis), possession by prescriptive right (LONI TEMPORIS PRAESCRPTIO), occupatio, and acquisition ex lege. Property was obtained, for example, in fulfillment of a sale,- gift,- or dowry-contract through a physical transfer; from the time of Justinian I this transfer could take place informally, in contrast to the earlier formal act, the mancipatio. In case of a purchase (sale), payment had to accompany the transfer in order for the acquisition of the property to be complete. Occupatio, appropriation with the intent to keep the object as property, was the legal basis for the acquisition of an object which had no owner. Acquisition ex lege (i.e., an acquisition where the acquirer does not participate in the transaction), involved primarily the acquisition of an inheritance by the lawful heir of the testator. The acquisition of possession was based on the effective tenure of an object and by the wish to have it: corpore et animo (Gr. somati kai psyche, lit. “in body and soul”).

-M.Th.F.

ACRE, KINGDOM OF. After the Third Crusade recovered Acre from Saladin (12 July 1191) but failed to regain Jerusalem, Acre became the capital of the kings of Jerusalem and a major center for the production of Crusader art. John of Brienne was king there (1210–25) before becoming Latin emperor in Constantinople. Restricted to a coastal strip, the kingdom of Acre was dominated by Italian merchant communities in the cities. A conflict between Venetians and Genoese over a house belonging to the Church of St. Sabas in Acre (1256–70) drove Genoa to ally itself with Michael VIII, thereby facilitating his seizure of Constantinople. The Venetian-Genoese struggles, however, spread into Byz. waters, where much harm was done to Byz. Acre fell to the Mamluks on 18 May 1291.

LIT. Prawer, Royaume latin. -C.M.B.

ACROCORINTH. See CORINTH.

ACROSTIC (ἀκροστιχίς), a composition in prose or verse in which the initial letters of each section form a word, phrase, or alphabetic sequence. Acrostics are regularly found in hymns, both kontakia and kanones, where the first letters of each oikos, or verse, are linked to form the author’s name (e.g., Τοῦ Ρωμανοῦ), an indication of the subject matter (e.g., Εἰς τὸν ἱερόν Ρωμανὸν ἔπος), or to make an alphabet (as in the Akathistos Hymn); letters can be doubled to allow the text to expand (e.g., Εἰς τὸν Χρυσόσωστομὸν) and some phonetic spelling is permissible (e.g., ταπινόν). Alphabetic acrostics link chapters and entries in the gnomologia (see GNOME) and MIRRORS OF PRINCES, hortatory works to which are related a series of shorter penitential alphabets in prose and verse and in the vernacular as well as the learned languages (Krumbacher, GBL 717–20). Acrostics are found in secular enkomia, spelling the name of the recipient (e.g., in the works of Dioskoros of Aphroditó). Alphabetic acrostics are also used for love songs, as in the EROTOPAIGNIA.


-EMJ.

ACTA ARCHELAI, anti-Manichaean document in the form of a disputasion involving, on the Christian side, Archelas, bishop of Kaschara in Mesopotamia (ca.270), and for the Manichaeans Turbo and Mani himself. Although the dispute is certainly not historical, the text contains authentic documents and genuine tradition concerning MANICHEANISM. The Acta were written before 350 by an otherwise unknown Hegemonios and were cited by authors such as EPIPHERANIOS of Salamis and SORATES. Only a few fragments of the original Greek version survive, but the full text exists in a defective Latin translation.


v Rimskoj imperii po dannym Acta Archelai,” VDI, no.3 (1955) 168–79.

- T.E.G.

**ACTIONS (ἀγώναι).** Under the classical formulay procedure of Rome, actions were written statements of grievance (formulae) that were allotted to the parties by the praetor on the basis of their descriptions of the conflict, so that they could bring their lawsuit before the judge. The substantive claims set forth in this formal statement were closely connected with the relevant obligation; as a rule every obligatio had its own actio and, inversely, where there was no obligatio (see PACTA) there was no actio. With the elimination of the formulary system in 342 (Cod. Just. II 57.1), the procedural aspect of the action became irrelevant. Action became the name for the substantive claim (obligatio) that a plaintiff brought against a defendant. The name of the action had to be mentioned in the first sentence of the plaintiff’s writ (editio actionis). Consequently, lists were compiled of the names of actions; of these, only the work **De actionibus** from the 6th C. has been edited.

**Actions in the Post-Justinianic Period.** The Byz. developed a detailed system of classification of actions (e.g., Synopsis Basilicorum A. 24.1). In charters, however, the term (which is common) has a vague meaning of “claim,” with the connotation of an illegal procedure. It is used primarily in formulas assuring legal protection for a buyer or grantee against the seller (grantor) or a third person who was thus prohibited from initiating any claims concerning the transferred object (e.g., Iuvr. 1, no.3.19–20; Χένοφ., no.9.45, etc.). A document of 1377 (Lavra 3, no.148) describes a nomimos agoge (with no further definition) brought against the monastery; the plaintiffs eventually dropped the claim, refusing to turn to “any Christian agoge” that could assist them, and they subsequently guaranteed the property of the Lavra. There is a difference between the elaborate categorization of actions in legal texts and the simple interpretation of the agoge in documents as a claim in general.

- A.K.

**ACTOR.** In Roman law actors (Lat. histriones) and mimes were considered as belonging to an infamous profession and were classified with those whom the emperor expelled from the army for shameful behavior (Digest 9:2:1). Despite the defense of actors by some intellectuals (LIBANIOS, CHORIKIOS OF GAZA), this negative attitude toward actors prevailed in Byz.: clerics were forbidden not only to participate in performances, but even to see a show. Various decrees, secular and ecclesiastical alike (esp. the rules of the Council in TRULLO), restricted theatrical performances. As late as the 15th C. Manuel II characterized the theatrical show as typical of the Ottoman court and found it reprehensible. The principal accusation against actors was the sexual promiscuity allegedly characteristic of their way of life: musicians, dancers, and actors are frequently mentioned in the same context as prostitutes. Nevertheless, in the late Roman Empire actors were to be found everywhere; a law of 409 prevented local urban authorities from transferring actors, charioteers, and wild animals from their cities and thus lessening the appeal of popular festivities (Cod.Just. XI 41.5). With the decline of the theater, actors assumed the role of clowns and jesters.

- Ap.K., A.K.

**ACTS (Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων),** the historical portion of the New Testament that describes events after Christ’s Crucifixion. The Byz. unanimously considered Luke to be the author of the Acts, but MS tradition links it more closely to the Epistles than to the Gospels: among almost 3,000 uncial and minuscule MSS of the New Testament listed by K. Aland (Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments [Berlin 1969]), approximately 335 contain the Acts together with the Epistles, but without the Gospels, while only ten contain the Gospels and Acts without the Epistles. The major Byz. commentary on Acts is that of JOHN CHRYSOSTOM. A full exegesis of Acts was falsely attributed to the 10th-C. Thessalian bishop Oikoumenios—Beck (Kirche 418) dates it to the end of the 8th C. Another complete commentary, by THEOPHYLLAKTOS of Ohrid, draws upon that of Chrysostom. Other commentaries are known in fragments from CATENAЕ.

Chrysostom highly appreciated the book of Acts:
it is no less beneficial for us, he says (PG 60:13f),
than the Gospels, since it demonstrates the realiza-
tion (ergon) of what was prophesied by Christ
and presented in the Gospels. The book, he con-
tinues (col.15.15–16), related the acts of PAUL,
who labored more than any other; Chrysostom
completes his work with a panegyric of Paul.
Chrysostom’s interpretation of Acts is permeated
by his ethical ideals of poverty over wealth and
pious ignorance over pseudosophy; he uses
his material for attacks on theatrical perfor-
mances. The commentary of DIDYMOS THE BLIND,
on the other hand, emphasizes Christological
problems. Referring to Chrysostom, Didymos (PG
39:1672AB) discusses the contradiction
between Acts and Paul in the story of the miracle on the
road to Damascus. The contradiction is resolved
by pointing out that in one case the text states
that his companions heard Paul’s voice, while in
the other they saw only the light and did not hear
the voice of the Lord. Lecions from Acts (to-
gether with the Epistles) formed the liturgical
book called the PRAXAPOSTOLOS. Various APOC-
RYPHAL acts described the exploits of individual
apostles.

Acts Illustration. Illustration of Acts is rare in
Byz. art. In monumental painting, only the 21-
scene cycle in the narthex at Dečani (14th c.) in
Serbia illustrates Acts itself, rather than episodes
from hagiographical cycles, such as the scenes of
PETER and Paul at MONREALE. Only two MSS of
Acts—both 12th C.—contain anything more than
a prefatory portrait of its author, Luke: Paris,
B.N. gr. 102, fol. 7v (see Kessler, infra), has a grid
of four scenes—Peter and JOHN at the Beautiful
Gate, the martyrdom of JAMES, Peter liberated
from prison, and the stoning of Stephen—and
Chicago, Univ. Lib. 965, preserves 13 of its orig-
inal 19 framed illustrations. The earlier SACRA
PARALLELA contains 17 vignettes illustrating episo-
des from Acts. These four monuments, though
chronologically diverse, reveal consistencies in the
selection and interpretation of subject matter that
occur also in byzantinizing cycles from Italy and
indicate that a coherent Byz. tradition of Acts
illustration did exist. It was extensive, settling on
particular passages and illustrating them densely:
ASCENSION, PENTECOST, activities of Peter, Paul,
PHILIP, and Stephen. In contrast to the illustration
of hagiographical cycles, Acts illustration was strictly
canonical.

LIT. A.W. Carr, “Chicago 2400 and the Byzantine Acts
in Italy and Byzantium,” DOP 31 (1977) 253–78. H. Kess-
ler, “Paris. gr. 102: A Rare Illustrated Acts of the Apostles,”
DOP 27 (1973) 209–16.

—J.I., A.K., A.W.C.

ACTS, DOCUMENTARY, documents of a for-
mal nature, preserved in original or in copy, and
varying according to their author and the nature
and importance of the question they concern.

Physical Characteristics. Normally acts were
written on PAPYRUS, PARCHMENT, or PAPER in black
or brown INK; emperors (and later despotai) used
purple ink for their signatures (and for some
other words, esp. in CHRYSOBULLS); the SEBASTO-
KRATORS and KAESARS used blue ink, the proto-
vestiarios green ink. Purple parchment, use of
gold or silver ink, and documents with miniatures
(12th, 14th C.) or with decorated initials (12th C.)
are rare. The script varies. In the 10th–12th C. a
notarial script is typical of official chanceries. Nor-
mally acts were written in Greek; the language
varies from moderately educated (chanceries) to
popular (some private deeds). Letters of foreign
relations were written in other languages (above
all in Latin) or were accompanied by translations
(few mentions of cryptographic or coded letters
survive). The contents of the document were
guaranteed by the author’s autograph signature
at the bottom, or by his protaxis, i.e., writing his
name at the top of the document; if the author
was illiterate, protaxis and subscription could be
replaced by a signon, i.e., an autograph cross in
the quarters of which the notary wrote the au-
тор’s name and titles. Some public documents
and most private ones bear also the signatures
(autograph, if possible) of witnesses and, if one
took part, of the tabellion or taboullarios (see No-
tary) who signed as a privileged witness. In some
cases, the transaction was further confirmed by
the signature of a bishop or an official, obviously
with the hope that thus the document would re-
ceive public fides. The authenticity of the docu-
ment was also guaranteed by a SEAL, hanging from
a string of variable value and color at the bottom
of an open document or securing a folded one:
the seals were made of gold (only the emperor),
of silver (rare; some despotai), lead and wax (gen-
eral use, including emperors and despotai). Several
annotations also survive; their interpretation is
not always sure: recognition that the contents of
the act reflect what was intended to be said; registration; or monocondyles on the place where two different sheets were glued together. Major chanceries had secret signs guaranteeing the authenticity of their acts, such as having the final word (kratos) of the chrysobulls written at the beginning of a line; other secrets of the patriarchal chancery (place of seal, way of folding, etc.) are described in the ΕΚΔΙΚΗ ΝΕΑ.

Composition. Most acts contain some (if not all) of the following parts. At the very beginning (protocol) and at the very end (eschatocol) of the document are formulas and pieces of information identifying author, addressee, and date. At the beginning is an invitatio, usually to the Holy Trinity; the intitulatio, with the name and titles of the author (emperors, patriarchs, certain officials) or the prooimion or signon (in private deeds); eventually indication of the addressees (inscriptio). The date is part of the protocol in certain documents, such as excerpts from decisions of the synod, some acts of public officials (until the 11th C.), as well as some private deeds of the late Roman period and, in southern Italy, of the 10th–14th C. Justinian I required a ready-made protocol with the date on which it was drafted. The eschatocol contains the date on which the document was written (edraphe) or issued (datum, Gr. apelythe) and the subscription(s). The date is expressed according to one of several chronologies: by consular years (until the 8th C.), regnal years (introduced in 537 and still used in the 11th C. in Italy), anno mundi (year of the creation), and indiction. The body of the act is composed of the prooimion (arena), a rhetorical introduction with philosophical and/or political considerations; the exposition of the affair (narratio); the decision or arrangement or order (dispositio); eventual spiritual or temporal sanctions for recalcitrants; and special clauses.

Probatory Value. The value of an act as evidence was limited, since its authenticity and validity could be contested at any time. An act of a state authority (instrumentum publicum) could be contested by the state itself (e.g., the privileges granted by an authentic imperial chrysobull would not be recognized by the authorities unless the chrysobull had been registered in time at the appropriate government services). An individual, however, could contest only its formal authenticity and bore the onus of proof. In the absence of notarial records (minutes) with probatory value, the diplomatic authenticity as well as the contents of private deeds could be contested in court. In such cases proof had to be brought in order to support them: testimony of the parties themselves, witnesses (including, first of all, the taboularios who drafted the deeds), judicial oaths, and graphological examination of the signatures (for the deceased).

Types of Acts. All chanceries and public or ecclesiastical authorities issued simple letters (grammata pitakia; see PITTAKIA), which, when sealed, were called sigillia. The imperial chancery also issued chrysobulls, edicts, novels (novellae), pragmaticae sanctiones, sacrae (sakrai), prolegomena, prooimia, horismoi, rescripta, lysis, etc. Horismoi and parakaleseis were also issued by despotai and other state or church dignitaries (caesars, patriarchs); entalmata, semeiomata, and hypomnemata were documents typical of the patriarchal chancery and of that of public servants, who also issued fiscal acts, such as apographia grammata, prakateria, periorismoi, isokodia (see KODIA), etc. All kinds of private documents survive: wills, deeds confirming sales, exchanges, and donations as well as documents that offer guarantees, make special agreements, etc.


ADAM AND EVE, the original ancestors of humankind, occupied an important place in Byz. theological doctrine. Adam (Ἀδάμ), whose name was interpreted as “man” or “earth,” was created perfect, but committed grave sin (original sin) by his own free will; his sin was considered more serious than that of Eve (Ευώ). Adam’s sin led to the loss of grace and to death, but Christ came to redeem his fall. Thus Christ was proclaimed a Second Adam, and Adam the prefiguration (typos) of Christ—either through similarity (created without human father) or in contrast (obedience versus disobedience, damnation versus salvation). Exegesis ascribed double prefigurative significance to Eve: as the typos of the church, since she was created from Adam’s rib and the church emerged from the open wound of Christ on the Cross, and as an antithesis to the Virgin Mary.
Representation in Art. Adam and Eve are depicted already at the Christian building at Dura Europos and play a significant role in art of the pre-Justinianic period, culminating in extensive cycles in the illustrated Cotton and Vienna Genesis MSS. Later they continue to occur in cycles which presumably reflect early models, such as the illustrated Octateuchs, the nave mosaics of the Cappella Palatina at Palermo and the cathedral at Monreale, and the narthex mosaics at S. Marco in Venice. Brief cycles, closely related iconographically, also appear on ivory caskets (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinschopf. I, e.g., nos. 67–69, 84), where their function is unclear. From the 9th C., the Anastasis provided an important new context for Adam and Eve with the youthful Adam of Genesis now a white-bearded patriarch; from the 12th C. the idealized features of Eve become lined and wrinkled.


ADDALI, DOCTRINE OF. See Doctrine of Addai.

ADDRESS, FORMS OF, various modes of exclamation, appeal, harangue, and greeting, preserved primarily in letters (both papyri and collections) as well as in documents and speeches; on rare occasions narrative texts preserve traces of formulas of oral address while recreating dialogues. Ziliacus (infra) suggests that in the 4th–6th C. a radical change in the form of addressing people took place, because of the bureaucratization of society, on the one hand, and its christianization, on the other. “Classicizing” authors, such as Libanius and Julian, retain the traditional literary forms of address: agathe, anthrope, kale, etc. In the papyri of the 5th–6th C., however, ancient forms of address practically disappear, being replaced by pious epithets (theotimatos, theophylaktos) or complicated adjectives with prefixes pan- and hyper-. The usage of the pluralis reverentiae ("plural of reverence"), unknown in the Christian milieu before the 4th C., was established thereafter, and from the 5th C. onward it became the rule in addressing the emperor. Some ancient epithets (philos, philatos, etc.) continued to be used throughout the Byz. period, while at the same time formulaic addresses were established: the emperor was "your majesty" (basileia sou), the bishop, "the most holy lord" (hagiota despoa). Terms of family relationship, father, brother, nephew, were also common, strictly distinguishing the type of connection between the correspondents. Platonizing forms of address (a laugurte) continue in works of high style until the end of the empire.


ADELPHATON (adelephaton), a "fellowship" in a monastery, which provided the holder (adelphatarios) with a living allowance (stipersia) for life. An adelphantos was normally granted in return for a gift of immovables or money (100 nomismata was the going rate in the 14th C.—N. Oikonomides in Dionys. 59) and guaranteed in a contract between the monastery and the beneficiary. Adelphata might also, however, be in the gift of the monastery’s patron, as with the adelphantos at the Mangana, which Manuel I gave to Manganeios Prodromos. There were two categories of adelphantarios: esomonitai, who joined the monastic community in some capacity, and esomonitai, who continued to live outside it. The institution is first attested in the 11th C. It always aroused some disapproval because it was seen to involve and encourage simony and lack of commitment to the monastic life; hence periodic attempts to restrict it to esomonitai, to keep it nonheritable, and even, in some monastic typika, to prohibit it altogether (e.g., Typikon of Charsianites, EEB 45 [1981–82] 491ff, 497. 510).


ADELPHOPPOIA (adelephopoia), the adoption of a brother or sister. Like adoption and baptismal sponsorship (see Godparents), with which it is always mentioned in treatises on prohibited degrees of marriage, adelphoporia was considered a spiritual relationship between two people, cre-
ated by the prayers of a ritual (Goar, *Euchologion* 706–8). Unlike these other spiritual relationships, however, *adelphia* was not recognized by civil or canon law and was therefore inconsequential with regard to rights of inheritance and marriage impediments (Demetrios Chomatenos, ed. Pitra, cols. 31–32, 726–26; John Pediasmios, ed. A. Schminck, *FM* 1 [1976] 156.375–81). A statement in the *Peira* (49.11), however, indicates that *adelphia* could be acknowledged as creating a marriage impediment between the two people who had contracted the tie. Repeated prohibitions against *adelphia*, including those in monastic *typik* show that the practice was widespread. *Adadelphia* was contracted by members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (e.g., the patriarch Thomas I of Constantinople [607–10] and Theodore of Sykeon: *Life of Theodore of Sykeon*, ed. Festugière, 106.1–6). It could confirm a friendship, as in the case of Romanos IV Diogenes and Nikephoros Bryennios (An.Komm. 2:196.10–16) and carried with it an obligation of mutual help and support (e.g., Danelis’s son John and Basil I: *TheophCont* 228.6–7).


**ADLOCUTIO** (lit. “address”), public address of the emperor to his soldiers or the civilian populace, usually at the conclusion of a campaign. Two depictions of *adlocutio* survive from the period of the Tetrarchy. On the Arch of Galerius in Thessalonike the emperor stands frontally on a platform in the center of the composition and addresses his army, represented by cavalry and footsoldiers assembled on both sides of him. On a relief on the Arch of Constantine in Rome the emperor proclaims to the Roman citizens the new era to follow his victory over Maxentius (312). He stands on the Rostra in the Forum Romanum and is flanked by senators on either side. In both reliefs the viewer, because of the symmetry of the composition and the frontality of the emperor, becomes the direct recipient of the imperial message. These are the latest extant examples in monumental art; the last-known numismatic representation of *adlocutio* is on a silver medallion of Constantine I dated to 315. Thereafter the subject disappears from the repertoire of Late Antique art.


**ADMIRAL**. See Ameralios.

**ADMONITION** (παραίνεσις, νουθεσία, νουθέτησις), a genre of didactic literature. To designate its products, Gregory of Nazianzos and John Chrysostom used the term *parainetikos* (other church fathers considered parts of the Bible “paraenetic”), while Kekaumenos used the title *logos nouthetikos* for a section of his work, going back to Xenophon and to the theoretician of rhetoric, Demetrios (both 4th C. b.c.). Byz. “paraenetic” speech differed from late Roman deliberative oratory (Kennedy, *Rhetoric* 19–23) in that it was ethically rather than politically oriented and was presented in written form. The *basilikos logos*, a kind of *enkomiion*, in fact contained substantial elements of admonition. So did the Mirrors of Princes, as indicated by the title *kephalaia parainetika* of the *Mirror* attributed to Emp. Basil I. In the 11th and 12th C. admonitions were produced addressing various sectors of society (e.g., the so-called *Strategikon* by Kekaumenos, Spanias): biblical and ancient precepts were mixed with contemporary anecdotes, and the language was plain and even close to the vernacular. The paraenetic genre flourished in the monastic milieu from the 4th C. onward and usually affected the standard language: *Chapters* (*kephalaia*) of sentences (*gnomai*) inculcated rules of ascetic conduct, sermons had a didactic purpose, and *hagiography* also aimed at ethical indoctrination.


**ADNOMUIASTES** (ἄδνομμαστης), always used with the epithet *megas*, described by a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 250.13–20) as a subaltern of the *megas domestikos*; his function was to issue horses and weapons to soldiers. In documents from 1290 onward the *megas adnoumi-
ADNOUMION (αδνούμιον, from Lat. ad nomen), an annual census and mobilization to enumerate and inspect soldiers of the provincial armies (the mata). The Life of St. Philaretos the Merciful, referring to a campaign against the Arabs in the later 8th C., describes an adnoumion at which soldiers were expected to present themselves with their horse and weapons (ed. M.-H. Fourmy, M. Leroy, Byzantium 9 [1934] 125-34-127.26). The 10th-C. De re militari (ed. Dennis, Military Treatises 320.3-322.41) recommends general adnoumia before and after campaigns to maintain accurate records of available manpower and equipment. The muster-lists recording these totals were kept at the bureau of the logothetes tou stratiotikou. The megas adnoumistas, marshaller, was in the 14th C. responsible for horses and equipment; he assisted the megas domestikos during the display of troops (pseudo-Kod. 250.13-20); the sign of his office was a silver staff with a dove on its haft.

LIT. Ahrweiler, Structures, pt.VIII (1960), 8f. —E.M.

ADOMNAN or Adamnan of Hy, Irish churchman and writer; abbot on the island of Iona, the Inner Hebrides (from 679); born ca.624, died 23 Sept. 704. His works, in Latin, include a treatise On the Holy Places (De locis sanctis), written before 686 or 688. It relies chiefly on eyewitness testimony dictated by Arculf, bishop of an unidentified see in Gaul, whose ship was blown off course and landed on Britain's west coast. Arculf visited the Holy Land in or before 683 or 684, traveled to Alexandria and from there, via Crete, to Constantinople, where he stayed for some eight months. He then sailed to Rome, probably via Sicily (whence his information on travel conditions, e.g., 211.8-10, 221.20-21, 222.8-10). Book 1, on the churches (Arculf sketched plans preserved in later MSS) and relics (E. Nestle, BZ 4 [1895] 338-42) of Jerusalem and its environs, is based almost exclusively on Arculf's nine-month stay there, while book 2's description of other sites depends more on written sources: e.g., the bustling shipping at Alexandria (223.55-60) is borrowed from "Hegesippus." Book 3 relates information Arculf collected in Constantinople on the city's legendary foundation (227.2-36), on Iconoclastic incidents involving an icon of St. George and its cult among the army at Diospolis, and on an icon of the Virgin (229.1-231.58, 233.1-31). It also describes Arculf's impression of Hagia Sophia (J. Strzygowski, BZ 10 [1901] 704f) and the ceremony of the veneration of the relic of the cross by the emperor and his court (228.21-38).


ADOPTIANISM, Christologies that depict Christ as a man whom God assumes or adopts as his Son, either at his baptism or resurrection. The adoption may be likened to the Servant of God in Deutero-Isaiah, or to the bestowal of the spirit on the Old Testament prophets. Or, it may conform to certain Hellenistic concepts (e.g., apophaticism) often associated with docetic or Gnostic views (see Gnosticism). All of these forms share a strictly monothestic conception of God, and for that reason they have been viewed in connection with Monarchianism. Adoptianism, in contrast to Modalism, retains the transcendence of God the Father while the Son is solely a reality within history, and the Spirit, in the history of salvation, is the unique gift of God, but not God himself.

To the extent that the Christology of the Antiochene School emphasized the full reality of Jesus' humanity, it could easily tend toward Adoptionism, as confirmed in Paul of Samosata (condemned in 268: H. de Riedmatten, Les actes du procès de Paul de Samosate [Fribourg 1952]). Later Antiochenes (Diodoros of Tarsos, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorios), however, established their notions on the basis of the consubstantiality (see Homoousios) of the Father and the Son/Logos. Nevertheless, in their Christology they preferred
ADOPTION (victoria). In Byz. legal practice adoption did not establish patria potestas; the adopted child/adult could inherit from an adoptive parent only if the latter died intestate (Epaphroditos aucta 15.9) or expressly designated the adopted child as heir (Sathas, MB 6:628-31). Leo VI extended the right to adopt to eunuchs and unmarried women (novs. 26, 27) and stipulated that an ecclesiastical blessing, not any civil procedure, was to be the essential constitutive act of adoption (nov. 24; Balsamon in commentary on canon 53 of Trullo—Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:429-31). Adoption thus became a spiritual relationship “above those of the flesh,” like baptismal sponsorship (see Godparent) with which it shared a common terminology and similar marriage impediments. From notarial contract formulas and case histories it emerges that children were given up for adoption by widows/widowers who could not afford to raise their offspring, while children were adopted by childless couples in order to obtain descendants and heirs. Michael Psellos' adoption of a daughter is the best documented case (A. Leroy-Molinghen, Byzantion 39 [1969] 284-317). Couples with children of their own might also adopt (D. Simon, S. Tróianos, FM 2 [1977] 276-83; G. Ferrari, Bollettino dell'Istituto storico italiano 33 [1913] 65, 81ff). A series of (proposed) adoptions by childless imperial couples in the 11th C. indicates a desire to provide an heir to the throne (Zoe's adoption of Michael [V] Kalaphates, nephew of her husband Michael IV), but also an attempt to forestall coups by their prospective adopted sons (Michael VI's adoption of Isaac Komnenos; Nikephoros Botaneiates' adoption of Nikephoros Bryennios).

In painting, the legitimization of patriarchy was expressed by the act of holding an adopted child upon the “father’s” knees. Probably derived from images of Abraham and Lazarus, as in the París Gregory (Omont, Miniatures, pl.XXIV), by the 11th C. this pose was used for the “Ancient of Days” (see Christ) and, from the 12th C., in images of the Trinity. A political extension of

the motif occurs in the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes (Papadopoulos, infra, figs. 1, 2) where both foreign princes adopted by the emperor and Byz. adopted by foreign rulers are shown on the knees of their “parents.”

A.DORATION OF THE MAGI. According to Matthew 2:1-12, the Magi (Magi) led by a star arrived at Jerusalem in search of the child who was born to become the Messiah or the king of the Jews; they were directed to Bethlehem, found Mary and Jesus, paid homage to him, and gave him three gifts: gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Matthew says only that they came from the Orient; some church fathers (e.g., Epiphanius) considered them as coming from Arabia, others (Diodoros of Tarsos, Cyril of Alexandria) from Persia, and others (e.g., the 5th-C. theologian Theodotus of Ankyra—PG 77:1364C) from Chaldaea. The number of the Magi was usually stated as three (primarily on the basis of the number of gifts), but the Syrian and Armenian tradition counts a dozen Magi. Later exegetes invented various names for the Magi; thus the 12th-C. writer Zacharias of Chrysopolis (Besançon in France) writes that their Greek names were Apellius, Amerus, and Damascus, meaning faithful, humble, and merciful, respectively (PL 186:83D).

Identified as kings already in the 3rd C., the Magi were interpreted as symbols of the conversion of the Gentiles, and so figured prominently in Early Christian art. As in Matthew, they were at first depicted as approaching the enthroned Virgin and Child, independent of the scene of the Nativity. Frequent pairings of the Adoration and Nativity on sarcophagus lids, ivories, and ampullae proclaim their common theme (the theophany of the Incarnation), not their narrative unity. The Adoration appears independently of the Nativity still in certain 11th-12th-C. monuments (churches in Göreme; Daphne) and, more frequently, in Palaiologan imagery influenced by the Akathistos Hymn. Usually, however, post-
Iconoclastic art integrates the Adoration and even the journey and departure of the Magi with the Nativity, because the Magi were commemorated on Christmas. Their original Persian costume is later assimilated to that of Old Testament priests; they mount horses, acquire names (Melchior, Balthasar, Kaspar) representing three races descending from Noah, and are extensively depicted in the frieze Gospels. A homily by John of Euboea in Jerusalem, Gr. Patr. Taphou 14 (11th C.) and Athos, Esphig. 14 (12th C.) (Treasures II figs. 342–392), is illustrated with 17 images of the Magi, many of them otherwise unparalleled.


**ADRAMYTTON.** See Atramyttion.

**ADRIANOPE** ('Αδριανόπολις, also Orestias, mod. Edirne), city in Thrace on the middle Hεbros River (navigable from Adrianople to the sea) and on the major military road Belgrade-Sofia-Constantinople. It was an important stronghold protecting Constantinople from invasions from the north, but is rarely mentioned as an administrative center: the 10th-C. Taktikon of Escurial lists the doux of Adrianople immediately after that of Thessalonike; in the 1040s the magistros Constantine Arianites held that position (Skyl. 458.48–49). As a bishopric Adrianople is known from the end of the 4th C., but its place in the ecclesiastical hierarchy declined from 27th in the 7th C. to 40th in the 10th C., despite its growing number of suffragans—from 5 to 11 (Laurent, Corpus 5:1:544). A center of the Macedonian nobility, esp. in the 11th and 12th C., Adrianople produced at least three usurpers: Leo Tornikios, Nikephoros Bryennios, and Alexios Branias; on the other hand, Macedonian troops supported Constantinople against eastern generals during the revolts of Nikephoros Phokas and Isaac Komnenos. In the 14th C. the demos of Adrianople became active, and in 1343 its revolt preceded the outbreak of the Zealots in Thessalonike.

Located at the intersection of important strategic routes, Adrianople was often the center of military activity: on 3 July 324 Constantine I defeated Licinius near Adrianople, on 9 August 378 Valens was routed here by the Goths (see Adria-

**ADRIANOPE, BATTLE OF**, in 586 the Avars besieged Adrianople in vain. In the 9th-10th C. Adrianople was a strong point in wars against the Bulgarians: Emp. Nikephoros I reportedly appointed an Arab experienced in “mechanics” to help defend the city, but to no avail (Theoph. 498.7–11); both Krum and Symeon managed to seize Adrianople temporarily. In the 11th C. resistance to the Pechenegs was based at Adrianople. Frederick I Barbarossa occupied the city and in 1190 signed there a treaty with Constantinople. Kalojan defeated Baldwin I of Constantinople at Adrianople on 14 Apr. 1205. In the 13th C. the city changed hands several times, being captured by the armies of Nicaea, Epirus, and Bulgaria. John III Vatatzes established Nicaean rule over Adrianople in 1242–46. In 1307 the Catalan Grand Company besieged it. Turkish begs seized it probably ca.1369, but the Ottoman sultan Murad I did not enter Adrianople before the winter of 1376–77 (I. Steinheir-Beldiceanu, TM 1 [1965] 439–61). It served as the Ottoman capital until their capture of Constantinople in 1453.

Hagia Sophia, an important domed quatrefoil church of the 5th–6th C., with ambulatories and galleries, was photographed in the 19th C., but no longer exists (N. Mavrodinov, 6 CEB, vol. 2 [Paris 1951] 286–90).


**ADRIANOPE, BATTLE OF**, the scene of a major defeat of the Roman army by the Goths on 9 Aug. 378. In 376 the Goths, under pressure from the Huns, crossed the Danube, probably in the area of DOROSTOLON, and were allowed to settle as foederati on Roman territory. Harsh treatment by Roman officials led the Goths to rebel, and some common people from Adrianople joined them. In 377 Valens left Antioch for Constantinople and sought assistance from Gratian, the emperor in the West. Valens led his troops to Adrianople, while Gratian's army was marching from Gallia to Sirmium. Relying on false reconnaissance information that the Gothic force was only 10,000 strong, Valens decided to launch an attack before the arrival of the Western army. Fritigern, the Gothic commander, sent envos
proposing an eternal peace treaty, but his overtures were rejected. The Roman cavalry, which at first attacked successfully, was soon exhausted, and the counterattack of Ostrogothic and Alan mounted warriors destroyed the Roman infantry. Valens stood firm for a while, with his select infantry, but then had to retreat.

The defeat was overwhelming; probably only a third of the Roman army was able to escape, and Valens was killed. According to one version, he was killed by an arrow, his body was stripped on the spot and later could not be recognized; another version relates that he was wounded, brought to a hut, and burned with the hut by his pursuers. Even though Fritigern was unable to take Adrianople, the Goths rampaged all over Thrace and reached the walls of Constantinople; only lavish gifts diverted them from the siege of the city. At news of the defeat, Gratian recalled his troops to the upper Rhine. Orthodox tradition connects Valens' defeat with his Arius persuasion.


- A. K.

ADRIATIC SEA (Ἀδριατικὸν πέλαγος), the narrow waterway extending north of the Ionian Sea from the Straits of Otranto; it lies between Italy on the west and Dalmatia on the east. Along the Italian coast there are few harbors between BARI and RAVENNA, and steep mountains rise along the eastern shore, but there are many islands and harbors on this side, with major entrepôts at ZARA, DUBROVNIK, and DYRRACHION. At the northern end of the Adriatic Sea are AQUILEIA and VENICE. Byz. maintained control of most of the cities along the east coast until the late 11th C., despite Slavic settlement and Arab raids as far north as Dubrovnik. The developing maritime power of Venice, from the 11th C. onward, made the Adriatic Sea a virtual Venetian lake.


- T. E. G.

ADSCRIPTICII (ἐναπόγραφοι, “registered”), landless cultivators recorded in census registers under the name of the owner on whose estate they lived and who was responsible for their tax liabilities; the term first appears in 451 (ACO, tom. II, vol. 1, pt. 2:353.9). Tenant adscripticii formed one type of coloni, but adscript status also encompassed some agricultural slaves and day laborers. Children of adscripticii normally inherited this status, while free proprietors could become adscripticii by alienating all their land or possibly through patrocinium vicorum. According to 5th- and 6th-C. legal texts, the condition of adscripticii approximated that of slavery (Cod. Just. XI 48.21): they could not possess personal property nor in most cases sue their masters (Cod. Just. XI 48.19; XI 50.1–2), they could not leave the land nor could an estate be sold without the adscripticii attached to it, and they could marry or receive ordination only with their master’s consent (Cod. Just. I 3.36). In reality, their condition might differ substantially from such legal prescriptions; some 6th-C. Egyptian adscripticii not only owned personal property, but even entered into contractual agreements with their landlord (P.Oxy. 1896). The adscripticii disappeared during the 7th C., although the term occurs anachronistically in later law codes (e.g., Ecloga ad Proceiron mutata 10.15).


- A. J. C.

ADULIS (Ἄδουλις), an Axumite trading city and episcopal see, located at the foot of the bay south-east of Massawa on the Red Sea coast of Abyssinia. It was visited by Kosmas Indikopleustes, who transmits (2.49–50, 54–65) the Greek text of a victory inscription of Ptolemy III Euergetes from a monument there, a copy of which was requested by Elesboam from the ruler of Adulis. The bishop of Adulis attended the Council of Chalcedon. Archaeological excavation has unearthed Axumite coins and the remains of a church with a semicircular apse. The city appears to have been destroyed by the Arab navy in the early 8th C.

ADULTERY (μοιχεία), or marital infidelity, was contrasted with fornication or illicit sexual intercourse; Gregory of Nyssa (PG 45:228C) defined porneia as the satisfaction of desire without offending another person, whereas moicheia is "a plot (epiboule) and injury (adikia)." On the ladder of sins described in the vita of BASIL THE YOUNGER, the toll houses for moicheia and porneia were positioned separately (ed. Veselovskij 1:31.28, 33.16). Some authors, however, equated fornication and adultery, since the only permissible union was in marriage. Canon law condemned adultery; both porneia and moicheia were considered as grounds for divorce, whereafter remarriage of the aggrieved partner was permissible.

Late Roman civil law introduced severe measures against adultery. In his law of 326 Constantine I (Cod. Just. IX 9.29.4) established the death penalty for adultery for both the guilty parties. Justinian I (nov. 134.10) retained the principle of Constantine's legislation but emphasized the possibility of reconciliation of the married couple: within a two-year period the marriage could be restored, but if the husband died before the end of this period, the adulterous wife was to be confined in a monastery for life. The Ecloga (17.27) introduced mutilation (cutting-off of noses) as the punishment for both men and women who committed adultery, and the Procheiron—in overt contradiction of Christian morality—allowed the husband to murder his wife's lover if they were caught in flagrante delicto (Hunger, Grundlagenforschung, pt.XI [1967], 311). It is difficult to judge to what extent these strict laws were applied in practice: many conflicts of this kind were probably resolved within the family, as described in the vita of MARY THE YOUNGER, who was beaten by her husband on suspicion of infidelity. Cuckolds were mocked and deer antlers used as a symbol of their disgrace (Nik.Chon. 322.55–59). Adultery by men seems to have been rarely punished in actuality.

Adultery could lead to property problems. According to novel 32 of Leo VI the husband of an adulterous wife was to receive her dowry as a "consolation" for his dishonor; her remaining property was to be divided between her children and the convent to which she retired.

The history of imperial adultery suggests certain changes in Byz. attitudes toward marital infidelity: Constantine VI's open adultery provoked the Moechian Controversy, and Leo VI's infidelity with Zoe, daughter of Stylianos Zaoutzes, initially had to be concealed; in the 11th C., however, Constantine IX overtly kept his mistress Skleraina in the palace. In the 12th C. Manuel I and Andronikos I officially promoted their illegitimate children.


—J.H., A.K.

ADVENTUS (ἀπώντησις), ceremonial arrival rooted in ancient society and religion. Although Byz. adventus ceremonies were held to greet bishops, officials, and saints' relics, the most spectacular adventus welcomed the emperor into a city. The two main ritual elements of adventus were the occasus (synanthesis, hypantesis, etc.) of a delegation out of a city to welcome the arriving party and its escort (propompe) into the city. The point of encounter was carefully defined (e.g., De cer. 495.1–15), since distance from the city and the delegation's composition symbolized the participants' relationship. Acclamations or existeroi poems (e.g., on Agnes of France), panegyrics, incense, lights, and crown offerings were traditional components of Byz. imperial adventus ceremonies. The route of the processions was decorated, included a visit to a shrine, and might have concluded with a banquet. Because the adventus expressed the bonds between the welcoming community and arriving emperor, it took on a deeper meaning as a demonstration of loyalty and consensus, particularly at an emperor's first entry, for example, Nikephoros II Phokas (De cer. 437.20–440.11). This made adventus important in imperial propaganda and explains its role in art and on coins. The adventus of an imperial fiancée lent unusual prominence to aristocratic women, for example, Irene, the bride of Leo IV (Theoph. 444.15–19; cf. pseudo-Kod. 286f). The ceremony was also adapted to other circumstances such as triumphs or conditional surrenders.

—M. McC.

Representation in Art. Depictions of the adventus ceremonies in Byz. art are very few. The monumental Arch of Galerius in Thessalonike and the Arch of Constantine in Rome show the standard Roman iconography: the emperor arriving in a chariot accompanied by cavalry and foot soldiers. On the silver largitio dish of Constantius II and on several commemorative medallions,
one as late as Justinian I, the scene is abbreviated, showing the emperor on horseback, led by a Nike figure and followed by a soldier. A fresco in the Church of St. Demetrios in Thessalonike, probably depicting the adventus of Emp. Justinian I into that city, is the last surviving representation commemorating a contemporary event. The two examples from the 11th C. usually interpreted as depictions of adventus deviate from the earlier examples. On a silk wall hanging in Bamberg a mounted emperor is flanked by two Tyché figures who present him with a crown and a helmet. More problematical is a scene on the ivory casket in Troyes, since the two emperors shown may be riding away in opposite directions from a fortified city placed in the center; it may depict a departure ceremony (PROFECTIO). Of a different nature are the miniatures of triumphal entries in the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes, since they illustrate a historical narrative and thus are not commemorative. Usually these show the emperors mounted and accompanied by horsemen approaching a city. The miniature depicting the triumphal arrival of John I Tzimiskes in Constantinople (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzes, no. 449) shows an icon of the Virgin and Child on a wagon leading the procession.


AEDICULARA (Lat., lit. “small building”), the architectural frame of an opening (door, window, or niche), consisting of two columns or pilasters supporting a pediment; more specifically a shrine framed by two or four columns supporting an entablature, a pediment, an arch, or a roof. The motif, commonly used in Roman architecture and popular in 5th- and 6th-C. Syria (e.g., the Praetorium at PHAINA) and Egypt (e.g., the White Monastery, or Deir-el-Abiad at SOHAG), was modified in Byz. From the 10th C. onward, the aedicula played a major role in the articulation of the TEMPLON screen, where it was often used for framing icons of Christ, the Virgin, and saints. These usually appeared in pairs, referred to as PROSKYNETARIA, that flanked the main section of the temple, as in the Theotokos Church at Hosios Loukas, at NEREZI, and at the CHORA. The aedicula continued to be used in a more general decorative role, albeit less frequently, during the last centuries of Byz. architecture, for example, in the squinches under the main dome of the Paregoretissa at ARTA.


AEGEAN SEA (Ἄγαιον πέλαγος), the Byz. mare internum between Asia Minor, Greece, and Crete, characterized by a rugged coastline and many islands that differ widely in size, physical condition, and economy. The larger islands seem to have been more densely populated than the smaller ones, at least in the later period (J. Koder, ByzF 5 [1977] 232f). Some islands (Crete, Lesbos, Lemnos) were rich in agricultural products, and in the later period the northern islands supplied Mt. Athos with grain; at the beginning of the 12th C. the pilgrim DANIIL IGUMEN from Rus’ was surprised by the amount of livestock on the Aegean islands.

The natural protection of the islands made them into places of refuge during the Slavo-Avar invasion (S. Hood, BSA 65 [1970] 37–45), even though some Slav boats penetrated to individual islands. The Arab onslaught changed the situation, esp. when in the 820s they seized Crete—some islands (like Paros) were deserted and only occasional hermits inhabited them. From the 10th C. onward the Byz. constructed numerous fortresses to guard the islands: they were built on high rocks protected by nature and fortified with massive walls (H. Eberhard, JÖB 36 [1968] 188). Malamut (infra) suggested that in the 11th–12th C. the islands prospered economically, whereas Wirth (infra) noted that from the late 11th C. onward they were virtually dependent on Venice.

In late antiquity the islands were divided between the provinces of Achaia and Insulae (Islands); by the late 7th C. some were put under the command of the strategos of the KARABISANOI and later included in the theme of the KIBYRHIOTAI. The 9th-C. TAKTIKON OF Uspenskij (55, 18–19) mentions the droungarioi of the Aegean Sea and of the Kolpos; according to Ahrweiler (Mer 77–81), the territory was divided into
two administrative units—the Aegean Sea in the north, and Kolpos, centered around Samos and including most of the Cyclades. The vita of David, Symeon, and George of Mytilene mentions the strategos of the island [of Lesbos], but the extent of his power is unknown. In the late 11th C. the theme of Kyklades was administered by a krites; it included Chios, Kos, Karpathos, and Ikaria. In the 12th C. Rhodes, Chios, and Kos were separated from the theme, and each governed by a doux. In 1198 a province called “Dodecanese” is known, with its center probably in Naxos.

After 1204 most of the southern Aegean Sea fell under Venetian control, while the islands along the coast of Asia Minor were retained by the Latin Empire. The campaign of Licario against Euboea in 1275–76 restored much of the Aegean to Byz. control, although the duchy of Naxos maintained Latin power on that island and Andros. By the end of the 13th C., however, the Byz. navy had collapsed and the islands were lost to the Venetians, Genoese, the Hospitallers, and Turkish pirates.


AELIA CAPITOLINA. See Jerusalem.

AELIANUS, CLAUDIUS, Roman rhetorician who wrote in Greek; born Praeneste ca.170, died ca.235. His On the Characteristics of Animals, an unsystematic collection of largely paradoxical animal stories, was a major source of Byz. zoological lore used by writers in many genres and esp. by Theophilos of Gaza (the 12th-C. paraphrase of whose work contains 32 parallels), Theophylaktos Simokattes, John Tzetzes, Michael Glykas, Manuel Philes (J.F. Kindstrand, SItalCf 4 [1986] 119–39), and various anonymous zoological exerptors. A new Byz. edition, represented by the 15th-C. MS Florence, Laur. 86.8, rearranged the stories thematically. The surviving MSS of Aelianus’s Miscellaneous Stories (Varia Historia), a similar collection of mainly human anecdotes, transmit a Byz. epitome of a fuller text that was known to Stobaios, the Souda, Psellus, and Eustathios of Thessalonike. Aelianus’s 20 surviving Letters of imaginary peasants were uninfluential but are contained in two independent MSS of the 10th and 15th C. On Providence and On Divine Truths, attributed to Aelianus by the Souda, are probably alternative titles of a single stoicizing treatise now lost. Aelianus is almost certainly to be distinguished from the author of the Tactics, a work seldom used in Byz. scholarship.


AELIUS ARISTIDES. See Aristides, Ailios.

AER (ἐρή). The largest of three liturgical veils, the aer was carried in the Great Entrance procession and placed over the eucharistic elements after their deposition on the altar. Liturgical commentaries interpret the aer as the shroud of Christ as well as the stone that sealed the Holy Sepulchre; later commentaries even refer to aeres as epitaphios (Symeon of Thessalonike, PG 155:288A). Initially, aeres were made of plain linen or silk (e.g., a white aer in De cer. 15.20; a silk aer in the Patmos inventory [ed. Astruc 21:32–33]), but in the late 12th C. they began to be embroidered with images, esp. the Amnos (H. Belting, DOP 34–35 [1980–81] 12–15).

All surviving aeres date from the late Byz. period. They are made of silk, gold-embroidered with images of the Dead Christ, angels, symbols of the evangelists and, by the end of the 14th C., the Lamentation (threnos), as well as with liturgical and dedicatory texts. The eucharistic phrases together with the specific designation of the cloths as aeres in the dedicatory inscriptions help to differentiate the aeres from epitaphios, which are often similar in appearance. Important examples include the (lost) aer of Andronikos II Palaiologos, and that of Stefan Uroš II Milutin (Belgrade, Museum for Ecclesiastical Art), both from the early 14th C. The fine mid-14th-C. Thessalonike aer (Athens, Byz. Museum) is embroidered with a three-part composition: a central Amnos panel flanked by two smaller side panels showing the Communion of the Apostles (see Lord’s Supper).

AERIKON (ἀερίκον, also aer), a supplementary fiscal levy first mentioned by Prokopios (SH 21.1–2) as imposed by the praetorian prefect of Constantinople during Justinian I’s reign. F. Dölger (BZ 30 [1929–30] 450–57) hypothesizes that the name originated from a fine for violating laws mandating sufficient distance (aer, “air”) between buildings in cities (e.g., Cod. Theod. IV 24, Cod. Just. VIII 10, 12.5c). The Taktika of Leo VI (ch.20.71) indicates that the stratiotai were obliged to pay state taxes (phoroi) and aerikon. In the 11th C., aerikon appears either as a fine for felony (plaisma) (novel of 1086—Zepos, Jus 1:312.15–24) collected by a bishop and/or a praktor or as a supplementary tax imposed on a village in the amount of 4–20 nomismata (Skyl. 404.56–58).

In 13th- and 14th-C. documents, the aer (aerikon in Trebizond) is frequently encountered as a supplementary charge alongside the ennomion of bees (Docheiar., no.53.23), angareiai, and mitaton (Koutloum., no.10.61–62), etc. The aer appears as a fixed sum, and the fine for murder and parthenophthoria as well as the tax for the treasure trove were considered its parts (e.g., Chil., no.92.146–48). This suggests that for Byz. the distinction between “fine” and “tax” was far from absolute. Aer could be granted by the emperor to privileged monasteries. Ostrogorsky (Féodalité 362–64) hypothesizes, although without any source evidence, that the state grant of a monetized aerikon (aer) to a landowner also implied the transfer of the rights of [low] justice over the paroikoi held by the recipient.


—M.B.

AESCHYLUS (Ajax, Greek tragic poet; born Eleusis 525/24 B.C., died Sicily 456. The Attic tragedian least known in the Byz. period, Aeschylus was listed as an Athenian king in the chronicle of Malalas (Malal. 72.9) and was even ignored by the learned compiler of the Souda. The earliest MS of Aeschylus’s seven extant plays dates from the 10th or early 11th C. Subsequent evidence of revived interest in Aeschylus is found in Psellus—who commends Aeschylus for his profun-

dity and gravity but finds him generally hard to understand (cf. A.R. Dyck, The Essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia [Vienna 1986] 44.58–64)—and in two dramatic works, Christos Paschon, which contains some 20 quotations from Aeschylus, and the Katomyomachia of Theodore Prodromos, which shows some verbal borrowings. Annotated editions of Aeschylus’s most widely studied plays, the triad of The Persians, Prometheus, and Seven against Thebes, were produced in the 14th C. by Thomas Magistros and Demetrios Triklinios. The latter also edited the Eumenides and Agamemnon. Triklinios’s autograph MS (Naples, Bibl. Naz. 2 F 31) is the primary authority for most of the Agamemnon. The number of surviving MSS and of quotations in Byz. authors indicates that Aeschylus stood third in popularity after Euripides and Sophocles.


AESOP (Αἴσοπος), a Phrygian slave who lived in Samos in the 6th C. B.C. and was renowned as the author of metaphorical animal fables, in prose, with a moral point. Originally traditional tales, but then a recognized literary device that was classed as a progymnasma, all such fables came to be attributed to Aesop, the fables of Aphthonios being an exception. The first collection, now lost but possibly known to Arethas of Caesarea, was made in the 4th C. B.C. Aesop’s fables are known in three major revisions: (1) the Augustana, probably first compiled in the 2nd or 3rd C.; (2) the Vindobonensis, of uncertain date; and (3) the Accursiana, in which Maximus Planudes had a hand. The fables of Syntipas are Greek versions of a Syriac translation of Aesop. Similar moralizing anecdotes with animal characters exist in the Physiologos and the animal epics, while a scattering of late Byz. non-Aesopic fables attest to the enduring attraction of the genre. Also attributed to Aesop are a collection of Proverbs and Gnomai. The Life of Aesop, written originally in Egypt in the 2nd C., turns the legendary information on
Aesop’s career into a diverting narrative, whose popularity continued into late Byz. and beyond; linguistically it provides useful evidence for the development of spoken Greek.

A MS in New York (Morgan Lib. 397), a significant witness for the text of the Aesopic corpus, includes an important series of miniatures (M. Avery, ArtB 23 [1941] 103–16). Accompanied by brief texts, incidents from at least three of Aesop’s fables are depicted in a rock-cut chamber above the narthex at Eski Gümüş (M. Gough, AnatSt 15 [1965] 162–64).


—E.M.J., A.C.

AESTHETICS. The aesthetic principles of the Byz. were revealed both in works of literature (esp. ekphrasis, epigram, and literary portrait) and objects of visual art. The ekphrasis retained the ancient principle that an art object was to imitate nature, and even hagiography stressed the resemblance of the icon to the original (the stereotype of recognition of a saint by means of an icon). However, the concept of corporeal beauty as a reflection of absolute (divine) beauty contradicted this naturalistic approach. The main goal of art was to represent the eternal, not the ephemeral; therefore, it was focused on humans (placed in a conventional landscape), on the spiritual elements of the human body (the face, esp. the eyes), on stability (movement and disorderly gestures were signs of barbaric character), on frontality (a rear or profile view was reserved for the devil or the enemy). In his ceremonial pose man was an “imitation of a statue,” rather than the statue being a copy of a live human being. In literary portraits the person described was usually perceived not as an entity, but as a construction, consisting of certain parts (forehead, eyes, nose, etc., down to the soles of the feet), each element being characterized separately.

The idea of uniqueness was alien; even the drama of Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection was miraculously repeated in liturgy and church decoration. Each event belonged not only to its historical place and time, but simultaneously to the ever-repeating cycle of the divine plan, and the transfer from concrete historicity to eternal mystery was performed by symbolic interpretation, direct references to the Bible or classical texts, stylistic parallels, and use of stereotyped imagery and vocabulary. Since all events were symbolically or metaphorically interconnected, the world was an enormous enigma or riddle, and both the author and the reader could reach a solution only through a thicket of obscurity. Because art was a demonstration of the divine plan, each phenomenon registered had its profound meaning, and each personage had his place on the moral scale. Art was didactic and interpretive, and seemingly distant events and images (including those of pagan gods) explained the fundamentals of contemporary politics and ideology.

Despite this black-and-white didactic approach, the Byz. recognized the artistic pleasure that could be conveyed by rhetorical skill, richness of vocabulary, nuanced imagery, descriptions of curiosities and miracles, conflict of opposites, and unexpected turns of the plot. General aesthetic principles underwent alterations due to historical changes in taste, individual style, or particularities of genres.


—A.K.

AETHERIA. See Egeria.

AETHICUS ISTER, conventional name for the author of a Latin cosmography allegedly translated from Greek by the priest Hieronymus, sometimes identified with Jerome. The book was known by the 9th C., but neither the date of compilation nor the identity of the author and translator can be established. References to Constantinople and Augustine (as well as to some other 4th-C. theologians) suggest a terminus post quem of 400. It is plausible that the author originated from the area of the lower Danube (he calls himself “Scythian by nation”) and emigrated to the West. The book describes the cosmos (including paradise, the Devil, and angels) and pays special attention to peoples not mentioned in Scripture and to marvelous countries and islands.
at the edge of the earth; Alexander the Great's expedition is related in detail. Greece, Macedonia, Cyprus, and other islands of the "Great Sea" are presented in much greater depth than other regions of the Mediterranean. Asia Minor being only briefly described and Italy hardly mentioned. The author is interested in seafaring and characterizes various types of ships. His sobriquet "philosophus" has no relation to philosophy, but is reminiscent of the "wise philosophers" who serve as informants in the Cosmographer of Ravenna and in the Parastaseis syntomoi chronikal.

ED. A. D'Avezac-Macaya, Éthicus et les ouvrages cosmographiques intitulés de ce nom (Paris 1852). For other ed. see Tuisculum-Lezikon 14f.

LIT. N. Vornicescu, Aethicus Historicus. Un filosof străvrômân de la Histra Dobrogeană (Craiova 1986).

AETIOS (Ἀέτιος), "Neo-Arian" (Anomoian) theologian; born Antioch ca.300 or ca.313 (Kopeck, infra), died Chalcedon 366/7. Born to the family of a low official, he embarked on a career as a goldsmith or physician. He then became interested in "logical studies" (as Philostorgius puts it) and traveled throughout Cilicia (Anazarbos, Tarso), making contacts with the Arian clergy and participating in theological discussions. In the 330s and 340s he taught in Antioch and Alexandria, inciting the enmity of the leaders of the Nicene party, esp. Basil of Ankyra. As a friend of the caesar Gallus he came under the suspicion of Constantius II and was exiled in 360; Julian, however, recalled Aetios from exile, appointed him bishop, and granted him an estate on Lesbos. He probably supported the rebellion of Prokopios and was consequently forbidden to enter Constantinople in 366.

Aetios was reputed to be a talented debater with a gift for sarcasm; he held a radical position condemning any attempt to seek reconciliation with the Orthodox. He supported the doctrine of anomoion (unlikeness) in opposition to the theory of the homooousion: the Ingenerate God (the Father) had no common essence with the created deity of the Logos. Aetios further asserted that the Son had one nature, will, and energy, being different from the Father (V. Grumel, EO 28 [1929] 159–66). Little survives from Aetios's literary works: his manifesto of 359 or 360 (the Syntagmation) is preserved (in a revised form?) in Epiphanius of Salamis (Panarion, bk. 76, ch.11); in addition a letter to a certain "Mazon tribunos" is known as are several fragments cited by later theologians.


AETIOS, eunuch and patrikios; died 26 July 811 (?). Aetios was protospatharios and trusted adviser of Empress Irene in 790, when Constantine VI exiled him. He regained influence after Irene's return in 792 and in 797 cleverly obtained the surrender of Caesar Nikephoros and his brothers. After Irene deposed Constantine in 797 Aetios vied with Staurakios to place relatives in power. In May 799 Aetios allied with Niketas, the domestikos ton scholon, against Staurakios; he became Irene's chief adviser, and, after the death of Staurakios in 800, probably logothetes tou droumou (D. Miller, Byzantium 36 [1966] 469). In 801 Aetios took command of the Opsikon and Anatolikon armies and appointed his brother Leo as monostategos of the Macedonian and Thracian themes in hopes of making him emperor. Aetios is credited (Theoph. 475:30–32) with blocking the proposed marriage between Irene and Charlemagne. He likely lost power after Nikephoros I deposed Irene, but may have been the patrikios Aetios who perished with Nikephoros in battle against Krum.


AETIOS OF AMIDA, physician; born Amida, fl. ca.530–60 in Alexandria and Constantinople. Aetios compiled a 16-book encyclopedia of medicine, traditionally called the Tetrabiblon from its division into four sections. His encyclopedia is rich in quotations from many authors of Greek and Roman antiquity; it begins with a summary of pharmaceutical theory, simplifying the often obscure thinking of Galen and Oríbasios on the topic (J. Scarborough, DOP 38 [1984] 224–26), followed by compactions of pharmacy, dietetics, general
therapeutics, hygiene, bloodletting, cathartic drugs, prognostics, general pathology, fever and urinary lore, diseases of the head, ophthalmology, and cosmetics and dental matters (bk. 1–8). The account of ophthalmology is the finest before the European Enlightenment (cf. E. Savage-Smith, *DOP* 38 [1984] 178–80). The remaining books of the *Tetrabiblon*—which await modern editors—contain significant summaries of toxicology and poisonous creatures (bk. 13) and gynecology and obstetrics (bk. 16). Compared with Alexander of Tralles, Paul of Aegina, and Oribasios, Aetius is arid in style and more interested in medical theory than in practice, but his *Tetrabiblon* is fundamentally important in its careful selections of ancient authorities and in its shrewd amalgamations of traditional and contemporary medical theory.


**AETIUS (Ἀετιος), magister militum;** born Durostorum (Dorostolon) ca.390, died Rome 21/2 Sept. 454. The son of an important military officer from Lower Moesia and an Italian noblewoman, Aetius in his youth was hostage to the Visigoths and Huns. After service under the usurper Ioannes he secured a military post from Valentinian III (ca.425) and was responsible for the defense of Gaul. In 432 he retired in temporary disgrace, but in 433 became *magister militum* of the West, a post he held continuously until his death. For years he was the most powerful figure in the Western provinces, dealing successfully with Visigoths, Burgundians, Alans, Franks, and others while supporting the throne of Valentinian III. His policy was to use various barbarian peoples (esp. Huns) against his enemies, both domestic and foreign. Aetius may have persuaded Valentinian not to give his sister Honoria in marriage to Attila. The Byz. sources allege that Attila’s purpose in attacking the West was to remove Aetius. In 451 Aetius allied with Theodoric the Visigoth and defeated Attila at the battle of the Catalaunian Fields, but he could not keep the Huns out of Italy. With the death of Attila, however, Aetius’s fortunes collapsed. In 454 he was assassinated by order of Valentinian, the emperor he had served so faithfully. Aetius made a great impression on contemporaries and was remembered by Prokopios (*Wars* 3.3.15) as one of the last of the Romans.


**AFRICA, CONTINENT OF.** Byz. knowledge of the configuration of Africa (Ἀφρική) did not go beyond that of Ptolemy. The northern coast was thought to be straight. The west coast was known as far as Cape Bojador, the east coast as far as Zanzibar. The interior, except for Egypt, Nubia, and Axum, was inaccessible or unexplored. The general name for the continent west of Egypt was Libya, although Olympiodorus of Thebes (ed. Blockley, fr.40) calls it Africa while Sozomenos (Sozom. *HE* 9.8.3) uses both terms interchangeably. Eunapios of Sardis (ed. Wright 440) says that “Africa” is the Latin equivalent of “Libya.” Byz. geographical descriptions are limited to east Africa. Prokopios of Caesarea and Kosmas Indikopoulos describe the Red Sea coast as far as Axum. Priskos of Panion (fr.21) traveled to the Egyptian-Nubian frontier; Olympiodoros (fr.35) penetrated five days’ journey into Nubia and visited the El Kharga (or Dakhla) Oasis (fr.32). Lives of saints, histories, and nonliterary documents provide many details about Egypt. After the Muslim conquest, esp. under the Fāṭimid, Ayyūbid, and early Mamluks (11th–13th C.), Byz. trade with Africa, focused at Alexandria, continued. Ivory was the most important trade commodity. Byz. itineraries written by Epiphanius Hagiopolites and John Abramius included Alexandria, and those by Andrew Libadenos and Agathangelos included the Thebaid (P. Schreiner, *XXII. Deutscher Orientalistentag [= ZDMG, supp. 6]* [1985] 141–49). (See also Corippus.)

AFRICA, PREFECTURE OF. The diocese of Africa was first raised to the level of a prefecture for a short period, between ca. 332 and 337, perhaps in response to unrest sparked by the Donatist controversy. This action, attaching the prefecture to someone outside the imperial family, was unusual, for other prefectures were attached to the emperor Constantine I or his sons. A precedent was perhaps the earlier expedition (309) of Maximian's praetorian prefect Caius Caeonius Rufius Volusianus to Africa to suppress Domitian Alexander. Apart from a brief revival in 412, the African prefecture was not again reconstituted as a separate entity until April 534, following the Byz. victory over the Vandals and recovery of its territory. The revived prefecture included the provinces of Africa Proconsularis, Byzacena, Tripolitania, Numidia, the two Mauritaniae, and Sardinia.

The primary function of the prefect of Africa was apparently to support the defense and administration of the African provinces through revenues raised within the prefecture. This was not easily achieved in the early years after the reconquest, as the Vandals had destroyed Roman tax records. By 549, however, the revenues were evidently stable enough for Solomon, in his capacity as prefect, to undertake the construction of a number of fortifications. At the end of the 6th C. the prefecture of Africa was replaced by the Exarchate of Carthage. The exarch (first mentioned in a letter of Pope Gregory I the Great) was a military commander (probably replacing the magister militum) who was placed over the praetorian prefect and gradually assumed the latter's civil functions. By this time Tripolitania was transferred to the diocese of Egypt.

Archaeological evidence from Italy, Gaul, and Spain in the 6th and early 7th C. reveals continued imports of oil, wine, fish sauce, and pottery from Africa, suggesting that the prefecture was reasonably prosperous. From letters of Pope Gregory I the Great addressed to African prefects and the works of Maximus the Confessor in the mid-7th C., one can deduce that prefects were...
expected to maintain civil order, protect against corruption, and defend orthodoxy. The Arab invasions of the late 7th C. drained the exarchate financially, forcing Byz. abandonment of Africa by ca.687 except for Carthage (which fell to the Arabs in 698) and SEPTEM (which surrendered in 711).


—R.B.H.

AFRICANUS, SEXTUS JULIUS, Roman author; born Jerusalem ca.160, died ca.240. Circa 221 Africanus wrote his Chronographies in Greek, which is preserved now only in fragments; it was either a world history or tables of synchronies and genealogies designed to integrate the Old Testament with Greek and Oriental secular history. He espoused the belief that the world would last 6,000 years from the Creation; the birth of Christ was placed in 5500. Although rejecting its millenarianism, EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA made much use of the work, both as model and source; an intermediary source may have been the similar Chronika of Hippolytus (ca.235), like Africanus an acquaintance of ORIGEN at Alexandria. Other late Roman and Byz. users and preservers of fragments include SOZOMENOS, the CHRONICON PASCHALE, and GEORGE THE SYNKELLOS. Fragmented also is Africanus's Kestoi (Amulets), an encyclopedia full of remarkable information. Byz. military writers used it for such things as cavalry techniques (F. Lammert, BZ 44 [1951] 362–69), while its sections on chemistry and explosives figured in the development of the so-called Greek Fire. Numerous extracts from its agricultural lore are preserved in the Geoponika, while literary and magical items attracted the attention of PSELLOS.


—B.B.

AFRICA PROCONSULARIS, PROVINCE OF. Under Diocletian the proconsular province of Africa was reduced in size; the boundary with Numidia was modified and the new provinces of Byzacena and Tripolitania were formed out of the old proconsular province. The Verona List makes reference to Zeugitana, the old name of the region around Carthage. This has generally been construed as an additional or alternative name for the proconsular province. The 4th C. saw an increase in urban building activity after a period of stagnation in the 3rd C. The Annona continued to provide the underpinning for trade in African exports, making the proconsular province among the richest in the empire. The arrival of the Vandals in 439 terminated the strong social and economic links between the province and Rome, but increased trade with Gaul, Spain, and the East may have offset some degree the loss of the Annona. Vandal confiscations of the estates of African nobles may have undermined the prosperity of the province; the cities were clearly in decline during the 5th C.

The Byz. reconquest of the African provinces (533) led to the fortification of a number of towns in response to the razzias of the Mauri, which began under the Vandals. Although there is evidence of continued commercial activity between Constantinople, the East, and Africa in the 6th and 7th C. (largely in kind, it would seem), it is still to Gaul and Spain, and once again Italy, that the bulk of African goods seemed to be directed. The economy of the province appears, however, to have been in slow decline, if we are to believe some recent archaeological evidence that suggests a drop in rural settlement in the 6th C. Africa Proconsularis remained under Byz. control until Carthage was seized by the Arabs in 698.


—R.B.H.

AGALLIANOS, THEODORE (also known as Theophanes of Medeia), patriarchal official and writer; born Constantinople ca.1400, died before Oct. 1474. A student of Mark Eugenikos, Agallianos ('Αγαλλιανός) became a deacon in 1425 and was hieromonk from 1437 to 1440 and again from 1443 to 1454. A staunch anti-Unionist, he
was temporarily suspended from office from 1440 to 1443. Taken captive by the Turks at the fall of Constantinople, he was released in 1454 and returned to the patriarchate. A friend of Gennadios II Scholarios, he was promoted to the office of megas chartophylax (1454) and in 1466 to megas oikonomos; twice, however, he was forced into retirement by a faction bitterly opposed to Gennadios’s policy of oikonomia. Circa 1468 he became bishop of Medea and changed his name to Theophanes (Patrineles, infra 14–25).

The writings of Agalianos include treatises attacking Latins and Jews, a work titled On Providence, and 17 letters, four of which are addressed to George Amirotzes. Most significant are his two apologetic Logoi of 1463, which defend his policies at the patriarchate and provide important autobiographical data as well as information on the patriarchs in the tumultuous decade following the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople. Agalianos was also a copyst of MSS who transcribed some of his own works and, for Cyriacus of Ancona, the text of Strabo.

ED. Ch.G. Patrineles, ed., Ho Theodoros Agalianos kai hoi anekdotoi logoi autou (Athens 1966). For complete list of works, see Patrineles, 43–60.


AGAPETOS (Ἀγάπητος), a 6th-C. deacon (probably of Hagia Sophia), and author of the Ekthesis, 72 chapters of advice to Justinian I on how to rule. The small work was written between 527 and 548, probably closer to the earlier date. The central message is that the emperor is God’s representative on earth, unanswerable to human pressure, but himself a mere man, who shapes his kingdom into an imitation of heaven by his own philosophy, purity, piety, and exercise of philanthropy. The Ekthesis combines classical notions of the philosopher king (culled, probably indirectly, from pseudo-Isocrates and Plato), and traditional methods of discreetly advising a ruler through panegyric and patristic tags and echoes of Eusebios’s conceptions of kingship. The result is a very early example of the Mirror of Princes, a genre emulated at least a dozen times throughout the history of Byz. Agapetus influenced some Byz. Mirrors of Princes, particularly that by Manuel II, but his greatest impact was upon the political ideology of Orthodox Slavs, esp. Muscovy (I. Ševčenko, Harvard Slavic Studies 2 [1954] 141–79). He was the first secular author ever to be translated into a Slavic language (Bulgarian translation of ca.900). In western and eastern Europe, Agapetus was the most widely read and published Byz. author after the church fathers.


AGAPETUS I, pope (from 8 or 13 May 535); died Constantinople 22 Apr. 536; Roman feastday formerly 20 Sept. (the day of his interment in Rome), now 22 Apr.; Byz. feastday 17 Apr. Born to an aristocratic Roman family, Agapetus belonged to the circle of Cassiodorus and planned with the latter to found a Christian university in Rome. He worked to expand the authority of the Roman see; for example, he intervened in ecclesiastical controversies in Byz. Africa where, after Justinian I’s reconquest, the situation of the Arian church (which had been supported by the Vandals) became threatened; Agapetus insisted on a hardline attitude toward former Arians converted to Orthodoxy (e.g., preventing them from holding clerical offices). He also took measures against the bishop of Larissa in Illyricum. His policy is reflected in a story told by John Moschos and another author (probably Gregory I the Great) who recounted the pope’s intervention in the sphere of influence of an Italian bishop or abbot (A. de Vogüé, AB 100 [1982] 319–25). After the Byz. invasion of Ostrogothic Dalmatia and Sicily, the Ostrogothic king Theodahad sent Agapetus as his envoy to Justinian in an effort to end the war. In this the pope failed (if, indeed, he had ever tried to succeed), but he capitalized on the precarious situation to intervene in the disputes of the Byz. church. Using the canonical argument that the pro-Monophysite patriarch Anthimos had formerly been bishop of Trebizond, he forced his resignation and consecrated Menas in his place.
The death of Agapetus and the Byz. reconquest of Italy checked the growth of the Roman see's influence over the church of Constantinople.


**AGAPIOS OF HIERAPOLIS,** or Maḥbūb ibn Qustaṭṭin, Melkite bishop of Hierapolis in Osroene; died after 941. Agapios composed a universal history in Arabic, from Creation to his own time, entitled the *Book of the Title. “It is,”* he explained, “the sort of book that is named ‘Chronicle’ in Greek.” Although the work originally ended in 941, in its surviving form it extends only to 776. The history of Agapios preserves fragments of otherwise lost works, such as the Greek *Chronicle* of Theophilus of Edessa (died 785). In turn, the work of Agapios was a source for the *Chronicle of Michael I* the Syrian.


**AGATHANGELOS,** pseudonym for the author of the standard Armenian account of the life of St. Gregory the Illuminator and of the conversion of King Trdat the Great at the beginning of the 4th C. Although Agathangelos claims to have been an eyewitness, the work cannot have been composed before the 5th C.

The extant Armenian text is not the original. From an early, now lost, text Agathangelos was translated into Greek, Syriac, and Arabic. From a revised Armenian text—the standard “received” version—further Greek and Arabic translations were made. No other Armenian text ever circulated so widely outside Armenia.

The extant Armenian text covers the period from 224 to the death of St. Gregory after 325. It describes the early careers of Gregory and Trdat, the tortures and imprisonment of Gregory by the yet unconverted king, the martyrdom at Valarsapat of nuns (Hrip’imē and her companions) who had fled from Diocletian, the release of Gregory and ensuing conversion of Trdat and the court, and the destruction of pagan temples.

It also gives an account of Gregory’s consecration in Cappadocian Caesarea, the founding of an organized Armenian church, the visit of Trdat and Gregory to Constantine I, and of the succession of Gregory’s son to the patriarchate. The text in its present form includes a long theological document, the “Teaching of St. Gregory,” which dates probably to the mid-6th C. (M. van Esbroeck, *AB* 102 [1984] 321–28).

Of particular interest are the information on pagan temple sites, the emphasis on the dependence of the early Armenian Church on Caesarea, and the identification of Valarsapat with the main episcopal see. Syrian influence in early Christian Armenia is ignored, as is the fact that the original 4th-C. see was at Atšat, west of Lake Van. Agathangelos thus represents a reworking of the Armenian ecclesiastical history to which pseudo-P’awstos Buzand bears earlier witness.


**AGATHIAS (‘Agathias),** writer; born Myrina, Asia Minor, ca.532, died ca.580. Early in his career Agathias was apparently *curator civilis* (concerned with public buildings) at Smyrna. He later became a successful lawyer (scholastikos) at Constantinople. His early *Daphniaika,* short hexameter pieces on erotic and other themes, are lost; so are other unspecified prose and verse works. In the 560s Agathias collected contemporary epigrams (including 100 or so of his own) by various friends, often fellow lawyers, notably Paul Silentarios, who may have been his father-in-law. This collection of hellenizing epigrams on classical and contemporary themes, called the *Cycle,* is incorporated in the *Greek Anthology* along with its preface addressed by Agathias to an emperor, either Justinian I or Justin II (Al. & Av. Cameron, *JHS* 86 [1966] 6–25).
Agathias's *History*, written in formal continuation of Prokopios of Caesarea, stops after five books covering the years 552–59, apparently because he died. Eastern and western campaigns are described, with the general Narses in Italy a major theme; Justinian gets a sensibly mixed press. Social and intellectual history also receives due attention, though church matters are played down or omitted. This, however, is stylistic affectation rather than paganism; despite some contrary opinions, Agathias was certainly a Christian.


AGE (ἡλικία). The ancient Greeks and Romans often considered the life of man as consisting of seven periods that corresponded to the system of seven planets; Macrobius developed the idea of the hebdomadic (seven-year) rhythm in the life cycle, according to which 49 was the perfect age and 70 represented the complete life span. In contrast, Augustine rejected the mystical meaning of the hebdomadic rhythm and of the astral connections of the human ages and established the concept of six ages of man that correlated with the six ages of the world: Augustine’s ages were infancy, childhood, adolescence, the periods of one’s prime and of decline, and old age; senectitude, however, was to be followed by the new morning, the age of the future life that shall have no evening. The six-age theory was widely accepted in the West, by Isidore of Seville among others.

The Byz. knew the ancient seven-age theory but did not develop either it or Augustine’s view. In their practical definitions the Byz. distinguished several ages of man: infancy, childhood, puberty or marriageable age (marked by separation of the sexes), and old age. They did not precisely define the different stages, and the attitude toward them varied: the young Niketas Choniates, for instance, ridiculed old age, but later expressed indignation with impertinent and silly youth (A. Kazhdan, *Kniga i pisatel’ v Vizantii* [Moscow 1973] 87f).

For the most part, society respected old age, partially because the average Byz. had a relatively short life expectancy. The elderly also commanded respect because they had accumulated wisdom and experience (polyspeira) and understanding (episteme) that could be transmitted orally (Sacra parastela, PG 95:1305D–1508D). Village elders (gerontes, protogerontes) with a good recollection of local traditions often resolved disputes over boundaries and land ownership. Many elderly Byz. complained, however, of the infirmities of old age; Niketas Magistros, for example, regretted the effects of age on his literary creativity (ep.22.2–4). The Greek Anthology (*AnthGr*, bk.5, no.76) includes an earlier poet Rufinus, who described the physical decline of the elderly—gray hair, wrinkles, colorless cheeks, and sagging breasts—as "a coffin-like galley about to sink," although Agathias noted cases where "time cannot subdue nature" (*AnthGr*, bk.5, no.282).

Elderly parents expected children to care for them; according to Neilos of Ankyra (PG 79:600C–601A), two children were sufficient for the needs of old age. Parents might disinherit children who failed to provide for them, as, for example, in the case of a spiritual son who had promised in writing to look after his aged mother (A. Guillou, *La Théotokos de Hagia-Agathe* [Vatican 1972] no.30.12–18). Widows frequently lived with their children and might even act as heads of households. Some monasteries provided hospices for the elderly (gerokomeia); as an alternative, many widows and widowers took monastic vows and received care in a monastery in exchange for a donation of cash or property (see ADELPHATON).


– J.H., A.K.

AGENTES IN REBUS (ἄγγελοι ἀφόροι, "messengers," or μαγιστροὶ, "magister's men"), a corps (schola) under the *magister officiorum* created, probably by Diocletian, to replace the former *frumentarii*. First mentioned in 319, their primary function was to carry imperial messages, which gave them the right to the *cursus publicus* (see DROMOS); they also had the duty to inspect this
service. Their broader responsibilities included supervision of the activity of any state functionary and reports to the emperor on subversion and administrative malpractice. Some *agentes in rebus*, called *curiosi*, were sent to the provinces as a kind of secret police. In addition to these functions, *agentes* acted as state prosecutors, inspectors of customs offices, state construction, and the billeting of soldiers; they also led diplomatic embassies. Their activity was closely interwoven with that of the schola of notaries (W. Sinnigen, *AJPh* 80 [1959] 238–54). The corps of *agentes* had a tendency to increase in size. While Julian tried to restrict their number, by Leo I’s reign it had reached 1,248 (*Cod. Just. XII* 20.3). The enrollment of the relatives of *agentes* was welcomed, but Jews and Samaritans were expelled (Jones, *LRE* 2:948). *Agentes in rebus* were exempt from the jurisdiction of provincial governors and could be dismissed, originally, by the *magister officiorum*, but after 415 (in the East) only by the emperor. The *agentes in rebus* disappeared by the 7th C.


—A.K.

**AGHT'AMAR.** See *Ayt’amar.*

**AGNELLUS,** also called Andreas; 9th-C. priest and abbot of S. Maria ad Blachernas and St. Bartholomew’s in Ravenna. He came from a leading family; his ancestor Ioannicius served in the central administration of Justinian II. Between 850/1 and the late 840s Agnellus composed the *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis* (*Pontifical Book of the Church of Ravenna*) in imitation of the Roman *Liber pontificalis*. His biographies of the archbishops of Ravenna up to his own time champion Ravenna’s pretensions vis-à-vis Rome. They also shed light on late antique Ravenna, the exarchate, Justinian II, the adaptation of Eastern hagiographical legends to a Western context (F. Lanzoni, *FellRav* 8 [1912] 318–26; 17 [1915] 793f; 18 [1915] 795–97)—the issue of icon veneration is alive in his account—and life in a Byz. provincial town, as remembered two or three generations after the imperial authorities’ departure. His sources included the lost chronicle of Archbp. Maximian (546–66), hagiography, occasional archival documents (including Byz. imperial privileges—K. Brandi, *Archiv für Urgenksforschung* 9 [1924–26] 11–13), oral tradition—particularly with respect to his own family—and a remarkably intensive, if uneven, use of the images and inscriptions of his city, many of which are now lost. The surviving text is corrupt and a few biographies are missing altogether (J.O. Tjäder, *ItMedUm* 2 [1959] 431–39).


—M.McC.

**AGNES OF FRANCE,** Byz. empress (1180–85); born ca.1171/72, died after 1204; daughter of Louis VII and Adele of Champagne. In 1179, as the result of an embassy of Manuel I, she arrived in Constantinople; early in 1180, renamed “Anna,” she was splendidly wedded to Manuel’s heir, Alexios II. After Alexios was killed, Andronikos I married her. When in 1185 his downfall seemed imminent, Andronikos attempted flight with Agnes and a favorite concubine, but they were apprehended. From 1185 to 1203, Agnes apparently lived in Constantinople, where she entered a relationship with Theodore Branas; they could not marry, lest she lose her dowry. Sought out in 1203 by members of the Fourth Crusade, she bitterly rejected them and spoke through an interpreter who claimed that she had forgotten French. During the sack of Constantinople she took refuge in the Great Palace. Subsequently she married Branas, who entered the service of the Latin emperors.


—C.M.B.

**AGONY IN THE GARDEN.** Christ’s prayer in the garden of Gethsemane before his arrest is first found depicted on the 4th-C. Brescia Casket (Volbach, *Early Christian Art*, pl.89). Christ’s standing posture and the scene’s place at the beginning of the Passion cycle imply inspiration from John 17:1–13, which opens the Holy Week liturgy. The Rossano Gospels, fol.8v, and Corpus Christi Gospels (F. Wormald, *The Miniatures in the Gospels*
of St. Augustine [Cambridge 1954] pl.1) show Christ twice, in PROSKYNESIS and upbraiding the sleeping disciples, reflecting Matthew 26:36–46 and Mark 14:32–42. All three Christ figures, the sleeping disciples, and the angel of Luke 22:39–46 appear in the superb 11th-C. miniature opening the Holy Week lections in Athos, Dion. 587 (Treasures I, fig.226). This conflation of the synoptic Gospels and John yielded the components that characterize the scene’s subsequent iconography. An esp. exhaustive version appears in S. Marco, Venice (ca.1220).

—A.W.C.

AGORA (ἄγορα, “marketplace”; Lat. forum), the center of public life in many Byz. cities and large towns. The agora was generally laid out on a rectangular plan, though forms such as the oval (at GERASA and the Forum of Constantine in Constantinople) and the circle (JUSTINIANA PRIMA) are known. Lined with porticoes, or stoas, and dominated by important religious, civic, and commercial buildings, an agora was often embellished with imperial statues, honorific columns, monumental arches, and Nymphae. Besides the seven major examples in the capital (see CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF) agoras also remained part of the urban scene at PHILIPPPI and THESSALONIKE beyond the 5th C. Construction of buildings within forums was prohibited by a decree of 383 (Cod.Theod. XV 1.22), but it was not long before the agoras in most cities were encroached upon by new construction, a process that accelerated thereafter. The term, however, remained in usage.

—M.J.

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS. Besides the PLOW, Byz. farmers employed two similar TOOLS for tilling and weeding, the makele (mattock) and dikella (two-pronged drag-hoe). The former is depicted in an illustration from Hesiod’s Works and Days (Venice, Marc. gr. 464, fol.34r) as a long-handled implement outfitted with a triangular blade set at an angle to the haft. In this instance it appears to resemble extant examples of the Italian ligio (see K.D. White, Agricultural Implements of the Roman World [Cambridge 1967] 39, fig.19). An illustration of the dikella is found in a 5th- or 6th-C. mosaic in Constantinople (Great Palace, 2nd Report, pl.47); here a farmer, grasping the handle of the implement, pulls the bifurcated blade, attached at right angles to the haft, slowly toward him, its two cutting teeth digging lightly into the soil. For turning larger clumps of soil the lisanion (spade-fork) was employed. This implement (as illustrated in Paris, B.N. gr. 2774, fol.36v) was shaped like the Greek letter π; the tool was manipulated by a handle attached in the center of the horizontal cover-bar.

At harvest time grain was reaped with a sickle (drepanon) rather than a scythe and threshed not with flails but with a threshing-sled (dokane); it was separated from the chaff with a winnowing-
fork (lekmeterion) and/or winnowing-shovel (ptyon). The vinedresser’s essential tool was the klaudeuterion or pruning knife, which (as illustrated in Venice, Marc. gr. 464, fol.34r, and Paris, B.N. gr. 2786, fol.140r) might have two blades—one in the shape of a half-moon and the other like a quarter-moon. This instrument could be used for hacking, cutting, or pulling back.

Except for mills and wine and olive presses, more complex devices were rare. The 4th-C. agriculturalist Rutilius Palladius (Opus agricola, ed. R.H. Rodgers [Leipzig 1975] bk.7.2.2–4) describes the reaper on two wheels pulled by an ox that was common in 4th-C. Gaul, but this vehiculum was not used in the East. A device for preparing dough operated by animal power was invented in the Great Lavra of Athanasios on Athos.


Agriculture (γεωπονία). Byz. had a diversified soil and climate even after the loss of Syria, Egypt, and North Africa in the 7th C. Its lands ranged from the hot littoral of the Mediterranean, where olive trees and even cotton could grow, to the fertile valleys of Thrace producing barley and grapes, to the arid pastures of Cappadocia sustaining numerous flocks. The most general features were the predominance of rocky soil, scarcity of water supply, and warm summers. This resulted in the relatively small size of fields, in the development of horticulture and viticulture (to what some extent was detrimental to grain production), and in stock breeding characterized by transhumance.

Byz. agriculture was polycultural. The primary types of cultivated land were the choraphon producing grain, the vineyard, and the garden in which fruit and vegetables were planted; in addition, flax, cotton, and sesame were grown, and in Sicily and the Peloponnese the silkworm was cultivated. Olive groves were typical of areas near the sea. There was no irrigation on a large scale (after the loss of Egypt), but gardens, vineyards, and sometimes olive trees were supplied with water by small conduits from natural sources or cisterns.

Agricultural technology was predominantly a continuation of ancient and Mediterranean traditions, for instance, the sole-ard plow, supplemented on particularly stony soils and in gardens by hand cultivation with hoes and mattocks. Agricultural implements included the sickle (not scythe), which left high stalks in the fields as cattle fodder and as fertilizer. For the threshing of wheat, the grain was trampled by oxen or crushed by a threshing-sled, rather than flailed. Complex mechanical devices were limited to wine presses, olive presses, and mills, both animal- and water-driven; there is no mention of water-lifting devices or reapers in Asia Minor or Greece. The land was cultivated in both winter and summer, and in the warmest regions two crops were produced annually. For nurturing the land Byz. farmers employed a two-field rotation system. The degree to which lands were manured is problematic.

Some innovations took place after the end of the Roman Empire. The quality of grain improved: hard wheat spread in Asia Minor and rye was introduced in the Balkans. These types of grain were more stable and easier to store. The system of harness changed around the 10th C., permitting the horse to be used for plowing. Windmills appeared, probably in the 13th C. The role of livestock increased, and dairy products (esp. cheese) assumed greater importance in the Byz. diet. By the 14th C. cattle and flocks of sheep and goats seem to have been a more significant indication of wealth than land.

Figures of agricultural yield are difficult to establish. A 12th-C. writer (Eust. Thess., Opuscula 155,69–71) asserted that on a small field he was able to harvest grain 20:1, but such high yield is atypical. In the estates of the Accaiuoli in Greece in 1380 the yield ranged from 1.6:1 to 5:1 (Schilb. Merologie 57, n.6). In any case Western observers stressed the plentiful supply of agrarian products in Byz., and from the 12th C. onward Byz. exported grain, wine, and other agricultural products to Italy and Dubrovnik. The political situation in the 14th and 15th C. caused a drastic change in rural conditions—the abandonment of
lands and the impoverishment of households as reflected in the *praktika* of Mt. Athos. Byz. farms were small units managed by families using primitive techniques. Only from early 15th-C. Thessalonike is there evidence about large-scale husbandry aimed at the improvement of soil (in part by irrigation), subleasing to smaller tenants, and increasing income; this intensive exploitation of land met resistance from monastic landowners.

Apparently in the late Roman Empire there was more land than there were people to till it, and an important function of legislation was to persuade farmers to stay on their allotments. This situation had changed by the 10th C., and legislation tended to prevent (rich) neighbors from acquiring neighboring properties. Although reduced in extent from the 7th C., the empire still possessed territories that could provide enough grain and other victuals to feed its capital (and indeed allow it to grow in the 10th C.), to supply armies in the field that could counter Arab attacks and eventually reclaim lost lands, and to support a general increase in the population in the 9th and 10th C. There is little evidence on the clearing of forest land, but the will of Eustathios Boillas suggests that some individuals tried to open up new lands, and Psellos (like some other landowners) expressed interest in expanding and improving his estates.

Around the 10th C. the most fertile regions of the empire, besides Thrace and southern Italy, were located in Asia Minor, esp. on the seacoast, while the main centers of cattle breeding were in Bulgaria, Thessaly, and the interior of Asia Minor. By the 12th C., while Balkan cities flourished, the rural character of Asia Minor grew more and more evident; under the Nicaean emperors in the 15th C. the west coast of Asia Minor produced abundant grain for export and became famous for its domestic fowl "industry." Asia Minor was soon lost, however, to the Ottomans, and the northern Balkans were either conquered or suffered from invasions. The Peloponnesos, on the other hand, maintained a prosperous agriculture to the end of Byz.


**AIKAR** (Ἄχιάρχος), grand vizier of the Babylonian king Sennacherib (or Asarhaddon, in Aramaic). He was the hero of an oriental saga known in an Aramaic version of the 5th C. B.C. and alluded to in the Book of Tobit, an apocryphal book of the Old Testament; some ancient Greek authors (e.g., AESOP, in his fables) were familiar with the saga, as was the Qur'an. The legend made Ahikar a victim of the slander of his adopted son Nadian; Ahikar miraculously escaped execution, however, and eventually emerged to save his king when the Egyptians imposed on the king the impossible task of building a castle in the air. Numerous gnomoi and fables were added to the legend. The legend of Ahikar is preserved in Old Slavonic, beginning with a Glagolitic MS of 1468. A. Veselovskij (Skazki tysjači odnoj noči 2 [St. Petersburg 1890] xvi-xviii) and V. Jagić (BZ 1 [1892] 108-11) hypothesized that the Slavonic text was based on a Byz. version, but Grigor'ev (infra) suggested that it drew upon an Armenian original.


**AIGINA** (Αἰγίνα), name of both an island in the Saronic Gulf southwest of Athens and of its principal city; it was located in the province of ACHAIA and eventually in the theme of HELLES. Archaeological evidence shows that the ancient city site on the west coast was inhabited throughout the Byz. period, while the *Chronicle of Monemvasia* (ed. Dujčev 12.04-95) says that Aigina served as a place of refuge for the inhabitants of CORINTH during the Slavic invasions. In the 9th C. Aigina suffered from Arab raids; probably at this time a new settlement was established at Palaiahora on a hill in the interior. In the 12th C. the island was used by pirates as a base for attacks on the surrounding coastlines (Mich.Akom. 43.17-18). Although originally granted to the Venetians after
AIGOS HERODIANOS. See Herodian.

AIMILIANOS (Ἀιμιλιανός), patriarch of Antioch (from before 1074 to 1078). Aimilianos was patriarch long before 1074 when Nikephoros Bryennios (Bryn. 203.2–4) first mentions him as the moving spirit of the city’s anti-imperial opposition. Because of Aimilianos’s great popularity, Michael VII Doukas had him escorted secretly from Antioch to Constantinople in 1074. Nikephoritzes, during his tenure as governor, had first suggested the removal, since he, too, had been opposed by the patriarch. The new governor of Antioch, Isaac Komnenos, orchestrated the execution of this difficult assignment. Even in Constantinople, however, Aimilianos did not resign his see or abandon his political activity. According to Bryennios, he was a “cunning and energetic” individual who eventually incited the people (demos) to rebellion (245.3–4). In effect, he became the ringleader of the anti-imperial faction of churchmen and senators responsible for proclaiming Nikephoros III Botaneiates emperor (25 March 1078).


AINEIAS OF GAZA, teacher of rhetoric; fl. 5th or 6th C. After studying Neoplatonism under Hierokles at Alexandria and visiting Constantinople, Aineias (Alveias) returned home to practice as a Christian sophist. His major work is the Theophrastus, a dialogue in which the Aristotelian philosopher of that name is defeated in arguments concerning immortality of the soul and the resurrection. Twenty-five letters also survive.


AINOS (Ἄινος, mod. Enez), city in Thrace on the east bank of the HEBROS River near its mouth. Prokopios (Buildings 4.11.1–5) reports that Justinian I transformed its low city wall into an impregnable fortification, and the Synkedemos of Hierokles (Hierokl. 634.5) lists it as capital of the province of RHODOPE. Nothing is known about the city from the 7th to 11th C., but it did function as an ecclesiastical center: first as an autonomous archbishopric, and by 1032 a metropolis (Laurent, Corpus 5.1:614f). It reappears in historical narratives in 1090 when Alexios I established his headquarters there during his war against the Pechenegs (An.Komm. 2:135.27–29). Thereafter its role increased: in the 12th C. it was a market where monks of the Kosmosoteira monastery bought olive oil directly from boats (L. Peti, IRAIK 13 [1908] 50.1–4). A 15th-C. historian (Kritob. 193.6–11) characterizes Ainos as a large polis thriving on trade with the neighboring islands of Imbros and Lemnos (the description is partly borrowed from Herodotus). Strongly fortified, it withstood the attack of the Bulgarians and Tatars in 1265 and that of the Catalan Grand Company in 1307. According to Chalkokondyles (Chalk. 520f), ca.1384 the people of Ainos invited a member of the family of Francesco Gattilusio to be their ruler, and it remained an important Genoese possession until it fell to the Turks in 1456; in
1460 Mehmed II granted Ainos to Demetrios Palaiologos, the deposed despotes of the Morea, but in 1468 it returned to Ottoman control.


AITOLIA (Αἰτωλία), a mountainous region in the western part of central Greece, between the Ambraic Gulf and the Gulf of Corinth; west of Aitolia lay Akarnania, a part of which occupied the fertile valley of the Acheloos River; the Akarnanian coast faced the islands of the Ionian Sea—Leukas, Ithaka, and Kephallenia. The region was a part of the theme of Nikopolis, then of the despote of Epiros. The ancient names of Aitolia and Akarnania were still used in the 6th C., and Prokopios (Buildings 4.2.1) even speaks of Aitolians and Akarnanians; the Synekdemos of Hierokles (Hierokl. 648.4) mentions Aigion as the metropolis of Aitolia. The names then disappeared from Byz. nomenclature, but were revived by historians of the 14th–15th C. (Kantakouzenos, Gregoras, Laonikos Chalkokoundyles), who often used them side by side with Epiros and sometimes as synonyms for the latter (TIB 3:39). The name Aitolia had been revived even earlier in ecclesiastical lists, and Naupaktos was called "of Nikopolis" or "of Aitolia" (Notitiae CP 10.531). In the acts of the local council of 1367 the metropolitan of Naupaktos is titled "hypertimos and exarch of all Aitolia" and the bishopric of Arta defined as "in Akarnania" (MM 1:494.6, 13). – A.K.

AKAKIA (ἀκακία, lit. "guilelessness," also ἀνεξικακία, "forbearance"), a cylindrical pouch of purple silk containing a handful of dust that the emperor carried in his right hand on ceremonial occasions; in his left he held a scepter, an orb, or a cross ornamented with precious stones (De cer. 25.20–22). In the Klerotologion of Philotheos (Oi-konomides, Listes 201.13–16) the order of the hands is reversed. Two late Byz. writers (pseudo-Kod. 201.12–202.3; Symeon of Thessalonike, PG 155.356AB) both emphasized that the akakia symbolized the instability of temporal power and the humility of its mortal bearer. According to Hārūn ibn Yahya’s description of the emperor’s procession to Hagia Sophia on Ash Wednesday, the ruler went on foot carrying a golden box with a bit of earth in it; at every two paces his “minister” exclaimed, “Be mindful of death!” and the emperor paused, opened the box, looked at the dust, and wept (A. Vasiliev, SemKond 5 [1932] 159).

A representation of the akakia can be seen on the mosaic of Emp. Alexander in the gallery of Hagia Sophia (P.A. Underwood, E.J.W. Hawkins, DOP 15 [1961] 191, 195f and n.30, fig.1).


AKAKIAN SCHISM, a temporary rift (484–519) between the church of Constantinople and the papacy, so named after the patriarch Akakios. By the end of the 5th C. the bishop of the imperial capital faced resistance from East and West: on the one hand, the popes emphasized their primacy among the five archbishops as confirmed by canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, and thus Pope Simplicius (468–83) entrusted Akakios with legatio pro nobis (PL 58.415C), treating him as the pope’s legate; on the other hand, the Eastern archbishops, irritated by the administrative decisions of Chalcedon (e.g., confirming for Constantinople the second place in the ecclesiastical hierarchy), tried in 477 to return to Ephesus the privilege of exarchate, to the detriment of the capital. The situation was aggravated by the theological split between Rome and the sees of Antioch and Alexandria that clung to Monophysitism, whereas Akakios wavered between the two creeds and kept shifting his allegiances.

In 482 Emp. Zeno and Akakios signed the Η- nikon, a compromise with the Monophysite Peter Mongos, but it was rejected by Kaldanson of Antioch (479–84) and by Monophysite monks in Egypt. The new pope, Felix III, sent envoys to Constantinople who regarded the compromise favorably. The Akoimetoi monks, the anti-Monophysite activists in Constantinople, accused the papal legates of succumbing to bribery and betraying the Roman interests; in July 484 Felix convoked a synod of bishops in Rome, abrogated the legates’ decision, condemned Mongos, and deposed Akakios. The papal letter enumerating the “sins” of Akakios was delivered to the patriarch by an Akoimeto monk who paid with his life for this courageous action.

As a result of the schism the name of Felix was...
removed from Constantinopolitan diptychs. Then Akakios moved against Kalandion, who was suspected of supporting the revolt of Leontios and Illos—he was deposed and replaced by Peter the Fuller; thereafter Martyrios of Jerusalem (478–86) signed the Henotikon.

Rome remained intransigent, however, and the pope had solid partisans in Constantinople; nor did the Henotikon find uncompromising adherents in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine. The revolt of Vitalian was carried out under the banner of the Chalcedonians. Patriarchs Makedonios (496–511) and Timothy I (511–15) tried to curb the Monophysite movement, but they refused to denounce the Henotikon and to remove Akakios from the diptychs lest they thereby acknowledge the victory of Rome. Reconciliation was difficult since Emp. Anastasios I expressed obvious pro-Monophysite sympathies; he even found Makedonios insufficiently anti-Chalcedonian and deposed him. Only the predominance of the Orthodox party under Justin I and the search for an alliance with Rome brought an end to the Akakian schism: on 28 Mar. 519 Justin abrogated the Henotikon and ended the break with Rome; the names of Akakios and Zeno were removed from the diptychs.

AKAKIOS (Ἀκάκιος), bishop of Berroia, Syria (from 378); born ca. 322, died ca. 433. Akakios became a monk at an early age, gaining a reputation for asceticism, kindness, and piety. He participated in the Council of Constantinople (381) and the Synod of the Oak (403). Because of his advanced age, he could not attend the Council of Ephesus (431) but played a mediating role behind the scenes. Contemporaries considered his only fault to be an implacable hostility toward John Chrysostom, a former friend with whom he had broken over a supposed insult. His follower Ba-laeus extolled his virtues in five Syriac hymns. A few of his many letters survive, including one to Cyril of Alexandria in support of Nestorios; they show him to be a man of personal and theological compromise.

AKAPNIOU MONASTERY, located in Thessalonike, perhaps on the acropolis. The date of its foundation is uncertain. V. Grumel (EO 30 [1931] 91–95) suggested that Akapniou (Ἀκαπνιοῦ, “without smoke”) was established by St. Photios.
of Thessaly in the early 11th C. on the evidence of a hymn by Demetrios Beaskos (end of 13th C.) that names a St. Photios as the këtor. The relationship of the monastery to the 11th-C. Akapnies family of civil functionaries (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 107, 159, 202) cannot be determined. Sometime in the 11th or 12th C., an early hegoumenos of the monastery, Ignatios, wrote a treatise on the mosaic of Christ at the Latomos monastery (V. Grumel, EO 29 [1930] 165–67).

During the Latin occupation of the 13th C. Pope Innocent III placed Akapniou under the protection of the Holy See. In the 14th C. it was involved in a number of disputes over properties located in Macedonia and in Thessalonike proper. Ignotij of Smolensk visited the monastery in 1405. After the Turkish conquest of Thessalonike in 1439 Akapniou lost most of its property (N. Oikonomides, SüdostF 35 [1976] 4).

LIT. Janin, Églises centrales 347–49. — A.M.T.

AKATHISTOS HYMN (Ἄκαθιστος Ὑμνος), an anonymous kontakion sung in honor of the Theotokos while the congregation stands (i.e., a-kathistos, “not seated”; a recollection of the all-night vigil during which, according to tradition, the Akathistos Hymn was first sung in thanksgiving for the lifting of the Avar siege of Constantinople in 626). Despite the liturgical developments of the 8th C., when performance of kontakia in their entirety was abandoned, the Akathistos Hymn continued in use, at first at the Feast of the Annunciation (25 March) and subsequently during Lent. The Akathistos Hymn consists of a prooimion (three of which, probably, exist) and 24 oikoi, or stanzas, linked by an alphabetic acrostic. The oikoi follow two alternating structures, one shorter with the refrain “Alleluia,” the other longer and with a set of 12 Chairetismoi (Salutations) to the Theotokos, ending in the refrain “Hail, wedded maiden and virgin.” The first 12 oikoi give the biblical narrative on the Incarnation; the remaining 12 meditate upon its mysteries. The whole coalesces to create a subtly interwoven net of images that is one of the high points of Byz. poetry. The author and date of composition remain uncertain. One prooimion, “To the defender and commander,” and hence the entire Akathistos Hymn, is attributed in the synaxaria to Patr. Sergios I in 626 and in the Latin translation (8th or 9th C.) to Patr. Germanos I in 717/18; metrical patterns and theological considerations, however, point rather to a date in the early 6th C. Despite the temptation to ascribe this masterpiece to another craftsman working in the same genre at approximately the same time, Romanos the Melode probably did not write the Akathistos Hymn. The hymn survives in a rich MS tradition.

Four illustrated copies of the Akathistos Hymn are preserved. Two are Greek: in Moscow (Hist. Mus., gr. 429), probably a product of the Hodgon monastery from the third quarter of the 14th C., and in Madrid (Escorial R.I. 19), whose late 14th- or early 15th-C. decoration shows Western influence. Two are in 14th-C. Slavonic Psalters: the Tomic Psalter in Moscow (Hist. Mus. M.2752) and the Serbian Psalter in Munich (Bayer. Staatsbibl., slav.4). The cycle is found somewhat earlier in monumental painting, but may be Palaiologan in origin. Illustrations of the first 12 oikoi rely on traditional iconography of the life of the Virgin and consequently are relatively standardized. The next 12 required greater imagination on the part of artists, and results varied.


—E.M.J., R.S.N.

AKEDIA (ἀκηδία), accidie, sloth or torpor, term for a state of listlessness found in monks. It was recognized as a special problem for hermits who lacked the encouragement of brethren in a cenobitic community. Neilos of Ankyra defined it as the “weakness of a soul unable to withstand temptation” (PG 79:1157C). Akedia was thought to be the result of indulgence in vices such as laziness, loquaciousness, and absorption in the emotions but was sometimes attributed to preternatural causes, a demon that was active at the noon hour. The demon made monks restless, excitable, and
negligent with regard to prayer and reading. Ake-
dæa could be overcome through assiduous attention to prayer and study of the Scriptures, patience, avoidance of idle talk, and manual labor (PG 79:1456D–1460B). Theodore of Studios (PG 99:1724C) prescribed 40 days repentance as punishment for this vice, including three weeks without wine or oil and 250 penitent prostrations (metanoiai) daily, for if uncorrected the sin could lead to the depths of hell.


—A.M.T.

AKEPHALOAI. See Peter Mongos.

AKHMIM (Panopolis, Πανών πόλεις), metropolis of the Panopolite nome of Upper Egypt, a bishopric from the early 4th C. A church is mentioned in a text of 295–300 a.d. (P. Gen. inv. 108), but no early examples have survived. They may have been destroyed in the 14th C., since al-Nahrawâlî (Die Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, vol. 3 [Leipzig 1857; rp. Beirut 1964] 109) indicates that many marble columns from Akhmim were reused in the Ka'ba at Mecca. Akhmim has been famous since the 5th C. for its textiles, many of which were found in early Christian (5th–7th C.) tombs nearby. Other tombs have yielded small articles of daily use. Papyri attest to a flourishing classical literary culture in the 4th–5th C.


—P.G.

AKHNÂS, or Akhnâsiya (Ἡρακλεόπολις, Heraclopolis Magna), south of Fayûm, approximately 15 miles west of Beni Suef, metropolis of the Heracleopolite nome of Egypt, site of a bishopric from 325. From Akhnâs have come a number of 4th- to 5th-C. architectural sculptures, such as niche-heads, capitals, friezes, etc., which once adorned mausoleums in the cemetery; many of these are decorated with mythological scenes. The site is now deserted, a vast field of pottery hills surrounded by several modern villages. Traces of a colonnaded street are visible. Spots where huge columns abound are currently referred to as ka-
niša ("church") but are more probably the remains of other public buildings.


—P.G.

AKINDYNOS, GREGORY, anti-Palamite theologian; born Prilep ca.1300?, died 1348. His baptismal name and original surname are unknown: Gregory was a monastic, Akindynos (Ἀκινδύνος) an adopted name. Of humble, most probably Bulgarian, ancestry, Akindynos studied in Thessalonike with Thomas Magistros and subsequently became a schoolteacher in Berroia. There ca.1330 he met Gregory Palamas and became a monk; he was, however, rejected by four Athonite monasteries, perhaps because of his reputation for secular learning. Akindynos returned to Thessalonike, where he became friendly with Barlaam of Calabria.

By 1337 Akindynos was in Constantinople and involved in the controversy over Palamism; in its early stages he played a mediating role between Barlaam and Palamas. By 1341, however, he began to question the orthodoxy of Palamite doctrine on divine grace, and threw his support to Barlaam. He was apparently condemned at the July session of the local council of Constantinople of 1341 (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF). Akindynos was a protégé of Irene Choum-
naina and the spokesman of Patri. John XIV Kalekas, who ordained him deacon and priest (1344). With the erosion of the authority of Kalekas and the victory of John VI KANTAKOUZENOS, Akindynos fell into disgrace; he was excommunicated at the council of 1347 and died in exile soon after.

His correspondence provides important insights into the hesychast controversy from an anti-Palamite viewpoint; many of his theological treatises, including the Antirhetica against Palamas, are still unpublished. Unlike later anti-Palamites, Akindynos was neither a Latin sympathizer nor influenced by Greek philosophy, as his opponents claimed. In his works he did not inveigh against the spirituality of the monks but against the Palamite doctrine of the divine energies, thus ex-
pressing the conservative approach to theology of his fellow intellectuals.


A.K.T., A.C.H.

AKINDYNOS, PEGASIOS, AND ANEMPODISTOS (‘Ακινδύνος, Πηγάσιος, “Ανεμπόδιστος”), martyrs who lived in the Persian Empire under Shapur II (r. 310-79); saints; feastday 2 Nov. The Passio, preserved in two different versions (the earliest MSS from the 9th C.), concentrates on their ordeal: they were thrown into boiling lead, into the sea, into a ditch full of bloodthirsty beasts. They remained unharmed due to the help of angels and by their endurance converted many pagans to Christianity: Shapur’s servant Aphonithos (who was immediately decapitated), the senator Elpidephoros (murdered together with his companions), and even the mother of the “basileus.” She, the three martyrs, and 28 other soldiers (stratioti) were burned in an oven. The legend was reworked by Symeon Metaphrastes.

Representation in Art. The three saints, sometimes joined by Aphonithos and Epidephoros, are depicted wearing Byz., rather than Persian, court costume. The Menologion of Basil II (p.155) shows the saints being thrown in the sea, the Persian converts being beheaded, and the martyrs being burned alive in a brick oven, all in the same composition. These saints, though collectively called the “Holy Five,” should not be confused with the more famous Five, Eustratios and his four companions, the Five Martyrs of Sebastia.


A.K. N.P.S.

AKOIMETOI, MONASTERY OF, an early monastic community in Constantinople, allegedly founded by the archimandrite Alexander the Akoimetos in 405 (Beck, Kirche 21), ca. 420 (Janin, Églises CP 16), or ca. 425 (G. Dagron, AB 86 [1968] 272), and originally located near the Church of St. Menas in the Mangana quarter. The akoimetoi (άκοιμητοι, lit. “sleepless ones”) were pledged to perpetual praise of God; their offices (popularly known as the akolouthia ton akoimeton) were continuous and uninterrupted, performed by three choirs in succession, each doing one eight-hour shift per day. This was actually a mitigation of Alexander’s original ideal of perpetual prayer, a fundamentalist construction of the New Testament command to pray unceasingly; he had imposed an unending cycle of 24 offices, one per hour, with a minimum of time permitted for unavoidable bodily needs (Vita, ed. de Stoop, PO 6 [1911] 680f).

As a result of persecution, the akoimetoi were forced to move to a succession of monasteries almost immediately after their establishment; by the mid-5th C. they settled at Eirenaion on the eastern shore of the Bosporos. Here the monastery flourished under the leadership of the ardent anti-Monophysite Markellos the Akoimetos, who served as hegoumenos for ca. 40 years; in this period the monks reportedly numbered in the hundreds. The monastery of the akoimetoi housed a scriptorium and library; in its early period the monastic community was trilingual, including Greek, Roman, and Syrian monks (Lemerle, Humanism 78, n.82). A contingent of the monks moved in 463 to the recently founded monastery of Stoudios. The akoimetoi had no influence after Iconoclasm, when Stoudite monasticism prevailed in Constantinople. By the 9th C. the monastery of the akoimetoi had returned to Constantinople or had established a metochion in the city; when Antony of Novgorod visited Akoimeto in 1200, it was within the walls. The monastery is not mentioned in the sources after 1204 and does not seem to have survived the Latin occupation.


A.M.T., R.F.T.

AKOLOUTHIA (άκολουθία, lit. “succession”), a liturgical rite, esp. the ritual or sequence of elements comprised in a particular rite or office (e.g., the akolouthia of the Prothesis, the asmatike ako­louthia). The term also refers to the “proper,” or variable parts, of the office of a day or feast (e.g., the akolouthia of the Nativity or of St. Nicho-
AKLOUTHOS (ἀκόλουθος, perhaps from ἀκολούθεω, "to follow"), in the late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philothaeos a subaltern officer under the droungarios tes vиглас or of the arithmos. From the 11th C. onward, as the droungarios tes viglas assumed primarily judiciary and police duties, the akolouthos became an independent commander of foreign, esp. Varangian, contingents (Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 130). Under Constantine IX, the patrikios and akolouthos Michael was one of the most prominent generals. In the 12th C. akolouthoi fulfilled predominantly diplomatic functions, for example, Eumathios Philokales, who is called acolitho in the Historia de expiditione Frederici (ed. Chroust, 60, 65). The last individual known to have held the position of akolouthos was John Nomikopoulos in 1199, but a 14th-C. ceremonial book was familiar with the office; it defines the akolouthos as the chief of the Varangians and states that he accompanied the emperor at the head of this group (pseudo-Kod. 184.20–24). (For ecclesiastical akolouthos, see Acolyte.)

AKRITAI (sing. ἄκριτης, from akro/akra, "summit, extremity"), term found in Byz. military treatises of the 10th and 11th C. denoting people stationed at the extremity of a given position, such as an army encampment or military formation. Its most common usage, however, designates inhabitants at the extremities of imperial territory, esp. along the eastern frontier. When used in this manner, the term akritai can, depending upon context, refer to army units stationed along the frontier, to the commanders of such troops, or to the civilian population along the border. The term does not seem to have had any technical meaning for Byz. provincial administration or military organization, nor does it refer to any specific type of unit composed of scouts or border guards, although such troops did exist and appear to have been called apelatai. In the epic poem Digenes Akritas, hai akrai generally denote the region near the Euphrates and the term akritai can refer to any inhabitant of this area including Muslims living outside the empire. In a later reference to Digenes' legendary exploits, Manuel I Komnenos was termed "a new Akrites" (H. Grégoire, Byzantium 25 [1955] 779–81).

AKRITIC IMAGERY. Episodes found in both Digenes Akritas and the Akritic Songs are possibly reflected in the sgraffito decoration of more than 100 ceramic plates of uncertain origin, but found as far afield as Constantinople, Thessalonike, Sparta, Corinth, and the Athenian Agora. At the last two sites, the pottery comes from a 12th-C. context. A plate found at Corinth, representing Digenes wooing Maximo, queen of the Amazons, seems to follow the epic closely, esp. in the depiction of costume and the setting (Grottaferrata MS, ed. Trapp, vv. 3114–17). On the other hand, a fragment from the Agora, showing the sword-bearing hero beside a dragon whose neck is pierced with five darts, reproduces the pente kontaria and other details in an Akritic ballad (ed. in Notopoulos, infra 127) without counterpart in the epic. Many plates show the warrior as foot soldier in contrast to both Digenes Akritas and the Akritic Songs, each of which describes the hero as a horseman. While 35 plates have the warrior wearing the podea or pleated kilt (sometimes called a fustanella) attributed to Manuel I, the "new Akrites," in a Ptochoprodromic poem, and 26 have him slaying a dragon, neither iconographic element is sufficient to identify the hero specifically as Digenes because both the kilt and the deed characterize other akritai named in the Akritic Songs. More identifiable is the subject of a relief from St. Catherine's in Thessalonike that shows a figure in plate armor tearing the jaws of a lion in accord with an event in Digenes Akritas (Grottaferrata MS, ed. Trapp, vv. 699–714). Evidence for illustrations to accompany the epic,
which may have been the source for five plates, may be found in the spaces left blank for illustration in the 16th-C. Escorial MS of *Digenes Akritis* and in the now lost MS seen in the 18th C. at the Xeropotamou monastery by K. Dapontes. Identification of these scenes as Akritic is, however, far from secure; they may well represent other folk tales now lost, but of which glimpses may be caught (e.g., in the romance of *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoе*).


**AKRITIC SONGS**, narrative vernacular songs or ballads usually in political verse, in which characters' names or actions appear to reflect episodes from the epic-romance *Digenes Akritis*. The first examples of Akritic Songs were collected in Pontos around 1170, at about the time when the Trebizond MS of *Digenes Akritis* was discovered. According to Sathas and Legrand (L. Politis, *A History of Modern Greek Literature* [Oxford 1973] 29), these songs represented the remnants of an ancient epic cycle predating *Digenes Akritis*. Episodes from *Digenes Akritis* that have been linked to these songs include the abduction of Digenes' bride (*He apagoge tes kores tou strategou*), the building of his castle (*Akritas kastron ektizen*), his encounters with wild beasts (*Ho drakos*), and his death (*Ho Charos maura ephoresen*), though the dramatic struggle with *Charon*, which is a striking element in the songs, does not occur in the epic. The hero's name in the songs fluctuates: he can be Digenes or Constantis or Giannis. R. Beaton (*Byzantium* 51 [1981] 22–43) has stressed that the connections between the songs and the epic are slight and that similarities are likely to have arisen because both draw on a common pool of traditional folk material. Those songs that come closest to the surviving epic are more likely to have been influenced by it than vice versa. Since most of the songs were collected from oral sources in the late 19th C. and have been subject to the transformations of up to a thousand years of oral transmission, the identification of precise references to Byz. historical events can be only conjectural.


**AKROINON** (*'Ακροινόν*, also Akrounos, now Afyonkarahisar), a city of Phrygia. Located at a main highway junction, Akroinon first appears in history when the Arabs attacked it in 716 and 732. In 740, Leo III won a decisive victory there over the Arabs led by Sayyid al-Batūl. Akroinon drew importance from its strategic location and steep acropolis, which provides a remarkable natural defense. It was a city of the Anatolikon theme and a bishopric of Phrygia Salutaris, first attested in the 10th C. Still Byz. when its governor revolted against Alexios I Komnenos in 1112, Akroinon was conquered by the Seljuks before 1146, when Manuel I won a victory there. The citadel bears a Seljuk castle that may include Byz. walls; it depended on cisterns of Byz. origin.


**AKROPOLITES** (*'Ακροπολίτης*, fem. *'Ακροπολίτις τισσα*), a family of civic functionaries; in the 13th C. George Akropolites exaggerated when he called his ancestors a noble kin (Akrop. 1:49.18–19). The name derives from *akropolis*, referring most probably to the Acropolis in Constantinople; in the 10th C. the first known Akropolites acquired Gregoras Iberitzes' house (Preger, *Scriptores* 2:150.1–2), which presumably was at the Acropolis (Skyl. 198.46–47). If so, the family was of Constantinopolitan origin. From the end of the 11th C. onward, the Akropolitai were mostly fiscal officials: Nicholas, *chartularios* of the *logothetes tou stratitikh* in 1088; Michael, *megas chartularios tou genikou*, whom Laurent (*Corpus* 2, no.353) tentatively identified with several other Michaels active in the 1140s. The position of the Akropolitai became more prominent in the second half of the 13th C. when George Akropolites was appointed *megas logothetes*; his son, Constantine, held the same post in the 14th C. (see *Akropolites, George and Akropolites, Constantine*). Leo Akropolites served as *doux* of Serres and Strymon ca.1295 (*PLP*, no.521), but his relationship to George and his son is unclear. Several family members were intellectuals: George and Constantine were famous writers; Melchisedek Akropolites, another of George's sons (blinded or executed in 1299), corresponded with Planoudes and instigated Alexios Philanthropenos to revolt. The Akropolitai intermarried with the Philanthropenoi, Tor-


AKROPOLITES, CONSTANTINE, hagiographer and statesman; born mid-13th C., died Constantinople? in or before May 1324. The eldest son of George Akropolites, Akropolites opposed the Union of Lyons, in contrast to his father. Circa 1282 he became logothetes tou genikou, still bearing this title when he signed a treaty with Venice in 1285. From 1305 to at least 1321 he was megas logothetes. He was related by marriage to Alexios Philanthropenos, the Tornikes (see Tornikios) family, and the imperial family of Trebizond. A patron of the arts, Akropolites was ktetor of the Constantinople monastery of the Anastasis, for which he wrote a supplementary typikon (K.A. Manaphes, EEBS 37 [1969–70] 459–65); he also commissioned an icon of the Virgin and Child, now in the Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow (V.I. Antonova, N.E. Mneva, Katalog drevenurskoj zvoo­psi. XI–na­kalo XVIII veka, vol. 1 [Moscow 1963] no.221, pl.172).

Akropolites was a prolific hagiographer, who wrote enkomia of about 30 saints, thus earning the name of “the new Metaphrastes.” He wrote about saints of earlier centuries, rather than his contemporaries, the one exception being an enkomion of St. John the Merciful the Younger (D.I. Polemis, AB 91 [1973] 31–54). His Logos on the iconodule martyr Theodosia (PG 140:893–936) was evidently inspired by the miraculous cure of himself and his son-in-law at her shrine. Of his letters 194 survive, mostly unpublished; his correspondents included Gregory II of Cyprus and Nikephoros Choumnos. He also wrote a chronicle from the foundation of Rome to 1261. Akropolites severely criticized the Timarion for both style and content (M. Treu, BZ 1 [1892] 361–65).


AKROPOLITES, GEORGE, civil official, teacher, and historian of the empire of Nicaea; born Constantinople 1217, died Constantinople 1282. Related by marriage to Michael VIII Palaiologos, Akropolites was the father of Constantine Akropolites and the monk Melchisedek. His parents sent him at age 16 from Constantinople to the court of John III Vatatzes, where he continued his studies under Theodore Hexapterygos and Nikephoros Blemydes. In the 1240s he was a tutor to the emperor’s son, Theodore II Laskaris, and performed chancery and ambassadorial functions as a grammaticos. Under Theodore II, Akropolites became logothetes tou genikou (1255) and then praitor (1256), with the duty of overseeing the troops in Macedonia. He held the title megas logothetes from ca.1259 to 1282. In the reconquered Constantinople he helped restore higher education as a teacher of philosophy, geometry, and rhetoric, producing at least two known students, the future patriarch Gregory II of Cyprus and John Pediasmpos. In 1274, as part of a three­man delegation to the Second Council of Lyons, he swore to accept the primacy of the Roman church on his own behalf and that of the emperor.

Contemporaries acknowledged his learning and characterized Akropolites as a man who “gave much to the emperor” (Constantine Akropolites, Diatheke, ed. M. Treu, DIEE 4 [1892] 48) and was “neglectful in matters of conscience” (Pachym., ed. Failler 2:409.23–25). He restored the Church of the Anastasis in Constantinople, which he bequeathed to his son Constantine, and wrote various works, notably his Chronike Syngyrahpe, the main Greek source for 1203–61. Written with the hindsight of the victorious party of 1261, it is infused with admiration for Michael VIII. The work was a source for the so-called Chronicle of Theodore Skoutariotes (who also made valuable additions to it) and for Ephraim. Other works are an epitaphios for John III, prefatory verses to his own edition of Theodore II’s letters, and two tracts on the Procession of the Holy Spirit.


AKTEMON (ἀκτήμων, lit. "without property"), a fiscal designation for a peasant who possessed no plow animals and little or no real property (at most, perhaps, only small vineyard or garden plots) but who possessed other livestock (e.g., asses, sheep, goats, bees). The term appears in documents from 1073 to 1303 that categorize peasants and peasant-holdings for fiscal and administrative purposes: in decreasing order, zeugaratos, boidatos, aktemon, and aporos. As economic units producing a fiscal revenue, four aktemones were equivalent to one zeugaratos. Accordingly, in the cadaster of Lampaskos, the angareia of an aktemon was valued at half the angareia of a boidatos. Aktemones are probably identical to the pezoi (“on foot,” i.e., peasants who worked without draft animals) found in some contemporaneous sources. Aktemones probably leased land or earned their living as craftsmen, laborers (douloutai), or hired men (misthioi).


AKTOUARIOS (ἀκτούαριος, Lat. actuarius or actarius), the name of an official whose functions changed over the centuries. In the late Roman Empire the aktouarios was a fiscal official whose duty was the distribution of military wages and provisions (O. Seeck, RE 1 [1894] 301f.). The term was in use at least to the 6th C.—in papyri (Preisigke, Wörterbuch 3 [1931] 92), inscriptions (Grégoire, Inscriptions, no.211), and legislative texts. The Basilika retained some old laws concerning aktouarioi, stressing among other points the distinction between aktouarioi and the taboullarioi (Basil, 6.35.6). The aktouarios reappears in the 9th-C. Taktikon of Uspenski and the Kletorologion of Philotheos but in vague contexts. In a 10th-C. ceremonial book he is described as distributing awards to victorious charioteers on behalf of the emperor (De cer. 345.14-15). R. Guillard (BS 26 [1965] 3) calls the aktouarios the chief of the couriers. The term changed its meaning again in the 12th, or perhaps as early as the 11th C.—from this time onward, aktouarios was the title of the [court? ] physician.


AKTOUARIOS, JOHN. See John Aktouarios.

AL.- See under latter part of name.

ALAHAN MANASTIRI (formerly called Koca Kalesi), a ruined complex of ecclesiastical structures situated between Karman (Laranda) and Mut (Claudiopolis) on the boundary between Isauria and Lykaonia. The ruins occupy an artificial ledge on a mountainside, approximately 250 m long and 30 m wide. They consist of a cave chapel (the earliest feature on the site), a three-aisled basilica that retains an impressive carved doorway and, some 110 m farther east, another church lacking only its roof. The east church was covered by a central tower on squinches, probably terminating in a pyramidal timber roof. The two main churches were joined by a colonnaded walk, along which were built a baptistery and other structures. Notable architectural sculpture survives. Funerary inscriptions of Tarasis (died 462), builder of apanteteria (meeting rooms), and of the junior Tarasis, who served as paramonarios (see prosonarios) from 461 onward, provide chronological confirmation for the attribution of the bulk of the complex to the reign of Zeno. During a secondary phase a smaller church was built in the nave of the west basilica. The cave church, baptistery, and living quarters were also repaired, but the east church remained derelict. The generally accepted assumption that Alahan was a monastery appears incorrect, so that its proposed identification with “the monastery at Apadnas in Isauria” that was rebuilt by Justinian I (Prokopios, Buildings 5:9:33) should be abandoned. It was more probably a pilgrimage shrine.


ALAMANIKON (Ἀλαμανικῶν), or "German tax," imposed in 1197 by Alexios III after Henry VI demanded 5,000 pounds of gold as tribute and agreed to accept 1,600. Before this levy on the provinces and Constantinople, the emperor summoned an assembly of senators, clergy, and members of the trades and professions. When he proposed that the property of each be assessed, the
assembly rejected the imposition as contrary to custom. In near revolt, members of the crowd blamed Alexios's maladministration, citing the waste of public funds and the imposition of incompetent relatives of the emperor as provincial governors. Alexios hastily disavowed the plan. He next tried to collect costly ecclesiastical objects not of primary use in the liturgy; when this attempt also met with resistance, he turned to plundering the tombs of past emperors, abstaining only from that of Constantine I. Thereby he acquired some gold and 7,000 pounds of silver. Henry VI's death forestalled the dispatch of the money.

LIT. Brand, Byzantium 193. —C.M.B.

ALAMUNDARUS (al-Mundhir), king of Hīra who raided the Byz. frontier for almost 50 years (ca.505–54), both as a client of Persia and as Lakhmid king; died near Chalkis 554. Around 523 he captured two Roman generals, Timostratos and John, and released them in the following year for a large sum of money. He participated in the Persian campaign that ended with the battle of Kallinkos. His role in the Strata dispute (ca.539) and his subsequent negotiations with the Romans provided the Persian king Chosroes I with a pretext for beginning the so-called Second Persian War, in which Alamundarus took part. For some ten years after this war he fought with his Ghassānid adversary Arethas, but finally was defeated and killed. Toward the end of his life he apparently received subsidies from Justinian I. Although Alamundarus married a Christian woman, Hind, the daughter of Arethas, king of Kinda, he was a pagan in word and deed. If he was converted to Christianity ca.513, as claimed by some ecclesiastical historians such as Theodore Lector, his conversion was of short duration.


ALAMUNDARUS (al-Mundhir), son of the Ghassānid king Arethas and his successor as supreme phylarch and king of the Arab foederati (569–582). Like his father before him, he, too, distinguished himself in the wars of the period and also as an arbiter in the Monophysite controversies. He participated in the campaign of 580 against the Persians, during which disagreements developed between him and the Byz. commanders. On two occasions, in 570 and in 580, he captured Hīra, the capital of his Lakhmid adversaries, in two lightning campaigns. In 580 he was received by Tiberios I in Constantinople and was allowed to wear a crown instead of a coronet or a band. Throughout his career, he tried to settle religious differences between the Monophysites and the Chalcedonians and also within the ranks of the Monophysites. In the quarrel between two Monophysite leaders, Paul the Black, the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, and Jacob Baradaeus, he took the side of Paul. His Monophysite persuasion was not well received in Constantinople. Justin II tried unsuccessfully to arrest him, but the two were later reconciled. Emp. Maurice, however, treacherously had him arrested and exiled to Sicily. Like his father, he was both patrikios and gloriosissimus.


ALANS (’Alanoi) were known in the West from the 1st C. A.D. Ammianus Marcellinus regarded them not as an ethnic entity, but rather as ubiquitous groups of professional warriors (cavalrymen) who practiced ritual adoption and used an East Iranian idiom as their lingua franca. Some of them took part in the exploits of the Goths, Huns, and Vandals, fought at the battle of Adrianople, and eventually settled in North Africa, Italy, and Gaul. Others became foederati; Aspar was reportedly of Alan origin.

Later sources distinguish two groups, the mountain Alans and the steppe Alans. The former, the Alans proper, lived in the northern Caucasus, between the Terek, Bol'soj Zelenčuk, and Argun rivers. Both groups were either subjects or associates of the Khazar state or Byz.; Justinian II sent an embassy to Alania (as the country is called by Theophanes the Confessor) seeking an alliance against the Arabs. Patr. Nicholas I Mystikos dispatched several church missions to the Alans, and between 914 and 916 Peter, archbishop of Alania, was active there. The remains of churches in Byz. style, dated to the 10th C., have been discovered in the region. In the 13th C. Theodore of Alania sent a report on his flock. Kulakovskij's attempt to locate the metropolis of
VICINA in Alania is erroneous (V. Laurent, EO 38 [1939] 91-103). The only known Christian Alan inscription (of the 10th–12th C., in a Greek script) was discovered on the Bol’soj Zelenčuk.

In the 11th C. Alans served as Byz. mercenaries. In the early 14th C. Andronikos II settled a 10,000-strong contingent of Alan men with their wives and children in Asia Minor to use against the Turks, but they were unsuccessful; their operation against the Catalán Grand Company in 1305 was no more fortunate. The Byz. made no clear distinction between Alans, Abchasians, and Georgians, even though John Tzetzes boasted that he knew how to address the Alans in their language. In the 11th C. the Georgian princess Maria was consistently called Maria of "Alania."

---


---

ALBANIA, CAUCASIAN ("Ἀλβανία, Ἄρμ. Aluan’k’), region northeast of Armenia and east of Iberia between the Kur River, the Caspian Sea, and the Caucasus range. From the 1st to the 6th C. it formed an independent kingdom with its own language and literature, now lost. It was evangelized from Armenia in the 4th C. (pseudo-P’awstos Buzand 3.5–6), whence it also received its alphabet in the next century (Koriwn, Life of Mashots, ed. K. Maksoudian [Delmar, N.Y., 1985] 70ff; pt.2, p.40). It remained within the orbit of the Armenian church, although it disputed the marchlands south of the Kur with the Arsacids. Ammianus Marcellinus (Amm.Marc. 18:6:22; 19:2.3) mentions Albania as an ally of Persia against the Romans in 359, a position confirmed by the Armenian sources for 369–70 (pseudo-P’awstos Buzand 5.4.13). Around 510 the Sasanians suppressed the Albanian monarchy and the country was ruled by a mazrpan residing at Partaw. In 628 Herakleios installed the Mihranid dynasty of Gardman in Albania; it remained in power under Arab suzerainty until 821, when Albania ceased to exist as an autonomous Christian principality.

---


---

ALBANIANS ("Ἀλβανοί"), also Arbanaiti, an ethnic group the origin of which is enigmatic. Attempts to connect medieval Albanians with those described by Ptolemy (e.g., E. Lange-Kowal, Zeit- schrift für Balkanologie 18 [1982] 136) do not pro-
vide sufficient evidence; Byz. texts begin to mention them only from the 11th C., and even these texts are open to question (E. Vranouse, *Symmeikta* 2 [1970] 207–54).

Hypothetically, we can assume that the Albanians were descendants of the ancient Illyrians (see *Illyricum*) who survived the period of barbarian invasions and, by the 11th C., occupied Arbanon, a mountainous valley of the Shkumbi River (A. Ducellier, *TM* 3 [1968] 353–68) that formed a part of the theme of *Dyrrachion*. The region was populated by a predominantly pastoral people. By the 13th C. the Albanians had spread far from this area; George Akropolites mentions the *phrourion* Kroia (Albanian Krujë) as a part of Arbanon.

In the 14th C. many Albanian nobles settled in different parts of *Epiros*: notable among them were Charles Topia ("princeps Albaniae," 1559–92) in Dyrrachion, John Spata in Arta, Balsa Bašić in Avlon, and the Kastrioti in Kroia. In Kroia the local lord, Skanderbeg, was able to defeat the Ottomans, but soon after his death the Ottomans completed their occupation of Albania. Dyrrachion, taken by the Venetians from Charles Topia in 1392, was evacuated by them in 1501. By the early 14th C. bands of Albanians had also spread into Thessaly. Around 1350 the *despotes* MANUEL KANTAKOUZENOS transplanted a large number of Albanians to the Morea to serve as soldiers and farmers in the depopulated peninsula; yet another wave of Albanians arrived in the Morea during the despotate of THEODORI I PALAIOLOGOS (Zakythinos, *Despotat* 101–05).


**ALBERTINI TABLETS**, 33 documents written in Latin on cedrood tablets and dating to the Vandal period (493–96); found on an estate in the Jabal Mrata south of the Tveste, they are named after their first editor. All but three of the documents constitute deeds of sale involving parcels of land under the category of *culturae Mancianae*, which formed part of the *fundus Tuleianus* and potentially neighboring *fundus*. The estate was owned by a landlord, Flavius Geminus Catullinus, *flamen perpetuus*, probably in absencia, but was evidently maintained by three brothers, Geminus Felix, Geminus Cresconius, and Geminus Janarius, possibly relatives of Catullinus, acting in capacities akin to the *conductores* of the Roman period. The reason for this rash of sales is not evident in the documents, but involved the purchase by the Gemini brothe rs of scattered plots, for rather low prices, from tenants of the estate (most of whom carry the family name of Julius, suggesting that they formed a single clan). It is evident from the deeds that it was the use of the plots and the ownership of the trees (mostly olive, but also fig, almond, and pistachio) and other crops cultivated on the plots, and not the plots of land themselves that were being sold.

*Cultura Manciana* was a land tenure arrangement, originally established under the terms of a Roman-period *lex Manciana* (evidently only in effect in Africa), in which lease or usage rights (*usus proprius*) to uncultivated land (*subsecivia*) on an estate was granted in perpetuity to an individual (*colonus/possession*) by the owner in exchange for shares of the crop. This arrangement is thought to have been designed to extend cultivation on estates through a system of tenancy. From the Albertini Tablets, however, it would appear that the predominant form of landholding on the estate of Catullinus was a Mancian tenure, suggesting that even primary parts of estates in Africa may have been brought into cultivation under the Mancian system. The tablets likewise suggest that this system was left essentially untouched by the Vandals.

In terms of agriculture, the tablets reveal continued arboriculture, particularly olive cultivation, as well as continued practice of floodwater farming technology along the Saharan frontier. The Albertini Tablets also provide valuable information on Vandal and early Byz. coinage and monetary values (P. Grierson, *JRS* 49 [1959] 73–80) as well as late Latin grammar, phonetics, and legal and agricultural terminology.


ALBERT OF AACHEN, canon; 12th-C. Crusader historian (the name is indicated only in two later MSS). Although he never traveled to the Levant, Albert authored in Latin the *Jerusalem History* (*Historia Hierosolymitana*), the most detailed contemporary account of the First Crusade (books 1–6) and the Crusader kingdom's early years (books 7–12). He likely began writing before 1119 (possibly as early as 1100–01; events of 1109–11 are dated one year too early). He probably wrote book 12 (events of 1111–19) in the 1120s and certainly before ca.1140 or 1150 (date of the earliest MSS: Knoch, *infra* 14–18); it contains apparently unfinished material. Albert enthusiastically but uncritically exploited the *Gesta Francorum*, oral reports of fellow Lotharingians, whom he lionizes, and possibly also lost sources, including an early form of Richard the Pilgrim's *Chanson d'Antioche*. Although Albert's reliability has been challenged, his data on the Hungarians, Pechenegs, and Byz. (bk.1, chs. 6–14) appear accurate (J. Kalić, *Beogradski Univerzitet, Zbornik filozofskog fakulteta* 10.1 [1968] 183–91). He treats the relations of Alexios I Komnenos with Peter the Hermit (bk.1, chs. 13–15, 22), Godfrey of Bouillon (bk.2), and Bohemund I (bk.9, ch.37, 47; bk.10, chs. 40–45) as well as a Turkish attack on Byz. territory (bk.12, ch.15).

-M.McC.

ALBOIN (Ἀλβόιος), Lombard king; born Pannonia?, died Verona 28 June 572. Circa 565, Alboin succeeded his fatherAudoin as king of the Lombards in Noricum and Pannonia. In 567, in alliance with the Avars, Alboin destroyed the Gepids, slew their king Cunimund, and married his daughter Rosamund. On 2 Apr. 568, allegedly at the invitation of Narses, Alboin left with his people for Italy, arriving in May 569. It is unlikely that Alboin entered Italy with the complicity of some Byz. authorities (Schmidt, *infra* 588f). By Sept. 569, aided by some Heruli, Rugians, Gepids, Alans, and Saxons, Alboin conquered Aquileia, Cividale, Venetia, and Lombardy. He entered Milan on 3 Sept. 569, easily overran Tuscany, Piedmont, and regions of Spoleto and Benevento (including Treviso, Vicenza, Verona, Brescia, and Bergamo), crossed the Po in 570, and took Pavia and Verona in 572. Alboin established himself in the former palace of Theodoric; in autumn 569 or early 570 he was proclaimed *dominus Italiae* at Milan. Alboin personified the valor and ethic of a warring society and had greater military than administrative ability. He capitalized on Justin II's preoccupation with other frontiers and the inadequacy of Byz. garrisons in Italy and started the process whereby Byz. control of Italy dissolved. His chamberlain Peredo slew him, possibly in league with Alboin's vengeful wife Rosamund.

-W.F.K.

ALCHEMY (χυμεία or χημεία). The "sacred art" of the transmutation of metals into gold or silver was, in Byz., a continuation of older Mesopotamian and Egyptian traditions of coloring or making alloys of cheaper materials so that they would be accepted as more expensive ones. Sometimes the writings of the alchemists are composed of simple RECIPES for achieving tinctures, confusions of metals, and other chemical effects, but often they are expressed in an allegorical mode infused with philosophical, religious, or astrological imagery that reflects their mystical nature, which is almost completely irrelevant to the perceptible world.

These two tendencies are clearly visible in the earliest Byz. alchemical texts, of the early 4th C.; the papyri of Leiden and of Stockholm contain recipes for imitating gold, silver, precious stones, and purple dye, while some of the surviving Greek treatises of Zosimos of Panopolis (3rd/4th C.) are primarily allegorical visions in which the transmutation of base metals into gold or silver is represented as a religious act whereby the adept ascends a series of ladders leading to the accomplishment of his goal. Other treatises ascribed to Zosimos in Greek, while still mystical, are more closely connected to actual chemical operations.

Indeed, early Byz. and Syrian alchemy, in combination with some material from Iran and India, is the foundation for the rich alchemical tradition in Arabic, which in turn inspired western Europe from the 11th C. onward. Much remains to be discovered in this vast literature in Syriac, Arabic, Persian, and Latin that is relevant to the history of Byz. science. The summary accounts given by Sezgin (*supra*, 77–111) and Ullmann (*supra*, 163–91) reveal the existence of works falsely attributed to *Apollonios of Tyana*; a *Kitāb al-Habīb* (Book of the Beloved), which had a Byz. original; many versions of Greek and Syriac treatises associated with the names of Plato, Aristotle, and Hermes; and Arabic translations of the alchemical works of *Stephen of Alexandria*, *Emp. Herakleios*, and *Marianos the Monk* (Lat. *Morienus*).

Works surviving in Greek of early Byz. alchemy (4th–7th C.) include the commentary on pseudo-Demokritos by *Synesios of Cyrene*, apparently composed before 389; the commentary on *Zosimos* composed by *Olympiodoros* (either the early 5th-century historian or—more probably—the 6th-C. philosopher); *On the Sacred Art* by *Pelagios the Philosopher* and *On the Divine Art* by *John the Archpriest*, who both use *Zosimos*; the mystical treatise *On the Making of Gold* by *Stephen of Alexandria*; two compilations, that of “the Christian” and an anonymous one, both of which cite *Stephen*; and the four alchemical poems ascribed to *Heliodoros*, *Theophrastos*, *Hierotheos*, and *Archelaos*. All of these texts and some anonymous compendia of recipes were included in a collection made in, perhaps, the late 9th or early 10th C. and dedicated to a certain Theodore. A primary descendant of this is the unfortunately mutilated Venice, Bib. Marc. 299, probably of the 10th C. It includes formulas and explanatory texts for the transmutation of metals, astrological diagrams purporting to show the heavenly *taxis* that allows the making of gold, and alembics and other apparatus for heating and distilling liquids. The MS was evidently still in use in the 14th C. when other drawings were added (Furlan, *Marciana* 4:11–15). Expanded versions of the collection are found in Paris, B.N. gr. 2325 (13th C.) and B.N. gr. 2327 (1478).

This last MS opens with a most significant contribution to alchemical literature, the letter *On How to Make Gold* addressed by Michael Pселlos to *Patr. Michael I Keroularios* in ca.1045/6 (J. Grosdidier de Matons, *TM* 6 [1976] 329f). In it he argues that the transmutation of one element into another is perfectly natural and then gives a series of recipes for manufacturing “gold,” degrading it, and extracting it from sand. Later in his career Pселlos attacked the unfortunate patriarch for having been such a good student (*CMAG* 6:73–89).

The final two authors under whose names alchemical treatises have been transmitted are *Kosmas the Monk* (who postdates Pселlos) and *Nikophoros Blemydes*, both of whom wrote collections of recipes. But in southern Italy a Latin alchemical treatise was translated into Greek already by the early 14th C.; the anonymous text, edited by C.O. Zuretti (*CMAG* 7), refers to Arnold of Villanova. Some other fragments of the alchemical works of Arnold of Villanova appear in a 15th-C. MS, Paris, B.N. gr. 2327. The *Semità recta* (Straight Path) falsely ascribed to Albertus Magnus is found in Paris, B.N. gr. 2419, perhaps translated into Greek by the scribe George Midiates in the 1460s.

The creative period of Byz. alchemy was the 4th–7th C., though the art continued to be studied and presumably practiced until the fall of Constantinople. Unlike astronomy, astrology, mathematics, and medicine, however, Byz. alchemy seems barely to have been enriched by translation from the Arabic, though there are some traces of eastern influence in the treatise from the 14th-C. codex Holkham gr. 290, now in the Bodleian (ed. O. Lagercrantz, *CMAG* 3), and in the work of *Kosmas*. The few treatises translated from the Latin texts influenced by the Arabic science were available only in Italy.


—D.P., A.C.

**ALEMANNI** ("Αλαμαννοί"), the Latin term for an amalgamation of a number of smaller Germanic tribes, including a segment of the Suevi. After some conflicts with the Roman Empire in the 3rd C., Alemanni concentrated in the area between the Upper Danube and middle Rhine. Relations with the native Roman population were frequently hostile. In 457 the Alemanni invaded Italy and later threatened Noricum. Following their defeat by Clovis (497?), some Alemanni escaped to Raetia to settle, after ca.500, south of Lake Constance under the protection of Theodoric the Great. Paganism remained widespread among the Alemanni until the late 6th C. They were eventually absorbed into the Frankish kingdom.

Coptic bronze vessels, Italian glass and ceramics, and a Byz. pectoral cross found in Alemanni graves indicate some economic and cultural links with the Mediterranean in the 5th to 7th C. The Byz. historians Prokopios and Agathias considered the Alemanni akin to the Germans; according to H. Ditten (*StBalc* 10 [1975] 73–86), their name was distorted by later copyists and rendered Albanoi. After a period of absence from the sources, the name reappears in the *Souda* (corrupted as Albanoi) and in many authors of the 11th to 15th C. in reference to the Germans, whereas the term Germanoi sometimes meant French. When Alexios III concluded a truce with Henry VI of Germany, a new tax called Alamanikon was introduced to pay tribute to the Germans.


—R.B.H.

**ALEPPO.** See Berroia: Berroia in Syria.

**ALEXANDER,** emperor (11 May 912–6 June 943); born Constantinople ca.870, died Constantinople. The youngest son of BASIL I and EUDOKIA INGERINA, according to the vita of St. BASIL THE YOUNGER, Alexander was co-emperor with his brother LEO VI from 879. During Leo’s reign Alexander was at odds with his brother and was even suspected of plotting against him. After ascending the throne, Alexander demoted Leo’s assistants (Himerios was imprisoned), possibly deposed Patr. Euthymios, and reinstated NICHOLAS I MYSTIKOS. Zoe Karbonopsina was expelled from the palace. Alexander’s administration had to face assaults from two directions: the Arabs attacked the area under the control of MELIAS, and SYMEON OF BULGARIA apparently invaded Byz. before Alexander’s death. R. Jenkins (SBN 7 [1953] 389–93) hypothesizes that an Arab embassy was sent to Constantinople during Alexander’s reign. Both the author of the vita of Euthymios and chroniclers are hostile toward Alexander and represent him as lecherous and lazy. A mosaic portrait of Alexander is preserved in the north gallery of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (P. A. Underwood, E. J. W. Hawkins, *DOP* 15 [1961] 187–217). Coinage reflects Alexander’s bad relations with though condemned and excommunicated by a synod convened by Alexander ca.321, Arius refused to abandon his teaching. This led to the convocation of the First Council of NICAEA (325) in which Alexander, accompanied by his deacon ATHANASIOS (future bishop of Alexandria), played an important role. Of his voluminous correspondence, only three letters survive. In these he reveals himself as an active and persistent supporter of the Orthodox position concerning the Son’s perfect consubstantiality and eternal generation from the Father. Fragments of sermons ascribed to him are also preserved in Coptic and Syriac.


—A.P.
Alexander to seek refuge in France. There the pontiff tried to organize an anti-German coalition, but the French king Louis VII was indifferent to this plan. Alexander eagerly negotiated with Emp. Manuel I. In 1161 Cardinal William of Pavia sent a letter to Manuel asking him to recognize Alexander and complaining that “the barbarians” had usurped the imperial throne. These negotiations became known in Frederick’s camp, where Alexander was accused of making an alliance with the emperor. In 1167 Manuel sent the sebastos Iordanos to Rome, promising church union on condition that Alexander recognize him as the emperor of the East and West. The plan, however, was never executed because, although Alexander wanted to use Byz. resources against Frederick, he was not inclined to sever all links with Germany. In the 1170s Alexander based his anti-German policy primarily on the support of the Lombard League, a coalition of northern Italian cities.


—A.K., A.C.

Leo VI: Leo’s son, Constantine VII, although titular emperor from 908, does not share the reverse of Alexander’s solidi. Rather, his place is taken by John the Baptist shown crowning Alexander, the first depiction of coronation by a sacred figure (C. Jolivet-Lévy, Byzantium 57 [1987] 447f).


Alexander IV (Rainaldo, count of Segni), pope (from 12 Dec. 1254); born Siena between 1100 and 1105, died Rome 30 Aug. 1181. While a cardinal Alexander had favored a pro-Norman policy; therefore, his election to the papacy was opposed by Frederick I Barbarossa, who supported several antipopes and forced

Alexander III, pope (from Sept. 1159); born Siena between 1100 and 1105, died Rome 30 Aug. 1181. While a cardinal Alexander had favored a pro-Norman policy; therefore, his election to the papacy was opposed by Frederick I Barbarossa, who supported several antipopes and forced
ALEXANDER OF TRALLES, physician; born Tralles 525, died Rome 605. According to Agathias (Agath. 5:6:3–6), Alexander was one of five prominent sons of a physician named Stephen; most famous of the brothers was Anthemios, the architect-engineer of Hagia Sophia. Alexander’s family probably knew the navigator-explorer Kosmas Indikopleustes, a fact perhaps reflected in the Far Eastern drugs included in Alexander’s 12-book medical encyclopedia. In his writing, Alexander exhibits a humane, enthusiastic approach to medicine and a continually adaptive sensitivity to active practice and therapy. These qualities have caused medical historians to call Alexander the “most modern” of the Byz. physicians, even though he readily prescribes amulets and other magical means for cures. Compared with Aetios of Amida, Alexander is certainly less concerned with theory than with the practical application of pharmaceuticals (J. Scarborough, DOP 38 [1984] 226–28). Alexander is also rightly famous for his “Letter on Intestinal Worms,” indicating an acute skill in observation of symptoms and precise case histories. His medicine is eminently sensible and one reads good accounts of ophthalmology (bk.2), what moderns would call angina (bk.4), diseases of the lungs and pleurisy (bk.5–6), kidney and bladder ailments (bk.9), and gout (bk.12). Alexander knew his Galen and other classical authorities, but subsumed them within his medical practice, continually adapting data from the written texts, nicely illustrated by Alexander’s rearrangement of pharmaceutical ingredients in many of his suggested remedies for specific diseases.

ALEXANDER ROMANCE. Ascribed to Kallisthenes of Olynthos, the historian who accompanied Alexander the Great on his expeditions (hence, pseudo-Kallisthenes), the Alexander Romance is based on an anonymous novel written originally in the 3rd C. and widely copied, with frequent accretions of fantastic episodes. Five recensions of the text, which can be dated from the 4th to 7th C., are identifiable. For their reconstruction the translations in Armenian (5th C.), Latin (by Julius Valerius Probus, 4th C., and the archpriest Leo, 9th C.), Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic are important. These recensions survive only in late MSS. There are also late Byz. redactions, one (the Byz. Alexander-Poem) in political verse and dated to 1588 and another in prose of uncertain date that survives in several discreet MSS of the 13th to 16th C. The Alexandria became popular in Rus’, where at least two recensions were known: one inserted in the chronographs (probably of the 12th C.) was close to the Alexander Romance, another, the so-called Serbian Alexandria, appeared about the 15th C. It was a free adaptation of pseudo-Kallisthenes, with an emphasis on the love affair of Alexander and Roxane, the daughter of Darius.

Although Alexander is treated as a traditional hero of romance (with a mysterious birth, etc.), he is nonetheless regarded as the first basileus of the Hellenes. As Alexander came to hold an emotive place in the Byz. view of the past, so the more sober accounts of the chroniclers were supplemented in the popular imagination (in, e.g., the vita of Makarios of Rome and the Apocalypse of pseudo-Methodsios of Patara) by references taken from the Alexander Romance to the exotic palaces, giants imprisoned in mountains, strange monsters and barbaric peoples on the borders of the empire, and so forth that Alexander encountered on his campaigns. Figures from the Alexander Romance such as the cynokephalos and scenes of Boukephalas and Alexander’s pursuit of Darius entered the illustration of the Kynegitika of Oppian, while Weitzmann (infra) interpreted panels on bone caskets as depictions of the ma-


J.S., A.M.T.
gician Nektanebos, Olympias, and Philip of Macedon, drawn from the same source. Richly illustrated versions of the Alexander Romance in both Greek (L. Gallagher, Thesaurusmata 14 [1979] 170–205) and Armenian survive from the 13th to 15th C.


—E.M.J., A.C., A.K.

ALEXANDER THE AKOIMETOS, archimandrite and saint; died Gomon, Bithynia, ca.430; feastday 20 Feb., although not included in the Synaxarion of Constantinople. An islander by birth, Alexander was educated in Constantinople, where he began an administrative career. He then left for Syria, where he lived as a hermit, frequently intervening in the affairs of cities such as Edessa, Palmyra, and Antioch. From Syria he returned to Constantinople with a group of disciples and settled near the Church of St. Menas. The inflexibility of the service of perpetual prayer that Alexander instituted (see AKOIMETOI, MONASTERY OF) and his constant interference in political activity aroused the hatred of the authorities and local population. Accused of MESSALIANISM, Alexander was condemned by an ecclesiastical tribunal and narrowly escaped being torn to pieces by the demoi (de Stoop, infra 698.4). He found temporary refuge in the monastery of HYPATIOS OF ROUPHINIANI, then went to Gomon, where he died. The vita of Alexander is known from a single 11th-C. MS, the anonymous author describing himself as Alexander's pupil.

The chronology of Alexander's life is far from clear: R. Janin (EO 33 [1934] 340) asserts that Alexander arrived in Constantinople ca.405 and founded the monastery of the Akoimetoi ca.420 (Janin, Églises CP 16), but the vita places Alexander's quarrel with Theodotos, patriarch of Antioch (424–28) before his arrival. J. Pargoire (BZ 8 [1899] 447) speculates that Alexander's expulsion from Constantinople must have taken place before 430, since NEILOS OF ANKYRA alluded to Alexander's troubemaking. It is also uncertain whether Alexander was the founder of the Akoimeto monastery; his vita (p.700.16–17) says that the monastery was founded after his death.

Ed. E. de Stoop, "Vie d’Alexandre l’Acémète," PO 6,5 (1911) 645–705, with Lat. tr.


—A.K.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT (Alexander III of Macedon), son of Philip II of Macedon and Olympias; born 356 B.C., died 323. Alexander was the instigator of the first attempt at world domination by a Greek-speaking ruler. His life and exploits are recorded briefly by Byz. chroniclers with emphasis given to his meeting with the widowed Kandake, the priests of Jerusalem, and the Brahmins of India. Little detail is given on his military campaigns, which are noted for starting from Constantinople and for destroying the empire of the Persians, which was then followed by that of the Macedonians in the succession of empires. As the ruler of a world empire that could be viewed as a predecessor of the Byz. and could also be fitted into the Old Testament framework, Alexander from the time of Constantine I was regarded as a model of the ideal emperor and appears as such in chronicles, orations, eschatological texts, etc. The legendary figure of Alexander was fostered by the ALEXANDER ROMANCE and other shorter texts, dealing with his encounters with apocryphal sages, as well as by the chronicles. Textiles of the 6th–7th C. showed him on horseback (D. Shepherd, Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art 58 [1971] 244–50), while later enamels and reliefs concentrated on the legend of his Ascension. Scenes from the life of Alexander—treated as the equivalent of the biblical heroes depicted there—decorated the palace of Digenes Akritas. The emotive and symbolic role that Alexander played in the Byz. popular consciousness is demonstrated by his continued importance in Greek folklore even after the fall of Constantinople.


—E.M.J., A.C.
ALEXANDER THE MONK, author of a treatise entitled *On the Cross*. He lived sometime between the mid-6th and 9th C.; the traditional date of the mid-6th C. or before 614 lacks any validity. Nothing is known of his biography. His identification with Alexander the Monk (from Cyprus?) who wrote an *enkomion* of the apostle Barnabas after the discovery of the apostle’s relic (488) is arbitrary.

*On the Cross* consists of two parts: a history of Christianity from the Roman emperor Tiberius to the discovery of the True Cross by Helena and the appearance of the Cross in Jerusalem in 351, and a panegyric on the Cross as the major symbol of Christianity: “God,” says Alexander (PG 87.3:4021B), “made every visible and invisible creature in the shape of a cross,” since everything in the world has “height, depth, breadth, and length” (cf. Eph 3:18); thus, the Seraphim are interpreted as “fourfold (tetramorphai) beings that prefigure the *typos* of the Cross” (4021C). The cult of the Cross exists in all cities, islands, and tribes (4072C). Because of this cosmic character of the Cross the Lord suffered death on the Cross (4036A). The treatise is known also in a Georgian translation whose earliest MSS belong to the 9th and 10th C.

Ed. PG 87.3:4016–88.


—A.K.

ALEXANDRIA (Ἀλεξάνδρεια), third largest city of the late Roman world (after Rome and Constantinople); founded by Alexander the Great in 331 B.C. Formerly capital of the Ptolemaic kingdom and the Roman province of Egypt, it was the administrative, military, and ecclesiastical center of the country as well as chief industrial entrepôt of the eastern Mediterranean and outlet for the annual shipments of Egyptian grain (the *embole*) to Rome and Constantinople. Its two harbors handled shipping for goods that had come down the Nile (papyrus, textiles, glass) and for the maritime trade of Orients as well as transshipments upriver of olive oil, metal goods, pottery, and wine. Laid out on the Hellenistic grid pattern, the city preserved splendid ancient monuments including the Pharos lighthouse (one of the so-called Seven Wonders); the Serapeum (temple of the syncretic god Serapis), which was partly demolished in Byz. times; and the Caesareum, converted into the patriarchal cathedral. Few remains are extant, except for the recently excavated theater, baths, and lecture hall at Kûm al-Dik (infra); the Moušeion and the Tomb (Sema) of Alexander are not attested after the 3rd C.

With its wealth, large population (about half a million) bilingual in Greek and Coptic, and flourishing infrastructure, Alexandria was the major intellectual and cultural center of the East, rivaling Constantinople in political influence as well. In literature, scholarship, science, and theology its schools attracted the best minds, and both secular and church patronage supported abundant production in written works and the visual arts. Christianity took root early, leading to the establishment of a powerful centralized patriarchate (see Alexandria, Patriarchate of), later split into Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian lines of succession; and a theological school, the Alexandria School, renowned for its Neoplatonic approach and allegorical method of exegesis. Large urban monasteries, such as the Ennaton and the Metanoia, which are attested in numerous 6th- to 7th-C. papyri, supported guilds of *philoponoi* (charity workers) and varied trades and professions. The mint of Alexandria was revived by Emp. Justin II.

Alexandria was briefly occupied by the Sasanians between 618 and 628/9 (L. MacCoull, *Studi classici e orientali* 36 [1986] 907–13); it fell to the Arabs under ‘Amr in 642 (Butler, *intra*, lxii–lxxvi), was briefly retaken by the Byz. in 645 but immediately recaptured by the Arabs; a second Byz. attempt at recovery in 652 proved unsuccessful.

Monuments of Alexandria. Almost no Byz. monuments have survived. Only the names and a few details regarding the history and location of its once numerous churches are known. The Greek Orthodox patriarchal Church of St. Sabas may preserve some sections of its original 7th-C. foundations. In the area called Kûm al-Dik (“pottery hill”) a late Roman bath, a 4th-C. odeon, and some 6th-C. Byz. houses have been excavated. There are also Early Christian tombs (e.g., the so-called Wescher Catacomb, now destroyed, which included a painted frieze representing the Feed-
ING OF THE MULTITUDE). With marble imported from Constantinople, a number of workshops in Alexandria produced architectural sculpture for use in the provincial towns of Lower Egypt; scores of examples have been found at ABU MINÆ as well as in Cairo.


ALEXANDRIA, PATRIARCHATE OF. In addition to using the title of pope (PAPAS), Alexandria’s bishop was, perhaps, the first to claim the title ARCHBISHOP. At NICAEA I (325) this see was mentioned, together with Rome and Antioch, among the major ecclesiastical divisions of the empire (canon 6). Its reputation was based on Alexandria’s political importance, the support received from monasticism, vast landed wealth, and Egypt’s long-standing tradition of centralization. In fact, by the 4th C. all of Egypt, the Pentapolis, and Libya had been brought under its central authority.

As a result, Alexandria played a prominent part in the theological controversies and ecclesiastical power politics of the 4th–5th C. Nevertheless, its powerful bishops’ claim to first place among the sees in the East gradually altered with the rise of Constantinople, promoted to second rank in 381. The bitter conflict that followed in the reigns of THEOPHILOS and CYRIL was finally resolved—at Alexandria’s expense and humiliation—at the Council of CHALCEDON (451). Indeed, Chalcedon’s rejection of DIOKOROS and his MONOPHYSITISM were fatal to Alexandria’s ecclesiastical and theological prestige and supremacy. Moreover, its unity also suffered. The patriarchate split into two unequal parties, with representatives of the non-Chalcedonian Monophysite majority contesting and sometimes occupying the patriarchal throne. This dissident group eventually formed the national Coptic church of Egypt. The decisive blow to the patriarchate came with the Arab con-

quest (641). Henceforth Constantinople, with the approval and confirmation of the caliphs, appointed Alexandria’s Orthodox patriarchs as a rule; the patriarchs controlled only a small minority of Christians in Egypt and followed Constantinople in all liturgical and canonical matters.


ALEXANDRIAN ERA, a system of computation of world chronology produced by two Egyptian monks and chronographers of the early 5th C., Annianos and Panodoros; the system is known from and was used by GEORGE THE SYNKELLOS (early 9th C.). Panodoros, a critic of EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA, tried to harmonize the data of the Bible with those of pagan sources (esp. the Canon of Kings by Ptolemy). He came to the conclusion that the Creation took place on 19 Mar. and the birth of Christ occurred 5,494 years after the Creation. The computation of Panodoros is the major Alexandrian Era (aera Alexandrina maior); the minor Alexandrian Era was suggested by Annianos who dated the Creation to the vernal equinox (25 Mar.) and placed the birth of Christ in 5501.

The Alexandrian Era remained in use outside Egypt: George the Synkellos (6.13–16) defended the idea that the first of the Jewish month Nisan (25 Mar.) and not the first of Thoth (29/30 Aug.), according to Egyptian custom, or the first of Jan. (the Roman usage), was the day of Creation; he also dated the Incarnation 5,500 years after the Creation (p. 2.26–27). Traces of the Alexandrian Era can be found in Theophanes the Confessor as well. Maximos the Confessor (PG 19:1249B) also calculated that Christ was born 5,501 years after Adam. After the 9th C. the Alexandrian Era was abandoned even though a unified system of computation did not immediately replace it. The difference between the Alexandrian Era and the Byzantine Era is approximately 16 years, but one also has to take into consideration the difference in the beginning of the year: 25 Mar. according to Annianos and 1 Sept. according to the official calculation of the INDICATION and of the Byzantine Era. To convert an Alexandrian date to an A.D. date, 5,492 is subtracted for dates between 25 Mar. and 31 Dec., but 5,491 for dates
ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL,  a conventional designation of two intellectual institutions. First of all, it was the theological tradition generally seen in opposition to the Antiochene School. As a developed institution it is attested from the early 3rd C. It consisted of an elementary (catechetical) school and a didaskaleion oriented toward the intellectual elite. The school operated under the control of the see of Alexandria, and a number of its teachers (Heraclas, Dionysios, Theognostos, Peter) became bishops of Alexandria in the 3rd C. The last known teacher of the school was Didymos the Blind. The theology of the Alexandrian School was developed by Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who envisioned primarily a cultivated and well-to-do urban audience and based their tenets on the Platonic tradition as revised by Philo. The main points were typological or allegorical interpretation of the Bible—viewing the Old Testament as a prefiguration of events of the New Testament; the doctrine of three hypostases with an anti-Monarchian emphasis; focusing on Christ’s divinity rather than his humanity; a dualistic anthropology in the manner of Plato; and a spiritual rather than “physical” perception of eschatology. The Arian distinction between the Father and Son was in a sense based on the Alexandrian concept of hypostases. Athanasios of Alexandria esp. Cyril of Alexandria signified a disruption rather than a continuation of the school, since they stressed the unity in substance and the divine nature of Christ, but not the diversity in hypostases.

The term also refers to the Alexandrian School of philosophy that flourished in the 5th to early 7th C.; it included scholars such as Hierokles, Hypatia, and John Philoponos; studied Aristotle no less than Plato; developed an interest in science; and remained devoted to Christian teaching.


T.E.G.

ALEXANDRIAN WORLD CHRONICLE, the conventional title given to a chronicle, illuminated fragments of which survive in the so-called papyrus Goleniščev (now in the Pushkin Museum, Moscow). The text is similar to that of Barbarus Scaligeri; the chronicle ends in 392. The papyrus has been dated by O. Kurz to ca.675–700 (in Kunsthistorische Forschungen, ed. A. Rosenauer, G. Weber [Salzburg 1972] 17–22). This MS is chiefly of interest to art historians, containing on eight fragments a profusion of unframed marginal illustrations, comparable to the Merseburg fragment of the Annals of Ravenna. The subjects represented include the Old Testament prophets, Roman emperors, a map of the Ocean and its islands, walled cities, and personifications of the Months in bust form (Iskusstvo Vizantii I, no.8).


B.B., A.C.

ALEXIOS (Ἀλεξίος), personal name (etym. “helping, supportive”). Classical antiquity knew the similar forms Alexis and Alexion (RE 1 [1894] 1466–71), but neither form is listed in PLRE, vols. 1–2, or mentioned by historians of the 6th–7th C. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 466–5) refers to only a single Alexios, drourgarios tes viglas under Irene. Alexioi also appeared as shadowy figures among two groups of martyrs allegedly murdered under Leo III (BHG 1:14), and in the Synaxarium of Constantinople we find “Alexios, bishop of Bithynia,” also a very vague reference. As far as Alexios Homo dei is concerned, the origin of the legend remains obscure. After the 9th C. the name became more common: Skylitzes refers to three Alexioi, as does Anna Komnene. In Niketas Choniates’ time the name Alexios was popular; he lists 24 Alexioi, second only to John (35). The five emperors who bore the name ruled between 1081 and 1204. The fashion probably did not extend beyond the elite: in the acts of Laura, vol. 1 (10th–12th C.), the name appears only as that of emperors; in Laura, vols. 2–3
(13th–15th C.), we meet an insignificant number of Alexioi and the name has fallen to twentieth place. —A.K.

ALEXIOS I KOMNENOS, emperor (from 4 Apr. 1081; born ca.1057, died Constantinople 15 Aug. 1118. Son of John Komnenos and Anna Dalassene, Alexios began his career as general under Michael VII and Nikephoros III. Together with his brother Isaac, Alexios revolted against Nikephoros (14 Feb. 1081). Constantinople fell on 1 Apr. and was sacked. Alexios came to the throne with the support of the military aristocracy, esp. the Doukai, to whom he was linked by marriage to Irene Doukaina. He found a difficult situation: the government had to cope with the revolts of aristocrats, the Seljuks occupied most of Asia Minor, the Pechenegs threatened the Danubian provinces, and Robert Guiscard was preparing to attack Constantinople. Alexios acted effectively: in 1081–93 he overcame the Normans, defeated the Pechenegs at Mt. Lebounion, and repelled Tzachas from Constantinople.

Alexios's successes owed something to diplomacy—alliances with Venice and Germany against the Normans (T. Lounghis, Diptycha 1 [1979] 158–67) and with the Cumans against the Pechenegs. His domestic policy was equally important: he restricted the influence of senators and eunuchs and relied upon a few military families. Those aristocrats who did not join the “clan” of the Komnenoi, esp. the Anatolian magnates whose estates had been taken by the Seljuks, lost power. His reform of titles was intended to reshape the ruling class. Conspirators (esp. aristocrats) repeatedly but unsuccessfully challenged Alexios (B. Scolatos, Byzantium 49 [1979] 385–94). He supported provincial towns, regulated their trade, and by ca.1092 had restored a sound coinage. Alexios aimed at centralizing the state, even though this state was constructed on a familial or patrimonial principle. Thus his mother and his older brother Isaac acted as emperors. He consolidated the administration under the logothetes ton sekreton (see Logothetes) and entrusted various departments to his courtiers. In the case of Leo of Chalcidon Alexios broke the church's resistance to official fiscal levies, but he consistently supported the church as the bearer of the true ideology (I. Ćičurov, VizVrem 31 [1971] 238–42). He allowed the condemnation of heretical intellectuals such as John Italos and—against his will—Eustatrios of Nicaea; Alexios tried and burned Basil the Bogomil.

The First Crusade created a serious problem for Alexios. Although he rid himself of the bands of Peter the Hermit, constrained most Crusader leaders to acknowledge their dependence on the empire, and used their forces to regain the coast of Asia Minor, he was unable (partly due to Taktikos's mistakes, partly to the intrigues of Bohemund) to prevent the creation of independent Crusader states in Palestine. Alexios was critically judged by Zonaras, treated equivocally by Nikephoros Bryennios, and eulogized by Anna Komnene.

Zonaras described Alexios as having debased the coinage, which was already in a poor state at his accession, but this is true of only the first ten years of his reign. Circa 1092 he carried out a major monetary reform, restoring a gold coin of good fineness in the form of the hyperpyron and creating two new fractional denominations (see Trachy) of electrum (see Trikephalon) and billon, which with the copper (initially lead) tetarteron were to form the standard coinage of the Komnenian period.

Alexios's reputation for piety is suggested by his gift of an icon, establishing the type known as the Virgin Kykkotissa, to the Kykko monastery on Cyprus at the time of its foundation. He also erected a mural (in one of the imperial palaces, according to Nicholas Kallikles) of the Last Judgment with Alexios on the side of the damned (Magdalino-Nelson, "Emp. in 12th C." 124–26). The illuminated MSS apparently sponsored by Alexios include two copies of the Panoplia dogmatike of Euthymios Zygabenos and the Barberini Psalter (Vat. Barb. gr. 372—J. Anderson, CahArch 31 [1983] 35–67).


ALEXIOS I KOMNENOS, emperor of Trebizond (1204–22); born ca.1182, died 1 Feb. 1222. Elder son of Manuel, son of Andronikos I Komnenos, Alexios was connected to Tamara of Georgia; Manuel's wife may have been Tamara's sister (K. Barzos, Makedonika 20 [1980] 30–47). When
Andronikos I fell and Manuel perished, Alexios and his brother David Komnenos may have been taken to Georgia, but the fact that one of Alexios's sons was John Komnenos Axouch (1295–38) suggests that Alexios may have remained in Constantinople, possibly married a daughter or niece of John Komnenos "the Fat" (M. Kuršanskis, *ArchPont* 30 [1970] 107–16; K. Barzós, *Byzantina* 7 [1975] 173), and fled only after John's conspiracy (1200). The fall of Alexios III seemingly inspired T'amar to mount a Georgian expedition against Trebizond, with Alexios and David as nominal leaders (Mar.–Apr. 1204). Once the region from Phasis to Sinope had been occupied, Alexios remained at Trebizond, probably using an imperial title, while David advanced into Paphlagonia. Niketas Choniates criticizes Alexios for his inactivity. In 1214, when Kay-Kâvûs I seized Sinope, Alexios may have become his vassal: Ibn Bibi records an immense annual tribute owed. Alexios founded the dynasty of the Grand Komnenoi.


**ALEXIOS II KOMNENOS**, emperor (1180–83); born Constantinople 14 Sept. 1169 (P. Wirth, *BZ* 49 [1956] 65–67), died Constantinople ca. Sept. 1183. A porphyrogenetos, son of MANUEL I and MARIA OF ANTIOCH, Alexios was crowned co-emperor in 1171, an elevation celebrated in pictures of Alexios, his father, and grandfather (Magdalino-Nelson, "Emp. in 12th C." 146f). In 1175, Alexios accompanied Manuel on an expedition to rebuild Dorylaion (P. Wirth, *Eustathiana* [Amsterdam 1980] 78). He married AGNES OF FRANCE on 2 Mar. 1180, a match that Spatharakis (Portrait 210–30) proposed was the occasion of an illustrated epitalamion in the Vatican Library. Barely adolescent when he succeeded his father, largely uneducated, Alexios indulged in amusements, while his mother and Alexios Komnenos the protosebastos ruled. Their regime favored the Italian merchants and the aristocracy, who pilaged the treasury and exploited government offices. To counter incursions by BÉLA III of Hungary and Kilic Arslan II, the regency sought assistance from the pope and Saladin. Opposition from Maria Komnene was easily suppressed, but

Lit. Miller, *Trebizond* 31–44. 120. PLP, no. 12084.

**ALEXIOS II KOMNENOS**, emperor of Trebizond (1297–1330); born 1283, died 3 May 1330. Son of JOHN II KOMNENOS of Trebizond and Eudokia Palaiologina, he used the surname Palaiologos as well as Komnenos (O. Lampsis, *REB* 42 [1984] 225–28). He was only 14 when his father died; he then came under the tutelage of his uncle, the Byz. emperor ANDRONIKOS II. Alexios refused, however, to marry Irene, daughter of Nikephoros Choumnos, and thwarted the emperor's wishes by marrying the daughter of Bekha Jaqeli, the ruler of Samkhe, in 1300 (M. Kuršanskis, *REB* 35 [1977] 252f). In 1301 Alexios mounted a victorious campaign to drive the Turkmans out of KERASOUS; he had less success in his efforts to rid TEBIZOND of the Genoese domination of its commerce. Treaties with Genoa (1316) and Venice (1319) granted both Italian cities trading privileges and exemptions from customs duties. Alexios built the walls of Trebizond that run down to the sea. His patronage of the arts is revealed by his benefactions to the monasteries of St. Eugenios (in Trebizond) and of Soumela, as well as by his correspondence with the astronomer Gregory Chioniades, who wrote a hymn to St. Eugenios at his request (L.G. Westerink, *REB* 38 [1980] 236, 239). Upon the death of Alexios, Constantine Loukites, protonotarios and protoevristios, composed his funeral eulogy (ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta* 1:421–30).

Lit. Miller, *Trebizond* 31–44. 120. PLP, no. 12084.

**ALEXIOS III ANGELOS**, emperor (1195–1203); born ca. 1153, died Nicæa 1211 or 1212. Elder brother of ISAAC II, Alexios spent most of the
reign of ANDRONIKOS I in Syria and was imprisoned in TRIPOLI ca.1185–87. Honored by Isaac, Alexios conspired and overthrew his brother. He was weak-willed, extravagant, and indolent, allowing birth, rank, and payments to guide his choice of officials, as in the case of Michael STRYPHNO. Provincial officials (Leo SGOURS, John Spyridonakes) sought independence, while the court's tyranny appears in the case of KALOMODIOS. The populace of Constantinople caused occasional outbursts but failed to support the uprising of John KOMNENOS “the Fat.” The strongest pillar of Alexios's regime was his wife EUPHROSYNE. Alexios experienced military successes in dealing with IVANKO and DOBROMIR CHRYSO; with KALOJAN, he made a treaty. He favored PISA and GENOA at the expense of VENICE. The Fourth Crusade found the empire in disarray; after a brief resistance, Alexios fled (17/18 July 1203). He wandered until he fell into the hands of BONIFACE OF MONTFERRAT (late 1204). Sent to Montferrat, Alexios remained there until ransomed (1209 or 1210) by MICHAEL I KOMNENOS DOUKAS of EPIROS, who dispatched him to KAY-KHUSRAW I (R.J. Loenertz, Byzantium 43 [1973] 370–76). When THEODORE I LASKARIS defeated the sultan (spring 1211), Alexios was captured. Theodore placed him in a monastery, where he died.


ALEXIOS III KOMNENOS, emperor of Trebizond (1349–1390); baptismal name John; born 5 Oct. 1338, died 20 Mar. 1390. Son of Basil I Komnenos (1332–40), the infant Alexios was exiled to Constantinople after his father's death. At age 11, however, he returned to TREBIZOND to claim the throne and, subsequently, enjoyed the longest reign of any Trapezuntine emperor. The early years of his rule were troubled by internal dissensions and the Turkoman threat. In 1355, he led an ill-fated expedition against the Turkomans that resulted in a rout of the Greeks; the chronicler PANARETOS narrowly escaped with his life. Alexios, however, also pursued a conscious policy of cementing good relations with the Turkomans by marrying two of his sisters and four of his daughters to various of their rulers (A. Bryer, DOP 29 [1975] 129–31, 136f., 148f.; E. Zachariadou, ArchPont 35 [1978] 339–51).

One of the main problems of Alexios's administration was relations with the Italian republics. At his accession, Alexios found the Venetian trading station ruined, and by 1350/1 regular transactions with Genoa ceased. In the 1360s the Venetians attempted to revive their activity in Trebizond and to attract Alexios to an anti-Turkish coalition, but chrysobulls issued by Alexios in 1364 and 1367 did not confer upon Venice any more privileges than it had had in the early 14th C. Since Alexios wanted to exploit Venetian trade for the benefit of his treasury, tensions arose. In 1376 Venice organized a military invasion, sponsoring the usurpers Michael Palaiologos the despotes (son of Emp. John V) and Andronikos the Grand Komnenos. Although the expedition failed to bring about Alexios's deposition, a new chrysobull in 1376 lowered Venetian kommerkia by 50 percent. Despite this chrysobull Venetian trade in Trebizond continued to decrease through the 1380s.

Alexios was a generous patron of monasticism, founding monasteries such as VАЗELOН in the empire of Trebizond and DIONYSIОU on Mt. Athos. The original chrysobull of foundation (dated 1374) of Dionysiou, portraying Alexios and his wife Theodora Kantakouzene, is preserved at that monastery (Dionys., no.4; Spatarakis, Portrait 185–87, fgs. 136–38). Alexios also restored the Soumela monastery.


ALEXIOS IV ANGELOS, emperor (1203–04); born ca.1182 or 1183, died Constantinople ca. 8 Feb. 1204. Son of Isaac II and his first wife, Alexios was left free after Isaac's blinding and in late summer/early autumn 1201 escaped to Italy. Welcomed in Germany by his sister Irene and PHILIP OF SWABIA, Alexios was present when Philip conferred with BONIFACE OF MONTFERRAT. About Dec. 1202–Jan. 1203 envoys from Philip and Alexios offered generous concessions to the Fourth Crusade at ZARA, if the Crusaders would put Alexios on the Byz. throne. Once the Crusaders accepted his offer, he joined them (May 1203) at Kerkyra. After Alexios III fled and Isaac II had been restored, the Crusaders required that Alexios IV be named co-emperor. He was crowned in early Aug., then joined them in an expedition to
Thrace (Aug.–Nov.). Upon his return, Alexios IV became the dominant emperor. Isaac and Alexios IV had vainly endeavored to fulfill the Treaty of Zara by formally submitting to the pope and collecting money for the Crusaders. When they could not be satisfied, Alexios fell under the influence of those hostile to the Crusaders, esp. the future Alexios V Doukas. Isolated from his former supporters, Alexios fell victim to Doukas, who induced him to flee the palace (28/9 Jan. 1204), then had him strangled in prison.

-C.M.B.

**ALEXIOS IV KOMNENOS**, emperor of Trebizond (1416–29); born 1382, died Achanto (near Trebizond) before 28 Oct. 1429. Son of MANUEL III KOMNENOS, Alexios served as co-emperor from 1395 to 1416. Sometime before 1404 he briefly rebelled against his father. Upon ascending to the throne, Alexios was first faced with war against the Genoese. In 1418 he agreed to pay them an indemnity of wine and nuts for four years. He tried to ensure the security of his kingdom through diplomacy, marrying his daughters to a White Sheep Turkoman chieftain and Emp. John VIII Palaiologos. It is unlikely that one of Alexios’s daughters married George Branković, ruler of Serbia, as is sometimes stated (A. Bryer, ArchPont 27 [1965] 28f). Alexios was assassinated during the coup d’état of his son, JOHN IV KOMNENOS (V. Laurent, ArchPont 20 [1955] 138–43).

-A.M.T.

**ALEXIOS V DOUKAS**, emperor (1204); died Constantinople ca. Dec. 1204. His sobriquet “Mourtzouphlos” (Μούρτζουφλος) was a reference to his overhanging brows, according to Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 561.23–25), but C. Symeonides (Byzantina 13.2 [1985] 1619–28) suggests it means “melancholy, sullen.” A Doukas of unknown lineage, Alexios was allegedly behind the attempted usurpation of John Komnenos “the Fat” (1200); possibly for that reason he was in prison when the Fourth Crusade installed Alexios IV. Released, he was named protovestarios, but sought to undermine Alexios IV. To gain popular support for his intended usurpation, Alexios Doukas led raids on the Crusaders outside Constantinople. Between 27 and 29 Jan. 1204, when the populace made Nicholas Kannabos emperor, Alexios Doukas encouraged Alexios IV to seek Crusader assistance, then exploited this move to win Varangian support to depose Alexios. On 2 Feb., as emperor, Alexios V failed in an attempt to ambush some Crusaders. He strengthened the walls and revitalized his troops. Funds were secured by confiscating aristocratic property. His followers defeated the first Crusader attack (9 Apr. 1204), but on 12 Apr., when the Latins burst in, Alexios V fled to Thrace. Taking with him Empress Euphrosyne Doukaina Kamatera and her daughter Eudokia, his paramour, Alexios V encountered Alexios III at Mosynopolis (summer 1204). Alexios III first allowed Alexios V to marry Eudokia, then trapped and blinded him. Around late Nov., Alexios V was captured by Thierry de Loos, tried for treason to Alexios IV, and thrown from the Column of Theodosios.

-C.M.B.

**ALEXIOS HOMO DEI**, saint; feastday 17 March. Born in Rome under emperors Honorius and Arkadios, Alexios was the son of a wealthy senator. To avoid an arranged marriage, Alexios sailed off to Syria, where he lived as a beggar in Edessa. After 17 years he returned to Rome and lived 17 more years on charity in his father’s house, unrecognized. One day, when Archbp. Markianos (no pope of this name is known) was celebrating the liturgy, a divine voice indicated that Alexios was “the man of God” (homo dei). Alexios was found dead with a document in his hands revealing his origin and story. According to his vita, “the very pious emperors” attended his funeral. It is commonly accepted that the Greek legend summarized above was based on a Syriac vita of an anonymous “man of God”: this saint, born in Rome, fled from his wealthy parents and his finance, lived as a beggar, and died in Edessa. Sixth-century MSS preserve the Syriac version. In Byz. the legend was known by the 9th C., when JOSEPH THE HYMNOGRAPHER eulogized Alexios. The text of the anonymous Greek vita was copied in many MSS, including one of 1023 (F. Halkin, AB 98 [1986] 5–16). The legend did not spread to Rome.
before 977; thereafter it grew very popular in the West and in Slavic countries. The Ethiopic translation makes Alexios the son of Theodosios II and transfers the locale of his deeds to Armenia. The focus of the legend—rejection of family and marriage for the sake of God—was one of the most important hagiographical themes (B. de Gaiffier, *AB* 65 [1947] 157–95).

**Representation in Art.** Portraits of the saint, which are rare, give him the features of John the Baptist. The 11th-C. imperial menologion in Moscow (Hist. Mus. gr. 183, fol.210) shows the saint laid out on his bed, mourned by his father, as the emperor removes the document from the dead man’s hands.


**ALEXIOS STOUDITES**, patriarch of Constantinople (between 12 and 15 Dec. 1025–20 Feb. 1043 [V. Laurent, *EO* 35 (1956) 75f]); died Constantinople. A former hegoumenos of the Studios monastery, Alexios was appointed patriarch without the necessary canonical formalities by Emp. Basil II, who was on his deathbed. Alexios acted in concert with Constantine VIII, and in July 1026 the new emperor, the patriarch, and the senate promulgated a novel anathematizing any revolt against the basileus (PG 137:1245AB). Alexios tried to protect the independence of the clergy, stressing in Jan. 1028 that no clergyman or monk could be judged by a civil authority, and in 1027 he condemned the practice of charistikon. With great energy Alexios attacked the Monophysites, esp. those in the Melitene region. He dealt also with matrimonial regulations. In 1038 Alexios and the synod defined the prohibitions on marriage between close relatives; they did not make a clear decision, however, concerning individuals of the seventh degree of relationship. The patriarch’s relations with the government deteriorated under Michael IV: it is reported (Skyl. 401.67–80) that John the Orphanotrophos, who desired to become patriarch of Constantinople, incited some metropolitans to demand the deposition of Alexios under the pretext that he had not been elected canonically, but the plan failed because of Alexios’s courageous resistance. No more successful was the attempt of Michael V to depose Alexios.

In 1034 Alexios founded a monastery of the Dormition near Constantinople. Its *typikon* is lost in the original but has survived in Slavic MSS, the oldest of which is of the 12th C. It reveals certain modifications of the original made by the translator (I. Mansvetov, *Cerkovnyj ustav* [Moscow 1885] 113–28).


**ALIMPIJ**, late 11th-C. Kievian painter. The *Paterik* describes Alimpij as helping painters from Constantinople who came to decorate a church (of the Dormition) in the monastery of the Caves when Vsevolod was prince of Kiev and Nikon was third abbot of the monastery (1078–91). After the church’s dedication, Alimpij became a priest. Later portions of the *Paterik* are devoted to miracles associated with icons that he painted. Like many artists, therefore, Alimpij worked in a variety of media. VlADIMIR MONOMACH is mentioned as learning of the “venerable” Alimpij. The painter’s career thus spanned at least a quarter of a century. The date of his death is unknown; he was buried in his monastery.


**ALLAGION** (αλλαγήν), a military detachment that in the 10th C. consisted of 50–150 warriors: imperial *allagia* had 320–400 (A. Dain, *Sylloge tactorum* [Paris 1938] 56). In the late 13th–14th C. the term *mega allagion* designated a garrison, esp. in Thessalonike, and the old *allagion* of the emperor’s guards was probably replaced by two *paramonai*, one on horseback, the other on foot. The *Chronicle of the Morea* describes *allagia* as mounted companies; Constantine, the brother of Michael VIII, had at his disposal 18 *allagia*, for a total of 6,000 warriors (D. Zakythinos, *Despotat* 2:133). In the 14th C. the commander of the
allagion was called the archon tou allagion; side by side with him, a ceremonal book (pseudo-Kod. 138.34–35) mentions the protallagator, both subalterns of the megas primikieros. Since each of the allagatores stood at the head of a single paramone, the protallagator was the commander of the whole company; the difference between him and the archon tou allagion is not clear. According to Pertusi (infra), the name ta allagia was reflected in the Arabic toponym Ṭalājā or Tafala for a theme located near Constantinople.


ALLAXIMOI (ἀλλάξιμοι, from ἀλλάσσω, "to change"), or allaximoi of the kouboukleion (De cer. 7.1–6), aulic servants in charge of the emperor’s wardrobe. The word allaxima or allaximata designated ceremonial apparel (Ph. Koukoules, EEBS 19 [1949] 78) that was stored in great quantities in the palace. The Kletorologion of Philotheos calls these servants hoi epi ton allaximon and places them under the command of the deuterous (Oikonomides, Listes 193.16–18).


ALLEGORY (ἀλληγορία) in Byz. was used in the sphere of both literature and theology.

LITERARY ALLEGORY. In antiquity, literary allegory was understood as a trope whose goal was the expression of a concept that differed from the literal sense of the words but was connected with them by similarity or contrast. Allegory remained an important vehicle of Byz. literature: thus, the image of the castle in Palaiologan texts served the function of both romantic adventure and didactic allegory (C. Cupane, JÖB 27 [1978] 264). In literary interpretation, biblical exegesis, and philosophy, the search for allegory meant the revealing of hidden content.

The same principle was applied to classical texts: the allegorical exegesis of Homer (and other poets) was practiced by Neoplatonists, who also interpreted Plato allegorically. Tzetzes, too, in his commentary on Homer, distinguished three kinds of allegory: physical, psychological, and pragmatic (historical). Late antique or Byz. novels and romances were interpreted allegorically to neutralize their erotic content (cf. the commentary on the Athiopika of Heliodoros, perhaps by Philagathos, and Manuel Philes on Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoë). Allegory was applied far beyond literary and philosophical exegesis: the ceremonial of the imperial court, the color of attire, the behavior of animals, an earthquake, all could receive an allegorical interpretation, since the cosmos was perceived as a riddle that needed an explanation. This interpretative allegory could be many tiered, having various meanings that were construed as noncontradictory.


THEORETICAL ALLEGORY. For theologians, allegory was the key method of hermeneutics (or technē) in textual interpretation from the Hellenistic period onward. The apologists, particularly theologians of the Alexandrian School, applied it to biblical exegesis in a manner similar to the interpreters of Homer and Hesiod, either to uncover the deeper, spiritual meaning behind the literal or historical sense, or to reevaluate offensive passages. At the same time, they opposed the allegorical interpretation of myths, seen as the main support of contemporary polytheism, and Gnostic allegorization, thus distancing themselves from both views. Likewise, they opposed Marcion and fellow adherents of Gnosticism who denied any salvific value to the Old Testament, and who regarded the Old Testament as a foreshadowing (typos) of the New Testament. In Galatians 4:21–30 the Alexandrian apologists found a model and justification for their "theological method" based on the unity of the Old and New Testaments, conducted on the premise that the Old Testament prefigures Christ, and that both constitute sacred Scripture.

Relating the two Testaments to the contemporary situation to uncover the desired inner meaning is clearly evident in the exegetical commentaries and sermons of Origen. Therefore, so far as Origen is concerned, the old controversy originated by the reaction of the Antiochene School as to whether or not Alexandrian allegory is more than an arbitrary interpretation of the texts, and thereby different from the Hellenistic or Gnostic
mythical interpretations, is relativized but not resolved.

Despite assertions to the contrary by all representatives of the Antiainen tradition, it is doubtful that Antiainen theoria or anagoge differed from the allegory of Origen as a theological or hermeneutical method. It is true that Antiainen thought is oriented more toward the text, and in the catenae of patristic exegesis after the Council in Trullo (691) and in the Byz. erotapokriseis typological exegesis stemmed largely from this orientation, which today is distinguished from allegorical exegesis. Nonetheless, radical allegorization continued to flourish, as shown, for example, in the commentary on the Hexaemeron by pseudo-Anastasios of Sinai (PG 89:851-1077), in which the first chapter of Genesis is given an allegorical interpretation to reveal Christ and the Church.


K.H.U.

ALLELENGYON (ἄλληλεγγύνη, "mutual security"). The term allelenyghe first appears in papyri designating joint guarantors of a debt or other obligation (P. Oxy. 1408) and by the 4th-7th C. had in practice become synonymous with mutual fideissio. Justinian 1 (in novel 99.1 pr.) distinguishes two types of fideissio: one where the cosureties answered fully and equally any legal action against them, and the other where a special contract limited each individual's liability to a portion of the total liability; in this case wealthy cosureties were responsible only for their own portion and not for the liabilities of their impoverished or fugitive partners. Texts of the 9th and 10th C. employ the word in the context of obligations to the fisc, and it seems in some sense to have replaced the older term epibole to describe the longstanding principle of communal tax liability: Emp. Nikephoros I required peasants to pay allelenygos (collectively) for poorer neighbors engaged in military service (Theoph. 486.26); the Treatise on Taxation compelled peasants to pay the taxes of neighbors who had fled the land (Dölger, Beiträge 119.2). In 1002 Basil II introduced the allelenyghe, requiring dynatoi to pay the arrears of poorer taxpayers; the precise procedures employed under this measure remain obscure. Under pressure from ecclesiastical officials, Romanos III abolished the allelenyghe in 1028. Nevertheless, a deed of purchase of 1097 (Lauria 1, no.53.34) mentions property based on mutual solidarity—allelenygos and alleloanadochos—and ca.1100 Nicholas Mouzalon accused tax collectors of eliciting payments from members of the village community on the principle of allelenyghe (F. Dölger, BZ 35 [1935] 14).


ALMSGIVING (ἐλεημοσύνη) was a social function consistently praised by theologians and moralists, even though some writers, such as Symeon the Theologian, denied the importance of almsgiving for personal salvation (Kazhdan, "Simeon" 12). Almsgiving is a major topos of hagiography, which presents saints either distributing their property among the poor or in conflict with their families over charitable giving (cf. Philaretos the Merciful, Mary the Younger). Even monks in certain monasteries were permitted to have private funds for almsgiving, or at least the practice was tolerated (AASS Nov. 3:566D).

The scope of charitable giving is hard to calculate. John Elemon reportedly compiled a list of the poor in Alexandria (more than 7,000) who were supported by his program of philanthropy. John Chrysostom stated that a tenth of the population of Antioch required material assistance; in Constantinople he counted 30,000 men and 20,000 women in need of welfare (Constantelos, Philanthropy 257-59).

With so many in need, the problem of how to influence (and control) them was of great importance. The poor argued that they had a right to bread and entertainment; the state of the 4th-7th C. complied, distributing special tokens (tesserae) for theaters, bathhouses, etc. (glass tesserae of the 5th-7th C. are known; K. Regling, RE 2.R. 5 [1934] 854); esp. important was the distribution of grain. Eventually the church transformed this
right of the poor into the charity of the church, the state, and the wealthy; the recipients had to stop demanding "bread and circuses" and to beg for alms. —A.K.

ALOUSIANOS (Ἀλουσιάνος), second son of the Bulgarian tsar JOHN VLADISLAV, who gave his name to a Byz. family; fl. first half of the 11th C. The origin of the name is unclear: it has been interpreted as Armenian (J. Ivanov), Jewish (S. Gičev: from alluf, "prince"), or Latin (I. Dujčev, who connected it with "Aloisius"). He served as strategos of Theodosiopolis and possessed lands (his wife's dowry) in Charsianon. Alousianos sided with rebels in Bulgaria in 1040. He joined Peter Deljan at Ostrovo (near Thessalonike) and forced Deljan to accept him as co-ruler. During the siege of Thessalonike, discord in the rebel army broke out between Alousianos and Deljan. According to Litavrin (Bolgaria i Vizantija 376–96), the Bulgarian nobles supported Alousianos until he was defeated at Thessalonike. When Michael IV led an expedition against the rebels, Alousianos blinded Deljan and fled to the emperor. For his treason Alousianos was rewarded with the title of magistros. His son Basil was governor of Edessa. Another son, Samuel, was commander of troops in Armeniakon; perhaps the seal of a Samuel Alousianos entitled proedros and doux was his. Basil and Samuel's sister married Romanos IV. Several Alousianoi (Constantine, David) are known from seals with effigies of the military saints George and Demetrios. Later the family lost its military functions, although some Alousianoi became higher civil officials, e.g., Thomas Alousianos, krites katholikos in Constantinople ca.1380–97. They were related to the ARAONIOI.


ALP ARSLAN, Seljuk sultan (1063–73); born ca.1030, died Turkestan Jan. 1073. Nephew of TUGHRUL BEG, Alp Arslan ruled Iran, Iraq, and northern Syria. To keep his Turkomans occupied, he allowed them to raid Byz. In 1064 he captured Ani with great slaughter. About 1070 he made a treaty with ROMANOS IV, which Alp Arslan considered violated by Romanos's subsequent recovery of Mantzikert (1071). Moving speedily from northern Syria, Alp Arslan inflicted a crushing defeat upon Romanos (see MANTZIKERT, BATTLE of). Alp Arslan soon released Romanos, perhaps to encourage civil strife in Byz. MALIKSHAH succeeded Alp Arslan.


ALT'AMAR (Aght'amar), island in Lake Van in eastern Anatolia. Gagik Arcruni, Armenian king of VASPURAKAN (908–36), had a fortified city built on this island; according to the 12th-C. addition to the History of the House of the Artshunik' (tr. R. Thomson [Detroit 1985] 354–61), it included a church and a palace with domes or pavilions decorated with scenes of combat, courtly pleasures, and animals.

Only the church, dedicated to the Holy Cross, survives. Built probably 915–29, it became the center of an important monastery. A domed quadrifoil of the type of St. Hrips'imé in VELARSAPAT, its blocky exterior carries the decoration described in the History: rinceaux enclosing scenes of courtly entertainments, Evangelists, and King Gagik offering the church to Christ. Individual animals, full figures and medallion busts of prophets and saints, and Old and New Testament scenes complete this most extensive of all surviving Armenian sculptural programs. Sources should be sought in the art of the Arab 'Abbāsid court, in 6th-C. Palestine, and in earlier Armenian sculpture. No principle governing the arrangement of scenes has been adduced.

The interior has an equally ambitious fresco program, including, in the drum of the dome, a GENESIS cycle and, along the walls of three secondary apses, a Gospel cycle that, although one-quarter obliterated, still contains 23 scenes. The History does not describe these paintings; A. Grishin (Patrergon, n.s. 3 [1985] 39–51) has questioned a 10th-C. date, noting that in places two layers of painting are visible. A lost stone loggia balustrade featured heads of exotic animals, including an elephant (Grishin, fig.4).

ALTAR OF VICTORY, symbol of pagan resistance in 4th-C. Rome. A statue of Victory (NIKE) was apparently brought from Tarentum in the reign of Augustus and stood near the entrance to the senate, where senators regularly offered incense on a small altar as they entered. The altar was first removed by Constantius II, perhaps in 357, and there was no great resistance. It was put back in place by Julian and removed again by Gratian, but this time the opposition was considerable. A delegation of senators sought its return, but Pope Damasus and St. Ambrose persuaded the emperor not to yield. In 384 Symmachus, then prefect of the city, addressed his poignant appeal for restoration to the court of the young Valentinian II; it nearly succeeded until Ambrose threatened the emperor with excommunication. In 390 a delegation from the senate approached Theodosios I in Milan with the same request and after some hesitation he refused. After the return of Theodosios to Constantinople the senate again sought assistance from Valentinian II; even though the magister militum Arbogast favored restoration, the emperor did not yield. The usurper Eugenius feared an open break with Theodosios and did not replace the pagan symbol. Honorius restored the statue in the senate, but not the altar, claiming that it was merely decorative and not an object of worship.


ALUM (στινπηρία), double sulphate of aluminium and potassium, or aluminium and ammonium. In the Middle Ages, alumen designated a number of white astringent mineral substances. Primarily used as a mordant to fix dyes in wooden cloth and impart brilliance to the colors, it was indispensable to the textile industry and also useful to painters and tanners. For most of the medieval period, until the mines of Tolfa in Italy began to be exploited (1462), alum production was concentrated in Egypt and Asia Minor, and from there it was exported to the West. According to Pegolotti, the best quality was alume di rocca from Koloneia. Alum of excellent quality was produced in Phokaia and Koylaion (Kütahya), while


ALTAR (ἡ ἁγία τράπεζα), the holy table on which the Eucharist is offered; it was located in the sanctuary behind the templon, at first in front of the apse, later within the main (central) apse of the Byz. triple-apsed sanctuary. Interpreted in Byz. commentaries as at once Jesus’ tomb, the table of the Last Supper, Golgotha, the heavenly altar, and the throne of God, the altar as a symbol of God’s dwelling is reflected in the rites of access to the altar in Eucharist and ordination rites, and in the later practice of concealing it behind curtains (Taft, Great Entrance 279–83, 413–16). The altar also served as a place of asylum.

The earliest altars—sometimes called mensae—appear to have been of timber and were portable. From the 4th C., as their place in the church became fixed, they began to be made of stone. Altars dressed in silver and gold and studded with precious stones are also recorded (Sozom., HE 9.1.4). Altars of this period were box-shaped or free-standing, the latter consisting of a circular, semicircular, or rectangular slab, variously attached to a plinth (Orlandos, Palaiochr. basilike 2:444–52). Sometimes (as at Hagia Sophia, Constantinople), the altar was set on a small platform above the level of the sanctuary (R. Taft, OrChrP 45 [1979] 288.16, 298.8). Below or near the altar stood the thalassa (a small basin, usually connected with a drainage system, that served for the ceremonial washing of priests during the liturgy). In representations, an altar is often shown covered with an evynye.

As early as the 4th C. altars were furnished with a case, called the kathathesia, containing relics (K. Wessel, RBK 1:119). By the 8th C. relics became indispensable for the inauguration (enkainia) of a church. The relics were placed either in a socket in the altar’s plinth, as at Daphni (ABME 8 [1955–56] 76), or in a crypt under the altar. In Western churches transformed into martyria, the altar sometimes took the form of a sarcophagus enclosing the saint’s relics, with an opening (the fenestella) facing west.
there were also alum mines elsewhere in Asia Minor, in Thrace, and the islands of the Aegean. Descriptions of the production of alum may be found in Jordanus the Catalan (ca.1330) and Pegolotti.

The rich alum mines of Phokaia were ceded by Michael VIII to the Genoese Manuele and Benedetto Zaccaria in 1275. They built a manufacturing town and tried to monopolize the export of alum to the West by obtaining from Michael VIII a prohibition of the export of Kolonelia alum by other Genoese. Although the prohibition was not effective, the Zaccaria were able to build a fortune on alum. Eventually alum became a major commodity in the commerce of Genoa, which retained a predominant position in the alum trade throughout the Middle Ages, although the price of its alum declined after 1382, as a result of political conditions, extensive mining, and the competition of Egyptian alum. Phokaia fell to the Ottomans in 1455, by which time Western sources of alum were being exploited.


Alyates (Ἀλύατης), a family of unclear ethnic origin. Its first known member, Anthes Alyates, a staunch supporter of Bardas Skleros, fell in the battle of 976 at Koukou lithos (between Melitene and Lykandos). I. Gošev Starobulgarski giagolčeski i kirimski nadpisi [Sofia 1961] 31–35 identified him with the strateletes Alyates, using the insufficient data of a 10th-C. inscription from the Round Church in Preslav. The 11th-C. Alyata were primarily military commanders: Leo, strategos of Cherson and Sougdaia in 1059; Theodore, governor of Cappadocia; another Alyates fell in battle against the Normans in 1108. In the 12th-C. the Alyata switched to civil service and occupied relatively low positions. Andronikos Alyates, contemporary of Alexios III, was kanikles; the family retained the post, which Nikephoros Alyates held in 1258–61. Several Alyata were active in administration throughout the 13th C.: the vestarios Alexios Alyates was sent in 1275 with a fleet against Genoese pirates in the Black Sea; another Alyates was a fiscal functionary; a seal of the sebastos John

Alyates is dated by Laurent ( Méd. Vat., no.69) to the early 13th C. In the 14th C. the Alyata played an important role in provincial life: George, sebastos in Thessaloniki in 1327; an Alyates who was sebastos in Chalkidike before 1319; another Alyates, ktetor of a church in Philippopolis. Later they are known only as clerics; Gregory Alyates, hieromonachos, was a scribe and songwriter in 1433–47.


Amaedo VI, count of Savoy (1343–83); born Chambéry, Savoy, Jan. 1334, died near Castriopignano, Italy, 27 Feb. 1383. Amaedo, the “Green Count,” inherited the title to Savoy at age nine and expanded his territory into the Piedmont. A cousin of John V Palaeologos (through John’s mother Anna of Savoy), Amaedo became involved in Byz. affairs when he led a crusading expedition against the Turks. In 1666 he commanded a fleet and an army of 1,500–1,800 men that recovered Gallipoli (Kallipolis), which had fallen to the Ottomans in 1354. He was, however, distracted from further campaigns against the Turks by news of John V’s detention by the Bulgarians at Vidin. He sailed into the Black Sea and seized several Bulgarian coastal towns. Amaedo’s siege of Varna forced the Bulgarians to give the Byz. emperor a safe-conduct through their territory (Dec. 1366). He delivered Sozopolis and Mesembria to the Byz. in exchange for 15,000 florins (to pay his mercenaries). Amaedo encouraged John to seek Union of the Churches and persuaded him to go to Rome in 1369 to make his personal submission to the pope and seek military aid. Amaedo’s expedition was a rare example of cooperation between Crusaders and the Byz. Empire.


Amalarius of Metz, archbishop of Trier (after 804–14) and of Lyons (835–838/9); liturgist active at the Carolingian court; died ca.850. In 813 he traveled to Constantinople as ambassador

Lit.
of Charlemagne to Emp. Michael I Rangabe to confirm a treaty between the two powers; received at Constantinople by Leo V, Amalarius returned with the treaty and the Byz. ambassadors Christopher the spatharios and Gregory the deacon to find Louis I the Pious on the throne and lose his own see. Rehabilitated a few years later, Amalarius participated in the synod of Paris on Ikonoclasm (825) and may have been considered for a second embassy at that time. His Versus marini describes the trip to Constantinople via Zara (Ep. ad Hilduimun, 5, ed. Hanssens [infra] 1:342:1–14), an audience with Leo V, and the dangers of shipwreck and Slav or Arab attack, while his liturgical works allude to contemporary customs at Constantinople (e.g., Codex expositionis II, ibid. 1:280:14–20, on the Exaltation of the Cross; Liber officialis, ibid. 2:197:2–6, on Latin Lections at Constantinople).


AMALASUNTHA (Ἀμαλασούνθα), or Amalasuntha, Ostrogoth queen (526–34) and queen (534); died Lake Bolzano probably 30 Apr. 535. The younger daughter of Theodoric, in 515 or 516 she married Eucharic, also a member of the Amali, and bore him Matasuntha and Athalaric, who, after the deaths of his father (522) and grandfather, was raised to the Ostrogoth throne under Amalasuntha’s regency. Together with Athalaric, Amalasuntha is depicted on a diptych of Orestes, Western consil in 530 (Delbrück, Consularispiyuchen, no. 32). Her policy was pro-Roman; Prokopios and esp. Cassiodorus praised her highly as a well-educated and beautiful woman. Her pro-Roman tendency was opposed by the Gothic military aristocracy, led by Amalasuntha’s cousin Theodahad, so that she considered fleeing to Constantinople. She changed her plan—according to Prokopios, because Theodora was jealous, but probably because Amalasuntha arranged a compromise with Theodahad. After Athalaric died she ruled as queen briefly but was compelled to marry Theodahad. Once proclaimed king, he exiled her to an island on Lake Bolzano where she was strangled. The remonstrances of Peter, Justinian’s envoy, were of no avail and Theodahad asserted that the murder had been committed against his will. Amalasuntha’s death became Justinian’s excuse for war: he ordered Mundus to invade from Illyricum and called Belisarios to Sicily. Amalasuntha was unequal to the challenge of preserving the heritage of Theodoric and miscalculated the consequences of her Roman ties.


AMALFI (Ἀμάλφη), Tyrrenian port in southern Italy, first mentioned in 596. Until 839 Amalfi belonged to the Byz. duchy of Naples. After that date the city and its territory became an independent state, within the orbit of the Byz. Empire. Imperial titles were conferred on most of the local rulers, praefecturi and, after 958, duces. From the 9th C. many Amalfitans were active in Mediterranean trade. Their ships were known in Egypt, the Maghreb, and Spain. They had colonies in Dyrrachion and Antioch and are frequently described as furnishing Oriental luxury goods to the West. Their quarter in Constantinople, with its Church of S. Maria de Latina, is documented from the mid-11th C.; on Mount Athos an Amalfitan monastery dedicated to the Virgin flourished between the end of the 10th and the 13th C. (A. Pertusi in Mill. Mont-Athos 1:217–51). Clerics and monks of both institutions translated Greek hagiographical texts into Latin. Between 1053 and 1062 Amalfi tried in vain to organize an alliance of the Western and the Eastern empires against the Norman invaders of southern Italy. Following the Norman occupation of 1073, political relations between Amalfi and Constantinople cooled; commercial relations also declined, with Amalfi losing ground to Venice, Byz.’s main naval ally in the Mediterranean.

Bronze doors commissioned in Constantinople for the cathedral of Amalfi survive in situ, although the cathedral itself was completely rebuilt after 1204 and the façade was again rebuilt after 1871. Nearly identical doors are in nearby Atrani, on the Church of S. Salvatore.

AMALIC I (Ἀμάλικος), king of JERUSALEM (1163–74); born 1136, died Jerusalem 11 July 1174. Upon succeeding his brother BALDWIN III, Amalric sought a Byz. bride to renew the alliance with Manuel I. Manuel rejected his accompanying request to be recognized as overlord of ANTIOCH. In 1167 Amalric married Maria Komnene, daughter of John Komnenos the protosebastos. Amalric sought Byz. aid in 1168 to prevent ZANGID occupation of Egypt, but by 1169, when a joint expedition occurred, SALADIN already controlled Egypt. A combined siege of Damietta (Oct.–Dec. 1169) collapsed over disagreements between Amalric and the Byz. commander, Andronikos KONTOSTEPHANOS. In the same year, Ephraim and other mosaicists commissioned by Manuel worked in Jerusalem and Bethlehem. From Apr. to June 1171 Amalric visited Constantinople. He was received privately by Manuel, did homage, and was magnificently entertained (Runciman, infra). A treaty proposing joint action against Egypt was never implemented. With Amalric’s death, the alliance of Byz. and Jerusalem effectively ended.

ten,” in Varia 1 (Bonn 1984) 132–42.

AMASTRIS (Ἀμάστρις or Ἀμαστρα, now Amsra), city on the Black Sea coast of Anatolia. It first appears in Byz. history when Kyros, a local monk, predicted to Justinian II in 695 that he would regain the throne. Amastris gained importance in the 9th C. as a port for communication across the Black Sea and as a military base. The vita of GEORGE OF AMASTRIS mentions an attack of the Rus’ on Amastris, but the date of the attack and even its historicity are under discussion. The city prospered in the 10th C.: NIKETAS DAVID PAPHLAGON, in an enkomion of a local saint Hyakinthos (PG 105:421C), calls it “the eye of Paphlagonia and even of the oikoumene” and the EMPIRON for trade with the northern Scythians. Amastris was a city of the theme of PAPHLAGONIA and seat of a katepano in the 10th C. (Ahrweiler, Mer 111). In the 12th C. it was administered by a dux (Laurent, Coll. Orphidan, no.227). Amastris was ruled by the Laskarids after a brief occupation (1204–14) by David Komnenos of Trebizond. Its later history is obscure: in the late 13th or early
14th C. it apparently was turned over to the Genoese, whose merchants were already established there. Amastris was a suffragan bishopric of Gangra; it became a metropolis by 940.

The site occupies the neck and steep slopes of a peninsula, with two harbors. The ancient city, which stretched to the mainland, was abandoned, apparently after the Rus’ attack, as Amastris contracted within new walls. Its Byz. monuments include two small single-aisled churches, perhaps of the late 9th C., and remains of a monastery that have been dated to the early 8th C.


AMATUS, bishop, possibly of Paestum-Capaccio or Nusco (E. Cuozzo, Benedictina 26 [1979] 323–48), and monk of Montecassino; born Salerno ca.1010, died ca.1083? Amatus wrote several Latin poetical works and a History of the Normans, which survives only in a 14th-C. French version. Amatus’s account of events from 1016 to 1078 reflects Montecassino’s pro-Norman stance and includes the revolt of the Lombard Meles (pp. 26.6–32.12), the expedition of Maniates against Sicily, and the struggle for southern Italy (pp. 66.5–93.8).


AMBASSADORS (πρέσβεις, ἀποκρυστάριοι) in Byz. were normally recruited from the higher echelons of the administration, the emperor’s immediate entourage, or those clerics (sent mainly to Christian countries, and, for specific reasons, to Sasanian Persia) or laymen, regardless of class or experience, who were considered able to succeed in their missions abroad. Their rank depended upon the importance of the ruler to whom they were sent. None of them were permanently accredited to a foreign country; they were sent or exchanged only when required for specific reasons of diplomacy. Beyond having the emperor’s confidence, an ambassador was expected to be honest, pious, able to resist corruption, and ready to sacrifice himself if necessary for the empire. He was expected to know something of the country to which he was sent and, if possible, its language (interpreters were also available). Able negotiators were entrusted with a series of embassies (e.g., Leo Choirspartes) or had their sons appointed as ambassadors in their place (some cases in early Byz., e.g., Nonnosos).

Byz. ambassadors going abroad carried their own safe-conducts and letters of accreditation (prokuratorikon chrysoboullon). Unlike low-ranking letter-carriers, ambassadors were fully or partly empowered to negotiate. The state covered their expenses and those of their suite. Embassies could be quite large, with many interpreters and servants. One aspect of their mission was to collect intelligence about the country they visited. (See also Apokrisiarios. For ambassadors to Byz., see Embassies, Foreign.)


AMBO (ἀμβώ, also called πύργος), a platform, often standing on four, six, or eight columns, in a church. Ambos were first recorded in the second half of the 4th C. (e.g., at the Council of Laodicea of 371), but most surviving examples date from the 5th or 6th C. (C. Delvoye, RBK 1:127). The example in the Dormition Church in Kalambaka (Stagai) shows that at least in some places Early Christian ambos continued to be used in the 12th C. (G.A. Soteriou, EEBS 6 [1929] 292, 302–04). The ambo stood in the nave, between the chancel barrier and the west wall, and took one of four main forms: the first and earliest has a single staircase; the second is “fan-shaped” with two curving staircases; the third and most widespread type has two staircases on its east-west axis; distinct from these is the fourth, Syrian type, combining the functions of ambo and syntironon (R. Taft, OrChrP 34 [1968] 326-59). The ambo of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, described by Paul Silentariou, was made of colored marbles of many hues and dressed with silver slabs (S.G. Xydis, ArtB 29 [1947] 1–24), but most surviving examples are carved in white marble. Some 13th-C. examples were of wood and portable (Kashdan, infra 425f).
Liturgically, the ambo (together with the bema) was one of the two focal points of the church, and processions back and forth along the solea or pathway connecting the two were a standard part of the ritual. It was at the ambo that the liturgy used to open with the intonation of the Trisagion and close with the final blessing or Opisthambonos Prayer (A. Jacob, Byzantion 51 [1981] 306–15). In Hagia Sophia the choir sang from beneath the ambo, the readers mounted it to read the lections, and the singers intoned from it the psalmody and troparia (Mateos, Typikon 2:281; Germanos, Liturgy 74). On the ambo or its steps the deacons proclaimed the litanies and other diaconika and exchanged the kiss of peace. Solemn orthros (Mateos, Typikon 2:309) and special ceremonies such as imperial coronation rites and the Exaltation of the Cross on 14 Sept. (illustrated in the Menologion of Basil II, p.35) were celebrated at the ambo, which also served as a pulpit for the proclamation of councils and their anathemas (Theodore Lector, ed. Hansen 119.17–20, 142.26, 144.12–13, 149.25–28), and even for secular announcements (Chron.Pasch. 715.16–716.8). Chrysostom even preached from the ambo by way of exception, the better to be heard (Sozom., HE 357.14–15).

Because the Gospel was proclaimed from the ambo, liturgical comments interpreted it as symbolizing the stone rolled back from Jesus’ tomb from which the angel announced the Resurrection to the Myrrphoroi in Matthew 28:2–7 (Germanos, Liturgy 62).


AMBOIDE, late 12th-C. Norman jongleur, possibly from Evreux. Ambroise participated in the Third Crusade and composed a lengthy verse Estoire de la guerre sainte (History of the Holy War) in Old French after his return from the Levant. Its vivid portrayal of the heroic deeds of Richard 1 Lionheart espouses the perspective of the average Crusader and describes, for example, the relations of the Greek population of Messina with the Crusaders (vv. 601–06) and the ruins of Rhodes (1287–1302). His account of Richard’s conflict with Isaac Komnenos of Cyprus and the king’ conquest of the island (1355–2106) includes a description of Isaac’s Greek and Armenian troops (1439–1700), his magnificent tent and gold and silver dishes (1669–72), the superb Byz. war horses (e.g., 1842–50, 1938), and Richard’s shaving of Byz.burgers who surrendered to him (1948). The Estoire was translated into Latin and incorporated into the revised version of Itinerarium peregrinorum by 1222.


AMBOUSE (Αμβρόσεως), bishop of Milan (from 373 or 374) and saint; born Trier ca.339, died Milan 4 Apr. 397; feastday 7 Dec. Son of a praetorian prefect of Gaul, Ambrose was trained as a lawyer and ca.374 became governor of Aemilia and Liguria, with his residence at Milan. In the same year the Arian bishop of Milan died and the people of the city demanded that Ambrose succeed him even though he was then a layman. Ambrose vigorously opposed Arianism and paganism and campaigned for the removal of the altar of victory from the Senate House in Rome; his moral authority forced Theodosios I to accept church-imposed penance after his massacre of thousands in Thessalonike in 390. Ambrose wrote in Latin but knew Greek and translated Josephus Flavius into Latin. He made extensive use of eastern ideas, esp. those of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzos. Many of his works are commentaries on the Old and New Testaments. His funeral orations on Valentinian II and Theodosios I as well as his letters are important sources for the history of the late 4th C.

The Greek church held Ambrose in high regard. His vita by Paulinus was translated into Greek (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Analekti 1:27–88), while an anonymous vita that relied upon Theodoret of Cyrrhus was compiled in Greek (C. Pasini, AB 101 [1983] 101–50); the latter served in its turn as the source for Symeon Metaphrastes (BHG 69). Numerous Greek hymns (kontakia and


**AMBULATORY**, a passage around a major space. Prokopios of Caesarea (Buildings 1.158) uses the term *aulë* (aisle?, lit. “courtyard”) for the colonnaded spaces around the naos (nave) of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople. Ambulatories facilitate movement in a church without disturbing central and sacred areas; they can give independent access to the pastophoria or lead to a contiguous church (LIPS monastery, Constantinople; Hosios Loukas). The ambulatories also served as spaces for ecclesiastical gatherings and for burials. The “ambulatory church” type consists of a naos separated by piers or columns from ambulatories to the south, west, and north, which often provided access to lateral chapels; the term has been applied to such late 13th-C. structures as the main church of the Pammakaristos (S. Eyice, *Anadolu Araştirmaları* 1.2 [1959] 223–34).


**AMBULATORY CHURCH.** See Church Plan Types.

**AMERALIOS** (άμεράλιος), commander of a fleet. A 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 183.21–23) defines an ameralios as subaltern of the megas doux and commander of the whole navy. It is generally accepted that the term was borrowed from the Catalans at the beginning of the 14th C. since Pachymeres (Pachym., ed. Bekker, 2:420.7–8) relates that Roger de Flor appointed an arch of his 12 ships, “whom their dialect calls amerales.” Amerales as a family name is known, however, at least from 1280 (*PLP*, no. 774). In the court hierarchy the ameralios was placed between the skouterios and epon ton deeseon.


**AMIDA** (Ἀμίδα, Diyarbakır in Turkey), capital and metropolitan bishopric of Mesopotamia. Fortified by Constantius II in 349. Amida was frequently contested between Byz. and the Sasanians. It was conquered by Shapur II in 359, retaken by Julian in 363, taken by Kavad in 502, and returned to the Byz. in 504; its buildings were restored by Anastasios I. It fell again to the Persians in 602, but was recovered in 628 by Heraclius, who built a Church of St. Thomas there. Amida came under Arab control in 640. The city walls, which still stand, are attributed to Constantius or Justinian I and were restored in the medieval period by various Muslim rulers. The Church of St. Kosmas disappeared in this century, but the sanctuary of the large tetracoon Church of the Virgin survives. According to *John of Ephesus*, a native of the region, there were five monasteries at Amida in his time. Amida was reportedly attacked five times by *John* (I) Tzimiskes: in 958, 959, 972, 973, and 974.


**‘AMİR.** See *Emir*.

**AMIROUTZES, GEORGE**, philosopher, theologian, and writer; born Trebizond ca.1400, died Constantinople after 1469. The name is a diminutive of the Turkish “emir.” Amiroutzes (*Ἀμιρούτζης*) is first mentioned as a lay adviser to the Byz. delegation to the Council of Ferrara-Florence, where he supported Union of the Churches (M. Jugie, *EO* 36 [1937] 175–80). Later, he allegedly repudiated his earlier views in a letter to Demetrius, duke of Nauplion (ed. M. Jugie, *Byzantion* 14 [1939] 77–93). Gill (*Personalities* 204–12) has, however, challenged the attribution to Amiroutzes of this anti-Unionist tractate. In 1447 Amiroutzes was an envoy from Trebizond to Genoa; from ca.1458 to 1461 he served as protovestarios and megas logothetes of the last Trapezuntine emperor, David I Komnenos (1458–61). After the surrender of Trebizond to the Turks (Aug. 1461), he went to the court of Mehmed II at Adrianople and then to Constantinople, where he continued his scholarly activity, discussing philosophy with the sultan and preparing a map of the world based on Ptolemy (F. Babinger, *Mehmed the*
Conqueror and His Time [Princeton 1978] 246–48). Because of his Turcophile stance, Amirouzes has frequently been charged with treachery and hypocrisy; he has been defended, however, by N.B. Tomadakes (EEBS 18 [1948] 99–143) and O. Lampsides (ArchPont 17 [1952] 15–54), who also dispute his alleged conversion to Islam.

The few surviving works of Amirouzes include a dialogue with Mehmed on Christianity, poems of fulsome praise for the sultan, and a few letters to contemporaries such as Bessarion and Theodore Agallianos.


LIT. PLP, no. 784. Beck, Kirche 772. —A.M.T.

AMISOS (Ἀμισός, now Samsun), coastal city of Pontos. Amisos is rarely mentioned before its capture by the Arabs in 863. It was a city of the Anatolikon theme and played an essential commercial role in supplying Cherson with grain (De adm. imp. 53:533–35). Seals mention several fiscal functionaries of Amisos: kommerkarios, dioketes, and abydikos. The city was occupied by the Turks in 1144, by the Komnenoi of Trebizond in 1204, and definitively by the Seljuks in 1214. During the first Turkish occupation it appears that Greek and Turkish settlements coexisted side by side. The remains of Amisos include late Roman walls, floor mosaics, churches, and inscriptions. Amisos was a suffragan of Amaseia.

Because of similarity of names, Amisos was formerly identified with the Sampson ruled by Sabbas Asidenos; his base was actually Priene.


—C.F.

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, Latin historian; born Antioch ca.330, died after 392. Born to a noble family, Ammianus saw wide military service in east and west as a staff officer (protector domesticus) in the years 354–63, including the siege of Amida (359) and Julian's Persian expedition (363). After returning home, he embarked on more scholarly travels to Egypt, Greece, and Rome, where, to judge from his resentful remarks, he fell victim to the expulsion of foreigners in the famine of 383. He was back in Rome in 392, enjoying the fame of his published history.

In his own concluding words (31.16.9), his Res Gestae covered the period 96–378 from the standpoint of a “former soldier and Greek.” The first 13 books, covering 257 years with a starting point designed to provoke comparison with Tacitus, are lost. The surviving books 14–31 cover in obviously much greater detail the years 353–78, ending in catastrophe (battle of Adrianople) and forebodings of doom. Ammianus combines traditional prejudices (patriotism, contempt for barbarians and mobs, outbursts against corruption and luxury) with a refreshing religious tolerance and balanced appreciation of his protagonists—even his hero Julian's feet of clay are acknowledged. His style is just as mixed, with Tacitean epigram and Vergilian color blended with a jagged Latin that wavers between clumsiness and power. Although a pagan, Ammianus includes a surprising amount of information and detached commentary on Christian affairs (E.D. Hunt, CQ n.s. 35 [1985] 186–200).


—B.B.

AMMONIOS (Ἀμμώνιος), teacher and commentator on Aristotle; born Alexandria late 5th C., died after 517. Ammonios imbued paganism from his philosophically minded parents; after the death of his father Hermeias, his mother took him and his brother to Athens to study under Proklos. His studies complete, Ammonios returned home where, except for some time in Constantinople, he remained as a lecturer on Plato and Aristotle. Photios (Bibl., cod. 187) vouchsafes his reputation in astronomy and geometry. He is variously praised and damned for his paganism, industry, and greed. Of his many writings, only the commentary on Aristotle's On Interpretation remains, though the gist of his lectures survives in students' notes. His most famous pupils included John Philoponus, who edited his lectures on Aristotle's Physics, Damaskios, Olympiodoros of Alexandria, and Simplikios.
AMNOS (ἀμνὸς “lamb”), term that refers esp. to the sacrificial lamb. In the Old Testament the lamb was a common sacrificial victim, esp. the paschal lamb; in the New Testament and church fathers it became a symbol of Jesus as victim (see LAMB OF GOD). In Byz. liturgical usage, the amnos is the central portion of the principal PROSPHORA bread, signifying Christ’s body; marked with a stamp, it is cut out at the PROTHESIS rite and consecrated at the Eucharist. GERMANOS I (Germanos, Liturgy, pars. 6, 21, 36) applied the symbolism of Isaiah 53 to this rite, and within a century the prophetic verses (Is 53:7–8) became the liturgical formula for the excision of the amnos. The use of a lance for this excision is symbolic of the soldier’s lance (see RELICS) that pierced Christ’s side at the Crucifixion (Jn 19:34). In wall painting at KURBINOV and elsewhere in and after the 12th C., the image of the amnos, in the form of a prone Christ Child on the altar, replaces the officiating Christ earlier represented in the apses of churches.

R.F.T., A.C.

AMORION OR PHRYGIAN DYNASTY, family that ruled from 820 to 867 and included MICHAEL II, THEOPHILOS, THEODORA, and MICHAEL III; it was so called because its founder, Michael II, was born in AMORION (see genealogical table). The dynasty is best known for its role in several significant religious events. It was responsible for the final defeat of ICONOCLASM, which Michael II had tolerated and Theophilos had revived, but which

Theodora ended (see TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY). Michael III created a schism with Rome by permitting the election of Patr. Photios, but his sponsorship of the mission of CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER and Methodios to Moravia and the baptism of Boris of Bulgaria helped draw the Slavs into the Byz. cultural orbit. The Amorian dynasty also witnessed the revival of secular learning through patrons such as Theoktistos and Caesar Bardas and scholars such as Leo the Mathematician. Under the dynasty the Arabs occupied Crete, Sicily, and parts of southern Italy, but, despite victories by MA’MON and Mu’TAŠIM over Theophilos, they made no permanent gains in Asia Minor and were on the defensive by the end of Michael III’s reign (Vasiliev, Byz. Arabes 1:22–264).

F.A.H.

AMORION (Ἀμόριον), now Hisar near Emirdağ on the borderlands of Galatia and Phrygia, was fortified by Zeno but gained importance only in the 7th C. when it became capital of the Anatolikon theme because of its strategic location on the main southern invasion route. First attacked by the Arabs in 644 and taken in 646, it was a frequent goal of their raids. In 742–43 it was the base of Constantine V during the revolt of AR-TABASDOS. Amorion gained its greatest fame when a native son, Michael II, became emperor and founded the “Amorian” dynasty. In 898, Amorion was taken and destroyed by the ‘Abbâsid caliph al-Mu’TAŠIM in a great campaign mounted against it. The officers and civic officials captured at that time and later executed for their refusal to renounce Christianity are renowned as the Forty-two Martyrs of Amorion. The city never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENEALOGY OF THE AMORIAN DYNASTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theopilos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulcheria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Grumel, Chronologir 362.
recovered from this attack, though it survived as a bishopric (under Pessinous; autocephalous by 787, metropolis before 860). Although Alexios I defeated the Turks there in 1116, Amorion had fallen definitively to the Seljuks after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071. The site preserves traces of its fortifications and foundations of several buildings, including a large church.

Lit. TIB 4:122-25.

AMORKESOS (Ἀμορκέσος, possibly Ar. Imru’ al-Qays), 5th-C. Arab chief (probably Ghassânid) in the service of Persia who for some reason left the Great King and crossed over to Byz. Having consolidated his position among the Arabs in northern Arabia he began to attack Byz. territory in Palestina III and finally crowned his successes with the occupation of the island of Iotabe in the Gulf of Elat. Desirous of becoming a Byz. phy- larch, he sent Bp. Petros to Constantinople ca.473 to negotiate with Leo I. This mission was successful and the emperor brought Amorkesos to Constantinople, where he treated him royally and made him phylarch.


AMPHILOCHIOS OF IKONION, churchman, theologian, and saint; born Diokaisarea? between ca.340 and 345, died after 394; feastday 23 Nov. Amphilochos (Ἀμφιλόχιος) was overshadowed by the big three Cappadocian Fathers to whom he was connected by friendship and family, Gregory of Nazianzos being his cousin. The hypothesis of K. Bonis (SBN 8 [1953] 3-10) that Amphilochos was the uncle of the deaconess Olympos was rejected by Oberg (infra 48, 78). After studying under Libanius at Antioch, and a decade or so as rhetor in Constantinople, he was consecrated bishop of Ikonion ca.373 at the behest of Basil the Great. An efficient fighter of heretics, he spoke at the Council of Constantinople in 381 and earned the praise of Theodosios I; subsequently he procured the condemnation of the supporters of Messalianism at the Council of Side ca.390. His last recorded appearance was at the synod of Constantinople in 394. The bulk of his writings is lost or fragmentary. Nine homilies survive, mostly on biblical texts, as does a treatise on false asceticism and his letter on the Holy Spirit. Most interesting are his 333 iambics For Seleucus, not so much for their routine exhortations to virtue as for their list of biblical books.


Lit. K. Holl, Amphilochoius von Ikionium in seinem Verhaltnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern (Tübingen 1904).

AMPHIPOLOS (Ἀμφιπόλις), city of Macedonia on the Via Egnatia not far from the mouth of the Strymon. In Roman times Amphipolis was capital of Macedonia I but by late antiquity it was subject to Thessalonike (Hierokl. 640.2). The bridges across the Strymon both north and south (at Mar- marion) of Amphipolis were used throughout the Byz. period. Slavs were established in the region in the 7th–8th C. The bishop of Amphipolis, first mentioned in 553, was suffragan of Thessalonike. The bishopric appears for the last time in a notitia dated after 787 (Notitiae CP 3.272). Even though authors of the 12th–14th C. continued to use the name as a geographic designation, F. Papazoglou (ZVR 2 [1953] 7-24) demonstrated that this was the result of conscious archaising and that the late antique city had ceased to exist; its place was taken by Chrysopolis, which is mentioned in various documents from the end of the 10th C. onward (including portulans of the 15th C.).

AMPHORA (Ἀμφόρεια), large ceramic transport and storage vessel used in all parts of the empire, at least through the 13th C. The amphora shapes of the 4th–7th C. were developed from ancient prototypes and manufactured in many centers throughout the eastern Mediterranean. Amphorae were normally either round or cylindrical in shape, with two handles extending from the shoulder to the mouth; the shoulder and often the whole body were marked with grooves, wheel-ridges, or combing, presumably to facilitate the use of ropes to secure the vessels in the holds of ships.

Archaeological evidence, from shipwrecks and land sites, reveals the extent of the use of amphorae in contexts ranging from household and commercial storage to long-distance transportation. Excavations in Constantinople (esp. at Sarachane and Kalenderhane), in Cherson and the eastern Crimea, and in Pliska, Tomis, and Diogenia show the development of amphora types in the 8th–10th C. when evidence from elsewhere is slight. By the 11th C. Byz. amphorae are again found commonly throughout the eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea, a characteristic type being a relatively small conical-shaped amphora with heavy wheel-ridges, a mouth with a very short neck, and short handles. While amphorae of the 4th to 7th C. are frequently marked with graffiti, those of the 11th to 12th C. are occasionally stamped, usually on the shoulder. Since these stamps are often monograms or abbreviated names (Nicholas, John, George, etc.), Jakobson (infra) believes them to be potters' marks (see STAMPS, COMMERCIAL).

Amphorae were still quite common in the 12th–13th C., but their usage seems to have declined in the 14th C., perhaps because materials were transported in other containers, possibly barrels. Amphorae were inserted into the walls of churches, esp. in the masonry of pendentives; according to some authorities, this was for acoustical purposes, but the amphorae were probably used simply as lightweight filling material. Amphora-like vessels could also be made of metal (see PLATE, DOMESTIC GOLD AND SILVER).


AMPHORA STAMPS. See STAMPS, COMMERCIAL.

AMPHULAE, PILGRIMAGE, vessels of lead, clay, and other materials that were used by pilgrims to transport oil, water, earth, etc., from the Loca Sancta. Particular types include UNGUENTARIA and MENAS FLASKS. The main collections are at MONZA AND BOBBIO in Italy, where are preserved more than three dozen small (diam. approximately 7–9 cm), embossed tin-lead pilgrim flasks, closely

AMPHULAE, Pilgrimage. Ampulla; silver. Monza Cathedral Treasury. To the left of the seated Virgin and Child are the Three Magi; to the right, the Annunciation to the shepherds.
related to the Sancta Sanctorum Reliquary in date (ca.600), provenance (Palestine), iconography, and function. Their iconography is drawn from the Palestinian Christological Cycle, with special stress (by frequency of choice and size) on the Veneration of the Cross and the Myrrophoroi—scenes evocative of the Holy Land’s two most famous shrines, the Holy Sepulchre and Golgotha in Jerusalem. The pilgrim eulogia they contained is revealed by a recurrent inscription: “Oil of the Wood of Life of the Holy Places of Christ.” Indeed, the Piacenza Pilgrim describes a ceremony in the Church of the Anastasis in Jerusalem for the blessing of such oil flasks through contact with the True Cross. Their amuletic function for pilgrims is revealed by their emphasis on the scene of Peter Saved from Drowning, and the inscription on one specimen: “Oil of the Wood of Life, that guides us by land and sea.”


‘AMR (Ἀμρ, Ἀμρ) more fully ‘Amr ibn al-‘Áṣ; Muslim conqueror of Byz. Egypt; born Mecca between ca.575 and 595, died al-Fustāt (Cairo) 6 Jan. 664. He converted to Islam between 627 and 630. A member of the tribe of Quraysh, he was a trader between Hijaz, al-‘Arish, and towns in southern Palestine. Short but hardy and broad-shouldered, he was brave, cool-headed, and clever, and an excellent horseman. Muhammad gave him various military commands; Abu Bakr appointed him to lead one of four armies against Byz. Syria. Victorious in southern Palestine, ‘Amr conquered Jerusalem, Askalon, Gaza, and Eleutheropolis (Elousa) and participated in the siege of Caesarea. Strategically well placed for an attack on Byz. Egypt and aware of its vulnerabilities, in Dec. 639 ‘Amr launched the invasion. At his own or ‘Umar’s initiative, he set out with a small force (3,500 or 4,000) for Egypt, via the coastal route to al-‘Arish. Soon 10,000 or 12,000 reinforcements followed. After taking Pelousion, ‘Amr defeated the Byz. at Heliopolis (640); by 642 he had overrun Egypt, including Babylon (Cairo) and Alexandria, and captured Barca in Cyrenaica. ‘Umar restricted ‘Amr’s command to the army in the lower Delta. ‘Uthmān removed ‘Amr, but a Byz.-inspired rebellion of the Greek population in 645 and a Byz. maritime expeditionary army forced his reinstatement. He checked the Byz. army at Alexandria and retook the city.


AMULET (φυλακτήριον). Although it could take many forms, from medicinal animal fur to apotropaic door frames, an amulet was usually a small artifact worn on the body, such as a pendant, armband (see ARMbands, AMULETic), ring, or token. Severos of Antioch (PO 29.1:79 [583]f) advises against “the suspension and attachment to necks or arms or other members [of those objects] called phyIaketeria, or protective amulets . . . .”

Especially common in the 4th to 8th C., and among the lower strata of society, amulets were roundly condemned by the church fathers and the church councils (e.g., Laodikeia I, canon 36). Magical power was invoked through medium, inscriptions, and/or imagery. For example, the earth of which PILGRIM TOKENS were made was believed to convey the power of the deity or saint from whose LOCUS SANCtus it was taken. As for inscriptions, apotropaic acclamations, such as HeiΣ Theos, commonly appear on 4th- through 8th-C. amulets, as do Hebrew sacred names, such as Ia·d. These were thought to convey the protection of divine power as, commonly, was the 90th Psalm: “He that dwells in the help of the Highest. . . .”

Like these inscriptions, amuletic iconography reflects varied, often ancient, sources. The Holy Rider—the generic emblem of good conquering evil—was an esp. popular image with pre-Christian roots, as were the Greco-Egyptian RING SIGNS that commonly accompanied it. Alexander of Tralles (Alex.Trall. 2:377) prescribes a treatment for colic involving a jasper ring bezel engraved with HERA·KLES choking the Nemean Lion. Yet, much as biblical quotations eventually found a role on amulets, so also did biblical imagery. Most often themes of deliverance or protection—such as the Sacrifice of Isaac—were chosen with the aim of establishing a typological bond. The Adoration of the Magi was a preferred theme for pilgrim amulets. More generic in its applicability was the evil eye.

Medical Amulets. Amulets in this subcategory were designed for specific diseases—thus excluding relics, icons, and pilgrim tokens, whose mi-
raculous powers might incidentally encompass healing. Clearly some of the more common Greco-Egyptian medico-magical gem amulet types (governing sciatica and hemorrhaging) continued into Byz. times. Some 5th- through 7th-C. pendants include amulets bearing texts invoking “good digestion” and related benefits. As with more generally efficacious amulets, power could derive from substance (e.g., haematite, which was thought to absorb blood), symbols (e.g., ring signs), phrases, or images: the image of a man bending over to cut grain provided “sympathetic magic” to treat sciatica, much as a representation of the Woman with the Issue of Blood would be used to treat hemorrhaging.

Medusa Amulet. This is the modern term for a very popular form of uterine amulet known from the 5th to 8th C. and esp. favored from the 9th C. onward. Its power derives from an image characteristic of a human head with seven (earlier) or 12 (later) serpentlike rays, all enclosed in a solar disc, which may also include magical ring signs. This image appears frequently on pendant medallions and less often on ring bezels and armbands (here, in the company of the Holy Rider and locus sanctus iconography). That their magical domain was the uterus is clear from many of their inscriptions. The uterus (hystera) is addressed directly, usually with the double epithet “dark and black one.” It is often accused of “coiling like a serpent, hissing like a dragon, and roaring like a lion”—and then is admonished to “lie down like a lamb”; a ring excavated at Corinth is inscribed: hysteron phylaktieron (“uterus amulet”). The Medusa-like image on these amulets developed out of the Greco-Egyptian Chnoubis, one of antiquity’s most popular gem-amulets—and one long recognized as specifically effective in treating disorders of the abdomen and uterus.


‘AMWÁS. See EMMAUS.

ANACHARSIS OR ANANIAS (Ἀνάχαρσις η 'Avanias), title of an anonymous 12th-C. pamphlet (probably written soon after 1158). Chrestides (infra) unconvincingly attributed it to Niketas Eugeneianos. The pamphlet is in the form of a dialogue between Aristagoras and the personification of Grammar, but is in fact a soliloquy by Aristagoras. Anacharsis, whose name is John (identified by Chrestides as John Kamateros, logos the tou dromou), received his derisive nickname ("delighted with Anna") from the name of his second spouse, Anna. The author presented him as the scion of a rich family who was the antithesis to the ideal of elite behavior: Anacharsis was a failure as a warrior, rider, and hunter and an unsuccessful musician, scribe, and astrologer. (The author dwells much more on these "social" accomplishments of an aristocrat than on traditional moral values or failings.) To make matters worse, after the death of his model first wife, Irene, Anacharsis became involved with the Jewish community. At the instigation of the Jew Mordecai, he married Anna, described as a "frog" who was baptized but was not improved even by this sacrament. The originality of the main image is in contrast to the imitiveness of the vocabulary, which relies greatly on the Bible, ancient authors, church fathers, and contemporary writers, primarily Eugeneianos, Michael Italikos, and Prodromos.


-A.K.

ANACREONTICS, a short-lined lyrical verse named after the 6th-C. b.c. Ionian poet Anacreon. Since Anacreontics always had a basic eightsyllable pattern, they were adapted more easily than other forms of meter (whose syllable numbers were more varied) from ancient patterns of long and short syllables to the Byz. rules of stress accents. Anacreontics were used for religious compositions (e.g., by Gregory of Nazianzos and Synesios of Cyrene and by Sophronios of Jerusalem); they were used for a secular composition by Dioskoros of Aphrodisi. Subsequently they became assimilated into Byz. metrics as an eight-syllable verse, parallel to 12- and 15-syllable meters (dodecasyllable and political verse respectively). Later Byz. Anacreontics (which might better be called trochaic octosyllables) had a rather monotonous tendency to include a stress on odd-numbered syllables and a central caesura after the fourth syllable.


-M.J.
ANAGNOSTES (ἀναγνώστης), reader or lector, at first a layman, then a cleric in minor orders whose primary function was to read, from the ambo, the texts from the Epistles (and, until the 7th C., from the Old Testament) prescribed for the liturgy. Anagnostoi are classified by Byz. canonical commentators among the minor clergy (κλειρικοὶ), who received ordination through the sign of the cross (σφραγίς). In 535 Justinian I tried to limit the number of readers in the Great Church of Constantinople to 110 (nov. 3); in 612 Heralkeios set the limit at 160 (ed. J. Konidaris, FM 5 [1982] 68). The emperor Julian was an anagnostes before renouncing his Christian faith, as were the 9th-C. patriarchs John VII Grammatikos and Photios in the first stage of their clerical careers.

Lit. Beck, Kirche 79. Darras, Οφσια 87–91. — P.M.

ANAGNOSTES, JOHN. See JOHN ANAGNOSTES.

ANAGRAPHUS (ἀναγραφῆς), fiscal official whose functions were hardly distinguishable from those of the epoptes. The earliest mention is on a seal of Leo, imperial baliator and anagrapheus of Opsikon (Zacos, Seals 1. no. 2095) of 750–850. The term is not used, however, in the taktika. Anagrapheus are mentioned in documents from 941 (Lavra 1, nos. 2 and 3) to at least 1189 (MM 4:320.7); Dölger thinks that they existed up to 1204. Their major function was the revision of the cadaster; thus an act of 1044 (?) states that anagrapheus can be sent by the emperor to confiscate the lands of those owners who did not pay demotion to the dioiketes (Pantel., no. 3.1–4). Their function presupposed the measurement of land (see Land Survey), and both Theophylaktos of Ohrid and Michael Choniates accuse anagrapheus of using false measures. Anagrapheus were usually attached to specific themes—Pelopponnesos (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 3220), Thrakieson (V. Laurent, EO 32 [1933] 36), Thessalonike, etc. (Dölger, infra 88).

There were also anagrapheus of special departments, such as George, anagrapheus of the Eastern dromos (Laurent, Corpus 2, no. 466), or the anagrapheus of the soldiers (kontaratoi) and of sailors (Kek. 268.4–5). The anagrapheus often combined his duties with those of the krites. After 1204 he was replaced by the apographeus.

Lit. Dölger, Beiträge 81f. Litavrin, Bolgarija i Vizantiya 301–05.

ANALOGY (ἀναλογία, lit. “proportion” or “resemblance”) was considered in antiquity, primarily by Aristotle, as a mode of predication using a term that is neither univocal nor equivocal but indicates a resemblance between parallel cases. In antiquity analogy served philosophical goals (primarily in mathematics and biology); the church fathers applied it to theology, esp. to discussing an essentially ineffable God. Origen (Comm. on Gospel of John 1:26.167—ed. E. Preußen [Leipzig 1903] 31), while defining Christ as “light of the world,” notes that spiritual concepts could have analogies to sensible objects. Gregory of Nyssa (PG 44:768A) states that the development of the soul presents a certain analogy to the stages of development of the human body through which is revealed order and sequence of the steps that lead man to the virtuous life. Greek theologians, however, did not elaborate a theory of analogy in the style of Thomas Aquinas. John of Damascus, who rarely mentions the word analogy (e.g., Contra Jacobitas 77.3—ed. Kotter, Schriften 4:134), broadly uses reasoning by analogy; he also attacks the weak analogies of his opponents, such as the Nestorians’ assertion that Christ was a human being because of his “dwelling” within a human being (i.e., the Virgin), just as he is called a Nazarene because of his “dwelling” in Nazareth, although he had been born in Bethlehem (Contra Nestor. 22.6–11—ed. Kotter, Schriften 4:271).

—A.K., M.W.T.

ANAMUR. See ANEMOURION.

ANANIAS OF ŠIRAK (Anania Širakac’i), the most notable early Armenian scholar of scientific subjects; he lived in the 7th C. (exact dates unknown). Ananias traveled to Theodosiopolis, Constantinople, and Trebizond, where he studied mathematics with Tychikos, a Greek from Pontus who had learned Armenian. Ananias wrote numerous works on cosmography, a Chronicle, and some theological works. The Geography (wrongly attributed to Moses Xorenac’i) has also been ascribed to him. Noteworthy is an introductory textbook of mathematics, with tables and a section of “Problems and Solutions,” the first of its kind in Armenian. The katholikos Anastasios (661–67) asked Ananias to establish a fixed calendar, but this was not put into effect (Grumel, Chronologie 143).
ANAPHORA (ἀναφορά, lit. “offering”), initially the eucharistic offering itself, but by the 6th C. the prayer accompanying that offering, the Eucharistic Prayer. Usually addressed to God the Father, the anaphora is the central element of the entire EUCARISTIA, the text that reveals its meaning: it recounts what Jesus did at the Last Supper (see LORD'S SUPPER) when he instituted the rite. Originally extemporaneous, fixed texts of the anaphora first appear in the 4th C. (A. Bouley, From Freedom to Formula [Washington, D.C., 1981] 217–53).

Eastern anaphoras show three structural types, Antiochene, Alexandrian, and East Syrian, distinguished from each other by the position of the intercessions (a later interpolation) relative to the anaphora's other, older elements. The Byz. anaphora of Sts. John Chrysostom, Basil, and James are all Antiochene in structure. They open with an introductory dialogue (R. Taft, OrChrP 49 [1983] 340–65; 52 [1986] 299–324; 54 [1988] 47–77; 55 [1989] 63–74) followed by a prayer of praise and thanksgiving to the Father for creation and salvation. This introduces the biblical TRISACTION, which is followed by a prayer recounting in greater or lesser detail the story of salvation in Jesus, esp. the account of the Last Supper, concluding with the chanting of Jesus’ Words of Institution over the bread and cup (“This is my body, this is my blood”). The anamnesis prayer follows, recalling Jesus’ command to repeat the rite (“Do this in memory of me,” Lk 22:19), his death, resurrection, ascension, and second coming. Then in the Epiclesis the Father is asked to send down the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine to change them into Jesus’ body and blood for the salvation of those who receive them worthily in COMMUNION. This petition leads to others: the DIPTYCHS and the intercessions for the living and dead. The anaphora concludes with a DOXOLOGY, chanted aloud, to which the people respond with “The Great Amen.” The term anaphora may also refer to the PROSPHORA, whether consecrated or unconsecrated, or to the veil (AER).

ANAPOLUS. See BOSPOROS.

ANARGYROI (ἀνάργυροι, lit. “without money”), epithet of healing SAINTS who, unlike secular physicians, performed cures without taking payment. The wondrous HEALING of the anargyroi was favorably contrasted with the activity of pagan deities such as Asklepios and Isis and with ordinary PHYSICIANS (J. Duffy, DOP 38 [1984] 24f). The principal anargyroi were Kosmas and Damianos, but the epithet was applied also to Kyros and John, Sampson, and Panteleemon. From the 10th C. a similar term was used to designate a healing saint or his tomb ("the free hospital," amishon iatreion), for example, Loukas the Younger and Athanasios of Athos.

Representation in Art. The anargyroi, generally depicted as young or middle-aged, are clad soberly in tunics and phelonio. They carry attributes of their profession: little medicine chests (sometimes oblong, sometimes cylindrical like a pyxis), narrow boxes of medical instruments, phials, little spoons, spatulas, or pickers (see Physician's Box).

ANASARTHA (Ἀνασάρθα, now Khanzir in Syria) was made a polis of Syria I in 528 by Justinian I, who renamed it Theodoria after his empress (Malal. 444.20–22). Anasartha was situated on the desert LIMES. Two martyrta were built there in the 5th–6th C., apparently by Arab wives of Byz. generals (Victor and Silvanus). City walls were constructed in 594/5, in the name of Emp. Mauric, state officials, and the local bishop, perhaps by Isidore the Younger, a mechanikos who had earlier built the walls at Chalkis and buildings at Zenobia. The walls of Anasartha may have been extended in 604 by a local (Arab?) Gregory
Abimenes in the name of Emp. Phokas and his empress Leontia.


ANASTASIA, APOCALYPSE OF, a compilation that describes the fate of sinners whom the pious nun Anastasia chanced to see during her visionary journey to Hell. The text, dated by Speranskij (infra) in the 10th or 11th C. and by Beck (Kirche 653) in the 11th or 12th C., survives in late Greek MSS (of the 15th–16th C.) and in two Slavic versions. Its content is banal, with an emphasis on the moral decline of mankind, and its cosmogony is traditional, resembling that of the Book of Enoch. The author, however, mentions some historical personages and such events as the reconciliation of Emp. Nikephoros II Phokas with his murderer John I Tzimiskes. Anastasia also reports meeting the protospatharios Peter of the kastron of Corinth, who is replaced in the Slavic version by Paul Samonas.

ED. Apocalypsis Anastasiae, ed. R. Homburg (Leipzig 1903).

ANASTASIOPOLIS. See DARA.

ANASTASIOS (Ἀναστάσιος), patriarch of Constantinople (22 Jan. 730–Jan. 754), probably of Syrian origin (Gero, Leo III 29, n. 17). Anastasios was originally a disciple and synkellos of Patr. Germanos I. He changed sides, however, and supported the Iconoclastic policy of Leo III. After Germanos’s deposition, Leo appointed Anastasios patriarch. He compiled and signed a document (libellus) against the veneration of icons and sent synodika to Pope Gregory II defending the Iconoclastic position; the papal reaction was to excommunicate the patriarch. Nothing is known of any further activity of Anastasios during the reign of Leo III; after the emperor’s death he supported Artabasdos and denounced Constantine V, alleging in a public statement that the emperor had confessed to the patriarch that Christ had been an ordinary man and not the Son of God (Theoph.

415.24–29). After his victory, Constantine ordered that Anastasios be flogged and ignominiously paraded naked on a donkey in the Hippodrome; nevertheless he retained him on the patriarchal throne. When Anastasios died, Constantine kept the see vacant for several months before appointing his successor, the Iconoclast Constantine II (754–66); both actions contributed to the declining reputation of the patriarchate.

LIT. RegPatr, fasc. 2, nos. 343–44. R. Janin, DHGE 2 (1914) 1465f.

ANASTASIOS I, emperor (from 11 Apr. 491); born Dyrrachion ca.430, died Constantinople 8 or 10 July 518. He was nicknamed Dikoros (“with two pupils”) because his eyes were of different colors. His flatterers called Anastasios a descendant of Pompey, a later legend (in George Hamartolos) made him a son of a priest; his mother is described as a Manichaean. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 149.27–150.1) calls him a supporter of the Manichees and rebukes him for patronizing a painter of this persuasion. He was famous for his Christian devotion (of Monophysite type). Circa 488 he was proposed as successor to Peter the Fuller as bishop of Antioch. Even though he held the relatively unimportant post of decurion of the silentarii, in 491 Zeno’s widow Ariadne selected him as emperor against the wishes of Patr. Euphemios (490–96) and of Zeno, who had wanted his brother Longinos to succeed him. Anastasios married Ariadne on 20 May 491 and banished Longinos to the Thebaid to die of starvation.

By 497 Anastasios quelled the independence of the Isaurian faction both in Constantinople and in Isauria. He reformed the fiscal administration by shifting the main tax burden from the urban centers (abolition of the Chrysargyron) to rural areas and transferred tax collection from the curiales to state-appointed vindices (E. Chrysos, Byzantina 3 [1971] 93–102). Anastasios created the comitia sacri patrimonii, transmitting a section of state property to the emperor’s private estate. In 494 he reformed the bronze coinage, issuing the large follis and several subdivisions. His frugal administration resulted in substantial economies so that at the time of his death the treasury contained 320,000 pounds of gold, despite energetic build-
ing activity in various frontier zones (I. Barnea, *Dacia* n.s. 4 [1960] 363–74).

Anastasios met with political resistance, esp. dangerous during the revolt of Vitalian, as well as religious opposition from the Orthodox, who accused him of Monophysite tendencies. He had to deal with severe tensions on the frontiers. After a period of relative calm on the Danube, the Bulgars began to penetrate into the empire. To check them, Anastasios ordered construction of the Long Wall in Thrace in ca. 503/4 according to B. Croke (*GRBS* 23 [1982] 73f). His relations with Theodoric the Great were hostile, and the popes condemned the Akarian Schism and tried to establish their jurisdiction over the northern Balkans. The Persians attacked Mesopotamia and temporarily seized Amida. Anastasios had no children, but his nephews and their descendants retained an influential position for at least five generations (Al. Cameron, *GRBS* 19 [1978] 259–76). Anastasios is sometimes held to be the emperor portrayed on the Barberini ivory.


---

**ANASTASIOS I**, patriarch of Antioch (559–70; 25 March 593–end of 598). Scholars (Sakkos, Weiss) now have rejected his identification with Anastasios of Sinai. Before his election as patriarch he had been *apokrissarios* of Alexandria to the see of Antioch. For his stiff opposition to the Aphthartodocetism of Justinian I, he was banished, probably to Constantinople, under Justin II (570). During this period he was befriended by the future Pope Gregory I, with whom he was later to correspond. His literary output is primarily dogmatic and polemic. Although the authenticity of some of his homilies is debatable, the address he delivered on his return to Antioch is genuine (25 March 593). Five of his treatises on the Trinity and the Incarnation exist in Latin translation. As a Neo-Chalcedonian, Anastasios used a strict Orthodox vocabulary but in some points (e.g., in the emphasis on the unity of divine and human natures in the Savior) he came close to moderate Monophysites. John of Damascus used him, and during the Iconoclast disputes both parties referred to Anastasios as an authority.


---

**ANASTASIOS OF SINAI**, theologian and saint; died after 700; feastday 21 Apr. S. Sakkos identified him with Anastasios II, patriarch of Antioch, murdered by the local Jews ca. 609. However, the brief note in the Synaxarion of Constanti

---

**ANASTASIOS II**, emperor (713–15): baptismal name Artemios; died Constantinople 1 June 719. Following the deposition of Philippikos by officers of the Opsikion theme, the protasekretis Artemios was crowned as Anastasios on 4 June 713. He reversed his predecessor’s support of Monothelitism by eventually replacing Patr. John VI (712–15) with Germanos I and by revalidating the Third Council of Constantinople. The raid of Maslama into Galatia in 714 prompted Anastasios to send envoys to Vida to Caliph Walid, but reports of large-scale campaign preparations in Syria spurred him to prepare Constantinople for an assault. He appointed competent thomoclan officers, including the future Leo III; ordered individuals in Constantinople to be able to support themselves for three years or else to leave the city; rebuilt the fleet; restored the land and sea walls; erected siege weapons; and stored grain. He also dispatched a fleet in 715 to destroy the Arabs’ timber supply in Phoenicia, but the expedition broke up in Rhodes and the Opsikion troops revolted in favor of Theodosios III. After a six-month struggle, Anastasios abdicated, became a monk, and was exiled to Thessalonike. In 719, at the instigation of the magistros Niketas Xylinites, he marched on Constantinople with help from Tervel, but eventually the Bulgars surrendered him to Leo and he was beheaded. His wife Irene buried him in the Church of the Holy Apostles, Constantinople.
and works which profit the soul." Anastasios participated in anti-Monophysite discussions in Alexandria between 635 and 640 but was still active ca.700, although he was a monk at the monastery of St. Catherine on Sinai.

His major work is the Guidebook (Hodegos), completed and supplied with the author's scholia sometime between 686 and 689. It is a polemic against heresies, esp. Monophysitism and Monothelitism. Anastasios also wrote sermons, including two that dealt with the creation of man: man was created from two natures, mortal and immortal, and thus was a paradigm of God's incarnation or Christ's synthesis. The distinction between his genuine works and spuria is not always clear. An erotapokriseis and a florilegium that had an anti-Monothelite tendency are ascribed in MSS to a certain Anastasios, who may be identical with the monk of Sinai. The hexaemeron is evidently not by Anastasios, although the conclusion of J. Baggarly (The Conjugates Christ-Church in the Hexaemeron of Pseudo-Anastasius of Sinai [Rome 1974]) that the author cribbed from Psellus and lived in the 11th-12th C. does not prove valid. In the Hexaemeron pseudo-Anastasios interpreted the six-day creation legend allegorically as a prefiguration of the relations between Christ and the Church. Some works of Anastasios are preserved in Oriental translations.


A.W. C.

ANASTASIS (Ἀνάστασις) or RESURRECTION is the Easter image of the Orthodox church. Usually believed to be based on apocryphal texts such as the Gospel of Nicodemus (but see Kartsonis, infra), it shows Christ bursting the gates of Hell and releasing those said to have believed in him before his Incarnation. First encountered in the 8th C., the Anastasis had assumed its classic form by the 11th: Christ strides over the shattered bolts of Hell's gates, sometimes treading upon the shackled personification of Hades; flanking Christ are sarcophagi from which emerge figures including Adam, Eve, and sometimes Seth on one side and David, Solomon, and John the Baptist on the other. Christ strides toward Adam, reaching to release him (Daphni), or upward, dragging Adam behind him (Hosios Loukas). A rare variant shows Christ standing centrally, exposing his wounds. In a Palaiologan version he pulls Adam with his right hand and Eve with his left (Chora). The image of the Anastasis is integral to Great Feast cycles in all media; accompanying the Easter lection (Jn 1:1-18), it opens many lectionaries and precedes John's Gospel in many Gospel books; it illuminates the Easter homily of Gregory of Nazianzos and hymns of resurrection; and it occupies the apse of certain late funerary chapels (Chora) and Crusader churches (see "Holy Sepulchre" under Jerusalem).


A.W. C.

ANASTASIOU BIBLIOTHECARIUS, papal official, Latin writer, and translator; born Rome ca.800 or before 817 (H. Wolter, LMA 1:573), died ca.879. Anastasius was 9th-C. Europe's leading expert on Byz. His rocky career saw him as cardinal priest of St. Marcellus in 847/8, a fugitive around Aquileia in 848-53, excommunicated and reduced to lay status by Pope Leo IV, and unsuccessful antipope in 855. Subsequently rehabilitated, Anastasius became abbot of S. Maria in Trastevere and, from 861 or 862, served as private secretary to Pope Nicholas I, regained the priesthood and became bibliotecarius Romanae Ecclesiae (head of the archive) to Hadrian II. From late 861, he shaped policy and authored diplomatic correspondence with Constantinople, particularly concerning Photios (N. Erth, Archiv für Urgudenforschungen 15 [1938] 82-121). Anastasius knew Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios and backed their endeavors to evangelize the Slavs (F. Grivec, Konstantin und Method: Lehrer der Slaven [Wiesbaden 1960] 78-82). In 868, Anastasius was accused of complicity in his relatives' attack on Hadrian's wife and daughter but was acquitted.

The following year, he traveled to Constantinople as Louis II's envoy to Basil I and probably negotiated the projected marriage alliance between the two empires. In the same capacity, he participated in the Constantinople council of 869-70 (see under Constantine, Councils of).
earning Basil’s irritation and papal satisfaction through a murky affair of documents stolen from the pope’s ambassadors. Between 2 Feb. and 13 Aug. 871, Anastasius probably wrote the letter of Louis II to Basil I preserved in the CHRONICON SALERNITANUM. After the accession of Pope John VIII in Dec. 872, his influence waned (P. Devos, Byzantion 32 [1962] 97–115) and he devoted himself to writing.

In addition to the many letters composed in his lords’ names, Anastasius probably wrote sections of the biography of Nicholas I in the Liber pontificalis—its views on Byz. are his—and influenced the author of the Life of Hadrian II. His unparalleled, if imperfect, knowledge of Greek allowed him to translate into Latin numerous works of Byz. literature desired in the West. A dozen such hagiographical texts, dedicated to popes, churchmen, and the Frankish ruler include a sermon by Theodore of Studios, Constantine the Philosopher’s lost writings on St. Kliment (the surviving preface from 877 or 878 sheds light on Constantine’s earlier career—P. Devos, P. Meyvaert, in Cyrillo-Methodiana [Cologne 1964] 65), as well as a Passion of Peter of Alexandria. These works seem to betray a fascination with the East combined with fear of Byz. heresy and political oppression (C. Leonardi in Hagiographie—cultures et sociétés [Paris 1981] 471–89).

Anastasius’s translations of theological works included Maximos the Confessor, a revision of John Scot Eriugena’s translations of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, and Collectanea of documents from the crisis over Monotheletism. The recent relations of the papacy with Constantinople explain Anastasius’s improved translation of the acts of the Second Council of Nicaea, the version of and commentary on the 869–70 council of Constantinople (C. Leonardi, StMed 3 8 [1967] 59–192), and a Chronographia tripartita based in large part on Theophanes the Confessor, the nearly slavish translation of which (D. Tabachovitz, BZ 38 [1938] 16–22) reflects older and more reliable MSS than the revised Greek originals that have survived.


-M.McC.

ANASTYLOSIS. See DEPOSITION FROM THE CROSS.

ANATHHEMA (ἀνάθημα, “that which is set aside, accursed”), the highest form of ecclesiastical censure directed at obstinate or unrepentant heretics, normally found at the conclusion of conciliar decrees and canons. The earliest recorded usage of the term is at the Council of Elvira, ca.305 (canon 52). The New Testament formula εἰ τις... ἀνάθημα ἔστω (Gal 1:9), met frequently in conciliar documents, was first employed by the local council of Gangra. The term supposed exclusion from the church’s fellowship and, as such, does not appear to have been clearly distinguishable from excommunication. Nevertheless, anathema, in contrast with the disciplinary procedure of excommunication, was essentially a more solemn pronouncement of condemnation. It was thus not a precise ecclesiastical punishment as much as a curse directed almost exclusively against false teaching. From the 7th C. onward the term is clearly distinguishable from excommunication in conciliar decrees (cf. Nicaea II, canon 1). According to Balsamon the church cannot exercise the right of total or eternal anathema by which the transgressor is deprived of all hope of salvation (PG 137:1237A). The word, which was used broadly as a malediction by individuals (e.g., in purchase deeds, MM 6:159.26–27, 161.30–31), was often coupled with the curse (δρακ) of the 318 Fathers of Nicaea I. The Synodikon of Orthodoxy, first drafted in the early 10th C., with additions made up to the 15th C., contains numerous anathemas of heretics.


ANATOLIA. See ASIA MINOR.

ANATOLIKON (Ἀνατολικόν), one of the original themes of Asia Minor, attested by 669. Stretching from the Aegean to Lykaonia and Isauria, it ranked first among all the themes. Its troops rebelled against Constantine IV in 681,
and in 714 its *strategos* successfully revolted to become emperor Leo III. Conscious of the power of the general, Leo apparently detached the western districts to form the Thrakesion theme. Anatolikon supported Constantine V in 742 against Artabasdos; in 803 its *strategos* Bardanes Toukios led a revolt. Early in the 9th C. its eastern districts were removed to form Cappadocia; under Theophilos, Seleukeia became a separate theme; and Leo VI added the region west of the Salt Lake to Cappadocia. The capital of Anatolikon was Amorion until at least 898. In the mid-9th C. Anatolikon contained 34 forts; its *strategos*, who bore the title *patrikios*, commanded 15,000 troops and drew a salary of 40 pounds of gold. Anatolikon last appears when its *strategos* Nikephoros Botaneiates was proclaimed emperor in 1077.

**LIT.** A. Pertusi in *De them.* 114–17. TIB 4:63–66. —C.F.

**ANATOLIOS** (Ἀνατόλιος), member of a famous family of jurists, *antecessor*, professor at the law school of Berytos, and one of the eight addressees of the Constitutio *Omnem* of Justinian I from the year 533. Anatolios was appointed by Justinian to the commission for the compilation of the Digest. He is probably identical with the jurist Anatolios, named specifically in some scholia to the *Basilika*, who wrote Greek paraphrases to constitutions of the *Codex Justinianus*. According to the generally accepted view of K.E. Zachariassen von Lingenthal (*Kritische Jahrbücher für Deutsche Rechtswissenschaft* 8 [1844] 803f), the Greek versions of the *Cod. Just.* VIII 4–56 that were admitted into the text of the *Basilika* originate in a paraphrase of the *Codex* by Anatolios. Since Ferrini’s edition of approximately 200 anonymous paraphrases of constitutions of the *Codex* (two of which are inscribed with “Anatolios” in the scholia to the *Basilika*), these have been regarded as extracts from this paraphrase.


**LIT.** Zachariassen, *Kleine Schriften* 2:326–33. —A.S.

**ANAZARBOS** (Ἀναζαρβός), now Anavarza), a city in the eastern plain of Cilicia on a tributary of the Pyramos. The civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of Cilicia II, Anazarbos was destroyed by earthquakes and rebuilt by Justin I, then Justinian I, and assumed their names in turn. Occupied by the Arabs in the mid-7th C., its exposed frontier location led to depopulation until it was restored in 796. After many Byz. attempts, Nikephoros II Phokas took Anazarbos in 962. It became the seat of a *strategos*, but fell to the Armenians in 1085 and to the Crusaders in 1097. Retaken by John II Komnenos in 1137 and by Manuel I in 1158, it was finally lost again to the Armenians ca. 1174. The site contains two basilicas of the 6th C., a cruciform church of uncertain date, and extensive remains of fortifications, some of them Byz.


**ANCHIALOS** (Ἄνχιαλος), Thracian city on the Black Sea coast; in the late Roman period it was in the province of Haemimontus. According to Ammianus Marcellinus (Amm.Marc. 27.4.12), it was a *civitas magna*. Prokopios (*Buildings* 3.7.18) identified its inhabitants as Thracians. Occupied by Avars at the end of the 6th C., Anchialos was later contested between Bulgarians and Byz.: in 763 Constantine V defeated the Bulgarians in a battle on the “field of Anchialos” (*Theoph.* 433.5). Empress Irene ordered the fortification of Anchialos, but under Michael I the Christian population left the town. In 917 a Byz. army was defeated near Anchialos in the battle at Achelous, and the town was annexed to Bulgaria. Anchialos was in Bulgarian hands in the 13th and 14th C., although Michael VIII tried to regain it by marrying his relative Maria to the Bulgarian tsar Constantine Tich. It was under Byz. control ca. 1423, but soon thereafter was conquered by the Turks.

According to legend, Anchialos was a Christian city as early as the 1st C.; Eusebios mentions its bishop Sotas (ca. 170). From the 7th C. onward, Anchialos was an autocephalous archbishopric under the direct jurisdiction of Constantinople.


**ANCHORITE.** See HERMIT.
ANCIENT OF DAYS. See Christ: Types of Christ.

ANCONA (Ἀγκών), Adriatic port in central Italy and an important Byz. stronghold during the Gothic war of the 6th C. In the mid-12th C. Manuel I used the commune of Ancona, which recognized him as overlord, as a Byz. base to fight the Norman kingdom, the Venetian predominance in the Adriatic, and the growing influence of the Western Empire in Italy. With the help of Byz. money and military advisers Ancona resisted the German assaults in 1158, 1167, and 1173. From the second half of the 12th C. Anconitan merchants are known to have traded in Dalmatia and in the eastern Mediterranean. Their colony in Constantinople, with its Church of St. Stephen (attested from 1199), was headed by a consul. According to a chrysobull of Andronikos II (1088), Anconitan ships paid 2 percent tax on goods entering or leaving the port of Constantinople (Reg 4, no. 2315), the same percentage as that paid by Venetian and Genoese ships. The travels of CYRIACUS OF ANCONA in the eastern Mediterranean resulted in the first important archaeological information about this region. In 1453 the Anconitan consul helped to defend Constantinople’s walls.


ANDRAVIDA (Ἀνδραβίδα, Fr. Andreville, origin of the name disputed), city in Elis in the northwestern Peloponnesos; primary residence of the prince of ACHAIA. According to the CHRONICLE OF THE MOREA (vv. 1426–29, ed. Schmitt 98f), Andraida was already a town before the Frankish conquest, but was not fortified. GEOFFREY I VILLEHARDOUIN established himself in Andraida almost immediately after his arrival. Its location in the rich Elean plain allowed it to be well supplied for the great gatherings the Frankish chivalry so enjoyed, while its proximity to the sea, through the port at Clarenza, permitted easy contact with the West; never fortified, it was protected by the castle of Chlemoutsi 5 km to the east. The city witnessed great assemblies of troops and courtiers, including the marriage of Hugues de Brienne and Isabelle de la Roche in 1277. Geoffrey I transferred the bishopric of Olena (Notitiae CP 21.134) to Andraida and it kept that title, although the bishop was a Frank.

No monuments from before 1204 are known, but three churches of the Frankish period can be identified in the sources: St. Sophia, St. Stephen, and St. James; this last possessed a hospital and was the burial place of the Villehardouins. The sanctuary and side chapels of the Dominican Church of St. Sophia survive: it was an enormous cathedral, more than 41 m long and nearly 19 m wide. It can be paralleled by many late 13th- and early 14th-C. Gothic churches in France and Italy. Its plan resembles that of St. Paraskeve in Chalkis. Inside the church was the tombstone of the princess Agnes (died 1286), with what is probably the coat of arms of the Villehardouin family (A. Bon, MonPiot 49 [1957] 129–39).


ANDREJ OF BOGOLJUBOVO, prince of Suzdal’; born ca. 1111, died 29 June 1174. Intending, like his father JURIJ DOLGORUKIJ, to rule over all of Rus’, Andrej did not aim to be prince of Kiev, which his army sacked in 1169. He developed his capital Vladimir on the Klazma River after Kiev, Byz., and Romanesque models and maintained a country residence at Bogoljubovo, after which he was nicknamed. Andrej tried to erect a second metropolitan see at Vladimir, but the Byz. patriarch LOUKAS CHRYSOBERGES rejected this project in a letter (ca. 1165–1168; wrongly dated to ca. 1161 by Grumel in RegPatr, fasc. 3, no. 1052). Andrej promoted the cult of the THEOTOKOS as his and his principality’s patroness (see VIRGIN OF VLADIMIR) and the veneration as a saint of LEONTIOS, a Greek and the first bishop of Rostov, who was martyred by local pagans in the 1070s. Andrej participated in church discussions concerning fasting on holy days, a topic simultaneously debated in Constantinople. His relations with Byz. were not as close as those of his father because in Constantinople relations with the Kievan ruler
took priority. Andrej was ruthless toward both his family and his close associates, a policy that precipitated a plot which ended his days.


—An.P.

ANDREW (Anastas), apostle and saint; feastday 30 Nov. He was the brother of Peter and, like him, a fisherman. The early legend, preserved in EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA, describes only his mission to Scythia; eventually he was said to have visited Thrace, and GREGORY OF TOURS states in passing that Andrew was in Constantinople as well. Not until the end of the 7th C., however, did the idea appear that Andrew ordained Stachys, the first (legendary) bishop of Constantinople. Photios (Bibl., cod.179) mentions "the so-called Acts of the twelve apostles, primarily Andrew" that were used by the Manichaeans Agapios, but we do not know the contents of the Manichaean legend.

The story of Andrew was developed by EPIPHANIOS OF KALLISTRATOS in Constantinople in the early 9th C. (PG 120:215—60); the author’s identity with EPHESIANS HAGIOPOLITITES has been suggested but remains questionable. Euphemiou was followed by various writers, including NIKETAS DAVID PAPHLAGON. Legend called Andrew the protokletos (first of the apostles) and made wordplays on his name (which means "courageous"); he is presented as a tireless missionary who traveled to Paphlagonia, the Caucasus, and the northern shores of the Black Sea. However, the notion of Andrew as the founder of the see of Constantinople did not become popular in Byz. and was invoked infrequently (e.g., by NICOSIOS DOXOPATRES in 1143). The cult of Andrew seems to have been more intense at Patras, with which legend associated his martyrdom and death. Constantine VII (De adm. imp., 49.26) ascribes to Andrew’s intervention the victory over the Slavs, who besieged Patras between 802 and 806.

Representation in Art. From the 6th C. onward, Andrew’s disheveled white hair and beard distinguish his portraits. He is often represented in the FEEDING OF THE MULTITUDE and with Peter in the scene of their calling. This usually follows Matthew 4:1—18 (Sant’Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna; Tokali Kilise, Goreme) and only rarely John 1:37—42, in which Andrew is the central figure, shown introducing Peter to Christ as in an 11th-C. Gospel book in Vienna (ONB, theol. gr. 154, fol. 223r). Of the apocryphal events from Andrew’s life, only his crucifixion on a cross or tree is illustrated: Belli Kilise, Soğanli; bronze doors of San Paolo fuori le Mura in Rome, 1070. He is shown preaching in the marginal Psalters (Ps 19) and baptizing in the Paris Gregory (fol. 426v). He appears among other saints on 10th- and 11th-C. ivories. Though both the Liber pontificalis (S.V. Gregory III) and the Letter of the Three Patriarchs (p.351) mention panels portraying him, the earliest surviving single-figure icons of Andrew are from the 14th C. (Nicosia, Icon Museum; Venice, Museo Correr).


—J.I., A.K., A.W.C.

ANDREW, archbishop of Caesarea (563—614). Andrew composed the second oldest commentary on the Apocalypse after that of Oikoumenios, with whom he was often in principled disagreement. His exegesis is esp. valuable as a source for the textual tradition of the Apocalypse. Arethas of Caesarea freely exploited it in the 9th C., and its influence spread further afield through translations into Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic. Fragments also remain of a work of moral comfort entitled Therapeutikon; his commentary on Daniel is lost.


ANDREW OF CRETE, poet, ecclesiastical orator, and saint; born Damascus ca.660, died Lesbos 4 July 740. tonsured at an early age at the mon-
Astery of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, Andrew became a notary of the Great Basilica there. Contrary to legend, he did not participate in the Council of Constantinople of 680. He was, however, sent on a mission to Constantinople in 685 and administered an orphanage and a poorhouse there. Between 692 and 719 he was elected metropolitan of Crete; the seal of Andrew, prōedros of Crete (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, no.619), is probably his. Andrew’s homilies allude to the invasions of the Scythians (Bulgarians) and of “the tribe of the maidservant Hagar” (Arabs) as well as to Leo III’s persecution of the Jews.

Andrew is often considered the creator of the new genre of the kanon that replaced the kontakion. His Great Kanon is enormously long, with 250 strophes. As a theologian Andrew was indifferent to monothelitism and developed the idea that the Virgin, although born of a human marriage, was in a sense the daughter of God (M. Jugie, EO 13 [1910] 129–35). Some works ascribed to Andrew in MSS are not genuine, for example the panegyric of James, the brother of the Lord (ed. J. Noret, H. Gaspart [Toronto 1978]). Andrew enjoyed considerable renown. His vita, written (9th C.?) by Patr. Niketas (to be distinguished from Niketas Magistros), was later re-worked several times. After 1204 a certain Akakios Sabaites produced a commentary on the Great Kanon that mentioned Basil II’s victory over the Bulgarians, the foundation of Mosynopolis, and the news of the Latin conquest of Constantinople (M. Richard, EEBS 34 [1965] 304–11).


Beck, Kirche 500–02.

ANDREW THE FOOL (ὁ σαλός), a “created” saint; feastday 28 May. He was supposedly a contemporary of the 5th-C. emperor Leo I, although his biographer presented him as an imitator of Symeon of Emesa, the holy fool who lived in the 6th C. A certain Nikephoros, priest of Hagia Sophia, wrote Andrew’s Life; its date remains disputed. According to C. Mango (RSBS 2 [1982] 309), the most probable date is between 674 and 695; J. Wortley (Byzantium 43 [1973] 248) ascribes to the vita a terminus post quem of 920, though he

dates some parts of it to the early 880s; L. Rydén (DOP 32 [1978] 129–55) prefers a date of ca.950–59. The earliest MS is a quire in Munich (Bayer. Staatsbibl. gr. 443) in a 10th-C. uncial script. The vita was translated into Georgian and Slavonic.

The Life of Andrew presents him as Scythian and the slave of the protospatharios Theognostos; Andrew acquired fluent Greek surprisingly quickly and became his master’s notary, but after a dream he turned to a spiritual life. He rejected all social conventions, lived in the streets, drank from puddles, slept on a dung heap, and not only endured hardships supernaturally but knew hidden things and foresees the future. His behavior, however, is less extreme than that described in the Life of Symeon. Andrew’s endurance is emphasized: he was beaten up by visitors to a tavern, a heavy cart ran over him, he survived bad storms. The Life introduces a certain Epiphanius, who was handsome, rich, socially conventional, and part of the establishment; he was nevertheless Andrew’s beloved pupil, whose election as “the bishop of the imperial city” Andrew predicted. The Life is consistently Constantinopolitan, its action unfolding on the streets of the capital. Its several visions and apocalypses include the prophecy that Egypt will pay her tribute, pakta (L. Rydén, DOP 28 [1974] 202.32–40). The Life describes Epiphanius’s vision of Hades: a murky area full of prisons and populated neither by devilish executioners nor tortured sinners but rather by animals that symbolize the souls of sinners.

Representation in Art. One of the very rare images of this saint is a late 12th-C. fresco in the cell in the Enkleistra of St. Neophytos on Cyprus. The rather emaciated saint wears a fleecy, short-sleeved, belted tunic and carries a little sprig of flowers (C. Mango, E. Hawkins, DOP 20 [1966] fig.92).

SOURCE. PG 111:627–888.


A.K., N.P.S.

ANDREW THE SCYTHIAN, late 9th-C. general of Basil I who distinguished himself in wars against Tarsos. He received the title of patrēkios and was appointed domestikos ton scholon. Andrew was re-
portedly (*TheophCont* 234–36) angered by a blasphemous letter sent him by the emir of Tarsos and led an expedition against this city; at the Podandos River he defeated an Arab army and took prisoner its commander, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Rashid (878). His enemies charged him with pusillanimity because, after his victory at Podandos, Andrew retreated without proceeding to Tarsos; according to another version (*TheophCont* 847.10–12), *Santabarenos* accused Andrew of supporting Leo against his father, Basil I. *Kesta Styppeiotes* replaced Andrew as *domestikos* (ca.883?), but Leo VI restored him to his previous position and possibly granted him the title of *magistros*.


**ANDRONIKOS I KOMNENOS**, emperor (1183–85); born ca.1118–20, died Constantinople Sept. 1185. Son of Isaac the brother of John II. Andronikos was nurtured with the future Manuel I, who remained personally partial to him. Andronikos, however, renewed his father's hostility to the ruling Komnenoi. Reconciled with Manuel in 1180, after many adventures, he became governor of Pontos. During the reign of Alexios II, he stirred opposition to Maria of Antioch. In Apr. 1182, Andronikos overthrew her, allowed a massacre of citizens of Pisa and Genoa in Constantinople, and became regent for Alexios II. He murdered Maria Komnene, her husband, and Maria of Antioch. His coronation as co-emperor (Sept. 1183) led to Alexios II's death.

Internally, Andronikos attempted reforms: provincial governors received adequate salaries, sale of offices ceased, corruption was prosecuted, pillaging of wrecked ships prohibited, and taxation moderated. He used the bureaucracy against the aristocracy; he harshly persecuted nobles, esp. rival Komnenoi (Kazhdan, *Gosp.klass.* 263–65); however, some nobles (including Constantine Doukas and Andronikos Doukas) were among his supporters. Many aristocrats (notably Alexios Komnenos the *pinnkernes*) fled to neighboring rulers, stirring opposition to Andronikos.

Externally, he had few successes. Beîla III occupied Niš (see Naissus) and Sofia (see Serdica) in 1182–83, then withdrew (1184). To gain naval support, Andronikos turned to Venice. The reappearance of Venetians in Constantinople alienated the populace. Cyprus fell to Isaac Komnenos. After the forces of William II took Thessalonike, the multitude in Constantinople were terrified; the populace seized an occasion to de-throne Andronikos (12 Sept. 1185). Captured after attempted flight, he was cruelly put to death.

Andronikos's talents and personality earned the people's admiration, but his violence and lasciviousness marred his achievements. His first wife was a Byz. aristocrat, his second *Agnes of France*; his favorite mistress was Theodora Komnene, widow of Baldwin III of Jerusalem. Representations of Andronikos are rare, though he is distinguished on his coins (Grierson, *Byz. Coins*, figs. 1109–12) by his long forked beard, remarked upon by Choniates.


**ANDRONIKOS II PALAIOLOS**, emperor (1282–1328); born 1259 or 1260, died Constantinople 13 Feb. 1332. His 46-year reign, the third longest in the history of the empire, was plagued by religious dissension, Ottoman advances, civil war, and financial problems; at the same time, arts and letters flourished, and Andronikos presided over a court that included such distinguished intellectuals as Theodore Metochites and Nikephoros Choumnos. During his reign there was considerable construction activity in the capital, esp. the restoration of churches and monasteries.

Co-emperor from 1272, Andronikos repudiated the unpopular Unionist policies of his father, Michael VIII, immediately upon the latter's death in 1282; he was unable, however, to resolve the Arsenite schism until 1310. He was staunchly Orthodox and pious, even superstitious, and very much under the influence of Patr. Athanasios I.

The financial difficulties of the empire during his reign are reflected in the continuing depreciation of the *Hyperpyron*. The resulting rise in prices and the emperor's use of a "scorched-earth policy" in Thrace in an attempt to stop the Catalans (A. Laïou, *Byzantion* 37 [1967] 91–113) led to widespread famine. Andronikos tried to increase revenues by raising taxes, adding a new tax on agricultural produce, and reducing tax exemptions. One of his most serious mistakes was
the dismantling of the fleet in 1285, which proved to be a false economy (Laiou, *infra* 74–76, 114f).

At the beginning of his reign Andronikos had to confront the growing threat of the Serbs on his northern frontier, under the leadership of Stefan Uroš II Milutin. After the Serbs took considerable Byz. territory in Macedonia, Andronikos decided to negotiate a peace treaty with the Serbs. As a pledge of alliance he married his five-year-old daughter Simonis to Milutin in 1298. The efforts of Andronikos to save Asia Minor from the Turks, such as hiring the mercenary Catalan Grand Company, proved fruitless; during his reign, the Ottomans seized much of Bithynia, including Prousa, which fell in 1326. The final years of the reign of Andronikos, 1321–28, were troubled by civil war with his grandson, the future Andronikos III. He was deposed on 24 May 1328 and died as the monk Antonios four years later.

Andronikos was married twice. His first wife, Anna, daughter of Stephen V of Hungary, whom he married in 1279, bore him Michael IX; his second wife was Irene-Yolanda of Montferrat.


Papadopoulos, *Genealogie*, no. 58.

–A.M.T.

ANDRONIKOS IV PALAILOGOS, emperor (1376–79); born Constantinople 11 Apr. 1348, died Selymbria 25 or 28 June 1385. Although the eldest son and heir of John V Palaiologos and his regent in 1366 and 1369–71, Andronikos was on uneasy terms with his father and twice engaged in open rebellion against him. The tension between the two men first surfaced in 1370, when Andronikos refused to help his father who was stranded penniless in Venice. In 1373, Andronikos joined forces with SAVCI BEG, son of Murad I, in conspiracy against their respective fathers. After the failure of the attempted rebellion, Andronikos was imprisoned and replaced as heir by his brother Manuel (II). He was also subjected to blinding, but apparently suffered the loss of only one eye.

In 1376, Andronikos escaped from prison. With Genoese and Ottoman support, he seized Constantinople and the imperial power. He was formally crowned on 18 Oct. 1377. His brief reign was marked by dependence on the Genoese and upon the Turks, to whom he ceded the crucial fortress of Gallipoli (Kallipolis). In 1379 John V overthrew his son and regained the throne. In a pact of 1381 he once more recognized Andronikos as his heir and granted him the appanage of Selymbria. In 1385, however, Andronikos again rebelled, unsuccessfully, against his father; he died shortly thereafter.

ANDRONIKOS V PALAILOGOS, a shadowy child emperor whose existence has only recently been acknowledged by Byzantinists; born ca.1400, died 1407? The title of a monody on the untimely death of a seven-year-old emperor (baseileus) specifically names the child Andronikos and describes him as the son of John VII. He was thus apparently the son of John and his wife Irene Gattilusio (subsequently the nun Eugenia), born while his father was regent in Constantinople. Andronikos must have predeceased his father, probably in 1407, since John VII is said to have died childless in 1408. Other evidence for Andronikos’ short life includes an ivory at Dumbarton Oaks, probably depicting John VII and Andronikos at Thessalonike in 1403/4 (Oikonomides, “Ivory Pyxis” 329–37).


ANEMAS (Ἀνεμάς), a family of the military aristocracy. The sobriquet Anemas is attested at the beginning of the 9th C. (Theoph. 482.30). The etymology of the name is debatable; the logical derivation from anemos, “wind,” was rejected by Ph. Koukoules, who connected it with aneme, “spool” (EEBS 5 [1928] 3). On the other hand, Chalandon (Commène 1:240) considered them descendants of the Cretan emir ‘Abd al-‘Aziz, whose son is called Anemas by Byz. chroniclers: he deserted to the Byz., became an army commander, and fell in the battle against Švjetoslav in 971. Whether the four Anemas brothers who were Alexios I’s generals belonged to his progeny is unknown; names of two of them—Leo and Michael—are attested. Despite their involvement in the plot of 1105, the family maintained its position; Manuel Anemas (died 1149), military commander, married Theodora, John II’s daughter, and had the high title of protosebastohyp催tatos. The family also intermarried with the Angeloi and Doukai. Alexios Anemas (who as a monk was called Athanasios) was eulogized in an anonymous epigram as a skilled archer and rider (Lamprkos, “Mark. kod.,” no.276.7–15). In 1162 Pankratios Anemas owned a prosteion and paroikoi near Thessalonike and a pronoia (Lavra 1, no.64). The family’s position declined after Manuel I’s reign, although sources mention them through the 15th C. (PLP, nos. 974–75).


ANEMOURION (Ἀνεμούριον, mod. Anamur), city and bishopric of Isauria, at the southernmost point of Asia Minor opposite Cyprus. Excavations have revealed the nature and development of Anemourion through the 7th C. After a major setback in the late 5th C., recovery is attested in the 4th by the construction of large baths and in the 5th by basilical churches with mosaic decoration. In 382, a new city wall was erected against the Isaurians, but their attacks led to a decline by the late 5th C.; prosperity returned with the establishment of peace in the 6th C. Major changes affected Anemourion in the late 6th and early 7th C., when large churches were abandoned and the baths and other civic buildings were filled with small houses and industrial workplaces, evidently a reflection of crowding and impoverishment. Anemourion was abandoned peacefully ca.660
when the Arabs gained control of Cyprus; its population probably retreated to the adjacent hill, whose extensive unstudied fortifications appear to include Byz. sections.


ANGAREIA (*ἀγγαρεία*), a term designating both state and private corvée. The term is of Persian origin, as noted by Eustathios of Thessalonike in his commentary on the *Odyssey*. The term was used in the Roman Empire for state corvée, esp. the service for the dromos, and for coercive sale of goods to the state. In Byz. it was expanded to include private services owed by peasants to their lord.


ANGEL (*ἀγγελός*, lit. "messenger"). Byz. angelology was developed primarily by pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite (R. Roques, *L’univers dionysien* [Paris 1954] 135–67) and later by Patr. Nikephoros I (B. Giannopoulos, *Theologia* 44 [1973] 312–38). Angels were construed as spiritual, that is, incorporeal beings (asomatoi), even if in early patristic writing their incorporeality was treated as relative: they were described there as having spiritual bodies of finer substance than those of men. Angels were held to be much more numerous than men, or even innumerable. Created beings, angels were brought forth by divine will, either before the material world or simultaneously with it. They had free will and were liable to sin: thus the Devil was a fallen angel. They had no foreknowledge of the future. Their function first and foremost was to praise God. They also served Christ and the church, assisting the faithful in the struggle against demons. Some theologians (but not Dionysios) developed the idea of guardian angels protecting individuals, nations, and esp. the souls of the dead. John of Damascus insisted that angels were not demiurges, thus rejecting the interpretation of dualism.

Dionysios advanced the concept of a hierarchy, dividing the angels according to their proximity to God into nine orders and three triads: *seraphim*, *cherubim*, thrones; virtues, dominations, powers; principalities, archangels, angels. The idea of angelic hierarchy was understood as parallel to the human ascent to the divine via three rungs of purification, illumination, and unification with God; in this connection monastic status was defined as the "angelic life." The cult of angels developed esp. in southwest Asia Minor, arousing concern among some church fathers of the 4th–5th C.: the Council of Laodikeia in Phrygia warned against the worship of angels, and Theodoret of Cyrthmus stigmatized it as a specifically Jewish superstition (C. Mango, *DChAE* 4 [1984–86] 53). Nevertheless, their veneration was strong in Byz. Hagiographic texts often represented them as fulfilling divine commands and particularly as eunuchlike guardians, clad in white, who accompanied the Virgin.

After the 5th C., the wingless divine messengers of the Old Testament (in such scenes as the *Philoxenia of Abraham and Jacob’s Ladder*) were invariably represented like the Nike and the winged creatures of the *Annunciation* and the *Myrrophoroi*. Endowed with curly heads, Hellenic profiles, and white garments, even in groups angels displayed an unvarying perfect uniformity. Across a millennium, their only significant iconographical development was a marked tendency to multiply in number.

Commenting on their traditional iconography, Psellus (ed. K. Snipes in *Gnomon* 2001) declares that angels have human form because they are rational beings but are winged because of their motion toward heaven. They carry orbs to indicate their speed, for a sphere scarcely touches the ground; the fillet around their heads suggests purity and chastity.


ANGELOS ("Ἀγγελός, fem. Ἀγγελίνα"), a noble Byz. lineage founded by Constantine from Philadelphia, who married Theodora (born 1096), the daughter of Alexios I. According to a 12th-C. historian (Zon. 3:740.1–2), Constantine Angelos was handsome but of lowy origin. The derivation of the name from "angel" seems plausible; rhetoricians called members of the family angelon-.
moi, “named after the angels” or “bearing the name of angels.” This type of name formation is exceptional, however, in Byz., and it is possible that the Angeloi took their name from the toponym of Angel or Agel (a district near Amida); this would explain why John Kamateros called ISAAC II ANGELOS “a man of the Orient” (Regel, Fontes 2:247.12). In the 12th C. several Angeloi served as military commanders; their identification is not always possible. In 1185 Isaac II Angelos was proclaimed emperor, succeeded by ALEXIOS III ANGELOS and ALEXIOS IV. After the fall of Constantinople in 1204, the Angeloi asserted their power in EPIROS and THESSALONIKE, first as independent rulers, later as imperial dignitaries; there they assumed the name of Angeloi Komnenoi Doukas to distinguish themselves from the “humble” Angeloi who are known as functionaries, physicians, clergymen, etc. (PLP, nos. 159–224). (See MICHAEL I Komnenos Doukas, Michael II Komnenos Doukas, Theodore Komnenos Doukas, Demetrios Angelos Doukas, Nikephoros II of Epiros. See also genealogical table.)


ANI ("Ἀνίαν"). fortress and city in the district of Sirak on the west bank of the Axurean/Arpa-Çay River in northeast Anatolia. It became the capital of ARMENIA under the later BAGRATIDS.

ANI, which had an important strategic position, was already known in the 5th C. as a fortress belonging to the Kamsaran family. In the 9th C. ANI was sold to the Bagratids and became the royal capital with the coronation of AšOT III in 961. The city grew so rapidly as an administrative and trade center that its dimensions tripled within 40 years and it became known as “the city of 1,001 churches.”

In 1045, the Armenian katholikos Peter Getadjar surrendered the city to Byz. and it became for a time the capital of the theme of IBERIA. Captured by the Seljuks in 1064 and sold by them to the Kurdish Shaddādīd emirs in 1072, ANI continued to flourish under them and under the ZAKARIIDS. Its slow decline began with the Mongol capture in the 13th C.

Monuments of ANI. Although the city has only been partially excavated, hundreds of its structures are known. It is closed at the south by Smbat II's walls (989) and dominated by a citadel at its
narrow north end. Buildings lie outside the walls and along the cliffs; under the city, extensive chambers were cut from living rock. Palaces, comfortable homes, dovecotes, caravanserais, warehouses, cisterns, meeting halls, monasteries, churches, and at least one mosque survive. Very few of these structures are dated, and none to the period of Byz. rule.

Three buildings are attributed by inscription to the architect Trdat: for Smbat II and Katranide, the wife of Gagik I, he built the cathedral (989–1001); for Gagik I, he built in 1001–20 St. Grigor (i.e., GREGORY THE ILLUMINATOR). Like other Bagratid donations, these are variations on 7th-C. church plans: the cathedral on that of St. Gayanê at VAEARSAPAT; St. Grigor, on Zuart'noch'. The Church of the Redeemer, which Trdat built for the merchant Apšarip in 1036, is an octafoil carrying a very large dome.

A lifesize relief, almost in the round, of Gagik I (now lost) was unearthed at St. Grigor, along with bronze censers with New Testament scenes and a chandelier with birds. Commissioned by the merchant Tigran Honens’ Georgians frescoed (1215) the Church of St. Grigor, but the program includes Armenian features, such as a life of the saint. N. Thierry (in Cuneo [1984] infra) believes that the poorly preserved frescoes of its forechurch, which have Greek and Georgian inscriptions, are late 13th-C. Byz. work.

Ani adopted Turko-Iranian elements, particularly under the Zaku'rids. Armenian and Georginian palaces and forechurches in the city feature muqarnas (stalactite squinches) and double-storied portals in geometric polychrome stonework and carpet-like filigree relief.


ANICIA JULIANA (Ἀνίκια Διοκτώρ), patrika and patron of the arts; born Constantinople probably 461 or 463, died Constantinople 527 or 529. The daughter of the future Emp. Anicius Olybrius and Placidia the Younger, Anicia Juliana remained at Constantinople with her mother when Olybrius went to Italy to become emperor in 472. Probably by 478 Anicia Juliana was the sole heir of her two famous parents. She married Areobindus soon after 478 and had a son, Olybrius (junior), who married Irene, niece of Anastasios I. Anicia Juliana often visited St. Sabas at Constantinople in 511/12; she reportedly was served by many eunuchs, who became monks of the monastery of St. Sabas in Palestine after her death. At her house in Constantinople a mob proclaimed Areobindus emperor in 512. She was a devout Chalcedonian who resisted the theological pressures of Emp. Anastasios and the Constantinopolitan patriarch Timotheos (511–18); she also corresponded with Pope Hormisdas to help to end the Akarian Schism. She built and embellished many churches in Constantinople, including St. Euphemia, St. Polyeuktos, and a church of the Theotokos in the Honoratae quarter. The Vienna Dioskorides was written for her.

ANICIUS, a noble family, originating from Praeneste, which in the 4th C. became one of the most influential and wealthy lineages in Rome. Unlike most Roman senatorial aristocrats, the Anicii converted to Christianity and supported the emperor of Constantinople. In the 5th C. the Anicii were believed to favor the barbarians and rumor spread that Anicia Falconia Proba ordered her servants to open the gates of Rome to Alaric. Between 455 and 457 Anicius Olybrius married Placidia, youngest daughter of Valentinian III, and in 472 became Roman emperor; after a few months' reign he died on 2 Nov. 472 of natural causes, a rare case among 5th-C. Western emperors. His daughter Anicia Juliana moved to Constantinople and was an important patron of art and architecture. Sextus Claudius Petronius Probus belonged to this lineage. The family retained influence until at least the mid-6th C., when Anicius Faustus Albinus Basilius was the last consul.

Another branch of the Anicii stayed in Italy and contributed much to the alliance of the Roman aristocracy with the house of the Amali; Boethius, for example, served Theodoric. Theodahad, while promoting Maximus, a member of the family, praised the Anicii as a lineage almost equal to the princeps. Jordanes completed his Getica with the statement that a union between the Amali and Anicii was embodied in the persons of Germanus, the son of Justinian I's nephew, and of Mathesuentha (Matasunta), granddaughter of Theodoric the Great.


ANIMAL COMBAT (τοῦ θεάτρου κυνήγια). The exhibition of animals at the circus games, the so-called venationes, was popular in ancient Rome, but it seems that by the 4th C. large-scale shows were hard to arrange. Although the Historia Augusta describes the games in the Circus Maximus in 281, when thousands of ostriches, stags, and boars were on display and the next day hundreds of lions, leopards, and bears, the correspondence of Symmachus is a more dependable source. He tells of the difficulties he encountered while organizing animal shows, saying that he had to be satisfied with Irish hounds, Italian and Adriatic bears, Egyptian crocodiles, and probably some antelopes, lions, and leopards from Africa. Venationes were still being held in the Colosseum under the rule of Theodoric the Great, and Justinian I, in novel 105,1, ordered the consuls to arrange venationes and to show men fighting beasts. A Byz. legend relates that ritual required the emperor to kill a bear and a lion in the “theater”; since Galerius was allegedly afraid to undergo this trial, the young Constantine (Ⅰ) slaughtered the beasts (A. Kazhdan, Byzantion 57 (1987) 216f.).

Scenes of animal combat were common on consular diptychs, while, later, scenes of hunting animals and birds became predominant. Although gladiatorial battles were prohibited by Constantine in 325, animal combat survived despite protests of the church fathers (thus, John Chrysostom [PG 59:519.33-34] condemned both horse races and the show of theriomachyantes, as did the Council in Trullo). In the 12th C., Benjamin of Tudela observed the combat of lions, bears, leopards, and wild asses in the Hippodrome.

Combat between animals and humans occupies an important place in hagiography and art, providing numerous legends about martyrs thrown into the arena and beasts refusing to attack them, or about martyrs who were killed by wild animals.


ANIMAL EPICS, narratives akin to the fable, though normally on a larger scale and lacking an explicit moral. Such material, which also had a worldwide currency (see Stephanites and Ichneutae), circulated throughout Europe from antiquity onward in the stories attributed to Aesop, which were well known in Byz. Though it lacks the narrative element and includes inanimate objects in its christianizing observations, the Phy-
siologos can perhaps be viewed as an extension of the Aesopic tradition. In late 12th-C. France, the Roman de Renart, drawing on traditional material, but adding an element of social satire to the tales of the cunning Fox, sparked a new interest in animal epics, which spread rapidly throughout Europe.

Byz.'s representative in this genre is the Synaxarion of the Honorable Donkey. With a similar tone of mild cynicism, though a different range of characters, are the Diegesis Ton Tetrapodon Zoon, the Pouloglos, and the Cat and the Mice (Ho kates kat hoi pontikoi), all anonymous and written in political verse at a popular level of the language; they reflect 14th-C. social conflicts. Shorter, and in prose, are the Porikologos and the Opsarologos of approximately the same date, also anonymous; these satirize Byz. legal customs. Lively and written in the vernacular, the late Byz. animal epics offer many insights into both the small matters of everyday life and the larger issues of contemporary social tensions.


-E.M.J.

ANIMALS. The Byz. kept a wide variety of domesticated animals and livestock to provide meat, milk, eggs, leather, wool, and feathers (see Swine; Sheep; Goats; Fowl, Domestic) and to serve as draft animals, beasts of burden, or riding mounts (horses, camels, donkeys, oxen, etc.). Horses were also used for cavalry, hunting, and equestrian sports. The Byz. kept dogs, cats, and some birds as pets; predator birds, like hawks and falcons, were also used for hawking.

The Byz. clearly distinguished between wild beasts and domesticated animals; the wild were not always identified with evil and the domesticated with good, however. The Diegesis Ton Tetrapodon Zoon (11.15–16) discriminates between carnivorous and herbivorous beasts, and domesticated animals such as dogs and swine were sometimes perceived as the embodiment of demonic power.

Exotic Animals. In an empire that, at its greatest extent, stretched from the Atlantic to the Ti-
ANKARA, BATTLE OF. In 1402, on the Çubuk plain north of Ankara (Ankýra), the Ottomans, whose power had been rapidly expanding, suffered a temporary setback when they were decisively defeated by the Mongols. The battle took place on 28 July (Kleinchroniken 2:370). The course of the fighting is described by Greek historians (Chalk. 1:145–47; Sphr. 208.6–10). The Ottoman army of Bayezid I that occupied a hill was attacked by Timur and was defeated, chiefly owing to the defection of the Anatolian Muslim contingents, in contrast to the sultan’s Christian vassals (notably Stefan Lazarević) who fought loyally. Bayezid and his younger son Musa were taken captive by the victor. Rumors spread that John VII Palaiologos had conspired with Timur (Barker, Manuel II 504–09). After the battle Timur reestablished the traditional beyliks (see Beg) and reduced Ottoman territory in Anatolia to its original heartland; he did not, however, invade Rumeli. The ensuing struggle for succession among Bayezid’s sons İsâ, Süleyman Çelebi, Musa, Mehmed (1), and later Mustafa allowed Byzantium to recover its autonomy for a short period, down to 1424, when it again became tributary to the Ottomans.


—S.W.R., A.K.

ANKYRA (’Aγκυρα, mod. Ankara), civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of Galatia. Ankyra’s strategic location on the main highway across Anatolia made it a center of trade and a major military base. Frequently visited by emperors, it was an imperial summer residence in the late 4th and early 5th C. In the 4th C., Ankyra was the seat of a cultivated pagan landowning aristocracy (known from the letters of Libanios); they were closely connected with the governors, who frequently adorned the city with public works. The local ruling class became Christian only in the 5th C., when the rich were famed for their piety and philanthropy. In the 6th C., the governor, bishop, and local magnates dominated Ankyra; its population was devoted to St. Theodore of Sykeon, who reportedly wrought many miracles in the city. Ankyra remained peaceful and prosperous through the early 7th C. In 610–11 it was the base of the revolt of Komentiolos. Sources attest a large range of public buildings, both pagan and Christian; few survive.

In 622, the Persians captured and destroyed Ankyra; afterward the large area of the ancient city was abandoned and Ankyra retreated to its heavily fortified acropolis. It became capital of the Opsikon theme in the 7th C. and of the Bouklarion in the 8th. The frequent goal of Arab attacks, Ankyra fell to al-Mustašim in 838, was rebuilt by Michael III in 859, and taken by the Paulicians in 871. After the Turks captured it ca.1080, Ankyra only briefly returned to Byz. rule following the Crusade of 1101.

An important center of Christianity, Ankyra was the home of Sts. Plato and Clement and the site of councils in 314, 358, and 375. The council of 325, planned for Ankyra, was transferred to Nicaea.

The site contains scattered remains of civic buildings, including a large bath that functioned until the 7th C., traces of luxurious houses, and the Church of St. Clement, a cross-domed brick structure (8th/9th C.?). Its fortress, one of the greatest of Anatolia, consists of a citadel, an upper rampart with closely spaced pentagonal towers, and an extensive lower wall. The inner fortress apparently dates to the mid-7th C., the outer to the early 9th; all were rebuilt by Michael III.


—C.F.

ANNA (“Annâ”) or Hanna, feminine personal name of Hebrew origin (etym. “veneration”). A similar name appeared in Greek and Roman mythology (G. Wissowa, *RE* 1 [1894] 2223–25; M. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* [Munich 1967] 251). In the New Testament (Lk 2:36) Anna is a prophetess of the tribe of Asher, but in a later Christian legend another Anna appeared, mother of the Virgin Mary. There is confusion between the female name Anna and the male Annas (also present in the New Testament); thus, ca.507 or
511 a man, Anna (probably of Germanic origin), was known as comes in Italy (PLRE 2:91f). Relatively rare in late Roman texts, the name became popular by the 11th C.: Skylitzes cites six Annas, more than Theodora and Irene. In the late Byz. acts Anna remained one of the most popular female names: vols. 2–3 of Laura list 48 Annas, second only to Maria.

LIT. M. Schönfeld, Wörterbuch der altgermanischen Person- und Völkernamen (Heidelberg 1911; rp. 1965) 22.

—A.K.

ANNA, princess of Kiev; porphyrogenetene daughter of Romanos II and sister of Basil II; born Constantinople 13 Mar. 968, died Kiev 1011 (acc. to Skylitzes, after her husband). In 968 Otto I unsuccessfully sought Anna's hand for his son Otto II. Hugh Capet (king of France 987–96), who desired alliance and kinship with Byz., was surprised in early 988 by news of Anna's impending marriage to Vladimir I of Kiev and withdrew from his plan to ask for the princess's hand for his son Robert. Although legend places Anna's marriage in Cherson in 989, it actually took place in Kiev in 988. In summer of that year Anna was welcomed in Rus', accompanied by a large retinue headed by Theophylaktos, the first metropolitan of Kiev (and formerly of Sebastia). In the 990s Byz. architects engaged by Anna raised Kiev's first stone buildings—the palace and the palace church of the Virgin, called the “Church of the Tithe.” Yahy̧ā of Antioch attributed to Anna the construction of many churches. Boris and Gleb were probably her sons.

—An.P.

ANNA KOMNENE. See Komnene, Anna.

ANNALES BERTINI ANI (so-called from the provenance of one MS from St. Bertin) continue the Annales regni Francorum. The first, anonymous section (a.830–34) was begun in the chapel of the Carolingian emperor Louis the Pious (814–40); it was continued by Prudentius, who took his work with him when he became bishop of Troyes (843–61), after which the tone grows increasingly independent of Charles the Bald. The continuation by Hincmar, archbishop of Reims (845–82), offers a wide-ranging but very personal view of the history of his times. In the royal annals' tradition, the Annales Bertiniani record Byz. diplomacy and military relations with the Franks (a.842, p.42; a.853, p.68; a.869, pp. 153, 164f; a.873, p.192) and the “Rhos” (a.889, pp. 30f) as well as Frankish activities among the Bulgars and Slavs (e.g., a.853, p.68; a.864, p.113; a.866, p.133f). They also attest to the impact of Byz. ceremonial on Frankish kingship (a.876, p.205) and Byz. pirates' activity in the western Mediterranean (a.848, p.55). Hincmar's relations with the papacy explain his knowledge of its affairs, particularly the Photian schism (a.867, pp. 138f; a.869, pp. 155f; a.872, p.187).


—M.McC.

ANNALES FULDENSES, Latin narrative of events from 714 to 887. The first section was compiled in the Mainz area (858–63) and subsequently (864–82) reflects views characteristic of the court of Louis the German (843–76) and his son, apparently in connection with the career of Liutbert, archbishop of Mainz, as royal archchaplain (870–82). Although it is not clear where compilation ends and year-by-year redaction begins, the Annales Fuldenses record eastern Frankish events, particularly in relation to Moravia, the Bohemians, and Bulgars (e.g., a.828–29, pp. 25f; a.845, p.35; a.866–67, pp. 65f), and document Byz. diplomacy, mentioning a crystal reliquary sent by Basil I to Louis the German (a.872, p.75; a.873, p.81), Western repercussions of the Photian schism (a.867, pp. 66f), and of Byz. ceremonial (a.876, p.86). The Bavarian continuation (a.882–901, pp. 107–35) preserves the court connection and describes Byz. embassies and Byz.-Magyar relations (a.896, pp. 129f).


—M.McC.
ANNALES IANUENSES, official historical record of the commune of Genoa and a prime source on relations with Byz. between 1099 and 1294. Caffaro (ca.1080–1166) began the Annales Ianuenses (by 1100?) and established the model for his successors. He had joined the First Crusade’s Genoese contingent (Aug. 1100–Jan. 1101) and visited the Orient again between ca.1130 and 1140. His career included stints as a diplomat (e.g., negotiations with Pisa, the papacy, and Frederick I), a successful admiral, and eight terms as consul (1122–49). In 1152, at Caffaro’s urging, the commune ordered a copy of the Annales Ianuenses for the public archive (preserved in Paris, B.N. lat. 10136; sketches illustrate various personalities and places), which he continued to 1163, narrating Genoa’s enterprises in the Levant and her competition with Italian rivals (e.g., the Pisan attack on 300 Genoese merchants at Constantinople: a.1162, 11.67.22–68.15). Caffaro also wrote a work On the Liberation of the Cities of the East (De liberatione civitatum orientis; ca.1155–56 in connection with a dispute with the kings of Jerusalem?) describing Genoese relations with Emp. Alexios I Komnenos and his lieutenants (11.114.15–115.7; 117.5–118.19) as well as travel distances in the Levant. From 1169 to 1294, the Annales Ianuenses were continued by various chancery officials, including the scribe and diplomat Ogerius, whose detailed account (1197–1216) records conflicts with the Latin rulers of Constantinople (e.g., a.1205, capture of a Venetian textile cargo, 12.98.22–99.16). Subsequent sections added by an anonymous continuator and by a committee treat the Palaiologans (a.1261, 1262, 1264–14.42.14–43.6, 44.9–45.15, 65.11–66.19).

ED. L.T. Belgrano, C. Imperiale di Sant’Angelo, Annales genovesi di Caffaro e de’suoi continuatori [== FSI 11–14 bis] (Genoa 1890–1929).


-M.McC.

ANNALES REGNI FRANCORUM, written in the chapel of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious (814–40), present a detailed but slanted—particularly by omission—record of royal activities (741–829). Writing probably began sometime between 787 and 793 with a retrospective account of events from 741 and continued to 795. The Annales Regni Francorum were then composed on a year-by-year basis to 829, with probable shifts in authorship in 808 and 820, and were continued in the Annales Bertiniani. They are an essential source on Byz. relations with the Franks, esp. diplomacy; a Byz. invasion of southern Italy (a.788, p.82); the capture of Sisinius, Patr. Tarasio’s brother (a.798, p.104); Emp. Nikephoros I’s recognition of Charlemagne as basilicus (a.812, p.136); competition over Venice and Dalmatia (a.806–10, pp. 122–30; a.817, pp. 145f; a.821, pp. 155f); relations of Byz. and the Franks with the Bulgars (e.g., a.812–13, pp. 136–39; a.824, pp. 164–67); an earthquake at Constantinople (Aug. 815, p.143); etc. Between 814 and 817, an unidentified member of the court began rewriting the text down to 817, improving the Latin, changing the political perspective slightly, and adding some details on Byz. (e.g., exarchs of Sicily in 788, p.83; a.798, p.105, the family name “Ganglano” of an ambassador). This revised version is called Annales Einhardi, reflecting an abandoned theory on its authorship.


-M.McC.

ANNALS OF BARI (Lat. Annales Barenses). The region of Bari produced three closely connected historical works on Apulia that are valuable sources for Byz.’s conflict with the Arabs and the Normans: (1) the Annales Barenses (605–1043), whose short notes grow more detailed for the 11th C. and are essentially local in focus; (2) the Annals (860–1102), ascribed in the 17th C. to “Lupus Protospatharius,” which are somewhat less parochial in their awareness of events elsewhere in the Empire; and (3) the Anonymous Chronicle of Bari (860–1115). All three relied on earlier, lost sources, some of which they shared (cf. Skabalanič, Gosudarstvo xxix–xxxiii).


ANNALS OF RAVENNA, conventional title of a Latin chronicle (probably of the 6th C.) of which only half of an 11th-C. folio (MS 202) has survived in the library of the cathedral in Merseburg (Saxony, in central Germany). The preserved folio encompasses events of 411–54, with numerous lacunas because of the absence of the upper half of the folio. The Annals, in the form of consular fasti with brief historical notes, belong to the type of the Calendar of 354 and like the latter are illustrated. The special characteristic of the Merseburg folio is its attention to Ravenna, usually ignored in other late Roman chronicles, and its indication of precise dates; the Annals mention the death of the Western emperor Honorius (who died in Ravenna) and give its precise date—27 Aug. 423—thus permitting a rejection of the date in Sokrates and Theophanes, 15 Aug. The Merseburg folio confirms the existence of the lost local annals of Ravenna, which may have been a source for such later chronicles as AGNELLUS as well as CASSIODORUS and MARCELLINUS COMES. Drawings in the columns of the text illustrate martyrdoms and other scenes of violence as well as an emperor (Valentinian III) enthroned on an orb in the manner of Christ in the apse of S. Vitale, Ravenna.


—A.K., B.B., A.C.

ANNA OF SOAVY, empress; baptismal name Ioanna; born 1306?, died Thessalonike ca.1365 (R.J. Loenertz, OrChrP 21 [1955] 218). Daughter of Count Amadeo V of Savoy, Anna married Emp. Andronikos III Palaiologos in Oct. 1326. She was accompanied by a large Italian entourage and promoted such Western customs as tournaments (see Sports) at the Byz. court. After her husband’s death in 1341, she became regent for her nine-year-old son John V. She joined with Patr. John XIV Kalekas and Alexios Apokaukos in opposition to John (VI) Kantakouzenos, eventually forcing him into the Civil War of 1341–47. The war necessitated drastic measures. Anna pawned the Byz. crown jewels to Venice (1343) and hired Turkish mercenaries to fight Kantakouzenos (1346). Although she converted to Orthodoxy at the time of her marriage, in 1343 Anna declared her submission and that of her son to the pope. In the hesychast controversy, she supported Kalekas, the opponent of Palamas, until 1347 when she turned against the patriarch and presided over the synod that deposed him, just as Kantakouzenos was entering Constantinople in triumph. Kantakouzenos pardoned Anna, but relations remained tense. In 1351 the empress went to Thessalonike to dissuade John V from rebelling against John VI. She remained there until her death, ruling the city as her appanage. Historians such as Gregorias and Kantakouzenos are very hostile to Anna, depicting her as a foreigner and cruel tyrant, but Nicholas Kabasilas composed a eulogy of her (M. Jugie, IRAIK 15 [1911] 112–21). Mosaic portraits of Anna and Andronikos survived in the Pammakaristos church in Constantinople until at least 1579.


—A.M.T., A.C.

ANNONA (res annonaria, ànvóva), financial term referring to (1) in-kind taxation, including both annona civica (which governed the requisition and transfer of commodities from Africa and Egypt for the maintenance of Rome and Constantinople) and annona militaris, or (2) any type of rations or provisions. Originally an irregular imperial levy of commodities, annona was established by Diocletian as the empire’s fundamental tax, paid in kind and based upon periodic assessments. From the end of the 4th C., however, the role played by annona in taxation diminished, as taxes came to be assessed and remitted in money; even the remaining annona, although still assembled in kind, was now frequently commuted into cash
payments (adaeratio). Thus, by the 6th C., the term was applied almost exclusively to rations and supplies, distinct from the public tax. When the term annona appears in later sources (e.g., the will of Eustathios BOILAS [ed. Lemerle, *Cinq études 27-217*]), it invariably refers to that portion of a salary paid in kind rather than with cash.


**ANNONA MILITARIS** (ἐκνύωνα). The *annona militaris* began as an unofficial tax in kind imposed by Septimius Severus (193–211) to obtain rations (wine, meat, oil, bread) or other necessities (e.g., wood) for the army. Another ration, the *capitus*, provided fodder for its horses. The *annona* and *capitus* became regular issue during the 3rd C., and the task of their assessment, collection, and distribution fell to the praetorian prefecture (Jones, *LRE* 448–62). These provisions were collected in supply depots and issued to the soldiers by the army quartermasters (actuarii). As taxes in kind were increasingly commuted to cash throughout the 5th C., the *annona* and *capitus* became ration allowances (in some cases at fixed rates of 5 and 4 solidi, respectively, in the *Cod. Just. I 27.1, par.22*), although rations in kind continued to be issued, esp. in the East. Eventually soldiers' pay, and that of civil officials, was computed in the cash equivalents of the *annona* and *capitus*, assessed at varying rates according to rank or grade of service (Haldon, *Praetorians* 120–25).


**ANNUNCIATION** (εὐαγγελισμὸς τῆς Θεοτόκου), feast of the angel Gabriel's announcement of the coming of the Holy Spirit on the Virgin Mary (Lk 1:26–38), celebrated 25 Mar. In Syria, Constantinople, and possibly Asia Minor, a feast of the Virgin that included the annunciation theme was originally part of pre-Nativity celebrations on the first or second Sunday before Christmas; this preparatory Sunday is attested in Constantinople before 431 (F.J. Leroy, *L’Homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople* [Vatican 1967] 66). But in 560 a letter of Justinian I defended 25 Mar. as the historical date of the annunciation event and affirmed that the feasts of the Nativity and Presentation in the Temple (HYPAPANTE) should be celebrated 25 Dec. and 2 Feb., respectively, because they depend on the Annunciation (M. van Esbroeck, *AB* 86 [1968] 351–71; 87 [1969] 442–44). Actually, the March date, probably introduced to Antioch in the 6th C., and to Jerusalem and the whole Christian world shortly thereafter, was chosen not in order to coordinate with Christmas, but because the identification of John the Baptist's conception with the autumn equinox put Jesus' conception at the spring equinox six months later and his Nativity (25 Dec.) at the winter solstice. The date 25 Mar. was, furthermore, considered the day of the Crucifixion, to make Jesus' life a perfect cycle, his conception and death had to coincide, since fractions were imperfect (Talley, *Liturgical Year* 8–13, 91–103).

One of the five Marian Great Feasts, and, with the Hypapante, one of two not based on New Testament apocrypha, the Annunciation is the
only one of the 12 fixed Great Feasts that can fall in Lent, Holy Week, or the week after Easter; if in Lent, it has an afterfeast of but one day, and if in Holy or Easter Week, this metheoria is suppressed entirely. On the day of the Annunciation, the emperor went in procession to the column of Constantine, celebrated the liturgy in the Church of the Chalkoprataeia, and feasted in the palace (De cer., bk.1, ch.30: Philotheos. Kletor. 195.16–197.5).

Illustrations of the Annunciation show Gabriel approaching the standing or seated Virgin Mary. Depicted by the 3rd C., the Annunciation became a pervasive Christian image. It appears in Christological cycles and also independently on jewelry, icons, bema doors, the triumphal arches of churches, and in some Gospel books preceding the text of Luke. The initial, simple confrontation of the holy figures was quickly elaborated. The well and purple wool, derived from the Protoevangelion of James (1:11–9), appear in 5th-C. art. The 6th-C. mosaic at Porec shows Mary enthroned before a basilican façade, as a royal figure, a type of the Church, and a portal of salvation. Post-Iconoclastic art, drawing on homilies, embroiders the scene with springtime elements incorporating Marian symbols (lilies, the closed garden) and doctrinal ones (the arc of Heaven, the dove and impregnating light, and—in the Hagioi Anargyroi at Kastoria—God himself). The richest of all Byz. Annunciation compositions is the late 12th-C. icon on Mt. Sinai, which, along with numerous Marian motifs, includes on Mary’s breast a faint mandorla containing the infant Christ, a reference to the Virgin Blachernitissa.


ANOINTING (χρίσμα), a ritual rubbing with a blessed oil or chrism, derived from widespread ancient use of unguents. Early Christian initiation rites like baptism used anointing; in the medieval West it marked accession to political power from the 7th C. onward. At what date anointing entered Byz. coronations is controversial. Old Testament metaphors, the Septuagint’s very frequent use of the phrase chrism basilica (e.g., 1 Sam [1 Kg] 11:5, 15:17), and the iconography of Davidic kingship (C. Walter, BMGS 2 [1976] 58–73) encouraged similar wording for the Byz. emperor’s accession, regardless of ritual. Neither De ceremoniis nor euchologia make reference to coronation anointing. Although there is some discussion about Niketas Choniates’ testimony (Nik.Chon. 457.15), anointing in connection with coronations appears irrefutably only after 1204, when debate waxed over whether Byz. anointing was introduced in response to Baldwin I’s Latin-style coronation anointing at Constantinople or could have entered Byz. ceremonial shortly before. Even in the latter case, the Western presence at court and in the imperial family scarcely excludes the possibility of Latin influence.

Theodore I Laskaris was anointed emperor in 1205 and anointing became solidly entrenched thereafter. A 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 258.3–29) describes how the patriarch mounted the ambo and anointed the emperor’s head just before crowning him, as he declared him “Holy!” (hagios) and the audience echoed the acclamation. Symeon of Thessalonike (PG 155:353B–D) gave the rite a chriostimimetic interpretation, reasoning that the emperor’s anointing paralleled that of Christ by the Holy Spirit. (For anointing of the sick, see Unction.)


ANONYMOUS, “ENANTIOPHANES.” jurist. Numerous scholia to the Basilika are inscribed “(τοῦ) Ἀνωνύμου” or “(τοῦ) Ἐναντιοφανοῦς.” According to the generally accepted opinion of K.E. Zacharià von Lingenthal (Kleine Schriften 2:152–54), these texts originate in the writings of an “elder Anonymous” and a “younger Anonymous,” the latter of whom should be identified with “Enantiophanes.” The “elder Anonymous” was perhaps active under Justinian I and may have composed a paraphrase of the Digest that served as the basis for the text of the Basilika. The “younger Anonymous” may have lived under Herakleios and provided the Digest paraphrase of
the "elder Anonymous" with explanatory notes (paraphrasi). The "younger Anonymous" was called "Enantiophanes" because he wrote a work entitled Peri enantiophaneion (On Apparent Contradictions), which is mentioned in the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles, a work that likewise can be attributed to him.


ANONYMOUS FOLLES. See COINS; MINTS.

ANONYMOUS VALESII. See EXCERPTA VALESIANA.

ANSBERT. See HISTORIA DE EXPEDITIONE FRIDERICI.

ANSELM, author, ambassador, bishop of Havelberg (1129-55), and archbishop of Ravenna (1155-58); born Germany? ca. 1100, died Milan 12 Aug. 1158. In 1155/6 Anselm visited Constantinople as the ambassador of the German emperor Lothair III to John II Komnenos to discuss possible joint action against Roger II of Sicily. In Apr. 1156, with the cooperation of Emp. John and Patr. Leo Styppes (1134-43), he participated in public debates in Constantinople with Niketas, archbishop of Nikomedia, on the filioque, the azymes, and papal primacy. In order to rebut Niketas's criticism of the Roman church's "innovations" in faith and practice, Anselm used his own theory of the church's historical growth in understanding the faith through the Holy Spirit. He politely, but firmly, upheld the Latin filioque doctrine and claimed that Niketas accepted his compromise formula: the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, but "properly and principally" only from the Father. Niketas evidently also agreed that the Greek "through the Son" was equivalent to the Latin "from both" (ab utroque). Both Anselm and Niketas called for an ecumenical council that would, they hoped, result in UNION OF THE CHURCHES. At the request of Pope Eugenius II, Anselm wrote (1150) the Dialogues, a detailed account of his debates with Niketas.

In 1153 Frederick I Barbarossa sent Anselm to Manuel I Komnenos to negotiate a marriage between Frederick and the Byz. princess Maria. While in Thessalonike in 1154, en route home, Anselm discussed the procession of the Holy Spirit with Basil of Ohrid and acknowledged that Latin arrogance impeded reunion.


ANTAE ("Antae"), a group of people in the area north of the Black Sea. According to Jordanes, in the 4th C. the Goths defeated the Antae and murdered their "king" (reX) Boz and 70 elders. Other authors (Prokopios, pseudo-Maurice, etc.) mention the Antae, usually alongside the Sklavonoi, in connection with the events of 535-602. Prokopios describes the Antae as a conglomeration of primitive and dirty nomads who practiced democracy and made war on foot, half-naked, armed with only spears and shields; they venerated the god of lightning.

The origin of the Antae is hotly discussed. Many scholars (e.g., G. Bonev, EkBalk 19 [1983] no.3, 109-20) consider them early Slavs; G. Vernadsky (JAOS 59 [1939] 50-66) developed the theory of their Alan origin; B. Strumins'kyj (HUkSt 3/4 [1979-80] 786-96) saw them Goths. The Antae were probably professional warriors, neighbors originally of the Alans and subsequently of the Ostrogoths, the Huns, the Bulgars, and the Avars. Justinian I, who accepted the title "Antikos," made them allies, and between 545 and 602 the Antae usually cooperated with the empire. Around 580 the Avars began to assume hegemony in eastern Europe and to demand the loyalty of the Antae. Attempts at negotiation failed, and the Avars killed the Antae envoy Mezamer. In 602 the Antae allied with Maurice against the Avars; Simokattes (Theoph. Simok. 293.15-16) relates that the khatagan dispatched an army under the command of Apsich to exterminate the Antae but the Avars were afraid and began to desert; after 602 the Antae disappear from the sources.
ANTHEMIOS OF TRALLES, architect, engineer, physicist, and mathematician; born Tralles in Lydia, died Constantinople? before 558 (the traditional date of his death, ca.534, is erroneous: G. Soulis, *Speculum* 35 [1960] 124). Anthemios was the son of a physician, Stephen; one of his brothers, Metrodoros, was a grammarian, another was a lawyer, and others were doctors. Anthemios achieved fame as the architect (with Isidore of Miletus) of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Nothing is known of his other architectural projects. Prokopios relates that Justinian I consulted Anthemios about flood control at Dara. According to Agathias, Anthemios was one of those scientists “who apply geometrical speculation to material objects and make models or imitations of the natural world” (Agath. 5:6.3). Anthemios’s experiments included the production of an artificial earthquake (using steam power) and artificial thunder as well as the creation of a powerful reflector. He wrote treatises such as *Concerning Remarkable Mechanical Devices* and *On Burning-Mirrors*; in the former he describes a curved reflector similar to one that he is said to have built. According to Tzetzes, Anthemios also wrote on mechanical and hydraulic subjects.


ANTHEMIOS, *Antēμios), prefect under Arkadios and Theodosios II; died after 414. Probably of Egyptian origin, Anthemios was a member of one of the most distinguished aristocratic families of the period. He was *magister officiorum* in 404 and praetorian prefect of the East from 405 to 414. He may have assisted in the deposition of John Chrysostom in 404, but he was presumably a Christian and escorted the relics of the prophet Samuel into Constantinople in 406. Sokrates (Sokr. *HE* 7.1.1) reports that he was the virtual ruler of the empire during the critical period of the minority of Theodosios II. He reorganized the food supply of the capital (*Cod.Theod. XIII* 5.32) and rebuilt its walls (*Cod.Theod. XV* 1.51) before he fell from power (see *Pulcheria*).

**ANTHEMIOS OF TRALLES**

Western emperor (467–72); born Constantinople, died Rome 30 June or 11 July 472. Grandson of the prefect Anthemios and son-in-law of Marcian, *patrikios*, and commander against the Huns and Ostrogoths, Anthemios was a candidate for the throne in Constantinople in 454. Leo I named him caesar and in 467 sent him to Italy, where he was proclaimed Augustus by the army. Leo concurred in the nomination as did Ricimer (who married the daughter of Anthemios), both hoping to counter the power and influence of the Vandal king Gaiseric. Celebrated by Sidonius Apollinarius and by Leo as the hope for unity between East and West, Anthemios was distrusted as a Greek and suspected of pagan sympathies. He played no part in the naval expedition against the Vandals in 468. Hostility developed with Ricimer, who finally invested Olybrius with the purple in 492. Ricimer attacked Rome, and Anthemios was captured and beheaded.

**ANTHEMIOS OF TRALLES**

architect, engineer, physicist, and mathematician; born Tralles in Lydia, died Constantinople? before 558 (the traditional date of his death, ca.534, is erroneous: G. Soulis, *Speculum* 35 [1960] 124). Anthemios was the son of a physician, Stephen; one of his brothers, Metrodoros, was a grammarian, another was a lawyer, and others were doctors. Anthemios achieved fame as the architect (with Isidore of Miletus) of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Nothing is known of his other architectural projects. Prokopios relates that Justinian I consulted Anthemios about flood control at Dara. According to Agathias, Anthemios was one of those scientists “who apply geometrical speculation to material objects and make models or imitations of the natural world” (Agath. 5:6.3). Anthemios’s experiments included the production of an artificial earthquake (using steam power) and artificial thunder as well as the creation of a powerful reflector. He wrote treatises such as *Concerning Remarkable Mechanical Devices* and *On Burning-Mirrors*; in the former he describes a curved reflector similar to one that he is said to have built. According to Tzetzes, Anthemios also wrote on mechanical and hydraulic subjects.
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ANTHIMOS OF NIKOMEDAEA, martyr under Diocletian and saint; feastday 3 Sept. According to Eusebius of Caesarea (Eusebius, HE 8.6.6), Anthimos (Ἀνθίμος), bishop of Nikomedia, was decapitated in 303; he was among those charged with setting fire to the imperial palace in Nikomedia. A Life attributed to Symeon Metaphrastes presents the trial and torture of Anthimos by Maximian. It is questionable whether any of his writings survive: the legend of Sts. Donna and Indes mentions a letter of Anthimos to persecuted communities (PG 116:1073C–1076B); a fragment, On the Holy Church, attributed to Anthimos by G. Mercati, is actually a work of Markellos of Ankyra according to Richard (Opera minora 2, no. 33).

Representation in Art. The earliest known portrait of Anthimos, on a mosaic (now lost) in the south tympanum of Hagia Sophia, apparently showed the saint as an elderly bishop; this is the most usual type, though his features vary. In the Theodore Psalter (fol. 95v), he bears witness to the burning of the church in Nikomedia in which 20,000 Christians are said to have lost their lives. Four scenes enclosed in roundels recount his martyrdom (including torture on a wheel) in a menologion MS of Symeon Metaphrastes (London, B.L. Add. 11870, fol. 44v); other MSS depict only his beheading.

Source. PG 115:171–84.
- A.K., N.P.S.

ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA AND ANTHOLOGIA PLANUDEA. See Greek Anthology.

ANTHOLOGIES, collections of largely secular verse, esp. epigrams, similar to a florilegium (excerpts from theological texts) or a gnomologion (gnomai, or moralizing excerpts from secular texts in both prose and verse). Selections from the major classical anthologies (those of Meleager of Gadara, Philip of Thessalonike, etc.) were combined in the 10th C. by Constantine Kephala with material from the Byz. period, esp. from the Cycle of Agathias. This collection, now lost as an independent work, in turn formed the basis for the main surviving Byz. anthologies, the Anthologia Palatina and the Anthologia Planudea (see Greek Anthology). There also survive a number of short anthologies (e.g., the 9th-C. Sylloge Euphemiana, the 13th-C. Sylloge Crameriana, the 14th-C. Appendix Barbaro-Vaticana), which contain a few epigrams not attested by the two major collections.

ED. See Greek Anthology.
LIT. AnthGr 1:82–84.
- E.M.J.

ANTHOUA (Ἀνθοῦα, lit. “flourishing”), the name or epithet given by Constantine I the Great to Constantinople–New Rome. John Lydos uses the epithet as a translation of Roman Flora, but E. Fenster (Laudes Constantinopolitanae [Munich 1968] 93, n. 5) questions his explanation. The epithet appears in historians and panegyrics; Paul Silentiarios, for instance, speaks of “golden-clad Anthousa” who subjugates barbarians (vv. 150–58). It is also found in geographical nomenclature (e.g., Eustathios of Thessalonike’s commentary on Dionysios Periegetes), and Manuel Holobolos still used it in his speech on Michael VIII’s reconquest of Constantinople.


ANTHROPOLOGY. The classical Byz. definition of man stems from the Greek philosophical tradition and is common to theologians, philosophers, and even elementary school textbooks; man is a rational, mortal being, or corporeal essence, endowed with speech and thought, capable of reason and knowledge. Man, a being that unites two natures in one person, was the favorite model for the hypostatic union from the 6th C. In this context the soul or spirit of man is contrasted to the body in purely negative terms (incorporeal, immortal, incorruptible), and man is perceived as a simultaneous synthesis of opposites: as “a being united ineffably and simultaneously of different essences” (Anastasios of Sinai, ed. Uthemann, Viae Dux 2.5, p. 58f), or as a “mixture of opposites” (Maximos the Confessor, PG 91:212D, 1032B).

In referring to Genesis 1:27, the patristic tradition sees man as the image of God, or, insofar as the Logos alone is the image of God, man is seen as an “image in the image of God.” From Genesis 1:26, “Let us make man in our image, and according to our likeness,” man is seen as an image of the Trinity in the structure of his soul,
not in the sense of Plato's tripartite division of the soul, but rather in the relationship of man's psyche to his logos and nous or pneuma.

The ability of Byz. anthropology to shed its theological context, at least outwardly, is shown in the thought of Michael Psellos and John Italos in the 11th C. (See also Nemiosios.)

ANTHROPOS (ἀνθρωπος, "man", Lat. homo), a term designating an individual in a relation of personal dependence; its synonyms were philos ("friend"), oikeios, and lizios. The term anthropos could cover relations between a strategos and his retinue, as in the Strategikon of Maurice; this usage is also found later, for example, in a 10th-C. source (TheophCont 374-17) that relates that Leo Argyros attacked Tephrike "with his anthropoi." An anthropos could be a subordinate of a civil official; thus an anonymous letter of the 10th C. was addressed to an anthropos of the krites of the Aegean Sea (Darrouzès, Épistoliers 377, no.47). More evidence of the "parafeudal" nature of Byz. "homage" is revealed in sources of the 11th and 12th C., in a Cretan charter of 1118 (MM 6:95-99), and in Kekaumenos as well as in the typika of Pakourianos and of the Kosmosoteira monastery. A seal of Niketas, "anthropos of the most fortunate caesar," is published but not dated (Zacos, Seals 1, no.643). Anthropoi not only served as a private retinue that followed their commander to battle, but also received land for their service. In later documents the term anthropoi was also applied to paroikoi. The "imperial men," basileikoi anthropoi, formed a special category.

ANTIPHATOS (ἀντιφατος), Greek translation of Latin proconsul or consularis, a governor of some special provinces (B. Kübler, RE 4 [1901] 1140–42). The term probably also designated the head of the administration of Constantinople until 359, when it was replaced by the urban prefect. From the 9th C. anthypatos was used as a dignity. According to E. Stein (BNJbb 1 [1920] 372f), the taktikon of Uspenskij (842/3) still listed the anthypatos as a provincial governor—a conclusion based only on the place of the title in the list. Guiland suggests that anthypatos as a dignity was first applied to Alexios Mousele under Emp. Theophilos. In the late-9th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos the term, often in conjunction with patrikios, was listed in a position between magistros and regular patrikios. The term protanthypatos is known from 11th-C. sources. A disanthypatos is also mentioned on a seal. These titles were not used after the beginning of the 12th C.

ANTICHRIST (Ἀντιχριστος), the greatest antagonist of Christ, esp. at the Second Coming (PAROUSIA). The Greek word Antichristos appears in the Bible only in the epistles of John (1 Jn 2:18–22; 4:3; 2 Jn 7), but the concept of the final struggle between a diabolic ruler (anti-Messiah or "the beast") and the divine forces is to be found in the Hebrew (esp. Essene and apocalyptic) tradition. Hippolytus of Rome in the 3rd C. was the first Christian author to devote a tract to the Antichrist (On Christ and on the Antichrist), the core of which was opposition to the Roman Empire. The theme was developed in Byz. commentaries on the Apocalypse by Oikoumenios, Andrew of Caesarea, Arethas of Caesarea, and Neophytos Enkleistos, since the two beasts in the Apocalypse that are identified with the Roman Empire or the cult of the emperor were interpreted as referring to the Antichrist.

Byz. theologians gave the Antichrist various names: Lampetis, Tetian, Lateinos, Benediktos (or Niketas), names for which the numerical equivalents of their Greek letters add up to 666, the number of the Antichrist (Rev 13:18). He was perceived either as the Devil incarnate or as a being consisting of a man combined with satanic energy. He was expected to come "when the time of the Roman Empire was fulfilled" (Cyril of Je-
ANTIGRAPHEUS (ἀντιγράφης), in the Kletorologion of Philotheos a subordinate of the quaestor. According to Bury (Adm. System 75f), antigraphes were successors of the late Roman magistri scriniorum under the magister officiorum. As the Greek rendition of the magister of a scrinium, the term antigraphus was used by various late Roman authors. It is not known what the functions of the antigraphis were after they moved to the department of the quaestor. Antigraphes are mentioned in the ECOLOGA (162.42, 166.104) as involved in the preparation of legislative acts. Later, the term antigraphe designated responses issued by the emperor (e.g., Latina 1, no.67.17), letters sent abroad (Dölger-Karayannopulos, Urkundenlehre 8g), etc. The seals of antigraphes, some dated to the 7th C., do not clarify their duties.

ANTIMENSION (ἀντιμήνιον), also antimesion (from Lat. mensa, “table”), a portable altar, often made of cloth. The term is first found in an enkomion of an obscure saint, Markianos of Syria; (text probably early 8th C.), where the “antimission” is identified as “mystike trapéza” (AASS June 3:281C–282D). Patr. Niketas I (766–80) reportedly set up an “antimission” in the Hippodrome and prayed before it when Leo IV crowned his son Constantine VI (Theoph. 450.16). The word occurs more frequently from the 12th C. onward when it refers specifically to a piece of cloth—linen (Symeon of Thessalonike, PG 155:332D–333A) or possibly silk. The so-called Nomocanon of Cotelier (J.B. Cotelier, Monumenta ecclesiae graecae 1 [Paris 1677]), produced between the 12th and 14th C., prescribes punishment for a priest who officiates without an antimension. The antimission contained a small pocket for relics and had to be consecrated by a bishop. Although consecrated as a portable altar, an antimission was to be used only when a consecrated altar-table was not available, or if consecration was in doubt. Its usage was quite common, esp. during the late period. The antimission became mandatory for the celebration of liturgy only in the post-Byz. period when it replaced the EILITON as the altar cloth on which eucharistic vessels were set; in earlier practice the antimission had been spread underneath the endyte. Since no Byz. antimensia are preserved, their exact appearance is not known, and there is no evidence that they were ever extensively decorated.


ANTINOÖPOLIS (Ἀντινόοπολις, also Antinoë, Antinou, mod. Shaikh Abada), town in Upper Egypt founded by Hadrian in 130; a flourishing center of Hellenic culture. In 297 Diocletian made Antinoëopolis an important administrative center and under Justinian I it became the seat of the doux of the Thebaid. It had a Christian community and was an episcopal see already in the early 4th C. The ANTINOŰPOLIS PAPYRI make reference to many churches, but excavations have unearthed only a few. There are two large basilicas in the east and south parts of the town, the latter of which dates probably from the 4th C.; it has five aisles and is built entirely of mudbrick. Of the former, only the crypt and sections of the atrium have survived. A third smaller church was discovered in the north cemetery. The site preserves traces of a colonnaded street, a large bath,
a theater, a hippodrome, and other public buildings. The ruins to the south of Antinoopolis are of early monasteries.

Among the burials of Antinoopolis the most famous is the chapel of Theodosia (probably late 4th C.): its frescoes represent Christ and the owner of the tomb accompanied by several saints. Other painted tombs were discovered in the mountains east of the city. The so-called Underground Church contains biblical scenes, e.g., The Marriage at Cana and the Massacre of the Innocents.


—P.G.

ANTINOÖPOLIS PAPYRI, literary and documentary papyri and parchments in Greek, Latin, Coptic, Arabic, Hebrew, and even Gothic, found by British and Italian excavations at the site of Hadrian’s foundation in Middle Egypt (modern Shaikh Abâda), attesting to the flourishing and multiformal culture of Antinoopolis from the 2nd C. until the Arab conquest. They include biblical, theological, medical, legal, grammatical, and stenographic texts, poetry, drama, philosophy, rhetoric, and all the usual documentary genres, from petitions to letters. The role of Antinoöpolis as capital of the Thebaid under its dux in the 6th C. is apparent from the abundant paperwork generated by the official chancery. The lawyer-poet Dioskoros of Aphroditó lived and practiced there during 566–73, and many papyri from his archive were written at Antinoöpolis. Illustrated Greek papyri were found at the site, including herbal illustrations and a drawing of charioteers. Coptic papyri, esp. tax receipts, provide evidence of ecclesiastical institutions and of the role of the dux of the Thebaid into post-conquest times.


—L.S.B. MacC.

ANTIOCH ('Αντιοχεια), the name of two cities in the Byz. Empire. The less important city was located in Anatolia, while Antioch on the Orontes, in Syria, was one of the major cities of late antiquity and the seat of one of the four Eastern patriarchates.

ANTIOCH OF PISIDIA, metropolis east of Lake Eğirdir on major routes through southern Anatolia; now Yalvaç. A Roman colony, Pisidian Antioch saw a revival of Latin and of prosperity in the 4th C. It remained a stronghold of paganism—centered on its temple of the moon god, Men—until ca.400, when the temple was destroyed and replaced by a church. Remains, which include a church with a floor mosaic of ca.380, indicate an active civic life in late antiquity. Thereafter, Antioch was exposed to attack: the Arabs wintered there in 665/6 and destroyed it in 717. The city never really recovered, but it did remain the ecclesiastical metropolis into the 12th C. The Paulicians established their church, Philippia, here in the mid-8th C. In 1097, the First Crusade rested in the fertile plain of Antioch, which by then had been permanently lost to the Turks.


—C.F.

ANTIOCH ON THE ORONTE (now Antakya in Turkey), city about 25 km from the Mediterranean and its port at Seleukeia Pieria, situated between the Orontes River and Mt. Silpios, and crossed east to west by the Parmenios torrent. Seleucid Antioch came to replace Berroia as the principal city of Syria until the latter city regained preeminence following the Arab conquest (636/7). The evidence varies as to the size of Antioch’s population. In 363 Libanios referred to 150,000 anthropoi, while 250,000 or 300,000 people reportedly perished in the earthquake of 526 (G. Downey, TAPA 80 [1958] 87–90). Excavations in 1939–45 at Antioch, its port, and the suburb of Daphne, revealed large houses and five churches at the three sites; a circus, stadium, the cardo, and several baths in Antioch itself; and a theater at Daphne. The numerous tessellated pavements uncovered illustrate the development of floor mosaics from the 2nd to 6th C. As an imperial residence (of Constantius II, Julian, Jovian, and Valens) in the 4th C., Antioch expanded. In its
The city walls were extended by Theodosius II in 430/1, and numerous other emperors also erected public buildings at Antioch. At least four gates led into the walled city, which was 3 km long from the years 430 to 540 and 2.3 km thereafter, when it was approximately 1.6 km wide.

The Tetrarchic palace, public baths, circus, and stadium (built 5th–6th C.) were on an island in the Orontes excluded from Justinian I’s circuit wall, which reduced the defended perimeter of Antioch. The island was connected by a bridge with the heart of the city, which was constructed in part over the Parmentios and contained the Forum of Valens, the praetorium of the governor of Syria I, a public bath (the Kommodion), and a market. To the southeast of this lay the district of Epiphaneia built against the slopes of Mt. Silpios. Here were concentrated the bouleuterion, the praetorium of the comes Orientis, a law court, two tetrapylons, an antíphoros (an open space in front of a forum), various civil basilicas and stoas, and the Church of Sts. Kosmas and Damianos. The south gate of the city, beyond the Jewish quarter of Kerateion, led to Daphne with its theater, hippodrome, and closely spaced “country houses.”

Antioch was capital of the diocese of Oriens under the comes Orientis, provincial capital from ca. 350 of Coele-Syria, and from ca. 415 of Syria I under a governor, and seat of the magister militum for Oriens. Antioch was also the seat of a patriarch (see Antioch, Patriarchate of). In 451, Jerusalem (which had been a suffragan of Caesarea Maritima) became a separate patriarchate with control over the three provinces of Palestine; in 488, the church of Cyprus was likewise made independent of Antioch.

Antioch has been described (Jones, LRE 857f) as a consumer rather than a manufacturing city. Certain goods were, however, produced there in connection with its role as an administrative center. It had an arms factory and a provincial mint from the 4th C. to 611, with workshops producing ceremonial armor and, in the 4th C. and 602–10, silver vessels with silver stamps. Antioch was also a commercial center whose port linked the trade routes from the East with the Mediterranean. There were kommerkiaroi of Antioch from the 6th C. The city apparently had a large middle class: in the late 4th C. John Chrysostom claimed that only 10 percent of the population was wealthy and only 10 percent poor. The inhabitants of Antioch were, moreover, “urbanized,” preferring the suburban pleasures of Daphne to rural villa life (Liebeschuetz, infra 51). The country around Antioch was noted for its pasture land (Libanius, or. 11.23, 26), and the province of Syria I contained such agriculturally productive centers as Dimas and Kaper Barada.

The literary culture of Antioch was primarily Greek, and the use of Latin by the imperial government was considered an intrusion. The city was noted for rhetoricians, historians, and theologians. In the 4th C. all these came under the influence of the pagan rhetor Libanius whose pupils at Antioch included—in addition to numerous future civil servants—not only Ammianus Marcellinus but also the Christian authors Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The last, the foremost member of the Antiochene School, which later came to include Theodoret of Cyrus, applied to the Bible the principles of Hellenistic exegesis learned from his teacher. A prolific church writer in Greek in the 6th C. was the Monophysite Severos of Antioch (although his works survive only in Syriac). Three types of historiography are represented by the works of Antiochene authors: the classical history of Ammianus, who followed Tacitus; the universal chronicle of Malalas; and the church history of Evagrios Scholastikos—the last following in the tradition of Eusebius of Caesarea.

Antioch was proud of a classical heritage that also manifested itself in art (e.g., in the personifications and mythological subjects of its 5th–6th C. pavements) and in a civic pride, best exemplified by Libanius’s Oration on Antioch. In 438 the city was flattered by another oration, that of the visiting empress Athenais-Eudokia, who alluded to the Athenian heritage that she shared with Antioch. The city responded appropriately with the erection of two statues in her honor by the local boule. Other classical traditions were maintained: curial building continued alongside public works financed by the imperial government. Although described by Prokopios in 540 as hedonistic and “not seriously disposed” (Wars 1.17.37, 2.8.6), the Antiochene mentality was then undergoing a change toward a collective religious
consciousness. When in 459 the body of Symeon the Stylist the Elder was brought from Telanissos into Antioch, the people refused to give it up to Emp. Leo I because they felt it would protect their city. The sanctification of the city proceeded when, after the earthquake of 526, a cross appeared in the sky and Antioch was renamed (528) Theoupolis in propitiation for contemporary calamities.

Like other cities, Antioch experienced incidents of urban unrest in the 4th–7th C. After the Riot of the Statues (387), when, in response to increased taxation, the population overturned the imperial images, both city and rioters were punished by Theodosios I: Antioch was for a time stripped of metropolitan rank and its baths, hippodrome, and theaters closed; some rioters were executed. Antioch also witnessed the intrigues of the imperial usurpers Gallus (died 354) and Illos (died 488). The first outbreak of violence at Antioch involving the Blue and Green circus factions occurred in the Hippodrome ca.490, with further riots in 494/5 and 507, when the charioteer Porphyrios was transferred to Antioch from Constantinople. The unruliness of the factions and financial problems led to the closing of the Olympic Games at Antioch in 520, but the theater was still in use in 531.

Religious divisions and conflict recurred in this period. Paganism continued late at Antioch: the sophist Isokias was prosecuted for pagan beliefs in 468, and in 562 two pagan priests from Antioch were brought to trial in Constantinople. In 578 a circle of pagans, exposed by popular protest, was said to include highly placed individuals in several cities including Heliospolis, Edessa, and, at Antioch, the patriarch Gregory himself, who was, however, acquitted. Antioch was also the scene of heretical conflict: until 378 the Arians at Antioch were alternately supported and persecuted by the resident emperors Constantius, Julian, and Valens. The local council of 341 (see under Antioch, Local Councils of) dealt with the problem of Athanasios and Arianism by drawing up four creeds. With the rise of the Monophysite movement in the 5th–6th C., the Chalcedonian patriarch Stephen was murdered (479) and succeeded by the Monophysites Peter the Fuller (died 488) and Severos (512–18). From 518, when a separate Monophysite patriarch was established in exile, local Monophysites were persecuted, notably by Ephraim, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (526–45). In 610 there was an uprising of both Monophysites and Jews at Antioch.

Antioch served as a military administrative center between the 4th and 7th C. The large army stationed in the East was paid and provisioned from here. It was the headquarters of the magister militum (e.g., Zeno, Belisarios, Tiberios, Maurice) and served as a base for imperial campaigns led by Constantius, Julian, and Jovian into Persia in the 4th C. and for Herakleios’s defense against the Arabs in the 7th C. The city itself was besieged by the Lakhmids in 529 and taken and sacked in 540 by the Persians; the Sasanians led away many of the inhabitants and resettled them in a replicated Antioch at Ctesiphon. After an unsuccessful attack in 573, the Persians occupied the city from 609/10 to 628.

According to Downey the decline of Antioch was occasioned by the Persian sack of 540, after which the city was rebuilt by Justinian on a lesser scale but never recovered its former vitality. Lasus, however, has demonstrated that in the 2nd half of the 6th C. the reconstruction of the main street was on a large scale. Furthermore, the city was again rebuilt by Maurice in 588, following an earthquake, and in 592 Evagrios Scholastikos mentions by name as still standing many of the buildings erected from the 4th C. onward (HE 1.16, 18.20; 3.28; 6.8). From the late 6th through 10th C. Antioch’s local history is obscure. Physically, however, many buildings erected before the 7th C. still stood in the Arab (later Byz. and Crusader) city, as attested by Arab geographers, and Justinianic circuit walls enclosed the medieval city.

After Antioch fell to the Arabs in 636–37 (Donner, Conquests 148–51), it became part of a frontier district called al-‘Awāsim and was hardly mentioned. In 944 it was taken by the Ḥamdānid Saff al-Dawla, who lost it in turn to the Byz. generals Michael Bourzites and Peter Phokas on 28 Oct. 969. Nikephoros II Phokas described it as the third city of the world, noted for its beauty, strength, size of population, and impressive buildings (Leo. Diac. 73.12–15). While Arab geographers likewise praised its attractions, Ibn Hawqal complained in 978 of the damage inflicted there by the Byz. (G. LeStrange, Palestine under the Moslems [rp. Beirut 1965] 369). After its recovery by the Byz., Antioch was administered after 969 first
by a strategos and then a doux or katêpano (V. Laurent, MelUnivios 38 [1962] 221–54). It served as a base of military operations elsewhere in the region against the Hamânâdis and, starting in 974, the Fatimids, whose authority had extended into central Syria. The Seljuk invasions of the Caucasus in the 1040s drove the inhabitants of Armenia into northern Syria, where they infiltrated the government at Antioch until in 1078 Philaretos Brachamios established his rule there, becoming a vassal of the atatêg of Mosul. Six years later Antioch fell to the Seljuks and in 1098 to the Crusaders (see Antioch, Princedom of).


ANTIOCH, LOCAL COUNCILS OF. Antioch was the site of two notable local councils.

LOCAL COUNCIL of 324/5. This pre-Nicene council convened under the presidency of Hosius of Cordoba. Its purpose was to forestall, through its censure of Arianism, any favorable outcome regarding Arius at the first ecumenical council of Nicaea. Its relationship to the latter is underscored by its provisional excommunication of the Arian sympathizer Eusebius of Caesarea, whose formal rehabilitation or condemnation was left to Nicaea to decide. Additionally, its anathemas anticipate those adopted later by the general council. Furthermore, its censure of Arius was quite explicit—Christ was said to be begotten “not from that which is not,” but ineffably and indescribably from the Father—even though the council was unaware of the theological terminology subsequently used at Nicaea. The council’s existence was unknown until E. Schwartz discovered a Syriac translation of its synodal letter. Its authenticity is now generally assumed, although contested initially by A. Harnack (Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 26 [Berlin 1908] 477–91).


LOCAL COUNCIL of 341. The pretext for the convocation (6 Jan.) of this “Dedication” council (concilium in encaenatis) was the consecration (Enkainia) of the Golden Basilica, begun in the reign of Emp. Constantine I the Great. Ninety-seven bishops and Emp. Constantius II, an Arian sympathizer, attended. The four creedal statements associated with the council were intended to avoid, if not reject, the homoousian terminology adopted by Nicaea I; hence their subsequent condemnation by the orthodox party. The first of these statements, it is true, is susceptible to an orthodox interpretation, while the second is possibly based on the creed of Lucian of Antioch. Equally, the council was not intentionally disloyal to Nicaea. Indeed, it expressly denied that its members were Arians. Still, the council’s pre-Nicene theology was semi-Arian, as Athanasios of Alexandria and the Western episcopate perceived. Most scholars believe the so-called 25 disciplinary “Canons of Antioch” to be the work of this council.

SOURCE. Mansi 2:1395–50.


ANTIOCH, PATRIARCHATE OF, one of the earliest bishoprics. Its archiepiscopal status and jurisdiction received canonical sanction at Nicaea 1 when it was recognized, together with the bishoprics of Rome and Alexandria, as a major see of Christendom (canon 6). Given Antioch’s size and importance within the empire, the city—the capital of the civil diocese of Oriens—was the major ecclesiastical center in the East after Alexandria. In the 5th C., however, the patriarchate began to lose its prestige as well as some of its jurisdiction—the result often of imperial pressure. At the Council of Ephesus (431) it failed to annex Cyprus, which was declared autocephalous. Then, at the
Council of Chalcedon (451), its Palestinian dioceses were placed under the jurisdiction of the newly created patriarchate of Jerusalem. This reduced the see to eleven provinces. The religious crises of Nestorianism and Monophysitism and the simultaneous growth of the patriarchate of Constantinople also contributed to Antioch's weakness and dismemberment. Monophysitism, in fact, resulted in permanent schism dividing the faithful into Melchites and Jacobites and the formation of a separate "heretical" hierarchy within its borders.

After the Arab conquest (636) Antiochene metropolitans with provinces still under imperial control were placed under the jurisdiction of Constantinople. The vacancy in the throne that occurred after 702 ended only in 742 when elections were again permitted. After the Byz. reconquest (969) candidates were appointed by the emperor and often consecrated, as in the case of John III, by the patriarch of Constantinople, but Antioch did not sever its relations with Rome (J. Nasrallah, Istina 21 [1976] 184f, 375f). Eventually, though, the synod of Antioch was allowed to present its own candidates for the emperor's selection. The Crusaders' promise not to elect the patriarch was not always kept. The existence of a Latin patriarch along with the Orthodox of course caused frequent tension. During the Crusades and Mamluk period, the titular patriarchs of this once powerful see usually resided in Constantinople. The transfer of the see to Damascus occurred under the Mamluks.


ANTIOCH, PRINCIPALITY OF. Founded by Bohemund after he took the city, the principality included the lower Orontes valley, the adjacent coast, and occasionally parts of Cilicia. Alexios I and his successors never abandoned their claims to the region, which still had a substantial Orthodox population. Bohemund's promised allegiance (1108) was refused by Tancred. Prince Raymond of Poitiers was constrained by John II to render homage but avoided surrendering the citadel to the emperor. Following conflicts with John and Manuel I, Raymond had to visit Constantinople and renew his allegiance. After Raymond's death, his widow Constance married Renaud of Châtillon, who first allied himself with Manuel, then, in 1155, plundered Cyprus. In 1158 Manuel's advance through Cilicia obliged Renaud to beg for mercy. He acknowledged his vassalage to Byz. and promised to yield the citadel of Antioch and accept a Greek patriarch. In 1159 Manuel entered the city in triumph. After Renaud's capture by the governor of Aleppo-Berroia (1160), Manuel assisted Antioch. In 1161 he married Constance's daughter Maria of Antioch. His general Constantine Kalamanos was captured by Nur al-Din along with Bohemund III in 1164. After Bohemund was ransomed by Manuel, he had to introduce an Orthodox patriarch into Antioch (1165–70). About 1178 Bohemund married a niece of Manuel, but abandoned her when Manuel died. Thereafter, Byz. was too preoccupied to pursue domination of the principality, one of the long-term goals of the Komnenoi. Antioch was seized by the Mamluks on 18 May 1268.


ANTIOCH “CHALICE,” dated to the 6th C., an ornate silver goblet on a low foot, composed of a plain cup set inside an openwork shell decorated with a grapevine containing 12 seated figures (identified as two representations of Christ and ten Apostles). It was reportedly found at Antioch in 1910, as part of the Antioch Treasure (see Kaper Koraon Treasure), and is now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Its first modern owners, Kouchakji Frères, maintained that the inner cup was the Holy Grail, which Christ used at the Last Supper and which, as a holy object, had been placed soon after within the protective and decorative outer cup. Although initially accepted by some scholars as a work of the 1st C., it was seen by others as either a late Roman object or a modern forgery; the general consensus is for a date of 500–550 (Age of Spirit., no.542). Now corroded and in fragile condition, its craftsmanship was of a high order, including
figures carved from solid silver. Its original function—as a chalice or lamp—remains unclear.


—M.M.M.

ANTIOCHENE ERA. In antiquity there was a proliferation of eras in which events were dated from some fixed starting point of purely local, rather than cosmic, significance. The era used at Antioch in Syria began on 1 Oct. 49 B.C. in honor of some event associated with Julius Caesar (probably the commencement of his dictatorship). It was established in 47 B.C. when Caesar visited Antioch. Each new year of the Antiochene Era began on 1 Oct., until some point in the second half of the 5th C. when it reverted to 1 Sept., thereby bringing it into line with the official Byz. year. The Antiochene Era continued in use until the time of the Arab conquest and was esp. employed by two 6th-C. Antiochenes, the chronicler John Malalas and the church historian Evagrius Scholastikos. To convert an Antiochene date to an a.d. date, subtract 49 for dates between 1 Sept. (or 1 Oct.) and 31 Dec., but 48 for dates between 1 Jan. and 31 Aug. (or 30 Sept.).


—B.C.

ANTIOCHENE SCHOOL, a conventional designation for a group of theologians (Diodoros of Tarsos, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom, Theodoret of Cyrrihus) active mainly in Syria in the 4th and 5th C. Unlike the Alexandrian School it had no formal institution, and the “Antiochene” theologians taught in different cities. The origin of the tradition is obscure; it is often connected with Lucian of Antioch who reportedly conducted a didaskaleion ca.270-312, but Lucian was probably an editor of the Old Testament rather than an exegete. Eustathios of Antioch, the anti-Arian leader, attacked the Alexandrian School and its allegorical interpretation of the Bible and thus set the foundation for future Antiochene exegesis and theology. One of its main points was an emphasis on “historical” (sometimes literal) interpretation of the Bible in the manner of classical philology and its commentaries on Homer; allegorical exegesis was not completely rejected but the Antiochenes criticized arbitrary associations between the Old Testament, the New Testament, and contemporary events. Their glorification of the human nature of Christ was closely connected with this “rationalist” interpretation of the Bible. The Antiochene stress on the immutability of the Logos, and accordingly the existence of two natures in Christ as “Son of God” and “Son of Mary,” led to a conflict with Alexandrian Monophysitism and to a moderate attitude toward Nestorianism. The “school” did not survive the 5th C.; some of its representatives were posthumously condemned in the 6th C. (see Three Chapters, Affair of the, and allegorical biblical interpretation won out over a rationalist historical approach.


—T.E.G.

ANTIOCHOS (Ἀντίοχος), or Antiochites (Ἀν-

τιοχ(ε)ίται), a name, later a family name, deriving from the city of Antioch where it was common in the 4th C. Several 5th-

C. Antiochoi were high-ranking officials in Constantine (O. Seeck et al., RE 1 [1894] 2491; PLRE 2:101-06): the eunuch Antiochos, Persian by origin, had much influence with Arkadios but was dismissed by Theodosios II ca.421; Antiochos Chouzon (died between 438 and 444), was prae-

torian prefect of the Orient (430) and a member of the commission on the Theodosian Code; his son was praecon prefect of the Orient in 448. Another Antiochos was prefect of Italy from 552 to 554. Some Antiochoi were active in cultural life: Antiochos, the rhetorician, bishop of Pilemais (Palestine) ca.400, is known as an adversary of John Chrysostom; another Antiochos, author of the Pandektes, a collection of biblical and pa-

tristic quotations, witnessed the fall of Jerusalem in 614—his identification with Antiochos Strate-

gos, however, cannot be proved. In the mid-

8th C., Antiochos, logothetes tou dromou, was a very influential politician; condemned by the council of 754, he was blinded and exiled. Another Antiochos was protostratego of Italy ca.763. Antiochoi of the 10th and 11th C. held military posts: Antiochos, father of Paul of Latros, was kones of the fleet; another Antiochos was doux of the Me-
LINGOI; the protospatharios Antiochos was doux of Calabria probably in the 11th C.; another Antiochos commanded a troop of Macedonians in 1081.

As a surname, Antiochos appears from the 11th C. onward: Leo Antiochos, Isaac I's general, fell in battle in 1057; Constantine was megas hetaiorites ca. 1094; his contemporary Michael Antiochos was primikerios of the external vestiaritai. The sister of Stephen Antiochos married Constantius, son of the sebastos Isaac Komnenos ca. 1100—the identification of the Isaac is impossible. The noble family of Antiochos was supposedly involved in a plot against Alexios I. In the 12th C. Gregory Antiochos was an official and a literary figure (see Antiochos, Gregory).

Several 11th- and 12th-C. Antiochitai are known, primarily from seals that preserve their titles but rarely their offices (e.g., Theocharistos, a fortress commander, or kastrophylax). Epigrams of the 12th C. also mention several Antiochitai, praising George for decorating a monastery and Theodore and John for supporting the poor (Lampros, "Mark. kod.," nos. 77.3, 82.11). The social character of the Antiochites family is unclear, esp. since their identification with the Antiochoi remains questionable. Apparently part of the 11th-C. military aristocracy, they seem to have lost their military functions after Alexios I. They possessed lands and supported monasteries; they produced a few intellectuals, including a military engineer ca. 1091 and an Antiochites who corresponded with Eustathios of Thessalonike. The names of Antiochos and Antiochites are rare in later centuries (PLP, nos. 1031–40); Theodore Antiochites (died 1407), a friend of John Chortasmenos, was John VIII's tutor in 1400–03.


ANTIOCHOS, GREGORY, high-ranking official, writer; born Constantinople 1125?, died after 1196. Antiochos did not claim descent from a noble lineage (Darrouzès incorrectly hypothesized his relationship to the Komnenoi), but his father was a man of means able to found a small convent. Antiochos was educated in Constantinople under magistros ton rhetoron Nicholas Kataphloron, Nicholas Hagiotheodorites, and Eustathios of Thessalonike. His first datable work is of ca. 1159. He gave up intellectual circles and his literary career, however, and entered the civil service. After a brief and unhappy period of private employment, he served in the imperial administration; in 1181 he was imperial secretary, then a judge. It is plausible that Antiochos supported Andronikos I and Patr. Basil II Kamateros (1183–86) and was forced to resign under Isaac II. He reappeared in the administration as megas droungarios ca. 1196. Antiochos was a defender not only of imperial omnipotence, but also of the senate; he favored "democratic" phraseology but stood aloof from military commanders. As a writer he was influenced by Eustathios of Thessalonike (esp. in letters addressed to the latter). He presents a vivid description, tinged with sarcasm, of the climate of Bulgaria and the Bulgarian way of life. He gives life to books and fruits, and endows animals with reason.


ANTIOCHOS STRATEGOS, author of a narrative on the capture of Jerusalem by the Persians in 614. The Greek original is lost, the text preserved in Georgian and Arabic versions. The identification of Antiochos Strategos with a contemporary monk Antiochos, author of the Pandeke, is not proved. Antiochos Strategos describes the siege of Jerusalem, stressing, on the one hand, the role of the Jews in the massacre and, on the other hand, the desire of the patriarch Zacharias (609–31) to conclude a treaty with the Persians and to prevent the pillaging of the city. The last chapter of the narrative is dedicated to the restoration of the True Cross to Jerusalem by Heraclios on 21 Mar. 631.


**ANTIOCH TREASURE.** See Kaper Koraon Treasure.

**ANTIPHON** (ἀντιφώνον), a selection from the Psalter, followed by a doxology, to be sung in the liturgy by two choirs in alternation. The singing of antiphona (antipallaion) is known from the 4th C. onward (Basil the Great, PG 32:764A). An antiphon may consist of several psalms, not necessarily consecutive; of one psalm only; or even of single verses. A refrain is not essential, but when found it is called hypopsalma, ephymnion, hypaecho, or Troparion—the name antiphon never being applied to the refrain itself. An archaic musical feature survives in the cadence of the antiphon, where the last four syllables of a line are applied mechanically, without regard for word accent, to four fixed, stylized melodic elements.


**ANTIPROSOPON** (ἀντιπροσωπών), a deputy, probably identical with the ek prosopou. The term is known from 995 onward (Livr. 1, no.8.10–11) and was used primarily in the 11th C. The earlier chrysobulls describe exemptions from the antiprosopoues of the strategoi, but a charter of 1081 (Lavra 1, no.43.45–49) mentions the duties of both military commanders and civil officials; in later documents the antiprosopon of the parathalassites is cited (nos. 55.32–33, 67.57). Seals dated by the editors to the 11th C. belonged to the antiprosopoues of the genikon (Zacos, Seals 2, no.957), of the sekron of the sakelle (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.817), and of an unspecified sekron (Zacos, Seals 2, no.851). —A.K.

**ANTIQUITY.** The Greco-Roman heritage was a powerful tradition, which, together with that of the Bible, influenced Byz. culture. From antiquity Byz. inherited the Greek language, the system of education, Roman law, the basic principles of rhetoric and literary style, and substantial forms of social and political organization. The Byz. did not differentiate themselves from their ancestors who lived in the eastern Roman Empire, but called themselves Rhomaioi and viewed classical Greek authors as models for imitation: Homer was the Poet, Aristotle the Philosopher, Galen the Physician, etc. They often compared events of their lives with episodes of Greek or Roman history, their institutions with those of the Greco-Roman past. Nevertheless, Byz. cannot be placed within the framework of antiquity.

First of all, the general social and cultural setting had changed: high antiquity was primarily an urban society, but after the 7th C. the empire lost its predominantly urban character; antiquity was a society of cives (“citizens”), united around municipia and gentes, whereas Byz. was family oriented; antiquity was pagan, while Byz. was consistently Christian, thus entailing a radical change in ethical values and the replacement of pluralistic approaches in philosophy by mandatory doctrine. The ancient heritage, always present, was in a state of constant flux. This was partly a natural result of the passage of time. Thus the vernacular, developing beneath the surface of written compositions, from the 12th C. onward overtly penetrated into written literature, first into poetry: meter based on the length of vowels—hexameter, etc.—was pushed into the background by meter based on accentuation; toward the very end of Byz. rhyme began to develop under Western medieval influences. The transformation of the ancient heritage was also connected with the change in the social and cultural setting. Even though the principles of Roman law remained alive in the works of 14th-C. jurists, the elaborate system of contracts was simplified, the distinction between ownership and possession confused, the law of marriage radically changed, and the impact of the totalitarian state on law grew substantially. Education also retained general patterns of the ancient system, but Christian textbooks were introduced, concern with physical development (gymnastics) was abandoned, elementary education shifted from the school of the paedagogus to the church, monastery, or the family circle, and the purpose of liberal education became the development not of a free and noble citizen, but of a state functionary or a high ecclesiastic.

Second, even though the Byz. referred often to classical authors they were more likely to cite late Roman masters. In an analysis of Byz. attitudes toward the past, I. Ševčenko *infra* [1987–88] 20–
24) has suggested three phases, corresponding to the 4th–6th C., the 7th–11th C., and the 12th–15th C., respectively. During the 4th–6th C., there was a manifest familiarity with antique authors. In the 7th–11th C., Byz. writers made greater use of late antique models than of ancient Greek authors. Thus the works produced in the 10th C. under the patronage of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos more frequently cited the Old Testament, Hellenistic and late Roman authors, even authors of the 6th–9th C., than Homer or Demosthenes. Similarly the Bibliotheca of Photios cites a number of late Roman historians while ignoring classical poetry. Finally, during the 12th–15th C., admiration for classical Greek authors revived, and Byz. scholars prepared commentaries on and new editions of the writings of high antiquity.

Third, there was an ideologically mandated ambivalent attitude toward antiquity among Byz. lay and ecclesiastical literati. Conditional veneration and respect had to go side by side with official rejection—this ambivalence was codified by church fathers (esp. the Cappadocians), who repudiated paganism, mythology, theater, “licentious behavior,” luxury, and the ideology of success, but in practice retained most elements of Hellenic culture (as transmitted by the Second Sophistic) as a powerful means of education and mental training. In the 10th and 11th C., involvement in the study of antiquity and ancient philosophy could make one liable to accusations of anti-Christian attitudes, and a few literati discussed the images of mythology and history to claim that “our” events are more significant, more virtuous, and more beneficial than those of antiquity. It must be remembered that more than half of surviving Byz. literature, for example, hagiography and hymnography, was virtually devoid of any influence from or allusions to classical authors.

Not many Byz. were able to understand the achievements of antiquity as well as did Michael Psellos or Eustathios of Thessalonike; cases of misunderstanding and distorting of tradition are numerous. Sometimes this distortion reflected a Byz. perspective: when Photios read Herodotus, he remained lukewarm to the development of Athens as a democratic republic—in his perception Herodotus was a historian of Persian basileis and of a Persian usurper; Eustathios used Homeric images to criticize excessive asceticism.

The concept of antiquity varied, depending on a Byz. author’s social and educational level. Thus the world chronicle of Malalas mentions almost nothing about Periclean Athens, but a great deal about Roman history, esp. the imperial period. On the other hand, Nikephoros Blemmydes is well informed on Persian campaigns against Athens. The concept of antiquity also changed as time went on. The late Roman period assumed antiquity to be a living phenomenon. Consequently, we view the philosophy of this period, represented by Proklos, Olympiodoros of Alexandria, and even John Philoponos, as a branch of ancient philosophy, while in 6th-C. Italy Boethius continued the same tradition. Historians such as Prokopios of Caesarea also worked in the classical vein and even many church fathers were educated in the principles of classical rhetoric and applied it to their sermons. It was probably the art and architecture of the period that diverged most from the antique ideal.

The second half of the 7th C. and the 8th C. were difficult times, when much of the learned tradition, including the ancient heritage, was lost. It is therefore logical that the next period of material and cultural revival—which acquired, undeservedly, the title of “Macedonian renaissance”—was devoted primarily to the retrieval and collection of the cultural, including ancient, heritage; from the Bibliotheca of Photios to the Souda the main tasks were the reediting and copying of the surviving texts, the accumulation of excerpts and fragments, and the ordering of scraps of information.

The situation changed in the 11th and 12th C., when the simple collection and organization of materials was replaced by commentaries and the development of the heritage. An advance was made from the satisfaction of practical needs (mathematics, agriculture, moral “science,” political “science”) that was predominant in the 9th–10th C. to an aesthetical perception of antiquity. The study of Homer, the tragedians, and Aristophanes progressed from the copying of scholia typical of the 9th and 10th C. to the essays and detailed commentaries of scholars such as Michael Psellos, Eustathios of Thessalonike, and John Tzetzes; a very nonorthodox Lucian was broadly copied and imitated, and Plato gained popularity on a level with Aristotle. There was a trend to combine both heritages—the ancient and the biblical—and direct comparison with personages of.
myth and ancient history became legitimate. Scholars and writers like Psellos, Tzetzes, and Eustathios had an enormous, if antiquarian, knowledge of ancient events, names, and terms. Thus reacquired in the 9th–12th C., after a short gap around the 8th C., the ancient tradition was not lost during the Palaiologan period. The greatest achievements of Byz. classical philology occurred during that period, in the work of Maximos Planoudes, Thomas Magistros, and Demetrios Triklinios. As a result of contacts with the West, the Byz. concept of antiquity was even expanded to the Latin heritage, including poets such as Ovid. Pletion made the most passionate attempt ever to use ancient tradition as a tool for reorganization of society and its beliefs, or at least as a vehicle for criticism of its social, political, and religious shortcomings. It was, however, impossible to restructure the Byz. world and to achieve a Platonic utopia. Moreover, the Byz. began to feel some weariness with regard to antiquity: Theodore Metochites was extremely well read in ancient literature (albeit he sometimes misunderstood his reading), but he complained that the ancestors of the Byz. had said everything so perfectly that there was no room for improvement by posterity. This awe of antiquity was in stark contrast to a Renaissance perception of ancient culture as exemplary, but distinct from the present.


ANTIRRHEETIKOS (ἀντιρρητικός), "refutation," a genre of polemical literature; often used as an adjective with such nouns as logos, kepalaia, and biblion. The word is rare in classical Greek (e.g., Sextus Empiricus 1:21), but Photios (Bibl., cod.160) uses it as a generic term when he writes that Chorikios of Gaza produced panegyrics, mono-

dies, epithalamia, and antirrhetics; by the last term Photios probably meant Chorikios's refutation of the common views that attacked the theater. Palladios in the Lausiac History (ch.38, ed. C. Butler [Cambridge 1898; rp. Hildesheim 1967] 2:121.1–2) relates that a certain deacon Evagrios wrote three books against demons, one of them entitled Antirrheikon. From the 9th C., when Patr. Nikephoros I and Theodore of Studios issued their antirrhetics against the Iconoclasts, and esp. in the 12th–15th C., the term designated treatises refuting heretical tenets: thus Nicholas of Methone devoted an Antirrheis to the refutation of Soterichos Pantugenos, and George Moschabari and John XI Bekkos exchanged antirrhetics (Beck, Kirche 678, 683); an anti-Palantine Arsenios wrote several antirrhetics against the Latins (Beck, Kirche 722), and Patr. Philoteos Kokinos composed antirrhetics against Gregoras. —A.K., E.M.J.

ANTI-SEMITISM. In Byz. anti-Semitism was manifested primarily in legal, secular, and religious texts; iconography; and periodic forced baptism of Jews. The economic rivalry and mob violence that characterized post-11th-C. Western Christendom appeared late in Latin-controlled areas such as Crete and Corfu. Theodosios II's codification of many local or ad hoc anti-Jewish laws effectively reduced Jews to a second-class citizenship, prohibiting proselytism, government or military service, and use of public baths. The Codex Justinianus interfered with their hitherto guaranteed social and religious autonomy as a religio licita (nov.146). Subsequent Byz. law codes (Basilika, Ecloga) and legal collections (Harmenopoulos) perpetuated some restrictions. Parallel Muslim discrimination, Jews were forbidden to ride horses.

Benjamin of Tudela observed that 12th-C. Greeks hated Jews (particularly tanners); further evidence of this prejudice is found in Anacharsis's snub of social climbers and Tzetzes' outright nastiness; the introduction of a humiliating oath; and their expulsion from Choni by Metri. Niketas. This secular and intellectual animosity was replaced under the Palaiologoi by concern over Jewish influence. Patr. Athanasios I protested their importance at court and in the market and objected to Byz. recourse to Jewish doctors; he tried
to banish all Jews from Constantinople. So too Maximos Planoudes complained of Jewish tanners housed in an abandoned monastery.

Byz. anti-Semitism derived mainly from polemics that justified the Christian appropriation of the Bible by denigrating Jews and Judaism. Byz. ecclesiastics effectively used the chastising and polemical language of the Septuagint and New Testament against Jews. In his *Evangelical Demonstration*, Eusebios of Caesarea emphasized Paul’s teaching of God’s rejection of Old Israel and Christ’s salvation of New Israel. Patristic and later sermons (John Chrysostom’s attack on the Jewish Sabbath) and hagiography (the vita of Basil the Younger even questions whether Jews can attain salvation) influenced the masses as did an iconography that depicted Jews as Christ-killers. In marginal Psalter illustration they are physically caricatured, to the point of being given dogs’ heads, and are shown tormenting Christ. Athanasios I refers to the “deicial synagogue”; and from the 11th C., in MS illustration the personification of Synagogue (see Ekklesia) is driven from the crucified Christ by an angel, while the apocryphal story of Jephonias the Jew, whose hands are cut off for upsetting the Virgin’s bier, enters images of the Dormition. Indeed, Jews were frequently accused of desecrating icons while Jewish insults to icons are an abiding theme in hagiography. A vocabulary of rejection permeates church canon and liturgy (esp. in Jerusalem). Theological polemics continued as a popular literary genre, for example, Matthew Blaistes and John VI Kantakouzenos. The non-Orthodox practices and beliefs of heterodox Christians (pejoratively called “Jews”) were rejected or punished as “judaizing,” as in Latin azymes. Even Iconoclasm was blamed on the Jews; for example Photios (Hom. 17.3) attributes the destruction of the apse mosaic of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, to a Jewish hand. Christian ecclesiastics recognized and feared the passive challenge of Judaism both as ideology and system of practices and its potential appeal to Christian converts, heretics, and rebels against the state religion. Condemnation of Judaizing heresies—Quartodecimanism, Novatianism, Tetradism, etc.—permeate Byz. legislation. Judaism thus became the perennial foil against which Christian Byz. expressed its self-identity. (See also Jews and Judaism.)


—S.B.B., A.C.
entering earthly Jerusalem on a donkey and Christ in heavenly glory).

Maguire, Art & Eloquence 53–83.

—A.K., I.S.

ANTONINA (Ἀντώνινα), wife of Belisarios; born Constantinople (?) ca.484, died probably Constantinople after 548. She was the daughter and granddaughter of charioteers in Constantinople and Thessalonike. Her mother may have been an actress at Constantinople. Married to an Antiochene merchant, Antonina had one legitimate daughter and no legitimate sons before being widowed. She married Belisarios and accompanied him to Carthage in 533 and thence to Italy in 535/6; she was at Porto during the siege of Rome by Totila in 546. Antonina remained at Constantinople when Belisarios was ordered to lead armies against the Persians in 540, but later set out to join him. Prokopios accuses her of sinister political influence on Justinian’s wife Theodora (e.g., contriving to depose Pope Silverius [536–37] and undermine John of Cappadocia) and of conduct that made Belisarios look foolish, allegedly including a romance with her adopted son Theodosios and the execution of two pages to hide the affair.


—W.E.K.

ANTONY (secular name Dobrynja Jadreković), archbishop of Novgorod (1210–22, 1223, 1225–28); died 8 Oct. 1232. He authored a description of Constantinople, Kniga palomnik (The Pilgrim Book, ca.1200), and possibly also the Tale of the Taking of Tsar’grad [by the Franks] (M. Aleškovskij, Povest’ vremennyh let [Moscow 1971] 71–83). The most detailed account of Constantinople’s sacred sites immediately preceding 1204, the Kniga palomnik is esp. valuable for its information on objects destroyed or looted by the Latins, such as the icon of Christ Antiphonites taken from the Chalkoprateia. It describes sites in Constantinople, Pera, and Galata as well as Hagia Sophia, where Antony pays particular attention to the relationship between the church’s layout and the conduct of services, although he is not above inventing pipes, a cistern, and “patriarchal baths” in the galleries. Antony is esp. interesting on the use made of relics—the head of Stephan the Younger carried around Constantinople by the city eparch on the saint’s day—and miraculous objects: a door bolt, called the Romaniston, located somewhere in Hagia Sophia, would draw the venom from snakebites. Antony also notes items of specific interest for the Rus’ (two tombs, an icon and church of Boris and Gleb) and provides the only known reference to an embassy to Constantinople from Roman of Galč (Galitzza) in 1200. The literary and formal qualities of the Kniga palomnik have been variously interpreted as either a plain and factual guidebook with anecdotal digressions or as a rhetorical narrative in which Constantinople is presented as a model.


—S.C.F., A.C.

ANTONY I KASSYMATAS (Ἀντώνιος ὁ Ἐκκασυματας), patriarch of Constantinople (ca. Jan. 821–Jan. 837?); baptismal name Constantine. Of low birth, he received a good education and became a lawyer (nomikos) in the Sphoraiou district of Constantinople ca.800. Subsequently he became a monk and then hegumenos of the Constantinopolitan monastery called Ta metropolitou (Janin, Églises CP 197). By 814 he was the Iconodule bishop of Syllaiou; when Emp. Leo V ushered in a new period of Iconoclasm, however, Antony shifted his position, tempted by the offer of the patriarchate (Script. incert. 350–52). In 814 he became a member of the committee headed by John (VII) Grammatikos that prepared a florilegium of scriptural and patristic passages supporting Iconoclasm. In 821 Emp. Michael II named Antony patriarch, thus disappointing Theodore of Studios, who hoped that Nikephoros I might be recalled to the patriarchal throne. Around 822 Antony excommunicated Job, patriarch of Antioch, for proclaiming Thoma the Slav empeor (RegPatr, fasc. 2, no.412). According to the Letter of the Three Patriarchs (ed. L. Duchesne, Roma e l’Oriente 5 [1912–13] 359), Antony participated in an Iconoclast council (of uncertain date) and, as divine punishment, was stricken with a loathsome
disease. The sources differ on the length of his patriarchate, ranging from 12 to 16 years. V. Grumel argues that Antony was still alive in Apr. 836, but gravely ill, and continued to be patriarch until 837, when he was succeeded by his synkellos, John VII Grammatikos (EO 34 [1935] 162–66, 506). He was anathematized in the SYNODIKON OF ORTHODOXY (ed. Gouillard, “Synodikon” 57.173).

LIT. RegPair, fasc. 2, no. 112. Lemere, Humanism 161f. Laurent, Corpus 5.1, no. 4. —A.M.T.

ANTONY II KAULEAS, patriarch of Constantinople (Aug. 893–12 Feb. 901 [Synax.CP 461]) and saint; feastday 12 Feb. The scanty facts of Antony’s biography are known primarily from a 14th-C. vita by Nikephoros Gregoras. According to this source, Antony lost his mother as a child, became a monk at age 12, was subsequently ordained, and elected hegumenos of an unnamed monastery. He then came to the attention of Emp. Leo VI, who made him patriarch; Antony supported the emperor against Photios. Gregoras emphasized the charitable works of the patriarch and praised his acts of social justice.

Antony is best known as the founder or restorer of the monastery known variously as tou Kaleos, tou Kalliou, or tou Kaulea. After 1192 the foundation was called tou kyr Antoniou. Emp. Leo VI preached at the dedication of a church in this monastic complex (ed. Akakios, Leonios tou Sophou panegyrikoi logos [Athens 1868] 243–48), describing its mosaics, pavement, and polychrome marble revetment. This text, outlining a conventional program of church decoration of the 9th–10th C., is notable for the analogy drawn between the splendor of the mosaics and that of the emperor’s entourage. Antony was buried in this church, as was Stylianos Zaoutzes. The vita by Gregoras describes a number of posthumous miracles at Antony’s shrine.


ANTONY IV, patriarch of Constantinople (Jan. 1380–July 1390; early 1391–May 1397); died Constantinople May 1397. A former hieromonn, perhaps from the Dionysiou monastery on Athos (F. Tinnefeld, JÖB 36 [1986] 106 and n.130, 115), Antony served twice as patriarch under John V and Manuel II. He was deposed in 1390 during the occupation of Constantinople by John VII Palaiologos and temporarily replaced by Makarios (who had previously been patriarch during 1377–79). Antony was restored to the patriarchate after Manuel regained his throne.

Antony is best known for a letter addressed to Grand Prince Basil I of Moscow, probably in 1393 (Meyendorff, infra 254), which not only asserts the universal spiritual authority of the ecumenical patriarch but also defends the universal sovereignty of the Byz. basileus, even though the empire was severely weakened by Ottoman invasions. In response to Basil’s statement, “We have a Church, but not an emperor,” Antony replied, “It is not possible for Christians to have a Church without an emperor,” and urged that the name of the Byz. emperor be restored to the diptychs in Moscow. Antony also corresponded in 1397 with Jagiello, grand duke of Lithuania (1377–1434) and king of Poland (1386–1434), saying that he would consider UNION OF THE CHURCHES if Jagiello joined Sigismund, king of Hungary (1387–1437), in a crusade against the Turks. Three of Antony’s seals survive (Oikonomides, Dated Seals, nos. 155–57).


ANTONY THE GREAT, Egyptian hermit and saint; born Kome, Upper Egypt, ca.251, died Pispir 356; feastday 17 Jan. Antony is often cited as one of the founders of the eremitic form of MONASTICISM.

Born to a prosperous peasant family, Antony gave away all his property and withdrew from society in order to follow strict asceticism. After a period of complete isolation in an abandoned fort, he began to attract followers. Together they settled at Pispir in the Egyptian desert. Here the monks lived separately but received guidance from their leaders.

The Life of Antony (356–57), attributed to ATHANASIOS of Alexandria after a Coptic original,
made him the model for many Christians, even outside of Egypt, who were drawn to the solitary life. In the *Life*, Antony is depicted as the perfect man who follows moderate ascetic practices, supports the church hierarchy, and performs miracles with divine assistance. According to the *Life*, he visited Alexandria to support Athanasios against the Arians. But there is no independent confirmation of his anti-Arianism; in the sayings and letters, Antony addresses practical and ethical questions only.

Antony was Coptic-speaking, not Greek-speaking, and probably dictated his letters in Coptic, even though it is not impossible that a Greek papyrus contains a fragment of Antony’s letter to Am[on?], his pupil (G. Garitte, *Muséon* 52 (1959) 17, n.23). The letters of Antony are preserved in two collections: seven letters surviving in Latin translation are usually considered genuine since Jerome mentioned a collection of Antony’s letters in seven parts—but Bardenhewer (*Literatur 3:81*) questioned their authenticity; a collection of 20 Arabic letters is attributed to Antony. In addition, some Georgian, Syriac, and Coptic letters and fragments are known. The Sahidic vita of Pachomios contains fragments of two of Antony’s letters. Some forged texts exist under his name, including monastic rules. Some of his sayings were incorporated into the *Apophthegmata Patrum*.


—J.A.T. A.K.

**ANTONY THE YOUNGER**, saint; baptismal name John; born Phossaton near Jerusalem 785, died 11 Nov. 865. Born to a noble family, Antony left for enlisted in the navy, and was eventually promoted by Michael II to ek prosopon (deputy governor) of the theme of Kibyrrhaiotai. He successfully fought against Thomas the Slav in 822/3, but in 825 abandoned his post to become the disciple of a stylist monk. He took the monastic habit and lived in various monasteries on Bithynian Olympos and in Constantinople. Antony was very close to Petronas, whose victory over the Arabs (863) he predicted.

His picturesque vita, written by a contemporary and preserved in 10th-C. and later MSS, is rich in information about Byz. medical services, everyday life, law, and the administrative system; for example, the trial of Antony by the *epi ton deeseon* Stephen in 829/30 is described in detail.


—A.K.

**ANZAS** (Ἀνζᾶς, Ἀντζᾶς), a family of civil functionaries. Their origins are variously described: Zlatarski (lst. 2:554) considered Ivan Anzas (Anço, his transliteration) a Bulgarian name; S. Rudberg (*Études sur la tradition manuscrite de saint Basile* [Lund 1953] 149f) thought it Italian. The first of them, John Anzas, assisted Theodoulos, archbishop of Bulgaria, in building the Church of Hagia Sophia in *Ohrid* in 1056. The family was active in administration in the second half of the 11th C.: Michael, quaestor and *nomophylax* (1077); John, notary (1087); Niketas, judge of the *velum* (1098). Some are known only by their seals (Laurent, *Corpus* 2:679), which are dated primarily to the same period: Constantine, judge of the *velum*; Nikephoros, sym- ponus; Niketas and Nicholas, judges of the Hippodrome. The Anzades served throughout the 12th C. as civil (Nik. Chon. 57:57) and ecclesiastical officials: Leo, bishop of Argos and Nauplia (ca.1143–57) and founder of the AREIA MONAS TERY, calls himself nephew of Constantine Anzas; the monk and *orphanostrrophos* Basil Anzas was the addressee of Manuel I’s ordinance of 1171. The last known Anzas, John, was an official responsible for assigning land to the Genoese in 1202.


**ANZITENE** (Ἀνζιτηνῆ), district of the eastern Byz. frontier, southeast of Armenia, commanding major routes through Armenia and across the Euphrates. Conquered from Persia by Diccrarian in 297, Anzitene was important for frontier defense until Justinian I conquered territory farther east. Under the Arabs, who took it in the 640s, Anzitene was a base for attacks against Byz. and
for control of Armenia. During this period, much of its Christian population immigrated to the more protected hills to the north. The object of frequent Byz. attacks, Anzitene was reconquered by 950 and assigned to the theme of MESOPOTAMIA. Anzitene, whose centers were at ARSAMOSATA and CHARPETE, is best known from the narrative of the campaign of Sayf al-Dawla in 956 and from the surveys and excavations at Asvan and the Keiban region that have revealed many details of local conditions in the Byz. period, which here ended after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071.


APA ABRAHAM, bishop of Hermonthis in Upper Egypt and hegoumenos of the nearby monastery of Phoibammon; born ca.554, died 624. His archive consists of more than one hundred Coptic ostraka, primarily letters, and his will, written in Greek but dictated in Coptic. The contents illustrate the power and prestige of the local bishop: supervising the requirements for candidates for ordination; celebrating the Eucharist and administering the provision of the bread and wine; choosing his successor as hegoumenos and disposing of his property; imposing ecclesiastical sanctions; being concerned with the morals and behavior of his flock; and protecting the interests of the poor. His encaustic portrait is preserved in Berlin (M. Krause in Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache 97 [1971] 106–11), and a liturgical book binding (inscribed with his name) and other altar furnishings from his church near Luxor are in the Coptic Museum in Cairo (M. Krause in The Future of Coptic Studies, ed. R. McL. Wilson [Leiden 1978] 10–12).

ED. W.C. Till, Datierung und Prospopraphie der koptischen Urkunden aus Theben (Vienna 1969) 52 (list of sources), P.Lond. 1 77. W.E. Crum, Coptic Ostraca (London 1902) nos. 49–76.


APAMEIA (Ἀπαμεία) on the Orontes River, now Arab village of Qal‘at al-Mudiq in modern Syria; capital city and metropolitan bishopric of the province of Syria II that was formed between 413 and 417. The Neo-Platonic school of IAMBlichos flourished there in the 4th C. A synagogue was paved probably in 391 by donors who recorded in inscriptions the size of the area that each had financed. Following earthquakes in 526–28, the tetraconch cathedral was rebuilt (?) in 533 by the archbishop Paul, and what may have been the governor’s palace was redecorated in 539, with a hunting pavement. An important relic of the True Cross was preserved at Apameia until its removal by Justin II (566 or 574). In 540 Apameia was stripped by the Persians of over 10,000 pounds of silver (Prokopios, Wars 2.11.2–38), and of yet more silver in 573 when they burned the city (John of Ephesus, HE 6.6). Following this event the cardo, an “atrium church,” numerous large private houses, and other buildings were rebuilt or repaired. Urban life continued at Apameia after the Arab conquest of 659 and came to an end only at some undetermined period thereafter.

In the illuminated Kynegetika of the pseudo-Opian (Furlan, Marciana 5, fig.37a), Apameia is represented as a walled city, dominated by a huge domed church and flanked by the Orontes between Mt. Diokleos and Mt. Emblonos.


APATHEIA. See Emotions.

APELATAI (sing. ἀπελάτος, lit. “one who drives away”), irregular light soldiers stationed along the frontiers who supplemented their military activities with brigandage, first appear under Basil I (TheophCont 685.5). Their duties primarily involved raiding (and plundering) enemy territory and acting as border-scouts and guides for Byz. expeditionary forces (De re militari, ed. Dennis 292.16–34). Apelatai were recruited from Armenian and Bulgarian freebooters and from Byz. soldiers otherwise unable to fulfill obligations for military service (De cer. 696.4); their commanders were appointed by Byz. provincial officials (De velitattione, 4:1.19–20). Apelatai were included in the muster rolls of themes, although it is unclear whether their remuneration comprised simply cash and rations or also stratistiotika ktemata. In western portions of the empire, apelatai were also termed chonsarii (Bulg. for “thieves”—Souda
APHRAHAT (" Aphraētēs"), Syrian theologian, often called "the Persian Sage"; died ca. 345. Under his name have come down 23 spiritual treatises called Demonstrations (Syr. tawīyāthā). He lived in the Adiabene region of Persia, east of Nisibis, and was of clerical status, though apparently not a bishop or monk, but rather one of the celibate "Sons of the Covenant" (Syr. Benai Qyāmā) who lived in the world. His Demonstrations range in date from 336/7 to 344/5; the last one was written during the persecution of Shāpūr II (M. Higgins, BZ 44 [1951] 265–71). The first 22 are numbered by the letters of the Syriac alphabet.

Theology and writings of Aphrahat draw extensively on the Old Testament, reflecting the religious milieu of 4th-C. Mesopotamia in which Christianity was seeking to define its identity as separate from Judaism. He praises Christ as the divine conqueror of death and as the completion and fulfillment of all the types and prophecies of the Old Law. Aphrahat is concerned with how to live as a Christian in this world, with prayer, charity, endurance of persecution, and concern for the poor; Demonstration 1 preserves an early credal text. There is an Armenian translation (ascribed to Jacob of Nisibis) of 19 of the Demonstrations; separate ones are also known in Ethiopic and Georgian.

APHRODISIAS (Ἀφροδισίας, now Geyre), city of Caria, notable for its extensive and well-preserved remains. Aphrodisias was metropolis of the province and had active schools of sculpture and philosophy. It was a seat of pagan teaching through the late 5th C. and had an important Monophysite church—sometimes with its own bishop—in the 5th and 6th C. Aphrodisias assumed the name Stauropolis in the 7th C., but by the 12th was usually known by the name of the province, Caria. It was sacked by Theodore Mankphas in 1188 and by the Seljuks in 1197; it became Turkish in the late 13th C.

Excavations have revealed much of Byz. Aphrodisias within its mid-4th-C. walls. The city centered on its cathedral church, formerly the temple of Aphrodite (converted in the mid-5th C.). Palaces with audience halls, probably of the bishop and governor, flanked the church. The agora to the south was apparently abandoned after a devastating earthquake in the 4th C. permanently altered the water table; many public buildings were rebuilt at that time. The south part of the city included baths, a basilica where the PRICE EDICT of Diocletian was displayed, and the theater, before which lay a large paved square. This became the main marketplace after the agora was abandoned, and commerce extended into the adjacent bath, whose basilica was converted into shops. The city was destroyed in the early 7th C. and never recovered. Thereafter, the theater became the main fortress and center of habitation. In the 10th/11th C. the cathedral was restored and a triconch church was built over the intersection of two abandoned streets.

APHRODISIAS, (Ἀφροδισίας, now Geyre), city of Caria, notable for its extensive and well-preserved remains. Aphrodisias was metropolis of the province and had active schools of sculpture and philosophy. It was a seat of pagan teaching...
underwent the regular procedure of allegorization, even if, in the decorative arts (Age of Spirit, nos. 288, 318), her image appears to have been used without ulterior significance well into the 6th C. Malalas mentions Aphrodite in connection with the story of Paris who proclaimed her the greatest of goddesses; in discussing the Judgment of Paris (Malal. 92f), he says that Aphrodite means desire from which everything is born—children, wisdom, temperance, skills, and all other material and intellectual things. In later literature Aphrodite appears primarily as a metonymy for sexual desire: Tzetzes (Hist. 9:16) calls Antony the prisoner of Aphrodite, while Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 139.31–32) describes Andronikos I Komnenos as giving himself completely "to the orgies of Aphrodite." Choniates also reports that during the sack of Constantinople in 1204 the Crusaders destroyed a statue of Paris handing the apple of discord to Aphrodite (648.42–43).

The birth of Aphrodite is depicted in a MS in Paris (B.N. Coisl. gr. 293). In a MS from Athos (Pantel. 6) the goddess is shown bare-breasted and standing on a column.
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APHTHARTODOCETISM (from ἀθάρτος, "in-corruptible," and δοκεω, "to seem"), a form of MONOPHYSITISM; the doctrine was formulated by JULIAN OF HALIKARNASSOS after his flight to Alexandria. In contrast to SEVEROS of Antioch, Julian denied any distinction between ousia and physis in Christ and thus saw in him only divine substance. Accordingly, he asserted that Christ’s flesh was incorruptible not only after the resurrection but from the moment of conception—like Adam’s flesh before the Fall. Christ’s suffering was contrary to the nature of his flesh but was the result of a miracle and due to his will. Julian based his soteriology not on the principle of man’s similarity to Christ but on the dissimilarity—Christ was incorruptible in order to free others from corruptibility. Thus, he distanced Christ from mankind even further than other Monophysites.

Aphthartodocetism was criticized by the Orthodox (esp. LEONTIOS OF BYZANTIUM) and by Monophysites (Severos of Antioch). The teaching spread in the East, esp. in Egypt where Julian’s friend Gaianos propagated it; he managed temporarily to seize the see of Alexandria in 535; thus his supporters were called Gaianitai. Some went so far as to assert that Christ’s body was not created, giving them the sobriquet aktistetai (Patr. Timotheos, PG 86:44C). Late in his life Justinian I saw Aphthartodocetism as a means to promote unity among his subjects, and in 565 he issued a new, lost edict supporting its teachings. The patriarch Eutychios refused to sign it and was exiled, but further difficulty was prevented by the emperor’s death.
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APHTHONIOS (Ἀφθόνιος), rhetorician from Antioch and pupil of Libanius; fl. late 4th to beginning of 5th C. Of his abundant works only a textbook of exercises (Progymnasmata) and 40 fables (mythoi) survive. He used the textbook of Hermogenes and described the same types of exercises, but following the example of Theon (1st C.) reintroduced the psogos (inventive) as a genre side by side with the enkomion. Aphthonios was popular with the Byz., who praised his clarity, contrasting it with Hermogenes’ complexity; Tzetzes (Hist. 11.112–48) evaluates Aphthonios at length, emphasizing his use of Examples. The progyrmnasmata are, however, treated in isolation and not integrated with other aspects of rhetorical theory. Used for the teaching of rhetorical, Aphthonios’s exercises were extensively commented upon by John of Sardis, John Geometres, and John Doxopatres. Eustathios of Thessalonike and Thomas Magistros considered him as a paradigm of Atticism.


—E.M.J., A.K.

APICULTURE (μελισσοκομεία), beekeeping, provided the major source of sugar in the Middle Ages; Byz was not influenced by the diffusion of sugar cane in the territories of the caliphate (A.M. Watson, Agricultural Innovation in the Early Islamic World [Cambridge 1983] 24–30). Apiculture also supplied Byz. with wax for candles and with the ingredients of medical remedies and alcoholic beverages: the Slavic (?) word for honey as a drink, in the form medos (cf. mead), was known to Priskos of Panion. Ancient traditions of apiculture were preserved in the Geoponika, which devoted book 15 to the location and construction of beehives, the behavior of bees, and the harvesting of honey. Byz. apiculture stood on a high level. A 12th-C. Jewish writer from northern France, Samuel ben Meyr, wrote that beekeeping in “the Greek realm” was more developed than in his homelandland (S. Krauss, Studien zur byzantinisch-jüdischen Geschichte [Vienna 1914] 113).

Beekeeping is mentioned in various sources. The vita of St. Philaretos the Merciful reports that he possessed 250 beehives (boutia), and prak-tika of the Palaiologan era show that peasants might possess as many as 30 beehives (melissia; cf. Laev. 2, no.91.III.4). A special tax on beehives, melissennomion, was levied, and a special name for beekeeper, melissourgos, was in use. The gathering of honey from wild bees is mentioned in the vita of St. Lazaros of Mt. Galesios and illustrated in the Venice Kynegetika of pseudo-Oppian (Kádár, Zoological Illuminations, pl.183, 1), where a man is shown being attacked by a swarm of wild bees as he raids their nest. Ceramic beehives of the 6th–7th C. have been found at several sites in Greece.

The image of the industrious bee was frequent in Byz. literature; thus Neilos of Ankyra (PG 79:180B) calls the prophets bees and Holy Scripture their beehive.


—A.K., A.C., J.W.N.

APION (Ἀπίων), an Egyptian family of large landowners of uncertain origin. Before 328 Aurelius Apion was eparch or prefect of Egypt (PLRE 1:82), but there is no evidence that either he or Flavius Strategius, comites and praeses of the Thebaid in 349 (PLRE 1:858–59), was related to the family that came to prominence in the late 5th C. Apion I, apo hyparchon in 497 (whose identity with Apio Theodosius, praeses of Arkadia in 488, cannot be proved), served under the command of Areobindus in 503. He fell from favor in 510 but returned to court under Justin I and in 518 became praetorian prefect. His son, Flavius Strategius, was comes sacrarum lationum from 535 to 538 and an envoy to the Persians in 531; Flavius’s son Apion II was consul in 539, but by 548 or 550 he had returned to Egypt where he was subsequently dow of Thebaid, administrator (pagarches) of Arsinoë, and chief of the curia in Oxyrhynchus. His descendants (attested until 623) bore high titles (patricios, honorary consul) and maintained a palace near the Hippodrome of Constantinople; in 603 Pope Gregory I the Great advised Apion III not to become involved in political activity (evidently against Phokas). The basis of the family wealth was their estate (oikos) in Oxyrhynchus. The Apions were Monophysites until 532 when Apion I solemnly abjured that form of Christianity. Gascou rejects Hardy’s hypothesis that in the second half of the 6th C. the
APELETON (ἀπελέκτον, from Lat. applicatum), lit. fortified camp; in documents of the 10th–14th C. the term designates the billeting of troops. The privilege granted to Ioannina by Andronikos II in 1319 prohibited the billeting (aplekeusai) of a soldier (stratiotes) in the house of a citizen “against his desire and will” (MM 5:81.27–28). In some documents the term aplekton is paired with mitaton (e.g., Lavra 1, no.6.23; Koutloum. no.10.62), and it is not always possible to understand the distinction between the two. Since a chrysobull of 1086 speaks of “the provisioning and aplekton of an army heading for or returning from war” (Lavra 1, no.48.44–45), one can hypothesize that aplekton was short-term billeting.


APOCALYPSE (᾽Αποκάλυψις), revelation, a genre of Hebrew and Christian literature that describes prophetic visions of the future. Several Hebrew books (Enoch, Baruch, etc.) belong to this genre, and among the Nag Hammadi texts are Apocalypses ascribed to Peter, Paul, and James. The Apocalypse included in the New Testament, often called the Book of Revelation, has traditionally been attributed to John the Apostle; Eusebios of Caesarea, however, doubted its authenticity, and Amphilochios of Ikonion confessed that most people considered it spurious.

From the beginning, exegesis of John’s Apocalypse was tinged with eschatological expectations of the end of the wicked world. In the West, this radical interpretation was rejected by Augustine: according to him, the Apocalypse gave only the general outlines of future history, without going into detail; in the East, the eschatological interpretation of the Apocalypse was abandoned already by Origen, and later exegetes (Okoumenios, Andrew of Caesarea, Arethas of Caesarea) avoided the concept of the millennial reign of God on earth before the Second Coming (Pa-rousia). After Arethas, creative interpretation of the Apocalypse came to a standstill.

Among later apocryphal apocalypses are those ascribed to Elijah, Mary, and the apostles Thomas, John, and Bartholomew. Some apocalyptic prophecies name as their authors nonbiblical personages: they deal primarily with the political future of Byz. and its struggle against the Saracens (pseudo-Methodios of Patara, Leo of Constantinople) as well as the vision of sinners punished in Hell (Anastasia).

Apocalypse Illustration. Despite the considerable quantity of Byz. apocalyptic literature treating the end of the empire, only one text—the Oracle of Leo VI—was surely illustrated. However, biblical apocalyptic illustration abounded, ranging from private mortality images through the Majestas Domini and prophetic Visions to the Last Judgment. Based on Old Testament visions, on Matthew 19 and 24–25, and on Ephrem the Syrian, it almost never reflects the Apocalypse of St. John. Though read, and in three surviving MSS prefixed with an author portrait, John’s Revelation was not accepted as canonical until the 14th C. and left no imprint on the Byz. liturgy. Its influence was peripheral, both geographically (Egypt, where Revelation was accepted as canonical, and Cappadocia, home of the two Byz. commentators on Revelation) and in content, as art reflects commentaries and magical texts more often than Revelation itself. In Cappadocia, 9th-C. versions of the Prophetic Vision and Last Judgment include the 24 Elders, the sea of glass, the river of fire, the sea vomiting up its dead, and the angel rolling up the scroll of Heaven. Of these motifs, only the sea of glass is unique to John, and it vanishes by the 10th C. The other elements continue to be used, but all reflect modifications based on non-Johannine sources, such as the Elders who carry the letters of the alphabet associated with them in magical texts; if other elements survive in Last Judgment representations, they are also from texts other than John’s.

APOCRYPHA (ἀπόκρυφα, lit. “concealed or rejected [books]”), works that in their title, form, and contents resemble books of the Old Testament and New Testaments, but are not accepted in the biblical canon. The discussion of what is canonical and what is apocryphal lasted through the 4th C.; in the early 6th C., a cleric in southern Gaul presented, in the so-called Decretum Gelasianum, the first (incomplete) list of apocrypha. The Old Testament apocrypha are mostly translated from Hebrew; among those that underwent substantial Christian revision are the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah, the Testament of Solomon, and the Sibyline Oracles. New Testament apocrypha were more varied. They can be categorized as apocryphal gospels, acts, letters, and apocalypses, following the main New Testament genres. Some of them are as old as the 2nd C. and probably originated in (or were eventually connected by their orthodox opponents with) a Gnostic or Manichaean milieu. Some of them are known from papyri fragments, some from MSS from NAG HAMMADI. Several apocrypha have survived only in Oriental, Latin, and/or Slavic versions.

Among apocryphal gospels one may distinguish, besides earlier (primarily Judeo-Christian) texts, those dealing with the childhood of Jesus (Protoevangelion of James, the Gospel of Thomas, the story of Joseph the Carpenter—written in Greek ca.400 but known only in Coptic and Arabic versions) and with his trial and execution (the Gospel of Nicodemus, various texts on Pontius Pilate, the Coptic gospel of Gamaliel). The 2nd-C. Gospel of Peter (known to Eusebios of Caesarea) tends to whitewash Pilate and to impose the guilt for Jesus’s execution fully on the Jews and Herod. The apocryphal gospels had to satisfy pious curiosity in the areas where canonical texts were reticent; they stimulated imagery in art (e.g., Anastasis, Dormition), but had a lesser impact on literature.

The case of apocryphal acts was different. Most are associated with the apostles Peter (esp. the so-called pseudo-Clementinae, which describe his travels and preaching), Paul, Andrew, John, and Thomas; the story of the apostle Thaddeus emerges in the legend of the Mandylion—both in the letter of Abgar and in the Doctrine of Addai (written in Edessa ca.400). The apocryphal acts were influenced by Greek erotic romances, with their journeys to exotic regions, themes of separation and recognition, and mirabilia; hagiographic elements are also very strong—suffering, imprisonment, and martyrdom, together with the resultant mass and individual conversions, constitute their essence. Church leaders judged the apocryphal acts severely: Amphilochoi of Iconion called them “diabolical works” (R.A. Lipsius, Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden, vol. 1 [Braunschweig 1889] 57), while Photios (Bibl., cod. 114) says that the acts of Peter, John, Thomas, Andrew, and Paul, published by a certain Leukios (Lucius?) Charinos, originated in a heretical milieu.

The original apocryphal acts are mostly lost: from the Acts of Peter only fragments survive, including the description of his martyrdom under Nero; Andrew’s Acts can be tentatively restored on the basis of later (partially Western) tradition; a substantial part of John’s Acts, ending with his death in Ephesus, is known. Significant sections of the Acts of Paul have been discovered in papyri as well as in Latin and Oriental translations; the story of his life served also as material for the vita of Thecla. The Acts of Thomas were written in Syriac, probably in the first half of the 3rd C. in a Gnostic milieu. They are the only apocryphal acts to survive in full; Greek, Latin, Ethiopic, and Armenian revisions of them are also preserved.

Apocryphal epistles include the so-called Epistle to the Inhabitants of Laodikeia, a 4th-C. compilation from Paul’s epistles that is sometimes inserted in Latin Bible MSS; the forged correspondence between Paul and a converted Seneca that was already known to Jerome; a third Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul’s refutation of the Gnostic tenets, that was eventually inserted in the Acts of Paul; the Epistle of Titus (Paul’s disciple) on the virtue of virginity—probably a Spanish work of the 5th C.; the Epistle of Barnabas; the Epistle of James on Christ’s teaching after his resurrection—a text of Gnostic character (probably of the 2nd C.); the Epistle of apostles reporting their conversations with Jesus after his resurrection—
the text, which probably originated in Asia Minor ca.170, survives in full only in an Ethiopic translation. The Epistle to the Alexandrians has disappeared without a trace. The genre was not developed in Byz., even though a number of hagiographic and homiletic works on Barnabas, Titus, and other apostles appeared.

The apocryphal APOCALYPTES were also unpopular in Byz. The genuine Byz. “apocalypses” dealt with the political situation of the empire more than with prophetic vision of the eschatological future of humankind.

The genre of apocrypha was more widely diffused in Slavic, Caucasian, and Oriental literature than in Byz. It was esp. important for the elaboration of Bogomil ideology (see APOCRYPHA, BOGOMIL).


J.J.

APOCRYPHA, BOGOMIL. The Bogomils, in an effort to justify and propagate their teachings, made use of the Slavonic versions of several early Greek APOCRYPHA, among them The Book of Baruch, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch, and The Vision of Isaiah. Only one apocryphal work is known to be an authentic Bogomil creation: the Interrogatio Johannis (or Liber Secretus, i.e., “Secret Book”), brought to Italy ca.1190 by Nazarius, the bishop of a CATHAR community in Lombardy, who had obtained it from a high-ranking Bogomil in Bulgaria. It is a dialogue between John the Evangelist and Christ, who replies to his disciple’s questions about the origin of the world, Satan’s power over man (whose body Satan created), and the end of all things. Satan’s final defeat, after the destruction of this world by fire, shows that the cosmological dualism of this text is of the “moderate” variety. The importance of this document lies in its uniqueness: no other known work stems directly from the Bogomils. It survives in two slightly different Latin versions, one of them going back to a document, now lost, from the archives of the Inquisition in Carcassonne. Whether the original was Greek or Slavonic is uncertain.


AHOEIPNÖN (ἀπόδειπνον, lit. “after supper”), compiled, the liturgical hour that completes the monastic day with prayer for a tranquil night free from sin and evil dreams. First seen in the Longer Rules of St. Basil the Great (PG 31:1016A) and possibly originating with him, apodeipnon is a monastic duplication of VESPERS, which had formerly constituted the final hour of the day. Psalm 90, cited by Basil, is always central to the apodeipnon ritual. Byz. apodeipnon also includes other psalms, the DOXOLOGY, the creed, a kanon, the TRISAGION, Our Father, TROPARIA, the Kyrie eleison repeated 40 times, prayers, a rite of mutual pardon, and a final LITANY. In the Byz. HOROLOGION, there are two forms of apodeipnon: the mega apodeipnon, reserved for Lent and certain vigils, is a series of three offices, each with its own introductory and concluding prayers, while the mikron apodeipnon is an abbreviated version comprising select elements of the mega apodeipnon, esp. its final part. Apodeipnon was unknown to the cathedral rite of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (see ASMATIKE AKOLOUTHIA), which had instead an evening service called pannychis (see VIGIL); cf. Mateos, Typikon 2:285, 311.

LIT. A. Raes, “Les Complies dans les Rites orientaux,” OrChrP 17 (1951) 133–45.

APOEIPCHON (ἀπό εἰπαρχον), or apo hoparchon, designation of a high-ranking official as well as an honorific title. To the first category belonged people like the apo eparchon poleos Theodore, a participant in the council of Chalcedon (451), and probably another Theodore, a 7th-C. “apo eparchon and eparch of Italy” (Zacos, Seals 1, no.2923). Unlike these high-ranking officials, ordinary apo eparchon, whose numerous seals are predomi-
nanty of the 7th C., were modest dignitaries often involved in the supervision of state workshops or toll collection; others were notaries, chartoularioi, droungarioi, etc. The title was granted to various intellectuals such as Zacharias, physician of Tiberios II; the historians Evagrios Scholastikos and Menander Protector; and Elias, the 6th-C. commentator on Aristotle. The origin of the title is obscure—Justianin I refers to it as an "ancient" one. The last mention is in the left 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos, in which the term is an "ancient" one. The last mention is in the 12th-C. Zonaras (Zon. 3:737f.) relates that Alexios I sent to "the fields and villages" apographeis who introduced some fiscal innovations. Dölger argues that Zonaras used the term in a nontechnical sense, but in 1175 a certain Andronikos Kantakouzenos functioned as the doux and apographeus of the theme of Mylasa and Melanoudion. The term remained in use through the 15th C. Sometimes apographeis combined their duties with those of the governor (doux or kepheale). Their signatures are found on various prakta; they appointed the posotes of paroikoi and land to the monasteries (Laoua 2, no.97,1-5) or conducted merismos (Laoua 3, no.165,31-32). Land survey for tax purposes was called apographe or more elaborately apographike exostes kai apokatastasis (e.g., Pantel., no.17,9)—it involved the measurement of land and the assessment of taxes. Apographeis were usually local functionaries (of Thessalonike, Lemnos, and so on); an act of 1344 employs the term katholikos apographeus (Dochetar., no.23,22), even though the individual, John Vatatzes, is known as apographeus of Thessalonike (PLP, no.2518).


APOKOUKOS ('Αποκουκος, fem. 'Αποκούκκος), family known from the end of the 10th C. Basil Apokaukos was strategos of the Peloponnesos ca.990. Two other strategoi named Apokau-

cos are known from seals (Davidson, Minor Objects, no.2764; Schlumberger, Sig. 363). From the end of the 12th C. Apokaukoi served as metropolitans in the region of Dyrrachion and Naupaktos (see, e.g., Apokaukos, John). The position of the family at the end of the 13th C. is far from clear: Gregoras emphatically asserts (Greg. 2:577,20-21, 575,5) that Alexios Apokaukos belonged to an obscure and low-born family (see Apokaukos, Alexios), but in 1277 a certain John Apokaukos bore the high title of sebastophanhyperlatos and served, together with George Akropolites and Theodore Mouzalon, as witness to Michael VIII's treaty with Venice (MM 3:96,24). Alexios Apokaukos's high position served to promote the careers of many of his relatives, who functioned as governors of Thessalonike and Adrianople, megas droungarios, etc. The family lost its position after 1345, even though George Apokaukos was an archon in Constantinople in 1403. Another Alexios Apokaukos, a painter and friend of Joseph Bryennios, settled in Crete after 1402. Demetrios Kyritzis Apokaukos was in the service of Mehmed II after the fall of Constantinople.

Lit. Polemis, Doukai 101. PLP, nos. 1178-95. —A.K.
for him (M. Sjuzjumov, VizVrem 28 [1968] 23f), and he backed the Zealot revolt there. According to Kantakouzenos, Apokaukos instituted a "reign of terror" in the capital, arresting wealthy citizens and confiscating their property; the family and followers of Kantakouzenos, in particular, were targets of the mob violence and destruction. Apokaukos was murdered by aristocratic political prisoners (archontes) as he was inspecting construction of a new prison.

Apokaukos built a fortress on the Bosporos at Epibatiai and may have founded or restored a church at Selymbria (S. Eyice, Byzantion 34 [1964] 77–104; O. Feld, Byzantion 37 [1967] 56–65). He had a lively interest in medicine. He commissioned the deluxe MS of Hippocrates (Paris, B.N. gr. 2144) that includes his fine portrait (Spatharakis, Portrait 148–51, hgs. 96–97). The De methodo medendi of John Aktouarios is dedicated to Apokaukos.


APOKOMBION (ἀποκόμβων, also κόμβον), a purse in which the emperor carried coins to distribute on feastdays. The term is derived from the word kombos, meaning joint or knot (e.g., Gregory of Nyssa, PG 46:669B), since apokombia were small bags tied with a ribbon. Sometimes the purse contained only one nomisma as a symbolic gift to a poor person (Oikonomides, Lístes 181.9), while apokombia given to the patriarch might hold more than 100 litrai of gold (De cer. 182.8–11). A 10th-C. ceremonial book (De cer. 76.22–23) describes
how the emperor took the apokombion from the praispositos and placed it on the holy altar. Representations of the apokombion are found in the mosaic panels in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, depicting Emp. Constantine IX Monomachos (N. Oikonomides,  

REB 36 [1978] 220) and John II Komnenos.

Lit. Treitinger, Kaiseridee 154.  

-A.K.

**APOKRISIARIOS** (ἀποκρισιαρίωσ, Lat. responsalis), in its ecclesiastical sense, the messenger or representative of a bishop or hegoumenos in dealings with higher authorities. The institution existed in the 5th C., but was first systematically established by Justinian I to prevent the heads of churches from neglecting the care and wasting the resources of their flocks in prolonged or frequent absences (Cod. Just. I 3; nov.6.2-3; nov.123.25). Apokrisiarioi were received by patriarchs and metropolitan from their respective subordinates, but the chief function of apokrasiarioi was to represent provincial churches at the imperial court. The most important patriarchal, archiepiscopal, and metropolitan sees maintained resident apokrasiarioi in Constantinople. Among famous churchmen who served as apokrasiarioi were Pope Gregory I the Great, who represented the Roman church at the imperial court (ca.578-86), and Demetrius Chomatenos, who represented the see of Ohrid at the patriarchate at the end of the 12th C. (For apokrasiarioi as a term for diplomat, see Ambassadors.)


-P.M.

**APOLLINARIS**, or Apollinarios, bishop of Laodikeia (from ca.360), theologian; born Laodikeia ca.310, died ca.390. A friend of Athanasios of Alexandria, Apollinarios polemicized against Arius and Diodoros of Tarsos and elaborated a Christology stressing the divine element in Christ; he taught that in Christ the human soul was replaced by the Logos. Later Apollinarius revised his views and proposed that Christ had a human body and soul, but "heavenly now" (reason). At first accepted as orthodox, Apollinarius played the role of Athanasios’s successor, but then became embroiled with Basil the Great. At the Council of Constantinople in 381 his teachings were condemned; he was eventually proclaimed a precursor of Monophysitism and a heretic, and his works were destroyed or preserved under wrong names (E. Cattaneo, Trois homélies pseudochrysostomienues sur la Pâque comme ouvrage d’Apollinarius de Laodicée [Paris 1981]). Jerome, who attended the lectures of Apollinaris in Antioch (P. Jay, REAug 20 [1974] 36-41), knew his exegetic works on the Bible, but found them inadequate. According to Sozomenos (Sozom., HE 5.18.3-4) Apollinaris tried to replace Homer with a work in epic verse on the antiquities of the Hebrews in 24 parts, in which he presented biblical history from Creation to the reign of Saul; he imitated Pindar, Euripides, and Menander in writing on themes of the Holy Scriptures. Apollinaris also wrote hymns for church services as well as songs in praise of God to be recited at work and play (Sozom., HE 6.25-4-5). According to Sokrates (Sokr., HE 3.16) he recast the New Testament in the form of Platonic dialogues, none of which has survived. Attribution to Apollinaris of a hexameter paraphrase of the Psalms (ed. A. Ludwich [Leipzig 1912]) is questionable.


-B.B., A.K.

**APOLLO**, Greek god of the sun, music, truth, and healing. His embodiment of the divinity of the sun (Hélos, Sol Invictus) caused his veneration to continue into late antiquity, as seen in Constantine I’s solar piety (Panegyrici Latini 7.177.10, a.321) and the 4th-C. statues identified as Apollo (G. Mansuelli, FeltRav 127-30 [1984/5] 291-95; the anecdote of the statue of Apollo brought by Constantine from Troy in Malal. 320.10-19). As late as 529, Benedict of Nursia tried to stamp out the worship of Apollo in the vicinity of Montecassino (Grégoire le Grand: Dialogues, ed. A. de Vogué [Paris 1979] 2,466-69). Since Apollo’s oracle at Delphi was the most famous in antiquity until its suppression by Theodosios I in 392, Byz. legend sought to attribute to it prophecies of the coming of Christ. A 12th-C.
APOLLONIUS OF TYANA (in Cappadocia), pagan wonder-worker and Neopythagorean philosopher of the 1st C., whose reputation survived well into the Byz. era. His legendary biography, written by Philostratos after 217, reflects the cosmopolitan worldview of the Roman Empire, making Apollonios travel to Babylon, India, Egypt, Ethiopia, and the Pillars of Herakles. The cult of Apollonios, who was considered a magician and miraculous healer, was promoted esp. in the 3rd C., and he came to be regarded by pagans as a rival to Moses and Christ. Sosianos Hierokles of Nikomedea (ca.307) argued that Apollonios was a greater worker of miracles than Jesus; Apollonios was also praised by Flavianus Nicomachus and in the Historia Augusta. His image appears on contorniates. Eusebios of Caesarea (PG 22:795–868) wrote a response ca.312 to the claims of Hierokles, denouncing Apollonios as a charlatan who was perhaps in league with evil spirits. None-
theless, the Christian world was slow to reject the cult of Apollonios. Until the 12th C. Byz authors (Malalas, Kedrenos, Tzetzes) mention him in favorable light, remembering his power to tame snakes and scorpions and describing the talismans erected by Apollonios in various cities to ward off fierce animals, noxious insects such as mosquitoes, and natural disasters. Whereas some Christian writers (e.g., the hagiographers of St. Therka and Anastasios of Sinai) denied the ability of Apollonios to work genuine miracles, for others he was a semi-Christian prophet. It is possible that a saint Basinas, known from a Greek prayer, may represent a transformation of Apollonios (Speyer, infra 63).


-A.K., A.M.T.

APOLLONIOS OF TYRE, hero of a novel disseminated throughout Europe in the Middle Ages. The extant Latin version dates from the 6th C. Whether the original was written in Latin or Greek has been inconclusively debated. Certainly the plot presents many of the characteristics of a Greek romance of the 2nd or 3rd C.: separations, false deaths, violent storms, a happy ending, etc.

Two versions in medieval vernacular Greek exist: one, in 852 unrhymed political verses, based on a Tuscan reworking of the Latin and dated to the 14th C.; and another, in 1,894 rhymed political verses, a free adaptation of the Historia d’Apollonio de Tiro of the Florentine Antonio Pucci (ca. 1310–80) and dated to the late 15th C. Despite a veneer of Byz. piety and the Italian intermediaries, the world in both cases remains that of late antiquity.

ED. Lat.—Historia Apollonii Regis Tyrii, ed. G.A.A. Korkeakas (Groningen 1984). Greek—(1) Narratio necrogrceca Apollonii Tyrii, ed. A.A.P. Jansen (Nijmegen 1954); (2) Venice 1534; rp. 1805.

ED: Beck, Volkstiliteratur 135–98.

APOLLOXONOS ANO PAPYRI, documents discovered by French excavations in a jar at Edfu in 1921–22, comprising the bilingual archives of the Apollinopolite pagarches Papas from ca. 648 to ca. 708. R. Rémondon published 104 Greek documents in 1953, but the Coptic pieces are still being edited. The Greek documents include official letters and orders from the Arab governor, memoranda from the topoteretes, requisitions of men and supplies for the cursus (expeditions against Constantinople), lawsuits, tax records, contracts, accounts, lists of goods, and private letters. The competence of the Arab emir’s Greek-speaking chancery is apparent, as is the problem of fugitives and their tax responsibility in their origo. The language of the documents displays the richness of official terminology that lived on in both Greek and Coptic long after attempted arabization of the chancery. These documents, along with the 8th-C. Aphrodite Papyri, furnish a richly detailed picture of local administration in Egypt as it was carried on by Christian officials still in responsible positions after 642.


-A.K., A.M.T.

APOLOGY (ἀπολογία), speech of defense or self-defense such as Plato’s Apology of Socrates. The term was esp. applied to the speeches of martyrs in defense of the Christian faith: thus, Eusebios of Caesarea (Eusebios, HE 5.21.4) relates that the martyr Apollonios gave “the most rational apology” before the senate. The apology of Justin Martyr (2nd C.) is the first example preserved of this genre. The earliest apologies were directed against the misconceptions of Christianity held by pagans and Jews. As Christianity gathered momentum, the apology acquired the character of polemic rather than defense: Athanasios of Alexandria used this title for the defense of his escape, for his apology addressed to Emp. Constantius II, and for his Apoletikos against the Arians. The conventional term “apologist” has been introduced by scholars to designate Christian writers of the 2nd–5th C. who both defended Christianity and refuted pagan or Jewish views. After the final victory of Christianity the term was rarely used: Anastasios of Sinai wrote a Tomos.
apologistikos. As late as the 15th C., however, Andrew Chryssoberges addressed an apology to Bessarion dedicated to the Palamite question (Beck, Kirche 743).

In a secular sense apology referred to a literary genre of self-defense (e.g., Arethas of Caesarea wrote an apology to explain his political position), a judicial defense (Ecloga 17.3, ed. Burgmann p.226.777), or—in the field of diplomacy—a rebuttal of importunate claims (De adm. imp. 1.2.21).

- A.K., E.M.J.

APOLYSIS. See DISMISSAL.

APOPHTHEGMATA PATRUM ("Sayings of the Fathers"), the anecdotes and maxims of the Egyptian DESERT FATHERS, preserved in various collections and languages. The core anthology is the alphabetic one (organized by speaker's name) compiled in the 5th or 6th C., perhaps by admirers of a certain Poimen who is disproportionately well represented. This collection is supplemented by a group of 400 anonymous sayings. They are written in simple language and offer practical advice on problems faced by cenobitic monks and hermits. Some sayings inculcate extreme asceticism and reflect an antipathy toward book-learning and women, while others are imbued with a common-sense attitude toward the rigorous life of the anchorite. They may be viewed, in part, as conscious Christian rivals to the many anthologies of maxims of pagan thinkers, while unconsciously providing one of the most fascinating sources of social and intellectual life in the late Roman period. Latin translations survive of four different collections, along with Arabic, Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, and Church Slavonic versions.

On the basis of two miniatures in the SACRA PARALLELA, K. Weitzmann suggested that some MSS of the Apophthegmata were richly illustrated (Weitzmann, Sacra Parallela 250, 262).


APOROS (ἀπόρος, "without means"), term with several related meanings, all derived from the general meaning "lacking sufficient resources"; the Farmer's Law (par.14) mentions aporoi farmers, incapable of working all their land, who contract with another party to cultivate a portion of it. As an economic term, aporoi normally designates the destitute, such as a widow left impoverished by her husband's death (Ecloga 2:7), and can serve to distinguish them from the working P O O R (Zepos, Jus 1:216.17). The term also denotes individuals unable to fulfill some legal or social obligation; here it does not refer specifically to poverty, although it still normally encompasses economically marginal elements of the population. An aporos thief is one who cannot provide the legally mandated twofold restitution of stolen property (Ecloga 17:11), an aporos captive is one unable to provide reimbursement for his ransom (Ecloga 8:2). The De ceremoniis (De cer. 696.1) contrasts poor soldiers who can still meet their obligations for military service with exaporoi, who cannot. In documentary sources, aporos is applied to: (1) ruined, uninhabited, or uncultivated land (Trincher, Syllabus, nos. 7, 5.10, 14) or (2) individuals who lack land to cultivate (Lavita 2, no.91. I. 55; 3, no.196.166). In this context, aporos may also designate those who for some reason are unable to work.


APOSTLES (ἀπόστολοι, lit. "envoys"), term applied primarily to the 12 disciples of Jesus. The synoptic Gospels and Acts of the New Testament list the apostles with slight variations that caused difficulties for theologians: John Chrysostom (PG 57:380f) noticed contradictions between the lists in Mark's and Luke's Gospels. Simon Peter is always at the head of the Twelve; he is followed by Andrew, James, or John; then in all lists are Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew the tax-collector, and James, son of Alpheus; Thaddeus, Simon the Canaanite, Simon the Zealot, and Jude, brother of James, do not occur in all lists;
at the end of the list is Judas Iscariot who, after his treachery, was replaced by Matthias. Paul is also called an apostle, although usually distinguished from the Twelve. The title was extended to other personages (esp. the Seventy Teachers, the successors of the Twelve), to Thecla, and to Constantine I the Great; the term was further applied to priests, bishops, and esp. to the pope, the holder of the "apostolic see."

Tradition stressed the humble origin and lowly professions of the Twelve: Chrysostom calculates that four were fishermen and two, tax collectors, and emphasizes that their leader was illiterate (PG 57:381.7–12). Nevertheless, they were "trumpets of the Spirit" (Tarasios, PG 98:1437B), prophets, and performers of miracles. They were held to be administrators of the church, legislators who created the Apostolic Constitutions, the authors of scriptural writings, and itinerant teachers of Christian truth. The Byz. compiled various brief indices to all apostles (attributed to Ephipanios, Dorotheos, and Hippolytos), but Byz. apocryphal, hagiographical, and homiletic texts are devoted to individual apostles, rather than the group. Nevertheless, Symeon Metaphrastes composed a didactic poem in dodecasyllables on the apostles; Nicholas of Methone produced a treatise on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the apostles; and Philothoos Kokkinos wrote an enkomion on the Twelve, as did Makarios Choumnos and Gennadios II Scholarios. A number of important churches were dedicated to the Holy Apostles, such as those in Constantinople and Thessalonike.

Representation in Art. Toga-clad, sandaled, and shown at first as beardless youths, the apostles were slowly individualized: Peter and Paul by the 4th C.; Andrew, Philip, John, and Thomas by the mid-6th C.; the others later and less consistently. The apostles initially acclaim Christ or his Cross (Sarigüzel sarcophagus [Volbach, Early Christian Art, pl. 75]); dome mosaics in Ravenna or are the witnesses obligatory in Late Antique images of theophany—observing Christ's miracles or witnessing while participating (Transfiguration, Ascension). As the original community of the faithful, the 12 apostles symbolize the church. Thus appearances of Christ after the Passion are represented with 12, rather than the canonical 11, disciples to indicate each scene's importance in the history of the church; the symbolic composition of the Communion of the Apostles (see Lord's Supper) shows the church's foundation in the Eucharist; and episodes involving Christ and the apostles as a group—Dormition, Pentecost, Last Judgment—adopt formalized compositions emphasizing their church-historical significance. Scenes from the individual lives of the apostles are rare and, except for the three surviving Acts cycles, largely apocryphal in origin. There are cycles of their martyrdoms (Hagia Sophia, Ohrid) that sometimes include vignettes of their ministry (see Holy Apostles, Church of the; Soćani; S. Marco in Venice); images of their preaching accompany Psalms 19 and 105 in the marginal Psalters.


—J.L., A.K., A.W.C.

APOSTOLES, MICHAEL, teacher, writer, and copyist of MSS; born Constantinople? ca. 1420, died Crete? after 1474 or 1486. After studying in Constantinople with John Argyropoulos, Apostoles (Ἀποστόλης, Ἀποστόλος) taught briefly at the Museum of the Xenon of the Kral, located at the Petra monastery. When Constantinople fell to the Turks, he was taken prisoner; after his release, he went to Crete, where he spent most of his remaining years teaching private pupils. He failed to achieve financial backing to set up his own school in Italy, and complained frequently of his straitened circumstances. He was a Uniate and made frequent visits to humanist circles in Italy. Bessarion commissioned Apostoles to seek out old Greek MSS for his library or, where necessary, to make copies; he is known to have copied (at least in part) about 115 MSS for Bessarion and others (partial list: C.G. Patrineles, EPMesArch 8–9 [1958–59] 69f). Apostoles made an important collection of proverbs (ed. Leutsch-Schneidewin, Corpus 2:233–744) and maintained an extensive correspondence. His literary oeuvre also includes treatises in defense of Plato (J.E. Powell, BZ 38 [1938] 71–86), an essay on the proper method of teaching Greek to Italians, and rhetorical pieces. His Oration on Greece and Europe, written after 1453, asserts the cultural superiority of the Greeks over Westerners; at the same time he recognizes that the Byz. era is at an end, while Italy is at the beginning of a new age (D.J. Geanakoplos, GRBS 1 [1958] 157–62).
APOSTOLIC CANONS (Κανώνες τῶν Ἀποστόλων), a collection of 85 ecclesiastical law canons, allegedly written by the Apostles; they form an appendix (8.47) to the Apostolic Constitutions. The regulations, which are generally very short and in no particular order, concern mainly the qualifications and duties of clerics and occasionally the conduct of laymen; they contain mostly threats of punishment. In the 85th canon, the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments are enumerated with certain, such as the omission of the and men Constitutions. The sources of the collection are the Apostolic Constitutions and the canons issued in the 4th C., esp. those of the councils of Gangra, Antioch (341), and Laodicea of Phrygia. The author, given in the 85th canon as Clement (I of Rome), is not necessarily identical with the compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions but must have been likewise active in the last quarter of the 4th C. in Antioch. The work was translated early on into Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic; ca. 500 it was partially rendered in Latin (only the first 50 canons) by Dionysius Exiguus. Its authenticity (disputed by the Decretum Gelasianum) was expressly recognized in 691 by the Council in Trullo (canon 2); from then on, the Apostolic Canons stood at the head of all canon collections. In the 12th C. they were the subject of commentaries by Alexios Aristenos, John Zonaras, and Theodore Balsamon.

ED. P.-P. Joannou, Discipline générale antique (IVe–IXe s.) 1.2 (Grottaferrata 1962) 1-53.


APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS (Διαταγαί τῶν Ἀποστόλων διὰ Κλήμεντος), a collection of ecclesiastical law and liturgical matters, divided into eight books. Books 1–6 represent an expanded version of the Didaskalia, an ecclesiastical rite that originated in Syria in the 3rd C. and was esp. concerned with penitential discipline. The first part of book 7 (chs. 1–32) contains an expanded version of the Didache, a work of catechetical and liturgical content composed in the 2nd C. in Syria; the second part (chs. 33–49) is composed of prayer formulas (among them the Great Doxology) and baptismal instructions. The main source for book 8 (chs. 3–45) is the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, a 3rd-C. ecclesiastical rite valuable for its exact description of the early liturgy (the so-called “Clement Liturgy”). The Apostolic Canons are attached to the work as an appendix. The compiler, ostensibly authorized by the Apostles, was possibly an Arian (according to Hagedorn, infra, an otherwise unknown Julian) active in Antioch during the last quarter of the 4th C. The Council in Trullo of 691 (canon 2) condemned the work (with the exception of its appendix) as a heretical forgery. Nevertheless, it was often copied, although rarely in full. Only short excerpts entered the collections of canon law.


APOSTOLOS. See Praxapostolos.

APOTHEOSIS (ἀποθέωσις). Deification of a mortal (a hero or ruler) was an idea broadly spread in the Hellenistic world (Alexander the Great was granted apotheosis) and came to be accepted, under the Latin term consecratio, by Roman emperors—first as a posthumous ceremony, later during their lifetime. It was accompanied by endowing the emperor with the title divus (divine) and developing a system of signs symbolizing his ascent to heaven—eagle, pyre, chariot. The concept of deification reached its acme under Diocletian, whose epithet, Jovius, indicated his direct connections with Jupiter; it was retained by Constantine I the Great and his successors, down to Theodosios I, who received the consecratio from the pagan senate. Some changes were introduced under Christian influence—the cremation rite was abolished, and the symbol of the regenerating
Phoenix disappeared; Constantine’s coins minted for his *consecratio* represented only the chariot and the hand stretched from the cloud in expectation of the divus. This tradition was alien to Christianity, however, and by ca. 400 it fell into disuse, leaving only some remnants in court terminology (Treitinger, *Kaiseridee* 155–57).

The term apotheosis appears in Nestorian polemics: Nestorios accused his opponents of the concept of the apotheosis of Christ’s human nature (F. Loos, *Nestorian* [Halle 1905] 167.1–2, 274.12–14), whereas he preferred to use the term “conjunction” (*synapheia*). Metaphorically, apotheosis could designate the mystical ascent to God. The image of the risen Christ, borne aloft by angels at his Ascension, depends upon Late Antique images of apotheosis.


**APPANAGE**, a conventional term borrowed from the vocabulary of western European *feudalism* and appearing in Byz. historiography with two meanings.

1. In the narrow sense, appanage designates a nearly independent territory granted by the emperor to a member of the imperial family, usually a younger son, to secure the grantee a source of livelihood or to insure a political and administrative connection between the provincial territory and the capital. The grantee characteristically maintained his own court, army, fiscal and judicial systems, and often conducted an independent foreign policy. His income was derived from the exercise of administrative rights over the territory and from land he held within the territory, though the grant of the appanage itself did not implicitly include the right of hereditary transmission. While the practice of granting substantial estates to imperial relatives was effected as early as the reign of Alexios I, the idea of an actual administrative partitioning of the empire between princes of the ruling dynasty was first entertained during the reign of Michael VIII. The civil wars of the 14th C. spurred the creation of appanages. From the mid-14th C., at one time or another, almost every younger son of an emperor held an appanage and most of the areas remaining in the empire were held as appanages: Thrace, Thessalonike with Macedonia, Thessaly and, most importantly, the Morea.

2. In the broad sense, appanage is conceived as any imperial grant, revocable at the will of the emperor, of an important region or *demesne* in hereditary title to an individual or institution.

Ahrweiler (*Structures*, pt.1 [1964], 112–14) contrasts appanages as held by members of the imperial family, by ecclesiastical institutions, and by wealthy laymen with the military *pronoia*.


**APPEAL** (*ἐκκάθητος*). The institution of appeal to a higher court existed in Roman civil and criminal procedure and acquired a coherent character through the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine I the Great. If the defendant was not satisfied with the judgment, he could appeal to the emperor or to judges vested with imperial authority; in the late Roman Empire these were governors and *praetorian prefects*, the latter’s judgment being final. Later, the *eparch* and the *droungarios tes viglas* served as appellate judges. The notion that their decisions were unappealable was rejected in Byz. (Simon, *Rechtsfindung* 20). The patriarch also had the right to consider appeals against lower courts. Besides a formal appeal, a petition for the emperor’s clemency was permitted; it had to be addressed to the office of the *epiton deeseon*.


**APPARENCES OF CHRIST AFTER THE PASSION** are variously reported in the Gospels, there being 11 different episodes in all. In pre-iconoclastic art, only the Doubting of Thomas (Jn 20:24–29) and the *Chairete* (Christ’s meeting with two *Myrrphoroi*) were represented. In the former scene, Christ stands centrally, framed by the door and flanked by 12 (not 11) disciples, including Thomas, who touches Christ’s side (Ravenna, Sant’Apollinare Nuovo). The *Chairete* scene corresponds best with Matthew 28:9, though sometimes one of the women is labeled Christ’s mother, in accord with hymns of Romanos the Melode
that hail the Virgin Mary as the first to see the risen Christ. The art of the 9th–12th C. continued to emphasize these events, the Doubting of Thomas often being added to cycles of the Great Feasts. In addition, a formal composition of Christ's Mission to the Apostles was introduced (Tokali Kilise, Göreme), the 12 Apostles displacing the canonical 11 disciples (Mk 16:15–18) to indicate the scene's symbolic significance as Christ's mission to his Church. Only extensive cycles (frieze Gospels, Monreale) represent Mary Magdalene in the garden (Jn 20:14–17) and the episodes at Emmaus (Lk 24:13–32), Tiberias (Jn 21:1–14), or in the closed room (Jn 20:19–23). Fourteenth-century fresco programs in Serbia regularly include post-Passion cycles, though they vary in the selection of scenes (STARO NAGORIČINO, Gračanica).


APPRENTICE (μαθητής). Apprentices are mentioned in the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch only once—the candlemakers were ordered not to send their slaves or mathetai to sell their wares in unauthorized places. M. Sjüzjumov (VizVrem 4 [1951] 23) surmised that there was no difference between an apprentice and a misthios. The 10th-C. vita of Elias of Heliopolis (ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, PPSb 19–9 [1907] 45–48) gives more detail about apprenticeship: Elias was 12 years old when he was apprenticed to a carpenter; he worked in the ergasterion but also waited upon his master and was paid a salary (ekmisthoma).

Several contracts of apprenticeship, called didaskalikai, are preserved in Egyptian papyri. The number of late Roman didaskalikai is very limited and their content is vague. I. Fikhman (Egiyet 80) explains the infrequency of late contracts by the increasing role of the hereditary artisan who was trained at home. Vat. gr. 952 preserves several contracts of apprenticeship for 14th-C. Constantinople. A furrier, a shoemaker, and a smith appear as masters in these contracts; the term of apprenticeship is 5–10 years, and the master usually is obliged to feed and clothe the apprentice and to give him (at the end of the training period?) a sum of 5–10 nomismata (G. Ferrari dalle Spade, SBN 4 [1935] 264–66). From these contracts one should distinguish contracts of service, some of which, written in Latin, were concluded between Italian masters and Greek journeymen (e.g., M. Balard, Génies et l’Outre-Mer, vol. 1 [Paris–The Hague 1973] no. 741; G. Balbi, S. Raiteri, Notai genovesi in oltremare [Genoa 1973] no. 68) for the term of 1–10 years.


APRENOΣ (ἀπρενός, lit. “idle”), term that in the taktika designated a certain kind of dignitary. In the late Roman Empire there were functionaries who received the cingulum, girdle, as the symbol of their duty, but fulfilled no function; they were called vacantes (R. Guillard, EEBs 37 [1969–70] 136–38). The vacantes should be distinguished from the honorati, retired dignitaries. The system seems to have been preserved in the 9th C., but it was confused. The first use of the term apratos is in a 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 375.6) who says that Justinian II ordered the empraktatoi and apratoi to be slaughtered; the meaning of the words here is unclear. The mid-9th-C. Taktikon of Uspenskij speaks not only of apratoi spatharioi, but also of tourmarchai and topoteretai (Oikonomides, Listes 59.12–14), that is, of officers who had functions but probably no title. In the Kletorologion of Philotheos apratoi are listed among the titularies of lower rank, such as strators or mandators.


APRENOΣ (Ἀπρενὼς), a family probably originating from Apros. The Aprenoi are described by Pachymeres as one of the greatest families of the mid-13th C., although nothing is known of their existence in the previous century. They intermarried with the Tarchanioi and Doukas families and sometimes bore the name of Aprenos Doukas. Andronikos Aprenos Doukas was prokoustrator ca.1266; the protovestiariates Aprenos fell in battle against Ivalio in 1280. Manuel Aprenos Doukas, oikeios of the emperor, is mentioned in a charter of 1293; he was apparently a wealthy landowner in the Smyrna region. The family still existed in the early 15th C. when John Aprenos, a high functionary in Thessalonike, signed a charter confirming the privileges of the Esphigmenou monastery (1409).

liT. Polemis, Doukai 102f. PLP, nos. 1206–11. —A.K.
APSE (καθίσμα, lit. “arch, vault”), a semicylindrical space vaulted with a conch, or quarter-sphere (Prokopios, Buildings 1.1.32); it may terminate the axis of a longitudinal space, normally at its east end. Its entrance is marked by a large arch, commonly referred to as a “triphal arch.” Apses of episopal churches housed a synthonon and a cathedra for the seating of clergy and bishop. The exterior may be semicircular, polygonal, or immured in the east wall of the structure, while the interior face is usually semicircular. Such disparities are no less true of subsidiary apses, when present, in the pastophoria.


APSEUDES, THEODORE, painter who worked at the Enkleistra of Neophytos Enkleistos on Cyprus. An inscription in the saint’s cell provides the artist’s name (Ἀπευδῆς) and the date of the decoration, 1182/3. The saint’s typikon confirms this date for the fresco of the Deesis in Neophytos’s cell that includes the saint’s likeness. Mango and Hawkins suggested that the saint’s protector, Basil Kinnamos, bishop of Paphos, brought Apseudes to Cyprus, where he painted the Anastasis and other frescoes in Neophytos’s tomb-chamber as well as those in the bema of the Enkleistra. Apseudes’ attenuated, serene figures exhibit the agitated drapery and intense expressions found also at Lagoçera. D. Winfield (Panagia tou Arakous Lagoudera [Nicòsia, n.d.] 16f) suggested that the Theodore named in an inscription there was the same Apseudes.


APULIA (Ἀπολλιά), southeastern part of Italy from the region of Monte Gargano down to Terra d’Otranto, separated from Lucania by the Bradano River. Apulia encompassed such cities as Bari, Brindisi, Otranto, Taranto, Lecce, Trani, and Gallipoli. The area was plundered during the Gothic wars of Justinian I; subsequently the Lombards conquered almost all of Apulia and annexed it to the Lombard duchy of Benevento. In the 8th C. Apulia was contested among the Lombards, Byz., and Arabs; in the 890s and 840s the Arabs occupied Brindisi, Bari, and Taranto and established several other settlements in the region. In the second half of the 9th C. the Carolingian king Louis II was unsuccessful in his war against the Arabs, but the Byz. emperor Basil I managed to reconquer Apulia; Byz. maintained a hold—though never total hegemony—on the region until the beginning of the 11th C.

The relative prosperity of urban communes, the large number of smallholders, and the development of wheat and oil production for the market provided the material resources for the Apulians’ struggle for independence (11th-C. revolts of Melo and later of his son Argyros). The Norman invasion, however, complicated the situation. In 1047 the German emperor Henry III recognized the Normans and granted their leader the title of duca, prompting an anti-Norman alliance of the papacy and Constantinople. The allies’ defeat at Civitate in 1053 and the conflict between the churches of Rome and Constantinople were followed by a restructuring of forces around Apulia. The reconciliation of Pope Nicholas II (1059–61) with Robert Guiscard expedited the Norman conquest of Apulia, accomplished by 1071.

Byz. had little impact on Apulian society. Town administration was in the hands of the Lombard aristocracy, and Lombard personal names outnumber Greek ones even in coastal cities (Wickham, Italy 157). Apulia was an important center of ceramic production in the 13th C.; so-called Proto-Maiolica ware was produced there and exported widely to Greece and the Levant.

Monuments of Apulia. Significant remains in Apulia include the large (5th-C.?) tetrachonch church of S. Leucio outside Canosa, related in design to contemporary Byz. churches and to S. Lorenzo in Milan, and 5th-C. vault mosaics in S. Maria della Croce at Casaranello, originally a cruciform chapel like the so-called Mausoleum of Galla Placidia in Ravenna. In Barletta is a colossal bronze statue of a 4th- or 5th-C. emperor, said to have been cast up from a shipwreck, presumably while being transported (in a Venetian ship?) from Constantinople (U. Peschlow in Studien Deichmann 1:21–33).

Like these early remains, the most important Byz. buildings are in the coastal cities where the ruling class resided. They include S. Pietro at Otranto and the architecturally similar S. Maria di Siponto (11th C.). The 11th-C. cathedral at
Canosa (S. Sabino) is a T-shaped building with five domes, possibly inspired by S. Marco in Venice and ultimately by the Holy Apostles Church in Constantinople. In Bari, medieval sources speak of a palacium or curte of the katepano; the arguments of Schettini (infra) that large parts of this building survive in the Norman church of S. Nicola have been generally rejected.

The most distinctive Byz. monuments of Apulia and Basilicata are the rock-cut churches and settlements usually inhabited by Basilian monks. The caves were mostly used in the 10th–11th C. and, as in Cappadocia, the churches were extensively painted. The oldest dated paintings are in the crypt of SS. Cristina e Marina at Carpignano Salesino, while the most completely preserved decoration is in the grotto of S. Biagio at San Vito dei Normanni, west of Brindisi; these paintings contain a Greek inscription of 1196.


AQUEDUCT (ὀχετός, ὕδραγωγός), essential element of a large city, bringing water for baths, nymphaeae, and public use. Aqueducts often reached far into the countryside and consisted largely of underground pipes or open cuttings, designed so that the water dropped gradually at an angle of less than 1 percent from the source. When valleys or swamps had to be crossed, aqueducts were supported on masonry arches, which are the most visible remains but rarely comprised 10 percent of the total length. Rome was supplied by 19 aqueducts; 32 km out of 428 rested on arches. Fourteen still functioned when cut by the Goths in 537. Constantinople originally drew its main water supply from Halkali, about 15 km northwest of the city, through an aqueduct built by Hadrian but universally known by the name of its restorer Valens. The arches, which carried it a distance of 970 m between the third and fourth hills, still stand and show much Byz. work. In the late 4th C., a network of aqueducts was constructed over 100 km west of Constantinople to satisfy the needs of the growing population. Their exposed location, however, obliged the city to depend also on vast cisterns (see under Constantinople, Monuments of). Aqueducts were esp. vulnerable to attack: that of Valens, cut by the Avars in 626, was only rebuilt in 758; it was restored on several occasions through the 12th C. Large provincial towns were also supplied by aqueducts (H. Hellenkemper, F. Hild, Neue Forschungen in Kilikien [Vienna 1986] 123–29). Most were destroyed during the troubles of the 7th C., after which cisterns became the main source of water for their reduced populations.

AQUILEIA (Ἀκύληα), naval and commercial city; capital of the province of Venetia et Istria in the 4th–5th C. and a center of communications between East and West. It served as a residence of Diocletian, Maximian, and Constantine I; Constantine’s sumptuous palace there is described in a panegyric (Panegyrici latini 6.6). Aquileia played a major role in the rivalries of 4th-C. emperors (e.g., Theodosios I defeated the usurpers Maximus and Eugenius near there). The city had a cosmopolitan population, saw extensive secular and ecclesiastical construction, and was described by Ausonius as the fourth city of Italy (MGH AuctAnt 5.2:100.65). A council condemning Arianism, presided over by St. Ambrose, was held there in 381; its bishops became increasingly powerful, exercising metropolitan jurisdiction over most of Venetia by 442. The bishops of Aquileia cultivated the tradition that St. Mark had evangelized the area as the basis of their claims to metropolitan jurisdiction in North Italy and to the title of patriarch (ranking with Rome, Alexandria, and other apostolic foundations), which they assumed sometime between the 5th and 7th C. The bishops opposed Justinian’s policy in the Three Chapters affair from ca.553.

As a strategic center close to the frontier of Italy Aquileia was subject to invasion: it was occupied by Alaric in 401 and 408 and was sacked
by Attila in 452. Its subsequent decline may, however, owe more to other factors, such as hydrographic changes and the breakdown of trade links with the areas north of the Alps than to barbarian attacks. After Aquileia was occupied by the Lombard king Alboin in 568, its patriarch, Paulinus I, transferred his see to Grado.

**Monuments of Aquileia.** In the 3rd–6th C. Aquileia was an influential center of the craft of floor mosaic. Most important are the pavements of the double cathedral, dated by inscriptions of Bp. Theodore (308–19). These include donor portraits, incidental motifs (wildlife, busts of seasons) with possible allegorical significance, and a large marine scene with the story of Jonah. In the 9th and 11th C. the south hall of the cathedral was rebuilt. Its crypt was painted around 1200 by a master or masters with access to the same cartoons used by mosaic workshops in Venice and Trieste.


**ARAB GEOGRAPHERS.** Early Arab geographers were mainly astronomers, administrative officials, or philologists; others were systematic geographer-cartographers, travelers, anthologists, or encyclopedists; many were polymaths. They provide valuable information on Byz.-Arab relations; on the Thughur (see ‘Awāsim and Thughūr); and occasionally on internal Byz. military, administrative, economic, and cultural affairs. Their most original information concerning the Themes and other administrative and strategic matters derives from official documents and accounts of returned prisoners and travelers. Ibn Khurḍābeh, Qudāma, and al-Maṣūdī preserve parts of the valuable reports of al-Jarmī, in addition to other primary documents and oral information. Ibn Rusta preserves the account of Ḥārūn ibn Yaḥyā, which is to be supplemented by al-Marwazī. The anthologist ibn al-Fakih (late 9th C.) gives isolated details, besides his list of Byz. themes as preserved by Yaqūṭ. Al-Maqqīṣī provides descriptions of Byz. naval warfare, routes through Asia Minor, and Byz. treatment of Muslim prisoners of war.

Ibn Ḥawqal, a native of the frontier and a systematic geographer, updates al-Ŷšarkhī and adds much original information. Both these and the great cartographer al-Idrīsī highlight the position of Constantinople and Anatolian towns on their maps. In the 13th and 14th C. the encyclopedist Yaqūṭ, the systematic geographer ibn Saʿīd of Granada (13th C.), and the travelers al-Ḥarawi, ibn Juvayr, and ibn Battiṭa are valuable sources for contemporary economic conditions and trade relations of Byz., its northern and
western neighbors, and, in the case of ibn Baṭṭūṭa, the turkification of Asia Minor. Constantinople, also known in Arabic as Būzanṭīyā, “Queen of Cities,” Istānbūlūn, and the “City of Caesar” (see Shboul, Al-Maṣ‘ūdi 243f.), continued to fascinate Arab geographers and visitors. Al-Harawi and ibn Baṭṭūṭa wrote esp. vivid descriptions of the Byz. capital. Other Arab geographers and cosmographers, for example, Aḥū al-Fidā‘ and al-Dīmāshiqi (13th–14th C.), also included Constantinople and Byz. in their surveys. Kračkovskij singled out several groups of Arab geographers: travelers of the 9th C.; authors of the general surveys of the 9th C. (ibn Khurdadbeh); the classical systematic school of the 10th C. (al-Īṣṭakhri, ibn Ḥawqal, al-Maqdisī) whose descriptions were based on detailed maps of the Islamic world; and the encyclopedists of the 13th–14th C. (Yaqqūt ibn ‘Abdallāh, ibn Baṭṭūṭa, et al.).


ARABIA, the Arabian peninsula, homeland of the Arabs and the Himyarites (see Himyar). Southern Arabia was famous for its riches, in spices, minerals, and fruits, although the rest of the peninsula was desolate and sparsely populated. Cities were founded largely on the caravan trade, developing along the western edge of the desert where Christians and Jews settled. Trade through Arabia involved not only items from the south but also from Axum, India, and China, allowing a rich interplay of ideas and cultures. Early visitors to Arabia from Byz. included the writer Nonnosos, his father Abrahām, and grandfather Euphrasios, who went on diplomatic missions to Kinda in the 6th C. Byz. imperial and ecclesiastical influence penetrated western Arabia but failed to convert Mecca, where Muḥammad appeared ca.610. His mission quickly and fundamentally changed the face of Arabia and its relationship with Byz., and Arabia became the base of operations against Byz. In the titanic struggle after Muḥammad died (632), the Arabs wrested Orients, Egypt, and the rest of North Africa from Byz. After the original conquests, however, Muslim operations against Byz. were conducted not from Arabia but from Umayyad Damascus in Syria, and thus Arabia practically lost its relevance to Byz.


ARABIA, PROVINCE OF. From 105 onward Arabia was the name of a Roman province created in the northwestern region of the former Nabataean kingdom (east of the Jordan) with its capital at Bostra. In the 4th C. its southern part (Negev) was separated from Arabia and named Palaestina Salutaris (Palaestina III); at the same time some northern regions were attached to the province of Arabia to create a barrier against independent Arab tribes. Arabia accepted the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Antioch, although from the 5th C. onward Jerusalem tried to absorb the region into its sphere of authority, but failed; by 518 only its southern part (the bishopric of Areopolis) had changed its allegiance, but Madaba remained under Bostra. During the ecclesiastical disputes of the 4th–6th C., the province of Arabia served as a place of exile for defeated churchmen, including the partisans of John Chrysostom. After 636 the territory fell to the Arabs, who were newly converted to Islam, but much of the population remained Christian and church construction continued through at least the 7th C. The Armenian Basil of Ialimbana preserved the description by George of Cyprus of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the province.


ARABIC LITERATURE. In its diverse genres, Arabic literature provides information on Arab perceptions of Byz. and occasionally on Byz. internal affairs. Pre-Islamic poetry (6th C.), the Qur’ān, and traditions attributed to Muḥammad allude to Byz. as a powerful neighbor. Chronicles (8th–15th C.) need to be supplemented by other writings, such as anecdotal anthologies, regional histories, and biographical compilations (e.g., ibn al-‘Adim, incorporating early material from the frontier region). Both
Arab historians (such as al-Baladhuri and al-Tabari) and Arab geographers are important. Works of jurisprudence (8th C. onward) and sermons from the frontier, such as those by ibn Nubata (died 984), provide insights into Byz.-Arab relations and reflect realistic attitudes (see Shboul [1981] infra).

Works of adab (belles-lettres, literary anthologies, and encyclopedias)—for example, by Jâhiz (died ca.869), Tanukhi (died 994), and Qalqashandi (died 1418)—contain valuable details on Byz.-Arab relations, including documents otherwise unknown. Poets, particularly those from the frontier such as Abu Firâs and al-Mutanabbi, illuminate aspects of the conflict and provide rare historical details.

Popular literature (e.g., proverbs and tales from the Thousand and One Nights) echo facets of the historical reality. In certain respects, the Arabic frontier cycles in prose (e.g., Dhat al-Himma) provide parallels with the Byz. Akritic songs and Diogenes Akritas.

Muslim polemics against Byz.—more political and cultural than strictly religious—include official epistles sent to Constantinople in the name of Arab rulers (e.g., Hârûn al-Rashîd) and criticism of local Christians with allusions to Byz. (e.g., by the polymath Jâhiz).

At least two semiofficial manuals (now lost) were written on Byz. administration and culture by Arab ex-prisoners of war: al-Jarmî (9th C.), and Ahwâzi (10th C.), quoted by al-Birînî (died 1048).

Unlike works of philosophy and science, few literary Greek works were translated into Arabic (see Fihrist [infra] 2:718), while few Arabic books (one on dreams) were rendered into Greek. Hellenistic influences on Arabic literature, directly or through Syriac, may be discerned, for example, in historiography, geography, literary criticism, and romance.

Arabic literature mirrors Arab attitudes toward Byz. as influenced by the vicissitudes of strategic, political, and cultural relations between the two worlds, and according to the different preoccupations of Arabic writers. In addition to the standard narrative histories and geographies, valuable perceptions are contained in biographical literature, works of jurisprudence, and other literary genres, including poetry and popular literature.

A distinction should be made between the official level expressed in documents, the learned level expressed by Arab scholars and men of letters, and the popular attitudes reflected in proverbs and tales, although the three levels cannot be mutually exclusive. The image of Byz. in Arabic literature, like the Arab-Byz. encounter and Arab history itself, must not be seen as static. Briefly, pre-Islamic poetry reflects Byz. as a powerful, wealthy, and civilized Christian neighboring empire, feared and admired by the Arabs. The Qur'ân and prophetic traditions are preoccupied with Byz. as a perpetual adversary. Official Arabic documents, however, such as letters addressed to Byz. emperors (e.g., Harun to Constantine V or Ikhsid to Romanos I), accounts of receptions of Byz. envoys, as well as works of Muslim jurists, generally show a pragmatic understanding of the dictates of politics and trade. The Fatimids, who at first reflect an unusually intransigent attitude, later resorted to political expediency.

The early image of Byz. as a civilized Christian neighbor, the existence in Islamic society of many individuals, slaves, and freedmen and women of Byz. background, as well as trade and travel between the two sides, modified hostile Muslim attitudes somewhat and provided real knowledge of Byz. culture. But concern about Byz. as the dangerous enemy remained paramount at all levels. In this context, Arabic literature, particularly at the popular level, partakes of the universal tendency to stereotype the adversary. Thus while Byz. slave girls appear lovely and industrious, the Byz. in general were most unattractive in Arab eyes.


ARABIC PAPYRI, found in the topmost levels of sites and rubbish dumps in Egypt from after 641. Arabic papyri, both documents and literary texts, have been found since 1824; they are scattered among collections and dealers the world over, and no comprehensive list of them exists.
Their texts include the Qur’ân and hadith, history and theology, official correspondence, tax records, protocols, poetry, proverbs, grammar, and medical and scientific works. Documents of the Arab administration are very numerous and comprise examples of every type, such as land-leases and sales, tax receipts, requisitions of men and supplies (esp. for the Arab fleet’s annual expedition against Constantinople), orders, safe-conduct passes (sigillata), and financial records. One can trace the beginnings of the use of Arabic by the Christian population in private letters and even marriage contracts. Christian Arabic literary texts on papyrus include a disputation text (in Heidelberg) and a polemical work (in Vienna). Papyri are of great importance for the history of the Arabic language and palaeography, for chronology, law, and economic history, and for every aspect of the institutions and culture of Egypt after removal from rule. Arabic papyri have also been found at sites outside Egypt (Damascus, Samarra, Israel).


**ARABISSOS** (Ἀραβισσός), modern Asin, ancient city in Cappadocia, later one of the cities of the Hexapolis in Armenia II, located on the road between Cappadocian Caesarea and Melitene. In late antiquity, Arabissos was a legionary station attested from 381 on as a bishopric (suffragan of Melitene). As it was his birthplace, Arabissos was embellished by Maurice. It suffered from the earthquake of 584/5 and esp. during the wars with the Arabs, when it was the center of a kleisoura. In the 11th C. Arabissos was known as an episkepsis, and in 1108 as a kastron. Near Arabissos is a cave where an unnamed martyr was revered; for the Arabs this became a site of the legendary Seven Sleepers.

In July 629 Herakleios met Shahrbaraz in Arabissos to arrange terms with Persia. Herakleios offered Shahrbaraz and his son the Persian throne. They agreed on the Euphrates as the frontier between the empires and probably negotiated the withdrawal of Persian troops from Syria, Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Egypt. Shahrbaraz promised to support Christianity and participated in the construction of the church named Irene ("Peace"). Patr. Nikephoros claims that Shahrbaraz agreed to become Herakleios’s subject. Although Shahrbaraz soon fell to an assassin, the terms of the treaty (Reg 1, nos. 200–01) at Arabissos continued to provide the basis for Byz.-Persian relations until the Muslim overthrow of the Sasanian Empire.


**ARABS,** called in the Byz. sources Arabes and Sarakenoi as well as Ismaelitai and Hagarenoi, meaning the progeny of the biblical Ishmael and Hagar.

Constantine I inherited from Diocletian a stable frontier with Arabia. To ward off invasions from the Peninsula, Byz. developed the system of foederati, who together with the soldiers of the limes Diocletianus, which extended from the Euphrates to the Red Sea, defended Roman Oriens. In the course of the late Roman period, the empire dealt with a succession of these Arab foederati: the Tānūkhids of the 4th C., the Ṣalihids of the 5th, and the Ghassānids of the 6th. The last were the most powerful and represented the maturest expression of the federate system. Their kings were integrated into the Roman military and administrative hierarchies: the official title of the federate chief was phylarch with the rank of clarissimus, but the supreme one was both patrikios and gloriosissimus. The system of phylarchs and foederati was so successful that the Strategon of Maurice is silent on the Arabs. The reign of Maurice witnessed a crisis in imperial-federate relations when the emperor had the Ghassānid Alamundarus exiled to Sicily. When the Muslim Arabs appeared in the 7th C. it was against a considerably weakened federate shield that they fought and won.

Before his death in 632, Muḥammad had united Arabia. His successors, the three “orthodox” caliphs, conquered the Byz. lands of Oriens and Egypt. The decisive battle was the Arabs’ victory at Yarmuk in 636. The Umayyads continued this career of conquest from Damascus, the new Arab capital: against the Byz. heartland, Anatolia, and
against the Byz. was continued by petty states in the east and in the west—the Aglabids, the Ḥamdānids, and the Fāṭimids, their military operations conducted from Kayrawān, Aleppo, and Cairo, respectively. During the entire 9th C., the Aglabids of Ifrikiya (Tunisia) dominated the middle Mediterranean and succeeded in conquering Sicily. In the east, the struggle was taken up in the 9th C. by the Ḥamdānids of Aleppo. The initial successes of Sayf al-Dawla were brought to naught, however, by Nikephoros II Phokas. The Fāṭimids of Egypt battled the Byz. in the 10th C., but John I Tzimiskes and Basil II contained their threats around Antioch and enlarged Byz. gains in northern Syria. The achievements of these three Macedonian emperors marked the turn of the tide against the Arabs. The destruction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre by the Fāṭimid al-Hakim (996–1021) was one of the contributory causes of the Crusades, which were fought mainly between Latin Westerners and the Turks, while Byz. and the Arabs were spectators. The Turks, a new virile Muslim people, took up the struggle against Byz. where the Arabs left off in the 11th C.

Economic and Cultural Exchanges between Arabs and Byzantines. Within the ʿAbbasid caliphate there were Christian monasteries and lay communities, in which Greek literature flourished throughout the 8th C. and probably later. In this milieu, or among Palestinian émigrés in Constantinople, the unrealistic dream that the caliph would convert to Christianity was cherished. Scholarly contacts developed and the caliphs tried to invite Byz. scholars, such as Leo the Mathematician, to Baghdad, Greek MSS were collected and translated, and Photios was probably able to work in Baghdad during his embassy to the city. Similarly, Arab influence penetrated Byz. art and architecture, and Theophilos is said to have built his palace on Arab models (see Islamic Influence on Byzantine Art). Ṭabbāsid attempts to support Byz. insurgents—from Thomas the Slav to Andronikos Doukas—presuppose close contacts with certain circles in Byz.

Arabs visited Constantinople as merchants, and one could meet there a Hagarene merchant in a black cloak and brick-colored sandals (PG 111:68:1 B–C). Some Syrian merchants stayed in Constantinople for ten years. They appeared not only in Trebizond or Artze, but probably even
in faraway Athens, where archaeological evidence attests an Arab colony of the 10th–11th C. (G.C. Miles, *Hesperia* 25 [1956] 329–44). People of double origin (Arab and Greek) were so typical in the eastern provinces that one of them became the hero of the epic of Digenes Akritas. Arab families, such as the Sarrakopoulos, Syropoulos, Bempetziotai, and Aplesparai, penetrated the ranks of the Byz. aristocracy.

**Representation in Byzantine Art and Literature.** As major rivals of the Byz. until the 11th C., Arabs occupied an important place in Byz. literary texts and images. Two clichés predominated: either differences of race were ignored (esp. in the presentation of Arab saints such as Gourias, Samonas, and Abibas) or Arab stereotypes were exaggerated, for example, when they were shown as terrifying raiders. Ethnic features were rarely displayed: sometimes the turban distinguishes Arabs, including John of Damascus, sometimes Arab invaders wear the three-piece garment (long tunic, underskirt, and patterned stockings) that appears in some images of the Magi in their Adoration of Christ. When Arabs do appear in works during and after the 12th C. (Ohrid, Peribleptos; Venice, S. Marco), they are usually portrayed among the nations of the Pentecost or as people taught by the apostles. The Madrid Skylitzes (Grabar-Manoussacas, *Skylitzés*, figs. 98, 138, 189, 190, 192) presents a dispassionate record of Arab rulers, costume, and architecture. Another miniature in this MS (fig.58) depicts an Arab horseman displaying his skill in the Hippodrome.


- I.A.Sh., A.K., A.C.

**Arbantenos** (Ἀρβατάντε ρος), or Arabantenos, a family known from the second half of the 11th C. The name is probably derived from al-Rawandān in northern Syria (Honigmann, *Ostgrenze* 140, n.7). Arbantenoi are first mentioned in non-Greek sources: Matthew of Edessa relates that Aruantan, the dux of Edessa, was captured by Turks in 1066/7 (Oikonomides, *Dated Seals*, no. 94); Ordericus Vitalis mentions Ravendinos, Alexios I’s protospatharios, to whom the inhabitants of Laodikeia surrendered ca.1099, as well as (another?) Ravendinos, “a powerful Greek,” a Byz. envoy to Antioch in 1118/19 and later to Jerusalem. The sebastos John Arbantenos was extolled by Nicholas Kallikles; he married Anna of the Komnenoi, and the *typhon* of the PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY in Constantinople calls him the husband of John II’s niece. Thirty years later, in 1165, another sebastos John Arbantenos, Manuel I’s gambros (son-in-law?), was active. Several Arabantenoi are known only by their seals: one of them, Nicholas, was protonotarios of Chaldia, probably in the 11th C. (Schlumberger, Sig. 290); other seals, dated to the 11th and 12th C., have no information about the Arbantenoi’s offices, but some bear effigies of military saints that presumably indicate their military functions. In the 14th C. a few Arabantenoi are attested (PLP, nos. 1215–17) but they are known only as land and house owners.


---

**Arbogast (Ἀρβογάστης).** Western magister militum and power behind the revolt of Eugenius; died 394. Arbogast was a Frank and subordinate of the magister militum Bauto under Gratian and Theodosios I. Upon Bauto’s death ca.388, Arbogast used his popularity with the troops to seize the office of magister militum. In 388, after Arbogast accomplished the final defeat of the usurper Maximum, Theodosios left him to manage the affairs of the young Valentinian II, who became a virtual prisoner. When Valentinian attempted to dismiss Arbogast, the general tore up the order, implying that he took commands directly from Theodosios. In 392 Valentinian was found dead and some historical sources implicate Arbogast. Arbogast sought to rule the West in his own name, but ultimately elevated Eugenius, although continuing to seek reconciliation with Constantinople. Arbogast was a moderate pagan who supported the revival of paganism under Eugenius. He tried to ambush the forces of Theodosios at the battle of the Frigidus in 394, but was defeated and took his own life.
ARCH (άψίς, καμάρα), a structural element composed of wedge-shaped blocks of stone or bricks (vousoirs) spanning an opening, usually semi-circular in form. Arches enlarge interior space by transferring the heavy loads of superstructures to isolated points of support (piers, columns), which can be more widely separated than those of trabeated construction. Arches can penetrate walls without diminishing their strength, carry bridges over rivers, aqueducts over valleys, terraces over cisterns, domes over naos, or clerestory walls over open colonnades. The widest spans achieved by Byz. builders are those of the great arches in Hagia Sophia—about 31 m (about 108 Byz. feet). Immured, they may articulate walls with blind arcades or spare large wall areas for groups of windows. Blind arcades, used to enliven exterior façades, sometimes employ pointed and ogee arches in addition to round-headed ones, as at the CHORA MONASTERY in Constantinople. Trilobe arches are also found in architecture of the 13th and 14th C., usually as window openings.

ARCH, MONUMENTAL, a structure consisting of a large single arch resting on piers or a large arch flanked by smaller arches, erected for commemorative purposes. Provided with a columnar façade (freestanding or half-columns supporting an architrave), the arch itself carried an attic on which were displayed honorific inscriptions and sometimes statuary. The only known freestanding Byz. monumental arch is that of Theodosios I erected in the Forum Tauri, Constantinople, ca.390?; though not fully excavated, it has been reconstructed as a triple arch approximately 43 m broad and 23 m wide (Müller-Wiener, Bildlexikon, figs. 294–98). A variant, the tetrastyle, consists of four arches arranged around a square and supporting a groin vault or dome, as at the ARCH of GALERIUS in Thessalonike. Such arches were often placed at the intersections of major streets. Monumental arches were also adapted for other purposes, such as city gates. The Milion (see Mese) in Constantinople, built in the form of a domed tetrastyle, was the marker from which distances on the roads leading to the capital were measured. The tetrastyle was also adapted for use in Christian cult buildings, for example, the Tetrastyle of the Forty Martyrs in Constantinople, which stood until ca.1400 (Majeska, Russian Travelers 231). A tetrastyle could also be structurally integrated into a church, as at Aphrodiasis (R. Cormack in Classical Tradition 114).

ARCHAEOLOGY. Byz. archaeology is a relatively young field of scholarship. Aspects of the discipline have been separately studied as Christian and underwater archaeology. In addition, the method known as archaeological survey is a notable tradition in Byz. studies. Following an overview of the field, each of these separate disciplines will be discussed in turn.

AN OVERVIEW. Byz. archaeology does not really exist as a discipline of its own, and—although there are significant exceptions (such as the excavations of the GREAT PALACE and several important churches in Constantinople [e.g., St. POLYEUKTOS, Kalenderhane Camii] and such late antique centers as NEA ANCHALOS)—most Byz. sites are explored in connection with the investigation of classical monuments. Because most of these are on the Mediterranean littoral many important Byz. sites in the interior are hardly known; in addition, the Byz. components of many were either summarily treated or completely ignored, with the exception of some standing buildings (primarily churches and city walls). Churches and their decoration (mosaics, frescoes, icons, church furniture, liturgical vessels, etc.) formed the subject of “Christian archaeology” (see below) that in fact coincided with the study of Christian art. Only recently have ordinary Byz. objects (houses, ceramics and other utensils, tools, and weapons) found during excavation of ancient sites begun to be described, collected, and studied. Primary attention has been paid to cities (chiefly late Roman cities) such as Carthage, Apameia, Cae- sarea Maritima, Korykos, Aphrodiasis, Pergamon, Sardis, Ephesus, Corinth, Athens, Cherson, and cities on the lower Danube; in some of them “post-Roman” strata of the 7th C. and later have been excavated. The countryside has so far received only limited investigation (mostly in northern Syria, Bulgaria, and the Crimea). Necropolises have been excavated in many places, with esp. fruitful results.
in the region of barbarian invasions (Pannonia, Bulgaria).

Archaeology is essential for the study of material objects about which there is little information in written sources or visual representations (household utensils, tools, simple ornaments of bone or metal); it can also provide data on regions that were normally ignored by medieval writers (e.g., the provinces and esp. the frontier zone). The history of urban life and of the Germanic and Avaro-Slavic penetration into the empire has been rewritten in the last decades on the basis of archaeological discoveries. Archaeology, however, faces various problems: while some materials (e.g., ceramics, glass) are preserved in excellent condition, others (wood, leather, cloth) disappear entirely or are severely damaged (iron), thus distorting the picture of material culture—in only a few regions (desert or swampy areas) have organic materials been preserved. The excavated artifacts must be identified, dated, and located in a historical milieu (ethnic, religious, social, etc.).

Unlike documents and literary texts, archaeological finds are studied not so much as individual objects, but as part of a series (e.g., ceramic bowls or glass flasks) and of an archaeological complex; their location (position in the excavated room and in an archaeological layer or stratum) is no less significant than their identification as belonging to a certain series (type or subtype). The chronology of an artifact (save for rare specifically dated objects) has to be established either on the basis of typology (position in a dated series) or stratigraphy (position in a dated stratum). For establishing a chronology of archaeological finds, coins have primary importance; since they can be dated, at least within a certain reign but sometimes even to a narrower period, they often supply the scholar with a terminus post quem for the whole stratum. After a number of dated finds, some objects (esp. ceramics) can themselves be dated with relative precision and become the yardstick for further ("typological") dating.

Establishing the ethnic, religious, and social background of the objects (or, rather, of their long-dead owners) is very difficult unless we have direct indications; ornamented objects (earrings, necklaces, bronze belt fittings, fibulae) can be helpful, although sometimes problematic—conclusions of this sort are mostly hypothetical. Changes in quality and fashion reflected in objects allow one to study economic, social, and cultural development; archaeology provides us with great numbers of objects and therefore permits tentative analysis of quantitative changes (increase of production, transition from one type of object to another, etc.). Discoveries of Byz. artifacts in remote regions (the Urals, China, Scandinavia) provide evidence for the study of trade routes and cultural influences. Archaeology reveals many aspects of the past on which written sources remain reticent; on the other hand, by dealing with "real" material objects archaeology easily creates an illusion of veracity that it, as a matter of fact, does not have: archaeological observations and conclusions are often extremely hypothetical and should be compared with the independent data of written texts.


Christian Archaeology. Archaeology as a discipline emerged first to study the remains of classical and biblical antiquity, and it was only later extended to the remains of the postclassical period, including that of Byz. Originally research into this era was restricted almost exclusively to churches and objects of liturgical use, hence it was defined as Christian archaeology; its purpose commonly was to discover objects that shed light on the practices and beliefs of the early church, and a devotional goal frequently prompted (and distorted) investigation. Byz. archaeology originated as a branch of Christian archaeology and this heritage influenced its development—for example, the relatively late emergence of interest in the nonreligious aspects of Byz. society. Christian archaeology as defined today does not restrict itself to religious topics, and meetings such as the International Congress of Christian Archaeology and periodicals like Cahiers archéologiques allow for presentation of research from all areas of the Mediterranean in the early Middle Ages.


—T.E.G.
**Underwater Archaeology.** Over the past 30 years technological innovation and the development of effective means of underwater excavation have made possible the archaeological exploration of the sea bed. This investigation has focused on two kinds of sites: near-shore sites that were once upon land but have sunk beneath the sea, usually because of earthquake, and shipwrecks. An important example of the former is Kenchreai, the eastern port of Corinth, whose harbor facilities sank in an earthquake in the late 4th C. Excavated Byz. shipwrecks include the 4th- and 7th-C. Yassi Ada wrecks (G.F. Bass, F.H. van Doorninck, Jr., AJA 75 [1971] 27–37. Eadem, Yassi Ada 1 [College Station, Texas, 1982]), the 11th-C. Serçe Liman wreck (carrying a large load of glass; G.F. Bass, F.H. van Doorninck, Jr., *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 7 [1978] 119–32), and the 12th-C. Pelagonnesos wreck (with a cargo of at least 1,490 ceramic vessels; Ch. Kritzas, P. Throckmorton, *Athens Annals of Archaeology* 4 [1971] 176–85). A wreck found in 1960 off Marzamemi in southeastern Sicily contained unused church furnishings—ambo, plaques, parapet slabs, monolithic columns, 28 column bases, etc. G. Kapitán (*Archaeology* 22 [1969] 122–33) identified these as Prokonnesian marbles and suggested a date in the reign of Justinian I. Shipwrecks are particularly rich sources of archaeological material since they have not been disturbed by later human activity and their destruction took place at a single time that can often be fixed quite precisely; some materials also are better preserved in water than they are in the soil. Wrecks thus offer fixed points for the dating of archaeological objects and provide important information about trade and the economy.

T.E.G. A.C.

**Archaeological Survey.** A means of gathering information about an area through the utilization of a broad-based archaeological research program, normally without excavation, archaeological survey relies on an investigation of what appears above the surface. Survey allows the study of an area much larger than can be covered by excavation, normally at a fraction of the cost, but it relies on previous stratigraphic excavation for the identification and dating of surface finds. Survey normally involves systematic investigation by teams of people walking across the landscape; aerial reconnaissance, geophysical methods, and architectural study also play important roles.

Byz. studies have a long tradition of observation and recording of archaeological sites and monuments; W. Ramsay, J. Strzygowski, D. Talbot Rice, and others were the pioneers of this archaeological method, and contemporary scholars have continued this tradition. In the past 30 years the theory and method of archaeological survey have developed rapidly and have been used with considerable success in the eastern Mediterranean. Survey can provide information about settlement patterns, economy, land use, and other aspects of life not available from written or traditional archaeological sources. Nevertheless, despite its particular applicability to Byz., where frequently rich documentary materials can provide a check on the archaeological evidence, and despite some notable exceptions (R.M. Harrison, *AnatSt* 31 [1981] 198–200, A.W. Dunn, *JÖB* 32.4 [1982] 605–14), the results of archaeological survey have rarely been used by Byzantinists. Instead, Byz. material from large survey projects is frequently analyzed by non-Byzantinists who do not always understand the special problems or questions of the period.

Nevertheless, survey projects, mostly in the Aegean area, have led to a certain degree of consensus about the development of the Byz. settlement pattern: remarkable prosperity and widespread settlement in late antiquity (when the number of sites is commonly only slightly less than the peak in the classical period) followed by complete collapse in the late 6th to 10th C., when survey generally fails to recognize any settlement whatever, followed by a slow recovery and another peak in the 12th–13th C., followed again by decline. This broad outline may well be correct, but it is affected by our lack of knowledge about the chronology of many Byz. ceramics and other items.


**Archaism,** or classicism, was a current in high-style Byz. literature inherited from the *Second Sophistic,* where it originated. It encompassed both language and style (*Rhetorical Figures,* etc.) and the contents (conscious presentation of contemporary events in the guise of ancient *Terminology,* characters, situations, etc.). Obsolete meters such as hexameter or anacreontic tetrameter were used. The late antique and early Byz. professors established a canonical list of ancient au-
thors who provided models: Homer was still the Poet, Aristotle the Philosopher, Demosthenes the Orator, Galen the supreme authority on medicine. Archaisms was not limited to the literary sphere: the Byz. considered themselves as Romans (Rhomaiotai), their capital as "New Rome" or "New Jerusalem," their Bulgarian or generally Slavic neighbors as Scythians, Roman law as still effective, etc. All values were created in the past: "There is nothing of mine," John of Damascus said of his work. The Byz. had only to follow their predecessors; accordingly, the idea of novelty or innovation bordered on heresy and revolt (P. Wirth, Arch 45 [1961] 127f). Some writers, however, became weary of archaisms and lamented, like Theodore Metochites, that their ancestors had accomplished everything, leaving no opportunity for their own creativity (H.G. Beck, Theodore Metochites [Munich 1952] 50–75).

Archaisms was neither a cultural game, nor a simple imitative "mimesis." Unlike Italian humanists of the 15th C., the Byz. rarely felt a distance between past and present. Archaisms created an illusion of stability and continuity in the shaky and unstable world of the Byz. elite.


ARCHANGEL (ἀρχάγγελος, "chief angel"). Although Michael and Gabriel appear in both the Old and New Testaments, the word archangel is not used in the Septuagint and occurs only twice in the New Testament. Nonetheless archangels came to hold an important place in Jewish legend and apocrypha and were revered in Christian tradition. Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite ranked the archangels in the third and lowest triad of his celestial hierarchy, between the "principalities" and angels. Only three archangels were recognized by the Christian church—Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, whereas other Jewish archangels (Uriel, Azael, etc.) were rejected by the pope Zacharias in 745. Of these three, Michael was held in the highest regard, whereas Gabriel and Raphael (who appears in the books of Tobit and Enoch) did not receive widespread veneration in Byz. A church was dedicated to Raphael in Alexandria, but the Synaxarion of Constantinople does not list a feastday for him. Other archangels appear in some apocrypha (e.g., Testament of Solomon) and in art.

Archangels were distinguished from regular angels as early as ca.500 (C. Mango, DChAE 12 [1984] 40f) by their court or imperial costume (chlamys or loros, red shoes) and attributes (such as the orb or sphaira). Michael and Gabriel stand dressed this way as an honor guard alongside Christ and the Virgin; they also head the heavenly host in images of the Synaxis ton Asomaton (see Asomatos). Their various appearances in the Old and New Testaments were collected into cycles of illustrations; in these narrative contexts the archangels are clad in the traditional angelic garb of tunic, himation, and sandals. Sometimes a large number of archangels, including Raphael and Uriel, is shown surrounding the figure of Christ Pantokrator in the dome, for example, at Palermo (Demus, Norman Sicily, pls. 13, 45), but images of archangels other than Michael and Gabriel are rare.

Michael was the archangelos par excellence; a church of "the archangelos" was assumed to be dedicated to Michael, one of "the archangeli" to Michael and Gabriel. The image of Michael is common on seals, whereas that of Gabriel is unknown.


ARCHBISHOP (ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, lit. "chief bishop"), a title initially used to designate certain metropolitans. It was applied to the bishops of the most important sees in the empire: Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. Hence its application by EPIPHANIOS of Salamis (Panarion, ed. Holl, 3:141.11) to designate Peter of Alexandria (300–311). With the rise of Constantinople and Jerusalem to patriarchal status in the 5th C., the epithet was used for the five chief bishops of the empire. The conciliar documents of this period repeatedly employ the term in this sense. Since the title was associated with ecclesiastical independence or autonomy, it was understandably also applied to autocephalous ecclesiastics, such as the primate of CYPRUS (beginning in 431) and to the most important bishops (Ephesus, Thessalonike, Caesarea in Cappadocia, Athens, etc.). This distinction was not always maintained, however.
Archbishops not directly dependent on any metropolitan but on a patriarch (the so-called “autocephalous archbishops” without suffragans) were very numerous; they ranked below the metropolitan and were elected by the ENDEMOUSA SYNODOS and the patriarch.


ARCHERY (τροφεία). Encounters with the Avars and Hun horse-archers forced the Byz. to emulate or recruit their skills. A 6th-C. treatise on archery (ed. Dennis, Military Treatises 128–35) names accuracy, force, and rapidity of shot as the essential skills to be mastered either from a standstill or while in motion. Two draws were known: the Mediterranean release, with two or three fingers pulling back the bowstring and the arrow to the left of the bowstave; and the Mongolian release, using the thumb (sometimes thumb and forefinger) to pull the string with the arrow to the right of the bowstave (S. James, BAR Int. Ser. 336 [1987] 77–83). Mounted archers were trained to shoot in both directions to break up a fleeing enemy or to defend themselves when in retreat. Prokopios (Wars 1.14–15) attests the versatility and hitting power of contemporary archers, citing instances where Byz. archery proved superior against the Persians (1.18.31–35) and Ostrogoths (5.27.26–29; 8.32.6–10).

Scattered details on archery come from the 10th C. Leo VI criticized the decline of archery (Taktika of Leo VI 6.5) and called for constant practice with the bow (11.49) as a useful weapon against the Arabs (18.131, 134-35), a point later emphasized in the Praecepta Militaria (4.27–34; 17.13–16). Expeditionary forces sought out good archers (De cer. 658.1–2) and took along thousands of arrows (De cer. 657.12–13, 17–19). The shafts were sometimes furrowed to shatter on impact, thus preventing reuse by the enemy. Although Byz. archery was effective against the Arabs in the 10th C., it was no match for the 11th-C. Turkish mounted archers, whose superior skills the Byz. acknowledged by actively recruiting them in the 11th–12th C. (See also Weaponry.)


ARCHIMANDRITE (ἄρχιμανδρίτης, fem. ἀρχιμανδρίτισσα, lit. “chief of a sheepfold”), monastic term with two principal meanings.

1. First appearing in 4th-C. Syria, in the early period of monasticism (4th–6th C.) the term is a common equivalent of ἡγουμένος, the superior of a monastery. G. Dagron (TM 4 [1970] 268f) argues that the term archimandrite was used primarily in Constantinople, esp. for the hegoumenos of the monastery of Dalmatou. Under Justinian I, the term hegoumenos began to supplant archimandrite, although archimandrite remained in use until the 10th C. as the designation for hegoumenoi of a few major monasteries.

2. From the 6th C. onward, according to Pargoire, archimandrite began to be used for the chief of a region or urban federation of monasteries, akin to exarch or protos. In this sense archimandrite is applied to the protos of holy mountains like Athos, Latros, and Olympos, or to the head of a group of monasteries in one city, as in Athens.


ARCHIMEDES, ancient Greek mathematician and engineer; born Syracuse ca.287 B.C., died Syracuse 212 B.C. Archimedes profoundly influenced medieval Arabic and Latin science and late medieval and Renaissance Mathematics but had little impact on Byz. after the 6th C. Archimedes is cited directly in the 4th C. by Pappos and Theon. In the early 6th C. three of his works were commented on by Eutokios and were probably studied by Anthemiou of Tralles and Isidore of Miletus. In the 9th C. Leo the Mathematician evidently possessed a MS of Archimedes’ treatises, which perhaps represents the unique transliteration of the main corpus of Archimedes’ works from uncial into minuscule (Lemerle, Humanism 196). Other MSS also survived, however, as is evident from the Arabic versions and from the 10th-C. Constantinopolitan copy of the On Float-
ing Bodies and the Method of Mechanical Theorems
(J.L. Heiberg, Hermes 42 [1907] 235–303). Archimedes is mentioned by Psellos in the 11th C. (Psellos, Scripta min. 1:26.24, 369.1) and is cited frequently by Tzetzes in the 12th C., for example, in his poem 35 “On Archimedes and some of his Devices” (Historiae, 47.106–49.159). Two MSS of the main corpus of Archimedes’ works were available to William of Moerbeke when he made his Latin translation at Viterbo in 1269.


—D.P.

ARCHITECT. In the late Roman Empire architects were usually men of high social status and education. Some were trained in geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, physics, building construction, hydraulics, carpentry, metalwork, and painting. They drew plans, elevations, and possibly perspective renderings. Downey (infra) distinguishes between the mechanikos, the fully trained architect, and the architekton, a “master builder.” Both terms seem to have disappeared after the 6th C., though the epithet architekton continued to be applied to God as creator (e.g., Patr. Germanos I—PG 98:316D–317A); they were replaced by oikodemos, builder (a term also found in Roman inscriptions), and, later, protomaistor, chief of a team or guild (see MAISTOR).

Architects known by name include:

Euphrates, a legendary figure
Anthemios of Tralles
Isidore of Miletus
Isidore the Younger

Eustathios, a priest from Constantinople, and Zenobios, who together designed the martyrion-basilica at the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem.

Rufinus of Antioch, who built the cathedral at Gaza, using a plan sent from Constantinople

Asaph and Addai, architects of the rebuilt cathedral at Edessa (K. McVey, DOP 37 [1983] 98)

Stephen of Aila, responsible for the basilica at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai

Patrikes, a patrikios who built the palace at Bryas

Petronas Kamateros, a spatharokandidatos, architect of the fortress at Sarkel

Demitras, Eustathios, and Nikon, mentioned as oikodemos (Laura 1, nos. 1.33, 6.17, App.1.13)

Trdat, an Armenian who restored the western portion of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, after 989

Ioannikios, oikodemos at Tmutorakan, died 1078

(E. Skržinskaja, VizVrem 18 [1961] 74–84)

Nikephoros, who erected the Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople

Rouchas, a monk sent by Michael VIII to Constantinople to restore Hagia Sophia

John Peralta, a Catalan from Sicily, and the megas stratapedarches Astras (PLP, no.1598), who repaired the dome of Hagia Sophia after 1346


Demetrios Theophilos, another protomaistor (Docheiar., no.50.22, a.1389).


—M.J., W.L., A.K.

ARCHITECTURE. Byz. architecture constitutes a building tradition generally associated with the history of the late Roman and Byz. empires and, to an extent, with its wider sphere of influence over a period spanning from ca.300–ca.1450. Byz. architecture defies a comprehensive conventional definition on either cultural, geographical, chronological, or stylistic bases. Between the 4th C. and the 15th C. several more-or-less coherent architectural developments and interludes took place that can be roughly grouped into seven chronological periods.

First Period (4th to 5th C.). Architecture during this period represents the perpetuation of tradition within the cultural framework of the Greco-Roman world and the political framework of the Roman Empire. This perpetuation of established architectural practice accounts for the degree of continuity in the regional traditions of planning, structural solutions, building technique, and decoration. Two factors play a decisive role in the architectural development of the period: urban survival and active christianization. Urban centers witnessed a slow but steady shift from pagan to Christian patronage of public buildings. Christian churches—predominantly basilicas—derived generically from pagan prototypes, and
their construction was entrusted to established workshops that had previously been employed on imperial pagan projects. Large-scale building under imperial auspices was one of the major industries in the Roman world, and the movement of manpower and technical personnel (architects, surveyors, etc.) from one completed building project to another was standard practice. This, in fact, constituted the essence of what we refer to as "workshop practice."

Building types such as the martyrion, baptistry, and mausoleum were also constructed in large numbers. Martyria display a considerable variety of plan types, reflecting the particular requirements of preexisting customs and functions accommodated on their sites. Mausoleums, large and small, which initially were freestanding and independent, increasingly become attached to church buildings as christianization proceeded.

**Second Period (6th C.).** This was the period of greatest architectural productivity in Byz. history. Often identified with the policy of reconquest of Emp. Justinian I, the vast building program was, in fact, begun by his predecessors Anastasios I and Justin I and continued by his successor, Justin II. The success of this grand enterprise was facilitated by the survival of the imperial order within the framework of the fully christianized, urban society. In a comprehensive record of the building accomplishments of Justin I and Justinian I, Prokopios of Caesarea provides us with a catalog of buildings and relates many details about the realization of the imperial program. This meticulous account, which includes descriptions of whole new towns, forts, churches, palaces, public buildings, markets, cisterns, aqueducts, and so on, is substantially confirmed by preserved buildings and archaeological finds.

Notwithstanding the survival of regional building practices, the period was characterized by the much more pronounced impact of the capital. Certain building types (basilican churches, mausoleums, cisterns) continued to be constructed according to the established norms of a given region. At the same time, architecture was now also "exported" from Constantinople, the center of imperial administration. Whether in the form of new church plan types such as the domed basilica, new structural solutions involving the use of vaulting, standardized building techniques, or the nature of architectural decoration, there is a strong indication of direct connections of the center with regional affairs. The marble trade and the shipping of building components (columns, capitals, and church furniture), illustrate the degree and the character of the impact of Constantinople. This phenomenon is to be understood in the light of extensive construction in frontier regions, often in newly conquered territories, with the aim of consolidating recently established borders.

**Third Period (7th to mid-9th C.).** In striking contrast to the preceding building boom this period is characterized by a virtual absence of construction. Beleaguered by foreign wars and internal crises, the empire experienced profound changes. The decline of cities was manifested in the physical decay of their fabric. The very meaning of "construction" during this period was practically reduced to preservation, repair, and patchwork. New building other than fortifications was rare, and large-scale construction exceptional. The few surviving examples in the latter category reveal conservative traits and expedient dependence on spolia.

**Fourth Period (mid-9th through 11th C.).** By the middle of the 9th C. relative political, religious, and cultural stability within the territorially shrunken Byz. Empire had been restored. Under the auspices of the Macedonian dynasty, building began anew, though under very different circumstances. Given new cultural parameters and an altered social structure, an architecture emerged that showed marked signs of departure from the old tradition. Palaces and palace halls of this period reveal a fresh source of influence—Islamic art and architecture (see Islamic Influence on Byzantine Art). Aspects of Islamic impact can also be seen in the decorative vocabulary of Byz. architecture, now significantly expanded beyond its traditional, classicizing framework.

Church architecture also reveals other sources of external influence, for example, Armenia. Church types proliferated while undergoing considerable reductions in scale. The latter phenomenon has been viewed as the function of shrunken economic means and the reduced demand for space of a smaller population. Still, some fairly large churches, notably piered basilicas, continued to be built during this period. The frequent appearance of smaller, centralized, and domed churches, on the other hand, involved changes in
the shape of the liturgy and altered symbolic perceptions of the church building. Seen as a miniature version of the cosmos, the church functioned symbolically regardless of its size. Demands for space in churches during this period were generally solved not by increasing the volume of the naos but by adding lateral spaces and parekklesia. When built simultaneously with the church itself, these parekklesia, unlike the earlier mausoleums, were often carefully integrated aspects of a building's overall form. Thus, for example, the multiplication of domes on churches of this period was the direct by-product of multiple chapels planned integrally with the main church.

**Fifth Period (12th C.).** Notwithstanding the military setbacks and the resulting geopolitical changes that affected the empire during the last third of the 11th C., architectural activity in the Komnenian period displayed remarkable vitality, with Constantinople playing the role of central clearinghouse for architects, artisans, ideas, and materials. Formal characteristics, decorative features, and even structural techniques are shared by a very large number of buildings, many of which were built in the provinces and even beyond the frontiers of the empire. This phenomenon, which parallels a similar trend in Byz. painting, reflects an increasing mobility in the Mediterranean basin. Both can be related to a general increase in East-West cultural interaction.

**Sixth Period (13th C.).** The period of the Latin occupation of Constantinople (1204–61) saw the disappearance of the empire's hitherto preeminent architectural influence. Instead, architecture flourished in several new centers of the splintered empire (Nicaea, Trebizond, Arta), each displaying distinctive local architectural characteristics. The stylistic coherence of the Komnenian epoch gave way to a new diversity. Thus, the political decentralization of the empire left its lasting imprint on the development of Byz. architecture.

**Seventh Period (14th to 15th C.).** Following the Byz. recapture of Constantinople in 1261, the city once more became the premier center of architectural activity. In addition to the remodeling and expansion of existing buildings, a fair number of new churches, monastic buildings, and palaces were constructed, particularly during the last decade of the 13th C. and during the first two decades of the 14th C. Church architecture during this period perpetuated the tradition of small-scale construction. The major stylistic change came in the treatment of walls, which lost their tectonic qualities in favor of flat surfaces covered by decorative patterns. The same disregard for spatial-structural articulation also permeated interiors. Here flat wall surfaces carried several tiers of continuous horizontal bands of monumental painting broken up into numerous small individual scenes.

The civil wars of the 1320s and 1340s brought architectural activity in the capital to a virtual end. Constantinopolitan architectural style was transplanted elsewhere (e.g., Mesembria, Skopje and vicinity, Bursa), presumably by migrant workshops, which found themselves employed by Bulgarian, Serbian, and Ottoman patrons. A few centers, such as Thessalonike and Mistra, kept the local architectural traditions alive beyond the early demise of Byz. architectural production in Constantinople. (See also Constantinople, Monuments of.)


**ARCHITRAVE.** See Epistyle.

**ARCH OF CONSTANTINE,** the last major monument of ancient Rome, located between the Roman Forum and the Colosseum. It was probably begun in 312, directly after the victory of Constantine I at the Milvian Bridge, and completed by 315. It was dedicated to Constantine I and presumably paid for by the senate. A triple arch (see Arch, Monumental) faced in marble, it has engaged columns resting on bases that depict captives; in the spandrels are figures of Victory, while other personifications include the seasons and river gods. Friezes of Constantine's adlocutio and distribution of largess appear on the north side, his siege of Verona and the battle at the Milvian Bridge on the south. Spolia above these friezes and elsewhere on the monument are reliefs of the deeds of Trajan, Hadrian, and Marcus Aurelius with their heads recut. Inscriptions on either side of the central passage proclaim the emperor to be the liberator of the city and the source of peace. While this program, like that of
other Roman arches, celebrates imperial authority and victory, it has been read by Pierce (infra) as Constantine's appropriation of the achievements of earlier emperors. No recognizable Christian signs appear on the arch. Rather, Constantine and his victories are associated with the SOL INVICTUS whose image occurs four times. The style and iconography of the Constantinian parts of the monument are almost universally interpreted as harbingers of Byz. art.


—A.C.

ARCH OF GALERIUS. Located in Thessalonike, the Arch of Galerius is not a true monumental arch, but more properly part of a tetrastyle that was expanded into an octastyle through the addition of piers for secondary passageways. It was located between the Rotunda of St. George to the north and the palace of Galerius to the south; only the west side of the structure is partially preserved. The original monumental complex, which was probably domed, spanned an important street running east to west: the central passage of the arch crossed the roadway, while the two smaller side passages continued what were undoubtedly colonnaded walkways. It provided a monumental entrance and a point of transition between the city and the sacred area of the palace. The structure was begun in 299 and construction continued at least to 303. It was made of a core of irregular stone blocks, faced with marble revetment in its lower section and with brick above. Statues of the emperors presumably looked out from the top to east and west. It was of impressive size, with the keystone of the surviving central archway 12.28 m above the modern pavement; its width is 9.70 m.

The piers are covered with reliefs arranged in horizontal zones separated by bands decorated with ribbons or garlands. The sculptures depict and celebrate Galerius's victory over the Persians in 297. Various historical scenes can be identified, such as Galerius and Diocletian sacrificing, Galerius speaking to his troops, and the emperor victorious in battle; these scenes are not arranged in any particular order, however, and are mixed with generic scenes of processions and personifications of victories. The "arch" is a prime example of Tetrarchic art, with figures often outlined rather than carved in relief, little concern for scale, and a desire to fill every part of the surface with decoration.


ARCHON (ἀρχων), a word used in antiquity primarily to denote a magistrate. In Byz. archontes were synonymous with megistanes and dynatoi; the term signified any officials who possessed power. In the words of Symeon the Theologian, archontes were those who had honor (time) and power (arche); he further defined the strategoi and archontes as the emperor's servants and friends who—unlike the common people—had personal contact with the monarch. Some subordinates of high-ranking officials (e.g., strategoi) were also called archontes.

In a technical sense, archon designated first of all a governor. The 6th-C. TAKTIKON of Uspenski lists archontes of Crete, Dalmatia, Cyprus (a 9th-C. seal of an archon of Cyprus—Zacos, Seals 2, no.852), and so on, whereas seals of the 10th-12th C. mention archontes of certain towns, such as Kratiea and Klaudiopolis, Chrysopolis, Athens, Panion, etc.; accordingly the term archontia was employed to describe the district administered by an archon. The term could be applied also to independent princes, such as the archon of Rhosia (A.V. Soloviev, Byzantion 31 [1961] 237-44).


ARCHONTES TON ERGODOSION (ἀρχοντες των έργοδοσίων), directors of state ergasteria (see Factories, Imperial) that produced primarily silk, jewelry, and weapons. Seals of many archontes of silk workshops (tou blattiou) are dated to the 7th and 8th C. Archontes ton ergodosion were sometimes called ergasteriarchai and combined their functions with those of the kommerkiarioi. According to the Kletorologion of Philotheos, archontes, along
with the *meizoteroi* ("foremen") of workshops, belonged to the staff of the *eidikon*. On seals from the 9th C. onward they are often called *koura­tores*. A certain Thomas, *eskeptron blattion*, recorded on a 7th-C. seal, was probably not director of a single workshop, but of a group of textile manufacturers. The office of the *archon* of the *chryschoeion* (gold workshop) is also known; his relationship to the *archon* of the *charage* is unclear.

**LIT.** Laurent, Corpus 2:323–43. 708f. Kazhdan, Derevnya i gorod 338–42. –A.K.

**ARCHONTOPoulos** (ἀρχοντόπουλος), according to Anna Komnene (An.Komn. 2:108.20), a term invented by Alexios I, meaning "a son of an archon." The *tagma* of *archontopouloi* was created in 1090/1 and consisted of about 2,000 young men, the sons of soldiers who had fallen in battle. The *tagma* is not attested in sources after the reign of Alexios (Hohlweg, Beiträge 52). The term *archontopoulos* (also, neut. pl. *archontopoula*; in an act of 1478, fem. *archontopoulai*—MM 3:260.2) was a generic designation of the nobility of second rank: thus Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, in a chrysobull of 1346, speaks of his *archontes* and *archontopouloi* who served as his administrators (Zogr., no.37.49). *Archontes* and *archontopouloi* are known also in Venetian Crete (Jacoby, Recherches, pt.I [1976], 23f). In 1261 a group of *archontopouloi* were to receive *exaleimmata* and other properties in the Macander valley with an "appropriate monetary posotes" for the sake of their *oikonomia*; thus, evidently in the form of a *pronoia* (Patmou Engrapha 2, no.66.3–4). Before 1348, *archontopouloi* in Serres seized a monastic *metochion* with its *proskathemenoi* (Kouloum., no.21.3). *Archontopouloi* are also attested in the Morea, Trebizond, and Epiros.


**ARCOSOLUM** (term found only in Christian Lat. inscriptions, lit. an arch over a throne or urn), an arched niche, usually for a *tomb*, carved out of or built in front of a wall. Such recesses are known as early as the 3rd C.; in 4th-C. *cat­acombs* the tympanum beneath the arch often received painted decoration. Carved *arcosolia* were esp. favored in Palaiologan Constantinople (South Church of Lips Monastery); the most lavish examples are the hoods over the tombs in the Chora Monastery.

**LIT.** J. Kollwitz, RAC 1:643–45. –A.C.

**ARCRUNI,** or Artsruni, an Armenian princely lineage, some of whose members settled in Byz. territory in the early 11th C. A 12th-C. continuator of the Armenian chronicle by Thomas Arcruni (ca.900), the *History of the House of the Arcruni*, relates that the resettlement was smooth and peaceful: the Arcruni received lands, towns, and high titles (*Thomas Artsruni: History of the House of the Artsruni*, tr. R. Thomson [Detroit 1985] 370f). They retained the Gregorian creed. Senekerim (*Σεναχηρίμα*) Arcruni, last king of Vaspurakan, became *strategos* of Cappadocia in 1021 or 1022 and lord (? of Sebasteia and other towns and estates (Skyl. 354f). His son David helped suppress the rebellion of Nikephoros Phokas (1022) and was rewarded with Caesarea, Tzamandas, and other lands (H. Berberian, Byzantian 8 [1933] 553); he inherited Sebasteia after his father's death in 1025. David's successor, his brother Atom (Ašot), ruled Sebasteia from 1035; in 1079/80 Atom sided with Gagik of Kars in a feud against the local Greek lords of the Mandales in a futile attempt to rescue Gagik of Ani.

Other Armenian nobles who moved to Byz. simultaneously with Senekerim Arcruni include his nephew (?) Derenik and another relative, Abelgharib Arcruni. The latter received Sis, Adana, and several other towns. Circa 1080 his residence was Tarsos, and he apparently adopted the Chalcedonian creed. Probably some Arcrunis entered the Byz. ruling elite and took the family name of Senacherim: THEOPHYLAKTOS of Ohrid (ep. 77.22–23) complained of Senacherim "the Assyrian" who originated from Mesopotamia; Alexios I entrusted Theodore Senacherim with distributing lands among monasteries (*Xénoph.,* no.1.92–93). It is unclear whether Senacherim, an early 13th-C. general, and (another?) Senacherim, governor of Nikopolis (Epiros) in 1204, were related to this family.

**LIT.** Kazhdan, Arm. 33–36. –A.K.

**ARCULF.** See ADOMNAN.
ARDABOURIOS (Ἀρδαβούριος), consul (447); magister militum of the East and patriarch under Marcian; died Constantinople 471. Oldest son of Aspar the Alan, he commanded troops in both East and West and reportedly helped his father secure the elevation of Leo I. In 459 he sent a detachment of Gothic soldiers to guard the corpse of St. Symeon the Stylite the Elder. In 465/6, when Leo accused Ardabourios of entering treasonable correspondence with the Persians, he was deprived of his rank (vita of Daniel the Stylite, 55). After he instigated an open revolt in Thrace in 469/70, he and his father were executed; his brothers Patrikios and Ermanaric survived. His grandson was Areobindus, consul in 506.


-T.E.G.

AREIA, MONASTERY OF, called Hagia Mone or Nea Mone, was founded near Nauplia shortly before 1143 by Leo, bishop of Argos and Nauplia (ca.1143–ca.1157), who was a nephew of Constantine Antzas (see Anzas). Leo originally established the monastery, dedicated to the Virgin, at Areia (Ἀρεία) as a convent for 36 nuns. Circa 1143, however, he was forced by the threat of pirate raids to move the nuns farther inland to a new convent that he built at Bouze. He then installed 36 monks at Areia. In Oct. 1143, Leo composed a memorandum (hypomnemata) in which he guaranteed the monastery’s independent status. He also prepared a typikon, based on that of Studios, but more lenient in some of its provisions; for example, he urged the monks to bathe weekly and permitted two meals daily during the fast days preceding the feast of the Holy Apostles, “because the days are longer.” In 1212 the region of Nauplia was occupied by the Franks, and in 1389 it came under Venetian control, but the monastery remained in the hands of Orthodox monks. It retained its independence until 1679, when it became a metochion of the Holy Sepulchre.

The cross-in-square monastic church, dedicated to the Zoódochos Pege (Life-giving Source), was completed by 1149, the date of a dedicatory plaque that names Leo as ktetor. Built of brick on a high foundation, it is decorated on the exterior with marble crosses and maeander friezes, like Membaka and other churches in Argolis. Of its interior ornament little remains save for the elaborate composite capitals of the four columns beneath the dome.


ARENGA. See Acts, Documentary.

AREOBINDUS (Ἀρεόβινδος), more fully Flavius Areobindus Dagalaiaphus Areobindus; died after 512. He was the grandson of Ardabourios and the son of Dagalaiaphus and Godisthea, and thus an Alan; in 478/9 he married Anicia Juliana, daughter of the Western emperor Olybrius. Despite the fall of his family in 471, Areobindus had a distinguished military career, serving as magister militum of the East in 503–04, along with Hypatios and Keler. At this time he withstood a Persian invasion and devastated Persian Armenia. He served as consul in 506. In 512 the opposition to Anastasios I sought to make Areobindus emperor, but he had already gone into hiding. Five examples of his consular diplomas are preserved.

Lit. PLRE 2:143f.

ARETHAS, Arab martyred ca.520 in Najran; saint; feastday 24 Oct. When the judaizing Himyarite king, Yūṣuf, came to power ca.520, he wanted—according to the sources—to stamp out Christianity in South Arabia, esp. at Najran. Arethas, the chief of Najran, resisted the overtures of Yūṣuf to surrender the city, but was finally overruled by his counselors. Yūṣuf violated the terms of the capitulation and asked the Christians to apostasize. Those who refused were martyred, among them Arethas, who was decapitated. A hagiographical version of his speech before death is preserved. The martyrdom of Arethas and his companions had far-reaching consequences. It convulsed the Christian Orient and occasioned a successful Byz.-Ethiopian expedition (see Axum) against South Arabia to avenge the martyrs. The Ethiopian king made Arethas’s son chief of Najran and built three churches there, one of which was dedicated to the “Holy Martyrs and the Glorious Arethas.” Arethas and his companions were moderate Monophysites close to the views of Severos of Antioch. A possible echo of

162 ARDABOURIOS
the martyrdoms of Najran may be detected in chapter 85 of the Qur’an.

Representation in Art. Illustrations of ten episodes of this story accompany an 11th-C. MS with the passio of Arethas by Symeon Metaphrastes (Athos, Esphig. 14, fols. 196r–198v; Treasures 2, pl.212f): the city of Najran besieged, the Christians outside its walls taken into slavery, and the city opening its gates to Yusuf, etc. There are occasional representations of just the beheading of the elderly bearded nobleman and his companions (e.g., Menologion of Basil II, p.135), but Arethas is otherwise rarely represented.


ARETHAS (al-Hārith), king of the Ghassānids (529–69), son of Jabala; not to be confused with Arethas, the king of Kinda. Around 529 Justinian I put him in command of almost all the Arab foederati in Oriens and thus centralized federate power. As supreme phylarch Arethas fought for Byz. in all its eastern wars. He participated regularly in the two Persian Wars of Justinian’s reign, distinguishing himself at the battle of Kallinikos and in the campaign of 541 in “Assyria.” He fought his Lakhmids adversaries on various occasions and finally defeated Alamundarus of Hira at a battle near Chalkis in 554. He also conducted punitive expeditions in the Arabian peninsula. A staunch Monophysite, Arethas contributed substantially to the revival of the Monophysite church in Oriens. He was instrumental in the consecration of Jacob Baradaeus and Theodore as bishop ca.540. He also defended Monophysitism against teachings such as the alleged Tritheism of Eugenios and Konon. In recognition of his services to the empire, Arethas was made gloriosissimus; he was also patrikios.


ARETHAS OF CAESAREA, scholar and politician, archbishop of Caesarea (from 902); born in Patras mid-9th C., died after 932 (according to Beck [Kirche 591], not before 944). During the struggle over the tetragamy of Leo VI, Arethas first supported Nicholas I Mystikos, then sided with the emperor. As theologian Arethas produced a commentary on the Apocalypse (based primarily on that of Andrew of Caesarea) and other exegetical works. Deeply interested in antiquity, Arethas acquired a large library, commissioning some MSS, adding scholia to others. Some scholia form a polemical dialogue with the author, some allude to contemporary affairs: criticism of the luxury at Basil I’s court, ridicule of Stylianos Zaboutzes, references to the war with Bulgaria, or the dispute over the tetragamy. Some of Arethas’s letters expressed his views on Leo’s marriage (Jenkins, Studies, pt.VII [1956], 293–372). In others he discussed the books he had read (Č. Milovanović, ZbFilozFak 14.1 [Belgrade 1979] 59–67). He also wrote homilies and pamphlets. One, esp. vitriolic, accused Leo Choriophaktes of pagan beliefs. The attribution of some of his writings still remains disputable; Jenkins (Studies, pt.XI [1963], 168) rejected and P. Karlin-Hayter (Byzantion 35 [1965] 455–81) defended Arethas’s authorship of the letter to a Saracen emir; J. Koder (JÖB 25 [1976] 75–80) saw in Arethas the author of the Chronicle of Monemvasia.

Arethas has been severely judged by modern scholars as “a narrow-minded, bad-hearted man” (R. Jenkins, Byzantium: The Imperial Centuries [London 1966] 219) and his style criticized as turgid; in fact Arethas rejected the ideal of plain speech, and consciously ornamented his vocabulary “with proverbs, quotations, allusions, and poetic lines, like multi-colored mosaic cubes” (Westerink, infra 5:189,26–31), thus paving the way for the revival of Byz. rhetoric.


ARGOLID (‘Αργολίς), area of the northeastern Peloponnesos divided into two distinct regions: a rich central plain and a mountainous perimeter. The main city was Argos, but in late antiquity Epidaurus, Methana, Troizen, and Hermione also had civic status. Remains of that date, both ecclesiastical and secular, are attested from these sites (on Epidaurus, see Krautheimer, ECBArch 118,
ARGOS

ARGYROPOULOS, JOHN, writer and teacher in Constantinople and Italy; born Constantinople? ca. 1399/4 (Canivet-Oikonomides) or ca. 1415? (Cammelli), died Rome 26 June 1487. Argyropoulos (Ἀργυρόπουλος) is first attested as a member of the Byz. delegation to the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438/9. From 1441 to 1443 he studied at the University of Padua, learning fluent Latin and earning a degree in letters and medicine; at the same time he gave private Greek lessons. He returned to Constantinople, and by 1448 was teaching at the Mouseion of the XENON OF THE KRAL; a pro-Unionist, he had converted to Catholicism by this time as well. After the fall of Constantinople, he emigrated in 1456 to Florence, where for 15 years he taught Greek philosophy, primarily Aristotle and to a lesser extent Plato. His students included Lorenzo de' Medici. He is credited with shifting the interests of Florentine humanists from rhetoric to the metaphysical philosophy of Plato. In 1471 he moved to Rome, where he joined the curia of Pope Sixtus IV, then under the leadership of Bessarion. With the exception of a four-year residence in Florence (1477–81), he spent the rest of his life in Rome as teacher and translator.

Argyropoulos made Latin translations of Aristotle (the Nicomachean Ethics), Porphyry, and Basil the Great. His own writings, in both Latin and Greek, were varied: his rhetorical works include a monody for Emp. John VIII (Lampros, Pal. kai Pel. 3:313–19), three orations to Constantine XI., and an introduction to the Progymnasmata of Apollonios. In theology, he composed treatises on the Holy Spirit and the Council of Florence (PG 158:991–1008), and 12 short erotapokriseis. P. Canivet and N. Oikonomides (Diptycha 3 [1982–83] 5–97) have proposed that Argyropoulos is the author of an invective against a certain Katablatas.


ARGYROKASTRON (Ἀργυρόκαστρον, mod. Gjirokastra in Albania), on the left bank of the River Drino, strongly fortified city, known only from the 14th to 15th C. In 1338–39 Argyrokonstron supported Andronikos III but later it was in Albanian hands; in 1418 it fell to the Turks under Hamza Beg and served as a Turkish stronghold against Albanian resistance. The surviving fortifications, much rebuilt in early modern times, are Byz., and pottery of the 12th–13th C. has been found.

LIT. Tib 3:11f. —T.E.G.
ARGYROPRA'TES (ἀργυροπράτης, lit. "seller of silver," Lat. argentarius), term that in the 6th C. primarily designated a moneylender. *Argyropratai* were known in Alexandria and other large cities, but the *argyropratai* of Constantinople were esp. rich and influential. Their private activities (lending money at 8 percent interest, mediating in the sale of precious objects, guaranteeing payment of debts) were combined with various state functions that enabled some of them to acquire significant wealth and exercise political influence. Several seals of *argyropratai* (some of them collective, belonging to two men) dated to the 7th–8th C. imply that their official activity continued long after Justinian I, who devoted three special laws to *argyropratai*. Some *argyropratai*, like Julianus "Argentarius," were wealthy enough to build churches. The function of the *argyroprates* as a moneylender is still found in the 9th-C. Basilike.

The term *argyroprates* also designated a vendor of gold and silver. The 10th-C. *Book of the Eparch* (ch.2) describes the guild of the *argyropratai* as primarily concerned with the sale of gold and silver objects, of bullion, and of precious stones. It is unclear, however, to what extent these 10th-C. *argyropratai* functioned as craftsmen (see jewelers). Although there is one reference in the *Book of the Eparch* to the *argyroprates* serving as a money changer (ch.2.9), most of their financial operations seem to have been shifted to the *trapezai* or bankers, who formed a separate guild. The term *argyroprates* virtually disappears after the 10th C.


- A.K., A.C.

**ARGYROS**, son of Melo of Bari; magistros, vestes, and dox of Italy, Calabria, Sicily, and Paphlagonia (1051–58); born ca.1000, died after 1058, possibly Bari 1068. During Melo's first revolt, Argyros and his mother were sent to Constantinople. Returning to Italy in 1029, Argyros repeatedly rebelled against the Byz., in 1042 with Norman assistance. When his opponent, the *katepano* George Maniakes, tried to usurp the Byz. throne, Argyros went over to the emperor (Sept. 1042). Summoned to Constantinople in 1045, he assisted in defeating Leo Tornikios, but quarreled with Patr. Michael I Kouroularios. In 1051 he returned to Bari, as its first Lombard governor. To halt the Normans, he sought an alliance with Pope Leo IX. The alliance materialized, but in 1053 Argyros and Leo were separately defeated and the pope taken prisoner. From captivity, Leo sent Cardinal Humbert to Kouroularios. Humbert's embassy (1054) visited Bari, and eventually Kouroularios claimed Argyros had forged offensive papal letters and had Argyros's son and son-
ARGYROS, ISAAC, mathematician, astronomer, and theologian; born Thrace? between 1300 and 1310, died ca.1375. A student of Nikephoros Gregoras, the monk Argyros was the leading Byz. champion of Ptolemaic astronomy in the 1360s and 1370s. He wrote a Construction of New Tables and a Construction of New Tables of Conjunctions and Oppositions (of the sun and moon), for both of which the epoch is 1 Sept. 1367. In them he recomputes for the Roman calendar and the longitude of Constantinople the mean motions of the sun, moon, and planets, and the syzygies that Ptolemy had tabulated in the Almagest according to the Egyptian calendar and the longitude of Alexandria. These tables were soon plagiarized and criticized by John Abramiós (Pингree, “Astrological School” 1961). In 1367/8 Argyros wrote a treatise on the astrolabe (ed. Delatte, AnecdAth 2:236–53), closely based on the similar treatise of Gregoras. In late 1372 he dedicated a work on the computus (PG 19:1279–1316) to Andronikos Oinaiotes (A. Mentz, Beiträge zur Osterfestberechnung bei den Byzantinern [Kónigsberg 1906] 27–29); in this work he indicates that he was at Ainos in Thrace in 1318 (Mercati, Notizie 233–36). He also wrote scholia on Theon, but did not write, as has been alleged, the anonymous Instructions for the Persian Tables.

Argyros's mathematical works include one on the square roots of nonsquare numbers (A. Allard, Centaurus 22 [1978] 1–43); a treatise based on Heron’s Geometrics concerning the reduction of nonright to right triangles and other geometrical problems, composed in 1367/8; and a Method of Geodesy, also based on Heron (J.L. Heiberg, Heronis Alexandrini Opera, vol. 5 [Leipzig 1914] xcvi–cii). He also wrote scholia to Ptolemy’s Geography and edited with scholia his Harmonics (I. Düring, Die Harmonielehre des Claudios Ptolemaios [Götëborg 1930] xxxiii, lxvi).

Like Gregoras, Argyros supported Barlaam of Calabria in the Palamite controversy. He wrote three anti-Palamite treatises, including an attack on Theodore Dexios’s concept of the light on Mt. Tabor (M. Candal, OrChrP 23 [1957] 80–113).


LIT. Mercati, Notizie 229–46, 270–82. PLP, no.1285. —D.P.

ARIOANDIA, in Greek mythology daughter of Minos and spouse of Theseus; after Theseus had deserted her, she married Dionysos. Nonnos of Panopolis, in the 47th book of his Dionysiaka, concentrates on the sudden transformation of the abandoned and lamenting Ariadne into the happy bride of her “heavenly wooer” and describes her triumphal wedding; when in the battle against Perseus Ariadne was turned into stone (petrodes ymphphe), Nonnos notes that she was happy in her death “because she found one so great to slay her” and because she was taken up to the heavens. The idea of happiness through death was important for the world view of the 5th C. Malalas emphasized another aspect of the myth of Ariadne: he eliminates the theme of Ariadne’s romantic attraction to Theseus, made her the wife promised him by the Cretans if he destroyed the Minotaur, and finally claimed that she retired to “the temple of Zeus” (instead of marrying Dionysos).

The name Ariadne was popular in the late Roman period. Leo I’s daughter Ariadne became an empress, and a legend tells of a saint Ariadne, a young bond-maid in Phrygia who fled from persecutions and found a happy death disappearing into a rock (petra).


ARIOANDIA, more fully Aelia Ariadne, augusta; born before 457, died Constantinople end of 515. The elder daughter of Emp. Leo I and Verina, Ariadne married Zeno in 466/7 and Anastasios I on 20 May 491. Since Leo had no sons, Ariadne’s marriages served to perpetuate the dynasty. Her union with Zeno also signified Leo’s alliance with the Isaurians against Aspar and marked an important point in the growth of anti-Germanic sentiment in Constantinople. Upon the death of Leo (474), her son Leo II became emperor but soon died, leaving power in Zeno’s hands. Ariadne may
have been involved in the revolt of Basiliskos and sought to soften Zeno's anger against her mother in the aftermath. When Zeno died in 491 Ariadne dominated the court and chose Anastasios I to succeed him.

An unusually large number of portraits of Ariadne survive in marble and ivory, a fact to be explained perhaps by her dominance over her consorts and repeated status as sole heir to the imperial office (Age of Spirit., nos. 24–25).


T.E.G., A.C.

ARIANISM, subordinationist heresy that denied the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son: it was named for its main proponent Arius. Arianism involved a dispute about the relationship of members of the Trinity: it taught that the Son was not coeternal with the Father but was created by him from nothing. This preserved the monarchy of the Father and a strict monotheism but raised problems concerning salvation since the sacrifice of a Christ who was less than fully God might prevent the genuine deification (theosis) of mankind. Arianism arose in Alexandria, where it was condemned by the bishop Alexander; it gained many adherents, however, throughout the East, including Eusebius of Nikomedea. At the Council of Nicaea in 325 the Orthodox party, led by Athanasios of Alexandria, was successful in securing the acceptance of a declaration that Christ was homoousios with the Father, which resulted in the condemnation of Arianism. Emp. Constantine I, who at first supported the decisions of Nicaea, soon began to waver; the exiled Arians were recalled in 328 and many Orthodox bishops, including Athanasios, were banished.

Constantius II openly supported Arianism and persecuted the Orthodox; several councils in the East attempted to heal the rift through a variety of compromises. As a result several forms of Arianism developed. Most extreme were the Anomoians, who emphasized the difference between the Father and the Son, but the Homoians, the Homoiousians, and the Pneumatomachi represented other variations; prominent Arian spokesmen included Aetios and Eunomios. The struggle between Arians and Orthodox also reflected rivalry among various bishops, esp. those of Constantinople and Alexandria; Arianism may have been a particularly important urban phenomenon in the East, esp. in Constantinople, and the social orientation of Arian monks may help explain the movement's initial success.

After the death of Constantius II Orthodoxy gained ascendency in the West, although in the East the emperor Valens was an Arian. The final victory of Orthodoxy came under Theodosios I at the Council of Constantinople in 381 (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF), and the sect slowly disappeared from the East. In the West, Arianism remained a pressing problem since many Germanic tribes had been converted by Arian missionaries and this religious difference long remained the line between Romania and Germania.

Later legends often dwell on the heinous behavior of the Arians. An unknown chronicler Ankyrianos (sometimes but groundlessly identified as Neilos of Ankyra) was quoted as stating that the Arians burned portraits of the 4th-C. bishops of Constantinople displayed at the Milion (see Mese) together with an image of the Virgin and Child (Parastaseis 68.13–70.2); later MS illustrations show them burning Orthodox churches (Omont, Miniatures, pl.LII). John of Damascus (Imag. 3:90.33–43, ed. Kotter, Schriften 3:183), reports, referring to Theodore Lector (HE 131), that an emperor (the name, Anastasios, may be an insertion of John) commissioned a painting showing the death of the Arian Olympios who had insulted the Trinity. As late as the Theodore Psalter (Der Nersessian, L'illustration II, fig.176), the Arians are depicted as opponents of Orthodox beliefs.

Source. H.G. Opitz, Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites (Berlin 1934).


T.E.G., A.C.
ruler, perhaps al-Ḥakam II (961–76). A practicing physician, he wrote on various medical subjects. He was deemed a competent philologist, and his astronomical, meteorological, and agricultural calendar was incorporated into the so-called Calendar of Cordoba.

His best-known work was a history epitomizing the annals of al-Ṭabarī and continuing the narrative into the 960s. Most of this work is apparently lost, but the MS Gotha 261 has been identified as the section for the years 903–32. This text focuses on Iraq, Spain, and North Africa, but includes no less than 12 accounts of conflicts with Byz. along the Thughūr (see 'Awāsim and Thughūr) as well as a brief report on a maritime expedition organized from al-Fustāt in 931. It also discusses diplomatic negotiations and Byz. embasies to Baghdad in 907 and 917.


ARILJE, a monastery in the western Serbian town of the same name, the seat of the Serbian bishops of Moravica. The main church, dedicated to St. Achilleios of Larissa, was founded by the Nemanjīd ruler Stefan Dragutin, the elder son of Stefan Uroš I, before 1296. Its essentially Byz. church plan has a single nave with short cross arms for the choir, a dome on a pendentives, a tripartite sanctuary, and a narthex. Its façade is decorated with a row of shallow arcades under the roof. According to a fragmentary inscription preserved in the drum of the dome, the frescoes were painted in 1296. To the traditional elements of a Byz. church program were added depictions of the Tree of Jesse, church councils, the Sacrifice of Abraham, the life of St. Nicholas (Sevcenko, Ni­cholas 40, 236–40), and the figure of a winged John the Baptist as well as portraits of Serbian bishops and archbishops (G. Babić in Savva Neman­jić 322–24) and members of the Nemanjīd dynasty. The style shows many features typical of Palaiologan art (see Monumental Painting), although certain mistakes in anatomy, the very strong contours that delineate both the figures and the painted architecture, and the relatively dark colors distinguish these frescoes from the best Constantinopolitan achievements of the time. The painters of Arilje were probably Greeks from Thessalonike: an inscription on a window soffit reads “MARPOU,” a Thessalonikan political slogan referring to Michael VIII (cf. Djurić, infra, and Pachym., ed. Failler, 1:48 n.2, 49.4). The painters’ evident preference for figural relief over the color harmonies favored by the previous generation (the Constantinopolitan artists working at Sopočani) also suggests a Thessalonikan origin for these frescoes.


ARISTAINETOS (Ἀρισταίνητος), fictitious author of two books of letters, probably written ca.520 (O. Mazzal, JOB 26 [1977] 1–5). The subject is sexual passion, treated in a variety of ways—as miniature romance, dialogue, description, etc. The style is rhetorical and full of quotations from earlier writers (Alkiphron, Menander, Plato, Lucian, etc., none later than about the 3rd C.). These are apparently known extensively and at first hand, a valuable indication of the literary works current in the early 6th C. and of the tastes of the time.


ARISTAKES LASTIVERTČI, 11th-C. Armenian historian. Aristakes came from Lastivert, near Erzurum; of his life nothing is known. His History of Armenia, describing the period 1000–72, is of particular value for Byz. expansion into Armenia, the collapse of the Bagratid dynasty, the invasions of the Seljuk Turks, and the eventual loss of eastern Anatolia. His attitude to Byz. is ambivalent: he often laments the misfortunes brought upon Armenia by foreign nations, but he blames the Armenians' own sins rather than Byz. malice. For the collapse of Armenian unity in the face of Byz. and Turkish invasions he blames the heresy of the Tondrakites, a group also attacked by Gregory Magistros.

ARISTEIDES, AILIOS, rhetorician of the Second Sophistic; born 117 or 129, died ca.189. In the discussion of the relative values of philosophy and rhetoric, Aristeides took a clear stand against Plato and asserted the primacy of Rhetoric. This probably was one of the causes of his popularity in Byz., where his works were copied (one of the best MSS was commissioned by Arethas of Caesarea) and provided with scholia. The Neoplatonist Olympiodorus of Alexandria polemized against Aristeides, not only in defending Plato but also, in a political context, while attacking the idea of democracy (F. Lenz, Opuscula selecta [Amsterdam 1972] 129–34). Aristeides was esp. often used by late Byz. authors such as Planudes, Thomas Magistros, and Chortasmenos; Theodora Raoulaina copied a MS of his Orationes. Metochites wrote a comparison of Demosthenes and Aristeides, arguing that the latter rivaled the more ancient orator in his mastery of eloquence and was superior to Demosthenes with regard to his moral and political attitude.


ARISTENOS ('Arístēnōs), a family of civil functionaries, mostly judicial. In the 12th C. Nikephoros Basilakes considered them a well-known lineage (A. Garzya, ByzF 1 [1966] 100.147–49); George Tornikios stated that they were famous not for their worldly brilliance but for piety (Darrouzès, Tornikés 176f). The Aristenoi are known from the mid-11th C. when at least two of them corresponded with Psellos. Gregory Aristenos, a judge at the trial of John Italos, is probably to be identified with his homonym, the proedros of 1094 (Gautier, "Blachernes" 258). Alexios Aristenos was an ecclesiastical official and canonist (see Aristenos, Alexios). Basil served as judge in 1196 (MM 4:305,12–13). Several Aristenoi are known only by their seals: an eparch (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.1036); a judge (no.901); Michael, the logothetes tou dromou (no.439); Basil, the parathalassites (no.1132). The family did not survive the fall of Constantinople in 1204.

ARISTOCRACY, ALEXIOS, mid-12th-C. canonist. Under Emp. John II Komnenos, Aristenos wrote a commentary on the Nomokanon (A. Pavlov, ŽMNP 309 [Jan. 1896] 172f) that probably antedated that of Zonaras. He fulfilled both ecclesiastical (proteidikos, skewophylax, megas oikonomas) and secular (nomophylax, dikaiodotes, orphanotrophos) functions. Since this combination was considered an infraction of canon law, the Council at Constantinople in 1157 required Aristenos to relinquish the position of dikaiodotes (see under Constantinople, Councils of). He was still alive at the time of Nikephoros, patriarch of Jerusalem (ca.1166–71). Nikephoros Basilakes wrote a panegyric of Aristenos. He was also close to Prodromos.

ED. Rhalles-Poties, Syntagma 2–4, or PG 137–38 (together with Zonaras and Balsamon).


ARISTOCRACY, a fluid concept in modern scholarship, usually denoting the ruling class, but equally applicable to those exerting moral and cultural as well as political leadership. The Byz. tended to avoid the words aristoi and aristokratia in favor of eugenés, literally "well-born," emphasizing the concepts of honorable ancestry and high-minded spiritual and moral qualities. The Byz. were ambivalent about what it meant to be "well-born." Scholarly debate has reflected this uncertainty. At one extreme, P. Bezobrazov (Otěrki vizantijskoj kul'tury [Petrograd 1919] 12) argued that Byz. had neither an aristocracy of noble origin nor a recognized nobility with strict privileges; at the other extreme, R. Guillard (BS 9 [1948] 15) claimed that Byz. always made a clear distinction between the old hereditary nobility and the nobility of rank and title.

It seems that the aristocracy of the late Roman era, an old landowning gentry with large estates worked by coloni, disappeared in the East with the crises of the 7th C. During the 7th–9th C. almost nothing survived that could be called a hereditary nobility but, then, from the mid-9th C. we see the rise of aristocratic families made up of landlords and military magnates, deriving their power from the theme organization, particularly in the frontier zones of Asia Minor or the northern Balkans. These became the dynatoi of 10th-
ARISTON AND DEIPNON, ancient terms designating midday and evening meals, respectively. The clear distinction between the two was lost in Byz., and Psellus reports that he taught his students the meaning of the word ariston (ἄριστον). Eustathios of Thessalonike, in his Commentary on Homer, sometimes identifies deipnon (δείπνον) as the evening, sometimes as the morning meal; ariston, he says, had the general meaning of meal. Nikephoros Bryennios (Bryn. 191.23–24) used ariston and deipnon interchangeably, as synonyms. Other sources, including monastic tytika, are more specific and distinguish ariston as the earlier and deipnon as the later meal. Monks ate their ariston after the orthros; sometimes it was their only meal. Laymen did not eat their first meal until midday: John II Komnenos is said to have had the ariston after hunting, and Niketas Choniates ridicules the emperors who were served an early deipnon. Nicholas Mesarites describes ariston as a noontime meal that included bread, wine, fish, meat, and vegetables (A. Heisenberg, Quellen und Studien zur spätbyzantinischen Geschichte [London 1973] pt.II, 3, pp. 41.35–42.2). The austere Ke­kaumenos (Kek. 224.21–22) recommended a large ariston and no deipnon. The anonymous author of On Food advises eating a full meal at noon and only bread and wine for deipnon (PhysMedGr 2:194.1–195.9).


ARISTOPHANES (Ἀριστοφάνης). Greek comic poet; born Athens ca.445 B.C., died Athens ca.388. The oldest MS to transmit Aristophanes’ 11 extant plays is of the late 10th C. At the same period, his life was recorded in the Souda along with some 5,000 entries from his text and scholia. Systematic study of Aristophanes began in the 12th C. with the extensive commentaries of John Tzetzes and continued in the 14th C. with the annotated editions by Thomas Magistros and Demetrios Triklinios. MS evidence shows that the plays selectively studied were Wealth, The Clouds, and The Frogs, with Wealth dominant because of its edifying message.

Known as “the Comic” (ho komikos), Aristophanes was considered the foremost standard for the Attic dialect (Gregory PardoS, ed. Schäfer, 6f). The wide range of his language and style as
well as the historical information in his plays undoubtedly caused his popularity with Byz. scholars and teachers who, it must be noted, made no attempt to expurgate his text. Tzetzes' judgment is particularly interesting: he criticizes Aristophanes' unfair treatment of Socrates but (Massa Positano et al., infra 2:377.1–10) admires Aristophanes' opposition to war and approves wholeheartedly of its obscenity when it serves to promote the noble cause of peace.


—A.C.H.

ARISTOTLE, ancient Greek philosopher; born 384 B.C., died 322. Byz. higher education always centered on the study of Aristotle. His works have been transmitted in over 1,000 MSS dated between the 9th and 16th C., making him by far the most widely copied ancient Greek author; he is also the most commented on. In the early period, interest in Aristotle was particularly strong at the school of Alexandria, where Ammonios and Olympiodoros of Alexandria managed to present philosophy in a way that avoided trouble with the church. Elias of Alexandria and David the Philosopher, who succeeded Olympiodoros as head of the Alexandrian school, were also commentators on Aristotle, as was John Philoponos. Compared to Plato, Aristotle was safer and of greater use to the Orthodox because parts of his system could be put directly to the service of theological discussion. After the 7th C., attention was concentrated on the logical treatises, which became the basis of philosophical studies. From then on the average educated Byz. had direct contact with Aristotle consisted of learning the main concepts of the Organon, beginning with the Categories and ending with Sophistical Refutations. At the same time, interest in the nonlogical works of Aristotle was never fully lost, and in the chain of commentators, which stretches unbroken from Photios in the 9th C. to John Chortasmenos in the 15th, several, through exegesis or paraphrase, made themselves and their students familiar with other parts of the Corpus. Striking examples are Psellos, who composed a commentary on the Physics, Michael of Ephesus, who commented on most parts of the Corpus including the zoological treatises, and Theodore Metochites, whose contributions to philosophical studies included paraphrases of the Parva naturalia. (See also John Italos and Eustratios of Nicaea.)

Aristotle and the Church Fathers. While the Alexandrian school made a serious study of Aristotle in the 4th–6th C., church fathers, esp. those of the Latin West, were cautious in their approach to Peripatetic philosophy; Jerome emphasized that it was heretics who cited Aristotle. In the East, Eusebius of Caesarea refuted various points of Aristotelian teaching, but some theologians (esp. Nemestos) drew upon Aristotle; Aristotelian logic became an important vehicle of argumentation in the Cappadocian fathers, and John of Damascus used Aristotle to build his system of Christian doctrine. The major points of Peripatetic philosophy that Byz. theologians found unacceptable were Aristotle's rejection of divine Providence as a decisive factor directing the universe; the concept that the god is physically represented in the fifth element, the ether, so that the god was reduced to the "soul of the world" that moves material things; the idea that visible things are coeternal with the god; and the doctrine of the mortality of the human soul, while only the nous (mind, intelligence) remained immortal.


—J.D., A.K.

ARITHMOS (ἀριθμός, lit. "number"), or poson, in documents from the mid-10th to mid-12th C. a fiscal term referring to the specific number of PAROKIKOS (or DOLOPOIKIKOS) families granted by the emperor to an individual or an ecclesiastical corporation. This number served as a means of quantifying a grant and could not be reduced or increased without imperial approval. In a chry-
suboll of 1148, Manuel I emphatically prohibited apósoz grants of paraioíkoí, that is, without indication of “number” (Zépos, Jus 1:377–26–27). Nikephoros III, in a chrysooboll of 1079, emphasized that the specific aríthmos could be increased or maintained only from the children and grandchildren of the douloí paraioíkoí of the monastery that received the grant (Laura 1, no.38.24–26); a similar formula is found in a charter of Manuel I of 1156—the poßen of 12 paraioíkoí was to be preserved, after the death of one of them, by drawing from their children (L. Petit, IRAIK 6[1900] 32.19–21). This meant that one and only one son (or grandson) of a peasant who was included in an aríthmos would replace his father in that role; the state could deprive the landowner of peasants above the aríthmos.

The fiscal and economic character of grants of an aríthmos as well as the status and obligations of paraioíkoí within an aríthmos are poorly understood. Although Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 2:63.14–15) uses aríthmos once to refer to the sizes of pronoía grants, the concept of aríthmos was superseded after the 12th C. by that of poßen, in which the object quantified was not the number of persons but the sum of endowed tax. In a charter of 1385 the monastery of St. Paul was granted not an aríthmos of peasants but all the “natural (phýskoi) paraioíkoí” of a certain area (A. Kazhdan, VizVrem 2[1949] 321). (For aríthmos as the term for a military unit, see VIGLA.)


ARİUS (Ἀρίους), theologian, founder of Ariantism; born Libya? ca.250, died Constantinople 336. A student of LUCIAN OF ANTIOCH, after ordination as a priest he became a popular preacher in Alexandria, and ca.318 his teachings began to excite controversy. Because he said that Christ was not coeternal with the Father, Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, condemned him and he fled to Nikomedea. The controversy soon spread throughout the East, and Arius won the support of many influential churchmen such as EUSEBIOS OF NIKOMEDAEA. Constantine I became involved in the controversy and summoned the Council of Ni-caea in 325; Arius was condemned and exiled to Illyria. In 328 Constantine recalled Arius, who soon managed to convince the emperor of the correctness of his views. ATHANASIOS of Alexandria opposed Arius’s teaching, but the latter allied with supporters of the first Meletian Schism; Athanasios was exiled, and the council of Tyre and Jerusalem rehabilitated Arius in 335.

“A man of the big city” (Kannengiesser, infra 208), Arius was an ascetic and a spiritual leader to numerous holy women and other disciples, a passionate preacher, and commentator on the Bible. Of his writings only fragments are left: a letter to Eusebios of Nikomedia and another to Alexander of Alexandria as well as the Thalia (Banquet), written at least partly in metric form (M.L. West, JThSt 33[1982] 98–105) before 320 (C. Kannengiesser in Kyriakov 1[Münster 1970] 346–51) and presenting his doctrine. Athanasios berates “the dissolute tone” and “effeminate tune” of the Thalia. According to Philostorgios (HE 2.2, p.136–8), Arius wrote songs for travelers on sea and land and for workers in the mills.

Athanasius relates that Arius died an ignominious death in a latrine. This tale, suspiciously resembling the fate of Judas, was developed in later legends (A. Leroy-Molinghen, Byzantion 37 [1967–68] 126–33; 38[1968] 105–11).


ARKADIA (Ἀρκαδία), mountainous central region of the Peloponnesos. The name Arkadia appears infrequently until the 15th C. (e.g., in pseudo-Sphrantzes). During the period of the Roman Empire, the area underwent an economic decline exacerbated by invasions of the Goths (end of the 4th C.) and Slavs (7th C.); the latter left substantial traces in local toponyms. Old cities (Orchomenos [at modern Kalamaki], Mantinea, Megalopolis) disappeared; the name Arkadia was applied to the city of Kyperissia on the west coast of the Peloponnesos, suggesting a population movement; in Tegea-Nikli archaeological excavations reveal a gap between levels of the 6th C. and those of the 10th–12th C. Byz. authority in the region was restored after the expedition of StauroKios in 783 and that of Skleros under Nikephoros I. The oldest church in Arkadia after the Byz. reconquest is probably St. Christopher in Pallantio of the 10th C. (A. Abramea in Geographica byzantina [Paris
ARKADIOPOLIS (Ἀρκαδιούπολις), name of two cities, in Asia Minor and in Thrace.

ARKADIOPOLIS IN IONIA (mod. Arakcilar in Turkey), suffragan bishopric of the metropolis of Asia (Notitiae CP 1.102). Its bishop attended the Council of Ephesus in 431; his successors are attested up to the 15th C. (E. Kurz, *VizYrem* 12 [1906] 103.8; J. Nicole, *REG* 7 [1894] 80.26). Laurent (*Corpus 5.1*, nos. 292–93) ascribes to this see two seals of bishops of the 10th–11th C., arguing that the hierarch of Thracian Arkadiopolis at that time would have been an archbishop.

ARKADIOPOLIS IN THRACE (mod. Luleburgaz, in European Turkey), city on the route from Adrianople to Constantinople, built on the site of ancient Bergoule. This ancient name was retained by late Roman geographers (*Tabula Peutingeriana*, Cosmographer of Ravenna, Hierokles, etc.) but in notitiae it appears already as Arkadiopolis—the see of the autocephalous archbishopric of Europe (*Notitiae CP* 1.49) and by the late 12th C. a metropolis. Most historians, from Theophanes to Kantakouzenos, make Emp. Arkadios the founder of the city; Kedrenos (*Cdr*. 1:568.5–7), however, relates that it was Theodosios I who built the *polis* on the site of ancient “Bergoulion” and named it in honor of his son (i.e., Arkadios).

As one of the strongholds (*kastron*—Beşevli, *Inschriften*, no.26) protecting Constantinople from northern invasions, Arkadiopolis was often subject to hostile attack. Attila seized the city in 441 and Theodoric besieged it in 473; Thomas the Slav retreated to Arkadiopolis after his assault on Constantinople; in 970 the Rus’ army reached Arkadiopolis but was defeated at its walls by Bardas Skleros. The stronghold was an important station on the route of the Third Crusade: the *Hystoria de expeditione Friderici* describes the attack of German soldiers on *Archadionopolis* where they found much wine and other stored goods. Near the “polisma” built by Arkadios,” writes Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 445.67), the general Alexios Gidos was routed by rebellious Bulgarians and Vlachs in 1194. After the fall of Constantinople in 1204, the *civitas Archadiopoli* (A. Carile, *StVen* 7 [1965] 218.27) was given to Venice, but the rights to it were disputed, and the city changed hands several times; according to Choniates, it suffered serious destruction, and Villehardouin relates that its inhabitants left the city and sought refuge in Adrianople. According to Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 1:541.17–21), by his time Arkadiopolis was an ancient city in ruins; he mentions that in 1340 Andronikos III planned to rebuild it.

ARKADIOS (Ἀρκάδιος), emperor in the East (395–408); born Constantinople 377/8, died Constantinople 1 May 408. The son of Theodosios I and Aelia Flaccilla, he became augustus in 383. Left as regent in Constantinople in 394 when his father departed to fight the usurper EUGENIUS, he shared power with his brother HONORIUS after the death of Theodosios the following year. Apparently weak-willed and averse to action (*Zosim. 5.12.1; Philostorg., HE 11.3*), Arkadios was dominated by others, first by RUFINUS (395–96), then EUTROPIUS (396–400), his wife EUDOXIA (400–04), and finally the praetorian prefect ANTHEMIOUS (404–08). During Arkadios’s reign ALARIC ravaged the Balkans, while the Huns broke through the Caspian Gates and the ISAURIANS disturbed eastern Asia Minor. Although Arkadios may not have dominated policy, important developments marked his reign: the growing movement toward the proscription of paganism, the defeat of GAINAS and the Germanic threat to Constantinople, and the deposition of JOHN CHRYSTOSTOM. The court of Arkadios encouraged the development of a new concept of imperial victory based not on the
military prowess of the emperor but on his piety, reflected in new symbols of victory set up in the Hippodrome and in the Column of Arkadios erected in 400.


ARKARIOS (ἄρκαριος, Lat. arcarius), in the late Roman Empire the name of various subordinate officials of treasuries—imperial, provincial, military, even private—who were often slaves or freedmen (P. Habel, RE 2 [1896] 429–31). In Byzantine practice the term retained a very restricted meaning. In the Kletorologion of Philotheos the arkarios is a subaltern official of the orphana­tophios. The stackurakondidatos Leo, in the first half of the 11th C., held the offices of chartoularios, arkarios, and imperial “measurer” (metretes) (Zacos, Seals 2, no. 837), thus suggesting that the arkarios was probably involved in fiscal or economic operations. The Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles (Rhalles-Poîles, Synagoga I:175.7–11) repeats Justinian I’s law of 530 (Cod. Just. I 2.24.16) that ordered the oikonomoi of Constantinople to give an accounting to the arkarioi (of the Great Church—omitted in the Nomokanon) every one or two months. It is unclear whether this rule reflects reality or only tradition. In Rome of the 6th–8th C., the arcarius, as keeper of the papal treasury, was, along with the sacellarius, the most important fiscal official.


ARKLA (ἄρκλα, “box”), a kind of treasury, probably provincial. The Kletorologion of Philotheos mentions the chartoularioi of the arkla in the department of the genikon as well as their notaries; the De ceremoniis identifies these chartoularioi as “external,” that is, acting outside of Constantinople (De cer. 694.19). A seal of the 11th or 12th C. belonged to a certain Demetrios, chartoularios of the arkla (Laurent, Corpus 2, no. 383). An 11th-C. fiscal document (Iuv. 1, no. 30.34) is signed by Gregory Chalkoutzes, chartoularios of the arkla of the West, a department of the genikon.

LIT. Bury, Adm. System 87. Dölger, Beiträge 69. —A.K.

ARK OF THE COVENANT (κιβωτός [Ex 25:22] or σχημὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου [Ex 37:5]). Usually found in narrative contexts such as the synagogue at Dura Europos and illustrations to Joshua (chs. 3–4, 6) (e.g., in the Joshua Roll, the Octateuchs), it occurs rarely and symbolically elsewhere: a fresco in the Chora treats the recovery of the Ark from the Philistines as a prefiguration of the Virgin (see also Noah’s Ark), while Kosmas Indikopleustes discusses the Ark’s cosmological significance. As a vessel threatened but divinely protected, the Ark symbolized the church for Niketas David Paplagon (Encomium, p.36) and other commentators. Gregory of Nyssa’s Life of Moses (2.179) glosses the tabernacle as Christ and the Ark as his powers.


ARMAMENTON (ἄρμαμέτρον, from Lat. ar­manentum), arms depot or arsenal in Constantinople. According to a 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 274.22–24), Emp. Maurice built an armamenton near Magnaura in 596 and set up his statue there; later sources ascribe both to Emp. Phokas. Guillaume (Topographie 1:42) surmises that there were two different armamenta. There are some data concerning other arsenals. An enigmatic inscription mentions a great arsenales of Theophilus (Guillaud, Topographie 2:107), and it is unclear whether this evidence can be connected with the mansion of Armamentarea (the wife of the chief of the arsenal?) allegedly built by Theophilus (Janin, CP byz. 455) or transformed by Empress Theodora into the monastery of St. Panteleemon (Oikonomides, Documents, pt. IX [1964], 195). Some anti-Iconoclast texts accused Leo III or Constantine V of transforming the Church of St. Euphemia into an arms depot. Armens in the Blachernai region and on the Propontis are known in the 14th C.

The administration of armamenta presents some problems as well. Both the taktikon of Uspskij and the Kletorologion of Philotheos mention the archon of the armamenton; Theophanes (297.17) speaks of ho epano of the armamenton in the reign of Phokas; Oikonomides (Listes 317) denies the existence of the katepano of the armamenton, whereas Ahweiler (Mer 424, n.4) doubts his thesis. Seals mention the archon, strategos, and chartoularios of the imperial armamenton. Questionable, however,
is the figure of the kourator of Arsanas or Artzanas whom Laurent considered a member of the staff of the armamenton—it would be more reasonable to interpret Arsanas as a local name, not as an arsenal. Armamenta possessed pack animals—a bronze tablet of the 6th C. indicates that they were exempt from angareiai (Zacos, Seals 2, no.187; cf. N. Oikonomides, Diptycha 4 [1986–87] 49–52).


ARMBAND (usually in plural form ψελ(λ)ία, Lat. armillae). The term usually refers to a military ornament, worn by Germanic soldiers on the upper arm. Elsewhere, it is described as armilla gallica, a bracelet inset with gem stones, worn on the lower arm. In the Romano-Byz. world the term armillae normally refers to military insignia in the form of armbands, made of silver and worn in pairs, one, or sometimes two, on each arm. Examples of armillae, as part of the emperor's largesse, may be seen in the exergues of 4th–7th-C. medallions (e.g., DOCat 2, no.2), where they are shown as complete rings. Elsewhere, as in illustrations in the Notitia Dignitatum, they are shown as incomplete hoops, with the open ends forming knobs. The two spectacular enameled bracelets found in Thessalonike in 1958 (Splendeur de Byz. 190) have also been called armillae.


ARMBANDS, AMULETIC, were manufactured in Egypt and Syria in the 6th–8th C. Most often silver, such jewelry is distinguished by recurrent inscriptions and images, and by a ribbonlike design with incised figural medallions. Typically these armbands show at least part of the Palestinian Christological Cycle as well as the beginning of the apotropaic 90th Psalm. More elaborate examples add ring signs, apotropaic acclamations, the Holy Rider, and some form of Chnoubis. Because these armbands are closely related to Medusa amulets, which in addition to the above words and images bear various uterine incantations, they too were probably made specifically for women and control of the uterus.


ARMENIA (Ἀρμενία), kingdom and province on the northeast frontier of Byz. Much of medieval Armenian history remains obscure and problematic because of the lack of native sources before the Armenian alphabet was created (5th C.) and the limited point of view of subsequent ecclesiastical historians. They were hostile to Iranian and Muslim cultures and Byz. Orthodoxy, which they rejected as nestorianizing after the Council of Chalcedon. They focused primarily on northern Armenia and often supported the interests of a particular noble family. The christianization of the country at the beginning of the 4th C. drew it toward the Romans and away from its Iranian past. Nevertheless, throughout the Middle Ages, Armenia remained a buffer zone oscillating between the classical world and the East. Consequently, its own history was conditioned by the balance of power beyond its borders, even though the native language, culture, and customs were stubbornly maintained. Internally, the sharp geographical divisions of the Armenian plateau fostered the centrifugal tendencies of the magnates, jealous of their prerogatives and inclined to view the ruler merely as primus inter pares.

Between 387 and 390 the earlier tripartite “Armenia” (the imperial province of Armenia Minor west of the Euphrates, the kingdom of Greater Armenia east of the river, and the southern Satrapies) was transformed by the division of the Arsacid realm of Greater Armenia into a smaller imperial portion and a much larger Persarmenia (comprising some four-fifths of the former kingdom) along a north-south line from Karin (Theodosiopolis) on the upper Euphrates to Dara in Mesopotamia. The Arsacid dynasty disappeared in both portions in the early 5th C. Thereafter, Persarmenia was governed by a marzpan, often a native magnate, residing at Duin, while the imperial portion, Armenia Interior, was first administered by a comes Armeniæ until Justinian I (nov.31 in 536) fused it with Armenia Minor, the Satrapies, and parts of Pontos to form regular imperial provinces known as Armenia I–IV. This pattern survived almost three centuries when Emp. Maurice, by the peace of 591, greatly increased the imperial portion by extending the Byz. frontier eastward almost to Duin and the northwest
corner of Lake Van. Armeno-Byz. relations grew increasingly strained during this period as Byz. attempts to force Armenia back into communion with Constantinople and to impose imperial institutions and customs fueled the hostility of the powerful native clergy and of the local magnates whose prerogatives were threatened. As a result, the Arab invasions of the mid-7th C. met comparatively little opposition.

At first, the Muslim occupation of Armenia was relatively mild and taxes remained low because the caliphate relied on the Armenian cavalry to repel the Khazars raiding through the Caucasian passes. Administratively, Armenia was now joined with Iberia and Caucasian Albania to form the province of Armenia. The crises of the 8th C. when the Turks profiting from the crises distracting Constantinople, tightened their hold. The turbulence of the Armenian nobles stirred up Muslim fanaticism and led to punitive expeditions, massacres, and deportations; much of the Armenian nobility was annihilated, and numerous Muslim emirates were established in the country.

From the 9th C. onward, Byz. eastward expansion and the simultaneous decline of the 'Abbasid caliphate permitted a native revival. The Bagratid dynasty established itself in the north while the Arcruni controlled most of Vaspurakan in the south. Armenian autonomy was recreated with the coronation of Ashot I the Great Bagratuni in 884 and that of Gagik Arcruni in 908, and the external balance of power was reestablished. This second period of independence, though politically fragile and increasingly fragmented, lasted almost two centuries; the native culture may have reached its zenith during this period (see Armenian Art and Architecture; Armenian Literature). Armenia likewise prospered through extensive international trade until Byz. expansion destroyed the external equilibrium once again.

Byz. expansion into Armenia began in the second half of the 10th C., and Taron became an imperial province in 966/7, but in 974 Emp. John I Tzimiskes was still collaborating with King Ashot III. Byz. annexation of Armenia accelerated in the next century. In successive campaigns, Basil II gained much of western Armenia, which became the theme of Iberia early in the 11th C. The cession of Vaspurakan threatened by the first Turkish invasions of the empire led to the creation of the Katepanate of Basprakania (Vaspurakan) in 1021/2. Byz. imperial pressure finally caused Gagik II to abdicate and surrender Ani to Byz. in 1045, after repeated attacks against the capital had failed. Imperial armies also failed to take Duin from the Muslims, but by the mid-11th C. most of Armenia had been converted into imperial themes—Tarun, Iberia, Basprakania, and Mesopotamia—while the native nobility migrated to Cappadocia, Georgia, or Cilicia.

As the Seljuks overran the country, the Byz. annexation of Armenia proved short-lived and ended with the Byz. defeat at Mantzikert in 1071. Therefore, Muslim dynasties controlled Armenia except for a brief revival under the Zakarids, who ruled the northern portion of the country for two centuries in the early 13th C. This Indian summer ended with the Mongol invasions of the 1290s; thereafter Armenia, dominated by various Muslim dynasties from the 14th C. onward, passed for centuries out of the orbit of the Mediterranean world.

The equivocal nature of Armeno-Byz. relations in every period is amply attested. Some collaboration unquestionably occurred because imperial support was indispensable if Armenia was to repel Eastern aggressions, and Byz. relied to a large extent on its Armenian military contingents. Armenian nobles repeatedly served the empire and settled and prospered in Asia Minor and Constantinople (see Armenians). Recurring religious dissensions marred these contacts, however, and Armenia’s traditional social structure (dominated by haughty magnates holding hereditary offices and domains) was fundamentally irreconcilable with the centralized and bureaucratic pattern characteristic of Byz., and with its fiscal policies. Despite Armenia’s rejection of Byz. language and religion, cultural and artistic ties were maintained; the Armenian architect Trdat was even summoned to Constantinople in 989 to restore the damaged dome of Hagia Sophia. Similarly, Armenia profited from the transit trade crossing the country—which led to the designation of Artašat as the only northern imperial customs post in the 5th–6th C. (Cod. Just. IV 63,4) and to the later prosperity of Ani—while Constantinople de-
pended on the same exchange for Eastern luxury goods and some Armenian products such as metals (silver, copper, lead, etc.) and the region's red-dyed and embroidered leathers and textiles. Nevertheless, Armenia's almost total deurbanization from 364 to late Bagratid times ran directly counter to the characteristic focus of the Mediterranean world on the city and hindered the development of Armenia's internal trade; lacking a native currency entirely, Armenia had to rely on Byz. or Arab coinage for all commercial transactions. The basic incompatibilities between Armenia and Byz. won out over their mutual reliance and prevented the integration of Armenia into the empire until both were overwhelmed by the Ottomans in the 15th C.


**ARMENIAKON** (Ἀμερινακῶν), one of the first themes of Asia Minor, originated in the command of the *magister militum* for Armenia instituted by Justinian I. Although 9th-C. sources (Theophanes the Confessor and al-Baladhuri) suggest that the theme may have existed as early as 629, its *strategos* is first unambiguously attested in 667. The theme encompassed eastern Anatolia from Cappadocia to the Black Sea and the Euphrates. In the 9th C. the *strategos* of Armeniakon commanded 9,000 troops and drew a salary of 40 pounds of gold; his domain included 17 fortresses. The army frequently played a role in politics, supporting the revolts of Leo III in 715 and Artabasdos (their former commander) in 742. They revolted against Irene in 790, but supported Michael II against Thomas the Slav. The importance of Armeniakon derived from its size and strategic location. The original area was divided early in the 9th C. into Armeniakon, Charsianon, and Cappadocia, and in the 10th C. Chaldia became separate, leaving Armeniakon to comprise the western Pontic coast as well as the mountains and valleys to the south. Its capital was Amaseia.


**ARMENIAN ART AND ARCHITECTURE.** The medieval art of Armenia falls into three main periods: that between the establishment of Christianity and the Arab invasions (ca. 305–750); that of the independent Armenian kingdoms (ca. 862–1021); and that of the pockets of Armenian power that survived under Seljuk, Georgian, and Mongol rule (ca. 1150–1500).

In architecture, many elements remain constant: churches are almost always made of a rubble conglomerate faced with large, finely joined tufa blocks. They are vaulted, and, after the 6th C., carry masonry domes. The exteriors of most Armenian churches barely hint at the spaces within. Domes are encased in cones or pyramids, and vaults are gabled. Apses are often embedded in straight walls. Steep niches indicate the position of aisles and apses.

**First Period (ca. 305–750).** Prior to the 6th C. Armenian churches were single-naved or simple basilicas (F. Gandolfo, *Le basiliche armene IV–VII secolo* [Rome 1982]). With the notable exception of Ereruk (ca. 500), they are also small and dark.

In the 7th C. the ties of Armenia with Georgia, Syria, and Palestine were strong, and this period produced a remarkable variety of centralized domed plans. Attempts to find examples, that surely predate the Justinianic taste for centralized churches have not been convincing.

Among the most popular domed church plan types is the cross-domed basilica (e.g., St. Gayan at Va'aršapat), in which transverse vaults raised to the height of the nave interrupt barrel-vaulted aisles. At the crossing, freestanding piers support a dome on squinches (a plan very similar to the Byz. cross-in-square). In the domed hall church (e.g., at P’thni, ca. 630) these piers abut the walls so that three deep niches replace each aisle. Here the dome is on pendentives. Small cruciform buildings with squinches were also popular, as was the domed quatrefoil superimposed on a cube (e.g., St. John at Mastara, 7th C.).

External sculptural decoration is generally restricted to cornices over windows and doors and at the gable-line; internal decoration is limited to capitals. Occasional figural elements appear: Old and New Testament scenes, or donor portraits. Memorial stelae illustrate the same subjects. A large relief of the Virgin Hodegetria survives, now built into the wall of the cathedral of Ojun. Vrt’anes K’ert’ol’s 7th-C. treatise in defense of

K'ert'ol also described MSS illuminated in the Greek style and bound in ivory. The 10th-C. Ejmiacin Gospels (Erevan, Mat. 2374) have 6th-C. Byz. ivory covers and include two illuminated pages taken from an earlier Gospel. The four full-page miniatures on these folia allow a fuller appreciation of the style preserved in the frescoes; all ha' strong ties with 7th-C. Byz. painting such as the apse mosaic at Krtt and the icon of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos at Kiev (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, pl.12, no.B.9).

**Second Period (ca.862–1021).** Armenian kings of the 9th and 10th C. supported a very retrospective architecture. Seventh-century church types served as the basis for new dynastic monuments at Ani and Aht'amarn, and the same phenomenon occurs in smaller principalities (the Holy Apostles at Kars [937] copies St. John at Mastara) and in monasteries. The new versions are often steeper in elevation than their models. Sculptural articulation, though often based on 7th-C. forms, developed in new directions, from the elegant, attenuated arcading at Ani to the exuberant figural reliefs at Aht'amarn. Large-scale donor portraits, some carved nearly in the round, appear at Ani, Aht'amarn, Sanahin, and Hatbat. Islamic influence in this period is evident in the use of muqarnas (stalactite squinches), polychrome stonework, and large expanses of flat, leafy interlace, esp. in forechurches and secular buildings.

The xacr'k'ar ("stone-cross"), a stone slab carved with a cross and a variety of other motifs, was used from the 9th C. onward. Serving a number of commemorative purposes, xacr'k'ars are usually freestanding, but were sometimes incorporated into the walls of churches and other buildings. Especially after the late 13th C., donor portraits and Old and New Testament scenes appear on xacr'k'ars.

Extensive fresco cycles survive at Tat'ev (ca.930)—where Stephen Orbelian (died 1304) says the painters were "Frankish"—and at Aht'amarn.

In some MS illumination, Byz. is the predominant influence, for example, in the painting style, ornament, and imagery (but not the placement of the scenes) of the Trebizond Gospels (Venice, San Lazzaro 1400, 11th C.) and in the narrative scenes in the Gospels of Gagik of Kars (Jerusalem, Arm. Patr. 2556, 11th C.). Several Gospels like that copied in Melitene in 1057 (Erevan, Mat. 3784) include Byz. compositions (e.g., the Entombment of Christ) developed only after Iconoclasm. The illustrations, however, are placed at right angles to the side margins; the erratically drawn figures in bright, wash-like colors on bare parchment are not Byz. in character. Other MSS preserve pre-Iconoclastic imagery, some in a style reminiscent of the Rabbula Gospels or Ejmiacin Gospels (the Mk'e Gospels, Venice, San Lazzaro 1144, dated 862), others in a flattened, linear transformation (Jerusalem, Arm. Patr. 2555, 11th C.). The influence of Islamic court art is clear in the miniature of Gagik now bound into his Gospels, showing him with his family, dressed in oriental robes, seated cross-legged on rich carpets.

**Third Period (ca.1150–1500).** After the Seljuk invasions, smaller Armenian principalities fostered their own, often highly individual, art (e.g., the MS painting of Armenian Cilicia). Although some activity continued in cities (e.g., the patronage of Tigran Honenc), it was the monasteries that became the most important focus for princely patronage.

Although patrons still turned to 7th-C. church types, they developed new plans for other buildings. Among the Zakerian additions at Halbat is the forechurch of the Church of the Holy Sign (1208–10), its roof supported by four intersecting arches, with a three-story bell tower (1245) with chapels on each floor.

The sculpture of the Prosian funerary church at Gefard and its forechurch (1285) is typically exuberant. Fleshy vegetal motifs and muqarnas ornament the dome of the rock-cut church, while animals and New Testament figures share the surfaces of the forechurch with crosses and interlace.

In the 14th C., the Orbelian family had tympana carved at Amalü with a variety of new subjects, for example, the Ancient of Days (see Christ: Types of Christ) with the Crucifixion and Adam. This inventiveness also emerges in MS illumination of the period. At Glajor, under Orbelian protection, T'oros of Tarōn and other artists developed Old and New Testament imagery reflecting the anti-Chalcedonian theology of their abbot,
Esayi N’ec’i, including, at the same time, Western images, for example, the crowned Virgo lactans.


ARMENIAN CHURCH. Considering itself autocephalous, this church traces its origin from the preaching of St. Gregory the Illuminator at the beginning of the 4th C. and also claims to be an apostolic foundation through St. Thaddeus. This double tradition stems from two evangelizing waves: the earlier came from Syria-Palestine and reached southern Armenia before the end of the 2nd C., the other represented the hellenizing tradition of Cappadocian Caesarea introduced by Gregory into Armenia and continued by his descendants. This second wave, which predominated in the northern part of the country, ultimately prevailed over the Syrian one, whose existence was all but expunged from the sources.

The Armenian church still recognizes only the first three ecumenical councils. It rejects the Council of Chalcedon as Nestorian, while simultaneously condemning Monophysitism, and holds to the Christological definition of Cyril of Alexandria: "One is the nature of the Incarnate Logos." Armenian primates ceased to be consecrated at Caesarea after the death of St. Nerses I the Great in the 4th C., but a break with Constantinople came only considerably later, at a date that is still debated.

Despite this breach, adherents of Chalcedon remained numerous, esp. in the western provinces of Armenia, as evidenced by the pro-Chalcedonian Narratio de rebus Armeniae (8th C.). The Armenian patriarch of katholikos resided from the 5th to the 9th C. at Duin on Persian territory and was thus free to defy Byz ecclesiastical authority, but western Armenian bishops disregarded his injunctions and continued to attend Byz. church councils. After the new partition of Armenia in 591, the Emp. Maurice even succeeded in installing a rival katholikos at Awan near Erevan, thus creating a schism that lasted some 20 years. Herakleios and his successors continued efforts to bring the Armenian church back into communion with Constantinople, but all compromise formulas failed, and in 725/6 the Council of Mantzikert proclaimed the union of the Armenian and Syrian churches, while maintaining their rejection of extreme Monophysitism. Some attempts at negotiation continued in Bagratid times. Armenian patriarchs corresponded with Photios and Nicholas I Mystikos, but the Council of Ani in 959 again condemned Chalcedonianism and its adherents in Armenia. Relations worsened in the 11th C. with polemics and forced rebaptisms occurring on both sides. Armenian historians denounced Armenian Chalcedonians in the service of Byz.—such as Philaretos Brachamios—as traitors and "Iberians," that is, no longer Armenian. During the sojourn of the katholikoi in Cilicia (1051–1444), a final attempt at union under the katholikos St. Nerses the Gracious (1166–79) failed after Emp. Manuel I died (1180); negotiations then focused, ultimately without success, on the Latin church, although relations between Armenia and Byz. were not entirely severed.

Byz. influence can be traced in Armenian ecclesiastical practices: Armenian liturgy follows the Greek liturgy attributed to St. Basil and the custom of distinguishing between the black (celibate, monastic) and white (married, secular) clergy follows Byz. usage. Other customs, however, differed from those of Byz.: the use of azymes and unmixed wine for the Eucharist, for example, as well as the early traditions involving hereditary patriarchs and clan bishops are purely indigenous.

LIT. M. Ormanian, The Church of Armenia (London 1912).

ARMENIAN LITERATURE. Until the year 400 the Armenians used Greek or Aramaic for their inscriptions, coinage, and correspondence. Syriac also was known in ecclesiastical circles. Only after Mesrop Maistros invented the native script did a vernacular literature develop.

The pupils of Maistros traveled to centers of Christian learning, esp. Edessa, the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and Constantinople, to study Syriac and Greek and to make translations. A corpus of translated literature rapidly developed. At first the emphasis was on liturgical, biblical, and gen-
eral theological writings, but succeeding generations of Armenians translated and adapted many of the standard texts of late antiquity dealing with secular scholarly themes.

Some of the first translators themselves composed original works, the earliest being the *Life of Mas'otc* by his pupil Korjun, and the treatise on evil and free will by the latter's colleague Eznik. Though the authors of the earliest major histories are unknown, the genre of historical writing devoted to Armenian themes quickly took root: Agathangelos described the conversion of Armenia in hagiographical style; pseudo-P'awstos Buzand dealt with the conflict of Christian and traditional values in the 4th C.; Ezike described the struggle of Christian Armenians against Sasanian domination in the mid-5th C.; the later Moses Xorenac'i gave the first account of the beginnings of the Armenian nation and of Armenia's historical role between the Roman Empire and Iran down to the time of Mas'otc'.

Characteristically, historians wrote about a specific house or province rather than the country as a whole. Pseudo-P'awstos focused on the Mamikonan family, and Lazar of P'arpi composed a history of 5th-C. Armenia extolling the virtues of the same family for his patron, Vahan Mamikonian, governor of Armenia (485–505). The work of Moses Xorenac'i was primarily concerned with the fortunes of the Bagratid family, and Thomas Arcruni glorifies the merits of the Arcruni princes of southern Armenia in his History.

Interest in Hellenistic and early Christian literature is demonstrated by translations of many Greek and Syrian church fathers and of Greek texts used in the schools of the eastern Mediterranean. Among theological works of especial importance translated from Syriac are the writings of Aphrahat and Ephrem the Syrian, the Lives of 4th-C. martyrs in Persia, and the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebios of Caesarea (his Chronicle was translated from the original Greek). From Greek were also translated works by Athanasios of Alexandria, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzos, and John Chrysostom. The Refutation by Timotheos Ailouros influenced later polemical catenae composed by Armenians. In the secular field the translation and adaptation for the Armenian language of the *Art of Grammar* by Dionysios Thrax led to extensive later commentaries on grammar. Works by the 6th-C. Alexandrians, David the Philosopher and Elias, led to an interest in logic. Rhetoric was studied through the *Progymnasmata* of Theon and of Aphthonios. An Armenian Book of *Chreiai*, attributed to Moses Xorenac'i, introduces Christian examples to illustrate traditional Greek themes. Pappos of Alexandria was used as a source for a unique work on geography, also attributed to Moses. Numerous works by Philo were very influential, and the *Jewish War* by Josephus was used, at least by Moses. The popular *Alexander Romance* was reedited with a Christian interpretation of its meaning in the 13th C. Also in the 13th C. the Syriac *Chronicle* by Patr. Michael I the Syrian was translated and adapted to Armenian interests.

The first translations were made in Edessa and Constantinople, where Armenians went to study. After the 5th C. Jerusalem became a significant center for Armenian (and Georgian) scholarly activity. Armenians joined Greek, Georgian, Syrian, and Western Catholic monks on the Wondrous Mountain near Antioch at the time of the Crusades, but being non-Chalcedonian Armenians had no monasteries on Mt. Athos. Numerous works, lost in Greek and Syriac, survive in Armenian versions: e.g., Irenaeus, Eusebios's *Chronicle*, some commentaries of John Chrysostom, Timotheos Ailouros's *Refutation*, Ephrem's *Commentary on the Diatessaron* (of which the original was discovered only in 1957). Translations from Armenian into Greek were rare, though Armenian was known by many Byz., e.g., the teacher of Ananias of Sirak. In addition, when Stephen of Siwnik' worked in Constantinople ca.715, he was assisted by a court official. Greek versions exist of two recensions of Agathangelos and one of the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*.

Many Greek letters sent to Armenian bishops (5th–12th C.) are preserved with the Armenian responses in the Book of Letters, an official compilation of correspondence between Armenians, Greeks, Georgians, and Syrians. (Tendentious alterations to these documents are not uncommon). The compilation of canon law begun by John of Ojun (*katholikos*, 717–28) includes the canons of many Greek councils.

Armenian writers evince little interest in later Byz. literature, though patristic works continued to be popular. Thus in 696/7 the *Ecclesiastical History* of Sokrates was translated; Stephen of Siwnik' translated the corpus attributed to pseudo-
DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE (ca. 715 in Constanti-

nople), as well as GREGORY OF NYSSA, On the Mak-
ing of Man, and NEMESIOS, On the Nature of Man.
The translation of the 7th-C. Hexaemeron of GEORGE
OF PISIDIA is, however, an unusual foray into later
Greek literature.

Armenian attitudes to Byz. were ambivalent:
interest in, and respect for, Greek learning re-
mained strong, but they were tempered by fear
of cultural and esp. religious domination. Not all
Armenians were staunchly anti-Chalcedonian, but
a defensive tone permeates much Armenian theo-
logical writing. Notably pro-Greek were the fa-
mous religious poet Gregory of Narek (ca. 950–
1010); NERSES SNORHALI, who worked toward a
reunion of the churches; and GREGORY MAGI-
STROS. Notably, the last's 88 letters reflect Byz.
attitudes towards learning and scholarship rather
than a traditional Armenian outlook.

The historians generally pay little attention to
Byz. save insofar as Armenian interests are di-
rectly involved. Thus the History of Heracleios of
Sebeos is of prime importance for the Byzantinist
because it describes Byz.-Persian rivalry, whereas
the histories of Lewond and John V Katholikos
are less directly useful because they describe Mus-
lim control of Armenia. Since Armenian histori-
ans concentrate on events in Armenia, they be-
come valuable witnesses after the eastward expan-
sion of Byz. power. In the late 10th and
11th C. Stephen of Taron (known as Asozik)
describes events up to the year 1000, while Ar-
istakes Lastivertc'i details the collapse of Ar-
menian independence. Matthew of Edessa is a
witness to the coming of the Turks, the collapse
of Byz. control in Armenia and eastern Anatolia,
and the arrival of the Crusaders.

Although they attempt both narrative and ex-
planation, the writers just named lack the sophis-
tication of the first historians (e.g., Eliše or Moses
Xorenac'ì). By the 11th C. more creative minds
had turned to poetry and theology. The Chronicle
of Samuel of Ani merely notes events year by
year, and this style became increasingly popular.
Histories on a grander scale were also produced,
however, the more important of these dealing
with eastern Armenia, Georgia, and the Mongols.
The last comprehensive history dealing at times
with Byz. is that of VARDAN VARDAPET, but it is a
secondhand source, since Vardan's career was spent
primarily in Greater Armenia and he had few
direct contacts with Greeks and none with Con-
stantinople.

Loss of Armenian political independence in the
11th C. did not disrupt cultural life or literary
production. Especially after the Armenians took
control of Cilicia, they were receptive to ideas and
influences from new quarters. Scholars traveled
even more than in the past, though not so fre-
quently to Constantinople. Latin and Arabic as
well as Greek were increasingly known. Gregory
Vkayaser (who abandoned his see as katholikos in
1067 after one year in office) and Nerses of
LAMBRON sought out numerous texts in Greek
and Latin not yet available in Armenian; at this
time the Black Mountain with its many monastic
centers of different nationalities became an im-
portant source for texts not yet translated into
Armenian. Medicine, primarily based on Arabic
sources, was studied. For the first time a secular
law code was compiled, by Mxit'ar Gos (died 1213).
SMBAT THE CONSTABLE revised this in light of
Cilician interaction with the Crusader principality
of Antioch, but Mxit'ar's work remained standard
in the Armenian diaspora in succeeding centuries.

Byz. as a source of inspiration was irrelevant to
Armenian writers after the 12th C. Nonetheless,
the fall of Constantinople in 1453 did spark a
literary reaction, and several laments (threnoi)
were written. This genre had a long history in
Armenian, e.g., Nerses Snorhali on the fall of
Edessa and GREGORY TZAY on the fall of Jerusa-
lem.

LIT. H.S. Anasyan, Hayakan Matenagijt'yun, 2 vols. (Er-
to Armenian Christian Literature (London 1960). R.W. Thom-
son, "The Formation of the Armenian Literary Tradition,
Hr. M. Bartikjan, To Byanton elas tos Armeniakas pegasus (Thes-

ARMENIANS formed an important and influ-
ential minority in the Byz. Empire. Before the
Arab invasion they were settled primarily in the
eastern provinces of the empire (Armenia I–IV)
and had lively economic and cultural connections
with the Syro-Palestinian world; certain Arme-
nians (e.g., Narses in the 6th C., Valentinos
Arsakuni in the mid-7th) held important military
and court positions in Constantinople. One might
expect that subsequent developments would have
severed relations between Armenia and the em-

pire. On the one hand, the decline of the city in Armenia and Byz. alike decreased trade and cultural exchange. On the other hand, the Armenian church rejected the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon; the radical anti-Orthodox movements of the TONDRAKITES and PAULICIANS attracted broad segments of the Armenian population. In reality, however, the role of Armenians in the empire kept growing, and many Armenians emigrated to Byzantium. The Armenian historian LEWOND relates several cases of mass flight from the Arabs, for example, that 12,000 Armenian nobles with their wives, children, and retinues found a home in Byz. ca.790. Some Armenian emigrés settled in Armeniakon and Chaldia, while others moved westward, to the northern Balkans (Philippopolis became one of the most important Armenian centers) and even to southern Italy.

Through the 10th C. Armenians played an important role in the Byz. army, producing many generals and several emperors: Leo V, Theodora (Theophilos's wife), Basil I, Romanos I Lekapenos, and John I Tzimiskes. Armenian commanders, such as MELIAS or KOURKOUS, were instrumental in expanding Byz. territories toward the Euphrates. These Armenians were predominantly Chalcedonian, some of them even holding high ecclesiastical positions in the Orthodox church; culturally they were hellenized and contributed much to the development of education and knowledge in Byz. Nevertheless, the Byz. attitude toward Armenians was often negative, and the stereotype of "the cunning and treacherous Armenian" became firmly implanted in Greek literature.

The number of Armenians in the empire increased drastically in the 11th C. as several Armenian states were annexed, and their population resettled in Cappadocia and neighboring lands. These newcomers probably retained their language, religion, and culture, including habits and costume. The clashes between semi-independent noble Armenians and local Orthodox landowners and bishops were sometimes acute; GAGIK II perished in one such conflict. Chalcedonian Armenian and Armeno-Georgian families (e.g., PAKOURIANOJ, TORNIKIOJ) continued to hold high positions (esp. as governors of frontier themes) and probably 10–15 percent of the Byz. aristocracy was of Armenian stock, but there was no Armenian emperor in this period, and few Armenians were affiliated with the Komnenian dynasty. From the end of the 11th C. the Armenian nobility tended to create independent states in CILICIA and nearby; from that time Armenians who served in the Byz. army were predominantly allies and not subjects of the emperor.

Frequent attempts to reach a reconciliation with the Armenian church produced vast polemical literature but no practical results. Enmity toward Armenians grew, and Patr. ATHANASIOS I, among others, considered contacts with Jews and Armenians defiling (ep.36.6); Patr. Joseph I Galesiotes called the Armenians "a morbid and rebellious people" (RegPatr, fasc. 4, no.1400). In the last centuries of Byz. history, Armenians lived in Constantinople as merchants but did not play any substantial role in the administration of the empire.


ARMOR. The 6th- and 10th-C. STRATEGIKA and other literary sources identify several types of body protection worn by Byz. soldiers. Body armor (thorax) for cavalrymen was made of chain mail or lamellar, small plates of horn or iron laced together or to a leather backing. These protective coats, called zabai, lorikia, or klibania, varied in length, reaching the ankles, knees, or waist. To guard against concussive as well as penetrative blows, heavy cavalrymen or KATAPHRAKTOI wore padded, waist-length surcoats (epilorikia, epanoklibania) made of wool, felt, or cotton over their mail or lamellar armor. They also wore apronlike coverings (pteriges, kremasmata) to protect the midsection. Armor for horses was made of hide, felt, lamellar, or mail, and covered the animal's face and chest; according to a 9th-C. chronicle (Theoph. 318.25–28), the horse of Herakleios survived a battle in 627 by wearing padded armor. Felt coverings hung from belts of light cavalrymen to protect their legs and part of their horses.

Infantrymen wore simple body armor such as knee-length quilted coats (kabadia) of felt or linen,
and other homemade types of armor are noted; a 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 386.1–7) describes a soldier’s linen corset, stiffened by soakings in wine and salt, which was strong enough to resist arrows. Gauntlets (manikia) and padded wool or cotton arm guards (manikelia), sometimes overlaid with mail, and wooden or iron greaves are prescribed for both infantrymen and cavalrymen in the strategika. The sources attest helmets (kranea, kassida) made of iron, either segmented or cast whole, sometimes with flaps of chain mail or felt to protect the face and neck; felt caps (komellaukia), however, were more commonly used by infantrymen in the 10th C. Many illustrations show soldiers wearing caps or helmets with a cloth hung over the back of the neck, presumably to protect against exposure to the sun.

Shields of many types and sizes—oval, rectangular, and kite-shaped—were made of wood and often sheathed in leather or iron, and were secured over the soldier’s neck or shoulder by straps to leave both hands free to handle weapons. The average infantryman’s shield was fairly large, about 1.4 m long and 80 cm across, but light infantry- and cavalrymen carried smaller shields. After the 12th C., Western triangular shields appear in illustrations.

A warm climate and open, mobile warfare kept Byz. armor relatively limited in comparison with that of Western knights, but, in spite of the comments of Liutprand of Cremona that the Byz. were lightly armed, they were still better protected than their enemies in the later 10th C. The Arabs were amazed by the sight of the heavily armored Byz. katabraktoi, and Skylitzes records that few Byz. were killed in a 970 engagement against the Rus’, though many were wounded (Skyl. 291.95–99); he later cites the effects of heat on the “fully armored” Byz. soldiers during a long battle against the same enemy (306.44–46). Byz. soldiers were obliged to carry their weapons and shields on the march and could be severely punished for discarding their equipment along the way (Leo Diac. 57.4–58.10). For sake of comfort they did not wear armor while marching; instead it was carried nearby on pack animals, to be donned quickly in case of attack (Taktika of Nikephoros Ouranos, TM 5 [1973] 2921).

Practically no archaeological material exists to support the evidence of literary sources for Byz. armor, but details and changes in armor are recorded in art. The lamellar corset is worn by numerous military saints and emperors depicted on ivories and in illustrated MSS of the 10th and 11th C. This garment is supplemented by leather straps suspended from the shoulders and waist, but Roman “fighting skirts” still appear. By the 12th C. knee-length coats of mail are shown (Klavrezou, Steatitie, no. 21). The greaves depicted in the images of the 10th and 11th C. were probably archaisms by that time, but innovations such as the kite-shaped shield, replacing oval and circular types, can be traced in representations of David and Goliath in Psalter illustrations.


ARMOUR, SONG OF, a poem of Tragoudi preserved in 15th- and 16th-C. MSS. It describes the exploits of young Armoures-Armouropoulos (the son of Armoures) who crossed the Euphrates with the help of an angel and annihilated a Saracen army. Despite the late date of the MSS, H. Grégoire hypothesized that the poem was a 9th-C. work (REGr 46 [1933] 29–69). On the sole basis of the resemblance of the name of Armoures to the name of the city of Amorion, he affirmed that the poem dealt with the Byz. retribution for the Arab capture of Amorion in 858 and that Armoures was Michael III. Even bolder was G. Veloudis’s hypothesis that Armoures should be identified with the emir of Melite, ‘Umar al-Aqta (BZ 58 [1965] 313–19).


LIT. Beck, Volksliteratur 53–57.

ARMY (στρατός, στρατόπεδον, φοσσάτον). The history of the army in the late Roman and Byz. period begins with the military reforms of the early 4th C. The legions once massed along the frontiers were reorganized into local frontier militias (limitanei) and mobile field armies (comitatenses) garrisoned within the empire. By the 5th C. five such armies under the command of
MAGISTRI MILITUM defended the empire in the East. Two armies (praesentales) were stationed with the emperor at Constantinople, two (per Illyricum, per Thracia) along the Danube frontier, and one (per Orientem) along the Euphrates; a magister militum per Armeniam was created in the 6th C. The forces consisted of native Roman enlisted men equipped by the state, and the FOEDERATI of many nationalities who were under Roman command. Foreign mercenaries (symmachoi) were sometimes hired as separate units under their own commanders (J.L. Teall, *Speculum* 40 [1965] 294–322).

The Strategikon of Maurice illustrates the transition during the 5th and 6th C. from Roman to Byz. methods of warfare, which increasingly relied on CAVALRY and ARCHERY in imitation of Persian and Avar practices (Bivar, “Cavalry” 271–91). The army’s total manpower in the 4th and 5th C. is estimated to have been as high as 650,000, of which only a minority were well-trained, mobile fighting men (R. MacMullen, *Klio* 62 [1980] 451–60). By the 6th C., the period of the great campaigns of Generals Belisarios and Narses, Justinian I’s army had decreased to 150,000 men. The declining decline in the empire’s manpower and resources was so acute that an army sent to fight the Persians in 578 numbered fewer than 6,400 men (H. Turtledove, *BS/EB* 10 [1983] 216–22). Internal rebellions and defeats by the Avars and Persians made the late 6th and 7th C. a time of crisis for the Byz. Although by 628 Herakleios was able to reorganize the shattered imperial forces into an army capable of defeating Persia, new, more aggressive enemies—the Arabs, Bulgars, and Lombards—inflicted serious defeats on the imperial armies and overran much of Byz. territory during the 7th and 8th C.

Two fundamental reactions to the 7th-C. military crisis shaped the Byz. army from the late 7th to the 11th C. The first step was the stationing of army groups (thematia) in military districts (themes); four such armies are mentioned in 687 (R.-J. Lilie, *JÖB* 26 [1977] 7–47). The second step was the reimposition of hereditary military service (strategia) in exchange for land (Hendy, *Economy* 619f.). The thematic armies, recruited and maintained locally, were sometimes effective against invaders (as at Akroinon in 740) but were slow to mobilize and coordinate for campaigns. They often lacked discipline and military skill and were prone to rebellion (Kaegi, *Unrest*). This tendency led Constantine V to dissolve the Opsikon army, which had represented the imperial field force, and create new imperial units, known as the tagmata, which were based in or around Constantinople. The tagmatic units were better equipped and paid than the provincial armies and formed the crack regiments of the Byz. army; after the early 9th C. tagmatic and thematic troops commonly joined forces for expeditions. The army was mostly composed of native recruits through the 7th to 10th C., although foreigners were hired (e.g., Theophores) or foreign peoples were resettled within Byz. territory to provide manpower (Theoph. 364.11–18).

The army’s greatest period was in the 10th and early 11th C., when the Byz. recaptured much of the territory lost to the Arabs and Bulgars. As shown by contemporary strategika, the army’s increased effectiveness was rooted in the efforts of such soldier-emperors as Nikephoros II Phokas and Basil II to employ more heavily armed men (e.g., kataphraktoi) and to perfect combined infantry and cavalry tactics in battle or on campaign. At the same time, however, the army’s composition and structure began to change; command was centralized at Constantinople (N. Oikonomides, *TM* 6 [1976] 141–47), and the growing presence of mercenaries (Rus’, Normans), already well attested in the 10th C., became even more pronounced during the 11th and 12th C. The old tagmatic and thematic units were replaced by new contingents—mainly foreign troops—billeted in the provinces (J.-C. Cheynet, *TM* 9 [1985] 181–94). Especially under Manuel I Komnenos, the Byz. eagerly attempted to adopt the Western panoply and tactics, but this had mixed results (R.P. Lindner, *JÖB* 32.2 [1982] 207–13). They also accepted such Western traditions as tournaments and the glorification of military prowess in literature and art. The size and multilingual character of 12th-C. Byz. armies astonished their neighbors, but this and the centralization of command made the army unwieldy; the fall of Constantinople to the Fourth Crusade in 1203–04 demonstrated the superiority of Western feudal armies over the imperial forces.

The emperors of Nicaea developed the traditions adopted by Manuel I and learned from their Western rivals; their armies were small but effective. They were composed of Western, Cuman,
and Turkish mercenaries, supported by provincial levies; Theodore II Laskaris later attempted to convert them into a national army to control the number and cost of foreign soldiers. The restoration of the empire in 1261 precipitated attack from various claimants and created a burden that Byz. was incapable of bearing. On the one hand, acting in the interests of great landowners, the emperors abolished the last troops of peasant soldiers who guarded the frontiers; on the other hand, they were unable to maintain the navy and substantial land forces. They tried to transfer the obligation of military service to local landowners at a time when Byz. faced the growing centralized armies of the Ottomans, which were primarily composed of professional warriors (janissaries), and the swift fleets and skillful mariners of the Italian republics. The Chronicle of the Tocco reveals the relative strength of the forces in the Balkans in the first half of the 15th C. when it calculates the military detachments of local lords at between 20 and 100 men, and those of the emperor at 500 horsemen, whereas the Turks could afford to send 30,000 soldiers to Epirus (A. Kazhdan in Bisanzio e l’Italia [Milan 1982] 173). Nor could the Byz. compete with the Turks in military technology, lacking, for instance, cannons such as those the Turks used during sieges in the 15th C. (see Firearms).


ÁRPÁDS (’Aρπαδίης in De adm. imp. 40.48), a dynasty of princes (876–1000) and then kings (1000–1301) of Hungary. Constantine VII preserves a legend (contrary to Arabic sources) that Árpád, founder of the dynasty, received his power from the khagan of Khazaria and of the “Turks” (Hungarians). Circa 894, at the invitation of Emp. Leo VI, Árpád attacked Symeon of Bulgaria and thus began the occupation of Pannonia and neighboring lands by the Hungarians. From the 11th C. onward, the Árpáds were in close contact with Byz.: according to a 13th-C. legend, Prince Imre (Henry), son of István (Stephen) I, married ca.1020 the daughter of a Greek emperor, whom de Vijay (infra) arbitrarily identifies as Romanos III; ca.1075 Synadene, a relation of Emp. Nikephoros III, was given in marriage either to an Árpád (Géza I [r. 1074–77] or László I [Ladislaj]) or to a Hungarian lord (acc. to A. Kazhdan, ActaAntHungr 10 [1962] 163–66, but contrary to Gy. Moravcsik, BZ 55 [1962] 381); Álmos, the blinded brother of King Kálmán (Coloman, r.1095–1116), fled to Byz., where he was renamed Constantine and granted the town of Constantinia in Macedonia (F. Szentpétery, A. Domanoszky, Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum, vol. 1 [Budapest 1937] 442f); Pyroska (Irene), László’s daughter, married Emp. John II in 1104/5; István, a brother of King Géza II (r.1141–62), fled ca.1155 to Byz., where he married Manuel I’s niece, Maria in 1161; László, another brother of Géza, followed István to Constantinople. Béla III was, for a while, heir to the Byz. throne; his daughter Margaret-Maria married Isaac II. An enigmatic kralina, Arete Doukaina, who possessed lands in Byz. ca.1157/8, was possibly the spouse of Boris Kalamanovic (V. Laurent, BZ 65 [1972] 35–39). Circa 1222 Béla IV married Maria, daughter of Theodore I; Agnes-Anna of Hungary was the first wife of Andronikos II and mother of Michael IX.


ARRHA SPONSALICIA (ἀρράς, “engagement gift”), a payment in money or in kind that served as the guarantee of the betrothal promise. It fell to the bride if the groom broke off the betrothal without good cause; in the reverse situation, the bride had to return the arrha. As an essential act for the betrothal—as an alternative to the written contract with the groom, the Basilika (1.12) stipulated that no prostimon be arranged in addition to the arrha. If the arrha was, until Justinian I, an optional payment, in the Ecloga (1.12) it appears as an essential act for the betrothal—as an alternative to the written contract with prostimon. The Epanagoge (title 15) and the Procheiron (title 2) return, as does the Basilika (28.1–2), to the Justiniannic legal situation, which considers the consent of the engaged couple sufficient for valid betrothal, without payment of an arrha. Even so, the
securing of a betrothal through *arrha* or *prostimon* remained common. Leo VI stipulates (nov. 18)—contrary to Leo I—that this securing should ensue through the “more important” *prostimon* (in contrast to *arrha sponsalicia*), as this was already taking place in custom.

In the wake of the extensive equalization of marriage and betrothal, the *arrha sponsalicia* survives as a payment, bound together with the blessing of the betrothal (Reg. 2, no. 1116). *Arrabon* or *arrabonismos* become synonymous with betrothal. *Prostima*, on the other hand, are prohibited for “genuine” betrothals, since they should be as little dissoluble in exchange for a money payment as the marriage (Reg. 2, no. 1167). According to the *Petra* (17.5, 17.14, 49.2) the betrothal was, on the contrary, still dissoluble through payment of the *prostimon*.

**ARSABER** (‘Αρσαβήρ, Arm. Aršawir), early 9th-C. usurper. An Armenian of noble background (C. Toumanoff, *Traditio* 27 [1971] 150), he served the Byz. emperor as quaestor and *patricks*. In Feb. 808 a group of lay and clerical officials opposed to Emp. Nikēphoros I, including the *synkellos*, *sakellarios*, and *chartophylax* of Hagia Sophia, proclaimed the “pious and most eloquent” Arsaber as emperor (Theoph. 483, 25–26). When Nikēphoros discovered the plot, Arsaber was beaten, tonsured, and exiled to Bithynia, while his supporters were beaten, stripped of their property, and exiled. Arsaber had a daughter, Theodosia, who married Leo V (Genes. 16.82–83).

**ARSACIDS** (‘Αρσακιδαὶ, Arm. Aršakuni), junior branch of the Parthian royal house ruling in Armenia until the beginning of the 5th C. The precise date of their establishment in Armenia is uncertain, and even in the 4th C. their chronology remains confused and highly controversial. Re-established on the throne by the Romans after the peace of Nisibis of 298, the Arsacids generally followed a pro-imperial policy. This orientation, deriving from their hostility to the Sasanian usurpers of their family’s kingdom in Persia, was reinforced by their conversion to Christianity in 314. Their arianizing policy under Constantius II alienated the native clergy as well as the magnates, and Armenian sources disagree with the allegiance to the Romans claimed by classical sources. Jovian’s abandonment of Armenia to the Sasanians in 363 led to the Persian occupation of the country and to the ultimate downfall of the Arsacid house. After the partition of Armenia between Rome and Persia in ca. 387, the Arsacid branch on imperial territory died out within a decade, while the Iranian branch ended in 428. Descendants of the Arsacids maintained an important, if primarily military, role at the Byz. court: in the 7th C. an Arsacid named *Valentinos Aršakuni* made a bid for the Byz. throne; in the 9th C. an apocrphal pedigree made Emp. Basil I one of their descendants.

**ARSÁK II/III** (Lat. Arsaces), Arsacid king of Armenia (338/50–363/68); his birth and death dates are uncertain. According to Ammianus Marcellinus (25.7.12–13), Aršák was a “constant and faithful friend” of the Romans, who rewarded him in 358 with a tax exemption and an imperial bride. Probably because of his attempts at centralization and his adherence to Constantius II’s arianizing policy, however, Armenian aristocratic and ecclesiastical sources are hostile to Aršák, portraying him as cruel and vacillating in his allegiance. Aršák seems to have supported the campaign of Julian the Apostate against the Persians in 363 (Julian’s threatening *Letter* to Aršák is usually deemed spurious). Abandoned by the Sasanians by Jovian’s peace of the same year, Aršák was captured by Shāpūr (Lat. Sapor) II and deported to Persia, where he died in the “Castle of Oblivion” a few years later.

**ARSAMOSATA** (Ar. Shimshāti, called *'Aσμόσατον* [Asmosaton] in the 10th C.; often confused with Samosata in Commagene; now Haraba), a fortress on the Murad Su (Arsanias River) about
ARSENIOS, metropolitan of Keryra (9th-10th C.). According to his akolouthia, Arsenios was born in Bethany (Palestine) during the reign of Basil I and became a monk at age 12. After being educated in Seleukeia (or the Orontes?), he went to Constantinople where, under Patr. Tryphon (928-31), he was entrusted with “the care of churches” (the post of oikonomos?). He was then elected bishop of Keryra (ca.933–56), where he survived an invasion of “Scythians.” On the other hand, an inscription of 1669 states that Arsenios’s relics were transferred to the Cathedral of St. James, Kerya, in 869 (Athenagoras in Eis mnemen Spyridonos Lamprou [Athens 1935] 436).

Several enkomia are attributed to Arsenios’s pen: on the apostle Andrew (BHG 105), the martyr Barbara (BHG 218), and the martyr Therinos who died in Epiros (BHG 1799). J. Mateos (OrChP 22 [1956] 368–74) ascribes to Arsenios the authorship of the kanon on St. Timothy of Prousia. Arsenios probably wrote the kanon of euchelaios, the sacrament of extreme unction for the sick (M. Jugie, EO 26 [1927] 416–19), and several other liturgical verses, including an Anacreontic on Easter Sunday (Matranga, AnecGr 2:670–75), in which he not only underscored the cosmic festivity but also employed pagan mythological images to portray the joy of spring. Arsenios’s identification with his homonym, a contemporary of Theodore of Studios and a friend of Photios, is questionable.

the anachronistic title of basilopator (see Basileopator). A 12th-C. historian (Zon. 3:231.17–18) states that he was a deacon of the Roman church. After forty years in the palace, Arsenios fled to Egypt, obeying a voice from heaven, and became a hermit in Sketis, then in Troia, then on an island near Alexandria, and again in Troia. Theodore of Studios describes Arsenios as a hermit who worked with his hands, weaving and sewing, and educated his pupils and visitors with shrewd conversations. His short stories are reminiscent of the Apophthegmata Patrum, and indeed several stories in the Apophthegmata are ascribed to a certain Arsenios (PG 65:87–108). Theodore also describes Arsenios’s physical appearance: a tall, lean man, bent with age, his beard reaching to his belly, his eyelashes worn away by excessive weeping. Symeon Metaphrastes included Arsenios’s vita in his collection. The 14th-C. Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos was the first to mention Arsenios’s literary activity, so it is questionable whether two short pieces preserved under the name of a monk Arsenios (PG 66:1617–26) should be attributed to him.

**Representation in Art.** Portraits of Arsenios echo Theodore’s description of the venerable desert father: he is gaunt, with an extremely long white beard (sometimes four- or five-pointed), and wears monastic robes. One menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes (Moscow, Hist. Mus. gr. 9, fol.11r) ignores his ascetic achievements and illustrates only his arrival on horseback from Rome and his instruction of the two young princes in Constantinople. His burial is included in another menologion (Paris, B.N. gr. 1528, fol.211r) and possibly on a fragmentary icon on Mt. Sinai (M. Chatzidakis, Venezia e il levante, vol. 2 [1974] 97, fig.67).


**ARSINOES.** See FAYYUM.

**ART (τέχνη).** The Greek term *techne* had a broad range of meanings, including mental dexterity, linguistic ability, and trickery as well as the skills of rulers and physicians. It therefore implied something closer to craft and denied a privileged role to the work of art and to its creator. Art was understood not as completing nature, as in Aristotle, nor as possessing value independent of nature, as in the modern view, but as nature: art reproduced reality, including those aspects of it that were normally invisible (John of Damascus, ed. Kotter, Schriften 3:126.2–3). Despite centuries of theorizing about the relationship of the image to its prototype, not until the 15th C. (Manuel Chrysoloras) was a practical distinction drawn between the image and that which it represented. Equally, written accounts of works of art rarely distinguish the material of which they were made: differentiations between the principal genres and materials are usually to be found only in inventories where they served quite other purposes than aesthetic appreciation or even evaluation as stimuli to religious faith. But descriptions of mosaic and wall painting (see Monumental Painting), the two main types of monumental decoration in Byz., largely ignore the contribution of the medium to the work’s final effect, emphasizing...
instead the lifelike of the image and its impact upon the beholder. Where the medium can be discerned at all, reports on icons, ecclesiastical silver, enamels, and textiles—some of the most frequently noted categories of portable works—stress function rather than form, message rather than materials.

Literature provides our primary means of access to the Byz. response to that which we call art and confirms the view that the purposes of representational art took precedence over its nature and materials. The effects of art—the magnificence of a building and its decoration, the glittering splendor of a piece of metalwork—all but efface other considerations. The purpose of architecture is to magnify the builder and often, as described in the Vita Basilii, to show that he has recovered the glory of the past. Such an approach links imperial founders, ktetors of lesser rank, and church builders. The significant aspect of a structure lies in what it says about its patron: it shows that an emperor has restored (often “from the ground up”) what had crumbled, be it the fabric of a building, the reputation of a city, or the strength of right belief.

On the one hand, what was ancient, when it survived, was prized for its own sake; on the other, its restoration was a Christian’s duty and a credit to him. Since an icon was understood to function by virtue of perfect correspondence to its subject, panels were frequently “made anew” (Skyl. 384.21–24) and portraits in mosaics and MSS often remade. Lacking autonomous value as art, frescoes were overpainted with subjects sometimes quite different from the originals. Nonetheless, both the means by which pictures were produced and their iconography demonstrate the respect for authority and tradition (Mansi 13:252C) and the emphasis on orthodoxy of thought and behavior, apparent in other aspects of Byz. culture. Many works can be shown to have a more or less close dependence upon earlier examples, due in some cases to direct derivation but more often to the employment of a conventional and ubiquitous visual vocabulary. This lexicon included individual figures and poses, gestures and backgrounds preserved either in model-books (see Models and Model-Books) or, more likely, in the memory of craftsmen. Such elements were used or modified, and their syntactical relationships adjusted, according to context.

Thoroughly pragmatic, artists borrowed established forms, much as builders used spolia, and usually invented only when an exemplar was not at hand. How faithfully older forms were transmitted depended upon opportunities for access to models and the purpose, training, and native ability of the artist. This approach to artistic production was reinforced by socially sanctioned notions of decorum, of what was appropriate to a particular type of commission. Although there were variations in the size of a ktetor’s investment, church programs of decoration conformed to highly developed ideas of what was fitting. Works in other favored media, above all textiles, book illustration, and metalwork, display similar homogeneity. While the same genres characterized Islamic art, the latter exhibited neither the Byz. emphasis on sacred decoration nor the resultant body of canonical subject matter. The overriding Byz. concern with an established and limited iconographical corpus likewise distinguishes it from the medieval West: most of the “profane” subjects—the virtues and vices, the liberal arts, the representation of trades and crafts—are largely missing from Byz. art.

The exploitation of older models was a phenomenon common to the visual arts and literature. Just as the 10th-C. historian Leo the Deacon was content to use descriptions of battles taken from Agathias writing four centuries earlier, so the 14th-C. mosaics of the Chora monastery, for example, quote details from the 10th-C. Joshua roll. Such “antiques” were valued both for their age and their potential as models. As descriptions were interchangeable in texts, so were details of physiognomy, clothing, and setting in art: identity often depended as much on inscriptions as on formal variation. The benign and constant cannibalism of earlier work largely undercuts the notion of successive renaissances that have been imposed on particular periods. The supposition that painters of the 6th, 10th, and early 14th C. were more interested in antiquity than those of other times attributes to them an unusual motivation when, in fact, the use of ancient types was a form of economy on their part. The more frequent appearance of “classicizing” elements in certain eras is merely because of the fact that these were periods of cultural revival producing more works of high quality.

While particular instances of copying may reflect an act of choice on the part of a patron, this attitude was culturally determined. Overt ex-
amples of the political supervision of artistic produc-
tion are few, but social control was compelling
and depended on the various functions assigned
to the work of art. Basil the Great (PG 32:229A)
regarded images, like the lives of saints, as inspira-
tions to virtue. More concretely, for Gregory of
Nyssa (PG 46:737D) they had the value of "silent
writing." This didactic role was expanded in the
8th and 9th C. For the patriarch Nikephors I
the educative power of icons exceeded that of
words, while Photios saw representations of mar-
tyrdom as more vivid than writing (L. Brubaker,
Word and Image 5 [1989] 23 f). Independent of
such theoretical statements, art provided a vehicle
for the expression of supplications and gratitude
to God (Sophronios, PG 87.3:3388C). Icons were
a means of access to the divine and responsible,
Psellos' mother believed (An.Komn. 2:34.8-10),
for human success. As materially rich creations,
works of art were considered proper gifts at holy
sites (Piacenza Pilgrim) and, as the will of Eu-
stathios Boilas and the diatasis of Michael Atta-
леiates make clear, to churches and monasteries.

Other types of document, notably the ek-
phrasis, emphasize the presence of Christ, his
mother, and his saints, in their images. This sort
of "realism" differs from that which allowed ac-
tuality to obtrude into representations of agricul-
ture, navigation, and the like, and to invest biblical
and hagiographical events with details that the
artist's contemporaries could recognize. Since all
attention was paid to the immediate significance
of a scene, no attempt was made to present the
past as such (see History Painting). Constantine
I, for instance, was sometimes given the features
of the reigning monarch, and incidents of the
Old Testament were employed for their value
as prefigurations of current events.

Despite such constants, developments in both
style and subject matter are evident over the
centuries, particularly in monumental painting,
which, to a much greater extent than in the West,
was the dominant visual medium. Such changes
are in part to be explained by church doctrine:
the Second Council of Nicaea had defined the
manner of representation as the domain of the
artist. Before this time, art displayed the icono-
graphical and formal diversity characteristic of
late antiquity and its far-flung cities. Lively scenes
drawing on the everyday world distinguish both
imperial imagery (Barberini Ivory) and Christian
themes (Rossano Gospels). A more rigorous defi-
nition of acceptable subject matter and its modes
of presentation emerged from the search for au-
thoritative, ancient statements concerning the va-
validity of images both before and during Icono-
clasm. To a degree this debate was responsible
for the evolution of an attitude, akin to ency-
clopedism, toward the artistic heritage that was
at once selective and prescriptive. In the service
of dogmatic clarity, art of the 10th and early 11th
C. exhibits a formal austerity based on the prin-
ciples of frontality and symmetry.

These features have been seen as reducing the
monumentality attributed to the painting of the
"Macedonian Renaissance" but they are symptoms
not causes. Rather, the late 11th- and 12th-C.
desire to express more complex Christological
ideas and more affective expressions of emotion
widened the range of art, in the creation of which
the number of identifiable and named artists in-
creased greatly. But territorial losses and the fall
of Constantinople to the Latins in 1204 brought
to a close four centuries in which the artistic
hegemony of the capital had been recognized and
emulated beyond the confines of the empire. Al-
ready in the 12th C. both Latin and Turkic ele-
ments can be found in art; this trickle became
a spate in and after the late 13th C. Even before
the Civil War of 1341-47 cut short a brief Palaio-
logan revival, the sponsorship of works of art had
passed into the hands of local magnates, both lay
and ecclesiastical; the final 150 years display a
range of representational quality and manners at
odds with the splendor and uniformity that had
characterized 9th-12th-C. production and on
which the reputation of Byz. art has long been
based. Only very recently has the appropriateness
of modern standards such as aesthetic autonomy
and independence of its ideological well-springs
been questioned (R. Nelson, Art History 12 [1989]
144-57). The recovery of and sympathy for the
context in which this body of production came into
being is now seen as a more direct route to
the understanding of Byz. art.

Lit. V.N. Lazarev, Storia della pittura bizantina (Turin
1966). A. Grabar, Byzantium from the Death of Theodosius to
the Rise of Islam (London 1966). R. Cormack, Writing in
e il suo pubblico (Turin 1986). C. Mango, The Art of the
Byzantine Empire 312-1453 (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972;
rep. Toronto 1986). W.F. Volbach, J. Lafontaine-Dosogne,
Byzant und der christliche Osten (Berlin 1968).

-AC.
ARTA (Ἀρτα), located at the site of ancient Ambrikia, on the river Arachthos, about 13 km north of the Gulf of Arta; capital of the state of Epiros from 1205 onward. There is no certain information on Arta before the end of the 11th C. In the 12th C., however, Arta was an important trade center frequented by Venetians and an archbishopric (its archbishop is attested in 1157); an episképsi of Arta probably existed within the theme of Nikopolis. The city flourished in the 13th C.: it was fortified evidently after 1227 (A. Orlandos, ABME 2 [1936] 156f.), and excavated artifacts suggest local ceramic production (A. Vavylopoloulou-Charitonidou, DChAE 4 12 [1984] 453–72). The CHRONICLE OF THE TOCCO describes Arta as the center of a fertile agricultural region with many water buffaloes, cows, and horses; merchants from Venice and Dubrovnik competed for the market of Arta, which supplied dried meat, lard, ham, furs, and indigo.

Arta was attacked by the empire of Nicea in 1259 to Nicean troops. The restored empire continued these assaults: Andronikos II attacked Arta unsuccessfully, but in 1338 Andronikos III took it. After a rebellion led by Nikephoros Basilakes the city surrendered to John Kantakouzenos. Afterwards Arta changed hands many times: it was conquered by Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, then passed to the Albanians, and in 1416 to Carlo I Tocco. It fell to the Ottomans in 1449.

The bishopric of Arta does not appear regularly in the notitiae and may have been combined with that of nearby Rogoi. In an act of 1367 Arta is named the “bishopric of Akarnania” (MM 1:494–13).

Monuments of Arta. The fortifications of the acropolis have been attributed to Michael I Komnenos Doukas, but in their present state they are largely post-Byz.; the palace has vanished completely.

There are churches in and around Arta that date, in part at least, from the 9th to 10th C.: simple wooden-roofed basilicas, sometimes topped by domes with high cylindrical drums (St. Demetrios tou Katsoure), or of a free-standing cross plan (St. Basil tes Gephyras, early 9th C.?). But the main building activity in Arta took place in the time of the despote of Epiros, when many of these early churches were also renovated. Because of the strength of this local tradition, the penetration of Constantinopolitan and Western influences into the region produced in Arta architectural forms of considerable originality that are behelden to neither. The 13th-C. structures, often still basilical in plan, have lively bands of brick and multicolored ceramic decoration, the latter even including figural plaques, as in the Church of St. Basil (S. Xenopoulos, EEB 6 [1929] 387–97), while stone figural sculpture adorns column capitals and tombs as well as church façades.

The most important monument in Arta is the large metropolitan Church of the Virgin Paregoritissa, founded by the despotes Nikephoros I Komnenos Doukas, his wife, and his son, ca. 1290. It has a square, blocklike exterior rising three stories like a palace; on its horizontal roofline appear five domes and a lantern. The interior is spacious, being a form of domed octagon like Nea Mone on Chios, though the eight piers here are divided into three tiers, with reused columns serving both as consoles and as vertical supports. The walls of the church had marble revetment up to the level of the surrounding galleries, and the dome itself has a Byz. program in mosaic: a huge figure of Christ Pantokrator surrounded by seraphim and cherubim, and 12 prophets between the windows of the drum. The mosaicists were presumably brought in from a Byz. center outside Epiros, though it is not known which. Western elements are also evident in the carved Romanesque monsters and reliefs with biblical themes that adorn the interior.

The Church of the Kato Panagia, built ca. 1250–70 by the father of Nikephoros I, the despotes Michael II Komnenos Doukas, has a barrel-vaulted nave, but a transverse vault rises high over the crossing to produce the effect of a dome. The plan, very similar to that of the Porta Panagia in Thessaly, has affinities also with Peloponnesian monuments of the 13th C. The monastery of Theodora (previously St. George) has a three-aisled basilica of the mid-12th C. The domed narthex added by St. THEODORA OF ARTA (ca. 1270) housed her tomb; a marble slab from her sarcophagus bears her portrait in relief, dressed as an empress, and that of a male figure, probably her son Nikephoros I.

Frescoes in the despotate churches of Arta are generally Byz. in inspiration (e.g., St. Nicholas tes Rhodias), most painted in the style of the early decades of the 13th C. The church of the Bla-
cherna convent preserves a fragmentary fresco showing a procession of the icon of the Virgin Hodegetria through the streets of Constantinople (M. Achimastou-Potamianou, DChAE 13 [1985–86] 301–06). The church itself (part of which may belong to the early 10th C.) is a three-aisled basilica with a dome over each aisle; fragments of its marble templeion with figures of angels flanking the Virgin have also been preserved, as has its marble mosaic floor, and some inscribed tomb reliefs that identify the deceased as members of the royal family.


T.E.G., N.P.S.

ARTABASDOS (Ἀρταβάσδως, Ἀρτάβαζος), usurper (742–43). An Armenian (Toumanoff, “Caucasia” 135), Artabasdos was appointed strategos of the Armeniakon by Anastasios II (713–15). He supported the revolt of Leo III against Theodosios III and subsequently received Leo’s daughter Anna in marriage, the title kourepalates (Guillard, Titres, pt.III [1970], 1981), and the position of komes of the Opsikon. The report of Eutychios of Alexandria that Artabasdos came from Germanieka, Leo’s birthplace, may explain their strong ties. After Leo’s death Artabasdos revolted against Constantine V in June of either 741 or 742, defeated him, and entered Constantinople, perhaps exploiting a reaction against Iconoclasm. He ruled with his eldest son Nikephoros as co-emperor and received recognition from Pope Zacharias. Artabasdos may also have crowned Anna and his youngest son Niketas (Synopsis chronike, ed. Sathas, MB 7:124.2–3). His most notable achievement was the restoration of icons (denied by Speck, infra, but reaffirmed by W. Treadgold, AHR 88 [1983] 94f). He sent Niketas as monostrategos to the Armeniakon, but Constantine defeated him in the summer of 743 and entered Constantinople on 2 Nov. of that year. Artabasdos and his sons were blinded in the Hippodrome.


P.A.H.

ARTABASDOS, NICHOLAS RHABDAS. See Rhabdas, Nicholas Artabasdos.

ART AND THE WEST. While the dedication of Constantinople as the new Rome symbolized imperial and artistic unity and Constantinople was patterned after old Rome in its topography and monuments, their shared traditions contained the seeds of future separation. After the division of the empire and the decline of the Western part in the 5th C., it was the art of the Eastern part that upheld the classical standards of old Rome while developing new Christian form and content. When Rome gradually lost its position as artistic capital after ca.450, Constantinople assumed this role; by the 540s its impact on Italian soil was evident in the architecture and decoration of the Church of S. Vitale in Ravenna.

The new Byz. art followed in the path of Justinian’s generals and, where political hegemony was maintained, this art flourished. As the attempt to reestablish the empire in the West failed in the face of barbarian invasions, however, manifestations of Byz. art in Italy became less the product of state patronage and, as at S. Maria Antiqua in Rome, more the result of individual traveling artists or workshops commissioned by Italians. Byz. rule continued in parts of Italy until the 11th C., so Greek artists were readily available, and possibly so even in areas not under Byz. control (e.g., S. Maria di Castelseprio). Iconoclasm may also have stimulated the flow of artists to the outlying provinces and beyond. North of the Alps, however, the impact of Byz. art was less pronounced. Major works such as Charlemagne’s Palatine Chapel at Aachen and the early 9th-C. Lorsch ivory bookcover were sponsored by the Western emperor and other knowledgeable political patrons who sought to follow imperial Byz. models. An itinerant Greek painter may have worked on the Schatzkammer Gospels (Vienna) ca.800. Farther afield the strength and frequency of Byz. influence were much less. Discrete elements of the Lindisfarne Gospels show that the artist had indirect contact with Byz. art in the late 7th C.
Similarly the full-page Virgin and Child in the Book of Kells, ca.800, reflects a Théotokos at some distance, probably filtered through intermediate works.

In the 10th–11th C., direct Byz. influence on artists working for the Western emperor intensified with the marriage of Otto II and Théophanie: an ivory (Paris, Cluny Museum) made for their coronation depends upon a Greek prototype. Byz. ivories also transmitted to Ottonian book-painters iconographic types such as the Dormition of the Virgin, and a Greek artist probably worked on the face and hands of Christ and the Virgin in the Codex Aureus of Henry III (Escorial Vit. 17, 1043–46). By contrast, in the British Isles much more selective iconographic borrowings continue to be found, for example, at Winchester in the Benedicentum of St. Aethelwold made for the Western emperor intensification of Otto II and Théophanie. Farther south direct Byz. artistic intervention did occur at Montecassino, however, to which Emp. Constantine IX made large donations and where Abbot Desiderius employed Greek artists. The impact of this project is visible in some of the frescoes of Sant’Angelo in Formis and in numerous 11th–12th-C. bronze doors on churches throughout Italy.

At the time of the Crusades, Byz. artistic influence in the West increased. This new and substantial phase is represented by and emanated from the monuments of the Norman kings of Sicily at Cefalù, Palermo, and Monreale; at S. Marco in Venice; and nearby at Torcello. Transmitted from Italy, with Venice as an esp. important intermediary, awareness of Byz. art spread widely through Europe at various levels of impact and understanding (A. Cutler, Mediaevalia 7 [1981] 41–77): in Spain in the now-destroyed chapter house at Sigena; in England in a major series of MSS, including the St. Albans Psalter and a series of giant Bibles, and frescoes at Canterbury; in France in MS illumination at Cluny and the frescoes of the chapel at Berzé-la-Ville nearby; and in Austria, Germany, and the Meuse valley in the work of goldsmiths such as Nicholas of Verdun.

The nature of the artistic relationship changed greatly in the 13th C. as a result of the Latin conquest of Constantinople, the Frankish presence in Greece during the Latin Empire (1204–61), and the strengthened contacts between Byz. and the merchant cities of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa. The two cultures interacted in a way that affected both Byz. art in the 13th and 14th C. and the development of the manière grecque in Duecento Italian panel painting. This manière, expressed early in the Kahn and Mellon Madonnas (Washington, D.C., National Gallery), evolved into the individual styles of Cimabue and Duccio; the prolongation of Byz.-influenced painting in Germany; the spread of panel painting to northern Europe; and even the provision of certain components of the developing Gothic style in France, seen, for example, in the Ingeborg Psalter (Chantilly, Musée Condé 1695, ca.1200).

The impact of Byz. art on the West in the 14th–15th C. is less clear, but one major change is apparent. Whereas until the 13th C. Byz. art had influenced the West without—except in the 4th–5th C.—the reverse being true, instances of Western artistic influence on Byz. became marked. Examples range from Italian-influenced sculpture in the Church of the Virgin Paregoritissa at Arta, through Western elements in the iconography of frescoes at Bojana, to the dedication pages of two 14th-C. Hippokrates MSS (Vat. Palat. gr. 199; Paris, B.N. gr. 2144), and a MS of the Alexander Romance (Nelson, Preface & Miniature 42f, 52f). A very late example is the fresco (ca.1450) decorating Tomb G in the Chora, "the first painting found in Constantinople in which clear-cut and precise evidence of direct Renaissance influence can be observed" (Underwood, Kariye Djami 1:292–95).

Although the interrelationship of Byz. art and medieval art in western Europe is clearly a complex phenomenon, the asymmetry of artistic flow, mainly westward from Constantinople and its empire, can be explained by a variety of factors. These include the strength and stability of the Byz. artistic tradition, the authority of imperial patronage, the high artistic quality maintained at Constantinople and consequent renown of Byz. art, the direct or indirect dissemination of objects, and the growing familiarity of Westerners with Byz. art and artists through travel and specific commissions. Only after the Crusades and expanded exploitation of the Mediterranean trade routes brought the West into direct contact with Byz. could the former begin to affect the art of Byz. Ironically, the very catastrophe that definitively sundered the Greek and Latin cultures, the
sack of Constantinople in 1204, provided the decisive turning point when western Europe saw a major infusion of Byz. works. This and the implantation of Franks on Greek soil sowed the seeds of artistic interpenetration. The role of the Latins in Frankish Greece and the Holy Land, and the resultant Crusader art and architecture, remain to be fully studied; similarly, the means of artistic transmission and interchange must be further clarified. Clearly the importance of the Crusaders’ intermediary role is one of the most significant new contributions to the understanding of artistic relations between Byz. and the West.


ARTAŞAT (Ἀρτασάτα), early Armenian capital on the north bank of the mid-Araxes River, founded by Artašēs (Artaxias) in the 2nd C. B.C. It was also the capital of the later Armenian ARŞAIDS. Recent excavations reveal that it was a major urban center, but rulers rarely resided there and it never recovered from its sack by the Persians in 363. Nearby DUN replaced it, probably in the second half of the 5th C. The main importance of Artaşat apparently lay in its position on the commercial transit route through Armenia; it was officially designated one of the three customs posts between Byz. and the Sasanians in the 5th C. (Cod. Just. IV 63.4), a position apparently reconfirmed at the Peace of 562, even though the clause did not specifically mention Artaşat (Menander Protector, fr.6, ed. Blockley 70.323–26). The city slowly declined to the level of a village, but was still known to 9th-C. Arab sources as a center for the production of red dye (kirmiz).


ARTEMIOS (Ἀρτέμιος), saint; died Antioch ca.362; feastday 20 Oct. Born to a noble family, Artemios was governor of Egypt in 360. An Arian supporter of Constantius II, Artemios persecuted both pagans and Orthodox Christians (PLRE 1:112). After Emp. Julian had him executed for his Christian beliefs, the deaconess Ariste brought his body to Constantinople, where it was later deposited in the Church of John Prodromos in Oxeia. The healing power of his relics became famous: a series of miracles is described in an anonymous collection of legends compiled in 660–68. Artemios mainly cured diseased testicles by means of incubation inside the church. The legend emphasizes the miraculous nature of Artemios’ cures: for instance, a certain George had a vision in which Artemios appeared as a butcher and performed an operation with a butcher’s implements. Artemios’s miracles attracted patients from Amastris, Phrygia, Chios, Rhodes, Alexandria, and Africa. It is questionable whether the Church of Prodromos was renamed in honor of Artemios.

PHILOSTORGIOS eulogized Artemios’s martyrdom, and on this basis a passio was produced: Bidez (infra, xliiv–lxviii) ascribes it to John of Rhodes (otherwise unknown); Beck (Kirche 482f) attributes it to JOHN OF DAMASCUS, although this is unlikely, since the passio is referred to in the 7th-C. Miracles. SYMEON METAPHRASTES included it in his collection of saints’ Lives.

Representation in Art. The somewhat confused historical tradition is reflected in art. In miniatures of the menologion of Metaphrastes, and in the Theodore Psalter (fol.75r), Artemios appears as a noble martyr with a short dark beard like that of Christ. In wall-painting, however, his military role is emphasized: he is dressed in armor and paired with other military saints, esp. MERVOUROS and Niketas the Goth. Scenes of his martyrdom apparently once adorned the temple of his shrine in Constantinople. His beheading is depicted in the Menologion of Basil II (p.126), and there is a Passion cycle of eight episodes in an 11th-C. MS on Mt. Athos (Esphig. 14, fols. 90r-v, Treasures 2.21f).


ARTEMIS, female deity of pre-Hellenic origin, whose cult survived in the late Roman Empire until the 5th–6th C. Artemis Ephesia, a variant who was popular in Asia Minor, was venerated as a helper of women in childbirth, as fertility goddess, and as city-protector. Her statue represents her with a dozen or more breasts exposed beneath a wide brooch and the mural crown. Sixth-C. poets also refer to Artemis as protector of women in childbirth. Her temple at Ephesus was closed only at the beginning of the 5th C. An inscription, probably of the 5th C. (M. Guarducci, Epigrafia greca, vol. 4 [Rome 1978] 400f), records a certain Demeas who "tore down the beguiling image of the daimon Artemis" and substituted a cross. At Sardis her temple was abandoned by the mid-4th C., and a small church was built at the eastern end.

The vita of St. Hypatios of Roupheianai records in the 5th C. a festival in the Bithynian uplands called the "Basket" (kalathos) of Artemis, which the rural population celebrated annually. Hypatios allegedly saw her appear in the form of a giantess swineherd. In the 6th C. Theodore of Sykeon heard a rumor about a place in Galatia, possibly a sacred grove, where it was popularly believed that Artemis resided with many demons and killed people. In the Byz. polemic against paganism Artemis was represented as extremely cruel; although she was a chaste virgin, she enjoyed bloody sacrifices and killed strangers and thus did not fit the ideal of Christian morality.

Radically transformed from her Antique image of athletic huntress, Artemis, represented as a kindly, hooded woman, presides with Oppian over the introductory miniature of the 11th-C. Venice Kynegetika.


ARTILLERY AND SIEGE MACHINERY. The Byz. employed catapults (petrobole) and other stone- or arrow-shooting devices (cheiroballistra, cheiro-
mangana) in siege operations. Although torsion catapults had been developed in antiquity, the Byz. normally used the less complicated and more easily maintained rope-pulled trebuchets favored by the Arabs, Avars, and steppe peoples (D.R. Hill, Viator 4 [1973] 99–116). A beam was fixed unevenly over a crossbar and a stone placed in a sling at the end of the longer arm; several men then pulled down the rope(s) attached to the shorter arm, flinging the longer arm upward and propelling the stone. The Miracles of St. Demetrios provide an excellent description of rope-pulled catapults (Lemerle, Miracles 1:154.9–22).

The cheiroballistron resembled a crossbow (see Weaponry). An arrow or stone was laid in a channel along the stock, while the string, fastened to the ends of the two arms, was wound back, locked, and released to fire the projectile. These weapons, usually mounted on stands, were used by defenders and attackers; Prokopios (Wars 5.21.14–18) describes Belisarios's men operating this weapon from a siege tower.

Remains of late 4th-C. catapults were discovered on the sites of some Dacian strongholds (N. Gudea, D. Baatz, Saalburg Jahrbuch 31 [1974] 50–72). P. Brennan (Chiron 10 [1980] 553–67) suggests that in the Danubian provinces of Scythia, Pannonia I and II, composite detachments of ballistarii were formed from both legions of each province; they operated catapults and other missile-wielding weaponry at permanent bridgeheads to assist expeditionary armies.

Siege machinery included wooden towers (helepolis) built or rolled next to the wall. They often had a platform from which to shoot Greek fire (as depicted in the 11th-C. Vat. gr. 1605, fol.185) and were covered with soaked hides to guard against similar incendiary weapons. Soldiers also used battering rams (krion) to break down gates; rams were also suspended from a frame to be swung back and forth against the target. Nikephoros Ouranos recommended tunneling above all other methods to collapse the wall (ed. J.-A. de Foucault, TM 5 [1973] 295–303). The soldiers made hutlike shelters (laiais) from branches and vines to protect themselves while undermining the base of the wall. Most artillery and siege machinery was built in situ during sieges instead of being transported. Engineers (technitai) accompanied the besiegers to construct the necessary equipment (Leo Diacon 16.11–21).
ARTISAN. There was no special Byz. term for the artisan and, contrary to B. Malich (BBA 51 [1983] 47–59), there was no clear distinction between the artisan and the MERCHANT. Of course, there were professional traders not involved in production as well as craftsmen who worked for an employer (or a rearranged customer) rather than for the market; but both Egyptian papyri and the Book of the Eparch note various artisans (e.g., candlemakers, soapmakers, silk weavers) who sold their own goods. The major branches of Byz. craftsmanship were metallurgy; production of weapons; manufacture of jewelry, pottery, and glass; production of textiles and clothing; the leather industry; carpentry and masonry; the building industry; baking of bread; and production of vegetable oil and other victuals. Late Roman texts present a diversified pattern of artisan professions (H. von Petrikovits, ZPapEpig 43 [1981] 285–306) that presupposes a very consistent division of labor, although the list of names is longer than the number of actual professions because various terms are used to refer to the same profession. The terminology of the Book of the Eparch seems to be less varied, and probably only silk production and the leather industry reflect any significant division of labor.

Craftsmanship was divided into several categories: state fabriceae or ergasteria basilika (see Factories, Imperial), guilds, and craftsmen outside state or guild organizations. Artisans were concentrated in towns; according to M. Ja. Sjuzjumov (VizVrem 11 [1956] 66f), they worked primarily in suburban areas—a thesis that is not supported by archaeological data. Monasteries (for example, the Studios) had their own workshops and monk-artisans. In praktika, the most frequently named rural artisans are smiths, tailors, and shoemakers.

Artisans appear more common in Late Antique than in Byz. art. An ivory fragment at Princeton (Age of Spirit, no. 254) shows a carpenter planing a board; masons lay up a wall in a fresco in the Via Latina catacomb, Rome (ibid., no. 253). In Byz. their role is as peripheral figures in compositions honoring a ktetor, as in the Vienna Dioskorides (fol. 6v; Weitzmann, Late Antique Ill., pl. 15), or as illustrations to biblical scenes such as the construction of Noah's Ark or the tower of Babel (see Genesis).


ARTISTS. No precise equivalent existed in Byz. Greek for this generic modern term: practitioners of the arts and crafts are variously referred to in texts and inscriptions as zographos or historiographos (painter), maistor, and kiskes used in the sense of an executant of a commissioned work (cf. ktetor). No clearly defined social or economic boundary separated ARTISANS from artists, some of whom achieved eminence. Lazaros was a member of two diplomatic missions to Rome, and Panteleon was on equal terms with a hegoumenos of the Constantinopolitan monastery of the Pana-giou. Some artists were rich enough to act as ketores themselves. A 1oth-C. goldsmith named Gregory paid for the construction of a church at Trani; Michael Proelusis (see list below), an early 14th-C. painter, rebuilt and restored a monastery on land that he had rented near Halmuros.

Unlike in ancient Rome, the practice of art in Byz. was not considered demeaning. Artists might be as lowly as the "poor widow woman" in mid-6th-C. Syria "who had been taught the art of drawing and used to . . . labor at it for her necessities" (John of Ephesus—PO 17.1:15); at the other end of the social scale its most celebrated exponent was CONSTANTINE VII PORPHYROGENETOS. Icon-painting was by definition an acceptable enterprise for a Christian, on the model of St. Luke who was supposed to have plded this trade. Painters are frequently described in hagiographic texts as "inspired" or "skilled," and many painters are credited with privileged, supernatural aid that enabled them to finish their commissions. A great master like Eulalios was celebrated by numerous writers of his time. Amateurs, lay and monastic and often of high rank, aspired
to such talents (N. Oikonomides in AAPA 1:45–51).

Artists were not narrowly specialized, which helps to explain consistencies in both style and subject matter across different media. While legal documents such as the Codex Theodosianus (Cod. Theod. XIII 4.2) and the Book of the Eparch distinguish, for administrative purposes, craftsmen by their trades, panel painters like Pantoleon also illustrated books, and muralists produced icons. At sites such as the Chora in Constantinople, mosaicists were probably also responsible for the frescoed decoration.

Of the training of artists almost nothing is known. The above-mentioned Syrian woman used to teach pupils for a fee; there is no later evidence for such instruction or for art schools in the narrow sense of the term. As is made clear in the will of the Cretan painter Angelos Akotantos (see list below), both skills and equipment, including drawings (skias mata), were transmitted from father to son. The transmission of technical skills from one generation to another is already implied in Constantine I's legislation of 334 (Cod. Theod. XIII 4.2, repeated in the Codex Justinianus—Cod. Just. X 66.1). Parents also placed their children as apprentices. One must suppose some sort of on-the-job training like that of Alimpijs, "given by his parents to study icon-painting" and employed as an assistant to the Byz. mosaicists at work in the monastery of the Caves at Kiev. Training would have been particularly necessary in mosaic, a craft demanding both individual expertise and a quasi-industrial organization.

Painters on a smaller scale and other craftsmen worked at home or, at least in the 4th–6th C., in small ateliers. A law of the emperor Valentinian of the year 374 (Cod. Theod. XIII 4.4) mentions painters' studios (pergulae) and workshops in public places. One such may be the room equipped with an easel used by a portrait-painter depicted in the Vienna Dioskuroides. Although it is often supposed that monasteries maintained painters' workshops in addition to their scriptoria, there is no documentary proof for such a notion. Most tasks would have been farmed out, by monks and laymen alike, to professionals.

In the 5th C. there is unequivocal evidence that painters worked directly from life (Theodoret of Cyrus, Histoire des moines de Syrie, ed. P. Canivet, A. Leroy-Molingen [Paris 1979] 2.248.11–16). A legend in the Life of Nikon II "Métaneiâte" has it that an artist could not paint the saint's likeness because he had no model. Artists probably knew the majority of the themes they were called upon to paint and used techniques that enabled them to work quickly. D.C. Winfield ("Painting Methods" 132f) estimated that fresco painters covered 6–7 sq. m daily. The team working with Theophanes "The Greek" finished painting the Annunciation Church in the Moscow Kremlin in one season. Yet, while employing well-established formulas and perhaps model-books, they were not externally controlled. There is no reason to suppose them regulated in aesthetic matters and almost as great a variety obtains in details of iconography as in the areas of style and composition. Conventional models and schemes of decoration were modified to suit the dimensions and layout of a building and, presumably, the financial size of a commission. Such factors, equally affecting portable artifacts, determined the mode of production.

The exercise of an artist's taste is not an identifiable characteristic of Byz. art. While artists were not limited to biblical subjects—both monumental painters (as in the patriarchal apartments at Hagia Sophia, Constantinople) and illuminators (as in marginal Psalter illustration) "commented" on current and recent events—interventions of this sort seem to have lain in the domain of the patron rather than with those hired to execute his wishes. Nonetheless, major painters could exercise considerable freedom in their choice of models: Pantoleon is known to have reproduced a picture he had just painted while, in the second half of the 14th C., Gastreas (see list below) traveled in Arkadia seeking "ancient icons" to copy.

With the exception of the team that decorated the Menologion of Basil II, artists' "signatures" do not appear in any numbers before the 12th C. The rare self-portrait of the scribe and/or painter Theophanes in a MS of ca. 1100 coincides with other individualistic trends in monumental painting of the period. By the 14th C., artists such as Kallierges were legends in their own time; others, like Panselinos, may be no more than legends. Artists' inscriptions are usually laconic; where longer, they constitute proof of literacy.

Proud boasts claiming the presence of Byz. artists abound in Latin and Slavic literature. While
Byz. artists had long been active abroad—a diaspora to Rome during Iconoclasm is often asserted, but Damascus, Montecassino, and Dubrovnik offer better-documented examples—named individuals are not found before the 13th C. Rather than venturing overseas alone, artists seem to have gone abroad in clusters. A succession of Greeks painted churches in Macedonia and Serbia after the fall of Constantinople in 1204; in the early 14th C. Byz. wall-painters were active in Venice, Sicily, Genoa, and Russia. A second spate returned or was summoned to Russia and Georgia in the 1370s. Preserved monuments show that they adapted themselves quickly to the local concerns and requirements of their new hosts.

Wall-painters and mosaicists such as Eualios are more widely celebrated in chronicles than illuminators and other craftsmen, a fame reflecting quite literally the size of their achievement; hagiography more often yields the names of icon-painters. Generally, artists appear in literature for achievements other than their artistry. This fact, the absence of documentation regarding patrons’ wishes, and the impersonal nature of much Byz. craftsmanship make it hard to define artistic personality. Yet the notion that art was always an anonymous activity is contradicted by the following selection of documented names. Many craftsmen, esp. painters, gem-cutters, and goldsmiths of the 4th–7th C., are known only by their names on funerary and other inscriptions. They have been collected by Mentzou (infra) and are not included here.

[A]etios, monk, signed a wall-painting in the Church of the Forty Martyrs at Suves (Cappadocia) in 1216/17 (Jerphanion, Églises rupestres 2:1:156–74).

Akotantanis, Angelos, icon-painter and proto psaites in Chandax 1407–13. His will (M. Manoussakas, DChAE 2 [1960–61] 146–48) was drawn up in 1436 before he sailed for Constantinople. Recently, several icons, signed by or attributed to Akotantanis, have come to light (M. Vasilake-Maurakake, Thesaurismata 18 [1981] 290–98; PLP, no.13318; cf. 13319, 13320).

[Anastasi]os, priest and painter of the Church of St. George at Apodoulous, Crete, 14th/15th C. (Kalokyris, Crete 3; PLP, no.90088).

Andrea[s], sculptor named in an inscription on the upper cornice of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople (unpublished; notice courtesy of L.E. Butler).

Apokaukos, Alexios, painter on Crete, fl. 1402–1421, executor of the will of Joseph Bryenios (PLP, no.1194).

Apsheude, Theodore.


Arsenios, monk and painter who, together with his son Theophylaktos, decorated a chapel of St. Michael in the Hasan Dağ in the reign of Constantine VIII (?) (N. Thierry, JSav [1968] 45–61).

Asbestos, Gregory.

Atzemos, Basil, also called Berges, 11th-C. (?) painter who signed a supplication to Symeon the Stylite beside the saint’s image in a Chicago MS, Univ. Lib. 947, fol.151v (Spatharakis, Corpus, no.919).

Bardas, Ioannitzes, painter, second founder of the “white church” at Selas in Chalkidike, and in 1285, hieromonk of the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos (PLP, no.2205).

Barlaam, early 14th-C. wall-painter whose name appears, together with the date 6827 ( = 1319/20), over the door of a room in the western part of the church at Gracanica (P. Mijovic, Studia slavico-byzantina et mediaevalia europea, vol. 1 [Sofia 1989] 1949–54).

Basilius Pictor.

Byzagios, Andronikos, wall-painter who worked in the chapel of St. George in the Athotine monastery of St. Paul, 1423 (PLP, no.3266).


Constantine and his son, John, named in inscriptions at Hagia Sophia, Ohrid, ca.1550 (G. Subotic, Zograf 5 [1974] 44–47; PLP, nos. 8593, 14166).

Daniel, painter of the cave church of S. Biagio at S. Vito dei Normanni (Apulia), named in an inscription of 1197 (Medea, Cripte 1:95).

Demetrios of Monemvasia, painter named in an inscription of 1095 or 1100 in the Church of St. Demetrios near Pourko on Kythera (Skwran, Development 162, no.28).
Elpidios, 5th-C. mosaicist known from an inscription in the basilica of the Virgin at Palaiopolis on Kerkýra (M. Guarducci, Epigrafia greca 4 [Rome 1978] 348f).

Euphram.

Eulalios.

Eugenikos, Manuel.

Eustathios, wall-painter named in an inscription of March 1020 in the Chapel of Sts. Marina e Cristina at Carpignano, Apulia (Medea, Cripte 1:114).

Euticius (Eutychios) of Naissos, mid-4th-C. silversmith. His name appears on a silver plate found at Augst (Kaiserauget, no.60).

Flavius Nicanus, early 4th-C. silversmith whose name is inscribed on ingots found at Šabac, south of Sirmium, and on two plates from Červenbreg (Bulgaria) prepared for the decennalia of Licinius (F. Baratte, JSav [1975] 198).

Gabriel, monk and painter in 1322, addressed in a letter by Michael Gabras for whom he painted an icon of the Virgin (PLP, no.3408).


George mastora, stone-carver (marmarar) named in an inscription of 1395 in the Church of the Phaneromene in the Mani (N.B. Dranakes, ArchEph [1967] 139-41).

George, painter and monk who witnessed the typikon of John I Tzimiskes (972); founder of the Zographou Monastery (Docheiaiv. 99, n.1; Prot., no.7.167).

“Georgius Grecus,” painter mentioned in the archives of Dubrovnik between 6 Aug. 1377 and 2 Apr. 1386 (Krekić, Dubrovnik, nos. 326, 373, 384).

Gerontios, wood-carver of the second quarter of the 5th C., recommended to the sophist Isokasios by Theodoret of Cyrhhus (ep.38, ed. Y. Azéma, 1:102.22-103.2).

“Hemanuel Grecus,” painter who became a citizen of Dubrovnik on 28 June 1367 (Krekić, Dubrovnik, no.268).


Isaías “the Greek,” wall-painter commissioned on 4 May 1338 to paint the Church of the Entry into Jerusalem in Novgorod (Novgorod-

Iveropoulos, John, identified in a Greek inscription in the crypt at Petrítzós (Bačkovo) as the painter of the upper and lower stories of the church (E. Bakalova, Bačkovskata kostnica [Sofia 1977] 133).

John, a monk and disciple of St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger who, according to the latter's vita (ed. van den Ven, 88f), even though untrained, carved the columns and capitals of a church at Sykeon.

John, deacon and founder in 1266 of the Monastery of St. George at Struga, near Ohrid, to which he gave an icon of the saint which he had painted. John supervised the decoration of the Church of St. Nicholas at Manastir in Macedonia in 1270/1 (Djuric, Byz. Fresken 20-22).

John, wall-painter who signed his name in Greek in the apse of the Church of St. Demetrius at Peć (V.R. Petković in Mél. Diehl 2:133-36; PLP, no.8591).

John of Athens, wall-painter named in an inscription of 1244 in the Church of the Trinity at Kranidi, Argolis, and, a year later, in the Church of St. John Kalybites at Psachra, Euboia (S. Kalopissi-Verti, Die Kirche der Hagia Triada bei Kranidi in der Argolis (1244) [Munich 1975] 2, 4).

Karkinélas, 8th-C. (?) silversmith mentioned in a fanciful tale in the Patria of Constantinople (Parastaseis 100.5-6).

Lazaros.

Leontios, deacon and painter on Cyprus, 1333.


Leontios, marmararios from Antioch, said in the vita of St. Thékla (ed. Dagron, 334-37) to have decorated the saint's church with both murals and an opus sectile pavement.

Libanios and Prokopios, mosaicists named in a pavement in a 5th-C. church at Heit, Syria (P. Mouterde, Syria 6 [1925] 360f, no.41).

Makarios, early 14th-C. painter, named by Manuel Philes (Carmina, ed. Miller, 1:131) as creator of an icon of Christ (PLP, no.16249).

Manasses, Constantine, wall-painter, decorated the Church of the Monastery of Paliapangia, near Sparta, 1304/5 (PLP, no.16599).
Maria, 14th–15th-C. painter, working in Georgia, who made an image of the Virgin (PLP, no.16894).

Marianos, mosaicist, who, with his son Aninas, worked at the synagogue of Beth-Alpha (C. Balmelle, J.-P. Darmon in AAPA 1:244).


Markos, 7th-C. (?), silversmith, who prepared a cross for the doux Neanias (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Analekta 5:5f).

Maximus, early 4th-C. vascularius whose name appears on two silver ingots found near Philippopolis. F. Baratte (JSav [1975] 198) suggested that Maximus's workshop was possibly responsible for six silver plates inscribed for the decennalia of Licinius and found at the same site.

Methodios, monk and painter said by Theophanes Continuatus (TheophCont 164.3) to have painted a Last Judgment that caused the conversion of Boris I.

Michael (Astrapas) and Eutychchios.

Modestos, painter in the Monastery of Magoulion in Constantinople, 1265/6 (PLP, no.19202).

Morphopoulos, Theodore, painter, hegoumenos of the monastery of St. Lawrence in Thessalonike in 1405/6 (PLP, no.19333).

Moses, a monk and painter on Mt. Athos in 1344. A Bogomil, he was anathematized by a synod at Karyes and expelled (PLP, no.19926).

Myron, 11th-C. painter addressed as a contemporary in a poem by Christopher of Mytilene (ed. Kurtz, no.112), possibly responsible for a portrait of the emperor Michael IV.

Naouma, Kyriakos, and Thomas, mosaicists whose names are recorded in a 6th-C. pavement at Mt. Nebo (C. Balmelle, J.-P. Darmon in AAPA 1:238, n.20).

Nicholas, anagnostes and painter in 1290/1 of the Church of St. George at Sklavopoula, near Selinos in western Crete (Kalokyris, Crete 31; PLP, no.20482).

Nicholas, a painter and paraikos of the Great Lavra ca.1300 (Lavra 2, no.91.122).

Nicholas the droungarios who, with his brothers, according to an inscription of 1074/5 in St. Merkouriou on Keryra, built and decorated the church (P.L. Vocotopoulos, CahArch 21 [1971] 152f).


Nikodemos, painter and hieromonk known by an inscription of 1310/11 at the Monastery of St. George at Karditsa in Boeotia (PLP, no.20353).

Pagomenos, John, wall-painter named in inscriptions of 1313–47 in eight churches in the districts of Apokoronas and Selinos, Crete (Kalokyris, Crete 31f; cf. PLP, no.8363).

Panselinos.

Pantoleon.

Paul, painter of the second half of the 12th C. who, according to Antony of Novgorod (ed. Loparev, PPSb 51 [1899] 17.3–11) was responsible for the fresco of the Baptism of Christ in the baptistery of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople.


Pausylpos of Thessalonike, silversmith, who signed the Achilles plate (Kaiseraugst, no.63) buried at Augst before 353.

Peter, early 13th-C. painter whose name appears on two icons at Mt. Sinai and to whom D. Mouriki (in Studemica et l'art byzantin autour de l'année 1200, ed. V. Korać [Belgrade 1988] 326–47) attributes two other panels.

Petrović "the Greek," who painted the interior


Phrangopoulos, Kyriakos, wall painter, fl. ca.1300. His name appears in a dedicatory inscription in the apse of the Church of St. Nicholas at Agoriane, Lakonia (M. Emmanuel, DChAE 14 [1987-88] 110). His connection, if any, with the Phrangopoulos family is unknown.


Riz(z)o (Ritzos), family of 15th-C. Cretan painters. Francesco Rizzo is first mentioned in a notarial document of 13 Feb. 1420, Nicholas Rizzo in the same year, and Andreas Rizzo in 1450 (M. Cattapan, Thesaurismata 10 [1973] 238-82).

Romulus, Flavius, early-5th-C. engraver whose name appears on a sardonyx in Leningrad carved with a scene of imperial investiture (Delbrück, Spälate Kaiserport. 211-14).


Scolopulus, Musocolus, goldsmith of Chandax mentioned in deeds of 1366 and 1377 (Krekić, Dubrovnik, nos. 256, 266).


Staurakios of Ebous, and his colleague Euremios, floor mosaicists named in a pavement in the Church of St. Stephen at Um er-Rasas (Jordan) in an inscription of March 756 (M. Piccirillo, Lib.am. 37 [1987] 180-82).

Stephen, icon-painter of the late 12th C., who signed two large icons at the Monastery of St. Catherine, Sinai (Soteriou, Eikones, nos. 74-75).


Theodore, mid-6th C., formerly a kastrensis (see KASTRESIOS) who gave up his position to be a carpenter, builder, and carver (John of Ephesus, tr. and ed. E.W. Brooks in PO 19:200f). Theodore, mid-11th-C. painter whose house is mentioned among the possessions of a monastery at Neokastron near Reggio-Calabria (A. Guillou, Le brébion de la métropole byzantine de Région [Vatican 1974] 201-535).

Theodore, painter of the 11th–12th C., named in an inscription on the Deesis in the cave chapel of Hagia Sophia on Kythera (Skawran, Development 163, no.30).

Theoktistos, 13th-C. painter who made a miniature of John Chrysostom and wrote the accompanying verses (PLP, no.7491).

Theophanes "the Greek.

Theophylaktos, wall-painter, who signed an image of Christ in the Chapel of Sts. Marina and Cristina at Carpignano, Apulia (Medea, Crïpte 1:115).

Theorianos, John, fresco- and possibly icon-painter, fl. 1346-50. His Greek signature appears on the sword of the Archangel Michael in the exonarthex of St. Sophia at Ohrid (Djurić, Byz. Fresken 88f).

Thomas, 7th or 8th C., monk and painter of Damascus known from an entry in the psalter, Leningrad, Pub. Lib. gr. 216, fol.349v (Iksusstvo Vizantij 2, no.479). A. Frolow (BEO 11 [1945-46] 121-30) hypothesized that Thomas was a mosaicist who had worked in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem.

Tzykandeles, Manuel, mid-14th C. scribe, illuminator (and fresco painter?), who decorated a commentary on Job, Paris, B.N. gr. 335 (Byzance et la France médiévale [Paris 1958] no.87).

Veneris, Daniel, who, with his nephew Michael, painted the Church of Christ at Meskla (Kydonia), Crete, in 1303. In 1318 Michael painted the Church of the Virgin in the province of Rethymnon (Kalokyris, Crete 32f; M. Cattapan, Thesaurismata 9 [1972] 203; cf. PLP, nos. 2601, 5151, 91999).

ARTUKIDS, Turkoman dynasty, 11th–15th C. Artuk (Αρτουκ) (died ca. 1091) appears in 1074/5, aiding Michael VII against Roussel de Bail­leul, whom Artuk captured and subsequently released for ransom. In 1086 Artuk became governor of Jerusalem; his descendants succeeded him there until expelled by the Fatimids in 1098. Thereafter, the family secured possession of Amid, Mardin, Martyropolis, and even, briefly, Aleppo. Artuk’s son Sukmân fought the First Crusade at Antioch; his brother İlghazi was temporarily allied (1115) with Roger, prince of Antioch, but subsequently defeated and killed him (1119). In 1120 İlghazi’s cousin Balak aided Ghażal against Constantine Gabras of Trebizond. Initially rivals of Zangi, the Artukids became followers of Nur al-Din and joined his display of force against Manuel I in 1159. The dynasty continued to serve successive rulers of northern Syria. Artukid copper coins imitated early Byz. coinage.

LIT. C. Cahen, EL2 1:662–67. –C.M.B.

ARTZE (Ἀρτζή), trade settlement (komopolis) near Theodosiopolis. According to an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 451.28–30) it was rich and densely populated, attracting many local, Syrian, Armenian, and other merchants. In 1049 the Seljuks captured and burned the town. Skylitzes’s statement that 150,000 inhabitants were killed by the flames and arrows is evidently an exaggeration.

The name survived in the Turkish toponym for Theodosiopolis, Erze­rum (Erzurum). –A.K.

ASAN (Ἄσανος, fem. Ἀσανία), or Asen, Bulgarian royal dynasty founded by Asen I in 1186. The evidence about the Asans’ ethnic origin is vague; theories have been advanced of the family’s Vlach, Cuman, or even Rus’ origin, none of which has proved valid. The family produced several Bulgarian tsars (up to John III, r. 1279–80; died as despotes before 1302); Ivan Alexander may have been related to the Asans. Some princesses of the house were married to Byz. emperors (Helene to Theodore II, Keratsa to Andronikos IV) or other rulers of the region (Maria to Henry of Hainault, emperor of Constantinople). The descendants of John III and Irene Palaiologina were active at the Byz. court and as generals and governors in the 14th C., but less in the 15th C.; these included, for example, Paul Asan, governor of Constantinople (1438–40), and Demetrios Asan, governor of Corinth (1444) and Nauplion (1448–53). (See genealogical table.)


ASBESTAS, GREGORY, archbishop of Syracuse. An ally of Patr. Methodios I, Asbestas (Ἀσβεστᾶς) was deposed in 853 by Ignatios.
His appeal to Pope Leo IV (847–55) gave the latter a pretext to intervene in the internal struggle of the Byz. church. In 858 Ignatios was deposed and Asbestas consecrated Photios as patriarch; the Council of 861 formally rehabilitated Asbestas and his supporters while condemning Ignatios. Asbestas's political leanings shaped his literary and artistic activity: he wrote a vita of his patron Methodios (J. Guillard, Byzantium 31 [1961] 374–80) and created (or ordered?) a series of caricatures ridiculing Ignatios; both are lost. Asbestas's miniatures are described by Niketas David Paphlagon as depicting Ignatios scourged, chained, banished, and perhaps executed, while captions identified the patriarch as the Devil, the Antichrist, and Simon Magus (PG 105:540D–541A). In disgrace during Ignatios's second patriarchy, Photios wrote to Asbestas, urging him to continue to erect churches with figural decoration (ep.112, ed. Westerink, 1:1150f).

Lit. P. Karlin-Hayter in Iconoclasm 141–45. A.C., A.K.

ASCENSION (ἀνάληψις), feast of Jesus' ascent into heaven (Lk 24:50–53, Acts 1:9–12), celebrated on the Thursday that comes 40 days after Easter. Originally celebrated together with Pentecost, the Ascension was first assigned its own feastday in the 4th C., a usage begun in the environs of Antioch ca.380. The evidence for Jerusalem provided by Egeria remains problematic (P. Devos, AB 86 [1968] 87–108), though the 5th-C. Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem already puts Ascension on the 40th day (A. Renoux, PO 35:72f).

The Ascension was one of the dominical Great Feasts; it had a week-long afterfeast, but no forefeast. A series of 13 receptions took place in Constantinople on this day, during which the emperor was honored by the factions; he celebrated the feast in the Church of the Virgin at Pæge, where he took communion and dined (Philothoeus, Kletor. 213.1–10; De cer., bk.1, chs. 8, 18).

Representation in Art. Initially shown in a form derived from imperial Apotheosis scenes, with Christ striding upward grasping the Hand of God (Milan ivory: Volbach, Early Christian Art, pl.93), the Ascension assumed in the 6th C. the form that characterized it thereafter (Monza and Bobbio Ampullae): Christ, bearded and enthroned in a mandorla surrounded by angels, rises over the 12 Apostles with Mary at their center. The presence of Mary, the inclusion of Paul, and the use of 12 apostles rather than the 11 disciples of Scripture are references to the Church, showing the Ascension as a major event in its history. In the Rabbula Gospels (fol.13v) elements from Ezekiel's prophetic Vision are added to underline the scene's eschatological connotations (cf. Lk 1:11). In the 9th C., the Ascension was represented in the domes of the Nea Ekklesia (Constantinople) and Hagia Sophia (Thessalonike), a situation so apt in form and in significance that it was repeated in all periods. By the 11th C. (St. Sophia, Ohrid), the Ascension was also standard in bema vaults, reflecting its eucharistic significance as the apotheosis of Christ's sacrificed flesh. The Ascension appears on icons, in mural cycles, in evangelia and Gospel books at Mark 16:19, and occasionally before Acts (Codex Ebnerianus, fol.231v).


ASCETICISM (ἀσκησις, "exercise, training"), the practice of austerity and self-discipline; an ideal for all Christians, but esp. associated with monks and hermits. Askesis was sometimes used as a synonym for monastic life; asketerion for a monastery or hermitage; and asketes for a monk, nun (asketria), or solitary. Asceticism was a characteristic of monasticism from the earliest hermits in the Egyptian desert (e.g., Antony the Great) to the hesuchasts and kelliotai of the last centuries of Byz. All monks were expected to follow an ascetic regime, but the degree of severity varied. It was practiced in a most extreme form by hermits, enkleistoi, stylites, and holy fools, but a number of celebrated ascetics lived in cenobitic monasteries. Although there were some noted female ascetics in the earlier centuries, rigorous mortification of the body was not expected of the aristocratic nuns of the late Byz. period (V. Laurent, REB 8 [1950] 78f). The chief forms of this discipline were celibacy, fasting, standing vigils, and sleeping on the floor; ascetics went barefoot, wore only a single tunic, even in bitter cold, mortified the flesh with hair shirts or chains and fetters, prayed continuously, and often lived in isolation. Basil the Great urged moderation so that monks
would not become arrogant on account of their ascetic achievements. He stressed, rather, obedience to the *hegoumenos*, requiring that a monk receive permission from his superior before embarking on an extraordinary fast.

An ascetic monk sought to gain control over his body and attain *apateia* or impassibility. Through such rigor a monk might be granted miraculous or prophetic powers; an ascetic way of life became a prerequisite for sanctity, replacing the martyrdom of the early Christian period. In the 12th C. some intellectuals criticized or even ridiculed excessive asceticism; Eustathios of Thessalonike suggested that one etymology for asceticism was *askos*, "wineskin," and the vita of Cyril Phileotes by Nicholas Kataskepenos rejected the immoderate practice of asceticism (A. Kazhdan, *GORThR* 30 [1985] 482–86).


—A.M.T.

ASEKRETIS (ἀσηκρήτις, an invariable form, from Lat. a secretis, in full "asekretis of the court") imperial secretary. The term seems to have appeared in the 6th C.; Prokopios found it necessary to explain its meaning (SH 14:4; Wars 2.7.15). Many scholars believe that the term originated in the 4th C., since Beronikianos, an AGENS IN REBUS, is called *asekretis* in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon; this term only appears, however, in the 6th-C. translation of Vigilius (A. Kraus, *RQ* 55 [1960] 45). The *asekretis* replaced the refer­ endarii and formed the upper echelon of imperial secretaries positioned higher than imperial notaries. Some *asekretis* were officials of the Praet­ torian prefect. The seals of *asekretis* are known from the 6th/7th C. (Laurent, *Corpus* 2, nos. 9–13). The offices of the *asekretis* were located in the Kathisma of the Hippodrome (Guillard, *Topographie* 1:185). At the Third Council of Constantinople (680–81), a functionary called *asekretis* held the title of gloriosus, suggesting that he was probably head of the college of *asekretis*—the office later known as Protaskekretis. *Asekretis* disappear from the sources after the 12th C., the term being replaced by Grammatikos.


—A.K.

ASEN I (Άσαν), otherwise called Belgun (S. Mladenov, *Spisanie na BAN* 45 [1933] 49–66), co-founder (with his older brother Peter of Bul­ garia) of the Second Bulgarian Empire; died Tarnovo 1196. Both his names are Turkic; his ethnic affiliation has been much discussed. Byz. and Crusader sources call the brothers Vlachs, but Bulgarian, Cuman, and Rus’ origins have been suggested (N. S. Tanašoća, *Revista de istorie* 34 [1981] 1297–1312). As G. Litavrin (*VizVrem* 41 [1980] 109) declares, the brothers were closely connected with local elements in Paristrian. When, ca.1185–86, according to Niketas Choniates, Peter and Asen requested entry into Byz. military service and a village as reward, they were refused. Exploiting discontent over taxation, they raised a rebellion. Isaac II (ca.1187) drove them beyond the Danube, where Asen recruited Cumans. With their aid, the brothers reoccupied Bulgaria and ravaged Thessaly; in 1190 they severely defeated Isaac. When (ca.1192/3) Peter allied himself with the Byz., Asen became the leader of the new state. He conquered Sofia, Melnik, and other strongholds. After a victory at Serres in 1196, Asen was murdered by Ivanko.


—C.M.B., A.K.

ASHLAR, cut stone masonry. Used throughout the Byz. period, ashlar was esp. characteristic of the architecture of Syria-Palestine, much of Asia Minor, Armenia, and Georgia. In Constantinople, this type of masonry was used particularly for foundations and piers that carried heavy loads, such as those supporting the dome of Hagia Sophia. Bands of ashlar alternate with bands of brick in the city walls of Constantinople, a technique found occasionally in later buildings such as the parekklesion of the Chora Monastery. In cloisonné technique (see Brickwork Techniques and Patterns), individual ashlar blocks are framed with bricks on all four sides.


—M.J.

ASHMUNEIN. See Hermopolis Magna.
ASHOT. See AŠOT.

ASIA MINOR, or Anatolia, the peninsula that forms the westernmost extension of Asia. It stretches from the Aegean to the Euphrates River and Antitaurus Mountains, a maximum distance of about 1,200 km, and from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, about 600 km. Its topography is determined by its mountain ranges. In the east they rise in sheer peaks. In the center they occupy the north and south regions of the peninsula, surrounding the relatively arid central plateau, and in the west break up into parallel chains separated by the broad and fertile plains of the Aegean region. The configuration of mountains and plains has influenced patterns of settlement and communication. Wealth and population have historically been concentrated in the western coastal plains, which support extensive agriculture of the Mediterranean type and are well connected by natural land routes that also lead into the interior; the region has many good harbors.

The broken country between the Aegean and the plateau contained many sites strategically located on roads, while habitation on the plateau was scattered along the routes that followed the edges of the central steppe. The adjacent parts of Cappadocia contained several populous valleys, but settlement diminished in the mountainous country to the east, where arable land is confined to narrow and often isolated valleys. The relatively unpopulated mountainous regions, which occupy much of the country, were valuable for their pastures and mineral deposits, as well as for defense of the routes that passed through them.

Asia Minor prospered in late antiquity, when it was divided into two dioceses and 24 provinces. Urban life flourished in the coastal regions and along the roads leading to the frontier; villages enjoyed the benefits of a long period of peace. The population was largely Christian by the 4th C. and thoroughly hellenized by the 6th C. Asia Minor was, however, the home of numerous heresies. Peace was rarely interrupted: the revolts of Prokopios and Tribigild in the 4th C., like the irruptions of the Huns in the 5th–6th C., passed rapidly; the revolts of Isaurians in the 5th C. were a more persistent source of trouble. The reign of Justinian I brought extensive construction of buildings and roads, but the financial demands of his wars drained local resources. Large areas, from Pisidia to Pontos, were afflicted by endemic brigandage and revolt, provoking administrative reforms whose failure was usually due to corruption. The plague of 542 reduced the population, but some cities and the southern coastal region continued to prosper.

The 7th C. brought fundamental change aggravated by Persian attacks that devastated the country, provoking the ruin of the network of cities upon which social and economic life had been based (C. Foss, EHR 90 [1975] 721–47). The Persians were immediately followed by the Arabs, who failed to achieve any permanent conquest of the peninsula but, through their incessant attacks over two centuries, precluded any possibility of recovery. The loss of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt to the Arabs meant that Asia Minor became the heartland of the medieval empire and its main bulwark against threats from the east. In order to survive, therefore, it received an extensive network of fortifications and its administration was militarized in the system of themes. Arab raids nevertheless struck through the country, culminating in the sieges of Constantinople from 674 to 678 and 716/17 and the capture of Amorion in 898.

During the 8th C., Asia Minor was a center of Iconoclasm and became ethnically diverse as Slavs were brought in to settle regions devastated by the Arabs or recurrence of the plague. At this time, the army dominated the country; in the 9th C., the themes of Asia Minor had a total force of about 70,000. Strategoi and their subordinates ruled provinces and cities; cities were often under the joint administration of a strategos and a bishop. Most large ancient cities had disappeared, replaced by smaller fortified towns and castles; eventually, new cities rose to prominence on account of their strategic locations. Most of the population lived in villages, with a fortress for refuge nearby. Some commerce still continued, esp. to serve the need of capital and army; regional fairs, often celebrated on the feast day of a saint, provided local stimulus.

Byz. moved on the offensive in the mid-9th C., gradually pushing back the frontier and establishing a peace and security that prevailed to the mid-11th C. Expansion eastward brought significant ethnic and economic change as immigrants from Syria and Armenia settled previously desolate re-
regions and as magnates, whose families played an ever-increasing role in politics, took over extensive tracts of land. Civil wars precipitated by their rivalries caused widespread disturbance in the late 10th C.

The Turks, whose raids began striking into Anatolia in the mid-11th C., brought the next fundamental change, in which the region, previously united, was divided between two or more powers. After the battle of Mantzikert in 1071, the Byz. permanently lost control of the east and center; thereafter they were precariously confined to the coastal region, where their position was seriously threatened by the Seljuk Turks. Although the First Crusade pushed the Turks back onto the plateau and allowed Alexios I to mark further gains, no part of the country was free from attack during his reign. John II frequently fought in Asia Minor, consolidating Byz. control by building strategic fortresses and establishing a foothold on the edge of the plateau. Under Manuel I, who restored security to many regions, the frontier was threatened by the immigration of Turkoman nomads. In an effort to solve the problem by striking directly at the Seljuks, Manuel met disaster at Myriokephalon in 1176. In the 1180s and 90s, major frontier forts fell and the Turks advanced westward, helped by the troubles attendant upon the Fourth Crusade.

After the fall of Constantinople in 1204 the Laskarids of the empire of Nicaea established an equilibrium with the Seljuks and secured their territories (the Aegean region and Bithynia) by extensive fortification. The prosperity they brought is reflected in their restoration of towns and foundation of monasteries. The Byz. recapture of Constantinople in 1261 was a disaster for Asia Minor: imperial attention shifted to the west and frontier defenses were neglected just as the weakening of the Seljuk state before Mongol attack left the Turkomans free to move westward. The Byz. position in Asia Minor crumbled rapidly; the southwestern coastal region was lost by 1270, the Meander valley by 1284, and most of the interior by the end of the century. In 1300 Byz. controlled only the northwestern coasts and a few fortresses that were islands surrounded by the Turkomans, who by now were establishing their own independent principalities of Aydin, Mentesh, Saruhan, and Karasi. Despite major campaigns, the Aegean region was lost by 1315, and Bithynia fell to the Ottomans by 1337. Subsequently, Byz. maintained only a few ports until 1360, and afterward only the virtually independent enclave of Philadelphia, whose fall in 1390 marked the end of Byz. Asia Minor.


ASIDENOS, SABAS, sometimes Sabbas, local ruler in Anatolia (fl.1204–14). Of unknown origin, Asidenos (Ἀσίδηνος) assumed power at Sampson (ancient Priene) and the lower Meander River valley when the Fourth Crusade conquered Constantinople. Possibly as early as 1205 his territory was added to the Nicene state by Theodore I Laskaris. He remained locally powerful, and in 1214 Theodore addressed him as sympenteros (relative-in-law) and sebastokrator (N. Wilson, J. Darrouzès, REB 26 [1968] 14f).


ASINOU, located in the foothills of the Troodos mountains, Cyprus, site of the Church of the Panagia Phorbiotissa, founded 1105/6, according to dedicatory inscriptions by Nikephoros the magistros (died 1115). This small, single-naved church of three barrel-vaulted bays is built of mortared rubble. The plastered exterior was incised in imitation of ashlar and painted with red zigzags. The laterally apsed narthex, partly of ashlar, was added later in the 12th C. Scenes from the Passion in the west end of the nave are well preserved; Christ’s Infancy cycle and the donor’s portrait in the central bay were repainted in the post-Byz. period. The votive images in the narthex date from the end of the 12th C. and later. The style of the paintings of the first phase of decoration is related to the more refined frescoes of the parekklesion of Hagios Chrysostomos near Koutsoudenis, donated by Eumathios Philokales. Paintings by the Asinou workshop are also found in Panagia Theotokos at Trikomo, Sts. Ioakeim and Anna at Kaliana, and the Panagia Amasgou at Monagri. Also associated stylistically with the frescoes at Asinou are several icons at the monastery of St. Catherine at Sinai (K. Weitzmann in Studies in Memory of D.T. Rice [Edinburgh 1975] 47–63).
AŞIQPAŞAZADE, great-grandson of the poet Aşıq Pasha (died 1333), dervish, ghazi warrior, and author of a Tevarih-i a/-i Osman, a history of the Ottoman dynasty from its origins to 1485; born in Elvan Çelebi (near Amasya) 1400, died Istanbul? after 1484. Aşıqpaşazade's Tevarih is a fundamental source for early Ottoman history. For events prior to 1420, Aşıqpaşazade depended chiefly on a collection of stories and legends about the Osmanoğulları (now lost, but used in the earliest anonymous Tevarih-i al-i Osman, and Uruc Beg), and materials derived from Yahşi Fakih. The subsequent account embodies more of Aşıqpaşazade's experiences and research among contemporaries. Intending his work for a wide audience, Aşıqpaşazade wrote in simple and lively Turkish. In form his Tevarih varies from straightforward narrative to poetry to extended dialogue.

Throughout his work Aşıqpaşazade treats Byz. themes as an aspect of the wider Ottoman struggle with the unbelievers. His information about Constantinople, and even major Byz. figures and events, tends to be generalized.


ASKALON (Aşkâlûn), on the southern coast of Palestine, was one of the most significant cities of the region, according to Ammianus Marcellinus (Amm. Marc. 14.8.11). The MADABA MOSAIC MAP shows the city plan, but no religious buildings; the remains of a 7th/8th-C. church, fragments of a synagogue, and the city wall are known, however, as well as a late 6th-C. mosaic. Pilgrims were attracted to Askalon by remarkable wells allegedly dug by Abraham and by the tomb of Kosmas and Damianos. One of the last Palestinian cities to fall to the Arabs (in 640), Askalon remained in the hands of the Fâtimids after the Seljuk occupation of Palestine. In 1099 the Crusaders won a battle over the Egyptians at Askalon but were unable to take the city until 22 Aug. 1153. Although Saladin took Askalon briefly in 1187, the Crusaders regained control from 1191 to 1247.


ASKIDAS, THEODORE, theologian; died Constantinople, Jan. 588. Askidas ("Aşkıdas") was hégoumenos of the New Lavra in Palestine and from 537 onward metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappadocia. A supporter of the tenets of Origen, Askidas belonged to the sect of so-called Isochristoi who taught that in the final apokatastasis (restoration) the faithful will attain a complete union with Christ. He was also suspected of supporting Monophysitism. In 543, however, he was forced to sign a condemnation of Origen; he also signed a condemnation of the THREE CHAPTERS. Pope Vigilius anathematized him in 551, but in the following year Askidas made peace with the pope. Of his works only a fragment is preserved (in Evagrios Scholastikos).


ASKLEPIOS, regarded as the son of Apollo; the major god of healing in ancient Greece. His cult was widespread in the Greek-speaking world; of his numerous healing shrines the most famous were Epidaurus and Cos in Hellenistic times and Pergamon under the Roman Empire. Christianity adopted a belligerent stance toward Asklepios and deliberately promoted the figure of Christ the Physician in opposition to Asklepios the Savior; some temples of Asklepios (e.g., at Epidaurus and Athens) were converted to Christian use. In the 4th C. Julian the Apostle strongly supported the cult of Asklepios and attempted to place it at the center of paganism. Well into the 5th C. the god was actively worshiped by individual Neoplatonists such as Proklos, who believed that as a young man he had been healed by Asklepios (Marinos, Vita Procli in I Manuali, tr. C. Faraggiana di Sarzana [Milan 1985] 314f). Thereafter, when the name of Asklepios had practically been forgotten, the influence of his cult lived on in those Christian shrines where incubation was practiced. Miracle.
accounts such as those of Sts. Kosmas and Damianos, Kyros and John, and Artemios all give evidence of elements that could be called “Asclepians.” The name asklepiadai continued to be applied to Byz. physicians.


--J.D.

**Asmatike Akolouthia** (άκολουθία ἁσματική, lit. “sung office”), the cathedral hours of the rite of Constantinople, found in fully developed and unadulterated form in 8th–12th-C. MSS of the euchologion (Arranz, “Asmatikos Hesperinos” 109–16). The rite was at first distinct from, but gradually mingled with and was ultimately replaced by, that of the monasteries of Constantinople (see Σαβατικά Τυπικά). In Thessalonike, the asmatike akolouthia was still in use as late as the 15th C. (Symeon of Thessalonike, PG 155:553D, 624D–625B).

According to the Typikon of the Great Church, which contains the rules for the asmatike akolouthia, the office comprised only the hours of orthros and vespers, with the occasional addition of a paenychis or a paramone (see Vigil), and a combined terce-sixt in Lent. But MSS of the euchologion include the Little Hours as well.

The asmatike akolouthia had no separate book of hours—the horologion being originally a Palestinian monastic book—but was celebrated from the euchologion (for prayers and diaikonika), the antiphonarion or Constantinople psalter (for psalmody and refrains), and the prophetoilogion (for Old Testament lections). Despite its name, this office had very little hymnody.

Lit. Taft, “Bibl. of Hours” 358–70. --R.F.T.

**Asmatikon** (Ἀσματικόν), a music book containing the special chants and refrains for the liturgy and the hours, sung by the small group of psaltai (singers) at Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Its repertory is set in a moderately ornate style. Eleven Greek and three Slavic Asmatika survive; each varies and none dates from before the 12th C., but there are substantial reasons for supposing that the Asmatikon was first compiled at Constantinople during the 11th C. or perhaps earlier. Nine of the MSS belonged to southern Italian religious houses of the Greek rite; the musical tradition they have adopted dates from 1225 at the latest. The remaining two Byz. MSS represent different, though not wholly dissimilar, melodic traditions. (For the solo items, see Psaltikon.)


--D.E.C.

**Asolik** (“singer”) or Stephen (Step’anos) of Tarôn, Armenian historian. Nothing is known of the life of Stephen, save that he came from the province of Tarôn and was appointed by the katholikos Sargis (992–1019) to supervise monasteries and churches. Sargis also commissioned Asolik to write a Universal History at the beginning of the 11th C. Although book 1 contains lists of biblical kings and rulers of ancient empires, and book 2 names Sasanian, Muslim, and Byz. rulers (down to Basil I), Asolik’s interest is primarily Armenia, esp. religious matters and Byz.-Armenian relations. Book 3 is thus a valuable source for the 10th-C. Byz. eastward expansion (from the establishment of the Bagratid dynasty in 885 until 1003).


--R.T.

**Asomatos** (ἄσωματος), incorporeal, term characterizing the intelligible world as opposed to the sensible one. In the strict sense the word could be applied only to God: according to John of Damascus (Exp.(ed. 26.5, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:75), “only the godhead (hieion) is really incorporeal and immaterial.” John, however, distinguished two types of incorporeality: that of substance or nature, possessed by God only, and that of grace, possessed by angels, demons, and souls (ibid. 26.55–57, ed. Kotter, 2:77). In contrast, Gregory of Nyssa (PG 44:1165B) classified angels among incorporeal beings: “All rational creatures are divided into incorporeal and corporeal; the angelic category is asomatos, the other category is man-kind.”
The Synaxis ton Asomaton, the feast honoring the incorporeal beings, was celebrated 8 Nov. and illustrated from the 11th C. onward (S. Gabelač, *Zograf* 7 [1977] 58–64). The homilies and liturgical poetry accompanying this feast were important sources for illustrated cycles of the angels and archangels. —A.K., N.P.S.

AŠOT I THE GREAT (’Arovōtos), founder of the Bagratid kingdom of Armenia; died 890. Succeeding his father as commander-in-chief (*sparapet*) of Armenia after the devastating Muslim punitive expeditions of the mid-9th C., Ašot consolidated the position of his house by expanding his domains at the expense of other feudal families and by dynastic marriages with the principalities of Siunik’ and Vaspurakan. In 858, his continuation of the generally pro-Arab policy of the earlier Bagratid house earned him the title of Prince of Princes (*bat'rig al-batāriqa*) and the suzerainty of the Arab emirates in Armenia. To maintain equilibrium on Armenia’s borders, Ašot assured Byz. of his continuing loyalty and encouraged the Armenian *katholikos* Zacharias to correspond with *photios*, although the Council of Širakawan (ca.862) failed to achieve a reunion with the Byz. church. By 884 (rather than 886 as formerly believed), Ašot felt powerful enough to have himself crowned king with a crown sent by the Arab governor in Azerbaijan; recognition by Byz. followed, endowing him with the title of *archon ton archonton*. Although Ašot was the master and arbiter of Armenia and Georgia, where he had his kinsman Adernarse crowned in 888, he continued to pay tribute to the Arabs. His authority over the Armenian magnates derived more from the power of his personality than from any formal base.


AŠOT II ERKAT (Iron King), grandson of AŠOT I THE GREAT; third Bagratid king of Armenia (914/15–928/9). Ašot reestablished Bagratid control over northern Armenia after the defeat and martyrdom of his father, Smbat I. His early success resulted in part from his recognition of Constantinople, where he was invited in 914 (not 921) and granted the customary title of *archon ton archonton* as well as military support. Patr. NICHOLAS I MYSTIKOS initiated at this time a correspondence with the Armenian *katholikos*, John the Historian. These friendly relations were later compromised by Ašot’s increasingly autonomous policy, esp. after the Muslims recognized him as Šahanšah (“King of Kings”). As a result, Byz. directed a campaign commanded by John Kourkouas against Armenia in 922 and apparently transferred the title of *archon ton archonton* to the rival southern Armenian kingdom of Vaspurakan, but was not able to check Bagratid consolidation at this time.


AŠOT III OLORMAC’ (Merciful), son of Abas I; last Bagratid king of Armenia to rule over a united kingdom (953–77). His generally prosperous reign was marked by the complete exemption of Armenia from the payment of tribute to the caliphate, by the transfer of the capital to Ani, by close collaboration with the Armenian church (which he supported against Chalcedonian sympathizers and local separatists), and by the assertion of royal authority over the magnates. Ašot was successful in his war against the Caucasian mountaineers and the Šamāndī emirs. Moreover, supported by his vassals, he checked the advance of Emp. John I Tzimiskes at the Armenian border (974), whereupon the emperor declared him his ally and spiritual son (MATTHEW OF EDESSA, ed. Dulaquier 16–24). Ašot’s reign saw a great expansion of monasticism with the establishment of the future intellectual centers of Sanahin and Haβbat (976); his extensive philanthropic foundations earned him the epithet “Merciful.” Nevertheless, his grant of KARS (Vanand) to his brother Musel and of Lori (Tašir, Joraget) to his son Gurgen divided the realm and ultimately weakened Bagratid control of Armenia.


ASPAR (’Aσπαρ), more fully Flavius Ardaburius Aspar, an Alan; consul (434), *patrikios*, and *magister militum*; died Constantinople 471. Together with his father Ardabourios, Aspar suppressed the rebel Ioannes in 425 and secured the throne
for Valentinian III. Aspar led a fleet against the Vandals in 431, fought against the Huns in 441, constructed a large cistern in Constantinople (see under Constantinople, Monuments of) in 459, and led the inhabitants of the capital in combating a fire in 465. Representing the power of the Germanic soldiery, he dominated the Eastern court and, after the death of Marcian, secured the elevation of Leo I in 457; as an Arian, however, he could not hope to gain the throne for himself. Aspar had his son Patrikios crowned as caesar in 469/70, but his influence was undercut by Leo's alliance with Zeno and the Isaurians. Aspar supported the campaign of Basiliskos against the Vandals, perhaps hoping to see it fail, and by 469 there was open rupture between Aspar and Zeno (A. Kozlov, ADSV 20 [1983] 30f). Aspar may have sought the support of Ricimer, but he and his son Ardabourios were captured and executed. Together with other members of Aspar's family, they are represented on a missorium in Florence (Delbrück, Consulardiptycchen, no. 35).

**ASPARUCH** ('Аспару́къ), Bulgar khan (ca.650–ca.700); third son of Kuvrat. Around 660 Asparuch led a Bulgar horde westward, crossing the Dnieper and Dniester before ultimately establishing a fortified camp in the northern part of the Danube delta; its precise location is much disputed (N. Bănescu, Byzantion 28 [1958] 433–40). From here the Bulgars raided Byz. territory across the Danube, perhaps exploiting Byz. preoccupation with Arab attacks in the 670s. Constantine IV responded by campaigning personally in 680/1, with disastrous results: the army was routed and the Bulgars crossed the Danube in pursuit, reaching Varna. Renewed attacks on Byz. towns compelled Constantine to recognize the Bulgars' occupation of Byz. land (apparently Scythia Minor and Moesia Inferior) and to pay them annual tribute (paktos), an agreement likely concluded in 681 but broken in 687/8 by Justinian II. Asparuch also subjected the local Slavic tribes to tribute payments and even resettlements, probably using them as bulwarks against the Avars to the west and the Byz. to the south. Nothing else is known of Asparuch's rule. A dubious tradition credits him with founding Pliska. An 11th-C. Bulgarian source records a legend of his death in battle with the Khazars (I. Dujčev, BZ 53 [1960] 207).

**ASPER** (ἀσπέρ) was a Latin word meaning basically "rough" but by extension "fresh" and (of silver) "white," a sense it had already acquired in early Roman imperial times. It first came into common use for a coin in the 12th C., mainly as a qualification of the billon trachy (τό νόμισμα τραχύ ἀσπέρ "the rough, white nomisma"), which to us is a dirty gray in color but was no doubt issued in a blanched state. It was sometimes also applied to the electrum trachy. In the 14th–15th C. the term was used of various nonconcave silver coins, mainly the small ones also known as doukatoportoú and their Turkish counterparts (ağçe, also from a word meaning "white") but occasionally, as at Trebizond, for large silver coins also. There are many contemporary Western parallels to the use of such a name for coins: blanc, witten, albus, etc.

**ASPIETES** (Ἀσπιέτης, fem. Ἀσπιετίνα, Ἀσπιετισσά), an Armenian lineage in Byz. service from at least the late 11th C. (etym. Arm. aspet, "rider, knight"). Prokopios (Wars 2.3.12) mentions the "great and numerous lineage of the so-called Aspetianoi," but no evidence connects the Byz. Aspetai and 6th-C. Aspetianoi. The first known Aspietes, Alexios I's general, boasted of his royal origin from the Arsacids (An.Komm. 3:58.28–29); he served as governor of Tarsos ca.1107/8 and stratopedarches of the Orient. There is no reason to identify Aspietes with Osin, son of Chetum, prince of Lambron (see correctly J. Laurent in Mélanges offerts à m. Gustave Schlumberger, vol. 1 [Paris 1924] 164f). Several Aspetianoi (Michael, Constantine, etc.) were military commanders under Manuel I; (another?) Constantine Aspietes commanded a troop in 1190; Alexios Aspietes, commander in Serres shortly after 1195, was captured by the Bulgarians and proclaimed emperor in Philippopolis after 1204 but was soon seized
and executed by KALOJAN. The chronicle of Magnus Presbyter (MGH SS 17:512), under the year 1189, mentions a Byz. embassy to Saladin, whose members were “Sovestat, Aspion, and old Constantin, a translator from Arabic”; the envoy may have been the sebastos Aspietis. The cultural role of the Aspietis is unknown: a monk John Aspiotes corresponded with Michael Glykas. Aspiotai of the 14th and 15th C. were landowners intermarried with sundry noble families, including Palaiologoi (PLP, nos. 1567–79), but did not occupy high positions; Maria Choumnaina Aspietisswa was the wife of a megas papias in 1324.

LIT. Kazhdan, Arm. 43–46.

- A.K.

ASPROKASTRON (Ἀσπρόκαστρον, or Maurokastron; Ital. Moncastro; Turk. Akkerman; Rum. Cetatea Alba; Russ. Belgorod Dnestrovskij—four of its names mean “White Fort”; Maurokastron and the corrupted form Moncastro mean “Black Fort”), city and port situated at the mouth of the Dniester, close to the site of ancient Tiras. It was probably a late Roman or early Byz. fortress but passed out of imperial control in the 7th–9th C. The information on “Maurokastron” in the 10th C. given by the Toparcha Gothicus is entirely fictitious. In the 13th C. Asprokastro belonged to the Polovzian khanate (see Cumans). From ca.1290 Asprokastro was frequented by Genoese ships that loaded grain and wax. For some years in the early 14th C. it was in Bulgarian hands, but by midcentury it had become a Genoese colony. From 1410 Asprokastro was subject to the princes of Moldavia, and in 1437 Venice opened commercial relations with the city. In the 15th C. it was a regular point of embarkation for travelers between Constantinople and central Europe, including Emp. John VIII Palaiologos. After 1453 Mehmed II brought colonists from Asprokastro to settle in Constantinople. For a time after 1457 Stephen the Great, Prince of Moldavia, resided there, but in 1485 Sultan Bayezid II captured Asprokastros and Chilia.


ASSARION (ασσαριον, from early Lat. assarius), used in the New Testament for the smallest coin in circulation (Mt 10:29: “Are not two sparrows sold for an assarion?”). It is used by Nicholas Rhabdas (in P. Tannery, Mémoires scientifiques 4 [Toulouse-Paris 1920] 158) in formulating a mathematical problem that has a contemporary setting—the author was writing in 1341—and it had apparently been revived as the name of the flat copper coin of approximately 2 g introduced under Andronikos II (1282–1328). Assaria were struck in great quantities during the first half of the 14th C.

LIT. Grierson, Byz. Coins 278. – Ph.G.

ASSEMBLIES. In addition to the senate, Byz. was familiar with other forms of assemblies with claims to political power. The most organized were the church councils (H. Gelzer, Ausgewählte kleine Schriften [Leipzig 1907] 142–55). Provincial assemblies of the late Roman Empire consisted of honorati (former imperial officials) and curiales; in contrast to the members of ancient assemblies, these were not elected and there was no representation in proportion to population (J. Larsen, CIlPh 29 [1934] 209–20). Despite Leo VI’s abolition of municipal bouleis, they continued to exist in provincial towns from the 11th to the 15th C., although they tended to be assemblies of local nobles rather than regular representations of constituencies.

Throughout the centuries Constantinople witnessed two kinds of assemblies: those convoked by usurpers or demagogues in protest against unpopular measures (which had no legal basis or regular organization) and those convened by the state in cases of emergency (for confiscation of church property in 1094, to raise funds to meet the demands of Henry VI in 1197, to discuss the imperial response to the Bulgarian tsar in 1341, etc.). Assemblies were esp. active during the civil War of 1341–47 (Weiss, Kantakuzenos 74–76). The assemblies were called ekklesiai, syllogoi, or syneleuseis; even though they were not representative of the electorate, they could include people outside the bureaucratic and ecclesiastical nobility. The assemblies or parliaments that functioned in the Crusader states (J. Colson, REB 12 [1954] 114–27) may have influenced Byz. assemblies.
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–A.K.

ASSEROS. See Beasts of Burden.

ASTERIOS OF AMASEIA, Cappadocian churchman and writer, overshadowed by his more famous contemporaries, the Cappadocian Fathers; born between 330 and 335, died between 420 and 425 (according to Datema, infra [1970] xxiv). Asterios (Ἀστέριος) was perhaps a lawyer before his appointment to the see of Amaseia in Pontos, sometime between 380 and 390. Of his oeuvre 16 homilies survive, and Photios (Bibl., cod. 271) lists four more. Some of these speeches have survived in Latin, Georgian, and Church Slavonic translations. Two homilies are of particular interest to modern scholars, the fourth (delivered 1 Jan. 400), which systematically refutes Libanius’s defense of the pagan New Year feast, and the eleventh, which contains an ekphrasis of a painting of some scenes from the vita of St. Euphemia of Chalcedon (W. Speyer, JbAchr 14 [1971] 39–47). The latter oration is a landmark of Byz. art criticism and is also informative about Asterios’s tastes in classical literature, notably for the writings of Demosthenes. The eleventh homily was translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius and was cited in toto during the Second Council of Nicaea, 787, to justify the veneration of icons.


B.B.

ASTERIOS SOPHISTES, rhetorician; died after 341. He was a pupil of Lucian of Antioch and a supporter of Arianism. Photios (Quaest. Amph. 312, ed. L. Westerink, 6.1 [1987] 112f) distinguishes him from the Orthodox Asterios of Amaseia. He wrote the Syntagmatarion (ed. Bardy, infra), an exposé of Arian views (preserved in fragmentary quotations in Athanasios of Alexandria), and homilies on Psalms and on Easter that have survived in catenae often under the names of Asterios of Amaseia or John Chrysostom. Asterios was probably a Jew who had converted to Christianity, and his works show some knowledge of Rabbinic teaching. His homilies are important as a source for the study of Jewish-Christian relations in the early 4th C.: Asterios views the Jews as an incarnation of evil and warns Christians against Jewish penetration into the church.


–A.K.

ASTERISKOS. See Paten and Asteriskos.

ASTRAMPYCHOS, a Persian magus of the 4th C. B.C. (Diogenes Laertius, 1.2). Various works of the Byz. era were ascribed to him, the most important being a dream book written in accented trimeters, datable between the 6th and 9th C. (S.M. Oberhelman, Byzantium 50 [1980] 489). This treatise formed the basis for later dream books falsely ascribed to Patr. Nikephoros I, Patr. Germanos I or II (the attribution is unclear), Gregory of Nazianzos, and Athanasios of Alexandria (the last two are replicas of the Nikephorean dream book). Other works assigned to Astrapychos deal with oracles (A.J. Hoogendijk, W. Clarysse, Kleio 11 [1981] 54–97; G. M. Browne, The Papyri of the Sorta Astrapychi [Meisenheim am Glan 1974]); geomancy (P. Tannery, ReGr 11 [1898] 96–105); love charms (P. Lond. 1 122); healing of asses (Souda, s.v. Astrapychos); and astronomy (E. Riess, RE 2 [1896] 1796f).


S.M.O.

ASTRAPAS, JOHN. See Michael (Astrapas) and Eutychios.

ASTROLABE (αστρολάβος), an astronomical instrument used to measure altitudes of the stars and to tell time. Ptolemy described the principles of the astrolabe in his Projection of the Surface of a
Astrology, a "science" of making predictions concerning the future or interpretation of the past based on the positions of the planets relative to each other, to the signs of the zodiac and their subdivisions, and to the 12 astrological places, and on the positions of the zodiacal signs relative to those places. The basic forms of astrology are: (1) genethlialogy, in which the positions at the moment of a person's birth or of his computed conception are the determining factors, dependent on which are various forms of continuous horoscope including transits, prorogations, and anniversary horoscopes (these permit updatings of the predictions made from the base horoscope); (2) catarchic astrology, in which the most favorable moment for commencing an enterprise is chosen in accordance with astrological rules, the main subordinate parts of which are iatromathematics (the application of astrology to medicine) and military astrology; (3) interrogational astrology, in which the horoscope of the moment at which a query is put to the astrologer is interpreted to provide its answer; and (4) political astrology, in which predictions of the future events within a nation or among several, or reconstructions of their histories, are based on various cycles as well as on horoscopes cast for significant times.

In antiquity only the first three types appear in texts; political astrology was developed in Sasanian Iran and early Islam and transmitted to Byz. between 800 and 1000 with other Arabic works. Byz. astrological literature, then, falls into three periods: summaries and compendia of classical astrology in the 4th–7th C., the translations from the Arabic in the 10th–11th C. (some translations were made later), and the compilation of vast compendia and the editing of earlier texts in the 11th–14th C.

The earliest known Byz. astrological authors were Pancharios, whose iatromathematical Epitome Concerning Bed-Illnesses was probably composed in the early 4th C., and Maximos, who wrote a poem on catarchic astrology, On Beginnings, in the 4th or 5th C. The second edition of the Introduction of Paul of Alexandria was apparently issued in 378. It is a work on genethlialogy in the tradition of Antiochus of Athens (fl. before 300) and Porphyry. Part of a work by Paul's contemporary, the so-called "Anonymous of 379," is preserved in the late 14th-C. compendium ascribed falsely to a certain Paicho (al-Balkhi).

In ca.415 Hephaistion of Thebes wrote an Astrological Effects based on Ptolemy and Dorotheos of Sidon (1st/2nd C.) for its genethlialogy and primarily on Dorotheos for its catarchic astrology. Also in the 5th C. the Anthologies of Vettius Valens (2nd C.), another text on genethlialogy, was edited and expanded, while probably in the same century was written the Treatment of Ptolemy's Astrological Effects attributed to Proklos. Circa 500 Julian of Laodikeia wrote a work on catarchic (including military) astrology, of which several chapters are preserved in Rhetorios of Egypt, who also includes in his collection a large number of 5th- and early 6th-C. horoscopes. Both the On Omens and On the Months of John Lydios
contain some astrological material. The only other extant 6th-C. work on astrology is the commentary of OLYMPIODOROS on Paul of Alexandria, based on a course of lectures given at Alexandria in 564.

In the early 7th C. Rhetorios of Egypt compiled the richest surviving collection of classical and early Byz. astrological texts. It is primarily devoted to genethliography but contains some material on catarchic astrology. After Rhetorios there was a gap in the astrological tradition in Byz. until the end of the 8th C., although in Arab-controlled Syria THEOPHILOS OF EDESSA wrote in Greek on genethliography, catarchic and interrogational astrology, and astrological history; he used not only such sources as Petosirios, Ptolemy, Hephastion, and Rhetorios, but also Islamic and Indian material. In 775 an astrologer pretending to be STEPHEN OF ALEXANDRIA wrote a “prediction” of the course of history of the caliphs based on the horoscope of the beginning of the year (1 Sept. 621) of the Hijra. The author is probably Stephen the Philosopher, who studied in Persia and wrote a defense of astrology, On the Mathematical Art, in the late 8th or early 9th C.

In the 9th C. LEO THE MATHEMATICIAN wrote a few trivial pieces on genethliography, and from the 10th C. survive a number of horoscopes cast by astrologers such as Demophilos. These astrologers, and probably others, were responsible for the first minuscule MSS of the older astrological literature, of which the surviving examples are the 9th-C. Florence, Laur. 28, 27, and the 10th-C. Laur. 28, 34 and Vat. gr. 1453. Demophilos was also the editor and compiler of astrological collections; he evidently made substantial revisions in the texts of Porphyry’s Introduction and of Rhetorios.

Shortly before the year 1000 began the extensive Greek translations of Arabic astrological works by such authors as Abū Ma’shar and his pupil Shâdhân; the Kitâb al-Thamara (Karpos or Fruit) ascribed to Ptolemy with its commentary by Ahmad ibn Yûsuf; and an enormous compendium ascribed to Ahmad the Persian and entitled Introduction to and Foundation of Astrology. Excerpts from most of these translations begin to appear in 11th- and 12th-C. compendia preserved in MSS such as Paris, B.N. gr. 2506; Vat. gr. 1056; and Vienna, ÖNB phil. gr. 115. Some translations served as the basis of translations into Latin in the 13th C.

The Byz. church took a firm stance against astrology. The astrological concept that human fate is determined by the position of stars at man’s birth contradicts the idea of FREE WILL and introduces necessity—ananke or heimarmene—in place of Providence. The decisive role of stars in human life and in the forecast of political events appeared to the church fathers (including JOHN OF DAMASCUS) as a reminder of the pagan identification of gods with celestial bodies. The church fathers, however, had to face an exegetical problem, since Holy Scripture itself dealt with celestial phenomena in their capacity to influence or predict earthly events of great importance, e.g., the appearance of a star (interpreted sometimes as a comet) to the Magi. Astrology seems to have been rejected by the patrician authorities, but in the 12th C. the discussion was revived and often acquired a political significance.

Manuel I was a promoter of astrological interests, and it was in the court milieu of the 12th C. that the astrological poetry of John KAMATEROs and Theodore PRODROMOS originated. In the 1180s Byz. astrologers were involved in active correspondence with their Arab and Western colleagues predicting disaster on the basis of the impending conjunction of planets on 16 Sept. 1186. Niketas CHONIATES ridiculed the extraordinary efforts designed to preserve the palace during the expected calamity. Manuel’s pro-astrological position prompted both disguised and overt criticism: while earlier in the century Anna Komnene restricted herself to a general disapproval of astrological views, Michael GLYKAS directly attacked Manuel and was subsequently thrown into prison and blinded.

During the Latin occupation of Constantinople (1204–61) little of an astrological nature seems to have been composed in Greek, except for the translation made by Alexios of Constantinople in 1245 of an Arabic version of the Apocalypse of Daniel, a work on celestial omens. In the Palaiologan period, however, the study of astrology revived with vigor. A dialogue entitled Hermippos, which offers a Christian defense of astrology, was composed in the early 14th C., probably by John Katrones (PLP, no.11551). But the most important Palaiologan astrologers were John ABRAMIOS and his pupil Eleutherios Zebelenos, also called Elias. Between 1370 and 1400 they revised many of the major classical and early Byz. astrological
treatises—Ptolemy, Hephaistion, Olympiodorus, and the beginning of Rhetorios—and the Greek translations of Shādhān and of Ahmad the Persian. Eleutherios was apparently responsible for the vast compilation of Greek and Arabic astrology which he falsely attributed to Palchos. The labors of these scholars have served to obscure and pervert the true history of ancient and Byz. astrology, although they did preserve many fragments that would have otherwise been lost. Their work was to some extent carried on in the 15th C. by men like John Chortasmenos and Isidore of Kiev.


D.P., A.K.

ASTRONOMY in Byz. began with commentaries on Ptolemy. In the 11th C. this activity was supplemented by an infusion of short texts based on Arabic astronomy. Finally, in the Palaiologan period, two contrasting schools developed, one based on the Ptolemaic tradition and the other on Islamic astronomy presented in translations either from Persian and Arabic or from Latin.

From the 4th to the early 7th C. were produced the commentaries on the Almagest by Pappos and Theon, the summary of that work in the Outline of Proklos, and the introduction to it by Eutokios; the two commentaries of the Handy Tables by Theon and that by Stephen of Alexandria; and a large number of scholia connected with both of these works of Ptolemy. There was also collected together, perhaps already in the 4th C., a group of early treatises on spheres by Autolycos, Euclid, and Theodosios, which formed a sort of corpus throughout the Byz. period. Other signs of astronomical activity in this period include the observations made by Heliodoros and Ammonios between 475 and 510; perhaps the planetary tables based on Babylonian goal-year periods that al-Zarqalī in the late 11th C. associated with Ammonios’s name; and some papyrus fragments of ephemerides (tables of true longitudes of the sun, moon, and planets) based on the Handy Tables. In this early period elementary astronomical knowl-
edge was necessary for the church—both for its practical needs such as establishing the calendar, esp. the date of Easter, and for outlining the image and the history of the cosmos. George of Pisidia in his Hexaemeron was able to draw upon a good astronomical textbook (G. Bianchi, Aevum 49 (1966) 35–42).

The study of astronomy lapsed in Byz. after Stephen’s commentary on the Handy Tables of ca.620 but continued to flourish outside the empire in Egypt, Syria, and Armenia. Its restoration in Constantinople in the 9th C. is attested to by the brief discussion of Greek and Islamic tables given by Stephen the Philosopher, probably in ca.800, and by the career of Leo the Mathematician. Further witness to the revival of interest in astronomy is the production of a number of deluxe MSS with astronomical contents during the 8th–9th C.; Vat. gr. 1291, which has a sun-table accurate only for 826–35, was dated by I. Spatharakis (BZ 71 [1978] 41–47) to the reign of Theophilos, but redated by D. Wright (BZ 78 [1985] 355–62) to ca.753, on a palaeographical basis. It was brought up to date until 866 and was in use possibly as late as the 12th C. A primitive text on computing the longitudes of the planets based on Vettius Valens (I 18) was written in 906 and was still being used in the Palaiologan period (Vettii Valentinis Antiocheni Anthologiae libri novem, ed. D. Pingree [Leipzig 1986] 398–406). In addition an elementary Quadrivium with instructions and examples for using the Handy Tables was produced in 1007/8.

In the 11th C. Islamic astronomy began to be familiar to the Byz., as can be seen from some translations of Arabic star catalogs; from the writings of Symeon Seth (which may include the scholium of 1032 to the Prolegomena to the Almagest); and from an anonymous astronomical treatise written between 1072 and 1088 (A. Jones, An Eleventh-Century Manual of Arabo-Byzantine Astronomy (Amsterdam 1987)). From the 12th C., however, nothing survives. From the 13th C. survive mainly uninspired texts by Nikephoros Blemydes, George Akropolites, George Pachymeres, and John Pediasimos.

In the early Palaiologan period, however, a knowledge of Ptolemaic astronomy was restored by Manuel Bryennios, Theodore Metochites, and Nikephoros Gregoras and was continued into the later 14th C. by Nicholas Kabasilas and
Isaac Argyros, and into the 15th by John Chortasmenos and Bessarion. The interpenetration of theology, celestial mechanics, geography, and harmony is clear in the early 14th-C. miniatures inserted into Venice, Bib. Marc. gr. 516. Furlan (Marciana 4:40–48) related many of these diagrams to the thought of Manuel Bryennios and Pachymeres. Followers of the so-called Islamic school included Gregory Choniaedes, who by 1300 had translated into Greek a number of Persian and Arabic astronomical tables; this tradition was followed by George Chrysokokkes and several anonymous treatises of the later 14th C. One work that encompasses both Ptolemaic and Islamic astronomy is the Three Books written by Theodore Melitenioties in ca.1361; also drawing upon both traditions were the pupils of John Abramios. Other Byz. discussions of Persian astronomy were composed on Cyprus in ca.1347 and on Rhodes in ca.1393.

The Latin texts translated into Greek include the Toledan Tables prepared on Cyprus in the 1330s, perhaps by George Lapidhes, and again by Demetrios Chrysoloras with an epoch of 1377; and the tables of Jacob ben David Yom-tob by Mark Eugenikos in 1444. Immanuel ben Jacob Bonfils’s Seven Wings was translated from Hebrew by Michael Chryssokokkes in 1435.

Classical Greek astronomical texts mention a number of observational instruments: meridional and equinoctial armillaries, a plinth, an armillary sphere, a parallactic instrument, and a dioptric are all described in the Almagest of Ptolemy. The Byz. also knew about the construction of these instruments through commentaries on the Almagest by Pappos and Theon, and through the summary of it in Proklos’s Outline. Ptolemy also described the principles of the two main time-keeping devices, the astrolabe and the sundial, in other treatises.

ED. Corpus des astronomes byzantins, ed. A. Tihon (Amsterdam 1983–).


ASYLUM (ἀσύλια), the refuge given by the church to all Orthodox Christians seeking protection from the threat of imprisonment or physical harm. Sources refer to asylum as the “privilege” of the church; it was evidently established by custom. The earliest mention, in canon 7 of Serdica (a.342/3) (Rhallets-Potles, Syntagma 3:248–52), takes it for granted, and there are no ecclesiastical laws establishing it, only civil legislation from the late 4th C. onward, acknowledging and regulating it. In 431 (Cod.Theod. IX 45.4) the boundaries of ecclesiastical sanctuary were extended from the nave and altar to include the entire precinct of the church building and severe sanctions were introduced against the transgressors of the rights of refugees (J. Herrmann in Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte, Gedachtschrift für Hermann Conrad [Paderborn 1979] 271–82). In many cases, nevertheless, fugitives (e.g., political) were forcefully dragged from the church. The church punished such violations by the imposition of excommunication and even excommunication (cf. vita of Tarasios, ed. Heikel, 407.11–37, 408.1–18).

Although Justinian I excluded asylum the perpetrators of the crimes of rape, robbery, adultery, and murder (novs. 17.7 and 37), a significant change occurred in the 10th C. with the novel of Constantine VII, which allowed murderers the protection of asylum. By the 12th C. Hagia Sophia in Constantinople had become famous as a place of asylum, esp. for killers (Nik.Chon. 342.9–15). It had a tribunal for such cases, headed by the protektikos, and certain parts of the church were known as the “Refuge” (R.J. Macrides, Speculum 63 [1988] 509–38). The right of asylum for murderers was again abolished by Manuel I (R.J. Macrides, “Justice” 190–204). In 1343 John V prescribed that those who sought protection in Hagia Sophia should head for a special room without disturbing the divine service (Reg 5, no.2886). Although there is less evidence for it, Hagia Sophia appears also to have offered protection to insolvent debtors (MM 2:448f, a.1400).


ATALANTA. See Meleager.

ATHANASIOS, archbishop of Alexandria, theologian, philosopher, and saint; born Alexandria 295, died Alexandria 2 May 373; feastdays 18 Jan., 2 May. After a fierce struggle (L. Barnard, OrchrP 41 [1975] 344–52), Athanasios was elected archbishop of Alexandria on 8 June 328. He
succeeded Alexander, whom he had served as secretary and accompanied to the Council of Nicaea in 325. Continuing Arian influence at the imperial court caused Athanasios to be deposed and exiled five times (335, 339, 356, 362, 365); his removal in 362 was due to his refusal to be maneuvered by Emp. Julian into fomenting Christian infighting. Two early tracts (ca.318), Against the Hellenes and the Incarnation of the Logos, attack pagan mythology and defend the Christian faith against Jewish and pagan criticism, respectively. His major work was the refutation of Arianism in four books: the authenticity of the final volume has long been suspect, and recently C. Kannengiesser (Athanase d’Alexandrie évêque et écrivain [Paris 1983]) tried to attribute the third book to Apollinaris.

The focal point of Athanasian theology is the concept of salvation, which Athanasios understood as the deification of man: “All are named sons and gods both on earth and in heaven.” This deification is possible because the incarnate Logos who assumed human flesh was—in contradiction to Arian dogma—the genuine God, of the same nature as the Father. “He was not a man who later became God, but God who later became man in order to deify us” (PG 26:92C–93A). Athanasios explains the mystery of the generation of the Son-Logos by the Father by using the metaphor of the sun, which is constantly emitting its rays. Athanasios, however, did not elaborate a refined terminology to describe the Trinity, nor did he draw a strict line between nature and hypostasis, nor between homousios and plain “likeness” (homoioi). Athanasios acknowledged the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit.

The fragments of his biblical exegesis show some allegorizing tendencies. His 39th Festal Letter (367) contains an important list of Old and New Testament books, with distinctions between genuine and apocryphal works. His Life of St. Antony the Great, a landmark in Christian literature and model for later hagiography, is a valuable source for early monasticism as well as for Egyptian social history and popular beliefs, esp. demonology.

**Representation in Art.** Athanasios was included in almost every painted group of church fathers as a balding white-haired bishop with a somewhat squared beard. His funeral is mentioned in the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos, and there are numerous representations of this scene in illustrated MSS of these Homilies; the scene takes the form of a funeral around the bier, attended by bishops and other clergy (Galavaris, Liturgical Homilies 49f). He is often paired with his fellow citizen Cyril of Alexandria, whose feast is celebrated the same day.


**ATHANASIOS I,** patriarch of Constantinople (Oct. 1289–Oct. 1293; June 1303–Sept. 1309) and saint; born Adrianople ca.1235, died Constantinople ca.1315; feastday 28 Oct. From his youth Athanasios was an ascetic monk who moved frequently from one monastery to another: he resided in turn on the holy mountains of Athos, Auxentios, Latros, Galesios, and Ganos, and made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Soon after 1282 Andronikos II installed him in a monastery on the Xerolophos hill in Constantinople and eventually made him patriarch. Athanasios was deposed from his first patriarchate because of his unpopular insistence on strict monastic discipline and the requirement that bishops reside in their sees. After ten years in retirement, he returned to the patriarchal throne but was again deposed to bring an end to the Arsenite schism.

His letters and sermons reveal a rigid and fervently pious individual who hoped to check the Turkish advance by urging repentance on emperor and people alike. Under his guidance the synod issued a new law (meara) in 1304 (*RegPatr*, fasc. 4, no.1607), confirmed by the emperor in 1306 (*Reg 4*, no.2293), which was designed to rectify injustices and raise moral standards; it covered such topics as inheritance, opening hours of taverns and bath houses, prostitution, and adultery. Athanasios sought to alleviate the sufferings of the poor and personally supervised distributions of food and clothing. He also organized a commission to control the supply and price of grain in Constantinople. At times he had considerable influence on the emperor; nonetheless his petitions were frequently ignored. After
his death his popularity led to the development of a local cult at his tomb where numerous miracles were attested. His sanctity was recognized sometime before 1368. Two vitae are preserved, both by Palamite authors, Joseph Kalothetos and Theoktistos the Stoudite (BHG 194, 194c).

ATHANASIOS II, Melkite patriarch of Alexandria (ca.1275-ca.1315). He was a former Sinaite monk who, because of the Mamluk occupation of Egypt, spent most of his tenure in exile. In 1275 or 1276 Athanasios went to Constantinople, where Michael VIII and his son Andronikos (II) granted him monasteries, to provide him with both a residence and income. He rapidly became involved in ecclesiastical controversies and found himself in opposition to his contemporary patriarchs of Constantinople, Gregory II and esp. Athanasios I, who confiscated Athanasios’s monasteries and forced him into exile on Rhodes ca.1289. Athanasios returned to Constantinople during the interval between the two patriarchates of Athanasios I (1293-1303). In 1294 he was entrusted with an embassy to Cilician Armenia that was aborted. After a series of narrow escapes in Greece, he presumably made his way to the metochion of Sinai on Crete. The place and date of his death are unknown.

Athanassios was bilingual in Greek and Arabic and a cultured bibliophile who acquired several MSS in Constantinople for the see of Alexandria. His most notable acquisition was the 5th-C. Codex Alexandrinus (London, B.L. Royal 1.D.v-viii).

ATHANASIOS OF METEORA, saint; baptismal name Andronikos; born Neopatras 1205, died Meteora 20 Apr. 1383. Born to a noble family, Athanasios was orphaned at an early age and entrusted to the care of his paternal uncle. He eagerly pursued both secular and religious studies in Thessalonike and Constantinople, where he met Gregory Sinaites, Isidore (I) Boucheiras,
and Gregory Akindynos. After a period on Crete as a hesychast, he became a monk on Mt. Athos in 1335 and took the name Antony (later changed to Athanasios). After a Turkish attack on Athos, Athanasios left the Holy Mountain ca.1340 with his spiritual master, a hesychast named Gregory. The two sought refuge and tranquillity among the rocky spires of the Meteora in Thessaly. For years Athanasios lived in solitude; eventually he settled on a pinnacle called Platylithos (“broad rock”), which he named Meteoron (“suspended in midair”). Here he established a cenobitic community of 14 monks for whom he drafted a short rule (vita, 251f) and built a church dedicated to the Theotokos (later reconstructed and rededicated to the Metamorphosis). His anonymous Life (BIHG 195) was written sometime after 1388 by a monk who had lived on Athos and had known Athanasios briefly at Meteoron.

—A.M.T.

ATHANATOI (ἠθανατοί, “immortals”), a tagma of noble youth. Created by John I Tzimiskes in 970 (Leo Diac. 107,11–12), they were armed and preceded the emperor on campaign (132,17–18). They camped, together with the hetaireia, next to the emperor’s tent (Dennis, Military Treatises 250,100). The 10th-C. taktikon of Escurial first mentions the domestikos of the thanatatoi. John I’s thanatatoi probably did not endure; they are not mentioned again until the end of the 11th C. when, according to Nikephoros Bryennios (Bryn. 265–67), Nikephoritzes revived the corps of thanatatoi and supplied them with armor, shields, helmets, and spears. Some chrysobulls of the end of the 11th C. (e.g., Lavra 1, no.48,28) place the thanatatoi together with the ethnic contingents, but S. Kyriakides (Makedonika 2 [1953] 722–24) strongly insists on their autochthonous origin. There is no evidence that the thanatatoi survived the 12th C.

—A.K.

ATHENA, in Greek mythology, daughter of Zeus, virgin goddess of wisdom, and eponymous patron of Athens. Myths about Athena, drawn from the standard classical curriculum of Byz. education, continued to furnish literary material down to the time of Tzetzes, who reproduced them in his Histories. The Iliad passage (5,837–39) describing Athena’s chariot creaking under her weight was often discussed by Christian apologists, who were concerned to reject the old embodiment of virginity and its power in Athena in favor of the new figure of the Virgin Mary. They ridiculed Homer’s description: a weightless deity could not have caused that phenomenon (Eust. Comm. II. 2:213,5–7). A 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chron. 158,70–72) used the same Homeric image to describe Manuel I’s bringing of an icon of the Virgin into Constantinople on a chariot: in the triumphal procession, the vehicle did not creak under the true Virgin. In Gnosticism, on the other hand, the figure of Athena was used positively to represent the divine Sophia.

An antique bronze statue of Athena, 30 feet high, stood in the Forum of Constantine in Constantinople until just before 1204, when the mob, interpreting the hand’s gesture as inviting the Latin army, tore it down (Nik.Chron. 558f). In Byz. art Athena appears in depictions of the judgment of Paris (J. Trilling, The Roman Heritage [Washington, D.C., 1982] 46, no.25; H. Zaloscer, Die Kunst im christlichen Ägypten [Vienna 1974] pl. 48). Clad as a Byz. empress, she is shown born from Zeus’s head in illustrations of the scholia of pseudo-Nonnos of Panopolis on the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos. George Gemistos Pléthon addressed a hymn to Athena in his Laws, hailing her as the power presiding over form (eidos) and impelled movement (kinéma gignomene), who rejects the superfluous (Alexandre, Pléthon 210).

The Byz. Tzetzes (Historiae, 1.176–77, 5,671–72) and Kosmas the Hymnographer (PG 38: 487,27–28) were also acquainted with the ancient myth that Athena, though a virgin, had borne to Hephastos a son called Erichthonios: how the perpetuation of this legend is related to the contrast between Athena and the Virgin Mary is unclear.

—L.S.B.MacC., A.C.

ATHENAIS-EUDOKIA, wife of Theodosios II, Augusta (from 2 Jan. 423); born Athens ca.400, died Jerusalem 20 Oct. 460. The daughter of
Leontios, a pagan philosopher in Athens, Athenais (Ἀθηναία) came to Constantinople where she was baptized, taking the Christian name Eudokia. She soon attracted the attention of powers at court, possibly those in opposition to Pulcheria, the emperor's sister. Athenais married Theodosios on 7 June 421 and bore him three children. The oldest, Licinia Eudoxia (born 422), was to become the wife of Valentinian III. In these years Athenais enjoyed considerable power and may have been the center of a faction of "traditionalists"—men such as her uncle Asklepiodotos and the prefect Kyros—who urged policies of religious moderation and supported classical culture. Athenais was, however, gradually eclipsed by Pulcheria, who gained increasing control over her brother. In 438 Athenais departed with Melania the Younger for the Holy Land, where she encountered Cyril of Alexandria and Barsama. She returned to Constantinople the next year and reached the height of her power. By 443, however, she again fell from favor as a result of allegations of adultery. She went to Jerusalem in voluntary exile, but apparently retained her imperial title. She sided with anti-Chalcedonian monks in Jerusalem in 452. Although she was ultimately reconciled to Chalcedon, she was nonetheless revered in Monophysite tradition (H. Drake, *GRBS* 20 [1979] 381–92). Athenais was highly educated and obviously independent-minded; some fragments of her poetry survive. Her story was romantically enhanced by later Byz. tradition.

ED. *Eudociae Augustae, Procli Lycii, Claudiani carminum graecorum reliquiae*, ed. A. Ludwich (Leipzig 1897) 11–79.


—T.E.G.

**ATHENS** (Ἀθῆναι), city in central Greece, in late antiquity part of the province of Achaia, listed by Hierokles as the "metropolis of Attica." Sacked by the Heruli in 267 and Alaric in 396, the city lost much of its ancient splendor and was surrounded by a fortification embracing only a fraction of its former area: at the end of the 4th C. Synesios of Cyrene described Athens in disparaging terms, as a place famous only for its production of honey. From the 4th to early 6th C., however, Athens maintained its place as an academic center and home of Neoplatonism, centered in the revived Academy of Athens and independent philosophical schools; among the students there were Basil the Great of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzos, and the future emperor Julian. Paganism apparently remained strong in Athens in the late Roman period, and Christian symbols did not become common on lamps until the early 5th C. (A. Frantz, *DOP* 19 [1965] 187–205). The empress Athenais-Eudokia, an Athenian, was noted for her learning. The effect of Justinian I's closing of the Schools of Athens in 529 remains controversial (Al. Cameron, *Literature*, pt.XIII [1965], 7–29).

The city was apparently sacked by the Slavs in 582 but remained in Byz. hands; in the 7th C. there was some political recovery, highlighted by the visit of Constans II in 662/3. From the late 7th C. Athens was part of the theme of Hellas. The city was threatened by Arab pirates but more peaceful relations are suggested by the probable existence of an Arab mosque (G. Miles, *Hesperia* 25 [1956] 329–44). It is usually assumed that during the Iconoclast crisis Athens supported icon worship; at any rate, Empress Irene, born in Athens, played a decisive role in the restoration of the cult of icons. In the early 9th C. another woman from Athens, Theophano, a relative of Irene, married the future emperor Staurakios (Theoph. 483.18). In 1018 Basil II visited Athens and gave thanks in the Church of the Virgin in the Parthenon for his victory over the Bulgarians. The letters of Michael Choniates, who was metropolitan of Athens 1182–1204, complain of the poverty of the city, the ignorance of the inhabitants, and the incapacity of imperial officials (J. Herrin, *DOP* 29 [1976] 253–84).

In 1204 the city withstood a siege by Leo Scouros, but by the end of the year it fell to Boniface of Montferrat, who appointed Guy de la Roche as the first duke of Athens. The duchy of Athens controlled all of central Greece and had interests in the Peloponnesos and as far north as Boudonitza; the dukes, however, had their primary residence at Thbes. In 1311 the city came under the control of the Catalan Grand Company, who surrendered it to Nerio I Acciajuoli in 1385 (K.M. Setton, *The Catalan Domination of Athens* 1311–1388 [London 1975]). In 1394 it passed briefly to Venice and then to Antonio Acciajuoli.
after 1403. In 1446 the future Constantine XI took Athens for Byz. but in 1456 it fell to the Turks.

The bishop of Athens was under the authority of the bishop of Thessalonike; he was raised to metropolitan status, probably in the 9th C. (V. Laurent, REB 1 [1943] 58–72); his suffragans included the bishops of Euboëa, central Greece, and the nearby islands (Notitiæ CP 7.496–506, etc.). A Latin archbishop, who replaced the Orthodox bishop after 1204, played an important role in the papacy’s plan to control the Greek church (J. Koder, JÖB 26 [1977] 129–41). Under the Acciaiuoli the Orthodox bishopric was re-established.

Monuments of Athens. Athens preserves many standing Byz. monuments and more have been brought to light by excavation, esp. in the Agora. In the courtyard of the Library of Hadrian a large quatrefoil structure of the 5th C. has been uncovered, probably a church rather than a lecture hall or audience hall as previously believed. On the slopes of the Areopagos and the south side of the Acropolis have been found houses associated with the philosophical schools. Basilican churches (e.g., the so-called Ilissos Basilica) were constructed on the periphery, but most of the pagan temples were not converted to Christian use until the late 6th C. or even later. From the 5th C. onward small-scale industrial activity was introduced into the former city center, as the ancient urban pattern was abandoned. The extensive ancient enceinte, repaired by Justinian I, was soon thereafter allowed to fall into decay; coin finds after the mid-7th C. are infrequent (F. Kleiner, Medieval and Modern Coins in the Athenian Agora [Princeton 1978] 12), and certain areas—the region of the Odeion (H.A. Thompson, Hesperia 19 [1950] 137) and the Pnyx (H.A. Thompson, R.L. Scarrton, Hesperia 12 [1943] 376)—were deserted. Recovery began in the 9th C. and reached its peak in the 11th–12th C. This period of prosperity ended, as far as the archaeological evidence shows, ca.1180 (Ch. Bouras, JÖB 31.2 [1981] 626f).

Beginning ca.975 with the katholikon of Mone Petake, there is an unbroken string of surviving churches, nearly all of the Constantinopolitan cross-in-square type; many have pseudo-Kufic decoration. The Church of the Holy Apostles in the Agora is a domed quatrefoil of considerable sophistication (A. Frantz, The Church of the Holy Apostles [The Athenian Agora 20] [Princeton 1971]);
the Church of Sts. Theodore is dated by an inscription to 1065, while the Kapnikarea (1060-70) has an exonarthex, as well as a parekklesia perhaps added during the Frankish period. The Panagia Gorgoeipikoos/St. Eleutherios (Little Metropolis) is made entirely of marble, mostly reused blocks, many of them sculptured; it dates probably to the period shortly after 1200. Most of the Athenian churches are small and are grouped in the area immediately to the north of the Acropolis. The poorly restored Panagia Lykodemou (11th C.) was a large domed octagon, presumably representing influence from the capital. None of these churches retains its original painted decoration. Fresco programs have survived, however, in several churches on the outskirts of Athens, notably the cave chapels on Mt. Pentele of the early 13th C., similar in style to that of the late Komnenian period, which preserve a hallowed portrait of Michael Choniates (D. Mouri, DChAE 4 7 [1974] 79-119), and the Omorfe Ekklesia of the late 13th C. which already reflects the latest stylistic developments in the contemporary painting of Macedonia (A. Basile-Karakatsane, Hoi toucho-graffies tes Omorphes Ekklesias sten Athena [Athens 1971]. The Parthenon was the cathedral church and the other buildings of the Acropolis were used as churches, while the Propylaia was converted by the Frankish dukes into a palace with a large tower.


ATHINGANOI (Ἀθηγανοί, lit. “Untouchables”), judaizing heretics in Phrygia and Lykaonia first mentioned as favored by Emp. Nikephoros I, who, according to the hostile report of Theophanes the Confessor, invited them in 810 to sacrifice a bull to quell a revolt. Emp. Michael I condemned them to death and massacred many but later relented. Theophanes Continatus defined them as Sabbath observers who were baptized and followed the laws of Moses except for circumcision, while each Athinganos was under the spiritual and material influence of a Jew. Constantin VII apparently disputed with them. An 11th-C. (?) abjuration formula accused them of practicing magic, astrology, and a ritual purity characterized by Levitical ablutions. The name was later attached to other groups, e.g., Adsina-noi (GYPSIES).


ATHOS, ACTS OF. The monasteries of Mt. Athos possess numerous charters of the Byz. (and post-Byz.) period, both in original and in copies. In its totality the collection is by far the richest Byz. archive of documentary material, providing abundant data on political, economic, and ecclesiastical history, the history of institutions and law, ethnic composition, literacy, etc. The oldest extant documents date to the late 9th C. The richest collections belong to the LA VRA, IVERON, HILANDAR, and VATOPEDI monasteries; in addition are preserved the acts of DIONYSIOU, DOCHEIARIIOU, ESPHIGMENOU, KASTAMONITOU, KOUTLOUMOUSIOU, PANTOKRATOR, St. PAUL, PANTELEEMON, PHILOTHEO, XENOPHONTOS, XOROPAMOU, and ZOGRAFHO, as well as those of the PROTATON and of several minor archives (Karakalou and Simopetra).

Attempts at systematization of the archives were begun at the end of the 18th C. by the monks themselves: Cyril of Lavra compiled a list of acts in his monastery’s archive (A. Guillou, BCH 82 [1958] 610-34). In the 19th C. some travelers to Athos copied and later photographed selected charters; an important collection of photographs was assembled by P.I. Sevast’janov (E. Granstrem, I. Medvedev, REB 33 [1975] 277-93). Russian scholars began the systematic publication of the acts of Athos—first of Panteleemon (Kiev 1873), then Vatopedi (St. Petersburg 1898), then in appendices to Vizantijskij Vremennik—while Greek scholars published individual acts in various periodicals. A systematic survey, started by G. Millet and continued by P. Lemerle, has resulted in the publication of many Athonite documents in Paris (now in progress); V. Mošin and F. Dölder also made important contributions. The Acts contain some of the most important surviving inventories of icons and liturgical equipment.
ED. Archives de l'Arles, ed. P. Lemerle, N. Oikonomides, J. Lefort et al. (Paris 1937—). (See entries on individual monasteries for editions of specific volumes.)


—A.K., A.C.

ATHOS, MOUNT, also called the HOLY MOUNTAIN (Hagion Oros), from the late 10th C., the most important center of Eastern Orthodox monasticism. Athos ("Aths") is the name given to the northermmost projection of the CHALKIDIKE peninsula, 45 km long, 5—10 km wide, as well as to the peak (2,033 m) that dominates this rocky finger of land. Its is linked to the mainland by a narrow isthmus 2 km in width. The peninsula has forests, meadows for pasturage, and small plots of land suitable for vineyards, orchards, olive groves, and gardens.

Athos was virtually deserted when monks first began to settle there, probably in the late 8th or early 9th C.; according to the 10th-C. historian GENESIOS (58.22), in 843 Athos was already a major monastic community, but his evidence must be treated with caution. The theories that the earliest monks of Athos were refugees from the Arab conquests of the eastern provinces of Byz., or Iconodules fleeing the persecutions of the Iconoclast emperors, have now lost favor. The first arrivals seem to have come from nearby regions, and to have been attracted by the unsullied solitude of the peninsula. Monasticism developed slowly on the Holy Mountain, however, because of its isolation, its rugged terrain, and the danger from Arab pirates. The early monks lived as solitary hermits or in small groups; the pioneers on Athos included Peter the Athonite (D. Papachrysanthou, AB 92 [1974] 19—61)—a semilegendary figure—and EUTHYMIOS THE YOUNGER, who arrived in 859. The first cenobitic monastery in the vicinity of Athos was KOLOBOS, founded near HIERISSOS sometime before 889. A fragmentary sigillum of Basil I (Prot., no. 1, s.883) is the earliest preserved imperial act concerning the Holy Mountain; it protected the Athonite monks from the intrusion of local shepherds.

The date of the first appearance of cenobitic monasticism on Athos proper is impossible to ascertain, but by the mid-10th C. some koinobia (e.g., XEROPOTAMOU) are attested. In 963 ATHANASIOS OF ATHOS, with the support of Nikephoros II Phokas, founded the Great LAVRA, which would soon hold first place in the Athonite hierarchy, a position it would maintain in perpetuity. By the end of the 10th C., many of the most important Athonite monasteries (e.g., IVERON, HILANDAR, ESPHIGMENOU, PANTHELEON, VATOPEDI, XENOPHONTOS, and possibly ZOGRAPHOU) had been founded; by 1001 46 monasteries were in existence (Papachrysanthou in Prot. 86—93).

Monks from non-Greek lands began to come to the Holy Mountain in the 10th C.: the Georgian monastery of Iveron was established in 979/80, soon followed by the Italian monastery of the Amalfitans (see AMALFI). Orthodox Armenians (Chalcedonians) were numerous at Espigmenou. In the 12th C. the peninsula began to attract more Slavic monks: Panteleemon was taken over by monks from Rus', and Hilandar was restored as a Serbian monastery. In the 13th C. Zographou came to be inhabited primarily by Bulgarian monks.

The organization of Athos in the 10th C. was relatively simple: the monks attended three annual assemblies at the PROTATON in KARYES and elected a PROTON who represented the community in its relations with ecclesiastical and secular authorities. By the end of the 10th C. (?) this assem-
bly was replaced by an irregular "council" that attracted on the average 15 participants, but occasionally as many as 40. The larger monasteries became independent of the Protaton, with the *hegoumenos* of the Great Lavra acquiring a more prestigious position in the local hierarchy than the *protos*.

In the 10th and 11th C. Athos attracted considerable imperial attention. Romanos I Lekapenos initiated an annual stipend (*roga*) for the Athonite monks and ordered the demarcation of a frontier boundary, probably in 941/2 (D. Papachryssanthou in *Prot.* 55). The rapid growth of the Lavra under the patronage of Nikephoros Phokas prompted the resentment of many Athonite monks, esp. the anchorites who feared for their way of life. John I Tzimiskes' issuance of a *typikon* for Athos, the *Tragos*, between 970 and 972, attempted a compromise, recognizing the rights of *hegoumenoi*, *kelliotai* (the spiritual leaders of anachoretic groups), and solitary hermits to attend the assemblies at Karyes. Both Nikephoros II and John I envisaged Athos as a stronghold of "poor monasticism," but under Basil II some monasteries began to acquire lands beyond the boundaries of the Holy Mountain and were gradually transformed into great landowners. Cenobitism became predominant, to the detriment of hermitages. In the 11th-12th C. new monasteries continued to be founded (*Kastamonitou*, *Dochiariou*, *Koutloumousiou*), and the older ones expanded their possessions. Economic activities on Athos increased, such as the sale of wood from Athonite forests and surplus agricultural products (fruits, vegetables, wine) cultivated on monastic estates. Many monasteries owned boats for the transport of these goods and the importation of necessary provisions; these boats often were granted exemptions from customs duties. Despite John I's prohibition of the presence of eunuchs, beardless youths, women, and even female animals on the peninsula, in the 11th C. substantial groups of *Vlach* shepherds settled with their families on Athos and supplied the monks with dairy products. The "Vlach question" caused such a scandal that ca.1100 Alexios I was forced to expel the herdsmen from Athos.

Constantine IX Monomachos's chrysobull of 1045 sheds light on the administrative development of Athos. The independence of individual *koinobia* increased; Lavra, Vatopedi, and Iveron were the top-ranking monasteries, taking precedence over the central administration of the *protos*. The growth of landownership incited conflicts among monasteries over estates as well as clashes with local landowners, esp. in Hierissos; with the Cumans who had settled in southern Macedonia; and with imperial functionaries. On the other hand, the patriarchate tried to establish its jurisdiction (at least partial) over Athos, which had been considered as subordinate only to the emperor.

The fall of Constantinople to the Fourth Crusade in 1204 and the establishment of the Latin Empire led to a period of difficulty for Athos, as Macedonia was troubled by the Latin occupation, the rising power of the Bulgarians, and rivalry between the empire of Nicaea and Epirus. Athos came under the rule of the Frankish Kingdom of Thessalonike from 1204 to 1224, and the monasteries lost some of their properties outside the peninsula, which they sought to recover after the Greek reconquest of Constantinople in 1261. The reign of Michael VIII Palaiologos was, however, extremely unpopular on Athos, because of the persecution of monks who refused to accept the Union of Lyons of 1274 (G. Rouillard, *REB* 1 [1943] 73-84; J. Koder, *JÖB* 18 [1969] 79-88).

In the early 14th C. Athos suffered from the raids of the Catalan Grand Company, but then enjoyed a period of prosperity during which several new monasteries were founded (Gregoriou, *Dionysiou*, *Pantokrator*, Simopetra). Documents recording various privileges conferred by the emperors on Athonite monasteries (a practice which goes back to the 9th C.) are esp. copious from the first half of the 14th C. Whereas the privileges granted by the government in the 10th C. were primarily *solemnia* (stipends from the state treasury) and the chrysobulls of the 11th C. mostly established monastic *exkousia* (immunity from taxes), the documents of the 14th C. were first of all donations of lands and *paroikoi*.

The properties of Athos took the form of fields, vineyards, pastures, mills, fishponds, entire villages, urban rental properties, and workshops. These possessions were concentrated in Macedonia (including Thessalonike), esp. on the Chalkidike peninsula and in the Strymon valley, but extended to Thrace, Thasos, Lemnos, Serbia, and...
Wallachia. The bulk of the acts of Athos (see Athos, Acts of) concern these estates, and include *praktika*, charters of sale, exchange, and donation, in addition to imperial chrysobulls confirming the monasteries' titles to their property and guaranteeing fiscal immunity. All ranks of people, from humble peasant to emperor, were anxious to make pious donations to Athomite monasteries; in addition to the emperors at Constantinople, the benefactors of Athos included the Grand Komnenoi of Trebizond, the rulers of Serbia and Bulgaria, and voivodes of Wallachia.

In the 14th C. *Idiorrhythmic Monasticism* developed on Athos, and the *koinobion* declined. By mid-century Turkish pirates were attacking the peninsula, forcing some of the monks to flee to Paroria or to Meteora. The Ottoman threat led to government restriction on the growth of monastic properties and the confiscation of some Athomite estates in the second half of the 14th C.; thus, after the Turkish victory at Marica in 1371 half of the *metochia* belonging to Athos were transformed into *pronoiai* and transferred to soldiers. This policy was continued in the 15th C. (Ostrogorsky, *Feodalité* 161–76). After briefly occupying Athos in 1387 and from 1493 to 1496, the Ottomans established permanent control over the Holy Mountain in 1490. The Turks recognized the autonomy of Athos in return for the payment of annual tribute, but the monasteries lost their immunities and their estates in Thrace and Macedonia.

Attitudes toward the intellectual life were varied. *Kelliotai* and hermits, who placed an emphasis on spirituality and asceticism, had little use for books. As N. Oikonomides (*DOP* 42 [1988] 167–78) has shown, many of the Athomite monks came from a rustic background and were illiterate. Nonetheless in the *koinobia*, founded on the Stoudite model, there was more emphasis on intellectual pursuits, esp. from the 13th C. onward. The monasteries amassed important collections of MSS (B. Fonkić, *PSb* 17 [1967] 167–75), some produced in their own scriptoria (e.g., at Philotheou, Hilandar, and Iveron). Among Athomite monks could be found composers (John Koukouzeles), hagiographers (Joseph Kalothetos), theologians (Gregory Palamas), and ecclesiastical writers (Theoleptos of Philadelphia). With its international assemblage of monks, cultural interchange was inevitable: Hilandar, Zographou, Pan-teleemon, and Iveron became centers for the transmission of Byz. religious literature to Serbia, Bulgaria, Russia, and Georgia, respectively.

As the Holy Mountain par excellence from the 10th C. onward, Athos attracted Byz. monks for six centuries. Many holy men, whose custom it was to wander from one monastery to holy mountain to another, spent time on Athos before moving on, thus reducing the cultural isolation of the Athomite monasteries. Because of its geographical proximity, Thessalonike, rather than Constantinople, had the closest links with the Holy Mountain. For some monks, like Palamas, a hegoumenate on Athos was the springboard to a bishopric; for others it might lead to the patriarchate of Constantinople as it did for Niphon, Kallistos, and Philotheos Kokkinos (R. Guillard, *EEBS* 32 [1963] 50–59).

It was one of the wandering holy men, Gregory Sinaius, who introduced to Athos in the 14th C. the "Jesus prayer," which was adopted by a small number of monks. From this new method of prayer developed a form of mystical spirituality, a renewed emphasis on *hesychasm* that was championed by Palamas (J. Meyendorff, *DOP* 42 [1988] 157–65). After many vicissitudes Palamism spread all over the Byz. world and was eventually declared Orthodox by the local council of Constantinople of 1351 (see under Constantinople, Councils of).


Art and Architecture of Athos. Little survives of the 10th–12th-C. architecture of the Holy Mountain except for the principal churches of a few monasteries and portions of the perimeter walls. The earliest Athomite churches generally had an inscribed-cross plan with a central dome, triconch apse, a double narthex, and lateral chapels to the west (P.M. Mylonas, *Thesaurismata* 2 [1963] suppl., 18–48). Instituted at the Lavra, this scheme was adopted at Iveron and Vatopedi and remained essentially unchanged until the double narthex was replaced by a unified rectangular space (sometimes called a *lite*) for singers at Hilandar. This scheme, in turn, was widely adopted, for example, at Koutloumousiou ca.1400. The
14th C. saw an expansion of the older monasteries, the addition of towers (pyrgoi) and other fortifications, and the creation of new institutions that tended to follow the established “Athonite type.” Most of the chapels and living and service quarters now to be seen on Athos date from the 15th C. or later.

In the churches mosaic decoration survives only at Vatopedi and Xenophonoton (now detached and kept in the “new katholikon”). The oldest preserved frescoes are at the katholikon of Rhabdouchou (P. Mylonas in 14 CEB, vol. 2B [Bucharest 1971] 552–54); frescoes of 1312 survive at Vatopedi but are much overpainted. The well-preserved program at the Protaton is of similar date. Thereafter, however, with the exception of fragments in the monastery of St. Paul, almost no wall painting survives from the period between the mid-14th and the early 16th C.

From the 10th C. onward, Athonite monasteries received gifts of liturgical silver, crosses, textiles, sometimes richly covered books, and esp. icons (of which the Lavra has 3,000, mostly post-Byz.), which form the nuclei of their treasures today. A few objects are the donations of generous rulers and other patrons from the period before 1453 but, like the physical fabric of the monasteries, the vast majority of the treasures date well after the foundation of the institutions that now house them. Despite the arguments of V.N. Lazarev (DChAE 4 [1964] 117–43), there is little evidence for resident ateliers of mural painters on Athos in the Byz. period; A. Xynogopoulos (CorsiRav 11 [1964] 419–30) suggested that at least in the 14th C. fresco painters came from Thessalonike and possibly Constantinople. The name or epithet zographos of a 10th-C. monk (see Zographou) suggests, however, that some artists took up residence; a 14th-C. workshop that made ICON FRAMES has also been hypothesized. Certainly masons were called in from the outside world in the 10th C. (Prot., no.7.141–42). Many of the illuminated MSS in the monasteries’ libraries reached Athos long after their creation elsewhere, just as many books with Athonite provenances are today to be found in libraries and museums outside the Holy Mountain.


—A.C.

ATRAMYTTION (Ἄτραμύττιον, l’Andremite of the Crusaders, now Edremit), city on the north-west coast of Asia Minor. Although obscure in late antiquity, Atramyttion was an important naval base when the Opsikian fleet stopped there during its revolt in 714, seized Theodosios (III), a native tax collector of Atramyttion, and made him emperor. Atramyttion was the northernmost city of the Thrakesion theme; in the 10th C., it was a tourma of Samos. The Turkish pirate Tzachas completely destroyed Atramyttion ca.1090; Eumathios Philokales rebuilt and repopulated it in 1109. It became a base for defense against Italian and Turkish attacks. Manuel I made it a center of Neokastria; by 1185 it was the headquarters of a separate theme (D. Zakythenos, EEBS 19 [1949] 8). Plundered by the Genoese in 1197, it was briefly seized by the Latins in 1205 and ruled by them in 1213–24. In 1268, the Venetians had a concession in Atramyttion, but dangers from the Turks made the Genoese of Phokaia take control of it in 1304. It fell to the Turks of Karasi before 1334. Atramyttion was a suffragan bishopric of Ephesos; its site contains no significant remains.

LIT. Ahrweiler, Mer 223f, 289f, 349.

—C.F.

ATRIKLINES (ἄτρικλίνης), courtier in charge of imperial banquets. The term is of Latin origin, from triclinium, dining hall, but it has often been distorted as artoklines, from Greek artos, bread. In his Kleirologion, Philotheos, who was himself atriklines, describes his function as maintaining order at banquets by positioning dignitaries according to their titles and offices (Oikonomides, Listes 83.15–24). This presupposed a clear knowledge of titulature. Although Philotheos was titled protospatharios, the atriklines held a relatively modest place in the hierarchy. The atriklines was mentioned in the mid-9th-C. taktikon of Uspenskij; the seal of the imperial atriklines Smaragdos (Zacos, Seals 1, no.16068) is dated in the 8th C. Some seals of atriklinai belong to the 11th C.; thereafter the fate of this functionary is unknown.


—A.K.
**ATRIUM** (ἀτρώα, αἰθριον) an open court directly preceding a church, usually enclosed by four colonnaded porticoes (a quadrripotrius) or, in churches possessing a narthex, by the narthex and three porticoes. Occasionally, as in Constantine I’s church at Mamre, simple wall enclosures replaced the porticoes. The form of the atrium was probably derived from that of the peristyle courtyards that often preceded Roman buildings. The conventional term atrium was apparently derived from the Greek aithron, meaning an area under the open sky, rather than from the Latin atrium, the main room of an Italic house. The open court is also called a louter, a term derived from the ritual ablutions of hands and feet at the kantharos, or fountain, located therein. The atrium was not a requisite feature of church architecture in any period, though it was common in many regions in the 4th–6th C. When present, atriums served not only as places for washing but also for the separation of catechumens and for starting entrance ceremonies, as local customs dictated. Churches with atriums are extremely rare after the 6th C., perhaps because of changes in the entrance rite. The atrium reappears in the 9th C. in two notable examples in Constantinople, the Pharos (?) in the Great Palace and the Nea Ekklesia as well as in the 11th-C. Church of St. George of Mangana.


**ATTALEIA** (Ἀτταλεία, mod. Antalya), city and bishopric of Pamphylia. Although inscriptions and remains indicate some prosperity in late antiquity, Attaleia became most important in the 9th–11th C. as a naval and military center. A special force of Mardaites under a katepano attested in the 10th C. may have been installed in Attaleia as early as 689. Attaleia was apparently capital of the Kibyrhiaotai theme; it was certainly a main base of the Byz. navy and a major entrepôt for trade with Cyprus and the Levant. According to Ibn Hawqal (10th C.), Attaleia was the center for collecting taxes on goods brought by trade or piracy from Muslim lands; the revenue from this amounted to 300 pounds of gold. He also states that the city was directly subject to the emperor and paid no taxes. Attaleia was a base of the imperial post that connected it with Constantinople in eight days by land and 15 by sea (Vasiliev, Byz. Arabes 2:2:414–19). Powerful Roman walls, rebuilt and extended by Leo VI, kept Attaleia from capture by the Arabs; it maintained its ancient size throughout the Byz. period. By the 11th C., Attaleia had a substantial Jewish community. Attaleia survived the turmoil after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071, remaining a center of imperial and Venetian trade, but by 1148 it was a Byz. island in territory overrun by the Turks. It was taken by the Italian Aldobrandini family ca.1204 and by the Seljuks in 1207. Attaleia, a suffragan bishopric of Perge, was elevated to a metropolis by Alexios I. Attaleia preserves the circuit of its walls, much of them Byz., and a large Justinianic cruciform church with a central tower, later transformed into a basilica.
ATTALEIATES, MICHAEL, historian; born Constantinople or Attaleia between ca. 1020 and 1030, died after 1085 (according to Gautier, after 1079). A man of modest origins, Attaleiates (Ἀτταλειάτης) had a brilliant career: a senator and judge, he had the title of proedros; he also acquired properties both in Constantinople and Rhaistaton which he described in his Diataxis of 1077. Lemerle (infra 111) estimates Attaleiates' properties at approximately 150 litrai. In the Diataxis Attaleiates incorporated the history of his acquisitions into his autobiography, established rules for the monastery of Christ Panoitirion in Constantinople and the xenodochion (in Rhaistaton), which he founded, and listed icons and liturgical objects belonging to the monastery. In 1073/4 Attaleiates issued a legal textbook, introduced by a survey of the development of Roman law from the Republic to the Basilika.

His major work is the History, encompassing the period 1034–79/80. Written primarily on the basis of firsthand observations, the book is less personal than the contemporary Chronography of Psellus, although in some cases Attaleiates describes his own role in events. The History is a rhetorical panegyric of Nikephoros III: Attaleiates not only ascribed to him conventional imperial virtues, but emphasized his noble origin and military prowess—qualities absent from earlier Mirrors of Princes. At the same time Attaleiates demonstrated an unusual interest in the fate of cities and in urban movements and stressed the links between his hero and urban populations. According to E.Th. Tsolakis (Byzantion 2 [1970] 258), the final version of the History was completed after Nikephoros's deposition in 1081, and thus is not the work of a sycophant, but a sincere expression of political views. Less talented than Psellus in exposing the clash of human passions, Attaleiates sought the causes of events. Also an acute observer of nature, he described the elephant and giraffe with naturalistic details.

ATTICA (Ἀττική), the territory of Athens. In late antiquity there is evidence of considerable prosperity, and settlements existed at many places: early Christian basilicas have been discovered at Brauron, Glyphada, Anabyssos, Koubaras, and Kalamos, among other sites. The silver mines at Laurion and Thorikos were apparently worked again and caves, such as that at Bari, were inhabited. G. Fowden (JHS 108 [1988] 48–59) suggests that increased production of silver was only partly responsible for this phenomenon, since pagans may have fled to more remote areas, and mountain passes were utilized in response to the barbarian danger. Along with the rest of the empire, Attica suffered from barbarian invasions in the late 6th through the 8th C.; although Attica certainly remained in Byz. hands, most of the settlements seem to have been abandoned: none of the Early Christian basilicas survived into later times.

Prosperity returned beginning in the 9th C., and many churches date to the 11th through 13th C.; most of these are simple cross-in-square structures, such as the katholikon at Kaisariane. Several fresco programs of the 13th C. survive (e.g., N. Comnendarakis-Panselinaou, Saint-Pierre de Kalvienia-Kovara et la chapelle de la Vierge à Merventa [Thesalonike 1976]); the former has a portrait of Michael Choniates. Porto Raphiti on the east coast seems to have developed as a major port. After the Fourth Crusade a series of towers was constructed, linking Athens with the hinterland of Attica and the east coast. The soil of Attica is rather poor and, as in antiquity, the area specialized in the production of honey, olives, and wine.

ATTICISM, the use in literature of an arcaizing and artificial form of Greek, based on imitation of the language of Athenian writers of the 5th–
4th C. B.C. Perpetuated by teachers of rhetoric and codified in lexika and textbooks, Atticism dominated the literature of the Roman Empire. Addressing an educated pagan public, Christian apologists such as Clement of Alexandria naturally used the Atticizing literary Greek their readers knew and accepted. As Christianity spread among the urban upper classes, Atticizing Greek, rather than New Testament Koine, became the normal ecclesiastical language esp. of the 4th- and 5th-C. church fathers. For the Byz., the works of these church fathers became models of language and style no less worthy of imitation than those of the writers of classical Athens. Every Byz. revival of education and culture was accompanied by a reassertion of Atticism, often marked more by the avoidance of features of the spoken language than by imitation of ancient models; Homer, Gregory of Nazianzos, and George of Pisidia were as “Attic” as Demosthenes. Throughout the Byz. period education perpetuated and institutionalized a distinction between spoken and literary Greek, which later widened and hindered the development of an expressive vernacular literature. Thus Photios praised the simplicity of New Testament language but did not practice it himself. Symeon Metaphrastes rewrote in inflated language and style some early saints’ Lives composed in a relatively popular language. Nikiphoros Choumnos declared that literary excellence required the imitation of classical and patristic models. While rhetoric, history, and theology were the domain of Atticism, technical writing, ascetic writing, and chronicles such as those of John Malalas and Theophanes the Confessor were often couched in simpler language.


ATTIKOS, bishop of Constantinople (Mar. 406–10 Oct. 425); born Sebasteia in Armenia, died Constantinople. After taking the monastic habit at an early age, Attikos joined the Pneumatoma-choi; he recanted their teaching when he moved to Constantinople and became priest there. Poorly educated, he was not popular as a preacher (Sokr. HE 7.23). This was probably one of the reasons for his hatred of John Chrysostom: Attikos was Chrysostom’s major accuser at the Synod of the Oak (403), and even after Chrysostom’s death Attikos was slow and reluctant to restore his name to the diptychs. More politician than theologian, Attikos left little in writing (Bardenhewer, Literatur 3:361f.), but he did much to strengthen the position of the bishop of the capital: Attikos was on good terms with the court, dedicated to Empress Pulcheria and her sisters a now-lost tract entitled On Faith and Virginity, and received from Theodosios II a personal privilege prohibiting the election of a bishop in the neighboring area without notifying the bishop of Constantinople (Sokr. HE 7.28). Attikos was active in fighting heresies (e.g., Messalianism and Pelagianism) and gained the support of Pope Celestine and approval of Pope Leo I. Cyril of Alexandria was more cautious but found in Attikos an ally in his anti-Nestorianism (PG 77:97B). The traditional assertion, however, that Cyril quoted Attikos as using the term theotokos in a homily (PG 76:1213BC) is wrong; the term appears in the next quotation, from a certain bishop Antiochos.


LIT. RegPair, fasc. 1, nos. 35–48. C. Verschaffel, DTC 1.2 (1937) 2220f. A. Bigelmair, LThK 3:1016ff. –A.K.

ATTILA (‘Attilao), ruler (dominus in Jordanes) of the Huns (434–53). He was the son of Mundius and successor of his uncle Rua (Rugila). At first he ruled with his older brother Bleda, but assassinated him in 445. The center of his realm was in the basin of the Tissa and Timos rivers, tributaries of the Danube; various peoples such as the Gepids, Goths, and Alans were under his power. Attila led several attacks against the northern Balkans, urging the emperors in Constantinople to sign peace treaties. In 434/5 (B. Croke, GRBS 18 [1977] 355–58) or after Feb. 438, he concluded a favorable treaty at Horreum Margi calling for an annual tribute of 350 (or 700?) pounds of gold. In 442 he reached Thrace; the
embassy of Nomos achieved a peace that lasted to 447 (B. Croke, *BS* 42 [1981] 159–70). In 447 the Huns advanced as far as the Chersonese and Thermopylae; when peace was arranged the tribute was increased to 6,000 pounds of gold. When Attila seized the territory from Pannonia to Navae, an embassy led by Anatolios and Nomos demanded and achieved the withdrawal of the Huns from this area. In 450 Marcian refused to pay tribute; surprisingly, however, Attila turned his attention westward, demanding marriage with Justa Grata Honoria (Valentinian III’s sister) and a substantial portion of the Western Empire. His invasion of Gaul ended in defeat at the Catalaunian Fields in 451. The following year Attila attacked Italy, capturing Aquileia, Milan, and other cities. He retreated after negotiations with Pope Leo I, probably fearing an attack of the Eastern army. He died of a hemorrhage in his camp on the night of his wedding with a Gothic woman named Ildico.

Jordanes describes Attila as a short man, broad-chested, with a large head, small eyes, and sparse beard. It has been debated whether Attila was only a cruel plunderer (O. Maenchen-Helfen, *BZ* 61 [1968] 270–76) or the founder of a new barbarian imperium, a forerunner of medieval steppe-states (G. Wirth, *BZ* 60 [1967] 41–69).


**ATUMANO, SIMON,** Greek humanist and Catholic prelate; born Constantinople early 14th C., died between 1383 and 1387. Born to an Orthodox Greek mother and Turkish father, his name, Atumano (Ἀτουμάνος), is probably derived from “Ottoman.” He became a monk at the Studios monastery and in 1348 was named as successor to Barlaam in the see of Gerace (Calabria). He converted to Catholicism and was Latin archbishop of Thebes from 1366 until his death. He made periodic trips to the West and taught Greek at the papal court in Avignon. After the conquest of Thebes by the Navarrese Company in 1379, Atumano retired to Rome, where he taught Greek, Latin, and Hebrew.

His knowledge of Hebrew, unusual at the time, enabled him to prepare a trilingual version of the Old Testament dedicated to Pope Urban VI (1378–89). He also translated into Latin Plutarch’s *On the Control of Anger*, composed a poem on John VI Kantakouzenos, and wrote scholia on Eupides.

identified by archaeologists in elite residences of the 4th–6th C.


AUGUOSTALIOS (αὐγοστάλιος, Lat. augustalis), from the 2nd half of the 4th C. the title of the prefect of Egypt (K.J. Neumann, RE 2 [1896] 2961). The term reappears at the end of the 10th C. but its meaning is unclear; in the Taktikon of Escurial (of 971–75) the title is placed between the epi ton deeseon and thesmophylax. A letter of Nikephoros Ouranos is addressed “To the protospatharios Pothis, the former augustalis” (Darrouzès, Epistoliers 222, no.11). A late 12th-C. (?) text is directed to a certain Katasamps as “diktator and archistrategos of our school of fish and of other sea animals, the doux and augustalis” (S. Lampros, NE 7 [1910] 356.25–27), although the use of the term here may be ironic. Oikonomides suggests that the Latin augustalis-augustalis could be translated into Greek as sebastophoros.


AUGUSTA. See Empress.

AUGUSTAION, enclosed open space in Constantinople, situated south of Hagia Sophia. Probably carved out of a preexisting agora called the Tetraostoon, the Augustaion is ascribed to Constantine I, who is said to have placed in it a statue of his mother Helena on a column (Hesychius in Preger, Scriptores 17). Remodeled in 459 (Chron. Pasch. 593.4) and again by Justinian I, the Augustaion served not as a public forum but as a courtyard of restricted access. It survived as an open space until the end of the empire.

Monuments. Several sculptural and architectural monuments were prominent features of the Augustaion.

1. Justinian’s column was surmounted by his equestrian statue. The shaft of the column was of brick, reveted with brass plaques. The bronze statue appears to have been remodeled from one of Theodosios I or II. It represented the emperor wearing a toupha, raising his right arm and holding an orb in his left hand (Prokopios, Buildings 1:2.11–12). The statue, delineated in a 15th-C. drawing emanating from the circle of Cyriacus of Ancona and now at the University Library, Budapest, was removed by Mehmed II. P. Gyllius (1544–50) saw and measured parts of it in the grounds of the Seraglio before they were melted down (De topographia Constantinopolis [Lyons 1561; rp. Athens 1967] bk.2, ch.17). The column itself was toppled ca.1515.

2. Statues of three barbarian kings offering tribute stood in front of Justinian’s column and probably formed part of the same triumphal ensemble. These are known only from the accounts of Russian pilgrims (Majeska, Russian Travelers 194–37, 184f, 240).

3. The Senate House was situated on the east side of the Augustaion. Built by either Constantine I or Julian, damaged by fire in 404, and burnt down in 532, it was rebuilt by Justinian I with a porch of six huge marble columns (Prokopios, Buildings 1:10.6–9). (See Senate House.)


AUGUSTINE, more fully Aurelius Augustinus, Latin theologian, bishop of Hippo Regius in Africa (from ca.396), and saint; born Tagaste, Numidia, 13 Nov. 354, died Hippo 28 Aug. 430. The son of a Christian mother and a pagan father, Augustine experienced a remarkable spiritual odyssey before converting to Christianity in 387. His major works were the Confessions, a sort of autobiography, and the City of God (De civitate Dei), contemplations on human conditions and goals, written after the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410. The desire for salvation is at the center of Augustine’s theology. Even though he wrote on subjects important in Byz. theology (Manichaeanism, Arianism), his major concerns were in other directions: for him the ideas of sin, free will (in his polemics against Pelagianism), and redemption stood in the forefront, while the Eastern church was involved in the Trinitarian and Christological controversies. Augustine’s command of Greek was shaky, but he probably knew some works of contemporary Greek theologians, for example, Theodore of Mopsuestia (J. McWilliam Dewart, Augustinian Studies 10 [1979] 113–32). His anti-Pelagian stand was known in the East,
Aurelius's work is to be distinguished from the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, which ends in 395.


AUSTRIA, from 976 an eastern borderland, or *Ostmark*, of the German kingdom. In 1148, as part of an effort to maintain alliance with *Conrad III*, Manuel I married his niece Theodora to Henry II of Babenberg (1141–77), Conrad's half-brother and the first duke of Austria. Walter von der Vogelweide praised her wedding. Theodora died in Vienna on 3 Jan. 1183. Two more Austrian dukes took Byz. princesses as their wives: Leopold VI (1198–1290) married Theodora, granddaughter of Alexios III Angelos, and the last Babenberg, Frederick II (1230–46), married Sophia, daughter of Theodore I Laskaris.

Rudolf IV of Habsburg was the first Austrian duke to be crowned Roman emperor (as Rudolf I, in 1273), but it was only later, with Frederick V Habsburg (as Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick III, 1443–93), that imperial ideology was clearly linked with Austria (*Austriae est imperare orbis universo*), a claim enhanced by the fall of Constantinople in 1453, making Frederick the sole emperor. The Austrian Habsburgs' claim to the Byz. imperial legacy was manifest in Frederick's wife, Eleanor, who offered to change her name to Helen and tried unsuccessfully to have her son Maximilian I named Constantine. The search for imperial legitimacy continued into the 15th C. with the emergence of legends linking the Habsburgs with the family of Julius Caesar and later with the Merovingians and ancient Trojans. The latter theory of descent contributed to an interest in Greek antiquity and ultimately to the cultural and political inheritance of Byz.

AUTHOR. The self-perception of the Byz. author ranged from cloaking himself in complete anonymity to devoting profound attention to his own personality, the difference being determined by both genre and epoch. The author does not appear at all in such genres as rhetorical exercises, romance, and epic, whereas historiography, epistolography, poetry, epideictic oratory, and even sermons permitted more opportunity for overt self-expression. In hagiography, the author sometimes presents himself through the topos of modesty; at other times he appears as the hero’s relative or disciple. The author-disciple assumes an esp. elaborate role in the vita of Basil the Younger; in some saints’ lives, however, like that of Andrew the Fool, the author-disciple is a fictitious figure introduced to give the impression of a truthful and authoritative account.

In the late Roman period the author often revealed himself, at least in the proemion, or in autobiographical pieces (cf. Gregory of Nazianzos), but in the 7th–9th C. the trend toward anonymity prevailed. In the 11th–15th C. the individuality of the author became more apparent: epistolography flourished, and certain historical works (Psellus, Niketas Choniates, John Kantakouzenos) came close to the genre of autobiography; in poetry, personal references are evident in Prodromos and Tzetzes, and some centuries later in Sachlikes. In poetry, as in hagiography, real personality is often mixed with clichés: thus the topos of the author’s imprisonment (e.g., Glykas, Della Porta) or poverty is frequent. The “ego” of the verses of Ptochoprodromos (a young monk, a henpecked husband) is obviously different from that of the actual author. The author’s self-expression takes various forms, from direct defense of his views (as in Gregoras) to a clever apology disguised as objectivity and sincerity (Kantakouzenos).


AUTOCEPHALOUS (αὐτοκέφαλος), the term used in Byz. canon law and in the Notitiae episcopatum to designate each diocese possessing the right to elect its own primate or kephale.
"head." These dioceses were completely self-governing, that is, independent of the five ancient patriarchates. The practice and the term itself were already established by the 6th C. (cf. Theodoret Lector 121.21). As Balsamon emphasizes, before the patriarchal centralization of the 4th C. all provincial primates or metropolitans were, in fact, autocephalous and were ordained by their own synods (PG 137:317D). Autocephaly was determined either by an ecumenical council (431, Cyprus), imperial decision (10th C., Bulgaria) or, as in the case of Georgia, by a disposition of the mother-church in the 8th C. (Balsamon, PG 137:320A). The autocephalic churches of Cyprus and Bulgaria followed the five patriarchates in order of rank (cf. Hierocles Synecdemus et Notitiae Graecae Episcopatum. Accedunt Nili Doxapatrii Notitia Patriarchatum et Locorum Nomina Immutata, ed. G. Parthey [Berlin 1866] 284–86). The primate usually carried the title of metropolitan, archbishop, or, occasionally, patriarch.

Apart from its primary meaning, the term was also used to define a distinct group of bishops without suffragans ("autocephalous archbishops") whose immediate superior was the patriarch (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, nos. 817–70). These bishops were not subject to any metropolitan, although in terms of precedence they followed the metropolitan.


AUTOKRATOR (αὐτοκράτωρ), official Greek translation of imperator, or emperor, until 629; used alongside basileus and other titles thereafter. The Greek term autokrator lacked the Latin’s military connotations, emphasizing rather autonomous power and monarchy. Christians had used the Roman monarchy to argue monotheism’s superiority over polytheism, but after Constantine I’s conversion monotheism buttressed the legitimacy of monarchy, which was already advocated by Hellenistic political philosophy and justified by analogies with the animal kingdom, for example, the “king” bee (F. Dvornik, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy, vol. 2 [Washington 1966] 611–723). The title autokrator appears on coins from 912, in chrysobulls from the 11th C., and in contemporary paintings depicting emperors. Outside of institutio and acclamations, the term developed a specialized meaning no later than the early 9th C. that, like megas basileus (cf. P. Schreiner, Byzantina 3 [1971] 173–92), distinguished the main emperor from co-emperors. Thus, autokratoria referred to the anniversary ceremonies of an emperor’s assumption of actual power as opposed to his coronation (e.g., Oikonomides, Listes 225:10–11; De cer., bk.2, ch.33, ed. Reiske 692.4–11). The Palaeologoi extended the use of the title to mark one of several co-emperors as designated heir (cf. pseudo-Kod. 252:24–253:3).

LIT. Dölger, Diplomatik 102–51. – M. McC.

AUTOMATA, devices powered by compressed air from bellows or by water, were displayed in the Magnaura and testified to in the 10th C. by Constantine VII and Liutprand of Cremona. Their existence in the 9th C. is surrounded with legends: they are said to have been constructed during the reign of Theophilos (Glykas names Leo the Mathematician as their engineer) and then destroyed by Michael III, who was in need of money (presumably they were melted down to extract their precious metals). The Magnaura automata included the throne of Solomon, which could be lifted high in the air; mechanical singing birds, perched in a gold tree, that fluttered their wings; and roaring golden lions. Writers in China report on a gold human figure that marked the hours by striking bells. Mechanical singing birds are also mentioned in romances (e.g., the Achilleis). The origin of the automata is unclear: Graba (Fin Ant. 1:286) argued that the machines at Theophilos’s court were imported from Baghdad, but related contrivances, such as organs and Greek fire, suggest that automata may have been native inventions based ultimately on the work of Heron of Alexandria.


AUTOREIANOS (Ἀυτοτριαῖον, fem. Ἀυτωτριαία), a family of state and church officials. The etymology of the name is unclear; it may be of Western origin. Autoreianoi are known from
the 1080s onward as judges (Michael in 1094 and perhaps 1082—see Gautier, "Blachernes" 258; John in 1196—see Labra 1, nos. 67.2, 68.2) and notaries (Theodosios in 1088—Palmou Engrapha 1, no. 48A.205). One family member became patriarch as Michael IV, another as Arsenios. Circa 1902—07 Phokas Autoreianos, grammaticos, served as doux of Thrakesion (Ahrweiler, "Smyrne" 151—54).

They were apparently a family of intellectuals: Theodosios Autoreianos (mid-12th C.) corresponded with John Tzetzes; the future patriarch Michael was a friend of Eustathios of Thessalonike and Michael Choniates; and some Autoreianoi were among the correspondents of Nikephoros Choumnos and Maximos Planoudes.

Lit. PIP, nos. 1691—96. —A.K.

AUTOURGION (αὐτούργιον, lit. "operated without assistance"), a property producing maximum revenue, euprosodon (Zonaras in Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:595.19—20). Balsamon (ibid. 595.4—7) includes in this category salt pans, olive groves, vineyards, meadowland, water mills, brickyards, etc. The term is infrequent in later acts, in which it also refers to vineyards, vivaria, aulakia (canals? cf. Labra 2, no. 104.177—79), and water mills (no. 112.24). Autourgia are usually contrasted with peasants' allotments and juxtaposed with such items of income as fairs, taxes, tolls, etc. (Zepos, Jus 1:382.22—25). Such capital-intensive assets could be exploited as demesne property and thus did not need to be rented out to peasants; they were conceived as the most valuable part of the estate. The term autourgion was also applied to any property that earned a profit.


AUXENTIOS (Αὐξέντιος), saint; born Syria ca.420, died Bithynia 14 Feb. ca.470. He came to Constantinople during the reign of Theodosios II and served as a soldier of the fourth schola. Circa 442 he resigned and left for Mt. Oxeia to live in solitude. His Life states that Emp. Marcian invited Auxentios to the Council of Chalcedon in 451, but the council acts do not mention him. During his second stay in Constantinople, Auxentios was closely connected with the Rouphinianai monastery. Suspected of disagreeing with the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, he cleared himself before Marcian. He left Constantinople again, for a cave on Mt. Skopas in Bithynia, where he lived as a hermit. A monastery that took the Saint's name was later founded on this mountain (see Auxentios, Mount). A noble lady Eleuthera (Stephanis in Psellos), the chambermaid of Empress Pulcheria, urged Auxentios to support the foundation of a nunnery in a nearby proasteion, Gyreta; Auxentios was buried in its chapel. Auxentios is said to have compiled "pleasant and useful troparia of two or three stanzas with plain and artless melody" (PG 114:1416A). His Life is known from the collection of Symeon Metaphrastes; this late version was reworked by Psellos, who emphasized Auxentios's role as imperial councilor and courageous market reformer and noted that he suffered from depression; Psellos also ascribed to Auxentios some features of his own biography (A. Kazhdan, Byzantion 55 [1983] 546—56).

Representation in Art. In the Menologion of Basil II (p.399), Auxentios appears as an orant monk; in the Theodore Psalter (fols. 38v, 96v) he appears once as a bishop bearing witness before Christ to the defeat of two armed men by an angel and once as a monk bearing witness to the defeat of two demons.


Lit. BHO 199—203C. —A.K., N.P.S.

AUXENTIOS, MOUNT, a holy mountain dotted with hermitages and monasteries, present-day Kayışdağ, located near Constantinople, 12 km southeast of Chalcedon. Called Skopa or Skopos in antiquity, the mountain took its name from the 5th-C. Syrian St. Auxentios, who spent the last 20 years of his life in a cave near the summit. Both men and women flocked to the mountain to live as solitaries under Auxentios's spiritual leadership. Circa 460 a certain Eleuthera built the convent of Trichinarea (sometimes called Trichinarai) at the base of the mountain for 70 of these pious women. It survived until at least the end of the 12th C.

No male monastery was built until the 8th C., when Stephen the Younger constructed a com-
plex for about 20 monks. Shortly thereafter he and his companions were exiled and the monastery destroyed during the Iconoclastic persecution of Constantine V. Sources of the 11th–13th C. report a number of monasteries under different names, including St. Stephen, Holy Apostles, the Archangel Michael, and the Holy Five (five Armenian martyrs of the early 4th C.), where Maximos Planoudes was hegoumenos. Some of these names may refer to the same institution, restored with a new dedication. The monastery of the Archangel Michael was renovated by Michael VIII, who composed a typikon limiting the number of monks to 40.

SOURCE. Dmitrievskij, Opisanie 1:769–94.
–A.M.T.

AUXILIARY DISCIPLINES (from Lat. auxilium, “help, assistance”), designation of certain branches of knowledge that apply general and concrete approaches (methodology and technique) to the analysis (primarily the external analysis) of historical sources. Traditionally, auxiliary disciplines include palaeography, epigraphy, papyrology, diplomatics, numismatics, sigillography, metrology, prosopography, chronology, genealogy, historical geography, toponymics, and heraldry. Source analysis (Germ. Quellenkunde) can also be described as an auxiliary discipline. The analysis of archaeological objects, elaborated in recent decades, requires the application of various scientific disciplines, such as geology, palaeobotany and palaeozoology, archaeometry, aerial photography, dendrochronology, physics, etc. Statistics employed for analysis of mass data has emerged as an auxiliary discipline as well. All of these disciplines have methods of their own, but their common goal is to provide the scholar with means of control and categorization of source material, of discarding false “information,” of placing historical events within the framework of space and time. From the use of auxiliary disciplines we must distinguish the application of interdisciplinary methodology, for example, the utilization of literary and archaeological evidence to resolve common problems.

–T.E.G., A.K.

AVARS ("Авары"), a nomadic people that appeared in the mid-6th C. in the steppe north of the Black Sea. Their previous history can be established only hypothetically, on the basis of identifications in Chinese and Byz. sources. Their language is thought to be Altaic.

The first Avar embassy appeared in Constantinople in 558. Justinian I concluded an alliance with the Avars and used them to alleviate the pressure of Pontic barbarians on the Byz. frontier. The Avars were able to control both Cotrigurs and Antae, but they then invaded Scythia Minor and occupied Pannonia after having destroyed the Gepids. The growth of Avar power created frictions in their relations with Byz.; under the command of Baian, the Avars, acting in alliance with the Slavs, conquered a part of the northern Balkans, including Sirmium (582). The emperor Maurice's attempts to stop the Avars were unsuccessful; in 626 their offensive reached its peak when, together with the Persians, they besieged Constantinople. Thereafter, the first signs of disintegration of the Avar confederation (khaganate) became visible: the Croatians and Serbs joined Emp. Herakleios in his struggle against the Avars and ca.635 Kuvrat acquired independence from the Avars. We know nothing about the Avars from 680 to 780. At the end of the 8th C., they reappeared in the West but were defeated by Charlemagne. In 805 Krum subjugated a group of Avars; survivors of the group were mentioned for the last time ca.950.

The Avars were mounted warriors and used the iron stirrup, saber, long lance, and reflex-bow that gave them tactical advantages in battle. Excavated Avar hoards contain luxurious objects of Byz. origin as well as Avar arms and complex belt sets that must have indicated the social status of their owners. Familiarity of the Avars with the forms of Byz. metalwork and jewelry is suggested by the objects in the Malaja Perešepina and other treasures. By the end of the 7th C. wealthy tombs disappear; luxurious booty is replaced by ordinary bronze and bone objects. The Avars became more sedentary, but they remained pagan.

AVLON, a harbor in Epiros mentioned in the Tabula Peutingeriana and the Cosmographer of Ravenna. It was known during the late Roman period as a "polis on the Ionian gulf" (Prokopios, Wars 5.4.21) connected with Italy and as a bishopric (first mentioned in 458). It played an important role during the wars against the Normans in the 1080s, and at the end of the 11th C. the Venetians obtained trading privileges there, probably as a reward for their assistance in the Anti-Norman war. It was assigned to the Venetians after 1204 but recovered by Michael I Komnenos Doukas of Epiros. In 1259 Michael II of Epiros surrendered Avlon to Manfred of Sicily who appointed Philip Chinardo to administer the area; in 1273 the Angevins established their power in Valona, but after 1284 the Byz. managed to occupy it. Valona, called civitas imperatoris Graecorum in Latin documents, served as a center of trade with Dubrovnik and Venice. The Angevins claimed Avlon until ca.1332, when the Albanians attacked it; in 1345/6 it fell to Stefan Uroš IV Dušan. After his death it formed a part of the dominions of the Serbian family of Baša; by 21 July 1418 it was in Turkish hands. Avlon should be distinguished from other centers of the same name, such as a suffragan bishopric of Athens (TIB 1:130f) or a valley in Palestine.


AVRAAMIIJ OF SMOLENSK, saint; fl. early 13th C.; feastday 21 Aug. Avraamij was a popular and controversial preacher and painter of icons on eschatological themes. The vita by his pupil Efrem presents Avraamij as a learned and ascetic monk—physically "a likeness of St. Basil"—who attracted a large lay following and aroused the hostility of the Smolensk clergy. Accused of heresy, of using secret or forbidden books (gō)ubinnyja knigi), of prophesy, and of taking others' (spiritual?) children, he was acquitted by the secular authorities and eventually made peace with his bishop. Avraamij's rhetoric and images, as reported by Efrem, as well as an extant sermon titled On the Celestial Powers sometimes attributed to Avraamij, concentrate on two topics: the fate of the soul after death, esp. its passage through the "customs houses" (mytarstva, telomiai) as described in the Life of Basil the Younger, and the Last Judgment, for whose depiction Avraamij was inspired by Ephrem the Syrian. Historians have tried, with little success, to specify Avraamij's alleged "heretical" interests, linking his enigmatic and perhaps imaginary (gō)ubinnyja knigi with both the Bogomils (G. Fedotov, Pravoslavnaja myśl' 2 [1930] 127–47) and the 14th-C. strigol'nik (B. Rybakov, SovArch [1964] no. 2, 179–87).


ÂWĀŠIM AND THUGHÛR, the Muslim regions and their defenses and fortifications along the Syrian-Anatolian border of Byz. from the time of 'Umar to the late 10th C. The 'Âwāšim were the inner regions of the frontier zone; the outer ones were the Thughûr. They included towns located at entrances to the Taurus Mountains or intersections of roads. The 'Âwāšim became a distinct entity after caliph Hârûn al-Rashid separated the area in 786 from the jund ("military district") of Qinnasrin (Chalkis) as the jund al-'Âwāšim. Hierapolis and Antioch were the major centers of the 'Âwāšim. The Thughûr were divided into Syrian and Mesopotamian sections. The former included passes between Syria and Cilicia and such towns as Adana, Tarsos, Mopsuestia, and Germanikeia (Marash). East of it lay the Mesopotamian portion, of which Melitene was the most important town.

These districts witnessed heavy fighting since they were bases for Muslim raids into Byz. As the 'Abbâsid Caliphate weakened, the 'Âwāšim and Thughûr had to rely more on themselves and nearby Muslim leaders in their unsuccessful struggle against Byz.

LIT. M. Canard, EI 2: 761f. Honigmann, Ostgrenze 42, 72. —W.E.K.

AXIOMATIKOS (αξιοματικός), a term that in the late Roman Empire had a vague meaning of military officer, as opposed to a recruit (Makarios of Egypt, PG 34:832B). According to the Chroni-
con Paschale (Chron.Pasch. 579.1). Empress Athenais-Eudokia promoted her brothers to the rank of axiomaticos. Malalas (Malal. 382.17) employs the word in a more specific sense when he speaks of an axiomaticos of Caesarea. In the 9th C. the word reappears in the Kletorologion of Philotheos where it designates some subaltern officers of the domestikos ton scholon. The De ceremoniis employs this term in its general sense—a person having an axioma, a post or title.

LIT. Guillard, Institutions 1:161. -A.K.

AXIOPOLIS ('Αξιοπόλις; in Prokopios, Axiopa; mod. Cernavodă in Rumania), a Roman port on the Danube and a fortress. A stone wall approximately 50 km long connected Axiopolis with Tomis on the Black Sea. The fortress and wall were reconstructed under Constantine I. In addition to fortifications, Christian inscriptions of the late 3rd–6th C. in Greek and Latin, naming some officials (e.g., dux and comites), as well as ceramics through the late 6th C. have been found in excavations at Axiopolis. The city then disappears. In the 10th C. a new fort was built, south of the Roman stronghold; among the remains are ordinary ceramics of the 10th–11th C. and an inscription (ca.9th–10th C.) with the Slavic name Vojislav, possibly of Kriusa. The last mention of the fort seems to be in al-Idrisi.


AXOUCH ("Αξουχ", "Αξούχος), a Byz. noble family of "Persian" (Turkish?) origin. The founder of the family, John Axouch, a captive of the Crusaders in 1097, became a servant at the court of Alexios I Komnenos and a playmate of John (II), the heir apparent. John II gave Axouch the title of sebastes and appointed him megas domestikos (or domestikos of the West and East); he died ca.1150 and was eulogized by Nikephoros Basilakes. Axouch’s daughter Eudokia married Stephen Komnenos; his son Alexios took as his wife Maria, daughter of Alexios Komnenos, the oldest son of John II. Alexios Axouch, a protostrator, commanded several military expeditions—to Italy in 1158, Cilicia in 1165, and perhaps Hungary in 1166. One of the wealthiest magnates, he lost the favor of Manuel I ca.1167 and was confined in a monastery. Alexios was criticized by contemporaries (Kinn. 267.13–16) for decorating one of his suburban houses with pictures of the campaigns of Kilic Arslan II, sultan of Konya, rather than those of the emperor as was customary (see History Painting). Alexios left two sons, one of whom, John Komnenos or John the Fat, fomented a riot against Alexios III on 31 July 1200 but was murdered in the struggle. The Axouch family is not attested in the Palaiologan period.


AXUM or Aksum ("Ախում), the kingdom that takes its name from its capital city located in the northern highlands of modern ETHIOPIA. Although Byz. considered Axum part of its sphere of influence, the Axumite rulers viewed themselves the equals of the Byz. emperors and maintained their independence. Its chief port, ADULIS on the Red Sea, served as both a way station on the trade route to India and a conduit for goods from the east African interior. The kingdom officially converted to Christianity in the mid-4th C. and was a suffragan of the archbishop of Alexandria. Aramaic-speaking monks were instrumental in the spread of a distinctively Semitic Christianity. Axum’s ties with Byz. were closest during the Byzantine Wars in South Arabia (517–37), esp. in 525 when Emp. Kaleb ’Ella ’Ashbēhā (Elesboa) conquered South Arabia at the behest of Justin I, who supplied ships but not troops. Justin’s desire to block Persian designs on South Arabia was ultimately thwarted when the Persians occupied the region in 599. Following the Arab conquests, Axum was cut off from Byz. and eventually lost its ports on the Red Sea to the Arabs. By the 8th C., Axum was in decline.


AYDIN (Alexander), a Turkish emirate in Anatolia that emerged in the late 13th C. from the breakup of the Seljuk sultanate of Rûm. It was most probably named after its founder, Aydin, about whom very little is known. It occupied the territories around the river Kaystros; its main ports were Ephesus (Theologos) and Smyrna, its capital
being Pyrgion. The emirate became powerful during the time of ʻUmur Beg (died 1348). His fleet repeatedly raided the Aegean islands, the Morea, Negroponte, and the littoral from Thessaly up to Constantinople, finally reducing the lords of these territories to the status of tribute-paying vassals. ʻUmur provoked two Crusades organized against Aydin in 1334 and in 1344, the latter known as the Crusade of Smyrna. He was a devoted ally of John VI Kantakouzenos during the Byz. Civil War of 1341–47. Western merchants frequented the territories of Aydin and purchased large quantities of agricultural produce (mainly cereals), livestock and related items from the nomads (cattle, horses, skins, cheese, etc.), and slaves. Consuls from Venice, Genoa, Rhodes, and Cyprus were established in Theologos. Aydin was annexed to the Ottoman state temporarily from 1390 to 1402 and permanently after Murad II defeated the rebel lord of Smyrna, Junayd (1424).


AYYÜBIDS, a Muslim dynasty that dominated Egypt, Syria and Palestine, Upper Mesopotamia, and the Yemen from the late 12th to the mid-13th C. They originated from a Kurdish tribe that lived near Duin in Armenia. Two brothers, Ayyūb and Shirkūh, served Zangī and Nūr al-Dīn as governors and generals. After Shirkūh conquered Egypt, he was proclaimed the vizier in 1169 but died almost immediately. He was succeeded by Ayyūb’s son Saladin, the actual founder of the dynasty, who defeated the Crusaders in 1187 and recovered Jerusalem for the Muslims. He engaged in diplomatic negotiations with the Byz. rulers Andronikos I Komnenos and Isaac II Angelos.

After Saladin’s death in 1193, his vast domain was divided between his three sons, brothers, and other relations; nonetheless his immediate successors al-ʿĀdil (died 1218) and the latter’s eldest son al-Kāmil (died 1238) were able to maintain the family unity that was required to withstand constant warfare with the Crusader states: in 1218–19 the Franks besieged Damietta and in 1227 Frederick II disembarked at Acre leading a new Crusade. During the week of 11–18 Feb. 1229 al-Kāmil was forced to sign a treaty with Frederick yielding to the Franks the control of Jerusalem, on condition that its fortifications would not be rebuilt and freedom of religion would be preserved in the city. Ayyūbid relations with the Seljuk rulers of Asia Minor were hostile: the expedition of united Ayyūbid forces against them in 1233 turned into a disaster, and in 1241 the Seljuks took Amida from the successors of al-Kāmil. The subsequent decentralization of power, the Turkish and Mongol pressure on the northeast border, and the new Crusade of Louis IX (his flotilla captured Damietta in 1249) weakened Ayyūbid Egypt, and in 1250 Mamlūk rule was established there. The northern Ayyūbids remained in power longer, but in 1258 the Mamluks took Baghdad and in 1260 they conquered Aleppo (Beroia) and Damascus.

The Ayyūbids supported commercial relations with the cities of Italy, southern France, and Catalonia; Egypt sold to Europe products imported from India but prevented the Westerners from entering the Red Sea. Regular trade connections with the Franks contributed to the penetration of Christian motifs in Ayyūbid minor arts.


AZDĪ, AL-, more fully, Abū ʻIsāmāl Muhammad ibn ʻAbd Allāh, al-Azdī, Arab historian; fl. ca.800–10. On al-Azdī’s life, our only source is his history, The Conquest of Syria. Clearly he was a narrator of Azdite and other Yemenite tribal accounts, gathering his information primarily from northern Syria, esp. Ḥims. His floruit can be ascertained from the archaism of his narratives and the death dates of the later authorities transmitting his work.

The Conquest of Syria is the earliest extant account of the Arab conquest. Proceeding from the summons to the tribes by Abū Bakr until the siege of Caesarea Maritima, it views these events as divinely ordained to reward Arab faith and punish Greek polytheism and misrule. Beneath this overarching doctrinal theme, the work is extraordinarily informative. Azdī reveals a sophisticated knowledge of developments on the Byz. side and
esp. of the activities and attitudes of the Christian and pagan populations in Syria. He deals with townspeople, peasants, and Bedouins as distinct groups; his account is unique for its detail on the shifting loyalties and complex maneuvering that characterized the conquest period.

ED. The Futooh al-Shâm, Being an Account of the Muslim Conquests in Syria, ed. W.N. Lees (Calcutta 1854), with Eng. summary.


AZOV SEA (Μακωρίς), an extension of the northeastern part of the BLACK SEA, reached via the straits of the Cimmerian Bosphorus. Trade routes went from the Sea of Azov north to Rus’ via the Don (Tanais) River and eastward to China. The Azov Sea was located in an area important for its salt and naphtha, and associated in Byz. convention with Cimmerians, Sarmatians, and Tauroscythians (see, e.g., Tzetzes, Hist. 12:835–36). Prokopios (Wars 8:4.7–7.12) asserts that the peoples of the Azov region were a continual threat to the borders of the empire. The northern Azov region was controlled in the 7th C. by Great Bulgaria (Theoph. 356.20–357.11) and in the 8th–10th C. by the Khazars (who built there the fortress of Sarkel). The peoples of the area (including Zicha) in the 10th C. are described by Constantine VII (De adm. imp. 42, 53). The possession of Tmutarakan by the Rus’ lasted at least until the end of the 11th C., though both a Rus’ and a Byz. administrative presence in the Azov region (e.g., in Rhosia) is postulated even for the late 12th C. From the mid-13th C. the Mongols dominated the area, while the trade routes between the Azov Sea and Constantinople came under the control of the Genoese from their settlement at Tana. Ignatij of Smolensk describes the route in detail, while Nikephoros Gregorias (Greg. 3:199.11–12) confirms its use for travel to and from Moscow. -S.G.F.

AZYMES (ἄγυμα “without yeast, leaven”), unleavened BREAD used by the Armenian and Latin churches in the eucharistic sacrifice based on the tradition that such bread was used at the Last Supper, at which Jesus instituted the Eucharist. The Byz. used leavened bread. Controversy on the issue occurred first between Greeks and Monophysite Armenians. Invited in 591 by Emp. Maurice to participate in a council of union, the Armenian katholikos Moses II uttered a famous rebuttal: “I shall not cross the Azat River to eat the baked bread of the Greeks” (Narratio de rebus Armeniis, ed. G. Garitte [Louvain 1952] 226f). Between Greeks and Latins, controversy began on this subject only in the 11th C. Responding to Greek criticism of the Latin practice, in 1054 Cardinal Humbert excommunicated Patr. Michael I Keroularios and his followers as “prozymite heretics.” The Greek theologian Niketas Stethatos responded.

Arguments used in the abundant Byz. polemical literature on the subject refer to the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper, which all describe the bread used by Jesus as artos—the standard Greek term for leavened bread—and not azymon. This historical argument, however, was less popular among the Greeks than references to the symbolic meaning of “leaven” (“The Kingdom of God is like unto leaven,” Mt 13:33), and also to a Christological argument: leaven gives “life” to bread, just as the soul gives life to the body. Consequently, Armenians and Latins were seen as denying the existence in Christ of a human soul, and therefore, shared the heresy of Apollinaris of Laodikeia.

BAALBEK. See Heliopolis.

BABYLAS (Βαβυλάς), saint; died Antioch ca. 250; feast day 4 Sept. Eusebios of Caesarea (Eusebios, HE 6.39.4) mentions in passing that Babylas died under Decius (249–51) in a prison in Antioch. The story was subsequently developed; Leontios of Antioch (died 357/8) says that Decius murdered Babylas because he forbade Emp. Philip the Arab (244–49) to enter the church; John Chrysostom (PG 50:533–72), in two polemical sermons against Julian, praises Babylas’s resistance to an emperor, but his information about Babylas is vague. Unlike Eusebios, Chrysostom stresses that Babylas was murdered. Hagiological texts transfer Babylas’s martyrdom to the reign of Numerianus (283–84) and sometimes provide Babylas with companions in martyrdom: a Greek text associates three children with him, while a Georgian legend describes a certain Basil of Epiphaneia, who was executed for his support of Babylas. Another stage in the development of the legend was the creation of St. Babylas of Nikomedea, who was venerated on the same day.

Representation in Art. Miniatures illustrating the vita of Babylas written by Symeon Metaphrastes depict the saint as an elderly bishop, and often show him being beheaded along with his little disciples. One of these MSS includes a cycle of four scenes showing him sitting in prison with his disciples, and being interrogated, scourged, and beheaded (London, B.L. Add. 11870, fol. 52r).


—A.K., N.P.S.

BACKGROUND, the farthest surface of an image, behind its chief objects of contemplation, was sometimes enlivened with architectural constructions and/or landscape. These elements are, however, usually uninhabited and treated ever more frequently as independent elements and conventional tokens of cities, mountains, etc., inserted behind figures. Buildings read as backcloths dropped behind a scene rather than as enclosures for the event depicted: in the Menologion of Basil II, for example, such sets often open out in inverse perspective. Likewise, portions of structures facing different directions are placed in the same plane. While this remains generally true, in 10th- and early 14th-C. art attempts were made, sometimes with success, to integrate figures into the setting so that the factitious distinction between the protagonists’ zone of operation and their background tends to disappear. Progressively from the 6th C. onward, settings are replaced with a blue or shimmering gold screen that denies space and depth, supernaturally focusing all attention on the main figures. —A.C.

BAČKOVO. See Petritzos Monastery.

BADÓER, GIACOMO, Venetian merchant who operated in Constantinople in 1436–40. His account books, kept in double-entry form, are one of the few sources to describe Constantinopolitan commerce in this period. Badoer’s books show that this merchant, whose activities were of medium size, had an annual turnover of merchandise valued at approximately 126,000 hyperpyra. They reveal Constantinople as an active trade center functioning primarily as an entrepôt. They illuminate the flow of merchandise (raw materials, wax to the West, silk cloth from the West), the activities of Byz. bankers, and the participation of Byz. merchants in trade. This was large in terms of the number of merchants and sea captains, but small in terms of capital engaged; it is seen also to have been a deficit trade with Western merchants. The account books show that the Byz. who traded with Badoer were engaged primarily in retail trade and were only tangentially concerned with foreign trade. The source has also been used to extrapolate the value of total Venetian trade in Constantinople, the importance of
Genoese merchants (seen as paramount), and the types of ships used to transport merchandise.


—A.L.

BAGHDAD (Baq̄īdā, Εἰρηνόπολις), capital of the caliphate for most of the ‘ABBĀSID dynasty. The name Baghdad was Persian; officially it was called Dār al-Salām ("City of Peace"). Caliph al-Manṣūr founded Baghdad as a circular city on a modestly inhabited site. He intended it as a camp for his troops from Khurāsān, using ruins from the nearby abandoned Sasanian capital of Ctesiphon. Baghdad's great prosperity lasted from 775 to 893. The ‘Abbāsid court briefly transferred its residence to Samarra from 896 to 892, when Caliph al-Mu’tamid returned to Baghdad. It remained the capital until the Mongols terminated the dynasty there in 1258.

The replacement of Damascus by Baghdad as the capital benefited Byz. by moving the center of Islamic power further from the borders of the Byz. Empire. The same move also made the Islamic capital more secure. Byz. embassies to ‘Abbāsid caliphs visited Baghdad and became means for cultural influences and some goods to cross otherwise closed frontiers. Such embassies to the Islamic capital were esp. notable in the 9th and 10th C.


—W.E.K.

BAGRATIDS (Παγκρατούνῆς; Arm. Bagratuni; Georg. Bagrationi), Armenian feudal family that gave royal dynasties to ARMENIA, GEORGIA, and Caucasian ALBANIA. The origin of the Bagratids was probably Iranian, but a late tradition, known even to Constantine VII (De adm. imp. 45,1–8), traces them back to the Old Testament King David and to the Virgin Mary. The original Bagratid domain lay in Sper in northwestern Armenia. Their hereditary office was that of "coronant" (t'agadir) of the ARSACID kings and perhaps of commander-of-the-cavalry (aspet), although the latter may be a family name rather than a title, since Prokopios (Wars 2.3.12–18) refers to them as Aspetianoi.

The power of the Bagratids grew in the 7th–8th C. when they served Byz., the Persians, and esp. the caliphate. Benefitting from the elimination of rival houses, the Bagratids extended their domains into central and southern Armenia (Tarkōn) and acquired the hereditary title Prince of Princes by the 9th C. In 884, Ašot I the Great was crowned king with the agreement of both the caliphate and Byz. The Bagratids ruled over Armenia until 1045, a senior branch residing at Ani, where the ruler styled himself King of Kings, and junior ones at Kars (Vanand) from 961 onward and at Lori (Tašir, Joraget) from 972 onward. Nevertheless they did not hold the Arsacid capital of Dūn and their control of Armenia was challenged by the establishment of a separate kingdom of Vaspurakan in 908. By the mid-11th C., Bagratid power had dwindled so far that Byz. annexed their kingdoms, except for Lori, which survived into the 15th C.

Secondary branches of the Bagratid house settled in Iberia and Taḵ’/Tao early in the 9th C. Ašot the Great (813–30) was named Prince of Iberia by the caliph and kouropalates by Byz., and in 888 Adarnarse IV was crowned king. The Georgian branch prospered as that in Armenia declined. Taḵ’ reached its apogee under DAVID of Taḵ’/Tao at the end of the 10th C. In 1008, Bagrat III united Abchasia and Georgia to form a single kingdom, which reached its zenith under David II/IV THE RESTORER and Queen T’amar, who supported the empire of Trebizond and ruled Armenia through her Zak’arid viceroyos. The Mongol invasions of the 1230s abruptly halted Bagratid prosperity, but the Bagratids continued to rule over a reduced and divided Georgia.


—N.C.G.

BAHĀ’ AL-DĪN, also called Ibn Shaddād, Arab historian, educator, jurist, and authority on Islamic traditions (hadith); born Mosul 1145, died Aleppo 1235. In July 1188, Bahā’ al-Dīn joined
the staff of Saladin to serve as the “judge of the army” and “judge of Jerusalem.” In this capacity he accompanied Saladin everywhere on his travels and campaigns, including the bitter fight against the Third Crusade. After Saladin died (1193), Bahāʾ al-Dīn remained active in Egyptian and Syrian politics.

Bahāʾ al-Dīn wrote several works, among them a treatise on the Holy War (jihād), dedicated to Saladin. The most important is his biography of Saladin, which, with the works by ʿĪmād al-Dīn, constitutes the most authentic source for Saladin’s life. Whereas for the account of the years prior to his entering Saladin’s service Bahāʾ al-Dīn depended on trustworthy friends, for the subsequent period he relied on his own observations. Although his work mainly concerns Saladin’s military and political accomplishments, the book contains important documents illustrating the relations of the Sultan, the Crusaders, and the Byz. In addition to brief references to Byz. participation in the 1169 attack against Damietta (Wilson, infra 57) and to Muslim capture of a ship that “came from Constantinople” to Acre on 12 June 1190 (p.182), Bahāʾ al-Dīn treats diplomatic exchanges between ISAAC II and Saladin, some of them affecting religious practices of the Greeks in Jerusalem and of the Muslims in Constantinople (pp. 198–201, 334f). He also quotes the Arabic translation of an Armenian letter from Katholikos Basil on the impact of Frederick Barbarossa’s Crusade on the Byz. Empire (pp. 185–89).


LIT. Gamal El-Dīn El-Shayyāl, Ef 3:933f. M.H.M. Ahmad in Lewis-Holt, Historians, 87f. –A.S.E.

BAHNASA. See OXYRHYNCHUS.

BAIAN (Baiaνος), Avar khan (ca.562–582/4) who led his people to the lower Danube by 562. Perhaps it was Baian who in 558 sent envoys to Constantinople to conclude an alliance: Theophanes the Confessor (232.6–10) gives no name. Menander Protector is the only historian to name Baian while recounting the attempts of the Avars to cross the Danube and seize Sirmium. Even though the negotiations of Baian’s ambassador Targitaj brought no result, emperors tried to use the Avars against the Gepids and Slavs. Finally, with the help of Greek engineers, Baian built a bridge over the Sava, besieged Sirmium, and impelled the Byz. to yield the starving city in 582. Kollauzt and Miyakawa’s statement (infra 249) that in 586 Baian beleaguered Thessalonike is mistaken; even more erroneous is M. Artamonov (Istorija Chazar [Leningrad 1962] 160), who gave his date of death as 630.


BAILO (μπαιούλος), “bailiff,” the head of the Venetian colony in Constantinople in the Palaiologan period and simultaneously the Venetian ambassador at the court of the emperor. Gregoras (Greg. 1:97.21–25) translates the term bailo into Greek as epitropos or ephoros. In this capacity the bailo replaced the Venetian podestà whose functions were more limited. The office of bailo was introduced after the Byz. reconquest of Constantinople by the agreement of 4 Apr.–30 June 1268. The bailo was elected by the Great Council in Venice for a short term (about two years or less); his salary was set at 100 librae a month. The bailo had two assistants (consiliarii) who were also sent from Venice. His duties were to administer the trade activity of the colony, sit in judgment, and supervise the four Venetian churches in the Byz. capital. There was a Venetian bailo in Euboea as well as in Constantinople, whereas Venetian administrators elsewhere bore different titles (dux of Crete, castellani of Methone).


BAIOULOS (βαίουλος, from Lat. baiulus, “bearer”) in Byz. signified a preceptor or mentor. Balsamon (Pg 119:1213D) derives the word from baion, palm leaf, allegedly because teachers had the responsibility to develop and supervise the growth of young minds. Probably not earlier than Theophanes the Confessor, the term was applied to the emperor’s preceptor, and in the 10th C. the honorific title of megas baiulos was created for Basil Lekapenos. Pseudo-Kodinos remarks (140.8–
g) that the place of the megas baiullos in the 14th-C. hierarchy is unknown; some contemporary lists locate him above the kouropalates.


**BAKCHEIOS, GERON** (Βάκχειος, Γέρων), Greek music theorist of the age of Constantine the Great; fl. late 3rd–early 4th C. He is known only for his *Introduction to the Art of Music* (Eisagoge technes mousikes), written in the form of a catechism. It is an eclectic production, mostly following the school of Aristoxenos (4th C. BC.). The short treatise, not in dialogue form, published under his name by F. Bellerman in 1841, is by Dionysios, Bakcheios's contemporary.


**BAKER** (μάγκυψ), also artopoioi, artokopos, artopoioi. These terms are already found in Egyptian papyri and refer specifically to those who made bread. In the 10th C. the bakers formed an important guild, whose members were exempted from public service, as were the animals they used to grind the grain. Their activities and profit (4 1/6 percent) were regulated by the state, and when grain prices varied, they were allowed to change the weight of the loaf, but not its price (*Bk. of Eparch*, ch.18). The quaestor of Constantinople could force beggars to work for bakers (*Epanagoge* 5.5). Bakers' shops could not be located beneath dwellings, or very close to them, for fear of fire (*Bk. of Eparch* 18.3; Harm. 2.4.14).

The question arises whether bakers who made the bread sold it in a retail fashion. The *De ceremoniis* (1.96) states that in the early months of the reign of Nikephoros II, the rebel Joseph Bringas went from the patriarchate past the Milion and ordered the bakers (*artopoioi*) to neither bake bread nor sell it on the market. The bakers in question may be identical to those who sold bread in the main bread market of Constantinople, the Artopolia, located just beyond the Forum of Constantine (*Parastaseis*, ch.40). If this is the case, then breadmakers and bread sellers are identical; it could well be, however, that the *artopoioi* who presumably worked in the Artopolia sold wholesale. Other texts (e.g., Theoph. 234.23) distinguish between *artopolia*, where bread was sold, and *mankipeia*, where it was made. It seems likely that in other parts of Constantinople outside the main bread market, as well as in smaller cities, those who made bread also sold it to the consumer. This is suggested by monastic documents that show (e.g., in Serres) *mankipeia* (Koutouloum. nos. 8.13, 18.42), but make no mention of *artopolia*, probably because the two were identical.


**BALĀDHURI, AL-**, more fully Abūl-'Abbās Abūmād ibn Yabāy al-Baladhuri, Arab historian; died ca.892. Little is known about al-Baladhuri. Clearly he was born into a well-connected family. He studied under or knew many of the great Iraqi scholars of his day, pursued his researches in several Syrian cities, and enjoyed patronage and favor at the 'Abbāsid court in Baghdad. A profoundly learned scholar, he was also a traditionist, poet, and Arabic translator of the *Testament of Ardashir*.

Two of Baladhuri's Arabic histories survive, both based on extensive oral and written sources. His *Conquests of the Provinces* relates to the conquests of the Arabs. It is arranged by province and describes many nonmilitary developments. The incomplete enlarged version is lost. The later *Genealogies of the Notables* (also unfinished and still largely unedited) is a voluminous history, organized genealogically, down to the early 'Abbāсидs. Baladhuri often deals with Byz. He relates the conquests of Syria, Egypt, and Cyprus in detail; discusses the campaigns for Rhodes, Crete, and Sicily; and describes frontier defenses and expeditions (by both sides). Also considered are diplomatic relations, preconquest conditions, the attitudes of the indigenous populations and later demographic changes, the continuing use of the Greek language and Byz. coinage, and commercial contacts between the two sides.

BALDWIN OF FLANDERS

BALDWIN OF FLANDERS (Βαλδοβίος), Latin emperor of Constantinople (1240–61); born Constantinople 1217, died 1273. It was his fate to preside over the dissolution of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. The youngest son of Peter of Courtenay, he was only ten when his brother Robert of Courtenay died in 1228. John of Brienne took over the reins of government on the understanding that Baldwin would eventually succeed. This agreement was sealed by Baldwin’s marriage to John’s daughter Marie. When John died in 1237, Baldwin was in the West, seeking help for Constantinople. To this end he mortgaged his county of Namur to Louis IX of France for 50,000 livres parisis. Late in 1239, Baldwin finally reached Constantinople by the overland route through Hungary and was crowned emperor in 1240.

He soon returned to the West and was given a place of honor at the First Council of Lyons in 1245. His presence insured that help for Constantinople was placed high on the agenda, but there was to be little effective aid because of Louis IX’s plans for a crusade. The help promised by the Spanish order of Santiago in 1246 failed to materialize (J. Longnon, Byzantion 22 [1952] 297–99). Baldwin was reduced to pledging his son Philip in order to raise money (R. L. Wolff, Speculum 29 [1954] 45–84). It was only a matter of time before Constantinople fell. After its conquest by the Nicaeans in 1261, Baldwin made his way to the West, seeking supporters who might help him win back his empire. The most promising was Charles I of Anjou. A treaty was concluded at Viterbo in 1267, whereby Baldwin surrendered suzerainty over the Frankish principality of Achaia against the promise of an expedition to recover Constantinople.


—M.J.A.

BALDWIN III, king of Jerusalem (1143–63); born 1129, died Beirut 10 Feb. 1163. In 1157, threatened by Nur al-Din, Baldwin began to seek Byz. aid and a bride from Constantinople. Theodora Kommene, Manuel I’s niece, married Baldwin in 1158. Shortly after Renaud of Antioch’s abject surrender to Manuel at Mopsuestia, Baldwin was ceremonially welcomed by the emperor. When Manuel entered Antioch in triumph (Apr. 1159), Baldwin rode in the procession. The threat of joint Crusader-Byz. action caused Nūr al-Din to make concessions, and Manuel unexpectedly returned to Constantinople. During 1160–61, Baldwin’s efforts to induce Manuel to wed Melisende of Tripoli instead of Maria of Antioch were unsuccessful. After Baldwin’s death, Theodora received Acre as her portion, but in 1167 she fled with the future Andronikos I.


—C.M.B.

BALDWIN OF FLANDERS, count Baldwin IX of Flanders, Baldwin VI of Hainault, then Baldwin I of the Latin Empire; born Valenciennes 1172, died Tūrnovo 1205 or 1206. He joined the Fourth Crusade and set out in Apr. 1202 at the head of the expedition’s largest contingent. To sustain the Crusade he supported Boniface of Montferrat and Enrico Dandolo in welcoming the offers of Philip of Swabia and the future Alexios IV. Baldwin and his troops played leading roles in fighting Alexios III and Alexios V. After the capture of Constantinople, he was elected emperor on 9 May 1204, probably through the votes of the Venetians; he was crowned 16 May.
Baldwin employed traditional Byz. titles but had a feudal concept of government. Despite his agreement that Boniface should have Thessalonike, he wished to occupy the city. Boniface reacted violently; peace was made only in Aug. 1204. Early in 1205 the Byz. of Thrace, alienated by Baldwin’s contemptuous attitude, revolted and summoned Kalojan to their assistance. On 14 Apr. Kalojan defeated and captured Baldwin outside Adrianople. He perished mysteriously in prison. In July 1206 news of his death was reliably reported to the Crusaders.


-C.M.B.

BALKANS (medieval *Açmos), the modern (19th-C.) name of the mountain range that extends about 550 km from the Timok Valley eastward to the Black Sea. The word Balkan (balqan) is Ottoman Turkish, meaning “thickly wooded mountain”; the Bulgarians called it in Slavonic *Stara Planina. The Balkans form the major divide between the Danube (north) and Marica (south) rivers, and are traversed by some 20 passes, of which the most important are Trajan’s Gate; Via Succorum (now Ichtimanski Prohod), a link on the Via Egnatia; and Siderophageyon.

In antiquity the Haimos mountains formed the ethnic frontier of the Thracians. During the Great Migrations it remained a natural border of the Byz. Empire against the Goths and later the Avars; its passes were well fortified. In the 6th and 7th C. the romanized Thraco-Illrian population was forced to settle in the mountains; they reappear in the 11th C. as the Vlachs. In the second half of the 7th C. the leading role was assumed by a Sklaven group called the “Seven Tribes,” but as early as 680 these Sklavenoi had become associates of the newly arrived Bulgars of Asparuch. A year later the Byz. acknowledged Bulgar occupation as a fait accompli and concluded a peace with the newcomers; Haimos became the Byz. frontier. In Omurtag’s treaty (816-17) the Byz.-Bulgarian frontier was defined by a line that ran westward from Devletos to Makroivada. The Bulgarians were allowed to fortify this line with ramparts and trenches; it became known as the “Great Fence” (herkesia).

REGIONS OF THE BALKANS

MOESIA Late Roman Province
ISTRIA Region
BOSNIA Late Byzantine and Non-Byzantine Area
BALSAMON, THEODORE, canonist; born Constantinople between ca.1130 and 1140, died after 1195. Balsamon (Βαλσαμών) occupied high positions in the church hierarchy: first as patriarchal nomophylax and chartophylax, then (from ca.1185–90) as patriarch of Antioch (although he remained in Constantinople). Isaac II considered the possibility of Balsamon’s election as patriarch of Constantinople but preferred Dositheos of Jerusalem (1189–91). Balsamon acted also as hegoumenos of Blachernai (PG 104:975A) and of the monastery ton Zipon. His major work is the Commentary (Exegesis) on the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles, begun in the 1170s; Balsamon’s aim was not only an explanation, but also a critical revision of contradictory and obsolete statements. Unlike his predecessors, Aristenos and Zonaras, Balsamon included in his commentary many legal texts now lost. He differs from Zonaras also in his political program; Balsamon staunchly supported strong imperial power and imperial political aspirations. He defended the privileges of the patriarchate of Constantinople and in this connection critically studied the Donation of Constantine (A. Pavlov, VizVrem 3 [1896] 21–29). His other canonical works included a treatise defending third-marriage, which were important for the aristocracy’s attempt to strengthen clan linkages (A. Pavlov, VizVrem 2 [1895] 503–11). Balsamon defended the role of the chartophylax against the protodikos. In 1195 he issued answers to canonical questions of Mark III, patriarch of Alexandria (ca.1195). He also wrote letters and epigrams that throw light on Byz. cultural life. As a canonist Balsamon was criticized by Neilos Kabasilas (A. Failler, REB 32 [1974] 211–23).

BANALITY in Western medieval law designated an economic monopoly imposed by landlords on their peasants; it included primarily the obligations to grind grain at their lord’s water mill, to bake bread at his oven, and to press grapes at his wine press. Banalities are known in Frankish Morea as jus linobrosis in quo actatur linum, “where the flax was worked on” (Longnon-Topping, Documents 38.13) or labotaga ubi fit oleum, “where olive oil was produced” (p.62.1). It is unclear whether these rights were of Greek origin or introduced by the Crusaders. The Greek term linobrocheion is frequently used in Byz. practika, for instance, together with opsonion and vivarium (Dölger, Sechs Praktika 36, A30) or with ennomion (Xenoph., no.15.24), that is, as one of the rents paid by peasants to their lord. A linobrocheion—as a work site—had to be located next to water, near a water mill (Lavra 2, no.105.23). A payment for using a mill, exagion, is mentioned in an act of 1089 (Xenoph., no.1.161). The existing sources do not, however, say that the use of these mills, olive presses, or places for soaking flax was coercive; it is plausible that former coercive rights were supplemented by regular payments imposed on the village as a whole or, indeed, that the use was not coercive but de facto unavoidable, since often mills belonged to the landlord.

BANDON (βάνδον), ensign or banner, eventually came to signify a small military detachment. As defined in the Strategikon of Maurice (86.21–22), “A bandophoros was a man who carried the ensign of a bandon.” The earliest evidence often refers to Persian banda. Malalas (Mal. 461.11–12) speaks of the “royal bandon” of the Persians, and Theophanes (Theoph. 319.5) reports that Herakleios took captive 28 Persian banda. Hagiographers of the 7th C. mention banda (W. Kaegi, Byzantina 7 [1975] 65–67), usually with ethnic designations. In the 10th C. a tourma was composed of five to seven banda, each bandon consisting of 50–100 mounted soldiers or 200–400 infantrymen. The commander of a bandon was called komes. Constantine VII equated bandon and topoteresa, considering the bandon as a territorial unit (De adm. imp. 50.94–110). Unlike other terms for territorial units, such as kleisoura or tourma, the bandon enjoyed longevity and survived at least in the empire of Trebizond (F. Usenski, V. Benešević, Vazelonski akty [Leningrad 1927] lx). LIT. Haldon, Praetorians 172ff, 276f. S. Kyriakides, Byzantinai meletai 5 (Thessalonike 1937) 537f. -A.K.

BANJANI. See Nikita, Monastery of Saint.

BANKER (πραπεζιτής). In the late Roman Empire the term trapezites was used synonymously with argyroprates, a moneylender (E. Hanton, Byzantion 4 [1927–29] 132f). Frequently cited in papyri, a trapezites was primarily an administrator of a trapeza or bank (F. Preisigke, Griewesen im griechischen Egypten 2 [Hildesheim—New York 1971] 59); in the 3rd–4th C. trapezitai were sometimes called demosioi or politikoi trapezitai—probably to distinguish them from private money changers. In the 5th and 6th C., these qualifying epithets seem to have disappeared; references are to plain trapezitai or to a lamprotatos trapezites (Preisigke, Wörterbuch 3:173f). Many, but not all, trapezitai were associated with propertied families, such as the Apions in Egypt, and served them as cashiers. Another term for the “banker”—money changer in the 5th–8th C. was kollekktarios (R. Bogaert, Chronique d’Egypte 60 [1985] 5–16).

The trapezitai of the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (ch.3) formed a guild separate from the argyropra­tai, at that time the dealers in gold and silver. Their principal function was to exchange money; their responsibilities also included assaying coins of poor alloy and denouncing the sakkoullarioi (“bag bearers”), probably unauthorized coin dealers operating “on the market squares and in public streets.” There is no evidence that the trapezitai of this period served as moneylenders. Great emphasis was placed on the necessity for trapezitai to prove their honesty. They were also supposed to carry out certain imperial assignments, the character of which is not defined in the Book of the Eparch.

In late documents as well as in the Book of the Eparch, money changers are also called hatalaktais. In 15th-C. Thessalonike a katalaktes named Platyskalites had a sister who was married to another katalaktes, called Chalazas (S. Kougeas, BZ 23 [1920] 153–16). The term trapezites continued to be used, as in the case of Iannes Androuses, a money changer of the late 14th C. (PLP, no.901111). The shops of money changers were small; thus, in the mid-14th C. the Lavra monastery owned in Constantinople a katalakttika trapezia that it had acquired from different people, some of them noble (Lavra 3, no.123.105–110). In 1400 a certain Samaminthes rented from the monastery of Hodegetria in Thessalonike two trapezia that he made from katalakttika in a perfumer’s shop (MM 2:526.17–23). Ecclesiastical institutions thus avoided the prohibition on engaging in the money-changing business.


BANQUET (συμπόσιον), feast held in private households during religious and public festivities or to celebrate a wedding or birth of a child. The guests sat in the dining room (triklinon) around the best table in the house. They either reclined on couches or mattresses (see beds) or sat on chairs and benches. At a banquet sponsored by Philaretos the Merciful the imperial guests sat at a round ivory table that accommodated 36 people (Vita, 137.31). Guests were seated according to their social position; usually ecclesiastics occupied the place of honor to the right of the host. Women and children sat apart in another room and were rarely introduced to the guests (Vita, 139.32–35). The host provided food, wine, and entertainment—music, song, and dancing. The clergy stayed only for dinner and had to leave when the entertainment began. Kekaume-
nos recommended avoiding banquets in order to be spared their intrigues and idle talk (Kek. 124.14–20).

Imperial banquets were held at the palace to mark the emperor's birthday, coronation, marriage, or birth of a child. They were also held on religious feasts and public holidays. On such occasions the emperor invited high officials along with the church hierarchy. The guests wore their insignia and regalia. The emperor sat at a separate "golden" or "honorable" table, joined only by the six most important state officials. The banquets were held in various palace rooms with different seating capacities. Therefore, each banquet had a different group of participants. The seating was arranged according to a strict protocol. Such occasions were both solemn and festive, including the distribution of imperial gifts to courtiers and songs and dances. A Westerner like Liuterand of Cremona criticized these imperial banquets as obscene and too lengthy, with food reeking of garlic, onions, and leeks. By the 14th C. such banquets were given only five times a year, on religious feast days (pseudo-Kod. 219.27–220.7).

In a typological illustration in Athens, Nat. Lib. 211 (G. Galavaris, Bread and the Liturgy [Madison, Wisc., 1970], fig.94), a table being heaped with food by attendants is compared to John Chrysostom serving the faithful at an altar.


BAPHEUS (βαψεύς, often incorrectly called Baphaion), site in Bithynia of a crucial battle in which Osman defeated the Byz. army under George Mouzalon on 27 July 1302. By this time, the Ottoman Turks had penetrated to the region of Nikomedea and threatened famine by blocking its communications. Mouzalon, with a force of 2,000, hoped to relieve the city and allow the inhabitants, who had taken refuge within its walls, to harvest their crops. Instead, the Turkish cavalry charge broke the ranks of the Byz., whose Alan contingent failed to participate, and Mouzalon withdrew ignominiously into the citadel of Nikomedea (Pachym., ed. Bekker 2:333–35). The battle produced a fatal weakening of the Byz. position in Bithynia, provoked a wave of westward-bound refugees, and left the defensible fortified towns as islands in a region soon overrun by the Turks. The exact site of the battle has not been determined; it was in view of Nikomedea, probably to the east.


BAPTISM (βαπτισμα, βαπτισμός), the sacrament of initiation into Christian life via ritual lustration in the name of the Trinity for the remission of sin. Baptism performed but once and never repeated was interpreted in the New Testament by metaphors of new beginning, esp. rebirth in the Spirit, dying and rising in Christ, restoration of sight and illumination, and with Old Testament types such as the Flood, the CROSSING OF THE RED SEA, and circumcision on the eighth day. Byz. authors like John of Damascus (Expositio fidei, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:181–86, 231.23–35) develop these traditional themes.

In the early church an elaborate initiation process, including a lengthy catechumenate, preceded baptism, which took place in the Baptistery, principally at Easter Vigil, but also, in Constantinople, on EPIPHANY, LAZARUS SATURDAY, and PENTECOST because of the baptismal and resurrectional symbolism associated with these days. With the decline of the adult catechumenate and the shift to infant baptism (by ca.600), the ritual elements that marked the principal stages of this three-year process of initiation were concentrated within the last weeks of Lent. Finally, on Holy Saturday evening, while the congregation kept vigil in Hagia Sophia with lections recounting biblical types of baptism, the patriarch in the Great Baptistry blessed the font, presbyters and deacons anointed the candidates, and the patriarch himself baptized them and anointed them with chrism. Then the neophytes, vested in the white robes of sinlessness, made their solemn ritual entrance into the church to the chant of Psalm 31 with the baptismal troparion (Gal 3:27 plus alleluia) as refrain, to join the waiting congregation in the final rite of initiation, COMMUNION in the paschal Eucharist (Mateos, Typicon 2:84–89). (For the feast of the Baptism of Christ, see EPIPHANY.)

BAPTISTERY (βαπτιστήριον), a building or room containing the font and used for rites of baptism. The earliest known baptistery was a room within the Christian domus at Dura Europos. Beginning with Constantine I's baptistery at the Lateran Basilica in Rome and continuing into the 6th C., baptisteries were often distinct constructions with a variety of forms—circular, octagonal, square, rectangular, cruciform, or triconch. No rules determined the position of the baptistery relative to its church. It could be located in front of, to either side of, or behind the church building and sometimes lacked any direct connection with the church. Some baptisteries were provided with vestibules and subsidiary rooms, though the font was usually located in the center of the main space, often beneath a dome. After the 6th C. and probably as the result of changing baptismal customs, the detached baptistery disappears. The font was moved into the church, occupying a position in the narthex or in a room set aside for that purpose. In monastic settings, the function of the baptistery was frequently superseded by that of the phiale.


M.J.

BARBARA, AL-. See Kaper Pera.

BARBARA (Βαρβάρα), saint; feastday 4 Dec. The different versions of her legend disagree as to her birthplace and the date of her martyrdom. Barbara was supposedly a daughter of Dioskoros, a rich and noble pagan in Heliopolis (or Nikomedes or Antioch), who placed Barbara in a tower (pyrgos) to prevent her from marrying. Ironically, she had no intention of marrying. She soon converted to Christianity and, during her father's absence, ordered a third window installed in the bath to symbolize the Trinity. When Dioskoros learned this, he tried to kill Barbara, but a supernatural force brought her to a mountain-top; helped by a shepherd who was at once transformed into a rock, her father discovered her and dragged her off to trial and execution. The execution is variously ascribed to the reign of Maximinus the Thracian (235–38), of MAXIMIAN, or of another emperor.

The legend was probably created by the 6th or 7th C. JOHN OF DAMASCUS praised Barbara (Schrif-
terms of culture rather than creed: not only wild nomads but also Christian Latins and even Orthodox Bulgarians could be regarded as barbarians. The distinction between the “Romans” and barbarians (the embodiment of vanity, cruelty, greed, bad manners, illiteracy, and so forth) survived and was still applied to all peoples outside the empire.

As a conventional image of imperial triumph, statues of defeated barbarians were set up on the spina of the Hippodrome in Constantinople and were frequently represented in Late Antique art (e.g., Volbach, Elfenbeinarbeiten, no. 54) and on coins.


BARBARICARII, gold-weavers, embroiderers in gold, probably of Germanic origin; the 4th-C. grammarian Donatus described them as working “with gold and colored threads.” Under Constantine I they were still private laborers, but later in the 4th C. state “factories” were founded in which they worked under the supervision of three praepositis branbaricariorum [sic] sive argentariaorum, who were posted in the West—Arles, Rheims, and Trier; in the West they were under the jurisdiction of the Comes sacrarum largitionum. In the East their function included the decoration of armor (helmets) and they were under command of the magister officiorum. By 374 their factories were known in Constantinople and Antioch, but the 5th-C. Notitia dignitatum locates them in every eastern diocese except for Thrace and Illyricum, which shared one workshop.

LIT. O. Seeck, RE 2 (1896) 2856ff. –A.K.

BARBARO, NICOLÒ, Venetian doctor attached to the fleet of Venice and eyewitness to the fall of Constantinople to the Turks; born ca. 1400, died after 1453. Barbaro kept a detailed diary of the siege from 2 Mar. 1451 to 29 May 1453. Back in Venice and nearly a year (at least) after the event, he reworked his record into an account that survives in the Venetian dialect autograph MS. His perspective on the siege is favorable to the Byz., highlights the Venetian contribution (e.g., he identifies leading Venetian participants, ed. Cor-

net, pp. 16–18), and accuses the Genoese of undermining the city’s defense, thereby complementing the accounts of Leonard of Chios and Jacopo Tedaldi.


LIT. Karayannopoulos-Weiss, Quellenkunde 2:527. A. Carille, LMA 1:1439. –M. McC.

BARBARUS SCALIGERI, conventional name of the author of a chronicle entitled (also conventionally) Excerpta latina barbari. The Greek original was produced in Alexandria after 412 (the end of the patriarchate of Theophilos of Alexandria is the last event mentioned). While from the Greek original only a parchment leaf of the early 5th C. survives (P. Berol. 13296), an awkward Latin translation of ca. 700 is preserved in a single MS (Paris B.N. lat. 4884). The name Barbarus Scaligeri was given for its first editor, the humanist Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609).

The chronicle consists of three sections: a world history from Adam to the fall of Cleopatra; a list of rulers (Assyrian, Egyptian, Greek, Persian, etc.) to which lists of Jewish high priests and Roman emperors have been added; and a list of Roman consuls from Caesar to 387. The list of emperors, which extends to Anastasios I, is considered an interpolation. The chronicle of Barbarus Scaligeri was based on older chronicles by Hippolytos, Sextus Julius Africanus, and Eusebios.

The Greek parchment leaf contains colored, strip illustrations paralleling the papyrus Goleniščev of the so-called Alexandrian World Chronicle: it has busts of saints, a scene of martyrdom, and one of the earliest representations of the walls of Constantinople (H. Lietmann in Quantalacumque Studies Presented to Kir sopf Lake [London 1937] 339–48).


BARBER (κουρέας). Information on barbers is scanty, despite the important role hair-cutting played in Byz. (e.g., through the monastic tonsure, or as a form of punishment, or as an expres-
sion of social attitudes through growing a beard. In late antiquity there were professional barbers, and Diocletian established the price of a haircut as 2 denaria. According to the Miracles of Kosmas and Damianos, a butcher could become a barber; he needed only special tools, kourika ergaleia, and some funds (around 50 nomismata) to set up a shop (H.J. Magoulias, BS 37 [1976] 28f). Some barbers worked in the precincts of churches; in the 14th C. Matthew Blastares mentioned barbershops operating at Hagia Sophia alongside the shops of perfume sellers (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:483,6–7). There were also barbers at the imperial palace; according to a legend, Emp. Julian dismissed all of them but one (Theoph. 47.12). Law codes (e.g., Basil. 60.11.1) mention barbers working near playgrounds.


BARBERINI IVORY (Paris, Louvre, inv. no. OA 9063), carved ivory panel that takes its name from the cardinal-legate whose collection it entered in 1625. The ivory is often assumed, with insufficient reason, to be one leaf of the so-called five-part diptychs. The mounted emperor is usually said to be Anastasios I; the suggestion that he represents Justinian I (D.H. Wright, 3rd BSC Abstracts [1977] 6f) is more likely to be correct. The right panel is now missing, but the military figure to the emperor’s left, presenting a wreath-bearing Nike, lends some support to the notion that ivories such as this were presented to the emperor rather than by him. The personification of Terra (Earth) at his feet and the Indians and other barbarians making offerings in the lower panel complete a selection of figures deriving from Roman imperial iconography. The pagan themes of tribute to majesty, of victory, and of prosperity are, however, christened by the beardless Lord set axially above the earthly ruler among cosmological symbols. The thesis that the central panel is a replacement (P. Speck, Varia II [Berlin 1987] 348–53) is unlikely, given that all four preserved panels bear liturgical notations written on the back, indicating that they were in Gaul as early as ca.613 (E. Hlawitschka, Rheinishe Vierteljahrsblätter 43 [1979] 1–99).

Lit.: Delbrück, Consulardiptychen, no.48. —A.C.

BARDANES, GEORGE, church official and metropolitan; born Athens second half of 12th C., died ca.1240. Bardanes (Βαρδάνης) was a central figure and spokesman, along with John Apokaukos and Demetrios Chomatenos, for the ecclesiastical independence of Epirus from the patriarch at Nicaea in the period of the Latin occupation of Constantinople. He began his career studying in Athens with Archbp. Michael Choniates; when Choniates went into exile on Keos after 1205, Bardanes served him as hypomnematographos and chartophylax (J. Herrin, DOP 29 [1975] 262f). He represented Choniates in Constantinople in 1214 in the discussions with Cardinal Pelagius of Albano and by 1218 was serving in the bishopric of Grevena, still with the title of chartophylax. Strongly recommended by Apokaukos, his friend and correspondent on matters of canon law (M.Th. Fögen in Cupido Legum 47–71), Bardanes was appointed metropolitan of Keryra in 1219 by Theodore Komnenos Doukas, without consulting the patriarch at Nicaea. He contributed much to the schism between the churches, officially declared in a letter to Patri. Germanos II, written by
Bardanes in 1228 on behalf of the Epirot clergy (R.-J. Loenertz, EEBS 33 [1964] 87–118), and ended in 1233 by another letter of Bardanes. In 1235/6 Manuel Angelos sent him on an embassy to Frederick II and Pope Gregory IX, but illness prevented him from fulfilling his mission. While convalescing at the monastery of St. Nicholas of Casole at Otranto, Bardanes took part in a discussion with a Franciscan, Fra Bartolomeo, on purgatory, of which Bardanes has left an account.


—R.J.M.

BARDANES TOURKOS (Bαρδάνης ο έπικλημ Τοῦρκος), unsuccessful rebel in 803. Of Armenian origin, Bardanes was a patrikios and strategos of the Anatolikon under Nikephoros I (Toumanoff, “Caucasia” 150); he is probably to be identified with the patriarch Bardanios who, as domestikos ton scholon under Constantine VI, arrested Plato of Sakkoudion and, as strategos of the Thrakesion, supported Irene against Constantine in 797 (Guillard, Titres, pt.IX [1970] 339f). In 803 Emp. Nikephoros I appointed Bardanes “manostrategos of the five eastern themes” (TheophCont 6.14–16), probably anticipating an offensive against the Arabs. On 18 July Bardanes was proclaimed emperor reportedly for economic reasons: Nikephoros may not have paid the troops, Bardanes had equitably distributed booty from Arab campaigns, or Bardanes may have opposed the high taxes of Nikephoros. His supporters included Michael (II), Leo (V), and Thomas the Slav.

According to several Byz. sources (Genes. 6.4–7.36; TheophCont 7), before his revolt Bardanes visited a holy man who prophesied that his rebellion would fail, Michael and Leo would each reign, and Thomas would himself instigate a revolt. The Armeniakon troops refused to join Bardanes, who unsuccessfully besieged Chrysopolis for eight days. Michael and Leo deserted him, and Bar- danes withdrew to Malagina to negotiate with Nikephoros, who apparently used Joseph of Kathara as an intermediary (see Moechian Controversy). Receiving a written guarantee of safety confirmed by Patr. Tarasios, in Sept. Bardanes took refuge in the monastery of Herakleon in the port of Kios (in Bithynia), where he became a monk under the name Sabbas. He moved to a monastery that he had built on Prote, but Nikephoros confiscated his property, arrested his supporters, and blinded him.


—P.A.H.

BARDAS (Βάρδας), caesar; died 21 Apr. 866 (TheophCont 206.13). An Armenian from Paphlagonia (Toumanoff, “Caucasia” 136) and brother of Empress Theodora and Petronas, Bardas began his career in the military. In 837 Emp. Theophilos, who entitled him patrikios, sent him with Theophobos into Abchasia, where he was defeated. He may have played a small role during Theodora’s regency for Michael III, but after helping Michael dethrone her by assassinating Theoktistos, he was named chartoularios tou ka-nikeleou, magistros, and then domestikos ton scholon. In 859 Michael entitled his uncle kouropalates and on 26 Apr. 862 crowned him as caesar.

An outstanding administrator, Bardas was responsible for many achievements of Michael’s reign, including the baptism of Boris I of Bulgaria, the mission of Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios to Moravia, and the election of Patr. Photios. Bardas contributed to the revival of secular learning by organizing a school in the Magnaura and patronizing scholars such as Leo the Mathematician (Lemerle, Humanism 185f). From his first marriage he had two sons—one he named domestikos ton scholon, another a strategos—and one daughter. He married his second wife, Theodosia, ca.855 and divorced her ca.862, but probably continued to live with his daughter-in-law Eudokia Ingerina, who had joined his household after the death of his eldest son, apparently ca.857. According to Niketas David Paphlagon (PG 105.504C), Bardas deposed Patr. Ignatios for condemning his relationship with Eudokia as
incestuous. Bardas was assassinated by Basil (I) while campaigning with Michael in Asia Minor. Following other numerous scenes from his life, this last event is depicted in the Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussac, Skylitzés, no. 195) in a manner suggesting that Michael III was responsible for Bardas's death.

-P.A.H., A.C.

BAR HEBRAEUS. See Gregory Abū'l-Faraj.

BAR HEBRAEUS. See Gregory Abū'l-Faraj.

BARLI (Bápo), Adriatic port in Apulia, occupied by the Byz. in 875/6 and used as a military base during their recovery of southern Italy under Basil I. In 893 Bari became the residence of the strategos of Longobardia and later of the Katepano of Italy. The Normans conquered the city in 1071. The population of Bari was predominantly Lombard, the local language was Latin, and the ecclesiastical rite was and remained Roman Catholic throughout the Byz. period. As the capital of Byz. Italy for almost 200 years, however, Bari experienced the presence of a conspicuous number of non-Italian officials, the immigration of new inhabitants from all parts of the empire (Greeks, Armenians, and Jews), and frequent contacts between the local upper class and Constantinople. In fact, 11th-C. documentation shows that many members of the upper class of Bari were bilingual and acquired Byz. tastes in art and literature. According to the local annals (MGH SS 5:51–63), Bari was also the center of Italian opposition to the Byz. government. There is some evidence of trade between Bari and the empire. In 1087, local merchants brought the relics of St. Nicholas of Myra to Bari. The church of the city's new patron saint, Nicholas, was built on the site of the Byz. governor's residence (praetorium), which was given by Duke Roger to the archbishop of Bari in the same year. Schettini (infra) argued that the extant church is actually the remodeled shell of the Katepano's palace, but his thesis has been generally rejected, not least because a document attests the destruction of the palace in a revolt of 1079. Many fragments of Byz. sculpture are still preserved in the town.


BARLAAM AND IOASAPH, prose romance of uncertain date and authorship. "A story beneficial for the soul," it describes the conversion to Christianity of the Indian prince Ioasaph by the hermit Barlaam and the subsequent conversion of King Abenner by his son Ioasaph. The plot provides the opportunity to develop the principles of the Christian creed and its advantages over paganism. One of the most widely read Greek texts of the Middle Ages, Barlaam and Ioasaph survives in over 140 MSS, some probably of the 10th C.; the earliest dated MS is from 1021 (B. Fonkic, AB 91 [1973] 13–20). The story is of Oriental origin, reflecting to some extent the life of Buddha, but the path of transmission of the legend from India to Byz. is unclear. The date of composition and the authorship of the Greek Barlaam and Ioasaph are also under discussion. Scholarly tradition clings primarily to two names: John of Damascus and Euthymios the Iberian, who allegedly translated the work from Georgian. Probably neither is to be credited with this achievement, and the work should instead be assigned to an unknown John of Mar Saba of the 9th C. (?), whose name appears on dozens of MSS. Barlaam and Ioasaph was translated into various languages, Latin, Slavic, etc.

Five densely illustrated Byz. MSS of Barlaam and Ioasaph survive, dating from the 11th C. (Jerusalem, Gr. Patr. Stavrou 42) and later. The earliest have purely narrative illustration that closely follows the text, much like that of the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes. Examples of the 13th to 14th C. include miniatures of the Flood, the Crossing of the Red Sea, and other Old Testament scenes. Paris, B.N. gr. 1128 (14th C.) adds a notable Creation cycle, as well as scenes of the Infancy of Christ, Miracles of Christ, and Passion of Christ. It also depicts Barlaam as a monk in its frontispiece and includes scenes and figures, such as carpenters, drawn from everyday life. In all versions, Indian buildings, boats, beds, and other realia are represented as if they were Byz. Only the occasional turban suggests the tale's exotic
The name Ioasaph was adopted by John VI Kantakouzenos and several members of the Nemanjid dynasty, who had themselves represented as the monastic hero of the story at Studenica and Gračanica (V.J. Djurić, CahArch 33 [1985] 99-109).


E.M.J., M.J.J., A.K., A.C.

BARLAAM OF CALABRIA, theologian; born Seminara, Calabria, ca.1290, died Avignon? June 1348 (A. Pertusi, ItMedUm 3 [1960] 108 n.1). Born in southern Italy to an Orthodox family, he became a monk in his youth. In 1330 he moved to Constantinople, where he was Jegoumenos of the Aka­taletos monastery until 1341. A protégé of Andronikos III, he served as an Orthodox spokesman in Union negotiations in Constantinople, and, in 1339, as imperial emissary to the courts of Naples and Paris. A brilliant but arrogant and contentious scholar, in the mid-1330s he began to attack Hesychasm for both its theology and manner of prayer. He accused Gregory Palamas of Messalianism, and argued that the light on Mt. Tabor at the Transfiguration was created and not eternal. His intemperate criticism of the mystical exercises of the monks of Mt. Athos (whom he called omphalopsychoi, “with souls in their navels”) triggered the controversy over Palamism that was to divide the Byz. church for over a decade. The local council of Constantinople of 1341 (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF) condemned Barlaam and ordered his anti-hesychast writings burned. He returned to the West, converted to Catholicism at Avignon in 1342, and became bishop of Gerace in Calabria (1342-48). At Avignon Barlaam met Petrarch, who was later to study Greek with him. Barlaam was anathematized by the Orthodox church in 1351.

Bilingual, Barlaam left writings in both Latin and Greek. Most of his anti-Palamite works (except for his letters and an unedited disputation with Gregory Akindynos) were destroyed, so his views are known primarily from the rebuttals of his opponents. His 21 anti-Latin treatises on the Procession of the Holy Spirit and papal primacy do survive (in Latin), but are mostly unpublished. Barlaam was also interested in astronomy and wrote treatises on solar eclipses and the astrolabe.


BARLEY. See GRAIN.

BARNABAS (Barvâbœ), apostle and saint; feast-day (together with St. Bartholomew) 11 June. Originally from Cyprus, he taught with Paul in Antioch and Cyprus and thereafter with Mark. He is considered the founder of the Cypriot church. Eusebius of Caesarea (HE 1.12.1) states that some people listed Barnabas among the 70 disciples of Christ. The epistle of Barnabas was seen as authentic by Origen and was included in some MSS of the Bible (e.g., Codex Sinaiticus), but Eusebius and Jerome considered it apocryphal. The New Testament Epistle to the Hebrews was attributed to Barnabas in the 2nd and 3rd C., but Eusebius rejected his authorship. Although the so-called Gospel According to Barnabas, a piece of pro-Islamic polemic, has survived only in Italian and Spanish, Cirillo (infra) considered it to have descended from an apocryphal work compiled in the Judaean-Christian milieu before the 5th C.

Byz. legend usually connects Barnabas with Cyprus. His relics, together with a copy of the Gospel of Matthew allegedly copied by Barnabas himself, were discovered under a tree in Cyprus (488?); this tradition was used by the Cypriots as an argument against their dependence on Antioch (Theodore Lector 121.19-23). The Cypriot legend was developed by Alexander the Monk in his
eulogy of Barnabas. Another legend, accepted in the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, stressed the connection of Barnabas with Peter—Barnabas was Peter’s companion and Peter ordained him; the memory of Barnabas was celebrated in Constantinople in the Church of St. Peter, near Hagia Sophia.


**BARSANOUCHIOS** (Βαρσανουχίος), monastic writer; died ca.545. An Egyptian by birth, Barsanouchios took up the vocation of a recluse at the *koimesion* of Abba Seridos at Thavatha, near Gaza. Together with another recluse at the same monastery, John “the Prophet,” Barsanouchios issued opinions, presumably in Greek, on a wide range of problems presented to him as questions coming from other monks, bishops, and lay people. The responses of the two holy men, called “the Great Old Man” and “the Other Old Man,” respectively, were gathered by a now anonymous monk of the monastery into a collection of some 850 questions and answers. As recluses, Barsanouchios and John corresponded with others only through intermediaries. Abba Seridos performed this service for Barsanouchios; the young Dorotheos of Gaza was intermediary for John. The texts of the responses of the two recluses furnish abundant evidence for many of the practical problems churchmen and others encountered in 5th- and 6th-C. Palestine. They approved the ascetical counsels of Evagrios Pontikos, while rejecting his “Origenism.” Their teaching was extremely influential in monastic circles. The kernel of their ascetical advice is the constant admonition to cultivate an attitude of freedom from and reliance on God.


**BARSAMA**, or Barsumas, metropolitan of Nisibis (from ca.470); born in northern Persia (as a slave?) between about 415 and 420, died 496. Educated in Edessa by Ibas of Edessa, he eagerly joined the Nestorians, stirring up such a hatred of the Monophysites that the “Robber” Council of Ephesus (449) demanded his expulsion from Ephesus. After the death of Ibas in 457, Barsama left Edessa and settled in Nisibis, where he was elected bishop. He successfully contested the authority of Babaway, metropolitan of Ktesiphon-Seleucia, and with the help of the Persian king Peroz (459–84) brought about the deposition of the metropolitan and a flogging that proved fatal; Barsama’s friend Akakios was appointed as Babaway’s successor. Barsama opposed the requirement of celibacy for the clergy and was himself married to a former nun. He founded the academy of Nisibis and invited Narsai of Edessa to teach there. A Syriac catalog of *Abû Ishî‘ Bar Berikâ* lists his sermons, hymns, and other works, of which six short letters (in Syriac) to Akakios of Ktesiphon have survived. At the end of his life Barsama opposed the *Henotikon* and the increasing influence of the Monophysites.


**BARTER ECONOMY.** Alongside the Byz. monetary economy there existed an element of barter that took various forms. First, small-scale producers may have exchanged their products in local markets, as did the 9th-C. peasant Metrios at a fair; but there he met a merchant who conducted his business in large amounts of cash (*Synax.CP* 721.30–34). Barter could be a first stage in transactions that eventually became monetized, as is evident by the development of Athonite trade (a clear case of barter is found in the vita of Athanasios of Athos [vita A, ed. Noret, par.38.9–30]; see also *Prot. nos. 7.99–100, 8.99–100*). Second, some taxes were paid in kind, not in the Byz. Empire proper but rather in outlying provinces. The Bulgarians, after the conquests of Basil II, were allowed to pay their taxes in kind. The conversion of these taxes into payments in cash, during the reign Michael IV, caused a revolt. Third, foreign trade occasionally took the form of an exchange of commodities. The *Book of the Eparch* (9.6) describes a classic barter situation:
Bulgarians or other non-Byz. go to Constantinople to exchange their goods; the linen merchants, acting as brokers, find the [Byz.] merchants who have the appropriate commodities and receive a commission, in cash, for their services. It is important to note the juxtaposition of a barter economy, resulting from the needs of outsiders, and the cash economy in which the Byz. merchants themselves operated. There is, finally, another type of barter, involving services. Professionals of one sort or another might receive their salary partly in cash and partly in kind; these include, for example, the bishops and priests of rural areas and the doctors of the hospital of the Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople.

Given the fact that taxes were collected overwhelmingly in cash and cash transactions were commonplace, the role of barter must not be exaggerated. The importance of barter may have increased somewhat in the 7th–8th C., but in general its role was secondary to the dominant cash economy.


BARTHOLOMEW (βαρθολομαίος), apostle, treated as one of the Twelve, and saint; feastday in Constantinople (together with St. Barnabas) 11 June. Byz. legends present Bartholomew as teaching in Asia Minor where, together with Philip, he suffered a martyr’s death in Hierapolis. Already Eusebius of Caesarea (HE 5.10.3) was aware of Bartholomew’s journey to “India” (Ethiopia or Arabia?), whither Bartholomew brought the Gospel of Matthew written in Hebrew. Eventually, the legend developed that he was crucified in Arbanopolis in Armenia, whence his relics were brought in a lead casket first to Benevento and then to Lipari. Armenian texts from the 7th C. onward claimed that Bartholomew died and was buried in “Urbanopolis of Great Armenia,” which, according to van Esbroeck, was a new name for Nikopolis of Pontos. The presence in Armenia of one of the Twelve Apostles (not merely that of Thaddeus, one of the 70) served as a justification for Armenian ecclesiastical autonomy. In Byz. the veneration of Bartholomew was probably connected with Thessalonike: there, Joseph the Hymnographer received the relics of “the great apostle” and soon after built (in Thessalonike?) the Church of Bartholomew (PG 105:964A). Several eulogies of Bartholomew were compiled (e.g., by Theodore of Studios).


BARUCH (Βαρούχ), legendary friend and companion of Jeremias; pseudonymous author of several Hebrew and Judaeo-Christian apocalyptic books. The Book of Baruch or Baruch I, which develops the theme of sin and repentance, became popular with Christian theologians; it was commented on by Theodoret of Cyrus, Olympiodorus of Alexandria, and (in the 7th C?) John the Droungarios. Theodoret (PG 81:761A) juxtaposed Baruch with Paul (“the divine apostle”) and stressed the concordance between Old Testament and New Testament. Baruch II is a Syriac Apocalypse, probably of the early 2nd C. Baruch III, which may also date to the 2nd C., has survived in only two Greek MSS of the 15th–16th C. and—in different forms—in Slavic versions. It is accepted that Origen knew Baruch III and that it was written before 231, even though Origen (First Principles 2.3.6) found “clear indication of the seven worlds or heavens,” where Baruch III speaks of Baruch’s ascent to the five heavens: the first two of these house sinners; the third a dragon, a sea, primal rivers, the garden of Eden (?), the sun with the Phoenix, and the moon; the fourth, the souls of the righteous; the fifth, the angels.


BASIL (βασιλεύς), personal name (meaning “imperial, royal”). Unknown in antiquity and in the New Testament, the name first appeared in the 4th C. (O. Seeck, RE 3 [1899] 48; PLRE 1:1148f). Relatively rare in the early centuries (Theophranes the Confessor lists only four Basils), it became more popular in the 10th and 11th C. when, for example, Skylitzes mentions 25 Basils, almost as many as Theodore (26); it is perhaps no coincidence that the two emperors named Basil ruled in the 9th–11th C. In the later acts of Lavra, vols. 2–3 (13th–15th C.), however, Basil occupies
only the eighth place among male names. The puns based on the etymology of the name are self-evident: thus Photios (Epistulae 3:42:1346) called Basil the Great “the imperial (basileios) attire of the church.”

—A.K.

BASIL, archbishop of Seleukeia (from ca. 440); ecclesiastical writer; died after 468. Basil vacillated publicly and dramatically in his attitude toward Eutyches and Monophysitism—either from opportunism or genuine changes of heart. He first opposed the Monophysites at Constantinople in 448, supported them the next year at the “Robber” Council of Ephesus, and finally subscribed to their condemnation at Chalcedon in 451 (M. van Parys, Irenikon 44 [1971] 493–514).

Forty-one biblical sermons survive under his name, though at least two (nos. 38–39) are spurious; six pseudo-Athanasian sermons (PG 28:1047–61, 1073–1108) are now, however, attributed to him. Photios (Bibl., cod.168) read 15 of Basil’s homilies, noting the exegetical influence of Basil the Great and John Chrysostom; he approved their content but found the style too pretentious. Basil’s taste for dramatic form has led to his being credited with an influence on the kontakia of Romanos the Melode (P. Maas, BZ 19 [1910] 285–306). G. Dagron (Vie et miracles de sainte Thècle [Brussels 1978] 13–19) has argued that Basil is not the author of the vita and Miracles of Thécla, as is usually thought. According to Photios, however, he did write a poetical version of her Acta, which has not survived.


—B.B., A.M.T.

BASIL I, emperor (867–86) and founder of the Macedonian dynasty; born Thrace or Macedonia 830 or 835 (E.W. Brooks, BZ 20 [1911] 486–91) or on 25 May 836 (Adontz, Etudes 67), died Constantinople 29 Aug. 886. Of peasant origin, Basil had a brilliant career under Michael III, was crowned co-emperor in 866, and became emperor after Michael’s murder 23/4 Sept. 867.

In the Vita Basili Constantine VII described Basil (his grandfather) as an ideal ruler concerned with fiscal administration, justice, and protecting the poor and catalogued the many structures, including the Nea Ekklesia and the Kainourgion in the Great Palace, that he built or restored. Basil’s known reforms reveal his tendency to strengthen state control over economic life: he prohibited the exaction of interest and tried (but failed) to require peasants to pay taxes for abandoned neighboring lands. He stimulated the restoration of Roman law and promulgated the Procheiron and the Epangogé.

Basil faced resistance of various sorts: the rebellion of slaves of his cousin Asylaion was crushed; in 872 Basil’s general Christopher routed the Paulicians; John Kourkouas organized an aristocratic plot in 883–85. There were also troubles within the family: Leo, Basil’s son and heir, was imprisoned, allegedly slandered by Santabarrenos, and reconciliation was achieved only just before Basil’s death. Basil fought the Arabs both in the East and in Italy. He seized Zapetra and Samosata in 873 but suffered defeat at Mellite; in 878 Andrew the Scythian won a victory at Podandos but retreated from Tarsos. The successes of Nasar and Nikephoros Phokas in southern Italy only partly compensated for the Byz. loss of Syracuse. In Italy Basil sought an alliance with both Louis II and the papacy; he had to yield to Pope Nicholas I and replace Photios with Ignatios. Basil succeeded in occupying Cyprus for seven years. He died after a hunting accident. Together with members of his family, he is portrayed at the start of the Paris Gregory MS.


—A.K., A.C.

BASIL I, grand duke of Moscow and Vladimir (1389–1425); born 1371, died Moscow 28 Feb. 1425. Son of Dimitrij Donskoj, he was sent in his youth as a hostage to the Golden Horde. Soon after Basil succeeded his father as grand duke,
he married the Lithuanian princess Sophia (1391). He annexed Nižni Novgorod and withstood the incursion of Timur in 1395. In 1393 Basil objected to the commemoration of Emp. Manuel II in the diptychs by the pro-Byz. metropolitan Kiprian, reportedly saying, “We have a church but no emperor.” It was in response to this incident that Patr. Antony IV sent his letter defending the universal sovereignty of the Byz. emperor. Good relations were soon restored, however, between Basil and Constantinople, for in 1398 Basil sent the Byz. emperor funds to assist in defending the capital against the Ottoman siege. In 1413 (P. Schreiner, BZ 63 [1970] 294) or 1414 (Barker, Manuel II 345) Basil’s young daughter Anna was married to the Byz. crown prince John (VIII) Palaiologos; she died in 1417 of the plague. Basil, his Lithuanian wife, his daughter Anna, and her Byz. husband are all depicted on the so-called “Large Sakkos” of Metr. Photios (1408–31), probably made between 1414 and 1417 (D. Obolensky, ECHR 4 [1972] 141–46).


—A.M.T.

BASIL I, ANONYMOUS POEM ABOUT, a work in 12–syllable verses, probably written before 872, since the author prays for the emperor’s victory over “the friends of Mani,” i.e., the Paulicians. The beginning is lost. The author praises Basil I as a megas basilicus whose deeds surpass those of all other emperors and who has succeeded in subjugating “false tribes.” At the same time he emphasizes that Basil is a peacemaker (eirenopoios), “the lord of tranquility,” far removed from “impious struggles,” who pursues justice and treats archontes and the poor alike. The panegyric is strikingly similar to the epitaph of Leo VI for his father, as well as the Vita Basili and Genesios; the anonymous poet stressed more emphatically than these writers the humble origin of his hero, and compared Basil with David. This theme was apparently an element of official propaganda, since on a mosaic in the Kainourgion palace Basil’s children were depicted as praising God who raised their father up “from Davidian poverty” (TheophCont 335.2–3).


—A.K.

BASIL II, emperor (976–1025); born 958, died Constantinople 15 Dec. 1025. Crowned in 960, Basil and his brother Constantine VIII succeeded on the death of John I Tzimiskes. Until his exile in 985, the parakoimomenos Basil Lekefenos exercised power; thereafter, Basil II governed. The rebellions of Bardas Skleros and Bardas Phokas were overcome with aid from Vladimir I of Kiev, to whom Basil married his sister Anna. The revolts convinced him to curb the wealthy landholders. His law of 996 limited their rights to acquire their poor neighbors’ properties; monastic lands were restricted. Basil forced landlords to pay the allelenygon of their poor neighbors. Nevertheless, the magnates remained powerful; numerous families that later became prominent originated in Basil’s reign (Kazhdan, Gosp. klas. 255–58). He fought to destroy the Bulgarian state led by Samuel of Bulgaria. His first campaign (986) ended in disaster at Trajan’s Gate. Rebellions and the need to oppose the Fatimids in northern Syria delayed further action.

From 1001, when he made a durable peace with the Fatimid caliph, Basil campaigned repeatedly against the Bulgarians. In 1014 at Kleidion (Slavic Belasica, near the river Struma) he captured a large Bulgarian force; allegedly, he blinded 14,000, allowing one man in 100 to retain one eye. Stunned by this catastrophe, Samuel died. Bulgarian resistance continued until 1018. Basil’s conquests were organized into the themes of Paestrion and Bulgaria. By the late 12th C., he was called “Bulgar-Slayer” (Boulgaroktonos). Croatia and Serbia became Byz. dependencies.

Basil forced David of Tayk/Tao to promise his lands to Byz. upon his death, and in 1000 Basil acquired most of them. In 1021–22 he defeated a Georgian effort to recover David’s territories, which became the theme of Iberia (V. Stepanenko, VizVrem 44 [1983] 211–14). In 1022 the king of Vaspurakan ceded his realm, which also became a theme. Around 1001 Basil had offered a marriage alliance to Otto III. Late in life, he planned aggressive expansion against Sicily and even the Western Empire.

Despite his wars, Basil’s prudent government
Basil II. Image of the emperor; prefatory miniature to a Psalter (Venice, Marciana gr. 17, fol.1r). The triumphant emperor is crowned by both the archangel Gabriel and Christ and is given a lance by the archangel Michael. At his feet, his defeated enemies; to his left and right, framed busts of military saints.

enriched the treasury. Devoted to military life, he refused to marry. Basil is depicted crowned by Christ, with his enemies in PROSKYNEISIS, in a psalter in Venice (Marc. Z.17—A. Cutler, ArtVen 31 [1977] 9–15). He was the recipient of the MENLOGION OF BASIL II.


—C.M.B., A.C.

BASIL II KAMATEROS, patriarch of Constantinople (Aug. 1183–Feb. 1186 [V. Grumel, REB 1 (1943) 261–63]). His career before the patriarchate is described in two unpublished speeches, by Gregory Antiochus and Leo Balianites, also a contemporary. A member of the Kamateros family, Basil served Manuel I primarily as a diplomat, but his mission to Rome (in 1169?) ended in a fiasco, and he was (temporarily?) banished. As a

man out of favor with Manuel, Basil was welcomed by Andronicus I, who had troubles with Pат. Theodosios Boradiotes; compelled to abdicate, Theodosios was replaced by Basil. Immediately Basil nullified Theodosios’s prohibition of the marriage between the illegitimate imperial offspring Irene and Alexios (despite their being close relatives) and freed the murderers of Alexios II from their solemn vow to be his guardians. The speech of Antiochos contains vague allusions to Basil’s ecclesiastical reforms: “The all-encompassing house of the church has been swept clean,” he says; no longer decked out in superficial ornament, the church stood now in all its natural beauty. The execution of Andronicus meant the end of Basil’s success. Even though he tried to gain the favor of the new ruler, Isaac II Angelos, by crowning him and by promulgating a synodal declaration that noblewomen forced by Andronicus to enter convents could return to secular status, Isaac did not want to retain a staunch supporter of his predecessor on the patriarchal throne; Basil had to abdicate and was condemned by the synod for permitting the marriage of Alexios and Irene. His subsequent fate is unknown.


—A.K.

BASILAKES (Βασιλάκης, fem. Βασιλάκινα), a family of Armenian or Paphlagonian origin. According to Matthew of Edessa, the noble Armenian Vasilak fell at the battle of Mantzikert in 1071. Nikephoros Basilakes made an unsuccessful attempt to usurp the throne in 1078 (see Basilakes, Nikephoros). George Basilakes was protopodros in 1094/5; he or his homonym participated in a plot against Alexios I. The will of Kale (Maria) Basilakina, produced between 1098 and 1113 (G. Litavrin, Starinar n.s. 20 [1970] 185–90; ViOč 2 [1971] 164–68), provides some data concerning the family’s affiliations and estates: they intermarried with the Dabatenoi and Pakouri­anoi and had high titles, including that of kouro­palates; Kale-Maria owned the village of Radolios granted her by Alexios I. By the mid-12th C. the position of the Basilakes family declined and they entered civil service. Constantine was envoy and treasurer “of foreign expenses” (ton ep’allo-


BASILEOPATOR

BASILEOPATOR (βασιλ(ε)οπάτωρ, lit. the "emperor’s father"), the office of protector or tutor of a young emperor. According to the Kletorologia of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 101.1–2), this office was created by Leo VI and occupied the highest rung on the ladder of offices; Philotheos listed it among the "special" axiai (ibid. 109.1–2). The title was invented in the late 9th C. for Stylianos Zaoutzes, the father of Zoe, second wife of Leo VI; a few years later Romanos Lekapenos was granted the same title (Aik. Christophopolou, Symmeikta 2 [1970] 60) before he became caesar. According to Liutprand of Cremona, Leo Phokas ardently desired to become pater vasillaeos. There is no evidence that the title was in use after the 10th C. It was employed without a technical meaning in some texts anterior to the 9th C. and by some 10th-C. authors referring to the earlier period; thus, Symeon Metaphrastes, in the Life of Arsenios (died ca. 445), said that the saint was the tutor of the emperor’s
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BASILEOPATOR—Regel, Fontes 2:235, 21; both warrior and intellectual, he perished in the war against the Sicilian Normans. Other known members of the family were insignificant provincial officials: John was nephew of John Tzetzes, Michael acted as logaristes in the Miletos region in the early 13th C.; Basilakes, nomikos (?) in Mistra ca. 1296, was a scribe and poet.

Lit. Kazhdan, Arm. 103–06; PLP, nos. 2967–68. —A.K.

BASILAKES, NIKEPHOROS, theologian and writer; born ca. 1115, died after 1182 (cf. A. Garzya, BZ 64 [1971] 301f). Born to a noble family (that was, however, losing its preeminent position), Basilakes served as imperial notary and then as didaskalos of the Apostle at Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (ca. 1140). According to his own testimony, he was very popular because he introduced new techniques of teaching. He belonged to the circle of John II and delivered panegyrics of both the emperor and his supporters, such as John Axouch and John Komnenos, archbishop of Bulgaria. Involved in a dogmatic dispute begun by Soterichos Panteugenos, Basilakes was condemned in 1156/7 and exiled to Philippiopolis (P. Wirth, ByzF 1 [1966] 389–92). His subsequent career is unknown, although some letters from this period survive. He probably dedicated his time to writing; ca. 1160 he produced a collection of his works with an introduction, in which he described his education, teaching, and literary activity, mentioning among other works four comedies or satires now lost. Basilakes produced both Progymnasmata and panegyrics and monodies, dedicated to his contemporaries (e.g., the monody on his brother Constantine). Conventional in style, these works abound in antique imagery. A unique speech of indictment against a certain Bagoas presents the biography of an average man, son of a fisherman from Constantinople and a Scythian (Cuman?) woman from Cimmerian Bosporos. Bagoas, who was a catamite according to Basilakes, received a good education, pretended to be pious, and with the help of some monks wormed his way into the Palace. He also committed a sacrilege by inciting a certain Hierotheos to smear honey on icons in a church.


BASIL ELACHISTOS ("the least"), archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (mid-10th C.); according to R. Cantarella (BZ 25 [1925] 293), he was born in Seleukeia. Basil wrote a commentary on the speeches of Gregory of Nazianzos, dedicating the work to Constantine VII. In the text he calls fortunate those cities which have philosophers as emperors (p. 6.3–4); in his commentary on the epitaph of Basil the Great (p. 25.3–18), the hero’s upbringing is strikingly like that of Basil I in the biography written by Constantine VII. Basil’s commentary encompasses ancient mythology and philosophy (e.g., refutation of Democritus’s concept of the existence of manifold worlds), rhetoric, painting, and sculpture; references to contemporary events are rare. J. Sajdak (Historia critica scholiastarum et commentatorum Gregorii Nazianzeni [Krakow 1914] 59–61) wrongly identified Basil with St. Basil the Younger.

Lit. Beck, Kirche 597. —A.K.
sons and was called *basileopator*. L. Rydén (*AB* 100 [1982] 494f) finds a reflection of this title also in the revised version of the vita of Philaretos the Merciful. After 1259, Michael VIII’s supporters tried to reintroduce the *basileopatoria* (Pachym., ed. Failsier, 1:105.13–16), which they found appropriate for the regent of the young emperor, John IV Laskaris.


**BASILEUS** (*βασιλεύς*), the main title of the Byz. emperor. Roman antiroyalism had camouflage[d] imperial monarchy behind the titles of *imperator-, autokrator* and *augustus*. In the Greek East’s literature and everyday speech, however, the Hellenistic royal title *basileus* (king) predominated for the emperors by the time of Constantine I (A. Wifstrand in *Dragna Martino P. Nilsson a.d. IV Id.* *Itul MCMXXXIX dedicatum* [Lund-Leipzig 1939] 529–39) and prevailed outside of 4th–6th-c. official documents. The emergence of barbarian kingdoms in the West imposed a distinction between universal monarchy—official documents in Constantinople seem to have used the term *basileus* for only the Persian shah—and these lesser rulers, whose Latin title *rex* was transliterated into Greek, while *basileus* increasingly was understood as "emperor" in unofficial usage. Common parlance, biblical example, and Hellenistic theories of kingship probably combined with Persia’s final collapse to encourage Herakleios to replace the traditional title *autokrator* with *pistos en Christo basileus* in an edict issued in 629, which symbolized the empire’s progressive hellenization (cf. I. Shahid, *Byzantion* 51 [1981] 288–96). A century later, the title began to appear on silver coins of Leo III and on gold coinage under Constantine VI.

The additional qualifier “of the Romans” (*basileus Rhomaion*) also goes far back in popular usage, but first appears on imperial seals in 654–68 (Zacos, *Seals* 1:19, no.18) and, for example, on Constantine IV’s subscription to the Third Council of Constantinople (680). An imperial document’s *institutio* uses it in connection with the Second Council of Nicaea (24 Sept. 787; *Reg* 1, no.346), but the combination first gained wide publicity on miliaria of Emp. Michael I Rangabe, in obvious response to Charlemagne’s imperial dignity (*DOC* 3.1:178). This Byz. assertion of Roman legitimacy sparked numerous disputes in diplomacy with Western rulers; the qualifier became the rule in chrysobulls and diplomatic letters down to 1453 (Döger, *Diplomatik* 141–48), but disappeared from coinage after Nikephoros III Botaneiates, except for a brief reappearance under the Palaiologoi (V. Laurent, *Cronica numismatica et archeologica* 15 [1940] 198–217). From the 9th c. onward, *megas basileus* is sometimes equivalent to the contemporary meaning of *autokrator*.

**Use for Foreign Rulers.** The applicability of the term *basileus* to foreign rulers started to cause problems for Byz. when its Christian neighbors began to challenge the Greek monopoly on the imperial status. As for the German emperor, the Byz. accorded him the title *basileus* of the Franks (but not *Rhomaioi*, Romans); a greater threat was the claim of the Bulgarian ruler to the title “*basileus* of the Rhomaioi and Bulgarians.” By the end of the 12th c. the nonofficial usage of the term *basileus* for foreigners became common: Niketas Choniates calls Roger of Sicily, Frederick Barbarossa, and Henry VII *basileus*; for George Akropolites, Kalojan was *basileus* of the Bulgarians; the Latin emperors of Constantinople and the Greek rulers of Trebizond were officially titled *basileis*. In the 14th c. the Serbian king assumed the title “*basileus* of the Rhomaioi and Serbs” in his official Greek documents. From the 13th c. onward, some authors used the title as a designation of some non-Christian Eastern rulers, for example, Timur, “*basileus* of Scythians and Massagetes” (*Sphr*. 204.24), or *megas basileus* Mehmed II (*Kritob*. 13.19), while other authors, like Doukas, avoided this title and gave to Eastern rulers the name of *tyrannoi*, *hegomenoi*, or *archegoi* (S.K. Krasavina, *VizVrem* 34 [1973] 102).


**BASILICA** (*βασιλική*), a type of church building. In Roman architecture, a basilica was a hall or building used for large assemblies and serving as a market, law court, or palace audience hall. The term is used by Eusebius of Caesarea to denote a church; thereafter, in Byz. Greek, it generally refers only to profane structures, with rare exceptions (cf. D. Feissel, *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de Macédoine du IIIe au VIe siècle* [Paris 1983])
Most commonly, the basilican church is characterized by an oblong plan consisting of a nave (NAOS) usually with two or more aisles and terminating in an APSE or tribunal. Generally, basilicas were covered with wooden trussed roofs and illuminated by clerestory windows. As a church type, the basilica displayed many regional variations with respect to proportions, number of aisles, and presence of a NARTHEX (or vestibule), ATRIUM, transept, GALLERIES, PASTORPHIA, etc. Typically, the nave was used for processions by the clergy, with lay persons occupying the aisles and galleries, if the latter existed. The basilica served as the standard church type until the 6th C. By this time, a variant employing vaulting throughout the building had come into being in areas such as Cyprus (A.H.S. Megaw, JHS 66 [1946] 48–56). A related development was the basilica with a dome or a tower over the nave. Although not as common after the 6th C., basilicas continued to be built. Beginning in the 9th C., a major revival of the basilica occurred, represented in Greece and the Balkans at Pliska and the Anargyroi at Kastoria as well as in Asia Minor (Hagia Sophia at Nicaea), though apparently not in Constantinople. Small-scale basilicas, however, constitute the most common church type until the 15th C. (For ground plan, see illustration in CHURCH PLAN TYPES.)


BASILICA DISCOPERTA, or "hypaethral basilica," a type of basilica in which the aisles and apse are roofed but the nave left open to the sky. The existence of this type is based on tenuous evidence. Only two ruined buildings—at Marusinac near Salona (426) and at Pécs—and a confused description by the PIACENZA PILGRIM of a monument in Hebron, "a basilica built with a quadrirporticus, with the middle atrium uncovered," suggest the type. The interpretation of the buildings at Salona and Pécs is debated, though they appear to have been roofless basilicas or open courtyards with exedrae along one of the short sides. E. Dyggve (ZKIRCH 59 [1940] 103–13) argued that this type represented the link between the classical heroon and the Christian MARTYRION, and that the type was also adopted for use in Late Antique PALACES (IDEM, Ravennatum Palatium Sacrum [Copenhagen 1941] 30f). Both theories have been largely discounted.


BASILICA (τὰ Βασιλικα, "the imperial [laws]"), or the Basilics, the term used from the 11th C. onward to designate an extensive collection of laws divided into six volumes or 60 books, begun under Emp. Basil I and completed in the first years of the reign of Leo VI (probably Christmas 888, A. Schminck, SubGr 3 [1989] 90–93). According to the preface composed by Leo, the work was to be a clearly arranged compilation of the legal material contained in the Corpus Juris Civilis, eliminating everything superfluous. The collection is based on all four parts of the Justinianic corpus, though there is little from the Institutes. The Latin texts, esp. those of the Digest and the Codex Justinianus, are presented in Greek translations (mainly of the 6th C.). The books are subdivided into titles, which are arranged according to subject and are always structured so that pertinent chapters from the Digest precede those from the Codex, which in turn precede those from the Novels. Many books of the Basilica have been handed down in only one MS; others can be reconstructed only partially through the indirect evidence provided esp. by the Epanagoge Aucta, the Synopsis Basilicorum, the Peira, the Tipoukeitos, and the commentary of Balsamon. Presumably in the middle of the 11th C. a catena commentary was appended to the work, composed mainly of excerpts from the writings of the 6th-C. Antecessores (the so-called "old scholia"); compared with these, the "newer scholia" (from the 11th and 12th C.) are fewer in number. –A.S.

The Basilika as a Source. The Basilika was considered the official collection of actual law, and the Book of the Eparch (1.2) prescribes that a notary be thoroughly familiar with the "60 books of the Basilika." The Basilika contains some precepts, however, esp. in the sphere of administrative and social regulations, that were definitely obsolete by
the 9th C., and its terminology is sometimes out of date and misleading (A. Kazhdan, *JOB* 39 [1989] 7–10). Some jurists, for example, the author of the *Meditatio de nudis pactis*, argued for the higher merit of Justinianic law over the *Basilika*.

—A.K.

**BASILIKE** (Βασιλική), a public building in Constantinople, located on the Mese, not far from the Milion. It formed a vast square courtyard, surrounded by colonnades inside and porticoes outside. Its relationship with the TETRASTOON is unclear. In the centuries immediately following the foundation of Constantinople it served as a legal and cultural center of the city: rhetoricians and lawyers assembled there, and in the 5th C. it housed the university and a library. A law of Theodosios II of 440 prohibited the establishment of shops and boutiques in the Basilike, bringing in horses, or celebrating marriages there. The building was burned down in 476 but immediately restored. Justinian I constructed a cistern nearby, probably the one now called Yerebatansaray (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF). Justin II placed in the Basilike a HORIZON (perhaps a sundial). After the 6th C. the Basilike lost its position as an intellectual center and was considered primarily as a repository of old statues, including those of the emperors Herakleios and Justinian II. In such a connection “the golden-roofed Basilike” is cited several times in the *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*. After the 10th C. it is no longer mentioned.


—A.K.

**BASILIKON** (βασιλικόν), a small silver coin weighing 2.2 g introduced by Andronikos II shortly before 1304 and modeled in weight, fineness, and general appearance on the Venetian grosso or silver ducat. Both coins have on one side a seated figure of Christ, and on the other two standing figures, but on the Byz. coins these are Andronikos II and Michael IX instead of St. Mark and the doge. By analogy with its prototype of the ducy (*ducatus*) of Venice, it was called a basilikon (from *basileus*), but Byz. sources of the early 14th C. often made no distinction between the two and called both doukatoi. The basilikon was worth 1/12th of a hyperpyron, so that it corresponded to the old milliareion, which had become no more than a money of account as two keratia. The value of the actual coins, however, fluctuated with the price of silver and was usually less, as
ratios of between 12.5 and 15 to the hyperpyron were common. Half basilika were also minted. The introduction of the basilikon marked a revival in the empire of the large-scale use of silver for coinage, but in the 1330s and 1340s its weight was reduced in response to a general silver shortage that affected Western Europe and the Mediterranean world. In the 1340s the basilikon weighed no more than 1.25 g and after the 1350s it ceased to be struck.


---

BASILIKOS LOGOS (βασιλικός λόγος), a variety of enkomion addressed to an emperor on some notable occasion. Menander Rhetor (pp.76–94) set out the form and the sentiments considered appropriate; the major points were the emperor's origin, physical appearance (esp. his handsomeness), upbringing, habits, deeds in peace and war, four virtues (courage, righteousness, prudence or moderation, and good sense), philanthropy, and good fortune (tyche). The term is rare: Michael Italikos devoted basilikoi logos to both John II and Manuel I, but the regular title of an imperial enkomion was logos eis ton autokrаторα, "speech to the emperor"; such an enkomion was delivered on special occasions and regularly on the feast of Epiphany. Eusebios of Caesarea, in his panegyric of Constantine I, established the principle of encomiastic oratory as depicting the ideal emperor rather than giving a factual account.

Hunger (Lit. 1:157) distinguishes between a conventional panegyric-enkomion and a more individualized Mirror of Princes. The structure of the basilikos logos varied: Italikos's panegyric of Manuel I contains many conventional elements (origin, prophecy, portrait), whereas his enkomion of John II is primarily historical. The Byz. basilikos logos became "Christian" with an emphasis on piety, and the concept of tyche disappeared. As a specific kind of basilikos logos, Menander (p.180) distinguished the presbeutikos, a speech to the emperor on behalf of a city in difficulty. In Byz. this subgenre disappeared, and the term presbeutikos designated the report of an ambassador (e.g., Theodore Metochites) on his mission.


---

BASILISKOS (Βασιλισκός), more fully Flavius Basiliskos, usurper (Jan. 475–summer 476); died Limnae in Cappadocia after Aug. 476. Brother of the empress Verina. Basiliskos was consul in 465 and magister militum from 468. His expedition against the Vandal king Gaiseric in 468 ended in disaster, but Verina saved him from punishment. He helped to overthrow Aspar for which he received the title of first senator in 474. When Leo I and soon after him Leo II died, the anti-Isaurian faction in Constantinople urged Emp. Zeno to flee. Basiliskos was acclaimed Augustus. Basiliskos wanted to gain the support of the Monophysites. He published an edict (enkykliion) abolishing the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon. This policy met with broad resistance from the people of Constantinople, led by Patr. Akakios and Daniel the Stylite. An enormous fire in the capital, which destroyed many books and works of art, was interpreted as a sign of divine wrath against Basiliskos. The army commanders, such as Basiliskos's former allies Illos and Armatus, joined Zeno who returned to the capital welcomed by the faction of the Greens. Basiliskos sought asylum in a church. He was promised that he would not be executed, was exiled with his wife and child, and was starved to death. Zeno crowned the son of Armatius, also named Basiliskos, as Caesar and heir to the throne, but soon thereafter executed Armatus and enrolled the younger Basiliskos among the clergy; the latter probably lived until the reign of Justinian I.


---

BASILIUS PICTOR, mosaicist whose name is given in both Latin and Syriac at the bottom of a frieze of angels set up ca.1169 in the Church of the Nativity, Bethlehem, where Ephraim also worked. Kühnel (infra) suggested that an abbreviation in the Syriac inscription yields the toponym Moschem and that this northern Syrian village was the painter's place of origin. There is no necessary reason to connect Basilius with the inscription Basil[ius] me fecit in the Melisende Psalter (see Crusader Art and Architecture) said to have been made in Jerusalem.
BASIL OF ANKYRA, bishop (336–43, 350–60); died Illyria ca.364. An erudite and eloquent former physician, Basil was appointed in 336 to replace Markellos as bishop of Ankyra by the synod of Constantinople. He was deposed in 343, restored after 350, and finally deposed in 360 and exiled to Illyria. As a moderate Arian, he was caught between the Scylla of his own extremists and the Charybdis of Orthodox opposition. Athanasios of Alexandria (De synodis 41) confirms his role as leader of the Homoiousians. He played a prominent role in the arianizing synods of Sirmium (351), Ankyra (358), and Seleukeia (359). Eiphanius of Salamis preserves (Panarion 73.12–22) a Trinitarian treatise (Hypomnematismos), which Basil co-authored with George of Laodikea. Many scholars ascribe to Basil the essay On Virginity that is included among the spuri of Basil the Great (F. Cavallera, RHE 6 [1905] 5–14). Other works such as a polemic called Against Markellos mentioned by Jerome are lost.


BASIL OF IALIMBANA. See George of Cyprus.

BASIL OF OHRID, metropolitan of Thessaloniki, rhetorician; died ca.1169. In 1154 Basil had a debate with Anselm of Havelberg, yielding on many points. Pope Adrian IV (1154–59) sent Basil a letter asking for help in bringing about the Union of the Churches. Basil participated in the council at Constantinople in 1157 against Soterichos Panteugenos (see under Constantine, Councils of). In 1160 Basil delivered a funeral oration on Bertha of Sulzbach, wife of Manuel I, with conventional praise of both the emperor and the late empress. Basil corresponded with Tzetzes.


BASIL THE BOGOMIL, leader of the Bogomils of Constantinople; died Constantinople ca.1111. Nearly all we know about him comes from Anna Komnene (An.Komn. 3:218–28), who describes his arrest, trial, and execution. A monk and a doctor, he appears to have become a teacher in the Bogomil sect ca.1070. According to Anna, he was tall, clean-shaven with a withered countenance, and went about with 12 disciples whom he called apostles. One of them betrayed him under torture. Emp. Alexios I invited Basil to the palace and persuaded him to expound his teaching; if Anna can be believed, her father then dramatically drew back a curtain, revealing a secretary who had secretly written down Basil’s confession. Verbal persuasion having failed, and on the advice of Patr. Nicholas III Grammatikos and the synod, the emperor ordered Basil to be publicly burned in the Hippodrome. Anna’s account of the execution is uncommonly vivid. Her horror at Basil’s beliefs cannot wholly conceal a grudging admiration for “an inflexible and very brave Bogomil.” About these beliefs she says very little, referring the reader to the relevant section of the Panoplia dogmatike of Euthymios Zigenbos, who presumably used Basil’s palace confession as his main source.


BASIL THE COPPER HAND, leader of an uprising against Romanos I; born in Macedonia, died Constantinople ca.932. According to the chronicle of Symeon Logothete (TheophCont 912.6–7), Basil was an impostor who falsely assumed the name of Constantine Doukas (killed in 913) and collected a following of “many people.” Arrested by Elephantinos, tourmarches of Opsikion, he was brought to Constantinople and condemned by the eparch of the city to have his hand cut off. Basil returned to Opsikion and had manufactured for himself a copper hand holding an enormous sword. He then gathered a “crowd
of the poor" and started "the great rebellion" against the empire. The rebels seized the stronghold of Plateia Petra, where various kinds of victuals were collected and, according to Symeon Logothete, looted at random. Defeated by imperial troops, Basil was transferred to Constantinople, where he accused many magnates of involvement in his rebellion. After an investigation proved his charges false, he was burned at the stake on the Forum Amastrianum.

The major problem concerning Basil's revolt is whether it can be considered a popular uprising; besides the direct evidence of Symeon Logothete, this hypothesis finds support in Constantine Doukas's popularity among the common people. The chronology of the revolt (before Theophylaktos was elected patriarch) suggests dating the event between the famine of 928 and Romanos's novel of 934 and treating it hypothetically as a reflection of peasants' wrath and an incentive for the emperor's agrarian legislation.

Lit. A. Kazhdan, "'Velikoe vosstanie' Vasilija Mednoj Ruki," VizVrem n.s. 4 (1951) 73–83, with criticism by H. Grégoire, Byzantion 21 (1951) 500–02. – A.K.

BASIL THE GREAT, bishop of Caesarea (from 370/1), writer and saint; born Caesarea in Cappadocia ca.329, died probably in Caesarea 1 Jan. 379; feastdays 1 and 2 Jan. His two brothers, Gregory of Nyssa and Peter of Sebaste, also became bishops, while his sister, St. Makrina the Younger, was a model ascetic. Education in Constantinople and Athens grounded Basil in both Christian and classical culture. During the course of his studies he met Gregory of Nazianzos, who became his lifelong friend; his student friendship with the future emperor Julian, however, was doomed by circumstances. He soon abandoned rhetoric, an early interest, for the monastic life. After travels to monasteries in Egypt and Syria, he settled near Neokaisarea in Asia Minor.

As one of the Cappadocian Fathers, Basil contributed much to the development of the concept of the Trinity as based on the principle of homousios. In so doing he became involved in political and ideological struggles, esp. in combating Eunomios. Basil encouraged an active economic, social, and cultural role for monks; he preferred the koinobion to the eremitic life and viewed the monastery as a community of brethren who had to live and work together. Basil wrote sets of Rules for monks and nuns that are preserved in a short and a long version; they greatly influenced the development of monasticism both in Byz. and outside the empire and are characterized by a tone of moderation and common sense. Of his homilies, those on the Hexaëmeron are most noteworthy for their content and style.

The letters of Basil furnish much geographical and secular information about the Roman Empire in the 4th C. A work of special interest and importance is the essay (written for his nephews) on deriving Christian benefit from pagan literature. Basil argues that pagan works, both prose and poetry, should be read eclectically, not uniformly censored or condemned; classical literature can be morally beneficial to Christians and, since pagan morality sometimes approaches Christian ethics, may serve as a propaedeutic to the true faith. Of the many authors cited, Homer and Plato (not surprisingly) stand out. His authorship of the Liturgy ascribed to him is questionable, even though attested as early as the 6th C.

Representation in Art. Basil, as a purported author of a liturgy, is regularly depicted at the head of one line of the procession of bishops adorning a church apse; John Chrysostom leads the other. Basil has a distinctive pointed black beard and narrow face, evident already on a Sinai icon of about the 7th C. (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, no.B.24). Episodes from his vita by pseudo-Amphlochos of Ikonion were illustrated as early as the 9th–10th C. in churches in Rome (J. Lafontaine, Peintures médiévales dans le temple dit de la Fortune Virile à Rome [Brussels-Rome 1959] 77f), while the 9th-C. Paris Gregory MS contains a variety of scenes relating to the saint in conjunction with Gregory's Homily 43 on Basil (fol.104r). Some of these scenes recur in 11th-C. MSS of the homilies as well (Galavaris, Liturgical Homilies 46–52). Among the frescoes in the Church of Hagia Sophia in Ohrid is one showing the saint first performing the liturgy (R. Hamann-MacLean, H. Hallensleben, Die Monumentalmalerie in Serbien und Makedonien, vol. 1 [Giessen 1963] fig.25); this theme also appears at the beginning of those liturgical rolls that contain the text of the liturgy of Basil. Narrative compositions from later periods are rare,
though there is a vita icon of Basil of the 13th C., now in the De Menil collection, Houston (Splendeur de Byz. 36, I.c.2).


-B.B., A.K., N.P.S.

BASIL THE NOTHOS (“bastard”), parakoimomenos; born ca.925, died after 985. The son of Romanos I by a bondwoman of “Scythian” (Slav?) origin, Basil was a eunuch from his boyhood. In 944—47 he was megas baioulous. Basil supported Constantine VII against Romanos I’s sons Stephen and Constantine and was rewarded with the titles of patrikios and parakoimomenos. In 958 he participated in the campaign of John I Tzimiskes against Sayf al-Dawla and was granted a triumphal procession at the Hippodrome (TheophCont 462.4). Romanos II pushed Basil into the background and replaced him with Joseph Bringas, thus inciting Basil’s hatred of Bringas; siding with Nikephoros II Phokas in his struggle against Bringas, Basil received from Nikephoros the highest title of proedros. Basil’s alliance with Nikephoros was brief: he joined Tzimiskes against Nikephoros, but again changed sides; he reportedly poisoned Tzimiskes (Skyl. 312.15—20). Basil administered the empire while Basil II was a child and used his power to accumulate enormous wealth. In 985, however, Basil II dispensed with his tutelage, exiled him to the shores of the Bosporos, and confiscated his property. In his Novel of 996 Emp. Basil annulled all the ordinances promulgated by Basil the Nothos.

Basil was one of the most lavish Byz. art patrons. Psellus (Chron. 1:13.11—22) comments on Basil’s concern for the monastery of St. Basil that he built in Constantinople. To this or some other house, he presented two reliquaries of a Symeon the Stylist, including one that allegedly contained the saint’s skull and is now at Camaldoli di Arezzo. The Treasury of St. Mark’s in Venice contains a splendid yellow jasper paten and chalice, the latter inscribed with the supplication of “Basil, proedros and parakoimomenos,” and thus datable after 963 (H. Belting, CorriRav 29 [1982] 52—57). The well-known enamel cross-reliquary now at Limburg—der-Lahn was commissioned by Basil in 964/5. He also ordered three very large books written on parchment of high quality: a collection of Taktika, including his own work on naval battles (Milan, Ambros. B 119 Sup.); a copy of the homilies of John Chrysostom (Athos, Dion. 70) dated to 955; and a Gospel book with the Pauline epistles in Leningrad (Publ. Lib. gr. 55).


-B.B., A.K., N.P.S.

BASIL THE YOUNGER, saint; died in Constantinople 26 Mar. 944 (less probably 952). His origins and early career are unknown. According to his vita he was brought by imperial officials from Asia Minor to Constantinople, where he was interrogated by Samonas, flogged, and thrown into the sea, but miraculously saved by dolphins. Angelide (infra) dates Basil’s arrival in Constantinople in 896, but the chronology of the vita is not reliable. Basil did not belong to any monastic community but lived in private homes (first with a certain John and his wife Helene, thereafter in the houses of the primikieros Constantine and of the Gongylas brothers), preaching morality and performing miracles.

Basil’s vita was written by his contemporary, the layman Gregory, a disciple of the eunuch Epiphanios; Gregory was a modest landowner possessing a proasteion near Rhaidentos. Although Gregory depicts some ordinary people, he focuses on Emp. Romanos I, his family, and courtiers such as Romanos Sarone and the patrikiaste Anastasia. The hagiographer describes important political events: the revolt of Constantine Doukas in 913, the death of Christopher Lekapenos, the Rus’ attack of 941, the fall of Romanos I. While some of these episodes took place outside, most of the action occurred indoors (Mango, Byzantium 82). A salient episode of the vita is the vision of the pious Theodora who served Basil for many years: during its journey to heaven Theodora’s soul passed customs houses (teloneia), and there-
BATHS (sing. βαλανείον, λουτρόν) remained an important element of urban culture during the late Roman period, functioning as centers of leisure and social intercourse. In Constantinople the most famous were the Baths of Zeuxippos. The Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae indicates that 5th-C. Constantinople contained as many as nine public and 153 private baths (see also Constantinople, Monuments of). Separate facilities were provided for men and women, and the interiors were sumptuously decorated with marbles and statuary; they were heated by hypocausts. Gregory of Nyssa (PG 46:449C) ridiculed a miserly money-lender in a Cappadocian town who did not go to the public bath because he was reluctant to pay the price of three obols. Even clergy and monks used public baths, which were occasionally decorated with subjects from Christian iconography. The church, however, regarded public baths as centers of immorality, issued regulations prohibiting mixed bathing, and condemned frequent visits to the baths by clergy.

After the 6th C. a profound change occurred: most of the huge public baths fell into disuse either because of the decline in population or simply because they proved too costly to maintain. Some establishments were destroyed, others transformed into churches or army barracks. Some public baths continued to operate in major cities, but the overall attitude of the public toward baths and bathing had gradually changed. Attendance at the baths was no longer a normal part of everyday life but had become a luxury or hygienic necessity. The new attitude toward bathing, shaped by teachings of the church, is reflected in monastic typika; those of the 11th and 12th C., for example, vary as to the frequency of bathing they prescribe: from twice a month to three times a year, with the norm being once a month. Kekaumenos testified without astonishment that the Macedonian town of Servia at the beginning of the 11th C. had only one bath, located outside the city walls. Michael Choniates described a provincial bath as a smoky and drafty hut heated by an open hearth. An extraordinary exception to this trend is the sumptuously decorated bathhouse of Leo VI, which is the subject of an ekphrasis by Leo Chorosphaktes (P. Magdalino, DOP 42 [1988] 97–118).

Baths came to be associated with healing: sick monks or nuns and patients in monastic hospitals were permitted more frequent or even unlimited baths. This connotation entered Christian symbolism so that the church building was sometimes called a spiritual balaneion, and God might be designated balaneus, or bathkeeper (Germanos II, Homily 2, ed. S. Lagopates, 225.7–11).

Relatively few baths of post-6th-C. date have been uncovered by archaeological excavations, for example, at Sparta (Ch. Bouras, ArchEph 121 [1982] 99–112) and Trikkala (A. Tziaphalas, ArchDelt 31.2.1 [1976] 178–81). The evidence suggests that they continued the Roman principles of planning and construction, generally being divided into a series of vaulted or domed rooms for dressing, exercise, and cold, warm, or hot bathing. Monastic baths, which constitute a distinctive and important category, continued to be built throughout the Byz. era (Orlandos, Monast. Arch. 95–108).
BATOPEDI. See VATOPEDI MONASTERY.

**Battle Standard and Flag** (σημεῖον, βάσιν, φλάμμου). Battle standards such as the Roman eagle or dragon were used by late Roman infantry units until the 6th C., while cavalry units were identified by the vexillum, a square banner on a pole. The raising of the standards was the traditional signal to begin battle, and since they often served as rallying points, the rank of standard-bearer (bandophoros) was assigned to an exceptionally brave soldier (Prokopios, Wars 4.10.4). Armies of the 9th and 10th C. carried standards bearing relics or icons (McCormick, *Eternal Victory* 247f), and banners suspended from a cross are also mentioned (Vasiliev, *Byz. Arabes* 2.2:59). The labarum, the cross itself, and cross-like standards were used from Constantine I onward, esp. by Iconoclastic emperors, and later by Nikephoros II Phokas (Leo Diac. 8.5–7). Regimenal standards were commonly used in imperial ceremonies and processions (Haldon, *Praetorians* 287f) and the imperial units or tagmata kept their ceremonial standards (psychia, kippetra) both in the Churches of St. Stephen of Daphne, and in the Church of the Lord (De cer. 640.16–641.5).

Battle flags (banda) in the shape of a square field (kephale) with trailing streamers (phlammula, from Lat. flammulae, "small flames") appeared as early as the 6th C. and were used for signalling and identification. The *Strategikon of Maurice* (Strat. Maurik. 1.2, p.82.75–80) notes that each unit (meros) had a flag whose field was of one color with variously colored streamers attached to identify the division (moira). The *Strategikon* warns that too many flags might be a hindrance and source of confusion in battle (2.10). The units of the baggage train (touldos) were also designated by separate flags (1.9, p.102.9–12). The 10th-C. *Praecepta militaria* (Praecepta Milit. 14.27–34) records that separate flags identified each 50-man cavalry unit (bandos) and its spare horses in battle; flags were also used to mark the places of each unit when preparing the camp (18.30–33). Battle flags are often depicted in illustrations (S. Dufrenne,

_Byzantium* 43 [1978] 51–60), and the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes offers a rich repertoire of standards and flags without, however, assigning them to specific nations. Under Michael II (Grabar-Manoussas, *Skylitzes*, no.60, fig.18), for instance, both Byz. and Arab armies carried dragon streamers. Wall paintings in Cappadocia depict several types of standard featuring the cross (D. Wood, *Archaeology* 12 [1959] 38–46).

Flags for signaling and identification were also important in naval warfare. A special dark-colored banner (kamelliaukion) was hoisted on the flagship as the signal to begin battle (TAKTIKA OF LEO VI 19.41).

_B. A. C._

.BADWIT, village in Upper Egypt, site of the monastery of Apa Apollo, probably founded in the late 4th C. The two churches (north and south) are both of basilican plan and are richly outfitted with columns, pilasters, and various carved friezes, most being spolia of the 4th–6th C. There are several monastic complexes; some contain small chapels, as well as large transverse halls, probably prayer-halls, which are furnished with painted niches. The niche in hall no.6 of the northernmost complex represents the Virgin Mary flanked by Apostles. Some complexes have kitchens. The large complex (1–XV) southwest of the two churches probably housed the monks. There are also several tombs nearby.

_Bawit's_ history resembles that of the monastery of Apa Jeremias at SAQQARA. The two churches of Bawit evolved from structures which were not originally ecclesiastical in purpose. The surviving wall paintings, though simple and provincial in character, use Byz. themes of decoration (e.g., MAJESTAS DOMINI, Virgin "Galaktotrophousa" [see VIRGIN MARY: Types of the Virgin Mary]). The monastic community continued to flourish in the 9th C., as seen from papyri.

_B. A. C._


-A.K., A.K., R.B.
BAZEFID I (Παϊαζίτης and similar forms), Ot-
oman sultan (1389–1402); born 1354, died Ak-
şehir 8 Mar. 1403. The successor of Murad I, he
was the first of the sultans to attempt the conquest
of Constantinople. From 1389 to 1394 Bayezid
maintained his authority over the Palaiologoi
through established tributary alliances and by ma-
ipulating their dynastic struggles to his advan-
tage. As of 1389, his key Palaiologan vassals were
John V and Manuel II in Constantinople, Theo-
dore I in Mistra, and John VII in Selymbria. It
is unlikely that Manuel and John VII partici-
pated in his first Anatolian campaign, which included
the conquest of PHILADELPHIA (1389–90). Early
in 1390, however, Bayezid probably sanctioned
John VII’s plans for a coup in Constantinople. By
March 1390 John was besieging the city with
Turkish troops. Although John VII seized Con-
stantinople (15–14 Apr.), afterward he made no
major concessions to Bayezid, who was then cam-
paigning in KARAMAN. Following Manuel’s recov­
ery for Constantinople for John V and himself (17
Sept. 1390), John VII took refuge with Bayezid,
then returned to Selymbria and remained the sultan’s loyal vassal until 1399. Likewise, John V
dispatched Manuel to Bursa (see PROUSA) to re-
affirm their tributary alliance with Bayezid, at
which time Bayezid pressured John V to disman-
tle recently built fortifications outside the GOLDEN
GATE in Constantinople. When John V died (16
Feb. 1391) Manuel returned to Constantinople
and established his rule—doubtless with Bayezid’s
consent. Bayezid then summoned Manuel and
John VII to join his campaign against Suleyman
Pasha of Kastamonu (see KASTAMON) and Kadi
Ahmed Bürhaneddin of Sivas (June–Dec. 1391).
In spring 1392, Bayezid appointed Manuel to pre-
pare a naval expedition to Sinope, but then
aborted the enterprise.
Bayezid’s rapport with Manuel and Theodore
deteriorated in 1393. Manuel’s efforts to achieve
reconciliation with John VII were betrayed by the
latter himself to Bayezid, and Theodore’s seizure
of Monemvasia from Paul Mamonas (another of
Bayezid’s dependents) also angered the sultan.
Late in 1393 or early in 1394 Bayezid summoned
Manuel, Theodore, John VII, and other vassals
to his court at Serres. Amid acrimonious confron-
tations, Bayezid allegedly resolved at one point to
execute Manuel and additionally pressured Theo-
dore to surrender control of Monemvasia and
Argos. Shortly thereafter both Manuel and Theo-
dore renounced their pacts with Bayezid, and he
assaulted them as rebels. By summer 1394 Baye-
zd had begun the siege of Constantinople, which
lasted eight years. Meanwhile, devastating raids
were launched into the Morea in late 1394 or
1395, and again in 1397. In 1399 John VII was
reconciled with Manuel and governed Constanti-
ople during Manuel’s journey to the West. By
1401 the morale of the citizens was low, and John
VII was negotiating with Bayezid for surrender.
The city was saved, however, when Timur de-
feated and captured Bayezid at Ankara (see An-
kara, BATTLE OF) on 28 July 1402. Eight months
later, Bayezid purportedly committed suicide, still
a captive of Timur.

Many Byz. perceived Bayezid archtypically as
a neo-Pharaoh or Sennacherib, whose blasphemo-
ous attack on the people of God and their holy
city inevitably evoked God’s saving wrath. In this
vein, Bayezid’s epithet yıldırım (“lightning bolt”)
was usually interpreted as an allusion to all-
consuming violence and destruction, and not
merely acarly or impetuous daring.

19. Schreiner, Kleinchroniken 2:339–70. E. Zachariadou,
“Manuel II Palaeologos on the Strife Between Bayezid I
81.

BEACON (φαυός). In the 9th C., Byz. created a
series of beacons across Asia Minor to give ad-
ance warning of Arab attack. Signals were flashed
from Loulon north of the CILICIAN GATES, where
the Arabs would be first observed, to Argos on the
Hasan Dağ in Cappadocia, and thence by a
series of unidentified stations to Mokilos above
PYLAI, then to Mt. AUXENTIOS and the imperial
palace, a distance of about 450 miles. The system
was reportedly created by LEO THE MATHEMATI-
cian, who devised a code for the interpretation
of signals, and had two identical water clocks (see
HOROLOGION) made for the terminal stations. His
work took account of the difference in longitude
and of the time the signal needed for transmis-
sion. Modern experiments suggest that one hour
would suffice for the entire distance. The beacons
consisted of huge bonfires on platforms or towers
within fortifications on isolated hills; two have
been identified at Loulon and Argos (TIB 2:135–
37, 223). In the open country of central Anatolia,
BEARD (γένος). In late antiquity the norm for men was to be clean-shaven, and imperial portraits of the 4th–6th C. present predominantly beardless rulers; after that date bearded images on coins came to symbolize imperial power or imperial seniority, although some exceptions can be found, such as Constantine V. On coins, a beard and moustache are often not portrait elements but conventions to distinguish a senior from a junior emperor. Later images of Constantine I, who was historically clean-shaven, show him with a beard, the shape of which was often changed to conform to the type worn by the current emperor. The huge beard of Constans II, added as an afterthought to the dies of his coins, gave rise to his nickname, Pogonatos (P. Grierson, NC 70 [1962] 159f).

The defense of beards originated not only within Christian circles, but also among pagans "philosophers" who saw, as Julian did, in the shaggy beard a symbolic rejection of effeminacy and a return to the classical fashion; Julian's satiric treatise Misopagón is addressed to those who criticized his beard. Beards served in the Byz. view as an indication of manliness, contrasted with beardless eunuchs; the deprivation of one's beard was considered a severe punishment. Monks were normally bearded.

After the schism of 1054 the beard became a symbol of national pride that differentiated Byz. from clean-shaven Latins. The cult of the beard was ridiculed, however, by satirists such as Theodore Prodromos (Boissonade, Anecd. 4:430–35). On the other hand, many 12th-C. authors (esp. Zonaras) relate that youths preferred to shave off their beard, evidently following the Latin style; the same fashion was mentioned by a 14th-C. historian (Greg. 1:396.17). Social prejudices against the beardless are reflected, to some extent, in proverbs and satiric texts, such as Španos. Touching the beard was an important element of body language.


—Ap.K., A.C.

BEASTS OF BURDEN (sing. ὑποζυγίον). To transport loads, the Byz. used animals, since in mountainous areas the cart could not always be employed. Horses were rarely used for transport or cartage; the main pack animals were asses (ονίκη) and mules (χειρινόι). Cattle and esp. donkeys are depicted as beasts of burden in illustrations of Old Testament narratives (Uspenskij, Seral'skij kodeks, nos. 260, 302), while, as in illustrations of Barlaam and Ioasaph, the ass remained the primary form of humble transportation. Camels and their drivers, kamelearioi, are usually mentioned in connection with Syria or Egypt. John VI Kantakouzenos, however, kept a number of camels in Thrace.

It is difficult to calculate the weight of a load; in the vita of Philaretos the Merciful (ed. A. Vasiliev, IRAIK 5 [1900] 724) a hypozugion carried 6 modii of grain. The load was sometimes put (or poured) into ceramic vessels attached on both sides of an animal. The rural population, unless exempt from this fiscal burden, was required to provide so-called parangaria—the duty of supplying military contingents or imperial officials with pack animals.


—J.W.N., A.K., A.C.

BEAUTY (καλλος). Physical beauty was not perceived by Christian apologists as a virtue—our bodies, according to Augustine, are defective, and will be improved by the Creator after our resurrection (V. Byčkov in Eikon und Logos [Halle 1981] 23f); Christ, in his Incarnation, assumed not a handsome body, but a plain and undistinguished one. Emphasis was placed on spiritual beauty, which might be accentuated by external ugliness,
esp. if the body was distorted and mutilated during a martyrdom or in ascetic exercises. Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite developed a hierarchy of beauty: the absolute beauty of God—an efficient and final cause, radiating into the world and attracting everything to itself; the beauty of heavenly beings; and the visible beauty of corporeal objects and beings. This visible beauty was understood as moral goodness rather than external handsomeness.

Beauty was also an aesthetic category. The beauty of nature and that of the Holy Writ, having been created by God, stood on a higher level of aesthetic values than the work of painters and writers (Gregory of Nyssa, PG 44:1197B). Although in theory beauty was linked to simplicity, Byz. ideologists discarded the early apologists' contempt for sumptuous ornamentation of the body and of buildings; external "beauty" came to occupy a significant place in both court ceremonial and liturgy. Ekphræsis praised the visible beauty of churches, icons, palaces, gardens, etc.; female beauty was described in romances and verses, and noted in funeral orations; and preambles to historical works named beauty of speech as one of the highest qualities.


BEBAIAS ELPIDOS NUNNERY, located in Constantinople, dedicated to the Theotokos Bebaia Elpidos ("of sure hope"). It was founded in the 1320s or 1330s by Theodora Synadene, niece of Michael VIII and wife of the megas stratopedarches John Komnenos Doukas Synadenos. When widowed, Theodora Synadene retired to her new foundation, taking the monastic name of Theodoule; her daughter Euphrasone, the "second founder" of the convent, accompanied her. The monastery is known only from its lengthy rule, written by Theodora between 1327 and 1342 and preserved in a deluxe parchment MS (Oxford, Lincoln College gr. 35), known as the "Lincoln College Typikon." It includes ten pages of double portraits, showing the founder's family as married couples in court and/or monastic costume. The sequence closes with images of the Mother of God, inscribed "he bebaia elpis," in the pose of the Virgin Hodegetria, gesturing toward Theodora and

Euphrasone on the facing recto. The final miniature (fol.12r) depicts nuns and novices gathered about their superior.

The convent, in the Heptakalon region, first housed 30 nuns, then 50. It followed the typikon of St. Sabas with regard to liturgy and dietary regulations. The convent possessed considerable property in Constantinople, its environs, and Thrace. It also received valuable donations of money and liturgical objects from relatives and descendants of Theodora who wished to assure their posthumous commemoration at the convent.

BEDE, called “the Venerable,” English Benedictine monk, polymath, historian, and theologian; born near Wearmouth (Northumberland) ca. 672/3, died Jarrow (Durham) 25/6 May 735. The Latin church fathers were major sources for him, but Bede also knew some Greek and possibly some Hebrew. His works on spelling, metrics, and computus, for instance, contain a little Greek (M.C. Boddin in Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture, ed. P.E. Szarmach, V.D. Oginnis [Kalamazoo, Mich., 1986] 55, 62, n.16). W.F. Bolton considered Bede’s use of Greek “passive,” based on earlier writers such as Jerome and Isidore of Seville and on interlinear Greek-Latin texts, but K.M. Lynch (Tradtitio 39 [1983] 432–39) argues that, by the late 720s when Bede wrote his second commentary on Acts, he read biblical Greek. L.T. Martin (American Benedictine Review 35 [1984] 211–16) and A.C. Dionisotti (Revue Bénédiction 92 [1982] 123–29) show that in this work and in On Spelling, respectively, Bede systematically compares variants, both Greek and Latin. Where his Ecclesiastical History of the English People touches on events at Constantinople, he seems generally to draw on preserved sources (e.g., bk. 1, ch. 13 on a 5th-C. famine, plague, and earthquake; bk. 5, ch. 15 on the pilgrim Arculf’s trip to the Levant and Constantinople; see ADOMNAN), but he supplies independent testimony on Theodore of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury, who supported the Lateran Council of 649 and glorified “the Holy Spirit inefably proceeding from the Father and the Son” (bk. 4, ch. 17). Bede’s Anglo-Saxon connections with Rome presumably explain his revision of the Latin translation of the Passion of St. Anastasius (cf. C. Vircillo Franklin and P. Meyvaert, AB 100 [1982] 373–400) as well as the independent testimony on contemporary events in Constantinople supplied in the chronicle appended to his De temporum ratione, such as Justinian II’s career (chs. 567 and 577–78, pp. 529 and 531), Philippikos’s destruction of conciliar images (ch. 581, p. 523), and the Arab siege of Constantinople and attack on the Bulgars in 717–18 (ch. 592, pp. 534f).


BEEKEEPING. See APICULTURE.

BEER. See BEVERAGES.

BEG (mod. Turk. bey), a Turkish title of unknown origin appearing on the oldest monument of the Turkish language, the 8th-C. Orkhon inscriptions, meaning “nobility” and opposed to bodun, i.e., “the mass of the people”; later it acquired the meaning “lord” and was widely used in the Islamic world as the equivalent of the Arabic title ‘amir (see EMIR). The Karakhanids and the founders of the Seljuk dynasty used it. The 14th-C. Turkish emirates or beyliks were ruled by a senior lord known as the  ula (big) beg, whose territory was
divided into provinces governed by members of his family, simple begs. The title was also used in the Ottoman Empire and was introduced into Greek as a loanword (παίκης, πέγη, etc.).


—E.A.Z.

BEH G A R (ἐπαίτης). Assistance to beggars was consistent with Byz. PHILANTHROPY toward the unfortunate. The texts rarely distinguish “professional” beggars from the poor, who are described as ptochoi, penetes, aktemones, or aporoi. Scenes of begging are, however, abundant in the sources: thus, a 14th-C. historian (Greg. 3:225,14–16) describes indigents in the streets who were stretching out their hands to the crowd, pleading for a small coin to buy some bread; Ptochoprodromos tells of a rich woman who fed her husband less well than the beggars who came to her house. Palladios in the Lausiac History (164.7–10) writes of indigent people who lived in the stoa of a church and were in constant search of food; a woman even gave birth to a child in this stoa. The beggars were either naked or wore clothes specific to the beggar’s cloak, himatia epaitika (PG 65:228B). Anna Komnene (An.Komn., bk.12,3; 3:63,19–20) relates that her mother Irene distributed money among epaitai, who were either naked or sisyrophoroii, clad in goat-hair cloaks. Some beggars are described as insolent: when one of them was given a loaf of bread, he demanded a cloak instead (Moschos, PG 87:2860A). The Homeric Iros (Odyssey, bk.18) was for the Byz. an archetypal image of the insolent beggar. The vita of Andrew the Fool (PG 111:708C) speaks of the “poor robbers” who stole Andrew’s cloak; the hagiographer comments that citizens called them “children of the archierewa,” a term probably indicating an institutionalized organization of Constantinopolitan beggars. It is not clear whether “the poor brethren in Christ” who were fed at the ptochotropheion of Attaleiates (Typikon, ed. Gautier, 47:495–501) and the poor people who were annually chosen to have their feet washed by the emperor (Treibinger, Kaiseridee 126f) were genuine beggars or poor people able to sustain themselves. The government tried to restrict the number of beggars in Constantinople by prescribing that the quaestor employ able-bodied beggars or expel them from the city.

LIT. Constantelos, Philanthropy 5, 26f, 119, 130, 260.

—A.K.

BEH A V I O R. The Byz. developed several images of ideal behavior. One of them was the eremitic ideal, with its tendency to mortification of the flesh in forms such as flight to the desert or wilderness, stylite life on a pillar, seclusion, and fasting. This ideal was contrasted with the communal life of the koinobion: both were based on the principle of tapeimata, “humility” (see MODesty, TOPos OF), but the cenobitic ideal placed more emphasis on discipline and activity than on individual abnegation. Attitudes toward philanthropy also varied; usually treated as a virtue, it was questioned by people such as Symeon the Theologian. Another criticism of asceticism (esp. in the 12th C.) came from clerical and lay intellectuals (such as Eustathios of Thessalonike) who contrasted hermits with virtuous married people living in the world.

The secular ideal of behavior was construed in several forms: individualistic behavior concentrated on the interests of the nuclear family, emphasizing obedience to the law and fealty to the ruling emperor (Kekaumenos); behavior based on tolerance and oikonomia, with developed bonds of friendship and values such as education and moderate enjoyment of life (Psellos); the knightly ideal, with stress on military prowess and personal fealty (Eustathios of Thessalonike). The ideal of women’s behavior slowly shifted from that of extreme piety (the prostitute transformed into an ascetic, a woman in male disguise eagerly searching for salvation) to the model housewife; in the 12th C. a new image appeared—the woman actively involved in political affairs, a patron of art, a faithful mistress

Byz. ideals of behavior were developed particularly in hagiography and in special moralistic treatises, such as those by Kekaumenos or Sapa­neas, in Mirrors of Princes, and in rhetorical writings (panegyrics, monodies, etc.). (See also ETHICS; Body Language.)


—A.K.
BEIRUT. See BERYTUS.

BÉLA III (Alexios to the Byz.), king of Hungary (from 1172); born ca.1148, died 23 Apr. 1196. Second son of Géza II (ruled 1141–61/2), by agreement with his brother István III Béla went to Constantinople ca.1163 to be betrothed to Maria Komnene, heiress apparent of Manuel I; Béla may have been named despotes (but see I. Stiernon, REB 21 (1963) 292). Manuel envisaged an eventual union of Hungary and Byz. In 1166 Béla helped fight Hungary to regain Croatia and Dalmatia, his promised inheritance. After the birth of Alexios II, the engagement to Maria was terminated; Béla (now caesar) wedded Anne of Châtillon, half-sister of Manuel’s empress. Upon the death of István III, Béla occupied Hungary with Byz. assistance. In 1181, he seized Croatia and Dalmatia; ca.1182–84 he took the Morava valley and Niš (Naissus). Following Anne’s death (1184), he sought the hand of Manuel’s relative Theodora, which would have given him a claim to the throne. When this marriage was denied, Béla’s daughter Margaret married ISAAC II ANGELOS. In 1192 he and Isaac met at Belgrade, but only in 1195 were they able to agree on joint action against Bulgaria. Isaac’s overthrow frustrated their cooperation.


—C.M.B.

BELGRADE. See SINGIDUNUM.

BELISARIOS (Βελισαρίως), general; born Germany on borders of Thrace and Illyricum ca.505, died Constantinople March 565. Belisarios became guard officer of Justinian I (who was then magister militum), doux of Mesopotamia (526), and then magister militum of the East (529). He defeated the Persians near Dara in 530, but Justinian recalled him because these operations ultimately failed. In 532 Belisarios suppressed the Nika Revolt. Belisarios commanded the successful expeditionary force that reconquered Africa in late 533, decisively defeated the Vandals, destroyed their kingdom in 533–34, and celebrated a triumph at Constantinople in 534. He occupied Sicily, then entered Rome on 9/10 Dec. 536. His victories were represented in mosaic on the Chalke Gate. Belisarios was recalled to Constantinople because of Justinian’s mistrust and fear of Persia. The emperor again sent Belisarios to Italy in 544, but recalled him in 548. Despite internal dissension and inadequate resources, he skillfully directed the reconquest of much of Italy from the Ostrogoths. In 559–60 he led an emergency defense against Cotrigur Huns who threatened Thrace and Constantinople. Justinian removed him as comes domesticorum in 562 but restored him to favor on 19 July 563. Belisarios was greatly influenced by his wife, Antonina, but was apparently indifferent to politics. He possessed many (possibly 7,000) bucellarii (private guardsmen). Master of strategy, operations, and tactics, with a swift and instinctive grasp of the potential in a situation, Belisarios was probably the best Byz. general. Prokopios of Caesarea, Belisarios’s assessor, described many of Belisarios’s campaigns and contributed to his high reputation.


—W.E.K., A.C.

BELISARIOS, ROMANCE OF, an anonymous verse text composed probably in the late 14th C. (cf. ROMANCE). The fate of the hero, blinded and reduced to begging at the central crossroads of Constantinople, exemplifies the workings of Envy. He has little connection with the historical Belisarios. Justinian I’s general, though both Prokopios and Theophanes the Confessor comment that envy destroyed Belisarios’s career. The legend first appears in a 12th-C. MS of the Patria of Constantinople and the Chiliades of Tzetzes, while the developed story reflects episodes from the 12th C. (the Petraliphas brothers and the siege of Kerkyra, 1149) and the 14th C. (the career of Alexios Philanthropenos). An underlying theme, unusual in Byz. literature, is a class-based tension between aristocrats and populace, which may account for the poem’s continued popularity in the post-Byz. period, when it circulated in two rhymed versions.


—E.M.J., M.J.J.
BELL (κώδων). Bells were used by the Romans for various purposes, for example, as children's toys (bells of this kind were found in catacombs) and as devices to signal the opening of public baths and help keep track of livestock. A bas-relief discovered in Galata and dated to the reign of Justin II shows a bell, struck by two men, that was apparently used to announce the beginning of circus games (H. Leclercq, DACL 3.2:1970).

Small bells for animals survive from the 4th C. onward; one is inscribed “St. Theodore help the horse (alogon)” (unpublished; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, inv. 1980.26). Small bells were also among the silver horse fittings (see CHARIOT MOUNTS AND HORSE FITTINGS) excavated in Nubia (W.B. Emery, L.P. Kirwan, The Royal Tombs of Ballana and Qustul [Cairo 1938] 262–71, pls. 55–56). A pavement mosaic at Umm Harreyin in Syria, dated 499/500, shows a bull with three bells hanging from its neck (J. Balny, Mosaiques antiques de Syrie [Brussels 1977], fig.61). The Farmer's Law (ch.30) establishes the punishment for a thief who removed a kodon from a cow or sheep.

The metal content of two 6th- or 7th-C. small bronze bells in the Ashmolean Museum has been analyzed and found to conform to the traditional high-tin formula for bells, a formula imported into the western world from southeast Asia where it originated in the Iron Age (P. Craddock in Application of Science in Examination of Works of Art, ed. P.A. England, L. van Zelst [Boston 1985] 64).

Theodore of Studios (PG 99:841A), when describing the persecution of the faithful in Constantinople, exclaims that the tolling of bells (kodonismos) was heard throughout the whole city—Theodore's hostile attitude toward the kodonismos suggests that he meant secular rather than ecclesiastical bells, since Byz. churches at that time used a gong or semantron for signaling the hour.

In the West, however, bells were widely used from the 6th C. to summon the faithful to church services. The sophistication of the Latin West in bell-founding is amply demonstrated by Theophilus Presbyter's extensive description (11th C.? of the techniques involved (Schedula diversarum artium, ed. A. Ilg [Vienna 1874; rp. Osnabrück 1970] 319–31). Such experience may have led Basil I to seek bells in the West: according to the CHRONICON VENETUM (ed. G. Monticolo, 126.13–16), the Venetian doge Orso II (864–81) sent to Constantinople 12 bells “and from this time onward the Greeks started having campanae.” LIUTPRAND OF CREMONA (Antapodosis 3:34) describes a machina in the NEA EKKLESIA that struck (sonat) ecclesiastical hours—it may have been an automaton equipped with a bell.

Some monasteries used kodones instead of semantra to summon monks: one is mentioned in the hypotyposis of Athanasios of Athos (Meyer, Haupttukenden 136.22–23), another in the bypikon of the KECHARITOMENE NUNNERY (P. Gautier, REB 49 [1985] 77.1035). Balsamon (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:521.32–522.5), however, considers the semantron as typical of Byz. and stressed that the Latins used the “brass-tongued” kampana. Another 12th-C. writer (Eust. Thess., Capture, pp. 134.23–136.14) also describes the animosity of the Normans toward wooden gongs and asks in astonishment why they were not hostile to “the large semantikoi kodones” in the Church of St. Demetrios. Texts of the 14th and 15th C. more frequently mention church bells that also rang at times of danger. After 1453 the Turks prohibited the tolling of bells. Allatios, in the first half of the 17th C., wrote that bells of brass and copper were rare in Greece, although many very old bells were preserved on Mt. Athos.


—M.M.M., A.C., A.K.

BELL TOWER, a multistoried structure built as an integral part of, or adjacent to, a church with the purpose of hanging Bells. Though at times functionally and formally related to monastic PYRGI, bell towers are invariably distinct from them. Belfries are made of masonry-bearing walls, perforated on all four sides. The top floor, where the bells are hung, usually has the largest openings. Relatively few Byz. churches with bell towers have been preserved (e.g., at the Omorphoklistis near Kastoria; Zoodochos Pege near Samara, Messenia; Aphentiko, Brontochein monastery, Mistra); several others survive in Serbia (e.g., Bogorodica Ljeviška in PRIZREN; main church of Žiča monastery) and Bulgaria (Pantokrator church at MESEMBRIA). No surviving example appears to antedate 1200. This led earlier scholars (G. Millet, L'école grecque dans l'architecture byzantine [Paris 1916; rp. London 1974] 137f) to assume that the form was imported from the West during the Latin
BELT (ζώνη, Lat. cingulum), in the early Roman Empire an element of military costume. During the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine I, a zone became part of the dress of every official, with the exception of the empress, who did not wear a belt since she was not considered a true officeholder. The fashion for belts spread, and in 382 the state tried to restrict the use of belts by civilians. Monks and priests followed the trend, viewing the belt as a symbol of purity, temperance, and manliness.

Byz. belts were made of leather or cloth, with buckles of bronze. Luxurious specimens could be purple or gilded. Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De cer. 470.10–12) mentions purple and quasi-purple zostriai (the price of which ranged from 8 to 16 miliareis apiece). As official insignia, belts of court functionaries differed in form and color; some were studded with precious stones. Higher orders of the clergy (from priests on up) wore belts, made of silk, over the sticharion and the epitetrachelion; the epigonation was attached to the belt. All-metal belts are unknown, except for gold marriage belts. Numerous belt fittings have been found, primarily on the frontiers of the empire, in civilian as well as in military contexts.

The Virgin's girdle was one of the most important relics in Constantinople. Brought to the capital perhaps in the 5th C. and contained in a special reliquary box or Soros, it was housed in the Church of the Chalkoprateia, and ultimately at the Church of Blachernai. Its deposit at the Chalkoprateia was celebrated annually on 31 Aug.

BELTHANDROS AND CHRYSANTZA (Βέλθανδρος καὶ Χρυσάντζα), an anonymous romance in 1,348 unrhymed political verses, written probably during the 14th C. in a language that shows the confusion of vernacular and learned

BELT FITTINGS. Until recently most excavated belt fittings of the 5th–7th C. were from barbarian graves and it was assumed that those found on Byz. soil were imports (Davidson, Minor Objects 287); recent finds from Constantinople and Asia Minor, however, suggest that the Byz. appropriated and diffused barbarian fittings. Most surviving specimens may be assigned to the 6th–7th C.; they are primarily bronze, with rare examples in gold, lead, iron, or silver. The discovery of bronze stamping molds in Cherson testifies to the existence of the local production of belt fittings of Byz. type in the 7th C. (A.I. Ajababin, SovArch 3 [1982] 190–98). A fairly limited range of design types is replicated in various media. A few deluxe fittings even bear gemstones.

Byz. belt fittings assumed a variety of forms: those with hinged buckles versus those on which only the tongue is hinged; those secured to the belt strap with pierced studs versus those with a slit through which the end of the strap could be looped. Examples of the latter type, with rigid buckle and strap loop, tend to be of the 8th–10th C. and most bear zoomorphic decoration. Earlier (6th–7th C.) specimens boast a greater variety of shapes (hearts, triangles, lozenges) and often bear highly stylized floral or zoomorphic motifs. Iconic images (Christ, the Virgin Hodegetria) occasionally appear, as do simple biblical scenes (e.g., the Annunciation), pagan heroes (e.g., Herakles), invocations, and expressions of good luck. Most common, however, are personal monograms, which suggests that personalized belt fittings may have facilitated the retrieval of one's clothing at the baths. (See also BELT; Marriage Belt.)

BELTHANDROS AND CHRYSANTZA (Βέλθανδρος καὶ Χρυσάντζα), an anonymous romance in 1,348 unrhymed political verses, written probably during the 14th C. in a language that shows the confusion of vernacular and learned
elements characteristic of this genre. A striking feature of the plot is the elaborate Erotokastron (Castle of Love) in which, in a dreamlike atmosphere, Belthandros selects from a bride show the girl destined to be his wife. He eventually finds her in Antioch and, after many hazards including a false marriage with her maid, they live happily ever after. The romance is familiar with some of the vocabulary (e.g., LIZIOS, “liege”) and habits (e.g., HAWKING) of westernized feudal society. Antecedents for the plot have thus been sought in Western literature, for example, in the (admittedly rare) château d’amour of Provençal poetry or in the Tristan story (for a marriage with the beloved’s maid). Equally likely, however, are precedents within the Byz. learned tradition itself, in chroniclers’ accounts of bride shows (C. Cukane, JÖB 33 [1983] 221–48) and in the EKPHRASEIS of gardens and buildings in the 12th-C. romances. The mixture of motifs reflects the Western penetration of Byz. society following the Fourth Crusade.


-BENEVENTO (Beneventonas), city in Campania, capital of the province of Samnium in the late Roman Empire. In the late 530s Benevento was contested between Justinian I’s general Belisarios and the Goths. Circa 545 Totila conquered the city and destroyed its walls. The Lombards occupied Benevento ca.570; various Byz. attempts at reconquest (e.g., Constans II’s siege of 663) failed, and the city and the duchy of Benevento remained under the nominal suzerainty of Lombard kings.

Much construction occurred during this period. Theoderata, wife of the duke Romuald, built the monastery of S. Pietro outside Benevento (680s). Duke Arechis II (758–87) is credited with building a palace (perhaps an addition to the existing ducal palace), extending the city walls, constructing the palace-church of S. Sofia, and granting the monastery connected with S. Sofia a water pipe to supply its bath as well as a yearly supply of wood for heating. The chapel of S. Sofia is described in 8th-C. documents as a likeness of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Excavations in 1950 revealed that the church originally was star-shaped, with two inner rings of supports and a low dome. It had marble and mosaic decoration that does not survive.

When the Lombard state was crushed by the Franks in 774. Benevento gained full independence. After its political surge in the 8th C., Benevento experienced internal strife (Salerno detached itself from the duchy in 849) and hostile attacks on its territory: the Carolingian king Louis II managed to repel the Arabs in 872, but only temporarily. Emp. Basil I sought an alliance with Lombard principalities, and in 876 a Byz. ambassador was sent to Benevento, Salerno, and Capua but had no success (Reg 1, no.495). In Oct. 891 the Byz. captured Benevento and the Byz. strategos remained there until 895, when he was forced to leave the city and its territory. Benevento was still politically dependent upon the empire, however, until the Norman invasion. With the help of the Normans, Atenuf III, prince of Benevento, defeated in 1041 the Byz. army of the katepano
Boioannes the Younger, but soon thereafter the Normans left the service of Atenulf and supported Salerno against him. The subsequent events are obscure; George Maniakes seems to have retaken Benevento from the Normans in 1042 (Skyl. 427.52–56), but the Byz. could not retain the city; in 1051 Benevento, in the face of a Norman attack, accepted the suzerainty of the pope.


— A.K., R.B.H., D.K.

BENJAMIN I, patriarch of Alexandria (626–65); born ca. 590, died 3 Jan. 665; feast day (Coptic church) 3 Jan. Born to a wealthy and apparently hellenized Egyptian family, Benjamin became a monk ca. 621 but soon entered the service of the Monophysite patriarch Andronikos, who later named him as his successor. The Byz. reconquest of Egypt from the Persians and esp. the arrival in 631 of Patr. Kyros compelled Benjamin to take refuge in Upper Egypt from Kyros’s persecutions. He returned only in 644 after the Muslims had captured Alexandria, reportedly following a decree by ‘Amr recalling him. Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam (died 871) claims that ‘Amr sought and received from Benjamin specific advice on administering Egypt. Benjamin probably left Alexandria during the temporary Byz. reoccupation (645) and may have offered ‘Amr support in exchange for leniency toward the local populace. The Coptic church revered Benjamin for having encouraged and organized the Egyptian Monophysites during and after the persecutions of the 630s and for rebuilding churches and monasteries. An account, preserved only in Coptic and Arabic versions but probably composed in Greek by Benjamin’s synkellos and successor Agathon, records Benjamin’s consecration of a church at Dair Macarius (Livre de la consécration du sanctuaire de Benjamin, ed. R.-G. Coquim [Cairo 1975]). Of Benjamin’s writings, only a “Homily on the Wedding at Cana” is extant in toto; written in Coptic, its vocabulary reveals strong Greek influences.


— P.A.H.

BENJAMIN OF TUDELA, or Bar Yonah, the most important and informative medieval Jewish traveler; fl. mid-12th-C. Spain. His Itinerary (Sefer Masoath), apparently unedited notes, outlines his travels during the 1160s from Spain along the Mediterranean coast to Byz. It also includes data on the Islamic world, Ethiopia, and Europe. Benjamin recorded unique censuses of Jewish congregations, economic observations, local pronunciation of Greek, and folklore. Our main source for 12th-C. Byz. Jewish history, the Itinerary also contains early descriptions of Vlachs, Oghuz Turks, Druses, and Assassins. His description of Constantinople is among the best extant. He mentioned guilds of Jewish silkworke in Thebes, Thessalonike, and Pera; tanners in Pera; and even an agricultural settlement near Delphi. He visited about 25 Byz. cities and recorded some 9,000 Jews.


BERA (Bjora), identified with modern Pherrai in western Thrace, site of the monastery of the Theotokos Kosmosoteira, founded before 1152 by the Sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos, son of Alexios I. Isaac built the cenobitic monastery as his residence and final resting place; he requested that his tomb be transferred to this new foundation from the church of the Chora Monastery in Constantinople, which he had restored earlier (N.P. Ševčenko, GOrThR 29 [1984] 135–39). The complex, surrounded by a wall, included a cistern, mill, and library. The monastery also had a gero komeion with 36 beds and a bathhouse for the use of monks and villagers. The monastery continued in use until the mid-14th C.

The typikon, drafted by Isaac starting in 1152, was closely modeled, for its liturgical sections, on the typikon of the Euergetis monastery in Constantinople. It provided for 74 monks, of whom 50 were to be choir brothers, the rest serving brothers. All the monks were to be over 30 years of age, and no eunuchs were permitted. Isaac
emphasized the independent status of the monastery and endowed it with substantial properties in Thrace. The *typikon* is an important source for local toponyms, esp. since it contains numerous Slavic place names (V. Túpkova-Zaimova, *Bal­kan­sko esizkeznanie* 2 [1960] 123–27) and for social and economic relations: as the former estate of a secular owner, the estates of the Kosmosoteira housed certain “vassals” who were given land in exchange for their service to the master (V. Arutjunova-Fidanjan, *Ti̇pt Grigor˘ıja Pakuriana* [Erevan 1978] 32–34).

The church at Pherrai, which is presumed to be the *katholikon* of the Kosmosoteira monastery, is a large modified cross-square structure with frescoes of the 12th C. By 1433 it had been reconsecrated into a mosque; it was restored and reconsecrated in 1940.

*Source.* L. Petit, “*Typikon du monastère de la Kosmo­soteira près d’Aenos* (1152),” *IRAIK* 13 (1908) 17–75.


BERBERS. See MAURI.

BERROIA (Βηρροία), name of cities in Syria and Macedonia.

**BERROIA in Syria** (Ar. Halab, Aleppo in mod. Syria), city and bishopric of Syria I; it stood on the road leading east from Antioch, about halfway to Hierapolis to the northeast and to the Tigris River to the east. It was raised to a metropolitan bishopric in 536. In 540, the citizens of Berroia gave only half of the 4,000 pounds of silver demanded by Chosroes I, who burned the city; the local military garrison then deserted to the Persians, complaining of a lack of pay (Prokopios, *Wars* 2.7). By the 580s, the Legio IV Parthica was stationed at Berroia (Theoph.Simok. 2.6.9). The city was under Persian rule from 604 to 628 and Arab rule after 636; after Nikephoros II Phokas took and sacked it in 692, Berroia was again Byz. between 905 and 1017. Among the few Byz. vestiges at Berroia is part of an aisled tetraconch (cathedral?) church (in the Madrasah al-Ḥalā­wiyya) with sculpture characteristic of the early 6th C.

---


**BERROIA in Macedonia**, city at the west end of the central Macedonian plain, sometimes confused in the sources with Beroe-Stara Zagora in Thrace. In late antiquity Berroia belonged to the province of Macedonia I. In the 7th C. Drougou­bitat settled in the plain below the city. In the late 8th C. the empress Irene is said to have rebuilt Berroia and named it Eirenopolis; some texts, including Theophanes (Theoph. 457.8–10), place Berroia-Eirenopolis in Thrace (Chionides, *Hist­oria* [1970] 2:14–18). The 10th-C. *Taktikon of Escurial* (Okonomistes, *Listes* 265,32) mentions a *stratages of Berroia* alongside that of Strymon, and an act of 1196 specifically names the theme of Berroia (*Lavra* 1, no.69.3). A letter of Theophy­laktos of Ohrid (ep.123, ed. Gautier 563.1) is addressed to a *doux* of Berroia. For a short time Samuel of Bulgaria held the city, but in 1001 Dobromir, its *katarchon* (i.e., governor or master), surrendered Berroia to Basil II. The city does not appear again in the sources until the end of the 12th C. It is questionable whether Peter and Asen conquered Berroia, since the evidence on this may refer to Thracian Beroe (Chionides, *infra* [1970] 2:27; n.3).

After 1204 Berroia was assigned to Boniface of Montferrat. In 1224 it was taken by Theodore I Komnenos Doukas of Epirus, then in 1246 by John III Vatatzes. John VI Kantakouzenos took an interest in Berroia, but in 1343/4 it was surrendered to Stefan Uros IV Dušan; Kanta­kouzenos retook the city in 1350, but it soon fell again into Serbian hands and was administered from 1358 by the Serbian noble Radoslav Chlapen. Berroia was once more Byz. ca.1375, but Ottoman attacks began at just that time. The Turks seized the city several times, definitively ca.1430.

The bishopric of Berroia, suffragan of Thessalonike, is known from 347. After 1261 Michael VIII promoted Berroia to an archbishopric, and by 1300 it had become a metropolis.

A considerable number of the monuments of the Byz. city have survived, and some of the many post-Byz. churches may have been built on Byz. foundations. An Early Christian cemetery with
more than 50 tombs has been excavated (ArchDelt 33.2 [1978] 264–66, 268, 273–82). Some churches with frescoes of the 12th and 13th C. are still standing, but the most significant monument is the Church of the Anastasis, an unpretentious, single-aisled basilica with spectacular frescoes dated by inscription to the year 1315 (S. Pelekanides, Kallierges: Holes Thetallakes aristas zagraphos [Athens 1973]). The artist is named Kallierges, the donors a certain Psalidas and his wife Euphrosyne. The paintings bear comparison with the mosaics of the Pammakaristos in Constantinople and the Holy Apostles in Thessalonike, and esp. with the frescoes of St. Nicholas Orphanos, also in Thessalonike. The program of the Anastasis church includes “panels” of the Crucifixion and the Anastasis in niches opposite each other. On the north and south walls are a Feast cycle with an expanded Passion sequence and the portrait of a monk in proskynesis before St. Artemios. The church may have been the katholikon of a patriarchal monastery (RegPatr, fasc. 5, no. 2018). The old cathedral is a Byz. construction using spolia from some Early Christian basilica (Ph.A. Drosogianne, ArchDelt 18.2 [1963] 249f).


BERTHA OF SULZBACH, sister-in-law of Conrad III and first wife of Manuel I; she was given the name Irene after her marriage; died Constantinople ca.1160. To confirm the alliance of 1140 with John II, Conrad sent Bertha to marry Manuel in 1142, but the wedding occurred only in Jan. 1146. She is said to have been just, charitable, pious, opposed to cosmetics, stubborn, and narrow-minded. She acted as a patron, and Tzetzes dedicated some of his works to her. Manuel soon neglected her in favor of other women, partly because she failed to bear a male heir; allegedly, Patr. Kosmas II Attikos, on being deposed (Feb. 1147), cursed her womb. In 1152 she bore Maria Komnenos and ca.1156 Anna, who died ca.1160. Bertha warned the emperor about the conspiracies of Andronikos Komnenos and Stypeiotes.

She was commemorated in an epitaphios by Basil of Ohrid (Regel, Fontes 1.2:311–30).


BERTRANDON DE LA BROQUIÈRE, Burgundian pilgrim to the Holy Land; died Lille 1459. Bertrandon, who was a knight of Philip III the Good of Burgundy, described his journey in a book entitled Voyage d'outremer. He set off in Feb. 1432 from Ghent to Palestine and visited Jerusalem, Damascus, Antioch, and many other places in the area; then, in a caravan, he traversed Asia Minor as far as Pera and Constantinople (which he left on 23 Jan. 1433). Bertrandon describes the city walls of Constantinople, its churches (Hagia Sophia, St. George, the Pantokrator, the Holy Apostles, Balchernai), and squares. The city seemed to him smaller than Rome, and he described it as having more open space than built-up areas. He saw Emp. John VIII and his brother Demetrios Palaiologos, despotes of the Morea, as well as the empress Maria Komnene, daughter of the emperor of Trebizond; Bertrandon writes how Maria mounted—“like a man”—a horse with a magnificent saddle; she wore a mantle and a tall pointed hat. Bertrandon also attended a solemn church service and a wedding of one of the emperor's relatives. From Constantinople Bertrandon traveled across Macedonia, observing that the countryside was completely devastated and, except for Selymbria, was in the hands of the Turks. The description is sober and concise but tinged with animosity toward the Greeks: he finds them less honest than the Turks and deceitful in their submission to the Roman church. It is worth noting that the court of Constantinople sought information from Bertrandon about Joan of Arc.


BERYTUS (Бърот, now Beirut [Ar. Bayrūt] in mod. Lebanon), city in the province of Phoenicia Maritima under Tyre and independent metropolitan bishopric under the patriarch of Antioch. Berytus was damaged by earthquakes in 347/8, 501/2, and 550/1; after the last, the city was re-
stored by Justinian I (Theoph. 227.21–228.4), epigraphic and other vestiges of which work (including a bath) have been found in the forum. Berytus was still noted in the 6th C. for its famous law school and for its state silk factories (Prokopios, SH, ch.25) as well as its private purple-dyeing industry. The Arabs took Berytus in 855; it was held briefly by John I Tzimiskes in 975.


BESSARION (Βεσσαριών), Greek expatriate scholar and theologian in Italy, cardinal (1439–72), and titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople from 1469; baptismal name John; born Trebi­zond 1499/1400?, died Ravenna 18 Nov. 1472. Educated in Constantinople and Mistra, Bessarion studied with John Chortasmenos, George Chrys­kokkes, and Gemistos Plethon. He became a monk in 1423 and subsequently deacon, priest, and hegoumenos of the monastery of St. Basil in Constantinople. Appointed metropolitan of Ni­caea in 1437, he attended the Council of Ferrara­Florence as a leader of the pro-Unionists. In 1439 he converted to Catholicism and was made a cardinal. After a brief return to Constantinople, he spent the rest of his career in Italy. He was appointed to numerous high ecclesiastical posi­tions, including that of papal legate, and was twice a candidate for the papacy (1455 and 1471). Ever mindful of his Greek origins, he lobbied unsuccess­fully for a crusade against the Turks.

It was as a scholar that Bessarion made his greatest impact. He wrote prolifically in Greek and in Latin, of which he acquired an excellent knowledge. During the Byz. portion of his career, he composed pro-Unionist theological treatises, refuting the views of Orthodox scholars such as Mark Eugenikos. He was also the author of nu­merous orations and enkomia, including a panegyric of his native Trebizond (ed. O. Lampides, ArchPont 39 [1984] 3–75). Probably written in 1436–37, he emphasized its seapower, military preparedness, and strong fortifications. The oration also described the layout of Trebizond, esp. the imperial palace and the thriving commercial and manufacturing quarter of this emporion tes oikoumenes or "marketplace of the world."

In Rome Bessarion headed an academy that produced new and/or more accurate translations of ancient Greek authors. To this end he was an energetic collector of Greek MSS, which he eventu­ally (1468) bequeathed to Venice, where they became the nucleus of the Biblioteca Marciana. He himself also copied some MSS (H.D. Saffrey, ST 233 [1964] 263–97). Bessarion took a moder­ate position in the mid-15th-C. debate over Plato and Aristotle; he did, however, write (in Greek) a lengthy work, Against the Calumniator of Plato, attacking the extreme Aristotelian views of George Trapezountios. He was the patron of Greek émigrés such as Theodore Gazes and Michael Apostoles, who wrote his funeral oration (PG 161:cxvii–cxl).


—A.M.T.

BESSARION RELIQUARY, a wooden stauro­theke, that is, a container for fragments of the True Cross, composed of several parts, now in the Accademia in Venice; it took its name from the 15th-C. cardinal who presented it to the Scu­ola della Carità in that city. Bessarion may have obtained it from "Gregory Pneumatikos," as he is called on the cross within the reliquary, perhaps Patr. Gregory III (1443–50/1). A second inscrip­tion speaks of "Irene Palaiologina, daughter of the emperor's brother," whom Frolov (infra) be­lieved to be the niece of John VIII rather than of Michael IX. The sliding lid of the stauro­theke is painted with seven scenes of the Passion of Christ surrounding the Crucifixion. Beneath this cover, a silver-gilt cross with the crucified Christ, flanked by Constantine and Helena in niello, is sur­rounded by eight framed enamel panels; four of these have windows for relics. This part of the reliquary may be Western, but the cross itself carries Byz. enamel with Greek letters, which Fro­low reads as the initials of such phrases as "The place of Calvary has become Paradise." Similar medallions are found on the back.
BESTIALITY, human intercourse with animals, was prohibited by the Old Testament, which associated it with homosexuality (Lev 18:22–23). This connection dominated Byz. canon law, which often imposed the same epiminthion for both sins (Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles 13.2). The Ecloga (17.39) imposed the penalty of castration and ranked bestiality after incest and consanguineous intercourse as the third sexual sin, before homosexuality. The condemnation of bestiality continued throughout Byz. history, from Basil the Great in the 4th C. to Demetrios Chomateneos and John Apokaukos in the 13th C., always stressing the perversity of this form of intercourse. In the Penitential attributed to John IV Nesteutes, both men and women were condemned for bestiality (PG 88:1893D). Some monastic communities, such as Mt. Athos, prohibited the residence of children, eunuchs, women, and female animals in or near monasteries to deter fornication, homosexuality, and bestiality. The τύπικον of the Phoberou Monastery (pp. 75.14–77.10, 82.9–25) denied access to female animals specifically to prevent bestiality; at other monasteries their prohibition seems to reflect a general repudiation of the female sex (C. Galatariotou, REB 45 [1987] 121).

Ancient myths with their elements of totemistic bestiality endured in literature and art, for example, in epigrams about Ζέους’s transformation into a bull or swan to seduce Ευρώπη or Leda (AnthGr, bk.5, nos. 65, 125, 307) and on the Europa casket. Pasiphaë, who disguised herself as a heifer to have intercourse with a bull and thus conceive the Minotaur, was interpreted as the embodiment of female initiative and its terrible consequences.


BESTIARY. See PHYSIOLOGOS.

BETHANY (Βηθανία, Ar. al-‘Azariya or ʿAyariyyah), located 3 km east of Jerusalem, is the site associated with the Raising of Lazarus. Eusebios of Caesarea (Onomastikon 58:15) speaks of Bethany’s Lazarion or “Place of Lazarus”—evidently a rock tomb. Egeria (ca.380) implies the existence of a church there, which was used in the stational liturgy on Palm Sunday. Its proximity to Jerusalem made it part of that city’s “pilgrimage circuit.” The early church, which had guest rooms, was rebuilt in the 5th C. A monastery existed there as well, and a second church, dedicated to Mary Magdalene, was erected during the time of the Latin Kingdom.


BETHLEHEM (Βηθλεήμ), village in the Judaean hills, 9 km south of Jerusalem, that was revered from the 4th C. as Jesus’ birthplace. The first church on the site of the traditional cave of the Nativity was built by Constantine I, probably on the initiative of Helena. It was a five-aisled basilica with an octagonal martyron, preceded by an atrium. This church was destroyed at the time of the Samaritan revolt of 529. Justinian I replaced it with another basilica, larger and more ornate: a narthex was added, a trefoil apse constructed, and two entrances cut leading to the cave of the Nativity. Much later, under Manuel I, the east end of the church received lavish mosaic decoration at the hands of Ephraim. Other points of pilgrimage were the shrine of the Holy Innocents; the Well of the Star; and the tomb of St. Jerome, who, with a group of matrons, had established two monasteries at Bethlehem.

After the Arab conquest of Palestine, Bethlehem was venerated by Muslims as the birthplace of “Īsā ibn Maryam” (Jesus, son of Mary) but never developed into an important center. The Crusaders occupied Bethlehem in 1199 and tried to create a bishopric there but lost it to Saladin in 1187.


BETH MISONA, dated to the 6th or 7th C., four liturgical vessels in silver acquired by the Cleveland Museum of Art in 1950. None of the objects has silver stamps but two bear
dedicatory inscriptions: the paten was offered by a certain Domnos to the Church of St. Sergios in the village (chorion) of Beth Misona, possibly to be identified with the modern village of Mshbine, southwest of Aleppo (Beeroia) in northern Syria; one of the three nearly identical chalices, with repoussé decoration, was presented to the same church by Kyriakos, son of Domnos. Because of the dedication to St. Sergios, a misreading of the village name, and confusion over modern provenance, the Beth Misona Treasure has mistakenly been called the Rusāfa Treasure (see Sergio-polis); instead it is one of several silver treasures given to village churches in the 4th–7th C.

Lit. Mango, Silver 228–31. —M.M.M.

BETROTHAL (μνηστεία, Lat. sponsalia). Roman law had no specific form of contract preceding marriage; no penalty for breach of promise existed. The legislation of Constantine I (Cod. Theod. III 5.2, etc.) introduced the concept of arrhaim sponsalia, the prenuptial gift, and by so doing transformed the informal agreement into a formal contract. Ensuing developments led to the reinforcement of the ties of the betrothal and a gradual disappearance of the clear distinction between it and marriage: the Council in Trullo (canon 98) equated marrying another person's betrothed to adultery, and the Ecloga prescribed the punishment of cutting off the nose for one who engaged in intercourse with another's betrothed. In 1066 a synod under Patr. John VIII Xiphilinos proclaimed the legal equality of the two institutions, and in 1084 Alexios I confirmed their identity (Reg. 2, no. 11.116). The celebration of the betrothal continued, nevertheless, after Alexios's novel, and Demetrios Chomatenos (Laiou, infra 2.95) strongly contrasts mnesteia and marriage, defining the former as "the prearrangement and preagreement of a marriage."

Despite the lack of consistency in the Byz. treatment of betrothal the following features seem to have characterized mnesteia, distinguishing it from gamos: (1) the type of priestly benediction—even in the later period "incomplete" betrothal, without priestly benediction, was possible; (2) the age of the partners, the betrothed being allowed to be of five to seven years (and older); (3) the lack of economic ties, the dowry not yet being transmitted to the family of the groom; (4) the tendency to avoid (if not legally prohibit) sexual relations between the betrothed; (5) a broader range of valid grounds for dissolution of the betrothal, for example, madness, religious differences—in the 11th C. it was debated whether the reduced means (aporia) of one of the parties could cause the termination of a betrothal (Peira 49.26); (6) certain betrothals (those not blessed by a priest) could be terminated, but under the penalty of a pro-stimon.


BEVERAGES (ποτά). Water was the basic beverage, closely followed by wine (often mixed with water), which was consumed in large quantities and considered a staple of the diet. An acidic wine, phouwska (really a mixture of vinegar and water), was served in cheap taverns called phouskaría (E. Kislinger, JÖB 34 [1984] 49–53). In monasteries, during the fasting periods, monks and nuns substituted for wine a hot drink made of boiling water mixed with spices such as pepper, cumin, and anise (eukraton or kyminotheron). Liqours were prepared from fruits such as dates, pears, and prunes. Neither dairy drinks nor beer seem to have been very popular. Eustathios of Thessalonike relates that "semibarbarians" prepared an intoxicating winelike drink from barley; he denotes this drink with an old Russian word, olovina or "beer" (A. Kazhdan in Okeanos 355). The housekon ("drink payment") was a reward given to laborers for their work (M. McCormick, AJPh 102 [1981] 160f).


BEZANT (Lat. bizantius aureus, OF besant), the name given in western Europe to the Byz. gold nomisma. The word is mainly found in documents of the 10th–13th C., and its use subsequently is literary or heraldic, the coins themselves being known to merchants as hyperpyra or perperi. —Ph.G.
BIBLE (Βιβλία, lit. "books"), also graphe (scripture) usually with the epithet "holy," the collection of books that constitute the foundation of the Christian creed. Even though the Bible consists of two sections, the OLD TESTAMENT and the NEW TESTAMENT, written in different languages and in different historical situations, the church fathers emphasized its unity and the concordance of Old Testament and New Testament that derives from divine inspiration, the Bible being a work of the Holy Spirit. However, some heretics (e.g., the Bogomils) contrasted the Old Testament and New Testament, rejecting the former (wholly or in part) as inspired by Satan.

The Bible presents to the human mind various difficulties and alleged contradictions, the solution of which can lead to a profounder understanding of the text. A special discipline, exegesis, arose, aimed at the interpretation of the Bible, while homiletics sought to explain biblical situations in sermons, the material of which was set out as scenes, dialogues, and rhetorical imagery. Two major branches of exegesis were founded: the Alexandrian School, which stressed the allegorical interpretation, and the Antiochene School, which stressed "historical" interpretation. The "true" exegesis of the Bible was the focal point of doctrinal discussions, beginning with the Arian controversy. Each faction of the theologians tried to find in the Bible appropriate references or to interpret biblical citations in a sense that accorded with their views; consequently the idea of biblical "obsccurity" requiring interpretation became important.

After the 5th C., the church assumed the exclusive right to interpret the Bible; tradition (paradosis) based on the sanctified church fathers imposed limits on previously free understanding. Dispute then centered on interpretation of the Fathers, rather than of the Bible itself.

---

BIBLIOTHECA, also Myriobiblon (Μυριώβιβλον, "thousand books"), conventional titles of a work of Photios. In the oldest MS (Venice, Marc. gr. 450) the heading of the work is "List and Description of Books We Have Read." The Bibliotheca contains 280 chapters ("codices") that describe 386 books according to Treadgold (infra 5). It also has a preface and epilogue, both addressed to Photios's brother Tarasios. If we take them at face value, Photios compiled the Bibliotheca before leaving on an embassy to the "Assyrians," i.e., Arabs; this embassy has been variously identified with those of 838, 845, or 855. F. Halkin (AB 81 [1963] 414–17), however, suggested a much later date of composition (after 875). Most recently A. Markopoulos (Symmetria 7 [1987] 165–82) proposed that the bulk of the Bibliotheca represents a revised version written in Photios's old age. B. Hemmerdinger hypothesized that Photios worked in Greek libraries in Baghdad (REGr 69 [1956] 101–09). N. Wilson surmised that Photios was working from memory (infra 95–99).

The Bibliotheca surveys both pagan and Christian authors, sometimes very extensively, sometimes briefly. Photios evidently avoids school texts (poets, Plato, Aristotle), is very interested in historical works, and devotes more attention to historians than to natural science; very indicative is his concern for lexika since he himself wrote one. The composition is not systematic, although several "codices" are organized in thematic groups. Photios sometimes provides biographical data on the author, summarizes the contents, and in some cases presents a theological and stylistic evaluation. Although Photios preferred a simple style, the Bibliotheca demonstrates that he could appreciate diverse stylistic approaches. Since his compilation includes many texts now lost, historians of ancient literature have studied it closely. Less attention has been paid to the Bibliotheca as reflecting the Byz. worldview. It is significant, for example, that Photios understood Herodotus as a historian of the Persian basileis and of an illegitimate revolt against them (cod. 60), and not as one who described the victory of the Greek city-states over a monarchy.

---


BILLETING. See MITATON.

BINBIRKILISE (Turk., lit. "thousand and one churches"), ecclesiastical site in Lykaonia, apparently medieval Barata (Bâparrà), attested as a bishopric from the 4th to the 12th C. The area contains the remains of over 40 churches, in two main groups. The majority stand in the lower town (Madenşehir) and consist primarily of vaulted basilicas with horseshoe-shaped apses of a massive ashlar construction, together with an octagonal church that strikingly corresponds to the description of a "martyrium" by GREGORY OF NYSSA (ep. 25). Those of the upper town (Değle) include cross-in-square churches of less regular masonry with decorative brickwork. Dating is difficult and disputed; it appears that the lower town flourished from the 4th to the 7th C. and was reoccupied in the 9th, while the upper town was a refuge during the Arab invasions.


BIOGRAPHY, a literary genre created in antiquity that flourished during the Roman Empire. It was considered an intermediate form lying somewhere between enkomion and historiography and having as its purpose the presentation of the hero's character (ethos) and/or actions (praxis) in logical rather than chronological sequence. The material was presented in anecdotes, maxims (sayings), catalogs of works, etc. Biographies were often combined in series, as by Plutarch. Late Roman biography included emperors (HISTORIA AUGUSTA), philosophers (Diogenes Laertius in the 3rd C.), and rhetoricians (the Lives of the Sophists by EUNAPIOS OF SARDIS). There was a tendency to transform the wise man into a "godlike" holy man like Pythagoras and Plotinos in their biographies by PORPHYRY, Origen in his Life written by EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA (bk.6 of the ECClesiastical History), and esp. APOLLONIOS OF TYANA. Works of this kind, along with the books of the Maccabees and the Acts of the Martyrs, contributed to the development of HAGIOGRAPHY, the vita of ANTONY THE GREAT by Athanasios of Alexandria being the model for the new genre. The late Roman biography of the holy man was based on a preconceived ideal of behavior, presented the hero's life as a continual acme from cradle to grave, and had the purpose of defending the principles of particular philosophical and religious schools.

In Byz., secular biographies were not very common, nor were they produced in series (unlike the Historia Augusta and Eunapios). The demarcation of the genre from both hagiography and historiography was vague: the Life of Basil I (Vita Basili) commissioned by Constantine VII was included in a historical compilation; Anna Komnéne's panegyric on her father, the Alexiad, was construed as a book on history; the biographies of some emperors (John III VATATZES) or empresses (Theodora, wife of Theophilos) who became revered as saints were couched in the form of vitae. The Byz. elaborated the genre of pejorative biography (inventive) such as the anonymous dialogue Anacharsis, and the pamphlets of Nikephoros Basilakes on a certain Bagoas, and of John Argyropoulos (?) on Katablattas (N. Oikonomides, P. Canivet, Diptycha 3 [1982–83] 5–97).


BIRDS (ovskyes). The Byz. raised birds for food and for use in sport and hunting. Book 14 of the GEOPONIKA is dedicated to rearing domestic fowl, primarily pigeons and hens. Ornithology fascinated Byz. artists and sportsmen, much as it had earlier Greek and Roman naturalists and bird-catchers. Aristotle's study of birds (esp. in Parts of Animals) left a heavy imprint on later ornithologists, but additional data were included by Alexander of Myndos (fl. 1st C. B.C.?) and elaborated by a certain Dionysios (fl. 1st C. A.D.?) in a tract called Ornithiaka or Ixeutikon. Dionysios's original text is lost, but a paraphrase with magnificent illuminations of 48 birds is part of the Vienna Dioskorides. The illustrations in this MS (esp. fol.48v) with 24 birds in a grid) suggest observations in the field of varied species such as the ostrich, various ducks, the moor hen, bustard, partridge, and many others. Later tracts on ornithology include an excellent work on HAWKING by Demetrios PEPAKOMENOS, who apparently used sources different from those of FREDERICK II in his On the Art of Hunting with Birds (De arte venandi

The mosaics of the Acheiropoietos Church in Thessalonike depict ducks and other birds, used in Roman fashion apparently without the symbolic content that had earlier been attached to the peacock; at the mausoleum of Galla Placidia in Ravenna, birds drinking from a chalice are depicted as attending a Fountain of Life. This interpretation persisted in the veritable aviaries that adorn the Canon Tables and headpieces of illuminated MSS. On the other hand, birds were sometimes seen as part of the natural world inappropriate to Christian decoration. The author of the Life of Stephen the Younger (PG 100:1120C) objected to the Iconoclastic mosaic program of the church at Blachernai in Constantinople, which included “cranes, crows, and peacocks, thus making the church, if I may say so, altogether unadorned.” Yet, as winged creatures free of earthly bonds, birds were widely represented in sacred settings and were a favorite motif in relief sculpture, as on the drum cornice of the Church of Constantine Lips. Bird-filled trees figured among the Automata of the Magnaura witnessed by Liutprand of Cremona.

In Byz. mythology birds played a lesser role than animals or snakes; a deep significance was ascribed to the dove, however, as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, and to the peacock and pelican. The theme of the eagle fighting the serpent was popular in art. Birds are dramatis personae in the Poulologos.


—J.S., A.C.

BIRTH (γέννησις). Women usually gave birth at home with the assistance of relatives and/or a midwife. There were, however, some lying-in hospitals, such as the institutions established in Alexandria by St. John Elefemon, according to one version of his vita (H. Delehaye, AB 45 [1927] 22.17–27). Paramedical and magical means were commonly used to achieve an easier delivery, for example, Anna, the mother of the future empress Theophano, was given, during her labor, a girdle from a monastery of the Virgin (E. Kurtz, Zwei griechische Texte über die heilige Theophano [St. Petersburg 1898] 2.28–34). The newborn baby was washed and swaddled in woolen wrappings. The placenta was sometimes retained as a talisman.

After childbirth the mother and those who assisted her were considered unclean and a priest was summoned to exorcise the evil spirits, yet the mother could not partake of communion until 40 days had passed. The wet-nurse was common, even though some moralists disapproved of this practice (J. Beaucamp, JÖB 32.2 [1982] 549–58). Male babies were preferred (e.g., Prodomos, Hist. Gedichte, no.44.6–7), but in general the birth of a child was a panegyris that provided an occasion for a banquet, visits, and gifts; if the baby was an heir to the throne, special festivities were held throughout the empire. The gross birth rate
in 14th-C. rural Macedonia is estimated as 44 per 1,000, but because of high mortality the net birth rate was 22 (Laiou, Peasant Society 292–94).

Birth scenes, with mothers shown frontally seated with raised skirts, are treated particularly candidly in the Vatican Book of Kings (Lassus, Livre des Rois, figs. 3, 6). Childbirth and the washing of the newborn infant are also depicted in images of the Nativity of Christ and John the Baptist. LIT. Kourkoules, Βίος 4:9–42. –Α.P.K., A.K., A.C.

BIRTH OF THE VIRGIN (γεννήσει τῆς Θεοτό­κου), one of the five Marian GREAT FEASTS, celebrated 8 Sept. with both a forefeast and a four- day afterfeast. The feast originated in Jerusalem with the dedication of a 5th-C. church at the Probatic Pool (Jn 5:2–9), where tradition placed the house of Mary’s parents Ioakeim and Anna (H. Vincent, F.-M. Abel, Jérusalem, vol. 2 [Paris 1926] 669–76). From the 6th C. onward, it was celebrated at this spot with a reading from the Protoevangelion of James (G. Garitte, Le calendrier palestino-géorgien du Sinaiac 34 (Xe siècle) [Brussels 1958] 324f). The earliest evidence for the existence of the feast in Constantinople, a kontakion by Romanos the Melode (no.35, ed. Maas-Trypanis, 276–80), is a paraphrase of this apocryphal narration, which was also incorporated into Byz. Menologion and panegyrica for use on the feast (Ehrhard, Uberlieferung 1:57, 204).

The feast opened in the evening with a pannychis (see Vigil) at Hagia Sophia, in which the patriarch took part. After the orthros service there was a procession, with a station (lithos) at the Forum (Mateos, Typicon 1:18–21), in which “the sovereigns and the whole senate proceed with great pomp” to the Church of the Chalkoprateia (Philothoe, Kletor. 293.10–11). Once the liturgy was over, the emperor offered a banquet in the Triklinos of Justinian.

In art the standard composition is first seen in the Menologion of Basil II (p.22) with Anna reclining on a bed, three gift-bearing women approaching, and midwives bathing the child. Used in narratives of the Life of the Virgin Mary, the scene also occurs among Christological feasts, as in the naos at Daphni. Versions from the 12th C. onward stress the wealth of the Virgin’s parents, adding a peacock fan (Daphni), richly carved cradle (MSS of James of Kokkinobaphos), palatial setting (King’s Church, Studenica), and numerous attendants (Chora). Ioakeim joins the scene in the 14th C. (Chora).


BİRÜNİ, AL-, more fully Abü'l-Rayhân Muham- mad ibn Âhmad al-Biruni, Muslim scientist, historian, and observer of cultures; born Kâth (in Khwârizm) 4 Sept. 973, died Ghazna? 11 Dec. 1048 (E. Kennedy, LMA 2:226) or after 1050 (D. Boilot, EI² 1:129). Under royal patronage in Khwârizm, al-Birûnî studied the sciences. After the Ghaznavid conquest (1017), he was lavishly maintained in Ghazna until his death. He visited India, but journeyed westward only to Iran.

Birûnî ranks among the greatest scholars of medieval Islam and wrote almost 150 works on science, geography, chronology, and history. He considers Byz. in his Vestiges of the Past (Chronology of Ancient Nations), written in 1000, incorporating much cultural information within discussions of calendars and eras. Major topics for Birûnî are doctrine, hagiography, customs concerning Lent, and MELCHITE festivals. Birûnî disregards at length on the Greek ecclesiastical hierarchy and the organization of the Byz. administration and army. Though sometimes offering secondhand information from Melchites in Khwârizm, Birûnî refers to The Learning of the Greeks, a book (now lost) by a certain Abû'l-Husayn (or Hasan) al-Ahwâzî (9th C.) based on his experiences in Constantinople.


BISHOP (ἐπίσκοπος), the highest ranking minis­ ter among the major orders of the Byz. CLERGY, supreme in all matters concerning the discipline (cf. Episcopalis Audientia), doctrine, and administration of the bishopric (episkope). As a generic term the title also included metropolitanas, pa-
triarchs, etc. St. Ignatius of Antioch (ca. 100) is the earliest witness of the monarchic episcopate and describes the bishop as the source and center of church unity. Although the exclusive focus of unity and authority in his district—as PROEDROS and archiereus of his flock and of his CHOREPIS-KOROS—a bishop was still subordinate to the metropolitain of the province of which his bishopric was a part. His nomination was in fact confirmed by the provincial metropolitian, from whom he also received consecration (Nicaea II, canon 3). Normally he was restricted for life to the see for which he was ordained, although translations were not unknown.

All ecclesiastical properties, charitable institutions, and hospitals of the bishopric were under the bishop’s disposition but were actually managed and administered by various officials, such as the OIKONOMOS. The revenues of the see were derived from property, voluntary offerings, and donations, and, from the 11th C., from ecclesiastical taxes as well, such as the KANONIKON and KANISKION. The income was used for the upkeep of the bishop and his clergy but also for the sick, poor, the redemption of war prisoners, and the maintenance of churches. Despite their considerable privileges and authority, Byz. bishops (with some exceptions) did not play the role of feudal magnates, unlike their counterparts in the West, although they often enjoyed considerable political influence. Their vestments were similar to those worn by PRIESTS except (later) for the episcopal Sakkos and Omophorion. (For list of bishops, see NOTITIAE EPISCOPATUM.)


BITHYNIA (Bithuния), a region of northwest Asia Minor, opposite Constantinople. Bithynia became a separate province in the early 4th C. Besides its capital, NIKOMEDA, Bithynia contained a few important cities (Nicaea, Chalcedon, Prousa) and rich agricultural land. Although its cities were eclipsed by the growth of Constantinople, Bithynia prospered from its location on the trade and military routes between Constantinople and Anatolia. The suburban coastal region east of Constantinople flourished particularly as the seat of many rich villas. Bithynia became part of the OPSIKION theme in the 7th C., then was divided between that theme and the OPTIMATOI. The civil province of Bithynia continued to exist into the 8th C., when Slav captives were settled there (Zacos, Seals 11:90f). Frequent later references are to the geographical region. Texts of the 13th C. mention a district called Mesothynia, which apparently denotes the peninsula of Nikomedia (D. Zakythenos, EEBS 19 [1949] 3). Bithynia preserves the remains of numerous fortifications but is esp. noted for its churches (Sige, Médikon, Pelekete, Nicaea). It was also a monastic center that grew in importance in the Iconoclastic period (Mt. Auxentios, Mt. Ólympos). Ecclesiastically, Bithynia was divided into three provinces after 451: Nikomedia, Nicaea, and Chalcedon.


BIZYE (Βίζη, mod. Vize), city in Thrace, northeast of ARKADIOPOLIS. A polis in the late antique province of Europe, Bizye appears in Byz. texts as kastron (Beševliev, Inschriften 184, no. 27), polisima (TheophChant 68.6–7), or polichnion (Zen. 3:346.15). The vita of MARY THE YOUNGER refers to Bizye as a polis, but describes the town’s inhabitants as engaging in agricultural work (AASS Nov. 4:699BC, 700F); in the eyes of the chronicler Geoffrey Villehardouin (par. 428), Vizoi (Bizye) was “good and strong.”

As a fortress Bizye played an important role during the 9th-C. revolt of THOMAS THE SLAV, whose son fled there but then surrendered to the emperor. Symeon of Bulgaria captured Bizye, demolished it, and later rebuilt the city walls. In the 13th C. Bizye was one of the larger ASTEIS (Akrop. 15414–15) and the base of many military operations; the city was one of the focal points during the CIVIL WAR OF 1341–47, and its demos actively participated in the political struggle (Weiss, Kantiakuzenos 75f). Bizye was finally taken by the Turks in 1453.

A bishopric by 431, then autocephalous archbishopric, Bizye became metropolis in the 14th C. It served as the place of exile for several impor-
tant ecclesiastical dissidents such as Maximos the Confessor (PG 90:160C).

The remains of ramparts still survive in the city. A.M. Mansel (Trakyanin kültür ve tarihi [Istanbul 1938] 45) suggests that their upper part was constructed in the 6th C. On the other hand, D. Dirimtekin (Ayasofya müzesi yılı [1963] 15-25) dates this section to the time of the Palaiologoi. The large Church of Hagia Sophia in Bizye combines the floor plan of a basilica with the elements of a cross-in-square church; its plan is similar to that of Dere Ağızı. C. Mango (ZRV 11 [1968] 9-19) suggests, on the basis of a painted inscription, now lost, that the church was built in the late 8th or 9th C. and housed the tomb of St. Mary the Younger in the 10th C. However, S. Eyice argues that the church dates to the 13th or 14th C., and may have replaced the earlier church where St. Mary was venerated (18 CorsiRav [1971] 293-97).


- T.E.G.

BLACHERNAI, CHURCH AND PALACE OF.
The name Blachernai (Βλαχέρναι) designates an area possessing a spring of water in the northwestern corner of Constantinople. A basilica of the Virgin Mary, which became the most famous Marian shrine of the city, is said to have been built there by Empress Pulcheria (ca.450). Leo I added a circular reliquary chapel (soros) after the "honorable robe" (see Maphorion) of the Virgin had been brought from Palestine. Situated a short distance outside the walls, the church was miraculously spared during the Avar siege of 626, after which Emp. Herakleios extended the walls to enclose it. A New Testament cycle in mosaic was destroyed by Constantine V and replaced by vegetal ornament and pictures of birds (Vita S. Stephani Junioris, PG 100:1120C). The church was burned down in 1070 and rebuilt. Fire destroyed it completely in 1434. Next to it was a bathhouse (Louma) in which the spring flowed. The latter is now enclosed in a modern Greek church.

South of the church complex and on higher ground, an imperial palace was set up by ca.500. It is known to us from protocols described in Decr. (bk.1, chs. 27, 34; bk.2, chs. 9, 12) and included one hall named Anastasiakos, another called Okeanos, and a third called Danoubios, the last communicating with the church complex by means of staircases. Under the Komnenoi the Blachernai palace became the customary residence of the emperor and was so strongly fortified as to resemble a castle. Alexios I and Manuel I built additional halls of great splendor. The Palaiologoi also lived in the Blachernai palace. Its approximate situation is marked by the mosque of Iyaz Efendi, but the evidence is too slight to allow even an approximate reconstruction (see also Tekfur Saray).


BLACK SEA. See Plague.

BLACK SEA (Πόντος Εὔξεινος, Μαύρη Θάλασσα). Throughout its history Byz. sought to maintain control of the Black Sea, in part to preclude foreign powers from establishing a foothold there and threatening Constantinople. Justinian I prevented the Sasanian Persians from gaining permanent access to the coast of Lazika; from the 7th C. Byz. policy in the area focused on diplomatic efforts and control of Cherson. Herakleios made a treaty with Kuvrat in hope of hindering Khazar access to the Azov Sea and the Crimea, and the Khazars were afterward the focus of Byz. diplomatic and missionary activity in the area. The Arabs never established a presence on the coast of the Black Sea, but the Rus' of Kiev repeatedly sailed through the Black Sea to attack Constantinople, beginning in 860. The city and naval arsenal of Cherson remained a Byz. possession (apart from a brief occupation by Vladmir I of Kiev in 988) until the Fourth Crusade, after which it passed into the hands of the empire of Trebizond. Only in 1215/16 did the Seljuk Turks establish a temporary naval base at Sinope; the
The southeastern coast of the Black Sea remained under the control of Trebizond until 1460.

Byzantine naval control was not matched by similar commercial success. The Black Sea was important as a source of food for Constantinople; fish came from its waters, and grain from the Dobrudja and Crimea. It was also a crossroads of long-distance trade, linking Byzantium with central Europe, Russia, the Caucasus, Central Asia, and China. This trade attracted Italian merchants, particularly Venetians and Genoese, from the 11th C. Manuel I, seeking an ally against Venice, granted Genoa the right to trade in the Black Sea. In 1261 Michael VIII granted the Genoese exclusive access to the Black Sea, together with tax exemptions, by the Treaty of Nympaion. Thereafter they dominated the Black Sea trade from their colonies of Galata, Vicina, Kaffa, Tana, Amastris, and Samsun (Amisos), and the profits of this trade were lost to Byz.

---


---

**BLASIOS OF AMORION**, saint; secular name Basil; born in village of Apatianai near Amorion, died Constantinople ca.912; feastday 20 Dec. After elementary schooling in his village, Blasios (Blàdós) came to Constantinople and chose an ecclesiastical career; Patr. Ignatios consecrated him deacon of Hagia Sophia. En route to Rome he had various adventures: he was sold into slavery to the “Scythians” (Pechenegs rather than Bulgarians), freed, robbed by pirates on the Danube, and saved by an angel; he returned to Bulgaria, met the local bishop and the “first archon” of the barbarians, and eventually reached Rome.
There he took the monastic habit and stayed for 18 years, mostly in the monastery of St. Caesarius, where he was consecrated priest. To escape his increasing fame, Blasios returned to Constantinople, joining the monastery of Stoudios ca.897. Around 900 he retreated to Athos, which he was forced to leave 12 years later because of a controversy. He returned to Constantinople but died soon after he had received a chrysobull from Leo VI. He was buried at the Stoudios monastery.

The anonymous author of his Life (written in the 920s or 940s and preserved in a single 10th- C. MS) claimed to have received his information from Blasios's disciple Loukas; it is plausible that the Life was produced in the Stoudios. The hagiographer praises Blasios's sociability and intellectual qualities (e.g., his work as a calligrapher) and defends moderation: the 

eganomenos who flogged the young monk Euphrosynos for having a filthy garment was condemned in a vision.


BLASTARES, MATTHEW, canonist and theologian, monk and priest in the monastery of Kyr Isaac in Thessalonike; died Thessalonike after 1346. In 1335 Blastares (variously spelled Blàstares, Blàsta ràs, Blàstàres) completed his principal work, Syntagma kata stoicheion (lit. Alphabetical Treatise) in 24 sections, most of them subdivided into chapters. Each chapter is devoted to a separate legal topic (e.g., 1.12 on robbers) and contains first the statements of CANON LAW and then those of civil law, the nomoi politikoi. In the preamble, Blastares defines his goal as gathering “all the canons” as well as interpreting and paraphrasing them (5.7–39). This attempt at reconciling canon and civil law differentiates the work of Blastares both from previous NOMOKANONES in which civil legislation is but an insignificant appendix and from previous synopses that ignore canon law (A. Soloviev, SBN 5 [1939] 700). As sources Blastares used not only the Basilika and other Byz. compendia but the Codex and Digest of Justinian I as well as the novels of various emperors (e.g., the novel of Andronikos II of 1306); he also used the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles and the commentary of Theodore Balsamon. The Syn-
tagma became popular beyond the borders of the empire and was translated into Serbian during the reign of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan. Blastares also wrote several short synopses of canon law, an index of Latin legal terms, theological works, hymns, etc.


PLP, no.2868.

BLATADON MONASTERY, established ca.1355 on the north edge of Thessalonike, next to the acropolis. Blatadon (Blastadon, Blàstòdow, Blàstæow, Blàstéow) was founded by Dorotheos Bates, metropolitan of Thessalonike (1371–79), and his brother Mark, a hagnographer and hieromonk from the Great Lavra (PLP, nos. 2818–19). Both were discipiles of Gregory Palamas and accompanied him to Thessalonike in 1352 after the triumph of Palamism. The monastery was dedicated to Christ Pantokrator and the Transfiguration. Ignatij of Smolensk visited it in 1405. The monks of Blatadon were anti-Unionist and opposed the Venetian occupation of Thessalonike (1423–30); Stoglioglyou (infra 162–73), however, rejects the tradition that they betrayed the city to the Turks in 1430 by suggesting to Murad II that he cut off the water supply. During the Turkish occupation, Blatadon was sometimes called Çavus Manastir.

Blatadon is the sole monastery of Byz. origin still functioning in Thessalonike; its much-restored 14th-C. church, on an inscribed-cross plan, is the only surviving Palaiologan building at the monastery. Frescoes dated between 1360 and 1380 by Ch. Mauropoulou-Tsioumi (He Thessalonike 1 [1985] 231–54) are preserved in the south chapel, and the library contains a number of Byz. MSS. Today the stauropegeic monastery houses the Patriarchal Institute of Patristic Studies (founded 1965), which owns an important collection of microfilms of MSS from Mt. Athos.


–A.M.T., A.C.
BLATTION (βλαττίων), a term that originally meant the color purple, and, by extension, the cloths, both silk and wool, dyed in the highest quality purple. By the 10th C., however, the term *blattion* had come to mean silk in general, regardless of shade. Silk curtains and festive hangings such as those in the Great Palace (*De cer.* 12.20, 572.2); hangings covering icons (Patmos inventory, ed. C. Astruc, *TM* 8 [1981] 21.33); and silk garments were all referred to as *blattia*. The meaning of the terms *diblattia* and *triblattia* is obscure. They have been thought to refer to the number of times the silk cloth was dipped in the dye, or to the number of colors used in weaving it. Guillaud has suggested that these may be double or triple bands of silk attached or applied to the basic piece of silk cloth, a proposal that neither the extant silks nor the depictions of court costume can readily substantiate. The term *blatopoles* (Prodromos in PG 133.11265B) designates a vendor of *blattia*.


A.G.

BLEMMYDES, NIKEPHOROS, teacher and writer in the empire of Nicaea; born 1197, died Ephesus ca.1269. Son of a doctor, Blemmydes (Βλεμμύδης, Βλεμμύδης) moved with his parents ca.1204 from Latin-occupied Constantinople to Bithynia where he pursued studies, including seven years of medicine, until his 26th year. His subsequent career in the church was initiated by Patr. GERMANOS II, who ordained him *anagnostes*, deacon, and *logothetes* in quick succession (1224–25). Ten years later Blemmydes took monastic vows, keeping his name, and ca.1237 was appointed *hegoumenos* of the monastery of Gregory Thau­matourgos in Ephesus. In 1241 he founded his own monastery near Ephesus. His attempts to ensure its independence failed, however, for it became a metochion of the Galesios monastery ca.1273.

Famous in his time for his learning, Blemmydes’ most important role was as a teacher. His best known students were George AKROPOLITES, whom he instructed in philosophy, and THEODORE II LASKARIS. In connection with his teaching duties he traveled to Athos, Thessalonike, Larissa, and Ohrid in search of books (1239–40) and wrote epitomes of logic and physics (PG 142:685–1320). A difficult man by most accounts, Blemmydes left a remarkable two-part autobiography, the *Partial Account* (1264, 1265), a defense of his life that contains elements of a hagiographical work (J.A. Munitiz in *Byz. Saint*, 164–68). His other surviving works include the *Imperial Statue*, a *Mirror of Princes* for Theodore II (which George GALESIOTES and George OINAIOTES paraphrased in the 14th C.), occasional verses, ascetic works, and fragments of a *typikon* (J.A. Munitiz, *REB* 44 [1986] 199–207).


R.J.M.

BLEMMYES (Βλέμμυες), a tribe of perhaps Libyan Berber origins that inhabited the eastern desert between the Nile and Red Sea in Upper Egypt. A 4th-C. historian (Amm.Marc. 14:4:3) describes them as half-naked warriors, all of equal rank, riding swift horses and camels. Diocletian in 297 ended the raids of the Blemmyes in Egypt by handing over to them the territory south of the First Cataract and by fortifying the island of Philae. The Blemmyes were concentrated in this area. Their embassies to the imperial court in the 320s and 330s are reported by Eusebius (*Vita of Constantine*) and in the *Abinnaeus Archive*. They resumed attacks in 373 (J. Desanges, *Meroitic Newsletter* 10 [1972] 33f); *Palladios* of Helens­polis met crowds of refugees from the Blemmyes at Tabennesi in the early 5th C. OLIMPIDOROS of THEBES, who visited the Blemmyes ca.423, reported that they possessed several cities and emerald mines and had developed a rudimentary form of administration headed by a “king.” An uprising of the Blemmyes was quelled ca.452 when Maximinos, the military commander of the THEBAID, defeated them and negotiated a hundred-year peace; at that time the Blemmyes were acting in concert with the Noubades (Nobatae), a neigh-
boring tribe, but soon a conflict arose between the two, and Silko, king of the Noubades, conquered the Blemmyes, as he boasted in an inscription. Probably to the 6th C. belong documents from the island of Gebelein (Greek and Coptic texts on leather from gazelle and crocodile skins) that record the names of some chieftains of the Blemmyes and indicate the penetration of Christianity into their predominantly pagan society. Justinian I reportedly destroyed their sanctuaries at Philae dedicated to Isis, Osiris, and Priapus. Greek papyri of the 6th C. often mention the Blemmyes, and in the early 7th C. a certain Dioskoros is known who, as a scribe of the Blemmyes, dealt with kommerkia. Kosmas Indikopleustes (11.21:2–5) indicates that the Blemmyes sold emeralds to the Axumites in Nubia, who then sent them to India. The numerous Coptic papyri of the 7th and 8th C. contain only two references to the Blemmyes.


**BLINDING** (*νυφλωσις*) as a punishment did not exist in the law of Justinian I; the evidence concerning the blinding of Christian martyrs during the persecution is probably legendary. The first certain case of punitive blinding is that of Patr. Kallinikos in 705 by Justinian II (Theoph. 375–13). The *Ecloga* mentions blinding only once (17.15)—as a punishment for stealing from the altar. The *Farmer's Law* (pars. 68–69) prescribes blinding for the thief of grain or wine who had been caught for the third time. Blinding became the major means of punishing political rivals; among the victims of blinding were Artabasdos, Constantine VI, Michael V, Romanos IV, and John IV. Michael VIII was probably the last emperor to resort to total blinding, although in 1373 John V, under pressure from Murad I, was compelled to order the partial blinding of Andronikos IV and his son, the future John VII (R. Loenertz, *EO* 38 [1939] 335). Blinding was a penalty for heretics, magicians, and traitors. Basil II employed mass blinding of prisoners to terrorize the Bulgarians with whom he was at war. Blinding was carried out by pouring boiling vinegar, gouging out the eyes, or applying a red-hot iron. The degree of blindness achieved could be of varying severity,
so that some generals continued to command armies after this operation. An attempt to introduce blinding in Kievan Rus' in 1097 failed because of general indignation.


A.K.

BLIND MAN, HEALING OF THE. The Gospels record several blind men healed by Christ: two who followed Jesus in Jericho (Mt 9:27-34); two who sat by the way in Jericho (Mk 10:46-52, Lk 18:35-43); one healed at Bethesda (Mk 8:23-26); and the man born blind, healed at Siloam (Jn 9:1-12). Gaining sight was an apt metaphor for gaining faith, and Early Christian art abounds in generic vignettes of Christ healing a blind person. Byz. art uses fewer such images, though no miracle cycle lacks some scene of blindness cured. Most frequently distinguished from the others is the healing at Siloam, usually depicted in at least two phases: Jesus placing mud on the man's eyes, and the man washing them. This is the most fully narrated of all healings: the Paris FRIEZE GOSPEL (fol.186r) uses eight vignettes. This healing is also distinctive in being one of the three water miracles recounted in the Gospel of John (also Christ and the Samaritan woman, Jn 4:5-30; paralytic at Bethesda, Jn 5:2-9) that are often joined in exegesis (E. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel* [London 1947] 363-65) and art (Sopocani, exornathex of Chora) to convey the healing power of faith.


A.W.C.

BLOOD (αἷμα) was understood in Byz. as the biblical "life of the living body" (Lev 17:11) and was consequently surrounded by taboos. The Book of the EPARCH (8.4) prohibited the use of blood for dyeing raw silk; the penalty for ignoring this prohibition was having one's hands cut off. Some blood taboos, such as the prohibition of eating blood, were imposed only on the clergy (APOTOLIC CANONS 62), whereas the cooking of blood broth (aimatia) was widespread among laymen. Bloodshed, as in military actions, was completely forbidden to the clergy. The precious Blood of Christ was regarded as the price of human redemption. The Church repeated the sacrifice of Jesus in the EUCHARIST, when the wine was thought to become the true Blood of Christ. Since blood was identified with life and redemption, the color purple, symbolizing blood, assumed an important role in the imperial cult. For Niketas Choniates, however, the imperial purple symbolized the shedding of blood and murder. Blood that left the body was identified with death, and a constant bloodthirstiness was ascribed to demons. Blood was also the symbol of union, as of family ties and particularly aristocratic lineages.


A.K.

BLOOD VENGEANCE. Killings in revenge are not well attested in Byz. sources. A. Mirambel (Byzantion 16 [1944] 381-92) mistakenly saw evidence for it in the term PHONIKON (but see P. Charanis, *Speculum* 20 [1945] 331-33). There are examples, however, of compensating the family of the deceased by handing over the person responsible for the MURDER: in the Peira (66.27; also 66.28) a slave who murdered a soldier at his master's order was given by the judges to the widow "to serve her." Neilos of Rossano advised the princess of Capua to give, as a form of penitence, one of her sons to the family of the man murdered by her sons at her instigation "for them to do with him whatever they wish" (AASS Sept. 7:308D-F).

The sources also preserve measures taken to prevent blood vengeance. Constantine VII legislated that the person guilty of a willful killing was to be subjected to lifelong exile far from the scene of the crime, thus protecting the victim's relations from the painful reminder of the crime and also helping to prevent a killing in retaliation (Zepos, *Jus* 1:233). Other factors that may have helped to check blood vengeance were the private settlement, which could be arranged between the murderer and the victim's family and which provided a form of compensation (*Basil. 11.1.1*; 60.53; 1; Peira 66.25 and 66.27), and the "warning" attached to documents issued by the church, addressed to civil officials and members of the deceased's family, admonishing them not to harm the killer, on penalty of excommunication (R.J. Macrides, *Speculum* 63 [1988] 509-38).

R.J.M.

BLUES. See Factions.
BOBBIO AMPULLAE. See Ampullae, Pilgrimage; Monza and Bobbio, Treasuries of.

BODRUM CAMII. See Myrelaion, Monastery of.

BODY (σώμα), sometimes distinguished from flesh (σάρξ), was considered in Byz. anthropology as one of the two "natures" that constituted man: unlike the soul, the body was construed as three-dimensional, visible, and corruptible (mortal). It consisted of four elements (stoicheia): earth, dry and cold; water, cold and wet; air, wet and warm; fire, warm and dry. It had four humors (chymoi): black bile, analogous to earth; phlegm—to water; blood—to air; light bile—to fire. The main somatic qualities were divisibility, qualitative change (warming, cooling, etc.), and mutability in response to voiding (kenosis) that created physical desires (hunger, thirst, etc.). A peculiar definition of the body is to be found in Anastasios I, patriarch of Antioch, and Anastasios of Sinai: the body is all that "was not uncreated" or "what originates from nothingness." The concept of a double creation—of the inner man and of the unity of the soul and body—had no chance of survival after the condemnation of Origenism. The body distinguishes man from both the angels and demons, even though sometimes the concept of angelic ( demonic) finer flesh was maintained. Thus, Psellos, in his demonology, insisted that the astral bodies of demons (pneumata) were vehicles to transfer false images, fantasies, and hallucinations, and to deceive mankind.

A major problem for Byz. theology was determining an appropriate moral or soteriological role for the body. The Byz. rejected the Stoic image of the body as the cage or prison of the soul as well as the Manichaean vision of the body as the embodiment of evil. The body, created by God himself, was conceived of as ethically irrelevant, an instrument through which the soul could sin. Corruptible as it was, the body was to expect resurrection.

BODYGUARD (σωματοφύλαξ). In addition to guards entrusted with the defense of the palace (hetaireia), there were small units designed to protect the person of the emperor; when the emperor traveled, the palatine somatophylakes guarded him (e.g., Attal. 9.20). Belisarios, while removed from supreme command, served as archon of the emperor's somatophylakes (Prokopios, Wars 8.21.1). In the 14th C. the corps of bodyguards was under the command of the primikieros of the court (aule) and consisted of several units, each of which had its own station: the Varangians stood watch at the doors of the emperor's chamber, the so-called paramonai in the palace court. There were also Tsakones and other mounted and foot soldiers (pseudo-Kod. 179f). The distinction between bodyguards, palace guards, and imperial retinue was blurred, and Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 184.11, 322.49) defined somatophylakes and doryphoroi ( retainers) together as the contingents closest to the emperor.

Bodyguards were often recruited from foreigners in West and East. Protection of the emperor was also assigned to some courtiers, one of whom, the parakoukomenos, slept at the threshold of the emperor's chamber. In the 5th- or 6th-C. romance The Tale of the Persian Affairs, it is said that King Kyros had female bodyguards, somatophylakesissai (E. Bradtke, Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof des Sasaniden [Leipzig 1899] 20.1–2)—but it is questionable whether this evidence reflects the existence of a corps of female bodyguards (of the empress?) at the late Roman or Byz. court. High-ranking military officers and influential private individuals might also have bodyguards (sometimes called boukellarios).

—A.K.

BODY LANGUAGE. The ideal of late Roman and Byz. behavior was "statuary": one should imitate the statue (agalma), avoiding unnecessary movements and appearing solemn and quiet. Early medieval attitudes condemned passionate emotions, including lamentations, and art and literature rarely present dramatic gesturing (M. Barasch, Gestures of Despair [New York 1976] 34f). Symeon the Theologian (Catéchêses, no.26.28–31) prescribed strict discipline for the body during prayer, and Psellos followed the same vein when he censured a priest for excessively moving his lips, shoulders, and hands (Ljubarskij, Psel 238).
Nevertheless, body movement was a significant component of state ceremonial (with proskynesis the extreme physical expression of self-submission), liturgy (the gestures of the priest), funerals (tearing of hair, beating of breasts), or marriage rites. It was also a part of everyday behavior—embraces and kissing signified greeting and respect (e.g., vita of Basil the Younger, ed. Vilinskij 1:398.14–16); a movement of a finger could denote a charitable attitude (vita of Basil the Younger, ed. Veselovskij 2:106.34–107.1); pulling out the hair of the beard expressed dismay (PG 111:797A); touching the beard indicated pleading for mercy (Athanasiou I of Constantinople, ep.94.19–22).

Some gestures—in reality or in fiction?—stressed a tragic situation, as in a description of the execution of Andronikos I (Nik.Chon. 351.53–54): the maimed emperor, whose hand had been amputated, in pain extended the stump to his mouth as if trying to suck out the dripping blood. On the other hand, the strange and indecent body language of a holy fool (such as Symeon of Emesa) was interpreted metaphorically as an expression of the saint's utmost humility.

---

**BOEOTIA** (Bou toutia), a region in central Greece; Thebes was still considered its metropolis in the 6th C. Prokopios (Buildings 4.2.24) stresses that the city walls of Boeotian towns were neglected before the reign of Justinian I, and Zosimos (5.5.7; ed. Paschoud 3:11.25–30) describes how “all Boeotia” was destroyed by the invasion of Alaric in 395/6. On the other hand, an inscription shows that in 401/2 Boeotia was able to provide the state with a significant amount of grain (F. Cauer, RE 3 [1899] 663), and U. Kahrstedt (Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit [Bern 1954] 86f) suggested that substantial areas of the region were turned over to large estates. Archaeological investigation demonstrates that in the 4th–6th C. Boeotia retained, in general outline, the classical urban pattern, the territory of Thebais showing even a remarkable resettlement. From the 7th C. Boeotia was in decline, and O. Rackham (BSA 78 [1983] 346f) concludes that this period was bad for men and goats, but good for trees, so that the woodland expanded. Some revival can be observed in the 9th–11th C. when the massive stone church at Skripou near Orchomenos (dated 873/4) and Hosios Loukas were constructed. The area seems to have been densely populated after 1204. Boeotia formed a part of the theme of Hellas, although the ancient name of Boeotia appears frequently in various authors; for instance, Skylitzes (Skyl. 341.28–29) lists Thessaly, Boeotia, and Attica; Nikephoros Gregorios (Greg. 2:239.7 and 17–18) speaks of Boeotia and Thebes as an administrative unit.


---

**BOETHIUS**, more fully Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, Latin philosopher and writer; born ca.480, died Ticinum ca.524. Of a rich and consular family, he was cared for by the family of Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus upon his father's death. Boethius may have studied in Alexandria. Boethius served Theodorik the Great as consul (510) and magister officiorum (ca.522–23), until his intervention in a treason trial resulted in his own condemnation, imprisonment, and execution on the same charge.

While in prison he wrote On the Consolation of Philosophy, a five-book dialogue in prose and verse between himself and Philosophy, neoplatonically showing how the soul may achieve a vision of God. His authorship, now generally accepted, of five theological treatises, including one on the Trinity and anti-Nestorian polemic (J.R.S. Mair in Maistor 149–58), demonstrates that Boethius was indeed a Christian. An expert in Greek as well as Latin and a practitioner of many genres including poetry, his main interests were philosophy and translation. His scheme to latinize all of Aristotle and Plato was never completed, although he did manage to translate some of the former. The above works, along with writings on logic, mathematics, and music, helped to consolidate the medieval educational concept of the seven liberal arts (quadrivium and trivium). Some of his work was later translated into Greek by Maximos Planoudes and Manuel kalekas (A. Pertusi, Aphos 11 [1951] 301–22) as well as by Prochoros Kydones (D.Z. Niketas, Hellenika 35 [1984] 275–315).

Ed. PL 63–64. Philosophiae consolatio, ed. L. Bieler (Tournhout 1957). Gr. tr. by Planoude—Boëce: De la consolation...
BOGOMIL, POP, the presumed founder of the sect of the BOGOMILS; fl. 10th C. Our information about him comes mainly from KOSMAS THE PRIEST, who states that Bogomil was a priest (pop) and that he began to teach his heresy in Bulgaria in the reign of Tsar Peter of Bulgaria (927–69). A Russian index of forbidden books, preserved in a 16th-C. MS, states that Bogomil wrote heretical books. His name is probably the Slavic equivalent of the Greek Theophilos. His dualist followers in 10th-C. Bulgaria, named after him, are described by Kosmas as “lamb-like, gentle, modest, and silent, and pale from hypocritical fasting. They do not talk idly, nor laugh loudly, nor give themselves airs. They keep away from the sight of men, and outwardly they do everything so as not to be distinguished from Orthodox Christians.”


BOGOMILS, a dualist, neo-MANICHAEAN sect, founded in 10th-C. Bulgaria, presumably by Pop Bogomil. It subsequently spread over the entire Balkan peninsula and parts of Asia Minor, exerted a formative influence over the CATHAR movement in Italy and France, and proved for five centuries a determined enemy of the Byz. church. Holding the material world to be the creation and realm of the Devil, the Bogomils denied most of the basic doctrines of the Orthodox church, including the Incarnation. They imposed, at least on a minority of “elect” initiates, an ascetic life that required abstinance from sexual intercourse, meat, and wine, and—at least in 10th-C. Bulgaria—preached civil disobedience. Most evidence of their teaching and behavior is in the works of their enemies, esp. KOSMAS THE PRIEST, Anna Komnene, and Euthymios Ziga-BOGOMIL, though some valuable information is also found in the Interrogatio Johannis (or Liber Secretus, i.e., “Secret Book”), the only undeniably authentic product of Bogomil APOCRYPHA.

Originally the Bogomil doctrines owed much to the teaching of the PAULICIANS, who lived alongside them in the Balkans, and, unlike the Bogomils, were warlike in spirit and frequently rose up in arms against their Byz. overlords. MESSALIANISM, with which Bogomilism was frequently identified in the later Middle Ages, was probably used by Orthodox writers of the time as little more than a label for suspect or heretical mystical currents.

In the 11th C. the sect gained ground in Constantinople where, under its leader BASIL THE BOGOMIL, it found converts in aristocratic circles. At the behest of Alexios I Komnenos, Euthymios Zigabenos described its doctrines, rules, and ceremonies at considerable length. In the 12th C. Bogomilism spread in the empire’s Slavic provinces (notably in Macedonia), and also in Asia Minor, where in the 13th C. the Nicaean patriarch GERMANOS II wrote a treatise against them. Despite continued persecution, notaries of Bogomilism scored notable successes in Serbia, Dalmatia, and esp. Bosnia, where under the name of Patarenes they later became the dominant religious group. After the Turkish conquest they disappeared from the Balkans.


BOHEMUND (Βαϊμούντος), son of ROBERT GUESCARD; born between ca.1050 and 1058, died Bari? 5 or 7 Mar. 1109 (A. Gadolin, Byzantium 52 [1982] 125–31) or 1111. In 1081 he accompanied his father in attacking Alexios I, but was forced to withdraw in 1084. He joined the First Crusade in 1096 and reached Constantinople ca.9 Apr. 1097. There he swore fealty to Alexios, but Alexios put off his request to be named domestikos of the East. During the siege of Antioch, Bohemund helped induce TATIKIOS to depart, then obtained the city in violation of his oath to Alexios. Bohemund fought against the Byz. at Laodikeia until he was captured by Danismend ca. July 1100. Following his ransom in 1103, he again fought the Byz. Late in 1104 he returned to Italy; with papal support,
he called for a new Crusade, then, in France (1106), proclaimed his intention of directing it against Alexios, whom he denounced for treachery to the Crusaders. His expedition to Dyrrahchion (Oct. 1107) became trapped between the Byzantine fleet and army. Bohemund was forced to accept a treaty at Devol (Sept. 1108) whereby he became an imperial vassal and received Antioch as a fief from Alexios (J.A.N. Ljubarskij, M.M. Frejdenberg, VzVrem 21 [1969] 260–74). Anna Komnene depicts him as valiant, clever, an outstanding and farsighted commander, but treacherous, deceitful, a natural liar, and chameleon. His goal, in her opinion, was to win for himself land and power, and ultimately to seize Byz.


—C.M.B.

BOILAS (Boīlas), name of Bulgarian origin; it designated a high Bulgarian title. The first known Boilas in Byz. was the patrikios Constantine, a contemporary of the 8th-C. empress Irene. St. Ioannikios is said to have been related to the Boilas family. In the 10th C. members of the Boilas family were military commanders: Bardas Boilas, strategos of Chaldia, inspired a revolt in Armenia ca.922; Petronas Boilas served as katepano of Nikopolis (on the Pontos?) during the reign of Constantine VII. Judging from the names, one might infer that these two Boilades were Armenians. Some members of the family were courtiers: the chamberlain Constantine Boilas was involved in 925 in an unsuccessful plot against Romanos I and was compelled to take the monastic habit. The status of the family declined by the 11th C.: historians of this period call Romanos Boilas, the favorite of Constantine IX, a man of humble origin (Psello, Chron. 2:38, par.140.10); he was in charge of the imperial guard. Convicted of plotting against the emperor ca.1051, he was exiled but soon returned to the court. The traditional image of Romanos Boilas as a buffoon accounts for the biased judgment of him in Psello and other sources. His contemporary, Eustathios Boilas, is known from his will of 1059 (see BOILAS, WILL OF EUSTATHIOS). Even though the name of Boilas was common in the later period (PLP, nos. 2933–41), the Boilades did not occupy significant posts at that time. George Boilas (ca.1400) wrote a now-lost treatise Against the Latins to refute the teaching of Thomas Aquinas (Beck, Kirche 745).

Lit. Winkelmann, Quellenstudien 150f., 181f. —A.K.

BOILAS, WILL OF EUSTATHIOS. In Apr. 1059, Eustathios Boilas, protospatharios, epi tou chrysotriklinou, and hypatos, wrote his will; it was then copied on the last blank folios of a MS of St. John Klimax (Paris, B.N. Coisl. 263). Boilas was writing in an unknown place (probably near Edessa in Syria) where he had taken refuge after leaving his native Cappadocia. He had previously served for 15 years under the late dux Michael Apokapes and was still attached to members of his family. Reasonably wealthy in 1059, he had many slaves and real estate that he distributed among his two married daughters and Theotokos tou Salem, his pious foundation, which was scheduled to remain their property. This testament is important because of its early date and because it provides an insight into a poorly known region and society.


BOIOANNES (Boiōhannēs), a family name, probably of Slavic origin. According to M. Mathieu (Nouvelle Chî 4 [1952] 299–301), the name was connected with the Slavic name Boian; it is also recorded in the form of Boinos, Baianos (Dujčev, Proučvanija 11, n.1; V. Beševliev, Byzantion 35 [1965] 3); one of Leo VI’s wives was Eudokia Biaina. The first known Boioannes was Basil, katepano of Italy in 1017–28 (see BOIOANNES, BASIL). It is questionable whether a rebellious magnate called Baianos (Skyl. 396.26), whose fortune was confiscated in 1094, belonged to the same family. Another Boioannes, exaugustus of Italian sources, was katepano of Italy in 1041; the Normans captured him. Skylitzes (Skyl. 426.38–41) considered him a descendant of Basil Boioannes. Constantine Boioannes, a member of the local nobility in Dyrhachion, is mentioned in a synodal decision of 1199 (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.1193): a certain Alexios Kapandrites, backed by an armed band, forced Constantine’s sister, Eudokia, to marry him; in
retaliation Constantine seized his undesirable brother-in-law, fettered him, and gave Eudokia in marriage to another man.


- A.K.

**BOIOANNES, BASIL, protospotharios and KATEPANO of Italy (1017-summer 1028); whether the name derives from Slavic or Greek is uncertain (M. Mathieu, Nouvelle Clio 4 [1952] 299-301). The career of Boioannes before his appointment as katepano by Basil II and after his recall by Constantine VIII is unknown. In Oct. 1018, at Cannae, Boioannes defeated the rebel Melo of Bari. He fortified northern Apulia, where he founded Troia (1019). Cooperating with Pandolf IV of Capua, Boioannes's army campaigned successfully on the Garigliano (1021). In response, Pope Benedict VIII summoned Henry II of Germany, who in 1022 captured Pandolf and vainly besieged Troia. After Henry's death (1024), Boioannes helped restore Pandolf (1026); Salerno, Capua, and Naples acknowledged Byz. overlordship. Boioannes secured papal recognition of Bari as a metropolis and of Troia and other places in the capitanate as bishoprics (W. Holtzmann, NachGött [1960] no.2:19-39). In 1024 Boioannes raided Croatia and in 1025 joined in an unsuccessful expedition sent by Basil II against Sicily. In May-Sept. 1041, another Boioannes, a son or relative, was katepano, but was captured by Lombards and Normans.


- C.M.B.

**BOJANA, a settlement in Bulgaria, southwest of Sofia, the site of a double church dedicated to Sts. Nicholas and Panteleemon. The smaller, east church has been dated on the basis of style to the 12th C. It has a square exterior enlivened by blind arches and a cruciform interior. The later church is a two-story funerary structure adjoining the older church at the west and serving as its narthex. The lower story is a barrel-vaulted hall with arcossola; the chapel above it is cruciform, with shortened cross arms and a central dome. Frescoes dated by inscription to 1259 cover the entire interior of both churches. The scenes follow the usual Byz. arrangement, and certain iconographic details (the fresco icons of Christ Euergetes and Christ Chalkites, the cityscapes) link the paintings to Constantinople. Despite the presence of some up-to-date details (such as the intricate armor), the tall, slim proportions of the figures and landscape in the compositions reflect Byz. models of the 11th and 12th C., and give the ensemble an archaic look. The lower church contains a cycle of scenes from the life of St. Nicholas of Myra; though Byz. in origin, the cycle is unusually long and displays many Western features. The captions to all the frescoes are in Slavonic; the artists may have come from TÜRNOVO. The donor portraits of the sebastokrator Kalojan (otherwise unknown) and his wife in the lower church are surprisingly individualized.


- E.C.S.

**BOLDENSELE, WILHELM VON** (originally named Otto of Nygenhusen), German traveler to Mt. Sinai; born in Westphalia-Saxony, died in Cologne? after 1337. A Dominican friar, Otto left his priory, changed his name to Wilhelm, and, in 1332-36, on assignment from the papal curia, traveled to the Levant. His purpose was probably not just a simple pilgrimage but also a reconnaissance with an eye to planning a new Crusade. At any rate, he paid serious attention to strategic points in Palestine and to the places where the Mamlûk sultan allegedly kept his treasures. On his way to Sinai Wilhelm stopped at Constantinople, Chios, Rhodes, and Cyprus; whether he visited Athens is unclear. In Constantinople he was received by Andronikos III, who gave him a letter to deliver to the sultan of Egypt. In his Itinerary, Wilhelm describes the marvelous churches and palaces of Constantinople and says that Hagia Sophia surpassed any other building in the world. He dwells particularly on the equestrian statue of Justinian I, which, to Wilhelm, seemed to threaten potential rebels and enemies of the empire. The Itinerary of Wilhelm was used by his contemporary Ludolf of Sudheim, who traveled to the East in 1336-41; in some cases Ludolf corrected and added to the work of his predecessor.
BOLERON (Βολερόν), region in Thrace between the Rhodope mountains and the sea, bounded by the Nestos River on the west and the defile of Korpiles on the east. First mentioned in the vita of Gregory of Dekapolis (as a geographical location), it became an administrative unit in the first half of the 11th C.: an act of 1047 refers to a “new dioikesis” of Boleron (Ioiv., no.29.77). By 1083 Boleron was considered a separate theme, containing at least two banda, Mosynopolis and Pertheorion (Typikon of Gregory Pakourianos, ed. P. Gautier, REB 42 [1984] 37.288). Most commonly it appears as part of the joint theme of Boleron, Strymon, and Thessalonike—the first known reference is the hypommnema of its judge Constantine Kamateros of 1037 (Docheiari., no.1.35). After 1204 the region was part of the Latin Kingdom of Thessalonike. It was probably reconstituted ca.1246 by John III Vatatzes and called the theme of Boleron-Mosynopolis. In the early 14th C. it was united with Mosynopolis, Serres, and Strymon under a kephale (Guillou, Méneète, nos. 7.25–26, 11.1–2). A document of 1344 (Docheiari., no.22.1–3), however, considers Boleron, Popolia, Serres, Strymon, and Melnik as kastra, in contrast to the themes of Thessalonike and Berroia.


BONE CARVING, a perennial industry, based on the slaughter of cattle and pack animals. Bone was used for buttons, knobs, and struts as well as for tools, esp. in the weaving trade. Bone gaming-pieces, containers, and bird-rings as well as ornamental handles for fans or fly-switches from many different periods have been found in Constantinople (M.V. Gill in R.M. Harrison, Excavations at Sarazhane in Istanbul, vol. 1 [Princeton 1986] 226–33, 251–53, 258–63); bone’s range of application thus exceeded that of ivory, although it was probably worked by the same craftsmen. Numerous plaques attached to caskets and boxes, often said to be of ivory, are in fact of bone.


A.C.

BONIFACE OF MONTFERRAT (Βουνφαίτιος ο Μόντιτς Φεράνττις), marquis of Thessalonike (1204–07); born early 1150s, died near Mosynopolis 4 Sept. 1207. In 1179–80 Boniface served as guardian of the captive Christian of Mainz while his brother Conrad of Montferrat traveled to Constantinople (D. Brader, Historische Studien: Bonifaz von Montferrat bis zum Antritt der Kreuzfahrt [1202] [Berlin 1907; rp. Vaduz 1965] 23–25). In June 1201, possibly influenced by his cousin King Philip II of France, Boniface accepted the leadership of the Fourth Crusade (E. Kittel, Byzantion 51 [1981] 562–65). At Christmas 1201, at Hagenau, he met another cousin, Philip of Swabia, and the future Alexios IV; they probably discussed the use of the Crusade to enthrone Alexios. Boniface avoided participating in the capture of Zara, but early in 1203 enthusiastically supported the proposal of Alexios and Philip of Swabia to turn the Crusade against Constantinople. After Alexios III fled, Boniface joined Alexios IV in an expedition through Thrace. In late 1203, he took a leading role in the discussions with Alexios IV.

During the sack of Constantinople, Boniface occupied the Great Palace, where his captives included the widow of Isaac II, Margaret of Hungary, whom he subsequently married. Because he had commanded the Crusaders, the populace of Constantinople anticipated his choice as emperor and hailed him as Ayos vasileas machio (“the holy emperor, the marquess”), but Baldwin of Flanders was elected. Boniface received Thessalonike as a kingdom, but a quarrel over it with Baldwin (mid-1204) was resolved with difficulty. Initially the populace of Thessalonike welcomed him warmly; later he appropriated the dwellings of the wealthiest inhabitants for his knights. In late 1204, using Margaret and Isaac’s son Manuel (clad in imperial robes) to smooth his advance, Boniface drove Leo Sgouros from Thessaly and occupied central Greece, where he captured Alexios III. The inhabitants of Thebes received Boniface enthusiastically, but he rejected the support of the Byz. aristocracy who then turned to Kalojan. In
1205–07 he fought Kalojan and allied himself with Henry of Hainault, then perished in a Bulgarian ambush.


—C.M.B.

BOOK (βιβλιον, βιβλα, δέλτος). The written word was of great importance in Byz., for the transmission of the Bible (the biblos par excellence) and patristic literature, and for the preservation of the heritage of classical antiquity. The number of preserved Greek MSS is about 55,000 (A. Dain, Les manuscrits [Paris 1964] 77), of which perhaps 40,000 are Byz. They are mainly in the form of a codex, but the roll survived in the transmission of liturgical texts and in the imperial chancery. Few pre-10th-C. MSS survive; the numbers of MSS produced increased dramatically with the introduction of minuscule script. Most MSS were liturgical or theological; these books predominate both in modern collections and in medieval inventories of monastic libraries. Literary, scientific, and historical books were generally found in the private collections of literati. Books were a rare and expensive commodity in Byz., because of the shortage of writing materials (parchment and paper) and the length of time it took a scribe to copy a MS (see Book Trade). N. Wilson has shown that in the 9th C. a MS of about 400 folios cost 15–20 nomismata, a sum reckoned by C. Mango as equivalent to half the annual salary of a civil servant (Books & Bookmen, 3f, 38f).

Private libraries rarely exceeded 25 volumes. Booksellers are scarcely ever mentioned; books were obtained by borrowing from friends, commissioning the copying of a MS at a scriptorium, or using a library. Hence books were highly valued by clergy and intellectuals; MSS from libraries frequently contain an imprecation against anyone who would dare steal the book. The designation of a book for a certain use might change in the course of the centuries; thus the Vienna Dioskorides (Vienna, ÖNB med.gr.1) was originally dedicated to the princess Anicia Juliana in the 6th C. but served as a herbal for a hospital in Constantinople in the 14th and 15th C. Many monasteries such as Studios, Hodegon, and Galesios housed important scriptoria; at others, however, esp. in the early Christian centuries, books were scorned. Antony the Great reportedly memorized the Scriptures so that he had no need for books (PG 26:845A, 945A); an abbot criticized a monk for spending money on codices instead of the poor (PG 65:416C).


—A.M.T., E.G.

BOOKBINDING (στάχωμα, ἄψισμα). The codex was protected by a binding, usually of leather or parchment, more rarely of silk or precious metals. Normally two leather-covered wooden boards held together and protected the quires, which the bookbinder stitched together. The dimensions of the quires and of the boards that form the binding are identical. In contrast to Western bookbinding, Byz. bindings did not have raised bands but were distinguished by a smooth spine. Sumptuous bindings sometimes took the form of metal book covers, occasionally adorned with precious stones or enamels. Technical names for elements of the decoration are known from the description of books in the inventories of monastic libraries (such as Patmos). Owing to the custom of storing MSS horizontally, the leather of the binding was protected by bosses (amygdalia, lit. “almonds”). Preserved examples of Byz. bookbinding permit the analysis of the stamps used for decoration; further research of this sort could enable us to investigate centers for bookbinding. Among the motifs used for blind-tooling on bindings from the late Byz. period are the monogram of the Palaiologos family (P. Hoffmann, Scriptorium 39 [1985] 274–81) and metal representations of patron saints.


—E.G.

BOOK COVER. Some ancient codices still have their original bookbinding of wooden boards, sometimes covered in leather; metal and silk and other textiles were also used for covers. A number of preserved metal and ivory plaques, which cor-
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Gospel lectionaries, intended mainly for display, either on the altar or during the Little Entrance. The Crucifixion is the dominant subject of medieval Gospel covers, though Deesis compositions and Nativity scenes are also recorded. By the 14th C., Crucifixion scenes on the front cover are accompanied by Anastasis scenes on the back. Both images are surrounded by busts of angels, prophets, bishops, or saints and Christological scenes closely resembling contemporary icon frames (Treasury S. Marco 176–78).


M.M.M., L.Ph.B.

BOOK ILLUSTRATION AND ILLUMINATION. Conventionally the terms are used synonymously, or the former may refer to figural and the latter to ornamental decoration. MS illumination—a topic of study inaugurated by N.P. Kondakov in 1876—provides the most comprehensive evidence for the history of Byz. painting and is the oldest and best-studied area of Byz. art history. MSS were decorated by scribes and/or illuminators. Some were painted at the same time as they were written, but generally the text of the entire book was first copied and then it was illustrated; miniatures were either added in spaces left by the scribe or painted on separate leaves. A rare example of the illustration preceding the writing is the Menologion of Basil II. In the latter the unit of work was the single folio, but more commonly an illuminator, working sometimes in a scriptorium, executed the entire quire. A scribe might illuminate his own work or collaborate with someone else. The basic composition of a miniature was first established by a preliminary sketch, which then was typically covered with opaque pigments. Colored washes sufficed for simpler ornament and became popular for figural illustration in the Palaiologan period. Miniatures, esp. those of the Decorative Style, often cracked and flaked and were repainted during and after the Middle Ages.

The overwhelming number of decorated MSS are religious, with the Psalter and Gospel book predominating. Certain liturgical texts were dec-

respond to the general sizes of Byz. books, are thought to have served originally as covers; examples are the 6th-C. sets of silver plaques in the Kaper Koraon Treasure and the Sion Treasure, decorated with standing figures or a cross under an arch. The colophon of a Syriac MS of 633/4 written near Damascus refers to its cover composed of metal plates and gems (J. Leroy, Les manuscrits syriaques à peintures [Paris 1964] 118). Elaborate fittings for book covers are described in church inventories in and after the 11th C.: cross-shaped panels (stauroi) at the center and L-shaped corners (gammata); hinged straps (kompothelika); roundels (boulai); nailheads (karphia); and almond-shaped bosses (amygdalia) (Pantel., no.7.6–8; C. Astruc, TM 8 [1981] 22f).

The most elaborate covers were reserved for
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orrhate, esp. lectionaries and liturgical rolls (see rolls, liturgical), but illustrated versions of the oktoechos and the sticharion are rare. A special edition of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos was created for liturgical use. Many MSS of the menologion are illustrated with images of saints and their martyrdom. Accounts of church councils, theological treatises, and monastic texts, such as the Typikon, the Heavenly Ladder of John Climax, or the romance of Barlaam and Ioasaph, were illustrated with varying frequencies.

Secular texts were decorated less often. A few imperial rolls open with imperial portraits or frame the text with decorated borders. The only Greek historical text with narrative illustration, the MS of John Skylitzes in Madrid, was produced in Norman Sicily. Various scientific manuscripts are accompanied by essential pictures and diagrams (Dioskorides, Nikander). Decorated literary texts are very rare, but fragments of a 5th-C. Iliad with later Byz. marginalia are preserved in Milan. Other decorated texts range from an Alexander Romance in Venice to an Epitaphalamion in the Vatican.

Illuminated MSS are more common in some periods than others. The rare and well-studied books from the pre-Iconoclastic period (Rossano Gospels, Rabbula Gospels, Genesis MSS in Vienna and London) are painted in a soft painterly manner of ancient origin. Little survives from the period of Iconoclasm, except a Ptolemy MS in the Vatican. From the latter half of the 9th C., the most important MSS are the Khlovd Psalter, the Paris Gregory, and the Sacra Parallela. The 10th C.—the height of Byz. illumination according to some—includes the classicizing Paris Psalter, Bible of Leo Sarellarios, Joshua Roll, and Stavronikitii Gospels. The style and iconography of 11th- and 12th-C. MSS (Menologion of Basil II, the Theodore Psalter, and the Codex Ebnerianus) are more innovative, however, and in this period, the ornament of headpieces, initials, and canon tables reaches its apogee. The many MSS of the Decorative Style testify to major provincial production during the late 12th and early 13th C. Palaiologan MSS feature pear-shaped figures, painted in pastel colors, and intricate ornament imitative of the Islamic arabesque. While some Palaiologan MSS were made for the emperor and his family, ecclesiastical patronage was more important. During the later 14th C., the production of deluxe Greek MSS declined; it all but ceased in the 15th C. but resumed in Renaissance Italy.

The reasons why decorated MSS were created are probably as numerous as the MSS themselves. For the many illustrated MSS that were donations to religious institutions, the principal motivation expressed in dedication notes is the hope of eternal salvation. Miniatures of the patron, offering the book to an intercessory saint, document the gift and proclaim the donor’s piety and association with saintly patrons. Images of contemporary persons affirm or legitimize political and social status, for example, Christ blessing the emperor or investing the hegoumenos of a monastery. Illustrations establish the context in which the text was used, as when the liturgical roll opens with a scene at the altar, an herbal adds to a plant picture an illustration of its medicinal use, or a lectionary depicts not the text’s content, but the religious occasion on which it was read. Even the most literal illustration calls attention to certain passages and not others. Some miniatures provide sophisticated commentary, while others serve as devotional images no different from other icons.

The contemporary significance of the illuminated MS in Byz. is attested by the language of inventories, wills, and notices of later owners and by the considerable impact that Byz. MS illustration had on Armenian, Syriac, and Coptic illumination. Byz. illuminators painted Gospel books in Georgian and Arabic, and Slavic artists adapted Byz. illustration and ornament for local contexts. Even Muslim artists copied illustrated scientific MSS. Few illuminated Byz. MSS are documented in western Europe before 1204, but many were imported afterwards. In the 15th C., humanists collected secular texts, which were seldom decorated, but their secondary interest in theological literature brought many illuminated MSS to European libraries. The appreciation of Byz. MSS as art objects is a product of the later 14th and 20th C. and had varied consequences. Miniatures were excised from MSS, forged by modern painters, and divorced from textual and cultural contexts in art historical studies. Yet the high artistic value accorded them gained a wider modern audience for Byz. culture in general.

LIT. N.P. Kondakov, Istoriya vizantijskogo iskusstva (Odessa 1876), tr. as Histoire de l’art byzantin considéré principalement dans les miniatures (Paris 1886–91). V.N. Lazarev, Storia
BOOK OF THE EPARCH ('Επαρχικόν Βιβλίον), a collection of regulations of the activity of the Constantinopolitan guilds, which came under the supervision of the eparch of the city. The complete text survives in a 14th-C. MS (Geneva, Bibliothèque de Genève, no.23); the title and preambles are also preserved in an Istanbul MS (Metochion Taphou, no.25). In several MSS can be found the first three paragraphs of chapter 1 of the Book of the Eparch excerpted, as it is said, from "the decrees on city guilds (somateia)" (P. Noailles, A. Dain, Les novelles de Léon VI le Sage [Paris 1944] 376f). The MS of Metochion Taphou gives the name of the legislator—Leo VI (as do the fragments from ch.1)—and the date, 911/12 (D. Gkines, EEBS 13 [1937] 186). However, the mention in four paragraphs of tetartera (coins that were not introduced until the mid-10th C.) permits the hypothesis that the treatise was compiled (or interpolated) under Nikephoros II Phokas. This opinion is rejected by A. Schminck (Rechtsbücher 27, n.26) who identifies the tetarteron cited in the Book of the Eparch as the tremissis or semissis known through the reign of Basil I.

The Book of the Eparch is a collection in 22 chapters of rules devoted to separate guilds—notaries; argyropratai; money changers; various dealers in clothing and perfume; candlemakers; soapmakers; purveyors of groceries, meat, bread, fish, and wine—as well as to some assistants of the eparch (legatarii) and the so-called bothroi and technital. Some chapters repeat the same statements and probably were compiled separately. Certain important professions and trades (e.g., potters, ironmongers, tailors, dyers, shoemakers, barbers, physicians) are not included.

P. Pieler (in Hunger, Lit. 2:471) considers the Book of the Eparch a document that "belongs completely to the sphere of the late antique system of guilds." P. Schreiner (in LMA 3:2043), on the other hand, emphasizes the differences between the commercial organization described in the Book of the Eparch and that of late antiquity, since the 10th-C. treatise reflects neither coercive nor hereditary membership in guilds. Sjuzjumov views the regulations as representing the economic ideas of Leo VI.

BOOK OF THE HIMYARITES, a Syriac text preserved (in fragments) in a MS of the 15th C. with some remnants in another, 10th-C. codex. The Book describes the persecutions by Masruq (Dhu-Nuwas) in Najran and the invasion of Kaleb (Eleboam), the king of Axum, in 525. The Book was written by a Monophysite author immediately after the events described, probably on the basis of oral information from eyewitnesses. Moberg (infra) tentatively identified the author as a certain Sergios (or George) of Rusařah, of whom nothing is known save his participation in an embassy sent by Justin I to the Lakhmid Alamundar of Hira. Shahid (infra), however, identified him with Symeon, bishop of Beth-Arsham, the author of a letter detailing the same events.

BOOK TRADE in the strict sense hardly ever existed in Byz., in contrast to the flourishing book production and distribution of late antiquity. There was a certain market for old and rare books, while new books were always produced on commission for the public library of the commissioner or the library of a public or ecclesiastical institution. Some MSS contain indications about the price, the charges for the copying and those for the material (i.e., the parchment) being calculated separately. Arethas of Caesarea paid around 15–20 nomismata on the average for a MS, about a third of this amount being for the parchment. In other cases the data concerning book prices are much less clear. Because the size and format of the books in question are often unknown, the average price of a Byz. book cannot be determined, much less related to the purchasing power of the currency during the period in question. Writing material remained expensive even after...
the introduction of oriental paper, and only in the last centuries of the empire were costs reduced by the importation of western paper. Under these circumstances acquiring and collecting books was a privilege of institutions and of a very few wealthy individuals. Owing to the high prices, intellectuals rarely could satisfy their need for books through purchase; as a result, scholars often borrowed books from one another and copied them personally.


W.H.

BOOTY (σκόπλας). The spoils of war included the enemy’s baggage, equipment, animals, money, and even their persons, which could be sold into slavery or held for ransom (see Prisoners of War). The military treaties laid down strict regulations against soldiers’ plundering during battle (for which the penalty was death) and assigned second-rank men or soldiers’ attendants to follow the combatants and collect booty or prisoners for distribution afterwards (Strat. Maurik. 2.g. pp. 126-28; Praecepta Milit. 7.14-21, 16.32-35). According to the rules on division of spoils set out in the Ecologa (18.1) and the 10th-C. Sylloge Tacti-corum, ch.50 (ed. A. Dain [Paris 1938] 98f), one-sixth of the collected booty was reserved for the imperial treasury and the remainder given out to the soldiery. Interestingly, officers did not receive booty in addition to their wages unless they had distinguished themselves in battle; their reward came out of the imperial share. The Ecologa 16.1-2 states that booty and gratuities granted to soldiers counted among peculium castrense.

Details from historical sources show practice at variance with theory in the distribution of booty and revenues derived therefrom. Ibn Hawqal describes the efforts of Nikephoros II Phokas to tax or appropriate revenues generated from the sale of prisoners or booty to finance his military expeditions (Configuration de la terre, tr. J.H. Kramers, G. Wiet, vol. 1 [Paris 1964] 192-94). Basil II divided prisoners taken at Longas (1016) three ways between himself, his allies from Rus’ and his own troops (Skyl. 355.22-24), and in 1018 simply paid his army’s wages out of money seized at Ohrid (Skyl. 358.14-359.18).


BORIL (Bopilas), Bulgarian tsar (1207-18); died after 1218. Boril seized the Bulgarian throne after the murder of his uncle Kaloja; to strengthen his position he married his uncle’s Cuman widow. He invaded the Latin Empire, but was completely defeated on 31 July 1208 outside Philippopolis, and was defeated again by the Latins in 1211, this time near Thessalonike. His hold over Bulgaria was always tenuous, with members of his family establishing themselves as semi-independent rulers. His brother Strej controlled Prosek with the support of the Serbian ruler Stefan I the First-Crowned. Using the good offices of the papacy, Boril turned to Henry of Hainault for help against this pair. In 1213 they concluded an alliance, sealed by Henry’s marriage to Maria (probably Boril’s daughter). The next year they launched a joint expedition against Serbia, but were repulsed. In 1211 Boril convoked a synod of the Bulgarian church at Turnovo, which condemned the Bogomil heresy. Though the synod conformed to the practices of the Orthodox church (J. Gouillard, TM 4 [1970] 361-74), Boril’s dealings with the papacy suggest that he may have been prompted by papal concern about the Albigenian heresy, which was believed to originate in Bulgaria (I. Dujčev, BBulg 6 [1980] 115-24). In 1218 Boril was overthrown by John Asen II and blinded.


BORIL, SYNODIKON OF, conventional name of a Bulgarian compilation of various anathemas of heretics. Its initial form was a translation from a Greek compilation of ecclesiastical bans similar to the Synodikon of Orthodoxy, including some anathemas of the 12th C. To this translated part an original section was added containing the decisions of the Bulgarian synod of 1211 convoked by Tsar Boril. Later on, complementary entries
were introduced dealing with ecclesiastical discussions of the 14th C. The text has survived in two major Bulgarian redactions (those of Palauzov and of Drinov) as well as in Serbian and Russian versions. The Bulgarian redactions probably reveal traces of the editorial work of Evtimij of Tūrnovo.


BORIS I (Búrgyovis), Bulgarian khan (852-89); died 2 May 907; commemorated in Orthodox calendars on 2 May. Byz. sources commonly use his baptismal name Michael. Soon after his accession Boris contemplated attacking Byz. but reportedly was dissuaded by a personal threat from Empress Theodora (Genes. 61.89-99); a treaty may have been concluded in 853 (G. Cankova-Petkova, BBulg 4 [1973] 25). During the early years of Boris's reign rivalry between Byz. and Western clergy over missionary activity in Bulgaria sharply increased in close connection with political maneuvering by Rome, Aachen, and Constantinople (J.-M. Santerre, Byzantion 52 [1982] 375-88; H.-D. Döppmann, Die slawischen Sprachen 5 [1987] 21-40). Boris's treaty with Louis the German in 862 provoked a campaign by Caesar Bardas in 863/4 that compelled the Bulgarian ruler to reject a Frankish alliance and be baptized in exchange for Byz. recognition of Bulgarian settlement in Zagorje south of the Balkans (P. Petrov, BBulg 2 [1966] 41-52). One legend says that Boris received religious instruction from his sister, who had converted to Christianity while a captive in Constantinople; another relates how a Greek monk painted an Icon of the Last Judgment that terrified Boris into becoming baptized (TheophCont 162.13-165.10). Patr. Photios baptized him in 864 (A. Vaillant, M. Lascaris, RES 13 [1933] 5-15) or perhaps 865/6 (S. Mihajlov, BHR 5.3 [1977] 63-71).

The conversion of Boris provoked a revolt by conservative Bulgarian nobles, which he cruelly suppressed. A letter from Photios in 865 to "the God-sent archon" Boris described the duties of a Christian ruler (Photii Epistulae et Amphilochia, ed. B. Laourdas, L. Westerink, vol. 1 [Leipzig 1983] 2-39). Byz. intentions to subordinate the Bulgarian church to Constantinople prompted Boris to seek local control over ecclesiastical jurisdiction in 866 from Pope Nicholas I; the pope answered Boris's questions about the consequences of conversion for Bulgarian customs (see Responsa Nicolai Papae) and indicated that he would send a bishop (R. Sullivan in Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History 3 [1966] 53-139). Yet Hadrian II delayed in appointing a bishop, and in 869 Boris sent ambassadors to Basil I; their meeting was recorded by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (Lib. PONT. 2:182-84). In March 870 a church council placed Bulgaria under the patriarchate of Constantinople. Boris expelled Western missionaries from Bulgaria, and Patr. Ignatios appointed clerics to staff the Bulgarian church (V. Svoboda, BBulg 2 [1966] 67-81).

Boris was not hostile to Byz. but realized the dangers of hellenization posed by Constantinople's religious dominance. In 885/6 he welcomed the disciples of Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios, including Kliment of Ohrid, who laid the foundation of a Slavic Christian culture in Bulgaria. Boris actively patronized the church: a later tradition reports that he built seven cathedrals (ed. A. Milev, Grückte zitija na Kliment Ochridski [Sofia 1966] ch.67). He built at least one court chapel at Pliska. In 889 he retired to his monastic foundation of St. Panteleimon at Preslav, but emerged temporarily in 893 to depose his son Vladimir, who favored a pro-Frankish alliance and reportedly persecuted Byz. clerics. A local church council that summer approved the accession of Boris's son Symeon and officially adopted Church Slavonic for Bulgarian liturgical use.


— P.A.H.

BORIS II, tsar of Bulgaria (969-71); son of Peter of Bulgaria and Maria (Irene) Lekapena; born probably Preslav ca.930, died near Ikhtimian between ca.976 and 985. At their mother's death (ca.969), Boris and his brother Romanos went as hostages to Constantinople. Returning to Bulgaria perhaps as early as 967, Boris was recognized as tsar at Peter's death. Bulgaria was already involved in the struggle between Svjatoslav of Kiev and the Byz. On his second invasion, Svjatoslav took Preslav (969), apparently peacefully; Boris continued to rule. John I Tzimiskes
captured Boris in Preslav (971, before Apr.). Once eastern Bulgaria was subdued, Boris was stripped of his crown, taken to Constantinople, and given the title magistros; Romanos was castrated. After the outbreak of the rebellion of the KOMETOPOLloi, Boris and Romanos escaped, but on his entry into Bulgaria in disguise Boris was slain by a Bulgarian guard. Romanos reached Vidin and served SAMUEL OF BULGARIA. According to an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 346.64–69), he surrendered Skopje to Basil II (between 1002 and 1004).


BORIS AND GLEB, saints; baptismal names Roman and David; Boris died 24 July 1015 at L'eto River, Gleb died 5 Sept. 1015 near Smolensk; feastday 24 July. Sons of VLADIMIR I, Boris and Gleb were murdered by their elder half-brother (or cousin) Svjatopolk and later widely venerated as martyrs. Several Byz. metropolitans of Kiev participated in translating the saints' relics at their shrine in Vyshhorod (north of Kiev): John I (before 1039), George (May 1072), and Niképhoros I (2 May 1115). A 12th-C. MS attributes the saints' first office to "metropolitan John of Rus,'" that is, John I or possibly John II, leading to conjecture that the extant Slavonic text was originally composed in Greek; portions apparently stem from Byz. offices for Sts. Prokopios and Kyros and John (F. Keller, Slavica Helvetica 7 [1973] 65–74). The cult's many hagiographic works, including a vita by Nestor of Kiev and the 1015 entry in the POVEST' VREMENNYYKH LET, also draw heavily on Byz. literary traditions (F. von Lilienfeld, BBA 5 [1957] 237–71; L. Müller, ZSlovPhil 25 [1956] 329–63, 27 [1959] 274–322, 30 [1962] 14–44). So too the saints' depiction on seals, icons, frescoes, enamel jewelry, and pectoral crosses and in MS illuminations reflects Byz. artistic models. Armenian synaxaria of the 13th C. contain a vita often thought (probably incorrectly) to be translated from a lost Greek Life (Ya. Dachkevytch, REArn n.s. 11 [1975–76] 323–75). In 1200 Antony of Novgorod reported a church of Boris and Gleb in Constantinople (Janin, Églises CP 65) and their icon in Hagia Sophia.


BORIS KALAMANOVIC, general; born Kiev ca.1113, died near the Danube River ca.1155/6. Son of Kalmán, king of Hungary (1095–1116), and Euphemia, daughter of VLADIMIR MONOMACH, he was born after her repudiation by Kálman. Between 1128 and 1130 Boris came to Constantinople, where he possibly married Anna Botaneiataina Doukaina Komnene (as a nun, Arête), a descendant of Isaac Komnenos and thus a cousin of John II (Barzos, Genealogia 2:33–43). As a pretender to the Hungarian throne, Boris was supported by several neighboring states. Around 1151, encouraged by Manuel I, he invaded Hungary. He was killed fighting Cumans south of the Danube. In Sept. 1157 the "kralaina" (i.e., the wife of the kral) Arete Doukaina donated fields and paroikoi to the monastery of Hiero-Xerorchaphion (V. Laurent, BZ 65 [1972] 35–39). (See also KALAMANOS.)


BORROWING, LINGUISTIC. Greek, like other languages, frequently borrowed foreign words for new objects or concepts. Where there was widespread bilingualism, whether regional or typical of a professional or other group (e.g., lawyers or soldiers), foreign words or expressions might also be used for convenience or prestige, even when a Greek equivalent existed. Up to the end of the 6th C. the principal source of loanwords was LATIN, the official language of the Roman Empire, and the main semantic fields involved were military affairs and public administration. Among early Greek loan words from Latin were hospitium, membrana or membranum, armation,fabrica, officiarios, aplikeuvo, rogeuvo. Literary Greek avoided these Latin loan words, replacing them by Greek synonyms or by circumlocations. After the 12th C.
most loanwords were from the Romance languages. Commercial and maritime terms were largely borrowed from Italian, terms of feudal law and administration from French; examples are phrountzato, φλουντζατο, kouherta, skouderes, printzes, phlamboulon, lizios, exomplon, kabolikevo, tenta. Turkish loan words, numerous in Greek from the mid-15th C., are rare in the Byz. period. Middle Persian, Proto-Bulgarian, Old Slavonic, Arabic, Khazar, Spanish, Catalan, Provençal, and Albanian also contributed occasional loanwords. To survive, loanwords had to be adapted to Greek phonological and morphological patterns. The gender of a loanword is often uncertain, and masculine or feminine words in Latin or Romance are often represented by neuter diminutives in Greek. Nouns were more easily borrowed than verbs. The frequency of borrowing from Latin led to the adoption of certain Latin suffixes, for example, -arios, -arion, -ianos, which were used to form derivatives from Greek stems. Romance suffixes such as -ella, -ello, -inos on the other hand, were scarcely used except in Romance loanwords; the principal exception is the Italian verbal suffix -aro (aorist -aris), which became extremely productive in late medieval Greek.


BOSNIA (Βοσνία), part of the Roman province of Dalmatia. Excavations in the territory of Bosnia (D. Basler, Architektura kasnoantičkog doba u Bosni i Hercegovini [Sarajevo 1972]) have shown that urban life and building activity survived there during late antiquity. The Slav invasion coincided with the ruralization of the area, even though the newcomers often settled in old church buildings or fortresses (N. Miletic, Balcanoslovica 1 [1972] 121-27). The name Bosnia (probably of Illyrian origin) first appears in the 10th C. in Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. temp. 32.151) as “Bosona”; according to Constantine, Bosona was a territory (chorion) parallel to “baptized Serbia” and included two kastra—Katera and Desnik. Traditional interpretation of this passage (e.g., B. Ferjanic in VizIzvori 2:59, n.202), that is, that Constantine envisaged Bosna as a part of Serbia, contradicts the Greek text. A 12th-C. Byz. historian (Kinn. 131.22-23) considered Bosnia part of Croatia and contrasted it (p.104.8-10) with the land of the archizoupan (prince) of the Serbs. Later tradition ascribed to Basil II the conquest of “all Bulgaria, Raška and Bosnia” (Ferluga, Byzantium 201).

In the 12th C. Byz. claimed that the Croatian and “Bosnaios” acknowledged their allegiance to the emperor (Browning, Studies, pt.IV [1961], 203.568-69), and Manuel I Komnenos accepted the epithet “ruler of Bosna” in his titulature (Reg 2, no.1469). At the end of the 12th C. the king of Hungary became the lord of Bosnia, but Kulin, the ban (prince) of Bosnia, managed to find support from Pope Innocent III ca.1203. Bosnia reached its peak in the 14th C. under King Tvrtko (died 1391), who in 1377 assumed the title “King of Serbia” and in 1389 participated in the battle at Kosovo Polje. The teaching of the Bogomils penetrated to Bosnia no later than the 12th C. and became the official creed of the land.


BOSPOROS (Βοσπόρος, Turk. Boğaziçi), the strait linking the Black Sea with the Propontis, usually called Stenon by the Byz. It is 28.5 km long (in a straight line) and barely 660 m wide at its narrowest. Both shores were studded with small settlements; the more important are listed below.

The European Side (south to north). Argyropolis was the area to the east of Galata.

St. Mamas (corresponding to Turk. Dolmabâche rather than Beşiktaş) included a harbor, built in 469, and an imperial villa equipped with a hippodrome. Leo I, Constantine V and VI, and Empress Irene occasionally resided there. The villa was burnt by Krum in 813 and robbed of its ornaments, but was soon rebuilt. Michael III, who used to race chariots there with his couriers, was murdered there (867). The harbor sheltered the ships of Anastasios II in 715 and the Kibyrrhaion fleet of Constantine V in 742. By the terms of the treaties of 907 and 945, the St. Mamas quarter was assigned as the compulsory dwelling place of visiting merchants from Rus’ (J. Pargoire, EO 11 [1908] 203-10).
St. Phokas (Ortaköy) was the site of a palace built by the patrician Arsaber, brother of Patr. John VII Grammatikos; Basil I transformed it into a monastery.

Hestai or Michaelion (Arnaoutköy) was the site of a famous shrine of St. Michael, attributed to Constantine I, in which cures were effected by incubation.

Phoneus was the site of the castle of Rumeli, built by Mehmed II in 1452.

Anaplous or Sosthenion (Istinye) is a small natural bay next to which was another Church of St. Michael, transformed into an important monastery by Basil II. One mile inland stood the pillar of Daniel the Stylite. Nearby was the Georgian monastery ta Rhomanou, founded in the 9th C.

The Asiatic Side (north to south). Hieron was a fortress. Not far from Hieron stood the monastery of St. John Prodromos tou Phoberou, residence of the painter Lazaros who was persecuted under Emp. Theophilos.

Eirenaion (Çubuklu) was the site of the monastery of the Akoimetoi, established soon after 439.

Ta Anthemiu (near Anadoluhisari), was the site of a monastery founded by Alexios Mosele, son-in-law of the Theophilos.

Sophianaii (usually placed at Çengelköy), a palace built by Justin II and named after his wife Sophia, was the birthplace of Herakleios Constantine (612).

Bithynian Chrysopolis was a village, not a town. Its most famous Byz. feature was a lavish monastery built in 594 by Philippikos, brother-in-law of Maurice. Maximos the Confessor is claimed to have been its hegoumenos; so was the future patriarch Pyrrhos. The body of the murdered emperor Michael III was temporarily buried here in 867. The point south of the harbor of Chrysopolis was called Damalis (lit. “heifer”) after an antique statue of a cow. Manuel I had a palace there.


- C.M.

BOSPOROS, CIMMERIAN (Crimean), ancient name of the Straits of Kerch, the passage leading from the Black Sea to the Azov Sea, as well as the name of the ancient city of Pantikapaion at the extreme eastern tip of Crimea; until the end of the 4th C. Pantikapaion was the capital of the kingdom of Cimmerian Bosporos, an ally of Rome. Excavations give evidence of a slow decline in the 4th C.; local coins ceased to be issued in 336/7. Nonetheless, the site has yielded important LARGITIO DISHES and other 4th- and 5th-C. Byz. silver (Iskusstvo Vizantii 1, nos. 34, 35, 44, 48). Occupation by the Goths ca. 370 aggravated the economic situation of the people of Bosporos. According to Gajdukević (infra 498), ca. 400 Bosporos occupied barely one-tenth of its former territory, yet it remained an important commercial center connected with lands as distant as Egypt and Syria. Christianity penetrated Bosporos in the 3rd C., and its bishops attended the ecumenical councils of 325 and 431.

Under Hunnic rule in the 5th C., Bosporos offered allegiance to the Byz. Empire ca. 530; Justinian I tried to make it a center of resistance to the Huns. As early as 576 the Old Turks occupied Bosporos. From the 7th C.—when the main city received the name “Kerch”—until the 10th C. Bosporos was a province of the Khazar realm. It was governed by a tarchan, but the population remained in part Christian: in the 8th C. a large Church of John the Baptist was built in Bosporos. In the 11th C. it was a part of the Rus’ principedom of Tmutorokan and received the name of Korchë. Archaeological excavation has revealed Byz. ceramics of the 10th and 11th C. Bosporos was probably under the direct control of Byz. in the 12th C. and can tentatively be identified as the port of Rhosia (Rusiya), named in some Greek and Arab sources. After 1223 and before 1240 the Mongols became its suzerains. With the Mongols’ permission, the Genoese soon established there a colony called Vesporo that, in 1332, was granted the rank of metropolis. Vesporo was conquered by the Ottomans in 1475.


O.F., A.C.

BOSTRA (Bóstra, now Buşra [Bosra] in Syria), capital city and metropolitan bishopric of province of Arabia and seat of its doux. Titus of
Bostra was bishop of the city in the 4th C. Bostra was an important trading center (in wine and grain) on the Via Trajana, esp. for caravans coming via Aila from Mecca. Extensive remains (civic, religious, and private) of the 4th–7th C. include ten inscriptions of Justinian I dated 539/40 and referring to the restoration of an aqueduct, wall construction, a Church of St. Job, and some unidentified buildings. Unusually large in scope, the extent of the construction seems to conflict with Prokopios’s account of Justinianic work at Bostra, which is limited to a poorhouse (πτολεχεῖον; Buildings 5.9.22). Although the aisled-tetraconch Church of Sts. Sergios, Bakchos, and Leontios (R. Farioli in Studien Deichmann 1:133–42), finished in 512/13, has been called the cathedral of Bostra, the latter should perhaps be identified with an even larger church discovered in 1985, of which the nave is on a scale with that of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople (Dentzer, infra 138, fig.5). Theodore, the “bishop of Bostra (?)” a companion of JACOB BARAœUS and leader of the Monophysites of Arabia from the 540s, was not, apparently, resident in the city, whose list of known ChalcEdonian bishops is extensive. Under the Arabs, Bostra was a prosperous pilgrimage stop between Damascus and Mecca.


BOTA (Bótα, from Lat. vota publica), a festival celebrated on 3 Jan., dating from 44 B.C. The Bota was celebrated in the traditional manner with sacrifices and public prayers at banquets and in the Hippodrome until the end of the 4th C., when Emps. Arkadios and Honorius proscribed the sacrifices. The Council in Trullo forbade Christians to celebrate the Bota, probably because the sacrifices were still being performed (Trombly, “Trullo” 5). A variant of the Bota called the Foot-race Boton (boton pezdromion) existed in Constantinople in the 9th and 10th C. The Bota remained on the official calendar of court ceremonial until the time of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, though by then the ritual was entirely christianized. Memory of the Bota had died out by the time of Balsamon (12th C.), who, using a false etymology for Bota (he confused it with the Greek word for “grazing beasts”), speaks of it as a festival of “the falsely named god Pan, the overseer, as the pagans blather, of beasts, cattle, and other animals” (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:450.11–15).


BOTANEIATES (Botaneiàtēs), a noble lineage first mentioned in an inscription of 571 from the Synada region (G. Buckler, Byzantium 6 [1931] 405–10); Artemon Botaneiates, surnamed Kroubbeles, was however from a place called Botania or Botane rather than a member of the family. Attaleiates praised the family’s nobility and established an evidently forged pedigree from the Roman Family; in contrast, Psellos (Chron. 2:183, par.18.21–25) asserted that Michael VII elevated the family from a modest status to high rank. Other than Andrew Botaneiates, spatharios (?) and anthypatos, whose seal is dated tentatively to the 9th C., the Botaneiatai became prominent only in the 10th C. According to Attaleiates, Nikephoros Botaneiates was Basil II’s archistrategos. Gregory Abūl-Faraj preserves the (legendary?) information that Nikephoros “Votanik” was a peasant who attained high positions in Cyprus and Antioch, fell into disgrace, and ended in penury. His son Michael was also Basil II’s general who served in Thessalonike and against Abchasia. Theophylactos was governor of Thessalonike in the early 11th C. His son Michael participated in the battle of 1014 against the Bulgarians. With no reason Zlatarski (ist. 1.2:732 and n.3) identified him with the first Michael, whose father was not Theophylaktos, but Nikephoros; the son of the first Michael was the emperor Nikephoros III Botaneiates. An unnamed grandson of Nikephoros III (Michael, according to P. Gautier, REB 27 [1969] 342) was betrothed to the daughter of Manuel Komnenos, Alexios I’s brother. The relationship of other Botaneiatai to Nikephoros cannot be established; until the first half of the 12th C. they were military commanders (e.g., Eustatios, strategos of Byblos) and landowners, related to both Komnenoi and Doukai; the death of George Botanaietes was lamented byProdromos. By the end of the 12th C. their role declined: John Botaneiates served ca.1197 as taboularios on Crete. The later Botaneiatai (PLP, nos. 3001–03) held insignificant positions.
In Byz., botany was a sum of dispersed observations, mostly derived from ancient texts, rather than a discipline in its own right. Byz. botany stood in the context of a rich lore, standardized in Greco-Roman times by the widely circulated handbooks of Theophrastos, Cato, Varro, Columella, and Pliny the Elder. The 10th-C. Geoponika compacts much data from earlier farmers' manuals, popular knowledge, and botanical tracts drawn from both Greek and Latin sources. Some botanical MSS seem to be dry lists of names and synonyms, but other texts indicate how Byz. botanists and herbalists improved on their predecessors' work. Study of Byz. scholia to Dioskorides reveals observations taken directly from nature, and vivid proof of Byz. botanical art is in the illuminated scientific manuscripts, particularly the Vienna Dioskorides. Later MSS also show detailed care, and Byz. texts of Dioskorides, Nikander, and similar authors suggest botanical skills throughout the Byz. millennium. The polymathic curiosity of Psellos encompassed botanical lore deemed extraordinary or marvelous, and Manuel Philes displayed expert knowledge of gardening in several of his poems on domesticated plants. Botany explicated plants in agriculture, dietetics, the compounding of drugs for pharmacology (J. Scarborough, DOP 38 [1984] 229–32), and occasionally in magical texts specifying herbs—for instance, the Geoponika and its sources, the Properties of Foods by Symeon Seth, and the scholia to Dioskorides.


appointed governor of Genoa, a new French dependency. Manuel and Boucicaut met again near Modon (Methone) in 1403, and Boucicaut provided four Genoese galleys to transport Manuel on the final leg of his return to Constantinople.

---

**BOUDONITZA** (Μουτσίντσα, also Mountinitza, Lat. Bodoniza, and other forms), Latin marquisate in the area of Thermopylae; its name is of Slavic origin (Vasmer, Slaven 106, no.36). The pass of Thermopylae was fortified by Justinian I and then by Basil II, but there was no population center until the 13th C., when Boniface of Montferrat entrusted the region to an Italian adventurer Guido (Guy) Pallavicini, the first marquis (1204 to sometime after 1237). The castle on a hill was constructed on ancient foundations and controlled the pass of Thermopylae. Nearby was a monastery where Michael Choniates sought refuge after 1204. Originally under the authority of the prince of Achaia, the marquisate extended its territory as far north as Lamia and emerged as a major rival to Theodore Komnenos Doukas of Epiros. Later it fell under the control of the duke of Athens. It survived a Catalan attack in 1311 but in 1332 the region was plundered by the Turks. In the second half of the 14th C. Boudonitza prospered under the rule of Marquis Francesco, who was supported by the Venetians, but the Ottomans continued their attacks; in 1408 some of its inhabitants moved, with their livestock, to southern Euboea; the castle fell to the Turks on 20 June 1414.

---

**BOUKELLARION** (Βουκελλάριον) were soldiers in the personal service of military and, occasionally, civil authorities from the beginning of the 5th C. onward (H.-J. Diesner, Klio 54 [1972] 321–24); the term *boukellarios* allegedly derives from the higher quality bread (Lat. *bucellatum*) they received. Drawn from all classes and many nationalities, these private retainers were chiefly concerned with their employer’s security and the coercion (or elimination) of his rivals. They formed their commander’s bodyguard while on campaign and were often assigned important tasks because of their superior equipment and fighting abilities. Many rose to prominence, including Belisarios, who later, as supreme commander, raised a force of 7,000 *boukellarios* on which he relied heavily during his campaigns (Prokopios, Wars 7.1.18–20).

During the 6th C. the state recruited *boukellarios* (usually through private citizens) as police and tax-collectors and for local defense; the case of Egypt is particularly well documented (J. Gascou, BIFAQ 76 [1976] 143–56). Other terms denoting privately hired soldiers (*hypsaspistai, spatharioi*) gradually replaced *boukellarios*, which by the 7th C. had come to designate one of the elite units comprised in the * Opsikon* field force.

---

**BOUKELLARION** (Βουκελλάριον), a theme of central Asia Minor, detached from the *Opsikon* in the 8th C. and named for the privately hired soldiers, BOKELLARION. Its *strategos* is first attested in 767. Boukellaron comprised Galatia, Hono- rias, Paphlagonia, and parts of Phrygia and was commanded by a *strategos* with 8,000 troops and headquarters at Ankyra; he was paid 30 pounds of gold. In the 9th C. Boukellaron included two towns and 13 fortresses. Circa 842 *Paphlagonia* was detached; under Leo VI Boukellaron lost the region east of the Halys to Charsianon and its southern districts around the Salt Lake to Cap-
PADOCIA. The reduced theme subsisted into the 11th C.; the region was lost to the Turks after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071.


BOUKOLEON (Βουκολέων, lit. “bull lion”), a quarter of Constantinople on the shore of the Sea of Marmara, south of the GREAT PALACE. It took its name from an ancient statue depicting colossal figures of a lion and a bull. It is not known when the statue was brought to the site; it survived the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and was described by western visitors in the 16th C. On the shore was a palace, or probably two palaces, one called the “palation of Leo Makellos,” another the “house of Justinian.” Their precise location has not yet been determined; the buildings probably adjoined the sea walls. The palace harbor, located in the same area, was called the limen of Boukoleon.


BOULGAROPHYGON (Βούλγαροφυγόν), now Baba Eski, near Adrianople, a battlefield where Symeon of Bulgaria routed the Byz. army in 896. The war against Bulgaria had been stabilized after Symeon’s first successes, thanks to the activity of Nikephoros Phokas and the employment of Hungarian contingents. Then, however, Stylianos ZAOUTZES, fearful of Nikephoros’s influence, managed to replace him with Leo Katakalon, who allowed Symeon to defeat the Hungarians with the help of the Pechenegs; thus when Katakalon met Symeon at Boulgarophygon, the rear of the Bulgarian army was no longer threatened. Symeon won the battle, Katakalon barely escaped, and his lieutenant, the protovestarios Theodoreos, was killed. Al-Ṭabarī preserves the story that Leo VI, in despair, ordered the arming of Arab captives to be sent against Symeon, but the Bulgarian prince did not wait for a new confrontation and signed a treaty: he returned to Byz. 30 strongholds seized in the theme of Dyrachion, whereas Byz. was obliged to pay an annual tribute. R. Nasledova suggests that the peace treaty was signed only in 904, after Leo of Tripoli attacked Thessalonike (Dve vīzantijskie chroniki X veka [Moscow 1959] 221f.). Whether Symeon marched against Constantinople before or immediately after the battle at Boulgarophygon remains unclear.


- A.K.

BOULLOTERION. See Sealing Implements.

BOULLOTES (Βουλλωτής), an assistant of the eparch mentioned in the Klerotologion of Philotheos. The Book of the Eparch imposed corporal punishment on a silk weaver who prevented a boullotes or milotes from entering his workshop. Both officials evidently performed the function of inspector, controlling the quality of products and certifying quality by affixing a seal (boulla).


- A.K.

BOURTZES (Βούρτζης, fem. Βούρτζανα), a lineage of military aristocracy probably originating from the Euphrates region. The name could derive either from Arabic burj, “tower,” or from the toponym Bourtzo-Soterioupolis (near Trebizond). They were considered Armenians by P. Charanis, Arabs by V. Laurent (see Kazhdan, infra). The family first appears in the second half of the 10th C. Michael Bourtzes was doux of Antioch under Nikephoros II Phokas; he supported the rebel Bardas Skleros but later went over to Basil II; he was again governor of Antioch ca.990–96. Three of Michael’s descendants—the brothers Michael, Theognostos, and Samuel—were involved in a plot against Constantine VIII, who blinded Constantin Bourtzes, Michael’s son, in 1025/6. To the same time should be dated a case of Peira (60.1): a certain Bourtzes bequeathed his land to his three sons, one of whom became rebellious and forfeited his estates. Nonetheless the family was among the noblest of the mid-11th C.; an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 488.63–66) calls a Bourtzes (along with Skleros, Botanletes, and Argyros) a most influential archon of the Anatolikon theme. Samuel Bourtzes commanded the
infantry in 1050; Michael Bourztes was a military commander during the reign of Michael VI; and Theognostos was strategos of Devol in the 1070s. Under Alexios I a certain Bourztes became toparches of Cappadocia and Choma. In the early 12th C. several members of the family possessed lands next to Mt. Athos; a forged chrysobull of Emp. John V (Kastam., p.84.11) mentions the church of "our holy father Nicholas surnamed Bourztes." The family was closely related to the Melissenoi. From the 12th C. the family's position declined; they appear in the provinces: for example, Constantine, an official on Crete in 1117/18 (MM 6:96.29–30), and George, metropolitan of Athens (died 1160—J. Darrouzès, REB 20 [1962] 190). John Tzetzes wrote to an unknown Bourztes. The name is very infrequent in later texts (PLP, nos. 3110–11).


BOURTZES, MICHAEL, general (died after 996). In 968 Nikephoros II Phokas bestowed upon him the title of patricios and appointed him strategos of the Black Mountain, with the special task of watching Antioch. Disobeying imperial orders, Bourztes and the eunuch Peter (former slave of a Phokas) attacked Antioch and in late 969 took it from the Arabs. Bourztes, however, was not rewarded for his success; this injustice incited his support of John (I) Tzimiskes, whom Bourztes helped to murder Nikephoros II. Basil II appointed Bourztes doux of Antioch, and, with Peter, Bourztes participated in the battle of Lapara in 976 against Bardas Skleros; Bourztes was, however, the first to take flight. Soon after this defeat he deserted to Skleros and fought against the emperor, but was again defeated. Skylitzes (Skyl. 321.58–59) stresses that those who fell at this battle were primarily Armenians. Soon Bourztes joined Basil II's army and together with Bardas Phokas fought against Skleros. In 990–96 he served again as governor of Antioch.


BOUTHROTON (Βούθρωτον, mod. Butrinti in Albania), located on the mainland opposite Kerkyra, in late antiquity a city of Old Epiros (Hierokl. 652.4); it was a suffragan bishopric (attested from the mid-5th C.) of Nikopolis, later of Naupaktos. It was probably ruralized thereafter: Arsenios, metropolitan of Kerkyra, praised its richness in fish and oysters, as well as the fertility of its territory. In the 12th C. al-Idrissi described Bouthroton as a small town with markets. In 1081 and 1084 Bouthroton was captured by the Normans. After 1204 it was first controlled by the despotate of Epiros, but from the mid-13th C. Bouthroton was contested between Manfred of Sicily, Michael VIII, and Charles I of Anjou, being temporarily returned to the Epirots. In 1386 it was ceded to Venice.

The surviving fortifications of Bouthroton are mainly post-Byz., but they contain masonry from as early as the 10th C. Remains of several Early Christian basilicas and a triconch building have been found; east of the ancient theater is an elaborate baptistery renovated in the 6th C., with mosaics probably of the 4th C. On the acropolis are ruins of a large three-aisled basilica with transept, probably constructed in the 5th–6th C., rebuilt in the 11th–12th C. In the northeast corner of the walls are remains of a small single-aisled church, probably of the 13th–14th C.


BOOUTOUMITES (Βουτουμίτης), a family name of unclear origin: J.A. Ljubarskij (in Anna Komnina, Aleskia) [Moscow 1965] 524. n.688) derives it from the toponym Boutouma-Budva in Serbia. A certain Boutoumites (died 1077), presumably a local landowner, was a donor to the pious institution of Michael Attaleiates (P. Gautier, REB 39 [1981] 127.171). In the 1070s Michael Boutoumites was in charge of the private militia of Michael Maurex in Herakleia Pontike (Bryen. 199.8–10). His later contemporary, Manuel Boutoumites, was a "warlike and noble man," according to Anna Komnene (An.Komm. 2:160.25–26); he was doux of the fleet ca.1090, doux of Nicaea after its recapture in 1097, commander in Cilicia in 1105, and envoy to Jerusalem in 1111/12. He may have been governor of Cyprus, as Laurent suggested (Coll. Orghidan, p.215). The family eventually lost its status, but a certain Boutoumites
is known as a kepále in a Thessalian town in the early 14th C. (PLP, no.3128).

BRÁBEION (βραβείον), properly "prize" or "reward," the term used in the Klerorologion of Philothéos to designate insignia by which a dignity was conferred upon its holder. It might take the form of a crown without cross (given to the caesar), tunics, ivory tablets, gold chains, special diplomas, etc.


BRACELET (βραχιάλιον or βραχιόλιον, lit. "armband," κλάνιον). Said in Justinian's Digest (34.2.25.10) to be worn by women, a bracelet is often shown in depictions of jewelry as part of a matching set, together with earrings, necklace, and belt. No such complete sets have survived, however. Bracelets preserved in collections are usually of gold and silver, although examples in ivory are also known. Specimens excavated usually from graves are more often bronze with traces of gilding, or simple glass bangles. These generally seem to be locally produced, although specimens found in Kiev were imported from Byz. (Ju. Ščapova, Steklo Kievs'koj Rusi [Moscow 1972] 107–13). The Roman form of a plain ring made of twisted gold or silver wires continued until the 4th C. In the 4th–5th C., tubular hoops had low relief decorative and figurative elements. In the 6th–7th C. the form became more complex, with medallions or coins, modeled animal forms, and gems in decorative claw settings added. In the 7th–11th C. wide bands with relief figures and sometimes Christian iconography predominate. These bracelets are fairly heavy, with hinged fasteners, as opposed to the ring types that slip over the hand or incomplete rings that relied on the metal's flexibility. Examples of less elaborate bracelets from the 7th–11th C. tend to be narrower, not hinged, and with punched decoration.


BRACHAMIOS (Βραχάμιος, fem. Βραχαμίνα, Βραχαμίνη), noble family with a name of Armenian origin, meaning "descendant of Vahram."

The family flourished in the mid-10th C. when the Arab poet Abu Firâs mentioned "the family of Bahrâm" among Byz. fighting against the Arabs (N. Adontz, M. Canard, Byzantion 11 [1936] 454, v.11). Sachakios (Arm. Sahak, Ishâq ibn Bahrâm of Arabic sources) was a general by 969 and later supported the revolt of Bardas Skleros. Eleventh-century seals attest several strategoi named Brachamios (George, Demetrios, Michael) as well as Kale Brachamina, wife of a strategos, and Epi­dios, doux of Cyprus.

Philaretos Brachamios (Varazhnuni), Romanos IV's strategos, doux and, according to Anna Komnene (An. Komn. 2:64.5–8), domestikos, was—if we believe Michael I the Syrian (Chronique, tr. Chatot 3:173)—an Armenian robber from the village of Shurbaz; thus his identification as a Byz. general is questionable. After Romanos IV's blinding, Philaretos became independent ruler of Tarsos, Antioch, Edessa, Melitene, and some other eastern centers. Greek, Syriac, and Armenian traditions all charge Philaretos with cruelty and greed: he allegedly confiscated the riches of Antiochene magnates and distributed them among his supporters. After Nikephoros III's accession to the throne, Philaretos acknowledged his allegiance to the Byz. and was proclaimed kouropalates and domestikos ton scholon of the East; in 1084 he surrendered Antioch to the Turks. He disappeared thereafter from the scene, but an anonymous Syriac chronicle mentions the sons of Philaretos domestikos, "Christians" (i.e., Orthodox) who ruled over Maraş and Black Mountain (A.S. Tritton, H.A.R. Gibb, JRAS [Jan. 1933] 72f.). The family is not known after the 11th C., except in 1171 when Brachamíoi served as messengers in negotiations between Manuel I and the Armenians.


BRAD. See KAPER BARADA.

BRANAS (Βρανάς, fem. Βράναυα), a noble lineage, its name apparently of Slavic origin (I. Duječev, Izvulstvüllüst 6 [1956] 348, n.3), although S. Lampros considered it Albanian and Ph. Koukoules Latino-Greek. In Serbia the name of Branos (Vran,
BRANAS, ALEXIOS, sebastos ca. 1166, general of Alexios II; partisan of Andronikos I; died Constantinople 1187. In a seal attributed to him (Laurent, Méd. Vat., no. 64), Branias is called protosebastos and his mother described as a Kомненoi; the continuator of William of Tyre named him "cosin de l'empereur Manuel" (PL 201:899C). In 1185 Branias routed the Normans, who had captured Thessalonike and were moving toward Constantino-ple; soon after, perhaps in 1186 (Dujčev, Med. 1:346f), but more probably in 1187, Branias revolted against Isaac II but was defeated by Con- rad of Montferrat and killed in battle at the walls of Constantinople. M. Sjiuzunov (Viz.Vrem 12 [1957] 69-72), emphasizing that the inhabi-tants of suburban Constantinople, esp. fishermen, supported Branias's rebellion, suggests that his defeat was a factor in the ruin of Constantinople's trade and handicrafts.

BRANIČEVO (Παντικόβα), a fortress and bish-opric on the river Pek, a right tributary of the Danube, not far from the site of Roman Viminacium, which was deserted soon after 600 (B. Saria, RE a.R. 8 [1958] 217-67). Near Viminacium, remains of fortifications (probably of Justinian I's time) were discovered: walls, towers, and an underground passage, 21 m long and 1.6-1.8 m high, that led to the river (M. Pindić in Limes u Jugosloviji, vol. 1 [Belgrade 1961] 127). Basil II's list of sees in the Bulgarian archbishop-opic of OHRID (H. Gelzer, BZ 2 [1893] 43-7) places the bishopric of Branitza between Niš and Belgrade. Branicevo was a station on the strategic road from Belgrade to Niš, en route to Constan-tinople (G. Škrivanić, Putevi u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji [Belgrade 1974] 83f). In the 12th C. the city belonged to the doukaton of Branicevo and Belgrade and was a focal point in the Byz.-Hungarian conflict. During the war of 1127-29, the Hun-garians razed Branicevo; the Byz. restored and colonized it in 1166. In 1182, while Constantino-ple was distracted by domestic strife, Běla III temporarily occupied Branicevo (Gy. Moravcsik, Studia Byzantina [Budapest 1967] 309) but returned to it as his daughter's dowry. The empire, however, was unable to retain the stronghold after about 1198; from the end of the 12th C., it was an object of contention between the Bulgarians, Serbs, and Hungarians. The Serbian prince Lazar took Branicevo in 1378/9, and the Turks conquered it in 1459.


- A.K.
BREAD (ἄρτος, also ψωμίoν in papyri [Preisigke, Wörterbuch 2:774] and narrative texts [e.g., PG 65:196C]) was the basic food in the popular diet. It was produced from wheat, barley, and infrequently millet; rye and oats were deemed unsuitable for baking. Wheat loaves were considered the finest, barley bread of lower quality. A 13th-C. historian (Ἀκτός 1:123.7–9) writes of bread made from barley and bran (which a man of his status could barely swallow) as typical of peasant food. Bread was made either at home or by professional bakers. Ἀθανάσιος of Ἀθός reportedly invented a device powered by oxen to mix the dough. Bread was produced in the form of loaves, sometimes flat ones; soldiers on campaign ate paximadion, bread baked twice and dried in the sun (T. Koliak in Byzantios 197–99). Bread was baked in furnaces or special ovens; in peasant households loaves might be baked in ashes, as Gregoras (Greg. 1:379.6–8) complains.

The daily bread consumption in the late Roman Empire was 3 to 6 pounds, according to Patlagean (Panwresé 46, 52); by the 11th–12th C. the average daily ration was reduced to 1.5 pounds, probably due to the loss of the grain-producing areas of Egypt and North Africa (A. Kazhdan, ByzF 8 [1982] 118). In the 10th–11th C. the price of bread was 1 nomisma for 8–18 modii; according to G. Ostrogorsky (BZ 32 [1932] 320–22) the price remained at the 4th-C. level. Byz. had periodic shortages in bread supply, and the state tried several times to introduce a monopoly on the grain trade and to regulate bread prices.

Constantine I transferred to Constantinople the Roman custom of distributing bread among the citizens. The first distribution took place on 18 May 332. The custom was abolished in 618, when the grain delivery from Egypt stopped. Despite this, the Basilika retained some imperial regulations concerning the panis civilis. The Codex Theodosianus (Cod.Theod. XIV) preserves 15 imperial ordinances of 364–408 that determine the right of citizens (house owners) to get the "state bread." It was baked in imperial bakeries (pistmatia publica) and distributed from special high counters (gradus). Each person entitled to panis civilis had to be entered on a list and assigned to a particular gradus; these people were given special tokens.

Gradually, the church took over the bread dole, transforming it from a citizen's right into an act of charity for the poor. The church had fed the poor long before 618 and retained this function after the state divested itself from the burden; the distribution of bread during a famine is a topos of many saints' lives.

Leavened bread as prosphora (in contrast to the azymes of the West) was one of the two elements of the eucharist, and accordingly played an important part in ecclesiastical symbolism (Christ as bread) and iconography.


—A.K., A.K.

BREBION (βρεβίον, from Lat. brevis), a term known from the 4th C. onward that designated an inventory or list of persons, officers, crafts, taxes, confiscated lands, etc. (O. Seeck, RE 3 [1899] 832). In the 10th C. properties of imperial monasteries were registered in the brebia of the sakellion (Ivir., no.9.30, Lavra 1, no.33.39). In later acts (e.g., Doshcar., no.58.5–6, Dionys., no.19.27) "the sacred brebion of a monastery" meant the list of persons to be commemorated: in an act of 1364 the word is employed synonymously with psychochartion (Xénonh., nos. 30.8, 35). On the other hand, the authors of monastic typika employed the term brebion for a document listing precious objects that belonged to the monastery. Michael Attaleiates used brebion to designate the appendix to his diatass that listed new acquisitions of movable and immovable properties (P. Gautier, REB 39 [1981] 83.1078–79). According to the typikon of the Euergetis monastery (P. Gautier, REB 40 [1982] 17.54–59), its brebion (now lost) included an inventory of cells, books, vessels, icons, liturgical garments and fabrics; the typikon of the Kecharitomene nunnery (P. Gautier, REB 43 [1985] 133.2007–23) states that typika and brebia should be placed in the skeupophylakia of both the Great Church and the Kecharitomene. In Slavic languages the word brenno acquired the meaning of an inventory of lands (D. Angelov, Agrarnite ot­nošenija v Severna i Sredna Makedonija prez XIV vek [Sofia 1958] 12, n.3).

Lit. Kalavrezou, Steatite 73–79. —A.K.
BRESCIA CASKET. See Lipsanothek; Reliquary.

BREVIAIRUM. See Festus.

BREVIAIRIUM (Lat. "summary"), a "brief," simple Latin guidebook to the holy sites of Jerusalem composed as "publicity material" for Western pilgrims. Likely of early 6th-C. date, it survives in two independent traditions derived from a single original. Additions probably reflect annotations of various users. Seemingly written to be carried around the city’s Loca Sancta, it gives numerous topographical indications and provides important evidence not only for the standard "Jerusalem tour" of the time, but also for structural details of such buildings as the Holy Sepulchre and the Golgotha Shrine, and for the existence and veneration of specific relics.


Lit. Wilkinson, Pilgrims 41, 182f, with Eng. tr. 50–61.

BRICKS (sing. πλίνθος). The production of brick was highly developed in the Roman Empire and continued in Byz., where both baked and sun-dried mud bricks as well as tiles were used. Houses "built of brick" (sing. plinthokistos) and roofed with tiles (enkeramos) are attested in documents (e.g., Lawra 2, no. 102.7). Workshops for brick production are also mentioned, such as an ergasterion to make keramoï (bricks and/or tiles) in an act of 952 (Lavra 1, no. 4.4). It is more difficult to decide whether the term keramarion (Ivir. 1, nos. 4.68, 12.14; Xerop., no. 9.A.26) meant a brick factory or a water pipe made of tiles. Workers in brick and tiles were called ostrakarios and kerama­poioi, and Constantine V is said (Theoph. 440.21–22) to have brought hundreds of them to Constantinople from Hellas and Thrace.

Bricks and tiles were often stamped with signs or inscriptions bearing names of craftsmen or emperors. Most Byz. brick stamps come from Constantinople and its environs—probably supplied from the same kilns—and from Thessalonike. The provinces (even Nicaea) have yielded few stamps, and in Dalmatia, for instance, late Roman bricks and tiles were produced without stamps (J. Wilkes in Roman Brick and Tile [Oxford 1979] 69f). Stamps from Constantinople are numerous for the late Roman period, but it is difficult to tell exactly when the practice of stamping bricks disappeared in the capital: there are stamps of the 10th–11th C., but probably no Palaiologan examples. On the other hand, stamped bricks and tiles of around the 10th C. are known from Cherson, the lower Danube, and Bulgaria.

The biblical plinthēia was a metaphor for bondage and the sinful state from which baptism liberates man.


– A.K.

BRICKWORK TECHNIQUES AND PATTERNS. From the 5th C. onward, Byz. architecture depended heavily on brick as a structural and decorative material. The most common building techniques involving this material were (1) alternating bands of several courses of brick and stone (related to the Roman opus vittatum), used from the 5th to 14th C. in Constantinople and its vicinity and less consistently elsewhere; (2) solid brick construction, used sporadically in the 5th to 12th C.; (3) the recessed-brick technique, an all-brick construction method in which every alternate course was set back from the wall plane with the recess filled in with mortar, producing seemingly thick mortar joints. This was commonly employed in Constantinople and vicinity from the 11th C. onward; from Constantinople the technique was exported to areas under Byz. influence (e.g., Kiev, central Balkans). A fourth method, the cloisonné technique, involved framing individual stone ashlars with brick on all four sides; it was widespread in Greece and the Balkans from the 10th C. onward. These basic building techniques were often combined with decorative patterns, executed in brick, that were used to highlight architectural features (e.g., apses, domes, tympanums, eaves) and to conceal structural timbers imbedded within walls. Some of these ornaments appear as early as the 10th C., but most became popular in the 13th–14th C. The most typical were reticulate revetments; diaper and checkerboard patterns; dogtooth friezes; and chevron, herringbone, and meander patterns as well as inscriptions executed in brick or specially cut tiles. Following the Roman practice, Byz. bricks were occasionally stamped in the course of production. The general significance of Byz. brick stamps has not yet been properly understood (C. Mango, AJA 54 [1950] 19–27).


– S.C.

BRIDE SHOWS are reported to have been organized on several occasions at the initiative of the empress-mother to select suitable wives for imperial princes. Commissioners were sent throughout the empire to find candidates who resembled an imperial ideal, which was enshrined in a picture (lavraton), and met specific measurements. Usually three candidates became finalists in this Byz. "Judgment of Paris," held in the imperial palace, when the young emperor-elect presented a golden apple or ring to his chosen lady. In 788 Empress Irene persuaded Constantine VI to select Maria of Amnia, the granddaughter of Philaretos the Merciful; in 807 Theophano, already married and hurriedly divorced, was chosen for Staurakios; in 830 Theophilos encountered Kassia and chose Theodora; in 855 the same Theodora, as empress, imposed Eudokia of Dekapolis on Michael III; and in 881 Basil I selected pious Theophano for his son Leo VI. An otherwise unattested bride show is recorded in the vita of St. Irene of Chrysovalanton. It has been argued that bride shows, in contrast with the foreign marriage alliances of the 8th C., helped to bind powerful regional families to Constantinople. Recently, however, scholars such as P. Speck (Kaiser Konstantin VI, 1 [Mun-
ich 1978) 203–08) and L. Rydén (Eratos 83 [1985] 175–91) have cast doubts on the historicity of the bride show; Rydén suggests that it is a literary topos of the 9th or 10th C., which reappears in the 14th-C. romance of Belthandros and Chrysantas. The custom of the bride show is also found in the medieval West and in 17th-C. Russia.


BRIDGES (sing. γέφυρα). Crossing rivers, esp. those that were wide or had rapid currents, created difficulties for travelers and military expeditions. In cases of urgent necessity pontoon bridges (of boats bound together) were constructed; long logs laid over the boats provided flooring for the roadway (An.Komm. 2:137.17–19). In 636 Herakleios built this sort of bridge over the Bosporos (Stratos, Byzantium, 2:139).

The Byz. inherited the technique of bridge construction from the Romans. They erected bridges of stone, brick, and/or timber set in concrete; the arches rested on piers (the same technique as used for aqueducts). The bridge near Limyra in Lycia, 360 m long, consists of 28 arches and seems to be lower than regular Roman bridges (W. Wurster, J. Ganzert, AA [1978] 288–304). The approach to bridges was sometimes fortified with towers. During the late Roman period several grandiose projects were executed: the bridge over the Danube constructed by Constantine I between Oescus and Susicava was 2,437 m long. Many bridges are named in the Tabula Peutingeriana. Prokopios mentions some bridges built by Justinian I; that over the Sangarios is still standing. Later sources mention various bridges (Zompe over the river Sangarios, one near Kosmidion, a bridge in Adrianople passing over three streams, etc.) as well as smaller gephyra (Lavra 3, no.146.40); it is, however, not clear which of these bridges were actually of Roman construction. Bridgelike con-

BRIDGES. Justinianic bridge. Built over the Sangarios River in Bithynia; 6th C.
traptions were used to assault the walls of besieged towns (e.g., An.Komn. 1:153.20–22; Nik.Chon. 623.61–62). A special tax called gephyrosis was imposed in the 11th C. (Lavra 1, nos. 38.38, 48.36) for the maintenance and repair of bridges. In the 12th C. the Kosmosoteira monastery (see Bera) was obliged to maintain two local stone bridges; in this connection the typikon of Kosmosoteira stresses that bridges are useful to many people.

In Christian metaphor gephyra served as an epithet for any person, action, or institution bridging this world and heaven: for example, the Mother of God (e.g., pseudo-Sophronios, PG 87.3.396B), Christ’s descent into Hell, John’s baptism, and prayer.


BRIGANDAGE (ληστεία), robbery carried out usually by members of lawless bands, often accompanied class struggle and military operations; Bartusis (infra) hypothesized that in the 14th C. brig­ands were primarily soldiers. Revolts of military contingents, such as the Catalan Grand Company, often led to looting, arson, rape, and so forth, as did urban riots and political upheavals, as for instance Alexios I Komnenos’s capture of Constantinople in 1081. Feuds of local lords (e.g., those described in the Peira) led to grave damage of peasants’ property. In turn, brigandage could be used by peasants for self-defense in their struggle with the dynatoi for land; in some cases the peasants were supported by ethnic groups (the Vlachs, Cumans, etc.) settled in the area. Byz. historical tradition described other ethnic groups (e.g., the Isaurians) as particularly inclined toward brigandage, but such statements were often ex­aggerated. The poeticized image of the brigand (apelates) penetrated into folklore and thence into the epic of Digenes Akritas, who was described as victorious over the apelatai. Church fathers and hagiographers equated brigands with demons (G.J.M. Bartelink, VigChr 21 [1967] 12–24), but at the same time hagiography described some reformed robbers as living in extreme piety.

Piracy, another form of brigandage, was a real scourge for maritime commerce and the inhabi­tants of coastal areas.


BRINDISI (Βρεντίσιον), city in southern Apulia with a splendid harbor; terminus of the ancient Via Appia, a primary point of departure for the East, and a center of trade with Dalmatia and the eastern Mediterranean. During the war against Totila in the mid-6th C., the Byz. general John (nephew of Vitalic) conquered Brindisi and used it as a center of operations in southern Italy. The Lombards took Brindisi in the second half of the 7th C.; it formed the southernmost point of the duchy of Benevento. Brindisi suffered from Arab attacks and was destroyed in 838. At the end of the 10th C. Byz. reestablished its administration in Brindisi and ca.1000 the patriarch of Constantinople elevated it to an archbishopric.

The Norman Robert Guiscard occupied Brindisi in 1071, but the Byz. continued trying to recapture it until the 1150s. Brindisi was the port of departure for Norman expeditions against Byz. and for the Crusades. The church of Brindisi was under the patronage of the papacy—in 1089 Pope Urban II dedicated the city’s cathedral—but the Greek rite and Orthodox communities remained in the city, as did the Jews. Brindisi was a primary center for the manufacture of proto-Maiolica pottery.


BRINGAS, JOSEPH, high official under Con­stantine VII and Romanos II; died 965 in mon­astery of the Asekretis, in Pythia (Bithynia). Eunuch, patrikios, and praetorius, Bringas (βηγγας) was promoted by Constantine to the posts of sa­kellarios and droungarios of the fleet (TheophCont 445.6–10); as paraokonomomenos he administered the empire under Romanos. An adversary of the mil­itary aristocracy, he quashed the scheme of the nobles to give the throne to the magistros Basil
Peteinos (Skyl. 250f) and zealously opposed Nikephoros (II) Phokas. Romanos left Bringas at the head of the state (15 Mar.–15 Aug. 963), but Theophano sided with Nikephoros Phokas, and Basil the Notos supported their alliance. Nikephoros pretended to obey orders and left Constantinople to join his army, but his soldiers proclaimed him emperor (2 July 963) and he marched against the capital. An addition to De cer. (p.435–37) described in detail the battle for Constantinople. The population of the capital supported the military aristocracy and defended Bardas Phokas, who sought asylum in Hagia Sophia; at the same time Bringas gained the assistance of the influential guild of bakers who stopped selling bread in order to compel the poor to cease their resistance (9 Aug. 963). At this time Basil the Notos armed 3,000 servants and sent them to pillage the houses of Bringas’s partisans; he also ordered warships to sail to Abydos and join Nikephoros. Bringas had no choice but to surrender. Nikephoros entered the capital and banished Bringas to Paphlagonia and subsequently to the monastery of the Asekretis near Nikomedea (Janin, Églises centres 86).


BRONTOLOGION (βροντολόγιον), a manual on divination by thunder. The Byz. attributed their brontologia to famous figures of the past, such as King David or Hermes Trismegistos, or to obscure Roman writers, such as Nigidius Figulus (W. and H.G. Gundel, Astrologumena [Wiesbaden 1966] 137–39). In his On Portents, John Lydos lists four brontologia that he allegedly used: three are concerned primarily with political predictions, the fourth (ascribed to Labeon) with agrarian events. The church condemned brontologia as based on astrology, and the Souda stated that divination by thunder was “diabolical property.” Nonetheless, the custom was well entrenched; several brontologia are known both in Greek and in Old Slavonic translation (Gromnik), and a brontologion was among the books taken along on the imperial baggage train (De cer. 467,11). Brontologia were structured on the position of the sun (or the moon) in the zodiac and on the calendar. The strength and the direction of the thunder also had to be considered. A brontologion preserved in a 16th-C. MS (Milan, Ambros. A 56 sup.) describes a series of political events, imagined or real: a revolt “in Egypt and among the Arabs,” the devastation of Cyprus, a barbarian expedition as far as Chalcedon (perhaps a reference to Igor’s expedition of 941), the absence of any king in “Comania” and Alania, the Crusade of 1147. This brontologion is attributed to “Leo the Wise” (i.e., Emp. Leo VI) but should be dated to the 12th C. As late as the 15th C. Kritoboulos observed that many people believed that thunder, lightning, and the wandering orbits of stars revealed the future.


BRONZE (χαλκός), the term used in Byz. as in classical Greece to designate both pure copper and its alloys with tin or with zinc (brass). The location and exploitation of copper mines from the 4th to the 15th C. is somewhat a matter of speculation. Bronze could be considered a semi-precious metal: Eusebios of Caesarea (Eusebios, VC 3.50.2) praises a church ornamented with gold, bronze, and “other very expensive materials,” while Prokopios (Buildings 1.2.4) speaks of the best bronze as being softer in color than pure gold and in quality not much inferior to silver.

Colossal monuments of bronze included the Anemodoulion at Constantinople (set up between 379 and 395) and the 6,000-pound cross erected by Eudocia at Jerusalem (Jean Rufus, Plérophories, PO 8 [1912], ch.11). Bronze statues of emperors, charioteers, etc. are recorded as late as the 7th C. (AnthGr 16.46–47), but only that of Leo I (?) (= Colossus of Barletta: U. Peschlow in Studien Deichmann 1:21–33) survives relatively intact. A medi eval deployment of bronze on a large scale was the revetment of an obelisk in the Hippodrome in Constantinople by Constantine VII. Among the few other monumental uses of bronze after the 9th C. were cast church doors, with incised decoration and silver inlay or chrysography, as well as doors of sheet metal with repoussé decoration. The doors of S. Paolo fuori le mura, Rome, bear the names of the founder (chymes) and the artist who manufactured and decorated them. The se bastokrator Isaac Komnenos transferred a bronze
grill (kangellon) from the Chora monastery to his Church of the Virgin Kosmosoteria at Bera to separate his tomb from the rest of the narthex. Rare decorative bronzes of the 10th and 11th C. include the water-spouting troughs of fountains (L. Bouras, DChAE 8 [1975–76] 88f).

In addition to their use on monuments and for decoration, copper and bronze were employed for functional purposes, for example, for coins, surgical instruments, liturgical vessels, roof tiles, armor, and esp. for lamps. Numerous bronze objects were used in the household (see Tools and Household Fittings). An inventory of 1142 lists (in addition to iron tools) bronze bells, vessels, caldrons, etc. (Pantel., no.7:28–29). Domestic bronzes (chalkomata), some of them tinned, include ewers, basins, pans, and various cooking wares (Koukoules, Bios 2:99–101, 105). Byz. inventories from the 11th C. often refer to various lighting devices of cast bronze, such as candelabra (manoula), candlesticks, polykandela, lamps, lanterns, lamnai (bronze beams with candleholders), and chorai (polygonal frames for the suspension of lights) as well as censers; some such devices of the 4th to 14th C. survive to this day. Bronze was also employed for icons, cast or in sheet metal, votive crowns, pectoral crosses, amulets, belt fittings, cone seals, and stamps as well as for ordinary jewelry. Keys, locks, and fittings for caskets were often cast in bronze as were steelyards, various weights and measures, and astrological instruments such as the astrolabe.

Large numbers of cast bronze household objects (ewers, caldrons, etc.) made in Byz., and mistakenly called “Coptic,” have been found outside the empire, in 6th- and 7th-C. burials throughout western Europe.

The scientific work that has been carried out on Byz. bronze (that is, copper alloy) objects has been largely restricted to those made between the 4th and 7th C. The results reveal a varying of alloys to suit manufacturing techniques. Some cast items from this period excavated at Sardis (e.g., censers, crosses, buckles, chains, etc.), which have been analyzed for their metallic composition, were found to be of a four-part (quaternary) alloy of copper, tin, zinc, and lead; other objects, such as cooking vessels made of sheet metal, were of nearly pure copper (J.C. Waldbaum, Metalwork from Sardis [Cambridge, Mass., 1983] 175–77). Other hammered objects, such as a group of 6th-C. ornamented sithulas found elsewhere, are made of brass, that is, copper and zinc (M.M. Mango et al., Antiquity 63 [1989] 308). The shift from the manufacture of bronze (copper and tin) to that of brass, which started in the Roman period and increased by the 7th C., has been explained in terms of the loss of the Spanish and British tin mines by the 5th C. (R. Bruce-Mitford, The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial, vol. 3 [London 1983] 945–61). But tin may still have been available in the Taurus Mountain mines, and 10th- and 11th-C. tinned copper polykandela, lamps, patens, chalices, and other objects, made apparently in imitation of silver, have been found in Asia Minor and the vicinity of Antioch.


-M.M.M., L.Ph.B.

BRUMALIA (Βρυμάλια), the festival of Dionysos, which was celebrated from 24 Nov. to the winter solstice. The Brumalia marked the end of the wine cycle, when the liquid from the grapes crushed during the September harvest had fermented and was ready to be poured into jars for consumption. Carousing and merriment accompanied the rituals, which included the invocation of Dionysos. In his treatise On the Months (ed. Wuensch, 172.41–51), John Lydos notes the survival of the cult in the 6th C.: the viticulturalists would sacrifice a goat to Dionysos because the animal ate and destroyed vines. Canon 62 of the Council in Trullo imposed a six-year excommunication on Christians who celebrated the Brumalia. The canon also condemned mumming and the donning of comic, satyric, and tragic masks, another Brumalian feature (Trombley, “Trullo” 5). Nevertheless, the imperial court celebrated the Brumalia. Stephen, the author of the vita of Stephen the Younger, condemns Constantine V as a “friend of demons” for his participation in the festival. In the time of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos the Brumalia consisted of acclamations for the emperor and a ceremony wishing him a long reign; on these occasions the emperor handed out аркодемия, bags of gold, to various officials (De cer. 601.6–20, 606.4–607.14). The popular celebration of the Brumalia persisted until at least the 12th C. (I. Rochow, Klio 60 [1978]
BRYAS. Ruins at Küçükýahli. These ruins are thought to be those of the 9th-C. palace at Bryas.

487f). Christopher of Mytilene notes the sending of small cakes (pemmata) as gifts at the Brumalia, and Theodore Prodromos mentions festivities on the day of cosmic joy of the Brumalia, but the religious character of these acts is unknown.


-F.R.T.

BRYAS (Brýas, mod. Maltepe). Asiatic suburb of Constantinople, opposite the Princés' Islands. It was the site of a palace built by Emp. Theophilos ca.837 in imitation of Arab palaces described to him by JOHN VII GRAMMATIKOS on the latter's return from his embassy to Baghdad. The only modification of the Arab model consisted in the addition of two chapels, one next to the emperor's bedchamber, the other, of triconch form, in the forecourt. The palace has been plausibly identified with a standing ruin at Küçükýahli, between Bostanci and Maltepe, that recalls the layout of princely Arab residences.


BRYENNIOΣ (Brýennios, fem. Brýenniσσa), a noble Byz. lineage. Etymology of the name remains unclear; according to E. Trapp, it derived from bryo, "to abound" (JÖB 19 [1970] 293). Bryennioi are known from the 9th C. onward: Theoktistos was sent by Michael III as strategos of Peloponnese (De adm. imp. 50.9-12); another Bryennios, strategos of Dalmatia, is attested from a 9th-C. seal (Schlumberger, Sig. 205f). Throughout the 10th C. they are not known. When the Bryennioi reappear in the mid-11th C., their relation to the 9th-C. Bryennioi is unclear: Attaleiates considered them a family of lower origin than the Botaneiatai. Like their predecessors,
the 11th-C. Bryennios were military commanders: Nikephoros, from Adrianople, served as ethnarch, commander of foreign mercenaries; he participated in a rebellion against Empress Theodora and was exiled; in 1057 he joined another aristocratic revolt and was captured and blinded. His son (also Nikephoros) Bryennios unsuccessfully tried to usurp the throne in 1077 (see Bryennios, Nikephoros); another son, John, supported his brother’s revolt and was appointed domestikos ton scholon; after the revolt, however, the Varangians arrested and murdered him. Nikephoros’s son (according to Zonaras) or grandson (according to Anna Komnene), the caesar Nikephoros Bryennios, was a general and historian (see Bryennios, Nikephoros). Another Bryennios served ca.1100 as dux of Thebes.

Caesar Nikephoros married Anna Komnene; some of their descendants bore the patronyms Komnenos and Doukas. They were primarily military commanders: John Doukas commanded both in Italy and against the Seljuks; his brother Alexios Bryennios, megas dux in 1156, was called the anthypatos of Hellas by Michael Choniates and praised as protector of the poor (Mich.Akom. 1:337.8–9). He is probably distinct from another Alexios Bryennios, dux of Dyrrachion and Ohrid, an addressee of George Tornikios in the 1150s (Darrouzès, Tornikès 162–66). Andronikos, son of the megas dux Alexios, served as governor of Thessalonike; involved in a plot against Isaac I, he was arrested and blinded; his son attempted a revolt but was also blinded. Joseph Bryennios, sebastos and the emperor’s gambros, was a general in the 1160s. Only Nikephoros Komnenos, John Doukas’s son, held a civil position: he was temporarily the functionary in charge of petitions (epiton deeseon).

Several Bryennios occupied important posts in the later period: George was megas droungarios in 1328, and Michael was commandant of Pamphilion in Thrace (1342). At this time the Bryennios were also active in the church, diplomatic service, and intellectual life: besides the philosopher Joseph Bryennios and writer Manuel Bryennios, a scribe Gregory Bryennios from Thessalonike copied translations of Thomas Aquinas in 1432 (PLP, nos. 3241–62). (See Bryennios, Joseph, and Bryennios, Manuel; see also genealogical table.)

Lit. Winkelmann, Quellenstudien 165f. – A.K.
BRYENNIOS, JOSEPH, monk, writer, and teacher; born ca. 1350, died before 1438, probably 1430/1. A fervent supporter of Orthodoxy, Bryennios lived for 20 years (ca. 1382–1402) in Venetian-occupied Crete as preacher and missionary. He spent most of his remaining years in Constantinople at the monasteries of Stoudios (ca. 1402–06) and Charsianites (1416–27). In 1406 Patriarch Matthew I sent him to Cyprus as topotereis to try to negotiate the administrative union of the Cypriot church with that of Constantinople, but his mission proved fruitless. In his later years he served as court preacher and official spokesman against Union of the Churches with Rome, playing an important role in 1422 in discussions with a Latin delegation to Constantinople (G. Patacsi, Kleronomia 5 [1973] 73–96).

Bryennios composed a considerable number of theological treatises defending Orthodox doctrine on the Holy Trinity and Procession of the Holy Spirit. He supported the Palamite argument that the light of Tabor was uncreated. Other works include a dialogue with a Muslim (A. Argyriou, EEBS 35 [1966/7] 141–95), in which Bryennios praised the tolerance of Islam and the virtue of some Muslims; he argued that the decline of Byz. was divine punishment for the sins of the Byz. He corresponded with John Chortasmenos, Nicholas Kabasilas, Demetrios Kydones, and Emp. Manuel II, among others. Mark Eugenikos wrote his epitaph.


A.M.T.

BRYENNIOS, MANUEL, Byz. scholar and possibly a music theorist; fl. Constantinople ca. 1300. Although academically eccentric, he instructed the statesman Theodore Metochites in mathematics, astronomy, and probably music (a didactic poem by Theodore reflects Bryennios’s teaching). His doctrines on mathematics and astronomy are to be found in a letter to Maximos Planoudes and in scholia to MSS of Ptolemy’s Almagest.

The only surviving work attributed to Bryennios is the three-volume Harmonika, based on ancient Greek tradition. The author treats his material more independently and carries his conclusions further than his sources, however. The neo-Pythagorean numerological theory of music is Bryennios’s most important source (more for facts than for metaphysical speculation). Other sources are Nicomachus of Gerasa, Aristides Quintilianus, Theon of Smyrna, and, above all, Claudius Ptolemy for his theory of the eight tonoi, the “shadings” of the tetrachords, and the monochord and its division.

Bryennios also drew extensively on the empiricist school of Aristoxyenos (4th C. B.C.). The first section of the treatise is based largely on this school; the second, however, is founded on neo-Pythagorean tradition and concludes with a comparison of the divisions of the tetrachords. The third section unites the Pythagorean and Aristoxenian traditions and culminates in a theory for constructing melodies. One section deals with the Byz. ecclesiastical modes and associates them with the ancient systems of transposition (tonoi, tropoi); this section is illustrated by the musical practice of Bryennios’s own time.

Bryennios’s treatise is the most comprehensive surviving codification of Byz. musical scholarship. Associated with the growing interest in mathematics in the early Palaiologan period, it contributed to the rediscovery of ancient music theory. The late Byz. Empire and the Italian Renaissance valued it highly: 46 MSS from before 1600 and two early Latin translations (1497 and 1555) survive.


A. M. T.

BRYENNIOS, NIKEPHOROS, 11th-C. usurper. Bryennios was a general and magistros who fought at the battle of Mantzikert (1071), served as a dux of Bulgaria in 1072–73, and was later governor of Dyrachion. In 1077 he headed a revolt against Michael VII, the center of which was located in Adrianople, but lost to Nikephoros III Botaneiates in the competition for the throne. Bryennios refused to accept the title of caesar and continued his rebellion, but he was then defeated by Alexios Komnenos (the future Alexios I) and...
blinded. Zonaras accused Alexios of this deed, but other historians do not support his version. Nikephoros III returned to Bryennios all his properties and granted him new honors and lands (Bryen. 285.1–3). Despite his blindness, in 1094/5 Bryennios was in charge of defending Adrianople against the Cumans and a rebel who claimed to be a member of the Diogenes family (Leo or Constantine?) and a son of Romanos IV; even though Bryennios belonged to an aristocratic family inclined to rebellion, he declined Diogenes’ proposal of an alliance.


—A.K.

BRYENNIOS, NIKEPHOROS THE YOUNGER, historian and general; born Adrianople? ca.1064 (A. Carile, Aevum 42 [1968] 436) or ca.1080, died Constantinople ca.1136/7. He was either the son (A. Carile, Aevum 38 [1964] 74–83) or grandson (S. Wittek-De Jongh, Byzantion 23 [1953] 463–65; P. Gautier, infra 20–24) of his namesake, the rebel of 1077/8. Bryennios married Anna Komnene ca.1097, participated in Alexios I’s campaigns, and became caesar ca.1111. In 1118 Irene Doupkaina and Anna Komnene unsuccessfully tried to proclaim him Alexios’s successor. Although in disfavor with John II, Bryennios still participated in the emperor’s expedition to Antioch, after which he died.

His unfinished memoirs, the so-called Historical Material (Hyle historias), were written after 1118 and describe the period 1070–79. He presents events not as a history of emperors, but as the power struggle of the mightiest families (the Komnenoi, Doukai, and Bryennioci); under the screen of a polite eulogy of Alexios is veiled criticism, whereas Nikephoros Bryennios the Elder is an unquestionable hero. Aristocratic traits (noble origin, wealth, martial prowess) are presented as positive values. In their structure, Bryennios’s memoirs are a forerunner of the romance, with the core of the tale being the marriage of Alexios and Irene after they overcame obstacles.


—A.K.

BUDGET. Evaluations of the Byz. budget are speculative and arbitrary because of lack of evidence. Yet in recent publications one finds figures that are not too contradictory: 900,000 solidi in the 6th C. (Hendy); 1,700,000 nomismata by the end of the 8th; 3,300,000 nomismata in the middle of the 9th (Treadgold); 1,000,000 half-pure hyperpyra in the 14th (Hendy). Fiscal revenue derived mainly from taxation on land (70–95 percent) and commerce and trade; voluntary contributions of wealthy citizens ceased after the 7th C. Regular major expenditures were salaries for members of the armed forces, the administration (less important), and dignitaries (largely self-financed) and cash outlays for philanthropic institutions. Public works were also self-financed through corvées; largess, such as the consulship, became occasional. Extraordinary expenditures, such as major campaigns or tributes, were dealt with either by spending accumulated reserves or by imposing extraordinary taxes and levies. Part of the payments were made in silk textiles, mainly those produced by the imperial workshops.


—N.O.

BUILDING INDUSTRY. Builders formed teams or companies. According to the vita of Symeon the Stylist the Younger, Isaurian masons lived in communities, caring for those team members who had lost their health while working. The Book of the Eparch does not consider the technitai or artisans a guild but a temporary association that included craftsmen of various professions: carpenters, masons, workers in gypsum, etc. Such a team of technitai is described in the vita of Germanos of Kosinitza: they were hired to build a church and signed a contract (homologia) according to which they were to be paid 100 gold coins upon completion of the work (AASS May 3:9*). In Basil. 15.1.39 (and schol. 1 to this passage) an ergolabos, or manager, served as intermediary between the owner and the workers. He was paid by the owner and erected the building using his own materials. In the Book of the Eparch, on the other hand, there is no distinction between ergolaboi and technitai and the owner is to supply the materials. The terms are also used synonymously
BULGARIA, state in the northern Balkans. Founded in 681 by Asparuch, Bulgaria included former Roman territory between the Danube, the Black Sea, the Balkan range, and the river Iskūr. It was populated by Slavs, Bulgars, Vlachs, and some remaining Greek inhabitants. The capital was established at Pliska. The Slav and Bulgar occupation led to the deurbanization of the region and the expulsion of the Christian church with its hierarchy built upon urban foundations. The focal point of domestic development in the late 7th–9th C. was the union of Slavs and Bulgars into a single ethnus that used the Slavic language, a Bulgar administrative system, and the Greek alphabet for the Proto-Bulgarian Inscriptions. This unity was reinforced by the christianization of the country by 864/5.

Even though Bulgaria profited from the defeat of the Avars by Charlemagne and extended its power to as far as the river Theiss, Bulgarian northern policy was primarily defensive: Bulgaria had to protect its northern frontier from the Germans, Hungarians, Pechenegs and other steppe tribes, the Rus’, and later the Tatars. Bulgaria’s policy in the south was more active, and Bulgarians were often involved in Byz. affairs, sometimes as allies (Tervel supported Justinian II), sometimes as dangerous adversaries (esp. under Krum and Symeon of Bulgaria). The periods of war were interrupted by peace treaties (the 30-year treaty under Omurtag), and sometimes Byz. managed to exercise considerable influence on Bulgaria, as happened in the reign of Boris I.

Despite the arrival in 885 of pupils of Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios who brought both the Slavic alphabet and incipient Slavic literature and liturgy, Byz. administrative and cultural influence on Bulgaria increased from the end of the 9th C. onward. Bulgarian rulers accepted Byz. imperial and ceremonial titulature (basileus for the former khan, patriarch for the archbishop, etc.); the new capital, Preslav, harbored a significant artisan population; and a substantial selection of Greek theological literature was translated into Church Slavonic. Trade and intermarriage (e.g., Tsar Peter and Maria, Romanos I’s granddaughter) helped consolidate Bulgar-Byz. links.

From the second half of the 10th C. Byz. began to gain the upper hand in the Balkans. After the plan to subjugate Bulgaria with the assistance of Svjatoslav of Kiev had miscarried, John I Tzimiskes evicted Svjatoslav from Bulgaria, annexed a substantial part of the country, and abolished the autocephalous Bulgarian patriarchate. The struggle of the KOMETOPOULOU and SAMUEL OF BULGARIA against Basil II, despite temporary success, was lost; by 1018 the whole of Bulgaria had been incorporated into Byz. and formed several themes—Bulgaria, Paradounavon, Dyrachion, etc.

The imposition of the “Byz. yoke” strengthened the Byz. impact on Bulgaria. The Byz. system of taxation was extended to the new themes, along with Byz. secular and ecclesiastical administration and Byz. forms of peasant dependence (pāroikoi, etc.). Intensified trade and the mass penetration of Byz. coinage accompanied the development of urban life. On the other hand, the Bulgarian aristocracy entered the ranks of the Byz. ruling class; Bulgarian topics were treated in Byz. liter-
CITIES OF BULGARIA, SERBIA, AND NEIGHBORING REGIONS
more, and specific Bulgarian forms of ideology, such as the Bogomil heresy, gained a strong hold in Byz. The Byz. domination over Bulgaria was several times challenged in the 11th C. (revolts of Deljan and George Votetch, the Bogomil rebellion in 1086). In 1185 a new revolt broke out, and by 1188 the weakened Byz. government had recognized the independence of Bulgaria north of the Balkan range, with its capital in Túrnovo. The Bulgarian victory at Arkadiopolis in 1193 led to the annexation of much of central Thrace. A new Bulgaria emerged, usually called the Second Bulgarian Empire.

At first (under Kaloyan, Boril, and John Asen II) Bulgaria profited from the disarray resulting from the Fourth Crusade to occupy more of Thrace and most of Macedonia, and after the Bulgarian victory over Epíros at Klokotnica in 1230 extended its rule to the Adriatic at Dyrrachion. The marriage of John Asen’s daughter to Theodore II Laskaris of Nicaea and the creation of a Bulgarian patriarchate in 1235 mark the apogee of Bulgarian power. This zenith was of short duration: the state faced serious domestic and international problems. The country lacked economic unity. The towns on the Danube, such as Vidin, were more connected with central Europe, those on the Black Sea were involved in Italian trade, and western Bulgaria tended toward Dubrovnik. While ca. 1200 Bulgaria profited from alliance with the Cumans, later the Tatar settlement in the steppe created a serious menace, heightened by constant conflicts with Byz. and Serbia and esp. by the Ottoman invasion of the 14th C. The internal instability found its expression in revolts, such as the mutiny of Ivailo. By the end of the 13th C. only northeastern Bulgaria recognized Tsar Georgij Terter I. For a short period Theodore Svetoslav, Michael III Síšman, and Ivan Alexander reunited Bulgaria, and the country, despite certain military losses, enjoyed relative peace and prosperity. From 1370 onward, however, the increasing encroachment of the Ottomans on the Balkans threatened the very existence of Bulgaria. In 1373 Bulgaria became a virtual Ottoman vassal, and in 1395 Murad I invaded and annexed it.

Of all the Slavic countries Bulgaria was the closest to Byz. Their interrelationship was very complex, ranging from military rivalry to trade connections (Bulgaria exporting to Constantinopolitan livestock and cattle) to religious and cultural exchange; some Greek regions were absorbed by Bulgaria and for almost two centuries Bulgaria was incorporated by Byz. The Bulgarian state was formed both under Byz. impact and in a constant resistance to the threat of “hellenization.” The material interpenetration did not abolish mutual mistrust, and political alliance was sporadic and short-lived. On the other hand, Bulgaria transmitted Byz. civilization to other Orthodox peoples, particularly Rumanians and Muscovite Russia (in the 14th C.). The absorption of Byz. culture was selective. The literature and ideology of Byz. Christianity, both in its learned and its popular form, were taken over (see Bulgarian Literature), as were the Byz. chroniclers’ picture of world history, a simplified version of Byz. civil and canon law, and some popular nonreligious literature such as the Alexander Romance. What was rejected was learned and classicizing literature and thought, including philosophy and science, which Bulgarian society neither needed nor understood. It was this filtered Byz. culture that was passed on to the non-Greek Orthodox world.


BULGARIAN ART AND ARCHITECTURE. The First Bulgarian Empire was founded on territory rich in Roman and Byz. remains. These and other sources were used to create an art designed to serve the national and religious needs of the new state. The earliest administrative center, Pliska, was laid out as a double fortress, an architectural solution also adopted at the second capital, Great Preslav. The most unusual monument from this period is the large relief of a horseman carved in the cliff above the religious center of Madara. Most likely carved in 705 and probably representing Khan Tervel, the relief is surrounded by contemporary and later Greek inscriptions of rulers’ names. The iconography—a horseman holding aloft a cup, with a lion below
and a dog running behind—bears close resemblance to rock-cut reliefs of Sasanian Persia. But the bold, monumental style, with the figure and the background rendered as two parallel planes, is typical of Bulgarian sculpture from this period and continues into the 1oth C. at nearby Preslav and Abtradaka.

Bulgarian ceramic tile decoration may also be Near Eastern in influence. Tiles—both flat tiles and semicircular cornice pieces, large and small—were specially made for use as wall revetment. Some tile images, such as a 20-tile icon of St. Theodore from Sofia and a group of smaller, single-tile icons from Tuzlalik, depict saints, though the majority are decorated with floral and geometric motifs. Many have been found in situ, adorning the floors and dado zones of small monastery churches around Preslav (the earliest datable example comes from the Round Church of Preslav, probably built before 907). Similar tile decoration is found in Constantinople as well, and probably derives from Arabic antecedents. It is possible that ceramic decoration was used in large quantities in and around Preslav even before its widespread use in Constantinople.

The Round Church at Preslav is a good example of the eclectic use of sources typical of much Bulgarian art of the early empire. The form of the church—a domed rotunda with an interior two-tiered colonnade preceded by an atrium that is enclosed by walls with niches and columns—has been likened to Armenian architecture, while the use of mosaic decoration shows Byz. influence. The structure may in fact reflect late Roman baptistery forms, underscoring one of the main functions of the church in the newly converted realm. Its round form may also indicate it was intended to serve as a palace chapel.

Byz. culture was to be the decisive influence on Bulgarian art during the 11th and 12th C., when the territory came under Byz. hegemony (cf. the frescoes of the ossuary of the monastery of Pelitza). By the time Bulgarian independence was won, Byz. culture had become the single major source for artistic creation.

The art of the Second Bulgarian Empire shows a resurgence of architecture and painting: Donations by nobles include the churches on Trapezitsa Hill in Tūrnovo and the Tower of Hreljo in the Rila monastery. Two-story churches, which were used for burial and whose structure served to level uneven terrain, may have derived from Byz. or Caucasian prototypes but became a popular local type of church plan. Other churches are elaborate variants of Palaiologan architectural forms: in the 14th-C. churches of Mesembria, for example, stone, brick, and ceramic inserts combine to produce a rich, textilelike patterning of the exterior quite unrelated to the internal divisions of the church (e.g., St. John Aleitourgetus).

Painting of the Second Empire shows two tendencies. Many monuments rely on Byz. models of the 11th and 12th C., introduced during the period of Byz. rule (e.g., Bojana). Other fresco ensembles and icons show more awareness of contemporary art in Constantinople. This is especially true of the royal commissions by Tsar Ivan Alexander. The rock-cut "Čurkva" at Ivanovo was decorated by Bulgarian artists in the most up-to-date Palaiologan style; bottom-heavy figures in twisted postures are placed in front of elaborate architectural façades. The flat ceiling of this humble church, which served a hesychast monastic community, is given an unusual treatment: copying the wall decoration, the ceiling is laid out with small scenes in square frames. Manuscript painting also tended to copy Byz. models, both contemporary and older; the Gospels of Ivan Alexander (London, B.L. Add. 39627, dated 1355/6) has the format of a frieze Gospel, and the portraits it contains of the tsar and his family are clad in Byz.-style imperial costume. The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses (Vat. slav. 2, ca.1345) copies a Byz. illustrated chronicle, adapting traditional scenes to illustrate the passages on Bulgarian history written expressly for this book. Icon painting (e.g., the late 13th-C. St. George, Plovdiv State Gallery no.486) also reflects contemporary Byz. Palaiologan style.


BULGARIAN LITERATURE. Although a number of inscriptions in Greek and a few Proto-Bulgarian inscriptions written in Greek characters survive from before the conversion of Bulgaria, and there is evidence that both the Proto-
Bulgarians (Bulgars) and the Slavs were acquainted with writing. Bulgarian literature is a product of the christianization of the country. When the pupils of CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER and Methodios, expelled from Moravia, reached Bulgaria in 885, bringing with them translations of the Scriptures and of the liturgy, they found the ground prepared for the development of literature in CHURCH SLAVONIC. There had already been 20 years of missionary activity by Greek and Roman clergy. Tsar Boris I was anxious to avoid too close dependence of the Bulgarian church on Byz. Furthermore, a generation of young Bulgarians, including the future Tsar SYMEON OF BULGARIA, had studied in Constantinople and brought some familiarity with Byz. literary culture back with them.

From their first arrival, the newcomers received royal patronage and encouragement on a grand scale. Schools were established in monasteries in Preslav and Ohrid for the training of Slavonic clergy and the translation or composition of the literature necessary for a Christian and civilized society. The beginning of Bulgarian literature can be dated with great precision to the second half of the 880s. Translation was the first priority. Among the earliest works translated by Konstantin of Preslav and others were select homilies of Athanasios of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzos, Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, and John of Damascus, which provided an introduction to theology. Translations of the chronicles of Malalas, Patr. Nikephoros I, and George Hamartolos familiarized Bulgarians with a historical process which was at the same time a process of salvation. The Christian Topography of Kosmas Indikopleustes furnished geographical information in a theological framework. The practice of translation provided a laboratory of language and style, in which experimentation with different genres flourished and the flexibility and expressiveness of Slavonic developed. With this end in mind, the short treatise of George Choiroboskos, On Figures of Speech, was translated in the late 9th or early 10th C.

Original writing went hand in hand with translation. Unknown authors wrote Lives, panegyrics, and akolouthiai on Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios, Kliment of Ohrid and Naum of Ohrid. John the Exarch and Konstantin of Preslav combined material translated or adapted from Greek with much original matter. Kosmas the Priest applied Byz. theological concepts to the elucidation of specifically Bulgarian problems arising out of the spread of the Bogomils and displayed a capacity for sharp social criticism. Poetry was written, both in Byz. 12-syllable meter, such as the anonymous enkomion of Tsar Symeon, and in the complex accentual rhythms of the Byz. liturgy, as in the kanon on St. Demetrios. A treatise on church music surviving in a single Glagolitic MS may well be connected with the development of liturgical hymns in the late 9th C.; it was written in Preslav or Ohrid.

Along with the “official” literature of the Byz. church, the Bulgarians took over and translated apocryphal and apocalyptic texts, such as the Vision of Isaiah. These provided a model for original compositions expressing Bulgarian aspirations and fears, such as the Story of the Cross by Jeremiah the Priest (10th C.) or the Thessalonican legend of the baptism of the Bulgarians. Both the Orthodox and sectarians, esp. the Bogomils, used such texts extensively; 25 apocryphal texts figure in the Izbornik of 1073.

What was not translated, adapted, or imitated in this period of the development of Bulgarian literature was the classicizing secular literature of the Byz., which must have seemed irrelevant and incomprehensible to Bulgarian readers and listeners. Thus Byz. literature and culture was filtered in its transmission to Bulgaria in the 9th and 10th C.

The piecemeal conquest of Bulgaria by the Byz. between 971 and 1018 destroyed the social and political structure that had fostered Bulgarian literature. Royal patronage, which had been necessary for the origin and rapid growth of Bulgarian literature, ceased. Monasteries, however, provided both a demand for and a supply of saints’ Lives, such as the earliest Life of St. John of Rila, written before 1183. A number of apocryphal writings, sometimes of Bogomil inspiration, probably date from the period of Byz. rule.

Now Bulgarian literature began to have some influence on Byz. hagiography. Theophylaktos of Ohrid wrote a Life of his predecessor Kliment that evidently drew on Slavonic sources. The protokouropalates George Skylitzes, who had served as strategos of a Bulgarian province, wrote a Greek
Life of St. John of Rila, which survives only in a 13th- or 14th-C. Slavonic translation. It may have been intended as a response to the pro-Bulgarian tone of the earlier Slavonic Life.

The restoration of Bulgarian independence in 1186 did not at once lead to a revival of Bulgarian literature. Feuding between ruling groups, threats from the Latin Empire of the Crusaders, and the general social and political instability of the country in the 13th C. were not conducive to literary production. Little literature survives from the period, apart from minor hagiographical texts and the Synodikon of Tsar Boris, which contains, along with traditional Byz. material, accounts of the Bulgarian church council of 1211 and of the restoration of the Bulgarian patriarchate, as well as panegyrics on Bulgarian rulers and churchmen.

In the 14th C. the encouragement of literature by successive church leaders, in particular Teodosije, superior of Klifitarevo monastery (died 1369), and Evtimij of Tarnovo, together with the patronage of Tsar Ivan Alexander, stimulated a remarkable literary and cultural revival, centered in monasteries in the Tarnovo region. Many new translations were made from Greek, including the Kephalaia (Chapters) of the hesychast Gregory Sinaiotes, an anthology of sermons of John Chrysostom, and the Chronicle of Constantine Manasses. Evtimij of Tarnovo composed Lives of Bulgarian saints, liturgical texts, and dogmatic treatises. His close friend Kiprian, an ecclesiastical diplomat of wide experience and for 17 years metropolitan of Moscow, wrote Lives of Russian saints, letters on dogma and church discipline, a synaxarion for the Russian church that included many Bulgarian and Serbian saints, and perhaps the first index of prohibited books. More than any other of his time he furthered the spread of southern Slavic and Byz. literary models and techniques in Serbia and Russia. Konstantin Kostenecki, who migrated to Serbia in 1410, wrote a Life of Stefan Lazarevic and translated Greek patristic texts. Grigorij Camblak, who migrated first to Serbia and then to Kiev, wrote many hagiographical works, liturgical compositions, and sermons. Ioasaf of Vidin included in his panegyric of St. Philothea much information on the Bulgaria of his time. Among the many minor and often anonymous works surviving from the 14th and early 15th C. are a short Bulgarian chronicle, letters on religious problems addressed to Evtimij of Tarnovo, and a verse panegyric on Tsar Ivan Alexander.

The literature of this period is marked by the influence, both in matter and in form, of contemporary Byz. literature. Hesychasm won strong and immediate support among most Bulgarian clergy and monks. A rhetorical, poetic, and often pompously inflated style was reflective of contemporary Byz. taste. At the same time, we sometimes find lively descriptions of Bulgarian society and life. Had not the Turkish conquest destroyed the structures of Bulgarian society, Bulgarian literature might well have flourished. As things were, it provided a stimulus and a model for the literature of Serbia, Rumania, and above all Russia.


BULGARIAN TREATY, ANONYMOUS TREATISE ON THE, conventional title of a speech preserved in a single MS (Vat. gr. 483 of the 13th or 14th C.) and dedicated to the signing of the peace treaty with the Bulgarians in October 927. The speech contains a survey of historical events: Leo VI is highly praised; then the author mentions a revolt (apostasia); the assault of the archon (Symeon of Bulgaria), who was crowned by the "helmet of darkness" (Nicholas I Mystikos); and the elevation of the new Moses (Romanois I), raised up out of the water to extinguish the flames of war. The text is full of classical references and obscure allusions, some of which are explained in red ink in the margins by the hand of the same scribe. Various scholars have suggested the following possible authors of the treatise: Nicholas Mystikos (F. Uspenskij in Letopis' 2 [1894] 121), Arethas of Caesarea (M. Šangin, Istorik-Marksist [1939] no.3, 177), Ngetas Magistros (J. Darrouzes, Reb 18 [1960] 126), and Theodore Daphnopates (I. Dujcev, DOP 32 [1978] 252f).
However, the most recent editor, Stauridou-Zaphraka, rejects all these identifications (infra 351–55).

---

**BULGARS, TURKIC, also Proto-Bulgarians, Pra-Bulgarians, a pastoral people, originally living in Central Asia. Swept westward in the great movement of steppe peoples that brought the Huns and later the Avars to Europe, some Bulgar tribes settled in Pannonia, where they were dominated by the Avars and took part in their campaigns against the Franks, Lombards, and Byz. In the 7th C. many of these Pannonian Bulgars settled in Italy, in Lombardy, the Rimini-Osimo area, and the region of Benevento. The main body of the Bulgar tribes, dwelling north of the Azov Sea and the river Kuban, were dominated by the Western Turkic khaganate from the mid-6th C. onward. In 632, profiting from divisions among their Turkic rulers, these Bulgars revolted successfully and formed a powerful confederation of Bulgar and related tribes known as Great Bulgaria, led by Kuvrat. Herakleios, seeking a reliable ally to block the Khazar advance westward, concluded a treaty with Kuvrat. After Kuvrat died, Great Bulgaria broke up under Khazar pressure. Some tribes migrated to the Volga-Kama region, some probably joined their kinsmen in Pannonia, some remained under Khazar rule, and some, led by Asparuch, migrated westward to the area between the Dnieper and the Danube delta. In 681 Asparuch and his followers invaded Byz. territory south of the Danube and established the First Bulgarian Empire. About the same time a group of Pannonian Bulgars and their Slav and Greek subjects led by Kouber migrated to northern Macedonia; Byz. authorities recognized their presence there. Both Bulgar groups had long been in contact with agricultural peoples and had largely given up their pastoral way of life. They quickly mingled with the Slavs among whom they settled, becoming a single people called Bulgarians. By the end of the 9th C. the Bulgars had probably ceased to exist as a separate ethnic and linguistic group. (See also Proto-Bulgarian Inscriptions.)

---

**BUREAUCRACY.** Byz. was governed by the emperor and administered by a corps of officials. The Byz. did not restrict the ruling class to a Greek version of the Western oratores and bellatores, clergy and knights, but regularly regarded officials as a separate category of the elite, often described as synkletikoi, senators (Kazhdan, *Gosp.klass. 66–70*). In the broad sense of the term, bureaucracy also encompassed military commanders and ecclesiastical functionaries. We do not have figures to determine the size of the bureaucracy, although the number of officials was larger than in any other medieval European society. Very approximate data can be drawn from the early 5th-C. Notitia Dignitatum and the Kletorologion of Philotheos. Around 400, there were 103 main offices of the central and provincial administration of the eastern part of the empire, both military and civil, and more than 260 subalter offices (the number of officials should be larger since many offices presupposed several functionaries simultaneously); ca.900, there were 59 main and about 500 subaltern offices, despite a drastic contraction of imperial territory.

The main spheres of administrative activity, besides ecclesiastical, were military, fiscal, and judicial—this categorization provided by chrysobulls from the end of the 11th C. Provincial administration was in the hands of either military commanders or judges, while diplomacy was not consistently separated from the general administration. A significant role was assigned to various imperial chanceries whose function was the composition of documents and the handling of correspondence addressed to the basileus. After the abolition of the office of the praetorian prefect no functionary presided over the whole executive activity; the mesazon of Paradynasteuon who tended to assume this role remained a semi-official imperial favorite.

There were neither social nor educational requirements for recruitment of civil servants—even
illiterate officials are known. Education, however, did provide one avenue of entrance, while children of officials had a better chance of obtaining administrative positions. By the 12th C. a pattern emerges in which military commanders or fiscal or judicial functionaries predominate in certain families, despite the absence of a hereditary system of titles or offices. The combination of land ownership and imperial service was typical, esp. among the military elite, even though the government tried to prohibit the strategoi from acquiring lands within their districts. Civil administrators originated more often than military commanders from families engaged in commerce; they were more likely to be connected with an intellectual milieu and the higher clergy.

A typical trait of Byz. bureaucracy was a close connection between the state government and the emperor's household. The difference between the two was ill defined, and the spheres of authority of the emperor's treasury and of the state financial bureau were barely distinguishable. Accordingly, the personnel of the imperial household, including eunuchs, was often assigned state functions, both civil and military. Until the end of the 11th C., the imperial household was considered to be a section of the state administration, and courtiers were included in the state hierarchy of the takta. The Komnenoi tried to reverse the system and treated the state as the patrimony of the ruling dynasty; relatives of the emperor not only actually obtained high positions in the bureaucracy but also assumed the highest titles by right of consanguinity. A patrimonial element became entrenched in the Palaiologan period. The 14th-C. bureaucracy described by pseudo-Kodinos is based on the principle of consanguinity/affinity and on a post at court rather than on state service.

A position in the bureaucracy was seen as prestigious; it was characterized, esp. from the 12th C. onward, by terms of dependence (on the emperor) such as doulos or oikeios; it was strictly contrasted with private service (A. Kazhdan, RE-SEE 7 [1969] 469–73). Public service was rewarded by salary (in a direct form or as a part of a province's revenues), by gifts from the emperor on feastdays, by donations of land or incorporeal rights (pronoia, charistikion, etc.), and, finally, by sportulae (see synetheia).

Texts preserve manifold complaints concerning malpractice of officials, esp. tax collectors (corruption, bribery, theft, biased judgment). It is important to remember, however, that historians and hagiographers record primarily exceptional cases, and that the administrative machine could function effectively, although centralization had its negative features—the apparatus was expensive and clumsy, decision making took place in Constantinople, competition between officials could easily grow into intrigues and cabals, and bureaucratic omnipotence opened broad opportunities for personal gain.

Modern scholars, particularly J.B. Bury and F. Dölger, have considered the Byz. bureaucracy as a coherent system with a well-defined division of functions, which drew upon the late Roman administration so that new offices smoothly replaced the old ones. This picture is idealized and simplified; the bureaucracy was often in a state of confusion with the result that the same term might designate various offices, different departments might fulfill identical functions, sekreta might combine responsibilities of completely different kinds, and rivalry penetrated the whole state machinery. Direct connection with the Roman system is illusory and based primarily on the deceptive similarity of terms. It is quite probable that around the 7th C. the bureaucracy underwent a profound transformation that cannot, however, be explained by reform or a series of reforms; the main features of the gradual change were replacement of the prefecture by the system of logothesia, introduction of themes, and the decline of municipal administration. The struggle for centralization was won by the emperors of the 9th and 10th C. The resistance of themes was crushed, the army of tagmata created, and an orderly hierarchy established. The 11th C. witnessed the triumph of the centralized administration of the civil bureaucracy that soon revealed its negative features. The Komnenoi tried to rebuild the bureaucracy on the patrimonial basis that, after a reaction under Andronikos I and the Angeloi, was revived by the Laskarids. The small state of the Palaiologoi yielded to decentralizing tendencies; the administration in Constantinople merged with the court, and in the provinces local forces achieved administrative independence.

BURGUNDIANS (Βουργούζιωνες), a Germanic tribe that crossed the Rhine in 406 and settled in the middle Rhineland. In 443, following their defeat by the Huns, AETIUS resettled them in the Rhone-Saône valleys (Burgundy) and eastern Switzerland. The kingdom of Burgundy, by virtue of its rich Roman heritage, well-entrenched Gallo-Roman aristocracy, and proximity to Italy, was the most romanized of all the barbarian states. Although the Burgundians were Arian, relations with the orthodox Gallo-Roman clergy were such that Avitus, bishop of Vienna, was permitted by King Gundobad to convert his son and successor Sigismund to orthodoxy in 516. At least three Burgundian kings were granted an official title by Eastern emperors, perhaps magister utriusque militiae per Gallias. Eastern influence in Burgundy is evident in the presence of 5th-C. churches dedicated to Sts. Kosmas and Damianos, Christopher, and George. The Greek TRISAGION was also introduced into the Western Mass by way of Burgundy in the early 6th C. Burgundy was overrun by the FRANKS under Clovis in 534. The Franks sent a contingent of Burgundians to support the Ostrogoths in their struggle against Justinian I’s forces in Italy. Tiberios I tried to intervene in Burgundian politics in order to secure Burgundian support against the LOMBARDS, but failed.

BURGUNDIO OF PISA, jurist, diplomat, Latin translator of Greek texts; born ca.1110, died 30 Oct. 1193. On 10 Apr. 1136 Burgundio appeared at Constantinople as an interpreter (along with MOSES OF BERGAMO) at the theological disputation of ANSELM of Havelberg, Lothar III's ambassador to Emp. John II Komnenos, with Niketas, metropolitan of Nikomedea. His career as a Pisan jurist (1140–74) is well documented. From 7 Nov. 1168 to 9 Nov. 1171 he helped head an embassy to Emp. Manuel I intended to restore Pisa's competitive position with her commercial rivals at Constantinople (Reg 1, no.1499). Burgundio's theological translations comprise Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew (finished on 29 Nov. 1151 for Pope Eugenius III from a MS supplied by the Latin patriarch of Antioch); part of John of Damascus's Fountain of Knowledge, or Pege gnoseos (1153 or 1154); Nemesios (ca.1164 or 1165; dedicated to Frederick I); and Chrysostom's Homilies on John (begun during the embassy from two MSS loaned by Byz. monasteries; finished 1179). He also translated Galen's On the Sects (1185; dedicated probably to Henry VI), Greek passages of the Digest of Justinian, and the Geoponika. His annotations occur in Greek MSS Florence, Laur. 74.5, 74.18, 74.25, 74.30, and Paris, B.N. gr. 1849. Burgundio reproduced the Greek as closely as possible but shows semantic flexibility for individual words; his versions shed light on the Byz. transmission of these works.

ED. See R. Durling, LMA 2:1097ff, for list of ed.


BURIAL (ząφη). Although practices varied in different areas, it was common in warm countries to bury the deceased on the first day after death. Following FUNERAL preparations, the ceremony at the tomb—including prayers, incense, and the epitaphios oration—centered on saying farewell to the departed and praying for his salvation and the pardon of his sins. The majority of people were buried in CEMETERIES, which were located outside of a city, town, or village. Some corpses were buried with valuables, which made their tombs liable to GRAVE-ROBBING.

Although a law of 381 (Cod.Theod. IX 17.6) prohibited the practice of burials in churches, it continued for clerics, distinguished monks, emperors, and influential laymen and their families. MAUSOLEUMS and MARTYRIA were erected to commemorate some imperial family members or the most venerated martyrs. Three distinct types of burials are to be found in BYZ. churches from early Christian times on: ARCO SOLA, tombs in the pavement, and SARCOPHAGI. All these types are
found in church porches, narthexes, naves, chapels, parekklesia, burial chambers, and crypts. The burial sites were frequently reserved by individuals during their lifetime; for example, in the 13th-C. typikon for the Lips Monastery in Constantinople, Empress Theodora prescribed the placement of her tomb as well as those of her family in various locations in the narthex and the nave of the church.

After the burial relatives of the deceased observed a period of mourning, during which, on the third, ninth, and fortieth day, they commemorated and prayed for the soul of the departed and prepared kolymba.


BURNING BUSH, a theophany to Moses on Mt. Sinai (Ex 3:1–6). Pilgrims such as Egeria (1.2–2.7) visited the site, and the monastery of St. Catherine reportedly was built there. The miracle was depicted early, for example, at the synagogue at Dura Europos, at S. Maria Maggiore at Rome (432–40), and at S. Vitale at Ravenna (ca. 540). In and after the 9th C. it is often included with the scene of Moses receiving the Law, since both accounts are connected with Mt. Sinai. In the Paris Psalter and the Bible of Leo Sakkarios, for example, the burning bush is represented halfway up the mountain. The Exodus account was read both at vespers and in the liturgy of the feast of the Annunciation, and the burning bush was already treated as a type of the Virgin by Gregory of Nyssa (PG 44:332D), a theme developed in later homilies and prayers. Images of the Virgin or Virgin and Child within the burning bush are found in Palaeologan art, for example, in a cycle of such prefigurations in the parekklesion of the Chora Monastery.


BUSTA GALLORUM (Bouostagallarios, lit. "tombs of the Gauls"), site on the via Flaminia, between Rome and Ravenna, near Tadinae (H.N. Roisle, RE supp. 14 [1974] 749–58, 799–809). Here, at the end of June/early July 552, Narses crushed Totila and thereby decisively broke the resistance of the Ostrogoths, marking the beginning of the end of their organized fighting ability. The Byz. enjoyed two-to-one numerical superiority, using Lombards, Herulians, and other barbarian infantry. The battle began with a single combat won by Anzalas, a retainer of Narses. Waiting for a troop of 2,000 mounted soldiers, Totila started a display of riding skill aimed at delaying the fight. Narses deployed his army in the shape of a crescent with foederati in the center and archers on the flanks. The Ostrogoths tried to smash the center but met a storm of arrows from the flanks. Prokopios, the only source for the battle, ascribes to Totila the order to use not bows but spears only (Wars 8:32.6). The unexpected counterattack of Roman cavalry finally compelled the Ostrogoths to retreat; 6,000 of them fell in battle, and many others who had surrendered were massacred. Totila, mortally wounded, fled.


BUTCHER. In the late Roman and Byz. eras a distinct terminology was used for dealers in and butchers of swine and merchants/butchers of other kinds of livestock (primarily cattle and sheep). A law of 419 (Cod.Theod. XIV 4.10), for example, united the separate guilds of swine merchants (suarii) and cattle merchants (pecuarii). In Egypt the pork butcher (choiromageiros) was often a separate tradesman (e.g., P.Cair.Masp. II 67164-3). The term makellarios (cattle butcher) appears several times in late Roman inscriptions from Korykos (MAMA 3, nos. 280, 538, and possibly 388); one of these inscriptions commemorates George makellarios logarites, perhaps a treasurer of the butchers’ guild.

The 10th-C. Book of the Eparche (chs. 15–16) divides the butchers/merchants into two guilds, the makellarioi and the choiremperoi (swine merchants); the makellarioi were strictly prohibited from buying swine and storing pork. At this time the makellarioi and choiremperoi served numerous functions, purchasing the animals, slaughtering them, and cutting up and selling their meat; in contrast the late Roman suarii and pecuarii were middlemen who bought animals from stockbreed-
ers and sold them to the actual butchers (lanii). Theophranthes the Confessor (Theoph. 225.8–9) used the term kreopoles for the tradesman who both slaughtered animals and sold the meat.

Butchers in Constantinople were required to operate in authorized markets—Stratégion and Tauros. They were forbidden to go to Nikomedea or other nearby towns to receive delivery of sheep or to buy swine outside these markets; makellarioi were, however, allowed to travel beyond the Sangarios River in order to purchase animals for a lower price. Makellarioi had to set prices under the supervision of the eparch; they received the heads, feet, and entrails of the butchered animals as their profit but had to sell the remainder according to the fixed price.

A few seals of butchers survive. An 8th-C. seal of the makellarios Anastasios (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 755) implies that butchers could have administrative functions. There is also a 10th-C. seal of the makellarios Leo (Zacos, Seals 2, no. 933). A guild of butchers probably existed in 15th-C. Thessalonike; in any case, a protomakellarios is attested there (S. Kougeas, BZ 23 [1920] 145.10, 146.39). The functions of the guild at this time, however, seem to have expanded, so that a protomakellarios in Constantinople also dealt in wool (Oikonomides, Hommes d’affaires 111). There is evidence of a struggle in Constantinople in the Palaiologan period over market privileges: in 1320 a Venetian bale protested the prohibition on Venetian meat and fish dealers in the capital’s meat market (Matschke, Fortschrift 96).

**BYTHOS (Βυθός)**, personification of the Depths of the Sea, occurring most commonly in representations of the Crossing of the Red Sea. Bythos is usually shown as a powerful naked male pulling Pharaoh from his horse into the water. Unknown in Early Christian imagery, he appears from the 10th C. in Psalter illustration and the Octateuchs. In the Bible of Leo Sakkellarios this figure is identified as Pontos, the Sea. (See also Thalassa.)

**BYZACENA** (Βυζακένα in antiquity). Under Diocletian, southern Africa Proconsularis was formed into a new province known as Valeria Byzacena. Byzacena was a major producer of agricultural goods from imperial and private domains situated on the eastern coast (Sahel) and near important inland towns such as Sufetula (Sbeita) and Thelepeta. In 442 Valentinian III ceded Byzacena to the Vandals. In the late 5th and early 6th C. much of southern Byzacena fell under the control of Mauri tribes. Following the Justinianic reconquest, Byzacena was ruled by both civil and military governors. The province was the scene of frequent warfare between the Byz. and Mauri until ca. 571. Byzacena continued, however, to export oil to Constantinople and other parts of the Mediterranean, although in evidently reduced volume. Surveys conducted around Sufetula and Cilium (Kasserine) show a decline in rural settlement in the 6th and 7th C. Byzacena was invaded by the Arabs in 647 and again in 665 and 669. In 670 a permanent Arab presence was established at Qayrawan. By the 680s the province was considered lost by Byz. authorities.

The ecclesiastical province of Byzacena did not emerge before the mid-4th C. Donatists predominated in the mountainous regions, Orthodox in the plains and coast; unlike Numidia, Byzacena was not torn by conflicts between the two sects. Byzacena was, however, a center of Orthodox resistance to the Arian Vandals and at the forefront of African opposition in the Three Chapters controversy. Byzacena was also involved in opposition to Monotheletism, which crystallized in the brief revolt (646–47) of the exarch Gregory.


**BYZANTINE ERA**, a system of computation of world chronology devised by the 7th C. Its elements are noticeable in the Chronicon Paschale written in the 630s. In 638/9 the monk and priest George elaborated its principles in a treatise on the computation of Easter (F. Diekamp, BZ 9 [1900] 24–32); it is difficult to decide whether he was the same priest and hegoumenos George to whom Maximos the Confessor dispatched a letter (PG 91:56–61) at approximately the same time. George’s point of departure was the observation...
that according to the Alexandrian Era the sun had to be created on the fourth day of its course and the moon in its full phase, already on the fifteenth day of its course. To eliminate this contradiction George made a shift of 16 years and concluded that the Creation took place not 5,492 but 5,508 years before the birth of Christ. Only by the end of the 10th C. did this system of dating become prevalent, although sporadic use of it in ecclesiastical documents can be found earlier, e.g., in 691 (V. Benešević, Syntaxa XIV titulorum [St. Petersburg 1906; 2d. Leipzig 1974] 145,17–19).

The era began originally on 21 Mar., but later (9th/10th C.) was shifted to 1 Sept.

To convert a Byz. Era date to an A.D. date, where commencement of year is 21 Mar., subtract 5,507 for dates between 1 Jan. and 20 Mar., but 5,508 for dates between 21 Mar. and 31 Dec.; where commencement of year is 1 Sept., subtract 5,508 for dates between 1 Jan. and 31 Aug., but 5,509 for dates between 1 Sept. and 31 Dec.


BYZANTINE RITE, the liturgical system of the Byz. Orthodox church, comprising the sacraments; the hours and vigils; the liturgical year with its calendar of feasts, fasts, and saints' days; and a variety of lesser akolouthai (blessings, enkainia, exorcisms, monastic investiture, etc.), all codified in liturgical books.

Renowned for the sumptuousness of its ceremonial and for its rich liturgical symbolism, the Byz. rite—in part the heritage of the imperial splendors of Constantinople—is actually a hybrid of Constantinopolitan and Palestinian rites gradually synthesized over the course of the 9th–14th C. Its history can be divided into four phases: "palaeo-Byz." (late Roman), imperial, Stoudite, and neo-Sabaitic. Antioch was the major center of liturgical diffusion in the prefecture of Orients, and with several early bishops of Byzantium coming from Antioch or its environs, the early Constantinopolitan asmatike akolouthia and liturgy of the Eucharist, esp. the anaphora, bear Antiochene traits. In the 6th–7th C., esp. under Justinian I with the construction of Hagia Sophia, the Byz. rite became "imperial," acquiring great ritual splendor and theological explicitation, the latter the result of the contemporary Christological controversies; new feasts, the creed, and several new chants (Trisagion, Monogenes, Chekroubikon) were added at this time.

By the 9th–10th C. the church of Constantinople had evolved its complete liturgical system, codified in the typikon of the great church. The monastic victory over Iconoclasm resulted in the gradual monasticization of the liturgy, esp. the adoption by Theodore of Studios of Palestinian monastic usages for the hours, which initiated an eventual fusion of Constantinopolitan and Palestinian liturgical books. The monks of Studios gradually combined the horologion of the imported Palestinian office of St. Sabas with the euchologion of the Great Church to create the hybrid "Stoudite" office: Palestinian monastic psalmody and hymns merged with the litanies and prayers of the Constantinopolitan asmatike akolouthia. This period is characterized by a massive infusion of new liturgical poetry into the offices, monastic compositions from both Palestine and Constantinople, and their gathering into new anthologies (Oktoechos, Triodion, PenteKostari-on, Menaion). It is in this period that the first Stoudite typika appear to regulate the use of these new "propers."

Meanwhile, the Byz. rite was spreading to the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, as these churches, weakened successively by the Monophysite schism, the Islamic conquests, and later the Crusades, gradually abandoned their own liturgies in favor of the Byz. rite. This process, already observable in MSS of the 9th C., was fostered esp. by Theodor Balsamon and was more or less complete in Alexandria and Antioch by the end of the 13th C., though the Liturgy of St. James remained in use longer in the patriarchate of Jerusalem (C. Charon [Korolevskij] in Chrysostomika [Rome 1908] 473–718; J. Nasrallah, OrChr 71 [1987] 156–81).

The Stoudite office, adopted throughout the Byz. monastic world, underwent further Sabaitic influence in Palestine. The result, codified in the Sabaitic typika, was adopted on Mt. Athos, where it received its final form under Patr. Philotheos Kokinos. This "neo-Sabaitic" rite was to spread further in the wake of the reform movement under the patriarchate of Philotheos, even replacing the asmatike akolouthia everywhere but Thessalonike. By the end of the empire the Byz. rite was in use throughout the Orthodox world and Sabaitic typika in force everywhere except south-
ern Italy and Rus’, which still retained Stoudite usages.


BYZANTION (Βυζάντιον, also Βυζάντιον), name of a Megarian colony at the southern mouth of the Bosporos, reportedly founded ca.660 B.C. The word is of Thracian origin; cf. the town of Byzye, the river Barbyses, etc. Ancient and Byz. legends considered a certain Byzas (the son of the nymph Semestre or a legendary Thracian king) as the founder of the city, sometimes together with the mythical Antes. The Parastaseis symtomoi chronikai often refers to “the days of Byzas and Antes” (e.g., Parastaseis 100.17); a combination of these two names must explain the toponym Byz-ant-ion. 

Constantine I chose Byzantium as the site of his residence, transformed gradually into a new capital. Byz. authors through the 15th C. (e.g., Douk. 43.9) used the name Byzantion for their capital, although the official designation was Constantinople (Gr. Konstantinopolis, “the city of Constantine”). The Byz. never extended the name Byzantium to their empire, which was termed “of the Rhomaioi”; for them the Byzantioi were the inhabitants of the capital. The term Byzantine Empire was coined by 16th-C. humanists.

Layout and Monuments. Seeing that Byzantium was absorbed into Constantinople without any radical replanning, its layout influenced that of the new city and many of its buildings survived into the Byz. period. The ancient city walls, renowned for their strength, described an arc from the Golden Horn to the Propontis, passing a short distance east of what was to be Constantine’s Forum. Demolished by Septimius Severus in 195–96, they were rebuilt in the second half of the 3rd C., probably along the same line. The acropolis of Byzantium, on the site of the present Seraglio, contained the main temples, which were still standing in the 6th C. Two fortified harbors lay within the walls on the shore of the Golden Horn. Next to them was an agora (later the Strategion). A second agora, called Tetrastoon, is represented by the open space south of Hagia Sophia, later the Augustaion. From there a colonnaded street, ascribed to Severus, led westward to the city gate. The theater, amphitheater (in the region of Mangana), the baths of Achilles and Zeuxippos, the aqueduct of Hadrian, and possibly the Hippodrome were further features of the ancient city that survived into the Middle Ages. The cemetery of Byzantium lay west of the city walls. The archaeological remains of Byzantium are very meager except for a good number of inscriptions.


BYZANTIUM, or Byzantine Empire, conventional name of a medieval state that existed for more than one thousand years. It can be viewed as a continuation of the Roman Empire inasmuch as its legal and administrative systems retained numerous Roman features; at the same time, it underwent significant transformations, evolving into a Christian and primarily Greek-speaking state centered on the Balkans and eastern Mediterranean. The Byz. themselves called their state the Roman Empire (basileia ton Rhomaios) rather than Byzantium, applying the name Byzantium only to their capital, renamed Constantinople. Byzantium as a term for the state was introduced into scholarship only in the 16th C. by Hieronymus Wolf (1516–80).

Since there is no act formally proclaiming the inauguration of Byz., no revolution abolishing the “ancient regime,” the date of its beginning remains under discussion; most scholars prefer the date of 324 (or 390), when Constantinople was founded by Constantine the Great, or 395, when the Roman Empire was divided between the sons of Theodosios I. It is easier to set a precise date for the end of Byz.; it ceased to exist in 1453 when Constantinople was captured by the Ottomans, although some remnants of the empire (the despotate of Morea, the empire of Trebizond) retained their independence until 1460 and 1461, respectively.

The population was multinational; after the loss of the eastern provinces to the Arabs in the 7th C., it was composed primarily of Greeks, Armenians, and Slavs. Its size is hard to estimate: J.C.
Russell (TAPhS 48.3 [1958] 93) proposed about 10.7 million inhabitants for Asia Minor and the Balkans ca.600 (see Demography). Greek was the official language from the 7th C. onward, although many ethnic minorities kept their own languages. The principal religion was Orthodox Christianity, but Armenians, Jews, and Muslims observed their own rites. Constantinople, which was founded as the emperor’s residence, became the capital by the 5th C. and remained the center of administration, culture, and cult until the end of the empire except for a short period of Latin occupation (1204–61), when the capital was moved to Nicea.

Geography of the Empire. Byz. territory was constantly in flux: originally encircling the entire Mediterranean Sea (extending over an area of more than 1,000,000 sq km in 560), it shrank first to a state occupying only the Balkans and northeastern Mediterranean, then to a state surrounding the Aegean Sea, and finally to a tiny domain on the Bosporos. For much of its history the Balkan peninsula and Asia Minor were its nucleus, supplying basic foodstuffs and manpower. This region is characterized by mountainous terrain (major ranges are the Haimos or Balkans, Rhodope, Taygetos, Pontic and Armenian ranges, the Taurus) with vast plateaus (e.g., Cappadocia) and relatively few valleys; the rivers, save for the Danube and Euphrates on its frontiers, are not major waterways, and are open to navigation only in their lower reaches. This landscape, tending to separate one region from another, strongly contrasts with the politically unified structure of the empire. Indented coastlines and numerous islands provided harbors and formed convenient “stepping stones” from Constantinople to Crete and from the western Balkans to Italy; however, as the empire’s political authority over the Mediterranean region diminished, its merchants lost their monopoly on commerce and yielded first to the Arabs and then to the Italians.

The empire possessed a variety of climatic and agricultural zones: regions with hot weather, suitable for growing cotton and palm trees; typically moderate Mediterranean areas producing olives and grapes; northern valleys rich in grain; mountainous plateaus providing pasture for flocks. This diversity of climate contributed to the development of transhumance on varying scales. There is no evidence for climatic change in the Byz. period. The issue of erosion has been much debated: there is no doubt that many harbors silted up and coastlines changed with the deposit of alluvium, but this may have been the result of commercial negligence rather than the cause of decreasing economic activity.


--A.K.

BYZANTIUM, HISTORY OF. This article is composed of an introductory overview of periodization, followed by six essays on the major divisions of Byz. history.

AN OVERVIEW. The separation of Byz. history into periods, like any historical periodization, is one artificially imposed by scholars. The most broadly used periodization is the tripartite division into early, middle, and late periods. This system has, however, two substantial shortcomings: first of all, it is based not on actual historical developments, but on the dubious philosophical premise that three is a magical figure; second, there is no common consensus concerning the borderlines between particular periods. The conventional system of periodization places the beginning of Byz. history either in the early 4th C. with the foundation of Constantinople by Constantine I the Great or at the end of that century with the division of the empire into Eastern and Western halves under the sons of Theodosios I, Arkadios and Honorius. There is much less agreement about what marks the end of the “early Byzantine” period (and, accordingly, the beginning of the “middle Byzantine” period); it has been variously dated to 505 (death of Justinian 1), 610 (accession of Heraclios), 717 (beginning of the Isaurian dynasty), and 843 (defeat of Iconoclasm and the Triumph of Orthodoxy). For the end of the middle Byzantine period scholars have usually chosen either 1071 (battle of Mantzikert) or 1204 (capture of Constantinople by the Latins). The “late Byzantine” period is traditionally dated from 1204 (or 1261, the recovery of Constantinople by the Byz.) to 1453, when Constantinople fell to the Turks.
The following historical survey does not attempt to establish precise boundaries between periods based upon specific political events; instead, this scheme for the most part uses vaguer, approximate dates corresponding to internal developments rather than to changes imposed from without. Thus, the proposed framework represents a more elaborate periodization than the traditional tripartite division while carrying the acknowledgment that it, too, represents an artificial scheme.

**Period of the Late Roman Empire (4th–mid-7th C.),** dubbed “Proto Byzantine” by Lemerle (Agr. Hist. 1–26). The application of the term “Byzantine” to this period is debatable, since the empire of this time preserved the main features of ancient urban society and remained a Mediterranean state par excellence. The issue is further confused by the fact that some scholars refer to papyri of the 6th and 7th C. as “late Byzantine,” and that likewise the final period of Byz. rule in Syria and Palestine (6th–7th C.) may be termed “late Byzantine.”

**Period of the “Dark Ages”** (mid-7th C. to ca.800/850) is characterized by the crisis of ancient city life, aggravated by serious territorial losses and cultural decline. Sometimes it is called the “period of Iconoclasm,” even though the two phenomena do not fully coincide chronologically; moreover, the concept of Iconoclasm does not cover all the changes that Byz. society underwent during this time. No more fortunate is the attempt to describe this period as one of Slavic penetration into the empire, which allegedly caused an essential restructuring of the Byz. economy and administration. In the first half of the 9th C. occurred the first stages of the process of recovery and consolidation that was to characterize the next period.

**Age of Recovery and Consolidation (ca.800/850–1000),** sometimes called the period of the “Macedonian renaissance” or of Encyclopedism. The latter term is more appropriate, although it refers only to cultural developments. During this period the “classic” form of the Byz. centralized and “totalitarian” state was established, and ideological and cultural uniformity was superimposed upon society. At the end of this period Byz. launched a series of offensive wars and managed to recover some of its territory in the east and the Balkans.

**Period of “Westernization” and the Empire of Nicaea (ca.1000–1261),** divided into two unequal parts by the fall of Constantinople to the Fourth Crusade in 1204. Characteristic traits of this period are the rise of provincial towns and of a semifeudal nobility, developments that were accompanied by a cultural flowering that is here called “pre-Renaissance” (the traditional term is “Komnenian renaissance”). Byz. took substantial steps toward “westernizing” its economy, social structure, and government, and despite religious friction was close to becoming a member of the European community of feudal states. The catastrophe of 1204 seems to have had no radical impact on the economic and social development of Byz.; the political pattern changed, however, and the centralized empire was replaced by a group of independent entities (the empires of Nicaea and Trebizond, the despotate of Epirus, the Latin Empire with its vassal states).

**“Empire of the Straits” (1261–1453).** Under the Palaiologan dynasty Byz. was a minor state whose territory continued to shrink under the blows inflicted by the Latins (esp. the Catalan Grand Company), Serbs, and Ottomans. The desperate situation was aggravated by socioeconomic factors—the growth of semifeudal forces, the increasing urbanization of western Europe, and the growing economic dependence of Byz. on the Italian republics of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa. The Byz. retained nevertheless the illusion of being a universal empire, while in the West national states were emerging as the dominant political form. The government and esp. the church could not reconcile their universal claims with the political realities. Byz. was unable to normalize relations with either the Turks or the West, nor could it unite the divided powers of eastern Europe to resist the Turkish onslaught.


Late Roman Empire (4th–mid-7th C.). The beginning of the late Roman Empire can be placed ca. 300. By that time Diocletian, through a series of administrative and economic reforms, managed to quell the so-called crisis of the 3rd C., during which the empire was beset by internal problems such as impoverishment of the populace, decline of military power, economic and monetary instability, and frequent rebellions and depositions of the emperor, as well as the increasing external threat from Germanic tribes and Sasanian Persia. The system of the tetrarchy established by Diocletian was effective during his 20-year rule but upon his retirement disintegrated. After long power struggles Constantine I the Great emerged victorious in 324. Constan-
tine’s policy of toleration of Christianity and his foundation of a new imperial residence in the East, Constantinople, were both significant events that began the process of transformation of the Roman Empire into the Byz. Empire.

For a century and a half, until 476, there continued to be emperors in both the Eastern and Western halves of the empire. The rulers in Constantinople managed to avert the threat of the Germanic tribes by diplomacy and accommodation (settling some Germans as foederati) but observed cold-bloodedly (and perhaps even instigated) the barbarian advance into the territory of the Western Empire: Alaric sacked Rome in 410, and later in the 5th C. the Ostrogoths overran Italy, the Visigoths took Spain, and the Vandals North Africa. In 476 the power of the last Western emperor in Italy, Romulus Augustulus, was abolished, although Julius Nepos continued for
a few more years (until 480) as claimant to the Western throne. Nevertheless, the first Germanic kingdoms on Roman territory were Roman-oriented and, with certain exceptions, ready to acknowledge the theoretical sovereignty of Constantinople. Moreover, in the 6th C. the generals of Justinian I were able to recover some of the Western lands lost to the barbarians, reestablishing Constantinople’s control over Italy, North Africa, and southeastern Spain.

By the end of the 6th C., however, much of Italy was again lost to the empire, when it was overrun by the Lombards. Also at the end of the 6th C. the Avars and Slavs began to break through Roman defense lines in the Balkans and to penetrate as far south as the Peloponnesos. The threat of the rival Sasanian Empire was contained until the early 7th C., when the Persians briefly took Egypt, Palestine, and Syria. Herakleios’s recovery of the Holy Land for the Byz. (629) was short-lived; within a decade, the Arabs, newly converted to Islam, had emerged as the dominant power in the Near East, and Byzantium lost its eastern provinces permanently.

The emperors of this period, who originated primarily from the northern Balkans (Thrace and Illyricum), were sometimes of humble background (Justin I was a peasant, Anastasios I an official, Valens and Leo I were military commanders of mid-rank, Phokas a soldier) or questionable descent (Constantine I was the son of a concubine, Zeno of an Isaurian chieftain). They rarely served as active generals, Julian, Theodosios I, and Herakleios being evident exceptions. Most rulers remained in Constantinople (Theodosios II, Anastasios I, Justinian I); their policies were open to the influence of strong empresses (e.g., Pulcheria, Ariadne, Theodora, Martina) as well as of eunuchs and lawyers. Emperors tried to stabilize the throne in two ways: on the one hand, there were attempts to establish a collegiality of power (the tetrarchy, the institution of co-emperors, the system of equal rulers in Rome and Constantinople); on the other hand, an effort was made to build up hereditary power (Constantine I—Constantius II—Julian from 324 to 363, Theodosios I—Arkadios—Theodosios II from 379 to 450). The establishment of dynasties was thwarted, however, by the failure of some of the most successful emperors to produce heirs or by the rivalry
of their sons by different wives; thus, Constantius II, Julian, Theodosios II, Marcian, Zeno, Anastasios I, and Justinian I all died childless, and the deaths of Constantine and Herakleios were followed by power struggles among relatives. In some cases successors to the throne were adopted sons (Tiberios I), nephews (Justinian I, Justin II), sons-in-law (Maurice), or husbands of the late emperor's widow (Anastasios) or sister (Marcian).

In the 4th and 5th C. the empire retained the major features of antiquity: it was still a Mediterranean state bound together not only by political but also by economic, cultural, and linguistic unity. The city and villa formed the cornerstones of the late Roman economy; trade flourished throughout the Mediterranean, and commercial routes over land and sea connected the empire with the remote areas of Ethiopia, India, and the territories beyond the Danube. However, from the 6th C. onward, an economic decline of the potius can be traced, primarily in cities of small and medium size. Larger cities (such as Alexandria, Antioch, and Carthage) continued to flourish; their role as administrative centers contributed much to the urban prosperity. Imperial residences played a special role: in the West, Rome preserved the place of honor as the former capital of the empire, but the court moved away—to Milan and then to Ravenna. In the East, Constantinople, inaugurated in 330, became the capital by the mid-5th C., superseding all its administrative, economic, and ecclesiastical rivals, such as Nikomedia, Naisos, Ephesus, and Alexandria.

By the mid-5th C., however, the urban system was in a state of crisis, both in the areas vulnerable to enemy invasions and in the regions that remained relatively safe from hostile attack. Changes in the countryside are difficult to interpret, since the evidence is contradictory. On the one hand, it is thought that from the 4th C. onward, the colonate (see coloni) began to assume the traits of personal dependency; by certain scholars this trend is even equated with medieval serfdom. On the other hand, both archaeological data and documentary material indicate that villagers (at least in certain regions) became more prosperous and independent. The aristocracy also changed in character: both the municipal and senatorial aristocracies (basically hereditary) were replaced (esp. in the East) by a new type of officialdom, seeking and depending on imperial favor.

The administrative structure of the empire was a substantial concern of the authorities; various emperors, esp. Diocletian, Constantine I, and Justinian I, tried to organize and reorganize central and provincial administration, the army, the system of taxation, and court life. Reforms were introduced and abolished, laws promulgated, and voluminous law books (Codex Theodosianus, Corpus Juris Civilis) compiled. The main directions of change were as follows: the reinforcement of the central bureaucracy, whose leaders, such as the praetorian prefect and magister officiorum, played a decisive part in the administration; the increasing impact of court ceremonial on all aspects of life; the restructuring of the army so that the defensive forces (including the limes and the troops of the foederati) acquired a predominant role; the gradual replacement of municipal bodies by provincial governors (duces, prefects) and their staves. Of momentous importance were the shifts in provincial organization: initial attempts to combine military and civil power in the same hands were succeeded by the separation of power; finally, by the end of the 6th C., exarchates were created, and the way was paved for the introduction of the theme organization.

The period of the 4th–7th C. saw the firm establishment of Chalcedonian Christianity as the official religion of the empire. Major patriarchates were organized at Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, and a series of ecumenical councils sought to define Christian doctrine. Monasticism, which had its beginnings in the desert, became an urban phenomenon as well; the accumulation of property by monasteries meant that these institutions began to play an increasing role in the economy.

Ancient scholarship and oratory, education, and forms of entertainment continued in the late Roman period. Many intellectuals spoke both Greek and Latin; rhetorical skill reached its peak in works of writers such as Libanius and John Chrysostom; libraries, universities, and theaters still functioned; and philosophers commented on and developed ancient doctrines. Nevertheless, profound changes took place in the sphere of culture: local ethnic traditions (Egyptian, Thracian, etc.) were revived; local literatures (e.g., Syriac, Coptic) emerged; the role of urban professionals (teachers, medical doctors) diminished; and by the mid-6th C. in the East, Greek became the pre-
dominant language of law and administration as well as of literature. The most important feature of late Roman culture was the increasing influence of Christianity. Although pagan scholarship and literature had their exponents up to the 6th C., Christianity dominated both institutionally, through its churches, monasteries, and philanthropic organizations, and ideologically, attracting the traditional intelligentsia and implanting its values and ideals of behavior. With the triumph of Christianity, new literary forms, such as the homily, hymn, and saint’s vita emerged, as did new genres of art and architecture.

By the end of this period, society and culture were far from being uniform. The Germanic conquests in the West in the 5th C. led not only to political division but also to a widening economic and cultural breach: the West became more and more latinized, while the East preserved a multilingual pattern with Greek as the language of administration. The pre-feudal landed aristocracy in the West, based on a system of estates and lineage, became increasingly independent, while in the East both the bureaucracy and nuclear family were more significant factors. The crisis of urbanism affected the West more strongly, and in the 6th C. the decline of ancient civilization was more evident there than in the eastern portion of the empire, which was gradually being transformed into Byzantium. In the East disputes took place between pagans and Christians, between numerous groups within Christianity (Arians, Monophysites, Nestorians, Neo-Chalcedonians), and between ethnic communities (attacks were launched against the Germanic foederati, the Sasanians, Samaritans, etc.). Scholarly issues were hotly debated, among others Aristotelian and Platonic world views as well as such religio-cultural topics as the legitimacy of the theater, the hippodrome, and divorce. Circus factions, which were normally the mouthpiece of the fans of the hippodrome, could proclaim political slogans at moments of crisis and thus produced an illusion of bipartisan political structure. The involvement of the state in theological discussions, esp. in church councils, however, prepared the climate for the medieval concept of “one state, one dogma.”


—A.K., A.M.T., T.E.G.

**“DARK AGES” (mid-7th C. to ca.800/850).**

During this period, which includes the ISaurian and Amorian dynasties, the empire suffered great territorial losses but eventually restructured its administration and stabilized its borders. The period witnessed far-reaching societal transformations and, near its close, the beginnings of a sustained economic and cultural revival.

During the 7th and 8th C. the ARABS (Umayyad Caliphate, ‘Abbāsid Caliphate) permanently occupied Byz. territory from Syria to Spain, ended Byz. naval hegemony in the eastern Mediterranean, and twice besieged Constantinople (Mu‘āwiya, Maslama). Although the caliphs Hārūn al-Rashīd and Mu’tasim invaded Byz. territory, by the 9th C. the empire had retained Asia Minor and stabilized a no man’s land running between Syria and Armenia. At the same time Byz. cultural influence on the Arabs was considerable, esp. under caliph Ma‘mūn. In the 7th C. the Bulgars under Asparuch established themselves south of the Danube, but through skillful diplomacy and military campaigns (e.g., Constantine V’s defeat of Telerig at Lithosoria) Byz. held on to Thrace and occasionally used the Bulgars as allies (Tervel). Krum attacked Constantinople in 811, but Omurtag made peace and accelerated the Bulgars’ entry into the Byz. cultural sphere, which culminated in the conversion of Boris I and the reign of his son Symeon of Bulgaria. In Italy Byz. could not prevent the advance of the Lombards, who took Ravenna in 751, nor of the Franks, who ultimately laid claim to the imperial title itself (Charlemagne, Louis I) and became the new secular protectors of the Papacy.

External pressures on Byz. accelerated significant internal political, economic, and social changes that definitively transformed late antique civilization into the medieval Greek world. Many scholars (esp. Sjuzumov and, most recently, Weiss) believe that the transition from late antiquity to the so-called middle Byzantine period was marked by a continuity of ideas and institutions. Yet mounting archaeological and numismatic evidence supports the view (advocated by Kazhdan as well as by Foss and Ch. Bouras) that during the 7th and 8th C.
the Eastern Roman *polis* underwent a severe crisis that disrupted the traditions of urban life. Many cities in Thrace, Greece, and Asia Minor ceased to exist or survived only as bishoprics (e.g., NAZIANZOS). Those that did survive were often drastically reduced in size or relocated altogether (EPHESUS). Most commonly, the population abandoned the traditional urban site to cluster in or around a fortified KASTRON on a nearby hill.

The breakdown of late antique urban life had a harmful effect on Byz. culture and also transformed everyday life by producing a shift from “open” to “closed” modes of social expression. Tertiary schools (universities) disappeared by the end of the 7th C. Original literary production in the 7th and 8th C. was apparently negligible. Ecclesiastical disputes stimulated theology, but the greatest Christian writer of the age, JOHN OF DAMASCUS, lived in Arab territory. Few artistic works—icons, mosaics, churches—can be attributed to the period. In architecture, the ancient house with its interior courtyards, galleries, and fountains now became a tight maze of small functional rooms. In town planning, broad boulevards and open squares disappeared in favor of small streets with limited open space. Churches replaced traditional urban assembly spaces such as BATHS and THEATERS.

Great changes were also underway in economic and social relations, although the scantiness of literary evidence leaves many details unclear. The tradition of private property ownership in cities appears to have yielded to a notion of supreme state ownership of property (see STATE PROPERTY). The BARTER ECONOMY became more important, although it still remained secondary to the monetary economy. Traditional late Roman social categories such as the hereditary nobility, urban aristocracy, dependent peasantry, and slaves declined significantly and were largely replaced by the nobility of the main urban centers (esp. Constantinople), provincial civil and military administrators, and an increasingly uniform rural population, although the appearance of powerful families (e.g., SKLÉROS) in the 9th C. signaled the revival of a hereditary aristocracy. The THEMÉ system contributed to this development by increasing the body of moderate landholders and free peasants. Legal texts such as the Farmer’s Law and hagiographical sources reveal the decline of large landed estates and the rise of free-holders, along with an increasing reliance on communal landownership, the abolition of compulsory peasant service, and the introduction of free movement.

The loss to the Arabs of rival cities like Alexandria and Antioch made Constantinople the center of the empire, and successive emperors instituted reforms aimed at strengthening the capital’s often precarious hold on the periphery. The Arab and Bulgar attacks stimulated a radical restructuring of PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION. The themes became the foundation of efforts to retain Byz. territory and then to reassert control over recaptured lands. By the mid-9th c. there were more than 20 themes in Asia Minor, Greece, the Aegean, and the Balkans as well as KLEISOURAI along the Arab frontier and KLIMATA in Crimea. This marked a decisive break with late Roman administration by transferring civil authority to military representatives, although the thematic system was also a source of instability, since it put powerful armies under individual commanders. Serious revolts originated in the themes (SABORIOS, BARDANES TÖRKOS, THOMAS THE SLAV), and more than one STRATEGOS became emperor (Leoníotos, Philippíkos, Leo III, ARTABASDOUS, Michael II). Efforts to reform the military, including reliance on small units like the DROUNGOS and the BANDON and increases in soldiers’ landholdings and wages, made the army more flexible and professional.

Changes in central civil administration made the court bureaucracy increasingly important in running state affairs. Several bureaucrats became emperor (Anastasios II, Theodosios III, Nikephoros I) or were proclaimed emperor in coup attempts (ARSABER). A key development was the emergence of chief bureaus—there were 13 by 842—and the growing influence of the post of LOGOTHETES. The most important official became the LOGOTHETES TOU DROMOU, many of whom (STAUARAKIOS, AEITOS, THEOKTISTOS) exercised great authority under weak rulers and during regencies (IRENE, THEODORA).

The primary legislative aim of the emperors was to maintain order in a turbulent world (NO-MOS STRATIOTIKOS, ECLOGA). This imperial insistence on unity and uniformity extended to religious affairs. Constans II tried to quell disputes over MONOTHELETISM by promulgating his TYPOS and punishing proponents of Orthodoxy (Pope MARTIN I, MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR), and Justi-
nian II convened the Council in Trullo to establish religious uniformity and eliminate pagan customs. In the 8th and 9th C. the attempt by several emperors to impose Iconoclasm on a reluctant population ultimately failed. The court instituted numerous fiscal reforms aimed at revitalizing the economy and increasing the state’s tax revenues. Many are attributed to Nikephoros I, but on the whole he merely formally systematized already existing measures. Most notably, the earthy tax (kapnikon) was extended to paroikoi belonging to the growing number of ecclesiastical establishments; the village community became collectively responsible for its members’ taxes (allelengyon); and the poll tax may have been separated from the land tax and applied to all taxpayers. Such reforms allowed Constantinople to benefit from an economic recovery that is discernible from the late 8th C.; state revenues apparently doubled between 780 and 850.

By the early 9th C. a cultural revival was also underway, stimulated by a growing economy and the reemergence of wealthy patrons. Historiography reappears with the works of Theophanes the Confessor and Patr. Nikephoros I. Kassia was a famous poet of the period. The emperor Theophilos launched an ambitious building program in the capital. The breadth of knowledge displayed by scholars such as Leo the Mathematician and the foundation of the school in the Magnaura (Theoktistos, Bardas) testify to the reinvigoration of Byz. secular learning. By this time Byz. culture was primarily Greek: Latin was little known or used.

AGE OF RECOVERY AND CONSOLIDATION (ca.800/850–1000). This period approximately coincides with that of the Macedonian dynasty. The intense desire to perpetuate the dynasty is seen in Leo VI’s series of four marriages in the attempt to produce a male heir (Tetrarogy of Leo VI) and in the eventual accession to sole power of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos and Basil II after the throne was usurped by strong civilian and military figures during the period of their minority (Romanos I Lekapenos, Nikephoros II Phokas, John I Tzimiskes).

The centralization achieved through Constantinople’s economic revival, the predominance of the civilian aristocracy, and the slow development of a new “knightslike” army permitted Byz. to stop the Arab invasions in the mid-9th C. and to go on the offensive from the mid-10th C. The successes of John Kourkouas, Nikephoros II Phokas, and John I Tzimiskes led to the Byz. reconquest of Syria and Crete; Bulgaria, a mighty rival ca.900, had to surrender to John I and was eventually annexed in 1018 under Basil II; Rus’ became an ally. Although Byz. recognized Otto I only as “emperor of the Franks,” the Byzantino-German alliance was strengthened by Byz. political and cultural influence. The economic revival that had begun in the first half of the 9th C., primarily in Constantinople and the Aegean coastlands, expanded farther: numismatic and archaeological evidence shows a gradual recovery in the 10th C. throughout Greece and Asia Minor at sites that had lain wholly or partially devastated in the previous period. Constantinople, however, remained the central point of trade and manufacture, its position unrivaled even by large cities such as Thessalonike and Ephesus.

Nor did the growth of private and ecclesiastical landownership yet challenge the state; although some stable clans (Skleros, Doukas, Phokas, Kourkouas) appeared by the 10th C., the state managed to check them and restrict their wealth, partly by bestowing upon the rural community the right of protimesis. Most aristocratic families served the government loyally, and aristocratic generals were primarily responsible for winning the glorious victories of the period. Another factor in Byz. military success was the restructuring of the army, whereby the heavily armed professional kathakartoi replaced the irregular contingents of thematic troops. Even when rebellious, the military aristocrats sought the support of Constantinople and strove to acquire the throne, not to create independent princehoods.

In 843 the government of Theodora restored the veneration of icons, but the monks who had led the resistance to Iconoclasm did not gain much. Strong monastic communities of working brethren—the ideal of Theodore of Studios—gave way to individualistically structured lavras and small monasteries dependent on state grants in kind and money (solemnia); the ideal of the poor brotherhood became very popular, and Nikephoros II Phokas supported it by restricting monastic landownership and by rewarding recently founded...
communities on Mt. Athos, which in their early stages renounced property. The role of monasteries in intellectual life declined: Byz. culture, which was controlled by monks in the first half of the 9th C., became increasingly secular after 850: after George Hamartolos, not one significant Byz. writer was a monk until Symeon the Theologian.

Arguably, the state (personified in the emperor) benefited most from Iconoclasm and its aftermath. The Byz. church was made subject to imperial power. Michael III disparaged the patriarchal office in Constantinople: the patriarchs, regardless of their personal qualities, became puppets in the hands of the emperor (among the deposed patriarchs of the period were Ignatios, Photios, Nicholas I Mystikos, and Euthymios). Twice the patriarchate was awarded to members of the imperial family (Stephen, brother of Leo VI; Theophylaktos, son of Romans I). Only in the second half of the 10th C. was the patriarchate, under Polyeuktos, strong and independent enough to influence imperial policy.

The imperial court and the officials of the capital assumed a fundamental role in the consolidation and reorganization of the empire. The concept of order (taxis) prevailed in the administrative and ideological activity of the time: the taktika (a literary genre typical of the period from the mid-9th C. to the late 10th C.) aimed at shaping the imperial administrative machine, mostly in its ceremonial functions; two surviving treatises on taxation, although not precisely dated, may best be assigned to the 10th or early 11th C. Writers from Leo VI to Nikephoros Ouranos produced a number of military textbooks (strategika); this genre also disappears after 1000. The outlines of an ideal imperial system were drafted in the milieu of Constantine VII in books on the themes (De thematibus), the goals of diplomacy (De administrando imperio), and the ceremonies of the imperial court (De cerimoninis). The law underwent "purification" as well: Basil I and Leo VI drafted or promulgated a series of legal books based on the formulas of Roman law (Prochiron, Epanagoge, Basilika).

Imperial regulations were extended throughout the empire: not only did imperial estates increase, but the state proclaimed its supreme right over all the lands of the empire; taxpayers were divided into several special categories according to their rents and services—stratiotai of different sorts, exkousaatoi of the dromos, Ordinary peasants. The government attempted to stabilize the categories it imposed on the population: 10th-C. legislation, from Romans I onward, aimed at preserving the village community, making a peasant responsible for his neighbor's taxes and prohibiting him from "fleeing" his village; the members of the community were also obliged to arm a soldier, if he lacked the means to buy a horse or weapons. The state developed the principle of just price, prohibiting the unfair pricing of land. The state even attempted to abolish usury, but when Basil I's measures failed, Leo VI was compelled to rescind them. The state also tended to regulate trade activity, promulgating the Book of the Eparch.

Regulation also encompassed ecclesiastical ritual and cultural life. Church architecture acquired a greater homogeneity in form and scale ca.900, the liturgy became more uniform, and Symeon Metaphrastes produced a monumental collection of saints' Lives for ecclesiastical feasts. The task of collecting the ancient heritage was emphasized: the Greek classics were transmitted, collections of the most important fragments were compiled (including the Geoponika), and Photios in the Bibliotheca surveyed significant works of ancient and early Byz. authors. Several lexika were published, among them the Souda.

The period was doubtless one of political success and expansion. Its accompanying cultural upsurge is often called the Macedonian renaissance, though a more proper term would be encyclopedism, meaning here the tendency to collect and set in order both Greek and Roman traditions. Little that is original is to be found in the numerous works produced during the period.


Period of "Westernization" (ca.1000-1204). This era began with the victories of Basil II, witnessed a collapse before the Turks and Normans in 1071, a partial revival under the Komnenian dynasty, a weakening under the Angeloi, and concluded with a seemingly fatal blow from the Fourth Crusade.

From Basil II's reign onward, the system of
great estates everywhere expanded. By the 12th C. most peasants were apparently dependent paroikoi on government, ecclesiastical, or private property. Cities grew: Constantinople was still in the forefront in the 11th C., but such provincial centers as Thessalonike, Trebizond, Artze, Corinth, and Thbes competed successfully; 12th C. Theban silk was superior to that of Constantinople. In the capital, a vigorous middle class appeared; it overthrew Michael V. The military crises of the late 11th C. forced Alexios I Komnenos to give extensive privileges—similar to those received by the Rus’ in the 10th C.—to Venice and Pisa in return for naval assistance; Genoa later obtained similar grants. Using their exemptions from customs dues, Italian merchants exploited the Byz. economy in the 12th C., arousing imperial and popular opposition in Constantinople. While magnates increased their properties where possible, they also sought lucrative government appointments in Constantinople. The Komnenoi secured the support of military-magnate families (Doukai, Palaiologoi, Kontostephanoi, and dozens more) through intermarriage, and an aristocracy based on ties of kinship developed. Whether this social structure (depen-
dent peasantry, militarized aristocracy) constitutes a “feudal” society remains debatable.

The emperors, esp. Alexios I Komnenos and his successors, zealously defended Orthodoxy against popular and intellectual heretics, including the Bogomils, John Italos, and Demetrios of Lampe. The rulers selected and supplant patriarchs and members of the higher clergy; Michael I Keroularios, Kosmas I, and Dositheos were among those deposed. Yet the ability of the secular clergy to oppose the emperor increased: Patr. Alexios Stoudites helped overthrow Michael V. Keroularios contrived the downfall of Michael VI, clerics such as Leo of Chalcedon seriously embarrassed Alexios I by opposing his appropriation of church treasures, and the metropolitans of Manuel I resisted his effort to ease the conversion of Muslims to Christianity. Above all, in 1054 Keroularios overthrew Constantine IX and forced a schism with the Western church.

Under Turkish pressure, the focus of monasticism shifted westward, although centers in Cappadocia continued to flourish. Christodoulos founded the monastery of St. John on Patmos; John II Komnenos and his wife Irene established
the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople. As the empire became more open to foreigners, ethnic monasteries developed within its boundaries: Gregory Pakourianos founded Petritzos for Georgians in Byz. Bulgaria; Stefan Nemanja established Hilandar for Serbs on Mt. Athos. Latin monasteries included an Amalfitan one on Mt. Athos and a Venetian one in Constantinople. Cenobitic life within monasteries declined in favor of individual monks' rights to own property and support themselves. In Constantinople "holy men," practicing eccentric forms of asceticism, were patronized by wealthy ladies and criticized by intellectuals. While monasteries expanded their landed wealth, many, mismanaged, fell into decay; a solution was sought in the charistikion.

In the 11th C., bureaucrats such as John the Orphanotrophos and Nikephoritzes dominated weak emperors; many of these officials were eunuchs. Scholars such as Michael Psellus and Patr. Constantine III Lechouides also achieved influential positions. The 11th C. allegedly witnessed a conflict between the bureaucrats, with their candidates for the throne (Romanos III, Constantine IX, Michael VII), and the landed-magnate generals with their candidates (Leo Tor-

BYZANTINE EMPIRE UNDER THE KOMNENOI

BYZANTIUM, HISTORY OF: Period of "Westernization" | 355

Nikios, Isaac I Komnenos, Alexios I). Psellus, an acute observer, was aware of the conflict between bureaucrats and military officers, but neither group seems solid or cohesive: the bureaucrats formed factions around personalities and policies, while the army was split into rival Anatolian and European wings. Emperors such as Isaac I Komnenos and Constantine X Doukas, who came from military backgrounds, were unable to free themselves from the traditional policies of the bureaucrats. With the accession of Alexios I, the government became dominated by imperial relatives; eunuchs lost importance.

Recruitment and leadership of the army posed difficulties. Military service formerly required of landholders was frequently converted into taxation. From the 1040s, foreign mercenaries filled the ranks; sources specify Turks of various sorts, Varangians, Normans, and other Westerners, including Anglo-Saxon refugees. Under John II and Manuel, exkousselai was conferred upon certain landowners, and some of them were granted charistikion and pronoia; Westerners could become liziotai and receive grants similar to Western fiefs. In the 11th C., mercenaries such as Roussel de Bailleul attained leadership, but after 1081
commanders of this sort were few. In the 11th C., officers were either court eunuchs or landed magnates; in the 12th, usually aristocrats linked to the Komnenoi or Angeloi. Despite periodic revivals, the navy could not be maintained; the effort to use Venetian, Pisan, and Genoese fleets ultimately failed. In 1204, Danes and Anglo-Saxons led the defense of Constantinople.

In the 11th C., Constantinople witnessed an intellectual flowering, chiefly among representatives of the middle class. Psellos revived interest in Plato, Neoplatonism, and their application to Christianity; in the 12th C., Tzetzes and Eustathios of Thessalonike enhanced the study of classical philology. Constantine IX established a law school for John Xiphilinos, while making Psellos "chief of the philosophers" (hypatos ton philosophon), a position that gave him some supervision over secular instruction in Constantinople. The application of formal logic to theology by John Italos and Eustathios of Nicaea alarmed Alexios I; instruction was placed under the patriarch's control. Later, the hypatos ton philosophon was ordered to exercise an academic censorship. In the writing of history (Psellos, Anna Komnene, Niketas Choniates) and literature (Theodore Prodromos, Eustathios of Thessalonike), conventional ways of depicting people and objects gave way to some elements of "naturalism" and attempts to show the complexity of human character.

Basil II's victories over Arabs and Bulgarians brought the empire a period of relative external peace, which permitted such rulers as Constantine IX to rely on the bureaucrats and repress the magnates and army. The fall of Bar to the Normans and the Turkish triumph at the battle of Mantzikert (1071) discredited the regime of the civilians, allowing independent Armenian states to appear in Cilicia and ultimately permitting Alexios I to seize the throne. The first three Komnenian emperors provided a century of stability; the army was rebuilt and the new aristocracy strengthened the throne, but concessions to the Italians undermined the economy. Alexios I repelled Norman and Pecheneg invasions of the Balkans; with the help of the First Crusade, he recovered coastal Anatolia. John II and Manuel fought with mixed success against Crusaders, Hungarians, Serbs, and Turks. Manuel's defeat at Myriokephalon (1176) and weak rulers after 1180 stopped the Byz. drive into Anatolia. Andronikos I sought to establish his power by bloodily suppressing the aristocracy, but he failed to reinvigorate the Byz. state. Cyprus, occupied by the rebel Isaac Komnenos, was later taken by Richard I Lionheart. The Angeloi emperors, Isaac II and Alexios III, failed to meet the many challenges that confronted them. Civilian aristocrats, displacing the military aristocracy of the Komnenoi, dissipated the empire's resources. Circa 1186, the Bulgarians and Vlachs established the Second Bulgarian Empire, while the Serbs gained their independence. In addition to these ethnic movements, rebels appeared, striving for separatist regimes: Theodore Mankaphas at Philadelphia, Leo Sgouros of Nauplia, Alexios and David Komnenos in Pontos. When the Fourth Crusade conquered Constantinople in 1204 and established the Latin Empire, the Byz. empire was already partially dismembered. That Byz. recovered was due to its regional strength in the successor states at Trebizond, Nicaea, and Epirus.


EMPIRE OF NICAEA (1204—61). The most successful of the three Greek successor states that emerged after the fall of Constantinople to the Fourth Crusade in 1204, the Nicaean Empire was founded by Theodore I Laskaris. Its core comprised the coastlands of western Asia Minor, stretching in an arc from the Paphlagonian coast to the southwestern tip of Asia Minor, where the river Indos (Dalaman Çay) formed the frontier with the Turks. Despite Turkish pressure along these frontiers, the Nicaean akritai were more than able to hold their own. The Nicaean lands in Asia Minor formed two distinct blocks: a northern region around Nicaea, the official capital, and the western coastlands, where in the hills behind Smyrna John III Vatatzes established his residence at Nymphaion. This area formed the hub of the Nicaean Empire. The treasury was housed at Magnesia, while Smyrna became the main naval base. Nicaea remained the residence of the patriarchs, but the emperors rarely visited
it except for their coronations. The choice of Nymphaion as a residence brought the emperors of Nicaea clear advantages. It provided a good vantage point for surveying the Turkish frontier, and it was in the heart of a very fertile region, where imperial and aristocratic estates were concentrated. Once Nicaean armies began campaigning regularly in Europe it was better placed than Nicaea, for it was situated on a shorter and more direct route to the straits of Kallipolis.

At one level, the history of the Nicaean Empire revolves around the ultimately successful struggle to restore the seat of empire to Constantinople. Recognizing the Greeks of the despotate of Epirus and the Bulgarians as serious competitors, the emperors of Nicaea realized that they must establish their authority in Thrace and Macedonia if they were to have a real chance of recovering Constantinople from the Latins. John III outmaneuvered his rivals and was able to gain control over northern Greece because his authority was based on an effective system of government and he had at his disposal a greater range of resources than any of his opponents. He built up the imperial domains and by careful management increased their profits. The incubus of a bloated and inefficient bureaucracy was swept away with the loss of Constantinople. In its place the Nicaean emperors created an inexpensive and efficient administration centered on the imperial household, in which the aristocracy had an acknowledged place. John III carefully supervised the fiscal administration. The fiscal surveys, always one of the strengths of Byz. government, were continued. The administrative and financial strength of the Nicaean Empire was reflected in the substantial armies it kept in the field and in its navy, which secured the islands along the Asia Minor coast.

Another source of strength was the presence of the ecumenical patriarch at Nicaea. The period was by and large one of cooperation between emperor and patriarch. The emperors could normally rely on the patriarchs for moral support. The patriarchal presence also gave the Nicaean rulers a role on the international stage that none of their rivals could match: there were a number of rounds of negotiations with papal representatives over the Union of the Churches; an alliance was concluded with Frederick II Hohenstaufen; and Nicaea became the acknowledged center of the Orthodox world. In 1220 the Serbian church turned for recognition of its autonomy to Nicaea. In 1235 Patr. Germanos II con-
ferred patriarchal rank on the head of the Bulgarian church. In both cases a primacy of honor was reserved for the Nicaean emperor and patriarch.

At another level, these examples show how changes long underway in Byz. crystallized during the period of exile. The recognition of the autonomy of the Orthodox church in Serbia and Bulgaria set the seal on their political independence. Although the Nicaeans were unwilling to make similar concessions to the Greeks of Epiros, the princes of the house of Komnenos Doukas were granted the rank of DESPOTES, thus reconciling their autonomous status with Nicaean claims to overlordship. Devolution of authority also occurred within the Nicaean Empire. The policy of granting EKKOUSSEIA to the great monastic and aristocratic estates was continued and extended into regions where they had been rare before 1204; the same is true of the PRONOIA. In the European provinces the Nicaean emperors issued a series of chrysobulls to the towns and cities, thus officially conferring upon them a measure of autonomy. The period of exile saw a significant growth of local and aristocratic privilege, but relations between emperor and aristocracy remained good until the reign of THEODORE II LASKARIS, whose attack upon the aristocracy, motivated by his desire to assert imperial autocracy, was doomed to failure.

The loss of Constantinople to the Latins dealt a severe blow to Byz. culture. The emperors of Nicaea sought to revive Byz. education by creating a palace school. A concerted effort was made to collect and copy manuscripts. Byzantium’s “Hellenic” past was increasingly appreciated in intellectual circles, which added a new dimension to the Byz. sense of identity. It contributed to the way that Byzantium’s universalist claims began to yield to a more strongly “nationalist” feeling, best caught in the growing hatred of what the Latins stood for. When, at last, the seat of empire was restored to Constantinople in July 1261 by MICHAEL VIII PALAILOGOS, a radical change in the structure and outlook of Byzantium had been completed.

“Empire of the Straits” (1261–1453). The restored “empire” of the 1260s was scarcely large enough to justify its name, limited as it was to the western coast of Asia Minor, northern Greece, and the southeastern Peloponnesos (with the Latin principality of ACHAIA in control of the rest of the peninsula). The despotate of EPIROS and the empire of TREBIZOND maintained their autonomous status. Despite the recovery of its capital, the empire continued to shrink during the remaining two centuries of its history. Although the diplomacy of MICHAEL VIII thwarted the plans of CHARLES I OF ANJOU for conquest, later Byz. emperors were less successful in containing the expansionist policy of their northern and eastern neighbors. By 1340 the OTTOMAN Turks had conquered most of Asia Minor; by 1355 the Serbs, under STEFAN UROŠ IV DUŠAN, controlled most of northern Greece, and the Turks had gained a foothold in Europe. Didymoteichon and Adrianople, the principal towns of Thrace, fell to the Ottomans in the 1360s, Thessalonike in 1387 (and again in 1430, after a brief period of Byz. and Venetian recovery). The independence of Epiros also ended in 1430 with the fall of IOANNINA. Only in the Peloponnesos did the Byz. despotate of MOREA prosper and expand (at the expense of the principality of Achaia); by 1430 it encompassed virtually the entire peninsula. Shortly thereafter, however, in 1453, MEHMED II took Constantinople by siege (see CONSTANTINOPLE, SIEGE AND FALL OF), and the Morea was able to hold out against Ottoman conquest only until 1460. The next year Trebizond, the last Greek stronghold, fell.

Numerous factors contributed to the final demise of the empire, which had already been seriously weakened by the Latin conquest of 1204. First of all, the restored Byz. state had to face the rising power of a vigorous new empire, that of the Ottomans, which steadily conquered Byz. territory and reduced Byz. to vassal status after 1371. The Ottomans besieged Constantinople from 1394 to 1402; the capital was saved only by TIMUR’S defeat of the Ottoman sultan BAYEZID I at the battle of ANKARA in 1402. This setback to the Ottoman fortunes, and the ensuing civil war among Ottoman princes, gave the Byz. Empire a reprieve and enabled it to resist until 1453, although MEHMED II did besiege the capital in 1422.

Second, the states of western Europe provided
little or no assistance to Byz., even though their very existence was threatened by the Turks. The papacy and Western rulers continued to demand that the Byz. emperor agree to Union of the Churches in exchange for military assistance. Twice the Byz. agreed to these conditions, at the Council of Lyons in 1274 and at the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1439; the promised Western aid either never materialized or was ineffective. The Western crusading movement had almost died out by the late 13th C.; the two crusades of the 14th and 15th C., the Crusade of Nikopolis (1396) and the Crusade of Varna (1444), both met defeat at the hands of the Turks.

Internal problems also weakened the Byz. state in the 13th–15th C. Although only one dynasty, that of the Palaiologoi, held sway throughout the final period, it was not as stable as might appear. It is true that only eight emperors (discounting the brief usurpation of Andronikos IV and John VII) ruled during a period of 195 years, for an average 24-year reign (Andronikos II was em-
Emperors of Byzantium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constantine I the Great</td>
<td>324-337</td>
<td>Leo VI</td>
<td>886-912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine II</td>
<td>337-340</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>912-913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans I</td>
<td>337-339</td>
<td>Regency for Constantine VII</td>
<td>913-920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius II</td>
<td>337-361</td>
<td>Romanos I Lekapenos</td>
<td>920-944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian</td>
<td>361-363</td>
<td>Stephen and Constantine Lekapenos</td>
<td>944-945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovian</td>
<td>363-364</td>
<td>Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos</td>
<td>945-959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valens</td>
<td>364-378</td>
<td>Romanos II</td>
<td>959-963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosios I</td>
<td>379-395</td>
<td>Nikephoros II Phokas</td>
<td>963-969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkadios</td>
<td>395-408</td>
<td>John I Tzimiskes</td>
<td>999-976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosios II</td>
<td>408-450</td>
<td>Basil II</td>
<td>976-1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcian</td>
<td>450-457</td>
<td>Constantine VIII</td>
<td>1025-1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo I</td>
<td>457-474</td>
<td>Romanos III Argyros</td>
<td>1028-1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo II</td>
<td>473-474</td>
<td>Michael IV Paphlagon</td>
<td>1034-1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeno</td>
<td>474-491</td>
<td>Michael V Kalaphates</td>
<td>1041-1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basiliskos</td>
<td>475-476</td>
<td>Zoe and Theodora</td>
<td>1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasios I</td>
<td>491-518</td>
<td>Constantine IX Monomachos</td>
<td>1042-1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>518-527</td>
<td>Theodora</td>
<td>1055-1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>527-565</td>
<td>Michael VI Stratiotikos</td>
<td>1056-1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>565-578</td>
<td>Isaac I Komnenos</td>
<td>1057-1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberios I</td>
<td>578-582</td>
<td>Constantine X Doukas</td>
<td>1059-1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>582-602</td>
<td>Romanos IV Diogenes</td>
<td>1068-1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokas</td>
<td>602-610</td>
<td>Michael VII Doukas</td>
<td>1071-1078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleios</td>
<td>610-641</td>
<td>Nikephoros III Botaneiates</td>
<td>1078-1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleios Constantine and Heraklonas</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>Alexios I Komnenos</td>
<td>1081-1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>641-668</td>
<td>John II Komnenos</td>
<td>1118-1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td>668-685</td>
<td>Manuel I Komnenos</td>
<td>1143-1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td>685-695</td>
<td>Alexios II Komnenos</td>
<td>1180-1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontios</td>
<td>695-698</td>
<td>Andronicos I Komnenos</td>
<td>1183-1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberios II</td>
<td>698-705</td>
<td>Isaac II Angelos</td>
<td>1185-1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II (second reign)</td>
<td>705-711</td>
<td>Alexios III Angelos</td>
<td>1195-1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippikos</td>
<td>711-713</td>
<td>Isaac II and Alexios IV Angelos</td>
<td>1203-1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasios II</td>
<td>713-715</td>
<td>Alexios V Doukas</td>
<td>1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosios III</td>
<td>715-717</td>
<td>Theodore I Laskaris</td>
<td>1205-1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo III</td>
<td>717-741</td>
<td>John III Vatatzes</td>
<td>1221-1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine V</td>
<td>741-775</td>
<td>Theodore II Laskaris</td>
<td>1254-1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo IV the Khazar</td>
<td>775-780</td>
<td>John IV Laskaris</td>
<td>1259-1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine VI</td>
<td>780-797</td>
<td>Michael VIII Palaiologos</td>
<td>1259-1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>797-802</td>
<td>Andronicos II Palaiologos</td>
<td>1282-1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikephoros I</td>
<td>802-811</td>
<td>Michael IX Palaiologos</td>
<td>1294/5-1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staurakios</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>Andronicos III Palaiologos</td>
<td>1328-1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael I Rangabe</td>
<td>811-813</td>
<td>John V Palaiologos</td>
<td>1341-1391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo V the Armenian</td>
<td>813-820</td>
<td>John VI Kantakouzenos</td>
<td>1347-1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael II</td>
<td>820-829</td>
<td>Andronicos IV Palaiologos</td>
<td>1376-1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophilos</td>
<td>829-842</td>
<td>John VII Palaiologos</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael III</td>
<td>842-867</td>
<td>Manuel II Palaiologos</td>
<td>1391-1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basil I</td>
<td>867-886</td>
<td>John VIII Palaiologos</td>
<td>1425-1446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constantine XI Palaiologos</td>
<td>1449-1453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
peror for 46 years, John V for 50). These figures are misleading, however, because the reigns of both emperors were severely shaken by usurpers and civil war. Andronikos II fought for seven years (1321–28) against his grandson ANDRONIKOS III before abdicating; the youthful JOHN V PALAIOLOGOS was challenged by JOHN VI KANTAKOZENOS, who gained power for seven years after the CIVIL WAR OF 1341–47. These civil wars sapped the strength of the empire, as a result of the devastation of agricultural land and the Byz. use of declining resources to fight each other instead of the common enemy. The Civil War of 1341–47 esp. revealed the hostility of the lower classes toward the landed aristocracy, as manifested in a series of popular urban rebellions, most notably that of the ZEALOTS in Thessalonike; it should be noted that all of these urban movements were ultimately unsuccessful. As rival factions invited Serbs and Turks to take sides in the civil wars as allies or mercenaries, they enabled these dangerous foes to encroach upon Byz. territory. Even after forcing the abdication of Kantakouzenos, John V faced a series of rebellions by his son Andronikos IV and grandson John VII. Another sign of imperial weakness was an increasing tendency for the emperor to divide his territory among his sons, assigning them APPANAGES, which they ruled as autonomous princedoms.

The state treasury was impoverished as revenues declined on account of the decrease in Byz. territory, the immunity from taxes of many large landholders and monastic estates, and the frequent inability of the local population to pay taxes as a result of civil war or foreign invasion. Instead of drawing on the military obligations of PRONOIA holders, the state was forced to pay for an army composed largely of mercenaries. On occasion the use of mercenaries backfired, as when the CATALAN GRAND COMPANY turned against the empire when the emperor was unable to pay them. Under Andronikos II, the fleet was temporarily dismantled as an economy measure. Gold currency, the HYPERPYRON, steadily depreciated in value. Most COMMERCE was in the control of the Italian republics (see VENICE, GENOA), so that the Byz. state received few customs revenues. ANNA OF SAVOY had to pawn the crown jewels to Venice for a desperately needed loan. The empire’s remaining wealth lay in the hands of the great landowners.

The empire became further divided by a number of ecclesiastical controversies. Michael VIII’s usurpation of the throne from the Laskarid dynasty at Nicaea precipitated the schism (1265–1310) between ARSENITES, who defended the Laskarid cause, and Josephites, who supported the new Palaiologan emperor. Simultaneously Michael alienated most of his subjects, esp. the monks, by his decision to agree to Union of the Churches at the Council of Lyons. Although he was motivated by the hope of checking Angevin aggression and of securing Western military aid against the growing power of the Turks, his policy was soon repudiated by his son Andronikos II. The middle years of the 14th C. were torn by the debate over HESYCHASM, which was condemned at first but later accepted by the church as orthodox doctrine. This dispute had ramifications in the political arena, as supporters of Gregory PALAMAS and hesychasm tended to favor Kantakouzenos in the Civil War of 1341–47, while the regency for John V opposed the new doctrines of PALAMISM. Disagreement over Union of the Churches continued until 1453, as the Byz. agonized over whether to acknowledge the primacy of the pope in the perhaps vain hope that they would be rewarded with a Western crusade against the Turks. John V personally converted to Catholicism, but not until the reign of John VIII did an emperor again dare to follow the policy of Michael VIII. The Union concluded at Florence in 1439 was rejected, however, by the populace of Constantinople. Loukas NOTARAS reportedly stated that he would rather be conquered by the Turks than submit to the pope.

This era of declining imperial power saw an increase in the prestige and authority of the Byz. church. The patriarchal throne was graced with distinguished scholars such as GREGORY II OF CYPRUS and GENNADIOS II SCHOLARIOS and reformers like the ascetic ATHANASIOS I. In 1312 jurisdiction over the monasteries of Mt. ATOS was transferred to the patriarch from the emperor. While the empire shrank, the sway of the patriarch of Constantinople was recognized in those lands of Asia Minor and the Balkans no longer under Byz. rule, as well as in Russia, and was even extended to LITHUANIA. MONASTICISM prospered, too, in the Palaiologan era; numerous monasteries were built or restored in Constantinople, Thessalonike, and Mistra. METEORA was colonized by monks from Athos and soon became a new holy
mountain, while Athos, revitalized by the mysticism of the hesychast movement, continued to be a major monastic center even though the peninsula suffered from the raids of Catalans and Turks.

Letters as well as the arts flourished; a sense of Hellenic national identity emerged, accompanied by a new intensification of interest in antiquity. In the major cities, a small but influential elite of intellectuals pursued studies in classical philology, astronomy, and medicine; they also commissioned the copying of numerous MSS. Among those scholars most inspired by the classical tradition were Theodore Metochites and George Gemistos Plethon. The 14th C. saw a revival of the genre of hagiography, as monks and secular literati alike composed Lives of contemporary holy men, or rewrote the Lives of older saints. Vernacular literature also gained greater importance, and there was particular interest in the genre of romance. Greater contact with the scholasticism and humanism of Italy provided a stimulus for scholars such as Demetrios Kydones and Bessarion. Although Constantinople remained depopulated and wheatfields and vineyards still could be found within its walls, the restoration or new construction of churches and monasteries in the capital and at Thessalonike and Mistra after 1261 attests to the artistic vitality of the declining empire, esp. in the first century of the Palaiologan era (see under Monumental Painting).

CADASTER, land registry for the purpose of tax assessment. Some early cadasters are preserved on papyri (J. Gasco, L. MacCoul, *TM* 10 [1987] 103−58). Knowledge of the Byz. cadaster in the 10th−12th C. is based on rules presented in the treatises on taxation (see Taxation, Treatises on), on four original folios preserved in Vat. gr. 215, and on some excerpts copied in documents of the archives of Iviron, Lavra, and St. Panteleimon. At least after 995 (maybe earlier) a census (anagraphe and later apagraphe) was conducted periodically (probably every 30 years), following a geographical pattern defined by the administrative circumscriptions of the provinces from the larger to the smaller (theme, dioikesis, enoria or archontia, hypotage). The results were inscribed in the kodikes of the province (the “boxes,” arklai) and duplicates were kept in the appropriate bureau in Constantinople (genikon, stratiotikon [see Logothetes tou Stratiotikou]). Each identifiable piece of land occupied a separate line (stichos) in the cadaster with the name of its owner (and taxpayer) or its successive owners added piecemeal, sometimes between the lines; there was also an indication of any temporary modifications of the land’s fiscal burden and the amount of the tax payable at the right end of the line (akrostichon). A copy of the kodix (isokodikion; registers with that name were created by Basil II) was seen as a necessary proof of ownership. The taxpayer received a praktikon, i.e., an act signed and sealed by the official enumerating his (eventually scattered) properties and their fiscal obligations. The geographical cadaster does not reappear in the 13th−15th C.; it seems to have been replaced by the thesis or megale apographike thesis, which included copies of the praktika delivered by every surveyor (apographeus) of the province. (See Land Survey.)

LIT. Svoronos, *Cadastre*. N. Oikonomides in *Dioms*. 141f. N.O.

CAESAR (καῖσαρ), a dignity formerly applied to the emperor himself, was used under Diocletian to designate a junior emperor who stood under an augustus and did not possess charismatic qualities (A. Arnaldi, *Rivista italiana di numismatica* 83 [1981] 75–86). Until the 11th C. caesar remained the highest title reserved primarily for the emperor’s sons, albeit with several exceptions: Bardas was caesar under his nephew Michael III. Nikephoros II made his father Bardas Phokas a caesar, Michael IV did the same for his namesake and nephew. The assertion of Patr. Nikephoros I (Nikeph. 42.22−23) that Justinian II granted Terkel the emperor’s cloak and the title of caesar is proved by the evidence of seals (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 2672). The ceremony of elevation of a caesar is described in the *De ceremoniis* (De cer. bk.1, ch.43). The insignia of the caesar was a crown without a cross. Alexios I lowered the rank of caesar, placing it below sebastokrator. In pseudo-Kodinos the caesar occupies the rank between sebastokrator and megas domestikos; from the 14th C., however, the title was conferred primarily on foreign princes, such as caesars of Vlachia, of Thessaly, or of Serbia.

According to Gy. Moravcsik (*ZRVI* 8.1 [1963] 229−36), the Slavic word *tsar* was derived not from the Byz. title but from the Latin designation for the emperor, probably in the 6th/7th C.


A.K.

CAESAREA (Καισαρεία, mod. Kayseri), metropolis of CAPPADOCIA. When its enthusiastic Christians destroyed pagan temples, Empr. Julian deprived Caesarea of municipal status, but it soon recovered to flourish under St. Basil the Great. Caesarea was a great military base with imperial factories of weapons and textiles to supply the frontier. Justinian I replaced its ancient walls, which included fields, gardens, and pasture within their circuit, with a shorter, more defensible rampart. Although Caesarea resisted Chosroes I in 575, Chosroes II took and burned it in 611. Nevertheless, its size and wealth impressed the
Arabs when they first attacked it in 646; they captured it temporarily in 726. Caesarea was first part of the ARMENIAKON theme, then of CAPPADOCIA, and finally, under Leo VI, of CHARSIANON. Caesarea was an important military base in the 10th–11th C.; John KOURKOUAS was stationed there, and NIKEPHOROS II PHOKAS and Bardas PHOKAS, whose revolt the city supported, were proclaimed emperor in Caesarea. Turkish bands attacked it in 1067 and 1073; the Danişmendis conquered Caesarea in 1092; at the time of the First Crusade it was a ruin. Except for some sections of its city walls, which may be Justinianic, the Byz. remains of Caesarea have perished. Caesarea was an ecclesiastical metropolis in the 4th C. Before 431 it won precedence over Ephesus, and when the patriarchate of Constantinople was definitively established, Caesarea became its second see, its archbishop entitled PROTHONOTAROS.


CAESAREA MARITIMA, port in Palestine and the capital city of Palestina I. Until 451 the archbishopric of Caesarea (Καίσαρεια) stood higher in the ecclesiastical hierarchy than Jerusalem, but the Council of Chalcedon subjugated it to Jerusalem. Extensive archaeological excavations have revealed an expansion of the city from the 4th to 6th C. Two aqueducts were restored in 385 and ca. 526, and the main harbor was revitalized between 501 and 518. In the 6th C. streets were refurbished, including a north-south thoroughfare perhaps 17.5 m wide (R. Wiemken, K. Holum, BASOR 244 [1981] 27–41). Interregional trade prospered at Caesarea: whereas in the 2nd C. 80 percent of the fine pottery found at the site came from northern Syria, in the 5th–6th C. 36 percent originated in Asia Minor, 32 percent in Cyprus, and 17 percent in North Africa (J. Riley, BASOR 218 [1975] 52f).

From literary sources we know that a hippodrome functioned at Caesarea in the mid-4th C. and probably into the 6th C. (J. Humphrey, BASOR 213 [1974] 44). The city was a major cultural center: EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA organized a theological school there; according to Isidore of Seville, its library contained 30,000 books. Many churches are mentioned in the sources: ca. 484 Zeno rebuilt the Church of St. Prokopios; the vita of Anastasios the Persian (died 628) describes several churches that continued to function under the Persian occupation of 604–28 (W. Kaegi, IEJ 28 [1978] 177–81).

The city fell to the Arabs in 640 or 641/2. Its capture was regarded in Muslim sources as the zenith of Arab military success in Palestine. Legend has it that Caesarea had 930,000 defenders against 17,000 Arab besiegers (M. Sharon in EJ 2:4:841). Under the Arabs, Caesarea ceased to be a major port and became the center of an agricultural area. The traditional opinion that the campaign of John I Tzimiskes in 975 reached Caesarea was refuted by J. Starr (Archiv orientalmi 8 [1936] 94f). On 17 May 1101 it was taken by the Crusaders, who retained it until 1187; thereafter the city was the target of countless raids, frequently changed hands, and soon declined.


CAESAROPAPISM, conventional term for the allegedly unlimited power of the Byz. emperor over the church, including unilateral intervention in doctrinal questions ordinarily reserved to ecclesiastical authority. By passively submitting to this system of imperial protective tutelage, the Church—it has been suggested—lost its own sphere of competence and essential independence; it became, in effect, an adjunct of the state bureaucracy.

The term has been rejected by most scholars as a misleading and inaccurate interpretation of Byz. political reality. First, not a single Byz. emperor tried to act as “pope” or patriarch, whereas the bishop of Rome did on occasion assume the role of caesar. Second, the actual relationship between the imperium and sacerdotium cannot be characterized as a simple subordination of the latter. On the one hand, some emperors described themselves as episkopoi ton etos, “supervisors (bishops) of external [things of the church],” and indeed they controlled the material resources of the church (lands, incomes, dependent peasantry); they even confiscated holy vessels in cases of state emergency. Emperors controlled the staffing of the
higher levels of the church hierarchy, including appointment and deposition of patriarchs and bishops. They enjoyed limited liturgical privileges. Their intervention in internal church affairs was less significant: only a few emperors (Justinian I, Manuel I) attempted to impose their theological views on the church, although others were active during the disputes over Iconoclasm or the debate over the Union of the Churches; the emperors or their representatives, however, usually presided over ecumenical councils. On the other hand, the church insistently defended its ideological independence, including canon law; developed (in the Epanagoge) the theory of two correlated powers (the emperor's and the patriarch's); and even proclaimed, in some ecclesiological treatises, that the power of the bishop is higher than that of the emperor. In certain situations the church administration controlled and judged secular functionaries. Finally, the clergy and monks possessed enormous economic wealth and wielded ideological influence over broad strata of the population, so that the church was capable of blocking governmental decisions. In sum, the term caesaropapism altogether exaggerates the degree of actual control of the church by the state.


Caffaro. See Annales Iauenses.

Cain and Abel (Kâïw, “Adam”), the sons of Adam and Eve. Their offerings (Gen 4:3–5) and Abel’s death at the hands of his brother acquired Christological and eucharistic undertones already apparent in the New Testament (e.g., Heb 12:24) and explored in great detail by exegetes such as Cyril of Alexandria (PG 69:33B–44D), who juxtaposed the righteous Abel with Christ. John Chrysostom, quoting Hebrews 12:1, discusses Abel as a martyr (Sur la providence de Dieu, ed. A.-M. Malingrey [Paris 1961] 236, ch.19.5). Abel’s gifts are cited in the Proskomide prayer of the liturgy attributed to St. Basil (Brightman, Liturgies 320; Taft, Great Entrance 365).

Representation in Art. At S. Vitale at Ravenna, a mosaic pairs Melchizedek’s offering with Abel’s, with clear eucharistic significance (DAICL 1.1:62). More extensive pre-Iconoclastic representations are implied by the mosaics of S. Marco in Venice, based on the Cotton Genesis, and by the Octateuchs. Cain and Abel also appear with Adam and Eve on a group of ivory caskets and occasionally in such contexts as the illustrated homilies of James of Kokkinobaphos. Abel often appears in the Anastasis.


Calabria (Kakaoebi), region in southern Italy. Under Diocletian Calabria and Apulia formed a single province administered by a corrector. Until ca.680 the name Calabria was applied to all of southern Italy, including Apulia and Bruttium but, after a significant part of this region had been conquered by the Lombards, Calabria came to designate the former province of Bruttium in the toe of Italy (M. Schipa, Archivio Storico per le province Napoletane 20 [1895] 23–47). The capital of Calabria was Reggio-Calabria.

Originally under the jurisdiction of the exarchate of Ravenna, ca.700 Calabria formed part of the duchy of Sicily (cf. Taktikon of Uspenskij). After Sicily fell to the Arabs (by 902), Calabria became a theme: Falkenhausen (Dominazione 30) maintains that this occurred between 938 and 956, whereas A. Pertusi (Byzantino-Sicula 2 [1975] 427f), referring to a series of Calabrian strategoi beginning with Eustathios ca.917 (Skyl. 263.47–48), suggests an earlier date. Possibly the Byz. did not acknowledge the loss of Sicily and considered Calabria as "Sicily." Sigillography provides evidence about the Byz. administration of Calabria: in the 8th C. it had a Rhaiktor (Zacos, Seals 1, no.1477); in the 9th C. a doux; and a seal of the 10th C. belonged to a certain Pothos, “tourmarches of Calabria and strategos of Sicily.”

In the late 9th and 10th C. Calabria was contested between Byz. and the Arabs. Nikephoros Phokas the Elder (died ca.900) secured Byz. power in the area, but at the end of the 10th C. the Arab threat again became serious. Otto II’s expedition against the Arabs in 982 was a failure, but Byz.
generals retained control over Calabria. Finally in 1060 the Normans occupied the region.

Calabria was strongly influenced by eastern (Greek) customs, culture, and dialect. The Greek ecclesiastical and cultural impact increased in the 10th C., after the Arab occupation of Sicily, when many Greeks, esp. monks, emigrated from there to southern Italy. In the ecclesiastical notation of 920–80 the “eparchia Kalabrias” is listed, with SANTA SEVERINA as its metropolitan see (Notitiae CP, no.8.51). Several monasteries are known from the documents of the 11th C.: St. Nikodemos near Mammola, St. Leontios of STILO (S. Borsari, Il monachesimo bizantino nella Sicilia e nell'Italia meridionale prenormanne [Naples 1963] 65). The Greek Orthodox population in the region was sizable: several saints of the Greek church (NEILOS OF ROSSANO, ELIAS SPELEOTES, ELIAS THE YOUNGER, PHANTINOS THE YOUNGER) were born or settled in Calabria, and Greek books were copied by local scribes. Greek saints’ Lives reflect a Byz. cultural world in the region (Wickham, Italy 157). Silk manufacture developed in Calabria under the Byz. impact. Greek language and culture survived there even after the Norman conquest; in the 14th C. an eminent Byz. theologian, BARLAAM, originated from Seminara in Calabria.


-A.K., R.B.H.

CALENDAR. See Chronology.

CALENDAR, CHURCH, a codification of the liturgical year in two lists, both arranged chronologically. One, the kanonarion, lists the feasts of the lunar or paschal cycle, the mobile feasts that vary in date depending on when Easter falls. The other, the synaxarion, is a list of the fixed feasts and saints’ days. The calendar was based on the 365 dates of the Julian solar calendar, but with the days of the month numbered continuously, rather than according to the Roman system involving Nones, Ides, and Kalends.

From 313 to 462, the cycle of fixed feasts began on 23 Sept. with the feast of the Conception of John the Baptist, the first Gospel mystery preparing for the Nativity of Jesus. After 462 it followed the civil year and began 1 Sept., the start of the INDICATION. By the 8th C., the 1 Sept. New Year’s day had acquired liturgical status with its own lections, and the feast of the BIRTH OF THE VIRGIN, celebrated on 8 Sept., gradually diminished the importance of the Baptist feast as the start of the fixed cycle (Grumel, Chronologie 192–203), though the latter is still called “the new year [day]” in the TYPikon of the GREAT CHURCH (Mateos, TYPikon 1:42, 54f).

Church calendars began to develop in the 4th C. from primitive lists of MARTYRS (saints’ days originate in the general custom of venerating the dead on the anniversary of their death), of commemorations and lections. Though the earliest developed calendars are the Jerusalem LECTIONARIES of the 4th–8th C., and there was much borrowing of feasts from church to church, the Constantinopolitan cathedral calendar is basically an independent tradition. It was not just a local usage that later spread far afield: this calendar was conceived from the start as a calendar for the whole of Byz. Fixed between 650 and 750, most likely before 700, it was used in all quarters of the empire by the 9th C., probably owing to the liturgical legislation of the Council in TRULLO (Ehrhard, Überlieferung 1:28–33).

Ehrhard divides extant calendar MSS of the 9th–15th C. into four types, according to their relative completeness. The final cathedral form of the calendar is transmitted to us in the TYPikon of the GREAT CHURCH. Its history, however, still remains to be written; it will have to be traced on the basis of liturgical books, feasts, saints’ days, and sermon collections.


- R.F.T.

CALENDAR CYCLES. This genre of HAGIOGRAPHICAL ILLUSTRATION depicted either the portrait or the martyrdom of one saint after another, arranged according to the date of his celebration in the church CALENDAR. The cycle could also include representations of the GREAT FEASTS on the appropriate day of the year.

Martyrological cycles may have existed already by the 8th C. (Life of TARASIOS by Ignatios, ed.
PHOTIOS, hom. 17, ed. Laourdas, 170.17–21). Basil I is known to have included scenes of martyrdom in the decoration of a por­ tico of the NEA EKKLESIA BASILII (Vita Basili­ lii 328.2–8). But there is no indication whether either of these lost examples actually followed the sequence of the church calendar.

The earliest and most important surviving cycle of this kind is the MENOLOGION OF BASIL II. Its miniatures were copied in the mid-11th C., this time to accompany a true MENOLOGION, the texts in this particular group of MSS being modified versions of the lives of the saints composed by SYMEON METAPHRASTES (F. Halkin, Le ménologue impérial de Baltimore [Brussels 1985]). Each of these texts concludes with a prayer for the well-being of the emperor, perhaps (but by no means surely) Michael IV.

A set of 11th-C. icons from Sinai preserves a calendar cycle of this type, and literary equivalents can be found in the contemporary metrical calendars, sets of jingles listing each saint and his manner of death composed by CHRISTOPHER OF MYTILENE and Theodore PRODROMOS (cf. E. Fohli­ eri, 1 calendari in metro innografico di Cristo­ foro Mitileneo [Brussels 1980]). Fresco versions appear first in the 13th C., and then only in churches in Thessalonike, Serbia, and Bulgaria, most of them royal foundations. The only other MS calendar cycle is a princely commission of the early 14th C. (Oxford, Bodl. gr. th. 1.1, Hutter, CBM, vol. 2, no.1); here as with the frescoes, no text, other than verse captions, accompanies the miniatures. The context in which these various martyrological cycles are found suggests that they may have originated in monumental painting; the significance of their imperial connections remains to be explored.

Though many Gospel LECTIONARY MSS include calendar notices, only very rarely are these notices accompanied by images (cf. Vat. gr. 1156 and Athos, Dion. 587, both MSS of the 11th C.). Where they do exist, the images are as laconic as the notices themselves, consisting mainly of a series of saintly portraits. This type of “portrait” calendar cycle apparently represents a separate tradition from the martyrrological one of the Basil Menologion and its successors; it recurs on another set of Sinai icons, but never in monumental painting.


CALENDAR OF 354, also referred to as the Chronographer of 354, an almanac drawn up from a large variety of both Christian and pagan documents, including consular fasti, tables of Roman festivals, a secular chronicle of Roman history, the regionaries of the city of Rome, Easter tables, and lists of bishops and martyrs. The various fragmented MSS, when collated, recreate what seems to be the oldest extant Roman Christian calendar; Mommsen (unaware of an unillustrated MS at St. Gall, not pointed out until 1953) derived them all from the lost Carolingian Codex Luxem­ bergiensis. The calendar throws together all manner of information, from key religious and secular items to such trivia as famous Roman gluttons.

The greatest interest and value comported by this calendar derives from the illustrations, made for his patron Valentine by the artist Furius Dionysius Filocalus, who also was calligrapher of the poems of Pope Damascus (366–84). The 26 illustrations, preserved in 17th-C. drawings based on the Carolingian copy, form a gallery of astro­ logical and political emblems appropriated for Christian purposes: no other visual document provides so immediate or broad an impression of mid-4th-C. beliefs and official imagery. The utility and accuracy of the pictures is assured by comparison with other Late Antique works. The large­ ness of Constans II and the personifications of great cities are subjects found on silver; those of the MONTHS are repeated in floor mosaics and represent the tradition inherited by Byz. artists.


CALEENDS (Καλάντωναι), a calendar custom marking the Roman new year; it was celebrated during the first four days of January. Libanios and John Chrysostom describe the Calends in detail (e.g., the decoration of house doors with laurel wreaths). Gregory of Nazianzos condemned this custom,
and a law of 395 prohibited the pagan celebration of holidays (Cod. Theod. II 8.22). The Calends gave rise to festive processions where participants got drunk, wore animal costumes, distributed gifts in specie (halandika), and banged on doors in the middle of the night. Chrysostom refers to this as “a procession of demons in the agorai” (PG 48:954.4–5). Christian clerics viewed the Calends, which fell during the 12 days between Christmas and Epiphany, as a continuation of the ethos of the Brumalia and the pagan cult practices associated with it. The mummers of the Calends gave rise to popular tales about demons called kalikan-tzaro. The Council in Trullo prescribed a six-year excommunication for participation in the Calends, but the practices went on at least until the time of Balsamon, who describes the mummary.


CALENDŽIČHA. See Eugenikos, Manuel.

CAMBLAK, GRIGORIJ, Bulgarian churchman and writer; born Tūrnovo ca.1365, died Kiev 1419. Although a member of an aristocratic Bulgarian family of Byz. origin (see TZAMBLAKON), it is now considered doubtful that he was the nephew of Metr. Kiprian of Kiev and Moscow (D. Obolensky, DOP 32 [1978] 80f). He was educated in Tūrnovo, where he studied with Patr. Evtimij (whose panegyric he later wrote), on Mt. Athos, and in Constantinople. Patr. Matthew I of Constantinople sent him on a mission to Suceava in Moldavia ca.1402–03. He then served as superior of the Dečani monastery in Serbia ca.1403–06. In 1406 Kiprian summoned Camblak to Moscow, but he turned back on news of the latter’s death. He moved to Kiev ca.1409, and in 1415 local bishops elected Camblak metropolitan as the result of Lithuanian pressure; he was, however, excommunicated by Constantinople and Moscow. In Feb. 1418, shortly before his death, he attended the Council of Constance, where he allegedly made a speech in favor of church unity under the pope.

Camblak wrote a wide range of hagiographical, homiletic, and liturgical works in Slavonic; many are still unpublished. His Razkaz (ed. in Kalužni-

CAMELS (sing. κάμηλος), common beasts of burden and a source of meat and of bone for carving throughout much of Syria and Egypt. In North Africa they were also used for plowing and pulling carts. Camels were envisaged as pack animals for the army in the Strategikon of Maurice. A workshop of camel saddles in Damascus is mentioned in the vita of Elias of Heliopolis (ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, PPSh 19:3 [1907] 48.2–5). Camels are also attested in 14th-C. Greece: John VI Kantakouzenos had them on his estates (Kantak. 2:1185.8). Camel drivers (kamelarioi) were considered persons of the lowest standing: the De administrando imperio attributes such a station to Muhammad. To be paraded through the streets on the back of a camel was a form of humiliation in Constantinople: under Justinian I, persecuted astrologers suffered this punishment (Prokopios, SH 11:37); in a similar fashion the deposed Andronikos I Komnenos was led through the capital on a “mangy camel” in the 12th C.

In art, the camel frequently denotes an Egyptian setting: an attribute of St. Menas or of the Joseph story, as on the cathedra of Maximian. Attesting to their ordinariness, camels normally appear in Creation scenes and in images of Adam naming the animals. A mosaic in the Great Palace depicts two boys riding on a camel.


—A.M.T., A.C.
CAMEO, ornament made from a precious or semiprecious stone, usually with two or more layers of different colors. The subject is carved in relief on the often translucent upper layer, while the lower layer forms the base. This distinguishes cameos from stones carved in intaglio. The quality of carving in Byz. cameos is not as high, generally, as in Roman examples. Stones favored in Byz. were carnelian, chalcedony, heliotrope, haematite, jasper, lapis lazuli, sardonyx, and rock crystal. Secular cameos often displayed portraits. Christian examples may depict the Virgin, Jesus, a scene from his life, or the bust of a saint. Although some Byz. cameos bear an inscription, it is usually not contemporary with the scene or figure. For this reason as well as the stone’s portability and intrinsic value, it is difficult to determine the date and provenance of cameos, although comparison with coins and seals can be helpful. One firmly dated 11th-C. example in London is of serpentine or green jasper, with a contemporary inscription that names Nikephoros (III) Botaneiates (Rice, Art of Byz., pl. 150). Cameos were often mounted to be worn around the neck as enkolpia or amulets. Glass paste cameos were made in imitation of hardstone cameos.


-S.D.C., A.C.

CAMP (ἀπληκτον, from Lat. applicatum). The location, construction, and security of the marching camp were of vital concern to Byz. campaign armies, and nearly every strategikon contains a section on encampments. The most thorough description of a temporary camp is given by the 10th-C. De re militari (ed. Dennis, Military Trea- tises 246–75), which instructs the surveyors preceding the army to locate campsites on level terrain with sufficient water supply nearby. The army camped in a square, keeping the infantry around the outside, the cavalry and supply train within. The commander’s tent and his retinue were in the center. Roads, entered by gates set up in the outer defenses, bisected the camp from north to south and from east to west. The distinctly Byz. plan of a square camp crossed by intersecting roads thus differs from the earlier Roman rectangular plan based on the T-shaped intersection of the via praetoria/praetorialis and is first attested in the 6th C.

To protect the camp, the strategika recommended digging a trench with the earth heaped up along the inner lip to form a rampart; the infantry might then fix their spears in the earth and hang or lean their shields upon them to make a shield-cover or palisade. John I Tzimisces’ army fortified their camp in this manner before Doro- stolon in 971 (Leo Diaec. 142.1–143.6); Yahyā of Antioch states that the ditch and shield palisade around the camp of Romanos III Argyros during the Syrian campaign of 1030 reflected “the usual practice of the Greeks in their camps” (M. Canard, REB 19 [1961] 305f). A well-protected camp enabled an army to resist attack and organize a counterattack, as when in 1068 Romanos IV Diogenes’ men first held off and then defeated an Arab army that had attacked their encampment (Attal. 113.8–114.22).


-C.M.

CAMPANIA (Καμπανία), a region south of Rome comprising the cities of Capua, Naples, Nola, and Benevento. The Garigliano is one of the important rivers in the area. From the reign of Diocletian onward, Campania was considered to encompass Latium as well, and according toProcopios (Wars 5.15.22) Campania stretched to the city of Tarracina. In Western terminology the name Campania was applied to two districts: Neapolitan Campania, forming a part of the duchy of Benevento, and the section included in the territory of the papacy. Campania was administered by a corrector, who from 333 had the high title of consularis. With rich land close to Rome, Campania played a important role during Justinian I’s reconquest of Italy in the 6th C.; when Totila captured Rome, he resettled Roman senators in Campania. Campania had many senatorial estates. The presence of senators accounts, in part, for the continued spending (moribus in most other parts of Italy) by patroni on secular construction in the province
during the 4th and early 5th C. Statues to governors and patroni also continued to be erected. Governors promoted secular building activity in Campania in the same period. The military and financial crisis precipitated by the Visigothic invasions, more than Christianity, is the probable cause for the decline in construction of secular monuments in the 5th C. On the other hand, Paulinus of Nola's construction of a church at Fondi in Campania is possible evidence of a redirection from secular to ecclesiastical building by the senatorial aristocracy residing in Campania.

In 553/4 the Franks penetrated the province (Agath. 40.16). After the 6th C. the name Campania rarely appears in Greek sources, but in the 12th C. the Timarion (53.19) still mentions Kampanoi and Italian merchants visiting the fair in Thessalonike. Because of Arab raids a complex trading pattern emerged between Byz., the Arabs, and the West, with Campania serving as a western apex.


CANA (Κανά), town in Galilee where Christ is said to have worked his first miracle, turning water into wine during a wedding feast (see CANA, MARRIAGE AT). Near Nazareth, its precise location has not been established. According to Jerome (Eusebios, Onomastikon 117:7) it was a "town of Gentiles" (oppidum gentium). Two sites preserve the ancient name: Kafir Kanna east of Nazareth, where remains of a Byz. synagogue were discovered, and Khirbat Kanna north of Nazareth. Many early pilgrims (Piacenza Pilgrim, Willibald [see HUGEBURG], Epiphanius Hagiopolites) mention Cana. The objects of veneration were the couch on which Christ reclined, a waterpot, and the spring at which the pot was filled. In the 12th C. only a small castellion existed at Cana (John Phokas in PPS6 8.2 [1889] 6.29–30), but pilgrims, such as Danil Igumen, continued to mention it.


CANDYMAKER (κηρούλλαρος). There was no Roman guild of candlemakers. The role of this profession evidently increased around the 7th C., when the ancient ceramic lamp was replaced by the candle. The word keroullarios appears in the 7th-C. Miracles of St. Artemios (ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 27.1); in the 9th C. Theophanes (Theoph. 487,31) speaks of a well-to-do keroullarios who worked in the Forum; a severe fire in the Forum in 931 destroyed the shops of furriers and candlemakers, keropoleia (TheophCont 420.13–16).

According to the Book of the Eparch, keroullarioi bought wax and olive oil (in part from churches) and sold candles in their shops, which, because of precautions against fire, had to be separated from each other by a prescribed distance (30 orgyalai); only for the workshops near Hagia Sophia was an exception made. The production of candles, esp. for great festivities, required elaborate skill: a 14th-C. source (pseudo-Kod. 191.9–16) describes a Christmas procession candle (lampas), the top of which was colored with cinnabar and the middle
CANDLES (sing. κηρυάς, κηρός) were used extensively in both everyday and ecclesiastical lighting in Byz. The ancient Greeks did not make much use of candles, but the Romans employed them, as well as torches, for festive processions and funeral services; their houses were illuminated with lamps made of clay or metal. There are reasons to suppose that in the 7th C. the practice changed and that candles began to replace lamps: first of all, very few clay lamps are found in excavations of post-7th-C. strata, although literary texts continue to speak of oil lamps; secondly, the profession of candlemaker (keroularius) is known from the 7th C. onward; finally, the term kerion, which in classical texts means honeycomb, acquired the meaning of candle and is used to form compound words such as keroprates (candle merchant) or keropoleion (candle workshop). Another word, lampas, which in classical vocabulary had designated torch or lamp, was used for larger candles (Clugnet, Dictionnaire 81, 89f). Late Roman candles were produced of both tallow and wax (F. Cabrol, DACL 3.2:1613); the Book of the Eparch (11:3–4) stipulates that the candlemaker could use wax and olive oil but not fat. Candles of inferior quality had no wicks (pimai). Sources mention the use of candles for processions (e.g., the vita of Eusebius of Alexandria, PG 86:309A), imperial ceremonies, and liturgy, but there is no information on candles in everyday life, save for the prohibition on light in individual cells of some monasteries; nor do we have any data on the price of candles.
Liturgical Candles. In worship, candles were used, with oil lamps, for both practical and symbolic purposes. Christians, who saw Jesus and his salvation as light and the candle as the image of the eternal light (PG 87:3985C), used candles from the 4th C. onward at funerals, at vespers, in processions, at epiphany and the Easter vigil, and eventually also at baptism,unction, etc.

Typical of Byz. ritual and private devotion was the honorific use of candles. Candles of varying sizes were kept burning on the iconostasis, by tombs, and before icons and other venerated images inside churches (see, e.g., P. Gautier, REB 32 [1974] 37-152, 39-165, 47-282). The patriarch was accompanied in procession by candles, a practice borrowed from court ceremonial, and emperor and patriarch offered obeisance with candles and incense at the opening of services. Liturgical candles evolved into the two episcopal candelabra: the triple-branch trikerion in honor of the Trinity and the double-branched dikerion for the two natures of Christ, with which the bishop bestowed solemn blessings.


CANICATTINI BAGNI TREASURE. See Plate, Domestic Silver and Gold.

CANON. For legal term, see Canon Law; Canons. For hymnographic term, see Kanon.

CANONIZATION (αναγνώρισης), official ecclesiastical acknowledgment and proclamation of the sanctity of an individual by the patriarch and synod of Constantinople. Although the term is sometimes loosely used by scholars for the period prior to the 13th C., canonization in Byz. appears to have been a development of the Palaiologan period. From the earliest centuries of Christianity, holy men and women were popularly revered as saints, commemorated on their feastdays, celebrated in hagiography, and represented in sacred images; the faithful prayed to them for intercession and sought healing from the relics at their shrines. This recognition of a person’s sanctity is properly termed anagnorisis. In the West, official papal canonization began in the late 10th C.; the earliest example in Byz. seems to be that of Patr. Arsenios in the late 13th C. In the 14th C. at least eight cases of canonization are attested, including Patr. Athanasios I, Meletios the Confessor (died 1286), and Gregory Palamas (cf. Reg. Patr., fasc. 5, nos. 2132, 2540; 6, no.2681a). Among the prerequisites for canonization were popular veneration, evidence of miracles, and creation of an iconic and hagiographic tradition.


CANON LAW, in a broad sense, is the totality of legal regulations concerning church life. In its narrow (formal) sense, it is the totality of the rules that derive from church authorities. Because of the great importance of the church, canon law in Byz. was of an importance equal to secular law (see Law, Civil). There did not develop a strict separation of the two spheres of law as in the Latin West.

Byz. canon law, static and adverse to all innovations, did not undergo any significant development. The history of Byz. canon law (in its narrow sense) falls into three periods: that of the councils (4th C.-second half of the 9th C.), that of the patriarchs (second half of the 9th C.-11th C.), and that of the canonists (12th-15th C.).

From the 4th C. come the most important sources by far: the canons issued by church councils. The canons of some councils were being assembled and arranged in chronological order by the 5th C. at the latest; these collections were supplemented and partly replaced—by the 6th C.—with “systematic” collections (organized according to subject matter) such as the Synagoges of Fifty Titles and the Nomokanones. Excerpts from the writings of church fathers (including the so-called Apostolic Canons) were also introduced into these collections. The bulk of the sources that became the recognized basis for ecclesiastical law was already established in the 6th C. and given the authority of an ecumenical council in 691 by the Council in Trullo (canon 2), which repudi­ated in particular the Apostolic Constitutions. These canons (which form the basis of canon law in its narrow sense) were considered to be, in principle, immutable.

The Constantinople council of 879-80 led by
Patr. Photios was the last council that issued generally recognized canons; from then on the corpus of canons was supplemented by occasional prescriptions of individual patriarchs, mostly with the participation of their enodemousa synodos. In the MSS these prescriptions constitute variously composed appendices to the collections of canons. Only certain prescriptions, in particular those dealing with marriage law, acquired an authority comparable to that of the canons.

The chronologically arranged canons were provided with continuous commentaries in the 12th C. by Alexios Aristenos, John Zonaras, and Theodore Balsamon; these commentaries, esp. those of Balsamon, took certain other sources into account as well. Byz. canon law studies—which originated in the 11th C., peaked in the 12th C., and flourished once more in the 14th C.—produced compendia, in particular the Syntagma kata stoicheion of Matthew Blastares and the Epitome canonum of Constantine Harmenopoulos as well as works on particular problems in the form of treatises and Erotaipokriseis (Niketas of Herakleia, John IV (V) Oxites of Antioch, Michael Choumnos, Niketas of Ankyra, Niketas "of Marionela," Basil of Ohrid). Finally, the judicial decisions of ecclesiastical authorities such as John Apokaukos, Demetrios Chomatenos, and the endemousa synodos of the patriarchs of Constantinople, whose register for the 14th C. is almost completely preserved, belong to the sources of canonical law in its narrow sense.

Sources of canonical law in its broad sense are the imperial laws regarding church life; these are of great importance because individual emperors, in particular, Constantine the Great, Justinian I, and Leo VI, issued large numbers of legal prescriptions involving ecclesiastical matters, which, on the whole, were respected by the church. Laws derived from the Corpus Juris Civilis were compiled in special collections (see, e.g., Collectio tripartita) or integrated into works based on the canons (the nomokanones, the commentary of Balsamon, the Syntagma kata stoicheion of Blastares).

Even if some collections of canon law are not arranged either chronologically or alphabetically, but according to content (esp. the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles), it is impossible to assert that a "system" of canon law was ever developed in Byz. This was done only in modern times and one can now (following Christophilopoulos) divide church law into five sections according to content: a general section, constitution, administration, penalties, and judicial procedure.

1. To the general section belong the concept of canon law (including its distinction from secular law, ethics, and theology); the relationship of the church to the state as well as to dissenters (Jews, Muslims, Latins, and heretics, like Manichaeans and Paulicians); and the sources of canon law and their interpretation (see Oikonomia).

2. To the constitution of the church belong the regulations concerning its members (who have been received into it through baptism): the laity, clergy, and monks as well as the prescriptions concerning the organs of ecclesiastical administration—the councils, enodemousa synodos, patriarchs, metropolitans, bishops, and monasteries.

3. The administration of the church includes the rules for the sacraments, esp. marriage, and for religious education as well as the laws regarding church property (see Property, Sacred), including the income of the clergy.

4. Ecclesiastical penal law deals—both generally and in particular—with ecclesiastical offenses such as apostasy, heresy, schism, simony, and sacred law as well as with ecclesiastical penalties such as excommunication, deposition and anathema (see also Epitomion, Penance).

5. Finally, the ecclesiastical judicial process (see Trial, Criminal Procedure) before the ecclesiastical courts (see Court, Law) forms a part of canon law.

Byz. canon law was not "law" in the modern sense of the term: neither in substance nor in procedure was the uniformity of the handling of norms ever vouchedsafe, because there was never an institutionalized legal education of the clerics concerned with the application of "law" and because the notion of an ubiquitous validity of legal norms (the "concept of the legal state") was completely absent. In several areas (e.g., that of penance) canon law was not clearly divided from ethics or theology; this is due to the fact that the most important producers of the norms of canon law, namely the councils and the church fathers, also determined the codes of ethics and the theological dogmas.

Research into Byz. canon law began in the West in the 16th C.; in the 16th and 17th C., Bonifidius, Voellus, Justellus, and Beveregius in particular produced a series of notable editions of canon
law sources. These studies were taken up again in the second half of the 19th C. by J.B. Pitra and at the beginning of the 20th C. by V.N. Benešević. The documents of the *endemousa synodos* of the patriarchs of Constantinople (*RegPatr*) have been the subject of research since ca.1930 by the French Assumptionists.

Systematic studies on canon law have been pursued since the second half of the 19th C., mainly in Orthodox lands (above all in Greece and, until the revolution of 1917, in Russia) where Byz. canon law was still largely valid. While this so-called inner legal history has received considerable attention, the area of the sources (so-called outer legal history) is still insufficiently researched: most texts still lack a classification of the MS tradition and a critical edition.


**CANONS** (κανώνες), term that in Roman law was used synonymously with *regulae*, rules, but that eventually acquired a technical meaning as the body of ecclesiastical law or of its individual regulations. As canonical were recognized the rulings of several councils, both ecumenical (Nicaea of 325, Constantinople of 381, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Trullo, Nicaea of 787) and local (esp. Ankyra, Gangra, Serdica) as well as the precepts of several authoritative church fathers (Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzos, Ambro­chios of Ikonion, Cyril of Alexandria, Tarasios, and others).

Canons covered broad areas of *canon law*—ecclesiastical structure, church discipline, norms of morality and behavior, liturgy, etc. Zonaras (PG 137:509D) distinguishes “the investigation of dogma and decisions (*psephoi*)” from formal canons that should, according to Balsamon, bear the signatures of emperors and “fathers” (PG 137:509A). In theory, canons had to be approved “by the common volition and unanimous desire” (Mansi 11:933D) of the council participants. Canons were considered to be “divine,” “saintly,” or “holy.” Justinian I emphasized the importance of canons: thus, in his novel 131 of 545 he endowed the canons of the first four ecumenical councils with the validity of imperial legislation.


**CANON TABLES**, a system of concordance to the Gospels devised by *Eusebios of Caesarea*. His letter to Karpianos, often included with the ten tables, explained their use. Numbered sections of Gospels were accompanied by a red number, corresponding to one of the tables, in which similar passages in other Gospels were listed. Eusebios's original design, preserved in certain 10th-­C. MSS, spread the ten tables over seven pages. In the 10th C., Constantinopolitan illuminators extended the series to ten pages and framed the matrix of numbers in elaborate arches. Canon tables enjoyed their greatest popularity and artistic success in the 11th and 12th C. Menageries of exotic animals and mythological creatures play on top of arcades, and personifications of the labors of the months and virtues are incorporated into the bases and capitals. The same themes appear in Georgian MSS decorated in Constantinople by Byz. painters. At the end of the 12th C. even more elaborate profusions of ornament embellish the tables of *Decorative Style MSS*. In the Palaiologan period, decorated canon tables are neither as common nor elaborate as before.


**CANOSCIO TREASURE**, 5th(?)-C. hoard of 24 silver objects (nine plates, four cups, nine spoons, a strainer, and a ladle) discovered in 1934 at Canoscio in Umbria and now in the cathedral treasury of Città di Castello. Although the Canoscio Treasure is often described as a church treasure, Engemann (infra) convincingly demonstrated that it was for domestic use and belonged to a couple whose names, Aelianus and Felicitas, are inscribed on at least one of its objects. Most of the plates have small crosses at their center, but the lack of dedicatory inscriptions and the flat
profiles of the plates argue against their being patins. The two largest plates, decorated with a cross flanked by two lambs, represent the introduction of Christian themes into household silver. Although usually attributed to the 6th C., individual objects are related to those in the 4th- or 5th-C. Carthage Treasure. Both these collections offer evidence for the intermediary stages of development in the types of domestic silver plate manufactured in the period between the better-known silver treasures of the 4th C. and those of the 6th and 7th C.


**CANTICLES.** See Psalter.

**CAPERNAUM** (Καφαρναούμ), a site in Galilee, identified as Tell Hum. Although Capernaum was the center of Jesus’ ministry in Galilee, it remained only slightly touched by Christianity. Eusebius of Caesarea (*Onomastikon* 120.2–4) described it as a village of “pagans,” and Epiphanius of Salamis (*Panarion* 30.11.9–10) listed it among those Jewish sites where no church had been constructed and no Christians dwelled. Excavations discovered there the remains of a synagogue with buildings of the 1st and the 4th–5th C. Pilgrims to Capernaum (Egeria, Piacenza Pilgrim) were shown the house of the apostle Peter transformed into a church. This holy site is identified as a room in a 1st-C. private house, whose plastered walls bore Christian graffiti. Its hall became a place of worship (*domus ecclesiae*) in the 4th C., and in the 5th C. an octagonal church was erected above it.
After the Arab conquest of Palestine the church is no longer mentioned, but pilgrims could see the house of John the Evangelist and the place where the paralytic was lowered through the roof. DANIIL IGUMEN confuses two Capernaums: one at the Lake of Tiberias, another near Caesarea. He says that Capernaum used to be a large and populated city but was deserted by his time; he reports a prophecy that the Antichrist would emerge from Capernaum (PPSb 3–9 [1885] 88f).

–G.V., A.K., Z.U.M.

CAPIDAVA (Καπίδαβα), a Roman military fort in the Dobrudja at a ford of the Danube, on the route leading to Histria and Tomis. Excavations have revealed two layers of settlement: a Roman castrum (or locus) existed to the early 7th C. (a coin of Maurice was found) and was restored several times, the last time probably by Anastasios I. The 6th-C. fort was smaller than the earlier one, and among numerous Latin inscriptions only a few can be dated later than the 3rd C. The second settlement was founded in the time of John I Tzimiskes and can be dated by coins that reach the reign of Theodora. The settlement was surrounded by a wall 2 m thick and the habitations were semisubterranean. The objects found in the second layer are of poor quality, primarily ceramics that show some influence of Slavic ware (the potters' stamps resemble those in Bulgaria); on the other hand, large clay caldrons indicate Pecheneg connections. The city name is mentioned by Constantine VII Porphyrogenetus (De Them. 1.60, ed. Pertusi p.86).

–A.K.

CAPITAL (κιόκρανον, κιονοκράνον), the crowning element of a column, a critical block that marks the junction of a load (e.g., of an epistyle) and its support (the column shaft). A capital is also used with pilasters and piers, where it marks the springing of an arch or vault. During the 4th–5th C. most Ionic and Corinthian capitals relied on Roman models (J.-P. Sodini, 10 IntCongChr-Arc, vol. 1 [Thessalonike 1984] 207–78). Corinthian, with acanthus decoration, was the dominant form and the source of inspiration for most other types: the Composite capital; the "Theodosian" with its characteristic fine-toothed acanthus; the windblown acanthus capital; and the two-zone capital in which animal or bird protomes surmount a zone with acanthus leaves or basket pattern.

Byz. arcades, however, demanded more compact capitals. Adopting the impost block, the impost capital had fully emerged by ca.530, followed by two variants: the kettle and fold capitals, marked by a preference for stylized floral ornament and undercutting (Orlandos, Palaiocrh. basilike 2:325–37).

Already ca.550 the production of new capitals dropped dramatically and the use of spolia became a common practice. Rare new forms after the 9th C. include the Corinthian-impost capitals in the Church of the Theotokos at Hosios Loukas (H. Buchwald, ArtB 48 [1966] 152), impost capi-
tals with busts of angels, and the Palaiologan impost capitals with busts of saints as at the church of the Chora monastery.


-L.Ph.B., W.L.

CAPITANATA, territory in northern Apulia that comprises, roughly, the modern Italian province of Foggia. The name, which appears first in the 11th-C. Chronicle of Leo Marsicanus (MGH SS 34:261), derives from katepano. In fact, during the first quarter of the 11th C. the katepano had reorganized the area, repopulating it with people from neighboring Lombard counties, and founding and fortifying new cities such as Civitate, Dragonara, Torre Fiorentina, and Troia. Troia’s act of foundation, by Basil Bosoannes (1019), has been preserved. The population and the local officials were predominantly Latin-speaking Lombards; the bishop of Troia was directly subject to the Holy See. The territory was intended as a line of defense against invaders from the north; the Normans occupied it in the mid-11th C.


-V.v.F.

CAPITATIO-JUGATIO (κατακόφαλον ή κεφαλάζιγγον), fiscal system related to Diocletian’s reforms; its exact nature is unclear, in spite of long and heated discussions. It ensured a fair distribution among individual taxpayers of the annona, the total amount of which was fixed by the authorities at various levels, from the praetorian prefect down to the provincial governor. The distribution was made by taking into account some established shares of tax liability, called jugum (for land) and caput (for humans, animals, etc.).

Capital. Byzantine Capitals. (a) Corinthian with acanthus decoration; (b) Composite; (c) Windblown acanthus; (d) Two-zone.
which were estimated as having equal value. Some scholars (Piganiol, Ostrogorsky) saw in the system a combination of poll tax and land tax, concluding that a jugum could not be taxed unless it had a corresponding caput and vice versa; consequently they related the system to the state's effort to bind peasants by law to the land that they cultivated. This theory has been broadly criticized.


- N.O.

CAPPADOCIA (Καππαδοκία), the hilly and mountainous region of central Asia Minor stretching from the Pontic mountains to the Taurus and from the Salt Lake to the Euphrates. Except for a few fertile plains (the best around Melitene), Cappadocia is not very productive and never supported a large population or extensive urban life. In antiquity, it had only three cities—Caesarea, Melitene, and Tyana; the emperor owned most of the land and its population was his tenants. Cappadocia is rich in minerals and was famed for cattle, sheep, and esp. horses. It gained importance from its command of the main highways across Anatolia and from its proximity to the frontier.

The wars of the 3rd C. depleted the population. Diocletian reduced the area of Cappadocia by forming the provinces of Armenia from its eastern regions. The remaining area, with its capital at Caesarea, was assigned to the diocese of Pontos. Hannibalianus, nephew of Constantine I, however, was briefly king (rex regum) of Cappadocia, Pontos, and Armenia (335–37). When Constantine confiscated the treasures of the temples, the imperial estates grew. They became the domus divina per Cappadociam; their revenues supported the imperial bedchamber. In 371, Valens detached the southern half, making a new province, Cappadocia II, with its capital at Tyana.

The writings of the Cappadocian Fathers provide considerable information about Cappadocia in the late 4th C., a time of great prosperity. After 363, when the region east of the Euphrates was ceded to Persia, Cappadocia gained in strategic importance and became more exposed. Tzannoi, Isaurians, and Huns ravaged Cappadocia in the 5th C., provoking a program of fortification continued by Justinian I, who rebuilt Caesarea and established a new fortified center at Morissos. Vainly hoping to repress widespread civil disturbance and revolts by imperial tenants, he appointed a proconsul with full civil and military powers in 535, but the old system was restored by 553. The Persians destroyed Sebastea in 575 and Caesarea in 611, introducing a period of great turmoil.

Arab attacks began with the temporary capture of Caesarea in 646 and intensified after they gained control of the Cilician Gates and Tyana in 708. The long wars led to major changes: the country was covered with strong, usually remote fortresses; large areas, esp. in the east, were depopulated; and Slavs were transported from the Balkans to strengthen the defenses.

In the regime of themes, Cappadocia was divided between Anatolikon and Armeniakon. When these were reduced in the early 9th C., the two new themes of Charshianon and Cappadocia occupied the ancient geographical area, which continued to bear the name Cappadocia for unofficial and ecclesiastical purposes. In Byz. administrative parlance, however, Cappadocia came to denote a smaller area, the highly exposed southern region. First mentioned (by Ibn Khurdadhbeh) as a kleisoura of Anatolikon, it became a separate theme by ca. 890. It extended from the Taurus to the Halys and had its headquarters at Korone in the mountains above the main invasion route of the Arabs. Its strategos, who drew a salary of 20 pounds of gold, commanded 4,000 men and numerous fortresses. Leo VI extended Cappadocia to the northwest by adding the region adjacent to the Salt Lake.

In the mid-9th C., the Paulicians attacked from their base of Tephrike just east of the frontier. That threat was removed in 878, but Arab raids continued until the capture of Melitene by the Byz. in 934 and the displacement of the frontier eastward brought renewed security. Major problems remained, however: notably depopulation from the long wars and the concomitant growth of the estates of the military aristocracy, many of whom were Cappadocian. Syrian and Armenian settlers helped to repopulate the country. The increasing power of the magnates sparked a series
of revolts led by Bardas Phokas and Bardas Skleros that spread from Cappadocia to afflict most of Anatolia from 963 to 989. After finally gaining control, Basil II moved against the Cappadocian aristocracy, confiscating the wealth of such families as the Maleinoi. He gained victories in the east and then annexed much of Armenia; in compensation, Armenian princes and their followers received lands and offices in Cappadocia. Large parts of the country became Armenian, and hostility between the newcomers and the native population grew. In 1057, the deteriorating military situation produced by increasing Turkish attacks provoked Bryennios, general of Cappadocia, to revolt. In the same year the Turks destroyed Melitene and in 1059 Sebastia; defense of such cities had long been neglected. After the devastation of Caesaarea in 1067, Romanos IV strove to restore the military situation in Cappadocia and the east. In 1071, he passed through Cappadocia en route to the fatal battle of Mantzikert, after which Cappadocia was permanently lost to the empire. A province of Cappadocia is last mentioned in 1081, when Alexios I summoned the toparches of "Cappadocia and Choma" to Constantinople (An.Komm. 1:131.16–17). This probably indicates either that imperial authority had survived in the westernmost parts of Cappadocia or that the name, perhaps together with troops, had been moved into Phrygia.


Monuments of Cappadocia. Few churches built during the 4th–7th C. have survived in the province (M. Restle, Studien zur frühbyzantinischen Architektur Kappadokiens [Vienna 1979]). The region is best known for the rock-cut churches and dwellings carved into its soft volcanic tuff hills. Large 6th–7th-C. congregational basilicas in the cliffs at Çavuşin and Avçilar survive, but most of the datable rock-cut monuments are small monastic chapels, often associated with cells, mills, winepresses, and refectories. Chapels that have been ascribed dates before 843—and sometimes much earlier—include Iaokeim and Anna and Niketas the Stylist in Kızıl Çukur and St. Basil at Sinassos (N. Thierry, RSBS 1 [1981] 205–28). The greatest period of artistic productivity, however, occurred between the cessation of major Arab attacks on Anatolia and the Seljuk conquest, reflecting the popularity of the region as a monastic center in the 10th and first half of the 11th C. Among the most important datable fresco cycles from this period are those found in Ayvalı Kilise or the Church of St. John (913–20), GÜLLÜ DERE; Tavşanlı Kilise (913–20); the Old Church of Tokatlı Kilise and Kilçlar Kilise in Göreme, each associated with a series inappropriately named the "Archaic Group"; the Great Pigeon House of Çavuşin (963–69) and the New Church of Tokatlı Kilise (mid-10th C.) in Göreme; Direkli Kilise (976–1025) and St. Michael (1025–28) near the HASAN ĐAĞ; ESŞI GÜMÜŞ near Niğde; St. Barbara (1006 or 1021) and Karabaş Kilise (1060–61) in SOĞANLI; and the COLUMN CHURCHES (mid-11th C.). In their architectural form, programs, and painting style, these chapels reflect the tension between metropolitan cultural hegemony and local artistic tradition.


CAPPADOCIAN FATHERS, BASIL THE GREAT, GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS, and GREGORY OF NYSSA, the three church fathers who combatted Arianism in the 4th C. and were later considered the highest ecclesiastical authority. AMPHILOCHIOS OF IKONION is sometimes included in this group. Basil was the great organizer of men and institutions, Gregory of Nazianzos the great orator and poet, and Gregory of Nyssa the profound and subtle philosopher. Together they are best regarded as masters of compromise and synthesis in their adaptations of Plato and ORIGEN to the Orthodoxy of ATHANASIOS of Alexandria. Their trinitarian definitions paved the way for the Council of CHALCEDON. Basil established and clarified the distinction between the one ousia (see SUBSTANCE) and three HYPOSTASES in support of the concept of HOMOOUSIOS. Gregory of Nazianzos developed the properties and mutual relationships of the three divine persons within the TRINITY. Gregory of Nyssa emphasized the divinity and consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit.

The Cappadocians also departed from Origenist notions of SIN, SALVATION, and TIME. In their view, sin is more a product of human weakness and succumbing to temptation than the result of
original sin. Salvation is attained by penitence, confession, the contemplation and understanding of the divine, and the final reconciliation of sinners with God after the temporary punishment of hell. Much of this comports their efforts to define and distinguish time from eternity, another major departure from Origen; the concept of diastema was developed to separate divine from created time (B. Otis, *StP* 12 [Berlin 1976] 327–57), a notion put forth to substantiate their theories of man's fall and redemption. Apart from theological matters, the Cappadocians responded directly to the social issues of their day, with all three denouncing chariot racing, a particular obsession of Cappadocia, as a source of unrest and riot (J. H. Humphrey, *Roman Circuses* [London 1986] 528).


CAPUA (Κάπυα), city in Campania. Some remains of late Roman Capua survive: an amphitheater (converted to a fortress in the late 9th C.), bath, and Mithraeum. The Vandal Gaiseric sacked and destroyed Capua in 456. In 594 it was taken by the Lombards. Thereafter Capua was at first under the rule of the duchy of Benevento, and Duke Arechis II (758–87) may have constructed a church there (CHRONICON SALERNITATUM 17.11; Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity* 84). Capua gained independence in the 9th C. sometime before 808, abbot Josue of S. Vincenzo al Volturino received permission from King Louis (later Emp. Louis the Pious) to destroy a “very ancient temple.” Ward-Perkins (ibid. 206) thinks this proves continued government control (presumably Carolingian) over ruined secular buildings in Italy after 800. The rulers of Capua acquired the title of princes ca.900. At this time the city had to struggle against the Arabs, but the Muslim danger was eliminated at the battle of Garigliano in 915. The Byz. impact on Capua was less significant than on neighboring Benevento; a Byz. attempt to seize Capua ca.891 failed; the Byz. expedition of 934 was but an armed embassy; the expedition of 956 ended with a token submission; and the activity of the katepano Basil Boioannes in Capua in 1026 was short-lived. German influence in the 10th C. was exerted through their vassal Paldolf I Cadofiltero (Ironhead) of Salerno (961–81), who succeeded in unifying the vast Lombard lands in southern Italy around Capua. In 966 Pope John XIII elevated the church of Capua to the rank of metropolis. Capua still flourished in the first half of the 11th C., when Paldolf IV managed temporarily to annex Naples, Gaeta, and Mon-tecassino, but the Normans captured the stronghold of Capua after a long siege (1058–62), and the principality became part of the Norman state.


CAPUT (Lat. “head”), technical term introduced in the fiscal system with Diocletian's reforms and having three possible meanings: an individual “heading” in the tax register; an unsecured (because it did not consist of land) share of tax assessment, equivalent to the jugum; a human or animal component in the formula of assessment. Basically, the caput seems to be a unit of account used within the system of capitatio-jugatio for taxing humans or animals working on land. According to Goffart (infra 35), the concept of caput dropped out of the codes; the SYRO-ROMAN LAW-BOOK is silent about it, while the jugum continued to figure in the laws, at least until the 6th C. As the assessment was gradually considered to be based on land alone, the caput disintegrated and the tenant of land was eventually bound to the soil, so as to be kept on the roll of taxpayers.

Lit. W. Goffart, *Caput and Colonate* (Toronto 1974).—N.O.

CARBONE, Italian monastery dedicated to St. Elias and St. Anastasios the Persian; founded at the end of the 10th C. by Loukas Karbounes in a wild mountain region of the Basilicata, probably under the influence of St. Sabas the Younger. While Loukas was active primarily in Armentum, his successors, seeking a refuge from the Arabs, retired to Carbone; nonetheless, one of its superiors, Menas, was captured by them. After the Norman conquest of southern Italy Carbone flourished under the patronage of the feudal fam-
ily of Chiaromonte. Greek monks continued to reside in Carbone until the 16th C.

Despite two fires (in 1174 and 1432) part of the monastic archive survives, including eight Greek documents of 1007–61. Among them are wills containing descriptions of their possessions drafted by Basil (Blasios) in 1041; Loukas II, a superior of Carbone (1059); and Gemma, widow of Nikesphoros, chartoularios and topopoteres of Taranto; also preserved is a sigilium of Argyros, son of Melo, of 1053, which describes a mutiny against the emperor led by “the impious archbishop [of Taranto] and his accomplices.”


CARIA (Kâpia), district of southwestern Asia Minor, south of the Meander River. Caria has a long indented coastline with many harbors, chains of forested mountains, and fertile interior valleys. It became a separate province ca.305, with Aphrodisias as its capital; the governor was a praeses until the 6th C., then a consularis (I. Ševčenko in Synthronon [Paris 1968] 29–41). In 536 Justinian I assigned Caria to the quaestura exercitus, together with Scythia, Moesia, the Aegean islands, and Cyprus; its purpose was evidently to assure supplies, esp. timber, to the Danube armies. John of Ephesus, in his mission to the pagans of Caria and neighboring provinces in 542, claimed to have made 80,000 converts; paganism was still strong in the mountain regions. Caria became part of the theme of Kibyrhiaiotai, but is mentioned as a province as late as 722, when it appears as belonging to the apotheke of Asia, Caria, the islands, and the Hellespont organized to supply the army (Hendy, Economy 656–60). Later uses of the term refer to the geographic area or to the ecclesiastical province, which lasted until the end of Byz. rule (late 13th C.). Caria is also the Byz. name for Aphrodisias.

LIT. Jones, LRE 43, 482f. 999. —C.F.

CARICATURE, a deliberately distorted picture of individuals or groups created for satirical purposes. In late antiquity and Byz. it was directed at both domestic and foreign enemies. Eunapios of Sardis (fr.78, FHG 4:49) relates how an eparch of Rome set up in the middle of the “Stadium” a picture on panels mocking the barbarians who flee the threatening Hand of God; the picture was accompanied by a written commentary. Legends again accompanied the best-known incident of caricature in Byz. history: according to Niketas David Paphlagon, minutes of a council opposed to Pati. Ignatios were illustrated by Gregory Asbestas with colored images identifying Ignatios as “the devil,” “the abomination of desolation” (cf. Mt 24:15), etc. Some contemporary marginal psalters had illustrations that caricatured the enemies of Israel. The Ziphites of Psalms 53 and 72:9 are depicted almost literally with their “mouths set against heaven” while their “tongues go through the earth.” The Hebrews who reproached Moses are represented with Silenus-heads and exaggerated Semitic features (Dufrenne, L’illustration I, fol.106v), while Iconoclasts such as John VII Grammatikos are shown with the wild hair normally associated with the Devil (Śękpina, Miniatjory, fols. 51v, 67r). In the 12th C., Eustathios of Thessalonike was ridiculed in a sketch that circulated in the city (Eust. Thess., Opuscula 98.42–64). Gregorios (Greg. 1:258.24–259.4) again describes the use of caricature in politics: enemies of Patr. Athanasios I painted on the base of the patriarchal throne a picture of Christ and behind him Andronikos II bridled and led by the patriarch “as a charioteer leads a horse.” —A.C., A.K.

CARIĆIN GRAD. See Justiniana Prima.

CARMEN CONTRA PAGANOS, 4th- or 5th-C. work, also known as Carmen adversus Flavianum, that survives only in one copy attached to a MS of Prudentius and consists of 122 hexameters written in difficult Latin, often ungrammatical and unmetrical. Its target is an unnamed prefect who restored paganism at Rome, offended God, and duly perished miserably. The equation of this villain by T. Mommsen with Virius Nicomachus Flavianus (died Sept. 394) still remains the most plausible; a rival theory, however, offers Gabinius Barbarus Pompeianus, prefect at Rome in 408/9 when besieged by Alaric, who after permitting pagan ceremonies was lynched in a food riot. Either way, the poem can be connected with the last attempts at a pagan revival in the West. Its theme and biting tone recall the pseudo-Cyprian
Carnival against a renegade Christian senator and the Carmen ad Antonium contained in two MSS of Paulinus of Nola and thought by some to be his. A recent theory (F. Dolbeau, REAug 27 (1981) 38–43) suggests that Pope Damasus (366–84) might have written the Carmen Contra Paganos.


-B.B.

CARNIVAL, in the strict sense of the three-day festivity preceding Lent, left no trace in Byz. sources; on the contrary, Lent was preceded by weeks of partial abstinence (those of apokreas and tyrophagos) that, according to Theodore of Studios (PG 99:1700B), were established to remind Christians of monastic order (laxis) or of "the new and spotless society." The Byz. did celebrate carnivals in the broader sense, however, as semipagan feasts that embodied sensual festivities; they expressed themselves primarily in masked processions and coarse jokes, often with sexual overtones. The elements of carnival were reflected in pagan festivities such as Lupercalia and Brumalia. Christopher of Mytilene describes a procession of masked students of the school of notaries on the feast of St. Markianos and Martyrios; one of them was disguised as the emperor. Carnival entertainment sometimes had a parodic character, as at the court of Michael III: there, fake liturgies were performed to the accompaniment of lyres (kitharai) and a certain Grillos was installed as a bogus patriarch surrounded by eleven "metropolitans," all in gilded holy vestments; Michael himself played the part of the "proedros of Koloneia" (TheophCont 200.15–201.17). Canon law discouraged acting in costume, prohibited laymen from masquerading as monks and clerics, and clerics from disguising themselves as soldiers or animals (PG 137:729D). Canonists lamented that on some saints’ days pious women had to stay away from church for fear of being accosted by excessively boisterous merrymakers (PG 138:245D–248B).


-A.K.

CARLODO, GIAN GIACOMO, Venetian official and historian; born ca.1480, died 3 June 1538. Caroldo’s numerous and delicate diplomatic missions included one to the sultan in Constantinople (relazione of 30 Sept. 1503 in Marino Sanudo the Younger’s Diari 5 [Venice 1881] 449–68); from 1520 he occupied a key position in the Venetian chancellery. From that date until 1532 Caroldo worked on a Historia Veneta, whose initial part (to 1280) derives chiefly from Andrea DandoLo. The independent final section (1280–1382), however, makes extensive use of archival records available to Caroldo and sheds valuable light, for example, on Byz.-Venetian relations, connections with Russia, the conflict between John V and John VI, the cession of Tenedos, and the pawning of the Byz. crown jewels. The Historia is largely unpublished and survives in three different redactions, two of which exist in partially autograph MSS.


-CARPENTER (τέκτων, λεπτορυγός, ξυλουργός). The terms for artisans working in wood, including the combined form tektos leptourgos, are common in papyri (Fikhman, Egipt 28f). Palladios (Hist.Laws., ed. Butler, 94.7–9) saw in a monastery in Panos 15 tailors, 14 fullers, 7 smiths, and only 4 tektos, which shows a relatively unimportant role for carpentry in this monastery. In his opinion (100.6–7) tektosniké or carpentry was a profession that should be learned in boyhood. Various carpenters—tektos, leptomorphoi, and, distinct from them, builders or oikodomoi—worked in the Studios monastery in Constantinople (Dobroklonskij, Feodor 413). It seems that by the 10th C. the distinction between the carpenter, mason, and builder became vague. SOUDA (ed. Adler, 4:517, 4:520).
no. 251) equates tekton with technites and conceives of him as a craftsman working on both stone and wood. In the Book of the Eparch, leptourgai appear in the chapter on technitai together with masons (marmaroi) and workers in gypsum. In the vita of Ioannikios the Great (AASS Nov. 2.1:407C), tektonema is the designing of the building to be constructed by technitai. Tektones do not appear in later acts of Athos, but the term xyloargos is known (e.g., Launa 1, no. 63.5, App. 1. 12).

Because of the disappearance of most artifacts of wood, carpenters are better known to philology than to archaeology, yet it is self-evident that woodworkers supplied the framework, joists, and tie beams of public and private buildings; ceilings such as that in the church of St. Catherine’s monastery at Sinai; and enemas, ambos, and benches. Their role in shipbuilding and the construction of vehicles was even larger. Various carpenters’ tools are named by Theodore of Studios, the Geoponika, and Eustathios of Thessalonike (Kazhdan, Derewija i gorod 234): one-edged ax, adze, saw, auger, plumbline, plane, square, even a wood-turning lathe (dinos).

The word leptourgia meant skillful craftsmanship and was applied to the Creation (George of Pisidia, Hexaem. 1270, 1505), whereas Anastasios of Sinai (ed. J. Pitra, Iuris ecclesiastici graecorum historia, vol. 2 [Rome 1868] 259.15) speaks of the demon’s “tektones and followers,” and Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 258.14, 301.23) uses the term tekton only metaphorically as schemer or contriver.


CARPETS (sing. τάπητις) or rugs designated in antiquity any kind of woven material used to cover floors, beds, walls, or apertures of doors (H. Schralf in Re 2. R. 4 [1932] 2251). This broad range of functions was preserved in Byz., and various carpetlike hangings (bela) played an important role in court ceremonial, concealing the emperor from the eyes of laymen (Tretinger, Kaiseridea 55f). In the opinion of Basil the Great (PG 31:288C), covering walls with carpets was a sign of excessive luxury; likewise John Chrysostom (PG 55:510.47) considered that carpets on the floor were as typical of the rich house as throns of slaves and tables glittering with gold. According to Asterios of Amaseia (PG 40:168A), wall carpets were sometimes covered with images of hunters, animals, and rocks. In the 9th C. the rich widow Danelis sent to Constantinople woolen carpets to cover the whole floor of the Nea Ekklesia; precious stones were woven into the carpets so that they resembled a mosaic (Theophant Cont 319.14–20). More modest was the carpet on which Epiphanius, friend of St. Andrew the Fool, slept on the floor (PG 111:705AB). Since pious people used carpets for kneeling in prayer, a new term, epeuchion (“prayer rug”), was created by the 12th C. for carpets.

Some carpets were produced in Constantinople or the Peloponneseos; Demetrios Chomateno (ed. pitra, 6:542.29) mentions a type of carpet that the local people called tserga. Some carpets were brought from Alexandria or Armenia; esp. famous for carpet production was Persia, and Herakleios seized precious carpets in Dastagerd.


CARPIGNANO SALENTINO (Καρπιγνάνοο), city in southern Apulia, Italy; site of the cave-church of St. Marina and Cristina, famous for its dated frescoes. According to A. Jacob (AttLinc Rendiconti, 37 [1983] 41–64), inscriptions identify the painters as Theophylaktos (959) and Eustathios (1020). H. Belting (DOP 28 [1974] 12–14) argues that the style of the earlier artist derives from late 9th C. Constantinople, while that of Eustathios is a copy of Theophylaktos’s work rather than a reflection of Byz. painting in the early 11th C. The church, long in use as a funeral chapel, also contains a long Greek metrical inscription on the death of a child and his father, a spatharios (between 1055 and 1075—A. Jacob, RSBN 20–21 [1983–84] 103–22).

Lit. C.D. Fonseca et al., Gli insediamenti rupestri medievali nel Basso Salento (Galatina 1979) 59–75. —V.v.F., A.C.

CART (ἀμαξα). Unlike the light chariot pulled by horses that was employed for chariot races and solemn processions, the cart was a heavy vehicle dragged by oxen and used for everyday business; grain and other foodstuffs were transported in carts (vita of Eustratios, 9th-C. hegoumenos of the Agbas monastery, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Analekta 4:387.6–9), and a peasant might visit a fair in a cart (Synax.CP 720.34). The
Codex Theodosianus (Cod. Theod. VIII 5.48) established the maximum weight permitted to be carried in a cart (raeda) of four wheels—98–164 kg of gold and 164–327 kg of silver—but these figures do not represent the real capacity of the cart (J. Béranger, MusHelv 28 [1971] 125). The ancient system of harnessing was based on traction at the neck of the animal, with a soft collar and a flexible yoke to which a long pole was strapped; this harnessing prevented the animal from hauling big loads. Lefebvre de Noettes (infra) hypothesized that in the 9th–10th C. the Byz. introduced some innovations in the ancient system of harnessing, releasing the neck and transferring the force of traction from the neck to the chest; this invention allowed the partial replacement of the ox by the horse.

The Byz. were acquainted with the so-called Wagenburg tactic (i.e., surrounding a military camp with a line of carts), which was used by some of their neighbors, such as the Cumans.


CARTAGENA. A Punic foundation on the southeastern coast of Spain, it later became the site of the Roman colony of Nova Carthago. In 425 it was destroyed by the Vandals. An inscription recording the repair of the city gates by the Byz. magister militum of Spain, Komentios, has led to the assumption that Cartagena was the capital of Byz. Spain, but the inscription provides no indication of the town’s status. Cartagena was seized by the Visigothic king Suinthila in 642.

Lit. Thompson, Goths 320f. 329f.

CARTHAGENE (Καρχηδών), port in North Africa near modern Tunis, the largest city in the western Mediterranean after Rome. Under Diocletian, Carthage became the seat of the African diocese. It contained numerous churches and monasteries, and was the focal point of many religious disputes, such as Donatism, Arianism, the Three Chapters controversy, and Monotheletism. The city mirrored Rome in its administration, monuments, wealth, and spectacles. Its aristocracy formed the core of the landed elite of Africa and retained close links with Roman senatorial circles. Carthage was the main port for African grain and oil exported to Rome as part of the Annona. It was also a major producer and exporter of amphorae, lamps, and tableware, esp. African Red Slip ware (see Ceramics). Under the Vandals, there is evidence of an increase in imports of amphorae and other pottery forms, suggesting that the economy was increasingly dependent on supplies brought from outside Africa. Nevertheless Carthage continued to export African agricultural products to Spain, Gaul, and the eastern Mediterranean.

Literary sources emphasize the continued flourishing of Roman culture, including a certain degree of civic patronage on the part of the later Vandal kings. Continuity is also evident in the archaeological record; a number of urban villas, for example, show evidence of remodeling and refurbishment. At the same time, there is evidence that the late Roman walls, Antonine Baths, Via Coelestis, theater, Odeum, and the enigmatic circular monument or rotunda near the theater were allowed to fall into a state of disrepair, and some churches belonging to the Orthodox community are known to have been closed.

Following the Byz. reconquest (533), Carthage, renamed Carthago Justiniana, became the civil and military capital of the prefecture of Africa and later the seat of the Exarch. Justinian I refurbished the walls, the circular and rectangular harbors, and a number of churches. He also constructed a fortified monastery called Mandracium, perhaps on the site of the civic basilica on the Byrsa. A mint was also established (a carryover from the Vandals, who minted in bronze and silver) to serve the monetary needs of the city, prefecture, and army. Justinian’s efforts at urban renewal were short-lived (ca. 533–60) and probably more cosmetic than substantive, as recent archaeological evidence shows little change in the character and quality of domestic life in Carthage from the Vandal to Byz. periods. There is also numismatic evidence for continuous inflation of the base bronze coinage throughout the 6th–7th C., possibly initiated by the building program and costly wars against the Maures, a condition that no doubt drained the resources of the city.

While clearly the center of Byz. influence in Africa, Carthage was also the focal point of frequent resistance to Constantinople. In 608 Heraclius, exarch of Africa, rebelled against Emp. Phokas, and his son, the future emperor Hera-
KLEIOS, led the fleet of Carthage against Constantinople. Another exarch, GREGORY, proclaimed himself emperor, with the support of the “Romans” (Roman Africans) and African tribes. Urban life at Carthage declined over the course of the 7th C., the conditions of habitation worsened, and intramural burials became widespread. Trade, now largely with the eastern Mediterranean, was also decreasing (both the circular and rectangular harbors were out of use by ca.650). By the mid-7th C. production of African Red Slip ware ceased altogether, and mint emissions were erratic and small. Arab invasions after 647 contributed significantly to Carthage’s decline, particularly after the founding of Qayrawān in 670. After 645/6, no bishop of Carthage can be certainly identified and a number of churches ceased to function. The city was conquered by the Arabs, after several attempts, in 698.


—R.B.H.

CARThAGNE TREASURE, dated to the 4th or 5th C. and found at Carthage before 1897, is composed of 24 objects of domestic silver plate (19 in the British Museum and five in the Louvre) and seven pieces of jewelry (four gold, three carved gems). One plate is inscribed with the name of the Cresconius family, known from a comes metal·lorum in 365 up to the poet Fl. Cresconius Корippus in the 6th C. The treasure itself, which is usually attributed to ca.400, was thought to have been buried at the time of the campaign against the adherents of DONATISM from 393 onward, or when the Vandal king GAISERIC took Carthage in 439. The display of a family name in the center of a plate occurs also in the CANOSCIO TREASURE and compares with the use of personal monograms in the 4th-C. Esquiline Treasure (Sheraton, Esquiline 80f) and on a long series of 6th- or 7th-C. plates. The beaded bowl and dolphin-handled ladles of the Carthage Treasure resemble those in the MILDENHALL TREASURE, while the covered bowls on raised foot find parallels on silver plate discovered in Italy.


CARTOGRAPHY. Ancient mapmaking reached its highest development with PTOLEMY. The ancient cartographic tradition, based on mathematics and practical observation, was continued by Arab cartographers, whereas the major goal of Christian mapmakers was to reconcile practical knowledge with biblical data. This concern is reflected in Kosmas Indikopoleustes’ drawings, which though preserved only in later MSS probably derive from his original sketches. The only surviving late antique map is the Tabula Peutingeriana based on ancient traditions; some maps are preserved in later MSS of such late antique writers as Isidore of Seville and Macrobius. Local maps certainly continued to exist and were even reproduced on mosaics, for example, the decorative MADABA MOSAIC MAP. Comparing the Madaba map with the itinerary of a certain Theodosios to the Holy Land (in the first half of the 6th C.), Y. Tsafir (DOP 40 [1986] 129–45) comes to the conclusion that at that time there was a variety of pilgrim maps all differing from each other.

Medieval Western maps of the world, the so-called mappae mundi, are known from the 8th C. on, revealing the geographic knowledge of Latin-speaking authors. No Byz. maps have survived, however, even though various texts (e.g., The Concise Measurement of the Entire Oikoumenē, of uncertain date) allow one to hypothesize the existence of maps, which were eventually used in PORTULANS. Three extant MSS with maps of Ptolemy’s Geography and one MS of STRABO belong to the 13th C. and were probably compiled under the direction of Maximos Planoudes (A. Diller, Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition [Amsterdam 1983] 109). A 14th-C. illustrated MS of Ptolemy, complete with maps, is preserved in Venice, Marc. gr. 516 (Furlan, Marciana 4:31–34). In the 15th C.
Italian maps, representing parts of the (former) Byz. Empire, were available: for example, a (military?) map of 1430–53 (probably of 1444) illustrating the northern Balkans, from the left bank of the Danube to Constantinople (M. Nikolić, *Istorijički časopis* 29–30 [1982/3] 63–75), and a map of Cyprus of 1480 (A. & J. Stylianou, *KyprSph* 34 [1970] 145–58).


**CASAUX DE PARÇON** ("shared households"), medieval French term designating properties held in co-seigneurie by a Byz. archon and a Frankish knight. This type of fiscal arrangement is attested on Frankish territory in the Morea during the late 13th and 14th C. The co-seigneurs shared the telos paid in cash by the dependent peasants of one or more villages and the right to their pastures. As for the demesne lands, the lords held them privately, unaffected by the co-seigneurial arrangement. *Casaux de parçon* is an example of compromise and temporarily peaceful coexistence between Franks and Greeks in the border areas of the Morea motivated by political and economic considerations and facilitated by the Franks’ adoption of Byz. fiscal practices.

**CASKETS AND BOXES** (θήκαι, κιβωτίδεα) in late antiquity were normally made of wood; metals and ivory were used for pyxides and more pretentious specimens in a variety of shapes—oblong, cubical, or spherical, with flat, domed, or pyramidal lids. One of the two large silver caskets in the Esquiline Treasure, decorated with domestic and mythological scenes and figures, contained lotion bottles while the other probably held bath linen. The internal arrangements and the iconography (Asklepios, Hygieia, Christ’s Healing of the Blind) suggest that some early ivory boxes were used for medications. Hasty construction of bone- and metal-clad examples as well as prolonged use mean that many have survived only as panels. Important examples such as the Brescia Lipsanokhe, made of ivory cornerposts into which panels with Old and New Testament scenes are

CASKETS AND BOXES. Lid of the Veroli Casket; ivory, 10th C. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Decorated with mythological scenes (l. to r., the Rape of Europa, Herakles playing the lyre, erotes, centaurs and dancing maenads).
slotted, have been reconstructed. As in the case of metal caskets made as late as the 14th–15th C. (W.D. Wixon in *Treasury S. Marco* 201–03), the original function of the lipsanothek is unknown; suggested contents include sacred bread, incense, and monetary offerings.

Equally uncertain is the function of numerous wooden boxes of the 10th–12th C., with ivory panels depicting scenes from Genesis, Joshua, and Kings (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, *Elfenbeinskulpt.* vol. 1, nos. 1–5, 67–98). Others, with bone panels representing warriors, fantastic animals, and puttilike manikins, framed with rosette bands, seem to parody classical mythology. There being no evidence to suggest their function, these are commonly supposed to have been ladies’ jewel boxes. This may have been true of the minority originally equipped with locks.


— M.M.M., A.C., L.Ph.B.

**CASOLE**, Italian town about 2 km south of *Otranto*. The Greek monastery of S. Nicola di Casole (στὸν Κασσόλων) was founded at Casole in 1098/9 by the monk Joseph under Norman patronage. During the later Middle Ages the abbey was one of the most prosperous ecclesiastical institutions in Apulia. The monastery’s reputation as a center of Greek learning is mostly due to its important library and to the presence of Nicholas of Otranto. Turks destroyed the monastery in 1480. Its archives and most of the MSS are lost; the *typikon* (1173) survives but has been only partly edited (Dimitrievskij, *Opisanie* 1:795–896).


— V.v.F.

**CASOLAN**, a founder of early monasteries in southern Gallia and a Latin ecclesiastical writer; born ca.560, natione Scytha, according to *Genesis* of Marseilles, that is, probably in Scythia Minor, died Marseilles after 432. Cassian (Κασσίανος) spent his youth in a monastery at Bethlehem, then in Egypt (in Sketis). After leaving Egypt suddenly, ca.399, he came to Constancia where John Chrysostom ordained him deacon. After Chrysostom’s deposition, Cassian moved westward in 405; in Rome he formed a friendship with the future pope Leo I and ca.410 settled in Provence, where he founded twin monasteries—one for men (named after the local saint, Victor) and another for women.

Here Cassian wrote three books in Latin. The first section of the *Institutions* describes monastic life in Egypt and Palestine, including monastic dress; in the second part of the treatise he presents the theory of *vices* that monks had to avoid; since four of them bear Greek names (gastriamargia, philargyria, acedia, and cedonoxia), it is quite plausible that Cassian used Greek sources, such as Evagrius Pontikos. The second book, *Collationes* (Conferences), consists of fictitious conversations with hermits (in the style of the *Aphthegmata Patrum*) and is concerned with the superiority of the way of salvation: the *Institutions* were intended to prepare the flesh for a virtuous life, while the *Conferences* dealt with the journey of the soul to the heavenly abode. Though very popular, the *Conferences* were suspected of Pela-
gianistic formulations and proclaimed apocryphal by the Western church. At the instigation of Pope Leo I, Cassian also compiled a refutation of Nestorius entitled On the Incarnation of the Lord.


CASSIODORUS, more fully, Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator, statesman and scholar; prefect of Italy (533–37) under Theodoric the Great; born Brutium ca.487, died Vivarium monastery ca.580. He was in Constantinople ca.550 for unknown reasons. Returning to Italy after Justinian I's reconquest, he founded and lived in the Calabrian Vivarium monastery until his death. As an official, Cassiodorus was instrumental in romanizing his Gothic masters both administratively and culturally. Vivarium, though physically short-lived, paved the way for medieval preservation of ancient texts and the Benedictine monastic tradition.

Cassiodorus was as tireless a writer as organizer. The Institutes are a blueprint for the union of secular and theological study. A commentary on the Psalms, drawing upon Augustine, emphasizes allegorical interpretation, while the De anima dwells upon the spirituality of the soul. The Historia Tripartita is a 12-book arrangement of the church historians Sokrates, Sozomenos, and Theodoret of Cyrhrus translated into Latin by Cassiodorus’s pupil Epiphanios. Principal secular works are the Variae, 12 books of his official correspondence preserving the imperial edicts that he had drawn up, a model for later chanceries; a Chronicle summarizing Roman history within a universal context from the time of Adam to 519; and a treatise on orthography. His History of the Goths is preserved only in an abridged version by Jordanes (B. Croke, CPhil 82 [1987] 117–34).


CASTELSEPPIO. Mural paintings discovered in 1944 in the unprepossessing Church of S. Maria foris portas, outside the Roman, Byz., and Lombard fortress (castellum) of Seprio, northwest of Milan, have figured prominently in the attempt to reconstruct the history of pre-Iconoclastic mural art in Constantinople. The paintings, very similar in style to MSS such as the Paris Psalter and Joshua Roll, are apparently the work of an itinerant Byz. master. Their remarkable naturalism first suggested a date in the 6th–7th C., though Weitzmann argued for the 10th. The later dating has been vindicated by radiocarbon analysis of the original roof beams, which suggests a range between 778 (or 808?) and 952 (P. Leveto-Jabr, Gesta 26 [1987] 17f). The murals covered the upper wall of the eastern apse with at least 11 scenes of the life of the Virgin, of which 8 survive, making Castelseprio an important witness to narrative iconographies rarely encountered in Byz. monumental painting before the 13th C.


CASTLES. See Crusader Castles; Fortifications; Kastron.

CATACOMBS, the usual term for rock-hewn burial grounds, which were in widespread use until the 6th C. Although catacombs were not the prerogative of any one religious group, or limited to a single region (witness Naples, Syracuse, and Alexandria), they are commonly associated with Christianity, under whose aegis they flourished, and the city of Rome, where the largest body of them has been discovered. From the 3rd C. Roman Christians largely buried their dead in extra-mural subterranean tombs composed of networks of corridors and cubicles that ranged in size from the small and presumably private (e.g., catacomb
of Vibia), single-family complex to the large, multi-storied structure housing thousands of tombs, administered by the church (e.g., catacombs of Calixtus, Domitilla). In the Roman catacombs all classes and ages were buried in loculi and arcosolia. Tombs were often marked with a carved or painted inscription identifying the occupant. Images expressing Christian hopes of salvation (Commendatio animae; the Good Shepherd), painted on the walls of the catacombs and carved on contemporary sarcophagi, are among the earliest Christian art known. After Christianity was granted toleration ca.311–13, the architecture and decoration of the catacombs became quite elaborate, drawing upon forms commonly used for above-ground tombs. The catacombs of Rome ceased to be used for burials in the 6th C.; they continued to be visited, however, and indeed even embellished with works of art (e.g., catacombs of S. Ermete, Calixtus), though sporadically, throughout the Middle Ages.


CATALAN GRAND COMPANY, band of Spanish mercenaries hired by Andronikos II to fight the Turks in Anatolia. The Catalans were able to recover some Byz. territory in 1304, but after the assassination of their leader Roger de Flor (1305) they turned against the Byz. Using the Kallipolis peninsula as their base, they raided the surrounding countryside for two years (1305–07). In 1307 they moved west, plundering Thrace, Macedonia, and even the monasteries of Athos. In 1309 they ventured further south into Thessaly; in 1311 they defeated Gautier de Brienne, duke of Athens, at the battle of Kephissos near Thebes. Having thus ended Burgundian rule over Athens and Thebes, the Catalan mercenaries established themselves in the duchy of Athens. They requested the protection of the Aragonese king Frederick II of Sicily (1296–1337), three of whose sons were in turn named dukes of Athens. Thebes, which served as the political and commercial center of the duchy, was captured by the Navarrese Company in 1379. Catalan rule over Athens lasted until 1388, when the city fell to the Florentine Nerio I Acciajuoli.

CATALAN GRAND COMPANY was established in Sicily after the Sicilian Vespers (1282), the revolt that expelled the Angevin dynasty hostile to Byz. In 1315 Ferrando of Majorca landed in the western Peloponnese, while his cousin Frederick, Aragonese ruler of Sicily, was at war with the Angevins of Naples. Ferrando was able, however, to keep only a part of the Morea for a year; he was defeated by Louis of Burgundy and beheaded. In the 14th C. the mercenary Catalan Grand Company had considerable impact on Byz., eventually establishing Catalan rule over Athens and Thebes. In 1351 Aragon-Catalonia allied with Byz. and Venice against Genoa; this coalition led in the following year to a successful but costly allied naval victory over the Genoese fleet in the Bosphorus. The Catalan chronicler, Ramon Muntaner (1265–1336), provides a valuable source for the history of relations between the Catalan Grand Company and Byz.


CATALAUNIAN FIELDS (Campi Catalaunici), site of a battle that occurred in 451, probably on 20 June. The battle of the Catalaunian Fields is also known as the battle of Châlons or of Maurica. After Emp. Marcian refused to pay the customary
tribute to the Huns in 450, Attila turned his attention to the West and invaded Gaul with a force of Huns and subject Germans. The magister militum Aetius organized the resistance and the future emperor Epaucharus Avitus arranged an alliance with Theodoric, king of the Visigoths. The Romans and their allies prevented Attila from reaching Orléans and pursued the Huns into eastern Gaul. The two armies met somewhere in what is now Champagne. The exact site has been subject to considerable but futile scholarly debate. The battle was long contested and ended in a draw, although this represented a moral victory for the Romans; Attila reportedly prepared a funeral pyre rather than fall into the hands of his enemies. Thorismund, son of Theodoric (who had died in the battle), wished to pursue the advantage and attack the Huns. Aetius, however, did not want the total destruction of Hunnic power and persuaded the new Visigothic king to return home to forestall the ambitions of his brothers. Attila was thus allowed to slip away and to plan his invasion of Italy in 452. The importance of the battle has generally been exaggerated in historical accounts.


CATANIA (Kaláta), city on the east coast of Sicily; together with the rest of the island, Catania belonged to the Ostrogothic state from 491. While Catania was under the Ostrogoths, royal permission was given to the town to repair its walls with blocks fallen from the ruined amphitheater (Casiodorus, Variae 111.49). In 535, general Belisarios recovered the town for the Byz. without encountering serious resistance. It was temporarily recaptured by Totila in 550; Prokopios (Wars 7.49.21) indicates that at this time the city was unwalled. The town was gradually hellenized: the seal of the 7th-C. bishop George has a Latin inscription, whereas the inscriptions of 8th- and 9th-C. seals are in Greek.

In the 9th C. the Arabs repeatedly plundered the environs of Catania. In 900 they besieged it unsuccessfully, but soon thereafter they conquered the city. A legend reports that George Maniates seized Catania in 1042 and took to Constantinople the relics of St. Agatha, who had supposedly been martyred at Catania; her bones were returned in 1126. The Normans occupied the city sometime in the second half of the 11th C.

The first known bishop of Catania was Fortunatus in the early 6th C. The see appears as an archbishopric under the authority of Constantinople in the notitia compiled between 787 and 869. In the mid-9th C. the bishop of Catania Euthymios was ordained by Patr. Ignatios but then joined the party of Patr. Photios and was probably rewarded by promotion to the rank of metropolitan by 869. After the fall of Sicily to the Arabs (by 902) the title of the metropolitan of Catania survived: Leo of Catania participated in the meeting convoked by Patr. Sisinnios in Feb., 997 (PG 119:741A), and “Katane of Sicily” is still listed in the notitia of the 13th C. (Notitiae CP, no.15.44). A Latin bishopric, however, was established in the city in 1086–89. The legendary vita of an earlier Leo of Catania describes frequent travel between Catania and Constantinople as well as the horse races in Catania; both the date and validity of this evidence remain disputable.


CATECHUMENATE (from κατηχούμενον, “those who receive instruction”), period and discipline of preparation for baptism. Characterized already ca.150 as a period of fasting, prayer, and instruction, the catechumenate reached classic expression ca.215 as a well-defined institution of candidates called catechumeni (Tertullian, De praescriptione Haereticorum 41.2, ed. R.F. Refoulé [= CChr, ser. lat. 1:221.4–7]). During the catechumenate, which normally lasted three years, the candidates were presented to the church leaders by Christian sponsors, tested, exhorted, and prayed over at common sessions with a teacher; they attended services in a special place reserved for them, but were dismissed before the Prayer of the Faithful, in which they could have no part. From the 7th C., church galleries are often called katechumenae, but by then the catechumenate was no longer a living institution in Byz. (R. Taft, OrChrP 42 [1976] 301ff).

Lent brought a second, final stage, when the photizomenoi (“enlightened”), those destined for baptism at Easter, were prepared, in a crescendo of initiatory rites that included renunciation of
Satan, profession of faith, stripping, blessing of the water, prebaptismal anointing, the bath of baptism by triple immersion, clothing, chrismation or sealing, entrance into the waiting community, kiss of peace, eucharistic offering, and communion, usually at the Easter Vigil. The dramatization of the ritual for maximum effect is revealed in the classic 4th-C. catechetical homilies of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Ambrose of Milan (E. Yarnold, *The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation* [Slough 1972]; H. Riley, *Christian Initiation* [Washington, D.C., 1974]).

After the 4th C., with the enrollment of infants in the catechumenate and of adults with no intention of seeking baptism in the immediate future, the two-stage system declined. In Constantinople, parents first presented their infants for admission to the “first catechumenate” 40 days after birth. Then on Monday of the fourth week of Lent, those to be baptized at the Easter Vigil were brought to the church for the prayers and exorcisms that began the “second catechumenate” (Mateos, *Typicon 2:39f*). These *photizomenoi* were prayed for in a special *litany* at all services for the rest of Lent. On Good Friday the patriarch held a catechesis for them at St. Irene, followed by the solemn renunciation of Satan and adherence to Christ (ibid. 78f). From at least the 8th C. onward, however, Byz. usage compresses all of this into a service immediately preceding baptism.


**CATENAE** (Lat. “chains”), scholarly term used from the 15th C. onward to designate the genre that the Byz. called “collection of exegetical fragments.” The genre was created by Prokopios of Gaza and survived the fall of Byz.; it expanded to some neighboring countries as well. Catenae consisted of quotations from theologians (both church fathers and heretical writers) attached to a particular verse of the Bible and following the sequence of the text itself. On the basis of the catenae to the Psalms, Dorival (infra) divided the genre into two groups: the Palestinian and the Constantinopolitan, the latter originating between 650 and 700. The first type of the Palestinian group is the Prokopian model, consisting of quotations from the commentaries or homilies of Palestinian authors. The second Palestinian type is the chain-scholia, characterized by their brevity and format: they were set forth in a column parallel to the biblical text so that every scholion stood side by side with the verse commented on; sometimes the scribe left empty space between two scholia. Constantinopolitan catenae often consisted of citations from one authority—primarily John Chrysostom, sometimes Theodoret of Cyrrhus; another Constantinopolitan type contained citations from the two authors and offered the integrated commentary of particular theologians, rather than quotations out of context. The third Constantinopolitan model combined Chrysostom and Theodoret with Palestinian authorities. Byz. exegetes produced catenae to the books of both Old Testament and New Testament (Octateuch, Psalter, Gospels, etc.). Catenae also exist in Christian Oriental languages (Coptic and Syriac).


**CATEPANATE.** See KATEPANATE.

**CATHARS** (from Gr. καθαροί, “the pure”), medieval dualist sect that flourished in Germany, southern France, and northern Italy. From the mid-12th C. onward, Byz. dualism exerted a formative influence on the Cathar movement, as several reliable Western documents attest. Contact between dualists of eastern and western Europe were facilitated by trade relations and by the Crusades (C. Thouzellici, *RHE* 49 [1954] 859–72). In the second half of the 12th C. dualist missionaries from the Balkans frequently visited Italy and France to propagate either the “absolute” or the “moderate” form of dualism in the local heretical communities. (The “absolute” dualists believed in two coeternal principles of good and evil, while the “moderate” dualists held that the evil di munio, creator of this world, was himself the creature of the one God.) The most prestigious of these visitors was Niketas, the leader of the
dualists of Constantinople, who came to preside over the heretical council of St. Félix de Caraman near Toulouse (which met probably between 1174 and 1177), and persuaded the French Cathars to adopt "absolute" dualism (D. Obolensky in Okeanos 489–500). The Cathars seem generally to have believed that their faith came from the Balkans. Thus, a group of them, condemned to the stake in Cologne ca.1143, declared that their religion had its home "in Greece and certain other lands" (the latter expression is generally taken to refer to Bulgaria). The Balkan origin of Catharism is confirmed by terminology: their name is Greek, and the Cathars were often known in the West as Bulgari, Bogri, or Bugres (hence bougre).

The teaching of the Cathars shows striking similarities with the doctrines of the Bogomils: these include denial of the reality of the Incarnation, repudiation of marriage, total opposition to the established church, and the belief (held by the "moderate" dualists) that the Devil was the son of God. The ritual of the Cathars was certainly influenced by that of the Bogomils.


---

CATHERINA (καθέδρα), term for a bishop's throne. Such seats were made of stone, wood, or, as in the case of the cathedra of MAXIMIAN, ivory. The cathedra stood in the center of the apse, at the top of the synthonon. It was used by the bishop during the liturgy and, in the early period, while he pronounced homilies. The bishop in his cathedra flanked by priests was likened to Christ among the Apostles. Certain cathedrae served strictly symbolic functions, as was the case with the "Sedia di S. Marco," a 6th-C. alabaster throne-reliquary now in Venice (Treasury S. Marco, no.7).

---

CATHERINE, MONASTERY OF SAINT. The site of the Burning Bush at the foot of Mt. SINAI (Djebel Mousa) was inhabited by the 4th C. A church marked the locus sanctus, and monks lived nearby in cells, as attested by the pilgrim EGERIA who visited the area in 381–84. Sometime between 548 and 565 Justinian I constructed a heavily fortified monastery around the shrine to protect the monks from Bedouin raids and for the defense of Palestine (Prokopios, Buildings 5.8.9). The monastery, which was and still is under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Jerusalem, has been continuously inhabited ever since. It also has strong ties with Cyprus and Crete, where it possesses metochia.

The monastery was originally called tou Batou (of the Burning Bush); it took the name of St. CATHERINE in the 10th or 11th C. after acquiring the relics of the Alexandrian martyr. Because of the monastery's remote location, its artistic treasures escaped destruction during the period of Iconoclasm; hence its collection of over 2,000 icons includes extremely rare examples of encaustic painting of the 6th and 7th C. The library contains more than 3,000 MSS in a variety of languages (Greek, Arabic, Georgian, Syriac, and Slavic) that reflect the diversity of the monks who have lived at Sinai.

Much of the 6th-C. architecture survives, including the fortification walls and the basilica, which preserves some of its original decoration such as the mosaic of the Transfiguration in the conch of the apse and fine wood carving on the entrance doors and ceiling beams.


---

CATHERINE OF ALEXANDRIA, saint; feast-days 24 and 25 Nov. Her passiones present Catherine, or Aikaterina (Αἰκατερίνα), as a young virgin of imperial stock who successfully debated with pagan philosophers in Alexandria in the presence of Emp. MAXENTIUS. The emperor ordered Catherine to be stripped of her "imperial purple garb" and flogged. Although Catherine succeeded in converting both the empress and the stratopedarches Porphyroton to Christianity, Maxentius ordered her decapitation; instead of blood, milk gushed from the wound, and angels carried
her body to Sinai. The monastery founded on Sinai at the site of the Burning Bush eventually took her name (see Catherine, Monastery of Saint). Viteau (infra) hypothesized, despite the legendary character of the passiones, that a Christian virgin Catherine had in fact been beheaded on 24 Nov. 305; he surmised also that the prototype of the passiones dates from the 6th C. or the first half of the 7th C. (see sharp criticism, AB 18 [1899] 69f). The evidence for Catherine’s cult is late: the monk Epiphanius who visited Sinai ca. 820 knew nothing of Catherine. The interconnection between the preserved passiones is unclear; one of them, an obvious forgery, names as its author Athanasios, tachygraphos (stenographer) and servant of the saint. The description of Catherine’s debate with the Alexandrian philosophers has passages in common with Barlam and Joasaph. The passiones were slightly reworked by Symeon Metaphrastes and also translated into Latin, Arabic, and other languages.

Representation in Art. Catherine is invariably clad in imperial vestments (loros with thorakion, and crown) and holds a martyr’s cross. Her beheading and the fiery death of her inquisitors appear in the Menologion of Basil II (p.207), and her dispute with the rhetors in the Theodore Psalter (fol.167r); there is a cycle of 12 scenes surrounding her portrait on a 12th-13th-C. icon on Mt. Sinai (K. Weitzmann, DChAE 4 12 [1984] 95f).


—A.K., N.P.S.

CATTLE. See Beasts of Burden; Livestock.

CAUCASUS (Kaukásos), major mountain range stretching some 1,200 km northwest to southeast from the Black Sea to the Caspian Sea, traditionally held to have been the natural frontier between Europe and Asia. Because many descendants of various nomadic tribes survived in high mountain valleys, Plutarch claimed that Pompey needed 120 interpreters on his Caucasian campaign, and medieval Arab geographers called it “The Mountain of Languages.” Historically the Caucasus served as a barrier protecting the settled kingdoms to the south from northern nomads, and measures were repeatedly taken to control its two main passes: the Darial (Dār-i Alan, “Gate of the Alans”) near the center of the chain on the “Georgian Military Highway” descending to Tbilisi, and the “Caspian Gates” on the seashore near Derbent. The Peace of 562 between Byz. and Persia stipulated that the Sasanians would garrison the passes, while the empire contributed a subsidy. Justin II abrogated this agreement, leading to the resumption of the Persian war at the end of the 6th C.

Though relatively impenetrable, the Caucasus remained a channel for both military and commercial purposes. Justinian I sought to evade the Persian monopoly over the silk trade by creating a route running north of the Caucasus to the Caspian and eventually the Far East. Nevertheless, fragments of silk have also been found in the mountains, and the later south-north trade between the caliphate and the Rus’ was carried on through the passes. These same passes allowed Byz.’s allies, the Khazars, to attack the Arabs in the 8th–9th C., while in the 12th–13th C. the Georgian kings drew support for the unification of their country from the Kipchak Turkish tribes north of the mountains. (For map, see next page.)


CAVALRY (ιππικον, καβαλλαρικόν) provided the offensive force in the Byz. army, and their tactics and equipment were thoroughly discussed in the military treatises. Their skills and tactics reflect the influence of the empire’s eastern enemies, most notably in the acquisition of the stirrup, possibly from the Avars (first mentioned in the 7th C.), and the use of mounted archers. Books 1–3 of the Strategikon of Maurice describe the techniques of cavalry warfare developed in the late Roman period, stressing mobility, the importance of reserves, and the need for individual skill...
with both lance and bow. Cavalry tactics sought to combine encirclement with shock by deploying three units forward in an attack line and four behind in support, with other units on both flanks detailed to outflank the enemy on the right and prevent enemy encirclement from the left. To this basic pattern of cavalry deployment the 10th-C. Strategika show the addition of heavy kataphraktoi for increased shock against enemy infantry, and a third line of reserves for protection against Arab skirmishers (Praecepta Milit. 3-4, pp. 10.15-18.15).

Cavalry warfare in the later period was influenced by Latin mercenaries, best illustrated by Manuel I Komnenos’s eager imitation of knightly tournaments (Nik.Chon. 108.53-109.88). These mercenaries provided the bulk of cavalrymen, esp. heavy cavalrymen, in Nicaean and Palaiologan armies.


CAVE CHURCHES AND DWELLINGS. See Rock-cut Churches and Dwellings.
ÇAVUŞIN. Near this village in CAPPADOCIA are two important rock-cut churches. The large, finely carved three-aisled Basilica of St. John the Baptist (probably 6th C.) until recently retained part of its impressive façade of massive rock-cut Ionic columns. Along with the Basilica of Dumaş Kadir Kilisesi in the village of Avşarlar, St. John the Baptist is prominent among a small group of early rock-cut monuments surviving in the province. The second historically significant structure is the Great Pigeon House, dated to 963–69 by the portraits of Nikephoros II Phokas and his family in the prothesis apse. With a figure on horseback at the front of a row of military saints is an invocation on behalf of Melias the magistros. Portraits (presumably of donors) at the feet of a colossal St. Michael at the east end of the north wall are almost entirely obliterated. The church was decorated with an elaborate Christological cycle largely dependent on the program of Tokali Kilise in GÖREMÉ Valley.


CEFALÙ, village on the north coast of Sicily. The cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul is a T-shaped basilica of largely French design, decorated in the apse and presbytery with mosaics. It was founded in 1131 as the burial church of King Roger II, but he seems to have lost interest in it; his porphyry sarcophagus eventually was transferred to Palermo cathedral and concomitantly the mosaic decoration was abandoned after the completion of the program in the presbytery. The mosaics in the apse (bust of the Pantokrator in the conch, Virgin with archangels and apostles on the wall below) are dated to 1148 by inscription. Because the craft had no local tradition in Sicily, it is assumed that these first mosaics were executed by Byz. artisans. Those in the presbytery (angels in the vault, and standing prophets and saints) are ascribed to Sicilian pupils.


CEIONIUS, a Roman aristocratic family that the Historia Augusta credits with royal descent. Actually, the founder of the family's fortune, Ceionius Rufius Volusianus, was not noble but rose through his own political achievements and a good marriage (T.D. Barnes, JRS 65 [1975] 46f). He prospered under Diocletian and Maxentius and retained a high position after Constantine I's victory; he was prefect of Rome in 313–15, but thereafter fell into disgrace. Nonetheless, his son, Ceionius Rufius Albinus, was prefect of Rome in 335–37; Ceionius Rufius Volusianus, named also Lampadius, prefect of Rome in 365, may well have been Albinus's son. His building activity proved burdensome for the local population and caused a riot in Rome, during which his house was destroyed. The family was still influential in the first half of the 5th C., when its representatives occupied posts such as comes rerum privatarum, quaestor, and prefect of Rome. The family owned estates in Italy and Africa and, unlike the Anicii, supported paganism; Publius Ceionius Julianus was a maternal uncle of Emp. Julian; under his nephew he served as comes Orientis and zealously persecuted Christians in Antioch. Another member of the family, Rufius Antonius Agrypnus Volusianus, loyal to paganism, discussed the doctrine of the Incarnation with Augustine (Matthews, Aristocracies 353). Some Ceionii, however, married Christian women, and St. Melania the Younger was related to the family. The Ceionii disappeared soon after 440.


CELIBACY (σελεβασία) was extolled by St. Paul and the church fathers, but was not considered as prescribed by God (John Chrysostom, PG 63:602.11–12). Only some radical dissidents/dualists (Chron. Pasch. 486.6–8) insisted on mandatory celibacy for laymen. Clerical celibacy was viewed as a matter of personal choice rather than a prerequisite for ordination. Except in the case of monks and nuns, no universal law excluded clerics from marriage. In the West, the Council of Elvira (beginning of the 4th C.) required, for the first time, the obligatory celibacy of the higher clergy, whereas the East remained reluctant to take this step: the First Council of Nicaea, under the pressure of the monk Paphnoutios, a victim of Dioce-
tian's persecutions and a strict ascetic, repudiated a proposal that would have made celibacy compulsory for all clergy. The development in the East was not uniform: in 4th-C. Asia Minor even a bishop could be a married man, whereas in North Africa, Synesios of Cyrene as a special privilege received a dispensation from abandoning his wife when he became a bishop; in Thessaly, at the time of Sokrates (HE 5:22.50), an ordinary cleric was forbidden to sleep with his wife after ordination. In 528 Justinian I prohibited marriages of bishops, having particularly stressed the significance of this regulation—bishops should not bequeath their property to their relatives, but to the church and the poor (Cod. Just. 1 3.41).

The Council in Trullo defined the rules that remained in effect throughout the entire Byz. period: the lower clergy could marry after ordination; priests, deacons, and subdeacons could retain their wives if they had married before ordination; married men elevated to the bishopric had to sever their marital bonds and their wives had to go to convents. The marital status of Byz. middle clergy was one of the serious points in the conflict between the Western and Eastern churches from the 11th C. onward, esp. after the Latin conquest of Orthodox territories, since the Greek priests were not required to be celibate.


—A.P., A.K.

CEMETERY (κοιμητήριον, lit. "sleeping place [for the dead]"). John Chrysostom, in his homily On the Name of the Cemetery (PG 49:393.33–36), declares that the place was named koimeterion to show that buried persons are not dead but asleep. Tombstones of the 4th–6th C. regularly refer to an individual burial as koimeterion. Christian cemeteries were both subterranean (catacombs) and above ground (areae). Even though some apotropaic symbols have been discovered in mid-4th-C. Christian cemeteries (N. Hamparjumian in Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren, vol. 1 [Leiden 1978] 473–77), pagans were refused burial there. Areae were located outside city walls; basilicas began to be erected there from the late 4th C. onward, as did mausoleums and martyria.

Tombs were commonly built of tiles or rubble masonry, often with vaults. Simple graves were often covered with plastered pseudo-vaults that were visible above the ground. Lamps were left burning at graves, and relatives and friends apparently gathered at tombs for memorial meals and celebrations. In the 6th–7th C. cemeteries began to invade the central areas of cities, including the ancient marketplaces. The Byz. also buried their dead in hypogaea, or subterranean vaulted chambers, esp. in Constantinople (Müller-Wiener, Bildlexikon 219–22). These varied from single rooms to multilevel structures where sarcophagi were separated by walls decorated with frescoes.

Most cemeteries were made up of simple interments with burials regularly oriented so that heads were at the west. In many areas simple tile-lined graves were covered with mounded dirt that was then sealed with a coat of plaster. Even though an edict of 381 (Cod/Theod. IX 17.6) prohibited burial in churches, the custom was well established, esp. for saints, emperors, and influential persons. Even in monastic cemeteries no equality obtained: the typikon of the 12th-C. Kecharitomene Nunneri (117.1727–31) provides that separate burial plots (stataria) be assigned to superiors, nuns of the higher rank (megaloschema), regular nuns, and servants.

The inscriptions from late Roman necropoles constitute a highly important source of social information: those from Korykos, for example, suggest flourishing mercantile activity in the 5th–6th-C. city (A. Gurevič, VDI [1955] no.1, 127–35); inscriptions from the so-called cemetery of Sts. Markus, Marcellianus, and Damosus in Rome (ca.331–406) show that this was the graveyard of ordinary people with an average life expectancy of 20.75 years (P. Saint-Roch, RACr 59 [1983] 411–23). Cemeteries can also elucidate the history of barbarian invasions (e.g., Avar necropoles in Pannonia); in the Balkans, Slavs were frequently interred in the ruins of earlier churches. Despite a common misconception, and although to a lesser extent than in classical burials, Byz. cemeteries commonly contained grave goods, including jewelry and vessels for wine and oil presumably used to prepare the body for interment.

**CENOBITIC MONASTICISM.** See Koinobion; Monasticism.

**CENSER** (θυματήριον, θυματός), a vessel designed to contain glowing coals on which incense was strewn; they were meant either to be set on a horizontal surface (standing censers) or to be swung by chains (hanging censers). Even though the *Liber pontificalis* ascribes to Constantine I the donation of gold censers to the Lateran basilica and St. Peter’s, it is doubtful that they came into ecclesiastical use before the very end of the 4th C. They were used (mainly by deacons) for censing the altar, the Gospel, and the elements of the Eucharist. Censers were also employed in a secular context to show honor to a great person and in private devotions (e.g., censing a site after an earthquake). It is hypothesized that incense burners found at Sardis were used to deodorize dye shops (J.S. Crawford, *The Byzantine Shops at Sardis* [Cambridge, Mass., 1990] 15). Although the vast majority of surviving examples are in cast bronze, several examples in hammered silver are known, including those in the Ston and the Cyprus Treasures, and another in the Metropolitan Museum (Mango, *Silver*, no. 85). Until the 8th C., hanging censers consisted of a cubical, polygonal, or cylindrical cup, sometimes accompanied by an openwork cover (*DOCat* 1, nos. 45–49). The most popular type is chalice-shaped with a low foot and decorated with Gospel scenes in relief. This type, with more than 50 surviving examples, appears to have remained in use well after Iconoclasm (*Age of Spirit*, nos. 563–64). After the 9th C., a new type of standing censer (*katzen, katzi(on)*) appears, with a shallow bowl and long flat handle, often decorated with the representation of the patron saint of a church (*Isskastv Vizantiti* 2, no. 570). Such objects are recorded in church inventories from the 11th C. onward (e.g., *Pantel.,* nos. 7, 12, 49), most of gilded or plain silver, but also of bronze. The *katzi* may have been used esp. in a funerary context. Censers often appear in representations of deacon saints, images of the Dormition, the Myrophoroi, and in scenes of the procession of venerated icons (A. Grabar, *CahArch* 25 [1976] 145, figs. 1–2).

Symbolically censers were perceived as images of Christ’s humanity and accordingly the epithet “womb of the censer” was applied to the Virgin (pseudo-Basil, *Hist. mystagog.*, ch. 42, ed. F.E. Brightman, *JThSt* 9 [1908] 388–93). Metaphorically, the tongue of a person praising a martyr could be called a censer (John Chrysostom, *PG* 50:583:39).


**CENSUS RECORD.** See Cadaster.


Youthful and aged centaurs playing musical instruments appear, along with erotes, as images of abandon—often in their traditional role of molesting Lapith women—on numerous caskets and boxes (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, *Elfenbeinskulpt.* I, nos. 21, 24, 26, 27). Purely decoratively, they
adorn the headpieces of 11th- and 12th-C. Gospel books.

P.A.A., A.C.

CENTO (Lat. for "garment made of patchwork," Gr. κέντρων), also Homerozentron (Anth. Gr. 9:381), a pastiche composed of borrowed lines (primarily from Homer). The composition of centos was a sort of literary game aimed at the creation of new associations, often parodical and even obscene. The practice originated in antiquity (both Greek and Roman) and is mentioned by Epiphanius of Salamis. Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Comm. Il. 4:757f) explains that the term was derived from a word designating a young shoot grafted onto another plant and was applied to a cloth of many colors (kentonion as a kind of garment appears in Apophthegmata patrum, PG 65:412D). Latin centos were based on Vergil: in the 4th C. Proba, a noble Roman lady, produced centos "to the glory of Christ." Greek centos were esp. popular in the 5th C.: a certain Leo the Philosopher compiled a 12-line cento on Hero and Leander, another cento on Echo, etc. The empress ATHENAIAS-EUDOKIA tried to use these techniques for religious poetry and composed the Life of Christ in borrowed Homeric hexameters, probably in imitation of Proba. Compilation was not restricted to Homer's verses, however; the CHRESTOS PASCHON is actually a cento, one third of which consists of lines taken from ancient tragedians; a similar technique was used for CATENAE and FLORILEGIA.


A.K.

CENTRAL ASIA, a somewhat vague geographical-historical term, here defined as the extensive region north and east of the Amu Darya (Oxus) River, consisting of the inhospitable steppes of Turkestan and Mongolia that lead to northern China. It was the great domain of the Altaic nomadic peoples and at the same time a part of the great caravan SILK ROUTE between Chinese and Islamic civilization. Here Buddhism, Manichaeanism, Shamanism, and Christianity often followed the great merchant caravans from the southwest to the east. After the great empires of the Gök Turks, the Uighurs, and finally the Kirghiz Turks in Mongolia, they were displaced there by the Mongols in the 10th C. To the west various Turkic groups (at least five identifiable groups) pressed ultimately onto the borders of Islam in Khurasan and Transoxiana. It was here that by the 10th C. they began to convert to Islam and to enter fully into the scene of political chaos and decline in the classical Islamic world. Certainly the most spectacular description of this steppe society is that preserved by the Arab, Ibn Faḍlān, who traversed frigid Turkestan in a great caravan in 922.

Relations with Byzantium. Material objects found in Central Asia indicate that there were (indirect?) connections between the late Roman Empire and this area. Thus in Old Merv was excavated a building, oval in plan, that evidently housed a Christian community (G. Dresvjańska in Trudy Jużno-Turkmeniistanskoi archeologičeskoj kompleksnoj ekspedicii 15 [Ash'habad 1974] 155–81); ampullae of St. Menas produced near Alexandria penetrated into Central Asia (B. Stavskij in Drevnij Vostok 1 [Moscow 1975] 299–307); Roman coins of the 6th C. as well as their imitations and a medallion with the portrait of Justinian I (M. Masson in Obščestvennye nauki v Uzbekistane 16.7 [1972] 29–38) have also been found. One of the routes from the late Roman Empire to China went through Central Asia; in the 6th–7th C. imperial envoys visited it, trying to engage its population in an alliance against IRAN. After the Arab conquest of Iran, Byz. links with Central Asia were severed.


A.K.

CERAMIC ARCHITECTURAL DECORATION. Polychrome ceramic ornament with vitreous glazes was widely used on façades and interior walls as well as on templon screens and icon frames from the late 9th to the 14th C. Though normally set between courses of brick, shallow bowls, plates, and TILES could be inserted at focal points in elaborate brick patterns, around window frames, or even inserted into ashlar blocks. Among pieces specifically made for architectural use (for example, at Tekfur Sarayi) were small tubes, their mouths pinched to form a cross, tapering to a long stem to facilitate bonding in the wall.
CERAMICS. The Greek word κεράμια (pl.) designated all kinds of vessels and pots. John Chrysostom (PG 62:349.28–29) speaks of golden κεράμια; usually, however, the term and related ones referred to earthenware products, both pottery and tiles. Potters were called kerameis; they were evidently professionals, although the Book of the Eparch does not list a potters' guild and in general they are infrequently mentioned in written sources. The word was applied metaphorically to God as demiurge, and Romanos the Melode (Hymns, vol. 4, no. 33.10.6) speaks of "the potter of the world" who washes clean the foot of the clay vessel.

Earthenware dishes were considered of lower quality than golden and silver vessels: Rabbula of Edessa is said to have ordered his clergy to dispose of their silver dishes and replace them with ceramic ones. Byz. pottery was manufactured on potter’s wheels (trochoi) and fired in kilns. The vessels varied in size and shape and were used for transport, storage, cooking, and eating. The principal functional types of Byz. ceramics in the 10th–13th C. were pithoi (usually embedded into the earth) for storage; amphoras for transport and storage; flat-bottomed pots with globular bodies and long-necked jugs usually with one or two handles; chafing dishes—deep bowls set on a ventilated stand with a compartment containing live coals to keep food warm; table dishes—bowls and broad shallow plates; small, usually two-handled cups; stemmed goblets; and flasks (including pilgrim flasks). Vessels ranged from elaborately decorated luxury products of fine clay, well-turned and glazed and painted, to crudely manufactured utilitarian wares.

Ceramics were produced in both towns and villages: the author of the Geoponika (85.20) describes the potter as the most necessary craftsman in the countryside; in 952 the Lavra monastery acquired for three gold coins a potter’s workshop located near the seashore (Lavra 1, no. 4.4); by 982 the Iveron monastery was served by a pottery workshop (? keramarion), also situated by the sea (Ivirl. 1, no. 4.68); Balsamon (PG 137:929C) lists potters’ shops (kerameia) among various agricultural properties. Excavations in Carthage, Cyprus, Asia Minor, and Egypt have revealed many centers of ceramic production in the late antique period; 10th–13th-C. ceramics from Corinth, Athens, and Cherson are relatively well studied, but Anatolian wares are not as well known. Constantinople is considered to have been a great center for the manufacture of pottery; R. Stevenson (in Great Palace, 1st Report 47f) concluded that pottery production in Constantinople declined by the 12th C. (at the end of the 12th C. 70 percent of the finds were ordinary mugs of coarse fabric). Ceramic production in Corinth, however, flourished in the 11th and 12th C.; in temporary decline after the Norman invasion of 1147, it recovered by the end of the 12th C. and prospered in the 13th C.

Ceramics were produced for both local use and export: North African pottery (mostly from Carthage) has been found in many areas, including the Crimea. It is quite plausible that some of the glazed pottery discovered in Cherson was imported from Constantinople (esp. in the 9th and
10th C.) and provincial centers such as Corinth and Thessalonike (in the 11th and 12th C.); after the 12th C. Byzantine exports to Cherson ceased (A. Jakobson, Srednecvovur Chersones [Moscow-Leningrad 1950] 229f).

Byzantine pottery developed in an unbroken tradition from the wares of late antiquity. In the 4th to 6th C. fine pottery was generally covered with red slip and often stamped, sometimes with figural decoration or Christian motifs; African Red Slip Ware (manufactured at Carthage) and Phocaian Ware (Asia Minor) were apparently the most prominent and were imitated at many local kilns. Large storage/transport amphorae were manufactured throughout the empire.

In the course of the 7th C. important changes took place in pottery manufacture and use, as local wares, frequently of inferior quality, took the place of imported wares, while vitreous glazed wares replaced the red-slipped fabrics of late antiquity. Constantinople and its vicinity seem to have been the major source of these new glazed wares. The earliest of these had a monochrome lead glaze (usually yellow or greenish-yellow) applied directly over the fabric, which was either white (producing a light-colored finished product) or reddish-brown (producing a darker color). By the 9th C. at least, some of these vessels were stamped (Impressed Ware), producing a design in low relief on the center of the interior; a shallow bowl on a high foot (so-called “fruit stand”) is a common form of this ware. Another luxury product of the 9th–12th C. was Polychrome Ware, in which designs (usually abstract but occasionally figural) were painted in various colors of glaze on a white fabric.

Beginning in the 11th C. a considerable number of different fine wares were produced, in part to satisfy the desires of the new Byzantine officialdom; most of these were inspired by the techniques and methods of contemporary Islamic pottery: Green and Brown Painted Ware, Slip-Painted Ware, Imitation Luster Ware, Sgraffito Ware, and Incised Ware. Most of these used simple geometric designs, but motifs derived from classical repertoires (e.g., rinceaux and running spirals) were not uncommon and several wares had figural decorations, sometimes people but more commonly fish, animals, and birds. Oriental motifs, esp. pseudo-Kufic, were common on several wares. Most of these fine wares continued into the 13th C. and beyond, as represented by Zeuxippos Ware and so-called Aegean Ware. Otherwise, political fragmentation and greater foreign influence led to a localization of ceramic production. Italian pottery, esp. Proto-Maiolica, came to replace Byzantine wares as the preferred luxury pottery, although locally produced Byzantine pottery continued to be made.

Coarse wares, including cooking ware, jugs, and other kitchen vessels, present a continuous line of development from antiquity to the end of the Byzantine period; most of these were locally produced. Many coarse wares were partially or fully covered with a yellow glaze, giving them a characteristic brown color (usually called Brown Glazed Ware); this was often used for cooking pots and small vessels as well as chafing dishes and was sometimes decorated with molded figures, occasionally of an obscene character. Most of these cannot be precisely dated. In addition to cocciopesto and tiles, clay was also used to produce bricks, lamps, children’s toys, censers, and simple icons with images of saints (J. Ebersolt, Byzantion 6 [1931] 559f).

Despite the pioneering work of D. Talbot Rice and others earlier in the century, the study of Byzantine pottery is still well behind that of other periods in the history of the Mediterranean, in part because of a lack of interest and in part because of the paucity of stratigraphically excavated Byzantine sites necessary to the elucidation of ceramic chronologies. Pottery from critical periods, such as the “dark age” of the 7th–8th C. and the 14th–15th C., is poorly known and little studied. Megaw and Jones (infra) have made an important beginning in the identification of individual wares and their distribution.


CEREMONY (κατάστασις, τάξις). Symbolic gestures, usually public and assembled into rituals,
marked important moments in Byz. life. Ceremony flourished at all social levels, from the Byz. infant’s baptismal liturgy and procession, to the promotion of the patrikios. It was, however, the ceremony that shaped the public life of the emperor, projected his power and legitimacy, and defined his relations to the church, army, senate, and people that concretized the imperial idea in a way essential to Byz. Roman imperial cult contributed to the content of ceremony, which took the Hippodrome, Hagia Sophia, and palaces and monuments of Constantinople as its main theaters. The high officials who stage-managed ceremonies—successively, the magistros, the praepositus assisted by the epi tes katastaseos, the protovestiariates assisted by the primikerios tes aules—relied on specialized treatises to design ceremonial traditional in appearance yet flexible in its details and adhering to the ideal of taxis. Peter Patrikios, the Klerorologion of Philotheos, Deceremonies, and pseudo-Kodinos suggest that ceremonial innovation and recording peaked in the 6th, 9th—10th, and 14th c.

Depending on the period, acclamation, coronation, shield-raising, and anointing inaugurated a reign; a procession, audience, or proskynesis manifested the emperor in the purple and with insignia; he was adored with proskynesis. Profectio and adventus heralded his departure from and return to the capital, while triumphs signaled his victorious return from battle; all allowed or forced Byz. citizens to display their loyalty and patriotism. The pervasive and spectacular propaganda of imperial ceremony captured the Byz. imagination, leaving manifold traces in art and literature, and fascinated foreigners like Liutprand of Cremona.


-M.McC.

Representation in Art. In their representations of these ceremonies the Byz. placed the same emphasis on the majesty of the imperial power. Thus, depictions of historical ceremonial events such as military triumphs, coronations, marriages, official receptions, etc., focus on imperial ideology in preference to fuller historical detail; these images have a specific and limited visual language that conveys the most significant act of the ceremony without reference to time or, in most cases, to place. The ceremonial events were commemorated in wall paintings and mosaics in public places and palace buildings as well as on more private objects such as MSS, ivory plaques, and silver vessels.

The formal or compositional principles are generally the same as those governing the performance of these ceremonies: symmetry, hierarchy, and frontality. These principles are used to focus attention on the emperor and to define the status of others in relation to him. In the images, this system of presentation is made immediately apparent by limiting secondary figures and eliminating the audience, as well as, for example, by marking hierarchy through color or through variations in the sizes of figures.

Little survives of all these representations, particularly of the monumental images. The types of ceremony commonly depicted in Roman art (profectio, adlocutio, largess, etc.), still found in some of the early monuments such as the Arch of Constantine in Rome, do not survive much beyond the Justinianic period. A notable example from the 6th c. is to be found in the mosaics of San Vitale, Ravenna, which show Justinian I and Theodora participating in a liturgical ceremony. Although a specific emperor, Justinian, is shown with a specific bishop, Maximian, the procession remains generic enough to be any liturgical procession requiring the presence of the emperor, such as the later ceremonial entry of the emperor and patriarch into Hagia Sophia on the great feast days.

Another ceremony, which can be inferred from the silver Missorium of Theodosios I (for ill., see plates, display), is the distribution of offices by the emperor, a ceremony that took place in the palace. In this depiction, Theodosios is enthroned in the center under an arch, just as he would have been seated in the palace under the arch of the apse in the throne room. He is flanked by his two co-emperors, who are placed in secondary positions. The emperor hands to an official of much smaller size the diptych listing the duties of his office. Although the emperor is handing out the tablets, his action is hardly noticeable. The emphasis is on his person and his successful rule, implied by the personification of Abundance at the emperor's feet.

In an 11th-c. miniature (Paris, B.N. Coisl. 79, fol.2r—for ill., see Emperor) there is a represen-
tation of an enthroned emperor with his administrators. He is in the center of the composition. Two officials, again much smaller in size, stand on each side. The hierarchy and symmetrical relationship of the figures to each other express the ceremonial configurations of official meetings of the emperor. The figure standing on the emperor's right side and closest to him wears fancier dress than others in attendance; the fact, too, that his hands are not covered, as are those of the others, is a sign of his more privileged position vis-à-vis the emperor.

These representations, although based on court protocol, are removed from the specificity of one historical moment. This has been achieved in different ways: sometimes, as in the Missorium, through the addition of another, allegorical dimension; sometimes through the lack of any reference to a spatial setting, as in the miniature. The presence of Christ in such images works in a similar way. In the representation of Romanos (IV?) and Eudokia on an ivory plaque in Paris in the Cabinet des Médailles, for example, Christ is crowning the imperial couple. It is not clear from the composition alone if this is a depiction of their wedding, coronation, both, or of the idea of investiture. It appears that such representations were meant to be more encompassing by containing all three and possibly even more readings, and did not limit their meaning or message to one historical moment.

Another such example is the representation of Basil II in a Venice psalter MS. The image shows Basil in military dress being presented with a crown by Christ and a lance by an angel. His defeated enemies are at his feet. This scene may have been created after a particular military triumph. The accompanying poem, however, does not mention a specific victory, instead stressing Basil's triumphant divine rule and power.

A second category of depictions of ceremonies is found within a narrative context. These images show events from the past rather than contemporary times. They are found in MSS like the Menologion of Basil II or the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes. In the Menologion the painters depict ecclesiastical ceremonies in which the emperor is participating; in the Skylitzes they illustrate imperial ceremonies described in the Chronicle. The compositions of these representations are also different. The narrative moves from left to right like a written text and does not follow the compositional principles outlined above. For example, in the Menologion on 26 Jan., a day commemorating an earthquake, the patriarch and the emperor, accompanied by clergy and citizens carrying candles, walk through the city in a penitential procession. The barefooted and simply dressed emperor, the candles, and the censer refer to a specific ceremony that must have taken place on that day. The depiction of the translation of the relics of John Chrysostom is another such example. Theodosios II and Patr. Proklos, who holds a candle and the Gospels, are shown receiving the body in front of the Church of the Holy Apostles. A representation of a similar event, the translation of the relics of St. Stephen on the ivory plaque in Trier, shows Theodosios II at the head of the procession and Pulcheria receiving them in front of the newly built church.

In the Madrid Skylitzes a number of ceremonies are depicted: receptions of ambassadors, baptisms, coronations, marriages, proclamations of emperors, and triumphal processions. Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzés, no.368, for example, shows the triumphal entry of Nikephoros II Phokas on horseback into Constantinople. A large group of musicians playing cymbals and trumpets is welcoming him. The ceremony of shield-raising is represented twice. These are the only two illustrations of this ceremony in Byz. art that represent Byz. historical figures; all others show Old Testament kings. Leo Tornikios (ibid., no.561) is proclaimed emperor by his rebel supporters, an event that we know took place as depicted. Another page (ibid., no.2) shows Michael I and Leo V raised together on the shield, with Michael placing his hand on the head of Leo, whom he has chosen as co-emperor. This depiction is not historically correct, since the coronation and raising on the shield never occurred simultaneously, but was presumably chosen to emphasize the new order of imperial rule.


ČERNJACHOVO, the name of a culture in the Ukraine (2nd C. A.D.–ca.400), known from ar-
archaeological excavations, first discovered and studied in 1899. The designation is derived from the agricultural settlement excavated in the village of Černjachiv (Kaharlyk region, Kiev district) on the middle South Bug River. This culture was spread over an area extending in a north-south direction from the sources of the Dniester and South Bug to the Danube delta (including Moldavia) and the Dnieper estuary. To the north it extended along a line that went from the upper West Bug (a tributary of the Vistula), across the region that later became Kiev, to the upper Sivers'kyj Donec', and traversed the Dnieper river bend, but it did not reach the Crimea.

The Černjachovo settlements, of which over 2,500 are known at present, are scattered along the rivers. Two groups are distinguishable, the larger settlements (2–3 km long, covering 35–45 hectares), and the smaller ones (300–400 m long, covering 3–4 hectares); in both groups semisubterranean dwellings coexist with subterranean. More than 350 burial grounds have been excavated, showing evidence of mixed burial rites, though inhumation seems to have prevailed. Characteristic is the production of gray and black pottery of high quality, iron tools, and metal ornaments; amphorae, terra sigillata, small lamps, buckles, and coins were exported to the Romans.

By A.D. 400 life in all Černjachovo settlements came to an abrupt end, which scholars at present connect with the Hunnic invasion. Animated debate still continues concerning the ethnic composition of the Černjachovo culture. The Slavic hypothesis (until recently highly favored) is gradually being abandoned. There is good reason to identify some bearers of this culture with the Ostrogoths in the Ukrainian "Mesopotamia" (Gothic Osium) described by Jordanes.


ČERNOMEN, BATTLE OF. See Marica, Battle of.

CEYLON (Σαρκαδών, mod. Sri Lanka), called Sinhala by its inhabitants during the Middle Ages. Archaeological investigations of the island have not been extensive and are of limited value; some hoards of 5th–6th-C. Byz. bronze coins and imitations have been found. Kosmas Indikopleustes, who describes the island's location correctly as being east of southern India, claims that Byz. merchants traded there and that a Christian community lived on the island. Its noteworthy export was the hyakinthos, a blue gem, perhaps the sapphire. Ceylon may have been involved in the spice trade and perhaps served as a clearinghouse for products from Southeast Asia. Byz. merchants participated in the trade directly, but not exclusively: Axumite, South Arabian, and South Asian ships are also known to have sailed to and from Ceylon. The preferred transit points inside the Byz. Empire were the Red Sea ports, esp. Klyisma. Partly to protect the Red Sea shipping lanes from Persian interference, Justin I forged an alliance with Axum. The Persian occupation of South Arabia in 599 and the subsequent conquest of the Red Sea littoral by the Arabs effectively closed this route to direct participation in Far East trade by Byz. merchants.


CHAIRS. See Furniture.

CHALCEDON (Χαλκηδών, now Kadiköy), city of Bithynia, located directly across the Bosporos from Constantinople. Chalcedon was permanently overshadowed by the nearby capital, but it did benefit in the 4th and 5th C. from the generosity of imperial dignitaries who enlarged its harbor and built palaces and churches in the vicinity. Chalcedon was taken by the Persians in 615 and 626 and by the Arabs during their attacks on Constantinople. It was the main camp for the First, Second, and Fourth Crusades before their further advances. Chalcedon fell to the Ottomans in 1350.

The Byz. remains of Chalcedon have disappeared: they consisted of a palace, a hippodrome, and numerous churches. Most notable was that of St. Euphemia, built outside the walls in the 4th C. and seat of the Council of 451 (see Chalcedon, Council of). It contained the circular domed shrine of the saint, from whose tomb was said to issue a miraculous flow of blood, and was decorated with paintings showing scenes from her life.
It was destroyed by the Persians. The suburbs of Chalcedon contained the important monastic centers of Roupheinianai and Mt. Auxentios. Originally a suffragan bishopric of Nikomedea, Chalcedon became an independent metropolis in 451.

**CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF**, the fourth ecumenical council, held in the Church of St. Euphemia of Chalcedon (8–31 Oct. 451). About 350 bishops attended its sessions, primarily those from the East. The leading roles at the council were played by the representatives of the imperial couple (Marcian and Pulcheria) as well as Paschinas, the legate of Pope Leo I, to whom the Egyptian bishops stood in opposition. The council intended to answer the Christological question raised by Eutyches after the Council of Ephesus (431). Chalcedon defined Christ’s two natures as inviolably united without confusion, division, separation, or change, in one person or hypostasis. This negative formula, distinguishing precisely between nature and person, was clearly aimed at the teaching of Nestorios and Eutyches. Doctrinally, it rejected neither the Council of 431 at Ephesus nor Cyril of Alexandria. Still, the definition acknowledging Christ “in two natures”—grounded on the Nicene faith, Cyril, and the Tome of Pope Leo I—was viewed by Egypt as a betrayal of strict Cyrillian Christology. This conviction, along with the council’s condemnation of Dioskoros and Eutyches and cancellation of the “Robber” Council of Ephesus of 449 (see under Ephesus, Councils of)—decisive blows to Alexandria’s ecclesiastical and theological hegemony—were to cause the Monophysite schism.

Chalcedon also granted patriarchal status to Constantinople by enlarging its territorial jurisdiction to include the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace and by confirming its existing honorary primacy after Rome (canon 28). Constantinople also received the right to hear appeals from regional metropolitans (canons 9, 17) and to consecrate the metropolitans of the three dioceses under its jurisdiction. Finally, because monasticism had become a serious urban problem by expanding into the cities, it was decided (for the first time in the history of Christian asceticism) to bring every monastery under the direct jurisdiction of its local bishop (canon 4).

**CHALDEAN ORACLES** (Χαλδαικά λόγια), a work that has been lost and is now known only in fragments, written in bad hexameters. The oracles purport to be revelations from the gods. The Souda ascribes the authorship of the oracles to two Julians—the father, surnamed the Chaldean, and his son “the Theurge,” who allegedly were active at the end of the 2nd C. The philosophical system of the Chaldean Oracles is dualistic, contrasting the world of the Intelligibles with evil Matter. The Chaldean deity is triune: it comprises the Paternal Intellect, an impenetrable monad; the Second Intellect, dyadic, since it unites the physical world created by it with the intelligible monad; and the Cosmic Soul that is identified as Hekate of Greek mythology. The human mind, a spark of the divine Intellect, must “empty” itself, that is, purge itself of evil Matter, in order to ascend to the god.


**CHALDIA** (Χαλδία), a theme of northeastern Asia Minor. It appears as a tourma of the Armeniae ca. 800, then as a separate ducatus in 824 and as a theme by ca. 840. Its status at that time is unclear: strategoi are known from the 9th–11th C., and doukes from the 8th to 10th (Oikonomides, Listes 349, 354). According to Arab geographers, Chaldia had an army of 10,000 and
six fortresses; its strategos had a salary of 10 pounds of gold and an equivalent amount from the local kommerkion. Chaldia comprised the eastern part of Pontos with the interior valleys; its capital was Trebizond. Its strategic but remote location gave it importance for trade and the military—it was a base of support for Thomas the Slav, but was virtually independent under the Gabrades in 1075–1140. As part of the empire of Trebizond, Chaldia denoted a more restricted area south of the watershed of the Pontic mountains, astride the major routes to the interior. Chaldia was dominated by local families and only loosely controlled by Trebizond. Its defensible location enabled Chaldia to maintain its independence until 1479. The area is rich in remains of Byz. churches and fortresses, among them the oldest church in the Pontos, at Leri (probably 6th C.).


-C.F.

CHALICE (ποτήριον), a liturgical vessel for holding the wine of the Eucharist, which in the so-called church history ascribed to Patr. Germanos I (ed. N. Borgia ch.39, p.31.17–29) is compared with the vessel used to collect Christ’s blood at the Crucifixion and the crater used at the Last Supper. Attested from at least the 4th C., the earliest form of the chalice is uncertain: the 4th-C. Durobrivae Treasure has two types of cup: one with two handles and resting on a foot and two others without feet. Silver chalices surviving from the 6th C. onward have a large cup on a flared foot usually with a knob; occasionally they have two handles. The cup usually has a dedicatory inscription around the rim and sometimes figural decoration below. Although elaborate chalices of gold, or studded with or carved from precious stones, are known from literary sources of the 4th–7th C., none survives. The chalice often forms a set with the paten (diskopotermion) in written sources.

Many important post-9th-C. chalices continue to have a tall, flared foot with a knob; others are made with a low foot and a pair of handles (krateres). Elaborate examples incorporate cups of semiprecious stone, rock crystal, or glass, mounted in gilded silver, occasionally with repoussé decoration (MM 2:566.19). Some display a Deesis composition (Pantel., no.7.13), others crosses and stars (P. Gautier, REB 39 [1981] 91.1209; REB 45 [1985] 155-103). Ordinary chalices were of beaten bronze, usually tinned. A 14th-C. chalice with monograms of Manuel Kantakouzenos consists of a cup of jasper mounted in gilded silver but lacks the enamels, stones, and pearls of earlier examples (Bréhier, Sculpture, pl.LXXI).


-M.M.M., L.Ph.B.

CHALKE (Χαλκή), main entrance vestibule of the Great Palace of Constantinople, so named either for the gilded bronze tiles of its roof or for its bronze portals. The earliest attested building was put up by the architect Aitherios under Anastasios I (AnthGr 9:656). Burned down in the
NIKA REVOLT, it was rebuilt by Justinian I as a rectangular structure with four engaged piers supporting a central dome. The ceiling was decorated with mosaics representing the emperor’s victories over the Goths and Vandals, with the imperial couple surrounded by a cortège of senators placed in the center (Prokopios, Buildings 1.10.12–19). The Chalke or its dependencies became a prison in the 7th–8th C. Basil I repaired the building and turned it into a law court (TheophCont 259f).

On the façade of the Chalke, above the main door, was an icon of Christ Chalkites, shown standing full-length on a footstool. Its origins are obscure. Its removal by Leo III in 726 or 730 was the first public act of imperial ICONoclASM. Restored by Irene ca.787, it was once again removed by Leo V and replaced by a cross. Soon after 843 the icon, in mosaic, was set up again by the painter Lazaros.

When the palace was enclosed by a less extensive circuit wall by Nikephoros II Phokas, the Chalke lost its importance as a vestibule. A small chapel dedicated to Christ Chalkites, built next to it by Romanos I, was reconstructed on a larger scale by John I Tzimiskes, who endowed it with relics and was himself buried there. The chapel, situated on an elevated platform, survived until 1804. Drawings and plans of the 18th C. help to place the chapel about 100 m south of the southeast corner of Hagia Sophia. The Chalke itself, robbed of its bronze doors by Isaac II, is not mentioned after 1200.


CHALKE, ISLAND OF. See PRINCES’ ISLANDS.

CHALKIDIKE (Χαλκιδική), peninsula in the northwestern Aegean, terminating to the south with the three promontories of (west to east) Kas­sandra (Pallene), Longos, and Athos. The area is among the best known from the Byz world because of the surviving documents from the monasteries of Mt. Athos (see ATHO, ACTS of), which owned many of the villages in the peninsula. The territory is hilly and wooded with a moderate climate suitable for growing grapes, grain, and fruit trees. Excavation at various sites has revealed a period of prosperity during late antiquity, followed by violent destruction in the 7th C. (e.g., O. Alexandre, ArchDelt 29.2 [1973–74] 674–77). Part of the theme of THessalonike, the Chalkidike was divided into several katepanates; there were cities at OLYNTHOS, KASSANDREA, and HIERISSOS. The CATALAN GRAND COMPANY ravaged the Chalkidike in 1307–09; excavation near Torone may show destruction from this period (N. Niko­nanos, ArchDelt 29.2 [1973–74] 770f, 776).


—T.E.G.

CHALKIS (Χάλκης). Several cities in the ancient and medieval Mediterranean world bore this name, most notably two cities in Syria and Greece.

CHALKIS AD BELUM (Syr. Qenensrin, Ar. Qinнasrīn), a city in northern SYRIA I, lying in a fertile plain surrounded by the limestone massif of Belus. It should be distinguished from the monastery of Qenneshre at EUROPOS. A caravan stop on roads from ANTIOCH and BERROIA, Chalkis was also strategically situated as part of the TIMES to which it gave its name. After Chosroes I extorted 200 pounds of gold from Chalkis in 540 (Prok­pios, Wars 2.12.1–5), Justinian I had its city walls rebuilt (Prokopios, Buildings 2.11.8–9) in 550 by ISIDORE THE YOUNGER, as confirmed by two extant inscriptions (IGSyR 2, nos. 348–49). Nearby, in 554, the Ghassānids won a decisive victory over the Lakhmid ALAMUNDURUS. Chalkis was under Persian rule ca.608/9–28 and taken by the Arabs in 636–37 after an unsuccessful resistance (Don­ner, Conquests 149f). The Umayyads made Chalkis a military headquarters and capital of the district (jund) of Qinnasrin. Chalkis was attacked and sacked by the Byz. in 966, 998, and 1030. It never recovered from Seljuk destruction at the end of the 11th C., after which it served merely as an arsenal and caravansary. Today Chalkis is in ruins. Chalkis ad Belum should be distinguished from Chalkis under Lebanon (now Anjar in Lebanon), a Hellénistic settlement that did not become a Roman or Byz. city.


—M.M.M.
CHALKIS IN GREECE, city founded in antiquity on the west coast of Euboea, where the island comes closest to the mainland. In the 6th C. a movable bridge (zeugma) linked the shores of the strait of Euripos (Prokopios, Buildings 4.3.18–19). Termed a city in the Synedra of Hierokles (Hierokl. 645.6), it reappears in Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 5.13–14, ed. Pertusi 90) as an island, and as an alternative name for Euboea. The name Chalkis, however, was preserved in the ecclesiastical hierarchy at least to the 9th C.; a seal of a droungarios of Chalkis also survives (Zacos, Seals 1, no.2587). It was assumed (e.g., by J. Koder in TIB) that the name of Chalkis was replaced by that of Euripos and of Chirios/Chrepos; the latter identification was rejected by Svoronos (Cadastre 72, n.2); the bishop of Euripos appears in notitiaia along with the bishop of Chalkis. It is not impossible that the settlement of Euripos was founded in the 9th C., after Chalkis had lost its urban character.

The kastron of Euripos was attacked by the Arabs in the 870s (TheophCont 298.8–12); when Skylitzes relates this episode he calls Euripos a polis (Skyl. 151.32). A bishop of Euripos participated in the council of 869/70. An inscription of the protospatharios Theophylaktos of the end of the 9th C. mentions the restoration of a road from Chalkis (E. Oberhummer, RE 3 [1899] 2086). In the 12th C. Euripos had a Venetian trading colony and a large Jewish population. At the beginning of the 13th C. a phourion was built there to defend the straits (Nik.Cron. 610.92). Euripos was attacked by a Venetian fleet in 1171 and seized by Venice in 1209. In the 13th–14th C. the city of Chalkis, which was called Negroponte by the Westerners, was the object of various attacks: by knights from Achaia in 1257/8, by Catalans in 1317, by Turks in 1350/1. The Turks took the city in 1470.

A figural floor mosaic found in the city is dated to the 5th C. The Church of St. Paraskeve, originally dedicated to the Virgin, is a wooden-roofed three-aisled basilica. Probably constructed in the 5th C., it was rebuilt in the 12th C. and connected with a monastery of the Virgin (Th. Theocharis, Archeion Euboikon Meleton 7 [1960] 1–23; D. Triantaphyllopoulos, ibid. 16 [1970] 186–91). It was one of the major churches of the Frankish period. The surviving fortifications of the city and the bridge-fortress are Venetian in date; although they presumably have Byz. antecedents, all trace of these has vanished.

—T.E.G.

CHALKOKONDYLES, LAONIKOS, historian; born Athens ca.1423 or 1430, died ca.1490. Little is known of the life of Chalkokondyles (Χαλκοκονδύλης); his father George fled to the Morea in 1435 after an unsuccessful coup attempt against the Acciajuoli. In 1447 Chalkokondyles was a student of PLETHON at the court of Mistra. He evidently spent his life somewhere in the Aegean region.

His history in ten books was written in the 1480s and covers the period 1298–1463. His purpose was to show "the downfall of the great empire of the Hellenes" and the growing power of the Turks; his emphasis on the rise of the Ottoman Empire is unusual for a Byz. historian. He had direct access to Turkish sources (e.g., the secretaries of the sultan) and provides some important information on early Ottoman institutions (S. Vryonis, International Journal of Middle East Studies 7 [1976] 423–32). For Chalkokondyles the basileus is the Turkish sultan; the Byz. emperor is designated as "basileus Hellenon." His account of the Byz.-Ottoman conflict is clearly modeled on the confrontation of Greeks and Persians described by Herodotus. The work also owes much to Thucydides in its use of direct speeches and Attic vocabulary. Chalkokondyles inserted lengthy excurses on various peoples and countries, notably the Muslims, Germans, Russians, South Slavs, and Spaniards. Chalkokondyles had a superstitious belief in omens and oracles and recognized Tyche as a force affecting historical events (C.J.G. Turner, BZ 57 [1964] 358–61). The weakest aspect of his history is the relative lack of chronological data.


—A.M.T.

CHALKOPRATEIA (Χαλκοπρατεία, lit. "Copper Market"), quarter of Constantinople, west of
HAGIA SOPHIA. It is said to have been originally inhabited by Jews, who had a synagogue there; these were allegedly expelled by Theodosios II and the synagogue replaced by a Church of the Theotokos, which is variously attributed to Empress Pulcheria or to Verina. The church, of basilical form, was repaired by Justin II and Basil I. Among its relics were the Virgin's girdle (zone), housed in a special chapel (soros), and a miraculous image of Christ Antiphonetes. The apse and parts of the north and south walls of the church are preserved, as is the undercroft of an octagonal structure north of the atrium.


CHANCEL BARRIER. See Templon.

CHANCERY. Officials in Byz. corresponded either personally or by using an official scribe (notarios and, after the 12th C., grammatikoi). One can speak of organized chanceries—i.e., bodies of secretaries, scribes, and other officials responsible for correspondence—only when dealing with the large central administrations of the emperor and the patriarch, and, possibly, the semi-independent despotai (which are very poorly known). Private deeds could be made legally by anyone who could write. There were also the specialized notaries, laymen or ecclesiastics. Formularies were often used for drafting all kinds of documents.

Imperial Chancery. Constantine I the Great created the corps of secretaries (schola notarius) under the command of a primikerios. Some notarii, called referendarii, were attached to the emperor's private service; in the 5th C. appeared the upper category of confidential notarii, the asekretis, who replaced the referendarii before the end of the 6th C. The role of the quaestor was important. Reports of individuals were examined and eventually answered by the four scrinia (memoriae, epistolarium, epistolarium graecarum, libellorum).

From the 8th C. onward, the chancery was directed by the protasekretis. Assisted by the asekretis, some imperial notarii, and the dekanos (?), he was responsible for the final drafting and preparation of original imperial acts (the draft was undoubtedly prepared by the office competent in the matter). The verification of the contents (recognitio) of the documents seems to have been the work of the kanikleios, who also probably added in some documents the words traditionally written in purple (except for the emperor's autograph subscription). Drafting imperial documents also required the help of other officials, esp. those with judicial competence: the quaestor (laws), the epitotheon, the mystikos, the mystagogos.

Some time after 1106 the protasekretis abandoned the chancery. It was then manned by grammaticoi and later (13th C.) by imperial notarii (who sometimes also acted as taboullarii) and translators (diemeneutai), mostly of Latin. The direction of the chancery, esp. as far as foreign relations were concerned, fell to the logothetes tou dromou and his protonotarios, and, in the 13th C., to the megas logothetes, while the protonotarios remained at the head of the notarioi or grammaticoi and controlled the everyday functions of the chancery. The real chancellor, with extended powers, was now and until 1453 the mesazon, the "intermediary" between the emperor and all the others.

Patriarchal Chancery. Initially placed under the guidance of the primikerios of the notarii, who was an archdeacon, this chancery and its activities in time were related to the office of the chartophylax, who was seen as the mesazon of the patriarch. The primikerios would draft the documents, register and authenticate outgoing acts as well as the minutes of the synod, issue certified copies or duplicate originals, and cancel previous documents. In his secretarial functions, he was in competition with the protonotarios, who became the head of the chancery. Also having direct access to the patriarch, the protonotarios, among others, added to outgoing patriarchal acts some secret authenticity marks. The primikerios remained the simple dean of the patriarchal notarii. Other important personnel, attested from the 10th C. onward, included the hypomnematomatographos, who assisted the chartophylax, and the hieromnemon, responsible for ordinations. Some secrets and procedures of the 14th C. patriarchal chancery are described in the Ekthesis Nea. Certain patriarchal documents were approved by the synod and
were thus qualified as synodikon (gramma, se-
meion, etc.).

LIT. Dölger-Karayannopulos, Urkundenlehre 57–67. Oi-
konomides, “Chancellerie” 168–73. Oikonomides, “Chan-
cery” 310–13. Darrouzes, Officia 296–525. Falkenhausen-

CHANDAX (Χάνδαξ, from Arabic al-Khandaq “moat,” via Candica to Candia, which became the name of the whole island of Crete), mod. Hera-
kleion on the north central coast of Crete. Founded by Andalusian Muslims under Abū Hafs ca. 827 on a site identified for the conquerors by a Christian monk (Genes. 33.11–17), Chandax replaced the nearby ancient settlement at Knossos, which had prospered through the 7th C. It was the base from which the Arabs completed their conquest of Crete; its walls were famous for their size and strength (e.g., Leo Diaconus 11.4–10). Nikephoros II Phokas besieged the city (shown in the Madrid Skylitzes), which capitulated on 7 Mar. 961; thereafter the Byz. recovered all of Crete. The emperor built a new fortress called Temenos near the Arab citadel, although the Arab walls continued in use (N. Platon, KretChron 6 [1952] 439–59). After the Fourth Crusade Chandax was first assigned to Boniface of Montferrat, but it quickly passed to Venice, which held it until 1669.

The bishop of Knossos continued to be recorded in the episcopal lists instead of Chandax (e.g., Notitiae CP 3.241, 10.467); the bishop of Chandax, separate from that of Knossos, is attested only in the 12th C. (13.484). In an act of 1206 (MM 6:151.17) the bishopric bears the double name “Knossos or Chandax.”

Aside from the fortifications, there are no Byz. remains at Chandax. The Church of St. Titos, originally of Byz. date, was destroyed in an earth-
quake.


CHANSON D’ANTIOCHE, Old French Cru-
sader epic on the conquest and defense of Antioch (1098). It is generally believed to have been composed by Richard le Pèlerin, a participant in the First Crusade, and has survived only in the exten-
sively revised form established before ca. 1177–81 by one Graindor d’Arras as part of a larger Cru-
sader epic cycle. A few scholars maintain that Richard, Graindor, and the early version are merely literary fictions; that Graindor was patron, not author of the work. Others have detected apparent traces of its use in contemporary Latin histo-
rians, for example, Albert of Aachen, Raymond of Aguilera, or Fulcher of Chartres. The Chanson treats Byz. directly and in some detail only during the Crusaders’ stay at Constantinople (vol. 1, pp. 56–67) and the siege of Nicaea (vol. 1, pp. 67–112).


LIT. C. Cahen, “Le premier cycle de la croisade (Antioche-

CHANT (ψαλμοθεία), the general term for litur-
gical music similar to plainsong, that is, monophonic, unaccompanied, and in free rhythm. Al-
though the language of the Byz. church was Greek, Byz. chant was not a continuation of ancient Greek music, but constituted a new departure based to some extent on Eastern models. The Byz. system of modes differs sharply from that of the ancient tonoi, but is quite similar to that of the medieval Western church.

Byz. chant differs from Western, however, in its textual basis. Whereas psalmic and other scrip-
tural texts prevail in Latin chant, the texts of Byz. chant are mostly nonscriptural, although often modeled after the psalms or cantries. Most are hymns, written in metrical arrangements that often employ an isosyllabic principle. Furthermore, in the Byz. tradition, unlike the Western, music for the liturgical HOURS is more important than that for the Eucharistic liturgy.

Chants in the early period were largely syllabic and were meant to be sung by the entire congrega-
tion. After ca. 850 the repertory was enriched by florid, melismatic chants (having more than one note per syllable) written for professional choirs.


CHAPEL, in Byz. terminology usually eu-
kterion, any space equipped with a consecrated altar table
and used for the celebration of the mass. A chapel is normally located within a larger complex to which it is related functionally, that is, as a palace church or a parekklesion (generally within a monastic compound). Chapels are usually small-scale, though this is not always a distinguishing criterion. Chapels accompanying larger churches appear in the earliest Christian monumental architecture and remain a common ingredient throughout Byzantine church architecture. Chapels vary considerably according to their function (burial, commemoration, private worship), their relative position (ground-level or elevated; accessible from the narthex, naos, or sanctuary), their plans (rectangular, polygonal, trefoil, quatrefoil, cruciform, cross-in-square), and their structural makeup (roofed in wood, barrel- or groin-vaulted, domed). When physically connected to a larger church, chapels become important ingredients in articulating new church plan types.


-SC, W.L.

**CHAPTERS (κεφαλαία)**, collections of sayings (aphorisms), usually combined in centuria that contained about 100 aphorisms each, although collections of 150 chapters are also known (as in Palamas). The genre of chapters existed throughout the entire Byzantine period, the last example being compiled by a certain Kallistos Kataphrygiotes ca.1400. Some centuria were written by well-known theologians such as Maximos the Confessor, Symeon the Theologian, Niketas Stethatos, and Gregory Palamas; other authors of chapters (John of Karpathos, Elias Ekdikos) are less famous. Unlike florilegia, chapters are the works of individuals; they often reflect not only traditional wisdom but also personal views. We do not know how they were created—whether as a spiritual testament or as part of an educational process. The aphorisms are assembled thematically, the topics being sometimes more general as, for example, the theological, "gnostic," and practical chapters of Symeon the Theologian, or more or less specific, such as On Being Unborn by John of Karpathos or On the Unity with God and On Contemplative Life by Kataphrygiotes.

- A.K.

**CHARAGE (χαραγή)**, term designating minting, in both narrative texts (Theoph. 365.15–16; An.Komm. 3:136.22, 137.9) and documents (Pantel., no.2.12–13, a. 1039/3). This meaning was preserved in Trebizond in the 14th–15th C. (Dionys., nos. 4:53, 27:20), as well as in a forged chrysobull of Romanos I (Xerop., no.B42); a post-Byzantine charter of donation of 1471 applies the term to "florins" (Lavra 5, no.173.21). A more complicated case is Manuel I's chrysobull of 1153 (Reg. 2, no.1390) in which charagai (pl.) are not "minting" but rather a sort of obligation: the legislator speaks of various tax alleviations—klasmata, sympatheiai, "humble" stichoai, and "stichoi liable to charagai." Svoronos (Cadastre 111) identifies charage with charagma and thinks that the tax in this case was calculated in gold coins. The archon tes charages is mentioned in the Kleitorologion of Philotheos as a functionary of the vestiarion, which led Dölger (Beiträge 28) to conclude that the vestiarion dealt not only with goods but also with minting money. The precise duties of the archon tes charages are not defined.


- A.K.

**CHARAGMA (χάραγμα)** initially meant the operation of a mint, then the coined money, then the gold nomisma seen as a real coin and not as an accounting unit. In fiscal context, the term was used to specify that whenever the tax (kanon plus some parakolouthemata) owed by a taxpayer amounted to a fraction of a nomisma (2/3 or more), he was obliged to give a (hard to come by) gold coin and receive his due change in silver or copper. In the early 12th C. and in a context of monetary instability, Alexios I's fiscal reform transformed the charagma into a means of establishing the real amount of the tax, calculated on the basis of the kanon. The word survives in documents until the end of the empire with a less clear meaning, indicating perhaps a secondary tax, or a tax on a special category of lands, or a term indicating the coinage in which part of the tax was paid.


-N.O.
CHARIDEMOS (Χαριδημός), also called Peri kal-
lous (On Beauty), a dialogue preserved under
the name of LUCIAN in several MSS of the 14th–15th
C. It consists of a conversation between two friends
taking a stroll in the suburbs of Athens, during
which Charidemos reports on three speeches
praising beauty; the first two were delivered by
men whose names are reminiscent of earlier phi-
losophers, PHILO and Aristippos (a companion of
Socrates), the third by Charidemos. The work
borrows extensively from the Helena of Isocrates,
but the material is rearranged. Unlike pseudo-
Lucian's TIMARION and PHILOPATRIS, the Char-
demos does not contain contemporary allusions
and polemics, unless we read in this way Aristipp-
pos's emphasis on the dangers caused by the beauty
of Helena and Hippodameia; the themes are pri-
marily mythological and philosophical.

The date of composition is impossible to estab-
lish. Although the dialogue was traditionally dated
to the 3rd C., Anastasi (infra, p.11) relocates it to
"a much later time" on the very shaky basis of the
similarity between the mythological tradition in the
Charidemos and inTZETZES. Anastasi evidently
intended thereby to propose a date in the Kom-
enian or Palaiologan period, but Hunger (Lit.
2:149 and n.178) erroneously inferred that the
editor dated Charidemos to the period of the "Ma-
cedonian Renaissance."

ED. Lucian, ed. M.D. Macleod, vol. 8 (Cambridge, Mass.–
London 1967) 467–509, with Eng. tr., Incerti auctoris Char-
demos, ed. R. Anastasi (Bologna 1971), with Ital. tr.
Lit. R. Anastasi, "Appunti sul Charidemus," SicGymn 18
(1993) 259–89.

CHARIOTEERS (sing. auriga, ἡρίοχος; later
φακτιονάριος, μικροπανής), popular profes-
sional racing drivers who competed in chariot
races for the victory of their factions, usually in
light, four-horse chariots. Charioteers enjoyed
good geographic mobility, sometimes changed factional
loyalties, and bore frequently recurring stage names
that are well attested in circus curse tablets (defixi-
ones) intended to jinx opponents. Their career
began in their teens and sometimes lasted 30 years
or more. In the 6th C., the heyday of the circus,
statues to champions were raised in the Hip-
podrome and their portraits adorned the KATHISMA;
in the provinces their renown is recorded in floor
mosaics sometimes bearing a driver's name (K.M.D.
Dunbabin, A/ A 86 [1982] 65–89). Epigrams con-
cerning these monuments survive in the GREEK
ANTHOLOGY.

Despite their popularity, early charioteers had
a low social status. After the 7th C., charioteering
seems to have been confined to Constantinople
and its environs. Phaktiomerios (usually interpreted
as charioteers of the Blues or Greens), heniochoi,
and mikropamitai (those of the Reds or Whites)
were integrated into the imperial precedence hier-
archy, since they appear in the Kletorologion of
Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes, p.161.3, 8, 14; cf.
p.125.5) and this presumably denotes an en-
hanced social status. DE CEREMONIIS (bk.1, ch.69,
ed. Vogt 2:131–42) describes several circus cere-
monies and procedures involving charioteers.
Theophilos and Michael III as well as ranking
members of their courts are themselves reported
to have raced as charioteers.

LIT. Koukoulos, Bitos 3:32–40. Al. Cameron, Porphyrus
the Chario(e) (Oxford 1973).

M.McC., A.C.

CHARIOT MOUNTS AND HORSE FITTINGS.

Bronze chariot mounts, formed of an orna-
mented double ring mounted on a socket, have
been described as rein guides or "shock absorber"
supports; several examples attributed to the 4th
C. have been found in Thrace, Pannonia, and
Spain (Age of Spirit., no.331). Some chariot orna-
ments of 6th-C. provincial governors (Theoph.
244.28–29) were covered with gold leaf.

Horse fittings, known from Byz. representa-
tions in various media (e.g., 4th–8th C.—Age of
Spirit., nos. 28, 41, 44, 80–81; 8th–11th C.—J.
figs. 73, 126; 14th C.—Lazarov, Storia, fig.494),
include bridle, collar, saddle, and stirrups as well
as decorative pendants in the form of small BILLS
and phalera (medallions and crescents, originally
indicating military distinction), attached to leather
straps or to a wood or leather saddle. Imported
Byz. silver horse fittings (4th–5th C.) found with
skeletons of horses in tombs at Qustul in Nubia
include three complete bridles featuring lion-
headed medallions, saddle pommels, and trapp-
ings composed of disks and pendants (Emery,
infra, pls. 26–31). Similar trappings are in the
4th-C. Esquiline Treasure from Rome (Shelton,
Esquiline 89–91). Other horse fittings, esp. in
bronze, have been found, for example, in the CONCEȘTI TREASURE, and three 4th-C. nosepieces,
incised with various scenes, originate from Italy (Age of Spirit., nos. 195, 215; Byzantinische Kostbarkeiten aus Museen, Kirchenschützen und Bibliotheken der DDR [Berlin 1977], no.92).


CHARIOT RACES (ἱπποδρομία, θέατρια ιππικα, τὰ ιππικά). Roman-style chariot racing was Byz.‘s most popular spectator sport from the 4th to the 7th C. Held at Hippodromes, races were divided into morning and afternoon sessions. Four teams of four horses competed. A charioteer, sporting the color of his faction (Blue, Green, White, or Red), drove each team. Women and religious were discouraged from attending.

The considerable expense of mounting chariot races may have been borne by the city in the 4th C. As circuses spread through the empire, perhaps along with Roman municipal institutions, the imperial treasury seems to have provided increasing support; this reflected general economic conditions and growing connections between the emperor and the circus, as the ideology of military victory came to pervade and fuse with the notion of sporting victory. Annual races commemorated imperial accessions, visits, and victories. Special races attracted large audiences for ceremonies connected with emperors’ coronations, marriages, and triumphs. The races sometimes exploded into riots, such as the Nika Revolt of 532 and others that shook Byz. cities and the throne into the 7th C.

After the 7th C., chariot races disappeared except in Constantinople; they survived there in diminished form as a traditional and indispensable prop of the monarchy, which continued to use them to celebrate important political events. Whereas the 4th- and 5th-C. state calendars of Philocalus (see Calendar of 354) and Polemius Silvius reveal as many as 66 annual racing holidays, each often comprising 24 daily races, De ceremoniis records fewer than a dozen annual racing holidays and only eight daily races in the 10th C. Though the popularity of chariot races in the 11th C. is reflected in a poetic account of a day spent watching them (Christopher of Mytilene, poem 90, ed. Kurtz, 56–60), by the 12th C. they were losing ground to the new Western spectacles of jousts and tournaments (see Sports); chariot races disappeared entirely after 1204.

The church was hostile to chariot races, which had once had pagan religious overtones; gambling connected with the races and their unpredictable result stood in sharp contradiction to the concept of Providence (see Pronoia). Preachers like John Chrysostom inveighed against the sport as a powerful rival that lured audiences away from church services. Nonetheless, ecclesiastical rhetoricians and hagiographers often employed literary imagery drawn from the hippodrome and its races.


CHARISTIKION (χαριστική ὀφειλα), lit. “gift of grace”), a system of giving monasteries to private persons or institutions on a conditional basis for a restricted period, usually a lifetime or three generations. The origin of charistikon is unclear. P. Charanis (DOP 4 [1948] 74f) found its roots in the 49th canon of the Council in Trullo; M. Sjuzjumov (Učenye zapiski Sverdlovskogo pedagogitcheskogo instituta 4 [1948] 90f) traced it to the leasing of temple allotments in antiquity; Beck (Kirche 136) said it originated with Iconoclasm. The earliest mention of the charistikes typos is in an act of Leo VI of 908 (Prot., no.2.12); the main evidence comes from the 11th and 12th C.

The beneficiary was called charistikarios as well as pronoetes, prostates, and ephoros, all terms emphasizing his function as supervisor and not as full proprietor. The beneficiary was supposed to wield administrative power over the monastic lands without interfering in ecclesiastical affairs. The right of granting charistikia belonged to emperors, patriarchs, metropolitan, founders of monasteries (including peasants), and high-ranking state officials. While some scholars suggest that during the 11th C. and earlier charistikion and pronoia were synonymous, others distinguish the two types of grants by the obligation the grantee bore (with the charistikion, toward the object granted; with the pronoia, toward the grantor). Grants of charistikion provoked a serious controversy; John IV (V) Oxites censured the practice of giving monasteries to lay persons, while Eustathios of Thessalonike argued that it freed monks from temporal concerns and troubles. Charistikion be-
came rare after 1204, though a synodal decision of 1317/18 deals with donations of monasteries kата skopon tov epimeleinav axiousthai to clerics of the diocese of Attaleia (Hunger-Kresten, PatKP 1, no. 53.8).


-M.B.

CHARITON (Χαρίτων), born in Aphrodiasia; author of Chaireas and Callirhoe, a romance in eight books written probably in the 2nd C. Chariton is thus the earliest of the extant Greek novelists, rather than the latest as was once thought. The novel is given an ostensibly historical background at the end of the Peloponnesian War (Callirhoe's father is the Sicilian general Hermocrates). Written in a clear straightforward style, it describes the meeting and marriage of the hero and heroine and the trials (false death, capture by tomb robbers, shipwrecks, etc.) that befell them after their separation and before they can be reunited. There is little evidence that the novel was widely read in the Greek Middle Ages, but the novelists of the 12th C. were clearly aware of Chariton's work, which influenced their choice of plot motifs.


CHARITY. See Almsgiving; Philanthropy.

CHARLEMAGNE (Kάροπολος), Frankish ruler (768-814); born 742, died Aachen 28 Jan. 814. The son of Pippin III, Charlemagne became sole king of the Franks in 771. After conquering the Lombards in 774 he came into direct conflict with Byz. interests in Italy. Ohnsorge (Konstantinopel und der Okädeni [Darmstadt 1966] 1-28) interprets his assumption of the title patriarchos in 775 as a statement of anti-Byz. intentions. Perhaps to counter the revolt of ELPIDIOS, in 781 Charlemagne sealed an alliance with Empress Irene by engaging his daughter Rotrud to Irene's son Constans. Charlemagne invaded Italy as far as Capua and apparently refused to send Rotrud to Constantinople, although Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 463.21-22) accuses Irene of breaking the engagement. The Frankish ruler further strained relations with Byz. by refusing to endorse the acts of the Second Council of Nicaea in 788 and later by adding his name to the Libri Carolini.

Charlemagne's destruction of the Avars in 796 extended his territory into central Europe. In 797 he negotiated a treaty with Irene that affirmed his sway in Istria and Benevento and recognized Byz. rights in Croatia. Relations were aggravated again by Pope Leo III's coronation of Charlemagne as imperator Romanorum on 25 Dec. 800, an act that reflected increasing Frankish appropriation of Byz. imperial language, symbols, and notions. Despite the coronation's long-term significance, Charlemagne did not intend to create a Western Roman Empire: the Frankish court argued that Irene's dethronement of Constantine VI had left the throne vacant and a woman in charge. The Byz. court considered the coronation an affront but not a threat to imperial unity (J. Arvites, GOrThR 20 [1975] 53-70; C. Tsirpanlis, Byzantina 6 [1974] 345-60). Charlemagne might eliminate the awkward situation by marrying Irene, but negotiations in Constantinople in late 802 were thwarted by AETIOS and the coup of Nikephoros I. In 810 Nikephoros sent an embassy to the Franks requesting naval help against Dalmatia; Charlemagne apparently agreed to return Byz. possessions along the Adriatic coast in exchange for recognition as emperor (ed. MGH, Epist. Karolini aevi 2: 546-48). The treaty was finalized in 812 by Michael I: Byz. ambassadors in Aachen acclaimed Charlemagne basileus and began negotiations for a marriage between Michael's son Theophylaktos and a Frankish princess. The Byz. evidently considered Charlemagne as emperor solely of the Franks and after 812 emphasized the point by designating their ruler basileus of the Rhomaioi.

CHARLES I OF ANJOU, king of Naples and Sicily (1265–85); born Mar. 1226, died Foggia, Italy, 7 Jan. 1285. Brother of Louis IX of France, Charles was an ambitious ruler who sought to create a Mediterranean empire and restore Latin domination over Byz. territory. With papal support he defeated Manfred of Sicily in 1266 at Benevento and gained control of Hohenstaufen possessions in southern Italy and Sicily. In 1267, by the Treaty of Viterbo, he joined Baldwin II, William II Villehardouin of Achaia, and Pope Clement IV (1265–68) in an anti-Byz. coalition. In 1273 Charles married his daughter to Baldwin's son, Philip of Courtenay, titular Latin emperor of Constantinople. His plans for a Crusade against the Byz. capital were thwarted in 1274, however, by Michael VIII's agreement to the Union of Churches at the Council of Lyons (L. Dujčev, Studi in memoria di p. Adiuto Putignani [Taranto 1975] 111–25). After the accession of the pro-Angevin Pope Martin IV (1281–85), who excommunicated Michael, Charles again prepared for an expedition against Constantinople. In 1281 he cemented his alliance with Venice and Philip of Courtenay at Orvieto. Again his plans were foiled by the diplomacy of Michael, who helped instigate the rebellion of the Sicilian Vespers in 1282. Michael's ally, Peter III of Aragon (1276–85), drove Charles from Sicily. The final three years of the French ruler's life were absorbed in the attempt to regain his Sicilian kingdom, and he had to renounce his projected attack on Constantinople.


CHARLES OF VALOIS, titular Latin emperor of Constantinople (1301–13); born 12 Mar. 1270, died 16 Dec. 1325. Son of Philip III of France and Isabelle of Aragon, Charles acquired titular rights to the Latin Empire of Constantinople through his marriage to Catherine of Courtenay in 1301. After serving as mediator in the Angevin-Sicilian war and bringing about the peace of Calabellotta (1302), Charles was free to pursue his ambitions for conquest of the Byz. Empire. Between 1306 and 1308, he negotiated alliances with the Venetians, Serbs, and Catalans and secured papal support for his "crusade." He was in a position to mount a formidable expedition against Constantinople. His plans were frustrated, however, by the need to remain in France to help his brother, Philip IV, and by the Catalans' neglect of their oath of fealty. After his wife's death (1307 or 1308) and the marriage of his daughter Catherine to Philip I of Taranto, prince of Achaia, in 1313, Charles renounced his ambitions in the East, allowing his son-in-law to press the family's imperial claims. Despite the significant threat that Charles posed for Byz., contemporary Byz. sources scarcely mention his plans for conquest.


CHARON (also Charos and Charontas), ancient ferryman of the dead across the River Styx or Acheron. He emerges in Byz. texts from the 10th C. onward as "night-thief of souls" (John Geometres, PG 106:949A; Achilleis, ed. D.C. Hesselung, 85–87), an idea that may be biblical in origin (Mt 24:43, 1 Th 5:2, 2 Pet 3:10). He is also described as black and fierce, holding the cup of death and a long, curved sword with which to sever the thread of life, a motif that connects him with Moira, or Fate (G. Moravcsik, SBN 3 [1931] 45–68). From the 12th C. onward Charon is addressed directly, sometimes engaging in dialogue with the bereaved; as violent bridegroom of young girls, despoiling their beauty; as premature culler of grapes or reaper of corn, esp. in the learned romances of the 12th C. (Niketas Eugeneians, Droisila and Charikles 2.173–85). Thus he is not merely a continuation of the ancient ferryman but an active agent of death, more concretely personified in later Byz. texts than Hades or Thanatos, with clear delineation of attributes: black looks, cruelty, use of sword, premature reaper of marriage in death.

CHARPETE (Χάρπετε, now Harput), a major fortress of the Byz. frontier situated above the Arsanas River (Murad Su), east of the Euphrates. Under its ancient name Ziata, Charpete formed part of the territory conquered by Diocletian from the Persians in 297. It was briefly recaptured by the Persians in 359. At that time it was a castellum of sufficient size to serve as a refuge for the country population (Amm.Marc. 19:6.1). It became a major fortress (called Ziyād) under the Arabs, who controlled it from the 640s until 937, when Romanos I Lekapenos conquered the area and incorporated it into Mesopotamia. Charpete was the base of the revolt of Bardas Skleros in 976 and remained until the battle of Manzikert (1071). It had great strategic importance as the main stronghold of the district of Anizitene; it was apparently never a bishopric. The site contains a powerful fortress that represents the reduction of the late antique settlement. Enlarged after the Byz. reconquest, it shows seven undated phases of construction.


CHARPEZIKION (Χαρπεζίκιον), probably to be identified with Çarpizek Kalesi (TİB 2:86, n.260), center of a dwarf theme east of the Euphrates, first mentioned in 949 (Oikonomides, Listes 241ff). It had an army of only 905 men and probably ceased to exist soon after the compilation of the Taktikon of Escurial (971–75), which lists the strategos of Charpezikion between those of Tephrike and Romanoupolis.


CHARSIAEITES MONASTERY, founded in Constantinople in the mid-14th C. by John (monastic name: Job) Charsiaeites (Χαρσιαϊτίς), a supporter of John VI Kantakouzenos. It was dedicated to the Virgin Nea Peribleptos. Its precise location is unknown but was probably within the city walls. The monastery had close ties to Kantakouzenos, who granted it a chrysobull, and spent part of his retirement there as the monk Ioasaph. Two of the monastery’s superiors became patriarchs (Neilos Kerameus and Matthew I); a third patriarch, Gennadios II Scholarios, took the habit there. Patr. Matthew composed a testament in 1407 that describes the origins of the monastery and includes a typikon as well as a hypotyposis drafted by his two predecessors as hegoumenos, Mark and Neilos. Makarios Makres wrote a description of the icon of the Nativity in the monastic church (H. Hunger, JÖB 7 [1958] 125–49).


CHARSIAON (Χαρσιανόν), fortress of Cappadocia between Caesarea and the Halys, supposedly named for a general Charsios who fought the Persians under Justinian I. Its site has not been located. First mentioned in 638, it was captured by the Arabs in 730 and was the scene of considerable fighting during the next two centuries. The fortress was the center of a district of the same name that became a kleisoura in the early 9th C. and a separate theme, created from parts of Boukellarion, Armeniakon, and Cappadocia, after 863. According to Arab geographers, Charsianon had four fortresses and an army of 4,000 men; the salary of the strategos was 20 pounds of gold. Charsianon was a base of the landed aristocracy in the 10th C.; the Argyroi had their homes there and the Maleinon their vast estates. In 1057, Charsianon supported the revolt of Isaac (I) Komnenos. The resettlement of Gagik II there in 1045 and influx of Armenians led to conflicts with the local Greek nobility. Charsianon was lost to the Turks after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071.


CHARTOPHYLAX (χαρτοφύλαξ), an ecclesiastical official of Constantinople and the provinces, usually a deacon, attested from the 6th C., with archival and notarial duties that grew in extent and significance with the growth of synodal trans-
actions. By the 10th C. the chartophylax was head of the sekreton of the chartophylakeion and principal assistant to the patriarch. The importance of his functions far exceeded his rank in the hierarchy which, by the 11th C., was fourth among the exokatakoiloi. In addition to archival and chancery-related duties he acted as intermediary between the patriarch and clergy, introducing clerics before the patriarch and conciliar gatherings, and receiving letters sent to the patriarch. He examined candidates to the priesthood and prepared testimonials for them (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 3:440–44; 2:587). The chartophylax also wrote Erotapokriseis on canonical matters and released them in his own name. He represented the patriarch and, in his absence, presided over the synod. A prostagma (1094) of Alexios I Komnenos, confirming the chartophylax’s right to this position, indicates that it was not a new privilege but a controversial one disputed by the bishops of the synod (Zepos, Jus 1:549f). Theodore Balsamon asserted, in his treatise on the functions and rights of the protekdikos and chartophylax, that the latter had judicial competence and presided over a court (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:530–41); this claim appears to have more to do with Balsamon’s need to bolster the office that he held than with the actual functions of the chartophylax. From the reign of Andronikos I, megas was added to the title of chartophylax.

Some monasteries included among their officials a chartophylax or chartophylakissa, a monk or nun responsible for the security and conservation of monastic records, and keeping track of borrowed documents.


CHARTOULARIOS (χαρτουλάριος, from χάρτης, official document), a generic term designating subaltern officials in various bureaus. Late Roman chartoularioi were known from 326 in the chanceries of the praetorian prefect, magister militum, etc. (O. Seeck, RE 3 [1899] 2193). The first known chartoularioi of the “divine logothetion” was mentioned in the 7th-C. Miracula of St. Artemios (ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 23,29). In the 9th–10th C. chartoularioi were functionaries with fiscal and archival duties in both central and provincial administration, such as the chartoularioi of the genikon, stratitiotikon, and dromos. Similar functions in the ecclesiastical hierarchy were performed by the chartophylax, and the two terms could be confused (Dartouzès, Offikia 20); the seal of a chartophylax of the genikon (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.358) is also known. A chartoularioi could be the head of an entire sekreton, such as chartoularios of the sakella (see sakellion) or vestiarion. According to seals, the chartoularioi of the genikon and stratitiotikon acquired the epithet megas from the end of the 10th C. Chartoularioi could be commanders on the battlefield (Dennis, Military Treatises 252.138); Theophanes (Theoph. 398.13–14) relates that Leo III appointed “his personal chartoularioi” Paul as strategos of Sicily. In the 12th C. some chartoularioi (e.g., Theodore Choummnos) exercised military functions. From the 15th C. onward, the megas chartoularioi was a high-ranking courtier whose duty, like that of the protostrator, was to lead the horse of the emperor. I. Medvedev (PSb 23 [1971] 63–67) rejected B. Pančenko’s hypothesis concerning the existence of a guild of chartoularioi.


CHARTRES NOTATION. See NEUMATA.

CHEESE (τυρός), an important food source, mentioned along with wine, olive oil, beans, and bread as a major component of the diet (Laura 1, no.27.19–21); it was commonly added as a relish (prophagion) to bread. The Geoponika (bk.18:19) gives a recipe for making cheese and says that the best type was made from goat milk. The Diegesis ton tetrapodon zoon praises cheese made from the milk of water buffalo. Some cheeses were pungent and used as appetizers with wine. The Vlachs were famous as cheese makers, providing the monks of Mt. Athos with their product. Cheese could be used for payment of rent in kind: thus, in 1382, the monastery of Nea Petra on Mt. Athos received from revenues in Lemnos 16 modia politika of grain, 4 modia politika of legumes, and 3 kantaria (a measure of approximately 40–48 kg) of cheese (Dionys. no.5.11–12). Imperial privileges exempted various monasteries from mandatory sales of grain, wine, meat, cheese, “and all other kinds of food” (e.g., Patmou Engrapha 1, no.6.53–
thus enumerating cheese among the most basic foodstuffs.


CHEILAS (Χειλάς), also Prinkips Cheilas, a family of Peloponnesian origin, known from the 13th—15th C. The Cheilades produced several ecclesiastical leaders and intellectuals: Theodosios Prinkips Cheilas was sent by Michael VIII as envoy to the Mongol khan Hülegü; ca. 1278–83 he was patriarch of Antioch. His contemporary John Cheilas, metropolitan of Ephesus, wrote against the ARSENITES and Patr. GREGORY II OF CYPRUS; the collection of letters in Paris, B.N. gr. 2022, was erroneously ascribed to John. John’s brother Constantine was a military judge (*krites tou phos-satou*) in 1293–94; two of his seals have survived (Laurent, *Corpus* 2, nos. 1193–94). Nikephoros Prinkips Cheilas, a rhetorician of the first half of the 15th C., wrote a monody on the death of Kleope Malatesta (died 1493), spouse of the despot Theodore II PALAILOGOS, and was closely connected with many intellectuals of his time, such as John EUGENIKOS, BRESSARION, PLETHON, and GENNADIOS II SCHOLIAROS.


CHEIROTHESIA (χειροθεσία), “the laying on of hands,” esp. by the bishop in the rite of ordination. Initially it referred specifically to the central part of the ordination process—the imposition of hands—rather than to the sacrament of ordination proper and the conferring of ecclesiastical dignity. Still, this distinction was not always maintained. Indeed the term became interchangeable with CHEIROTONIA and the whole liturgical act of ordination (cf. Nicaea I, canon 19; Council of Chalcedon, canon 15). By the 8th C., however, cheirothesia came to be used for the ecclesiastical ceremony conferring minor orders of SUBDEACON, ANAGNOSTES, etc., through the sign of the Cross (*sphragis*), while cheirotonia was reserved for the ordination of the major orders of DEACON, PRIEST, and BISHOP. According to SYMEON of Thessalonike (PG 155:361D), the first took place “away from the altar” (*exo tou bemaatos*), whereas the second was performed “at the altar” (*en tou bema-tos*). In general, of course, cheirothesia was also a common element in a number of other rites, such as baptism, in which the laying on of the hands in benediction took place.

CHEIROTONIA (χειροτονία). In its primitive etymological sense the term, meaning “stretching forth the hands,” signified primarily appointment or election to office. In Christian canonical and sacramental usage, the word came to designate the liturgical rite by which a candidate was ordained into one of the three major orders of the Christian CLERGY. Specifically, the sacrament included both the appointment and the laying on of the bishop’s hands on the ordinand in the rite of CHEIROTHESIA. Zonaras described cheirotonia as the liturgical act in which the invocation of the Holy Spirit by the bishop is accompanied by the laying on of hands on the candidate for ordination (PG 137:37A; cf. John Chrysostom, PG 60:116.15–20). The same canonist was nevertheless aware of the ancient distinction between simple nomination and the actual rite of consecration, for he observes that the election (*pséphos*) eventually came to be called ordination (*cheirotonia*) by the church fathers (cf. C. Vogel, *Irénikon* 45 [1972] 7). The bishop alone had the right to perform the ceremony.


CHELANDION (χελάνδιον) was sometimes used synonymously with DROMON to refer to oar- and sail-powered warships of varying sizes and speeds (A. Dain, *Naumachica* [Paris 1943] 66), but other sources indicate that chelandion generally meant a transport ship, such as the type used by Constantine V to ferry horses to Bulgaria in 762 (Theoph. 432.29–433.1) or by Basil II to transport men and supplies during his siege of Tripolis in 999 (Yahyā of Antioch, PO 23 [1932] 459). Another term, *pamphyllos*, refers to round-hulled vessels that served to carry war machines and horses; smaller transport ships were called *sagenai, saktourai*, and *katenai*, names that indicate an Arabic origin.
CHEMISTRY. See Alchemy.

CHENOLAKKOS MONASTERY, a Bithynian monastery of uncertain location. Chenolakkos \((Χηνολάκκος, \text{"Goose Pond"})\) was founded in the early 8th C. by a St. Stephen, who is known only from his liturgical notice in the \textit{Synaxarion of Constantinople} for 14 Jan. \((\text{Synax.CP, 392–94})\). He established the monastery at Chenolakkos, on land given him by Patr. Germanos I. The monks of Chenolakkos supported the restoration of images by the Second Council of Nicaea in 787; the monk Thomas signed the \textit{Horos} (decree) as a delegate of the \textit{hegoumenos} John.

In the 9th C. Chenolakkos is known as the monastery where the iconodule \textit{Methodios}, the future patriarch, first adopted the habit and worked as a scribe. The monastery disappears from the sources between the 10th and 12th C.; it reappears in the second half of the 15th C. as an insignificant \textit{metochion} of the Constantinopolitan monastery of St. Demetrios of the Palaiologoi, housing only two monks.

\textit{LIT.} Janin, \textit{Églises centrales} 189ff. —A.M.T.

CHERUBIKON \((χερουβικόν)\), the Cherubic Hymn, important \textit{troparion} that accompanies the transfer of gifts in the \textit{Great Entrance} and introduces the eucharistic half of the \textit{liturgy} with its references to the preanaphoral dialogue ("let us lay aside all worldly care"), \textit{Trisagion} ("sing the thrice-holy hymn"), and \textit{communion} ("to receive the King of All"). Its name derives from its opening words, in which the singers are assimilated to the \textit{cherubim} around the throne of God. The other Great Entrance hymns that replace this hymn in the Liturgy of Basil on Holy Thursday (\textit{Toú deípnoú}), Holy Saturday (\textit{Sígesato pasa sarx}), and at \textit{Presanctified} (\textit{Nun hai dynametis}) are by extension also called \textit{cheroubika}. The \textit{cheroubikon} and \textit{Toú deípnoú} were introduced under Justin II in 573–74 (\textit{Cedr. 1:685.3–4}), perhaps replacing earlier psalmody (Ps 23 with alleluia). The Holy Saturday chant comes from the Jerusalem Liturgy of James; it appears in Constantinople by the 11th–12th C. but is only an optional replacement for the \textit{cheroubikon} until the end of Byz.

\textit{LIT.} Taft, \textit{Great Entrance} 53–118. —R.F.T.

CHERNIBOXESTON \((χερνιβόξεστον, \text{from } χερνιβείον + ἔξοςτος \text{"wash basin [and] ewer"})\), term attested from the 6th C. in papyri and in an inscription of 582–602 on a silver vessel, for a washing set, either domestic or liturgical. The basin often took the form of a long-handled \textit{trulla}, while the ewer was a handled jug. In a series of long-handled pans with dated \textit{silver stamps}, the three latest (of 582–651) apparently still have matching ewers (Dodd, \textit{Byz. Silver Stamps}, nos. 30–31, 48–49, 75, 77). While none of the complete sets displays Christian motifs, other ewers with a church dedication (\textit{Kaper Koraon Treasure}) or New Testament iconography may bear witness to the early ecclesiastical use of washing sets mentioned in the \textit{Euchologion} and described in the \textit{Liber Pontificalis} by the Latin terms \textit{urceus} and \textit{agmanile}. In the 10th C. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos described the use of \textit{cherniboxeston} decorated in low relief and of "precious towels" for the washing of hands during palace ceremonies (\textit{De cer.} 586.3–5).

\textit{LIT.} Mango, \textit{Silver} 106ff. —M.M.M.

CHERSON \((Χερσόν\), a Greek colony in the immediate vicinity of modern Sebastopol on the Crimean peninsula, was from the 2nd C. a part of Roman Lower Moesia. Christianity was firmly established there by the beginning of the 4th C. The altar of a cruciform church discovered in 1897 contained a silver reliquary, with reliefs intact, bearing a monogram, bust, and control stamps of Justinian I (\textit{Iskussto Vizantii 1, no.151}). Cherson was the most significant city of Crimea in the 5th–6th C.; excavations have shown, however, that large-scale production of salted fish and wine stopped during this period. The economic situation in Cherson in the 7th–8th C. is still disputed: Jakobson \((infra)\) stresses decline and desertion, whereas A. Romanèuk (in \textit{From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium} \textit{[Prague 1985]} 123–35) emphasizes the continuity of urban life. At this time Cherson was a place of exile for Pope Martin I and Emp. Justinian II. In the 8th C. it was under
the rule of a Khazar governor (tudun). According to a later legend, it offered shelter to Iconodule refugees from Byz.

Byz. rule was reestablished by Emp. Theophilos who, ca. 832, created the theme of Klimata (see Klima). From the 10th to the 12th C. Cherson enjoyed great prosperity. The minting of autonomous coins of municipal character was resumed by Michael III (DO 3.1:91f) at this time, and abundant seals survive of Byz. officials in Cherson, primarily those of strategoi and kommerkiarioi. The colony assumed pivotal importance in relations between Byz. and the Khazars (the starting point for the missionary activity of Constantin the Philosopher), Pechenegs, and Kievan Rus'. It played an essential role in the conversion of Kievan Rus' in 988/9: according to a legend, Vladimir I of Kiev was baptized in Cherson. Many inscriptions and graffiti (both Greek and Latin) have been recovered in Cherson through archaeological excavations.

After 1204 Cherson accepted the suzerainty of Trebizond. It began to lose its Greek character, mainly because of Alan impact and economic ties to the northern Caucasus and the Near East. By the end of the 14th C. it was destroyed by the armies of the Golden Horde.


O.P., A.C.

CHERUBIM (χερουβ(ε)μι), celestial beings who held an important place in the Old Testament as supporters of God; God was enthroned upon them and they moved his chariot. Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite describes them as the second order of the first triad of heavenly beings, between the SERAPHIM and the thrones (thronoi), another order of angels. In contrast, Gregory of Nyssa (PG 45:348A) eliminates the distinction between cherubim and thronoi, since God was enthroned upon the cherubim. Greek authors represented the cherubim as fiery, with four faces and many eyes (poluomnata), although Origen warned against literal interpretation of these features. Their usual functions included driving the heavenly chariot, praising God, defending the church, and assisting at the Last Judgment, but pseudo-Dionysios emphasized the spiritual qualities of the cherubim—their ability to receive the gift of light, to contemplate the primordial might of thearchic splendor, and to see and comprehend God (Celestial Hierarchy 7.1.32-34). Accordingly, the name cherubim was interpreted as meaning “full knowledge” (John Chrysostom, PG 48:724.55), even though they were unable to comprehend God as he comprehended himself.

Images of two cherubim were placed on the Ark of the Covenant (Ex 25:18-22) and in the Temple of Solomon (1 Kgs 6:23-29). The Chronicon paschale (Chron. Pasch. 462.9-13) states that the latter were seized by the Roman emperor Titus and affixed by Vespasian to the gates of Antioch. These Old Testament images of cherubim were cited by John of Damascus and others in polemics against the Iconoclasts: although made by human hands, they were nonetheless the object of divine cult and could thus be used to justify the Christian veneration of icons.

The cherubim were first depicted as regular ANGELS; later, under the combined influence of Ezekiel’s visions (Ez 1:4-25, 10:1-22) and of Revelations 4:6-9, they took the form of composite creatures having at least four “many-eyed” wings, the top pair usually crossed, with a human face in the very center of the wings, and the heads of the four apocalyptic beasts at the sides (man and ox to the left, lion and eagle to the right; see EVANGELIST SYMBOLS). Their feet are human but winged, and they may have a pair of hands coming out the sides, to hold a sword or spear. The fiery wheels of Ezekiel’s vision are often included either directly below them or nearby. The cherubim were sometimes given six wings, a feature borrowed from Revelations or from the closely related seraphim.

Cherubim appear in the pendentives of churches to support visually the image of the cross or of Christ Pantokrator in the dome (e.g., 9th-C. mosaics in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople); they also guard the gates of Paradise (e.g., in OCTATEUCH illustration [Gen 3:24] or in scenes of the Last Judgment). On the Limburg an-der-Lahn reliquary they are labeled archai. Their liturgical connection (the Cherubikon hymn describes how they support the throne of God) led to their being depicted on RHIPEDIA.

CHESS (ξετρίκων), a game of Eastern origin, unknown in the later Roman Empire. The date of its penetration into Byz. is not established. When Anna Komnene (An.Komn. 3:71.11–16) described Alexios I playing chess with some of his relatives, she added that the game "came to us from the Assyrians." A 15th-C. historian (Douk. 99.17–18) depicts Timur as playing zatrikion with his son; by that time, the game was also known among the Latins, under the name of skakon. The Diegesis ton tetrapodon zoon (vv. 918–27) distinguishes between skakoi, zatrikia, and tablia, and states that bishops, archontes, and merchants played these games using pieces of gold and silver; skakoi and tablia, according to the same text (vv. 615–21), were made also of bull’s horn. Wood and bone pieces were used as well. The game of chess was interpreted in the so-called oneirokritikon of Patr. Germanos I (F. Drexl, Laographia 7 [1923] 437–70) as foretelling a fight. More explicit is the Oneirokritikon of Achmet ben Sirin (pp. 192.3–193.9): victory at zatrikion foreshadowed profit, good luck, or military success.


- A.K., A.K.

CHILANDAR. See Hilandar Monastery.

CHILDHOOD. The Greek terms for child, teknon (το τέκνον) and pais (ὁ ή παῖς), were applied to boys and girls alike, while pais could also designate a slave, and teknon had a connotation of spiritual relationship. Even though some Byz. practiced abortion and contraception, procreation was considered the primary goal of a married couple and infertility was viewed as a disaster; the birth of a child, esp. a boy (Prodromos, Historische Gedichte, ed. W. Hörandner, no.44.1–7), was a cause for rejoicing and celebration. The number of children varied considerably; Laiou (Peasantry 310) calculates that the household coefficient in the domain of Iveron in the first half of the 14th C. was 2.9 to 4.9 and in that of Lavra 4.1 to 4.9.

The infant (brehos, in prakita also called pais hypomazios—Estphg., no.7.3–4) was weaned at about two or three years of age. Babies were swaddled at birth and nursed either by their mother or a wet-nurse; the attitude of Byz. society toward wet-nursing was equivocal (J. Beaucamp, JÖB 32.2 [1982] 546–59). Breastfeeding was depicted in the image of the Virgin Galaktotrophousa and of some saintly children shown suckling; hagiography tells of some future saints who as infants refused to suckle on fastdays. Infant mortality was high, the case of Maria the Younger probably being typical: she bore four children of whom two died in infancy. Children were esp. susceptible to disease after weaning (D. and P. Brothwell, Food in Antiquity [London 1969] 186–89).

Formal education began at age six or seven, either at school (for boys) or with a tutor or literate parents; rote memorization, esp. of the Psalms, was emphasized. Only a small number of children went on to secondary schooling. Despite John Chrysostomos’s warnings against indulgence (Sur la vaine gloire, ed. A.-M. Maline (Paris 1972) 96.239–100.266, 196.1058–1064), children, even boys, wore gold jewelry and gems (e.g., the gold belt, bracelet, and necklace renounced by Theodore of Sykeon, Vita, ch.12). Children played with toys and games and pets.

Parents were prohibited from selling or abandoning their children, although Constantine I, in a law of 329, permitted the sale of children “in the case of extreme poverty” (Cod.Just. IV 34.2) with the right of a later repurchase. Some children were abandoned, often at the thresholds of churches or houses of the wealthy. Some orphans, even of substance, faced problems: the vita of Lazaros of Mt. Galesios (AASS, Nov. 3:529D) describes how their neighbors expelled orphans from their father’s house and seized their belongings. Orphans directed by the state and church tried to alleviate the problems of orphans and abandoned children.

Even though the concept of patria potestas (the father’s rights over his children) diminished during the Roman Empire, Byz. parents retained substantial rights (often customary) with regard to their sons and daughters: parents could inflict corporal punishment on their children, albeit some moralists (like Kekaumenos) criticized whipping; they could castrate boys to make them eunuchs (Rudakov, Kul'tura 187); they used children’s labor in the household (esp. as shepherds and swineherds), and sent them out to work as ap-
prentices, servants, and prostitutes, retaining their earnings. Parents controlled their children’s future by arranging their betrothal and marriage. After reaching adulthood children usually resided outside the parents’ household, but sometimes (at least, in the case of peasant families) remained in their parents’ homes after their own marriage and the birth of first grandchildren. Conflicts between fathers and sons as described in hagiography (A. Kazhdan, *Byzantion* 54 [1984] 188–90) refer primarily to the attempts of children to leave the family and take monastic vows. Despite the paternal authority over children, Byz. literature reveals the affection of both parents and grandparents for their offspring and of children for their mothers and fathers. Thus Psellos was very fond of both his mother and of his daughter who died in childhood (G. Vergari, *Studi di filologia bizantina*, vol. 3 [Catania 1985] 69–76), and Anna Komnene remained devoted to her parents, although secretly critical of her nephew, Manuel I.

The principle of Roman law that considered children as legally subordinate to the father (*persona alieni turis, Gr. hypoxousioi*) was accepted by the law of Justinian, albeit with some modification, and preserved in the terminology of the *Ecloga*. The *Proceiron* still required the formal emancipation of the son from his father’s power (Zachariá, *Geschichte* 113, n.327), but Leo VI, in novel 25 (ed. P. Noailles, A. Dain, pp. 99.26–101.5), ruled that the son who established an independent household should be granted legal independence (*autexousion*) regardless of any formal procedure of emancipation; the child also had full rights to objects received from his/her mother or a third person. Byz. law retained the Roman principle of equal division of inheritance between the children.

There was no transitional period from childhood to maturity corresponding to the *ephebeia* (youth) of antiquity, even though the term, in a nontechnical meaning, appears in some authors (e.g., Synesios, ed. N. Terzagli, 2:289.20). Legally adulthood began at 25, but in fact the borderline between childhood and maturity was not sharply defined: marriage, taking monastic vows (after the 7th C. the minimum age for entry into a monastery was ten years), entering military or civil service, the opening of one’s own workshop meant the end of childhood. In reality it occurred about the age of 16 or 18, although precocious cases are known, mostly in a legendary form, as in the epic of *Digenes Akritas* or in saints’ Lives.

Images of the *Presentation of the Virgin* and cycles depicting her infancy invariably show the child as a miniature adult; the emphasis on the youthfulness of Christ Emmanuel is almost unique in iconography.


---

**CHILIA (Келлия, Келлио), mod. Kiliya**, city and port at the northernmost mouth of the Danube 50 km northeast of Ismail. Probably ceded, with nearby Vicina, to Michael VIII by the Mongols after 1261, it returned to Mongol control later in the century. In the early 14th C. it belonged to the Second Bulgarian Empire and was a port of call for Venetian ships trading with Bulgaria. Later in the century, as Vicina declined and Genoa ousted Venice from the Black Sea trade, Genoese influence grew, and a Genoese colony and garrison were established in Chilia. After 1370 it seems to have passed to the control of the princes of Moldavia; in the 15th C. the Wallachian port of Braila eclipsed Chilia, and in 1484 the Ottoman Turks captured it. Its principal exports were grain, wax, honey, and slaves. Emp. John VIII Palaiologos passed through Chilia on his return journey from Italy and Hungary in 1428. It is doubtful whether the Byzantine toponym *Chele* ever referred to Chilia. Some scholars identify Chilia with *Lykostomion*.


1. In agriculture, a *chilias* is a measure of vineyards indicating 1,000 vines. Depending on the quality of the soil, the region, and the customs of
viticulture, the area of 1 chilias ranged between 1 and nearly 4 modioi (= approx. 878 to 3,512 sq.m). According to the metrological sources, in the Balkans a chilias could be an area of 1,000 sq. orgyia.

2. As a measure of fields, 1 chilias is equal to 1,000 modioi.

3. When measuring the tonnage of ships, chilias indicates a capacity of 1,000 thalassioi modioi.

4. In the trade of the Levant, esp. among the Italians, the chilias (It. migliaio) is a quantity of 1,000 pounds (litrai, libbre) and differs according to the pound used. Migliaio can also, however, be a larger measure of calculation for oil, for example, of 646 liters in Venice or 713 liters in Negroponte.

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 83-89, 117. — E. Sch.

CHINA. The enormous distance between Byz. and China makes direct contact between the two doubtful. Byz. coins and precious objects, however, penetrated to China. A golden necklace, part of it possibly Byz., was found in the tomb of Princess Li Jingxun (600–08; see A. Kiss, Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 38 [1984] 33–40), and Chinese archaeologists have found various Byz. coins of the 6th and the first half of the 7th C. If Shiao Nai (VizVrem 21 [1962] 178–82) is correct and a solidus of Justin II was found in a tomb dated between 595 and 599, then coins could move from Byz. to China in less than 20 years. The discovery of Sasanian silver dirhems in the same localities suggests that they came through the intermediary of the Persian Empire. In light of these discoveries, the romancelike legend, preserved by Prokopios of Caesarea and Theophanes of Byzantium, about smuggling the silkworm (see SILK) from the land of Serinda becomes less incredible, although the location of Serinda remains questionable.

Chinese reports about Da Qin and its apparent successor Fulin have been identified as referring to the Roman Empire and Byz., although some scholars consider them descriptions of a Taoist utopia (K. Shiratori, Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko 15 [1956] 25–72). The chronicle of the Tang period (618–907) depicts the capital of Fulin as having a large gate ornamented with gold; a palace adorned with gold, fragrant wood, and ivory; and an automaton indicating the hours. Twelve ministers administer the country, the emperor has a crown resembling a bird with wings, and the people use chariots and wear garish apparel (H. Wada, 14 CEB [Bucharest 1975] 2:445–50). This picture is perhaps a distorted reflection of Byz. reality.

Nestorian monks reached China in 635 and the Nestorian communities there were known to 13th-C. western European travelers; the history of these communities between the late 9th and the 12th C. is obscure. Nestorian monks from China occasionally visited the West. In 1278 two Nestorians, Patr. YAH ALLAH III and Sauma, set out from Beijing for Jerusalem. Sauma arrived at Constantinople where Andronikos II received him; in 1287 he reached Naples, then visited France and England, negotiated with Pope Nicholas IV and by 1291 returned to China (The Monks of Kūblái Khan, Emperor of China, tr. E.A. Wallis Budge [London 1928]).


—D.W.J., A.K.

CHIONIADES, GREGORY, astronomer, physician, teacher, and bishop; born Constantinople between 1240 and 1250, died Trebizond ca.1320; baptismal name George. After becoming a monk, Chioniades (Χιωναδῆς) went from Constantinople to Trebizond, where he probably composed his notes on John of Damascus's Dialectics and On the Orthodox Faith. In the early 1290s he traveled on to the court of the İl-Khāns at Tabrīz, where he began studying astronomy under Shams Bukhārī. Between Nov. 1295 and Nov. 1296 Shams dictated to him in Persian the rules for using the 'Alā'ī Tables of al-Fahhad, which Chioniades rendered into barbaric Greek as the Persian Astronomical Composition. The conventionally titled Revised Canons, which he wrote in the spring and fall of 1296 in order to express some of these rules in a better style, indicate that he was then already becoming familiar with the shorter Arabic version of al-Khāzini's Sanjārī Tables and with the Persian İl-Khānī Tables of al-Ţūsī, both of which he sub-
Among the Persians and for his writ a confession of faith. REB. He of Tabriz in 1305, at which his name to He re-ru. He then retired as a monk to Trebizond. At his death he left part of his library to Constantine Loukites.


CHIOS (Kios), island in the eastern Aegean Sea, near the coast of Asia Minor, in late antiquity part of the province of the islands. Excavations have revealed building activity through the 6th C. Thus, the third construction phase of the Basilica of St. Isidore is assigned to the mid-6th C. (C.I. Pennas in Chios, ed. J. Boardman [Oxford 1986] 332). Late Roman buildings at Pendakas were abandoned by the beginning of the 7th C. when the inhabitants probably retired to the relative security of the fortress south of the harbor (J. Boardman, BSA 53–54 [1958–59] 303). Emborio continued to be inhabited into the 7th C. (J. Boardman, Greek Emborio [London 1967]); the fortress seems to have been destroyed by fire soon after 660 (M. Hood, J. Boardman, JHS 75 supp. [1955] 23).

Archaeological evidence from the following centuries is obscure.

Chios was included in the theme of the Aegean Sea and ruled in the 9th C. by an archon (Laurent, Coll. Orhidjan, no.204); some seals indicate the role of Chios as a customs station: in 690/1 a certain George was general komeymiarios of the combined apotheke of Asia, Chios, and Lesbos (Zacos, Seals 1, no.168); in the 9th C. a dioiketes of Samos and Chios (no. 2216) is known. In the 11th C. Chios stood under the command of its own strategos distinct from that of Samos (Skyl. 373.12–13).

Chios was attacked by Tzachas ca.1083 and was later a Byz. base against him. The island was sacked by the Venetians in retaliation for the Latin massacre of 1171, and in 1204 it was granted to Baldwin of Flanders; it passed effectively to the Genoese in 1261 as a result of the Treaty of Nymphaiion. From 1304 to 1329 Chios was occupied by the Zaccaria, from 1329 to 1346 governed by a Greek administrator in the name of the emperor; on 15 June 1346 the Genoese fleet besieged Chios and in eight days conquered the entire island. Kantakouzenos relates that the inhabitants resisted the Genoese, and Tzybos, a former governor of the island, attacked them but was killed; a later chronicle described a plot organized by the local metropolitan who wanted to hand Chios over to the emperor but failed. In a chrysobull of 1355 (Reg. 5, no.3042) John V Palaiologos considered Chios a Genoese possession (the similar privilege of 1367 [Reg 5, no.3117] is probably a forgery).

A Genoese record of 1395 lists 2,142 Greek households on Chios (about 10,000 people). The land belonged to secular nobles (Schilizzi, Coreis, etc.) and to the monastery of Nea Mone that in the 14th C. complained of the shortage of grain and the small number of douloparoikoi. The Genoese administration abolished the angareiai of peasants and replaced them with the kapnikon of two hyperpeta; indirect taxes were also increased. Chios remained in Genoese hands until 1556, when it fell to the Turks. Chios was a suffragan bishopric of Rhodes and from the 14th C. a metropolis without suffragans.

Aside from Nea Mone, an imperial foundation of the 11th C., Chios preserves the remains of many Byz. buildings and sites. The Church of the Panagia Krina is a smaller copy of the katholikon.
of Nea Mone with frescoes of the 13th C. and later (Ch. Bouras, *DChAE* 4 10 [1980–81] 165–80), while the Holy Apostles at Pyrgoi is of similar shape, with well-preserved exterior architectural detail. The general outline of the castle above the modern town is probably Byz., although it has undergone rebuilding in many periods; in the castle, the Church of St. George may originally have been built in 993.


CHLAMYS (χλαμύς, also χλανίς), a long cloak fastened on the right shoulder by means of a fibula so as to leave the right arm free. In antiquity, a short chlamys was worn by soldiers, hunters, and riders. Diocletian’s Price Edict refers to various kinds of chlamys, including a military type, a simple and a double chlamys, the latter being mentioned for the first time in this document. The two pointed sections hanging down over the legs were called “Thessalian wings” by later lexicographers (Hesychios of Alexandria, Photios, *Souda*, Eustathios of Thessalonike). By about the 6th C. the chlamys had lost its military character and in its longer form became a crucial element of court costume. The presence of a tablion generally differentiates the civilian chlamys from military cloaks such as the paludamentum or sagion. The chlamys was made in different colors, including white, each office being associated with a specific color. It was bordered with rows of gems or pearls, and on certain occasions it was fastened in front, under the throat. A purple chlamys with a gold tablion was the prerogative of the emperor and was laid upon his shoulders in a special section of the imperial coronation rite (*De cer.* 192.23–193.1); he wore the chlamys over the divetesion, but not generally over the loros. Members of his family might wear chlamydes adorned with eagles.

Representations of the chlamys abound, in imperial portraits and images of Old Testament kings such as David or Solomon, in portraits of courtiers, or of princely martyrs. These chlamydes are all evidently made of silk woven with a great variety of gold floral, circular, or spade-shaped designs.

Seeing a chlamys in dreams had a broad range of meanings. If the chlamys was frayed and dirty, this meant the downfall of a regime, if new and splendid, it foretold happiness and the birth of a male heir (Achmet Ben Sirin, *Oniocrates*, ed. Drexel, p.116.1–7).


—A.K., N.P.S.

CHLEMOUTSI (Χλημούτσι or Χλουμούτσι, Fr. Clermont, Ital. Castel Tornese), castle in Elis in the northwestern Peloponnesos. It was the primary fortification of the principality of Achia, constructed on a hill with a panoramic view westward to the Ionian Sea and controlling passage into the interior of the Peloponnesos. It was built between 1220 and 1223 by Geoffrey I Villehardouin who used the wealth of the Moreot church for its construction, and was consequently excommunicated. Despite the castle’s formidable size and position, it seems to have witnessed no memorable sieges or battles; it was frequently used as a prison, and the Greeks captured at the battle of Makryplage in 1264 were held there. Chlemoutsi is frequently confused with the port of Clarence (Clarentia, Clarenza, mod. Kyllene) some distance to the northwest, which was the site of the mint of the principality until its destruction in 1429. Chlemoutsi remained in Frankish hands until 1429 when it was taken by Constantine (XI) Palaiologos, then despotes of the Morea, and used by him as a base for his attack on Patras. The despotes Thomas Palaiologos kept John Asen prisoner at Chlemoutsi. It was taken by the Turks in 1460.

The surviving fortress is almost entirely Frankish. It consists of a large polygonal circuit wall and, at the summit of the hill, a powerful keep—an irregular hexagon, with sides 60–90 m long—and an interior court. The walls are in fact enormous halls, over 7 m wide with two stories, the upper supported either on vaults or with wooden beams. Living quarters were on the upper stories. Elaborate arrangements brought water from the roofs to huge cisterns under the floors.
CHLIRARA (Χλιάρα), settlement on the road from Pergamon to Philadelphia, known from the 11th C. onward. It is mentioned several times by Anna Komnene, who states that the semibarbarian Monastras controlled Pergamon, Chliara, and neighboring towns (polichnia) (An.Komm. 3:155.1). In the mid-12th C. Chliara was already a polis; it was fortified by a city wall ca.1162–73 (Nik.Chon. 150.35–40). The bishopric of Chliara, a suffragan of Ephesus, is listed in a notitia (Notitiae CP 10.47), the date of which is variously placed between the 10th and the 13th C. The Partitio Romanae mentions the “province” of Atramytton, Chliara, and Pergamon, but the Crusaders could not retain this region and Chliara fell to the Nicene emperor Theodore I Laskaris. It suffered from a severe earthquake in 1296 and from Turkish invasions. A 15th-C. historian (Douk. 221.13–14) is the last Byz. source to mention “Chliara, on the borders of Lydia,” but it had long ago been lost by the empire to the Turks.

Recent excavations in the valley of Lykos have revealed the remains of Chliara on the rocks of Gordikale. The find includes a city wall of stone and brick with traces of towers and a settlement that, as Rheidt hypothesizes, housed about 200 families.


CHNOUBIS (Χνούβις). The deity or damon engraved on popular medical gem amulets, the Chnoubis takes the form of a coiled serpent with a lion’s head and a nimbus and rays, surrounded by the seven planets or 12 houses of the zodiac. This pagan amuletic device, believed to prevent abdominal ailments, was christianized in late antiquity when the image of Chnoubis evolved into a dominating Gorgon head, often accompanied by the inscription, “Lord, help the wearer.”

The Chnoubis also appears on Christian uterine or Medusa amulets, which derive directly from pagan uterine amulets (hysterika phylakteria). The Christian versions have the lion-snake Chnoubis on the obverse inscribed with the Trisagion or invocations of the Virgin, and, on the reverse, the command to the womb to lie down quietly as well as various symbols such as the pentalpha star, lunar crescents, “Z”s, and eight-pointed stars. The purpose of both pagan and Christian womb amulets was to ensure childbirth without complications.

LIT. Vikan, “Art, Medicine, and Magic” 75–78. Bonner, Studies 56–60, nos. 81–86.

CHOIROBOSKOS, GEORGE, grammarian, deacon, and chartophylax of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople; fl. early 9th C. Choiroboskos (Χιροβοσκός) was above all active as a teacher and is described in the titles of some of his works as oikoumenikos didaskalos (see Didaskalos). His principal writings are an extensive commentary on the Rules (Canon) of declension and conjugation by Theodosios of Alexandria (4th–5th C.); commentaries on the grammarians Apollonios Dysulos (2nd C.); Herodian, and Dionysios Thrax, which survive only in fragments; a treatise on orthography, also fragmentary; a commentary on the Encheiridion by Hephaestion of Alexandria (2nd C.); epitomes or grammatical analyses of the Psalms; and a treatise on poetical figures. The dry and detailed treatises of Choiroboskos played a major part in transmitting ancient grammatical doctrine to the Byz. world. The work on poetical figures was translated into Old Slavonic, probably in Preslav ca.900, and the translation was included in the Izbornik of 1073, copied for Prince Svjatoslav Jaroslavitch of Kiev. The Epimerisms on the Psalms were used in schools in the mid-10th C. Eustathios of Thessalonike quotes Choiroboskos frequently as an authority. Renaissance grammarians found in his works a mine of information on literary Greek.


CHOIROSPHAKTES, LEO, diplomat and writer; died after 919; Koliás (p.15) dates his birth between 845 and 850, Beck (Kirche 594) ca.824. Choirosphtikes (Χιροσφάκτης) was a high-ranking official (mystikos and kanikleios under Basil I, magistros from 896) and a relative of Zoe Karbo-
Nopsina. Leo VI sent him on three embassies to Symeon of Bulgaria and in 905 to Baghdad. Probably involved in the rebellion of Andronikos Doukas (Jenkins, Studies, pt.XI [1963], 171), he was arrested probably in 907, but eventually returned to Constantinople and participated in the unsuccessful attempt of Constantine Doukas to seize the throne. In 913 Choirousphaktes was tonsured and confined in Studios.

Choirousphaktes’ letters are an important source for the history of Byz.-Bulgarian relations. He also wrote epigrams, hymns, and theological works, including Theology in a Thousand Lines, dedicated to Michael III. The attribution of some of his works remains problematic since the MS tradition is often obscure. Mercati (CollByz 1:271—309) ascribed to Choirousphaktes an ekphrasis in verse, On the Bath-house in Pythia, which he dates to 911; R. Anastasi (SicGymn 17 [1964] 1—7) rejects the attribution. Choirousphaktes was the object of severe and vitriolic accusations by Arethas of Caesarea and probably Constantine of Rhodes. M. Sangin (VizSb [1945] 228—48) interpreted this criticism as a reaction against Choirousphaktes’ intellectual activity; on the other hand, Karlin-Hayter treats Choirousphaktes as a “sniveller” in comparison with Arethas, “a fighter” (Studies, pt.IX [1965], 456).

CHOMA (Xώμα, now Homa), fortress of Phrygia in the upper Meander valley, became important as a frontier post in the 11th—12th C. Its troops, Chomatenois, were in the service of Nikephoros III and Alexios I; at that time, Choma was isolated in an area overrun by the Turks. It was then center of a district called Choma and Cappadocia, under a toparches. Choma’s location on a major road to the interior made it a base for the campaigns of Alexios I and Manuel I. Continually threatened by Turkish armies and nomads, Choma was refortified in 1193 by Isaac II and given the name Angelokastron. It fell to the Turks soon after 1204; it was never a bishopric. Choma was formerly identified with Soublaino (Ramsay, Cities 1:221—26), a fortress rebuilt by Manuel I in 1175 and dismantled by him the following year according to the treaty after the battle of Myriokephalon; its site was apparently in the vicinity of Choma.


CHOMATENOS, DEMETRIOS, a central ecclesiastical figure in the independent state of Epirus; born mid-12th C., died ca. 1256. In the late 12th C. Chomatenos (Χωματηνός) or Chomatianos (Χωματιανός) served as apokrisearios from the archbishopric of Ohrid to the patriarch in Constantinople; he was also chartophylax in Ohrid and in 1216/17 was appointed archbishop of the autocephalous see at Ohrid by Theodore Komnenos Doukas. In 1225 or 1227/8 Chomatenos crowned Theodore emperor in Thessalonike, thus inviting the censure of Patr. Germanos II at Nicea and causing the schism (1228—33) between the Epirot and Nicaean churches (G. Prinzing, RSBS 3 [1984] 21—64).

That Chomatenos claimed and enjoyed a quasi-patriarchal position can be seen not only from his coronation of Theodore but also from the protocol of documents issued by his chancery even after Theodore’s defeat in 1230. The collection of Chomatenos’s acts and letters, approximately 150 pieces, constitutes the main source of the administrative and ecclesiastical history of Epiros, Serbia, and Bulgaria in the first half of the 13th C. (G. Prinzing, EpChron 24 [1982] 73—120; 25 [1983] 37—112; B. Baršić, B. Ferjančič, ZRVI 20 [1981] 41—58). His acts, mainly decisions on marriage law, inheritance, and cases of killing, like those of his colleague John Apokaukos, are major sources for the social and legal history of the period; they indicate the level of legal knowledge, methods of argumentation, and range of cases that came before a bishop’s court. Chomatenos’s statements on the limitations of imperial power are unprecedented (D. Simon in Gedächtnisschrift für Wolfgang Kunkel [Frankfurt 1984] 449—92). Probably between 1230 and 1234, he wrote a brief vita of Kliment of Ohrid, a Bulgarian saint (P. Koledarov, Literaturna misil 27 [1983] no.3, 89—100).


CHONAI (Xövæt, now Honaz), city of Phrygia. The inhabitants of Kolossai, an ancient city of the plain long in decline, moved to the nearby defensible mountain site of Chonai in the 8th C. An important highway fortress, Chonai was a bastion of the theme of Thraakesion and may have been its capital (C. Foss, Ephesus after Antiquity [Cambridge 1979] 1951). It was devastated by Turkish raids in 1070 and after the battle of Mantzikert (1071) became a major frontier defense. Chonai was attacked in 1144, 1189, and 1191, and taken by the Turks after 1204. The great Church of St. Michael in Chonai was a center of pilgrimage and location of great trade fairs, on the ancient site of Kolossai. This was a large basilica decorated with mosaics; nothing of it survives. Chonai was the birthplace of Michael and Niketas Choniates. It became an autocephalous bishopric ca. 860 and a metropolis (without suffragans) ca. 950. The remains of its Byz. fortress have not been studied.

LIT. Ramsay, Cities 1:208–16.

CHONAI, MIRACLE AT. A miracle performed by Michael the Archangel at Chonai was celebrated 6 Sept. As told by Symeon Metaphrastes, the miracle occurred shortly after the deaths of the apostles John and Philip. Next to a healing spring of sweet water, in an oratory dedicated to St. Michael, lived a hermit Archippus. The devil and local unbelievers conspired to dam the river, whose two branches ran on either side of the spring, in order to flood both the spring and the oratory with brackish water. Michael appeared just in time to cleave the rocks in an earthquake, thus diverting the river and preserving hermit, spring, and cult.

Images of the miraculous event show Archippus and the chapel on the right and the Archangel driving his staff into the earth on the left, while the river, descending in two streams from above the figures, plunges down the center of the scene into the cleft created by Michael’s staff (e.g., Sinai icon, K. Weitzmann, The Icon: Holy Images, Sixth to Fourteenth Century [New York 1978] pl.22). Sometimes devils with pickaxes appear (Venice, Marc. Zg86). Known first from the Menologion of Basil II (fol.17), the image is one of the rare examples of a miracle of a saint illustrated with the degree of consistency characteristic of feast icons. Michael wears the pallium, though independent images of him in armor are sometimes labeled “Choniates” (e.g., at Karahük Kilise, Göreme).


A.W.C., N.P.S.

CHONIATES, MICHAEL, writer and metropolitan of Athens (1182–1204), brother of Niketas Choniates; born Chonai ca.1138, died Boudonitza ca.1222; the name Akominatos often assigned to him is incorrect. Choniates (Χωνιάτης) was a pupil of Eustathios of Thessalonike. As metropolitan he was an energetic defender of Athens’ interests, esp. during the city’s siege by Leo Sgouros. After the Latin conquest, Choniates left Athens, lived on Keos in 1205–17, and via Euboea went to the monastery of Prodromos in Boudonitza (B. Katsaros, Byzantina 1 [1981] 99–137). Politically Choniates was a strong opponent of the civilian aristocracy, which he criticized for its indifference to the provinces; he was esp. critical of those who came from peasant and artisan families (Lampros, infra 1:337.16–22). He welcomed Andronikos I at first but then withdrew support, frightened by his reign of terror “that put the whole world in fear” (1:210.12–15).

Choniates was one of the rare writers who escaped from convention and produced lively vignettes, such as a description of a dirty and drafty bathhouse on Keos (A. Berger, Das Bad in der byzantinischen Zeit [Munich 1982] 71). He often developed his similes and metaphors into full-blown images. In one of his treatises Choniates discussed the question of the relationship of the artist and his audience, defending the thesis of the creator’s independence from the crowd’s appraisal, even though in actual rhetorical practice he had to take into consideration the desires of his audience (I. Cițuțov, 14 CEB 3 [Bucharest 1976] 68ff).

In frescoes in the Church of St. Peter at Kalynia Kouvara and in the south chapel of the cave of Penteli, dated 1239/4 by inscription, Choniates is depicted as a nimbed bishop, thus suggesting that in Attica he was regarded as a saint shortly after his death (A.K. Orlando, EEBS 21 [1951] 210–14; D. Mouriki, DChAE 7 [1973–74] 96–98, fig.1).
CHONIATES, NIKETAS, government official, historian, and theologian; younger brother of Michael Choniates; born Chonai, Phrygia, between 1155 and 1157, died Nicaea, spring/summer 1217 (V. Katsaras, Ἄρθρα 32.3 [1982] 83–91). After studies probably in Constantinople, Choniates (Χαρίατης) began his career before 1182 as a provincial functionary in the Black Sea region; he returned to Constantinople, retired while Andronikos I reigned, but resumed service after Isaac II ascended the throne, eventually becoming λογοθέτης τον σκέτρον. In 1204 he fled to Nicaea but failed to receive any position of influence there.

Choniates’ History [Chronikē diegesis] is the most important source for 1118–1206, although the author’s personal (sometimes biased) opinions color it. A major example of Byz. prose, it reveals a new approach to human beings. They are presented as having contradictory, good and evil qualities and as being the active forces in history, while God functions as the highest moral principle. In a period of disaster, terror (esp. under Andronikos), and moral decline, Choniates defended the values of human life and property as well as culture. The History is permeated with a foreboding of catastrophe, also reflected in the imaginative system of metaphors and similes, taken from motifs of storm, shipwreck, fire, disease, and beasts of prey. Traditional clichés are interwoven with irony, psychological observations, crude jokes, obscenities: Choniates is concerned with the human body and its excretory and sexual functions, but shies away from his own curiosity. His speeches (panegyrics of Isaac II, Alexios III, Theodore I, address to the bishop of Philippopolis, monodies) and letters are more conventional than the History; factual inconsistencies between them and the History can be explained by the differing purposes of the two genres. He also wrote the Thesaurus of Orthodoxy (Panoplia Dogmatike), a refutation of heresies up to his time (published only partially).

CHORA MONASTERY (Turk. Kariye Camii), located in the northwestern region of Constantinople near Edirne Kapı. The early history of Chora (Χώρα, lit. “dwelling place”) is obscure. A legendary tradition attributes the foundation to the 6th-c. saint Theodore (BHG 1743), supposed uncle of Justinian I’s wife Theodora; a more reliable source identifies the founder as Krispos, son-in-law of the 7th-c. emperor Phokas. In the 9th C. Chora was a center of resistance to Iconoclasm; the iconodule saints Theophanes Grafftos and Michael Synkellos were associated with the monastery and buried there. Restored in the 11th C. by Maria Doukaina, mother-in-law of Alexios I, Chora was again renovated in the 12th C. by her grandson, Isaac Komnenos the Sebastokrator. Like its predecessor, Isaac’s church was a domed basilica built of recessed-brick masonry on a cross-in-square plan with, however, a larger, single apse. Traces of its mosaic decoration remain in the south window of the nave.

The church deteriorated during the Latin occupation of Constantinople, but Theodore Metochites restored it magnificently (1316–21). He rebuilt the dome over the nave and replaced the narthexes and parekklesion, decorating them with resplendent mosaics and frescoes. Of the mosaics in the nave, only panels of Christ, the Virgin, and the Dormition remain. The well-preserved mosaics of the narthexes and the frescoes of the parekklesion are critical for our understanding of the style of monumental painting of this period. In the outer narthex esp. notable are the image of Christ, identified as he chora ton zonton, “the dwelling place of the living,” on axis with the entrance; the cycle of his Infancy with long sequences on the Magi and the Massacre of the Innocents; and that of his Ministry in the domical.
CHORA MONASTERY. Frescoes in the eastern end of the parekklesion of the church; early 14th C. Below: church fathers, the bishops (l. to r., unidentified, Athanasios of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzos, Cyril of Alexandria). In the arch: Anastasis. In the arch: two miracles of Christ with the archangel Michael in the center.

vaults. The focus of the inner narthex is the donor portrait of Metochites offering his foundation to the Lord. In this area are mosaics of the Deesis with Christ Chalkites, but without the Prodromos, accompanied by images of Isaac Komnenos and “Melania the Nun”; 17 scenes of the life of the Virgin; and an unusually full complement of 70 ancestors of Christ. The eastern half of the parekklesion, used as a mortuary chapel, is fittingly devoted to the Last Judgment and culminates in the Anastasis, abnormally placed in the conch of the apse. On the chapel walls are frescoes of military saints, some partly covered or destroyed by the finely carved hoods of sepulchral monuments. Along the south walls are Old Testament prefigurations of the Virgin.

Metochites also endowed the monastery with substantial estates, added a hospital and public kitchen, and donated his important collection of books. During the Palaiologan period, Chora housed Constantinople’s most comprehensive library and was frequented by scholars such as Maximos Planoudes and Nikephoros Gregoras, as well as Metochites himself. Sultan Bayezid II (1481-1512) transformed the church into a mosque.
CHORAPHION (χωράφιον, “cultivated field”). The word, rare in classical and patristic texts—Neilos of Ankyra (PG 79:456D) speaks of those who diligently plow their choraphia—was used four times in the FARMER’S LAW and became the term for field in documents of the 10th–15th C. The Treatise on Taxation (ed. Döhlger, Beiträge 113.16–17), like the Farmer’s Law (pars. 25, 83) and later documents, distinguishes choraphia from vineyards, and there is direct evidence concerning plowing and sowing choraphia. Choraphia are also contrasted with pastures (e.g., MM 4:30.19–20). A choraphion was normally under 10 modioi in area, whereas the more general term ge, “arable land,” was commonly applied to much larger tracts, although the combined expression choraphia ge is used as well.

The terms esochoraphia (e.g., Lavra 3, no.164.8, 13), esothyrochoraphia (Pantel., no.17.21), choraphion esotheron (Chil., no.q2.123), and the infrequent exchoraphia (Vazelon, no.144.12; Dionys., no.25.118 app.), that is, inner and outer fields, probably designated the location of a choraphion closer to or farther from the house. Choraphia could have common borders with vineyards (e.g., Lavra 1, no.18.29–32); the cadaster of 1264 for the bisho- pric of Kephalonia (ed. Th. Tzannetatos [Athens 1965]) registers choraphia bordering a garden (p.31.31) or vineyard (p.44.204–06) as well as roads or buildings; the cadaster of 1235 for the monastery of Lambiotissa includes a choraphion bordering an olive groove (MM 4:8.10–11). A choraphion could be surrounded by a ditch (MM 4:7.33–34) or boundary marks (MM 4:189.8–9). Olive trees and nut trees grew on some choraphia. All this indicates that choraphia were not peasant “shares” in a particular field, thereby providing evidence against the existence of an “open field” agricultural system.

CHORIKIOS OF GAZA, 6th-C. Christian rhetorician. Chorikios (Χορικιος) was pupil and eulogist of PROKOPIOS OF GAZA. Forty-six declamations of various types survive. Apart from the historical value of his panegyric on Prokopios, his descriptions of the churches of Sts. Sergios and Stephen at Gaza present invaluable evidence for the variety of CHURCH PLAN TYPES, construction techniques, and figural imagery employed in the 530s and 540s. These accounts are characteristically Justinianic in their emphasis on splendor for its own sake; compared to Corippus, realistic description in Chorikios still bulks larger than symbolic interpretation. Chorikios is also an excellent source for accounts of festivals celebrated in Gaza (F.K. Litsas, 1982 JÖB 32.3 [1982] 427–36).

Also important for its material on mime and theater is his Apology for the Mimes, last in a series of such defenses (reaching back to Libanius and Lucian) against the attacks, Christian and pagan, of John Chrysostom and Ailios Aristides. Theater, esp. mime, was controversial, persisting as it did in the face of the Christian onslaught, both legislative and ecclesiastical. Chorikios himself had to reckon with both Justinian’s theater closures and the notorious thespian past of the empress Theodora.
CHORTASMENOS, JOHN, writer, teacher, and bibliophile; born ca.1370, died before June 1439. Chortasmenos (Χορτάσμηνος) was a man of diverse interests, whose career was shaped by his love of books and literature. He first appears in 1391 as a notary in the patriarchal chancellery, a position he held until ca.1415. At an unknown date he became the monk (and then hieromonk) Ignatios; by 1431 he had been made metropolitan of Selymbria.

Chortasmenos included among his pupils Bes-sarion, Mark Eugenikos, and Gennadios (II) Scholarios. He wrote a variety of works: 56 letters, some of which are addressed to other authors, such as Joseph Bryennios and Demetrios and Manuel Chrysoloras, as well as to Emp. Manuel II; poems, including iambic verses on the palace of Theodore Kantakouzenos and epigrams on the recently deceased scribe Ioasaph; orations; a vita of Constantine I and Helena; scholia on John Chrysostom; prolegomena to the Logic of Aristotle; and a short treatise on hyphenation. Particularly interesting are two detailed descriptions of serious illnesses he suffered (H. Hunger in Polychronion 244–52). D. Nastase has suggested
that Chortasmenos was the author of a (lost) chronicle that covered the period between the Histories of John VI Kantakouzenos and the historians of the fall of Constantinople (cf. Hunger, Lit. 1:482). An anonymous account of the Ottoman siege of Constantinople in 1394–1402 was attributed by Hunger to Chortasmenos, a hypothesis rejected by P. Gautier (REB 23 [1965] 100f).

At least 24 MSS have been attributed to the private library of Chortasmenos: they include codices of Euripides, Aristotle, Plutarch, Lucian, Libanius, Byz. historians, and the Introduction to Astronomy of Theodore Metochites. Chortasmenos is also remembered for reissuing the famous 6th-C. herbal of Dioscorides (Vienna, ÖNB, med. gr. 1). Chortasmenos copied several MSS, including menaia that he donated to his diocese and astronomical texts for his own use (E. Gamillscheg, Codices Manuscriti 7 [1981] 52–56).


- A.M.T.

CHOSROES I (Χοσροής), called Anūshirwān ("of the Immortal Soul"), Persian "great king" (531–78/9). Under his father Kavad, Chosroes participated in suppressing the social movement of supporters of Mazdak. As king he introduced several fiscal and administrative reforms and achieved a certain centralization of the state. He used Justinian I's domestic problems and involvement in Western politics to continue the war. The first war (527–32), inherited from his father, was ended by the so-called "Eternal Peace" that preserved the frontier of 502. In 540 Chosroes invaded Mesopotamia and Syria and seized Antioch; simultaneously the Persians were active in Lazica. For this invasion he found an ally in Vitiges. New activities in Lazica interrupted the truce of 545, but in 561 the parties signed a 50-year treaty preserving the status quo. War broke out again in 572, originating in the Armenian revolt against Chosroes, Justin II's suspension of tribute, and Byz.-Persian contest in southern Arabia and Ethiopia for the control of the sea routes to the East. Despite some success, the Byz. general Justinian could not retain Armenia.

Probably in 592 (Cameron, Literature, pt. XII [1969], 13, 21) Chosroes offered asylum to Neoplatonist philosophers persecuted in Byz. In Arabo-Persian historiography he is presented as an ideal monarch. Cruel, hard, but worthy of respect, he failed, however, to rectify serious institutional defects. Modern scholarship often exaggerates the influence of Chosroes' reforms on Byz. (E. Stein, Opera Minora Selecta [Amsterdam 1968] 65–70; Ostrogorsky, History 97, n.2).


- W.E.K.

CHOSROES II, or Khusrau II Parvēz ("the victorious"), the last of the "great kings" (from 590) of Sassanian Iran; died Cesiphon 29 Feb. 628. Chosroes came to power after crushing the rebellion of Bahram Chobān against Chosroes' father, Huzram IV. According to L. Gumilev (Problemy vostokovedenija 1960) no.3:228–41), Bahram revolted after he had defeated the Turks who, with the Khazars and Arabs, had invaded Iran in concert with the Byz. plan for the Persian war. Chosroes had to flee to Byz. territory; Maurice and Domitianos helped restore him to the throne in 591. The Byz. generals Komentiolo and (eventually) John Mystakon were sent to support Chosroes. The treaty with Byz. provided for the surrender of Dara and Martyropolis. Chosroes remained Maurice's ally, and rumors circulated that he converted to Christianity.

The overthrow of Maurice by Phokas gave Chosroes a pretext for invading Byz. in 604 and reoccupying lost regions. Chosroes' generals Shahh-Bārāz and Shahīn were successful, but at last Herakleios organized a counter offensive and in 617 won a decisive victory near Nineveh. Chosroes was deposed and his son Kavad-Shibīya and, after a trial, murdered in prison.


- W.E.K.

CHOUMNAINA, IRENE, anti-Palamite nun and bibliophile; born 1291, died Constantinople.
ca. 1355. Daughter of Nikephoros Choumnos, Irene married the despotes John Palaiologos, son of Andronikos II, in 1303. Widowed in 1307 at age 16, she sought solace in monastic life as the nun Eulogia. Despite her father's opposition, she gave much of her fortune to the poor and spent the remainder on the restoration of the monastery of Christ Philanthropos Soter. She became superior of this double monastery, to which her parents later retired. The convent, which housed 100 nuns, was one of the largest in 14th-C. Constantinople. Only a few ruins of the monastery have been uncovered, between the Mangana palace and the sea walls. The typikon for the monastery is extremely fragmentary; its surviving chapters stress the importance of the cenobitic life (P. Meyer, BZ 4 [1895] 48f).

Choumnina's first spiritual director was Theoleptos, metropolitan of Philadelphia; in the 1330s she also conducted extensive correspondence with a monk whose identity cannot be established. She was an ardent supporter of Gregory Akindynos and was harshly criticized by Gregory Palamas for meddling in theological controversy. Although errors in spelling and syntax reveal Choumnina's lack of formal education, she was praised by her contemporaries for her erudition, possessed a substantial library, and commissioned the copying of MSS.

ED. A.C. Hero, A Woman's Quest for Spiritual Guidance: The Correspondence of Princess Irene Eulogia Choumnina Palaiologina (Brookline, Mass., 1986).


CHOUMNOS (Χούμνος, fem. Χούμναινα), a family of predominantly civil functionaries attested from the mid-11th C. The first known Choumnos was Michael, deacon and chartophylax of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople in 1049 (MM 4:317.11-12). John "Soumn..." (read "Choumnos"). served as chief of the koiton in 1087 (Patmou Engraphe 1, no. 47.24). Another Michael (died ca.1133) was nomophylax and chartophylax of Hagia Sophia and later metropolitan of Thessalonike. Several 11th- and 12th-C. Choumnos are known only from their seals. The sebastos and char toutarios Theodore Choumnos, an important official of Andronikos I, is probably to be identified with the Choumnos who served as tax collector in Athens. Theodore was also entrusted with a military command. A chrysobull of 1192 mentions the "late sebastos Choumnos" (J. Verpeaux [in Nicéphore Choumnos (Paris 1959) 28] mistakenly named him "grand logothète"—see R. Guillard, REB 29 [1971] 82) who inflicted damage on the Genoese; his identification with Theodore is not probable. Nikephoros Choumnos (died 1234) also served as a tax collector in the Thrakesian theme. A later Nikephoros Choumnos was an important politician and writer (see Choumnos, Nikephoros); his brother Theodore was also a courtier. Several letters survive of Nikephoros's son John, the parakoimomenos and general (Boissonade, AeneNova 203-22); another son George was chief of the imperial table and megas stratopedarches. His daughter Irene-Eulogia Choumnina played an important role in 14th-C. religious life. Several other Choumnos were influential courtiers: the stratopedarches John received a pronoia in 1344; Nikephoros was megas hetairestarches in 1355. Makarios Choumnos founded Nea Mone in Thessalonike in the 1360s and was hegoumenos of Stoudios in the 1370s.


CHOUMNOS, NIKEPHOROS, statesman and intellectual; monastic name Nathanael; born between 1250 and 1255, died Constantinople 16 Jan. 1327. Choumnos studied rhetoric and philosophy with Gregory (II) of Cyprus in preparation for a government career. He first appears in the sources ca.1275 as a quaestor entrusted with an embassy to the Mongol khan in Persia. Under Andronikos II, he was promoted to mystikos in 1293, and ca.1295 became eti tou kanikleiou. Circa 1293-1305 he was also megasazoun and one of the most loyal ministers of Andronikos. He secured an alliance with the Palaiologan dynasty in 1303 through the marriage of his daughter Irene Choumnina to the despotes John Palaiologos. In 1309-10 Choumnos served as governor of Thessalonike; thereafter he gradually withdrew from public service, after being supplanted in influence by his political and literary rival, Theodore Metochites. In the 1320s the two men engaged in bitter polemics over questions of literary style, Choumnos attacking the writings of Metochites for their lack of clarity. Metochites in
turn criticized his rival for his devotion to physics and his ignorance of astronomy, the highest form of science. Circa 1326 Choumnos retired to the monastery of Christ Philanthropos. His writings include rhetorical pieces; treatises on philosophy, cosmology, and theology; and 172 letters. He possessed a great fortune, based primarily on land in Macedonia, and founded the monastery of the Theotokos Gorgoepekoos in Constantinople (V. Laurent, *REB* 12 [1954] 32–44).


**CHRESIS** (χρησ). In a broad sense, *chresis* implied the principles (e.g., *orthe chresis*, “proper use”) by which church fathers integrated Graeco-Roman culture within the Christian worldview (Gnilka, *infra*). In documents, *chresis* meant “use” (e.g., *Lavra* 1, no. 59.27) and was the usual word for *usufruct*. In accordance with the principles of Roman law, a scholium to the *Basilika* (Basil. 16.1.7) defines the *chresis* of a field as working the field and enjoying everything produced on it. Legislation of the 10th C. employs *chresis* in a different sense: a novel of *Roman* II (Zepos, *Jus* 3:289.31–32) orders that, while a peasant in debt may hand over the *chresis* of his allotments (*topoi*) temporarily to a *dynatos*, he is not to be deprived of ownership of the property. Thus, the individual who received the *chresis* of a property (i.e., the *usufructuarios*) was not necessarily the one who worked the property. The word appears with this particular meaning occasionally in the 12th C.: in a document from 1153 (Lavra 1, no. 62.7), a monk’s *chresis* of a property owned (and worked) by a monastery provided him with an annual income (*siteresion*). In an extended use of the word a *praktikon* from 1181 (Lavra 1, no. 65.26) distinguishes between a monastery’s rights of *despoleia* (ownership) over some *paroikoi* and a group of *pronoiai*’s *lifetime chresis* and *nome* (possession) over the same *paroikoi*. *Chresis* appears only rarely in documents thereafter (e.g., from 1315: *Espig*, Appendix B.71).

**CHRISM.** See ANOINTING.

**CHRISMON.** See CHRISTOGRAM.

**CHRIST.** [This article is divided into three sections that treat the theology of Christ (Christology) that developed in Byz., the literary image of Christ, and the types of Christ used in artistic representations. For depictions of Christ in narrative scenes, see the following entries: AGONY IN THE GARDEN; Anastasias; Appearances of Christ after the Passion; Ascension; Blind Man, Healing of the; Cana, Marriage at; Crucifixion; Deposition from the Cross; Epiphany; Feeding of the Multitudes; Flight into Egypt; Galilee, Storm on the Sea of; Infancy of Christ; Lazarus Saturday; Lord’s Supper; Miracles of Christ; Mission to the Apostles; Nativity; Passion of Christ; Temptation of Christ; Traditio Legis; Washing of the Feet.]

**Byzantine Christology.** The image of Christ encountered in the Byz. church and in its theology is not so much that of the Synoptic Gospels, although Orthodoxy confesses the human nature (substance) of Christ and expresses it in the iconographic program of the Great Feasts, but rather the Johanneine Christ (Logos), the Pantokrator, the Transfigured or Resurrected One who is enveloped by the MANDORLA. The church fathers of the 4th C. in particular exerted a lasting influence on liturgical texts, and their Christ is the Logos who is “of one essence with the Father” (homooousios). Against *Arius* and *Eunomios*, they emphasized Christ’s divine status, thereby initiating the Christology “from above” so characteristic of Byz. and of the *Antiochene School* as well: the Logos “became flesh” (John 1:14), the Preexistent One “became man” (cf. Gal 4:4).

According to Grillmeier there are two distinctive types of Christology: the Logos-sarx (cf. *sarkosis*, Incarnation) and the Logos-anthropos (enanthroposis) models. Representatives of the first type are inclined to attach no theological relevance to the human soul, or human freedom, of Christ. At the very least, they ignore it (e.g., *Athanasiou* of Alexandria); or, they deny its existence altogether so that in the union the Logos
assumes the function of the soul (e.g., Apollinaris of Laodikeia); or, they subordinate the soul of Christ (and his human personality) to the pre-eminence of the Logos. Accordingly, the divine activity of the Logos concerning the human reality of Christ is often vitalistically interpreted (theokinesis), as in all Christologies of Monophysitic tendency since the Council of Ephesus (431); this tendency is seen above all in Cyril of Alexandria, if one excludes the compromise formula that he offered in 433 to the Antiochenes and that the Council of Chalcedon (451) accepted as his belief. Emphasizing Christ as a “man with a body and soul” runs the risk of conceiving the union of the divine and human in the “God-Man,” in the most extreme instance, as a relationship of two persons, that is, in the juxtaposition of two beings, as in the Nestorian “Christology of separation.”

Increasingly, a tendency developed to deny the “God-Man” certain human experiences believed to be “merely human.” From the beginning the fact of Christ’s sinlessness, a doctrine derived from Hebrews 4:15, was evident to the faithful and soon became a principle of interpretation. Athanasios, for instance, could still accept the ignorance (to agnoein) of Jesus as a characteristic of his human nature (PG 26:624A); but later, certain statements in the Gospels were seen only as an accommodation (oikonomia) to the audience: “I told you that I do not know, when in truth I do know” (Didymos the Blind, PG 39:920B). The height of this tendency is shown in the Monothelite controversy when Maximos the Confessor denied the possibility of a gnomic will in Christ, that is, the freedom of choice or free will.

After the acceptance of dyophysitism at the Council of Chalcedon, theology was occupied with an explanation of the union, kept within the scope of the Chalcedonian definition (Neo-Chalcedonism), as taking place in the Person of the Logos (hypostatic union). This view came to fruition in the 6th C. in the anathemas of the Fifth Ecumenical Council (553) and in so-called Theopascitism under Justinian I. This made it possible to accord prominence to the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria and to offer the Monophysites a formula that drew from both traditions (e.g., “Known in two natures; united, without commingling, of two natures”).

Emphasizing the hypostatic union gives prominence to the Logos as the basis of the union so that he is the existential foundation of the one Christ. Thus, emphasis on the predominance of the Logos, in an Alexandrian context, brings prominently into view the deifying “energy.” Man as a union of two natures, body and soul, was a Christological model before Chalcedon and was used by Pope Leo I as well as the Monophysites. Not until Neo-Chalcedonism, however, does it become the focus for clarifying the hypostatic union and for distinguishing between varying degrees of individuation, in particular the differentiation of the individuality of nature or substance and of person of hypostasis. The individuality of body and soul, both of which are conceived within a Platonic framework, are united in a particular man, in his person or hypostasis, on which basis the individual “exists in himself” as an independent being; yet, he is more than a particular instance of a common nature, or species.

The consequence of this model is shown in the Christology of Patr. Anastasios I of Antioch with his emphasis on the deification of man: “Many times have our holy fathers made use of the paradigm of man when reflecting on the union of natures [in Christ]. As man is constituted of different activities (energeiai), some of which belong to the rational soul, some to the body, in the same way we understand the union that took place in our Saviour; just as we see one hypostasis constituted of different natures, so also we see it constituted of different energies,” the divine and human (Doctrina Patrum, ed. F. Diekamp, 13.1, pp. 79.13–80.3).

If, as in Theodore of Raithou, the energies are expressly connected with the hypostasis, or together form a prosopon derived from a prosopon, then Neo-Chalcedonism is able to promote a single, hypostatic energy of Christ. In other words, there is created a Chalcedonian monoenergism (or Monothelitism) as, for example, in the anthropological paradigm to which Patr. Sergios I refers Pope Honorius (Mansi 11:536AB). By emphasizing that the subject of the activity and will is one, both Nestorianism and the possibility of conflict between the divine and the human in Christ were excluded, while Christ’s sinlessness, and its accompanying mode of freedom, was firmly established.

It is noteworthy that Maximos the Confessor sought to understand the uniqueness of Christ’s
hypostatic union by altering this paradigm, after a phase in which he avoided or even rejected it, and thereby provided anthropology with a significantly different model of man. The human hypostasis is never absolutely independent, never autonomously free; in its worldly and communal existence it is precisely defined as a union of natures, bound by necessity and impotence to arise and disappear, together with its elements, and to be so constituted until the end of the world. Christ alone is a pure hypostatic union standing above the laws of unions in the natural order. Consequently, he is an absolutely unique hypostasis and is not like man, who is unique only in a relative sense, existing as one particular among many other particulars of the same species. The autonomous character of Christ's hypostasis differs from that of the hypostases in the natural order, for there the independence of the hypostasis is conditioned by the essential elements that constitute the species.

Maximos's concept of "person," therefore, is not concerned with its precise content, but rather its ontological structure. Since Christ is a unique synthesis established in divine freedom, he is not subject to anything in or of the world. For Maximos, as soon as one defines the content of the hypostasis, its activity and will, one falls into Monophysitism, for one's thought moves within the framework of the natural synthesis characterizing man.

This Christological model was, however, unique and had little impact on the history of Byz. theological thought, where distinguishing marks are the predominance of the Logos, the notion of the mutual interpenetration (perichoresis) of the divine and human natures, and the communication of idioms produced by the hypostatic union. As a result, theological scholarship acquired the religious flavor peculiar to the tradition of Alexandrian Monophysitism, and this became normative for Byz. thought. The divine Logos is the one whom the believer encounters in the icon of Christ, and in the life, suffering, and resurrection of Jesus. It is God who in Jesus has assumed all mankind and whose presence extends in an aesthetic experience.

This experience is in no apparent conflict with God's transcendence, with respect to his essence. The argument of the Iconoclasts—which maintained that the iconographic representation of Christ, to the extent that it claims to depict God and man, either separates his two natures (falling, therefore, into Nestorianism) or fuses them into one (thereby falling into Monophysitism)—reflects not the experience or consciousness of the faithful, but rather competing pseudo-rational Christological formulas. An example of an alternative view is the simple statement of Patr. Nikephoros I that in the icon of Christ the Logos is made visible if it represents his body and therefore refers to him. At issue is the role of perceptible symbols in conveying spiritual understanding: "We do not err when we depict Christ crucified at all times, for if what we see mentally, while absent, is not also seen with the senses in painting, then even what we see mentally will be lost" (Theodore of Studios, PG 99:436A).

In spite of this spirituality, the dogmatic formula of Monophysitism remained unacceptable to Byz. thought and theologians were constantly involved in its refutation, esp. when the conquests in Armenia and on the borders of the Euphrates confronted them again with the Monophysite church. Christology also played a role in the polemic against Islam in that Monophysite, and even Nestorian, influences are discernible in the Qur'an, thereby indicating the milieu in which it originated.


—K.-H.U.

**LITERARY DESCRIPTIONS OF CHRIST.** Although the New Testament provides no information on the physical characteristics of Christ, gradually the church fathers developed verbal descriptions of Christ in his human manifestation. Using Isaiah 52:13–53:12 as their source, some early fathers (Clement of Alexandria, Basil the Great, Cyril of Alexandria) imagined Christ as an unattractive man of short stature and ordinary features (A. Michel, DTC 8 [1947] 1153). Others (Jerome and Augustine in the West, John Chrysostom in the East) provided a different literary portrait, based on the description of the Messiah in Psalm 44:3 as "the most beautiful of the sons of men." Chrysostom (PG 57:346.19–26) states that Christ's countenance was surely comparable
to the glorious face of Moses and to Stephen the Protomartyr, who resembled an angel.

By the 9th C. detailed descriptions of Christ were developed: the Letter of the Three Patriarchs (ed. Duchesne 277.15–18) refers to the church tradition that presented Christ as being "of good build, three cubits tall, with eyebrows that meet, beautiful eyes and long nose, curly haired, bent over, of healthy appearance, with a black beard, a complexion the color of wheat, and long fingers." The same features are listed in the letter to Emp. Theophilos falsely ascribed to John of Damascus (PG 95:349C) and by Oulpios (ed. Chatzidakos, EEBS 14 [1938] 411.39–43).


Types of Christ. The iconographical tradition of representing Christ was slow to develop. Once established, however, images of Christ remained remarkably consistent, because of the emphasis, from the 6th C. onward, on "authentic" likenesses of Christ that were all supposed to derive from acheiropoietos fashioned during his lifetime.

Early images of Christ showed him together with the apostles, or in other contexts, such as performing miracles; if depicted alone, he at first took the form of the Good Shepherd. In these cases he was generally depicted young and beardless.

Other images of Christ alone are documented only from the 6th C. onward (the lost acheiropoietos icons from KAMOULIANAI and PANIAS, in the Praetorium of Pilate in Jerusalem, and at Memphis). Two of these, the miraculous images of Christ's face known respectively as the MANDYLION and the KERAMION, survived longer; both were transferred to Constantinople during the 10th C. These two icons have also been lost, but versions of them made during the 11th C. show a bearded Zeus-like head of Christ, which suggests that these early lost images all used the same type later known as

CHRIST: Types of Christ. Christ Emmanuel in a medallion on the breast of the Virgin; mosaic, early 14th C. Church of the Chora monastery, Istanbul.
the Pantokrator. This is confirmed by the earliest surviving panel portrait of Christ, an icon at St. Catherine's monastery, Sinai (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, B1), and by the image on the solidus of Justinian II, the first figure of Christ to appear on coins (J.D. Breckenridge, The Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II [New York 1959]).

**Christ Pantokrator.** The concepts that separate the types of Christ are theological, having to do with the various manifestations of Christ in his relation to God the Father; the images themselves are based on the prophetic visions of God as well as on traditional representations of antique divinities. The Pantokrator, or "all-sovereign," designates the best-known type: Christ is represented frontally as a severe dark-bearded figure, clad in a tunic and dark blue himation, blessing with his right hand raised before his chest and holding a Gospel book in his left. His hair is parted in the middle, and two strands of hair may fall left or right from the center of his forehead. His halo is inscribed with a cross. The features do not change but can be subtly altered to convey a more strongly ascetic, merciful, or judgmental impression, depending on the taste of the period. The image is generally accompanied merely by the abbreviation IC XC, the monogram of Christ; the word Pantokrator begins to accompany this image only in the 12th C. Variations in the image are legion: Christ may be holding the book open or closed, from beneath or with his fingers stretched out over its binding. He may bless with the first two fingers raised and the last two touching the thumb or with all raised but the fourth finger. Instead of blessing, he may point to the book.

In monumental painting, this Pantokrator figure, in the form of a bust, was deemed particularly appropriate for dome decoration, where it could appear that Christ the ruler was coming from the heavenly world into the earthly through the center of the dome; it was also frequently placed over the entrance to a church, esp. the door between narthex and naos. Christ Pantokrator could be represented seated on a throne, as in the coins of Basil I (DOG, ed. Grierson, 3.1:154–60), but most often appears as a bust.

**Christ Emmanuel.** Christ as the preexistent Logos, the incarnate Word, the flesh immortal, was depicted in the form of a frontal beardless youth with curly locks pushed behind his ears, a high forehead and a cross-halo; he was known as the Emmanuel (Is 7:14). Though images of the youthful Christ were common in the 4th–5th C., separate images of Christ Emmanuel labeled as such appear with any frequency only from the 11th C. onward. Images of the MAJESTAS DOMINI in the frontispieces to Gospel MSS of the Decorative Style group replace the mature Christ with the figure of the young Emmanuel. Manuel I Komnenos used the image of Christ Emmanuel on his coins, evidently a reference to his own name. The Virgin Blachernitissa is shown with the Emmanuel enclosed in a medallion on her chest, and the features of the Emmanuel were borrowed for images of Christ Anapason, for the sacrificed child in the Amnos, for Christ in the Burning Bush, etc.

**Ancient of Days.** God the Father was never represented, but Christ's oneness with the Father (see Trinity) was conveyed through the image of Christ as the Ancient of Days (ho palaios ton hemeron), an elderly figure with white hair and beard, bearing a cross-halo. His robes and gestures are those of the Pantokrator. The image itself, rarely inscribed, is based on the description in Daniel 7:9 (cf. Rev. 1:14); it grew in popularity from the 12th C. onward.

The relation between the three aspects of Christ (Pantokrator, Emmanuel, Ancient of Days) is explored esp. in the 11th and 12th C., when all three may appear together on a single MS page (as three figures seated on three thrones in Paris, B.N. gr. 74; S. Tsuji, DOP 29 [1975] fig.4) or in a single church, each in a separate dome (NEREZI), or in three medallions down the barrel vault of the nave (St. Stephen, KASTORIA).

**Christ as Angel.** The rare image of the Christ-angel is based on Isaiah 9:6, which speaks of the Messiah as the angel of the Great Council (S. Der Nersessian, CahArch 13 [1962] 209–16). This and other Old Testament passages were adopted by Gregory of Nazianzos in his Second Homily on Easter (PG 36:624AB) to describe the vision of Habbakuk, and illustrated MSS of his homilies from the Paris Gregory on illustrate his homily with the image of an angel in a mandorla. Later versions stress the relation of the angel figure to Christ by giving the angel the cross-nimbus. Christ as SOPHIA was also depicted as the Christ-angel.

Only a couple of Christ images are clearly related to famous icons in Constantinople: CHRIST CHALKITES and CHRIST ANTIPHONETES. Both are
essentially Pantokrator images. Images in which Christ’s eyes look off to the viewer’s left, the direction followed by his “forelock,” has been associated by A. Cutler with Christ Euergetes (DOP 37 [1983] 35–45). Other epithets accompanying figures of Christ, such as soter (savior), eleemos (merciful), philanthropos (lover of mankind), hyperagathos (supremely good), and zoodotes (giver of life), while they correspond to the dedications of famous monasteries, do not necessarily represent distinct types or famous originals. The image of Christ Anapason derives from a popular literary allegory, rather than from any theological tenet or special icon original. The MAn of Sorrows and the Helkomenos (“the one dragged along”), which shows Christ being dragged to the cross and is known from at least the early 12th C. onward, are both illustrations of narrative Passion scenes.


CHRIST, GENEALOGY OF. See Genealogy of Christ.

CHRIST ANAPESON (ἀναπεσόν, lit. “the reclining one”), the image of Christ asleep, awaiting resurrection. The image depends ultimately on the description of the lion in Physiologos as a beast who sleeps with his eyes open and whose offspring, born dead, are wakened to life by their father on the third day. References in the Bible to the unsleeping lion of Judah (esp. Gen 49:9; cf. Ps 121:4) led to the incorporation of the Physiologos description into biblical commentaries and to the development by the mid-14th C. of the image of Christ as a youth reclining on a bed, legs crossed, his head resting on his right hand, his eyes open. In his left hand he holds a scroll. In monumental painting the image is most often placed in or at the entrance to the pastophoria (A. Grabar, La peinture religieuse en Bulgarie [Paris 1928] 257–62). The figure of Christ may be flanked by two angels carrying the symbols of the Passion (e.g., at Peribleptos church, Mistra); the instruments of the Passion serve to emphasize Christ’s sacrifice, as does the location near the sanctuary (in the case of the Peribleptos, the conch of the diakonikon) (S. Dufrenne, Les programmes iconographiques des églises de Mistra [Paris 1970] 33, 54). The recumbent pose is occasionally assumed by the Christ child in images of the Virgin of the Passion.


CHRIST ANTIPHONETES (ἀντιφωνητής, lit. “the one who responds,” also “the guarantor”). An icon of Christ Antiphonetes famous for its miracles was kept in Constantinople in an unidentified “domed tetrastyle” building thought to go back to the time of Constantine I the Great; it was probably in the neighborhood of the Church of the Virgin at Chalkoprateia, where the icon is known to have been housed from at least the 9th C. onward. Its best-known miracle (7th C.) involved a merchant and the Jewish creditor to whom he gave the icon as surety, and it may explain the meaning of the epithet “the giver of surety.” According to Psellus (Chron. 1:149, ch.66.1–10), the empress Zoe owned an icon of Christ Antiphonetes through which she foretold the future, as the complexion of Christ on the icon was capable of responding to questions by changing color. According to a 13th-C. chronicler, she also founded a Church of Christ Antiphonetes in which she was buried (Sathas, MB 7:163.3–5). An icon of Christ Antiphonetes appears, inscribed as such, on her coins and on other coins of the 11th C. (DOC, 3.1, ed. Grierson, 162f). The image is that of a standing, three-quarter length Christ. arms held close to his sides, with the palm of his right hand held up so as to face the viewer. It appeared again in the now destroyed 11th-C. mosaic on a bema pier in the Koniessis church in Nicaea (C. Mango, DOP 13 [1959] 252), but rarely thereafter. There was a 12th-C. monastery of Christ Antiphonetes on Cyprus.

CHRIST CHALKITES (Χαλκίτης), Christ of the CHALK Gate. The site and historical associations of this image of Christ assured its fame, yet its exact appearance remains unclear and may in fact have changed with the repeated restorations to which it was subject. Leo III's order to remove (or destroy) the image in 726 or 730 initiated ICONOCLASM. The 9th-C. version, installed under Patr. Methodios after the TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY, was executed by the artist LAZAROS in mosaic. Frolow construed Methodios's epigram on this image to mean that Christ was depicted as a bust of the Pantokrator type, with the arms of the cross as three separate spikes—that is, not inscribed in a halo—behind his head. Coins of John III Vatatzes that bear a standing figure of Christ are labeled as is a similar one in the Deesis mosaic in the narthex of the Church of the CHORA in Constantinople. But the gesture of Christ's right hand varies, and P. Grierson has suggested that the 13th—14th C. any standing figure of Christ was called Chalkites (DOC 3.1:160—62).


CHRISTIANOUPOLIS (Χριστιανούπολις), city of the Peloponnese, probably to be identified with the modern village of Christianou in western Messenia (N.A. Bees, *OrChr* n.s. 4 [1915] 265—67), although connection with ancient Megalopolis in Arkadia has also been suggested. The city probably did not exist in antiquity but was briefly important in the 12th C. The bishop of Christianoupolis, unknown previously, held metropolitan status from the end of the 11th C. (*Notitiae CP* 11.79). By the 13th C. the city had declined and in 1222 Pope Honorius III divided its territory between the bishops of Korone and Methone (*Regesta Honorii Papae III*, ed. P. Pressutti, vol. 2 [Rome 1895] 50). Christianoupolis is perhaps to be identified with C(h)ristiana of Latin documents of the 13th—14th C., which mention a tower (Bon, *Morée franque* 348). The Greek see was restored before 1278 and is mentioned thereafter (V. Gruvel, *AOC* 1 [1948] 166).

Preserved at the site is the large Church of the Transfiguration (restored), a domed octagon similar to the *katholikon* of Hosios Loukas and Daphni, dated to the 3rd or 4th quarter of the 11th C. It was apparently an episcopal church; its construction may be associated with the elevation of Christianoupolis to metropolitan rank.


CHRISTODOLOS OF KOPTOS (in Egypt), poet of 5th—6th C. Two of his epigrams in the *Greek Anthology* (bk.7, nos. 697—98) commemorate the death of John of Epidamnos, consul (467) and prefect (479). Christodoros's hexameters on the statues standing in the Zeuxippos baths at Constantinople comprise book 2 of the *Greek Anthology*.

These verses, filled with the favorite Roman praise of the statues' lifelike qualities, tell us much about the cultural taste of the times; the presence of statues of the Latin authors Vergil and Apuleius is particularly striking. JOHN LYDOS (*De magistratibus* 3.26) quotes one line from Christodoros's poem *On the Disciples of the Great Proklos*. Possibly Christodoros wrote the fragmentary poems in P. Gr. Vindob. 29788B-C (R.C. McCall, *JHS* 98 [1978] 98—63). The Souda credits him with an epic on the Isaurian war of Emp. ANASTASIOS I as well as patria on Constantinople, Thessalonike, and other cities, but none survives.


CHRISTODOLOUS OF PATMOS, saint; baptismal name John; born Bithynia first half 11th C., died Euripos in Euboea 16 Mar. 1093. After elementary education in his native village, Christodoulos (Χριστόδουλος) became a monk on Mt. Olympos in Bithynia. When his spiritual father died, Christodoulos visited Rome, Bethlehem, and Jerusalem. Forced by Turkish invasions to leave Palestine, he headed for Latros, where he was protos from 1076 to 1079. The Turkish threat then compelled him to seek refuge in Strobilos, Kos, and Patmos. On Patmos Christodoulos
founded a monastery dedicated to John the Theologian and eagerly contributed to the economic regeneration of the island, which had been devastated by invasions. In 1092 a Turkish attack made Christodouloos flee to Euripos, where he soon died.

For his monastery on Patmos, Christodouloos received privileges from Alexios I, including a chrysobull of April 1088; he composed three sets of Rules: the Hypotyposis (1091), the Diatheke (Testament) (1093), and the Kodikellos (1093). John, metropolitan of Rhodes, wrote the Life of Christodouloos, probably ca.1140; Athanasios, a monk on Patmos and later patriarch of Antioch (1156–70), wrote an enkomion of Christodouloos based on the Life. After 1191 Theodosios, a monk from Constantinople, compiled another enkomion containing a description of Christodouloos’s posthumous miracles and substantial information about political events of the late 12th C.

ED. MM 6:59–90.


CHRISTOGRAM (also Chrismon) and Christ’s monogram are terms for various monogrammatic abbreviations of the name of Christ that began to appear during the 3rd C. and became popular in the 4th C. as a result of their use by Constantine I the Great and his sons. The two most common types are (1) the combination of Chi (X) and Rho (P), the first two letters of the Greek name Christos, and (2) a starlike figure consisting of the initials of Iesous Christos, Iota (I) and Chi (X), the horizontal beam of the cross being often added to each of these figures. A third type of Christogram consists only of the combination of Rho and the cross beam. The programmatic intention can be stressed by the addition of the letters Alpha (A) and Omega (Ω) or of attendant figures like apostles, angels, putti, etc.

The Christian meaning of the abbreviations in question is not always demonstrable, the combination Chi-Rho and similar figures (crux ansata) having been used in non-Christian milieus much earlier. Therefore the original aim of Constantine when placing a symbol of this kind on Labarum and shield cannot be established with certainty (transfer from Mithraic cult?). From the 4th C. into the 6th, the Christogram was used as an apotropaic device on imperial armor and as a sign of imperial triumph. It quickly became a sign of Christ’s triumph as well, appearing already on early 4th-C. “Passion” sarcophagi, atop the cross, as it had stood atop Constantine’s labarum. Its Christian use hereafter was varied and extensive. Occasionally ornamental, it was a widespread sign of Christian affiliation; it often symbolized Christ’s triumph, and sometimes symbolized Christ himself. From the 5th C. onward, it was replaced more and more by the Cross; it remained in use, however, in special functions, e.g., on doors (apotropaic), on documents and letters (inocvative), or as a pattern of versus intexti. Its monumental use ceases after the 6th C. in Byz.


CHRISTOPHER, general; dates of birth and death unknown. He was domestikos ton scholwn under Basil I and also was the emperor’s gambros; according to C. Mango (ZRVI 14–15 [1973] 22, n.35), he married Basil’s eldest daughter, Anastasia. R. Guillard identifies him with the magistros Chris-
topher of the same reign. In 872 Christopher led the army against the Paulicians; he seized Tephrike and thereafter sent the strategoi of Armeniakon and Charsianon to meet Chrysocheir at Bathyrax: an attack in the dead of night compelled the Paulicians to flee, and Chrysocheir was killed during the pursuit (P. Lemerle, *TM* 5 (1973) 103).


CHRISTOPHER, bishop of Ankyra; fl. first half of the 13th C. After being elected exarch of the West on 6 Aug. 1232 at Nicaea, Christopher was sent to the despotate of Epirus as legate of Patr. Germanos II to end the schism between the churches of Nicaea and Epirus. Upon arrival in Epirus in 1233, he convened a synod where the termination of the schism was declared. He was well received by most of the Epirot clergy, who provided him with financial support during his stay. He met with leaders of the schism, like George Bardanes, and investigated the status of certain stauropegial monasteries (G. Prinzing, *RSBS* 3 (1983) 24, 52, 57).


CHRISTOPHER LEKAPONES, eldest son of Romanos I; co-emperor (921–31); died Constantinople? 931. Christopher replaced his father as megas hetairiarches ca.919 and was crowned co-emperor on 20 May 921. The patrikios Niketas, father of Christopher’s wife Sophia, tried unsuccessfully to incite him to rebel against Romanos and in 928 was removed from the palace. Maria Irene, Christopher’s daughter, was married to Peter of Bulgaria.

LIT. Runciman, *Romanus* 64f, 71f. – A.K.

CHRISTOFOR PASCHON (Χρυστός πάσχων), anonymous drama presenting the story of Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection. Although the *persona dramatis* are derived from the Gospels (Virgin, Mary, John, Joseph of Arimathea, Mary Magdalene, and others), the author has them express their feelings and attitudes in words borrowed from ancient writers, primarily Euripides. He structures his drama, however, on different aesthetic principles, replacing action with a narrative account of the action (both the chorus and heralds play a substantial part) and emphasizing the sudden shifts in emotion (S. Averincev in *Problemata poetiki i literatury* [Saransk 1973] 255–70); the author accordingly changes the lexical pattern of his sources (I.G. Rizzo, *SicGymn* 30 (1977) 1–63). The problem of authorship remains un-
solved; the MS tradition ascribes the work to Gregory of Nazianzos, and A. Tuillier accepted this traditional point of view, but the majority of scholars prefer to date Christos Paschon in the 12th C. Among possible authors mentioned are Prodomos, Tzetzes, and Manasses, none of them unquestionably proven. R. Dostalova (JÔB 32/3 [1982] 80) hypothesized that the work could have been produced in the circle of Eustathios of Thessalonike, while L. MacCoull (BSAC 27 [1985] 45–51) returned to late antiquity by hypothesizing an origin in 5th- to 6th-C. Egypt.


-A.K.

CHRISTOUPOLIS (Χρυστούπολις, mod. Kavala), seaport in northern Greece located on the site of ancient Neapolis; it was the harbor of Philippi. Prokopios (Buildings 4.4. p.118.50) mentions Neapolis in the list of Macedonian phouria fortified by Justinian I; it is still named among Macedonian bishoprics in a notitia compiled after 787 (Notitiae CP 3.274), and is listed by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 2.36, ed. Pertusi 88) among Macedonian poleis. The name of Christopolis had probably replaced that of Neapolis by the second half of the 9th C.; seals of several kommerkiarioi and an archon of Christopolis have been published (Schlumberger, Sig. 114; Zacos, Seals 1, no.2404). Its walls were rebuilt by the strategos Basil Kladon in 926 (S. Reinach, BCH 6 [1882] 267–75).

Located on an important mainland route from Thessalonike to Constantinople, Christopolis was the object of many attacks; it was burned by the Normans in 1185, captured by Baldwin of Flanders, and seized by semi-independent Lombard barons. In the 13th C. the area was contested among Latins, Bulgarians, the despote of Epirus, and the empire of Nicaea, with John III Vatatzes the ultimate victor. In the early 14th C. it was a part of the theme of Boleron-Mosynopolis (Guillou, Ménécée, no.16.1), in 1335–38 an independent theme (Xénoph., nos. 23.23, 25.1). Be-

cause of the strength of its fortifications (G. Mpakalakes, Hellenika 10 [1938] 307–18), it withstood the attack of the Catalan Grand Company in the early 14th C., but Stefan Uroš IV Dušan later conquered it. The Byz. retook Christopolis in 1357–58, after Dušan’s death, and John V gave it to two brothers, the stratopedarches Alexios and the megas primikerios John, who had commanded the army that seized Christopolis (Ostrogorsky, Serbska oblast 147–54). The city surrendered to the Turks in 1387.

The bishop of Christopolis, first attested in the early 10th C., was suffragan of Philippi; he became autonomous archbishop before 1260 and metropolitan without suffragans by 1310. The traditional view that Christopolis also had the Slavic name Moruvac was rejected by G. Theocharides (Makelonia 6 [1964–65] 75–89).


—T.E.G.

CHRIST PHILANTHROPOS MONASTERY. See Kecharittomene Nunnery.

CHRONICLE (χρονικά, also χρονογραφικά, χρονογραφεῖα, rarely χρονογραφία), the term that the Byz. applied, without a strict distinction, to various types of historiography, and that has acquired, in modern scholarship, several specific meanings. The concept of the monastic chronicle as opposed to the secular “history” created by high state officials was rejected by Beck (infra), who demonstrated that among 21 so-called chronicles only one-third were written by monks, one of whom (George the Synkellos) was a man of high education. As a conventional term, chronicle can designate any one of the following types of works: (1) historical works describing world history from Creation (John Malalas, George Synkellos, George Hamartolos, Glykas) or large sections of past history (as in Theophanes the Confessor, Patr. Nikephoros I) that for the most part were not based on the author’s personal observation; the sections on ancient history were derived primarily from Josephus Flavius, Sextus Julius Africanus, and Eusebius of Caesarea; Zonaras, however, used more sophisticated
sources; (2) short chronicles that narrated in an annalistic form political events within a limited chronological period; esp. abundant are short chronicles dealing with the Turkish invasions (see Chronicles, Short); (3) short lists of dated events (ancient empires, emperors’ reigns, patriarchs, popes, etc.) beginning with the ancient past (e.g., the Chronographikon of Patr. Nikephoros I, the chronicle of Peter of Alexandria), attested in Byz. from c.800 onward, that, according to Z. Samodurova (VizVrem 36 [1974] 139–44), were contained in MSS alongside short works on grammar, geography, rhetoric, philosophy, metrology, etc., and probably served educational ends (VizVrem 21 [1962] 146f); and (4) private notes with chronological dates, such as the list of the children of Alexios I in Moscow, Hist. Mus. 53/147 (A. Kazhdan in Festschrift F. Altheim, vol. 2 [Berlin 1970] 233–37).


—A.K.

CHRONICLE OF 819, a short, annotated chronological table of events and notable persons from the birth of Christ to 819, written in Syriac. The author, a Monophysite, and probably a monk at Qartamín, a monastery near Mardin, listed those persons and events that were of interest to members of the Syrian Orthodox church. Of particular interest are the references to military encounters between the Muslims and “Romans” in the 8th and 9th C. The chronicle was later integrated almost completely into the so-called Chronicle of 846.


—S.H.G.

CHRONICLE OF 1234, conventional title for the universal history in Syriac, composed by a now anonymous Edessan author ca.1240. The work covers roughly the same ground as does the Chronicle of Michael I the Syrian, which is earlier by almost a half-century and with which the Chronicle of 1234 often disagrees in details. The latter chronicle is composed of two major parts, a narrative of civil affairs and a record of ecclesiastical events. The two parts are conflated up to the time of Constantine I; thereafter they are in separate books. In the Chronicle’s present state of preservation, a unique and incomplete 14th-C. MS, the civil history reaches the year 1234 (hence the conventional title) while the ecclesiastical record ends in 1207. The importance of the Chronicle of 1234 lies in the fact that it preserves excerpts from earlier works that are now lost. Examples of works surviving only in quotations are writings attributed to John of Asia, Dionysiou of Tell Mahre, and a history of Edessa by Basil bar Shúmana (died 1171). Other now unknown sources used by the author appear to be the same as those used by Theophanes the Confessor (A.S. Proudfoot, Byzantion 44 [1974] 367–439).


—S.H.G.

CHRONICLE OF CAMBRIDGE, conventional and incorrect title of an anonymous chronicle preserved in two Greek versions (Vat. gr. 1912 and Paris, B.N. suppl. gr. 620 of the 11th C.) and in an Arabic translation (MS of Cambridge, of the 13th C.). It consists of brief notes with chronological indications, encompassing 827–965 and relating primarily to Greco-Arab wars in Sicily; it was apparently the continuation of a general chronicle, from Adam to 825/6. G. Cozza-Luzi suggested that it was written in 998/9, with the Arabic text produced in the beginning of the 11th C.


—A.K.

CHRONICLE OF EDESSA, or Histories of Events in Brief, as the work is called in Syriac, is essentially a list of notable events and noteworthy churchmen associated with the history of the city of Edessa from the 3rd to 6th C. The now anonymous Chronicle, which was compiled in the 6th C., survives in a unique MS (Vat. Syr. 163). It pre-
serves excerpts from the archives of Edessa as well as other sources, and is important for the history of the establishment of Christianity in the Syriac-speaking world. In its present form the Chronicle is probably an abbreviation of a longer recension of the same material. In turn, it became a source for later chronicles.


-S.H.G.

CHRONICLE OF GALAXEIDI, a brief chronicle composed ca.1703 by Euthymios, a monk of the monastery of the Savior in Galaxeidi (a port on the Gulf of Corinth). Drawing on apparently authentic documents preserved in the monastery and adding a liberal dash of epic imagination and religious credulity, the chronicle provides some interesting sidelights on late Byz. resistance movements in the southern Balkans as well as on earlier events, such as the Bulgarian invasion of the Peloponneseos under Romanos I (Jenkins, Studies, pt.XX [1955], 205–09; Bon, Peloponnese, 80 and n.4).


-E.M.J.

CHRONICLE OF IOANNNINA, name given by Vranoussis to an anonymous 15th-C. prose chronicle, originally wrongly attributed to the nonexistent “Komnenos and Proklos.” The chronicle, written ca.1440, is the longest and most informative of the surviving texts on medieval Epirus and describes the tyrannical reign over Ioannina of Thomas Preljubovic (1366/7–84). The author is very hostile to Thomas and emphasizes his cruelty. The second portion of the chronicle concerns Thomas’s pious widow, Maria Angelina (died 1394), and her marriage in 1385 to the Florentine Esau Buondelmonti, who ruled benevolently until 1408 or 1411. The chronicle also contains information about the settlement in Epiros of Serbs and Albanians. It concludes with the year 1399; however, an Oxford MS of the chronicle contains additional entries up to 1417/18 (L. Vranoussis, Historiika kai topographika tou mesaionikou kastrou ton Ioannimon [Athens 1968] 78f). There is also a vernacular version of the chronicle, written in the 18th C., that ends with the death of Thomas.


-AM.T.

CHRONICLE OF MONEMVASIA, conventional and perhaps incorrect title of a local anonymous chronicle preserved in four late MSS (of the 16th C.) that differ from each other in content. Lemerle argued that the original chronicle (reproduced in Ivir. 329) should be called the “Chronicle of the Peloponneseos”: it describes events in the Peloponneseos from Justinian to Nikephoros I. The additional section deals with later events, some of which can be dated from 1082 to 1339. Lemerle argued that the chronicle was written before 932, when it was used in a scholion by Arethas of Caesarea; J. Koder even hypothesized that it was Arethas who compiled the chronicle (JÖB 25 [1976] 75–80). I. Dujićev (in Charteris Studies 54) rejected these conclusions on the basis of the allusion to Nikephoros II who lived after Arethas; he dated the chronicle to 963–1018. The chronicle’s statement that the Slavs dominated the Peloponneseos for 218 years has provoked heated discussion: S. Kyrkiakides (Byzantinai meletai, vol. 6 [Thessalonike 1947]) considered the chronicle as a nonauthentic text, whereas P. Charteris (DOP 5 [1950] 39–66) insisted on its historicity.


-AM.T.

CHRONICLE OF THE MOREA (Χρονικόν τοῦ Μόρεως), an anonymous account of the Frankish conquest of the Morea, from the First Crusade to 1292, which survives in four versions (Greek, French, Italian, and Aragonese, while extracts appear in the chronicle of Dorotheos of Monemvasia); debate continues whether the original was in Greek or French. The main MS of the Greek text (which is composed of over 9,000 lines of political verse) dates from the late 14th C., not long after the time of its composition in the first
decades of that century. Including many Frankish loanwords and written in the mixed Greek found also in the late Byz. verse romances, this work contains a large number of repeated lines, a feature which usually indicates a close connection with traditional oral poetry (M.J. Jeffreys, *DOP* 27 [1973] 163–95). The *Chronicle* is a major witness to the forms of vernacular Greek at this time. The unknown author shows good knowledge of the legal niceties of Moreot feudal procedure and is more familiar with the council chamber than the battlefield; on events outside the Morea he is totally unreliable. Taking a Frankish standpoint and at times showing a vehemently anti-Byz. and anti-Orthodox bias, his account reflects vividly the cultural mix of the Frankish-Greek Peloponnesos of the late 14th C.

**CHRONICLE OF THE TOCCO**


**CHRONICLE OF THE TURKISH SULTANS**

(Χρονικὸν περὶ τῶν Τούρκων σουλτάνων), conventional title of an anonymous chronicle of the Ottoman sultans, compiled at the end of the 16th C. It is preserved in a unique MS (Vat. Barb. gr. 111), which lacks both opening and closing folios; another MS (Vat. Barb. gr. 598) contains some fragments of the text (E. Zachariadou, *Hellenika* 20 [1967] 166). In its present form the *Chronicle* runs from 1373 to 1513. Zoras (infra) and Moravský (Byzantinoturcica 1:296) suggested that the chronicler used CHALKOKONDYLES and LEONARD OF CHIOS as well as some sources now lost; Zachariadou (infra) demonstrated that its major source was the Italian chronicle of Francesco Sansovin (in its second edition of 1573), which the chronicler translated with slight changes and additions; he used also pseudo-DOROTHHEOS OF MONEMVASIA and an independent story of SKANDERBEG. The *Chronicle’s* significance for Byz. events is minimal.


**CHRONICLES, CITY.** Local chronicles form a subdivision of the genre of chronicles; few are known (e.g., CHRONICLE OF MONEMVASIA). One can hypothesize that some kind of annalistic records were kept in Antioc and Constantinople, but the traces are very indistinct. A chronicle of Antioch seems to have been the main source for MALALAS (bks. 1–17); Theophanes and some other historians also rely on local materials. PARASTASEIS SYNTOMOI CHRONIKAI drew its detailed knowledge of the late 6th-C. emperors from a written source that might be a lost chronicle (Parastaseis 45), and some information concerning natural phenomena (solar eclipse, comets) in the second part of the
chronicle of SYMEON LOGOTETE might be drawn from a city record (A. Kazhdan, *VizVrem* 15 [1959] 140f). Schreiner (*Kleinchroniken* 1:24) listed annalistic notes from Thessalonike, Argos and Nauplion, Thebes, Mytilene, and Mesembria as well as those of Groc-Venetian provenance; they belong primarily to the 14th and 15th C.


**CHRONICLES, SHORT (Βραχέα Χρονικά),** a name imposed by S. Lambros (the first editor of these texts) on a series of unrelated brief notices found scattered in the margins and on blank folios of MSS from the 10th C. onward. A major characteristic of these notices is a precise date by indication, year, month, and day (after the *Chronographia of Theophanes the Confessor*, 9th C., this annalistic form ceased to be used for major works). The Short Chronicles vary in type and can include extracts from longer works, lists of imperial reigns, records of events in a particular locality, and notes of births and deaths within an individual family. Though often scrappy, the Short Chronicles, which cover all periods from the 4th C. to the Turkish conquest of the Aegean in the 16th and 17th C., frequently contain information unattested elsewhere; they provide an invaluable web of references that corroborate and complement the narrative historians.

ED. *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, ed. P. Schreiner, 3 vols. (Vienna 1977–79), with partial Germ. tr. – E.M.J.

**CHRONICON ALTINATE,** a complicated Venetian compilation that survives in 13th-C. MSS and whose legendary early history of Venice and its relations with Byz. comprises catalogs of rulers and bishops. It preserves an essential document on the circumstances of the deaths of Byz. emperors and descriptions of their tombs that was compiled in the 10th C. and continued from the 11th to 15th C. The 10th-C. section is a Latin translation of a lost memorandum of the emperors' reigns that once figured as the hitherto lost chapter 42 of *De cer.* book 2 (C. Mango, I. Ševčenko, *DOP* 16 [1962] 61–69) and sheds considerable light on problems of imperial chronology.

ED. R. Cessi, *Origo civitatum Italie seu Venetiarnum [= FSI 73]* (Rome 1933) 102–19.


**CHRONICON PASCHALE,** conventional title for a Byz. universal chronicle, probably written in the 630s. It was so named by its first editor DuCange because it presents methods of determining the date of Easter. It has sometimes been called the Alexandrian Chronicle, although in fact the work does not follow the Alexandrian chronographic tradition. The *Chronicon Paschale* originally covered the period from Adam to 629/30, but the preserved text breaks off in 628. It is the first extant chronicle to use the reckoning of 21 March b.C. 5509 for the date of Creation. Though largely a compilation of *Sexius Julius Africanus*, *Eusebios of Caesarea*, *Kosmas Indikopleustes*, and other sources, it does provide documentary and contemporary evidence for the 6th and early 7th C., esp. the reigns of Phokas and Herakleios. From the prominence accorded to *Sergios I*, patriarch of Constantinople, it has been conjectured that the author was a member of his circle.


**CHRONICON SALERNITANUM,** essential source on Byz. Italy and its relations with neighboring principalities by an anonymous 10th-C. monk of Salerno (perhaps Radoald, abbot of St. Benedetto—H. Taviani, *Annales de Bretagne et des pays de l'Ouest* 87 [1980] 175–89). The chronicle draws on the *Liber pontificalis*. Paul the Deacon, *Erchempert*, and lost archival materials, which are sometimes incorporated into the account (e.g., the letter of Louis II to Basil I and the spurious epistolary exchange between Charlemagne and the *basileus*), as well as oral tradition; it also narrates in lively—and sometimes inventive—fashion the deeds of the princes of Benevento and Salerno from the 8th C. to 974. It is particularly valuable for the later period.

CHRONICON VENETUM, the oldest surviving Venetian history, which narrates events from the sixth C. to 1008. The prominent role the anonymous work gives to the diplomat John, deacon, chaplain, and confidant of Doge Pietro II Orseolo (976–78, 991–1008), suggests that John may have written it. Most material on Byz. for the first two centuries comes from the 8th-C. chronicler Paul the Deacon. From ca.800 the Chronicon has independent value, although its sources are unclear and its chronology imprecise. It downplays Venice’s formal links to Byz. but documents relations in the conferral of dignities like spatharios, hypatos, etc., on dogs (e.g., 103.12–13, 104.1–2, 106.16–17); the defense of Byz. Italy (109.4–12, 113.11–115.4); the dispatch of Venetian bells to Constantinople for a church built by Basil I (126.13–16); and the purchase of artwork in Constantinople (143.1–2). It also treats Eastern events like the revolt of Bardanes Tourkos (100.14–19), the Bulgarian victory over Michael I (106.6–14), the attack of the Rus’ on Constantinople in 860 (117.14–118.5), Romanos I’s coup and Constantine VII’s restoration (134.23–136.13), and the marriage at Constantinople of the doge’s son with Basil II’s “niece,” Maria Argyropoulina (167.27–169.11), who was actually a sister of Romanos III (Vannier, Argyrop 43).


—M.McC.

CHRONOGRAPHER OF 354. See Calendar of 354.

CHRONOLOGY. Byz. inherited from the ancient world its wide variety of systems for ordering events at proportioned intervals on a fixed scale and for measuring the time between them, and it proceeded to construct new systems of its own. Nature’s way of ordering the passage of time is twofold: the monthly cycle of the moon and the annual seasonal cycle of the sun. Following Ro-

man usage, the Byz. calendar comprised a week of seven days, with each day divided into hours of light and dark which varied in length depending on latitude and the seasons; and a year of 365 days divided into 12 months of uneven duration with a bissextile or leap year every four years. At Constantinople and throughout most of the Byz. world each new year began on 1 Sept. (before 462, on 23 Sept.). This day traditionally signified the beginning of the indiction, the official administrative year, which became compulsory for legal purposes in 537 (Justinian I, nov.47). The indiction was originally a cycle of years used in Egypt for the purpose of assessing land tax and in 312/13 a regular indiction of 15 years was instituted. Although the successive indiction cycles were themselves never numbered, each year within the cycle was, and the indiction became the usual way for the Byz. to distinguish recent and forthcoming years. When a document is dated only by an indiction, the exact year must be established by some other means. The date of Easter was the other recurring chronological yardstick for Byz.; it required the provision of paschal tables setting out successive years with each year’s Easter date. Sometimes events were dated in or from a year of cataclysmic or portentous events such as earthquakes, eclipses, and comets.

The passing of time was ordered in a number of short-term and long-term ways. In the short term an event might be ascribed to a particular indiction or eponymous year. There was a variety of eponymous years that could begin and end at any point in a solar year: regnal years of Byz. emperors and foreign rulers (regnal years of Byz. emperors might also be used outside the empire, e.g., in Italy); years of the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; years of the popes of Rome; and years of leading imperial officials such as praetorian prefects. Until the 7th C., following Roman practice, each year beginning on Jan. 1 was a consulship named after one or two consuls designated for that year. This was the usual way of dating years in chronicles and in public and legal documents. Lists of consuls were maintained for chronological reference.

The ordering of time over longer spans was much more complex and controversial. Some traditional measures were utilized: Olympiads (each year being the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th of a successively numbered Olympiad beginning in 776 B.C.);
local eras used in different cities and regions such as the Antiochene Era or the Diocletianic Era originating in Egypt and beginning on Thoth 1 (Aug. 29). The years of Diocletian were used initially for Easter tables but were later employed to date events and documents. More significant were the chronological measures developed by the Byz. themselves: lunar/solar cycles and world eras. Lunar cycles (19 years) and solar cycles (28 years) were employed to establish recurring synchronism and were compounded into larger cycles of 532 (= 28 × 19) years for fixing paschal dates (see Computus). The cycles also formed the basis for calculating eras from Creation, on the suppositions that the age of the world could be discovered precisely by chronographical methods and that the death and resurrection of Christ were epochal dates of special cosmic significance. All Byz. era calculations were based on the lunar cycle of Anatolios of Laodikeia, which began in 258, and the world era of Julius Africanus (Incarcarnation in 5500, or 5501 by George the Synkellos’s reckoning). Consequently, the Alexandrian Era was constructed by changing the commencement of the year to 29 Aug., and the Byzantine Era was constructed by adjusting the cycle of Anatolios first to the equinoctial new moon (21 Mar.), then to the indiction. There were other eras such as that of Malalas (Incarcarnation in 5967, Crucifixion 6000) and the eras of the Incarnation (date dependent on world era) and the Ascension (beginning in 31). The official era became the Byzantine Era, while the civil year corresponded to the liturgical year, reflecting the way Byz. had come to sacralize chronology and the calendar.

The multiplicity of dating systems used by Byz. up to the 9th C. meant that historians and annalistic chroniclers always needed to reconcile and combine overlapping systems. The chronicle of Malalas, for instance, dates events by consulsships and indications, by the Antiochene Era, and by years from Adam. It was not easy to maintain perfect synchronism over a long period, as evidenced by the miscalculation of Theophanes the Confessor for the events of the 7th/8th C. After Theophanes a unified system of chronology was used, and the date of the Creation as 5,508 years before the Incarnation was generally accepted.

To establish the chronology of events, modern scholars rely primarily on direct indications of dates. The sources, however, present various difficulties in chronology: (1) many Byz. historians do not date every event; thus, Byzantinists can place undated episodes in time only by inference, assuming that events were presented in strict chronological sequence (not always true); (2) some events or documents are dated by indication only, and the scholar needs additional information to establish an absolute date; (3) in some cases, when there is a discrepancy between the date by indication and the date from Creation, the scholar must decide which date is correct (or if both are wrong); (4) a similar problem arises when events are assigned different dates in Byz. and non-Byz. sources. If a source has no date whatever, the event can sometimes be dated on the basis of astronomical data (mention of eclipses and comets), of natural phenomena (earthquakes, plagues, etc.), or of feasts (e.g., by the occasional coincidence of Easter or a Sunday with a day and month of the solar year).

Auxiliary disciplines have elaborated complicated methods to date MSS, inscriptions, coins, seals, ceramics, and other objects; to establish the chronology of archaeological material, not only the discovery of relatively well-dated objects (esp. coins) is necessary, but also stratigraphy, that is, the sequence of inhabited levels. Particularly important and difficult is the dating of literary texts, esp. anonymous ones, that can be based only on the mention of persons and events and, to a far lesser degree, on stylistic and linguistic criteria.


—B.C., A.K.
as the time of the sensible world and aion (eternity) as the time of the everlasting cosmos (Basil the Great, PG 29:596B; Gregory of Nazianzos, PG 36:320B).

LIT. O. Waser, RE 3 (1899) 2481f. —A.K.

CHRYSAPHEs, MANUEL, musician; fl. ca. 1440–69. Although little is known about his life and growth as a musician, apparently Chrysaphes (Χρυσάφης) was the most prolific and distinguished composer, singer, scribe, and theoretician of the late Byz. period. At least two of his dated autographs survive: Athens, Iveron 1120 (July 1458) and Istanbul, Topkapi 15 (July 1463). Numerous sources reveal that he held the office of lampadarios (see SINGERS) at the imperial palace, and, as John VIII and Constantine XI commissioned certain of his compositions, his association with the imperial court is confirmed.

Chrysaphes’ compositions appear with great frequency in musical collections written after the mid-15th C. In this he compares favorably with the prolific 13th- and 14th-C. writers Glykys, Koukouzeles, Korones, and Kladas. All adhere to the new stylistic trends of the Palaiologan period, characterized in musical composition by the dominant kalophonic idiom. Chrysaphes—like his predecessors, acutely aware of the need to refurbish older chants, which were no longer suitable for the new, expanded liturgy, and to enrich the repertory with fresh vocal settings—composed a variety of musical offerings in diverse styles to suit the new requirements: solo and choral hymnody and psalmody; embellished chants; kratemata (see Teretismata); etc.

Chrysaphes was one of the few Byz. composers to write about theoretical and practical matters that he considered essential for a true understanding of Byz. chant. His treatise, entitled On the Theory of the Art of Chanting and On Certain Erroneous Views That Some Hold about It, is of great value in that it clarifies hitherto unexplained aspects of modal theory and musical practice and provides much important information about the development of Byz. singing in the 14th–15th C.


CHRYSARGYRON (ξρυσάργυρον, collatio australis), tax in gold and silver levied every five years, originally designed to pay the quinquennial do-natives to the army. The tax was instituted by Constantine I and collected from negotiatores, a term primarily denoting merchants, but also including moneylenders and prostitutes; doctors and teachers were exempt. The tax was assessed on the capital assets of the negotiatores, along with their tools and families. Officials elected in each city by those liable for the tax collected the chrysargyron; it was esp. burdensome for city dwellers and those of small means. In the 5th C. it was collected every four years. In 498 Emp. Anastasios I abolished the tax, making up the difference from his own estate.


—T.E.G.

CHRYSOBALANTES, THEOPHANES, physician; fl. probably 10th C. Recent research has demonstrated that the name of Theophanes Nonnos, previously ascribed to this physician, derives from a Renaissance forgery. No biographical data are known. At the orders of an emperor “Constantine Porphyrogennetos,” probably Constantine VII, Chrysobalantes (Χρυσοβαλάντης) compiled a therapeutic manual composed of abstracts from the writings of Oribasios, Aetios of Amida, Alexander of Tralles, and Paul of Aegina. This compendium survives as the Epitome de curatione morborum in 297 chapters. He also wrote a pharmaceutical tract, the De remediis (as yet unpublished). A third treatise, De alimentis, describes the nutritive values of various foods.


—J.S.

CHRYSOBERGES (Χρυσοβέργης, “golden wand”), a family known from the late 10th C. Some family members were judges or fiscal officials, such as “Krysobourgiou,” judge of Melitene under Rómanos III (Michael I the Syrian, Chronique 3:140f); Peter Chrysoberges, patrikios and
judge of the *velum* and Charsianon (Schlumberger, Sig. 285; the editor's date—10th C.—does not seem acceptable: at that time Patrikios was too elevated a title for a provincial judge); Peter, *megas chartularios* of the genikon (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.335) in the 11th C.; John, *megas chartularios* of the soldiers' *logothesion* in 1088; Michael, *logariastes* on Crete in 1193.

Other members of the Chrysoberes family were high ecclesiastical functionaries: two patriarchs of Constantinople, Nicholas II and Loukas Chrysoberes; Theodosios, patriarch of Antioch in the mid-11th C. (Laurent, Corpus 5,2, nos. 1521–24); Chrysoberes, metropolitan of Naupaktos, an addressee of Theophylaktos of Ohrid; another Chrysoberes, archbishop of Corinth ca.1170 (V. Laurent, REB 20 [1962] 214–18); Stephen, *char-tophilax* of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople in the mid-12th C. (Laurent, Corpus 5,1, no.101; he was, according to Laurent, identical with the archbishop of Corinth); Nikephoros Chrysoberes, metropolitan of Sardis and a writer (see Chrysoberes, Nikephoros). The family possessed lands and held modest posts in the Smyrna region from the 12th C. onward (Ahrweiler, "Smyrne" 109f). While they still participated in administration in the 14th C.—a Leo signed a charter of 1322 as imperial *doulos* (Chil. 1, no.85,98–99), and a John was an imperial envoy ca.1343—by that time they were mostly peasants, artisans, and scribes.

**CHRYSOBERGES, MAXIMOS**, theologian; died Lesbos? between 1410 and 1429. He was the elder of three brothers, all of whom became Dominicans; both Theodore and Andrew rose to be vicar-general of the order. Maximos was a student of Demetrios Kydones and studied Aquinas in his teacher's translation. After his conversion to Catholicism, he entered a Dominican monastery in Pera ca.1390. A few years later he went to Venice to study philosophy and (in 1396) to Pavia to study theology. In 1398 he traveled to Rome, where he received permission from Pope Boniface IX (1389–1404) to celebrate the Dominican rite in Greek. Circa 1399/1400 he went to Crete, where he participated in a public disputation with Joseph Bryennios and wrote his *Discourse to the Cretans on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*. He also engaged in polemics with Neilos Damilas. Maximos believed that the decline of the Byz. was a result of their disobedience to the pope.


---

**CHRYSOBERGES, NIKEPHOROS**, rhetorician; born probably ca.1160 (not 1142), died after 1213?. Promoted with the patronage of Constantine Mesopotamites to the post of didaskalos ca.1186, Chrysoberes probably fell into disgrace in the 1190s but was then appointed *magistros ton rhetoron* (1200–04) and produced speeches to Alexios III, Alexios IV, and Patr. John X Kamateros. Circa 1204 he succeeded his uncle as metropolitan of Sardis. Both his political views and literary principles were traditional and conventional. He praised imperial power but unlike Eustathios of Thessalonike remained unimpressed by military prowess. The Italian problem occupied an important place in Chrysoberes' works. In 1202 he criticized the Italians for their arrogance and vanity but was more cautious in 1204, trying to present them as loyal servants of Alexios IV.


---

**CHRYSOBULL** (χρυσόβουλλον), generic name for several types of documents bearing the emperor's gold bulla; later, used to indicate solemn documents, even those without such a bulla. Chrysobulls were also issued by the emperors of Trebizond and by Slavic rulers, esp. by Stefan Uroš IV Dušan.

Types of chrysobull included the *chrysoboullos logos*, the *chrysoboullon sigillion*, the *chrysoboullon*, and the *chrysoboullos horismos*. The *chrysoboullos logos* (preserved originals from 11th to 15th C.) was a solemn document for granting privileges (including unilateral confirmations of treaties with
countries of western Europe), sometimes also for communicating important administrative decisions or for publishing new laws. The word *logos* (usually three times), part of the date, the word *legimus* (until the 12th C.), and the full imperial autograph signature were written with red ink. The *chrysobullon sigillion* (origins from 11th to mid-14th C.) was for lesser privileges, often related to real estate. Words written in purple ink were *sigillion, legimus* (until 1119), and the emperor’s autograph *menologem*. In some early *sigilla*, the gold seal was accompanied by the emperor’s wax seal. The *chrysobullon*, sometimes defined as *horkomotikon* (when confirming an oath) or *prokuratorikon* (when it served as a procuratio), was a document for confirmation of treaties, safe-conducts, appointment of representatives (13th–15th C.), signed either with full signature, or with *menologem*. The *chrysoboullos horismos* (middle of the 14th C.) was a less-solemn document in which only the emperor’s full signature was written in purple.

The gold bulla and the emperor’s autograph full signature in purple (exception: *menologems* 1341, 1342) were also used to confirm treaties (*trevae, symbolation, symphonia*) with Venice and Genoa (1341 and after) as well as the *litterae patentes* (Gr. *aneagmenai graphai*) issued in Paris by Manuel II (1400, 1402), although the word *chrysobull* was not used of them.


---

**CHRYSOCEIR** (Χρυσοχείρ, lit. “Golden Hand”), last leader of the Paulicians (ca.863–ca.878/9). Chrysoceir may have served in his youth as an officer in the imperial army, but his career is known primarily after his succession to his uncle, Karbeas. Chrysoceir sided with the Muslims and fought vigorously against Emp. Basil I, raiding as far as Nicaea, Nikomedea, and even Ephesus, but the capture of Tephrike and his own murder by a renegade named Poullades (ca.878/9) brought about the end of the Paulician principality. The memory of his career must have survived in popular tradition, for in the *Digenes*

AKRITAS he seems to have been turned into Di-
gen's Muslim paternal grandfather.

LIT. Lemerle, "Paulicien" 96–103. Garsoian, Paulician
Heresy 30f, 39, 128f.

—N.G.G.

CHRYSOGRAPHY. See Illuminators.

CHRYSOKEPHALOS, MAKARIOS, metropolitan
of Philadelphia (1336–82); baptismal name
1382. Born to a noble family, Chrysokephalos
(Χρυσοκέφαλος) is first attested, as a scribe, in
1327. By 1328 he was a monk and was later
ordained hieromonk. After becoming metropolitan
of Philadelphia, he traveled frequently to
Constantinople to participate in the permanent
synod (enemousa synodos); he remained a moderate
on the questions of Union of the Churches and
Palamism. In 1345 he was praised by Akin-
dynos (ep.48) for his opposition to Palamas, but
switched sides by the following year and signed
the Tomas of the local council of Constantinople
of 1341 five years after it had been issued. By
1350 he had the title of exarch of Lydia, and in
1351 he was called "universal judge" (see KRITAI
KATHOLIKOI). He was a candidate for the patriarc-
chate in 1353 but was defeated by PHILOTHEOS
KOKKINOS.

Chrysokephalos was celebrated by his contemporaries as an orator and writer. In his youth he compiled the Rhodonia (Rose Garden), an anthology of PROVERBS and GNOMAI. Later he wrote CATENAE on Matthew and Luke, homilies, and a vita of St. Meletios of Galesios (BHG 1246a). Passarelli (infra) argues that he was responsible for the resto-
rati on of the basilica of St. John at Philadelphia and delivered his Homily on the Feast of Orthodoxy at its inauguration. His correspondents included Sophianos, Makarios Paradeissas, and Theodore MéLITENIOTES (cf. R. Walther, JÖB 22 [1973] 219–

ED. Rhodonia—ed. Leutsch-Schneideuw, Corpus 2:135–
L'omelita sulla festa dell'ortodossia e la basilica di S. Giovanni di
Spyridon Lauriotes in GregPal 5 (1921) 582–84, 869–24
and Ho Athos 8–9 (1928) 8–11.

LIT. M. Manousakas, "Makariou Philadelphias tou
Chrysokephalou anekdota chronika semeiomata," Thesau-

—A.M.T.

CHRYSOKOKKES, GEORGE, astronomer and
physician; fl. Trebizond and Constantinople
c.1335–50. Chrysokokkes (Χρυσοκόκκης) is first
noted as a scribe who copied the BATRACHOMYOMA-
chia and Odyssey in 1336 (Vat. Palat. gr. 7). Frag-
ments of his works on medicine, perhaps influ-
enced by contemporary Persian practice, survive
in some MSS. He studied astronomy in Trebi-
zond under a priest named Manuel, who owned
MSS containing astronomical tables and their can-
ons translated by Gregory CHIONIATES from Per-
sian and Arabic into Greek. Taking his geograph-
ical table and one of his three star-catalogs from
Chioniates' version of the Zij al-Sanjari of al-
Khâzînî, his calendaric tables from the Zij al-'Alâ'i
of al-Fahhad, and most of his planetary tables and
their canons from the Zij-i Ikhâni of al-Ṭûsî,
Chrysokokkes produced ca.1346 an Introduction to
the Syntaxis of the Persians (Exegesi eis ten Syntaxin
ton Person), dedicated to his "brother," John Char-
sanites (perhaps identical with John Charsianites,
the founder of the CHSARIANITES MONASTERY—
H. Hunger, JÖB 7 [1958] 137). Some 30 MS
copies survive of this extremely popular work,
which influenced several anonymous sets of astro-
nomical tables and canons written in the second
half of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th C.
as well as the Tribilos of Theodore Meliteniotes.
Shelomo ben Eliyahu of Thessalonike (fl.1374–
86) translated Chrysokokkes' Exegesi into Hebrew
(B. Goldstein, Journal for the History of Arabic Scie-
ence 3 [Aleppo 1979] 56f). Chrysokokkes himself
made no significant contribution to astronomy (D.
Pingree, DOP 18 [1964] 144f). His authorship of
the brief list of equivalent ancient and modern
toponyms (published by U. Lampsides, BZ 38
[1938] 320–22) is extremely doubtful.

A later George Chrysokokkes, active in Con-
stantinople ca.1420–30, was an important hu-
manist. counting among his students BESBARI
and among his Italian patrons FILEFO, Aurispa,
and Cristoforo Garatone (Wilson, Scholars 271f).
Another astronomer, Michael Chrysokokkes, a
notary of the Great Church in Constantinople,
translated the astronomical tables of Immanuel
ben Jacob Bonfils from Hebrew into Greek in
1435 under the title Hexapterygon (P. Solon, Cen-

ED. Tables and one star-catalog—Astronomia philolaica,
Canons (partial)—Ad historam astronomiae symbola, ed. H.
CHRYSLORAS, DEMETRIOS, writer and government official; born before 1360, died after April/May 1416. Little is known of his biography; his relationship to Manuel CHRYSLORAS (Χρυσολόρας) is unclear. He was an intimate of MANUEL II PALAIOLOS, who addressed eight letters to Chrysoloras between 1397 and ca. 1417. About 1384/5 he went on an embassy to a “barbarian” ruler, probably the Ottoman sultan Murad I. Despite his friendship with Manuel, he served as mesazon for JOHN VII PALAIOLOS in Thessalonike from 1403 to 1408.

Chrysoloras wrote a variety of works: anti-Latin polemics (including a dialogue among Thomas Aquinas, Neilos Karasillas, Demetrios Kydones, and himself), a eulogy of St. Demetrios, and discourses on the Annunciation and Dormition. His enkomion of a flea is still unpublished. In 1403 he composed an oration of Thanksgiving on the first anniversary of the defeat of BAYEZID I at Ankara (P. Gautier, REB 19 [1961] 340–57). His description of the ideal emperor (Comparison of Old Rulers and the Present New Ruler) was the source of a closely related work, his “Hundred Letters” to Manuel, a collection of very short letters praising the emperor.


CHRYSLORAS, MANUEL, diplomat and teacher of Italian humanists; born ca. 1350, died Constance 15 Apr. 1415. About the same age as MANUEL II, Chrysoloras was the emperor’s friend and was entrusted with numerous European missions. During embassies to Venice in the 1390s he first came into contact with Italian scholars. From 1397 to 1400 he taught Greek in Florence; his most prominent student was Guarino of Verona (1374–1460). After his return to Constantinople in 1403, he continued his teaching and prepared a textbook on grammar. Chrysoloras made periodic trips to the West to seek assistance against the Turks; in 1406 he was in Venice and Padua, from 1407 to 1410 in Paris, London, Spain, and Bologna. Chrysoloras converted to Catholicism and spent two years in Rome (1411–13) attempting to negotiate the convocation of a church council. He then attended the Council at Constance, where he died.

His relatively small literary output included a Comparison of the Old and New Rome, in the form of a letter to Emp. JOHN VIII PALAIOLOS. In this work Chrysoloras shows his appreciation of the naturalism of antique art and marvels at the ancient ruins and Christian shrines of Rome, but concludes that Constantinople is the superior city because of its incomparable location and wondrous monuments such as Hagia Sophia. An autograph MS (Meteora, Metamorph. 154) preserves a lengthy and important discourse to Manuel, written in 1414, eulogizing the deceased despotes THEODORE I PALAIOLOS, and urging the promotion of education and study of the past (C.G. Patrinelis, GRBS 13 [1972] 497–502).


CHRYSOPOLES (Χρυσόπολις, lit. “Golden City”), the name of at least two Byz. cities, one in Macedonia, the other in Bithynia.

CHRYSOPOLES IN MACEDONIA, a kastron at the mouth of the STRYMON River; it was located near ancient AMPHIPOLES which disappeared in the 7th C., although some archaizing authors (from Bryennios through Kantakouzenos) continued to use the name Amphipolis. Chrysopolis is first attested in an act of 984 transferring from Lavra to Iveron 25 exempted households there (Iviri, no.6.32–35). An act of the mid-11th C. (ibid., no.30.2) places Chrysopolis in the district (dioikesis) of Boleron and Strymon. Chrysopolis was a harbor on “the sea of Chrysopolis” (Solovjev-Mošin, Grčke povelje, no.9.43–44); in 1347 Stefan Uroš IV Dušan conferred upon Lavra an annual reve-
nue of 300 hyperpera from the salt pan and mooring stations in Chrysopolis (ibid, no.16, 48–51). The town is also mentioned in Greek portulans of the 15th–16th C.

Surviving walls represent several phases ranging from the original settlement in the west to a vast extension in the east during the 14th C., probably under Andronikos III, and later repairs.


CHRYSOPOLIS IN BITHYNIA (Scutari, mod. Üsküdar), a harbor on the eastern shore of the Bosporos, and a suburb of Chalcidon. It was one of the principal places to cross the strait to Constantinople. In antiquity it was a simple home (W. Ruge, RE 3 (1899) 2518). In the 9th C. Patr. Nikephoros I described it as a coastal churon opposite Constantinople (Nikeph. 44.10–11) and as a port, epineion (60.25).

Licinius was captured in Chrysopolis after his defeat in 324 and delivered to Constantine I. The town gained significance in the 7th and 8th C., when both the Arabs attacking Constantinople and armies from rebellious themes headed toward the Bosporos: thus in 668 the soldiers of Anatolikon assembled in Chrysopolis to demand that Emp. Constantine IV accept his brothers as co-rulers; in 715 the town served as a base for the Opsikionoi who mutinied against Anastasios II; in 717 the future Leo III moved against Theodosis III from Chrysopolis. The town also played a crucial role in the revolt of Artabasdos against Constantine V. In 803 Bardanes Tourkos arrived there and waited in vain for the citizens of Constantinople to invite him into the city. In 988 Basil II defeated Bardas Phokas at Chrysopolis, and in 1055 the rebellious Bryennios went to Chrysopolis. Around 1050 Chrysopolis formed a theme under the command of a strategos (Skyl. 467.2–3). Its role evidently diminished after the Turkish conquest of Asia Minor, where these uprisings had originated. In 1200 Alexios III moved to Chrysopolis when there was a rebellion in Constantinople. Under its new name, Scutari, Chrysopolis is mentioned by Latin authors in the 13th C.

Chrysopolis was an important monastic center.

The most renowned of its monasteries was built by Philippikos.


- A.K.

CHRYSOTELEIA (χρυσοτέλεια, lit. “tribute in gold”), a tax introduced by Anastasios I. It is described by a 6th-C. chronicler (Malal. 394,8–10) as a tax imposed upon Juga, collected in money instead of in kind, and used “to feed the stratiotai.” Evagrios Scholastikos (HE 3:42) criticizes Anastasios for levying the chrysoteleia, since the emperor “sold the soldiers’ expense” and placed a heavy burden on taxpayers; according to John of Antioch, Anastasios’s measures left the provinces (eparchiai) empty of military contingents (FHG 4:621, fr.215). This evidence has been variously interpreted: as a new tax replacing the chrysargyron that Anastasios had abolished; as a commutation of the annonae; and finally as an adae-ratio tironum (see Secondary Taxes) that was effective only temporarily. The vernacular expression chrysoteles eispraxis (exaction in gold) used by the hagiographer of Nikon ho “Mete-noeite” (ed. Sullivan, ch.58.13) was understood by N. Svoronos (Cadastre 85, n.1) as synonymous with charagma.


- A.K.

CHRYSOTRIKLINOS (Χρυσοτρικλινος, “golden hall”), a hall in the GREAT PALACE, probably constructed at the end of the 6th C. A domed octagon lit by 16 windows, the Chrysotriklinos was the place of ceremonial receptions, esp. at Easter. Its principal table (of gold or rather gilded silver) accommodated 30 high-ranking state and church functionaries; there were 2 to 4 additional tables for 18 persons each, where subordinate officials were seated. Literary sources sometimes mention a small table for the emperor who sat apart from his guests. The imperial throne, decorated with a mosaic representing the enthroned Christ, was placed in the apse of the Chrysotriklinos. The hall contained exquisite furniture, of which the most renowned piece was the so-called Pentaptychion, a large cupboard displaying vases, crowns, and other precious objects. The Chrysotriklinos was surrounded by numerous halls: Tripeton (a ves-
tibule of Chrysotriklinos). Horologion (possibly containing a sundial), Kainourgion (adorned with 16 columns and with mosaics depicting imperial expeditions), Lausiakos, and the Triklinos of Justinian (II), from which one could reach the Hippodrome through the Gate of Skyla. The official in charge of the Chrysotriklinos (also called the protospatharios of Chrysotriklinos) was an important court dignitary, but his functions are not yet clear.


-A.K.

CHURCH (ἐκκλησία, lit. “assembly”). The Byz. did not develop a systematic ecclesiology. Instead, for them the church was a sacramental communion that included not only the earthly oikoumenē but the Kingdom of Heaven as well, with angels, saints, and God himself: in the words of Isidore of Pelousion (PG 78:685A), a “union of saints hammered out of true faith and perfect behavior.” In general, however, the Byz. church rejected the claims of Donatism and Montanism, whose followers sought to exclude sinners from membership in the church. Sanctity and unity were considered basic features of the church, contrasted with the multiplicity and falsity of paganism and heresy. The unity of the church was underlined by such epithets as katholike (general) and oikoumenike (universal), and its dogmatic correctness by the epithet orthodoxos (of right belief).

Administration of the church was based on patristic texts and the canons of ecumenical and local councils, codified beginning in the 6th C. and regularized in the Nomokanon of Fifty Titles. The Byz. church did not have a single head, rejecting the idea of papal primacy, but embraced the concept of pentarchy in which patriarchs and the pope maintained administrative control of their individual territory. In fact, the loss of the East to the Arabs in the 7th C. and the separation of the West made the patriarch of Constantinople the de facto head of the Byz. church. The Byz. defended the concept that the authority of the council was superior to the power of the patriarch; in an extreme form, an anonymous treatise of the 10th C. tried to justify the superiority of an assembly of metropolitans over the patriarch of Constantinople (Darrouzès, infra 24–29). On the contrary, Niketas of Amaseia defended the thesis that the patriarch was the supreme arbiter in the ecclesiastical sphere. With regard to the state, theoreticians insisted that the church was superior to the civil administration (e.g., John Chrysostom, PG 61:507.42–43), in contrast to the attempt of the state to treat the emperor as the supervisor (“bishop”) of the church’s external affairs. The author of the Epanagoge presented the theory of two equal powers, that of the emperor, who deals with material matters, and that of the patriarch, responsible for mankind’s spiritual health and salvation. In practice, however, civil administration usually had the upper hand over the church.

As an institution, the church possessed an established organization based on a hierarchy of rank (bishop, priest, deacon, etc.), on administrative gradations (patriarchate-metropolis-bishopric, etc.), on regular assemblies (councils), and on the system of ecclesiastical officials. Its privileges included a special canon law distinct from civil law, and various exemptions for the clergy. The church obtained jurisdiction over the clergy and in some matters over the laity. Its material basis consisted of the ownership of land, imperial grants (solemnia), movable property (esp. liturgical vessels and vestments), and voluntary donations and bequests; the mandatory tithe was a relatively late innovation. Ecclesiastical property was in theory inalienable, and attempts to confiscate it aroused serious conflicts (e.g., the case of Leo of Chalcedon).

Being a holy body, the church could expel sinful members, both temporarily and permanently (by means of excommunication). Missions expanded the church’s influence by spreading Christianity to new territories, baptizing heathens and heretics, and converting Jews and Muslims. The Byz. church had no monopoly on education, but it obtained supervision over teaching and offered episcopal posts to many outstanding scholars. Its means of salvation were challenged by some mystics who, like Symeon the Theologian, considered the individual path of vision of the divine light as superior to the activity of the institutionalized church. The political role of individual bishops was significant in secular affairs, but the influence of episcopal organization had to compete with monasteries (see monasticism) that
often managed to obtain independence from local bishops (stauroregion) and even from the patriarch.

source. Darrouzès, Ecclés.


CHURCHES, CAVE AND ROCK-CUT. See Rock-cut Churches and Dwellings.

CHURCHES, IMPERIAL, were of three main types, all more or less exempt from patriarchal and episcopal jurisdiction, although this exemption was contested in the early 11th C. by Patr. Alexios Stoudites (cf. Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 5:29) and no doubt at other times. 1. One group included the churches and chapels of the imperial palaces and provincial governors’ residences (praitoria). Their exemption is authorized in a real or spurious piece of imperial legislation whose administrative terminology reflects the realities of the 6th–7th C. (L. Burgmann in Cupido Legum 20).

2. Another group included those founded by emperors, in association either with the Palace (Nea Ekklesia, Chalke) or, more commonly, with monastic and philanthropic institutions in Constantinople (e.g., Myrelaion, Mangana, Pantokrator). Such foundations, officially designated as “pious houses” (eugeis oikoi) or, by the 11th C., “pious bureaux” (euge sekreta), constituted, with their large endowments, a special crown domain (N. Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 138–40).

3. Finally, there were monasteries whose founders, often highly respected, influential ascetics, put them under the direct protection of the emperor, in order to make them independent (autoxoustos or autodeskota) of other earthly authorities (Meester, De monachico statu 104; I. Konidares, To dikaios tes monasteriales periousias [Athens 1979] 173–79). Such foundations were registered in the imperial sakellion (Lavra 1, no.33) and put under the care of particular government ministers (P. Magdalino, REB 42 [1984] 235f).

CHURCHES, PRIVATE, were characterized, in canonical terms, by “oratory” (eukterion) status, and, for practical purposes, by dependence on a “proprietor” (ketor) able to determine how and by whom the foundation was used. Although the rights and requirements of ketores varied considerably and were sure to lapse sooner or later, it is useful to draw a conceptual distinction between churches founded on this basis and churches founded for purposes of public worship. The institution of the private church was already well established by the 6th C., and became even more popular later, accounting for the vast majority of churches built after the slump of the 7th–8th C. From this time the existing public churches were, except in newly reoccupied and reorganized provincial areas, generally more than adequate, while the urge to found one’s own church was widespread among all who had the means, which, to judge from many surviving structures, did not have to be very great.

A private church was the expression of all that the founder held most dear. It provided an intimate venue for his regular religious observances; it embodied his personal devotion to the heavenly figure to whom it was dedicated; it was a spiritual investment for his own salvation, and, as sacred property, a financial investment that was relatively secure from fiscal erosion and partial inheritance. Whether it served as a funerary chapel or merely commemorated the ketor and his family in its prayers, it was a monument to him and the unity of his kin. The significance of the private church is very well illustrated by the will of Eustathios Boilas (1059), who with his late sister’s grandchildren had joint responsibility for a church that his mother had founded, while he himself was founder of two churches, one a burial chapel, and, close to his house, another which clearly meant more to him than either of his two daughters to whose hands he reluctantly entrusted its fate (Lemerle, Cinq études 23–29).

The relationship between private churches and the authorities was ambivalent. Local bishops, who were often ketores in their own right, cannot have objected to modest foundations whose properties were registered in an inventory in the episcopal archives and might be added to the episcopal estates after the founder’s death—a practice that Basil II tried to prevent (Zepos, Jus 1:268). On the other hand, churches founded by rich and powerful ketores threatened to take business away
from the bishop's church, esp. from the 9th–10th C., when legal restrictions on the liturgical functions of domestic eukteria lapsed and founders were able to evade episcopal control by placing their foundations under the jurisdiction of the patriarch. The possibility that private services in domestic chapels were a cover for clandestine gatherings concerned the state as well as the church. William Adam (pseudo-Brocardus), a Western writer of the 14th C., saw the private churches as a politically subversive institution peculiar to Byz. (RHC Arm. 2:475).

The proliferation of private churches, whether urban or rural, domestic or monastic, undoubtedly affected the development of liturgy and church architecture from the 6th C. The exclusion of the laity from entrance processions, the confinement of these within the church, the elevation of the sanctuary barrier, and the disappearance of the synthonon and soleá may all be related to the saying of private masses in private chapels. The intimate scale of the Byz. church of the 10th–12th C. and its standardization as a hierarchy of inner surfaces peopled with icons had much to do with the ktetor's desire for communion with his own personal “heaven on earth.”

The diversity of plans, masonry types, and forms of decoration in private churches is evident in such regions as have been investigated in detail (Göreme, Kastoria, and the Mani), although local traditions tended to dictate norms in these respects. More idiosyncratic were the oratories that existed in monasteries such as St. Catherine's on Mt. Sinai and that of Constantine Lips, and in katholikai ekklésiai, for example, in the galleries of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. After the 8th C., private chapels are found in the residences of both lay persons and ecclesiastics.


CHURCH FATHERS (ἐκκλησιαστικοί πατέρες in Eusebios of Caesarea, Against Markellos 1.4.3), the most authoritative ancient Christian writers, second in their significance only to the Apostles. The totality of their oeuvre is called patristics or patrology. In the first centuries of Christianity the title “father” was given to spiritual teachers in general and esp. to bishops; pateres was also the term for the desert fathers whose sayings were collected in the Apophthegmata Patrum and for the participants in the First Council of Nicaea. The concept of the church fathers as guardians of Christian tradition was developed from the 4th C. onward, when their opinions were frequently used during Trinitarian and Christological discussions and were, for this purpose, gathered in florilegia; one of these florilegia was the so-called Doctrina patrum de incarnatione Verbi (The Doctrine of the Fathers on the Incarnation of the Logos), a collection of Orthodox and “heretical” statements concerning Monophysitism and Monothelitism, produced between 660 and 685 (Beck, Kirche 446). In the West, a (partial) list of “holy fathers” was established, probably in the 6th C., and is found in the so-called Decretum Gelasianum, the apocryphal decree of Pope Gelasius I.

The early Christian theologians are divided into the earlier Apologists (Justin, Hippolytos, etc.) and later “fathers” in a narrow sense of the word, while such authors as Origens, Tertullian, and Lactantius occupy an intermediate place. Among the Western fathers Augustine was considered supreme; after him patristics declined, and theological thought revived only in the 11th C., in the form of scholasticism. In the East, patristics flourished from the 4th to the 6th C., with pride of place being given to the Cappadocian Fathers and pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite in the theological field, while John Chrysostom marks the apogee of Christian ethics. John of Damascus summarized the whole development of Christian doctrine up to his time and can be called the last of the church fathers. The great theologians of the post-patristic period (Symeon the Theologian, Nicholas of Methone, Gregory Palamas, etc.) are not considered church fathers.

CHURCH PLAN TYPES. The classification of religious architecture by type was first established around the turn of the 20th C. and served as a chronological taxonomy. Although this method of dating has largely been superseded, the identification and study of these types remains a useful system of basic classification. The most common plan types are the following: basilica (e.g., St. Achilleos, Mikra Prespa); domed basilica (St. Irene, Constantinople); cross-domed church (Hagia Sophia, Thessalonike); cross-in-square (North Church of Lips Monastery, Constantinople); domed octagon (Nea Moni, Chios); Greek cross, or domed octagon (katholikon, Daphni); ambulatory church (Pammakaristos, Constantinople); triconch, or trefoil (large-scale: katholikon, Great Lavra, Mt. Athos; small-scale: Koubelidike, Kastoria); tetraconch, or quatrefoil (large-scale: martyrion [?], Seleukeia Pieria; small-scale: Veljusa). (For ill., see next page.)

Many other church plan types existed, but they were less commonly employed. Most could be enlarged by the addition of enveloping spaces—exedrae, ambulatories, aisles, porches, or chapels—resulting in new compound plans and more elaborate exterior massing. Multiplication of domes (St. Sophia, Kiev) is one of the most important architectural by-products of this phenomenon.


CHURCH PROGRAMS OF DECORATION. From the earliest surviving remains it is evident that Christian edifices were adorned with figural images selected and positioned according to their religious significance. Already in the mid-3rd-C. baptistery in Dura Europos both symbolic depictions such as the Good Shepherd and representations derived from biblical narratives such as the Healing of the Cripple were used to reinforce visually the beholder’s ritual experience.

From the 4th to 7th C. elaborate narrative cycles from both the New and Old Testaments appeared on the interior walls of Christian monuments (S. Maria Maggiore, Rome; S. Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna). Other monuments displayed votive panels (St. Demetrius, Thessalonike). On the triumphal arch and in the apse of the bema a variety of themes occurred, including Christ in Majesty among saints, apostles, and/or donors (S. Vitale, Ravenna), the prophetic vision (Hosios David, Thessalonike), the Virgin with accompanying figures (Kitti, Lythrakomi), and even narrative images, like the Transfiguration (St. Catherine, Sinai; S. Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna).

Ephrases of churches in Constantinople and surviving provincial monuments suggest that in the period from the 9th through the 10th C. programming was flexible. Scenes such as the Ascension and Pentecost as well as the Pantokrator might appear in the central vault. The Virgin was the most popular but certainly not the only subject for the conch of the apse. The nave might be adorned with elaborate Christological narratives or with single figures. Particularly in the provinces, votive programs seem to have maintained their pre-Iconoclastic popularity.

The so-called “Middle Byz. Program” appeared as a dominant formula only at the end of the 10th and beginning of the 11th C., coincident with the political consolidation of the empire. This scheme is typified by a Pantokrator in the central dome and the Virgin, most often holding the Child, in the conch of the bema. The heavenly court—angels, prophets, apostles, and saints—are ranked on the walls and vaults below along with icons of the Great Feast cycle. The hierarchical nature of this program complements the pyramidal ordering of space in the relatively small, centralized churches constructed during this period. With the collapse of the empire in 1204, narrative programming with the multiplication of framed, quadratic images replaced the more iconic and architeconic forms of the earlier period.


CHURCH SLAVONIC, in its broadest sense, the liturgical and literary language of the Orthodox (and Catholic Croatian) Slavs. The term Old Church Slavonic (OCS) is normally reserved for the language of the earliest translations by Sts. Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios and their immediate successors, as preserved in Glagolitic and Cyrillic MSS of the 10th–11th C.
Subsequently, distinct local recensions of Church Slavonic emerged through its interaction with the Slavonic vernacular languages (Russian Church Slavonic, Bulgarian Church Slavonic, etc.).


-S.C.F.

**CIBORIUM** (κυβόριον), a domed or pyramidal structure on four or six columns (K. Wessel, *RBK* 1:1055). In Roman times ciboria were erected over tombs both to protect them and to enhance their importance, hence their use over the altar symbolizing the tomb of Christ. Similarly, the silver ciborium at St. **DEMETRIOS** in Thessalonike was thought to mark the site of the saint’s tomb (Lemerle, *Miracles* 1:114f). A pyramidal ciborium rose over the sarcophagus containing the saint’s relics in the church of **HOSIOS LOUKAS** (R.W. Schultz, S.H. Barnsley, *The Monastery of Saint Luke* [London 1901] 29, pl.46). Circular, hexagonal, or rectangular in plan, ciboria survive mostly in fragments; exceptionally complete examples are the restored ciborium of the Katopoliane in Paros and that of the Metropolis church at Kalambaka (see STAGOI). Some ciboria display columns with spiral fluting and Corinthian or protome capitals, their pyramidal or domed canopy terminating in a cross (Orlandos, *Palaiochr. basilike* 2:471–81). Painted representations of ciboria suggest that they were furnished with curtains, though this point has been contested (Mathews, *Early Churches* 165–68).

Ciboria sometimes combined colored and white marble, while those of St. Polyuektos and St. Euphemia in Constantinople displayed inlaid glass decoration. They were cast in bronze and gilded, or dressed in silver like that in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, as described by PAUL STENTARIOS.


-L.Ph.B.

**CILICIA** (Καλκία), Roman province of southeastern Asia Minor consisting of two districts: Cilicia Pedias, a well-watered fertile plain bounded by the Taurus, Antitaurus and Mediterranean, and Cilicia Tracheia, the rugged region of the southern Taurus stretching west to **PAMPHYLIA**.

Under Diocletian, Cilicia Trachea became part of **ISAURIA**. Cilicia Pedias was divided ca.400 into Cilicia I (metropolis TARSOS) and Cilicia II (metropolis ANAZARBUS); their churches were under the patriarchate of Antioch. Located on the highway from Constantinople to northern Syria via the CILICIAN GATES, Cilicia prospered; it was a densely populated center of agriculture, trade, and manufacture (esp. of linen) through the 6th C. In 646, however, Mu’AWIYA found the area virtually deserted, and by the early 8th C. it was occupied by the Arabs, for whom it became a bulwark against Byz. attacks. These achieved their goal with the reconquest of Cilicia by Nikephoros II Phokas in 965. The district did not then form an administrative unit, but was ruled by strategoi of separate fortresses (N. Oikonomides in *CEB*, vol. 1 [Bucharest 1974] 288f). After 1071 Byz. lost Cilicia to Philaretos Brachamios; thereafter, it constantly changed hands between Byz., Crusaders, Seljuks, and Armenians. John II Komne-
nos took it in 1137; Manuel I Komnenos had to reconquer it in 1159; it was definitively lost to the Armenians after 1176 (see CILICIA, ARMENIAN). Cilicia contains the remains of numerous late antique churches and medieval fortifications.


—C.F.

CILICIA, ARMENIAN (also known as Lesser Armenia), principality (1073–1099) and subsequently kingdom (1099–1375) under the Armenian RUBENID and Het’umID, and the Latin LUSIGNAN dynasties. Armenians fleeing from Seljuk invasions after the Byz. defeat at Mantzikert (1071) took refuge in Rubenid strongholds such as Vahka and Gobidar (Kopitar) in the Antitaurus mountains, and the Het’umid Lambron near the Cilician Gates. By the end of the 12th C. the Rubenids had established a kingdom that encompassed at its peak the coastal plain of Cilicia as well as the surrounding mountains. Its capital was located at Sis, in the foothills.

The princes of Armenian Cilicia, although occasionally supported by the Crusaders, were forced to recognize the suzerainty of Byz. (reaffirmed by the campaigns of the emperors John II Komnenos in 1138 and Manuel I Komnenos in 1158) and negotiations were opened between the Armenian church and the Byz. Empire. The Third Crusade enabled the Rubenid prince Leo II to be crowned king as Leo I (see Leo II/I). Officially, Byz. sanctioned this action, but Armenian Cilicia turned thereafter increasingly toward the Latins.

The kingdom prospered from the trade passing from the West to the Far East through its port of Ayas (It. Lajazzo), esp. during the period of Mongol protection in the second half of the 13th C. Its international culture reached its apogee in the same period.

The recognition of Mongol suzerainty by the Het’umids in 1253 bolstered Armenian Cilicia for a time, but its political situation between the Seljuks of Rûm, the Mamlûks of Egypt, and the Mongols remained precarious, esp. after the conversion of the latter to Islam at the end of the 13th C. By 1292 the Armenian patriarchs were forced to abandon their seat at Hromkla on the Euphrates overrun by the Muslims and to seek refuge at Sis. Internal struggles between pro- and anti-Latin parties, fueled by the growing influence of Western institutions and by the negotiations for an ecclesiastical union with Rome, sapped the strength of the kingdom still further. The hostility of the Armenian nobility toward the Latin Lusignans led to the murder of King Guy in 1344. In 1375, an Egyptian force overran Cilicia, sacked the capital, and carried away the last king as a prisoner to Cairo.


—N.G.G.

Art of Armenian Cilicia. The many ruins of fortified towns in Cilicia include both palaces and churches, some with traces of monumental painting. Some silverwork survives—a reliquary and bookbindings—but it is MS illumination that best reveals the brilliant art of the Cilician court. The traditions of great scriptoria (in both monasteries and towns) and the contributions of individual artists and aristocratic patrons can be traced for decades at a time: for example, MSS are known from Hromkla from just after the founding of the patriarchal see there in 1151 until the Mamlûk sack of 1292; among them are seven signed from 1256 to 1269 by the artist T’oros Roslin.

Although Armenian workshop traditions survived the emigration to Cilicia, Byz. styles and images are found throughout Cilician painting. A 13th-C. Gospel (Erevan, Mat. 7651) copies almost all the miniatures of the 11th-C. Frieze Gospel in Florence. Ornate inscriptions and arabesque arches on Canon Table pages, however, reflect Islamic art, while the Lectionary of Het’um II (Mat. 979) contains Chinese elements. Cilician royalty are shown wearing oriental textiles. Latin influence was particularly strong after the Council of Sis (1252), as the affinity of T’oros Roslin’s figure style to that of the Arsenal Bible (Paris, Arsenal 5211) or the adoption of the Madonna della Misericordia type for Cilician donor portraits demonstrates.


—A.T.
CILICIAN GATES (Πύλαι Κιλκίς), the narrow pass, 1,050 m high, that offers the easiest crossing of the Taurus Mountains between central Anatolia and the plain of Cilicia, and thus always the route of a major highway. It was esp. important during the wars with the Arabs after they gained control of Cilicia in 709. The term strictly denotes the narrow pass but is also applied to the whole stretch of road through the mountains. The main center of this district was Podandos, a city and bishopric and later kleisoura of Cappadocia, which was the constant goal of (often successful) Arab attacks in the 8th–10th C. Lulon, on a steep peak at the west end of the pass, provided a final defense and served as the first in the chain of beacons that rapidly transmitted news of attack to the capital. The pass contains the remains of several fortresses.

Lit. TIB 2:223f, 261–64. —C.F.

CIRCUS. See CHARIOTEERS; CHARIOT RACES; HIPPODROMES.

CIRCUS PARTIES. See Factions.

CISTERNs. See CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF: Cisterns.

CITATION was an important stylistic device closely connected with the tendency toward archaism and imitation (mimesis). On the one hand, citation was a sort of game between the author and reader, the former avoiding any direct indication of the origin of the citation and the latter challenged to guess the source (Hunger, Lit. 2:7). On the other hand, citation could be a powerful vehicle to convey direct information; e.g., Christian apologists (imitating their Jewish predecessors) quoted ancient poets for their propaganda, and during theological discussions citation was the major argument that time and again led to forgery or deletion of crucial passages. The most commonly quoted texts were the Bible, Homer, and the ancient tragedians. Often citations originated not from original texts but from florilegia and lexika; quoting from memory was common and frequently caused distortions. The frequency of citation differs from work to work: some texts (Christos Paschon, Anacharsis, Barlaam and Ioasaph) are consciously composed of borrowed lines, while other works used citations to a limited degree. Since the concept of plagiarism did not exist, the use of quotations could grow into a copying of entire passages. Even though there was an element of showing off the author’s knowledge (D. Christides, EEpSPTh 22 [1984] 689), citation also performed specific aesthetic functions. It connected the present with the past, depicted objects and events from an alien point of view, and introduced the element of unexpectedness and strangeness (esp. by combination of biblical and pagan quotations); a new image was often constructed from borrowed words and sentences.


CITIES (πόλεις), the cornerstone of classical civilization, were centers of population, culture, trade, manufacture, and administration. By the 6th C., the East contained more than 900 cities, of which the greatest were CONSTANTINOPLE, ALEXANDRIA, and ANTIOCH. A large provincial city might extend 2 km in its greatest dimension and have a population of 50,000, but most were much smaller. Urban wealth was based on agriculture, but trade and manufacture were significant. These were usually on a small scale in which the artisan would sell the goods he made, but many cities, esp. ports, had extensive trade in essential or luxury goods. Major classes of the urban population were the curiales, bureaucrats and state officials, ecclesiastics, landowners, and the members of guilds, the craftsmen and shopkeepers.

The city differed from rural areas by its provision of public works and services. Most were maintained until the 6th C.: cities provided free bread, aqueducts, clean and lighted streets, baths, markets, theaters, hippodromes, and latrines. Diocletian instituted municipal higher education to supply trained civil servants. The church, whose revenues were increasing, offered public welfare, with hospitals, poorhouses (ptochotropheia),
homes for the aged (gerokomeia), and inns (xenodocheia). As cities found public works more difficult to support, governors came to build or restore them. Such activity was concentrated in provincial capitals, which often prospered at the expense of lesser cities. Urban prosperity varied considerably, from Constantinople, which could draw on the revenues of the empire, to cities in exposed regions like North Africa (e.g., Carthage in the 7th C.) and the Balkans, where ruin and contraction were common.

Cities were administered by councils or curiae, which relied on rents, endowments, local taxes, and contributions from their members (curiales or decurions) to support their expenses: supplying bread and water to the population, higher education, police, and esp. maintenance of baths and other public facilities. The confiscations of Constantine I and Constantius II deprived the cities of their territories and taxes; the resulting financial distress was only partially relieved when Valens remitted one-third of these revenues. The history of late antique cities is thus marked by shortage of money, weakening of the councils, and growing interference from Constantinople. As the decurions became increasingly reluctant to serve, the government tried a series of expedients to maintain the councils, install responsible administrators (defensor civitatis), and restrain the influence of rapacious governors. Finally, Anastasios I entrusted the cities to their bishops and landowners, replacing the councils with the collective responsibility of the church and properties.

Many cities suffered serious demographic decline from the bubonic plague of 542 and later years; however, Constantinople, provincial capitals, pilgrimage centers, and cities along main highways and trade routes continued to prosper.

Excavations have revealed the physical aspect of the late Roman city. The broad boulevards, numerous open squares, and massive palaces and churches of Constantinople represented the planning of the age but could not be duplicated elsewhere. New districts of cities like Antioch, however, show a regular plan featuring orthogonal streets with monumental arches at their intersections. Most cities followed existing and often irregular plans, but in all cases colonnaded streets (emboloi) were an essential element for communication and commerce, as rows of shops laid out behind their mosaic-paved colonnades became the chief markets. In general, the ancient urban fabric survived: theaters, odeons, baths with gymnasia, marketplaces, and civic centers were all maintained, while the villas and luxurious apartments of the rich were frequently expanded, and monumental fountains adorned the streets. Major changes reflected religion and style. Pagan temples were abandoned and demolished for building materials; churches took their place. In some cases, temples were turned into churches, but more often the churches grew up on the periphery and only gradually invaded the city center. Late antique cities looked very different from their predecessors: buildings universally employed reused material, often covered on the outside with plaster, and were decorated inside with frescoes, cut marble, and mosaics. Color was manifest everywhere. Ancient urban regularity tended to disappear as open spaces and streets became cluttered with shoddy commercial construction (shops were typically extended into streets, and booths set up in colonnades), and abandoned buildings were left in ruins. Deterioration of open space was esp. marked in the 6th C. Cities like Justiniana Prima, or some in Lycia, have virtually no civic buildings of the traditional type but contain houses and shops closely packed along regular streets and dominated by one or more large churches, thus illustrating the decline of public works and growth in the power of the church.

In the 7th C., cities underwent fundamental and permanent transformations as they reduced in size and population; their public works and services came to an end. They generally became ruralized, differing from fortresses or villages only in their size, occasional preservation of ancient buildings, and continuing role as seats of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Merchants and craftsmen became rare; the curiales disappeared; cities were commonly under the command of military officials, subordinates of the strategos. External blows—Persian, Arab, Slav, and Avar attacks—contributed to the crisis.

A typical city of the Dark Ages consisted of a fortified center, often with a separate acropolis, which occupied a small part of the former urban area. The walls, built from ruined buildings, typically incorporated or obliterated former public structures and ignored previous streets. Within them, civic buildings were almost universally
abandoned: most became quarries for building material; others were occupied by squatters who built poor dwellings within them, often in connection with burning their marble for lime to make mortar. Churches, however, survived, often as increasingly dilapidated basilicas that came to tower over the small and crowded industrial installations (for pottery, glass, lime, and iron working) and houses. Monasteries and cemeteries, formerly alien to urban areas, came within the walls. Houses were small and poorly built, usually containing courtyards with large pithoi for storage of grain and liquids. With the abandonment or destruction of aqueducts, cisterns were constructed everywhere. Many settlements clustered behind the walls of a hilltop fortress, while others were scattered around the ancient ruins, often as separate settlements resembling villages, each with its own water supply and limited facilities for production. Even Constantinople was affected: large parts of the city fell into ruin, public services were abandoned, and the population declined drastically.

Recovery began in the 9th C. and continued in Asia Minor through the 11th, in Greece through the 12th C. The cities never regained their ancient roles, but conditions within them improved as peace and trade brought growth. New larger circuits of walls were built, but cities continued to expand outside them. Small neighborhood churches were erected and an occasional open marketplace appeared, but cities remained crowded and poorly built, with small houses along narrow winding streets which had no relation to earlier planning. In this, new foundations hardly differed from the old; fortresses and churches were the dominant elements, other structures found room beside them. The 13th C. brought some prosperity to the cities of Asia Minor, which often received new walls and churches, while in Greece the Frankish period brought a growth of city-fortresses on hilltops. The last period of Byz. rule, when the central government was weak, allowed the cities to gain some independence, often recognized with concessions when they were re-integrated into the empire. In some places a local aristocracy assumed considerable authority. Cities of the splinter states grew and flourished. They often consisted of a citadel (kastron), an upper enclosure where the ruler, magnates, and bishop had their palaces; and a lower town (emporion) devoted to commerce, with the homes of the common people and foreigners (who sometimes had their separate castle). By the 14th C. houses were large and spacious, aqueducts were again in use, and the standard of living was higher than it had been since the 7th C. Even such places, however, were small compared with their late antique predecessors, offered few if any public services, and showed no sign of systematic planning.

The normal artistic representation of a city was as a walled enceinte, studded with towers and rendered in bird's-eye perspective. Entered via a single portal, cities shown as models in the hands of a benefactor or as elements of background are customarily filled with elaborate architecture including a domed church. Only rarely, as in the Madaba mosaic map, do they contain structures that allow specific identification of the site. A unique planimetric view of Constantinople appears on the hyperpers of Michael VIII and Andronikos II.


CITIZENS (πολίται). Byz. law preserved the Roman concept of citizenship, as granted to all free inhabitants of the empire in 212. Byz. citizens were distinguished from slaves, whose acts of manumission recognized them as citizens (e.g., Sathas, MB 6:618.13–14). Changes in citizenship to take advantage of commercial privileges could cause problems (e.g., MM 3:189.11–19 of 30 Oct. 1436) and dual citizenship is attested after 1204. It is unclear how Byz. proceeded juridically toward the numerous foreigners (e.g., Armenians, Latins) who entered imperial service, but many were successfully assimilated. Externally, Byz. citizens were usually recognizable by a national costume and particular traits of grooming; for example, in 787 the Beneventans offered to enter the Byz. Empire and adopt the Byz. national dress and haircut (Codex Carolinus 83, p.617.5–31). Shared cultural traditions, patriotism, loyalty to the emperor, Orthodoxy, and, from the 7th C. onward,
the Greek language helped shape Byz. citizens' distinctive identity.


CITY TAXES. Until the 7th-C. crisis, Byz. cities, important demographically as well as economically, had their own municipal administrations and finances, based mainly on rents of city land (astika), on contributions (voluntary or not) of wealthy citizens (esp. civic magistrates), and on city taxes, the vectigalia, collected on local economic activities. City taxes were taken over by the Comes sacrarum largitionum, partially returned by Julian, then confiscated again by Valentinian and Valens, the latter being obliged to return part of them to the city administrations. In the meantime, urban economic activities had started to decline. After the 7th C., when the smaller and less economically active "medieval" cities appeared, administered directly by state officials and financed by the government, city taxes disappeared.

LIT. Jones, LRE 732–54. –N.O.

CIVIL PROCEDURE (χρηματική δίκη). The Justinianic civil lawsuit began with the plaintiff's (enagon) submission of the writ (libellos) at the court of law; from there it was served, together with a summons, on the defendant (enagomenos). On the first day fixed for trial the formal conditions were clarified (esp. the question of the competency of the court), an oath was taken by the participants in the proceedings, and surety was arranged by the plaintiff and defendant or by their representatives. The first part (prooimion) of the procedure was concluded with the formal statement of dispute (prokatatxis). The next step was the examination of evidence that could be undertaken by the assessors. The most important types of evidence were the testimony of witnesses and documents. Witnesses did not necessarily have to appear in person, but they did have to confirm their recorded testimony under oath. Where other proofs were lacking an oath could be imposed on one party by the other or by the judge. After a maximum of three years, a trial concluded with a final judgment (apophasis), which had to be drawn up in writing and read aloud. If the losing party neither complied with the decision nor appealed within ten days, the victorious party could file for the legal execution of the judgment four months after the court's announcement of the decision.


Later Developments. In post-Justinianic law, witnesses, documents, and oaths continued to play the chief role in litigation. Although late Roman procedure tended to give more weight to documents than to oral testimony, the Peira 30.17 reversed this principle: while acknowledging the preeminence of written evidence in cases such as marriage or sale of property and other business affairs, Eustathios Rhomaios proclaimed that oral testimony was generally the most reliable. Byz. law thus paid much attention to exposing false documents (S. Troianos, EEBS 39–40 [1972–73] 181–200). The use of oaths contradicted the injunction of Matthew 5:33, and commentators on Basil. 22.5 tried to reconcile their practice with the Gospel ruling by quoting John Chrysostom. Byz. legal practice also accepted certain paralegal means of decision-making: rhetorical arguments that could be more convincing than legal ones, the principle that the emperor's word is beyond law (this could be extended to those to whom the emperor delegated his authority), and mob pressure. The use of various ordeals as a means of establishing the truth emerged despite some strong resistance. Literary texts (e.g., hagiography) could be submitted as evidence, and references to Homer or Aristotle could be used to establish precedent.


CIVIL WAR OF 1341–47. Following shortly after the conflict between Andronikos II and Andronikos III (1321–28), this war further divided and weakened the remnants of the Byz. Empire. When Andronikos III died in 1341, leaving his nine-year-old son John V Palaiologos as heir to the throne, a struggle for the regency developed between John (VI) Kantakouzenos, the megas domestikos, on one side, and the empress Anna of Savoy, Patr. John XIV Kalekas, and the megas...
doux Alexios Apokaukos, on the other. Taking advantage of the absence of Kantakouzenos from Constantinople on military campaign, John XIV declared his own regency and confiscated Kantakouzenos’s property in the capital. In Oct. 1341 Kantakouzenos was proclaimed emperor in Didymoteichon, triggering war. Kantakouzenos was generally supported by the provincial landed aristocracy and proponents of hesychasm, but there were numerous exceptions. At first Kantakouzenos fared poorly in the war as the result of anti-aristocratic rebellions in the towns of Macedonia and Thrace, notably the revolt of the Zealots in Thessalonike. But after receiving assistance from Umur Beg, emir of Aydın, and Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, king of Serbia, his fortunes improved and he gained control of Thessaly, Epiros, and parts of Thrace and Macedonia, despite Dušan’s switch of allegiance to John V. The murder of Apokaukos in 1345 was a severe blow to the regency. After 1345 Umur was forced to withdraw his troops, but Kantakouzenos replaced them with Ottoman soldiers supplied by the emir Orhan (E. Werner, BS 26 [1965] 255–76). In 1346 Kantakouzenos was crowned emperor at Adrianople, and the following year he entered Constantinople. An agreement that he and John V should rule as co-emperors ended the civil war. The prolonged struggle was disastrous for Byz., as it brought anarchy to the cities and devastation to the countryside. In Didymoteichon, for example, soldiers turned to brigandage in order to secure the necessary provisions (C. Asdracha, Etip 7,3 [1971] 118–20). The war also permitted Dušan to expand his empire into Thrace and Macedonia. The victory of Kantakouzenos significantly affected the church, since it enabled the triumph of hesychasm.


CLARENZA. See CHLEMOUTSI.

CLARISSIMUS (λαμπρότατος), honorific epithet applied to senators that became an official title during the early Roman Empire. According to the Excerpta Valesiana (ed. Moreau-Velkor 9.3), when Constantine I created the senatus in Constantinople he granted new senators the title of clari to distinguish them from the clarissimi of Rome. When the titles of illustris and spectabilis were introduced in the second half of the 4th C., clarissimus began to designate the lowest category of senators. Between 450 and 530 use of the title clarissimus (as well as spectabilis) declined and ceased to be applied to senators at all. Jones (LRE 2:529) considers it still as hereditary, but Guillaud (Institutions 1:681) denies it. The title was not part of the Byz. bureaucratic hierarchy.


—A.K.

CLASSE. See RAVENNA.

CLASS STRUCTURE. Class is a conventional sociological term designating extensive groups of people who have common characteristics with regard to their place in the system of production, their wealth, power, and prestige. The difficulty in defining Byz. class structure originates in the difference between Byz. stratification and the contemporary scholarly models (which in turn, vary according to schools of thought, Marxist or non-Marxist), from the lack of clear-cut boundaries between various classes, and from cases of social mobility. The Byz. resorted to several methods of social categorization: (1) slaves and free men, (2) “great” and “small,” or “powerful” (dynatoi) and “poor,” with a third category of men of moderate means (mesoi) introduced on occasion; (3) classification by profession, as in Psellos—senators, monks, the urban masses, and those involved in agriculture and trade; (4) a tripartite classification of Western type—soldiers, clergy, and ordinary people (Kazhdan-Franklin, Studies 142–44).

Four factors were taken into account by the Byz. in defining the elite or ruling class: good family background (this principle seems to have been reestablished by the 10th C.); wealth (including salaries, rewards, extortions, etc., in addition to property); hierarchical rank; and prestige or high moral reputation. The shift from an elite based on rank and position to an elite determined by family background and ownership of land was a crucial development of the Byz. class structure. Merchants probably emerged as an independent class by the 11th C. but were never legally defined
as a distinct category. The lower class encompassed various groups of rural and urban population: common soldiers, state and private peasants, craftsmen and peddlers, misthioi, slaves, beggars. The lower clergy (paroikoi-priests, working monks) in a certain sense belonged to this class. Intellectuals did not form a separate group until the 12th C.; before then they were part of the secular and ecclesiastical administration.


CLAVIJO, RUY GONZÁLEZ DE, a high-ranking official of Henry III, king of Castile; died 2 Apr. 1412. With an embassy he journeyed to the court of Timur in Samarkand, which he described in detail. The embassy left Seville on 22 May 1403 and returned to Castile on 24 March 1406. Clavijo describes several islands of the Aegean Sea (Rhodes, Chios, Lesbos (“Metelin”), mentions Mt. Athos (“Monteston”), and dwells at length on Constantinople and Pera. He was most interested in churches and monasteries (Hagia Sophia, St. John the Baptist, Blachernai [“de la Cherne”], etc.) and their treasures, relics, and ornaments; among others, Clavijo describes the Church of Mary “Peribleuco” (PERIBLEPTOS), at whose entrance were represented 90 castles and towns allegedly granted to the church by an emperor Romanos; privileges listing the rights of the church to these castles and confirmed by wax and lead seals were displayed nearby. Clavijo also reports on the Hippodrome, the city walls, wells of sweet water, the money-changers’ street, warehouses, and the fetters used to punish those who sold meat or bread with false weights. He noticed that many buildings were in a state of ruin. Clavijo visited Trebizon as well. He devotes considerable attention to relations within the imperial family and to the war between Venice and Genoa.


CLAVUS, a vertical stripe decorating the Roman tunic; the wide ones (clavi lati) were originally an indication of the senatorial rank of the wearer. The clavi were usually purple or gold and were woven into the tunic in pairs; they were visible on the shoulder even when the tunic was covered by another mantle. In Byz. art, clavi are primarily found decorating the tunics of Christ, the angels, and the apostles, figures who are regularly shown clad in ancient garb. Clavi embroidered with rows of flowers adorn the tunics of the female members of the imperial entourage and those of female martyrs in the 6th-C. mosaic processions of S. Vitale and S. Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna, and David’s tunic in the 10th-C. Bible of Leo Sake-
LARIOS (fol.263). In Egypt, tapestry bands have been found decorated with comparable floral and figural designs; these were probably clavi for tunics. Simple, dark-colored clavi adorn the Byz. liturgical vestment called sticharion, in which case they are called potamoi ("rivers").

LIT. M.G. Houston, Ancient Greek, Roman and Byzantine Costume and Decoration (London 1947) 97, 138, 143. Papas, Messgewänder 107f.

—N.P.S.

CLEMENT III (Guibert of Ravenna), antipope (elected Mar. 1084; born Parma ca.1025, died Civita Castellana 8 Sept. 1100. Henry IV of Germany supported Clement against Popes GREGORY VII and URBAN II. Urban sought an accommodation with Byz., whereas Clement tried to gain the support of Byz.'s northern neighbors: on 8 Jan. 1089 he created a Serbian archbishopric under Roman jurisdiction. Around 1088 Clement sent envoys to JOHN II, metropolitan of Kiev.

LIT. J. Ziese, Wibert von Ravenna (Stuttgart 1982).

—A.K.

CLEMENT V (Bertrand de Got), pope (from 5 June 1305); born in the Bordelais ca.1260, died Roquemaure, Comtat Venaissin, 20 Apr. 1314. Forced to leave Italy, Clement settled in southern France, residing from 1309 in Avignon. He advocated the idea of a new Crusade with limited objectives. While proclaiming the liberation of the Holy Land as the ultimate goal, the Crusaders' armies were directed to specific areas: Clement supported the attack of the Hospitallers on Rhodes, the official purpose of which was to protect Armenia and Cyprus from the infidel, to hinder trade with the Saracens and to prepare a universal crusade. Also under the banner of a crusade, Clement organized a war against Venice and managed to regain FERRARA for the papacy.


—A.K.

CLEMENT V (Bertrand de Got), pope (from 5 June 1305); born in the Bordelais ca.1260, died Roquemaure, Comtat Venaissin, 20 Apr. 1314. Forced to leave Italy, Clement settled in southern France, residing from 1309 in Avignon. He advocated the idea of a new Crusade with limited objectives. While proclaiming the liberation of the Holy Land as the ultimate goal, the Crusaders' armies were directed to specific areas: Clement supported the attack of the Hospitallers on Rhodes, the official purpose of which was to protect Armenia and Cyprus from the infidel, to hinder trade with the Saracens and to prepare a universal crusade. Also under the banner of a crusade, Clement organized a war against Venice and managed to regain FERRARA for the papacy.


—A.K.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, more fully T. Flavius Clemens, early Christian philosopher; born Athens? ca.150, died Cappadocia before 215. Educated in Alexandria, he worked there as a teacher from ca.200 until he was forced to leave the city because of anti-Christian persecutions. Like ORIGEN, Clement belonged to a group of well-educated Christians who sought a certain reconciliation with pagan ideas and were influenced by Platonism. Clement's aim was the struggle against Gnosticism and radical extremists within Christianity: he argued that the rich could be saved, defended marriage, praised education, and took the concept of Logos (Reason), not Theos (God), as the basis of his doctrine. Clement laid the foundations for the ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL and paved the way for the incorporation of pagan learning within Christianity; he was a foremost
Clement was not one of the more popular church fathers in Byz.: Prodromos (PG 193:1265AB), for example, criticized him for treating language as an immaterial and rejecting the search for beauty and nobility of expression. Aretas of Caesarea and Caesarea was interested in Clement: at his instigation, a certain Baanes prepared in 914 a MS of two of Clement’s works (Protreptikos and Paedagogus), which was provided with scholia by Baanes and Aretas (Paris, B.N. gr. 451). Some other writings have survived in MSS of the 11th and 12th C.

CLEMENT OF OHRID. See Kliment of Ohrid.

CLEMENT SMOLJATIĆ. See Klim Smoljatić.

CLERGY (καλῆς), term that initially designated the entire Christian community, the people of God (laos, laity) chosen to participate in God’s inheritance or kleronomia (1 Pet 5:3). By the 3rd C. the term was restricted to those appointed as ministers of worship within the Christian community. Below the major orders (hieromenoi) of bishop, priest, and deacon were the minor orders (klerikoi) of subdeacon and anagnostes. Besides differences in functions, the two orders were distinguished by the method of ordination (chierotonia)—the ritual act that also served to separate clergy from laity. Their lives and responsibilities were fixed by ecclesiastical law. Ordination to the priesthood and episcopate was forbidden before age 30, whereas deacons and subdeacons could be consecrated at ages 25 and 20, respectively (Council in Trullo, canons 13, 14). Once appointed to a city or church they could not transfer elsewhere (Nicaea I, canon 15). Equally, all were subject to episcopal jurisdiction and could sue each other only in episcopal courts (Council of Chalcedon, canon 9). Admitted to the office of deaconess, women were forbidden entry to both the priesthood and episcopate.

Generally, clergy were forbidden to participate in secular occupations such as trade, usury, or banking; nor were they allowed to become civil servants, although they could perform manual and agricultural labor (Nicaea II, canon 15) and serve as imperial advisers (like the monk Ioannikios in the court of Alexios I). In practice, however, these restrictions were not always observed, as several 12th-C. synodal and patriarchal decrees illustrate (RegPatr, fasc. 3, nos. 1048, 1092, 1100, 1119). Clerical privileges included exemption from certain taxes, military service, and other municipal duties (Cod.Theod. XVI 2.1–47, 5.1; Council of Chalcedon, canon 7). Despite their social, judicial, and pecuniary exemptions, Byz. clergy never constituted a rigid sociological entity—a self-conscious antithesis of the laity—as in the West. Significantly, they rarely held high state office and were never the exclusive bearers of high culture. Except for bishops, they were also not separated from the laity by celibacy.

CLICHÉ, in modern terminology, a trite or repeated phrase or idea. In Byz. literature two types of cliché can be distinguished. (1) In works written at a learned level of the language at all periods, the conventions of rhetoric (which, learned in the schoolroom, underlay virtually every literary genre) imposed structures and sequences of ideas that most writers and audiences accepted as appropriate and followed. (2) In many works written in the political verse at a popular level of the language in the 14th–15th C., large numbers of lines and half-lines were repeated virtually unchanged, both within a given poem and in others (see Romance). Debate continues as to whether this is the result of plagiarism and quotation, or whether these “clichés” (phrases like mikroi te kai megaloi, “great and small”) represent in written form the style of a traditional literature, originally disseminated orally.
CLIMATE in Byz. was determined by the situation of the Mediterranean Sea, which is enclosed to the south and southeast by a band of deserts and to the north and northeast by mountain ridges (Pyrenees, Alps, and Caucasus). Winds, dry in summer and bringing rain in winter, blow primarily north to south; the strong winter winds, esp. dangerous along the southern Mediterranean shore, could bring navigation to a halt. The combination of rainy winters (from approximately Oct. to Apr.) and summer drought is typical of the Mediterranean. Summers were hot, but winters mild, except on elevated plateaus where considerable snow accumulated; permanent snow cover is found only on mountains at high elevations. The diverse climate was due partly to latitudinal situation (the hottest areas—North Africa, Egypt, and Palestine—were lost to the Arabs in the 7th C.) but also to elevation, with sharp contrasts between the coastal lowlands and interior highlands.

The coast was sufficiently warm for the cultivation of olives, mulberry, and, in some areas (Sicily, Crete), cotton. Vineyards and many fruit orchards could be found at higher elevations and farther to the north (including Thrace), but Bulgaria was considered by the Byz. to be a region that produced little fruit. Grain grew everywhere; the predominance of wheat in Asia Minor and of barley in the Balkans depended more on soil than on temperature. The plateaus (esp. Anatolia), with their cold winter nights and shortage of water, were best for cattle and flocks of sheep and goats, while the contrasts between lowland and highland contributed to the development of transhumance. Special climatic regions were the hinterland of the Black Sea, the Caucasus and the Armenian highlands, the Anatolian plateau, Egypt, and the valley of the Po—a transitional region between the Mediterranean and Central European climate.

The question of changes in the Mediterranean climate in historical times has been variously approached by historians, some of whom attribute the decline of the Roman Empire to climatic changes; climatologists, however, deny radical changes, even though some warming and desiccation ca. 1500 can be observed (F. Braudel, La Méditerranée 1 [Paris 1966] 247). It is plausible that deforestation also took place over time, but neither its scale nor chronology can be established.


—A.K.

CLOCK. See HOROLOGION.

CLOISONNÉ. See ASHLAR; BRICKWORK TECHNIQUES AND PATTERNS; ENAMELS.

CLOSED DOOR or gate (πύλη κεκλεισμένη) of the sanctuary of the Temple, seen by Ezekiel (44:1–3) in a vision. This was not to be opened or traversed by any man, for God had entered in by it. The image was taken, for example, by Theodoret of Cyrhrh (PG 81:1233B), to symbolize the Virgin’s womb. ROMANOS THE MELODE (Hymnes 2, ed. J. Grosdidier de Matons [Paris 1965] 103:4–10) describes Mary as the Closed Gate (aparanoiktos pyle) who opened the door to the Magi that they might see the Door (thyra), the infant Christ. In the context of increased interest in prefigurations of the Virgin, the Door is represented at the CHORA (S. Der Nersessian in Underwood, Kariye Djamii 4:346) and other Palaiologan churches.


—C.B.T., J.H.L.

COATS OF ARMS. The use of heraldic INsignia as a symbolic representation of families did not develop in Byz. The broad range of images (Christ, the Virgin, the cross, various saints) found on seals are personal rather than familial emblems. Certain "blazons" have, however, been interpreted by some scholars as official imperial or familial coats of arms. Soloviev (infra) considered the double-headed eagle as an emblem of the Komnenoi and the tetragrammatic cross with four Bs as the blazon (from ca. 1297) of the Palaiologoi. G. Vikan (ArtB 63 [1981] 326) has connected other emblems (including a multipetal flower, a swastika, and four overlapping bars) with the Palaiologos family. Some of these symbols—whether blazons or not—were placed on imperial standards; thus, a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 167.17–23) states that on ordinary warships the customary imperial banner (phlamoulon) was displayed, that is, the cross with pyrekhole (flints?)—
probably the tetragrammatic cross—whereas the ship of the *megas doux* displayed the image of the mounted emperor. In Aug. 1439 John VIII Palaiologos conferred upon Giacomo de Morellis, a citizen of Florence, the right to place on his banner the imperial “blazon” (*semeion*); on the chrysobull, beneath the text, is pictured a double-headed eagle (*Reg* 5, no. 3489).


**CODEX** (*déltos, πυκτίων, τεύχως, κόδιξ*), the preponderant form of the Byz.—and modern—book. It consists of *quire* made of sheets of *papyrus*, *parchment*, or, later, *paper*, which were prepared for copying by the application of *ruling patterns* in order to guide the writing; the written quires were stitched, usually one to another, to form the smooth spine characteristic of Byz. *bookbinding*. Unlike the earlier roll, the codex fitted more text into less space because each sheet was written on both sides. Moreover, since the codex could be immediately opened to any page, it allowed random consultation. In appearance, Byz. codices range from sumptuous illuminated MSS (see *Book Illustration and Illumination*) to lavish editions of the classics to tax registers or heavily annotated working texts produced by scholars for their personal use.

The codex probably derived from the Roman businessman’s parchment notebook, itself inspired by the bound and waxed wooden tablets (*codices*) used as notepads in antiquity and Byz. Travelers seem to have been among the first to favor the new format, and the codex enjoyed unique prestige among Christians from the 2nd C., esp. for Scripture. Eusebius of Caesarea mentions the order issued by Constantine I that fifty codices of the Bible should be copied for liturgical use in Constantinople. From 300 onward, the codex replaced the roll as the chief vehicle for literary texts. The physical transformation of the book encouraged intellectual change as well. The capacity of and the ease of access within the codex now made practical the creation—and quick consultation—of vast works of reference, such as the codification of Roman law at Constantinople in the 5th and 6th C. For artists the invention of the codex made possible the painting of full-page miniatures.


**CODEX CAROLINUS**, collection of letters sent by popes (Gregory III through Hadrian I) and from the Byz. Empire to Charles Martel, Pippin, and Charlemagne, compiled at Charlemagne's command in 791. Only the papal letters survive. They constitute the chief source on Frankish involvement in Italy. Because the papacy acted as an intermediary between Byz. and the Franks, these letters shed valuable light on Byz. relations with the Carolingians (eps. 11, 25, 28–29, 36–37 on the negotiations of Constantine V with Pippin, and ep. 45 on the planned marriage of Leo IV with the king’s daughter) and, above all, on Constantinople’s projects to recapture its Italian holdings (eps. 15, 17, 30–31, 38, 57, 61, 64–65, 80, 82–84) and subdue the Iconodule papacy (eps. 20, 32). They also transmit general information deemed relevant to the Frankish court, for instance the Eastern patriarchs’ attitude toward Iconoclasm (ep. 99), Constantine V’s death (ep. 58), an Arab invasion of Asia Minor (ep. 74), news from Byz. Istria (ep. 69), and the activities of Byz. or Venetian merchants (eps. 59, 86).


**CODEX EBNERIANUS**, a 12th-C. illustrated New Testament in Oxford, Bodl. Auct. T. inf. 1. 10, named after its 18th-C. owner. Bound in a silver cover with a 10th-C. ivory fragment, the MS is decorated with ornate *canon tables* and *headpieces*, a double portrait of Eusebius of Caesarea and Karpiano, and ten portraits of New Testament authors. Accompanying most portraits are liturgically inspired narrative scenes. The MS was copied by the same scribe as Escorial X IV 17, but illuminated in the different style of the MSS of James of Kokkinobaphos. It is the product of
the preeminent school of Constantinopolitan illuminators during the second quarter of the 12th C. In 1391 the scribe Ioasaph of the Hodegon monastery added liturgical notations to the MS, and its evangelist portraits served as the model for the Palaiologan miniatures inserted into Venice, Marc. gr. 1, 8. The MS is marked with Georgian quire signatures, but was still in Constantinople in the 16th C.


**CODEX GREGORIANUS**, a collection of imperial rescripts issued sometime between 291 and 294 by a certain Gregory, who is otherwise unknown. It is impossible to determine whether it was prepared in the East (Berytus?) or elsewhere, or whether it was a private tool or an official document, for purposes of instruction or for practical use. It contains edicts from the year 196 to Diocletian; the latest law (of 295) is often considered a later addition. The material is organized, according to subject matter, in books and titles. It is possible that the original text of the edicts has here been contracted and paraphrased (N. van der Wal, Bollettino dell’Istituto di diritto romano 22 [1980] 7). The text has survived only in fragments—in the **CODEX JUSTINIANUS** and in various legal compilations, such as the Fragmenta Vaticana, scholia of the Sinai Library, and the lex Romana Visigothorum.

Ed. P. Krüger, Collectio librorum iuris anteustiniani 3 (Berlin 1890) 224–33, 236–42.


**CODEX HERMOGENIANUS**, a collection of imperial rescripts published after the **CODEX GREGORIANUS** by a certain Hermogenianus, usually identified as a praetorian prefect of 304. The text has survived in fragmentary form in the same sources as the **CODEX GREGORIANUS** (with the exception of the appendices to the lex Romana Visigothorum), but it differs from the latter in several respects: the **CODEX HERMOGENIANUS** is shorter, divided only into titles (not books), and contains primarily the edicts of Diocletian. The 5th-C. Christian author Sedulius notes that Hermogenianus had his work published three times; accordingly, Rotondi (infra) postulates that the first edition appeared in 295, the second in 305, and the third included three constitutions of 314–24. Seven rescripts of 364/5 are considered later additions.

Ed. P. Krüger, Collectio librorum iuris anteustiniani 3 (Berlin 1890) 234f, 242–45.


**CODEX JUSTINIANUS**, a collection of imperial constitutions (in the form of leges, rescripta, sanctiones pragmaticae) from Hadrian to Justinian I, that, along with the Digest, the Institutes, and the Novels of Justinian I, constitutes the Corpus Juris Civilis. Executed at Justinian’s request, the collection was intended to take the place of the **CODEX GREGORIANUS**, the **CODEX HERMOGENIANUS**, and the **CODEX THEODOSIANUS** and to provide a compilation of imperial law arranged according to subject and freed from contradictions and repetitions. To this end Justinian appointed a commission of ten lawyers under the direction of Tribonian. The original collection, the so-called **Codex vetus**, which has been transmitted only in short fragments, was made public on 7 Apr. 529 through the introductory constitution “Summa.” It soon stood in need of revision—not least because of Justinian’s own legislative activity.

With the constitution “Cordii” of 16 Nov. 534 the so-called **Codex repetitae praelectionis** was promulgated and made authoritative. It contains 12 books that, in contrast to the Institutes and the Digest, reflect the socioeconomic and ecclesiastical problems of the time in the form of numerous administrative, penal, civil, and ecclesiastical regulations. The language of the constitutions is predominantly Latin. The regulations of the **Codex Justinianus** were introduced into the Basilika, esp. in the Greek version of Thalelaios; treatments of the **Codex Justinianus** by the jurists Isidore, Anatolios, and Theodore Scholastikos are also preserved. Revisions in the sequence of the laws of the **Codex Justinianus** are transmitted only in fragments. With a view to the integration of the **Codex Justinianus** into the Basilika, the individual titles were divided up according to subject and, where appropriate, attached to the Basilika chapters originating in the Digest.
ED. CIC, vol. 2.

M. Th. F.

CODEX SUPRASLIENSI S, the largest surviving Old Church Slavonic MS (found in 1823 in the Suprasi monastery in Poland), is a menologion for the month of March that contains saints’ Lives and sermons for Holy Week and Easter. It was probably copied in central or eastern Bulgaria between 900 and 1050 on the basis of an original created in the circle of Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria.

More than half of its 285 folia were lost during World War II; the other portions are in Ljubljana and Leningrad. Margulié’s (infra) and some other scholars hypothesize that the original of the Codex was in Glagolitic. The Codex was translated from a Greek pre-Metaphrastic menologion and contains 48 hagiographical texts; for some of them the Greek sources have not yet been identified. The work of the translator (or translators?) was difficult, since the original also contained the writings of some experienced rhetoricians (Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, Epiphanius of Salamis), and in some cases their language was misunderstood. The compiler of the Codex probably introduced stylistic alterations. The Codex is an important monument of Byz. intellectual influence upon Bulgaria ca. 900.


A.S.

CODEX THEODOSIANUS, a Latin law book named after the emperor Theodosius II. By a constitution of 26 Mar. 429, Theodosios, together with his co-emperor Valentinian III, established a nine-member commission to produce a collection of all of the imperial constitutions published since Constantine I (following the model of the Codex Gregorianus and the Codex Hermogeni-

ANUS), integrating into the collection appropriate passages from the writings of the jurists. By a constitution of 20 Dec. 435, the same emperors set up a new commission of 15 people that was to collect all general imperial constitutions since Constantine I and, if necessary, to improve them by changing the text or dividing them into several titles. The work came to fruition and was published by a constitution of 15 Feb. 438. On 1 Jan. 439 the Codex Theodosianus went into force for the entire Roman Empire. The Codex contains more than 2,500 constitutions (from the years 311–437) and is divided into 16 books; the books are subdivided into titles within which the constitutions are arranged in chronological order. The MS transmission of the Codex Theodosianus is poor, esp. for books 1–5, which are only indirectly preserved, in the Lex Romana Visigothorum. For this Lex as well as for the Codex Justinianus, the Codex Theodosianus was the most important source. The Codex Theodosianus was provided with commentaries (F. Wieacker in Symbolae Friburgenses in honorem Ottonis Lenel [Leipzig 1935] 259–356). After approximately a century it was superseded by the Corpus juris civilis, esp. the Codex Justinianus.


A.S.

CODICIL. In classical Roman law, the codicil was at first a document strictly connected to a will, in which the testator addressed the heir of the will and requested that he execute a fideicommissum. The codicil had no required form; it had to be announced in the will or be authorized by a (later) will. When codicils independent of the will came into use, they began to compete with wills. A will was distinguished from a codicil in that it had a required form and by the circumstance that only in wills could heirs be appointed and disinheriting effects be added. The difference was weakened by the testator instructing that his will be maintained as a codicil in the case of invalidation. Justinian I further reduced the differences by his
regulation that a codicil must be drawn up in the presence of five witnesses (it was seven for wills). In the post-Justinianic period, the required number of witnesses for a will was reduced even further (Nov. Leo VI 41): five witnesses in the city, three in the country and while on journeys. Since already in late antiquity the significance of the appointment of heirs diminished with the decline of the Roman household structure, the codicil should have disappeared. If it is still mentioned in the legislation of the Macedonian period and in the legal literature that follows it until Har- menopoulos, this appears to be—as the lack of evidence from practice allows one to surmise—only a traditional reminiscence. — D.S.

Codicils in Administrative Terminology. Codicil (Lat. codicillus, Gr. κοδικελλος) designated in Roman terminology the emperor's brief writing and particularly the diploma of appointment to a high office or the conferring of a high title. They are known from literary and legal texts of the 4th C. onward. At that time they were usually accompanied by ivory diptychs and probably put inside the diptych's sealed wings. Texts of the 8th–10th C. sometimes mention separately granting either the codicils or ivory plakes (tablets). The preparation of codicils in the late Roman Empire was the duty of the primicerius notariorum (the chief of the notaries), while in the 10th C. it was the responsibility of the kanikleios, who was paid by the grantee 16 nomismata per piece (Oikonomides, Listes 95.8).


— A.K.

CODICOLOGY (lit. "the study of the codex"), the scholarly term coined by A. Dain (Les manuscrits [Paris 1949] 71–86) as an equivalent of the German Handschriftenkunde ("the study of manuscripts"). Dain conceived of codicology as a discipline dealing with the history of MSS and their collections, research on their present location, and the compilation of catalogs and repertories of catalogs (Les manuscrits [Paris 1964] 77); that is, with the history of books after their completion. The term, however, gradually has acquired a different meaning—the study of ancient écrits in contrast to that of écriture (F. Masai, Scriptorium 10 [1956] 286–92), that is, study of the hand-produced book as an archaeological object rather than of its script. Thus it has become identical with the German Buchwesen ("the structure of the book"), one of the two divisions of palaeography.

Codicology examines the book's size, material (papyrus, parchment, paper), physical properties of inks and pigments, preparation for writing (ruling patterns and systems), structure (quires, their signatures, sewing, bookbinding and rebindings), ownership markings, and so forth, all of which changed over time and place. In so doing, it often determines characteristics specific to various production centers (scriptoria) and libraries. The use of the neologism codicology can be justified by the fact that recent study puts more and more emphasis on the book as a material vector of culture, unlike traditional palaeography, which tended to study the book in a cultural vacuum.


— M.McC., E.G.

COERCION, NONECONOMIC, an application of moral or physical compulsion to force people to work. It was based primarily on political, social, and personal relations (esp. dependency) and only secondarily on market values. The tendency of the landlord was to exact the maximum benefit from the laborer without ruining the existence of the slave/serf or his dependent household; the tendency of the laborer was to perpetuate his household. Accordingly, rent was established in Byz.—in practice, not in theoretical calculations—not only on the basis of the actual quantity and quality of the soil (arable land, vineyards, olive trees, gardens), livestock, yokes of oxen, number of family members, but primarily on the basis of intangible factors of social status and personal relations. Thus a curious phenomenon arose: poorer peasants could be compelled to pay a proportionately higher rent than their wealthier counterparts (in another or even in the same village) and, on the average, the poorer tenants would fulfill heavier obligations than the wealthier householders—in contrast with the modern system of progressive taxation. The numerous tax exemptions granted to churches and monasteries, officials and courtiers, originated from the same
principle. This principle was extended to land prices, variations in which went beyond the usual market conditions. Noneconomic coercion in Byz. was shaped not only through landlord-tenant relations reflected in local customs but also through the state with its elements of state ownership of property (see STATE PROPERTY, MONOPOLY, and the concept of the "enslavement" of the entire population to "the father and the lord," that is, the emperor.


COINAGE, FOREIGN. The circulation of foreign coinage played no role in the Byz. Empire during the greater part of its existence. During the early centuries the only coin-producing state with which Byz. was in contact was Persia, and although there is literary evidence for Sasanian silver drachmae circulating on the frontier (e.g., at Nisibis) hoard evidence shows that such coins did not penetrate into the interior. The thin, broad fabric of Umayyad dirhems certainly determined the appearance of the silver MILIARESION introduced by Leo III, and miliareia later in the 8th C. are sometimes found overstruck on 'Abbasid dirhems (G.C. Miles, MN 9 [1960] 189–218). Only in the last two centuries of the empire, after the Fourth Crusade and the occupation of most of the former imperial territories in the Aegean by Westerners, did foreign coins come to be used on a large scale in the empire and to influence the designs of Byz. coins. The most important of the intruders were initially the Venetian silver ducat, copied as the BASILIKON, and the Frankish TORNASE. Later the Venetian gold ducat, imitated at Chios and at Fogliavecchia on the neighboring mainland and by the Genoese at Pera in the suburbs of Constantinople itself, replaced the Byz. gold HYPERPYRON, which ceased to be minted in the 1350s. From ca.1380 onward the small change of Constantinople seems to have largely consisted of Turkish akçe, minted mainly at Bursa, which supplemented the locally produced ASPERS and were of about the same value.

Lit. T. Bertelé, "Moneta veneziana e moneta bizantina," in Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo XV (Florence 1975) 9–146. — Ph.G.

COIN FINDS are customarily classed into three categories: hoards, site finds, and casual or isolated finds. These categories are not exclusive, however; most hoards come to light by chance. A hoard is defined as a group of coins concealed or lost as a unit. Site finds are those brought to light by archaeologists in the course of excavation. Isolated finds are those turned up by chance in digging a field, preparing a road surface, or as the result of some similar activity.

HoardS. Finds of this type are valuable partly as sources of material, partly because of their size. In addition, sometimes the presence of a container tends to ensure the survival of their contents in good condition. They are also useful because they show what coins were in circulation or at least were available at the time of concealment or loss. Their interpretation is often delicate: a savings hoard will differ in composition from one buried in an emergency. Also, although coins have been hoarded at all periods, usually they were recovered by their original owners except in times of unrest. Then too, since a single hoard may have belonged to a traveler from outside the area where it was found, its contents are not necessarily a reliable guide to the local circulating medium. Comparing several hoards whose contents overlap is the surest means of determining the order of issue of undated coins. In many periods hoards are virtually limited to gold and silver coins of substantial inherent value, but in the Byz. world, as in Roman times, there are also many hoards of low-value coins. Much of Hendy's work on the coinage of the 12th–13th C. was made possible by the great number of (mainly) Bulgarian hoards of billon and trachea of the period. Unfortunately the reporting of hoards in most former Byz. lands is inadequate, and the only comprehensive bibliography (Mosser, infra) is long since out of date. Byz. coin hoards in the USSR throw much light on trade routes (see Kropotkin, infra), while inside former imperial territories they have been helpful in documenting Slavic penetration of the Balkans (J. Juroukova, BBulg 3 [1969] 255–63) and the military situation in the Aegean area under Herakleios (D.M. Metcalf, ABSA 57 [1962] 14–23).

Site finds. These consist mainly of low-value coins that were easily lost and not worth their owners' trouble to recover. The older excavation reports often neglected to take proper note of them, and in particular failed to find the great numbers of tiny 5th- and 6th-C. copper NUMMI
that require systematic sieving of the soil. A new standard in this respect was set by the American excavations at Athens, Corinth, Antioch, and other sites, mainly from the 1930s onward. The reports of these have made possible the study of fluctuations in coin use between different periods, though their interpretation presents many problems. Simple comparisons between the numbers found for different rulers, as was common in the older reports and historical works based on them, can only mislead, for coins will normally have remained in circulation many years after they were struck, and denominations of different sizes and values are not equally likely to be lost. The coins themselves are usually in poor condition as a result of prolonged burial. They are so corroded or worn as to be of little use for the study of types and inscriptions and of no use at all for metrological purposes. They are, on the other hand, essential to archaeologists for dating associated objects and the buildings or excavation strata in which they were found.

**Casual Finds.** This type of find generally occurs in the countryside and is usually of single coins. In most former Byz. lands these tend to be inadequately reported. The scholarly value of such finds comes mainly from the light they throw on the areas over which coins circulated, esp. outside the cities, and occasionally for the identification of local mints.


---

**COINS.** Byz. coinage derived from that of the later Roman Empire, and there is no sharp division between them. Nevertheless, in many respects they are very different. It has long been customary to start the Byz. series with Anastasios I, since a separate line of emperors in the West had come to an end with *Julius Nepos* (died 480) and because Anastasios's creation of the copper follis in 498 determined much of the pattern of minting for the future, but the older books begin with Arkadios, since from 395 there were separate lines of emperors in East and West.

**Metals.** Metals for coins were mainly the three standard ones used in the ancient world—gold, silver, and copper—but the proportion and form of coins in each metal has varied greatly over the centuries. Heavy copper coins were not struck in the 5th C. (their place being taken by tiny nummi), nor were they struck after the late 11th C. A coinage in silver barely existed in the 5th–6th C., and between the late 11th and the late 13th C. the traditional silver miliareia were replaced by *tri kep hala* of electrum (a gold-silver alloy) for higher values and *trach eia* of billon (that is, a silver-copper alloy containing less than 50 percent silver) for lower ones. The trach eia also substituted for the heavy folles of copper no longer minted. The gold remained of high quality until the 1030s, when a half century of progressive debasement began. *Nomisma ta* of good quality were revived by *Alexios I* in 1092 as part of a general coinage reform which reestablished a currency on whose quality users could rely, but these *hyperpyra* were only 20.5 carats fine (85.4 percent) instead of 24 carats as previously. The use of good quality silver coins was revived only with the creation of the *basilikon* in the first years of the 14th C. Gold hyperpyra were no longer struck after the mid-14th C. *Lead* was occasionally used, e.g., for ten-nummus pieces in 6th-C. Italy (C. Morrisson, *Rivista italiana di numismatica* 83 [1981] 119–30).
and for Alexios I’s first tetartera or half-tetartera of 1092.

**Thematic Content.** The thematic content of Byz. coins differed markedly from that of Roman ones, as did the way the emperor was represented. Beginning with the reign of Constantine I all coin types of a positively pagan character disappeared, although for the next two-and-a-half centuries representations of Victory and of Roma and Constantinople (see also Personification) continued to be tolerated because it was possible to regard them as symbolic and not as objects of worship. The cross began to be used as a main type in the mid-5th C., though only on a few denominations; only under Tiberios I did it become the main reverse type of the gold coins. A bust of Christ, first shown on coins of Justinian II, became a regular feature of the coinage only after the restoration of images under Michael III (843), but from then on representations of Christ, of the Virgin (first under Leo VI), and of the saints (first under Michael IV) are normal. A bust or standing figure of the emperor was almost always present, except on the so-called Anonymous Folles (970–1092), which have religious types and inscriptions only. But the personality of the emperor was eclipsed by the greatness of his office. Characterized portraits in high relief, a distinctive feature of Roman coinage during the Principate, were replaced by formalized frontal effigies in low relief, usually with no attempt at reproducing an individual likeness. Instead, the status of the emperor was shown by his costume (chlamys, fibula, crown) and insignia (scepter, globus cruciger, akakia).

**Language.** The language of the coin inscriptions was initially Latin, as were the elements of the emperor’s style (DN for dominus noster, PE or PF for perpetuos or pius felix, AVG for augustus), but Greek legends began to be used in the 7th C. (EN TOVTO NIKAN on folles of Constans II) and Greek titles such as basileus, despotes, and so forth in the 8th. After a long period in which Greek and Latin characters were used indiscriminately and might even appear together in the same word, the use of letters in a specifically Latin sense disappeared in the 11th C., so the C was henceforward invariably a sigma and H an eta.

**Collections.** Byz. coins are found by the thousand every year, some in regular excavations, in which case they are preserved as part of the record, but the majority pass through dealers’ hands to collectors and some in due course to museums. The major collections are those of Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale), London (British Museum), Berlin (Staatliche Museen), Leningrad (Hermitage), and the Dumbarton Oaks Center of Byzantine Studies in Washington, D.C. The British Museum catalog of 1908 was for a half century the standard work of reference on the subject, but it has now been largely superseded, other than as a collection of material, by the catalogs of the Paris collections (to 1204) and of Dumbarton Oaks, three volumes (to 1081) out of a projected five having been published to date. Much Heritage material is available in the unfinished work of Tolstoy (to 886). For the period 491–720 these have been supplemented by a synoptic survey published under the auspices of the Numismatic Commission of the Austrian National Academy of Sciences. For coins of the 4th C., from the accession of Diocletian (284) to the death of Theodosios I (395), the standard reference work is vol. 6–9 of Roman Imperial Coinage; since vol. 10 has not yet appeared, there is no satisfactory work covering the century from 395 to 491.

---

**COIN SCALES,** conventional name for small bronze implements for weighing coins or small amounts of precious material in granulated or powdered forms. Invented by the Romans, a coin scale is a lever balance with fixed fulcrum at midpoint; it is supported from above either by a hinged bracket or by a cord or wire (Davidson, Minor Objects, no. 1466). The coin is placed in a small pan at the end of one arm, and balance is achieved either by the predetermined weight of the other arm, through a counterpoise placed in
a corresponding pan, or by a tiny weight that may be slid across a scale in an open channel along the other end.


-G.V.

COISLIN NOTATION. See Neumata.

**COLLECTIO 25 CAPITULORUM**, a 6th-C. collection of canon law prescriptions, mainly those of Justinian I, divided into 25 chapters. The work consists of 21 Greek constitutions reproduced verbatim from titles 1–4 of the first book of the *Codex Justinianus* as well as from the Justinianic novels 120, 131 (chs. 13–14), 133, and 137. The most recent piece in the collection is novel 137 of March 565. However, since the work is sometimes transmitted without the four novel chapters, these may represent a later addition. This was the opinion of Zachariā von Lingenthal, who also conjectured that the original compilation was composed soon after the completion of the *Codex Justinianus* (a.534) as an appendix to the *Synagoge of Sixty Titles*.


-A.S.

**COLLECTIO 87 CAPITULORUM**, a 6th-C. collection of canon law prescriptions of Justinian I, divided into 87 chapters. The work consists of excerpts, most of them verbatim, from 12 Justinianic novels that were published between 535 and 546. Since Justinian I is referred to as deceased in the rubric and in the short note between the *pinax* (table of contents) and the main text, the work cannot have been produced before 11 Nov. 565. The sporadic attribution in MSS of the collection to Patr. JOHN III SCHOLASTIKOS is perhaps plausible; on the other hand, the hypothesis that the work (in its “first edition”) was composed soon after 546 as an appendix to the *Synagoge of Fifty Titles* is insufficiently substantiated.


-A.S.

**COLLECTIO AVELLANA** (6th C.), a dossier of 243 letters and edicts of emperors, popes, bishops, and magistrates, spanning the years 367–553. Many of them belong to Pope Hormisdas (514–23). This collection derives its name from Fonte Avellana, Italy, where a MS of it was found. Its documents are often valuable sources for both ecclesiastical and secular affairs, esp. when the two come together: a dispute of 384 about Lucifer of Cagliari (died between 364 and 375), a supporter of Athanasios of Alexandria; allegations by Pope Gelasius I of a pagan revival at Rome; and controversy over the *Theopaschitism* involving Justinian and Severos of Antioch are three such examples. A Latin translation of the treatise of *Epiphanius of Salamis, On the Twelve Precious Stones*, is appended to the end of the collection.


-B.B.

**COLLECTIO TRIPARTITA**, a collection of canon law prescriptions taken from the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, divided into three parts. The work, which aims at a comprehensive coverage of the relevant material, consists of (Greek) résumés of norms originally written in Latin or Greek. The first part is taken from the *Codex Justinianus* (I, 1–13), the second from the *Digest* and the *Institutes* (regulations on the *res sacrae*, etc.), and the third from the *Novels of Justinian* (in the paraphrase of Athanasios of Emesa, titles 1–3). The latest prescription (reproduced in paraphrase) is novel 144 of Justin II from the year 572 (3.3.3). According to Zachariā von Lingenthal, the collection was produced shortly thereafter (ca.580) as an appendix to a *Syntagma of Fourteen Titles* (see *Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles*). Stolte has suggested the younger Anonymous, “Enantiophanes” as the author of the *Collectio Tripartita*.

ED. PG 138.1077–1336.


-A.S.

**COLOBIUM (κολόβιον)**, a form of *tunic*, ampler than the *chiton*, and either sleeveless or short-sleeved. Its use is particularly associated with the monks of Egypt, where it was sometimes adorned with colored stripes (DOROTHEOS OF GAZA, ed.
Regnault-Préville, 168.28–170.24; see also Clavus. It is the garment in which Christ is clad in early representations of the Crucifixion (e.g., the Rabbula Gospels of 586).

Lit. Oppenheim, Mönchskleid 95–103. — N.P.S.

**COLONUS** (κολωνός). The Latin term *colonus*, like the Greek *γεωργός* (peasant), literally means “tiller of the soil,” in contrast to the *pastor*, herdsman. In late Roman legislation the term became the designation of a perpetual tenant. The term covers various categories of peasants, primarily *liberi coloni*, free tenants, and *adscripticii*. The status of *coloni* differed in different provinces, and different sources stress different aspects of their condition, legislation emphasizing their fiscal bonds to the soil, while in documents (e.g., the correspondence of Symmachus, the Albertini Tablets) they appear relatively independent. The term *colomatus* is used in legislative acts (e.g., Cod. Theod. XII 1.33) to denote the condition of the rural population.

The origin of the colonate is debatable. The institution probably developed from various roots and was assimilated under the pressure of the economic and fiscal conditions of the late Roman Empire, although it never attained real homogeneity. In the East it may have been drawn from Hellenistic (and even pre-Hellenistic) forms of dependency and at any rate was determined by the state fiscal requirements; in the West the increasing role of landed magnates contributed to the strengthening of bonds between the *colonus* and his master.

On the one hand, the *coloni* were construed as free people and Roman citizens; at the same time they were liable to service or serfdom—*servitute dediti* (Cod. Just. XI 50.2 pr.). They possessed some property, but it was treated as a *peculium*; they could not give anything away without their master’s permission. They could marry both free people and slaves and were able to litigate, even against their own master. They were not allowed to leave their *origo*, the land they lived on—but their master was also prevented from evicting them from this land. One became a *colonus* by birth (if both parents were *coloni* or the mother alone), or by a long residence as a tenant on a lord’s land (in the East); barbarians could be settled as *coloni*, as could *beggars*, if healthy. Free peasants under the *patrocinium vicorum* could be transformed into *coloni*. The colonate could be terminated by emancipation, by long service in a different status (e.g., as a *decurion*) in another province, or by entering religious orders.

By the end of the 4th C. the *coloni* were often mentioned together with slaves (e.g., Cod. Just. XI 48.12 of 396), but it is improbable that the colonate originated from the mass settlement of slaves on the land. The evolution of the colonate after the 6th C. is far from clear. There is no evidence of dependent peasants in the East in the late 7th–9th C., and it is impossible to prove that the later *paroikoi* were descendants of Roman *coloni*. In the West the term *coloni* continued to designate dependent peasants (e.g., in the correspondence of Pope Gregory I the Great). The Western *coloni* were probably of various conditions: in Visigothic Spain they seem to have merged with servile tenants, while in France they maintained a status between freemen and *servi*.


**COLOPHON** (κολοφών, lit. “summit, finishing touch”), or subscription, a note on a MS (usually at the end) with information on its date, the place where it was written, and sometimes the *scribe*. Colophons are not only the main source of information about copyists but also are important for social and political history, prosopography, the economics and technology of book production and *book trade* (prices, wages, length of time needed to copy a MS), and the history of copying centers (scriptoria). Dates and places mentioned in colophons are basic to the study of the development of the Greek script (mostly *minuscule*) and of regional MS production. As a genre, Greek colophons are less informative than Syriac or Armenian ones.

COLOR, a functional and aesthetic element associated with earthly and heavenly splendor and therefore central to Byz. CEREMONY, both courtly and ecclesiastical. Brilliance of color was prized for its own sake, but varieties of hue also underlay hierarchical distinctions in costume. Primary colors are specified in De ceremoniis and the pseudo-Kodinos, although some names of colors, such as atrabatika, are unidentifiable. The color of the emperor’s garb was sometimes left to his pleasure (De cer. 187.13).

No equivalents to Western treatises on the making of colors (Roosen-Runge, infra) are known, but a passion for polychrome brilliance shines through the taste for jewelry, enamels, and colored mortar. In monumental painting, islands of brilliant color, set in fields of gold, green, or white are juxtaposed from the 6th C. onward. Landscapes and architectural backgrounds employed secondary hues—purples, greens, ochres. In and after the 10th C. complementary colors were used, such as blue to highlight a purple area or red for the shadows of a green garment. Generally, carbon-black was used for shadows, and chalk or gypsum for white highlights. Blacks and whites were mixed with pigments to darken or lighten them. By the 12th C., a “three-tone” scheme had been evolved in Fresco technique. At the same time, hard, opaque colors, esp. in book illustration, aspired to the effect of enamel. The late 13th and 14th C. saw the introduction of unusual pinks and a great variety of greens.

No thorough analysis of the palette of Byz. painters has been made, but it is known that they relied more heavily on organic pigments than did Armenian artists. Mineral sources used included ultramarine and vermilion; cochineal seems to have been a source of red (M.V. Orna et al., Archeological Chemistry 4 [1989] 265–88). Vegetable sources yielded red-lake as well as orpiment and saffron for yellows. Colors were rarely blended; the separation of hues helps to explain the predominance of Line and contour in painting.

The palette of Byz. writers, with some exceptions (e.g., Eustathios of Thessalonike in his commentary on Homer), is relatively poor, limited to black, white, gold, and purple. Some authors, however, masterfully used colors for their political and moral purposes. Thus Niketas Choniates applied “multicolored” characterizations to Andronikos I, whose instability he wanted to stress; Niketas violates the chromatic convention when he construes the gold of imperial garb as “the color of bile” predicting defeat and the purple of the emperor’s ink as the color of the blood of innocent victims (Kazhdan-Franklin, Studies 257–63).

Symbolism and Significance of Color. Throughout the Byz. period, color choice remained among the most powerful expressions of symbolism, affecting the palettes of painters, the choice of ink, parchment, seals, and costume. The color of imperial garments and crowns varied according to the occasion on which they were worn; sometimes, as in the case of the divetesion worn in Holy Week, it was clearly symbolic. The highest state ranks were connected with particular colors: with rare exceptions gold and purple were exclusive to the emperor, blue was typical of the sebastokrator, green of the caesar. Pseudo-Kodinos carefully indicates the color of the footwear, dress, and hats assigned to each rank of officials on special occasions. Occasionally, symbolic color yielded to practical considerations. Though all emperors down to Marcian had had purple sepulchres, Justin I and Theophilus were buried in green marble tombs, Michael III in white, perhaps because supplies of porphyry were exhausted.

Conventions rather than rigid rules governed choices of color in painting. In the Transfiguration, Christ’s robe is usually white, as are the tunics of martyrs; in Miracle and Passion scenes, he often wears imperial purple. The Virgin’s garments are usually purple or blue but in the Nativity, where the Child receives “courtly” gifts, it may be gold (e.g., at the Cappella Palatina, Palermo). Angels frequently have haloes of celestial blue; Hades and demons often have gray flesh while personifications such as Slander in Klimax MSS display this tonality as well as bluish-gray clothing.

(not *kion*) was often used to designate a moral pillar or support; the word was employed for the apostles and Christ, for saints (esp. Peter and Paul), for the church. According to John Chrysostom (PG 62:554.30–37), the church is the *stylis* of the *oioumenē* and truth is the *stylis* of the church. The biblical image of “the pillar of fire” (Ex 13:21) was combined with the concept of support. Christ, says Epiphanius of Cyprus (*Panarion* 66.35.2, ed. Holl 5:183.23–26), is the way that we follow, the *stylis* as the support of the truth, the cloud sheltering the children of Israel, and (again) the *stylis* as the fiery pillar in the desert. (See also *Columns, Honorific*.)

—W.L., T.E.G., A.C.

**Columns, Churches.** The term is used for three closely related **rock-cut churches**, Karanlık Kilise (Dark Church), Elmali Kilise (Apple Church), and Çarıklı Kilise (Sandal Church) clustered in Göreme. All three imitate the **cross-in-square** plan of built churches, although the western corner bays in Çarıklı were never excavated. Each was ornamented with a *deesis* in the apse and a conventional feast cycle (see *Church Programs of Decoration*) in the nave, augmented by images derived from earlier churches in the valley, for example, Tokali Kilise’s Ascension/Blessing appears in the barrel vault of Karanlık’s narthex. Four donor portraits are preserved in Karanlık (Basil and the priest Nikephoros in the apse and Genethleos and John *entalmatikos* [a patriarchal functionary?] over the entrance) and three in Çarıklı (Theognostos, Leo, and Michael on the west wall). The paintings have been dated to the mid-11th C. (Jerphanion, Epstein) and to ca.1200 (Restle). (For ill., see next page.)


—A.J.W.

**Columns, Honorific,** large freestanding columns erected for commemorative purposes. The practice of erecting such columns was a continuation of Roman custom and esp. common in the capital in the 4th–5th C. (see *Constantinople, Monuments of*). Honorific columns were of two basic types. The first consisted of a monolithic shaft standing on a base and supporting a capital

—A.C.

**Column** (*κίον, στόλος*). The chief and definitive support in trabeate architecture from ancient to modern times, the classical column consists of a base with horizontal moldings, a cylindrical shaft (monolithic or in segments called drums), and a capital, carved to articulate the juncture of weight (superstructure) and support (the column’s shaft). In the columnar basilicas, stoa, colonnades flanking streets, and open courts of the Hellenistic, Roman, and Byz. city, the column, by its size and spacing, determined the scale of the structure and the urban character of the city. In the arcuate, domical architecture of Rome and Byz., heavy piers carried the principal loads of the building; in these structures columns formed a secondary support system, screening side aisles from central naves, or became decorative additions to the piers themselves (Early Christian and Byz. baptisteries; vaulted chambers in imperial palaces; domed basilicas like St. John’s, Ephesus; Hagia Sophia, Constantinople; San Marco, Venice).

Stone columns have great compressive strength and can carry heavy loads; hence they remain useful after the building has fallen into disuse. Reused ancient columns (*spolia*) have been identified in Early Christian and Byz. structures, for example, S. Sabina and S. Maria in Trastevere, Rome, and St. Demetrios, Thessalonike. Byz. builders, particularly under Justinian I, exploited quarries of varied colored marble (unlike their ancient Greek predecessors); they also developed a new form of capital (*impost capital, impost block*) to provide a better juncture between heavy masonry arches and the column shaft than that offered by the traditional Ionic or Corinthian capital. The shafts were normally undecorated, although spirally fluted columns were esp. popular in the 6th C. (J.L. Benson, *Hesperia* 28 [1959] 254–72). In all periods inscriptions might be carved upon them or votives attached. Columns were represented on sarcophagi, in MS illumination, on ivories, and in other media where they served to frame figures of importance who are often shown standing beneath an arch. A few ascetics (called *stylites*) chose to take up residence on the top of large column shafts.

In metaphorical and symbolic vocabulary *stylis*
that in turn held a statue of the honoree. Among such monuments erected in Constantinople were the so-called Porphyry Column of Constantine I and the Column of Marcian, both of which remain standing, as well as others known only from literary accounts and drawings. The second type was derived from the Column of Trajan in Rome and consisted of a shaft composed of drums resting on a base and supporting a capital and statue. Both base and shaft were carved in relief, and the figures on the shaft were set in a spiral frieze. Two such columns existed in Constantinople: the Column of Theodosios I, fragments of which survive, and that of Arkadios, its shaft and carvings known only from drawings. Although the practice of erecting honorific columns was abandoned after the 6th C., it was revived in a fashion by Michael VIII, who erected a column near the Church of the Holy Apostles. It was topped by a bronze statue of the archangel Michael and the emperor offering him a model of the city (Pachym., ed. Bekker, 2:234.17). Whether such columns influenced the cult of stiltite saints appears not to have been investigated.


COMES (κόμης, lit. “companion”), Lat. designation for the personal adviser or retainer of an emperor or barbarian king. Constantine I gave the term a technical sense (first mentioned in
early terminology, *comes domini nostri* or *comes Augustorum nostrorum*, emphasized the personal link to the emperor or his family. The term was employed for officials of different ranks or *ordines* (of which there were three at the time of Constantine); it presupposed a special assignment and encompassed various meanings. As an honorary title it was bestowed on some of the highest state functionaries, such as the *magister officiorum* or *quaesitor*; it became part of bureaucratic denominations, such as the *comes sacrarum largitionum* or *comes rerum privatarum*. Besides this upper echelon of the *comites consistorii* there were other *comites* who were not members of the *consistorium*. Some *comites*, such as the *comes Africæ* (B. H. Warrington, *BZ* 49 [1956] 55–64) or *comes Aegypti*, were provincial administrators, while others fulfilled fiscal or economic functions or acted as guardians and overseers. In later times *komes*, the Greek form of the term, continued to be used for officials with various functions such as the *komes hydaton*, *komes tes kortes*, and others; *komites* were also subaltern officers of the army and navy units. The office or function of a *comes* was termed a *comitiva*.


---

**COMES RERUM PRIVATARUM** (*κόμης τῆς ἱδικῆς παρουσίας*, lit. “of the private fortune”), high-ranking official of the later Roman Empire who administered the imperial estates. The office—like that of the *comes sacrarum largitionum*—was created ca. 318 and first mentioned ca. 342–45. The responsibility of this *comes* was to control income from the land of the emperor as opposed to that of the state; this distinction, however, was not consistently applied. The functions of the *comes* encompassed collecting rents and accepting land grants given to the emperor as well as forfeitures and escheats, and protection of the fisc from the intrusion of private owners. The *comes* also handled the sale of movable and immovable imperial properties and was a member.

of the consistorium. His officers were called palatini rerum privatuarum; in 399 their number was 300 (Cod.Theod. VI 30.16). By the end of the 4th C. the Cappadocian estates were transferred from the control of the comes to that of the praepositus sacri cubiculi. Anastasios I created, before 509, a separate office of the comes patrimonii to manage the imperial estates, while the comes rerum privatuarum preserved functions connected with grants and forfeitures. Thus he was transformed from a financial into a judicial official; he acquired duties that went far beyond his former obligations, for example, serving as a judge in cases involving grave-robbing and marriage. The office disappeared in the 7th C., some of its functions assumed by the sakellarios.


COMES SACRARUM LARGITIONUM (κόμης τῶν βείων θησαυρῶν, lit. “of the sacred largess, of the sacred treasuries”), high-ranking financial official of the late Roman Empire, created probably ca.318 and first mentioned between ca.342 and 345. The comes sacrarum largitionum replaced the former rationalis and obtained administration of those taxes that did not come to the department of the praetorian prefect, that is, chrysargyron, taxes on senators, customs duties, and the so-called “voluntary payments.” Income from the emperor’s private land passed from this comes to the comes rerum privatuarum as early as 379. The comes sacrarum largitionum also controlled mines, the production of state mills and dyeworks, and minting. The comes had a central office divided into several scriinia (bureaus) and a large staff in the dioceses and provinces. He enjoyed some judicial rights in cases related to taxation and after 425 also had jurisdiction over the officials of his staff. He was a member of the consistorium. From the end of the 5th C. the role of the comes sacrarum largitionum decreased, esp. after the abolition of the chrysargyron; the last comes is mentioned under Emp. Phokas. In the 7th C. the office was replaced by the sakellarios. Insignia of the comes sacrarum largitionum are shown in the Notitia dignitatum, while his control stamps are found on numerous silver objects (see Silver Stamps).

COMETS (sing. κομήτης, lit. “with long hair,” ἀστήρ). Byz. records refer frequently to indefinable astronomical phenomena, thereby making it difficult to be certain that it is a comet that is being described because, except for Halley’s Comet, the observation cannot be verified astronomically. Generally, a comet was called a semeion and sometimes it was qualified by a particular shape, such as that of a swordfish. Although some Byz. scholars followed Aristotle in stressing a natural scientific explanation for comets, the majority of the Byz. population understood a comet to be an omen predicting disaster. As a result an elaborate ritual of prognostication for comets was developed (John Lydos, On Omens 10–15). Some comets, however, such as the one used to foretell the Arab irruption of 632 (Theoph. 336.21–24), were merely invented. Like earthquakes, eclipses, and fires, the appearance of some comets was commemorated by an annual liturgy (Synax. CP 154.24–26). The most reliably attested Byz. sighting of comets were in 389, 418, 422, 442, 466, 518, 734, 744, 974, 1042, and 1345. Halley’s Comet was sighted in 451, 530, 837, 912, 989, 1066, 1145, 1222, 1301, and 1456.

LIT. Grumel, Chronologie 469–75. –B.C.

COMIC, THE, a mode intended to excite laughter, is rare in preserved Byz. art. Excluded almost by definition from Christian representation, comic elements do appear in the peristyle mosaics of the Great Palace at Constantinople that show, for example, a man thrown from a donkey. If their content is correctly read, it survives on some late glazed ceramics. Otherwise humor as we know it is hard to trace in art after the 6th C. A possible exception is the antics of the children in some 14th-C. representations of the Baptism of Christ (D. Mouriki in Okeanos 460–62). The caricature found in psalter illustration and the parody of classical and mythological images evident on bone caskets and boxes are functionally different from the comic mode.

–A.C.
COMITATENSES (from comitatus, military retinue), late Roman field army or mobile troops as opposed to the limitanei or border troops. The creation of the body of comitataenses was attributed to Diocletian by T. Mommsen (Hermes 24 [1889] 195–279) and O. Seeck (RE 4 [1901] 619f), despite the direct evidence of Zosimos (Zosim. bk.2, ch.34), who ascribed the innovation to Constantine I. It is likely that before Constantine the comitatus was only a body of imperial guards (W. Seston, Historia 4 [1955] 295). In the 4th C. the comitataenses consisted of about 110,000–120,000 men (Hoffmann, infra 1:304) including infantry (legiones), cavalry (vexillationes), auxiliary troops of foreign soldiers, and scholae palatinae. The infantry and cavalry stood in theory under the command of different magistri militum. In 364 each unit of comitataenses was divided into two parts: those called seniores served primarily in the West, juniores in the East. After 373 some units of limitanei were assigned to serve with comitataenses; Theodosios I restructured the comitataenses, uniting cavalry and infantry regiments under individual magistri urbis militiae. Circa 395 eastern contingents consisted of five armies, two attached to the court and three stationed in Orients, Thrace, and Illyricum. Comitataenses were considered more privileged troops than limitanei. R. MacMullen (Klio 62 [1980] 459) suggests that the number of well-trained comitataenses declined in the second half of the 4th C., and later the difference between comitataenses and limitanei disappeared.


COMITIVA. See CODES.

COMMANDERS, MILITARY. In theory, the emperor was supreme commander of the army, but only a few (such as Constantine V, Nikephoros II Phokas, Basil II, or the Komnenoi) personally led armies in the field. Magistri militum were supreme commanders of the empire’s armies until the 7th C. By the early 8th C. the domestikos ton scholon had become chief commander, seconded by the strategos of the Anatolikon; after the 11th C. the rank of megas domestikos desinged supreme military commander. Despite the high number of mercenaries in the Byz. army, supreme command was rarely given to a foreigner.

High military command was not necessarily entrusted to capable soldiers. The assignment, duration, and independence of military command was subject to considerations other than proven ability, and emperors were careful to bestow command on a temporary basis to loyal courtiers or family members, regardless of their actual military experience or ability. During the 10th and 11th C., when practically every successful general (Bardas Skleros, George Maniakes) made a bid for the throne, command assigned on the basis of loyalty was particularly evident, as was the ensuing deleterious effect of loyal but incompetent commanders on the army’s performance. Eunuchs, automatically precluded from the throne, frequently received command of armies; while some were effective generals (e.g., the 6th-C. Narses), many brought disaster on their men. Constantine Gongyles, for example, led the impressive expeditionary army to Crete in 949, which was annihilated as a result of his carelessness (Skyl. 245.35–246.52).

COMMANDS, MILITARY. The Strategikon of Maurice (Strat.Maurik. 3.5, pp.152–54) provides a detailed description of commands issued by a MANDATOR during the army’s training exercises. The soldiers began to march upon hearing the blast of a trumpet (boukinon or touda) or seeing an ensign wave a banner (plamoulon); the striking of a shield or hand signals brought them to a stop. The Strategikon lists all oral commands in Latin; a 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 258.15–19) records an order given by Komentiolo “in the ancestral language” (i.e., Latin), “torna, torna, fratres,” during an expedition against the Avars in 586, but by the end of the 9th C. Latin commands had apparently been discarded, as Leo VI lists the same commands in a Greek version in his Taktika (e.g., 7.65–69). The 10th-C. Praecepta militaria indicates that battle commands were taught in training, and that most were signaled by trumpet (4.1–2; 15.22–23).

Daily orders were issued to officers in writing
(De re militari 32.4–12). The emperor, in theory the supreme military commander, likewise transmitted written commands to his generals. A 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 154.43–48) relates that Manuel I sent a letter (grammata or biblon) to Andronikos Kontostephanos on the eve of a battle with the Hungarians (8 July 1167) forbidding him to engage the enemy because he found the day unpropitious. Kontostephanos, however, disregarded the command, hid the letter under his cloak, gave battle, and won the day. (See also Battle Standard and Flag.)


A.K., E.M.

COMMENDATIO ANIMAE (Lat., lit. “commending of a soul”), popular prayer for the dead in Western ritual, known from the 3rd C. onward and influential in art and hagiography. It contains 13 petitions on the model of “Free his soul, Lord, as you freed Daniel from the lions’ den.” The Old Testament events cited include Noah and the Flood, Job’s sufferings, the sacrifice of Isaac, Jonah and the whale, and the rescue narratives of the Book of Daniel: Daniel in the Lions’ Den, the Three Hebrews in the Fiery Furnace, and Susanna and the Elders. St. Thekla is the only non-biblical figure included. A. Baumstark (OrChr. n.s. 4 [1914–15] 298–305) identified early Byz. analogues to the Commendatio in the Great Euchologion.

Scenes referred to in the Commendatio recur in the catacombs and elsewhere. For instance, a 3rd-C. cup from Diokleia includes the three Daniel scenes (with all figures orant), Jonah and Isaac, with quotations from the Commendatio (H. Leclercq, DACL 3:3009–11, fig.3396). Frescoes in the necropolis at El-Bagawat include the three Daniel scenes, Noah, and Thekla (Idem, DACL 4:439f). The Brescia casket (Volbach, Elfenbeinarbeiten, no.107) juxtaposes images of Jonah and of the rescue narratives of Daniel. Often hagiographers ascribe a version of the Commendatio to saints about to face torture (e.g., Lukillanos—ed. F. Halkin, AB 84 [1966] 16f, 26), esp. if the approaching torture is by fire (e.g., Juliana—PG 114:1444D, 1448f).


-C.B.T.


Differing methods of interpretation were inherited from the two schools of patristic exegesis, Alexandrian and Antiochene. For the more spiritualizing ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL (Dionysios, Maximos, Symeon to some extent), the contemplation (theoria) of liturgical rites raises the soul to the realities of the invisible world. Here analogy takes precedence over biblical typology, and the liturgy becomes an allegory of the soul’s progress from sin to divine communion via a process of purification symbolized in the rites. This Alexandrian system left little room for the saving mediation of Jesus’ earthly life, death, and resurrection. By contrast, the exegesis and mystagogy of the ANTIQUEHENE SCHOOL, more attentive to historia than to theoria, emphasized the relationship between liturgical rites and the historic saving actions of Christ, of which the sacramental rites are an “imitation” (mimesis: Cyril) and “memorial” (anamnesis: Chrysostom), as well as being an initiation and foretaste of the heavenly worship.

Patr. Germanos I, joining both methods, added the more literal Antiochene mystagogy to the Alexandrian heritage of pseudo-Dionysios transmitted to Byz. via Maximos. Thus for Germanos the church is not only, as for Maximos, “Heaven on earth, where the God of heaven dwells and moves.” It also “images forth the crucifixion and burial
and resurrection of Christ" (Germanos, Liturgy, par.1). The Great Entrance not only shows "the entrance of all the saints and righteous ahead of the cherubic powers and the angelic hosts. . . . It is also in imitation of the burial of Christ" (par.37). This synthesis reached classical expression in the more extensive and complete commentary of Kabasilas, which represented a return to the balanced method of Germanos after the exaggerated allegorical historicism of the Pro- theoria.


—R.F.T.

COMMERCE AND TRADE. The role of trade in Byz. changed over time, depending on political circumstances and on general economic development. In the period through the 6th C., among the factors facilitating economic exchange within the empire were the existence of cities, a common currency, the low internal duties of 2 to 2.5 percent, and the relative openness of the Mediterranean, even after the creation of a Vandal fleet. Among the factors inhibiting exchange were state exactions, the fact that the needs of the army and the provisioning of Constantinople were met by levies or payments in kind thus obviating trade, the difficulties of transportation, and a certain degree of self-sufficiency on the large estates. Modern scholars tend to stress these inhibiting factors; nevertheless, the evidence for the existence of internal trade is clear: wine and oil (commodities for mass consumption) were objects of relatively long-distance trade, as were wool, metals, marble, timber, and manufactured goods, esp. cloth and luxury products, the last having a market that was diffused geographically but restricted in size. Great periodic markets (fairs), such as those of Aigai (in Cilicia) and Edessa, catered to this internal long-distance trade. At the local level, markets were small and so was the radius of activity. The fairs outside Antioch served the needs of local villages; small towns exchanged products with the countryside, forming local networks of exchange within a system of relative self-sufficiency. Trading activity was greater in the eastern part of the empire, while in the West the process toward self-sufficiency was more advanced. It is impossible to quantify the importance of trade in the economy of this period; Jones's statement (LRE 2:872) that the collatio bustralis, a tax on trade and manufacturing, accounted for 5 percent of imperial revenue, is a fiscal, not an economic calculation.

In terms of international trade, its most important expression was the importation of spices, silks, jewelry, and other luxury products from China, Persia, and India; these commodities arrived at the stations of the Persian frontier, the Syrian cities, or Clysm and Aila, and then were transported to both the eastern and the western part of the empire. Foreign trade appears to have been particularly active in the 5th–6th C. It was somewhat hampered by the fact that trade in the most important item of exchange, silk, was highly regulated.

The political, demographic, and military troubles that afflicted Byz. in the 7th C. brought about economic changes that affected trade. The tendency toward self-sufficiency became much stronger than in the previous period, while urban decline reduced the level of exchange between town and countryside. Land routes became very difficult and communications along the Mediterranean, although they never completely stopped, were disrupted by piracy. Trade declined but did not cease, the provisioning of big cities, esp. Constantinople, acting as an impetus to it. Large fairs, like that of Ephesus, continued to exist. The Rhodian Sea Law testifies to the survival of maritime trade. It was probably in order to stimulate such trade that Emp. Nikephoros I imposed a forced loan on the large shipowners of Constantinople. Locally, exchange took place in small markets where an element of barter was also to be found. International trade was reoriented to some extent toward the north and to the Black Sea. In the 8th C. the Byz. had trade relations with Bulgaria and in the 10th C. with the Rus'. The silk trade, now taking place primarily within the empire, may have been considerable. Quantifiable information is, once again, lacking.

By the 10th C., there is evidence of a strong revival of trade. The Book of the Eparch, along with other sources, shows a large number of different trades and crafts in Constantinople. The state regulated and circumscribed, to some extent, the activities of the various guilds. At the same time, Constantinople appeared as a center of international trade, with Syrian, Italian, Rus', and
Bulgarian merchants, whose contact with Byz. merchants was also regulated. The market of Constantinople stocked spices, which arrived by way of Trebizond, cloth from Syria (also mentioned in Thessalonike), and linen cloth from Bulgaria and the Pontus. Trade relations with the Muslims became very active in the middle of the 10th C. The internal market also appeared active. The size of mercantile enterprises remained small.

In the 11th-12th C. a number of general changes combined to activate the economy of exchange. Urban growth acted as a stimulant, as did the rise of an important Italian market and, possibly, the general quickening of economic activity in the Mediterranean, partly the result of the activities of Italian merchants. Byz. traders from Constantinople appear in the documents of the Cairo Geniza, importing into Egypt brocades and luxury textiles as well as furniture: chests, cupboards, and bedsteads of Rûm. Constantinople and Thessalonike were still the most important trade centers. The Timarion attests to the vitality of the commerce of Thessalonike, while Benjamin of Tudela (p.20) says of Constantinople, “It is a busy city, and merchants come to it from every country by sea or land, and there is none like it in the world except Baghdad.” A number of smaller centers of exchange developed: Halmyros, Demetrias, Preveza, and others. Michael Choniates speaks of the dependence of Athens on trade. The Black Sea witnessed important commercial activity throughout the period. Byz. aristocrats still shied away from commerce, at least in their normative statements; and large economic units (e.g., the Kosmosoteira monastery at Bera) tried to buy necessities such as oil directly from the producer, rather than through middlemen. At the same time, monks themselves participated in trade, primarily, perhaps, by selling their produce, but also, it seems, by sometimes acting as middlemen.

The acquisition of trade privileges first by Venice (at the end of the 11th C.) and then by Pisa and Genoa played an important role in these developments. The chrysobulls to the Venetians gave them access to an increasing number of markets, both in Constantinople and in provincial cities. Venetian merchants were interested not only in trade with the East, but also in the internal trade of the Byz. Empire; this is also evident in the chrysobull of 1198 (the date is under discussion), which greatly expanded the markets acces-
sible to the Venetians. Venetian involvement in domestic trade was facilitated by the fact that, after 1126, the Byz. paid no kommerkion on their transactions with the Venetians. This may have acted as a stimulant to trade and may even have profited some Byz. merchants; in the long term, however, it subsidized the Venetian middleman to the detriment of the Byz.

During the Palaiologan period, the trade of the Byz. Empire functioned under very different conditions from the past. The dominant factor in the eastern Mediterranean in this period was the presence of Western merchants, primarily the Italians, who had turned the terms of trade in their favor. By the late 13th C., they had created a network of exchange that resembled an international trade network; within it they were dominant, since they controlled communications, information, exclusive access to Western markets, and privileges in the marketplaces of the Levant, including the Byz. Empire. Through their colonies and trade stations, Western merchants exercised overwhelming influence on trade. Byz. trade formed part of this complex and served the needs of Western markets. Food and raw materials were exported to the West, from which manufactured products, primarily Italian and French cloth, were imported. Constantinople was a particularly important pivot in this system when the Pax Mongolica (mid-13th-mid-14th C.) made it easier for merchandise from the Far East to reach the Mediterranean by way of the Black Sea. By contrast, after the mid-14th C. the relative importance of Constantinople declined, to the advantage of Cyprus, Ayas (Lajazzo in Lesser Armenia), and eventually Alexandria and Berytus.

Throughout this period trade was active, esp. along the coasts of the Aegean and the Black Sea, the islands, the inland route from Thessalonike to Prizren and other Serbian towns, and the Danube delta. Monemvasia, Thessalonike, and Trebizond were major commercial centers. Indeed, it may be said that commercial activity was greater in this period than ever before. Byz. merchants and sailors participated in this activity quite substantially, as did members of the aristocracy. They were primarily active in local or interregional trade, however, rarely gaining access to international trade, which was the most lucrative. Only in the late 1340s did the Byz. try to capture the profitable Black Sea trade for themselves. It was an
abortive effort, which came to an end in 1350. For the rest, their activities remained important, extensive but subsidiary, until the establishment of the Ottoman Empire changed the terms of trade once again.


COMMODATUM (τὸ εἰς χρόνιν διδόμενον), a loan for use free of charge. As a type of contract commodatum was already under Justinian I (Digest 13.6) manifestly an artificial term that can be distinguished from loan and misthôsis only with difficulty because of the unclear terminology of the Byz. with regard to ownership. Even so, it is treated in detail in the Basilika (13.1) and is still found in Harmenopoulos (Harm. 2.10). In practice it was confused with a wide variety of other types of transmission for use: in Peira 46.5 it is characterized as "polymorphic." In fact, chresis is also readily used as a term for rights of use (usufruct), for example, the rights of a widow over the property of her deceased husband (Nov. Just. 22) or for longi temporis praescription (cf. Harm. 1.16.5). D.S.

COMMUNION (μετάληψις), the eating and drinking in common of the consecrated bread and wine (Jesus’ body and blood), climax of the rite of the Eucharist, as sign of the spiritual communion (κοίνωνία) of Christians with one another in Christ, and, through him, with the Father in the Holy Spirit. The fraction and distribution of one loaf (1 Cor 10:16–17) and the drinking from one cup, as well as the old requirement that each receive the consecrated elements from the hand of another, symbolized the fellowship involved. Communion in both Eucharist and prayer was restricted to the baptized who had not been excluded by excommunication or grave sin. Communion among churches was symbolized by inviting visiting bishops to join in celebrating the Eucharist.

Originally all church members in good standing communicated at every Eucharist, but by the end of the 4th C. the church fathers complained of a decline in the reception of communion, though they themselves were scaring people away by calling communion a "dread" mystery to be received only by those worthy, in fear and trembling. By the Middle Ages, laity communicated at most a few times a year, on the Great Feasts, esp. Easter. Monks, however, continued to receive communion more often: daily communion was a rarity in Byz. monasteries, but weekly communion, though not universal, remained common.


COMMUNION OF THE APOSTLES. See LORD’S SUPPER.

COMMUTATION (Lat. adaeratio). Following the monetary reform of Constantine I, Byz. constantly favored the commutation of fees or contributions in kind and of services and corvées into monetary payments. In the early centuries, the annona as well as the caput or the levies of animals (horses, pigs) or weapons were commuted into cash contributions at such a variety of rates (often arbitrarily established) that the fiscal burden of contributors and the illicit gains of some tax collectors could also vary considerably. In the fiscal system of the Macedonian period, the adaeratio of services due to the state as well as of sportulae (see Synethia) in kind due to officials was common: for example, the military obligation (strateia) of a farmer-soldier for one year could be replaced, in the 10th–11th C., by a cash payment of 4–6 nomismata; similar arrangements were possible for peasants attached to the dromos and for most secondary taxes in kind, some of which were claimed in cash so often that new names had to be invented (antikaniskon, antimitatkion, etc.). In the late 11th C. and afterward, in times of monetary instability tax collectors increased their revenues by playing with the ex-
change rates of the various coins. In the 14th C. the kaniskion was commuted to 6 keratia per year.

LIT. Jones, LRE 207f. 460f, 625f, 670f, 702–04. Morris-
son, “Logariké” 419–64. Kazhdan, Agrarnye otnošenija 120.
-N.O.

COMPUTUS. The date of Easter in Byz. was
determined by a set of simple rules and a variety
of cycles, collectively called the computus. The
rules are essentially that Easter falls on the first
Sunday that follows both the 14th day of the
Paschal lunar month (Passover) and 21 March in
the Julian calendar. The two cycles in common
use were of 19 years (19 solar years = 235 months;
the years of intercalation [embolismic years] were
numbers 3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17, and 19 of the cycle)
and, from the 5th C. onward, 532 years (= 19 ×
28). The 28-year solar cycle is the product of a
four-year leap-year cycle and seven weekdays.
The combination of the 19-year lunar cycle and the
28-year solar cycle results in the precise recur-
rence of the sequence of Julian calendar dates of
Easter in each 532-year cycle. The so-called “re-
forms” of the computus in general consisted sim-
ply of changing the epoch at which the 19-year
or 532-year cycles begin, or of changing the one
year in each cycle in which the saltus lunae or “leap
of the moon” (an ephemeris of 12 instead of 11 days)
occurs. It is true that, following the Islamic value
for the length of a solar year that had been known
in Byz. since the 11th C., Nikephorus Gregoras
proposed a reform of the calendar (Pingree,
“Chionia & Astronomy” 138f), but this propo-
sal was not accepted. The immense Byz. litera-
ture on computus includes treatises by Isaac Ar-
cyros and Nicholas Rhadas.

Ready-made computus tables (or paschal tables)
indicating the dates of Easter for the observable
future survive in many MSS. Usually compiled
by the readers/owners, their earliest date gives the
terminus ante quem for the completion of the MS.

77. O. Neugebauer, Ethiopic Astronomy and Computus (Vi-
enna 1979).
-D.P.

CONCEȘTI TREASURE, dated to ca.400?, found
at Concesti in Moldavia in 1812 and now in the
Hermitage Museum, Leningrad. It includes six
Byz. silver objects, Hunnish gold jewelry, and
horse fittings (see Chariot Mounts and Horse
Fittings). Three silver objects have decorations
from classical mythology: the amphora, one of the
most elaborate silver vessels of the late an-
tique period, has relief decoration of a hunt, a
battle between Greeks and Amazons, and a ma-
rine thiasos (Dionysiac revelry); the situla has a
frieze incorporating Hylas, Leda, Apollo, and
Daphne; and the plate, one of the largest known
(diam. 55 cm), is decorated on its rim with gilded
and niello-inlaid portrait medallions and hunt
scenes, comparable in technique to the Sutton
Hoo Treasure plate and a trulla in the Mytilene
Treasure. The other silver objects in the treasure
include a ewer, of a well-known type; a folding
stool that resembles others from Ostia and the
Lampsakos Treasure; and a helmet of a type
introduced by Constantine I (see Armor). It has
been suggested that the treasure belonged to a
Hunnish prince who may have acquired the silver
objects as booty during a campaign in the Danube
region and that the burial took place between 400
and 410.

LIT. Matzulewitsch, Byz. Antike 129–37. Kent-Painter,
Wealth 138f.
-M.M.M.

CONCH (κόχχη, lit. “mussel shell”), a half-dome
covering a niche or apse. Its shell-like or ribbed
form, which appeared behind and above the seats
of magistrates in Roman basilicas, was taken over
into Christian iconography (Volbach, Eifenbeinar-
beiten, nos. 137, 150, 153f). In Byz. churches a
conch was usually decorated with mosaic or fresco
as a focus for the interior decoration. In early
basilican churches the conch of the apse normally
contained an image of Christ; in later, domed
churches the conch of the apse became, after the
dome, the most conspicuous location in the build-
ing and was reserved for the image of the Virgin.
Conches were also used for other visually and
structurally prominent roles—for example, in the
supporting system for the dome in certain domed
octagon churches (as at the Nea Moni on Chios),
for the covering of subsidiary apses in triconch
and tetrachon churches, and for covering eves-
drae of polygonal churches and other buildings
(e.g., triklinia and refectories). Smaller-scale conches
were also used in conjunction with niches as exterior decorative devices (H. Buchwald, JÖB 26 [1977] 265f, 290–95).


-M.J.

CONCUBINAGE (παλακεία, ἀγραφὸς γάμος in Ecloga 2.6), a stable sexual relationship, frequently of a married man with a woman of lower status, was considered legal in Roman law (Ph.J. Thomas in Huldigungsbundel P. van Warmelo [Pretoria 1984] 290–36). Church fathers attacked concubinage, equating it with prostitution. In 326 Constantine I prohibited married men from keeping concubines (Cod. Just. V 26.1) and in 336 he threatened with infamy and deprivation of Roman citizenship any men of high rank who tried to treat as legitimate their children by bond-maids, freedwomen, actresses, or tavern keepers (Cod. Theod. IV 6.3 pr.). Anastasios I and Justinian I were more tolerant toward concubines and their offspring, and the Ecloga still protected concubines against the arbitrariness of their "husbands." Leo VI abolished this institution (nov.91); the previous opinion that this action was initiated by Basil I was questioned by N. Oikonomides (DOP 30 [1976] 173–93) who interpreted Procheiron 4.26 as an interpolation of a section of Leo VI's novel of 907. Concubinage evidently survived this abolition, and in the 13th C. Demetrios Chomatemos mentions pallaika and concubines (pallakai) kept by men of various status and in various areas of Epiros.

The status of the children of concubines, filii naturales, posed a problem for legislators who tried to distinguish them from offspring resulting from casual intercourse (with prostitutes, etc.); their attitude toward these children kept shifting, as they sometimes granted and sometimes withdrew their rights to the property of their fathers. In reality many illegitimate children of emperors and noblemen by their concubines assumed high ranks and social importance.


-J.H., A.K.

CONFESSION (έξωμολόγησις), the solemn act of acknowledgment of one's sins, was considered by the church fathers as indispensable in the search for salvation. As Athanasios of Alexandria (PG 27.481 A) states, "Confession is the beginning of salvation." John Chrysostom (PG 57.426.35–37) asserts that sin is such a stain that even thousands of springs of water cannot remove it, only tears and confession. The early church encouraged public confession, but from the end of the 4th C. this practice declined, and the right of hearing confession and imposing penance was entrusted to the church as an institution and individually to priests. The Byz. church, however, placed less emphasis on the institutional and legalistic approach to confession than did its Western counterpart: confession was not included in the list of sacraments established by Theodore of Studios. John Chrysostom (PG 49.292.34–44) stresses that there are many different ways of repentance (metanoia) and none are difficult: "Are you a sinner? Enter a church, confess your sins, and receive absolution." The informal character of Byz. confession is evident from a text ascribed to Anastasios of Sinai (PG 89:372 A): "If you find a spiritual man, experienced and capable of curing you, confess before him without shame and full of faith, as if before God and not a human being."

In the monastic milieu confession to a pater pneumatikos, a spiritual father, was a regular practice. At the Bebaias Epipodionos nunnery daily confession was prescribed (Typikon, chs. 105–11). But in the secular world it was not common, except during Lent or as acknowledgment of serious sins. Byz. penitentials do not suggest a rigid format for absolution or a strict scale of penances (epitimia); absolution was expressed mostly in the form of prayer and the remission of sins was attributed to God rather than to the priest.


-A.K.

CONFESSOR (όμολογητής), an honorific title designating primarily those who, during the persecutions of the 3rd–4th C., overtly proclaimed themselves Christians; the feminine form, homem-
logetria, is rare—for example, Epiphanius of Salamis (PG 42:192B) mentions an anchorite, Paphnutius, who was the son of a homologeta. The difference between the confessor and martyr was still vague in the 3rd C.; Origen applied the term martyr to all who witnessed to the truth, although he knew that the term was generally reserved for those who proved their faith by shedding their blood. After the victory of Christianity, the term acquired the metaphorical sense of “pious Christian,” as in the 5th-C. inscription of “Domnos homologetes” (W. Ramsay, JHS 25 [1905] 172). It was also specifically applied to some ardent defenders of Orthodoxy, such as Maximos the Confessor and Theophanes the Confessor, who suffered exile or imprisonment, but not death, for their beliefs. (For confessor as one who hears confession, see Pater Pneumatikos.)


A.K.

CONFISCATION. Legislation of the 4th–6th C. prescribed confiscation as punishment for traitors, heretics, pagans, and parties contracting illegal marriages; in addition, the property of pagan temples, certain municipal estates, and individuals who died intestate without legally recognized heirs, was subject to confiscation. While several of these categories ultimately fell into disuse, confiscation for both treachery and treason persisted in modified forms throughout later periods: the Ecloga (6.2) stipulates that the fisc could recover half the estate of a husband who died intestate and was survived only by his wife (see Abytikion); the Peira (60.1) documents a complicated division of property between the fisc and the heirs of a proscribed member of the Bourztes family; Manuel StrabomanoS (P. Gauthier, REB 23 [1965] 183.30–31) describes how his father was punished with confiscation under Alexios I, adding that the victims were allowed to retain a portion of their property and that many subsequently received aid from the emperor himself. Confiscated lands became state property, administered until the 7th C. by the comes rerum privataram.

Alongside such practices sanctioned in civil law, confiscation also developed certain extrajudicial forms based largely upon administrative regulations of the army and fisc. In the 10th C., military officers were permitted during foreign invasions to seize private cash to purchase supplies (De obsidione toleranda 49.20–22), and several emperors appropriated ecclesiastical treasure to meet urgent military expenses. Lands abandoned for 30 years might become classified as klasma and revert to the fisc, while stratiotika ktemata could be withdrawn from their original possessors for transfer to more reliable soldiers. Theophylaktos of Ohrid (ep. 26, ed. Gautier, Lettres 215–17) mentions widespread confiscation by imperial officials in Bulgaria. In addition, emperors progressively obtained the right to confiscate any landholding in exchange for its just price or the equivalent in land (vita of John Chrysostom, PG 114:1156A), and both Nikephoros I (Theoph. 487.27–488.1) and Basil II (Skyl. 340.88–95) appear to have appropriated private property without any compensation. Such widespread application rendered confiscation a continual threat in Byz. society, and a number of writers (e.g., Skylitzes, Kekaumenos, and esp. Niketas Choniates) express disapproval and fear of its frequently unjust or arbitrary nature.


A.J.C.

CONFRATERNITY (ἄδελφότης, “brotherhood,” or διακονία, “diaconate”), a private association of laymen and clergy, men and women, established for devotional purposes (e.g., the veneration of a particular icon) and for mutual assistance among members (e.g., in cases of sickness, for funeral or memorial services). One function of a confraternity was to hold a procession with cult icons on feastdays, a scene depicted in the Blachernai monastery at Arta. Such lay confraternities had charters, strict regulations for members, and other similarities to the confraternities found in the medieval West. There is evidence for Byz. confraternities from the 6th C. until the end of the empire, with perhaps a discontinuity during the Iconoclastic era. A late 11th- or early 12th-C. typikon exists for a confraternity at Thebes.


M.B., A.C.
CONRAD III (Κορράδος) of Hohenstaufen, king of Germany (1138–52), never crowned Western Emperor; born 1093, died Bamberg 15 Feb. 1152. Begun in 1140, negotiations with John II Komnenos for an alliance against Roger II of Sicily culminated in 1142 with the dispatch of Bertha of Sulzbach to Constantinople as bride for Manuel I. Conrad led the German contingent on the Second Crusade in 1147. Because of clashes with Byz. forces, he feared to enter Constantinople, but crossed the Bosphorus with his army. Defeated in Anatolia by the Turks, Conrad joined Louis VII, leader of the French Crusaders. From Ephesus, ill and exhausted, Conrad sailed to Constantinople (ca. Jan. 1148), where Manuel entertained him; he continued by sea to the Holy Land. Returning after the Crusade's failure, Conrad landed at Thessalonike, where, at Christmas 1148, he and Manuel agreed on a joint attack on Roger. Manuel was to receive Apulia and Calabria as Bertha's dowry. Because of ill health and preoccupations in Germany, Conrad failed to execute these plans.


CONRAD OF MONTFERRAT, claimant king of Jerusalem (1190–92); died Tyre 28 Apr. 1192. Son of the marquess William VI of Montferrat, Conrad and his brothers Boniface of Montferrat and Renier of Montferrat allied with Emp. Manuel I against Frederick I Barbarossa in 1179. Conrad captured Frederick's representative, Archbp. Christian of Mainz (Sept. 1179), then went to Constantinople to confer with Manuel; he was there at Manuel's death. In 1186 Isaac II offered the hand of his sister Theodora and Conrad accepted. He reached Constantinople about Apr. 1187, and the marriage occurred immediately. Conrad became caesar. During the subsequent revolt of Alexios Branias, Conrad enlisted Western cavalry and infantry as well as Turkish and Georgian merchants; his generalship was crucial in defeating Branias. Conrad soon became discontented, however, and perhaps learned of the threats posed by Saladin in the Holy Land. Around late June 1187 (or Sept., according to R.-J. Lilio in Varría 1 [Bonn 1984] 163–74), he abandoned Theodora and sailed to Tyre. There he helped organize the defense of the city and preserve the remnants of the kingdom of Jerusalem. In 1190 he married Isabel (daughter of Amalric I and Maria Komnene) and claimed the kingdom.

LIT. Th. Ilgen, Markgraf Conrad von Montferrat (Marburg 1880). Brand, Byzantium 18–20, 80–84. —C.M.B.

CONSAWGUINITY. See RELATIONSHIP, DEGREES OF.

CONSCIENCE (συνείδησις), a term rarely found in ancient philosophy. Taken literally, synedesis originally meant personal knowledge or understanding shared with another; eventually it came to mean self-awareness. From the 1st C. B.C. the term appears more frequently, often with a negative connotation, in reference to an attitude that approaches our notion of conscience. In the New Testament, while the term does not occur in the Gospels, it appears 30 times throughout the remaining books, but only in the Pauline epistles is it understood in an ethical sense as the stage at which the self feels either justified or condemned.

In Christian sources synedesis primarily denotes either self-justification or self-condemnation, even though its alternative meanings are not wholly absent. For example, in Ignatius of Antioch and Clement of Rome conscience becomes more authoritarian, emphasizing faithful obedience to the authority of the church. The Philonic or Pauline notion is evident in John Chrysostom, for whom conscience is the highest authority next to the command of God, an understanding that unites him with John of Damascus, for whom the law of God is embedded in human conscience, called the law of the mind (Exp. fidei 95, 8–10, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:222). It is the impulse, the tension that maintains the life of ascetic spirituality, for the conscience demands satisfaction. The ascetic life of the saints shows conscience as a form of martyrdom, while it may also refer to the monastic life: “Let conscience serve as a reflection of your obedience” (John Klimax, PG 88:712B). In this tradition, the formation of conscience requires certain spiritual qualities, “vigilance of the heart” and “sobriety” (nepsis).


---

**CONSTORIUM (τεῖον συνεδρίου),** the body of imperial advisers that replaced the former consilium in the late Roman Empire. The term *consistorium* was derived from the hall in which the meeting was convened; W. Kunkel (ZSavRom 85 [1968] 295, n.96) rejects the traditional derivation of the name from the obligation of participants to stand during its sessions. The mention of the *consistorium* in a decree of Diocletian (*Cod. Just. IX* 47.12) is probably a later “correction” of the scribe, and the first secure evidence comes only from 347, although it is plausible that the *consistorium* was a creation of Constantine I. Membership in the *consistorium* was never fully regularized, but by the end of the 4th C. the *consistorium* was composed of two groups of members or *comites consistoriani*: (1) the chiefs of the central administration (magister officiorum, quaestor sacri palatii [see Quaestor], comes sacrarum larcitionum, and comes rerum privatarum), and in some cases the praetorian prefect and certain military commanders, and (2) advisory officials with minor rights. The functions of the *consistorium* included promulgation of imperial laws, reception of foreign ambassadors, and discussion of high policy (although sometimes this was discussed within a narrower and less formal circle of the emperor’s proximi, including the empress) and high justice. A session of the *consistorium* was called a silentium. The *consistorium* never developed into an independent institution, remaining a consultative and ceremonial body. By the end of the 4th C. emperors rarely participated in the *consistorium*, as the emperor’s “inner cabinet” came to play a growing role as the advisory board. Senators actively participated in the judicial work of the *consistorium* from the 5th C.; in the 6th C. Justinian I essentially abolished the distinction between the consistorium and the senate.

---

**CONSTANS II,** emperor (641–68); son of HERAKLEIOS CONSTANTINE and grandson of Heraclius; born Constantinople 7 Nov. 630, died Syracuse 15 July 668 (Grierson, “Tombs and Obits” 49f). Christened Flavios Herakleios, Constans was crowned co-emperor as Constantine (Constantine III, according to Stratos) by his uncle, HERAKLONAS, in Sept. 641. He became sole emperor after Heraklonas and MARTINA were deposed in winter 641/2, ruling officially as Constantine (his coins bear the name) but popularly known as Constans. His thick beard earned him the nickname “Pogonatos.” With his wife Fausta, daughter of VALENTINOS ARŞAKUNI, he had three sons: Constantine (IV), Herakleios, and Tiberios. Throughout his reign, Constans was occupied by the empire’s external enemies. Against the Arabs he probably organized the themes of ANATOLIKON and OPSIKION and personally campaigned in Asia Minor and Armenia. The first Greek inscriptions on Byz. coins (“In this conquer”) are found, together with Constans holding a cross, on folles of his reign. Evoking the success of Constantine I at the Milvian Bridge, this slogan was intended to urge the army to victory over the Muslims. He suffered defeats, however, esp. at the naval battle of Phoenix (mod. Finike in Turkey) in 655, and twice (651, 659) accepted peace treaties (see Muṣawwa). He had more success against the Slavs, personally invading SKLAVINIA in 658 and resettling captives in Asia Minor. He also probably organized the theme of HELLAS. Anxiety over external threats led him to leave Constantinople for the West ca.660. Arriving in
Italy in 663, he campaigned against the Lombards before settling in Sicily, where he created a theme and raised a navy and army. Constans's measures to finance his military activities were unpopular, esp. in Italy, where high taxes and confiscations of church vessels antagonized the local nobility and clergy. He faced numerous rebellions (e.g., those of Saborios, Olympos, and Gregory, exarch of Carthage). His religious policy attempted to end Christological arguments, but his Typos only angered Western bishops, partly resulting in the trials of Pope Martin I and Maximos the Confessor. He also infuriated Pope Vitalian in March 668 by decreeing the independence of the archbishop of Ravenna. Constans was murdered while bathing, either struck in the head by a servant or stabbed by the conspirators who proclaimed Mezzi dos emperor. His body was returned to Constantinople, perhaps personally by Constantine IV, and buried in the Church of the Holy Apostles.


CONSTANTIA (Κωνσταντία), Constantiana, and other variants, name of several sites (towns and/or strongholds), primarily in the northern Balkans.

CONSTANTIA in the Rhodope Mountains, a town destroyed by Kalojan in 1201 (Nik.Chon. 532.22–23). It is probably the Constantia listed in a notitia of Patr. Nicholas I Mystikos as a suffragan of Philippopolis (Notitiae CP, no. 7.592). Excavations at Assara (near Marica in Bulgaria) have revealed the remains of a late Roman and medieval town (coins of Anastasios I, Phokas, and Leo VI were found) that has been identified as Rhodopian Constantia.


CONSTANTIA on the Danube, 5th-C. fortress (phouririon) mentioned by Priskos (FHG 4:72.16), probably to be identified with the 11th-C. phouririon of Constantia, referred to by Skylitzes (Skyl. 301.2–3). It was near modern Belgrade, at the juncture of the Morava and the Danube.

CONSTANTIA on the Black Sea. See Tomis.


CONSTANTIA near Ohrid, a phouririon erected by Basil II (Skyl. 359.40–42).

OTHER CONSTANTIAS. Cities also possessing this name existed in Calabria, Cyprus (anc. Salamis), and Phoenicia, and infrequently this name was given to Constantinople. Constantina (now Viranşehir in Turkey) in northern Mesopotamia was called Konstanta by Theophanes the Confessor. – A.K.

CONSTANTIANA. See Constantia.

CONSTANTINA (Κωνσταντίνα, Syr. Tell), city in northern Mesopotamia, now Viranşehir in eastern Turkey. Constantina was the headquarters of the doux of Mesopotamia in 363–527 and 532–40 and a bishopric of Osroene subject to Edessa (L. Dillemann, Haute Mésopotamie orientale et pays adjacents [Paris 1962] 75, 107f.). Malalas (Malal. 323.14–19) states that Constantina was rebuilt by Constantine I on the site of ancient Maximianopolis, which had been destroyed by a Persian attack and an earthquake. Constantina, also called Konstanta by Theophanes, should be distinguished from the Konstantia in Phoenicia, previously called Antarados, that was rebuilt by Constantius II (Theoph. 98.8–9). In the 6th C. Constantia was headquarters of General Priskos and an important point of contention during the Persian wars. Jacob Baradaeus was born near Constantin and was a monk at the monastery of Phesiltha outside the city. Constantin fell to the Arabs in 639.

Parts of city walls, a large-aisled, centralized church (the “Octagon”), and an entire (?) warehouse of 543 were still standing in 1972; other remains of the 4th–6th C., including Greek inscriptions, are recorded by travelers. A tetrapylon disappeared in this century.

Lit. Bell-Mango, Tur ‘Abdin 154–57. – M.M.M.
CONSTANTINE (Κωνστάντιος), personal name. It is uncertain whether the name was used before Constantine I the Great; a certain Aurelius Constantine is named in an undated inscription (CIL 3294). The name may have been coined on the basis of Constantius, Constantine the Great’s father; at any rate, in the 4th C. Constantius was more popular than Constantine (PLRE 1:223–28). The relative frequency seems to have changed in the 5th C.: PLRE 2:311–25 lists 24 Constantines and 20 Constantii. Prokopios mentions only four Constantines, but thereafter the frequency increased: 28 in Theophanes, 60 in Skylitzes, 15 in Anna Komnene (in the last two cases Constantine is the most popular name). Niketas Choniates has 22 Constantines, third after John (35) and Alexios (24). In Lauro, vol. 1, encompassing the period of the 10th–12th C., 37 Constantines are listed, third only to John (90) and Nicholas (42), but in the later Lauro, vols. 2–3 (13th–15th C.), Constantine occupies only the seventh place. Constantius seems to have almost disappeared after Theophanes, but the vernacular form Konstras, rare in Lauro 1, occurs 30 times in Lauro 2–3. Constantine was the most popular name for emperors; 11 bore the name between the 4th and 15th C. and it should be noted that Leo V changed the name of his son Symbatios to Constantine (E. Patlagean in Byz. Aristocracy 27). Four patriarchs had this name but there are very few saints named Constantine in the Byz. calendar.

CONSTANTINE, co-emperor; eldest son of Basil I by his first wife Maria, although some sources name Eudokia Ingerina as his mother (see G. Ostrogorsky, SemKond 5 [1932] 28); born ca.859 (Vogt, infra) or 863/4 (E. Kislinger, JOb 33 [1983] 129), died 3 Sept. 879 (P. Karlin-Hayter, Byzantium 36 [1966] 624–26). Constantine was proclaimed co-emperor in 867/8, and his name is included with Basil’s in the title of the Procheiron. Basil planned his betrothal to a daughter of Louis II, and the question was discussed with Frankish envoys in 869 (A. Gasquet, L’empire byzantin et la monarchie franque [Paris 1888] 412). Constantine accompanied Basil in his expedition against the Arabs in 879 (Vasiliev, Byz. Arabes 2.1:88–91, 93–94).

Constantine always appears beardless on his father’s coins (Grierson, DOC 3.2:474 and nos. 1–4.8, 10–11). Spatharakis’s view (CahArch 23 [1974] 97–105) that Constantine was depicted in the well-known Paris MS of the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos (Paris B.N. gr. 510, fol.8v) was corrected by I. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner (JOb 27 [1978] 19–24).

Lit. Vogt, Basile Ier 58f.

CONSTANTINE. See also Konstantin.

CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT, Augustus (from 25 July 306); born Naissos 273/4, died Nikomedea 22 May 337; feastday 21 May. Son of Constantius Chlorus and Helena, he was proclaimed as Augustus in Britain upon the death of his father. He was subsequently acknowledged as Caesar by Galerius and as Augustus by Maximian,

and his imperial position was confirmed at the Conference of Carnuntum in 308. He defeated Maxentius at the battle of the Milvian Bridge in 312, thus becoming sole ruler of the West. Alliance with Licinius turned to hostility, and after victory over his rival at Chrysopolis in 324 Constantine became ruler of the whole empire. He associated his sons with him as caesars—Crispus (317), Constantius II (317), Constantius II (324), and Constans I (333)—but he remained sole Augustus until his death. He had two consorts, Minervina (perhaps a concubine) and Fausta (see genealogical table).

Constantine carried out important administrative and military reforms, completing and/or reversing those of Diocletian. He organized the entire empire into three or four prefectures, each under its own praetorian prefect, below whom were provinces and the cities. At court, officials such as the comes rei privatae, comes sacrarum larcionum, and magister officiiorum, wielded great power as heads of large amorphous bureaus, while magistri militum commanded the army, increasingly dominated by the comitatenses. Constantine reformed the coinage, issuing a gold solidus that remained the standard coin through the 11th C. To celebrate his victory over Licinius he founded a new city on the site of ancient Byz.; Constantinople was inaugurated on 11 May 330, not so much a “new capital” as an imperial residence and monument to the emperor’s greatness. According to the Chronicon Paschale (1:527–29), his huge building program consisted almost entirely of secular structures, whereas Eusebius of Caesarea emphasizes the churches and martyria that Constantine built in the capital and at Nikomedia, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

Like most of his predecessors, Constantine sought divine support for his rule and ultimately came to base his power on a special connection with the Christian God. This concept developed slowly, augmented by the emperor’s victories, and culminating in the image of Constantine in the works of Eusebius of Caesarea, esp. the Vita Constantini. In the latter work (VC 4.15) Eusebius interprets the upward gaze exhibited by Constantine on his coins as a gesture of piety. In fact, his numismatic portraits exhibit a remarkable range of types (D.H. Wright, DOP 41 [1987] 493–507). It is still debated whether Constantine actually issued the so-called Edict of Milan. Constantine became involved in the controversies surrounding Donatism and Arianism, convoked the first ecumenical council at Nicaea, and approved its decisions, although he later came to support Arianism. He was baptized on his deathbed by Eusebius of Nikomedia. The so-called Donation of Constantine is a forgery, probably of the 8th C.

As the first Christian emperor and the founder of Constantinople, Constantine set the style that was followed by nearly all Byz. emperors. Despite his very real human failings, Constantine was very quickly heroized as founder of the new politico-religious order and regarded as a saint; he was commonly pictured, frequently along with his mother, in figural representations of rulers in church decoration.
CONSTANTINE II, caesar (from 1 Mar. 317) and augustus (from 9 Sept. 337); born Arles, Feb. 317, died Aquileia 340. He was the son of Constantine I, perhaps illegitimate. In the arrangements made after his father's death Constantine II ruled Britain, Gaul, and Spain. He was, however, apparently regarded as the senior emperor. A strong opponent of ARIANISM, he returned ATHANASIUS of Alexandria from exile in Gaul despite the opposition of CONSTANTIUS II. In 340 Constantine responded to a perceived slight from CONSTANS I by invading Italy, where he was killed.

LIT. Jones, LRE 112–14. PLRE 1:223. Barnes, New Empire 8, 44f. -T.E.G.

CONSTANTINE III, usurper in Britain and Gaul (407–11). He is described as a common soldier but was a man of ability who was proclaimed emperor in Britain in 407. He made himself master of much of Gaul, being able to mint coins extensively at Trier, Lyons, and Arles. In September 411 he surrendered to Honorius's army and was put to death. He is not to be confused with either HERAKLEIOS CONSTANTINE, son and successor of HERAKLEIOS, or with CONSTANS II, both of whom have been called Constantine III by some historians.

LIT. E. Demougeot, "Constantin III, l'empereur d'Arles," in Hommage à André Dupont (Montpellier 1974) 89–125. -Ph.G.

CONSTANTINE III LEICHOUSES (Λειχοῦδης), patriarch of Constantinople (2 Feb. 1059–9/10 Aug. 1063); born Kouzenas (Psellos in Sathas, MB 5:300.10) or Constantinople (Sathas, MB 4:390.18–19 ca.1000, died Constantinople. The statement of later chroniclers that he was a eunuch is probably incorrect. Together with John MAUROPOUS, Leichouses was the leader of the young intellectuals who came to power under Constantine IX; he became MASEZON (Beck, Ideen, pt.XIII [1955], 329) but had to retire ca.1050. The question of the prononai that Constantine IX granted to Leichouses over the MANGANA monastery is under discussion; it was apparently an administrative function (A. Hohlweg, BZ 60 [1967] 291–94), rather than a semi-feudal property (K. Juzbašan, VizVrem 16 [1959] 24–28). He returned to political activity only when Michael VI sent him and Psellos as envoys to the rebellious Isaac I Komnenos, who eventually chose Leichouses to replace MICHAEL I KEROUARIOS on the patriarchal throne.

The policy of Leichouses as patriarch is little known: he evidently resumed negotiations with Pope Alexander II (1061–73) concerning the filioque (PL 145:633B). His hostility toward the Monophysites was relentless: MICHAEL I THE SYRIAN mentions the patriarchal decree of 1063 to burn all the sacred books "of the Syrians" (tr. Chabot, 3:166). Leichouses regulated the right of asylum in such a way that a priest involved in a murder was proclaimed free, whereas a slave (oikeites) Demetrios, guilty of murder, was extradited to his owner in exchange for the payment of 24 nomismata (PG 119:853–56). On his seals Leichouses retained the title of ecumenical patriarch (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, no.17). Psellos devoted to him an enkomion praising his friend as a talented administrator and even military commander.


CONSTANTINE IV, emperor (668–85); born ca.650, died Constantinople 10 July (?) 685. In the 19th C. many scholars identified Constantine IV with "Constantine Pogonatos," who in reality was his father, CONSTANS II (E.W. Brooks, BZ 17 [1908] 460–62). Proclaimed co-emperor in April 654 by Constans II, Constantine avenged his father's murder by going to Sicily in early 669 and defeating Mezizios (E.W. Brooks, BZ 17 [1908] 455–59, rejects Constantine's personal participation). Constantine ruled with his younger brothers Herakleios and Tiberios until 681, when he disposed and mutilated them, probably because of a
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conspiracy (E.W. Brooks, EHR 30 [1915] 42–51). With them and his son Justinian (II) he is shown in an apse mosaic in S. Apollinare in Classe, presenting privileges to that church (Beckwith, ECBA, fig.96). Throughout his reign Constantine faced external pressures but preferred diplomatic to military responses. The Arabs raided Byz. territory yearly and in 674–78 besieged Constantinople itself, but their defeat compelled Mu‘awiya to sign a 30-year truce on terms favorable to Byz. Shortly thereafter Constantine signed treaties with the Lombards, who had captured Brindisi and Taranto (after 671), and the Avars (Reg, nos. 241, 240). In the Balkans Constantine unsuccessfully campaigned against Asparuch and formally recognized the Bulgars’ settlement south of the Danube, in response to which he created the theme of Thrace. He hoped to end the empire’s religious disputes by summoning the Council in Trullo and personally presided at 12 of its 18 meetings. He also attempted to revalue the bronze coinage by minting an 18-gram follis. He died of dysentery and was survived by his wife Anastasia and their sons Justinian and Heraclius.


CONSTANTINE V, emperor (741–75): born Constantinople 718, died Strongylon 14 Sept. 775. Leo III crowned his son Constantine as co-emperor in 720 and in 732 married him to the Khazar khagan’s daughter, who took the name Irene and bore him Leo (IV). Constantine’s second wife, Maria, died shortly after their marriage ca.750. By a third wife, Eudokia, whom he crowned in 769, Constantine had five sons (including Caesar Nikephoros) and a daughter. After succeeding Leo in 741, Constantine was briefly driven from Constantinople by Artabasdos, but regained the throne in Nov. 743. Byz. sources displayed their hostility toward his zealous support of Iconoclasm by nicknaming him “Kaballinos” (“groom”) and “Kopronymos” (“dung-named”) for supposedly having defecated while being baptized. Constantine convened a church council at Hieria in 754 and thereafter persecuted Iconophiles in the bureaucracy, army, and church; his attacks on monks evolved into a campaign against monasticism as an institution. He also rejected the cult of saints, including the intercessory power of the Theotokos, and was hostile to relics, except those of the True Cross. In the Life of St. Stephen the Younger (PG 100:1120C), Constantine is indicted for scraping the holy pictures off the walls of the Church of the Virgin at Blachernai. In the provinces he relied on strategoi like Michael Lachanodrakon to execute his iconoclastic and fiscal policies. Constantine wrote treatises on Iconoclasm that survive as his fragmentary Questions (Peuseis, ed. Ostrogorsky, Bilderstr. 7–45).

An outstanding general, Constantine served in 740 with his father at Akroinon. He campaigned frequently against the Slavs and Bulgarians, winning decisive victories at Anchialos in 763 and over Telerig at Lithosoria in 773. He also campaigned successfully against the Arabs, capturing Germanikeia in 746 and Theodosioupolis and Melentine in 752. For resettling captives from Armenia in Thrace, he was blamed for introducing Paulicians into the empire (Theoph. 429.19–22). He repopulated Constantinople with families from Greece after a plague in 747. Constantine transferred Sicily, Calabria, and Illyricum from papal to Byz. ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but, by neglecting northern Italy and the Lombards’ seizure of Ravenna, he drove the papacy closer to the Franks. He created the Boukellarion theme and restored the aqueduct of Valens during a drought in Constantinople in 767. He financed his campaigns and enriched the treasury by raising taxes and selling confiscated monastic properties. Constantine was buried in the Church of the Holy Apostles, but in the 9th C. his bones were exhumed, burned, and cast into the sea (Grierson, “Tombs and Obits” 53f).


CONSTANTINE VI, emperor (780–97); son of Leo IV and Irene; born Constantinople 14 Jan. 771, died before 805 (E.W. Brooks, BZ 9 [1900] 655). Leo crowned Constantine VI as co-emperor
in 776, but after Leo's death Irene ruled as Constantine's regent with Staurakios. In 782 she betrothed Constantine to Rotrud, the daughter of Charlemagne, but broke the engagement in 788 and married Constantine to Maria from Amnia in the Armeniakon. This reportedly upset Constantine (Theoph. 463.24-27) and likely contributed to his growing animosity toward his mother. He signed the acts of the Second Council of Nicaea (787) condemning Iconoclasm, but his close association with Michael Lachanodrakon, with whose help he deposed Irene in Dec. 790, may indicate Iconoclastic leanings. He was an ineffectual ruler, fruitlessly campaigning against the Bulgarians and Arabs in 791 and being severely defeated by the Bulgarians at Markeleiai in 792. His restoration of Irene in 792 disappointed his supporters. In 792-93 he thwarted a conspiracy in favor of his uncle, Caesars Nikephoros, and at Irene's urging blinded Alexios Mospel, thereby aggravating an uprising in the Armeniakon, which he cruelly suppressed. He instigated the Moechian Controversy in 795 by divorcing Maria, who had given him two daughters, and marrying his mistress Theodote. Undermined by Irene and Staurakios, he was dethroned and blinded on 19 Apr. 797 (S. Petrides, EO 4 [1900-01] 72-75). He died in exile and was buried in Irene's monastery of St. Euphrosyne (Grierson, "Tombs and Obits" 54f). Constantine's only recorded monumental portrait was a mosaic at the Church of the Virgin of Pege, together with one of his mother.

CONSTANTINE VII PORPHYROGENNETOS, emperor of the Macedonian dynasty (945-59); born 17 or 18 May 905, died Constantinople 9 Nov. 959. His birth to Leo VI and Zoe Karbonopisina provoked the conflict over the Tetrarchy of Leo VI. Crowned co-emperor probably on 15 May 908 (P. Grierson-R. Jenkins, Byzantium 32 [1962] 133-38), he was excluded from power for almost four decades, successively dominated by Alexander, Nicholas I Mystikos and Zoe, and Romanos I, whose daughter Helen married Constantine in May 919. His independent rule began only after Romanos's sons were deposed on 27 Jan. 945. Dismissing Romanos's supporters, Constantine sought the assistance of aristocratic families such as Phokas. A contemporary source (TheophCont 456.14-16) asserts that Constantine surrounded himself with noblemen (eugeineis) on whom he bestowed titles and gifts, while another (Skyl. 237.14) reports that the emperor chose his functionaries regardless of their noble merits (ouk aristidenti).

In his legislation Constantine proclaimed a complete rupture with his predecessor's policy: he called Romanos's officials and generals venal and unwarlike (Zepos, Jus 1:226.5) and tried to alleviate (kouphisa) the tax burden that his father-in-law had required the peasantry to bear.
(TheophCont 443.13–18). In fact, however, Constantine’s novels, written predominantly by Theodoret of Dekapolis, retained principles of Romanos I’s legislation, such as the concept of the protection of the poor from the dynatoi; he made, however, certain concessions to small archontes and small monasteries. Especially important in this respect was a novel (now lost) mentioned in Theodoret’s decision of 960/1: in it, Constantine, responding to the request of the military archontes (Zepos, Jus 1:239.19), obliged even the poorest peasants to compensate the illegal buyers of their allotments; they were allowed, however, five years for this repayment.

Constantine fought against the Arabs without great success. The expedition to Crete in 949 was a failure, and although his armies seized Germa- nika in 949 and crossed the Euphrates in 952, they were subsequently defeated by Sayf al-Dawla. Nikephoros (II) Phokas led the offensive from 954 and in 957 captured Ḥadat; in 958 John (I) Tzimiskes conquered Samosata. Despite the baptism of O’la, princess of Kiev, and her visit to Constantinople, Constantine was unable to establish a strong alliance with the Rus’.

Constantine contributed much to the systemization of knowledge and encouraged the compilation of encyclopedic works such as Excerpta de legationibus (see EXCEPTRA) and Geoponika; he also encouraged historical writing intended to eulogize Basil I and thereby present Basil’s predecessors as inept villains. This aim was achieved by the anonymous author of the Imperial Histories, ascribed to a certain Genesios, and by a collection conventionally called Theophanes Continuatus. Constantine collaborated in several works on the empire’s administrative system and foreign relations that are preserved under his name: De administrando imperio, De thematibus, and De ceremoniis. To his literary heritage also belong several speeches, letters (e.g., correspondence with Theodore of Kyzikos), and specimens of liturgical poetry.

Constantine’s reputation as guiding spirit of the so-called Macedonian Renaissance is based on the prooimion of the continuators of Theophanes (TheophCont 3.15–4.1), who declare that the emperor brought a palinsozia (“new life”) and palingenasia (“rebirth”) to what had been lost in the course of time. The same source (450.12–20) tells of Constantine’s “accurate” painting and his role as “corrector” of stonemasons, carpenters, goldsmiths, silversmiths, etc., and attributes numerous works to his hand (447.1–450.11). Liutprand of Cremona (Anatopodosis 3.37) confirms also that Constantine engaged in zographia, that is, that he worked as a painter. Constantine’s portrait is found on an ivory plaque in Moscow (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinskulpt. II, no.35) and perhaps on a Mandylion icon at Sinai.


A.K., A.C.

CONSTANTINE VIII, emperor (1025–28); born 960/1, died Constantinople 12 Nov. 1028, according to YAHYA. Son of Romanos II, Constantine was crowned co-emperor probably 30 Mar. 962 (Oikonomides, Documents, pt.XIII [1965], 73–76). During the reign of his elder brother Basil II, he lived in idleness. He married Helena, daughter of Alypios, who bore him three daughters: Eudokia (who became a nun), Zoe, and Theodora. Upon succeeding his brother, Constantine continued his devotion to chariot racing and theatrical spectacles, although he did enjoy the imperial duty of receiving embassies. He was strongly influenced by his household eunuchs, capricious, and prone to inflict blinding on the slightest excuse. Among his apparently innocent victims were Constantine Bourtzes, Nikephoros Komnenos, and Basil Skleros. Because Basil II had allowed two years of tax arrears to accrue, Constantine collected the taxes for five years in three. He considered annulling the allelygyon that Basil had imposed but did not live to do this. His general Constantine Diogenes repelled an attack by Pechenegus, and George Theodorakanos defeated a Muslim naval incursion. On his deathbed, Constantine married Zoe to the future Romanos III.

Generally accepted as portraits of Constantine and Basil II are the co-emperors in the Bari Exultet Roll (Archivio della Cattedrale 1). If this is so, it is, apart from his coins, the only portrait known of Constantine.

CONSTANTINE IX MONOMACHOS (Movomáxos), emperor (1042–1055); born ca.1000, died Constantinople 7/8 Jan. (Kleinhchroniken 1:159, 167) or 11 Jan. (Grumel, Chronologie 358; Ostrogorsky, History 337) 1055. From a distinguished family, Constantine was exiled to Mytilene by Michael IV. He was recalled to wed Zoe (11 June 1042) and crowned the next day; their mosaic portraits survive in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople. He enjoyed the support of the commercial classes of Constantinople; leading merchants became senators. He also gathered around him such intellectuals as future Patri. Constantine (III) Leichoudes, future Patri. John (VIII) Xiphilinos, Michael Psellos, and John Mauropous, whose epigrams describe two images of Constantine. A law school was established under Xiphilinos, and Psellos became hypatos ton philosophon.

Constantine extravagantly maintained his mistress, Skleraina, and her successor, an “Alan” (Georgian) princess. He converted into taxpayers peasants in “Iberia” who had owed military service and substituted mercenaries. A moderately adulterated nomisma perhaps facilitated commerce (Morrison, "Dévaluation" 6f). These policies alienated the military aristocracy. The revolts of George Maniates and Leo Tornikios were overcome with great difficulty.

Constantine experienced some successes over foreigners: the Rus’ of Jaroslav of Kiev were defeated (Shepard, "Russians Attack" 147–212), and Gagik II yielded Ani. Nonetheless, the frontiers proved porous: the Turks of Tughrul Beg devastated eastern Anatolia, the Pechenegs occupied the Danubian plain and ravaged Thrace, and the Normans advanced in southern Italy. Late in his reign, these disasters caused Constantine to dismiss Xiphilinos and other intellectuals. He turned to the eunuch John, who instituted harsh taxation. In his final year, Constantine could not control Patri. Michael I Keroularios.

Psellos’ Chronographia vividly depicts Constantine’s personality; later Byz. writers blamed his extravagant policies for the ensuing collapse of Byz. Among his lavish foundations were the monastery of the Nea Mone on Chios and the monastery at Mangana, built near the house where Skleraina lived. MSS presumably commissioned by Constantine include a rich copy of the homilies of John Chrysostom (Sinai gr. 364) that contains a frontispiece showing the emperor between Zoe and Theodora (Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.66).


CONSTANTINE X DOUKAS, emperor (1059–67); born ca.1006, died Constantinople 22/3 May 1067. An Anatolian magnate, Constantine was briefly imprisoned, then retired to his estates when his father-in-law Constantine Dalassenos was arrested (1034). In 1057 Constantine supported the rebellion of the future Isaac I Komnenos. Through his second wife, Eudokia Makrembolitissa, a niece of Patri. Michael I Keroularios, he was allied to the opponents of Michael VI Stratios-tikos within Constantinople. During Isaac’s reign, Constantine supported those hostile to Isaac’s reforms (E. Stânescu, RESÉE 4 [1966] 55–69). Nevertheless, through the influence of Michael Psellos, Constantine was designated emperor by the dying Isaac and crowned on 23/4 Nov. 1059. He undid Isaac’s reforms, restoring many to office and promoting leading guild members to the senate. Soldiers who felt neglected sought to enter the civil hierarchy (Attal. 76.10–12). He avoided a plot (Apr. 1061) led by the epharch of Constantinople (D. Polemis, BZ 58 [1965] 61f). His generosity to monasteries and individuals required heavy taxation, which inspired rebellion (1066) in northern Greece (G. Litavrin, VizVrem 11 [1956] 123–34). Constantine could barely rally 150 soldiers to oppose an incursion of Uzes across the Danube (1064–65). Turkish raiders overran the eastern boundaries, and Alp Arslan seized Ani. Constantine’s reign was deemed disastrous by Ataleiates; even Psellos was critical. At his death, the augusta Eudokia took power on behalf of her sons (N. Oikonomides, Documents, pt.III [1963], 102). She had already held the place of honor (the spectator’s left) on folklis of Constantine’s reign. Their joint portraits appear in a badly damaged miniature in a copy of the Sacra Parallela (Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.68). Constantine’s best–preserved likeness, again with Eudokia, is on a reliquary of St. Demetrios in Moscow (Iskusstvo Vizantij 2, no.547).
CONSTANTINE XI PALAILOGOS, emperor (12 Mar. 1449–29 May 1453); born Constantinople 8 Feb. 1405, died Constantinople 29 May 1453. Last member of the Palaiologan dynasty and final ruler of the Byz. Empire, Constantine was the fourth son of MANUEL II and Helena Dragas. He is sometimes called Constantine XII because of the erroneous supposition that Constantine Laskaris was crowned emperor in Apr. 1204 (cf. Brand, Byzantium 258 and 381, n.58). Constantine came to the Morea in 1428 to share the despotate with his brothers THEODORE II and THOMAS PALAILOGOS; he ruled as despotes for 20 years. He significantly strengthened the Byz. position by the restoration of the Hexamilion (1444) and the conquest of Patras (1429), Athens, and Thebes (1444). His dream of reasserting control over Greece, however, was destroyed by the Ottoman campaign of 1446. Since both of Constantine's older brothers, Theodore and Andronikos, predeceased him, he inherited the throne upon the death of the childless John VIII. He was crowned at Mistra on 6 Jan. 1449 and began his reign in March when he reached Constantinople. He did not receive a second coronation in Hagia Sophia.

As a pragmatist Constantine accepted the Union of Florence, in the hope of gaining military assistance from the West. During his short reign he made several desperate appeals to European rulers (R. Guiland, EEBS 22 [1952] 60–74 and BS 14 [1953] 226–44). He did not implement the Union, however, until 12 Dec. 1452. Constantine fought bravely during the Ottoman siege of Constantinople and was killed on the ramparts during the final Turkish assault. He died without heir, since his two marriages were childless.

CONSTANTINE DRAGAŠ (Δραγάš), Serbian nobleman and autonomous ruler; died 17 May 1395. Together with his brother John Dragas (died 1378/9), he ruled a large region of northeastern Macedonia, inherited from their father the sebastokrator and despotes Dejan (Ferjančić, Despoti 168–70). He was called gospodin (lord) in Serbian documents, kyr (Koutloum., no.40.15) or authentes (MM 2:260.8) in Greek texts. It is a matter of dispute whether he was ever given the title “despotes of Serbia” (cf. J. Darrouzès, REB 27 [1969] 62.72–73 and n.; Ostrogorsky, infra 288f). With their mother Theodora-Eudokia, sister of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, the Dragas brothers generously endowed monasteries on Mt. Athos, esp. Hilindar, Panteleem, and Vatopedi (S. Novaković, Zakonski spomenici [Belgrade 1912] 446–48, 452–57, 510–15, 676, 738–40). After the battle of Marica in 1371, Constantine and John were forced to become vassals of Murad I; Constantine was fighting on the side of the Turks when he fell in battle at Rovine. His lands were subsequently annexed by the Ottoman Empire.

Despite their Ottoman vassalage, the Dragas brothers maintained close relations with Byz. Probably after 1386, Constantine took as his second wife Eudokia Kommene, daughter of Alexios III of Trebizond (I. Djurić, ZRVI 22 [1983] 259–72), and in 1392 he gave Helena, his daughter by his first wife, in marriage to Manuel II Palaiologos. Their son Constantine XI bore the family
name Dragases in addition to Palaiologos. Helena died on 13 Mar. 1450 as the nun Hypomone; several Byz. rhetoricians wrote funeral orations in her memory.


–J.S.A.

CONSTANTINE LASKARIS. See under Constantine XI Palaiologos.

CONSTANTINE OF KERKYRA, theologian condemned in Jan. and Feb. 1170 for his heretical interpretation of John 14:28, “The Father is greater than I.” Stressing the hypostatical unity of the Father and the Son, Constantine denied that the Son was inferior on account of the real and concrete humanity which he assumed in the incarnation (RegPař, fasc. 3, no.1119). According to V. Grumel (EO 28 [1929] 283–94), Constantine wrote the treatise On the Orthodox Creed (Napisanie o pravoj vere) preserved in Old Church Slavonic and ascribed to Constantine the Philosopher; S. Kos (De actuore expositionis verae fidei S. Constantino Cyrillo adscriptae [Ljubljana 1942]; cf. B. Schultze, OriChP 9 [1943] 229–31) rejects this identification and considers the author a disciple of Methodios, perhaps Kliment of Ohrid. Even more questionable is the identification of Constantine with Constantine Bykinator, an official (kanstrisios) of Hagia Sophia and archbishop of Bulgaria mentioned by Michael Gazes in 1203 (C. Giannelli, EEBs 23 [1953] 224–32).

LIT. J. Gouillard, “Synodikon” 221f. –A.K.

CONSTANTINE OF RHODES, poet; born ca.870 or 880 at Lindos, Rhodes, died after 931. Constantine began his civil career as secretary of Samonas and his literary career as a satiric poet, accusing Leo Choriothaktos of paganism and mocking a eunuch called Theodore the Paphlagonian. Later, as Constantine VII’s asekretis, he produced an ekphrasis (surviving perhaps in an unfinished form) consisting of two sections: descriptions of the Seven Wonders of Constantinople and of the Church of the Holy Apostles. In full conformity with the encyclopedic tendencies of 10th-C. literature, his descriptions are a catalog of elements rather than an emotional perception of the achievements of architects and painters (A. Epstein, GRBS 23 [1982] 81f). Constantine’s description of the Seven Wonders was used by Ke-drenos, probably through an intermediary source. His satiric poems are inelegant, being essentially lists of the base qualities of his opponents.


LIT. G. Downey, “Constantine the Rhodian: His Life and Writings,” LCMS 212–21. –A.K.

CONSTANTINE OF SICILY, 9th-C. poet, named also grammaticos and philosopher. He wrote Anacreontic verses to which Krumbacher (GBL 723) ascribes a vivid naturalness. Constantine mentions Arab attacks on Sicily. Lemerle (Humanism 199–200, n.95) attributes to him, although reluctantly, a poem in which the author regards Photios as his teacher. Constantine was also involved in a polemic against his teacher, Leo the Philosopher; his vitriolic verses charge Leo with paganism and threaten him with Hell, where he will meet his friends, ancient poets and scholars. The identification of both Constantine and Leo is difﬁcult: Lipsic (Ocherki 355) is inclined to see in Leo the Philosopher Leo Choriothaktos and to connect Constantine’s invectives with the polemic of Arethas and Constantine of Rhodes against the latter; Lemerle identifies Constantine’s teacher with Leo the Mathematician. M.D. Spadarolo (infra 183–92) hypothesizes that the author of the polemical verses was Constantine the Philosopher.


LIT. R. Anastasi, “Costantino Siculo e Leone il Filosofo,” SiccGymn 16 (1963) 84–89. –A.K.

CONSTANTINE THE JEW, saint; born Synada, Phrygia, died on Bithynian Mt. Olympus 26 Dec., after 886. Born to a Jewish family, Constantine adopted Christianity. His conversion began when he spontaneously imitated a merchant who crossed
his mouth while yawning; "the power of the sign" was such that Constantine without baptism acquired a fervent belief in Christ (cols. 629F–630A). Constantine's relatives forced him to marry, but on his wedding night he fled to the Phlouboute monastery near Nicaea, where he was baptized, became a monk, and stayed 12 years. He was ordained a priest and tried to convert Jews living in Nicaea. When Constantine attempted to move to Olympos, he was brought back as a fugitive and put in chains. Prompted by St. Spyridon in a vision, Constantine traveled via Attaleia to Cyprus and returned with a relic, the right hand of Palamon (an otherwise unknown martyr), which he gave to the monastery of St. Hyakinthos at Nicaea. Although he settled on Olympos (at Atroa, later at Bolion-Balaios), he still attempted to influence affairs in Constantinople: he supposedly reconciled the emperors Basil I and Leo VI.

His anonymous Life, apparently written during Leo's reign, eulogizes the emperor (648F); since the author, in describing the region of Nicaea, speaks of "our desert" (645C), he must have belonged to a Nicaean monastic community. He sympathizes with the upper stratum of the provincial population and stresses that Constantine found support first of all among "those who were noble by nature and fortune and earthly distinction" (644A–B). The hagiographer avoids vivid detail, but the miracles are unusual—a girl who tried to seduce Constantine fainted at the sign of the cross; some books fell from Constantine's pouch into a torrent, but were brought to his feet undamaged. No mere humble compiler, the author incessantly comments upon his story, asserts that his hero deserves an exquisite logos, not a mediocre composition (628C), and boasts that no one could have done the job much better than himself (651C).

sources. AASS Nov. 4:628–56. Synax. CP 345f.

CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER (monastic name Cyril), missionary to the Slavs and saint; born Thessalonike 826/7, died Rome 14 Feb. 869; feastday 14 Feb. Constantine and his brother Methodios were the sons of the droungarios Leo and Maria, who may have been a Slav. Displaying remarkable intelligence as a youth (he reputedly memorized the works of Gregory of Nazianzos), ca.842 Constantine journeyed to Constantinople, where he gained the favor of the eunuch Theoktistos and received an advanced education; the tradition that he studied philosophy under Leo the Mathematician and Photios, however, is disputed (Lemerle, Humanismus 185–91). He was ordained priest and became chartophylax of Hagia Sophia under Patr. Ignatios, but was later appointed a teacher of philosophy at the school of the Magnaura. His legendary erudition brought him prominence: he reportedly defined philosophy in secular terms for Theoktistos (I. Ševčenko in For Roman Jakobson [The Hague 1956] 449–57), bested John VII Grammatikos in a debate over Iconoclasm, learned Hebrew, disputed Muslim theologians at the caliph's court at Samarra, and debated Jewish spokesmen before the khagan of the Khazars.

In 863 Michael sent him and his brother Methodios to Moravia to comply with the request of Rastislav for missionaries. In preparation, Constantine devised the Glagolitic alphabet and a literary language, Church Slavonic, into which he translated numerous Greek works, including the so-called liturgy of John Chrysostom, selected daily offices, the Psalter, the New Testament, and perhaps Leo III's Ecloga. In Moravia, Constantine and Methodios organized a native church using the local Slavic tongue, but under pressure from the Frankish clergy they journeyed to Rome in 867, where Constantine died, having been tonsured shortly before his death. He was buried in the Church of St. Clement, whose relics he had discovered in Cherson in 860 and brought to Rome. His 9th-C. Church Slavonic vita, perhaps composed by Methodios, draws heavily on Greek sources (I. Ševčenko in To Honor Roman Jakobson, vol. 3 [The Hague 1967] 1817). The existence of Constantine's original Greek works, esp. concerned with St. Clement's relics, can only be deduced from references or surviving fragments in Church Slavonic sources.

CONSTANTINE TICH, Bulgarian monarch (1257–77), whose reign coincided with a period of bitter internal feuding and repeated foreign invasions. After the murder of Tsar Michael Asen and the brief reign of Sebastokrator Koloman (probably murdered), Constantine was proclaimed tsar by a group of boyars. No sooner had he suppressed a revolt by a certain Mico, son-in-law of John Asen II, than he was faced by a Hungarian invasion, in which he lost much of northwestern Bulgaria to the Hungarians. By dynastic marriages, successively to Irene, daughter of Theodore II Laskaris, and to Maria, niece of Michael VIII, Constantine sought in vain to assure himself of Byz. support. In 1263 the Byz. invaded Thrace, took Philippopolis, and advanced toward Sofia, but the Hungarians drove them back. In desperation Constantine made an alliance with the Mongol Golden Horde in southern Russia. Their combined forces advanced nearly to Constantinople, but when the Mongols withdrew with their booty, Constantine had to fall back empty-handed. Exploiting Bulgarian weakness, the Hungarians extended their rule and that of their Bulgarian puppet Svetoslav. All that was left to Constantine was the territory between the Danube and the Balkan range east of the river Iskur, and from 1271 even that was regularly raided by the Mongols, with whom Michael VIII had allied. By the end of his reign Constantine was a virtual vassal of the Mongols.


R.B.

CONSTANTINOPLE. [This entry treats the history and development of the city of Constantinople. For a discussion of its public monuments, city walls, and cisterns, see CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF. The capture of the city by the Turks is treated in CONSTANTINOPLE, SIEGE AND FALL OF. Individual monasteries and churches are the subject of independent entries.]

Capital of the Byz. Empire, Constantinople (Константинополис, Turk. Istanbul) was founded by Constantine I in 324 on the site of the Greek city of Byzantium and dedicated on 11 May 330. The creation of imperial seats of government in the provinces was in line with the policy of the Tetrarchy; Diocletian had already established his residence in nearby Nikomedea. If Constantine was not satisfied with Nikomedea, it was probably because he considered Byzantium to be strategically more advantageous. It commanded access to the Black Sea and lay at the juncture of two military highways, the European Via Egnatia and the road leading from Chalcedon to Nikomedea and points farther east. Yet the site of Byzantium also had the great weakness of being unprotected on the landward side by any natural barrier—a factor that came into play barely 50 years later and posed thereafter a constant threat.

Constantinople was formed by the expansion of Byzantium. The new center of imperial authority, consisting of the complex of the Great Palace and Hippodrome, was placed within the ancient city. From there a colonnaded street, already built by Septimius Severus, ran to the old city gate. Constantine laid out a circular forum outside the gate and continued the main artery (later named Месе) in a straight line westward. About 1.2 km west of the forum a Capitolium was set up. There the street forked, one arm extending southwest to the Golden Gate (near the mosque Isakapi Mescidi; to be distinguished from the Theodosian Golden Gate), the other northwest to meet a new line of walls that described an arc from the Propontis to the Golden Horn, roughly from the modern quarter of Samatya (Псаматия) to that of Cibali. No maritime defenses were put up since at the time there was no threat from the sea.

Constantine envisaged a sharp increase in the population and made arrangements for grain supply from Egypt amounting to 80,000 rations—perhaps a target rather than the figure requisite at the time. Indeed, the population did climb steeply in the 4th–5th C., a process that is reflected in gradually expanded harbor capacity, granaries, and water supply. It is difficult to determine when it reached its peak or to estimate a maximal population figure (opinions have ranged between 250,000 and 1,000,000). Clearly, so large a center of consumption could be maintained only thanks to a complex and potentially vulnerable system of provisioning dependent on Egypt. In addition to the subsidized supply of bread (and oil?) such comforts as were expected in the biggest cities (i.e., luxurious public baths and entertainment in theaters and the circus) attracted people to Constantinople.

The oft-repeated statement that Constantine
willed his new residence to have from the start a purely Christian character is not substantiated by the evidence. The old pagan temples on the Acropolis and elsewhere were not disturbed and the Capitolium, which may be attributed to Constantine, had a clearly pagan character. Constantine probably built no more than three churches: St. Irene to serve as cathedral, and two martyria dedicated to local martyrs, St. Akakios (near the Golden Horn) and St. Makarios in the cemetery area outside the land walls. The Church of the Holy Apostles was built by Constantius II next to Constantine’s mausoleum.

The Gothic invasion and the defeat of the emperor Valens at Adrianople (378) served to underline the vulnerability of Constantinople and necessitated new defensive measures, esp. to protect the water supply only recently guaranteed by the construction of a network of aqueducts extending as far as Bizye in Thrace and possibly farther west, a distance of some 100 km. It was probably to this end, and not because of a multiplication of exposed suburbs, that by 415 the land walls were extended 1.5 km to the west of the Constantinian circuit. The wide belt of land that was added to the city appears to have been sparsely
populated and much of it was taken up by cemeteries. Three enormous open-air cisterns were there—with a total capacity of approximately 1,000,000 sq. m—those of Aetios (421), Aspar (459), and St. Mokios (ascribed to Anastasios I). Somewhat later, a forward defensive line was built from Selymbría to the Black Sea at a distance of 65 km from the city: this was the so-called Anastasian or Long Wall, 45 km long. Fairly effective for a time, it was abandoned in the 7th C. because of the difficulty of keeping it manned and repaired.

The emperors of the Theodosian line made a sustained effort to embellish Constantinople and provide it with further public works such as granaries and the great Theodosian harbor on the Propontis. Simultaneously members of their family and government officials invested heavily in real estate, building for themselves mansions of princely magnificence. The only extant statistical account of the city, the Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae, dates from this period (ca. 425): it describes briefly the 14 urban Regions and lists the principal monuments contained in each one. Twelve of the Regions were within the Constantinian walls; the 13th was at Sykai (Galata), the 14th at an unknown location (Eyüb?) up the Golden Horn. All in all there were 5 palaces, 14 churches, 8 public and 153 private baths, 4 forums, 4 harbors, 52 major colonnaded streets, 322 other streets, and 4,388 domus (substantial masonry houses?). Multistory tenement houses clearly existed, for their height was limited by law to 100 ft., and specific regulations protected the right to a view of the sea, governed the distance between houses, the width of streets, etc. (Cod. Just. VIII 10.12, reign of Zeno). Constantinople was becoming overcrowded.

The second half of the 5th C. ushered in a period of mounting civil strife and frequent fires,
the most serious being that of 465, which destroyed about half the city. Circus riots became common: the Nika Revolt of 532 left the center of the city in ashes—allowing Justinian I to indulge his passion for building. Procopios (Buildings, bk.1) provides a detailed description of Justinian’s (and Justin I’s) constructions, which suggests, apart from such public buildings as had to be rebuilt after the fire, a shift towards churches, 33 of which are mentioned. The churches built or rebuilt under Justinian include Hagia Sophia, Sts. Sergios and Bacchos, and St. Irene. Another large church built in the Justinianic period was St. Polyeuktos. The population of the city was, however, gravely depleted, perhaps halved by the plague of 542.

Building activity at Constantinople continued until ca.600, then ground to a halt. In 618 grain supply from Egypt was permanently discontinued. In 626 Constantinople suffered its first siege, the cutting of its major source of water (restored only in 768), and the devastation of both its European and Asiatic suburbs. In 674–78 Arab fleets blockaded it. In 715 Anastasios II, foreseeing another Arab attack, expelled all inhabitants who were unable to lay up provisions for three years: only a shrunken population could have survived the Arab siege of 717–18. In 740 a terrible earthquake threw down a considerable portion of the walls; the catastrophic plague of 747 followed.

Practically no building, other than defensive, is recorded for the period ca.600–ca.780. By the end of the period of Iconoclasms, Constantinople must have had a population of a few tens of thousands living amid the ruins of past glories. Only one public granary appears to have survived, and one harbor (out of four) continued to function for nonmilitary purposes. The great public baths and theaters were abandoned. Limited construction was resumed under Irene; Theophilos repaired the sea walls; Basil I undertook a sustained effort of rebuilding mostly churches that had fallen into ruin (31 are named). The pattern of imperial munificence, already foreshadowed by Justinian, shifted decisively to imperial palaces, churches, and hospices for the poor and the ill; what had earlier been the “civic” sphere was abandoned.

Doubtless Constantinople started to recover in the 9th C., with a gradual rise in population and an expansion of commercial and artisanal activities. The Book of the Eparch, while silent about many crafts, mentions the importation of commodities both from the provinces and foreign countries (silk, linen, ungents, honey, wax, soap). The textile industry was active, but exports severely discouraged. Shops along the main street were beginning to charge high rents (N. Oikonomides, DOP 26 [1972] 345–55). Probably the opening up of the Black Sea by the Kievan princes, for all the dangers it brought (witness the attacks on Constantinople in 860, 941, and 1043), benefited trade. Even so, little was built in the 10th C.

The 11th–12th C. witnessed further expansion. Artisanal occupations became profitable, tradesmen exerting a growing influence on political affairs, and new crafts were developed (e.g., the manufacture of bronze doors), some of which were exported to Italy. Of greater importance was the installation of foreign trading colonies. While the Rus’ in the 10th C. were kept at arm’s length at St. Mamas on the lower Bosporos, the Amalfitans, Venetians, Pisans, Genoese, Anconitans, and Germans gained concessions along the Golden Horn, opposite Galata, acquiring their own landing facilities, storehouses, and churches. The size of the colony of Latins in the late 12th C. has been estimated at about 7,000 (Hendy, Economy 593f), although much higher figures are given in some sources.

In terms of construction a feature of the 11th–12th C. is the establishment by emperors and members of the aristocracy of great urban “abbeys”—monasteries in name, they also served educational, welfare, and financial functions. Such were the monasteries of the Virgin Peribleptos, of Kosmas and Damianos, of the Mangana, and of Christ Pantokrator, and the orphanage of St. Paul (enlarged by Alexios I), the last so big that a tour of it required a whole day.

The great fire of 1203 and the Latin occupation (1204–61) destroyed the prosperity of the Komnenian city, which was subjected to systematic spoliation. The initial recovery under the Palaiologoi is mostly reflected in further imperial and aristocratic monasteries, some of which survive (St. Andrew in Krisei, the Virgin Pammakaristos, Christ of the Chora, etc.). By the middle of the 14th C. decay had set in. Travelers from abroad (Clavijo, Pero Tafur, Bertrand de la Broquière, Buondelmonti) describe a partially deserted city contrasting with the bustle of Genoese
Pera across the water. When it was stormed by the Turks in 1453, Constantinople probably had a population of 50,000.


-C.M.

CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF. Constantinople was the site of many ecumenical and local councils.

**CONSTANTINOPLE I.** Summoned by Theodosios I (May–June 381), this second ecumenical council of some 150 bishops had as its object the final settlement of the Arian controversy. Although no Western representatives attended, by 451 the council was deemed important enough to be universally accepted as ecumenical. Under the presidency of Meletios, bishop of Antioch (360–81), the synod endorsed the faith of the First Council of Nicaea as well as the full consubstantiality and divinity of the Holy Spirit. In effect, both Pneumatomachoi and followers of Apollinaris were condemned. Probably the so-called Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, which Chalcedon later attributed to the council, was originally a local baptismal profession of faith containing the Nicene formula. It may in fact have existed as early as 362. Finally, the council proclaimed Constantinople as the second see of Christendom with honorary precedence over all other sees, except the elder Rome (canon 3). The basis of this primacy, as the canon succinctly states, was the city’s political standing—"because it is New Rome." The acts of the council either did not survive, or, more probably, never existed.


-A.P.

**CONSTANTINOPLE II.** The fifth ecumenical council (May–June 553) was convened by Justinian I to reconcile the proponents of Monophysitism by convincing them that the Council of Chalcedon had not lapsed into Nestorianism or denied the Council of Ephesus. Therefore the council condemned the Three Chapters (the person of Theodoret of Edessa, and some writings of Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa), which the Monophysites had viewed as anti-Cyrian and hence Nestorian. Although initially apprehensive that the council was rejecting Chalcedon, Pope Vigilius eventually accepted the council’s decisions (Dec. 553). As a matter of plain fact, the posthumous condemnation of the three 5th-C. authors of the Three Chapters reaffirmed and preserved the authority of Chalcedon and Cyril of Alexandria. Thus the modern criticism (C. Moeller) that the council’s Neo-Chalcedonian opposed authentic Chalcedonian Christology and somehow betrayed Chalcedon is unwarranted. The council also anathematized Origen. This was aimed at the Origenist monastic parties of Egypt and Palestine, who had proposed their own heretical solution to the Christological problem.

Reconciliation, however, proved impossible, as Monophysitism was by then too deeply entrenched to be influenced by the emperor’s desperate bargains or anti-Nestorian zeal. The Egyptians, as Sophronios of Jerusalem put it, were not a race to change their minds or end their hostility toward the central government of Constantinople.


-A.P.

**CONSTANTINOPLE III.** The sixth ecumenical council (7 Nov. 680–16 Sept. 681) was convoked by Constantine IV to settle the controversy over Monothelitism. This doctrine was used by the government early in the 7th C. to conciliate the dissident Monophysites. The council drew up a comprehensive decree in which the reality of Christ’s two wills and two energeiai (operations), one divine and the other human, were acknowledged and declared inseparably united to one another (*Mansi* 11:637B). For if there were two natures in the incarnate Christ, as Chalcedonian
Christology affirmed, there had to be two wills. All those accused of Monotheletism were anathematized, including Pope Honorius (625–38), who had given his written approval to the doctrine, and four patriarchs of Constantinople (e.g., Sergius I and Pyrrhos). The earlier opponents of Monotheletism, Maximos the Confessor, Pope Martin I, and Sophronios of Jerusalem, were thus vindicated. To complete its work and to issue disciplinary canons, the Trullo council convened in 691–92.


—A.P.

**COUNCIL OF 869–70.** Basil I convoked this council (5 Oct. 869–28 Feb. 870) to settle the Photian schism and to restore communion with Rome. In the presence of three papal legates, Patr. Photios was deposed and anathematized and his predecessor Ignatios reinstated. Despite protests from the Roman delegation, it was announced at the council that Bulgaria was placed under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Constantinople. In addition, 27 canons were issued endorsing such matters as the theory of the Pentarchy and the veneration of images (canons 3 and 21).

Following the restoration of Photios, the decisions of 869–70 were annullcd at the council of Constantinople of 879–80 (see below). The council of 869–70 was therefore omitted from the list of ecumenical councils recognized by the Latin church, until the second half of the 11th C. After the dispute with Michael I Keroularios, the West began to include it among the ecumenical councils. This interpretation was due (as Dvornik conclusively demonstrated) to Western canonists, who thought the council had not been annulled in 879. Except for a synopsis of the original Greek text (Mansi 16:308–420), the council’s acts survive only in the Latin translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius.


—A.P.

**COUNCIL OF 879–80.** This council composed of 383 bishops solemnly recognized Photios as patriarch and annullcd the decisions of the anti-Photian council of Constantinople of 869–70 (see above). As Dvornik has shown, its rehabilitation and vindication of Photios definitively ended the Photian schism, because the pope, John VIII, never repudiated the council’s decisions, to which two papal legates had subscribed. Thus the “second schism” described by subsequent “legend” never occurred. On the contrary, the council succeeded at achieving reunion and was even recognized in Rome as “ecumenical” until the Gregorian Reform, when the official Roman tradition was abandoned in favor of the council of 869.

Likewise with Rome’s full endorsement, the council anathematized anyone who would tamper with the original text of the creed (Mansi 17:520E–521A). Although the “privileges” of Rome were recognized, the canonical and judicial authority of pope and patriarch were defined in terms of equality (canon 1). Papal jurisdiction over the Byz church was thus excluded. The council’s decisions were inserted in every subsequent Orthodox collection of canon law and normally followed those of the first seven ecumenical councils. It is referred to as “ecumenical” by some Byz authors.


—A.P.

**LOCAL COUNCIL OF 754.** See Hieria, Local Council of.

**LOCAL COUNCIL OF 815.** This council, which met in Hagia Sophia in spring 815, marks the second restoration of Iconoclasm. The iconodule patriarch Nikephoros I was deposed shortly before the council and replaced by the Iconoclast Theodotos I. Promoted by Leo V, who was convinced that the military disasters of his imperial predecessors, Irene and Nikephoros I, were caused by their support of images, the council repudiated the decisions of Nicaea II (787) and reaffirmed those of Hieria (754). Although a committee headed by John (VII) Grammatikos had assembled a florilegium in preparation for the council, its renewed opposition to image venera-
tion was based on a repetition of the Christological arguments of Hiera: an icon either depicts the uncircumscribable Godhead, or else divides the Lord’s humanity from his divinity, thus compounding the evil (Ostrogorsky, infra 50). The council’s doctrinal definition (Horos) called icons “spurious” and ordered their destruction, but (unlike Hiera) refrained from declaring them idols. Only fragments of the acts of 815 survive.

source. Ostrogorsky, Bilderstr. 46–60.
LIT. P.J. Alexander, “The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and Its Definition (Horos),” DOP 7 (1953) 35–66. — A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 843. Summoned by the widowed empress Theodora on the first Sunday of Lent (11 March 843), this council marks the official destruction of ICONOCLASM and the solemn restoration of image veneration in the Byz. church. The deliberations of this assembly are lost. Its restoration of images was understandably based on the authoritative decisions of NICAEA II (787). Hence its excommunication of all those who stubbornly clung to the belief that the incarnate Lord was “indescribable.” The council also deposed the patriarch JOHN VII GRAMMATIKOS, replacing him with METHODIOS I. Later the liturgical text of the SYNODICON OF ORTHODOXY was composed to commemorate the TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY.

LIT. C. Mango, “The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios,” in Iconoclasm, 139–40. — A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 920. The council settled the controversy over the TETRAGAMY of LEO VI, which had divided the Byz. church for nearly two decades. In effect, it successfully resolved the schism between, on the one hand, NICHOLAS I MYSTIKOS and his followers, who had been unwilling to sanction either the union of LEO VI with ZOE KARBONOPISIA or its issue, and, on the other, the bishops supporting EUTHYMIOS, who had granted the desired dispensation. Specifically, fourth marriages were explicitly banned by the council’s TOMOS OF UNION (9 July 920). Although third marriages were condemned, childless widowers under 40 years of age were exempt, while those with children were subject to a four-year penance. The council, according to Nicholas’s correspondence (ed. Jenkins and Westerink, ep.94, 361.20–22), also made provisions for restoring bishops expelled from their sees during the controversy.


LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1094. This council was convened by Alexios I in Blachernai in order to resolve the case of LEO OF CHALCEDON. The chronology of the synod is obscure: Grumel (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.967) and Beck (Kirche 57) date it in 1092, Gautier (infra) at the end of 1094. A. Gla- binas (He epi Alexiou Komnenou [1081–1118] peri hieron skeuon, keimelion kai hagion eikonon eris [Thessalonike 1972] 179–82) at the beginning of 1095.


LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1156–57. The two sessions, 26 Jan. 1156 and 12 May 1157, met to discuss the teaching of the patriarch-elect Soterichos PANTEUGENOS concerning Christ’s sacrifice on the Cross. The council affirmed through its spokesman, NICHOLAS OF METHONE, that the sacrifice of the Cross and the eucharistic sacrifice (which were one and the same) were offered to the entire Trinity, rather than to the Father alone as Panteugenos maintained. The council reasoned that the redemptive or “economic” activity of God, of which Christ’s oblation was the expression, was a Trinitarian action involving all three persons of the Trinity. In addition, the council (quoting the liturgical formula of the CHEROUBIKON) argued because of the single hypostatic union of Christ, the Logos both “offers and is offered, receives and is received.” The anathemas condemning Panteugenos were entered into the SYNODICON OF ORTHODOXY (Gouillard, “Synodikon” 72–74, 210–15).


LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1166–67. This council involved a series of meetings summoned by Emp. MANUEL I KOMNENOS to pronounce on the meaning of the text, “The Father is greater than I” (Jn 14:28). The origins of the controversy lie in the active political and ideological relations with the West during Manuel’s reign. It is usually agreed that his ambassador, DEMETRIOS OF LAMPE, introduced this controversy in Byz. after discussing the question with Western theologians during his mis-
sions to Italy and Germany. In the debate, the opposition argued that the Son could not be inferior to the Father because Christ’s humanity had been deified and was thus “one” with his divinity. The council found this interpretation close to Monophysitism and unacceptable. Specifically, the reality of Christ’s humanity, as concrete humanity—“created and mortal”—was inferior to God. The hypostatic union of Christ’s two natures (as defined by the Council of Chalcedon) did not erase the differences between Christ’s humanity and divinity; his divinity was greater. Likewise, in Trinitarian theology proper, the Father was considered “greater” than the Son inasmuch as he is hypostatically the unique cause, the *principium divinitatis* of both the Son and the Spirit. Finally, the council also found unacceptable the following three interpretations: that the Johannine text separated intellectually Christ’s human from his divine nature; that it underlined his *kenosis*, or condensation, during the Incarnation; and that it indicated his position (due to his shared humanity) as God’s favored Son. The council’s condemnation of the opposition was subsequently inserted in the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*. The marble plates on which its decision was inscribed were placed in Hagia Sophia (C. Mango, *DOP* 17 [1963] 317–39). The problems of this council continued to be discussed during the session of Feb. 1170.


**Local Council of 1285,** also known as the Second Council of Blachernai (5 Feb.–Aug. 1285). Presided over by Patr. Gregory II, the council was convoked at Blachernai to decide whether the expression “from the Son” (Lat. *filioque*) was equivalent to the patristic phrase “through the Son” advocated by the Unionist ex-patriarch John XI Bekkos, who held that the hypostatic existence or procession of the Spirit was “through” or “from” the Son. The council pronounced this unacceptable, for the Spirit’s eternal mode of origin is an act of the hypostasis of the Father and not of the essence. Rather than revealing the Spirit’s personal procession, the phrase “through the Son” simply refers to the Spirit’s energetic, eternal manifestation by the Son—an activity common to all three divine persons (*Tomos, PG* 142:240C–D). Only in this sense is the Spirit said to proceed through or even from the Son (*ex patre filioque*). Besides condemning Bekkos, the assembly formally repudiated the Council of Lyons (1274). Although several ecclesiastics subsequently opposed the synodal *Tomos* of 1285, penned by Gregory himself, the church never altered or rejected it. Thus it holds a permanent place in Orthodox tradition. The council, in fact, is of major importance as the only official conciliar reaction of Byz. to the *filioque*. It should be noted that the same distinctions among energy, hypostasis, and substance, which Gregory made and the council endorsed, were later elaborated and developed by Gregory Palamas.


**Lit.** Papadakis, *Crisis in Byz.* 62–101, 155–67 (tr. of *Tomos*).

**Local Council of 1341.** The council was convoked (10 June) under the presidency of Emp. Andronikos III to resolve the dispute between Gregory Palamas and Barlaam of Calabria. Both Patr. John XIV Kalekas and future Emp. John VI Kântakouzenos were present. The one-day session was unfavorable to Barlaam, who therefore soon left Constantinople. A second council, with the same participants, convened in Aug. and condemned Gregory Akindynos, who had continued the struggle on Barlaam’s departure. Since Andronikos had died days after the June debate, Kantakouzenos presided.

The synodal *Tomos* published after the Aug. meeting is unmistakably Palamite in content (cf. *PG* 151:680B, 688C), reflecting the victory won for HESYCHASM. Because it concentrates solely on the June meeting and fails to mention the second council in Aug. and its formal condemnation of Akindynos, its authenticity has been questioned. Indeed, M. Jugie (*DTC* 11 [1932] 1778–84) criticized the document as unreliable, a tampered version of the June debate that Kantakouzenos had forced Kalekas to sign. J. Meyendorff, however, has argued that the political rivalry between
Kalekas and Kantakouzenos for control of the regency explains the shape of the Tomos. Specifically, Kalekas refused to present the Aug. synod as official because his adversary had usurped an imperial prerogative by presiding over it; acknowledging the second council would have implied support of Kantakouzenos’s imperial ambitions. Kalekas, therefore, accepted only the earlier synod—excluding the Aug. session—simply because it was the one at which Andronikos had presided, hence the shape of the Tomos.


—A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1347. This council of 8 Feb. reaffirmed the decisions of 1341, which had settled the controversy between Gregory Palamas and Barlaam of Calabria over hesy- chasm. These decisions had been overturned by the regency of Anna of Savoy and Patr. John XIV Kalekas during the long civil war (1341–47). The synodal Tomos of 1347 actually incorporates the decisions reached by an earlier assembly (2 Feb.), days before the triumphant entry of John VI Kantakouzenos into Constantinople. Favoring Palamism, these decisions include the deposition of Kalekas and the excommunication of AKINDYNOS. The text gives a Kantakouzenist version of the civil war by blaming Kalekas alone, rather than Anna or Alexios Apokaukos, both of whom are viewed as the patriarch’s victims. Aside from its “legitimist” interpretation of the war, the Tomos also ratifies the doctrinal decisions of the local council of Constantinople of 1341 (see above) and lifts Kalekas’s excommunication of Palamas. The document contains signatures of three sets of bishops: those present on 2 Feb., those who signed before the enthronement of the new hesychast patriarch Isidore I (17 May), and those who signed afterward, including Palamas as newly elected archbishop of Thessalonike.


—A.P.

CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF. The architectural monuments of Constantinople may be considered from the point of view of the following three topics: public monuments, cisterns, and walls. The principal churches and palaces are the subject of independent entries.

PUBLIC MONUMENTS. The architectural development of Constantinople may be divided into three main periods.

First Period (4th–early 7th C.). Constantinople was built as a late antique city with all the normal features of contemporary urbanism, only more magnificent. A straight avenue bordered by colonnades (EMBOLOI) was obligatory: at Constantinople this was the MESE, which ran from the arch
of the Milion near the Hippodrome to the Capitolium, a distance of 1.7 km, then as far again to the Constantinian Golden Gate. This longitudinal avenue was crossed at right angles by another (later called emboloi tou Dominon), with a tetrapylon at the intersection. At intervals along the main avenue were squares, or forums (see Agora), each adorned with suitable monuments. Two of these were inherited from ancient Byzantium, namely the Strategion, later remodeled by Theodosius I, and the Tetrastoon, which became the Augustaion.

The umbilicus of Constantine's city consisted of a circular forum (called simply ho Phoros) bordered by porticoes. At its center stood a column (see Columns, Honorable) made of drums of porphyry and supporting a statue of the emperor wearing a radiate crown. The column is still preserved in a truncated form (Turk. Cemberlitaş). On the north side of the Phoros was the Senate House with a porch of porphyry columns; facing it on the south was a monumental fountain (nymphaeum). The next forum to the west (Forum Tauri, corresponding to modern Beyazit) was laid out by Theodosius I in imitation of Trajan's Forum in Rome: it had a triumphal arch on each side (parts of the west one are preserved; see Arch, Monumental), a basilica and, on axis, a gigantic column covered with spiral reliefs commemorating the emperor's military exploits (destroyed ca.1500).

The next two forums to the west, the Forum Bovis (ho Bous) and the Asmavrios, are poorly documented. Then, on the city's seventh hill (Xerolophos), was the Forum of Arkadios, with a second spirally decorated column (pedestal preserved). At the western limit of the walled city, the Golden Gate (both Constantine's original and that constructed by Theodosius II farther west) had the form of a triumphal arch; evidence indicates that the processional way linking the two gates also received a monumental treatment.

Nearly every emperor from Constantine I to Phokas commemorated his reign by erecting monuments in the capital. Beyond those already mentioned, only two survive: the so-called Column of the Goths on the Seraglio Point, which may be Constantine's, and Marcian's Column. The colossal Corinthian capital discovered in 1959 in the courtyard of the Seraglio has been linked to a column of Leo I and the Barletta Colossus (U. Peschlow in Studien Deichmann 1:21–33). Justinian I was glorified by a column and equestrian statue in the Augustaion; Justin II erected a column of his own in the quarter called Deuteron and started to build another one (not completed) near the baths of Zeuxippos; Phokas put up a column near the Tetrapylon. In addition to imperial monuments, several statues of pagan gods, mythological figures, philosophers, and so on were imported from other cities by Constantine and his successors and placed in public baths, forums, the Hippodrome, and elsewhere. New honorific statues of persons other than emperors were also made, the last recorded one being a statue of Niketas, cousin of Herakleios (ca.614). A monumental weathervane called the Anemodoulion was decorated with bronze statues. These display monuments were put up for the city's adornment but also to express certain ideological messages (e.g., imperial victory, the wisdom of the senate, etc.) and to provide an appropriate setting for ceremonial occasions.

Public buildings of an ornate character included the two Senate Houses; the Basilike next to the Augustaion, which appears to have been a vast stoa with a gilded roof surrounding a central courtyard; the theaters (of which little is known); the Roman amphitheater (Kynegion) and the Hippodrome; the public baths, the biggest of which may have been the Constantinai (begun 345, completed 427) and which also included the Karosianai (built by Valens in 375), the Arkadianai (395), the Honorianai (412), the Helenianai, and the bath of Bagisteos (started by Anastasios I, completed by Justinian in 528) in addition to the famous baths of Zeuxippos and the ancient bath of Achilles near the Strategion. The construction of baths was a favored sector of imperial munificence because of the popularity of bathing.

Also constructed in the capital during the 4th through 6th C. were the Great Palace and the Hormisdas, Antiochos, and Lausus palaces. The principal churches erected in this period were St. Mary of Blachernai and St. Mary at Chalkoprateia, the Basilica of St. John at the Studios Monastery, St. Polyeuktos, Hagia Sophia, St. Irene, Sis. Sergios and Bacchos, and the Holy Apostles.

Second Period (7th–12th C.). The construction of display monuments ended in the early 7th C., when the time city or, at any rate, its main
avenues and squares must have resembled a vast stage set. The "dark age" that followed caused the abandonment of earlier urbanistic practices, the gradual ruination of public buildings, and a shift in popular mentality: the monuments that remained were no longer understood for what they were and assumed a mythic character. They were invested with occult power, either beneficent or maleficient, and interpreted as presages of things to come. The cryptic messages they conveyed could be decoded only by "philosophers." It is in this manner that they are interpreted in the PATRIA OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

The so-called Macedonian Renaissance brought a few instances of the collection and reuse of earlier pieces of sculpture and one recorded case of the restoration of a monument (the masonry obelisk of the Hippodrome by Constantine VII) but did not return to the monumental tradition of antiquity. The Macedonian and Komnenian dynasties, however, constituted a period of considerable construction activity, during which the MANGANA and BLACHERNAI palaces were built in Constantinople and the BRYAS palace in the suburbs. New churches and monasteries of this time include the NEA EKKLESIA, MYRELAION, LIPS MONASTERY, KALENDERHANE CAMII, and PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY.

Third Period (13th–15th C.). Following the Fourth Crusade and the period of Latin occupation of Constantinople (1204–61), during which numerous buildings were damaged or fell into disrepair, a surge of new construction occurred under Michael VIII and Andronikos II. Perhaps to symbolize his work of restoration, Michael VIII erected a group of statuary near the Church of the Holy Apostles representing the emperor offering a model of the city to St. Michael. In addition to the palace of TEKFUR SARAYI, several new monasteries and churches were built, most notably the South Church at the Lips monastery, PAMMAKRISTOS, CHORA, and the BEBAIAS ELPIDOS NUNNERY.


CISTERNs (κυρτότερα). Constantinople, with no rivers, few springs, and fast runoff of rainwater, needed reservoirs to tide the city over dry spells and lengthy sieges, when AQUEDUCTs might be threatened. Water from forests west of the city was introduced into open cisterns (total capacity approximately 900,000 cubic m [Janin, infra 202]) and more than 80 covered cisterns (capacity approximately 160,000 cubic m). Constantinople's daily consumption of water was about 10,000 cubic m. Most cisterns were built between the late 4th C. and early 7th C. as population burgeoned. The largest open cistern was that of ACTEOS (probably the eparch of the city in 419); built in 421, it measured 244 × 85 × about 14 m deep and had a capacity of between 250,000 and 300,000 cubic m. Covered cisterns included BINBAIREK (Philoxenos), whose superposed columns reached a height of 12.4 m and were set in 16 rows of 14 columns each (capacity about 40,000 cubic m), and the BASILIKE (Yerebatan Sarayi), whose 336 columns, 8 m high and set in 12 rows of 28 each, supported a chamber capable of holding approximately 78,000 cubic m.

The major cisterns, usually placed on hills, sup-
plied water to about 40 public baths as well as monasteries and churches. The use of columns rather than the brick and cement piers used by the Romans reduced maintenance costs; impost blocks make an early appearance in cisterns. Hydraulic cement (opus signinum) lined the structures.


—K.M.K., W.L.

WALLS. The first fortifications of Constantinople, on the land side only, were started by Constantine I and completed by Constantius II. In the reign of Theodosios II the Land Walls were extended about 1.5 km to the west so as to describe a huge arc, 6 km long, extending from the Propontis to the Golden Horn. Completed by 413 and repaired on numerous occasions (notably after the earthquakes of 447, 740, 989, etc.), they continued to protect the city throughout the Byz. period and parts of them are still standing. They consist of an inner wall 11 m high with towers at intervals of about 70–75 m, a lower outer wall also furnished with towers, and a moat. The walls are built of bonded masonry with bands of brick (five successive courses going right across the wall) alternating with bands of cut-stone facing, enclosing a core of mortared rubble. The only section of the Theodosian walls that has not survived was in the area of Blachernai, where, as documented both in texts and visible remains, their original line was brought forward by Herakleios to enclose the Church of the Virgin and by Manuel I to protect the imperial palace. The Land Walls were pierced by six main gates, including the Golden Gate, and a number of secondary posterns.

The Sea Walls, both along the Propontis and the Golden Horn, consist of a single line of fortifications and are today poorly preserved. They were first built in 439 and repaired many times, notably under the emperors Anastasios II and

Theophilos. About 65 km west of Constantinople the LONG WALL was built to defend the imperial capital from attack from that direction.


CONSTANTINOPLE, PATRIARCHATE OF. Constantinople was one of the four major patriarchates of the eastern Mediterranean.

History. According to legend, the see of Constantinople was founded by the apostle Andrew, who ordained a certain Stachys as the first bishop of Byzantion. However, the information concerning the first bishops of the city, including two contemporaries of Emp. Constantine I, Metrophanes and Alexander, is mostly legendary. Canon 3 of the Council of Constantinople (381) established Constantinople’s place of honor in the ecclesiastical hierarchy right after Rome; nevertheless, the patriarchate of Constantinople (if we can believe the statement of Sokrates [HE 5.8.14] that the bishop of Constantinople was already called patriarch at this time) had under his jurisdiction only the “megalopolis” and probably Thrace, whereas Pontos, Cappadocia, and Asia formed independent eparchies. Canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon (451) confirmed the precedence of Constantinople over the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria and its jurisdiction over all of Asia Minor.

The bitter rivalry during the 5th C. between the patriarchates of Constantinople and Alexandria was a major factor—in addition to theological and cultural causes—in the controversy over Monophysitism; the papacy’s support of Constantinople in this conflict contributed much to the defeat of Alexandria. In the 6th C. the political situation in Italy, which was first subordinated to the Ostrogothic kings and then conquered by the Byz. army, paved the way for Constantinopolitan supremacy; this new status was reflected in the acceptance by the bishop of Constantinople of the title “of the New Rome” and esp. Ecumenical Patriarch.

The fall of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem to the Arabs in the 7th C. deprived these three patriarchates of political significance. The patriarch of Constantinople, however, was unable to profit from this situation and expand his role further, since he was restricted by the same factor that had previously promoted his power, that is, his proximity to the imperial throne. Meanwhile, the papacy, more or less emancipated from oppressive political tutelage, was slowly gaining momentum. From the 8th C. onward the popes assumed an independent attitude toward the Byz. emperors, developed further the concept of primacy, and endeavored to intervene in Byz. internal affairs (Iconoclasm, conflict between the patriarchs Photios and Ignatios, the Tetracygm of Leo VI). Ideologically, Constantinople countered the concept of primacy with the doctrine of the Pentarchy, the theoretical equality of the five patriarchates. For a time the patriarchate of Constantinople, taking advantage of the political power of the emperor, was able to expand its authority: it acquired jurisdiction over Illyricum and southern Italy (8th C.), as well as newly converted Bulgaria (9th C.). In the 11th C., however, Roman influence started to penetrate into the Balkans, then into Syria and Palestine. Tensions between the papacy and the patriarchate of Constantinople came to a head in 1054 with the mission of Cardinal Humbert to the Byz. capital and his excommunication of Patriarch Michael I Keroularios, resulting in a deep conflict between the two churches (see Schism).

After the Fourth Crusade in 1204 a Latin patriarchate was established in Constantinople and the Orthodox patriarchate was forced to go into exile in Nicaea. Following its restoration in 1261 the patriarchate of Constantinople never regained its former splendor. It was beset by controversies over the Arsenites, Union of the Churches, and Palamism, which caused deep rifts among the faithful. Although its theoretical sphere of influence, which extended to Moscow, was much greater than that of the Palaiologan emperors, the patriarchs gradually lost even their authority over Slavic countries. The Serbs, for example, established an independent patriarchate at Pécs in the mid-14th C. Nevertheless the patriarchate of Constantinople survived the political fall of the Byz. capital in 1453.

Organization and Jurisdiction of the Patriarchate. The patriarch was in theory elected by the
metropolitans of his patriarchate, and only they had the power to depose him. The metropolitans, however, were entitled only to nominate a slate of three candidates from whom the emperor would select the new head of the church, and in practice the emperor had the final say in both the appointment and deposition of patriarchs. The patriarch administered the territory under his jurisdiction from his headquarters at Hagia Sophia, the GREAT CHURCH. In theory his right hand and potential successor was the synkellos; in practice the chief offices were held by the priests and deacons of Hagia Sophia—oikonomos, skeuophylax, sakellarios, chartophylax, kanstrisios, referendarios, etc. The metropolitans, whose number varied over the centuries (the Corpus of Laurent records 66 metropoleis), expressed their views through the councils and through the emendousa synodos. The tensions between the officials of Hagia Sophia and metropolitans (V. Tiftixoglu, BZ 62 [1969] 25–72) reflected the conflict between centrifugal and centripetal tendencies. The revenues of the patriarchate of Constantinople came from lands located in various parts of the empire and from donations of the imperial treasury that amounted to between 180 and 200 pounds of gold in the 11th C.

The rights of the patriarch, besides his function as the bishop of the capital, included appeal in both ecclesiastical and secular cases, the stauropegion, and the interpretation and elaboration of canon law. From the 5th C. onward the patriarch of Constantinople played a role in the ceremony of the imperial coronation, but he actually crowned the emperor only in the absence of a senior emperor. In addition, the patriarch wielded an exceptional moral authority, although the extent of his influence depended on the real balance of power between the emperor and the church, the degree of popularity of the patriarch, his connection with the monastic establishment, etc. The theory of two powers—those of the emperor and patriarch—emerges in the Epanagoge but did not find a consistent application in Byz. ideology: the bishops of Constantinople displayed a wide range of behavior, including cowardly subservience to a powerful ruler (Attikos), fruitful collaboration with the throne (Sergios I, Athanasios I), and bold opposition to the imperial will (Michael I Keroularios).

The Patriarchs, 300–1204. From the beginning of the 4th C. to 1204 there were 100 patriarchs; the average duration of a patriarchate was thus nine years. Of these patriarchs, 35 died after resigning or having been deposed and five were deposed temporarily. Data concerning the patriarchs’ social and ethnic background are incomplete: at least one (Fravitas [488–89]) seems to have been a Goth and another (Niketas 1 [766–80]) of Slav origin; four were Italians, three came from Armenia or were of Armenian stock; three from Alexandria (all within the 4th–6th C.); six from Syria, including Theodosios Boradiotes (counted already as Armenian); one from Tarsos, one from Trebizond, five from Cappadocia, Pisdia (?), Phrygia, and Isauria, two from Cyprus, one from Aegina; approximately 12 were natives of Constantinople, even though the origin of some (e.g., Constantine III Leichoudes) has not been definitely established. Very few originated from the Balkans—Paul I was from Thessalonike and Michael III possibly from Anchialos.

Of the 100 patriarchs, 30 were former hegumenoi, hieromonks, or simple monks. L. Breher (6 CEB 1 [Paris 1950] 223) counts 45 patriarchs of monastic background during the period 705–1204, but he evidently included men of other status in this group. The “monastic patriarchs” are unevenly distributed over time: only five in the 4th–8th C.; seven from 815 to 912; only four in the 10th C.; and 14 in the 11th and 12th C. Ten patriarchs were former bishops transferred from other sees—seven of these belong to the earlier period, 341–766; later this practice almost ceased. Another ten patriarchs were former priests. The Constantinopolitan ecclesiastical administration produced 27 patriarchs: at least four were synkelloi, 17 were administrators (skeuophylakes, oikonomoi, sakellarioi, etc.). Distribution of this category over time is also uneven: seven patriarchal officials became patriarchs in the 5th–6th C., whereas the undeveloped 4th-C. administration produced none; the 7th C. presents the highest number—ten in 607–715; only two are known from 730–80 and none in the 9th–11th C. (unless we count the monks and synkelloi Euthymios and Antony III [974–79] as officials). Patriarchal officials reappear in the 12th C.—six between 1111 and 1189.

Among the former laymen were two princes—Stephen, son of Leo VI, and Theophylaktos, son of Romanos I (both within the short period
### Patriarchs of Constantinople, 381–1465

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nektarios</td>
<td>381–397</td>
<td>John VII Grammatikos</td>
<td>837–843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chrysostom</td>
<td>398–404</td>
<td>Methodios</td>
<td>843–847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsakios</td>
<td>404–405</td>
<td>Ignatios</td>
<td>847–858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attikos</td>
<td>406–425</td>
<td>Photios</td>
<td>858–867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisinnios I</td>
<td>426–427</td>
<td>Ignatios (2nd patriarch)</td>
<td>867–877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestorios</td>
<td>428–431</td>
<td>Photios (2nd patriarch)</td>
<td>877–886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>431–434</td>
<td>Stephen I</td>
<td>886–893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proklos</td>
<td>434–446</td>
<td>Antony II Kauleas</td>
<td>893–901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavian</td>
<td>446–449</td>
<td>Nicholas I Mystikos</td>
<td>901–907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatolios</td>
<td>449–458</td>
<td>Euthymios</td>
<td>907–912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gennadios I</td>
<td>458–471</td>
<td>Nicholas I (2nd patriarch)</td>
<td>912–925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akakios</td>
<td>472–489</td>
<td>Stephen II</td>
<td>925–927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fravitas</td>
<td>489–490</td>
<td>Tryphon</td>
<td>927–931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphemios</td>
<td>490–496</td>
<td>Theophylaktos</td>
<td>933–956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonios II</td>
<td>496–511</td>
<td>Polyeuktos</td>
<td>956–970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy I</td>
<td>511–518</td>
<td>Basil I Skamandrenos</td>
<td>970–974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John II Kappadokes</td>
<td>518–520</td>
<td>Antony III Stoudites</td>
<td>974–979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphanius</td>
<td>520–535</td>
<td>Nicholas II Chrysosoberges</td>
<td>979–991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthimos I</td>
<td>535–536</td>
<td>[vacancy]</td>
<td>991–996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menas</td>
<td>536–552</td>
<td>Siisinnios II</td>
<td>996–998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthychios</td>
<td>552–565</td>
<td>Sergios II</td>
<td>1001–1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John III Scholastikos</td>
<td>565–577</td>
<td>Eustathios</td>
<td>1019–1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthychios (2nd patriarch)</td>
<td>577–582</td>
<td>Alexios Stoudites</td>
<td>1025–1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John IV Nesteutes</td>
<td>582–595</td>
<td>Michael I Kourkarios</td>
<td>1043–1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyriakos</td>
<td>595–606</td>
<td>Constantine III Leichoudes</td>
<td>1059–1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas I</td>
<td>607–610</td>
<td>John VIII Xiphilinos</td>
<td>1064–1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergios I</td>
<td>610–698</td>
<td>Kosmas I</td>
<td>1075–1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhos</td>
<td>638–641</td>
<td>Eustathios Garidas</td>
<td>1081–1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul II</td>
<td>641–653</td>
<td>Nicholas III Grammatikos</td>
<td>1084–1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhos (2nd patriarch)</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>John IX Agapetus</td>
<td>1111–1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>657–658</td>
<td>Leo Styppeiotes</td>
<td>1134–1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas II</td>
<td>669–675</td>
<td>Michael II Kourkouas</td>
<td>1143–1146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John V</td>
<td>675–677</td>
<td>Kosmas II Atikos</td>
<td>1146–1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine I</td>
<td>677–679</td>
<td>Nicholas IV Mouzalon</td>
<td>1147–1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore I</td>
<td>679–686</td>
<td>Theodotos I</td>
<td>1151/2–1153/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George I</td>
<td>686–687</td>
<td>Neophytos I</td>
<td>one month in 1153/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore I (2nd patriarch)</td>
<td>688–694</td>
<td>Constantine IV Chlarenos</td>
<td>1154–1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul III</td>
<td>694–706</td>
<td>Loukas Chrysosoberges</td>
<td>1157–1169/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinikos I</td>
<td>706–712</td>
<td>Michael III</td>
<td>1170–1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyros</td>
<td>712–715</td>
<td>Chariton Eugenioites</td>
<td>1178–1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John VI</td>
<td>715–730</td>
<td>Theodosios Boradiotes</td>
<td>1179–1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanos I</td>
<td>730–754</td>
<td>Basil II Kamateros</td>
<td>1183–1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasios</td>
<td>754–766</td>
<td>Niketas II Mountains</td>
<td>1186–1189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine II</td>
<td>766–780</td>
<td>Dositheos of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Feb. 1189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niketas I</td>
<td>780–784</td>
<td>Leonios Theotokites</td>
<td>Feb./Mar.–Sept./Oct. 1189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul IV</td>
<td>784–806</td>
<td>Dositheos of Jerusalem (2nd patriarch)</td>
<td>1189–1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarasios</td>
<td>806–815</td>
<td>George II Xiphilinos</td>
<td>1191–1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikephoros I</td>
<td>815–821</td>
<td>John X Kamateros</td>
<td>1198–1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodotos I Kassriteras</td>
<td>821–837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patriarchs of Constantinople (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael IV Autoreianos</td>
<td>1208–1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore II Eirenchos</td>
<td>1214–1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximinos II</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel I Sarantenos</td>
<td>1216/17–1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanos II</td>
<td>1223–1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodios II</td>
<td>1240/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel II</td>
<td>1243/4–1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenios Autoreianos</td>
<td>1254–1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikephoros II</td>
<td>1260–1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenios Autoreianos (2nd patr.)</td>
<td>1261–1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanos III</td>
<td>1265–1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph I</td>
<td>1266–1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John XI Bekkos</td>
<td>1275–1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph I (2nd patr.)</td>
<td>1282–1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory II of Cyprus</td>
<td>1285–1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasios I</td>
<td>1289–1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John XII Kosmas</td>
<td>1294–1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasios I (2nd patr.)</td>
<td>1303–1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niphon</td>
<td>1310–1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John XIII Glykys</td>
<td>1315–1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getasimos I</td>
<td>1320–1321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaia</td>
<td>1325–1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John XIV Kaledas</td>
<td>1334–1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isidore I Boucheiras</td>
<td>1347–1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallistos I</td>
<td>1350–1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philotheos Kokkinos</td>
<td>1353–1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallistos I (2nd patr.)</td>
<td>1355–1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philotheos Kokkinos (2nd patr.)</td>
<td>1364–1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makarios</td>
<td>1376/7–1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neilos Kerameus</td>
<td>1380–1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony IV</td>
<td>1389–1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makarios (2nd patr.)</td>
<td>1390–1391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony IV (2nd patr.)</td>
<td>1391–1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallistos II Xanthopoulos</td>
<td>1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew I</td>
<td>1397–1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthymios II</td>
<td>1403–1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph II</td>
<td>1410–1416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrophanes II</td>
<td>1416–1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory III Mammes</td>
<td>1443–1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasios II</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gennadios II Scholarios</td>
<td>1454–1456, 1463, 1464–1465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Grumel, Chronologie 435–37, with modifications.

of 886–956); to their numbers could be added Ignatios, but he was son of a deposed ruler and by the time of his election was a hegoumenos. In addition to these princes, 13 other laymen were elected: four in the 4th–6th C., only one in the 7th C., seven between 784 and 1063, and only one, Basil II Kamateros, the supporter of Andronikos I, during the final 150 years of the period.

The Patriarchs, 1204–1453. Thirty-five patriarchs ascended the throne of Constantinople during these 150 years, for an average reign of seven years. Especially after the Palaiologan restoration, service as patriarch proved to be risky. On account of the tumultuous history of the Orthodox church in this period, fully half of the patriarchs between 1261 and 1453, 14 in all, either were deposed or abdicated under pressure. Seven of these were later reinstated. Reflecting the shrunken boundaries of the empire, virtually all the patriarchs were of Greek ancestry, with the exception of Joseph II, who was Bulgarian. The vast majority of the Palaiologan patriarchs (80 percent) came from a monastic background; a number served as hegoumenoi or metropolitans before being selected as patriarch (F. Tinnefeld, JOB 36 [1986] 89–115). The only layman to become patriarch in this period was John XIII Glykys, a former logothetes tou droumou.


—A.K., A.M.T.

CONSTANTINOPLE, SIEGE AND FALL OF. The Ottoman sultan Mehmed II resolved as early as autumn 1451 to attack Constantinople, but officially proclaimed his intent only in Jan. 1453. By 5 Apr., he positioned an army allegedly 80,000–100,000 strong outside the land walls of Constantinople, while an armada of more than 120 ships patrolled the coastal waters. Constantine XI, with the help of the Venetian commune and other foreign allies (notably the Genoese Giovanni Gustiniano Longo), defended Constantinople with 26 warships and fewer than 7,000 fighting men. The
CONSTANTIUS II (Konstantíus), caesar (from 8 Nov. 324) and augustus (from 9 Sept. 337); born 7 Aug. 317, died Mopsoukrene, Cilicia, 3 Nov. 361. The son of Constantine I and Fausta, he was married three times, to the daughter of Julius Constantius (name unknown), to Eusebia, and to Faustina. Perhaps responsible for the murder of his rivals after Constantine I's death, Constantius was originally assigned Oriens, Pontica, Asiana, and Thrace. He became ruler of the entire empire after the overthrow of Constans I and the defeat of Magnentius in 353. Constantius fought the Persians throughout his reign and waged successful campaigns against the Germans in Gaul and the Sarmatians on the middle Danube. He named Gallus as caesar in 351 and Julian in 355 after the usurpation of Silvanus. Constantius was influenced by moderate Arianism and resisted the urging of his brothers who wanted to recall Athanasios of Alexandria. Constantius tried to restore unity to the church by councils held in Ariminium and Seleukeia in 359–60, but the supporters of the homoousion remained insigntent. Constantius is remembered as a persecutor of the Orthodox. His reign was important in the development of Constantinople, whose senators were granted equality with those of Rome in 357. He was responsible for the construction of the original church of Hagia Sophia; the Chronicon Paschale records his lavish donations at the dedication of the basilica in 360. Constantius died in Cilicia in 361 on his way to the West to deal with the usurpation of Julian. His best-known portrait is on a largitio dish now in Linzgrad (Iskusstvo Vizantii, vol. 1, no.34).


T.E.G.

CONSTANTIUS CHLORUS, or Marcus Flavius Valerius Constantius, augustus (305–06); born Dacia Ripensis ca.250, died York 25 July 306. A fiction of Constantinian date made him a descendant of Claudius II Gothicus (268–70). Constantius had a typical military career, becoming governor of Dacia and then, in 288, praetorian prefect to Maximian in Gaul. In response to the usurpation of Carausius and the loss of Britain as well
as a part of Gaul, Diocletian proclaimed him Caesar and member of the Tetrarchy on 1 Mar. 293. At the same time he was adopted by Maximian as part of the “Herculian Dynasty.” Later in that year Constantius drove Carausius from Gaul and in 296 reunited Britain to the empire. In practice though not in theory the Western provinces were divided between Constantius and Maximian. Constantius was responsible for Britain and Gaul from his primary residence at Trier, but he campaigned regularly against German invaders south of the Rhine. Constantius was a devotee of Sol Invictus but apparently did not actively persecute the Christians. There is, however, no reason to credit later Christian testimony that Constantius was a Christian.

Upon the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian in 305, Constantius became senior emperor in the West and apparently added Spain to his territories. In the same year Constantius crossed over to Britain and campaigned against the Picts in the north, where his son Constantine joined him. Constantius had children by two women, first Helena the mother of Constantine I, and later (by 289) Theodora, the stepdaughter of Maximian, with whom he had six children; one of them was named Anastasia (Resurrection), an indication of Jewish or Christian sympathy.


CONSTELLATIONS. The standard constellations referred to in Byz. texts are the 48 listed by Ptolemy in the Almagest (7.5–8.1): 21 northern constellations (Arktos mikra, Arktos megale, Drakon, Kepheus, Boötes, Stephanos boreios, Ho eggonasin [Herakles], Lyra, Ornis, Kassiopeia, Perseus, Heniochos, Ophiouchos, Ophis, Oistos, Ae
tos, Delphis, Hippou protome, Hippos [Pegasos], Andromeda, and Trigonon); the 12 signs of the zodiac (Krios, Tauros, Didymoi, Karkinos, Leon, Parthenos, Chelai [Zygon], Skorpions, Toxotes, Aigokeros, Hydrochoos, and Ichthyies); and 15 southern constellations (Ketos, Orion, Potamos [Eridanos], Lagoos, Kyon, Prokyon, Argo, Hydra, Krater, Korax, Kentauros, Therion, Thymiaterion, Stephanos notios, and Ichthys notios).

Another set of constellations, however, is referred to by Rhetorios of Egypt in his descrip-
tion of the stars that rise simultaneously with each of the 96 decans (paranatellonta); these and others are found in several related Byz. astrological texts (F. Boll, Sphaera [Leipzig 1903; rp. Hildesheim 1967] 5–294). Finally, in a calendar for sailors ascribed to a protopatharios and strategos of the Kibyrhhaiotai theme, the stars are named after the saints or religious events on whose feast days they are first visible (A. Olivieri, CCAG 2:214–16).

There are numerous catalogs of the individual stars that constitute the constellations. In astronomical contexts they are derivatives from the catalog in the Almagest (some, including lists of astrolabe stars, being transmitted through Arabic and thereby acquiring an altered nomenclature, but one that is still equivalent in meaning), while in astrological contexts, aside from the paranatellonta tradition mentioned above, they are derived from the associations of planets with stars found in Ptolemy’s Astrological Effects (1, 9). The astronomers frequently confuse their lists to 30 “bright stars” (P. Kunitzsch, ZDMG 118 [1968] 62–74).

The constellations are seldom depicted in Byz. art. The available evidence was assembled by H. Stern (Le calendrier de 354 [Paris 1953]). A 14th-C. MS at Milan preserves unusual miniatures of the constellations (D. Pingree, JWarp 45 [1982] 185–92). (See also Stars.)

–D.P.

CONSUBSTANTIALITY. See Homoousios.
when the system of indictions and years of the emperor's reign was introduced, at first alongside the old system of consular dating. The last eponymous consul was Basil the Younger in 541; after him only emperors assumed the hypatiea. The last recorded instance is Constans II in 652, but Stein (Op. minora 340–48) suggests the office continued to exist until the 9th C. when Leo VI, in novel 94, abolished the institution as a contradiction of the existing political structure. After this time the term hypatos acquired a completely different meaning.


CONSULARIA ITALICA. See Annals of Ravenna.

CONSULARIS (ὑπατικός), Roman title bestowed on a former consul. In the 3rd C. it became customary to designate as consularis the governor of a province where several legions were assigned. Consulares were considered of higher rank than other governors (praesides and correctores): they were accorded the title of clarissimus. Among the provinces under consulares ca.400 were Palestina I, Phoenicia, Syria I, Cilicia I, Cyprus, Pamphylia, Hellespont, Lydia, Galatia, Bithynia, Europa, Thrace, Macedonia, Dacia Mediterranea, Crete, and Pannonia. By the 6th C. Pannonia was removed from this list and placed under a praeses, while several other provinces became consular; according to Hierokles, they were Epirus Nova, Lycia, Caria, Pisidia, Lycaonia, Phrygia Pacatiana, Phrygia Salutaris, Cappadocia I, Helenopontus, and Arabia. Justinian I's novel of 535 gives a different list, however. The term hypatikos appears on some seals, for example, a 7th-C. seal with a Latin legend (Zacos, Seals 1, no.1197). The title was abandoned when the Roman provincial administration gave way to the new system of themes. The equivalent term proconsul was translated as anthypatos.

LIT. B. Kübler, RE 4 (1901) 1138–42. —A.K.

CONTOURNIAE (from L. contornia, "rim"), the name given since the 18th C. to the large copper-alloy coinlike objects, approximately 5 cms. in diameter, manufactured in some quantity at Rome between the middle of the 4th C. and the last quarter of the 5th, although certainly not products of the official mint. They have on one side the head of an emperor, usually of the 1st or 2nd C., or of some well-known literary or historical figure (e.g., Homer, Alexander the Great), and on the other a representation of a mythical or historical event or of a scene from the circus or public life. Their name derives from the deep groove that always marks their edge, but the purpose of this, as indeed of the objects themselves, is unknown. Because their designs are conspicuously pagan, Alföldi has argued that contourniates were propaganda medalets issued in connection with the public games by the senatorial aristocracy of Rome. They are of special interest to art historians through the contrast between their simplified iconography and the more sophisticated treatment of artistic themes on the gold and ivory objects apparently produced for members of the same senatorial classes. The contourniates often
CONTRACEPTION. The use of contraception was condemned by church fathers. The Penitential ascribed to John IV Nestēutēs considers it a form of infanticide, categorizing several kinds of birth control: application of an ointment (trimmata) that is perceived as the least heinous; drinking a potion (pharmakon); and the worst—the use of herbs to induce abortion (PG 88:1904C). Another text attributed to the same author (col.1924A) required sinners to confess their desire to remain childless, induce an abortion, or use contraceptive herbs. John Chrysostom calls the use of contraception “a murder before birth” (PG 60:626.50–51) and views it as harmful not only because it prevents procreation but also because it leads to involvement in contraceptive magic and idolatry (ibid., 627.6–8). The practice of contraception was usually limited to prostitutes and to women tempted to break their vows of chastity or of marital fidelity. Married couples, however, sometimes abstained from or restricted sexual intercourse after having produced a child or two. Epiphanios of Cyprus (Panarion 26.5.2–6) describes with indignation (and evidently with strong exaggeration) the habits of heretical Gnostics who did not wish to bear children but fornicated for the sake of pleasure, using coitus interruptus or abortion as a means of contraception; they are even reported to have ground up the embryo in a mortar, mixed it with honey, pepper, and other spices, and to have eaten it at their loathsome assemblies.

Byz. medical writers, esp. Paul of Aegina in the 7th C., transmitted the theories and techniques of contraception outlined by the 2nd-C. Gynaikēia of Soranos, which recommended vaginal wool suppositories and the application of olive oil, honey, cedar resin, alum, balsam gum, or white lead to prevent sperm from passing into the uterus. Paul, however, provided only one herbal contraception recipe, whereas Dioscorides had 20. In the 6th C. Aetios of Amida recommended mag-
Types of Contract. Roman and Byz. law distinguished various types of contract. The first group formed “real” contracts, that is, loan, commodatum, deposit, and pignus; stipulation was the main form of the oral contract; consensual contracts included sale, contracts of letting or hiring a thing, service contracts (contracts for paid labor—see mistrhos), partnership, and mandatum.

Extant Contracts. Multiple late Roman and Byz. contracts survived in original form and in contemporary copies. From the earlier period those are primarily on both Greek and Latin papyri (see Ravena Papyri); from the later period are extant certain contracts (mainly purchase deeds) preserved in monastic archives (Mount Athos, Lembiotissia, etc.). (See Acts, Documentary.)

CONTRITION (πένθος), in Byz. spirituality, is the remorseful heart or the gift of tears, whereby one mourns not only for one’s own sins and the sins of the world, but also for the suffering of Christ. This is not a metaphor of the earthly life as “the vale of tears,” but a real weeping and shedding of tears. The Byz. believer sees in the beatitude, “Blessed are they who mourn, for they shall be comforted” (Mt 5:4), the promise of comfort obtained through tears. Accordingly, contrition must be united with unceasing prayer (e.g., the Jesus prayer characteristic of hesychasm) in order to advance in the spiritual life and to attain its goal, hesychia. “In death, God will not reproach us if we have performed no miracles, or if we are not theologians or mystics, but most certainly will we render account to Him if we have not ceaselessly bewailed our sins” (John Klimax, PG 88:816D).

In the APOPHTHEGMATA PATRUM and in hagiography in general one often encounters the gift of tears. The Abbot Isaac, for example, sought the gift of being able to weep continuously, as did Mary under the Cross (PG 65:357B). For Symeon the Theologian, in whose spirituality the experience of spiritual perception or aisthesis gains significance, the gift of tears is as necessary for salvation as the sacrament of baptism, for that is the baptism of the Spirit. Thus Niketas Stethatos, in his vita of Symeon (90.7–8, OrChrAn 12 [1928] 124), likens Symeon’s tears to the flowing waters of baptism. Symeon recommended his own practice to his monks as the ideal: daily prayer and the cultivation of a contrite heart.


COOKING WARE, ceramic vessels used for the preparation and serving of food. Byz. cooking pots developed directly from traditional late Roman shapes, although one cannot exclude the possible influence of wares from the barbarian north. Most were locally produced and are difficult to date except in the most general terms. The pots were simple in design, with a flat or more commonly rounded bottom, round or vertical sides, and a simple often outturned rim on which a lid could be placed; two horizontal or vertical handles were generally added. Cooking ware was comprised of a coarse clay, normally with a liberal admixture of sand and small stones, which usually fires black; the pots were often placed directly in the fire for cooking and it is not always possible to tell if blackening came from the firing process or from use. From the 7th C. onward, cooking pots were commonly glazed on the interior with a yellow glaze that fires a dark brown. (For cooking wares made of metal, see Tools and Household Fittings.)


COPTIC ART AND ARCHITECTURE, a conventional designation for the art and architecture of Christian Egypt.

Christian art in Egypt derived from late Roman provincial art and was fully dependent upon the Graeco-Roman traditions developed along the Mediterranean littoral. Once Constantinople had become securely established as the cultural center of the empire, however, its influence in Egypt increased: in Alexandria, the seat of Byz. civic and military administration and a center of Hellenic culture from the time of its foundation, artistic developments in Constantinople were in-
roduced early and rapidly displaced local tradi-

tions.

The earliest surely datable churches are the transept basilica of Hermopolis Magna and the church of the Dayr Anbā Shinūda (the so-called White Monastery) near Sohag (both first half of the 5th C.). Most of the remaining churches belong to the 6th and 7th C., while those in Old Cairo do not date from earlier than the last decade of the 7th C. For the most part these churches are conventional three-aisled basilicas, but they have an aisle across the west end (the so-called “return aisle,” not to be confused with a narthex), a distinctive feature originating in Ptolemaic and Roman cemetery architecture. Few churches have an atrium. The east end is normally straight, since the apse is usually flanked by pastophoria. A good number, however, have a triconch sanctuary (Sohag, Dendera, and the Monastery of the Syrians in Wādi Natrūn), and a secondary triumphal arch before the entrance into the triconch; from the spatial division this arch caused in front of the sanctuary was to develop the khārus (choir, from Gr. choros) of the early medieval Egyptian church (e.g., Saqqāra). Exceptions to the simple basilican plan are the transept basilicas at Hermopolis Magna, Abū Mīnā, and Marea, and the two tetraconch churches at Abū Minā; these plans were evidently imported from abroad.

The churches at monastic sites are usually rather simple (Sohag is an exception, and the two five-aisled basilicas of the Pachomian monastery at Pbow are impressive only for their size). Each form of monasticism in Egypt developed its own particular type of accommodation: while anchoretes lived in small separate houses containing individual sleeping rooms, oratories, and kitchens (as at Kellia), cenobites were accommodated in larger lodging-houses, occasionally in common dormitories (e.g., Dayr al-Balāyza).

Great quantities of architectural sculpture, such as friezes, niche-heads, and capitals, have been found in Bawṭ and Saqqāra (most now housed in the Coptic Museum in Cairo). Stylistically these pieces are dependent on artistic developments in Constantinople: even the interlaced foliage friezes considered peculiar to Egypt derive from East Roman acanthus branches. Only the form of the door-lintel shows a continuation of Pharaonic design. Spolia were used extensively, and by the end of the 8th C. local production of stone architectural sculpture seems to have come to an end. Figural sculpture found particularly in Akhnās and Oxyrhynchus appears mainly in sepulchral contexts, incorporated into an architectural framework in the form of stelae or niche-heads. Pagan themes are common in works of the 4th and 5th C.; in the 6th and 7th C. the figures are completely surrounded by ornament.

A few wall paintings have survived in catacombs and ecclesiastical buildings; these show the influence of Alexandria. In churches and monastic buildings somewhat later in date than the catacombs, there are frontally posed representations of saints and important figures of Egyptian monasticism. Even the images of Daniel in the Lions’ Den, the Holy Rider, or St. Menas between two camels are more iconic than narrative in character. Compositions in the niches of the little chapels at Bawṭ and Saqqāra are often of high quality, and most echo large-scale models. Though the famous Egyptian mummy portraits belong entirely to the pagan period, their encaustic technique was adapted in early Christian icon painting. The portrait of Apa Abraham, bishop of Hermouthis, in the Louvre (ca.600) follows Byz. models such as the icon of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos from Sinai, now in Kiev (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, B.9).

Many early Coptic textiles have survived, thanks to the dry climate of Egypt. Though figural motifs of pagan origin were still in use even in the Christian period, these textiles are decorated primarily with ornamental motifs. Egyptian pottery, which is relatively mediocre because of the poor quality of the local clay, follows late Roman types known from the Mediterranean littoral. Many painted bowls have been found dating from the 5th and 6th C. Of much higher standard are the Egyptian works in ivory; the majority of these was produced in Alexandrian workshops and had considerable artistic value even outside of Egypt.

The patrons of Christian art during the 5th and 6th C. in Egypt were mostly local magnates of hellenized Egyptian or partly Greek origin; they were continuously receptive to new developments in Constantinople and lent Coptic art its simultaneously classicizing and Christian character. The art from monastic sites shares this blend of clas-
cial and Christian elements, though it is executed in materials more modest than those used in the opulent city cemeteries.


—P.G.

**COPTIC LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.** Coptic is the latest stage of the Egyptian language, written in the Greek alphabet plus seven signs derived from demotic. Originally five major dialects—Sahidic, Bohairic, Fayyumic, Akhmimic, and Lycolopolitan (Subakhmimic)—were recognized; modern scholarship has detected several more idiolects (R. Kasser, *Musäon* 93 [1980] 53–112, 237–97; 94 [1981] 91–152). Beginning with 3rd-C. horoscopes, Coptic became the language of Christian Egypt, attaining classic literary status by the 5th C. in the writings of Shenoute. From early versions of the Bible and the liturgy, Coptic writings came to include homilies, hagiography, biblical commentary, panegyric and apocalyptic, both translations from Greek and Syriac and original productions by Egyptian writers. However, not much original theological writing survives. The rich Gnostic literature found at Nag Hammadi and elsewhere was written partly in Coptic. The extent to which Coptic was part of the bilingual society of Byz. Egypt is seen in the enormous volume of Coptic financial and legal documents and letters, as well as inscriptions, surviving from the period of Byz. control and down to the 9th C. The immediate post-conquest period produced more hagiography, hymnody, and lectionary texts. Coptic persisted among the Christian community after the Arab conquest but was inexplicably moribund by the 11th C. A little survives, memorized but comprehended, in the present-day liturgy of the Coptic church.


—L.S.B. MacC.

**COPTS,** the name, derived from Greek *Aegyptioi* via the Arabic *Qibli,* of the autochthonous Christians of Egypt, descendants of the population of Pharaonic times; since the 5th C., they have been adherents to a non-Chalcedonian church later termed "Coptic Orthodox." The term "Copts" is really an anachronism for the Byz. period but serves to designate those who used Coptic as their principal language (or bilingually with Greek) and as a major vehicle of culture, thought, and theology. As a label "Copt" does not carry an automatic class or confessional connotation. A Copt was not necessarily a peasant, an Upper Egyptian (as opposed to an Alexandrian), or a Monophysite; Athanasios and Cyril of Alexandria were Copts as were Pachomios and Shenoute. The Copts constituted a culturally vigorous and creative ethnic group within the empire, producing highly original visual art and abundant literature; the submergence of their language and culture after the Muslim conquest has not been explained. Some eight million Copts survive in Egypt today; large diaspora communities live in North America and Europe.


—L.S.B. MacC.

**COPY, OFFICIAL** (*i6rov*). Major chanceries kept records of outgoing documents and could provide official copies of them. In the imperial chancery copies were identical to the originals but lacked the emperor's signature (and eventually replaced the gold seal by a lead one). The patriarchal chancery produced excerpts of the synod's minutes signed by the *chaktophylax* or copies of documents signed by him and his notaries. Lay administrations had similar practices. Certified copies of all documents could also be delivered by bishops or other public officials, who signed at the bottom or on the verso. These copies could be used instead of the originals even in tribunals (at least from the 10th C. onward) as Byz. had broken with the Roman tradition of banning copies as evidence.

For reasons of security, individuals or institutions (e.g., monasteries) had their archival documents copied on *kontakia* (long rolls of parchment
CORinth (Κόρινθος), city on the Isthmus of Corinth in the northeastern Peloponnesos; it enjoyed the protection of the powerful citadel of Acrocorinth and had harbors at Lechaion on the Gulf of Corinth and at Kenchreai on the Saronic Gulf. The commercial and strategic location of the city made it important throughout the Byz. period.

In late antiquity it was capital of the province of Achaea. The city was devastated by earthquakes in 365 and 375 and by Alaric in 396; afterward the civic center was rebuilt on a monumental scale, but a new city wall encircled only part of the ancient area (T.E. Gregory, Hesperia 48 [1979] 264–80). At least four churches are known in the ancient city, another on Acrocorinth and an enormous 5th-C. basilica at Lechaion (D. Pallas, Ergon 1961 141–48; 1965 105–12). From the late 6th C. Corinth declined. A tomb of the 7th C. found near the walls belonged to a warrior and contained non-Byz. objects; these finds

including women and children, settled (814–15) near Alexandria. In 818 they occupied Alexandria but were expelled from the city and sometime between 824 and 827 landed in Crete. In 839–40 Emp. Theophilos sent an ambassador to Cordoba. In Sept. 947 a Byz. embassy led by the eunuch Salomon arrived in Cordoba and was received by the caliph 'Abd al-Rahmān III. Among the gifts brought by Salomon were a Greek MS of Dioscorides and a Latin MS of Orosius. The caliph, in response, sent to Constantinople a group of envoys headed probably by the bishop of Carthage. It is possible that this exchange of ambassadors was somehow connected with the Byz. abortive expedition against Crete in 949. Al-Ibrīsī (tr. P. Jaubert, 2:60) reported that the qibla of the Great Mosque at Cordoba was decorated with mosaic tesserae sent to 'Abd al-Rahmān by “the emperor of Constantinople.”

CORFUS. See Kerkýra.

CORDOBA (Lat. Corduba), capital of the Roman province of Baetica in southern Spain in the late 3rd and early 4th C., later replaced by Hispalis (Seville). Ossius (or Hosios), bishop of Cordoba (died 357/8), was a staunch supporter of Nicaean orthodoxy and an influential adviser of Constantine I. Little is known of the city’s history in late antiquity, but it was probably an object of Vandal and Visigothic raids. In 550 it was attacked by Agila, king of the Visigoths; the inhabitants of Cordoba defeated him and captured the royal treasure. Justinian I used the situation as a pretext to send a small army into Spain under command of Liberios, although there is no clear evidence to indicate that Cordoba was ever directly occupied by Byz. In 572 Cordoba was seized by King Leovigild, but by 584 it was again independent and the refuge of Hermenegild, Leovigild’s rebellious son. Hermenegild was betrayed and taken prisoner, and Cordoba fell to the king.

In 711 it was conquered by the Arabs and in 716 became the administrative center of al-Andalus. After several riots against the Umayyad caliph of Spain, 15,000 Muslim refugees from Cordoba, or paper) or in volumes (see KôDIX) that constituted chartularies (such as those of Nea Mone of Chios, of St. John Prodromos on Mt. Menoikion, of Makrinissa on Pelion, of Hiera/Xerchoraphion and of Latmos near Miletos, of Lemnos [Lembiotissa] near Smyrna, of Vazelion in the Pontos, etc.). Only some were certified by a superior authority, but all may have been seen as having some probatory value.

raised the question of whether the city was captured in the 7th C. (G.D. Weinberg, *Hesperia* 43 [1974] 512–21); a mutilated inscription, perhaps honoring the victory of Constans II, led to the hypothesis that he recaptured Corinth. The question of the ethnic origin of the invaders has also been discussed, although archaeology can rarely establish the ethnicity of skeletons found in tombs (K.M. Setton, *Speculum* 25 [1950] 502–43; 27 [1952] 351–62; J.H. Kent, ibid. 25 [1950] 544–46).

The primary settlement may have shifted to Acrocorinth in the 7th C. Corinth was perhaps capital of the theme of Hellas from the late 7th C. and was capital of the theme of Peloponnese from the early 9th C. Numismatic evidence suggests that the economy of the city began to recover in the 9th C. (D.M. Metcalf, *Hesperia* 41 [1973] 180–251).

The city of the 11th–12th C. differed significantly from late antique Corinth: public buildings (except churches) disappeared, streets became narrow, and the old Roman marketplace was covered by small shops. Shops also moved to colonnades along the major streets, and tombs slowly began to encroach upon the ancient civic center. From the 9th C. onward the settlement abandoned the ancient city plan, as shops, workshops, gardens, churches, and monasteries jostled one another without any apparent order. Workshops for the production of ceramics (with remains of kilns) and glass (G.R. Davidson, *AJA* 44 [1940] 297–324), as well as smithies, have been excavated. Narrative sources emphasize the existence of a flourishing silk industry in the 12th C. The city continued to function as an important harbor.

In 1147 Roger II of Sicily attacked Corinth: the inhabitants fled to Acrocorinth, which fell as a result of the incompetence of the commander Nikephoros Chalouphes. Roger carried off both Corinthian notables and artisans (particularly the city’s famed silk weavers) as well as considerable wealth, including an icon of St. Theodore. The city apparently did not fully recover from the sack of the Normans. Leo Sgouros took Corinth in 1202.

In 1205 the Crusaders, nominally under the authority of Boniface of Montferrat, began a siege of Acrocorinth, defended by Sgouros. The attackers built a castle at Penteskouphi, but the siege dragged on until ca. 1210 when Theodore Komnenos Doukas, brother of despotes Michael I of Epiros, gained control of Acrocorinth, presumably by treaty; the city became part of the principality of Achaia, and is termed a capitanate in the Assizes of Romania. Little is known of Corinth under Frankish rule, as it was not one of the great baronies; the mint was, however, located at Corinth until it was moved to Clarence (Clarenza). The city and castle were formally surrendered to the Byz. in 1262 by William II Villehardouin, but the local commander refused to relinquish control. Corinth was ceded to Philip I of Taranto ca. 1300 and in 1305 a great tournament was held at the Isthmus. In 1358 the city was given to Niccolò Acciajuoli, who strengthened the defenses. In 1395 Theodore I Palaiologos, despotes of the Morea, gained control of Corinth for Byz. In 1397 he surrendered the city to the Hospitallers, who held it until 1404, when they returned Corinth to Byz. control (J. Chrysostomides, *Byzantina* 7 [1975] 81–110). Around 1443 the future emperor Constantine XI appointed a certain John Kantakouzenos as governor in Corinth. The territory was ravaged by the Turks in 1446. Mehmed II attacked the city in 1458, and on 8 August the residents surrendered Acrocorinth to him.

The bishop of Corinth was metropolitan of the Peloponnese and of the province of Achaia (L. Duchesne, *MEFR* 15 [1895] 375–78). He was present at most of the early councils; in 431 he was the only bishop from the Peloponnese and in 680 the only representative from Greece (Mansi 11:689). In the crisis after the Slavic invasions the bishop of Patras contested control over the Peloponnese with Corinth, and in the 10th C. the suffragans of Corinth were restricted to the eastern Peloponnese and the Ionian Islands (*Notitiae CP* 7:488–95, 9:371–99).

There was a sizable monastery of St. John in the area of the ancient center, and literary sources and seals refer to an important Church of St. Theodore whose site has not been identified. None of the Byz. churches of Corinth has survived intact. The fortifications of Acrocorinth rest largely on ancient foundations, but many sections of Byz. masonry, probably of the 6th–7th C., can be seen, esp. along the inner western wall.

CORINTHIA, the upper part of the entablature of a colonnade or of a door-frame. By the 6th C., the use of cornices was extended to define architectural space by marking the level of galleries or the springing of arches, domes, and vaults. A variant on cornices of the Corinthian order appears in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, and other Justinianic monuments, with characteristic modillions decorated with acanthus leaves (L. Butler, Ayasofya Müzesi Yılılığı 10 [1985] 27–32). Less ambitious churches display cornices with plain torus or cyma recta profiles decorated with a wide range of acanthus leaves, palmettes, and anthemia, etc. Simplified cornices continued to be used in domed, cross-in-square churches or Greek cross-octagons after the 9th C. Those in the church of Constantine Lips in Constantinople have traces of gilding and color, constituting a revival of 6th-C. forms (C. Mango, E.J.W. Hawkins, DOP 18 [1964] 306–09). The katholikon of Hosios Loukas retains cornices cast in plaster, while that of Daphni shows chapelle cornices with colored inlay evoking opus sectile (Grabar, Sculptures II, pl.XXXIV).


CORON. See Korone.

CORONATION (στέψιμον, στεφάνωσις), imperial accession ceremony (together with acclamation, adventus, shield-raising, banquets, circus spectacles, and anointing), whose significance reflects that of the crown as imperial insignia. From the time of Julian to the 6th C., the coronation shared the imperial election’s military character, as soldiers crowned the new emperor with a torque during his acclamation and shield-raising. From the 5th C. the patriarch of Constantinople blessed the insignia and participated in the coronation, but a constitutional interpretation of his role (P. Charanis, Byzantina 8 [1976] 37–46) seems unlikely (e.g., C. Tsirpanlis, Kleronomia 4 [1972] 63–91). It reflects, rather, the church’s prestige and individual patriarchs’ political stature (F. Winkelmann, Klio 60 [1978] 467–81). Patriarchal coronations occurred only when there was no senior emperor, a minority of cases from 450 to 1000. The shift of coronations (De cer. 410–33) from the Hebdomon to the Hippodrome in the
5th or 6th C. reflects Byz.'s changing political structure. As late as 776, Constantine VI was crowned co-emperor in the Hippodrome between ceremonies in Hagia Sophia.

The coronation of Constans II in the ambo of Hagia Sophia (641) began a long series of coronations at the Great Church and reveals imperial legitimacy's religious element, underscored by the scheduling of coronations to coincide with holy days like Christmas or Easter, and by imperial epithets like theosteptos or a Deo coronatus (G. Rösch, Onoma basilieis [Vienna 1978] 67, 140f). The well-documented Byz. coronation of the 10th C. (De cer., bk.1, ch.38, ed. Vogt 2:1–5, and Goar, Euchologion 726f) comprised receptions by officials and factions during a procession to Hagia Sophia; the patriarch crowned the emperor in the ambo and the audience acclaimed him; the emperor then ascended a throne to receive the officials' proskynesis. A eucharistic liturgy followed. The coronation of co-emperors was similar (De cer., bk.1, ch.38, ed. Vogt 2:3.1–19), except that, like empresses, they were crowned by the senior emperor. Coronations of empresses took place in the Augustaion and at St. Stephen of Daphne (De cer., bk.1, ch.40, ed. Vogt 2:11–15).

The Nicaean Empire temporarily abandoned the coronation of co-emperors and systematically added shield-raising and anointing to the ritual. The Palaiologoi restored co-emperors' coronations. Their ceremony (Kantak. 1:196.8–204.3; cf. pseudo-Kod. 252–72) began with the emperor's subscription to a profession of Orthodoxy (his first use of his title), shield-raising, and acclamation. Next, the emperor, enthroned on a wooden platform in Hagia Sophia, received the sakkos and diadem. Coronation was now integrated into the eucharistic liturgy during which the patriarch and church dignitaries performed the anointing in the ambo. Then the patriarch—assisted by the senior emperor if there was one—crowned the new emperor, who was acclaimed again, and the liturgy continued. A proskynesis followed. Empresses were crowned by their husbands and then performed a proskynesis to them. Several days of festivities ensued. Commemorative coins were often issued in connection with coronation largess; 9th-C. Byz. coronations customarily involved large payments to the clergy of Hagia Sophia and to the bureaucracy and army (see, e.g., McCormick, Eternal Victory 229).


-M.Mcc.

Representation in Art. Depictions of coronations occur on a number of different objects (ivory plaques, MS frontispieces, silver vessels, coins, wall paintings), the earliest probably being that of Basil I in the Paris Gregory (Ormont, Miniatures, pl.XIX). Most depictions show the emperor or imperial couple receiving the crown from Christ, the Virgin, or an archangel. The presentation of the emperor crowned by the divine power expresses the tendency to construe the fact not only as a historical event but as an image of the emperor-Godhead relationship and the selection of the emperor by God. The images on the ivory plaques and the coins were most likely commemorative of the historical event. The coins were first issued at the time of the coronation but often continued through the reign; the ivory panels were possibly given out as gifts to court officials to celebrate the occasion. There are several ivory plaques with the theme of coronation—for example, the Moscow panel of Constantine VII being crowned by Christ. In a similar manner the imperial couple of Romanos and Eudokia is crowned by Christ on an ivory plaque in the Cabinet des Médailles in Paris, which commemorates not only the coronation of Romanos (IV?) but also his marriage to Eudokia (I. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, DOP 31 [1977] 305–25). A number of coronation scenes illustrated in the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes are neither commemorative nor contemporary with the events they represent. These scenes accompany the chronicler's narrative; they vary in detail but all show the historical ceremonial by depicting the patriarch crowning the emperor or the imperial couple (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzes, nos. 266, 328, 542).

LIT. Grabar, L'empereur 112–22, pls. XXIII–XXVI, XXVII.2, XXVIII.5, 6.

CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS, the name given from the 16th C. onward to the legislative work of Justinian I. It consists of the Institutes, the Digest, the Code Justinianus, and the Novels of Justinian I. All four parts were taught in the law schools of Berytus and Constantinople. The translations of the Latin text of the Corpus that
CORRUPTION in the Roman and Byz. worlds was a means of exercising private power for the achievement of public or private purposes by exploiting the latent compliance of state and ecclesiastical officials. The system was based on a sense of community within the bureaucratic officiandom and was enhanced by the intermixture of private and public elements of administration. The system worked through favoritism (for relatives, friends, former servants or slaves, etc.; bribes, which could be official or semiofficial (grants, *sportulae*); fear; and moral pressure, sometimes effective for pious ends (e.g., the extortion of a donation for a monastery). The exploitation of subordinates also comes under this category (soldiers exploited by a *strategos*, peasants by a local landowner, etc.). The illegal acquisition of private property, a portion of state taxes, or objects belonging to the state (e.g., ropes or other parts of a ship) were widespread types of corruption and barely distinguishable from theft. The state might condone such practices and even institutionalize them (e.g., the payment of judges by litigants), but in some cases measures had to be taken to suppress dangerous excesses; thus, for instance, some emperors of the 10th C. tried to limit corruption in the form of seizure of land by the *dynatoi*.

Corruption is denounced by Byz. authors of all periods. They criticized not so much the purchase of titles and offices, which was always practiced to various extents and was often considered legitimate, but rather arbitrary administrative actions motivated by personal profit. In the sources, emperors are accused of appointing the rich instead of the best or of practicing the abhorred *simony* to increase their own revenues; public officials, of accepting kickbacks; fiscal officials, esp. the taxfarmers, of crushing the rural populations by collecting unauthorized taxes or by other fraud-

---

CORRUPTION | 535


LIT. Wenger, *Quellen* 582–734. —M.Th.F.

**CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS, COMMENTARIES ON THE.** Evaluation of the writings of Justinian’s contemporaries on the *Corpus juris civilis* depends on one’s opinion of how the Justinianic prohibition on commentary is to be interpreted, a matter that has long been controversial. The prohibition is found in the introductory constitutions to the Digest: it forbids all *commentariori* and *interpretationes* except for translations (*kata podas*), summaries (*indices*), and indications of supplementary and parallel regulations (*paratitla*). The extensive legal literature produced in Justinian’s time seemingly provides ample evidence that the prohibition was not observed. The possibility cannot be excluded, however, that the prohibition was not directed at that literature at all. To this end, arguments of content or of form have been adduced. Arguments based on content claim that the surviving legal literature comments on the law affirmatively and does not represent divergent points of view; only the latter were forbidden, to avoid the danger of confusion. Arguments based on form claim that this legal literature consists of “private” lecture notes, not the published commentaries of professors. Another variant of the argument based on form has been put forward by Scheltema (*infra*), who argues that it was not the production of divergent opinions that are forbidden but rather their inclusion in MSS of the Digest. Given that the prohibition is found only in the Digest (which contained the harmonized remains of the controversies of classical jurists) and given its formulation (that contradictions should be avoided), an explanation based on content is preferable. The relevance of Justinian’s directive remains questionable, however, since the uncritical summing up and exegetical character of juristic writings is probably due not so much to the prohibition on commentaries as to a general professorial mentality. (See also ANTECESSORES.)


were produced in both cities form the foundation of Byz. law and were incorporated into the Basilika and its scholia. Considerable sections of later law books—transmitted mainly through the Basilika—can be traced back to the *Corpus Juris Civilis*. In western Europe the Corpus was forgotten soon after Justinian but was rediscovered in the 11th C. In many European countries it remained the authoritative source of law into the 19th C. (see LAW, ROMAN).
ulent practices. The most famous corruption scandal is that of the KRITAI KATHOLIKOI in 1337.


-A.K. N.O.

CORVÉE, compulsory, usually unpaid, day labor for the state or for one’s lord. State corvées, attested since the Roman period, most commonly involved the regular or occasional obligation of local inhabitants to furnish their labor (and their animals) for maintenance of the DROMOS. Such labor—includes within the terms ANGAREIA, parangareia (from the 11th C., services and animals provided for secondary roads), leitour gia (“public service”), and douleia (“service”)—usually unre- munerated, was also supplied for the building of ships (hatterokitisa, karabopoia), fortifications (kastrokisia), and perhaps for rural and urban guard duty (apovvigesis, vigla, paramonai). In particular areas, certain categories of persons (clergy, bakers, some peasants and soldiers. Jews on Chios in 1049) were exempted (exkoussatoi) from corvée, but this could be annulled in times of emergency (esp. due to war). Probably because of the rise of the paroikia, evidence of state corvée is rare after the 12th C. State officials, while traveling, dem- anded (legally or illegally) labor services from the peasant and urban population: accommodations, food, animals. Landlords needed special privileges to be exempted from such burdens.

The novel of Constantine VII of 935 speaks of angareiai demanded by dynatoi (Zepos, Jus 1:209–20) and considers them a form of oppression. By the 11th C., state corvées were occasion- ally transferred to private landowners and bur- dened their dependent peasants. Documents from the 13th to 15th C. require paroikoi to work (with their animals) for their lords for a fixed number of days per year (ranging from 12 to 52 days, with 12 and 24 being the most common). Svoronos (in Lavra 4:165–68) estimates that in the early 14th C. corvées accounted for at most 20 percent of the cultivation of the domain lands of the monastery of Lavra. The commutation of corvées for cash payments, attested throughout the Byz. era, became common in the last centuries of the empire (e.g., in the cadaster of Lampasakos [1218/19], a zeugaratos was compelled to replace his service obligation by a payment of 4 hyper- pyra).


-M.B.

CO-SEIGNEURY. See CASAUX DE PARÇON.

COSMETICS. The production of cosmetics was often associated with that of perfumes and unguents; those involved in this trade formed a guild (Bk. of Eparh 10.1–2). Simple cosmetics were prepared at home along with medications, unguents, concoctions to grow or dye hair, and so on, as described in various manuals (e.g., G. Litavrin, VizVrem 31 [1971] 249–301). Syneon Seth stated that women applied bean flour to wash their faces, and according to Dioskorides, they anointed their skin with olive oil from Sikyon. Empress Zoë took a passionate interest in preparing perfume and unguents in her palace. Cosmetics—including hair dyes, skin emollients, makeup, and eye shadow—were widely used, esp. by women, to embellish their face and thus to stress their social status. The church took a nega- tive stand toward cosmetics that was retained as late as the 15th C., when John Eugenikos wrote a pamphlet against women who powdered their face, painted their lips, covered their cheeks with rouge, or even blackened their eyebrows to become more attractive (S. Eustratiades, EBS 8 [1931] 42–46).


COSMOGRAPHER OF RAVENNA, anonymous Latin author of the 7th C. who compiled a book called Cosmography. After an introduction that di- vides the earth into 12 southern and 12 northern regions, he gives the geographic nomenclature of the known world: (1) a list of cities and rivers; (2) a periplus of the Mediterranean, beginning with Ravenna; and (3) a list of islands in the various seas. The Cosmographer often draws upon the same source as the Tabula Peutingeriana. He refers to many authors, patrician or otherwise, but his knowledge of ancient geographers is very questionable: he quotes only PROLEMY, whom he confuses with a king of Egypt. Some of the au- thorities (“philosophers”) whom he cites are imag-
inary, and legendary data appear side by side with reliable information. The author’s goal, as he himself formulates it, is to preserve for mankind in a time of general political disturbances the memory of geographic names; he makes no attempt to order the sites in a logical fashion.


—A.K.

COSMOLOGY, conventional term for the doctrine of the structure or arrangement of the cosmos, classified by the Byz., like all knowledge of the past, as “human sciences,” the presupposition of THEOLOGY as a view of ultimate unity. The starting point for Byz. cosmology was the spherical model of Aristotle, as modified by Ptolemy, in which the earth, planets, sun, and moon follow orbits within a large finite sphere. The Alexandrian theologians in general adopted this view. Origen at least knew of it and raised no objections. Clement of Alexandria used the spherical theory, for example, in the allegory of the Ark of the Covenant, hinting already at a fundamental contrast with the Antiochene School, which saw the universe as a cube consisting of two tiers, heaven and earth, separated by a firmament (stereoma) which divides the “waters above” and the “waters beneath.”

These two views clashed shortly before the middle of the 6th C. The Alexandrian view was represented by John Philoponos, who interpreted the first chapter of Genesis on creation against the background of Greek physics and astronomy. The Antiochene belief was represented by Kosmas Indikopleustes, who argued from the Bible and yet actually followed ideas popular in the East and, without realizing it, borrowed from the Greek tradition. For Philoponos (De opificio mundi, ed. Reichardt, 78.20–26, 119.1–5), Moses is the teacher of Plato; according to Kosmas, Moses received the mandate from God to oppose the spherical cosmology of the Babylonians and Greeks (Topographia christiana, ed. Wolska-Conus, 1:437–39, 449–51).

The antispHERical trend was intensified in the 6th C. through the condemnation of Origenism. At the very least, the presupposition inherent in the spherical image of the world, that the spheres are moved by intelligent minds, was anathematized by Justinian I. This conception of cosmos, altered in various ways, generally speaking was responsible for “the popular mind-set in the Middle Ages, and apparently displaced the conception of a spherical world in the Greek world up to the time of Photios and Psellos” (Wolska, infra 182). Naturally, there were exceptions, as, for example, John of Damascus (Exp. fidei 20.9–11, 42–50, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:50–52).

More important for Byz. spirituality and mysticism is the fact that theoria physike, religious contemplation of the world, remained an essential element in the ascent to God. It served as the presupposition for attaining the vision of God (theologia), a possibility realized through perfected praxis. This means that the program of Evagrius Pontikos (A. Guillaume, RHR 91 [1972] 50f) was preserved in the tradition of the church, esp. through Maximos the Confessor, in spite of the tendency of Byz. spirituality to disregard the world and history in order to find God immediately (cf. Hesychasm, Palamism).


—K.-H.U.

COSMOS (κόσμος, lit. “world”). The fundamental Greek world view emphasized the unity, harmony, and beauty of reality. In the Platonic tradition, the perceptible cosmos is conceived as an image of the world of noetic ideas in the divine intellect, composed of preexistent matter. Christian tradition, in contrast, developed its notion of creation “out of nothing,” without reducing the cosmos to “the world of man” (a tendency observed in late antiquity); it did not view the cosmos as fundamentally evil, as did Gnosticism. The cosmos was seen in a more external, material, eschatologically or ontologically transient character, in contrast to the inner, spiritual, eternal life yet to come. Inasmuch as the cosmos was conceived as a universe, or as the embodiment of all things, the use of a holistic model suggests itself to conceptualize the cosmos as analogous to
an organism possessing the attributes of a "World-soul." The problem for Byz. authors who sought to preserve the holistic model consisted in excluding the notion of a World-soul ("neither divine nor rational"), and particularly in rejecting the doctrine of the World-soul as a third hypostasis, advocated by "the most eminent of the pagan theologians" (John Italos, Quaestiones quodlibetales, pars. 42.6, 68.1, ed. P. Joannou, pp. 52.27, 109.21-22), while maintaining, on principle, an organized totality. -K.-H.U.

Representation in Art. In art the cosmos was depicted as a complex involving Paradise and its rivers, Earth shown as a mountain below the firmament (stereoma) and surrounded by Ocean; the cosmos is represented as a many-leveled structure, as well as planimetrically, in MSS of Kosmas Indikopleustes. From the 14th C. onward "Kosmos" is identified as a personification in images of the Pentecost. (See also Cosmology.) -A.C.


COSTUME. Byz. clothing consisted generally of several layers of loose tunics and mantles (chlamys, himation). The simplest was a knee-length belted chiton with short sleeves, which was worn by laborers, shepherds (including the youthful David in Psalter illustrations), and children. Slightly more formal dress was a full-length tunic adorned in the early period with stripes or clavi and square ornaments at specified places; later tunics had tight sleeves and an embroidered hem and collar. This was the usual costume for ordinary city dwellers or provincial dignitaries. Over this could be thrown a mantle, whose form varied with the sex and social status of the wearer. Trousers, a Germanic and Eastern fashion, are rarely depicted in art, but texts suggest that they were worn, at least occasionally, by the 12th C.; men also wore tight leather hose. Hats (see headgear) did not flourish until well into the 11th C. For footwear, men wore boots reaching to mid-calf rather than sandals.

Though the basic elements of costume, such as tunics, cloaks, belts, hats, and scarves, were common to most social groups, both lay and ecclesiastical, certain versions of these garments became associated over the course of time with specific offices and titles. In fact, costume in Byz. was so strictly regulated and determined by the wearer's office, or role in society, that the distinction that we might make today between costume on the one hand, and insignia or even liturgical vestments on the other, must have been blurred. Elements of costume, both lay and ecclesiastical, were awarded to the wearer in special rituals; on rare occasions, the emperor, as a special honor to a courtier of a certain rank, might grant him the right to wear a special hat or vestment properly belonging to the rank above, but this was inconceivable to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Being invested of one's costume or forced to wear another's could have the effect of "defrocking" and be a cause of humiliation: for example, Sergios and Bakchos were deprived of their mantiaka (see Torque), and the general Theophilos Erotikos was forced after the failure of his revolt to appear in the Hippodrome in women's clothes (Skyl. 429.13-17).

Imperial Costume. From the costume of a consul, whose office the emperor had assumed, imperial costume derived the loros; this jeweled stole, his red (purple) boots of tzanga, and the crown became the most distinctive elements of the imperial wardrobe. The loros was worn over a silk tunic, the divetesion or sakkos, either of which may in turn have been worn over another tunic of which only the embroidered (detachable?) cuffs are visible in representations. Other garments, such as the skaramangion (another form of tunic) and the chlamys or sagon, were worn not only by the emperor but also by members of the court. For his coronation, the emperor wore the divetesion, the chlamys, and tzanga (Leo Gramm. 246.19-21). The emperor donned full military dress (see Armor) on campaign as well as to celebrate a triumph upon his return to the capital; on such occasions his dress differed from that of his officers only with respect to his crown and red boots.

Purple was the prerogative of the emperor and his relations, and of his household attendants under certain conditions. Compromises on color could be arranged for political purposes: Nikephoros III Botaneiates allowed strands of scarlet to be woven into the clothes of Constantine Doukas (whose father he had deposed as emperor), in honor of Constantine's imperial lineage (An.Komn. 1:115.22-23), and Alexios I Komme-
nos later restored to Constantine as caesar the right to wear shoes entirely of red.

Some imperial garments bore figural designs; for example, the mantle of Empress Theodora in the mosaic at S. Vitale, Ravenna, is adorned with the figures of the Three Magi. In the 14th C. Eagles made of pearls decorated the shoes of members of the imperial family. The imperial garments were so stiffened with gold embroidery and weighed down with gems as to render the emperor and empress virtually immobile.

**Aristocratic and Court Costume.** Aristocratic dress differed from ordinary lay costume in the greater number of layers involved (usually a long-sleeved tunic was covered by another looser tunic, which in turn was topped by a chlamys), in the greater length of the tunics, in the richness of the materials, and probably in the brightness and variety of its colors. Aristocratic costume was intrinsically valuable, not only for its silk material, but for the large number of pearls and precious stones used to adorn the fabrics. Garments were decorated with gold embroidery along the hems, around the upper arm, and at the cuffs: rows of pearls also outlined the various sections of the garment, and collars were studded with gems. In fact, it is hard to determine whether these collars should properly be considered pieces of jewelry or parts of actual garments. The higher the official, the more gems on his clothing and the less his freedom of movement. Some court robes were adorned with lions or pictures of the emperor as well as the more usual floral patterns.

At court, Oriental garments were much in vogue from at least the 9th C. onward (N.P. Kondakov, Byzantion 1 [1924] 7–49): courtiers adopted a wide variety of long silk caftanlike garments (e.g., KABBADION), belted and highly patterned, as well as exotic headdress. Sources that indicate the names of these garments, if not their actual appearance, are the Klerotologion of Philotheos (late 9th C.), De ceremoniis (10th C.), and pseudo-Kodinos (14th C.). The color of the costume was of paramount importance, far more so than the pattern of its fabric: courtiers were lined up in processions by color, and sometimes only the color of their shoes, for example, served to distinguish the dress of two officials of differing rank.

**Monastic and Ecclesiastical Costume.** The monastic habit (see SCHEMA), provided by the monastery usually on an annual basis, consisted of a long dark tunic of cotton or wool; the analabos, a sort of sleeveless vest comparable to the scapular; a dark cloak (mandyas); the khoukoullion, or hood; and black slippers (kalliga).

Ecclesiastical vestments were again a series of tunics, mantles, and scarves, strictly determined by the rank of the wearer: the sticharion and orarion for a deacon; the sticharion, pheionion, and epitrachelion for a priest; and these plus the omophorion, epimanikia, and encheirion/epigonation for a bishop.

**Dress of Women.** There seem to have been comparatively few variations in female dress. Most women wore a full-length long-sleeved tunic and the maphorion over a tight headdress to cover their heads. The distinction in dress between married women and nuns was probably small: nuns, to judge by representations, wore the maphorion more tightly drawn about the neck, so that no part of their body was visible except face and hands. In artistic representations, maidervants, midwives, and the Samaritan woman, always a special paradigm of rural beauty, can have long unbound hair or a loose turban. Their tunics are often sleeveless, as are the tunics of various female personifications; they may wear a short knee-length tunic over a longer one. Female court attire other than that of the empress is rarely illustrated: the women dancing with Miriam in the 11th-C. Vat. Gr. 752, fol.49v (Spatharakis, Corpus, fig.123), wear tunics with extremely wide pointed sleeves, jeweled sashes or belts, and pillowlike headdresses. Donor portraits of the 14th C. show women in beautifully woven silk Oriental tunics like those of the men.

**Nudity.** The Byz. rejected the antique cult of the nude. In art, complete nudity is reserved for the images of Adam and Eve, for Christ in the scene of his baptism, and for figures in exile such as Job. Partial nudity is often associated with people on the fringes of society: wild-haired demons, the devil, certain extreme ascetics (Onuphrius wore only palm fronds), martyrs stripped of their official robes and brought to desert places for execution, or for personifications of natural features, such as river gods.

—N.P.S.

COTRIGURS AND UTIGURS (Κοτρίγουροι, Ουτρίγουροι), Turkic peoples, settled in the mid-6th C. north of the Black Sea, between the Dnieper and the Don. At the request of their Gepid allies the Cotrigurs sent a large force against the Lombards in Pannonia. Urged by the Gepids, the Cotrigurs then raided Byz. territory in 551 and withdrew only when their eastern neighbors and kinsmen, the Utigurs, who lived east of the Don, were bribed by the Romans to attack their home territory. The Cotrigurs had seen the wealth of the empire, however, and realized its vulnerability to a fast-moving cavalry force. In 558/9 they crossed the frozen Danube near its mouth and advanced into Byz. territory in three columns. One swept into Greece as far as Thermopylae, the second entered the Kallipolis peninsula, and the third, commanded by ZABERGAN, approached the walls of Constantinople, where their arrival caused consternation until Belisarios drove them away. During their return they were again attacked by the Utigurs; the hostility between the Cotrigurs and the Utigurs continued until both were subdued in the 560s by the Avars, who took some of the Cotrigurs with them to Pannonia. The Utigurs then became part of the Turkic confederation that captured Bosporos (Kerch) in 576, while the rest of the Cotrigurs became part of the Bulgar confederation settled north of the Azov Sea in the mid-7th C.

—R.B.

COTTON GENESIS. See Genesis.

COTYAEUM. See Kotyaion.

COUCHES. See Furniture.

COUNCILS (συνόδοι), formal deliberative bodies of bishops and ecclesiastical representatives (priests, deacons, laymen, or monks) that gathered to discuss and regulate disputed questions of church doctrine and discipline. Such assemblies, which could be ecumenical, metropolitan, episcopal, or patriarchal, expressed the essential nature of the church as community or koinonia. The church was indeed conceived as synodal or conciliar in structure from the beginning. This pattern and practice of conciliarity had in fact become the rule by the 3rd C. As regional meetings of several Christian communities were convoked to discuss controversial issues, with nonparticipating churches being informed of their decisions. Presbyters, deacons, and laymen also attended, but probably only as “observers” or as advisers to the episcopal college.

Ecumenical Councils. Strictly speaking, the early church could only express its conciliar nature on a local rather than an “ecumenical” scale while Christianity was still an illegal religion. When it was recognized in the 4th C., however, universal or ecumenical councils representing—at least in theory—the entire episcopate of the empire became possible. Besides, as the church was seen as coextensive with the empire, reliable pronouncements became more urgent; exact definitions of faith were needed in order to determine imperial policy toward dissident or schismatic groups. This was clearly the primary goal of these assemblies as far as the state was concerned. Accordingly, these larger convocations, unlike the pre-Nicene councils, were given imperial confirmation and the binding force of law. Nicaea I (325), convoked by CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT, was the prototype. Seven such councils—all held in the East—were recognized by the Byz. church as genuinely ecumenical: Nicaea I, Constantinople I, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople II, Constantinople III, and Nicaea II. The eighth “ecumenical” council acknowledged by the West, the council of Constantinople of 869–70, was annulled by the union synod of 879–80. In contrast to the Byz. position, the Roman Catholic church considers as ecumenical several councils convoked by popes; four Lateran synods (1123, 1139, 1179, 1215), two councils of Lyons (1245 and 1274), Vienna of 1311, Constance (1414–18), FERRARA-FLORENCE, etc. Two of them, the Second Council of Lyons and Ferrara-Florence, deliberated problems connected with Byz. (For articles on individual councils, see under site of convocation: e.g., Ephesus, Councils of.)
Significantly, none of the ecumenical councils was convened by a pope. The emperors, who often presided over them (either personally or through their representatives), summoned them. All, moreover, were extraordinary or occasional gatherings. This being so, the canonical literature lacked fixed rules (a typically Byz. phenomenon) concerning their convocation, composition, and organization. Byz. canon law has in fact no philosophy of ecumenical councils.

Although the emperors hoped to use the ecumenical councils as an immediate, binding authority to achieve unanimity or uniformity and cohesion throughout the empire, such councils and their decisions were not accepted mechanically in advance, as divine institutions *de jure divino*. Nicaea I, for example, was not universally acknowledged until 381, while others (Serdica, Hieria, the “Robber” Council of Ephesus, Ferrara-Florence) were eventually accepted as local councils, or rejected as outright heretical concilia-bula, even when they possessed all the criteria of ecumenicity. Their reception therefore was not based on any outward juridical notion of ecumenicity, but on the truth they embodied as authentic organs of episcopal and ecclesial consensus. It was this alone—viewed as a manifestation of Christ’s abiding allegiance to his church—which eventually caused them to be recognized as binding and infallible in authority (J. Meyendorff, *SVThQ* 17 [1973] 267f). Councils quite simply were not above the church.

**Metropolitan Councils.** Unlike ecumenical councils, provincial (or metropolitan) councils were a permanent institutionalized phenomenon: convocations of bishops of a particular province, meeting in the provincial capital under the presidency of the metropolitan, were in place before the 4th C. They met to discuss controversial issues of common concern, but also for episcopal consecrations, which required conciliarity, that is, the presence and participation of all bishops of an ecclesiastical area. Only with Nicaea I, however, were these metropolitan councils permanently established by being ordered to meet twice yearly (canon 5). This regulation was confirmed by Chalcedon (canon 19), but was subsequently changed to a single annual convocation (Trullo, canon 8; Nicaea II, canon 6). The duties of these councils were quite extensive, covering questions of faith, liturgy, morals, discipline, and organization. Nicaea I likewise decreed that the election of a bishop to a vacant see be placed in the hands of all the neighboring bishops of the province (canon 4). These canons mark the beginning of a distinction in ecclesiastical law between different kinds of synods and are, as such, an important stage in the evolution of conciliar theory.

**Episcopal Councils.** The episcopal council was the official assembly of the bishop and clergy of a single bishopric (*paroikia*). It was always under the authority and presidency of the bishop and was responsible for all matters concerning the *paroikia*. This type of council was affected considerably by the new legislation; although not entirely eliminated, it was certainly superseded by the metropolitan council, henceforth viewed as the superior authority. The latter indeed became the higher court of appeal for sentences generated by the lower episcopal council (Nicaea II, canon 3).

**Patriarchal Synods.** The 4th C. also saw the introduction of patriarchal synods, which were councils of the individual patriarchates convoked and presided over by the patriarchs. The most important consultative body of the patriarch of Constantinople was the *endemousa synodos*. This was essentially a permanent “resident” synod with a continuous existence throughout the medieval period in which decisions were reached in collegiality. But regional or local patriarchal councils were also important, particularly after the 11th C. when no ecumenical councils were held because of the schism. In contrast with the *endemousa*, these exceptional, more solemn assemblies held during major doctrinal disputes, included not only metropolitans and bishops, but often also the emperor and members of the senate. Their doctrinal definition (*tomo*) was sometimes included in the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, as was the case with the local councils of Constantinople of 1156–57, 1166–67, and 1351 (see under Constantineople, Councils of). The authority of the Byz. church was not therefore restricted to the age of the seven ecumenical councils alone; essentially, regional councils could be and were accepted as universally valid testimony of the Orthodox faith.

**Time and Place.** Normally circumstance and convenience determined the time and place of meeting for councils. This was the case with ecumenical councils, which had to accommodate not
only large numbers, but individual participants traveling long distances. Provincial councils, however, met at the capital of the province. They could also be convened “at the place where the bishop of the metropolis shall approve” (Chalcedon, canon 19; Trullo, canon 8). The actual convocation was held in a church such as Hagia Sophia, or in a building attached to the church, such as the baptistery or diakonikon, with the imperial residence or palace an alternative choice, as the councils held at Hieria, Blachernai, and Trullo illustrate. Often individual contingents (e.g., the Egyptian and Antiobian at Ephesus and Chalcedon) were housed in different buildings. This did not always prevent riots, bloodshed, or even separate or rump synods, which assembled in order to undermine the work of the majority or opposition (see Serdica and Ephesus), for quite often bishops were accompanied by sizable overzealous parties of supporters consisting of priests, monks, and laitymen. It should be noted that this nonepiscopal (i.e., nonvoting) element was often invited to speak and join in the discussion.

Documents. Minutes of the deliberations were carefully recorded by secretaries, although some, such as the acts of Nicaea I and Constantinople I, have not survived. Those of the endemousa were kept in the chartophylakeion of the patriarchate. The signing of these documents was determined by seniority of ordination or by the traditional order (taxis) of sees. The five major sees of the empire (pentarchy) took precedence over all others. A priest or deacon signed if he had attended as a representative of a particular see. In addition to doctrinal definitions, disciplinary canons regulating the life of both clergy and laity were also frequently issued by councils. Often collected separately, these formed an important component of ecclesiastical law. Occasionally anathemas, excommunications, or depositions (kathairesis) directed against individuals or groups would be attached to the dogmatic decisions. Exile or imprisonment in a monastery often accompanied such ecclesiastical punishments.

Church and State. The secular power was represented in most councils, esp. ecumenical and patriarchal ones. Given the close ties between church and state in Christian Byz., this was both natural and understandable. Imperial interest in the outcome of councils was no doubt one reason the public transportation system (cursus publicus) was placed at the disposal of the bishops at Nicaea I; it also explains why emperors often presided over some councils (cf. Marcian at Chalcedon) and even took part in their deliberations. True, abuses and even compulsion were not unknown (e.g., the submission of Pope Vigilius to Justinian I at Constantinople II [see under Constantinople, Councils of]). Despite the tension caused by such flagrant abuse of imperial power, however, the right of formal decision in matters of faith belonged to the episcopate. Indeed, the church was often successful (though not always immediately) in resisting an emperor’s pressure.

Representations in Art. Surviving depictions of councils assume a form closely related to that of other images of authority such as the Pentecost and the Last Judgment. Following Late Antique schemes such as the council of the gods in the Ambrosian Iliad (see Homer) and the emperor’s presidency at the games on the base of the Obelisk Theodosios, they show a semicircle of hierarchs meeting as a college and supervised by the emperor as epistemonarches.

The earliest images of councils are known only from texts. Six councils were depicted in the Mese, in Constantinople, set up, according to the author of the Life of Stephen the Younger, to edify “country folk, foreigners, and the common people” (PG 100:1172A). By the early 8th C. such pictures were fairly common, including mosaics of the First Council of Nicaea in an unknown church in that city. Mosaics showing structures symbolizing each of the seven ecumenical councils, many reworked in the 12th C. and today fragmentarily preserved, survive in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. After Iconoclasm, council scenes were no longer purely commemorative. In the marginal Psalters, Leo V appears amid Iconoclastic bishops at the Council of 815 to illustrate hypocrisy and bloodthirstiness (Ps 25:4), while Theodosios I presides over the First Council of Constantinople in a miniature in the Paris Gregory reflecting the concern of Photios with both Iconoclasm and the Filioque. Even more central is the position given to an Iconoclast shown condemned by Nicaea II, in the Menologion of Basil II (p.108). The Madrid MS of John Skylitzes devotes a unique series of pictures (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzes, nos. 310–12) to the council that forced the resignation of Patr. Tryphon (927–31). Frescoes of four councils—painted as usual
in the narthex—in the Metropolis at Mistra may have liturgical significance (S. Dufrenne, Les Programmes iconographiques des églises byzantines de Mistra [Paris 1970] 8, 59f). The miniature in Paris, B.N. gr. 1242 (Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.86), that shows John VI Kantakouzenos towering over identifiable metropolitan and Patr. Kallistos I at the Council of 1351 reasserts the traditional meaning of council pictures as images of imperial hegemony in matters of doctrine.


COURT, LAW (δικαστήριον). The emperor was the source of law and the supreme judge who determined the right of appeal and of amnesty; the power to judge was thought to be delegated by him to individual institutions or officials. All government bureaus (σερετα) possessed to some extent the right to condemn and pardon, and even the genikon had its own court; since the heads of departments frequently had no professional legal knowledge, they usually were given symponoi as assistants (Balsamon in Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 3:339.2–9). In the army, strategoi and their subalterns exercised judicial authority. More specific judicial functions were fulfilled by the eparch of the city and the quaestor, whereas the epion deeseon presided over petitions and appeals. As chief of police, the droungarios tes viglas had judicial duties. The imperial judges of the velem or Hippodrome (replaced later by the krítai katholikoi) constituted the highest court. In rare cases the senato discussed crimes of great importance. Bishops, aided by their staff, exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction extending far beyond canon law, and the precise demarcation between civil and ecclesiastical courts was not always clear.

In the provinces, jurisdiction lay in the hands of the local administration, and governors frequently bore the title of judge (krites) or praetor; sometimes special magistrates arrived from Constantinople to hear local cases. Masters were considered the judges of their slaves and servants, unless they were personally involved in the case (Peira 51.1). The concept of judicial immunity was never very highly developed in Byz.


CRAFTSMEN. See ARTISAN; GUILDS.

CREATION (κτίσις ἐκ τοῦ μη ὄντος). The classical formulation of the Christian doctrine of creation states that the cosmos was brought into existence out of nothing through the omnipotence and free will of God. On the other hand, the divine generation (gennessis) of the Son and the Procession (ekporeusis) of the Holy Spirit, interpreted as "creation" and coming into existence by Arians and the Pneumatomachoi, respectively, had to be distinguished from creation of world and mankind; at the same time any doctrine of emanation to explain creation had to be excluded, since it does "not stem from the essence of God" (John of Damascus, Exp. fidel 8.57–78, 81.6–11; ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:20f, 180).

Emphasis on the freedom and contingency of divine creation runs counter to the idea of its eternality and necessity. In this connection, the question as to the motive of creation (why did God create the world?) receives an answer in which the Platonic tradition and esp. pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, that is, the view that the Good continuously generates out of itself, are interpreted to mean that man cannot penetrate the transcendent essence of God who alone is good (Lk 18:19). The question, then, is met by referring to this notion of the essence of the Good: that God creates because he wills to, and not because he is good, an answer that emphasizes the apophatic character of theology (and not, as
in the West, the possibility of theological catastrophic statements). Finally, in connection with the emphasis on God’s freedom in the creation, the Platonic notion that the ideas within the divine mind serve the demiurge as models, insofar as it is given an anthropomorphic interpretation, is rejected.

In spite of the tension that exists between the Platonic cosmological model (presumably based on Gen 1:2 LXX) and belief in the “sovereignty of God,” that is, the unlimited power of God in relation to the world, and in spite of (or even because of) the cosmological speculations of Gnosticism, there slowly developed in early Christianity the doctrine of creation out of nothing that also served as a twofold front against both Gnosticism and philosophy. Nevertheless Plotinus’s interpretation of matter as the final emanation and pure privation (steresis), and Porphyry’s arguments against an eternally preexistent matter, led outwardly to an approach that, for example, in Alexandria in the 5th C., produced a formal (i.e., outward) synthesis in the philosopher Hierokles, who taught that God eternally creates, yet not “out of preexistent matter,” but only on the basis of his will (Photios, Bibl., cods. 214, 251, ed. Henry 3:126.22–26, 7:189.23–191.23). John Philoponos sought, in opposition to Proklos and Aristotle (W. Wieland in Festschrift für Hans-Georg Gadamer [Tübingen 1960] 291–316), to provide the doctrine of creation with a philosophical basis to which he later gave an exegetical foundation by tying it to Basil the Great’s homilies on the Hexaemeron. The cosmology he opposes is that of Theodore of Mopsuestia and his disciple Kosmas Indikopleustes.

In the 11th C., under the influence of the Neoplatonic doctrine of emanation, creation is seen to be continually rooted in the procession and return to God, a “movement proceeding from its origin (arche)” (e.g., John Italos, Quaestiones quoddam libetales, par.69, ed. P. Joannou, pp. 114–17), which constitutes the relationship of the creature to the Creator, except that the difference between them is not addressed. This is observed particularly in commentaries on theological statements of Gregory of Nazianzos.


Representation in Art. Based on the twofold account of Genesis 1:1–2:4 and 2:5–25, representations of the Creation are found in numerous artistic contexts and may be divided into at least three categories, developed probably not much later than Basil the Great’s Hexaemeron. This popular text is preserved in more than 100 MSS, but none of them received narrative illustration. The striking iconographic feature of the days of Creation personified as angels—e.g., in the Cotton Genesis—derived not from biblical exegesis but from Late Antique art (M.-T. d’Alverny, CahArch 9 [1957] 271–300). In another variation type God is present and directs the Creation (Cappella Palatina, Palermo, and Monreale); in a third type, represented by the Octateuchs, the action is carried out by an unseen heavenly power.


CREDITOR (δανειστής), either a professional money-lender (argyroprates or banker) or anyone else to whom money was owed. In Justinianic law and later, social status determined the rate of interest. One could get a loan even from a monastery. Christian public opinion condemned usury and both legal texts and narrative sources describe the cruelty of creditors: Epanagoge 35.1 prohibits creditors from exhuming corpses “under the rationale of debt,” and Demetrios Kydones (Correspondance, ed. Loeneritz 1:30.140–50) describes how a creditor dragged an insolvent debtor from beneath his bed, beat him, “shouted about silver, interest, and months,” and took him before a judge. The hagiographer of St. Philaretos the Merciful sympathizes with a peasant whose ox died and who wanted to run away before his creditors (chreotpheiletai) attacked him like wild beasts (M.H. Fourny, M. Leroy, Byzantion 9 [1934] 119–4–7).

As security the creditor usually received immovables from the debtor—either as a mortgage
or the actual physical possession. If the debtor proved to be insolvent, the ownership of the land, house, or other item was transferred to the creditor.

- A.K.

CREED (σύμβολον), in the strict sense of the word, the short brief exposition of the principles of Christian belief as formulated at the ecumenical councils of NICAEA (325) and the First Council of Constantinople in 381 (see under CONSTANTINOPEL, COUNCILS OF), and as transmitted by the acts of the Council of CHALCEDON (451). Formulas representing the Nicean “creed,” as cited by various theologians, esp. in the commentary of THEODORE OF MOPSTUEIA, do not give a homogeneous text, and the concept of the Nicean creed in the 4th C. seems to have been relatively vague. The creed of Constantinople is also problematic: first of all, it is not mentioned until Chalcedon (an argument ex silentio); secondly, EPIMPHANOS of Cyprus, in a book written seven years before Constantinople I, presents the creed in the same form as that of Constantinople rendered at Chalcedon, although the text of Epiphanius may be interpolated (B.M. Weisgerber, Theologie und Philosophie 53 [1978] 407–14). Thus, the creed of Nicea was developed only over time; it derived from (but did not eliminate) local creeds, probably the creed of Caesarea as attested by EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA. It served as a baptismal formula that eventually assumed the role of the line of demarcation from heresy—whether this happened by 381 or only 451 is not clear. The text of the creed also survived in papyri of the 5th (J. Kramer, ZPapEpig 1 [1967] 131f) and 6th C. (O. Montecucchi, Aegyptus 55 [1975] 58–69).


CRETAN LITERATURE. Little is known of Cretan literary activity until the late 14th C.; by this time, following the division of territories in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade, Venetian feudal overlords and Greek subjects had settled into a relationship in which the Italo-Venetian and Cretan Greek dialects and the Catholic and Orthodox faiths maintained a relatively harmonious coexistence. Of the earliest identifiable writers, Leonardo DELLA PORTA stands apart from Stephen SACHLIKES and MARINOS FALIERI, a younger contemporary, in that he employed a standard form of Greek whereas Sachlikes and Falieri preferred the Cretan dialect. Both the latter demonstrate other features that remained characteristic of Cretan literature until the end of its Golden Age. These are the use of rhymed POLITICAL VERSE and a delight in scenes of comic realism drawn from the back streets and brothels of urban Crete. Cut off from the mainstream of Byz. educational traditions and open to influences from western Europe, writers in Crete showed an acquaintance with the vernacular literatures of Byz., esp. the verse ROMANCES (probably also composed and copied on the fringes of the Byz. world), and an awareness of Venetian literary fashions (esp. sharply observed amatory dialogues) which was to culminate in the masterpieces of George Chroratzis (Erofili, Katsourbos) and VINCENTO KORNARO (Erotokritos).


CRETE (Κρήτη), large island in the eastern Mediterranean, midway between Greece and Africa. In the Roman period Crete was primarily agricultural, with industries producing mainly for the local market (L.F. Sanders, Roman Crete [Warminster 1982] 32–35); the island had numerous poleis—different sources give various figures, from 22 to 29—the most important being GORTYNA and KNossOS. Until 295–97 Crete formed a joint province with CYrene but was then separated and under Constantine I included in the diocese of Macedonia. The administrative changes of the 7th C. are obscure: several seals of archontes of Crete are known (Zacos, Seals 1, no.1782) as well as one of a tourmarches of Crete (no.2059)—but this is not sufficient evidence to postulate the existence of a theme of Crete. The 9th-C. Taktikon of UspeNSKIj lists both the archon and—separately—the stratigos of Crete; this double governorship is still enigmatic.

The island was attacked by the Goths in 268,
Vandals in 457, and Slavs in 623. Sometime between 824 and 827/8 expatriate Spanish Arabs led by Abū Hafs landed in Crete, quickly conquered the whole island, and established their capital at Chandax. The Cretan Arabs had a highly developed urban culture and tolerated Christianity. The Muslim occupation of Crete did, however, leave the whole of the Aegean Sea open to devastating raids from the island. After several efforts by his predecessor had failed, in 961 Nikephoros (II) Phokas reconquered Crete and brought enormous treasure for his triumph to Constantinople (Theodosios the Deacon 2:8). After 961 Crete was under the authority of a strategos; in the 10th-C. Taktikon of Escurial he is placed between those of Cyprus and Hellas (Oikonomides, Listes 265-27). From the time of Alexios I Komnenos until 1204 Crete was administered by a doux or katepano. The bishop of Gortyna was archbishop of Crete from the beginnings of Christianity on the island, originally under the papacy and after 732/3 under the patriarch of Constantinople.

Crete under Venetian Rule. After the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204, Crete was given to Boniface of Montferrat, who sold it to Venice. The island became a source of agricultural products for the Republic, esp. grain, wine, olive oil, cheese, and wood (A. Laiou in Bisanzio e l’Italia [Milan 1982] 183-86); Venetian influence led to the commercialization of Cretan agriculture. The Greek inhabitants seem to have been less involved in commerce than the Latins and Jews; Laiou (supra 193) reckons that Greeks are named in 20 percent of the 14th-C. notarial acts that she studied. Crete was also an important base for Venetian trade with the Levant, esp. Aydin, Menteshe, and the Mamluk territories (E. Zachriadou, Trade and Crusade [Venice 1983] xxxiiiii). The harsh domination of Venice prompted several revolts in which not only the Greek population but also some Venetian nobles participated, as in 1363 (J. Jegerlehner, BZ 12 [1903] 78-125); in 1453 Sifius Vlasto, a Greek from Rethymno, conspired to overthrow the Venetian government but his scheme was betrayed (M. Manoussakas, He en Kretse synomasis tou Sephe Blastou [Athens 1960]). The Orthodox clergy in Crete was limited to 130 members who were under the jurisdiction of the Latin archbishop of the island (Z. Tsirpanlis, Hellenika 20 [1967] 44-72). In spite of all the political and religious restrictions, Venetian Crete was a place where Greek and Latin cultural traditions came into contact, resulting in a revival of art and Greek literature, esp. in the vernacular, by such writers as Stephen Sachlikis and Leonardo della Porta.


Monuments of Crete. The monuments built on Crete before the Arab conquest of the island are impressive for their size and number (more than 40 survive): the churches at Panormos and Gortyna are large three-aisled basilicas built of carefully dressed blocks, the former having a tripartite transept, atrium, and fine architectural carving.

The far smaller medieval buildings were often built into the ruins of these grander structures. None can be dated before the restoration of Byz. rule in 961, and relatively few from the period preceding the Venetian domination, despite the missionary activity of John Xenos and Nikon ho “Metanoiete.” The Church of the Virgin at Myriokephala, part of a monastery founded by Xenos, has a layer of painting dating from the early 11th C. (G. Antourakes, Hai monai Myriokephalon kai Roustikon Kretes meta ton parekklesion auton [Athens 1977]). The Church of St. Panteleimon at Pege (formerly Bizariano) probably dates from the 12th C.; one of its columns was formed by piling four reused Corinthian capitals on top of one another.

The churches erected under the Venetians are, for the most part, modest one-aisled barrel-vaulted structures lacking dome and narthex, built of stone or rubble masonry with little external decoration. The influence of the Venetians appears mainly on the façades, in the occasional pointed arch or ornamental carving. These churches served as private chapels, or were used by small village communities; as the many surviving inscriptions indicate, they were donated by groups of villages as well as by individuals and families. An adjoining church was frequently constructed parallel to the first, and though the two were designed to communicate and could be virtually contemporary, each “aisle” had a different dedication and
different donors. One of the relatively few domed structures is the cruciform Church of the Virgin Gouverniotissa at Potamies (mid-14th C.).

The fresco decoration of these churches was both rich and surprisingly independent of Western influence (although there are three portraits of St. Francis). The earliest dated program is that of St. Anne at Amari (a.1225, S. Papadake-Oekland, DChAE 7 [1973–74] 31–57); many later ones are also precisely dated, and many, esp. those of the 14th C., bear the names of the artists as well; the name of John Pagomenos appears in eight churches in western Crete over the years 1313–47, and that of the Phokas brothers in three churches in eastern Crete from 1436 to ca.1453 (T. Gouma-Peterson, Gesta 22 [1983] 159–70). The small scale of the churches led to a reduction in the scale of the paintings, but not of their content: some of the individual scenes in the grid of fresco panels adorning the barrel vaults are scarcely larger than portable icons. The lack of a dome meant that the bust of Christ Pantokrator was often displaced to the conch of the apse, where it was flanked by the supplicant Virgin and John the Baptist in a Deesis composition. The programs are not as laced with liturgical themes as are those at Mistra, for example, but are rich in narrative, esp. hagiographical subjects (M. Basileke, Kritike Hestia 1 [1987] 60–83), including the life of the Virgin and local saints.

The earliest frescoes of Crete reveal closer ties with the monastic centers of Asia Minor than with the art of Constantinople or even mainland Greece; 13th-C. monuments such as St. George at Sklavopoula (1290/1) are still provincial versions of 12th-C. Komnenian painting. In the 14th C., however, the successive trends in Palaiologan Monumental Painting as evidenced in such centers as Constantinople, Thessalonike, Serbia, and Mistra came to Crete fairly promptly; apparently without any widespread importation of metropolitan artists, this art would take firm root on the island. In the north and south aisles of the Panagia Kera at Kritsa, the 11 scenes of the life of the Virgin and the elaborate Last Judgment are characterized by multifigured compositions with imposing architectural backdrops, melodramatic poses, and exaggerated facial expressions reminiscent of the early 14th-C. works of Michael (Astrapas) and Eutychios (M. Borboudakis, Panagia Kera [Athens, n.d.]; S. Papadake-Oekland, ArchDelt 22 [1967] 87–111), while the frescoes in the church of the Virgin at Sklavopoula (late 14th–early 15th C.) show the influence of the more graceful and wistful "mature" Palaiologan style favored in Constantinople and Mistra. This latter style was ultimately to lead to the development of the so-called Cretan school of painting of the 15th and 16th C.


CRIMEA, known in antiquity as Tauric Chersonese, a large peninsula situated between the Black and Azov Seas; in Byz. Greek texts the term Khazaria is sometimes used for Crimea. The interior was occupied in the 5th C. by the Huns, but in the early 6th C. Byz. established its power at least in the coastal cities of Cherson and Cimmerian Bosporus. Justinian I ordered the restoration of walls and built phouria at Aloustos and Gorzobitai to protect the coastal part of the Crimea (Prokopios, Buildings 3.10–11); the location of the frontier remains under discussion (e.g., E. Vejmann, ADSV 17 [1980] 19–33). Byz. suzerainty was terminated ca.600, and the remnants of urban life dwindled, but it is plausible that the countryside flourished in the 7th–8th C. (A. Jakobson, Rannesrednevekoye sel'skoe poseleminja Jugo-Zapadnoj Tavriki [Leningrad 1970]). The Khazars dominated Crimea from the 7th to 10th C., but from the 9th C. onward Byz. struggled for hegemony, its stronghold being Cherson and the theme of Klimata (see Klima).

The ethnic composition of Crimea was diversified: besides Greeks and the remnants of Scythians and Sarmatians, there were Goths in Dory, Bulgars in the region of Bosporos, Alans and Pechenegs in the interior, and Rus' in nearby Tmutarakan. Armenians and Italians settled in cities of the peninsula from the 13th C. onward. The Byz. designated the local population of Crimea indiscriminately as "Tauroi" or "Tauroscythians."

After 1204 Crimea was at first within the economic sphere of Trebizond; during the period
of Tatar political domination (after 1235) Genoese and Venetians used Crimean towns (esp. Sougdaia and Kaffa) as bases for long-distance trade. In 1475 the entire peninsula fell to the Ottomans.


CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (ἐγκληματικὴ δίκη). The office of public prosecutor was unknown in Byz. law. Nevertheless, criminal procedures could be initiated by the authorities, but there were few laws governing how they were to be carried out. Punishable offenses were often prosecuted on application of a private person. The nature of the crime dictated who was entitled to prosecute: the injured or harmed person alone, or his relatives and anyone else. The accuser was, as a rule, called a kategoros, and the accusation to be recorded in court was an engraphe; however, the blurred distinction between criminal and civil procedure is reflected in the terminology of the sources. Criminal procedure differed from civil procedure in several ways: for example, there were variations in the arrangements for accusation and representation; witnesses had to appear in person; torture played a large role; the accused could be held in custody; a trial could not last more than two years; and the unsuccessful accuser (syko-phantes) was threatened with the same punishment that would have befallen the accused had he been convicted (tautopolheia).


CRISPUS (Κρίσπος), more fully Flavius Julius Crispus, son of Constantine I and Minervina, probably the emperor’s concubine; born ca.305, died Pola 326. A pupil of Lactantius, he was Caesar from 1 Mar. 317 together with the infant Constantine II. He was apparently put in charge of Gaul and acclaimed for victory over the Franks and Alemanni in 320 and 323. He is titled invictus on a milestone from Lorraine—probably an allusion to the cult of Sol Invictus. As commander of the fleet Crispus played a notable role in the defeat of Licinius in 324, but in 326 was suddenly executed. Aurelius Victor says specifically that this was by order of his father, and many authors (John Chrysostom, Sidonius Apollinaris, etc.) saw a link between his death and the subsequent murder of his stepmother Fausta. Zosimos was the first to relate that Crispus came under suspicion of being involved with Fausta; when Constantine had him murdered, Helena took the loss of her grandson very hard, and Constantine, in order to placate her, placed Fausta in an overheated bath where she suffocated. P. Guthrie (Phoenix 20 [1966] 327f) dismisses any connection between the two murders, but his arguments are not convincing; Crispus must have committed or at least been charged with a serious crime, the nature of which remains uncertain.

CRITICISM, LITERARY, was stimulated in Byz. by the necessity to take a stand with regard to the literary heritage of antiquity. The first task was the assemblage, systematization, and categorization of the surviving texts; this took the form of compiling various lexika and florilegia and establishing the canon of selected authors and works. A greater challenge was the appreciation of classical literature: rejected by radical Christians like Tatian owing to its allegedly amoral character, it was sanctioned—at least as a valid instrument in aiding logic and rhetoric—by such authorities as Gregory of Nazianzos, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil the Great, and, to a lesser degree, John Chrysostom. The judgment was pronounced on the basis of ideological criteria, not literary ones; this ideological approach survived in much later centuries as well and is exemplified by the refutation by Constantine Akropolites of the Timarion. On the other hand, literary critics applied allegorical reinterpretation to pagan texts, esp. to the antique and late antique romances, some of which were seen as the story of the soul’s longing for salvation (Poljakova, Roman. 43–48). Photios, in his Bibliotheca, included a literary evaluation of the books he had read as well as their moral significance (G. Kustas, Hellenika 17 [1962] 132–69). Psellus contributed much to literary criticism: he wrote a stylistic appreciation of the work of a hagiographer, Symeon Metaphrastes; analyzed the rhetorical skill of Gregory of Nazianzos (Mayer, “Psellos'
Rede" 27–100); and compared George of Pisidia with Euripides (A. Dyck, Michael Psellus: The Essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius [Vienna 1986]). Psellus emphasized two contradictory principles of a successful literary style—its variety in vocabulary, meter, and form and its internal unity (Ljubarskij, Psell 158f). Eustathios of Thessalonike and Theodore Metochites also analyzed the style of ancient models, such as Plutarch and Synesios, and John Merkouropoulos (see John VIII Chrysostomites) tried to characterize the literary achievements of John of Damascus and Kosmas the Hymnographer.


CROATIA (Χροβατία), northwestern Balkan state, created by Croatian Slavs, who moved into the area in the 7th C. According to Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp. 31.68–70, 83–84) there were two different Croatian states—Pannonian Great or White Croatia, which was pagan, and baptized Dalmatian Croatia; the latter included the kastra of Nin (Nona), Biograd (Belgradon), one of many "white towns"), Velica (Beltin, and Skradin (Skordona). Constantine asserts that the Croatians were settled there by Emp. Heraclios.

The early centuries of Croatian history are obscure. In Charlemagne’s time the region came under Frankish domination. After his death (814), a rebellion by Pannonian Croatians was crushed by the Franks, but Dalmatian Croatia gained strength under local princes. It obtained papal recognition of its independence in 879, under Prince Branimir (879–92). During the rule of Prince Tomislav (from between 910 and 914 to ca.928) Dalmatian and Pannonian Croatia were united, thus creating a powerful state. In about 923 the Byz. emperor Romanos I sent an embassy to Tomislav to form an alliance with Croatia and Serbia against Symeon of Bulgaria; Symeon’s invasion of Croatia turned into a disaster for Bulgarian troops. It is unclear how and why, but Tomislav then abandoned his Byz. alliance and sought papal support; by 925 Rome acknowledged him as a king.

Probably the danger of Venetian penetration persuaded Tomislav’s successors to turn again to Byz.; at any rate, King Peter Kresimir IV (1058–74) acted as representative of the Byz. emperor in Byz. Dalmatia. Culturally Croatia became further removed from Constantinople when two ecclesiastical conventions in Split (1060 and 1074) condemned and prohibited the Slavonic liturgy, but it survived in many peripheral churches. This anti-Byz. attitude was further developed by King Zvonimir (1075–89/90), under whom Croatia entered a period of internal instability and Hungarian intervention. In 1102 Croatia became united with Hungary, but remained a distinct state, with the Hungarian king being separately elected and crowned as king of Croatia (until 1235). Thereafter Croatia had no further involvement with Byz. affairs.


CROSS (σταυρός), symbol of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ. From the earliest years of Christianity the paradox that through his death on the cross Christ destroyed the power of death and offered the hope of eternal life to mankind has made the cross a symbol of Christianity.

THEOLOGY OF THE CROSS. Although the cult of the cross (see CROSS, CULT OF THE) did not blossom until the 4th C., theological development of the symbolism of the cross had already begun in the writings of the Apostolic period, with particular reference to Old Testament prototypes (prefigurations) of the cross as, for example, Moses’ attitude of prayer in the victory over the Amalekites, the Tree of Life, and the bronze serpent. The numerous Byz. sermons pertaining to the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross are devoted chiefly to these prototypes. Surviving examples of these homilies represent a kind of hymnic litany extolling the cross as the sign of victory and salvation (e.g., Makarios Chrysokallos, PG 150:177C). The church fathers repeatedly express their wonder that what was once a symbol of shame became in Christianity a symbol of honor for both crowned heads and simple people, and is treated as such in every church and square and found even on clothing and ordinary utensils (see "The Cross in Everyday Life," below). The danger that the symbol of the cross might degenerate into something meaningless and commonplace is
expressed, among other ways, in a decree of Emp. Valentinian III (Cod. Just. I 8, a.427) and in a resolution of the Council in Trullo (canon 73) forbidding incorporation of the cross into a church floor where it could be trampled underfoot.

Perhaps the most significant theology of the cross is that of John Chrysostom. In many of his sermons, devoted wholly or in part to this theme, he treats the multifaceted mystery of the cross. Beginning with the worldwide spread of Christianity, he emphasizes the central position of the cross as the work of philanthropia, or the symbol of God's providential care (kedemonia) for the world. Rooted in the cross is the salvation of the world because Christ gave his life (psyche) as ransom for the enemy (Chrysostom, PG 58:622.53-55). Referring to St. Paul (Col. 2:14), Chrysostom proclaims that the baptism and the cross canceled the contract that pledged us to the Law and that stood against us: "Not only was it canceled but torn to pieces, the nails of the cross cleft it, made it invalid" (PG 50:462.54-463.1). Through the erection of the cross the air is purged of demons, the citadel of the Devil destroyed. Thus, the cross became the monument to the flight of the enemy. As the Devil conquered Adam through the wood of the Tree of Life, so Christ overcomes Hell through the wood of the cross, leading men who are held captive there to freedom. Through Christ, the sol justitiae, the cross is also immersed in the transfigured light of God. This theological conception yields the artistic form of the crux gemmata, that is, the cross of gold or mosaic overlaid with pearls and precious stones (A. Lipinsky, FelRav 3 30 [1960] 5-62). Chrysostom also considers it obvious that the "sign of the Son of Man" is the cross that precedes Christ in his Parousia or Second Coming.

The veneration of the cross was furthered significantly through Constantine I the Great's vision of the cross at the Milvian Bridge in 312, by Helena's discovery of the True Cross, and by the development of the cult of the cross in the 4th C. and later. It was also advanced by liturgical development in the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, whose status was further intensified by Emp. Herakleios's recovery of the True Cross from the Sasanians and its restoration to Jerusalem in 631. For a brief time Iconoclasm also contributed to the portrayal of the cross as an alternative to icons. The Christian attitude of prayer facing east was fixed by mounting a cross in this direction; it also counteracted the orientation of the Jewish Temple and the Marcionites and Phoundagiagites, who prayed facing west.

The liturgy of the triumphal cross was taken as a model for the acclamations for the victorious emperor returning home. The emperor bore the cross on his diadem as a symbol of Christ's sovereignty, while the monks wore this symbol on their headgear or kououlion (J. Engemann in Theologia crucis—Signum crucis: Festschrift E. Dinkler [Tübingen 1979] 137-53). The Patria of Constantinople describes the erection of the cross in the public square of the capital city (probably done first under Theodosios I). The sign of the cross, which was used in all the sacraments, but particularly in the administration of baptism, was made as the eschatological seal of righteousness in the name of Christ. A sermon on the life-giving cross (pseudo-Chrysostom) gives a comprehensive description in one particular passage: "We [i.e., Christians] have for our ship [anti skaphos] the Old and New Testaments, the cross as our helm, Christ as our helmsman, the Father as our captain, the Holy Spirit as our west wind, grace as our sail, the disciples as our sailors, the prophets as our soldiers; we direct ourselves, therefore, beyond the ship into the ocean of thought not to extract a pearl, but something more valuable even than the pearl" (PG 50:817).


The Cross in Everyday Life. The sign of the cross dominated every aspect of daily life: it marked churches, graveyards, religious foundations in general, and house altars. Believing it to be the only true weapon against demonic and evil powers, the faithful wore it around their necks or had it stamped or embroidered on their clothes. To ward off misfortune, the sign of the cross was engraved or carved in a prominent place on city walls, public buildings, bridges, dangerous passes, and private homes. The Second Council of Nicaea ruled that the cross is properly set up not only in churches and on sacred vessels and images but
also “in houses and on streets” (Mansi 13:377CD).
At times of pestilence, drought, or flooding the
faithful carried crosses in litanies led by the clergy.
Miraculous salvation from such natural catastro-
phes was affirmed with the sign of the cross, as
when Theodore of Sykeon gave a blessing and
made the sign of the cross after concluding a
miracle (vita, ed. Festugiére, ch.43:56). On the
banks of a flooded river, at the boundaries of
vineyards or cultivated fields ready for harvest,
or at a place from which evil spirits had previously
escaped, a cross would be erected or carved to
ensure protection against demonic powers (Ibid.,
ed. Festugiére, ch.43:45, ch.45:21–22, ch.53:5,
ch.114:41, ch.144:4, ch.155:15–16). Similarly, a
newly launched ship bore the sign of the cross on
its masts, bow, and stern. Farm animals were also
blessed with the sign of the cross.
Marks of the cross have been widely found in
quarries, apparently used to lend spiritual strength
to the workers’ technical skills (Sodini et al., Alichi
1 124–26). They were painted on the walls of
churches—together with inscribed prayers at To-
kali Kilise in Göreme—before being covered with
more elaborate decoration. Replacing the laba-
rum, the cross was a common sign of faith on
weapons. Gregory Abu’l-Faraj noted among the
loot taken by the Arabs from the Byz. in 887 gold
and silver crosses from the heads of their spears.
During a celebration in honor of the True Cross
that lasted from 28 July to 13 Aug., the houses,
walls, and other buildings in Constantinople were
blessed (De cer. 539:19–21). The illiterate signed
documents by simply drawing a cross; inscriptions
and the signatures of the literate on documents
were usually preceded by a cross.
Occasionally there were acts of impiety such as
swearing and taking false oaths on the cross (Kou-
koules, Bios 3:363, 377) or even faking miracles—
discovering supposedly hidden crosses and pre-
senting them to the faithful, thereby exploiting
their piety (vita of Lazaros of Mt. Galesios, AASS
Nov. 3:512f).
LIT. Hunger, Reich 182–84.

-Cross, Cult of the
Though John Chrysostom says that Christ “did not leave the Cross on
earth but seized it and carried it up to heaven” (PG 49:403:61–3), legends of the finding and
identification of the True Cross by Helena in
the first half of the 4th C. abound. By the second
half of the 4th C. relics of the Cross, used as
amulets—though the practice was condemned by
canon 36 of the Council of Laodikeia ca.360–90
(Mansi 2:570; Gregory of Nyssa, Vie de sainte Ma-
crine, ed. P. Maraval [Paris 1971] 240f, n.2)—had
spread from Jerusalem to Antioch, Cappadocia,
and Constantinople. Circa 384 Egeria described
the beginnings of the liturgical cult of the Cross
on Good Friday in Jerusalem: on Golgotha behind
the chapel of the Cross the bishop took his seat,
and the Wood of the Cross and the Title were
taken out of their box and placed on a table. The
relics were guarded by deacons to prevent the
pilgrims from biting off a piece as they passed to
kiss the Wood (Diary 37:2–3). Egeria also furni-
nishes our earliest description of the 14 Sept. feast
of the Cross in Jerusalem, where it celebrated the
finding of the Cross, associated with an earlier
13–14 Sept. dedication feast of the cathedral com-
plex on Golgotha.
The rite of the Elevation of the Cross is first
attested at the Golgotha martyrion in the 6th C.
(ed. H. Usener, Der hl. Theodosios, Schriften des
Theodoros u. Kyrillos [Leipzig 1890] 71). The 7th-
C. Chronicon Paschale speaks of the exposition
of the Cross (staurophanes) on 14 Sept. (1:531:9–
d2), and testifies to the exaltation (hypsosis) rite in
Hagia Sophia on that day in 614 (705:3–6). In
the rite of Constantinople this exaltation theme
overshadowed the earlier inventio motif, and the
ritual exaltation became the central ceremony,
celebrated with the greatest solemnity (Mateos,
Typicon 1:24; De cer., bk.1, ch.31 [32]). For four
days (10–13 Sept.) the wood of the Cross was
exposed for veneration, and the Sunday before
and after the feast and its vigil (paramene) were
all directed toward the celebration. On 14 Sept.
itself, at orthros in Hagia Sophia, the patriarch
entered in solemn procession bearing the relic of
the Cross, escorted by the emperor and court
dignitaries bearing candles. They formed an honor
guard along the ambo and solea as the patriarch
mounted the ambo with “the precious wood.”
After prostration and prayer, the patriarch ele-
vated the relic of the Cross thrice to the four
corners of the earth, then the people came for-
ward to venerate the relic. After the service the
emperor offered a banquet in the Triklinos of
Justinian (Oikonomides, Listes 222f). In the 14th
The exaltation rite took place on a platform erected in the Triklinos (pseudo-Kod. 239–40).

In the Sabaitic typika this feast is one of the 12 Byz. Great Feasts and the only nonbiblical dominical feast. It does not celebrate Jesus' passion, like Good Friday, but the Cross as instrument of salvation, the triumphant symbol of Jesus' victory over death.

One of two Byz. feasts that are fast days, the Exaltation is solemnized by a forefeast with agrypnia and a week-long afterfeast with apodosis. The festive propers for 14 Sept. in the menaion are repeated on Holy Cross Sunday in the triodion, the Third Sunday of Lent (but cf. Mateos, Typikon 2:38–45).

Historical Development. The veneration of the Cross was concentrated on two "historical" events—the vision of the Cross by Constantine I the Great on the eve of his victory over Maxentius in 312 and the appearance of the Cross in Jerusalem in 351 as described by Cyril of Jerusalem in his letter to Constantius II (E. Bihain, Byzantion 43 [1973/4] 264–96). To this a third "historical" event was added—the discovery of the Cross by St. Helena and Makarios, "patriarch" of Jerusalem. The relic of the True Cross was captured by the Persians who seized Jerusalem in 614, but recovered by Herakleios and restored to Jerusalem in 631. Enormous literature has been devoted to the veneration of the Cross, the treatise of Alexander the Monk being one of the most important works on the subject; unfortunately, the traditional dating in the mid-6th C. cannot be substantiated. The cult of the Cross acquired a particular significance under the Iconoclast emperors of the 8th C., when the Cross was treated as the symbol of the Christian church—on the other hand, the Iconodules emphasized that the Cross is only one of a number of symbols and no more important than the icon. The Iconoclasts stressed the mili-
tary function of the Cross as the instrument of victory; this victory-giving role of the Cross is developed also in the hymns of Kosmas the Hymnographer, whereas John of Damascus remained lukewarm with regard to this theme. A legend of the Iconoclast period recounts that Constantine the Great erected in Constantinople three crosses named Jesus, Christ, and Victory (Herakleios renamed the latter Aniketos, Unvanquished); these crosses were located in the Forum, Philadelphia, and Artopoleion, places that served as stations during the victory celebrations of the 6th C. The Cross remained a military symbol throughout the 10th C.


RFT. A.K.

CROSS, PROCESSIONAL. The carrying of crosses in procession is attested at least as early as 499, when clergy, monks, and lay persons of both sexes, armed with such emblems, traversed Edessa to appease the Providence that had caused an earthquake (JoshStyl 27). Crosses were carried in churches during the LITTLE ENTRANCE and through cities, as in the procession of the patriarch of Constantinople from Hagia Sophia to the Forum of Constantine (De cer. 29.16–17). A miniature in the Menologion of Basil II (p.142) depicts a deacon bearing through the streets a huge pearled cross with pendant jewels, supported by a strap around his neck.

Surviving processional crosses, made of a variety of metals, may be identified by a tanga at the base for insertion in a staff and sometimes by their decoration on both sides. At least two crosses of the 10th–11th C. are referred to as a signon in the texts inscribed upon them (C. Mango, infra 42). In inventories they may be called litanikoi (will of Eustathios Bollas) or baiophorikoi stauroi (Diataxis of Michael Attaleiates). Such docu-

ments suggest their role in the liturgies of even small churches and chapels, when they may have been of quite modest size. Preserved processional crosses of the 6th–7th C. average 30–60 cm in height; they often have flaring arms terminating in small knobs and have suspension holes for pendants—sometimes the Apocalyptic letters alpha and omega. Usually made of hammered silver, some bear dedicatory inscriptions (Mango, Silver 87–91, 235, 249). Post-Iconoclastic crosses in both silver and bronze retain these features but frequently have disks at the ends of their arms or melon-shaped fittings (DOCat 1:59f).

Most surviving examples in silver consist of sheets wrapped around an iron core (L. Bouras, The Cross of Adrianople [Athens 1979]) that may be decorated in repoussé on the obverse and with niello and gilding on the reverse, as on the so-called Cross of Michael I Keroularios. Elaborate processional crosses could be decorated with the Deesis or with scenes pertaining to their donor or the patron saint of a church. The most impressive post-Iconoclastic specimen is the monumental cross of Nikephoros II Phokas in the Lavra on Mt. Athos (A. Grabar, CahArch 19 [1969] 99–125), which is embellished with gems and busts of saints in repoussé.


CROSSING OF THE RED SEA, the escape of the Israelites from Egypt across the Red Sea, whose waters parted miraculously (Ex 14:15–30). This event offered a promise of salvation, both personal and collective, that was visualized as early as the 4th C. in the Via Latina catacomb and on numerous sarcofagi. Didymos the Blind (PG 39:691–8), John Chrysostom, and others treated the Crossing as a type of baptism (F. Dolger, Antike und Christentum 2 [1930] 63–69). As an image of salvation, the passage was chanted in the ambo of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, on Holy Saturday (Mateos, Typicon 2:84–85). The main application of the image derived from the analogy drawn with Constantine I’s triumph at the Milvian Bridge (Eusebios, HE 9.9.8); it provided a basis for imperial victory celebrations in the mid-10th C. (De cer. 610.2–5). Contemporaneously, the triumphal song chanted by Moses entered Ode
illustration. A miniature in the Paris Psalter shows Night (Nyx), Bythus, and other personifications participating in the Israelites' triumph. With or without these additions, the Crossing remained a standard component of Psalter and other Old Testament illustration.


CROSS-IN-SQUARE CHURCH. See Church Plan Types.

CROTONE (Krótôv), also called Cotrone, coastal city in Calabria. It was an important stronghold during the Gothic wars in Italy: Totila's army besieged it in 551/2, but Justinian I sent a special fleet that saved the city (Prokopios, Wars 4.25.24—26.2). During the Lombard invasion the Byz. continued to hold Crotone. Several important battles were waged near the city: Gay (Italie 937) suggests that in 982 Otto II chased the Arabs from Crotone but was defeated the same year; in 1052 the Normans routed Argyros, son of Melo, at Crotone.

Legend has it that Dionysios the Areopagite, on his way from Athens to Paris, stopped at Crotone and was for a while its bishop. The city's first attested bishop, however, was Jordanes in 551. Bishops of Crotone attended councils at Constantinople in 680, 757, and 870. When the metropolis of Reggio-Calabria was created in the early 9th C, Crotone was one of its suffragans. —A.K.

CROWN (στέφανος, στέμμα), with purple robes and boots, the imperial insignia par excellence. Coins are the best guide to the chronology of changes in crown design, which evolved from simple to complex. Various terms designate crowns of different types, but their rigor and the exactness of modern identifications of terms and designs is unclear. Constantine I adopted the Hellenistic symbol of the diadem and its evolution dominated crowns down to the 12th C. It consisted essentially of a circle of jeweled panels with hanging ornaments called prependoulia and surmounted by a cross; it was sometimes combined with helmets. A 10th-C. ceremonial book (De cer., bk.1, ch.37, ed. Vogt 1:175.10—178.15) refers to red, white, blue, or green crowns, perhaps indi-

cating cloth linings. The torque was used as a crown in coronations from 360 to the 6th C. and may have developed into the collar depicted in imperial portraiture from the 11th C. Modern studies of the late Byz. crown call it kamelaukion and emphasize its golden top that covered the head. The modiolos seems to have been used from the 5th to 13th C. Another kind of crown, the crested toupha, was particularly associated with military events. Empresses' crowns resembled emperors' diadems, except that they normally showed triangular elements projecting upward from the circle. Late Roman caesars shared other imperial insignia, but not the diadem (Zosim. 6.13.1, ed. Mendelssohn, 293.10—12; Vita Marcelli 34, ed. G. Dagron, AB 86 [1968] 316); Byz. heirs presumptive wore some kind of headgear, for example, the kamelaukion (De cer., bk.2, ch.27, ed. Reiske, 628.5—10) and phakiolion (De cer., "Append.", ed. Reiske, 500.12—15).

Crowns were worn during ceremonies. Emperors possessed several, of which particular crowns do not seem to have been handed down, as in the West. Some were buried with the emperor, others given to churches as votive offerings (Theoph. 281.16—20, 453.87—30). Late Roman emperors removed their crown as a sign of mourning (Malal. 421.16—21; Theoph. 173.1—7), penance, and usually—to the 10th C. at least—when they went to church. This custom had changed by Palaiologan times, when it was specified (pseudo-Kod. 268.4—20) that the emperor should remove the crown during communion. When not worn, crowns, like other insignia, were entrusted to court eunuchs. The praepositus usually crowned or uncrowned the emperor (Theodosius in Itineraria et alia geographica [Turnholt 1965] 123.13—124.6). Crowns were kept in cases called korniklia (De cer., bk.1, ch.1, ed. Vogt, 1:4.17).

Client rulers received crowns and other insignia thanks to Byz. diplomacy. The Hellenistic custom of offering golden crowns or wreaths to emperors, as at adventus, became a tax (aurum coronarium) and, in the 9th and 10th C., a symbolic exchange (McCormick, Eternal Victory 211f).

Surviving Examples of Byz. Crowns. Whereas representations of Byz. diadems are copious on diptychs, coins, wall paintings, miniatures, and so forth, few actual specimens have been preserved. Some pieces of an imperial crown were found in
1860 near the Hungarian village of Nyitraivánka; it is unclear how this diadem came to Hungary—as an imperial gift or after the looting of Constantinople in 1204. Z. Kádár (Folia archaeologica 16 [1964] 121f) reconstructs the iconography of the crown as follows: in the center was the Pantokrator flanked by personifications of Modesty (Tapeinosis) and Truth (Atheyelia); below them was a portrait of Constantine IX Monomachos with Zoe and her sister Theodora; on the back King David was represented with Sophia and Propheteia; the three dancing women beneath them suggest that it must have been a festive event (wedding or coronation) that caused the crown to be made.

The lower part of the so-called Hungarian crown of St. Stephen (corona graeca) contains portraits of Michael VII Doukas, his brother or son Constantine, and the Hungarian king Géza I; it was probably sent from Constantinople between 1074 and 1077 as a present to the ruler of Hungary, although Deér (infra) questions that the object was originally intended to be a crown.

Imperial crowns are made of precious metals and ornamented with precious stones and enamels. Much more modest are two tin-plated copper crowns (in the Byz. Museum of Athens) with inscriptions mentioning the spatharokandidatos Romanos, his wife, and children; the objects, probably of the 11th C., may have served either as an altar decoration or as marriage crowns. —A.K.


CROWNING. See Marriage Rite.

CRUCIFIXION. Christ’s death on the Cross (σταύρωσις), the culminating event of the Passion of Christ, was not depicted until the 5th C.; the earliest surviving representations are from the late 6th C. (RABBULA GOSPELS, fol.131T; SANCTA SANCTORUM, RELIQUARY; AMPULLAE). They include many participants—the Virgin Mary, John the Apostle (or Theologian), thieves, soldiers playing dice, the lance- and the sponge-bearer—and most versions show Christ with open eyes, in spite of the open wound on his side as the unmistakable sign of death. This is explained by the theology of the cross of John Chrysostom, who provided a profoundly Antiochene stamp: “Because God loved the world (Jn 3:16), his temple, endowed with a soul, was crucified” (PG 59:159.7–8). The anti-Monophysite emphasis on Christ’s mortal corporeality attests, through the simultaneously opened eyes, the inseparability of the divine Logos from the body and soul of the dead Christ (only the body of Christ sleeps on the cross, while his divinity remains awake). Post-Iconoclastic images show Christ dead with closed eyes, blood and water flowing from his side, to demonstrate his humanity (J. Martin in LCMS 189–96). In these representations he wears a loincloth rather than the earlier COLOBIUM.

In the marginal PSALTERS scenes of Christ being led to the cross, and its raising, indicate that narrative cycles of the Crucifixion existed by the 9th C. In the 10th–12th C., when the scene had become the feast icon for GOOD FRIDAY, the composition focused on the figures of Christ, Mary, and John, only sometimes adding further, symbolic motifs: mourning MYROPHOROI; the centurion Longinus (the first person converted by Christ’s death); personifications of EKKLESIA and Synagogue; Mary fainting beneath the Cross. In Palaiologan art the narrative is again enriched with crowds of onlookers and additional scenes (cf. the long cycles of the Crucifixion at STARIO NAGORICINO and GRAČANICA). A crucifix was placed on top of the TEMPLE FROM the 12th C. onward.


CRUSADER ART AND ARCHITECTURE. The presence of CRUSADER STATES in Syria and Palestine between 1099 and 1291 set the stage for vigorous artistic activity, esp. at the LOGA SANCTA in JERUSALEM, BETHLEHEM, and NAZARETH, formerly under Byz. control and at that time possessed by the Latin Kingdom. Crusader art was sponsored mainly by the resident Franks, but the artists who carried out these commissions in-
cluded western Europeans, indigenous Christians, Frankish artists born in the Crusader states, Armenians, and Byz. Greeks.

After the capture of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099, the Crusaders were challenged to settle and defend newly won territory. From 1099 to 1231 defensive architecture was a high priority, but church building was also attended to. After 1112 in Jerusalem, Crusader architects boldly unified the great Byz. rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre with the Calvary chapel to create a pointed-arch, rib-vaulted French type of pilgrimage church, reusing portions of the Byz. mosaic program. In Bethlehem, the Church of the Nativity was captured intact in 1099; the Crusaders used this Justinianic building for their early coronations and decorated it starting in 1130 with fresco painting in Romanesque styles on the nave columns. In Nazareth, by 1107 TANGRED had rebuilt the Church of the Annunciation on ruins of Byz. buildings. The barrel-vaulted Latin basilica with transepts is used at Nazareth and in Jerusalem in the Church of St. Anne, started shortly after 1113.

The richest and most diverse artistic output of the Crusaders was in the 12th C., esp. between 1131 and the early 1180s. When Melisende (died 1161), eldest daughter of BALDWIN II and his Armenian wife Mornia, came to the throne in 1131, her personal patronage apparently stimulated much activity in and around Jerusalem. The most famous work directly associated with her is the Psalter (London, B.L. Egerton 1139), completed by 1143. Three artists executed the illustrations, all Western-trained, but strongly if differently influenced by Byz.; one of them, Basilios, signed the DEESIS image in Latin. Taken together, the paintings, the text of the calendar with its notable English features, and the ivory covers with a Byz.-looking prince engaged in works of mercy, a Western iconographical concept, epitomize the mélange of East and West that characterizes Crusader art.

Completing the Holy Sepulchre was the most important project of the 1130s and 1140s. The double portal of the main façade echoes the Byz. design of the Golden Gate in Jerusalem. The rich sculptural decoration included elements from Roman, Early Christian, and Arab sources along with Byz.-inspired mosaics in the west tympanum, acanthus capitals, and two Romanesque lintels. At its dedication on 15 July 1149, the Holy Sepulchre must have been a spectacular monumental statement of the interpenetration of artistic traditions that characterized the new Frankish art. Elsewhere in Jerusalem, sculpture in a robust French style decorated the Hospitaller complex, while on the Haram al-Sharif some of the most beautiful nonfigural Crusader sculpture, featuring a wet-leaf acanthus motif in an Italo-Provençal manner, seems to have been sponsored by the Templars.

At Tyre the Byz. church was rebuilt, while at Ramla and nearby Lydda (Diospolis) the smaller churches of St. John and St. George, respectively, demonstrated the more typical Romanesque-Levantine basilica with a flat stone roof and a Near Eastern vocabulary of architectural sculpture. Some of the best known Crusader castles, such as Saone, Krak des Chevaliers, and Belvoir, were begun or rebuilt in these years. Finally, Nazareth and Bethlehem emerge between 1150 and 1187 as major centers of sculpture and painting respectively. The Nazareth capitals, reflecting Romanesque style, Byz. iconography, and Islamic muqarnas, are the best-preserved examples of a major atelier from which nearly 100 figural fragments survive (J. Folda, The Nazareth Capitals and the Crusader Shrine of the Annunciation [University Park, Pa.–London 1986]). The frescoes painted on the nave columns in the Church of the Nativity include a series in the Byz. style and extensive mosaics signed by Basilios and Ephraim. They were completed by 1169 under the patronage of the local bishop, King AMALRIC I, and Emp. MANUEL I Komnenos. The strong Byz. influence here and nearby in the frescoes of the Hospital church at Abu-Ghosh, along with the contemporary products of the Holy Sepulchre scriptorium, reflect the close ties between the Latin Kingdom and the Byz. Empire from the mid-1160s to the death of Amalric (1174).

Saladin's conquest drastically reduced the artistic output of the Crusaders. Only a few places held out, including the castles of Krak des Chevaliers and Margat where frescoes in Byz. style were completed despite the difficult circumstances. Tripoli, Tyre, and Antioch also remained in Crusader hands and the Third Crusade quickly restored Acre (1191), but not Jerusalem. For a century Acre was the major port and the political and artistic center of the Latin Kingdom.

Artistic activity in the Crusader states was thus diminished until the mid-13th C. Castle building
continued of necessity but only one important church was completed, Nôtre-Dame of Tartus. Only one major MS has been attributed to the period: the psalter, possibly commissioned ca.1235 by Frederick II, combining English and Byz. aspects—notably a thoroughly Byz. Nativity and prophets holding scrolls with texts translated from the Septuagint—with a German approach to the program of scenes (Buchthal, Latin Kingdom 40–43).

Artistic output, esp. painting, increased sharply after 1250, stimulated by Louis IX who resided in the Latin Kingdom from 1250 to 1254. The illustrations for an Old French Bible apparently commissioned by Louis are in an accomplished Franco-Byz. style strongly related to frescoes painted in Kalenderhane Camii in Constantinople during the period of Latin occupation. Icons on wood panels demonstrate Byz. influence, while the strength of the Italo-Byz. style reflected the Italian presence in the merchant quarters of Acre. Paralleling developments in the West, secular codices became increasingly popular. A Histoire Universelle, possibly prepared as a gift for Henry II of Lusignan, has a frontispiece showing the impact of Islamic art. Surprisingly, the last important painter in Acre used a purely French Gothic style for the Hospitallers. Recently arrived from Paris, he worked in Acre in the decade before its fall in 1291.


CRUSADER CASTLES. In the East the Crusaders, familiar with the motte-and-bailey castle, encountered Byz. and Arabic fortifications, esp. a descendant of the Roman castra (rectangular, with corner towers) and the irregular mountain-crest castle, usually with several defensive lines on the weakest approach. A vast Byz. crag-type fortification, perhaps 10th C., became the castle of Saone (Sahyûn, between Laodikeia and the Orontes). In the 13th C., this pattern was used on a peninsula at Château Pélérin (‘Atlit, between Haifa and Caesarea). In Frankish Greece, after 1204, the Crusaders adapted these plans to their needs. Refortified classical and Byz. sites include the Acropolis of Athens and Acrocorinth (see Corinth). Chlemoutsi (Clermont) in Elis is an irregular hollow hexagon crowning a low hill. Karytaina is a crest-type castle above a gorge in the central Peloponnesos; Plamaton and Boudonitzza defend the vale of Tempe and a pass near Thermopylae, respectively.


CRUSADER STATES. The states first founded by the Crusaders were on former Muslim territory, where the principal vestiges of Byz. rule were the Christian minorities (Melchites, Jacobites, Maronites). These states included the kingdom of Jerusalem, the principality of Antioch, the county of Edessa, and the county of Tripoli.

Upon lands that the Crusaders later conquered from Byz., the Crusaders founded the kingdom of Cyprus, the Latin Empire of Constantinople, the kingdom of Thessalonike, the principality of Achâia, the duchy of Athens, the duchy of Naxos, and various lesser feudal units. Venice assumed direct rule over Crete, Methone and Korone in the Morea, and eventually Euboia, while Genoa acquired Chios, Lesbos, and Phokaia. Rhodes passed to the Hospitallers. The populations of these states and dependencies were Byz. or partially Byzantinized Slavs and Vlachs. In the Crusader states an aristocracy of Western knights and lords was superimposed on the local society. While the aristocracy followed Western feudal customs, enshrined in the Assizes of Jerusalem and of Romania, the populace generally observed Byz. law, paid dues modeled on what they had paid the emperors, and maintained their Orthodox religion.


CRUSADES were military expeditions launched by popes, initially against infidels for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The term “bearer of the Cross” (staurophoros), known from Greek texts from the 4th C. onward, has been
construed as referring to monastic life, not Crusaders. The idea of the holy war prevailed during Herakleios's expeditions against the Persians. This idea reappeared in the West in the writing of Pope Gregory VII and assumed final form in the proclamation of Pope Urban II.

Alexios I was partially responsible for inspiring the Crusades. In March 1095 his envoys met Urban II at Piacenza and appealed for Western help against the Seljuk Turks. The pope publicly urged assistance to Byz. On 27 Nov. 1095, at Clermont, Urban renewed his appeal for aid to the Eastern Christians and called for the rescue of the Holy Sepulchre.

The armies of the early Crusades passed through Byz. territory, traveling either from Braničevo on the Danube through Sofia to Constantinople, or from Dyrrachion via Thessalonike. Crossing the straits, they marched through Byz. and Turkish territory to Antioch and the Holy Land. The Byz. attempted to provide markets where the Crusaders could purchase provisions, while restraining them from pillaging the countryside. Nevertheless, the undisciplined Westerners often plundered; policing (usually by Pecheneg horsemen) was brutal. Skirmishes in which both sides suffered losses led to ill feeling.

Forerunners of the First Crusade (1095–1099) were bands led by Peter the Hermit and others that reached Constantinople in 1096. Faced with their turbulence, Alexios transferred them to Anatolia, where they were largely destroyed by the Turks. The survivors blamed the emperor.

The portions of the First Crusade led by nobles such as Godfrey of Bouillon and Bohemund reached Constantinople in late 1096 and early 1097. As they arrived, Alexios sought to gain each leader's favor by gifts, induce him to swear fealty to the emperor, and make him urge later arrivals to do the same. Those who took the oath pledged to return to Byz. all territories recently seized by the Turks. Some, like Hugh of Vermandois and Bohemund, readily agreed; others, like Godfrey, demurred. Godfrey, after his followers quarreled with the Byz., attacked Constantinople, but was beaten off; reconciled with Alexios, he took the oath.

The Crusaders and Byz. jointly attacked Nicaea
(May–June 1097); the former were displeased when the city surrendered to the Byz., but Alexios appeased them with gifts. He dispatched Taktikos and a small force to support their march across Anatolia. During the siege of Antioch, Taktikos was forced to withdraw and Bohemund later used this action to justify his seizure of Antioch. The Crusaders succeeded in capturing Jerusalem on 15 July 1099.

An expedition of Lombards and some French nobles that set out from Europe in 1100 encountered difficulties in crossing Byz. territory; some Lombards even attacked the Blachernai Palace. In 1101 the Crusaders’ rash conduct in Asia Minor brought them disaster. Alexios was charged with treacherously betraying them to the Turks. Byz. claimed Antioch and strove until 1180 to subordinate its princes. Alexios I’s attacks caused Bohemund to join with the pope and launch a Crusade against Byz.; it was defeated in 1108.

The Second Crusade (1147–1149) consisted of a German contingent led by Conrad III and a French one led by Louis VII. In 1147 Conrad’s followers clashed with the Byz. in Thrace, and Manuel I was pleased to transport them over the Bosporos before Louis arrived. Although the French enjoyed a friendly reception from Manuel, Bp. Godfrey of Langres proposed the seizure of Constantinople. Germans and French suffered heavy losses at the hands of the Turks in Anatolia. Manuel provided shipping to transport the survivors from Attaleia to Antioch (Jan. 1148), but the Byz. were blamed for betraying the Crusade. In July the French withdrew from Damascus after an unsuccessful attack.

In subsequent decades, as pressure on the Crusader states from Nur al-Din and Saladin increased, the kings of Jerusalem sought alliance with Byz. Baldwin III married a Komnene, as did his successor Amalric I. A joint Crusader-Byz. force attacked Damietta (1169), but disagreements and mutual distrust caused the expedition to fail. Amalric did homage to Manuel in Constantinople in 1171. In 1177 Manuel attempted to renew the alliance, but the weakness of Amalric’s successors prevented any action.

After Saladin’s conquest of most of the kingdom of Jerusalem (1187), Isaac II attempted a rapprochement with him. To obtain Saladin’s good will, Isaac lured the portion of the Third Crusade (1189–1192) led by Frederick Barbarossa into Thrace, then attempted to destroy it (1189). Enraged, Frederick wrote to his son Henry VI ordering him to bring a fleet for an attack on Constantinople. Isaac, however, soon yielded and allowed Frederick to proceed, but he drowned in Cilicia (10 June 1190) and his army scattered. Another section of the Third Crusade, led by Richard I Lionheart, seized Cyprus from its Greek ruler, Isaac Komnenos. The French and English forces failed to regain Jerusalem but did capture Acre on 12 July 1191. In 1195–97 Henry VI planned a Crusade and used it to blackmail Byz. Only Henry’s death saved the empire from having to pay the Alamanikon tribute.

Byz. hostility to the Crusades, evident in the writings of Anna Komnene and Kinnamos, and with some qualifications in Niketas Choniates, was reciprocated, as shown by Western authors such as Raymond of Aguilers, Odo of Deuil, and Ansbert. Bohemund and Frederick I had proposed a Crusade against Byz. (S. Kindlimann, Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel als politische Forderung des Westens im Hochmittelalter [Zurich 1969]). Pope Innocent III was ready to threaten a Crusade as a means to bring about church unity (A.J. Andrea, I. Motsiff, BS 33 [1972] 6–25). The Crusades had made Constantinople’s wealth known in the West. Philip of Swabia and his ally Boniface of Montferrat had ambitions in the East. Venetian merchants wanted an assured monopoly in Constantinople (Lilie, Handel und Politik 557–95). Philip, Boniface, and Doge Enrico Dandolo of Venice assisted the refugee Alexios IV; they easily won the support of many members of the Fourth Crusade (1202–04) for a diversion against Constantinople. After Alexios IV and his successor Alexios V proved hostile, the Crusaders seized Constantinople for themselves (12 Apr. 1204) and cruelly sacked it. The hostility of the Byz. populace to the Latin Empire established by the Crusaders contributed to its short life (1204–61). The Crusader principalities founded in the Morea, however, such as the principality of Achaia, enjoyed greater success.

After the Latin Empire fell, the Turkish menace to the West was recognized and the defense of Constantinople prompted several Crusades. In 1344 Smyrna was won, but the Crusade of 1396 ended in a crushing defeat at Nikopolis (see Nikopolis, Crusade of). A final attempt to save Constantinople resulted in the Ottoman victory
at Varna (1444) that assured the Turkish conquest of Byz.

Economically, the Crusades stimulated the development of Venice and Genoa at the expense of Constantinople. While cultural exchange between Byz. and the West increased, their mutual hostility furthered the schism. Originally intended in part to rescue Byz. from the Turks, the Crusades contributed substantially to its downfall.


—C.M.B.

CRUSADES, WESTERN HISTORIANS OF THE.
The First Crusade focused Western imagination on the seemingly providential events in Palestine (and secondarily in Byz.), stimulating new departures in Latin literature (G. Spreckelmeyer, Das Kreuzzugslied des lateinischen Mittelalters [Munich 1974]). Letters, like the one that Count Stephen of Blois sent his wife about Constantinople (ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1098–1100 [Innsbruck 1901] 138–40), or oral and written reports, like the Gesta Francorum, brought new knowledge of Byz. shaped by the confrontation of differing civilizations and conflicting objectives. Crusader admiration or hostility centered initially on Alexios I rather than the Byz. people, reflecting the emperor’s all-pervasive position. The Gesta was rewritten in the polished style required by the so-called 12th-C. renaissance for a burgeoning audience of educated clergy. Although some added little more than literary trappings, others, such as Albert of Aachen and Guibert of Nogent, supplied new material deriving from local Crusaders and, possibly, early vernacular epics. By interpreting Byz. in terms of Western society, they also unconsciously distorted it. Even non-Crusader historians such as Orderic Vitalis, Caffaro (see Annales Ianuenses), and Roger of Hoveden incorporated the Levant into their historical productions. The classicizing literary climate revived antique stereotypes about shifty, effeminate Greeks who were tacitly assimilated to the modern-day Byz. emperor. But early Crusaders did not emphasize religious differences, and the relative serenity of a Lotharingian theologian like Rupert of Deutz typifies the early 12th C.

The growth of administrative kingship and literacy meant that, from the Second Crusade, clerical record-keepers accompanied Western rulers. Some histories, like that of Odo of Deuil, the diarylike material of Tageno, and the Historia de expeditione Friderici, reflect the royal retinues’ contacts with Constantinople, while other Crusaders authored personal accounts like the Itinerarium peregrinorum. Religious hostility toward Byz. swelled dramatically as Western theology’s accelerating development and obsession with local heretics affected differences between the Byz. and Latin churches, exacerbating political conflicts. The old stereotypes now encompassed the Byz. people, increasingly considered as an ethnic unit. The classicizing ideals of the 12th C. revived the Trojan legend and reinforced assimilation of contemporary Byz. and ancient Greeks even as it sharpened hostility, since the “Franks” believed their ancestors came from Troy. The Crusader states, however, produced Latins who knew Byz. directly and could be essentially positive, like Fulcher of Chartres, or reflect political tensions, like Radulf of Caen. This milieu explains the masterful portrayal of Byz. by William of Tyre.

Although epic overtones already pervade Albert and Radulf, written vernacular Crusader poems emerge only late in the 12th C. with the Chanson d’Antioche and the verses of Ambroise. Western fantasies of Byz. and its riches worked their way into fictional works like the Voyage de Charlemagne and the tales of Walter Map, even as the Third Crusade’s failure diminished expectations from such enterprises. The fascination peaked tragically with the Fourth Crusade as Byz. treasures flooded Western society, accompanied by reports of the conquest like the Devastatio Constantinopolitana and the account of Gunther of Pairis. Count Baldwin’s court in Hainault had pioneered vernacular literary innovation, and his role in the conquest combined with the primacy of French as the Crusader states’ vehicular language to encourage prose histories like the Estoire d’Eracles; the works of Geoffrey Villehardouin, Henri de Valenciennes, Robert de Clari; and, later, the Chronicle of the Morea.
CRYPT (from κρυτή, “concealed place,” also “vault”), a chamber beneath the main floor of a church, usually containing relics or tombs. Although never a requisite feature, crypts are found in Byz. churches of all periods and in a variety of locations. Most of the early basilicas of Constantinople were provided with a small cruciform crypt located directly beneath the altar, as in the 5th-C. Stoudios basilica. The entry into these crypts was usually by means of a narrow stairway opening in the interior of the apse, though in other churches, such as the 6th-C. Church of St. John in Hebdomon, access was obtained from outside the building. The spacious crypt under the transept of the 5th-C. Basilica of St. Demetrios in Thessalonike encircled a part of a Roman bath in which the saint was believed to have suffered his martyrdom. The function of many later crypts is not clear; those under such churches as the katholikon of Hosios Loukas, the ossuary of the Petritzos monastery, and the Taxiarchs in Thessalonike were designed expressly for funerary purposes.


CRYPTOGRAM, an encoded text. The most frequent system of cryptography in Byz. MSS originated in magic papyri from the 3rd/4th C. and is based on the use of Greek letters as numbers. The numerals are distributed in three lines, each with nine letters, which switch places within the line: alpha (i.e., one) becomes theta (nine), beta (two) becomes eta (eight), etc. The letter in the middle (epsilon, nu, phi) cannot change its place. This “three-line system” also occurs as early as the Job MS of Patmos (Patmos gr. 171) of ca.800. Another method, also based on the Greek numerals, replaces one letter by two with half of the numerical value (e.g., iota [ten] becomes epsilon-epson [five and five]). This kind of cryptography is attested in dated subscriptions of the 11th–12th C. Scribes of the 14th–15th C. invented a personal cryptography by contorting the Greek letters.


-EG.

CUBICULUM. See KOTTON; PRAEPOSITUS SACRI CUBICULI.

ČUČER. See NIKITA, MONASTERY OF SAINT.

CULTURE encompasses all forms and results of human activity: modes of production, food, clothing, and shelter, which constitute the material aspects of life; behavior with its norms—ethics and law as well as ceremonial and religious rite; education as the means to transmit the normative; spiritual life—visual arts, literature, music, science, philosophy, and theology. The terms “culture” and “civilization” are used interchangeably with regard to Byz.

For a long time Byz. culture was considered a mechanical agglomeration of independent phenomena. In the standard textbook, S. Runciman’s Byzantine Civilisation (New York 1933), as well as in many similar works, government and law, social life, church and monasticism, literature, science, and art form independent sections of a multistory construction, with no staircase leading from one floor to another. The first modern attempt to integrate, rather than merely to juxtapose, the various aspects of Byz. culture, was H. Hunger’s Reich der neuen Mitle (Graz-Vienna-Cologne 1965). The structure of books that followed Hunger (A. Kazhdan, Vizantijjskaja kul’tura X–XII vv. [Moscow 1968] and A. Guillou, La civilisation byzantine [Paris 1974]) differed drastically from that of Runciman; the authors dealt with economy (“the acquisition of the world”), social ties, power of the state, and what Guillou calls “culture,” that is, spiritual culture, and what in Kazhdan’s book is divided into “the image of the world” and AESTHETICS.

If Byz. culture is perceived not as an agglomeration but as a unified entity, the question arises as to the nature of this entity. Hunger, while situating the problem on a purely spiritual plane,
considered Byz. culture as an ancient civilization in the process of transformation into a Christian one. H.G. Beck (infra) shifted the emphasis: in his view, Byz. culture was determined by the role of the state, which created an atmosphere of political orthodoxy and left very little room for non-conformity; Byz. literature and theology, wrote Beck, reflected this political and ideological uniformity.

Kazhdan began his analysis of Byz. culture from a different point: according to him, social groupings (microstructures) played in Byz. a lesser role than in antiquity or in Western medieval countries, whereas family links were stronger and more stable. This situation contributed to the development of individualism, which, however, deprived of the support of any hierarchy and of social groupings, gave way to the omnipotent power of the state and became an "individualism without freedom." An extreme ambivalence with regard to cardinal concepts and a search for stability within the world of imagination determined the main lines of Byz. spiritual life.

Every culture includes traditional elements (heritage) side by side with innovations. The problem of their interrelationship in Byz. has been hotly discussed. The well-established view, that Byz. culture was determined by the continuity of ancient elements (Greek and/or imperial Roman), was developed by G. Weiss (HistZ 224 [1977] 529–60) and continues to be dominant. On the other hand, A. Toynbee (Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his World [London 1973] 510–74) emphasized the radical differences, "the antithesis between the Byz. spirit and the Hellenic spirit," as expressed in such cultural phenomena as prosynesis, dress, architecture, visual art, etc. This antithesis could be explained by Beck's omnipotent state and political orthodoxy, but Averincev (Poetika), following Hunger rather than Beck, interpreted the non-Greek elements of Byz. culture as oriental, penetrating the empire via the Bible.

Both Weiss and Toynbee, regardless of their disagreement, dealt with Byz. as a unity, whether inherited from antiquity or replacing antiquity; Averincev also believed that previously existing "culture circles" were interconnected to form the phenomenon of Byz. culture. Kazhdan and Mango (infra) have a different approach, perceiving Byz. culture as a historical rather than metaphysical event. Both acknowledge the decline of ancient urban civilization, the cultural crisis, and the subsequent revival of culture; for both of them, ancient tradition is not a simply and automatically inherited treasure, but wealth that was almost lost and later regained.

Although a unity, that is, having a common denominator, Byz. culture was far from absolute uniformity; on the contrary, a permanent ambivalence, an inner contradiction, was typical of it (H. Hunger, Byzanz, eine Gesellschaft mit zwei Geschäften [Copenhagen 1984]), as of any living civilization. This ambivalence was caused by various factors: the opposition of centrifugal and centripetal forces, that is, the capital and the province, or a rigid asceticism and a joyful and tolerant approach to life, of the hermitage and koimobion, of patrictic tradition and Hellenic heritage, of totalitarianism and nonconformity and; finally, by ethnic, linguistic, and religious divergences, as well as conflicts between classes and social groups.

CULTURE, DIFFUSION OF. Different kinds of diffusion of Byz. culture may be distinguished.

1. Diffusion of material objects does not in itself indicate any assimilation of culture. Byz. coins (see Coin Finds) and metalwork have been discovered as far north as Scandinavia and as far east as India and China. They may have found their way there through trade, as loot, or as the renumeration of mercenaries.

2. The impact of Byz. on neighboring non-Christian countries was exercised both through trade and Christian communities established there, as in Sassanian Persia, whose kings were anxious to profit from higher Byz. expertise in the crafts and even to emulate a Byz. way of life. The Muslim world proved more resistant to Byz. cultural influence, though it showed interest in ancient and late antique Greek philosophical and scientific writings.

3. A higher degree of penetration was achieved
in Christian countries of Roman Catholic obedience, esp. in Italy, parts of which were Byz. for a long time, less so in Germany, Hungary, and Scandinavia. This is most noticeable in art (painting and mosaics more than architecture) that was spread either by migrant Byz. craftsmen or by the importation of objects (e.g., bronze doors), giving rise to local imitations. The West showed little interest in Byz. writings, except for the several translations made in the 9th C.: those by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (chronicles, acts of the Council of 787), the two translations of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite (one of them by John Scotus Eriugena), and a few works of hagiography. Forced symbiosis between Greeks and Latins, beginning with the Third Crusade, led to a greater assimilation of Latin culture by the Greeks than vice-versa. In the 14th and 15th C. a number of Greek scholars, who were attracted by Italian humanism, studied Latin and taught Greek in Italy; some (e.g., Manuel Chrysoloras, George Trapezuntios) became distinguished teachers of Greek, others (Michael Apostoles, Bessarion) collected Greek MSS for Italian libraries, or, like Theodore Gazes and George Trapezuntios, made translations of Greek authors, primarily Plato and Aristotle (see TRANSLATION). An exceptional case is that of Armenia, which, though non-Orthodox, was so intimately tied to the empire as to become profoundly influenced by it.

4. The most thorough diffusion was achieved in Orthodox, mostly Slavic, countries (Bulgaria, Serbia, Kiev, Halyc, and Muscovite Rus’ as well as Romania, Alania, and Georgia); the countries of this cultural Byz. commonwealth owed the bulk of their civilization to Byz., including religion, ceremonial, art, alphabet, and literature. Byz. writings in Greek translated into an Old Church Slavonic koine circulated throughout the Slavic Orthodox world (with the Balkans, esp. Bulgaria, being the main source of such translations). In the case of Georgia, some translations were made from the Arabic as well. In Orthodox countries the diffusion of Byz. culture (esp. in art and literature) continued well beyond the fall of Constantinople; in some countries (Bulgaria, Serbia, Romania) it is attested as late as the 18th C.


CUMANS (Kouμανοι; in Byz. works of the 11th to 13th C. often “Scythians”; Turkic Qıpçaq, Slavic Polovtsy), a confederation of Eurasian nomadic and seminomadic tribes who replaced the Pechenegs in the east European steppe ca.1050–60 and were, in turn, subjected by the Mongols in 1222–97. Cattle breeders and warriors (their capital was located near present-day Khar’kov, Ukraine), the Cumans were also involved in trade (esp. slave trade), for example, with Sougdaia and Chernos. The Cumans appeared on the Byz. frontier on the Lower Danube at the end of the 11th C., first as allies of the Pechenegs with whom they plundered Thrace in 1087. In 1091, however, Alexios I Komnenos used the Cumans against the Pechenegs: the alliance remained ephemeral and Cuman invasions continued at least until 1160. Diaconu (infra) hypothesizes that ca.1122 the Cumans destroyed Dinogèia. At the same time the Cumans began to settle on Byz. territory; some of them were granted pronoiai (Ostrogorsky, Féodalité 48–54). After the Mongol invasion, the Cuman influx into Byz. increased: in 1241 John III Vattatzes reportedly settled 10,000 Cumans in Thrace and Asia Minor, and in 1259 Cuman contingents played an important role in the battle of Pelagonia. Cumans were famous as skilled archers. Their loyalty, however, was sometimes doubtful: in 1256 at Didymoteichon they deserted to the Bulgarians (Angold, Byz. Government 188ff).

The Cumans participated in the anti-Byz. revolt in Bulgaria in 1186, but it is difficult to prove that Peter and Asen I were of Cuman origin (P. Mutafčiev, Izbrani proizvedenija 2 [Sofia 1973] 162–68), even though “Asen” was evidently a Turkic name. Archaeologically the Cumans are little known, and their tombs difficult to distinguish from those of the Pechenegs. The Mamlûk dynasty that ruled Egypt and Syria from 1250 to 1517 was partially composed of former slaves (mamlûk) of Cuman origin.

CURIA (βουλή), city council. In late antiquity curiae administered cities and their territories, controlled local expenditure, sent embassies to the emperor, issued honorific decrees, and appointed urban teachers (sophists). Their heaviest responsibilities were the provision and maintenance of public works and services, and collection of taxes, for which the members had collective responsibility. Curiae selected their own members, curiales or decurions, who sat for life. In the East, curiae were large, often with 500 members; Antioch had 1,200. None of the curiae’s activities involved major policy decisions, which were decided by the governor and his representatives. The financial obligations of service in the curia made citizens increasingly reluctant to serve and anxious to find any avenue of escape; consequently, the curiae declined in size and prestige, and governors came to run cities through their own officials. A law of Anastasios I effectively substituted the collective responsibility of church and landowners for the curia. According to John Lydos, the curiae were a memory by the mid-6th C. In actuality they continued to exist, but only for ceremonial purposes. Leo VI issued a novel abolishing curiae, but their activity is revealed in various later sources. Curiae met in bouleuteria, commonly theaterlike buildings that were kept in good repair through the 6th C.


-C.F.

CURIALES (βουλευταί), members of the local council or CURIA (Gr. boule) of a municipium in the late Roman empire; the term replaced the former decuriones. Constantine I transformed the curia into a body in its own right by giving its members specific rights and obligations and prohibiting them from changing status (e.g., becoming senators, military officers, or clergymen). The major purpose of this legislation was to preserve the class of urban landowners who were responsible for the normal functioning of the city’s institutions (finance, food supply, public works, entertainment). This concern was underscored in the law of 386 (Cod.Theod. XII 3.1) prohibiting curiales from selling their land and slaves. The obligations of curiales were burdensome, esp. their responsibility for local tax-collecting, but at the same time they possessed some fiscal and legal privileges. Libanius presents the curiales of Antioch as an active and efficient body; probably they were less influential in the West, but even there Salvian of Marseilles (5th C.) described curiales as exploiters of the surrounding population.

The diminishing number of curiales and increasing state requirements in the 4th C. forced the government to take coercive measures, including the forcible subscription of criminals to the curia, along with official complaints on the avoidance by curiales of their duty. With regard to the later status of curiales, Bowman and Liebeschuetz emphasize the state’s encroachments on the rights of the curiales, the introduction of offices (such as the defensor civitatis) that held an intermediary position between the central government and the city, and the subjugation of the city to government control. Kurbatov, on the other hand, stresses the differentiation among the curiales and the appearance of an upper echelon which he identifies with feudal seigneurs. The curia as an institution disappeared after the 6th C., and Leo VI abrogated legislation concerning the municipal boule (nov.46), but the elements of municipal administration remained in Byz.


-A.K.

CURRICULUM. The meaning of enkylhios paideia, “general education,” had already begun to narrow in Hellenistic times and continued to do so in late antiquity. John Tzetzes (Historiae 11:15,18–28) plainly stated that the term enkylhios paideia (or mathematika), which previously encompassed the seven “liberal arts,” now designated grammar only. The traditional three-tiered education that had still functioned in the 4th–6th C. was simplified
after the 7th C. and consisted of two stages: the teaching of the elementary skills of literacy (reading, writing, and knowledge of sections of the Bible) and enkiklos paidēia, primarily grammar. Since the school was predominantly private, variations and complementary components were often introduced. The revival of the ancient curriculum (including the quadrivium) probably began in the 9th C.: the professors of the Magnaura school taught some of these disciplines on the secondary level. As a result the 9th C. witnessed the transmission of mathematical and astronomical MSS before those of historians and poets (Wilson, Scholars 85–88). The attempt to resuscitate tertiary education in the 11th C. and the organization of philosophy and law schools in Constantinople had only a limited effect; the curriculum remained oriented toward grammar, philosophy, and rhetoric, with casual sallies into the quadrivium, medicine, and some exotic sciences such as optika, katóptrika (see mathematics), and kentrobarike (e.g., Mich. Ital. 157.10).


-CURSING (κατάρασις), the imprecation of evil or damnation on a person or thing. Church fathers endeavored to soften the passages involving cursing in the Bible and to demonstrate that such curses were not acts of hatred but merely predictions of the future. Nevertheless, cursing remained a regular element of life, and the Timarion (ed. R. Romano, p.67.478) says that the Byz. were particularly fond of it. Cursing was used to protect contracts, property, tombs, and so on; the curse (ara) of the 318 Fathers of the First Council of Nicaea is commonly invoked on purchase charters and in MSS to keep the document from being stolen. Cursing was also used to strengthen church discipline (against heretics, violators of canon law, etc.), anathema being its strongest form. Cursing was thought to bring forth the anger of God and relegate the accursed to the power of the Devil. Cursing could also be an act of evil persons, and Muhammad, among others, was accused of cursing. The euchologion contained prayers for the lifting of curses (ed. Goar, 545–49, 693–96).


CURSIVE, a style of Greek script, the origin of which can be traced back to the script used in business papyri. In the 4th C. Greek cursive evolved from the chancery script; it is contained within four parallel lines and shows typical features for the letters beta, eta, iota, kappa, and delta, and esp. for the epsilon with the upper stroke in the form of a beak. This script occurs in Egyptian papyri of the 6th–8th C. The minuscule evolves from the cursive; this development can be seen already at the end of the 7th C. in the subscriptions of the members of the Third Council of Constantinople (680), written partly in minuscule, partly in uncial. The 8th- or 9th-C. Vat. gr. 2200 is a unique codex exhibiting an alternative to the minuscule, a cursive script used for literary rather than chancellery purposes (L. Perria, RSBN 20–21 [1983–84] 25–68). Cursive elements survived in the regular minuscule, for example, MSS copied by Ephraim in the mid-10th C. or texts written in scholarly hands. N.G. Wilson was able to assign an earlier date to codices written by scholars by comparing them with dated documents showing cursive features (in PGB 221–39).


CURTAIN. See Katafetasma.

CUSTOM (συνήθεια). Byz. legal theory recognized the normative force of custom but tried to set strict limitations on it. Like a law, a customary regulation could achieve recognition only when it had been examined and approved judicially or sanctioned directly by an emperor. When a custom hindered the efficacy of a certain law, it was interpreted as a procedural error on the part of the people to whom the law was addressed, not as the legal establishment of a counterregulation. Thus, a law based on legislation could be rendered ineffective by contrary custom, but it could not be abrogated. The high theoretical value placed on statutory law, closely linked with the concept of the emperor as the living law through God's grace, was contradicted in practice by an enor-
mous mass of customary regulations. This profusion could be explained by the inaccessibility of the legislation, the difficulty of its language, the complexity of its content, and its contradictory nature. A further explanation lies in its inability to adapt to the social developments of the Byz. state, for which only a very small proportion of the Roman imperial and late antique norms were appropriate. Finally, there were a great number of special local or ethnic regulations which the central government was unable to override in the provinces through equivalent legal measures.

Custom in Byzantine Documents and Novels. Although the Byz. clearly distinguished between the law (nomos) and custom (synetheia), they often treated them as parallel and noncontradictory concepts (e.g., *Dochetae*, no.6.60–61, a.1118, no.40.41, a.1370/1). The legislators, however, had to cope with the cases of discrepancy between the two: many of the novels of Leo VI dealt with synteheia—in 16 cases he approved of customary regulations and only in five or six cases rejected them. Passages in many documents state that a particular tax was levied or should not be levied, or a particular procedure had been performed or had not been performed *kata ten synetheian*, “according to custom.”


-C.N.O.

**CYCLE**, in art, a conventional term for a sequence of images recounting events in the lives of biblical and other sacred figures and, in history painting, of emperors. Christian cycles were, to some extent, successors to representations of the vitae of pagan mythological heroes. They existed as early as the 4th C.: the Lipsanothêk at Brescia displays a sequence of pictures drawn from the Passion of Christ, while events from the lives of Moses and Peter are excerpted on sarcophagi of the period. Even at this stage, as in the Palestinian Christological Cycle, dogmatic and typological considerations outweighed narrative impulses in the selection of scenes. The early existence of cycles of the lives of Joshua and David has been hypothesized; the latter was certainly in existence by the time of the Second Cyprus Treasure (early 7th C.). The concept of cycles finds full development in church programs of decoration, icons, and manuscript illumination in and after the 9th C. Cycles of the Infancy, Ministry, and Passion of Christ, and of the lives of the Virgin Mary and of some saints (see Hagiographic Illustration), pervade the remaining centuries of Byz. art. Cycles in the literal sense of the term may then be said to exist in that the sequence of Great Feast scenes appears to be correlated with the recurring liturgical year. In the Palaiologan era cycles multiply both in the recondite nature of their contents and in number, sometimes drawing on hymnographic material such as the Akathistos Hymn.
CYNEGETICA. See Oppian.

CYNEGIUS MATERNUS, staunch supporter of Theodosios I and praetorian prefect 384–88; died Constantinople or en route to Constantinople, March 388. Probably of Spanish origin, Cynegius was an active adversary of paganism, notorious for demolishing pagan temples in Syria and for his anti-Semitic attitude. According to J. Matthews (JThSt n.s. 18 [1967] 438–45), Theodosios brought to Constantinople from Spain not only Cynegius but an entire clan of his relatives, who went on to dominate court life in the capital. One of Cynegius’s relatives was Aemilius Florus Paternus, proconsul of Africa (393), who kept the province loyal to Theodosios when Italy was in revolt. Matthews also postulates a family connection between the clan of Cynegius and Serena, Theodosios’s niece and the wife of Stilicho. Another Cynegius, a zealous Christian, was a member of the consistorium under Arkadios.


CYPRIAN. See KIPRIAN.

CYPRIUS (Κύπρος), island in the northeastern Mediterranean, an important way station between East and West, with good ports, rich agricultural land, and significant mineral deposits, esp. copper. Cyprus, which constituted a province within the prefecture of Orients, enjoyed considerable prosperity in late antiquity and urban life apparently flourished during the period. A series of terrible earthquakes devastated the island in the mid-4th C., but urban life did not collapse. Salamis in the northeast, rebuilt and renamed Constantia by Constantius II, became the capital; restructured urban centers continued at Kourion, Paphos, and elsewhere. In 536 Justinian I removed Cyprus from the jurisdiction of the prefect of Orients and placed it, along with five other provinces, under the newly created quaestor exer-
citus. Cyprus continued to play an important political and economic role in the 6th and early 7th C., since it was at first spared the military upheavals that afflicted the rest of the empire.

The rise of Arab sea power, however, meant the end of peace, and Cyprus became a battlefield between Byz. and Islam. In ca.647 the island began to be the target of Arab raids, whose success forced the abandonment of many of the cities and the dislocation of others (e.g., the removal of Kourion to nearby Episkope). Justinian II resettled some Cypriots in the area around Kyziko and in 688 he signed a treaty with the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik, by which Cyprus seems to have become a no-man’s-land in which taxes were paid both to Byz. and to the caliphate and in which both powers had access to ports (which they might use to mount attacks on each other). In the 9th C., however, pressure built within Byz. for reconquest of Cyprus, and after several false starts Basil I finally accomplished the task (at an uncertain date), incorporating Cyprus into the theme system; after seven years, however, the island resumed its former status. In 965, Nikephoros II Phokas brought Cyprus firmly within the Byz. sphere; it became a province governed by a ka-tepano. In the 11th–12th C. there was some economic recovery, and new cities were founded on the coasts near the deserted sites of antiquity: Ammochostos near Salamis, Lemessos near Amathos, while Nikosia (Leukosia) in the center of the island became the capital. Monasteries and churches sprang up throughout the island as witnesses of this new-found prosperity and cultural vigor.

In the 11th and 12th C. the Cypriots felt heavily burdened by Byz. administrative and fiscal policies, even though the complaints of Patr. Nicholas IV Mouzalon seem to be exaggerated. In 1043 Cyprus revolted, and the protospatharios Theophylaktos, “judge and praktor of the state revenue,” was murdered (Skyl. 429.4–12). In 1092 Cyprus and Crete simultaneously rebelled against Alexios I Komnenos, but the uprising was quelled by John Doukas. Rhapsomates, the leader of the Cypriots, was taken captive, and Alexios sent Eu-stathios Philokales with a strong garrison to the island. In 1184 Isaac Komnenos seized control of Cyprus and proclaimed the island independent.

In the 12th C. the island became a focal point
in the struggle for domination over Syria. In 1148 the Venetians acquired trade privileges in Cyprus. Renaud of Châtillon, the Crusader prince of Antioch, raided Cyprus in cooperation with T'oros II of Lesser Armenia in 1155 or 1156; in 1161 pirates equipped by Raymond, count of Tripoli, attacked Cyprus. In 1191 Richard I Lionheart occupied the island. The next year Richard sold Cyprus to the Knights of the Temple, then presented it to Guy de Lusignan. Under Lusignan rule, most of the land was handed out as feudal grants and the Catholic hierarchy appropriated all the larger sees, relegating the Orthodox clergy to villages and remote areas. The Lusignan period nevertheless seems to have been prosperous, as attested by numerous archaeological sites throughout the island: not only churches and fortresses, but also villages and medium-sized farmsteads. The remains bear witness to considerable cultural contact, particularly with Italy and the Levant. In fact, during those years Cyprus was, after Palestine, the most important Western outpost in the East, the staging ground for whatever Crusader aspirations still remained.

The data concerning connections between Cyprus and Byz. in the 13th–15th C. are scanty. Letters addressed by the Orthodox patriarch (prob. Neophyts) and by Henri Lusignan to John III Vatatzes (K. Chatzepsaltes, KyprSp 15 [1951] 63–81), though limited in factual content, show friendly relations between the two states and the allegiance of the Cypriot church to Nicaea; the patriarch does not complain of the situation of the Greek church in Cyprus. Byz. influence at the court of Nikosia seems to have increased during the reign of Jean II Lusignan (1432–58) who was married first to Medea, daughter of the half-Greek marquis of Montferrat John-James Palaiologos, and then to Helena, daughter of Theodore II Palaiologos, despotes of Morea, who managed to place her adoptive brother Thomas as grand chamberlain; in her circle an idea arose to replace the Latin archbishop of Nikosia, Hugh (died 1442), with an Orthodox Greek (A. Vacalopoulos, Praktika tou A' diethous kyprologikou synedriou, vol. 2 [Leukosia 1972] 277–80).

Even though tradition claimed that the evangelization of Cyprus was the result of the activity of St. Paul and his disciple Barnabas, no data on the Cypriot ecclesiastical hierarchy before 325 are
known. Since administratively Cyprus was under the government of the diocese of Oriens, its church was placed under the jurisdiction of Antioch. In the 5th C. the metropolitans of Cyprus led a struggle for ecclesiastical independence, taking advantage of the conflict between Antioch and Alexandria and appealing to the authority of Rome and Constantinople (G. Downey, PAPh 102 [1958] 224–28). Antioch tried to retain its jurisdiction before the Council of Ephesus in 431, but the Cypriots elected Reginos their metropolitan, and in Ephesus he joined the cause of Cyril of Alexandria. Peter the Fuller tried again to recover Antiochene jurisdiction expecting help from Emp. Zeno, but Anthemios, the metropolitan of Cyprus, stubbornly resisted. In 488 the tomb of the apostle Barnabas was discovered; it also contained a copy of St. Matthew’s Gospel that Anthemios immediately sent to the emperor. Zeno proclaimed the church of Cyprus autocephalous (a decree confirmed by Justinian I); the metropolitan received special signs of respect: a garment of purple silk, a scepter instead of a staff, the right to sign his letters in red, and the title of makarios (“beatitude”). Greek archbishops existed in Cyprus until 1260 (V. Laurent, REB 7 [1949] 33–41).


Monuments of Cyprus. Several large ecclesiastical complexes of the 4th–5th C. have been excavated on the island. Among the most impressive is Salamis. The Basilica of St. Epiphanius, which probably functioned as the cathedral of the city, is the largest Christian building discovered on Cyprus. Other important sites include a 4th-C. ecclesiastical complex at nearby Kampanopetra; Kourion, with a large 5th-C. episcopal basilica and baptistry; Pégia, with two basilicas, a baptistry, and a bath dated to the late 5th or early 6th C.; Soloi and Gialousa.

Mosaics ascribed to the 6th or 7th C. at Kîtî and Lythránkomi were incorporated in churches rebuilt either before the Arab invasions of the 7th C. or during the Arab-Byz. treaty period (688/9–mid-10th C.). Similarly unclear in chronology are the monuments of the Karpas peninsula, including a cross-in-square church near Rizokarpaso, and three vaulted basilicas, all built over the ruins of earlier churches.

A group of triple-domed basilicas including St. Lazaros at Larnaka, St. Barnabas at Salamis, Sts. Barnabas and Hilarion at Peristerona, and St. Paraskeve at Geroskípos, may be very tentatively ascribed to the period before the Byz. reconquest of the island by Nikephoros II Phokas in 965. After the reconquest there is little evidence of artistic activity before the early 11th C., when the cross-in-square katholikon of St. Nicholas tes Steges received its first fresco phase, including a Great Feast cycle. At the beginning of the 12th C., the image of St. Nicholas with a monastic donor was painted on a masonry partition inserted between the diakonikon and the naos. Later in the 12th C. a narthex decorated with a Last Judgment was added.

Perhaps in response to the rebellion of Rhapsomates in 1092 and the advancing armies of the First Crusade, there was much construction on the island during the reign of Alexios I. For example, Saranda Kolonnes, the fortress protecting Paphos harbor, which was initially erected in the 9th C. (?), was rebuilt (the Crusaders would make further additions to this castle after they took the island in 1191). At Koutsovendis, the monastery of Hagios Chrysostomos, founded on 9 Dec. 1090 by a hegoumenos George, was fortified. The complex included a domed-octagon katholikon built partially in cloisonné-brick with a parekklesion. The high-quality decoration of the latter dates from the late 11th or early 12th C. Asinou and a large number of other churches with frescoes stylistically related to those at Koutsovendis further attest to rebuilding on the island in the late 11th and early 12th C.

The second half of the 12th C. is also rich in monumental remains. The Holy Apostles at Parechorio, a small, single-naved, domed church, was decorated with a feast cycle in the 3rd quarter of the century. The unpublished church at Kato Lefkara also seems to date from this period. The rich, painted programs of the Enkleistra of St.
NEOPYHTOS ENKLEISTOS AND LAGOUDERA date to the end of the 12th C.

Before the Latin occupation of Cyprus, its art and to a lesser degree its architecture were informed by a tension between Constantinopolitan and local traditions. In contrast, 13th-C. painting on the island represents a distinctively regional development. The monastery of St. John Lampadistes at Kalopanagiotis is a complex of three churches. The first surviving phase of fresco decoration of St. Herakleidios, a cross-in-square church constructed probably in the 11th C., dates from the 13th C. The Panagia at Moutoullas, a small, rectangular, wooden-roofed structure, was decorated with scenes from the life of Christ for John, son of Moutoullas, and his wife Irene on 4 July 1280. The small monastic church of Panagia Amasgou at Monargi received its principal medieval decoration in the 13th C., though a few fresco fragments of the early 12th C., stylistically related to the paintings at Asinou, also remain.


CYPRUS TREASURE. Two treasures of the 6th to 7th C. are known by this name.

FIRST CYPRUS TREASURE. Found at the end of the 19th C. at Karavas, a village close to Lambousa (anc. Lapithos) west of Kyrenia in Cyprus, the First Cyprus Treasure included 39 silver objects (plate, censer, bowl [with silver stamps of 578–82, 605–10, 641–51, respectively], and 36 spoons) of which all but 11 spoons entered the British Museum in 1899. In 1906 a find of three silver plates (all with stamps of 610–30) decorated with a monogram (read as “Theodore A”) was associated with this treasure by Dalton, as was eventually the Second Cyprus Treasure. Several spoons have inscribed names, including that of Theodore, and one set of 11 spoons has a series of running animals. Although the single plate, bowl, and censer have Christian decorations (cross, busts of Christ, and saints), none is inscribed with a dedication to a church and the treasure is probably domestic silver plate with pious ornamentation like that in the Canoscio Treasure.


SECOND CYPRUS TREASURE. Discovered in 1902 very close to the find-spot of the First Cyprus Treasure, this second find consisted of two lots: 11 silver plates concealed in a walled niche and eight pieces of gold jewelry buried in a pot nearby. Eight bronze objects (lampstand, two lamps, five ewers) also formed part of the group. The silver objects, now divided between the Nikosia and Metropolitan Museums, included the nine David Plates of 629/30 and two dinner plates, one bearing the monogram of a certain John (with silver stamps of 605) and one bearing a small cross (with stamps of 613–30). The jewelry included a belt and a chain containing consular and imperial medallions of Maurice (584, 585). The second treasure was probably part of the contemporary First Cyprus Treasure (which contains similar dinner plates) and belonged to a highly placed family that received imperial gifts in 584–85 and 629/30 and acquired other objects between 578 and ca.641. The objects were probably buried when the island was invaded by the Arabs in ca.647.


CYRENAICA (Κυρηναία). The Roman province of Cyrenaica comprised the plateau of Djebel Akhdar on the east coast of Libya. Under Diocletian it was divided into two provinces: Libya Superior or PENTAPOLIS and Libya Inferior. Both provinces suffered from frequent attacks by the Austuriani in the 4th and 5th C., leading to the establishment of a dux Libyaram ca.385 and, by the late 5th C., of a dux Libiae Pentapoleos. Regulations regarding the provisioning of troops on the times of the province, published in the reign of Anastasios I (Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, 9.1 [Leiden 1938] no.356), indicate the continuing interest of Constantinople in maintaining control over Cyrenaica. Anastasios and Justinian I also undertook
the refortification of some towns in Cyrenaica in response to new barbarian attacks, most notably by the Mazikes (see MAURI). Despite these attacks, archaeological evidence from the cities indicates that trade, largely with the Aegean and northeast Mediterranean areas, continued from the earlier Roman period, although never in great volume. The main export was perhaps grain, but olive oil and seafood products may also have been traded. Much archaeological work remains to be done on the rural history of Cyrenaica in the late Roman period, our prime source of information still being SYNEIOS, bishop of Cyrene in the late 4th and 5th C.

Cyrenaica was subordinated to the church of Alexandria and thus affected by Egyptian religious controversies. In the 4th C. Arianism obtained support among Cyrenaican bishops. Zeno's HENOTIKON is addressed to both Cyrenaican and Egyptian clergy, indicating the existence of a strong Monophysite church in Cyrenaica in the 5th C. In 609 Herakleios marched from Cyrenaica into Egypt in his revolt against Phokas. The history of Roman Cyrenaica ends with the Arab invasions of 642 and 645.


R.B.H.

CYRIACUS OF ANCONA, or Ciriaco de’ Pizzicoli, Italian merchant; self-taught humanist and epigrapher fascinated by antiquities; born Ancona ca.1391, died Cremona ca.1455. From 1412 to 1454 he traveled incessantly over the territories once or still controlled by Byz. Beginning ca.1424, he kept in Latin a detailed diary, the Commentaria, that recorded his movements; the people he met, including John VIII Palaiologos (K.M. Setton, Speculum 33 [1958] 227f and n.14), Gemistos PLETNON, and other Byz. potentates and scholars; the places and monuments he saw and sketched; and passages from Greek (for example, B. Baldwin, Scriptorium 37 [1983] 110–12 on the Athos MS of Nonnos) and Latin MSS he consulted. Most important of all, he transcribed vast numbers of Greek and Latin INSCRIPTIONS, for many of which he is the oldest or only witness. In all these do-
mains he collected Byz. material no less avidly than classical, although his honesty has sometimes been questioned.

Of the multivolumed original diary only a small fragment about the Peloponnese (1447–48) survives; more is preserved in autograph extracts that Cyriacus sent to various acquaintances, and sections of the account of his travels in Greece (1435–37) survive in copies. This complex and fragmentary textual tradition complicates the exploitation of his myriad materials. He avidly collected Greek MSS in such places as Constantinople, Thessalonike (M. Vickers, BMGS 2 [1976] 75–82), Chios, and Mt. Athos, where he also made a list of the MSS he examined in Nov. 1444 (ed. Bodnar-Mitchell, 49.859–56.1041).


M.McC.

CYRIL, bishop of Jerusalem (ca.348/50–386/7) and saint; born near Jerusalem ca.313; feastday 18 Mar. Accused both of theological submission to his Arian superior Akakios, bishop of Caesarea, and of harboring pro-Nicene sentiments, Cyril was thrice deposed (357, 360, 367) and thrice restored (358, 362, 378). His major extant work
is a series of 24 catechetical lectures, transcribed by a listener, which were delivered as Lenten and Easter instructions for catechumens. The last five, the Mystagogical Catecheses, may have been written wholly or partly by his successor as bishop, John II of Jerusalem. Cyril's lectures provide much information on both the liturgy and the topography of 4th-C. Jerusalem. His observations on the eucharist are particularly important, as he was the first theologian to discuss transubstantiation and to emphasize its sacrificial nature. His lectures include much on the theory and practice of baptism, which for him was a prerequisite for salvation. His Christology is Nicene, although he notably eschews the term homoousios, more in opposition to Sabellianism than Arianism. The word does, however, appear in his letter to Constantius II describing the apparition of a cross of light in the sky over Jerusalem on 7 May 351; this letter also refers to Helena's discovery of the True Cross (ed. E. Bihain, Byzantium 43 [1973] 264–96; the letter is also preserved in a Syriac version, ed. J.F. Coakley, AB 102 [1984] 71–84). The presence of the term homoousios here may imply a Cyrilline change of mind, or simply an interpolation. A homily on the paralytic also survives.


-B.B.

Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria (from 18 Oct. 412), theologian, and saint; born Mahalla in Egypt 378, died Alexandria 27 June 444; feastday 9 June. He succeeded on the patriarchal throne his uncle Theophilos whom he had attended at the Synod of the Oak (403), which deposed John Chrysostom. His early years in office (up to 428) were marked by conflicts with Jews, Novatians, and pagans, the last provoking suspicion that he was involved in the murder of Hypatia (415). In later years (between 431 and 441), Cyril wrote a detailed refutation of Against the Galilaeans by Julian, thus revealing the tenacity of Egyptian paganism.

The early writings of Cyril were mainly biblical commentaries, allegorical in method though less so than those of Origen, and polemics against Arianism, in which he developed the Trinitarian views of Athanasios. While Athanasios had to deal primarily with the question of the Trinity, Cyril wrestled with Christological problems. Nestorios consistently separated the God-Logos in the incarnate Christ from the Man, accepting only the synaphia or "contact" of the two natures. Cyril's aim was to preserve the concept of unity of the God-Man as a necessary condition of salvation. For this purpose he employed the term hypostasis (introduced by Apollinaris) and asserted that the Logos and the flesh (he preferred these words to "god" and "man") in Christ were not in contact but in hypostatic unity (Richard, Opera minora 2, no. 42, pp. 243–52). Accordingly, Cyril insisted that the Virgin Mary had given birth not only to the man Jesus but to God and therefore deserved the appellation Theotokos. Cyril did not distinguish clearly, however, between the concepts of hypostasis and nature, and sometimes assumed that Christ possessed one hypostasis or nature (physis). Formulations of this kind allowed for a monophysite interpretation of his doctrines. This Monophysite cast to Cyril's writings accounts for the preservation of a great many of his works in Armenian, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Coptic. As S. Gero (OCh 62 [1978] 77–97) demonstrated, there is no evidence to support the theory that Cyril encouraged icon veneration.

Representation in Art. Portraits of Cyril, with his dark pointed beard, resemble those of Basil the Great, but Cyril wears a special pointed bonnet, the prerogative of the patriarch of Alexandria. The bonnet is often decorated with crosses.


-B.B., A.K., N.P.S.
CYRIL, jurist of the time of Justinian I. Cyril was the author of a Greek paraphrase of the Digest, many fragments of which have been preserved in the scholia to the Basilika. His paraphrase of books 41 to 50 of the Digest appears to have been the basis for certain sections of the Basilika text as well.


- A.S.

CYRIL (saint). See CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOpher.

CYRIL III, patriarch of Antioch (29 June 1287–ca.1308?). The third of his name to sit on the throne of Antioch (not the second; cf. V. Grumel, Mobilnyj 98 [1962] 260, n.3). Cyril was metropolitan of Tyre until his election as patriarch in 1287. A rival claimant, Dionysios I, was elected at the same time in Cilicia. In 1288 Cyril went to Constantinople, where Patr. GREGORY II and ATHANASIUS I refused to recognize his election. He lived in Constantinople at the Hodegon monastery and was finally recognized in 1296 by Patr. John XII Kosmas (1293–1303). He resided in the capital until his death or resignation ca.1308. Athanasios remained hostile to him and accused him of causing a schism in the church (ep.69, ed. Talbot). The chronology of the patriarchate of Antioch in the early 14th C. is not yet fully resolved; PLP (no.14053) suggests that Cyril may have resumed the patriarchate between 1310 and 1314.


- A.M.T.

CYRIL OF SKYTOPOLIS, monk and hagiographer; born Skytopolis (in Palestine) ca.525?, died after 592?. Cyril’s father, a lawyer named John, supervised his early religious education. When still a young child, Cyril met St. Saba, who strongly influenced his future monastic career. According to Flusin (infra), Cyril became an anagnostes shortly after 532 and in 543 was tonsured as a monk. He left almost immediately for Jerusalem, where he met St. John the Hesychast, whose biography he would later write. In 544, after spending some months as a hermit in a lavra near the Jordan, he entered the cenobitic monastery of St. Euthymios the Great at Jericho, where he spent the next ten years. Following the condemnation of Origenism in 553, Origenist monks were expelled from the New Lavra of St. Sabas and replaced in 555 by Orthodox monks, among them Cyril. In 557 he moved to the Great Lavra of Sabas, where he died shortly thereafter.

Despite his short life Cyril wrote a number of biographies of Palestinian monks, such as Sabas, Abraham, Kyriakos (also preserved in Georgian), Theodosios, and Theognis. His evident aim was to produce a corpus of vitae of Palestinian saints, an ambition fostered both by local patriotism and a firm belief in the relationship between holiness and the desert. The historical details in his Lives, where verifiable, are accurate. He is informative on topics ranging from the phylarchs of the Parrembo in Palaeustria I to the movements of Hychios of Jerusalem. Cyril is occasionally illuminating on Constantinople, as in the story of “the liberating of the polis and the church” (ed. Schwartz 176.1–2) from the three hieres—of Arius, Nestorius, and Origen.


- B.B., A.M.T.

CYRIL OF TUROV. See KIRILL.

CYRIL PHILEOTES, saint; born in Philea near Derkos ca.1015, died 2 Dec. 1110 [1120, according to Karlin-Hayter, infra]. A holy man who remained a long time in the world, Cyril spent three years as a sailor; he had a wife and children but was very devoted to monastic life and consistently restricted both his sexual life and diet. From his homeland he frequently visited Constantinople, but he traveled even further, to Chonae and even to Rome. Cyril was connected with the Komnenoi and some of their supporters: Eumathios Philokales, George Palaiologos, Michael Doukas, etc. He took the habit at the monastery founded at Philea by his brother Michael and received there his monastic name of Cyril; his secular name is unknown. Alexios I granted the monastery a confirmation of the independence of all its possessions from the treasury.
Cyril's Life, written by Nicholas Kataskepenos (died after 1143), has an unusual structure: every chapter or paragraph begins by stating a fact in Cyril's biography, followed by a series of patristic quotations that tend to emphasize the general significance of this fact. Kataskepenos presented a rigoristic approach to salvation: his hero performed not only traditional fasting and vigils but also self-flagellation with rope and club (e.g., ch.5.7). Unlike Symeon the Theologian, Cyril is said to have approved of monastic friendship and to have eagerly practiced charity.


**Cyrhhus** (Kúpos, also Hagiopoulis, now Huru Pegamber in eastern Turkey), city of northern Syria in the province of Euphratensis. Bishops of Cyrhus are known from 325 onward; between 460 and 570 it became an autocephalous metropolis. Libanios speaks of it as a small city that had formerly been great; its function as the region's fortress was usurped, under Constantius II, by Hierapolis. Theodoret of Cyrhus, who was the city's bishop in the 5th C., describes the city primarily as a residence of hermits; his own building activity there included the construction of stoas, two bridges, an aqueduct, and the maintenance of public baths. Some revival took place under Justinian I, who stationed a garrison at Cyrhus and ordered the repair of the city walls and the construction of a roofed aqueduct. Several inscriptions have been found in Cyrhus bearing the names of Justinian, Theodora, and Belisarios. The martyron of Sts. Kosmas and Damianos near Cyrhus, first mentioned by Theodoret, was later called a "wonder of the world" by Arab writers; its materials were removed by al-Walid (705-15) for his mosque at Berroia. The circuit walls and the remains of two large basilicas, all from the period of the 4th to 7th C., still stand at Cyrhus; a residential quarter by the cardo has been excavated; and two bridges survive in the area. The remains of a large basilica and traces of an aqueduct have also been discovered.

The Arabs took Cyrhus in 637. From the 10th C. onward the Byz. tried to regain it; in 905 Andronikos Doukas plundered Cyrhus and took its inhabitants captive. Romanos III was defeated in this region in 1030. In the 12th C. Armenians and Crusaders fought over "Guris"/"Qurus"; thereafter it is not mentioned by historians.


**Cyzicus.** See Kyzikos.

**Czech Literature.** Church Slavonic as a liturgical and literary language coexisted with Latin in the Bohemian (Czech) church until its use was banned in 1096/7. The basic texts were probably imported from Moravia. The earliest Church Slavonic MS of indisputably Czech provenance, the 11th-C. Glagolitic Prague Fragments, is a Byz. liturgical text translated from Greek. All other extant Czech translations are from Latin works, although some translators may have known Greek (F. Mares, BS 24 [1963] 247-50). Native literature is esp. notable for its hymnography (the Canon to St. Václav [Wenceslas], the hymn Hospodine pomejny) and hagiography (numerous Latin and Church Slavonic vitae of Václav [died 929], of Václav's grandmother Ludmila [died ca.921], and probably of St. Prokopios). Translated and original Czech literature was exported to the Slavic Orthodox world, particularly to Rus' (P. Devos, AB 72 [1954] 427-38; B. Florja, BS 46 [1985] 121-30). Most Church Slavonic works of Czech origin survive in Eastern Slavic MSS, the earliest dating from 1095/6. (See also Konstantin Mihailović of Ostrovica).

Lit. M. F. Mares, An Anthology of Church Slavonic Texts of Western (Czech) Origin (Munich 1979).

Czechia. In the 9th C., when reached by Byz. missionaries, Czechia was a vassal state of Great Moravia. According to legend, Methodios converted Borivoj of Prague and his wife Ludmila. After the Hungarian invasion and collapse of Moravia (ca.906) two independent princedoms
emerged: one under the Přemyslid dynasty of Prague and another (until 991) under the Slavnik dynasty of Libica. Constantine VII seems to have had some information about Czechia: his “White Serbloi” who lived beyond “Turkey” in a place called Boiki (or Boimi?—De adm. imp. 32.2–4) may be the Slav inhabitants of eastern Bohemia. Twelfth-century Byz. authors speak of the Tzechoi who were allied with Hungary and Kiev against Manuel I (e.g., Lampros, “Mark. kod.” 174, no. 320.6–7), though Kinnamos (Kinn. 223.5–8) implies that the “king of the Tzechoi” was the empire’s λιζιος at the time of the Second Crusade. Vincent of Prague (MGH SS 17:681) records that a noble Czech, Boguta of Moravia, served Manuel and was granted several castles. In 1273 Byz. and Czechia negotiated concerning a union of the churches and the organization of a crusade. In 1451–52 a Hussite emissary, probably Matthew English, came to Constantinople and after lengthy defense of the Hussite creed obtained a letter dated 18 Jan. 1452, signed by seven church dignitaries and inviting the Hussites to join the Greek church. The letter, however, satisfied only the most moderate leaders of the Czech movement. Chalkokondyles conveys some data about the Tzechoi or Boemoi (Ditten, Russland-Exkurs 56f), asserting, for instance, that they were fire worshipers.

DABATENOS, or Diabatenos (Διαβατηνός, fem. Διαβατηνή), a family that flourished in the second half of the 11th C., possibly of Armenian origin. A certain Davatanos, doux of Edessa, fell in battle ca.1062; his brother Levon held the same position in the 1070s. We do not know whether he is to be identified with Leo Diabatenos, a general under Romanos IV, and another Leo, governor of Mesembria in 1080. Another Dabatenos, under Alexios I, served as topoteters of Heraklea in Pontos and of Paphlogonia (1081); perhaps he was the same Dabatenos who more than 20 years later was doux of Trebizond. Even less certain is his identity with Michael Dabatenos, protocheirologos in 1094/5 (P. Gautier, REB 29 [1971] 245f). Several Dabatiotes left seals with such titles as sebastos, prokouropalates, and katepano. Soon after 1100 the family position declined, and the Dabatiotes attested in the 13th and 14th C. were paroikoi, priests, or owners of small farms (PLP, nos. 5365–70).


DACIA, the territory north of the Lower and Middle Danube. It was conquered by Trajan and then abandoned by the Romans in the mid-3rd C. Aurelian, however, created the province of Dacia Ripensis on the south bank of the Danube between Moesia I and Moesia II. Its major cities were Ratiaria and Oescus; Priskos of Panion (fr.1) called Ratiaria a large and densely populated city. Military camps and forts, rather than cities, were typical of the province. Dacia Ripensis flourished in the mid-4th C., and the Romans even managed to recover some fortes on the north bank of the Danube. Gothic foederati penetrated into Dacia, and some settlements probably belonging to them (e.g., a fortified village at Vit) have been excavated. This system of Germanic settlements continued after the battle of Adrianople (378), as in Succidava, where the last Roman coins are of 408–23; probably thereafter the system of forts was demolished by the Huns. The empire renewed the construction of strongholds north of the Danube at the end of the 5th C. and was able to maintain them through the end of the 6th, when Dacia was occupied by the Avars and Slavs (O. Toropu in 9 CEFR [1974] 71–81).

Dacia Mediterranea lay south of Dacia Ripensis and was probably created sometime later. Its capital was Serdica and its major cities were Naissus, Pautalia, and Remesiana. Dacia Mediterranea was more urban and more Greek than Dacia Ripensis and played a larger role in ecclesiastical development.


DACO-GETANS, autochthonous population on both banks of the Lower Danube. Ancient authors considered them a single group, speaking a dialect of the Thracian language, but recent scholars distinguish three ethnic elements: Thracian, Illyrian, and Daco-Moesian (C. Pohiric in L’ethnogénèse des peuples balkaniques [Sofia 1971] 171f). Despite romanization of the region, old Ghetian traditions, esp. old forms of ceramics, survived in Scythia Minor and in Moesia through the 6th C. (C. Scorpan, Thracia 2 [1974] 33–34). From the 7th C. onward, the Slavs settled on the Danube, assimilating a substantial part of the autochthonous population, then the Bulgars and Pechenegs moved into the area. The ancient Daco-Getans mingled with these peoples, even though some Daco-Getans, esp. in mountainous regions, retained their latinized language and certain cultural traditions, eventually emerging as Vlachs.

The ethnic name Dakes reappears in the 10th—11th C. to designate Pechenegs; in the 12th—15th C. it was applied primarily to the Hungarians (Moravcsik, Byzantioturcica 2:116) and, in the 15th C., even to the Danes (E. Trapp, JÖB 36 [1986] 301f).

DAKTYLOS (δάκτυλος, "finger"), the smallest Byz. unit of length, equal to 1/16 pous [= 1.95 cm], also called monas (unit).

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 16. - E. Sch.

DALASSENE, ANNA, mother of Alexios I Komnenos; born ca. 1025, died 1 Nov. 1100 or 1102. Her father was Alexios Charon, her maternal grandfather Adrianos Dalassenos (N. Adontz, Byzantion 10 [1935] 171-83). She married John, brother of Isaac I Komnenos, in 1040 or 1045; their children included Manuel, Maria, Isaac, Eudokia, Theodora, Alexios, Adrianos, and Nikephoros. After Isaac I's abdication, Dalassenos opposed the Doukas family, who had succeeded to the throne; she even disliked Alexios's marriage to Irene Doukaina. She actively encouraged Isaac and Alexios's revolt against Nikephoros III (14 Feb. 1081) and had to seek refuge in Hagia Sophia and then the Petronion monastery. Upon Alexios I's accession, she became powerful at court. During his campaigns (beginning in Aug. 1081), he granted her sweeping administrative powers (Reg no. 1073): written or verbal, rational or ridiculous, her orders were to be obeyed as the emperor's own. A copy of her pittakion for Christodoulos of Patmos (May 1088) survives (Patmou Engraphe 1:342-51, no. 49), and in 1095 she ordered the blinding of Nikephoros Diogenes (An. Komn., 2:201.16-22). After popular charges of misgovernment seemingly disturbed her relationship with Alexios (Zon. 3:746.4-7), she retired to the Pantepoptes monastery. Her piety and patronage of monks were renowned; Anna Komnenē greatly admired her.

LIT. Skoulatos, Personnages 20-24. - C.M.B.

DAKTYLOS was the smallest Byzantine unit of length, equal to 1/16 pous (≈ 1.95 cm), also called monas (unit).

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 16. - E. Sch.

DALASSENE, ANNA, mother of Alexios I Komnenos; born ca. 1025, died 1 Nov. 1100 or 1102. Her father was Alexios Charon, her maternal grandfather Adrianos Dalassenos (N. Adontz, Byzantion 10 [1935] 171-83). She married John, brother of Isaac I Komnenos, in 1040 or 1045; their children included Manuel, Maria, Isaac, Eudokia, Theodora, Alexios, Adrianos, and Nikephoros. After Isaac I's abdication, Dalassenos opposed the Doukas family, who had succeeded to the throne; she even disliked Alexios's marriage to Irene Doukaina. She actively encouraged Isaac and Alexios's revolt against Nikephoros III (14 Feb. 1081) and had to seek refuge in Hagia Sophia and then the Petronion monastery. Upon Alexios I's accession, she became powerful at court. During his campaigns (beginning in Aug. 1081), he granted her sweeping administrative powers (Reg no. 1073): written or verbal, rational or ridiculous, her orders were to be obeyed as the emperor's own. A copy of her pittakion for Christodoulos of Patmos (May 1088) survives (Patmou Engraphe 1:342-51, no. 49), and in 1095 she ordered the blinding of Nikephoros Diogenes (An. Komn., 2:201.16-22). After popular charges of misgovernment seemingly disturbed her relationship with Alexios (Zon. 3:746.4-7), she retired to the Pantepoptes monastery. Her piety and patronage of monks were renowned; Anna Komnenē greatly admired her.

LIT. Skoulatos, Personnages 20-24. - C.M.B.

DALASSENOΣ (Δαλασσηνός, fem. Δαλασσηνή), a noble Byz. lineage originating from Dalasa-Talas on the Euphrates and known from the late 10th C. Adontz's hypothesis that the family was of Armenian stock can neither be proved nor refuted. The magistros Damianos and his son the patrikios Constantine were governors of Antioch in 996-998 and in 1025, respectively. Constantine, called "the lord of the Eastern land" in contemporary epigrams, was an important landowner; Constantine VIII regarded him as his heir, but in the 1030s Constantine Dalassenos fell from imperial favor and was arrested by Michael IV. His brother Theophylaktos was doux of Antioch according to a seal; the third brother Romanos was katepano of Iberia. In the 1060s and 70s the Dalassenoi served in the Balkans: Theodore as doux of Thessalonike and Serres, Damianos as doux of Skopje. Anna Dalassenē was married to John Komnenos and became mother of Alexios I Komnenos. Thereafter the Dalassenoi ceased to be military commanders: the sebastos Theodore served as a judge in 1196; another Theodore, sebastos (and eparch), is known from a seal; a third Theodore is mentioned in Tīpoukeitōs as a lawyer in Eudokia's court (1067), but the high title of protonobelissimos makes this attribution dubious (see Nobelissimos). In the later period the name Dalassenos is rare and used only in a low level of society (PLP, nos. 5035-36).


DALMATIA (Δαλματία), Roman province on the eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea whose capital was Salona. After brief domination by Odoacer, and then by the Ostrogoths, ca. 538 Dalmatia became a Byz. proconsular province, consisting of coastal cities and nearby islands, from Istria to Kotor. It prospered through maritime trade. In the early 7th C. when Slavs and Avars invaded the hinterland and destroyed the coastal cities (Salona, Epidaurus), these centers were replaced by new ones (Split, Dubrovnik). Both cities and islands remained under Byz. rule, but their ecclesiastical jurisdiction alternated between Rome and Constantinople. The metropolis became Zadar (Zara) administered by a prior or archon. Whether he was a Byz. functionary or local magnate remains unclear. In the early 9th C. Charlemagne subjugated Dalmatia, and the dux Jadera briefly functioned there as Frankish representative; in 812 the Franks returned Dalmatia to Byz., but it remained practically independent until the late 860s when Basil I established a Byz. theme there. Ecclesiastically it formed the metropolis of Ke-
phalia under the jurisdiction of Constantinople (*Notitiae CP*, no.3,54).

The area consisted of several independent economic and political zones: the northern centers tended to be pro-Venetian; the mid-Dalmatian cities, mostly autonomous, wavered in their loyalties between Venice and Hungary; Dubrovnik temporarily formed a special Byz. theme; the southern cities were linked with Serbia and Zeta. After a short-lived Venetian conquest in 1000, the Byz. presence in Dalmatia weakened. Various forces—Venice, Croatia, Hungary, the Normans—contended for domination over the area, and in the 1060s real Byz. authority disappeared, except in Dubrovnik. After the union of Croatia with Hungary (1102), northern Dalmatia was under Venice; the central area under Hungarocroatian kings; the southern area nominally Byz., but in fact autonomous. Croatian impact on Dalmatian cities and islands intensified. Brief restoration of Byz. influence in the mid-12th C. collapsed in 1180. From 1204 to 1358 Venice dominated Dalmatia, after which all the area except Dubrovnik was conquered by Hungary. Venetian domination returned in the early 15th C. and lasted until 1797.


**DALMATIC OF CHARLEMAGNE.** Neither a dalmatic nor belonging to Charlemagne, the so-called Dalmatic of Charlemagne, a piece of silk dating ca. mid-14th C., is a patriarchal sakkos presumably from Constantinople; documented in Vatican inventories from 1489, it is currently in the Treasury of St. Peter's. Its association with Charlemagne is purely legendary. The dark blue silk sakkos is decorated with an extensive gold-embroidered figural cycle on the theme of Salvation. The complex iconography begins with the Transfiguration on the back of the garment, continues with the Communion of the Apostles (see *Lord’s Supper*) on the shoulders, and ends with the Parousia, the Second Coming of Christ on the front. Embroidered inscriptions include Matthew 26:26–27, John 11:25, and Matthew 25:34.


**DALMATOU MONASTERY,** an important early monastery, evidently the first to be constructed in Constantinople. Dalmatou (Δαλμάτου, Δαλματίου) was founded in 382 by the Syrian saint Isaac outside the Constantinian walls in the eastern part of the Psamathia quarter. After Isaac's death ca.406, he was succeeded as superior by his disciple Dalmatios, a former officer of the imperial guard (died 438), after whom the monastery was named. In the 5th C. Dalmatou was a bastion of Orthodoxy, and its superior was given the title of archimandrite of exarch, supervisor of the other monasteries of the capital. Beginning in the late 7th C., the monastery was frequently used as a place of confinement for political prisoners, such as the deposed emperors Justinian II, Leontios, and Philippikos. During the Iconoclastic controversy, the Dalmatou monastery was persecuted because of its fervent support of images and even closed for a time. In the 9th C. the vita (unpublished) of Hilarion (died 845), a superior of Dalmatou and iconodule confessor, was written by a certain Sabas (*BHG* 2177, 2177b). In the late 12th C. Dalmatou was transformed into a nunnery; in 1182, Maria, widow of Manuel I Komnenos, was confined there. Thereafter the monastery disappears from the sources.


**DAMAGE BY QUADRUPEDS.** Roman law regulated wrongful damage to property by the Lex Aquilia, which deals primarily with the killing of another person's slave or animal and with damage by the burning, breaking, or destruction of another's property. To these two categories Byz. law added the specific case of praida (προϊδα). The word is derived from Latin praeda (meaning "booty," and metaphorically "gain") and was used in late Roman texts in its original sense of "booty" (e.g., John Moschos, PG 87:3024B). The Farmer's Law, however, lends to this term a new legal sense, that of damage by quadrupeds, and regulates the punishments and compensations due on
both sides when an animal wanders onto a neighbor’s land and causes damage or is injured (pars. 25, 48–53, 58). Some of these norms were accepted in (Italian?) provincial law. Where this “original and practical rule of arbitration” (Simon, *infra*) first arose is unclear. It could be a borrowing from neighboring countries—it exists in the Lombard *Edictum Rothari* and in its Greek translation (*MGH Leges* 4:231)—or a local Byz. development due to similar rural conditions.

**Lit.** Simon, “Provinzialrecht” 102–10. —A.K.

**Damascus (Δαμασκός),** ancient city in southern Syria situated 100 km inland from the Mediterranean between the coastal mountains and the desert, in an oasis watered by the Barada River. An important military stronghold on the eastern frontier, Damascus was one of four cities of Óriens with an arms factory (*NotDign* 11.18–23). The city was the metropolitan bishopric of the province of Phoenicia Libanensis, which was under the civil administration of Emesa. Little remains of Byz. Damascus. The Roman temple of Zeus Damascenos was closed by Theodosios I and a church (later named for John the Baptist) was built within its precincts. Sauvaget (*infra*) demonstrated that the ancient street grid of Damascus evolved into an irregular “oriental” system, but subsequent attempts to date this change to the 5th–6th C., rather than later (H. Kennedy, *ByzF* 10 [1985] 170, n.91), are conjectural. Sophronios of Jerusalem was a native of Damascus.

The city was under Persian rule from 612 to 628 and was taken by the Arabs in 635. There are several conflicting accounts of the siege—including one that emphasized the role of the father of John of Damascus—and the peace terms made between the victors and the people of Damascus (payment of tribute, division of property), as quoted in some sources, may be of dubious authenticity (Donner, *Conquests* 131–45, 246f). Soon after its conquest Damascus became the capital of the Umayyad Caliphate (661–750). In 708 the Church of John the Baptist was replaced by the Great Mosque, which was decorated with wall mosaics attributed by some scholars to Byz. craftsmen. In the 10th C. Damascus passed to the Ikhshidids and Fatimids of Egypt, and, while briefly controlled by the Turk Afteqin, was placed under Byz. protection in 975. From 1154 the city was the base of Nur al-Din, and from 1174 it supported Saladin, who died there.


**Damascus Chronicle.** See *Ibn al-Qalânis*.

**Damaskenos, Peter,** monk and ascetic writer, fl. ca.1156/7. His major works, of the type of the *Philokalia*, were entitled “Admonition [Hypomnemesis] addressed to his own soul” and “Sayings in alphabetical order.” They are based on tradition (the latest author cited is the 10th-C. Symeon Metaphrastes) and treat primarily the problem of salvation. Although Damaskenos’s world view is optimistic and he argues that the way of salvation is open to lay persons (biotikoi), he ascribes the highest esteem to solitary (hesychastic) monks. The ideal way of salvation is neither social nor that achieved in a monastic community, but individual. The first stage of this path is the purification of body and soul, in which reading forms an important element; the second stage, called *theoria* or *gnosis*, is reached not only through meditation but through divine grace: beginning with the contemplation of Christ’s passion, the soul soars up to the contemplation of God in his attributes. Damaskenos was very popular in both late Byz. and Russia.


**Lit.** J. Gouillard, “Un auteur spirituel byzantin du XIIe siècle, Pierre Damascène,” *EO* 38 (1939) 257–78. —A.K.

**Damaskios (Δαμάσκος),** or Damaskios Diodochos, last scholar of the *Academy of Athens*; born Damascus ca.460?, died after 538. Damaskios both studied and taught rhetoric at Alexandria, also studying Plato with Ammonios. Moving to Athens, he studied several subjects, including mathematics, under Marinos. He eventually headed the Neoplatonist school. Sometime after Justinian’s closing of the Academy in 529, he emigrated with six fellow traveling philosophers to the Persian court. Soon disillusioned, they returned to
Byz. territory in 532 under a special treaty giving them safe-conduct and freedom of expression. An epigram that he wrote at Emesa (AnthGr 7:533) shows him still alive in 538.

His biography of his colleague Isidore can be reconstituted from fragments in Photios (Bibl., cods. 181, 242) and the Souda. Of his Platonic commentaries, that on the Philebus is wholly extant, those on the Parmenides and Phaedo partly so. A treatise On First Principles also survives. Several lost works include four books of mirabilia, thought by Photios (Bibl., cod.130) to be concisely written and good of their kind. Damaskios’s literary versatility continues the tradition of the Second Sophistic, while his wedding of science and superstition is typical of late Neoplatonism.


DAMILAS, NEILOS, hieromonk of the monastery of Karkasina at Hierapetra (Crete); died ca.1417. In 1399 Damilas (Δαμιλάς) established nearby, at Baionaia, a nunnery dedicated to the Theotokos Pantanassa and composed a typikon for the nuns. His rule emphasized the cenobitic life, proper psalmody, daily reading, and strict supervision of the nuns to prevent unauthorized contact with men, whether monks, lay workers, or relatives.

Damilas knew Latin as well as Greek, and took an interest in contemporary theological controversies. He composed a treatise, addressed to Maximos Chrysarges, supporting the Orthodox position on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. A bibliophile and scribe, he included in his will of 1417 (ed. S. Lampros, BZ 4 [1895] 585–87) an inventory of books, probably bequeathed to the nunnery at Baionaia. His library numbered 41 volumes, primarily liturgical or theological, but included one lexikon and a MS of the works of Cato, Boethius, and Manasses. In the inventory he noted that six of the MSS were in his own hand.


DAMNATIO MEMORIAE, a modern term designating a punishment for high treason or maiestas, inherited from Rome. The name damnatio memoriae derives from the fact that traitors could be tried posthumously. As a formal procedure, damnatio memoriae is attested only in the late Roman period (e.g., Institutes 4.18.3; cf. Theophilus in Zepos, Jus 3:268.34–38). It entailed obliteration of the condemned’s memory through destruction of his images, erasure of his name from inscriptions, and cancellation of his legal acts (Cod.Theod. XV 14.1–13). Damnatio memoriae was carried out chiefly against usurpers and their appointees, as the consular datings suggest (R.S. Bagnall et al., Consuls of the Later Roman Empire [Atlanta 1987] 25). In later centuries the formal procedure lapsed, but some of its features crop up in measures taken after a change of government, as when Emp. Alexander’s name was removed from literary works (J. Grosdidier de Matons, TM 5 [1973] 229–42) and images of Nikephoros II Phokas were destroyed after his fall. Acts of Basil the Notios were invalidated unless countersigned by Basil II (Reg 1, no.774). Likewise, certain names were suppressed or restored to the liturgical diptychs, depending on the doctrinal tendency of the moment.


DANAE, a mythological figure, daughter of the Argive king Akrisos. She was sealed by her father in a chamber and there conceived a child by Zeus, who visited her in a shower of gold. The image was used in Byz. literature in its direct form, for example, as a simile for a person imprisoned and chained, “like Danaë by Akrisos of old” (Nik.Chon. 56.44). More important, the myth of Danaë had an impact on the creation of Christian legends about noble girls sealed by their
fathers in a tower or an isolated palace where a visiting angel would initiate them into the Christian creed. One of the “Christian Danaës” was St. Barbara; another was St. Irene-Penelope, daughter of King Licinius, who was secretly baptized by Timotheos, disciple of the apostle Paul (BHG 952γ-954C).

LIT. A. Wirth, Danaë in christlichen Legenden (Prague-Vienna-Leipzig 1892).

—A.K.

DANCE (δρυχησις) was inherited by the Byz. from their Greco-Roman past. The attitude toward dance was hotly discussed in late antiquity, when the church fathers rejected dance together with the theater as an embodiment of immorality. On the other hand, in 361 Libanius published an oration, On the Dancers (ed. R. Foerster, 4:420–98), defending both the art of dance and dancers. Although his oration was a refutation of Ailios Aristide (J. Mesk, WienSt 39 [1908–09] 59–74), he was definitely referring to contemporary matters. Dancing on stage died out as did the theater, but dance performances survived in court festivities. They are represented on several artifacts, such as the crown of Constantine IX Monomachos and the silver vase of the 12th C. from Berezovo; the dancers wear long dresses, usually with broad sleeves, and wave kerchiefs over their head. As part of court ceremonial, the members of factions (demoi) performed an “exotic” dance, the Gothic Pageant (De cer., ed. Vogt, 2:88ff, 102–04, 149ff, 182–85).

Despite rhetorical attacks on dance, it remained popular with different levels of Byz. society: the wife of Digenes Akritas danced for her husband on a small carpet (blattis) to the accompaniment of a lyre (kithara); the logosethes tou dromou John Kamateros is described by a 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 113.95) as dancing the licentious kordax, “kicking his legs to and fro.” Lewd dances with suggestive movements and nudity are further documented by the 15th-C. Comedy of Kata-blattas (ed. P. Canivet, N. Oikonomides, Dipycha 3 [1982–83] 29.43–46, 43.194, 210, 73.647). Dance formed an indispensable element of all feasts—the Calends and Brumalia, for example—and esp. weddings. The festival of St. Agathe included dancing by women in the cloth-making trades (A. Laiou in Festschrift Stratos 1:112ff); in taverns men danced with women to the music of flute and cymbals and the clapping of hands.


DANDOLO, ANDREAS, jurist, historian, and doge of Venice (from 4 Jan. 1343); born 30 Apr. 1306, died 7 Sept. 1354. As doge, Dandolo allied Venice with Cyprus and the Hospitaliters against the Turks (1343–45) and waged war against Genoa in alliance first with John VI Kantakouzenos and then John V Palaiologos. In St. Mark’s, he sponsored the restoration of the Pala d’Oro and commissioned the baptistery mosaics and the chapel of St. Isidore. Dandolo ordered the overhaul of the statutes of Venice (Liber Sexitus, 1343–46; Vol-umen statutorum legum ac turium tam civilium quam criminalium DD. Venetorum [Venice 1709]) as well as a systematic collection of instruments relative to Venice’s role in the Levant, Liber albus, which is a precious source on Byz.-Venetian relations (e.g., the treaty of MANUEL I with Venice, Reg 2, no.1365), and Liber blancus, which is on Italy.

Before becoming doge Dandolo had written a concise chronicle from Venice’s origins to 1342, but his most important work, the Chronica per extensum descripta (A.D. 48–1280) was begun after assuming power. Although its chronological framework derives from the universal chronicle of Paulinus, bishop of Pozzuoli (died ca.1344), it transcribes 40 documents and summarizes about 240 others, including numerous Byz. instruments. Aside from the latter (e.g., Emp. Leo V’s order of an embargo on trade with the Arabs, 144.31–33; Reg 1, no.400), this chronicle provides most valuable evidence for the period after that covered by the CHRONICON VENETUM, which it used. Dandolo organized his account after the 8th C. by reigns of doges; he is favorable to the Byz. monarchy at the outset, but his account becomes hostile in the second half of the 12th C. owing to Byz.’s religious deviance; his glorification of the policies of his ancestor Enrico DANDOLO may reflect anti-Turkish projects afoot at the time of the work’s composition (F. Thiriet, RESEE 10 [1972] 5–15).


—M.McC.
DANDOLO, ENRICO, doge of Venice (1192–1205); born Venice ca.1107 or later, died Constantinople ca.29 May 1205. Before becoming doge, Dandolo (Δάνδουλος) served on embassies to Manuel I (1172) and Andronikos I (1184). According to later legend, a Byz. emperor had him blinded, but the story is unconfirmed; his impaired vision did not hinder his vigorous activity. Elected doge ca.Apr. 1192, Dandolo found himself drawn into protracted negotiations with Alexios III; his shrewd foresight is evident in his instructions to envoys sent in 1197. Despite Alexios's renewal of Venetian privileges (1198), Byz. officials abused Venice's rights. In 1201 Dandolo and his council contracted with envoys of the Fourth Crusade to construct a large fleet in return for payment and to send 50 galleys at their own expense. In 1202, when an insufficient number of Crusaders appeared to repay Venice's expenditures, Dandolo offered to postpone the debt, provided that the expedition recover Zara. With Dandolo's encouragement, the Venetians joined the Crusade. At Zara, Dandolo welcomed the suggestion of Philip of Swabia and the future Alexios IV that the Crusade place Alexios on the throne; he had possibly negotiated earlier with Alexios.

Dandolo played a leading role in the capture of Constantinople in 1203, in the ensuing discussions with Alexios IV and Alexios V, and in the conquest of 1204. By the Treaty of March 1204 and the Partitio Romanae, he secured for Venice repayment of its expenses and three-eighths of the empire. He was at Adrianople when Emp. Baldwin I was captured; Dandolo facilitated the Crusaders' retreat but died shortly after. He was buried in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople. Villehardouin admired Dandolo's ability and forceful leadership; Niketas Choniates stigmatized his cunning and vengefulness and imputed to him the Crusade's diversion against Byz.


DANIEL, or Danielis (Δανιήλ), a rich widow in Patras; born ca.820, died Naupaktos? ca.890. She sponsored the future emperor Basil I when he came to Patras ca.850 in the service of the imperial official Theophilos. According to the biography of Basil by Constantine VII (TheophCont 226–28), a monk in Patras prophesied that Basil would obtain imperial power, and Danelis lavished attention upon him and made him spiritual brother of her son John. Later, Basil appointed John protospatharios. Danelis left almost all her property to Leo VI (p.917–21) instead of to her grandson (her son John predeceased her). Her wealth struck the imagination of her contemporaries; she reportedly owned “innumerable” slaves, 3,000 of whom Leo VI freed and settled in southern Italy; she controlled “not a small part of the Peloponnesos as her personal property,” and even for her dispossessed heirs she retained 80 proaspeia. Given the general paucity of great estates in 9th-C. Byz., Danelis's case requires special explanation. Runciman suggested that her wealth was based on a flourishing silk production in the Peloponnesos, but E. Weigand (in Eis mmeme Spyridonos Lamprou [Athens 1935] 504) pointed out that the description of her riches mentioned no silk, only sidonia erga. It is worth noting that Constantine VII states that Basil I was ready to proclaim Danelis mistress (kyria) of “the whole of this land” (p.228.14–15) and that she returned from her voyage to Constantinople “as the lady (despina) and queen (basilissa) of the country” (p.919.8). Possibly Danelis's estates around Patras, an area that in the early 9th C. was controlled by Slavic tribes, still formed a semi-independent “prince-dom” in the middle of the century. Granting the title protospatharios to foreign princes was not atypical of this period.


—A.K.

Origen, in his fourth homily on Ezekiel (PG 13:569-704), led the church fathers in distinguishing three types of just man, represented by Noah, Daniel, and Job (H. de Lubac, Exégèse médiévale, vol. 1.2 [Paris 1959-61] 571-74). Daniel in the Lions' Den (Dan 6) and the Three Hebrews were types of the Resurrection, according to, for example, ORIGEN (Contra Celsum 7.57). During Daniel's second sojourn in a lion's den, Habakkuk brought him bread, which Hippolytos and others interpreted as a eucharistic prefiguration. The Commendatio animae prayer refers to the rescue narratives of the Book of Daniel—Daniel in the Lions' Den, the Three Hebrews, Susanna and the Elders. The Life of Daniel the Stylite, who was named after Daniel, alludes to him frequently and refers to Nebuchadnezzar (ch.68), Susanna (ch.71), and the Three Hebrews (ch.92).

Daniel's relics and tomb, preserved at the church of St. Romanos in Constantinople, were visited by pilgrims. With the Three Hebrews, Daniel was commemorated on 17 Dec. at Hagia Sophia (G. Majeska, DOP 28 [1974] 363).

Representation in Art. Images of Daniel are found, particularly with the soteriological implications attached to the story of the Lions' Den, from the 4th C. onward on sarcophagi and ivory pyxides (Age of Spirit., nos. 421, 436) as well as on objects of daily use (no.377). This scene, with Daniel orans between two lions, was repeated with few changes in illuminated MSS of Kosmas Indikopleustes and in the Menologion of Basil II. In the marginal Psalters, Daniel's vision of the great mountain (Dan 2:34-5) is added. In such miniatures, as in his appearances among the Prophets in church domes, Daniel is usually clad in Persian costume. The eschatological implications of the Book of Daniel were virtually ignored in art.


C.B.T., J.L., J.H.L., A.C.

DANIEL OF SKETIS, monk and hegoumenos of Sketis; saint; born early 6th C., died after 576 in Tombak, Lower Egypt, according to Coptic tradition. His activity is known from a series of short stories that in Ethiopic and Coptic versions form a unified work. The stories are presented as if told by Daniel himself or his associates and contain precious details not only about monks (e.g., the repentant Mark who lived in Alexandria pretending to be a fool) but also of craftsmen (the argyroprates Andronikos in Antioch) and members of the upper class (the patrikia Anastasia, who fled from Constantinople to Sketis). The stories, simple in structure (similar to the Apophthegmata Patrum), combine adventures with moral indoctrination: Daniel was supposedly captured three times by "barbarians" in the desert; the third time he killed his captor, which so upset Daniel that he visited ecclesiastical and secular authorities in Alexandria, Rome, Constantinople, Ephesus, Jerusalem, and Antioch in search of punishment, but he was exonerated everywhere. Another story deals with the eternal question of the damaging influence of wealth: rewarded through Daniel's prayer, a stonemason named Eulogios found a cave full of coins, moved to Constantinople, and became "eparch of the holy praetorium." Wealth and glory did not make Eulogios happy; involved in the Nika Revolt of 532, he was forced to flee to his village from Justinian I's revenge. Only Coptic and Ethiopic traditions made him a staunch anti-Chalcedonian (H. Bacht, LThK 5:155). Besides the Greek original, Daniel's stories are known in Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, and Arabic, the last very close to the Greek version.

Representation in Art. Portraits of Daniel, very rare, can be found at Hosios Loukas and in the Enkleistra of St. Neophytos: the saint is portrayed as a monk with a white beard, which, in the Enkleistra, has five strands.

DANIEL THE STYLITE, saint; born in village of Meratha near Samosata 409, died near Constantinople 11 Dec. 493. At age 12 he entered a monastery. After visiting Symeon the Stylist the Elder, Daniel set off for Constantinople and in 460 mounted a pillar in Anaplous on the Bosporus. His anonymous Life is preserved in two versions: Delehaye (infra, xxxv) regards it as a contemporary work; Beck (Kirche 411) dates it ca.600. The hagiographer presents Daniel as a legitimate heir of Symeon—he received Symeon's leather tunic after the stylist's death. The hagiographer also stresses Daniel's political role: for example, he acted as mediator between Emp. Leo I and Gubazes, king of Lazika; he descended from his pillar to resolve the conflict between Patr. Akaikos and Basiliskos. The power of this stylist exceeded that of the emperor: when Leo I dared to mount a horse in sight of the saint, the horse threw him. Daniel was above the elements, too: after the wind tore off Daniel's tunic one winter night, his disciples found him atop the pillar, his body seemingly lifeless and covered by icicles, but they revived him using sponges with warm water. His funeral was regal—tens of thousands of candles were lit, and a large sarcophagus of precious stones was prepared for him. Symeon Metaphrastes reworked Daniel's Life.

Representation in Art. Portraits of Daniel show an elderly monk behind a grill atop his column (MENOLEGION OF BASIL II, p.237) or under a little protective shelter letting down a basket (Theodore Psalter, fol.26v); in church decoration he is paired with other stylists, esp. St. Symeon the Stylite the Elder, who occupy corresponding positions in the church. At Nea Mone on Chios, he is portrayed as having hair that comes down over his shoulders and a very long beard. A mosaic portraying Daniel is also preserved in Monreale.


-A.K., N.P.S.

DANIIIL IGUMEN, an early 12th-C. superior (hegoumenos), presumed to be from southern Rus'; sometimes identified with Danil, bishop of Jur'ev (1114-29). He wrote an account of a journey from Constantinople to the Holy Land, normally dated 1106-08, though conjectures span 1104-09. Danil traveled by sea, stopping at Ephesus and several islands, onward via Cyprus to Jerusalem. During his 16-month stay in the Holy Land he was based at the Lavra of St. Sabas, one of whose monks acted as his guide. Danil's account is exceptionally broad in scope and diverse in detail: his terse descriptions are dense with information on measurements and distances; shapes and dimensions; and local crops, weather, and produce. He also reports stories (often apocryphal and perhaps oral) connected with the sites he visits. Relations between the Orthodox and the Latins are cordial: on a trip to Galilee, Danil travels with King Baldwin I of Jerusalem for safety; he accepts the blessing of the Latin monks on Mt.
Tabor; and he describes at length the joint celebration of the descent of the Holy Light at the Holy Sepulchre at Easter (probably 1107), confirming in all essentials the 1101 account by Fulcher of Chartres.


DANIȘMENDIDS (Τανσομάνιοι), a Turkoman dynasty that ruled over Cappadocia, the Iris valley, and the regions of Sebasteia and Melitene. Its founder, Emir Danisman, appeared after 1085 during a period of anarchy in Muslim Asia Minor. Later he fought against the soldiers of the First Crusade: in 1100, near Melitene, he captured one of its most prestigious leaders, Bohemund, whom he imprisoned in Neokaisareia. Emir Danișmand is the hero of a Turkish epic poem combining history and legend, the Dânișmendndâné. He was succeeded by Emir Ghażî, who increased his power by intervening in the dynastic strife among members of the Seljuk house; he also fought against the Byz. emperor John II Komnenos in the region of Kastamon. Around the mid-12th C. the Danișmendid territories were divided by dynastic struggle from which the Byz. profited. Manuel I Komnenos allied with the Danișmendid Yaghi-Basan and used him against the Seljuks. The Seljuks, however, defeated the Byz. in 1176 at Myriokephalon; after they conquered Melitene in 1178 the Danișmendid dynasty disappeared. Some preserved coins of the Danișmendids bear Greek or Greek and Arabic inscriptions.

LIT. I. Mêlikoff, EI² 2:110f. C. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Tur-
22, 155–59, 220f.

DANIȘMENDNâME, or Book of Melik Danișmand, a Turkish epic composed in 1360 by Arif Ali, but based on a mid-13th-C. version by Mawlama ibn Ala, now lost. A mixture of simple prose and poetry, the Dânișmendnâme recounts the legendary deeds of Emir Danișmand (died 1104), known to Anna Komnene as Tanismanes, the founder of the Danișmendî beylik in northern Anatolia. As a whole, the Dânișmendnâme depicts the emir’s confrontation with Christians of Asia Minor as a perfect expression of ghazâ, or holy warfare, in the cause of Islam. This aside, the work indubitably reflects the mentality of the Turcomans who conquered Anatolia in the 11th–12th C. as well as the character of the conquest.


DANUBE (Δανοῦβος), ancient Istris, the most important river of central and southeastern Europe. The name Danoubios/Danoubis was being used already in late antiquity (Julian, pseudo-Kaisarios, Stephen of Byzantium), but it did not totally replace the classical Istris. The Danube rises in the Black Forest of Germany and empties into the Black Sea, forming a huge delta. Some of its right-bank tributaries (Sava, Drina, and Morava) connected Byz. territories with the Danube. The river is divided into three almost equal sections: the upper (down to Vienna), middle (to the Iron Gate, near Orsova, Rumania), and lower reaches.

The Romans made the Danube their frontier and established the following provinces to its south: Raetia, Noricum, Pannonia, Moesia I and II; Dacia was to the north. They built a fortified limes, many ports, and cities (e.g., Sirmium, Singidunum, Dorostolon). In the division of the empire in 395, Raetia, Noricum, and Pannonia were ceded to the Western Empire. Soon afterward, however, the territory south of the Danube was occupied by the Germanic peoples, the Huns, and finally (568) by the Avars. Anastasios I and Justinian I tried to fortify the Danubian frontier in its middle and lower reaches, but by 600 the Avars and Sklaventai destroyed what was left of the limes. The Sklavini began to emerge; the “Seven Tribes” settled along both banks of the Lower Danube and by 680 the whole of Moesia was under Bulgar control.

Byz. reconquered the south bank of the Danube between 971 and 1018 and retained it in the 11th–12th C., establishing the themes of Sirmium and Paristrion. Byz. struggled to protect this area from raids of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans and competed with Hungary in the 12th C. for the region of Zemun and Braničevo.
The Danube was an important mercantile route but, being on the Byz. frontier, did not much influence its internal development. Protected by a fleet and a system of fortresses, it created a serious obstacle for invaders: but the nomads of the steppe learned to cross it—on ice in rare winters when the Danube froze, or swimming behind their horses, or in small boats.


**DAPHNE.** See Antioch.

**DAPHNI** (Δαφνειον, Δαφνιον), located approximately 10 km west of Athens, the site of a celebrated monastery dedicated to the Mother of God and best known for the mosaics of its *katholikon*. Sculptural remains led Millet (infra) to suggest that an earlier church on the site dated from the reign of Justinian I. There is no textual support for this supposition, however; Daphni is not named among the more than 100 monasteries whose representatives attended the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 (Mansi 13:152–56). The dates of construction and decoration of the present church, laid out as a Greek cross-octagon (see Church Plan Types), are unknown, although the mosaics are generally held to be of the late 11th C. The monastery was certainly in existence in 1048 when Dionysios, “monk and priest of the monastery of Daphni,” attached his name to the *tupikon* of a confraternity serving Hosios Loukas. Several seals of the monastery, one of a *hegoumenos* Paul (Laurent, *Corpus* 5.2, no.1245), have been attributed to the 10th–12th C. Daphni is briefly mentioned in the 12th-C. *vita* of *Meletios the Younger* (ed. Vasilievskij, 55-31).

Although it is sometimes assumed to be an imperial foundation, the construction of the church cannot be connected with two later, much damaged frescoes of emperors in its narthex. Cistercian monks settled at Daphni between 1207 and 1211, building an exonarthex and a small cloister on the south side. It remained in Latin hands until the Ottoman occupation of Attica in 1458. Apparently abandoned in the 18th C., the monastery was partially restored after World War II (E. Stikas, *DChAE* 43 [1962–63] 1–47).

The mosaics of Daphni, some employing silver tesserae and set against expanses of gold, are dominated by a Pantokrator in the dome, made more fierce in a restoration of 1889–97, and prophets in the drum. Below, four Great Feast scenes in the squinches and others in panels on the walls concentrate on the life of Christ. Despite the church’s dedication, the only Mariological pictures in the nave are the Birth of the Virgin in the northern arm of the cross and her Dormition over the west door. Other scenes from her life are found in the southern portion of the narthex. Throughout, portraits of saints are far fewer than at Hosios Loukas. The style of the mosaics, often described as having a “classical” or “antique” aspect, is unparalleled in works later than the *Menologion of Basil II*. Their serene monumentality is due in part to balanced composition, in part to skillful framing within ornamental arches on the walls or, as in the squinches, their setting above a finely cut marble cornice.


DAPHNOPATES, THEODORE, high-ranking official and writer; died after 961. Protasekretis, patrikios, and magistros (according to the headings of his works), Daphnopates (Δαφνόπατης) played a very important role at the court of Romanos I; he probably lost influence under Constantine VII, but Romanos II briefly appointed him to the post of eparch of Constantinople. The correspondence of Daphnopates sometimes has an official character and sheds light on Byz. international and domestic politics (including the enthronement of Patr. Theophylaktos and relations with Symeon of Bulgaria). The letters deal also with Armenian affairs; Daphnopates apparently knew Armenian. The correspondence treats theological questions as well, and two letters are dedicated to the interpretation of a dream of Romanos II. Daphnopates wrote homilies, one of which describes the miracles worked in Antioch by a holy relic (the hand of John the Baptist), its theft from Antioch and transfer to Constantinople. He also composed several hagiographical works (on St. George, Theophanes the Confessor, Theodore of Studios) and a collection of excerpts from John Chrysostom arranged systematically, a work typical of 10th-C. Encyclopedism. Skylitzes describes Daphnopates as a historian, and some scholars have suggested that he wrote the last section of the chronicle of Theophanes Continuatus. I. Dujčev (DOP 32 [1978] 252f) considers Daphnopates as the most probable author of an anonymous speech on the Bulgarian Treaty.


DARDANELLES. See HELLESPONT.

DAVID (Δαβίδ), the greatest king of Israel, according to the Bible. David was venerated in Byz. as the author of the Psalms and creator of Christian music and poetry. He was also treated as a prefiguration of Christ: his fight with Goliath symbolizes Christ's victory over Satan, his function as shepherd presages Christ's role as shepherd of souls, etc. The ambivalence of the biblical David—his vices and humility when set against his heroic exploits—attracted Byz. interest, and his penitence for his sins (infidelity, the murder of Absalom) was frequently discussed. David became an esp. popular figure in political rhetoric of the 12th C. when Manuel I and Andronikos I were compared to him. Michael Choniates (1:215,9–24) specifically compares Isaac II to icons of David.

Representation in Art. David normally appears in imperial garb; when this regalia changed, that of David did not. In monumental painting he is found among the PROPHETS or with Solomon in the ANASTASIS. In Psalter illustration David is shown holding the text, inspired by God, or leading musicians. Illustrating the events of 1–2 Kings, he occurs in many narrative situations, such as the anointing by Samuel or slaying Goliath; both scenes occur already on the David Plates. In the PARIS PSALTER and elsewhere, David the shepherd and musician appears as ORPHEUS, inspired by
the personification of Melodia. This composition passed into secular art, serving as the centerpiece of a 12th-C. silver bowl with a representation of Digenes Akritas and Eudokia (Darkevič, "Svetskoe iskusstvo" 132–99).


DAVID, SYMEON, AND GEORGE OF MYTILENE, three Iconodule brothers from Lesbos; saints; feast day 1 Feb. Born to a family possessing a modest amount of property, they lived as hermits and monks on Lesbos; George was elected bishop of Mytilene. Only Symeon is said to have been exiled to the Aegean island of Lagousas, whence he set off for Constantinople, fleeing Arab attacks; he stood on a column near Pegai on the Black Sea. On the basis of their Life, van den Gheyn (infra 210) constructs this chronology of the brothers: David, 716–83/93; Symeon, 764–843; George, 763–844. Halkin (infra 468) questioned the authenticity of the Life, which contains serious chronological contradictions. On the evidence of a 10th-C. Life of George, Patm. gr. 254 (AB 72 [1954] 221), Halkin calculated that George was born ca. 776, became bishop in 804, and died on 7 Apr. 821. I. Phountoules attempted to distinguish three different Georges of Mytilene. The Life of the three brothers seems to have been written after Petronas’s victory over the Arabs in 863 and before the assassination of Bardas (865), to whom George prophesied a happy future (ed. van den Gheyn, p.252.22–30). Anti-Iconoclastic in its tendency, the Life eulogizes the empress Theodora and reveals a good knowledge of her circle; it provides a vivid, contemporary account of the restoration of images (H. Grégoire, Byzantium 8 [1933] 517–20). The collective hero of the Life is a pious family: the "pure virgin" Hilaria, sister of David, Symeon, and George, is also praised, as well as their uncle; the brothers were buried in a common "family" tomb.


DAVID I KOMNENOS, last emperor of Trebizond (1459–Aug./Sept. 1461); born between ca. 1407 and 1409, died Constantinople 1 Nov. 1463. Third son of Alexios IV Komnenos, David held the title of despotes during the reign of his brother John IV Komnenos. In 1458 he went to Adrianople to pay tribute to the Ottoman sultan Mehmed II. Shortly after David ascended the throne, he surrendered Trebizond to the Ottomans, who had attacked by land and sea. He was taken prisoner, together with his family. After a brief period of exile in Adrianople and Serres, David was accused of a conspiracy and subsequently executed.


DAVID II/IV THE RESTORER, Bagratid king of Iberia (1089–1125). Benefiting from the withdrawal of Byz after Mantzikert in 1071 and the collapse of Seljuk rule 20 years later (1092), David restored the power of the Georgian crown over the rebellious native dynasts with the help of mercenaries recruited from among the northern Caucasian Kipchak tribes. He reunited the principalities of Abchasia, K’aheti, and K’art’li into a single kingdom, with Tbilisi, which he had taken from the Muslims in 1112, as its capital. His military victories, together with his foundation of cultural and intellectual centers such as the monastery of Gelati, laid the foundation for Georgian power which, in the second half of the 12th C., reached into Armenia and Azerbaijan.


DAVID KOMNENOS (sometimes called David I Komnenos), ruler of Paphlagonia (ca.1204–12); monastic name, Daniel; died Sinope 13 Dec. 1212. Younger brother of Alexios I Komnenos of Trebizond, David helped conquer Trebizond, then, in late 1204, pushed west with Georgian and other
mercenary troops to occupy Paphlagonia. His lands extended from Sinope to Pontic Heracleia. Namely, David was subject to his brother. Attacking Nikomedea in 1205, his general Synadenos was defeated and captured by Theodore I Laskaris. Under pressure from the Nicaeans, David allied himself with Henry of Flanders; with aid from Constantinople, he survived Theodore’s siege of Heracleia (1206). But after his ally Thierry de Loos was defeated and captured by Theodore’s general Andronikos Gidos (1207), David was forced onto the defensive. He lost Heracleia to Theodore ca.1207; after his death the rest of Paphlagonia passed to the Nicaeans.


DAVID OF TAYK’/TAO, dynast of upper Tayk’/Tao (from 961); junior member of the Iberian Bagratid house and ruler of the Armeno-Iberian marchlands; died 31 Mar. 1000. David’s support of Emp. Basil II against Bardas Skleros won him the title of kouropalates and extensive territories along the Armeno-Byz. border from Tayk’/Tao by way of theodosiopolis to Mantzikert, which he retook from the Arabs between ca.992 and 994. David’s eminent position allowed him to play the role of arbiter in both Armenia and Georgia, and his bilingual court was a great intellectual and artistic center. In 969 David founded a church at Oški (in southern Tao-Klarjet’i), where he and his brother are represented as donors in stone reliefs, once flanking a Deesis and again in the south cross arm. Georgian inscriptions identify “David Magistros” and “King Bagrat, duke of dukes,” as builders of the church, a model of which they hold in the first set of images (W. Djobadze, BZ 69 [1976] 39–62).

Childless, David intended to make Bagrat III of Abchasia his heir and worked to unify other Georgians lands under him, until quarreling with him in 988. After David supported Bardas Phokas, Basil II forced him in 989 to will his lands to Byz. David’s death, possibly instigated by the pro-Byz. party among his nobles, gave Basil a pretext to annex Tayk’/Tao and to transform it into the core of the new theme of Iberia, an event that marked the beginning of the Byz. conquest of the Armenian plateau.


—N.G.G., C.M.B., A.C.

DAVID OF THESSALONIKE, saint; born Mesopotamia ca.450, died ca.540 on a boat en route to Thessalonike; feastday 26 June. He went as a boy to Thessalonike from the east, became pious, lived (for three years?) in an almond tree near a church, and later inhabited a cell. Aristeides, archbishop of Thessalonike, sent David to Constantinople to request the transfer of the eparch’s residence from Sirmium (endangered by Avar invasions) to Thessalonike. David, an Abraham-like hermit with hair down to his loins, was respectfully received by Empress THEODORA and then by Justinian I, in whose presence David worked a miracle—he held hot charcoal embers without burning his hands. He died after his successful mission. According to John Moschos, a certain Palladios in Alexandria related how David dwelt in a cell outside the walls of Thessalonike and how soldiers observed a miraculous fire pouring out of his cell windows. David’s anonymous Life, written in Thessalonike ca.720, contains a surprising eulogy of Theodora. David’s exploits were praised by JOSEPH THE HYMNOPHGRAPHER, Makarios MAKRES, and others.

Representation in Ari. The saint is depicted as a hermit with a long beard that sometimes reaches his feet, for example, in a relief of ca.900 (A. Xygopoulos, Makedonika 2 [1941–52] 143–66); in the parekklesion at CHORA, he is depicted seated in a nest atop an almond tree whose branches substitute for the capital of a stylite’s column. The church of Hosios David in Thessalonike was dedicated to him.


—A.K., N.P.S.

DAVID PLATES, a set of nine plates decorated with a series of scenes from the life of King DAVID, now divided between the Nikosia and Metropoli-
tian Museums. Part of the Second Cyprus Treasure, the plates, made of solid silver chased from the front, all have silver stamps dated to the period 613–629/30 and bear witness, therefore, to high standards of metalworking in the early 7th C. Of three graduated sizes, these dishes were intended as display plates; the biblical scenes, which include David’s combat with Goliath, have been interpreted as commemorating the war Herakleios waged with the Sasanian Persians, which ended in 628, thereby narrowing the date of the plates to 629/30. A plate from another possible David series, found in Russia (Age of Spirit, fig.61), suggests that several sets may have been made for imperial distribution as largitio dishes.


David the Philosopher, a pupil of Olympiodoros in Alexandria in the second half of the 6th C.; Greek sources attribute to him an Introduction to Philosophy and a Commentary on Porphyry’s Eisagoge. In Armenian tradition, however, David the “Invincible” Philosopher was thought to be a pupil of Mesrop Mahtoc. Medieval accounts of his defense of Armenian orthodoxy against the Council of Chalcidon are legendary. Armenian translations of the two Greek works noted above and of Greek commentaries on Aristotle’s Categories and Analytics were attributed to him. Certainly, the Armenian renderings of these standard philosophical texts were of fundamental importance for the development of Armenian philosophy. Numerous Armenian commentaries on the Prolegomena, or “Definitions and Divisions of Philosophy,” were written in the 13th and 14th C.


-R.T.
their heads, on the model of the Hours represented in floor mosaics at Antioch and elsewhere. Personified days played a part in the iconography of the seasons.

LIT. Grumel, Chronologie 165 ff. — B.C., A.C.

DAYR ANBĀ HADRĀ. See SYMEON, MONASTERY OF SAINT.

DAZIMON (Δαζίμων), a site in PONTOS, probably at the modern village of Dazmana (see P. Wittek, Byzantion 10 [1935] 55) above the Iris River, east of Amaseia, at the edge of an extensive plain. Although first mentioned in 375, Dazimon only became important in the wars between Byz. and the Arabs. In those years, the neighboring plain, an imperial estate in the late 6th C., formed an apleron where the troops of the ARMENIACON joined the emperor on eastern campaigns. In 838 Dazimon was the site of a major battle between Emp. Theophilos and the Arabs led by Afshin. In spite of initial Byz. success, the Arabs won a major victory that enabled them to capture Ankyra and eventually AMORION. The Byz. forces took refuge in Amaseia; news of the defeat at Dazimon provoked a riot in Constantinople. Remains of the site have not been reported. Dazimon has alternatively been identified with Tokat, whose jagged peak bears a fortress, some of which is Byz.


DEACON (διάκωνος “attendant, servant”), a specific office in the Byz. church. A deacon’s duties both in the primitive and patristic period were distinctly ministerial. He assisted at baptism (see also DEACONESS), served at the celebration and distribution of the Eucharist (which, however, only a PRIEST OR BISHOP could perform), supervised the charities dispensed by the church, managed the diocese’s properties and finances, and acted as the bishop’s secretary (cf. Council of Laodikeia, canons 21, 23, 25). The latter duty normally fell to the archdeacon, a title which first emerged in the 5th C. Despite his wide authority as the bishop’s chief assistant, the deacon was subordinate to both priest and bishop. He was, as such, the lowest in rank among the three major orders of the CLERGY. Conciliar legislation emphasized the inferiority of the office and even forbade the deacon to sit among the priests (NICAEA I, canon 18). This was later modified for a deacon representing his bishop at a council (Council in TRULLO, canon 7).

From the 11th C. the deacons of HAGIA SOPHIA at Constantinople, esp. those who were members of the ENEMOUSA SYNODS, managed to acquire and wield considerable power and influence within the patriarchate (V. Tiflizoglou, BZ 62 [1969] 33–36). Under Emp. Herakleios the number of deacons at Hagia Sophia was fixed at 150 (Reg 1, no.165), although by the late 12th C. their number had probably dwindled to about 60 (P. Wirth, ByzF 2 [1967] 380–82).

Canonically, the deacon was ordained to a specific diocese or church at age 25 or above (Trullo, canon 14). Marriage was permitted, but only before ordination. The deacon’s characteristic vestments were the ORATION and STICHARIUM. (See also SUBDEACON.)


— A.P.

DEACONESS (διακόνισσα). The feminine form of the term deacon dates from the 4th C. (NICAEA I, canon 19). Her chief liturgical function was to assist at the baptism of women, which, for reasons of decency, could not be performed exclusively by the male clergy. The decline of adult baptism, however, hastened the demise of the office. By the 12th C. it had indeed lapsed, although the title was still being used (“improperly,” according to BALSAMON) for certain women monastics (PG 137:441 D). In the EUCHOLOGIA, their ordination (Goar, Euchologion 218–22) paralleled that of the deacon. It was permissible only to widowed or unmarried women, however. Still, priesthood was never conferred upon a deaconess, although it could be conferred upon her male counterpart. EPIPHANIOS of Salamis emphasizes that deaconesses were not priests but women–elders (PG 42:744D–745A). The age for ordination, 60, was later reduced to 40 (Council of CHALCEDON, canon 15; Council in TRULLO, canon 14).
DE ACTIONIBUS, an anonymous treatise on actions in civil lawsuits. The work has the practical aim of enabling potential plaintiffs to give the correct name to their action. Its original version derives probably from the legal literature connected with the Justinianic antecessores, since its association with the 5th–6th-C. theory of civil procedure (libel suits) is evident. The treatise was still copied and supplemented in MSS of the 11th and later centuries, although the procedural act (editio actionis) appropriate to it cannot be provided for that period.


—D.S.

DE ADMINISTRANDO IMPERIO, conventional and incorrect title of a book compiled by Constantine VII or under his supervision and dedicated to his son Romanos II. The plan, according to the preface, consisted of four points: the relationship of the “nations” (ethnē) with the Rhomaioi and the means of using some ethnē to defeat and subdue dangerous neighbors; the gifts desired by the ethnē; the characterization of their geographical situation and their customs; the changes that took place in the “empire of the Romans.” Moravcsik (Byzantinoturcica 1:362f) tried to demonstrate that the work conforms to the plan despite occasional repetitions, contradictions, and errors; on the contrary, Lemercé (Humanism 320f) emphasized the book’s incoherence and heterogeneity. De administrando imperio has two levels, purely informative sections taken from archival documents and didactic indoctrinations concerning methods of diplomacy; accordingly, one must distinguish between the date of compilation (probably the 950s) and the date of texts included. Some materials are of signal importance (e.g., ch.9 describing the “way from the Varangians to the Greeks”), some are based on unreliable legends, but as a whole De administrando imperio is a unique source for the history of the Caucasus, the north shores of the Black Sea (Rus’, Pechenegs, Hungarians, Khazars), and the Serbians and Croats. The announced fourth section on changes within the empire remained unwritten.


—A.K.

DEATH (θάνατος). There was no fixed Byz. terminology for death; it is variously designated as a separation, passing away, the end of life, return, repose, payment of the common debt, and other formulations. The Byz. view of death, derived from Greco-Roman philosophy, is that it is the separation of the soul from the body; this separation was construed as temporary since eventually the soul would be reunited with its body. Death occurs through the commandment of God and is brought about by an angel sent for that purpose. There were divergent views, however, as to whether the hour of death was predetermined by God. Only the saints could foretell the day of their demise. The soul (naked and without gender) is usually envisaged as leaving the human body through the mouth in order to begin a 40-day journey in the company of the angels. In its ascent to heaven it must pass through the telomeia, or tollhouses, of the demons (cf. vita of Basil the Younger), which charge it for its sins. Thereafter it has the opportunity to see both PARADISE and HELL, and is then brought to a place of rest until the Day of Last Judgment. Doctrines of the wandering of the soul and reincarnation were totally rejected. Both Neoplatonic philosophy and Christianity saw death as a liberation from captivity, and yet laid greater stress on the positive aspect of birth to a new life. For this reason, such theologians as Basil the Great (PG 31:484A) and John Chrysostom criticized loud and excessive mourning over the dead. There was even objection in some radical monastic circles to a special BURIAL.

The rites of the FUNERAL liturgy and certain representations of the hereafter, which derive from
customs and beliefs antedating Christianity, were transformed by Christianity in a specific way. The ancient beliefs in a journey taken by the soul after death, in the need to provide ephodon (victuals) for the journey (G. Grabka, *Traditio* 9 [1953] 1–49), and in a ship and escort of souls, were taken over by the church fathers but filled with new content. Angels took over the role of the psychopompoi, the church became the ship of souls, while the ephodon was seen above all as the Eucharist received before death, though we find it occasionally given a wider meaning so that it includes faith, baptism, or the monastic life. That the Eucharist could sometimes be understood almost superstitiously as a kind of dowry for the hereafter is shown in the recommendation that eventually resulted in the repeated reception of the Eucharist on the day of death in the hope that one would die with the Host in one’s mouth (PG 29:CCCXV, BC). According to Chrysostom, the reception of communion (as an unrivaled means of nourishment) on one’s deathbed ensured the escort of angels (rather than demons), while at the Second Coming (parousia) the righteous entered directly into the dominion of God (PG 61: 364-30–34). Numerous Byz. adopted the monastic habit on their deathbed in greater hopes of salvation.

Another custom, that of kollyba, is derived from the pagan tradition of a (private) funeral meal conducted by relatives at the tomb of the deceased. It was unanimously opposed by the church in the West as a pagan superstition, but the practice survived in the Byz. church. Kollyba were distributed and liturgical prayers were said for the dead particularly on the 3rd, 7th (or 9th), and 30th (or 40th) day after death (G. Dagron in *Temps chrétien* 419–30); the prayers were seen as accompanying the soul of the deceased on its journey. These dates were believed to represent important stations on the soul’s journey either to the final vision of or banishment from God. The deceased were also commemorated on the anniversary of their death and on the Saturday before Meatfare Sunday (to Sabbaton tes Apokireo). The Byz. believed that the fate of the soul could be influenced through the prayers and intercessions of the living and made generous donations to churches and monasteries in order to ensure the proper commemoration of deceased relatives.

The contemplation of death (*melete thanatou*), taken from Stoicism, found a particularly vibrant resonance in the monastic milieu. Church fathers illustrated the frailty of human life by referring to the once-famous Alexander the Great whose grave was unmarked and unknown, while the innumerable graves of the martyrs were everywhere held in the highest honor. Monks desired to know what their brethren saw and experienced in the hour of death; they even contrived to consult the bones of the dead over their fate in the hereafter in order to learn the effectiveness of their intercession; even resurrection of the dead by the saintly desert fathers was reported (PG 34:244B–246A). The death of a saint is often connected with the vision of light, and the effusion of a clearly perceptible fragrance. Conversely, death itself generally brings one near the realm of the “black one” (“Ethiopian” = devil), and is connected with the symbol of the sword (and on icons with the cup of poison). The pre-Constantinian church gave the highest value to martyrdom as a baptism of blood, an imitation of the Lamb of God, and birth into heaven. The martyrs, therefore, as those who had been redeemed, continued to intercede for the living.

Hagiography uniformly stresses the serenity with which the dying saint faced death, because of his belief that death meant freedom from the bonds of the body and union with the divine. The prevailing attitude in epitaphs and monodies is quite different, however. Death is likened to the mythical Charon, who cuts man’s tree of life. Untimely death is generally seen as unjust and as a blow to the family and friends of the departed.


**DEBT** (*χρέος, Lat. debitum*) designated in Roman law both an obligation that originated from the contract of a loan and the object of this contract, that is, a sum of money or a thing owed by one
DE CEREMONIIS, in full, De ceremoniis aulae byzantinae, the modern title for a 10th-C. treatise of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos that treats court ceremony in the spirit of encyclopedia for the glorification of the emperor and his servants. Major and minor ceremonies are described in minute detail from the perspective of court officials who staged secular rituals. To interpret De ceremoniis requires knowledge of each section's origin because it compiles 5th–10th-C. records (see Table) that document Byz. government, diplomacy, prosopography, Constantinopolitan topography—esp. that of the Great Palace—and historical events. The complete MS (Leipzig, Univ. Lib. 28) is dated to the 10th C. (I. Rochow, Klio 58 [1976] 193–97). It is less a finished work than a dossier that contains instructions for ceremonies and descriptions of actual performances intended as raw material for the former: thus book 2, chapter 38, was stripped of specifics to form the prescriptive book 2, chapter 14 (G. Ostrogorsky, E. Stein, Byzantium 7 [1932] 185–233 and F. Dölger, BZ 36 [1936] 145–57). It also includes sundry memoranda on subjects ranging from officials' salaries to military logistics. The imperial family implied by book 1, chapters 1–9, fits a time frame of ca.957–59, while datable references reveal revisions no earlier than Constantine's last years (bk.1, ch.28—after 27 Feb. 956; bk.2, ch.15—after autumn 957); the text was certainly revised under Nikephoros II Phokas and book 1, chapter 97, may suggest a connection with Basil the Nothos.

Constantine states that book 1 derives from records. Chapters 1–83 offer fairly homogeneous prescriptive material on holy-day processions to Constantinopolitan sanctuaries (1–37) and secular ceremonies (38–83), such as coronations, marriages, funerals, officials' promotions, and circus celebrations. Chapters 84–95 are unrevised extracts from Peter Patrikios, including verbatim
### Chronological Synopsis of the Sources of *De ceremoniis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book and Chapter</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 1–9 (Vogt 1:3–56.8)</td>
<td>Processions and acclamations from Christmas to after Pentecost (interrupted by a lacuna)</td>
<td>ca.957–59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 9–18 (Vogt 1:56.9–105)</td>
<td>Yearly processions from Easter to Ascension</td>
<td>Probably Michael III (ca.847–62?); rev. ca.900–03 and ca.957–59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 19–21</td>
<td>Feasts of the Prophet Elijah, the Nea Ekklesia, and St. Demetrius</td>
<td>Probably Basil I; rev. under Leo VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 22–23</td>
<td>Processions of 14 Sept. and Christmas</td>
<td>Same as chs. 9–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 24</td>
<td>Feast of St. Basil the Great</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 25–35</td>
<td>Processions from Epiphany to Holy Saturday</td>
<td>Same as chs. 9–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 36</td>
<td>Feast of the Union of the Church</td>
<td>After 920: 957–59?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 37</td>
<td>Imperial costume for processions</td>
<td>ca.900–03; rev. ca.957–59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 41</td>
<td>Empress’s coronation and wedding (Irene)</td>
<td>17 Dec. 768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 43–44</td>
<td>Promotions to caesar and nobelissimos</td>
<td>2 Apr. 769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 46–52 (except next section)</td>
<td>Various promotions</td>
<td>Probably Isaurian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 48 (Vogt 2:57.9–60.11)</td>
<td>Acclamations for promotion to patrician</td>
<td>ca.957–59?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 53</td>
<td>Acclamations for promotion to eparch</td>
<td>ca.957–59?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 54–58</td>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>Isaurians?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 62–63</td>
<td>Faction audiences</td>
<td>Constantine VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 64</td>
<td>Faction audience</td>
<td>Michael III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 65</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Constantine VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 66</td>
<td>Winter faction audience</td>
<td>Michael III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 67</td>
<td>Arrangement of dignitaries during faction audiences</td>
<td>Constantine VII?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 68</td>
<td>Hippodrome</td>
<td>Late 7th, early 8th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 69, 71–73</td>
<td>Hippodrome</td>
<td>Michael III?; rev. Con-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 69 (Vogt 2:136.13–23)</td>
<td>Acclamations on vanquished emir</td>
<td>ca.957–59?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 70</td>
<td>Hippodrome</td>
<td>Same as ch. 68, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 84–95</td>
<td>Extracts from Peter Patrikios</td>
<td>heavily revised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 96</td>
<td>Acclamations for Nikephoros II</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 97</td>
<td>Promotion to proedros</td>
<td>963–69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 1–25</td>
<td>Secular ceremonies</td>
<td>Constantine VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 14</td>
<td>Enthronement of patriarch</td>
<td>After 933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 15 (Reiske 570.11–598.12)</td>
<td>Receptions of ambassadors from Tarsos and reception of Olga</td>
<td>946 and 957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 17</td>
<td>Coronation of Romanos II (lost)</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of De ceremoniis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book and Chapter</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 19</td>
<td>Triumph in the Forum</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 20</td>
<td>Triumph in the Hippodrome</td>
<td>956 or 958–959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 23 (Reiske 622.1–17)</td>
<td>Leo VI’s first haircut</td>
<td>866–70?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 27–39</td>
<td>Herakleios’s ceremonies; funeral of Patr. Sergios I</td>
<td>638–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 31–37</td>
<td>Promotions and audiences</td>
<td>Michael III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 38</td>
<td>Enthronement of Patr. Theophylaktos</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 40–41</td>
<td>Ceremonial costume</td>
<td>945/6–959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 42</td>
<td>Imperial tombs and obits (partially lost: see Chronicon altinate)</td>
<td>Constantine VII; rev. after 959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 44</td>
<td>Expeditions against Crete and Italy</td>
<td>911; 935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 45</td>
<td>Expedition against Crete</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 47 (Reiske 681.5–682.17)</td>
<td>Styles of address for Bulgar ruler</td>
<td>ca.922–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 48 (Reiske 690.6–16)</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>ca.920–22; rev. 945–95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 49–50</td>
<td>Payments to officials</td>
<td>Leo VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 51</td>
<td>Inspection of Constantinople’s granaries</td>
<td>Same as bk. 1, chs. 84–95?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chs. 52–53</td>
<td>Kletorologion of Philoteos</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 54</td>
<td>Pseudo-Epiphanius of Cyprus</td>
<td>Herakleios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 56</td>
<td>Factions’ payments</td>
<td>After 963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

protocols of accession from Leo I to Justinian I (chs. 91–95, partly recycled in acclamations for Nikephoros II Phokas [bk.1, ch.96]).

Constantine’s claim that book 2, possibly an afterthought, draws only on oral tradition holds generally for book 2, chapters 1–25, although even they contain historical records (see Table). The disparate documents of chapters 25–56 may have been physically associated with Constantine’s own copy and transcribed as they were found at the end of the Leipzig MS; they shed precious light on such matters as military mobilization (bk.2, chs. 44–45) against Crete and Italy (cf. G. Huxley, GRBS 17 [1976] 295–300), while a diplomatic style sheet (bk.2, chs. 46–48) illuminates the hierarchy of states (Dölger, Byzanz 183–96; W. Ohnsorge, BZ 45 [1952] 320–39). The remaining chapters concern mostly officials’ precedence, fees, and payments (bk.2, chs. 49–50, 55; 56 concerns BRINGAS). The language of De ceremoniis provides valuable testimony on vernacular usage (G. Moravský, 5 CEB, vol. 1 [Rome 1939] 514–20) and governmental technical terms, esp. of Latin origin (partial list: A. Landi, Koinonia 2 [1978] 301–22).

A treatise, On Imperial Expeditions, incorrectly dubbed Appendix ad librum I (Reiske, infra 444–508), precedes De ceremoniis in the Leipzig MS. Constantine based it largely on a lost work by Leo Kataylas, magistros under Leo VI, and dedicated it to his son. It details the logistics of an imperial campaign into Anatolia (G. Huxley, GRBS 16 [1975] 87–93; Hendy, Economy 304–15) and concludes with records of triumphs by Justinian I, Theophilos, and Basil I.


-M.Mcc.
DECIUS, a Roman aristocratic family that flourished under Theodoric the Great. Its connection with the earlier Roman family of the same name is unclear. Caecina Decius Albinus (PLRE 1:35–36), urban prefect of 402, probably a descendant of the Caesars, may have been the founder of the Decius family. Caecina Decius Acinatius Albinus, urban prefect of 414, may be his son. The family is better known from the end of the 5th C., when Caecina Decius Maximus Basilius was consul (480), as were two of his brothers (484, 486). All four of Basilus’s sons attained consular rank: Albinus in 493 (presumably the first consul appointed by Theodoric), Avenius (501), Theodorus (505), and Importunus (509). They formed, however, a house divided into two pairs of brothers, the first two supporting Pope Symmachus, the other two his rival Laurentius. Circa 519 Albinus was involved in religious discussions to end the schism between Rome and Constantinople, and ca.522 the referendarius Cyprian accused Albinus of having sent treacherous letters to Justin I. Boethius attempted to defend Albinus, but they were both arrested. In 525, however, Theodoric sent Theodorus and Importunus with Pope John I as ambassadors to Constantinople. Their relatives continued to serve as consuls until 534.


A.K.

DECURIONES. See Curiales.

DEEDS OF PURCHASE. See Sale.

DEER (Ἑλαφος, νεβρός). Along with the gazelle and wild goat the deer was a popular object of hunting; miniatures depict scenes of dogs or domesticated leopards in pursuit of deer. According to legend, Basil I was pursuing on horseback a huge stag that suddenly dragged the emperor from his saddle and carried him away on its antlers. Venison was recommended during cool seasons, but not in summer when it was considered poisonous. The horns of the deer were viewed as symbols of marital infidelity. Andronikos I reportedly exhibited antlers of the deer he had hunted, ostensibly to show the size of the killed beasts but actually to mock the inhabitants of Constantinople for the adultery of their wives.

Christian legend described the hart or male deer as fighting and killing snakes, and in this capacity the deer became a symbol of Christ. The 4th-C. exegete Philon (of Karpathos or Karpasia?) describes Christ as turning toward the Gentiles and running like a gazelle or deer to the ends of the world (PG 40:768). Since the nature of the deer is destructive, comments Cyril of Alexandria (PG 69:825A), and snakes flee from its smell and color, the Lord is rightly called nebros since he tramples on and destroys the power of adversity. Apostles, preachers, saints, and all the righteous
were also compared with harts as crushing the power of the serpent.

**Representation in Art.** The image of the hart or stag entered Christian art partly because of Psalm 42:1: “As the hart panteth after the water brook, so panteth my soul after thee, O God.” The thirsting soul was associated particularly with **baptism**, and the hart was widely used in 4th-C. **baptistery** decoration, esp. floor mosaics. Constantine I is supposed to have given the Lateran baptistery in Rome seven 80-pound silver harts that spouted water, and many other baptisteries had hart-shaped fountains or spigots. In Ravenna 5th-C. mosaics in the “Tomb” of **Galla Placidia** show harts flanking streams and the Tree of Life.

Harts appear beside Psalm 42 in the marginal **psalters** and occasionally atop **canon tables**.


**DEESIS** (Δέησις, lit. “entreaty”), the word used since the 19th C. to identify as an image of intercession the Byz. composition of the Virgin Mary and **John the Baptist** standing on either side of Christ with their hands extended toward him. Byz. used the word **deesis** for this composition, too, but not for it exclusively: the Virgin Mary praying, or the Virgin or a donor presenting a petition were also called **deesis**. Intercession, moreover, was neither the exclusive nor the original
DEFENSOR CIVITATIS, an official of the late Roman Empire who functioned as a semi-private advocate of provincial citizens in relations with the central government. The origin of the office remains unclear. It is probable that in the first half of the 4th C. in the eastern provinces of the empire (Egypt, Arabia) there existed the so-called syndikoi or ekdikoi, who acted as advisers of the urban populace in conflicts with the administration; in the West the institution was introduced by Valentinian I in a law of 368 (for Illyricum) as an element in the emperor's anti-aristocratic policy (A. Hoepfner, RH 182 [1938] 225–37). The first defensores were chosen from the upper class of former functionaries such as agentes in rebus or governors, and some had senatorial rank. The importance of the defensores declined gradually, but Justinian I attempted to return the office to its former significance. The functions of the defensor were vaguely defined; primarily he was to record all complaints and by so doing check the malpractice of local administrators. The defensor also had judicial authority in minor cases (Justinian I, nov. 15.3.2, 4). With the decline of the city in the 7th C. the office of defensor civitatis fell into disuse.


DEHES, village in northern Syria, in the mountains between Antioch and Chalkis ad Belum. The history of Dehes, as revealed by archaeological excavation, illustrates the region's economic development. The village prospered in the 4th–6th C., when the enlargement of an olive press suggests flourishing olive cultivation. The buildings grew larger; the houses of nuclear families were transformed into the habitats of extended families. Construction techniques and planning improved—from an irregular to an orthogonal system. After the mid-6th C. the growth of Dehes stopped, even though coin finds indicate economic activity through the reign of Constans II and probably until 674. There are no signs of a catastrophic destruction, but slow decline led to the abandonment of the site ca.900. Incidental coins of the 11th C. (down to Alexios I) testify to the Byz. penetration of northern Syria in that period.


DEIFICATION. See THEOSIS.

DEIPNON. See ARISTON AND DEIPNON; LORD'S SUPPER.

DEIR ZA'FARAN MONASTERY, the "Saffron monastery," also called Mar Hanianiya, Monophysite monastic complex built ca.530 northwest of DARA in Mesopotamia, 5 km east of Mardin in Turkey. Its early history is obscure, but Deir Za'faran should perhaps be identified with the monastery of Natapha where Monophysite bishops sought refuge during the persecution of Justin I. The well-preserved triconch main church of Deir Za'faran displays a complete example of the early 6th-C. type of ornate architectural sculpture found in fragments at, for example, AMIDA, Dara, and SERGIOPOLIS. Refounded in 793 by Mar Hananiya and again ca.1125 after short periods of abandonment, from the 12th C. Deir Za'faran was the seat of the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch. It formerly housed an important Syriac library, which contained a 6th-C. illuminated MS.
DEKANOS (δεκανός), originally a subaltern officer in the Roman army. From the 4th C. onward, the term designated palace messengers, esp. those of the empress. According to Kallinikos’s vita of HYPATIOS OF ROUPHINIANAI (ed. Bartelink, ch. 41.13), they were mounted dekanoi. They served also as guardians of gates. JOHN LYDOS equates them with lictors (rabdouchoi). In the Kletorologion of Philotheos the dekanos is a modest functionary under the PROTASEKRETIS. According to the De ceremoninis, while accompanying the emperor on an expedition dekanoi were in charge of imperial papers (chartria). The seals of dekanoi are few; the owner of one (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.215, 11th C.) was protospatharios, praitospositos, and dekanos. The term was applied as well to hermits in command of ten other monks, to subalternal patriotic officials, and to ecclesiastical fossores whose function was to bury the dead. It was also used to render the Syriac dihkan, a notable of modest rank (P. Devos, AB 64 [1946] 95). The term does not appear in pseudo-Kodinos, but patriarchal dekanoi are mentioned in later hierarchical lists, at the very bottom (Darrouzès, Offilia 557-32).

In accord with the many functions served by dekanoi, figures labeled as such on works of art display considerable variety. On an early votive icon at Mt. Sinai, the dekanos Leo is shown wearing a square nimbus, a blue mantle with pearl borders over a yellow chiton, and a red belt and shoes. In the Paris Chrysostom (Paris, B.N. Coïlin 79, fol.2r) a dignitary standing at the emperor’s left is inscribed ho proedros kai dekanos. He wears the red mantle decorated with golden ivy leaves of the proedros over a blue chiton and a red hat with black tassels.

DELICT. In Justinianic law a textbook distinction was made between private offenses (delicta, hamartemata, plememeleta) and crimes that were prosecuted through public CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (crimina, enklemeta) (Digest 47-48). THEFT, ROBBERY, damage (see LEX AQUILA), and HYBRIS were considered primary forms of civil wrongs (Institutes 4.1), while crimes included TREASON, ADULTERY, MURDER, FORGERY, violence, embezzlement of public money, and kidnapping (4.18). Through the politically motivated expansion of criminal jurisdiction, however, this distinction had already largely lost its practical meaning. The terminology in the legal texts was vague, and post-Justinianic legal collections eventually placed even the regulations on damage in the area of criminal law (Ecloga 17.7-9; Basil. 60.2-5). The list of punishable offenses inherited from Roman law changed with the christianization of the law: actions that violated the church’s sexual and moral standards were penalized ever more harshly.

DELIANT, PETER, Bulgarian leader of a revolt in 1040-41; died after 1041. His Slavic name, meaning “victor,” normally rendered (O)dekatos, was distorted by Psellos (Chrom. 1.76, ch.40.5-7) into Doliarios, from dolos, “treachery” (M. Dinić, PKJIF 30 [1964] 237f). The revolt, caused by a grave economic situation in Bulgaria, was worsened by the tax reform of JOHN THE ORPHANOTROPHOS, who replaced payment in-kind by cash. Deljan’s origin is unknown; an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 409.89-90) states that he was a slave who fled from Constantinople. Deljan proclaimed himself a son of SAMUEL OF BULGARIA. Marching from Belgrade, Deljan occupied Niš (Naisos) and Skopje. The troops of the theme of Dyrrachion, who joined the revolt, elected a soldier, Tichomir, basileus of Bulgaria. At a meeting of the two rebel groups (probably at Skopje), after an oration by Deljan, Tichomir was stoned to death. Deljan seized Dyrrachion, sent troops to Thebes, and marched on Thessalonike. Probably at this time the theme of Nikopolis joined the Bulgarian rebels; to Deljan’s camp also came courtiers of Michael IV, such as Manuel Ibatzes. ALOUSIANOS became Deljan’s co-ruler, but in 1041 blinded him and betrayed him to Michael IV. The Byz. then subdued Bulgaria; Deljan and Ibatzes were brought to Constantinople for Michael’s triumph. The entire story, from Deljan’s rise to his blinding, is lavishly illustrated in the Madrid Skylitzes (Grabar-Manoussacca, Skylitzes, nos. 524-29, figs. 255-58).

DELLA PORTA, LEONARDO, first Cretan vernacular poet; born Chandax, Crete, shortly before 1346?, died Chandax? 1419/20. Born to a noble Orthodox family on Venetian-occupied Crete, Della Porta (Ντελλαπορτάς) received a broad education and was bilingual in Greek and Italian. He spent most of his career in the service of Venice as soldier and ambassador. He commanded a warship that fought the Genoese near Negroponte and campaigned in Italy during the Chioggia War (1378–81). In May 1389 he was made a lawyer (diaketois) in Chandax; he served as Venetian envoy to the Ottoman sultan Murad I, to Theodore I Palaiologos of Morea, and to the Hafsid sultan of Tunis, Abu-al-Abbás Aḥmad (M.I. Manousakas, EEBS 27 [1957] 340–68). His final embassy, in 1409, was to the emir of Menteshe at Miletos. Shortly thereafter he fell into disgrace and was imprisoned on charges of fathering an illegitimate child.

While in prison, Della Porta wrote four poems in political verse. The longest and most important poem is a dialogue between the poet and Truth, in which Della Porta protests his innocence and relates many autobiographical details. His other three poems are On Retribution, On the Sufferings of Christ, and prayers to Christ and the Virgin.


DELOS (Δήλος), small island in the Cyclades in the central Aegean Sea, formerly a chief place of the cult of Apollo. In late antiquity there was a substantial community on the island, largely dependent on trade. From the 7th C. the site was abandoned. The remains of several churches survive, including that of St. Kerykos south of the Agora (mid-6th C., with fragments of the ambo) and another near the Asklepieion (perhaps late 7th C.). All of these are simple single-aisled basilicas.


DELPHI (Δελφοί), city in central Greece on the southern slope of Mt. Parnassos, site of the ancient sanctuary and oracle of Apollo; it attained civic status sometime before the 4th C. and enjoyed the attention of several 4th-C. emperors (C. Vatin, BCH 86 [1962] 229–41). Constantine I removed various monuments from Delphi, including the famous Tripod of Plataia, which was set up in the Hippodrome of Constantinople. The pagan cult apparently continued throughout the 4th C., and the Pythian Games were celebrated at least until 424 (Cod. Theod. XV 5.4). The city was probably abandoned in the 6th–7th C. Delphi was apparently a bishopric, although perhaps only briefly, since only a single incumbent is attested. A notitia of the late 8th or 9th C. mentions a bishopric of Delphi (Notitiae CP, ch.3.719).

The late antique city of Delphi was probably located in an area west of the sanctuary, where the remains of a large three-aisled basilica with figural mosaics were found. In the sanctuary itself only spolia of the 4th–6th/7th C. have been securely identified (G. Daux, BCH 86 [1962] 909–12). Recent excavation in the gymnasium suggests, however, that there was a church in that area.


DEMARCHOS (δημαρχος), a term designating the leader of a circus faction. The demarchoi played a prominent role in the Hippodrome and in imperial ceremonial, at least until the 10th C. The term is first attested in 602; the reference in the Notitia Constantiopolitana to two demarchoi under Theodosios II is late and suspect. They are sometimes called dioketai in popular usage (Miracles of Artemios, ch.21, p.26.25). Cameron (infra) considers demarchoi to have been the conductors of a choir or claque, whereas G. Manoljović (Byzantion 11 [1936] 630f) saw them as military commanders of the demoi.

By 842 or 843 at the latest (cf. Zacos, SHA 1, no.2017, for the seal of a demarchos John assigned to the 8th C.), the taktika show they had been coopted into the imperial hierarchy and held dignities such as hypatos of protospatariarcoi. De ceremoniis (bk.1, chs. 53 [55]–65 [66], ed. Vogt 2:75–80; cf. bk.1, ch.89 [80], Vogt 2:178f) pre-
serves protocols for promoting *demarchoi* and their assistants: besides *chartoularioi* and notaries, a deputy (*deutereuon*); specialists, a poet and a composer (*melistès*), for acclamations; the *charioteers*; and *geitonarchai*, whose function ("neighborhood supervisors") remains unclear.

*Demarchoi* of the 11th C. held posts such as *symponos* or *logariaste* (*Zacos, Seals* 2, *nos. 601–02*; *Laurent, Corpus* 2, *nos. 819, 1056*). Although *demarchoi* continue to crop up in the sources, the nature and extent of the continuity of their institutional attributes is uncertain. In the early 14th C., "two of the *demarchoi*" monitored the grain trade and bread production of Constantinople (*Patr. Athanasios I of Constantinople, ep.100, pp. 256f, 429*), a ceremonial book mentions their banners or *phlamoula* (pseudo-Kod. 196.28–33), and they administered Constantinople’s *geitonai*. During the siege of 1453, they played a military role (Matschke, *Fortschritt 101f*. When pseudo-Sphrantzes (*Sphr. 386.24*) relates that Constantine XI appointed Giustiniani Longo *demarchos* and *strategos* over 400 warriors, the word evidently has a military connotation.


-A.K., M.McC., A.M.T.

**DEMESNE**, or domain, a Western medieval term designating that portion of the lands of an estate not granted to tenants but retained by the landlord for his own use. When applied to Byz. conditions the term refers to those lands that were operated by the owner or his representatives, either by exploiting the labor of slaves or the *angarei* of dependent peasants or by leasing the lands on a short-term basis. Despite the abundance of papyri we have only a very vague idea of the structure of demesne in Egypt. I. Fikman (*Oksirinich gorod papirusov* [Moscow 1976] 73) suggests that the estates of the *apias* consisted of *autourgia*, where the "permanent personnel" and hired laborers worked (i.e., *demesne*), and the allotments of tenants; the *autourgia*-demesne formed the smaller part of the estates.

There is no data, even approximate, on the size of *demesne* until the end of the 11th C. when it appears astonishingly large. According to F. Dölger (*Bulletin of the International Committee of Histor-

**DEMETRIAS (Δημητριάς)**, city in east central Greece, on the Pagasitic Gulf, just southwest of modern Volos; the ancient city was of considerable importance because of its harbor. Prokopios (*Buildings* 4.3.5) names Demetrias among Thessalian *poleis* allegedly refortified by Justinian I, but ancient urban life may have already come to an end by the beginning of the 6th C. (P. Marzolff in *Demetrias* 3 [Bonn 1980] 391f). Its territory was settled by the Slavic Belegizitai in the 7th–8th C. The city was placed either in the province of Thessaly (Hierokl. 642.3; *De them. 2.41*, ed. Persusi, 88), or Hellas (*TheophCont* 364.12). It was plundered by the Arabs in 901 or 902 and by the rebellious Bulgarians in 1040. After 1204 Demetrias was granted to the empress *Euphrosyne Doukaina Kamaetera* and in 1210 to Margaret, widow of Boniface of Montferrat. After 1240 Demetrias was supposedly a possession of Manuel of Thessalonike, but in fact it was controlled by the family of the Melissenoi. In the late 13th C. Demetrias was contested between Byz. and the Vene-
tians of Euboea. In 1310 it was plundered by the Catalans, who held it until at least 1381. From 1333 the inhabitants began to migrate to Volos; in 1393 Demetrias fell to the Turks. The bishop of Demetrias, known from 422, was the first suffragan of Larissa.

Byz. Demetrias occupied only a fraction of the ancient city. Besides traces of the walls, there survive the remains of a 4th-C. basilica and another (4th/5th C.) near the northern harbor, along with an aqueduct restored in Byz. times.


DEMETRIOS (Δημήτριος), personal name. Common in antiquity, it became quite rare in the later Roman Empire (*PLRE* 1:247f, 2:352); not a single theologian of this name is known from that period, but a priest Demetrios was active in Carthage ca.393 (A. Mandonu, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, vol. 1 [Paris 1982] 271). St. Demetrios, the savior of Thessalonike in the 7th C., is an exceptional hero of this name in the hagiographical calendar (another Demetrios is said to have suffered under the Iconoclasts, the third was an obscure saint in Sicily). The name does not appear in Theophanes the Confessor. Skylitzes mentions St. Demetrios and three other Demetrioi, one of whom was Bulgarian and another Georgian ("Abasgian"). The name became popular in the later period and probably in the countryside; at any rate, in the acts of *Lavra*, vols. 2–3 (13th–15th C.), we find 222 Demetrioi, holding third place after John and George.

A.K.

DEMETRIOS, CHURCH OF SAINT. Located in Thessalonike, this was a major pilgrimage church in the central part of the city, probably built in the 3rd quarter of the 5th C. (W. Kleinbauer, *Byzantion* 40 [1970–71] 40) when the cult of St. Demetrios was transferred from Sirmium. Tradition ascribes its construction to the Roman governor Leonios in 412/13; M. Vickers (*BZ* 67 [1974] 348) has identified him with Leonios, praetorian prefect in ca.435–41 (*PLRE* 2:669). The church is a cross-transcept basilica, more than 55 m long, with five aisles, galleries, and low clerestory windows. Piers and column groups alternate in the nave and, although the columns are *spolia*, they are arranged according to their color. The capitals of the nave arcade date from the 5th C. According to the Sotirious, the church was constructed on the site of several Roman buildings, including a bath and/or nymphaeum incorporated in the crypt under the sanctuary—this may have been the source of the sweet-smelling oil believed to flow from the saint's relics. Krautheimer (*infra* 474, n.49), however, suggests that the apse excavated beneath the present nave may be rather a remnant of an earlier church built by Leontios. A silver ciborium, probably located in the main aisle of the church, housed a silver image of the saint and became the focus of the cult (D. Pallas, *Zograf* 10 [1979] 44–58). The church was damaged by fire between 629 and 634, and restored immediately thereafter; it was again virtually destroyed by fire in 1917, and the present basilica was rebuilt, as far as possible with original materials.

Much of the interior decoration of the church was destroyed in the various fires, but a number of mosaic panels have survived; others are known through texts or from watercolors made shortly before the fire of 1917 (R. Cormack, *BSA* 64 [1969] 17–52). The mosaics do not appear to have ever constituted a coherent program, but are a series of independently commissioned dedicatory panels. Some date before the 7th-C. fire, others just afterward or as late as the 11th C. While the earliest ones show the saint *orans* approached by donors (or worshipers) with their children, sometimes in landscape settings, the late 7th-C. panels celebrate the saint's actions on behalf of the larger community (e.g., his rescue of the city from the "barbarous flood of barbarian ships," probably a naval attack of 647). The increased abstraction of design and elegance of costume of these later 7th-C. mosaics, executed after the fire, may indicate a closer connection with the art of Constantinople. There were also frescoes of unknown date, now lost, depicting the life and miracles of the saint. One extant fresco depicts an *aventus*, probably that of Justinian II into Thessalonike in 688.

A chapel dedicated to St. Euthymios the Great, added to the southeast corner of the church, was frescoed in 1303 at the behest of Michael the *protostrator* (Michael Tarchaneiotes Glabas) and his wife Maria, the couple that was also responsible for the decoration of the *parekklesion* of the Church of the Pammakaristos in Constantinople.
The frescoes, which include a cycle of the life of the saint (T. Gouna-Petersen, *ArtB* 58 [1976] 168–83), were executed by painters working in a style closely related to that found in the Protaton on Mt. Athos; the paintings help confirm the Thessalonian origins of the artists of the Milutin school (see Michael [Astrapas] and Eutychnios). Another Church of St. Demetrios in Thessalonike was located on the seashore (S.D. Mantopoulos, *Makedonika* 20 [1980] 175–91).


**DEMETRIOS ANGELOS DOUKAS** (Angelodoukas in a MS of 1244—L. Politis, *BZ* 51 [1958] 26gf), *despotes* of Thessalonike from before 25 Sept. 1244—Dec. 1246; born ca. 1220, died Lentiana? in Bithynia. Younger son of Theodore Komnenos Doukas, Demetrios succeeded his brother John as ruler of Thessalonike; the title of *despotes* was bestowed on him, as on his brother, by John III Vatatzes. Some charters of Demetrios, including a “chrysobull with a seal of silver,” are mentioned in the inventory of Hilandar (A. Solovjev, *SemKond* 10 [1938] 33–38, nos. 9, 39, 54, 55), but have since disappeared. Demetrios’s brief reign ended in 1246, when some of the leading citizens of Thessalonike organized a conspiracy to surrender the city to the Nicaean emperor. There was little Demetrios could do: he was young and dissolute and real power lay in the hands of the chief families. Following his deposition, he was imprisoned at Lentiana, where he probably died.

Lit. Nikol, *Eptos I* 141–47. Polemis, *Doukai* 93, no. 46. –M.J.A.

**DEMETRIOS OF LAMPE**, diplomat and secular theologian; born Lampe (near Atramyttion), fl. 1160s. Kinnamos reports that after missions to Italy and Germany, Demetrios rejected the Western teaching that Christ is at the same time inferior to God the Father and equal to Him (Kinn. 251–56). He had a disputation with Manuel I, who defended this doctrine and emphasized the existence of two natures in Christ. Then Demetrios submitted a treatise in which he developed his concept. Kinnamos, who thought that only professors, ecclesiastics, and emperors were entitled to discuss theological subtleties, avoids presentation of the core of the dispute. No richer is the information provided by the 12th-C. German theologian Gerhoch of Reichenberg, who knew that Hugo Eteriano argued against Demetrios. Despite the resistance of the emperor and of Patr. Loukas Chrysoberges, Demetrios found many partisans among the elite of the capital, and his case stirred up heated discussion at the local council of 1166–67 in Constantinople (see under Constantino, Councils of).


**DEMETRIOS OF THESSALONIKE**, saint, often called the “Great Martyr” and *myrobytos*, “giving forth myrrh”; feastday 26 Oct. The early lists of martyrs (including a Syriac martyrology of 411) mention Demetrios (or Demetrios the deacon) in Sirmium. By the 6th C., however, Demetrios was closely connected with Thessalonike, where he reportedly worked many posthumous miracles; Emp. Maurice tried to obtain relics of Demetrios from Thessalonike, but in response to his request Archbp. Eusebios stated that the inhabitants of the city did not know the site of his interment (Lemerle, *Miracles* 1:89:20–25).

Demetrios’s biography, unknown before the 9th C., is preserved in three versions: that of Photios (*Bibl.*, cod. 255), paralleled by an anonymous Greek account and a Latin translation of *Anastasius Bibliothecarius* produced in 876; the anonymous story in *Vat. gr. 821* (11th-C. MS); and that of Symeon Metaphrastes. According to the version known to Photios, Demetrios was a “teacher of piety” executed by Emp. Maximian in Thessalonike when the emperor was returning from the stadium where the young Christian Nestor defeated in single combat and killed Maximian’s favorite, the gladiator Lyaios. There is no link between Demetrios and Nestor in Photios’s version—Demetrios was murdered only because Maximian “was intoxicated by wrath and impiety.” Nestor appears as the actual hero of the story, and Demetrios only as a passive victim; nothing is said about his background.

The link between the two martyrs was created
(or developed?) in the 10th C. In the version of Symeon Metaphrastes, Demetrius inspires Nestor, and in the Synaxarion of Constantinople Nestor is said to have come to the arena with the cry: “God of Demetrius, help me!” Metaphrastes stresses emphatically (PG 116:1185A) that Demetrius did not become famous through the brilliance of his ancestors; in contrast, in Vat. gr. 821, Demetrius is depicted as a noble senator, military commander, and anthypatos of Hellas (PG 116:1173B). Photios mentions Leontios, the future eparch (governor) of Illyricum, who supposedly found in Thessalonike the place “in which the body of the martyr was laid to rest” and built there “the famous shrine.” The parallel anonymous Greek text adds that it was near the stadium and public bath. The identification of Leontios causes problems since Leontios, prefect of Illyricum, was the addressee of two laws of Theodosios II issued in 412 and 413 (Cos.Thed. VII 4-32, XII 1-177), but M. Vickers (BZ 67 [1974] 348) rejects this date and places him ca.435-41 (PlRE 2:669). The story of Leontios was developed (AASS, Oct. 4:94E–95A): he allegedly attempted to remove Demetrius’s relics from Thessalonike but was stopped by the saint himself; so he took only Demetrius’s garment, and brought it to Sirmium, where he built another church. Vickers hypothesizes that the cult of Demetrius originated in Sirmium, whereas P. Lemelre (Miracles 2:202) argues that it was transferred from Thessalonike to Sirmium.

Miracles performed by Demetrius were described by many authors: the earliest accounts are those of John I, archbishop of Thessalonike in the first half of the 7th C., and an anonymous late 7th-C. writer. The old legends are a very important source for the history of the Slav attacks on Thessalonike. The topic of the sufferings and miracles of Demetrius was very popular in Byz. literature; there are later versions of his miracles—Niketas of Thessalonike, mid-11th C. (A. Kazhdan, Byzantium 52 [1982] 420-22); John Staurakios, late 13th-C. (I. Duječ, AB 100 [1982] 677-81)—and enkonnia in his honor by Archbp. John (D. Hemmerding-Iliadou, BalkSt 1 [1960] 49-56). Archbp. Plotinos (V. Túpkova-Zaimova, BBulg 3 [1970] 119-23), Leo VI, Eustathios of Thessalonike, Constantine Akropolites, Nicholas Kabasilas, etc. The cult of Demetrius was widely spread among the Slavs.

**Representation in Art.** The numerous extant 7th-C. portraits of the saint in his grave church in Thessalonike (see Demetrius, Church of Saint) celebrate the role of Demetrius as protector both of individuals and of the city as a whole. The most important image of the saint, which was housed in the ciborium, is known, however, only from texts (Cormack, infra). There was once a mosaic (7th C.? ) on the façade of the church depicting Demetrius’s cure of the prefect Marianos and inside the church were frescoes of the saint’s martyrdom. But extensive cycles with relevant episodes from the life of St. Nestor as well as Demetrius’s rescue of Thessalonike from the Slavs exist only elsewhere; on a 12th-C. silver reliquary in the Vatopedi monastery on Mt. Athos (A. Xyngopoulos, ArchEpPh [1936] 101-36; A. Grabar, DOP 5 [1950] 3-5) and in wall painting (Mistra and Serbia). Enkolpia containing tiny figures of the saint lying in his tomb (A. Grabar, DOP 8 [1954] 307-13) served as PILGRIM MEDALLIONS and PILGRIM TOKENS.

Originally portrayed as a youthful princely martyr clad in tunic and chlamys, the image of Demetrius as a military saint had emerged by the 10th C. Demetrius was thereafter often paired with St. George; the two are shown side by side in full armor or both on horseback, and differ essentially only in their hairstyle (that of Demetrius being less full and rarely covering the ears). His image as a warrior was used by Alexis I Komnenos on his coins (Hendy, Coinage 437).


**DEMETRIOS PALAILOGOS, despotes of Morea (1449-60); born Constantinople ca.1407/8; died Adrianople 1470 as monk David. Fifth son of Manuel II, he is described by Zakythinos (infra 241) as ambitious but of immoral character. A mysterious flight to Hungary in 1423 suggests difficulties with his family. In 1442 he besieged**
Constantinople in league with the Turks (Lampros, Pal. Kai Pel. 2:52–57 and I. Vogiatzides, NE 18 [1924] 78–84). Despite his anti-Unionist views, he accompanied John VIII to the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1437–39). When Constantine XI became emperor in 1449, Demetrius left his appanage on the Black Sea for Mistra to share the despotate of the Morea in its final years with his brother Thomas Palaiologos. Throughout his career Demetrius was willing to seek accommodations with the Turks; he requested assistance from the sultan during his conflicts with Thomas. After surrendering Mistra to the Ottomans in 1460, Demetrius married his daughter Helena to Mehmed II and was treated honorably by his son-in-law. He moved to Adrianople and received sizable revenues from Ainos and the islands of Lemnos, Imbros, Thasos, and Samothrace.


DEMOCRACY (δημοκρατία). In a shift that illuminates the social distribution of political power in Byz., democracy’s earlier meanings, which had relatively positive connotations (“popular government,” “republic,” or even “Roman Empire”), faded by the 5th C. and the term assumed the pejorative overtones that dominated Byz. usage: “disturbance” or “riot” associated with “the people” or lower classes (demoi).


DEMOGRAPHY. In broad terms, historical demography addresses two interrelated issues: the absolute size of population in a city or region and the composition and natural growth (or decline) of such populations. The former is influenced by incidents of natural catastrophe (esp. famines and epidemics), by wars, foreign immigration, and by patterns of migration from one district to another or between urban areas and their hinterlands. The latter is determined by such considerations as average duration of women’s childbearing years; rates of fertility and infant mortality; the normal age of marriage; life expectancy; quality of diet and medical care; and by the size, wealth, and cohesiveness of family-household units. Where the number of households is known, a coefficient can be employed to estimate total population; where more complete documentation exists, this population may be broken down according to age and sex and compared to a statistical model (“life table”), which in turn permits calculations of birth and mortality rates, expectations of life at various ages, and rates of population replacement.

Unfortunately, sources for Byz. demography remain fragmentary. Although some judicial compilations provide valuable insights regarding the size and stability of litigant families, Byz. authors did not otherwise ordinarily concern themselves with demographic issues, and most information must be derived either from physical evidence or from surviving government records. Excavations reveal both a qualitative (desertion or repopulation) and a quantitative picture: using as data the size and number of excavated houses, A. Jakobson (VizVrem 19 [1961] 154f) calculated that the average 10th–11th C. city had about 5,000 inhabitants. Osteological material and remnants of grain furnish evidence on medieval diet, while funerary inscriptions provide data on births and mortality, although in many cases this information is insufficient or presented in a manner unsuitable for statistical analysis (Patlagean, Structure, pt.IX [1978], 169–86).

The most important sources are praktika, primarily of 14th-C. southern Macedonia. Many offer detailed listings for members of peasant families dwelling on the estate; since a number of areas underwent recurrent assessments—in 1300–01, 1316–18, 1320–21, and 1338–41—their praktika give some indications concerning household stability. At the same time, praktika should be employed with extreme caution. As fiscal documents, they tend to omit information deemed inessential for taxation; in particular the ages of the population are not recorded—nor is it certain at what age a child was first enrolled—and any division into age groups can thus form at best only a rough approximation (P. Karlin-Hayter, Byzantion 48 [1978] 501–18). It also seems likely that women, when not acting as heads of households, were persistently undercounted, and the registers do not appear always to have taken fully
into account either newly arrived families or those who no longer worked on the estate but might remain in the same (or a neighboring) village (D. Jacoby, *Speculum* 61 [1986] 677f).

Literary texts provide isolated population figures for individual cities: 4th-C. Antioch, 150,000–200,000 inhabitants; 6th-C. Jerusalem, 53,000; 10th-C. Thessalonike, 200,000 (an exaggeration); 11th-C. Edessa, 35,000; 13th-C. Nicea, 30,000–35,000. The population of Constantinople (Jacoby, *Société*, pt.I [1961], 81–109) could not have been larger than 400,000 in the 5th–6th C. All attempts to provide a reliable estimate for the entire population of Byz. have failed, but it is possible to chart its broad fluctuations over the centuries. The steady growth of the 4th and 5th C. seems to have given way during the 6th and 7th C. to a precipitous decline under the recurring impact of famines, plagues (esp. that of 542), and foreign invasions; this was followed in turn by a period of slow recovery. Evidence for the 11th and 12th C. is ambiguous: economic expansion and a modest urban revival indicate growth, while political decline suggests stagnation. The territorial losses of the late 11th C. cost the empire a large portion of its population, and from 1200 onward the areas that remained appear to have experienced virtually continuous demographic regression, exacerbated during the 14th C. by civil wars, the Black Death, and the disruptions caused in Macedonia by marauding mercenaries of the Catalan Grand Company; by 1450 the population of Constantinople itself did not exceed 40,000–50,000.

We also possess information regarding certain aspects of fecundity and life expectancy. Although the legal age for marriage was set at 12 (women) and 14 (men), the usual age appears to have been older (about 15 and 20, respectively); women might normally remain fertile until age 40–45. Infant mortality remained high in all periods (perhaps as great as 50 percent), and the presence of religiously inspired celibacy and heretical groups that rejected procreation probably exercised a significant—if quantifiable—limiting influence on birthrates (Patlagean, *Structure*, pt.VIII [1969], 1353–69). In addition, abortions, contraception, and abandonment of infants are all attested, esp. in the early centuries. Evidence from 4th–7th-C. Palestine indicates that half the adult male population died by age 45, three-quarters by 65, and that women suffered significantly higher rates of early mortality.

Our knowledge of life expectancy in succeeding centuries must remain inferential: Nicholas I Mystikos (ep.29, ed. Jenkins-Westervink, 200.47–49) states that few of his contemporaries survived to 70, while Basil Pediadites (S. Lampros, *Kerkys-raika anekdota* [Athens 1882] 48.21–3) considered an individual over 60 to be decrepit; nevertheless a comparison reveals the possibility that the Byz. in the 11th–12th C. had a longer life expectancy than their predecessors in the 4th–6th C. and their Western contemporaries (A. Kazhdan, *Byz* 8 [1982] 116f). The subsequent centuries probably experienced a demographic crisis: A. Laiou (FM 6 [1984] 279–84) suggests that in 13th-C. Epiros the number of children per family was below the level required for the population to replace itself; she also calculates (Peasant Society 296) that in 14th-C. Macedonia 71 percent of females died by age 45 and 74 percent of males by age 50.


*DEMOI* (δημοί), without further qualifiers, usually means “the people.” It can refer to members of the circus factions and is sometimes used this way alongside meros or demotai, esp. in technical texts like DE CEREMONII. Th. Usopensky (*Viz*Pрем 1 [1894] 1–16) mistakenly connected the political districts of ancient Athens, also called *demoi*, to the very different Byz. meanings. This misidentification fueled the notion that factions resembled political parties and preserved some vestige of ancient Hellenic democracy, which in turn led to far-reaching interpretations of 5th–7th-C. Byz. history based on the interplay of factional riots, the presumed or attested factional loyalties of various emperors, and the social, economic, and religious identities ascribed to each faction. In fact, as Sjujumov and Cameron (infra) independently demonstrated, the *demoi*, whether in the singular or plural, have little to do with districts or political parties in the modern sense.
DEMONOLOGY. Byz. demonology is substantially derived from the patristic synthesis laid down by John of Damascus. Witch hunts appear not to have taken place, as in the West, but there was widespread interest in the theme of demons not only among the common people but among scholars as well. The latter is instanced in two systematic tracts falsely attributed to Michael Psellus. In the longer of the two, Timotheos, or On demons, the unknown author uses the form of a Platonic dialogue to provide an overview of the opinions of the pagans and distinguishes six kinds of demons, which dwell in the vicinity of the moon, in the air, on the earth, in the water, under the earth, and in the darkness. The author also states that the Euchites or Messalians, who are the focus of the dialogue, erred when they saw Satan as the Son of God, since he is simply the prince of lies, cast into the darkness because he thought he could be equal to God. Demonology was frequently connected with idolatry.


DEMONS (haimoves, also allotrioroi, lit. “strangers, aliens”), evil spirits. In addition to rejecting the view that demons were offspring of marriages between angels and daughters of Cain (Gen 6:1–4), Christianity also repudiated the dualist idea of uncreated demons, who were creators of the material world. God created them good and with free will, but they chose the path of evil because of their envy of man. Sometimes they were identified with pagan gods.

Although these fallen ANGELS were incorporeal (contrary to previous views acknowledging a certain kind of body in demons), they were not free from physical desires. They inhabited the earth (esp. dark places like tombs and caves) and its surrounding atmosphere, and appeared to men in the disguise of animals (DOGS, SNAKES, etc.), as ETHIOPIANS, robbers (G. Bartelink, VigChr 21 [1967] 12–24), women, and so on. Rarely represented in art before the 11th C., demons are shown thereafter as small, usually black creatures who travel in packs. They beset Christ in scenes of his MINISTRY, pull monks from the ladder of JOHN KINGS, and collectively stand in for the DEVIL (Galavaris, Liturgical Homilies, fig. 459). In contrast to Western medieval versions, they are usually absent from scenes of the Last Judgment. They were hostile to mankind, producing crop failures, storms, famines, droughts, and other disasters, and attempted to divert men from righteous ways. Demons were esp. active in seducing hermits. Beginning with the vita of ANTONY THE GREAT by Athanasios of Alexandria (W. Schneemelcher in Pietas [Münster/Westf. 1980] 381–92), hagiographic literature presents manifold scenes of the personal struggle of saints against demons. Especially dangerous was the so-called demon of midday (Ps 90:6), who infused the human heart with aRUPE, or torpor and dejection. The demon of midday was sometimes identified as ARTEMIS (C.D. Müller, JHaChr 17 [1974] 95–98).

Some men sold their souls to demons for the sake of power or glory, while others were possessed by demons who caused sickness, esp. mental derangement. Demons had their place in the cosmic development of history: not only were they seducers of men (from the days of Adam and Eve), they were accusers of sinners: demons grabbed their victims’ souls and tortured them in HELL. The best protection against demons was piety and its material manifestations such as the sign of the cross, holy water, incense, amulets, holy books (particularly the Psalms), icons, and sincere prayers. A sure and effective defense against demons was to respond with scriptural passages, to ask the demon its name, or to mock and ridicule it. There was a special service of EXORCISM to rid possessed people of demons.

DEMOSIARIOS (δημοσιαριος, from demosion, “state treasury”), a fiscal category of peasants whose nature is unclear. Demosiaioi appear in only a handful of documents from the mid-10th through the mid-11th C.; in these documents they are sometimes called paroikoi and are often associated with exkousiatoi tou dromon (see EKKSOUSSATOI) and stratiotai, two fiscal categories of peasants with specific obligations toward the state. The traditional interpretation has been that demosiaioi were peasants settled on imperial domains. Ostrogorsky, however, hypothesized that demosiaioi were paroikoi held by the state who owed the state the same fiscal and service obligations that private paroikoi owed their lords. Basing his reasoning on the appearance of the term demosiaioi and later terms such as demosiakos paroikos (which he considers to be equivalent), Ostrogorsky concludes that demosiaioi were in effect state paroikoi and that an independent free peasantry disappeared during the 10th C. and was replaced by an agrarian system in which there were only state paroikoi and private paroikoi. On the other hand, Lemerle, along with other scholars who reject Ostrogorsky's hypothesis, maintains the traditional view and suggests that demosiaioi (and the dedemosiakomenoi paroikoi found in a few 11th-C. documents) were a special category of peasants who lived on state domains and, while these might well be called state paroikoi in that they held land on condition of fiscal and service obligations toward the state, they were perhaps not numerous and did not, during the 10th and early 11th C., signal the disappearance of a free peasantry. It is plausible that the villeins of the Commune, on the Venetian territory of Romania, distinct from the villani or parichi of individuals (Jacoby, *Recherches*, pt.1 [1976], 35f. pt.III [1975], 149), originated from Byz. demosiaioi of the period before 1204.


DEMOSIOS (δημοσιος), term designating the state treasury, fisc, a meaning also found in antiquity. In Byz. the fisc was called demosios primarily as a recipient of fines—in these cases the term is used side by side with vestiarion (Dölger, *Beiträge* 29)—or as a recipient of confiscated property or escheat (e.g., *Ecloga* 2.7). The use of the term demosios as recipient of fines is testified to by later acts, for example, a purchase deed of 1373 (Docheiar., no.42.81). Another use of the word is the definition of the fisc as owner: thus the *Ecloga* (13.1) mentions the lease of land from the demosios or other institutions. In the same way, a prostagma of Manuel II from 1409 contrasts the property of the demosios and that of monasteries. Accordingly, ta demosia denotes state properties; a chrysobull of 1311 speaks of officials administering ta demosia (*Panet.*., no.10.65–66). More rarely the term was employed in connection with tax collecting; thus in 1344 the *provestiarites* John Doukas expressed his concern that the demosios should not suffer in the case of penury (Docheiar., no.23.6–7). The term demosios kanon or to demosion was, however, broadly employed for tax. It remains disputable whether the distinction between demosios and the private imperial (basilikos) treasury, drawn in certain texts (e.g., *Ecloga*, 16.4) reflects reality.


DEMOSTHENES, Athenian orator; born 382 B.C., died 322. He remained “The Orator” for the Byz., who referred to him frequently and used quotations from his speeches through the 15th C. Libanios and Zosimos drafted short biographies of Demosthenes based on ancient sources; numerous papyri from Byz. Egypt contain texts of Demosthenes. A statue of the orator in the Baths of Zeuxippos in Constantinople was described in verse by Christodoros of Koptos. Demosthenes was among those classical authors in whom interest was revived in the 9th C. Photios (Bibl., cod.265) gives a detailed biography of Demosthenes (based on pseudo-Plutarch), and the earliest surviving MS, Paris, B.N. gr. 2934, is dated by Dilts (*infra*, vol. 1 [1983] 7) to the 9th C. Interest in the orator continued in the 10th C., to which four more MSS are dated. In the *Souda* a biographical note was compiled. The MSS were supplied with scholia in which on rare occasions “contemporary” notes were inserted, for example, “Byzantium is now Constantinople” (In Or. 5.25.40) or “Perinthis, a Thracian polis, now named Herakleia” (In Or. 11.3.10).

For Nicholas of Myra Demosthenes was the embodiment of virtue compared to the wretched orator Aeschines (*RhetGr*, ed. Walz., 1:358.8–9) and superior even to Pericles (1:381.1–3). Tzetzes
(Historiae 6.67–188), on the contrary, relying upon a tradition hostile to Demosthenes (based on Aeschines, among others), presents the orator as a Scythian by birth, effeminately dressed, perverse, and easily bribed. Metochites developed the same approach in his comparison of Demosthenes and Aristides (ed. M. Gigante, ParPass 20 [1965] 51–92). Even though as a rhetorician Demosthenes was superior to Aristides, he paid the price of living in a democracy, being ensnared by his passions, and adapting his views to the political situation. Aristides, on the other hand, who lived in the security of the Roman Empire, was concerned only about the serenity of his style.


DEMOTIC. See Coptic Language and Literature; Egypt.

DE OBSIDIONE TOLERANDA (How to Withstand Sieges), conventional title of an anonymous treatise on siege warfare. References to the capture of Thessalonike (904) and the fall of Kitros (924) provide a terminus post quem for the work; mention of the "ferocious Bulgars" reflects its focus on the empire's western regions. The author reviews the initial steps to be taken once enemy intentions were known, including gathering and rationing foodstuffs; collecting raw materials (e.g., wood, linen, flax, cotton, hemp) for weapons and other equipment, while destroying any source of enemy provisioning; and evacuating the elderly or unfit. He then lists the town's craftsmen (carpenters; tailors; smiths; makers of rope, weapons, and saddles) who were to be put to work on necessary items and tasks. Further defensive measures included digging a moat around the wall and setting traps to impede enemy assault, while the walls were heightened, repaired, or doubled where necessary. Citizens and soldiers were properly mobilized and a system of patrols was organized; criminals, a potential source of treachery, were to be rounded up. Forays to ambush the enemy en route to or to ravage their land were advised. Though fully attentive to contemporary conditions, the author frequently supports his recommendations with examples drawn from the past, revealing a wide knowledge of earlier Byz. and classical historians and tacticians.


DE PECULIUS, a special tract on family property law, esp. on the separate property of children (peculium) and their assets that could not be acquired (apropristria) by the person who had authority over them. Demetrius Chomatenos attributed the work to Eustathios Rhomaios. The purpose of the study was the instruction of fellow judges on this difficult material, after uncertainties had arisen in judging.


DEPOSITION FROM THE CROSS (Ἀποκαθήλωσις). The removal of Christ's body from the Cross, though not described in the Gospels, had been elaborated in hymns and homilies by the time the earliest surviving Byz. images appear in the PARIS GREGORY (fol.30v) and in Tokali Kilise, GÜREMÈ, in the 10th C. (Maguire, infra, pl.76; A.W. Epstein, Tokali Kilise: Tenth-Century Metropolitan Art in Cappadocia [Washington, D.C., 1986] pls. 38, 85). These images differ markedly. The Paris Gregory version is emotionally reserved, with Mary standing to one side while Joseph of Arimathea supports Christ's body and Nicodemus removes a nail from his hand. The two Güreme versions are more emotional, as Mary embraces Christ's body, laying her head against his. The reserved variant—with John added and Mary holding Christ's hand—persisted through the 12th C. The more expressive variant continued as well, with the figures gaining in dynamism and emotional urgency in accord with the mounting intensity of the Holy Week liturgies (NEREZI). A fresco at MILEŠEVA anticipates the yet more expressive Palaiologan versions by adding the lamenting Holy
Women and depicting Mary Magdalene holding Christ's hand while Mary embraces his torso, her cheek on his.


DERE AĞZI, site in the Kasaba Valley of central Lycia, noted for its elaborate cross-domed church, which has a domed nave, side aisles ending in pastophoria, a narthex flanked by towers, an exonarthex, and two attached octagons; galleries rise above the aisles and narthex. The masonry consists of rubble faced with cut stones, with bands of brick; much of the material was imported from the region of Constantinople. Traces of frescoes and mosaics suggest a date in the late 9th or early 10th C.; this dating is questioned, however, by U. Peschlow (BZ 79 [1986] 84). The architecture finds parallels in the monasteries of Lips and the Myrelaion in Constantinople. The Byz. name of the church is unknown. Surrounding buildings suggest it was a monastery; its size, wealth, and style indicate a wealthy patron in the capital. The site also housed a small settlement, protected by a large fortress with towers of varying shape; it contains cisterns and ruined buildings and may date from the 9th C.


DE RE MILITARI (On Warfare), conventional title of an anonymous, untitled military treatise dealing with campaign tactics mainly but not exclusively beyond the northwestern frontiers of the empire. The author, a plain stylist and an experienced soldier, envisions an army of about 25,000 men under the emperor's personal command and sets forth the proper procedures for preparing the expeditionary camp (1–6), marching through difficult terrain in enemy territory (9–20), and attacking or defending camps and fortifications (21–27); he concludes with brief notes on assembling and training the army, transport units, and daily assignments (28–32).

The date of the treatise is uncertain. A reference to theagma of the Athanatou (created 970) provides a terminus post quem for its composition, and the emphasis on Bulgaria links it to Basil II's many wars against Samuel of Bulgaria between 986 and 1014. The De re militari is appended to the Taktika of Leo VI in the earliest MSS and was apparently written to complement the Devitatione (ca.975); although similar in style and reliance on firsthand experience, the two texts reveal interesting contrasts in military terminology and conditions between the empire's eastern and western frontiers.

DERMOKAIITES (Δέρμοκαιτης, fem. Δέρμοκαιτης; etym. "hide-burner"), a noble family known from the mid-10th C. An early Dermokaites was a soldier who became a monk and addressee of Symeon Logothete; another (or the same) Dermokaites was the monk on Mt. Olympos to whom Romanos I Lekapenos sent the written confession of his sins in 946. John and Michael Dermokaites were troop commanders ca.1036–40. The family rose to prominence after 1204, when the sebastos Michael Dermokaites held the episkopis of Sampson (see Priene) ca.1216. In 1306/7 the sebastos Dermokaites was recommended by Patr. Athanasios I to take charge of the grain supply of Constantinople. In the 14th–15th C. some members of the Dermokaites family were civil servants and courtiers, such as Theophylaktos, judge in the 1360s; George Dermokaites Palaiologos, governor of Imbros in the mid-15th C.; and Dermokaites, chamberlain of John VIII. They were apparently related to the Rubenids and later the Palaiologos, Asan, and Chrysoloras families. Their role in cultural life was insignificant, even though a Dermokaites was an addressee of Michael Gagaras, and Dermokaitissa Asanina Palaiologina, who was buried in a chapel of the Chora Monastery (after 1330?), may have been among the patrons of the church.

As the numbers of monks increased, some of their desert settlements grew to the point where, paradoxically, “the desert was made a city” (Athanasiou, Life of Antony, ch.14, PG 26:865B), and the real desert often became an ideological phenomenon. Through the Byz. period, the desert symbolized Christian life in its most challenging form (as in Philoxenos of Mabbug, Letter 6; John Klimax, Ladder of Paradise 15,62).

In Psalter illustration and the later Octateuchs, Eremos is personified as a male figure in classical garb sitting in the wilderness that the Israelites traversed before the Crossing of the Red Sea. Desert also appears as a counterpart to Earth in late Byz. representations of the Christmas sticheron. Here it always appears as a woman, depicted as seated, standing, or, as in the frescoes of the Holy Apostles at Thessalonike, kneeling and offering a manger to the Christ child.

As the numbers of monks increased, some of their desert settlements grew to the point where, paradoxically, “the desert was made a city” (Athanasiou, Life of Antony, ch.14, PG 26:865B), and the real desert often became an ideological phenomenon. Through the Byz. period, the desert symbolized Christian life in its most challenging form (as in Philoxenos of Mabbug, Letter 6; John Klimax, Ladder of Paradise 15,62).

In Psalter illustration and the later Octateuchs, Eremos is personified as a male figure in classical garb sitting in the wilderness that the Israelites traversed before the Crossing of the Red Sea. Desert also appears as a counterpart to Earth in late Byz. representations of the Christmas sticheron. Here it always appears as a woman, depicted as seated, standing, or, as in the frescoes of the Holy Apostles at Thessalonike, kneeling and offering a manger to the Christ child.

DESSERT FATHERS, usual designation for the early ascetics of Egypt to whom are attributed the sayings that became, in written form, the APOPHTHEGMATA PATRUM. Beginning in the 3rd C. they withdrew to the edge of the settled land of Egypt (see Desert), singly or in groups, as a visible alternative to village and family life and more directly to confront powerful spiritual forces. Individuals among them acquired fame for their exploits of sanctity: Sts. Antony and Makarios the Great; Moses the Black, reformed highwayman; Theodore, who sold his books to give the money to the poor; Ammonas, who vanquished a basilisk; Daniel, who defied a barbarian raid; Basarion, who never sat down; Poemen, who loved the hidden life; Hor the silent; and Pambo the humble. There were women too. Said to embrace continence, Synkletike who taught peace. Their life and spirituality were the goal of many pilgrimages in late antiquity. Individual figures such as Arsenios the Great, Antony, and Mary of Egypt appear in church programs of decoration from the 11th C. onward as paradigms of monasticism.
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DESPOTES (δέσποτης, lit. "lord, master"), official epithet applied to God, the patriarch, and bishops, but mainly to the emperor. The title of despotes, which was created in the 12th C., occupied the highest rung on the hierarchial ladder, second only to the emperor and co-emperor. The origins of the title are disputed. According to G. Ostrogorsky (Byz. Geschichte 153–65), Manuel I created it in 1163, under Hungarian influence, for his heir presumptive Alexios (the future Béla III) who appeared as despotes in a document of 1167 (P. Wirth, Byzantina 5 [1973] 424). Already before 1163, however, despotes was an epithet for the highest nobility, applied on seals to sebastokrators and caesars (L. Stiernon, REB 21 [1963] 292; A. Kazhdan, ZRVI 14–15 [1973] 41–44) or even used as a separate title (e.g., Stephen Kontostephanos: Zacos, Seals 1, no. 2723). From the 13th C. emperors bestowed the title on several individuals (primarily their sons) simultaneously, and it did not signify the right to succession. Under the Palaiologoi, despotai were active both in Constantinople and at the head of the largest appanages—Thessalonike, Epiros, and Morea. Only Morea, however—and even it not without doubts (P. Wirth, BZ 56 [1963] 353)—can properly be called a despotate; for Epiros the term was employed only in sources from the late 14th C. onward, predominantly of Western origin (L. Stiernon, REB 17 [1959] 124–26). The term penetrated into Bulgaria (15th C.) and Serbia—the first known Serbian despotes was Jovan Oliver in the 14th C. The rulers of Kerkyra in the 15th C. were also named despotai.


DETERMINISM, or a belief in the strict causality of events, was a concept developed by Greek philosophers, esp. Demokritos; the Byz. retained the theory that ananke, heirmarmene, automaton, or tyche was an impersonal force determining the behavior and fate of humans regardless of their free will. The Eastern church fathers rejected determinism. Thus Eusebius of Caesarea (Praep. evang. 6.11) refuted the idea that the stars determined human actions. He argued that God, as creator, stands above the stars, while reward or punishment is meaningless without the freedom of human will. Eusebios's concept can be found in such church fathers as Gregory of Nyssa (PG 45:168B), and was reaffirmed later on by Manuel II (PG 156:419–42). Nikephoros Gregoras delineated two contrasting views: either that divine pronoia ruled over mankind or that necessity (ananke) governed men's fate, a view ascribed by him to John (VI) Kantakouzenos (A. Kazhdan, Byzantium 50 [1980] 320–22). Determinism was a presupposition of astrology.

The treatise entitled On the Predestined Terms of Life, which is attributed in the MS tradition either to Germanos I or to Photios (as a part of his Amphilochia), presents another aspect of antideterminist polemics (ed. C. Garton, L. Westerink [Buffalo 1979]). The problem discussed in the treatise is whether God predestines and foresees all the events of human life and death (in which case murderers only fulfill divine orders) or whether our evil actions could persuade God to change his previous decision—in other words, whether God acts as an impersonal force or is a personal deity changing his decisions in accordance with our behavior and prayer. This treatise, based upon Basil the Great, accepts the second solution.

The problem was debated anew in the mid-12th C., when Nicholas of Methone launched an attack against a treatise that was falsely attributed to an unnamed church father and that defended the doctrine of aoristia, the lack of any predestined terms of life. The discussion was again revived in the 14th–15th C., esp. by Plethon (I. Medvedev, Vizantiskij gumanizm [Leningrad 1976] 104–29).


DE THEMATIBUS (Περὶ τῶν θεμάτων), conventional title of the book written by Constantine VII or under his auspices on the geography of the empire. The book consists of two parts dealing
respectively with the East and the West. Each part is divided into sections dedicated to individual themes (Anatolikon, Armeniakon, etc.), treating the origin of the name, boundaries, and history of the area. Much of the information, however, is taken from Stephen of Byzantium and Hierokles and describes the situation of the 6th C.; later changes and events are mentioned only infrequently. Thus the work falls within the framework of encyclopedic endeavors of Constantine VII such as the Excerpta. The date of production is hotly debated. The book used to be considered a "juvenile work" of Constantine and dated to the period 934–44; recently scholars have begun to attribute it to a later year, after 952 (T. Lounghis, REB 31 [1973] 299–305) or at least after 944 (H. Ahrweiler, TM 8 [1981] 1–5).

ED. De thematicus, ed. A. Pernats (Vatican 1952).

DEUTEROS (δεύτερος, lit. “second”), eunuch in charge of imperial insignia: thrones, curtains, vessels, and apparel. His staff included ho epι ton allaximon (see ALLAXIMOI), VESTITORS, and ho epι ton axiomaton (keepers of insignia and ceremonial garments for dignitaries). DIAiArioi with their primikerios were subordinates of both the deuteros and the papias. According to Beljaev, there were two distinct groups of diaiarioi, but Burby (Adm. System 128) suggests that the same dialiaroi were under the command of both eunuchs. The deuteros was considered the assistant of the papias; at least he substituted for the papias when the latter was ill.


DEVASTATIO CONSTANTINOPOLITANA, a brief but detailed account of the Fourth Crusade between 1202 and 16 May 1204 inserted into the MS of the Annales Herbeiopenses. The Latin eyewitness's identity is controversial, but he may have belonged to the entourage of Boniface of Montferrat or, less probably, that of Baldwin of Flanders. M. Kandel's arguments (Byzantion 4 [1929] 179–88) for the Devastatio Constantinopolitana's dependency on the letters of Baldwin I to Pope Innocent III are not conclusive.

DEVELTOS (Δεβελτος, Δηβελτος) or Deultum, city and fortress in Bulgaria about 20 km southwest of Burgas, controlling the north-south coastal road. An episcopal see from late antiquity, in the 8th C. Develtos was a major Byz. defensive position against the Bulgarians. Captured by Krum in 812, it became a strong point on the Bulgarian defensive earth wall constructed by Omurtag, which ran from the Black Sea to the river Marica. With the treaty of 846 Byz. regained Develtos, but Symeon of Bulgaria recaptured it in 896.
After 927 it became once again a Byz. possession, and at the end of the 12th C. part of the Second Bulgarian Empire; it remained in Bulgarian hands until falling to the Ottoman Turks in 1396. Due to its location, Develtos was a center of trade and accordingly a seat of kommerkiarioi from the mid-9th C. onward (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 285; 2, no. 159bii).

Lit. E. Oberhummer, RE 5 (1905) 260. — R.B.

DEVGENIEVO DEJANIE (Deeds of Devgenij), Slavonic prose version of Digenes Akritas. The Devgenievo Dejanie survives only in three defective MSS of the late 17th and 18th C. and in fragments copied from a lost 16th-C. MS. Together they comprise five episodes: the adventures and marriage of the “tsar Amir” and his Greek bride, and the birth of Devgenij; Devgenij’s youth; Devgenij’s defeat of Filipap and the warrior-girl Maximiana (Philopappos and the Amazon Maximo of the Greek original; A. Schmaus, BZ 44 [1951] 495–508); Devgenij’s courtship and marriage to Stratigovna (i.e., the daughter of a strategos); and Devgenij’s victory over the tsar Vasilij. The last episode has been interpreted as indicating a profoundal tendency in the Greek epic; E. Trapp insists, however, that such names occur only in the Slavonic version and not in the Greek original (Byzantina 3 [1971] 201–11). It has been claimed that the Slavonic translation reflects the “original” of the “literary” version of Digenes, in some respects comparable to the Grottaferrata MS, but also that the Slavonic is merely a contaminated adaptation of a late offshoot of the Greek tradition. The translation is often assigned to pre-Mongol Kiev, though many scholars favor a 14th-C. southern Slav provenance.


DEVIL (διάβολος), Satan, the prince of demons; the name was interpreted by the majority of church fathers as “calumniator.” He was considered incorporeal by Gregory of Nyssa (PG 46:456A) and other church fathers (e.g., Theodoret of Cyrhrus, PG 85:473D). By the 11th C. the theory arose that the Devil and demons had opaque bodies; Niketas Stethatos refuted this opinion, but Pselllos developed it (A. Ducellier in Le Diable au Moyen âge [Paris 1979] 202f). In Manichaean and later Bogomil doctrine the Devil appears as an eternal principle and the cause of evil; the Christian perception of the Devil was developed as a refutation of this dualist view. The Devil is a creature, one of the ANGELS, who, possessing free will, changed his nature and out of pride and wickedness revolted against God. As the enemy of God the Devil is hostile to mankind, always trying to entrap men, esp. those of saintly character; however, he involuntarily benefits humanity since man can prove his virtue in this contest.

In everyday practice the Devil’s foreknowledge (albeit limited) and power sometimes leads to confusion of good and evil forces, but a man possesses the means (esp. the cross) to dispel him. The Devil was defeated by Christ but allowed to continue his activity against mankind; ignorant of his destiny the Devil blasphemes against God but at Christ’s Second Coming (PAROUSIA) he will be thrown into fire with his host. Magicians were said to use the Devil’s help in achieving their goals. The Byz. presented the Devil as a snake or dog, as Ethiopian or black, and as baskanos (calumniator), having the evil eye (G. Bartelink, OrChP 49 [1983] 390–406). His epithet was kosmokrator, “world-ruler.” ANTICHRIST was his “general” in the war against the Good.


DEVILO (Δέβολις [Deabolis], Διάβολις [Diabolis]), a fortress and bishopric on the Via Egnatia south of Ohrid (precise location unknown), first mentioned in connection with Basil II’s conquest of Bulgaria: in 1018 he subdued a revolt in so-called Diabolis (Skyl. 360, 43, 60). As a kastron under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Kastoria, Diabolis appears in Basil’s grant of a privilege to the Bulgarian church in 1019; only in a later list
(Notitiae CP 13:835) is Diabolis named as the second bishopric of Justinana Prima, or Bulgaria. Theophyllaktos of Ohrid (died early 12th C.), however, speaks of the city as the see of Kliment of Ohrid (ca.900) and the center of his school, but no independent sources confirm this late evidence. In 1072 the rebellious Bulgarians captured Diabolis before attacking Kastoria.

Devol played an important role during the Norman war against Alexios I, and in 1108 the emperor forced Bohemund to sign there a treaty with the empire, in which Bohemond conceded vassal dependence on Byz. Devol remained an important stronghold in the 13th and 14th C.


DEVSIRME. See JANISSARIES.

DEXITRUM JUNCTIO. See MARRIAGE RITE.

DHŪ-NUWĀS (Διύνος), ruler of Himyar (517–25). A native of South Arabia, he seized power by overthrowing his predecessor (probably Ma‘adi karib); he converted to Judaism, took the name of Joseph (Yūsuf), and, seeking alliance with Iran, turned against Greek and Ethiopian Christian merchants active in Himyar. Malalas (Malal. 433:13–17) relates that Dimnos, the king of the Himyarites, murdered Roman merchants and stopped their trade with Ethiopia and India. The Axumite expedition (probably led by Elesboam or his father) to Himyar was an immediate response to the policy of Dhū-Nuwās. At first compelled to flee, Dhū-Nuwās gathered forces and in 518 reconquered the cities of Zafār, Muhwan, and Najrān; many Christians were killed. According to an inscription, Dhū-Nuwās’s general slaughtered all of the inhabitants of Muhwan and burned its church. Dhū-Nuwās tried to gain the support of Iran and the Lakhmids but failed, whereas the Roman-Ethiopian alliance was strengthened; in 525, with the help of the fleet sent by Justin I, Elesboam again invaded Himyar. In a battle on a seashore Dhū-Nuwās was killed by an Ethiopian soldier whom Yu. Kobiščanov (VizVrem 25 [1964] 234f) identifies as Abraha. Al-Tabari, however, knew a legend that Dhū-Nuwās preferred suicide to disgrace and threw himself, with his horse, into the sea. After his death South Arabia reverted to Axumite rule.


— A.K.

DIABATENOS. See DABATENOS.

DIADEM. See CROWN.

DIADOCHOS (Διάδοχος), bishop of Photike in Epiros, prominent opponent of MONOPHYSITISM in the 450s; born ca.400, died before 486. Little else is known, though a possible connection with Victor Vitensis has been suggested (H.-I. Marrou, REA 45 [1943] 225–32). Diadochos’s major work, One Hundred Chapters on Spiritual Perfection, was widely admired by many Byz. Its three major concerns are to advocate the virtues of asceticism; to stress the three virtues of faith, hope, and esp. love as the basis for spiritual contemplation; and to combat the MESSALIAN notion (condemned at the Council of Ephesus in 431) of demons in the soul by arguing that evil exists only as a consequence of sin. A homily on the Ascension, a Catechism, and the Vision (in which the author conducts a dialogue with John the Baptist in a dream) also survive.

Ed. Œuvres spirituelles, ed. E. des Places (Paris 1966), with Fr. tr.


— B.B.

DIAKONIA. See CONFRATERNITY.

DIAKONIKA (διακονικά, from διάκονον, “deacon”), liturgical exclamations, LITANIES, DITYCHS, etc., of the DEACON. The book in which diakoniκa
were collected was called a diakonikon or hierodiakonikon, though these texts were ultimately incorporated into the euchologion. There are a few extant diakonika rolls (e.g., Sinai gr. 1040 of the 12th C. [Dmitrievskij, Opisanie 2:127–35]).

Lit. Taft, Great Entrance xxxii–xxxiii. – R.F.T.

DIAGONIKON. See Pastophoria.

DIACRITICS. Ancient Greek was divided into a number of dialects, all of which were mutually intelligible. As cities lost their autonomy to Hellenistic monarchies and later to Rome, local dialects were replaced by Koine for public communication, gradually degenerated into peasant patois, and ultimately ceased to be spoken. Only the language of the Tsakones in the southeastern Peloponnesos and the Greek of southern Italy show traces of the ancient Greek dialects. These, as they appeared in literature, were known to the Byz. mainly from the compilatory On Dialects of Gregory Pardos. In the Middle Ages a new differentiation of Koine into regional dialects began. These developing dialects were used in literature only occasionally and in regions outside Byz. control and influence, such as 14th-C. Cyprus. Estathios of Thessalonike sometimes quotes contemporary dialect words or forms in his Homeric commentaries, and there are other indications of interest in dialects, as part of spoken Greek, in the 12th C. After the fall of Constantinople, poets and dramatists in Venetian-ruled Crete began to write in the local dialect and to elaborate it for literary use. This literature in Cretan dialect continued to be written until the mid-17th C.


– R.B.

DIAGOLYGOΣ, a literary form of conversation or dispute. Throughout their history the Byz. imitated two main types of antique dialogue: the Platonizing/philosophical and the Lucianic/satirical. The philosophical kind was much used by Christian writers of the 2nd–7th C. The finest examples of the Christian dialogue were written by Augustine in the West and Gregory of Nyssa in the East, who retained the scenic background of the conversation. The Christian dialogue, however, changed the social milieu (in the Banquet of Methodios of Olympos ten virgins are debating the virtues of celibacy) and replaced Plato’s dialectical mode of inquiry with overtly didactic and militant polemic: dialogue ceased to be a method of arriving at the truth and became a vehicle for polemics (e.g., Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Tryphon) communicating the message of salvation (Hoffman, infra 162). Voss (infra 348) asserts that another formative influence on the Christian dialogue was that of Jewish disputations over the Torah. In the 6th to 8th C. dialogue was used for ascetic indoctrination (Pope Gregory I the Great, who was nicknamed Dialogus; Maximus the Confessor) or solving theological problems (Patr. Germanos I [2], On Predestined Terms of Life). The philosophical dialogue is found later in the Palaiologan period; thus Gregoras wrote a number of Platonizing dialogues, esp. Florentios, or On Wisdom, devoted to polemic against Barlaam. John Katares defended astrology and used Arabic sources in his classicizing dialogue Hermippos, or On Astrology.

From the 10th C. onward, Lucianic satirical dialogue became popular. Whether pseudo-Lucianic (Charidemos, Philopatris, Timarion), anonymous (Anacharsis), or pseudonymous (Timoteos, or On Demons, ascribed to Psellus), they are set in the world of the past or even in Hades (again, in the wake of Lucian), and in their audacity strain the limits of Orthodoxy. Dialogical elements also appear as part of independent genres; in the sermon, whether prose or poetical; in acts of martyrs (in imitation of judicial interrogation); and hagiography, but rarely in historiography (the introduction to the History of TheophyIaktos Simokattes is couched as a dialogue between History and Philosophy, and Theophanes the Confessor reproduces a dialogue with Kalopodios). Alexios Makrembolites employed the genre for political and moral propaganda. The scholarly erotapokrisis took the structural form of a dialogue. Vernacular poets used the dialogue form in threnoi.

DIALYSIS (διάλυσις), a legal transaction by which parties settled a quarrel existing between them or an uncertainty about a legal situation through compromise. Consequently, a second settlement on the same matter was inadmissible after the conclusion of a dialysis, and any matter that had been decided conclusively in court could not become the object of a dialysis (cf. Peira 7.1,3,6,17). Moreover, a compromise agreement was inadmissible if it led to a result that was not recognized by the legal system (e.g., a divorce by mutual consent: cf. Peira 7.7,8). Apart from this, however, every conceivable matter in dispute (even criminal acts) could be the object of an (oral or written) settlement. The legal situation achieved by the settlement could be changed later only by a challenge to the legitimacy of the dialysis (e.g., in cases of deception or threat).

In the documents, along with this rigorous and readily used form of settlement (cf., e.g., the formulas for division of immovable things and termination of a suit through dialysis—Sathas, MB 6:631–34), various mixed forms were developed. As early as the 6th C. a connection arose between dialysis and the Aquilian stipulation, on account of their common character of “general settlement.” This finally led to the designation of every “conclusive settlement” through, for example, receipts, declarations of guarantee, etc. as a dialysis, even in circumstances where there were no legal uncertainties (cf., e.g., Xerop. no.4-3, a.1032; Pantel. no.4-36, a.1048; Laura 1, no.42-4, a.1081).


-D.S.

DIASTAXIS (διατάξις, Lat. ordo), a book of rubrics for the bishop or priest presiding at the Eucharist, or, less frequently, at Vespers, Orthros, and ordinaries. Diastaxis developed because early euchologion MSS contained few rubrics to regulate the proper celebration of the services. The diastaxis can be traced back as far as the 10th C. (A. Jacob, OrChrP 35 [1969] 249–56), though no MSS earlier than the 12th C. have survived. The most important diastaxis is that of Philotheos Kokkinos, whose codification of Byz. rubrics acquired general authority during the time he was patriarch. His diataxis rubrics for the prothesis were applied ca.1580 to the pontifical Eucharist in the archieratikon (see LITURGICAL BOOKS) of Demetrios Gemistos, notary of Hagia Sophia under Philotheos. The Presanctified diataxis attributed to Theodore of Studios is not authentic in its present redaction. (For diataxis as a form of monastic rule, see Typikon; for diataxis as a will, see Inventory.)

LIT. Taft, Great Entrance xxxv–xxxvii. Taft, “Pontifical Liturgy.”

-D.S.

DIDASKALOS (διδάσκαλος), a general term for laymen or clerics who were teachers of sacred or profane subjects; also, a technical term for those attached to the Patriarchal School at Hagia Sophia and engaged either in instruction in the faith or exegesis of Holy Scripture. Among those attached to Hagia Sophia two groups may be distinguished: an unspecified number of didaskaloi attested from the 11th C. whose status and duties were defined by Alexios I Komnenos in an edict of 1107 (ed. P. Gautier, REB 31 [1973] 165–201), and the trio of didaskalos tou evangeliou (also oikoumentos didaskalos), didaskalos tou apostolou, and didaskalos tou psalteriou known from the 11th and 12th C. The didaskaloi of Alexios’s edict were usually clerics of Hagia Sophia but could be recruited from laymen and monks who were distinguished by their virtuous character and ability to teach. Their function was pastoral, instructing people in the faith and policing their behavior in the capital. The three didaskaloi of Holy Scripture were always deacons and held a rank in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Their duties consisted of exegesis and preaching, as their didaskaloi ai indicate. There is no consensus of opinion as to their function. The idea that they were teachers of theology has recently been restated (B. Katsaros, Ioannes Kastamonites: Symbole ste melete tou biou, tou ergou kai tes epoches tou [Thessalonike 1988] 163–209). Didaskaloi in both groups usually advanced to a higher position in the church, often becoming bishops or metropolitans. (See also MAISTOR TON Rhetoron.)


-R.J.M.
DIDYMA. See Hieron.

DIDYMOS THE BLIND, last head of the catechetical school at Alexandria; born ca. 313, died ca. 398. Didymos (Δίδυμος) had a reputation for erudition, although he was blind by four and never attended school. He numbered among his pupils Jerome and Rufinus, who attest to his scholarship and influence. His condemnation for Origenism at the Council of Constantinople in 553 may account for the loss of much of his vast corpus. Excerpts from his commentaries on Genesis, Ecclesiastes, the Psalms, and Job survive (with some of Origen) in a 6th- through 7th-C. group of papyri found at Tura near Cairo; their exegetical method is allegorical. Fully or partly extant are On the Trinity, Athanasian in its defense of consubstantiality; On the Holy Spirit (in Jerome’s Latin translation), also urging consubstantiality; and Against the Manicheans. Didymos may have written the Against Arius and Sabellios ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa (K. Holl, ZKirch 25 [1904] 380–98). Other dogmatic and polemical works are lost. Overall, Didymos defends and develops a diversity of theological issues, being orthodox on the Trinity, Christology, and the Holy Spirit, but following Origen in anthropology and eschatology (primarily in the doctrine of the so-called apokatastasis, i.e., the ultimate salvation of all rational creatures—men, angels, and demons).


DIDYMOTHEICHON (Διδυμότηχον, “twin-wall”), city of Thrace, located on a hill above the river Erythros, a tributary of the Hebrós. Giannopoulos (infra 2–7) assumes that Justinian I built the fortress to replace Plotinopolis, situated in a valley somewhere nearby but difficult to defend. By the 9th C. Plotinopolis was completely replaced by Didymoteichon; in fact it had probably already disappeared in the 7th C., and the mention of Plotinopolis by Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De them. 1.55, ed. Pertusi 86) is anachronistic. The kastron of Didymoteichon (Beseliev, Inschriften 180f, no. 21) was taken by Krum in 813; its first known bishop, Nikephoros, participated in the council of 879. The fortress is mentioned as the place of exile for Bardas Skleros.

From the end of the 12th C. Didymoteichon appears as one of the most important strongholds in the area, and a sought-after prize for Latins, Bulgarians, rulers of Epiros, and John III Vatatzes, who occupied it ca. 1243. During the Civil War of 1341–147 Didymoteichon was the headquarters of John VI Kantakouzenos who was crowned there in 1341. Matthew I Kantakouzenos held Didymoteichon as his appanage. In the 14th C. Didymoteichon consisted of the citadel (polichnion in Gregoras) and a lower city that was destroyed during the civil war and rebuilt in 1542. The city was temporarily taken by the Turks in 1559 and permanently conquered in Nov. 1561.

The bishop of Didymoteichon became archbishop in the 12th C. and metropolitan in the 13th C. From 1204 to 1206 Didymoteichon was the residence of the patriarch John X Camateros and a center of resistance to the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople.

Some remains of the medieval city survive, including traces of the double city wall with towers and gates, a water reservoir of stone and brick, and the Church of St. Catherine of ca. 1300.


DIE, an instrument for striking coins. It normally consisted of a lower die of bronze or iron that could be fixed in a block of wood and had its upper face engraved in intaglio with the design of one side of the coin, and an upper die consisting of a cylinder of metal that could be held in the hand and had on its lower face the design for the other side. Coins were made by placing blank pieces of metal of the correct weight and fineness between the two dies and striking the upper one with a heavy hammer. No Bvz. coin dies have been preserved: the pincerlike object in the Fogg Art Museum (published as a die by Vermeule) is in reality a bouloterion (see Sealing Implements) for striking lead seals (V. Grumel, REB 15 [1957] 211–14). Their form is not in general likely to
have been different from 7th-C. Sasanian dies, of which three are known, or those of contemporary western Europe. They were evidently produced in limited numbers only, as obverse dies prepared for gold coins were sometimes also used for silver ones, and reverse dies without the names of specific emperors might be carried over from one reign to a later one. The concave coins of the later Byz. period apparently required the use of more elaborate double dies.


DIEGESIS TON TETRAPODON ZOON
(Διήγεσις τῶν τετραπόδων ζώων), or Tale of the Four-Footed Beasts; an anonymous satirical poem in just over 1,000 political verses, dating from the late 14th C. At the instigation of Emp. Lion, the four-footed beasts establish a truce between the carnivorous and herbivorous animals to meet and debate their respective qualities, but the lively discussion degenerates into savage fighting, from which the herbivorous animals emerge victorious. Written at a vernacular level of the language, which includes some of the repeated phrases found also in the late Byz. verse romances, the poem survives in five MSS, of which at least two were intended to be illustrated. It falls within the traditions of Greek fables and animal epics and the western European Roman de Renart and “Debate” poems among animals, such as Chaucer’s Parliament of Foules. The elements of satire, which incidentally give insights into contemporary culinary practice, arise generally out of the implied contrast between animal and human behavior. The conflict between the carnivores (the aristocracy?) and the herbivores (the people?) must reflect the civic turmoil of the late 14th C. Despite the date (15 Sept. 1365) embedded in the text, the Diegesis cannot now be linked to any particular event. Similar Byz. works include the Oparologos, Poulologos, and Synaxarion of the Honorable Donkey.


–E.M.J.

DIEIT. The Byz. ate one to three times a day (see ARISTON and DEIPNON). Attitudes toward food varied: the ascetic ideal praised temperance in diet, and saints are described as surviving on water and beans or wild plants and berries.

There is little information about the food of ordinary people. It consisted primarily of bread, legumes, and vegetables, supplemented by olives, fruit, fish, and wine. Dairy products, except for cheese, played a lesser role. The poor subsisted mostly on vegetables and vinegar, legumes prepared with olive oil, a gruel made of flour or barley, or perhaps an onion omelet (sphoungaton). The fruit and vegetables were varied: apples, pears, grapes, figs, melons, cabbage, leeks, cucumbers, carrots, garlic, onions, zucchini, etc. (Laiou, Peasant Society 28–32). Fish from the sea were preferred to those from lakes or rivers. Sugar was provided primarily by honey. The traditional view is that ordinary people rarely ate meat, but there is evidence suggesting that from the 7th C. onward the consumption of meat increased. The food of monks is better known, thanks to regulations in the Typika; meat was excluded from the monastic diet.

The food of the noble and wealthy classes was sumptuous and even exotic; some products, like caviar and sturgeon, were imported from afar. Wild game adorned the table. Food was often cooked with olive oil; for seasoning, various sauces were used as well as vinegar, pickled cabbage, and spices such as pepper and cinnamon. Desserts and honey cakes made of flour mixed with boiled must (oinoutta) or made of the finest wheat flour in circular shapes (krikelos) completed a rich meal.

Recipes for dishes survive mainly in treatises dealing with the nutritious properties of food and the monthly regimen that should be observed for good health (e.g., by Symeon Seth), but 12th-C. writers such as Eustathios of Thessalonike and Ptochoprodromos take pleasure in describing luxurious dishes. A common dish for rich and poor alike was monokhythron, a mixture of fish, cheese, and vegetables cooked in a casseroles and served as a one-course meal. The author of the
third Ptochoprodromic poem (ed. D.-H. Hessel-
ing, H. Pernot, 55.175–56.186) mentions this dish,
including as its ingredients sturgeon, Vlach cheese,
cabbage, olive oil, pepper, garlic, and sweet wine.
Another rich meal was prepared with salt pork
and cabbage, all drenched with fat. Poultry might
be stuffed with almonds or dough balls and mar-
inated in red wine. Fish was either fried in olive
oil, grilled, or made into soup with vegetables
such as dill, leeks, etc. Drying, salting, smoking,
and pickling were the main methods for the pres-
ervation of food.

Lit. Koukoules, Bios 5:9–121. A. Karpozelos, “Realia in
mentation des diverses classes sociales dans l’Orient médi-
éval,” Annales ESC 23 (1968) 1017–53. E. Jeanselme, L.
Oeconomos, “Aliments et recettes culinaires des Byzant-
tins,” Proceedings of the 3rd International Congress of the History
of Medicine, London 1922 (Antwerp 1923) 155–68. M. Dem-
bińska, “Diet: A Comparison of Food Consumption be-
 tween some Eastern and Western Monasteries in the 4th–
“How Reliable is Early Byzantine Hagiography as an Indica-
tor of Diet?,” Diptycha 4 (1986–87) 5–11. M. Poljakova-
skaia, A. Čekalova, Vizantija: byt i nray (Sverdlovsk 1989)
76–79.

Ap. K., A. K.

DIGENES AKRITAS (Διγενῆς Ἄκριτος), epic-
romance in political verse compiled, perhaps in the
12th C., from earlier material, much of which
may originally derive from oral sources (see Po-
etry, Oral). The text falls into two halves. The
first, epic in tone, concerns Digenes’ father, an
Arab emir, and his marriage to Digenes’ mother,
dughter of a Byz. general. The second, which
has an atmosphere of romance, deals with Di-
gen’s (“born of two races”) and describes his
precocious childhood, his exploits in hunting and
against brigands on the borders (the akrai, which
he guards as “Akritas” or “Akritez”), and his
peaceful life with his bride in their palace on the
Euphrates till death comes to them. The first part
reflects personalities and events from the 9th- and
10th-C. Arab-Byz. wars, as analyzed by H. Gré-
goire. The second is virtually timeless, whether
a survival from the distant past or a later attempt
to recommend harmony between Byz. and the
Arabs. The general worldview presented by the
whole text predates the 11th-C. Turkish invasions
of Asia Minor; many details of geography and
titulature confirm that dating. The most likely
date for the composition of the surviving version,
however, is the 12th C., during the revival of
interest in the romance (cf. the extensive quo-
tations from Achilles Tatius in MS G [Grotta-
ferrata]). The existence of the poem is first attested
at this time by a reference in a Ptochoprodromic
poem to Manuel I Komnenos as a “new Akrites.”

The poem survives in six Greek MSS and a
Slavic version (Devgenievo Dejanie). The latter
is less complex than the Greek, and it is unclear
whether it derives from an early stage of the
Greek text or represents a simplification of the
Greek story. Recent research suggests that four
of the Greek MSS (Trebizond and others) derive
from a 16th-C. compilation and so are of no value
as witnesses to earlier stages. The two older ver-
sions survive in the Grottaferrata and Escorial (E)
texts, which plainly derive from one original text.
They differ greatly, however; the Grottaferrata
version is well-organized and at the middle level
of Byz. linguistic purism, while the Escorial text
is closer to the language of everyday speech but
full of gaps and metrical irregularities. Although
critics are evenly divided on their support of the
Grottaferrata or Escorial text as the more accurate
reflection of their common archetype, recent dis-
cussions have stressed the early elements in both.

Each gives an interesting insight into the life of
the wealthy magnates of the eastern frontier of
Byz. in the 9th to 11th C. Digenes’ palace on the
Euphrates consisted of a stone house at least three
stories high, an elaborate garden, and a courtyard
containing his private church. The ceilings of the
palace were decorated in mosaic with Old Testa-
ment scenes (exploits of Moses, David, Joshua,
and Samson) and a vast repertory of mythological
and History Painting including scenes from the
Iliad, the Odyssey, and the life of Alexander the
Great.

Digenes Akritas has left scattered signs of influ-
ence outside Byz. in Arabic literature and in the
Slavic version, but its greatest impact has been in
modern Greek culture. Digenes and Akritas (rarely
both together) are frequently found in traditional
folksongs (see Akritic Songs), while the hero of
the epic is often used as a symbol of medieval
Hellenism in modern Greek literature and also
represented in objects of art (see Akritic Im-
agery).

Ed. Digenes Akrites, ed. E. Trapp (Vienna 1971). Digenes
Akrites [MS G], ed. J. Mavrogordato (Oxford 1956), with
Eng. tr. Basileios Digenes Akrites [MS E], ed. S. Alexiou
DIGNITIES AND TITLES (ἀξίαι διὰ βραβείων),
ranks in the official hierarchy. Unlike Western feudal titles, Byz. dignities were nonhereditary and bestowed by a brabeion. Four consistent systems of dignities are known: (1) the late Roman system in which membership in the senate served as the major denominator—the clarissimi, later illustres, were senators par excellence; (2) the system of the Taktika in which dignities were concurrent with office, and all officials holding the dignity of protospatharios and higher were considered members of the senate; (3) the Komnenian system in which the dignity depended on relationship with the emperor (son, brother, son-in-law, etc.); and (4) the late Byz. system reflected in pseudo-Kodinos in which the difference between dignity and office disappeared. The development of each system involved an inflation of old titles and their replacement by new ones; thus, the dignities of magistros, patrikios, and so on declined in importance by the mid-11th C., intermediary titles (proedros, etc.) were introduced, and at the end of the century a new system based on the dignity of sebastos elaborated. Sebastos was inflated by the end of the 12th C., giving way to pompous denominations such as panhypersebastos, sebastokryptatos, and probasebastokryptatos, some of which were known earlier. The Kletorologion of Philotheos lists 18 dignities of “bearded men” and eight of eunuchs. The following list, based on the Kletorologion of Philotheos, gives 18 dignities in descending order of importance.

Caesar
Nobelissimos
Kouropalates
Zoste patria
Magistros
Anthypatos
Patrikios
Protospatharios
Dishypatos
Spatharokandidatos
Spatharios
Hypatos
Strator
Kandidatos
Mandator
Vestitor
Silentiarios
Stratelates and Apo eparcho


M. Th. F.
DIKAIODOTES (δικαιοδοτης), a high-ranking judge. In a nontechnical sense of “dispenser of the laws” the term was known in antiquity and used in Byz. texts (e.g., NE 19 [1925] 181.6). As the head of a σκερετον, the dikaiodotes is mentioned for the first time in an edict of Alexios I of 1094 (J. Nicole, BZ 3 [1894] 20.6). The dikaiodotes presided over one of the tribunals in Constantinople. The post was very important in a civil career; its holders could obtain simultaneously the office of kanikleios (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.226). Theodore Pantechnes, during his career of 1148–82, exercised the functions of quaestor, dikaiodotes, and eparch of the city (Darrouzès, Tornikès 50f). The precise character of the duties of the dikaiodotes is not yet known. The last mention is that of 1197 (Patmou Engrapha 1, no.11 B.34–35, p.108)—the sebastos and dikaiodotes Michael Belissariotes.


- A.K.

DIKAIOPHYLAX (δικαιοφυλαξ), a title designating a subaltern judge, first attested in Constantinople and the provinces in the mid-11th C., conferred by the emperor on both laymen and churchmen (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 902–04; N. Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 135). From the reign of Michael VIII the title was conferred exclusively on churchmen by imperial appointment. The dikaiophylax’s duties involved cases of an ecclesiastical nature and required knowledge of civil and canon law. The first dikaiophylax in Constantinople after its reconquest in 1261, the deacon and epito deeseon of Hagia Sophia, Theodore Skoutarites, was empowered to exercise all the judicial functions and rights formerly attached to the office (MM 5:246f). Skoutarites and all subsequent dikaiophylakes were included among the exokatarkoloi, combining one of the titles assigned to the latter with that of dikaiophylax.

Lit. Darrouzès, Officia 109–11.

- R.J.M.

DIKAIOΣ, used only in dative case, δικαίω, “by commission,” was a term formed similarly to ek prosoτo; it designated a deputy (of a patriarch), an administrator acting on behalf of (lit. “in the right of”) the patriarch. The chartophylax is described as acting dikaios tes archierosynes in a novel of Alexios I of 1094 (Zepos, Jus 1:649) and as dikaios tou patriarchou by Balsamon (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:587.11–12); John Cheilas, metropoli-

tan of Ephesus in the second half of the 13th C., wrote about the professors of the Great Church who taught on behalf of the patriarch (dikaios tou patriarchou) as his representatives, ekklesios (Darrouzès, Ekkles. 388.3–4). In 1350, the synod of Constantinople announced that the hieromonachos Niphon was not the patriarch’s representative (Eis dikaios autou—MM 1:297.25). An act of 1316 (Epiph., no.12.66) mentions also the agent (dikaios) of the protos of Mt. Athos. More than ten other “agents” of the protos are mentioned in the documents of 1322–94, and others are known after 1462 (D. Papachrysanthou in Prot. 161–64). An exceptional case is Theodosios, who signed an act of 1375 as “monk and dikaios (in nominative case) of the Holy Mountain,” not of the protos (Pantel. no.15.21).


- A.K., A.M.T.

DIKTYS OF CRETE, author of what purports to be an eyewitness account of the Trojan War (Ephemeris belli Troiani) but was actually written in the 2nd or 3rd C., as two papyrus fragments of the lost Greek original (P.Tebt. II 268, P.Oxy. XXI 2539) testify. These fragments also support the claims of the Latin translation by “Septimius” (4th C.?) to be a faithful version of the first five books; the remaining books have been condensed into one. Extracts from the original text of Diktys are embedded in the Byz. chronicle tradition, esp. in John Malalas. They have, however, been recast and confused with the work of the otherwise unknown Sisyphos of Kos. Diktys’s account, determinedly rationalistic and eschewing the supernatural, was a major source on the Trojan War for the Byz., for some of whom—e.g., John Tzetzes—Diktys provided a counterbalance to the “falsehoods” of Homer. Diktys’s material is also reflected in the vernacular War of Troy, a close translation of Benoit de Ste. Maure’s French adaptation of the Latin version.


- E.M.J., M.J.J.

DIMODAION (διμοδιαυν, lit. “of two modior”), a secondary tax. In the list of taxes collected in Lampsakos in 1218 it is reckoned as an insignifi-
cant sum (0.6 percent of the whole amount), whereas in a *praktikon* of Lavra of 1321 it amounts to about 14 percent of the *oikoumenon* (Lavra 2, no.109.941). The nature of the *dimodation* is unclear: Solovjev-Mošín (Grēke poulevi 423f) associate it with trade duties, G. Litavrin (VizVrem 37 [1976] 29) with taxes on fruit trees. In many documents it appears together with *charagma* (e.g., Xēnoph., no.29.19; Lavra 3, no.118.196–97); both were said to be collected annually (Ephigr. 7, no.14); it can also be mentioned in a different context, e.g., listed between *zeugaratikion* and *mitaton* (Docheiar., no.25.15).

—A.K.

**DINOGETIA** (Δινογέτεια, mod. Carvân in Romania), city and stronghold that formed a part of the *limes* in *Scythia Minor*. It was located on a small island in the Danube. Excavations have revealed two layers of settlement. The late Roman (4th–6th C.) rectangular fortress was built on a rock dominating the island; it had a cobblestone and brick-paved main street 4–5 m broad and official buildings, such as the *praetorium*, baths, basilica, etc. Dinogetia was damaged by fire, probably during the *Cotrigur* attack in 559, and was deserted ca.600. The fortress was restored by John Tzimiskes and was inhabited, according to coin finds, through the reign of John II Komnenos. Excavations revealed habitations (mostly semisubterranean) and a small church; the population engaged in fishing, agriculture, and carving bone and wood. Connections with Byz. are attested to by coins (some hoards of gold were found), jewelry, and seals, including that of Symeon, *katêpano* of “Paradounabon” (Paristrion). A seal of Michael, “poimenarches of Rhosia,” indicates ecclesiastical connections with Kiev during the first half of the 12th C. Identification of the castle (*phourion*) of Demnitzikos mentioned in Kinnamos (Kinn. 93.19) as Dinogetia (A. Bolšacov-Ghimpu, RESEE 5 [1967] 543–49) remains hypothetical.


**Secular Diocese.** In the early Roman Empire the diocese was a part of a province. In the late 3rd C. the term was applied by Diocletian to a greater area, larger than the province but smaller than the *praefectura* of the praetorian prefect. According to the so-called *Verona List*, ca.297 the empire consisted of 12 dioceses: Oriens (later divided into Egypt and Oriens), Pontus, Asia, Thrace, Moesia (divided later into Dacia and Macedonia), Pannonia, Britain, Gaul, the Seven Provinces (Vienne), Italy (later divided into two parts, with centers at Milan and Rome), Spain, and Africa. At the head of the diocese stood the vicar, but some seem to have been administered directly by the praetorian prefect. The system of dioceses, planned as a vehicle of centralization, created a cumbersome bureaucracy. In the 5th C. it ceased to operate effectively. Anastasios I and Justinian I tried to abolish it (Jones, *LRE* 1:374) and to transfer some functions from the vicar to the provincial governor. The diocesan system disappeared in the 7th C.


**Ecclesiastical Diocese.** The ecclesiastical diocese was an administrative unit modeled on the secular diocese (to be distinguished from its modern usage as an episcopal province). The First Council of Constantinople of 381 (canon 2) mentions dioceses of Alexandria, Oriens, and Asia; so also pseudo-Palladius, in his *Dialogue* on John Chrysostom, speaks of the Egyptian and Asian dioceses; in the 5th C. Sokrates referred to the Pontic diocese. Following the example of secular provincial administration, dioceses were subdivided into episcopal provinces, *eparchia* and *paroikia*. The Council of Antioch of 341 distinguished between the bishop of a metropolis (i.e., *eparchia*) and one of a *paroikia*. The bishops of dioceses acquired the titles of exarchs and/or patriarchs, with the exception of the bishop of Constantinople, who was titled patriarch without being the head of a diocese.

The system of patriarchate-metropolis-bishopric became entrenched in the Byz. church; the diocesan units, on the other hand, disappeared, although territories controlled by the *exarch* resembled, to a certain extent, the late antique dioceses. Nevertheless, canonists of the 12th C.

**DIOCESE** (διοικησις), territorial unit of both secular and ecclesiastical administration.
discuss the term: according to Zonaras (PG 137:420C), patriarchs were the exarchs of dioceses. Balsamon (PG 137:420AB) is even more explicit; he says, with some hesitation, "The exarch of a diοθεσις, I believe, is not the metropolitan of each eparchia, but the metropolitan of the entire dio-
cese; as for the diocese, it comprises many epar-
chiae. . . . Now some of the metropolitan are
called exarchs, but in their dioceses they have no metropolitans subordinated to them; it is plausible
that [our] exarchs are different from the exarchs
of that time [of the time of the council of Chal-
cedon] or that they are the same but have lost the
privileges given to them by the canons [of Chal-
cedon]." The term is not employed after the 12th
C. The word diοθεσις was also used in a general
sense for government or ordering—by Christ, the
angels, the Devil, the church, etc.

LIT. A. Scheuermann, RAC 3:1056–59. A Fliche, V.
-A.F. A.K.

DIΟCLETIAN (Διοκλητιανός), emperor (284–
305); born Dalmatia 22 Dec. 243 or 245?, died
Split, 3 Dec. 313 or 316. Diocles, as he was originally
known, rose from an obscure origin through the
army to become comes domesticorum and then
emperor. He ended the anarchy of the 3rd C., in
part by appointing MAXIMIAN as augustus in 283
and Galerius and Constantius Chlorus as cae-
sars in 293, thus forming the Tetrarchy. As
senior emperor Diocletian devoted his attention
primarily to the East, from his residence at Ni-
komedicia. During his reign Diocletian reformed the
administrative structure of the state by ap-
proximately doubling the number of provinces
and grouping them into dioceses, each under the
jurisdiction of a vicar. Diocletian seems generally
to have made a principle of separating military
and civil authority, and most of the governors
had no troops. Late in his reign he apparently
began to appoint duces as military commanders,
usually with jurisdiction that crossed provincial
boundaries. In military policy Diocletian is com-
monly contrasted with Constantine I since he
generally relied on stationary frontier troops, al-
though each member of the imperial college ap-
parently had a mobile field army. Diocletian at-
ttempted to restore the finances of the empire with
reformed coinage and the PRICE EDICT. He re-
gularized requisitions in kind with the ANNONA
based on a system of CAPITATIO-JUGATIO.

Like many of his predecessors, Diocletian iden-
tified himself with one of the gods, in his case
Jupiter. He did not, however, take action against
the Christians until 303, with the beginning of
the Great Persecution, in which scriptures were
to be surrendered and churches demolished. Sub-
sequent edicts dismissed all Christians in state
service, subjected them to legal disabilities, and
finally ordered the arrest of clergy. The perse-
cutions were unevenly enforced, but there were
evidently many apostasies. Byz. tradition remem-
bers Diocletian primarily as a persecutor. On 1
May 305 Diocletian abdicated and went into re-
irement at Split, where he had built a palace.
He emerged from there only briefly to attend the
Conference of Carnuntum in 308, after which his
life is obscure.

Diocletian's physiognomy, esp. his downturned
mouth and short-cropped beard, is familiar from
a number of busts and medallions (Age of Spirit.,
no.5).

LIT. Jones, I.R.E. 37–76. S. Williams, Diocletian and the
Roman Recovery (London 1985). P. Brennan, "Diocletian
-T.E.G. A.C.

DIΟCLETIANIC ERA, an era used in Egypt,
computed from the starting point of 1 Thoth (29
Aug.) A.D. 284. Originating in pagan computa-
tions of the genealogy of the Apis bull and used
in 4th-C. horoscopes, it came to be employed by
Egyptian Christians in the 6th and 7th C. in epi-
taphs, colophons, and eventually in documents.
In the late 8th C. in Nubia it also came to be
called the "Era of the Martyrs," and this name
gradually superseded the earlier designation by
the 13th C.

LIT. L. MacCoul, K. Worp, "The Era of the Martyrs," in
Miscellanea Papyrologiae, ed. R. Pintaudi (Florence 1989).
-L.S.B.MacC.

DIΟDOROS (Διόδωρος), bishop of Tarsos (from
378) and theologian; born Antioch, died before
394. Educated at Athens, Diodoros became a monk
and then hegoumenos of a monastery outside of
Antioch. He was an ardent opponent of Arianism
and of the pagan revival of Emp. Julian. In 372
Valens banished him to Armenia; he was then
recalled and made bishop of Tarsos.

Diodoros played an important role in the mid-
Constantine, commander of the *tagma* of Western *scholae* under Basil II. His career was concentrated in the Balkans: he commanded the troops in Thessalonike and was *archon* of Sirmium; a seal of a *strategos* of “Serbia” is usually ascribed to him (V. Laurent, *ReB* 15 [1957] 190f), but the meaning of “Serbia” remains questionable. It is also unclear whether Constantine was governor of Bulgaria. Married to a niece of Romanos III Argyros, Constantine was accused of conspiring against him, transferred to Asia Minor as *strategos* of the Thrakesian theme, and eventually arrested; he died during an inquest. His son became Emp. Romanos IV Diogenes, whose sons were allies of the Komnenos family: Constantine, married to Alexios I’s sister Theodora, was killed at the walls of Antioch in 1073; Alexios appointed Nikephoros Diogenes governor of Crete.

Nonetheless the family remained inclined to revolt: involved in a plot in 1094, Nikephoros was blinded and exiled to his estates. Several members of the Diogenes family (or imposters who took their name) acted against Constantinople in alliance with foreign princes: Ordericus Vitalis mentions “the son of august Diogenes,” instigated by Bohemund to claim the imperial throne; the *Russian Primary Chronicle* tells about a Cuman expedition against Byz. in 1095 commanded by a certain Diogenes; in 1116 Leo Diogenes, the son-in-law of Vladimir Monomach, participated in an expedition of the Rus’ against Byz. The family’s role declined by the 12th C., and John Diogenes is known only in the modest position of Manuel I’s court orator. In 1254 Constantine Diogenes, *doux* of Leros and Kalymnos, was ordered to conduct a census of these islands; his *praktikon* is still unpublished (Angold, *Byz. Government* 139, n. 110). No data about later members of the family survive.


---

**DIOIKEITES** (διοικητῆς), a term designating several fiscal officials. The origin of the term is obscure. Bury’s suggestion (Adm. System 89) that it was connected with the late Roman *proces* was rejected by Dölger; Egyptian *dioiketai* were fiscal and judicial functionaries on the local level despite their high-sounding epithets (A. Steinwenter, *Studien zu den koptischen Rechtsurkunden* [Leipzig 1920; rp. Amsterdam 1967] 19–25); Theophanes

---

**DIOGENES** (Διογένης), a noble lineage, probably of Cappadocian origin (Attal. 99.21–22, 170.16–17). In the 11th C. Psellus regarded the family as “ancient and flourishing” (Psellus, *Chron.* 2:157, par. 10.2); the first attested Diogenes, however, is
(Theoph. 367.27) uses the word in a vague sense of “administrator.” A clear indication that the dioiketes was a tax collector is given only in Leo VI’s novel 61 and the *Treatise on Taxation* in the Marcian MS (Venice Marc. gr. 173, fols. 276v–281). The first mention of dioiketes is that of Paul, “dioiketes of the eastern eparchiae” in 680 (probably the same as Paul, “dioiketes of the Anatolikon,” whose seal is in Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.2290), although the acts of the Third Council of Constantinople (680–81) do not clarify Paul’s functions. Dioiketai of the eparchiae are known from seals of the 7th and 8th C. (Laurent, *Corpus* 2:645–58). Dioiketai belonged to the sekretos of the genikon but carried out their duties in the provinces. Zacos and Veglery (Zacos, *Seals* 1, p.1880) published 37 seals of various dioiketai linked either to traditional provinces (Bithynia, Galatia, Lydia, Thrace) or new territorial units (Anatolikon), but mostly islands (Samos and Chios, Euboea, Andros, Cyprus, Sicily) and cities, predominantly coastal (Ephesus, Kyzikos, Myra, Rhaidestos, Milletos, Thessalonike). The latest seal (no.3161) is of the early 10th C. Later dioiketai belonged to themes, such as a dioiketes of Boleron, Strymon, and Thessalonike in 1074 (Lavra 1, no.36.5). It is plausible that dioiketai were rewarded by the so-called synetheia (Ivir. 1, no.29.96, a. 1047). The term remained in use in the 14th C. and the office is mentioned in pseudo-Kodinos, but after 1109 the dioiketes was replaced by the praktor. Another dioiketes—of the metata (see Mitaton)—belonged to the department of the logothetes ton ageion (Laurent, *Corpus* 2:297f).

LIT. Dölger, *Beiträge* 70f.

DIOKLEIA (Διόκλεια), a stronghold (kastron) in Illyricum, at the confluence of the Zeta and Morava rivers. Excavations have located it north of modern Titograd and have revealed remains of walls, an aqueduct, and a basilica (C. Patsch, *RE* 5 [1905] 1251).

In 297 Dioklea became the capital of the Roman province of Praevalitana. The kastron was allegedly built by Diocletian—the legend is preserved by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (*De adm. imp.* 29.11–14), Kinnamos, and some Latin texts (A. Meyer in *Vesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 54–59 [1954–57] 35–102). Another tradition asserts that Diocletian was a native of Dioklea (P. Skok in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, vol. 1 [1927] 62f). It is unclear when Dioklea became a bishopric (G. Mikulin, *DHGE* 14 [1960] 541) but, at the beginning of the 7th C., Pope Gregory I addressed letters to its bishop. Soon thereafter the city was destroyed by the Avars; in the 10th C. Constantine VII (*De adm. imp.* 35.9–11) noted that the kastron of Dioklea was deserted. Legend has it that the last bishop of Dioklea fled either to Dubrovnik or Antivari.

The name Dioklea was also extended over the entire region along the Adriatic littoral between the theme of Dyrrachion in the south and the town of Kotor in the north. The population was Slav (predominantly Serbian) with strong Roman elements. Constantine VII locates the region of Dioklea near “the castellia of Dyrrachion” and states that in his time the area was populated by the Diokletianoi, a tribe considered by the Byz. as “Scythian” along with the Croats, “Serboi,” Zachloumi, Terbouniotai, and Kanalitai. A seal of Peter, archon of Dioklea, has been dated (Schlumberger, *Sig.* 493) in the 9th C., but it is not known whether Peter was the commander of a Byz. garrison or an independent ruler. The name Dioklea reappears in Kekaumenos (Kek. 168.12) as a site where “Tribounios the Serbos” routed the army of Michael, katepano of Dyrrachion. In 1179 Constantine Doukas was Byz. governor (doux) of Dioklea, Dalmatia, Split, and Dyrrachion (Ahrweiler, *Mer* 260f). It is an established scholarly view that the region of Dioklea or Duklja was also called Zeta from the 11th C. onward.


DIOKLETIANOUPOLIS. See Kastoria.

DIONYSIOS OF TELL MAHRÉ, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch (from 818); died 845. In addition to his successful administration of the Monophysite church in Syria and Mesopotamia under the disabilities imposed by the Islamic government, the fame of Dionysios rests on his reputation as an ecclesiastical chronicler, whose now lost work
was quoted by later writers such as Michael I the Syrian (died 1199) and Gregory Abūl-Faraj.

As a result Dionysios was mistakenly believed to be the author of a universal chronicle in Syriac, written in the late 8th C. by an anonymous monk in the monastery of Zuqin, in northern Mesopotamia near Amida. The Chronicle of pseudo-Dionysios of Tell Mahrē, as the work is now called, is preserved in a unique 9th-C. MS. Its contents record the succession of events from biblical times to the year 775 (it mentions Emp. Leo IV), with the fullest narratives covering the final 47 years (728/9–75), presumably the years of the writer's maturity. The Chronicle is important as a record of the relationships between Byz. and the Arabs in the 8th C. It incorporates the so-called Chronicle of Joshua the Stylicate. The author drew material from a number of earlier sources (such as the Ecclesiastical History of John of Ephesus) for which the Chronicle is itself now an important source.


DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE (Διονυσίως ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης), 1st-C. saint; feast day 3 Oct. Dionysios was a noble Athenian, a member of the supreme tribunal of the city, who was converted by St. Paul and selected by him as first bishop of Athens. Maximus the Confessor cites allusions to Dionysios in early sources (Dionysios, bishop of Corinth; Polycarp's letter to the Athenians; Eusebios of Caesarea) but knows little about the saint's biography. The Latin legend confused him with Dionysios, a missionary in Gaul, and developed the theme of his martyrdom. The Latin legend was translated into Greek by an anonymous hagiographer (PG 4:669–84); his text later served as the source for the vita produced probably ca.893 or 894 by Michael Synkellos, who transferred the date of Dionysios's execution from the reign of Domitian to that of Trajan. Symeon Metaphrastes included Dionysios in his menologion (PG 115:1032–49), and his life is briefly described in the Synaxarion of Constantinople, where the saint is portrayed as follows: “He was of moderate height, emaciated, with white and sallow skin, flat-nosed, with puckered eyebrows, sunken eyes, always deep in thought, with large ears, abundant gray hair, a moderately cleft upper lip, a straggly beard, a slight pot-belly and long slender fingers” (SynaxCP 102.8–14).

Representation in Art. Byz. artists imagined Dionysios as an elderly bishop of Athens, who, after his execution, was able to carry his own head around and entrust it to a Christian woman. He is thought to have witnessed the eclipse at the time of the Crucifixion (Khludov Psalter, Moscow, Hist. Mus. gr. 129, fol.45v) and to have been present at the Dormition of the Virgin.


DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE, PSEUDO-, pseudonym of the author of a corpus of theological writings that includes Celestial Hierarchy, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, Mystical Theology, Divine Names, and letters; fl. ca.500? The author represents himself as St. Paul's disciple, but his true identity is unknown: various candidates have been proposed, including Severus of Antioch, Peter the Fuller, Peter the Iberian, or someone in the circle of John Scholastikos. His theology was irrelevant to the major problem of his era—the relationship between the natures in the incarnate Christ; Dionysios dealt with the same philosophical problem of unity and plurality on a completely different level—even his vocabulary differs from that of his contemporary theologians. Dionysios drew extensively upon the Neoplatonists, esp. Proklos, but he introduced essential revisions in the system of Proklos: Dionysios eliminated the concept of the ψυχή, moved the world of ideas from the νόμος to the “One,” and emphasized the χωρίσμα (separation) between God and created beings.

While dealing with the problem of the Trinity, Dionysios avoided the Neoplatonic construction of the triad that might have been helpful for his purpose (B. Brons, Gott und die Seelenden [Göttingen 1976] 325f.). He stressed God's ineffability and unity and dwelt more on God's attitude toward the created world than on his internal development in the categories of natures and hypostases. The world, created not by God's free will but by innermost necessity, was a static, not a historical
to survive in nearly original form. It sums up a long tradition of linguistic study by Hellenistic scholars. Essentially a series of definitions, sometimes illustrated by examples, the work is based on the usage of poets and prose writers, not on the spoken language. It deals with prosody, phonology (see PHONETICS AND PHONOLOGY), the parts of speech, and MORPHOLOGY, but not syntax. The brevity and clarity of Dionysios's work guaranteed it success as a schoolbook for more than 1,000 years. A mass of commentaries grew up around it, some the work of a single author, such as George CHOIROBOSKOS or HELIODOROS, others catenalike compilations. Dionysios's Grammar served as a model for the Latin grammatical studies of Varro, Remmius Palaemon, and later scholars. It was translated into Syriac—to the structure of which it was ill adapted—and Armenian. The Armenian version in its turn was the object of several commentaries (N. Adontz, Denys le Thrace et les commentaires arméniens [Louvain 1970]). Though largely replaced in the Greek world as a schoolbook in the 19th C. by the Erotemata of Manuel MOSCHOPoulos and similar pedagogical grammars, Dionysios's work greatly influenced the Renaissance study of language. Modern European grammatical terminology is largely based on the work of Dionysios.


DIONYSIUS THRAX

DIONYSIOS THRAX, Greek grammarian and pupil of Aristarchos, whose work on Homeric philology he continued; born Alexandria ca. 170, died ca. 90 B.C. His Grammar (Technē grammaticē) is the earliest surviving systematic treatment of the subject and the only book of a Hellenistic scholar

(1.e., developing) system and consisted of certain hierarchies—angels, institutions, and men; salvation was a result of God's incarnation and philanthropy rather than an active volition of the soul to ascend to God. Dionysios's hierarchical vision of the cosmos was profoundly social—even though H. Goltz (Hierarchiae [Erlangen 1974] 200) overstates it as a "legal and rational type of power organization."

Dionysios's emphasis on the divine unity accounts for his acceptance by the MONOPHYSITES: Severos was the first to refer to Dionysios, and the Monophysites employed Dionysios in the discussions in Constantinople in 532/3; their Orthodox opponent HYPATIOS of Ephesus rejected Dionysios's evidence as a forgery. Later, however, Dionysios was recognized by the Orthodox, esp. MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR, and PACHYMERES wrote a paraphrase of Dionysios. He was less popular in Byz., however, than among the Syrians and esp. in the West where his hierarchical worldview gave a convenient ideological sanction to the feudal organization.

In 827 a MS of Dionysios was presented to Louis the Pious by a Byz. embassy; soon thereafter the corpus was translated into Latin (M. McCormick, ICS 12 [1987] 218f). The pseudo-Dionysian corpus also attracted the attention of such scholars as John Scotus Eriugena and Robert Grosseteste. As a writer Dionysios made abundant use of composite words, tautologies, and antitheses; such an "obscure" style was meant to reflect the complexity and contradictions of the enigmatic world (Averinçek, Poëtica 139f).


Trapezantine emperor Alexios III Komnenos. The latter became the ktetor of Dionysios, financing the construction of its principal buildings. In 1374 the emperor issued a confirmatory chrysobull (Dionys., no.4); at its head are depicted Alexios and his wife Theodora (Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.136). The monastery also received property and fiscal exemptions from the emperors in Constantinople (Dionys., nos. 3, 5, 10, 13). Dionysios was declared a patriarchal monastery in 1389.

The archives contain 28 Byz. documents dating between 1056 and 1464. In the library are approximately 237 Greek MSS of the 15th C. or earlier (Lampros, Athos 1:319–436; Euthymios Dionysiates, EEBS 27 [1957] 233–71). Its most precious possessions are a richly illustrated lectionary, cod. 587 (C. Walter, DHAE 13 [1985–86] 181–89) and cod. 61, an 11th–12th-C. copy of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos. An ivory plaque depicting the Crucifixion above a scene of the soldiers casting lots (BCH 81 [1957] 604) may be of doubtful authenticity.


DIONYSIUS EXIGUUS, Christian scholar; fl.ca.500–ca.550. Dionysius was a monk (abbot in some sources) from Scythia who spent most of his life in Rome. Cassiodorus reports that Dionysius assumed the Latin epithet Exiguus ("the Little") out of humility. His obsessive interest in the chronology of Easter produced his most famous achievement, the first reckoning of historical events from the birth of Christ rather than from Diocletian (284), using 753/4 a.u.c. (ab urbe condita, "from the foundation of Rome") as the year of the Incarnation. He also assembled the first proper collection of Canon law, including translations of Greek laws. His laudable desire to reconcile the churches of East and West prompted him to translate important texts into Latin, for example, the Life of Pachomios; On the Making of Man by Gregory of Nyssa; and the Tome to the Armenians of Proklos, patriarch of Constantinople.

DIONYSOS, Greek god of fertility and wildlife, both animal and vegetable, primarily of wine; in a later myth the son of Persephone. His cult grew in importance during the Roman period when the idea of a happier life in the netherworld was connected with the image of Dionysos, and scenes of Dionysiac myths began to appear on sarcophagi. Proklos refers to an Orphic tradition that proclaimed Dionysos the king of all the gods for six generations, and Macrobius perceives him as the god who combines in himself other deities, such as Helios and Apollo, as the soul of the world (Daszewski, infra 411). Nonnos of Panopolis devoted to Dionysos a voluminous epic, the Dionysiaka, in which the god is primarily a world-conqueror, subduing nation after nation in bloody battles and showing his courage. Finally, Malalas—following, probably, Eusebius of Caesarea—rationalized the ancient myth, humanizing and historicizing the god; he created for Dionysos a human genealogy and made him a mortal deified on account of his miracles and benefactions. O. Nicholson (Byzantion 54 [1984] 253–75) suggests that Galerius viewed Dionysos as his divine protector and interprets Lactantius’s criticism of Liber (Latin form of Dionysos) as polemics against Galerius.

A widespread motif in art—sometimes with connotations of resurrection—until the 6th C., the image of Dionysos disappears thereafter only to return in the 11th C. in the much narrower compass of illustrations to the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos. Based on the commentaries of the pseudo-Nonnos, these most commonly pictured scenes from his birth and childhood (Weitzmann, infra, figs. 52–58, 164–65) and his military and maenadic companions (see Maenads). In the pseudo-Oppian MS in Venice (Marc. gr. 479), Dionysos is depicted as a handsome youth wearing a short tunic and carrying ivy branches (Weitzmann, infra, fig.119).
DIOSKORIDES, Greek physician and pharmacologist, author of works on pharmacology and herbal lore; fl. ca.65. His De materia medica was a fundamental medical and pharmacological tract in Byz.; numerous physicians attached their comments to Dioskorides’ original text, and occasionally challenged his opinions (J.M. Riddle, DOP 38 [1984] 95–102).

The De materia medica survives in at least ten illustrated MSS. The earliest (Vienna, ÖNB med. gr. 1) is the most luxurious of Byz. scientific manuscripts, with 498 miniatures, mostly full-page paintings of plants in alphabetical order (as against Dioskorides’ original sequence). It also includes depictions of snakes, insects, spiders, scorpions, various animals, and birds to illustrate paraphrases by Euteknios of the Theriaka and Alexipharmaka of Nicander, the Ornithiaka of Dionysios of Philadephia, and similar tracts. Among five frontispieces, one shows seven famous physicians of antiquity, and one depicts Anicia Juliana, daughter of the emperor Gallus Placidus, surrounded by personifications and dropping gold on a copy of the book. A much-abraded acrostic within the octagonal ornament of this page was read by A. von Premerstein (JbKSWien 24 [1903] 105–24) as an expression of gratitude to Juliana from Honoratai (sometimes called Onoratoii), a town near Constantinople, for a church she had built there; in the spandrels of the octagon, putti are depicted building this church, which was completed, according to Theophanes the Confessor, by 512. Added marginalia indicate that the Vienna Dioskorides was in Latin hands for a time after the Fourth Crusade. In the 14th and 15th C. Greek monks in the monastery of St. John Prodromos in Petra made numerous notations in the book. Among the monks was Nathanael, who was also a doctor at the nearby hospital founded by Stefan Uroš II Milutin. In 1406 Nathanael asked John Chortasmenos to have the MS restored and rebound; Chortasmenos partially transcribed the uncial text and added, in minuscule, names of persons and plants. In 1422/3 the MS was still in the Prodromos library; some-

time after 1520 it passed into the hands of the Jewish physician of Süleyman the Magnificent and was eventually purchased by Charles V.

A lavish copy of the Vienna Dioskorides was produced in the 10th C. (New York, Morgan Lib. 652). Romanos II sent an illustrated version to the caliph of Cordoba about the same time.


DIOSKOROS (Διόσκορος), patriarch of Alexandria (444–51); died Gangra 4 Sept. 454. Dioskoros succeeded Cyril as bishop of Alexandria, determined to defend the position of his see and destroy all vestiges of dyophysite Christology, esp. as it was taught by Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa. Haughty and impetuous in temperament, he antagonized even some of his natural allies in Alexandria. Dioskoros supported the Monophysite monk Eutyches in his conflict with Palt. Flavian of Constantinople; in 449 he presided over the “Robber” Council of Ephesus, using coercion to secure the victory of Alexandrian theology and the condemnation of Flavian. Two years later at the Council of Chalcedon Dioskoros was in turn deposed and exiled to Gangra, where he soon died; he was not, however, condemned for heresy but only for his strong-arm tactics at the “Robber” Council. Much of the Egyptian church remained loyal to Dioskoros until his death and refused to accept Proterios, who had been named as his successor in Alexandria by the council. Later Monophysite opinion, however, did not always regard Dioskoros with favor, but in some Monophysite circles he was viewed as a saint. A Syriac vita of Dioskoros by his disciple Theopistus is preserved (ed. F. Nau, Journal Asiatique 10 1 [1903] 5–108, 241–310).


—T.E.G.

**DIOSKOROS OF APHRODITO** in Egypt, poet and lawer who represented the people's interests in letters and petitions to the local grandees; died after 585. Dioskoros (Διώσκορος) visited Constantinople in the 550s on family business (V. Martin, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 15 [1929] 96–102). A cache of papyri containing his papers was found in the early 20th C. Apart from classical fragments, they contain his own writings. His prose includes an important Greek-Coptic glossary, petitions and business contracts, and a treatise on metrology. His verses, in assorted meters, range from classicizing exercises to panegyrics and epitaphia addressed to local magnates. Dioskoros's *enkomion* of Justin II provides early testimony on the veneration of the imperial image (L.S.B. MacCoul, *Byzantium* 54 [1984] 575–85). The verses show his fondness for decorative epithets, for self-quotation, and for combining pagan with Christian imagery. What once were thought to be inaccuracies in his versification can now be understood as reflections of Coptic phonology and syntax. Since much of his verse and prose output is preserved in draft stage, it affords an opportunity to see a late antique writer at work.


—B.B., L.S.B. MacC.

**DIOSKOUREI**, Castor and Polydeuces (Lat. Polux), Greek mythological figures; twin brothers of Helen, they share immortality between them, living half their time in the netherworld and half on Mt. Olympus. Represented as riders on white steeds, the Dioskouroi were connected with the astral cult; they were also perceived as helpers of mankind, esp. at sea (e.g., Himerios, ed. A. Colonna, or.q.112–13) and in illness. The veneration of the Dioskouroi continued after the triumph of Christianity: on North African pottery of the 4th C. representations of the Dioskouroi are accompanied by the 12 apostles or the Raising of Lazarus, and on sarcophagi with the scene of St. Peter's arrest (F. Bejaoui, *Ant. Afr.* 21 [1985] 173–77). Pope Gelasius I attests to the existence of a cult of "Castrares" that the people did not want to abandon. The attitude of the church to the Dioskouroi was ambivalent: the church fathers rejected the myth of their immortality; on the other hand, they tried to replace the Dioskouroi by Christian pairs—thus, the apostles Peter and Paul assumed their function as helpers at sea, and Kosmas and Damianos their function as healers. More questionable is the Dioskourian origin of the Cappadocian triplet saints Speusippos, Elasippos, and Melesippos, who are said to have been skilled riders. Niketas Choniates compares the imperial brothers Isaac II and Alexios III Angelos to the Dioskouroi (Nik. Chon. 452.14).

In the MS of pseudo- Oppian in Venice (Marc. gr. 479), Polydeuces is shown in a boxing match with Amykos, king of the Bebyrkes, while Castor is depicted as a soldier. In other miniatures of the same MS the brothers are shown hunting, both on horseback and on foot (Weitzmann, *infra*, figs. 118, 128–29).


—A.K., A.M.T.

**DIOSPOLIS** (Διώσπολις, also called Lydda, Ar. Ludd; George of Cyprus calls it Georgiopolis), a city in Palestine southeast of Jaffa, which became an early center of Christianity. Its bishop was synkellos of the patriarch of Jerusalem, and the see an autocephalous archbishopric. The Council of 415 in Diospolis supported Pelagius (see Pelagianism). According to the Piaenza Pilgrim, a miraculous column stood near Diospolis; as the Lord was being led toward this pillar to be scourged, it was lifted up in a cloud and set down in the middle of the road. The cult of St. George was early attached to Diospolis. Legend has it that George was born in Diospolis and his remains brought there after his death in Nikomediea; pilgrims speak of his miracle-working tomb in Diospolis. Even after 'Amr conquered Diospolis, the city remained a place where George was venerated: in the 10th C. there was a splendid church dedicated to him; a Muslim legend, probably based...
on the image of George killing the dragon, predicted that at the door of this shrine Christ would slay the Antichrist. The remains of a monastery of St. George, built by the Crusaders over a church of Justinian I, are still evident in and around the Greek Orthodox church of Lydda.

(For Diospolis in Bulgaria, see IAMBOL.)


--G.V. A.K. Z.U.M.

DIPLOMACY, conducted for such purposes as negotiating treaties and arranging imperial marriages or exchanges of prisoners, was one of the main activities of the Byz. government and largely contributed to its successes. A solid ideology underlay this diplomacy, which an educated and versatile bureaucracy conducted with subtle pragmatism.

The uniqueness and supremacy of the empire on earth was a concept inherited from Rome and enhanced by the theory that imperial power was obtained by God's will according to God's choice. Following these principles, the ideal would have been to unite all the world under one Christian Roman emperor, always perceived as a peacemaker (airenopoios). This was one long-term objective for Byz. diplomacy, but in the meantime the defense of the empire had to be guaranteed. This basic theory remained practically unchanged throughout the history of Byz., even in its most somber moments.

The existence of other rulers, with varying degrees of sovereignty, was officially recognized. Each had a specific place in the theoretical framework of a big family, the center of which was the Byz. emperor: the designations "son" (often vassal), "brother," "cousin," "nephew," etc., indicated the closeness and the rank that the emperor assigned to each ruler. Following the imaginary example of heaven and the concrete one of the imperial court, a real (and changeable) hierarchy of states was construed on the basis of power, religion, and recognized level of civilization. At the top of this hierarchy, after Byz., came the Sasanian Persians, then the Arabs, with whom the emperor negotiated on terms of quasi-equality.

The western European states—previously part of the empire, but separate from the 5th C. onward—were given mediocre positions, even though they were Christian and had an admitted affinity with the Byz. This hierarchy was manifested in official correspondence in the form of address assigned to each foreign ruler or in the weight of the gold seal (bulla) used to seal the letter sent to him (e.g., in the 10th C. bullae of four solidi were used for letters to the Arab caliph, three solidi for the khan of the Khazars, two solidi for the archon of Rus', one or two solidi for the pope and for the king of the Franks, etc.). These differentiations were even clearer in the way that some treaties were concluded and put in writing.

Whenever possible, the appearances dictated by the above ideology had to be respected. Instead of "paying tribute" the Byz. said they "gave gifts" or, better, granted titles and the accompanying salaries to foreign rulers and their entourages, thus reaffirming implicitly the emperor's supremacy. Only when compelled did the emperors accept humiliation (e.g., Nikephoros I agreed in 806 to pay Hārūn al-Rashīd not only a hefty tribute, but also three nomisma for his personal capitation and three more for his son's). They also agreed to accommodations (oikonomia). Although the Byz. forcefully refused to recognize other Christian emperors, they accepted unwillingly the use of the imperial title by other rulers (Charlemagne, the German emperors, the Bulgarians, and the Serbs); the title "emperor of the Romans" they retained for their sovereign alone. This general ideology, recognized and accepted by most other states, helped the Byz. considerably in conducting their foreign policy, enhanced as it was by the long tradition of the empire.

Diplomacy used various means. Pressure on the other party could be exerted directly by the armed forces, indirectly by allies that Byz. could turn against its enemies, by civil strife that it would provoke, or just by supporting the pro-Byz. political party. On the other hand, to make individual friends, Byzantium used its prestige and wealth as well as its capital, Constantinople, which offered a high quality of life. Close relatives, esp. sons, of foreign rulers, were invited for prolonged stays in Constantinople, where they were exposed to Byz. culture and religious practices (and served as hostages). Foreign rulers were invited to visit
Constantinople, where imperial wealth and power could be displayed while negotiations were conducted.

Marriages of Byz. princes to foreign princesses were accepted from the 8th C. onward; Byz. princesses of blood, close relatives of the emperor, married abroad from the 10th C. onward. Marriages to foreigners were, however, usually arranged with illegitimate children of the emperor or with children of the aristocracy. Royal insignia could be attributed and a sovereign title assigned to a foreign ruler who would agree to become the (adopted) “son” of the emperor, thus recognizing his superiority.

Attribution of Byz. titles in order to create bonds of dependency was practiced throughout Byz. history; in some cases these titles became hereditary to the foreign princes. Gifts or periodic payments were intended to secure the conclusion of a treaty, an alliance, or the prince’s neutrality. Similarly, commercial privileges were granted to foreign colonies (attested from the 10th C. onward). Missions, when successful, attracted the foreign country into the orbit of the Byz. church, which in turn provided the converts (partly or totally) with ecclesiastical personnel. By accepting Byz. Christianity, the foreign ruler became subject to spiritual pressures by the patriarch of Constantinople.

Byz. had no diplomatic service as such but made use of a large, competent, and well-organized bureaucracy, various branches of which would, when necessary, deal with foreign states. Rarely, diplomatic negotiations were conducted by provincial governors (e.g., the Katepano of Italy or the strategoi of Cherson). Foreign policy was decided by the emperor or the Magister Officiorum, later by the Paradeisyeon, and eventually by the Mesazon. Foreign correspondence was prepared in the imperial chancery (under the Palaiologoi, supervised by the megas logothetes). Ambassadors, who also collected intelligence, were assisted by a corps of interpreters, even though Greek, esp. demotic Greek, was a major language of diplomacy in the eastern Mediterranean, also used in negotiations between non-Greek-speaking peoples. Foreign ambassadors were received by the logothetes tou dromou. Very seldom did sovereigns themselves conduct negotiations; usually they were the work of embassies, sent ad hoc, that held discussions mostly with high officials. The permanent foreign representatives in Constantinople (bailo, podestà) had their place in the imperial ceremonies and consequently were in close contact with the authorities.


DIPLOMATICS, the auxiliary discipline dealing with the critical study of archival documents (see ACTS, DOCUMENTARY), has a short history as far as Byz. is concerned. B. de Montfaucon first treated the subject in chapter 6 of his Palaeographia graeca (Paris 1708). Byz. acts were also examined critically by some Athonite monks, such as Cyril of Lavra and Nikodemus Hagiotreites, both in the 18th C. Setting aside the Papyri, one is left with few surviving diplomatic materials, because all Byz. state archives and most monastic ones have perished.

Archives known to preserve Byz. documents are relatively few: the monasteries of Mount Athos (see ATHOS, ACTS OF), Patmos, and Meteor are the main depositories of monastic archives, together with the numerous documents of churches and monasteries preserved in southern Italy and Sicily. Original documents of foreign relations can be found in western European state archives (esp. Genoa, Venice). Many more acts are scattered in various collections, originals or copies in MS codices, including collective copies and medieval chancery records.

The main goal of diplomacy is to study Byz. documents in order to reconstitute the lost archives and Byz. chancery techniques; to classify the preserved documents according to the authorities that issued them; to examine them, be they original or copies (official or unofficial, certified or not, preserved in other documents or in narrative sources), and to establish whether they are authentic or forgeries. The limited probatory value of the written act may explain why the
relatively few Byz. fakes come from periods of political upheaval (such as the 14th and early 15th C. in Macedonia). Moreover, the documents have to be published properly (if possible, with facsimiles) and commented upon adequately in regard to the wealth of information that they contain concerning the administration and the finances, the economy and society, the prosopography and the geography, the historical events that they mention, their language and their calligraphy, even the literary trends and ideology that are reflected in them, esp. in their rhetorical prooimia.


—N.O.

DIPLOVATATZES. See VATATZES.

DIPTYCH (διπτυχος), any laterally connected pair of panels in wood, ivory, or precious metal; the term is customarily applied to leaves more ceremonial in purpose and more elaborate than writing tablets. Ivory diptychs are the best studied. According to the Historia Augusta, ivory diptychs were used to record proceedings of the senate. In 5th-C. Carthage calculi eburnei served to preserve the names and deeds of proconsuls (CChr Ser. lat. 60:220). It is possible that John Chrysostom's allusion to "golden" deltoi (PG 56:110.46) refers to diptychs issued as documents of appointment to high officials. No such literary evidence is available for other subsets: the classes known as imperial and five-part diptychs (see below). Frequently depicted in the Notitia Dignitatum, official diptychs seem to have been framed in gold, an element lacking in presumably privately issued specimens carved with mythological scenes, games, or literary figures (Volbach, Elfenbeinarbeiten, nos. 54–61, 66, 68–69). Even though related in size and technique to the consular diptychs (see below), such private diptychs were probably distributed in much smaller quantities.

Pagan ivory diptychs disappeared in the 6th C., although a parallel Christian series, the so-called five-part diptychs, continued to be issued after that date. Sacred diptychs (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinchulpt. II, nos. 40–42, 52–53, 60, 122, 222–23), functioning as folding icons, were less prevalent than triptychs in the 10th–11th C., but hinged panels continued to be used as insignia of office: the Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 93.22–95.1, 127.25–27, 129.4–5) specifies that the emperor should present decorated ivory plaques to candidates for the patriciate, a distribution confirmed in De cer. (248.11). Like the codicil diptychs of late antiquity, these may have contained parchment documents of appointment.

Consular Diptychs. These were panels issued by ordinary consuls upon their accession to office. The earliest surviving specimen is that of Felix, consul in 428; the series closes with the end of the civil consulate in 541 because emperors who thereafter assumed the consulate did not issue diptychs. Normally, consular diptychs bear the name, cursus honorum, and a likeness of the honoree. Rome and Constantinople were the most likely centers of distribution. Diptychs of the 5th C. are generally simple portraits; most 6th-C. examples show the consul presiding over the games that marked his accession. More than 30 identify
a specific consul; a handful of others, although anonymous, probably also belong to the consular series. It is not certain that all such appointees issued diptychs, and the number and nature of recipients must have varied. Gaius Apollinaris St-
ponius (ep.3.6.5–6) indicates that consuls distributed panels to their friends and relatives; the diptychs of Justinian I (521) and Philoxenos (525) bear dedications to the senate or its members. Inscriptions are usually in Latin, occasionally in Greek, though language alone cannot reveal their place of manufacture. Slight variations in iconography, combined with the evidence of technique, point to ivory workshops that produced other sorts of panels (A. Cutler, Byzantion 54 [1984] 75–115); surviving in greater numbers, consular diptychs were serially produced. Their inner surfaces have recesses like those of normal writing tablets, but the notion that these huge slabs of ivory—those of Apion, consul in 539, measure nearly 41 × 16 cm each—were filled with wax and inscribed cannot be verified. Many consular panels were reused for Christian purposes in the Middle Ages. Preserved in this way, they constitute an invaluable tool for modern scholarship since they are precisely datable by the name of the official they bear.

Five-part Diptychs. Known only in ivory, they are paired and sometimes hinged assemblages of five panels attached to one another by tongue-
and-groove joints. Each group of five panels forms a leaf measuring approximately 35 × 30 cm overall. If the so-called imperial diptychs are included, panels survive from 13 such objects. Neither the function nor the dates of five-part diptychs are known with any precision. Office-holders appear on some fragments and a consul is depicted on one (Delbrück, infra, no.47), but this is an insufficient basis on which to suppose, with Delbrück, that five-part diptychs showed the consul's reception of codicilli. On the majority of examples, usually dated between the 6th and 8th C., Christ, the Virgin, the Lamb of God, or a cross occupies the central panel, surrounded by Gospel scenes. Some of these may have been designed from the start as book covers (F. Steenbock, Der kirchliche Prachtinband im frühen Mittelalter [Berlin 1965] 11–21).

“Imperial” Diptychs. A subset of five-part dipt-
ychs, they contain the depiction of an emperor or empress in their central panels. Though no example survives in its original state, there are 12 fragments belonging to eight different specimens; these are customarily assigned to the 5th or 6th C. Images of various dignitaries appear on the flanking plaques, a bust of Christ or a personifi-
cation of Constantinople in the upper register, and barbarians bringing offerings in the lower. “Imperial” diptychs have therefore been thought to celebrate perpetual victory, a theme repeated on some of their inscriptions. On the basis of one example inscribed with a consul’s cursus honorum but lacking his name (Delbrück, infra, no.49), it is assumed that they were presented to the ruler by consuls at their inauguration. H. Thümmel (BS 39 [1978] 196–206) conversely suggests that “imperial” diptychs were presented by emperors to state officials and that examples with Christian iconography functioned as insignia bestowed on high clergy when they took office. (See also Barberini IVORY.)

diptychen. A. Goldschmidt, “Mittelstücke fünfteiliger Elfenbeinentafeln des VI.–VII. Jahrhunderts,” JbKw 1 (1929) 30–
33.

—A.C.

DIPTYCHS, LITURGICAL, lists of names of the living and of the dead proclaimed aloud by the deacon during the Eucharist. The practice is attested from as early as the 5th C. The church of Constantinople had two separate lists, that of the dead being further subdivided into a list of laymen and a list of clergy, with the bishops of Constantinople listed according to the order of their succession. The diptych soon became a vehi-
cle of political struggle. Already in 451 it was prohibited to “read from the altar” the names of the leaders of the “Robber” Council of Ephesus. Names of emperors, popes, and bishops were often erased from diptychs and restored only after some form of reconciliation had taken place.

Sometimes inscribed on double tablets of ivory, liturgical diptychs could be local, as in the Syrian traditions, commemorating representatives of the local church, or ecclesial, commemorating hier-
archs of other churches with which the local church was in communion, or the two combined. Byz. diptychs were the combined type and were chanted by the deacon during the anaphora, not before it, as in the Syrian rites.
DISEASE. The Byz. cherished an interest in diseases and knew how to describe them. Although images created by Psellos are usually static, he was able to show the changes in human appearance caused by disease (Ljubarskiij, *Psell 241f*). Byz. authors produced detailed descriptions of disease—both the pandemic plague and individual illness (H. Hunger in *Polychronion* 244-52). Scientific medicine clearly classified ailments—from plague to rabies, ophthalmic afflictions, leprosy, various skin rashes, cholera, pneumonia, and tuberculosis. Human diseases were understood through the ancient notions of imbalances among the four humors, best known to Byz. medical writers from the works of Galen, although physicians were well aware of the Hippocratic origins of humoral pathology.

Side-by-side with scientific diagnosis was a “demonic” explanation of disease; not only was miraculous healing conceived as a struggle against demons, but even a well-read man such as Photios, who knew Hippocrates, Galen, and Oribasios, explained gastric illness as the action of a fecal demon (PG 101:553A-B). He also assumed that the moon could cause disease (117B-D).

**DISHYPATOS** (δυσπατος, i.e., twice hypatos), title mentioned the first time at the beginning of the 9th C.: the *dishypatos* Thomas was an addressee of Theodore of Studios (PG 99:498C). The *Kletarologion* of Philotheos places the title after that of the *protospatharios*. In the 11th C. the title *dishypatos* was often conferred on judges, anagrapheis, and chartoularioi. The title seems to have disappeared in Byz. by the end of the 11th C., but was known in southern Italy in the beginning of the 12th C. John, son of the imperial *disipatus* Ursus, was mentioned as late as 1178. *Dishypatos* as a family name appears in the 12th C. and becomes relatively common in the Palaiologan period (PLP, nos. 5522-45).

**DISHYPATOS, DAVID,** Palamite monk and apologist; died by 1354, perhaps by 1347. Dishypatos (*Δυσπατος*) was a member of an aristocratic family that was related by marriage to the Palaiologan dynasty. He first appears ca. 1337 as a correspondent of *Barlaam of Calabria.* Despite this connection, he favored the views of Gregory Palamas. In 1341 he was at the monastery of Takekyromene in Paroria, a stronghold of hesychasm, when he was summoned to Constantinople to support Palamas in his struggle with Barlaam.

After the local council of Constantinople of 1341 (see under Constantinople, Councils of) Dishypatos began to compose polemical tracts against Barlaam and Akindynos, notably a *Logos* addressed to Nicholas Kabasilas (ca. 1342) and a lengthy iambic poem of 610 verses in response to Akindynos’s poetical attack on Palamas (ca. 1342-44). In 1346, at the request of Anna of Savoy, he wrote a *Short History of the Heresy of Barlaam and Akindynos.* Some works of Dishypatos were translated into Slavonic languages probably in the second half of the 14th C. and are known in MSS from the 15th C. onward (G.M. Prochorov, *Todrcl* 33 [1979] 32-54).

**DISHYPATOS, MANUEL,** 13th-C. patron of an icon of the Virgin Hagiostoria now in Freising Cathedral. He is sometimes identified with Manuel Opsaras Dishypatos, metropolitan of Thessalonike, 1258-60/1 (PLP, no. 5544). Dishypatos’s offering retains its original silver-gilt votive, on which the image is described as the “Hope of Those Who Have Lost Hope” (*Hs Eipiston Apelpismenon*). Dishypatos is identified as a *kanstresios* (see *Kastresios*); the dodacasyllabic verses are said to have been written by Dishypatos himself (M. Kalligas, *ArchEph* [1937] pt.2, 505). Plaques of the Hetoimasia, archangels, and saints attached to the frame led Wessel (infra) to postulate an enamel workshop in mid-13th C. Thessalonike. The icon, which reached Freising in

---


1440, is described in a Latin inscription on the altar on which it rests as a gift to Gian Galeazzo Visconti “from the emperor of the East.”


A.C.

DISKOPOTERION. See Chalice; Paten and Asteriskos.

DISMISSAL (ἀπόλυσις, lit. “release”), a formula pronounced at the end of a liturgical service or sometimes of one of its parts, as in the apolysis of the catechumens after the reading of the Evangelion (e.g., Maximos the Confessor, PG 91:692D–693A). The formula of the apolysis varied, the major types having been the so-called small and great dismissal; the latter was used after vespers, orthros, and the divine liturgy (Eucharist). 


A.K.

DISTORTION, the alteration in shape or proportion in an image, frequently employed to convey values on a hierarchical scale, the expression of emotion—less often used than in the medieval West—or for purposes of caricature. Despite antique theoretical systems designed to avoid distortion, which were transmitted by Proklos, the absence of coherent perspective often resulted in what, to the modern eye, appear to be deformations of space and proportion. Some distortions, however, are evidently attempts by the artist to compensate for the spectator’s point of view; monumental figures, intended to be seen from below, often appear with disproportionate heads or legs when viewed from appropriate positions. Spiritual values such as asceticism have been held to explain distortion of the human form; some such instances must be attributed rather to artistic incompetence or lack of concern for plasticity.

A.C.

DIVETESION (διβητήσιον, also διβητισιόν), a long ceremonial silk tunic resembling the Latin dalmatic, for use on only the highest state occasions. It was worn, belted, instead of the skaramangion (perhaps over another simpler tunic), under the loros, chlamys, or sagion, esp. by the emperor, but also by certain court officials. Red, green, and white divetesia are mentioned in texts, but the color purple was restricted to the emperor. According to a 10th-C. ceremonial book (De cer. 423.2), Anastasios I wore a sticharion divetesion; the term is encountered frequently in the 9th–11th C. but is not used by pseudo-Kodinos in the 14th C., by which time the garment had apparently been replaced by the sakkos.

In imperial portraits it is not always easy to distinguish between the skaramangion and the divetesion; both seem to have been woven with gold designs and ornamented with panels of gold embroidery on the shoulders and hem. The divetesion (if indeed this is the garment depicted in the portraits) changed somewhat over the course of the 11th and 12th C.: the sleeves grew tighter, and the lower embroidered hem was no longer a strictly horizontal band but extended up the outer edge of each leg into a point or roundel. The comparable tunic that the emperor wore under the loros had immensely wide sleeves.


DIVINATION, foreseeing or prediction of future events or disclosure of hidden knowledge. Various mantic arts were inherited by the Byz. from ancient practice but were transformed and christianized. They can be divided into two major forms: “natural” divination based on the spontaneous observation of the world and inductive (“artificial”) divination originating from the use of special means. To the first group belong the observation of celestial bodies (astronomy), of meteorological events and natural phenomena (e.g., thunder [see Brontologion] and earthquakes), of dreams (see Oniokritikon), of birds (the eagle and others) and animals. The behavior of horses was sometimes alleged to predict the destiny of a new ruler or of a military campaign. According to Haron Ibn Yahya, if imperial horses, when led into Hagia Sophia, took the bridle in their mouths, it meant that the Byz. had defeated the Muslims (A. Vasiliev, SemKond 5 [1932] 159f).

In the 6th C. a dog allegedly was able to divine which women in a crowd were pregnant and which men were adulterers (Theoph. 224.15–27). It is unclear if any special means were used by the
9th-C. Peloponnesian shepherds who announced the fall of Syracuse to the Arabs two weeks before the news was confirmed (Genes. 89.64–75). The natural divination of oracles, the ecstatic and unintelligible utterances of prophets, so fashionable in antiquity, lost significance, yet Niketas Choniates describes a seer, Basilakes by name, active in Rhaidestos, whose nonsensical words and enigmatic gestures were interpreted by his followers as predicting the future.

Inductive divination encompasses the use of various objects, such as books, icons, flour, mirrors, fire, dice, dishes, etc. Herakleios reportedly resorted to bibliomanteia (picking a passage of the Bible at random) to determine where his army should spend the winter (Theoph. 308.15–16). Particular importance was attached to names and letters. The emperor Maurice, for example, predicted that his successor’s name would begin with the letter phi (it happened to be Phokas).

The church condemned, in principle, all types of divination but had to comply with its christianized forms. Thus divination by icons is still attested by Blastares, and Anastasios of Sinai recommended the random opening of the Bible to predict the future.


DIVORCE (διαζύγιον) or dissolution of marriage (διαλύσις του γαμού) was a concept alien to classical Roman law, which acknowledged the right to end a marriage at any time by mutual agreement or by repudiation of the spouse. This principle was preserved in the law of papyri of the 4th to 7th C. (A. Merklein, Das Ehescheidungsrecht nach den Papyri der byzantinischen Zeit [Erlangen-Nuremberg 1967]). Roman divorce, though easy, might involve (if it was considered without grounds) moral condemnation, legal penalties, and material compensation. The Christian church rejected the concept of unrestricted divorce. Constantine I in 331 forbade spouses to send a notice of divorce (repudium) on arbitrary grounds; only if the husband was guilty of murder, sorcery, or grave-robbery was the wife permitted to repudiate him and recover her entire dowry; if she separated on other grounds, she lost everything “to her last hairpin” and was to be deported to an island (Cod. Theod. III 16.1).

Justinian I prohibited divorce by mutual consent, except in cases in which the couple took monastic vows, and established a restricted list of legal causes for separation: conspiracy against the emperor or the spouse; adultery or misbehavior on the part of the wife (dining and bathing with other men, living outside her house, attending circuses games and theaters, and the hunting of wild animals); the husband’s inducing his wife to fornicate with other men or a false accusation of adultery against the wife (nov. 117.8–9). Justin II, in 566, reinstated the Roman tradition (C. Castello in Mneme G.A. Petropoulou, vol. 1 [Athens 1984] 295–315), his rationale being that divorce was a lesser sin than irrational hatred that might lead to attempted murder or suicide.

The indissolubility of marriage was formulated and firmly established in the Ecologa 2:91–3, which listed very few legal grounds for the dissolution of marriage: the wife’s prostitution, impotence of the husband for a period of three years, and one spouse plotting against the other. Some supplementary reasons for divorce were introduced by later legislators, but the principle of the indissolubility of marriage (except for entrance into a monastery) dominated Byz. civil and canon law. One should probably distinguish between divorce proper and the annulment of marriage caused by its illegality (e.g., marriages prohibited by impediments, such as consanguinity) or by the social inequality of partners.

Cases of divorce were brought before law courts, civil and ecclesiastical alike, and their decisions show that in practice the principle of dispensation (oikonomia) was applied more frequently than civil and canon law suggest. Eustathios Rhomaios mentioned cases of divorce by consent (ek synaineoses—Peira 25.37, 25.62), although penalties were exacted; he also included contracts of divorce (Peira 7.8, 25.30) and devoted serious attention to the regulation of the property rights of the divorced couple. In the 13th C. Chomatenos and Apokaukos judged cases of divorce involving people from various walks of life; besides the traditional legal grounds (the husband’s impotence, the wife’s adultery) other reasons were taken into account: incompatibility of the couple, implacable hatred, sodomy, consanguinity; when a husband abandoned his wife and refused to return to her, she might be permitted to remarry.

DIYARBEKIR. See AMIDA.

DJEMILA (anc. Cirtul), site of a Roman colony in Numidia Cirtensis (mod. Algeria). The city was considerably transformed in the second half of the 4th C., when several basilicas, known from both texts and archaeology, were built. Construction dates for the so-called Christian quarter are less certain, although Djemila, like Theveste to the southeast, seems to have enjoyed a huge building campaign in the first quarter of the 5th C. At the heart of this campaign was the construction of two basilicas, each with extensive FLOOR MOSAICS and large crypts under their apses; the relative chronology of these churches is disputed (N. Duval, P.-A. Février, *8 IntCongChrArch* [1969] 241): the larger has a mosaic inscription naming as its founder a bishop Cresconius, whose identification is uncertain. To the west of these churches was built an exceptionally large baptistery in the form of a rotunda. Other buildings were given over to the administration and accommodation of an evidently large clergy. Numerous private residences, such as the “House of the Ass” and the “House of Europa,” had elaborate floor mosaics installed, which Dunbabin (*Mosaics* 256) dates to the end of the 4th C. or the beginning of the 5th; in other houses there was extensive restoration of older pavements. The date at which Djemila was abandoned is unknown.


DNIEPER (Δάναπης, also Βορυσθένης), river flowing south from the Valdai hills to the Black Sea west of the Crimea. Tributaries and portages link the upper Dnieper to the Volga for eastern traffic and to the Dvina and Lovat' for access to and from Novgorod and the Baltic. Byz. references to the Dnieper usually imply its lower section, which curves in an eastward loop through the steppes: Theophranes (Theoph. 357.28) describes the crossing of the Dnieper by the Bulgarians of ASPARUCH; Skylitzes (Skyl. 455.38) states that the Pechenegs are found from the Dnieper to the Danube. From the mid-11th C. the lower Dnieper was controlled by the Cumans, from the mid-13th C. by the Mongols, and in the late 14th and early 15th C. by Lithuania under Vitovt. The Dnieper was used by the Rus' as a route between the Black Sea and northern Europe from the late 9th C., and it became the main commercial artery connecting Kiev, Smolensk, and other towns. The lower part of this route “from the VARANGIANS to the Greeks” (*Povest' vremennych let* 1:11–12) is described in detail by Constantine VII (*De adm. imp.* 9), who pays special attention to its twin hazards: a series of rapids and attacks by the Pechenegs. The Russo-Byz. treaty of 944 guaranteed to Cherson the right to fish unmolested at the mouth of the Dnieper (*Povest' vremennych let* 1:37).


DOBROMIR CHRYSOS (Δοβρομίρος Χρυσός), founder of an ephemeral Bulgarian principality; died after 1201. The name Dobromir is applied to him only in a speech by Niketas CHONIATES (*Orations* 166.14). He probably joined ASEN in his revolt against Isaac II, then changed sides and was sent to defend Strumitsa where he proclaimed himself independent. V. Zlatarski (*Godišniki na Sofijskija Universitet, Ist.-fils. Fak.* 29 [1933] 1–20) hypothesized that he was identical with the "jupanus vel satrapa Bulgariae" mentioned by Ansburt, but P. Mutafčiev rejected the identification (BZ 34 [1934] 205). According to Zlatarski, Dobromir, who, like Ivanco, was hostile to Kalojan, tried in 1197 to make an alliance with Alexios III. Again Dobromir changed sides and established his "principalit" in PROSEK. In a treaty Alexios III acknowledged Dobromir's power over Prosek and Strumitsa and gave him as wife the daughter of the *protostrator* Manuel KAMYTZES. Dobromir ransomed Kamytzes from Bulgarian captivity and in 1201 started a war against Byz. The alliance with Kamytzes did not last long. Dobromir accepted Byz. sovereignty and married the emperor's granddaughter Theodora. Thereafter, he disappears from the sources.


- A.K., C.M.B.
DOBROTICA (Τομπροτίτσας, also called Dobrotić, mostly by Rumanian scholars), a local ruler in Dobrudja; died before 1387. He was the brother of prince Balik (BalicA), whose capital was in Karvuna. In 1346 Balik sent Dobrotica and another brother Theodore to Constantinople to support Anna of Savoy. Defeated by John VI Kanta- kouzenos in 1347, Dobrotica acknowledged Byz- suzerainty. By 1357 or 1366 Dobrotica received the title of despotes. He was Balik's successor, moved the capital to Kaliakra and then to Varna, and acted, in alliance with Byz., against Bulgaria. He expanded his territory from the Byz. frontier to the Lower Danube. Dobrotica gave his daugh- ter in marriage to Michael Palaiologos, the third son of John V, and in 1373 probably supported Michael's unsuccessful expedition against Trebi- zond (Kleistheniken 2:310f). He severed depend- ency from the patriarchate of Tūrnovo and ac- knowledged the jurisdiction of Constantinople.


DOBUDRAJA, a region between the Lower Dan- ube and the Black Sea. In the 4th–6th C. the province of Scythia Minor approximately en- compassed this territory. In the 7th C. the Avars and Slavs penetrated into Dobrudja; ca.680 As- paruch passed through the region and estab- lished his capital in Pliska. The political alle- giance of Dobrudja in the 8th–10th C. is under dispute: Bulgarian historians consider it a part of Bulgaria; Rumanian scholars assert that the Byz. retained control over the Lower Danube. In the 960s Svjatoslav of Kiev claimed the estuary of the Danube, but John I Tzimiskes defeated him and reconquered Dobrudja. The Byz. constructed fortresses on the Danube and encouraged de- velopment of coastal centers (e.g., Chilia), but Dob- rudja was subject to raids by the Pechenegs and other nomads. Under Byz. control the “Roman” ethnic element (Vlachs and future Rumanians) recovered and actively participated in the Bulgar- ian revolt that led to the organization of the Second Bulgarian Empire. Byz. tried to retain the ports of Dobrudja, but was slowly driven out by the Venetians and Genoese. In the 14th C. semi-independent archontes of Slavic and proto- Rumanian origin were active in Dobrudja—Balik, Dobrotica, and others—and Mircea the Elder temporarily annexed Dobrudja to Wallachia. After their defeat of the Crusaders at Varna in 1444, the Ottomans completely occupied the region.


DOCHEIARIOU MONASTERY, located on the southwest coast of the peninsula of Mt. Athos, northwest of the Xenophontos monastery. The origins of Docheiariou (Δοχειαριou) are obscure: it was apparently first established before 1013 by John Dochearios (probably the former cellarer of Xeropotamou) at the Athonite port of Daphne, with a church dedicated to St. Nicholas. Oikono- mides hypothesizes that the monastery was trans- ferred to a new location in the mountains between 1051 and 1056 and, finally, between 1083 and 1108 was moved to its present site near the sea. By the early 12th C. its dedication had changed to St. Michael. At this time the hagoumenos Neophytos, considered the second kitar of the mon- astery, built a larger church and a fortification wall with a tower. He also acquired important properties in Chalkidike and composed a testa- ment (sometime after 1118). From the 14th C. Docheiariou was an imperial monastery. It played no role in the hesychastic controversy; its monks were more involved with temporal concerns and engaged in mercantile shipping. Docheiariou was always a cenobitic monastery inhabited by Greeks. In the early 15th C. the Russian deacon Zosima recounted that Docheiariou was ninth in the Athonite hierarchy.

The archives contain 60 acts of the Byz. period (1037–1424). The will of hagoumenos Neophytos (Docheiara, no.6.29–31, 58–60) boasts of the pre- cious textiles (pepla) he had added to the monas- tery’s treasury and of the ecclesiastical silver, books, and icons he had amassed. At present the library contains approximately 100 MSS of Byz. date (Lampros, Athos 1:233–69), of which cod. 5, a 12th-C. menologion (Treasures 3, figs. 258–68), and four Gospel books are notable for their illustration. The monastery also possesses a relief of the Ascension of Alexander, who is raised to heaven.
by griffins. Docheiariou's present buildings are almost all post-Byz.


-AM.T., A.C.

DOCTRINA JACobi NUPER BAPTIZATI (the Indoctrination [διδασκαλία] of Jacob Recently Converted), a treatise dated in 634 (Bonwetsch, infra, p.xvi) or 640 (Nau, infra, p.715). It takes the form of a pseudo-dialogue (one party only asks questions without entering the discussion) between a certain Jacob and a group of Jews. In its prologue a man called Joseph claims to have been present during the conversation of Jacob with the Jews and to have written it down. In addition to Emp. Herakleios, the title names George, the eparch of Carthage, and it is plausible to suppose that the treatise was produced in Africa.

The main theme of the treatise is the limited character of the message of the Old Testament; only the "new law" brought forth by Christ assures the salvation of mankind. An important theme of the Doctrina is the moral perversion of Jews, which Jacob illustrates by his own activities before conversion. This topic allows the author to describe (in a very vague way) some contemporary events, such as the conflict between the Blue and the Green factions, the "tyranny" of Emp. Phokas, and the Arab expansion under Muhammad. The treatise has survived both in the original Greek (without the prologue) and in Ethiopic and Slavic translations (W. Lüdtke, Archiv für slavische Philologie 33 [1912] 317).


-AM.K.

DOCTRINE OF ADDAI, 5th- or 6th-C. Syriac account of the origins of Christianity in Edessa and environs, which relies on earlier materials. The anonymous work is basically a collection of documents preserved in the archives of Edessa under the names of Hanan, the archivist of Abgar V (4 B.C.–A.D. 59), and Labūmnā bar Sānaq, the king's scribe. The documents consist of a letter of King Abgar to Jesus inviting him to Edessa, which Hanan reportedly delivered personally, bringing back an oral reply, and accounts of the sermons and miracles worked in Edessa by Addai, an apostle sent to the city by Judas Thomas after the ascension of Jesus. The same story appears in digest form, but including a letter from Jesus to Abgar, in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebios of Caesarea (Eusebios HE 1.13). In the Doctrine of Addai the author reports that Hanan painted a portrait of Jesus, which Abgar installed in one of his palaces. Important themes in the Doctrine are apostolic succession in Edessa, the imperium Romanum as the appropriate civil milieu for Christianity, antipagan and anti-Jewish polemics, the canon of the scriptures, and divine protection guaranteed for Edessa, "the Blessed City."


-S.H.G.

DODECASYLLABLE, a Byz. development of the ancient iambic trimeter, the meter of most dialogue in classical tragedy. Early in the Byz. period, accurate trimeters were written by the long and short syllable patterns of ancient prosody. However, by the 9th C., since Greek had lost the distinction between long and short syllables, a new meter developed around two aspects of the iambic trimeter that could still be appreciated: a basic line length of 12 syllables; and a division after either five or seven syllables by the two caesura patterns of the ancient meter. To this outline was added a set of stress accent preferences that varied according to fashion and personal taste, but observed as an absolute rule a stress accent on the eleventh syllable. A learned writer like John Tzetzes, while conforming to the stress patterns, also judged dodecasyllables for their accuracy as quantitative trimeters, condemning false quantities in his own early work. Most Byz. dodecasylables, however, at least from the 12th C. onward, pay little regard to quantity, esp. the vowels $a$, $i$, and $u$ (the diphthongs $au$, $iu$, and $ui$), whose length is not immediately apparent.

Dodecasyllables were used for works of epic tone after the decline of the hexameter (e.g., by George of Pisidia) and were very frequent in
epigrams and ceremonial poetry. A small proportion of popular poetry also appears in dodecasyllable form, leaving open the suspicion that the verse may have developed at an oral level before being adopted by the written word.


DODEKAOFTON. See Great Feasts.

DOGMA (δόγμα), a term encountered in the New Testament in connection with the edict of the so-called Apostolic Council of Jerusalem (Acts 16:4) where it signifies "what seems right, or good, or reasonable." In Byz. theology, it generally retains an ambiguity, referring variously to opinions or teachings of the church, of pagans, of philosophers, or of heretics. Thus, for example, in the so-called Definitiones Patmenses (OrChrP 46 [1980] 335–37), the word dogma is understood more broadly than in modern usage that has established it as a theological term since the 17th C. In effect, what we now call dogmas, Byz. theology finds in the Creed of Nicæa and Constantinople as well as in the definitions of Anathemas of the subsequent ecumenical councils, and concretely in the Synodikon of Orthodoxy. Thus, dogma means orthodox teaching as "true concept concerning all matters" (Anastasios of Sinai, ed. Uthemann, Viae Dux, 2:6, pp. 10–12).


DOGS (sing. κύων). Used for guarding and rounding up flocks of sheep, but also for hunting or simply as a companion or pet, the dog was particularly indispensable in agricultural communities. It is the inveterate companion of David in Psalter illustration and other works depicting the young shepherd. The Farmer's Law (pars. 25 and 75–77) heavily penalized anyone who killed, poisoned, or injured a sheep dog. The guilty faced corporal punishment and had to pay double for the animal's price. The training of hunting dogs was entrusted to skylagogoi, who took charge of the hounds during the hunting expeditions of the nobility. Hunting dogs were highly prized and might be sent as gifts. The dog’s usefulness is reflected in the Kynosopion of Demetrios Pepa-
gomenos, which describes the breeding and training of dogs and the treatment of their diseases; rabies is mentioned along with observations on its symptoms (R. Hercher, Claudii Aeliani Varia Historia, Epistolae, Fragmenta [Leipzig 1866] 587–99).

The Byz. praised the dog for being man’s most faithful companion. A common and familiar theme is the dog’s revelation of the murderer of its slain master (Tzetzes, Hist. 4:131, 152). We also hear of trained dogs entertaining the public by performing various acts (Malal. 453,15–454,4). Following classical models, Nikephoros Basilakes composed an enkomion for dogs that mentions the use of guide dogs by blind beggars (Porgimnasmi e monodie, ed. A. Pignani [Naples 1983] 136,95–97). Three centuries later Theodore Gazes composed a similar enkomion dedicated to Mehemd II (PG 161:985–97). In hagiography, however, the dog is often depicted as a symbol of evil or even as the embodiment of the Devil (e.g., AASS Nov. 3:517f). Similarly, superstitious beliefs held that a dog seen early in the morning brings bad luck.


DOKEIANOS (Δοκειανός, fem. Δοκειανή), a family name probably derived from the toponym of Dók(e)ia, said to be in the Armeniakon theme or in Paphlagonia. The Dokeianoi were known in the 11th C. predominantly as military commanders; the first, Nikephoros, was katepano of Italy before 1040; in 1040/1 the post was occupied by Michael Dokeianos, who was killed during an unsuccessful expedition against the Pechenegs in 1050; Theodore, magistros and megas doux, was one of the closest supporters of Isaac I, his uncle. Another Dokeianos married Alexios I’s niece Sophia (L. Stiernon, REB 23 [1965] 228) and was granted the high title of sebastos. Anonymous epigrams (Lampros, "Mark. kod." 147f, 161f) mention their son, who died prematurely, and their daughter Irene Kornene, wife of Isaac Vatatzes. The Dokeianoi were rich: Michael possessed a mansion in Paphlagonia (Bryen. 194f), and a charter of 1110 (Lavra 1, no.59,34) mentions "a moat of the Dokeianoi" near Thessalonike; Irene Kornene, according to the epigrams, was raised in luxury, with servants and golden vessels. Despite their relationship with the Kornenoi, the Dokeianoi lost their prominence after Alexios I’s
reign; we know only that a certain Dokeianos was appointed bishop of Dyrachion in 1212. The name appears in later sources, but the late Dokeiani are mostly peasants, clerics, or scribes (PLP, nos. 5560–78). John Dokeianos was a writer in the mid-15th C. (see DOKEIANOS, JOHN).

Lit. Falkenhausen, Dominazione 93. – A.K.

DOKEIANOS, JOHN, rhetorician, copyist, and bibliophile; fl. mid-15th C. Our knowledge of Dokeianos (Δοκειανός) is based almost exclusively on the evidence of his own writings. His earliest work that can be dated with any certainty, an address to the despotes Theodore II Palaiologos, was apparently composed ca. 1436 (Topping, infra 6); he evidently lived into the 1470s, when he wrote an epigram on the deceased patriarch Gennadios II Scholarios. Dokeianos is perhaps to be identified with the John Dokeianos who was teaching at the patriarchal school in Constantinople in 1474. Dokeianos was closely associated with the Palaiologan family, both in Mistra and in Constantinople, and served as tutor to the princess Helena Palaiologina, daughter of the despotes Demetrios Palaiologos.

Dokeianos’s preserved works are primarily rhetorical, such as enkomia and addresses to Constantine XI. A monody on Catherine, Constantine’s second wife, has been attributed to Dokeianos by P. Sotiropoulos (JÖB 35 [1985] 223–29). His love of classical literature is revealed by his frequent citations of ancient authors and allusions to antiquity, and by the catalogue of his personal library, which included volumes of Homer, Hesiod, Aeschines, Xenophon, Aristotle, and Hermogenes. He was also a copyist of MSS, notably Venice, Marc. gr. 520, which includes works of Theognis and Plutarch.


DOLICHE. See Telouch.

DOME (ἡμισφαίριον), a hemispherical vault, distinguished by its pure geometry and by its centralizing role in the planning of buildings. The dome is perhaps the most characteristic feature of Byz. church architecture, lending both internal and external coherence. Domes could be built of stone (e.g., audience hall of al-Mundhir at Sergiopolis, 6th C.), tubular ceramic elements (e.g., San
DOMESTIKOS (δομεστικος), a term designating a broad range of officials, ecclesiastical, civil, and military. Prokopios (Wars 3.4.7) explains the term as the Latin form of the Greek koiminos, "companion." In the church hierarchy they were the heads of specific groups connected with order and ritual (anagnostai, subdeacons, etc.), esp. as conductors of the choirs of singers (Darrouzès, Offikia 596). In the civil service the term is known from 355 for the chief of a bureau, identical to privieros; domestiki of the sekraton or of the epiphories are mentioned on later seals. Domestikoi were influential, some of them close to the emperor, some confidants of important functionaries (O. Seeck, RE 5 [1905] 1296f). By the late 9th C. when Philotheos compiled the Kletorologion, there were two kinds of military domestikoi: the commanders of tagmata, esp. the domestikoi ton scholon, and their subaltern officers who, according to the anonymous book on tactics (ed. Dennis, Military Treatises 252.139–49), stood under the command of the comes. From the end of the 11th C., domestikoi of the themes are also known (Guillon, Institutions 1:588–93), relatively low officials who dealt primarily with theme finances. (See also Megas Domestikos.)


DOMESTIKOS TON EXKOBITON (δομεστικος των Ἐξοκοβιτων), commander of the tagma of the Exkoubitoi. The small corps of excubitores was created by Leo I as a select imperial guard and put under the command of a comes excubitorum (Jones, LRE 1:658), a post that had considerable importance in the 6th and 7th C. The first known domestikos ton Exkoubiton was Strategios, who held the title of statharios, in 765 (Theoph. 438.10–11). Bury (Adm. System 57) suggests that this change in title from comes to domestikos meant degradation of the rank, but the real significance of the shift escapes us because of the paucity of sources. In the mid-9th-C. taktikon of Uspenskij the domestikos ton Exkoubiton occupies a place inferior to all strategoi; in later taktika he was ranked ahead of Western strategoi. In the 10th-C. taktikon of Escorial we find two domestikoi—one for the East and another for the West; Oikonomides (Listes 330) hypothesizes that besides these two there was a special domestikos for Constantinople. In the 11th C. the title of the commander of Exkoubitoi became archon (Skyl. 380.92–93), and a 12th-C. his-

VITALE, Ravenna), or of brick (e.g., Hagia Sophia, Constantinople). The interior of the dome could be either a smooth hemisphere (e.g., St. Irene, Constantinople), scalloped (also known as a "pumpkin dome," e.g., Myrelaion Church, Constantinople), or ribbed (e.g., Hagia Sophia). All these methods of construction and interior articulation appear as early as the 5th–6th C. and persist to the very end of Byzantine architecture. Structurally and iconographically, the Byz. dome descended from Roman antecedents. Yet, unlike Roman examples, Byz. domes were related to basically longitudinal rather than fully centralized buildings. An ingenious system of structural supports, involving either pendentives or squinches, was developed to permit the setting of the dome over the rectilinear space of the naos. In addition to being the crowning architectural element, the dome was also the focus of church programs of decoration.


DOMENTIJAN, Serbian scholar and writer; born ca. 1210, died after 1264. For most of his life Domentijan was a monk in Hilandar on Athos, where he wrote a (very long) Life of St. Sava ca. 1250 at the request of King Stefan Uros I and in 1269/4 a Life of St. Simeon (the former king Stefan Nemanja). Both texts make an impressive display of scriptural and theological learning. They are valuable sources for the historian, but must be used with caution because they are partially derivative. Both draw on the Life of Nemanja by his son Stefan the First-Crowned; in the Life of Simeon, Domentijan copies long passages verbatim. Another unacknowledged source of motifs is the panegyric on Vladimir I by Metr. Iliarion of Kiev. The Life of St. Sava was revised by the monk Teodosije in 1290–92.


R.B.
tiorian (An.Komm. 1:151.19) uses the verb *exarcho* to describe the function of the *domestikos*. It is not known, however, whether this change was official or only due to literary taste, and whether this *tagma* was a united body of *Exkoubitori* or one of the two (or three) divisions (East, West, and Constantinople).

Some seals of the 7th C. bear the name *exkoubitori*, while *domestikos* of the Exkoubiton or the Exkoubitori appears in those of the 8th–9th C.; their titles are *spatharioi* (in the 8th C.), *protopatharioi*, and even *patrikios* (Zacos, Seals 1, no.2403) in the 9th C. Their staff included a *topoteretes*; a *protomandator*, with his *mandatores*; the bearers of ensigns; and *skribones*. This last term, which in the 7th C. probably was a dignity (see Zacos, Seals 1:3;1649) and was combined sometimes with the civil functions of *dioiketes*, *zygostates*, etc., designates in the Taktika of Leo VI (4.6) officers assigned for occasional services.


DOMESTIKOS TON HIKANATON (*domestikos* τῶν Ἰκανατῶν), commander of the *tagma* of Hikanatoi. The origin of the Hikanatoi is obscure; Bury rejects the possibility of their identification with *foederati*, stressing that there is no evidence whatever that Hikanatoi were foreigners. Haldon suggests that the regiment of Hikanatoi was modeled on the *viglia*. According to the vita of Patr. Ignatios, the office was created in 809, and Niketas (the future Ignatios) was the first appointee. Without rejecting this testimony, Bury expresses doubts, but G. Ostrogorsky and E. Stein (Byzantion 7 [1932] 193f, n.2) accept the evidence as valid. The *domestikos* ton Hikanaton is mentioned in all the Taktika of the 9th–10th C., but the evidence from the 11th C. is already questionable since the sources may use Hikanatoi as a family name. Among his subordinates were the *topoteretes*, *chartoularios*, *komites* (see *comes*), and so on. The seals of several *domestikoi* ton Hikanaton of the 9th C. are preserved.


DOMESTIKOS TON NOUMERON (*domestikos* τῶν Νουμέρων), commander of the *tagma* of the Noumera. This *domestikos* is listed in all the Taktika. The first known *domestikos* ton Nourmeron is Leo Lalakon who was active during the reign of Michael III (PG 1055:513B); one of his contemporaries, Theophilitzes, is said to have held the office of the *komes* ton teichon and that of the Noumera (*TheophCont* 655.10–11), which may mean that the two offices were not yet separate. Bury assumes that the *droungarios* of the Noumera mentioned on a 7th- or 8th-C. seal was a predecessor of the *domestikos*. J. Haldon (*Praetorians* 256–75) hypothesizes that the regiment of the Noumera was established in the late 7th C. and had close contacts with the factions. On seals of the 9th C., *domestikoi* ton Noumeron have titles of *spatharioi* and *protopatharioi* (Zacos, Seals 1:1881). The functions of this *domestikos* included protection of the palace and supervision of the city prison of the Noumera. On his staff were the *topoteretes* and *chartoularios*, as well as *tribuni*, *vicarii*, and others. The office does not seem to have survived the 11th C.


DOMESTIKOS TON OPTIMATON, governor of the theme of *Optimatoi* or commander of the *tagma* deployed there. The Taktika do not mention a *strategos* of the Optimatoi. This *domestikos* occupies in the hierarchical lists a position much lower than all the Eastern *strategoi*. Oikonomides (*Liste* 939) emphasizes his function as provider of mules for the army. Nothing is known about his role on the battlefield. The staff of the *domestikos* ton Optimaton was structured like that of other *tagmata*, including a *topoteretes*, *chartoularios*, *komites* (see *comes*), and so on.


DOMESTIKOS TON SCHOLON (*domestikos* τῶν σχολῶν), commander of the *tagma* of the *scholae*. It is plausible that this office originated from that of the *domestikos* on the staff of the *magister officiorum*, who became independent as the *magister* was assigned other duties. The first known *domestikos* ton scholon is the *patrikios* Antony in 767 (Theoph. 442.25–26). In the Taktika the *domestikos* ton scholon occupies the place below the *strategos* of Anatolikon but before the other *strategoi*. The term is rarely used in military books of the 10th C. (e.g., Dennis, *Military Treatises* 292.25).
During the reign of Romanos II the office was divided in two, *domestikoi* of the East and of the West; they are listed in the *taktikon* of Escurial (Oikonomides, *Listes* 263.23–24) but even at that time below the *strategos* of Anatolikon. In reality the *domestikoi ton scholon* was commander in chief of the army (or one of its two sections); from the end of the 9th C. the Phokas family attempted to monopolize the office. Constantine VIII and some of his successors, desiring to restrict the independence of noble families, often granted the office to eunuchs, but from the mid-11th C. the post was returned to the military aristocracy. The *me-gas domestikos* as commander in chief functioned until the fall of the empire, whereas the simple *domestikos* (known at least through 1320) became an honorary title conferred on governors and the like. The staff of the *domestikos ton scholon* included *topoteretai*, *komites* (see *comes*), *chartouariai*, subaltern *domestikoi*, and others.


DOMINICANS. The religious order founded by St. Dominic in 1215 soon became active in missionary work in the East. By 1228 it was firmly installed in the Latin Empire of Constantinople and in the Holy Land. A regional grouping within the order, the Societas Fratrum Peregrinantium, began ca. 1300, was suppressed from 1363 to 1375, then revived. It operated in the Genoese colonies in the Crimea, then in Armenia, Persia, and Georgia.

Members of the order residing in the East, esp. in the Dominican convent in *Pera*, were active as papal legates, imperial ambassadors to the papacy, proselytizers, and polemists. Many became fluent in Greek and wrote theological treatises in that language addressed to prominent Byz., including Andronikos II, hoping to persuade them to accept the Latin teachings on the process of the Holy Spirit and on papal primacy.

In 1309 the Dominican order chose Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas as official teachers of theology. The writings and translations of Demetrios Kydones enhanced the influence of Thomism in Constantinople. In the late 14th and early 15th C. a number of Byz. in Kydones’ circle converted to Roman Catholicism and joined the order, including the brothers Andrew, Theodore, and Maximos Chrysoberges and Manuel Kalekas.


DOMITIANOS (*Δοµιτιανός*), diplomat, bishop of Melitene from 580, and saint; born ca. 550, died Constantinople 10 or 12 Jan. 602; feastday 10 Jan. Domitianos was a cousin of Maurice—Paret rejects Honigmann’s assumption that Domitianos was the son of Peter, Maurice’s maternal uncle. Domitianos spent 582–85 and 591–98 primarily in Constantinople as Maurice’s adviser; Pope Gregory I addressed several epistles to him. He played the key role in the empire’s Persian policy: after Chosroes II fled to Byz. territory in 591, Domitianos became his confidant, accompanied the king on his expedition to Iran, and negotiated the treaty with him. Domitianos directed Maurice’s religious policy in the eastern regions; this policy was—contra H. Grégoire (*Byzantion* 13 [1938] 395f)—intolerant toward the Monophysites. The later Monophysite tradition (e.g., GREGORY ABUC’L-FARAJ) is hostile to Domitianos, accusing him of seizing all Monophysite churches in Mesopotamia and northern Syria and of persecuting the “faithful.” He was guardian of Maurice’s children.


DOMITIUS ALEXANDER, usurper (308–09). He was *vicarius Africæ* and briefly controlled Tripolitania, Numidia, and Sardinia, as well as Africa proper. He was condemned at the Conference of Carnuntum in 308 and defeated by Maxentius, whose rule over Italy was threatened by Domitianus’s control of African grain and recognition of Constantine I. There is disagreement about the date when the revolt was suppressed (Barnes gives 309, Stein 311).


DONATION (δωρέα). Byz. law fluctuated between accepting an oral agreement as a sufficient form of the donation contract and requiring a
written contract or a certain number of witnesses (3–7). Leo VI in novel 50 established the rule that a donation whose value surpassed 500 nomismata was void without a written contract, whereas a lesser donation was valid if confirmed by three witnesses. Byz. law categorized a donation as a specific form of alienation that was usually contrasted with sale (e.g., Docheiari., no. 154). More explicit is a sigillum of Michael VIII of 1267 or 1282 (Docheiari., no. 8.14–16) that cites alternative methods of acquisition: through a kletor’s charter, through an imperial prostagma or other imperial dorea, through purchase, exchange, donation (proskenesis), or improvement of the property.

Even though the mixed form negotium cum donatione was known to Roman law, in Byz. the distinction between sale and donation became obscured, partially due to the concept of the spiritual (psychike) donation, that is, made for the salvation of the soul. Thus, in some charters (e.g., MM 4:408.33) there are clauses stating that the seller of property to a monastery did not accept the full price but granted part of the payment to the monastery as a donation. On the other hand, a transaction could be called dorea even when it was actually a sale (e.g., Kastam., no. 1 [a.1047]). The term “donation” could also cover the medieval precarium remuneratorium: thus, in 1232 Alexios Tesaiotes donated his possessions to the monastery of Lembiotissa, but the family remained on their holding, probably as monastic proskathemenoi (Kazhdan, Agrarmye otnosheniya 160f).

LIT. Zachariä, Geschichte 302–05. —A.K.

DONATION OF CONSTANTINE (Constitutum Constantini), an 8th-C. Latin document, purporting to be an act of Constantine I. Perhaps originating in the chancery of Pope Stephen II (752–57) or Paul I (757–67), it is based heavily on the 5th-C. Legenda S. Silvestri. In the document Constantine I professes his faith (confessio) and grants to Pope Silvester I several imperial insignia and privileges (donatio), the Lateran Palace, as well as Rome, Italy, and the western regions. Some scholars speculate that the Donation was fashioned to bolster Pope Stephen’s negotiating position with the Frankish ruler Pepin (741–68) against the Lombards in 754. More regard it as a papal attempt to diminish Constantinople’s authority by demonstrating that, since Constantine had offered imperial rank to Pope Silvester and since the pope had acquiesced in Constantine’s move from Rome to Constantinople (the new urbs regia), the papacy took precedence over the patriarchate of Constantinople and the pope could transfer the empire’s center from Constantinople back to Rome. Now, however, specialists minimize the document’s political aspect and assert that it was not an official, anti-Byzantine act, but rather part of the rivalry between the Lateran Palace and the increasingly prestigious Vatican Church of St. Peter (R.-J. Loenertz, Aevum 48 [1974] 245, and de Leo, infra 118f, suggest that a Greek monk wrote it in Rome’s Monastery of St. Silvester).

Nevertheless, since the Donation of Constantine contradicted the Byz. claim that Constantine’s translatio imperii had made Constantinople the New Rome, it figured prominently in numerous Latin-Greek polemical exchanges over political and ecclesiastical primacy. The chancery of Otto III declared the document fraudulent, but Pope Leo IX sent a copy to Patr. MICHAEL I KEROUARIOS in 1054, and Cardinal HUMBERT later issued a revised version to support the pope’s dispute with the Byz. emperor and the Eastern patriarchs. Yet in the 12th C. Byz. writers likewise began to appeal to the Donation. Under Manuel I Komnenos, JOHN KINNAMOS effectively used it to attack Western rulers who usurped the imperial title and to deny that popes had the right to confer it, while Theodore BALSAMON used the document to justify Kerouarios’s reaction in 1054 against the papal legates (G. Ostrogorsky, SemKond 7 [1935] 187–204). A Greek translation of the Donation, extant in MSS of the 14th C. (ed. W. Ohnsorge, Konstantinopel und der Oktzident [Darmstadt 1966] 108–23), was likely done as early as the 12th C.


DONATIO PROPTER NUPTIAS (προγαμμαία, πρὸ γάμου δωρεά). From the 4th C. onward, the
wedding gift of a man to his wife—as opposed to the “engagement gift” (ARRHA SPONSALICIA) common in earlier times—became an institution subject to special rules. According to the laws of Justinian I, the husband was obliged to provide a donatio for the benefit of his wife that was equal to her promised dowry (Nov. Just. 97 pr., 1–2). These two assets constituted the marriage property, administered by the husband with limited power of disposal. The question as to who received the donatio after the death of the husband depended on the marriage contract, which, in addition to the legal reversion of the property brought into the marriage, should provide for an equally large profit (kerdos) for either marriage partner from the fortune of the one who died first. If there were children, the widow was due the usufruct from the donatio and a portion of the property equal in size to the inheritance of a child (ibid. 127,3). If the woman married a second time, she lost her portion from the donatio (ibid. 2,1, 22,23). The Ecloga (2,3) explicitly denied the husband’s obligation to provide a donatio of equal value to the dowry and considered it sufficient that the man, “as is common,” increase the worth of the dowry through a gift. Both the Procheiron (tit.6; 9,12,13), and the Basilika (29,1,2) reproduce Justinianic law but without the prologue and the first chapter of novel 97 concerning the equivalence of the donatio and the dowry. In the Epaphroge (tit.19), the donatio appears in a form that has not yet been studied in detail but appears to partly recast that in the Ecloga; it occasioned a detailed contemporary commentary. From the time of the novels of Leo VI, the term dorea is often replaced by hypobolon.


DONATISM, named after its primary teacher Donatus, a rigorist sect that developed within the African church in the early 4th C. in the aftermath of the Great Persecution. The Donatists refused to accept Caecilian as bishop of Carthage because he had been consecrated by Felix of Abthungi, who was accused of betraying the faith under the threat of persecution. A synod of 70 rigorist bishops declared Caecilian’s elevation invalid and consecrated Majorianus in his stead. Majorianus died soon afterward and Donatus became bishop.

Shortly after the battle of the Milvian Bridge in 312 Constantine I offered financial support to the African church in the person of Caecilian. The Donatists appealed to Constantine and a commission was established in 313 under the presidency of Pope Miltiades (311–314) to hear the conflicting claims. This body condemned the Donatists, who appealed to the Council of Arles (314), with the same result. Constantine hesitated to persecute the Donatists openly, but by 316 he had personally condemned them and there was some persecution; in 321, however, Constantine ordered effective toleration. Constans I resumed persecution in 347, but the Donatists resisted, celebrated their rites in secret, and began to turn to violent reaction against government officials and the Catholic party. In 362 Julian ordered an end to persecution, but after his death Donatism was again outlawed. Attacked by Optatus, bishop of Milevis, and esp. by Augustine, Donatism nevertheless remained a vital force until the end of Christianity in North Africa.

The Donatists, who claimed that they were following the teachings of St. Cyprian, appealed to local African and rigorist sentiment. Donatism resembled Novatianism in its rigorism and ecclesiology, but its adherents went beyond most similar groups in their view of the sacramental system: they held that the validity of the sacrament depended upon the rectitude of the celebrant. By the mid-4th C. some Donatists were associated with the circumcelliones, banditlike gangs who terrorized the cities and villas of Africa. The sect was centered in the villages and countryside of Numidia; some scholars have seen the movement as a reflection of “nationalist” or social sentiment.


DONKEYS. See Beasts of Burden.

DOORS were made of a variety of materials, usually wood but also bronze; occasionally they might be inlaid with ivory (bone?) or silver.
Wooden Doors. Wood was the material most commonly used for doors. Some 20 examples survive, generally dated 12th–15th C., normally the main door of a church or of its templon. An unusual concentration is found in Cyprus (Soteriou, Mnemeia tes Kyprou, pls. 142–44). There and elsewhere, Byz. specimens are less elaborate than the 5th-C. doors of Rome and Milan. Structurally, wooden doors consist of either stiles and rails enclosing panels or vertical planks nailed to horizontals. Some small bema doors are made of a single piece of lumber; most are decorated with the Annunciation. A door at the monastery of St. Catherine on Sinai has reliefs of animals, birds, and plants. Openwork leaves survive at Ioannina (A. Zachos, Epychron 3 [1928] 220–22) and doors decorated with a geometric framework at Boulgareli (A. Orlandos, DChAE 2, fasc. 3–4 [1924] 69–73).

Bronze Doors. Byz. manufacture of bronze doors occurred in two periods—a 4th- to 7th-C. continuation of Roman traditions and a medieval revival. Although Constantine I removed from the Artemision at Ephesus the pair of doors decorated with a gigantomachy and erected them at the Senate House in Constantinople (Constantine of Rhodes, vv. 125–52), he apparently also made new bronze doors for his Forum (Preger, Scriptores 2:279f), and Constantius II did likewise (360?) for Hagia Sophia. Doors of the cathedrals of Tyre (314–17, with relief plaques—Eusebios, HE 10.4.42), and Edessa (504/5—JoshStyl, ch.89) were covered in metal revetment. Surviving from the 4th to 7th C. are both cast bronze doors—with silver inlay) in the Lateran Baptistry, Rome (461–68)—and revetted doors—at Hagia Sophia, Constantinople (with copper and silver inlay and appliqué decoration), and at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai (550–65). By the 9th C. techniques of manufacture of bronze doors may have been forgotten, judging by the patchwork example in the southwest vestibule of Hagia Sophia (838–40) and by cases of reuse in Constantinople in the NEA EKKELESIA (880), on the acropolis, and at the GOLDEN GATE (963). The craft was revived, however, by the 11th C. when bronze doors, often decorated with figures and inlaid with silver, were made in Constantinople for export to a series of churches in Italy: at Amalfi (ca.1060), MONTECASSINO (1066), S. Paolo, Rome (1070), Monte Sant' Angelo (1076), Atrani (1087), S. Marco, Venice (1080, 1112), and Salerno (1100), the first five having been ordered by members of an Amalfitan family that had commercial interests in Constantinople as well as Syria/Palestine. The origin of the so-called “Korsun doors” in Novgorod (Byz. or Russian?) is under discussion.

Ivory and Silver Doors, criticized by St. Jerome, are mentioned more rarely in Byz. than in Latin literature and occurred only in lavish contexts. Six (?) of the nine doors leading from the narthex to the nave of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, were reputed to be of ivory (Preger, Scriptores 1:96.11–12, note). The elefantine pyle of the Daphne in the Great Palace, first mentioned in 802, was used by the emperor on his way to the Covered Hippodrome (De cer. 518.8). Most doors described as ivory were probably wood inlaid with bone, like the examples preserved at the Proto ton on Mt. Athos and at Elsson, restored in 1296 (G. Soteriou, EEBS 4 [1927] 327–31). Alexios I Komnenos ordered the removal and recasting of the silver decorations on the doors of the Chalkoprateia Church in Constantinople, which depicted 12 dominical feasts (E. Miller, RN 11 [1866] 362.20–23; I. Sakkelion, BCH 2 [1878] 118.10–14).


—Ch.Th.B., M.M.M., A.C.

DORMITION (κοιμησις), feast of the “falling asleep,” that is, death, of the Virgin Mary, celebrated 15 Aug. One of the 12 Byz. Great Feasts, the Dormition is preceded by a two-week lent and has an afterfeast of nine days. It has been celebrated on 15 Aug. since the 6th C., replacing an earlier feast of the maternity of Mary found on that date in the earliest Jerusalem sources (A. Renoux, PO 36.2:189–91, 354–57; M. Aubineau, Les Homélies festivals d’Hesychius de Jérusalem, vol. 1 [Brussels 1978] 145–69).

Originally a mobile celebration in Constantinople (M. van Esbroeck, Maxime le Confesseur, Vie de la Vierge [Louvain 1986] xxx), the Dormition had become a fixed feast by the time of Emp.
Maurice; it was celebrated at Blachernai (Theoph. 265f; Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, PG 147:292AB). In the Typikon of the Great Church (Mateos, Typikon 1:368–73), the festivities began at dawn with a procession from St. Euphemia to Blachernai for the synaxis. After the liturgy, the emperor offered a banquet for the patriarch and other dignitaries (Philotheos, Kletor. 219.24–221.4). But in the 14th C., the emperor attended both vespers and the subsequent Eucharist at Hagia Sophia instead, resting in the patriarchal chambers in between the services without returning to the palace (pseudo-Kod. 245.11–15).

The variety of Byz. names for the feast, signifying either Dormition or Assumption (analepsis) (M. Jugie, La mort et l’assomption de la Sainte Vierge (Vatican 1944) 185–95; Wenger, infra 422f), reflects differing theological opinion as to whether Mary really died, as was generally believed in Byz., or had been simply assumed into heaven. Both Theodore of Stoudios (PG 99:1696C) and the Typikon of the Great Church call the feast the metastasis.

**Representation in Art.** The most important texts for the iconography are the second homily of John of Damascus on the Koimesis (ed. Kotter, Schriften 5:516–40) and the “Pastoral Letter” of John I of Thessalonike, read during orthros of 15 Aug. (M. Jugie in PO 19:344–438). Both draw on the legend, Transitus Mariae, associated with James (the Lord’s brother), which includes the Dormition in a narrative running from the Annunciation of the Virgin’s imminent death (see Gabriel) through the disappearance of her body (M. van Esbroeck in F. Bovon et al., Les Actes apoecyphes des apôtres [Geneva 1981] 265–85). The earliest preserved representations of the Virgin’s death are 10th-C. Constantinopolitan ivories, isolated litur-
DOROTHEOS, VISION OF, Greek hexameter poem preserved in a unique papyrus codex of the 5th C. (P. Bodmer 29). The poem, in 343 lines, describes the narrator’s journey to the court of heaven where he saw God, Christ, and the “swift angel” Gabriel. Christ was enthroned like a Roman emperor and surrounded by angels uniformed like Roman soldiers and court officials, and bearing such titles as domestikos, praipitositos, primikerios, ostiarios, etc. The man was severely punished for disobedience and vanity, baptized, and indoctrinated by Christ who admonished him to be modest. Probably written by an Egyptian poet, the work marks an important stage in the development of Christian epic.

DOROTHEOS OF GAZA, monk and ascetic writer; born Antioch ca. 500, died between 560 and 580. Born to a wealthy family, Dorotheos received a classical education and became an ardent book collector. He then entered a monastery near Gaza where he came under the influence of the recluse BARSANOUPHIOS, author of a polemic against ORIGEN, and his friend John the Prophet. P. Canivet has suggested that Dorotheos was forced to leave this monastery because of his sympathy with the Origenist doctrines of EVAGRIOS PONTIKOS (REG 78 [1965] 336–46). Dorotheos subsequently (ca. 540) founded and headed his own cenobitic monastery, also near Gaza. He compiled for the monks’ use a set of spiritual instructions (Didaskalai) inculcating the ascetic life. His work was frequently cited by THEODORE OF STOUTOS. The Didaskalai survive in a 9th-C. abridged revision probably made by one of Theodore’s followers; some of its 24 sections may not be authentic. The Didaskalai were translated into Syriac, Arabic, Georgian, and Church Slavonic. Eight of his letters and a small collection of maxims also survive.


DOROTHEOS OF MONEMVASIA, a name (perhaps fictitious) under which was printed a world chronicle that has survived in many MSS whose interconnections are not yet fully worked out. The first redaction ended at 1570. The chronicle consisted of several disconnected sections: biblical and ancient history; lists of Roman and Christian emperors, of Turkish sultans, and of patriarchs of Constantinople; the history of Rome from Aeneas to Emp. John VIII Palaiologos; the history of sultans to Selim II; and the history of the Greek church. The last section contains a prose version of the Chronicle of Morea, the story of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, a chapter on Venice, etc. The original compilation seems to have been based on a “popular” paraphrase of Theophanes the Confessor, Theophanes Continuatus, and the Ekthesis Chronike (which covers the period from 1391 to 1515), as well as several now unidentifiable sources (e.g., for the Komnenian period).

The identity of the author of the original is under discussion: Moravcsik (infra) was inclined to accept the authorship of Manuel Malaxos from Nauplion, K. Sathas (Sathas, MB 3, p. 67') suggested Hierotheos of Monemvasia, T. Preger (BZ 11 [1902] 4–15) hypothesized that the author was an unknown Venetian. Russo and Lebedeva (infra), on the other hand, assume that Dorotheos could be a real person, a bishop of Monemvasia in the 16th C.

ED. Bibliothekon perielexen en synopsei diaphoroum kai exochous historias (Venice 1631; rp. 17 times up to 1818).


DORY (Δόρυ), also called Doros, a region in the mountainous southwestern part of Crimea where, according to Prokopios (Buildings 3.7.13), those Goths settled who did not follow Theodoric to Italy. The kastron or phorourion of Doros was situated in Crimean Gotha; Justinian II sought refuge there in 695. A bishopric was founded in Dory either by the end of the 7th or in the 8th C. Excavation has revealed the ruins of some “cave towns” (Eski-Kermen, Mangup, etc.) in the land of Dory as well as basilicas of approximately 6th-C. date and fortifications.

The name Dory disappears after the 9th C., probably surviving in the form Theodoro (N. Bănescu, BZ 35 [1935] 35f); the name Mangup for this region is first attested in a letter of the Khazar king Joseph (ca. 960): the Goths of Dory were at this time vassals of the Khazars. There is vague evidence that ca. 1223 the towns of Gotha paid tribute to the emperor of Trebizond (M. Tichanova, MatIAssArch 34 [1953] 328f). Vasiliev’s hypothesis (infra 157f) that Constantine Gabras was sent to the Crimea after his independent rule in Trebizond had been terminated in 1140 proves invalid (Kazhdan, Arm. 91).

By the 13th or 14th C. a principedom of Theodoromanget appeared on the site of Dory. Eski-Kermen suffered from the raid of NOGAY in 1299, and probably between 1395 and 1404 Mangup

---

was under the rule of Timur; after Timur’s death, the prince of Theodoro-Mangup, Alexios, regained independence, and the principality retained it, even after the Ottoman conquest of the Crimea in 1475. Around 1425 a fortress and palace were built in Mangup and the Church of Constantine and Helena restored. Greek traditions survived in Mangup, and Greek inscriptions, both funerary and dedicatory, have been found there. In the late 14th C. the hieromonk Matthew of Khazaria wrote in Greek a poetic account of his visit to Theodoro, describing the devastation caused by the raids of Timur.


DORYLAION (Δωρύλαιον, mod. Eskişehir), city of northwestern Phrygia, on a strategic road junction controlling passage from Constantinople to the interior of Asia Minor. A major military post, Dorylaion was frequently mentioned after 741, when it was base of the revolt of Artabasdos. It was a bastion of the Opsikon theme and an aplektos; Arab raids often reached it in the 8th–10th C. According to Ibn Khurdādhbih, Dorylaion was noted for its plains, where imperial pack animals were raised, and for its hot springs. After the Turks captured it in 1086, Dorylaion lay in ruins in a man’s land frequently occupied by nomadic Turkish tribes until Manuel I took the region in 1175, drove out the nomads, and built a new fortress for defense of the frontier (P. Wirth, BZ 55 [1962] 21–29). Soon after the battle of Myriokephalon, however, the city fell to the Seljuks. Dorylaion was a bishopric of Phrygia Salutaris, under Synada. Remains of the fortifications, which surrounded the medieval hilltop town, have entirely disappeared; they indicated two periods of construction, perhaps of the 7th–8th and 12th C.

LIT. MAMA 5:xxii–xvii. —C.F.

DOUKAS (Δούκας, fem. Δούκανα, from doux, "leader, general"), a noble Byz. lineage. The hypothesis of their Armenian origin (doux being a translation of Arm. sparapat, “general”) cannot be proved. The first known Doukas was sent in the 9th C. by Empress Theodora to convert the Paelicians forcibly. The family was very prominent in the early 10th C. when Andronikos Doukas and Constantine Doukas served as military commanders; they became prototypes of two personages in the epic poem Digenes Akritas (see Doukas, Andronikos and Doukas, Constantine). It is not clear whether Andronikos Doukas, who sided with Bardas Skleros in 976, was related to the elder Doukas. One of his sons, Bardas Mongs, commanded the fleet sent in 1016 to Kharzaria (the Crimea). Again it is unknown whether Constantine X Doukas, who ascended the imperial throne in 1059, and his son Michael VII Doukas were related to the elder Doukas as affirmed by Psellus and Nicholas Kallikles; Nikephoros Bryennios even went so far as to assert that their ancestors served Constantine I the Great. A 12th-C. historian (Zon. 3:675f) wrote, on the other hand, that the old lineage died out after the unsuccessful revolt of Constantine Doukas in 913, and Constantine X was a descendant only through the female line. The 11th-C. Doukas, who originated from Paphlagonia, were generals and governors: John Doukas was katepano of Edessa in 1059 (see Doukas, John); his sons were respectively domestikos ton scholon and protostrator; Konstantios Porphyrogenetos, Michael VII’s brother, was a famous soldier, even though he died at age 20 (at Dyrrhachion in 1081).

The Doukai intermarried with many aristocratic families, including Komnenoi (the family name Komnendonoukas was used): Irene Doukaina, Andronikos’s daughter, became Alexios I’s wife; at the beginning of his reign Alexios considered her cousin Constantine Doukas as his heir apparent (see Doukas, Constantine); Irene’s brother, the protostrator Michael, was one of the most important generals at the end of the 11th C.; another brother, John, was megas doux. In the 12th C. the name of Doukas was fashionable and applied to some members of other families (Angelos, Kamateros, Vatatzes, etc.); it is difficult to identify some of the Doukai (the numerous Johns present a particular problem) and impossible to establish their connection with the imperial Doukai. Some were generals, but others served in the civil administration as logothetes, hetairiarches, or vestiaries.

The Doukai were great landowners. Their role
in cultural life was insignificant, although the despotes Andronikos is represented both in the monograms and portraits of a MS of John Klimax in Milan (Ambros. B 80 Sup.), produced between 1068 and 1078. After the 12th C. only those Doukai are known who were interrelated with other lineages and formed "hyphenated" families. Descent from the Doukai was claimed, for example, by George Palaiologos, sebastos and megas hetaireiarches, who included Constantine X Doukas and Michael VII Doukas among his "ancestors" in the painted pronaos of his monastery church in Constantinople. (See genealogical table.)


A.K., A.C.

DOUKAS, historian; born ca.1400, died 1462 or later. Neither his baptismal name nor the date and place of his birth are recorded. His grandfather Michael Doukas, who was a supporter of John VI Kantakouzenos, fled from Constantinople in 1345 and took refuge at Ephesus with the Turkish emir of Aydin. Doukas is first mentioned in 1421, living in Nea Phokaia and serving the Genoese podesta, Giovanni Adorno, as secretary. Subsequently he entered the service of the Gattilusio family, which controlled Lesbos. He went on several missions as envoy to the Ottoman sultan, visiting Adrianople, Didymoteichon, Philippiopolis, and Istanbul.

The History of Doukas begins in 1341 and breaks off suddenly in 1462, in the middle of an account of the Ottoman siege of Mytilene. Doukas was an eyewitness to several of the events he describes, and his narrative is generally considered biased but reliable. He spoke Italian and Turkish, and thus had access to Genoese and Ottoman sources of information. He is the only Byz. historian to describe the peasants’ revolt on the western coast of Asia Minor in 1416–18, led by Bürklüde Mustafa, who advocated a "communistic" way of life and proclaimed the equality of Islam and Christianity (H.I. Cotsonis, BZ 50 [1957] 397–404). In contrast to Kritoboulou’s praise of Mehmed II, Doukas emphasized the absolute immorality and cruelty of the Ottoman sultan. He viewed the Turkish conquests as God’s punishment for the sins of the Byz., but for him Fortune (tyche) was also an important element of historical causation. As a man in Frankish service, Doukas supported a policy of Union with Rome and felt that some
accommodation with the West was necessary to preserve the empire. An old Italian translation of Doukas includes an interpolated section on the battle of Kosovo Polje (M. Dinić, ZRVI 8.2 [1964] 53–67).


**DOUKAS, ANDRONIKOS**, general under Leo VI; died ca.910 in Arab captivity. A *patrikios*, Andronikos won an important victory over the Arabs at Maraş (Nov./Dec. 904, according to Arab sources). Byz. chronicles relate that Andronikos, who was then ordered to join *Himerios* in his expedition against the Arabs, suddenly revolted and “with his relatives and slaves” seized the town of Kabala near Ikonion. After Gregoras Iberitzes besieged him there for six months, he defected to the Arabs; Leo tried to persuade him to return, but through the intrigues of Samonas the Arabs learned of this scheme and put Andronikos in prison, where he probably died. His son Constantine Doukas managed to flee.

The story of Andronikos’s plot raises several questions. C. de Boor, relying on the vita of Patr. Euthymios, dated the beginning of the revolt to summer of 904, whereas A. Vasiliev (Byz. *Arabes* 2.1:181–90), trusting Arab sources, preferred the date of 906/7. R. Jenkins (*Speculum* 23 [1948] 222–25) treated the revolt as part of an aristocratic scheme by Andronikos, Nicholas I Mystikos, and the admiral Eustathios Argyros, who allegedly yielded Taormina to the Arabs in 902. Eustathios’s treason at Taormina was questioned by R.H. Dolley (SBN 7 [1953] 340–53), but Andronikos’s links with the patriarch seem substantiated by the story of Nicholas’s resistance to the *Tetragyam* of Leo VI. Epic elements color the chroniclers’ narration of Andronikos’s history, and eventually both Andronikos and his son Constantine were praised in the epic of *Digenes Akritis*.


**DOUKAS, CONSTANTINE**, general, son of Andronikos Doukas; died Constantinople July 913. Constantine arrested Samonas during his flight to the Arabs and testified in the senate that Samonas was abscending to Syria. Constantine probably joined his father’s rebellion against Leo VI and followed him to Arab territory. Eventually, however, he escaped to Byz., was promoted to the post of strategos of Charsianon and then *domestikos ton scholon*, and fought victoriously against the Arabs. After the emperor Alexander died (June 913), Constantine entered Constantinople with an army and was proclaimed emperor at the Hippodrome; he may have been summoned by Nicholas I Mystikos, who was frightened by the difficult political situation and esp. the Bulgarian threat. Unexpectedly, Nicholas changed his mind and prepared resistance to Constantine, who was killed at the gates of the Great Palace. Begun by aristocrats (including Leo Chotrophaikes, an Armenian named Kourtikios, and many relatives of Constantine), the rebellion was supported by the common people, and accordingly Constantine’s defeat led to mass executions; scores were affixed to stakes on the eastern shore of the Bosporos. Popular legend preserved Constantine’s memory: in the 930s the rebel Basil the Copper Hand assumed Constantine’s name. At the same time the aristocracy praised him and his father as heroes; traces of this glorification are found in the epic of *Digenes Akritis* and in the vita of Basil the Younger. Six miniatures in the Madrid Skylitzes MS depict Constantine’s revolt (Grabar-Manoussac, Skylitzés, nos.277–82).


**DOUKAS, CONSTANTINE**, son of Michael VII Doukas; born Constantinople ca.1074, died ca.1095. Doukas was porphyrogennetos and heir; his enamel portrait accompanies Michael’s on the Holy Crown of Hungary (Wessel, Byz. *Enamels*, no.37). He was betrothed to the daughter of Robert Guiscard. During the reign of Nikephoros III, Doukas’s mother Maria of “Alania” protected him. After the accession of Alexios I Komnenos, Doukas was again recognized as heir and affianced to Anna Komnene; they shared imperial acclamations. *Theophylaktos* of Ohrid com-
posed a basilikos logos or Paideia basilike for him. After the birth of John II, however, Constantine lost his title. In 1094 Doukas entertained Alexios at his estate near Serres. His end is unknown.

Lit. Polemis, Doukai 60–63. –C.M.B.

DOUKAS, JOHN, caesar; died ca.1088. Brother of Constantine X, Doukas was one of the eastern generals who petitioned Michael VI in 1057. During his brother’s reign, Doukas became caesar and helped suppress a conspiracy (1061). While Eudokia Makrembolitissa and Romanos IV ruled, Doukas upheld the rights of his nephew, Michael VII. The Doukas family’s enmity to Romanos appeared when Doukas’s son Andronikos caused the retreat at Mantzikert, which left Romanos in the Turks’ hands. When Romanos was released, Doukas led a coup that excluded Romanos and Eudokia from the throne in favor of Michael VII. Doukas’s sons Andronikos and Constantine led Byz. forces against Romanos, and Doukas ordered Romanos’s blinding. He introduced Nikephoritizes to Michael. In 1074 Nikephoritizes sent him as commander against Roussel de Bailleul; defeated and captured, Doukas became (half-willingly) Roussel’s puppet-usurper. Captured by the Turks and then ransomed, he became a monk to evade punishment. In 1078 he encouraged Michael to abdicate. He sponsored the marriage of his granddaughter Irene Doukaina to Alexios I Komnenos, enthusiastically joined the Komnenoi when they revolted, and helped select Alexios for the throne. He corresponded with Psellos, and the earliest known MS of Constantine VII’s De administrando imperio comes from his library.


DOUKATON (δουκάτον), rare term designating a territorial unit. Hagiographical texts of the 6th–7th C. understand doukaton as a district under the command of a doux: doukata of Palestine (Cyrol of Scythopolis, ed. Schwartz, p.150.1) or of Alexandria (in Philostorgios, HE 167.26–27). This meaning reappeared in the 10th C. Constantine VII used the term in an antiquarian context when describing the division of the Roman Empire into eparchiae, hegemoniae, doukata, and the so-called consular provinces (De them., ch.1.59–61, ed. Pertusi, p.62). For him, doukaton was both the land of the Venetian doge (De adm. imp., 28.47–50) and a part of a strategis (59.88–89). The term was also used in the treaty with Bohemund of 1108 to designate the princeedom of Antioch (An.Komn. 3:135,28–29).


DOUKATOPOULON (δουκατόπουλον, pl. doukato-pouloi), a coin referred to in some fragmentary accounts from Thessalonike of the early 15th C. (S. Kugéas, BZ 23 [1914–19] 149). Badaro called it a ducatello or duchatello and valued it normally as 1.5 keratia, thus identifying it with the smallest silver coin (approximately 1 g) then being struck at Constantinople, the 1/16th of a hyperpyron and 1/8th of a stauraton. Its name, a diminutive of “ducat,” resulted from its being a continuation of the depreciated basilikon ducat of the 1340s.

Lit. Hendy, Economy 54 of. –Ph.G.

DOULOPAROIKOS (δουλοπάροικος, from doulos (“slave”) and paroikos), a category of peasants whose nature is unclear. The term appears in four chrysobulls dating between 945/6 and 1079 that grant or confirm tax-exempt status to the douloparoi held by certain monasteries in the vicinity of Thessalonike. In addition, a passage from John Tarchaneiotes’ Diegesis (probably from the early 12th C.), describing the arrival of the pastoral Vlachs on Mt. Athos, states that these Vlachs served the monks of Athos “like douloparoi.” In these sources douloparoi seem to bear no fiscal or service obligations toward the state and their status seems to be hereditary. Oikonomides suggests that douloparoi were agricultural slaves and freedmen who held land from their masters in return for corvées and a part of their harvest. On the contrary, Litavrin (Viz. Obiscestuo 86) considers douloparoi as peasants working on demesne lands and possibly identical with akeimones and aporoi.

It remains unclear whether douloparoi can be equated with the douleutai and douleutoparoi (MM 5:11.19) of documents of the 13th C. A charter
larger district, sometimes called doukaton: Antioch (after 969), Chaldia (969), Thessalonike, Adrianople (after 971), Mesopotamia (976), and Italy. The doux of Koloneia is mentioned in the story of the Forty-two Martyrs of Amorion (ed. Vasil'evskij, Nikitin, 29-36), but this may not reflect official terminology. H. Ahrweiler (BCH 84 [1960] 65ff) identified doux with katepano. The term was also applied to the domestikos ton scholon (N. Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 142) and, along with megas doux, designated commanders of the fleet. After the 12th C. the term lost its prestige and the governors of small themes were called doukes (D. Angelov, BS 12 [1951] 60).


DOUR (μπούρις, Lat. dux), general. The term dux acquired a technical sense at the time of Diocletian (first mentioned in 289) when it designated the military commander of limitanei stationed within the borders of a province, with the official title dux limitis provinciae illius. The mobile troops of comitatenses were put under the command of the dux by Anastasios I in 492. The dux normally functioned separately from the civil administration; only in a few provinces (Isauria, Mauretania, the Thebaid) did the governor combine both military and civil functions. Also exceptional were cases when the dux administered troops stationed in several provinces. With the decline of the Roman administrative system, the term dux came to be employed to indicate a subaltern officer, merarches or commander of a moira (Strategikon of Maurice 1.3.12-13), while the governors of themes were eventually called strategoi.

From the 2nd half of the 10th C. the term was revived to indicate the military commander of a
and dowry deeds show. However, deviations from these norms did exist; many are documented in the Ecloga, the Epanagoge, and certain treatises and scholia.


M. Th. F.

DOXOLOGY (δοξολογία, lit. "glorification"), a liturgical formula of praise, esp. the concluding exclamation (ekphonesis) of a prayer. Simple doxologies, used with great frequency in liturgical services and by church fathers to conclude sermons, are found already in the New Testament. As a response to the Arian crisis (see ARIANISM), Trinitarian doxologies ("Glory to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit") were leveled ("Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit"). The "Great Doxology," or Gloria ("Glory to God in the Highest"), an elaboration of Luke 2:14 sung only at orthros and apodeikticon, is to be distinguished from the widely used "Lesser Doxology" ("Glory to the Father").


R. F. T.

DOXOPATRES, JOHN, 11th-C. rhetorician, commentator on APITHIONOS and HERMOGENES. It is unclear whether Doxopatres (Δοξοπατρής or Δοξαπατρής) used their works in the original or via Byz. commentators, such as JOHN GEOMETRES, whom he cites in his writings. The life of Doxopatres is obscure. He quoted an inscription from the apse of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople praising Romanos III for his generous donation of 50 "talents" of gold (Mercati, CollByz 2:291f). He also wrote an ETHOPONIA on the words that Michael V would have pronounced after his dethronement. 'Tzetzes referred to Doxopatres' works.


A. K.

DOXOPATRES, NEILOS, theologian and canonist of first half of 12th C.; baptismal name Nicholas. Doxopatres (Δοξουπατρής) held a combination of ecclesiastical and secular offices in Constantinople: deacon of Hagia Sophia, patriarchal notary, and imperial nomophylax; his title was protoproedros of the protosynkelles. Before 1142/3 he took the monastic habit and left for Sicily, where he worked at the court of Roger II. He was commissioned by Roger to write a treatise on the five patriarchates (first in the form of an epitome), in which he not only attacked the concept of Roman PRIMACY, but also developed the idea of Constantinople's superiority in the PENTARCHY. In so doing Doxopatres differed radically from those southern Italian Greeks like PHILAGATHOS who defended papal primacy (J. Siciliano, BSIEB 6 [1979] 175). This book on the patriarchates exists also in an Armenian translation. G. Mercati (ST 68 [1935] 64–79) attributed to Doxopatres an anti-Latin polemical treatise titled On Oikonomia, of which only two books are preserved. Doxopatres produced marginal notes to ATHANASIUS of Alexandria.

Ed. F. N. Finck, Des Nilos Doxopatres "Taxis ton patriarchikon thronon" (Marburg 1902).


A. K.

DRAGAŠ. See CONSTANTINE DRAGAŠ.

DRAGONS. See SNAKES.

DRAMA (δράμα), ancient term designating action on a stage. With the disappearance of the THEATER, the term lost its literal meaning and was used either metaphorically (e.g., drama of life, of the world), or came to signify "story." Sometimes the term drama or its derivatives were applied to works in DIALOGUE form produced not for the stage but reading: thus CHRISTOS PASCHON is variously titled in the MSS as hypothesis dramatike, tragedy, or just stichoi (verses). The term could be used to characterize a romance; for example, Photios describes the romance of HELIODOROS and some other ancient romances as dramatikon. A later romance, that of Eusathios MAKREMBOLITES, was also called a drama. The term was used fig-


DREAMS AND DREAM VISIONS. In the medieval world dreams and dream visions were considered significant sensory phenomena that could predict the future or grant understanding. This belief derived partly from classical traditions. At the same time, church fathers accepted the dream as a regular means of divine revelation (M. Du laey, Le rêve dans la vie et la pensée de saint Augustin [Paris 1973] 35–127). Dreams were considered to have played a critical role in the conversion of non-Christians, in the lives of saints, and in imparting divine knowledge. Problems resulted, however, from the acceptance of dreams: (1) dream interpretation had been connected intimately with pagan divination and augury; (2) if God could speak in one’s dreams, then so could the devil and demons; (3) some heresies like Gnosticism and Montanism manipulated dreams to assail Orthodoxy and to sanction its own doctrines; and (4) a dream could have earthly causes (physiological, psychological, or intellectual factors). Therefore, Byz. writers concentrated on the classification of dreams by type and provenance in order to determine what sorts of dreams had a divine origin and therefore were authoritative.

Many conflicting systems of dream classification existed (A. Kessels, Mnemosyne 22 [1966] 389–424); the most common was the fivefold system, based on the dream’s prophetic ability. The enhypnion and phantasma were nonpredictive dreams: the former is caused by mental or physical distress or a preoccupation with daily concerns, while the latter is the distorted image that a dreamer perceives between the sleeping and waking state. Three types of dreams were significant: the oneiros, a symbolic dream that usually required interpretation; the horama, or prophetic vision; and the chrematismo, a dream wherein God or some divine emissary proffers information or advice. At first, the horama was emphasized because of its greater religious authority and the nonsymbolic clarity of its contents; moreover, because of Iconoclasm, dream images were viewed as suspect and thus the dream came to be considered an inferior activity of the human soul.

Despite an influx of Arabic texts on dreams and a growing interest in pagan dream interpretations (Artemidorus of Ephesos, a dream interpreter of the 2nd C., was known to the Souda and the Philopatris), oneirocriticism became thoroughly Christianized, with dream books (oneirokeftika) passing under the names of biblical or historical personalities. The Oneirokeftika of Achmet Ben Sirin is the best known example of Christian dreamlore. The cult of saints was closely interwoven with dreams used for predicting the future and for healing the sick, whereas demonic visions, esp. of sexual character, were condemned. Imperial propaganda also employed the dream topic in order to demonstrate the divine origin of the emperor’s power.


– S.M.O.

DRIMYS (Δριμύς), a family name meaning “sharp” or “angry” (Koukoules, Bios 6:484). In the mid-11th C. Psellos (Scripta min. 2:69.17) referred to a “very noble” Drimys involved in litigation over a property. Leo Drimys, spatharakandatos and strategos, known only from his seal, may have lived even earlier. A different Leo, vestes, is known from another, later 12th-C. seal: he was a governor (judge or katepanos) of Bulgaria. Zlatarski (Ist. 3:17) identified him with the “župan or satrap of Bulgaria” mentioned in Ansbart’s chronicle. Demetrios Drimys was governor (prator) of Hellas and Peloponnesos in Andronikos I’s reign and judge of the velum and protoasekretis under Isaac II. Members of the Drimys family did not occupy high posts thereafter, except for Dionsios Drimys, parakoimomenos ca.1300. John Drimys, a “Westernner” and priest in Constantinople, pretended to be a relative of the Laskaris family; in 1305, backed by the Areites and probably by the lower classes, he organized a conspiracy against Andronikos II (I. Ševčenko, Soc. & Intell., pt.IX [1952], 149f). The synod of 1305 condemned Drimys and he was banished. V. Laurent’s attempt to identify him with another pro-Laskaris con-
spirator, Glykys, does not seem valid (A. Kazhdan in Charanis Studies 79–81). According to Ševčenko, it is tempting to associate the arrest of Manuel Moschopoulos with Drimys’s plot.

LIT. PLP, nos. 5827–32. —A.K.

DROMON (δρόμων, “runner”), a term first used in the 5th C., generally referring to several similar types of decked warships emphasizing speed over weight, which became the mainstay of the Byz. navy. Prokopios (Wars 3.11.15–16) describes swift dromones powered by one bank of rowers, but later sources indicate two banks, one above the other (Taktika of Leo VI, 19.7). The dromon also had two masts, sometimes three, supporting triangular lateen sails. Its standard length is calculated at approximately 40 m, the breadth at 5.5 m. Smaller dromones carried a complement of 100 men, but larger types could carry as many as 290 or more (De cer. 670.3–6). Offensive weapons included a ram fixed to the prow and a launcher shooting Greek fire mounted on the forecastle. An important advantage over Arab vessels was the wooden tower (xylakastron) amidships from which catapults and archers could fire down on the enemy, while hides soaked with water were hung along the sides to protect the ship against enemy incendiaries. In combat their sails were furled and the masts lowered; a sea battle in the 11th-C. Kynegetika MS (Furlan, Marciana 5, fig.36a) shows mastless vessels, their sides protected by shields between which project eight or ten oars. Their shallow draught also made them useful for amphibious operations, as evident from Nikephoros II Phokas’s efficient disembarkation of his army on Crete in 960 (Leo Dic. 7.15–8.12).


DROMOS (δρόμος, lit. “course”), also the “imperial (demosios) dromos” (John Lydos, On Magistacies 2.10.24, 29), Latin cursus publicus, the system of imperial post and transportation. The state post that existed during the early Roman Empire was reorganized by Constantine I or by Diocletian. It consisted of two sections: the regular (platys) dromos for goods and the accelerated (oxyx) dromos for imperial officials and their baggage. The former was served by oxen pulling carts (angareia), the latter by horses and mules. It was forbidden to harness horses to carriages. On the roads, stations (mansiones, Gr. stathmoi) were established to change animals and to rest; they served also to collect goods for state transportation. Prokopios (SH 50.9) says that a rider without baggage could cover a distance of 5–8 stathmoi a day. Control over the dromos belonged to the department of the praetorian prefect who was the only official to grant evictions, the documents entitling a person to use the dromos. Eventually, the surveillance of the dromos was taken over by the magister officiorum and in the 7th or 8th C. by the logothetes tou dromou. According to seals, there was a distinction between Western and Eastern dromoi. The provision of animals, carriages, and hay was a burden imposed primarily on the exkoussatoi of the dromos. A chrysobull of 1109 speaks of the “burden of dromos and shipping” (Laure 1, no.58.8–9), and charters of tax exemption include a clause concerning angareiai and additional angareiai (parangareiai) just after “the supply of grain” (Patmou Engrapha 1, no.5.74–75). The term demosios dromos was employed also for the roads themselves (Iuvr. 1, no.22.19).


DROUGOUIBITAI (Δρουγουβιται), the name of two settled groups of Sklavenoi, one in southern Macedonia (between Thessalonike and Berroia) and another in Thrace around Philippopolis. The first vowel appears variously in the sources as “a,” “o,” and “ou.” The name is suspiciously close to the “DREGOVICI” of the Kievan chronicle. Vasmer (Slaven 177) suggests a Slavic etymology, but O. Pritsak (SetStu 30 [1983] 404) proposes a Turkic derivation. They appear in the Miracles of St. Demetrios together with four other Sklavene groups, among them the Sagoudatay, who lived along the left bank of the Bistrica River, southeast of Thessalonike. The Drougovibitai of the Miracles had their own “kings.” They paid tribute to Byz. and were required to go to war as allies of Byz.

The name survives in later documents. A charter of 897 mentions the village of Dragobountoi (Laure 1, no.11.15–18); a certain Dragoboundos was a neighbor of the Iveron monastery in 1047
DROUNGARIOS (δρογγαρίος), a military rank first mentioned in the early 7th C. During the 7th and 8th C., a droungarios in the provincial armies (themata) represented a high rank, immediately below tourmarches and above komes, and in command of a droungos of as many as 1,000 men, later a bandon of between 200 and 400. However, 9th- and 10th-C. sources indicate a gradual decrease in the authority of the droungarios. In the 911 expedition to Crete, the droungarioi commanded no more than 100 men each (De cer. 656.14–15), and in 949 the droungarioi figure only slightly higher than the common soldiers in rank and pay (De cer. 666.19–20, 667.10, 669.9). By the 11th C., droungarios and komes were equivalent ranks (Kek. 294.21–22), eventually merging into the combined office of droungarokomes.


DROUNGARIOS TES VIGLAS (δρογγάριος τῆς βιγλᾶς), or of the arithmos, commander of the tagma of the vigla. The first mention of this droungarios is in the work of a 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 466.3–5) who relates that in 791 Empress Irene sent the spatharios and droungarios tes viglas Alexios Mosele against rebellious soldiers in Armeniakon. The major function of this droungarios was guarding the emperor on expeditions and in the palace. The droungarios was the emperor’s confidant and an active military commander. In the 10th C. represented among the droungarioi tes viglas are generals and members of aristocratic families such as Eustathios Argyros, John Kourkouas, and Manuel Kourtikios. Under the command of the droungarios were officials such as the topoteretes, chartoularios, and komites (see Comes); one of these, the akolouthos, is known only for this tagma.

About 1030 the function of the droungarios tes viglas changed radically (N. Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 133f.), and he became a member of the judiciary. Eustathios Rhomaios, author of the Peira, occupied this post. From the second half of the 11th C. the epithet megas was added to this title (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 891–97). The droungarioi as judges were primarily members of the civil nobility—from families such as the Keroularioi, Kamaferoi, and Makrembolita; among them are several writers such as John Skylitzes, John Zonaras, and Gregory Antiochos. On the other hand, Constantine Komnenos and a certain Kontostephanos were probably not droungarioi tes viglas, but droungarios tou ploimou (A. Kazhdan, BZ 76 [1983] 384). Droungarioi tes viglas existed until the end of Byz.; pseudo-Sphrantzes (Spht. 340.31–32) equates them with the chief of the Janissaries.

tou ploimou. The role of the navy having diminished in the 11th C., the droungarios of the fleet, now called droungarios tou stolou, commanded primarily the battleships of Constantinople (Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 146). Even though under the Komnenoi the post was given the epithet megas, the droungarios lost his preeminence in the navy and was replaced by the megas doux; nonetheless, the post of the megas droungarios remained highly ranked, and in the 13th and 14th C. it was held by members of the families of Gabalas and Mouflon. The staff of the droungarios included the toptoteretes, chartoularios, komites, and others. C. Mango (RSBS 2 [1982] 299f) hypothesized that a chartoularios of the navy existed in the 7th C., but there is no direct evidence to support this hypothesis. The function of the komes of the hetairia, who was under the droungarios, is disputed; Bury (Adm. System 111) considered him a commander of foreign marines, while Oikonomides (Listes 340) argued he was commander of a special detachment of guards.


DROUNGOS (δρούγγος, δρόγγος, from the German thrunga), a word with three meanings. (1) Prior to the 12th C., a droungos was a subdivision of the army of a theme, commanded by a droungarios; it was larger than a bandon but smaller than a tourma. (2) From the end of the 12th C., the term designated certain mountainous areas of Attica, Lakonia, and Epiros, and was synonymous with zygos (“mountain range” or “pass”). (3) During the 13th and 14th C., the term was applied to the military or paramilitary corps assigned to such mountainous areas.


DRUM, a cylindrical, polygonal, or, less frequently, square element providing visual and structural support for a dome. The drum served to elevate the cupola and accommodate windows illuminating a building’s interior. It developed from an essentially buttressing function in Roman domes. In 6th-C. architecture, the drum became a more open system of independent wall buttresses separated by windows, directly related to the internal, structural ribs (e.g., at Hagia Sophia, Constantinople); yet a drum does not actually elevate the dome above its base (hence the term “false drum”). From the 9th C. onward, drums were used almost exclusively to elevate and visually accentuate domes externally. Through the 13th C. drums tended to be relatively squat, but in the 14th C., their proportions became considerably attenuated (e.g., Holy Apostles, Thessalonike). Drums also underwent a process of increasingly more elaborate external articulation. From simple geometric forms (cylinder, octagonal, or polygonal prism), they evolved into highly elaborate structures through the use of engaged colonnettes, recessed arches, surface textures, and other treatments.

~S.C.

DRUNKENNESS (μέθη) was condemned as a grave sin and social evil by the church fathers, such as Basil the Great in his homily Against Drunkards (PG 31:444–64). In actual practice, however, wine drinking was a popular pastime, in private, at banquets and public feasts, and in taverns. The Book of the Eparch (19:3) prohibited the operation of taverns on Great Feasts and Sundays before the second hour of day, and ordered them closed at the second hour of night. Patr. Athanasios I (Ep. 44:22–26) urged Andronikos II to fine anyone entering a tavern for the purpose of drinking, from Saturday evening to Sunday. Byz. moralists condemned drunkenness; one historian (Nik.Chon. 54:54–56) saw in alcoholism a principal reason for the decline of the empire. Some emperors were presented by historians as drunkards, for example, the Greens are reported (Theoph. 296.25–27) to have mocked Phokas, exclaiming, “You have drunk again of the cup; you have lost again your senses”; it is unclear whether it was a genuine insult or an apotropaic incantation. Michael III was presented by hostile historiography as a drunken sot, a characterization that may be fabricated. Literati used the theme of drunkenness for parodies—Manuel II’s diatribe Against Drunkenness or grotesque vernacular verses like the Physiological Tale of Peter Zyphomoustos, the Father of Wine (G. Protopapa-Boufoulidou, EEBS 39–40 [1972–73] 594–611)—or for mild ridicule, as in Psello’s


DUALISM is a modern notion, probably first used by Thomas Hyde (1700) in his Historia religiosi veterum Persarum. Technically, it denotes religious understandings, worldviews, or philosophical theories in which there appear two original principles fundamentally irreconcilable and opposed to one another. It may also include those religions typified by an eschatological dualism, for example, Manichaeanism and most systems of Gnosticism, which see an eschatological superiority of good over evil. Byz. also encountered dualism among the adherents of Messalianism (Euchitai), Paulicians, and Bogomils or Phoun- dagiagites.

In a broader sense one can speak of an anthropological dualism. The Platonic doctrine of the soul and intellect predominant in Byz. emphasized their distinction and thus implied a dualistic conception of the body, of matter, and of the imagination. Byz. adopted an ethical dualism inherited from the New Testament. This appears esp. in the Gospel of John in the contrast between the world of darkness and the Kingdom of Light; but while this referred to the fundamental contrast stemming from belief and nonbelief, it could be converted into an ontological statement.


—K.-H.U.

DUBROVNIK (Lat. Ragusium; Gr. Ραοῦσιον, Ραγουσιον; Ital. Ragusa; Slavic Dubrovnik), port city and fortress in DALMATIA. It was founded probably in the 7th C., according to Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, by refugees from ancient Epidaurus, which was destroyed by the Slavs and Avars ca.615. It was under Byz. authority; an Arab siege in 866–67 strengthened the Byz. presence. The city remained under Byz. domination until 1205, with intermittent Venetian (1000–1030) and Norman rule (1081–85, 1172, 1189–90); it became an archbishopric in 1022. For a while in the 11th C. it was the seat of a Byz. theme. It was under Venetian control from 1205 to 1358, and then became a self-governing patrician city-state under Hungarian protection until 1526.

An important center for maritime commerce, Dubrovnik played a prominent role as intermediary in the metal trade between the Balkan hinterland and the West in the 13th–15th C. In the 13th C. representatives from Dubrovnik signed three treaties with the despotate of Epiros that granted their merchants free trade in Epiros on the condition of paying 3 percent kommerikon: only the purchase of grain was restricted and special customs duties had to be paid for weaponry and horses. If there was a treaty with Andronikos II of ca.1320 (Reg 4, no.2433), it was of short duration, since Dubrovnik sided with Venice against Byz. In 1451 the city received new trade privileges from Constantinople, through a chrysoibull of Constantine XI, and from the despotate of Morea, through argyroibrin of Thomas and Demetrios Palaiologos (M. Andreeva, BS 6 [1935–36] 110–65).

Dubrovnik became a very prosperous, strongly fortified city, with remarkable urban development (well-planned and paved streets, stone houses, churches and palaces, a sewage system, an aqueduct, medical services, pharmacies, a hospital, an orphanage, etc.). Byz. interest in Dubrovnik is reflected in a description of the city by Chalkokondyles (2:285, 15–23), who emphasized that Dubrovnik, founded by the "Illyrians" (evidently Slavs), was governed by good laws in an aristocratic manner.


—B.K., A.K.

DUN (Δούβις or Τίβιν), early medieval capital of ARMENIA on the east bank of the Azat River some 20 km south-southeast of modern Erevan. Duin may have been founded in the 4th C. (Moses Xorengač'i, 3:8 vs. pseudo-Pawstos Buzand, 3:8), but it probably did not replace Artašat as capital until a century later. After the Arsacid dynasty fell in 428, Duin became the seat of the Persian and then the Arab governors of Armenia as well
as of the Armenian *katholikos* until the 9th C. The city was captured by both Herakleios (629) and Constantine IV (652/3), but it did not remain in Byz. hands. In the Bagratid period Duin did not regain its status as capital; Muslim emirs controlled it more often than Armenian kings. The last Byz. attempt to reconquer Duin in 1045 failed.

Despite the great earthquake of 893 which nearly destroyed the city, recent excavations attest its importance, and both Prokopios (*Wars* 2.25.1–3) and 10th-C. Arab geographers praise Duin as an international trade center famous for its textiles. The city continued to flourish under the Zak’arids when the Georgian queen T’amara used it as her winter residence after 1203; only in the 14th C. did Duin gradually decline as a result of the Mongol conquest of Armenia.


**DUIN, LOCAL COUNCILS OF.** The first church council at Duin, convoked in 505/6, was directed against Nestorianism; the Armenian church accepted the *Henotikon*, underscoring its anti-Chalcedonian tendency, and thus took the first step toward Monophysitism. These anti-Nestorian ideas were further developed in the “Letter of the Armenians to the Orthodox in Persia.”

The second synod, of 554, formally rejected the council of Chalcedon. Hr. Bartikjan (*Istočniki dlia izučenija pavelikaniskogo dvizhenija* [Erevan 1961] 26–31) questions the traditional view that the synod dealt not only with Nestorianism but also Paulicianism and that its decisions are the first evidence concerning the Paulicians in Armenia.


**DUKLJA.** See Diokleia; Zeta.

**DURA EUROPOS** (now Sâlihiyyah in Syria), Seleucid/Roman settlement on the Euphrates River near the Persian frontier, destroyed after it fell to the Sasanians in 256. For Byz. studies Dura Europos is notable, among other things, for the wall paintings in its synagogue (now removed to Damascus) and other cult buildings and for its Christian “house church.” Of a type that preceded the congregational church built on the plan of a public building (e.g., the basilica), this house church was an ordinary house, built ca. 240, whose rooms surrounding a courtyard were designated for congregational activities (instruction, celebration of the Eucharist, baptism). One room was decorated in fresco with individual narrative scenes from the Old and New Testaments. By contrast, the walls of the synagogue were painted with continuous bands of interrelated scenes from the Old Testament, and the Mithraeum and Temple of the Palmyrene gods displayed carved and painted sacrificial scenes. The figures in all types of compositions are distinguished by frontality and an intense gaze directed outwards. Most of these iconographic, compositional, and stylistic features occur later in Byz. art.


**DURRÊS.** See Dyrrachion.

**DUŠAN.** See Stefan Uroš IV Dušan.

**DUX.** See Doux.

**DYER** (*bêoîs*). The profession was common in the late Roman Empire, and the term *baphes* often appears in papyri (Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* 1:261) and inscriptions (J.-P. Waltzing, *Études historiques sur les corporations professionnelles*, vol. 3 [Louvain 1899] nos. 121–28). Basil the Great (PG 31:568A) uses another term, *deusopoi̇s*; this dyer prepared a vat for tincture (*baphe*) and then dyed fabric in *purple* or some other color. “I imitate *deusopoi̇s*,” says Theodoret of Cyrhhus (PG 81:232A), “by imbuing the water of the holy baptism in the color of blood.” A *deusopoi̇s* worked in the Stoudios monastery in the early 9th C. (Dobrokloškij, *Feodor* 413). An epitaph of a young Jewish dyer was discovered in medieval Corinth (J. Starr, *BNJ* 12 [1936] 42–49). The *Book of the Eparch*, however, does not mention a guild of dyers, even though *Peira* 51.7 cites *baptike*, the dyeing profession, as an example of a somateion.
The Book of the Eparch itself twice mentions ba-phika, dyes that were imported from Syria and sold by perfumers (myrepsi), and, in the chapter on serikarioi, the legislator prohibited dyeing silk with blood. It is difficult to explain this silence on the dyers' guild; serikarioi could have dyed silk themselves, but it is also possible that they dealt with a somatikon of dyers omitted from the Book of the Eparch. Nicholas I Mystikos (Letters, no.139,11–13) emphasized the durability of Byz. dye, which could not be washed out.

-A.K.

DYING. Byz. writers often described the process of dyeing, both in cases of massive numbers of deaths (during a plague, hostile invasion, etc.) and in individual instances. Some descriptions of this kind are conventional and standardized. Thus, the death of pagans and heretics was presented contemptuously—a legend depicted ARIUS as dying in a public lavatory—and their physical sufferings were enormously exaggerated (e.g., Theoph. 427.25–28, 448.12–21). Martyrs and saints, on the other hand, were typically represented as dying peacefully, without pain; they had a positive attitude toward death, rejoicing at their approaching union with God. Other descriptions contain valuable observations (e.g., Anna Komnene's detailed depiction of her father's death), are sincere in their sympathy (Prodromos's image of his dying friend, Stephen Skylitzes), and, in contrast to the usual static portrayals, acquire dynamism in displaying the decay of the human body (Ljubarskij, Psell 241f).

Confession and the eucharist were administered to the dying by a priest; unlike the Latin church, Byz. priests also performed the uncion of recently deceased people as well as the sick and moribund. Many Byz. tried to assume the monastic habit before they died: a 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 221.52–222.64) describes the last hours of Manuel I, for whom the courtiers were unable to find a monk's cloak of proper size. Pious people on their deathbed expressed concern about their relatives or brethren; thus, Lazaros of Mt. Galistos allegedly had died and was being lamented by his monks, when he unexpectedly opened his eyes and signed the typikon of his monastery.
-AP.K. A.K.

DYNAMIC STYLE, a term introduced by Demus (infra) to identify and characterize a highly mannered stylistic trend datable toward the end of the 12th C. Distinguished by elegant, often elongated figures, contorted poses, and esp. by an unnatural reduplication of thick, undulating drapery folds (e.g., at the overfall of the himation and the hem of the chiton), the dynamic style was first recognized in a series of geographically separated, dated mural cycles (Kurbinovo, Lagoudera, Monreale). Undated icons and MSS have more recently been linked to (and dated according to) this stylistic trend.

-G.V.

DYNAMIS (Δυναμις), the embodiment of Power, or Strength, personified as an armed, winged female. Ultimately derived from the goddesses who protected warriors in Classical art, Dynamis attends David in his fight with Goliath in the Paris Psalter (Cutler, Aristocratic Psalters, fig.248) and in the illustration of marginal Psalters; she is opposed to Alazoneia (Boastfulness), who abandons the giant. A similar but unidentified figure protects David on sarcophagi of the 4th and 5th C.
-A.C.

DYNATOI (δύνατοι, lit. "powerful"), legal term designating prominent office- or titleholders potentially capable of using their positions to aggrandize themselves at the expense of weaker neighbors. According to the normative formulation of Romanos I Lekapenos (Zepos, Jus 1:299.1–9), the dynatoi were comprised of the following categories: high officials of the army, central bureaucracy, and provincial administration; magistroi, patrikioi, and holders of senatorial dignities; metropolitans, bishops, and hegoumenoi; and administrators of imperial and ecclesiastical foundations. As this definition was predicated upon social rather than economic status, the dynatoi probably included some possessors of modest fortunes, but substantial wealth was considered a normal attribute (Zepos, Jus 1:210.5–11). The highest posts and dignities were frequently, although never hereditarily, transmitted among a
limited number of families, some of which by the 11th C. had begun to form an inchoate aristocracy.

The 10th and 11th C. witnessed increasing, at times forcible, encroachment by the dynatoi on peasant landownership, threatening the empire’s social equilibrium and jeopardizing its chief source of taxes and soldiers. Emperors from Romanos I to Basil II enacted legislation to arrest this phenomenon as well as to curb the particularistic influence exercised by the dynatoi over provincial society at the expense of centralized imperial authority. The earliest novel directed against the dynatoi, that of Romanos I, used to be dated 922 (Reg 1, no. 595), but this date is questionable; the first dated edict (Reg 1, no. 628) is that of Sept. 934, which bars dynatoi from obtaining peasant lands. Basil II subsequently voided all such acquisitions made after this date and abolished the 40-year statute of limitations that had hitherto protected these transactions (Reg 1, no. 783). Special restrictions were placed upon landholdings of powerful monasteries and upon the alienation of stratiotika ktemata to dynatoi, and dynatoi were forbidden to retain tematic soldiers in their personal service or to interfere with local commercial fairs; they became liable—through the allelengeyon—for the tax arrears of poorer neighbors.

The term dynatoi was used in charters as well as in law codes: a judge’s decision of 952 deals with an allotment encircled by the lands of dynatoi, so that no weak neighbor could exercise the right of protimesis over it (Lauria 1, no. 4.22–23); an act of 1037 excludes any dynaton prosopon from inheriting certain land (Esphig., no. 2.24). Thereafter the term fell into disuse.


A.J.C.

DYRRACHION (Δυρραχιον, Slav. Drač, Albanian Durrës, Ital. Durazzo, anc. Epidamnos), city on the eastern shore of the Adriatic Sea, the western terminus of the Via Egnatia, capital of the province of Nova Epirus. Despite earthquakes in 341 and 522 and an Ostrogothic sack in the 480s, Dyrrachion remained a major port and for-

tress in the area; Anastasios I, a native of Dyrrachion, provided the city with a triple wall and citadel, rebuilt by Justinian I. The question of Slavic settlement in the region is disputed. In the first half of the 9th C. the fortress was in Byzantine hands, and a theme of Dyrrachion was established: the strategos of Dyrrachion is mentioned in both the 9th C. Taktikon of Uspenskij (Oikonomides, Listes 49.17) and seals of the first half of the 9th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 2521, 2655); Ja. Fergus, on the basis of a letter of Theodore of Studios, hypothesized that the theme was founded under Nikephoros 1 (12 CEB, vol. 2 [Ohrid 1961] 83–92).

The city, although a metropolitan see (Notitiae CP 3.20), was a stronghold rather than an economic center as it had been in late antiquity; according to Anna Kомнене (An.Kомн. 1:142.3–13), Dyrrachion occupied only a part of ancient Epidamnos whose ramparts were ruined. The old city played an important role during Basil II’s war against Bulgaria and during the revolt of Deljan. Nikephoros Bryennios and Nikephoros Basilakes, successively doukes of Dyrrachion, revolted in the 1070s. The Normans attacked it several times: Robert Guiscard took the city in 1081, Bohemund besieged it in 1107–08; in 1185 William II of Sicily pillaged it. From the 12th C. onward, Venetians (and later merchants from Dubrovnik) used Dyrrachion as a port for the export of local products (salt, wood, hides) and tried to establish their political power over the city, but were opposed by Michael I Kомненос Doukas of Epirus, Manfred of Sicily, Serbs, and Byz. In 1392 Venice occupied Dyrrachion and held it until 1501 when it fell to the Ottomans.

The role of Dyrrachion in the Byz. ecclesiastical hierarchy gradually diminished: the metropolitan had eight suffragans in the 9th C. but none by the end of the 12th C.—its territory was taken over first by Ohrid and then by the Latin archbishopric of Bar (Antivari). By the 14th C. Albanians became the dominant inhabitants.


DŽVARI. See Mq’zet’a.
EAGLES (sing. ἀετὸς). The most majestic of birds was employed as both a sacred and a secular emblem. In myth the eagle appears as an instrument of God's will, announcing the selection of the capital or promotion to the imperial throne: Skylitzes relates the prophecy regarding the future Basil I, overshadowed in his cradle by an eagle's wing, as depicted in the illustrated Madrid MS (Graber-Manoussacas, Skylitzés, no.202). The motif of an eagle battling a snake occurs in floor mosaics, as a sculptural group in the Hippodrome of Constantinople, and probably as a military emblem (L. Maculevič, VizVrem 16 [1959] 185–202), symbolizing the victory of Good over Evil. As an aspect of imperial symbolism, the consuls carried an eagle-topped scepter, which is depicted on their diptychs. This form of scepter disappeared from coins in the reign of Emp. Philippikos. The eagle may have symbolized the emperor in the early 6th C.: J. Engemann (in Festschrift Wessel 109–15) has interpreted the Anastasios Plate in the Sutton Hoo Treasure in this light. Eagles with rings in their mouths and jeweled collars are found on imperial silks of the late 10th or early 11th C.

The date of the introduction of the double-headed eagle in Byz. has been much discussed. It was certainly employed by members of the Palaiologan dynasty (Belting, Illum. Buch 64, figs. 35–36), perhaps to suggest that the empire looked both to the East and West. It was appropriated by John VI Kantakouzenos for his footstool (Spatharakis, Corpus, vol. 2, fig.477) and by the Venetians for the state barge that welcomed John VIII. Perhaps the latest occurrence is on the pavement in the Metropolis at Mistra, where Constantine XI was crowned. The single-headed eagle continued in imperial portraits, such as that of Alexios V in the Choniates MS in Vienna (Belting, ibid., fig.15).

In patristic exegesis the image of the eagle represented a supernatural envoy, an angel, or Christ himself. As an Evangelist symbol it normally indicated John, although on occasion it was used for Mark. In the Physiologos the eagle is a symbol of regeneration. (See also Coats of Arms.)


EARRINGS (ἐνώπτια) have been found, often singly, throughout the Byz. world, mostly in funerary contexts but also in treasures. They may be made of gold, silver, bronze, gilded bronze, and/or enamel, with or without added precious and semiprecious stones or glass paste. Most are designed to pierce the earlobe as a simple hoop that fastens into a knob or ball. In the late antique period the fashion was hoops of wire, with or without additional decorations of granulation, braid, or beads. By the 6th–7th C. the popular style was a hoop or a flat lunette shape, with pendant chains ending in one or more gems, pearls, or beads. Examples of this type are worn by Empress Theodora and her ladies in the mosaic in S. Vitale, Ravenna. Gradually the lunette shape changed from a solid form to filigree; by the 10th C. it was three-dimensional and basket-shaped, with extensive granulation. This type is often hard to distinguish from Islamic jewelry. Simple bronze earrings with traces of gilding have been found in many excavations and demonstrate a popular market for "costume" jewelry, imitating pieces produced in more costly materials.


EARTHQUAKES (sing. σεισμός). Since most of the Byz. world lay within a region esp. vulnerable to earthquakes, a quake is recorded for almost every year of Byz. history, the best documented being those at Constantinople. As in pagan times, the Byz. interpreted quakes, like other natural phenomena, as heavenly portents, signifying either
forthcoming catastrophe or divine displeasure at the sins of man. To atone for the divine anger manifested through quakes, the Byz. developed various liturgies, held processions, and frequently sought the intercession of a local holy man. Sometimes relics were employed as a talisman to ward off quakes. As a perpetual reminder of the power of God’s wrath, an annual commemoration of many devastating quakes took place on the anniversary of their occurrence; some became part of the liturgical calendar, at least at Constantinople and Alexandria. The Byz. were little interested in the natural causes of quakes, but there were always a few advocates of the Aristotelian explanation that quakes were caused by the movement of winds in subterranean caverns. An 11th-C. historian (Attal. 88.22–89.2) found it necessary to refute this theory. Photios, in his sermons and in the Bibliotheca, presented the traditional view that quakes are caused by our sins; pseudo-Symeon Magistros (TheophCont 673.10–12), however, accused him of teaching that quakes were caused not by mankind’s sins but “by abundance of water.” The most significant quakes at Constantinople occurred in 365, 348, 447, 525, 557, 740, 886, 869, 989, 1064, 1296, and 1346. A full list is in Grumel, Chronologie 476–81, but a modern catalog is needed.


EASTER (Πάσχα), the feast of the RESURRECTION (Anastasis), the Jewish Passover christianized, with Jesus being the new paschal sacrifice and lamb (see AMNOS). By the beginning of the 3rd C., the focus of the feast, which originally commemorated the entire victorious passover of Jesus from death to life, narrowed to the resurrection. BAPTISM at the Vigil preceding the feast makes the Christian as well as Christ protagonist of the rising. The First Council of Nicaea canonized the celebration of Easter on the Sunday after the first full moon after the spring equinox. The Eastern use of astronomically inaccurate paschal tables and calendar led to differences in calculating Eastern and Western Easter. From the 4th C. onward, Easter was prepared for by LENT and with its fasting and CATECHUMENATE, and more immediately by HOLY WEEK. Its celebration extended through the following week, called “bright week” or “renewal,” and throughout PENTECOST until its closure (apodosis) the day before the ASCENSION.

Easter liturgy in Constantinople is detailed in the Typikon of the Great Church (Mateos, Typikon 2:82–97) and in books of ceremonial (De cer., bk.1., ch.35; pseudo-Kod. 231.17–238.4). Later Byz. Easter services, of Palestinian origin, are found at the end of the TRIODION and the beginning of the PENTEKOSTARION.

In Constantinople the Easter vigil began HOLY SATURDAY evening in Hagia Sophia with festive VESPERS, during which the customary three lections were expanded to a series of fifteen Old Testament readings, eight of which were always read, with the others added only if necessary to occupy the people until the BAPTISMS and anointings were finished and the procession was ready to enter. After the first lection, the patriarch went to the Great Baptistery, where he blessed the waters and the oil of the catechumens and incensed around the baptismal font thrice, then anointed and baptized the phoizomenoi. After the conferral of baptism, the patriarch led the neophytes, now vested in robes of white, to the Church of St. Peter just east of Hagia Sophia, where he administered to them the SACRAMENT OF CHRISTMATION (confirmation). After all had been chrismated with myron, the patriarch, accompanied by twelve bishops, led the neophytes in solemn procession, to the chant of Psalm 31[32], into Hagia Sophia to join the waiting congregation for the Liturgy, which began not with the usual TRISAGION but with the baptismal TROPAIION from Galatians 3:26. At this liturgy the neophytes completed their initiation by receiving COMMUNION for the first time.


ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIANS, conventional name for a group of historians whose works were dedicated to the history of the Christian church. Eusebius of Caesarea was the founder
of the genre, followed by Gelasios of Caesarea, Philostorgios, Sokrates, Sozomenos, and some other writers of the 5th and 6th C. The objective of Eusebios was to show the heroic progress of Christianity from the apostolic age to the victory of the new religion; this victory was achieved primarily due to the charismatic emperor Constantine I. History acquired a providential and teleological character, the line between miracle and reality was blurred, and political history merged with the biography of the holy man. The successors of Eusebios, both orthodox and heretical, stressed the local element, the piety of saints and bishops, and native traditions. In the 6th C. Theodore Lector, in his compilation, tried to gather from his predecessors all substantial evidence concerning the development of Christianity after Constantine. Many of the works of ecclesiastical historians (e.g., Basil the Cilician, John Diakrinomenos) are lost and known only from fragments or from the Bibliotheca of Photios. After Theodore Lector, the genre practically disappears, and church history tended to be combined with general political history. In the 14th C. Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos returned to the genre when he composed his antiquarian Ecclesiastical History, based on the works of earlier church historians and some hagiographical texts.


—A.P.

ECLIPSES (sing. ἔκκλησις). The computation of a lunar or, even more, a solar eclipse was a difficult problem for Byz. astronomers, but one that was often tackled, it seems, just to display the astronomer’s superior knowledge. Early surviving examples of eclipse computations are those by Pappos and Theon in the 4th C. and by Stephen of Alexandria in the early 7th. Thereafter, until the Palaiologan period, there survives only one eclipse computation, for 1072, in a text based on an Arabic source (A. Jones, An Eleventh-century Manual of Arabo-Byzantine Astronomy [Amsterdam 1987]). Anna Komnene (An.Komn. 2:92f), however, records how Alexios I Komnenos used a prediction of a total solar eclipse to his advantage in negotiations with the Pechenegs (K. Ferrari d’Occhieppo, JOB 23 (1974) 179–84). In the late Byz. period interest in eclipse prediction revived: we have computations in the translations from

ECCLESIOLOGY (ἐκκλησιολογία), a modern term to designate the study of the nature of the church. In Greek patristic literature and Byz. apologetic and dogmatic surveys, the church was never an object of systematic theological speculation. This lack of ecclesiological development, however, was not deliberate for the church was ultimately the context of all theology, the presupposition of all theological speculation. Besides, the church as a sociological phenomenon, as a visible institution with its own administrative structure and unity within the framework of the empire, was frequently the object of conciliar and imperial legislation. Texts such as the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles, the Epanagoge with its theory of the two powers, and the canonical corpus of the Council in Trullo are in fact a rich source of information on church structure, discipline, and ecclesiastical ideas. Equally, practical problems generated by canon law, such as the relationship between ecclesiastical and imperial legislation, were often the object of debate by canonists (cf. Balsamon, PG 104:981B–C).

In addition, from the 11th C. various authors dealt extensively with such issues as the prerogatives of a metropolitan and his relationship to the patriarch, right of appeal, celibacy, the functions of the patriarch as president of the synod, canonical questions raised by the Arsenite schism, and episcopal or clerical elections, depositions, ordinances, and resignations. Another essentially ecclesiastical problem was of course the debate over primacy (cf. Pentarchy). The church’s understanding of itself as an institution did not, however, emphasize structure or juridical categories exclusively, for these, it was realized, could never adequately exhaust or define the ultimate reality of the church as a divine and earthly community.

—A.P.
Persian and Arabic in the 1290s, in the treatises by Nikephoros Gregoras and Barlaam of Calabria in the 1330s, a number of such computations for the years 1374–1408 executed by John Abramos and his successors, and one by Michael Chrysokokkes in 1435.

Eclipses were, of course, one of those natural phenomena regarded as ominous in Byz. The texts that instructed Byz. on how to interpret these omens include Ptolemy (Astrological Effects 2, 5–10), Hephaestion of Thebes (Astrological Effects 1, 20–22), John Lydos (On Omens 9), Rhetorios of Egypt, and Theophilos of Edessa (Astrological Effects 6–7) as well as chapters of astrological texts translated from Arabic such as those of Abū Ma’shar and of Abū Hâmid al-ʿArab (“possibly Achmet ben Sirin”). The eclipse that marked the Crucifixion was often indicated in art by the averted heads of the Sun and Moon.

Observations of Eclipses and Their Use for Dating Events. Reports of eclipses in Byz. documents are to be used with caution. Although astronomically verifiable, the observational locations of most recorded Byz. solar and lunar eclipses are difficult to determine because of lack of precision in the historical records that is frequently compounded by textual corruption. Following the Aristotelian tradition Byz. scholars ascribed eclipses to natural astronomical causes, but the majority of the Byz. population interpreted them as divine signs or omens. Some eclipses were therefore invented or redated to suit a particular predictive purpose such as that of Pachymeres (Pachym., ed. Failler 159,4–6) for the death of Theodore II Laskaris in 1258. As in the case of comets, earthquakes, and fires, the annual commemoration of an eclipse (such as that of 8 Aug. 891) was occasionally incorporated into the liturgical calendar (Synax. CP 878,9–16). The most reliably attested Byz. solar eclipses occurred on 6 June 346; 28 Aug. 360; 19 July 418; 14 Jan. 484; 29 June 512; 4 Oct. 590; 5 Nov. 644; 5 Oct. 695; 15 Aug. 760; 16 Sept. 787; 14 May 812; 8 Aug. 891; 22 Dec. 968.


—D.P., B.C., A.C.

**ECLOGA** (Εκλογή τῶν νόμων, lit. "selection of the laws"), a law book issued in Mar. 741 (rather than 726) by Leo III and Constantine V. The Ecloga presents in 18 titles the most important legal standards for everyday life, representing the first official attempt at a revival of the administration of justice after over 100 years. Among the few substantive innovations are the restrictive divorce law (Ecloga 2.9), a regulation concerning division of war booty (18), and the penal law (17). The section on penal law introduces, in addition to a great number of punishable sexual offenses, a new system of punishment by mutilation that echoes the offense; it is surely to this that the announced “improvement in the sense of greater clemency” in the title of the law refers, because of the extensive restriction of capital punishment.

The originality of the Ecloga lies above all in its form. Its concise compilation of legal material and the fact that its selection and arrangement was oriented more to the circumstances of life than to legal systems made the Ecloga a prototype of the Byz. legal handbook. The Ecloga appears to have been quickly supplemented by the Appendix Eclogae (ed. L. Burgmann, S. Troianos, FM 3 [1979] 24–125), a heterogeneous collection of mainly penal law regulations. Along with the Appendix, which included the Nomos Stratiotikos, the Farmer’s Law, and the Rhodian Sea Law, the Ecloga constituted a corpus of secular law unrivaled until the end of the 9th C.

Under the Macedonian dynasty, the Ecloga was replaced, in a move to reappropriate Justinianic law, by the Ἐπαναγωγή; the latter, however, remained strongly indebted in content and form to the Ecloga, as did the Prochiron, issued somewhat later, whose polemic, as Schminck has shown (Rechtsbüchern 641), was directed not against the Ecloga but against the Epanagoge. The continuing popularity of the Ecloga is attested by the existence of numerous copies and compilations (some of southern Italian origin), the Zakoń Švédny Ljude and other Slavonic translations (see Law in Slavic Countries, Byzantine), an Arabic adaptation (ed. S. Leder, Die arabischen Eclogae [Frankfurt
am Main 1985), and an Armenian translation (see Law in the East, Byzantine).


-L.B.

ECLOGA AUCTA, an adaptation of the Ecloga. Designated in one MS as the “second Eklogadion,” it probably antedates the Macedonian period. As far as can be determined from the indirect (Ecloga privata aucta) or fragmentary transmission, the author borrowed the structure and style of the Ecloga and copied some of its chapters verbatim, but revised, replaced, or expanded the rest. The changes are characterized by a renewed rapprochement with Justinianic law; the mutilation punishments of the Ecloga are eliminated, with the exception of castration for sodomy (17.12b).


LIT. Troianos, Poinatios.

-L.B.

ECLOGA BASILICORUM, a legal commentary composed in 1142 by an unknown lawyer on a selection from the Basilika, which existed at the time but has not been transmitted independently. The commentary was intended to cover all 60 books of the Basilika but actually comprises only the first ten. Its sources are chiefly the complete text of the Basilika with scholia, the paraphrase of the Institutes by the 6th-C. jurist Theophilos, and the legal writings of the 11th C. The commentary is characterized by explanatory paraphrases, examples (thematismoi), short introductory explanations (protheorai), and quotations of legal principles (kanones). Recent imperial legislation is incorporated, and concrete examples are provided, esp. for the area of court procedure. The beginning of the work, as handed down, is not original.

LIT. L. Burgmann, Ecloga Basilicorum (Frankfurt am Main 1988).

-L.B.

ECLOGA PRIVATA AUCTA, a compilation of the Ecloga and Ecloga aucta. It is itself poorly transmitted, but nonetheless provides crucial evidence for the text of the Ecloga aucta. The pro-
ECONOMY. The Byz. economy was based primarily on agriculture; the intensive cultivation of land was typical of the littoral areas in both the Balkans and Asia Minor, whereas in the mountainous regions a pastoral economy predominated. Urban life was also concentrated mostly along the coastline. The means of production were limited as is typical of the Middle Ages—the ergasterion, operated by a family (with the help of one or two laborers) and located in the same building as the living quarters, was the main site of industrial activity, larger factorylike units being reserved for state needs (mint, armories, production of luxury goods); but even the “factories” were assemblages of individual producers rather than cohesive entities. In the countryside, production was organized on small parcels of land with the help of traditional agricultural implements requiring manual labor with only a limited use of animal power. The use of natural power resources was restricted mainly to water mills for grinding grain and to the automata at imperial palaces; the mechanical “pre-revolution” of the 12th and 13th C. touched Byz. only insignificantly, and the wind mill (in evidence by 1300) appeared here later than in the West. Nevertheless, until the end of the 12th C. Byz. was considered the wealthiest country of Europe, rich in grain, wine, dairy products, clothing, and jewelry.

Transportation (see Travel), like production, was limited. Poor roads rendered impossible overland trade of any significance, and the Byz. were mediocre sailors. The Roman domination over Mediterranean commerce was weakened by the Arabs in the 7th C., and Byz. maritime activity was sharply curtailed by the growth of the Italian maritime republics from the 12th C. onward. The Byz. did not organize trading expeditions on a large scale, preferring to attract their neighbors to Constantinople, Thessalonike, or Trebizond rather than to sail ships or organize caravans to foreign centers, although some Greeks traveled to the Crimea, Egypt, and Montpellier.

A monetary economy was always a characteristic of Byz., although some fluctuations in its history can be observed: unquestionably dominant in the 4th--mid-7th C., it declined thereafter; it was then revived first in Constantinople and the littoral areas (after 800) and then inland; it was extremely active from the 11th to mid-13th C., but subsequently Byz. coins were replaced by Italian currency, as the Levantine trade was transferred to Venice and Genoa and their colonies on Byz. soil. A barter economy, including rents and salaries in kind, existed not only in the countryside but also in Constantinople where officials and physicians were paid for their services, in part, with grain, fodder, and clothing.

Surviving figures on the Byz. budget and private wealth are not reliable; it can, however, be safely stated that Byz. aristocrats derived their incomes more from their salaries (and related revenues) than from their estates (G. Litavrin in VizOče [Moscow 1971] 152–68). Assets were expressed in terms of money rather than land. An example is the dowry of Theodora (Manuel I’s niece), which consisted of 100,000 hyperpers, plus 10,000 hyperpers for wedding expenses as well as jewelry, clothing, carpets, etc., estimated at 40,000 hyperpers, whereas her husband, Baldwin III of Jerusalem, gave her as a gift the city of Acre (William of Tyre, PL 201:734AB). Contrasting with this reality is the concept of Byz. moralists (e.g., Kekaumenos) that land is the most honorable source of income. The nonmonetary wealth of Byz. aristocrats consisted of livestock as well as land. Income from trade was held in low esteem, sometimes even despised.

The state played a major role in the Byz. economy: it levied taxes on land and trade, retained the privilege of minting, possessed certain monopolies, exercised control over guilds, and owned vast lands and workshops. All these supplied the state with large revenues. At the same time, the state had enormous expenses: for the army and diplomacy; for the salaries of dignitaries; for building activity; and for various largesses for ecclesiastical institutions, officials, and the needy. The largesses either took the form of direct donations, or conferral of the right to a portion of taxes, or exemption from taxation. The concentration of resources (in money and in kind) in the state treasury and their generous distribution among officials, churches, and indigents (primarily in Constantinople) created in the capital an atmosphere conducive to the increased production of various goods (esp. objects of luxury and
religious cult) and for the marketing of grain, meat, fish, etc. Constantinopolitan merchants, unlike those of Venice and Genoa who sought distant markets and resources, were not aggressive but conservative, awaiting imports and spoiled by the constancy of state demands.

There are many blank spaces in the picture of Byz. economic development, but it can be presented tentatively as follows: the late Roman economy was evidently prosperous but based on the exploitation of the countryside by the city and of the province by the capital. By the mid-7th C. the urban economy was in decay, trade shrinking, the monetary economy contracting; on the other hand, the countryside recovered after its previous stagnation and was able to compensate for the lost provinces. In the 9th and 10th C. slow revival concentrated around Constantinople, whereas in the mid-11th–mid-13th C. it was the provincial town that benefited most and the countryside that was able to supply agricultural goods to neighboring countries. The domination of the Italian republics in the Mediterranean led to greater economic activity in Byz. territory, but Greek merchants and the Byz. state harvested only a slight portion of the growing revenues.


ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH (οἰκουμενικός πατριάρχης). Only in the 6th C. did the term come into regular use as a courtesy title for the archbishops of Constantinople (Mansi 8:1038A, 1042D, 1058A). Patr. Menas, for example, used it in 536 (Mansi 8:959B). By the end of the century, under John IV Nesteutes, that title was also being used in official correspondence. Finally, by the 9th C., under Photios, it entered official protocol in addressing the patriarch. Michael I Keroularios was the first to introduce it on his seal (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, no.16).

Strictly speaking, the qualifying term denoted the superior Orthodox patriarch of the ecumenical empire of Byz., whose see was also the imperial capital. It did not mean “universal” bishop, but “superior” bishop (H. Grégoire, Byzantien 8 [1933] 570f). The title therefore was not intended to deprive Rome of its honorary primacy within the pentarchy; nor did it imply universal jurisdiction over the entire church. Still, Popes Pelagius II (579–90) and Gregory I the Great were scandalized by it (Mansi 9:1213C–E).

LIT. S Vaillé, Le titre de patriarche œcuménique avant saint Grégoire le Grand, EO 11 (1908) 65–69. V. Laurent, “Le titre de patriarche œcuménique et la signature patriar-
EDESSA (Ἕδεσσα, mod. Urfa in Turkey), capital of the province of Osroæne until it was lost to the Arabs ca.640; it remained an important Christian and commercial center in the Islamic world until at least the 13th C. Situated in the Mesopotamian plain, Edessa is dominated on the south by a high rock and crossed by the Daisian River. Little remains of late Roman Edessa apart from sections of Justinian I’s circuit walls, the temenos walls of the present Great Mosque (which stands beside what was probably the north-south cardo), traces of various structures on the acropolis, and rock-cut tombs. Local written sources, however, supply concrete details concerning the period.

Edessa was christianized in the 2nd C. when its king, Abgar IX (179–216), accepted the faith. The event was recorded in various legendary accounts that attribute the conversion of the king, identified by Eusebius as Abgar V the Black (4 B.C.—A.D. 7, then 13–50), to a correspondence with Christ, who sent him the Mandylion. The text of the letter was inscribed as a talisman above the city gates and the Mandylion came to be displayed in the cathedral. Christianity at Edessa was eventually represented by four groups (Monophysites, Nestorians, Chalcedonians, Maronites). Church building is recorded in the Chronicle of Edessa (of ca.540): a cathedral (312/13–23); its baptistery (369/70); and at least seven other churches (345–471), including that of the Apostle Thomas, visited by Egèria. Altogether 30 churches are known by name. Bishops and governors provided charitable and civic amenities between 458 and 505: infirmary, towers, bridges, circuit walls, aqueducts, baths, praetorium. Eulogios also provided 6,800 xestai of oil to light public porticoes. Following a flood Justinian rerouted the Daisian River and rebuilt the damaged southern part of the city, including the Cathedral of St. Sophia and the Antiphores, the latter being, apparently, an open space in front of a forum. In 578–603 Bp. Severos erected porticoes and “numerous constructions” (Michael I the Syrian, Chronicle 2:373).

Edessa was a literary and intellectual center of Syriac culture, whose writers included the theologians Aphrahat, Ephrem the Syrian, and Rab-

BULA of Edessa as well as Joshua the Stylist and Dionysios of Tell-Mahre. The theological school, founded in 363 by immigrants from Nisibis, was closed in the 5th C. for Nestorian bias; it was subsequently refounded at Nisibis.

During the 6th-C. Persian military campaigns, Edessa remained a rich, impregnable city. When it finally fell under Persian control from 602 to 628, it supplied Chosroes II with 120,000 pounds of silver, much of it from the furniture revetments of St. Sophia and the city’s wealthy inhabitants. Herakleios resided there after his victory over the Persians in 628. Conquered soon thereafter by the Arabs, Edessa was recovered in 944 by the Byz., who removed the Mandylion to Constantinople. The city fell to the Crusaders in 1098. The local Chronicle of 1234 records the conquest of Zengi in 1146 as particularly devastating, as was undoubtedly that of the Mongols. (For Edessa in Macedonia, see Vodena.)


EDESSA, COUNTY OF. The first Crusader state in Syria, the county included Edessa and Saruj east of the Euphrates, and Tell Bashir, Kesoun, and other towns west of it. In 1097 Baldwin of Boulogne was invited by the Armenians of Edessa to aid them; their lord Thoros adopted Baldwin. Thoros was soon murdered by his own people (A.A. Beaumont in The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to Dana C. Munro [New York 1928] 104–12), and Baldwin became count. Armenians constituted a large part of the county’s inhabitants. The Byz. never yielded their claim to Edessa, but it was too remote for them to exercise authority. After Zangi took Edessa, the area west of the Euphrates was preserved. In 1150, following the capture of Count Joscelin II, Countess Beatrice sold Tell Bashir, Aintab, Duluk, and a few other fortresses to Manuel I, who agreed to garrison them and pay Beatrice and her children a life-income. The Byz. troops, however, proved insufficient, and in 1151 Nur al-Din easily seized these places.

EDICT OF MILAN, the name given by modern scholars to the first decree granting toleration to Christianity, supposedly issued by CONSTANTINE I and LICINIUS as a result of a meeting in Milan in 313. The text of the edict, given by Eusebius of Caesarea (HE 10.5.2–14) and Lactantius (Lactant. De mort. pers. 48.2–12), grants religious freedom to both Christians and non-Christians and orders the return of confiscated church property. The authenticity of the edict was called into question by O. Seeck (ZKirch 12 [1891] 381) who pointed out that, according to Lactantius (Lactant. De mort. pers. 34; cf. Eusebius, HE 8.17.3–10), Galerius had issued a similar edict of toleration in 311. Others (e.g., Christensen, infra) have more recently argued that the originator of the edict was Licinius and that he was following in the tradition established by Galerius. Both Constantine (in 306) and even MAXENTIUS (in 311) had declared toleration prior to 313 and the whole concept of the “Edict of Milan” should probably be discarded. Nevertheless, the question continues to be debated (see M. Anastos, REB 25 [1967] 13–41).


EDICTUM (ἐδικτον), edict, term used for general laws following Roman tradition. Edicta were usually addressed to groups (all the emperor’s subjects or the inhabitants of a region or the members of a profession), but some were addressed to individuals (top officials, lay or ecclesiastic); they were usually signed by the emperor and countersigned by the quaesitor. The edictum differed from the sanctio pragmatica (pragmatikos typos) in that the latter was used for special laws, with general application but issued in response to a private request. With increasing frequency, laws were called novellae (constitutiones; see Novels), nearai (nomothesiai), or sakrai (from sacra lex). From the end of the 11th C. onward legislation was promulgated more and more in the form of a chrysobull or a prostagma.

LIT. Dölder-Karayannopoulos, Urkundenlehre 71–84.

EDIRNE. See Adrianople.

EDUCATION (παιδεία) in Byz. was based on two contradictory principles: Greco-Roman tradition and Christian faith. Christianity, in its extreme, rejected ancient civilization as permeated by false mythology, permissive and cruel morality, and a deceptive image of the world and its history; being a “religion of the Book,” however, it required of its followers an elementary aptitude for reading (see LITERACY) and the memorization of essential texts. The resolution of this contradiction was to maintain traditional educational methods and to make pagan literature acceptable by allegorical interpretation, by alleging derivation from Old Testament sources, by discerning in it a foreshadowing of Christianity, or by concentrating on the form while rejecting the content. Egyptian exercise books of the 4th–7th C. still contained mythological names and traditional maxims and anecdotes used for teaching reading and writing. Children in schools continued to be given the “venom” of Homer and the poets to develop their knowledge of language, while their upbringing was supposed to supply them with an “antidote” of moral precepts.

The 7th C. was a watershed in the development of education. By that time the tertiary schools (universities) had disappeared, and even secondary schools (those of grammar) became rare. In the 9th C. the young CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER was unable to find a grammatikos in Thessalonike. The scholarly curiosity of youth had to be content with private teachers, in the form of individual teacher-student connections, as was the case with LEO THE MATHEMATICIAN who found on Andros a “wise man” to teach him rhetoric, philosophy, and arithmetic. The vast majority of those who overcame illiteracy acquired only the rudimentary skills of reading and writing with the help of parents and local literate men. Thus JOSEPH THE HYMNOPHограф, who was born to a well-to-do family, was taught by his parents; there is no mention in his vita of a professional teacher or of Joseph’s going to school. NICHOLAS OF STOUDIOS was educated by his parents and continued his studies, from the age of ten, in the Stoudios monastery. These two examples may be atypical, however, and should be used with caution, since Joseph was born in Sicily and became a refugee in the Peloponnese, while Nicholas was destined to be a monk. Other saints’ vitae on occasion mention teachers (didaskalois) to whom children were sent to learn hiera grammata, the act of reading. The vita of THEODORE OF EDessa, which
describes the saint’s education by a sophist Sophronios whom the Edessenes had as a “common teacher” and who taught the boy grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy, is exceptional for 9th-C. saints; in reality it is a later hagiographic “romance” of the 10th C., reflecting the situation of the subsequent period.

This shift occurred in mid-9th-C. Constantinople when Caesar Bardas organized the Magnaura school to revive the “external [secular] wisdom” that had been neglected by previous generations “which wallowed in boorishness and illiteracy” (TheophCont 185.2–5). Leo the Mathematician, the head of the school, taught philosophy, while his student Theodore instructed in mathematics, Theodegios in astronomy, and Kometas in grammar. This school was revived or refounded by Constantine VII (TheophCont 446.1–22). Two sources provide insights into school life of the 10th C.—the vita of Athanasios of Athos, who started as a popular teacher in Constantinople, and the correspondence of the anonymous teacher (see Teacher, Anonymous). Secondary education, under control of the state, was concentrated in Constantinople and was organized on the private basis of teacher-student relations. It had as its major goal the formation of the higher echelon of functionaries. The main subject of teaching was grammar (with elements of eloquence and philosophy); students also studied the dead language of the ancient classics. The subject matter for training was Homer, Aelian, Demosthenes, etc., with the Bible added to this classical heritage. Epimerisms to the Psalms from the school of George Choiroboskos served as a textbook.

The 11th and 12th C. marked a new level in the development of Byz. education. An attempt was made to reintroduce the tertiary school, the University of Constantinople. Other educational institutions were also active in the capital, including the school at the Church of the Holy Apostles described in detail by Nicholas Mesarites, where the classes combined students of various ages, from children learning to count on their fingers to medical doctors discussing the pulse. The Patriarchal School was created, the new schedographia was applied as a method to enhance independence of thought, and competitions of students took place. The greatest intellectuals of the time were involved in education, including John Mauropos, Michael Psellus, Eustathios of Thessalonike. Unlike Western universities, however, the Byz. school of the 11th–12th C. was not granted legal independence; it functioned under the sway of the state, its main figures (nomophylax, maistor ton rhetoron, hypatos ton philosophon) being institutionally imperial officials. Moreover, from the end of the 11th C. onward the church was acquiring institutional impact on education.

The fall of Constantinople in 1204 was a heavy blow to education, which had been concentrated in the capital. An attempt to found a Latin university in Constantinople was stillborn. In the Greek-controlled territories of the splintered empire there seem to have been no formal academic institutions, but only individual teachers who attracted small groups of devoted followers; thus the young Nikephoros Blemmydes wandered from one teacher to another, via Nicaea, Smyrna, and Skamandros. He established a school with five students at the monastery of Gregory Thaumaturgos in Ephesus. After the recapture of Constantinople in 1261 Michael VIII founded a “school of philosophy” headed by George Akropolites. The school of Maximos Planoudes in Constantinople ca.1300 was linked with a monastery, although it was also supported by imperial grants (stieresia). Nikephoros Gregoras had his school in his room (oiikikos) in the Chora monastery. All these private schools concentrated on grammar, even though time and again the disciplines of the quadrivium are proudly mentioned. Much information on education in the 14th and 15th C. is contained in the letters and other writings of Theodore Hyrtaenos, George Lekapenos, and John Chortasmenos. The last evidence on Byz. schools is the correspondence of 1453 (J. Darrouzès, REB 22 [1964] 122), which mentions a school in Adrianople administered by a didaskalos and his young assistant. It was under the patronage of the local judge and was probably attached to his house.


—A.K., R.B.
EGERIA (4th C.), a wealthy nun from the western Mediterranean or a land on the Atlantic coast (Aquitaine? Galicia?) who left a detailed account (approximately one-third extant) of her journey to the Holy Land in 381–84. The earliest graphic account of Christian pilgrimage to survive, her Travels records observations and responses to a variety of Loca sancta in Palestine, Syria, and Egypt. Included are elements of the natural terrain (e.g., trees “planted by the patriarchs”), humble tombs and houses traditionally associated with heroes of the Old and New Testaments, churches that had been recently built by Constantine I, holy men (esp. in Egypt), and the local religious community and liturgy (particularly in Jerusalem). Indeed, her account is most valuable for what it reveals of the topography, piety, and esp. the liturgy of the Holy Land as pilgrimage was acquiring its distinctive Christian character and a rapidly increasing number of participants.


EGNATIA, VIA, Roman military road running across the Balkan peninsula, built in the second half of the 2nd C. B.C. It had two starting points on the Adriatic: Apollonia and Dyrrhachion. Thence it passed by Lychnidos (Ohrid), Heraclea Lynkestis (near Bitola), Edessa, Pella, and reached the Aegean Sea at Thessalonike. It then cut across the base of the Chalkidike peninsula to Amphiopolis and Philippi and originally terminated at Kypselas on the Hebros (Marica). Its extension to Byzantium appears not to have borne the name of Egnatia. From the Hebros the road went to Herakleia (Perinthos, Marmara Ereğlisi), then (before Constantine I) struck inland to avoid the lagoons of Athyras (Büyük Çekmece) and Rhegin (Küçük Çekmece), passing through Kainophrourion (Kurfait?) and Melantias (Yarım Bursuz?); it reached Byzantium at the gate of Melantias. By ca.330 the stretch from Herakleia to Byzantium was shifted to the coast and made to pass by Selymbria, Athyras, Rhegin, and what was to become the suburb of Hebdomon before terminating at the Golden Gate of Constantinople.

A number of milestones have been discovered, some of them post-Constantinian in date. The last epigraphically attested evidence of upkeep is of the reign of Valentinian and Valens (364–75), but Prokopios of Caesarea (Buildings 4.8.5) records that the stretch between Hebdomon and Rhegin was first paved by Justinian I. Whatever its physical condition, the Egnatia remained a major route of overland communication for much of the Middle Ages.


EGYPT. As a province of the late Roman Empire, Egypt was simultaneously the principal source of the vital grain supply and the seedbed of a flourishing and original culture. Thoroughly reorganized by the reforms of Diocletian, the region was divided into six provinces for most of the period—Aegyptus I and II, Augustamnica, Arcadia, and Thebaïd I and II—and integrated into the fabric of the empire. The 4th C. was a time of radical and profound change. The old Roman metropolis with its administrative division called a nome (the chora) became a civitas plus its territorium; the hinterland was made up of rural administrative districts (pagi) presided over by praepositi who took the place of the old strategoi. The taxation system was completely reworked according to principles of abstract productive units and collective responsibility. The workability of the liturgy system, which compulsorily assigned civic and administrative functions to members of the town councils and the decurion class, was shored up by ties to the central authority. The governor of Egypt was the Augustalis, with duces and praesides under him in the provinces. By 382 Egypt constituted a diocese of its own with its capital at Alexandria.

After the Great Persecution in 303, the Christian Church became a prime originator and carrier of culture in Egypt. The Coptic language emerged alongside Greek in the Bible and church services and eventually in record-keeping and public documentation; native Egyptian thinkers and writers were in the vanguard of thought in philosophy, theology, and belles-lettres. The monastic movement, beginning with Antony the Great and Pachomios, captured the imagination and channeled much of the best talent of Egyptian society.
The 5th C., less well documented, saw a further transformation from the mobile world of post-Constantinian society to a new pattern of greater stability. The Codex Theodosianus already reflects the growth of patronage and of attachment to one’s idia (Lat. origo, “place of origin”), which was to shape late antique Egypt. The fixed land-tax (demosios) payable in money did away with the older differentiated categories of land. The growth of the large estate (oikos) and the privilege of independent tax collection (autoprageia) are difficult to trace in the extant sources, but it may be assumed that they were substantial and their effects favored locally based productivity. The large monasteries became great landowners, encouraging both economic and literary output. The increasing centralized power of the patriarchate of Alexandria, under such bishops as Cyril and the monastic leadership of Shenoute, encouraged Egyptian ecclesiastical independence prior to the Council of Chalcedon (451). Open controversy over what constituted authentic patriarchal authority and succession produced polemical literature, liturgical experimentation, and the beginnings of a self-defining Egyptian Christian hagiography, esp. monastic biography. The first effort to compose a history of the Egyptian church in Coptic also occurred in the later 5th C. Egyptian poets traveled widely (see Poets, Wandering), serving as court officials and envoys; Nonnos of Panopolis reshaped the late Greek epic and told the Gospel story in hexameters.

The tax reforms of Anastasios I (before 518) and the thorough reorganization of Egypt by Justinian I’s Edict 13 (probably 538/9) together restructured and centralized the administration and its bureaucracy. The doux of each province held both civil and military power, and local tax collection was managed by pagarchs, officials of the notable class who succeeded to the functions of the old decurions. The large landowners of each area grouped together as syntelestai to look after their interests and maintain the rights of their tenants. The estates of these proprietors functioned in a quasi-public manner: the rent (phoros) payable to an estate’s central office came to function as a tax revenue, while the tenants of an estate performed jobs equivalent to compulsory services (letourgeiai). The embole or annual grain shipment to Constantinople was maintained using vessels belonging to both magnates and monasteries. Financial records were extremely thorough, as the abundant surviving papyri attest. By the 6th C. Egypt possessed a rich local culture that integrated with striking success classical pagan learning and a strong locally based Christianity. Comparative prosperity encouraged a flowering of the visual arts, esp. sculpture and textiles (see Coptic Art and Architecture), and an active literary life in both Greek and Coptic, producing works ranging from encomiastic poetry to philosophy, theology, homilies, and saints’ Lives. Coptic jurisprudence also came into its own.

The successors of Justinian developed varying economic and religious policies for Egypt. Under Maurice all official documents had to begin with a Christian invocation. Abundant papyrus documentation in both Greek and Coptic attests to the continuing vitality of economic and social institutions; the numerous papyrus codices of classical
and patrician literature produced in the later 6th–early 7th C. illustrate the ongoing currents of Egyptian cultural life. Coptic visual art continued to flourish. Herakleios’s revolt against Phokas led to his taking control of Egypt ca. 609. During his reign the Persians occupied Egypt between 618/19 and 628/9, leaving behind papyrus documents in Pahlavi. Herakleios’s appointee to the Chalcedonian patriarchate, Kyros “the Caucasian,” also discharged civil functions. Both Benjamin I, the non-Chalcedonian patriarch, and the influential Upper Egyptian bishop Pesynthios of Coptos lived to be eyewitnesses of the Arab conquest, as did the monastic founder Samuel of Qalaman and the chronicler John of Nikia. The political takeover of Egypt by a Muslim military force proceeded piecemeal (640–42). Historians still have not satisfactorily explained the reasons for its success. Most of the late antique administrative structure remained in place for about a hundred years, but after ca. 800 the old culture began to die.


EIDIKON (éidíkon), imperial treasury and storehouse. The etymology of the word is disputed; Guillard supported the view that it originates from idikos, “private,” whereas Bury (Adm. System 98) flatly rejects this derivation and E. Stein (Studien 149) connects the term with the word eidos, “ware.” Accordingly, it remains uncertain whether the eidikon was the emperor’s private treasury, that is, the successor to the department of the Comes rerum privatarum, or a special state treasury that had no connection with the emperor’s patrimonium.

The first mention of the eidikon is in the 9th C., from the reign of Theophilos; Laurent’s assertion (infra 305) that the institution was autonomous from the 7th C. is not supported by any evidence. The eidikon was a storehouse of precious goods, such as gold and silk as well as various materials for the needs of the army and the navy, and Arab dress for spies. The eidikon functioned as a state treasury; one of its responsibilities was the payment of roga to senators. The head of the eidikon was called eidikos (variants idikos and edikos) or epi tou eidikou, and from the 11th C. logothetes tou eidikou. In addition to regular notaries, his staff included archontes ton ergodosion and directors of the armamenton and of the warehouses in the Great Palace. The sekretos of the logothetes tou eidikou was still functioning in 1081 (Lavra 1, no. 43,65), and eidika (in the plural) are mentioned in a formula of exemption in 1086 (Lavra 1, no. 48,50). Thereafter the department seems to have been abolished; Guillard suggests that it was replaced by the logothesion of the oikeiakoi.


EILITON (ειλίτων, lit. “wound, wrapped”), a cloth spread over the top of the altar for setting the eucharistic elements, the Byz. equivalent of the Latin corporal. Eilita were of linen (Symeon of Thessalonike, PG 155:317B) and possibly silk. In the post-Byz. period their function was superseded by the antimension. As with other altar cloths, such as the endyte, the eilita were given symbolic significance in liturgical commentaries, esp. as the winding sheets of Christ (e.g., pseudo-Sophronios in PG 87:3985B). No Byz. eiliton has survived. Although it is generally believed that eilita were unadorned, they may, in fact, have had decoration: several painted representations of altar-tables show the eucharistic vessels placed over eilita-like covers decorated with corner gamma, for example, the Melchizedek and Abel mosaic in S. Vitale, Ravenna, and the Communion of the Apostles mosaic in St. Sophia, Kiev.


EISAGOGE. See ΕΠΑΝΑΓΟΓΗ.

ΕJMIAΣΩΝ. See ΒΑΛΑΡΣΑΠΑΤ.

EKDİKOS. See ΠΡΟΤΕΚΔΙΚΟΣ.

EKDOΣIS (ἐκδοσις, “issuing, publication”), or editio (Lat.), recension of the text of a work of literature made available by the author or by an editor for copying. First used by Alexandrian scholars to
denote a recension of the text of Homer, in Byz. usage ehdosis often denotes a particular version of a text believed to have been approved by the author. Thus Photios (Bibl., cod.77) owned copies of two ehdoseis of the History of Eunapios and the first ehdosis of the Atticist lexicon of Ailios Dionysios (Bibl. cod.152). The Breviarium of Patr. Nikephoros I and the History of Niketas Chroniates survive in two variant recensions that are possibly the work of the author. Sometimes successive ehdoseis of a text have become amalgamated in the MS tradition and can be reconstructed only in part by textual criticism, as is the case with the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius of Caesarea. Early versions of official texts were sometimes suppressed and replaced by later versions; thus the first version of the Codex Justinianus, issued in 528, but lost, is known only from the preface to the second edition, published ex repetita praelectione (De emendatione Codicis Justiniani, par.4). The term ehdosis is sometimes used in the Palaiologan period for a version of a classical text—most often a play—accompanied by marginal notes and other explanatory matter and prepared by a scholar for teaching purposes. It also sometimes denotes a collection of the letters or speeches of a Byz. writer, often in chronological order, as in the case of Michael Chroniates, and prepared by the author himself or by a friend or pupil. In antiquity and the Middle Ages there is nothing corresponding to an “edition” of a printed book. Handwritten books are never entirely uniform.

—R.B.

EKKLESIARCHES (ἐκκλησιάρχης, fem. ἐκκλησιάρχισσα), sacristan, a church official who was responsible for setting out the liturgical books, sacred vessels, eucharistic wine and bread, and for providing the appropriate number of candles and lamps for lighting the church. In monasteries, the ekklesiarches was one of the leading officials, appointed by the superior. At the Be-baias Elpidos Nunnery in Constantinople, the ekklesiarchissa, together with the oikonomos, was second only to the superior; at Lips, however, she was subordinate to the skewophylakissa (see Skewophylax). The ekklesiarches not only prepared the church for services, but led the monks or nuns in the singing of the offices, making sure that they knelt or stood at the proper moment, made responses correctly, and that no sections of the office were omitted or recited in wrong order. The ekklesiarches also maintained proper discipline among the monks or nuns. The typikon of Bebaias Elpidos (pp.45.19-47.31) states that the ekklesiarchissa should be a good singer who is very familiar with the liturgy, esp. since she is responsible for the instruction of novices in the chanting of the office. The ekklesiarches at the Petrizes monastery (Typikon, ed. Gautier, p.69.827-30) received an annual stipend of 20 nomismata.

—A.M.T.
EKPHRASIS (ἐκφρασις), a formal description. Well known in ancient literature, description received its formal definition in the rhetoric of the Roman Empire: the textbooks considered an ekphrasis as a descriptive speech (logos) whose goal was to make the subject visible; HERMOGENES lists as subjects of ekphrasisis persons, places, periods of time, actions, and feasts. NICHOLAS OF MYRA adds to this list works of art. The theoreticians of rhetoric perceived the ekphrasis as a kind of PROGYNASMA, but in practice the ekphrasis was essential to many major genres (epic, historiography, romance, hagiography, etc.) or existed as a separate unit in prose (ekphrasis proper) or verse (epigram). While persons and actions became in practice the subject of other rhetorical genres, primarily panegyrics, ekphrasesis focused on the description of works of art, mainly buildings, either secular (e.g., by PROKOPIOS OF GAZA, CHORIKIOS, CONSTANTINE MANASSES) or sacred (by GREGORY OF NYSSA, PAUL SILentiARIOS, NICHOLAS MESARITES); epigrams often dealt with minor artifacts. Ekphrasesis of cities were typical of the earlier period (e.g., LIBANIOS on Antioch), disappeared for a long time, but were revived in the 13th–15th C. by THEODOROE II LASKARIS, Theodore Metochites, Bessarion, and John Eugenikos. Ekphrasesis of religious feasts were common, often inserted in a sermon. Rhetoricians also produced descriptions of everyday objects: gardens (usually embedded in a romance), hunting scenes (Constantine Manasses, Constantine Pantechnes), and fairs (TIMARION). Even parodical and critical ekphrasesis are known: SYMEON THE THEOLOGIAN describes the silly behavior of the lazy merchant at a fair, and GREGORY ANTIOCHOS the shabbiness of Serdica.


EK PROSOPOU (ἐκ προσόπου), a generic term for deputy or representative, similar to ANTIPOSON. The Taktika of Leo VI (ch.4.7, PG 107:701C) applies this term to the strategos as imperial legate; Basil BOIOANNES, strategos and katepano of Italy, calls himself ek prosopou in a document of 1023 (GUILLOU, Byz. Italy, pt.VII [1961], 28.30–31). Various functionaries, even metropolitans, had ek prosopou as deputies. In the Taktika of the 9th–10th C. the ek prosopou occupied a place lower than strategos and was considered a temporary representative of the strategos, katepano, or kleisourarches. AHRWEILER (infra) hypothesizes that the ek prosopou had primarily fiscal functions but the evidence is not clear. Kekaumenos (Kek. 196.20) forms a noun ekprosopike for the district under an ek prosopou and states that it, along with archontia, could be a risky source of income; the ek prosopou of various themes (ANATOLIKON, BOUKELLARION, etc.) and regions (ATHENS, PHILIPPOLIS, etc.) are named on seals. In the 11th C. the asekretis Michael served as ek prosopou of [the logothetes] ton agelon (ZACOS, SALS 2, no.845). The term probably disappeared after the 12th C., but in a document of 1214 (?) an obscure tax, ekproseptikon, is listed after kaniskion (Paimou Engraphe 1, no.23.9; cf. no.36.13).


EKTHESIS (Εκθεσις, “statement of faith”), the formula issued by Emp. Heraclios at the end of 638 in an attempt to reconcile Chalcedonians and Monophysites by supporting MONOTHELETISM. The text of the Ekthesis, which was written by PATR. SERGIOI I of Constantinople, attempted to end disputes concerning MONOENERGISM by forbidding a discussion of the energy in the person of Christ, while asserting that the two natures of Christ were joined by a single will (see FREE WILL). The formula “one will” had been proposed by POPE Honorius I (625–38) in a letter to Sergios. Although the Ekthesis was accepted by local councils in Constantinople in 658 and 659, Heraclios soon realized the futility of his conciliatory attempt and did not press the issue. Constans II withdrew the Ekthesis, replacing it with the Typos (see TYPOS OF CONSTANS II) in 648. The Ekthesis was condemned at the Third Council of Constantinople in 680 (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF).

ED. MANSI 10:901–98.


EKTHESIS NEA (lit. “new setting out”), the only known Byz. chancery handbook, dated 1 Sept.
1386. Preserved in many MSS, it concerns letters (pittakia), mainly those written by ecclesiastics. Though not a true formulary, it lists opening (and eventually concluding) formulas used by the patriarch of Constantinople in letters addressed to other patriarchs, autocephalous archbishops and suffragan metropolitans and archbishops; opening formulas used by the patriarch and by metropolitans when writing to other ecclesiastics and to lay rulers; presentation of the patriarchal pittakia; opening formulas for all kinds of letters of laymen and of ecclesiastics (only in MS Sinai gr. 1609); and transfers and promotions of bishops (ceremonies, documentary formulas). The Ekthesis Nea is interesting for the political and social ideologies reflected in the formulas and for the unique insights it provides into the patriarchal chancery's secret methods of preventing or discovering forgeries: the usage or lack of a seal, the kind and placement of the seal, the format in which the letter was folded, and the formulation and placement of the address all had to be combined according to strict, complicated, and secret rules in order to guarantee the authenticity of the document.

ED. AND LIT. Darrouzès, “Ekthesis Nea.”

ELATIKON (ελατικόν, probable etymology, “for marching”), an accessory tax mentioned in several documents of the 11th C. (e.g., Ivið., no.30.33; Lavra 1, no.39.7; Pantel., no.3.30), always in connection with synethia. According to a treatise on taxation (ed. Dölger 122.21–22), synethia was collected for the dioiketai (an act of 1047 speaks of the synethia of the dioiketes and of elatikon [Ivið., no.29.96]), whereas elatikon was received by taxeotai (probably the subalterns of the dioiketai), whose functions are not known. A novel of Alexios I, the so-called Palaia logarike (see Logarike, Palaia and Nea), states that elatikon is collected by the genikón and transferred to officials called sekretoí (Zepos, Jus 1:332.20–23). An act of 1098 directs that synethia and elatikon, as well as another secondary tax, dikeraiosexapollon, be paid to the owner or partial owner of the village (or of its part), Maria Basilakina (Dölger, Schatz., no.65.13–14). Elatikon was calculated as a certain part of the main tax, and the total of synethia and elatikon from a single estate should not rise above 10 nomismata (Zepos, Jus 1:333.41–43).

LIT. Svoronos, Cadastre 82f. Litavrin, VizObiščtvo 90.

—A.K.

ELECTRUM. See Coins.

ELEMOI MONASTERY. See HELIOU BOMON MONASTERY.

ELEOUSA MONASTERY. See VELJUSA MONASTERY.

ELEPHANTS (sing. έλεφας). The Byz. knew both the African and Indian elephant; Kosmas Indikopleustes (3:353–54) distinguished between the Indians, who domesticated the elephant, and the Africans, who hunted them. Byz. armies frequently encountered war elephants during the Persian Wars (Prokopios, Buildings 2.1.11; Agath. 110.8–11, 119.4–8). In the early 7th C. Heraclios made a triumphal entrance into Constantinople in a chariot drawn by four elephants that were exhibited in the circus and the Hippodrome (Nikeph. 22.20). By that time, however, the elephant was not widely used for warfare. The author of the Anonymous Treatise on Strategy (6th C. or later) did not discuss fighting with elephants because he considered their use obsolete (Dennis, Military Treatises 44.20–21).

Their appearance in the empire was a rare sight. Marcellinus Comes reported the arrival of an elephant in Constantinople in the reign of Anastasios I (MGH AuctAnt XI.2.94, 33–34), while John of Ephesus (3.2.48, 3.6.10) described the “pious” behavior of several such beasts in the Hippodrome under Justinian I, perhaps booty from the Persian War. Constantine IX Monomachos obtained an elephant and a giraffe for his zoo in Constantinople (see ANIMALS). In the Diegesis ton tetrapodon zoon (106.943) the elephant is mocked because his legs lack joints. The Physiologos (128–33), however, portrays the elephant as a sacred animal whose characteristics and habits symbolize man’s fall and salvation. As the source of ivory, its tusks were always prized; esp. large examples are shown among the offerings to an emperor on the Barberini Ivory.

Statues of elephants stood in public places in Constantinople (Parastaseis 80.18–19, 98.9–13). In most surviving mosaic representations the ge-
nus is indeterminate, but the peristyle mosaic at the Great Palace of Constantinople clearly depicts both an African and an Indian elephant, one attendant upon Dionysos, the other engaged in an animal combat. An African elephant is depicted with some verisimilitude in the Venice MS of the Kyngeletika (see Oppian), fol.36r; others, much more fantastic, occur among the fauna that adorn the frames of canons tables.


ELESBOAM (Ἐλεσβωάς, Ἑλλησθεαῖος), also called Kaleb Ella Asbeha; Christian king of Axum (from ca.520); saint; born ca.500, died ca.540. In alliance with Justin I, Elesboam led an expedition to Hîmår in 525, defeated the native king Dho-Nuwas, and set in his place Sumayfâ' Ashwa', who was eventually overthrown by Abara; the latter nevertheless remained Elesboam's vassal. Elesboam's victory inscription was discovered in Ma'rib (A. Caquot, Annales d'Ethiopie 6 [1965] 223–26). Elesboam did not succeed in transforming South Arabia into a fully integrated part of Axum. Malalas (Malal. 457ff) describes the luxury of his costume and of his chariot pulled by four elephants.

Elesboam was a Monophysite and the Axumite church acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria. In Christian tradition he appears as a builder of churches and destroyer of idols in South Arabia (I. Shahid, DOP 33 [1979] 55–66).


ELIAS (Ἠλίας), a spatharios and retainer of Justinian II sent in 711 with a naval expedition to Cherson and installed there as governor. Elias soon joined the revolt of Philippikos, whereupon Justinian murdered his children and "compelled his wife to marry her Indian cook" (Theoph. 379.16–17). After Philippikos entered Constanti- nople, Elias was detailed to pursue Justinian into Asia Minor. Finding the emperor's camp at Damatrys and inducing his Byz. and Bulgarian troops to desert him, Elias personally decapitated Justinian and returned the head to Constantinople.

Lit. Stratos, Byzantium 5:157–75.

ELIAS I, patriarch of Jerusalem (23 July 494–Aug. 516); born ca.430, died Aila, on Red Sea, 20 July 518. An Arab by birth, he spent his early youth as an anchorite in the Nitrian desert. During the Monophysite persecution of Timotheos Ailouros Elias took refuge in the lavra of Euthymios the Great in Palestine, and in 473 was ordained priest. While serving at the Church of
the Anastasis in Jerusalem he founded two monasteries near Jericho. His episcopate was troubled by Monophysite infiltration into Palestine. In his resistance he received the help and repeated support of St. Sabas. At the council of Sidon (511) the dissident opposition failed to force him to denounce the Council of Chalcedon. His attitude ultimately caused his deposition and banishment (Aug. 516) to Aila as Monophysitism was strengthened under Emp. Anastasios I. But his stand was also a factor in the failure of Anastasios to impose Monophysitism as the official faith of the empire. Significantly, the emperor's selection of a successor to Elias marks the beginning of Constantinople's interference in the internal affairs of the patriarchate of Jerusalem and in the appointment of its patriarchs.


ELIAS BAR SHINAYÁ, a scholar, monk, and priest of the Nestorian community; metropolitan of Nisibis (from 1008); born Nisibis 11 Feb. 975; died after 1049. Bilingual in Syriac and Arabic, he has to his credit a long list of works in both languages, only a few of which have been published in modern editions or studied by modern scholars. His particularly important contributions to scholarship were in Syriac grammar and lexicography, religious dialogue with the Muslims, and historiography. Elias was the only Nestorian man of letters to compose a universal history in Syriac, and it is this work alone, usually called the Chronography, that is well known. It survives in a unique MS (London, B.L. 7197) that dates from the writer’s own era. The Chronography is in two parts, the first of which includes the universal chronicle and a list of canons; the second part is a treatise on the calendar systems of the several communities in the Oriental patriarchates, complete with conversion tables to tabulate the references from one system to another. For Byz. history the chronicle is valuable for its notices of military engagements between the Arabs and the Byz., esp. in the 10th and early 11th C.


—S.H.G.

ELIAS EKDIKOS, theologian, fl. 11th C. (Beck, Kirche 588) or 11th-12th C. (Disdier, infra). His biography is unknown, and his works are often ascribed to other authors: Maximos the Confessor, John of Karpathos, Nikephros Moschopoulos (N. Tomadakes, Athena 78 [1980–82] 284f). His major work is a Florilegium entitled Other Chapters, a compact presentation of Christian piety. Elias distinguishes three elements of the human being: the body (connected with aisthesis, the capacity of feeling); the soul with its faculties, dianoia (“thought”) and logos; and nous (“reason”). The human being is normally mired in passions, but while Maximos considers all the passions as directed against nature, Elias is ready to accept that corporeal passions are kata physin (“according to nature”). The main path to salvation is, according to Elias, through acquiring apatheia, liberation from passions, and the fear of God is an important means to achieve this end. Apparently Symeon the Theologian influenced Elias, but he differs from Symeon in the system of his imagery, preferring agricultural and military metaphors and similes (Kazhdan, “Simeon” 18).

Ed. PG 90:1401–61 (under the name of Maximos) and 127:1129–76.


—A.K.

ELIAS OF ALEXANDRIA, Neoplatonist commentator of Aristotle (6th C.), possibly the same person as Elias, prefect of Illyricum in 541, although the title apo eparchon could have a different meaning. He seems to have succeeded Olympiodoros of Alexandria ca.565–70 as the head of the Alexandrian philosophical school and was in turn succeeded by David the Philosopher. The MS tradition of Elias is confused and the distinction between him, David, and the so-called pseudo-Elias as well as their distinction from earlier authors is not always clear. It is assumed that the oeuvre of Elias includes commentaries on Aristotle’s Organon, on Porphyry’s Isagoge, and
probably *Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy* as well as some minor works. Although officially Christian, Elias supported the ancient idea of the eternity of the world, whereas David mentions this doctrine without discussing it. Elias also followed Olympiodoros in defending the priority of the universal in nature as well as in logic.


---

**ELIAS SPELEOTES**, saint; born Reggio Calabria 864?, died nearby at Saline, 11 Sept. 960. His vita, which attributes to him a longer life than that of the first hermit, Antony, mentions very wealthy parents and an accident that maimed his hand and led to the surname Monocheir (“One-Hand”). After unsuccessful attempts at becoming a hermit in Muslim Sicily and a recluse in Rome, Elias ultimately found a spiritual master in his Calabrian homeland, the monk Arsenios. Together they fled Muslim attacks by crossing to Patras in the Peloponnesos. Upon returning to Reggio, they met **ELIAS THE YOUNGER** and his disciple Daniel, with whom Elias dwelt at Saline after their two masters had died. He then moved north to Melicucca, near Seminara, where he began to direct crowds of followers, first in a lavra involving many small caves, and then, after a vision of himself nurturing a hive of bees, in a monastery in a large cave. Elias was also a scribe who copied many books. His Life, written at Melicucca at least a generation later, features control over animals, exorcisms, prophesies, and ecstatic trances. He reportedly warned the patrikios Byzalon that he who resists the emperor resists the divine order and precisely predicted this rebel’s death.


---

**ELIJAH** (’Há‘és), Hebrew prophet who was taken up to heaven in a fiery chariot. John Chrysostom contrasted Elijah with Christ: in ascending to heaven, the former gave his cloak to Elisha (4 Kg 2:13), whereas the latter gave the gifts of grace (charismata) to his disciples (PG 50:450). In a second homily Chrysostom compared Elijah’s cloak with the eucharistic body (sarx) of Christ (PG 49:46). These ideas were not taken up in the
visual arts, although Elijah’s Ascent (4 Kg 2:11–19) appears as early as the Via Latina catacomb in Rome. More extensive narrative cycles are found in the Sacra Parallela, as illustrations to the Book of Kings, and, surprisingly, in the diakonikon of the church at Morača (1252), where Elijah’s birth and ten other scenes from his life are depicted (A. Skovran-Vukčević, ZRVI 5 [1958] 149–72). Elijah’s most frequent appearance is in the New Testament image of the Transfiguration. Because of his association with mountains, Elijah’s name was attached to monasteries and settlements in lofty locations throughout the empire. A 12th-C. icon at Sinai (Soteriou, Eikones, no.74) may be due to a local cult on this mountain. Basil I was esp. devoted to Elijah, founding or rebuilding many churches dedicated to him. Elijah is occasionally cited in hagiography, as in the vita of David of Thessalonike (ed. Rose, ch.16.31).

- J.H.L., A.C., C.B.T.

ELIS. See Andrawida.

ELISABETH THE THAUMATURGE, mid-5th-C. saint; born near Thracian Heracleia, died Constantinople; feastday 24 Apr. Elisabeth was born to a “noble and rich” couple, after a long period of sterility, on their estate on Thrakokrene (later Abydenoi). Orphaned at 15, she divided her gold, silver, and other property among the poor, emancipated her slaves, and confined herself in the nunnery of St. George on the Mikros Lophos, in Constantinople. Two years later her paternal aunt, hegoumene of the convent, died, and Patr. Gennadios I appointed Elisabeth in her place. Leo I conferred on the nunnery an imperial estate of St. Babylas in Hebdomon where a dragon dwelt. Elisabeth, in imitation of St. George whose convent she headed, “sealed” the dragon with her cross, spit on him (W. Lackner, AB 92 [1974] 287f), and trampled him to death. She performed cures, including posthumous healing miracles. An anonymous Life of Elisabeth is preserved in a 14th-C. MS, but Halkin (infra) dates this vita before 591 on the basis of an argumentum ex silentio (no mention of the Avar devastation of Herakleia). It is plausible that Elisabeth’s legend is a female version of St. George and the dragon.

- A.K.

ELIŠE, author of an Armenian History describing the unsuccessful revolt led by Vardan Mamikonian against Sasanian overlordship in 450/1. Of Eliše little is known, and it is debatable whether he wrote as an eyewitness (as he claims) or whether this History was written after that of Lazār oF P‘arpi, who describes the same events somewhat differently.

Eliše’s History is one of the most sophisticated works in early Armenian literature. Speeches, letters, and dialogue enhance Eliše’s message; according to him, nation and Christian faith are one, the apostate and the traitor are identical. Eliše was familiar with a wide range of Greek and Syriac texts, but his main model was the Maccabees. The setting is Armenia and Iran; Eliše notes that the Byz. emperor Marcian abandoned the Christian Armenians to their fate. Some later Armenian writers (e.g., Vardan Vardapet) adduce this war of 450/1 as the reason for the absence from the Council of Chalcedon of bishops from Greater Armenia. Numerous theological works are also attributed to Eliše, but their authorship is most uncertain.

- R.T.

ELPIDIOS (Έλπιδος), a patrikios sent as strategos to Sicily by Empress Irene in Feb. 781. Within two months he was accused of supporting Caesar Nikephoros and his brothers who were aspiring to the throne; Eplidios may even have proclaimed himself emperor. Irene sent the spatharios Theophilos to arrest Eplidios; when the Sicilians would not surrender him, she had his wife beaten, tossed, and imprisoned with his sons in Constantinople. Perhaps it was in reaction to the revolt of Eplidios that Irene sought an alliance with Charlemagne through a marriage between his daughter Rotrud and her son Constantine VI (C. Tsirpanlis, Byzantina 6 [1974] 347). In 782 Irene
dispatched a large expedition to Sicily, forcing Elpidios to flee to North Africa, where the Arabs reportedly invested him with imperial regalia. In 794 he accompanied Sulaymân, the son of Hārūn al-Rashîd, on a raid into Byz. territory (E.W. Brooks, EHR 15 [1900] 741).


ELPIOS THE ROMAN. See Oulpios.

EMBASSIES, FOREIGN. Foreign ambassadors and their retinues were received at the frontier by the service responsible for the imperial post; on their way to Constantinople, they were accompanied by officials (basilikoi), were provided with safe-conducts (sometimes chrysobullai), used the post (dromos) facilities, and were offered food and hospitality by the taxpayers of the regions that they crossed (this was a secondary tax). Once in the capital, they were in contact with the magister officiorum and in later centuries the logothetes tou dromou, who also accompanied them in official meetings. They were the responsibility of the scrinium barbarorum (early period) and resided in a special residence, the apokrissiarkion. The emperor tried to impress them by displaying his power and wealth and by stressing his supremacy among rulers, sometimes by using mechanical gimmicks (automata); then he might invite them for meals and eventually have direct discussions with them, such as the ones vividly described by Liutprand of Cremona. Simplicity prevailed in the later centuries with the decline of the empire. The exchange of presents was a standard feature of all incoming and outgoing embassies, whose security was guaranteed by the receiving state, sometimes (for barbarians) by giving or exchanging hostages. (For outgoing Byz. embassies, see Ambassadors.)


EMBOLOS (ἐμβόλος), the regular late antique word for a colonnaded street, also denoted the porticoes that lined it. The frequent appearance of the term in texts and inscriptions of the 4th–6th C. reflects the appearance of the cities, in which emboloi were a prominent element, common to any place of size or pretension. The streets often served as main arteries through the cities (though many were closed to wheeled vehicles). The colonnades provided access to shops which formed the major commercial centers, often replacing the ancient agoras. As commerce flourished, vendors’ booths were often set up between the columns, and shops were extended out into the street despite official prohibition. Emboloi were particularly prominent in Constantinople where they connected all parts of the city. Principal emboloi in Constantinople were those of the argyropratai, of Domninus, of Leontios, and of Zeuxippos as well as the Grand (Makro) and the New (Neos) emboloi. After the 7th C., emboloi in provincial cities generally lost their function and were frequently built over with houses.


EMBROIDERY, either of silver (ἀργυροκέφαλης) or of gold (χρυσοκέφαλης, also chrysosolenokenteta, chrysoklabia, and chrysoklabaria) was used for the costume of emperors and high functionaries, liturgical cloths, etc. It was executed by skilled artisans, or chrysoklabaroi: Theophanes (Theoph. 469.3–4) refers to an imperial workshop of chrysoklabaroi in Constantinople; Philotheos speaks of imperial tailors, chrysoklabaroi, and goldsmiths as participating in court ceremonial (Oikonomides, Listes 133.9–10); and an Epitaphios in Berat (ca.1376) is signed by a chrysoklabares George. The De ceremoniis frequently mentions embroidered costumes but rarely describes them in detail; once it speaks of the emperor’s purple maphorion as covered with gold-embroidered roses (De cer. 529.15). The lóros, esp. that worn by emperors, was particularly sumptuous, embroidered with gold and precious stones. The finest embroideries were done with silk, gold, or silver threads on purple, red, or blue silk backing. Silk threads were used primarily for faces and occasionally detail. Most of the design was embroidered with gold and silver threads made either as metal strips wound around a silk, often colored, yarn (these are known as chryso- and argyronemata or by the attributive solenotos or klapotos) or as finely drawn wires (known
as *syrmata*); both were applied by couching. Embroideries could also include pearls and enamels (e.g., on the Great Sakkos of Patr. Photos of Moscow, 1409–13).

Except for a few fragments from Egypt, surviving embroideries are late in date; the Halberstadt KALYMMATA of ca. 1195 are probably the earliest datable example. Other important specimens include the 13th-C. St. Lawrence textile sent to Genoa by Michael VIII Palaiologos (now in the Palazzo Bianco in Genoa) as well as the so-called Dalmatic of Charlemagne, and the Thessalonikē aer, both 14th C. The use of embroidery in the decoration of textiles appears to have increased with the decline of silk weaving and a greater demand for specific figurative compositions on liturgical cloths and costume in the Palaiologan period.


EMESA (Ἐμέσα, Έμεσας, Αρ. Ήμίς [Homs] in Syria), city of the province of Phoenicia Libanensis, at the crossing of routes from PALMYRA to the sea and from DAMASCUS to the north. It became an autocephalous metropolitan see under the patriarch of ANTIOCH after the head of John the Baptist was discovered there in Feb. 453 by monks of the Spelaion (Cave) Monastery; the relic was placed in the cathedral and venerated by pilgrims. Although about 300 Greek inscriptions from Emesa (dating from the 1st C. B.C. onward) have been published (*IGL* Συρ. 5, nos. 2202–501), there are relatively few other archaeological remnants of the antique city; those of the Byz. period include a basilica and funerary chapel (ibid. 2205–11). The vitae of local saints, such as Julian of Emesa, and esp. the vita of SYMON of EMESA by Leontios of Neapolis (C. Mango in *Byz. und der Westen* 25–41) mention other, public buildings: a hippodrome, theater, two baths. ROMANOS THE MELODE was a native of Emesa. The city was under Persian rule from 609/10 to 628.

There are several conflicting accounts of the loss of Emesa to the Arabs in 635–36. Then Abū 'Ubayda al-Jarrah abandoned Emesa, and the Byz. force entered the city (Donner, *Conquests* 132f.), but after the defeat of Yarmuk the situation changed and Herakleios left Emesa. The Arabs seized the city without bloodshed after the population had paid a ransom (71,000 dinars) and probably turned the Church of St. John into a mosque (N. Elisseeff, *Et* 3:397); the urban properties left vacant were divided up among the Muslims (Donner, *Conquests* 247). Emesa remained under Muslim control thereafter except for short periods in the 10th C.: the Arab geographer al-Iṣṭākhri (951) praised the climate, soil, and paved streets and markets of Emesa, but lamented the damage caused in the area by the Byz. (G. Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems* [rp. Beirut 1965] 533f). Nikephoros II Phokas occupied Emesa in 969 and took away the head of John the Baptist; JOHN I TZIMISKES levied tribute there in 975; the Byz. burned the city in 983 and Basil II extended his authority over it in 995, setting fire to it yet again in 999.

LIT. P. Peeters, "La Passion de S. Julien d'Emēse," *AB* 47 (1929) 44–76. –M.M.M.

EMIR (ἀμιρᾶς, εμίρης), Turkish form of Arabic title ʿamīr, generally meaning "commander" and largely used by the Islamic peoples. In early Islamic times only commanders of armies used the title, but later persons exercising administrative and financial authority adopted it. Under the Seljuk it was given to military officers and to younger princes. In the late 13th and in the 14th C. it was used by lesser rulers such as those of the Turkish states that succeeded the old sultanate of Rûm; it was finally used by the Ottoman sultan. The term appears in early Byz. sources (e.g., THEOPHANKES THE CONFESSOR) as a loanword from the Arabic. The names of some Byz. families (e.g., Amiropoloi, Amiroutes) originate from this title. The *Song of the Amiras (Emir)* forms the first section of the epic *Digenes Akritas*. It was gradually used alternatively with or replaced by the Turkish title BEG.


EMMANUEL. See Christ: Types of Christ.
EMMAUS (Ἐμμαύσης, Ar. ‘Amwās), identified by Sozomenos as Nikopolis, and, according to Eusebios of Caesarea, “a famous polis” in Judaea, on the road from Jerusalem to Jaffa. It was an autocephalous archbishopric under the jurisdiction of Jerusalem. It contained several goals of pilgrimage—a healing spring and churches. Ruins of a church and baptistery with mosaics of the 5th/6th C. were discovered there. The city also had a Jewish and Samaritan population. Conquered by the Arabs between 634 and 638, it was decimated by the plague of 639. Emmaus was displaced by Diospolis and then Ramla, and later pilgrims give confused testimony concerning its location. The Byz. church was rebuilt in the Crusader period.

It remains debatable (R. Janin, DHGE 15 [1963] 428) whether the Emmaus mentioned in the Gospels as the place where Christ had revealed himself to two of his disciples can be identified as Emmaus-Nikopolis.


—G.V., Z.U.M.

EMOIONS (πά το πάθη) were defined by Nemesios as a kind of movement (kinesis): movement according to nature is evil, whereas movement against nature is emotion or passion (PG 40:673C). Ancient ethics created an ideal of freedom from emotions—apatheia or ataraxia—and church fathers inherited from the ancients a condemnation of emotions, which were identified as vices; thus Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote, in accordance with Romans 7:5, of sinful passions working in our body (PG 66:808A). The hegumenos Dorotheos in the 6th C., however, drew a distinction between the two—pathe are evil desires and hamartiai (vices) their energies, or realizations (PG 88:1621D). Theologians emphasized consistently that God has no emotions and is apathes (Gregory of Nyssa, PG 45:49B).

The solemnity of Byz. ceremonial, ecclesiastical and imperial alike, rejected emotional movements; an uncontrolled gesture or unbalanced behavior were signs of barbaric, uncivilized upbringing, whereas an ideal appearance presupposed “measure,” “balance,” and “rhythm,” or harmony and symmetry (Ljubarskij, Psell 235f) in contrast to emotional outbursts. Ammianus Marcellinus described the “statuesque” pose of Constantius II, and the imperial portraits of the 4th C. presented motionless, “stony” figures. Patience was treated as a necessity in any situation and would be rewarded in heaven (E. Osborn, Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought [Cambridge 1976] 133). Hagiographers also emphasized that their heroes and heroines acted without emotion in the most distressing situations, even on the verge of death. At the same time, the Byz. distinguished between good and bad emotions: laughter was a bad emotion, whereas tears (see CONTRITION) were always welcome and indicated a sympathetic character; the gentle smile also fit the ideal of sanctity. Strong emotions such as passionate love of God were also acceptable in Christians. The PASSION OF CHRIST is the focus of the theology of salvation. From the 12th C. onward Byz. writers presented emotions even more boldly (e.g., delight in dancing and even obscure body language); they participated enthusiastically in processions and even displayed emotions that trespassed on the conventional moral code.

Representation in Art. In art, emotions were expressed less through physiognomy than through gesture. D. Winfield (DOP 22 [1968] 128) suggested that painters limited themselves to two basic facial attitudes: one for emotional disturbance, one for tranquility. Confronting innumerable impassive saints, the modern observer may doubt even the second category (L. Brubaker, Word and Image 5 [1989] 19–32). The reason for this lack of animation was not necessarily the sacred nature of the image: similar expressionless faces characterize scores of warriors, mimes, and dancers on bone caskets and boxes, the largest preserved class of secular art. Manuel Chrysoloras (PG 156:57D–59A) echoed the 3rd-C. theoretician Philostratos (Die Bilder, ed. O. Schönberger [Munich 1968] 4.21–22), who had prescribed that artists convey dispositions, as these are reflected in faces. The steeply angled brows of mourners in the Vienna GENESIS convey obvious feeling, but, while many 5th- and 6th-C. images show open-mouthed horror or smiling pleasure, no extant works of art display the range of expressions that CHORIKIOS OF GAZA and Nicholas Mesarites purport to describe. Except for the sorrowful Virgin in Crucifixion scenes, emotional manifestations are rare even in the “pathetic” phase of 12th-C. MONUMENTAL PAINTING;
in the 14th C., the Massacre of the Innocents is performed by murderers treated at worst as CARICATURES.

LIT. Maguire, "Depiction of Sorrow." —A.K., A.C.

EMPEROR (called BASILEUS, AUTOKRATOR, also DESPOTES), the pinnacle of Byz. POLITICAL STRUCTURE and society, whose extraordinary position is reflected in virtually every creation of Byz. civilization. The ideology of his power came from Rome, refashioned by Christian and Hellenistic conceptions. The divinely promoted emperor was considered to have been elected commander in chief, whether it was the army, senate, or CITIZENS that acted as God’s agents by their ACCLAMATION. This lack of juridical clarity helps explain the LEGITIMACY of military success, the absence of hereditary succession (designated successors were made co-emperors), and the vitality of USURPATIONS.

From the 7th and 8th C. onward, Byz.‘s new social conditions fostered the gradual appearance of a legitimacy of birth—PORPHYROGENETOS—and lineage. The providential ruler chosen by God (ek theou on coins—DOC 3.1:179) was conceived as God’s representative on earth, the sun and serenity were his chosen metaphors, and he enjoyed unique liturgical and executive privileges within the church (A. Michel, Die Kaiseracht in der Ostkirche (843–1204) [Darmstadt 1959]). As the source of law, he was not bound by it (Basil. 2.6.1; cf. e.g., Leo VI, nov.47) and some believe he possessed a right of land ownership over the entire empire (Kazhdan, Gosp.klass. 229–35). Although Byz. frequently revolted against emperors and killed or toppled them, and their effective authority was somewhat ambiguous, few questioned the idea of emperor. The reality of his power lay in a professional army and a bureaucracy expert at extracting wealth through elaborate taxes and extensive private revenues, the whole enhanced by PROPAGANDA and the emperor’s centrality to Byz. mentality and PATRIOTISM—a system unparalleled in European states before the 13th C.

The emperor was distinguished from his subjects (douloi) by his seclusion in the PALACE and his way of life (a living archaism in the 10th C.); by a sacral status inherited from the IMPERIAL CULT; by his use of PURPLE and GOLD (e.g., CHRYSOBULLS), CEREMONY, and INSIGNIA; and by a sanctity indirectly derived from the cult of Constantine I and the commemoration of his successors in the Synaxarion of Constantinople. He was united with his subjects by the exercise of his powers, his justice (cf. the story of Theophilos and the marketplace: TheophCont 87.9–88.3) and PHILANTHROPY, by ceremony and prayers that concretized their mutual relations, by their oaths of allegiance, and by their payment of taxes. His relations with the aristocracy were explicitly defined by the office and dignities he granted them.

By Ostrogorsky’s count, 88 emperors ruled Constantinople from 324 to 1453 for an average reign of about 13 years, or 12 without the exceptional longevity of the Palaiologoi (an average of over 19 years from 1259 to 1453). This apparent stability contrasts with high turnover in periods of crisis (e.g., 695–717, seven emperors came to
power in 22 years; 797–820, five in 23; 1055–81, seven in 26; 1180–1204, six in 24) and numerous failed usurpations. The unusual political and administrative continuity favored by this longevity must be reckoned a factor in Byz. survival.

Patterns of the transmission of power changed significantly, the most important trends being the decline of election—partly supplanted by successful usurpation—and the growth of family succession in later dynasties of Komnenoi and Palaiologoi. The period 324–610 saw ten designated successors take power without significant violence against the senior emperor; seven of these successors were family members, six more were elected, and four took power violently, although among them Constantine I and Julian could claim family and institutional rights. Family and usurpation loomed larger from 610 to 1204, when 32 co-emperors succeeded, 25 of whom were offspring and six more coopted into the imperial family; Michael I Rangabe might claim election, but he was the son-in-law of Nikephoros I. Twenty-one took power violently.

The family dominated late Byz. succession: eight emperors, all with close family connections by blood or marriage, took power as designated successors, although two used violence to enforce their claims; moreover, the two elected emperors were sons of emperors. Of the four usurpers, two were closely related to a predecessor.

The institutional background of emperors reflects the political structure: the early Byz. army (324–610) supplied 12 emperors, the bureaucracy only Anastasios I, while the imperial family provided nine emperors, if one includes Constantine I and Basiliskos. The period of the 7th–12th C. reflects the triumph of lineage, and the bureaucracy and palace milieu gained against the army: the former supplied roughly one emperor for every two from the army. The bureaucracy disappears as a recruiting ground for late Byz. emperors.

Except for Zeno, the European provinces supplied all early Byz. emperors of known background born outside of Constantinople down to Tiberios II; thereafter, Asia Minor (with some exceptions, e.g., Irene and Basil I) predominated for emperors born outside Constantinople, reflecting its enhanced economic and social significance. In its final centuries, the empire's reduced size severely limited the possibilities and their significance.

Most new emperors came from the aristocracy. Nonetheless, the rise of nonaristocrats to supreme power through imperial service (e.g., Justin I, Basil I, Michael IV) was an exceptional but persistent phenomenon down to the Komnenoi; more common, probably, was the rise of second-generation aristocrats (e.g., Valens, Justinian I). Aristocratic background and the premium Byz. placed on literacy meant a high level of culture among the overwhelming majority of emperors, many of whom, like Justinian I, Constantine VII, or Manuel II, have left significant writings. (For list of emperors, see Byzantium, History of.)


M.McC.

EMPHYTEUSIS (ἐμφύτευσις), in the 4th C., the term referring to a set of administrative regulations whereby estates belonging to the crown were transferred to private cultivators. By the late 5th C. emphyteusis had developed into a specific type of written contract governing long-term, usually perpetual leases of real property applicable not only to crown lands but to holdings of private and ecclesiastical landlords. Emp. Zeno defined emphyteusis as a right distinct from lease or sale, although possessing certain qualities of both (Cod. Just. IV 66.1). An emphyteuticus could not be evicted as long as he paid an annual fee (solita pensio) or presented to his master receipts (apodochae) for public services; his tenement was heritable and could be alienated unless the tenant had lost the contract, emphyteuticum instrumentans (Cod. Just. IV 66.2–3).

In case of sale, the owner possessed a right of preemptive purchase and was otherwise entitled to a payment equal to 2 percent of the purchase price. Persons undertaking an emphyteutical contract were required to pay an initiation fee, to keep the land in cultivation, and to return it unimpaired. Special restrictions (Justinian I, novel 120) were placed on the use of emphyteusis for ecclesiastical lands in order to prevent the alienation of church property. Later jurisprudence adhered closely, with some simplifications and modifications, to Justinianic regulations. After the 7th C. emphyteusis appears primarily to have been
applied to ecclesiastical property. Legal texts retain the traditional meaning of the term (e.g., D. Simon, S. Trojanos, FM 2 [1977] 67f) up to the 15th C. (e.g., Xenoph., no.32.29–30), whereas in documents of the 15th–15th C. the term emphyteuma was applied to the urban milieu (Constantinople, Thessalonike, Serres) and denoted, like enotikon, “house rent,” the annual payment for a house built by the tenant (A. Kazhdan, JÖB 39 [1989] 22).


EMPORION (εμπόριον, μπόριο in later sources, e.g., the Chronicle of the Tocco), a term of ancient origin (J. Rougé, Recherches sur l’organisation du commerce maritime en Méditerranée sous l’empire romain [Paris 1966] 108) designating a place of trade, found along frontiers, coasts, and trade routes. Primarily associated with seaports, they are also attested in inland areas, such as Thrace and Bithynia. Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 75.56–57) defines the emporion of Corinth as “the lower polis.” In charters emporia (usually juxtaposed with kastro) are small settlements of urban type where ships can be docked (Lavra 1, no. 55.59–60, a.1102). Near the emporion tou Kotzinou, on the island of Lemnos, was the kastron of the same name (Dionys. no. 25.12–15, a.1430), and the Lavra of Athanasios was said to own a house in the kastron Kotzinou and two more in the emporion (Lavra 3, no. 164.4–5, a.1415), which according to another document (Lavra 2, no. 77.108, a.1284?) was located at the seashore. The term might designate a commercial quarter of a town, a market situated outside the urban fortifications (e.g., emporion of Adrianople), or a settlement which was in itself a marketplace, as in the case of Sagoudaous, donated by the sebastokratr Isaac Komnenos to the Kosmosoteira monastery at Bera. In scholarly literature the term also has a number of meanings—from early medieval trading settlements in the West (R. Hodges, Dark Age Economics [New York 1982] 47–65) to small Byz. towns (Litavrin, VizObstěstovo 122–24) to great coastal cities (M. Sjuzjumov, VizVrem 8 [1956] 26–41).


EMPRESS (augusta, αὐγούστα, βασιλίσσα; cf. E. Bensamar, Byzantium 46 [1976] 243–91). Legally, the empress depended on the emperor (Digest 1.3.31; Basil. 2.6.1; Scholia Bas. 2.6.1), but in favorable circumstances late Roman empresses, such as Pulcheria, Ariadne, Theodora (wife of Justinian I), or Sophia (wife of Justin II) might wield great power, esp. through a regency. Their social background (e.g., the marriage of Honorius and Arkadios to generals’ daughters) illuminates the empire’s changing political structure; conversely, the case of the wife of Justinian I, Constantine VI, or Theophilos shows how such marriages generated power and influence for the woman’s family. Newcomers on the throne tried to solidify their power by marriage to an established empress, from Marcian and Pulcheria to Nikephoros III Botaneiates and Maria of “Alania.”

In the late Roman period the status of empress was granted only grudgingly to imperial women: of the first 26 emperors’ 30 known wives (324–527) only nine were augustae. Four others became augustae as mother, sister, etc. These early augustae issued coinage, authenticated documents with lead seals (Licinia Eudoxia—Zacos, Seals 1, no.2759), wore imperial insignia, and possessed their own retinues. Their public life, largely separate from their spouses, involved a kind of parallel court and ceremonies with the female elite (McCormick, Eternal Victory 203f). Like Leontia (602), some became empress at their husband’s accession, some on marriage, and others afterward or not at all, whence the different coronation options in De ceremoniis (De cer., bk.1, chs. 39–41). The reasons are not always clear, but down to the 8th C., at least, empress status could follow the birth of a male heir (D. Missiou, JÖB 32.2 [1982] 489–98).

The solidification of Byz. aristocratic lineages and the Komnenian privatization of the state probably enhanced the power of the empresses. They kept most earlier privileges and wives became empresses more regularly—for example, Alexios I crowned Irene Doukaina one week after his accession and his dynastic successors’ spouses appear to have been simultaneously crowned and married or affianced. As Irene, Theodora (wife of Theophilos), Zoe, Eudokia Makrembolitissa, Maria of Antioch, and Anna of Savoy show, successful female regency became more frequent, while Irene, Zoe, and her sister Theodora even ruled briefly in their own names. From Anna
Dalassene's administration of the empire onward, acts issued by empresses survive that compare with those of their male counterparts and that show them administering very considerable wealth (F. Barisić, ZRV 13 [1971] 143–202; U.V. Bosch in Mel. Dujčev 89–102).

From 788 to 881 sources mention bride shows for selecting imperial spouses. Diplomacy began to bring foreign wives for emperors in the 8th C., when marriages with Khazar princesses were followed by failed negotiations for Frankish ones. Foreign brides might be coached in the Greek language and Byz. customs before arriving in Constantinople (Theoph. 455.23–25) and changed their names when they assumed Byz. identity. Their geopolitical status peaked under the Komnenoi, with brides from the German Empire and Capetian France. Such alliances became so usual in late Byz. that a ceremony was established for the adventus of imperial fiancées from abroad, but Palaiologan wives came from lesser echelons of regional potentates.


ENAMELS. Enameling is a means of embellishment in which glass, colored with metallic oxides, is heated until it melts and fuses with metal. Although enameling techniques varied over time and place, the Byz. were best known for their cloisonné enamel, in which cells divided by thin strips of gold (cloisons) are filled with glass and fired. After cooling, the composite surface of glass and metal is ground and polished. The lustrous result became the norm for enamels of the 10th–12th C., which were used on icons, reliquaries, book covers, chalices, and crowns, and even sewn onto ecclesiastical vestments.

The Byz. precursor of cloisonné was a technique in which enamel, often thinly applied, was contained within loops of filigree (either wire or strips set on edge) that determined the outline of the desired motif. The earliest example is a medallion portrait of a 5th-C. empress (Wessel, Byz. Enamels, no.2), probably Licinia Eudoxia, consort of Valentinian III. This filigree technique was in use at least until the 7th C.

Cloisonné enamel was the technique used from the 9th C. onward, and Buckton (infra) has suggested that the origin of Byz. cloisonné technique is to be found in the Carolingian world. Whatever its origin, the technique was well established in Byz. for reliquaries and enkolpia by the time the votive crown of Leo [VI] was made (Treasury S. Marco, no.8). The emperor appears in a loros and stemma on one of the medallions. The busts of Leo and of saints on these medallions have backgrounds of translucent green, which is characteristic of 9th-C. enamel.

Already apparent here is the substitution of enamels for precious stones, which were still used on other votive crowns. Gems are again absent on a chalice inscribed "Lord, help the Orthodox emperor Romans" (ibid., no.10), an ancient sardonyx vessel, the lip of which is enclosed in a metal band with enamel images, including those of Christ, the Virgin, and Lazaros the icon painter. Their haloes and garments, displaying a great variety of blues, are silhouetted against the gilt metal, instead of having an enamel background. This technique became standard from the 10th C. onward and is responsible for the "typical" Byz. enamel, with the figure isolated against the gold of the plaque or medallion. A second sardonyx chalice with an identical inscription was likewise brought to Venice as booty from Constantinople in or after 1204 (ibid., no.11).

Numerous enamels have been seen as products of late 9th–10th-C. Georgian art, but work from the Caucasus is hard to distinguish from Byz. examples; further difficulties of identity and authenticity are raised by the alterations and forgeries undertaken by 19th-C. dealers and restorers. Unquestionable, datable Byz. enamels include the Limburg an-der-Lahn Reliquary and some precious objects of the 11th C. usually interpreted as crowns of Constantine IX (Wessel, Byz. Enamels, no.32) and Michael VII (the so-called Holy Crown of Hungary—Studien zur Machtssymbolik des mittelalterlichen Ungarn, eds. F. Fülep, E. Kovács, Zs. Lovag [Budapest 1983]).

Constantinople as a source of "export enamels" is also apparent in two enameled triptychs, possibly brought to the West by Wibald of Stavelot. The most celebrated example is the Pala d'Oro, the largest surviving complex of such materials; part of it was in Venice by the early 12th C. The original form and content of this object is much debated, not least the question of which of several empresses named Irene is depicted on it. It is
certain that the Pala was enlarged and further embellished with loot from the Fourth Crusade, including enamels of six scenes of the lives of Christ and the Virgin. According to Sylvester Syropoulos, these enamels were recognized in 1438 by Patr. Joseph II as coming from the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople (S. Bettini in Treasury S. Marco 41f).

Byz. enamels are distinguishable from Venetian work by the fineness of their cloisons and their saturated colors, qualities esp. evident on icons such as the full-length St. Michael in Venice (Treasury S. Marco, no.19), the effect of which is accentuated by gemstones. In the case of other pieces of the 12th—13th C., enameled backgrounds have reappeared, now using opaque colors, not the translucent green of the 9th C. This technique has been attributed to Thessalonike (Wessel, Byz. Enamels, nos. 60, 63). From the late 14th C. onward, enamel was increasingly used in conjunction with other media: cloisonné tondi depicting archangels, prophets, and church fathers were juxtaposed with repoussé scenes on the silver-gilt cover (Treasury S. Marco, no.20) of a Greek lectionary, copied by a certain Sophronios at Ferrara before 11 Nov. 1439. Among the latest Byz. enamels are the eight medallions at the extremities of the gilded filigree cross inside the Bessa- rion Reliquary.


ENANTIOPHANES. See Anonynous, "Enantiophanes."

ENCAUSTIC. See Icon: Painted Icons.

ENCHEIRION (ἐγχειρίων), a rectangular piece of soft material, embroidered with gold thread, that was worn as a vestment by a bishop over his sticharion. It was attached to his belt so as to hang down over his right thigh. Its use was apparently restricted to bishops. First attested as a vestment in the book of pseudo-Germanos I on the liturgy (PG 98:396B) and in a letter of Patr. Nikephoros I (PG 100:200C) and in representations of the late 10th C. (Menologion of Basil II, pp. 54, 74, 188, 254, 340), the encheirion was replaced during the 14th C. by the stiffer, lozenge-shaped epigonation.


ENCYCLOTICAL (lit. "circular"), in the narrow sense of the word, a formal pastoral letter sent by the pope to the entire church; the term was used from 1740 (E. Mangenot, DTC 5.1 [1939] 14). However, in late Roman practice the terms enkyklios epistolai or enkyklios grammata were applied to "circulars" written by church fathers of great authority: thus, Clement of Rome reportedly wrote enkyklioi epistolai "to be read in holy churches" (Epiphanios, Panarion 30.15.2). Origen sent en- kyklia grammatata (Eusebius, HE 6.18.4); Alexander of Alexandria wrote 70 enkyklioi epistolai addressed to various bishops and devoted to the refutation of Arianism (Epiphanios, Panarion 69.4.3). The term was applied also to letters of certain patriarchs: Anatolios in 451/2, Gennadios I in 458/9, Pyrrhos in 639, Paul II in 642, etc. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 22.16) relates that the First Council of Nicaea dispatched to Alexandria, Libya, and the Pentapolis an enkyklios epistolai concerning the Arian heresy. Evagrius Scholastikos (HE 3.7) employs the term antenkyklios, saying that Emp. Basiliskos, fearing the resistance of Patr. Akakios, withdrew his previous pro-Monophysite enkyklios and issued antenkyklios confirming the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon. The term enkyklios apparently fell into disuse after the 10th C.

-A.K.

ENCYCLOPEDISM, a conventional term introduced by Lemerle to replace the less precise "Macedonian Renaissance" as a characterization of Byz. culture of the 9th C. through the beginning of the 11th C. The main feature of this period was the "organization" of an administrative and cultural structure; for this purpose various manuals were produced—on the bureaucratic hierarchy (taktika), on tax collecting (see Taxation, Treatises on), on military tactics and strategy (strategia), on agriculture (geoponika); Ro-
MAN LAW was systematized in the BasiLika and related texts, and rules for the guilds of Constantinople (the Book of the Eparch) were issued. It was also a period of active transliteration of texts from uncial to minuscule and of attempts to gather, observe, and appreciate the ancient heritage—from Photios’s Bibliotheca to the Souda. The systematization and “organization” also covered such spheres as education, hagiography (Symeon Metaphrastes), and church decoration. The activity of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos and his court was the focal point of new tendencies, resulting in the compilation of such works as De thematibus, De administrando imperio, and De ceremoniis. The epoch produced many polymaths, like Leo the Mathematician, Photios, and Arethas of Caesarea, but the emphasis was not on creativity, but on copying and collecting.


ENDYNE (ἐνδύνια), a cloth that covers the top and all four sides of the altar. Apart from a possible instance in the museum of S. Marco in Venice, only representations of such cloths survive from the Byz. period, most from the 6th to 7th C., as in the Melchizedek mosaic at S. Vitale and the bema of Sant’Apollinare in Classe, both in Ravenna. Textual references to endyntai continue from the mid-6th C. until the end of the empire; special attention is paid to them in the De ceremoniis since, on Great Feasts, emperors either kissed or changed these altar vestments (see Speck [1966] infra, nos. 18—24). Although the endyntai represented in the Menologion of Basil II (pp. 14, 324, 358) have only geometrical ornament, those referred to in earlier literature are much more elaborate. Paul Silentarios (Friedländer, Kunstbeschrieb. vv. 759—805) tells of a purple silk altar cloth at Hagia Sophia in Constantinople bearing images of Christ, Peter, Paul, and, on its hem, hospitals and churches founded by Justinian I. Bp. Victor of Ravenna had a cloth of gold and silver with his own likeness made for the Basilica Ursiana, and Archbp. Maximian’s endyntai for the same church had not only his portrait but “the whole story of our Lord” (Agnellus, ed. Holder-Egger, 324.28—33; 335.37—40). The Iconoclastic Council of 754 (Mansi 13:332B) declared that figure-bearing cloths might not be destroyed but could be altered with the permission of the patriarch and the emperor. Thereafter most references occur in typika, such as that of the Petritzos monastery (ed. Gautier, REB 42 [1984] 123.1730—33), and inventories such as that of Patmos (ed. C. Astruc, TM 8 [1981] 22), since endyntai were a favorite offering of church benefactors.

ENERGY (ἐνεργεία). According to Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, and other church fathers, the activity of the Logos in creation and redemption derives ultimately from God the Father; it is opposed by the “activity” (energeia) of the demons (energoumenos = “demon-possessed”). In the writings of the church fathers the doctrine of the divine energies reaches its zenith in the definition of the two energies, or wills, in Christ, corresponding to his two natures, as opposed to the doctrine of Monotheletism. Important for the philosophical orientation predominant in late Byz. thought is the real distinction between God’s essence and his energies (in the plural, but referring to the Trinity as a unity) represented by Gregory Palamas, set in the framework of the Orthodox doctrine of grace and knowledge in opposition to Barlaam of Calabria. According to Palamas, the three divine persons necessarily remain hidden and inaccessible to the faithful, while the uncreated energies—which are one with the divine essence and, accordingly, representations of it (as, e.g., the light of Transfiguration)—convey to him participation in divine life.

As a result of the unsystematic and polemical manner of expression characterizing his occasional writings and his somewhat arbitrary and selective use of the theology of the church fathers, Palamas attracted a long line of opponents, both in his lifetime and later (e.g., Gregory Akindynos, Nikephoros Gregoras, the Kydones brothers, John Kyparissiotes), who believed that knowledge of God was connected essentially to the Creation. Both sides appealed, rightly or wrongly, to pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, or at least to various aspects of his apophatic and cataphatic theology.


ENGASTRIMYTHOS (ἐγκαστρίμυθος, lit. “belly-talker”), a witchlike descendant of the ancient Sibyls or prophetesses. Engastrimythoi, often male, were ventriloquists who disguised their voices and made mantic utterances, as if a deity or demon were acting within and speaking through them. Their activities are attested in the 4th C. by pseudo-Justin (PG 6:1324A) and in the 5th C. by Theodor of Cyrhrus (PG 80:337C); in the 6th C. a female engastrimythos was admitted to the imperial court after Justin II showed symptoms of insanity, in order to “make known the facts about his illness” (vita of Symeon the Stylite the Younger, ed. P. van den Ven 1:180, ch.209.15–16). Canon 60 of the Council in Trullo condemned people who feigned possession; the practice must have continued, however, as Theodore Balsamon, in his gloss to this canon, denounces those “who feign being possessed as a means of profit, and proclaim certain things with the evil, satanic gaze of the prophetesses of the pagans” (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:441.13–15). (See also Oracle; Sibylline Oracles.)


ENGLAND ( Бретания). The Roman province of Bretania was probably abandoned by the empire after 428 or even 442 (H.S. Schultz, JRS 23 [1933] 36–45), but some contacts with the East seem to have been maintained. In the 6th C. Prokopios of Caesarea had copious information about remote Bretania, which he viewed as lying at the extremity of the known world; the 6th–7th-C. SUTTON HOO TREASURE also provides evidence for these links, and the 7th-C. vita of JOHN ECLEMON mentions a ship from Alexandria carrying zinc from Bretania. Two Greeks, Theodore of Tarsos (archbishop of Canterbury) and Adrian (born in Africa), played an important part in the English church of the 7th C., ushering in a brief period of Greek cultural and religious influence on the island (see Bede). Some English pilgrims visited Byz., and Byz. influence on English political terminology is reflected in the title of King Athelstan, basilisc Anglorum (a.931).

Official diplomatic relations resumed in the mid-11th C., attested to by several Byz. seals found in England—one of Sophronios II of Jerusalem (ca.1059–64) (V. Laurent, NC 72 [1964] 49f) and one of the envoy John-Raphael, after 1066 (V. Laurent, NC 71 [1963] 93–96). After the Norman conquest some Anglo-Saxon refugees offered their services to Alexios I and are mentioned as Inglinoi in several of his chrysobulls (C. Head, Byzantium 47 [1977] 186–98). Alexios I established an English colony at Kibotos or Chevetot (on the Gulf of Astakos). English VARANGIANS are mentioned
as late as 1329. Several Byz. diplomatic missions to England are recorded in the 11th and 12th C. Manuel I Komnenos sent embassies in 1170, 1176, and 1177 and conducted a lively correspondence with King Henry II (1154–89), no doubt in the hope of securing his support against the French and Normans, who threatened the empire. The Latin conquest of Constatinople (1204) contributed to a renewed but short-lived English interest in Greek learning during the 13th C., as evidenced by the collection of Greek MSS by John of Basingstoke, who actually studied in Athens, and the scholarship of the Franciscans Robert Grosseteste and Roger Bacon. The last major contact between Byz. and England occurred in 1400 when Manuel II Palaiologos visited England for two months in a largely unsuccessful attempt to enlist the financial and military support of Henry IV (1399–1413) against the Turks.


ENKAINIA (ἐγκαίνια), ceremony of dedicating or consecrating a city (e.g., Constantinople, 11 May 330), a secular monument (e.g., Constantine I’s mausoleum, 21 May 337), or a church (also called kathiriosis). The term had been applied to the Temple in Jerusalem, but by the 4th C. Eusebios of Caesarea used it to describe the dedications of churches in Tyre and Palestine. The purpose of enkainia was to make the space holy, and early Christian writers stressed the similarity between baptism and the dedication of a church; accordingly, lustration with holy water occupied an important place in the enkainia rite. Usually preceded by a synaxis, the ceremony was concentrated around the altar, which was washed, anointed, and covered; a procession with relics and exorcism also formed a part of the ceremony. These ritual steps are summarized by Patr. Germanos I in his commentary (Germanos, Liturgy 56) and commented on at length by Symeon of Thessalonike (PG 155:395–398). The vita of Patr. Euthymios describes the enkainia of the Church of the Anargyroi at Psamathia: monks from nearby monasteries spent the entire night in prayer and thanksgiving, and at dawn a procession of torchbearers, with the cross and Gospel book, wended its way to the newly built church. After the dedication the hegoumenos of the Psamathia remained inside the building for 40 days.

According to Athanasios of Alexandria (PG 25:612B), the dedication of a church was impossible without the order (prostaxis) of the emperor. The rite of enkainia could be performed by the patriarch, e.g., Photios conducted the enkainia of the Nea Ekklesia (1 May 880). The date of such a ceremony was often chosen to coincide with one of the Great Feasts, as in the case of Justinian I’s Hagia Sophia (25 Dec. 537). Enkainia was also the term used for the annual celebration of the dedication of a church (Mateos, Typicon 2:186), and esp. the Triumph of Orthodoxy.


EN KEREM (Ar. ‘Ayn Karim), a site 7 km west of Jerusalem with remains of three churches of the 5th/6th C.: two basilicas, one of which was dedicated to the Holy Martyrs of God, and a chapel of the Visitation. Some vague evidence indicates the place’s connection with the cult of John the Baptist; there was an 8th-C. church of St. Elizabeth “in the village of Encharim,” and EPIPHANIOS Hagiopolites locates “the family house” of John on “Mt. Carmel,” which is interpreted by Wilkinson (Pilgrims 156) as En Kerem.

The site is related to the legend in the Protoevangelion of James (22:3), according to which St. Elizabeth and the infant John were saved during the Massacre of the Innocents by a mountain that opened up to conceal them. A clay Eulogia in Monza portrays this event (Vikan, Pilgrimage Art, fig.12).


ENKLEISTOS (ἐγκλειστος, “enclosed”), term attested from the 4th C. for a monk or nun who confined himself or herself in a cell, under a vow of perpetual seclusion. An enkleistos might either lead the solitary life of a hermit, as in the case of
St. Pelagia (who disguised herself as a monk and lived in a cell on the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem), or, like St. NeophytoS Enkleistos of Cyprus, be attached to a monastic community after a period of isolation. NeophytoS lived in a cave, which he excavated and enlarged so that it could accommodate a tomb and a chapel for the celebration of the liturgy. He eventually became the hegoumenos of a koinobion but performed no administrative duties, leaving them to the oikonomos and docheiarios of the monastery. The typikon of NeophytoS is the only monastic rule that prescribes that the hegoumenos must be an enkleistos; the typikon of the Euergetis Monastery in Constantinople permitted the hegoumenos to be an enkleistos, but did not require it (C. Galatariotou, REB 45 [1987] 132ff). Other enkleistoi who achieved sanctity were David of Thessalonike, who reportedly spent 70 years in an enkleisterion (John Moschos, PG 87:2921B); Stephen the Younger (PG 100:1148C); and Plato of Sakkoudion.

-A.M.T.

ENKOLPION (ἐγκόλπιον, lit. “in” [or “on] the bosom”), an object with Christian imagery, or containing a sacred relic or inscription, worn around the neck. Enkolpia were produced in virtually all materials used for jewelry. They could take the form of a simple disc, with figures, scenes, and/or inscriptions, or be a container of some sort. The enkolpion protected the wearer by means of its imagery or, in the case of a reliquary, by its contents.

The term enkolpion may encompass many other objects—phylakteria, eulogiai, amulets. Enkolpia were in use from the 4th C. onward and have been found throughout the Byz. world. Literary accounts describe them given as gifts or as belonging to individuals: a 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 451.85–87) records one that depicted the Virgin Mary, to which Isaac II Angelos was esp. attached and which he embraced while confessing.


-S.D.C., A.C.

ENKOMION (ἐγκόμιον), or panegyric, a speech of praise. The authors of ancient rhetorical textbooks identified enkomion with epideictic of the good in general (thus Theon in RhetGr, ed. Spenigel 2:61.22), and accordingly Menander Rhetor (pp. 2–6) believed that enkomia included praise of cities, men, animals, accomplishments, and arts; he excluded only hymns to the gods. As special types of enkomia, Menander lists the basilikos logos and, reluctantly, the prosphonetikos logos.

Byz. practice, however, distinguished enkomion from ekphraseis and limited it to the praise of persons: saints, emperors, patriarchs, and others. The praise of saints was the subject of hagiography; the emperor and patriarch were eulogized by official rhetoricians on regular days (Epiphany and the Lazarus Saturday, respectively), and enkomia in prose and verse were delivered on special occasions—weddings (Epithalamion), funerals (Epitaphios or Monody), victory celebrations, and so forth. Encouraging elements occur in historical works, even though some historians, following Lucian, tried to distinguish between enkomion, a consistent praise of a person, and history, which aimed at the truth (Ljubarskij, Psell 139ff). On the other hand, the enkomion of one person might prove to be an invective against another. Panegyrics of private persons, side by side with those of emperors and patriarchs, became common from the end of the 11th C. At the same time parodical enkomia were composed
on frivolous subjects, for example, on a flea (by Michael Psellos, and later Demetrios Chrysoloras).

LIT. Hunger, Lit. 1:120–32. –E.M.J., A.K.

**ENNOMION** (ἐννομίον, from nome, “pasture”), a tax and/or charge on pasture land and/or on the right of pasturage. The term was used in Hellenistic and Roman papyri as well as in several inscriptions (S. Avogadro, Aegyptus 14 [1934] 293–97). In Byz. it appears first in Peira 37:2 and is frequent in later praktika. In Peira, ennomion is a charge paid by the owners of livestock grazing on a common pasture; the collected sum was divided between the owners of the pasture (including those peasants who had no livestock) according to the amount of state taxes paid by each. In a praktikon of 1073, ennomion is a part of the lord’s revenue collected from certain pastures (Patmos Engrapha 2, no. 50.123–24, 136) and measured per capita: 1 miliresion for a horse or ass, 1 nomisma for 100 sheep (ibid., no. 50.314–315). A metrological treatise (11th C. or later) calculates the ennomion of sheep also as 1 nomisma for 100 animals but gives a higher rate for other livestock (water buffaloes, mares, and cows)—1 nomisma for 3 animals (Schilbach, Met. Quellen 59.30, 60.10–14). In later documents, ennomion appears as an annual payment inscribed in praktika, and its correlation with the telos-oikoumenon does not seem to be fixed: thus, in a charter of 1319, “the ennomion of sheep and swine” together with the charge on bees makes 24 percent of the entire payment (Lavra 2, no. 106.22–23); in a praktikon of 1321—together with linobrochion (see Banality), about 5 percent (Xenoph., no. 15.24–27); in a praktikon of 1317—together with aerikon, 3 percent (Lavra 2, no. 104.165–66).

It is difficult to distinguish the ennomion levied on livestock (the melissenonomion, a charge on beehives, is also known) from the dekaeia on herds (choirodekaeia and probatochoirodekaeia). Ennomion was usually collected by a private owner: thus Andronikos II Palaiologos in 1319 granted the monks of Hilandar the right to levy the emperor’s relatives, archontes, stratitai, and all laymen and clerics who let their animals graze on the pasture of the village of Georgela (Chil., no. 41.73–82). But it could be a state levy—thus, in 1447 a metochion of the Lavra on Lemnos was granted 200 sheep free from ennomion (Lavra 3, no. 171.9–10).


**ENOCH** (ʾĒwōḵ), son of Cain or Jared and father of Methuselah; one of the biblical patriarchs. The Book of Enoch stands first in pseudo-Athanasius’s list of apocrypha. Three major versions of it survive. Enoch I, known only in an Ethiopic translation from Hebrew or Aramaic, is a work of the Hellenistic period. Enoch II exists only in Old Slavonic. It is an enigmatic text, probably translated from Greek (ca.1000?), although N. Meščerkij (TODRL 19 [1963] 130–47) suggested the possibility that it was translated directly from Hebrew. Enoch II describes how the patriarch was taken up to God through seven heavens and then returned to describe his vision. Its theology is uncompromisingly monotheistic, its ethics permeated by sympathy with the needy and by sexual chastity. The date of the original composition cannot be established. Enoch III, a Hebrew apocalypse of the 5th–6th C., deals with a journey of Rabbi Ishmael into heaven, where he met Enoch, son of Jared, whom God had elevated above the angels and appointed as his viceroy.


**ENOIKION** (ἐνοικίον), rent paid for a leased property. In classical antiquity the term enoikion, meaning house rent, seems to have been distinguished from phoros, rent for the lease of a workshop (ergasterion); already in late Roman Egypt, however, the two terms were confused (Fikman, Egrp 44). Often used in the Book of the Eparch, enoikion designated primarily the rent for an ergasterion, but merchants staying in mitata also had to pay enoikion. The term and its cognates continued to be used in late documents: an act of donation of 1338 mentions three ergasteria enoikiaka (Kouloum., no. 18.44) near the emporion of Serres. Sometimes the word enoikiaka is used as a noun to designate rooms for rent (Lavra 2, no. 71.70); in an act of donation of 1115 (Lavra 1,
no.60.35), however, enoikiaka are contrasted with houses and evidently mean workshops.

Michael Attaliates collected the enoikion of 24 nomismata for a bakery, 14 nomismata for a perfumery, and 5 nomismata for "houses" used by a physician (P. Gautier, REB 39 [1981] 43.440–45). Charters also provide some data about the amount of enoikion: in 1294, 200 hyperpers for a tower (pyrgos) containing several workshops (e.g., for shops selling woolen garments) and a kitchen (MM 4:286.4–7); in 1342, 700 hyperpers for a chain of shops—grocery stores, perfumeries, a bakery, and vegetable markets (Lavra 3, no.123.115–33); in 1419, 30 hyperpers for "houses" (Xénoph. no.32.21); in 1445, eight nomismata and a vessel of flaxseed oil for a workshop processing flaxseed (Lavra 3, no.168.4–7). In a prestolagma of 1202 (MM 3:50–53) the rent for houses and ergastera is called either enoikion or emphyteuma; the latter term is usually explained as the rent for a newly established shop.

The payment of rent sometimes caused discontent in Constantinople. As a result, on one occasion Emp. Romanos I paid the enoikha of impoverished inhabitants of the city (TheophCont 429.22).

Lit. Bk. of Eparch 153f. —A.K.

ENTABLATURE, a horizontal beam carried on columns marking the juncture of load and support in trabeated construction. In ancient architecture the entablature was divided proportionately into three parts, bottom to top: architrave (or epistyle), frieze, and cornice. In arcuate architecture (Roman, early Christian, and Byz.) entablatures disappeared to be replaced by a molding, sometimes elaborately carved, marking the crowns of the arches carried by the columns, the floor level of the galleries, or the springing of major arches supported by piers. Entablatures were used in Old St. Peter's (central nave only) and survive in S. Maria Maggiore, Rome; at Studios and Sts. Sergios and Bakchos (exedrae only), Constantinople; Church of the Nativity, Bethlehem; and in the columnar TEMPLA of Byz. churches built during and after the 9th C. (See also IMPOST BLOCK.)

—W.L.

ENTERTAINMENT. For amusement the Byz. enjoyed games and spectacles such as CHARiot RACES in the hippodrome, triumphal processions, visits of foreign dignitaries and ambassadors, religious festivities and panegyres (see FAIR), banquets, and ceremonies that provided recreation and excitement. The streets were also the setting for various kinds of shows with exotic or strange animals and wild beasts. Performances were given by acrobats, jugglers, magicians, actors, and mimes. Apart from this kind of popular entertainment people found recreation in board games such as chess, in gambling, and in various sports. Hunting, hawking, and equestrian sports attracted mostly the aristocracy. The common people went to taverns, where they engaged in dances and jesting, while baths and the theater gradually declined in importance. On certain holidays, like the feastday of Sts. Markianos and Martyrios or the January festival, there was CARNIVAL-like masquerading and processions in which even the clergy participated along with the people.


ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM. Celebrated on PALM SUNDAY, Christ's Entry marks the beginning of his PASSION (Mt 21:1–11, Mk 11:1–10, Lk 19:29–40, Jn 12:12–19). Its imagery shifted with shifting interpretations of the Passion. On the 4th-C. Junius Bassus sarcophagus (Volbach, Early Christian Art, pl.42), the Entry adopted the iconography of imperial ADVENTUS that itself had already shaped the Gospel account. Showing a youthful Christ astride a donkey greeted by the personification of Jerusalem, the Entry proclaimed the Passion as Christ's victory over death and the beginning of his sovereignty in the eternal Jerusalem. A different, more narrative inflection characterizes the 6th-C. versions (ROSSANO GOSPELS, fol.1v), where Christ is a mature man seated side-saddle and welcomed by palm-waving crowds who lay their coats in his path. The Passion had by now acquired an emphasis on sacrifice, and henceforth a narrative version of the Entry focusing on Christ's humanity predominated. Post-Iconoclastic art replaced the personified city with the figure of a mother and child; other symbolic details are the Spinario, or boy removing a thorn from his foot (Berlin ivory—Rice, Art of Byz., pl.115), and the prophet Zechariah (cf. Zech 9:9). Palaiologan art emphasizes the steepness of Christ's downward path to symbolize his descent into Hell.
ENVERI, 15th-C. Turkish poet and chronicler. All that is known of his biography is that he accompanied MEHMED II on campaigns to Wallachia, Bosnia, and Lesbos in 1462–63. He was the author of the Desturname (Book of the Grand Vizier), a universal history commissioned by Mehmed II’s grand vizier Mahmud Pasha (who functioned in an official capacity 1455–68). Written in Turkish verse, the Desturname was completed in 1465. Relevant to Byz. studies is book 18, which celebrates the Aydinoğulları, or emirs of Aydın, chiefly Umur Beg (died 1348), and books 19–22, which cover Ottoman themes to 1464. Enveri’s unparalleled account of Umur Beg’s campaigns rests on excellent, evidently contemporary sources. Its value in clarifying the liaison between John VI Kantakouzenos and Umur Beg during the Civil War of 1341–47 is demonstrated by P. Lemerle (L’Émirat d’Aydin, Byzance et L’Occident, Recherches sur “La Geste d’Umur Pacha” [Paris 1957]). Enveri’s treatment of the Ottoman dynasty in books 19–20 also depends primarily on an anterior source, but is much less detailed and significant. His information in books 21 and 22 about Mahmud Pasha, a scion of the Angeloi who converted to Islam after 1451, is of great importance.


ENVIRONMENT. The Byz. perceived their natural surroundings mostly in standardized, conventional terms: the desert was the region of “mountains and caverns and holes in the earth” (e.g., Barlaam and Ioasaph, ed. Woodward, Mattingly, p. 48.20–21), the mountains precipitous and unassailable, the sea seething with waves. When a civilized area was described, the accent lay on its material assets, not its pleasurable aspects: cities were said to possess temperate climate, fertile soil, and sweet water in abundance. The image of the world was usually presented as a catalog of abstract designations of individual categories. The vocabulary of a writer (e.g., Niketas Choniates) might contain numerous names of trees, flowers, and animals, but these flora and fauna were reminiscences of ancient scholarship rather than live elements of real environment. The gardens in romances are as deprived of individuality as the emotions revealed in this setting.

Some exceptions, however, can be discovered. Gregory Antiochos describes a miserable winter in Bulgaria—the barrenness of the land, the ears of travelers assaulted by the bleating of sheep and the grunting of pigs: the description is sarcastic but vivid (Kazhdan-Franklin, Studies 219f). Gregory is esp. rich in fresh images of nature: a tree reflected in a pool (Greg. 2:705, 10–19); the kingfisher building its nest in the sand in stormy winter weather (3:130f); Mt. Athos, blessed with forests and flowery meadows, where in the morning the nightingale, singing in a grove, blends its song with the matins prayers of monks (2:714f). Also notable are the letters of Manuel II Palaiologos, who frequently describes his natural surroundings, whether a storm at sea, a barren plain in Anatolia, or the pleasures of the environs of Thessalonike, with their cool springs, shady trees, fragrant flowers, and birdsongs (eps. 16, 45, 67, 68).


EPANAGOGE (Ἐπαναγογή, Return to the Point), correctly Eiasagoge (Εἰσαγωγή τοῦ νόμου, Introduction to the Law), a law book of the emperors Basil I, Leo VI, and Alexander, divided into 40 titles. Patr. Photios took part in the composition of the work, which was probably promulgated in 886; he wrote the preface and the two most important titles (2 and 3), on the emperor and on the patriarch. The Epanagoge was to serve as an “introduction” to the comprehensive legislation known later as the Basilika and to replace the Eclaga of the Isaurian emperors. The source of the Epanagoge, which comprises nearly all spheres of law, is almost exclusively the Corpus Juris Civilis, whose regulations were to a certain extent intentionally altered or even falsified; the Eclaga, too, served as a model. Although the Epanagoge stopped being officially circulated soon after its promulgation and was replaced by the Prochiron
about 20 years later, many of its regulations were adopted into private law books (Epanagoge aucta, Epanagoge cum Prochiro composita, Syntagma of Matthew Blastares). The law book is transmitted in few MSS; extensive scholia to it have been preserved which sometimes comment critically on the text.


Epanagoge Aucta, a law book that consists of 54 titles and an appendix; it is based on the Epanagoge and, from Title 17 onward, the Prochiron. The Basilika were also used as an important source. The unknown compiler was acquainted with the legislative works produced under Leo VI; thus he summarized approximately 30 Novels of Leo VI, gave preference to the marriage property law of the Prochiron, and often detached the new regulations of the Prochiron from their context. He knew that the Ecloga was an “Isaurian” law book (15.8). The Epanagoge aucta, which is transmitted in about 10 MSS, bears the rubric “Leo the emperor” and shows no traces of later laws. Thus, it is probable that it originated soon after Leo’s death (912).

ED. Zepos, Jus 6:49–216.

Epanagoge cum Prochiro composita, a law book in 42 titles that is composed of the Epanagoge and the Prochiron. In some of the few surviving MSS, the compilation also includes excerpts from the Basilika as well as numerous marginal glosses. Some scholia to the Epanagoge (esp. to title 19) are integrated into the work. The law book, fragments of which have been preserved in a palimpsest MS of the 10th C., is ascribed in its rubric to “the emperor Leo the Philosopher,” and was presumably produced soon after the death of Leo VI (912).


Eparch (ἐπαρχὸς or ὑπαρχος), the name of several officials, the most important of which was the eparch of the city; other officials bearing this title were the eparchs of lesser towns. Except in the case of Thessalonike, they are known only from the late Roman period, and in Thessalonike the eparch acted under the supervision of the doux. Guillaud (infra) also gives a list of eparchs as chiefs of offices (eparch of the court, nykti eparchos, and so on), but J.-C. Cheynet (BS 45 [1984] 50f) argues that some of them never existed while others functioned only during late antiquity. Thus the eparch of the army is known in the 6th C. but not after that date (A. Failler, REB 45 [1987] 199f). The title of apo eparchon (the former eparch) is known primarily from sources of the 6th–8th C.


Eparchia (ἐπαρχία), province, the term used by narrative sources, primarily of the 11th and 12th C., as synonymous with the official theme. In ecclesiastical vocabulary eparchia meant an episcopal province.

LIT. Ahrweiler, “Administration” 69f. —A.K.

Eparchius Avitus, Western Roman emperor (9 July 455–18 Oct. 456); born Clermont, Gallia, ca.395–400, died 457?. A member of the Gallic aristocracy, Eparchius was descended from the patricia Philagrius (PLRE 1:693), of whom nothing is known. Eparchius was related to many senatorial families, Gaius Apollinaris Sidonius being his son-in-law; he served under command of general Aetius and enjoyed Visigothic support. Eparchius was praetorian prefect in Gaul in 439. In 455 Petronius Maximus appointed Eparchius magister militum and sent him as envoy to the Visigoths; when Petronius was murdered, first the Visigoths and then the Gallic nobles urged Eparchius to accept the diadem; he was proclaimed emperor at Arles. Eparchius sent an embassy to Emp. Marcian asking for recognition but did not receive it, even though he boasted that his request had been granted. After his return to Italy, unable to stop the Vandal pillaging or to revitalize the grain supply of starving Rome, Eparchius incurred the hatred of both the indig-

K.F. Stroheker, Der senatorische Adel im späten Gallien (Tübingen 1948) 152–54. —A.K.

EPARCH OF THE CITY (ἐπαρχος τῆς πόλεως), successor of the late Roman urban prefect, the governor of Constantinople. The eparch of the city was considered supreme judge in Constantinople and its vicinity, second only to the emperor, and was the chief of police responsible for order, decoration, and ceremonial in the capital; as the head of the city police the eparch also had jurisdiction over prisons. Other functions were to control commercial and industrial activity in the capital, as reflected in the Book of the Eparch. Christopher of Mytilene characterizes in detail the symbolism of the eparch’s attire and of the trappings of his white horse (no.30.12–26); for example, the gilded copper bosses on the horse’s harness represented the eparch’s concern for the poor. In the Kletorologion (9th C.) Philotheos lists the following members of the eparch’s staff: symponos, logothetes tou praitorion, district judges, geitoniarchai, parathalassites, exarchs and prostatatai [of the guilds?], boullotaí who appended seals to merchandise, and others; of this list, the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch mentions exarchs and prostatatai, boullotaí, and sympones (possibly in a different function), but it introduces other assistants of the eparch—the legatarios and the mitotoes, inspector of the quality of silk textiles (Stückle, Zunft 93). After 1204 the role of the eparch declined and his office was divided up among several kephalatikeunotes (K.-P. Matschke, BBulg 3 [1969] 81–101) under the pressure of feudal forces. Seals of the eparch of the city dating from the 6th to the early 13th C. are known (Laurent, Corpus 2:545–79).


EPEIKES (ἐπεικὴς, on seals regularly epiketes), official on the staff of the homes tou staulou, who is mentioned in all taktika of the 9th and 10th C. According to a 10th-C. ceremonial book (De cer. 480.1–3), he was responsible for providing the fodder and water for horses as well as horse-shoes, bridles, and saddles. His function was probably the management of the imperial stables—at any rate, a seal of the 8th or 9th C. belonged to the “epiketes of the imperial stables” (Zacos, Seals 1, no.1806), and the owner of another was an “imperial epiketes” (no.2480C). Basil, the “epiketes of the basileus” (Skyl. 179.73; he is called just a plain epiketes in TheophCont 362.17), participated in the conspiracy of Samonas. At the end of the 10th C. Christopher Doukas was called Epeiketes, an epithet viewed by Polemis (Doukai 27) as a nickname. It is unclear how the term penetrated into the Armenian milieu—in the 1060s an Armenian “Pecht” served as a doux of Antioch; an Armenian prince “Epicht” was murdered by Greeks ca.1078 (Kazhdan, Arm. 124–26).

LIT. Oikonomides, Listes 339. —A.K.

EPEIREA (ἐπιειρεία, lit. “abuse, contumely”), a term that, at least from the 10th C. onward, was used by fiscal officials to designate extraordinary state “requisitions” (Lemerle, Agr. Hist. 167) or special taxes (Dölger, Beiträge 61). An act of 927 contrasts the state (demoteles) epereiai with military service (strateiai), both due for the land (Iuvir., no.1.8–9); an act of 974 (?) mentions epereiai side by side with angareiai, aplektos, and the (illegal) mitaton (Lavra 1, no.6.22–23). Later documents sometimes give a list of epereiai; thus, an act from ca.1200 includes angareiai, kastroktsiai, psomozemia, and several other charges (Xerop., no.8.17–18). A privilege of 1199 has an unusual list of epereiai connected with trade: kommerkcion, dekateiai (tithe) of wine, charge tor shipping (naulon), etc. (Palmou Engraphe 2, no.59.7–8). The term demosiakhe (state) epereia (e.g., Zepos, Jus 1:366.8) indicates that the central government was owed these charges, whereas Theophylaktos of Ohrid spoke of douleiai and epereiai required by local authorities (Letters, ed. P. Gautier, no.12.20). Accordingly an act of 1429 mentions “the demosiakhe and other epereiai” (Lavra 3, no.167.19–20), and a chrysoff of 1405 refers to “epereia archontike and demosiakhe” (Binon, Xeropotamou, no.20.24).
Thus, the term seems to have no strict, technical meaning. Having a connotation of “abuse” it could denote various types of charges and was primarily employed in the clauses of tax exemption. It is, however, questionable whether the exemption “from all epeereiæ” designated, as Solovjev and Mošin (Grčke povijesti 437) suggest, freedom from all taxes.


- M.B.

EPHESUS (* Ἐφεσός, near mod. Selçuk), seaport of Aegean Asia Minor. As capital of the province of Asia, Ephesus enjoyed considerable prosperity due to commerce, banking, and the patronage of the proconsul and the metropolitan bishop. Constantius II, Arkadius, and esp. Justinian I adorned the city, which is best known from its remains. They indicate that classical public works and services—theater, market, baths, the civic center, and marble-paved, colonnaded streets lined with shops—were maintained and that richly decorated private houses continued to be built until the early 7th C. The city was christianized by the 4th C. and saw the erection of churches and monumental crosses and the transformation of open public spaces as private buildings encroached on them. The numerous Late Antique buildings usually used spolia and were adorned with frescoes, mosaics, and marble. Prosperity ended ca.614, when large parts of Ephesus were destroyed (by Persians or earthquakes), never to be restored.

New fortifications enclosed less than half the ancient city and created a new defensive center around the Church of St. John a mile away. Its walls were probably a response to the Arab attacks that began in 654. Ephesus became a city of the Thraesion theme; in the 10th C., it was the center of a tourma of the theme of Samos. Ephesus was the site of a major regional fair in the 8th C., which generated considerable revenue. By the 9th C., neglect and the resultant silting had ruined the harbor and the city had moved to the hill around the Church of St. John to become an inland fortress. The city survived the attack of the Paulicians in 867/8 or 869/70, had Italian concessions after 1082, and was occupied by the Turks 1090–96. It was then usually known as “Theologos” (after St. John) or simply the Kastron.” In 1147 Ephesus was host to the Second Crusade and in 1206 recognized the Laskarids, under whom it became a center of learning. Nikophoros Blemmydes taught here, with George Akropolites and Theodore Laskaris among his pupils. The late 13th C. brought Turkish threats, temporarily dispelled by the Catalan Grand Company, which made Ephesus its base in 1304; it fell to the Turks of Aydin the same year.

Traditions that associated Ephesus with St. Paul, the Apostle John, the Virgin, and the Seven Sleepers made it the natural site for the councils of 431 and 449 and the frequent goal of pilgrimage.

Monuments of Ephesus. Ephesus preserves numerous civic buildings and two huge churches: the Basilica of the Virgin, seat of the councils, built in the 4th C. and twice rebuilt on a smaller scale after the 6th C., and the Basilica of St. John. The latter, the largest and most important church in the city, had its beginnings in the tetrapylon martyrion erected over John’s purported tomb as early as ca.300 and was mentioned by Egeria (29.10) in the last quarter of the same century. Probably ca.450 a cruciform church with a wooden roof was built on the site, incorporating the tetrapylon at its crossing. The western arm, with one or two narthexes, contained a nave and two aisles, while the eastern arm had four aisles and terminated in an apse. The church was rebuilt under Justinian I, with work beginning before 548 and completed prior to 565. The cruciform plan was maintained but the building was now covered with a series of six domes resting on massive piers. The western arm, longer than the others, consisted of two such bays, while the crossing, north, south, and east arms each had a single bay in a design described by Prokopios (Buildings 5.1.4–6) as closely resembling that of the Church of the Holy Apostles, Constantinople. The church was flanked by an octagonal baptistery built in the 5th C. and a domed, octagonal skewophylakion, or sacristy, erected in the late 6th or early 7th C. St. John’s was the scene of an annual miracle when healing dust issued from the evangelist’s tomb at the time of his feast on 8 May.


- C.F. M.J.
Ephesus, Councils of. Two important councils were held in Ephesus.

Council of 431. The third ecumenical council was summoned by Theodosios II to settle the conflict between the Antiochian Christology of Nestorios of Constantinople and that of the Alexandrian school represented by Cyril. Lasting from 22 June to 22 July, the council had approximately 150 participants at its opening. The lively political and ecclesiastical rivalry between the patriarchal sees of Alexandria and Constantinople complicated the long-standing opposition between the two schools. Although the council did not formulate its own Christological statement, it did accept that of the First Council of Nicaea (325) as interpreted by Cyril. In effect, it approved his theology that the humanity and divinity of the incarnate Christ were united in one hypostatic union—homoousis kath'hypostasin. By so doing, it formally recognized the propriety of Mary's title Theotokos (God-bearer), which Nestorius had denied. Finally, the council also condemned the beliefs of Pelagius (see Pelagianism) as heresy. These matters were decided before the arrival of John I, patriarch of Antioch, and his delegation. The latter understandably refused to accept the Cyrilian majority's condemnation of Nestorius. A brief schism followed, ending in 433 when Cyril and John were finally reconciled. The doctrinal and ecclesiastical victory had nevertheless gone to Alexandria. Cyril's rival, Nestorius, and his theology were crushed and humiliated. Ephesus is the first general council with extant original acts.


Ephoros (ἐφόρος, lit. "overseer"), term for an ancient Spartan magistrate, revived in the 11th C. It is not found in the Taktika of the 4th and 10th C. On seals, ephoroi bear the high ranks of proedros and vestes and sometimes combine their duty with judicial functions, as in the case of Theodore, judge of the velum and ephoros. On the other hand, charters of 1044–88 mention the ephoroi of imperial kouratoreiai who, according to N. Oikonomides (TM 6 [1976] 198), administered all the kouratoreiai over the entire empire. The staff of the ephoros included notaries and domestikoi. The term is found in the letters of Theodore Prodromos (PG 193:1299A) and Michael Italikos (ep.18). At the end of the 12th C. Niketas Choniates held this post, but it disappeared after 1204.

Ephoros was also the term for the lay administrator of a monastery, who was responsible for its economic management; the term is first attested in the 11th C. Other terms used for this position—epitropos, antileptor, and prostates—are found in 10th-C. sources. The ephoros was granted ownership (kryptai) of the monastery and its properties and was supposed to be its protector, assuring for
example, that it received fiscal exemptions (M. Nystazopoulou, Symeikta 1 [1966] 85–94). The ephoros might play an important role in the election of the hegoumenos and would have the power to remove him. Galatariotou (infra) concludes that an ephoros was more commonly appointed by aristocratic ktetors or founders; nonaristocratic tytpika either deliberately refrain from making this sort of appointment or appoint an ephoros to serve primarily as a contact with the outside world and to represent the monastery’s business interests and not to intervene in the internal administration of the monastery. In aristocratic typika, the ephoros is usually a relative of the ktetor, and the term is often a euphemism for a charistikarios (Ahrweiler, Structures, pt.VII [1967], 3f), who received financial benefit from the monastery, which he was granted as charistikion. Such ephorosoi sometimes abused their privileges and brought ruin on the monastery.

In a nontechnical sense, the term ephoros was applied to the ecclesiastical oikonomos and sakellarios (Dattouzès, Ofskia 555.1–2).


EPHRAIM, mosaist who worked with BASILIUS PICTOR in 1169 in the Church of the Nativity at BETHLEHEM. Ephraim’s name is found in the Greek portion of a partially preserved bilingual inscription formerly situated above the Gospel scenes in the church’s choir. It describes him as historiographos kai mouziatoros, names MANUEL I, AMALRIC I, and Raoul, bishop of Bethlehem, and gives the date for the work’s completion. The inscription is fully recorded on the flyleaf of a monastic miscellany, now Jerusalem, Greek Patr. Taphou 57.


EPHRAIM (Ἐφραίμ), chronicler from Ainos in Thrace; fl. at the end of the 15th C. or early 14th C. Ephraim is known only from his chronicle in dodecasyllables that presents the history of Old and New Rome through their rulers, from the 1st C. A.D. to 1261. It is followed by a verse catalog of the bishops of New Rome from the foundation of the church by the apostle Andrew to the accession of Patr. Isaiah in 1323. The latter is the only chronological indication for Ephraim’s life. The chronicle’s sources are ZONARAS, NIKETAS CHONIANES, and George AKROPOLITES, and is most detailed for the period 1204–61. Ephraim is true to his sources; variations and departures from them are minor and can be ascribed more to the needs of the meter than to independent knowledge.


EPHREM THE SYRIAN, theologian and hymnographer; saint; born Nisibis ca.306, died Edessa 9 June 373; feastday 28 Jan. Born probably to Christian parents (although his Syriac Life states that his father was a pagan priest), Ephrem spent most of his life in Nisibis, serving as a deacon. After the Persian occupation of Nisibis in 363, he moved to Edessa. Hagiographical accounts (e.g., the spurious sermon ascribed to GREGORY OF NYSSA) credit him with confronting ARIANISM in Egypt and visiting BASIL THE GREAT at Caesarea. His diverse writings (exegetical, dogmatic, polemical, ascetic), mostly in verse, were composed in Syriac but translated into Armenian, Greek, Latin, and Church Slavonic. Most important is his liturgical poetry, which includes hymn cycles on church feasts, funeral hymns, and polemics against various heresies, esp. those of ARTUS, BARDESANES, and MANI. Two other favorite themes were grim descriptions of the Day of Judgment and the supreme virtues of the Virgin Mary. Ephrem was a major influence on the development of Syriac and Byz. HYMNOGRAPHY. Despite some modern scepticism (J. Grosdidier de Matons, Romanos le Mélodie et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance [Paris 1977] 22f), his impact on ROMANOS THE MELODE in terms of theme and imagery (e.g., heat, light, the “thorny nature” of man) seems certain (W.L. Petersen, VigChr 39 [1985] 171–87).

Representation in Art. Ephrem was depicted as a monk with a scant beard from at least the 10th C. (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, no.B-58). The
scene of his death, a popular post-Byz. composition, had its origin in the Byz. period: the corpse of the saint, laid out on a bier in an open landscape, was surrounded by vignettes of eremitical life, showing monks at work in their rocky cells or preparing to descend by various means of transport for the funeral. These elements, which appear already in 11th-C. MSS of the Heavenly Ladder of John Climacus, were occasionally used for scenes of the death of other saints as well (e.g., Arsenios the Great).


EPHTHALITES (Ἐφθαλίται), a Hunnic people whose history and nomenclature are not clear. Many scholars assume that the peoples variously referred to as (H)Ephthalites, White Huns, Yeta, Hayatila, Chionites, and Kidarites are related and of Hunnic origin. Christensen (infra) believes the Kidarites and Ephthalites to have been different peoples on the basis of Prokopios, who says that the latter were white-skinned. In any case, the presence of this single group (or plurality of groups) in Sasanian Iran is demonstrable from the 4th C. through the reign of Chosroes I Anushirwan in the 6th C. Migrants from Mongolia, they settled along the Oxus River probably in the late 4th C.; under their king Grumbatras they participated in the expedition of Shāpūr II against Byz. Mesopotamia in 359; as Kidarite Huns, they settled in Bactria and Gandara in the 5th C. They participated in the dynastic struggle on behalf of Pērōz against his brother Hurmazd III in 457 and later took Pērōz captive. This evidently inaugurated a period of strife and tension, settled finally in 557 by Chosroes Anushirwan who, in alliance with the Turkic khan Silzboulos, crushed the Ephthalites and divided their lands with the Turks.

The ethnological discourse of Prokopios (Wars 1.3) on the Ephthalites indicates that they were sedentarized and yet also retained Central Asiatic shamanistic customs; for example, the hetairai of the chief were interred alive with their deceased master.


EPIBOLE (ἐπιβολή, Lat. adjectio sterilium) was the official transfer of abandoned land, together with its fiscal obligations, to relatives, co-contributors, or members of the same village or fiscal unit. The measure, initially meant to stabilize state revenues, enhanced the development of the fiscal communities described in 8th–10th-C. texts; it ended by indicating a complicated procedure by which, at every revision of the cadaster, the kanon was reassessed, taking into consideration the previous assessments and all eventual increases or decreases of fiscal obligations or taxable assets of each fiscal unit (village or large landowner); the established fiscal burden was then distributed to individual contributors. The basic characteristics of the institution survived in the late 11th and early 12th C., but the way it was actually applied had by then changed considerably owing to the decline of small landed property and the increase of state lands and large privileged private properties. At this time officials began to consider the possibility of a unified rate of epibole for the whole empire.


EPIC. Several types of epic flourished in the late Roman period: (1) PATRIA, or histories of cities such as Tarsos, Berytus, and Nicaea; CHISTODOROS OF KOPTOS wrote patria in epic verses on Constantinople, Thessalonike, and other cities (Al. Cameron, Historia 14 [1963] 489); (2) epic enkomia of famous persons, primarily emperors and high officials, by such authors as Claudian (who wrote both Latin and Greek epics), the empress Athenaia-Eudokia, Kyros of Panopolis, and Corippus; (3) mythological epics by Nonnos, Quintus of Smyrna, Kollouthos, Mousaios, etc.; and (4) biblical epics, an attempt to reproduce various Old and New Testament episodes in hex-
ameters; of these the paraphrase of St. John's Gospel, probably by Nonnos, is the most remarkable. Many of these epics are lost (esp. the city histories) and known only from fragments or citations in Libanius, the *Soula*, and other sources. Proklos defended Homer against Plato's criticism (S. Koster, *Antike Epotheorien* [Wiesbaden 1970] 99–114), while introducing a threefold division of poetry: the sublime, full of divine virtues; the middle, having educational purposes; and the lower, which with the help of imitation and fantasy leads the soul into error.

Epic form was occasionally used for works without epic content, such as didactic poetry. Dionysios Periegetes (2nd C.) and Oppian (3rd C.), authors popular in Byz., wrote in hexameter, as well as Markellos of Side, a physician of the 2nd C. From the 4th C. onward, hexameter was replaced in didactic works by iambic trimeters and prose; on the other hand, *centost* preserved Homeric meter and vocabulary but were sometimes far removed from an epic character.

After the first half of the 7th C., epic disappeared, although even much later (12th C.) poets praised imperial military achievements in hexameter. The last 7th-C. epic *enkomiom*, by George of Pisidia, was already iambic. The later epic Digenes Akritas differs in meter, content, and language from earlier examples and is closer to the tradition of soldiers' songs than to Homer.


---

**EPIFANII PREMUDRYJ**, or Epiphanius the Wise, monk of the Trinity monastery of St. Sergei near Moscow; died ca. 1420. His reputation as the most florid hagiographer of Rus' rests primarily on his vita of St. Stefan of Perm' (died 1395). The vita's elaborately expressive and emotive verbal devices are sometimes thought to be a literary and aesthetic extension of the spirituality of hesychasm, although features of the style can be traced to Serbian vitae of the 15th–14th C. and indeed to Byz. rhetoric (M. Mulić, *TODRL* 23 [1968] 127–42). Epifanij parades his knowledge of patristic and Byz. hagiographic traditions and of the Greek language, and he was prominent among those who represented the hesychast culture of Constantinople and Athos in Rus' (see KIPRIAN), probably having spent time in Constantinople and Athos himself. He wrote an *enkomiom* and, in 1418,
a vita of St. Sergej of Radonež (died 1392), which survives in a version reworked by PACHOMIJ LOGOFET. In a letter to the archimandrite Kirill of Tver', Epifanij describes the activities and working methods of THEOPHANES THE GREEK, from whom he requested and copied a miniature depiction of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.


EPIGONATION (ἐπιγονόται), a lozenge of stiff embroidered cloth worn as a vestment by a bishop over his sticharion. It measured about 30 cm on each side and was attached to the belt so as to hang down over the right knee. Its use was restricted to bishops at least until the 14th C. First mentioned in the 12th C. by Theodore Balsamon (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:178.25–66), who states that it represents the cloth with which Christ washed the feet of the apostles, the epigonation gradually replaced the softer encherion. The earliest surviving examples, which date from the 14th C., are embroidered with an image of the Anastasis.


EPIGRAM (ἐπιγραμμα), originally an inscrip- tion, esp. a funerary inscription; in Hellenistic and Roman times a short poem, usually in elegiac couplets, often with an erotic or satiric theme. In the early centuries of Byz., though caustic cynicism and eroticism can still be seen in epigrams (e.g., of Palladas and later of Paul Silentiarios and Agathias), such subjects were already being replaced by soberer topics that reflected a christianized society, as in the funerary epigrams of Gregory of Nazianzos. Thus the epigrams of George of Pisidia or Theodore of Studios frequently deal with icons, saints, or church festivals. Epigrams were also used in doctrinal polemics, as during the Iconoclast period, or to vent personal spleen (as in Constantine of Rhodes).

During the 10th C. anthologies of classical and Byz. epigrams were made, first by Kephala and later by the anonymous compiler, or compilers, of the Anthologia Palatina (see GREEK ANTHOLOGY). Epigrams continued to be a fertile genre whose wide-ranging and prolific practitioners included John Geometres, John Mauropos, and Christopher of Mytilene. From the 12th C. onward there is a tendency, as in the poems of Theodore Prodromos and Manuel Philes as well as in numerous anonymous verses, for epigrams to revert to their primary use as dedicatory inscriptions attached to votive offerings (icons, church vessels, etc.) and on tombstones (cf. Lampros, "Mark. kod." 3–59, 123–92). A particular form of epigram was the metrical inscription on seals (sometimes one line long), giving the name, title, and office of the seal owner. Still used, nevertheless, for an enormous variety of topics normally written in 12- and 15-syllable lines, they are perhaps now best called "occasional verse."


EPIGRAPHY. A discipline of Byz. epigraphy does not yet exist. While it cannot be said that it will occupy the same central position as it does in classical studies, it can nevertheless make a substantial contribution in a variety of fields (e.g., institutions, prosopography and onomastics, linguistic frontiers, etc.). Ideally, it should encompass all types of writing except in MSS, in particular the following:

1. Inscriptions on stone, including graffiti
2. Painted and mosaic inscriptions (those on mosaic pavements, which form an important group, cease with very few exceptions in the 7th C.)
3. Objects of household and religious use, including jewelry and amulets
4. Coins, seals, and weights
5. Brick stamps (limited primarily to the 4th–6th/7th C.)
6. Ivories and steatites

For some of the above categories (ivories, steatites, coins, and seals) we do have more or less complete corpora, but most of the other material remains extremely scattered in works such as publications of individual monuments, excavation reports, regional surveys, and museum catalogs, where Byz. inscriptions are interspersed with antique ones.

Strictly speaking, Byz. epigraphy ought to include all inscriptions originating within the empire, whatever their language (Greek, Latin, Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, etc.). In practice, however, those in indigenous languages have been left to their respective specialists and attention has been concentrated on those in Greek and Latin. The boundary between the latter two up to the 6th C. runs across the Balkan peninsula, roughly along a line from Dyrrachion to Odessos (Varna) and in Africa between the Roman provinces of Libya and Tripolitana. The use of the two “prestige” languages, however, particularly of Greek in the eastern provinces, does not necessarily reflect the most commonly spoken language in an area; for example, in Syria up to the Arab conquest the vast majority of inscriptions are in Greek. A case may also be made for including in the sphere of Byz. epigraphy regions outside the empire where Greek inscriptions of Byz. character have been found (e.g., Nubia, 8th–12th C.). Greek was also used in Proto-Bulgarian inscriptions, and the Alans wrote their inscriptions in Greek characters (10th–12th C.).

The first aim of the epigraphist is correct reading, which involves the resolution of abbreviations, monograms, and cryptograms, and familiarity with formulas and titulature. A concurrent preoccupation concerns the evolution of script, since it permits the dating of inscriptions within broad limits when an absolute date is not given, which is in the majority of cases. By and large, Byz. inscriptions before the year 1000 are in capital letters, written without division between words and hardly ever accented. Ligatures between vertical letters (like M, N) are frequent; that of ο plus υ (.yahoo) comes into widespread use from the end of the 5th C. onward. Abbreviations are limited to titles, professions, dates, nomina sacra, and the conjunction kai. An important change in script occurs in the early 11th C.: abandoning its earlier sobriety, it strives after an ornamental effect. It borrows an increasing number of ligatures and abbreviations current in MSS and places one letter above or within another with a consequent loss of legibility. One can almost say that the content becomes secondary to calligraphy.

The thematic classification of inscriptions, as it has been elaborated for classical antiquity, is only partly applicable to the Byz. period. The following breakdown is tentative:

1. Sacred texts
2. Decrees (practically none after the 6th/7th C.) and grants of privileges. The latter are extremely rare, but note the painted chrysobulls in the Brontochion church, Mistra (ed. G. Millet, BCH 23 [1899] 100–118), and at Stagoi.
3. Tokens of official control or regulation (coins, silver stamps, weights, brick stamps)
4. Marks of ownership (e.g., boundary stones) and authentication (seals)
5. Records of building and/or decoration
6. Honorific inscriptions accompanying statues or portraits (almost none after the 6th/7th C.)
7. Records of death (epitaphia and commemorative graffiti)
8. Acclamations
9. Invocations, pious and magical formulas
10. Dedications, often introduced by the formula Deesis tou doulou
11. Epigrams, often on small objects (e.g., ivories, icon frames, crosses, etc.)
12. Painters’ “signatures” (none before the 11th C. and rare thereafter)

It should be noted that many inscriptions, esp. those in verse, are preserved by way of MS tradition—the Greek Anthology, among the works of poets such as Theodore Prodromos and Manuel Philes—although it is often difficult to determine whether their compositions were in fact inscribed. As an example of a real inscription preserved in this manner we may quote the epigram on the Sangarios bridge (attributed to Agathias), which is found in the Palatine Anthology (AnthGr 9:641) and Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (DeThem. 5, ed. Pertusi 70.21–26).

EPILEPSY. See Insanity.

EPIMANIKIA (ἐπιμανίκια, ἐπιμάνικα), a pair of detachable gold-embroidered cuffs worn as a vestment over the sleeves of a bishop’s sticharion. Contrary to Lampe, who says that epimanika are first mentioned in the Liturgy ascribed to John Chrysostom, the first reference is that by the mid-11th C. Patr. Peter III of Antioch, who spoke of encheiria, epimanikia, and epitrachelia ornamented with gold as details of the patriarchal costume (PG 120:800C). They occur in representations of bishops as early as the mid-10th C. (e.g., Bible of Leo Sakkarios, fol.9), or even the late 9th C. (tympanum mosaics in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople); it is not entirely certain, however, that these early images show detachable cuffs. The use of epimanika was still restricted to bishops in the late 12th C. according to Theodore Balsamon, who says they represent the bonds that encircled Christ’s wrists during the Passion (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:478.16–24). All the epimanika that have survived date from the post-Byz. period.


—N.P.S.

EPIMERISMS (sing. ἐπιμερισμός, “distribution, parsing”), elementary word-by-word commentaries on literary texts intended for school use and comprising parsing, morphology, orthography, prosody, semantics, and etymology. Epimerisms on Homer existed from late antiquity. George Choiroboskos composed epimerisms on the Psalms, which were in use as a schoolbook in the 10th C. The classicism of the Palaiologan period led to the composition of epimerisms on select works of Aelianus, the Philostrati, and Agapetus by such scholars as Maximos Planoudes (S. Lindstam, Eranos 19 [1919–20] 57–92) and Manuel Moschopoulos. George Lakapenos even composed epimerisms on a collection of his own letters. Anonymous epimerisms on prayers and other short religious texts are numerous and impossible to date. The epimerisms on Homer and the Psalms were originally separate books, while the later epimerisms seem from the first to have been written in the margins or between the lines of the text that they were designed to explain. Used for grammatical instruction as well as for textual exegesis, epimerisms were therefore sometimes detached from their texts and rearranged alphabetically. Akin to the epimerisms on literary texts were the word-by-word grammatical explanations of scheide, short pieces of text, often of ambiguous meaning, which were widely used in schools from the 11th C. onward for instruction in grammar (see Schedographia).


—R.B.

EPIPHANIES (Ἐπιφάνεια, biblical and Syr. Hamath, Ar. Ḥamāh or Ḥamāt in mod. Syria), city on the Orontes River and bishopric of Syria II. A Roman temple was transformed (by 400?) into a church, which was later rebuilt (in 595?) and dedicated to the Theotokos and Sts. Kosmas and Damianos. There are epigraphic references (5th–6th C.) to this building and to another church and a winter bath at Epiphaneia (IGLSyr 5, nos. 1999–2004). That part of the Kaper Koron Treasure of 6th–7th-C. liturgical silverware that is known as the Hamah Treasure was reportedly found at Epiphaneia. Evagrios Scholastikos was born in Epiphaneia. After the Arab conquest of the city in 636–37 (Donner, Conquests 112, 148–51) the Church of the Theotokos was transformed into the Umayyad mosque, which still survives, although Nikephoros II Phokas is said to have burned the mosque of Epiphaneia during a raid in 968.


—M.M.M.

EPIPHANIES. Appearances of a god or beneficent manifestations of the divine in a human context, epiphannies were a staple of late antique paganism in both religious and state imperial cults. Mystery cults organized their rituals around epi-
EPIPHANIES, shrines of healing gods recorded miraculous cures as epiphaniations, and the imperial cult celebrated as an epiphany the emperor's birthday, arrival in a new place, accession to office, outstanding deeds, and ceremonial appearances at court. Christ's life, too, came to be understood in terms of theophanic events, or epiphaniations. The 6th of Jan. (EPHANY) was the earliest feast celebrating Christ's manifestation as divine and united the Baptism, ADORATION OF THE MAGI, and miracle at Cana. Christ's early life was dotted with epiphanies marked by angelic appearances (ANNUNCIATION, admonitions to Joseph, heavenly hosts at the NATIVITY); apocryphal Gospels added others. The single such appearance during his ministry is the TRANSFIGURATION, but his miracles, being beneficent manifestations of the divine, were also regarded as epiphanies, and they early acquired the appropriate iconography with a disciple to serve as a witness. Epiphanies recur in the PASSION and its aftermath: the ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM, patterned after an imperial epiphany, the ANASTASIS, ASCENSION, and PENTECOST. (See also VISIONS.)

- Epiphanies, bishop of Salamis (Constantia) in Cyprus (from 367); saint; born Eleutherospolis in Judaea ca. 315, died at sea en route to Salamis from Constantinople 12 May 403. First prominent as founder of a monastery near his birthplace (ca. 335), Epiphanios served as metropolitan in Cyprus for 96 years. A rigorous Nicene, he combatted all heresies, esp. Origenism; his struggle against the latter involved him respectively with JEROME and THEOPHilos of Alexandria in serious conflict against JOHN 11 of Jerusalem (394) and JOHN CHRYSOSTOM at Constantinople in 402. He was equally hostile to classical education, perhaps deliberately affecting a poor Attic style, which, according to Jerome, enabled him to reach the masses through his writings.

His most important works include the Ankyrotos (lit. "holding fast like an anchor"), the Panarion (or Refutation of All the Heresies), and a volume misleadingly entitled On Weights and Measures, which is actually a biblical dictionary. His criticisms of religious art (now generally thought to be genuine) prefigure the Byz. controversy over ICONOCLASM. Epiphanios recommended to Emp. Theodosius I that curtains adorned with sacred images be removed and used for burial shrouds and that frescoes be whitewashed (Ostrogorsky, Bilderstr. 67-75; Mango, Art 41-43). His works were translated into a number of medieval languages, including Armenian, Georgian, Arabic, Syriac, and Church Slavonic.


-E.B., A.M.T.

EPIPHANIOS HAGIOPOLITIS, the author of the first Byz. description of the Holy Land; fl. end of the 8th C. (J. Darrouzès in DHGE 15 [1963] 615) or in the 9th C. (Hunger, Lit. 1:517). Nothing is known of him. His short PROSKYNETARION begins with his journey via Cyprus and Tyre to Jerusalem, from which he took trips to Alexandria, "the great Babylon of the Pharaoh," Raithou, and Mt. Sinai, and to Gethsemane, the Jordan River, and Galilee. The Loca sancta described are connected with the Old Testament (Joseph's warehouses, Moses' miracles); with Christ, the Virgin, and people related to them (e.g., the tomb of Lazarus); and with some saints (the tomb of Kyros and John in Edessa). Certain monasteries are named, as are the places where the patriarch of Jerusalem officiated. Some sentences of Epiphanios duplicate a section of a legend about Constantine I the Great, but it remains unclear which of the texts has priority. Neither the Arab presence nor Charlemagne's protectorate are mentioned. Epiphanios used to be confused with his namesake from Constantinople, the hagiographer who compiled vitae of the apostle ANDREW and of the Virgin.


-A.K.
EPIPHANY (τὰ Ἔπιφάνεια), the feast of lights (la phota), also called ta theophania, celebrating the Baptism of Christ in the Jordan River. Epiphany originally commemorated not a single event, but a mystery, the appearance of salvation in Jesus revealed in a cluster of New Testament events, principally Jesus’ birth and his baptism. Histori- cizing tendencies in the 4th C. led to a separation of the cluster: the Nativity was moved to 25 Dec. and the Baptism was then celebrated by itself on 6 Jan. The feast gained importance during the controversies over the divine origins of Christ and with the subsequent definitions of the First Coun- cil of Nicaea.

Epiphany is celebrated with a solemnity matched, among the fixed Great Feasts, only by that accompanying the Nativity. There is a preparatory Sunday, a four-day forefeast, a paramone vigil (as before the Nativity) that includes a blessing of the waters, a synaxis honoring John the Baptist on the day following the feast (7 Jan.), and eight days of afterfeast (Mateos, Typicon 1:174–91). The blessing of the waters, an important part of the ritual, is attested already in 387 at Antioch by John Chrysostom (PG 49:365f). According to a 10th-C. ceremonial book (De cer., bk.1, chs. 3, 25–26), the patriarch and the emperor celebrated the vigil at the Church of St. Stephen the Protomartyr at the Daphne Palace and the Epiphany rite itself in the Church of Hagia Sophia; on the day of Epiphany the emperor, honored at a number of receptions by the factions, confirmed new mag- istroi to office.

Representation in Art. The feast of the Baptism of Christ was represented by the 3rd C. and had acquired its standard composition by the 6th (Cathedra of Maximian): Christ frontal or in profile in the water, John the Baptist to one side, angels to the other, the dove descending in a light-burst from above, the personified Jordan below. Post-Iconoclastic versions added a cross in the water, referring to the cross at the pilgrimage site in Palestine (Hosios Loukas); two disciples and the axe at the root of a tree (cf. Lk 3:9; Menologion of Basil II, p.299); swimmers, linking this with John’s other baptisms; and a dragon in the depths, associating Christ’s descent into the water with his descent into Hades (see Anastasis). The Baptistry at Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (by 1200) embedded the Baptism in a cycle of scenes of John’s ministry. In Palaiologan art the Baptism was incorporated in such a five- to seven-scene cycle, and Christ’s precipitous descent into the water was emphasized to permit analogies with his descent into the cave at birth and into Hades at death. Only in miniatures in the 12th C. MS, Chicago, Univ. Lib. 965 (fols.37r, 61v) is the Baptism separated from the descent of the Spirit in accordance with Scripture (Lk 3:21–22).


—R.F.T., A.W.C.

EPIROS (Ἐπιρος), northwestern Greece, a mountainous area between the Pindos and the Ionian Sea, with a rich coastal area, important for its connections with the West. Perhaps under Diocletian the province of Epiros was separated from Achaea, and by the time of the Verona List (produced between 328 and 337) it was divided into the provinces of Old Epiros (in the south) and New Epiros (in the north), both administratively part of the diocese of Moesia, later transferred to that of Macedonia. According to Hierokles (Hierokl. 651.3–654.1), Old Epiros (capital Nikopolis) had 12 cities and New Epiros (capital Dyrrachion) had nine. The area was plundered by the Vandals in the 5th C. and many of its cities were fortified or refortified by Justinian I (F. Wozniak in Nikopolis, ed. E. Chrysos [Preveza 1987] 263–67). Epiros was overrun by the Slavs in the late 6th–7th C. and most of the cities disappeared. Restoration of Byz. control came largely from the sea beginning in the 8th C. The themes of Dyrrachion and Nikopolis were created in the 9th C. By the end of the 12th C. many smaller territo- rial units were organized: a chrysobull of 1198 lists the provinces of Dyrrachion, “Jericho et Cani- non,” Ioannina, Drynopolis, and Nikopolis; some of them included private units—episkepes, called pertinentia in the Partitio Romaniae (in Arta, Acheloos, Lesiana, etc.); the Partitio also lists “chartolatarata” of Glavina and of Bagentia. In the 13th C. an independent principality (see Epiros, Despotate of) emerged, engulfing all these areas.

Epiros was inhabited by Greeks, Slavs, Albani- ans, and Vlachs; Italians also penetrated the area. The ecclesiastical center of Epiros until ca.8oo was Nikopolis; it was later succeeded by Naupak-
tos, whose suffragans in the 10th C. were Bun-
ditzza (probably not Boudonitzza?), Aetos, Ache-
loos, Rogoi (or Arta), Ioannina, Photike or Bella,
Adrianoupolis (Drynoupolis), and Boutheroton
(Noticiae CP 7:575–83). Many early Christian
churches have been found, esp. at Nikopolis and
along the coast, while later monuments are more
common in the interior, esp. around Arta.

Epiroou kata ten protobyzanite epoche (d-’st’ aiona),”
~T.E.G.

EPIROS, DESPOTATE OF, one of the independ-
ent Greek states established after the fall of
Constantinople in 1204 during the Fourth Cru-
sade, along with the empires of Nicaea and Tre-
bizond. The term despotaton can be properly ap-
plied only for the 14th-15th C.; it is first used in
a chrysobull of 1342. Although belonging to the
Angelos dynasty in Constantinople, the early rul-
ers of Epiros used the family names Komnenos
and Doukas. The state was founded by Michael
I Komnenos Doukas, who gained control of the
entire northwestern coast of Greece and much of
Thessaly. His ambitious brother Theodore Kom-
enos Doukas captured Ohrid in 1216. The-
odore, who dreamed of recovering Constantinople,
took Thessalonike from the Latins in 1224 and
was crowned as emperor, thus briefly setting him-
sell up as a rival to the emperor of Nicaea. In
1242, however, Theodore’s son John was forced
by John III Vatatzes to substitute the title des-
potes for “emperor,” and in 1246 Thessalonike
was annexed by Nicaea. During the reign of Mi-
chael II Komnenos Doukas, Nicaean forces tem-
porarily conquered much of Epiros after the bat-
tle of Pelagonia (1259). But Epiros recovered its
independence by 1264 and continued to be ruled
by Greek despotai until 1318, when it came under
the control of the Italian Orsini family (1318–37).

After a brief period of restoration of Greek
rule, Epiros was occupied by the Serbs in 1348.
The Chronicle of Ioannina describes the un-
popular rule of Thomas Preljubovic over Ioan-
nina from 1366/7 to 1384, while Arta was gov-
erned by the Albanian clan of Spata. In the late
14th C. Ioannina returned to Italian control, first
under the Florentine Esau Buondelmonti (1385–
1411) and then under the house of Tocco, which
also acquired Arta from the Albanians. Epiros
was conquered by the Ottomans in the 15th C.;
Ioannina fell in 1430, Arta in 1449. The geo-
ographical isolation of Epiros, esp. the barrier of
the Pindos mountain range, enabled it to remain
separate from the Byz Empire until the Turkish
conquest, but the Byz. emperors always regarded
rulers of Epiros as rebels and maintained the right
to confer the title despotes.

In the 15th C. Epiros was populated primarily
by Greeks alongside whom lived Slavs (for whom
the names of Macedonians, Bulgarians, and
Droogobites were used), Albanians, Vlachs,
Jews, Turks, Armenians, and Latins. The surviv-
ing documents reflect a society composed primar-
ily of free peasants who formed communities and
enjoyed the right of protomesis. Towns had a
strong landowner class, mostly free peasants; de-
pendent peasants were rare (D. Angelov, Izvestija
na Kamara na narodnata kultura, seriija: Human-
itarni nauki 4:3 [Sofia 1947] 3–46). The region
consisted of several themes (e.g., Bagenetia, Ache-
loos, Skopje, and Drama) which normally in-
cluded a single town and its environs; the gover-
nor of a theme was usually called doux, but also
kephale, energon, etc. (D. Angelov, BS 12 [1951]

Greek Despotai of Epiros and Emperors at
Thessalonike (1205–1318)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael I Komnenos</td>
<td>1205–1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doukas, ruler of Epiros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Komnenos Doukas</td>
<td>1215–1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruler of Epiros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emperor at Thessalonike</td>
<td>1224/5? or 1227–1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Angelos, emperor at Thessalonike</td>
<td>1230–1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>1237–1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emperor at Thessalonike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demes at Thessalonike</td>
<td>1242–1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrios Angelos Doukas,</td>
<td>1244–1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despot of Thessalonike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael II Komnenos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doukas, ruler of Epiros</td>
<td>(demes of Epiros from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(demes of Epiros from</td>
<td>ca. 1230–1266/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1249)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikphoros I Komnenos</td>
<td>1268/8–1296/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doukas, despot of Epiros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, despot of Epiros</td>
<td>1296–1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source: Based on Nicol, Epiros II 252, with modifications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59–62). (See table for a list of the rulers of Epiros from 1205 to 1318.)


A.M.T., A.K.

**EPISCOPALIS AUDIENTIA**, identified in the *Codex Justinianus* as the juridical powers and privileges conferred upon bishops. Actually, Christian leaders had heard and decided disputes involving members of their local congregations since Christian antiquity. Only under Constantine I did such arbitration receive official recognition. Constantine introduced the episcopal tribunal into Roman civil legal procedure by ordering that either party in a suit might have the case heard by a bishop. By the early 5th C., however, the government modified this, restricting the bishop’s juridical powers to mediation and stipulating that both parties to the dispute had to consent (cf. *Cod. Just.* I. 4-7, 8). In sum, episcopal judicial activity in civil matters had ceased to exist, except in the form of arbitration inter volentes (“between willing parties”). Under Justinian I, however, a layman involved in a dispute with a cleric was once again able to bring his case to the bishop’s court (nov. 86). Moreover, a law of Heraclius (Reg 1, no. 199) stipulated that all civil suits brought against clerics in Constantinople were to be heard by the patriarch (cf. the later decree of Alexios I, Reg 1, no. 1071).

In trials involving clergy the bishop continued to act as judge. Episcopal tribunals, in fact, had jurisdiction over all civil and disciplinary cases in which the litigants were clergy. Conciliar legislation insisted that such trials were the exclusive concern of ecclesiastical courts and that clerics could settle their differences only in such courts (Council of Chalcedon, canon 9).


A.P.

**EPISKEPSIS** (ἐπισκέψις, lit. “care, inspection”), a fiscal term with three different meanings. (1) Most commonly, it refers to a particular property belonging to the imperial domain (basilike episkepsis—Dölger, *Beiträge* 120.19), a fiscal unit composed of a collection of properties held by the emperor or a member of the imperial family and sometimes by other individuals (in 10th–13th-C. documents). The monastery of Patmos was granted annually 700 modioi of grain from the emperor’s episkepsis on Crete but, at the end of the 12th C., it was impossible to provide the monastery with grain, since the government had given these episkepsis over to some local nobles for a cash payment (MM 6: 131.6–10). (2) Episkepsis could refer to a fiscal division of a theme (in documents up to the 12th C.). (3) The term was also used to describe the actual daily “administration of property,” particularly of imperial property.


**EPISKEPTITES** (ἐπισκεπτῖτης), a subaltern official mentioned in the 9th-C. *Klerorologion of Philotheos*; there were episkeptitai in the departments of the dromos, the eparch of the city, the agelai (see *Logothetes ton Agelon*), and the kouratores. The majority of them were administrators of imperial domains (the so-called episkepsis), such as the protospatharios Stephen, episkeptites of the imperial ktemata in 996 (Iovr. 1, no. 10.6). Episkeptitai of several locations, small and large (including Peloponnesos and Armeniakon), are mentioned on seals. Ecclesiastical episkeptitai were accountants dispatched by the oikonomos (MM 5: 355–35).


A.K.

**EPISTOLAE AUSTRIACAE**, collection of letters assembled at Metz late in the 6th C. that documents Byz. diplomacy and military relations with the Merovingian Franks. This activity was prompted chiefly by Constantine’s efforts to buy effective military support for Byz. operations in Italy. King Theudebert I sent two letters to Justinian I (eps. 19–20, between 536 and 538 and 546/7, respectively) and one letter to King Thou-
Epistolae Visigoticae, 7th-C. collection of letters that preserves the courteous correspondence of Sisebut, king of the Visigoths, and Caesarius, patrikios and governor of Byz. Spain. Their contents concern negotiations with Constantinople ca.615 (F. Görres, BZ 16 [1907] 530–32) for a peace treaty to end Gothic military successes against the Byz. during the disastrous early period of Herakleios.

Epistolography, or the art of writing letters, a genre of Byz. literature akin to rhetoric, popular with the intellectual elite. Copious examples survive from all periods, in more than 150 published collections containing approximately 15,000 letters (Mullett, infra 75). Antecedents for the form exist from the classical period (e.g., the letters of Aristotle or Plato, whether genuine or spurious, or those of Herodes Atticus), and also in the Pauline Epistles of the New Testament, which themselves show awareness of Hellenistic epistolary practice (as described by, e.g., pseudo-Demetrios, On Style, chs. 223–35). Byz. letters preserved substantial elements of the ancient genre—in form, composition, and the system of imagery; direct quotations and borrowings were very common.

The first flowering of the Byz. letter, combining influences from both the Christian tradition and the classical Greek, appeared in the 4th C. with the collections of Emp. Julian, Libanius, Synesios, and the Cappadocian Fathers (who became a model and quarry for later writers). To this period also belongs the fictitious correspondence of the apostle Paul with the philosopher Seneca that survives only in a Latin version. After the 4th C., letter writing became less fashionable, although some voluminous collections are preserved (esp. that of Isidore of Pelousion); after Theophylaktos Simokattes the genre virtually disappears until its revival by Theodore of Studios and Photios. Thereafter it plays a leading role as a literary genre, becoming esp. popular in the Palaiologan period. The peak of epistolographic activity falls in the 11th–12th C., when such masters as Psellus, Eustathios of Thessalonike, Gregory Antiochos, and Michael Choniates worked, and John Tzetzes created an original, albeit unwieldy, genre of letters accompanied by verse commentaries.

The theoreticians of late Roman rhetoric, Hermogenes and Aphthonios, ignored epistolography, but it is discussed by other theoreticians of the Second Sophistic and later, esp. in the pseudonymous Epistolary Characters (between the 4th and 6th C.) wrongly attributed to either Libanius (J. Sykutris, BNJ bb 7 [1930] 108–18) or Proklos. Theon of Alexandria (1st–2nd C.) classed epistolography as a progymnasma under the heading of ethopoia, or character drawing, for the opportunities it gave to depict character. Pseudo-Proklos suggested a definition of the letter as a written conversation (hormilia) between people who are separated and produced a sophisticated categorization of 41 types of letter. He emphasized the ideals of clarity (sapheneia) and reasonable length. The clearest indication of the Byz. concept of the ideal letter can be found in letters that themselves discuss the form, as in the letter of Gregory of Nazianzos to his nephew (ep.51, ed. Gallay). There he recommends that letters should be brief, clear, and phrased like a conversation.
with an absent friend and should treat serious topics with elegant expression. Epistolography received no attention in the general handbooks until the 14th C., when Joseph Rhakendytes devoted a chapter to it in his encyclopedia. The technique of letter writing was presumably taught by example from model collections, such as MS Patmos 706.

Byz. letters survive mainly in copies, with the exception of numerous papyri and late letters that were preserved in the fabric of bookbindings (J. Darrouzès, REB 22 [1964] 72f and n.3). They were nearly always intended for publication, either in the sense of public reading or through circulation as a collection. Some collections of letters were made from copies kept by the authors, others were gathered from the recipients by a later editor. Evidently many an author (e.g., John Tzetzes) rearranged and edited his letters before issuing the collection. Letters were frequently, if not normally, meant to be read aloud, not just to the intended recipient but also to an appreciative audience. Evidence for such occasions is intermittent but persistent from the 4th C. to the Palaiologan period. In this way epistolography filled the gap created by the disappearance of the theater; like rhetoric in general, letter writing uses theatrical terminology.

Byz. lacked regular mail service. Imperial letters were sent with special couriers; private individuals used friends, casual acquaintances, or servants as letter bearers (grammatophoroi). Letter writers sometimes complain of the difficulties of finding a suitable emissary. For example, the governor Theodore Branas dispatched a letter announcing the invasion of the Cumans with a monk who was walking to an annual panegyris in the town of Kouperion; the monk, however, "stuffed the letter in his bosom and consigned it to the darkness of his black robes," and failed to deliver it (Nik.Chon. 500.78–92). The grammatomorph was supposed to be a "living letter" (empsychos epistle) and convey factual information, while the letter served as a literary ornament added to the message. Often the letter was accompanied with a gift that could range from a book to fish and fruit.

Letters can usefully be divided according to their purpose, into official, private, and literary examples. The letters dispatched by emperors, patriarchs (Nicholas I, Athanasios I), and officials, as well as petitions addressed to them, functioned as documents and were eventually quoted and referred to as such; some official letters are preserved in the minutes of meetings where they had been read aloud. Private letters were limited to the exchange of opinions between two correspondents, whereas literary letters were addressed (at least by implication) to a broader audience and often dealt with invented persons and situations. According to their content, letters can be divided into diplomatic, theological, and scholarly examples; letters of recommendation, indoctrination, and censure; and letters of consolation. Many letters express only banal politeness and standard friendship with conventional complaints about the correspondent’s silence. The erotic letter died out after Aristaiinetos.

The letter was not clearly distinct from related genres. The connection between conversation, homily, and letter was close, and a number of sermons exist in letter form. A letter could grow into a theological tract, as did Photios’s lengthy letter to Asot I (ed. B. Laourdas, L. Westerink, 3 [1985] 4–97), or into a historical work, such as the epistle of the monk Theodosios to Deacon Leo on the capture of Syracuse in 880 (Hunger, Lit. 1:359f). The preamble to a major work could take the form of a letter; Photios’s letter to his brother Tarasios introduces his Bibliotheca. On the other hand, larger literary works could include letters; thus Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 3:94.2–99.9) quoted in his History the vernacular letter of the sultan of Egypt.

Though the Byz. letter may have aimed at originality combined with ornamentation and elegance in phrasing, variation in theme was not so important. A standard structure evolved, including—as expected—a greeting, inquiries after the correspondent’s health, statements of the subject matter, and closing expressions of good will. Under Christian influence, however, certain formerly standard phrases changed. Thus in the exordium the old formula “A greets B” was usually replaced by “B is greeted by A,” since according to the Christian tradition of tapeinotes (see Modesty, Topos of) it was improper for the author to place himself first. Alongside the old formulaic conclusion “Be healthy” appears an elaborate prayer for divine blessing on the addressee and his family. The letter was considered a rhetorical piece, and the correspondent sometimes asked to be forgiven for his inadequacies.
Special attention was paid to *prooimia* that showed the correspondent’s extensive knowledge of biblical and classical literature. Formulaic content was accompanied by vivid observations, witty jokes, and expression of true feelings. Certain topics recur, giving scope for the writer’s ingenuity in phraseology: the letter was a sign of friendship, it was a gift, it revealed the sender’s soul, it united separated friends while lamenting the distance that divided them and the loneliness this entailed. It must be remembered that the real subject matter of a letter was often delivered orally by the courier; hence, though obscurity for its own sake was not recommended, letters frequently contain generalities rather than specific details, thus increasing the already existing trends toward “deconcretization” and abstraction. At times, and esp. when a writer can be detected borrowing phrases and even complete letters from other authors, one feels that Byz. letters rarely include any “real” information.

Nevertheless, the genre is an important source for studying Byz. history and culture. Many describe or allude to crucial events and are esp. useful for establishing the relations between various members of the intelligentsia and the intellectual atmosphere of the empire. Because letters are part of a conversation rather than a source of direct information, the chronology and identification of the persons or events mentioned may be difficult; the problem is sometimes alleviated by the presence of lemmata, or headings, with some factual indications, or by the existence of chronologically ordered collections of letters, frequently prepared by the author himself (Tzetzes, Michael Choniates, etc.). Sometimes, however, the lemmata were added by a later editor and provide erroneous information on the names and offices of the addressees. Another problem is that fictitious letters can be intermixed with real ones or form a special collection. In MS tradition the body of the correspondence is usually divided, with the letters of each correspondent forming a separate unit; the establishment of interconnected pairs remains, as a rule, problematic.


---

**EPITAPHEIOS** (ἐπιτάφιος, ἔπος), technical term with two meanings.

**Liturgical Cloth.** The large piece of silk used in the Burial of Christ procession at the Holy Saturday *orthros*, symbolically interpreted as the bier of Christ, was called an *epitaphios*. *Epitaphios* are usually embroidered either with the image of the Dead Christ (Ἀμνος) or with the Lamentation (threnos) and inscriptions. They evolved from Late Byz. *aeres*, which they resemble in their overall shape and figural decoration, but the texts on the *epitaphios* derive from Paschal hymns, esp. the *troparion* beginning *Noble Joseph*. The appearance
of epitaphios as distinct liturgical cloths coincided with the formalization of the Holy Saturday ritual in the early 14th C. Surviving Byz. epitaphios, all fine gold and silk EMBROIDERIES, include those of John of Skopje (1349) and Syropoulos (late 14th C.), both at Hilandar; of Nicholas Eudaimonoianes (ca. 1407, in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London); and that of Euphemia and Eupraxia (ca. 1405, Putna).


Funeral Speech (ἐπιτάφιος λόγος). Menander Rhétor distinguished several types of epitaphios: a pure ἐνκόμιον (usually delivered some time after the death of the person commemorated), monody, consolatory speech (παραμυθητικός), and epitaphios proper; in the three last types the elements of praise, lamentation, and consolation are to be mixed in different proportions.

Byz. practice did not retain this categorization, and rhetoricians employed the terms indifferently. Encomiastic epitaphios were composed to commemorate biblical personages or saints, usually in connection with the translation of relics; they formed a kind of sermon. Secular epitaphios were pronounced or written, in prose or verse, relatively soon after the death of their subject. The subjects of epitaphios were emperors, patriarchs or other ecclesiastics, relatives or friends of the rhetorician, and—esp. from the late 11th C.—members of the high aristocracy. Apart from the insights they can offer into the structure of family life (e.g., George Tornikios on Anna Komnene’s upbringing), epitaphios frequently provide valuable prosopographical information and other historical details.

In late Roman epitaphios praise and lamentation prevail: in Himerios and Libanios the mention of blessed future life (mákrasmos) is minor. Even later, in the lamentation included in Digests Akritas, the theme of the irrevocability of the loss predominates. Under Christian influence, however, the theme of consolation was added, and the rhetor began to downplay the feeling of loss...
and to emphasize the forthcoming heavenly reward. Normally conventional and objectified, epitaphioi sometimes became a means to express personal emotions, as in the monody on Stephen Skylitzes by Theodore Prodromos. On the other hand, some writers exercised their skill in mock-heroic laments for dead birds (Constantine Mnasess, Michael Italikos).


EPI TES KATASTASEOS (ἐπι τῆς καταστάσεως, lit. "chief of presentations"). Since katasasis also means "order," Bury (Adm. System 118f) rendered the title as master of ceremonies and connected the epi tes katasasis with the late Roman comes dispositionum; G. Ostrogorsky and E. Stein (Byzantium 7 [1932] 206–10) noted that the scrinium dispositionum is unknown after 534 and connected this official with the comes admissionum. The 10th-C. De ceremoniis links the epi tes katasasis with silentiatoroi and even considered him as one of the silentiatoroi (De cer. 238.4) and as a member of the kouboukleion (503.5–6), the service of the imperial bedchamber. The 9th-C. Taktikon of Us tenskj refers to him twice (Oikonomides, Listes 57.25, 59.17), situating him first between the protoanotarios of the dromos and the archon of the armenaton, that is, among the civil officials, and secondly, at the bottom of the list of courtiers, concurring with the information of the De ceremoniis. Another problem is raised by the Kletorologion of Philotheos, which defines the post as a special axia (ibid., 109.7) and states that its staff consisted of hypatoi, vestitores, silentiatori, and syn kelittoi (125.8–12), who at least in part were dignitaries rather than court officials.

LIT. Oikonomides, Listes 309. –A.K.

EPI TES TRAPEZES (ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης), aulic courtier in charge of imperial banquets; he introduced guests, together with the pinkernes waited upon the emperor, and delivered dishes from the emperor’s table to the guests. The epi tes trapezes was a eunuch; seals from the 8th C. onward indicate that he sometimes combined his duties with those of the koubikoularios or parakoimomenos. The vita of Maximos the Confessor mentions an epi tes trapezes as existing in the mid-7th C., but this evidence must be used with caution since the text is of later date. Some epi tes trapezes commanded troops and fulfilled special state assignments. Seibt distinguished the epi tes trapezes from the domestikos tes trapezes (known from 680 onward) who was not a eunuch. The epi tes trapezes possessed a varied staff, called hypour gia, and was assisted by a domestikos tes hypour gia. Along with the emperor’s epi tes trapezes there was a banquet chief for the empress, known both from the Taktika and from seals (Seibt, Bleisiegel, nos. 48–49). Seibt hypothesizes that in the 7th C. the epi tes
trapezes assumed the major functions of the kastresios; ca.800 certain of these functions were in the hands of the kenarios. From the 13th C. both epi tes trapezes and domestikos tes trapezes were high ranks conferred on nobles; among the holders of this dignity were members of such families as Tarchaneiotes, Nestongos, and Notaras. Both terms appear in later romances (P. Pieler, *JÖB* 20 [1971] 194, 213, 218). Nikephoros Gregorazs relates a legend that the dignity of epi tes trapezes, from the time of Constantine I the Great, was hereditary for the princes of Russia.


**EPITHALAMION** (ἐπιθαλάμιος λόγος), a speech in either prose or verse to celebrate a marriage, whether of a private individual or a member of the imperial family. Examples survive from the 4th C. (e.g., Himarios, or.9, with a protheoria, “introduction,” on the principles governing the composition of epithalamia); the 6th C. (e.g., Choririos of Gaza, or.5, on a triple wedding, and the epithalamion of Dioskoros of Aphrodito); and esp. from the 12th C., when many imperial couples were hymned in this way (e.g., Theodore Prodomos, on the wedding of the sons of Anna Komnene and Nikephoros Bryennios). The genre, considered a form of enkomion, early attracted a rich collection of erotic allusions drawn from Greek mythology (cf. Menander Rhetor, *On Epideictic Speeches*, ch.6), which in the 12th C. combined with imperial imagery to produce a new and bewildering exuberance of plant, animal, and cosmic symbolism.


**EPITHEG** (ἐπιθητος) can be considered as a rhetorical trope (Martin, *Rhetorik* 264). Greek authors rarely used the term (e.g., the 2nd-C. grammarians Apollonios Dyskolos, in *Grammatici graeci*, ed. R. Schneider, G. Uhling, vol. 2.2 [Leipzig 1910; rp. Hildesheim 1965] 56f); Latin theoreticians stressed that epithets were to be used sparingly. Eustathios of Thessalonike, in his commen-

tary on the *Odyssey* (*Eust.Comm. Od.*, p.1459.32–35), noticed the deliberate use (or avoidance) of epithets that would demonstrate the author’s attitude toward heroes. In late Roman and Byz. practical aesthetics, epithets acquired an exaggerated importance. First, many writers (pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, Nonnos of Panopolis, Germanos I) strove to create very long epithets, mostly composites, to stimulate the imagination and to reveal the enigmatic nature of the cosmos. Second, the growing role of ceremonial in society enhanced the creation of rigidly formalized epithets (the emperor was always eusebes, “pious,” the serpent, “wicked” or “creeping”), so that the epithet was becoming an antonomasia, that is, an appellation substituted for a proper name, as the “Queen of Cities” was a designation for Constantinople. The individual writer had to reconcile two contradictory principles—the trend toward pompous epithets and the patristic prescription of plain and “truthful” exposition (the latter quality was consistently praised in Photios’s *Bibliotheca*). Byz. literature presents a broad range of stylistic approaches, from the matter-oftactness of John VI Kantakouzenos to the agglomeration of epithets in epideictic oratory.


**EPITIMION** (ἐπιτιμίων), a penalty imposed on a penitent by the priest following sacramental confession. The term was already in use by the 4th C. (Basil the Great, *PG* 32:721A). As a rule these penitential exercises, mentioned in Byz. canonical and ascetical literature, presupposed repentance and consisted of prayer, fasting, Scripture reading, prostrations, almsgiving, and, on occasion, temporary exclusion from the Eucharist. They were distinguished by their largely positive character and relative mildness from such formal punishments (*timoriai*) as excommunication, suspension, or deposition, which were inflicted by the church for more serious transgressions such as heresy or apostasy. Since sin was understood as a disease rather than a legally punishable crime, *epitimia* in Byz. penitential practice and theology were viewed as corrective remedies, that is, as a form of spiritual healing. At any rate, they were never reduced to a payment of a fine due to God. In sum, the Western juridical notion of sin as a violation of the law, in which penance constitutes
punishment or satisfaction payable to God, is for the most part not a feature of Byz. penitential literature.


—A.P.

EPITOME LEGUM (Extract from the Laws), the conventional term for a law book that has been transmitted in various versions. The oldest version must have been closely related to the Epitome Laurentitana, which contains 50 titles, follows the title sequence of the Prochiron and dates to "the first year of Constantine, the son of Leo" (g13–914?). "In the first year of Romanos" (921) an extensive revision of the text was made that altered also the sequence of titles. The author of both these versions must have been the Symbios named in the preface. The aim of the law book was presumably an improvement and expansion of the Prochiron; the additions, most of them dealing with private and penal law, were based almost exclusively on the Corpus Juris Civilis. The MS tradition of the Epitome Legum is limited. The published edition (of Zachariä von Lingenthal) is based on the MS Oxford Bodl., Barocc. 173, for titles 1–23, and on Vat. gr. 2075 (which represents another version) for titles 24–45.


—A.S.

EPI TON ANAMNESEON (ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναμνήσεων), an official who, according to a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 185f), used to record warriors and other people distinguished by their exploits; in the 14th C. he had no clear-cut function. Guillard (infra) views the epi ton anamnesen as the successor of the magister memoriae, a late Roman official in the bureau of the magister scriitorum and asserts that the office of epi ton anamnesen existed long before Constantine IX. He includes George Spanopoulos, a contemporary of Alexios I, in the list of "memorialists" even though the text explicitly calls Spanopoulos "the former genikoς" (Zepos, Jus 1:334.3–5). Very few epi ton anamnesen are known. Under Andronikos III, the epi ton anamneson Spanopoulos acted as mesazon, according to a vague expression of Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 2:991–2); another epi ton anamneson, Logaras, addressed a letter to Andronikos III (S. Lampakes, EEBS 42 [1975–76] 405). There were also epi ton anamnesen in the patriarchal chancery—one of them, Petriotes, composed a preamble to a patriarchal letter of 1365 (MM 1:472.28–29) and several other documents (Darrouzès, Offkia 357. n.3).

LIT. Guillard, Titres, pt.XXIV, 147f. —A.K.

EPI TON DEESEON (ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων), official whose duty was to receive petitions addressed to the emperor and to answer them. He is usually considered the successor of the late Roman magister memoriae (or a memoria) who, according to the Notitia dignitatum, dictated adnotationes and preces; it should, however, be noted that the office of a certain Benivolus, memoriae scriiniis praesidens (Rufinus of Aquileia, Church History 7.16), is rendered in Greek by Sozomenos (Sozom. HE 7.13.5) not as epi ton deeseon, but as ho epi tois grammateusi ton thesmon; his function was to formulate laws (O. Seeck, RE 2.R. 2 [1923] 898). The earliest known epi ton deeseon is Theodore, owner of a seal of the 7th C. (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.290). The epi ton deeseon has no title higher than protospatharios on seals through the first half of the 11th C. The importance of this official rose in the second half of the 11th and the 12th C., when he was not only honored as protoproedros (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 253–54), but the office was held by members of the noblest families, such as the Komnenoi, Skleroi, Kamateroi, and Kastamonital. George Chatzikies was still active as epi ton deeseon in 1321 (Reg 4, no.2450), and the office is mentioned by pseudo-Kodinos. The Klerotologion of Philotheos omits any mention of the staff of the epi ton deeseon but at least one seal of a notary of petitions is known (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.255). There were also provincial epi ton deeseon—in Sicily, Peloponnese, and so on—known by their seals, as well as epi ton deeseon of the patriarch (Darrouzès, Offkia 378f); one patriarchal epi ton deeseon was Eustathios of Thessalonike.


—A.K.

EPI TON KRIGEON (ἐπὶ τῶν κρίσεων), judicial office created between 1043 and 1047, before the
foundation of the law school under a nomophylax. A scholion to Basil. 7.1 (ed. H.J. Scheltema, ser. B, 1:36) lists the *epi ton kriseon* as one of four effective judges holding tribunals, alongside the *droungarios* (τες νιγλας), quaestor, and eparch. According to Attaleiates, the court of an *epi ton kriseon* had to resolve the legal problems presented to it by thematic judges—as Οἰκονομοί (ΤΜ 6 [1976] 134) suggests, due to the low level of legal knowledge of provincial judges—but it was not a court of appeal. Seals of several *epi ton kriseon* survive, including one of [Alexios?] Aristenos. The *epi ton kriseon* is not mentioned as the head of one of the four courts in Manuel I's novel of 1166, but is mentioned in the 12th-C. *Ecclesia Basilicorum* (e.g., at B.9.1: 64 = C.7.44.1 [p. 372 of Burgmann's edition]). The office existed at least until 1204; Niketas Choniates was one of the last *epi ton kriseon*.


**EPI TOU KANIKLEIOU.** See Kanikleios.

**EPITRACHELION** (ἐπιτραχελίας), a liturgical stole, generally of silk, which was worn over the *sticharion* only by priests and bishops. The narrow strip of cloth, about 2 m in length, hung down in front in two overlapping panels that were sometimes fastened together. Though representations of *epitrachelia* are not found before the 10th C., the term is attested as early as the 8th C. (Germanos, *Liturgy*, ch.18, ed. Borgia 17.16–20); according to pseudo-Germanos, the *epitrachelion* or *phakielion* represents the cloth on Christ's neck by which he was dragged to his Passion. In the artistic representations, all that can be seen of the *epitrachelion* is its fringe and its lowest band of ornament (since it is generally covered by the *phelonion*), but actual *epitrachelia* that have survived from the 14th or 15th C. have an elaborate embroidered decoration: images of saints standing under arcades, or busts within roundels. The figures are outlined in pearls.


**EPOIKOS** (ἐποίκος, "inhabitant"), term designating free peasant-taxpayers in the *Treatise on Taxation* (Dölger, Beiträge 119.24) and in certain, mostly 13th-C., documents. In the latter, the word is at times applied to *paroikoi* (MM 4:255.20–30), inhabitants of towns (e.g., Ioannina—MM 5:82.12), as well as "clerics, soldiers and all the common people" (Sathas, MB 6:641.20–21), and appears to mean simply "resident."


**EPOPTES** (ἐπόπτης, lit. "overseer"), the designation of two officials.

1. The 9th-C. *Kletorologion* of Philotheos mentions *epoiphes* as subaltern officials under the *eparch of the city*; the *Book of the Eparch* ignores them and Stöckle (Zunft 93) identified them with *mitolai*, supervisors of silk weavers.

2. *Epoiphes* were also fiscal functionaries in the genikon whose duty was to check the amount of individual tax payments, allowing reductions (συμπαθείαι) or increasing the required sum. Their activity is described in a treatise on taxation (ed. Dölger), and they are often mentioned in the 11th-C. privileges given to monasteries, along with *exisotai*. The functions of *epoiphe* and *exisotai* are barely distinguishable. *Epoiphes* were stationed in themes. Several charters of 941–56 (Lavra 1, nos. 2–3; Xerop., no. 1) mention a certain *protopatharios* Thomas, *asekrites*, *epoiphe*, and *anagrapheus* of Thessalonike, who directed the sale of *klastata*; a later document (Ivbr. 1, no.30) refers to *sympathaeia* granted by the *epoiphe* Thomas as well as his "addition" (tax-increase) in the same area. The last mention of *epoiphe* is in Manuel I's edict of 1153. Dölger argued that *epoiphe*, together with *exisotai*, are mentioned in a law of 496; this law is preserved only in the *Basilika* (56.8.13), and its attribution to Anastasios I is, according to the editors, H. Scheltema and N. van der Wal (ser. A. 7 [1974] 2570), spurious. Furthermore it is not known when the Greek translation was produced.

Lit. Dölger, Beiträge 79–81. – A.K.

**EP'REM MCIRE** ("the Less"), translator; died end of 11th C. One of the most important Georgian scholars of the 11th C., Ep'rem was educated in Constantinople. His father was Vaçe K'ariĉ'isde of T'ayk'/Tao, who moved to Constantinople with other Georgian nobles in 1027. By midcentury Ep'rem was on the Black Mountain, where other Georgians including George Mt'ac'mindeli were
also active in translating Greek texts. Ep’rem was superior of Kastana from ca.1091 until his death. His renderings of Greek are notable for their clarity and exactness; his output was immense. His translations include patrician works (John Chrysostom, Ἱμίλιες ἐπιστολῶν; Gregory of Nazianzos, Ἱμίλιες; Theodoret of Cyrthus, Ἱστορία); dogmatic theology (John of Damascus, Fountain of Knowledge); mystical theology (pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite); and ascetic works (Basil the Great of Caesarea, Asketikon; Ephrem the Syrian, Asketikon; John Cassian, De Institutiis, which Euthymios the Iberian had begun on Mt. Athos; and Palladius, Historia Lausiaca).

LIT. Tarchnišvili, Georg. Lit. 182–98. —R.T.

ERAS. See Alexandrian Era; Antiochene Era; Byzantine Era; Diocletianic Era.

ERCHEMPERT, 9th-C. Lombard monk of Montecassino and envoy to Pope Stephen V (885–91). He composed verses for a martyrlogy (ed. in U. Westerbergh, Beneventan Ninth Century Poetry [Stockholm 1957] 77–81) and, at Capua after 885, wrote a Hystoriola Langobardorum Beneventi degencium that traces the history of the duchy of Benevento from 774 and breaks off in 889. Although Erchempert was hostile to foreigners, particularly the Byz. ("equal to beasts and ... worse than Agarenes," ch.81), by whom he was captured in 886 (ch.61), he provides unique information on Byz. Italy and Byz.’s role in the conflicts among the southern Italian principalities and Arabs.

ED. G. Waitz, MGH SRL 234–64.
—M.McC.

ERGASTERIA BASILICA. See Factories, Imperial.

ERGASTERION (ἐργαστηρίον), a workshop or small retail store, or combination of the two. Justinian I distinguished tradesmen who operated "an ergasterium or other legitimate business" (Cod. Just. IV 92.26, par.2) from the illustres. Cognate terms, such as ergasteriakos (working man) or ergasteriarches (foreman of a workshop), were also used in the late Roman period. It is impossible to calculate the number of workshops in a city, but Justinian’s novels 43 and 59 give a rough idea by indicating that the owners of 1,100 ergasteria in Constantinople that belonged to the Great Church (Hagia Sophia) were exempted from making contributions for funeral expenses. The 10th-C. Book of the Eparch lists ergasteria in Constantinople of argyropratai, vestiopratai, linen merchants, soapmakers, grocers, bakers, and owners of taverns.

Documents also name various kinds of ergasteria, some of which are the same as those mentioned in the Book of the Eparch: sardamarikon ergasterion, a grocery store (Lavra 3, no.123.120–21) or mankiphon ergasterion, a bakery (Lavra 3, no.148.10–11); some are different, such as the workshop of a myrepsos or perfume and unguent maker (Lavra 3, no.123.110), a workshop for the production of flaxseed oil (Lavra 3, no.168.4–5), or a potter’s workshop (Lavra 1, no.4.4); sometimes mills are described as ergasteria. Several documents stress that ergasteria were located in the marketplace or forum. The Book of the Eparch explicitly prohibited argyropratai from working at home, stating that they must ply their trade in their shops on the Mese; linen weavers, on the other hand, were forbidden to sell their goods in their ergasteria but had to peddle them on their backs on market days.

Several workshops (potteries, glass factories, smithies) have been excavated in Corinth, Sardis, and elsewhere. A well-excavated glass factory in Corinth occupied one room in a house and contained only a single furnace; the empty space in front of the furnace was an 11 sq m area that could accommodate only a master and one apprentice. An act of 1419 (Xenoph., no.32.8–10) mentions five grocers’ ergasteria “in the great store” in Thessalonike that were eventually joined and transformed into a wineshop; they also must have been small.

Ergasteria could be the property of landowners (including churches and monasteries) who leased them out. Oikonomides (infra) calculates that the income from an ergasterion equaled about 6 percent of the investment; the tax on the ergasteria that he investigated ranged from about 3 percent to 11–13 percent of the income.
Church fathers used the term broadly in a metaphorical sense: Gregory of Nazianzos calls Alexandria the _ergasterion_ of education (PG 35:761A); Ephrem the Syrian considers marriage “an _ergasterion_ of life” (ed. J.S. Assemani 3:210F); the womb is frequently characterized as “the _ergasterion_ of nature.” Accordingly, a gabled building labeled _ta ergasteria tou martyriou_ in a mosaic at Yaktos (D. Levi, _Antioch Mosaic Pavements_ [Princeton 1947] pl.LXXIXa) probably designates the site of a martyrdom.


---

EROTAPKRIZEIS (ἐρωταποκρίσεις), a distinctive genre of Byz. literature, a combination of _dialogue_ and _gnoma_. _Erotapkrizeis_ are series of questions and answers related to dogma, exegesis, canon law, riddles, etc. They are either anonymous, or the participants in the “conversation” are shadowy figures deprived of any characterization, one of them playing the role of teacher, another the pupil. There is no strict sequence in the development of questions, although some unity of subject matter is preserved. Answers are formulated in gnomic form as an unquestionable truth, leaving no room for uncertainty. _Erotapkrizeis_ are known from ca.400; they gained popularity in the 7th–9th C. when the greatest theologians (Maximos the Confessor, John of Damascus, Photios) worked in this genre; one example is ascribed to Anastasios of Sinai. After the _Amphilochia_ of Photios, the most developed example of _erotapkrizeis_, they became infrequent; Nicholas of Methone and Niketas of Herakleia were among the rare practitioners of the genre. They were revived in the 15th C. by writers such as Symeon of Thessalonike and Mark Eugenikos. The genre (mostly in the form of translations) was popular in medieval Slavic literature (cf. the _Izbornik_ of 1073).

LIT. C. Heinrici, _Griechisch-byzantinische Geschäftsbücher_ (Leipzig 1911).

---

EROTPAIGNIA (Ἐρωτοπαιγνία, “Games of Love”), a collection of vernacular love poems in political verse found in a unique late 15th-C. MS, though the poems themselves are older. The _Erotopaignia_ include three alphabetic _acrostics_ (“Alphabets of Love”), all incomplete and with stanzas of varying lengths; an _Hekatologa_ (“Hundred Words”), a counting song in which a young girl lightheartedly challenges her lover to list the ways in which he has suffered for her; and an assortment of letters, laments, and songs not unlike the songs and letters found in _Libistros_ and _Rhodame_. Once thought to have come from Rhodes (and thus sometimes called “Rhodian Love Songs”), their place of origin is unknown; some of the amatory vocabulary, however, with references to enslavement to Eros, suggest that the _Erotopaignia_ come from the mixed Frankish-Greek milieu that produced the vernacular verse romances. Anonymous, probably not the work of a single author,
ESOTHYRION (ἐσοθύριον), also enthryion, a (fiscal?) term designating lands situated close to the center (καθεδρα) of a chorio and specifically to a (rural) church (e.g., Duchetar., no.60.2). The Treatise on Taxation (ed. Dölger, Beiträge 115.28–30) makes a distinction between esothrya and esothrya, lands of a peasant located within and outside the village; as time went on, the esothrya were transformed into hamlets (agria). Together with autourgia, esothrya were considered the most valuable part of a stasis or estate. The praktika of the 14th and 15th C. often mention esothrya in peasants’ holdings or use specific terms referring to gardens: esokeption (Epshig., no.8.42), esokeption within the chorio (Chil., no.92.28), a chapel with an esokeption (Palmon Engrapha 2, no.74.32–33), esokeption outside the kathisma-courtyard (Dionys., no.23.7), esoperbolion (Xerop., no.18A.60), esoperbolion with nut trees (Epshig., no.14.127), esoperbolion (Epshig., no.14.86). There were also “inner” choraphia. The exo- (outer) designation seems to have been infrequent in later documents: a praktikon of 1284 registers “the inherited arable land of 140 modioi with an esothyron” located somewhat away from the household (Lavra 2, no.73.90).

LIT. Dölger. Beiträge 136f. — A.K.

ESPHIGMENOU MONASTERY, late 10th-C. foundation on Mt. Athos. Located on the northeast coast of the peninsula, 3 km east of Hilandar, the monastery is first mentioned in 998 when Theodore was hegoumenos. Its original name was Espigmenou (“the slaughtered”), perhaps a reference to Christ, the sacrificial lamb. Espigmenou (Ἐσπηγμένου) prospered in the 11th C., acquiring vast properties on the Athoneite peninsula. At this time the monastery housed a certain number of Chalcedonian Armenians, including Theoktistos, who was hegoumenos in the 1090s and became protos of Athos ca.1035. In ca.1001 Nikkephoros, a monk of Espigmenou, was sent on an important mission to the Charsianon, where he founded a monastery and probably exercised influence on the recently annexed Caucasian lands


The establishment reached its zenith in the 14th C., when it was an imperial cenobitic monastery housing 200 monks and owning more than 12,000 modioi of land, chiefly in Chalkidike and the Strymon valley. Among the monks who spent some time in residence there were Athanasios (I), the late 13th-C. patriarch of Constantinople, and Gregory Palamas, hegoumenos in 1335–36, who attempted to introduce hesychasim into the monastery. Stefan Uros IV Dušan issued two chrysothori in 1346–47 confirming the monastery’s titles to various properties, and granting certain tax exemptions (Epshig., nos. 22–23). The history of Espigmenou becomes obscure after the Ottomans took control of Athos in 1430.

The 31 Byz. documents preserved in the monastery’s archives range in date from 1034 to ca.1409, and include early 14th-C. praktika that provide information on peasant households in Macedonia. The library holds more than 100 MSS of Byz. date (Lampros, Athos 1:170–99), the most valuable of which is an illuminated 11th-C. menologion with miniatures on purple parchment (Treasures 2, figs. 327–408). The treasury contains a mosaic icon of the 14th C., depicting the blessing Christ (Furlan, Icone a mosaico, no.35).


ESQUILINE TREASURE, a hoard of mostly domestic objects made in the 4th C., unearthed on the Esquiline Hill in Rome in 1793. The precise contents of the treasure are a matter of dispute as no inventory was made at the time of its discovery. Shelton (infra) demonstrated that of the 61 objects eventually associated with the treasure only 31 can definitely be documented as part of the original hoard; 27 pieces now remain, most of which are in the British Museum. Authenticated items include one bronze ewer and 30 silver objects: nine monogrammed dinner plates (one now missing), a bowl, a flask, the elements of a cherniboxentos set, two caskets. Six furniture
ornaments (= four Tyches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome; a Pair of Hands), and six horse trappings. Of the documented objects, in addition to the missing silver plate, a lamp, lampstand, and a second plate have also been lost.

The quality and nature of the objects, which included dinner and toilet articles as well as insignia of office (the Tyches and Hands), indicate that the treasure belonged to a family of high standing. The mixture of pagan imagery and Christian inscriptions is characteristic of the Late Antique period in general. A date of 379–83 for the manufacture of the objects and for their role as wedding gifts was originally hypothesized on the basis of inscriptions on the silver. The names of Secundus and Projecta appear on one casket. Monograms on the plates were deciphered as those of Turcius Secundus, supposedly a member of the gens Turcia prominent in 4th- to 5th-C. Rome, and of his wife Projecta Turcii. The latter was in turn considered to be the Projecta, aged 16, whose epitaph was composed by Pope Damasus (366–84). Shelton challenged these identifications and datings, suggesting instead that the treasure was made over a period of years 330–70 for several members of the Turcius household.


ESTATE. In Byz. various terms, often of períphrastic character, were used to denote the estate: agora (field), oikos (house), ktenata (properties), proasteion (suburb), zeugelatian (lit. “driving a yoke of oxen”); a monastic estate provided with a chapel was called a metochion. An estate usually included a mansion, desmesne land, and lands worked by tenants as well as hilly pastures. Within the estate, the Byz. distinguished the enthyr (or esothyr), located close to its nucleus, from the remote esothyr (Treatise on Taxation, ed. Dölger, Beiträge 115:24–33); they also distinguished autourgia as the most profitable portions of the estate. Balsamon (Rhalles-Poties, Syntagma 2:595,4–18) describes salt-pans, olive groves, vineyards, meadows, wateaways, and pottery workshops as autourgia: he acknowledges the flexibility of the concept, since an autourgia could cease to produce income, while an exochorion proasteion could become profitable. In documents vineyards (L. Petit, IRAK 6 [1900] 29.26–27), watermills (Lavra 2, no.105.24), vivaria, and the enigmatic aulakia and griopholoi (Lavra 2, no.104.177–8) were considered autourgia.

An estate usually did not coincide with the village but occupied a part of it, while the other part of the village either belonged to the village community or formed another estate: thus, in the village of Gradec in 1300, one landlord held 26 peasant households, a collective of owners had 19, one man had eight, another seven, and three lords possessed one household each. Estates could form a complex outside the village or comprise dispersed tenures in different villages.

Estates of the late 4th–5th C.—complete with villas, pasturage, and orchards—are represented in contemporary floor mosaics (Dunbabin, Mosaics 122, figs. 111–13), but Byz. equivalents are unknown.


---

ESTOIRE D’ERACLES, traditional title of the works of a group of French historians of the Crusades, comprising the translation of William of Tyre made in France in 1220–23 and various vernacular continuations of widely varying value and origin. The name derives from the opening words’ reference to Emp. Heraclius in connection with the rise of Islam. The discrepancies and elaborations of the French translation with respect to William’s original Latin seem to have no independent historical value (Morgan, infra [1973] 185–87). Several of the continuations are extremely valuable, particularly that for the years 1184–97, which derives from the lost Holy Land chronicle of Ernoul (presumably Ernoul de Gibel, associate of Baldwin II, lord of Ibelin and Ramla, in Palestine [ca.1187–93]) and sheds light on the fall of Jerusalem to the Muslims in 1187; the reigns of Andronikos I Komnenos, Isaac II Angelos—whose portrait was supposedly painted above the door of every monastery in Constantinople (ed. Morgan, infra [1982] 29), Alexios III Angelos, and Conrad of Montferrand (Morgan 26–30); the Third Crusade; and the conquest of Cyprus (Morgan 116–21) from the perspective of
Outremer. The various continuations give substantially the same account of the Fourth Crusade (ed. de Mas Latrie, 348–95) and provide much data on politics in the Levant and the relations of Byz. and Armenia to the Crusader states.


—M.M.C.

ESZTERGOM RELIQUARY. This silver-gilt and enamel reliquary, kept in the cathedral treasury of the Hungarian city of Esztergom, displays a sizable piece of the True Cross, surrounded by images in three registers: above are two mourning angels; at the center Constantine I and Helena point to the relic in its sunken cross-shaped cavity; illustrations of Christ’s Road to Calvary and Descent from the Cross are below. Between the arms of the cross appear four enamelled disks, with inscriptions reading “Christ gives grace to Christians.” Inset enamel strips with quatrefoils define the borders of the panel and the relic. This panel once formed the inner part of a triptych, the wings of which have been lost. The present frame is a Palaiologan addition. The relicquary’s bright, opaque coloring, its fragmented borders, the rectilinear setting of the cloisons (thin strips of gold) and, in the inscriptions, the iota decorated with a nodule are characteristic of mid-to-late 12th-C. enamels; parallels are the feast scenes added to the Pala D’Oro in Venice after 1204 and two teardrop shaped panels on a composite icon in the Hermitage (Iskusstvo Vizanti 2, no.540). The date of 1190 assigned to the reliquary in the 17th-C. will of Cardinal Kutassy of Hungary therefore seems to be accurate.


—M.E.F.

ETCHMIAXIN (Ejmiačin). See VALARŠAPAT.

ETERIANO, HUGO, lay theologian and author; born Pisa between ca.1110 and 1120, died Velletri? (Italy) 1182. Eteriano studied theology and philosophy in France and Italy and went to Constantinople ca.1160 with his brother, Leo TUSCUS, who became an imperial interpreter. In Constan-
tinople Eteriano continued his studies and became an adviser to Emp. Manuel I Komnenos on Latin theology and the Union of the Churches. His background in Latin scholasticism was influential in resolving a Christological controversy at the local council of 1166 in Constantinople (see under CONSTANTINOPE, COUNCILS OF) where he argued with DEMETRIOS OF LAMPE. At the emperor’s request, Eteriano, with Leo’s help, wrote a polemical treatise, On the Holy and Immortal God (also known as On the Heresies of the Greeks), which sought to demonstrate that both the Greek and Latin church fathers taught the dual procession of the Holy Spirit (the filioque). The book, written in both languages, was sent to Pope ALEXANDER III in 1177. At the request of two German scholastics, Eteriano compiled the Book on the Difference between Nature and Person (ca.1179), which consisted of translations of Greek patristic texts on Trinitarian theology and his comments on them. Pope Lucius III made Eteriano a deacon and a cardinal in 1182, the year of his death.


—F.K.

ETERNITY (aiōn) can only be defined negatively in relation to time, either as a duration without beginning or end or as existence without change or (temporal) succession. Eternity as an attribute of God was first discussed in the Christian era by ARIUS and the early Arians (e.g., EUNOMIOS). They argued that the Son was generated “before the ages” but was not “co-eternal” with the Father. In this sense, GREGORY OF NYSSA (as the First Council of Nicaea had already done) also opposed the use of the term “unbegotten” as an essential attribute of God the Father, since it excluded the Son of God from the Trinity. The definition of eternity was also linked to the revelation of the name Yahweh, in that the eternal God as “Life itself” transcended even infinity (without beginning, without end). Probably in view of the Gnostic doctrine of the emanation of the aeons, or even the eternity reserved for men and angels, John of Damascus (Exp. fidei 15, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:43f) admitted that eternity may not always mean “aion” in the strict sense. The Palamite doctrine
of energies with the presentation of a divine, uncreated light came out of the framework of the Cappadocian doctrine of eternity.


**ETHICS**. Ethical reflection in Byz. often took place in the context of discussion of questions of moral theology, in which Christian revelation was the fundamental reference (e.g., for concepts such as **sin, virtue, vice, devil**). Ethics in the strict sense, a philosophical inquiry independent of religion first established as a distinct science by Aristotle, also survived, esp. in the continued interest taken by Byz. thinkers in ancient philosophy. As in the case of his corpus of logic, Aristotle's ethical works formed a core around which Byz. commentaries, glosses, and paraphrases accumulated. His *Nicomachean Ethics* was read with ancient anonymous scholia and those of Aspasios, to which were added partial commentaries by Michael of Ephesus, Eustathios of Nicaea, and a slightly later Byz. anonymous, the whole constituting a corpus translated into Latin by Robert Grosseteste. A paraphrase of the *Nicomachean Ethics* was copied for John VI Cantakouzenos. On the basis of such materials, summaries of ethics were prepared, for example, by John of Damascus, Michael Psellos, and Joseph Rhakendyes.

Another ethical system that had a considerable impact on monastic circles was Stoicism, as represented in the works of Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, and the stoicizing On Virtues and Vices (*De virtutibus et vitibus*) attributed to Aristotle (and copied for Arethas of Caesarea) and the Concerning the Emotions (*Peri pathon*) attributed to Andronikos of Rhodes as well as in a number of popular moralizing anthologies. An example of an ethical system based on principles Stoic in inspiration is provided by Plethon's treatise On Virtues.

Less broad in appeal was the ethical theory of Neoplatonism as formulated in particular in the *Sentences of Porphyry*. The solutions proposed by the Neoplatonists (esp. Proklos and Ammonios) to the problem of evil—evil is not a substance, but a privation of good, in particular in the form of moral turning away from God—and its reconciliation with free will and divine providence were, however, adopted by Psellos and by the *sebastokratour* Isaac Komnenos. Indeed, in its identification of the ethical good (*eudaimonia*) as union with God, to be attained in contemplation by means of purifying by virtue the soul of its corporeal existence, Neoplatonism had already given, through the Cappadocian fathers, a fundamental structure to Byz. moral theology.

Aristotelian ethics could be integrated into this structure, in Psellos's view, in that the lowest type of virtue, "political virtue," concerns the rationally ordered and harmonious life of man as a union of soul and body, a life formulated by Aristotle and including practical wisdom and political action. The higher levels of virtue, purificatory and contemplative, which Porphyry added to political virtue, indicate for Psellos the path that leads man as immortal soul to transcend the world and reach greater union with God. The same place is assigned to Aristotle's ethics in the Christian life by Eustathios of Nicaea. Barlaam of Calabria proposed in his *Ethics according to the Stoics* (PG 151:1341–64) a similar integration of Stoic and Platonic ethics: Stoic ethics prescribes the ideal life for man as he is; Platonic ethics concerns life beyond this world. (See also behavior.)


**ETHIOPIA** (from *Aðiophes*, supposedly the people with "burnt faces"), the geographical-racial (not political) designation of the region in Africa south of Byz. territory, esp. south of Egypt. The eastern part of Ethiopia including South Arabia was sometimes called *India* and the inhabitants Indians (e.g., Sozom., *HE* 2:24; Theodoret 1:22).

Although Ethiopia was a general designation, it was usually qualified to pinpoint the specific area under discussion. Eusebios (*HE* 2:11.13) specifies Meroitic Nubia when he speaks of the Ethiopia that is ruled by a queen. Prokopios, discussing the Himyarite wars, speaks of "the Ethiopians who are called Axumites" (*Wars* 1:19, 17). Byz. historians were aware of tribal groupings and political units within Ethiopia, for example, *Blemmyes*, Nobades, Axumites. Individuals identified as Ethiopians were to be found in Egyptian monasteries, the most notable being Moses the Black of Sketis (early 5th C.). No part of Ethiopia was
ever included in the Byz. Empire, but in the 7th C., both Lower Nubia and esp. Axum were Byz. allies. The Arab conquest of North Africa cut off Ethiopia from Byz.


ETHIOPIANS (Ethiopæs). From classical times the term Ethiopian referred to all dark races from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean: specifically, to the Cushite inhabitants of the kingdoms of Meroe and Axum. This inaccurate terminology, reflecting both Ptolemy’s geography and Ethiopia’s own position on the way to India, was inherited by the Byz., whose attitude toward “blacks” greatly differed from that of Westerners (C. Prager, JMRS 17 [1987] 260, n. 5).

St. Moses the Black, a Nubian, is referred to as Ethiopian or Libyan; Theophilus the Indian, possibly from the Maldives Islands, is variously described as Ethiopian, Blemmyes, or Libyan (G. Fiaccadori, Studi classici e orientali 33 [1983] 295–300; 34 [1984] 273 ff. and n. 112). Yet trade with India and events in 6th-C. Najran soon led to a better knowledge of Axum and Adulis, both visited by Kosmas Indikopleustes ca. 518. As allies in control of the eastern routes, the Ethiopians were then favorably regarded by diplomats and merchants alike. Between 644 and 678 the widespread hope of an Ethiopian intervention against the Mesopotamian Muslims in fulfillment of Psalm 67(68):31 still focused on the Axumite power. Methodios of Patara even claimed Ethiopian origins for the Byz. Empire, ultimately equating it with Ethiopia (M.V. Krivyov, in Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Ethiopian Studies [Moscow 1988] 6, 111–17). After the Islamic conquest of Egypt, the decrease in relations with Nubia and the decline of Axum prevented further contacts between the Byz. and Sudanese or Abyssinian blacks—although the “Ethiopians” serving in Theophilos’s army or those involved in the 904 Arab raid on Triessalonike may have been Sudanese mercenaries.

From the 10th C. onward men of color are indeed mentioned frequently in Byz. literature, but the vast majority of references, following the old Mediterranean stereotype of imaginary blacks, is generic: either connected with scriptural problems (E. Benz, Abba Salama 6 [1975] 17–36) or totally devoid of any anthropological reality, as representing the proverbial darkness impossible to “wash off” (after Lucian, Against the Ignorant Book Collector 28). Bordering upon and overlapping the same cliche are the Ethiopian demons that typify the spirit of fornication in early monastic hagiography (P. Devos, AH 103 [1985] 61–74). Thus Ethiopians became protagonists of disturbing dreams (P.-A. Fevrier, Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques n.s. 19 B [1985] 295 and n. 8). This kind of demonology took shape in Egyptian milieux subjected to the savage raids of Nubian tribes, and spread then to Syria and Palestine and later to areas lacking direct experience of “evil blacks”: but color awareness never implied racial prejudice, nor did black chromatic symbolism, of superstitious origin, necessarily refer to ethnic types (F. Lepore, ParAbb 39 [1984] 310–20).

The interpretations of scriptural Ethiopians prevailed over the scanty associations with demons and internal phantoms, whose frightfulness lay, however, not so much in the color of their skin as in other physical features (J. Winkler, JHS 100 [1980] 160–65). Far from the “racial” image of black hypersexuality, the Iliad’s “blameless Ethiopians” (bk.1:423) were models of continence and dignity (which again precluded the identification between blacks and slaves); credited with wisdom and astrological learning, they became a symbol of Christianity’s ecumenical mission, like the black King of the Epiphanies.

The same developments and sensibility are found in the visual arts, esp. MSS of the 11th–12th C. Besides the small and conventional negroid figures used for decoration, Ethiopians with distinctive African traits appear, for instance, the Blemmyes in the Menologion of Basil II; and demons are usually depicted as black. According to the Byz. eschatological perspective, blacks are also shown, chiefly in “Pentecost” scenes, among the nations reached by the preaching of the Apostles (Kazhdan-Epstein, Change 185).

ETHIOPIC LITERATURE, the literature written in Ge'ez, the southern Semitic language of successive Christian kingdoms of the region that is now ETHIOPIA. Of three main periods, only the first, the Axumite period (4th–6th C.), was directly influenced by Byz. literature in the form of translations from Greek religious texts to fulfill the needs of newly christianized Axum. By the 6th C., the Old Testament had been translated from the Septuagint and the New Testament from an Antiochene Greek text aided by reference to a Syriac version. The Book of Jubilees, the Apocalypse of Esdræ, the Ascension of Isaiah, and the Book of Enoch were included in the Ethiopic canon. The Qerlos, a compilation of writings of the church fathers, esp. Cyril of Alexandria; the Synodos, a collection of conciliar decrees; the Lives of Sts. ANTONY THE GREAT and Paul the Hermit; the rule of St. PACHOMIOS, the PHYSIOLOGOS, and various liturgical texts all belong to this period. During the revival of Ge'ez literature (14th–15th C.), vitae of indigenous saints were produced that show indirect Byz. influence via models surviving from the earlier period. After the 14th C., the region, isolated from Byz. since the Arab conquest, developed an indigenous literature subject to some Coptic-Arabic influence. (See also KEBRA NEGAST.)

LIT. F. Cerulli, Storia della letteratura etiopica (Milan 1956).

- D. W. J.

ETHNARCH (ἐθναρχης, lit. “leader of a people or nation”), a term (possibly of Hellenistic Jewish origin) to designate any ruler of barbarians: thus, Philostorgios (Philostorg. HE 34.7) used it for the Jewish ruler of Himyar, Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 268.30) for the chiefs of the Sklavenes, Constantine Manasses (Historiae v.2525) for the Vandal kings, etc. Church fathers designated pagan national gods as ethnarchai, and accordingly Basil the Great (PG 29:656B) considered the angel-ethnarch as a guardian appointed to each ethnos. By the end of the 10th C. the term ethnarch (as well as satrap) entered the Byz. state hierarchy: the Taktikon of Exarchid (Oikonomides, Listes 271.24, 273.29) mentions both the ethnarch and his topteteres. In 1051 Constantine IX appointed the patrikios Bryennios as ethnarch and sent him against the Pechenegs, and ca.1078 Borri. was protoprodros and ethnarch (Brven. 283.2). Since a seal calls him proedros and megas primikertos of the ethnikoi (V. Sandrovskaja, PSb 23 [1971] 29), it is plausible that the ethnarch of the 11th C. was a high-ranking commander of foreign mercenaries.

LIT. Oikonomides, Listes 333. - S. B. B., A. K.

ETHNOLOGY as a separate discipline did not exist in Byz., but ethnological problems were touched upon by various writers. This was not only because of human curiosity but esp. because of the political situation of an empire that constantly had to deal with a variety of peoples attacking it, trading with it, or settling on its territory. The Byz. considered themselves as the chosen people and viewed foreigners as barbarians; they nonetheless left valuable descriptions ranging from folkloric fantasies (e.g., in the vita of MAKARIOS OF ROME), to pragmatic information (e.g., the STRATEGIKON OF MAURICE), to narratives of embassies (e.g., PRISKOS OF Panion). The works of historians (Prokopios, Theophyllaktos Simokattes, Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, Leo the Deacon, Anna Komnene, Laonikos Chalkokondyles, among others) are esp. rich in ethnological descriptions. Pictorial images of various peoples are to be found in scenes of PENTECOST, in the illustrations to Psalters and Octateuchs, in the images of the LAST JUDGMENT, and in such secular MSS as the Madrid Skylites (M. Garidis, Byzantion 39 [1969–70] 86–91).

The Byz. emphasized the continuity of ethnological groups and applied to contemporary peoples ancient names (such as Scythians) and ancient topos characterizing their behavior, habits, food, and dress (B. Zástérová, BBA 52 [1985] 16–19). Some observers (e.g., Pachymeres) recognized modification in language and clothing because of assimilation; Chalkokondyles noted the process of cultural differentiation over time. Cultural development, unless ascribed to divine influence, was considered as a technological progression from the primitive gathering of food to civilization. In Tzetzes’ view this led to moral decline, whereas Eustathios of Thessalonike connected it with the development of law and righteousness.


- A. K.

ETHPOIOIA (ἠθοποιεία, lit. “character-drawing,” Lat. sermoquatione), a rhetorical figure, one of the PROGYMNASMATIA. According to HERMENEGIDES (ed. Rabe, 9–11), it was “an imitation of the character
of the person described,” such as “what kind of words Andromache would have pronounced while mourning over Hector” (hence the words τίνας ἀεὶ εἰσί μοι γότου in the title of many Byz. etthropoinai). The person had to be a “real” individual, either historical or mythological, but statements put into his or her mouth were invented. Hermogenes divides etthropoinai into ethical (with the emphasis on character), pathetic (with the emphasis on emotion), and mixed.

In the 4th–5th C. (Libanius, Severos of Alexandria, rhetorical school of Gaza) etthropoina remained a rhetorical exercise, drawing the material primarily from mythology and stressing unusual and unreal situations. Some later Byz. etthropoinai (e.g., by Nikephoros Chrysoberges) retain a conventional character. A number of authors of the 10th–12th C., however, developed the genre far beyond a school exercise: even mythological subjects (e.g., Pasiphae’s infatuation with a bull, by Nikephoros Basilakes) could sound erotic and nonorthodox (H.G. Beck, Byzantinisches Erotikon [Munich 1984] 113). At the same time biblical and hagiographical themes were introduced; historical personalities of the day, such as Nikephoros II Phokas, were featured, and elements of everyday life emerged. Eustathios of Thessalonike presented a certain Neophytoς of Mokissos complaining that he had been robbed in a bathhouse. This ethrhoia is full of irony underscored by references to mythology and to Christian moral imperatives. The ethrhoia form was used as an element of other genres, e.g., in Psello’s Chronography (O. Schissel, BZ 27 [1927] 271–75).

After the 12th C. the popularity of ethrhoia declined, the pattern became more conventional, and even Manuel II’s ethrhoia on the words that Timur allegedly addressed to Bayezid I was deprived of any real content (H. Hunger in Studien zu alteren Geschichte Osteuropas 1 [Graz-Cologne 1959] 1561). An exception is Alexios Makrembolites’ Dialogue between the Rich and the Poor, which has the title of ethrhoia.

ETYMOLOGIKA (ἐτυμολογικά), lexika giving the derivation, real or imagined, of words. Early Greek thinkers saw language as a natural phenomenon; the Stoics saw it as a conventional system based on analogy. Both looked for a correspondence between the form and meaning of words and propounded explanations based on this principle. In the 5th C. Oros and Orion made collections of such explanations, which survive only in fragments (Das attische Lexikon Oros, ed. K. Alpers [Berlin 1981]). Ninth C. Byz. scholars drew on these works, as well as on lexika, commentaries, etc., to compile their own etymologia. The earliest, the Etymologicum Genuinum, survives in two 10th C. MSS, but has not yet been completely edited. A slightly later compilation from similar sources, the Etymologicum Gudianum, is probably connected with Phoitos and his circle. The compiler of the Souda used both of these. About the mid-12th C. another compiler drew material from the Genuinum and the Gudianum, as well as from the lexikon of rare words falsely attributed to Cyril of Alexandria. In the independent spirit of 12th C. scholarship he freely abbreviated, transposed, and modified what he found in his exemplars. This compilation, known as the Etymologicum magnum, was used by Eustathios of Thessalonike. The unpublished Lexikon Symeonis, a shorter compilation of the same period, sometimes follows the Genuinum more closely. The explanations offered by the etymologia are often fanciful, for example, ἀγάπη (love) from “to lead everything” (ἀγομέν τό πῶν); γυμνὸς from κυπτρό, “since the naked [man] (γυμνός) stoops (κυπτεῖ) in order to conceal his pudenda in shame”; κάμηλος (camel)—because “she bends her thighs (κάμπτει τοὺς μηνούς)”; λύπη (sorrow) from “to open (λύειν) the countenance (τοὺς ὀφαγάς) for tears.” Nonetheless, these compilations are valuable for the light they throw on the Byz. understanding of their own literary language, as well as for their quotations from lost Greek texts.


ETYMOLOGY, a division of grammar in antiquity, which in the 4th C. acquired special significance as a tool for discovery of concealed links between essence and phenomenon. Broadly applied by Iamblichos, it became fashionable with literati of the 5th C. when various etymologiaka
were compiled. Far from giving scientific explanations, Byz. etymology eagerly suggested multifarious interpretations (Krumbacher, *GBL* 573–75), probing various paths to penetrate behind the sound of the word: thus, *anthropos* was considered to originate from *ano* ("up") and from various verbs meaning "to look" or "to be inclined." During the 10th-C. encyclopedic revival, the search for the etymology of geographical names became popular, and the chroniclers (pseudo-Symeon Magistros, Genesios, etc.) included etymological explanations, partly borrowed from Strabo, partly invented, but as a rule fantastic (A. Diller, *TAPA* 81 [1950] 245–53; Constantin VII’s team of writers in the De *themata*ibus also developed pseudohistorical and mythological etymologies, although the explanations of some names (Boukellariou, Opsikion) are factual (Hunger, *Lit.* 1:532). Etymology appears also as a vehicle of polemic and praise: the names of saints were interpreted as emphasizing their virtue, the names of opponents their folly or vice: thus, Nikephoros Gregoras called the followers of Palamas palamnaioi ("murderers") (H. Hunger, *Aspekte der griechischen Rhetorik* [Vienna 1972] 131f). Eustathios of TheSSalonike effectively used etymologies in his antimonastic polemic, linking asketes with askos ("wineskin") and laura with spoudesilaura ("whore") (Kazhdan-Franklin, *Studies* 152).

EUAGEIS OIKOI (ευαγείς οἰκοι), a category of pious institutions, also called theioi or divine. Probably in the 6th C., the previous philanthropic organizations (see *philanthropy*) created by Christians to assist the poor, the aged, and the infirm became more institutionalized. At the same time they became powerful landowners, and Justinian I in his novel 120 of 544 regulated their rights to acquire or lease properties; in the category of pious institutions the legislator included hostels (Xenodochēia), hospitals, poorhouses (Ptochotropēia), orphanages, and sometimes churches and monasteries as well. Byz. law distinguished between euagneis oikoi and imperial estates; the administration of some pious institutions, however, was incorporated into the state system. In the Taktika of the 9th and 10th C. chartudarii and xenodochoi of euagneis oikoi are mentioned, and in acts of the 11th C. the oikonomos of euagneis oikoi appears. In the 12th C. the latter official was replaced by the *megas* logiastēs of euagneis sekreta (Podnou Engraphe 1, nos. 18.438, 19.26; Laura 1, no.68.1). The term seems to have disappeared after 1204. Specific oikoi such as Eleutheriou and Mangana were closely linked to the economy of the imperial court.


EUBOEA (Εὐβοια, in Western sources Negroponte), large island in the Aegean Sea (second in size only to Crete) off the east coast of Greece. It consists of three parts: the well-irrigated and forested north, a mountainous central section with fertile coastal valleys, and an unproductive south; the central section is separated from Boeotia only by the narrow strait of Euripos. Hierokles (Hierokl. 644.10, 645.6–8) lists four poleis in Euboea: Adephas/Aidepos in the north, Chalkis and Porthmos (mod. Aliveri) in the middle, and Karysos in the south. Some settlements (Avlon, Oreos) are attested as bishoprics from the 8th or 9th C. onward, but nothing is known of their urban character. Archaeological excavations have revealed mosaics, remains of basilicas, and fragments of sculpture through the 7th C., even from remote areas of the island. The establishment of monasteries in the 11th and 12th C. (e.g., Panagia Peribleptos near Polikita) are an indication of Byz. recovery.

Owing to its isolated location, Euboea seems to have suffered little from hostile invasions. Vandal fleets reached the island in 466 and 475, but there is no evidence of Avar and Slavic attacks. Arabs from Tarso attempted to capture Chalkis in the 870s, but details of this expedition are hard to establish (Vasiliev, *Byz. Arabes* 2.1 [1968] 56, n.1); the city was burned by the Venetians in 1171. As an administrative unit Euboea existed at least through the 8th C., as shown by a seal of Kosmas, the dioikētēs of Euboea (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.2078). Thereafter the island was part of the theme of Hellas and was designated Chalkis or Euripos; from the 13th C. it took the name Negroponte, although Byz. historians continued to call it Euboea until the 15th C. (eg., Kritob. 165.19, Douk. 75.19). From 1332 the Turks began to attack isolated areas on Euboea and in July of 1470 the island fell to them. Until the 15th C. the church
of Euboca was under the administration of Athens. Under Latin domination the church of Euboca was an important outpost of papal power.

Most of the surviving churches on Euboca date from the 13th and 14th C., and are found in the Karystos section of the island. They are small, single-aisled, barrel-vaulted churches, founded, according to their fresco inscriptions, primarily by local couples. Although their fresco programs are fundamentally Byz. in character, some Western iconographic influences are evident, perhaps deriving from Romanesque MSS. Western traits also appear in haloes, painted architecture, and the special outlining of figures (A. Koumoussi, Les peintures murales de la Transfiguration de Pyrgi et de Sainte-Thècle en Eubée [Athens 1987]).


EUCHAIATA (Εὐχαίατα, now Avkat), city of Pontos, west of Amaseia. In the 5th C., Euchaita served as a place of exile for many prominent clergymen, including the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch. It was made a city by Anastasios I, who fortified the polisma after an attack by Huns in 515. It was burned by the Sasanians in 615, attacked by the Arab caliph Mu’awiyah in 640, and occupied by Arabs during the winter of 663/4. On this last occasion, while the Arabs plundered the city and demolished the Church of St. Theodore, the population fled to forts in the nearby hills. Nevertheless, the city recovered and the church was rebuilt. Euchaita was a city of the Armeniakon theme; the Arabs ambushed the strategos and captured the treasury of the theme in 810 (Theoph. 489.17–20). The works of the metropolitan John Mauroposes show that the festival of St. Theodore was the scene of a crowded fair in the mid-11th C. Its later history is unknown. Originally a suffragan bishopric of Amaseia, Euchaita became an autocephalous archbishopric by the 7th C.; its increasing importance derived from the cult of St. THEODORE TIRON transferred here from Amaseia. Euchaita became a metropolis under Leo VI. No remains have survived. The relation between Euchaita and the neighboring Eucheneia (named Theodoropolis by John I Tzimiskes in 972) is not clear.


C.F.

EUCHAIATA (εὐχαίατα, “thanksgiving”), principal Christian liturgical service, called the liturgy or the Divine Liturgy in Byz. usage. Based on Jesus’ command (Lk 22:19) to repeat in memory of him what he did at the Last Supper, the Eucharist is first seen (in 1 Cor 10:11) as a ritual meal in which bread and wine are offered and blessed as Jesus’ body and blood in memory of his saving work, esp. his sacrificial death (1 Cor 10:26). Originally celebrated in the context of an agape meal, perhaps daily, by the 2nd C. the Eucharist had been separated from the agape, joined to a service of scripture lections, and associated with Sunday as the ritual symbol of the risen Jesus’ enduring presence among his followers. In the 3rd C. appear the first written formulas of the anaphora or central prayer expressing the service’s significance. Eucharist is considered a sacrifice (thysia) because it is the sacrament of Jesus’ sacrifice on the Cross as well as an icon of the “heavenly liturgy” or permanent self-offering that Jesus offers before the throne of the Father (Heb 8–10, 12:22–4), a favorite theme of Byz. commentaries.

Within Byz., Eucharist was a source of theological disputes, esp. with the Iconoclasts, who held that the consecrated bread and wine were the only true types or rikon of Jesus (S. Gero, BZ 68 [1975] 4–22). Against this the Second Council of Nicaea defined that the consecrated bread and wine are no image, but Jesus himself (Mansi 13:264). The Byz. also quarrelled with others over eucharistic practice (see Latin Rite, Zeon, Epi-
glesis). Byz. eucharistic theology achieved its classic synthesis in the commentary of Nicholas Ka-
silas, who not only maintained a balanced position fair to Latin views, but also found a via media between the two opposing tendencies of Byz. eucharistic theology, represented in the 12th C. by Soterichos Pantéugenos, who seemed to reduce the Eucharist memorial to a subjective

Eucharist was originally celebrated at Byz. only on Sundays, Saturdays, and feasts. By the 8th–9th C. Byz. lectionaries provide lections for weekday Eucharist (P.M. Gy in *Miscellanea G. Lercaro*, vol. 2 [Rome 1967] 255–59), though this was probably only in monasteries since the *Typikon of the Great Church* does not have such lections. Only ca.1053 or 1054 did Constantine IX Monomachos assign revenues to have Eucharist celebrated daily in Hagia Sophia (Skyl. 477.64–69). Daily Eucharist never became the rule in Byz., though the Stoudite *typika* provide for it except on the ferias of Lent and Holy Week (PG 99:1713B). It was celebrated less frequently in monasteries after the introduction of the *Sabbatic typika*, though there was provision for communion via the *presanctified* liturgy on days without Eucharist (Taft, *East & West* 61–80). (For representations of Christ’s celebration of the Eucharist, see Lord’s Supper.)


-E. R.F.T.

**EUCHELAION.** See UCTION.

**EUCHOLOGION** (εὐχολόγιον), prayer book used by the principal liturgical ministers (bishop, priest, deacon) for all services of the Byzantine rite. A vast anthology whose contents vary widely from MS to MS, the early *euchologion* contained the * prayers and diaconika* for the cathedral services of the capital and was the principal *liturgical book* originating in Constantinople. The earliest of the numerous surviving MSS of the *euchologion* is Vat. Barb. gr. 396, dating from the second half of the 8th C. (A. Strittmatter, *EphLil* 47 [1933] 329–67).

Used even in monasteries for the Eucharist, the *euchologion* became more and more monastic in character as the Palestinian hours introduced by the Stoudite monasteries of Constantinople gradually merged with elements of the cathedral hours (*asmatike akolouthia*) to form a new, hybrid, monastic office in Constantinople (see Stoudite *typika*). Arranz (“Asmatikos Hesperinos” 109–16) classifies various MSS of the *euchologion* on precisely this basis: their relative purity in transmitting the *asmatike akolouthia* of Constantinople or their degree of monastic content. A. Jacob, on the basis of their text of the Chrysostom liturgy, divides *euchologion* MSS into two recensions, the ancient and the new, subdividing the former into two families, Constantinopolitan and south Italian. Printed versions distinguish between the *Mega euchologion* (and extracts thereof, such as the *hieratikon* or *leitourgikon*), which contains the Eucharist service, vespers, and orthros, and the *Mikron euchologion* (or *hagiasmaterion*), which contains the other sacraments, blessings, funerals, and occasional services.


-E. R.F.T.

**EUCLID,** ancient Greek mathematician; fl. ca.300 B.C. in Alexandria and perhaps Athens. Euclid’s best known and most influential work, *The Elements*, was the basic textbook on geometry for the Byz., who normally studied it in the revision prepared by Theon of Alexandria. The most famous copy of this revision is Oxford, d’Orville 301, dated 888, which belonged to Arethas of Caesarea. The original version is preserved only in the 9th-C. Vat. gr. 190. Commentators on *The Elements* include Pappos of Alexandria, Proklos, and Simplicios. Leo the Mathematician gained such renown for his understanding of Euclidean theorems that the caliph al-Ma’mun tried to lure him to Baghdad (Lemerle, *Humanism* 173–78). Among later scholars who wrote on Euclid were Maximos Planoudes, George Pachymeres, Niképhoro Grigorás, Isaac Argyros, and Barlaam of Calabria. *The Elements* was translated into Latin (by Boethius) and into Arabic.

Two other works of Euclid, the *Data* and the *Optics*, survive both in an original version and in a revision by Theon. Both works were translated...
into Arabic by Ishāq ibn Hunayn, and there is an anonymous Latin translation of the Optics, perhaps made in the 12th C. Pachymeres used the original version of the Optics in book 3 of his Quadrivium.

The Mirrors, which is attributed falsely to Euclid, is perhaps by Theon. Two musical works, the Introduction to Harmony and the Division of the Scale, are sometimes ascribed to Euclid in Greek MSS; the first is most probably the work of Cleomides, though the second may be in part Euclid’s.


—D.P.

EUDOKIA (Εὐδοκία), feminine personal name. The word is frequent in the New Testament, meaning “good will, favor.” Unknown in the 4th C., the name was evidently coined for Athenais and soon thereafter given also to the elder daughter of Valentinian III. It was not widely used in the early period, even though Theophanes lists four Eudokiai. However, in the late Byz. acts of Lerna, vols. 2–3, Eudokia holds sixth place among female names, between Theodora and Zoe.

—A.K.

EUDOKIA INGERINA ( returnUrl="#" Εὐδοκία Ἰγνερίνα), mistress of Michael III, wife of Basil I, mother of Leo VI and Alexander; born ca. 840, died Constantinople 882/3. She was the daughter of Inger, who was perhaps of Scandinavian origin (Mango). Around 855 Michael took Eudokia as his mistress, angering his mother Theodora and Theoktistos, both of whom hated her “for her impudence” (TheophCont 655,3–4). Despite his marriage to Eudokia Dekapolitissa, Michael apparently continued his involvement with Eudokia Ingerina, although nothing was heard about her for a decade. Kislinger speculates that ca. 856 Michael married her to a son of Caesar Bardas to legitimize her social status and that Bardas took up with her after his son’s death.

In 865/6 she married Basil; the notion that she is named and depicted on an ivory casket that is said to have been a wedding present for the couple has been shown to be false (A. Cutler, N. Oikonomides, ArtB 70 [1988] 77–87). In Sept. 866 Eudokia gave birth to Leo. Some scholars consider this a nominal marriage, arranged by Michael to give legitimacy to Leo, who was his child, but most assert that Leo was actually Basil’s son (Ch. Toul, Parnassos 21 [1979] 15–35). If Eudokia continued as Michael’s mistress, then her son Stephen, born in Nov. 867, would have been Michael’s child as well. With Basil she had Alexander and three daughters; she is portrayed with her two sons in the Paris Gregory. Eudokia became involved ca. 878 with a Niketas Xylinites, whom Basil forced to be tonsured. In 882 she arranged a bride show for her son Leo, at which he chose Theophano, one of Eudokia’s relatives. In his funeral oration for Basil, Leo called Eudokia “the finest of women” (A. Vogt, I. Hausheer, OC 26.1 [1932] 52,18).


—P.A.H., A.C.

EUDOKIA MAKREMBOLOITISSA, empress (22/23 May–31 Dec. 1067); died after 1078. Niece of Patr. Michael I Keroularios, Eudokia married Constantine Doukas by 1049. Before he became Constantine X, she bore him Michael, two other sons, and two daughters; thereafter she had Konstantios and a daughter. She became augusta (empress) during her husband’s reign; as he was dying, she swore, in the presence of Patr. John VIII Xiphilinos, synod. and senate, never to remarry. Following Constantine’s death, she ruled for her sons, the emperors Michael VII and Konstantios, who appear with her on her coins. Supported by the caesar John Doukas, she made her own official decisions. The Turks continued to attack the eastern frontier; Caesarea and the region of Antioch were plundered. The Byz. troops, badly paid and provisioned, were demoralized. Realizing the need for a male ruler, Eudokia obtained from the patriarch the annulment of her oath and selected as her new husband Romanos (IV) Diogenes. She bore him Nikephoros and Leo. When, after the battle of Mantzikert, Romanos was released by Ali Arslan and sought to regain his throne (early Oct. 1071), Eudokia hesitated. The caesar John summarily forced her into her own convent of Phiphoudion; Nikephoros III recalled her to Constantinople. A copy of the Sacra Parallela prepared for Eudokia depicts her with Constantine Doukas and their sons
(Spatharakis, *Corpus*, fig. 126). I. Kalavrezou-Maceneir (*DOP* 31 [1977] 305–25) suggested that Eudokia appears with Romanos IV on a controversial ivory in Paris, against the traditional view that the depiction is of Romanos II and his empress.


**EUDOKIMOS** (Εὐδόκιμος), saint; born Cappadocia 807, died Charsianon? 840. His father Basil was reportedly influential at court, and Eudokimos began his career in Constantinople. Theophilos supposedly appointed him stratopedarches of Cappadocia (although Eudokimos’s low title of kandidatos is incompatible with the high office he allegedly received). He fought victoriously and when he died was buried in the ornate uniform of a general.

His Life is preserved in two versions, one by Symeon Metaphrastes; Ch. Loparev (*infra* [1908]) considered the other to be the original, if not composed by Ignatios the Deacon then at least created in his circle. Actually, however, it was written by Constantine Akropolites (H. Delehaye, *AB* 51 [1933] 270f), who suppressed some details of the Metaphrastic version, itself not rich in information. The first part of the Life is a biography of the saint: although he was a soldier and not a hermit, he displays the whole range of traditional virtues, such as celibacy and concern for the poor. The second section describes miracles performed both at Eudokimos’s tomb and during the translation of his relics to Constantinople; the most vivid is the story of the theft of the corpse from Charsianon, at the request of Eudokimos’s mother, by the monk Joseph (arbitrarily identified by Loparev with Joseph the Hymnographer): the corpse supposedly lifted his arms and legs in order to help Joseph remove his garment. The hagiographer does not mention Iconoclasm; Sevcenko (“Hagiography” 127) calls Eudokimos “a good candidate for an Iconoclast saint.”

**Representation in Art.** Eudokimos, whose portraits first appear in 11th-C. MSS of the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes, is almost invariably depicted as a young saint in full military costume. In wall painting, despite his natural death, he is paired with true martyr-warriors such as George and Demetrios.


**Eudoxia** (Εὐδοξία), wife of Arkadios and empress (from 9 Jan. 400); died Constantinople 6 Oct. 404. Daughter of a Roman mother and Bauto, a Frankish general of Valentinian II. Eudoxia possessed outstanding beauty (Zosim. 5.3.2). She grew up in Constantinople and married Arkadios on 27 Apr. 395. She bore the emperor five children, including Pulcheria and Theodosios II.

Although pregnant during much of her short reign, Eudoxia was involved in politics and managed to secure the fall of the powerful eunuch Eutropios. Her outspokenness and alleged vanity earned the opposition of John Chrysostom, who reportedly compared her to Jezebel and Salome; the conflict between the two threatened the normal harmony between the people of Constantinople and the Theodosian house. Upon Eudoxia’s urging, Chrysostom was exiled in 403, but popular response forced the court to recall the bishop. He was again exiled in 404. Later in the year Eudoxia suffered a fatal miscarriage, interpreted as punishment for her opposition to the popular bishop.


**Euergetis Monastery,** a foundation of the mid-11th C., located in the European suburbs of Constantinople, approximately 3 km outside the land walls. It was dedicated to the Theotokos Euergetis (Ἐὐεργετής). The original founder, Paul, retired to his country estate in 1049 and built a few simple cells for the handful of monks who joined him in his monastic retreat. After Paul’s death in 1054, his successor as hegoumenos, Timothy, put Euergetis on a solid financial base and constructed a new church and larger katholikon. Timothy, who lived as an enkleistos, was revered as the second founder. Circa 1055 he composed two
DROSILLA AND CHARIKLES: the work contains various allusions to Byz. reality, and the portrait of Dro-
silla, the heroine, coincides verbatim with that of
the ideal bride of his epithalaimion. In the romance
Eugeneianos combines a lofty lyricism with earthy
scenes and parody. Some of his epigrams are also
D. Christides identifies Eugeneianos as the author
of an anonymous dialogue ANACHARSIS OR ANA-
nias and several letters.

ED. R. Hercher, Erotici scriptores Graeci (Leip-
29–32. Russ. tr. F. Petrovskii, Nikita Eugeniam, Poem o
Nicetas Eugeneianos sur ‘Theodore Prodrome.’” VizVrem 9
(1902) 446–63.
LIT. Hurter, Lit. 2:135–36. A. Kazdan, “Bemerkun-
gen zu Niketas Eugeneianos,” JÖB 16 (1867) 101–17. M.
Kyratzis, “Of Professors and Disciples in Twelfth (sic) Cen-
romanzo di Niceta Eugeneiano: modelli narrativi e stilistici.”

EUGENEIKOS, JOHN, churchman and writer; born Constantinople after 1394, died after 1454/5.
The younger brother of Mark Eugeneikos, John
Eugeneikos (Ευγενικός) was a married deacon who
held the positions of notary and nomophylax at the
patriarchate. Like his brother a fierce opponent of
Union, he stayed only briefly at the Council of
FERRARA-FLORENCE. On his way home from Ven-
ice in 1438, he survived a shipwreck and, in re-
sponse to this narrow escape, wrote a work titled
Oration of Thanksgiving (ed. Lampros, infra, 271–
314). Because of his opposition to the council, he
was exiled to the Morea, where he joined the group of literati at Mistra (1439–47). He also
traveled to Trebizond, his father’s birthplace, and
to Mesembria (1454/5). He ended his life admin-
istering the metropolis of Lacedaemonia (Sparta).

Eugeneikos was a prolific author who wrote in a
variety of genres; many of his works are still
unpublished. His polemical writings include an
Antirrhetikos attacking the Decree of Union of 1439.
He composed several paronymiakes and monodies,
ekphrases of icons, a threnos on the fall of Constan-
tinople (which was soon thereafter translated into
Slavic), kanones and hymns, prayers, and sermons.
Recently, A. Sideras ascribed to Eugeneikos an
anonymous monody (Byzantion 54 [1984] 300–
14). His encomiastic ekphrasis of Trebizond (ed.
O. Lampside, ArchPont 20 [1955] 25–36) differs

EUGENEIANOS, NIKETAS, 12th-C. writer. A
disciple or friend of PRODROMOS, Eugeneianos
(Ευγενιανός) led a hard life (according to his
own very rhetorical statements), until he was res-
cued by the sebastos and megas dronangarios Stephen
Kommenos, whose teacher Eugeneianos claimed
to have been. In 1156/7 he wrote a monody on
Stephen; he probably also dedicated an epithala-
aimion to Stephen’s wedding in the early 1158.
Eugeneianos dedicated to Prodomos another
monody in prose, as well as two in verse (C.
37 [1987] 186–209) suggests that Eugeneianos
was the author of an anonymous monody that is
preserved in Heidelbergenesis 18 and has signifi-
cant similarities with a monody of Prodomos
(whom Eugeneianos could imitate). An example
of such imitation is also Eugeneianos’s romance

TYPIKA, a foundation typikon containing a rule for
daily life and a very lengthy liturgical typikon, an
important example of STODOITE TYPIKA.

The foundation typikon, which served as a model
for the typika of the Kosmoseuteia (see BERA),
MAMAS, HELIOUT BOMON, Kecharitomene, and
HILANDAR monasteries, is our primary source of
information about the Euergetes monastery. The
monastic complex included a hospice to provide
lodging and medical care for travelers and the
sick; distributions of food were made daily to the
poor. Euergetes also had a metochion within the
walls of Constantinople. During the Latin occu-
pation of Constantinople (1204–61) the monas-
tery was given as a dependency to MONTECASSINO,
but apparently the Greek monks were not ex-
pelled. St. SAVA OF SERBIA visited the monastery
several times between 1196 and 1235 and was a
major benefactor of the institution. Euergetis
disappears from the sources after the 13th C. It
should be distinguished from the Constantinople
monastery of Christ Euergetes, which possessed
an icon bearing this epithet and was a foundation
of the 10th or 11th C. (A. Cutler, DOP 37 [1983]
42).

SOURCES. Liturgical typikon—ed. Dmitrievskij,
Opisanie 1:256–514. Foundation typikon—ed. P. Gautier,
radically from the *ekphrasis* of Bessarion: while the latter concentrated on the trade of this "em-
porion of the world" and on the architecture of the palace, Eugenikos praised the rustic beauty of
meadows and forests around the city and their gorgeous vegetation. Among his hagiographical
writings is a eulogy of James the Persian (ed. C. Hannick, *AB* 90 [1972] 261–87), of whom Euge-
nikos possessed a relic, and an *akolouthia* for his brother Mark (ed. L. Petit, *SBN* 2 [1927] 195–
235). Of his letters 36 survive, many of them attacking Latin doctrine. In his introduction to the
*Aithiopika* of Heliodoros (H. Gärtner, *BZ* 64 [1971] 322–25), Eugenikos suggested a "mythical"


—A.M.T., A.K.

**EUGENIKOS, MANUEL,** wall-painter, decorated the monastery church of Calendžiča (Georgia) at the behest of Dadian Varneq I, prince of Mingrelia (1384–96). His large body of surviving work has been related to frescoes in the church of Theodore Stratemates at Novgorod and to an icon at Mt. Sinai. Although his name is Trapazente-
"itione, Greek and Georgian inscriptions at Calen-
džiča report that Eugenikos was brought from Constantinople.


—A.C.


Son of the deacon George Eugenikos, who was *sakellios* of Hagia Sophia, Eugenikos received the baptismal name of Manuel. After his father’s death, Eugenikos studied in Constantinople with John Chortasmenos and George Plethon. In 1420 he became a monk on Antigone (Princes’ Islands); two years later he returned to the capital, where he entered the Mangana monastery and was eventually ordained a priest. Shortly before the Council of Ferrara-Florence, Eugenikos was made metropolitan of Ephesus. He attended the council as one of the leading Byz. theologians and presented the extreme Greek position concerning the *filioque* (M. A. Orphanos in *Philoxenia* [Mün-
sichr 1980] 223–32) and purgatory (C. Tsirpanlis, *BS* 37 [1976] 194–200). He was the only Greek delegate who refused to sign the decree of Union (1439). After his return to Ephesus via Constan-
tinople, he was imprisoned for two years on Lemnos (1440–42). Eugenikos has been both criticized as a "narrow-minded obstacle to Union" (Gill) and praised as an uncompromising and consistent supporter of the conciliar Christian tradition (Tsirpanlis). He was canonized by the Orthodox church in 1456; his brother John Eugenikos wrote his vita (ed. S. Petridès, *ROC* 15 [1910] 97–107). An *akolouthia* also survives (ed. L. Petit, *SBN* 2 [1927] 193–235).

In his numerous theological works Eugenikos defends Palamism (e.g., 72 *Kephalaia*) and the anti-Latin position on *filioque* and purgatory. A few of his letters are preserved as well as hagiographical compositions and hymns (*kanones* in honor of the Virgin). He also wrote *ekphraseis* on paintings that indicate his appreciation of art (D. Pallas, *Byzantion* 52 [1982] 357–74) and solutions to philosophical questions (*aporiai*) such as the existence of a soul in animals, evil, and free will. Many of his works remain unpublished.


—A.M.T.

**EUGENIOS** (Eiγένιος), martyr and saint, allegedly a victim of Diocletian’s persecutions; feastday 20 or 21 Jan. In Symeon Metaphrastes (PG 116:497–506) he appears as an associate of the martyr Eustratios (see Five Martyrs of Sèbas-
telia), but in the *Synaxarion* of Constantinople Eugenios is depicted as the principal hero of another group of martyrs, consisting of Valerianus, Candidius, and Aquilas (*Synax.CP* 406–07). In both
cases, the persecutor is Lysias, dux of "Satalea" (Satalea is the name of several towns in Asia Minor and Armenia). Whatever the origin of the legend, by the 11th C. Eugenios became the patron of Trebizond: one of the major churches in Trebizond was dedicated to him, and under the Grand Komnenoi his image was common on the local coins, the so-called aspro komneneata (M. Kuršanskis, ArchPont 35 [1978] 27). His martyrdom is illustrated in the Menologion of Basil II.

John (VIII) Xiphilinos, the future patriarch and a native of Trebizond, compiled the passio of Eugenios and wrote about his miracles (M. van Esbroeck, OrChrP 47 [1981] 392). The latter provide information on climate, everyday life, and on an appearance of the Rus' in Trebizond in the days of "Constantine the Younger." The martyrdom of Eugenios and his posthumous miracles were also the subject of several later works, some anonymous and some by known authors (Joseph, metropolitan of Trebizond [1364–67], John Lazaropoulos, Constantine Loukites) who were active at the court of the Grand Komnenoi in the 14th C. The Miracles by John Lazaropoulos is rich in factual historical material, beginning with Basil I and including both Trebizond and the neighboring lands (Iberia, Chaldea, and even Cherson).


**EUGENIOS OF PALERMO**, high-ranking official at the Sicilian court; admiral (from 1190), translator, and poet; born Palermo ca.1130, died ca.1203. Henry VI imprisoned him in 1195–96; after his release he was appointed master chamberlain of Apulia and Terra di Lavora (1198–1202). Jamison's identification of Eugenios with Hugo Falcandus Siculus has not proved valid. Eugenios belonged to the group of Sicilian intellectuals versed in Arab, Latin, and Greek culture. He translated Ptolemy's works from Arabic into Latin and Sibylline oracles from Greek into Latin; he also wrote Greek poems. He focused on human behavior, treating it on the basis of classical and patristic tradition with a slight tint of personal experience. Eugenios published and perhaps ed-

ited a version of Stephanites and Ichneutae by Symeon Seth, and in his poems he developed the theme of the instability of human life, typical of Byz. didactic literature of the 11th–12th C. He praised the ideal of ascetic life; in another poem he presented the ideal image (eikon) of the ruler—somewhat vaguely, but emphasizing military prowess (v.21.60–66). Many other poems are dedicated to such topics as greediness, garrulity, caluny, and virginity.

ED. Versus iambici, ed. M. Gigante (Palermo 1964), with Ital. tr.


**EUGENIUS** (22 Aug. 392) died 6 Sept. 394. A former teacher of Latin grammar and rhetoric, Eugenius was magister scrinii at the court of Valentinian II when the latter was murdered in 392. When Arbocast, the Frankish magister militum, failed to hold power in his own name, he appointed Eugenius as Western emperor. Eugenius was nominally a Christian but, as a moderate in the religious controversies, he was acceptable to the pagans of Italy, who chafed under the autocratic religious policies of Theodosios I. When Eugenius could not secure the recognition of Theodosios, he threw himself fully into the arms of the pagan party. Under the direction of the praetorian prefect Nicomachus Flavianus paganism revived in Italy. Theodosios elevated his son Honorius to imperial rank in 393 and marched against Eugenius the next year. At the battle of the Frigidus, Eugenius was taken prisoner and executed.


**EUGENIUS III** (Bernardo Pignatelli of Pisa), pope (from 15 Feb. 1145); died Tivoli 8 July 1153. Eugenius spent almost all of his papacy in a struggle against the Romans, who expelled him from the city even before his consecration. A Cistercian and follower of Bernard of Clairvaux, Eugenius sanctioned the Second Crusade (1 Dec. 1145) and
tried to achieve union with the Greeks (Roger II of Sicily, in contrast, tried to use the Crusaders for his own purposes against Byz.). After the failure of the Second Crusade, Eugenius was forced to seek alliance with Roger; he took advantage of Roger’s military support to return to Rome in Nov. 1149 but did not break with Conrad III and his ally Manuel I Komnenos.


EUGENIUS IV (Gabriele Condulmaro), pope (from 3 Mar. 1431); born Venice ca. 1383; died Rome 23 Feb. 1447. After ascending the papal throne Eugenius had to deal with the resistance of many Italian cities, including Rome (from which he fled in 1434, not returning until 1443), as well as church prelates who assembled a council in Basel. He carried on negotiations with Emp. John VIII Palaiologos and transferred the council from Basel to Ferrara, where he brought the emperor, Patr. Joseph II, and their retinue of 700 men. At the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–39) a decree of union was signed, but it was short-lived. Eugenius tried to attract to the union other separated Eastern churches—namely the Armenians and the Copts. After the council the pope promised to send a fleet of ten ships to John and to rouse Germany and Hungary to action against the Turks. The fleet was delayed but the papal nuncio Garatoni arrived in Constantinople to outfit ships and crossbowmen. A papal letter to Garatoni of 25 Aug. 1440, however, reveals the growing tensions between the two churches and the inclination of the pope to reduce the patriarchate of Constantinople to the level of an ordinary local church. Eugenius supported the expedition of Hunyadi that ended in 1444 in a defeat at Varna—a disaster that demonstrated the futility of Byz. expectations of a Western crusade.


EUGENIUS VULGARIUS, southern Italian cleric whose surname may indicate Bulgarian background; fl. Naples; ca. 1400. Hoping for material reward, Eugenius dedicated to Leo VI four flattering Latin poems—including one figure poem in the shape of a pyramid, complete with a prose explanation of its symbolism. He also composed verses for Pope Sergius III (964–11) and local potentates and wrote defenses of Pope Formosus (ed. E. Dümler, Auxilius und Vulgarius [Leipzig 1866] 117–39). His metrical martyrology reflects Byz. tradition on Barnabas the Apostle (ed. P. Meyvaert. AB 84 [1966] 360–67).


EUGIPPIUS, abbot of the monastery of Lucullan and biographer; died Castellum Lucullanum, near Naples, after 533. Isidore of Seville mentions the spiritual rule which Eugippus wrote for his monastery. He corresponded with a number of churchmen, including Dionysius Exiguus. Eugippus was also known to Cassiodorus, who (Institutiones 23) deprecates his neglect of secular studies but praises his biblical scholarship, recommending his Selections from the Works of St. Augustine. Eugippus is best known for his Life of St. Severinus, the apostle of Noricum, whose disciple he was and whose remains were deposited at his monastery. This biography was written in some haste ca. 511 to get ahead of an anonymous rival whose study of the monk Bassus provoked fears that his treatment of Severinus would be too literary for ordinary readers. It was sent for approval (duly received) to the Roman deacon Pachianus as a Memorandum (Commemoratorium), a title that disingenuously plays down its own considerable rhetoric. Although giving Severinus his meed of miracles and other supernatural skills, the Life emphasizes secular events, set down in accurate chronological sequence and providing overall a unique eyewitness picture of the last decades of the western Roman province of Noricum, esp. the social life of river towns between Vienna and Passau.


EUKTERION (εὐκτήριον), or eukterios oikos (εὐκτήριος οἶκος), lit. “a house of prayer” and therefore, in theory, any church building. Generally, however, the term was used of private churches—oratories and chapels—distinct from, or appended to, the main places of public worship. Secular and ecclesiastical authorities were anxious to ensure that privately founded eukteria did not subvert or overburden the church’s episcopal structure. Justinian I ordered that construction was not to begin until the local bishop had consecrated the site, approved the priest, and received from the would-be founder (κτητόρ) sufficient funds for staffing and maintenance; donors who could not afford this were encouraged to contribute to the restoration of unused or ruined churches (novs. 57.1–2; 67; 123.18; 131.7). He also prohibited the celebration of the liturgy in the oratories of private houses (novs. 131.9; 58), a prohibition that the Council in Trullo repeated and extended to baptism (canons 31 and 59). Insofar as the prohibition was designed to prevent the dissemination of heresy, it had lost much of its urgency by the end of the 9th C., when Leo VI repealed it as being unnecessarily restrictive now that Orthodoxy was secure “and by divine grace eukteriai oikoi have been erected to God in almost every house, not only of the illustrious, but also of the common people” (nov. 4; see also nov. 15).

This policy ignored, however, the now more serious threat that eukteria posed to the sacramental raison d’être of the public churches and that Patriarch Alexios Stoudites later (1028) attempted to remove by forbidding the use of eukteria for any service apart from the liturgy (RegPatr, fasc. 2, no. 835). According to Balsamon, an eukterios oikos was a church that lacked consecration through chrisma, deposition of martyr relics, and enthronement of the officiating prelate (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:4581, 4796–9).

131. Beck, Kirche 83–86. —P.M.

EULALIOS (Εὐλάλιος), painter who seems to have flourished as a mosaicist and icon-painter under Manuel I; he is alluded to in several texts of the 12th–14th C. Nicholas Mesarites attributes to him the images of the Pantokrator and the Mys- rophoroi in the Church of the Holy Apostles, Constantinople, and suggests that Eulalios in- serted his own image into the latter scene. This statement was questioned by Demus (infra) but is still consistent with the ethos of 12th-C. monumental painting.


EULOGIA (εὐλογία, “blessing” or “benediction”), the term applied to consecrated gifts as well as to the bread offered optionally at the eucharist or blessed separately and distributed in church or sent as a gift. The term was extended to the “blessing” at departure and that received by a pilgrim through contact with a holy place, person, or object. It could be received either directly and immaterially, for example, through kissing the wood of the True Cross, or conveyed indirectly through a substance of neutral origin (e.g., oil, water, earth) that itself had been blessed by such contact. In the latter case, the material itself, as in Symeon tokens (see Pilgrim Tokens) or its container (e.g., Menas flasks, pilgrimage ampulae) might bear a representation of the sanctifying agent or event. The richest account of Byz. pilgrimage  eulogiai is that recorded ca. 570 by the Placenza Pilgrim, who, for example, reclined on a couch in the Garden of Gethsemane “to gain a blessing” (ch. 17). At the Holy Sepulchre he describes the blessing of little flasks of oil through contact with the True Cross and the blessing of earth brought into the tomb. Pilgrim eulogiai were valued for their amuletic and medicinal powers; Cyril of Skythopolis (ed. E. Schwartz, 110.10–11, 164.14–18, 218.6–7, 228.13–14) for example, writes that St. Sabas (among others) used the oil of the True Cross to exorcise evil spirits; a flask at Bobbio (Giovanni, Ampoules, Bobbio no. 1) is inscribed “Oil of the Wood of Life, that guides us by land and sea.”


EUNAPIOS OF SARDIS, pagan writer and historian; born Sardis 345/6 (PLRE 1:296) or 349 (R. Goullet, JHS 100 [1980] 67), died after 414. Eunapios (Εὐναπίος) lived mainly in Sardis, apart
from five student years at Athens when his parents recalled him, thus aborting a visit to Egypt. His combination of sophistry and medicine (typical for the age) helped him achieve a friendship with ORIBASIOS, famous doctor and confidant of Julian. So did his rancid PAGANISM, the central emotional and intellectual impulse of his writings, albeit he did admire his Christian mentors Chrysanthios and Prohaeresios. His *Lives of the Sophists*, written in or after 399 (T.M. Banchich, GRBS 25 [1984] 183–92), celebrates various Neoplatonists, iatrosophists, and rhetoricians in different degrees of fervor and coolness.

His *History*, surviving only in fragments, formally continued that of Dexippos, and encompassed in 14 books the period 270–414. Its precise structure and date of composition are endlessly debated, as is whether he used AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS as a source or vice versa. Photios (Bibl., cod. 77) knew two versions or EKDOSIS: the original being too anti-Christian for pious stomachs, Eunapios produced a toned-down “New Edition,” clumsily done with subsequent obscurities in the text. His *History* is widely biased toward paganism and Julian, ostentatiously neglectful of precise chronology, and crammed with rhetorical digressions and descriptions of individuals and events; ZOSIMOS exploited it to the point of plagiarism. Photios is relatively kind to his style; modern taste generally prefers C.G. Cobet’s label “most stinking” (*Mnemosyne* 6 [1878] 318).

**EUNOMIOS** (*Evōmios*), leader of Neo-Arians (Anomoians); born ca. 335 in Cappadocia (in Ol- tseris or more probably Dakora), died Dakora ca. 394. Son of a cultured peasant, Eunomios learned the skill of TACHYGRAPHY and served as a teacher in Constantinople. In Antioch he met AETIOS, whose secretary and disciple he became and whose fate he shared, being exiled by Constantius II, recalled by Julian who gave him properties in Chalcedon, and subsequently becoming involved in the revolt of Prokopiou. In 360 (according to Philostorgios) or ca. 366 (according to Sokrates), he was appointed bishop of Kyzikos. After the death of Aetios, Eunomios headed the radical group of Arians and was ordered by Theodosios I to produce their exposition of faith; Theodosios, however, rejected their Anomoian views and banished Eunomios to the lower Danube and then to Cappadocia, where he died.

Like Aetios, Eunomios taught that God the Creator was ingenerate, whereas the Son was created and possessed a different essence and different energy; the Father, the Son, and the Spirit formed a hierarchy of nonconsubstantial beings. Naturally, Eunomios avoided the concept of the Trinity. The Logos-Christ was a created deity and never assumed the human nature—a view that Eunomios shared with the Theopaschites. He introduced a particular form of baptism—a single immersion in the name of the death of Christ (and not in the name of the Trinity). Eunomios professed the power of reason, and contemporaries testify to the clarity of his argumentation. He rejected the idea that God was unknowable: Sokrates ascribes to him the assertion that God does not know more of his essence than we do. Eunomios’s works are lost but some of them (the *Apology, the Apology of Apology, and the Exposition of Faith*) are known in fragments from refutations produced by his opponents (Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa).

---

**EUNUCHS** (sing. ἐκτομιός) played an important role in the church, the army, and the civil administration. Several patriarchs were eunuchs: GERMANOS I, METHODIOS, IGNATIOS, and others, the last of them being EUSTATIOS Garidas (1081–84); among generals NARSES was especially famous; among civil officials were EUTROPIOS, SAMONAS, JOSPH BRINGAS, BASIL LERAPENOS, and JOHN THE ORPHANOTROPHOS. High palace dignities such as PRAEFECTUS SACRI CUBICULI and PARAKOIMOMENOS were until the 11th C. held mainly by eunuchs. Eunuchs also served in the houses of aris-
tocrats. Legislation prohibited castration, although Leo VI (nov.60) mitigated the punishment imposed for performing this surgery. Despite this legislation the operation was often performed on both children and adults, including members of the aristocracy. Some eunuchs were imported from the Caucasus, the caliphate, and Slavic countries. Rare at the time of Constantine I, eunuchs acquired importance during the reign of Constantius II in conjunction with the growth of the bureaucratic system; Julian's attempt to restrict the role of eunuchs failed. They retained important positions through the 11th C., but were pushed out of the highest posts under the Komnenian dynasty, as aristocratic ideology with its veneration of manliness became dominant (A. Kazhdan, ADSV 10 [1973] 184–97); they were rare in the 14th–15th C. Because of their fear of homosexuality, monastic leaders tried to exclude the “beardless” from certain monasteries (e.g., on Mt. Athos).

It is usually thought that eunuchs, who had no children of their own nor were allowed to ascend the throne, preserved greater loyalty to their masters. G. Walter (La vie quotidienne à Byzance au siècle des Comnènes [Paris 1966] 95) questioned this thesis, arguing that in reality eunuchs participated in diverse plots and schemes against the emperors. Theophylaktos of Ohrid (Discours, Traités, Poésies, ed. P. Gautier [Thessalonike 1980] 287–331) wrote a defense of the status of eunuchs, demonstrating that they had always played an important role in the palace, in the church, and esp. in the creation of ecclesiastical music. Theophylaktos provided his reader with a list of eunuch-martyrs and named a worthy contemporary, a certain Symeon, who organized a synoikia (community) of eunuch-monks. The monastery of St. Lazaros in Constantinople was reserved for eunuchs by Leo VI (Janin, Églises CP 299).

EUPHARIA, Church of Saint, built in the 4th C. at the place of her burial, about 1.5 km from Chalcidon. It consisted of a basilica with an attached circular martyrion in which the body of Euphemia was kept in a silver sarcophagus. Once a year the body reportedly exuded an effluvium of blood that was distributed in glass ampullae. A painted cycle of Euphemia's martyrdom (in a "roofed passage") is described by Asterios of Amaseia. The Council of Chalcidon was held in the church in 451. The Persian invasions of the early 7th C. caused its destruction and the transfer to Constantinople of the "uncorrupted body," which was housed in the converted great hall of the palace of Antiochos next to the Hippodrome. During the Iconoclastic period the new church was secularized and the relics were thrown in the sea by Constantine V; they were miraculously saved and returned in 796 to the refurbished church, which survived until the end of the Byz. Empire. Excavations in 1942 and 1950–52 revealed part of the palace of Antiochos, including the hexagonal building that housed the church, opening on to a semicircular portico. A late 13th-C. cycle of wall paintings illustrates the saint's martyrdom.


EUPHARIA, Church of Saint, died 16 Sept. 303, according to the Fasti Consulares Vindobonenses (MGH AuctAnt. 9:290). Egeria mentions the cult of Euphemia (Euphemia) in Chaldon, and Asterios of Amaseia describes her annual feast and the pictorial representation of her trial and death by fire. The Church of St. Euphemia housed the Council of Chaldon in 451 (see Euphemia, Church of Saint). Halkin (infra, xvii) dates the earliest passio (preserved in 11th- and 12th-C. MSS) soon after this council. It provides little information, but the details of the trial and execution differ from Asterios's description; for example, Euphemia was supposedly thrown to wild beasts and died in the arena. The Synaxarion of Constantinople (Synax.CP p.811–19) assigns to Euphemia the miracle of determining the decision of the Council of 451: two tomoi, one orthodox and another heterodox (Monophysite), were placed in Euphemia's coffin; after several days the council members reopened the coffin and found the heretical creed under Euphemia's feet and the orthodox one in her hands. Euphemia's cult was popular in Byz. Constantine of Tios (ca.800) related that Leo III ordered her relics thrown into the sea, but two pious brothers saved
them and brought them to Lemnos. In the 15th
C. Makarios Makres reworked this legend. Latin
versions also survive (H. Boese, *AB* 97 [1979]
360–62).

**Representation in Art.** Portraits of the saint
show a virgin martyr clad in a *maphorion* and long
tunic. In the *Theodore Psalter* (fol.163v) and
in some MSS of Symeon Metaphrastes she is shown
flanked by beasts from the arena (in accordance
with the text), while in others she stands nude in
a pyre (as in the description by Asterios) or is
beheaded. A fresco cycle of 14 scenes illustrating
her martyrdom adorns her church in Constanti-
nopole (R. Naumann, H. Belting, *Die Euphemia-
Kirche am Hippodrom zu Istanbul und ihre Fresken*

**Source:** F. Halkin, *Euphémie de Chalcédoine* (Brussels 1965).

**Lit.:** *BHG* 619–624n. J. Wortley, "Iconoclasm and Leip-
sanochism: Leo III, Constantine V and the Relics," *Byz* 8

**EUPHRADES (Ἐὐφρατέας),** legendary architect of
Constantinople during the reign of Constantine
I. He is described as a eunuch, *parakoitomononos,* and
eponym of a church or *gerokomeion* in the
district of Leomakellan in Constantinople. He
is mentioned in the *Patria,* in pseudo-Symeon Ma-
gistros, and in some legends about Constantine.
According to one of the legends, Euphrates built
the city ramparts, developed the sewage system,
excavated cisterns, and erected Hagia Sophia.
Another legend relates that he came to Constantin-
one on the eve of the battle at the Milvian Bridge
and advised the emperor to abandon polytheism
and trust in the true God and his son Christ. Eupha-
ras also reportedly invited inhabitants of various
cities to move to Constantinople and furnished
them with *annonae* and dwellings. He supposedly
provided "the archontes of Rome" with new houses,
fountains, and gardens identical to those they had
possessed in Rome. Euphrates is not mentioned
in any source before the 9th C.

**Lit.:** F. Halkin, "L'empereur Constantin converti par

**EUPHRAATES (Ἐὐφράτης),** longest (2,760 km) river
of western Asia. The Euphrates was navigable
from north of Edessa; it was a principal waterway
for transportation, but vulnerable politically and
militarily. Heavily fortified since Roman times, the
river provided the principal means for Persian
expeditions against Byz. Much defensive con-
struction took place in the reigns of Anastasios I
and Justinian I. Important cities along the Eu-
phrates included Melitene, Samosata, Hier-
apolis, Zenobia, and Kirkesion. Stretches of the
Euphrates were part of the Sasanian-Byz. border.
The river continued to be a principal invasion
route for Muslims against Byz. in the 7th–9th C.
Control of its upper reaches, including such
strongpoints as Kamacha, occasioned much Byz.-
Muslim warfare. The Euphrates floods from No-

tember to the end of March, and, esp. in April
and May, carries heavy silt to the Mesopotamian
plain. Its water allowed the agriculture that flour-
ished along its banks, in contrast to the often
parished lands beyond the reach of irrigation.

**Lit.:** J.G. Crow, D.H. French in *Roman Frontier Studies*
1979, eds. W.S. Hanson, L.J. Keppie (Oxford 1980) 903–
12. G. Frézoulès in *Le Moyen-Euphrate: Zone de contacts et
EUPHROSyne DOUKAINA KAMATeRA, empress (1195–1209); fl. ca. 1169–1210. She married the future Alexios III Angelos ca. 1169 and bore him three daughters: Irene (born ca. 1170), Anna (born ca. 1171 or 1173), and Eudokia (born ca. 1172 or 1174). Stronger-willed and more intelligent than Alexios, she had great influence over him; she occupied the palace when word of his coup reached Constantinople. Her support for Constantine Mesopotamites created opposition from her son-in-law Andronikos Kontostephanoς and her brother Basil Kamateros, who informed Alexios of her affair with a certain Vatatzes. The latter was executed and Euphrosyne was shut in a convent for six months (1196–97). Upon her return she regained dominance over her husband, although she could not prevent Mesopotamites’ fall (1197). Abandoned by Alexios in Constantinople when he fled, she was arrested, but Alexios V Doukas took Euphrosyne and Eudokia with him when he left Constantinople. After Alexios V and Alexios III met at Mosynopolis, Euphrosyne joined her husband in his wanderings. Carried off to Montferrat with him, she was ransomed by Michael I Komnenos Doukas of Epiros and passed the rest of her life near Arta.

litr. Polemis, Doukai 131.

EUPRiPIDEs (Εὐπρίπιδης), Greek tragic poet; born Salamin 480 b.c., died Macedonia 406. Following the tradition of late antiquity, Byz. scholars favored the ten so-called select plays of Euripides. Knowledge of the nine other tragedies was rare but evident in Psellos, John Tzetzes, and Eu-stathios of Thessalonike (cf. Wilson, infra 177, 204). The earliest extant MS of Euripides (Jerusalem, Gr. Patr., Taphou 36) dates from the 10th or 11th C., and his life is included in the Souda. In the early 14th C. the triad of Hecuba, Orestes, and Phoenician Women, which had become standard in the school syllabus, received philological study in the form of scholia and/or recensions by Maximos Planoudes, Manuel Moschopoulos, Thomas Magistros, and Demetrios Triklinos. Of particular significance is the latter’s edition of all 19 plays.

The only attempt at literary criticism of Euripides—Psellos’s comparison of Euripides and George of Pisidia (ed. A. Colonna, SBN 7 [1953] 16–21)—survives in a damaged MS that, because of its poor condition, prevents any conclusions as to Psellos’s verdict. Clearly, however, he admires Euripides for his ability to arouse pity and for his versatility of style. Judging from the number of surviving MSS, Euripides was the most popular of the great tragedians. He influenced the language of the Verses on Adam by Ignatios the Deacon, the Katomyomachia by Theodorus Prodromos, and esp. Christos Paschon.

While scenes from Euripides are represented in the floor mosaics of Antioch, no illuminated Byz. MSS of the plays survive. Nevertheless, K. Weitzmann (Hesperia 18 [1949] 159–210) hypothesized their existence and impact on the Venice Kynegitika (see Oppian). In his view several caskets and boxes depict episodes from the tragedies, notably the sacrifice of Iphigenia on the Volcri Casket and Hippolytos crowned on other ivories. Other scholars, however, connect the Volcri casket with Nonnos of Panopolis.


EUROPA, in Greek mythology daughter of Pho-nix or of Agenor (king of Tyre), who was ab ducted by Zeus disguised as a handsome bull. This episode was known to Byz. authors; for example, Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 142.16–22) compares her with Theodora Komnene, who was se duced by the future emperor Andronikos I. A scholiast to Tzetzes (Hist. 7:369) transfers Europa from Phoenicia to Egypt and makes her the daughter of Nilus. The church fathers rational ized the myth of Europa in the same manner as the myth of Danae, but did not attempt to alle gorize it in a Christian sense, prevented probably by the connotations of bestiality. The rape of Europa is represented twice on the Volcri Casket.
in London (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, *Eisenbem-
skulpti*. 1, no. 23) and on other ivories.


- A.K., A.C.

**EUROPE** (Εὐρώπη). The Byz. retained the an-
cient concept of three continents—Europe, Libya (Africa), and Asia. Since only narrow straits di-
vided Europe from Libya, Theophranes (Theophr.
95.1–2, 426.3–4) considered Spain “the first
country of Europe from the West Ocean.” The
border between Europe and Asia was more dif-
cult to define. The Bosporos-Hellespont was a
natural dividing line; to the north, the Tanais (Don) River was considered a border—Laonikos
Chalkokondyles (Chalk. 1:123,6–8) assumed that
“the land beyond the Tanais” was larger and
wider than Europe. Prokopios (Wars 8:6.13–15),
however, rejected such a view and—referring to
Aeschylus—established the borderline at Colchid-
dian Phasis. Eustathios of Thessalonike, in
his commentary on Dionysios Periegetes (GGM
2:222.5–12, 264.44–45), acknowledged the exis-
tence of ishmuses that formed buffers between
the continents—Arabia between Libya and Asia,
and the Caucasus, a “large and broad ishmus
between the Caspian Sea and the Euxineos (Black
Sea).” The semilegendarily land of Thoulouse was
viewed as the farthest part of northern Europe.

Europe was considered a geographic unity: ac-
gording to Eustathios (2:264.44–45), it was the
most varied in form among the continents, sur-
passing Asia and Libya in wealth, its production
of fruit, and the virtue of its population, but had
fewer animals. The idea of Europe as a political,
cultural, and emotional concept was not de-
veloped in Byz., even though it emerged in the West in the 13th and 14th C. at the expense of
the concept of Christendom: Byz. was left outside
Europe, which contributed to the relative indif-
ference of the West to the fall of Constantinople.

The name *Europe* was also applied by Greek
authors to a part of Thrace, as both an adminis-
trative and ecclesiastical division.

LIT. D. Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea* (Edin-
di Europa alla fine del mondo antico,” *L’Europa nel mondo
hos ennoia chorou ste Byzantine historiographia,” in *By-

- R.B.H., A.K.

**EUROPOS** (Εὐρωπός, Ar. Jarābūlus, Ceraulus on
the Turkish-Syrian border), city of Ephrētēnsis
built on the site of ancient Carchemish at a stra-
tegic crossing of the Euphrates River. Its walls
were built by Keler, *magister militum* of Anastasios
1 (JoshStyl, ch.1) and again by Justinian I (Pro-
kopios, *Buildings* 2.9.10). In 542 Europos was made
the military headquarters of Belisarios (Proko-
pios, *Wars* 2.20.24). Circa 525 Monophysite
monks, expelled under Justin I from Seleukia
Pieria, established the monastery of Qenneshre
(“eagle’s nest”) on a height opposite Europos.
After the Arab conquest (639) it became famous
for the preservation of Greek studies until 815;
when the monastery was burned by local people;
it was restored by Dionysios of Tell-Mahre (died
845).

LIT. F. Nau, “Histoire de Jean bar Aphthoniaca,” *ROC* 7

- M.M.M.

**EURYTANEIA**, modern province in central
Greece. The ancient Eurytanes were a tribe in
Aitolia. The rugged mountainous terrain of the
region has led to its relative isolation; it contains
a number of churches and monasteries, but most
are post-Byz. (J.T.A. Koumoulides, *GORThR* 30 [1985] 61–83). One of the most important Byz.
monuments was the large 9th-C. domed church at
Episkopi, 40 km west of Karpenision, dedicated
to the Dormition (P.L. Vokotopoulos, *He ekkle-
siastike architekonike eis ten dytiken sterean Hellada
It received three distinct programs of wall painting;
the first contemporary with its construction, the
second in the late 10th or early 11th C., and the
third in the first half of the 13th C. Before the
church was submerged beneath the modern res-
ervoir of Kremasta, the frescoes from all three
stages were removed to the Byzantine Museum in
Athens (M. Chatzidakis in *Holy Image*, nos. 2–6).

LIT. A. Orlandos, “Byzantina mnemeia tes Aitolioakar-
oloakarnania* (Athens 1985).

- A.C.

**EUSEBIOS** (Εὐσέβιος), personal name (meaning
“pious”). The name first appeared in the 4th C.
and immediately spread widely in the Christian
and the pagan milieu: we know several pupils of
Libanius who are called Eusebios as well as many
officials whose religious beliefs cannot be deter-
EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA, churchman and scholar; born ca.260, died 339 or 340; according to a Syriac list of saints he was buried on 30 May. He was educated by Pamphilos, a priest in Caesarea, who developed Origen's traditions and enlarged Origen's library; his high esteem for Pamphilos led Eusebius to accept the surname “of Pamphilos.” Pamphilos was arrested in 307 during the anti-Christian persecutions, but he kept working in prison with Eusebius's assistance; he was beheaded in 309. After the execution of Pamphilos and some of his students, Eusebius fled to Tyre and then to the Thebaid.

In 313, however, as soon as the edict of tolerance was issued by Galerius, he was elected bishop of Caesarea. He became Constantine I the Great's favorite and a historiographer and participated in many theological discussions of the period. He perceived the threat represented by Monarchianism and was tolerant, even supportive, of the Arians; allied with Eusebius of Nikomedia he actively contributed to the deposition of the orthodox Eustathios of Antioch in 330 and Athanasios of Alexandria in 335. He also participated in the Council of Constantinople in 336 that attacked the views of Markellos of Ankyra.

As a scholar Eusebius was an outstanding systematic who assembled copious data. His works are devoted primarily to the problems of apologetics and church history. His major apologetic treatises are the voluminous Preparation and Demonstration of the Gospels, both dedicated to the Arian bishop of Syrian Laodikeia, Theodotos. In the Preparation he endeavors to show that “the philosophy and religion of the Hebrews” is more ancient and richer in content than Greco-Roman paganism and exercises a more powerful influence on human life. In the Demonstration, on the other hand, he asserts that Judaism is limited and ephemeral, only a fragile shell, whereas Christianity forms a permanent kernel.

The most important historical works of Eusebios are the Chronicle, the Church History, and the Vita Constantini. In the Chronicle, Eusebios, following in the steps of Sextus Julius Africanus but using other sources as well, gave the lists of ruling dynasties of Chaldeans, Assyrians, Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, and in brief form events of biblical and nonbiblical history, with special attention (in the last section) to the growth of Christianity. Thus Eusebios emphasized the same apologetic principle that permeates his Preparation: Christianity is not a sheer novelty but a religion properly rooted in the past. Eusebios produced several revisions of the Church History that are reflected in the two families of manuscripts, as well as in the 5th-C. Syriac version: he reworked his text in connection with the drastic changes in the political situation. Nevertheless the main principles of his approach remained consistent: first of all, his ten-book History presents an enormous amount of information, citing earlier works and documents; these citations may not always be dependable, but Eusebius believes that story-telling must be factual in order to be convincing. Second, history is a field in which the Savior is actively leading mankind to a teleologically foreseen future; accordingly, those who follow the Lord's path become victorious and, vice versa, those who emerge victorious are men following in the way of the Lord. In other words,
the emperor is successful because he fulfills the plan destined by God; he is the representative of God on earth. Constantine is praised precisely because he was victorious, and Eusebius makes him more Christian than he really was. Third, only the major patterns of development are salient while certain facts deviating from or contradicting them can be omitted or transformed or replaced by myth (as Crispus's murder is omitted; Constantine's conversion to Christianity is provided with a supernatural setting; and Galerius, the author of the first edict of tolerance, is presented as a diehard persecutor of Christians)—all with the noble aim of emphasizing the teleology of human salvation.

The Byz. often criticized Eusebius. Sokrates called him "double-tongued." The Second Council of Nicæa of 787 prohibited quoting Eusebius as a witness of correct belief. Two events account for such a negative attitude: Eusebius's pro-Arian stance and his rejection of the cult of icons. Despite these "shortcomings," Eusebius obtained great authority and for the Byz. remained the major source for the early centuries of Christianity and a textbook for anti-pagan and anti-Jewish polemics.

EUSEBIUS OF EMESA, bishop of Emesa (from ca.340) and biblical exegete; born Edessa ca.300, died Antioch or Emesa 359. A native speaker of Syriac, Eusebius learned Greek at school prior to exegetical and philosophical training at Antioch and Alexandria; the latter city introduced him to the friendship and Arianism of George, bishop of Laodiceia, though he refused to succeed Athanasios of Alexandria to its see in 339. His advent at Emesa was greeted by riots against his supposedly "too scholarly" personality; intervention by George and the patriarch of Antioch secured his position. Apparently semi-Arian in views, Eusebius was praised for his rhetorical skills and prolific popular writing by Jerome, who singled out his homilies on the Gospels and pamphlets against the Jews, Gentiles, and Novatians. Theodoret of Cyræus mentions treatises against Manichaeans and Marcionites. Greek fragments of his commentaries on Genesis and Galatians show him to follow the Antiochenæ School of exegesis. About 60 homilies survive in whole or part in Armenian (H. Lehmann, Per piscatores [Ahrus 1975]), Greek, Latin, Slavic (M. Matejic in Literatura ruské i folkloristika v čas academikůa [Sofia 1951] 121-135), and Syriac. The pseudo-Eusebian Gallican sermons belong mainly to Faustus of Riez (Eusebius' "Gallanicus", Collectio homiliarum, ed. J. Leroy, F. Glocie, 3 vols. [Turnhout 1970-71]).


LIT. E. M. Buylaert, L'héritage littéraire d'Eusebe d'Emesa (Louvain 1949).

EUSEBIUS OF NIKOMEDEIA, Arian bishop of Nikomeidea (from ca.318); bishop of Constantinople (from 338/9); died ca.342, probably at Constantinople. Eusebius was a fellow pupil of Arius under Lucian of Antioch. After Arius's condemnation ca.320, Eusebius, who had just become bishop of Nikomeidea, organized an epistolary campaign in support of Arius. Although Eusebius subscribed to the decisions of the Council of Nicæa in 325, he was soon exiled to Gaul by Constantine I on charges of supporting the Melitans (see Meletic Schism). After his recall in 328, he became a leader of the extreme Arian party, who came to be known as "Eusebians." He gained the favor of Constantine I and in 337 baptized the emperor during his last illness. The triumph of the Arian party was evident when Eusebius became bishop of Constantinople in 338 or 339. His brief tenure in Constantinople was marked primarily by hostile maneuvering against Athanasios of Alexandria.

Virtually none of Eusebius's writings survive, with the exception of a few letters preserved by the ecclesiastical historians Socrates (Sokr. HE 1.14), Sozomenos (Sozom. HE 2.16), and Theodoret of Cyræus (HE 1.5).

EUSTATHIANS. See Eustathios of Antioch.

EUSTATHIOS (Εὐσταθίος), martyr executed under Hadrian and saint; feast day 20 Sept; prebaptismal name Placidas. His legend is preserved in two Greek passions, one ascribed to Symeon Metaphrastes (a Nuremberg MS presents slight variations—J.-M. Olivier, *AB* 93 [1975] 109f); in a panegyric of Niketas David Paphlagon; in a Latin translation known already in the 9th/10th c. (O. Engels, *Histh* 76 [1957] 119f); and in a Coptic version. When the legend was created is unclear. It has sometimes been viewed as a reflection of Indian motifs that reached Byz. via Syria; traces of the supposed migration have yet to be shown. In its core the legend is a Christian version of the Job story: under Trajan, the rich Roman general Placidas, “stratedates in the language of the Romans,” saw a huge stag with a cross between its antlers and heard a heavenly voice summoning him to baptism. He became Christian with his whole family, assumed a new name (Eustathios or Eustachios), suffered numerous disasters (plague, death of cattle and slaves), left home for Egypt, and was separated from his wife and two sons en route. Unlike the biblical Job but like the heroes of Greek romances (T. Hägg, *Symbolar Osloenses* 59 [1984] 61–63), Eustathios suffered only temporarily, later recovering both family and fame. A new blow struck after Trajan’s death, when Hadrian ordered Eustathios and his family burned in a bronze bull.

**Representation in Art.** Eustathios is depicted in military costume from at least the 10th c. onward. The two most frequently illustrated scenes of his legend are (1) his vision, which appears in Cappadocian and Georgian churches and in the marginal psalters (where, rather than a cross, the image of Christ in the form of an icon appears between the antlers of the stag, and Christ asks, “Why are you pursuing me?”); and (2) the martyrdom of Eustathios and his family consumed by flames inside the brazen bull. Further episodes accompany certain MSS of Metaphrastes.


EUSTATHIOS OF ANTIOCH, theologian; bishop of Berroia (Aleppo) and from 323/4 to 326 (H. Chadwick, *JThSt* 49 [1948] 27–35) or more probably to 328/9 (Hansson, *infra*) bishop of Antioch; born Side, died Traianopolis in Thrace before 337. At the First Council of Nicaea in 325 Eustathios was one of the ardent opponents of Arius; subsequently an Arian synod in Antioch deposed him and in 330 Constantine I exiled him to Traianopolis. In 362 his partisans, called Eustathians, consecrated Paulinos as bishop of Antioch in opposition to Meletios, thus precipitating the (second) Meletian Schism.

Little of Eustathios’s writings have survived; some of his work is preserved in Syriac or Georgian translations (e.g., M. van Esbroeck, *OrCh* 60 [1982] 189–214), and attribution is sometimes questionable. Eustathios attacked ancient philosophers, such as Plotinos (fragment in Syriac—R. Lorenz, *ZNTW* 71 [1980] 109–28). He also criticized the allegorical exegesis of Origen (in *On the Witch of Endor*, the only completely extant work of Eustathios). Fragments of his work *On Melchisedek*, directed against the Melchisedekians, who thought the Priest-King of Salem greater than Christ, are dated in their present form to 420–50 by B. Altaner (BZ 40 [1940] 30–47). The major target of Eustathios was Arianism. His concern was to show that the Logos assumed, in the act of incarnation, the entire man and not the body (oros) only. He strongly emphasized the existence of the two natures of Christ; this later allowed his enemies to accuse him of Nestorianism.


EUSTATHIOS OF EPIPHANEIA (in Syria), historian; died ca.505. His major work, entitled *Brief
EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKE

Church according to the *Souda*, is now lost, but both Malalas and Evagrios Scholastikos drew upon it. It is plausible that this chronicle began with the destruction of Troy and reached the Roman wars against Persia in 502–05. If we can believe Evagrios, Eustathios epitomized pagan (Zosimos, Priskos, etc.) and ecclesiastical (Eusebios of Caesarea, Theodoret of Cyrus, etc.) historians. Eustathios's *Historikon* of the Judaean Archaeology by "Iosepo" is included in the catalog of the library in Patmos of 1200 (P. Maas, *BZ* 98 [1938] 350). Probably the same text is preserved in a MS of the 13th/14th C., Paris B.N. gr. 1555A, where it bears the title *Epitome of the Archaeology by Iosepos* [written] by Eustathios of Epiphaneia in Syria; the short fragment based on *Josephus Flavius* begins with Adam and Eve and ends with Vespasian and Titus.

ED. *FHG* 4:138–42.

EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKE, church official, scholar, and writer; born ca.1115, died Thessalonike 1195/6. The hypothesis of Kiyrakiades (infra, xxxv–xxxvi) that he belonged to the Kataphloron family is not valid. Educated in Constantinople, Eustathios served as a scribe under the future Patriarch Michael III; he became deacon, after 1166 magistros ton rhetoron, and ca.1178 (the traditional date of 1174 is wrong) archbishop of Thessalonike. Eustathios wrote a commentary on Homer, sometimes using the epic for allusions to contemporary events. He also commented on Pindar, Aristophanes, Dionysios Periegetes, and John of Damascus. Although he is studied primarily as an interpreter of ancient texts and collector of lost antique commentaries, Eustathios was an original thinker and a great writer. Politically he supported Manuel I, but dared sometimes to criticize the emperor, esp. for his attempts at accommodation with Islamic doctrine. Eustathios praised military prowess, but censured both venal bureaucrats and greedy and illiterate monks; he defended charistika. In contrast to contemporary views, he set secular ideals above those of hermits in his vita of Philothemos of Opsikon. Eustathios poetized manual (esp. agrarian) labor and developed the concept of historical progress from a primitive way of life to civilization. He rejected slavery as an evil and unnatural institution. As a writer, he endeavored to shift from conventional abstraction to the presentation of great events by means of little details and frequent recourse to sarcasm and irony. He enjoyed life, considered human relations more important than ritual, and loved the richness of language; his plays on words are much more complex than the usual bints at the significance of a name. His sermons and official panegyrics are more conventional than his best works, such as *On the Capture of Thessalonike* (in 1185) or *On the Improvement of Monastic Life*, which expressed his individual attitudes in a series of portraits and vivid scenes.


EUSTRATIOS (Eυστράτιος), hagiographer; died after 602. A priest of Hagia Sophia, Eustratios was a pupil of Euthychios, patriarch of Constantinople, whom he accompanied into exile and whose life he commemorated in a panegyric. He also wrote a biography of the Persian saint Golinduch, based on Stephen of Hierapolis (G. Garitte, *AB* 74 [1956] 422). In his treatise on souls, which survives in fragments and is also mentioned by Photios (*Bibl.* cod. 171), Eustratios defended three points: souls are active immediately after their separation from the [dead] body; they act on their own initiative and not as vehicles of God's powers; they are in need of church services that bring about their "freedom and liberation from vices."

EUSTRATIOS (martyr). See Five Martyrs of Serastela.

EUSTRATIOS OF NICAEA, philosopher and theologian, pupil of John Italos; fl. ca. 1100. Eustratios was not condemned in 1082 with his teacher but was promoted by Alexios I. He supported the emperor in his confrontation with Leo of Chalcedon, became oikoumenidos didaskalos ca. 1115/16 (Daiouzhes, Ecclés. 306, 1.2) and metropolitan of Nicæa. With John Phournes Eustratios participated in the dispute against Peter Grossolano. In 1114 he polemized in Philippopolis against the Armenians. Eustratios commented on Aristotle and proclaimed the importance of logic for theology: even Christ, he wrote, argued with the help of Aristotelian syllogisms (P. Joannou, Reb 10 [1952] 34.22–23). Eustratios developed the concept of the universalia as pure “names,” whereas he regarded only the individual as existing. Accordingly Eustratios stressed the limitations of art, asserting that the artist could not present the substance, but only the appearance of men and animals (Demetrakopoulos, infra, p. 132.9–24); heavenly beings, such as angels, could be painted only symbolically. In his polemic against the filioque, Eustratios, like Phournes, considered the Logos and the Holy Spirit as the hands of God the Father (Demetrakopoulos, pp. 68.29–69.1, 95.5–6), and in his polemics against the Armenians he emphasized the human nature of the incarnated Logos. In 1117 he was accused of heresy: the major charge alleged was his sharp distinction between the divine Logos and Christ incarnate as a slave. Although Alexios I and Patrikios IX (1111–34) tried to rescue Eustratios, he was condemned and forced to abdicate, despite his assertion that the accusation was based on unfinished drafts stolen from him. Rehabilitated after his death, Eustratios was cited as an authority at the council of 1157.

Euthymios, patriarch of Constantinople (Feb. 907–May 912); born Seleukeia in Isauria ca. 834, died proasteion Agathou, on the Bosporus, 4/5 Aug. 917. A monk from his youth, Euthymios sympathized with Prince Leo (the future Leo VI) in his conflict with Basil I; after Basil’s death Leo appointed him hegoumenos of a monastery in the Psamatia quarter of Constantinople, member of the senate and synkellos, and made Euthymios his spiritual director. Euthymios opposed Leo’s “foreign” advisers (the Armenian Stylianos Zaoutzes, the Arab Samonas, and Italian Nicholas I Mystikos), and defended the interests of the traditional court aristocracy. During the crisis
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over the Tetragamy of Leo VI, when Patr. Nicholas sided with the Doukas family against Leo. Euthymios continued to support the emperor; after Leo banished Nicholas, he appointed Euthymios as his successor. The patriarchate of Euthymios brought no peace, and Nicholas was recalled from exile—either by Leo or, immediately after Leo’s death, by Alexander, who banished Euthymios to Agathou.

The writings of Euthymios are insignificant: sermons on the conception of St. Anna and a festal homily on the Virgin. Attribution of certain works ascribed to Euthymios in some MSS is not yet proved (C. van de Vorst, *AB* 33 [1914] 452ff. A. Ehrhard, *BZ* 24 [1924] 186ff). The anonymous vita of Euthymios, composed by a monk of Psamatia after 932 (D. Sophianos, *EEBS* 38 [1971] 289–96), is one of the richest sources for the period from the death of Basil I to the early years of Constantine VII; unfortunately some sections of the MS are lost. A new fragment has been discovered by B. Flusin (*TM* 9 [1985] 119–31). On the other hand, the panegyric of Euthymios by Arethas is conventional and provides only limited data.


---

**EUTHYMIOS OF AKMONIA** (in theme of Opsikion), theologian of first half of 11th C., who used to be confused with Euthymios Zigabenos. His biography is little known. Euthymios states that as a boy, during the reign of Basil II, he visited Akmonia with his mother because of a lawsuit. Later he became a monk in the Peribleptos Monastery in Constantinople. He mentions the death of Romanos III in 1034. Circa 1050 Euthymios sent a letter from Peribleptos to Akmonia to warn his fellow citizens against the menace of the heretics who were called Bogomils in the West (this is the first mention of the term in Byz. literature), but *Phoundagiades* in the Akmonia region; Euthymios was worried that the extreme asceticism of the Bogomils made their teaching attractive to monks. It is quite possible that Euthymios also wrote the so-called first inductive against the Armenians, which was formerly attributed to the *katholikos* Isaac or a certain John of Nicaea.


---

**EUTHYMIOS OF SARDIS**, metropolitan of Sardis (ca. 785–803); saint; born Ouzara (on the frontier of Lykaonia?) 754, died on island of St. Andrew, near Cape Akritas, 26 Dec. 831 (not 824 as previously believed). A leader of the Iconophiles, Euthymios played an important role during the Second Council of Nicea in 787. Some years later, he was accused by Emp. Nikephoros I of participation in the revolt of Bardanes Tourkos and was deprived of his see and exiled to the island of Pantelleria near Sicily. Recalled from exile, he defended the veneration of icons during the reigns of the Iconoclast emperors Leo V and Theophilus and was twice banished. Several letters of Theodore of Studios to Euthymios survive. His vita was written by Patr. Methodios I; a rhetorical panegyric by a certain Metrophanes is also preserved. Methodios relates that Euthymios forced the young woman whom the future emperor Nikephoros I wanted to marry into a nunnery, thus kindling Nikephoros's animosity.


---

**EUTHYMIOS THE GREAT**, a founder of cenobitic monasticism in Palestine; saint; born in Melite 376/7; died in his lara near Jerusalem 20 Jan. 473. Nobly born and dedicated to God from infancy, Euthymios became a priest ca. 396 in Melite. Around 406 he went to Palestine, where he met Theoktistos from Cappadocia (died 466), who became Euthymios's closest associate. Circa 411 they settled in a cave, which served as church for the cenobitic monastery they founded after some hesitation (vita, ed. Schwartz, p.17–3); here the Arab Phylarch Aspebatus converted to Christianity. Leaving Theoktistos as head of the monastery, Euthymios wandered through Pales-
tine and organized monasteries in Marda and Aristoboulia; then he built his lavra 5 km from Theoktistos's monastery; the church was dedicated in 428/9. The lavra had 15 cells, where the monks stayed during the week; on Saturday and Sunday they gathered to eat in the refectory and sleep in the dormitory. Euthymios remained neutral during the first phase of the Nestorian dispute; after the Council of Chalcedon of 451 he sided with JUVENAL of Jerusalem, denounced his rival Theodosios, and helped to win the support of the empress Eudokia. CYRIL OF SKYTHOPOLIS wrote Euthymios's Life.

**Representation in Art.** Generally depicted as a balding old monk with a particularly long white beard (sometimes tucked under his belt), portraits of Euthymios occur as early as the frescoes of BAVT and SAQQARA and wherever groups of desert monks are included. The illustration of nine events in the saint's life adorns a parekklesion (renovated in 1303) adjacent to the Church of St. DEMETRIOS in Thessalonike; the fresco cycle begins before the saint's conception and ends with his death, emphasizing his role as a ministrant of the church and his activity in baptizing Aspebetos (T. Gouma-Peterson, *ArtB* 58 (1976) 168–83).

**EUTHYMIOS THE YOUNGER,** also called Euthymios of Thessalonike, saint; baptismal name Niketas; born village of Opso, Galatia 823/4, died island of Hiera 14/15 Oct. 898. Euthymios was born to a well-to-do family (exupatrides) obliged to give military service (strateia). He married Euphrosyne, also of prosperous background, and fathered a daughter, Anastas. In 841/2 he left his family and fled to Bithynian Olympus to become a monk. He traveled much: twice to Athens, to Thessalonike, to the island of Neoi, and elsewhere. He ascended a column (styles) at least twice and ended his life as a hermit in a cave; nevertheless, the cenobitic monastery was his ideal, and he tried to establish order among dispersed monastic settlers on Athos. Circa 864 Euthymios became a deacon (D. Papachryssanthou suggests that he was a priest) in order to arrange liturgical services for Athanite hermits; ca.870 he converted the ruinous Church of St. Andrew at Peristerai, east of Thessalonike, into a monastery. In a sense, his activity foretold and prepared the way for ATHANASIOS OF ATHOS.

Euthymios's Life was written by his disciple Basil, tonsured ca.875 (erroneously identified by Porfirij Uspenskij as an archbishop of Thessalonike). His eyewitness account has many chronological indications (not always accurate). Basil persistently stresses the importance of manual labor for monks. He mentions Arab raids on Athos and surrounding areas but is quite uninterested in events in Constantinople.

**EUTHYMIOS THE IBERIAN,** saint, also known as Euthymios Mt'aç'mindeli ("of the Holy Mountain"); born Georgia between 955 and 960, died Constantinople, 15 May 1028. Son of John the Iberian and cofounder of the monastery of Iveron on Athos, Euthymios served as superior from 1005 to 1019. He contributed much to the translation of Greek theological and hagiographical works into Georgian (lists of these translations are found in his Life and in the Testament of his father); some sources also ascribe to him translations from Georgian into Greek, including BARRAM AND IOSAPH—the latter is, however, questionable. The *tyfikon* written by Euthymios for his monastery is lost, but it is cited in his Life. The Life of Euthymios and his father was written in Georgian by GEORGE Mt'ac'mindeli ca.1043 and includes valuable information about the revolt of Bardas Skleros.

**EUTOKIOS** (*Eútökios*), commentator on mathematical works; born Ascalon ca.480. A contemporary of AMMONIOS and ANTHEMIOS of TALLES, Eutokios was active in Alexandria and perhaps...
Constantinople in the early 6th C. He is also known to have lectured on philosophy. Eutokios wrote commentaries on three works of Archimedes—On the Measurement of a Circle, On the Sphere and the Cylinder, and On Plane Equilibria. The first two of these commentaries were used by Isidore of Miletus, the last two were translated into Latin by William of Moerbeke at Viterbo in late 1269. Eutokios also wrote a commentary on books 1–4 of the Contes of Apollonius of Perga that is dedicated to Anthemios. Finally it has been persuasively argued by J. Mogenet (L'introduction à l'Almageste [Brussels 1956] 22–34) that Eutokios was also the author of the Introduction to Ptolemy's Great Composition, which was originally the scholia to book 1 of the Almagest to which he refers in his commentary on the On the Sphere and the Cylinder. The Introduction seems to have been used by George Trapezuntios for his Introduction of 1451 (J. Monfasani, Collectanea Trapezuntiana [Binghamton, N.Y., 1984] 674, 687).

Eutokios was not a mathematician of any originality but did understand almost all of the technical material that he commented on. He also preserves a number of solutions by earlier mathematicians whose works are no longer available to us.


LIT. J. Bulmer-Thomas, DSB 4:488–91. Wilson, Scholars 451, 86. —D.P.

**EUTROPIUS** (Ἐὔτρωπιος), favorite of Arkadios; born near the Persian frontier, died Chaledon Aug. 399. An emancipated slave and eunuch, he entered the service of Theodosius I and became the guardian of the young Arkadios. With the support of Stilicho, Eutropius removed Rufinus and replaced him as the most powerful figure in the empire, first as praepositus sacri cubiculi (from 395), then as patrikios (398) and consul (399)—both titles never previously awarded to eunuchs. He granted privileges to the Jews (esp. merchants) and secured the support of the church by appointing John Chrysostom as bishop of Constantinople and by issuing ordinances against heretics and pagans. Eutropius successfully commanded an army against the Huns who invaded Armenia in 397/8. He nevertheless excelled hatred by his avarice, by denouncing and condemning respected officials, by abolishing the church’s right of asylum, by disrupting the alliance with Stilicho when he supported the revolt of Gildo, and by showing contempt toward Gothic mercenaries (esp. Tuirigild and then Gainas). In 399 Eutropius finally managed to offend the empress Eudoxia, who dismissed him. Fearing for his life, the eunuch fled to Hagia Sophia. Chrysostom, in a brilliant speech, requested imperial mercy for the former consul. Eutropius was nevertheless exiled to Cyprus, then recalled and executed. His acts and honors were nullified by an edict of 17 Aug. 399.

The sources (Eunapios, Zosimos, Claudian, etc.) describe Eutropius in extremely negative terms.


**EUTROPIUS**, Latin historian and, according to the Souda, a sophist; born Bordeaux? 4th C. Although there is some discussion about his identity and career, Eutropius apparently held a string of high offices under various emperors: magister epistularum (before 361), magister memoriae (369), proconsul of Asia (371–72), praetor præfect (Illyricum, 380–81), and consul (in 387). Both Symmachus and Libanius addressed letters to him in the period 387–90. In 393 he was one of several historians to accompany the emperor Julian on his ill-fated Persian expedition. Eutropius composed a breviary of Roman history in ten books from 753 n.c. to Valens’ accession in 364. It is conventional in opinions, sober in subject matter, and clear in language. His silence on Christianity does not prove him a pagan, as some believe, as such reticence is a stylistic affectation of many late Roman historians. Eutropius’s book became accessible to the Byz. through the Greek translations of Paionios, a pupil of Libanius (L. Baffetti, BNfbb 3 [1922] 15–36), and of Capito Lysius in Justinian’s time.

**LIT.** Eutropii Breviarium ab urbe condita, ed. G. Santini (Leipzig 1979).

EUTYCHES (Ἐὐτύχης), monk and archimandrite of a suburban Constantinopolitan monastery (from 410); born ca. 370, died after 451 or even 454 (D. Sierron, DPAC 1:1907). An ardent opponent of Nestorius, Eutyches was a staunch supporter of Cyril of Alexandria; he defended the interests of Alexandria at the court of Theodosios II, exercising influence there due to his connections with the eunuch Chrysaphios, his godson. Developing Cyril’s ideas, Eutyches launched the concept of Monophysitism. Theodoret of Cyrhhus attacked him anonymously in the Erastites, and Eusebios, bishop of Dorylaion, accused him of heresy in 448. At his trial later that year, Eutyches denied that Christ had two natures after the Incarnation; he refused to acknowledge even the hypostatical union of two natures in Christ and to accept that Christ was consubstantial (homoousios) with mankind. Patr. Flavian condemned him on 22 Nov. 448, a condemnation subsequently supported by Pope Leo I. Eutyches, however, won the day at the “Robber” Council of Ephesus in 449 when Flavian was deposed. The death of Theodosios II was a heavy blow for Eutyches: he was deposed and exiled to a site not far from Constantinople. Pope Leo, in a letter of 9 June 451, insisted on Eutyches’ banishment to a more remote place. His subsequent fate is unknown.


EUTYCHIOS, patriarch of Constantinople (Aug. 552–between 22 and 31 Jan. 565; 2 Oct. 577–6 Apr. 582) and saint; born Phrygian village of Theios/Theion 512, died Constantinople; feast day 6 Apr. His father was a lieutenant of Belisarios (PG 86:2281BC). Educated in Constantinople, Eutychios became a monk and then katholikos (i.e., superior of all the monks) in the metropolis of Amaseia (col. 2296AB). Justinian I selected him to succeed Menas as patriarch, since Eutychios supported the emperor’s position in the dispute about the Three Chapters. Eutychios presided over the Council of Constantinople in 553 and dedicated Hagia Sophia after its restoration. Probably by 558 relations between Eutychios and Justinian had begun to deteriorate; the emperor urged both him and Belisarios to attend a silentium that investigated the case of some subordinates of Belisarios who were involved in a plot (Theoph. 238.11–13). The patriarch’s opposition to Apthartodocetism aroused Justinian’s anger, and the emperor exiled him to Amaseia, replacing him with John III Scholastikos; after the latter’s death Eutychios was restored by Justin II. Eutychios had a theological discussion with the future pope Gregory I on the question of the resurrection of the flesh.

Of his works (on Origenism, against the Monophysite interpretation of the Trisagion, etc.) little has survived excepting titles. His pupil Eustratius wrote the vita of Eutychios, full of biblical and patristic allusions; it contains some data on Chosroes I’s invasion, and some miracles worked by Eutychios are of interest for cultural history. Thus the patriarch healed a young mosaicist who had been injured by a demon after he was forced to destroy a mosaic in a private house in Amaseia on which the story of Aphrodite was depicted (PG 86:2333D–2340B). Eustratius called his hero “the archiereus of the oikoumene” (col. 2281A), an early case of the use of this title.


EUTYCHIOS, exarch of Ravenna (ca. 728–ca. 751). A eunuch of patrician rank, Eutychios was sent by Leo III to Italy after the murder of the exarch Paul, probably to remove Pope Gregory II for opposing the emperor’s Iconoclasm (Anastos, “Leo III’s Edict” 26–31; D. Miller, MedSt 36 [1974] 102–05). Eutychios went first to Naples and unsuccessfully attempted to have Gregory and the Roman nobles murdered. He then approached the Lombards and agreed to help King Liutprand gain Spoletto and Benevento in exchange for aid against Gregory. When they arrived in Rome (729?), however, the pope won over Liutprand, who reconciled Eutychios and Gregory. Eutychios apparently stayed in Rome, for shortly thereafter (730?) Gregory gave him troops against Tiberius Petasius. The sources do not mention Eutychios further by name, but he is assumed to have been exarch until the Lombards’ capture of Ravenna
EUTYCHIOS (painter). See Michael (Astrapas) and Eutychios.

EUTYCHIOS OF ALEXANDRIA, known in Arabic as Sa'id ibn Baṭṭīq (i.e., “patriarch”); Melkite patriarch of Alexandria (from 22 Jan. 935); born 17 Aug. 877, died Fustat 11 May 940. A learned physician, Eutychios is best known for the Annals that go under his name, a chronography on the Byz. model written in Arabic and extending from the age of Adam to the year 938. The form in which the Annals of Eutychios has been published in modern times is the result of numerous editorial expansions by later Melkite writers. A notable feature of the Annals, in the accounts of the years after the rise of Islam, is the coordination of the reigns of the caliphs and of the Oriental patriarchs with the reigns of the patriarchs and emperors of Byz. The Annals report important events in the history of Byz., such as the so-called Moechian Controversy in the time of Constantine VI, and they propose an eccentric account of Iconoclasm by representing it solely as an overreaction to the abuses of certain iconophiles on the part of Emp. Theophilos (Griffith, “Apologetics in Arabic” 154–90).

A number of other Christian Arabic works are assigned to Eutychios, most importantly a long apologetic treatise, The Book of the Demonstration. It is now clear, however, that this and other texts attributed to him were not written by Eutychios.


EVAGRIOS PONTIKOS (Eváγyrios Pontikós), monastic writer; born Ibara, Pontos, ca.345, died Egypt 399. He was ordained anagnostes by Basil the Great and deacon by Gregory of Nazianzos, who was also his teacher. In 380 he accompanied Gregory to Constantinople, where he attained fame as a preacher; a scandalous love affair, however, soon forced his departure. Having been received by Melania the Elder at Jerusalem, in 383 Evagrios embraced the monastic life in Egypt, living in Nitria and Kellia. He associated with Makarios the Great and Makarios of Alexandria (G. Bunge, Ἰρενίκσσα 56 [1983] 215–27, 323–60) and supported himself as a calligrapher. Evagrios also composed his works on the monastic life during his sojourn in the Egyptian desert.

Evagrios followed Origen, accepting his idea of the preexistence of souls as pure intellectual beings that assumed flesh and became sinful but are to be reconstituted in angelic shape (apokatastasis) and unified with God. Jesus Christ was the single spiritual being who did not fall away from the Logos, although he remained united to the flesh. Asceticism was for Evagrios the main path to salvation. He developed the concept of “practical” behavior, which he interpreted not as the “active” but the anachoretic life; its major purpose was the struggle against eight wicked logismoi, or sinful desires, namely gluttony, fornication, avarice, grief, wrath, torpor, vainglory, and arrogation. Cleansed of these logismoi the pious man would be able to contemplate the created world and divine wisdom.

After Evagrios was condemned for Origenism in 553, many of his works were lost; some are preserved under the name of Neilos of Anykra, some in Syriac, Armenian, Latin, and other translations. Nevertheless his concept of practical behavior, his list of eight logismoi, and his aporphitic style as well as the literary genre of spiritual cenotaria (short catechetical units) or chapters influenced subsequent monastic literature, for example, Cassian, Palladios, and later Symeon the Theologian.

ED. Traité pratique ou le mauvais, ed. A. & C. Guillaumont, 2 vols. (Paris 1971), with Fr. tr. The Praktikos: Chapters on...
EVAGRIOS SCHOLAΣΤΙΚΟΣ, ecclesiastical historian; born Epiphaneia in Coele Syria ca. 536, died after 594. Evagrios was a lawyer (scholastikos) at Antioch, also holding some probably honorary administrative offices. His Church History covers in six books the years 431–594, using both secular and ecclesiastical sources. Photios (Bibl., cod. 29) thought him an undistinguished stylist, but soundly orthodox and commendably interested in the history of images. A Chalcedonian in theology, he treats the Council of 451 at length, but is compromising toward Monophysitism. His secular narrative emphasizes the virtues and achievements of Marcian, Tiberios I, and Maurice. A certain parochialism, however, results in more space being given to the affairs of Antioch (esp. the career of Patr. Gregory [570–93]) than to Constantinople. His style is conventionally rhetorical, but not excessively poetic, and he eclectically uses pagan and Christian models (V. Cairns, ByzF 8 [1982] 29–50). Overall estimates vary widely, often criticizing him for credulity, but his eyewitness accounts, sifting of sources, citation of documents from the archives of the Antiochene patriarchate, and inclusion of bibliography make his history invaluable.


Lit. P. Allen, Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian (Louvain 1981).

EVANGELION (ευαγγέλιον), evangelist, the Byz. Gospel lectionary, used chiefly at Eucharist. The evangelion contains only those Gospel passages that are actually read. The first part has the Gospel lections for the mobile cycle, in liturgical order John, Matthew, Luke, Mark. It must not be confused with the tetraevangelion (see Gospel Book), which contains the complete text of the four Gospels, arranged exactly as they are in the New Testament, but with the beginning and end of each passage to be read indicated in the margin and numbered. The second part, known as the synaxarion (wrongly as the menologion), lists the lections for each day of the year from 1 Sept., providing the full Gospel passage unless it already appears earlier in the volume. The Gospel lections for feasts that fall on a fixed date in the church calendar are selected; those of the movable, temporal cycle, which varies depending on the date of Easter, are semicontinuous, i.e., read more or less in the order in which they occur in the Bible text. In the latter cycle, each Gospel is associated with a particular period of the year: John, the period from Easter to Pentecost; Matthew, from Pentecost to the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 Sept.); Luke, from then until the beginning of Lent; Mark, throughout Lent.

Usually included in MSS of the evangelion are the Twelve Passion Gospels read at Good Friday orthros. These are a composite series of harmonized readings from the four Gospels, of Palestinian origin, arranged to recount in chronological sequence the events of Jesus' passion and death.

Lectionary Illustration. Evangelia are frequently adorned with Evangelist portraits; further figurative illustration, which is relatively rare, may comprise headpieces, smaller framed or unframed pictures near the appropriate lection, marginal illustrations, and inhabited initials. In the most sumptuously illustrated evangelia the synaxarion section is also illustrated; these MSS date primarily between the 10th and 12th C.


EVANGELIST PORTRAITS, found throughout Byz. art, are prominently represented in the pendentives below the domes of churches, on the templon, on the epitaphios, and esp. in MSS, where they are the most commonly illustrated subject. In physical type, the older, gray-haired Matthew and John contrast with the younger, dark-haired Mark and Luke. In MSS, they are rarely represented standing; they are usually seated, and depicted as writing, meditating, reach-
EVANGELIST SYMBOLS. The four beasts (Zo-
dia) of Ezekiel 1:10—man, lion, ox, eagle—were
associated from the 2nd C. onward with the four
Evangelists of the New Testament. In Byz. art,
they most often surround Christ in Majesty. Thus
they first appear projecting from the mandorla
of the youthful Christ in the apse mosaic at Ho-
stos David in Thessalonike. In several 10th-
through 11th-C. Cappadocian apses showing the
Prophetic Vision, the symbols accompany a ma-
ture Christ; labeled with the words intoned in the
liturgy before the trisagion, the symbols link the
Christ of the image with the revealed Christ of
the liturgy. In various Gospel frontispieces, they
surround the Majestas Domini, echoing certain
Gospel prefices that explain the existence of four
Gospels by referring to the four beasts crying the
glory of “him who sits upon the Cherubim.” In
some Gospel books, each Evangelist is paired with
a symbol. The pairing of symbols and Evangelists
varies from book to book throughout the 11th–
12th C. Only with a late 12th-C. set of verses
found in eight decorative style Gospels does
the pairing standard in the West and in Armenian
art appear: man/ Matthew, lion/ Mark, ox/ Luke,
eagle/ John. Possibly through Western influence, this
pairing becomes customary in Palaiologan art.

Lit. J. Lafontaine-Desogne, “Théophanes-Visions aux-
quelles participent les prophètes dans l’art byzantin après
la restauration des images,” in Synthronon 135–43. Nelson,

-A.W.G.

EVARISTOS, mid-11th-C. deacon and librarian
(bibliothelax), author of a letter addressed to Con-
stantine VII Porphyrogenetos, “born in the
purple silk.” The letter is preserved only in Ara-
bic. The emperor had commanded Evaristos to
produce a history of the saints “in easy language.”
In his letter Evaristos informs the ruler that he
has sketched biographies of the saints, established
their dates, and verified the records. Evaristos’s
compilation, now lost, was probably a step toward
the comprehensive work by Symeon Meta-
phrastes.

Ed. A.S. Lewis, M.D. Gibson, Forty-one Facsimiles of Dated
Christian Arabic MSS (Cambridge 1907) 27f (with Eng. tr.).

-A.K.

EVE. See Adam and Eve.
EVERYDAY LIFE, in the broad sense, encompasses the entirety of Byz. culture: thus, T. Talbot Rice's book (infra) includes sections on the imperial court, church, administration, army, etc. In the narrow sense, everyday life is ordinary human activity and comprises diet and costume, behavior and superstitions, entertainment, housing, and furniture. The subject is poorly studied and sources are limited: historiography, rhetoric, and liturgical texts are not very helpful, although they are the best known writings; archaeology provides some scattered data; hagiography, documents, and letters offer only small nuggets of information (P. Magdalino, BS 48 [1987] 28–38). The content of mural and book illustration is of mixed evidential value: the costumes, gestures, and attitudes of protagonists in sacred iconography appear to be conventional and often antique, yet peripheral details in both urban and rural scenes may well reflect current circumstances.

While daily life in late antiquity was municipally oriented and situated primarily in open spaces, Byz. funneled its energy inside closed buildings. A comparison of two great vitae, those of Symeon of Emesa (6th C.) and Basil the Younger (10th C.), reveals the change: Symeon is depicted in the streets and squares, Basil within the houses of his supporters. Public life did not totally disappear—some processions and feasts continued to be held in public—but it was significantly contracted: the theater ceased to exist, religious services dispensed with many outdoor liturgical ceremonies, even races and circus games tended to be replaced by carnivals and by sports and competitions, such as polo and tournaments, which were on a reduced scale and socially restricted. The shift from reading aloud to silent reading, the adoption of silent prayer, the abandonment of public repentance, the playing of quiet board games like chess—all these belong to the same phenomenon of "privatization" of everyday life.

With the exception of churches, there was no new construction of public buildings in Byz. towns, and the regular city planning of antiquity, with squares, porticoes, and wide avenues, was replaced by a chaotic maze of narrow streets and individual habitats. The houses of the nobility (villas or mansions) also lost their orderly arrangement, which was replaced by a group of irregularly shaped rooms, bedchambers, terraces, and workshops; also abandoned was their openness to nature in the form of the atrium—with its impluvium, inner garden, and fountain—or naturalistic floor mosaics. Houses became darker, and the shift in lighting from lamps to candles after the 7th C. contributed as well to this change.

The increased use of tables and of the writing desk influenced various habits—from reading and writing (including the format of the book) to dining and games. The bed as the symbol of the most private aspect of daily life became consistently distinct from chairs or stools, which were used for more social occasions. Pottery (see ceramics) grew more uniform and less decorated than in antiquity; it served primarily the private needs of the family, whereas imperial banquets used gold and silver ware.

A respect for the human body determined the form of ancient costume: the body was covered only minimally and there was no fear of nakedness. Byz. costume, however, which began to adopt the use of trousers and sleeves, was a reaction against the openness of antiquity, and heavy cloaks provided people with additional means of concealment.

Patterns of food consumption evidently changed as well: in the ordinary diet, the role of bread decreased, whereas meat, fish, and cheese became more important. Dining habits changed, too, from a relaxed reclining to the more formal sitting on chairs. While we can surmise that the actual diet was not spared by medieval standards, the predominantly monastic ideology of the Byz. condemned heavy meals and praised ascetic abstemiousness.

Bathing habits also changed: the public baths, which had served virtually as a club for well-to-do Romans, almost disappeared and ancient bathhouses were often transformed into churches. Provincial baths were few, located in log huts full of smoke coming from an open hearth.

The nuclear family was the crucial social unit responsible for the production of goods, so that hired workers (misthioi) and even slaves (see slavery) were considered an extension of the family; the education of children was also the family's responsibility. The family was limited to a certain extent by the neighborhood, guild, or village community; it was these microstructures that took charge of organizing feasts. Women, who indisputably played a decisive role in the
household, were compelled to remain in a special part of the house and to wear "decent" dress, which served clearly to distinguish a matron from the PROSTITUTE, whose more revealing costume suggested immoral conduct. The unity of the family was emphasized by the custom of common meals and by the father's right to indoctrinate (sometimes with physical force) all the members of his small household.

Depictions of everyday life are rare as primary subjects in art, although many indications can be gleaned from biblical images in MSS such as the OCTATEUCHS where, for example, scenes of birth, legal penalties, and activities such as threshing and various modes of transportation reflect Byzantine practice. A market scene appears in a fresco at the Blachernai monastery in Arta which depicts a procession of the Virgin Hodegetria. It shows merchants displaying their merchandise in baskets and on benches, fruit and beverage vendors, and their customers. By contrast, ceramic household vessels made for everyday use, when they do contain figural decoration of any sort, show scenes from mythology, fable, or epic.


-A.K. A.C.

EVIL (κακία). The core of the problem of evil is how far responsibility for it can be attributed to God. Late antiquity presented two diametrically opposed concepts of evil. The dualistic systems of Gnosticism and Manichaeanism considered evil as a "substance" warring with the good, symbolically treated as a battle of darkness against light. The material world is the realm of evil, created by the inferior deity and contrasted to the divine and heavenly world. In contrast, Proklos assumed that evil had only a dependent existence (parhypostasis) and was caused by manifold factors such as weakness, lack of knowledge, or lack of goodness; he criticized Plotinus, for whom evil was an inherent quality of matter.

Christianity overcame the contradiction after painful vacillations; Origen, for example, viewed the cosmos as consisting of an opposition of light and darkness. The core of the Christian solution is Augustine's view that Adam's original sin was perpetrated contrary to nature (divine nature has no evil in itself); original sin was committed not due to human free will (as was the view of Pelagianism), but by the mysterious dispensation of God, who knows how to transform evil into good. John of Damascus, on the other hand, emphasized that any creation of God was good, but that both angels and mortals were autexousiai, that is, granted freedom of choice to follow God's law or deviate from it; we are responsible for our wrongdoing, just as the criminal, not the judge, is responsible for a felony and deserves punishment. John also drew a distinction between evil "by nature" (deviation from God's law) and "apparent" (subjectively perceived) evil, that is, the hardships and trials of life (including fasting, vigils, etc.) that in fact contribute to our salvation. Redemption from Adam's sin was achieved by Christ's sacrifice and is continued in baptism and other sacraments. John Chrysostom consistently explains Christ's sacrifice as propitiating the Father and reconciling mankind with an angry God. In Christian belief, the devil and his demons are the embodiment of evil; the mission of saints is the battle against demons. Despite the symbolism of light and darkness this struggle is not conceived dualistically, since it evolves under God's paternal care and aims at the improvement of corrupted human nature.


EVIL EYE, a popular amuletic image of the 4th-8th C. characterized by an eye surrounded by a variety of threatening beasts and instruments: lions, snakes, scorpions, daggers, etc. Most often it is found on a bronze pendant amulet whose other side bears the Holy Rider. Amuletic inscriptions against the evil eye, without a representation, are also common (e.g., "the seal of Solomon holds the evil eye"—Russell, infra 540). Both would combat the envious glance that was popularly believed to facilitate the access of demons to a coveted thing or person. The antidote was to display the inevi
table suffering of the covetous individual or, more specifically, of his "evil eye." In *The Testament of Solomon* (ed. C.C. McCown [Leipzig 1922] 18.39) one demon reports: "My power is annulled by the engraved image of the much-suffering eye."


- G.V.

**EVLIYA ÇELEBI,** Ottoman scholar, sipahi, and traveler; born Istanbul 25 Mar. 1611, died Istanbul 1884. Evliya was the author of the ten-volume *Seyahatname* (Book of Travels), professedly a description with considerable elaborations of Evliya's extensive journeys and various sojourns throughout the Ottoman Empire and beyond, primarily for ca. 1630-76. Evliya wrote to entertain and his language is a mixture of learned and vernacular Ottoman. His sources include his personal observations, hearsay, cited and uncited literary works, and his own lively imagination. Assuredly, some of what Evliya wrote is fictitious. Nonetheless, he conveys a plethora of credible data regarding the geography, cities, monuments, institutions, peoples, and cultures of the Ottoman Empire of his time. For Byz. studies, Evliya's work is replete with information concerning the status and development of previously Byz. peoples under Ottoman rule. Book 1 is esp. important for its material on the topography, ethnography, and folklore of Istanbul. No critical edition of this work yet exists.


- S.W.R.

**EVRENOS ("Ephevegel and similar forms),** Ottoman general; died Yenice-i Vardar 1417. Originally a beg of Karasi, Evrenos joined the Ottomans after they conquered that beylik. Evrenos had served from 1359 as general under Süleyman Pasha, Murad I, Bayezid I, Süleyman Çelebi, and Mehmed I. Evrenos participated in virtually all the critical campaigns and battles fought by the Ottomans in Europe during his lifetime. During the 1360s-80s, he led many of the Turkish conquests in Byz. Thrace and Macedonia and captured Corinth in 1397. Evrenos himself acquired vast estates, centered at Yenice-i Vardar (mod. Yiannitsa in northern Greece), the site of his family tombs.

Byz. views of Evrenos were typically negative. Manuel II, writing ca. 1409, attributed to him an "unrivaled" hatred of Christians and extreme cruelty. Among Muslims, Evrenos was renowned for his heroism, piety, and generosity.


- S.W.R.

**EVTIMIJ OF TÜRNNOVO,** patriarch of Bulgaria, teacher, and writer; born Túrnovo between about 1320 and 1330, died Bačkovo ca. 1400. As a young monk in a monastery in Túrnovo he was attracted by Hesychasm, of which he became a lifelong defender. He was the protégé of Patr. Teodosije, with whom he went to Constantinople in 1363. He then spent some years in the Lavra and Zographou monasteries on Athos. Returning to Bulgaria in 1371 he founded the monastery of Holy Trinity near Túrnovo, which became a center of scholarship and literature. Elected patriarch in 1375, he helped in the struggle to preserve Bulgarian independence and to maintain the religious unity of the Bulgarian people. After the Turkish capture of Túrnovo in 1393, he was expelled and imprisoned in the Petritzos monastery at Bačkovo.

Evtimij revised and corrected earlier Church Slavonic translations from Greek and sought to standardize Slavonic orthography and grammar in the face of linguistic change. His original writings comprise Lives of Bulgarian saints (for example, St. John of Rila), panegyrics of saints, theological treatises, and liturgical texts. He extended the flexibility and expressiveness of Old Slavonic and introduced to Slavonic literature something of the culture of mid-14th-C. Byz. His works enjoyed great influence in Serbia, Rumania, and Russia as well as in Bulgaria.


EXAGION (ἐξαγών, Lat. exagium), a unit of weight equal to 1/72 of the heavy Roman libra or Byz. logarike litra [= 4.44 g]. Synonymous terms are stakion, soggio (It.), and mitqal (Ar.). Since the solidus weighed exactly one exagion, the term was also used to refer to the coin. Exagion can also identify the weights used to control gold coins. After 1204 exagia of different weight are reported, that is, they are 1/72 of "pounds" that differed from the logarike litra.

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 183, 204. K. Wessel, RBK 2:795-800.

EXAKTOR (ἐξάκτορ), fiscal official in the late Roman Empire whose main function was to exact arrears of taxation; exaktores had under their command a staff of subaltern officials, including praktoreis. Usually attached to a particular city, the exaktor was first appointed by the emperor, later by the curia. After the 6th C. the exaktor disappears temporarily.

The 9th-C. taktika do not mention exaktores, but the 10th-C. Taktikon of Escurial places them between the protasekretis and mystikos. They seem to have retained certain fiscal functions. An act of the 11th C. is signed by John, megas chartoularios of the genikon and exaktor (N. Wilson, J. Darrouzès, REB 26 [1968] 18.18). Tzetzes (Hist. 5,609-11) boasts that his grandfather George was a renowned exaktor who fulfilled the duty of praktor in various themes. At the same time, the exaktor became a high-ranking judge of the imperial tribunal. After 1204 the post is unknown.


EXALEIMMA (ἐξάλειμμα, from exaleipho, "to wipe out, erase" [from the tax roll]), a fiscal term applied to immovable property. The term appears, almost exclusively in documents, from 1259 to

1361, although the adjective exaleimmatikos, as in exaleimmatike stasis, is firmly attested from 1300 until 1420. Exaleimmata were bought, sold, donated, granted in pronoia, reassigned to other paroi, broken up and parcelled between paroi and their lord, and given fiscal assessments comparable to other properties. While V. Vasilievskij (ZMN 210 [1880] 158) first identified exaleimma as escheat, later scholars (Dölger, Sechs Praktika 122; Zakythinos, Despotat 2:240; Solovyev-Mošin, Greke povelje 432) frequently interpret exaleimmata as ruined properties. A few documents, however (Zogr., no.18.11-14; M. Goudas, EEBS 3 [1926] 133f, no.7.6-10; Docheiar., no.40.13-14), demonstrate that exaleimmata could be cultivated properties producing income.

The use of the participle exalipheis in the Treatise on Taxation (Dölger, Beiträge 116.2-6) and later documents through the 12th C. and the use of the adjectival exaleimmenos in mid-11th- to mid-13th-C. documents suggest that an exaleimma was an escheated property, which reverted to the owner's lord (a private landlord or the state in its role as a landlord) as a result of the death or flight of its owner (usually a paroi) without leaving a proper heir. The use of these terms also suggests that in the late Byz. agrarian system, based on the paroi, exaleimma played a role analogous to that held by klasma in the earlier Byz. agrarian system based on the village community.


EXALTATION OF THE CROSS. See Cross, Cult of the.

EXAMPLE (παράδειγμα) was considered by ancient rhetoricians as a trope (Martin, Rhetorik 262), based on the juxtaposition of objects and aimed at exhortation or dissuasion; unlike the parable, examples dealt with actual phenomena and not with possible ones (RhGr, ed. Spengel, 3:200.21-201.2). The church fathers frequently used examples to clarify subtle theological concepts, such as illustrating the Trinity by means of the sun and its rays, or demonstrating the existence of two natures in Christ by the example of the human soul and body. Leontios of Byzantium (PG 86:1453A-C) asserted that theological truth could not be proven by "natural reason" and
EXARCHATE, a new type of territorial and administrative unit created at the end of the 6th C. in CARTHAGE and RAVENNA; these existed until the end of the 7th and the middle of the 8th C., respectively. The external feature of the exarchate was the unification of military and civil power in the hands of the exarch, a reform that had been prepared by partial changes of provincial administration under Justinian I. Structurally considered, both exarchates were territories threatened by constant hostile pressure, populated by people with a language and cultural traditions different from those of Constantinople, strongly rural, with an aristocracy that tended to emigrate to Constantinople and a local church that acquired political power. All this formed a certain antinomy between the strong administration of an exarchate and its tendency toward economic and social separation from the empire.

LIT. A. Guillou, Régionalisme et indépendance dans l'Empire byzantin au VIIe siècle (Rome 1969).

EXCEPTA (Έκλογαι), conventional title of an "encyclopedia" produced by CONSTANTINE VII and his collaborators. According to the preface, the emperor gave orders for necessary books to be collected from the whole oikoumene, excerpted and arranged in 53 sections (hypotheses) dedicated to specific topics. The purpose was to use the experience of the past for moral and political education. One of these hypotheses, De legationibus, is preserved in full, and significant parts of De virtutibus et vitii, De insidiis, and De sententiis also survive. Only the titles are known of several other sections. The compilers used both ancient and Byz. writers; the latest is GEORGE HAMARTOLOS. Some of these sources are now lost. Only from the Excerpta do we know PRISKOS, PETER PATRIKIOS, MENANDER PROTECTOR, EUNAPIOS, and JOHN OF ANTIOCI. The excerpts were slightly edited and supplied with commentaries. The compiler of the Souda used the Excerpta (C. de Boor, BZ 21 [1912] 381–424; 23 [1914/19] 1–127).

- A.K.

EXCERPTA LATINA BARBARA. Sec Barba- rus Scaligeri.

EXCERPTA VALESIANA (or Anonymus Valesii), so called after their first publication in 1636 from a single 9th-C. MS by Henri de Valois (Valesius), comprise two very different works. The first, apparently composed ca. 590, is a biography of Constantine I the Great, entitled Origo Constantini imperatoris. This piece has won much modern praise for its clarity, accuracy, and impartiality; here and there the text corresponds with passages in Orosius. The second excerpt, seemingly written ca. 550, deals with Italy under the Ostrogoths Odoacer and Theodoric the Great in the period 474–526, under the title Item ex libris chronicorum inter cetera. This extract, demonstrably using such sources as the Life of St. Severinus by Eugippius and the Chronicle of Maximianus, bishop of Ravenna (died 556), is equally notable for its anti-Arian bias and unclassical Latin.

- B.B.

EXCOMMUNICATION (ἀφορμοσύς, “casting out”) entailed the exclusion of the transgressor from the community or fellowship of the church and its sacraments, esp. the Eucharist. Offending members included emperors, for example, Leo VI and Michael VIII. The separation from the church’s sacramental life was either absolute or partial, that is, it could be either temporary or for the lifetime of the individual. Thus excommunication could be either “greater” or “less.” (Like the anathema, the greater meant full removal from Christian society.) Once excommunication was imposed, the offender was obliged to express METANOIA and to avail himself of the church’s penitential procedure by which he was gradually reconciled to the church. Thus, ultimately neither partial nor total isolation from the church’s sphere deprived the wrongdoer of membership in the Christian community.

- A.P.

EXECUTION, or capital punishment, the most severe of penalties. The Ecloga lists crimes punished by execution: intentional murder, rape, incest and pederasty, robbery and arson, and esp. crimes against the state—mutiny or lèse majesté, treason or espionage. The death sentence was also to be imposed on apostates from Christianity and those who robbed churches at night, magicians and sorcerers, and heretics (Manichæans and Montanists are specifically named). As the means of execution, the Ecloga mentions primarily the sword, and rarely burning at the stake or hanging on the phourka, the fork-shaped gallows that replaced the cross, which as the Christian symbol was prohibited as a means of execution from the time of Constantine I. Historical texts seldom mention execution. Phourkai were employed for the mass execution of rebels or traitors (e.g., Theoph. 184.4–6; Theoph. Cont 303.17, 877.4); burning at the stake was the fate of Basil the Copper Hand and Basil the Bogomil as well as the slaves who murdered Asylayınasters. Historical texts seldom mention execution. Phourkai were employed for the mass execution of rebels or traitors (e.g., Theoph. 184.4–6; Theoph. Cont 303.17, 877.4); burning at the stake was the fate of Basil the Copper Hand and Basil the Bogomil as well as the slaves who murdered Asylaiosters. Hagiographical legends abound with stories of execution, but it is difficult to distinguish truth from pious invention. There was always a hesi- tancy to resort to execution; in the case of political crime, blinding, exile, or confinement in a monastery often substituted for execution. In the 14th-C. Balkans there was a tendency to replace the death penalty with a fine (B. Krekić, BS/EB 5 [1978] 171–78); the spread of the phoinkon reflects the same tendency in Byz. On the other hand, the government always strove to prevent private persons from carrying out execution, particularly in the form of religious or blood ven- gence (A. Mirambel, Byzantium 16 [1944] 381–92).

- A.K.
EXEDRA (ἐξεδρον), any room, semicircular or rectangular in plan, that opens full-width directly onto an adjacent larger space or room, covered or uncovered. Widely used in antiquity to flank streets, porticoes, and forums, exedrae figured prominently in the interiors of imperial Roman baths, palaces, and villas. Eusebios of Caesarea noted their presence at the basilica in Tyre, the Octagon at Antioch, and the Constantinian Martyrion in Jerusalem. Christian Latin authors (e.g., Paulinus, PL 14:37) apply the term to the apse of a basilica. Exedrae like these, open only to the central room, flanked the Octagon in the Palace of Galerius, Thessalonike, and several Constantinopolitan palaces. Much later they are found at the Nea Moni, Chios, and elsewhere. Concomitant with their role as adjacent rooms, other exedrae were designed as essential parts of centralized churches. Carried on arches that link the major piers, these allow free passage from the central space to the aisles or ambulatory spaces, expanding the breadth while articulating the elevation of the space covered by the central dome (S. Vitale, Ravenna; Sts. Sergios and Bakchos, Constantinople; Hagia Sophia, Constantinople). Exedrae enabled the Late Antique and Byz. architect to transform a square, rectangular, or polygonal plan into a single volume of space unified around a central, vertical axis. Hence their pervasive use in Byz. architecture.


EXEGESIS (ἐξηγησις, lit. “leading out”), hermeneutics, explanation or interpretation of the Bible. The foundations of exegesis were laid by the Alexandrian School, esp. Origen, who suggested that the sacred text had several layers of meaning. He recommended threefold exegesis on the model of a tripartite human nature, consisting of body, soul, and spirit. This approach supposes literal, allegorical, and spiritual senses of the text, or—to put it differently—references to the past, present, and future. Against this, the Antiochene School emphasized the need to grasp the real (historical) sense of the text and saw the basis for this in the contemplation of words, including study of the Hebrew original of the Septuagint. The main direction of Byz. exegesis was to find in the Old Testament testimonies concerning Christ, which were then exploited in the theological disputes of the 4th–5th C. Among the greatest exegetes were Athanasios of Alexandria, Ephrem the Syrian, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret of Cyrus. In the 6th C. original exegesis came to an end, to be replaced by study of the exegesis of church fathers and by the assembly of authoritative citations in catena. The Council in Trullo (692) restricted creative hermeneutics; this plus the loss of the knowledge of Hebrew contributed to the decline of exegesis.


EXEMPTION, the term commonly used by modern historians to denote a form of immunity—any of several means whereby persons or property were released from some or all of their state obligations for the benefit of a person or institution, reflecting the basic principle that all property and persons bore fiscal burdens. Some exemptions were temporary (sympatheia, klasma, kouphismos) and were granted and revoked by an apographeus with each fiscal survey (exosis); others were (usually) permanent privileges (exkousseia, ateleia) that could only be granted by the emperor: they exempted merchants from taxes on commerce and owners from the taxes due on their property (land, ships, etc.) or from the taxes (telos, kanon) or supplementary charges (epereia, corvees) owed by their dependent peasants. Yet another category of exemption (astrateia) exempted persons from the service connected with strateia. Permanent exemption from taxation, granted to certain properties of a few privileged monasteries and individuals in the 10th and 11th C., seems to have become almost the rule in regard to large landowners by the 14th C. Scholars view this devolution of fiscal authority to private individuals and religious corporations as either a symptom or cause of the gradual weakening and collapse of state authority in the 12th–15th C.

Lit. Lemercier, Agr. Hist. 122, 168–70. 173f. 308. 244.
EXILE, a form of punishment. Byz. law distinguished two types of exile: *exoria*, banishment or deportation, which could be temporary or permanent, and *periorismos*, confinement within prescribed boundaries (*Basil. 60.51.4*). In defining *exoria* the author of the *Synopsis Minor* (*Zepos, Jus 6:398f*, par. 70) stressed the prohibition against being in the city in which the emperor resided or was passing through. The quaestor had the right to banish illegal aliens from Constantinople. The major difference between *exoria* and *periorismos* concerned the disposition of the property of the criminal: those under *periorismos* had their property confiscated; those under *exoria* retained it (*Zepos, Jus 6:501, par. 80*). The Book of the Eparch several times mentions *exoria* as a penalty for economic crimes; normally, however, exile was reserved for political criminals and suspects, esp. church leaders (*John Chrysostom, Pope Martin I, Theodore of Studios, Photios, etc.*). The place of banishment could be to the border of the empire, an island, or some less remote location; some suspects or criminals were relegated to monasteries or placed under house arrest on their own estates. Experiences of exile varied widely; a special genre of letters from exile presents a broad range of feelings, from nostalgic longing for the capital to complaints about lack of books, starvation, and torture.


EXKOUSSEI (ἐξουσσεῖα), a fiscal official whose functions were similar to those of the epoptes. The term *exosis* designated the fiscal survey that in the 13th C. was carried out by high-ranking functionaries. The distinction between *exosis* and *apographe* (see *Apographeus*) is not clear. In 1254 Constantine Diogenes, who was *apographeus* and *exises* of the islands of Leros (Lerne) and Kalymnos, conducted *apographe* and *exosis* (*Patmou Engrapha 2, no.65.1*); the forged document allegedly signed by Joseph Pankalas in 1261 speaks of the *anatheseis* and *exosis* of the island of Kos (*Patmou Engrapha 2, II.29*); an act of 1407 mentions the *apographike exiosis* [sic] of the island of Lemnos (*Pantel., no.17.9*), a *praktikon* of 1430 the *apographike exisis* of the same island (*Dioryss., no.25.1*). The term *exosis* was employed for surveys of the theme of Thessalonike (*Xénoph., no.12.1*) and elsewhere.


EXKOUBITON. See DOMESTIKOS TON EXKOUBITON.

EXKOSSATOS (ἐξοκοσσᾶτος, from Lat. *excusatus, “excused,” cf. EXKOUSSEIA*), an uncommon term of unclear meaning, applied to people, oikoi, and ships (*plopia*). In the 10th C. some people called *exkossatowi* were engaged in crafts for the imperial household (*De cer. 488.18*, R. Cantarella, *BZ 26* [1926] 31.2). A chrysobull of 1060 distinguishes *exkossatowi* tou dromou from *stratiotai* and *demosiarios* (*Lavra 1, no.33.32–34*); ostensibly, these *exkossatowi* served the imperial dromos. In an early example of the devolution of state revenues to private landowners, documents from the second half of the 10th C. refer to *exkossatowi* or *exkossavomenoi* households granted to the monastery of Iveron, which received their *telos* (*Ivri. 1, nos. 2.21–22, 6.23.33*); in the 13th C., *exkossatowi* households are known (*MM 5:15.6–7*).

Apparently, the designation *exkossatos* did not necessarily imply that the individual, household, or ship served the state or that the *exkossatos* was excused from paying the *telos*. It meant, rather, that the state no longer received some or all of the fiscal obligations owed by the *exkossatowi* (whether *telos* and/or *epereia* is disputed), either because of service to the state (in which case the *exkossatoi*, if a peasant, paid less or no taxes) or because some or all of the *exkossatowi*’s state obligations were granted to a private individual or corporation. In later texts, the terms *exkossatowi* (*MM 5:260.20, a.1342*), *enkousatowi* (the *Chronicle of Morea*), and the Latin *incosati* (derived therefrom) designated privileged individuals, probably exempt from taxes and military service.


EXKOUSSEIA (ἐξουσσεία, from Lat. *excusatio, “release”), a type of exemption from certain obligations toward the state and from *introitus* (the entrance of officials into an estate). As a fiscal term, *exkousseia* appears in documents and literary
texts from the 10th C. through the end of the empire. *Exkousseia* were granted to the owners or holders of a variety of economic instruments that bore fiscal obligations, including land, *paroikoi*, ships, buildings, and animals. The two interpretations of the nature of an *exkousseia* conflict. The most common opinion is that *exkousseia* is essentially synonymous with Western immunity and implied complete tax exemption (*ateleia*) and, in the 14th C., specific judicial privileges over a property owner’s *demesne*. A. Kazhdan (Vizōč [1961] 186–216), however, argues that, at least in the 10th–12th C., *exkousseia* was unrelatable to immunity; it was rather an exemption, not from the *telos*, but from *epereiai*. In the 14th–15th C., *exkousseia* seems to refer to any kind of tax exemption.


**EXOKATAKOIOI** (εξωκατάκοιλοι), term known from the 11th C. onward to designate five (a pentad) or six principal officials of the patriarch or a bishop: *megas oikonomos*, *megas sakkarios*, *megas skeupophylax*, *chartophylax*, the head of the *sakellion*, and later the *protek dikos*.


**EXORCISM** (ἐξορκισμός), an imprecation against the Devil and demons, to drive them away, or out of a possessed person or area; also a liturgical rite for that purpose. Exorcism occurs often in the New Testament. Tertullian considered it an act that any Christian was able to perform, but by the 3rd C. professional exorcists appear. Particular importance was ascribed to the exorcism preceding *baptism*. Other exorcistic rituals, blessings, and prayers contained in the *euchologion* are the *euchelaion* (see *UNCTION*), the “Exorcism of St. Tryphon” recited on Holy Thursday and Easter; the blessing of a field, garden, vineyard, or house; prayers against the evil eye and against evil spirits dwelling in people or in houses.

Hagiographical texts present abundant cases of exorcism—healing of the possessed, the expulsion of demons (in the form of wild beasts, dragons, scorpions, etc.) from the places they had occupied, and the elimination of evil forces preventing a good harvest or catch. Exorcism was performed by imposition of hands, anointing with oil, the sign of the cross, by prayers, and by application of pieces of a saint’s clothing.


**EXPOSITIO TOTIUS MUNDI**, an anonymous treatise preserved in two Latin versions and probably translated from a Greek original; the latter was compiled in the mid-4th C., perhaps ca.360. The treatise begins with a description of Eden, which is populated by *makarenoi* (the Blessed; *carmari* in one Latin version); discussions of India and Persia then follow. This introductory part has parallels (probably originating in the same source) in Greek *hodoporeiai*, or guides, to Eden. After Persia comes the description of “our land,” that is, the Roman Empire: Syria, Egypt (essentially limited to Alexandria), Asia Minor from Cilicia to Bithynia, Thrace (where its “two splendid cities” of Constantinople and Herakleia are treated as equals), Macedonia, Greece, Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, and the islands—Cyprus, Crete, Sicily, and Britannia. This part is free of the legendary cast that characterizes the introductory section; in addition to a list of districts and cities, it contains observations on climate, commerce, political structure, and behavior. The treatise shows little trace of a Christian worldview. Its author may have been a widely traveled merchant.


‘EZĀNĀ’ (*Aeúçavā*), “tyrant” of Axum (ca.323 to 340/1 or 347/8) and identical to “Abreha” (Dombrowski, *infra* 162–64); known primarily from
undated, mostly bilingual inscriptions and from a letter of Constantius II cited by Athanasios of Alexandria. F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (Klio 39 [1961] 234–48) denied, however, that the ‘Ezānā of the inscriptions was the Aeizana of the letter, and dated ‘Ezānā to the 5th C. The ‘Ezānā of the inscriptions claimed authority over Himyar and other lands. In the first half of the 4th C. Frumentius, a captive in Axum, started to organize Christian communities, but Christianity was not yet the state religion in Axum. Frumentius traveled to Alexandria, where Athanasios ordained him bishop of “India” (i.e., Ethiopia). In the letter to ‘Ezānā and his brother She’azana, Constantius required Frumentius to return to Alexandria ca.328 and receive ordination from a new Arian patriarch, George. Another attempt to include Axum within the orbit of Byzantine influence is reported by Philostorgios, who recounts that Theophilos the Indian visited both Himyar and Axum in his way to the East; since the embassy was sent by Constantius, it is reasonable to suppose that Theophilos negotiated with ‘Ezānā.


EZERITAI (‘Ezeritai), one of two groups of Sklavenoi attested in the Peloponnesos. An etymology from the Slavic ezero (lake) is evident; D. Georgacas (BZ 43 [1950] 327–30) hypothesized that ezero was a translation of the toponym Helos (lit. “marsh meadow”) near Taygetos, where the Ezeritai settled. In Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De adm. imp. 50) the Ezeritai are mentioned, along with the Melingoì, as paying tribute of 300 nomismata; they revolted in the reign of Romanos I, were defeated, and ordered to pay 600 nomismata. Unlike the Melingoì, Ezeritai do not appear in later Byzantine sources, but the bishopric of Ezeri, in the Peloponnesos, is attested in 1340 (MM 1:218.31).


EZRA*. See ZORAVA.
FABLE (μῦθος) was considered by rhetoricians as a type of progymnasma; it had, however, a broader function of communicating a moral message in the form of a short essay with a gnomic conclusion. Classical authors, such as Demosthenes or Aristotle, did not consider fable as a noble genre; it evidently acquired more popularity in the Roman Empire. While Hermogenes treated fable briefly, the orator NICKOLAS OF MYRA (ed. Felten 6–11) devoted an extended paragraph to it. Nicholas defined fable as a fictitious story having no verisimilitude, but illustrating a truth; it dealt either with human beings or animals. Some people also included among fables myths about the gods, but Nicholas considered the latter as a separate genre, mythika diegemata. He stressed the fable’s simplicity of language and the inclusion of an epymythion or moral.

The earliest fable collection to survive, the so-called Collectio Augusta, cannot be precisely dated; the 4th–5th C. is a possible date. Later collections are known throughout the Byz. period (F. Rodriguez Adrados in La fable [Geneva 1984] 182). The Byz. imitated ancient fables, esp. those ascribed to AESOP and Babrius (ca.2nd C.), sometimes paraphrasing and revising them. Some fables are included in the progymnasma of Theon. Libanius, Aphthonios, Theophylaktos Simokattes, Nikephoros Basilakes, and Nikephoros Chrysobelges; some fables exist as chapters in progymnasma, others appear as episodes in lengthier genres. Oriental fables are broadly used in Barlaam and Josaph and esp. Stephanites and Ichnelates of Symeon Syr. In the Palaiologan period the animal epic was developed out of animal fables.


—S.C.

FAÇADE (πρόσωψ, lit. “appearance”), the front or any side of a building designed with the intention of being seen. Initially, the Byz. concept of the façade was based on classical prototypes; hence its use was restricted to a relatively few public building types such as palaces (e.g., the façade of the 5th-C. Palace of Theodoric in Ravenna as represented on a mosaic in S. Apollinare Nuovo, RAVENNA) and, even less commonly, churches (e.g., the 5th-C. façade of the Theodosian rebuilding of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople). As the classical tradition in Byz. waned, so did interest in monumental façades. They returned to importance in the 9th–10th C. The façades of such Constantinopolitan churches as the 10th-C. Myrelaion and the 11th-C. Pantepoptes display a classicizing structural logic. The latter example also exhibits a tripling of recessed arches and pilaster strips, a mannerism characteristic of Komnenian architecture in the capital (e.g., Pantokrator Monastery, Kilise Camii, and Gül Camii). At the same time, in various parts of Greece, a very different, unclassical attitude toward façade articulation emerges (e.g., Panagia Gorgoepikoos in Athens, Merbaka near Nauplion, and Hagia Theodora in Arta). Here we find flat walls decorated by continuous horizontal bands and surface textures, in complete disregard of the building’s interior structure. This attitude toward façade decoration becomes even more widespread in the 14th C., with isolated areas of resistance, as at Mistra, to the general unclassical current.


—A.K.

FACTIONS (from Lat. factio; Gr. μέρος, δῆμος or δήμου, δημόται; sometimes used as technical term), associations that staged circus games; associations of partisans of any one of the four colors inherited from Rome that competed in chariot races. Blues (Veneto) and Greens (Prasinoi) were the chief rivals and seem to have cooperated with Whites (Leukoi) and Reds (Rousoi),
respectively. The theory that factions or demoi resembled political parties is now largely abandoned.

Numerous inscriptions and narrative sources show that the factions’ importance grew as circus racing spread over the Roman East and factional identities were extended to the theater and its professionals in the late 5th C. Factions sat in special sections, raised monuments to their charioteers, and became deeply involved in performing acclamations, as the Hippodrome and its vast audiences attracted a developing imperial ceremonial. The circus’s enhanced political significance—perhaps in tandem with undiagnosed social and economic pressures—aggravated the tendency of excited fans to explode in the insufficiently explained riots that wrecked the cities of the late 5th to early 7th C. (e.g., Nika Revolt), which contemporaries connected with factional rivalry. Certain neighborhoods seem to have been particularly associated with one or another faction (Gascoy, infra); the factions could be mobilized to man the walls of their city in crises and they certainly played a role in the civil war between Phokas and Heraclius. Faction members were a small minority of racing fans in 602, when Constantinople counted 900 Blues and 1,500 Greens. Partisans may have been young and come from comfortable backgrounds. By the 8th C. they were headed by demarchoi. Some members’ titles reveal specialized functions; those of meliatai and poietai underscore the link with ceremonial acclamations that would typify the factions in the 9th and 10th C.

Factional circus strife vanished after the 7th C.; chariot-racing and factions now became restricted to Constantinople and its environs. De ceremoniis details their ceremonial and circus duties; it sometimes distinguishes peratikoi factions—headed by demokratai (the Domestikos ton Scholon for the Blues and Domestikos ton Exkoubiton for the Greens)—from politikoi factions, headed by the traditional demarchoi (e.g., De cer., bk.1, ch.2, ed. Vogt, 1:29.6–31.17), a distinction which perhaps reflects the suburban or urban origin of their members. These organizations were integrated into the imperial administration: the taktika place their officers in the imperial hierarchy (see De cer., bk.2, ch.55, ed. Reiske, 798.20–799.16, for the longest list of personnel) and, in the 10th C., the factions were subordinate to and salaried by the praepositos. The medieval factions kept their special Hippodrome seats; they had their own organs, stables and, for their performances, were assigned phialai in the Great Palace as well as stations on the routes of imperial processions. Blues were particularly associated with the Virgin of Diakonissa church. Each faction certainly counted more than 50 members (De cer., bk.2, ch.21, ed. Reiske, 617.10–13). They might wear wreaths or crowns (stephania) and hold handkerchiefs (encheiria) while performing (e.g., De cer., bk.2, ch.15, ed. Reiske, 577.10–12). Ceremonial poems by Theodore Prodomos suggest that faction-like groups (demoi) were still performing in imperial ceremonies of the 12th C.


FACTORIES, IMPERIAL (ἐργαστήρια βασιλι κάκα). Although production of goods was concentrated in small ercastria, significant numbers of laborers from certain fields of craftsmanship came under the supervision of state officials. Production of weapons, for example, was largely under state control, as were major construction projects: according to a 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 440.19–23), Constantine V assembled 6,000 tech nitai (artisans) from various provinces in order to repair the aqueduct in Constantinople and placed them under the supervision of archontes ergodioktai with a patrikos at their head. In addition to the production of weapons, imperial factories were involved in minting coins (see MINTS), weaving (gynaikea), dyeing silk, and making jewelry. Seals list various archontes ton ergodosion; in Laurent’s Corpus (vol. 2) are listed 11 archontes of the blattion, one archon of the chrysokalon (luxurious garment), and one of the jewelry factory. In other sources the state production of silk is most frequently attested: Theophanes (Theoph. 469.3–4) mentions the fire in an imperial workshop (ergodosion) of chrysokabrio; the vita of An tony II Kauleas (ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Sbornik grečeskih i latinских pamiatnikov, vol. 1 [St. Petersburg 1899] 18.25) refers to the head of the imperial silk factory; Leo the Deacon (Leo Diac.
146.24–147.2) mentions another head of the imperial histourgia under whom a system of weavers labored. Next in frequency are imperial jewelry workshops—in the 10th C. a high-ranking official, the sakellarios Anastasios, was archon of the chrysochorion (Theroph Cont 892.14–15). Anna Komnene (An.Komm. 2:10.10) speaks of an imperial “foundry” (choneia) where gold and silver were worked. Finally, Nicholas Mesarites describes the ragged crowd of workers at the mint who toiled day and night under the merciless gaze of their overseers.

We do not know how the work in these workshops was organized. It is plausible that some private craftsmen (e.g., lorrottomo) were coerced into working in imperial factories; some contingents of imperial craftsmen consisted of people sent there as punishment for a crime: thus, Theodore of Stoudios (PG 99:1249D) writes about a man condemned for icon veneration who was forced to work with the weavers as an imperial slave. Eusebios of Caesarea also considered the workers in imperial gynaikeia as state slaves. According to the Book of the Eparch, private artisans’ slaves who broke rules could be made into state slaves.


FACUNDUS, bishop of Hermiane in Byzacena; died after 571. He was an opponent of Justinian I’s religious policies. A leading supporter of the Three Chapters, Facundus represents the disillusionment of the African hierarchy after Justinian’s reconquest. He attended synods in Constantinople in 546 and 547–48; there he wrote a defense of the Three Chapters, maintaining that the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ibas of Edessa, and Theodoret of Cyrrhus meant the abandonment of the faith of Chalcedon. In 550 he participated in a council in Africa that condemned Pope Vigilius. After the Council of Constantinople in 553 he continued to write and was, at least briefly, excommunicated.


—T.E.G.

FAIR (πανήγυρις), an occasional or periodic market, that is, one that is not permanent either in terms of time or in terms of structures such as market stalls and, in this way, is distinguished from regular market days. The Greek term panegyris has different meanings, even within the same period and author. Its original meaning being a general gathering, it could refer to a religious feast, a public celebration, a commercial fair connected with a religious celebration, or a purely episodic market, as in the promise of Alexios I to the Crusaders to provide them with “abundant fairs.” The local fair, attested in many parts of the empire, served the exchange needs of the local population. Libanius provides a classic description of the function of a fair in the 4th C., which was the exchange of products among the inhabitants of various villages of the same locality; the network of exchange thus being formed obviated the need of exchange with the city. In the late 10th and 11th C., there is mention of local fairs where the merchants came both from the vicinity and from other areas, and where therefore the exchange involved more than the locality itself. The periodicity seems to be institutionalized.

Large international fairs are also attested, one such being the fair of Chonai during the feast of the Archangel Michael, and the fair of Themalonike, connected with the feast of St. Demetrios, for which the Timarion provides a description. The fairs of the Peloponnesos in the 14th C. seem to fall into an intermediate category.

A tax (kommerkion) was levied upon commercial activity at fairs and could be remitted by the emperor or given as a grant. The kommerkion of the fair of Erethios, remitted in part by Constantine VI in 795, was 100 pounds of gold. In the late 10th C. and after, there is evidence that the powerful, or the communities, or the monasteries of a locality where a fair was constituted, received revenues from the fair. A novel of Basil II (Zepos, Jus 1:27f) suggests that the merchants who participated in a fair could act together and choose its locality, their interests taking precedence over those of the person who had rights over the place (cf. also Peira 57).

---

**FALCONRY.** See Hawking.

**FALIERI, MARINOS** (Μαρίνος Φαλιέρος), poet: born ca.1395, died 1474. One of the most prominent feudal landlords of Crete, Falieri played a major role in the island’s affairs. As a young man (ca.1425–30), he (rather than his grandson of the same name, ca.1470–1527) wrote several short works in rhymed political verse. Though the *Didactic Discourses* (advice to his son) and the *History and Dream* (a dream encounter in dialogue form between the author and his beloved) owe something to Byz. demotic literature (esp. the Spænas poem and the romances Belthandros and Chrysanta and Libistros and Rhodame), they are also influenced by western European literary currents, in particular those of contemporary Venice. This is even more the case with the *consolatio* (Rhima Paregoretike) addressed to his friend Benedicto da Molino. The *Lamentation on the Passion and the Crucifixion* is a dramatic depiction, perhaps based on an icon. The *Erotic Dream*, closely modeled on the *History and Dream* and normally attributed to Falieri, is possibly not by him at all. A man of practical experience rather than wide education (he was familiar with legal Latin and at home in vernacular Greek, while his first language was the Venetian dialect), he—like his predecessors Schalikos and Leonardo Della Porta—is a witness to the cultural life of Venetian Crete in the early 15th C.


---

**FAMILY.** Although the family was the fundamental unit (microstructure) of Byz. society, there was no specific word for it in Byz. Greek: the most common term συγγένεια (synonymia) designated both the nuclear family and kinship in general; relationship through marriage is defined or rather described as “connection and joining” (*Basil. 28:4:11,*). The term *φαμιλία/φαμελία* (from the Lat. *familia*) is found in some acts of the late 14th–15th C. (*Laiou 3, nos. 140:15, 161:15; Dockier, no.53,16,* where it denotes a family household in contrast to one run by a widow.

The Byz. family was primarily a nuclear family, although extended families of 20–30 members are occasionally mentioned in hagiographical and documentary sources. The frequency of occurrence of extended families varied over time and space. According to A. Laiou (*Peasant Society* 80), in the 14th-C. theme of Smyon families were on the average larger than those in Thessalonike. *Ecloga* 2.2, when prohibiting marriages between members of a *syngeneia*, lists the following categories of relatives: parents, children, brothers, sisters, and *exadelpoi*, that is, nephews and nieces; then follow relations by affinity—stepfather/stepmother, father/mother-in-law, brother/sister-in-law, etc. Relations between uncle and nephew were often very close (J. Brenner, *ZPapEpig* 50 [1983] 173–86). A family could also include adoptive children (see ADOPTION) and such members of the household as *mistrhiai*—as potential husbands of a master’s daughter.

The nuclear family formed the household and was the main economic unit in both town and countryside. The husband and wife worked side by side in the fields or in the workshop, and children (see CHILDHOOD) were involved in household activities from an early age, esp. in the country where they tended their parents’ swine or sheep; in cities, the boy might leave the family at an early age to become an apprentice. The Byz. family was a much more cohesive unit than the late Roman family: MARRIAGE was concluded by a solemn MARRIAGE RITE and not mere consensus (A. Laiou, *R* 4 [1985] 189–201); CONCUBINAGE was, at least in theory, abolished; DIVORCE was restricted; BETROTHAL was equated to marriage; the property of the husband and wife was administered as common effects with overlapping rights to both portions.

Although the nuclear family was the cornerstone of Byz. social organization, it was nonetheless limited by several factors. It was viewed as a concession to the frailty of human nature and as taking second place to eremity (see HERMIT) and CELIBACY, which occupied a higher rung on
the ladder of values. In some instances the state controlled the family. Not only were princely marriages often concluded on the basis of political considerations—resulting sometimes in personal tragedies—but on occasion the state imposed marriages (some nuns were compelled to marry monks during the period of Iconoclasm, widows and maidsens were sometimes forced to marry foreign mercenaries) or made a couple divorce if the union was considered socially improper. The state also exercised the right to abiotikon, appropriation of a certain part of the inheritance left by the deceased head of the family (if he died intestate) to the detriment of his relatives. Although kinship and lineage were underdeveloped in comparison with countries of western and northern Europe, they still played a certain role and influenced the functioning of the nuclear family. Some distant relatives were entitled to certain rights, such as protimesis in the sale of land. The rights of the individual within the family were emphasized: there was no right of primogeniture in Byz. law, and the family property had to be divided, at least in theory, among the children of the pater familias (often in equal parts between brothers and sisters) and in this way dispersed, unless the relatives agreed to retain the unity of their properties. For example, in 15th-C. Trebizond, five relatives (syngonikarchioi) possessed land collectively (Vazelon, nos. 43, 44).

As in the West, monks did not marry and produce new families, and monastic propaganda urged children to leave the family and sever their links with their parents. On the other hand, some monks and nuns maintained connections with their close relatives, entered the same (or a neighboring) community, or created artificial, familylike small units. Moreover, unlike the West, Byz. priests and deacons (but not bishops) were allowed to be married. In addition to monks and nuns, there were other groups of people who did not marry but maintained familial relationships: eunuchs who could not procreate children nonetheless preserved close ties with their nephews; teachers of ecclesiastical/state schools who frequently remained single (in expectation of an episcopal see) and favored their nephews; men who kept concubines. Slaves were not permitted to have a legitimate family (at least until the 11th C.), although they did have monogamous unions.

Along with strengthening of family links over time, there was increasing prestige of the woman as wife and mother whose role in the household was decisive. The warmth of relations between parents and children is often stressed in Byz. literature—in evident disregard for the demands of some rigorists (e.g., the author of the vita of St. Alexios Homo dei) who praised the dissolution of family ties. Some heretical dogmas, for example those of extreme Dualist sects, went so far as to advocate the total abolition of the family and rejected sexuality and procreation. As a pivotal institution of social life, the family served as a model for structuring other types of social relations. The emperor was proclaimed to be the father of his subjects, and family terminology and used to describe both his relations to neighboring rulers and some hierarchical ranks (e.g., gambros, son-in-law); family terminology characterized the relationship of the teacher to his disciples (his "sons" or "nephews"), esp. within the sphere of spiritual influence; the concept that in the monastery the spiritual father replaced the biological parents was widespread in Byz.


**FAMILY 2400. Sec Decorative Style.**

**FAMINE (λιμός).** In a marginally subsistent agricultural economy such as that of Byz., famine followed any climatic irregularity that interfered with agricultural, esp. grain, production. Byz. chronicles and saints' lives regularly record the harsh winters, droughts, floods, and plagues of locusts that jeopardized the annual harvest. Because God provided for mankind, any disruption to that provision was interpreted as a sign of divine displeasure with a particular situation or event, as in the case of the famine that followed the deposition of Elias as patriarch of Jerusalem in 516 (Cyril of Skythopolis, Vita Sabae, ch.58, ed. Schwartz 159,7–14). Since bread was a staple dietary requirement for the Byz. population, a
failed harvest could lead to high mortality. Fami-
ines were usually localized, affecting first the
countryside, then the nearby cities. Larger urban
centers, esp. Constantinople, could sometimes de-
lay the impact of famine by controlling the storage
and distribution of grain, but shortages could still
lead to riots as in the capital in 409 and 602.

Major famines occurred in 383–85 (Antioch),
443 (Constantinople), 498–502 (Edessa), 516–21
(Palestine), early 540s, early 580s, 600–03 (Syria),
under Basil I (Skyl. 277f), 927/8 (‘the great fam-
ine’), 1032 (Cappadocia and neighboring areas),
and 1037 (Thrace and Macedonia). From the sec-
ond half of the 11th C. and the 12th C., data on
famines are rare (Kazhdan-Epstein, Change 27, n.
11). Turkish invasions of the 14th–15th C. often
resulted in famines, as did the ‘scorched earth’
policy of Andronikos II when combattting the
Catalan Grand Company in 1306 (A. Laiou, By-
zantium 37 [1967–68] 91–113). The results of fami-
ine were esp. severe in spring when stored grain
had been exhausted: women evidently had a higher
mortality rate during famines than men. Famine
and the miraculous help of a saint is a frequent
theme of hagiographical literature.

Lit. Patlagan, Pamet 74–92. Svoronos, Etudes, pl.19
(1969), 121.

—B.C.

FAN, LITURGICAL. See Rhipidion.

FANTINUS THE YOUNGER. See Phantinos
the Younger.

FARMER’S LAW (Νόμος Γεωργικος), a legal text
preserved in dozens of MSS from the end of the
10th C. onward. It regulates relations within a
village (theft, trespassing of boundaries, damage
caused by or to livestock, etc.) or, rarely, between
two villages; a tax (extraordinia) is mentioned only
once; two kinds of land lease are regulated, but
not land purchase. There has been considerable
discussion of the date, provenance, and character
of this law code. It has been dated to the 7th C.
(particularly to the reign of Justinian I) and to
the 8th C. (as contemporaneous with the Ecloga).
Its origin has been placed in Italy and in Con-
stantinople—the absence of any reference to olive
groves and horses in the Farmer’s Law suggests,
however, an origin in hilly, inland terrain. It has
been variously viewed as a record of Slavic cus-
tomary law (even though not a single Slavic term
is to be found there); as a selection of Justinianic
norms (the name of Justinian—I or II—is includ-
ed in some MSS); as pre-Justinianic rules; as
biblical, eastern, or Hellenic precepts; as imperial
legislation; and as a private collection.

Whatever its provenance, the Farmer’s Law ref-
lects conditions in the countryside (limited to
certain territories), between the crisis of the mid-
7th C. and the 9th-C. revival. Its context is a
milieu in which the free peasantry dominates,
slaves appear only as shepherds, and ownership
of large landed estates is practically unknown. Of
85 articles of the Farmer’s Law, 40 deal with cattle
breeding, livestock damaging crops, etc., whereas
only 16 are devoted to land cultivation and related
questions, nine to vineyards and gardens, two to
agrarian implements, and four to houses and barns.
Like Western medieval leges, the Farmer’s Law
protected the animal from the neighbor (pars. 38,
59, 51, 53, 54, 85) rather than the neighbor’s crop
from an animal that caused damage (pars. 78–
79). The peasants described in this law own their
individual allotments, while some portion of the
village land is in common ownership. The rela-
tions are similar to those described in the Western
leges barbarorum, but it is unnecessary to seek for
explanation in a direct borrowing (e.g., from the
Italian Lombards)—a similar situation could cre-
ate similar regulations. The Farmer’s Law was
revised by HARMENOPoulos and translated into
Rumanian and Slavic languages.

Ed. and lit. I. Medvedev, E. Piotrovskaja, E. Lipšic,
95. J. Karayannopoulos, “Entstehung und Bedeutung des
Nomos Georgikos,” BZ 51 (1958) 357–73. J. Malafosse,
“Les lois agraires à l’époque byzantine,” Recueil de l’Académie
de législation 19 (1910) 1–75. N. Pantazopoulos, “Peculiar
Institutions of Byzantine Law in the Georgikos Nomos,” RE-
SEF. 9 (1971) 541–47.

—A.K.

FARM. Usually designated as staseis in fiscal
documents, farms varied with regard to their size
and location. A regular farm consisted of a house
with its enclosure and well; within the enclosure
were also sheds for hay and straw, pits (goubai)
for grain, pitharia (large, partially buried vessels
for wine and other products), and sometimes wine
presses, animal-driven mills, and stalls. The most valuable parts of the farm were called autourgia. The farm encompassed arable land, gardens, olive groves, and vineyards as well as the right to use common pastures (usually located in wooded hills), but products varied according to terrain and climate: some villages had practically no arable land, others did not cultivate olives or grapes; some farms were oriented toward fishing or the breeding of livestock.

The nucleus of the farm usually formed a part of the village, whereas the land consisted of small scattered parcels (up to 25–33 pieces) planted in such a way that vineyards could border choraphia, etc. There were no "open fields" or systematic redistributions of allotments, but parcels formed stable units normally surrounded by fences and ditches. Besides the principal homestead, a stasis could include hamlets (agridia) located far from the nucleus. Large landowners had farms called proasteia and (as monastic property) metochia, which were sometimes separated from the center of the estate by significant distances.


—J.W.N., A.K.

**FASTING (ιετοεία),** freely chosen total or partial self-deprivation of, or abstinence from, certain kinds of food and drink, usually for a predetermined period, as a means of penance and asceticism. Fasting was practiced either in common, before major feasts of the church, or individually, under the discretion of a spiritual elder. In early Christianity, fasting meant total abstinence from food and drink at least until evening. Later the notion of fasting was extended to include reduction in the quantity of, or abstinence from only certain kinds of, victuals.

On the symbolic or liturgical level, Christian fasting was related to expectation of the parousia, and thus partook of the nature of a vigil; first seen in this way in Asia Minor in the 2nd C. in conjunction with the vigil on the eve of Easter, this fast was later extended to the two days, then to the entire week, preceding Easter (whence Holy Week), finally to 40 days (whence tessarakoste, or lent), to which was prefixed later, in the 6th–7th C., a pre-Lenten "Cheesefare Week." Other lents of the church year, and fasting on the vigils of Nativity and Epiphany, and on two feasts—the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 Sept.) and the Beheading of John the Baptist (29 Aug.)—were also added. The Byz. system of fasts was completely in place by the 11th C.

The daily eucharistic fast from midnight until communion, in general use from the 5th C. onward, is also to be understood as a vigil for the coming of the Lord. This symbolism is the basis for forbidding fasting on Saturdays and Sundays and during the 50-day season of pentecost, since these times signified the presence of the Risen Lord, the fulfillment of the Messianic age, symbolized in the Bible by banqueting.

From the 4th C. onward, tradition distinguishes various degrees of fasting, from the total Easter fast of one or more days, to giving up meat (apokreas) or cheese (tyrine). Xerophagia ("dry nourishment") was a fast that lasted until evening, followed by a meal of only bread, salt, and water. Even the Eucharist was thought to break this fast; hence Byz. fast days were "aliturgical," that is, on these days the Eucharist, being a morning service, was either not celebrated at all, or was replaced by the presanctified. In addition to lent, Monday (in monasteries), Wednesday, and Friday were traditional fast days except during the 50 days of Pentecost. Fasting included abstinence from marital relations. Monks practiced more severe and frequent fasting than the laity and never ate meat (E. Jeanselme, 2e Congrès d'histoire de la médecine [Évreux 1922] 1–10).

Church fathers preached on fasting, and it occupies a prominent place in monastic literature (H.-J. Sieben, *DictSpir* 8 [1974] 1175–79) and in hagiographical texts. Saints might refuse even bread for certain periods and feed instead on wild berries, acorns, or dried locusts; the infant Nicholas refused to nurse on fast days, a sure sign of future sanctity. Yet excessive fasting was criticized by some intellectuals as hypocrisy: if we leave our poor brother to fast and die of hunger, says Eustathios of Thessalonike (Escorial Y ii 10, fol.39v), this is not nestia but lesteia, robbery.

FATE. See Determinism; Tyche.

FĀTIMIDS, Shiite Muslim dynasty (909–1171). Its first four caliphs lived in North Africa until Fātimid armies captured Egypt in 973. The Fātimids first clashed with Byz. in 911 at Demona (Sicily). Between 914 and 918 the Byz. governor of Sicily agreed to pay an annual tribute of 22,000 gold pieces, which Romans I succeeded in reducing to 11,000. Byz. diplomatic contacts with the Fātimids included embassies in 946, 953 (truce), and 957/8 (five-year truce), and treaties in 967 and 975. The Byz. unsuccessfully attempted to prevent Fātimid expansion in northern Syria, which was partitioned de facto in 969. Caliph al-Mu‘izz failed to prevent the Byz. reconquest of Crete. Caliph al-’Aziz persuaded Byz. in 987/8 to lift the prohibition against commercial contacts and to allow prayers in his name to be recited in the mosque of Constantinople. He died preparing a major expedition against Byz. as protector of the Ḥamdānids. A Fātimid fleet defeated Byz. in 998, resulting in a ten-year truce in 1001. After Caliph al-Ḥākim destroyed the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, commercial relations were severed from 1015/16 until 1032. A ten-year treaty, which included permission for Byz. rebuilding of this church, was signed in 1038 and renewed in 1048. Relations cooled after Constantin IX died but briefly improved under Isaac I because of common fear of the Seljuks. Seljuk and Crusader invasions separated Byz. and Fātimid territories, but diplomatic and commercial contacts continued until the end of the Fātimid dynasty.


FAYYŪM (from Coptic Phiom or Piom, the sea), area of Middle Egypt where agriculture was highly developed in Ptolemaic and early imperial times; its capital was Arsinōe (Crocodilopolis). By the early 4th C. the prosperity of the Fayyūm had declined and several settlements were abandoned, but papyrus finds attest to the continuity of the chief city through the 7th C. Churches have been excavated at Tefydni, Madinat Mādī, and Ḥawār. They are generally of basilican plan, with a tripartite sanctuary, but are provincial in character, the nave being often no wider than the aisles. Nearly all the columns are spolia. Medieval sources (al-Nābulūsī, Description du Fayyum au VIIe siècle de l’Hégire [Cairo 1899; rp. Beirut 1974]; see the excerpts of G. Salmon, BIFAD 1 [1901] 29–77) refer to numerous monasteries, of which only a few have left traces. Some sites still called “Dayr” (monastery) have early churches: Dayr al-Naqūl (also Dayr al-Malak Ḥabriyāl) has parts of a 7th-C. basilica; and Dayr al-Banāt, near Dayr al-Naqūl, is a ruined monastic site with remains of a church and refectory. The region is particularly known for its FAYYŪM PORTRAITS.


FAYYŪM PORTRAITS, funerary portraits that survive in large numbers from the Fayyūm. The practice of covering the faces of mummmies with images painted on wooden panels began during the Roman occupation of Egypt, when the native population could no longer afford the traditional, elaborate sARCOPHAGI. At first naturalistic, such portraiture had become increasingly abstract by the time it went out of fashion in the 4th C. The importance of Fayyūm portraits for Byz. art is twofold: on the one hand, their realistic detail offers parallels for contemporary jewelry and clothing, and on the other, their shape, encaustic technique, and abstract, hieratic style contributed instrumentally to the development of 5th–7th-C. ICON painting.


FEAR (φόβος) was divided by Nemesios (PG 40:688B–689A) and John of Damascus (De fide orth. par.29, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:81) into six categories: oikhoS, hesitation or fear of future ac-
tions; *aidos*, awe or fear of blame; *aishyne*, shame or fear of having acted dishonestly; *kataplexis*, consternation at the sight of a great imaginary apparition; *ekplexis*, terror caused by an unusual apparition; and *agonia*, anguish or fear of failure. John of Damascus (*De fid. orth.* 64.10, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:162) considered cowardice and anguish to be physical emotions, expressed in ways such as sweating and "clots of blood" (*Lk* 22:44).

Church fathers interpreted fear mostly as a spiritual emotion. Basil the Great (*PG* 29:369C) distinguished between a good fear, which brings salvation, and a base fear caused by lack of faith. The good fear was fear of God (often in the formula "fear and trembling [*tremos*]"), which was contrasted with fear of punishment (and with the fear the Hebrews felt before God). In Symeon the Theologian *phobos tou Theou* is a complete and voluntary subjugation to God, self-abnegation and transformation of oneself into a slave of God.

A secular parallel to Symeon’s fear is Kekaumenos’s fear of the ever-present dangers that threaten man in every aspect of his life, such as perils of nature (poisonous mushrooms, falling rocks) or of human relationships (traps laid by friends or subordinates) or of the imperial court with its danger of disfavor. The Byz. felt themselves surrounded by dangerous natural phenomena (earthquakes, storms, drought, locusts, etc.), political turmoil (enemy invasions, rebellions), and social instability; it required enormous faith to overcome fears and maintain optimism. The usage of metaphors implying fear (shipwreck, fire, disease, death) was esp. typical of Niketas Choniates, distinguishing him from Psellos and Gregoras, who stressed the possibility of a happy end after severe trials.

A.K.

**FEAST** (*εορτή, πανήγυρις*). Byz. daily life was dominated by a succession of festivals, whether these were the recurring ones of the liturgical year, or sporadic ones on the occasions of imperial weddings, triumphs, or other ceremonies. Manuel I’s list of feasts (1166) counts 66 full *panegyres* (without Sundays) and 27 half-feasts (R. Macrides, *FM* 6 [1984] 140–55).

The liturgical feasts, both "mobile" and "fixed," are recorded in church calendars. Feasts can be "dominical" (*despotikh*, of Christ), "Mariam" (*Theotokariak* of the Virgin Mary), "sancorial" (of the saints), or "occasional" (commemorating the founding of a city, the consecration of a church, a council, a miracle, a transfer of relics, a natural calamity, etc.). They may even celebrate a dogma or its triumph, e.g., "Trinity Sunday" or the Triumph of Orthodoxy. There is a cycle of fixed commemorations for every weekday, while Sunday always commemorates the Resurrection. Ceremonial for the various feasts is described in the liturgical typikon.

In the *Typikon of the Great Church*, more important feasts were preceded by a vigil (*paramon*), but *Nativity, Epiphany*, and Exaltation of the Cross (see *Cross, Cult of the*) were the only fixed feasts with a fore- and afterfeast (*Mateos, Typikon* 2:294, 311). Later, *Sabbatic typika* distinguished five different ranks of festive solemnity: two classes of Great Feast (dominical and Marian), Middle Feasts, Lesser Feasts, and days of simple commemoration. Only Great Feasts and a few important Middle Feasts merited an all-night vigil, or *agyria*; they may be preceded by a period of fasting. Apart from that, these categories affected chiefly the celebration of *orthros* and *vespers*. Only on Great Feasts did the festal kanon replace at *orthros* the kanon of the movable cycle found in the *oktoechos*, *triadion*, or *pentekostarion*. Middle Feasts had Great Vespers and the Great Doxology at *orthros*, but no vigil. Lesser Feasts had the Great Doxology at *orthros*, but only simple vespers. These categories were not rigid, however, and sometimes elements that (ideally) pertain to feasts of one class were assigned to a feast of a different rank.

Many feasts in Constantinople involved the participation of the emperor. On dominical feasts, he attended services in *Hagia Sophia*, on the Marian feasts he proceeded to the *Chalkoprateia* of Blachernai churches, while on the Thursday of *Holy Week* he performed the ceremonial *Washing of the Feet* mandated by Jesus in *John* 13:14. Numerous saints’ days also included solemn processions around the city (see *LITTE*). A certain number of guests were usually invited to dine at the palace after the feast and could be entertained by *mimes*. The main sources for the emperor’s activities on these days are the *Klerorologion of Philotheos*, *De ceremoniis*, and pseudo-Kodinos.

Food and wine were usually distributed to the population in the city squares, or to the poor.
before monastery gates. Feasts were also accompanied by games in various forms, from horse races to semitheatrical performances. Christopher of Mytilene describes a masquerade, a procession of notaries in costume, one dressed as the emperor, on the feast of their patrons Sts. Markianos and Martyrios (25 Oct.). In the 14th C. the church assumed the staging of biblical stories on feastdays, esp. that of the Three Hebrews. (For the fairs that accompanied feastdays, see Panegyris.)


—R.F.T.

FEAST OF ORTHODOXY. See Triumph of Orthodoxy.

FEEDING OF THE MULTITUDE. Christ's miraculous multiplication of five loaves and two fishes to feed 5,000 people occurs in all four Gospels; a similar episode with 4,000 people (Mt 15:32–59, Mk 8:1–10) was amalgamated with it in both exegesis and art. Suggesting the bread of the Eucharist and its ability to sustain all who come, the scene occurs repeatedly in art of the 4th–6th C., often in conjunction with the miracle at Cana. Initially, it is shown schematically, with only baskets and fishes; 6th-C. versions use figures, but formally, with a frontal Christ blessing food presented by symmetrically placed disciples. The 6th-C. Sinope Gospels (A. Grabar, Les peintures de l'Evangéliaire de Sinope [Paris 1948], pl.III) show bread baskets and people picnicking beside this symmetrical group; this version recurs in 9th-C. monuments. The Feeding is infrequent in later art, appearing only in extensive cycles, but it does develop, becoming more narrative in form. Its eucharistic significance is acted out rather than symbolized, as the symmetrical composition is displaced by scenes of the breaking and distribution of the bread (Monreale-Demus, Norman Sicily, pl.87A–B). This development culminates in richly discursive Palaiologan representations, esp. that at the Chora.


—A.W.C.

FELIX III, pope (13 Mar. 483–1 Mar. 492). Born to an aristocratic Roman family, Felix was elected with the support of Odoacer and tried, at the beginning, to maintain correct relations with Emp. Zeno despite Rome's opposition to the Henotikon. Pressure from the Chalcedonian Alexandrian clergy hardened Felix's anti-Monophysite position, although his legates—willingly or not—entered into communion with Patr. Akakios; Felix demanded deposition of the Monophysite Alexandrian patriarch Peter Mongos and excommunicated the legates and Akakios, thus leading to the Akakian Schism (484). He found support among certain circles in Constantinople, esp. the Akoimetai. The three failed attempts to resolve the schism in Felix's lifetime fit into the broader context of Byz. policies toward Odoacer and Theodoric the Great. One of Felix's collaborators was the future pope Gelasius. The two men contributed much to the increasing papal independence from Constantinople in the realm of dogma.


—A.K.

FENARI ISA CAMII. See Lips Monastery.

FEodosij of Pečera, superior of the Kiev Caves monastery or Kiev-pečerskij monastyr' (ca.1060–74); saint; born Vasil'ev, died Kiev 3 May 1074; feastday 3 May. Feodosij (Theodosios) is regarded as the founder of cenobitic monasticism in Rus' for having introduced into the Caves Monastery the Rule of Stoudios, which he obtained either from a Kiev monk residing in a Constantinopolitan monastery (according to Feodosij's vita by the monk Nestor) or from Michael, a Stoudite monk who had accompanied Metr. George (ca.1065–76) to Kiev from Constantinople (according to the Povest' vremennych let sub anno 1051). The monastery's Paterik (13th C.) also credits Feodosij with hiring Byz. architects from Constantinople to build the monastery's stone Church of the Dormition (founded in 1073). Some 20 written works are attributed to him with varying degrees of certainty. His brief Lenten homilies, which have the best claim to authenticity,
chiefly concern monastic discipline and repeatedly stress the authority of Theodore of Studios. A virulent anti-Latin tract and a letter on fasting attributed to Feodosij are more likely the works of another Feodosij ("the Greek," fl. mid-12th C.), who also translated into Slavonic the letter of Pope Leo I to Patri. Flavian of Constantinople.


S.C.F., P.A.H.

FEOFAN GREK. See THEOPHANES "THE GREEK."

FERRARA (Φερρα, ópia), city in Emilia, in northern Italy. The city was evidently founded in the early 7th C., at which time a fortress was built on the left bank of the Po; by the 12th C., however, the Po had changed its course, and by 1438, when Emp. John VIII Palaiologos came to Ferrara, the closest point of disembarkation seems to have been Francolino, about 10 km from Ferrara (Syropoulos, Mémoires 226–234). The fortress belonged to the exarchate of Ravenna, was captured by the Lombards, and in 757 transferred to Pope Stephen II by the Lombard king Desiderius. Under the rule of its Countess Mathilda (1063–1115) the city supported the popes (esp. Gregory VII) against Henry IV of Germany. For several centuries Ferrara struggled against the ecclesiastical supremacy of Ravenna and the political claims of Venice. At the initiative of Pope Eugenius IV, Ferrara housed the Council of Ferrara-Florence during its first phase in 1438 until an outbreak of plague forced the participants to move to Florence. The city seems to have had a small Greek colony concentrated around the Church of St. Julian, near which Dionysios, metropolitan of Sardis, was buried in Apr. 1438 (V. Laurent in Syropoulos, Mémoires 257, n.5).

A.K.

FERRARA-FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF. The council opened at Ferrara (1438–39). It was, however, transferred to Florence on account of the plague. Viewed by Rome as ecumenical, the council aimed at the union of the churches. Its convocation was a concession to the Byz., since Rome had previously refused to accept their demands for a free and open council in which both parties would be treated as equals. All the same, East-West antagonism remained. The papacy looked with contempt on the ruined Byz. Empire and strove for the political subordination of the Greek church, while traditional Byz. distrust of and frustration and disillusion with the West were still very much alive. Besides, the atmosphere was politically conditioned from the beginning. The large Byz. delegation, which included the patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph II, and Emp. John VIII Palaiologos, was also seeking military aid against the Turks.

Despite the council's prolonged deliberations on the controversial issues—papal primacy, filioque, purgatory, azymes—genuine unity was not achieved. Indeed, the basic issues were not fully resolved. Both papal primacy and the filioque were defined in Latin terms. A crucial argument for union, moreover, lost its persuasiveness soon after the council, when the military crusade promised by Pope Eugenius IV was destroyed at the battle of Varna (1444). Not surprisingly, the union decree (6 July 1439) of this council proved just as ephemeral as the union of Lyons (1274). The Byz. church officially repudiated it shortly after the collapse of the empire. Both the Memoirs of Sylvester Syropoulos and the acts of the council itself are unofficial compilations, reflecting their authors' individual views and perspectives.


FESTUS, Latin historian; died Ephesus 3 Jan. 380. The old identification with Rufius Festus Avienius or his son is not valid. Festus is plausibly, though unprovably, equated with Festus of Tridentum in Raetia, governor of Syria and then proconsul of Asia (372–78), a character condemned for his many vices by Ammianus Marcellinus, Eunapios, and Libanius. After several vicissitudes of fortune, he met the poetic fate of dropping dead on the steps of the temple of
Nemesis at Ephesus. Festus's Breviarium is a jejune précis of Roman history from the city's foundation to 369, basically a propaganda piece for the intended Persian campaign of Valens, who may have requested the work as an aide-mémoire, or to whom it may have been addressed in hopes of imperial favor. Several MS headings have it addressed to Valentinian instead, perhaps an error, although some speculate that Festus sent the work to both emperors with different dedications. Highly derivative for the most part, his work has some value for the administrative and military history of the Roman east from the late 3rd–4th C.


FETHIYE CAMII. See Pammakaristos, Church of Hagia Maria.

FEUDALISM, a term often used in modern Byz. scholarship to characterize a variety of Byz. social, economic, and political institutions and relationships. As in other fields of history, scholars disagree on the term's definition and therefore on whether/when Byz. became a "feudal society," what parts of it were "feudal," and whether the term should be applied to Byz. at all. Some academics, esp. Marxists, maintain that Byz. society can be understood only in a feudal context. These scholars variously consider Byz. to have become "feudal" in the 3rd, 7th, or 10th C., depending on such issues as whether the late Roman coloni were already serfs and whether the inhabitants of the 10th-C. village community were free smallholding peasants or dependents of the state (see Demoskarios). On the other hand, those who consider feudalism to be the devolution of public (state) power into private hands debate when and to what extent privileges—fiscal (see Exemption), administrative, and judicial—were granted to large landowners and even to towns, while agreeing that the process of devolution reached its fullest extent in the 14th–15th C.

Others see feudalism as primarily a system of hierarchical relationships among members of the ruling class, and, while the Western feudal con-

ccepts of fealty, homage, the benefice, and vassalage had little expression in Byz., these scholars debate whether the Byz. aristocracy ever became a hereditary, "feudal" nobility. Still others consider it misleading to apply the term feudalism, so laden with its autochthonous western European connotations, to Byz. Even these scholars, however, find it difficult to ignore the parallels between Western medieval and Byz. institutions (whether borrowed or indigenous to Byz.; see Immunity, Lizions, Appanage, Pronoria) and often find it useful to speak, if not of feudalism, then of "feudalizing tendencies" or the "feudalization" of Byz.


FIBULA (περόνη), a fastener for a cloak, shawl, or overgarment, usually placed on the shoulder of the wearer. Made of bronze, gilt bronze, gold, or silver, it is essentially a securing device, as distinct from a brooch, which is primarily decorative and consists of a hinged pin fastened to a front plate. The fibula was made of a single length of wire coiled on itself to produce a spring, while the back was bowed to allow for the bulk of the fabric it held. Its back portion was generally diamond- or lozenge-shaped, or cruciform, but circular fibulae appear by the 6th C. Initially they were plain, then repoussé; later versions are of openwork with gilt, gold wire, pendant gems and pears, and glass paste; eventually they were decorated with cloisonné enamel. Gold fibulae with inscriptions were given by rulers as gifts on state occasions down to the late 4th C. Conversely, plain bronze wire fibulae, resembling large safety pins, have been found in simple burials. The Byz. version of this fastener is generally the 6th-C. type, with rounded back, varying amounts of gold and gems, and sometimes a pendant cross or Christian inscription. The jeweled fibula that Justinian I wears on the right shoulder in the mosaics of S. Vitale, Ravenna, identifies his imperial status.

Plain fibulae of bronze have been found during archaeological excavations in various centers of Greece and Macedonia (e.g., Nea Anchialos, Edessa
FILEFO, FRANCESCO, Italian humanist, teacher, and translator; born Tolentino, Italy 25 July 1398, died Florence 31 July 1481. Filelfo (Φιλέλφος) spent the years 1420–27 in Constantinople as secretary to a Venetian official. He took advantage of this sojourn to study Greek with George Chrysokokkes and with a member of the Chrysoloras family, whose daughter he married. As a result of his studies, he became an ardent philhellenic, brought back to Italy MSS of 40 Greek authors, and named one of his sons Xenophon. He taught both Greek and Latin literature in Bologna, Florence, and Milan.

After his return to Italy, Filelfo was active as a translator of ancient Greek authors such as Xenophon (the Cyropedia) and Plutarch. He maintained close relations with both the Italian and Greek émigré scholars of his day, conducting correspondence in Greek and Latin. Of his Greek letters 110 survive, many on literary topics (requests for books, criticism of literary works, discussion of Aristotelian philosophy). His most frequent addressees were Theodore Gazes (18 letters), Bessarion (16), and John Argyropoulos (10). His letters contain many allusions to classical Greek literature and mythology. He was appalled by the Turkish conquest of Constantinople and recognized the consequent threat to Italy. Gazes addressed to Filelfo his treatise on the origins of the Turks. Filelfo also wrote three books of poems in Greek, of which only a few have been published.

Fifth Ecumenical Council. See Constantinople, Councils of: Constantinople II.
Constantinople, Councils of), which stated that
"the Creed cannot be subtracted from, added to,
altered or distorted in any way . . ." (Mansi
17:516C). Photios composed a lengthy refutation of
the "double procession" following his retire-
ment in 886. It is generally believed that the
interpolated creed was accepted in Rome in 1014.
The interpolation was affirmed as legitimate
by the councils of Lyons (1274) and Ferrara-
Florence (1438–39), but was rejected in the East.

LIT. M. Jugie, De processione Spiritus Sancti ex foniibus
revelationis et secundum orientales dissidentes (Rome 1936).
R. Haugh, Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Contro-
versy (Belmont, Mass., 1975). B. Schultze, "Zum Ursprung
"Maximus the Confessor and the Filioque," Stp 18.1 (Kal-

—J.M.

FIRE (δμπρησμός, πῦρ). Fire was an ever-present
hazard in the large, densely populated cities of the
Byz. world; consequently a metropolis like
Constantinople had a squadron of fire fighters
(collegiati) under the jurisdiction of the eparch
of the city in each of its regions. Nevertheless, great
conflagrations, begun accidentally or deliberately,
still engulfed whole sections of large cities as they
spread rapidly along the porticoes and major
thoroughfares. Like earthquakes, fires were in-
terpreted by the Byz. as signs of divine anger; for
example, the fire of 1 Sept. 465 was thereafter the
object of an annual liturgical commemoration
(Synax.CP 6.3–9). Major fires in Constantinople
occurred in summer 388; 12 July 400; 20 June
404; 25 Oct. 406; 15 Apr. 428; 17 Aug. 433; 448;
1–2 Sept. 465; 475; 498; 509; 510; 6 Nov. 512;
15–17 Jan. 532 (during the Nika Revolt); July
548; 13 May 559; Dec. 560; 12 Oct. 561; Dec.
563; Apr. 583; 603; 10 Aug. 626; Dec. 790;
886/7; spring 912; summer 931; 6 Aug. 1040;
after Sept. 1069; before 1194 destroying the
northern region of Constantinople (Nik.Chon.
445.29); 25 July 1197; 17 July 1203 (set by the
Crusaders); 19–21 Aug. 1203; 12 Apr. 1204; 25
July 1261 (the Greeks burned the Latin quarters);
Nov. 1291; 1303; 1308; Aug. 1351; 29 Jan. 1434
(this list compiled after Schneider with slight cor-
rections). Fires outside Constantinople are little
known or studied, though the sources mention
attacks by enemies who set fire to strongholds,
threshing floors, and crops in fields.

The image of fire or flame occupied a signifi-
cant place in theological concepts and in litera-
ture: fire was the major means of punishment in
hell, and a final conflagration was expected at the
end of the world. Metaphorically, the Byz. would
speak of the fire of wrath, passion, heresy, per-
secution, etc. The pagan concept of the divine
nature of fire (e.g., the Persian worship of fire)
was refuted and ridiculed, but the image of God
as fire was retained, as well as the concept of
miraculous fire related to angels and saints. The
Byz. themselves stressed the ambiguous nature of
fire, contrasting material and immaterial (spiri-
tual) fire, divine fire and fire of sin, illuminating
and burning fire.

LIT. A.M. Schneider, "Brände in Konstantinopel," BZ
—B.C.

FIREARMS. Portable firearms were unknown in
Byz. Cannons were developed in western Europe
during the 14th C. and were first used against the
Byz., to little effect, by the Turks in their siege of
Constantinople in 1422. G. Škrivanić (Kosovska
bitka [Cetinje 1956] 28–30) asserts that Dubrovnik
obtained cannons by the mid-14th C. and that
during the battle at Kosovo Polje in 1389 both the
Serbs and the Turks used firearms. But while the
Turks continued to invest in improved siege
guns, the Byz. had neither the materials nor the
money to develop their own cannons. Doukas
(Douk. 307.20–309.27) and other historians re-
counting the fall of the city in 1453 (see Con-
stantinople, Siege and Fall of) tell of the Hun-
garian gunsmith Urban who first offered his skills
to the impeunious Constantine XI Palaiologos
before entering the far more remunerative service
of the Turks. The cannons he built for Mehmed
II the Conqueror, esp. one huge gun capable of
firing a stone weighing over 1,000 pounds, were
instrumental in demolishing parts of the city walls
and blocking the Golden Horn to the ships of
Byz. allies, while the few small Byz. guns were
badly outweighed and outranged.

LIT. J.R. Partington, A History of Greek Fire and Gunpowder
Balkans on the Eve and After the Ottoman Conquest of the
Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," in War, Technology
and Society in the Middle East, ed. V.J. Parry, M.E. Yapp
(London 1975) 164–94.

—E.M.

FIRST ECUMENICAL COUNCIL. See Nicaea,
Councils of: Nicaea I.
FISCAL SYSTEM. Continuing the Roman practice, the state maintained a budget based mainly on agricultural revenues. Indirect taxation, esp. from customs (the octava, then the kommerxion), always burdened the circulation and sale of merchandise. On the contrary, city taxes disappeared after the 7th C.

Payment of taxes has always been seen as a main and inevitable obligation of the population, but devolution of fiscal revenue was also practiced to varying degrees: tax exemptions allowed landowners to keep for their own profit at least part of the fiscal revenues; and fiscal revenues could be the object of outright grants to individuals (logismoi), often as a compensation for services provided to the state (esp. in the pronoia system). Such practices had important social consequences.

First Period (4th to 7th C.). The 3rd-C. crisis and Diocletian’s reforms resulted in a fiscal system based mainly on contributions in kind, first of all on the annonae, the burden of which was distributed to taxpayers following the system of capitatio-jugatio. Fiscal revenue from land was stabilized for periods of time according to the indiction and was eventually increased (or restored in case of abandoned lands) by the epibole. Following the establishment by Constantine I of a stable monetary system based on gold, the fiscal services, eager to collect precious metal, applied increasingly the principle of commutation, in spite of the injustices that this might entail, and ended by officially transforming the land tax into a contribution in gold (chrysoteleia). In 518, public finances were healthy, with attested reserves of 320,000 pounds of gold. Fiscal income was complemented by various secondary taxes and services.

Until the 7th C. at least, the empire’s fiscal services were attached to the praetorian prefect (and, secondarily, to the comes sacrarum largitionum) and functioned through provincial governors and various local authorities (or the latifundary landowners). Synethelai were the main remuneration of tax collectors.

Second Period (8th to 12th C.). The new fiscal system is essentially known from the 9th C. onward, thanks esp. to some treatises on taxation. It was based on the idea that each fiscal unit, be it an individual (pronoia, owning one or more prouastheia), or a village (chorion, a community of small landowners with some communal properties), was expected to produce a stable fiscal revenue each year, following the principle of fiscal solidarity among its members. Until a tax alleviation was granted, neighbors were responsible for the tax of abandoned lots; and if, after alleviation, they agreed to take over such a lot, they were required to pay deferred taxes (opisthoteleia) as if they had already been exploiting it. Solidarity in payment of taxes was brought beyond the limits of the fiscal unit by Basil II with the allelengyon.

The main tax, the kanon, was placed on land (4.166 percent ad valorem; but this “fiscal” value could differ from the real one—Schilbach, 1978, Quellen 59f) and its amount was established according to the epibole for each fiscal unit described in the cadaster; it was increased by the parakoautemata and had to be paid mostly in gold coins (charagma). To these were added the hearth tax and many secondary taxes, corvées, and services (in kind or in money). Some categories of land (those submitted to the stratheia or the dromos) were in principle exempt from secondary taxes, as were those of lay or ecclesiastic landowners that had received a privilege from the emperor (very seldom was the kanon included in such exemptions). Various tithes were collected from state-owned lands.

Fiscal services were under the authority of the logothetes of the genikon, whose representatives operated in the provinces under the supervision of the strategoi: anagrapheis conducted the census, epos tai revised the cadaster, exisotai verified and redistributed the fiscal burden of the contributors, and dioketai collected the taxes. Military obligations related to the stratheia were controlled by the logothetes tou stratiotikou, postal obligations by the logothetes tou dromou. The protonotarios of the theme was in charge of provincial finances and levying most of the secondary taxes and corvées. In the 10th–11th C. provincial judges also collected taxes.

Third Period (12th to 15th C.). The fiscal system, although retaining its main characteristics, changed considerably by adapting to new realities: the development of large landed property, social changes in the countryside (peasants were now increasingly paroikoi, often of the state), enhanced by the development of the pronoun system. The tax collector was now the praktor of a given province, most often a tax farmer. The census,
carried out by the apographeus (whose praktika replaced the systematic cadaster), served as a basis for calculating the fiscal revenues that would be collected by the state (or by landowners who were granted tax exemptions) or would be distributed to pronoia holders. Land was taxed at a flat rate (50 modioi: 1 hyperpyron) and this tēlos was distinguished from the tax on the paraikoi (Oiikoumenon), which was calculated according to principles that are not yet clear. The secondary taxes, smaller in number but not necessarily lighter, presented substantial regional variations (Lefort, “Fiscalité” 315–54).

Between 1404 and 1420, the Byz. administration, established in the Chalkidike after 20 years of Ottoman domination, perpetuated the pre-existing fiscal system with some Islamic taxes—the harac (land tax), the usr (tithe), the kephalatikon (capitation)—and with very few secondary taxes and services (N. Oikonomides, SüdostF 45 [1986] 1–24). (See also Taxation.)


FISH BOOK. See Opsarologos.

FISHING (ἄλειος). Peasants living in villages along the seacoast, or near a river, marsh, or pond, engaged in fishing to secure an important source of protein in their diet. The Great Lavra on Mt. Athos possessed, among its autourgia, two canals for fishing, a fishing boat (harabion), and 60 fishponds (vivaria), while in the list of its paraikoi 56 boats and 374 vivaria are mentioned (Svoroнос in Lavra 4:163); the peasants paid a rent (halevo) for the right to fish. Another rent for fishing was called halieutike tritomoria or tetramoria (third or fourth part). In cities located on the coast there were teams of fishermen, each with a headman (prateuron), like the group of fishermen in Chalcidon whose catch was disappointing until Loukas the Styliote blessed their nets and made them promise to give him a tithe, that is, every tenth fish; the other fish were to be sold (Delehaye, Saints stiles 212f). Smoked fish and caviar were brought to Constantinople from the Azov Sea. Commercial fishing from a small fleet of boats in a sea inhabited by a variety of species illustrates the homily of John of Damascus on the Nativity in the 11th-C. Menologion from Athos, Esphigmenou 14 (Treasures 2, fig.348).

The images of fish and angler had an honorific place in the Byz. system of metaphors. Fish was the symbol of Christ himself (IXΘΥΣ = Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Θεου Υἱος Σωτῆρ), and it was common to send fish to friends as a valuable present; “fishers of men” was an epithet of the apostles.


-F.W.N., A.K., A.C.

FISHMONGER (ἰχθυοπράτης). The term ichthyoprates (or ichthyopoles) existed in Roman Egypt (Preisigke, Wörterbuch 1:705) where the profession seems to have been distinct from that of fisherman or halieus (ibid. 1:56) and that of the vendor of salted and smoked fish or tariheutes (the feminine form tarihepratissa is attested in a 6th-C. papyrus; ibid. 2:578f). Fishermen in Constantinople could sell their catch themselves, like the man described in the vita of Andrew en Krisei (AASS, Oct. 8:141B) who operated in the Forum Tauri and was armed with an ax “that is used by the men of his profession.” The Book of the Eparch, however, strictly distinguished between fishermen and ichthyopratai: the latter would buy the catch at the seashore and on the skalai and sell it in special kamara, vaulted shops, in the fish market, under the control of prostatai—either the eparch’s officials or the guild’s elders. Fishmongers were prohibited from dealing in salted and smoked fish (the privilege of the saldamanrioi or grocers); their profit was set at one miliarion per nomisma (about 8 percent) or 2 folles per nomisma—about 1.5 percent (Bk. of Eparch 17:1 and 3)—a contradiction that is hard to explain. John Tzetzes (ep.81.16–82.2) relates that fishmongers were buying 12 fish for a copper coin on the seashore and selling 10 fish for the same coin on the market, thus making
16.6 percent profit. The annual income of the fisc from the trade in fish was calculated in the 14th C. at 10,000 hyperpers (Greg. 1:428.19–20).


-A.K.

FIVE MARTYRS OF SEBASTEIA, Eustratios and his companions, Auxentios, Eugenios, Mardarios, and Orestes, legendary martyrs under Diocletian, executed in Sebasteia, Armenia; feastday 13 Dec. According to the legend, Eustratios Kyriskes, an officer (skriniarios) in the army of the doux Lysias, proclaimed himself a Christian and was condemned together with the priest Auxentios. Their courage inspired many others to accept martyrdom. Before death they were severely tortured: Eustratios had to wear shoes with sharp nails inside; Mardarios was hanged upside down; Eugenios's tongue and hands were cut off. When Auxentios was beheaded, a miracle occurred: his head disappeared, later to be found at the top of a tree. The collection of Symeon Metaphrastes includes the passio, poor in information; it mentions many ancient mythological personages and authors such as Hesiod, Aeschylus, Plato, and Aristotle. According to the Libri pontificales, the martyrs' relics were transferred to Rome under Pope Hadrian I (772–95), but Arauraka in Armenia, where they were buried, remained a cult center until the 11th C. Niketas David Paphalagon and Michael of Studious wrote Greek eulogies of the martyrs. Armenian, Latin, and Spanish versions of the passio also exist.

Representation in Art. The Five Martyrs of Sebasteia, the "Holy Five," as they were often called, were an extremely popular group, included in many monumental church programs, on icons, and in MSS (e.g., the Theodore Psalter, fol.158r). Their portraits are well established by the 11th C.: Eustratios as a dark-bearded official wearing a special chlamys fastened at the front with several clasps and a white loros or scarf around his neck; Auxentios as an old man in court costume; Eugenios, a younger man also in court costume; Mardarios, wearing a red felt hat; and Orestes, a young beardless soldier wearing a cross around his neck. The Menologion of Basil II (p.241) illustrates their diverse martyrdoms as do some MSS of the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes; one MS in Turin, which contains nothing but the metaphrastic vita of these saints, is illustrated with a considerable number of miniatures scattered through the text. A painted temple beam depicting 11 posthumous miracles of Eustratios has been preserved at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai; no textual source for the miracles has been found (Soteriou, Eikones, no.113).

SOURCE. PG 114:468–505.


-A.K., N.P.S.

FLABELLUM. See Rhipidion.

FLAG. See Battle Standard and Flag.

FLAVIAN (Φλαβιανός), bishop of Constantinople (July 446–between 8 and 11 Aug. 449); died Lydian Hypaepa Aug. 449 or Feb. 450. Elected as successor of Proklos, Flavian immediately entered into a conflict with the court: the eunuch Chrysaphios, favorite of Theodosios II, reprimanded Flavian for not sending presents of gold to the emperor on the occasion of his election, but the bishop refused to yield (Theoph. 98.11–19). Then, in 448, with Pope Leo I's support, Flavian dismissed Bassianos, the popular bishop of Ephesus, whose election had been approved by Theodosios II and Proklos. A crisis erupted when in 448 Flavian condemned and deposed the Monophysite archimandrite Eutyches, a protégé of Chrysaphios. Following an appeal by Eutyches, Theodosios II convened the "Robber" Council of Ephesus (449), which deposed Flavian. The mood in Ephesus was evidently hostile to Flavian; even its bishop Stephen voted for Flavian's condemnation. Flavian was banished and probably died en route to exile, even though shortly afterward the legend arose that he had been murdered by his enemies. Emp. Marcian ordered that Flavian's remains be brought to Constantinople and buried
in the Church of the Holy Apostles. Emp. Leo I and the Council of Chalcedon praised Flavian in 451 as a victim of the Monophysites.

ED. PL. 51:724-28, 731-36.

---A.K.

FLAVIANUS, a Roman senatorial family closely related to and ideologically connected with that of SYMMACHUS. Two Flavius played a signal role under Theodosios I. Virius Nicomachus Flavianus (ca.334-94) belonged to the intellectual elite of Rome and was known as a translator, a character in Macrobius's Saturnalia, and a historian; his Annales, which extended to 366, served as the main source for AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS. He owned estates in Apulia and Sicily. A dogged supporter of paganism, he favored the Donatists in 377, while serving as vicarius of Africa, and was dismissed by Gratian; Theodosios, however, restored him to favor, appointing him quaesitor in 389 and then praetorian prefect for Illyricum and Italy. His son, Nicomachus Flavianus junior, obtained Theodosios's favor even earlier, and served in 382/3 as proconsul of Asia. Dismissed for flogging a decurion, he fled home, escaping the emperor's wrath. Both father and son joined the insurrection of Eugenius; after their defeat, the father committed suicide and the son found asylum in a church. He obtained Theodosios's pardon by accepting Christianity and promising to return the salary he and his father were paid during Eugenius's usurpation. He served in Italy and Africa (until 432) and was three times urban prefect. Their relation to other Flavius is not specified in the sources.


---A.W.C.

FLOOD, THE (κατακαλυσμός). According to the Chronicon Paschale (42.12-16), the inundation of the world (Gen 6-8) completed the period of "barbarism" that encompassed the ten generations from Adam to Noah when men had no ruler and everyone lived in accordance with his own law. GEORGE THE SYNKELOS states (15.24-27) that before the flood men occupied a small area between Paradise and the ocean, but thereafter they started settling all over the earth. Thus the flood was the starting point for the development of individual "nations."

The flood posed a serious problem for exegetes: how to reconcile the extermination of all mankind (except for Noah and his family) with the idea of divine mercy. As John Chrysostom put it (PG 55:448.14-15), the flood allows us to contemplate the balance between God's mercy and God's justice. The flood was caused by men's sins that needed to be punished, but, on the other hand, those who were destroyed have been given time to repent; the mercy of God was symbolized by the olive branch. Previously Origen had rejected other explanations of the flood, such as it being an element of the cosmic cycle or representing a change in the divine plan. The flood was also construed as the prefiguration (typos) of baptism.

FLIGHT INTO EGYPT. The Holy Family's flight to escape Herod's massacre of the young children (Mt 2:13-15) belongs to the cycle of Christ's Infancy. It appears often in 4th- through 6th-C. art, where, cast as an imperial adventus, it assumes triumphal significance: Mary and Christ ride a donkey led by a youth or angel toward a city and the personification of Egypt; Joseph follows. Some versions depict palms, recalling Christ's similarly triumphal Entry into Jerusalem (see also PALM SUNDAY) and a domed city, perhaps Heliopolis, where—according to pseudo-Matthew and The Arabian Gospel of the Childhood of Christ—the idols fell when Christ arrived. The adventus composition recurs in the 10th C. at GOREME, with the youth labeled JAMES. Generally, however, the triumphal element dwindles, and later versions emphasize Christ's humanity. The personification appears only sporadically, Joseph takes the lead (see FRIEZE GOSPELS), and, in certain 12th-C. compositions, he carries Christ on his back (Cappella Palatina at Palermo). Palaiologan painters relished this detail, but also depicted the triumphal scene of the falling idols (CHORA).


---A.K.
The vivid narrative of the Flood and Noah’s Ark (Gen 7:17–8:14) was widely illustrated in the great repositories of Genesis iconography, such as the Cotton Genesis and Vienna Genesis (Weitzmann, Late Ant. Ill., pl.23) but was rare in monumental art.


—A.K., J.H.L.

**FLOOR MOSAIC** (ψηφωτητήμα, λιθόστρωτον), floor covering composed of tesserae, cube-shaped pieces of stone or glass, set into mortar in geometric and/or figural designs. The craft was widespread in the Roman Empire and continued uninterrupted into late antiquity; it flourished from the 4th to the 6th C. but was apparently not practiced in Byz. after the 7th. Late Antique floor mosaics are almost exclusively *opus tessellatum*, i.e., composed of uniform tesserae of variously colored stone—primarily marble and limestone—sometimes supplemented with terra-cotta and/or glass tesserae. Their substrata comprise three layers of progressively finer and thinner lime mortar with ground brick or *pizzocolana*: the *radius* (a layer of coarse mortar poured over packed stones), the *nucleus*, and the setting bed.

Floor mosaic was used widely in public buildings and luxurious residences where it provided a decorative, durable, and waterproof surface; it was apparently less prestigious than *opus sectile*. Figures and ornament of floor mosaics generally follow the style of monumental painting. Scholars have identified criteria of composition and style unique to floor mosaics, but the inherently conservative nature of the craft and variations according to region and quality make dating by style uncertain. Not only ornament, but subject matter and style varied according to region; until the early 4th C., eastern Mediterranean mosaics displayed illusionistic mythological scenes in prominent frames placed in the center of the floor, in contrast to the polychrome depictions of hunts and other subjects from the amphitheater on North African mosaics (see North Africa, Monuments of) or the black-and-white style typical of Rome and Ostia.

In some regions these practices continued during the early 4th C.; elsewhere style and/or subject matter changed significantly. The eastern Mediterranean was particularly conservative. Illusionistic mythological scenes still dominated pavements at Antioch and Shahba-Philippopolis. In the Balkans, some mosaics (e.g., at *Sirmium*) show influence from western Europe, others from the East. Polychrome hunting and marine mosaics with two-dimensional figures distributed across the entire floor, as in Roman North Africa, then became popular in other regions, including Italy. The largest ensemble of early 4th-C. mosaics, at Piazza Armerina, included subjects—hunts, marine scenes, *putti* harvesting grapes—close to contemporary floors in *Carthage*. At *Ganizgrad* in eastern Serbia, *Emp. Galerius* decorated his palace with hunting mosaics. Such subjects were rare in the 4th-C. eastern Mediterranean; those in the “Constantinian Villa” at Antioch are exceptional. After the edicts of toleration issued in ca.311–13 (see Edict of Milan) monumental Christian buildings, as at *Aquileia*, provided new settings for floor mosaics. Christian subjects were combined with preexisting decorative and figural elements. *Synagogues* were also decorated with floor mosaic, sometimes figural, e.g., the zodiac at *Hammath Tiberias*.

By the end of the 4th C., most floor mosaics were ecclesiastical. At this time a vogue for strictly geometric floor mosaics—in churches and secular buildings alike—dominated the eastern Mediterranean, e.g., at Antioch (Kaissie Church), Aphaia, Epidaurus, Salona. They extended as far west as northern Italy, while figural mosaics remained popular in North Africa and Italy.

Most 5th-C. floor mosaics in the eastern Mediterranean, particularly in Syria and Palestine, had figures executed in a two-dimensional style, contained in a geometric framework or regularly distributed across a white ground. The same themes dominated in secular and religious contexts. Depictions of animals alone or in rustic scenes and hunts, rare in the East earlier, now became extremely popular. Usually the subject matter remains secular, e.g., at Huarte (Basilica of Photios), Antioch (Martyrion of Seleucia), Tabgha (Nilotic scenes in *Heptapegon*). Sometimes biblical content was introduced: Adam appeared among the animals at Huarte (Michaelion), Noah’s Ark was depicted at Mopsuestia, the “Peaceable Kingdom” was a popular theme in *Glicia*, e.g., Karlik. Biblical narrative scenes like
the Samson cycle at Mopsuestia are rare in floor mosaics, evidently deemed inappropriate for them. In an edict of 427, Theodosius II forbade placing the sign of Christ on pavements (Cod. Just. 1. 8). In the Balkans, geometric mosaics remained the norm well into the 5th C. When figures reappeared, they were less varied than in Syria. Figure carpets with birds and vessels and the Fountain of Life flanked by deer or peacocks were popular. Geometric floors with donor inscriptions remained common into the 6th C. in Dalmatia and northern Italy. Christian mosaics of North Africa were restrained, tomb mosaics with symbolic motifs being typical.

In the 6th C. floor mosaics continued to flourish in Phoenicia and Palestine, but fewer were laid in Syria than in the 5th. Elements of the natural world, including personifications of seasons and months, remained the most common subjects. Frequently these subjects were incorporated into ornament. The medallion style, characterized by a decorative framework of repeated circles sometimes outlined by stylized vine RINCEAUX, was particularly prominent, as at Kabr Hiram. Mosaics of the period of Justinian I reflect the concept of the church building as microcosm, with the terrestrial world depicted on the floor, e.g., GERASA, Church of St. John, MADABA MOSAIC MAP. At M T. NEBO, compositions symbolic of paradise were placed in sanctuaries. Many synagogues received floor mosaics representing ceremonial utensils and images of the zodiac (Beth Alpha) or animals in vine scrolls (as at Nirim). Depictions of the natural world penetrated into the Balkans by the late 5th–6th C. Personifications of the months appear at Tegea and again at Argos. Elaborate representations of terrestrial creation are seen at Herakleia Lynkestis and the Dometius Basilica at Nikopolis.

In the peristyle of the GREAT PALACE in Constantinople, illusionistic depictions of animals, circus scenes, and vignettes from nature were scattered across a white ground. Although this mosaic somewhat resembles the 5th-C. mosaics of northern Syria, available archaeological evidence suggests a 6th- or 7th-C. date. Seventh-century floor mosaics are rare in the provinces. Only a few crude examples, such as the scenes of everyday life from Deir el-Adas in Syria, can be dated so late. The craft declined together with the provincial cities, although it was briefly revived outside Byz., in Umayyad mosques and desert palaces in Syria and Palestine in the 8th C.


FLOORS. The Greek word πατος (πατος) designated both a story of a building ("second πατος"—Latav 3, no.154.5-6; "fourth πατος"—Koutloum., no.15.93) and "floor" in the usual sense (Patmou Engraphe 2, no.52.170). Ordinary houses had floors made of pounded earth (they were called "without floors," ἀπατός—Patmou Engraphe 2, no.52.165), wooden boards (xylopatoś—MM 3:58.18, or sandopatoś—Patmou Engraphe 2, no.52.168), or might even be paved with marble (μαρμαροπατοś—Patmou Engraphe 2, no.50.103, or πατος dia marmaron—MM 3:55.28-29). Palaces, mansions, and churches often had opus sectile or mosaic floors (see FLOOR MOSAIC). Archaeological data testify to the preservation of ancient techniques of flooring (A.G. McKay, Houses, Villas and Palaces in the Roman World [Southampton 1975] 1981); furthermore, ancient materials were frequently reused for floor renovation (Ch. Bouras, DChAE 11 [1982-83] 101). Mosaic floors were laid on a layer of mortar, which in turn was set on a bed of sand or of crushed marble and small pebbles (A.L. Jakobson, Rannesrednevekovij Chersones [Moscow-Leningrad 1959] 222).

A law of 427 (Cod. Just. 1.8.1) and canon 73 of the Council in Trullo prohibited depicting signs of the cross on the floor lest they be stepped on; the law of 427 was included in the Basilika (Basil. 1.1.6). Balsamon, commenting on these decisions, distinguished between those who depicted the cross on the floor due to their simplicity and excessive piety and those who did it consciously to show their disrespect for the cross (Rhalles-Potles, Synonyma 2:475.28-33).


FLORENCE (Φλωρεντία), city in Tuscany. In the late Roman period the city's territory decreased significantly, though the legend that Florence was destroyed by Totila and rebuilt by Charlemagne strongly exaggerates the events. S. Reparata (over
60 m long) is one of the larger churches built in Italian urban centers in late antiquity, and as such is good evidence for local patronage of ecclesiastical construction. The site of the Roman forum continued to be used in medieval times as a market. Local tradition links the establishment of Christianity in Florence with Eastern influence; A. Amore (in *Bibl. Sacr.* 9 [1967] 494) believes that in 6th-C. Florence a chapel of St. Menas, housing his relics, spurred the development of the local cult of St. Miniasus.

In 1094 Pope Urban II visited Florence, Pisa, and Pistoia calling for participation in the First Crusade, but Florence remained aloof. Later some of the city's high-ranking clergymen participated in the Crusades: Guido of Florence, the cardinal-priest of San Chrysogono, was the pope's legate to the Second Crusade and contributed to the reconciliation between the Byz. and the Westerners; at the beginning of the 13th C. Walter of Florence was bishop of Acre. In the 14th C. the Florentines became more active in the East even though Florence's role was less sophisticated than that of Venice, Genoa, or Pisa: bankers from Florence established themselves at Alexia; the Florentine family of Acciaiuoli became major landowners in the Peloponnese but retained ties with Florence (they were involved in constructing a monastery in Certosa near Florence); the 14th-C. Florentine merchant Francesco Pergolotti demonstrated interest in and knowledge of trade with Constantinople; and the names of Florentines trading with "Turkey" are recorded in Genoese archives (e.g., M. Balard, *Gênes et l'Outre-Mer*, vol. 1 [Paris–The Hague 1973] no. 257, a. 1289). In the 15th C. Florentines tried to receive trade privileges in Constantinople; they were granted a chrysobull in 1439. The despotes of Mistra sent envoys to Florence in 1446 and 1450.

The Florentines participated in preparations for the Council of Ferrara-Florence in the mid-15th C.; they sent a ship to Constantinople to bring some Greeks to Italy (Syropoulos, *Mémoires* 198.5) and were active in persuading the delegates to leave Ferrara, which was ravaged by plague, and to move to Pisa or another city in Florentine territory; finally the council was transferred to Florence at the beginning of 1439. In the 15th C. Florentine humanists had contacts with Byz. scholars such as Plectron. After the fall of Constantinople Florence provided refuge for some Greek intellectuals: thus Demetrios Chalkokondyles (a relative of Laonikos Chalkokondyles) became a professor of Greek language in Florence in 1475; a large collection of Greek manuscripts was assembled in the city.


---

FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF. See Ferrara-Florence, Council of.

FLORILEGIUM (L., lit. "collection of flowers"), a Western medieval term conventionally applied to a Byz. genre of excerpts from earlier authors collected with an explicit purpose. The term is used esp. for theological anthologies, in contrast to predominantly secular collections of *gnomai* or *gnomologia*. A florilegium of quotations from commentators on the Bible, strung together and attached to a biblical text, is called a *catena*; one consisting of secular verse is termed an *anthology*; short *florilegia*, composed of groups of approximately 100 sentences on either religious or secular matters, are known as "centuries."

Richard (infra) distinguishes between dogmatic and spiritual *florilegia*. Up to the end of the 4th C., the former were rare, an exception being the *Philokalia* compiled by Basii the Great and Gregory of Nazianzos from Origen's writings. They became more common during the 5th-C. Christological disputes and during the Monothelete and Iconoclast controversies. A later example is the *Panoplia Dogmatike* of Euthymios Zigabenos.

Spiritual *florilegia* with a moral and ascetic emphasis appear from the 8th C. onward. Richard divides them into three categories. The first includes those based on the *Sacra Parallela* (attributed to John of Damascus) and related texts. The second includes a group of sacro-profane *florilegia* beginning with the *Locii Communis* (or *Capita Theologica*), attributed to Maximos the Confessor, but compiled in the 10th C. They flourished during the period of so-called *encyclopedism* (end of 9th to 10th C.) and in the 11th C. (Melissa). Based on the *Sacra Parallela* and, in their profane part, on *Stobaios*, they were directed toward an educated public of both clergy and laity. The third category includes monastic
florilegia, of which the first example is attributed to Anastasios of Sinai (the Erodotopoiis). They flourished in the 11th C. and later; their authors included Nikicon of the Black Mountain and John IV Onites of Antioch. Although florilegia usually contained sententiae of various church fathers, collections from a single author (e.g., Basil the Great) are known (J.F. Kindstrand, *Eranos* 83 [1985] 113–24).


—E.M.J. A.K.

**FLORIS AND BLANCHEFLOR.** See Phlorios and Platziia-Phlora.

**FOEDERATI** (φοιδεράτοι, from Lat. foedus, "treaty"), in Roman law a term for the barbarian tribes who were allies of the empire. In the 4th C. the term was applied to those barbarian groups that—like the Visigoths in 332—were settled on the territory of the Roman Empire on the condition of providing military service (E. Chrysos, *Dacoromania* 1 [1973] 52–64). The term was transferred to elite (mainly mounted) troops recruited primarily from various barbarian tribes. There has been some confusion over the date of this change. C. Benjamin (*infra*), referring to Malal. 374.12–13, spoke of a certain Areobindus, comes of foederati in the reign of Theodosios I, although he questioned the veracity of this evidence and himself placed the beginning of the institution of the "new foederati" in the reign of Honorius; Malalas, however, made Areobindus a contemporary of Theodosios II, not Theodosios I.

The 5th-C. historian Olympiodorus of Thebes (fr.7—FHG 4:9.6–10) states that the terms boukellariotai and foederati appeared under Honorius, but his evidence may be anachronistic. They are better known from the sources of the 6th C. Prokopios (Wars 3:11.3) stresses the further change in the status of the foederati: while previously only barbarians were enlisted as foederati, in his day anyone could join their ranks.


**FOLIO** (from Lat. folium, Gr. φύλλον, "leaf"), a leaf of a quire, consisting of one half of a folded sheet (bifolium or unio) of parchment or paper. In Byz., MSS only the front of the leaf (i.e., the right-hand page, or recto, as opposed to the reverse side, or verso) is numbered, if there is any numberation at all (most numberation of folios has been added later by owners or librarians). Thus, in modern citations of MSS, folio numbers are qualified by the addition of "recto" or "verso" (abbreviated r and v), e.g., fol.317r or 31v. Normally eight folios (folia), or four sheets, constitute a quire.

—A.M.T. R.B.

**FOLLIS** (φόλλις), a Latin word originally meaning a purse and applied to bags of coins of any metal of determined value. This remained its meaning until the end of the 4th C. The bishop-archon EUPHANORIS of Salamis defines it as a bag of 125 silver pieces. The description of the largest bronze coin of the Tetrarchy as a follis is an anachronism. (It was called a nummus.) With the reintroduction of heavy copper denominations at the end of the 5th C. the term was applied to the heaviest of these, the 40-nummus piece bearing the mark of value M (= 40). This remained the normal meaning of the word until the end of the 11th C., the notional value of folles being 1/24th of a miliareion and 1/288th of a solidus, though it is not likely that these ratios can have been sustained in the 7th–8th C., when the follis's weight fell from the approximately 16 g of the early 6th C. to not much over 4 g. The follis was sometimes called an obol, mainly in literary sources but also in, for example, the Book of the Eparch. After Alexios I's coinage reform of 1092, the follis was replaced as a coin by the smaller tetarteron and as a unit of account displaced by the keration, so the word gradually disappeared from use. Its Italian equivalent follaro (from follis auris "copper follis"), used at Dubrovnik and elsewhere for locally minted copper coins, was applied by Badoer and other foreign merchants to the smallest copper coin of 15th-C. Con-
stamnople, but the Greek name for these is unknown.

**FONDOCA.** See PHONDAX.

**FONT, BAPTISMAL** (κολυμβηθρα, βαπτιστηριον, φωτισμηριον), a built or stone-carved basin in a special annex of the narthex or atrium of a church or an autonomous baptistery. Until about the 7th C., a large font, set deep into the baptistery floor, was mainly intended for the baptism of adults; this could be square, rectangular, circular, hexagonal, octagonal, cross-shaped, four-lobed, or multi-lobed in plan. Later, however, smaller fonts, carved in marble or cast in bronze and usually chalice-shaped, were used for the baptism of children only. At Hosios Loukas the font is decorated with lion masks (R.W. Schultz, S.H. Barnsley, *The Monastery of Saint Luke* [London 1901] 32). Other important examples are the roughly octagonal font at the monastery of Hosios Mietios (*ABME* 5 [1939-40] 103, fig.51) and a round one from the Church of the Holy Apostles in the Athenian Agora (A. Xyngopoulos in *Euriterion ton mesaionkon neuomian tes Hellados*, vol. 1.1, no.2 [Athens 1929], fig.74).

**FOOT-STOOL** (υποποδιον, σουππεδιον), a normal concomitant of the throne and a symbol of relative superiority within sacred or social hierarchies. Following Isaiah 66:1 and Psalm 109:1, Christ is sometimes represented seated in heaven with his feet on a footstool connoting the world. At ceremonies, the emperor stood or sat with his feet on a podium, a purple cushion, or porphyry disc (rota); in his portraits a more or less elaborate footstool is customary. When the figure of the emperor was centrally placed, even between an archangel and a church father (Spatharakis, *Portrail*, fig.72), the emperor's footstool implies that he outranked them. When a ruler or other mortal flanks a sacred figure, he is rarely elevated in this fashion. Ecclesiastics are almost never shown raised on a footstool. Some wooden footstools included a heating device (Koukoules, *Bios* 2:2:80f).

**FOOD.** See Diet.

**FOOLS, HOLY** (σαλοι), a group of saints gifted with extreme foresight who, in their humility, pretended to be half-witted ("fools for Christ's sake"). The series of holy fools begins with Symeon of Emesa who embodied—in an extreme form—protest against the traditional values of urban civilization; the Life of Andrew the Fool is less extreme. The author of the Life of Basit the Younger says that this saint claimed to be "foolish" (although he remained wise and learned) in order to escape the traps of the Devil (ed. Veselovskij, 1:50:33-4). The unpredictable and enigmatic actions and words of these saints manifest their freedom from earthly bondage and their attachment to the heavenly world. A secularized version of the holy fool is found in the Life of Philaretos the Merciful, whose extraordinary generosity was viewed as "foolish" by his family and who was rewarded on earth with worldly well-being. Byzantine salo found continuators and imitators in the Russian *juridince*.

**FOOTWEAR** (υποδηματα). In antiquity there were three kinds of footwear: open sandals fastened with leather straps, shoes covering the foot, and high boots. All three types were used in Byz., but boots seem to have become most common: the term *tspanion* shifted from the sandal to the boot; Niketas Choniates (*Nik.Chon. 322.26-27*) considered white boots, *krepedes*, reaching up to the knees, as the typical footwear of a laborer; in artistic representations, the emperor and members of his family are always depicted wearing the same type of high red boots, adorned with little rows of pearls, esp. at the tips and ankles. The Virgin Mary is shown wearing this kind of footwear, although without pearls; their bright color contrasts with her dark robes. Angels too wear such boots when clad in the imperial loros.

Courtiers are depicted as shod in black, though
little can be seen of the form of their shoes under the long tunics. Active figures in shorter tunics are shown wearing high boots to the mid-calf, composed either of what looks like soft white leather above a hard black sole or of strap-work like a high sandal; in many of these cases it is hard to determine what is legging and what is shoe. Shepherds, such as those in scenes of the Nativity, occasionally wear fleece leggings above bare feet; bare feet are otherwise rare, reserved for peripheral figures such as demoniacs. John Chrysostom considered it shameful to appear in the agora without *hypodemata*, but going barefoot was a common form of penance and mortification of the flesh.

In art, monks and the clergy are depicted as wearing low black slippers, surely the *kaligia* mentioned in *typika*; for example, at the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople a monk was issued two pairs of *kaligia* annually (P. Gautier, *REB* 32 [1974] 65.609–10), at the Kosmoseitara at Bera one pair (L. Petit, *IRA 19* [1908] 49.17). In the late Roman period one form of sandals was called *kamagia*. *John Lydos* (*De mag. 30.22–32.5*) described them as black footgear supporting the sole and toes and bound with leather straps to the ankle. They formed a part of the patrician costume. There were also military *kamagia* (*Lat. campagi militares*), mentioned in Diocletian’s Price Edict; according to Malalas (*Malal. 322.10–11*), soldiers wore *kamagia* and *chlamydes* at festivities. In the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos and *De ceremoniis*, *kamagia* are the footgear of officials.

Footwear was produced by shoemakers from leather and cloth, esp. silk. Shoes were usually black or white, though bright colors (purple, green, blue) had social significance and were worn by the emperor and officials of highest ranks. Information on the price of shoes is scarce: in Diocletian’s Price Edict it ranges between 50 and 120 denarii, in a Vazelon document of 1272 *kaligia* cost two asporoi.


**FOREIGNERS** (*έβοι, also *ethnikoi*) were equated in the late Roman Empire with *barbarians* since it was assumed that the empire encompassed the entire civilized world, the *oioumenes*. Foreigners were either direct enemies or mercenaries and *foederati*. In the late 4th and 5th C. they dominated the Roman army, providing such high-ranking generals as *Gainas*, *Stilicho*, and *Aspar*; this provoked a xenophobic reaction sometimes expressed in demands for the restoration of a native army (*synesthes*), sometimes in massacres of Germanic garrisons (whose soldiers were also unpopular as Arian heretics), and sometimes in attempts to replace foreigners by local tribes such as the *Isaurians*. After the 7th C. the mass recruitment of foreigners as mercenaries ceased, even though some foreign contingents (*e.g.*, the “Persian tagma” of *Theophobos*) served in Byz. armies. The late 9th-C. *Kletorologion* of Philotheos (*Oikoumides, *Listes* 177.29–30*) lists as *ethnikoi* the *Khazars*, *Hagarenes*, *Franks*, and the enigmatic *Phargani*. The recruitment of foreigners (*Rus’*, Franks-Normans, Englishmen, etc.) increased after the end of the 10th C. They formed a special corps of *ethnikoi* (*e.g.*, *Lavra 1, no.33.82*) under the command of an *ethnarches* (*Oikoumides, *Listes* 271.24*) or *primikerios* of the *ethnikoi* (*Zacos, *Seals* 2, no.732*).

In the 12th C. the role of Turkish mercenaries became probably more important than that of Westerners. At the same time the character of Western infiltration began to change: from the 12th C. onward, Western residents tended to be diplomats and advisers rather than military commanders; an esp. significant group among them were *merchants*, primarily Italians (Venetians, Genoese, etc.), who settled in special colonies in both Constantinople and the provinces.

The government tried to make foreigners adjust to Byz. conditions: they were given lands and sometimes tax privileges, and marriage with Greeks was encouraged: the vita of Athanasia of Aegina refers to an edict that required all single women and widows to marry *ethnikoi* (*F. Halikin, *Six médiévistes d’histoire byzantine* [Brussels 1987] 181.7–9*). The attitude toward foreigners outside the empire was also shifting: the system of *foederati* gradually disappeared, and the concept of equilateral alliances with western, northern, and eastern powers (Frankish and later German empire, Caliphate, Khazar Khaganate, etc.) was introduced; the relations with allies were regulated by political and commercial treaties. Nevertheless the perception of foreigners as barbarians, heterodox, and schismatic prevailed; Kekaumenos argued against raising foreigners to high rank, Constantine VII
Porphyrogennetos discouraged imperial marriages with foreigners, and the number of such matches remained limited in the 10th and 11th C. In the 12th C. this attitude began to change, and the number of marriages with foreign princes increased dramatically. Niketas Choniates emphasized that there were bad and good foreigners and dared to create an idealized portrait of Frederick I Barbarossa. Commercial competition and the increasing political dominance of Italians in Byz. cities as well as the narrow-minded policy of the Catholic church and the Frankish princes on territories occupied by the Crusaders contributed to growing animosity against Westerners, while economic collaboration, mixed marriages, and the need for joint resistance to the Turks created a basis for better mutual understanding. This ambivalent situation is reflected in the unsuccessful attempt at Union of the Churches.


FORGERY, LITERARY, a work whose actual author differs from the author whose name appears in the title. One should distinguish between medieval and modern forgeries. The latter were the creation of scholars (primarily from the 16th to early 19th C.) and were either ascribed to famous church fathers (e.g., A. Harnack, Die Pfaffen-Irenäus-Fragmente als Fälschungen Pfaffen nachgewiesen [Leipzig 1900]) or were anonymous like the fragments of Toparcha Gothicus. Medieval forgeries include both legal (laws and documents) and literary texts. Byz. forgeries were prompted primarily by religious zeal, the need to refute heretical views and corroborate those of the author by apostolic or patristic authority, or to promote the veneration of a local saint or martyr whose biography remained obscure. Political interests of the state, of an institution (like the papacy), or noble family could play an important role, and economic claims were involved in issuing bogus monastic charters.

The forms of forgery varied: modest alterations and interpolations, fake translations (W. Speyer, JbAChr 11–12 [1968–69] 26–41), fake quotations in florilegia, false prooimia to genuine works, apocrypha, Lives of saints of Apostolic times purportedly written by their disciples (e.g., Pankra-}

Tios of Taormina), pseudonyms, and false minutes of authoritative assemblies. The author of a fictitious text might even imitate archaic handwriting (L. Rydén, DOP 32 [1978] 132–34). Among the most notorious ancient and medieval forgeries are the Historia Augusta, pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, the Apostolic Constitutions, and the Donation of Constantine. Many works were ascribed to famous writers (some to several different ones); others appear under unknown names, but the events described are chronologically misplaced.


FORMOSUS, pope (from 6 Oct. 891); born Rome; ca.815/16, died 4 Apr. 896. Bishop of Porto from 864. Formosus served as legate of Popes Nicholas I and Hadrian II. In 866/7 he led a mission to Bulgaria to bring the country under Roman jurisdiction (Dujčev, Medioveco 1:183–92). He also played an important role at the Council in Rome (July 869) that anathematized Photios. A candidate for the papacy in 872, Formosus was defeated by John VIII and soon thereafter deposed from his bishopric and banished. He was restored to his see, however, in 883 by Pope Marinus I and was elected pope after the death of Stephen V, despite already being bishop of another see. After he ascended the papal throne Formosus sought the support of Arnulf, king of the eastern Franks, who entered Rome and was crowned by Formosus. In his relations with Constantinople Formosus maintained neutrality between the parties of Photios and Ignatios.


FORMULARIES, model books for drafting documents; used by major chanceries and, more
often, by less educated and less pretentious notaries. They reflect the reality that prevailed at a certain moment and in one particular part of the empire (the hypothesis of regional formularies has been suggested on the basis of the preserved notarial acts). Such collections of formulas, mostly from the 13th C. onward, are preserved in literary and legal MSS. The chancery formulas were classified either by possible addressee or in order to guarantee the respect of etiquette (as shown in the Ekthesis Nea), or by subject in order to provide the proper rhetorico-philosophical prefaces for solemn documents (e.g., Prooimia).


-N.O.

FORTIFICATIONS. Fortification was a necessity that has left traces throughout the Byz. Empire, providing the most abundant and massive class of remains. Principles and techniques were inherited from the Romans; Byz. added little but consistently maintained a tradition of massive stone fortification. In the Roman defensive system, the main fortification was along the frontier (limes) where the bulk of the army was stationed, forming a network of fortresses strengthened by a deep militarized defensive zone. Within the empire, fortification was rare.

The invasions of the 3rd C. brought significant changes: thereafter, cities were regularly surrounded by walls, a response to the constant danger of attack. Major Byz. settlements were fortified and typically situated on a defensible hilltop. The fortress (kastron), which contained the garrison and civil and ecclesiastical officials, often became the core of a settlement that extended outside the walls (emporion). Characteristic Byz. fortifications consisted of fortified commercial cities (e.g., Constantinople, Thessalonike, Attaleia); thematic capitals (Nicaea, Ankyra) that were important military bases; subordinate military outposts (Kotyaion); and forts that commanded routes by land (Malagina) and sea (Hieron). For the rural population, refuge sites were extremely important, usually consisting of large and remote hilltops where the population of a district could flee at the time of attack. Monks also felt the need for defense, so monasteries in the countryside were commonly fortified (N.C. Moutsopoulos in Pyrgoi kai Kastra [Thessalonike 1980] 8-43).

Byz. fortified sites were defended by man and by nature. Byz. defenses typically consisted of a curtain wall with projecting towers of varying shape and heavily fortified gates. They were massively built, with a core of mortared rubble and a facing whose nature varied with time and place. Elaborate fortifications had a lower outer wall (proteichisma). A moat (taphros) was common at sites on flat terrain. Defense was from platforms on the towers, where catapults and ballistas were employed, and from the parapets of the walls, manned by archers. Often a city had, besides the outer line of fortification, an inner citadel (koula in Kekaumenos). Larger fortifications had additional defensive levels in chambers within walls and in towers. Fortifications were generally designed to take advantage of a natural situation, usually a steep hilltop, a river, or other obstacle. Many were located for strategic reasons at road junctions, mountain passes, river crossings, or narrow straits.

While large structures like the walls of Constantinople, Nicaea, or Attaleia and barrier walls such as the Hexamilon were imperial foundations, most Byz. fortifications are anonymous, and building inscriptions are very rare. It is likely that the majority were built and maintained by the government through imposition of the kastroktesia, though the numerous refuge sites were probably the results of individual initiative. In the 11th C. and later, concessions allowed individuals to build fortifications on their estates, lay and monastic alike. The walls of Constantinople were manned by troops of low ranks, nomera, and teichistai, supplemented by the citizen militia; provincial fortifications were defended by the thematic troops, and minor fortifications by local landowners and citizens.

Byz. fortifications show a distinct historical development, with constant change until the end of the empire. The greatest Byz. fortification, which served as the model for many others, though never equalled, was the "land wall" of Constantinople (see under Constantinople, Monuments.
der Manuel I there was a defensive system, the Neokastro, which included the massive walls of Pergamon and several smaller forts set back in the hills. By his time, the idea of regular or decorative facing was in decline, and the strong concrete core was simply faced with rubble, covered by plaster for protection against the elements or the hooks of an enemy; walls were normally reinforced with an internal network of wooden beams which also attached the facing to the core. Adaptation to technological change is visible at Constantinople and Kotyai, where Manuel I built towers suitable for the installation of the new heavier catapult, the trebuchet, and for use of the crossbow. The Laskarids were also great fortification builders, with notable results at Nicaea. Under the Palaiologoi, Western techniques, such as tall keeps and machicoulis, played an increasing role. The last advance appears in the walls of John VIII at Constantinople, with round ports for firearms, which were fundamentally to transform fortification.

Until the 12th C., the art of fortification was far more developed in Byz. than the West. The great stone fortifications of the 7th C. have no counterpart in Europe. The Crusader castles built in Syria, the Peloponnese, and elsewhere, however, had innovative designs; and after the Crusades the West surpassed Byz., which has nothing to compare with the sophistication of French and English fortifications of the 13th C. Nevertheless, the walls of Byz. cities, which were usually far longer than those in Europe, proved adequate until the advent of cannon.


FORTY MARTYRS OF SEBASTEIA, saints; feastday 9 March. According to the homily of Basil the Great (PG 31:508-40), they were soldiers condemned for their Christian beliefs; forced to stand naked all night in an icy lake, they froze to death. Their corpses were burned and the ashes thrown into the water. Gregory of Nyssa and esp. Ephrem the Syrian developed the theme. Ephrem (or his Greek editor) provided a date and location for the martyrdom, near Pontic Sebasteia.
tyrdom was almost as widespread and established as any biblical feast scene: forty half-naked men of varying ages standing huddled together in shallow water, some intrepidly supporting the faint, others praying or cowering with apprehension while Christ above witnesses their plight. Forty crowns sometimes hover in the sky over their heads. This composition, an almost "academic" study in male physique, was reused for the representation of a group of the damned in the Last Judgment frescoes in the parekklesion at CHORA. The basic composition, which appears first on 10th-C. ivories, was occasionally expanded to include an image of the bathhouse and the guard who substituted at the last moment for the single member of the group who lost heart and fled to the warmth of the bathhouse (e.g., at ASINOU). Other episodes of the legend were also illustrated: the attemptedstoning of the saints, the beheading of the survivors of the frozen lake, and the burning, dispersal, and gathering of the relics (in the marginal Psalters, Der Nersesian, L'illustration II 92f, and in the prothesis of the Church of St. Sophia in OHRID). These scenes may reflect a lost cycle in Constantinople or in the martyr's church in Caesarea.


-A.K., N.P.S.

FORTY-TWO MARTYRS OF AMORION, legendary saints executed in 845 by the Arabs in Samarra; feastday 6 Mar. The monk Euodios wrote the martyrs' legend, probably soon after the event described. In a verbose preamble, he theorized that the adoption of heretical opinions by emperors caused all Byz. defeats; the capture of AMORION in 838 was the last link in the chain. Evidently confusing the caliph al-Mu'tasim (833–42) with his son al-Wāthic (842–47), during whose reign the martyrs were executed, Euodios credits "Abesak," the protosymbolos of the Ishmaelites,
with seizing Amorion after a 13-day siege, slaugh-
tering all the inhabitants and soldiers, and
leading the commanders of seven themes into
captivity. Theological discussions between the
martyrs and various people dispatched to the jail
by the protosymboulos (gymnosophists, officials,
Greek traitors) make up the core of the legend.
The martyrs remained steadfast during their seven-
year ordeal, rejecting Islam and defending Chris-
tian values. Ethiopian executioners murdered them
on the bank of the Euphrates. Apparently the last
example of the genre of collective martyrdom
(which did not survive the 9th C.), Euodios’s leg-
end was important to later literature; V. Vasil’ev-
skij (infra, 101f) suggested that Theophanes Con-
tinuatus was aware of Euodios; several versions
of the legend appeared, including one ascribed
to Michael Synkellos.

Representation in Art. Unlike their counter-
parts, the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia, these mar-
tyrs were rarely represented; they appear merely
as a group of courtiers in chlamyses and tunics in
a MS of the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes
in Messina (Univ. Bibli., San Salvatore 27, fol.172v).

Ed. Skazanie o 42 amorijskich muzenikach, ed. V. Vasil’ev-
skij, P. Nikitin (St. Petersburg 1905).

Lit. BHG 1209–1214. A. Kazhdan, “Hagiographical

FORUM. See Agora. For forums of Constan-
tinople, see Constantinople, Monuments of.

FOUCHER OF CHARTRES. See Fulcher of
Chartres.

FOUNDER. See Ktetor.

FOUNTAIN OF LIFE. The fountain of life
(Gen 2:10) and its water were pervasive images
of Christian salvation. Baptistry decoration
throughout early Christendom showed the drink-
ing harts of Psalm 42:1 (see DEER) or birds flank-
ing vases. A 5th-C. floor mosaic at lunca in Tu-
sisia shows the four rivers of PARADISE flowing
from a circular fountain that recalls the Holy
Sepulchre in Jerusalem; from the 7th C. onward
the Holy Sepulchre itself was called “the fountain
of our resurrection.” Hymns call Christ a fountain of
life and the source of the life-giving water that
flows through the Gospels to nourish the Church
and link the water that flowed from his side at
the Crucifixion with baptism. Art reflects this lit-
erary image only in the frontispiece to a 12th-C.
Gospel book (E. Akurgal et al., Treasures of Turkey
[Geneva 1966] 119); there, to illustrate a verse
calling the Evangelists rivers of the Word, the
Evangelists are depicted with John pointing to
Christ as their source. A fountain came to signify
the harmony of the Gospels—fourfold but issuing
from one source—and the ornamental vases with
birds or beasts found in illuminated MSS may
refer to this. The Virgin Mary was known as the
Zoodochos Pege, or “life-giving fountain.”

Lit. P.A. Underwood, “The Fountain of Life in Manu-
scripts of the Gospels,” DOP 5 (1950) 41–138. T. Velma-
s, “Quelques versions rares du thème de la Fontaine de Vie
dans l’art paléochrétien,” CahîArch 19 (1969) 29–43. R.S.
Nelson, “Text and Image in a Byzantine Gospel Book in
Istanbul (Ecumenical Patriarchate, cod. 3)” (Ph.D. diss.,

FOURTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL. See
CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF.

FOWL, DOMESTIC. The Geoponika (bk.14)
preserves excerpts from ancient agronomists on
domestic fowl, describing pigeons and hens as well
as peacocks, pheasants, geese, and ducks; the Poul-
ologos has almost exactly the same assortment
of fowl—hens, pigeons, geese, pheasants, and
peacocks. Chickens provided the Byz. with the
best meat: the hen (ormitha) in the Poulologos (vv.
260–65) boasts that her chicks (poulia) have been
eaten by bishops, exarchs, priests, Varadariotes,
ambassadors, emperors, and senators, while a 12th-
C. author (Eust. Thess., Opuscula 311, 42–54) de-
scribes a fat, white ornis marinated in wine and
stuffed with dumplings. Chickens formed part of
the kaniskion (e.g., Iur. 1, no.29,97), and hens’
eggs were common even in the houses of the poor
(S. Papadimitriu, Feodor Prodrom [Odessa 1905]
165, n.107). John III Vatatzes encouraged the
development of the poultry “industry” in western
Asia Minor and presented his wife with a beautiful
crown acquired with money earned from the sale
of eggs. Domestic birds other than chickens were
rare; the martyr Tryphon is said to have fed geese
in his boyhood (Rudakov. Kultura 281, n.96).
Peacocks were popular on the estates of great
FRANCISCAUS, the Order of Friars Minor or Minorites (called φράτριοι by the Byz.). Founded by Francis of Assisi in 1209, the order expanded rapidly, numbering approximately 3,000 friars by 1221. It soon planned missionary expeditions to the East to convert the Muslims. Francis himself made a trip to the Holy Land in 1219 and then preached at the court of the sultan in Egypt. Other Franciscans soon became involved in missionary activities in the East, including Constantinople and Kaffa. By 1220 the Franciscans were influential at the court of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. In the 13th C. the Franciscan province of Romania expanded to roughly 20 convents. A number of Franciscan theologians, many of whom spoke Greek, served as papal legates to the Byz. court in Nicaea to discuss controversial points of theology, thus preparing the way for the Union of Lyons in 1274. The earliest of these was the English Franciscan, Haymo of Faversham, a master of theology at the University of Paris, whom Pope Gregory IX sent to Emp. John III Vatatzes in 1234 to discuss the UNION OF THE CHURCHES. The practice continued until the decisive missions of the Greek-born Franciscan, John Parastron, who accepted Mi-
Michael VIII's profession of faith prior to the Council of Lyons and also acted as interpreter there.

The most visible mark of the order's presence in the capital during the Latin occupation of 1204-61 is a cycle of frescoes devoted to the life of St. Francis in Kaleshriane Camii. When the Byz. recaptured Constantinople in 1261, the last Latin patriarch of the city left a member of the order there as his vicar, although the Franciscan convent was evidently abandoned. In ca.1296, however, the Franciscans returned and kept a convent in Constantinople until they were again expelled in 1307. Thereafter they maintained their house in Pera, continuing to serve as imperial emissaries to the pope as well as papal envoys to the imperial court throughout the 14th C. Some Franciscan churches built in the Greek provinces still survive, esp. on Crete.

FRANKOPOULOS. See Phrangopoulos.

FRANKS, a Germanic people, probably formed during the 3rd C. from a regrouping of several different tribes that inhabited the eastern bank of the lower Rhine. Subdued by Constantius Chlorus and Constantine I, the Franks were heavily recruited into the Roman army and a segment known as the Saliæ was settled in what is now the Netherlands. In the early 6th C., the Franks were united politically by Clovis (Chlodovechus, 481/2-511), who extended Frankish rule over the whole of Roman Gaul with the exception of Septimania and Provence. Clovis also converted to Orthodox Christianity, the first barbarian king to do so. This conversion and his victory over the Visigoths (508) contributed to a Byz. perception of the Franks as potential allies against the Arian Gothic kingdoms and later the Lombards in Italy. Merovingian kings from Clovis onward were frequently honored by Constantinople with the titles consul and patrikios.

Relations between the Franks and Byz. were often strained over conflicting interests in Italy, a situation exploited by the papacy in its struggle to extricate itself from Byz. control. The papal coronation of Charlemagne in 800 brought the Franks into political, religious, and ideological competition with Byz., while Charlemagne's victory over the Avars was a threat to Byz. influence on the Lower Danube. The decline of the Frankish empire in the 9th C. and its division into three parts by the Treaty of Verdun in 843 decreased the rivalry; Arab attacks on Italy even contributed to an alliance between Louis II and Basil I. In the 10th C. the role of the Western Empire was assumed by Germany, and creation of the kingdom of France began.

FRANKOPOULOS. See Phrangopoulos.

FRANKOPOULOS. See Phrangopoulos.
FREDERICK I BARBAROSSA (lt., lit. “Red-Beard”), king of Germany (1152–90) and Western emperor (crowned Rome 18 June 1155); born ca. 1125, died near Seleucia in Isauria 10 June 1190. When he succeeded Conrad III, Frederick (Φρεδερίκος) considered marrying a Byz. princess. He deemed the invasion of southern Italy (1155–57) by Manuel I a threat to his own claims there. When Manuel allied himself with William I of Sicily (1158), Frederick became his major Western opponent. Against Byz. pressure Frederick sought to maintain German ascendency over Hungary; with the installation of Béla III, Manuel triumphed there. From 1165 Manuel subsidized the League of Lombard towns in northern Italy, which in 1176 defeated Frederick (P. Classen, Ausgewählte Aufsätze [Sigmaringen 1983] 155–70). Pope Alexander III also opposed Frederick and ca. 1166–67 considered recognizing Manuel as sole emperor (ibid., 176–83; R.-J. Lille, ByzFg 9 [1985] 237–43). When in 1189 Frederick led the German portion of the Third Crusade through Byz. territory, Isaac II (to fulfill his agreement with Saladin) attempted to trap him in Thrace. German devastation compelled Isaac to yield (Treaty of Adrianople, 14 Feb. 1190). Frederick passed through Byz. Anatolia with little friction. Niketas Choniates admired Frederick’s devotion to the Crusade’s goal.


FREDERICK II HOHENSTAUFEN, king of Sicily (1198–1250), German emperor (1212–50); born Jesi 26 Dec. 1194, died Fiorentino 13 Dec. 1250. In his long struggle with the papacy, Frederick found it useful to build up contacts in Byz., esp. with John III Vatatzes (E. Merendino, Byzantino-Sicula 2 [1974] 371–83). By the late 1230s rumors were circulating in the West that Vatatzes had promised to do homage to Frederick if he helped him recover Constantinople. The Nicaean emperor contributed troops to Frederick’s forces at the siege of Brescia in 1238. In return, Frederick barred passage through southern Italy to forces going to the rescue of Latin Constantinople. If never technically a vassal, the Nicaean emperor allowed himself to be bound very closely to Frederick by marrying Frederick’s illegitimate daughter, Constance Lancia (“Anna”), ca. 1244 (Reg 3, no. 1779). Vatatzes gained little from this alliance.

When papal forces defeated Frederick at Parma in 1248, Vatatzes decided that more might be gained from the papacy. In 1249 the Nicaean emperor reached an understanding with papal envoys over the question of the Union of the Churches. The Hohenstaufen connection seems to have polarized the Nicaean court between those who wanted rapprochement with the papacy and those, like Theodore II Laskaris, who favored a continuing understanding with the Hohenstaufen. Theodore was much impressed by this upholder of the ideal of imperial authority in the face of the challenge from the papacy.

Frederick’s chancery was able to conduct its diplomacy with Byz. in Greek. Frederick’s patronage of Greek men of letters contributed to the last flowering of Greek literature in southern Italy, centered on the monastery of S. Nicola di Casole (M. Gigante, Poeti bizantini di Terra d’Otranto del secolo XIII [Galatina 1986]).


FREEDOM (ελευθερία), a concept developed in antiquity as the opposite of slavery and potential enslavement by the barbaric world. Freedom was conceived of as the possibility of free actions limited by virtue and responsibility, that is, by inner and social factors. Stoicism introduced the concept of determinism (as opposed to free will) and saw freedom as the acceptance of fate. Christianity made the problem even more complex by replacing blind fate with God’s providence (pronoia) and by emphasizing the ethical and soteriological aspect of freedom. The problem became evident in discussion incited by Pelagius (see Pelagianism) and in Christian refutations of Manichaean dualism. John of Damascus, using Ne-
MESIAS and some other predecessors, formulated that man is autéxousios, possessing free will, and responsible for evil-doing since God cannot be the cause of bad behavior; neither necessity (anánke or heimarmene, for eternal phenomena), nor nature (for plants and animals), nor Tyché (for chance events), nor automaton (sheer coincidence) determines events (Exp. fidei 39.23–39, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:97). Man is free to choose his actions, even though sometimes providence provides his plans from achieving fulfillment (Exp. fidei 40.17–18, p.98). Freedom can be the source of wrongdoing: the ideal of behavior is the renunciation of desires and full subordination to God, whereas demons and evildoers are free.

Parallel to this transformation of ancient freedom into Byz. subordination was a shift in the perception of slavery: the saint became the slave (doulos) of God, the courtier the slave of the emperor. Political eleutheros acquired a new meaning not connected to the idea of a free and civilized society: eleuthera began to designate tax exemption, and eleutheroi were those people free from state taxes.


—A.K.

FREE WILL (θέλημα γνώμικών, “will of choice”), a concept that stands at the center of the controversy over MONOTHELETISM. Patr. Sérgios I argued in his letter to Pope Honorius that two contradictory wills in Christ, the divine and human, cannot be accepted because such an idea would establish in him two “subjects” or “persons,” thereby falling into the heresy of NESTORIANISM. It is the hypostasis of the Logos who is freely obedient to God, experiencing no conflict and moving the human reality of Christ.

For MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR the doctrine of “one hypostatic will of the Logos” leads to the negation of a free human will in Christ, and consequently to the abrogation of the nature of the soul. On the other hand, he agrees with the Monothelites that any opposition to the will of God, even in Gethsemane, must be excluded in Christ, and that a unity that consists only in a common goal possessed by two wills is not suffi-

cient to protect against this. Further, he agrees that such a view ultimately implies Nestorianism. The human will of Christ, so he argues, must be understood as a capacity of self-determination belonging to human nature, but not as a will of choice. Such a gnomic will is found only in a “person” or hypostasis “enabled” to make decisions, or better, condemned, because this freedom of choice is merely a deficient mode of freedom, rooted not in man’s true nature, but in his existential condition after the sin of Adam. For MAXIMOS, Adam possessed no gnomic will before his sin, and yet he sinned.

John of Damascus took up the doctrine that Christ possessed no human gnomic will on account of the hypostatic union; yet one can speak of one gnomic will of Christ precisely because of the hypostatic union and the unity of the willed objective (meaning that “in both his natures he wills and acts for our salvation”). “For the natural human will” in Christ willed the same as God (Exp. fidei 36.104, 120–23, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:91f). Photios, who quotes this text in his AMPHIOCHIA (80.60–86, ed. L.G. Westerink, 5:113f), concludes that neither God nor Christ has a gnomic will (80.184–225, p.111f).


—K.-H.U.

FRESCO TECHNIQUE. A modified 

buon fresco, involving the application of lime-binding pigments directly to a layer of fine wet plaster added over an initial plaster coat, was used throughout Byz. times as an alternative to mosaic for wall decoration. No Byz. term corresponds exclusively to this technique. Because of its relative cheapness or its inherent modeling potential, fresco became increasingly popular in the 13th–14th C.

Examination of frescoes as well as literary allusions to painting indicate that pigments were applied in layers, even though the mixing of pigments in the modeling of flesh is found occasionally. Final flesh pigments, black or dark ochre outlines, and white highlights as well as inscriptions were normally added only after the initial layers of the painting had dried, a practice that has contributed to their loss. The range of color was limited to natural pigments that remained stable in conjunction with the lime of the plaster, for example,
lime white and lime putty, ochres varying from bright red and yellow to dark brown, earth green, and carbon black. A black wash was commonly used under blue (azurite) or green to produce a dark ground. The appearance of more expensive pigments such as ultramarine blue (from lapis lazuli) and gold and silver foil distinguish lavish works. Vermilion is also not unusual, although it tends to turn black. The rich coloristic impression given by many surviving fresco programs is a testament to the ingenuity with which masters manipulated their limited palette.


A.J.W.

FRIENDSHIP (φιλία) was an important category of ancient ethics, praised in both myth and philosophy. The church fathers, although not rejecting philia, contrasted it with true spiritual love or agape. According to Basil the Great (ep.133, ed. Y. Courtonne, 2:47.1–2), “corporate” friendship is a condition fostered by long association. Byz. epistolography preserved a stereotypical attitude toward friendship, with pertinent complaints about the friend’s silence. In the 11th C. the question of friendship was much discussed; Symeon the Theologian and Kekaumenos denied that friendship was a virtue, the latter opposing it to the nuclear family and the former the individual path of salvation. In contrast, Michael Psellos highly approved of friendship in theory and acted energetically on behalf of his friends in practice. In Niketas Choniates, the notion of philia acquires a broad range of meanings: alliance between states, semifeudal allegiance, political support, respect, although “pure friendship” appears infrequently. While antiquity emphasized primarily male friendship, the church fathers introduced the concept of heterosexual friendship between two celibate persons; equal “in Christ,” the partners in this relationship appear often as the male instructor and female apprentice.


A.K.

FRIEZE GOSPELS, conventional term for illustrated MSS in which successive scenes, in the narrative order of each Gospel, are arranged in strips across the page and within the body of the text block. Illustrations of these MSS also include headpiece miniatures (S. Tsuji, DOP 29 [1975] 165–205) and Evangelist portraits. Only two such books (Florence, Laur. 6.26 and Paris, B.N. gr. 74), of the 11th or early 12th C., survive.


A.C.

FRONTALITY, the arrangement of figures in a work of art so that the beholder engages them face to face. Like the related principle of symmetry, it is fundamental in Byz. composition. Following the decline of three-dimensional sculpture, which allowed a virtually infinite variety of axes and poses, frontality became pronounced on aedicul reliefs such as the base of the Obelisk of Theodosios in the Hippodrome and generally in portraits and portraiture. Almost invariably the most important figure in an image is shown in this manner, although in compositions such as the Anastasis the effect may be mitigated by the protagonist’s attitude toward other participants. Established in icon painting by the 6th C., frontality became a dominant formal characteristic, allowing immediate recognition of a holy figure, his or her accessibility and, above all, the intensity
of private communication. That the Byz. were
conscious of this unmediated experience even in
monumental decoration is demonstrated by the
ekphrasis of the Pantokrator in the Church of the
Holy Apostles (Constantinople) written by
Nicholas Mesares (ed. Downey, 870, 901).

Swoboda, "Die Frontalfigur zwischen Spatantike und

FRONTIER (δέρνον). In antiquity the frontier was
considered as a demarcation line between the
civilized οίκουμενε and the "savage" world of the
BARBARIAN: its significance was more cultural than
political and therefore fluctuated. Regular rela-
tions with the Persian Empire, and later with the
Arab caliphate, contributed to a clarification of
the legal concept of a frontier, while necessities
of defense produced a concrete, physical notion
of a border. Prokopios, who paid serious attention
to the problem of frontiers, recognized them as
following natural barriers—rivers, mountains,
deserts, seas; the Limes was a manmade fortified
frontier. The idea of frontier, however, was not
consistently applied: for a long period Cyprus was
shared between the Arabs and the Byz., while
considered (theoretically) as parts of Byz. territory
under the command of Byz. officials (or local
rulers adorned with Byz. titles). Intermediary zones
populated by bilingual settlers, subject to regular
raids from both sides and owing uncertain allegi-
ce, commonly existed along Byz. frontiers
(such was the milieu of Διγένες Ακρίτας). This
legal disequilibrium resulted in the application to
state frontiers of terms such as ηυροθερια or συνο-
ρια, which were normally used for rural boundary
marks. The existence of foreign enclaves made
the system of frontiers even more confused.

Border areas, despite their dangerous military
situation, contributed much to cultural and ethnic
exchange (by means of mixed marriages) and
often served as cradles for new development: thus
the new nobility of the 11th–12th C. came from
the borderlands of eastern Asia Mi-
nor and Macedonia, and innovative military tac-

FRUIT (καρποί) was an important component of
the Byz. diet. The GEOPONIKA (bk.10.74) pre-
serves an ancient categorization of fruit into αφορά
(soft) and ακρωδρα (hard-shelled); to the latter
group, besides the walnut, chestnut, and pistachio,
belonged the pomegranate. The ΠΩΚΟΠΟ-
ΓΟΣ gives a long list of fruit: quince, citron, pear,
apple, cherry, plum, fig, etc., whereas the walnut,
almond, and chestnut form a separate category
characterized as "Vorangiani." The peach ("Per-
\'\'sian apple") was also known. Fruit trees were
planted in gardens, while nuts and chestnuts usu-
ally grew in groves. A poor peasant might possess
only a single tree, as did an alterikos in the vita of
Michael Maleinos (L. Petit, ROC 7 [1902] 563,12–
19) whose only asset was a pear tree. The πρακτικα
of the 14th C. mention pear, fig, walnut, cherry,
almond, and mulberry trees; according to Laiou
(Peasant Society 297), the peasants of the Iveron
estates in the village of Gonatou owned, on the
average, 20 trees each in 1320. Calculations by N.
Kondov (infra) show that in the northern Balkans
the pear tree was more common than the apple
and the cherry tree more common than the plum.
Wild berries were also gathered; some saints are
described as picking wild strawberries (λιθαμάρια).

Some fruits were grown for market, but the
Byz. preferred produce from their own gardens:
the fruit imported by Bulgaria, stated Gregory
Antiochos (J. Darrouzès, BS 23 [1902] 279,39–
48), was spoiled—the apples wrinkled, the pears
bruised, the figs dried up, having lost their sweet-
ness during their lengthy transport.

As in the Roman tradition, artists continued to
use fruit and foliage as symbols of abundance.
attached to wreaths and other forms of ornament.

Lit. N. Koudov, Ovoččarstvoto v bulgarskite zemi prez srednovekovieto (Sofia 1969). Dölger, Schatz. 188.
-A.K., J.W.N., A.C.

FRUIT BOOK. See Porikologos.

FULCHER OF CHARTRES, priest; participant in and chronicler of the First Crusade; chaplain of Baldwin I; born ca.1058, died 1127/8. At Jerusalem in late 1101 Fulcher began a Jerusalem History (Historia Hierosolymitana), whose lost first version apparently narrated events to 1105 and was known, for example, to Guibert of Nogent. Fulcher later pursued his account down to 1124; ca.1127 he revised and continued the whole to constitute its present form. William of Tyre exploited his work, and in the 13th C. it was shortened and translated into French. Fulcher's first sections (pp. 171–214) record the Crusaders' travels across the Balkans, his wonderment at the wealth, beauty, merchants, and "20,000 eunuchs" of Constantinople, relations with Emp. Alexios I, and the siege of Nicaca. He documents the return of some of the Crusaders to Europe via Constantinople (pp. 318–21), Bohemund's war with Byz. in 1107–08 (pp. 518–25), and deplores Venetian raids on the Byz. Aegean in 1125 (pp. 758–61).


-M.M.C.

FUNERAL (κηδεία). This rite had a double purpose: to say farewell to the deceased and to assist the soul in its ascent to heaven. The ritual had three major stages: preparation of the body and soul at the home of the deceased, the funerary procession, and the graveside service and burial. Preparations began immediately after a person's death with the washing and clothing of his body. Normally, relatives washed the body with warm water mixed with wine and spices, anointed it with perfume, wrapped it in appropriate garments, and closed the eyes and mouth. All these stages are subsumed in representations of Christ's Passion (K. Weitzmann in De arthibus opuscula XL, ed. M. Meiss [New York 1961] 476–90).

Typical burial garb consisted of a swaddling linen cloth and the shroud. White linen garments were customary among the majority; for example, Constantine I the Great was buried in his white linen baptismal robe. Monks and clergy, however, were clad in clerical vestments according to their rank. Luxurious garments often distinguished imperial or wealthy personages. Exceptions were made to meet the last wishes of individuals: thus, the vita of the 9th-C. saint Eudokimos reports that he asked his colleagues to place him in a coffin dressed in military garb with an attached sword and to give him honors of a strategos, the position he occupied in his lifetime (ed. Loparev, pp. 209:8.30–35; 210:8.5). Those devoted to him even covered his coffin with the blanket under which he died (ibid., 211:9.20). On the other hand, Melania the Younger was buried in garments associated with saints (vita, ed. Gorce 268.13–270.3).

After burial preparations, the corpse of a lay person was displayed on a small couch in a room or vestibule of a house for mourning and lamentation by family and friends. The body was oriented so that it faced east, with hands crossed on the chest and holding an icon; candles and incense burned alongside the corpse. Sometimes holy bread was put into the corpse's hands, but the church prohibited offering communion to the dead. The singing of psalms over the body served to protect the soul against demons. The coffin of a monk or cleric was placed in the narthex of a church. When Lazaros of Mt. Galesios died, his body was brought into the church, laid on the floor, and his leather chiton and fetters removed; then, probably after washing him, the monks replaced his chiton, laid him on a couch in the narthex, and prepared a coffin of cypresswood (AASS Nov. 3:587E–588A).

Following the visitation period, the funeral procession set off for the burial with lamps and burning incense, the cortèges of saints or emperors attracting large crowds. If the corpse had to be transported some distance to its final resting place (e.g., Alexios, the older son of John II), it was embalmed or simply placed in a closed coffin.

Mourners typically engaged in lamentations and tragic gestures (tears, beating the chest, pulling out the hair). Chrysostom, however, urged the replacement of wailing with the singing of psalms. Some rigorously ascetic saints also protested against
exaggerated expression of emotions: Basil the Younger (vita, ed. Vilinski 1.333.13–23) forbade laments and beating the chest at his funeral, since he considered it a time of rejoicing and entrance into “the spiritual marriage chamber.”


Furniture. The main pieces in a Byz. household were beds; tables; various seats (benches, chairs, thrones); stools; chest with locks; and “small towers” (pyrgiskoi) for precious objects. In a broader sense, furnishings included carpets, cutlery (katapetasmata), and lighting devices (lamps). Hagiographers and authors of sermons often mention precious pieces of furniture, covered with ivory plaques, silver, or gold. On the other hand, wills and inventories of the 11th–15th C. list icons; books; and gold, silver, bronze, or glass vessels, but are strangely silent about beds, tables, and chairs.


Furrer (γουνάριος). The word gounarios is unknown before the 6th C. Fikhman (Egipet 90) suggests that kauzheplokos and related terms used in some papyri designated furriers, but their context is unclear. S. Calderini (Egypit 26 [1946] 17) translates it as “weaver of wool.” Constantinopolitan furriers had their shops in the Forum (of Constantine?), where as early as 532 the basilica of the gounarioi; the structure was damaged at least twice by fire (Janin, CP byz. 98). In 14th-C. Constantinople there was a flourishing business of processing furs imported from the north: a contract of apprenticeship to a furrier survives from this period (G. Ferrari dalle Spade, SBN 4 [1935] 264), and a Latin document of 1313 mentions a furriers’ house in the quarter of Peltiarii or “furriers” (Loenertz, ByzFrGr 1425, no.4). Many furriers were Jews, esp. Jews from Venice (Matscheke, Fortschrift 96f).

Fustät, Al-, medieval Egyptian town at the southern end of the Nile delta. In late Roman times the site was occupied by the fortress of Babylon, and it was the camp (fusatoi) of the besieging forces of ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAsh in 640/1 that evolved into the Arab town. From a garrison for Arab forces advancing across North Africa, al-Fustāt soon became the capital of Egypt. Its position gave it control over Nile commerce, particularly the vital grain trade, and a leading role in traffic moving along the southern Mediterranean coast. Byz. ships often called at al-Fustāt, Byz. goods (esp. textiles) were extensively traded, and by the time of the Fāṭimid many Byz. merchants and craftsmen had settled there.

Al-Fustāt also figured in the conflict with Byz. More securely situated than the often-raided coastal towns, it served as a naval base and a market for the spoils of piracy and war. In 1168 the town was burned by the Fāṭimid vizier Shāwar to prevent its capture by Amārīc I of Jerusalem. Already affected by repeated plagues and famines, unrest, and increasing competition from neighboring Cairo (founded 968), it did recover somewhat, but by the 13th C. was no longer of much importance.


—L.G.
GABALAS (Γαβαλᾶς, fem. Γαβαλίνα), a family that served primarily with the fleet. Both the origin of the name and the early history of the family are unclear. S. Kourouses rejected the suggestion that the name originated from Gabala-Biblos and hypothesized a connection with the Old Testament Gaballos. The family’s link with the Arab Jabala, the father of the Ghassânid king Arethas, or the late Roman patricius Gabalas (Seibt, Bеlsieglе, no.129) cannot be established. Kourouses claims that the Gabalas family was known at least from the 9th C., but the seal of John Gabalas, dated by K. Regling to 850–1050 (BZ 24 [1924] 99ff) is insufficient for such a dating, and other seals of various individuals named Gabalas provide only meager information. Documents cite late 12th-C. members of the Gabalas family; two were high-ranking officials of the fleet: the protonobilissimos hypertatos Stephen (Seibt, supra, no.158) and John (Laumas 1, no.67,34). After 1204 the Gabalas family took control of Rhodes: the caesar Leo Gabalas signed a treaty with the Venetians against John III Vatatzes in 1234; Leo’s brother John succeeded him in 1240. John III captured the island in 1249. One of his navy commanders, also a Gabalas (Ahrweiler, “Smyrne” 169, calls him John), was megas drongarios until 1266/7 (PLP, no.3293). John Gabalas was megas drongarios in 1341 (Kantak. 2:118.21–23): he probably supported John VI Kantakouzenos but then betrayed him and became megas logothetes by 1344. Guillaume (Institutions 1:542) believes he was drongarios tes viglas, but, in view of the family traditions, presumably he commanded the fleet.

In the 13th C. members of the Gabalas family possessed lands in the Smyrna region. Some of them were church officials and some were intellectuals, including Manuel Gabalas (see GABALAS, MANUEL). None is known as a member of the administration after the mid-14th C., except for Michael Gabalas, oikeios of Manuel II ca.1400 (PLP, no.3310). The settlement of some family members in Crete can be explained by the traditional interest of the Gabalas family in maritime business.


—A.K.

GABALAS, MANUEL, also known as Matthew of Ephesus; metropolitan of Ephesus (1329–51); born Philadelphia ca.1271/2, died before 1359/60. Gabalas began his career in Philadelphi as anagnostes, deacon, and then as protoonotarios (1309–12) of Metr. Theoleptos. He lost his position because of his opposition to Theoleptos’s continuing anti-Arsenite stance. He was widowed in 1312. In 1321 he became a priest and, after reconciliation with Theoleptos, chantophylax of Philadelphi; in 1322/3 he took the monastic habit. He spent much time in Constantinople, where he became acquainted with literati such as Nikephoros Gregoras and Nikephoros Choumnos. He continued to live in the capital even after his appointment to Ephesus because his see was under Turkish occupation. He spent the years 1332–37 in Thracian Bysis, where he was named metropolitan kat’epidosin (i.e., to obtain additional income besides that from his own see). When he was finally able to enter Ephesus in 1339, local Muslims made his life miserable by barring him from the cathedral (which was converted into a mosque) and throwing stones at his house (ep.55). Because of his opposition to Palamism, he was eventually deprived of his see.

Gabalas was also a writer; his 63 surviving letters treat literary and philosophical topics and make frequent allusions to Homer and Plato. He also wrote three treatises on the Odyssey. His other works include an oration to Andronikos II and three monodies. Reinsch (infra 45–57) recently identified Gabalas as the author of 200 Chapters on moral themes (cf. A. Angelou in Maistor 259–67). Gabalas also worked as a scribe, copying, for example, Vienna, ÖNB, theol. gr. 174, an autograph MS of his own works.
Gabras, Michael, writer and official of the imperial chancery; born ca. 1290, died after 1350. Almost nothing is known of Gabras except for the internal evidence of his voluminous correspondence. A resident of Constantinople, he eked out a meager living as a bureaucrat, and seems to have had continual (or pretended) financial difficulties: many letters to his friends are requests for necessities such as bread, salt, fish, wheat, and barley.

Gabras was the author of a number of rhetorical works, including eulogies of his mother and father, four orations to Andronikos II, and a monody on the deceased Michael IX. He also wrote “criticism of books” and a book on dreams. None of his oeuvre has survived, except for a large group of 462 letters dating between 1308 and 1327. These are addressed to 111 different individuals, including luminaries such as Andronikos II, John (VI) Kantakouzenos, Nikephoros Choumnos, and Theodoret Metochites. Despite the emphasis upon style over content common to Byz. epistolography, Gabras’s letters are not without interest. Some are requests for favors, complaints about his health, and lamentations over the death of his brother, John; many others deal with literary matters as Gabras exchanges MSS with his friends and seeks their opinion of his own work.

Gabriel (גֶּרֶבְרָיאַל, in Hebrew meaning “man of God”), angel; feastday 26 March. Gabriel appears in the Old Testament in the vision of Daniel (Dan 8:15–16, 9:21–22) and in the Gospel of Luke (Lk 1:11–13, 19, 26–38) as the messenger announcing the forthcoming births of John the Baptist and Jesus Christ. He was popular in Jewish legend and apocrypha as a guardian of the world and as a destroyer of enemies and sinners; for Muslims he is the one who revealed the Qur’an to Muhammad. In Christian tradition Gabriel was promoted to the rank of Archangel (not conferred upon him in the Bible) and revered either together with the Archangel Michael or in connection with the Annunciation.

Gabriel’s function as a messenger was expressed by his carrying a walking staff, but he could also be depicted frontally as a guardian, clad in the imperial garb of an archangel holding globe and scepter, accompanying, along with Michael, the figure of Christ or the Virgin (e.g., the bema mosaics in Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, Nea...
Mone on Chios). Gabriel is shown crowning the emperor Basil I in the 9th-C. Paris Gregory (fol. Cv). His role in the Annunciation, one of the Great Feasts, assured his presence in nearly every church program and on innumerable icons as well as in cycles of the Akathistos Hymn; Gabriel appears also in images of the Virgin of the Passion and in extended cycles of the Dormition as the angel who brings the news to the Virgin of her impending death. Although he occasionally joined Michael in performing a miracle, Gabriel had no miracle cycle of his own.

There were at least five churches or chapels in Constantinople dedicated to Gabriel (Janin, Églises CP 66); a church of Gabriel in Miletos is also known (Grégoire, Inscriptions, no. 220bis).


GABRIEL HIEROMONACHOS, composer who lived and worked at the monastery of Xanthopoulos; fl. Constantinople first half 15th C. He may be the author of Discourse on the Signs of Chant, known from 16th-C. MSS. This treatise discusses the meaning of the neumata in allegorical and etymological terms.


GABRIELOPOULOS (Γαβριηλόπουλος, fem. Γαβρηληπολύνα), a family known in the 14th C. Stephen GabrieLOPOULOS established his rule over Thessaly sometime between 1318 and 1325 with a formal recognition from Constantinople of his dependency; he bore the title of sebastokratōr. Until his death in 1332/3 he possessed Stagoi, Trikkala, Phanarion, and several other castles. After a period of struggle for Thessaly, Michael GabrieLOPOULOS gained control there; in June 1342 he issued a charter in favor of the archontes of Phanarion, guaranteeing privileges such as freedom of disposition of their property, exemption from taxes and billeting, strict conditions of military service, freedom from responsibility for treasonous relatives, and the tribunal of peers (C.P. Kyrkis, Hellenika 18 [1964] 73–78). As the lord (authenthes) of the area, Michael swore an oath that confirmed these privileges. His further fate is unknown. Other GabrieLOPOULOS are known at the same time in the Strymon region: a GabrieLOPOULOS made a donation to Esphigmenou before 1318 (Esphig., no. 14.198), a certain GabrieLOPOULOS possessed one third of the village of Krousovo before 1347 (no. 23.16). The family’s relationship to George Kydones GabrieLOPOULOS (fl. 1348–83), physician and writer (see George the Philosopher), is unclear. A certain GabrieLOPOULOS was exiled in 1370 for possessing books on magic.

Lit. PLP, nos. 3430–35. B. Ferjančić, Tsarilja u XIII i XIV veku (Belgrade 1974) 168–89. —A.K.

GAETA (Γαήτη), port on the Italian Tyrrhenian coast, of importance to Byz. in the 8th C.; during the Lombard conquest of central Italy, it assured communication between Rome, Naples, Sicily, and Constantinople. After the fall of the exarchate of Ravenna (751), Gaeta, which was part of the duchy of Naples, remained officially Byz. Between the end of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th C., however, the dynasty of the local hypatoi—called duces after 915—gradually became independent. Constantine VII considered Gaeta a part of Longobardia (De adm. imp. 27.46–52). The economic interests of Gaeta were predominantly related to those of the neighboring papal states; accordingly the city participated in the silver circulation of northwestern Europe, in contrast to the rest of southern Italy, where Byz. and Arab gold coinage prevailed. Nevertheless merchants from Gaeta are attested in Constantinople during the 10th–11th C. In 1032 Gaeta was conquered by Pandolf IV, the Lombard prince of Capua, and in 1064 by the Normans.


GAGIK I (Gakikios), last major Bagratid king of Armenia (989–ca. 1017–20). Gagik was able to maintain a senior position vis-à-vis the other Bagratid kings of his time ruling in Kars and Lori, esp. after the death of David of Tav'k/Tao, whom he supported against the Kurdish emirs of Azerbaijan. The divided kingdom of Vaspurakan offered no challenge to Gagik, who also acquired considerable territory in the east at the expense of Siwnik', to which, however, he returned certain
eclesiastical privileges. Gagik's dominant position allowed him to withstand pressure even from Byz.: when Basil II reached the Armenian border in 1000 to claim the bequest of David of Tavk' / Tao and the other Armenian and Georgian rulers were hastening to submit to Basil, Gagik remained defiantly inside the walls of his capital, Ani. For the rest of his reign, which marked the peak of Bagratid power in Armenia, his authority remained unchallenged; Ani, whose cathedral was completed by his queen, became a major administrative and cultural center.


NGG

GAGIK II, last Bagratid king of Armenia (1042–45); son of the anti-king Ashot IV; died Kzistraî ca.1079/80. At the death of his predecessor John Smbat, Byz. demanded the surrender of Ani with the support of the pro-Byz. party in the capital. The imperial troops, however, failed to take the city and the opposition party crowned Gagik king in 1042. In 1045, the young king was persuaded by Byz. to journey to Constantinople, where he was detained and induced to abdicate in exchange for the title of magistros and domains in Cappadocia (possibly Charsianon and Lykandos, though Byz. and Armenian sources disagree on the location). Meanwhile, the katholikos surrendered Ani to the Byz. After Gagik abdicated, he composed a defense of Armenian doctrine (preserved by Matthew of Edessa), which Gagik is said to have delivered at Constantinople in 1065. Gagik was apparently murdered by the Byz. to avenge his slaying of the metropolitan of Caesarea. A Byz. seal bearing the name of Maria, “the daughter of Kakikes Aniotes,” is preserved (A. Kazhdan, Byzantium 42 [1972] 602).


NGG

GAINAS (Γαϊνας), general of Gothic origin; born north of the Danube, died in the northern Balkans before Jan. 401. Having begun his career as a common soldier, he was one of the commanders who led Theodosios 1's barbarian troops against the usurper Eugenius in 394; the next year, in collaboration with Stilicho and Eutropios, he accomplished the fall of Rufinus and became comes rei militaris (395–99). Appointed magister utriusque militiae in 399, he was ordered to march against the Gothic commander Troadigild, but instead joined forces with him and engineered the fall of Eutropios. Power was seized, however, by the anti-Germanic group of aristocrats headed by Aurelianos. Gainas secured the latter's exile, and, acting in alliance with Kaisarios, the former praetorian prefect, he entered Constantinople with Gothic contingents. The Goths, Arian in belief, were opposed by the populace, whose anti-Germanic sentiments were expressed by John Chrysostom and soon thereafter by Synesios. Gainas tried to obtain a church for the Arians, to seize money belonging to the bankers, and to occupy the imperial palace, but failed. On 12 July 400, Gainas's troops were massacred. Gainas escaped to Thrace, where he met with resistance from the local population. The administration in Constantinople sent some other Goths under the command of Fravitta against him. In the meantime Gainas was killed by the Hunnic chieftain Uldin. At the beginning of 401, Aurelianos returned to the capital amid a triumphant welcome. Kaisarios withdrew from politics; Fravitta was executed, and the “Gothic party” was defeated. In the early 5th C. the exploits of Gainas and his fall from power were the subject of two epic poems (Sokr. HE 6.6.36), since lost, and were probably the theme of the Column of Arkadios in the Forum of Arkadios.


NGG

GAISERIC (Γαϊςερηκος), king of the Vandals (from 428); born 389, died 25 Jan. 477. Gaiseric led the Vandals from Spain to Africa in 429 and undertook its conquest. Peace with the Romans in 435 divided Africa between the two peoples. After a Roman expedition failed in 441, Gaiseric negotiated a treaty in 442 with Valentine III whereby the Vandals received further territory (Africa Proconsularis, Byzacena, eastern Numidia). In the 450s Gaiseric became involved in European affairs, urging Attila to attack the Visigoths, capturing and sacking Rome in 455, taking Valentin-
ian III's widow Eudoxia and her daughters back to Africa, and raiding the coast of Greece. In 460–61 the Western emperor Majorian built large fleets to attack the Vandal king, but the latter captured them before they set sail. Gaiseric made regular attacks on Italy, in part to further the imperial claims of Olybrius. The elevation of Anthemios in 467 meant greater Eastern involvement and led to the ill-fated expedition against Gaiseric under Basiliskos in 468. Probably in 476 Gaiseric made peace with Emp. Zeno.

Gaiseric was an Arian and systematically persecuted the Orthodox; he discriminated between Romans and Vandals in his kingdom and promoted the latter. Under Gaiseric Vandal naval power shook Roman control of the Mediterranean and spread terror as far as Alexandria.


**GALAKRENAI** (Γαλακρέναι, "fountains of milk"), site of several Byz. monasteries on Asiatic shore of Bosporus, near Chaledon. Scholars have been unable to identify the precise location of Galakrenai, evidently a place where springs of water were made milky in color by a solution of carbonate of lime. Three different monasteries are attested in this group.

1. The monastery of Galakrenai, first mentioned in 535. It may have been here that a lavishly illuminated copy of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos (Vat. gr. 463) was written in 1072 by Symeon, a pupil of a Theodore who was superior of "the monastery of Galakrenai" (J.C. Anderson, *DOP* 32 [1978] 178–83).

2. The monastery of Nicholas I Mystikos, founded by the patriarch ca.900. He retired to Galakrenai for five years after his deposition from the patriarchate in 907 and was buried there after his death in 925.

3. The monastery of John the Rhaiktor, founded by this official in the early 10th C. He was tonsured there in 926, after being accused of complicity in a plot to assassinate the emperor Romanos I Lekapenos. This monastery had a metochion in Constantinople. During the Latin occupation of the capital, John the Rhaiktor's monastery was given to the prior of the Pisan Church of St. Peter, located in Constantinople. After the Byz. recovery of 1261, the monastery, reduced to six monks, became a metochion of the Constantinopolitan monastery of St. Demetrios of the PalaioLOGOIs.

It is unclear which of these monasteries was given to the PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY in Constantinople as a metochion in the 12th C.


- A.M.T., A.G.

**GALATA** (γάλατον, Γαλατάς, etym. unclear), settlement occupying a promontory on the north side of the Golden Horn facing Constantinople. Originally called Sykai, by ca.425 it had become an integral part of the city, of which it formed the 13th Region. It possessed a theater, baths, dockyard, and other facilities (Notitiae urbis Constantinopolitanae, ed. Seeck, p.240.1–23). Defensive walls were probably built in the course of the 5th C. In 528 Sykai was granted the status of a city and renamed Joustimanoupolis. It may have been abandoned in the 7th C. since later sources do not mention a city. Instead we find a fort (kastellion), ton Galatou, situated on the seashore, which served as a point of attachment of the chain barring the mouth of the Golden Horn (first attested in 717).

Churches and monasteries of Galata include St. Irene (on the site of present-day Arap Camii), dedicated in 551. Many more were just outside Galata, including the cruciform martyrion of the Maccabees (4th C.), St. Thekla, St. Konon, and the leper-house of St. Zotikos. The area to the east of Galata, known as Argyropolis (Turk. Top-hane) is mentioned in the legend of St. Andrew as the site where the apostle ordained Stachys as first bishop of Byzantium.

Probably in the 11th C. Galata became a Jewish quarter that attained a population of about 2,500 (Jacoby, *Société*, pt.II [1967], 175–89). The Crusaders captured the fort in 1203 and destroyed the Jewish quarter. Attacked by Michael VIII in 1260 and occupied the next year, Galata was granted by him to the Genoese (1267), the precise limits of the colony being defined in a document in 1303. Despite stipulations to the contrary, the Genoese built walls around their settlement, which they gradually enlarged. A city of Western aspect, Galata became extremely prosperous thanks to international trade. It capitulated to the Turks in 1453, retaining many of its privileges, but quickly
declined as a commercial center. The name *Pera*, as used in the 13th–15th C., is synonymous with Galata.

No Byz. remains survive at Galata. The Genoese walls, of various dates and now to a large extent dismantled, include the Galata Tower (mid-14th C., much rebuilt).


---

**Galatia (Γαλατία),** the northern hill region of the central Anatolian plateau, stretching from the mountains of Paphlagonia to the Salt Lake and from the Sangarios River eastward past the Halys. The region was sparsely inhabited, with few cities but a large rural population in its fertile areas; it produced wheat, sheep, and goats. Galatia gained strategic importance from its location on the highways from Constantinople to the eastern frontier.

The province of Galatia was created under Diocletian with its capital at Ankyra. Galatia was divided into Galatia I (metropolis Ankyra) and Galatia II, or Salutaris (metropolis Pessinus), ca.398. In 535, Justinian I gave the governor of Galatia I the title of comes, with both civil and military powers to deal with endemic brigandage; the reform was revoked in 548. Gelimer was granted estates in Galatia after his defeat. The civil province lasted into the 8th C. (Zacos, *Seals* 1, nos. 136, 3189), by which time Galatia had become part of the Opsiakion theme, then the Boukellarian. The ecclesiastical province, embracing all Galatia from the time of Constantine I, was also divided ca.398; its parts persisted through the Byz. period. Late mentions of Galatia in narrative sources have geographic, not administrative meaning.

**Lit.** *TIB* 4:54–58.

---

**Galea (γαλέα, from γαλέος, "swordfish" or "small shark"),** a term first used in the 10th C. to denote light, rapid *dromones* powered by one bank of rowers (*Naumachica*, ed. A. Dain [Paris 1949] 21). They were commonly used as messenger ships or for reconnaissance in enemy waters. Pirates are usually said to have *galeai*, which seem to be oar-powered ships, lighter and more nimble than an ordinary *dromon*.

**Lit.** Ahrweiler, *Mer* 414. **E.M.**

**Galen, Roman physician and philosopher;** born Pergamon 129, died Rome? ca.210. The mark of this single Roman medical writer on Byz. medicine was extraordinary; his adaptations of the Hippocratic four humors as well as his use of Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics in creating an all-encompassing medical theory ensured his use as a source by learned Byz. physicians from Oribasios to John Aktouarios. Oribasios was the first to make a synopsis of Galenic medicine; the extant sections of his *Medical Collection* show the first stages of a Byz. adeptness in fusing parts of Galen’s works with contemporary medical practice; this streamlining tendency continued through the medical encyclopedias of Aetios of Amida, Alexander of Tralles, and Paul of Aegina. Yet the best Byz. medical authors did not simply borrow the quotations of “lost” authorities as they might be found in Galen, but generally went back to the original texts when they were available and set them in an assured context with those of the great Pergamene. Oribasios, for example, apparently consulted directly the *Materia Medica* of Dioskorides, and probably formulated the first Greek alphabetical listing of drugs in Dioskorides’ work, the ancestor of so many alphabetical “Dioskorides” texts in Greek, Latin, and Arabic. Oribasios’s technique in using Dioskorides side-by-side with Galen was followed by almost all later Byz. medical encyclopedists. Not only professionals but also educated Byz. (e.g., Michael Choniates) read Galen, who was popular enough to become a comic figure in the Timarion. By the 13th–14th C., Galen had become the authority on medicine in Greek, Latin, and Arabic (see also Instancy). His quasi-monotheism, best seen in *Use of the Parts of the Body*, made his medicine and medical philosophy easily adaptable to Christian and Islamic canons.


GALERIUS, more fully Caius Galerius Valerius Maximianus, caesar under Diocletian (293–305) and Augustus (from 1 May 305); born Romulianum in Illyricum ca. 260, died Nikomedea May 311. Galerius presumably rose through the army and may have been praetorian prefect under Diocletian. As Caesar he was responsible for much of the Balkans; his primary residence was at Thessalonike, where remains of his palace can still be seen. He carried out wars against the Carpi on the Danube (295) and against the Persians (297–98), the latter commemorated on an arch in Thessalonike (see Arch of Galerius). After Diocletian's abdication Galerius became senior emperor in the Tetrarchy, with Maximinus Daia as his Caesar. In 307 he opposed the proclamation of Maxentius as emperor. The next year he convoked the Conference of Carnuntum, the result of which was the appointment of Licinius as Caesar and the redivision of the empire. Lactantius pictures Galerius as an outspoken pagan, persecuting Christians in his own territories and responsible for Diocletian's edicts against the church. He continued the persecution until he fell gravely ill; in 311, shortly before his death, he anticipated the Edict of Milan by granting toleration to the church. Galerius is remembered in the Byz. tradition as the archetypal persecutor, properly punished for his crimes by a painful death.


GALERIUS, ARCH OF. See Arch of Galerius.

GALESIOS, MOUNT (Turk. Alamandağ), monastic center north of Ephesus, on right bank of the Kastros River (Küçük Menderes). Monks were first attracted to this holy mountain in the 11th C. by the stylite St. Lazaros. Three monasteries, under one hegoumenos, were built near the successive sites of his pillar: (1) the Savior, reserved for 12 eunuchs; (2) the Theotokos, for 12 monks; and (3) the Anastasis, for 40 monks. A diatyposis for the three institutions is incorporated in the Vita S. Lazar (AASS Nov. 3:585). A fourth monastery, the Theotokos of Bessat, was imperial and had its own hegoumenos; it housed 300 monks in the 11th C. but rapidly declined. Near the mountain was the convent of Eupraxia, which served as a residence for female relatives of Galesiot monks.

Galesios entered a period of obscurity after the death of Lazaros, but in the 13th C., with the establishment of the empire of Nicaea, a "monastery of Galesios" again attained prominence. Two early Palaiologan patriarchs, Joseph I and Athanasios I, were former Galesiot monks, and a third, Gregory II of Cyprus, wrote a new version of the Vita Lazar. The monastery was reputed to have a rich library and had an active scriptorium (F. Halkin, Scriptorium 15 [1961] 221–27). Its history came to an end in the 14th C. when it was captured by the Turks (AASS Nov. 3:503).


GALESIOATES, GEORGE, patriarchal official and writer; born Atrymyttion or Constantinople? between 1278 and 1280, died after 1346. Galesiotes (Γαλησιώτης) was apparently a family name and does not indicate that he was a monk at Mt. Galesios (F. Halkin, Scriptorium 15 [1961] 225–27). Galesiotes studied with Gregory II of Cyprus and then with Manuel Holobolo, to whom he later addressed a funeral monody. As a secular cleric, he began his career as archon of Hagia Sophia (ca.1303); he succeeded George Pachymeres as protektos ca.1310. He held this post until 1334, when he took charge of the sakellion. Galesiotes' works include a monody for Theodore Xanthopoulos and, according to S.I. Kourouses, a lament on the collapse of the dome of Hagia Sophia in 1346 (EEBS 37 [1969–70] 247–50). He was probably also the author of an oration of thanksgiving for the Christian naval victory over the Turks off Atrymyttion in 1334 (V. Laurent in Eis mnemen K. Amantou [Athens 1960] 25–41). In collaboration with George Oinaioites, he prepared a paraphrase, in simpler language, of the Imperial Statue of Nikephoros Blemmydes.

H. Hunger and O. Kresten have recently proposed that the George Galesiotes who copied patriarchal documents from ca.1325 to 1357 is to be distinguished from the author Galesiotes, and suggest that he was a younger contemporary, perhaps his nephew (Hunger-Ševčenko, Blemmydes 33f).

GALIC. See GALITZA.

GALILEE, STORM ON THE SEA OF. Matthew 8:23–27. Mark 4:35–41, and Luke 8:22–25 tell of Christ sleeping in a storm-tossed boat on the Lake of Galilee. Awakened and upbraided by his disciples, he calmed the storm, chiding them for their lack of faith and eliciting their awe. The scene is illustrated only in extensive cycles in: FRIEZE GOSPELS, in marginal Psalters at Psalm 89g, in several DECORATIVE STYLE MSS, and at CHORA. The richest depiction, that in the Florence frieze Gospel (fol.120v), shows the boat three times: with Christ and the disciples seated, with Christ asleep and then rebuking a personification of the wind, and with Christ chiding the disciples.


GALITZA, or Galić (Γάλιτζα, also “Galatikon” in Theodore Prodromos—A. Kazhdan in Okeanos 356), town on the Dniester and center of one of the principalities of Rus’. Vladimirko of Galić (1141–53) was an ally (or vassal; hypospondos in Kinn. 115,19) of Manuel I against Geza II of Hungary. Vladimirko’s son Jaroslav harbored the future emperor Andronikos I in 1165, but Manuel’s diplomacy secured Andronikos’s return. ANTONY OF NOVGOROD mentions a Galician embassy to Constantinople in 1200, possibly negotiating for the campaign of Roman of Galitza against the Cumans in 1201 (Nik.Chon. 522,26–523,35). The bishopric of Galitza, under the metropolitan of Kiev, was founded between 1147 and 1153. In the 14th C. it was sporadically raised to the rank of metropolis (Notitiae CP, nos. 17,157, 18,159). Casimir of Poland, requesting a metropolitan from Patr. PHILOTHEOS KOKKINOS in 1370, after his annexation of Galitza (MM 1:577,29–32), mentions four previous incumbents, and when Metr. Antony was appointed in 1371 bishoprics of Cholm, Turov, Peremyśl, and Volodimer were put under his jurisdiction (MM 1:579,23–24). In the mid-13th C. Galitza played a conspicuous role in the transmission of Byz. literary culture in Slavonic translation: the best texts of the translations of MALALAS, JOSEPHUS FLAVIS, and the ALEXANDER ROMANCE all derive from Galician compilations.


GALLA PLACIDIA (Γάλλα Πλακίδια), more fully Aelia Galla Placidia, Augusta of the Western Roman Empire (421–50); born 388 (S.I. Oost, CPL phil 60 [1965] 1–4) or 393 (S. Rebenich, Historia 34 [1985] 372–85) in Constantinople or Thessalonike, died Rome 27 Nov. 450. Daughter of Theodosios I, she spent most of her life in the West. When Rome was sacked by Alaric in 410 the Visigoths carried Galla Placidia off to Gaul, and in Jan. 414 she married the new king Athaulf. After his death she was returned to the Romans. On 1 Jan. 417 Galla married the patrician Flavius Constantius to whom she bore the future emperor Valentinian III and a daughter, Justa Grata Honoria. In Feb. 421 Honorius proclaimed Constantius augustus (as Constantius III), but Theodosios II refused to recognize his accession. There are some vague indications that Constantius made warlike preparations against the East, but he died on 2 Sept. 421. Galla Placidia was accused of treason and conspiracy against her brother Honorius. She sought sanctuary at the court of Theodosios II in 423. After the death of Honorius the Eastern court used Galla Placidia and her son to assert indirect control over the West. Valentinian was brought to Italy and created augustus, with Galla Placidia exercising regency over him, a power she shared increasingly with the magister militum Aeitus. She was an ardent supporter of Orthodoxy and a generous donor of churches, esp. in Ravenna, but she also knew how to maintain a modus vivendi with Arians. Her only known portrait is on solido struck under Valentinian III.


GALLERY (ὑπερψοφος, κατηχουμενος, κατηχου- μενον), a corridor above the aisles and narthex of a church, opening fully onto the space of the
nave through arcades or colonnades. Galleries occur in major churches throughout the empire from the 4th to 13th C. Reserved elsewhere for women or (in early centuries) for catechumens, galleries in palace chapels or churches became the preserve of the emperor or local ruler and his court, in part because they provided easy access to the church from upper levels of adjacent palaces (Hagia Sophia, Constantinople; St. Sophia, Kiev); portions of the gallery in the Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, served as the parakyptron and metatorion and were the setting of church councils. Canon 97 of the Council in Trullo (692/3) forbade priests and laymen to live in galleries with their wives (a ban renewed by nov. 73 of Leo VI). Galleries were introduced into all types of churches: longitudinal basilicas, whether tria-xao (extra muros) basilica at Philippi; St. Demetrios, Thessalonike) or domed (St. John, Ephesus; S. Marco, Venice), and centralized churches, whether circular (Konjul, Macedonia), polygonal (S. Vitale, Ravenna); tetraconch (S. Lorenzo, Milan; Zuari‘noc‘), or otherwise. They do not appear in the naves of basilicas where major fresco or mosaic cycles were planned in continuous sequence of images. While galleries become less common after the 7th C., they reappear with some frequency in the 13th–15th C., most notably in Mistra and other provincial capitals. Galleries enhance the majesty of ecclesiastical spaces; may add substantially to the cost of the structure; identify imperial, royal, or princely presence; and exhibit society divided between the people below and the aristocracy above.

—W.I. K.M.K.

GALLIPOLI. See Kallipolis.

GALLUNIANU TREASURE, dated to the 6th C. and found in 1963 near Poggibonsi in Tuscany, Italy, 2.5 km from Galognano. Now in the Pinacoteca of Siena, the treasure contains six silver objects (four chalices, one paten, one spoon). Two objects bear inscribed dedications made by, respectively, Svegeruna and Hinnigilda (names of
Germanic, perhaps Gothic, origin), with one mentioning the “church of Gallunianu,” a place identified with the modern village of Galognano. All six objects resemble comparable types found in Asia Minor and Syria and have been ascribed to local Byz. manufacture in the mid-6th C., on the eve of the Lombard invasion. In size and composition (type of objects and dedications) the Gallunianu Treasure is similar to contemporaneous silver treasures from other Byz. villages.


M.M.M.

**GALLUS** (Γάλλος), more fully Flavius Claudius Constantius Gallus, caesar of the eastern part of the empire (from 15 Mar. 351); born on the estate of Massa Veternensis, Etruria, 325/6, died near Pola end of 354. Nephew of Constantine I and half-brother of Julian, he survived the massacre of his family in 337 and lived out of public view until Constantius II made him caesar. Constantius then gave his sister Constantia to Gallus in marriage and stationed him in Antioch so that he could deal with the Persian threat while Constantius suppressed the usurpation of Magnentius. Gallus succeeded in keeping the Persians at bay. He was a fervent Christian of Arian persuasion; he reportedly placed the relics of St. Babylas in the temple of Apollo at Antioch to silence the demon’s prophecies. Ammianus Marcellinus condemns the cruelty of Gallus, his bloody suppression of a Jewish revolt in Palestine, and the murder of some subordinates, but R. Blockley (infra) considers these charges unfair. In 354 he was recalled and executed by orders of Constantius.


T.E.G.

**GAMES, BOARD,** were inherited from antiquity and common among all layers of society. There were several kinds of board game: in addition to chess Koukoules (infra) distinguishes among dice (kybola), backgammon (tablola) or checkers (petteia), and knucklebones (astragalismos), but the exact difference between them is hard to define. It is reported (Malal. 345.16–17) that Theodosios I transformed the temple of Artemis in Constantinople into a tableparochion or gaming room for dice players. Gambling by clergy, however, was prohibited by canon law (PG 137:125C–128B). The major reason for the prohibition was the Byz. tendency to abstain from playing with tyche or fortune. Anna Komnene, who approved of chess, was very critical of other board games. They became ubiquitous during the late period: in 1437 Per Tafur saw gaming boards in the imperial library of Constantinople (N. Wilson, GRBS 8 [1967] 54). John Choummos (end of the 13th C.), in a letter to a “philosopher” (Boissonade, AeneNov 215f), describes gambling along with feasting and dancing as main elements of an entertainment during the calend: “the spotted bones,” he says, “promptly changed the mood of men, making some happy and others sad.” Sachlikes complains (or rather boasts) of his losses at gambling.

Excavations have uncovered many dice and other gaming pieces of uncertain date. Game boards have been found, scratched crudely on paving slabs of roadways and buildings. These are mainly of two types: circles divided into wedge-shaped sections and rectangles divided into square sections.

**GAMBROS** (γαμβρός), properly “son-in-law,” term that in the 12th C. became a semiofficial title encompassing a broad group of nobles linked to the emperor by affinity—husbands of the em-
GAMZIGRAD, modern name of a fortified site in the province of Dacia Ripensis, north of Niš in Yugoslavia. Thanks to an early 4th-C. inscription reading “Felix Romuliana” (D. Srejović, Stinarar 36 [1985] 51–60 and fig. 1), it can be identified as the Romyliana mentioned by Prokopios (Buildings 4:4). Pseudo-Aurelius Victor, in his epitome, relates that Galerius was buried in a place called Romylium in honor of the emperor’s mother, Romula.

Monumental walls with 20 octagonal towers and elaborate gates to the west and east surround the site. Inside this fortification excavations have revealed two temples, one of which may be the mausoleum of Galerius, and palatial structures; mosaic pavements include Dionysiac and hunting scenes. Fragments of marble cult statues and of porphyry figure(s) of an emperor survive; architectural sculpture depicts royal themes. This imperial complex was erected at the beginning of the 4th C.; construction occurred in two phases, apparent in both fortifications and interior architecture. It deteriorated soon after the death of Galerius but was reconstructed at the end of the 4th or early 5th C. and survived through the 6th C. The nature of the site changed, however: two Christian churches, simple dwellings, and workshops were built. According to Prokopios, Justinian I restored Romyliana. A basilica dating to the late 6th C. was the latest monumental construction. Afterwards the area acquired a rural character.

GANGRA, LOCAL COUNCIL OF. This council was convened ca.341 (date disputed) to condemn the radical asceticism associated with the Eustathians (see EUSTATHIOS OF ANTIOCH). Its only surviving document is a synodal letter consisting of 29 canons and a concluding epilogue (sometimes viewed as an additional canon) addressed to the episcopate of neighboring Armenia. The ascetics under judgment were primarily accused of rejecting family life and marriage (including married clergy), promoting social revolution by encouraging slaves to disobey their masters, in-
sisting that the rich could not enter the Kingdom of God, inspiring women to dress like men, and maintaining their own private liturgical assemblies while rejecting those of the church. Although evidence is lacking, the theological and socioeconomic implications of these ascetic novelties were no doubt discussed at length. Their explicit condemnation by the council is nevertheless balanced by a forceful affirmation (in the letter’s epilogue) of traditional asceticism and continence. The canons constitute our earliest and, hence, crucial evidence for the origins of monasticism in Asia Minor. Despite their provincial origin, they were included in all the major canonical collections of the church; Balsamon and Zonaras commented on them (PG 137:7233–73).

SOURCE: Marsi 21095–1122.


—A.P.

GANOS, MOUNT, holy mountain in Thrace, on the western shore of the Sea of Marmara, about 15 km southwest of Rhaistoe. Located near the small town of Ganos (Γάνος, mod. Gazióy), by the 10th or 11th C. the mountain was the site of a federation of monastic communities, headed by a protoi (Lauraint, Corpus 5.2, nos. 1228–32). One of its most famous protoi was John Phournes, who assisted Euthymios Zigabenus in the compilation of his Panoplia. Its monasteries suffered destruction during the attacks of the Bulgarians in 1199, the Crusaders in 1203, and the Catalan Company in the early 14th C. In the late 13th C. the future patriarch Athanasios I founded a double monastery there and clashed with the pre-Unionist bishop of Ganos who had been installed by Palt. John XI Bekkos. Maximos Kausokalibites spent the early part of his career on Ganos.


—A.M.T.

GARDEN (κήπος, also called περιβολιον). Essential to Byz. horticulture, gardens formed a valuable part of a domestic establishment, providing its members with fruit and vegetables. Even a poor monastery had a garden (e.g., vita of Meletios the Younger, ed. V. Vasil’evskij, PSS 17 [1886] 21.17–19), and most peasants, according to Athostite praktika, had vineyards and small garden plots (Latoi, Peasant Society 33). Big farms, like that of the Argyropoulou in 15th-C. Thessalonike, which raised vegetables for market, are also known. There was no clear distinction between vineyards, gardens, and kitchen gardens: vines often grew together with (and upon) fruit trees, and vegetables were raised under trees; accordingly “mixed” terms such as ampelokephal (vineyard-garden) were used. Gardens were usually established where there was access to water; in instances where irrigation was used, the plot was sometimes qualified with the adjective hypopotion (drinking). Probably the term chersoperibolôn designated allotments where no irrigation system had been installed. Vineyards and gardens were usually surrounded by a fence and a ditch (already mentioned in the Farmer’s Law), and later even by a brick wall, and special guards were commonly used to prevent trespassing.

Pleasure gardens occupy an important place in Byz. romance as a place for romantic encounters, and the garden of Eden played a significant part in Byz. cosmology.

—O. Schissel, Bev byzantinische Garten (Vienna 1942).


—J.W.N., A.K.

GARIGLIANO, or Liris, a river in southern Italy (in the area of Gaeta). In the second half of the 9th C. there existed on the right bank of the Garigliano an Arab colony dangerous both to Rome and to Byz. possessions in southern Italy. In the next century Pope JOHN X forced the Arabs to retreat to the Garigliano from Narni and Ciculi. In 914 the coalition that arose against the Arabs of the Garigliano region included the newly elected pope, Constantinople, and Berengar of Friuli as well as Spoleto and several other southern Italian principedoms. In June 915 the Byz. fleet blocked the estuary of the Garigliano, and a united army (including the troops of Nicholas Picingli, strategos of Longobardia) forced the Muslims to flee to the mountain peaks. In Aug. 915, pressed by famine, they tried to escape but were killed or captured. A legend asserts that the apostles Peter and Paul appeared and encouraged the Christian army.
GARIZIM. See Neapolis.

GARLAND, rope woven of leaves, usually laurel, sometimes with fruit or flowers and, like the wreath, suggestive of ceremonial splendor. Common in Late Antique art, garlands were sometimes carried by putti and combined with masks in the classical tradition. They frequently festooned official and funerary monuments, for example, the Mausoleum of Diocletian at Split, consular diptychs, and sarcophagi.

Garlands decorated vaults and arch soffits in monumental painting and mosaics throughout Byz. art, e.g., Church of the Acheiropoietos, Thessalonike, apse mosaic of Hagia Sophia (Constantinople), and the Chora Monastery. Framing elements consisting of garlands appeared in floor mosaics, textiles, and book illumination, for example, the Paris Psalter. They were most common from the 4th to 6th C. and again in the 9th to 10th C.

GASMOLIOS (γασμούλιος, also βασμούλιος, etym. unknown), a descendant of a Byz. and a Latin (most often a Byz. female and a Latin, esp. Venetian, male). The word first appears in sources of the second half of the 13th C. Following the reconquest of Constantinople by Michael VIII Palaiologos in 1261, gasmoulai were recruited in large numbers as mercenaries to form the core of the light-armed contingent serving aboard Michael's refurbished fleet, this Gasmonikon appears in several naval campaigns during the 1260s and 1270s. Despite Andronikos II's reduction of the fleet in 1285, some gasmoulai remained in the service of the emperor, others served aboard Latin ships or acted as pirates in the Aegean. Later they seem to have played a significant military role in the Civil War of 1341–47. By the mid-14th C. service in the fleet as a gassaul (gasmoulite douletis) had lost its ethnic character. Gasmonoi served the Ottomans in the second half of the 14th C., and gasmoloi with a hereditary military obligation (servitio et tenimento vasmula) served the Latin rulers in the Aegean in the 15th–16th C. A number of gasmolai were Venetian nationals. Their nationality was a source of friction between the empire and Venice from 1277 until the 1320s.

GATE, CITY, designated by πύλη, the same word as "door," formed an opening in the city walls, usually in the form of an arch. The gate marked the point where the principal urban thoroughfare changed into a highway. Through the gate the city communicated with the outer world: goods were imported, livestock driven to market, troops departed and returned, visitors and processions entered. Some portals were the setting of ceremonies, such as adventus. The gates sometimes consisted of wide passages for carriages and narrow wickets for pedestrians. Gates were the weak point in the system of fortifications; they had to be barred at night and guarded by special watchmen who had possession of the keys; they were flanked by towers.

The Roman practice of embellishing the main entrances in city walls was pursued at Split, Gamzigrad, and other towns and camps. Gates were decorated with statuary set in niches and colonnades resting on corbels to either side and above the gate. Other examples are preserved at Nicea, Nikopolis, and the north and south gates at Seriopolis. Apart from the Golden Gate and those of the Blachernai quarter, the names of seven of Constantinople's gates are known. Most derive from the region of the city in which they were situated, local churches (e.g., St. Romanos), or destinations beyond them (Pege, Rhetion). Towers flanking these gates bear many inscriptions attesting to their imperial sponsorship or restoration. There is little basis for the widespread supposition that some gates were reserved for military use only.

In Byz. symbolism the pyle (gate or door) played an important role: both heaven and hell were supposed to have gates; Christ was a gate in the tower that represented the Church, and the gate facing east was a typo of the Virgin. In iconography, the gate stood for the city in the Entry into Jerusalem, for the province in the Flight
INTO EGYPT. Book illustrators employed a *pyla* (a pi-shaped framed headpiece) at the “entrance” of many texts.


GATTILUSIO (Γαττιλούζος) or Galtusi, Genoese family that ruled Lesbos from 1355 to 1462. The Levantine branch of the family was founded by Francesco I, an adventurer who was reportedly instrumental in securing control of Constantinople for John V Palaiologos in Nov. 1354 (Douk. 67–69). He was rewarded with marriage (summer 1355) to the emperor’s sister Irene (who took the name Maria) and with lordship over Lesbos. In 1356 he helped Amadeo VI of Savoy recapture Gallipoli (Kallipolis) from the Turks. Doukas called Francesco a “good and faithful friend” of John V; he accompanied the emperor to Rome in 1369. Francesco died in the earthquake that struck Lesbos on 6 Aug. 1384, together with two of his sons, Andronico and Domenico.

He was succeeded by his son Francesco II (1384–1403), whose daughter Irene (later Eugenia) married John VII Palaiologos and was the mother of the short-lived Andronikos V (N. Oikonomides, *Thesaurismata* 5 [1968] 28–31 and “Ivory Pyxis” 331f). To underline their Palaiologan connections, the Gattilusio family made frequent use of the double-headed eagle on their coins and heraldry. The family ruled over Lesbos until 1462, when Niccolo Gattilusio was forced to surrender to the Turks. They also acquired control of other northern Aegean islands and coastal lands, including Ainos, Thasos, Samothrace, Lemnos, and Palaia Phokaia. The salt beds of Ainos and alum mines of Phokaia provided substantial income. An important source for the later history of the family is Doukas, who was in the service of the Gattilusio and went on embassies for Dorino I (1428–55) and Domenico (1455–58). (See genealogical table.)


GAUFREDUS MALATERRA, Benedictine monk who accompanied other Normans to southern Italy and who evidently belonged to the entourage of Count Roger I of Sicily; died before 1101. At Count Roger I’s request Gaufredus authored *On the Deeds of Roger Count of Calabria and Sicily and his Brother Robert Guiscard*, a history of the Normans from ca. 1058 to 1099. Dedicated to Angerius, bishop of Catania, the work mixes prose with verse and apparently was left unfinished. Although the earlier part contains legendary material, the contemporary section offers unique details on prosopography and military events of the Byz.-Norman conflict in southern Italy, possibly furnished by Roger’s court. Gaufredus considered

---

**Selected Genealogy of the Gattilusio Family in the Levant in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Francesco I</th>
<th>m. Irene-Maria Palaiologina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francesco II</td>
<td>m. (?) daughter of John V Palaiologos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacopo I</td>
<td>Dorino I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domenico</td>
<td>Niccolò</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on A. Luttrel, *DOP* 40 (1986) 103–12.
the Byz. too soft to make good warriors (bk.3, ch.13), but his account sheds much light on Byz. CALABRIA, esp. on George Maniates (bk.1, chs. 7–8), and the subjugation of Calabria (bk.1, chs. 9–37). He describes how Guiscard exploited Michael VII’s deposition (bk.3, chs. 13–14) and the Norman assault on Greece (bk.3, chs. 24–29, 33, 39–41).


M. McC.

GAVRIIL OF LESNOVO, Bulgarian hermit and saint; born Osiche near Kriva Palanka, f. 11th–early 12th C. Gavril founded the monastery of the Archangel Michael (later known as the Lesnov monastery) on the slopes of Mt. Plavitsa, near the village of Lesnovo (now in the Yugoslav republic of Macedonia). Established in the period of Byz. rule in Bulgaria, it became a center of learning and book production throughout the Middle Ages. In the second half of the 14th C. the saint’s remains were removed to the Church of the Holy Apostles in the capital city of Tarnovo. The present monastery church was built in 1347 by the Serbian despot Jovan Oliver on the site of Gavriil’s original church. The fine frescoes are probably of the same date.


R.B.

GAYANÉ. See VALARŠAPAT.

GAZA (Γαζά, Ar. Ghazzah), ancient city on southern coast of Palestine that remained prosperous until the end of the 6th C., when the PACENZA PILGRIM (ch.33) called it a “lovely and renowned city.” Gaza lay inland, almost 5 km from its harbor at Constantia. It was a center of trade with Mecca; according to Arabic legend, Hashim, great-grandfather of Muhammad, died there. Gaza resisted the penetration of Christianity and until the beginning of the 5th C. possessed a pagan shrine of Zeus Marnas (the Marneion), which was finally destroyed by Porphyrios of Gaza, probably in 492. Even after the extinction of paganism, Gaza remained an important focus of ancient culture; teachers at its school of rhetoric included CHORIKIOS OF GAZA and PROKOPIOS OF GAZA, while DOROTHEOS OF GAZA was an influential monastic writer. On the MADABA Mosaic Map, Gaza is shown as a large city with colonnaded streets crossing its center and a large basilica in the middle, probably the church erected over the Marneion. A mosaic dated by Greek inscription to 508/9 was found during the excavations of a synagogue on the seashore; it represents David as Orpheus, and dressed as a Byz. emperor (A. Ovadiah, IEJ 19 [1969] 193–98).

When Gaza was conquered by the Arabs under ‘AMR in 635, the soldiers of the garrison were massacred; the Christian civilian population survived, however, and the city remained the seat of the governor of the Negev. In 723–26 the pilgrim Willibald saw a church in Gaza. The sequence of ceramic finds near Gaza indicates that soon thereafter the area was abandoned (L.Y. Rahmani, IEJ 33 [1983] 219–30). Probably recovered by the 10th C., Gaza was again in ruins when it fell to the Crusaders. They fortified it anew from ca.1149, and a lower town of merchants and peasants grew up around the citadel. The citadel of Gaza played an important part in the Crusaders’ conquest of ASKALON. Saladin captured Gaza in 1187, but Richard I Lionheart retook it and the Latins held it until 1229. Gaza was never a goal of pilgrimage, but an EULOGIA stamp with a representation of the Virgin was found near there (L.Y. Rahmani, IEJ 20 [1970] 105–08).


Gazes, Theodore, A.K., Z.U.M.

Gazes, Theodore, Greek émigré teacher and translator in Italy; born Thessalonike ca.1400, died Policastro in Calabria 1475/6. The early career of Gazes (Γαζή) is poorly documented. Before 1440 he moved to Italy and taught Greek in Ferrara, Naples, and Rome, where he joined the literary circle of Bessarion. In Ferrara he wrote the Introduction to Greek Grammar (D. Donnet, Byzantion 49 [1979] 133–55), which became the standard textbook for humanists and was highly praised by Erasmus. He also delivered a speech called On the Importance of Greek Studies, in which he emphasized the value of reading Greek literature as preparation for participation in political life. Gazes contributed much to developing mutual knowl-
edge of the Latin and Greek worlds; he translated Cicero and Claudian into Greek and made Latin translations or paraphrases of Xenophon, Aristotle, and some patristic texts (e.g., Chrysostom's commentary on Matthew). The study of Aristotle, whom Gazes tried to reconcile with Christian doctrines on the Trinity, on the immortality of the individual soul, and on the incarnation, led him into polemics with Plethon, the consistent follower of Plato.

Gazes supported the policy of Union of Churches, in which he saw the only means to stop the Ottoman conquest. His letter to Francesco Filefo, a treatise on the origin of the Turks (PG 161:997–1006), attests to his interest in their history. Moreover, Gazes argues against Plethon's fatalistic concept of the Turkish invasion as a revenge for Alexander the Great's conquest; he lays the foundation of historical criticism, drawing a contrast between Plethon's account and the history of the Turks as presented by "Skylax" (i.e., Skylitzes), whom Gazes finds closer to Strabo.

GEITONIARCHES (γειτονιαρχής), the chief official of the geitonia. According to the 6th-C. GREGENTIOS (PG 86:577D), the king of the Himyarites established in his capital 36 regions and appointed to each a geitoniarch with a sekretos. In the late 9th-C. KLETOROLOGION OF PHILOTHEOS the term designates subaltern officials of two departments—that of the eparch of the city and that of the demarchoi. The scanty evidence creates problems. If 10th-C. geitoniarchai were in fact district magistrates, it seems strange that Philotheos speaks of only 12 geitoniarchai (Oikonomides, Listes 209.22), whereas there were 14 districts in Constantinople. Secondly, if the geitoniarchai of the demarchoi were local supervisors, then it is curious that there was only one geitoniarchai of each color (Cameron, Circus Factions 92, n.3).

GELASIOS OF CAESAREA, nephew of Cyril of Jerusalem, died 395. Gelasios (Γελάσιος) was elected bishop of Caesarea in 367. As a Nicaean, he naturally fell foul of the Arian emperor Valens and was ousted, but came back on the accession of THEODOSIUS I. THEODORET OF CYRRHUS (HE 5.8) commends the purity of both Gelasios's doctrine and his life. JEROME (De vir. ill. 130) observes that he wrote quite well, but did not publish. At least some works circulated, however, since a number of authors do cite him. PHOTIOS (Bibl., cod.89) distinguishes two or three Gelasioses of Caesarea and lists their works, among which was the Church History, which ends with the death of Constantine the Great. Its relationship to the last two books of the continuation by RUFINUS OF AQUILEIA is much disputed (J. Schamp, PBR 6 [1987] 45–52; idem, Byzantion 57 [1987] 360–90). Only fragments survive, as is the case with his Exposition of the Symbol, possibly similar to the catechetical lectures of his uncle Cyril. A polemic Against the Anomaenae mentioned by Photios is lost.

GEITONIA (γειτονία), neighborhood, quarter; the term was esp. often applied to Antioch, where Malalas (Malal. 417.14) mentions various geitoniai. Some geitoniai are known by name: in Evagrius Scholastikos (HE 2.12), Ostrakine; in Malalas (272.6), Skepane; and in Theophanes (Theoph. 68.16), Iobiton. G. Downey (A History of Antioch [Princeton 1961] 478) suggests that Ostrakine was the potters' quarter. Theophanes (296.6) also mentions the geitoniai of the Blues in Constantinople, and in an excerpt from Malalas (T. Mommsen, Hermes 6 [1917] 380f) a geitonia la Mazentiolou in Constantinople reappears. A.P. Djakonov's theory (in VizSh 155) that geitoniai were centers of factions is now rejected.

The term geitonia disappeared after the 6th C. but the term geitonema ("neighborhood") continued in use. The hagiographer of GREGORY OF DEKAPOLESI (vita, ed. Dvornik. 63.22–26) reveals that geitonema gave some right to a neighboring piece of land.

---


- A.K.

LIT. Oikonomides, Listes 321, n. 194. 326. - A.K.


- B.B.
GELASIOS OF KYZIKOS, church historian; died after 475. The name of Gelasios (Γελάσιος) is preserved only by Photios (Bibl., cads. 15 and 88); the MSS of his writings, of which the oldest and the most important codex is Milan, Ambros. gr. 534 of the 12th and/or 19th C. (i.e., later than Photios), are anonymous. Of his life is known only what he himself says in the preface to his History: he was a son of a priest in Kyziko and composed his work during the rebellion of Basiliskos in order to refute the statement of the partisans of Eutyches that the fathers of the Council of Nicaea allegedy had been inclined to the Mono-ophysite creed. The title of the book was Ekklesiasti- tike historia (Church History), replaced in later tradition by the title Syntagma of the Holy Council in Nicaea. The book begins with Constantine I the Great's assumption of power; the manuscript breaks off at the description of the synod in Tyre in 335. According to Photios, the history originally extended to the end of Constantine's reign; the Bibliotheca also records that Gelasios rejected the view that the emperor was baptized by a heretic and affirmed that Constantine was Orthodox. For his compilation Gelasios used some sources that are still extant (EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA, RUFINUS, SOKRATES, THEODORUS OF CYRHIUS) as well as some texts now lost, such as the Church History of Gelasios of Caesarea, the Church History of a certain John, and the documents of the Council of Nicaea, particularly the address of Constantine to the Council and the dialogue between the Fathers of Nicaea and the Arian philosopher Phaidon.


—A.K., B.B.

GELASIUS I, pope (from 1 Mar. 492); died 21 Nov. 496; probably an African by birth. As archdeacon and papal secretary under FELIX III, Gelasius exerted influence even before his election to the papacy. He contributed much to developing the concept of papal primacy. Unlike his predecessor leo i, Gelasius sought support from the barbarians, esp. THEODORIC THE GREAT. When Emp. Zeno and particularly Anastasios I inclined toward alliance with Alexandria against Rome, he favored severing relations with Constantinople. He rejected the Henotikon and accused Patr. AKAKIOS of heresy; his opposition to Constanti- nople was formulated in instructions (communitorium) sent to Theodoric's magister officiorum Probus Faustus Niger. In his treatises, Gelasius developed the idea of papal authority as parallel to that of the emperor—as a governor of all the Romans based on the jus publicum—but with the emperor receiving his power from men and the pope from God. Accordingly, Gelasius stated that the canons of the Council of CHALCEDON (451) had validity only insofar as they were acknowledged by the papacy, and he denied the legality of canon 28 (H. Anton, ZKirch 88 [1977] 79-82). It was probably under his auspices that the legend of Pope SILVESTER developed.


—A.K.

GELATI, a monastic academy southwest of Ku- taisi in Georgia, founded by DAVID II/IV THE RESTOREK in 1106 and completed under King Demetrius (1125-56). The katholikon, a domed cruciform building with low chapels inserted at the four corners, is completely frescoed, save the apse, which carries a mosaic of the VIRGIN NI- KOPOUS. The subject and medium are both rare in Georgia, suggesting Byz. work, as does the presence of a lengthy Greek inscription. The pose of the Virgin, however—standing and closely flanked by archangels—and the enamel-like colors, are local features, as is the juxtaposition of the mosaic with frescoes (now obscured by 16th- and 17th-C. work) in the nave. Twelfth-century frescoes in the narthex represent the Seven Ecumenical COUNCILS.


—A.T.

GELIMER (Γελίμερ), last Vandal king (530-34); born North Africa at unknown date, died Galatia at unknown date. The son of Gelaris, great-grand- son of GAISERIC, and nephew of kings Guntha- mund and Thrasamund, Gelimer became king
after his overthrow of the philobyzantine Hilderic on 19 May (Stein, infra 311) or 15 June 530 (Courtois, infra 269). This act and his haughty rejection of the demand of Justinian I that Hilderic be handed over created a diplomatic pretext for the Byz. reconquest of North Africa. Belisarios’s landing of an expeditionary force in Sept. 533 surprised Gelimer, who ineptly directed the Vandal resistance; Belisarios subsequently defeated the Vandals at Ad Decimum on 13 Sept. 533. Gelimer unsuccessfully tried to besiege Belisarios at Carthage, was crushed at Tricamarum in mid-Dec., and fled to Mt. Pappa on the border of Numidia during the winter of 533–34. In Apr. 534 Gelimer surrendered to Belisarios, effectively ending Vandal resistance. Gelimer was brought to Carthage, and then in the summer of 534 with his wife and children to Constantinople, where he was exhibited in a triumph in the Hippodrome. Justinian gave him an estate in Galatia but denied him the rank of patricius because he refused to renounce Arianism. Despite his earlier reputation for military prowess, Gelimer was a poor military commander whose complex and moody personality (according to Prokopios, Wars 3:19.25–29) caused his lack of steadiness and inability to rule or to save his kingdom and people.


—S.D.C., A.C.

GENEALOGY OF CHRIST, enumerated in Matthew 1:1–17 (40 names) and Luke 3:23–38 (56 names), is commemorated on the Sunday before Christmas. Illustrations of Christ’s ancestors are rare: for example, Paris, B.N. gr. 64, fol. 103–117, and the two FRIEZE GOSPELS where the ancestors appear as witnesses to the Incarnation. The 43 ancestors named in the liturgy adorn the inner narthex domes of the CHORA, and ancestors appear in the nave of the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem (12th C.). Christ’s Davidic ancestry through his mother, Mary, is frequently emphasized: David is axially aligned with Christ in monumental cycles and accompanies him in Gospel headpieces (Parma, Bibl. Pal. 5—Nelson, Preface & Miniature, frontispiece); the marginal PSALTERS illuminate Psalm 71 with an image of Mary, who also prefaces aristocratic Psalters; and the TREE OF JESSE flourishes in Palaiologan art.


—W.E.K.

GEMS (λιθάρια) in Byz. were used for JEWELRY, on horse fittings, weapon mounts and scabbards, and religious items, such as crosses and liturgical vessels; they could also be attached to textiles. All types of precious and semiprecious stones were used, the most common being carnelians, emeralds, sardonyx, jasper, haematite, lapis lazuli, amethysts, and rock crystal. Stones were used in their natural crystalline form wherever that occurred, polished or carved into CAMEOS and ringstones. They were rarely faceted, even though the use of diamonds for cutting diamonds was known. Gems were used in conjunction with gold, silver, and other materials. Thirty stones, of seven different kinds, are combined with marble and glass paste on Justin II’s reliquary cross (C. Belting-Ihm, JbRGZM 12 [1965] 142–68). A law of Leo I (Cod. Just. XI 12[11]) expressly states that private individuals were forbidden to use pearls, emeralds, and hyakinthoi (sapphires, aquamarines, amethysts?) on harness trappings but were allowed to use other gemstones. The imperial monopoly on the use of specific gems may have been entirely for economic reasons or could imply belief in the amuletic value of such stones. The two most important works on the healing powers of gems were written by EPIPHANIOS OF SALAMIS and MICHAEL PSELLOS.


GENESIOS (Γενέσιος), conventional name of the 10th-C. author of the anonymous “History of emperors” that is preserved in a single MS (Leipzig, Univ. Lib. gr. 16); an 11th-C. hand wrote the text of Genesios, but on fol.248 another, later hand has inserted the notation “Genesiou” (F. Steinman, VizVrem 21 [1914] 37–39). There have been numerous attempts to reconstruct the biography and genealogy of Genesios, who has been given the first name of Joseph (a Joseph Genesios is mentioned in the preamble to Skylitzes) and
proclaimed the son or grandson of a certain Armenian Constantine (A. Markopoulos, ZRVI 24–25 [1986] 103–08). Written at the court of Constantine VII, the chronicle encompasses the period 813–86 and presents events from the viewpoint of the Macedonian dynasty.

The problem of its interrelationship with Theophanes Continuatus is complicated: because Genesios stated that he employed eyewitnesses and rumors (p.3.11–12), he used to be considered the source of Theophanes Continuatus; comparing the texts, however, leads to the conclusion that he borrowed his material from the continuator (esp. from Vita Basilii) or that they both depended on the same source. F. Barisic suggests that Genesios used Sergios the Confessor (Byzantion 31 [1961] 170f.). Genesios’s composition is loose, full of insertions and non sequiturs. Especially poor is the last section, on Michael III and Basil I; its allegedly precise data turn out to be either invented or suspect.


GENESIS, first book of the Old Testament, which deals with the Creation. Illustration of the Book of Genesis is found most abundantly in two fragmentary MSS that are unrelated iconographically.

The Vienna Genesis (Vienna, ÖNB Theol. gr. 31; 6th C.) now consists of 24 folios of an estimated 96. It is a sumptuous book, written in silver ink on purple-dyed parchment. The layout is conceived around the illustrations, with the lower half of each page given over to the artist and the text in the upper half abbreviated from the Septuagint. No manuscript quite like it survives. Theories about the origin of its iconography and style have led to an attribution to the region of Syria/Palestine, although the purple parchment might seem to point to Constantinople itself.

The Cotton Genesis (London, B.L. Cott. Otho B.VI; 5th C.) once contained the full text of Genesis and some 360 miniatures, but a fire in 1731 reduced it to charred and shrunked fragments. Scholarly ingenuity has reconstructed in large part its original layout and to some extent the appearance of its miniatures. This was possible after study of iconographically related material, notably mosaics in the porches of S. Marco at Venice, which, since the work of Tikkanen (1899), have been accepted as closely related descendants of miniatures in the Cotton Genesis. The Cotton Genesis has been attributed to Egypt, in part on the basis of its interest in the Joseph story and enthusiasm for Nilotic landscapes, beehive granaries, and pyramids.

Further cycles of Genesis illustration in the early period are implied by the Octateuchs and monuments such as the mosaics of Monreale. Yet, in contrast to the situation in and after the 10th C., when it is often argued, artists frequently made reference to pre-Iconoclastic artistic treasures, it is striking that the Cotton and Vienna Genesis MSS seem to have been unknown in the East. Both had reached Venice and been consulted by artists by the early 14th C. at the latest (for the Vienna Genesis, see H. Buchthal, Historia Tria Nova [London 1972] 47–52). Genesis illustration is usually held to be characterized by its literalism. Significant elements were derived from extrabiblical sources, notably Jewish and Christian legends and exegesis, which probably entered the pictorial traditions before the 6th C.


GENIKON (γενικόν), major fiscal department that dealt with assessment of land and other taxes, maintaining the lists of taxpayers, and collecting payments (Dölger, Beiträge 194f). It also served as a tribunal for fiscal cases; Basil I is said to have presided over trials in the genikon. It occupied a special building allegedly constructed by Constantine I and located within the Great Palace. The building was destroyed by Isaac II (Janin, CP Byz. 176f).

The head of the genikon was the logothetes tou genikou. The office is distinct from that of the genikos logothetes, who was a high-ranking provincial kommerkarios in the 6th–7th C. The first mentioned head of the genikon logothesion was
the (former?) monk Theodotos ca.692. N. Oikonomides (Dated Seals, no.23) attributed to him the seal of Theodotos “monk and genikos logotheites.” Under the logotheites were various officials: megas chariouarios, chariouarioi of the arkai, epoptai, dioiketai, komes hydaton, oikistoi, kommerkiarioi, komes tes lamias, etc. The role of the genikon declined under the Komnenoi but recovered under Andronikos I and the Angeloi. After 1204 the term logotheites tou genikou survived only as a title, often conferred on intellectuals such as George and Constantine Akropolites and Theodore Metochites. The chrysobull of 1302 mentioning the sekraton of the genikos logotheites (Xerop. 235.40) is a forgery. Pseudo-Kodinos refers to the logotheites tou genikou but admits ignorance of his functions. The last logotheites tou genikou was probably Iannes [sic] Androuses in 1380 (PLP, no.90111).


GENNADIOS I, patriarch of Constantinople (Aug./Sept. 458–between 17 and 20 Nov. 471); born ca.400. A man of wonderful memory and excellent education, he was highly praised by Gennadios of Marseilles. A consistent opponent of Alexandrian political and theological independence, Gennadios polemicized in his youth against Cyril of Alexandria and later deposed Timotheos Alouros. On the other hand, he was a true ally of Pope Leo I and composed an enkomion of the pope’s tome addressed to Flavian and directed against Eutyches. In 458 or 459 Gennadios sent an encyclical epistle condemning simony (RegPatr, fasc. 1, no.143). Gennadios enjoyed fame as a miracle worker: Theodore Lector relates that the patriarch healed a painter whose hand withered because he dared to depict Christ with the attributes of Zeus; when the avanorton Charisios refused to improve his behavior, Gennadios predicted his death, which indeed occurred the next day. Little has survived from his exegetical and dogmatic works. Neophytos Enklestios wrote a eulogy of Gennadios, whom he compared to Daniel the Stylite and Andrew the Fool (H. Delehaye, AB 26 [1907] 221–28).


GENNADIOS II SCHOLARIOS, theologian and patriarch of Constantinople (6 Jan. 1454–56, 1463, and 1464–65); baptismal name George; born Constantinople between 1400 and 1405, died Mt. MONOIKEION ca.1472. He is sometimes referred to as Kourteses, perhaps his mother’s name. A student of Mark Eugenios, John Chortasmenos, and Joseph Bryennios, Gennadios taught logic and physics in Constantinople. By 1438 he was didaskalos, senator, and krites katholikos. He attended the Council of FERRARA-FLORENCE, where he took a Unionist position. By 1444, however, Gennadios became an avowed opponent of Union of the Churches and inherited from Mark Eugenios the leadership of the anti-Unionist party. He was consequently deposed (1446/7) from his official positions and ca.1450 took monastic vows at the Charsianites monastery. Gennadios was captured by the Turks in 1453; after his release he served three times as patriarch. He sought to reach a modus vivendi with the Turkish authorities, urged a policy of oikonomia with respect to infractions of the canons, and hoped for spiritual revival among the Orthodox. In the interlude between his patriarchates, he retired to the Prodromos monastery near Serres; he later died and was buried there.

Gennadios knew Latin well and admired Latin scholarship, esp. the works of Aquinas, of which he prepared translations and commentaries. He wrote an ardent defense of Aristotle, who had been attacked by Plethon, and sought to incorporate into Byz. thinking scholasticism and the Thomist interpretation of Aristotle (G. Podskalsky, Theologie und Philosophie 49 [1974] 305–23). His extensive writings include anti-Union treatises; expositions of the Christian faith for Mehmed II (A. Papadakis, Byzantion 42 [1972] 88–106); and essays on divine providence, predestination, and the origin of the human soul.


GENNADIUS OF MARSEILLES, Latin theologian; died between 492 and 505. His biography is unknown, and most of his works (including books against Nestorios and Eutyches) are lost.
His book *On Famous Men*, which is a continuation of *Jerome*, is our most important source concerning Christian writers of the 4th and esp. 5th C. Cennadius knew both Greek and Latin, he described only those works he himself had read, and he tried to be objective in his approach. He viewed Pelagios as a heresiarch; at the same time he had no praise for Augustine, rejecting his concept of predestination.

LIT. B. Czapl, *Cennadius als Litterarhistoriker* (Münster 1898); M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 4.2 (Münich 1920) 552–54.

A.K.

**GENOA** (Γένα) [Genova], port city in Liguria in northwestern Italy, which after Diocletian belonged to the province of Alpes Cottae. It was a bishopric in the 5th C., and its bishop Paschasius participated in the Council of Chalcedon in 451. Two edicts of Theodoric the Great mention a Jewish community and a synagogue in Genoa. By 539 the city was in the hands of the Byz.; it was taken for a short time by the Franks, but then remained Byz. until the 7th C. The Lombard king Rothari conquered Genoa ca.642 and destroyed its walls. The city recovered in the 10th C. despite Muslim raids in 930–35; in the 11th C. Genoa defeated the Arabs and expelled them from Sardinia; its fleet also sacked Tunis.

The Genoese took part in the First Crusade, sending a squadron of 19 vessels that was instrumental in attacking the Syrian and Palestinian coast. Genoa's abundant archives record Genoese trade activity with Syria, Alexandria, and Constantinople; in 1155 Emp. Manuel I Komnenos, suspicious of Venice, granted the Genoese a chrysobull promising them an embolos and skalai in Constantinople as well as a reduction of the kommerkion. In their penetration into "Romania" the Genoese encountered competition from Venice and Pisa; Manuel I considered Genoa a natural ally in his struggle with Venice, and after 1171 the Genoese position in the empire became favorable. In 1201 the Genoese ambassador Ottobone della Croce received new privileges from Alexios III, and relations were active in 1203 when the threat of the Crusaders' attack on the Byz. capital became imminent (P. Schreiner, *QFI/Arch* 63 [1983] 292–97).

Although Venice benefited enormously from the fall of Constantinople in 1204, Genoa took advantage of Greek hostility toward Venice to secure its position in the Empire of Nicaea. Guglielmo Boccanegra, "captain of the people," concluded the Treaty of Nymphaiion with Michael VIII in 1261, and after the Byz. reconquest of Constantinople the same year Genoa attained a privileged position in the empire, replacing Venice. The Genoese naval victory of 1284 at the battle of Meloria (near Livorno) weakened, if not completely destroyed, Pisa, another rival (Genova, *Pisa e il Mediterraneo tra due e trecento* [Genoa 1984]), making Genoa the major Italian power in the Levant. Genoa established colonies in Pera (see Galata), Chiòs, the Danubian delta (Vicina, Chilia), the Crimean (Kaffa, Soğuda), and Trebizond; alum mines in Phokaia were ceded to the Genoese. From 1292 on, however, the Venetians waged a counterattack that led to a series of wars involving the Greeks, Catalans, and Turks (C.P. Kyrris, *Byzantina* 4 [1972] 331–56; M. Balard, *TM* 4 [1970] 431–69). The treaty of 1352 signed by John VI Kantakouzenos expanded Genoa's privileges in the Levant (I.P. Medvedev, *VizVrem* 38 [1977] 161–72). Thereafter Genoese activity began to decrease, owing to the collapse of the Mongols and the advance of the Ottomans, among other reasons; Pera was lost in 1453, Kaffa in 1475, and Chiòs in 1566.

The Byz. of the 14th C. attentively observed internal strife in Genoa. Theodore Metochites deplored it as an example of the inadequacies of democracy; Gregoras and Kantakouzenos mention Simone Boccanegra's rise to power (1339–44). However, an attempt to demonstrate that Boccanegra's uprising inspired the zealots in Thessalonike (where a Genoese colony allegedly existed) is inconclusive (Ševčenko, *Soc. & Intell.*, pt. III [1953], 609–17).

A textile with a cycle of the Life of St. Lawrence and extensive Latin inscriptions, sent by Michael VIII to his Genoese allies, is preserved in the Galleria di Palazzo Bianco (Cutler-Nebbett, *Arte* 318f). R. Nelson (*ArtB* 67 [1985] 548–66) suggested that frescoes painted in the Cathedral of St. Lawrence in Genoa ca.1310 were the work of an itinerant Byz. artist.

GENRE, LITERARY. The concept of genre is historically determined, and the classical categorization of literature into three genres (lyric, epic, and drama) did not apply to Byz. The Byz. had no coherent theory of genre, except in the case of rhetoric, whose works they divided, in accordance with ancient principles, into various gene and eide (Martin, Rhetorik 9). Some Byz. writers, such as Psellos (Ljubarskij, Psell 139–41) or Eustathios of Thessalonike (Kazhdan-Franklin, Studies 183–87), tried to draw a distinction between certain genres. The principle of classification for medieval literature was functional rather than aesthetic—the objective and the audience addressed were the major criteria of categorization; accordingly, the genres formed an interconnected system that can be characterized as a hierarchy of genres. Each genre was supposed to possess strict rules of stylistic formulas (which some historians of literature call "etiquette"), even though the Byz. accepted the existence of mixed genres. Eustathios justified this formulaic method of composition: although in antiquity Solon demanded that each work of art be unique, now standards had changed, and God and the divine deeds of emperors should be praised repeatedly, retained "as a seal of brilliant character," and promoted everywhere (Regel, Fontes 1:98.21–27). Eustathios argued that the repetitive formulas were necessary for the didactic purposes of Byz. literature.

The type of genre was often, but not in every case, stated in the heading of a work (logos, epitaph, chronic, vita, etc.), but this categorization is not always the author's and in any case is inconsistent. From the point of view of modern criticism, one can distinguish the following major genres: poetry (secular and religious, both with subdivisions), rhetoric (with many subdivisions), and esp. sermons, epistolography, hagiography, theological literature (primarily polemic and exegesis), historiography, admonitions, romance, fable, gnomic, proverbs, and satire. Although scientific and juristic literature contain some elements of literary genres, they belong to the sphere of normative, not didactic and entertaining works.


GEORGEY I VILLEHARDOIN (Στεφάνος Β' Βασιλεύς), prince of Achaia (ca.1209–25/31); born between 1170 and 1175, died between 1225 and 1231. Nephew of the historian George de Villehardeouin, Geoffrey accompanied the part of the Fourth Crusade that went to Syria. There, in 1204, he learned of the capture of Constantinople and set sail for the city. His ship was forced to pass the winter of 1204/5 at Methone, where an unnamed Byz. magnate invited him to help seize that area. Their cooperation prospered until the magnate's death. In summer 1205, his son's hostility forced Geoffrey and his followers to seek out Boniface of Montferrat, then besieging Nauplia. With Boniface's consent, Geoffrey joined William I of Champlitte in conquering the Morea. After William departed for France, Geoffrey did homage to Emp. Henry of Hainault (1209) and became prince of Achaia. Around 1209/10 he took the Acrocorinth (where he constructed a donjon) and then the Lakanion plain, leaving only Monemvasia, the Slavs of Taygetos, and the Mani unconquered. In the feudal organization of the principality, former Byz. magnates assumed a recognized place while peasants continued to pay dues similar to those in Byz. times. The circumstances of Geoffrey's death are unknown.


GEORGEY II VILLEHARDOIN, prince of Achaia (ca.1226/31–1246); born France ca.1195?, died Morea early summer 1246. The son of Geoffrey I Villehardeouin, he came to the Morea ca.1210. In 1217 he married Agnes de Courtenay, daughter of Pierre de Courtenay, Latin emperor of Constantinople. As Pierre's vassal Geoffrey helped the Latins oppose Byz. efforts to reconquer Constantinople. In 1236 and 1238 he fought against John III Vatatzes, who was besieging the capital. The Latin emperor rewarded him with suzerainty over Euboea. During Geoffrey's reign
the principality of Achaia enjoyed great tranquility and prosperity. Since he left no male heir, he was succeeded by his brother William II Villehardouin.

111. Bon, Morée franque t: 75f. 79–115. Longnon, Empire latin 165f., 175f. HC 2:242–44. —A.M.T.

GEOFFREY DE VILLEHARDOUIN (historian). See Villehardouin, Geoffrey.

GEOGRAPHY as a scholarly discipline was inherited by the Byz. from antiquity. Strabo and Pausanias were the favorite sources of Stephen of Byzantium in the 6th C., and interest in Strabo was revived by the 9th C. (A. Diller, Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition [Amsterdam 1983] 1–62, 137–82): a 9th-C. Heidelberg MS contains a selection of minor geographical works, including the Periplus of the Erythrean (Red) Sea (see Periplus), and an epitome of Strabo (Wilson, Scholars 87). Strabo and Stephen of Byzantium were excerpted in chronicles and leixika, in works by Constantine VII Porphyrogenetus, and elsewhere. The didactic poem on geography of Dionysios Periegetes (2nd C.) also acquired popularity and was commented on by Eustathios of Thessalonike, among others. Ptolemy, however, was more appreciated as the author of the Handy Tables than as a geographer, and Eratosthenes, the most scientific of ancient geographers, remained scarcely more than a name to the Byz.

The late Roman period witnessed an interest in descriptive geography—from accounts of marketplaces and harbors (Expositio totius mundi) to the itineraries of pilgrims (Egeria). The development of this genre stopped after the 6th C. and only slowly revived, beginning with Epiphanius Hagiopolites (end of 8th or 9th C.). The resurgence of travel literature from the 11th C. on shows growing interest in geography, although the Byz. retained a generally negative attitude toward travel. Psellus made ironic remarks about the wandering monk Elias (Ljubarskij, Psell 74–79), and Niketas Choniates ridiculed Patr. John X Kamateros for behaving as if he had journeyed throughout the world. Later this negative attitude disappeared: Gregoras included in his History (Greg. 3:3–75) a lengthy section devoted to his friend Agathangelos, who allegedly spent 20 years traveling around the Mediterranean, describing his journeys in letters. The representatives of Greek travel literature of the 12th–15th C. are John Phokas, Andrew Libadenos, and Laskaris Kanonas. To descriptive geographic literature also belong the narrative accounts of ambassadors to foreign lands, such as Priskos of Panion and Nonnosos in the late Roman period and Constantine Manasses, Nicholas Mesarites, and Theodore Metochites in the 12th–14th C. Many geographic observations, based partly on personal experience and partly on the records of travelers, are contained in historical works from Ammianus Marcellinus to Laonikos Chalkokondyles.

Theoretical geography, however, lagged behind descriptive observations. Cartography was barely known after the late Roman period. Description of lands and cities tended to be replaced by lists of names, as in Hierokles or the Cosmographer of Ravenna, rarely supplemented with information. More elaborate are the lists of themes and esp. of neighboring peoples in Constantine VII's De administrando imperio and De thematibus, which also provide historical and ethnographic data. Various causes hampered the development of Byz. geographic perceptions. First, writers felt the need to reconcile observations and empirical findings with preconceived notions based on the Bible—such a combination of personal experience and traditional stories is typical of Kosmas Indikopleustes. Following another tradition, already found in ancient literature, some Byz. "geographers" uncritically accepted bookish information as true. Even in De thematibus the distribution of cities in ancient times is not distinguished from the situation of the 11th C. Finally, geographic views were strongly influenced by folklore; fantastic notions regarding alien lands and peoples were often blended with reliable information.

In Byz. cosmography views on the shape of the earth ranged from the domed cube (Kosmas) to the globe (Photios), but in both cases the oikoumene was centered on the Mediterranean, which was seen as surrounded by three continents—Europe, Asia, and Libya—that were surrounded, in their turn, by the Ocean. The extremes of the earth—the British Isles, China, and Black Africa—were more often than not presented in legendary form, whereas India had a double existence—both as a place situated on the Ganges and as another identified with Ethiopia. Far in the east was the earthly Paradise, where the four major rivers (see Paradise, Rivers of) supposedly rose.
 GEOPONIKA (Περί γεωργίας ἐκλογαί), collection of excerpts on agriculture dedicated to Constantine VII; probably compiled 944–59. The Geoponika deals with grain production, horticulture, apiculture, and esp. viticulture. In the preface the compiler praises Constantine's victories and patronage of philosophy, rhetoric, and all sciences and arts. Since the state consists of three elements—the army, the clergy, and agriculture (p.26–7)—it was natural to issue an encyclopedia of this kind.

The originality of the Geoponika has been much discussed. Lipić emphasizes the original elements of the treatise (e.g., the author expressed the hope that the Arabs would perish [p.19,16]) and regards the Geoponika as a source for the study of 10th-C. agriculture. Lemeler asserts that the Geoponika contains nothing original except the preface; he argues that the Geoponika was based on the work of Kassianos Bassos the scholastikos (an office that had already disappeared by the 10th C.) and ascribes to him all the personal remarks included in Bassos's Eklogai, a compilation based in turn on the work of Vindanius Anatolios of Berytus (4th C.), mentioned in Photios's Bibliotheca (cod. 169). Gemoll, on the other hand, saw in Kassianos Bassos the compiler of the Geoponika. This very popular book has been preserved in approximately 50 MSS of the 11th C. and later; the Geoponika (or its source) was translated into Arabic, Syriac, and later into Armenian. In 1157 Burgundio of Pisa acquired a MS of the Geoponika and translated it into Latin the section on viticulture.


LIT. Lemeler, Humanism 33–6. W. Gemoll, Untersuchungen über die Quellen, der Verfasser und die Abfassungszeit der Geoponika (Berlin 1884).

GEORGE, saint; principal feastday 23 Apr. No reliable evidence attests his martyrdom, attributed to the time of a legendary Persian king Dadianos and located in Lydda (Diospolis in Palestine); later accounts transferred his execution to Nikomedea and the reign of Diocletian. Nevertheless the veneration of George is attested very early. An inscription of 323 found at Shakka in the Hauran mentions George “and the saints who suffered with him.” A decree of Pope Gelasius I of 496 rejects George's acta as apocryphal; several 6th-C. pilgrims observed the cult of George's tomb in Lydda. The earliest fragments of his passiones are the 5th-C. palimpsest in Vienna, the 6th-C. papyrus from the Negev, and a fragment (ca.1000?) from Nubia (W.H.C. Frend, AB 100 [1982] 79–86). The earliest passio emphasized George's ordeal and endurance; gradually, the theme of George as intercessor developed, esp. in his Miracula (some of which cannot be dated earlier than 1100—A. Kazhdan, Byzantium 52 [1982] 420), in which the saint helped in finding cattle, releasing captives, etc. Unlike the passiones, the Miracula present George as a mounted knight. George, Demetrios, Theodore Stratelates, and Theodore Teron were the most popular military
SAINTS; Emp. John II Komnenos introduced the image of George in military costume on coins. The legend of George's victory over the dragon was known probably only from the 12th C. Many writers such as ROMANOS THE MELODES, Theodore DAPHNOPATES, and Theodore PRODOMOS eulogized George. His *passiones* were translated into Latin, Slavic, Coptic, Armenian, Arabic, and Ethiopic.

**Representation in Art.** Virtually no other saint is so widely depicted in Byz. art as George. His portrait as a youthful warrior, elegantly clad, his hair in tight curls, is an essential feature of every church program, and appears in every other possible medium as well, from painted icons to ivory, from MSS to coins. In the post-Iconoclastic period (mostly after the 10th C., though there is a 9th–10th C. icon with a related image on Mt. Sinai; Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, B.44) George is also shown on horseback, often as a pendant to the mounted St. Theodore Stratelates (B. E. Scholz, *JÖB* 32.5 [1982] 243–53). His martyrdom on the wheel appears in the earliest marginal Psalters, and cycles of his martyrdom, with its long sequence of tortures as well as some of his miracles, are painted in subsidiary areas of churches from the 11th C. onward, esp. in Georgia and Serbia.

Large historiographed icons may contain over a dozen scenes surrounding a central figure of the saint; in some of these the figure of George is in relief, as though to imitate one of the three-dimensional wooden statues (zoana) of George such that he housed in his church in Omorphokeklesia near KASTORIA.


GEORGE BRANKOVIĆ, despotes of Serbia (from 1427); born ca.1375, died Belgrade 24 Dec. 1456. Between 1398 and 1402 BAYEZID I reinstalled George and his brother Gregory in lands confiscated from their father Vuk. George participated in the battle of Ankara in 1402 as a Turkish vassal; after the Ottoman defeat he returned to Serbia via Constantinople and used the temporary weakness of the Ottomans to build up a significant principality. Silver mines at Novo Brdo provided Branković with the necessary financial resources to construct between 1428 and 1430 a new capital on the Danube, the well-fortified Smederevo.

In 1427 Branković inherited the territory of his childless uncle, STEFAN LAZAREVIĆ, and received the title of despotes from the Byz. emperor John VIII. In addition to coping with the increasing
Ottoman threat, Branković had to resist both Venice and Hungary; he lost Belgrade to Hungary in 1427 and had to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Hungarian king. In these conditions Dubrovnik and Constantinople were his natural allies. In 1414 he had taken as his second (or third) wife Irene Kantakouzene, granddaughter of Matthew I (Nicol, Kantakouzenos 184-88, no. 71). Irene’s brother Thomas became one of Branković’s leading generals. A daughter Mars was married to Murad II (I. Papadrianos, Hellenika 19 [1966] 113-16).

In 1439 Smederevo fell to the Turks. In 1444 Branković and Hunyadi, voivode of Transylvania, recaptured Smederevo and in 1444 reinstated the despotate of Serbia. This initially successful Christian crusade against the Turks ended the same year, however, in defeat at the battle of Varna (in which Branković did not participate). Branković resumed his vassalage to the Ottomans and was forced to send a contingent of troops and sappers for the siege of Constantinople in 1453. After the fall of the Byz. capital, Mehmed II repeatedly attacked the Serbian despotate. In 1455 the Turks captured Novo Brdo and in June 1459, after the death of Branković, they took Smederevo, thus ending the last Serbian medieval state. A portrait of Branković with his family is preserved on a chrysobull of 1429 in the Espigmenou monastery on Athos.


—J.S.A.

GEORGE HAMARTOLOS (“the sinner”), or George the Monk, author of a universal chronicle encompassing history from Adam to 842. His biography is unknown, the time of his compilation under discussion. The traditional date of ca. 866/7 has been questioned by P. Lemerle (TM 1 [1965] 259, n.13); W. Regel (Analecta byzantino-russica [St. Petersburg 1891] vi–xiii) hypothesized that George used the Life of the empress Theodora (who died 867) and was therefore a contemporary of Leo VI; A. Markopoulos (Symmetiku 5 [1983] 252–55), although rejecting Regel’s argument, believes that George could not have written before 872. C. de Boor based his edition on a single MS (Paris, B.N. Coisl. 305 of the 10th or early 11th C.), even though various other MSS represent a common archetype (P. Odorico, fOB 32.4 [1982] 39).

George’s Chronicle is very combative and biased. He claims that his “small and modest biblidarion” conveys undorned truth, for it is better “to stammer in the path of the truth than to be false while imitating Plato” (1:2,3–10); whether George had more than textbook knowledge of Plato remains unclear (G. Belliore, Sileno 4 [1978] 23–71). George hates Iconoclasm, Islam, Manichaeanism, and idolatry and often expresses his hatred with a string of obscene epithets. He focuses primarily on the events of ecclesiastical history: thus he dedicates ten lines to Julius Caesar, but 20 pages to Augustus, whose reign coincided with Christ’s birth. George is expansive in describing church councils and quotes abundantly from the church fathers. For the Byz. period his main sources are Theophanes and Malalas; he is independent for 813-42. Some MSS contain a continuation sometimes ascribed to Symeon Logothete, going up to 948 or 1081, even 1142/3. The Chronicle was translated into Old Georgian and Church Slavonic. An illustrated late 13th- or early 14th-C. MS of the latter version, now in Moscow (Lenin Lib. 100), contains an author portrait and a full-page image of Christ enthroned between Michael, prince of Tver (died 1318), and his mother. One hundred twenty-seven miniatures set in the text-columns depict Old Testament, New Testament, and historical subjects. These are derived by Podobedova and others from Byz. chronicle illustration.


—A.K., A.C.

GEORGE KOMNENOS, emperor of Trebizond (1266–80); born after 1254, died 1284 or later. Young and violent when he ascended to the throne, he changed the cautious policy of his father Man-
uel I and took an anti-aristocratic course. He also supported anti-Unionists and, in his foreign policy, attempted alliances with the Golden Horde and some Georgian princes against the Mongols of Persia. In 1278 George replaced his title of despotus with that of basileus to emphasize the independence of his position. This action provoked objections both in Constantinople by Michael VIII and in Tabriz by the Ilkhan Abaga. En route to Abaga, in the mountains near Tabriz, George was betrayed by Trapezuntine nobles, seized by the Mongols, and imprisoned. He was probably liberated after Abaga's death in 1282. In 1284 he (or an impostor) invaded Trebizond; again betrayed, he was captured by his brother John II Komnenos and died in captivity.


--- A.K.

**GEORGE MT'AC'MINDELI** (“of the holy mountain,” Gr. Hagiorites), Georgian translator and hagiographer; born Trialeti 1099, died Constantinople 1065. After long study in Constantinople (1022–34), George went to Mt. Athos; he became superior of the Georgian monastery of Iveron ca.1045, then traveled widely—back to Georgia, to the Black Mountain, and to Jerusalem. George is important for his extensive translations from Greek into Georgian. These include revisions of the Psalms, Gospels, Acts, and Epistles; liturgical and hymnographical texts (the Great Synaxarion, Menaion, Sticharia, and homilies); and patristic texts (Basil the Great of Caesarea’s _Hexaemeron_, Gregory of Nyssa’s _On the Making of Man and Commentary on the Song of Songs_). His most valuable original work (written ca.1044) is a Life of John and Euthymios the Iberian, respectively the founder and first superior of Iveron. George’s own Life was written soon after his death by a disciple, also named George, at the request of George the Recluse on the Black Mountain, where George Mt’ac’mindeli was well known.


--- R.T.

**GEORGE OF AMASTRIS,** saint; born in the town of _ton Kromenon_, near Amastris, died Amastris between 802 and 807; feastday 21 Feb. Born to a family of local nobility, George began at an early age to participate in church administration; he then became a hermit on Mt. Agriosike but subsequently moved to the cenobitic community of Bonyssa (in Paphlagonia?). Patr. Tarasios appointed him bishop of Amastris ca.790, although the emperor supported a different candidate.

The Life of George, preserved in a single 10th-C. MS, consists of a biography, very poor in details, and the description of a few miracles, including the conversion or at least appeasement of the barbarian “Rhos,” who attacked Amastris and tried to despoil the saint’s tomb. The authenticity of this information depends on the date and attribution of the Life: Vasili’evskij (infra) and, recently, Ševčenko (“Hagiography” 123–25) attribute it to Ignatios the Deacon, whereas G. da Costa-Louillet ( _Byzantion_ 15 [1940–41] 245–48) considers it a 10th-C. work. A. Markopoulos ( _JOB_ 28 [1979] 78–82) proposes a compromise solution: that the Life is by Ignatios but the “Russian miracle” is an insertion produced under the influence of _Photios_. Another puzzle in the Life is its lack of anti-Iconoclastic invective, despite George’s evident closeness to Empress Irene and esp. to Emp. Nikephoros I, whose ascent to the throne George allegedly predicted. The hagiographer is exceptionally eloquent when criticizing trade “on land and sea” (p.52f).

--- Source. V. Vasili’evskij, _Russko-vizantijskaja issledovaniya_, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg 1893) 1–73, reproduced in his _Trudy_ 3:1–71.

--- Lit. _BHG_ 668–668e.

--- A.K.

**GEORGE OF CYPRUS,** 7th-C. geographer of whom nothing is known save that he was born in Lapithos on Cyprus. His work is preserved in a compilation ascribed to another obscure individual, the Armenian Basil of Lalimbana, although Darrouzès ( _Notitiae CP_ 34, n.1, 42f) considers this attribution extremely hypothetical; the compilation is assumed to have been written in the 9th
C., and the compiler probably altered the text of George’s work. While accompanied in MSS by notitiae, that is, lists of metropolitan sees, archbishops, and bishops, George’s record, like that of Hierokles, contains secular administrative divisions, including cities (the term polis is usually omitted), kastra, homai (villages), klimata, and, rarely, polechnai (towns), islands, and harbors. George begins with the district under the “eparch” of Rome or Italy, then follows with Africa, Egypt, and the Orient (Anatolike), that is, Glicia, Isauria, Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phoenicia, Palestine, Arabia, and Cyprus. The list is evidently incomplete.

ED. Descriptio orbis Roman, ed. H. Gelzer (Leipzig 1890) 28–56. 

GEORGE OF MYTILENE. See David, Symeon, and George of Mytilene.

GEORGE OF NIKOMEDIA, metropolitan of Nikomedia (from ca. 860); deacon and chartophylax of Hagia Sophia, preacher, author of various encomiastic works, esp. some devoted to the Virgin Mary. The typikon of the Euergetes monastery (Dmitrievskij, Opisanie 1.1:550,30–32) included George’s sermon on “the thronos of the Virgin” in the service for Good Friday. According to H. Maguire (“Depiction of Sorrow” 162f), George’s introduction of the theme of the Virgin “holding and embracing the body” of Christ influenced the artistic representation of the scene of the DEPOSITION FROM THE CROSS beginning with the 10th C. (an early surviving example is a fresco in the Old Church of Tokali, Göreme). R. Cormack (in Iconoclasm 151–53) hypothesized that the painted wooden reliquary of the True Cross, now in the Vatican, reflects the dramatic description of the Virgin kissing Christ’s bleeding feet in George’s sermon for Good Friday. The homily on the Presentation of Christ published as a work of Athanasios of Alexandria (PG 28:973–1000) is spurious and in some MSS ascribed to George of Nikomedia (CPG 2 no. 2271).

ED. PG 100:1336–1329. 

GEORGE OF PISIDIA, poet; born probably in Pisidian Antioch, died between ca. 631 and 634. George served as deacon, skevophylax, and referendarios in Hagia Sophia at Constantinople. His unabashedly Christian tone and stylistic innovation of using the iambed trimeter for epic poetry, the first step toward the later POLITICAL VERSE, make him a significant early landmark in Byz. poetry; Psellus even compared him (sometimes favorably) to Euripides (A. R. Dyck, Michael Psellus: The Essays on Euripides and George of Pidisia [Vienna 1986] 25–74). George’s major historical epics eulogize Herakleios, esp. for his campaigns against the Persians and Avars. Imperial virtues and achievements are exalted but emphatically subordinated to God. Some predilection for medical dictation and imagery is observable (J. D. C. Frendo, Orpheus 22 [1975] 49–56). George’s language and themes strive for symbiosis of sacred and profane, classical and biblical; Frendo (infra 186) praises his “dazzling sophistication and intellectual subtlety.” Others celebrated by George include Patr. Sergios I and Bonos the patrakios. Of his religious poetry, George’s best efforts are the iambic hexaemeron on the Creation (which was translated into Church Slavonic) and a rare hexameter piece On the Vanity of Life; also notable are a hymn on Christ’s Resurrection and a polemic against Severos of Antioch. His short poems on religious and secular subjects look back to the Hellenistic and forward to the Byz. epigram.


GEORGE OF TREBIZOND. See George Trapezountios.

GEORGE THE MONK. See George Hamartolos.

GEORGE THE PHILOSOPHER, also known as George (metropolitan?) of Pelagonia, writer of the second half of the 14th C. Virtually nothing cer-
tain is known of his biography, although his classical allusions indicate a secular education. He wrote a (still unpublished) treatise against Gregory Palamas and an enkomion of John III Vatazhes, who was later called St. John the Merciful (Gy. Moravcsik, BZ 27 [1927] 96–39). Moravcsik theorized that George was originally a monk at the monastery in Magnesia where the saintly emperor's relics were preserved but that, under the pressure of Turkish occupation, he moved to Pelagonia in Macedonia. N. Festa also attributed a Lenten homily to Vatazhes' hagiographer (VizVrem 13 [1906] 1–35).

Probably to be distinguished from George of Pelagonia is George Kydones Gabriellopoulos (ca.1323–ca.1383), also known as George the Philosopher, who was a friend and correspondent of Demetrios Kydones (PLP, no.3433; cf. F. Tinefeld, OrChrp 38 [1972] 141–71). This George was probably born in Thessalonike, became Kydones' physician in Constantinople, and then traveled to Cyprus, Palestine, Crete, the Morea, and Genoa. He was a Platonist and, like George of Pelagonia, an anti-Palamite.


A.M.T.

GEORGE THE SYNKELLOS, historian; died after 810. His life is scarcely known; he was a monk and a synkellos of Pat. Tarasios. V. Grecu questioned the hypothesis that George visited Palestine and Syria (BSHAcRoum 28.2 [1947] 241–44). His Selection from Chroniographers (Ekloge chronographias) covers history from the creation of the world to Diocletian (284); perhaps he planned to continue it to his own time but was prevented by illness and death. The work is an antiquarian compilation of various carefully indicated sources (Josephus Flavius, Sextus Julius Africanus, etc.) in separate topical clusters. Even though different layers of George's information are sometimes contradictory or repetitious, his purpose is consistent: to set forth the history of mankind in strict chronological sequence. The presentation is uneven, shifting from dry lists of rulers to descriptions of events. George's choice of material is arbitrary; e.g. in George Hamartolos, only a few lines are dedicated to Julius Caesar, in contrast to a vast section on Augustus. C. Mango's attempt (ZRVI 18 [1978] 9–17) to ascribe to George the authorship of the Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor was criticized by I. Čičurov (VizVrem 42 [1981] 78–87), who admitted, however, that George could have provided Theophanes with some materials collected for his own work. The only complete MS of George is Paris B.N. gr. 1711, dated 1021 (A. Mosshammer, GRBS 21 [1980] 289–95). Anastasius Bibliothecarius used George for his Historia tripartita.


A.K.

GEORGE TRAPEZOUNTIOS, conventionally termed "George of Trebizond," humanist teacher, rhetorician, and translator; born Crete 3 Apr. 1395, died Rome ca.1472/3. The descendant of Trapezuntios who emigrated to Crete, George moved to Italy ca.1416, converted to Catholicism in 1426, and taught Greek in Vicenza, Venice, and Rome. He attended the Council of Ferrara–Florence as a supporter of the Pope, and in the 1440s entered the papal curia as a secretary. George's translations of Aristotle, Plato, Demosthenes, and the Cappadocian fathers were severely criticized, perhaps unfairly, by some of his contemporaries. His translation of Ptolemy's Almagest fared better, although his commentary was attacked. He also produced a wide variety of writings predominantly in Latin on rhetoric, logic, philosophy, theology, astrology, and astronomy (J. Irmcher, 12 CEB 2 [Belgrade 1961] 362). He dreamed of the unity of mankind, but was shocked by the expectation of Plotho that this unity be achieved on the basis of a revitalized paganism. George built his hope first on papal supremacy, but in 1453 expressed the utopian view (in his Greek treatise On the Truth of the Christian Faith) that the Turkish sultan, converted to Christianity, would be able to conquer the world. George's hopes in this respect were strongly affected by his eschatological vision of the Roman Empire (meaning the papacy) fighting the Antichrist. In 1465
he went to Constantinople as emissary of Pope Paul II to Mehmed II, but his mission was unsuccessful; on his return to Rome in 1466, George was briefly imprisoned for his fulsome praise of the sultan.

George argued that the study of antiquity was useful as preparation for political activity. He had high regard for Cicero, but replaced the latter's ideal of the orator-philosopher with that of the orator-statesman (Monfasani, George of Trebizond 294). George had a hot temper and quarrelsome nature; although a translator of Plato, he turned into an ardent defender of Aristotle in his Comparison of the two philosophers. As a result he was the target of the polemic of Bessarion, Against the Calumniator of Plato. George sharply criticized not only Pletho and Bessarion, but the more moderate Gazes: Plato's closeness to Christianity George considered deceptive, whereas Aristotle, he said, taught the immortality of the soul, creation ex nihilo, and a consistent monotheism; he even anticipated the Christian Trinity (Monfasani, George of Trebizond 157).


GEORGIA. The modern term refers to two areas: eastern Georgia (Georg. K'art'li, Gr. Iberia, Arm. Virk', Pers. Gurgan) and western Georgia (Gr. Colchis, later Lazika; Georg. Egrisi, later Abchasia). These were united politically in Byz. times only in the years 978–1258 and 1330–1491, but had a common language and similar social structure.

The Georgian language (with Mingrelian, Laz, and Svan) belongs to the southern Caucasian, or Kartvelian, group. The literary language is based on the K'art'li dialect and the written tradition (cf. Georgian literature) goes back to the 5th C.

King Mirian of Iberia was converted to Christianity in the 330s by Nino, known to tradition as a captive attached to the court. There were Chris-

tian settlements on the Black Sea coast by the 4th C. Western Georgia accepted Christianity in the same century, but as in Armenia, the populace was not fully converted until much later. In 505 or 506 at the Council of Duin the Georgians and Armenians rejected Chalcedon. At the beginning of the 7th C., however, the Armenian and Georgian churches split; from then on the Georgians remained in communion with the Greek church. This encouraged close contacts, political and intellectual, between Byz. and Georgia; relations with Armenia were intimate but often strained.

The original capital of K'art'li, Mc'er'ata, remained the patriarchal seat after Tbilisi became the political capital in the reign of Vaxtang Gorgasali (ca.440–522). At the end of his reign, dislodged by the Persians, Vaxtang fled for a short time to Western Georgia, which remained under Byz. control. After 523 the Persians installed a marzpan (governor) in Tbilisi, and Iberia with Armenia fell into the Iranian orbit. In the following century the Muslims gained control of both Armenia and Iberia. The enlarged province was ruled from Duin, Tbilisi remaining the center for local administration.

The caliph's hold over Georgia lasted two centuries. In 888, three years after the Armenian Bagratid princes assumed the royal title, Adarnarse of the Georgian branch of that family claimed the title of king. Georgia was not united, however, for Abchasia remained an independent kingdom until the reign of Bagrat III (978–1014).

As the borders of Byz. expanded eastward in the 10th C., upper Tavk' was annexed on the death of its prince David of Tavk'/Tao in 1000. Unlike the Armenian kingdoms, however, which were incorporated into the empire in the 11th C., Georgia remained independent. After Byz. control in eastern Anatolia collapsed following the defeat at Mantzikert (1071), the Georgians extended their sway in Caucasus under David II/IV the Restorer and his descendants. The eastern region of Kakhetia was incorporated in 1105. Tbilisi was regained in 1122 from the Shaddadids (a Muslim Kurdish dynasty of Gandza, which had occupied Ani and Tbilisi after the Turkish conquest of Anatolia). Tbilisi now became the capital; the monastic complex of Gelati near the earlier capital of Kutaisi remained an important center of learning. In 1124 Ani was captured, but during the remainder of the 12th C. it passed back and
forth several times between Georgians and Shād-dadids.

Cultural contacts between Georgia and Byz. were fostered in Constantinople and in monastic centers such as Mt. Athos (where the Georgians had their own monastery, Iveryon), Mt. Sinai (see G. Garitte, Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens littéraires du Mont Sinai [Louvain 1956]), and Jerusalem. Political ties were strengthened in the 6th C., when the emperor first bestowed titles (usually kouropalates) on Georgian princes. In the 11th C. marriage alliances confirmed those ties: in 1032 Bagrat IV married the niece of Romanos III, following a visit to Constantinople by Bagrat’s mother Maria, herself of Armenian descent; Bagrat’s daughter Maria of “Alania” married Michael VII Doukas and subsequently Nikephoros III. The daughter of David II IV the Restorer married the grandson of Alexios I Komnenos, while the first wife of Andronikos I Komnenos was related to Queen Tamara (who helped Alexios and David Komnenos to seize Trebizond in 1204). Many nobles of Georgian or Armenian descent served in the Byz. army, such as John Tornikios and Gregory Pakourianos.

After 1204 direct contacts with Constantinople were few. The Mongol attack of 1220 curbed the military success of Tamara and her son George IV (1212–23). In 1240 Queen Rusudan (1223–45) appealed to Pope Gregory IX for help. Latin missionaries had been in Tbilisi since 1233 and a Latin bishopric was established there in 1329. Nevertheless, the Georgian delegation to the Council of Ferrara-Florence did not sign the act of Union.

In the 14th C. Georgian control over eastern Georgia and Armenia declined. George VI (the Brilliant, 1314–46) moved his capital to Kutaisi and contacts with the West and Trebizond became more significant. The second wife of Bagrat V (1360–95) was Anna, the daughter of Alexios II of Trebizond; the daughter of Alexander I (1412–42) married John IV Komnenos of Trebizond. Constantinople remained beyond the Georgian horizon, save for unsuccessful negotiations to arrange a marriage between the daughter of George VIII (1446–65) and the last emperor, Constantine XI.


R.T.

GEORGIAN ART AND ARCHITECTURE.

Georgian art retained its distinctive national character throughout the medieval period despite significant foreign influences affecting certain media. Byz. influence was strongest in the 11th–14th C.; it dominated some schools of metalwork (esp. enamels) and painting. Before the Arab conquest Georgian architecture and sculpture followed a course parallel to that of Armenian art and architecture, but, although both nations based their later architecture on the achievements of the 7th C., the experimental Georgian approach after ca.800 has little in common with Armenia’s almost reverential use of 7th-C. models.

Architecture and Stone Sculpture. The earliest Christian monuments are small hall churches and basilicas; centralized domed plans were introduced by the 7th C. As in Armenia, virtually all the churches are constructed of rubble conglomerate faced with tufa; vaults and domes are also masonry. Because most architectural types used in Georgia appear simultaneously in Armenia (Džvari at Mćxet’A [586 (or 587)–604?]) is paralleled by Avan [ca.590], C’romi [626–35] by St. Gayané at Varešapart [630–41]), attempts to assign precedence to either tradition have proved fruitless. The few Georgian church plan types not attested in Armenia include a tetraconch with four small oval chambers inserted between the apses (Ninoc’mind‘a [6th C.??]) and the widely used “three churches basilica,” in which partition walls with only one or two small openings divide nave and aisles into very distinct spaces.

In the early basilican churches, only pier capitals and bases are sculpted; those in Sion at Bolnisi (478–89) carry Christian symbols (the Cross with stags, peacocks) and pre-Christian Georgian or Sasanian motifs (animals pursuing one another, vegetal patterns). Façade programs begin ca.600. Džvari at Mćxet’a displays donors kneeling before Christ and angels. At Ateni (7th C.), separate reliefs show donors at the hunt and Christ and the Virgin. An altar (?) slab from Cebelda combines an image of St. Eustathios and the stag with Old and New Testament scenes and donor portraits. N. Thirry (BK 44 [1985] 169–223) has shown that at least one atelier (in Gugaren) pro-
duced stelae for both Armenian and Georgian patrons, but some forms, such as standing crosses, are attested only in Georgia.

The Arab invasions curtailed building in Georgia, but the experimentation in church plans that typifies 7th-C. architecture had resumed by 800. Somewhat debased standards of construction, with more use of uncut or rough-cut stone facings and less sculpture, suggest the difficulties encountered during this period.

The triumphs of the Bagratids intensified building activity, particularly the foundation and restoration of monasteries. The new, lighter churches dwarf their predecessors. By the early 11th C. finely cut tufa was used again almost universally in Georgia, along with elaborately carved façades: blind arcading, bands of fleshy vegetation, large crosses, Old and New Testament scenes. Exteriors now give little hint of the spaces within: Nikorcminda (early 11th C.) appears to be a blocky inscribed cross, but the north, south, and east arms together conceal five radiating apses.

Monumental Painting. Although Iconoclasm did not affect Georgia, little figurative art other than stone carving survives from before the 9th C. In the apse at C'roni (626–35), Christ holding a scroll, flanked by apostles, is visible in a mosaic and its underdrawing. The only later example of mosaic occurs at Gelati, which has the more traditionally Byz. theme of the Virgin and Archangels.

At Ateni, the 7th-C. fresco program consisted of the Cross in the dome and geometric patterns in the conches. The Cross is often painted in the dome and Christ in glory in the apse; in Tall/Tao and in David-Garedža far to the east are examples from the 11th C. or even earlier. In 10th- through 13th-C. Svanetia, painting may be restricted to the apse, and saints popular locally—George, Julitta, Kyros—appear both as individual figures and in abbreviated cycles.

The Georgian kings and princes of the 12th–13th C. favored Byz. programs of church decoration, although these were altered to fit Georgian church plans and often preserved the unusual placement of the Cross and of Christ. Thus at Ateni in 1080, elements of a typical Byz. program were distributed over the four apses of the 7th-C. tetraconch, while the Cross remained in the dome. The rock-cut hall church of the Dormition at Vardzia (1184–6) is painted with a thoroughly Byz. program, and King George III and Queen Tamara of Georgia appear here in imperial Byz. robes; the Glorification of the Cross has been displaced to the narthex vault. At St. Nicholas in Kinevisi (1208) and at Timotesubani (ca.1220) the dome contains the Cross along with a Deesis.

The program and style of Ahtala (early 13th C.) are typical of late Komnenian painting. The church may have been frescoed by Byz. artists. Palaiologan models were widely accepted, esp. in western Georgia, where Byz. artists worked at Calendzica (1384–96; see Manuel Eugenikos), and probably at Lihni (mid-14th C.). The frescoes of the Church of the Transfiguration at Zarzma (first half of the 14th C.) have iconographic and stylistic ties with the Iveron Monastery on Mt. Athos.

Manuscript Illumination. The earliest surviving Georgian illuminated MSS are 9th- and 10th-C. Gospel books. Their decoration consists primarily of full-page canon tables and standing Evangelist portraits, although the First Druči Gospels of 940 (Tbilisi H-1660) also includes the Virgin and three Miracles of Christ.

More up-to-date Byz. styles were introduced from the 11th C. onward as Georgian monasteries edited and translated Greek texts. The synaxarion of Euthymios the Iberian of 1030 (Tbilisi A-648) resembles contemporary Byz. menologio, as does the 14th-C. synaxarion (Leningrad, Publ. Lib. gr. 01–58); both are bilingual (Greek/Georgian; P. Mjović, Zagreb 8 [1977] 17–23). The Second Druči Gospels (12th C.; Tbilisi N-1667) is a frieze Gospel. The style monn is also represented in the text miniatures of the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos (Tbilisi A-109; its frontispiece miniatures, however, are in a broad fresco style). According to a Greek inscription, Michael Koresh illustrated the 13th-C. Vansk Gospels (Tbilisi A-1335) in Constantinople.

Metalwork and Enamel. Metal (esp. silver-gilt) was the favored medium for icons; repoussé was used both for scenes and for the floral grounds of icons set with small enamels. The earliest dated example, the Transfiguration from Zarzma (886), is a very shallow relief with chased lines. Later, figures were modeled almost in the round (e.g., the Ishan Crucifix of 973 and the 11th-C. tondo of St. Mamas on the lion).

Although Georgian figured enamels from the 8th–9th C. are distinct from Byz. work, Greek inscriptions are common (as in other Georgian figural art), and by the 11th C., Byz. influence
was so strong that it is hard to distinguish Georgian from Byz. work.


GEORGIAN CHRONICLES. The term is a loose rendering of K'art'lis Cxovreba (Life of K'art'li [Iberia]), an official collection of some, but not all, historical works written in Georgian between the 8th and 14th C. (For the others, see Georgian Literature.) The process of compilation had begun by the 12th C. In the early 18th C. King Vakhtang VI appointed a commission that edited and amplified it into a continuous whole. Since then earlier MSS have been discovered, the earliest (Queen Anne Codex) dating to the period 1479-95 (C. Toumanoff, Traditio 5 [1947] 340-44).

The first item in the collection is the History of the Kings of Iberia by Leonitus Mroveli, archbishop of Ruisi, giving the legendary origins of the Georgian people. There follow the History of King Vakhtang Gorgasali by Dzuan, giving a semiautobiographical account of that 5th- or 6th-C. king (the Armenian abbreviated adaptation of the first five parts of the Chronicles, made in the late 12th or 13th C., falsely attributes the whole collection to Dzuan); the Martyrdom of King Ar'bel II (died 786); the Chronicle of Iberia, 786-1072 (from whose original title, Cxovreba, the whole collection probably derives its name); the History of the King of Kings, an enkomion of David II/IV the Restorer; the Histories of the Sovereigns, which deals primarily with the reign of Queen T'amar; and the History of the Mongol Invasions, covering the period 1212-1346. The last four items are of special interest for Byz.-Georgian relations.


LIT. C. Toumanoff, "Medieval Georgian Historical Literature," Traditio 1 (1943) 139-82.—R.T.

GEORGIAN LITERATURE. Before the creation of a script for their native tongue, the Georgians used Greek and Middle Persian written in Aramaic script. As in Armenia, at the beginning of the 5th C. church authorities created a script for Georgian based on the Greek alphabet (unlike Armenian, the extra letters are added at the end). The oldest surviving examples of Georgian are the inscription of 493/4 at Boulisi church and undated inscriptions on mosaics in Jerusalem (G. Tsereteli, BK 11-12 [1961] 111-30).

The first texts written in Georgian are translations of biblical and liturgical texts. The translation of the New Testament was based on the earliest Armenian version (the surviving Armenian text is a later revision); in the 10th-11th C. an extensive revision of the Bible based on Byz. Greek MSS was undertaken (B. Metzger, The Early Versions of the New Testament [Oxford 1977] 182-98). The influence of Jerusalem was strong in liturgical texts, reflecting the large number of Georgian monastic establishments in Palestine.

The earliest original composition is the Martyrdom of St. Su'asanik (daughter of Vardan Mamikonean); her cult was popular in both Georgia and Armenia (I. Curtaveli, Martviloobay Su'anikisi, ed. I. Abuladze [Tbilisi 1938; rp. 1978]). After the rupture with the Armenian church in the time of Katholikos Kyrlion (early 7th C.), literary contacts were less significant with Armenia than with Greek centers. Because the Georgians were Chalcedonian, they frequented Constantinople as well as Greek monasteries on the Black Mountain, on Mt. Athos, and in Palestine. Hence translations from Christian Arabic played a significant role in the development of Georgian Christian literature (G. Garitte, Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens littéraires du Mont Sinai [Louvain 1956]).

Historical works in Georgian date from the 7th C. The texts, both those included in the official Georgian Chronicles and others, primarily concern local matters. Of greater value for the Byzantinist are the Lives of numerous Georgians who were active in Constantinople, Mt. Athos, the Black Mountain, and the Holy Land (Latin tr. of Georgian texts in P. Peeters, AB 36-37 [1917-19] 1-317). Scholars such as Ep'rem Mcire and George M'tac'mindeli translated anew or revised earlier versions of biblical, liturgical, hagiographical, and patristic texts. John Petric treated 11th- and 12th-C. Byz. philosophical traditions. In the same period astronomical and medical texts were translated from Arabic. After the 12th C., however, secular literature (prose and poetry), despite overtones of Aristotelian and Neoplatonic philosophy, was more influenced by Persian models.
GEPIIDS (Γεπίδες), an eastern Germanic people, akin to the Goths. They are first mentioned in the Historia Augusta. In the 4th C. they settled in northern Dacia and were soon subjugated by the Huns. After the death of Attila, the Gepids, commanded by their prince Ardaricus, defeated the Huns at Nedao in 454, leading to the dissolution of the Hunnic confederacy. The Gepids occupied the flatland on the left bank of the Danube and were supported by Constantinople against the Ostrogoths. Sirmium was, for a long period, a bone of contention between the Gepids and the Ostrogoths, but at the time of Prokopios (mid-6th C.) the Gepids held both Sirmium and Singidunum. Justinian I encouraged the Lombards to attack them; allied with the Avars, the Lombards defeated the Gepids in 567/8. After this catastrophe the Gepids disappeared. Many hoards of gold and silver objects, including the princely graves in Apahida (near Cluj), have often been attributed to the Gepids, but the ethnic attribution of 5th-C. archaeological material found in Dacia is difficult—the distinction between Germanic tribes and the local population or Sarmatians is not easy to draw (V. Kropotkin, SovArch [1958] no.2, 316). In the 12th C. the name Gepids reappears in Byz. historiography and rhetoric as a designation of Hungarians (Gy. Moravics, BZ 30 [1929/30] 250).


GERAKI (Γερακί, Γερακί, anc. Geronthrai), town in the Peloponnese, situated between Monemvasia and Sparta; it flourished in the 13th–15th C. The Frankish baron Guy de Nivelet was granted the region after the Fourth Crusade, but ca.1263 it was returned to the Byz. Geraki was an important town of the despotate of the Morea. It fell to the Ottomans by 1460.

A fortress was built by Guy de Nivelet ca.1290 on a hilltop less precipitous than that of Mistra. The fortress was well protected by the mountain ridge save for the southern section where the walls were reinforced by two square towers; the walls, which were 1.5–1.7 m thick, have ceramic decoration. The approximate size of the stronghold was 125 × 60 m.

The Frankish town grew up on the west slope of the hill, while the Byz. town was situated in the plain below. Numerous churches survive in both sites, as well as in the fortress. East of the modern village is an early Christian basilica, now in ruins. To the northwest is the well-preserved Church of the Evangelistria, probably of the 12th C. Its virtually complete fresco program, of the late 12th C., seems to be the work of two painters, probably contemporary with each other and from Constantinople. Moutsopoulos-Demetrokalles (infra 136), however, argues that the frescoes are of two different periods. Southeast of the village is the Church of St. Sozon, of inscribed cross plan and dating to the 12th C., according to Moutsopoulos-Demetrokalles (infra 218); frescoes of the 12th or early 13th C. survive only in the cupola and sanctuary. Very similar in plan is the Church of St. Athanasios (ca.1200); its poorly preserved frescoes (14th C.?*) include portraits of bishops framed like icons. The frescoes of the small single-naved church dedicated to John Chrysostom have survived in their entirety; they are of two layers, one ca.1300, another dated ca.1450.

Within the fortress is the Church of St. George, originally built under the Franks with two naves; a third nave and narthex were added after the Byz. recovery of Geraki. Its frescoes probably date to the second half of the 14th C. A church of the late 13th C., dedicated to St. Nicholas, has frescoes of St. Mary of Egypt and Zosimos on its masonry templon.

About 8 km south of Geraki lies the Church of Hagios Strates, built ca.1430 (S. Kalopissi-Verti in Festschrift Wessel 147–66), which contains unusual
GERMANIKEIA (Γερμανικεία, mod. Maraş), city in the Antitaurus at the edge of the Mesopotamian plain, on roads connecting Asia Minor and Syria. A bishopric of Euphratesis, Germanikeia became a Monophysite center in the 6th C.; it was the birthplace of Nestorios and later Leo III “the Isaurian.” Persians occupied Germanikeia when Herakleios campaigned there in 625. Briefly recovered by Byz., it was destroyed by the Arabs in 657, then rebuilt by them to become a base for raiding Asia Minor. Germanikeia was the scene of constant fighting in the 8th–10th C., when it was usually controlled by the Arabs and attacked by the Byz. In 746, Constantine V transferred some of its inhabitants (including many Monophysites) to Thrace; in 769, the people of Germanikeia, accused of spying for Byz., were deported to Palestine. Michael LACHANODRAKON pillaged the region in 778; Theophilos temporarily reconquered it in 841; and in 879 Basil I made Germanikeia the goal of his eastern expedition, ravaging the suburbs when he failed to take the city. It was finally taken by Nikephoros II Phokas in 903. Germanikeia was the southernmost point reached in the campaigns of Romanos IV in 1068–69. The area was entrusted to Philaretos Brachamios, who created an ephemeral Armenian principality there from 1078 to 1097. Although briefly captured by Alexios I in 1099, it was soon lost to the Crusaders of Edessa.

GERMANOI (Γερμανοί, derived from the Latin Germani), Byz. term for the Germans. Prokopios (Wars 3.11.29, 12.8) defined Germanoi as the former name of the Franks, associating the latter with the Rhineland Germans of the early Roman Empire. Through the 15th C. it remained an axiomatic ethnic formula in Byz. historiography that Germanoi and Frankoi were the same, the only exception being the occasional and even more anachronistic association of the Germanoi with the “Keltoi” (Celts). The Germanic peoples of the Holy Roman Empire were not independently recognized in Byz. sources until the 11th C., and then as Alemanni or Nematzi. Thus, Kinnamos defined the German Conrad III as the king of the Alamanoi and the French Louis VII as the king of the Germanoi.
GERMANOS (Γερμανος), general, nephew of Justin I (PLRE 2:505) or more likely Justinian I; born before 505, died Serdica early autumn 550. Justinian appointed him magister militum per Thracias; he successfully fought the Antae. In 536 Justinian sent him to suppress the revolt of Stotzas and, in 540, to defend Antioch against Chosroes I, but Germanos abandoned the city. Thereafter he fell into disfavor, due esp. to Theodora’s hostility: the empress saw in him a probable successor to Justinian and was angry with Germanos’s marrying his daughter Justina to a powerful leader of the foederati—John, nephew of Vitalian. After Theodora died and Germanos displayed loyalty by refusing to join the plot of Artabanes and Arsakes (who probably were planning to place Germanos on the throne), Justinian changed his attitude toward his nephew. He approved Germanos’s marriage with the Ostrogothic princess Matasuntha of the Amali, which established Germanos as heir to both realms; Germanos was to replace Belisarios as commander of land operations against the Ostrogoths. He assembled an army in Illyricum and frightened the Slavs who had tried to cross the Danube, but died suddenly before the expedition started.

Prokopios (Wars 7:40.9) praises his manliness, justice, and generosity. Germanos showed himself to be a brave warrior. He was immensely rich, kept a personal retinue, and was popular in Constantinople. By his first wife, Passara, he had two sons, one of whom, Justin, was executed by Emp. Justin II; Matasuntha bore him a posthumous son, named Germanos.


GERMANOS I, patriarch of Constantinople (11 Aug. 715–17 Jan. 730) and saint; born between 630 and 650 (Garton-Westerink, infra, p.v) or between 653 and 658 (Lamza, infra 57), died Platanion 730 or 742?; feastday 12 May. Germanos was reportedly more than 90 years old at his death. However, his vita (Lamza, infra 204.73–76) states that in 705, when he reached the middle of his life, Germanos turned 37; this would give him dates of 668–742. E. Stein asserts, on shaky grounds, that Germanos belonged to the family of Justinian I (Klio 16 [1919–20] 207). In 609 Germanos’s father was executed and Germanos castrated. Elected bishop of Kyzikos ca.705, Germanos supported Emp. Philippikos-Bardanes in his sympathy for Monotheletism but opposed Monotheletism after the fall of Philippikos in 713.

As patriarch, Germanos supported Leo III and praised in his sermons Leo’s victory over the Arabs. He was probably that anonymous patriarch who questioned the Paulician Gegnesios (Peter of Sicily, PG 104:1284B–1285A) and permitted him to remain at large; among the issues discussed were veneration of the cross and of the Virgin, sacraments, and baptism, but not icon veneration. It is not clear how and when the patriarch came into conflict with Leo’s policy of Iconoclasm; probably the veneration of the Virgin, to whom Germanos dedicated several sermons, was the major point of dispute. Germanos was forced to resign and was replaced by the Iconoclast patriarch Anastasios.

The oeuvre of Germanos is not yet established; the distinction between his writings and those of Germanos II is occasionally hard to draw. The dialogue On Predestined Terms of Life is sometimes ascribed to Photios; even his authorship of the commentary on the liturgy preserved under the curious title of Church History remains dubious. The commentary was translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius. In his genuine works Germanos is revealed as an experienced rhetorician: he created new composite words, such as theobastaktos (PG 98:321A, 324D, 368A) or axiozographistos (PG 98:336CD), used symmetrical structure of clauses (e.g., the chairitesmoi so typical of the poetry of Romanos the Melode), and exquisite puns such as korakes and kerykes (PG 98:265CD). Especially interesting is his dialogue between Gabriel and Mary in the sermon on the Annunciation in which the protagonists converse on different stylistic levels, the archangel being majestic and the Virgin simple and naive. He was a hymnographer who wrote kanones; the Akathistos Hymn has been attributed to him by some scholars. The anonymous vita of Germanos is legendary; it was written not in the 8th (Beck, Kirche 506) or 9th C. (Garton-Westerink, infra, p.v, n.1) but in the 11th C.

GERMIA II, patriarch of Constantinople (4 Jan. 1223–June 1240 [V. Laurent, REB 27 (1969) 136f.]); born Anapulous second half of the 12th C., died Nicaea. Germanos was a deacon at Hagia Sophia when Constantinople fell to the Latins in 1204; he fled to a monastery at Achyraous. In 1223 John III Vatatzes selected him as patriarch-in-exile at Nicaea (A. Karpozilos, Byzantina 6 [1974] 227–49). He was a strong proponent of the Nicene claim to be the sole legitimate Byz. successor state and emphasized his own authority as ecumenical patriarch; he censured Demetrios Chomatemos for crowning Theodore Komnenos Doukas as basileus in Thessalonike (G. Prinzling, RSB 3 [1964] 21–64). By 1232 he had regained control over the dissident church of Epiros, even visiting Arta to establish his jurisdiction (1238).

In 1235, however, he acknowledged the limited autocephalous status of the church of Bulgaria and recognized the archbishop of Tarnovo as patriarch. Germanos was noted as an opponent of Union of the Churches, esp. at the synod of Nicaea-Nymphaion (1234). He wrote several anti-Latin treatises (on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, azymes, purgatory, and baptism), produced numerous homilies, and was also a poet, composing kanones on the seven ecumenical councils and political verses on repentance. Only a small portion of his oeuvre has been edited.

ED. S.N. Lagopates, Germanos ho B' patriarches Konstantinoupolis-Nikaias (Tripolis 1913). For complete list of works, see Beck, Kirche 6071.


A.M.T.

GERMANY, kingdom that succeeded that of the Eastern Franks; the term Germania was applied to it in Latin texts of the 10th C. The Greeks called its population Alamanoi (ALEMANNI), FRANKOI, GERMANOI, and, in official documents, Nemitzoi. The coronation of Otto I the Great in 962 as emperor of the so-called Roman Empire created the problem of "two empires," Byz. at first denying the imperial title to the German king, then acknowledging him as the king or even basileus of the Frankoi. The situation in Italy made the problem even more complicated: Otto I tried to subdue it, and Nikephoros II Phokas supported minor Lombard rulers against Germany. A temporary alliance with Germany was reached by John I Tzimiskes, who married his relative Theophano to Otto II; as a result their son, the half-Greek Otto III, came to ascend the German throne. The political alliance was accompanied by the intensification of economic and cultural links. Despite some frictions, relations between the two empires remained tolerable throughout the reign of Conrad III, when Manuel I married Bertha of Sulzbach. Theological contacts were evident on the eve of the Constantinople local council of 1166–67 (see under Constantinople, Councils of) (P. Classen, BZ 48 [1955] 339–68).

A serious conflict developed when Frederick II Barbarossa sought to retain control of Italy, and Manuel I sent money and armies to support the resistance of Italian cities. Byz. lost the struggle and capitulated to Henry VI. Philip of Swabia used his conjugal connections to intervene in the domestic strife in Constantinople at the time of the Fourth Crusade, while Frederick II Hohenstaufen cherished the expectations of an alliance with John III Vatatzes and a successful war against the infidels. In the 14th and 15th C., Germany, which was in political decline, remained aloof from active involvement in Eastern politics, although emperor Sigismund (1433–37) negotiated with Manuel II; his assistance, however, was not effective.


R.B.H., A.K.

GERMIA (Γέρμα, now Yörme), a city in western Galatia below Mt. Dindymon. It was famed for its healing spring whose fish, with the aid of the archangel Michael, were said to effect cures. When Stoudios, consul in 454, was healed there, he
restored the Church of St. Michael and built homes for the sick and aged. Germaia, under its alternative name Myriangeloi ("10,000 Angels"), became a bishopric by 553 and received a visit from Justinian I in 554, which may have occasioned its promotion to autocephalous archbishopric. A rank it maintained through the Byz. period. Theodore of Sykeon visited Germaia in the late 6th C. and was said to have worked miracles there. It fell to the Turks after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071. The site contains a five-aisled basilica of ashlar masonry with much sculptured decoration; probably built by Studios, it is the largest surviving church in Galatia. Justinian and Theodora extensively restored it. The site is frequently confused with the nearby Colonia Germa.


GERMIYAN (Kemâyva), a Turkish emirate that emerged from the breakup of the Seljuk sultanate of Rûm. Its name probably derives from a Turkoman tribe that appears, in the Greek form "Karmianoi," in an account of the miracles of St. Eugenios worked as early as 1223 (A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Sbornik istorii i po istorii Trapezandskoi imperii [St. Petersburg 1897] 131.12). Around 1239 a Turk named Germiyan, established in the Meltene region, was in the service of the Seljuk sultan; ca. 1277 the Germiyan-oglu Husam al-din ibn Alishir founded an emirate with Kütahya (see Köyayı) as its capital. Byz. authors seem to give the dynastic founder's name, Alishir, to any Germiyan-oglu. According to Pachymeres (ed. Bekker, 2:2426.16), Germiyan was the most powerful Turkish state in the early 14th C. Its emirs were apparently the overlords of the Turkish emirs of the Aegean regions; they attacked Philadelphia repeatedly and extracted poll-tax (jizye) from the inhabitants before 1314. According to the 14th-C. Egyptian encyclopedist al-‘Umari (Notices et extrait 13 [1838] 355), they also extracted tribute from the Byz. The emirate produced alum in Gediz (the ancient Kadol), which was sold in the ports of Ephesus (Theologos) and Miletos (Palatia). In 1381 the Ottoman prince Bayezid I married a girl of the Germiyan dynasty and received some territories as dowry. The emirate was annexed by the Ottomans temporarily (from 1390 to 1402) and finally in 1428/9.


—E.A.Z.

GEROKOMION (γεροκομείον), or gerotropheion, home for the destitute elderly, under the direction of a gerokomos. As part of their tradition of philanthropy, the Byz. built special homes for elderly people who could not be cared for by their families. According to the Patria of Constantinople, gerokomeia were founded in Constantinople as early as the 4th C. At least 27 gerokomeia are recorded as having existed at one time or another in the capital, many of them imperial foundations; the best known was the facility at the Pankoktor Monastery for 24 elderly men who were no longer able to work because of infirmity or illness (Typikon, 109.1347–111.1389). The residents received an allocation of food, oil, firewood, and a cash allotment for clothes and incidentals, and were entitled to two baths per month. In case of severe illness they were admitted to the monastery hospital. Other monastic gerokomeia were those associated with the provincial monasteries of Petritzos and Kosmoteira at Bera and the Constantinopolitan monastery of St. George of Mangana. In the mid-10th C. gerokomeia were specifically included in Nikephoros II Phokas’s law forbidding the construction of new monasteries and affiliated charitable institutions in order to curtail their rapid increase and permitting only the restoration of existing institutions (Reg 1, no.699). This legislation was soon revoked, however, by Basil II.


—A.M.T.

GEROKOMOS (γεροκόμος), director of a gerokomeion, or old-age home. Justinian’s novel 7.12 names the gerontokomos as an ecclesiastical official along with oikonomos, xenodochos, orphantothers, and others. Several seals are preserved that belonged to ecclesiastical gerokomoi, such as the priest Theophylaktos and Epiphanius, "gerokomos of [the monastery?] of St. Kyros," both of the 8th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 2543, 3102). It is unclear whether Constantine, apo eparchion and
gerokomos (seal of the 7th C., ibid., no.1800), was an ecclesiastical or secular official. That the gerokomos could be a former high-ranking official is seen in a later addition to the 7th-C. Life of St. Spyridon (P. van den Ven, *La légende de S. Spyridon* [Louvain 1953] 91f., n.), speaking of a patriarch John, who was gerokomos and later bishop of Trimithous in Cyprus. In the late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos the gerokomos together with the xenodochos appears as a secular functionary in the department of the sakkellion. His functions are not specified. A xenodochos and gerokomos of Nicaea is known from a seal of ca.900 (Zacos, *Seals* 2, no.269); enigmatic is the undated seal of Constantine primicerius and gerokomos of the Constantinopolitan (?) monastery in Psamathia (Zacos, *Seals* 2, no.426). In the lists of functionaries of the 11th C. another official with the similar name of gerotrophos appears in the same clause as orphanotrophos (Dölger, *Beiträge* 46; cf. Zacos, *Seals* 2, no.487). In the 11th C. a patriarchal official who fulfilled the same functions preserved the old name of gerokomos (Laurent, *Corpus* 5.1, no.134).


**GESTA EPISCOPORUM NEAPOLITANORUM.** See John of Naples.

**GESTA FRANCORUM ET ALIORUM Hierosolimitanorum** (Deeds of the Franks and other Jerusalem Pilgrims), earliest account of the First Crusade from May 1095 to 12 Aug. 1099, by an eyewitness participant, who, to judge from his simple Latin and expert observation of military matters, was a professional soldier in the contingent of Bohemund I, probably from Apulia. The work may have been completed by 1099 and seems to be mentioned in 1101; it was used by a number of later historians of the Crusade like Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres. The author, who may have known a little Greek (ch.20, p.46), supplies detailed evidence on relations of the Crusaders, esp. Bohemund, with Byz. and their passage through the empire (chs. 2–9, pp. 2–21; ch.27, p.65; ch.30, p.72). Although extremely hostile to Emp. Alexios I, the author admits instances of Byz. assistance and shows no religious animosity. He even implicitly recognizes Byz. logistical skills and admires the Tourkopoulos (ch.8, p.16) as well as the Turks (ch.9, p.21).


**GESTURE**, a movement of the body as an element in a comprehensive system of communication. Human gesturalization can be divided into two categories: “natural” movement (body language) expressing various emotions, and gestures based on deliberate cultural, legal, political, and religious conventions. Both archaic Roman law and barbarian *leges* provided for special gestures to reinforce contracts or the statements of witnesses; Byz. law infrequently applied such procedures, although there is mention of solemn processions that testified to or revised boundaries between two properties. Conventional gestures were used in a broad range of state ceremonies with *proskynesis* as the extreme expression of self-submission and including acclamations, expressions of power and triumph, and the granting of titles and/or offices. The submission of conquered cities could take the form of conventional processions. Gestures accompanied acts of secular and ecclesiastical investiture (e.g., cheirotonia and cheirothesia), formed an integral part of liturgy and prayer, and were used for healing of specific (esp. mental) diseases. Birth festivities, weddings, and funeral ceremonies also involved conventional language of gesture based on actual or feigned emotions.

The largely formulaic contexts in which gesture was used and the immobility and frontality of the human figure lent added importance to signals of the head, arm, and hand. Prokopios's record of the gesture made by the Justinian I statue in the Augustaion and Paul Silentiarios's description (Friedländer, *Kunstbeschreibung*, lines 776–77) read more into Christ's preaching hand than is immediately apparent from artistic expressions of the period. Nonetheless Roman motions of address, triumph, supplication, concord, and meditation endured and were applied to such themes as the acclamation of Christ, blessing, angelic salutes, the Visitation, and Evangelist portraits. To these were added more dramatic, natural movements, for example, a hand covering
the mouth, the cheek or, in extremis, the whole face to express grief. Such physical vocabulary was freely transferred from one scene to another. In and after the 12th C., the number and intensity of gestures multiplied as part of a process in which iconography was enriched esp. with pathetic imagery. At its most sophisticated, gesture carried not only emotional connotations but also ideological significance: according to the sermons of George of Nikomedea, Mary's embrace of the dead Christ emphasized his humanity and thus the reality of the Incarnation.


—A.C., A.K.

GHASSÂNIDS, the dominant group among the Arab foederati in the 6th C. Their most illustrious rulers were Arethas, his son Alamundar, and his grandson Namaan. The Ghassânids fought for Byz. against the Arabs of the Peninsula, the Lakhmids of Hira, and the Persians. They were Monophysites, and this set the emperors against them, Tiberios I and Maurice esp. seeking to weaken their power. The Ghassânids, however, did not disappear in the reigns of Phokas and Herakleios and continued to play an important role in the wars of Byz. The "Saracens" singled out for honorable mention in the bulletin issued by Herakleios after his victory over the Persians in 628 are most probably the Ghassânids. In 636 they appear in the Arab sources as the principal Arab federates of Byz. at the battle of Yarmuk. After that defeat, those Ghassânids still loyal to Byz. settled in central Anatolia, in Charsianon, and Cappadocia. According to al-Tabari, Emp. Nikephoros I was a Ghassânid. The Ghassânids were great builders of churches, monasteries, palaces, and castles; their court was visited by the foremost poets of pre-Islamic Arabia who composed panegyrics for their kings.


—I.A.Sh.

GHĀZĪ (Γαζής), also called Amīr Ghāzī and Gümüştegın Ghāzī; Danişmend emir; died 1134. Eldest son of Danişmend, in 1104 he inherited Sebastia, Amaseia, Neocaesarea, and adjacent towns. Around 1120 he defeated and held for ransom Constantine GABRAS, dox of Chaldia (A. Bryer, The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos [London 1980] pt. III [1970], 177.) About 1127 Ghāzī acquired Caesarea, Ankyra, Kastamon, and Gangra, becoming the leading Anatolian Muslim ruler. John II took Kastamon in 1132, but Ghāzī recovered it the following year. On his deathbed, he received the title malik from the caliph.


—C.M.B.

GHULĀM (Ar. pl. ghilmān, lit. "pages"), a member of the armed forces of slave status utilized in the Arab caliphate from the 9th C. onward and developed by the Sāmānid. They formed a professional army; according to Ibn Al-Athir (8:157), "a soldier must be able to take with him everything he possesses, wherever he may go, and nothing must hold him back." These troops were manned primarily by young Turkish slaves bought or captured on the northeastern borders of the Sāmānid realm between the Islamic and Turkic worlds. A description of the ghulām system is found in the Sīyāsatnāma of Nizām Al-Mulk. It was this system, introduced into Anatolia by the Seljuks of Rūm and continued by the Anatolian beyliks, that would reach its most famous form in the Ottoman Janissary system.


—S.V., A.K.

GIDOS (Γίδος), a family known in the second half of the 12th and in the 13th C. S. Papadimitriu (VizVrem 5 [1898] 734; VizVrem 6 [1899] 169) considered the name to be the Greek rendering of the Italian name Guido; W. Hecht (Aussenpolitik 85, n.336), however, doubts that Gidio of this period were still Latins.

The Gidio of the 12th C. may have descended from the son of ROBERT GUISCARD named Guido, who deserted to Byz. and became Alexios I's military adviser; Anna Koman (An.Komn, 2:51.10) relates that Alexios suggested to Guido a relationship by marriage. The legendary CHANSON D'ANTIOCHE (v.901, 1033) calls Guido (Guis) the
emperor’s close friend and seneschal but not his nephew, as Chalandon (Commène 1:92) says. Thomas of Toscana (MGH SS 22:498) preserved a legend that William, Guiscard’s son, married Alexios’s daughter and became the lord of his empire, but died without descendants.

Under Andronikos I, Alexios Gidos was megas domestikos of the Orient; he retained his high position after Andronikos’s downfall and in 1194 still commanded the eastern troops sent against the Bulgarians. Andronikos Gidos was Theodore I Laskaris’s general; in 1206 he defeated the Italian allies of David Komnenos. It is hypothesized that he is to be identified with the Andronikos Gidos who ruled Trebizond from 1222 to 1235 (Miller, Trebizond 19).

Lit. Guillard, Institutions 1:408f.  — A.K.

GIUSTINIANI LONGO, GIOVANNI, Genoese hero of the final siege of Constantinople (see Constantine, Siege and Fall of); died Galata or Chios early June 1453. Giustiniani, a member of a distinguished Genoese trading family based on Chios, arrived in Constantinople on 29 Jan. 1453 and offered his services to Constantine XI. He brought with him 700 soldiers and two ships. The emperor gave him the title protosstrator and promised him the island of Lemnos. Since Giustiniani was experienced in siegecraft, he was placed in charge of the defense and repair of the land walls. He fought valiantly against the Turks, inspiring loyalty and courage in both Greek and Italian soldiers. On 29 May, in the final hours of the siege, Giustiniani was wounded and abandoned his post; many Genoese troops then panicked and fled. The Ottoman janissaries took advantage of the ensuing confusion to make their final successful assault on Constantinople. Doukas stresses Giustiniani’s bravery and the severity of his wound, whereas the “siege section” of the Chronicon Maius of pseudo-Sphrantzes (perhaps by Sphrantzes himself) accuses Giustiniani of cowardice and of using his wound as an excuse for flight (Sphr. 426.9–24). His wound must have been serious, since Giustiniani soon died, either in Galata (pseudo-Sphrantzes) or Chios (Doukas).


GILDO, Moorish prince and Roman official in Africa; died on the river Ardalo, near Thereste, 31 July 398. A son of Nubel, the king of Mauritania, Gildo was a client of the family of Theodosios I. In 373, when his own brother Firmus rebelled, he helped Theodosius the Elder put down the revolt. He was appointed comes of Africa in 387/8 (S.I. Oost, CPhil 57 [1962] 29) or 385 (Matthews, Aristocracies 179). He probably preserved hostile neutrality during the revolt of Eugenius. In 397 he broke with the Western court and declared allegiance to the government in Constantinople; he withheld the customary grain shipments from Africa to Rome. In Africa Gildo incited the hostility of the urban population by vast land confiscations and by his favoritism toward the Donatists. Stilicho mounted an expedition against Gildo, and Gildo’s brother Mascezel (whose children Gildo had murdered) was entrusted with the campaign. The Eastern court offered no assistance. Gildo retreated inland, far from the urban centers. Easily defeated, he was killed. The estates he acquired by confiscations formed a special area in North Africa, the Gildonicum patri monium.


GLABAS (Gamma, fem. Glabas, a family name probably of Slavic origin (glava, “head”): Manuel Philes (Philes, Carmina, ed. Miller 2:107, no.57.74–75) clearly recognized the Slavic etymology of the name. From the late 10th C. the Glabades were active in Macedonia: the first, Basil, an illustrious in Adrianople, suspected of pro-Bulgarian leanings, was arrested by Basil II and imprisoned for three years. Another Glabas conspired against Constantine VIII and was blinded. In 1047 men “from the kin of the Glabades” (Skyl. 442.74–75) supported the rebellion of Leo Tornikios in Macedonia. Nonetheless the family remained in Byzantine service: ca. 1050 Niketas Glabas, toptoteretes of the tagma of the scholae, was sent from Adrianople against the Pechenegs. Another (?) Niketas Glabas is named strategos on a seal (Schlumberger, Sig. 667). They did not play any significant role.

GIRDLE. See Belt.
under the Komnenian dynasty, remaining provincial landowners: in the mid-13th C. they still lived in Kastoria (Akrop. 1:90.18–19). The protostrator Michael Tarchaneiotes Glabas was governor of Thrace under Andronikos II (see GLABAS, MICHAEL TARCHANEIOTES). Another Glabas served in the 1330s as a high-ranking civil functionary—megas dioikites and judge (PLP, no.4215). Some Glabades occupied high ecclesiastical positions, for example, Ignatios, metropolitan of Thessalonike (PLP, no.4222), and another metropolitan, Isidore Glabas (see GLABAS, ISIDORE). Women of the family were active as well: Maria Glabaina, known only from her 11th- or 12th-C. seal (Laurent, Corpus 5.2, no.1396), possessed a charistithion and probably founded a monastery of St. Stephen; after 1310 another Glabaina, protostratorissa (perhaps the wife of the protostrator Glabas?), founded a convent (V. Laurent, EO 38 [1939] 297–305). The Glabades were apparently closely connected with the TARCHANEIOTES family.

Lit. PLP, nos. 4200–28. –A.K.

GLABAS, ISIDORE, metropolitan of Thessalonike (25 May 1380–Sept. 1384 and Mar. 1386–11 Jan. 1396); baptismal name John; born Thessalonike? 1341/2, died Thessalonike 11 Jan. 1396. He became the monk Isidore in Apr. 1375. His first years as metropolitan coincided with the future emperor Manuel II's defense of Thessalonike against the Turks (1383–87). Although Glabas urged the citizens to respect and support Manuel, he himself left his see during the siege, was temporarily deposed, and resided for a while in Constantinople. After the capture of Thessalonike (1387), he traveled to Asia Minor to negotiate with the Turks; this perilous trip is described in the monody of Constantine Ivankos (PLP, no.7973) on Glabas. By 1393 he had returned to his see. His sermons (many unpublished) and letters provide evidence for conditions in Thessalonike during the Turkish siege and during the occupation of 1387 to 1403 (A.E. Bakaloopoulos, Makedonika 4 [1955–60] 20–34). He reported that even under the Turkish yoke some Byz. officials remained in their positions. Glabas complained of heavy Ottoman taxation; a sermon of 1395 (ed. B. Laourdas in Prosphora eis Stilpona P. Kyriakiden [= Hellenika, supp. 4, 1953] 389–98) is one of the first Byz. sources to refer to the Ottoman devshirme, the dreaded "child levy" (S. Vryonis, Speculum 31 [1956] 433–43). Glabas argued that the fall of the city was divine punishment for the decadence of priests and monks, and the moral decline of its citizens.


Lit. R.-J. Lochert, "Isidore Glabas, métropole de Thessalonique (1380–1396)." REB 6 (1948) 181–87, with add. V. Laurent, 187–90. PLP, no.4223. –A.M.T.

GLABAS, MICHAEL TARCHANEIOTES (or Michael Doukas Glabas Tarchaneiotes), protostrator; born ca.1235, died after 1304. Glabas is first mentioned in 1260 as the Byz. official assigned to regain Mesembria from the Bulgarian rebel Miko. He held a series of government posts, megas papias, kouropalates, pinakeries, and megas konostaulos, culminating sometime after 1297 in the dignity of protostrator. He waged successful campaigns against the Bulgarians in 1263 and 1278 and fought the Angevins in Albania ca. 1284. In 1297, as governor of the western part of the empire, he was entrusted with defending Macedonia against the Serbs and built or restored 15 fortresses in Thrace. He died soon after his campaign of 1304.

Glabas and his wife, Maria Doukaina Kornene Braniai Panaiologina, were wealthy patrons of the arts. In 1903 they sponsored the restoration of the Chapel of St. Euthymios the Great, attached to the Church of St. Demetrios in Thessalonike (T. Gouma-Peterson, ArtB 58 [1976] 168–83). Glabas also restored the monastery of Pamakaristos in Constantinople; he was buried there in the parekklesion constructed by his widow, who became the nun Martha. Glabas had become a monk before his death and, as an inscription about the apse mosaic records, the chapel was intended as a pledge for his salvation. His military exploits were commemorated in a (now lost) fresco cycle, probably at the Pamakaristos, known from the description in a poem by Manuel Philes.

GLAGOLITIC, the earliest alphabet for the writing of CHURCH SLAVONIC, probably invented by ST. CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER in the mid-9th C. It consisted of 40 letters, apparently derived partly from Greek MINUSCULE, partly from adaptations of Semitic letters, and partly from characters devised by Constantine the Philosopher himself. Among the Orthodox Slavs, Glagolitic was almost completely supplanted by Cyrillic by the beginning of the 11th C., although in Serbia and parts of Macedonia it survived until the 13th C. The Catholic Slavs of Croatia used it until the late 18th C.


S.C.F.

GLASS, PRODUCTION OF. The term for glassmaker, hyalopos (and variants), is known from papyri, early hagiographic texts, and epistolography (Smets, Viz.obšestvo 86). John Chrysostom (PG 61:142:24–26) was astonished by the glassmakers who transformed sand into a cohesive and transparent substance. The vita of Symeon of Emesa describes the workshop of a Jewish glassmaker in Emesa in which the needy found warmth at the furnace and watched the blowing of vessels that at times burst; Moschos mentions a hyalopos who was blinded by the flame (Rudakov, Kul’tura 149f) and a Jew in Constantinople who was a glassmaker (hyaulourgos) by profession (E. Mioni, OrchP 17 [1951] 93–25). They are relatively seldom mentioned in later texts: thus, in the 12th C. Michael Glykas (Annales 506.7) speaks of a Jewish hyeletpos, but this glassmaker lived in the days of Justin II. There is neither a glassmakers’ guild in the Book of the Eparch nor any evidence that the monks of the Studios produced glass, unless we surmise that the phlaskopoi in this monastery (Dobroklonsky, Istor. 143) blew glass bottles. In the 15th C. some glass wares were imported from Italy (Oikonomides, Hommes d’affaires 104).

Nevertheless, later Byz. objects of glass are well known: vessels (bottles, goblets, cups), often of blue or green glass, sometimes with marvered-in decorations; bracelets; mosaic cubes; window panes; etc. An inventory of 1142 lists glass lamps (Pantel., no.7.25). Literary sources mention chamber pots made of glass (Koukoules, Bchos 2:7:6, n.11). Some late Roman glass workshops were found in Sardis (A. von Saltberg, Ancient and Byzantine Glass from Sardis [Cambridge, Mass., 1980]), Galilee (G. Davidson Weinberg, Museum Haaretz Bulletin 10 [1968] 49f), and other locations. In Corinth two glass factories of the 11th–12th C. were excavated and it is plausible that glass was produced in Constantinople and Paphos. Byz. glass was exported (e.g., several Byz. vessels have been found in Byelorussian Novgorod and in Ani); Romanos I, when dispatching an envoy to Italy, sent with him 17 glass vessels together with a luxurious garment (De cer. 651.13–16).

Technological analysis of Corinth glass suggests that it belonged to the same type as the Roman and Egyptian wares (and probably the glass from Cherson and Belaja Veža-Sarkel), but the Byz. glassmakers learned by the 11th C. to proportion their materials better and to produce more durable glass (F. Matson, AJA 44 [1940] 325–27). Some fragments of Byz. stained glass have been found in Istanbul (see GLASS, STAINED).


A.K.

GLASS, STAINED. Although certainly not as prominent a part of 10th–12th-C. Byz. church decoration as MOSAICS and FRESCOES, stained glass nevertheless had an important role. This is clear from the discovery of the window fragments from the south church of the PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY in Constantinople. Datable to shortly after 1025, they attest to a mature stained-glass tradition, generally similar to that of the West in style and technique, but clearly not dependent on it. Indeed, this monument’s early date suggests that the influence was the other way around. Highly ornamental in effect, Byz. stained glass had more in common with enamelwork than with monumental painting, although large figures dominated each panel. Characterized by large areas of blue and a dark purple-red, it was cast in rectangular pans, unlike Western glass, which was blown. Indeed, the Western monk Theophillus (ca.1110–40) indicates that blue, a color achieved with
GLASS CRUETS, a common type of mold-blown vessels decorated with Christian and Jewish symbols (primarily crosses and menorahs). Distinguished by a squat hexagonal or, more rarely, octagonal body, with intaglio decoration on its side, this vessel type is known in two main variants: "bottles," with short necks (and, occasionally, handles), and "jugs," with long necks, spouts, and handles. Most are of brown glass and nearly all examples are between 8 and 16 cm in height. Findspots and provenance, which point toward Palestine and Syria, suggest sepulchral use. Their remarkable uniformity speaks for a single workshop, whose activity can be dated to the 6th and early 7th C. on the basis of similarities between certain cross types employed and those appearing on coins. A ritual function is beyond doubt, but the often-repeated suggestion that they are pilgrims' flasks is supported neither by ins scriptional evidence nor texts and is difficult to reconcile with the interchangeability of Christian and Jewish symbols that is characteristic of the type. There is also no evidence to support the theory that certain of the crosses replicate the jeweled cross then standing on Golgotha in Jerusalem.


GLASS PENDANTS are small (approximately 2 cm diam.) disks of colored glass—usually blue, yellow, or green—with a suspension loop and a die impression on one surface. Similar in appearance to GLASS WEIGHTS, they were manufactured in the eastern Mediterranean (Egypt, Syria, Palestine) until the 7th C., perpetuating a traditional, inexpensive type of jewelry current among pagans and Jews of the Roman period. Clearly amuletic in function, glass pendants typically bear scenes of protection (the Good Shepherd) or deliverance (the Sacrifice of Isaac); the cross or CHRISTOGRAM also appears, as do representations of one of the Sts. SYMEON THE SYLITE.


GLASS WEIGHTS, small disks (diam. approximately 1.7-2.5 cm) of colored glass—mostly yellow, green, or blue—used as EXAGIA. Their derived weights correspond to the SOLIDUS, SEMISSIS, and TREMIS; they would have been used either with COIN SCALES or BALANCE SCALES. Issued by the EPARCH OF THE CITY, glass weights may be either figural or nonfigural. Figural specimens most often show the eparch, identified by inscription and usually with a MAPPA in his raised hand. More rarely, the emperor is shown, either alone or with simply the MONOGRAM of the eparch. Sometimes one or two eparchs are shown with the emperor or with Christ above (in this case with one eparch only); again, a monogram iden-
titles the issuing official. Nonfigural glass weights usually bear a single monogram (either cruciform or block-shaped). Rare specimens also include numerical weight designations (e.g., KA for 21 siliqua). Closely related to bronze flat weights, glass weights were issued in substantial quantities throughout the 6th C. and into the 7th. From Constantinople they made their way via commercial routes to points throughout the Mediterranean basin. Many duplicates are known.

LIT. A. Vikan-Nesbitt, *Secunda 36f*.

---

GLEB. See Boris and Gleb.

GLOBOS. See Spilaia.

GLORIOSUS, or gloriississimus (ευνοογοτατος), the highest title of senators in the 6th C. As the old senatorial titles lost their eclat, the state tried to introduce new distinctions. In the mid-5th C. the illustres were renamed magnifici, later excelsi, and in the 6th C. gloriosi. The title was awarded to prefects, magistri militum, magistri officiorum, quaestores, and praepositi sacri cubiculi, whereas comites (see Comes) received the title of magnificentissimus. The title of gloriosus was also granted to some barbarian kings, such as the Ostrogoth Theodoric the Great.


--A.K.

GLOSSAE, glosses and commentary on legal texts and terminology. In the adaptation of the Latin texts of the Corpus Juris Civilis by the predecessors for a Greek-speaking population, most Latin technical terms were left untranslated. The Greek novels of Justinian I and his immediate successors also included a great number of Latin expressions. The rapid decline in knowledge of the Latin language made it necessary to replace most of these words through *exhellenismos*, as the *prooimion* to the *Prochorion* calls it, or at least to comment on them in the MSS. Alphabetically arranged lists of glossae, called lexae rhomaiakai, soon appeared. Some of these lists can be attached to specific works of legal literature; some lists were enlarged or combined with others. Greek words were also adopted as lemmata; the glossae were mixed with Latin-Greek glossae drawn from the works of John Lydos and with short independent commentaries on legal actions and similar concepts of Roman law.


---L.B.

GLOSSARIES, BILINGUAL, lists of words either in Greek with Latin translations or in Latin with Greek translations produced by Carolingian scribes and preserved in MSS from the 9th C. onward. They are based on the so-called *Hermeneumata pseudo-Dositheana* (3rd C.? and various other sources, including *Isidore of Seville* and *Macrobius*. The texts are of different lengths. Thus the *Scholia Graecarum glossarum* contains about 450 Greek terms and definitions; other expanded glossaries are the so-called "Philoxenus" (Latin-Greek) and "Cyrillus" (Greek-Latin); many are short, limited to several words. The etymologies are often more fantastic than those found in *Isidore*, and explanations of Greek words can be completely wrong. The glossaries, however, can be indicative of Western interest in Byz. institutions; for example, the St. Gall glossae of the 9th C. include terms (with interpretations) for Byz. charitable institutions such as xenodochium, pschotrophium, nosochion, orfanotrophium, gerontochion, and bryphotrophium; the definitions are probably drawn from Julian the Antecessor, a Constantinopolitan jurist of the 6th C. (B. Kaczynski, *Speculum* 58 [1983] 1008–17).


---

GLYKAS, MICHAEL, 12th-C. writer; born first third of 12th C., perhaps on Kerkys (cf. Krambacher, GBL 381). As imperial grammaticos, Glykas (Γλυκᾶς) was involved in a plot against Manuel I; according to Kresten ("Styppioteis" 66–70), this scheme was connected with the conspiracy of Theodore Styppioteis in 1159. Blinded (perhaps not totally), Glykas was imprisoned until at least
1164. His identification with Michael Sikidites (Kresten, *op. cit.* 90–92), who was charged ca. 1200 with heresy and magic, is not impossible. Politically Glykas was anti-Komnenian: in his chronicle (*Biblos chronike*) of events from the Creation to 1118, he followed Zonaras in criticizing Alexios strongly. He also condemned Manuel I’s astrological enthusiasm. Glykas’s attitude toward antiquity was critical as well; he rejected all ancient philosophers save Aristotle. He rejected also the idea of *ananke*, “historical determinism”—his polemic against astrology was connected with this antedeterministic approach to history. Both Glykas’s chronicle and his letters, often on similar subjects, were overtly didactic. His substantial additions to the first part of the chronicle are borrowed from the *Physiologos* (F. Sbordone, *BZ* 29 [1929/30] 188–97) and demonstrate Christian moral principles. Proverbs which Glykas collected and abundantly inserted in his works also served didactic ends. His language is plain albeit scholarly, but in his *Verses from Prison* Glykas was one of the first to use the vernacular.


**Gnome** (γνώμη, Lat. *sententia*), pithy saying or maxim. A *gnome* was a type of rhetorical ornamentation, similar to a *proverb*, that was supposedly familiar to the audience and accordingly would evoke predictable sentiments (Martin, *Rhetorik* 257f). Theoreticians of rhetoric, such as Aphthonios and Nicholas of Myra, treated the *gnome* as a kind of *prognymasia* and tried to distinguish it from the *chreia* (Hunger, *Lit.* 1:100f). Collections of *gnomat* (*gnomologia*) were made from ancient authors, both in prose (e.g., Democritus, Isocrates, Epictetus) and verse (e.g., Euripides, Menander of Athens), and were presented either thematically or alphabetically. The distinction between *gnomologium* and *florilegium* is narrow and conventional. Though many scholars use the terms interchangeably, *gnomologium* may be kept for works of predominantly secular content.

The *Eklektik of Stobaios* contained large numbers of ancient *gnomai* used by Byz. writers and by the later (mostly anonymous) compilers of *gnomologia*, of which the fullest is the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* (Vat. gr. 743, 14th C.). Other examples include the *Gnomologium Democrito-Epictetum* (ed. C. Wachsmuth, *infra* 162–216), the *Gnomologium Parisinum* (Paris, B.N. suppl. gr. 134, 13th C.—ed. Sternbach, *infra*), and that of John Georgides (10th C.; Paris, B.N. gr. 1166—ed. Odorico, *infra* 119–255). On the basis of various recensions Wachsmuth (*infra*) tried to reconstruct the text of a *Gnomologium Byzantium* (i.e., the corpus of *gnomai* in circulation in Byz.). To the genre of *gnomologia* also belonged works of more developed character (*Keaumenos, Speanas*, etc.), in which *gnomai* are elaborated in short stories or didactic digressions. Greek *gnomai* were translated into Syriac and Arabic.


—F.M.J., A.K.

**Gnosticism** (from γνώσις, “knowledge”), a loose-knit and variable system of belief based on *dualism* and the premise that the full revelation of God is given only to a select few. It flourished esp. in the 2nd C. The works of Gnostics were condemned and destroyed so that until fairly recently their teachings were known only through the Christian polemic directed against them; the discovery of the *Nag Hammadi* texts, however, makes Gnostic writings directly available. Gnostics ranged from the Valentinians, who taught an elaborate and decidedly non-Christian mythology, to Marcion (died ca. 160), who was a Christian heretic with dualist tendencies. Gnostics associated the God of the Old Testament with Satan, and their Christology was docetic; it was an early rival of Christianity, and much of Orthodox theology was developed to answer its challenge. By the 3rd C., however, Gnosticism was no longer a
threat, surviving in an institutionalized form only among the MANDAENS. Nevertheless, Gnostic ideas continued to be influential in the ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL, esp. in the writings of CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, ORIGEN, and EVAGRIOS PONTIKOS. Some scholars have seen Gnostic influence in the PAULICANS and BOGOMILS, but this is unlikely except in the most general sense.


- F.E.G.

GOATS (αὐγίδαια). Goats are often mentioned in combination with sheep as aigidoprobata (Lavra 2, 109.361) or may be listed separately (e.g., Lavra 1, 38.36). A household might keep as many as 100 goats (Lavra 2, 109.584), and a monastery a flock of 2,000 sheep and goats.

The Byz. kept goats for milk, cheese, meat, and wool. The term aigeionetaxa (“goat silk”), used by PROCHPRODOMOS (3.77), indicates that their wool was considered a high-quality material. On the other hand, the rough cloak of a holy man could also be made of goat wool (PG 120.45B). The GEOPONIKHA (bk.18.9–10) devotes less space to goats than to sheep, but otherwise there are no data to establish the relative proportions of the two species. According to the GEOPONIKHA, goats were pastured on mountains; the vita of Paul of Latros (ed. H. Delehaye, AB 11 [1892] 481) also tells of a peasant (georgos) who lived with his goats in the mountains, but returned home at harvest time.

- A.K. J.W.N.

GOD (Θεός). Of five known ancient etymologies of the word theos the church fathers retained at least three: from theo, “run”; theoreo, “observe”; and tithemi, “set” (I. Opelt, StP 5 [1969] 392–40). The Christian concept of God originated as a middle way between the pagan idea of gods as “older brothers” of humans, immortal but vulnerable to human passions, and the Eastern concept of the transcendent God, fully distinguished from mankind. Dissatisfied with the pagan idea and esp. hostile to the concept of the divine emperor, church fathers tried to preserve the monothestic principle of the Old Testament without disrupting the ties between God and mankind, thus making possible the “divinization” or salvation of man.

According to Gregory of Nyssa (PG 45.932C), God is unknowable in his essence; thus, the church fathers, using apophatic THEOLOGY, define God primarily with negative epithets, commencing with the negative prefix αὐθ (“without”): thus anachos (without beginning), apermeotes (untimely), etc. (e.g., John of Damascus, Exp. fidei 2:1–12, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:8f). However, the concepts of oikonomia and incarnation make it possible to bridge the gap between God and man. The incomprehensibility of God created an epistemological problem—how can we learn about God? John of Damascus (Exp. fidei 3:4–5, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:10) solved it by arguing (see ANALOGY) that our belief in God is natural (physis).

Other qualities of God emphasized his omnipotence and omniscience (usually beginning with pan- (“all”), e.g., PANTOKRATOR) or his justice and PHILANTHROPY toward men. In the political sphere God was considered the guarantor and guardian of the Byz. Empire and of its ruler in particular.


- G.P., A.K.

GODFREY OF BOUILLON, duke of Lower Lorraine; born ca. 1060, died Jerusalem 18 July 1100. Leading the Lotharingian contingent of the First Crusade, Godfrey (Γοργοφρέ) peacefully traversed the Balkans until, at Selymbria, he learned that HUGH OF VERMANDOIS was captive in Constantinople, whereupon he devastated the region. Mollified by Alexios I, he pacified his troops and reached the outskirts of Constantinople on 23 Dec. 1096. Alternating peace and conflict between Godfrey and the Byz. culminated in a serious battle outside Constantinople on 2 Apr. 1097. Anna Komnenes says he was attacking the city; pillaging of the suburbs followed. Only after further skirmishes did Godfrey agree to enter Constantinople and swear fealty to Alexios (5 Apr. 1097). Thereafter he mediated between Bohemian
MUND and the emperor. Godfrey played a leading role in the Crusade. After the conquest of Jerusalem he may have become advocatus sancti sepulchri. Anna Komnene calls him wealthy and arrogant and emphasizes his rapid changes of attitude toward Alexios.


—C.M.B.

GODPARENT (ἐνανάδοχος), a sponsor at the sacrament of baptism, one who "stands as a surety," receiving the baptized infant or adult from the "waters of rebirth." All Orthodox Christians, except monks and nuns, could stand as godparents. Some imperial and aristocratic offspring had more than one godparent; other children had only one. Usually the same person served as godparent for all the children of a marriage. Baptism established a spiritual relationship between godparent and godchild and created a tie between godparent and natural parents, "coparenthood" (συνεξελεξία), which manifested itself in gift-giving, social contact, and joint business ventures. Godparents were chosen from among friends and relatives. According to the church fathers, it was the godparent's duty to give moral and religious instruction to his godchildren. A few cases show that godparents sometimes took in orphaned godchildren, raised them, and provided for their education and marriage. Marriage impediments among spiritual relations increased from the 6th C., when godparent and godchild were forbidden to marry, until by the 12th C. the prohibitions were considered to be the same as those for blood relations. Godparenthood has elements in common with adoption.


—R.J.M.

GOLD (χρυσός) was considered the most precious metal in Byz. As with other metals, the location and exploitation of gold sources and mines between the 4th and 15th C. is somewhat a matter of speculation. It was used (sometimes alloyed with silver or copper as billon and electrum) for manufacturing coins, medallions, enamel plaques, luxurious domestic plate and liturgical vessels, and jewelry. Gold foil was used for gilding architectural details (Asterios of Amaseia [PG 40:209B] inveighs against those who dwell beneath "roofs overlaid with gold") and metal objects. It was also used in "gold glass," mosaic tesserae, book illumination, and icon painting, and even woven into textiles and used in embroidery.

Much gold was reserved for imperial use, even if Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 189:57-62) ridicules it as "the color of bile" that has ominous significance when worn during battle. Only the emperor issued chryso-bulls and dined on golden dishes; gilded automata occupied a place of honor in imperial ritual. Theologians interpreted gold as condensed light, as the symbol of incorruptibility, truth, glory, and of the sun.

Many recorded "gold" objects and furniture (such as those mentioned by Constantine VII [De cer., 580, 4; 615:9-10; 593:6]) were probably gilded silver, like the Byz. objects of the 10th–11th C. preserved in San Marco. Very few vessels made of gold survive from the 4th–15th C. Most of a selection of gold jewelry (dated from 350 to 1000) analyzed in 1986 was found to be 86–96 percent pure, that is, more debased than gold solidi of the same period; later jewelry (11th–13th C.) was 80–89 percent pure. Gold for jewelry was worked in repoussé, filigree, and granulation techniques and drawn out as wire and in the form of straps.


—M.M.M., L.Ph.B.

GOLDEN GATE (Χρυσαὶ Πύλαι, Χρυσεῖα Πύλη), monumental gate situated at the south end of the land walls of Constantinople, used for imperial triumphs and other state occasions (see CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF). It was constructed under Theodosios, most probably Theodosios II. Built of marble blocks, it consists of three arched openings flanked by square towers. A Latin inscription in metal letters placed on the central arch refers to the gilding of the gate (i.e., of its valves) after the defeat of a usurper (Ioannes, executed at Ravenna in 425). The gate was dec-
orated with various statues. The complex was protected by an outer wall, pierced by a single gate, on either side of which were placed antique mythological reliefs. The latter survived until the 17th C. A fort, built here by John V in 1389/90, was immediately dismantled by order of Sultan Bayezid I. The gate was incorporated into the Castle of the Seven Towers (Turk. Yedikule) erected by Sultan Mehmed II in 1457/8.

There were Golden Gates in some other cities as well, such as Antioch (also called the Gates of Daphne, end of the 4th C.) and Thessalonike (also called the Gates of Bardar). In the 11th C. a golden gate was erected in Kiev.


—C.M.

GOLDEN HORDE. See MONGOLS; TATARS.

GOLDEN HORN. See CONSTANTINOPLE.

GOLDSMITH. See JEWELER.

GOLGOTHA. See SEPULCHRE, HOLY.

GONIKON (γονίκον), a category of land ownership. F. Uspeenskij (in Sbornik statej po slavjanovedenju, sostavlennoj i izdannoj učenikami V. I. Lamanskogo [St. Petersburg 1883]) contrasted gonikon and pronoria as hereditary patrimony versus a conditional grant. As a term denoting the origin of property ("parental"), gonikon also distinguished patrimonial land from property received through paradosis (conferred upon a paroikos by his landlord or the state), exaleimma, dowry, and purchase (Chit., no.92) as well as from other relatives. Paroikos who held gonikon could be called gonikarioi (Laiou, Peasant Society 184). In an extended application complementing the term’s literal sense as a titulus acquirendi, imperial grants to religious institutions (e.g., Chit., no.24.14) and laymen often state that property or revenue was henceforth to be regarded as if it were or had become gonikon (hos gonikon . . . kiena [Binon, Kérapotamou, no.20.2], kata logon gonikatoles [Guillou, Méneéée no.6.6]). In these cases, gonikon implied an intensified degree of tenure over the property but not necessarily the right to bequeath or to alienate. Ostrogorsky (Féodalité 134) suggests that at minimum it included the right to profit fully from improvements to a property and could be applied to certain kinds of conditional grants. On the other hand, in an act of 1432 from Trebizond, gonikon is distinguished from property held in simple possession (te diapheraousa nome kai goniakaia—ed. V. Laurent, ArchPont 18 [1953] 263-79, 264.85–86).

The very rare verb gonikewomai means "to make hereditary"; thus, in 1307 Andronikos II Palaiologos granted Alexios Diplomatizes' request that a property already within his oikonomia be "hereditized" (gonikeulhe) so that he could hold it "as gonikon" (katechitai . . . hos goniken—Guillou, Méneéée, nos. 2.3, 9–10); and in 1261 Michael VIII Palaiologos granted land in hereditary tenure (eis charin goniikeulheis) to the Thelematarioi. The fluidity and imprecision in the use of the word is also seen in Frankish Greece; the Chronicle of the Morea employs ionika, pronota, and, in the French version, héritage as equivalents of "fief" (Jacoby, Société, pt.VI [1967], 430–32).


—M.B.

GOOD FRIDAY (μεγάλη [άγια] Παρασκευή), the day of the CRUCIFIXION, the Friday before EASTER, from at least the 2nd C. a day of FASTING. Originally Good Friday had no special liturgical services since it was considered, with Holy Saturday and the Easter Vigil, an integral part of the paschal triduum (three concluding days of HOLY WEEK). By the end of the 4th C. it had become a feast in its own right, celebrated at Jerusalem with a lengthy vigil Thursday night and on Friday with the veneration of the relic of the Cross (see CROSS, CULT OF THE) and an office of litanies on the PASSION of Christ, services that soon spread to Constantinople and elsewhere. The Typikon of the Great Church (Matcos, Typikon 2:76–83) describes a vigil at Hagia Sophia with reading of the Twelve Passion Gospels (see EVANGELION), followed by the veneration of the Passion relics, esp. the Sacred Lance, a service that drew huge crowds and lasted until noon. After the hours of terce-sext, the patriarch held a service for the catechumens at the Church of St. Irene. The day concluded with
the liturgy of the Presanctified at Hagia Sophia. The emperor participated in the veneration of the lance, the service of terce-sext, and the catechism at St. Irene. The introduction of Jerusalem Holy Week customs at Constantinople from the 9th C. led to the demise of these services. According to Antony of Novgorod, in Constantinople by ca.1200, only in the Anastasia church in the Portico of Domninus was there a service to venerate "the Lord's nail and blood" (ed. Ch. Loparev, PPSb 51 [1899] 29). The other churches were merely washed and strewn with blossoms in preparation for Easter.


GOOD SHEPHERD (καλὸς ποιμήν [Jn 10:11], agathos poimen; cf. also Lk 15:3–7), a Christian symbol borrowed from pagan images of a kriophoros (ram-bearer): Christ was perceived by early Christians as both the Lamb of God and the shepherd who cares for his flock. The date of the origin of the Good Shepherd’s representation in art is debatable. Klauser (infra) denied its existence at the time of Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian; he likewise rejected the interpretation of kriophoroi on early sarcophagi as representations of the Good Shepherd. This figure, however, was a favorite image of Christ in the catacombs of the 3rd–4th C. and in small-scale sculpture (K. Weitzmann, DOCat 3, nos. 3, 5). The theme of the shepherd and his flock occurs in early baptismaries and in the baptismal ritual of Eastern churches. The shepherd was depicted standing with the sheep slung over his shoulder or seated among his flock, protecting his lambs, playing a flute, or carrying a milk pail; he is usually a beardless youth wearing a tunic. In the 5th-C. mausoleum of Gallia Placidia in Ravenna the figure is royal, clad in gold and purple robes, and holding a cross-staff instead of a crook. The Good Shepherd does not occur as an independent image after the 6th C.


GÖREME, a valley in CAPPADOCIA, the site of a number of medieval rock-cut refectories, mills, cells, and painted chapels attesting to a thriving monastic enclave for which there is no textual documentation. Churches with elaborate figural decorations include Kiliclar Kilise, a cross-in-square structure (early 10th C.?); El Nazar, a domed-cruiform church (early 10th C.?); the COLUMN CHURCHES; and the Yilanli Group, a series of relatively crudely carved and simply decorated monuments probably dating from the period of Seljuk occupation after 1071. Tokali Kilise, a complex of three churches, retains the most elaborate carving and decoration in the valley. The Old Church may be ascribed to the early 10th C. on the basis of its close stylistic relation to Ayvali Kilise in Gülü Dere. Images in the Pigeon House in Çavuşın (963–69) were derived from those in the New Church, thus providing it with a terminus ante quem. The extremely rich narrative cycles of the New Church are lavishly rendered in a classicizing style with quantities of ultramarine (see FRESCO TECHNIQUE) and gold and silver foil; the cycle is unique within the empire for high-quality monumental painting of the mid-10th C.


GORTYNA (Γόρτυνα, also Gortys), capital of Crete in late antiquity, located in the south of the island. Gortyna remained the capital until the Arab conquest and the establishment of Chandax ca.824–27. An earthquake ca.670 caused much destruction and early Arab attacks prevented substantial rebuilding. Byz. sources speak of the destruction of Gortyna by the Arabs and the martyrdom of its bishop Cyril, although both accounts are probably fictitious (Christides, Crete 92–94) and the city—much reduced—continued to exist after the conquest. The bishop of Gortyna, always a metropolitan, was frequently listed simply as metropolitan of Crete; in the later 10th C. he held the 10th rank in the empire, above that of Corinth, Sicily, and Thessalonike.

The governor's palace (praetorium) was rebuilt
in 381–83 and continued in use into the Arab period, after which it was apparently transformed into a monastery (Sanders, infra 80). The acropolis was fortified, perhaps in the 7th–8th C. The Church of St. Titos, probably built in the early 7th C., is a domed three-aisled basilica with three apses and side aisles terminating in apses; the sanctuary is a triconch with flanking pastophoria. It was probably rebuilt in the 10th C. Another church was constructed in the remains of the temple of Apollo; it may have served as the cathedral until construction of St. Titos.


GOSPEL BOOK. The tetraevangelion (Τετραευγελίων), not to be confused with the Evangelion, contains the text of the four Gospels, arranged exactly as they are in the New Testament, but with the beginning and end of each passage to be read in the margin, and numbered.

The illustration of Gospel books is a subject of major interest. From before the 8th C., only two illustrated Greek Gospel books—the Rossano Gospels and Sinope Gospels (Paris, B.N. gr. suppl. 1286)—survive, but the Syriac Rabbula Gospels is also preserved. Following Iconoclasm, the typical Gospel book was written in minuscule script. Containing prefaces and liturgical aids, it was decorated with canon tables, headpieces, initials, and evangelist portraits and was sometimes produced in diminutive format in combination with the Psalter to form a devotional book. Only rarely did it receive extensive narrative illustration (e.g., the two Freie Gospels). Its prefaces prompted certain subjects, such as evangelist symbols, figures inspiring the evangelists, and the Majestas Domini. Its devotional and liturgical character occasioned preliminary iconic images and miniatures of nonbiblical events that pertain to the text’s liturgical context, for example, the Dormition of the Virgin or the Anastasis. The most innovative MSS were produced in the 11th and 12th C., and many MSS in the Decorative Style (e.g., Karahisar Gospels) survive. In the Palaiologan period, the illustrated Gospel book remained popular, but its decoration was generally restricted to headpieces and evangelist portraits with occasional iconic miniatures.


—R.S.N.

GOSPEL OF NICODEMUS. See Nicodemus, Gospel of.

GOSPELS (Εὐαγγέλια, lit. “good message”). The canonical Gospels are Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John, an evangelical canon established by the end of the 2nd C.; other gospels were proclaimed to be apocrypha. The most ancient papyrus fragments of the Gospels belong to the 2nd C.; from the 4th C. onward complete MSS are known that contain both the Old and New Testament; separate MSS of the Gospels are preserved from the 4th–5th C. (the Freer Gospels from Egypt). The text is preserved in the form of the Gospel book (tetraevangelion) and the Gospel lectionary or Evangelion.

Exegesis of the Gospels created difficulties that the church fathers sought to explain: the four versions of the Gospels differ and sometimes even contradict each other. Origen endeavored to resolve the contradictions by applying allegorical interpretation. Theodore of Mopsuestia, on the other hand, avoided allegorical assimilation of contradictory stories and treated the Gospels as the memoirs of apostles with differing recollections. In the West, Augustine collected parallel, but inconsistent, passages without trying to reconcile them artificially. Although original exegesis did not continue after the 6th C., the matter of discrepancies between the Gospels arose time and again. John I., archbishop of Thessalonike, tried to establish in his homily on the Myrophoroi a concordance of Gospel evidence for Christ’s resurrection. Euthymios Zigabenos and esp. Theophylaktos of Ohrid produced voluminous commentaries on the Gospels.

The plain style of the Gospels also created difficulties for the Byz., who were fond of exquisite rhetoric. Some authors, such as John Chortasmenos, defended this stylistic simplicity against the fashionable Atticism.
GOTHS (Γοθοί), a Germanic people who, according to Jordanes, migrated from the Vistula region to Oium, between the Drinester and the Don. Archaeological remains of the Černjachovo culture have been tentatively identified with them. From 298 onward, the Goths harried the Danubian provinces, Greece, and Asia Minor, and ca. 273 Emp. Aurelian yielded Dacia to them. At this time they probably formed two groups, Vistigoths and Ostrogoths, which moved westward in the 4th C. They played an ambivalent role in relation to the late Roman Empire—as attackers and plunderers, and as foederati. In any case, the archaeological record in the Danube provinces does not suggest an economic crisis during the 4th C. when the Goths were settling this area. Some Gothic generals (Gainas, Trigidild, Fravitias, etc.) became influential at the court in Constantinople. Their leading position in the army incited envy and hostility both among aristocratic intellectuals (such as Synesios of Cyrene) and the population of Constantinople whose spokesman was John Chrysostom, a hostility exacerbated by the Arian creed that had been spread among the Goths by Ulphilas. On 11 July 400 a massacre of Gothic soldiers took place in Constantinople. Gainas soon fled and perished, Fravitias was executed, and the Gothic impact diminished. The hordes of Alaric were turned toward Italy, and the empire was deprived of valuable warriors in the face of the Hunnic invasions.

Both the Visigothic and Ostrogothic kingdoms in the West at times offered formal allegiance to Constantinople. In the 6th C. Justinian I reconquered Italy and a part of Spain, but his success was of short duration: the Goths who were ready to accept the Roman way of life and to form an alliance with the empire were replaced by the much more innovative Lombards. Some Goths remained in Byz. where in the 8th–9th C. the district of Gothograikia existed in northwestern Asia Minor (Kulakovskij, Istorija 3:414–16); they also continued to be found in neighboring areas such as Dory in the Crimca.


GOUDELES (Γούδελαις, fem. Κούδελαινα), a noble Byz. family. The first Goudeles, perhaps of Slavic origin, was blinded by Constantine VIII for his role in a plot organized by Presianos (see Aaroni- os) and other Slavs. The 11th-C. Goudeles were influential magnates in Asia Minor (Christopher Goudeles was magistros and strategos) who took part in aristocratic plots and rebellions of 1034 and 1078. Although related to the noble lineage of Tzirandeles, the position of the Goudeles declined by the 12th C. They reappeared in the 13th C. as military commanders and landowners: the will of the imperial doulos Goudeles Tyrannos of 1294 is a useful description of an estate in the Smyrna region (MM 4:285–87). Some Goudeles were important functionaries, esp. ca. 1400–53: George Goudeles, mesazon of Manuel II; his son John Goudeles; Nicholas Goudeles, an envoy to Russia in 1436 (with Isidore of Kiev) and to Ferrara in 1438 and a defender of Constantinople in 1453. For this Nicholas, or some earlier scion of the family, his widow, the nun Theodoul Palaiologina Goudelina, had a 12th-C. lectionary (Oxford, Bodl. Aust. T. inf. 2.7) bound in leather and stamped with the Palaiologan eagle. She presented it, as an undated entry on folio 357v notes, for the salvation of Nicholas’s soul (Hutter, CBM 1:72 [no. 42]).


GOURIAS, SAMONAS, AND ABIBAS (Γουρίας, Σαμώνας, Ἀβίβας; Syriac Gürjä, Šmona, and Ḥabib), martyrs and confessors, saints; feastdays 15 Nov. and 2 Dec. According to legend, Gourias of Sargai, an ascetic, and Samonas of Canada, his companion, were brought to trial under Diocletian by Mysianos, governor (hegemon) of Edessa, and executed, after severe tortures, on the hill of Bēth-alah-qiqla, north of Edessa. Abibas, a deacon from the village of Tel Sehe, was judged by Lysanias (or Ausonios), governor of Edessa under Licinius, and burned in a cemetery near Edessa. Syriac, Armenian, Greek, Georgian, Arabic, and Latin versions of the legends survive; most schol-
ars assume that the original was in Syriac, although different from the preserved Syriac versions, and probably similar to the Armenian and one of the Greek texts. The author of Abibas's *passio*, Theophilos, claims to have been an eyewitness, but errors in chronology suggest that the legends are later works.

The three martyrs appear together in the story of Euphemia and the Goths, as protectors of a young woman married to a barbarian, taken from Edessa, mistreated, and her baby poisoned; the martyrs miraculously brought her home, and eventually the Goth was executed—on the initiative of Eulogios, bishop of Edessa (378–87). This legend is known in Greek and Syriac; Burkitt (*infra*) tried unsuccessfully to prove that the original was in Syriac. EPHREM THE SYRIAN dedicated a strophe to Gourias, Samonas, and Abibas; JACOB OF SARUG wrote another hymn. SYMEON METAPHRASTES included the legends in his collection; ARETHAS OF CAESAREA wrote a *laudatio* of the martyrs.

**Representation in Art.** The three saints together reflect the three ages of man: Abibas is depicted as a young deacon, the other two as princely martyrs in tunic and *chlamys*, with Gourias generally elderly and Samonas middle-aged. The Euphemia miracle is sometimes treated as an independent text, but no illustrations of it survive. In the *Menologion of Basil II* (p.183), Gourias and Samonas are about to be beheaded, while Abibas is being burned alive in a furnace; in another contemporary *menologion*, there is a scene of the translation of their relics (Athos, Vatop. 456, fol.253r, Weitzmann, *Studies* fig.224).


—A.K., N.P.S.

**GRAČANICA,** a monastery and the seat of the bishops of Lipljan, near Priština (Yugoslavia). The present Church of the Dormition (originally Annunciation) was begun ca.1311, under the auspices of the Serbian king STEFAN UROŠ II MILUTIN, on the site of a destroyed 13th-C. church and a 5th–6th-C. basilica. Milutin’s church is in all likelihood the work of builders from Thessalonike and, possibly, from Arta; in quality, Gračanica exceeds contemporary achievements in these two centers. The church consists of a domed cross-in-square naos, enveloped by a bema flanked by two domed lateral chapels, north and south ambulatory wings, and an inner narthex. Two additional domes cover the corner bays of the inner narthex. The characteristic five-domed scheme at Gračanica is marked by an unusually well-balanced composition and elongated proportions. The exterior displays high-quality cloisonné construction and a restrained application of decorative brickwork. Painted before 1321, the frescoes represent a fairly standard version of the church programs of decoration of the Palaiologan era, including Old Testament prefigurations and liturgical subjects in the bema. Milutin’s charter for the monastery and the death of a Serbian bishop are depicted in the south chapel; portraits of the Nemanjid dynasty arranged in a family tree borrowed from the *Tree of Jesse* appear in the inner narthex. The painters developed the style of Michael (Astapas) and Evtychios, displaying some interest in human anatomy and employing both original and reverse perspective. Gračanica may have been at first intended to serve as Milutin’s mausoleum church, but this idea was subsequently abandoned. The church continued to function as a mausoleum for local bishops and eminent individuals.


—S.C., G.B.

**GRACE (χάρις, lit. “gift”)** is a free and unmerited favor of God. Christianity contrasted itself, as a religion of grace, with Mosaic religion based on the Law. The source of grace is God acting through Christ or the Holy Spirit, always in synergy with man (see SYNERGISM). The INCARNATION was the major vehicle of grace. Christ liberated man from the damnation of sin and opened for him the way of SALVATION and divinization. After the Incarnation the Church mediated grace through the sacraments. The relationship between grace and free will was seldom explicitly discussed in Byz as it was in the West. And yet, the doctrines of gnosis (see Gnosticism), MANICHAEISM, and fa-
talism as well as the philosophical presentation of the soul's similitude to God, present a clear distinction between the image (eikon) of God in man, which cannot be lost, and his likeness (homoiosis) to God, which can be realized only through ascetic labors. Theosis, or deification, is the work of the trinitarian energy in which the Holy Spirit assimilates man to the Incarnate Son of God.

This strongly personal conception of divine activity was questioned from time to time through the conception of the multitude of uncreated energies in Palamism. The theological expression of grace is found also in the idea of the sonship (Cyril of Alexandria, PG 73:156CD) of those who believe and of participation in the divine nature through spiritual rebirth. Earlier mysticism used such phrases as “the presence of the Trinity in the soul” and “the illumination of man,” which was the preferred way for speaking from the time of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite and was embraced esp. by Palamite Hesychasm (J. Meyendorff, GregPal 37 (1954) 19–31).


—G.P.

GRADO (Грао), late Roman city and fortress (castrum) on an island south of Aquileia, probably serving as its harbor. The first churches seem to have been built here in the 4th C. In the 5th and 6th C. Grado was used as a place of refuge; in 568, after the Lombard conquest of his city, the bishop of Aquileia, Paulinus I, transferred the see and its treasures to Grado. Eventually, two rival dioceses were formed: vetus Aquileia and Aquileia nova, or Grado. While Aquileia severed its relations with Constantinople and Rome, forming an independent patriarchate under Lombard authority, Grado remained within the Byz. sphere. Its bishop Elias (Greek by origin) supported the principles of the Council of Chalcedon, however, against those of the Second Council of Constantinople of 553; he promoted the cult of St. Euphemia, dedicating the new cathedral to her in 579. The exarch of Ravenna exercised authority over the church of Grado. The patriarchate of Grado was organized probably between 607 and 614 to counterbalance that of Aquileia, and the two sees pursued rival claims to metropolitan jurisdiction over the province of Venetia-Istria until the dispute was resolved in Aquileia’s favor by Pope Alexander III in 1180. The city was in decline from the 11th C., and after 1156 the patriarchs of Grado moved to Venice. There was a Byz. garrison in Grado: inscriptions made by milites of two infantry numeri and a mounted “Perso-Justinianus” numerus have been found.

Monuments of Grado. The well-preserved Cathedral of S. Euphemia encloses a contemporary floor mosaic. The cathedral’s baptismal and its mosaic pavement are older—from the second half of the 4th C. Ninth-century sources mention a throne of St. Mark sent by Emp. Heraclios to the bishop of Grado (ca.630). A group of ivory plaques dispersed in various museums was once commonly ascribed to this throne, but K. Weitzmann (DOP 29 (1972) 43–91) refuted the attribution. S. Tavano (AntAa 12 (1977) 445–89) has returned to the theory that they belonged to the throne. A second, alabaster reliquary throne, now in the Treasury of S. Marco in Venice, is thought by some scholars (Treasury S. Marco 98–105) to have originated as another gift by Heraclios to Grado; but as M. Werner demonstrated (Studies in Iconography 10 (1984–86) 32, n.75), the iconography of its bas-reliefs suggest on the contrary that it may have been made in northern Italy.


—A.K., D.K., A.C.

GRAIN. Wheat was the predominant grain in the empire. Two archaeological finds from Egypt demonstrate that the cultivation of hard wheat, which is easier to thresh and store than the soft wheat of Roman times, began there just before the Arab conquest of the 7th century (A.M. Watson, Agricultural Innovation in the Early Islamic World [Cambridge 1983] 20). Hard wheat was also the major grain in the 10th-C. finds from Beycesultan in Anatolia (H. Helbaek, AnatSt 11 (1961) 90f). Barley was probably cultivated more in the Balkan peninsula, whereas wheat was common in Asia Minor. In the finds from Beycesultan, rye is attested in an insignificant amount, but it increased
occurs during the winter, favoring the sowing of crops in the fall and their harvesting and threshing in the spring. Mirroring such a cycle of production, Michael Psellus admonishes, “The best time for sowing of wheat is thought to be the 11th and 19th of November. Thereafter come many rainy storms, soil and water combining to bring the sowings to fruition” (Boissonade, AneGr 1:242). Harvesting is a normal component of Old Testament illustration. In the Octateuch’s grain is shown being cut with sickles (Uspenskij, Seral’skij kodeks, no.284), but is more often gathered without implements (ibid., nos. 205, 305).

The supply of grain evidently decreased in the 7th C., when Byz. lost Egypt and North Africa to the Arabs and the steppes of the northern shore of the Black Sea also ceased to be a granary for the empire. Moreover, Sicily was conquered by the Arabs in 902. This probably led to the declining consumption of bread in Byz., partly compensated by the growing role of livestock.


**GRAMMAR** (γραμματική). For Dionysios Thrax grammar was “the practical knowledge of the language generally used by poets and prose writers” and was subdivided into topics such as orthography, prosody, morphology, mythology, and figures of speech (but not syntax). It was thus a descriptive study of the language of Greek literature. Byz. teachers continued to use Dionysios’s brief treatise and built round it a vast corpus of commentaries; in their hands, however, as the spoken language diverged more and more from the classicizing language of literature, grammar became prescriptive rather than descriptive, and laid down rules for correct spelling, inflection, meter, etc. The Byz. grammatical grammar (grammatikos), responsible for the second stage in education, tended to concentrate on the study of classical Greek poetry, esp. Homer, leaving prose to the teacher of rhetoric (cf. Theodore of Studios, PG 99:117C-D; Michael Psellus, in Sathas, MB 5:90-92). The principal textbooks used until the 12th C. were Dionysios Thrax with his Byz. commentaries (esp. that of George Choiroboskos), Theodosios’s Canons and the commentaries on it, On Orthography by Theognostos, epimerisms on
Homeric and on the Psalms, and a handbook attributed to Theodore Prodromos. From the 12th C. onward textbook in the form of questions and answers (eroтемата) tended to replace the older manuals. Anonymous erołemata occur in MSS as early as the 12th C., and others were later written by Manuel Moschopoulos, Manuel Chrysoloras, Demetrios Chalkokondyles, and others.


R.B.

GRAMMATIKOS (γραμματικός). In addition to its ancient meaning of “scholar” or “teacher” often used as a sobriquet, the word came to signify scribe or secretary. In the 14th C., pseudo-Kodinos (185,23–24) simply equated grammaticos and notary. An act of 1217 (Reg 3, no. 1693) mentions Nicholas Kaltothes, grammaticos of the imperial vestiarion (MM 4:290,5–6); in 1258 George Probaton was of grammaticos of the theme of the Thrakesion (Ahrweiler, “Smyrne” 160). Several seals of grammaticoi, primarily of the 11th–12th C., are known (Laurent, Corpus 2:663–67). Dölger and Karayannopoulos (Urkundenlehre 64) suggest that the term grammaticos replaced that of asekretis under the Komnenoi. The term also appears in the acts of Athos of the 11th–12th C., probably only as a sobriquet but, at least from 1406 (and possibly already in the 11th C.), it could signify the secretary of a monastery (J. Lefort et al. in Ivm. 1:218). Some patriarchs of Constantinople (John VII, Nicholas III) were called Grammatikoi.

A.K.

GRAND KOMNENOS (Μέγας Κομνηνός), title of the emperors of TREBIZOND. An unofficial epithet of members of the Komnenoi in 12th-C. oratory, it was eventually applied to the Trapezuntine branch of the family, which descended from ANDRONIKOS I KOMNENOS. The first example is a MS note concerning the death of DAVID KOMNENOS (N. Oikonomides, REB 25 [1967] 141, n. 67). The initials MK appeared on the coinage of Emp. George (1266–80) and by 1282 the title was entrenched. B. Hemmerdinger’s hypothesis (Byzantion 40 [1970] 33–35) that the title was based on that of Hohenstaufen was refuted by O. Lampsides (Byzantion 40 [1970] 543–45). The purpose of this titulature was to emphasize the rights of the Trapezuntine rulers to the Komnenian heritage. Accordingly, it was only in Trebizond that the epithet megas was applied to the mesazon. The Grand Komnenoi actively and deliberately emulated the emperors of Constantinople in the construction of fortifications and the patronage of monasteries. Thus ALEXIOS II KOMNENOS enclosed the lower city of Trebizond with a huge wall and fortified Kerasos. He re-founded the monastery of St. Eugenios at Trebizond, as Manuel I of Trebizond (1298–63) or his successor had built that of Hagia Sophia in the same city. On the model of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, portraits of ALEXIOS IV KOMNENOS

Grand Komnenoi and Emperors of Trebizond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEXIOS I KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1204–1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andronikos I Gidos</td>
<td>1222–1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John I Asouch</td>
<td>1235–1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel I KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1238–1263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andronikos II KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1263–1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1266–1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN II KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1280–1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodora</td>
<td>1298–1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXIOS II KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1297–1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andronikos III KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1330–1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel II KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basil Komnenos</td>
<td>1332–1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Palaiologina</td>
<td>1340–1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Anachoutlou</td>
<td>17–30 July 1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Komnenos</td>
<td>30 July–7 Aug. 1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Anachoutlou</td>
<td>7 Aug. 1341–4 Sept. 1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John III Komnenos</td>
<td>1342–1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Komnenos</td>
<td>1344–1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXIOS III KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1349–1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUEL III KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1390–1416/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXIOS IV KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1416/17–1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN IV KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1429–1456/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID I KOMNENOS</td>
<td>1459–1461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Grumel, Chronologie 372, with modifications.
and his son John IV Komnenos flank an image of the Virgin in the tower of Hagia Sophia, Trebizond. From John II Komnenos onward, the Grand Komnenoi supported the monastery of Soumela. Even legends of these rulers aped those of the emperors of Constantinople: as Romanos I of Constantinople allegedly slew a lion, so Alexios II of Trebizond is said to have destroyed a dragon whose head was then publicly exhibited. (See table for a list of Grand Komnenoi of Trebizond.)


GRATIAN, more fully Flavius Gratianus, Western Roman emperor (from 24 Aug. 367); born Sirmium 18 Apr. or 23 May 359, died Lyons 25 Aug. 383. The son of Valentinian I, in 374 he married Constantia, daughter of Constantius II. A pupil of Ausonius, Gratian followed his advice after he succeeded his father in Nov. 375 (with his half-brother, the minor Valentinian II, as co-ruler). Gratian expressed respect for the senate and traditional cultural values such as rhetorical education (S. Bonner, AJPh 86 [1965] 113–37) and promoted men such as Symmachus, Petronius Probus, and Nicomachus Flavianus.

The defeat of his uncle Valens at Adrianople in 378 marked a radical change in Gratian’s policy. Shocked by the Goths’ victory, Gratian withdrew from Illyricum and interpreted the catastrophe as the result of God’s wrath against the people of the region because of their Arianism; under the growing influence of Ambrose he became an ardent Christian and supporter of Orthodoxy. He had the Altar of Victory removed from the senate of Rome, and in 379 or rather 383 (At. Cameron, JRS 58 [1968] 96–99) renounced the pagan title of pontifex maximus. He sought alliances with people like Theodosios I, whom he appointed ruler of the East in 379. The revolt of Maximus in 383 provoked discontent in Gratian’s army. He was assassinated by his own magister equitum.


GRAVE-ROBBING (πυμβαρνυχία) belongs, like SACKLIEGE (hierosylia), to which it is closely related, to crimes against religion. It included every kind of desecration of burial places, esp. the plundering of valuables, the theft of building material, and the unauthorized exhumation of corpses. The type of punishment varies accordingly, ranging from penalties for THEFT to capital punishment (Basil. 60.23; Ecloga 17.14; Nov. Leo VI 96; Balkamon, in Rhalles-Potes, Syntagma 1:207–09, 325f.). Ecclesiastical law, which assigns EPITHEIA to grave-robers, recognizes comparable variations (Basil the Great, canon 66; Gregory of Nyssa, canon 7; and the Byz. commentaries, Rhalles-Potes, Syntagma 4:222, 326–28). Valuable grave goods increased the likelihood of grave-robbing; the desecration of imperial graves may also have been politically motivated. Grave-robbing (klophphoresai to soma, cf. vita of St. Peter of Athos, ed. K. Lake, The Early Days of Monasticism on Mount Athos [Oxford 1909] 34.34f) is a relatively rare subject in hagiography; usually the saint is described as capable of protecting his own grave from desecration (e.g., George of Amastris, St. Nicholas of Myra in 809).


GREAT CHURCH (ἡ μεγάλη ἐκκλησία), the original name of the Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople; according to a 5th-C. ecclesiastical historian (Sokr. HE 2.16), the emperor Constantius II “built the Great Church that is now called Sophia.” The edifice took this name no doubt because it was larger than any other church in Constantinople. Even after the church came to be called Hagia Sophia, it continued to bear concurrently the name Great Church (Prokopios, Buildings 1.1.66). By the 8th C. the term was also applied to the patriarchate of Constantinople and by extension to the entire Orthodox Church. The seals of patriarchal officials frequently call them oikonomos, chartolarios, etc., “of the Great Church” (e.g., Laurent, Corpus 5.1, nos. 50–54, 66–71). The expression megale ekklésia or megas naos might also be applied to some larger provincial churches
such as Hagia Sophia in Thessalonike (S. Kaplanneres, Byzantiaka 5 [1985] 84f).

**GREAT ENTRANCE** (ἡ μεγάλη εἴσοδος), ritual procession that opens the second half of the liturgy, the Eucharist, just as the Little Entrance opens the earlier part, the Liturgy of the Word. The deacon carries the paten with the eucharistic bread and the priest the chalice with the wine from the prothesis chamber (see PANTOCRATOR) into the nave of the church, then through the temple to the altar. The entrance of the bread and wine symbolizes Christ’s coming in the sacrament of his body and blood.

The Great Entrance is a ritualization of the primitive transfer of the gifts offered by the congregation: these gifts were brought from the synagogal treasury to the altar by deacons. It is first attested at Constantinople in sources of the 6th C. (Eutychios of Constantinople—PG 86.2: 2400C—2401B), at which time the CHERUBIKON chant was added to accompany it. Formerly called the “entrance of the holy mysteries” (Maximos the Confessor, PG 91.603C) or simply the “preparatory procession of the deacons” (Germanos, Liturg. par.37), it is first called the Great Entrance in the 12th–13th-C. DIATAxis in Athens (Nat. Lib. 662, P. Trempelas, Hai treis leitourgias kata tous en Athenais kodikas [Athens 1935], p.9) to distinguish it from the Little Entrance.

Early commentaries interpreted the Great Entrance also as the angelic procession of the Celestial Eucharist (see LORD’S SUPPER), later also as the triumphal Entry into Jerusalem (see PALM SUNDAY), as Jesus led to the cross, as his burial cortège, his entry into glory, the entrance of the saints and the just, etc. The Great Entrance in Hagia Sophia was esp. splendid on those days when the emperor participated in the liturgy, moving at the head of a vast procession of clergy and members of the court through the church to greet the patriarch at the doors of the temple.

**LIT. R. Taft, The Great Entrance (Rome 1975).**

**GREAT FEASTS** were originally distinguished from regular liturgical feasts on the basis of the special liturgical practices surrounding their celebration. In the Typikon of the Great Church only Easter, the Nativity, and Epiphany were distinguished as Great Feasts; they were preceded by a forefeast in the form of a vigil the night before. The number of Great Feasts eventually increased to 12 (dodekaorton): nine fixed feasts (Annunciation, Nativity, Epiphany, Hypapante, Transfiguration, Birth of the Virgin, Presentation of the Virgin and the Dormition, the Exaltation of the Cross) and three mobile (Palm Sunday, Ascension, Pentecost). The “paschal triduum” (Good Friday to Easter) was so important as to be in a class by itself, beyond the category of Great Feasts.

Only the nine fixed feasts have both a forefeast (proeortia)—usually one day long but lasting five days at Christmas and four at Epiphany—and an afterfeast period (methororia) of one to eight days, plus a closure (apodosis). These same nine feasts, as well as four others—Circumcision (1 Jan.), the Birth (24 June) and Beheading (29 Aug.) of John...
THE BAPTIST, and Sts. Peter and Paul (29 June)—were important enough to have an orthros a single kavon, that of the feast, as well as the Great DOXOLOGY; all have Great VESPERS, and a vigil that is usually an aγρυπνία. Nativity and Epiphany have further festive material the preceding and following Saturday and Sunday and the older Constantinopolitan paramoné as a vigil, instead of the monastic aγρυπνία, the eve of the feast—these being elements retained from the 10th-C. Typikon.

The manner and degree to which the emperor participated in the liturgy of these feasts was not always related to the solemnity of the feast itself. His involvement on Palm Sunday and Easter, for example, was actually less than on some other days.

The choice of what constituted a Great Feast did not in fact always have a purely liturgical basis, and in other contexts the list could be different. The illustrated dokeoartion cycles, which dominate Byz. art in all media from the 11th C. onward, comprise six fixed feasts (Annunciation, Nativity, Epiphany, Hypapante, Transfiguration, Dormition) and six mobile (Lazarus Saturday, Palm Sunday, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost).

Only the dominical Great Feasts totally displaced a Sunday office. Six Great Feasts were followed by a synaxis or closely related special commemoration, to which should be added the commemoration of the Holy Spirit the Monday after Pentecost. (For the artistic representation of Great Feasts, see New Testament Illustration and entries on individual feasts.)

LIT. Mother Mary, K. Ware, trs., The Festal Menaión (London 1977).

R.F.T.

GREAT LAVRA. See Lavra, Great.

GREAT PALACE (Μέγας παλάτιον), the imperial palace of Constantinople situated on a sloping site between the Hippodrome and the sea walls. Built or begun by Constantine I, it remained the actual residence of the emperors until the reign of Alexios I, who moved his court to the Blachernai palace, and continued as the official imperial residence until 1204. The Latin emperors also lived there.

The archaeological remains of the palace are meager. Apart from a system of artificial terraces (E. Mamboury, T. Wiegand, Die Kaiserpaläste von Konstantinopel [Berlin-Leipzig 1934]), they are limited to: (1) a seaward façade deployed along two re-entrant angles of the sea walls, overlooking the artificial harbor of Boukoleon; (2) a stretch of defensive wall, probably the one built by Nikephoros II Phokas, running north from the old lighthouse tower of the sea walls; and (3) remnants of an apsed hall preceded by a peristyle court (66 × 55 m), the latter decorated with a magnificent floor mosaic. This complex, excavated in 1935–38 and 1952–54, appears to date no earlier than the reign of Justinian I and has not been convincingly identified with any of the palatine buildings known from the textual evidence.

The palace is best known to us as it was in the 9th–10th C. and should be visualized not as a symmetrically planned complex (although parts of it may have been) but as an irregular agglomeration of buildings of various dates separated by gardens and sporting grounds. The three principal texts that help us to recreate the layout of the palace are the De ceremoniis; the description in TheophCont (139–43, 325f) of the buildings put up by the emperors Theophilus and Basil I; and the account by Nicholas Mesarites of the failed coup of John Komnenos the Fat in 1200. On the basis of these and other sources, repeated attempts have been made to reconstruct the palace on paper, the first by J. Labarte (1861). All are highly conjectural.

Of the earlier phase of the palace relatively little is known. It had a monumental vestibule called Chalke opening on to the main street (Mese) to the southeast of Hagia Sophia; an area occupied by the barracks of the palace guards (scholarioi, excubatores, candidati); a “public” section, centered on a big court (called 1 tribunal or Delphax) with meeting rooms (Consistorium, Augusteus) and a dining room (the Hall of the 19 Couches) grouped around it; finally, a residential wing called Daphne, which communicated with the imperial box (Kathisma) in the Hippodrome by means of a spiral staircase (kochlias). A chapel of St. Stephen was added by Pulcheria (ca.428) and another, of St. Michael, before the end of the 5th C. The palace had a harbor or other landing facilities and was certainly protected by a wall. A private sport-
ing ground called "the covered Hippodrome" may have dated from the same period.

The Chalke and guards' quarters were burned down in the Nika Revolt (532) and rebuilt by Justinian I. Justin II is credited with the Chrysotriklinos (Golden Hall), a domed octagon that was to become the throne room and ceremonial center of the palace. Tiberius I (soon after 578) remodeled the north section of the palace to provide new quarters for himself and his family. A further expansion was carried out by Justinian II, who strengthened the palace walls and built a big reception hall called Ioustinianos or the Triklinos of Justinian. The next important building phase was initiated by Theophilos, who erected a two-story complex (the Trikonchos, the Sigma, and several pavilions). Next, Basil I put up residential rooms (the Kainourgion and the Pentakoubouklon), the Nea Ekklesia, and several chapels and laid out a polo ground (Tzynanisterion).

Judging the defenses of the palace to be inadequate, Nikephoros II surrounded what was then the central part of it, i.e., the part overlooking the palatine harbor of Boukoleon, with a strong wall. No further building activity is recorded until the mid-12th C., when Manuel I erected a hall called Manouelites decorated with mosaics depicting his victories (P. Magdalino, *BMGS* 4 [1978] 101–14) and probably another, in the Seljuk style, called Mouchroutas, directly to the west of the Chrysotriklinos. During the Palaiologan period the palace gradually fell into decay; except for the Nea Ekklesia, little of it had survived by the time of the Turkish conquest.


---

GRECE, the southern part of the Balkan peninsula, encompassing the Peloponnesos, Central Greece (Attica, Boeotia, Akarnania, Aitolia), Northern Greece (Thessaly, Macedonia, Epirus), and the islands of the Aegean and Ionian seas. The traditional concept of an economic de-

cline of Greece during the late Roman period needs substantial revision: even though the destinies of individual cities differed (Thessalonike flourished, while Athens stagnated), classical urban civilization prevailed in the 4th–6th C. and was able to overcome the attacks of the Goths and Huns. The antique city pattern remained despite active construction of churches (T. Gregory in *City, Town and Countryside in the Early Byzantine Era* [New York 1982] 43–73). The situation changed drastically in the 7th C.; it remains under discussion whether it was the result of an internal economic and political crisis (the mechanism of which escapes us) or was caused by the invasion of the Avars and Slavs (whose impact, however, could not have been greater than that of the Goths and Huns). The ancient cities disappeared or were ruralized, construction work ceased almost entirely, and new settlers penetrated down to the southern parts of the Peloponnesos.

The old administrative system (Greece belonged to the prefecture of Illyricum), forming the provinces of Achaia, Thessaly, Macedonia, and Epirus, dissolved, since Constantinople retained control essentially over only a narrow strip along the sea coast with cities such as Thessalonike and Corinthis, whereas in the interior independent principalities (see Sklavinia), tribal units, and semi-independent grand possessions (like those of the widow Danelis) became established.

Ecclesiastical administration also underwent changes by the end of the 7th C.; many bishoprics ceased to exist—at the Council of 680 only the bishops of Lakedaimon, Athens, Corinth, and Argos were present as well as a handful of Macedonian representatives: Thessalonike, Selymbria, Herakleia, Mesembria, Bize, Ainos, Philippi, Amphipolis, Edessa, Uzusa, Dyrachion, Stobi (Ostrogorsky, *Byz. Geschicht e* 107–09); in the *Notitia* of pseudo-Éphimarios 27 metropolitans from Asia Minor are listed and only five from Greece, predominantly from northern regions (Thrace, Rhodope, Haimimontos [see Haimos]). A part of Greece stood under the jurisdiction of Rome until the mid-8th C.

The Byz. reconquest of Greece began at the end of the 8th C. and, though in some districts Slavic villages survived through the 14th C., the country was deeply hellenized by the 10th C. (J. Herrin, *BSA* 68 [1973] 113–26). In the 11th and 12th C. Greece witnessed an economic revival.
greater than Asia Minor: the larger cities such as Thessalonike, Corinth, and Thebes successfully competed with Constantinople as trade and manufacturing centers, and splendid churches were erected throughout Greece. Some writers (e.g., Michael Choniates) deplored the cultural decline of ancient cities such as Athens, but probably this attitude itself indicates the increasing self-consciousness of provincial intellectuals who accused Constantinople of grasping the lion's share of wealth and glory. At any rate, many first-rate literati dwelt in Greek towns and actively participated in local administrative and ecclesiastical life.

Administrative units of Hellas and Thrace were formed in Greece from which gradually other themes separated: Peloponnesos, Nikopolis, Dryrachion, Thessalonike, Macedonia, Strymon, Boleron; other themes encompassed the islands of
the Aegean Sea. Rome lost its jurisdiction over East Illyricum. A notitia of the 8th–9th C. reflects the growing role of Greece in church organization: there are listed 27 metropolitans from Asia Minor compared with ten metropolitans from Greece, including southern sites—Patras, Athens, and Larissa.

After the fall of Constantinople to the Crusaders in 1204, Greece was relatively easily conquered by the Franks, in contrast to Asia Minor where they met a stubborn resistance. Boniface of Montferrat established himself as the king of Thessalonike, then the following Frankish states were created: the principality of Achaia (Morea), and the duchy of the Archipelago (both under the direct suzerainty of the Latin emperor of Constantinople); the lordship of Athens and Thebes standing in a vassal relationship to the king of Thessalonike; Euboea (Negroponte), which was dependent on Thessalonike and Venice; and the county of Kephallenia, in theory held by Venice but actually autonomous.

The centers of Byz. resistance in Greece were the despotate of Epirus and Monemvasia as well as some mountainous areas of Taygetos that escaped subjugation to Achaia. By 1248 Monemvasia had to surrender, but by that time the empire of Nicaea became a factor; in 1259 at the battle of Pelagonia it showed itself as the strongest power in the Balkans, and in 1261 a Nicean general was able to reconquer Constantinople. In 1262 Achaia ceded three strongholds (Mistra, Monemvasia, and Maina) to the Byz. emperor, thus opening the way for the Greek recovery of a part of the Peloponnesos; Michael VIII also attacked Thessaly and Euboea and then penetrated as far as Avion and Dyrrachion. The Byz. reconquest of Greece, however, was short-lived: first the Catalan Grand Company, then the Serb-Serbian offense under Stefan Uros IV Dušan, and finally the Turkish invasion eliminated the successes achieved by the Greeks in the second half of the 13th C.

In the 14th and 15th C. Greece was divided into various independent and semi-independent seigneuries, of which Epiros, the despotate of Morea, and Kephallenia seem to have been the most stable and militarily active; these seigneuries engaged in constant internecine warfare, and also fought against the Turks, Serbs, Albanians, invaders from Italy, and not infrequently Constantinoplc. Nevertheless, the country prospered economically; population density grew; and trade relations with Venice, Dubrovnik, and Sicily flourished. The relations between the Franks and the Greeks were not strictly determined; the Byz. ruling class found a modus vivendi, strengthened by intermarriages; the ordinary Greeks, however, felt oppressed by both Latin knights and Italian merchants, and Orthodoxy, in opposition to the idea of subordination to the pope, served as an expression of ethnic and social hatred.

The Turkish occupation of the Greek mainland was accomplished by 1460 (the conquest of Morea); it put an end to the existence of the multinational agglomeration created in Greece during the 13th–15th C. Some islands continued their independent status for a while longer, partly under Venetian protection.


—A.K.

**GREEK. See Language.**

**GREEK ANTHOLOGY**, conventional title for two collections of ancient and Byz. epigrams.

1. *Anthologia Palatina*, the name given to a collection of about 3,700 epigrams contained in a unique MS, now divided between Heidelberg (Palat. gr. 23) and Paris (B.N., suppl. gr. 384). The MS is usually dated to the 10th C. (A.D.E. Cameron, GRBS 11 [1970] 339–50), but an 11th-C. date has been proposed by R. Aubreton (REA 70 [1968] 32–82; AntCl 38 [1969] 459f). Presenting complex codicological problems, the MS—in which several hands can be distinguished—also includes revisions and late insertions. Created by an unknown compiler, who probably drew on the 10th-C. Kephalaia anthology of pagan classical and late antique epigrams and funerary inscriptions, the *Anthologia Palatina* is set out in 15 books. Of these, books 3–7, 9–12, and probably 13–14 represent the core taken from Kephalaia's collection. Books 1 (Christian epigrams, largely from inscriptions in churches), 8 (funerary epigrams by Gregory of Nazianzos), and 15 (a miscellaneous
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GREEK FIRE (ὑρίον πῦρ, lit. “liquid flame”). Kallinos was said to be the inventor of the liquid fire that saved Constantinople from the Arabs in 678 and from the Rus’ in 941. Its exact composition and means of propulsion are still uncertain, esp. since the term “Greek fire” was used to refer to various types of incendiary weapons. Although some scholars prefer to understand Greek fire as an explosive compound triggered by saltpeter (E. Pászthory, Antike Welt 17.2 [1986] 27–37), the most likely ingredients included crude oil (obtained from regions east of the Azov Sea [Tmutorokan, Zichia] or from wells east of Armenia listed in De adm. imp. 53.483–511) mixed with resin and sulphur, which was then heated and propelled by a pump (siphon) through a bronze tube (streptone). The liquid jet was ignited either as it left the tube or by flaming projectiles fired after it. The Byz. were careful never to divulge details on the composition or propulsion of Greek fire (De adm. imp. 13.73–103); thus even when the Bulgars captured a great supply of the mixture and firing tubes (Theoph. 499.13–14) they were unable to use them.

The use of Greek fire in sea battles is frequently mentioned in the sources, but it was also used in siege machinery (see ARTILLERY AND SIEGE MACHINERY). The Arab historian Ibn al-Athir describes the terrible effect of flame-throwing tubes during the Byz. attack on Duin in 927, a danger the Arabs were able to avert only by killing the operator (Vasiliev, Byz. Arabes 2.2:150). The remains of a medieval workshop that produced Greek fire “grenades” were discovered in Hama-Emphaneia (P. Peniz, Antiquity 62, no.234 [1988] 89–93).


GREEK-CROSS DOMED OCTAGON. See CHURCH PLAN TYPES.
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and central Italy, he sailed to Alexandria; from there, soon after the martyrdom of Christians at Najhran and the Akumite intervention of 525 that ended with the defeat of the Jewish Himyarite king Dhū Nuwas, the patriarch of Alexandria, called Proterios in the vita (but actually Timothy III), sent him as bishop to the land of Hymyar (V. Christides, Annales d’Ethiopie 9 [1972] 115–46). Having consecrated several churches together with the Akumite king Kaleb ‘Elẖa ‘Ašbehā (Elesroam), Gregentios remained in Zafār at the side of Abrahā, the newly appointed Akumite vicery of Hymyar, to reestablish Christian Orthodoxy. He died some thirty years later, on 19 Dec., and was inscribed on this day in the Synaxarion of Constantinople (Synax. CP 328–30; G. Fiaccadori, Egitto e Vicino Oriente 3 [1980] 314, n. 79).

With the name of the saint are also connected the so-called Laws for the Himyaries (BHG 706h–i), and the Conversation with Herban the Jew (BHG 706d); ostensibly forming an integral part of the vita, both are, in different measure, subsequent compilations. The whole dossier was assembled not before the 10th C., although the Laws for the Himyaries shares some points with legal inscriptions from pre-Islamic South Arabia (A.K. Irvine, BSOAS 30 [1967] 290f.), and the Conversation, a cento of passages from various texts, may reflect the drastic efforts of the saint to convert the local Jews.

Gregentios is called Gregory in one MS of the vita (BHG 705a). The latter name (a lectio facillior) appears constantly in the Slavonic tradition and is also found in the inscription on a Cypriot fresco of 1110–18 that portrays the saint (C. Mango, E. Hawkins, Dop 18 [1964] 339 and fig. 44).


Gregorios, graphene tos, archbishop of Zafār, in South Arabia, and saint, II. mid-6th C. His biography is based mainly on haphazard and legendary information (R. Aubert, DHGE 21 [1986] 1385f). According to the vita (BHG 705d) by Palladius, bishop of Najhran, preserved in a Slavonic translation, Gregentios was born in the late 5th C. in Moesia. After journeying to north
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GREGENTIOS (Gregentios), archbishop of Zafār, in South Arabia, and saint, II. mid-6th C. His biography is based mainly on haphazard and legendary information (R. Aubert, DHGE 21 [1986] 1385f). According to the vita (BHG 705d) by Palladius, bishop of Najhran, preserved in a Slavonic translation, Gregentios was born in the late 5th C. in Moesia. After journeying to north

GREGORAS, NIKEPHIROS, polymath and historian; born Herakleia Pontike ca.1260/1 (V. Grecu, BSHA 27 [1946] 56–61) or 1293/4 (H.-V. Beyer, JÖB 27 [1978] 129f.), died Constantinople between 1358 and 1361. Orphaned as a child, Gregorios (Γρηγοριος) was initially educated by his uncle John, metropolitan of Herakleia. Circa 1314/
he went to Constantinople to study logic and rhetoric with the future Patr. John XIII Glykys, and philosophy and astronomy with Theodore Metochites. He supported Andronikos II in the civil war of 1324–28, but later also found favor with Andronikos III. Gregoras was a partisan of John VI Kantakouzenos during the Civil War of 1341–47; from 1347, however, when Gregoras succeeded Akindynos as leader of the anti-Palamite party, his fortunes declined. Shortly after taking monastic vows, he was condemned and anathematized by the local council of Constantinople of 1351 (see under Constantinople, Councils of) and placed under house arrest. After his death his corpse was dragged through the streets of the capital.

Gregoras was one of the most versatile scholars of the 14th C. Based at the Chora monastery, where he ran a school and had access to the library of Metochites, he wrote hagiography (including Lives of Michael Synkellos; Theophano, wife of Leo VI; and John of Harkleia), rhetorical works, and theological treatises (antiorthetics against Gregory Palamas). His dialogue Phloaretios, or On Wisdom, a discussion between Gregoras and Barlaam of Calabria, is a successful imitation of a Platonic dialogue. He also maintained an extensive correspondence, wrote treatises on the construction of the astrolabe, and calculated eclipses; his proposals for calendar reform and for the calculation of the date of Easter were not adopted, but presaged the Gregorian reform of 1582.

The most important work of Gregoras was his Rhomaikhe Historia, in 37 books. It covered the period 1204–1359, and he imposed a strict annalistic structure on his material. He emphasized the events of his own lifetime, with particular attention to theological controversy. Gregoras rejected a determinist explanation of historical events, arguing that God is not responsible for men's evil actions, but that he does foresee the future (A. Kazhdan, Byzantion 50 [1980] 320, 324f). Although the history was composed over many years and never properly edited or revised by Gregoras, it is an extremely valuable source for the first half of the 14th C. and as a complement to the memoirs of Kantakouzenos.

---

**GREGORY** (Γρηγόριος), exarch of Carthage and relative of Herakleios; died Sufetula 647. A supporter of the anti-Monothelite position of Maximos the Confessor, the "most pious patrikios" Gregory was already exarch by July 645, when he attended the disputation in Carthage between Maximos and Patr. Pyrrhos and reportedly helped reconcile them (PG 91:287A). In late 646 or early 647, Gregory and "the Africans" rebelled against Constans II. Gregory's actions are partly explained by African estrangement from Constantinople over Monothelitism; local support was strong for Pope Theodore and Maximos (both later accused in Constantinople of inciting Gregory), and during 645/6 various African synods denounced the "heresy." The more immediate cause was probably anxiety about the Arabs' conquest of Egypt. In 647 Abdallah invaded western Tripolitania and marched on Byzacena. Gregory, who had marshalled his forces at Sufetula, confronted him in the nearby plains and was defeated. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 343.25-27) and some Syriac sources record that Gregory fled to Constantinople, but most scholars accept Arab reports that he was killed in battle.

---


Nikephoros Gregorae Epistulae, ed. P.A.M. Leone, 2 vols. (Ma-
he made a truce with the Lombards who threatened Rome in 592 and 593 and reorganized the utilization of church *patronia*, esp. in Sicily (V. Recchia, *Gregorio Magno e la società agricola* [Rome 1978]). Gregory recognized not only the secular authority of the emperor, but also his authority in ecclesiastical matters, provided the emperor did not violate the canons. Gregory did not actively interfere in the domain of the patriarch of Constantinople, although in 595 he examined an appeal from two priests condemned in the Byzantine capital. He recognized the see of Constantinople as the first among the Eastern patriarchates but rejected the claim of John IV Nestor to the title of Ecumenical Patriarch. He was opposed to Maurice and his court and welcomed the usurpation of Phokas, displaying the portraits of the new imperial couple on the Palatine Hill.

Gregory is generally believed to have been the author of the *Dialogues*, although this attribution has recently been challenged by Clark (infra). These Dialogues, which were miraculous stories about 6th-C. saints and deliberations on the immortality of the soul, were translated into Greek by Pope Zacharias, and were popular in Byz. Short anecdotes about Gregory, probably known to John Moschos, as well as pieces in *synaxaria* and *menologia* (F. Halkin, *OrChP* 21 [1955] 109-14), formed the core of Gregory's Greek *vitae*.


**GREGORY II OF CYPRUS**, patriarch of Constantinople (28 Mar. 1283–June 1289); born Cyprus ca.1241, died Constantinople 1290. He was educated in Cyprus, Nicaea, and Constantinople, where he studied under George *Akropolites* (*Autobiography* 177-87). He then joined the ranks of the palace clergy. In 1283 he was elevated to the patriarchate. Although under Michael VIII he supported the negotiations with the West for Union of the Churches, Gregory was disillusioned by its apologists, the “Latinophones,” and with Rome’s unyielding demands for submission. His patriarchate was thus marked by the restoration of Orthodoxy and the formal rejection of the union of Lyons at the local council of Constantinople of 1285 (see under Constantineople, Councils of). Eventually, however, the complex ecclesiastical crisis provoked by the *Armenites*, conservative bishops, and unionists opposed both to his rule and to the Tomos of 1285, forced his conditional resignation (1289).

Gregory played a prominent part in the intellectual revival of the late 13th C., as his correspondence, proverb collection, *enkomia*, declamations, and Lives of the saints indicate. His *Autobiography*—possibly inspired by the *autobio-
graphical reflections of Nikephoros Blemmydes—is a brief yet precious account of the cultural and "academic" background of his youth in Nicaea and Constantinople. His correspondence, too, in an elegant Attic style, contains material evidence for social and economic history (M. Bibikov, ZRVI 17 [1976] 93–99).


LIT. RegPatr. fasc. 4, nos. 1460–1548. Papadakis, Crisis in Byz. —A.P.

GREGORY III, pope (18 Mar. 731–28 Nov. 741) and saint. Of Syrian origin, Gregory was elected unexpectedly after the demise of Gregory II and inherited his predecessor’s conflict with Byz. At the council convened in Rome on 1 Nov. 731, Italian bishops condemned Iconoclasism. Gregory sent messengers to Emp. Leo III, but they either tarried from fear or were detained and arrested. To quell the pope’s resistance, Leo dispatched to Italy a fleet, which was destroyed in a storm in the Adriatic Sea. Then Leo ordered the tenants of the papal patrimonio in Sicily and Calabria to pay their taxes not to Rome, but to the fisc (A. Guillou, ZRVI 19 [1980] 74–78); he also transferred Illyricum to the jurisdiction of Constantinople. In this precarious situation Gregory vacillated between alliance with the duchies of Benevento and Spoletto, on the one side, and with the Lombard king Liutprand, on the other; he even endeavored in 740 to attract Charles Martel as Rome’s protector. Gregory did not disrupt political ties with Byz., however, and urged the Venetians and the archbishop of Grado to support exarch Eutychios when the Lombards forced him to flee Ravena in 737.


GREGORY V (baptismal name Bruno), pope (3 May 996–18 Feb. 999); great-grandson of Otto I the Great. The first pope of German origin, Gregory sought collaboration with Otto III. He found a rival in John Philagathos, the archbishop of Piacenza, a man of Greek ancestry who was close to Theophano, the Byz. mother of Otto. Basil II supported the claims of Philagathos: when the latter arrived in Constantinople for diplomatic negotiations, the emperor sent him back with the Byz. emissary Leo of Synada. Philagathos was proclaimed pope in Rome in Feb. 997 (as John XVI), but in Feb. 998 Otto III reinstalled Gregory and severely punished the pope’s adversaries.


GREGORY VII (Hildebrand), pope (from 22 Apr. 1073); born Tuscany between 1020 and 1025, died Salerno 25 May 1085. Continuing the policy of Leo IX, Gregory worked to establish a strong papacy supported by a reformed clergy. At the beginning of his pontificate Gregory was involved in military actions against the Norman Robert Guiscard. He assembled certain southern Italian princes and was even in touch with North African Christians (C. Courtois, RH 195 [1945] 220–25) in expectation of an alliance against the Normans. Gregory also strove for an accommodation with Byz. He corresponded with Emp. Michael VII and dreamed of organizing a “crusade” to alleviate the plight of Byz. (Cowdrey infra). Everything changed in 1080; as a result of Guiscard’s military success and the conflict with Henry IV of Germany, Gregory accepted Guiscard’s homage on 29 June and recognized his occupation of Amalfi, Salerno, and Fermo. When Guiscard waged war against Byz., Gregory insisted that the Venetians who opposed the Norman penetration into the Adriatic would not support the “excommunicated” (Greeks), and he sent his congratulations to Guiscard after his victory over Alexios I. Sources concerning Gregory’s relations with Armenia, Kiev, and southern Slavs are vague. Matthew of Edessa even relates that the Armenian katholikos Gregory II traveled to Rome in 1075; the pope Gregory attempted to mediate the conflict between Poland and Rus’ and urged Zvonimir to recognize his vassalage to Rome.

GREGORY IX (Hugo, count of Segni), pope (from 19 Mar. 1227); born Anagni ca. 1170 (R. Aubert, *DHGE* 21 ([1986] 1437), died Rome 22 Aug. 1241. He was the nephew of Innocent IV. Gregory spent his pontificate primarily in the struggle with Frederick II. At the same time he endeavored to strengthen the Latins’ position both in Palestine and in Constantinople. He collected money for the organization of new crusades and developed a new system of punishing heretics by sending them to Constantinople for several years (P. Segl, *DA* 32 [1976] 209–20). Gregory insisted that Frederick lead a crusade to Palestine—the pope wanted him to help the Latins and at the same time to divert Frederick from Italy, where he had been attacking papal territory. Gregory tried to increase the power of the Latin patriarch of Constantinople by making him a papal legate, whereas Innocent III had sent an independent legate to check the power of the patriarch (R.L. Wolff, *DOP* 8 [1954] 285–90). Gregory initiated negotiations with the Greek patriarch Germanus II; Germanus’s letters of 1232 to Gregory and the cardinals (*RegMat*, fasc. 4, no. 1256–57) emphasize readiness for Union of the Churches on the basis of papal primacy but complain about the injustice perpetrated by the Latins, esp. on Cyprus. In 1233 Gregory dispatched Haymo of Faversham to Nicara, but negotiations failed.


---

GREGORY XI (Pierre Roger de Beaufort), pope (from 1370); born Limousin 1329, died Rome 27 Mar. 1378. He was the last of the Avignon popes. His principal aim was to return the curia to Rome, a goal that he achieved in 1377 after an expensive war against Florence. Gregory devoted many words—but little money—to the East, where the position of the Christians was seriously threatened, esp. after the Turkish victory at Marica in 1371. The pope subsidized the garrison in Smyrna but was unable to summon a new crusade since only the Hospitallers were ready to offer money and manpower: Venice was at war with Genoa, while other Western states (including Hungary and Aragon) were indifferent or suspicious of the papal project.


---

GREGORY ABUL-FARAJ, Syriac scholar; known as Bar Hebraeus in the West, a sobriquet that translates the name by which he is usually called in Syriac and Arabic texts; baptismal name John; born Melitene 1225, died Maragha, Azerbaijan 30 July 1286. The son of a physician named Aaron, he took the name Gregory when he became a bishop in the Monophysite community. After occupying several episcopal sees, in 1264 Gregory became the bishop of Tagrit, and thus the ma-
GREGORY MAGISTROS, prince of the Pahlavuni family, lord of Bjni in the valley of the Hrazdan River; born Bjni (near Ani) ca.990, died Tarón ca.1058. He was important in the political and intellectual life of Armenia. After Constantine IX occupied Ani in 1045 (ending the Bagratid kingdom), Gregory went to live in Constantinople. He joined a Greek campaign against the Turks in 1048 and was appointed magistros and doux of Mesopotamia. Thereafter he resided at his estates in Tarón, devoted to literary studies and the repression of the Tondrakites. His son Vahram became katholikos (1065–1105) as Gregory III Vakayaser (“martyrophile”); his descendants included NERSÊS ŠNOKHILI and NERSES OF LAMBRON.

Widely read in Greek literature, Gregory translated Plato’s Timaeus and Phaedo and part of Euclid’s Geometry and composed various theological works. His most notable legacy is a collection of 88 letters written on public and private matters in a recondite style full of classical allusions. They are unique in Armenian as conscious imitations of Byz. epistolography.

ED. Grigor Magistros (Hore, ed. K. Kostaneau) (Alexandropol 1910), T'ala'adut'ienk (Venice 1868).


GREGORY OF AKRAGAS, exenate, bishop of Akragas, and saint; fl. ca.700; feastday 24 Nov. Under his name is preserved a commentary on the Ecclesiastes of Solomon (G.H. Ettinger, SfP 18.1 [1886] 317–20). Gregory’s biography, written by a certain Leonios, hegoumenos of the monastery of St. Sabin in Rome, is confusing; it makes Gregory a contemporary of Justinian II and eyewitness to the struggle against the Monotheletes and at the same time a deacon under Patr. Makarios II of Jerusalem (552, 563/4–ca.573). The focal point of the vita of Leonios is Gregory’s arrest in Akragas and Justinian’s intervention with an unnamed pope to release him; the Sicilian bishops are presented as supporting Gregory against the pope. The anti-Roman tendency of

GREGORY DEGHA PAHLAVUNI. See GREGORY TLAY.

phrian or primate of the Monophysite community in the former Persian territories, with his official residence at the monastery of Mar Mattai, near present-day Mosul. Gregory was a polymath whose career and accomplishments represent the full flowering of intellectual life in the Syriac-speaking community in the 19th C. He composed major works in theology, philosophy, mysticism, law, and Syriac grammar.

For the Byzantinist, however, his most relevant work is the Chronicle, a universal history that Gregory composed on the basis of the Chronicle of Michael I the Syrian. Gregory’s Chronicle presents secular and ecclesiastical history in two separate sections, often called the Chronicon syriacum and the Chronicon ecclesiasticum, respectively. The secular chronicle covers the period from Adam to the Mongol invasions; the ecclesiastical chronicle begins with Aaron, the Israelite priest, and continues in the Christian period following the succession of the patriarchs of Antioch, listing only the Monophysite holders of the office after the time of Severos of Antioch. In a second section of the ecclesiastical chronicle, however, Gregory also presents the history of the church in the Persian world, from the time of the apostle Thomas onward, on the basis of Nestorian sources. Gregory worked on the ecclesiastical chronicle until his death in 1286. His brother, Bar Šama, brought it up to 1288. A later writer included a record of events to the year 1496. Gregory’s Chronicle is esp. valuable for the years after 1193, where the chronicle of Michael the Syrian ended, and for the period of the Mongol invasions, which Gregory witnessed.


GREGORY DEGHA PAHLAVUNI. See GREGORY TLAY.
Leontios (was he really a *hegoumenos* in Rome?) also reveals itself when he gives the list of Gregory's works, one of which was dedicated to St. Andrew who is titled the "chief (koryphaios) of the apostles," an epithet usually reserved for the "Roman" apostles Peter and Paul.


—A.K.

**GREGORY OF CORINTH.** See Pardos, Gregory.

**GREGORY OF DEKAPOLIS,** saint; born Eirenopolis, Isaurian Dekapolis, before 797, died 20 Nov. 842 (Dvornik), 841, or even earlier (Mango). After finishing elementary school Gregory stayed 14 years in a monastery, whose archimandrite was Symeon, Gregory’s maternal uncle. Thereafter he started his wanderings: he spent a winter in Ephesus, then set off for Constantinople, but landed in the Prokonnesos, passed through Ainos, Christophopolis, Thessalonike, and sailed to Sicily via Corinth; he stayed three months in a cell in Rome, lived as a recluse in Syracuse, and returned to Thessalonike, from where he visited Mt. Olimpos and Constantinople.

Gregory’s vita, written soon after 842/3, is assigned by three MSS to Ignatios the Deacon; this attribution was questioned by W. Wolska-Conus (TM 4 [1970] 340) but supported by Ševčenko (“Hagiography” 123). Gregory lived through the second period of Iconoclasm but did not himself suffer from persecution: the hagiographer accordingly calls him “a martyr without meals” (Dvornik, *infra* 70.3–4). Gregory enjoyed the vision of divine light and worked miracles (a Saracen tried to kill Gregory, but his hand immediately withered). The Life contains only vague information about a revolt of the *exarchon* of Sklavinia, but provides much evidence on administrative and legal practice in Byz.: a conflict concerning the right of the “neighborhood” (*geitonomia*—p.63.22–26), the *praktor* of the state treasury seizing property not bequeathed by will (p.55.20–24), etc. Images of Gregory, rare in MSS and even rarer in monumental painting, show the saint as a monk with a trim round white beard.


—A.K., N.P.S.

**GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS,** bishop of Constantinople (27 Nov. 380–381), bishop of Nazianzos (382–84), and saint; born 329/30 in Arianos, near Nazianzos, died Arianos ca.390; feastday 25 Jan. One of the Cappadocian Fathers, he was a close friend of Basil, the Great, whose fellow-student he was in Cappadocian Caesarea and Athens. Like Basil, he entered monastic life after completing his education. His homonymous father, bishop of Nazianzos, consecrated a reluctant Gregory as priest in 362; he assisted his father until the latter’s death in 374. In 379 Gregory went to Constantinople, where he was appointed as its bishop. A strong supporter of Nicene orthodoxy, he fought against the adherents of Eunoios at the Council of Constantinople in 381, over which he presided. He then abdicated and returned home where he died after some last years of writing and contemplation.

Gregory was a prolific author, who wrote poetry, including 254 epigrams collected as book 8 of the *Greek Anthology*, orations, and many letters, to such friends as Basil and Gregory of Nyssa. Among his letters are attacks on the heresy of Apollinaris, the so-called *Theological Letters*. His homilies include sermons on specific feastdays, funeral orations for family and friends, a treatise (or.2) on the burden and duties of priesthood, a diatribe (or.20) against the mania at Constantinople for dogmatic controversy, and two gloating accounts of the death of Julian.

The authors of his vitae, the 7th-C. Gregory the Priest (PG 35:243–304) and Niketas David Paphalagon (ed. and tr. J. Rizzo, *The Encomium of Gregory Nazianzen by Nicetas the Paphalagonian* [Brussels 1976]), stress his role in the dogmatic struggle of the period; at the Council of Chalcedon he was granted the official epithet “the Theologian.” Unlike Basil and other contemporary dogmatists, however, Gregory was foremost a rhetorician and poet (H. Musurillo, *Thought* 45 [1970] 45–55) who considered poetic vocation a prophetic activity.
and his works as a sacrifice for God's altar (S. Costanza in Lirica grecia de Archiloco a Elitis [Padua 1984] 235). If Basil's asceticism was communal and monastic, Gregory's centered on his own experience as reflected in his poetic Autobiography; his vision of the world was personal and aristocratic and he stressed his distance from the "crowd" (B. Lorenz, VigChr 33 [1979] 240). Although his observations were personal and individual, he often used conventional situations; for example, although he never married and had no son, he lamented in one of his moral poems the untimely death of a bridegroom and the grief of the parents. He had a sincere belief in the afterlife and Christianity gave him solace against death, so that Gregory treated the Christian paideia primarily as a preparation for the end of earthly existence. To express his experience Gregory often used antiquated meters, albeit with certain modifications (D. Sykes, BZ 72 [1979] 6–15), and exquisite vocabulary. His verses, full of classical themes and images (M. Kertsch, Bilder sprache bei Gregor von Nazianz [Graz 1980]), were not suited for liturgical purposes; nevertheless, his poems were popular among later literati: they were commented upon by Kosmas the Hymnographer and imitated by Prodomos, among others.

Illustration of the Homilies of Gregory. Numerous illustrated copies of his homilies attest to Gregory's significance in later periods. Beyond the Paris Gregory a smaller selection of 16 homilies became popular in the 11th C. Arranged in the order of reading during the church year, this "liturgical edition" was illustrated with images appropriate to the individual feastdays. Among the more elaborate versions is Sinai gr. 339, a mid-12th-C. MS commissioned by the hegoumenos Joseph Hagioglykerites of the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople; its ornament is related to MSS of James of Kokkinobaphos (J.C. Anderson, ArtB 61 [1979] 167–85).

Representation in Art. Gregory, as one of the three most important church fathers, was invariably included in the procession of bishops adorning church apses, near the figures of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great; he is distinguished by his balding head, healthy face, and squarish beard. The inclusion of Gregory the Priest's biography of the saint into the Paris Gregory MS inspired a whole page of illustrations depicting events from his life (fol. 452r), while the autobiographical references contained in various of Gregory's sermons prompted the inclusion of narrative compositions (Gregory teaching, attending funerals and councils, etc.) in many MSS of the liturgical edition of these sermons. Several of these latter MSS contain an author portrait of Gregory seated at his desk like an Evangelist.

- GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS
- GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS. Portrait of Gregory writing. Frontispiece of a manuscript of the liturgical homilies of Gregory (Sinai gr. 339, fol. 4v); 12th C. Monastery of St. Catherine, Sinai. The manuscript commissioned by Joseph Hagioglykerites, hegoumenos of the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople.

---


GREGORY OF NYSSA, theologian, the youngest of the Cappadocian Fathers, and saint; born in the region of Neokaisareia between 335 and 340, died after 394; feast day 10 Jan. He was one of nine children, including an older brother Basil the Great and a sister, Makrina, whose vita he later wrote. Anagnósties by the age of 20, Gregory unexpectedly renounced his post, married a certain Theosebia, and turned to the study of rhetoric. When his brother Basil received the metropolitan see of Caesarea, he ordained Gregory (ca.371) as bishop of Nyssa. Gregory, however, did not meet his brother's expectations: Basil accused him of “simplicity” and “lack of experience” in church administration (Basil, ep.100.27–29, 215.16–17, ed. Y. Courtome [Paris 1957–61]). Gregory became involved in a conflict with the civil government and was forced to leave his see temporarily (376–378); during his absence the pro-Arian party took the upper hand. He returned to Nyssa after the death of Valens. During Basil's life Gregory felt restrained and wrote little (e.g., his essay On Virginity), but after his brother died in 379 Gregory's political and literary activity flourished: he attended the synod of Antioch in 379, served briefly as bishop of Sebastia, supported Gregory of Nazianzos at the Council of Constantinople in 381, delivered funeral orations for members of the imperial family in 383 and 385, wrote his major works (Against Eunomios, the Great Catechesis, On the Making of Man, homilies on the Song of Songs, etc.), and participated in the synod invoked by Patr. Nektarios in 394.

Well read in classical literature, Gregory highly valued Plato and had more respect for Origen than did Basil. He was much interested in scientific problems, and often touched upon physical, physiological, and medical topics. He became involved in the Trinitarian discussions which dominated his era and followed in his brother's footsteps, refining the views of Athanasios of Alexandria and polemizing with the Arians. His personal interests, however, lay in the spheres of anthropology and eschatology; he was esp. concerned with the problem of man's perception of God (theognasia—PG 44:773A); the contemplation of divine beauty, which is the most sublime end of our desires, is made possible by God's creation of man according to His image, "in order that the similar (homoios) might see the similar" (PG 46:176A). At the same time man is a sensual being and therefore is in danger of substituting valuable material objects for the sublime principle. Gregory saw in the Holy Writ and in the "tradition given to us by the fathers" the vehicle of discriminating between the divine and the material. Unlike Eunomios, who affirmed that a complete perception of God was possible through logical operations, Gregory asserted that our knowledge of God was restricted and could be achieved primarily through an ecstasy, "a sober inebriation" (PG 44:992A).

Gregory was respected by the Byz. and called "the father of fathers" at the Council of Nicaea in 787, but he always remained in the shadow of the two more prominent Cappadocian fathers. Some works of other theologians (e.g., Severos of Antioch—see M. Kugener, ROC 3 [1898] 435–51, or Anastasios of Sinai—Beck, Kirche 445) were ascribed to him; in the 14th C. Gregory's concept that all beings, save God, had been created provoked a heated discussion between Neilos Kabasilas and John Kyparissiotes; his statement was interpreted respectively as being a doctrine in support of or in opposition to Hesychasm.

Representation in Art. Gregory's association with Gregory of Nazianzos means that his portrait is included in illustrated MSS of the latter's homilies (Galavaris, Liturgical Homilies 46–48, 53–58, 183–85). A dark-haired bishop with a pointed beard, Gregory of Nyssa is commonly included in the procession of bishops adorning church apses.


-A.K., B.B., N.P.S.
GREGORY OF TOURS, bishop of Tours (from 573): born Clermont-Ferrand ca. 540, died 17 Nov. 593 or 594. An aristocrat of senatorial background and adviser to Merovingian kings. Gregory was the most important historian of Merovingian France. His gift of lively narrative in late Latin produced two works significant for Byz. The Historiarum libri X, or Histories in Ten Books, describes the rising power of the Franks from the 5th C. down to Gregory’s own time. For the early period Gregory used written sources (including valuable extracts from lost Gaulish historians on the usurper Maximus and general Aetius) and oral traditions of debated value. For Gregory, Byz. was simply res publica (bk. 2, ch. 3) and its activities in the West appear in connection with this main theme, from the alliance of Anastasios I with Clovis (2.37–38—M. McCormick in E. Chrysos, Das Reich und die Barbaren [Vienna-Cologne 1989] 155–80), DIPLOMACY (6.2), and Byz. complicity in a Frankish usurpation (6.24, 26–28) to the Franks’ role in Byz.’s war against the Lombards (10.2, Epistolae australiae) and the activities of Byz. merchants in Gaul (7.31). The Histories also provides independent evidence on the ascensions of Tiberios I (5.30—cf. Av. Cameron, JThSt n.s. 26 [1975] 421–26) and Maurice (6.30); Gregory’s information on Justin II, the Persian pillage of a suburb of Antioch, and the defection of Persarnenia (4.40) probably came from Monophysite circles in Constantinople.

The Libri VIII miraculorum, or Miracles in Eight Books (M. Heinzelmnn in Hagiographie—cultures et societe [Paris 1981] 235–57), includes stories reported by travelers, e.g., on Justin II and Empress Sophia (1.5), Patras (1.30), the building of St. Polyeuktos in Constantinople (1.102), and Byz. Italy (Virtutes S. Martini 1.13–16) as well as the development of the cult of icons (R.A. Markus, JThSt n.s. 29 [1978] 151–57). Gregory also wrote the Miracles of St. Andrew (BHL 4390) and, with the help of a Syrian named John, a Latin translation of the account of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus (B. Krusch, AB 12 [1893] 371–87).


GREGORY SINAITES, hesychast monk and writer; born Koukoulos, near Klaizomenai, ca. 1255 or 1265?, died Paroria 27 Nov. after 1337 (the traditional date of 1346 cannot be confirmed). The exact chronology of his career is uncertain. Born to wealthy parents, Gregory was captured in his youth by Turks. After his release he fled to Cyprus, where he became a monk, and then went to Mt. Sinai. He left Sinai after disputes with other monks and made his way to Athos, via Jerusalem and Crete, where he studied with the monk Arsenios and learned the “Jesus prayer,” the repetition of the phrase “Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me.” On Athos he reportedly introduced this “prayer of the heart,” a continuous and imageless form of prayer combined with control of the breathing (K.T. Warc, ECHR 4 [1972] 3–22), and was a forerunner of hesychasm. Turkish raids forced Gregory to flee from Athos and eventually to settle at Paroria in Thrace. Here ca. 1330 he founded a monastery on Mt. Katekryomene, which attracted both Greek and Slavic monks and received financial support from the Bulgarian tsar Ivan Alexander. Gregory’s disciples included Romylos of Vidin, Theodosios of Tornado (died 1369), and the future patriarch Kallistos, who composed his biography.

His principal work was the Most Beneficial Chapters [Kephalaia] in Acrostic, 137 short essays on the contemplative life (see Vita Contemplativa). Other chapters treat the hesychastic method of prayer and breathing. Gregory’s Discourse on the Transfiguration identifies the light perceived by mystics with the light on Mt. Tabor.


SOURCE. Vita by Kallistos—ed. I. Pomjalovskij, Zapiski-FilozofstnUniv 53 (1866) 1–64.

GREGORY THE ILLUMINATOR (Γρηγόριος τῆς μεγάλης Ἀρμενίας, lit. “Gregory of Great Armenia”), considered the founder of the Arménian Church and its first bishop; saint; fl. first half of
the 4th C.; Byz. feastday 30 Sept. The two main
censuras of his vita (A and V) differ in a number of
details and each survives in several versions
(Armenian, Greek, Arabic, Georgian, etc.). Ac-
cording to the "received tradition" found in re-
cension A (by Agathangelos), Gregory was of
Parthian origin and the son of the murderer of
the Armenian king Xosrov I. Saved from the
massacre that befell his family, he was educated as
a Christian at Caesarea in Cappadocia. On his
return to Armenia, he miraculously survived tor-
ture for his beliefs by King Trdat the Great.
Gregory preached the new faith to the king and
his court and baptized them. He was consecrated
bishop of Armenia at Caesarea. Though still occa-
cionally disputed, P. Ananian's proposed date
of 314 for the conversion of Armenia now seems
incontrovertible (Mission 74 [1961] 43-73, 317-
60). Gregory sent missionaries to the neighboring
lands of Georgia and Caucasian Albania. Near
the end of his life, he consecrated his son Aris-
takes as his successor and sent him to attend the
First Council of Nicaea. Gregory is said to have
then retired to a hermitage where he died, though
accounts of the end of his life remain unclear.
His mission marks the beginning of hellenizing
influence in the Armenian church as opposed to
the earlier Syrian influence found in the southern
part of the country.

Representation in Art. The earliest known Byz.
portrait of Gregory is the mosaic (now destroyed)
on the south tympanum of the nave of Hagia
Sophia, perhaps connected with Emp. Basil I's
claims of Armenian ancestry (Mango, Materials,
figs. 57-59). Gregory is depicted as an elderly
bishop in many later church programs and in
menologia, where he may appear in the company
of the virgin martyrs Hirip’imneh and Gayanê. The
scene of his beheading in a menologion (B.L. Add.
11870, fol.242v) is without textual basis. Mini-
tures in the Theodore Psalter show him being
released from the pit and converting King Trdat
(fol.48r). His life was depicted in one of the churches
dedicated to him at Ani (1215).

Let. M. van Esbroeck, “Témoignages littéraires sur
les sépultures de saint Grégoire l'Illuminateur,” AB 84 (1971)
387-417. Garsoian, Epic Histories 375f. S. Der Neressian,
"Les portraits de Grégoire l’Illuminateur dans l’art byzan-

GRIGOR TROYAN (“youth”), a nephew of NERSÉS
SNORHALI of the Pahlavuni family; katholikos in
Armenian Cilicia (1173-93); born 1193, died 1193.
Gregory pursued discussions with the Byz. au-
thorities concerning union of the Greek and Ar-
menian churches. In 1179 he called a synod at
Hrom-klay, the patriarchal see, where NERSÉS OF
LAMBRON made an Oration in favor of compro-
mise, but bishops from Greater Armenia were
opposed. When Emp. Manuel I died in 1180,
negotiations ended. Gregory also sought closer
relations with the Syrian and Roman churches,
corresponded with Pope Lucius III (1181-
85).

ED. Namakanisi Grigor Kečobhos (Venice 1865). E. Dula-
rier, "Elégie sur la prise de Jérusalem," RHC Arm. 1:269-
307 (with Fr. tr.).

LIT. Tekeyan, Controverses 35-54. —R.T.

GRiffin (γρύψ, γρύφος), mythological creature
with the body of a lion, head of an eagle, winged,
and sometimes having a serpent for its tail; Con-
stantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De cer. 381.1) in-
terpreted it as a hybrid of lion and vulture. Leg-
end placed griffins in the land of the Scythians
and Hyperboreans. Late Roman poets (Claudian,
Sidonius Apollinaris) connected the griffin with
Apollo, as did Servius, the 4th-C. commentator
on Vergil, who lists three symbols of Apollo: the
lyre, griffin, and arrows. Sidonius Apollinaris
describes the chariot of Dionysos as pulled by grif-
fins. According to NONNOS of PANOPOLIS (Diony-
siaca 48:382-83), a griffin, "a bird of vengeance,"
winged and four-legged, flew round the throne of
Nemesis. In the Alexander Romance the hero
flies on griffins. Psello (Sathas, MB 5:246.3-4)
pees with irony of writers who made Alexander
yoke griffins and fly up from the earth. Lexico-
graphers (Hesychios, Photios) confused the griffin
with the hippelektros ("horse-rooster"), another
fabulous animal with four legs, wings, and a hooked
beak.

Associated in Rome with the light-bringing
Apollo, the heads and bodies of griffins formed
Christian lamps in the 4th C. (Age of Spirit., nos.
560-61). But in Byz. the griffin's presence, where
not purely ornamental, may depend on a more
ancient, Oriental tradition that saw it as apo-
ropaic. In this sense, perhaps, griffins flank the
fountain of life and decorate textiles (as on the
costume worn by Alexios V; Spatharakis, Por-
trait, fig.99). Griffins are found frequently on
enamels, on the ornamental pages of illuminated
MSS, and in a great variety of other media where they support the ascension of Alexander.


GROCER (σαλομάριος; in inscriptions usually σαλκυμάριος). According to the Book of the Eparch (ch. 13), grocers were purveyors of preserved meat and fish (smoked, salted, or dried), cheese, butter, olive oil, honey, and pulses of all kinds as well as raw pitch, gypsum, nails, and other goods sold by weight. They were restricted, however, to selling goods weighed with a steelyard rather than with balance scales. Furthermore, they were not allowed to sell products that were the responsibility of other guilds, such as soap, perfume, wine, fresh meat, or linen. Their shops or ergasteria could be located anywhere in Constantinople, on squares and streets, “so that the provisions necessary for life were readily available.” M. Sjuzjumov (BizVrem 4 [1951] 32) hypothesized that saldamaria were businessmen owning sizable storehouses, but this cannot be proven. The Poulogogos (ed. S. Krawczyński, 110.445) accuses the crown of damaging both the grocer (samarades/sardamaries) and the plowman, thus suggesting that the former displayed his wares in the open air. In 1419 the Athonite monastery of Xenophon possessed five ergasteria sardamariaka in the Grand Stoa of Thessalonike (Xenoph., no.32.8–9)—evidently they were not large stores. A chrysolibull of 1342 notes that greengroceries (lachanopoeia) in Constantinople that had been recently acquired by the Lavra of St. Athanasios were transformed into two ergasteria—one for perfume (myrepsikon), the other a sardamariakon (Lavra 3, no.123.121–23).


GROSSETESTE, ROBERT, bishop of Lincoln; English theologian, scholar, and statesman; born Stradbrook (Suffolk) ca.1168, died 9 Oct. 1253. An example of the new type of ecclesiastical trained in the universities, Grosseteste played an important role in the introduction of Aristotelian learning at Oxford. Profoundly learned in Greek, he possibly knew some Hebrew as well. At Lincoln, he assembled a group of scholars (some from southern Italy) and with their assistance translated various Greek texts into Latin, including Aristotle’s On the Heavens, with the commentary of Simplikios, and Nicomachean Ethics, with the commentaries of Michael of Ephesus, Eustroption of Nicæa, and others; the pseudo-Dionysios corpus, with the scholia of Maximos the Confessor; On the Orthodox Faith by John of Damascus; On the Passions, attributed to Andronikos of Athens; and other theological texts.


GROSSOLANO, PETER, sometimes called Chrysolanus, theologian, bishop of Savona, then archbishop of Milan (from 1101 on); died in the monastery of St. Sabas in Rome 6 Aug. 1117. Entangled in the struggle of local parties, Peter was twice forced to leave Milan (1103, 1112). In 1112, en route to Jerusalem, he stopped at Constantinople, where he engaged in discussions with Byz. theologians, including Niketas Seides, Theodore of Smyrna, and others, the major topic being the primacy of Rome. Alexios I, according to a note in a MS of Montecassino, was very supportive of Grossolano. When the latter read his pamphlet On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, the emperor exclaimed that now wisdom came from the Occident to the Orient and that Peter’s treatise made the work of the Greek theologians superfluous (H. Block, DOP 3 [1946] 223f). It remains unclear whether Peter was on an official mission of Pope Paschal II or went to Constantinople as a private individual. After his return to Rome, Peter resigned at the Lateran synod of 1116.

ED. PG 127.911–19.


GROTTAFERRATA, site about 18 km southeast of Rome where the Greek monastery of S. Maria di Grottaferrata (τῆς Κυριοφερράτης) was
founded in 1004 by Neilos of Rossano under the patronage of the counts of Tusculum. Though subject to the Holy See, the monastery followed the Byz. rite; therefore, in 1088, Pope Urban II considered its abbot, Nicholas, a suitable intermediary to send to Constantinople to discuss the question of the azymes. Most of the monks of Grottaferrata were of Calabrian origin. Some, following the example of their learned founder, were able scribes, hagiographers, and hymnographers, and the monastery still preserves an important collection of Greek MSS.

The monastery church, parts of which are 11th-C., was built and decorated according to Italian practice but with some use of Byz. iconography. Over the main entrance is a Deesis in mosaic of the early 12th C.; inside, on the apsidal arch, is a mosaic Pentecost that M. Andaloro (Roma l'anno 1300 [Rome 1983] 253–73) and V. Pace (Boll-BadGr 41 [1987] 47–87) attribute to the time of Innocent III. Three registers of frescoes on the nave walls are recorded but have mostly disappeared. A 13th-C. Hodegetria on the altar shows traits of Cypriot painting. Bessarion was commendatory abbot of Grottaferrata from 1462 to 1472.


GUARDIANSHIP (ἐπιτροπεία, also ἐπιτροπῆ). The prime duty of a guardian was to administer the ward’s property and to arrange the child’s marriage. In Roman law guardianship existed both for wards and for adult women, but imperial legislation later restricted it to wards. The guardianship for minor orphans could be either testamentary or statutory (guardians appointed from among relatives, male or female); in the absence of a statutory or testamentary guardian an official guardian could be appointed. A papyrus of 336 presents the petition of a bishop who wished to avoid the guardianship of some children (Taubenschlag, Law of GRE 162, n.25a). After the 8th-C. Ecloga, the term for guardian, epitropos, was replaced—although inconsistently—by kouvator (Zachariá, Geschichte 162, n.501), whereas epitropos referred primarily to an official representative and administrator (e.g., Lavena 3, no.160.1–2). The termination of the guardianship of minors was established in Roman law at 25 (still in Cod. Just. V 30). Leo VI’s novel 28 mentioned the age of 18 (for girls) and 20 (for boys) but allowed local functionaries to decide the question in every concrete case. His novels 26 and 27 extended to eunuchs and virgins the possibility of adoption of children, and they thus became guardians. Sexual relationships between guardians and their charges were strictly prohibited.


GUERCIO, BALDOVINO (Βαλδόβινος Γέρτζος), Genoese mercenary and ambassador; died before 1201. Guercio entered Byz. military service and fought for John II against the prince of Antioch, probably in 1142–43. Subsequently, he served Manuel I. Fighting Roger II of Sicily (1147–49), he was taken prisoner. He was released, possibly by William I of Sicily in 1158. Guercio became a trustor of the empire and received a house and property that Genoese sources describe as a feudum (“fief”; A. Sanguinetti, G. Bertolotto, Atti della Società ligure di storia patria 28 [1896–98] 471). In Genoa he pursued a distinguished career, while maintaining ties with Byz. In 1179 he escorted Agnes of France to Constantinople. In 1188 Isaac II wrote Guercio about the approaching Third Crusade and recent negotiations with Genoa (ibid. 406f). Following the depredations of the Genoese Guglielmo Grasso, Guercio in 1193 successfully served as an envoy conveying the excuses of his fellow citizens (ibid. 456–59). Because of the piracies of the Genoese Gafforio (1197), Guercio’s feudum was confiscated by the emperor. In May 1201 the Genoese envoy was directed to seek its restitution for Guercio and his heirs.


GUIBERT OF NOGENT, abbot of Nogent (from 1104). Latin theologian and historian; born between ca.1053 and 1064, died ca.1124. Guibert’s works include a critique of relic cults (On the Saints
and the Relics of Saints, ca. 1119) and an Autobiography (De vita sua, ed. E.R. Labande (Paris 1981)). His History or God's Deeds Through the Franks of ca. 1108, an account of the First Crusade (1095–1104), draws on the Gesta Francorum and Fulcher of Chartres supplemented by oral sources. In its eight books of prose and verse (E. Burstein, CahCM 21 [1978] 247–63), Guibert's obsessions triumph over critical acumen where Byz. is concerned. He discusses John the Baptist's reliefs at Constantinople (Historia—bk.1, ch.5; cf. PL 156:624CD), paraphrases part of the controverted letter of Emp. Alexios I to Robert of Flanders (Reg 2, no.1152), and criticizes Alexios ("that most filthy tyrant") as a usurper who vaunted the beauty of Byz. women to lure the French to Byz. Guibert calls Anna Dalassene a witch and claims Alexios's taxation required every Byz. family to prostitute one daughter and castrate one son, whence the shortage of virile Byz. soldiers (bk.1, ch.5). Books 2–3 describe the beginnings of the Crusade from Clermont through the crossing of the Byz. Empire, while the remainder refer frequently to Alexios's relations with the Crusaders.

ED. RHC Oecid. 4 (1879) 117–263, including anony. continuation to 1112, pp. 261–93.


GUILDS (σωστήματα, also somateia); organizations of craftsmen and merchants devoted to promoting the economic interests of their members. The late Roman state created various state workshops, fabricae, to satisfy the needs of the army, bureaucracy, and court, and imposed certain requirements on free collegia, or guilds. The degree of state requirements could differ with regard to different guilds: those collegia that dealt with the supply of Rome, Constantinople, and other major cities (bakers [pistoria], naviculares, swimmongers, etc.) were subject to greater government control than guilds involved in more "private" activity. The state tried to implant the principle of hereditary professions, but there are serious doubts that it managed to achieve this aim—at least, Egyptian papyri contradict the principle (Fikman, Egipt 64–68). Membership in the guild of bakers or swimmongers was considered an obstacle to social advancement. Compulsory association with a profession and restriction to a place of origin is attested even by papyri. At the same time, the members of guilds possessed various economic privileges and often exercised political pressure. The direction of the development of the late Roman guild system is under dispute: F. de Robertis (Orpheus 2 [1955] 45–54) rejected the traditional view concerning the continual strengthening of the compulsory guild in the late Roman Empire and surmised that coercion reached its peak under Theodosios II but ended by the reign of Justinian I.

The 10th-C. guilds as reflected in the Book of the Eparch were privileged corporations protected from the competition of both landowners involved in trade activity and artisans and/or merchants who were not guild members. Admission to the guild was sought by those for whom membership was not compulsory and expulsion from a guild was done as a punishment. Under the leadership of elders, guilds regulated—albeit under the supreme surveillance of the state—the quality and volume of production, prices of goods and salary of the misthioi, and acquisition of wares from outside merchants. Direct services to the state existed but were insignificant. Guilds of 10th-C. Constantinople resembled Western medieval corporations (of the Parisian type) more than the compulsory collegia of the 4th C.

Corporate organizations existed in the 11th C. (Kazhdan-Epstein, Change 51f), but the system seemed to become less rigid in the 12th C.: Nicholas of Methone (A. Demetrakopoulos, Bibliotheca ecclesiastica [Leipzig 1866] 279.12–14) emphasized that the Byz. did not dictate the choice of living place or trade to people possessing the necessary skill; an ordinance of Manuel I (Reg 2, no.1384) permitted the sale of a money changer's shop freely to any "worthy" person. Documents of the 14th–15th C. mention the elders of various corporations (notaries, butchers, makers of perfume) in Constantinople. As for the protomaishores of construction workers in Constantinople and Thessalonike, they were most likely, not the elders of guilds but leaders of teams of builders.


—A.K.
GUILOCHE. See INTERLACE.

GÜLLÜ DERE, valley in Cappadocia near ÇAVUŞIN. Among the ROCK-CUT CHURCHES found in this valley two are noteworthy. Gülülü Dere III, a rectangular church with a single large apse, is often said to have been carved before the 8th C. because of the three large crosses in low relief on its ceiling. The apse is decorated with an elaborate MAJESTAS DOMINI ascribed to stylistic grounds to the 9th or early 10th C. Gülülü Dere IV, also known as Ayvalı Kilise or the Church of St. John, is a small, double-worked complex with an elaborate fresco program. A donor's inscription mentioning the emperor Constantine should probably be dated to the sole reign of Constantine VII between 913 and 920; the name of the monument's principal patron has been obliterated. In addition to a rich Christological cycle, the LAMB OF GOD and a number of Old Testament scenes are depicted. Gülülü Dere IV, the Old Church of Tokatlı Kilise (see GÖREME), and the Church of the Holy Apostles at Sinassos appear to have been decorated by the same atelier (Thierry, Bull-SocAntFr 1971 170–78).


GUNTER OF PAIRS, Latin poet, historian, and theologian; born ca.1150, died after 1208 or 1210. Gunther’s epics show links with the court of Frederick I: the fragmentary Crusader poem Solymarius (ed. W. Wattenbach, Archives de l’Orient Latin 1 [1881] 555–61) draws on Robert of St. Remy and is dedicated to Prince Conrad (died 1196); Ligurinus (ca.1186/7; ed. PL 212:327–476), based on Otto of Freising, celebrates Frederick’s exploits in Italy. Circa 1204 Gunther became a Cistercian monk at Pairs (Alsace), where he composed (25 June 1205–ca.June 1208) the Historia Constantinopolitanæ, a polished account of the Fourth Crusade that mixes prose and verse but is marred by tendentious omissions, such as the transport contract with Venice (ch.6, p.71) and the restoration of Isaac II Angelos (ch.12, p.88). He minimized the bloodshed during the capture of the Byz. capital and stated that Constantinople’s sack merely avenged Greek treatment of the Franks’ putative Trojan ancestors (ch.18, pp.102f); he also exaggerates (e.g., the power of the Byz. fleet; ch.17, p.98), particularly the role played by Martin, his abbot and informant (cf. Longnon, Companions 249f). Gunther seems fundamentally hostile to the Byz., whom he calls “the dregs of the dregs,” (ch.10, p.84), and focuses on Martin’s theft of relics from the burial church of Irene, wife of John II Komnenos (ch.19, pp.105f) and their translation to Paris. Gunther may have written in part to defend Martin from charges levied by his order in 1206. Martin’s booty included relics of Christ, Sts. John and James, etc. (ch.24, pp.120–22) and a Crucifixion icon from the imperial insignia (ch.25, p.125).


—M.McC.

GYNAIKEION (γυναίκειον, gynaecemion), in classical Greek, a part of the house reserved for the women; in the late Roman Empire, a type of imperial textile FACTORY. ISIDORE OF SEVILLE (Etymol. 15.6.3) explains the word as “a gathering of women [Greek gynè means “woman”] working with wool.” The gynaecii of these workshops were men, however, not women (R.S. Lopez, Speculum 20 [1945] 6, n.3), and an edict of 365 (Cod. Just. XI 8.3) regulates the status of a free woman who married a gynaecarius. The Notitia dignitatum mentions procuratores gynaeci in Gallia as well as in the East (in the latter case without any precise localization). Constantine I’s edict of 333 (Cod. Just. XI 8.2) refers to gynaecia and dyers’ workshops. Eusebios of Caesarea (Eusebios, VC 2.34.1) considers workers in gynaieia and linen workshops the slaves of the treasury. Sozomenos (Sozom. HE 1.8.3) includes gynaieia among places such as mines and linen workshops to which people were sent to do forced labor. The use of the term in papyri is unclear (Fikhman, Egitet 37, n.218).

In later centuries the word apparently disappeared and its meaning was forgotten. In the title of Basil. 54.16 the Latin term procuratores gynaeci
was rendered in Greek as "prokouratoreis of women," while in paragraph 9 of the same chapter the legislator introduced a reference to "the woman assigned to a gynaikerion" who was seduced or corrupted—whereas no woman had been mentioned in the original law of 385 (Cod. Just. XI 8.9).


**GYPSIES** (Αἰγύπτιοι, mod. Gk. Γόβτοι, i.e., Egyptians), from 1300 onward also called Katsibelois, "wanderers" (cf. Russ. kočevnik, "nomad"—R. Volk, BZ 79 (1986) 1–16). In Greek and Georgian sources from the 11th–12th C. onward gypsies were called Athinganoi-Adsincani even though they had nothing in common with the 8th-C. ATHINGANOI. According to a Georgian legend, the Adsincani were invited by Constantine IX to destroy ferocious beasts that were devouring the game in an imperial hunting preserve. Balsamon describes the Athinganoi as magicians, snake charmers, and fortunetellers; the same characterization was given to them by later authors such as Patr. Athanasios I and Joseph Bryennios. They wandered in Crete (1232) as vagabonds, according to the Irish monk Symon Semeonis; in Corfu (1373) as refugees from Epiros; and in Nauplia (ca. 1400) as an organized Feudum Acinganorum whose gypsy leader John had the title drungarius Acinganorum. Mazaris satirized Aegyptioi as arrogant, beggars, liars, thieves, and practitioners of black magic. They were also siege makers and blacksmiths. Numerous ruins in Greece are still popularly called (from the 14th C.) Gyphtokastra.


—S.B.B., A.K.
HADES, ancient ruler of the underworld and brother to Zeus and Poseidon. In Byz. literature Hades connotes both (1) the underworld, as an equivalent to Christian Hell, as well as more generally, in secular texts, the place where all the dead are, at least initially, congregated; and (2) the personification of Death as a symbol for the tyranny of human mortality. In hymns and homilies from the 4th–6th C. onward Hades (alongside Thanatos, or Death) is portrayed with ravenous jaws and an insatiable belly (cf. Andrew of Crete, PG 97:1048A), swallowing old and young alike, an elaboration of an idea found in the Old Testament (Is 5:14, Pr 27:20). In the Resurrection hymns of Romanos the Melode (Hymnes, ed. J. Grosdidier de Matons [Paris 1967] 4:444, 462, 466, 476–80), Christ’s redemption of Adam involves a physical combat with Hades, followed by humorous squabbling, as in Ephrem the Syrian. References in 12th-C. secular literature are frequent, but mainly unspecific, suggesting the gradual replacement of Hades as personification/agent by Hades as place. The ferryman Charon becomes a more concrete personification of death.

In art Hades is usually depicted in the guise of a venerable pagan god; though often dark-skinned, he is not caricatured. In scenes of the Last Judgment he sits in Hell, with a condemned soul on his knee as the antithesis of Abraham in paradise. He lies pierced in the stomach by the cross (on an ivory of the Crucifixion surely influenced by the hymns of Romanos the Melode, see M. Frazer, MM/9 [1974] 153–61), or fettered like a defeated barbarian king in the dark pit of Hell, or trampled by the triumphant Christ in scenes of the Anastasis.


HADRIAN I, pope (1 Feb. 772–25 Dec. 795). Upon his election to the papacy Hadrian imme-
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HADRIAN II, pope (from 14 Dec. 867); born Rome 792, died Rome Nov. or Dec. 872. Born to a noble family, Hadrian married before ordination. His election was a compromise between supporters and opponents of the policy of Nicholas I. Since Rome was under the protection of the Frankish ruler Louis II, Hadrian’s pontificate experienced no serious internal crisis, and his disagreement with Anastasius Bibliothecarius was temporary. Although Hadrian had inherited from Nicholas a conflict with Byz., the Arab threat in southern Italy required an alliance involving Louis II, the pope, and the new Byz. emperor Basil I. Patr. Photios became the first victim of their concord, and at the council at Constantinople in 869/70 the papacy’s position toward Photios was upheld. Hadrian supported new Slavic churches in Bulgaria and Moravia, however, against Byz., thus creating grounds for a new confrontation. In 870 Bulgaria recognized papal jurisdiction and was rewarded with the creation of an archbishopric. After the death of Constantine the Philosopher in Rome, Hadrian ordained Methodios archbishop of Pannonia and Moravia, hoping to include this territory in the Roman sphere of influence. Byz. reacted only after Hadrian’s demise: in the 870s Basil I pursued an active policy in the northern Balkans, and the council at Constantinople (879–80), although in an obscure form, retained Byz. claims to ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria.

HAGIA SOPHIA (Ἁγία Σοφία, lit. “Holy Wisdom”), name of numerous churches in the Byz. Empire and neighboring countries. Two of the most important were the cathedral church of Constantinople and that of Thessalonike. Others were to be found, for example, in Monemvasia and Ohrid as well as at Kiev.

HAGIA SOPHIA IN CONSTANTINOPLE. The first church on the site, of basilical form, was built near the Milion (see Mese), that is, in the neighborhood of the Great Palace and Hippodrome, by Constantius II (not Constantine as often stated) and inaugurated in 360. It was known as the Great Church (Megale Ekklesia)—the name Hagia Sophia is first attested ca.430—and had the episcopal palace attached to its south side. Burned down by the supporters of John Chrysostom in 404, it was rebuilt, once again as a basilica, by Theodosius II and completed in 415. The only extant part of the Theodosian basilica is a colonnaded porch, probably the façade of the atrium rather than of the church itself (A.M. Schneider, Die Gräbungen im Westhof der Sophienkirche zu Istanbul [Berlin 1941]).

The second Hagia Sophia was destroyed by fire during the Nika Revolt against Justinian I (Jan. 532). Rebuilding was started immediately, under the direction of the architects Anthemios of Tralles and Isidore of Miletos, and the new cathedral was inaugurated on 27 Dec. 537. An
drew his support; Emp. Manuel I Komnenos dispatched an army to aid the rebels. It is still not known whether Hadrian concluded a formal alliance with Byz. William of Tyre presents the pope as the soul of the rebellion, while Kinnamos asserts that Hadrian offered cooperation. The rebellion was a failure, and in 1153 Hadrian signed a treaty with William I in Benevento, followed in 1157 by a Byz.-Norman agreement. The growing tensions with Frederick, however, pushed Hadrian toward Constantinople; the pope’s correspondence with Basil of Ohrid reveals that both parties viewed rapprochement as possible.


HADRIAN IV (Nicholas Breakspear), pope (from 4 Dec. 1154); born Abbot’s Langley, England, between 1110 and 1120, died Anagni 1 Sept. 1159. Hadrian was confronted with the plans of Frederick I to subdue Italy and the growth of Norman power in the south. In the spring of 1155 the barons of Apulia revolted against William I of Sicily, and Frederick unexpectedly with-


—A.K. M.McC.
account of the construction and the technical difficulties that had to be overcome is given by Prokopios (Buildings 1.1.21–78). In large part, Justinian's church is still standing. It is a domed basilica, that is, a combination of longitudinal and centralized planning, nearly square (78 × 72 m excluding the two narthexes), its nave covered by a dome 100 Byz. feet (31 m) in diameter and two semidomes, but at the same time clearly separated by rows of columns into three aisles, with galleries over the lateral aisles and narthex. The original dome collapsed in 558 and was rebuilt by Isidore the Younger some 7 m higher than the first one. The church, rededicated on 24 Dec. 562, was the subject of a descriptive poem by Paul Silentiarios.

The architectural conception of Anthemios and Isidore differed in some respects from the present form of the building. The dome, which may have continued the curvature of the pendentives, produced a more overwhelming impression from inside than the current steeper dome. The north and south tympanums appear to have been pierced by large windows, thus affording a more brilliant illumination. The exterior was unencumbered by buttresses. The liturgical fixtures are known in their post-562 form. They included a gold altar table surmounted by a ciborium; a projecting chancel screen of 12 columns; and, joined to the latter by an enclosed passage (solea), a lofty ambo. Most of these features as well as the top row of seats of the synthronon in the apse were sheathed in silver revetments.

The church was surrounded by subsidiary structures. To the west lay a colonnaded atrium with a fountain at its center; to the north the larger of two baptisteries (the smaller, still extant, being at the southwest) and, at the northeast corner, a circular sacristy (skenophylakion); the south side was flanked by the patriarchal palace (built 595–77), a multistory building whose main apartments communicated with the south gallery of the church. The rooms situated at the south end of the west gallery, which preserve remnants of mosaic decoration, served as offices (sekreta) attached to the patriarchal complex (R. Cormack, E.J.W. Hawkins, DOP 31 [1977] 175–251). At the southeast corner of the church a raised passage connected Hagia Sophia to the Great Palace.

Hagia Sophia was naturally the liturgical center of the capital. Administratively it was joined to three other nearby churches, namely St. Irene, the Theotokos of the Chalkoprateia, and St. Theodore of Sphorakios; all four churches were served by the same clergy, whose establishment was limited by Justinian to 425, but which increased to 525 in the next century. Hagia Sophia also played an essential part in imperial ceremonial and had two rooms (metatoria) reserved for the emperor's use. The itinerary of imperial processions in and out of Hagia Sophia is minutely described in the De ceremoniis.

The most important structural alterations of the church during the Byz. period were the following. Repairs after the earthquake of 869 may have included the rebuilding of the tympanums in their present form (R.J. Mainstone, DOP 23–24 [1969–70] 353–68). In 989 the main west arch collapsed together with the west semidome and a portion of the dome; they were rebuilt by the Armenian architect Trdat. In 1317 massive exterior buttresses were added on the north and east sides of the building. In 1346 the east arch collapsed, bringing down the east semidome and one-third of the dome and destroying the ambo under-
neath; the damage was repaired by 1353 with the restricted means that were then available.

The marble and opus sectile decoration of the vertical surface of the walls is relatively well preserved. The mosaic decoration of Justinian’s church appears to have been largely nonfigural and much of it still survives in the vaulting of the narthex, side aisles, etc. The summit of the dome was occupied by a huge cross in a medallion. After Iconoclasm a program of figural mosaics was undertaken and part of it is preserved: an enthroned Virgin in the apse (C. Mango, E.J.W. Hawkins, *DOP* 19 [1965] 113–52), two archangels in the bema arch, prophets and church fathers in the tympana (Eidem, *DOP* 26 [1972] 1–41). Narrative scenes are known to have existed in the gallery vaults (Baptism, Pentecost, Isaiah’s vision). Other preserved mosaics may be regarded as individual insets. They include a 10th-C. panel of the Virgin and Child flanked by Constantine I and Justinian I in the southwest vestibule; the enthroned Christ with a prostrate emperor (Basil I or Leo VI) at his feet in the lunette above the “Imperial Door”; the imperial portraits (Alexander—P.A. Underwood, E.J.W. Hawkins, *DOP* 15 [1961] 189–217, Constantine IX with Zoe, John II Komnenos with Irene) and the Deesis (late 13th C.) in the gallery. The Pantokrator in the main dome (which was restored in 1355) has disappeared. In 1989 the mosaics on the eastern arch, comprising the figures of John V Palaiologos, the Virgin Mary, and John the Baptist, as well as a Hetoimasia (cf. Mango, *infra* 66–67) came to light.

In 1453 Hagia Sophia was converted into a mosque (Aya Sofya Camii). Apart from the addition of four minarets, it underwent several re-
pairs, the most important in 1573 and the following years, then in 1847–49, the latter carried out by the Swiss architects Gaspare and Giuseppe Fossati.


—C.M.

HAGIA SOPHIA IN THESSALONIKE. The present building, located in the southeastern part of the city, was constructed over the remains of a large five-aisled basilica, incorporating, however, only the central portion of the latter. It is a cross- 
domed building with thick walls, narthex, well-
defined aisles, heavy central piers, and galleries. The building does not fit easily into the history of Byz. architecture and has been variously assigned to the 6th through the 8th C.

Mosaic decoration of the interior can be assigned to several phases. Monographs of Constantine VI and Irene provide a date of 780–97 for the original mosaic decoration of the sanctuary, which included a huge cross in the apse (behind later figural decoration). In the dome is a mosaic of the Ascension, the oldest representation from any dome; the apostles stand on a multicolored rolling groundline, set off from each other by trees. An inscription in the dome states that the work was done under Archbp. Paul in November of the 4th indiction, but the precise year is not given; if Paul is to be identified with a correspondent of Photios, the composition should be assigned to the 880s. In the half-dome of the apse is the Virgin and Child, either contemporary with the mosaic in the dome, or perhaps as late as the 11th C. (Cormack, infra 134). In the narthex are frescoes of the 11th C. (D. Mouriki, DOP 34 [1982] 93 and fig. 26).

The church was the city’s cathedral from 1205 (under Latin occupation), but it may have held this honor at an earlier date. Gregory Palamas was buried in the church in 1359.


HAGIOCHRISTOPHORITES, STEPHEN, politician of lowly origin; died Constantinople 11 Sept. 1185. The son of a tax collector, Hagiochristophorites (Ἀγιοχριστοφόριτς, “bearer of the holy Christ”) lost his nose as punishment for his attempt to marry a noblewoman. The staunchest supporter of Andronikos I, he acquired great influence during Andronikos’s purges; he was labeled Antichristophorites by his adversaries. Andronikos rewarded him with the title of sebastos and the office of a logothetes. Hagiochristophorites helped organize the murder of Alexios II and many trials of aristocrats. He was killed by Isaac (II) Angelos, the future emperor, when he went to Isaac’s house to arrest him.

LIT. Brand, Byzantium 606, 61f. —A.K.

HAGIOGRAPHICAL ILLUSTRATION. The primary focus of Byz. hagiographical (see Hagiography) illustration was portraiture: the particular deeds of individual saints played a comparatively minor role in all but the very earliest period.

The first works of this genre are scenes relating to the death of certain martyrs, located at their martyrium. Though for most of these monuments only written descriptions survive (see Asterios of Amaseia on paintings at the martyrium of Euphemia of Chalcidon), it is clear that the scenes of martyrdom were often expanded into small “Passion” cycles comprising a routine sequence of episodes: arrest, trial, torture, and execution. These sets of images were more closely attached to a particular place than to a specific text.

Funerary portraits, usually orans figures, were set up at the tomb of the saint. These might be copied on liturgical objects (cf. the ivory Menas pyxis), on pilgrim tokens and ampullae, or even on votive panels erected elsewhere in the same sanctuary (e.g., those in St. Demetrios at Thessalonike). A few portable panels painted with portraits of saints have survived from the late 6th to 7th C., primarily at Sinai (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, nos. B5, 9, 11); their widespread use is attested in written sources, however, as is the assumption that such icons were capable of acting with many of the miraculous powers available to the saint during his lifetime (Kitzinger, Art of Byz. 91–158; R. Cormack, Writing in Gold [New York 1985] 17–94).
Venerated first at tombs in far-flung quarters of the empire, the relics of a great number of these saints were eventually translated to Constantinople and the cults absorbed by the capital. With the establishment of the calendar for the church of Constantinople (see Synaxarion of Constantinople), each saint found his particular place in the celebrations of the liturgical year and, at the same time, began to assume a specific physiognomy. A few saints (such as Peter and Paul) had already acquired fixed features before Iconoclasm, but the arguments raised during that period concerning the identity of an image with its prototype led over the course of the 9th through 11th C. to a growing emphasis on consistency and on the clear definition of the physical features of dozens of other saints as well.

A Byz. hagiographical portrait presents each saint in one of the three ages of man: the beardless youth, the dark-bearded mature man, or the white-haired elder. His features are then further defined by his particular hairstyle and the shape of his beard. Of equal importance is the saint’s costume, which indicates his profession, his rank in the secular or ecclesiastical hierarchy, and even his ethnic origin. Whether the saint is depicted on a large wall mosaic or inside a painted initial, his features and dress, esp. in the 11th C., are so precisely rendered as to be immediately recognizable. Only women are not so clearly distinguished one from another, partly because they usually appear veiled, so that there is no way of indicating the important differences in hairstyle (exceptions are princesses such as Helena and Catherine of Alexandria and the hermit Mary of Egypt). St. Peter carries his keys, the Anargyroi their medical implements, but attributes referring to specific events in a saint’s life were never a common feature of Byz. hagiographical portraiture.

The portrait type, often confirmed by literary tradition (e.g., Oulpios the Roman), generally claimed to reproduce an image of the saint painted while he was still alive. Once visual types were fixed they could be easily transmitted, even by means of written descriptions as succinct as those found in the later painter’s manuals (Dionysius of Founa, Hermeneia tes zographikes techne, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus [St. Petersburg 1909] 150–70).

The innumerable saintly figures adorning Byz. churches are arranged in groups according to their professional category, following a generally accepted hierarchy in church programs or, more rarely, according to the date of their liturgical celebration. The precise situation and composition of each group was, however, constantly adjusted to suit the specific architectural design and purpose of the church it adorned.

Narrative, such as there was, reemerged very slowly. The portraits of certain saints are regularly accompanied by specific narrative elements (the Miracle at Chonai, Eustathios and the stag, the two Symeon the Stylites on their columns, and the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia in the freezing lake). These images, found already in the 9th and 10th C., probably go back to lost Constantinopolitan originals, but they are essentially “expanded” portraits, rather than distilled narrative. Calendar cycles, best represented by the so-called Menologion of Basil II, consist primarily of scenes of torture and execution, with each saint receiving exactly the same amount of space, regardless of his general importance or the complexity of his career.

Narrative cycles devoted to a single saint rarely, in fact, appear in MS format, with the exception of a few brief sequences in early MSS of the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos and the marginal Psalters. Even the most important Byz. hagiographical collection of all, the ten-volume menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes, was rarely accompanied by any illustration other than portraits.

True biographical cycles are found primarily in icon and monumental painting. A few scenes from the lives of saints Basil the Great, George, and Symeon Stylites the Elder appear in the 9th- and 10th-C. churches of Cappadocia. But comprehensive narrative sequences beginning with the birth and ending with the death of the saint occur first in fresco in the 12th C. and on the so-called vita icons of the early 13th C. Scarcely more than a dozen of these icons survive, most from Sinai and Cyprus; they present the bust or full-length figure of a saint surrounded, usually on all four sides, by a series of 6, 12, or even 16 compartments containing narrative episodes from his life. The form of these vita icons may derive from the practice, esp. popular in the 12th C., of surrounding painted icons with costly metal frames (N. Ševčenko, 14 BSC Abstracts [1988] 321). The fresco cycles have no fixed place in the church but are most commonly found in secondary areas such as...
the nartiex of the pastophoria, often in connection with donor tombs. The number of different saints whose vitae were illustrated in either medium was rather limited: before the 14th C., cycles of saints Nicholas of Myra and George vastly outnumber all others. Miracle cycles are rare, with the exception of that of Eustathios on Sinai (see Five Martyrs of Sebastia).

The formal connection of these narrative cycles with the structure of vita texts suggests that, though their iconography cannot have derived from illustrated MS models (which apparently never existed in large numbers), they may nonetheless have been a response to the prescribed reading of the Metaphrastian Lives at the orthros service in monastic communities, a practice that can be documented from at least the 12th C. (Ehrhard, Überlieferung 2:314–18). Though neither the monumental nor the icon cycles strictly follow the Metaphrastian or any other specific text, either with regard to the general choice of scenes or the details of any episode, they do have their own visual conventions comparable to the topos of the hagiographers (H. Maguire, ArtB 70 [1988] 98–99), such as the conscious borrowing of a familiar biblical composition to illustrate an event in the life of the saint.

No new genres of hagiographical illustration were introduced after the 12th C., though the number of cycles and variety of saints involved increased. In portraiture, there was a gradual loss of physiognomonic precision but a gain in psychological range. The vita cycles, esp. the frescoes, absorbed contemporary Palaiologan innovations in biblical iconography, showing an increased reliance on drama and multifigured compositions. The growing programmatic thrust—whether political, eremitical, episcopal, etc.—of church decoration in this period also frequently affected the content of the hagiographical cycles (e.g., Th. Gouna-Peterson, ArtB 58 [1976] 168–82; S. Tomkević in Miletija u istoriji srpsko naroda [Belgrade 1987] 51–65). Resonances established between biblical and hagiographical cycles grew even more sophisticated as church decoration became more and more elaborate and various otherwise unrelated cycles had to be unrolled on a single wall (Maguire, supra 94–98).

Hagiography, modern term for a genre of Byz. literature whose aims were the veneration of the saint and the creation of an ideal of Christian behavior as well as documentation and entertainment. As a portrayal of historical personages, hagiography overlaps with historiography, conveying historical information, using chronicles as sources, and, in turn, serving as a source for chronicles; as an edifying genre, hagiography may bear resemblance to the sermon. Three major types of hagiography already existed in the early centuries of the empire: martyrion, the account of a martyr’s trial and execution; vita, a saint’s biography; and Apophthegmata Patrum, a collection of wise sayings of hermits. Probably by the 7th C. the description of posthumous miracles was established as a separate type.

Hagiography provides a variety of information to the Byzantinist (F. Halkin, 13 CEB, Main Papers XI [Oxford 1966] 1–10). First of all, saints’ lives convey data concerning their heroes and the monasteries and/or cities where they lived. Second, since a number of saints played important political roles, their biographies contain data, sometimes unique, about momentous events, although the reliability of the evidence may vary from one vita to the next. Some vitae are biased, others indifferent to reality and so concerned with their edifying or propagandizing purpose that chronology is distorted, events invented, suppressed, or transferred from other vitae. More dependable are hagiographic data on everyday life. The style of hagiographical works ranged from highly elevated to simple, inclining toward the vernacular. Sometimes they are full of vivid details, and adventures of heroes are woven into a romance with such elements as travel, shipwreck, concealment, and pursuit. The account of miracles, including posthumous ones, is a typical element of hagiography.

Early hagiography (4th–7th C.) tried to reject the ancient values of urban civilization: the holy man was liberated from his obligations toward society and authority and submitted exclusively to God, for whose sake he was ready to endure poverty, suffering, and tortures; accordingly, the
DESSERT was chosen as the most typical setting for the saint's exploits (ANTONY THE GREAT). When the saint entered the city gates, it was to reject the traditional norms of behavior (SYMON OF EMESA). Family ties were renounced (ALEXIOS HOMO DEI), and the saint was closer to wild beasts than to his relatives. A shameful past, such as prostitution, was not an obstacle to holiness; neither were illiteracy, ugliness, or poverty. Early hagiography emphasized the collective nature of the body of saints: many martyrs met execution in groups, and the wise "fathers" of the *apophthegmata* were a faceless throng, who can hardly be distinguished as individuals. On the other hand, the individuality of the hagiographer was maintained, and the most famous hagiographers of the period (ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, JOHN MOSCHOS, LEONTIOS OF NEAPOLIS, SOPHRONIOS OF JERUSALEM) are well-known personalities. The main centers of hagiographic production were the cities and monasteries of Egypt, Palestine, and Syria.

With the general decline of literary activity from the late 7th and through almost the entire 8th C., hagiography diminished; it regenerated slightly before 800, first in the eastern provinces, and flourished from the 9th to 11th C. The passionate denial of ancient ideals that was typical of earlier saints' lives lessened: the daring hermit gave way to the efficient builder of the monastic community (ATHANASIUS OF ATHOS, LAZAROS OF MT. GALESIOS), the wild holy fool made his way into the establishment (BASIL THE YOUNGER), prostitutes and women in disguise were replaced by the ideal matron (MARY THE YOUNGER). The sanctity of family ties was assumed as a virtue, although not consistently (A. Kazhdan, *Byzantium* 54 [1984] 188–92). The saint's political role was highly esteemed, his connections with Constantinopolitan functionaries carefully stressed: some vitae (EUTHYMIOS, patriarch of Constantinople) avoid the miraculous elements, except for the saint's foresight, and emphasize the saint's role in political and ecclesiastical struggles; the Life of IGNATIOS, patriarch of Constantinople, is a purely political pamphlet against Photios. The collectivity of martyrs begins to disappear; it is significant that the story of the FORTY-TWO MARTYRS OF AMORION was produced in several versions, some of which acquired individual heroes. We know little about individual hagiographers of this period, although some of them (Niketas, author of the Life of Philaretos the Merciful, and esp. Gregory, hagiographer of Basil the Younger) provide some personal information. IGNATIOS THE DEACON was probably the only professional hagiographer of the period. On the other hand, the collection and editing of old vitae attracted distinguished writers, such as NIKETAS DAVID PAPHLAGON and esp. SYMON ETAPHTRES.

The Life of Lazaros of Galesios is the last great piece of 11th-C. hagiography. In the 12th C., intellectuals became critical of the image of the holy man: hagiographical production was scanty (P. Magdalino in *Byz. Saint* 52–54), and EUSTATHIOS OF TESSALONIKE composed a spectacular "anti-vita" of PHILOTHEOS OF OPSIKION. At the same time some evidence of popular hagiography is preserved: the Life of Paraskeve was reportedly burned by order of the patriarch because of its vernacular character, and the miracles of ST. GEORGE, some of which should be dated in the 12th C., conjure up an image of the saint as a clever fellow, ready to bargain and conscious of his profit. The authors of "popular" vitae plunged into anonymity, whereas we have the names of some professional writers, such as PRODROMOS and TZETZES, who tried their skill at saints' lives, although their hagiographical essays are not their best work. The interest in AUTOBIOGRAPHY as a redeveloping genre, as well as the propagation of the military ideal, contributed to the decline of hagiography: Psellos attempted to rewrite the Life of AUXENTIOS, permeating his work with autobiographical elements; BLEMMYDES wrote his own biography—he did not expect his disciples to eulogize his virtues.

Some hagiographers of the Palaiologan period (GREGORY II OF CYPRUS, Constantine AKROPOLITES, Theodora RAOULINA) preferred the laudation of saints from earlier periods, while others concentrated on the lives of contemporaries. Some vitae took the form of biographies of politicians (Emp. JOHN III VATATZES, patriarchs ARSENIOS AUTOKEFALOS, JOSEPH I, ATHANASIUS I, ISIDORE I BOUCHERAS) and theologians, such as PALAMAS. Their anti-Palaiologan resistance or principles of church independence are the predominant reasons for the recognition of their saintship (R. Macrides in *Byz. Saint* 68). Other writers emphasized the ascetic life of the hermit (NIPHON, ROMYLOS, MAXIMOS KASOKALBITES).

The Bollandists laid the foundations of the study
of hagiography (H. Delehaye, L’oeuvre des Bollandistes à travers trois siècles (1615–1915) [Brussels 1959]). In the 19th C. a critical approach toward hagiography developed: H. Usener (Kleine Schriften, vol. 3 [Leipzig-Berlin 1914] 74–104) attacked Christian legend from two points—as historical fraud and for the alleged construing of the image of the saint in terms of ancient mythology. Delehaye limited Usener’s hypercriticism and tried to distinguish trustworthy and legendary texts. The Munich school (Ehrhard) and later Bollandists (Halkin) concentrated on collection and classification of hagiographical works, and vitae were broadly used as sources for historical information (Rudakov, Magoulas), but only recently has the tendency developed to use saints’ lives as documents for ideology and social psychology (Brown, Patlagean, Magdalino). In this case the old problem of reliability loses its significance: regardless of its legendary nature, hagiography is an important means of understanding how the Byz. perceived their world.


HAGIOTHEODORITES (Ἀγιοθεόδωριτης), a family of Byz. civil and ecclesiastical functionaries attested from the first half of the 12th C. The first known were Constantine, lawyer, philosopher, and rhetorician at John II’s court, and Nicholas, protos of a monastery (named on a seal). They became esp. influential under Manuel I: John was his favorite but fell from imperial favor; later three brothers played important roles—the logothetes tou dromou Michael (from 1158), the eparch of Constantinople John (ca.1160); and Nicholas, metropolitan of Athens in the 1160s and 70s. Konstas Hagioteodorites served as logothetes ca.1258 and then as Theodore II’s private secretary.


HAIMORROISSA, HEALING OF. See MIRACLES OF CHRIST.

HAIMOS, MOUNT. See BALKANS.

HAIR (κόμη). The Byz. church inherited from primitive Christianity a negative attitude toward hairstyling: “Flowing locks,” says St. Paul (1 Cor 11:14), “disgrace a man,” and the image of the unkempt John the Baptist was an embodiment of the rejection of haircuts. This attitude prevailed more or less unchanged to the last centuries of Byz. Despite this clear-cut ecclesiastical position, the tendency to care about hairstyles emerged time and again.

In the late Roman period, men were clean-shaven and generally wore their hair short; those who wore long hair in plaits or curled were regarded as effeminate. In the 6th C. the youth of the circus factions styled their hair in the “Hunnic” fashion: long at the nape and shaved at the front of the head. By the 10th C. men wore their hair longer, and even monks adopted longer hairstyles, to the dismay of the church. In the 12th C. moralists inveighed against excessive attention to hairstyling. On the other hand, both hair and beard were indicative of social status and deprivation of either was considered a punishment. Hair color was also significant; the term xantha ethne (“blond tribes”) designated the peoples of central and eastern Europe, in contrast to the dark-haired peoples of the Mediterranean.

The predominant hair fashion for women throughout the centuries was parted in the center and held in place with a comb or band. Combs made of bone are often found in archaeological excavations. Outside the house women were expected to cover their head with veils. Both men and women were admonished not to wear wigs or to dye their hair. (See also BARBER.)


HAIR ORNAMENT. Justinian’s Digest (34.2.25.10) classes as jewelry HEADEAR, such as "headdresses,
turbans and half-turbans, a head covering, a pearl hairpin that women are accustomed to possess, saffron-colored [hair] nets." Only traces of such hair ornaments survive, but three main types are depicted in Byz. art.

1. A jewelled band that is worn on the forehead at the hairline. Only the part from ear to ear can be seen; this part presumably continued around the back of the head, under the hair, as a band of fabric.

2. A circlet, often jeweled, worn around a chignon on the top of the head. A jeweled diadem, now in Baltimore (Jewelry: Ancient to Modern, ed. A. Garside [New York 1980], no.420), has been interpreted as this second type, or as part of a jeweled collar. It could also be part of a jeweled band.

3. An ornamented mesh or net, worn over the entire head, reaching to the forehead.

All three types seem to be contemporary and appear in the Theodora panel at S. Vitale, Ravenna.

111. Koukoules, Bios 4:367f. —S.D.C.

HALABIYAH. See Zenobia.

HALMYROS ('Αλμυρός, name derived from the salt-flats in the area), commonly known as the "Two Halmyroi" because of its double fortified citadels, city in central Greece on the Pagasitic Gulf south of modern Volos. It is identified with modern Tsingeli and Kephaloia near ancient Halos. In late antiquity an agricultural settlement is attested at nearby Aidonion, with oil and wine presses (N. Nikonos, ArchDelt 26 [1971] Chronikon 312f). In the 12th C. Halmyros played an important role as an entrepôt for Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, succeeding Nea Anchialos and Demetrias as the primary port of Thessaly. The Venetians attacked Halmyros in 1171 as retaliation for the massacre in Constantinople, and in 1198 its ports were again opened to them. In 1204 it was first given to the deposed Alexios III as a place of retirement but soon fell into the hands of the Latins; by 1246 it was under the control of Michael II of Epiros and in 1249 it is attested as the center of a theme of the empire of Nicaea. Halmyros was attacked and occupied by the Catalan Grand Company between 1307 and 1310. The city had a significant Jewish community. The bishop of Halmyros was suffragan of Larissa.

Little remains of the two fortified acropolises or the Byz. town between them, although several churches, many of them belonging to the Italian communities, are attested in documents from the 12th C. onward. Some Byz. sculpture (N. Giannopoulos, BZ 25 [1925] 339-46), seals (Idem, BZ 17 [1908] 131-40; 18 [1909] 502-10), and inscriptions (Idem, BCH 14 [1890] 240-44; 15 [1891] 562-71; 23 [1899] 396-400) have been found. The so-called Alonissos ship, whose wreckage was discovered on the seabed just off the island of Pelagos, was perhaps involved in trade with Halmyros. It contained a large cargo of pottery of the 12th C. (Ch. Kritzas, Athens Annals of Archaeology 4 [1971] 176-82).


HALO. See Nimbus.

HAMĀH. See Epiphaneia.

HAMĀH TREASURES. See Kaper Koraon Treasure; Ma'arak al-Nu'mān Treasure.

HAMDĀNIDS, Muslim dynasty in Mosul and esp. at Aleppo, of Taghibite Arab origin (ca.868-1015/16). The independent emirate was established at Mosul between 930 and 934, and under Nāṣir al-Dawla extended power over most of upper Mesopotamia. Nāṣir was succeeded by his son Abū Taghib, who resisted Byz. attack in 972 but infuriated John Tzimiskes by capturing the domestikos Melias, who died in captivity. In 976 Abū Taghib supported the rebellion of Bardas Skleros. The Ḥamdānī dynasty at Aleppo began in 944 under Sayf al-Dawla. Many Ḥamdānīs left Aleppo because of the Byz. threat. The Ḥamdānīs were forced to maneuver between Fātimids, Buwayhids, and Byz. Sa'd al-Dawla, the son of Sayf al-Dawla, massacred many monks at Dayr Sen'īn, in response to the Byz. invasion of 985. The Byz. governor of Antioch, Michael Bourzikēs, helped the Ḥamdānīs against the Fātimids, but Ḥamdānī power declined after the Byz. treaty
with the Fatimids in 1001. A son of Sayf al-Dawla, Abu'l Hayâ'î, fled to Basil II and later probably converted to Christianity. Sa'd's minister Lu'lû and Sa'd himself prostrated themselves before Basil II in 955. Lu'lû's son Mansûr fled to Byz. in 1015/16 and received a castle for aiding Romanos III in northern Syria in 1030.


HAMILTON PSALTER. See Psalter.

HAND OF GOD. The image of a hand emanating from clouds or an arc of Heaven appears in both Christian and imperial art in the 4th C. Its Christian use surely derives from earlier Jewish art, where it is an image of God's voice or word, amplifying scriptural metaphors of God's hand as his power or protection. In imperial art, the hand displaces fully embodied deities and functions differently and more actively. In medallions of Constantine I the Great, for example, a hand reaches out to crown the emperor or draw him upward at his apotheosis. The gesturing hand of Jewish tradition continues in later Christian art to signify the voice or approbation of God, appearing in such New Testament compositions as the Baptism and Ascension as well as in numerous Old Testament scenes. Other 4th- through 6th-C. images, however, based on the imperial version, show the hand actually drawing Christ upward at his Ascension, or holding a crown over Christ, the Cross, the Virgin Mary, or a saint. This version vanishes in later Byz. art, where Christ himself confers crowns on rulers and performs concrete acts. Probably a distinct, later development is the huge hand holding souls in the LAST JUDGMENT (cf. Wisdom of Solomon 3:1), seen in late Byz. monuments (CHRORA).

The theme of "the king's heart in the hand of God" (Pr 21:1) that, for fathers of the church, had imposed limits on imperial authority, was reinterpreted in the Justinianic period to mean the all-embracing authority of the basileus (H. Hattener, ZSavKan 67 [1981] 1–21).


—A.W.C., A.C.

HAPLOUCHEIR, MICHAEL, member of the senate who eagerly supported Andronikos I in 1183; Eustathios of Thessalonike acrimoniously censured Haploucheir (Ἀπλούχειρ) for his dishonest behavior (Eust. Thess., Capture 44:19–20). He probably belonged to the same family of civilian nobility as Thomas Haplocheir, judge of the velum under Manuel I. Haplocheir has been identified, on good grounds, with the poet of the same name, who wrote a short iambic dramation presenting a debate between a rustic who praises Fortune and a wise man (sophos) who laments his miserable fate and is ready to renounce his fane and become a craftsman. The theme of a poor intellectual's envy of a well-to-do artisan is typical of 12th-C. writers such as John Tzetzes and Theodore Prodromos.


HARAWI, AL-, more fully Taqi al-Din Abû al-Hasan 'Ali al-Harawi, Arab author, ascetic, and traveler; born Mosul, died Aleppo 1215. He had a varied career as preacher in Baghdad and Aleppo and as envoy and confidant of the Ayyûbid sultans, including Saladin. In the course of his missions he traveled widely, to Palestine and Egypt, and in 1175 to Norman Sicily. He also visited Constantinople, where he met Emp. Manuel I Komnenos. His vivid descriptions of the Hippodrome and the statues of Constantinople are partly reproduced by Yakût, al-Qazwînî, and other encyclopedists. His three principal works are the Guide to the Places of Pilgrimage, Memoir on the Ruses of War, and Last Counsels of al-Harawi.


HARAVILLE TRIPTYCH. See Triptych.

HÂRITH, AL-. See Arethas.
HARMENOPOULOS, CONSTANTINE, 14th-C. jurist. Harmanopoulos (Ἀρμενόπουλος) signed a document of 1345 (Chil. 134) as sebastos and judge of Thessalonike; by 1349 he was also a nomophylax, after 1359 krites katholikos. He compiled a “corpus” of secular and canon law. Secular law is represented by the Hexabiblos (Six Books), also called the Procheirion nonon (Handbook of the Laws), of 1345. This compilation grew out of the Procheirion but adds excerpts from the Synopsis Basilicorum, the law book of Michael Attaleiates, the Synopsis minor, the Peira, and the work of Julian of Askalon. Harmanopoulos organized the legal material into a new system, which made it easier to use and thus enormously popular; it is transmitted in almost 70 MSS. In practice it served as a law code (in Greece into the 20th C.) and was adopted in several Slavic countries. Attached to the Hexabiblos as a regular component is the Farmer’s Law, presumably reorganized by Harmanopoulos (I. Medvedev in VizOč [Moscow 1982] 216–33).

Canon law is represented by the Epitome canonum of Harmanopoulos, which contains a selection of canons with commentaries (PG 150:45–168), a confession of faith (PG 150:29–32), and a treatise on heresies (19–29). Some shorter works of Harmanopoulos are also transmitted (lexika, an enkomion on St. Demetrius).


-HARNESSMAKER. See Lorotomos.

HAROLD HARDRADA (or more properly Hardradi, “Hard-Ruler”), king of Norway as Harold III (1046–66); born 1015, died Stamford Bridge, England, 29 Sept. 1066. In 1039 or 1031 Harold (’Arpaγgi) fled from Norway to Jaroslav of Kiev and reached Byz. probably in 1034 (J. Shepard. JÖB 22 [1973] 150). Harold and his Varangians participated in several Byz. military campaigns; in Sicily with Maniakes, in Bulgaria against Deljan, and probably against Muslims in the Aegean. The report in Norwegian sagas of his fight against Pechenegs—in 1036 according to K. Giggaar (BalkSt 21 [1980] 385–401)—and of his journey to Jerusalem is questionable. He was granted the title of spatharokandidatos. A supporter of Michael IV, Harold probably took part in the deposition and blinding of Michael V. Because Constantine IX changed the Byz. attitude toward the Rus’ and Varangians (G. Litavin, VizVrem 27 [1967] 83f) or because he suspected that Harold would join the rebellious Maniakes (A. Poppe, BS 32 [1971] 28), the emperor imprisoned Harold. He escaped and reached Kiev probably in winter 1042/3. In spring 1045 he married Jaroslav’s daughter Elizabeth and possibly incited Jaroslav to attack Constantinople. Byz. coins brought to Scandinavia by Harold in 1045 may have served as models for Danish mints (P. Grierson, ByzF 1 [1966] 124–38; M. Hendy, NChron 10 [1970] 187–97).


-A.K., C.M.B.

HARROWING OF HELL. See Anastasis.

HÂRÜN AL-RASHÎD (’Aapōw), caliph of the ’Abbâsids (789–809); born al-Rayy (near Tehran) Feb. 766, died Tûs (Khurâsân) 24 Mar. 809. He was the son of Caliph Muḥammad al-Mahdî (775–85). In 780 the young Hârûn invaded the Armeniakon and took Semaloues, and in 782 he was enabled by the defection of the Byz. general Tatzaros to advance to Chrysoupolis and force Empress Irene to make peace. During the negotiations he captured and held the eunuch Staurakios until Irene signed a three-year treaty requiring the Byz. to release all prisoners, pay an annual tribute of 70,000 dinars, and make commercial concessions. As caliph, Hârûn strengthened his border with Byz. by building frontier fortresses linking up with Tarsos. He paid special attention to the fleet, which several times attacked Cyprus and Rhodes. In 790 Hârûn’s navy defeated a Byz. force off Attaleia; Theophilos the stratêgos of Kibyrrhaiotai was captured and exe-
cuted after refusing Hārūn’s order to turn traitor. In 796 Hārūn made Raqqa on the Euphrates his chief residence, probably anticipating sustained campaigns against Byz. and eastern Iran. In 798 Abbasid forces invaded Byz. territory to Ephesus. Hārūn initially refused Irene’s request for peace, but, after Khazar attacks on his northern flank, he signed a four-year treaty again requiring the Byz. to pay annual tribute to the Arabs. He personally campaigned against Byz. in 803 and in 806, when he captured Heraclea and Tyana and exacted a humiliating treaty stipulating that Emp. Nikephoros I annually pay 30,000 solidi and a head tax of 3 solidi for himself and his son Staurakios. Hārūn destroyed churches in frontier areas to punish what he thought were pro-Byz. sympathies. He died campaigning in Khurāsān.


—P.A.H.

HĀRŪN IBN YAHYĀ, 9th–10th-C. Arab author. Captured as a civilian (a fact usually ignored by scholars), Hārūn was carried off from Askalan via Attaleia to Constantinople, where he lived for years, perhaps as a slave. His account, a valuable report on Byz. and other Christian nations, includes a detailed description of Constantinople, its walls, gates, statues, relics, water supplies; the Palace, its decoration and furnishings; Hagia Sophia; Christmas festivities; banquets; imperial processions; chariot races in the Hippodrome; the conditions of Muslim prisoners; the route to Rome via Serbia; a description of Rome’s marvels; and a reference to Britain. This account survives in the Book of Precious Things by ibn Rusta (born Isfahan, fl. late 9th–early 10th C.), an Arab anthologist of Persian origin.

Modern scholars have dated Hārūn’s report variously between 880 and 912, due to differences regarding internal clues, the possible date of his capture or release, whether ibn Rusta quotes him directly, and whether all the details are based on Hārūn’s own observations. G. Ostrogorsky (SemKond 5 [1932] 251–57) has argued for 912–13, Alexander’s reign, as the date since no empress or co-emperor is mentioned. Actually, Hārūn describes a typical procession, not necessarily a specific one, and the emperor is depicted as a co-emperor (wearing black and red boots). It is reasonable to date the account to ca.900.


—A-Sh.

HASAN DAĞ, site in CAPPADOCIA. On the north slope of this volcanic cone are a number of churches, including Sangöl and basilicas II and III near Viranşehir of the first half of the 6th C. (?) and Kemer Kilise (Viranşehir I) and Anatepe of the 7th C. (?). These solid, ashlar-faced monuments are most commonly cruciform in plan, although basilicas with both single and double naves also occur. To the north of Hasan Dağ is the Peristrema Valley with a number of rock-cut churches still adorned with painted decoration. Several also retain datable dedicatory inscriptions. Direkli Kilise, a large cross-in-square church, bears an inscription mentioning the emperors Basil (II) and Constantine (VIII) and is thus datable to 976–1025. The single-nave chapel of St. Michael was decorated by the monk Arsenios and his son Theophylaktos, protospatharios and aixiarcho (N. Thierry, JSav [1968] 46, reads taxiarcho) during the reign of a porphyrogennetos, most likely Constantine VIII (1025–28). A dedicatory inscription in Kirk Darğ Atu Kilise dates its paintings to 1283–95. The fresco decorations of several churches, including Yılanlı Kilise, Ağac Atu Kilise, Eğri Taş Kilisesi, and Kocar Kilise, are rendered with a vital primitivism that makes for difficult ascription on the basis of style and suggests the relative isolation of this valley from continuous metropolitan influence.


—A.J.W.

HATS. See HEADGEAR.

HAWKING. The sport of hawking or falconry involved the use of hawks to hunt various birds, such as cranes, wild geese, partridges, and pheasants. For this purpose the falconer (hierakarios)
trained young hawks; those imported from Georgia were esp. prized. Other species besides the hawk were also used. The *Onesophion* (ed. R. Hercher, *Claudii Aelianii Variar Historia, Epistolae, Fragmenta* [Leipzig 1866] 577–79) mentions seven hawk-names, mostly obscure. There is evidence, however, that the falcon was known and used in this kind of hunting.

Some evidence for the early practice of hawking is found in the *Oneirokritikon* of Achmet ben Sirin (232.16–17). From the 11th C. onward a growing number of references described hawking as a sport enjoyed by the ruling class and the emperor. Manuel I Komnenos’s passion for this type of hunting is reflected in an *ekphrasis* by Constantine Manasses. Another contemporary description was composed by Constantine Pantechnes. The growth of interest in hawking is evinced by the practical manuals that circulated at that time. Such a *Hierakosrophion* is attributed to Demetrios Pegasomenos and deals with the breeding and training of the hawk and treatment of its diseases (Hercher, *supra*, 335–516). (See also Protoierakarios.)

---

**HEADGEAR (καλυπτρα).** Until the 11th C. a headcovering was not a usual part of either official or ecclesiastical costume, with the exception of the monastic hood, or *konkoullion*, and the traditional veils of women.

Only the patriarch of Alexandria was entitled to cover his head for the celebration of the Eucharist; thus the Alexandrian patriarchs Athanasios and Cyril are depicted wearing a small black or white cap. In the 14th C. the patriarch of Constantinople wore a white *mitra*, not a mitre but a gold-embroidered veil. St. Spyridon is shown wearing a small straw bonnet (perhaps a pun on his name, which derives from the word for a small basket), Patr. Methodios a headdress knotted under the chin, an allusion to the story that his jaws were dislocated by Theophilos.

Two of the *protopoiodroi* depicted in Paris, B.N. Coisl. gr. 79 wear low red boxlike hats with a tip that flops down over one ear, while two others wear higher white beehive-shaped ones; the latter may be an early form of the *skiadion*. Another form of lay headgear is the turban, the *phakteolis* or *phaktiolion*, which by the 12th C. was no mere orientalism typical of Arabs. Ethiopians, and Palaestinians but common garb, esp. for women. The women depicted with Miriam in a circular dance in a Psalter in the Vatican (Vat. gr. 752, fol. 449v; Spatharakis, *Corpus*, fig. 123) wear huge headresses that must reflect court fashions of the 11th C. Shepherds wear broad-brimmed straw hats, sailors a Western-inspired tight black cap tied under the chin. Israelites wear hoods identical to the *maphorion*.

In the Palaiologan period, hats proliferated; the emperor and other officials wore the *skiadion* and another squarish hat rather like a mitre, whose name is unknown (the *skaranikon*, which is sometimes presumed to be a kind of hat, was most likely a garment). Women wore the *maphorion*, though the empress apparently went unveiled. Young relatives of the emperor wore either nothing on their heads at all, at least while inside the palace and until adolescence (pseudo-Kod. 145.15–18), or a purple headband called a *tainion* (DOC 2.1.81, n. 158).

---

**HEADPIECE**, the decorated frame or panel at the beginning of a text. Pre-Iconoclastic illuminators generally devoted little attention to the embellishment of a book’s title and framed it with only a series of dashes and corner flourishes. But in the Paris Gregory broad borders with classical patterns surround the titles, as do gold *ciboria* and *pi*-shaped brackets in 10th-C. MSS. Occasionally, medallion portraits were added to the *pi* or rectangle, and, in the 11th C., the headpiece displayed increasingly complex figural programs, inspired in part by the decorated *templon*. Many 12th-C. headpieces incorporate the subject matter of frontispieces (e.g., author *portraits*, *evangelist symbols*, narrative scenes), or contain only ornament. As a result, the title, the original pretext for the headpiece, was relegated to a subsidiary status above or below the panel. Complex ornament fills the headpieces of MSS of the Decorative Style. Palaiologan versions rarely include figural elements, but revive Komnenian designs or create more elaborate patterns based on the Islamic arabesque.
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HEART (καρδία). The starting point for Christian theology and mystical belief with regard to the heart is the Old Testament command to love God with one’s heart, soul, and body (Dt 6:5). In his commentary on John 13:23–25, Origen explains the heart of Christ as the inner meaning of his teaching, as the divine sense that one can discern more deeply with one’s heart (PG 13:87AB; see also PG 11:129BC–130A). In passages such as these, “heart” is a metaphor for nous (see INTELLECT). However, in view of many different opinions among Greek philosophers, Gregory of Nyssa (PG 44:156C–164D) expressed his doubt concerning this definition of kardia. While Evagrius Pontikos alternated between biblical and philosophical usages, later monastic mystics of experience, such as Diadochos of Photike, pseudo-Makarios/Symeon, and Hesychios Sinaite (6th–7th C.), show a great preference for the term heart in the sense of psyche, conscience, the seat

the Younger, rubbing oneself with holy dust or a Symeon token (see PILGRIM TOKENS) made from the earth of the Wondrous Mountain where the stelite’s pillar stood. Amulets were commonly used as prophylactic devices. Supplicants whose prayers for healing were answered left votive offerings at the shrines in thanksgiving.

Representation in Art. Three categories of depictions of healing may be identified: Christological healing scenes (e.g., in the FRIEZE GOSPELS such as Florence, Laur. Plut. VI 23); illustrated miracula of “doctor saints” such as Kosmas and Damianos (e.g., in the Lectionary, Athos, Pantel. 2—Treasures 2, fig.278); and deluxe illustrated compendia of pre-Byz. medical treatises such as the 10th-C. edition of Apollonios of Kition, On the Setting of Dislocated Bones, and Soranos of Ephesus, On Bandaging. Unfortunately, the latter generally reveal less about contemporary Byz. MEDICINE than about ancient prototypes (Weitzmann, Ancient Book Illum. 18–23). Again, the saint’s miracula are iconographically much less explicit concerning both symptoms and treatments than are the texts upon which they draw, being based, for the most part, on even more “generic” healing scenes developed for illustrated Gospels.


—A.M.T., G.V.

HEALING. Byz. turned to two different sources when seeking cures from illness: to the PHYSICIAN trained in the Greco-Roman tradition and to faith healing; miraculous cures might be provided by a holy man (in imitation of the healing MIRACLES of Christ), by the relics of a saint, or by a shrine at a locus sanctus. A standard topos of hagiographical descriptions of healing miracles is the failure of the physician to effect a cure (even though he received a substantial fee), contrasted with the “free” healing available at the tombs of saints, esp. the Anargyroi, those who took no payment for their services. Among the methods of faith healing were INCUBATION, kissing the tomb, anointing oneself with oil from the lamp suspended above a saint’s tomb, drinking oil or water that had come into contact with the relics, or, in the case of the shrine of St. Symeon the Stylite

HEADPIECE. Headpiece for the Gospel of St. Luke (Patmos, 81, fol.155r); manuscript dated 1334/5. Monastery of St. John, Patmos.


—R.S.N.
of passion and feeling, but also the remembrance of God. For Diadochus (Cap. gnost. 56), for example, the heart is the organ for sensing God. Hesychios (PG 93:1481CD, 1509D) emphasized the need to guard the heart in order to maintain Hesychia and to call upon Jesus Christ alone. Pseudo-Makarios (PG 34:573C) saw the spirit as the (vigilant) "eyes of the heart." Nikephoros Athonites (or Sinaites) in the 14th C. defined the Jesus prayer for Hesychasm (PG 147:963B-964A) in conjunction with the heart: "Settle yourself, collect your mind, breathe in through the nose whence the breath enters the heart. Let the mind with the inhaling breath enter into the heart."


—G.P.

HEARTH TAX, conventional name for any tax levied by household or “hearth” (kapnos), such as the kanonikon. It appears first as a supplementary levy: Malalas (Mal. 246.16–19) relates that the guilds in Antioch, allegedly in the 1st C., had to fulfill a leitourgia from each hearth for the repair of city porticoes. According to Ibn Khurdadbeh, a tax based on hearths was collected in Byz. for military purposes. The kapnikos was probably a tax on households. Even though the kapnikon is not mentioned explicitly after the 12th C., some scholars maintain that it had simply become a component of the telos. On the basis of a mathematical analysis of the telos of 14th-C. paroikoi, Lefort (“Fiscalité” 342f) concludes that only paroikoi without taxable property paid a hearth tax, usually amounting to 1/6 hyperpyron. K. Chvostova (VizVrem 39 [1978] 63–71) rejects Lefort’s method of calculation and assumes that the telos of every 14th-C. paroikos contained, in a latent form, the hearth tax, but it was esp. significant in poorer households. The verb kapnomologein (lit. "to count hearths") was used in a vague sense to describe the activity of tax collectors (Zeus, Jus 1:384.19–20; Mich. Akom. 2:106.29) but not in the specific sense of "levying the kapnikos (or kapnomologion)."


—M.B.

HEAVEN (oḯparoys). Two traditions merged in the Byz. perception of heaven—one popular (Eastern and late Jewish) transferred via the Bible, the other inherited from Greek physics and astronomy. In the Bible, heaven is located beyond the firmament (steromía), a solid vault resting firmly on foundation pillars over the earth and dividing the water into two domains, one above and another below it. When "the windows of heaven" open, the upper water falls on the earth as rain, hail, or snow. The stars are suspended from the firmament. Heaven also meant the space (air) between the firmament and the earth—"the middle distance (chora)" in Byz. terminology. Since the Old Testament often used the word in plural form, it enhanced speculation concerning the number of heavens, the favorite number being seven. Both the imagery and the perception originating in apocalyptic literature of heaven as the place of salvation and of a heavenly Jerusalem (the earthly paradise in the third heaven) were developed in Byz., esp. in the exegesis of the Antiochene School as well as in sermons on Lent, in the Hexaemeron, and in commentaries on Job. Heaven is the handiwork of God, although some Gnostics and Dualists ascribed the creation of heaven to the demiurge. Although distinct from God, heaven was nevertheless perceived as the sphere of the eternal and divine; God’s throne is there, and it is the abode of Christ (whence he will come for the second parousia) and of the Virgin and angels. Metaphorically, "the kingdom of heaven" was construed as the realm of God.

Byz. cosmology was divided with regard to the form of heaven—whether the ancient model of a spherical heaven was to be retained or whether heaven was a flat roof over the cubic world (as in Kosmas Indikopleustes); alternatively John Philoponus conceived heaven as "the all-encompassing space beyond" the spherical firmament that divided it from the realm of the corruptible. Much discussion ensued as to whether heaven is self-limiting and surrounded by the void (PsEllos, De omnifaria doctrina, par.120.1–6), or whether heaven, as the place of fixed stars and moving planets, is of a different substance from the corporeal world, which is composed of four elements; whether it is eternal in its movement; and finally, whether the assertion of the physicists (according to John Italos, Quaestiones quodlibetales, par.11, ed. Joannou, p.13.22–23) that the "heavenly body" occupies no physical space is valid, since otherwise the concept of the corporeal
world would come to a *regressus in infinitum*, the idea of an unmeasurable infinite space.

—K.H.U.

HEBDOMON (Ἑβδομον, lit. "seventh"; Turk. Bakırköy), suburb of Constantinople situated on the Sea of Marmara and astride the Via Egnatia seven Roman miles west of the Milion (Milliarium). The site of an army camp, it possessed a Tribunal, facing a plain called Kampos (Campus), on which several emperors were proclaimed, starting with Valens (364). Valens resided at Hебdomon in a villa or palace and built a harbor there. A little later churches were erected of St. John the Evangelist (before 400); of St. John the Baptist (391), to receive the relic of his head; and of the Prophet Samuel (411), also to receive his relics. Justinian I rebuilt the palace (called Jucundiana) and the Church of the Baptist. Hебdomon was probably devastated in the 7th–8th C. Arab fleets put in there in 673 and 717. Basil I rebuilt the churches of St. John the Evangelist and St. John the Baptist, which had fallen into ruin. The former, transformed into a monastery, was the burial place of Basil II and was later ceded to Nikephoritizes and, after him, to Empress Maria, wife of Michael VII. By 1260 it was in ruins.

Archaeological remains include a vast open-air cistern to the north of the suburb (Fil Dami), a gigantic granite column, an inscribed statue base of Theodosius II, a circular mausoleum, and parts of the church of St. John the Baptist, similar in plan to S. Vitale, Ravenna.


HEBROS (Ἑβρος), or Marica, river in Thrace, flowing into the Aegean Sea near Ainos. The Hеbros is the largest of the north Aegean rivers, draining the Haimos and Rhodope massifs, through the plains of Serdica, Philippopolis, and Adrianople. It was navigable as far as Adrianople, and there were no fords south of the city. In 1205 the Latins under Henry of Flanders, who were besieging Didymoteichon, were swept away by a sudden flood of the river (Nik.Chon. 624,6–10); the next year Kalojan tried to divert the Hеbros at Didymoteichon in an attempt to take the city (Nik.Chon. 632,23–25). The Hеbros valley was the site of the battle of Marica in 1371.

—T.E.G.

HEGOUmenos (ἡγούμενος, fem. ἡγουμένισσα), the superior of a monastery; related terms were *abbas*, *archimandrite*, *proestos*, or *koimobirates*. A *kathegoumenos* was a *hеgoumenos* who had been ordained, a *prohegoumenos* was a retired or dismissed *hеgoumenos*. *Hеgoumenoi* were responsible for the administration, economic management, and spiritual leadership of a monastic community. They were most often selected from within the monastery, theoretically from among those monks or nuns most revered for their wisdom and piety. The office of *oikonomos* was frequently a stepping stone to the hegoumenate. In the case of an imperial foundation, the *hеgoumenos* might be appointed by the emperor, but most often he or she was designated by a predecessor or elected by the monks or nuns. The procedure of election, which varied considerably from one monastery to another, was regulated by the monastery’s *τυρικος*.

In theory, the *hеgoumenos* possessed autocratic power over the brethren: he would admit new monks, expel dissidents, impose *epitimia*, appoint monastic officials, and supervise their activity. He also ensured the regular and proper observance of the daily offices and all special feastdays and supervised and maintained the monastic properties. He was assisted by a number of officials, such as the *oikonomos* and *ekkleiarχes*. In his spiritual role, the *hеgoumenos* usually served as the *pater pеnumатиκος* or confessor of the monks, even if he was not a priest. His tenure was not limited by any term or checked by any institution; the *hеgoumenos* said to give an accounting only in the hereafter. In fact, however, he was restricted by tradition and by a group of “select brethren”; if caught in malfeasance, he could be deposed (A. Kazhdan, *VizVrem* 31 [1971] 65–67).

The *hеgoumenos* often had special privileges (e.g., better food and drink), had much greater contact with the outside world, and sometimes had influence at the imperial court and patriarchate. A number of patriarchs were former *hеgoumenoi*. Some *hеgoumenoi* abused the prerogatives of their rank and were criticized for dining on expensive delicacies and rare vintage wines, for frequent
bathing, wearing silken garments, and being worldly businessmen. *Hegoumenoi* were, for example, the target of a satire by *Prolhprodromos* (ed. Hesseling-Petmoil, 48–71) and were attacked by *Eustathios of Thessalonike* in his treatise *On the Improvement of Monastic Life* (pp. 258, 57–259, 11).


**HEIR** (κληρονόμος), the one to whom the estate of a deceased person falls, be it alone or with others (synkleronomoi), either on the basis of a will or by way of intestate succession. The heir entered into the legal position of the deceased and was accordingly responsible for the obligations of the testator, just as he, conversely, could put forward the testator’s claims. The heir was also considered a debtor of the legacies bequeathed (*legaton, fideicommissum*) by the testator. The entrance into the inheritance took place informally; the possibility of declining it evidently played no role in practice, since its purpose—keeping one’s own property from being liable for the debts of the deceased—was, from the time of Justinian I, achievable by establishing an inventory (*beneficium inventarium*) that documented the size of the inheritance. The Lex Falcidia guaranteed a limitation on the heir’s responsibility for paying out the bequests made by the testator. All natural persons (including slaves, minors, and the unborn) could inherit, as could corporate bodies, communities, the church, or pious foundations. In addition to the limitations that intestate succession brought with it through its system of preference, there was a set of punishable offenses (e.g., lèse-majesté, heresy) and other factors (e.g., second marriage, status as a concubine [pallake] or illegitimate child [nothos]) that precluded or lessened the right to inherit. (See also succession.) —D.S.

**HEIRMOLIOGION** (εἱρμολογίον), a liturgical MS with or without musical notation, comprised of the heirmoi, the model stanzas referred to at the beginning of each of the nine odes of a kanon and on which the ode’s melody and rhythm are based; heirmoi are also listed in a similar way at the beginning of a kontakion. Since normally only the opening words of an heirmos are given, the heirmologion was a necessary reference tool from which the singer learned the full melody and thus was able to adapt it to any text. The heirmoi, like troparia and sticherai, are either sung to a unique melody (idionela) or are based on another (prosomoia). In comparison with other liturgical books, relatively few heirmologia survive, perhaps because of the heavy use to which they were subjected.

There are two types of heirmologia, both divided into eight sections, one for each musical mode. The first, more common type lists the heirmoi kanon by kanon, giving the heirmoi for each ode within a complete kanon before listing the next kanon’s heirmoi. The other type, mainly found in Slavonic MSS, gives the heirmoi by ode, that is, it lists the heirmoi for all the first odes for every kanon within that mode before moving on to the second ode. The earliest MSS date from the mid-10th C. The texts of the heirmoi are paraphrases of the biblical canticles originally sung during the Orthros, but later replaced by the kanones.


**HEKATE**, Greek goddess of the netherworld, associated with dead souls and evil dreams. Psuedonnon, in his commentary on Gregory of Nazianzos, states that the Greeks believed her to be a goddess identical to Artemis or to Selene or a deity in her own right accompanied by big dragon-headed men. In this company, images of Hekate’s cult statue appear in 11th-C. MSS of the commentary (Weitzmann, *infra*, figs. 70–72). In the late Roman period her cult was celebrated in hidden places, often connected with Dionysos or Mithra. Malalas (Malal. 307, 17–18) ascribes to Diocletian the construction of a subterranean temple of Hekate that had 365 steps leading down to it from ground level.
HELENA, Augusta (from ca.325) and saint; born Drepanon, Bithynia, between ca.250 and 257; died Rome, between 330 (PLRE 1:410f) and 336 (O. Seeck, RE 7 [1912] 2822); feastday 21 May, together with Constantine I. Born of humble status, possibly of Jewish stock (J. Vogt, Classical Folia 31 [1977] 148), she was an innkeeper when she met Constantius Chlorus whose concubine (or wife?) she became and to whom she bore the future Constantine I. Separated from Constantius after his marriage to Theodora, the step-daughter of Maximian, Helena returned to the court only after Constantius had died and Constantine had become emperor. She was no less influential than Constantine’s wife Fausta. On the portrait in the palace at Trier, executed in 321, Helena, crowned, is represented together with Fausta, Constantine’s half-sister Constantia, and the younger Helena, the newly wed spouse of Helena’s favorite, Crispus. In her honor Drepanon was renamed Helenopolis, and the province of Helenopontus was created. Circa 325 both Helena and Fausta received the title of augusta. After the execution of Crispus in 326, Helena may have played a role in the murder of Fausta. Helena was apparently inclined to Arianism, venerating Lucian of Antioch, the teacher of Arius and Eusebius of Nikomedea. In 326 she set out on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, where she founded and generously endowed churches of the Nativity in Bethlehem and the Ascension in Jerusalem. She sponsored churches in Constantinople and other places, but spent the end of her life in Rome and not at Constantine’s court. She was buried in a splendid mausoleum on the Via Labicana (F.W. Deichmann, A. Tschira, JDAI 72 [1957] 44–110).

Helena’s memory was surrounded with legends, the most important of which was her alleged discovery of the True Cross, in the company of which she is often represented, together with Constantine I. Her cult developed by the 8th C., when the imperial pair of Irene and Constantine VI was compared to Helena and Constantine I. It was sometimes alleged that Helena was a prostitute when she conceived Constantine.

—A.K., A.C.

HELIODOROS (Ἡλιόδωρος), dated by scholars from 2nd to 4th C., from Emesa; author of the Aithiopiaka, the longest and structurally most complex of the surviving Greek romances. That Heliodoros was a Christian bishop, as the church historian Socrates claimed, is unlikely. The Aithiopiaka opens in medias res on a scene depicting the debris of a drunken brawl on the seashore and continues with a series of retrospective narratives that disclose the previous history of the heroine, Charikleia, the white-skinned daughter of the rulers of Ethiopia, and the hero, Theagenes, a Thessalian nobleman. After enduring further hazards appropriate to this genre—attacks by robbers, attempted murder by fire, abductions, etc.—the couple are finally united in marriage and become priest and priestess of the Sun. The novel’s tone is restrained, both linguistically and morally, and perhaps for this reason met with qualified approval in the Greek Middle Ages (see Photios, Bibl., cod.733; Psellos, De Chariclae et Leucippe ludeium), esp. in comparison with the psychologically more venturesome Achilles Tatius. Of the 12th-C. novelists, Theodore Prodromos and Niketas Eugenianos seem to have been particularly aware of Heliodoros’s work. Byz. commentators, such as an unidentifed Philip the Philosopher and John Eugenikos, interpreted the romance’s love affair as an allegory of the soul’s pursuit of a virtuous life.


HELIOPOLIS (Ἡλιόπολις, now Baalbek [Baal-bakk] in Lebanon), Syrian city located in a valley between the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon mountain ranges. It was a center of paganism with grandiose temples of Zeus, Aphrodite, Hermes, and Dionysos. Constantine I closed these temples, prohibited the veneration of Aphrodite, and built a church there. Christianity continued to meet resistance, however, and Rabuula of Edessa (died 436) was beaten by heathens when he arrived at Heliopolis to demolish the idols. Emp. Julian persecuted Christians in Heliopolis, and the elite of the city remained predominantly pagan until the late 6th C. (John of Ephesus, HE 3.27). In the meantime the government tried to adapt the gi-
gantic shrines for Christian use. Theodosios I reportedly destroyed the temple of Zeus; he tore down the altar and the tower in the Great Court and replaced them with a basilica of St. Peter; ancient sculptures were consistently destroyed. A baptistery was added, and the Hexagonal Court was probably covered in wood in order to create additional interior space. Heliopolis was a bishopric of the province of Phoenician Syria subject to Emesa until 400, when it became part of the newly formed Phoenicia Libanensis under Damascus. Inscriptions (IGLSyr 6 [1967] nos. 2827–31, 2882, 2888) record secular construction: canals in the 4th C. and 430/1 and ramparts in ca.440 and 635/6, on the eve of the Arab conquest. Kallinikos, the inventor of Greek fire, originated from Heliopolis.

The Arabs took Heliopolis in 637 and transformed the sanctuary into a stronghold. In 761 in the district of Heliopolis there was a rebellion under the leadership of a Syrian named Theodore; all the rebels were slain (Theoph. 431.23–26). The city passed to the Fatimids in 972 but was temporarily occupied by John I Tzimiskes in 974. Eventually Saladin established his control over Heliopolis. After changing hands many times it became the chief town of a district under the Mamluks.


HELIOS (Ηλιος), the solar god of Greek mythology, often identified in late antiquity with Mithra and Apollo. In Neoplatonist cosmology, Helios played a significant role. Julian dedicated to him a hymn in which Helios appears as the nous (mind or reason) that contains within itself all the highest ideas; the nous reveals itself as the sun, the visible world’s creator and keeper, which implants the ideas into preexisting but dead matter; man is also the creation of Helios and after his death he returns to Helios, who accepts and stores the souls. The Sol Invictus, or invincible sun, was the symbol of Helios as protector of the emperor in the late Roman period. It is unclear whether Constantine I the Great supported the cult of Helios: T. Preger (Hermes 36 [1901] 457–69) asserted that Constantine erected his own statue as Helios, but J. Karayannopoulos (Historia 5 [1956] 341–57) attempted to reject Preger’s thesis. Christians interpreted Helios euhemeristically as the king of Egypt, the son of Hephaistos. Malalas connected two legendary episodes with “King Helios” as the protector of morality Helios discovered the shameful liaison of Ares and Aphrodite; Romans introduced horse races in honor of Helios, who was to supervise the races between the Earth (the Greens) and the Sea (the Blues). Elements of the veneration of Helios were retained in the popular worldview (H. Grégoire, M. Letocart, REA 42 [1940] 161–64). On the other hand, Christianity also used solar symbolism, presenting Christ as sol salutis (see Sol Justitiae) and accepting Sunday as a holy day. In the 15th C. George Gemistos Plethon addressed Helios as “hegemon of heaven and of every created being” (Alexandre, Pléthon 136). The image of the sun remained the focal point of Byz. imperial propaganda.


HELIOU BOMON MONASTERY. A monastery of Heliou Bomon (Hλειον βομῶν, “altars of the sun”) is first mentioned in the 10th C.; Janin suggests that it is the same as Elaiobomoi (“olive altars”), known in the 9th C. By the 12th C. Heliou Bomon had fallen into decline and was rebuilt by Nikephoros the Mystikos, who also recovered the monastery’s confiscated estates. At this time Heliou Bomon changed its status from a patriarchal to an independent monastery (RegPar, fasc. 3, no.1044). Emp. Manuel I helped support the costs of restoration. Nikephoros’s typikon of 1162 limited to 20 the number of monks at Heliou Bomon and at its metochion in Constantinople, which was dedicated to St. Bassianos. The typikon is closely modeled on those of Euergetis and St. Mamas.

It appears that Heliou Bomon was identical with or was united with the monastery of Eleugmoi, since the typikon refers to the monastery as “Helio Bomon or Eleugmoi.” The Eleugmoi monastery first appears in 10th-C. sources. In 1042 Emp. Michael V was confined there after his deposition from the throne. In the late 12th C. the hegoumenos of Eleugmoi became archimandrite of all monasteries in the Mt. Olympos region. The Eleugmoi monastery was located at modern Kurşunlu
in Bithynia, 12 km east of Mudanya. C. Mango (DOP 22 [1968] 169–76) has identified the 12th-C. Church of St. Aberkios, which still stands there, as the building constructed by Nikephoros. The church has distinctive recessed brickwork, a single nave with dome (now collapsed), an apse with a triple window, and a vaulted narthex.

source: Dmitrievskij, Opytvanie 1:715–69.

HELL was often designated with the classical terms Hades or, more rarely, Tartaros, and also with the biblical word Gehenna. The netherworld of the Byz. was located deep beneath the earth and construed as the realm of the Devil and demons where sinners would be punished after death or after the Last Judgment. The damned underwent different kinds of punishment. The image of Hell was contrasted with that of Paradise and originated from the concept of a reward or punishment in the afterlife for a virtuous or sinful existence on earth.

Origen considered the suffering in Hell as temporary; his eschatology was dominated by the idea of the apokatastasis panton, the cyclical restoration of all spiritual beings and their final return to God. Some traces of this concept are to be found in pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, who taught the epistrophē, or return to God. The church fathers, however, rejected the Origenist teaching—both John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria (PG 77:1072B–1088B) defended the idea of eternal punishment in Hell. This latter doctrine was finally accepted at the council of Constantinople in 553.

The Byz. sometimes distinguished several underworlds. Hades could be cast as an intermediate state for the souls of people who lived before the Christian era and who were liberated by the descent of Christ. Hades was also an intermediate place for all souls until the Last Judgment, and, often inhabited by a personification of its ruler, the domain represented in images of the Anastasis. Hades and Gehenna were names for the place of punishment for sinners. In Gehenna there was no possibility for repentance and love of God. The Byz. created special genres of vision and journeys to Hell in which perceptions of the netherworld varied drastically, from a place of torture and suffering (in the vita of Basil the Younger), to a murky area full of animals symbolizing sins (the vita of Andrew the Fool, PG 111:772A–773B), to a site of rest, conversation, and litigation (Timarion).


HELLAS (Ἐλλάδας), Greece, as a generic term usually applied to central Greece south of Thermopylae and the Peloponnesos but excluding Epiros; its inhabitants were sometimes called Helladikoi (Charanis, Demography, pt.XVII [1953], 615–20). The Synekdemos of Hierokles equates Hellas with the province of Achaia. The theme of Hellas was created between 687 and 695 but debate continues about its original extent. Charanis (Demography, pt.XVIII [1955], 172–76) argues that only the eastern parts of central Greece were included, while Zakythinos (infra 54) thinks that Thessaly and the Peloponnesos were also part of the theme. By the end of the 8th C. Hellas was restricted to east central Greece, with Thebes as residence of the strategos or krites. In the 9th–10th C., among the western themes, the strategos of Hellas ranked below those of the Peloponnesos, Nikopolis, and Kibyrrhaioi (Oikonomides, Listes 105.12–15). Perhaps as early as the 10th C. the administration of Hellas was occasionally combined with that of the Peloponnesos, probably for military reasons. After 1205 most of Hellas fell under the authority of the duke of Athens. The church of Hellas was generally under the authority of the bishop of Athens, thus under the papacy until 732/3.


HELLENES (Ἑλλῆνες). The expression Hellen and its derivatives had in the late Roman period two principal meanings: helleniso meant first of all “to speak Greek” and to Hellenikon denoted the Greek language, whereas the noun Hellen with corresponding adjectives and adverbs designated “gentile, pagan” and had a pejorative meaning in the writings of the church fathers; accordingly Justinian I speaks of “the fallacy of impious and
foul Hellenes" (Cod. Just. XV 18.10); on the other hand, Julian (e.g., ep. 22 [ed. Wright] to Arsakios, high priest of Galatia) praises Hellenic "liturgy" and Hellenic good works. The positive self-respect of the Hellenes disappeared after the victory of Christianity, but the ambiguity (Greek language—pagan rite) persisted. Thus Arethas of Caesarea speaks of both "Hellenic language" (e.g., Scripta minora 1:96:25—26) and ofellenizomes as opposed to Christians (1:62:24—5), and in Anna Komnene (An.Komm. 2:34.12) the wisdom of Hellenes and Chaldaeans is contrasted with real knowledge. More complicated is the position of Niketas Choniates, for whom "Hellenic" designates not only language or adherence to paganism, but also Byz. allegiance—the Hellen aner is identical with the Rhomaioi (Nik.Chon. 301.18), and Hellenic poles are Byz. cities (496:50). From the 13th C. onward, the Byz. saw themselves not only as Romans but also as Hellenes (see Hellenism).

Hellenism. Two meanings of the term *Hellenism* are of concern to scholars of Byz. The first designates the consciousness among medieval and modern Greeks of their identity with the inhabitants of ancient Greece and an emphasis on their position as heirs to Greek classical civilization. The second meaning, modeled on the German usage of the word *Hellenismus*, refers to the period in the history of the region of the eastern Mediterranean between Alexander the Great (356—323 B.C.) and the Roman conquest of the region in the late 2nd and 1st C. B.C., also called the Hellenistic period.

1. Devotion to Greek civilization. Throughout the millennium of their empire, Byz. scholars expressed their links with ancient Greek culture through the conservatism of their archaising literary language, which attempted to "atticize" or imitate the Greek written in the Golden Age of Athens. The system of education in Byz. also used a curriculum based heavily on the study of a limited selection of ancient authors; a familiarity, often superficial, with classical Greek literature was presumed among the literati, who made frequent allusions to antiquity in their writings.

A greater emphasis on Hellenism began to manifest itself in the course of the 12th C. and became more marked in the late Byz. period, in the face of continuing conflict with the Westerners and the growing threat from the Turks. Moreover, as the empire shrunk, it lost its multiethnic composition and by the 13th C. was limited, for the most part, to Greek-speaking lands. The Greeks began to call themselves *Hellenes* as well as *Rhomaioi* and to think of themselves as a *genos*, or "nation." Intense interest in ancient Greek culture was a characteristic of the Palaiologan period, culminating in George Gemistos Plethon, who advocated a return to a somewhat philosophical version of ancient Greek paganism, utopian social reforms based on Plato's *Republic*, and the establishment of an independent Greek state in the Peloponnese.

2. Historical period. In the Byz. era, the historians Malalas, George the Synkellos, Kedrenos, and Zonaras were particularly interested in Hellenism. They emphasized, among other themes, the internal strife in which the *toparchiai* (the realms of the diaochoi or successors of Alexander) were involved until they were engulfed by the Romans; they were also concerned with Jewish history under Hellenistic monarchs and with the mission of Jesus. As for the Hellenistic cultural heritage, the Byz. paid special attention to scientific writings (e.g., Prolemy), works on grammar (Dionysios Thrax), didactic poetry (Aratos, 3rd C. B.C.), and epic (Apollonios of Rhodes, 3rd C. B.C.).

HELLESPONT (Ελλησπόντος), a term designating both a strait and a province.

1. Also called "the Stenon," the Hellespont was the strait between the Aegean Sea and the Sea of Marmara, with the cities of Abydos and Lamysakos on the Asian shore and Kallipolis on the European shore. The Hellespont was of obvious
strategic and commercial importance as a major approach to Constantinople by sea. In the 4th–5th C. it was under the command of the archon of the Stenon, who was stationed in Abydos and provided with a flotilla of 5 dromones. Justian I, according to Prokopios, established there a state customs post (teloneion). Seals from the end of the 7th and the early 8th C. mention the apostheke (storehouse) of Hellespont and its kommerkaria; it usually appears as a joint apostheke of “Hellespont and Constantinople” (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 190), or of “Hellespont and Asia, Caria, Lydia, and islands” (nos. 226, 236). Thereafter the term Hellespont disappears from administrative nomenclature, although the strategos of the Stenon is mentioned (Oikonomides, Listes 358, n. 394)—this, however, could refer to the Bosphorus. In 1204 the Venetians gained control of Hellespont and the Latin Empire held most of the land on either side. By 1235, however, John III Vatatzes recovered the area. In the 14th C. the Hellespont was occupied by the Turks.

2. Hellespont also designated a late Roman province in northwest Asia Minor, originally part of the province of Asia, but a distinct entity in the Verona list and in an inscription quoted by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 1.32–33, ed. Pertusi 611); its capital was Kyzikos, and Hierokles (Hierokl. 661.14–15) assigned it 30 cities. The civil province disappeared in the 7th C., but the ecclesiastical diocese survived, with Kyzikos as metropolis (Notitiae CP 1:10) and suffragan bishoprics including Abydos, Germe, Illus, Lampsakos, and Troas (ibid. 1:131). At the end of the 7th C. Justinian II resettled a large number of Cypriots in the region. The city of New Justinianopolis was granted the rights of the diocese of Constantin in Cyprus so that its bishop presided over all the bishops of the province of Hellespont (De adm. imp. 48.11–15). The measure, although confirmed by the Council in Trullo, lost no trace in the notitiae.


HENOTIKON (Ἐνωτικόν, edict of “unity”), theological formula issued by the emperor Zeno in 482 in an attempt to secure reconciliation between Chalcedonians and Monophysites. The text (Eva-

grios Scholastikos, HE 3.14) was apparently the work of Akakios, patriarch of Constantinople, with the assistance of Peter Mongos. The Henotikon sought to end theological controversy by glossing over the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon and ignoring the critical issue of the natures of Christ. It condemned both Nestorios and Eutyches and demanded adherence only to the first three ecumenical councils. The Henotikon proved acceptable to neither side, however; furthermore, it was condemned by Pope Felix III in 484 and gave rise to the Akarian Schism. The Henotikon was a notable attempt by an emperor to solve a theological difficulty by imperial fiat. The Henotikon remained in force during the reign of Anastasios I but was abrogated by Justin I in 519.


HENRI DE VALENCIENNES, French continuing of Geoffrey Villehardouin for events in the Latin Empire of Constantinople from May 1208 to July 1209. Henri is possibly identical with a cleric who authored a verse Vie de S. Jean l’Evangeliste ca. 1200 and apparently accompanied the future Latin emperor Baldwin of Flanders on the Fourth Crusade; he may also be the Master Henry sent to the pope in 1205, who evidently became a canon of Hagia Sophia and witnessed the Concordat of 1210. His History, which was intended as an independent work, was probably composed in 1208 and 1209, and certainly before 1216. It treats the Latin campaigns against the Bulgarians, relations with David Komnenos and Theodore I Laskaris, and Emp. Henry’s struggle against the Lombard knights of the Kingdom of Thessalonike. Although Henri lacks the balance and vision of Villehardouin and delights in speeches and fictitious dialogue, he offers abundant details on historical topography, costume, climate, and other matters.


LIT. J. Longnon, “Sur l’histoire de l’empereur Henri de Constantinople par Henri de Valenciennes,” Romania 69
HENRY VI, Western emperor (1191–97); born Nijmegen, Netherlands 1165, died Messina 28 Sept. 1197. Son of Frederick I Barbarossa, Henry was crowned king of Germany in 1169. In 1185 Henry married Constance, daughter of Roger II of Sicily. The death of William II of Sicily allowed him to claim that throne. In 1194 Henry overcame Norman resistance, led by Tancred of Lecce. In Palermo, he found Irene Angelina, widow of Tancred’s son, whom he married to Philip of Swabia. At Easter 1195, Henry proclaimed a Crusade, partly to levy tribute on Byzantium. His envoys made harsh financial demands on Isaac II early in 1195 and renewed them to Alexios III at Christmas 1196. To meet these, Alexios tried to levy the Alamanikon, but Henry’s unexpected death forestalled dispatch of the money.


HENRY OF BABENBERG, called “Jasonirgott,” first duke of Austria; born ca. 1114, died Vienna 13 Jan. 1177. A half-brother of Conrad III and marquess of Austria after 1141, Henry accompanied Conrad on the Second Crusade. To cement the pact between Conrad and Manuel I, he married (1148 or 1149) Theodora Komnene, daughter of Manuel’s brother Andronikos and Irene Komnene (Barzos, Genealogia 2:171–89). Officially, the court poets hailed the marriage, but Theodore Prodomos, putting words in Irene’s mouth, makes her lament Theodore’s union with a “Western beast” (RHC Grecs 2:768.122). After disputes with Frederick I Barbarossa over possession of Bavaria, in 1156 Henry received Austria as a separate duchy. In 1166 he went to Serdica to try to make peace between Frederick and Manuel. Theodora survived her husband and died 3 Jan. 1183. Their son, Leopold V (born 1157, duke 1177–94), visited Constantinople in 1181 or early 1182 on his way to the Holy Land.


HENRY OF HAINAULT, emperor of the Latin Empire (1206–16); younger brother of Baldwin of Flanders; born Valenciennes ca. 1174, died Thessalonike 11 June 1216. Having joined the Fourth Crusade, in 1204 Henry (Enrico) defeated an ambush by Alexios V. When Baldwin was captured in 1205, Henry became regent; after Baldwin’s death he was crowned (20 Aug. 1206). Following the death of Kalojan, Henry exploited discord among Boris of Bulgaristan, Slav in Rhodope, Strez at Prosek, the Serbs, and Epirus to his own advantage (G. Cankova-Petkova, BHR 4:4 [1976] 51–61). Because of the hostility of the Lombard barons of Thessalonike and northern Greece, in 1208–9 Henry marched to establish Demetrios, son of Boniface of Montferrat, on the throne in Thessalonike. Henry received the homage of Athens and the Morea. In 1211 Henry defeated Theodore I Laskaris at the Rhyniakos River and regained the Anatolian coast from Nikomedea to Atramyttion. He conciliated his Byzantine subjects by welcoming Theodore Branas into his service, offering fair treatment, and preventing the imposition of Western ecclesiastical usages. A 13th-C. historian (Akrop. 1:28.12–19) testifies to the good reputation Henry gained.


HEPHAISTION OF THEBES, astrologer; born Thebes in Egypt 26 Nov. 380. Hephaestion compiled in ca. 415 one of the most important summaries of classical astrology available to the Byz., the Apotelesmatika, or Astrological Effects. This consists of three books: the first on definitions and celestial omens, the second on genealogy, and the third on catastrophic astrology. Hephaestion is in no sense original but rather copies or summarizes earlier texts. Some of these we still possess in Greek (e.g., Ptolemy), some also survive in Arabic translations (most importantly Dorotheos of Sidon), but most are known only from other citations in the astrological literature (e.g., by Ptolemy, Hipparchus, Critiodamus, Thrasyllus, and Antigonus of Nicaea).

The importance that the Byz. accorded to Hephaestion’s work is demonstrated by the existence of four epitomes, two of which were made in ca. 1000 and the last in the School of John Abra- mios in the late 14th C.
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HEPTAPEGON (Ar. Ain et-Tabgha, from ἑπταπέγων [χωρίῳ], Hebrew En ha-Shiv’ah, “Seven Springs”), PILGRIMAGE site on the northeastern shore of the Sea of Galilee. Six springs still flow near the remains of three early Christian churches, each with New Testament associations. A small 4th-C. church directly on the shore (beneath the modern chapel of the Primacy of Peter) incorporated a stone table (altar) where, according to tradition, Christ served breakfast to the disciples after the Resurrection (Jn 21:12–13). Pilgrims chipped small pieces from this table “for their well-being” (Égérie, Journal de Voyage, ed. P. Maraval [Paris 1982] 95f). Nearby, a 5th-C. basilica (with a smaller 4th-C. precursor beneath it) commemorated Christ’s Feeding the Five Thousand ( Mk 6:32–44). Its exceptional mosaic pavements, among the earliest figural mosaics in Christian Palestine, depict the loaves and fishes as well as marsh plants, fowl, and buildings. The third church (6th C.) rose above a small grotto where Christ was thought to have uttered the Beatitudes (Mt 5:1–12). These associations were still alive during the Crusades.


HERACLEOPOLIS MAGNA. See AKHNÍS.

HERAKLEIA (Ἡράκλεια). Three cities with this name figured prominently in Byz. history.

HERAKLEIA IN THRACE (anc. Perinthos, mod. Marmara Ereğli), city on the north shore of the Sea of Marmara, at the junction of the Via Egnatia and the main Balkan road to Naissus. Renamed Herakleia by Diocletian (who was Herculean in official terminology), it continued to be called Pe(i)rinthos by antiquarians up to the mid-15th C. (e.g., Kritob. 35-24). According to Propósis (Buildings 4.9.14), it had been the most important city in the province of Europa, but was replaced by Constantinople, which was originally its suffragan. A bishopric in 325, Herakleia appeared as a metropolis in notitiae; the number of its suffragans increased, but Constantinople became independent of Herakleia in 330 or 381 (Dagron, Naissance 418f).

Herakleia was attacked by the Goths after the battle of Adrianople in 378, then by Attila, by the Avars, and the Bulgars. The city is mentioned by many later authors, among others Nicholas I Mystikos (ep.19-42), Skylitzes, Gregoras, and Kantakouzenos, mostly as a geographical site or an ecclesiastical center. The citizens of Herakleia supported Thomas the Slav against Michael II (Theophont. 71.5–6). In the Partitio Romaniae (A. Carile, StVen 7 [1965] 249) “Tyrecc” was assigned to the Venetians. The city played an important role during the civil wars of the 14th C. In 1382, together with Rhaides and some other Thracian towns, Herakleia was given over to Andronikos IV. Little is known about the internal life of the city: a seal of the 9th–10th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, no.1974) belonged to a spatharios and archon of Herakleia, but it is not certain that the Thracian Herakleia was meant. The remains of an aqueduct and at least one church—perhaps that of St. Glykeria, damaged by the Avars in 591 and rebuilt by Maurice—have been preserved.


HERAKLEIA IN CAPPADOCIA (anc. Kybistra), a city of Anatolikon at the southern edge of the Anatolian plateau and the beginning of the pass to the Cilician Gates; now Tont Kalesi near Ereğli. Herakleia gained importance during the wars with the Arabs, who first attacked it in 708 and destroyed it in 806; it was soon restored. Herakleia was the scene of fighting into the 10th C. and consequently appears in the epic of Digenes Akritas. As a bishopric of Cappadocia II, it was always known by its ancient name; it became autocephalous ca.1060. The site contains no significant remains.

LIT. TIB 2.108–90.

HERAKLEIA PONTIKE (mod. Ereğli), a city, bishopric, and excellent harbor on the Black Sea coast of Anatolia; it was in Paphlagonia after Diocletian and then was joined to Honoria ca.385. Theodosios II visited Herakleia Pontike and rebuilt it ca.440 after an earthquake. The Pontic Mountains protected Herakleia Pontike from Arab attack, so that Basil I could draw population from it for his new foundation, Kallipolis. Turks, however, ravaged the area after the battle of Man-
Tzikert in 1071. David Komnenos, brother of the ruler of Trebizond, took Herakleia Pontike in 1205 and made it capital of his domain, called Paphlagonia; he lost it in 1214 to Theodore I Laskaris, who made it a major frontier bulwark. Thereafter it was usually called Pontoherakleia. The Genoese had a colony there after 1261 and bought the city from the weakening empire in 1360; they held it until the Ottomans captured it after 1453.

Late antique Herakleia Pontike occupied a high hill by the sea and spread into the adjacent plain; it withdrew to the hill after the 7th C. The city's walls, rebuilt by David Komnenos, and its Laskarid citadel, are preserved as well as a basilical church perhaps built by Theodosius II.

(For Herakleia Lynkestis, see Pelagonia.)


- C.F.

HERAKLEIOS (Ἥρακλειος), emperor (from 5 Oct. 610); son of the exarch of Carthage; born ca.575, died Constantinople Feb. 641. Herakleios seized power when he arrived with an African fleet to overthrow the “tyrannical” Phokas (G. Rösch, ḪOB 28 [1979] 51–62). The Greens and Patr. Sergios I supported the overthrow. Herakleios found the empire in trouble: the Slavs and Avars were invading the northern Balkans; the Persians exerted severe pressure on the eastern frontier. The general Komentiolos revolted against Herakleios in Ankyra, and in Antioch the partisans of Phokas were still at the helm (Kaegi, “New Evidence” 308–30). The first years of Herakleios's reign witnessed a new Persian offensive, commanded by Shahbaraz and Shahn, which resulted in the Persian capture of Jerusalem in 614 and occupation of Egypt from ca. 619 to 629. Herakleios entertained the idea of transferring the capital to Carthage but gave up the plan at the request of Sergios and the population of Constantinople.

Unable to fight on two fronts, in 619 Herakleios concluded a truce with the Avars. After reorganizing the army (reinforcement of cavalry and lightly armored archers), in 622 he mobilized his forces in Asia Minor, won several victories, and invaded Armenia. The crucial battle took place in 626, when Shahbaraz reached the Bospors and together with the khan of the Avars besieged Constantinople. The attack on 7 Aug. failed; both the Avars and the Persians retreated. In 627 Herakleios was able to invade Persia, inducing panic: Chosroes II was overthrown and Kavad-Shrubya signed a peace treaty. This victory has been seen as the occasion celebrated in the series of David Plates. As a result Herakleios was able to recover the True Cross, which had been captured by the Persians. The success was but temporary: in 634

---

**SELECTED GENEALOGY OF THE FAMILY OF HERAKLEIOS**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HERAKLEIOS</th>
<th>m. Epiphania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m. (1) Fabia-Eudokia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m. (2) Martina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eudokia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HERAKLEIOS CONSTANTINE</th>
<th>m. Gregoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flavius</th>
<th>Fabius (?)</th>
<th>HERAKLIONAS</th>
<th>Martinos</th>
<th>Martina</th>
<th>daughter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>Theodore</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Augustinos</td>
<td>Februnia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theodore, Aemephalte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constans II</th>
<th>Theodosios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUSTINIAN II</th>
<th>m. Anastasia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herakleios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. (1) Eudokia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. (2) Theodora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Grunetel, Chronologie 362.
```
Heraclios Constantine’s death left the empire in a predicament. Rumor had it that Martina had poisoned him. Little is known of Heraclios Constantine’s personality, but he was popular among the people of Constantinople.


HERAKLES, son of Zeus and Alkmene, the most famous hero of Greek mythology. The Latin Hercules is connected with the emperor and the imperial cult well into late antiquity (cf. Maximian Herculanus). In Byz. literature Heraclakes appears as a standard part of imperial imagery, the defender (Theodore Prodromos, ed. Hörandner, no.16.78) and accomplisher of wondrous deeds (An.Komm. 1:36.11–16). Traces of Prodikos’s allegorical interpretation (Heraclakes at the crossroads) are found in Basil the Great (PG 31:579AB, ch.5.14). In the *Soudu* (2:584) Heraclakes becomes an allegory of the philosopher, who, protected by the lionskin of wisdom, kills the Hydra of desire with the club of rationality. According to K. Weitzmann (*SemKond* 8 [1936] 88f), Heraclakes dragging Kerberos from Hades provided a model for Christ’s raising of Adam in Anastasis scenes. Various anecdotal material survives as well: for example, Heraclakes as high priest (*mystikos, telesos*), who becomes king of Italy after a childhood spent in Spain (Malal. 86.12–17). Most of all, Heraclakes and his labors are used throughout Byz. literature as a symbol of physical power or prodigious achievement, for emperors in particular (Leo Diac. 48.17; *TheophCont* 332.20f). As a symbol of fortitude for both pagans and Christians, he appears frequently on 6th-C. textiles, silver, and ivory (*Age of Spirit*, nos. 136, 139, 206). Some elements of this imagery survive in popular literature. The death battle of Digenes Akritas with Charios, for example, reflects the struggle of Heraclakes and Thanatos (D.A. Notopoulos, *Laographia* 17 [1958] 451–53). Widely and often comically, Heraclakes’ labors are represented on ivory and bone caskets and boxes. Prokopios of Gaza describes their depiction on a clock. Heraclakes could symbolize lust and servitude to women (Nik.Chon. 139.39–43). Sometimes the first night of lovers is compared to a “Herculean labor” (Theodore Daphnopoulos, ed. Darrouzès-Westerink, 17.15).
HERAKLONAS (Ἡρακλωνᾶς), or Herakleios II, emperor (Apr./May–Sept. 641 [until July 642, according to Stratos]); son of Martina and Herakleios; born Constantinople 626, died probably Rhodes, date unknown. Co-ruler with his half-brother Herakleios Constantine, Heraklonas ascended the throne at the latter’s death, but Martina ruled de facto. Supported by the army of Thrace, she attempted to remove Herakleios Constantine’s supporters and primarily the treasurer Philagrios; Patr. Pyrrhos became her main adviser and she pursued a policy of Monotheletism. This internal friction coincided with Arab successes in Egypt. Martina sent Patr. Kyros back to Alexandria; he assumed the civil administration while generals fled to save their lives. The opposition of the senate and of the troops in Asia Minor compelled the emperor to surrender: Herakleios Constantine’s son Constans II was proclaimed co-emperor, and to balance this shortcoming Martina made her son, David-Tiberios, the third basilicus. The compromise was temporary, and the revolt of Valentinos Arsakuni overthrew Heraklonas and his family. After his nose was slit, Heraklonas, with his mother and brothers, was exiled to Rhodes.


HERALDRY. See Coats of Arms.

HERBAL. See Dioskorides; Scientific Manuscripts, Illustration of.

HERESY (αἵρεσις, lit. “sect, school”), a term used by the church fathers to designate a sectarian or dissident teaching, sometimes that of pagans or Jews (including Manichaeanism) but mainly within Christianity. There was a double terminological difficulty. First, each party accused the other of heresy—thus, the emperor Julian (quoted by Cyril of Alexandria, PG 76:565C) asserted that the tenets of the “Galilaeans,” not those of the Hellenes or Jews, were heresies, and conflicting Christian communities tended to call themselves “orthodox” and their adversaries “heretics.” Second, it is necessary to distinguish heresy, a division on doctrinal grounds, from schism, a split caused by disagreement on church policy and questions “capable of adjustment” (although sometimes doctrinal issues were also involved).

Basil the Great (ep.188.1, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 2 [Paris 1961] 121–24) makes the following distinctions between hairesis, schisma, and parasynagogae: heretics are those who are completely severed from the faith, while schism encompasses those unable to find a common solution to certain ecclesiastical problems, and parasynagogai are assemblies of rebellious bishops and priests and of disobedient laymen. As examples of heretics Basil mentions Manichaean, Gnostics (both Valentinians and Marcionites—see Gnosticism), and Montanists (“Pepouzenoi”—see Montanism), while ancient Katharoi, Enkrattai, and Hydroparastatai were schismatics. This theoretically clear distinction was muddied in later usage: when the Latin and Byz churches severed communion both parties employed the terms heretics and schismatics for their adversaries. Works on heresies developed into a common genre of Byz. theological literature (e.g., the Panarion of Ephipanius of Cyprus and Panoplia dogmatica of Euthymios Zigabenos). The Synodikon of Orthodoxy was a regular liturgical condemnation of heresies.

With the conversion of Constantine I the state became involved in the definition of and struggle against heresy, and the legal codes contain various penalties for heretical groups, frequently in ranked order, with more pernicious heresies treated more harshly. Church councils, both local and ecumenical, were commonly called to define faith and combat heresy. The idea of doctrinal error as dissent and a crime resulted from the concept of “political orthodoxy,” that is, an obligatory uniformity on major points of the creed. The proliferation of sects and philosophical schools in antiquity was singled out as a shortcoming of paganism.

The late Roman period witnessed a rich blend of heresies. In the 4th–7th C., the question of salvation was of preeminent importance: in the West it acquired a moral and juristic flavor, focusing on the concept of free will (Pelagianism), whereas in the East ontological problems (the substance of the Trinity, the natures and wills of Christ in his divinity and humanity) were the
major subject of discussion (Arianism, Nestorianism, and Monophysitism). These “heresies” became entrenched outside the empire, while within, by the end of the 7th C., the Chalcedonian view became dominant; the terms Arian, Manichaean, etc., were, however, often applied to various later heresies.

John of Damascus, in his work On Heresies, lists besides the principal heresies a series of proponents of false doctrines rarely mentioned in or completely unknown from other sources, such as the Euchyrianistoi, who denied that Christ received his flesh from the Virgin and asserted that it came from a divine source (ch.82.1–4, ed. Kotter, Schriften 4:49); the Theokatagnostoi, who dared to censure some words and actions of the Lord and holy persons (ch.92.1–3, p.57); the Thneto-psychitai, who drew no distinction between the human soul and body and believed that the soul perished with the body (ch.90.1–2, p.57); the Heliotropitai, who worshiped the heliotrope flower, seeing in it a symbol of the soul ascending to God (ch.89.1–5, p.57); the Gnosiomachoi, who rejected any Christian doctrine (gnosis) since God allegedly did not require anything but good deeds (ch.88.1–4, p.57); the Heiketai, ascetics who were Orthodox in their belief but gathered together with female ascetics in the nude in order to worship God with dancing and singing (ch.87.1–4, p.56f); and the Ethnophrones, who accepted pagan habits such as astrology, divination, incantations, and Hellenic feasts (ch.94.1–8, p.58).

The major religious dissent of the 8th–9th C. was connected with the theological interpretation of the icon—was it an idol that impaired the proper worship of God (the view of adherents of Iconoclasm) or a mysterious link between mankind and the Godhead, instrumental in the mystery of salvation? After the cult of icons was restored, dualism in the form of Bogomilism came to the fore, while from the 9th C. onward, the schism with the West, based on theological and liturgical differences (esp. problems of the fulgone and azymes) developed. In later centuries indigenous Byz. heresies evolved from differing interpretations of the role of institutional and individual paths to salvation: ca.1000 SYMEON THE THEOLOGIAN came under suspicion because he emphasized the significance of the vision of the divine light and the personal links between teacher and disciple to the detriment of the sacraments; in the 14th C. HESYCHASM developed Symeon’s individualistic or mystical approach.

The origins and exact nature of Byz. heresy have been much debated. Some scholars have suggested that heresy was caused by social and economic factors and that the poor and powerless of the empire expressed their dissatisfaction through adherence to heresy. Others have seen heresy as a reflection of otherwise suppressed national aspirations on the part of North Africans, Syrians, Egyptians, Armenians, Slavs, and other peoples of the empire. A third approach is to suggest that heresy reflects the reemergence of earlier pagan philosophical systems or native religions. Economic, political, national, and cultural phenomena may indeed have had an impact on the development and preservation of certain heresies (rivalry between Constantinople and Alexandria, Syrian adherence to Monophysitism, Platonic traditions in Origenism, urban-oriented Arian propaganda, social protest in Bogomilism, etc.), but the essence of Byz. heresies emerged from dynamic forces within Christianity, primarily from attempts to understand the nature of the Godhead and of the world, to comprehend the concepts of evil (including social evil) and good, and to find the best way to salvation.

Representation of Heretics in Art. Heretics, usually shown in poses of submission to church authority, appear in MSS from the 6th C. onward. The heretic Makedonios is depicted groveling before the First Council of Constantinople in the Paris Gregory (Omont, Miniatures, pl.1), while the defeat of another heretic, probably to be identified as Arius, is represented in the Menologion of Basil II (p.108). Arius and Nestorius appear in lectionaries prostrate before church fathers, while Iconoclasts are shown in marginal Psalter illustration whitewashing icons and being trampled by their adversaries. The vision of Peter of Alexandria, as in the Metropolis at Mistra, became an emblem of the Arian disruption of the church and is often found in the decoration of illuminated manuscripts. The representation of heretics in narthexes and monastic refectories seems to be a post-Byz. phenomenon.


HERMES, ancient Greek divinity. Although the myths of Hermes were criticized and ridiculed by Christians, there were some attempts to reconcile his image with the new religion. Early apologists compared his role as the messenger of the gods with that of the Christian Logos. On the other hand, Hermes was considered to be the greatest of Hellenic philosophers, one who "prophesied" the idea of the Trinity and oikonomia; he was allegedly a contemporary of Moses, together with whom he studied Egyptian wisdom; some people even identified him as Moses. Kosmas the Hymnographer (PG 38:496.21–32) says that Gregory of Nazianzos rejected this identification; Kosmas, however, assumes that Hermes was the first to call God "triune."


HERMES TRISMEGISTOS (Ἑρμῆς Τρισμέγιστος, lit. "Thrice-Greatest") is the Greek name given to the Egyptian god Thoth, who, as the divinity of wisdom, was believed to be the author of a number of religious texts. The Greeks adopted these documents, known as the Hermetica, between the 1st and 3rd C. and regarded them as the revelation of Hermes Trismegistos. They combine elements of magic, astrology, alchemy, philosophy, and theology. They were much read in late antiquity, esp. in the 4th C. They were excerpted by Stobaios for his anthology in the 5th C., but between the 6th and 11th C. they practically disappeared from sight in Byz. This must have been partly due to the fact that the occult was never a safe subject in the Christian empire. In the 11th C. Psellos was familiar with parts of the Hermetica, but the next signs of real interest do not appear until the 14th C. The four earliest surviving MSS of the collection date from that century, and there are some references to it in Nikephoros Gregoras.


HERMIT (ἀναχωρητής, ἐρημίτης, ἡσυχαστής), a monk or nun who retired from the world to live a solitary life of prayer and asceticism. The hermits like Antony the Great who withdrew to the desert of Egypt in the 3rd and 4th C. were the earliest Christian monks; eremitism continued to be a prominent form of Byz. monasticism until the 15th C. Later hermits were more likely to live on holy mountains such as Olympos, Auxentios, Athos, Ganos, and Meteora. There were women hermits until the 11th C.; thereafter nuns were found only in cenobitic convents (A.M. Talbot, GOrThR 30 [1985] 16–18). Particularly rigorous asceticism was practiced by the styuite saints and recluses (enkleistoi).

Eremitism was generally considered to be superior to cenobitic monasticism because of the greater hardships associated with the solitary life and the greater opportunities for spiritual improvement. In art (e.g., Der Neressian, L'Illustration II, fig.245) anchorites like St. Onouphrios illustrate the physical self-denial of those who are fed by God. Usually a monk had to spend three years in a koinonion before he could receive permission from the hegoumenos to become a hermit. A number of monks moved back and forth between the cenobitic and eremitic life, ignoring the principle of monastic stability; most holy men spent at least part of their careers in solitude. Still there was tension between cenobitism and eremitism throughout the centuries. Basil the Great, who espoused cenobitism, attacked the eremitic way of life because of the impossibility of material self-sufficiency, excessive concern with the self, and the lack of opportunity to practice charity. Eustathios of Thessalonike criticized the self-centeredness of the hermit who hid away in a cave, likening him to Homer's Cyclops. Another problem for the hermit was his lack of access to the liturgy and sacraments, if he were not a priest (A. Kazhdan, BZ 78 [1985] 53–55). Some hermits solved this problem by attending services on the weekend at a nearby monastery.

HERMOPOLIS MAGNA (Ἐρμοῦ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, Ar. Ashmunāyn), town in Upper Egypt, metropolis of the Hermopolite nome, an episcopal see from the second half of the 3rd C. (Eusebios, HE 6.46.2). Hermopolis Magna is well known from Greek and Coptic papyri as a flourishing cultural and administrative center. Of the two surviving 5th-C. churches, the larger, which was probably the cathedral, is a transept-basilica, with each arm of the transept ending in a large conch. Many of its columns (spolia from earlier Roman buildings) are still standing. It was part of a large ecclesiastical complex, which was surrounded by porticoes and had two richly adorned propylae.

The other church, a more ordinary basilica, is much less well preserved. Along its south side are vestiges of an underground burial and the foundations of a baptistery.


HERODIAN (Ailios Herodianos), 2nd-C. Greek grammarian who wrote on all aspects of grammar other than syntax, but concerned himself principally with prosody and morphology. His Universal Prosody (Katholike prosodia), now lost, gave in-
formation on the accentuation of approximately 60,000 words. The Philetairos, a short Atticist lexikon attributed to him, is certainly a much later compilation. His only work to survive entirely is a short treatise titled On Singular Words (Peri numeros lexeos). His rich and carefully ordered collections were sources, direct or indirect, for all later grammarians, not least those of Byz. Probably Theodosios of Alexandria (4th–5th C.) wrote an epitome of the Universal Prosody. The treatise of Theognostos, On Orthography, was based largely on Herodian, as was the unpublished On Breathings by Theodoretos (date uncertain). Many Byz. commentaries and grammatical writings draw on Herodian, and in this way enable fragments of his lost works to be reconstructed.


LIT. P. Egenolff, Die orthographischen Stücke der byzantinischen Literatur (Leipzig 1887). Egenolff, Orthog. —R.B.

HERODOTUS, Greek historian; born Halicarnassus ca.485 B.C., died 425. Herodotus was known in 4th-C. Egypt (P.Oxy. VI 857), and papyri of his work are found as far away as Dura-Europos (C.B. Welles, TAPA 70 [1939] 203–12). The extent of the direct familiarity of the Byz. with Herodotus is debatable. Malalas (Malal. 161.5–9) included him in a list of poets and philosophers who were contemporaries of Philip II of Macedon, and in the Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai (p.66.1) “the chronographer Herodotus” appears as a source for Constantine I the Great’s murder of his son. Photios (Bibl., cod.60) characterized Herodotus in a few words as a historian of the Persian kings and the usurper Smerdis—a very Byz. perception (or misperception?) of the book.

Interest in Herodotus awakened in the 10th C. The earliest preserved MS dates from this time; the Souda includes Herodotus’s biography, and the Excerpta of Constantine VII contain passages from him. Herodotus’s Persians were considered to be ancestors of the Arabs. Psellus (Mayer, “Psellos’ Rede” 53.208–09) praised Herodotus as the most eloquent writer. In the 12th C. chroniclers such as Zonaras and Manasses had studied his text (E. Jeffrey, Byzantium 49 [1979] 213ff. 234), and other scholars (Gregory Pardos, John Tzetzes, Eustathios of Thessalonike) referred to him. Many authors must have been familiar with Herodotus through reference works, but it seems plausible that Chalkokondyles, in describing the Turks, imitated Herodotus’s legends and tales (Gy. Moravcsik in Polychronion 369f).


HERVE FRANKOPOULOS (Ερβέβητος ὁ Φραγγόπουλος), mid-11th-C. commander of Norman mercenaries in Byz. service. He may have been the founder of the Byz. family of Phrangopoulos. Hervé fought in Sicily under George Manakes (1038–40), allegedly with great success. In Byz. service by 1050, he commanded the Normans on the eastern frontier; transferred westward in that year, Hervé and Katakalon Kekaumenos were defeated by the Pechenegs near the Danube. In 1056, Hervé demanded the title of magistros from Michael VI; rejected, he withdrew to his estate at Dagarabe in the Armeniakon theme. During the winter of 1056–57, he won the support of 300 Franks and led them toward Lake Van (1057). After an initial success over Turks, Hervé and his followers were enticed into Chiat, where he was seized and many of his followers slain. Apparently Hervé gained his liberty and supported Isaac I, for a seal indicates he received the title magistros as well as the office of vestiariates and strateletes of the East (Schlumberger, Sig. 659f). According to Matthew of Edessa, ca.1063 Turks in Amidia bribed a “Frankobol” (possibly Hervé) to hold back from battle; subsequently Constantine X executed him.


HESIOD (Ἡσίοδος), early Greek poet popular in Byz.; born Ascr. Boeotia ca.750 B.C. According to M. West (CQ 24 [1974] 161), the Works and Days is preserved in more than 260 MSS (more than 100 of them later than 1480), the Theogony in approximately 70, and the Shield of Herakles in about 60. The oldest MS of the Works (Paris, B.N. gr. 2771) dates from the second half of the 10th C. Planudes and his circle prepared an edition of Hesiod, providing corrections of minor metrical faults. A subsequent edition was issued by Triklinios, who made grammatical and orthographical improvements in the text. The Souda
attributes to Hesiod other works now lost or surviving only in fragments. Quotations from Hesiod, many of them extensive and sometimes not based on the extant MSS, are found in the Ety-

mologika. Scholia to Hesiod derive from an original of ca. 900; Arethas of Caesarea may have played some role in the annotation of the text.

The Neoplatonist Proklos wrote a commentary on the Works based on earlier comments by Plu-
tarch. He read the poem not as literature but as a textbook for moral and practical guidance (C. Fa-
tation of the myths; he also criticized Proklos's proximity and obscurity. The commentary of Man-
uel Moschopoulos is an unpretentious para-
phrase. An allegorical commentary by the deacon John Galenos (12th C.) also survives (Hunger, Lit. 2:61, n.27). The anonymous exegetis of the Theo-
gony in two Naples MSS is probably of the 13th or 14th C. (M. Capone Ciollarro, Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana 30 [1981] 113–28) and not of the 11th or 12th C. as formerly thought.

Seventeen illustrated MSS of Hesiod are pre-
served, the earliest of the 11th C.; one example, Venice, Marc. gr. 464, was completed in two stages by Demetrios Triklinos on 20 Aug. 1316 and 16 Nov. 1319 and belonged to Bessarion (Furlan, Marciana 42:25–29). Copies of the Works and Days contain a varying number of images of PLOWS and other AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

—K.S.. A.K., A.C.

**HESPERINOS.** See Vespers.

**HESCHASM** (from Ἥσυχασμα, “to be quiet, at rest”), conventional term for the method of mo-
nastic prayer and contemplation (HESCHIA) de-
signed to achieve communion with God through interior quietude. The practice centered on the perpetual "prayer of the heart," the constant re-
citation of the short Jesus Prayer, "Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me" (for an early Byz. commentary on this prayer, see R.E. Sinkewicz, MedSt 49 [1987] 208–20). This spirit-
tuality of contemplative monasticism can be traced back to the desert fathers. The monastery of St. CATHERINE on Mt. Sinai was an important center for the diffusion of this prayer. Descriptions of such prayer are mentioned in DIADOCHOS OF Pho-
tike and JOHN KLIMAX. The terms hesychastes and hesychia, however, are earlier, even common, in 4th-C. monastic and patristic literature. Typically, hesychastes was often used as a synonym for a hermit or anchorite. Late Byz. writers often at-
tached to the prayer physical exercises designed to achieve concentration (prosoche). These psycho-
smotic methods (cf. Hausherr, infra 9 [1927] 164) were viewed as tools and not as an end. Finally, the entire tradition was unified in Pala-
mism, the doctrinal synthesis of Gregory Palamas.

In addition to its original technical meaning, the term hesychasm is often used to describe 14th-
through 15th-C. political, social, and religious movements. Clearly hesychasm became a social and political phenomenon once it was drawn into the 14th-C. social struggle and the Civil War of 1341–47, but those who joined the opposing camps did not do so on the basis of any inherent rela-
tionship or opposition between Palamism and the sociopolitical conflict. Palamites and anti-Pala-
mites could be found in both camps. In sum, any connection between hesychasm and the feudal nobility associated with Kantakouzenos's forces has never been demonstrated. The familiar "Palamas-Kantakouzenos" identification was ulti-
mately political in essence.

A link has also been suggested between the "withered" art of the late 14th C. and the victory of hesychasm with its supposed Iconoclasm, mo-
nastic rigorism, and opposition to the Hellenistic traditions of the Palaiologan "renaissance." This impoverishment, however, was probably caused by economic factors. Besides, the argument fails to account for the unusual extension of Palaiologi-

an art in the Slavic world, supported by Palamite monastic circles. Although the use of the term hesychasm to describe the different currents of the 14th C. is convenient, it is misleading if only because these currents were far more complex and sweeping than those of hesychast spirituality, which was concerned primarily with contempla-
tive prayer (J. Meyendorff in Okeanos. 447–57).

—Lit. I. Hausherr, "La méthode d'oraision des hes-

HESYCHIA (ἡσυχία, lit. “tranquility”), the key concept in Byz., esp. monastic, spirituality through which man ascends to God. Hesychia involves the stilling of the normal human senses and passions in order to perceive the transcendent God. Inner and outer hesychia were not normally to be found in ordinary society, and hesychia became the particular goal of solitary eremitic or hesychastic monks (Justinian I, nov. 5–3). The “philosophy” of hesychasm consists of three essential points: (1) renouncing the importance of family and the world, (2) renouncing one’s own will and attaining complete obedience, and (3) a life of single-minded, pure devotion to God. The prophets Elijah and John the Baptist were seen as biblical prototypes of hesychia, or silent absorption in God. The hesychast leads a life like the angels, he is the anti-type of the angels on earth. His virtues are solitude, ascetic tears (penthos), fear of God, humility, love, and the capacity to suffer. He avoids physical hearing, seeing, and speaking and dedicates himself entirely to the purification of the heart through watchfulness (nepsis, prosoche; cf. pseudo-Makarios/Symeon, PG 34:517,C). A life filled with the pursuit of uniting hesychia and learning permeates the autobiography of Nikephorus Blemmydes. In the 14th C., the concept of hesychia is central to the psychosomatic method of prayer of Nikephorus Sinaite and the doctrine of energies of Gregory Palamas.


HESYCHIOS (Ἡσυχίος), pagan historian; born at Miletos, died after 582. Son of a lawyer, Hesychios is always described as ἀλευστριος. He wrote a world history in six sections (surviving only in fragments), from the Assyrian king Bel to the death of Emp. Anastasios I in 518. Photios (Bibl., cod. 69), who still had access to the entire work, says Hesychios added a (now lost) supplement on the early reign of Justinian I. The Patria of Constantinople (Pregel, Scriptores 1:1–18) preserves a revised fragment from his account of the history of the city of Byzantium up to the time of Constantine I, which is an imaginative blend of fact and fancy. Hesychios also assembled a collection (Pinax or Onomatologos) of biographies of pagan men of letters, exploited by Photios and acknowledged as a prime source by the Souda, but now lost; a work of similar title and scope surviving under his name (ed. J. Flach [Leipzig 1880]) is spurious and late.


HESYCHIOS OF ALEXANDRIA, 5th- or 6th-C. Greek lexicographer who compiled a lengthy, alphabetically arranged list of rare words, mainly from poetry and local dialects, with their explanations, occasionally supported by brief quotations. Very many of these words are not attested in surviving literature. Hesychios’s main source was the lost Periergonopenetes of Diogenianos of Heraclea (2nd C.), itself an epitome of a longer lexicon by Pamphilos (1st C.). His Lexikon, which survives in a single 15th-C. MS, is both abbreviated and interpolated with biblical and other glosses from Byz. lexika. Arethas of Caesarea may have had access to a longer version of the text and perhaps helped transmit it. Though not much used by Byz. literati because its recondite vocabulary was of little use to the rhetorician, Hesychios’s Lexikon was probably used by Theognostos in his treatise on orthography (K. Alpers, Theognostos Peri Orthographias [Hamburg 1964] 27–60), and by Eustathios of Thessalonike in his Homeric commentaries.


HESYCHIOS OF JERUSALEM, theologian and saint; died after 451; feast day 28 March. Hes-
chios lived as a monk near the Egyptian frontier; by 412, according to Theophanes (Theoph. 83.6–7), Hesychios was a well-known presbyter and preacher in Jerusalem. Circa 428/9 he was present at the consecration of the church of Euthymios’s monastery with Juvenal, patriarch of Jerusalem. The many fragments, scattered and translated into Armenian, Georgian, and Latin, tend to confirm the Byz. claim that he wrote a commentary on the entire Bible. Hesychios’s exegetical method is entirely allegorical, also evincing hostility to philosophy as the source of heretical error. His Christology follows that of Cyril of Alexandria, albeit expressed in less technical language. He attacks Arianism and the heresy of Apollinaris and was himself accused (posthumously) of Monophysite leanings in a letter of Pope Pelagius I (555–61). In addition to biblical exegesis and his various homilies and sermons, not yet all published, he wrote a Church History, lost save for the Latin translation of an anti-Nestorian chapter read at the Council of Constantinople in 553 in denunciation of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

HETAIREIA (étaireia), a unit of the emperor’s bodyguard, whose function is uncertain. Litavrin (VizObščestvo 47) surmised that protection of the emperor was only occasionally the responsibility of the hetaireia, its major function being the administration of a special category of estates. Bury (Adm. System 107) identified the hetaireia with the foederati of the 9th C., an unlikely suggestion (Haldon, Praetorians 246). There were several hetaireiai—three or even four (Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 130); they consisted largely of foreigners—Khazars, Pharganoi, probably Rus’, and Hungarians. Bury identified the Pharganoi as Turks from Central Asia, esp. Ferghana; however, a chrysobull of 1079 uses the term Pharganoi for Varangians (Laura 1, no. 38,30), and the term could have been an altered form of this ethnic designation.

P. Karlin-Hayter (JÖB 23 [1974] 116, 116) suggested that the epi megalos hetaireiai (commander of the grand hetaireia) was a subordinate of the hetaireiaches.

By the end of the 11th C. the structure of the hetaireia changed. Bryennios (Bryen. 77.5–8) says the hetaireia was customarily made up of noble youths. The various hetaireiai were probably consolidated into a single unit; Anna Komnene (An.Komm. 1,20.8) speaks of hetaireia in the singular in a scene where Bryennios (269.12–13) used the plural form. Already in the 12th C. and more often in the 14th C. the term hetaireia was employed generically to describe the private retinue of a magnate bound together by an oath.


A.K.

HETAIREIACHES (étaireíearches), also megas hetaireiaches, commander of the hetaireia, a semi-military official (stratarches) responsible for the security of the imperial palace; he also carried out delicate assignments for the emperor and could be placed at the head of an army. Unknown at the time of the mid-9th-C. Taktikon of Uspeiskij, the hetaireiacheres (and megas hetaireiacheres) appears in the Kletorologion of Philotheos at the end of the 9th C. Narrative sources first mention the hetaireiacheres under Michael III. The post acquired particular significance at the beginning of the 10th C. when the future emperor Romanos I Lekapenos held this office; he was succeeded by his son Christopher. The militant emperors of the second half of the 10th C. pushed the hetaireiacheres into the background, but the post regained influence in the 11th C. when some court eunuchs held it. Under the Komnenoi hetaireiacheres was not a high position and was occupied primarily by nobles of the second echeion, even though we find among the hetaireiaarchai some relatives of the ruling dynasty, such as George Palaiologos (O. Lampside, Byzantion 40 [1970–71] 403–06). In the 14th C. pseudo-Kodinos stressed the hetaireiacheres’s functions of control over foreigners rather than his duty as the guardian of the emperor. Under Andronikos II members of some great families (Mouzalon, Nestongos-Doukas) held this post and the hetaireiacheres often functioned on missions far from the palace.
HETOIMASIA (ἕτοιμασία, lit. “preparation”), the prepared throne for Christ’s Second Coming or PAROUSIA (Ps 97). Hetoimasia is the name conventionally given to images of a richly appointed throne bearing—in some combination—Gospel book, Cross, crown, dove, and Passion instruments. The name is not coeval with the image. Initially, in the 5th–7th C., the image signifies not the empty throne awaiting God, but—in accord with antique use of the throne to represent the presence of a god or emperor—God’s mystic presence upon the throne. Similarly, in apses and cupolas from the 12th C. onward, the hetoimasia is flanked by officiating bishops or angels and bears the objects of their devotion: the Passion instruments, which signal the saving power of Christ’s appearance and sacrifice, both in life and in the liturgy, and the dove, which indicates the role of the Trinity in the Eucharist. By the 11th C., however, the hetoimasia is also found in compositions, above all the Last Judgment, that included Christ himself enthroned. In such cases the hetoimasia displays the Cross and Passion instruments just as the True Cross was displayed upon a throne in court rituals; here it represents not Christ himself mystically enthroned, but the sign of his Second Coming. It carried this meaning into its many independent appearances on reliquaries, icons, MSS, and sanctuary arches. In such instances it acquired, from the 12th C. onward, the label of the “prepared throne” of the Second Coming.


HET’UMIDS, second dynasty to rule Armenian Cilicia (1226–1341). The Het’umids were originally lords of Lambrom and Barbaron near the southern approaches to the Cilician Gates, and as such first pursued a pro-Byz. policy at odds with that of the ruling Rubenids. The theologian Nersès of Lambrom was a member of this family. After the death of Leo II/1, the regent Constantine of Lambrom arranged the marriage of his own son, Het’um I (1226–69) to the Rubenid princess Zabel, thus placing his family on the Cilician throne.

After achieving royal power, the policies of the Het’umids then shifted toward recognition of Mongol suzerainty, and Het’um I himself journeyed to the court of the khan in 1253. Cilicia prospered under his rule, and under that of his immediate successor, Leo II/III (1269–89). The latter was helped by Het’um’s brother Smbat the Constable. Serious difficulties arose, however, with the accession of Het’um II (1289–1301) who faced simultaneously the conversion of the Mongols to Islam and the advance of the Mamluks. In 1307 the Mongols executed the new king Leo III/IV together with his uncle, the former king Het’um II, who had abdicated in favor of Leo. Internal quarrels between pro- and anti-Latin parties weakened the realm still further. Osin I (1308–20) was murdered by his relatives; his heir Leo IV/V (1320–41) was killed by the Latinophiles, who then offered the crown to the Lusignans.


HEXAEMERON (lit. “six days”), a term denoting the account in Genesis 1 of the creation of the universe in six days, also connotes the patristic commentaries and other writings on this narrative that form a distinctive literary genre both in Byz. and in the West. Though preceded by Theophilos of Antioch (died after 181), apparently the first Christian user of the word, the nine homilies of Basil the Great on the Hexaemeron are the first patristic landmark. Rejecting pagan theories as self-contradictory, Basil presents a firm Christian view based on Moses’ supposed authorship of Genesis. The universe is not eternal but has a moral purpose. Concerned to show the active role of God as creator, Basil rejects allegory for science, presenting the elements and beauty of the world in a literal way. His sensibly eclectic philosophy and science draw heavily on Aristotle, Plato, and Poseidonios. Basil’s homilies were immediately and enduringly influential. Gregory of Nyssa supplemented them with his On the Making of Man, an anthropological disputation on man’s creation, and the Apologetic Explication on the Hexaemeron, which continues Basil’s rejection of allegory. Other patristic contributors include Theodore of Mop-
tempts (fragments concerning Gen 1–3 survive) and Severianos of Gabala. An outstanding (albeit rare) Byz. poetic treatment is the iambic Hexameron by George of Pisidia (G. Bianchi, Aevum 40 [1966] 35–52). In the West, Basil’s homilies were exploited by Ambrose of Milan and translated into Latin ca. 440 by the African Eustathios; they were also translated into Church Slavonic by John the Exarch. The Hexameron of Robert Grosseteste (written ca. 1232/3) was greatly influenced by the Hexameron of Basil (R.W. Southern, Robert Grosseteste [Oxford 1986] 204–10).


-B.B.

HEXAFOLLON. See Parakolouthemata.

HEXAGRAM (ἕξαγραμμα, lit. “six-grams”), a silver coin of the 7th C. weighing 6.82 g, that is, six grammata or scruples, and probably reckoned 12 to the solidus. Introduced by Herakleios in 615, it was struck in huge quantities throughout his reign and that of Constans II. Specimens of Constantine IV are rare, however, and under his successors it became a ceremonial coin only occasionally struck, ceasing entirely under Anastasios II.

Lit. P. Yannopoulos, L’hexagramme (Louvain-la-Neuve 1978).

-Ph.G.

HEXAMETER, the meter of Homer, enjoyed great prestige throughout the Byz. period. In the 4th–early 7th C. the hexameter was the vehicle of a widespread group of professional poets radiating from Egypt (e.g., Pamprepios, Christodoros, Kolouthos, Nonnos, and Triphiodoros), many of them reaching high civic positions, who concentrated on mythology, ekphrasis, and local history. Their use of the hexameter was extremely complex, adding many rules to those of the Alexandrian poets, which themselves were more strict than those of Homer. It is generally assumed that this complexity was a self-conscious refinement, but some features of their rules plainly relate to the final disappearance of the sense of syllable quantity in Greek, which probably took place within this period. Until the end of the 6th C., the writing of hexameter, though an archaic feature, appears to have remained a living means of artistic expression, rather than the revival of a dead form. Normally, poetry written in hexameter preserves an archaic lexical pattern.

The last poem of this tradition is credibly attributed to George of Pisidia and its form has suggested a possible link to the political verse. Subsequent hexameters are clearly antiquarian exercises, based (with greater or less success) on ancient models, rather than following the development of a live form of expression. Some of the ceremonial verse of Theodore Prodromos, however, is in the hexameter, perhaps implying public recitation in the 12th C. Later, this meter was used by Nikephoros Blemmydes and esp. Theodore Metochites. Surviving treatises on hexameter include one ascribed to Plutarch, another to Herodian (Krubacher, GBL 596ff).


-M.J.J.-A.K.

HEXAMILION (Ἑξαμιλίον, “six-miler”), barrier-wall across the Isthmus of Corinth, from the Saronic Gulf to the Gulf of Corinth (an actual distance of about five miles), designed to defend the Peloponnesos against an attack from the north. Literary and archaeological evidence show that the isthmus was defended at various times in antiquity and plans were made to fortify it during the crisis of the 3rd C. The devastation of the Peloponnesos by Alaric led to the realization of this plan in the early years of the 5th C., at about the same time as construction of the Land Walls of Theodosios II in Constantinople. The wall was 10 Roman feet (nearly 3 m) thick, approximately 8 m high, with towers that were primarily rectangular; a large fortress was located near the former Sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia. The fortifications were apparently allowed to fall into disrepair and were restored by Justinian I. The Hexamilion was defended during the time of the Slavic invasions, but it seems not to have been an effective barrier. Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 610.5–7) reports that the isthmus was unsuccessfully defended against the Crusaders in 1205.

In 1415 Manuel II rebuilt the Hexamilion, and during the next half-century it served as the primary defense of the Peloponnesos. The Turks breached the walls in May of 1423 and the future
emperor Constantine XI rebuilt it in 1443; subsequently a prophecy (perhaps inscribed on the wall itself) was circulated to the effect that the Hexamilion would protect a revived empire (F.W. Bodnar, A/JA 64 [1960] 165–72). The Hexamilion fell again to the Turks on 10 Dec. 1446 despite a spirited defense. The Venetians restored the fortifications in 1462. Another Hexamilia, ancient Lysimachia, was a bishopric suffragan to Hierakleia in Thrace (Laurent, Corpus 5:1:229–31).


HEXAPTERYGA. See Seraphim.

HEXAPTERYGOS, THEODORE, teacher and writer; born ca. 1180, died Nicaea ca. 1236. Educated at the Patriarchal School of Constantinople, Hexapterygos (Ἐξάπτερυγος) was evidently the student of George Tornikes and Constantine Stilbes. He became a teacher of poetry and rhetoric in Nicaea and taught George Akropolites and four other students sent to him by Emp. John III Vatatzes in 1234 (Akrop. 1:49.24–50.3). Six tales (diegemata) and a funeral oration on a certain Stephanos, one of his relatives, are extant in a Vienna MS (ÖNB, philol. gr. 254). His seal, bearing a dodecasyllabic legend, is preserved in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection (acquisition no. 58.106.4608).

LIT. Hunger, Lit. 1:442. Constantinides, Education 9–11. -C.N.C.

HIERAPOLIS (Ἱεράπολις, "holy city"), name of two cities in the late Roman Empire, one in Phrygia, the other in Syria.

Hierapolis in Phrygia (now Pamukkale) rarely appears in historical sources, but excavations have revealed significant Byz. remains. Notable among them is the richly decorated octagonal Church of St. Philip, built on the site of the apostle's alleged tomb and surrounded by a large rectangular colonnade in the late 4th/early 5th C. It was never rebuilt after its destruction by fire in the mid-6th C. The site also contains four other large basilical churches of the 5th–6th C.; one of them was built into a Roman bath. The churches, large and numerous for a relatively small city, indicate that Hierapolis was considered a particularly holy site. Secular buildings are poorly known; the city walls have been assigned to the 4th/5th C. By the 10th C. Hierapolis was in decline: churches had been replaced by small chapels; squatters occupied the shrine of St. Philip; and the city came to resemble a village. By 1190 it was ruined and abandoned. Originally a suffragan bishopric of Laodikeia, Hierapolis became a metropolis before 553.


Hierapolis in Syria (Μέμπετζε in Leo Dia c. 165.22, Syr. Mabbug, Ar. Manbij), city in northern Syria, northeast of Berroia (Aleppo); probably under Constantius II it became the capital of Ephratensis. Hierapolis was a military headquarters during the wars with Persia: in 363 Julian assembled his army there. In 540 Chosroes I imposed tribute on the city, and in 590 Komentiolos welcomed Chosroes II near Hierapolis and started his expedition from there into the Persian interior. Ammianus Marcellinus (Amm.Marc. 14.8.7) calls Hierapolis an "ample city." Justinian I had to shorten the extent of its walls since by his time they encompassed abandoned areas and were difficult to defend (Prokopios, Buildings 2.9.13); he also tried to improve the city's water supply.

A religious center in antiquity, Hierapolis became an ecclesiastical metropolis subject to Antioch. The 6th-C. rhetorician Prokopios of Gaza relates that Indians, Phoenicians, Scythians, Hellenes, and inhabitants of Asia Minor congregated in Hierapolis to hear panegyrics. Hierapolis developed into a Monophysite center; Philoxenos of Mabbug was bishop there in the early 6th C., and Thomas of Harqel in the early 7th.

Taken by the Arabs in 637, Hierapolis became a part of the jund of Qinnasrin yet retained Christian churches and relics, perhaps including the Holy Tile, or Keramion (its original location is also assigned to Emesa). Abd Firās, governor of Manbij, was captured by the Byz. in 962 and taken to Constantinople, where he wrote poems about his longing for his city. According to Yahyā of Antioch, in 966 Nikephoros II Phokas forced the
people of Manbij to surrender the Holy Tile to him. Leo the Deacon, however, says that when John I Tzimiskes seized Hierapolis in 974, he found other relics: Christ's sandals and the bloody hair of John the Baptist (Leo Diam. 165.21–166.3). In 1025, Hierapolis was taken once more by the Muslims but was again recovered by the Byz. in 1068, when Romanos IV captured the city and fortified its citadel. The Byz. then retained it until 1086, when it was taken by Malikshān. The Crusaders occupied Hierapolis in 1110/11. John II Komnenos passed the city by without attacking it, and the Greeks never reestablished their rule over Hierapolis.


-M.M.M.

Hieria (Turk. Fenerbahçe). The name (spelling varies, 'Iepia, 'Isepia, 'Hpia) is derived from Hiera Akra. Hieria, an Asiatic suburb of Constantinople, is a promontory, terminating in a little peninsula and situated opposite Chalcedon to the east. Here Justinian I built a palace with a harbor and a Church of St. Mary (Prokopios, Buildings 1.3.10, 1.11.16–22). Hieria was the residence of Heracleios (611, ca.636) and the seat of the Iconoclastic council of 754 (see Hieria, Local Council of). A chapel of the Prophet Elijah was added by Basil I, who also resided there. Further buildings were put up by Constantine VII (TheophCont 451f). Site of one of the emperor's summer palaces, Hieria often served as a reception point of triumphal returns from campaigns in the East. The existence of the palace is documented until 1203, but the archaeological remains (cistern, harbor breakwater, funerary inscriptions) are meager.


Hieria, Local Council Of. Constantine V summoned this council (10 Feb.–8 Aug. 754) at the palace of Hieria in Chalcedon to condemn the veneration and production of images as idolatrous and pagan. The council regarded itself as having ecumenical authority, a claim subsequently rejected by the church because four of the five patriarchs had refused to participate. Actually, the see of Constantinople was itself vacant at the time. The 338 bishops in attendance were guided primarily by the emperor's own theology and devotion to Iconoclasm. Their dogmatic definition insisted that a pictorial representation of God in any form was impossible. They argued that an icon of Christ either depicted his humanity alone, or both his humanity and divinity. That is, it either separated Christ's human nature from his divine, which was Nestorianism, or it confused the two, which was Monophysitism (Mansi 13:252A). Indeed, the only true image of Christ, representing him in his totality, was the eucharist. This ingenious Christological argument, later condemned as heretical by Nicaea II, was clearly intended to go beyond the purely scriptural prohibition of images used previously by Iconoclasts. The council's definition survives solely in the acts of Nicaea II.


Hierissos (Iepirosós, also Erisso), town (kastro) in the Macedonian Chalkidike near the neck of the Athonite peninsula; it was founded on the site of the insignificant ancient city of Akanthos and is known from the 9th C. It formed an urban community that possessed common land (koinotopian), bought and rented lands collectively, was responsible as a whole for paying rent and taxes, and collectively defended its rights in court. A unique act of 982 (Iviron, no.4) bears crosses indicating signatures of 74 notable inhabitants (oikotores) of the kastro, of whom at least 14 had Slavic names (one having signed in Glagolitic). 24 or more of them were clerics (priests, lectors, deacons, etc.), three or five had low secular offices (komes, archon, kouboukleisios) as well as exarch and domestikos who may have been either secular or ecclesiastic, two were described as owners (oikodespotai), and only one was a craftsman—a chalkew (smith). The importance of Hierissos grew as Mt. Athos became a major monastic center—it served as a stopping place on the way to the peninsula. Around 883 John Kolobos founded the Kolobou
HIEROKLES, presumed author of the Synedemos, a geographical list of the cities of the Eastern Empire, dated before 535. Nothing else is known of the man. As preserved, the Synedemos is a bare list of cities, arranged according to provinces and in rough geographical order within the provinces. The document undoubtedly owes its preservation to confusion with episcopal notitiae, which it superficially resembles. The Synedemos, however, seems to have been based on secular administrative documents from the mid-5th C., although additions to the list were made through the reign of Justinian I, at which time Hierokles presumably wrote. It has been suggested that the present text of the Synedemos is an epitome of a fuller, geographically oriented guidebook, but the list of cities is very different from the itineraria and it contains information different from what one would expect in a work of merely antiquarian interest. In format the Synedemos can be compared to the Description of George of Cyprus and to the Paris MS. B.N. gr. 1115A (the so-called "Iconoclast notitiae"), to which it is certainly related. Although there are many errors and lacunae in the text, its reliability as a guide to the overall municipal structure of the empire seems sound.

ED. A. Burckhardt, Hierolēs synedemos (Leipzig 1893). E. Honigmann, Le Synedemos d'Hierolēs et l'apocryphe geographique de Georges de Chypre (Brussels 1939).

HIEROMONACHOS (ἱερομονάχος), or hieromonk, a monk ordained as a priest. Justinian I (nov. 133, 2) decreed that four or five priests were sufficient for each monastery; the typikon for the Petkrittos monastery (ed. Gautier, 59-63) prescribed six priests for a community of 50 monks. The hieromonachos was charged with conducting the services in the monastic church.

HIERON (ἱερόν), name of two places in Asia Minor.

HIERON ON THE BOSPOROS, a fortress guarding the approach to Constantinople, now Anadolu
Kavak. Justinian I replaced its archon with a comes Stemon Pontikes thalasses whose duties included surveillance of shipping and collection of customs at the local demousian telos. By the 9th C. a para-thalassites took the place of this official. The customs revenues of Hieron increased from the 9th C. onward, as traffic with the north grew; they were considered a valuable source of income during the revolt of John (VI) Kantakouzenos in 1345, when both the government and the rebel attempted to increase them. Hieron was attacked in 822 by Thoman the Slav and in 941 by the Rus’, whose fleet was destroyed there. It was taken by the Genoese in 1350 and by Mehmed II in 1452. Hieron contains a powerful fortress (Yoros kalesi), perhaps the work of Manuel I Komnenos, with Genoese rebuilding.

Hieron near Miletos. Hieron was also the Byz. name for ancient Didyme whose famous temple of Apollo, fortified against Gothic attack in the late 3rd C., was repaired by Diocletian and Julian; subsequently a church was installed in it. The fortress was strengthened in the 7th C. and became the nucleus of a new bishopric, Hieron or “the Temple,” a suffragan of Miletos attested through the 12th C. Alexios I Komnenos enlarged the fort (C. Foss, GOrThR 27 [1982] 157f) and used it as a base for his reconquest of western Asia Minor. Hieron, which consisted only of one ancient building and a surrounding village, is important for illustrating the nature of a small Byz. city and bishopric.

Hieronymus. See Jerome.

Hikanatoi. See Domesticos ton Hikanaton.

Hikanosis (ἱκανωσις, lit. “equalization”), a fiscal term used in a treatise on taxation (Dölger, Beiträge 122.41) to designate the operation by which the surveyor ensured that each taxpayer held no more land than the quantity corresponding to the tax that he was paying. The process is also described (ibid. 121.31–32) as assessing “the land that corresponds to the figure (of tax) due by the stichos.” The term hikanosis and its derivatives are found in a number of documents. A chrysobull of Alexios I of 1089 (Xenoph., no.2.14–29) explains that the emperor had established a “norm” (metron) in view of assessing how much land should correspond to each nomisma (of tax paid by the landowner). Also in 1089 Anna Dalassene ordered that the land “imposed” on the monastery of Docheiarion be “equalized in accordance with its payment [teloumenon] to the fisc” (Docheiar., no.2.23–24). In the 14th C. the verb hikanopoiesthai (“perform an equalization”) was applied to the assessment of land in accordance with the granted posotai (Docheiar., no.26.3–4; Dions., no.2.32–33). If, after the hikanosis, it appeared that the taxpayer held more land than he was entitled to (according to the amount of tax that he paid), this “superfluous” land (spirttai ge or perisseia) could be taken away from him.


Hilandar Monastery, Serbian monastery on Mt. Athos, located near Esphigmenou, 2 km inland from the northeastern coast of the peninsula. Originally a Greek foundation, Hilandar (Χελανδάριον) may have been established in the late 10th C. by George Chelandarios (“the Boatsman”); by 1015 it was deserted and had been handed over to the Kastamonitou monastery. The plan of the main church and possibly its opus sectile floor date from the monastery’s foundation, as do portions of the eastern enclosure wall and a large area to the southeast, including the Tower of St. George.

In 1198–99 the monastery was restored as a Serbian koinobion by Stefan Nemanja (died 1199), who took the monastic name Symeon, and by his son Sava, who composed in 1199 a typikon based on the rule of the Euergitis monastery in Constantinople. They constructed a new church and added a refectory, which was later partly rebuilt. By the early 13th C. Hilandar was inhabited by
9o monks. A chapel in an upper story of the Tower of St. George contains wall paintings dated by Bogdanović et al. (intra 64) to the mid-13th C.
The next great benefactor of Hilandar was Stefan Uroš II Milutin, who in 1309 replaced the late 12th-C. kathedikon with a new triconch church with narthex (S. Nenadović, *HilZb* 3 [1974] 85–208; P. Mylonas, *HilZb* 6 [1986] 7–45) and also restored the refectory; he strengthened the monastery’s fortifications and added a tower at the harbor. Originally endowed by Nemanja with 15 Serbian villages, Hilandar became very wealthy and, by the mid-14th C., owned one-fifth of the Athos peninsula, plus lands from Macedonia (esp. Strymon and Chalkidike regions) to Serbia, 360 villages or parts of villages in all. At this time it held fourth place in the Athonite hierarchy. Hilandar was completely independent of the authority of both the protos and Byz. emperor. The hegoumenoi of Hilandar frequently became archbishops of Serbia.

Hilandar became an important Serbian Orthodox religious and cultural center (see SERBIAN LITERATURE): the Serbian writers Domentian, Teodosije, and Danilo were all monks of Hilandar. It was also a treasurershouse of Serbian art. It contains an important collection of icons, notably a mosaic icon of the Hodegetria (Furlan, *Icone a mosaico*, no.7); it is ascribed by V. Djurić to the end of the 12th C. Djurić (*BZ* 53 [1960] 333–51) argued that in the 14th C. Hilandar was a center of icon production, and dated the Ćin (an icon row from the church’s templon) to ca.1360, seeing there the same hand that painted a Gospel book (cod.9) in the monastery’s library. The Serbian variant of Old Church Slavonic developed at the monastery, which housed a scriptorium, a center for translation, and bilingual library. Most of the approximately 1200 MSS preserved at Hilandar are in Slavic; esp. notable are the numerous illuminated MSS of the 13th C. The archives, which include 172 Greek and 154 Serbian documents from the medieval period, provide information on the structure of the countryside, pronota, taxation, and the economic inequality of the peasants.


---

**HIMITATION (μετάφρασμα), a mantle, the Greek equivalent of the Roman *pallium*. It was originally an oblong outer garment of wool or linen, worn over the tunic, and draped over the left shoulder and body in such a way as to leave the right shoulder free. In this specific form it survives in all Byz. representations of figures in antique garb, such as Christ, the apostles, and prophets, but it was apparently not in daily use after late antiquity.

In the Byz. monastic *typika*, the word *himation* refers to a different garment, namely the dark cotton mantle worn by monks (e.g., P. Gautier, *REB* 32 [1974] 65,609) and nuns. When used in the plural (e.g., P. Gautier, *REB* 40 [1982] 67,930), it has the more general meaning of clothing.


**HIMERIOS**, teacher and orator; born Prusias, Bithynia, between ca.300 and 310, died after 380. Himerios ("μετάφρασμα") spent most of his life at Athens, first as a student, then (probably) in an official teaching post. Though his pagan memorialist Eurapios would not think so, his most distinguished students were Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzos. He died old, rich, blind, and epileptic. He produced at least 75 speeches and declamations; time has spared only 24, with excerpts and fragments from ten or so others. Thematically, they are the traditional mélangé of the old-style sophist: reworkings of great moments in Athenian history, school lectures, addresses to high officials—elegant nothings, for the most part. Yet Photios (cf. A. Colonna, *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati*, vol. 2 [Milan 1956] 95–106), a great admirer of their style, compares his pagan stance to the "secret yappings of dogs amongst us" (*Bibl.*, cod.165), which may suggest he had read items more detectably pagan than anything now extant.
HIMERIOS (Ὑμηριός), admiral under Leo VI; died Constantinople? 912/13. A relative of Zoe Karbonopsina, Himerios belonged to the ranks of civil officials and was given, by chroniclers, the offices of protasekretis and logothetes tou dromou; he had the title of patrikios. Leo VI sent Himerios in 904 to prevent Leo of Tripoli from besieging Thessalonike, but Himerios did not dare attack the Arab fleet; later, however, he won a brilliant victory over the Arab fleet “on the day of the apostle Thomas” (6 Oct.). The exact year of this battle is questionable; Grumel assumes that it occurred in 908, but 905 or 906 are more plausible dates (Vasiliev, Byz. Arabes, 2:1:185, n.1); reportedly sent with Himerios, Andronikos Doukas unexpectedly defected. Arethas of Caesarea praised Himerios’s victory (P. Karlin-Hayter, Byzantium 29–30 [1959–60] 300.28). In 911 Himerios, as droungarios of the fleet, commanded a fleet sent against the Cretan Arabs but was defeated by the Arab admirals Damian and Leo of Tripoli off Chios in April 912 (R. Jenkins, Hellenika supp. 4 [1953] 277–81). After his return to Constantinople, Himerios was imprisoned by the emperor Alexander and died six months later.


HIMS. See EMESA.

HIMYAR, the land of the Himyarites ( latina), a state in South Arabia (now Yemen) that included the littoral on the Red Sea and Indian Ocean (with cities such as Najran and Zafar) and inland territory inhabited by Bedouins. Himyar played an important role in late Roman trade with Axum and India, bringing to the Mediterranean spices, myrrh, silk, etc. For a short time in the 4th C. Himyar was under Axumite domination, as it was to be again in the 6th C. An attempt in the early 6th C. to establish independence under a native ruler, Dhū-Nuwwās, was suppressed by the Axumites supported by a navy sent by Justin I. The new ruler, Abraha, however, while continuing tribute payments to Axum, conducted an independent policy and managed to consolidate his kingdom and to expand its borders northward. Justinian I tried to involve Himyar in active warfare against Persia but the Himyarites avoided direct confrontation with the Persians. Circa 570 some Himyarite chiefs invited the Persians into their country, and King Masruq, the last member of Abraha’s dynasty, fell in battle; Himyar was placed under Persian governors with their residence in San‘ā.

Christianity penetrated Himyar in the 4th C. (acc. to Philostorgios), although Theodore Lector dates its appearance in the area much later, in the reign of Anastasios I. The country became a battlefield between Christianity and Judaism, which had had a strong tradition in Himyar. Christianity, in its Monophysite version, triumphed with military support from Axum and Constantinople; local bishops acknowledged the jurisdiction of Alexandria. When Muhammad sent his first embassy to South Arabia, the emissaries did not meet any serious opposition from the local population, and the Himyarites converted to Islam.


HICIPTRICA. See ANNALES BERTINIANI.
contains miniatures depicting the treatment of sick horses and a portrait of Hierokles (Weitzmann, Grundlagen 24).

Byz. veterinarians were forced to invent fresh words to describe the ailments of animals, quite often viewed as analogous to human diseases, and the drugs prescribed and theories assumed are similar to comparable matters in Byz. medicine as a whole. Farm lore is prominent in the hippiatric literature, much as it is for the simple veterinary care suggested for horses, dogs, domestic birds, pigs, and even bees as listed in the Geoponika.


HIPPOCAMP (ἱππόκαμπος), seahorse, a fabulous monster with a horse’s body and fish’s tail on which sea deities would ride. The hippocamp is infrequently mentioned in literary texts and plays no role in mythology; the church fathers ignore it. The image does often appear, however, in both classical and Byz. art, notably on bone caskets and boxes.

—A.K.

HIPPODROMES, arenas for horse and chariot races as well as other events.

Hippodrome of Constantinople. According to unverified tradition, the Hippodrome was built by Septimius Severus (shortly after 196) and completed by Constantine I, who provided it with an imperial box (Kathisma) and built the Great Palace next to it. It served not only as a sports arena, but also as a setting for the proclamation of emperors and the celebration of triumphs and as a focus for the public life of the city’s population.

As a building the Hippodrome was a typical Roman circus of the period of the Tetrarchy. It was hairpin-shaped, with its gates (Lat. carceres; Gr. κανκελλα, θυραι) toward the northeast and its curved end (Sphendone) pointing southwest. The arena was divided into two tracks by a slightly oblique barrier (Lat. spina, Gr. euripos), upon which were placed obelisks, statues, and other ornamental features. Rising tiers of seats supported on vaulted passages surrounded the arena except for the side occupied by the carceres. Above the seating ran a continuous colonnaded passage. The Kathisma rose along the east side, probably somewhat south of center, while the west side, as in some other Roman circuses, followed a somewhat irregular line. The exact length of the Hippodrome is unknown, but must have been about 450 m. The outer width measured at the base of the Sphendone is 117.5 m and the inner width 79.5 m. The seating capacity may be tentatively estimated as somewhat above 100,000.

The 12 gates were equipped with a mechanism that enabled them to be opened simultaneously. At their center rose a tower surmounted by a quadriga of four gilded horses (which at the time of the Fourth Crusade were transported to Venice, where they remained until recently on the façade of S. Marco). Starting from the gates, the competing chariots made for the turning post (Lat. meta, Gr. kumptes) marking the north termination of the spina, then went round the course seven times in a counterclockwise direction. The finishing line was probably in the western track, directly in front of the grandstands (Gr. demoi) occupied by the partisans of the two main factions. Opposite these grandstands was the imperial Kathisma, corresponding to the palatina of the Circus Maximus. It was built into the seating and appears to have been a two-storied structure, with the imperial loge and a reception hall on the first floor. It communicated with the palace by means of a spiral staircase (Gr. κοχλία) and was protected at the rear by bronze doors, which barred access to the palace in the event the Kathisma was occupied by insurgents, as happened during the Nika Revolt (532).

In the late Roman period chariot races were held frequently, but by the 9th C. they were reduced to about three a year, not counting those for special occasions such as imperial triumphs or the reception of foreign potentates. These special races went on until the Latin occupation. The conduct of the games is minutely described in the De ceremoniis (bk.1, chs. 68–73). A schematic representation of the games has survived among the frescoes of St. Sophia, Kiev.

The structure of the Hippodrome was kept up until ca.1200. In 1203 the west wing was burnt down and soon thereafter the Crusaders melted
down the bronze statues that had decorated the spina, as Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 647–55) records. In the Palaiologan period the Hippodrome, now partly in ruins, was used for jousts. A view, published by O. Panvinio (1600), illustrates its condition in ca. 1480. Surviving portions include the tall substructure of the Sphendone, the substructure of part of the east wing, and three monuments of the spina, namely: (1) the Egyptian obelisk of Thutmose III set on a marble base bearing reliefs and bilingual inscriptions of Theodosios I from 390 (see OBELISK OF THEODOSIOS); (2) the Serpent Column, the central shaft of the Delphic tripod dedicated by the victorious Greeks after the battle of Plataea (479 B.C.); and (3) the masonry obelisk or Colossus, bearing an inscription of Constantine VII recording its re-decoration with bronze plaques. Two marble bases (out of seven), which had supported the statues of the charioteer Porphyrios, have been unearthed in the Turkish Seraglio. In 1952 part of the seating of the west wing of the Hippodrome was excavated.

The Hippodrome was a monument rich in legends. Its Roman origins and pagan associations with the Dioskouroi, Poseidon, Helios, etc., were still remembered in the 6th C. (John Lydos, De mensibus 1:12; 4:30, 73; Malal. 173–77). Various features of it received a cosmic interpretation: the 12 gates denoted the signs of the zodiac; the seven races run round the spina signified the spheres of the planets, the colors of the four factions stood for the four elements, etc. Confused historical memories, e.g., the slaughter of the Nika riot, were woven into the earlier mythology.

**Hippodromes outside of Constantinople.** Hippodromes existed in many other cities of the empire, but all of them went out of use after the 6th–7th C. The old Circus Maximus in Rome was reconstructed in the 4th C., and at the beginning of the same century Maxentius built a circus 520 m long and 42 m wide; an obelisk was erected on its spina or barrier (A. Frazer, ArtB 48 [1966] 385–92). The circus of Maxentius had space for 10,000 spectators. Private hippodromes in Rome are also mentioned (A. Manodori, Anfiteatri, circhi e stadi di Roma [Rome 1982] 225–29). The circus in Carthage, cleared by excavation, seems to have been active through the 5th C.—the area was later used for a rubbish dump (The Circus and a Byzantine Cemetery at Carthage, ed. J.H. Humphrey, vol. 1 [Ann Arbor 1988] 114–16).

The existence of hippodromes in the East is attested to primarily by written sources. Papryri, inscriptions, and occasional references in historical works describe the organization of circus factions (Blues and Greens) rather than the physical structure of the buildings. Data concerning factions survives from Alexandria, Oxyrhynchus, Caesarea Maritima, Antioch, Emesa, Heliopolis, Kyzikos, Ephesus, Priene, Stratonikeia in Caria, and several other cities (A. Christophilopoulos in Charisterion eis Anastasion K. Orlandou, vol. 2 [Athens 1966] 558–60). Hagiographical texts describe horse races in Gaza, the factions of the hippodrome in Emesa, and the hippodrome in Damascus (Rudakov, Kultura 87f). It is plausible to assume that chariot racing declined after the 6th C. and provincial hippodromes are scarcely ever mentioned in later centuries: Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Thess., Capture 106.30) speaks of a politikos (municipal) hippodrome in Thessalonike, but Rudakov is wrong in asserting that the vita of Lazaros of Mt. Galesios (AASS, Nov. 3:580B) mentions horse races in Magnesia; the hagiographer is referring to hippodromia in Constantinople.

The average hippodrome took about five years to build and, when complete, measured about 450 × 70 m. The omission of an upper colonnade, still present at the Circus Maximus, could be because of the lack of a local tradition in equestrian sports or a perceived need for haste in construction. In the late Roman world hippodromes played an essential role as a setting both for court ceremonial and the ruler’s appearance before his subjects. Hence they were frequently built in a city that an emperor determined as his chief residence. Rejecting the pattern that had prevailed down to the time of Constantine I—when hippodromes were built outside the city—most such structures of the 4th C. and after were built within the walls and often next to the imperial residence. Apsidal buildings adjacent to the hippodromes of Sirmium, Milan, and Thessalonike suggest provision for an imperial loge. As at Constantinople, therefore, hippodromes became in effect an integral part of the palace.

---

HIPPOKRATES. See Scientific Manuscripts, Illustration of.

HIPPOLYTOS, in Greek mythology the son of Theseus and the Amazon Hippolyte, a victim of his stepmother Phaedra’s passionate love for him. When Hippolytos repulsed her advances, Phaedra accused him of seducing her, and Theseus asked Poseidon to kill Hippolytos. Phaedra’s attempted seduction appears on a silver plate of the 5th or 6th C. (DOCat 1, no. 7) and again, half a millennium later, in bone carving (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinskulpt. I, no. 30). In literature Hippolytos becomes a symbol of chastity: thus Themiostios returns several times to the legend of Hippolytos, emphasizing his sophrosyne (e.g., or. 1:88,9–10, 2:202,11–12). Malalas describes at length the story of Hippolytos, with the intention of exonerating Phaedra and showing that both she and Hippolytos were innocent and that Theseus was fully responsible for their deaths. Diverging from ancient sources, Malalas presents Hippolytos as a man of dark complexion, short-haired, snub-nosed, broad-faced, with sparse beard and large teeth; he also stresses that Hippolytos was a mature and strong hunter and calls him “Theseus’s son by a concubine (pallake)” (Malal. 88,13). It is impossible to judge to what extent Malalas’s story may have been influenced by the “triangle” of Constantine I–Fausta–Crispus; the latter was Constantine’s son by the concubine Minervina (Zosim. 2:20,2), a young but talented military commander, who perished (along with his stepmother Fausta) as a victim of his father’s jealousy.

Hippolytos is depicted in art as a hunter in a MS of pseudo-Oppian in Venice (Marc. gr. 479; Weitzmann, Gr. Myth. 115, fig. 130).


HIRA, Arab city on the lower Euphrates, the capital of the Lakhmids prior to the rise of Islam. Nestorian Christians exiled from Byz. fled to Hira, from which Christianity spread in the Arabian peninsula; the city became officially Nestorian with the conversion of the last Lakhmid king al-Nu‘man (580–602). After his death the city received a Persian governor and in 633 it capitulated to Muslim arms. Hira was eclipsed by Islamic Kufa, but in the 9th C. it produced the most important figure in the transmission of Greek science to the Arabs, Hunayn ibn-Ishaq.


HISTAMENON (νομισμα ἵσταμενον, lit. “standard”), a term commonly applied in the 11th C. to the gold nomisma of full weight in order to distinguish it from the substandard tetarteron. Because the histamenon of the mid-11th C. were concave, the term passed, in the shortened form of stamena (first attested 1090), to the Byz. billon and copper trachaea of the 12th–13th C., used particularly by the Latins in a variety of spellings (stamina, stanmini, etc.). Its exact meaning in any particular case has to be deduced from the context.

LIT. Hendy, Coinage 28.

HISTORIA AUGUSTA (4th C.?), a conventional title for a collection of Lives of Roman emperors and pretenders from 117 to 284, with a real or faked lacuna for 244–59. It was ostensibly written in the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine by six otherwise unknown biographers: Aelius Lamiplidius, Aelius Spartanius, Flavius Vopiscus, Julius Capitolinus, Trebellius Pollio, Vulcacius Gallianus. If it had a preface and Lives of Nerva and Trajan, its emulation of Suetonius would be complete, but too much logic on its part cannot be assumed. In content and form, the Lives are a poor man’s Suetonius, crammed with exotic and erotic details and written in a sometimes remarkable Latin. Much of its documentation and information is demonstrably false and wrong, though it still has to be used when other sources are lacking. The collection parades conventional views of good emperors and senatorial virtues; efforts to equip it with any consistent philosophy have foundered. The current fashion is to follow H. Dessau’s thesis (Hermes 24 [1889] 337–92; 27 [1892]
HISTORIA DE EXPEDITIONE FRIDERICI
History of the Expedition of Frederick), an account of the Crusade of Frederick I, compiled in Austria ca. 1200, possibly by a priest Ansert. The Historia expanded an earlier record (partially preserved, but misassessed by Chrout) by adding a prologue, documents, and annals (1190–97) of events in the Holy Land. The earlier record seems to derive from TEGNO and another participant, probably in Frederick's entourage. The Historia attests diplomatic contacts with Constantinople and Ikonion before Frederick's departure (pp. 151) and quarrels over imperial titles (pp. 49–51). It offers a list of Crusaders (pp. 18–22), a detailed description of their trip and the state of the empire (pp. 26–75), and several Byz. documents (p.29, Reg. 2, no.1592; p.51.13–18, Reg. 2, no.1598; pp. 64.15–66.22, Reg. 2, no.1603). Further knowledge of the lost earlier record comes from an anonymous History of the Pilgrims (History peregrinorum), compiled in the 1190s (ed. Chrout, pp. 116–72).

Both histories overlap somewhat with the brief, factual account of the Gesta Friderici (Deeds of Frederick [on the Holy Expedition], ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRG 27 [Hannover 1892] 78–96), which may also derive from Frederick's entourage. It adds new, vivid details to the crossing of the empire (e.g., the Byz. felled trees to block the road through Bulgaria, p.80).

ED. A. Chrout, Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzugs Kaiser Friderichs I. [= MGH SRG i.5, 5] (Berlin 1928) 1–115.

HISTORIA LANGOBARDUM BENEVENTANORUM. See Ercempert.

HISTORIANS, ECCLESIASTICAL. See Ecclesiastical Historians.

HISTORIOGRAPHY, one of the primary genres of Byz. literature. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 3.11–12) used the terms chronographoi and historiographoi to designate historians; this division into history and chronicle, sanctioned by K. Krumbacher, became traditional, although recently serious doubts have been expressed as to its validity. The Byz. themselves did not clearly distinguish between historia and chronikon: the late Roman historians preferred the title History for their works, but from Malalas onward “Chronicle” became the typical heading, not only of George Synkellos, Theophanes, or George Hamartolos, but even of some unquestionably “historical” works such as those by Psellos, Niketas Choniates, or George Akropolites. On the other hand, some authors like Patr. Nikephoros I, Skylitzes, Kedrenos, and Zonaras, who wrote in a chronicle style, used the title History. Eustathios of Thessalonike distinguished between the terms historin (“to write of the past”) and syngraphein (“to write of contemporary events”).

The Byz. contrasted historiography and enkomion, emphasizing that historiography’s objective was pursuit of the truth. Indeed the element of criticism was substantial in historians. This overt or implied criticism, directed against deceased or living emperors and courtiers, was usually juxtaposed with praise for an ideal figure from the past (Constantine I for Theophanes), from contemporary society (Nikephoros III Botaneiates for Attaleiates), or even from the “barbaric” world (Mehmed II for Kritoubolos).

This was conceived as linear, not circular, both by late Roman pagan historians with their concept of eternal Rome (F. Vittinghoff, HistZ 198 [1964] 573) and by Christians according to whom history was moving toward Christ’s parousia or Second Coming. This perception of time as a continuum is obvious in the so-called “world chronicles” that begin with Adam or Creation and treat at length both the biblical and Roman past, whereas ancient Greek history is poorly represented (Jeffreys, “Chroniclers” 237f). It is less evident in works on
limited periods that nonetheless implicitly or explicitly continue each other, so that Theophanes and his continuators, Leo the Deacon, Psellus, Anna Komnene, Niketas Choniates, Akropolites, Pachymeres, and Gregorios present an uninterrupted account of events. The geographic scope was wide for late Roman historians who were very interested in ethnography and the problem of barbarians; after Theophanes, the Byz. oikoumenene shrunk, and with rare exceptions (e.g., Chalkokondyles) historians dealt with territory under Byz. control.

The philosophy of history is providential, God or Prorokia being considered as the ultimate cause of events. Providence could be conceived as in a perpetual dialogue with mankind, sending messages in the form of portents, earthquakes, visions, or miracles, and reacting to humankind's piety or sinfulness; or it could be removed to the background, while Tyche or human activity proved to be the decisive factors in historical development. In the Palaiologan period historiography had to attempt to explain why God had forsaken his “chosen people” and granted victory to barbarians (C.I.G. Turner, BZ 57 [1964] 346–73).

The idea that economic or social causes could influence history does appear in historiography, if rarely (A. Kazhdan, VizVrem 19 [1961] 86f).

Politically and religiously biased, historians expressed their prejudices by direct praise or invective (esp. George Hamartolos) or by tendentious choice of facts and selective omission of undesirable events. The application of elements of historical criticism is infrequent, although occasionally historians present two contradictory versions and appeal to the reader to resolve the contradiction. More often than not historians uncritically copied their sources and thus created confusion and inconsistency. Documents are infrequently cited, but sometimes letters, treaties, or laws are reproduced, whereas speeches are usually artificial creations, modeled upon earlier examples. Statistical information is rarely dependable.

In addition to the truth, “delight” or “entertainment” was a goal of historiography. This purpose was served by anecdotes, jokes, sensational stories, mirabilia, miracles, love affairs, and murder scenes. On the other hand, the authors used rhetorical techniques, embedding into their story ekphrasis and enkomia, tropes and figures, metaphors and similes. Archaism formed a link with the past: by imitation, cliches, and citations from earlier models, the historian established his place in the tradition. The structure of the narrative varied between two extremes—the strictly chronological, annalistic method elaborated primarily by Malalas, Synkellos, and Theophanes, and the biographical approach ("by reigns"), which was already used by the continuators of Theophanes. Very few historical works were dedicated to specific events (e.g., Eustathios of Thessalonike, John Kananos).

Although written primarily in prose, poetry was not excluded as a form of historiography, both for world history and specific historical reigns/events.

HISTORY PAINTING. In Byz., as in ancient Rome, history painting normally depicted climatic events in the lives of emperors, such as acts of courage, victories, and the subjugation of barbarians (cf. Mansi 13:356B). A 12th-C. historian (Kinn. 266.7–9) describes the sponsorship of pictorial celebrations of imperial triumphs as "customary among men placed in authority." Thus John Lydos (De magistratus, ed. A. Bandy, p.114.14–15) reports pictures of the rise of Leo I set up by a praetorian prefect, and Zacharias of Mytilene (HE, ed. E.W. Brooks, CSCO 88, p.41.27–29) mentions a similar tribute to Justin I commissioned by a chartularios. These pictures were displayed in public places, an agora, and a public bath, respectively. But from the 6th C. onward, history painting is found primarily in the precincts of imperial palaces. A mosaic showing Belisarios’ victories over the Vandals and Goths and the reception of their tribute by the augusti covered the ceiling of the Chalke. The emperor Maurice had the story of his life up to his accession displayed in the Karianos portico at Blachernai (Theoph. 261.13–15), and Basil I’s “toils on behalf of his subjects, his warlike exertions and the prize of victory bestowed by God” (Theoph. Cont. 332.19–22) were depicted in his Kainourgion in
the Great Palace. Robert de Clari (Conquête, p. 28) describes pictures above the doors of churches in Constantinople depicting the overthrow of Andronikos I by Isaac II Angelos. Lesser men also commissioned this genre of painting: scenes of ancient history appeared among many others in the palace of Digenes Akritas: Alexios Axouch was criticized for displaying victories of the sultan rather than the emperor.

Eusebios of Caesarea (VC 3.3) and later writers read such pictures allegorically. Euthymios Malakes drew an analogy between depictions of the deeds of Manuel I and the Miracles and Passion of Christ. An anonymous text, preserved in Venice, Marc. gr. Z 524, draws parallels between the same emperor's victories, shown in the house of Leo Sikountenos in Thessalonike, and the conquests of Moses and Joshua. The only Palaiologan works known are the paintings of Michael VIII's victory over the Angevins in the vestibule of the palace, described by Pachymeres (Pachym., ed. Faillier 2:651.1-4). The propagandistic or allegorical nature of such images differentiates them from both the narrative pictures of the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes and the historical episodes in the Paris Gregory (Paris, B.N. gr. 510).

Lit. Grabar, L'empereur 36, 40f, 83f, 93. Magdalino-Nelson, "Emp. in 12th C." — A.C.

HISTRIA (anc. 'Iστρια), a Greek colony on Lake Sinoe, in Scythia Minor, near the shore of the Black Sea, north of Constanța in Romania. The city prospered in the 4th-6th C., when its ramparts were rebuilt three times, some bricks bearing stamps of the time of Anastasios I. Excavations have uncovered a commercial district, with various workshops and private habitations that usually form clusters, and several public buildings, including a basilical edifice of the 6th C. (E. Condurachi in Charisien en Anastasion K. Oriaion, vol. 4 [Athens 1967-68] 161-68). The sector containing two Roman baths of the 2nd C. was a commercial region in the 4th C. and later the location of a basilica and a cemetery; it was abandoned in the 7th C. (A. Suceveanu, Histría 6 [1982] 85-92). In the eastern sector was a large palacelike house.

The period of prosperous activity ended ca. 580; the last excavated layer contains humbler habitations. Numerous coins of Maurice (H. Nubar, Histría 3 [1973] 84) are connected with that emperor's attempt to protect the area against Avar attacks; then the number of Byz. coins decreases and stops after Herakleios. Sporadic coin finds of the late 10th-12th C. (ibid. 227f) indicate a Byz. presence in the region, but Histría did not regain its former significance. In the sector of the Roman baths, an 11th-C. (Pechenç?) tomb was found, containing jewelry of a type also known from Dinogetia and the steppe north of the Black Sea (A. Suceveanu, SCIV 24 [1973] 495-502).


-A.K.

HOARDS, NUMISMATIC. See COIN FINDS.

HODEGON MONASTERY, located in Constantinople east of Hagia Sophia near the sea walls. Hodegon ("Οδήγων, "of guides, conductors") apparently took its name from the monks who led blind pilgrims to a miraculous spring that was able to restore sight. The church was allegedly founded in the 5th C. by the empress Pulcheria to house precious relics, which later included St. Luke's portrait of the Virgin Hodegetria. In late Byz. this icon was removed from the church every Tuesday and carried in procession through the streets, attended by large crowds hoping for miraculous cures.

The monastic complex was built by the 9th C., perhaps by Michael III, and restored again in the 12th C. In the Palaiologan period a scriptorium flourished there, specializing in the production of deluxe liturgical MSS (L. Polites, BZ 51 [1958] 17-36, 261-87). Among its scribes were Chariton (fl. 1319-46) and Iosaph (fl. 1360-1405/6). The Palaiologan emperors had close ties with the monastery and visited it frequently; Andronikos III died there in 1341. During the late 13th and 14th C. the monastery was granted to the patriarchate of Antioch as a metochion, and served as a residence for Syrian monks visiting Constantinople.

HOLOBOLOS, MANUEL, teacher, orator, and active anti-Unionist; born ca. 1245, died Constantinople between 1310 and 1314. In the service of Michael VIII as a grammaticos from an early age, Holobolos (Ολοβόλος) suffered repeatedly at the hands of the emperor. In 1261 his lips and nose were mutilated because he showed distress at the blinding of John IV Laskaris. Holobolos thereupon entered the Prodromos monastery in Constantinople with the monastic name Maximos (W. Hörandner, JÖB 19 [1970] 116–19). In 1265–66, through an appeal of Patr. Germanos III, he was appointed rhetor and assigned to teach, possibly at the school attached to the orphanage of the Church of St. Paul (Pachym., ed. Failler 2:369.5–371.5). Again in disgrace in 1273 because of his anti-Union stance, Holobolos was exiled to the monastery tou Megalou Agrou on the Sea of Marmara. He returned to Constantinople after Michael’s death and was active in condemning the Unionists both in 1283 and at the Council of 1285 in Blachernae (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF). In addition to regaining the title of rhetor, he was protosynkellos, according to a letter addressed to him by the Dominican Simon (1299). A monody written for Holobolos by a student and relation, George Galesiotes, states that he was teaching until the end of his life (S.I. Kourouses, Athena 75 [1974–75] 335–74).

As rhetor, Holobolos composed several orations for Michael VIII that are important sources for the early years of his reign (1259–61) and for the restoration of Constantinople after 1261. Holobolos also wrote verses for the emperor and his son Andronikos II to accompany the Epiphany prokepsis ceremony, commentaries on Theokritos’s Technopaignia, and a logos katechetikos for Germanos III.


—R.J.M.

HOLY APOSTLES, CHURCH OF THE, name of numerous churches in Byz. territory, the most famous of which were those in Constantinople and Thessalonike.

HOLY APOSTLES IN CONSTANTINOPLE. The first building on the site in Constantinople was a circular mausoleum erected by Constantine I for his own burial. Next to it a cruciform basilica was built by Constantius II, who deposited in it relics of the apostles Timothy (356) and Luke and Andrew (357—G. Downey, DOP 6 [1951] 72). In 550 the church was rebuilt, again in the shape of a cross, by Justinian I, who added a second mausoleum. The two mausolea served as the burial place of emperors until 1028. After Iconoclasm the church was restored by Basil I and decorated with a cycle of mosaics described in ca.940 by Constantine of Rhodes. The mosaics appear to have been partly redone in the 12th C. and were described once again by Nicholas Mesarites. After the Turkish conquest the church was ceded to Gennadios II Scholarios as the seat of the patriarchate, but he found it unsuitable and moved instead to the Church of St. Mary Pammakaristos. The church was demolished and the mosque of Mehmed II Fatih built on its site. Several of the imperial sarcophagi were salvaged (P. Grierson, DOP 16 [1962] 1–69). The Church of the Holy Apostles resembled that of St. John at Ephesus in its cruciform plan and five-domed elevation, a scheme later replicated at S. Marco in Venice.


—C.M.

HOLY APOSTLES IN THESSALONIKE. The Church of the Holy Apostles (originally the Church of the Virgin) in the western part of the city is a fine example of Palaiologan monastic architecture. On the west and south façades are brickwork monograms and carved inscriptions naming the patriarch Niphon of Constantinople as founder, which would date the church to the period 1310–14; recent carbon-14 analysis of the fabric of the church shows that all of the building was constructed at the same time, but suggests a date of ca.1329. The monk Paul is named as a second keter. The exterior of the church is richly decorated with brickwork patterns of all kinds: zigzags, hook patterns, cross-stitch designs, pendant tri...
angles, grill patterns, and hexagon stars. The west façade of the outer narthex was an open arcade. The church is effectively divided into two parts: a naos with central dome on four columns, plus a narthex, is surrounded by a U-shaped ambulatory with galleries and domes at each of the four corners. The interior is dominated by verticality; the proportion of height to width of the central bay is 5:1. The interior was once adorned with mosaics, on the upper levels only, and with frescoes, presumably executed by a Constantinopolitan workshop, perhaps the same that decorated the Church of the CHORA.


HOLY FACE. See MANDYLION.

HOLY FOOLS. See FOOLS, HOLY.

HOLY MOUNTAIN (ἀγιον ὄρος). A number of mountains (with their environs) in the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Levant attracted substantial numbers of monks and acquired reputations as "holy mountains." Among the earliest were Mt. AUXENTIOS, Mt. SINAI, and the WONDROUS MOUNTAIN, first settled in the 4th and 5th C. LATROS probably received its first monks in the 7th C., OLYMPOS and ATHOS in the 8th–9th C. Until the first half of the 10th C. Olympos was considered the Holy Mountain par excellence; subsequently Athos took pride of place. Mounts GANOS and GALESIOS became flourishing monastic communities in the 10th and 11th C. METEORA was the last to be founded, in the 14th C.

Holy mountains are usually characterized by relative isolation and rugged terrain, and appealed to the desire of many monks to reside in a remote wilderness area (see DESERT). They housed both hermits and *koimobia*; a number of holy men moved from one holy mountain to another in the course of their careers. Holy mountains often tended to be centers of Orthodox monastic resistance to such unpopular developments as ICONOCLASM (Olympos) or the UNION OF THE CHURCHES (Athos, Ganos); at the same time, new spiritual trends (e.g., PALAMISM) might begin in such a monastic center. Holy mountains tended to limit the access of women, whether as visitors or as nuns in permanent residence. Two of them (Athos and Meteor) strictly prohibited the admission of women to the mountain for any purpose; Latros had no numeraries at all; Galesios, Auxentos, and Olympos each had one, which functioned in part to house female relatives of monks who lived on the mountain (A.-M. Talbot, *GOrThR* 30 [1985] 21). –A.M.T.

HOLY RIDER, a modern term encompassing a variety of 5th- through 7th-C. amuletic images distinguished by a mounted figure. Following a well-established Antique iconographic tradition, most examples show the horse at full gallop and the figure, in military garb, impaling a beast or demon beneath the animal’s hooves. In some cases, the warrior is identified as Solomon or, more rarely, as St. Sisinnios; the victim is often a semi-nude female, the she-devil Gyllou (or Alabastria). The intent was not to portray a specific figure or historical event, but rather to evoke virtuous power and, more generally, the triumph of good over evil. Most Holy Rider AMULETS take the form of bronze pendants or haematite intaglio tokens, although the motif is found as well on amuletic rings, armbands, fibulae, belt fittings, and earthen tokens.

LIT. Bonner, *Studies*, nos. 294–326. Vikan, “Art, Medicine, & Magic” 79–82, n.59. –G.V.

HOLY SEPULCHRE. See SEPULCHRE, HOLY.

HOLY SPIRIT (πνεῦμα ἁγιου), third person of the TRINITY. The Holy Spirit appears in early Christian literature as a primary experience of the community and the individual Christian. His activity is manifested in his gifts, esp. the gift of prophecy which thrived in Syro-Palestine and Asia Minor, particularly in MONTANISM. In Christian experience, the Holy Spirit is encountered in the
baptismal liturgy, in the Trinitarian confession of faith, and in the doxology of the Church.

In the 4th C., the Council of Nicaea set forth a simple confession concerning the Holy Spirit: “We believe... also in the Holy Spirit.” But at the Synod of Antioch of 341 this simple formula was expanded and the Holy Spirit presented as the eschatological gift and “paraclete” promised by Jesus. These elaborations reveal that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was developed in conjunction with the concept of homoousios, the consubstantiality of the Logos with the Father.

The Pneumatomachoi were those who denied the deity of the Holy Spirit and depicted him as a created gift of God. Their most significant opponents were Athanasios of Alexandria and Basil the Great. In his four letters to Serapion of Thmuis, Athanasios unites the Holy Spirit to God himself. The Father effects all things through His Logos in the Holy Spirit, involving not only salvation, but creation as well. This Trinity, moreover, is indivisible, constituting one God. At the Synod of Alexandria held in 362, Athanasios argued for an expansion to the Nicaean Creed by condemning those who said that “the Holy Spirit is a creature separate from the essence of Christ” (PG 26:800A). To contemporaries such language approached Sabellianism (see Monarchianism); Markeleos of Ankyra, for example, had been misunderstood earlier when he said something similar.

A confession concerning the divine nature of the Holy Spirit was formulated for the first time in the theology of Basil and incorporated into the creed of the First Council of Constantinople (see under Constantinople, Councils of). The Holy Spirit is “the Lord, the Giver of Life.” In other words, he stands at the side of God the creator and redeemer. The formula, “He proceeds from the Father,” describes how he is distinguished from the Son within the inner relationships of the Godhead. The unity of worship expressed in the formula, “He is worshiped and glorified together with the Father and the Son,” confirms that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one in essence. “He spoke through the prophets,” does not explain the significance of prophecy, but the unity of Old Testament and New Testament and their divine testimonies. The term homoousios, after the controversies it provoked in the 4th C., was consciously avoided, but, inasmuch as the Spirit is introduced as the third hypostasis of the one divine essence, it was not retracted.

A major issue in Byz. theology concerned the filioque and the Procession of the Holy Spirit “from the Father.” That the Son or Logos participates in the Procession of the Holy Spirit was not called into question in either the Byz. or patristic traditions. Apart from some polemical formulas found in the writings of Photios, no one maintained that the Holy Spirit proceeds “from the Father alone”; rather, the Father is the single “uncaused Cause (aitia)” with respect to whom the Son can hold but a mediating position, a concept wholly in line with Greek speculation on first principles. This was expressed in the popular Byz. formula, “from the Father, through the Son” (ek tou patros dia tou hynon). In precisely this sense, Maximos the Confessor interpreted the formula used by Pope Martin I: the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. As the uncaused aitia, the Father is seen to be the “Ultimate Principle” which does not preclude a mediator (PG 91:136AB).

For Byz. theologians the cause of the controversy was not the coordinating formulas used in Western tradition as much as the addition of the filioque to the Nicaean-Constantinopolitan creed by Western theologians in the 7th C. The first polemical discussion on this point took place at the Council of Gentilly (767). The prelude to the controversy was set up in the Libri Carolini, and in the dispute that erupted in 808 over the use of the filioque in the liturgy of the Benedictine monks of Jerusalem. When Photios in his encyclical of 867 put forth the view that the filioque introduces two principles into the Godhead, thereby dissolving the unity of God (“The monarchy,” he says, “is dissolved into a ‘dysatheism’”), what had been an ecclesiastical question was now made a dogmatic issue.

The Photian Synod of 879/80 (see under Constantinople, Councils of) expressly declared that the filioque introduced a new heresy. Photios and his followers saw in the Procession (probole) of the Spirit a unique property that distinguishes the Spirit as a hypostasis in the Trinity. Both the Son and the Spirit come forth (proodoi) from a single principle: the Son in the manner of generation; the Spirit in the manner of procession, but apart from any mediation. Only in terms of the economy (oikonomia) of salvation does the Son partici-
pate in the sending of the Spirit. Strict Photians, therefore, distinguished between the "economic" and "immanent" models of the Trinity: the Spirit comes forth εκ του πατρος, communicates with mankind διά του θεοῦ (Theophylaktos of Ohrid, PG 123:1224D). This theme is evident in the Byz. theological controversies with, for example, Peter Grossolano or Anselm of Havelberg, or the controversy with Rome over Union of the Churches, particularly under Michael VIII Palaiologos, or at the Council of Ferrara-Florence.

The compromise that the Greek doctrine of mediation expressed by the formula διά του θεοῦ, "through the Son," has the same meaning as the Latin filioque is found already in the teaching of Niketas "of Maroneia." Some Byz. theologians even held views that approached the Latin position. Nikephorus Blemmydes, for example, was originally a strict Photian, but in two of his later writings he maintained that the Son's generation and the Spirit's procession can be differentiated only if the Son participates in the latter. These writings prompted John XI Bekkos to undertake a detailed study of patristic texts, which led to the Union of Lyons (1274). The study of Bekkos, however, had no impact on Byz. theology, which remained essentially Photian.


-K.H.-U.

HOLY TIE. See KERAMION.

HOLY TOWEL. See MANDYLION.

HOLY WEEK (ἡ μεγάλη ἐβδομάς), the week before EASTER, called "great" in Byz. usage, as are its days ("Great Monday," etc.). It originated in the extension to six days of the variable paschal period of fasting that ended at the Easter vigil, a development first seen ca. 250 in Dionysios of Alexandria, Ep. ad Basilidem 1 (The Letters and Other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria, ed. C.L. Feltoe [Cambridge 1904] 90–105). The Easter vigil was at first the only liturgical service of Easter Week, but Eusebios (HE, bk.2, ch.17.21–22) and Epiphanius of Salamis (Panarion, ed. Holl. 3:523.23) already bear witness to the existence of other vigils during the week, and in 384 Egeria (Diary 30–98) describes a full cycle of stational services in Jerusalem commemorating the Passion week (see GOOD FRIDAY), a cycle confirmed in detail by the 5th-C. Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem.

The Holy Week services in Constantinople differ little from those of other weeks in the Typikon of the Great Church (Mateos, Typikon 2:66–91). But by the 9th C. the more dramatic Jerusalem services had already begun to influence Constantinopolitan usage and were to predominate with the decline of the cathedral liturgy of Constantinople after 1204.

Imperial participation in the services of Holy Week was most evident on Holy Thursday. The emperor assisted at the liturgy, after which he distributed cinnamon and two apples to the dignitaries, then dined with guests (De cer. 33). There is no mention here of his participation either in the adoration of the Passion relics or in the Washing of the Feet. According to the Typikon, it is the patriarch who washes the feet of 12 clergymen after vespers (Mateos, Typikon 2:72f) as the New Testament account (Jn 13) of the event is read aloud. But in a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 288.10–299.20) the emperor himself washes the feet of 12 poor people before the start of the liturgy.


-R.F.G.

HOMER (Ὄμηρος), "the Poet," was the most widely read and studied ancient author in Byz. For example, Niketas Choniates' History contains 134 quotations from the Iliad (some used several times) and 58 from the Odyssey, whereas the next most popular writer, Lucian, is represented by only 24 passages. Byz. schoolmasters and students were constantly occupied with the Homeric poems, esp. the Iliad, which became a basic text in the curriculum; students memorized much of it. Thus citations from the Homeric epics are found throughout late antique and Byz. literature, although analysis of papyrological data suggests a decrease of interest in Homer in late antiquity. P. Mazon (Introduction à l'Iliade [Paris 1967] 64f) registers 75 fragments of the Iliad from the 3rd C., 17 from the 4th, 16 from the 5th, five from the 6th, and one from the 7th (uncertain papyri
such as the 2nd/3rd C. are here omitted). Nevertheless, educated church fathers quoted Homer: thus, Cyril of Alexandria, who barely mentions Homer's name, was influenced by Stoic tradition and saw in Homer's gods symbols of vices and virtues or metonymies of the elements of the cosmos; he rarely polemized against Homeric polytheism (G. Bartelink, WS n.s. 17 [1983] 62–68). Probably in the 6th C., an otherwise unknown female writer, Demo, wrote a commentary, primarily allegorical, on Homer. Dioskoros of Aphrodito in 6th-C. Egypt owned the famous Cairo codex of Homer and called him “the best poet.”

Interest in Homer revived in the 9th-10th C. The oldest complete MS of the Iliad, Venetus A (= Venice, Marc. gr. 454), which was formerly attributed to the scribe Ephraim and dated before 947 (B. Hemmerdinger, REGr 69 [1956] 433f), is probably from the last quarter of the 10th C. (E. Mioni, Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Padova 1 [1976] 185–93). The oldest copy of the Odyssey (Florence, Laur. 32.24) is also of the 10th C. The Epimerisms, commentaries of the most elementary nature, were dated by Ch. Theodoridis (BZ 72 [1979] 1–5) to the beginning of the 9th C., but A. Dyck (infra 7) places them in the 9th–10th C. At the same time collecting of scholia began; many of them are contained in Venetus A, but they derive mostly from Hellenistic and Roman sources (N. Richardson, CQ 30 [1980] 265). From Constantinople the knowledge of Homer expanded to Baghdad in the 9th C. (G. Strohmaier, BS 41 [1980] 196–200).

The most important Homeric scholarship dates from the 12th C.—the massive commentaries by Eustathios of Thessalonike and two long commentaries by Tzetzes. Eustathios used the vernacular Greek of his time and drew on the customs of peasants and townsfolk and recent events to explain the epic. He felt that Homer belonged to this world, sensing no distance between the Homeric past and his own day. Tzetzes' interpretation was more antiquarian (he tried to fill in the gaps in Homer's narrative) and allegorical, aimed at revealing historical, moral, and cosmological allegory. Among other commentators on Homer were Isaac Komnenos the Porphyrogennetos and George Lekapenos. Manuel Moschopoulos composed a paraphrase of the first two books of the Iliad, omitting the “Catalog of Ships.” The story of the Trojan War excited the imagination of vernacular authors such as Constantine Hemonos.

In an utterly unclassical manner, Homer is depicted as a young man with long hair in a 9th-C. MS of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos (Weitzmann, Gr. Myth., fig.96). Together with Orpheus and Hesiod he appears among the “theologians” attacked by the church fathers.


HOMILY. See Sermon.

HOMIOUSIANS (from ὁμοούσιος, "of like substance"), a group, often called “semi-Arians,” who refused to accept the term homooousios but who believed in the perfect divinity of Christ and the similarity of his divine nature to that of the Father. Although these beliefs may be traced back to Origen, the Homioiusians as a “party” came into existence ca.356 in an attempt to find a compromise between Orthodoxy and Arianism. Leading members of the Homioiusians were Basil of Ankyra, Makedonios of Constantinople, and George of Laodikeia; they were to be distinguished from the Homoians, who maintained closer ties to strict Arianism. The movement met opposition on philosophical grounds since nothing can be “like” God's nature; moreover, the assertion of "likeness" also implies difference, leading on the one hand to charges of polytheism and on the other to the identification with Arianism (Wolffson, Philosophy 336f). The Homioiusians did, however, influence the theology of the Cappadocian Fathers.

HOMOOUSIOS (ὁμοόυσιος, lit. "consubstantial," "of the same substance"), term crucial for the understanding of the relationship among the persons within the Trinity. Not used in the Bible, it was introduced by the 3rd C. in Gnostic interpretation of emanation and probably also in the Sabellian view of God’s epiphanies in history as Father, Son, and Spirit. Origen and his disciples seem not to have applied the term to the Son (R. Hanson in Epiktasis: Mêlanges Jean Daniélov [Paris 1972] 293–303), but the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata (268) condemned the consubstantiality of the Father and Son. Paul probably understood consubstantiality in a sense of Monarchianism, perceiving the Son only as an attribute (Logos = reason) of the Father, and the accusation was nothing but a dialectic argument against him. The further discussion of the term was provoked by the teaching of Arius that the Logos was a creation of the Father, his intermediary in the act of salvation and therefore subordinate to him. The teaching was rejected by the creed of the First Council of Nicaea that formulated the belief in the Son of God, born, not created, consubstantial (homoousios) with the Father. The idea of consubstantiality was to protect Monothelism against the concept of a separate God-mediator. The tendency to identify the substance of the persons, however, introduced the danger of Monarchianism that was interpreted as applying the notions of monoousios and tautoousios instead of homoousios and thus removing the hypostatic difference of the persons.

The term homoousios was under attack during the 4th C.; the semi-Arians wanted to replace it with homoeios ("similar") as representing a looser relationship or a recourse to Scripture (cf. Jn 5:19). It was the interpretation of the Cappadocian Fathers that brought forth a synthesis and produced the canonical formula “one ousia (substance), three hypostases.” This formulation preserved the concept of substantial identity as well as numerical difference of Godhead and provided Byz. theology with a weapon against the accusation of tritheism (Anastasios 1, patriarch of Antioch, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, Traditio 37 [1981] 105–08). Despite the opposition of the Pneumatarchoi, the term was also applied to the Holy Spirit. Through the definition of Chalcedon (451) the term entered Christology.


HOMOSEXUALITY (παθησαμωσία, ἀρρενομοιοτητά, ἀρρενοκοιτία), also called the “sin of sodomy” (e.g., Makarios the Great, PG 34:224B), was prohibited by the Old Testament (Lev 18:22) and continued to be condemned in Byz. It was common in the late Roman Empire when an abundance of young slaves and eunuchs created favorable circumstances for its practice. Many church fathers, esp. John Chrysostom, inveighed against this form of sexual activity. Denounced by the church as criminal and contrary to Holy Scripture, homosexuality was prohibited by Justinian I’s novels 77 and 141, which repeated the punishment of death by the sword decreed by Cod. Theod. IX 7.3. The same punishment was imposed by the Ecloga (17:38) and Ecloga ausa (17.6); the latter exempted youths under 15 from the death penalty, sentencing them instead to flogging and confinement in a monastery. Ecclesiastical law punished the sin with two or three years of excommunication. The Penitential of pseudo-John IV Nestitutes instructed the confessor to inquire about the sin of arrenokoiotia (PG 88:1893C) and detailed different forms of homosexuality.

Malalas (Mal. 436.6–15) describes the trial of two bishops accused of homosexuality, Isaiah of Rhodes and Alexander of Diospolis in Thrace. The former was exiled after cruel tortures, the latter castrated and dragged along the streets in an ignominious procession.

Accusations of homosexual behavior sometimes appear in Byz. polemics: thus Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 443.15) lists “the impious lust for men” among Constantine V’s vices. Such accusations became less common after the 9th C., probably as a result of the consolidation of family values and developing masculine ideals; in the last
centuries of Byz., however, complaints about homosexuality (e.g., in the writings of Pat. Athanasios I and Joseph Bryennios) were again heard. Homosexuality was found in both male and female monasteries (*typikon* of Phoberou monastery, 80.31–82.9); several *typika* denied access to beardless youths and/or eunuchs in an attempt to protect monks from temptation (C. Galatariotou, REB 45 [1987] 121f).

**HOMS.** See *Emesa*.

**HONORIUS** (*ōnôrios*), Western emperor (from 393), younger son of Theodosios I; born Constantinople 9 Sept. 384, died Ravenna 15 Aug. 423. He was summoned to the West by Theodosios in 394 and assumed power after his father’s death in 395. His elder brother Arkadios ruled the East and the whole empire was never again united. Because of Honorius’s youth the court was dominated by the *magister militum* Stilicho, whose two daughters, Maria and Theodoria, were married to Honorius ca. 398 and 408, respectively. The double portrait of Honorius on a consular diptych of 401 has persuaded most scholars that he is represented, together with Maria, on a cameo in Paris (Delbrück, *Consularidipytchen*, nos. 1, 66). In fear of Alaric, he moved his residence from Milan to Ravenna, which henceforth became the primary Western capital. After the death of Stilicho in 408 the patrician Constantius became the power behind the throne and married the emperor’s sister Gallæ Placidia. In 421 Constantius was made emperor, but his claims were rejected by Theodosios II, perhaps because Honorius was childless and the Eastern court had ambitions in the West. During the reign of Honorius, Rome was sacked by Alaric. Much of Gaul and Spain fell into barbarian hands. Honorius and his brother Arkadios were represented as consuls on the latter’s honorific column in Constantinople.

**HORMISDAS**, pope (from 20 July 514); born Frosinone, Campania, died Rome 6 Aug. 523. Hormisdas inherited the problem of the Arakian Schism but sought reconciliation with Byz. After the revolt of Vitalian, Emp. Anastasios I was forced to seek accommodation with supporters of the Council of Chalcedon and addressed the pope as mediator; Hormisdas sent his emissaries to Constantinople with a *libellus*—conventionally called the formula of Hormisdas—which required the full acceptance of Chalcedon and the condemnation of both the Nestorians and the Monophysites. The negotiations failed, but in 519 under Emp. Justin I a new papal embassy and Patr. John II (518–20) signed an agreement stating that the names of Akakios and his four successors on the patriarchal throne, as well as those of Zenus and Anastasios I, were to be deleted from the diplomas. The personal and ideological victory was, however, Pyrrhic (Caspar, *infra* 130), and in fact the pope’s influence over the eastern part of the empire (including Thessalonike) was drastically restricted; this is in contrast to Hormisdas’s funeral inscription (by his son, Pope Silverius) noting “Graecia’s obedience to your command.”

**HORISMOS** (*ὅρισμος*, lit. “definition”), term for an imperial decree, known from the late 11th C. onward; it was synonymous with the *prostagma*. The rare term *chrysoboullios horismos* designated a less solemn form of the *chrysobull*, which had no words written in red ink except for the emperor’s signature. The term could be applied to the charters of an emperor (e.g., *Koutoum*, no. 8.34), a *doux* (*Lauria* 1, no. 64.99), a despotes, or a metropolitan (*despotikos horismos*—*Xenoph*. no. 32.42).

HOROSCOPE (θέμα, θεμάτιον, ή διάθεμα; ὀροσκόπιον ὀροσκοπεῖον, ὀροσκόπιον) is the ascendant), the representation of the positions in the zodiac at a certain moment of the planets, of the cusps of the 12 astrological places (topoi), and sometimes of other astrological entities such as lots (klērotai). They may be either diagrams, in which case they are usually squares, or simple lists of longitudes. The latter is the normal method of presentation in documentary horoscopes (e.g., on papyri), which also usually are without any interpretation; diagrams are often used in literary sources, esp. astrological treatises, where they are normally accompanied by an interpretation.

Horoscopes may be cast for any significant moment in any of the branches of astrology, and, if interpreted, may provide information on social, economic, and political as well as biographical aspects of life in Byz. Since the seven planets move at different velocities, each horoscope generally represents a situation that is unique within the two millennia that astrology has flourished. They are, therefore, easily datable. Most interesting are the political horoscopes, which include the following:

1. The horoscope of Constantinople for 11 May 330, cast by Demophilos in ca.990 (D. Pingree in *Prismata* 305–15)
5. The horoscopes of the coronations of Alexios I Komnenos (on 1 Apr. 1081) and Manuel I (on 31 March 1143) (Pingree, “Choniades & Astronomy” 138ff, n.29)
6. The horoscope for the year prefixed to his almanac for 1336 by Andrew Libadenos (GCAG 7:152–160)
7. The horoscopes cast by John Abramios for Andronikos IV between 1373 and 1376 (Pingree, “Astrological School” 191–96)  —D.P.

HORSE FITTINGS. See CHARIOT MOUNTS AND HORSE FITTINGS.

HORSES (טַנֶּחָה, also עֲלוֹגָה). Horses were not common in the Roman Empire, where the principal beasts of burden were oxen and mules, and the army relied primarily on foot soldiers. The role of cavalry increased in the 4th–6th C. due to the conflict with mounted barbarians, and by the beginning of the 7th C. the cavalry was the most numerous of the Byz. elite troop formations (D.R. Hill in War, Technology and Society in the Middle East, ed. V.J. Party, M.E. Yapp [London 1975] 37); its role became crucial with the introduction of the kataphraktos. It is plausible to hypothesize that the invention of a new system of harnessing animals to a cart and plow increased the use of horses in everyday life. Late Byz. práktika suggest that only the richest peasants could afford horses, although two horses in one household are attested (Laure 2, no.99.135); less well-to-do villagers might have “half of a horse” (no.99.126.139). Great landowners like John VI Kantakouzenos owned large numbers of horses; Kantakouzenos complained that he lost 1,500 mares when his property was confiscated in 1241/2 (Kantak. 2:185.5–6). In the 11th C. the Athonite monastery of Xenophon (Xénonph., no.1.1541) possessed 100 dray horses and donkeys. The Byz. appreciated “Arab” horses; it is unclear whether the term refers to a breed or to animals imported from the caliphate. Thessaly was famous for its horses (e.g., An.Komn. 1:20.14), and imperial herds of horses were raised in Malagina.

As chariot races declined in significance after the 7th C., equestrian sports like polo and tournaments became popular in the higher echelons of society; horses were also used for hunting by nobles who chased deer and boar on horseback; the mounted knight, whether the emperor or St. George, was a symbol of manliness. Clergymen and women, on the other hand, were supposed to ride mules, and Jews in 12th-C. Byz. were forbidden to ride horses. The Byz. cared about their horses, and hippiatrica or “horse medicine” was a field of special study. The Geoponika discussed their diseases in book 16, and Oppian’s book on horses was popular.

The main elements of the harness of a saddle horse were the leather saddle attached by the girth strap (P. Connolly in Roman Military Equipment ed. M. Dawson [Oxford 1987] 11), the bridle with snaffle bit (Davidson, Minor Objects 337, no.2887), and the iron stirrup. (See also CHARIOT MOUNTS AND HORSE FITTINGS.)


HORTICULTURE, including arboriculture, was practiced extensively throughout the empire. In addition to fruit, the Byz. grew a wide variety of vegetables. Onions and cabbage were esp. important: NICHOLAS I MYSTIKOS (ep.152.3–5) relates that a village had to supply Hagia Sophia with cabbage (kranbe) and was therefore exempted from other state taxes. Legumes or pulses (ospría) of different kinds were also a mainstay of the diet. A donation of 1191 (MM 4:202.17–21) describes a household that possessed 120 modii of grain and 39 modii of three varieties of legumes—beans (phabata) and two sorts of peas (erebinthia). In the praetorian of Baris in 1073 the ratio was different (Patmou Engraphe 2, no.50.119): 410 modii of wheat and barley and only 5 modii of beans. A judicial decision of 1421 incorporates a list of vegetables raised on a garden farm in Thessalonike (Dölger, Schatz., no.102.23–24), including leeks, carrots, onions, garlic, lettuce, cucumbers, and gourds.

The Geoponika (bk.12.2.3) advises the farmer that three elements are necessary for the successful production of vegetables: fertile soil, water, and manure. The same text prescribes remedies for ridding gardens of grubs and insects (bk.12.8).
HOSIOS. See Saint.

HOSIOS DAVID, church in Thessalonike. Located in the northern part of the city, Hosios David is the earliest surviving example of a domed cross plan, dating to the last third of the 5th C. The church, which until 1921 was dedicated to Christ, is 14.75 m on a side; the dome has vanished but the pendentives survive. All but the eastern arm of the cross are accessible from the exterior through doors. In the apse is a mosaic of the young beardless Christ, seated on a cloud, in a rainbow mandorla over the Four Rivers of Paradise, flanked by the Evangelist symbols and figures thought to represent the prophets Ezekiel and Habakkuk or Isaiah. An inscription below invokes Christ as the source of living waters. The mosaic is now generally dated to the late 5th C., although alternatives as late as the 7th C. have been proposed (Kitzinger, Making 141, n.41). Frescoes illustrating four Great Feasts have been discovered in and below the south vault; these date from the third or last quarter of the 12th C. and provide a transition between the style of Nerezi and that of the 13th C., for example, Mileseva (E. Tsigaridas, Hoi toichographies tes mones Latomou Thessalonikes hai he byzantine toigraphike tou 12ou aiwono [Thessalonike 1986]). Other frescoes from the late 13th to early 14th C. have been found elsewhere in the church.

The church served as the katholikon of the Latomou monastery, which is first attested in the first half of the 9th C. when Joseph the Hymnographer took up residence there; it is not mentioned again in historical sources until the Palaiologan period. After the Ottoman conquest of Thessalonike in 1430, it was transformed into a mosque, the Murad Camii.

A legendary tale by the monk Ignatios, hegoumenos of the Akauiou monastery in the 11th C., recounts that the daughter of the emperor Maximin secretly converted to Christianity and commissioned a picture of the Virgin. After it was mysteriously transformed into an image of Christ, she had it concealed under a layer of bricks;

subsequently the Latomou monastery was built on the site. Under the Iconoclastic emperor Leo V, the revetment suddenly fell off, revealing the image beneath (Jalin, Eglises centre 392–94). A 14th-C. icon in Sofia bears the image of Christ, identified by inscription as “Jesus Christ of the miracle of Latomos” (A. Grabar, CahArch 10 [1959] 289–99); it clearly seems to be a copy of the mosaic in Thessalonike.

HOSIOS LOUKAS, monastery and pilgrimage site in Phokis (Greece), known for the wonder-working tomb of its eponymous saint, Loukas the Younger, in the larger of its two churches. The smaller, cross-in-square church, now dedicated to the Theotokos, may be the same as the Church of St. Barbara mentioned in the vita of Loukas. According to Stikas (infra), the smaller church was built between 946 and 955 by Krinites Arotas, strategos of the theme of Hellas, who was resident in Thebes. Bouras (infra), on the other hand, attributed the Theotokos church to the patronage of Romanos II, dating it shortly after 960 on the basis of the marble reliefs of its drum revetment, templon screen, etc. While the Theotokos lacks painted decoration, that of the adjacent katholikon is the oldest mosaic program from the period of the 10th–11th C.

The plan of the larger church, which replaced a little martyrium built after Loukas’s death (953), is complicated by a domed octagonal core allowing squinches to support the main dome. This fell after an earthquake in 1593, but most of the church’s mosaics, including more than 150 images of saints, are preserved. D. Mouriki (CorsiRav 31 [1984] 397) has dated them to the 1020s. The Christological mosaics in the narthex are notable for their severe symmetry, as are the iconlike panels in the naos; in the same style and probably contemporary are frescoes in the northwest, southeast, and northeast chapels (this last specifically connected with Loukas’s cult), as are those in the narthex gallery and in the crypt around his tomb. No document survives relating directly to
HOSIOS MELETIOS, monastery on the south side of Mt. Kithairon (Myoupolis), on the border between Attica and Boeotia, founded ca. 1081 by MELETIOS THE YOUNGER. The monastery flourished in the 12th to early 13th C.; its hegoumenos Ioannikios corresponded with Michael CHONITES. Initially after 1204 Hosios Meletios remained in Greek hands, but in 1218 it was controlled by the Latins and was plundered, perhaps by Theodore Komnenos Doukas of Epiros. The monastery is surrounded by a rectangular fortification. The katholikon is a cross-in-square of Con-

the foundation of the katholikon. Bouras argues that it was built between 997 and 1031; M. Chatzidakis (CahArch 19 [1969] 127–59) suggested the date of 1011, while Stikas proposed that the ktor was Constantine IX. Similar reliefs are found at a metochion of Hosios Loukas at Aliveri in Euboea, dated 1014 by inscription (not 1010, as in A. Grabar, Sculptures II, pls. XXVII–XXVIII, pp. 60f).


HOSPITALLERS

HOSPITAL (ξενών, νοσοκομείον). One of the early Christian customs that impressed pagans was the care of the infirm, ill, and the elderly; by the 4th through 6th C., institutions were established that functioned as combinations of hostels and sick bays. Documentation is controversial for hospitals in the early centuries of the Byz. Empire, and scholars define the term hospital differently, but it seems certain that fully operational institutions for health care of the sick were founded by the 9th or 10th C. in the major cities; Miller (infra) argues for a date as early as the 6th C. The most meticulously documented hospital is that of the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople (1136). The monastery’s tyôkôon describes in detail the institution’s use of special physicians and five pharmacists who compounded drugs on orders from the attending doctors; the 50 beds were divided among five wards separated by diagnosis of various illnesses. The women’s ward had a female physician (iatraina); two surgeons and two physicians staffed an outpatient clinic. The medical staff included an ophthalmologist, a specialist surgeon for hernia repair, and an attendant who kept the surgical instruments sharp and clean. Other known hospitals include that at the Great Lavra on Athos (10th C.), and in Constantinople the 10th-C. Xenon of Sampson (PG 115:309B–304B) and the Lips Monastery (14th C.). Victims of leprosy were treated in specialized hospitals.

HOSPITALITY (φιλοξενία), an aspect of philanthropy, which pious Byz. practiced both on a private basis (subject to state approval—cf. vita of Gregory of Dekapolis 54.2–7) and institution-

ized in the form of hospices (xenodocheia) for passing travelers in the provinces and for needy provincials who had to stay in Constantinople. Most information on such hospitality comes from monastic sources. Most xenodocheia built after the 9th C. were attached to monasteries. Two late 11th-C. tyôkôa indicate the type of food and shelter provided. At Rhaidesos, Michael Attakeites arranged for pilgrims to the Holy Land and other poor wayfarers to be fed and lodged in an annex to his prochotropheion, where two modioi of bread and a measure of wine were to be allocated weekly for their sustenance (ed. P. Gautier, REB 39 [1981] 49). Gregory Pakourianos established three xenodocheia on the estates of his monastery of Petritzos (Baçkovo), one at Stenimachos near Philippiopolis, and two on the coast road near the mouth of the Strymon. The first, equipped with “many beds,” a stove, and a portable brazier, provided warm accommodation where sick travelers could stay for three nights, or longer in critical cases. This hostel had a daily allocation of two modioi of wheat and two measures of wine—double the amount allocated to each of the other two hostels. In all three, the basic diet of bread and wine was supplemented by a variable cooked dish (prophagion) prepared from dried and fresh vegetables (ed. P. Gautier, REB 42 [1984] 110–15).

HOSPITALLERS, or Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, a military-monastic order founded in the Holy Land in the early 12th C. The predominantly French order played a vital role in the Crusader kingdoms, providing military and medical services. After the expulsion of the Crusaders from Acre in 1291, the Hospitallers embarked upon the conquest of Rhodes (1508-10), following a brief interlude on Cyprus. Rhodes remained their base until 1522 when the island was captured by the Ottomans. The Hospitallers exercised a benevolent rule over the local Greek populace, who regarded them as protectors.

Despite their limited numbers and small fleet, the Hospitallers continued their crusading efforts in the 14th and 15th C., primarily against the Turkish emirates on the west coast of Asia Minor, like Menteshe and Aydin. In 1344
involved in the Latin recovery of the port of Smyrna from Umer Beg and defended the lower fortress until 1402 when it was destroyed by Timur. The Hospitallers had few direct relations with Byz. except during the reign of Manuel II. In 1390 they sent two galleys to Constantinople to help Manuel depose his usurper nephew John VII. In desperation after the Christian defeat by the Ottomans at Nikopolis in 1396 (Zakythinos, Despot 1:347), Theodore I Palaiologos sold Corinth to the Hospitallers in 1397 and the rest of the despotate in 1400. The Hospitallers successfully defended the Isthmus of Corinth against the Turks, but withdrew by 1403, at least in part because of the hostility of the local Greeks. By 1404 Theodore had recovered all of the despotate from the Hospitallers.


---

**HOUR (ωρα).** The Byz. divided both night and day into 12 hours each (numbered 1 through 12) so one referred to the “seventh hour of the night” (Theoph. 319.10–11) or the “fourth hour of the day” (ibid. 493–30). Such hours inevitably varied in length according to both latitude and season. The “first hour” (prote hora) was at sunrise; the “third hour” (trite hora) midmorning; the “sixth hour” (hekate hora) noon; the “ninth hour” (henate hora) midafternoon. Hespera (evening) was one hour before sunset, and apodeipnon the period after sunset. In addition to its division into hours, the night could also be divided in accordance with Roman custom into four vigiliae or “watches.” The hours were measured by a sundial or horologion such as a waterclock.

The unequal length of hours made their further partition into smaller components rather difficult and quite theoretical. For everyday life it was usual to refer to the “half hour” and “quarter hour.” A period of time—a “point” or “moment”—was defined as stigme (= Lat. punctum). One of the rare sources to mention it is the vita of Loukas the Styliste (ed. Delehaye, Saints stylistes 229.15–17). For astronomical purposes, however, Byz. computists divided the day into 24 equal hours but employed different systems of division. According to that of Psellos, for example, 1 hour

= 5 lepta; 1 lepton = 4 stigmata; 1 stigme = 12 rhopai (G. Redd, Byzantion 5 [1929–30] 257–15). On the other hand, an anonymous computist of the 11th–12th C. (ed. F. Karnthaler, BN 1 [1934] 5:24–26) measures one hour as equivalent to 5 stigmata, 10 lepta, 150 moirai, 1,200 ripai, etc.


---

**HOURS, LITURGICAL (ωρα),** often called the “Divine Office,” a schedule of daily prayer comprising, with variations depending on the tradition, orthros, the “Little Hours” (First, Third, Sixth, and Ninth, or prime, terce, sext, and none), vespers, apodeipnon, mesonyghtikon (nocturns), and occasional vigils. To these are sometimes added “intermediate” and “Great” or “Imperial” Hours. The Byz. intermediate hours, or monastic mesoria, are said after each of the Little Hours only during the lent preceding the feasts of the Nativity and Sts. Peter and Paul. The “Great Hours,” also called “Imperial,” a form of Little Hours characterized by three scripture lections, a prophecy, an apostle, and a gospel, are celebrated on Good Friday and the vigils of Nativity and Epiphany. Great Hours were first created from elements originally found in a single Palestinian Good Friday vigil service at the ninth hour. Great Hours are not found in the horologion but in the triodion and the menaion for the days indicated.

The hours are a formalization of early Christian private prayer at set times, based on the New Testament command to pray without ceasing. The full cursus results from monastic developments of the 4th C. when the two original hours (orthros and vespers) were filled in with services at the other traditional times of private prayers (third, sixth, and ninth hours and at night).

Most Divine Offices are hybrids resulting from a synthesis of cathedral and monastic usages. One such office was created under the aegis of St. Theodore of Studios (see SToudITE Typika). This “Stoudite” office combined the prayers and diaconika of the cathedral office of Constantinople, contained in the euchologion, with the psalmody and hymns of the monastic office used in Jerusalem, contained in the horologion. By the 12th C. this hybrid Stoudite office had spread throughout the Orthodox world, even back to Palestine; there, at the Lavra of St. Sabas, it was somewhat altered.
to suit the more austere, less rigidly cenobitic lifestyle of the Palestinian anachoretes, and a further synthesis was made (see Sabattic Typika), which eventually took over the field (see Byzantine Rite). Its rubrics were codified by Patr. Philotheos Korkinos (PG 154.745–66). There are two extant 15th-C. commentaries on the hours: the Treatise on Prayer by Symeon of Thessalonike (PG 155.535–670; tr. H.L.N. Simmons [Brookline, Mass., 1984]) and one by Mark Eugenikos (PG 160.1163–93).


—R.F.T.

HOUSES (sing. okkia). In the late Roman Empire houses took two main forms: the insula or apartment house, and the domus or private residence. Descriptions of the regions of Rome in the mid-4th C. list 46,602 insulae and 1,797 domus. The excavations at Ephesus unearthed two insula-type buildings that were constructed in the 1st C., but underwent numerous remodelings up to the 7th C. The ground floor contained vaulted shops above which were situated modest rectangular rooms. The two-story mansion of a wealthy citizen formed a component of one insula. There is no archaeological evidence concerning later insulae, but written sources attest their existence in Constantinople, mentioning “five-roofed” (pentorophoi) houses and containing complaints about neighbors who kept pigs on upper floors. The ground plan of the domus was a peristyle type, containing an inner courtyard (atrium) surrounded by rooms that formed the outer walls of the house. The domus was usually a one-story dwelling with many conveniences, including a bath, kitchen, latrines, plumbing and heating systems, and storage rooms. By the 7th C. the focal point of the house shifted from the atrium to the second floor gallery (hyponeum), where guests were received (E. Mioni, OrChrP 17 [1951] 83–24–25).

A series of laws (Cod. just. VIII 10.12) regulated the construction of a new house or the remodeling of an old one. The law ordained that a distance of at least 12 Greek feet had to be maintained between houses. Repairs to an old house were allowed, but not changes to its original plan. Neighbors’ access to daylight and a view of the sea (esp. in Constantinople) were protected. A balcony could not be built over a street less than 12 feet wide. Furthermore, a staircase leading from the street to the balcony was not permitted because it presented a fire hazard or could obstruct traffic in the street.

The Byz. town houses that have been unearthed in excavations and that date from 1000 onward present several building types. One common plan of a private residence (e.g., at Corinth, Athens, Pergamon, Thebes) was a rectangular building with a central open space that had no peristyle, but perhaps an open-fronted roof; the courtyard and the surrounding rooms on the ground floor served as storerooms for agricultural products (with pithoi placed in the pseudo-atrium), stables, etc. Workshops (ergasteria) were also situated on the ground floor; living quarters were upstairs. Another common plan was a house without a courtyard or with a narrow courtyard in front of the main façade (e.g., at Pergamon and Eupipos). Construction was of poor quality, with frequent reuse of ancient architectural elements. The rooms were small and irregular in shape, and the houses were erected along narrow alleys without any obvious planning.

Written sources demonstrate the same irregularity of the house even in Constantinople. In his foundation charter of 1077 (ed. P. Gautier, REB 39 [1981] 27.159–29.181) Attaleiates describes his mansion in the capital, which consisted of several buildings connected by a common courtyard; the buildings had a ground floor (katageon) and an
upper floor (heliakos) that projected over the courtyard; the mansion also included a chapel and a three-story dwelling with a donkey-driven mill on the ground floor. Another important description is found in a purchase deed of 1320 for a house in Thessalonike (Dölger, Schatz., no. 111.16–26): it was made of stone and brickwork covered with tiles; adjacent was a two-story building with a thatched roof. The houses of the wealthy provided separate quarters for women, usually in the inner part of the building.

Houses in the countryside were usually modest: built of wood, unbaked bricks, or even reeds, they were rectangular in plan and consisted of small rooms and a porch (e.g., at Armatova in Elis [Peloponnesos]); some had only one or two rooms, with earthen floors, open hearths, and a timber roof (e.g., at Lun in northern Italy—B. Ward-Perkins, BSR 49 [1981] 91–98). Nicholas Mesarites describes village houses made of reeds plastered with mud and covered with thatched roofs. In sharp contrast were the mansions of wealthy landowners (like Digenes Akritas), surrounded by gardens and defended by walls and towers (Pyrgoi).

The architectural decoration of houses was usually simple, but noble mansions and palaces might be ornamented with polychrome façades, arcades, and balconies as at Tekfur Saray in Constantinople, or with a columned front as on the site of the Seraglio, or with niches and blind arcades as in Mistra (A. Orlandos, ABME 3 [1937] 1–114). The window openings, wide on the upper stories and narrower on the ground floor level, were mostly semicircular.


HRABŮR ČERNORIZEC ("militant monk"), Slavic monk who wrote a brief and enigmatic treatise, *On the Alphabet*; fl. ca. 880. The authorship, date, and purpose of the work have been much debated since it first came to the attention of scholars in 1824. The text opens with a short discussion of the history of the Greek alphabet, drawing on both classical and Christian sources, and of the invention of the Slavonic alphabet by St. Constantine the Philosopher. It then goes on to a vigorous and passionate defense of the religious use of the *Church Slavonic* language and alphabet against the proponents of the trilingual dogma, who believed that the liturgy could be celebrated only in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. The consensus today is that the author was a Bulgarian, probably a member of the circle of Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria before his accession, and that the treatise was written between 885, when the pupils of Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios reached Bulgaria, and 893, when Symeon succeeded his father. During this period there was conflict in Bulgaria between users of the new Slavonic liturgy and Byz. clergy using the Greek liturgy. The treatise shows considerable linguistic discernment.

*Ed. O. piomech, ed. A. Giambelluca-Kossova* (Sofia 1986).

—R.B.

HRIPŠIMÉ. See VALARŠAPAT.

HUDÚD AL-ÂALAM (The Regions of the World), an anonymous Persian geographical treatise written in 982/3, and one of the earliest surviving Persian prose texts. A comprehensive descriptive analysis of the world as known to 10th-C. Muslims, it was composed by an armchair scholar utilizing other books (primarily those by Ibn Khurdadhbeh, Jayhani, and al-Istakhri) and oral traditions. The early geographical sources for knowledge of Byz. have been identified as the two Byz. prisoners, Abi Muslin al-Jarmi (redeemed 845–46) and Hârûn ibn Yahyâ (late 9th C.). The dates of their information are quite relevant to the anachronistic description that the Hudûd al-Âalam presents of Byz., including 14 Byz. provinces (three in Europe and 11 in Anatolia), thus repeating Ibn Khurdadhbeh and Qudâmâ ibn Ja'far. Constantine VII Porphyrogenetus, on the other hand, who wrote earlier than the Hudûd al-Âalam, lists 12 provinces in the west and 18 in Anatolia. Furthermore, the treatise’s evidence on Byz. cities is inconsistent. Of the land of Rûm it says, “It has many towns and villages,” and “Each of these provinces... has numerous towns, vil-
lages, castles, fortresses... only to contradict itself: "In the days of old, cities were numerous in Rüm, but now they have become few." By the late 10th C. it would seem that the number and size of cities were in fact on the increase.


---S.V.

HUGEBURG, 8th-C. Anglo-Saxon nun in the Franconian abbey of Heidenheim who composed the stylistically ambitious but grammatically shaky Lives (BHL 8966, 8931) of two brothers who were her relatives: Wynnebald, first abbot of Heidenheim (ca.751–61), and Willibald, bishop of Eichstätt (741–24 Sept. 787), collaborators with St. Boniface in the evangelization of Germany. Willibald dictated his account to Huguburg on 23 June 778; her retelling of his travels (723–29) in Byz. Italy, western Asia Minor, the Holy Land, and Constantinople displays linguistic characteristics distinct from Huguburg's diction and seems to follow closely Willibald's own words. It focuses on pilgrimage shrines but also sheds light on shipping routes and conditions (via Monemvasia "in Slawinia" and the Aegean, 93.1–94.8, 101.16–102.13), towns (Ephesus, "Strobolis" [= Strobilos]), styliates at Miletos (93.15–24), monuments (Jerusalem; tombs of Sts. Andrew, Timothy, Luke, and John Chrysostom in Constantinople; the church in Nicæa, seat of Nicæa I, 101.18–28), general historical conditions (Cyprus's neutrality and peace between Byz. and the Arabs, 95.23–17: plague in Syria, 100.3–9; cf. Theoph. 1:410,19–20), water buffaloes in Palestine (96.10–11), the embassy of Emp. Leo III to Pope Gregory II (100.28–30), and the contemporary state of legends (e.g., an anti-Jewish anecdote about the Virgin's funeral, 97.32–98.5) in one of the most obscure periods of Byz. history. There is no apparent reference to Iconoclasm.


--M.McC.

HUMANISM, a scholarly term often used to designate a certain period of cultural development and, in this sense, identical or similar to the concept of renaissance. Thus, for I.P. Medvedev (Vizantijskij gumanizm XIV–XV vv. [Leningrad 1976] 4) humanism is the "philosophical and literary stream of the Renaissance period." All the cautionary statements applied to the concept of Byz. renaissance(s) remain valid with respect to Byz. humanism, although we can safely assume the existence of individual humanists in Byz. (e.g., PLETHON) or of certain humanistic features in late Byz. culture. It is doubtful, however, that Byz. ever had a humanistic milieu resembling that of Italy in the 14th and 15th C.

From a different perspective, Hunger (Reich 355–59) describes "Christian humanism" as a phenomenon distinct from the Western Renaissance; the core of this humanism is the confluence of Christian and classical elements, a conciliatory attitude toward the ancient heritage. The concept of perpetual humanism meshes better with the idea of Byz. continuity than that of perpetual renaissance since it does not require revivals and their counterpart—cultural gaps or dark ages. Humanism has also been identified with Christian philanthropy and active efforts to alleviate human...
misery (Constantelos, *Philanthropy* 66). Lemerle (Humanism xi) speaks of two Byz. humanisms, the first of which, in the 9th-10th C., “corresponds” (chronologically) to the obscure centuries in the West, whereas the second humanism, that of the Palaiologoi, having been prepared already during the Komnenian period, developed through contacts with the West. Lemerle, however, does not define the notion of humanism.


-A.K.

**HUMBERT** (Oδηπέρτος), cardinal of Silva Candida; born ca.1000, died Rome 5 May 1061. As a monk at Moyenmoutier (Lorraine), Humbert studied Greek; he accompanied Pope Leo IX to Rome and became the principal Greek scholar in the Curia. He translated and responded to the letter on Latin ecclesiastical usages by Leo of Ohrid, sent in 1053 to John, bishop of Trani. Humbert then headed Leo IX’s embassy to Emp. Constantine IX, arriving in Constantinople early in 1054. His letters to Patriarch Michael I Keroularios, treatises against Byz. liturgical practices, and response to Niketas Stethatos inflamed the patriarch and clergy. His intemperate polemics contributed to a controversy that Constantine IX tried vainly to quell. On 16 July 1054 Humbert deposited on the altar of Hagia Sophia a bull excommunicating Keroularios and his followers (PL 143:1001-04). It condemned the lack of the filioque in the Creed and various Byz. liturgical customs, esp. the use of leavened bread rather than azymes. Following his return, Humbert’s self-justifications helped perpetuate the schism.


-C.M.B.

**HUMOR.** Laughter was considered in antiquity as a virtue, a divine quality, and writers (including Plutarch) collected jokes and anecdotes often ascribed to famous personages. An anonymous collection of this kind was produced, probably in the 3rd-5th C., under the title of Laughter-Lover (Philogelos). Christian society, however, rejected laughter; it was replaced by tears of contrition, compunction, and a quiet smile, frequently described as a quality of a saint. Attitudes toward humor nevertheless remained ambivalent: not only did the Philogelos survive in a number of MSS, but Sokrates (HE 6:22) describes a collection of theological jokes attributed to Bp. Sisinnios. Byz. humor might take the form of a fun; for example, in a 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 44:1:23-27), when Isaac II asked for some salt (balas) at dinner, the mime Chaliboures replied, “Let us first come to know these women, and then command others (allas) to be brought in.” The Byz. also found humor in improper or absurd situations such as the lascivious dance of the old lady Maryllis, described by Niketas Eugeneianos (Hunger, *Lit. 2:136*). Exaggerated improper situations were frequently used in personal invective and religious polemic, and in such genres as satire, parody, and epigram; the elements of self-mockery developed as well. The peak of humor was achieved by Christopher of Mytilene, Psellus, Pschoprodromos, Eustathios of Thessalonike, and Sachlikes. There was also coarse and graceless humor, consisting of the culmination of contorted curses.


-A.K.

**HUNGARY,** country founded by the Magyars or Hungarians, a people whom the Byz. called Tourkot and, from the 10th C. onward, Oungroi (early evidence for Oungroi is found in the vita of Basil the Younger). In the 9th C., Hungarians lived in the basin of the Don River and, according to an Arabic source, sold Slavic captives in Cimmerian Bosporos to the Byz. In 887 the Hungarians for the first time entered into direct military contact with Byz.: according to a revised version of George Hamartolos, the Bulgarians invited the Oungroi to put down a rebellion of Byz. captives on the Danube, but the Byz. fleet overcame the Oungroi and repelled their attack (Zlatarski, *Lit. 1*:339ff). In the Byz.-Bulgarian war of 894-96 they acted as Byz. allies but, under pressure from the Pechenegs, moved westward and settled in Pannonia, where they organized their state under the dynasty of the Arpads.

In the 10th C., the Hungarian often invaded the Balkans; a Hungarian legend eulogizes the
chief Botond, who allegedly knocked a hole in the gates of Constantinople with his battle-ax. In 948, two Hungarian princes were baptized in Constantinople. In 953 a Greek monk was sent as bishop to Hungary; the mission was temporarily successful, esp. in the eastern and southern parts of the country, but when István (Stephen) I (1000–
1038), the first Catholic king, defeated rival Byzantine relatives and chief-tains, Greek influence began to decline. Even though Greek monasteries were founded in the 11th C., and Greek-speaking monks lived in some religious houses as late as 1210, the country became increasingly Catholic and Latin-oriented. Byz. goldsmith-work, jewels, ecclesiastical vessels, reliquaries, and coins reached Hungary throughout the 11th–12th C., partly by trade, but mostly as imperial gifts; best known among these are the gold treasure of Nagyszentmiklós, the so-called Monomachos crown (probably a gift to Andrew I) and the crown given to Géza I (now the lower part of the “Holy Crown of Hungary”; see CROWNS).

After László I (Ladislas) penetrated into Croatia and Kálman (Coloman) annexed Dalmatia, the territorial conflicts between Constantinople and Hungary caused several wars; Hungary often made alliances with Serbia, the Normans, and the principalities of Rus’ against Byz. In the 12th C. the situation became very complicated: while there were many dynastic contacts between the Árpád and Constantinople, the support frequently granted to Árpád pretenders by Constantinople caused recurrent tension between Hungary and Byz. When Béla III—who for a while was expected to unite both states under his rule—returned to Hungary, he turned definitively to the West and, from the 13th C. onward, the intensity of Byz.-Hungarian relations decreased. When, however, the Ottoman threat became serious, Byz. turned to Hungary for help: in 1366, Emp. John V Palaiologos visited Lajos (Louis) I of Hungary; in 1423/4 John VIII sought an alliance with Sigismund of Hungary; and in 1434–36 two Byz. embassies visited Hungary during their trips to the West. János Hunyadi, who had been successful in repelling the Turks from the borders of Hungary, was defeated in 1444 when he mounted a crusade that was crushed at Varna, and in 1452/3 he acted too slowly to prevent the fall of Constantinople.

HUNS (Ouvros), an Asian (possibly Turkic) people that appears in Roman sources beginning with Ammianus Marcellinus: it is generally accepted that the Huns are to be identified with the Hsiung-nu of Chinese sources and are related to the Ephthalites in Central Asia. Around 375 the Huns crossed the Danube, conquered the Alans, and expelled the Goths from the steppe north of the Black Sea. They participated in the Visigoth attacks on the empire but after 380 retired north of the Danube. After 450 they moved westward to Gaul. Their attitude toward the empire was ambivalent for several decades: some Huns served as foederati, others organized raids—in 422, under the command of “King” Ruga, they reached Thrace (B. Croke, GRBS 18 [1977] 347–67). In the east, the Huns in 395 crossed the Caucasus but were destroyed by the Romans at the Ephrates. Ruga’s successors were Bleda and Attila. Attila created an “empire” that reached from Gaul to the northern Balkans, but after his defeat by Attila the empire of the Huns disintegrated quickly.

The Hunnic empire was a conglomerate of various nations, including Alans and some Germanic tribes. The Huns were nomads, although archaeological finds include some agricultural implements. They were horsemen, armed with bows and swords, who astonished Romans by their speed and discipline. Prisikos of Panion noted that the Huns treated their slaves well and that Roman craftsmen worked for the Huns. A. Bernštam (Otech istorii ganov [Leningrad 1951]) suggests that the Huns played a progressive role in history by destroying slave-owning societies; E.A. Thompson (A History of Attila and the Huns [Oxford 1948] 209) asserts that in the West the magister militum Attilus, as a representative of the great landowners, looked forward to cooperation with the Huns against the Visigoths and Bagaudae, whereas in the East the ruling class induced Theodosios II to fight Attila.

After the collapse of the reign of Attila, the name Hun was applied to various peoples: some

of them (Sabir, Cotrigurs and Utrigurs) may have been related to the Huns, but for others (Bulgarians, Avars, Hungarians, even Ottomans) it was only an archaizing ethnic designation.


HUNS, WHITE. See Ephthalites.

HUNTING (κυνήγιον). In the Byz. countryside hunting had first of all a practical purpose—protection of the flocks from wild beasts. It also provided meat as a supplement to the diet, although it was not as important as fishing. Farmers snaring hares are represented in MS illumination (e.g., Kádár, Zoological Illuminations 179, 225). They also hunted quail: a post-Byz. text describes a great slaughter of quail in Crete in 1494, when a single night’s catch netted 4,000 birds (Canon Pietro Casola’s Pilgrimage to Jerusalem, tr. M. Newett [Manchester 1907] 316f).

Hunting played a more important role as a pastime of the upper class and is represented on their possessions, such as silks and an ivory casket in Troyes (Athens Cat., no.52). Three emperors (Theodosios II, Basil I, and John II) died in hunting accidents. There were imperial officials called protokynegos and protoberakarios, and hunting images formed a signal element of imperial symbolism. Hunting was also considered a good substitute for military training (cf. Spanias, ed. Wagner, p.6,122–23). Enthusiasm for hunting peaked under the Komnenoi, when special ekphrasis on hunting became fashionable (e.g., by Constantine Manasses and Constantine Pan-technes). On the other hand, Michael Psellus, who was expressing the intellectual outlook of his time, had no enthusiasm whatsoever for hunting (Psellus, Scripta Min. 2:205,3–6).

The quarry of noble hunters was primarily bears, boars, and deer, but smaller animals such as hares and birds were also hunted. The prey of the various social classes—which are distinguishable by their costume—is illustrated in the Venice Kynegetika MS of Oppian. The spear was the most common hunting weapon. Noble hunters rode horses; the Byz. also trained dogs and leopards for hunting as well as various birds for hawking. Pero Tafur (ed. M. Letts, 1451) observed that the Greeks were great hunters with falcons, goshawks, and dogs. The equipment of the fowler was simpler: nets, decoy birds in cages, long cords, bird-line, and reeds. His pursuit is treated in illuminated MSS (Treasures II, fig.300) as one of the seasonal activities evoked by the Easter homily of Gregory of Nazianzos.


HUNYADI, JÁNOS (lxýgchos ó Χουνιάδης, in Chalkokondyles usually Χουνιάτης), Hungarian general and statesman; born between 1407 and 1409, died Zemun 11 Aug. 1456. Probably of Wallachian origin, Hunyadi began his career as a retainer at baronial courts and achieved the high posts of voivod of Transylvania and, in 1446–53, regent for the minor László (Ladislas) V. He also amassed great wealth.

In 1442–43 Hunyadi successfully campaigned against the Turks, reconquering Niš and Sofia. However, the crusade of Varna in which he participated in 1444 ended in disaster. In early 1451 Hunyadi signed a three-year truce with Mehmed II, confirming it on 20 Nov. on condition that the sultan would build no strongholds on the Danube. When Mehmed began preparation for the last siege of Constantinople, Constantine XI sent envoys to Hunyadi. In the fall of 1452, the Hungarians agreed to assist if they received Mesembria as their operational base. After long deliberations, a chrysobull was delivered to Hunyadi that granted him Mesembria (Reg 5, no.3545). In Apr. 1453 Hunyadi’s ambassadors appeared in Mehmed’s camp, threatening to wage war unless the Turks ceased besieging Constantinople. The rumors about Hunyadi’s intervention as well as frightening omens in the Turkish camp caused Mehmed to waver, but the military council insisted on maintaining the siege. It was too late for Hunyadi to intervene, but in 1456, when Mehmed besieged Belgrade, Hunyadi won a victory that stopped the Turkish advance for decades. Soon thereafter Hunyadi died of the plague.
HYAKINTHOS OF CYPRUS, metropolitan of Thessalonike (ca. late spring 1345–spring 1346); born Cyprus, died Thessalonike before 19 May 1346. Little is known of this anti-Palamite hieromonk; he lived at the monastery of the Hodegon in Constantinople and is probably to be identified with the Hyakinthos who carried letters from Nikophonos Gregoras to George Lapites in Cyprus. Gregory Akindynos praised Hyakinthos in his correspondence as “admirable” and “most holy” (ed. Hero, eps. 52.48–49, 60.54). He was made metropolitan by Patr. John XIV Kalekas, but was unable to enter Thessalonike until fall 1345, when the Zealots regained control of the city. His short tenure was marked by persecution of Palamite clergy and monks. Kyrrres (infra) argues that Hyakinthos was the metropolitan attacked in the “Anti-Zealot” Discourse of Nicholas Kabasilas for simony, alienation of property, and imposing fixed taxes on monasteries.


HYBRIS (ὑβρίς), injury to another person through word or deed; it even includes trespassing. Hybris committed in a public place, against a person of standing, or in connection with bodily injury was considered severe hybris. Only the injured party had the right to initiate a suit, which could be either private or criminal (Basil. 60.21). Hybris against a donor or patronus led to the forfeiture of the gift or emancipation; children who committed hybris against their parents were disinherited (Basil. 31.6.6.1; 35.8.41; 48.26.1; 49.2.19).

LIT. Kaser, Privatrecht 2:439. —L.B.

HYDATUS, Latin historian and churchman; born Lemica (mod. Ginzo de Limia) in northern Spain ca. 395, died Galicia? ca. 470. During youthful eastern travels, Hydatius met Jerome at Bethlehem. Back in Spain, he was ordained in 416 and by 427 was consecrated bishop of an unknown see, perhaps Aquae Flaviae (mod. Chaves in Portugal). On a secular trip to Gaul in 431 he met the general Aetius, toward whom he may be too partial. In 460, the Suevi kidnapped and briefly imprisoned him. As a theologian, Hydatius acquired a reputation as an expert on Priscillianism (see PRISCILLIAN), which he opposed.

His Chronicle, a continuation of Jerome’s, covers the period 379–469. Albeit not blind to the world at large, Hydatius focuses on Spain. While prone to inflate casualty figures and unduly partisan, he penned a reliable and well-considered account of most events, giving a uniquely rational reason, surprising in a bishop, for the retreat of Attilla from Rome. Hydatius can be a useful source for Byz. history when his part of the world is involved, for example, the Visigothic vicissitudes of Gallia Placidia.


HYMN (ὕμνος). A religious poem set to fairly simple music and sung in Byz. sacred services. In early Christianity, the term “hymn” was applied to all devotional chant; later it referred only to newly written poems, as distinguished from the scriptural psalms and canticles. The earliest hymns are known to us from the New Testament: the Magnificat, the Song of Symeon, and the short poetic texts quoted by St. Paul in his epistles. Byz. hymns appear first in patristic literature, important early examples being the “Homily on Pascha” (a distant precursor of the kontakion) by Bp. Melito of Sardis and the Phos hilaron and Ho homagenes hymos (see MONOCHORES, HO), two early troparia, the latter ascribed to Justinian I.

Although no original music for these hymns survives, probably, like their Gregorian counterparts, Byz. melodies were largely based on the principle of one tone to each syllable of the text, which made them suitable for congregational singing. Even the music for the hymns of ROMANOS THE MELODES and JOHN OF DAMASCUS is unfortunately lost, but the dramatic character of the texts suggests that they were chanted in a kind of
HYMNOGRAPHY, a fertile and creative area of Byz. literature. A hymn can be defined as a poem on a religious topic, primarily intended for liturgical use and to be sung, but also including verse written for private devotional purposes. The decisions of the Councils of Laodicea (4th C.) and Braga (6th C.) prohibited hymns in the liturgy on other than scriptural themes. Hymn singing was part of Christian worship, as it had been of Jewish practice, from the earliest years. Possible specimens of such hymns can be extracted from the New Testament (e.g., Eph 1:3–14) and from the church fathers (e.g., the Easter Homily of Melito of Sardis), while embedded in the 4th-C. Apostolic Constitutions are hymns such as “Glory in the highest” and “O, gladsome light” (Phos hilaron); other similar hymns also survive on papyrus. The limited evidence leads to the conclusion that these early hymns were written in rhythmic prose, used a simple language, and were sung responsorially. From the 5th C. there are a few indications (e.g., the comments of Abba Pambo [Christ-Paranikas, infra, xxix–xxxi] and the phrases preserved in the Life of Auxentios [PG 114:1416]) that the psalms and canticles were now part of the Orthros and Vespers services and that troparia and stichera, stanzas inserted between psalm verses, were in use (although some monastic communities were opposed to music in services). The earliest hymn writers known by name (Anthimos and Timokles) are also recorded from this period, though none of their works can now be identified.

Hymns had also been written in classical meters (e.g., by Gregory of Nyssa or Synesios), but these, of limited appeal and intelligibility, were unlikely to have been intended for liturgical use. There had developed, however, in response to the evolution of the spoken language and under influence from Syriac literary patterns, increasingly elaborate verse forms that built lines using stress rhythms, an equal number of syllables for phrases in corresponding stanzas, and acrostics. These tendencies culminated in the kontakion, a metrical homily consisting of a prooimion and a varying number of oikos, or stanzas, linked by an acrostic. The kontakion, probably chanted by the preacher with the choir singing the refrain at the end of each oikos, became the dominant form of the hymn in the late 5th–6th C. Though antecedents for many of its features can be found in earlier phases of Greek literature (e.g., in the late 3rd-C. Parthenios of Methodios, bishop of Olympos), the most immediate models exist in Syriac and esp. in the works of Ephrem the Syrian. At its best, as in in the Akathistos Hymn or the Christmas Hymn of Romanos the Melode, the leading exponent of the genre, the kontakion is characterized by vivid dialogue and striking imagery.

Toward the end of the 7th C. the kontakion was replaced by the kanon, for reasons not fully understood, but perhaps connected with a change to a more varied musical setting. As late as the 9th C. kontakia were written (notably by Joseph the Hymnographer), but normally in shortened form for use within the kanon. A kanon, paraphrasing and meditating on the nine biblical canticles which it replaces, consists of nine odes, each made up of an heirmos and several troparia. Innumerable examples of kanones, many as yet unedited, survive either in full or abbreviated service books, such as the Menaion. Notable exponents of the genre include Andrew of Crete, John of Damascus, Kosmas the Hymnographer, and Joseph the Hymnographer.

Though hymns, in the form of kanones, stichera, and troparia, continued to be written until the fall of Constantinople, for all practical purposes by the end of the 11th C. the liturgical calendar was full; few additions were made later. The Orthodox church in southern Italy, led from the Grottaferrata monastery, long remained an active center of hymn writing. Many hymns, like those of Symeon the Theologian, which were not on scriptural subjects, may have been intended for personal use only.

Hymns of all types, whether long forms like the
kontakion and kanon, or the shorter elements like the troparia and stichera, were a vital feature of the services of the Orthodox church, involving psaltes (singer), choir, and congregation. Their language, drawing on the koine of the Old and New Testaments, was rarely complex, though in the kanon, communication seems sometimes to have been subordinate to the musical setting. Limited to paraphrasing biblical passages in ways relevant to a particular feast or saint, the authors’ ingenuity is frequently admirable.

Hymnographers, while predominantly monks and clerics, nevertheless came from all walks of life and included emperors (e.g., Justinian I, Leo VI), some learned scholars (e.g., John Mauro-rous), and a few women such as Kassia (E. Catalygiou-Topping, Diptycha 3 [1982–83] 98–111). With the early acceptance of stress meters at a time when literary compositions were struggling to impose the irrelevant archaic quantitative meters, hymn writers acknowledged the fact of linguistic change and the need for accessibility with greater realism than the classicizing secular poets.


—E.M.J.

**HYPAPANTE** (ὑποπαντή, lit. “meeting”), the Presentation of Christ in the Temple (Lk 2:22–38) at the time of Mary’s purification, 40 days after giving birth. The Hypapante, one of the 12 Byz. Great Feasts, is celebrated 2 Feb.

A Presentation feast is first seen in Jerusalem ca.384; it was celebrated on 14 Feb., this being the 40th day after 6 Jan., the feast of Epiphany, which at that time in the East comprised the Nativity as well as the Baptism. In 518, Severos of Antioch called Hypapante a recent Palestinian innovation not celebrated in either Antioch or Constantinople (PO 29:246.16–26; cf. 38:400–15). Justinian I decreed its celebration throughout the empire (Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, PG 147:292A). There is some confusion concerning the date on which the feast was celebrated in Constantinople. Under Justinian it was 2 Feb. (M. van Esbroeck, AB 86 [1968] 351–71; 87 [1969] 442–44), but in 602 the riot that broke out against Emp. Maurice during his procession to Blachernai to celebrate the feast apparently took place on 14 Feb. (M. Higgins, Traditio 1 [1943] 409f).

The Hypapante has one day of forefeast, a synaxis the following day, and seven days of after-feast, which may be foreshortened by an early Lent. Despite the fact that, in the celebration of the feast, the theme of Jesus’ encounter with Sy- meon predominated over that of the Virgin’s puriﬁcation, the Hypapante was considered one of the five Marian Great Feasts and was celebrated by the emperor at the Church of the Virgin at Blachernai.

**Representation in Art.** Rare in art of the 7th and 8th C, the Hypapante attained its standard composition in the 9th. C. Usually showing Sy- meon and Anna standing to the right of a ciborium and altar and the Virgin with the Child and Joseph with his donation of pigeons to the left, the event is presented as a theophanic recognition.
of Christ. Symeon, who perceived Christ’s divinity, displaced the priest at the altar, often assuming his vestments, and Anna may gesture in acclamation. An alternative composition, developed in the 9th C. but widespread only in the 12th, emphasizes the themes of Christ’s sacrifice and Mary’s grief, as Symeon holds the Child over the altar and the Virgin assumes her mourning posture from the Crucifixion. The late 12th-C. image of Symeon alone cradling the Child in the posture of the Virgin Eleousa derived from this composition, showing Symeon as a prophet of Christ’s Passion. Both variants of the full composition and the condensed “Symeon Glykophilon” (“sweet-beloved”) continued into Palaiologan art.


R.F.T., A.W.C.

HYPARCH. See Eparch.

HYPATIA (Ὑπατία), Neoplatonist teacher; born Alexandria between 353 and 360 (R. Penella, Historia 33 [1984] 126–28), died Alexandria 415. Educated at Alexandria, Hypatia owed her zeal for mathematics to her father Theon, whose work she assisted and surpassed, revising the third book of his commentary on the Almagest of Ptolemy; her commentaries on Diophantos of Alexandria and the Conics of Apollonios of Perga are lost. Hypatia remained in Alexandria to become that city’s most celebrated and adored teacher of mathematics and Neoplatonism (the version of Porphyry rather than that of Iamblichos). Pupils (Synestios being her most famous one), populace, and statesmen alike succumbed to her dazzling combination of intellect, beauty, virtue (which disappointed would-be seducers), eloquence, and political acumen. All this and her paganization provoked the hatred of Cyril of Alexandria, who may or may not have procured her brutal murder by a gang of hospital attendants (parabalanoi) led by one Peter the Reader.


HYPATIOS (Ὑπάτιος), bishop of Gangra, legendary 4th-C. saint; feastday 14 Nov. His major miracle was the killing of a dragon that had taken up residence in the state treasury under Constantius II, thus causing severe financial problems; Hypatios used his staff, topped with a cross, to kill the dragon, and the icon of Hypatios was allegedly placed at the treasury entrance to protect it. After returning to Gangra with the emperor’s fiscal privilege, the abolition of the tax called xylelaion (Ferri, infra 89.1–5), Hypatios was murdered by partisans of Novatianism.

Several vitae and a passio are dedicated to Hypatios. It was suggested by Ferri that the earliest vita was written in the 5th C. and the passio, teeming with fantastic episodes, between 500 and 700, but F. Halkin (AB 51 [1933] 392–95) demonstrated that his argument was ill founded. If the abolition of the xylelaion reflects the same measure recorded as a law of Justinian I (Malal. 437.17–18), the vita cannot be earlier than the 6th C.; if the Scolian basilicus Chobar was modeled on Kouber-Kuvrat, the passio was produced after 680.

Representation in Art. The Menologion of Basil II (p.181) shows the bishop confronting the dragon by spearing it in the mouth and setting it afire. The saint himself is then killed by a woman throwing stones from an upstairs window (though the title of the page refers to his koinêsis, or peaceful death). The composition is repeated in the illustrated “imperial” menologion in Moscow (Hist. Mus. 183, fol.158).


A.K., N.P.S.

HYPATIOS, general who was briefly declared emperor in 532; died Constantinople 19 Jan. 532. The nephew of Emp. Anastasios I, he was consul ca.500. In 503 he was sent with Patrikios and Areobindus to command a campaign against the Persians. In 513 he was magister militum in Thrace, where his unpopular administration contributed
to the revolt of Vitalian. Defeated in 514, he was deprived of his position, then reinstated, defeated once more, and captured by the rebels. He was commander again in the East under Justin I and negotiated with the envoys of Kavad; the negotiations failed, and after an investigation Hypatios was removed from the court. In 529 he was replaced as the Eastern commander by Belisarios. In 532, at the time of the Nika Revolt, Hypatios was proclaimed emperor but was executed when the rebellion was quelled. His body was thrown into the sea, but was later washed up and buried in the Church of St. Maura; verses supposedly written for his cenotaph survive in the Greek Anthology (AnthGr bk.7, nos. 591–92). His property was confiscated but later restored to his children.


HYPATIOS, bishop of Ephesus (from 531); died ca.541. Early in his bishopric he presided at the conference convoked at Constantinople by Justinian I to reconcile Severos of Antioch and the Monophysites, whom he confounded by showing the spuriousness of the writings ascribed to Diosysios the Areopagite (J. Guillard, REB 19 [1961] 75). He was also the orthodox spokesman at the Council of Constantinople in 536 that anathematized Severos and other Monophysites. In the interim, Hypatios had taken Justinian’s request for a ruling on Theopaschitism to Pope John II (533–35) at Rome. Fragments remain of at least two books titled Miscellaneous Questions, answers to the questions of his suffragan, Julian of Atramytton (H.G. Thümmel, BS 44 [1989] 161–70). They include an important statement on the cult of images in which church art is defended as an appropriate aid for uneducated people to progress from material to spiritual contemplation of the divine. The many citations in biblical catenae suggest his authorship of commentaries on Psalms, the Twelve Prophets, and Luke. An inscription (Grégoire, Inscriptions, no.108) found at Ephesus in 1904 preserves his instructions on the obligations of Christian burial.


HYPATIOS OF ROUPHNIAI, saint; born Phrygia ca.366, died near Chalcedon 466, on 30 June, according to J. Pargoire (BZ 8 [1899] 451); feastday 17 June. A scholastiko, Hypatios’s father educated his son well, but after a family conflict Hypatios left home for Thrace and became a shepherd. At about 20 he joined an ascetic, Jonas, and assisted him in building the fortified monastery of Halmyrisos. Circa 400 Hypatios founded the monastery of Roupphinai; from 406 he was its hegoumenos. From 436 onward, he was considered the “father” of all the monks of Constantinople. His monastery was a community of laborers; the monks earned their living by making woolen garments and baskets and by gardening (pp. 100.14–16, 248.7–14). Hypatios struggled against pagan traditions; he prevented the prefect Leonios from restoring Olympic games in Chalcedon and caused the disappearance of Artemis, a giant female demon (pp. 270–72). He supposedly resisted Nestorianism even before the Council of Ephesus and was connected with the Akoiometoi (E. Wolfe, BZ 79 [1986] 302–09). The preamble of Hypatios’s Life says that it was written by his disciple Kallinikos and discovered by an anonymous “editor” who corrected the style, esp. mistakes caused by “the Syriac dialect.” Bartelink (infra 12) trusts this claim and dates the Life to 447–50. If, however, the preamble is fictitious, the author must have lived later—in the 6th C., according to Beck (Kirche 404).


HYPATOS (ὑπατος), Greek term for consul. Hypatios and apo hypaton (ex-consul) became honorific titles by the 6th C. and declined in importance thereafter. A letter of Pope Gregory I the Great shows that in Constantinople one could obtain cartas exconsulatus for 30 librae (C. Courtois, Byzantium 19 [1949] 541). The seals of hypatoi and apo hypaton are numerous from the 7th–9th C.; the title is usually combined with modest func-
tions, bureaucratic and fiscal, even though sometimes the hypatos could serve as strategos (e.g., Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 918–19). In the Klerotologion of Philotheos hypatos is a title following that of spatharios, and owners of several seals are titled spatharios and hypatos. In the 10th-C. Taktikon of Escurial hypatos appears as an office—according to Oikonomides (Listes 325) with judiciary functions. The texts of the 11th C. again present hypatos as a title but of a higher rank than the protospatharios; the title seems to have disappeared after 1111. (See also Anthypatos; Dihypatos.)

Lit. Oikonomides, Listes 296. Seibt, Bleisiegel 342–45. –A.K.

HYPATOS TON PHILOSOPHON ("chief of the philosophers"), title of the president of the school of philosophy in Constantinople. F. Fuchs (Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter [Leipzig-Berlin 1926] 29f) suggested that the office already existed in the 10th C., but the chrysobull of Romanos I that mentions the hypatos ton philosophon Paul Xeropotaminos (Xerop. 227.18) is a forgery, and Constantine, under Emp. Constantine VII, was kathgetes and not hypatos. Thus the title was apparently introduced in 1047 (or slightly earlier) by Emp. Constantine IX for Michael Psellos, whose successors were John Italos and Theodore of Smyrna (ca. 1112). The office reappears ca. 1165 or 1167, when the future patriarch Michael III received this post. While the first hypatoi were serious scholars who contributed much to the development of philosophy, Michael's appointment had a different purpose, to control the followers of "pagan" philosophy and to defend the purity of Orthodox tenets. The office continued to exist in later centuries: in the 14th-C. lists of functionaries, the hypatos occupies a place between the logothetes tou dromou and megas chartoularios (pseudo-Kod. 300.21–22, 321.48) or is named in the same breath as the "first of the rhetors," dikaiophylax and nomophylax (338.143–45), probably an anachronistic statement reflecting the situation of the 11th C. The hypatoi of the 13th and 14th C. were teachers acting under the supervision of the patriarchate (Fuchs, ibid. 50–52).


HYPERBOLE (ὑπερβολή), one of the tropes, an exaggerated statement whose goal was the embellishment of speech. Byz. theoreticians, following their ancient predecessors, considered hyperbole as an exaggeration beyond verisimilitude (e.g., George Chiroboskos in RhetGr, ed. Spengel, 3:252.25–29). However, a modern critic may view the term beyond its limited role of stylistic ornamentation and consider the Byz. vision of the cosmos as hyperbolic. This was expressed, on the lowest level, through frequent use of prefixes such as poly- or archi- or superlatives (to stress the extreme of certain qualities). It was also expressed, on a higher level, through means used in other medieval literatures as well: endowing the hero (or antihero) with exaggerated qualities such as irresistible power, overwhelming beauty, immeasurable cruelty, or an extraordinary ability to endure pain or deprivation. The hyperbolic vision of people and objects was typical of certain genres, esp. hagiography, hymnography, and epic didactic oratory. Rhetorical hyperbole could be traditional, tinged with antiquarian allusions. Thus Attaleiates asserts that his hero's generosity surpassed the riches of the gold-bearing rivers Pactolus and Chrysorrhoe (Attal. 273.22–274.3; cf., e.g., Strabo 13.4.5), but the same Attaleiates could make more innovative comparisons, as, for example, his description of a victory so bloodless that not a single nose was bloody (Attal. 271.8–9). The use of hyperbole is also found in Byz. art as in depictions of the priest Symeon flying through the air to meet the infant Jesus in the temple (Maguire, Art and Rhetoric 84–90).

Lit. A. Quacquarelli, "Note sull'iperbole nella sacra Scrittura e nei Padri," VecChr 8 (1971) 5–26. –A.K.

HYPEROON. See Gallery.

HYPERPYRON (νομισμα υπέρπυρν, lit. "highly refined"), the gold coin of standard weight (4.55 g) but only 20.5 carats fine, introduced by Alexios I in 1092 and continued by his successors, though a few earlier 11th-C. references show the name already had been applied to nomismata. The term continued in use until the end of the empire, but after gold coins ceased to be struck
at Byz. in the mid-14th C. it became a money of account, divided notionally into 24 keratia. The shortened forms *perperum* (Lat.) and *perper* (It.) are Western. In the Balkans and southern Slavic borderlands it provided in various forms (e.g., *perper, iperpera*) a convenient name for a number of denominations, usually silver, and moneys of account.


**HYPOBOLON** (ὑπόβολον), the term used from the time of Leo VI for the wedding gift of a man to his wife. Formerly called *donatio proprie nuptias*, it had been obligatory since the reign of Justinian I. Leo VI promulgated three novels on the hypobolon. According to the novels, the hypobolon should be of less value than the dowry. In the case of childlessness and the predecesse of the husband, it fell in full to the wife; if the wife died before her husband, it reverted to him (nov. 20). If there were children, the surviving spouse obtained a portion of equal value to the inheritance of a child—as in Justinianic law—but the portion was not calculated on the value of the hypobolon (or dowry) but on that of the entire property of the predeceased (novs. 22 and 85). The amount of the hypobolon to be provided by the husband, or his family, varied. According to the Peira and the treatise *De hypobolo* by Eustathios Rhomaios (ed. D.R. Reinsch, FM 7 [1986] 239–52), in cases of uncertainty the hypobolon amounted to half the dowry; lower amounts were also possible. According to the Synopsis minor (V 4), in default of other agreements, the hypobolon amounted to a third of the dowry.


**HYPOCAUSTUS** (ὑπόκαστωτον), Roman system of radiant heating in which hot air circulated under a floor made of square or circular brick or tile and raised on low piers (*suspensurae*); heat could also rise through flues in the walls. Hypocausts can be found throughout the Roman world in public and private baths and in palaces and upper-class housing. Until at least the 6th C. Byz. builders continued the hypocaust system throughout the empire, both maintaining Roman structures (Müller-Wiener, Bibliothekon 49f) and adding new hypocausts, even in monasteries (A. Berger, Das Bad in der byzantinischen Zeit [Munich 1982] 102–67; Orlandos, Monast. Arch. 100–08).


**HYPMONEMA** (ὑπομνήμα), term designating various kinds of documents (e.g., in P.Cair. Mast. I 67303, II 6731). A hypomnema petition was addressed to the emperor; the response to it was called istsis (see RERIPLIPIUS) or semiosis. A letter of Patr. Athanasios I (RegPatr, fasc. 4, no.1774) mentions hypomniastika as short documents compiled in the patriarchal chancellery and goes on to complain about the greed of copyists who made such compilations; it is plausible that the patriarch was referring to petitions. Usually, however, the patriarchal chancellery defined the term differently. In earlier documents hypomnema designated synodal decisions or minutes (e.g., synodal hypomnemata of 29 Sept. 394—RegPatr, fasc. 1, no.10), but evidently from the 10th C. onward it applied to a patriarchal decree. The first case of its use is allegedly a lost act of Nicholas I Mystikos of 923 (RegPatr, fasc. 2, no.684), but it is only called a hypomnema by Patr. Nicholas III in 1084. A patriarchal hypomnema (e.g., the act of Matthew I of 1398—RegPatr, fasc. 6, no.3066) was a solemn decree provided with a seal and signature; the designation sigilliodes hypomnema was sometimes employed (sigiliion from the mid-13th C. onward). A hypomnema decision or record could be produced in other offices; thus Theodore of Nicæa (mid-10th C.), in a letter to the eparch Constantine, mentions that official’s “wise hypomnemata” (Dorouzès, Epistoloi 304.7).

A special official, the hypomnematos, is mentioned in the 10th-C. tactikon of Beneševic (Oikonomides, Lists 251.26) and later texts. In the above-cited letter of Patr. Athanasios, ko epi ton hypomnematon is one of the senior officials of the patriarchal chancellery. Hypomnema was also a form of panegyric of a saint, e.g., the hypomnemata on the Twelve Prophets (BHG 1591).


**—A.K.**
HYPOSTASIS (ὕποστασις, lit. "substance"), an ancient term used by philosophers and scientists primarily to designate individual or real existence; Plotinos applied it to his supreme principles—the One, Intellect, and Soul. The word appears in the New Testament five times without having any technical meaning, and in its use by 3rd-C. theologians it was not clearly distinguished from ousia (substance); at the First Council of Nicaea it was used as a synonym for ousia. As late as the Council of Sardica hypostasis was conceived of as real existence, and the acceptance of individual divine hypostases proclaimed heretical. Only at the Council of Alexandria in 362 did Athanasios of Alexandria approve the difference between the terms hypostasis and ousia, and in the wake of the creed of the First Council of Constantinople in 381 the Cappadocian interpretation of the Trinity as three hypostases and one ousia became canonical.

Hypostasis was contrasted to the substance or nature of the divinity, and defined as the individual property (idules) of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, whereas ousia—as an individual reality—was the element they shared (koonon) that presupposed a Stoic ontology. In Christology hypostasis was equated with the concept of person at the Council of Chalcedon (451). This teaching was further developed by John of Caesarea and Leontios of Byzantium who defined the hypostasis as "being-for-itself" (kath' heauten einai), discerning two degrees of individuation, the nature and the person; this formula was analyzed by Maximos the Confessor and Anastasios of Sinai (ed. Uthemann, Vita Dux 22.4.85–86 [p.303]).

The distinction between ousia and hypostasis was not fully understood in the Latin West, which tended to translate both terms as substantia; this accounted for the Eastern opinion that the West was Nestorian, that is, that the concept of two natures was in fact the concept of two hypostases in Christ. This linguistic misunderstanding appears in John of Caesarea and Anastasios of Sinai.

HYPOTHEC (ὑπόθηκη, lit. "deposit, pledge"), in Roman law, a type of pledge or security. It differed from a pignus in that the object pledged remained with the debtor, even though the rights of possession were vested in the creditor. Justinianic law and Byzantine legal textbooks retained the Roman distinction between hypothec and pignus; thus, a scholion to Basil. 25.1.1 rejects as mistaken the application of the term hypothek to a pignus (enechyrion), arguing that the pignus was contracted by the physical transfer of the object, the hypothec "by simple agreement (symphoron)." A pledge without any actual physical transfer of the object was known in late Byzantine practice; an act of 1285 describes the case of Theodore Bronas who loaned a man 1.33 litrai of silver; when the man died and his widow could not repay the loan, she pledged olive trees to Bronas equivalent to the amount of the debt. She retained the right to regain her trees after having repaid the loan; no interest is mentioned (MM 4:114.21–28).

The term "general hypothek," however, is used in documents with the meaning of "guarantee" (e.g., Docheiari. no.3.3–4; Laura 1, no.53.6), applied not to a pledge but to the sale or exchange of land. The term rhethi hypothekhe, in the will of Theodore Kerameas of 1284, refers to a certain piece of land used as security for a loan (Laura 2, no.75.40–42).

LIT. Buckland, Roman Law 475f. Kaser, Privatrecht 2, par.231.4.

HYRTAKENOS, THEODORE, early 14th-C. writer and teacher in Constantinople; born in Hyrtakos on the Kyzkos peninsula (F. Dölger, BZ 31 [1931] 411f). Hyrtakenos (Ὑρτακηνός) is known only from his writings, which include an enkomion of Andronikos II and monodies for Michael IX, Irene-Yolanda of Montferrat, and Nikephoros Choummos. He also wrote a panegyric of the Theotokos and an enkomion of the anchorite Annas, the miracle worker. His ekphrasis on the Garden of St. Anne is based on a picture that he reports having seen.

His 93 surviving letters are addressed to such luminaries as Andronikos II, Patr. John XIII Glykys (S.I. Kourouses, EEBS 41 [1974] 344–53), Nikephoros Choummos, and esp. Theodore Metochites (21 letters). In them, he complains about his straitened circumstances (surely exaggerated)
and appeals for a siteresion (payment in money or grain) for his services as a teacher and placement on the state payroll. One letter includes a request for a coat lined with fox fur. Other letters describe his exchange of books with friends, requests for copies of MSS, and references to his own library. Constantine Loukites, who was in Trebizond, commissioned him to purchase a copy of the Odyssey in Constantinople (ep.56). Hyrtaenos was well read in classical literature; his correspondence contains an unusual number of mythological allusions and citations of ancient authors.


IAMBLICHOS (Ἰάμβλιχος). Neoplatonist philosopher; born Chalkis (in Coele-Syria) ca. 250, died ca. 325. Iamblichos supposedly learned about Neoplatonism from Porphyry in Rome. Later he established his own school at Apameia in Syria, where he expounded a mixture of Neoplatonism, Pythagorean thought, and eastern mysticism to the detriment of the theories of Plotinus, further dazzling his students with genuine or stage-managed feats of clairvoyance and levitation. His name became talismanic among the pagan rearguard opposition to Christianity, esp. Emp. Julian.

His extant writings comprise a Life of Pythagoras, a Protrepticus (or Exhortation to Philosophy), and three mathematical treatises; the authorship of On the Mysteries, a defense of magic, is disputed but it is probably an authentic work of Iamblichos. A fragment of his treatise on rhetoric survives. Commentaries on Plato, Aristotle, and the Chaldean oracles are mostly lost, as are the essays On the Soul (some fragments survive in Stobaeus) and On the Gods. Eunapios of Sardis (Lives of the Sophists 458 [p.362]) deprecates his uncooly style. Iamblichos influenced the course of Neoplatonism through both his writings and his pupils, eclectically importing all manner of superstitions and eastern beliefs, perverting mysticism into magic, and fitting these new elements into an ever more expanding and abstruse system with a heavy reliance on trinitarian subdivisions.


- B.B.

IAMBOL (Διάμπολες). city in eastern Bulgaria on the river Tundza, sometimes identified as late Roman Diospolis. On the route from Adrianople to the passes over the Balkan range. Iambol played an important role in hostilities between Byz. and Bulgaria as well as in confrontations with invaders from the steppes. Ceded to Bulgaria by Justinian II in 705, it was recaptured in the mid-8th C. by Constantine V and retaken in 812 by Krum. After John I Tzimiskes captured it in 971, it remained in Byz. hands for two centuries. In 1049 the Byz. general Constantine Arianites was defeated by the Pechenegs at Iambol, and in 1093/4 the city surrendered to the Cumans, who held it briefly. From ca. 1190 it was incorporated in the Second Bulgarian Empire. In the late 13th C. Iambol changed hands several times; during the 14th C. it was a Bulgarian frontier city, twice taken and briefly occupied by the Byz. An inscription records the setting up of a column, no doubt to mark the frontier, by Ivan Alexander in 1356/7. In 1373 the Ottoman Turks conquered Iambol.


- R.B.

IASITES (Ιασιτῆς), a noble family known from ca. 1000. Some were generals, such as Nikephoros, strategos of Cherson, and Michael, archon of Iberia, who commanded the troops sent in 1047 against Leo Tornikios. Another (Michael?) Iasites married Eudokia. Alexios I’s daughter, ca. 1110, but soon fell from imperial favor and was expelled from the palace; perhaps his support of John Italos caused his dismissal. The Iasitai were also related to the Keroulario. Some of them founded a monastery in Constantinople before 1158. Later Iasitai are known as judges (Constantine, epi ton derseon), fiscal officials (Iasites, praktor of Bulgaria before 1108), courtiers (Leo, komes tou staoulo), members of the clergy (Michael, metropolitan of Nikomedia, 1285–89), and literati (the monk and hagiographer Job in the 1270s, Gregory in the 14th C.).


- A.K.
IASOS (Ἰάσως), coastal city on a peninsula in Caria, west of Mylasa. It appears in written sources only as a base of the Kilyrriaioi theme and as a suffragan bishopric of Aphrodisias; it was last mentioned in the 12th C. Its excavated remains, however, provide considerable information about the life of a small Byz. city. During late antiquity, Iasos maintained its civic buildings, added several churches, and expanded to the adjacent mainland where large houses, whose remains indicate much activity in processing agricultural products, were built. Its forum was demolished in the 6th C. After the 7th C., the apparent date of a new fortification wall, some parts of the city were abandoned and others changed as public and private structures were ruined and built over with small houses. The remains of these domestic buildings have provided evidence for manufacture of pottery, glass, and iron products. Iasos had evidently become smaller and poorer by the time of the dated evidence (9th–10th C.). Remains indicate occupation through the 13th C.; the region fell to the Turks before 1269.


IATROSOPHISTES (ἰατροσοφιστής), term applied to teachers of medicine and skilled physicians. Iatrosophistai, who survived as a class through the 7th C., were often suspected of cryptopaganism: Sophronios of Jerusalem, in the Miracles of Kyros and John (ed. Marcos, ch.30.2), tells of Gesios, an Alexandrian iatrosophistai, who allegedly was baptized under compulsion and uttered a Homeric couplet while in the font. Only after the saints cured his painful illness (which his own professional skill had been unable to correct) did Gesios convert to Christianity. The cults of healing martyrs such as Kyros and John or Artemios competed with the iatrosophistai for clients by publishing miracle collections that criticized the iatrosophistai for arrogance, high fees, and clinical failure. Epiphanius of Salamis in Panarion 64.67.5 speaks of “iatrosophistic trickery,” associating medical skill with magic. The term is used occasionally in later texts (e.g., Theophilos Protospatharios and the Snouta), but Theophanes the Con-
the city, but after Rabbula’s death succeeded him as bishop. He was, however, unable to maintain peace in the church: he was accused of Nestorianism, and, although vindicated at hearings conducted in Tyre and Berytus, he was deposed by the “Robber” Council of Ephesus in 449. The Council of Chalcedon returned him to his see, where he remained until his death.

Of Ibas’s works only a letter to Mari, bishop of Ktesiphon (Seleukeia on the Tigris), has survived—in a Greek translation of the original Syriac text (ACO, tom. II, vol. i, pt. 3:32–34). Although Ibas reproached Nestorius for rejection of the title Theotokos, all his polemics were directed against Cyril of Alexandria whom Ibas saw as the successor of Apollinaris of Laodikeia. The fathers of Chalcedon approved the theology expressed in his letter, but Ibas’s views continued to be controversial long after his death, and he was condemned in 553 during the Affair of the Three Chapters. After Ibas’s death many of his partisans, teachers and students of the school of Edessa, moved to Nisibis.


-TEG.

IBERIA (“Ἰβηρία”), northeastermost theme of the Byz. Empire, created by Basil II from the inheritance of David of Tav’k/Tao. The precise date of its creation is controversial; the theme was probably organized soon after Basil’s campaign of 1001 and considerably earlier than 1022, when it was consolidated by the emperor’s Iberian campaign. The territories of the theme first consisted of David’s domains, stretching southward along the eastern Byz frontier and into central Armenia, where it included the city of Mantzikert. In 1045, the lands of the Bagratid kingdom of Shirak became part of the theme and its administrative center shifted to Ani. The Seljuks captured this city in 1064, but in 1064/5 the Bagratid kingdom of Kars entered the theme, which included southern Tav’k/Tao, Basean, and Kars, until it disappeared in the 1070s when the Seljuks advanced into imperial territory.


-NGG.

IBERIANS (“Ἰβηροί”). The term “Iberia” was used in Greek with various meanings. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adn. imp. 25) notes that it could mean Spain or Georgia in the Caucasus. Georgian Iberia corresponds with K’art’li, the eastern part of the medieval Georgian kingdom (see GEORGIA), and is to be distinguished from the theme of Iberia, which included part of northern Armenia but not K’art’li. The various peoples of the Caucasus were often confused; thus John Tzetzes calls the Iberians, Ahasians, and Alans one people (P. Gautier, REB 28 [1970] 208).

“Iberian” was also used for Armenians who belonged to the Chalcedonian rather than the Gregorian Monophysite church (V.A. Arutjunova-Fidanjan, Armjane-chaklidonuty na vostočnych granicaх Vizantijskoj imperii [Erevan 1980]), those whom Armenian sources pejoratively call cayt (see Tzatoi). Hence the typikon of Gregory Pakourianos permits only “Iberians” in his monastery. The term “Iberian” could also be applied to inhabitants of the theme of Iberia or, in its narrowest sense, to a monk from the monastery of Iveron.


-RT.

IBERON MONASTERY. See IVERON Monastery.

IBN AL-‘ADIM (or Kamāl al-Din), Arab historian and Ayubid official; born Aleppo 1192, died Cairo 1262. He was a member of a prominent family that discharged various official responsibilities under the successive dynastic regimes in Aleppo (see Berroia). He himself, after studies in Aleppo, Damascus, Jerusalem, Baghdad, and the Hijaz, served in Aleppo as a diplomatic secretary, as a judge, and later as the chief minister of the Ayubid regime. In 1260, as the Mongols approached, ibn al-‘Adim fled from Aleppo to Egypt. When they withdrew, he revisited his native city, found it destroyed, and returned to Cairo.
Ibn al-Ądim wrote several works, the most important of which are his two major books on Aleppo. The Ultimate Quest of the History of Aleppo, of which ten unpublished MS volumes survive, is an alphabetically arranged biographical dictionary of men connected with Aleppo. His second historical book, The Quintessence of Aleppo’s History, offers a chronological presentation of material gathered for the dictionary. The chronicle ends in the year 1243. It has the great merit of compiling all sources, and of recording various opinions on historical events and presenting the events in chronological order or according to political states. It includes Aleppo’s relations with the Byz. during the 10th C. and the Crusader period.


IBN AL-ĄTHİR, or ʿIzz al-Dīn Abūḥasan ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad, Arab historian; born Jazirat ibn ʿUmar (on the Tigris) 13 May 1160, died Mosul June 1233. Born into a prosperous scholarly family well connected with the Zangids, he received an excellent education and became a private scholar enjoying official patronage. He traveled frequently, esp. to Syria, where he witnessed some of the campaigns of Saladin and eventually settled in Aleppo.

He composed several biographical works and a history of the Zangids but is best known for his Consummate History, a vast work (from Creation to 1231) considered the acme of Arabic annalistic historiography. The earlier chapters, though largely based on al-Ṭabarī, contain valuable accounts (mostly on military campaigns) from other sources now lost. For the 12th–13th C., he writes from personal knowledge and contemporary informants; though unquestionably preoccupied elsewhere, he offers a fragmentary but useful view of Byz. military history for 1164–1228. He describes the maneuvering between the various powers in Asia Minor and the reception of refugee Muslim princes in Constantinople, recounts several disastrous expeditions of the Komnenoi in Asia Minor, and provides details on the Third Crusade, including Byz. efforts to repel Frederick Barbarossa and the fall of Cyprus to Richard I Lionheart in 1192. The Latin conquest of Constantinople is described in detail. Later reports, though recounting continuing decline, portray Byz. as a still-formidable power.


IBN AL-QALĀNISĪ, Arab historian of Muslim Syria; born Damascus ca. 1072, died there 17 March 1160. A member of a prominent family of Damascus, he twice served as its chief municipal official (tātās). He is best known as the author of the chronicle Continuation of the History of Damascus, used heavily by several later generations of Muslim historians. It covers a dramatic period of Syrian, Mesopotamian, and Egyptian history extending from the mid-10th C. to 1160, overshadowed by the changing fortunes of Byz., Fatimid, Crusader, and Zangid protagonists. For anterior historical events, ibn al-Qalānisī relied on Syro-Egyptian archives and minor chronicles, but he based the coverage of contemporary developments on his own observations, eyewitness accounts, and documentary evidence. Although the work of ibn al-Qalānisī mainly deals with political-social life in Damascus and in central Syria and Palestine, it constitutes a unique chronicle of the first 60 years of the Crusader period written from the Arab vantage point.


IBN BATṬŪTA, more fully Shams al-Dīn Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdallāh, celebrated Arab traveler; born Tangier 1304, died Morocco ca. 1369 or 1377. A jurist by education, his extensive journeys by land and sea covered all Islamic lands and most other countries of Asia and Africa
and included visits to the Crimea, Asia Minor, and Constantinople. His *Travels* were dictated in 1355 at the request of the sultan of Morocco. Although scholars have minor quibbles about his veracity, chronology, and the "editorial" role of his scribe, the *Travels* of ibn Battūta are an invaluable primary source for 14th-C. history. His account of Asia Minor (visited 1331–33) records the rise of the Ottoman principality under Orhan; it is esp. illuminating on the processes of Islamization, Turkification, and Byz. decline. His report on the Crimean Tatars records their relations with the Palaiologoi, including the marriage of a Byz. princess to their khan. During a five-week visit to Constantinople (late 1331), having arrived via the Crimea with the caravan of the returning Byz. princess, ibn Battūta met Emp. Andronikos III and toured markets, churches, and monasteries. Valuable because of the uniqueness of his "private" visit, his sympathetic account also enriches our knowledge of the topography of 14th-C. Constantinople and Byz.-Islamic mutual perceptions.


---

**IBN BIBI**

Arab author of a history, written in Persian, of the Seljuks of Asia Minor (Rûm); fl. 13th C. His father served as secretary at the chancellery of the Seljuk sultan in Konya and went on several diplomatic missions. Ibn Bibi himself made a career at the same court, becoming the head of the chancellery of the secretariat of state.  

Ibn Bibi’s work, *‘Ala’ al-Commands i.e., of *‘Ala’ al-Din Kay-qubâdh I* Concerning *‘Ala’id Affairs*, completed in 1281/2, draws from his personal experiences at the court and covers events, including Seljuk-Byz. relations, from the end of the 12th C. until 1282. It is the only source of information about his own life. Apart from the main text (Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Aya Sofya 2985), there exist an abbreviated Persian version, *Mukhtasar*, composed in 1284/5 by an unknown writer while ibn Bibi was still alive, and a Turkish adaptation, written in the early 15th C. by an Ottoman court historian, Yazıcıoğlu ʿAli.  


---

**IBN HAWQAL**, more fully Abū al-Qāsim ibn ʿAlī al-Naṣīb, Arab geographer of the systematic school (see Arab Geographers); born Nisibis, died after 988. His *Picture of the Earth* is a primary document for the historical geography of the Islamic world, Byz., and other lands. As a merchant-scholar, he traveled widely between 943 and 973, visiting the Caspian Sea region, Fāṭimid Egypt, North Africa, Sicily, Spain, and southern Italy. He knew the Arab-Byz. frontier region well and participated in Arab military expeditions into eastern Anatolia.  

His book (first published before 967 and revised twice, ca. 977 and 988), though begun independently, is essentially a recast of the *Routes and Kingdoms of al-Iṣṭakhrī*, which the aging author requested him to edit when the two met in Baghdad (951–52). A comparison of the two works, with reference to Byz., the Thughur (see *‘Awāṣim and Thughur*), Sicily, and Mediterranean trade, reveals ibn Hawqal’s independent judgment and sense of history, as well as his concern for detail. His maps are also more developed and show some Byz. themes and towns. Equally important are his insightful remarks on Islamic Sicily, the policies of the Ḥamdānids, the military and financial policies of Nikephoros II Phokas, the decline of the Islamic Thughur, and the impact of the Byz. reconquista. Of particular interest is his account of the Banū-Ḥabīb of Nisibis, cousins of the Ḥamdānids who, during the reign of John I Tzimiskes, converted to Christianity and cooperated with the Byz. in their campaigns against the Muslims. Ibn Hawqal reflects subtle Fāṭimid propaganda and is severely critical of the Ḥamdānids.  


---

**IBN JUBAYR**, more fully Abu al-Ḥusayn ibn Jubayr Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Majid, Arab traveler and man of letters; born Valencia 1145, died
Alexandria 29 Nov. 1217. After working as a government secretary in Arab Granada for a time, he made two major and eventful sea journeys to Mecca and back (1183–85 and 1189–91) and a less eventful one in 1204 (Krakovskij, infra) or 1217 (Pellat, infra). Only the first journey is recorded in his extant Travels. Ostensibly a pilgrim to Mecca, his main itinerary included Ceuta, Sicily, Alexandria, Cairo, Jedda, Mecca, Madina, Bagdad, Aleppo, Damascus, Tyre, Acre (the last two were in Crusader hands at the time), again Sicily, Cartagena, and Granada. He traveled on Genoese ships both ways with Christian and Muslim pilgrims and merchants.

His Travels, written in a diary form giving the names of Muslim and Christian months, is an important document for political, economic, and social conditions not only in Islamic lands but also in the Mediterranean world. In particular, it notes the conflicts and peaceable contacts between Crusaders and Muslims; Byz.-Genoese relations; and Sicily under William II, including the conditions of Muslims. It gives, moreover, a valuable description of the cathedral of Palermo and a unique account of the Norman court. He also alludes to Byz.-Norman relations and records the curious echoes in Sicily of recent Seljuk victories over Byz. Especially interesting is his report on Andronikos I's use of Muslim troops in seizing the throne in Constantinople in 1182 (Hecht, Ausstenpolitik 33).


IBN KHURDĀDHBH, more fully Abu al-Qāsim ʿUbaydallāh ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Khurdādbeh, author of the earliest surviving Arabic administrative geography, including vital details on Byz.: born Khurāsān ca.825, died Iraq ca.912. Of Persian origin, he grew up in Bagdad, where he studied Arabic philology, literature, history, and music. He was director of posts and intelligence in al-Jībāl (ancient Media) and a boon companion of the ʿAbbāsid caliph al-Muʿtāmid (870–92).

Of his ten books, including a world history, only extracts of On Entertainment and Musical Instruments, containing references to Byz. music, and an incomplete version of his Routes and Kingdoms (composed ca.846–70, revised ca.885) survive. His fame rests on the latter book, which is a primary source for Islamic administrative and economic history as well as Byz. military administration. His account of Byz. is based mostly on the lost writings of the Arab prisoner al-Jarmī (released 845), but also on official documents. It preserves a curious report of an Arab scientific expedition to the cave of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus. More important is his concise information on Constantinople; topography, routes, distances, towns, and fortresses of Asia Minor; official Byz. hierarchy; army strength, revenues, and organization; and the first known Arabic list of Byz. themes, with the earliest mention of Cappadocia and Charsianon as military districts. His work also refers to Byz.'s northern neighbors and international trade.


IBN RUSTA. See Hārūn ibn Yahyā.

IBN SHADDĀD. See Bahāʾ al-Dīn.

ICON FRAMES (sing. περιφέριον, e.g., Paniel, nos. 7.21, 53) are usually slightly raised from the surface of the icon and display figural representations, floral or geometric ornament, and bosses. From the 11th C. onward they are frequently recorded in church inventories but may have been in use at least a century earlier. The most elaborate examples were made of precious metals, enamels, and stones or glass beads (Treasury S. Marco 172) or, more frequently, of repoussé silver (M. Chatzidakis, Icons of Palinos [Athens 1985] nos. 1–2). Another technique—cloisonné silver without enamel inlay—appears on numerous frames of the late 13th–14th C. (M. Chatzidakis, JOB 21 [1972] 79–81).

The figural decoration of icon frames consists of busts (laimia) of saints or whole-figure representations (stasidia), sometimes including donor portraits. These form a Deesis composition complementary to the main subject of the icon. Others display Gospel scenes or events from the life of
the depicted saint. Most of the elaborate frames surround venerated icons of the Virgin. They were less often employed on icons of Christ or a church’s patron saint and only rarely on icons of Gospel and other scenes. Simpler frames are restricted to geometric or floral ornament.


ICONIUM. See Ikonion.

ICONOCLASM (from εἰκονοκλαστής, “image-destroyer”), a religious movement of the 8th and 9th C. that denied the holiness of icons and rejected icon veneration. Clerical opposition to the artistic depiction of sacred personages had its roots in late antiquity (Baynes, Byz. Studies 116–49, 226–39). In the 4th C. EUSEBIO OF CAESAREA, evidently drawing on the christology of ORIGEN, denied the possibility of artistically delineating Christ’s image (G. Florovský, ChHist 19 [1950] 77–96). There was also an Iconoclast movement in 7th-C. Armenia (Alexander, History, pt. VII [1955], 151–60). In the early 8th C. several bishops in Asia Minor, notably Constantine of Nakoleia and Thomas of Claudiodiopolis, condemned the veneration of images (G. Ostrogorsky in Mel. Diehl 1:235–38), citing traditional biblical prohibitions against idolatry. Their views became a movement when Emp. Leo III began to support their position publicly in 726 (Anastas, “Leo III’s Edict” 5–41). His order to remove an icon of Christ from the Chalke gate caused a riot. In 730 Leo summoned a silence that forced Patriarch GERMANOS I to resign and issued an edict commanding the destruction of icons of the saints. Persecutions under Leo appear to have been limited to instances of destroying church decorations, portable icons, and altar furnishings; there is no solid evidence of martyrdom.

The usurper ARTABASDOS temporarily restored icon veneration, but CONSTANTINE V broadened the theological base of Iconoclasm by personally writing treaties and organizing silention. Constantine introduced an explicit christological aspect into Iconoclasm by asserting that a material depiction of Christ—who as God is uncircumscribable—threatened either to confuse or separate his two natures. In 754 Constantine summoned a council in Hieria, which condemned icon vener-

ICONOCLASM. Iconoclasts whitewashing an image of Christ. Marginal miniature in the Khudov Psalter (Moscow gr. 129, fol.67r); 9th C. State Historical Museum, Moscow. The Iconoclast with the wild hair is thought to represent the patriarch John VII Grammatikos.

ation as diabolical idolatry and insisted that the Eucharist was the only appropriate, nonanthropomorphic image of Christ. Constantine reportedly rejected worship of relics and attacked the cult of Euphemia of Chalcedon, but the 754 council affirmed the efficacy of the intercession of saints and denied only the propriety of venerating them through material depictions.

The acts of the 754 council were not strongly enforced until the 760s, when several ICONOPHILES were executed, including STEPHEN THE YOUNGER. Constantine rigorously persecuted Iconophiles in Constantinople, esp. monks; strategoi such as Michael LACHANOPODRAKON extended this antimonastic campaign into the provinces. Yet outside the capital Iconoclasm was irregularly supported and often restricted to redecorating churches with secular art. In the capital, according to the vita of Stephen the Younger, Constantine
replaced pictures in the Church of the Virgin at Blachernai with "mosaics [representing] trees and all kinds of birds and beasts...". Yet images of Christ and the saints remained in the seikreta of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, until 768/9, when Patr. Niketas I (766–80) had them removed (Nikeph. 76.21f). Iconoclasm waned after Constantine’s death: Leo IV persecuted only a small group of officials in Constantinople in 780, and in 787 Constantine VI, Irene, and Patr. TARASIOS secured an official condemnation of Iconoclasm at the Second Council of Nicaea.

The emperors of the Amorian dynasty revived Iconoclasm, but it lacked the vigor of the 8th-C. movement. Leo V deposed Patr. MIKHOPOROS I and summoned a synod in 815 that renounced the restoration of icons and rehabilitated the Hieria council (P. Alexander, DOP 7 [1953] 35–66; idem, History, pt.IX [1958], 493–505). Michael II, although an Iconoclast, did not force the issue. Theophilos, influenced by JOHN VII GRAMMATIKOS, prohibited the production of icons and persecuted prominent Iconophiles, including EUHYMIOUS OF SARDIS, THEODORE GRAPHTOS, and the painter LAZAROS, but in 843, Empress THEODORA and THEOKTISTOS engineered the TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY. Although several church councils in the 860s and 870s condemned Iconoclasm again (F. Dvornik, DOP 7 [1953] 67–97), it was no longer a major issue.

While Byz. sources blame external factors like Jewish magicians and Caliph Yazidd II for influencing Leo III and his supporters, modern scholarship offers various explanations for the development of Iconoclasm. Many specialists favor an ideological interpretation: Iconoclasm was the revival of ancient polemics against religious art (Alexander, Patr. Nicephorus 6–22), which harbored vestiges of paganism (Martin, Iconoclastic Controversy); Leo III was attempting to purify religious doctrine and practice because God was punishing the Byz. for idolatry by sending Arab attacks and natural disasters, such as an earthquake on Thera in 726 (C. Mango in Iconoclasm 21). Other scholars emphasize economic motives: the emperors used Iconoclasm to confiscate monastic and ecclesiastical property (M.Ja. Szujiu- mov, Utenye zapiski Svjedlowskogo gosudarstvennego pedagogicheskogo instituta 4 [1948] 48–110). More recently, scholars have stressed the role of imperial power: Iconoclasm was the climax of CAESAR-

OPAPISM (G. Ladner, MedSt 2 [1940] 127–49); the reestablishment of the traditional imperial cult (L. Barnard, Byzantium 43 [1973] 13–29); or the effort of emperors to establish their authority in ecclesiastical matters at a time when they were under pressure to regenerate Byz. society and ward off its external enemies (J.F. Haldon, BS 38 [1977] 161–84). Another explanation considers Iconoclasm against the backdrop of the crisis of early Byz. CITIES: for the secular clergy, particularly bishops, the potentially centrifugal nature of the cult of saints—physically localized and emotionally privatized by holy men, icons, relics, and monasteries—threatened their ability to retain a centralized ecclesiastical authority that could define the holy and shore up the weakened structures of Byz. civic life (P. Brown, EHR 88 [1973] 31f).

Economic and political factors played important roles in the development of Iconoclasm, but the central issue of the controversy was the doctrine of SALVATION. By the 8th C. the Orthodox victory in the dispute over Christ’s human and divine natures had affirmed the possibility of man’s ascent to God, but without delimiting the instrumentality of salvation or the position of the holy in Byz. society. Iconoclasm was genuinely concerned that increasing devotion to icons, by effacing the distinction between the material image and its spiritual prototype, was encouraging idolatry (E. Kitzinger, DOP 8 [1954] 82–150) and thus blurring the crucial distinction between the sacred and the profane. The Iconoclasts accepted only the Eucharist, the church building, and the sign of the cross as being fully holy, because only those objects had been consecrated by God directly or through a priest and were thus capable of bringing human beings in contact with the divine, whereas icons and relics were illegitimately consecrated from below by popular veneration (Brown, supra).

The outcome of Iconoclasm was a partial victory for both sides. The Iconophiles, aided by thinkers such as JOHN OF DAMASCUS, won the theological battle by formulating a theory of images that regarded icons as efficacious vehicles of the holy and having it formally endorsed as Orthodoxy. Yet the Iconophiles owed their triumph to sympathetic emperors, whose authority over church affairs was thereby strengthened. In particular, imperial jurisdiction over monasteries
was established: strong, centralized monasteries (see Studios) were undermined and increasingly replaced by smaller, less cenobitic monasteries under state patronage and control. Moreover, religious dissidents (see Theodore of Studios) failed in appeals to Rome to counter imperial efforts to dictate religious policy. The flight of many active monastic Iconophiles to the West permitted conformists like Photios and Euthymios to hold the patriarchate. Among other consequences, the Iconoclasts' reliance on nonrepresentational religious art contributed to the exaltation of the cult of the cross (J. Moorhead, Byzantium 55 [1985] 165–79), while in the West imperial support for Iconoclasm provoked denunciations from popes Gregory II and Gregory III and pushed the papacy further toward dependence on the Franks (see also Libri Carolini).


ICONOPHILES (εἰκονοφιλεῖς, "lovers of images"), also iconodules (εἰκονόδουλοι, "servants of images"), a term apparently coined during the period of Iconoclasm—it occurs as early as the 8th C. (Lampe, Lexicon 410)—to denote those who defended the holiness of icons and the propriety of icon veneration; they called their opponents iconoclasts (εἰκονοκλάσται, "image-breakers"). Among the most prominent iconophiles were Patr. Germanos I, John of Damascus, Theodore of Studios, Patr. Nikephoros I, Stephen the Younger, Theodore Graptos, and Euthymios of Sardis. Monks were the most ardent iconophiles and suffered particularly under Constantine V and at the hands of Michael Lachanodrakon.

- P.A.H.

ICONOGRAPHY, the demonstrative subject matter of Byz. works of art, imbued above all with Christianity and the cult of the emperor. While history painting, portraits, and personifications were inherited from antiquity and remained abiding subjects, in other areas of content marked changes are discernible. As early Christian concern with typology declined, Old Testament subjects tended to disappear save where themes such as the Ark of the Covenant were newly interpreted. By the 6th C. a broad range of motifs from the New Testament and Apocrypha was in use, as well as an extensive hagiographical repertory. The 9th–11th C. saw new themes created under the influence of the liturgy and homiletic sources; developments intensified in the 12th C. when special attention was paid to such motifs as the Melismos (see Fraction) and pathetic aspects of Christology. A secular repertory drawing on classical mythology was used already in the 10th C., enriched with motifs taken from both everyday life and the West, esp. in the Komnenian era. The multiplication and extension of monumental cycles, often dependent on hymnography, and the elaboration of prefigurations of the Virgin, are marked characteristics of 13th- and 14th-C. art.


ICONODELLES. See Iconophiles.

ICONOGRAPHY. See Templon.

ICONS (sing. εἰκών, "image"). In its broadest sense an icon is any representation of a sacred personage, produced in many media and sizes, monumental as well as portable; in its narrowest sense icon most often refers to a painted wooden devotional panel (see "Painted Icons," below).

Icon Veneration and the Theory of Images. The term eikon was ambiguous, applied even to ancient statues, while other terms of pagan vocabulary, such as stele or agalma, could be used for images of Christ. On the other hand, the Byz. tried to contrast eikon with eidolon (idol), which was an embodiment of pagan cult; sometimes, however, the difference between them disappeared as in the story about a heathen ektypon that turned out to be an image of the Archangel Michael (Malal. 78f).

Christianity inherited a hostile attitude toward
images from the Old Testament prohibition of Exodus 20:4 ("Thou shalt not make . . . any graven image") and from the era of persecutions, when Christians were forced to sacrifice in front of imperial images. Many early church fathers (e.g., Eusebius of Caesarea, Epiphanius of Cyprus) disapproved of icons, esp. those of Christ, since he should be worshiped as an "image (eikon) of the invisible God." Nevertheless, Christians decorated their catacombs and eventually their churches with images that were considered to be holy. Church fathers such as Basil the Great defended the veneration of images as offered not to the picture but to the prototype (PG 32:140C).

The dispute became acute in the 8th and 9th C. during the controversy over ICONOCLASM. The Iconoclasts argued that portrayal of Christ leads either to Nestorian separation of humanity from divinity or Monophysite confusion of humanity and divinity; they considered the eucharistic elements as the only proper "icon" of Christ. Iconophiles, the defenders of icon veneration (primarily John of Damascus, Theodore of Stoudios, Patr. Nikephoros I), developed Basil's idea and elaborated the concept of three levels of image: Christ as the natural image of the Father; man as the divine image by adoption and imitation; and the icon as an artistic image of Christ or the saints. Consequently, they also developed a terminology to differentiate the veneration of icons: they distinguished the relative veneration (timetikel/schetike proskynesis) of the icon and saints from the genuine worship (latreia) of the object depicted and stressed that the purpose of veneration was to arouse devotion. Attacking the Iconoclasts, they connected the latter's anti-iconic attitude with Manichaean (Paulician) and Jewish tenets. John of Damascus emphasized the didactic role of icons, esp. for the illiterate, whereas the LETTER OF THE THREE PATRIARCHS and saints' vitae describe the wondrous power of icons, which could heal the sick and bring retribution on assailants.

The principles of icon veneration were summarized at the Second Council of Nicaea (787), which, however, laid greater emphasis on the tradition of miracle-working icons (such as the Mandylion and other acheiropoieta, likenesses "not made by human hand") than on theological subtleties. Doubts about icon veneration remained alive even after the defeat of Iconoclasm (J. Guillard, AnnEPHE, 50 section. 86 [1977/8] 29–50).


—G.P., R.S.

PAINTED ICONS. The painted wooden panel is the most copiously preserved and longest-lived genre of that very distinctive form of Byz. art, the portable devotional icon. Its history can be studied best from the panels at the monastery of St. Cath- erine, Sinai, the only comprehensive collection of Byz. examples that survives. The earliest preserved panel-painted icons—some 27, all at Sinai—belong to the 6th–7th C. (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, nos. B.1–B.31). All are on wood and are from 14 to 92 cm high. They use antique media, either encaustic (pigment suspended in wax) or tempera (pigment suspended in egg yolk, the medium found in most post-Iconoclastic panels). Their forms—likewise antique—include single rectangular panels, diptychs (derived from writing tablets), and triptychs (recalling Late Antique devotional triptychs with images of the gods); no round examples survive, but they are depicted in other media and so may have existed. Their portrait compositions echo Late Antique commemorative portraits and imperial lavrata. Thematically varied, with New Testament theophanies, Old Testament scenes promising salvation, and full- and half-length portraits of Christ, the Virgin Mary, prophets, and major saints, they reflect not so much liturgical formulas as private devotions. Chronologically, these panels coincide with extensive evidence in other media and in saints' vitae of images mediating the holy. Thus they seem to reflect a significant stage in the development of the icon, as it moved from private use into more public visibility. The diverse subjects and formats of these earliest panels indicate that most came into the church as private votive donations, and their use remained extraliturgical, focusing individual devotions.

Panels of the 8th and 9th C.—surviving only at Sinai (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, nos. B.32–B.41)—
TEMPLON emerged as the focus for its public display. Normally stored on hooks in aisles or the sanctuary, panels were moved to the templon—or to a PROSKYNETARION in front of it—on the day of the feast they represented. Shifted in accord with shifting feasts, the panels remained portable, seldom exceeding the height of about one meter accommodated by the templon. In shape, however, they adapted to the rectangular intercolumniations of the templon, and only private panels retained the varied antique forms.

Panels of the mid-11th through 12th C. are characterized more by innovation and proliferation than by standardization. The liturgy, now thoroughly regularized, was enriched emotionally by the incorporation of evocative ceremonies, esp. those of Holy Week. This opened the way for artistic invention within liturgical boundaries, generating new, emotionally charged images based on hymns and prayers: the MAN OF SORROWS, variants of the VIRGIN ELEOUSA, Symeon Glykopilon (see HYPAPANTE), the major bilateral icons (see below). These new themes were suited to, and probably originated as, devotional panels. They coincided with an expanded use of panel-painted icons in both public and private devotion. Richer patterns for the disposition of panels in church and templon emerged, generating new and distinctively Byz. shapes: the long, narrow templon beam displaying a Great Deesis or Great Feasts cycle; the panels hung in the templon’s intercolumniations, usually showing Christ, Mary, John the Baptist, or the church’s patron saint; the holy (or “royal”) doors in the templon adorned with the ANNUNCIATION; the Crucifixion mounted above the templon; the calendar icons, whose registers display the feast images for entire months; and the hagiographical or “vita” icons, showing a saint surrounded by scenes from his or her life. While such images may often have been made of precious materials in the churches of Constantinople, panel painting was generally adopted, proving preferable in scale, weight, adaptability, and affordability. Many more panel paintings survive from the 12th C. than from any earlier century. Sinai itself was fully furbished with panel-painted icons then, and panel painting began to take on a local cast in the byzantinizing cultures of Russia and Italy.

The climactic proliferation of panel painting came in Palaiologan art. The 14th is the first
century in which panel paintings dominate works in other media both numerically and artistically. More panels are preserved than icons in other media; for the first time they survive from all parts of the Orthodox world, reflecting numerous local traditions. Their imagery expands, embracing complex allegories and arcane New Testament and hagiographical events. Other media imitate them: MS illumination contracts to frontispieces resembling icons; monumental painting exhibits grids of iconlike rectangular pictures; in the realm of precious materials, the miniature mosaic (see “Mosaic Icons” below), which attempts to imitate the fluid modeling of panel painting, displaces the more abstract media like enamel. The templon develops into the iconostasis, the opaque screen of fixed icons, tier upon tier.

Little is known about icon painters. Though some were monks, others were clearly laymen, and many practiced in a variety of media (see Artists).

Metal Icons. Vulnerable because their material could be reused, few icons in precious metals survive today. They were numerous in the Byz. era, however, in both public and private contexts. In private use, gold, silver, bronze, cloisonné enamel, and cameos were formed into icons for personal adornment on amulets, pendants, belts, and rings. Byz. wills refer to devotional icons of silver and copper. Silver examples do not survive, though several small bronze panels seem to copy more costly silver models, just as the gilded bronze triptych in London reflects models in ivory (K. Weitzmann, The Icon: Holy Images, Sixth to Fourteenth Century [New York 1978], fig. E). In the public realm, cloisonné icons adorned not only imperial and ecclesiastical vestments and vessels, but also church furniture. The Pala d’Oro in S. Marco in Venice preserves Byz. enamels both from the church’s 12th-C. antependium (altar front) and from the templon beam of the Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople. These represent Christ, apostles, angels, and Great Feasts. Individual metal icons most often show single figures: Christ, the Virgin Mary, an archangel or a major saint (military saints, Nicholas of Myra). The most spectacular surviving examples are the two cloisonné and relief panels of St. Michael in Venice (Treasury S. Marco, nos. 12, 19); the paired cloisonné plaques there (nos. 9, 14), now used as bookcovers, may originally have been used as devotional panels in Byz.

Mosaic Icons. Some 48 Byz. mosaic icons survive from the 11th through 14th C. Artistic hybrids of outstanding luxury, they unite the portability of panel paintings with the mosaic technique of mural art and the precious materials of metalwork. Wax or resin on wood serves as a setting bed for jewellike tesserae of solid gold and silver, semiprecious stones, ivory, and enamel flux. One
densely that they appear seamless and breathtakingly illusionistic. Sometimes their media are mixed, with molded haloes of gilded gesso around mosaic figures or mosaic highlights in painted fields (Florence diptych).


IC XC NIKA, partly abbreviated form of the Greek Ἰησοῦς Χριστός νικά, "Jesus Christ, conquer," or Ἰησοῦς Χριστός νικά, "Jesus Christ conquers" (DOC 3.1:231). Inspired by Constantine I's vision at the Milvian Bridge, the slogan was repeated during acclamations in the Hippodrome. The sigla occur on various objects, for example, on a commemorative inscription of 740–41 on the walls of Constantinople and cantonned within the arms of the cross on pages of the Paris Gregory and the Bible of Leo Sakearios. In this form they served generally as invocatory or apotropaic signs at the entrances to houses and churches, on bread stamps, and on the backs of icons and ivories. On coins, a similar formula Ἐν τούτῳ νικά was introduced in 641 (DOC 2.1:101); although it was replaced by IC XC NIKA under Leo III, it reappears in the 11th C.


IDACIUS. See Hydatius.

IDIORRHYTHMIC MONASTICISM, an individualized form of monastic life. The term idiorrhythnia (ιδιορρυθνία), meaning "following one's own devices," is found as early as the 5th C. (Mark the Hermite, PG 53.1.1057A), but this type of monasticism did not become at all common until the Palaiologan era and has a negative connotation throughout the Byz. period. In general, idiorrhythmic monasticism has been condemned by the Eastern church (as in the *typhon* for the monastery of Areia, 249.13–14) because of its deviation from the traditional ideals of the koimobion, or cenobitism. Nonetheless, by the late 14th C. the idiorrhythmic regime appears to have become established in some monasteries on Mt. Athos as
an alternative to the cenobitic or eremitic form of monasticism. Idiorrhythmic monks are permitted to acquire personal property; through their labor they earn income to purchase food and clothing. They take their meals separately in their cells rather than in a communal refectory and may eat meat. The organization of an idiorrhythmic monastery also differs from its cenobitic counterpart; instead of the absolute rule of a ἕγουμενος elected for life, the affairs of the monastery are administered by an oligarchic council (σύναξις) of προστάτοι who make decisions and two or three ἐπίτροποι who execute them.


—A.M.T.

IDOL (εἰδωλον), a generic disdainful term used by Christian apologists to characterize pagan gods and their images, idolatry being synonymous with pagan worship. The Christians emphasized that idols were dead and that their veneration was instigated by demons. The term also designated phantoms, ghosts, and hallucinations, but it was applied to statues without derogatory connotation (Av. Cameron, J. Herrin in Parastaseis 31). The multiple meanings of the term became obvious during the dispute over Iconoclasm when the Iconodules were accused of idolatry and had to elaborate a strict distinction between the dead idol that did not represent anything but itself—wood, stone, or metal—and the icon that as the image of God, the Virgin Mary, or saints had to be distinguished from its material in the same way that the parchment, ink, and paint on manuscripts were distinguished from the word of the Lord.

—A.K.

IDRISI, AL-, more fully Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Idrīsī, Arab geographer, cartographer, and botanist; born Ceuta (North Africa) 1100, died Ceuta ca. 1165. Educated in Islamic Cordoba, he traveled throughout Spain and other parts of the Mediterranean world. In 1138 he was invited by Roger II to settle in Palermo, where he led a team of cartographers and researchers that produced a spherical map and a world geography. The resulting Yarning Man’s Journey, or Book of Roger (begun 1139, completed Jan. 1154, under Roger’s official patronage), is perhaps the best work of medieval cartography, marking the climax of Arab geography and demonstrating

Norman Sicily's intellectual achievement. Al-Idrīṣī wrote a summary of this for William I.

Besides his description of Sicily, Italy, Spain, northern Europe, and Africa, some of his material on Byz. is original, though he freely uses earlier Arab geographers. The assumption that he visited Constantinople or Asia Minor is based on a misreading of his statements. He adds new information on later developments, topography, towns, ports, and economic and commercial activity in Byz., Seljuk Asia Minor, Armenia, Trebizond, and the Balkans. His work on Materia Medica seems to distinguish between ancient and Byz. Greek.


—A.Sh.

IGNATIOS OF SMOLENSK, writer; fl. 1389–1405. Ignatij (Ignatios) traveled from Moscow to Constantinople in 1389 in the entourage of Metr. Pimen. After Pimen’s death (Sept. 1389) and the appointment of Kripian, Ignatij remained in Constantinople at least until 1392 and probably in the Balkans and on Athos until ca. 1405. The three works soundly attributed to him—a Journey to Constantinople (1389–92), a Description of Thessalonike and the Holy Mountain, and parts of an Abbreviated Chronicle to 1404—together form a selective diary of Ignatij’s observations. The meticulous details and chronologies make Ignatij’s works valuable and varied repositories of information. Topics on which he is the sole or main eyewitness source include the Don River route to Constantinople; the struggle for the throne between John VII and Manuel II in 1390–91, as reflected in the life of the capital; and the coronation of Manuel II in 1392. Ignatij also provides a list of churches in Thessalonike and the earliest Eastern Slavic description of Athos. His Journey relates his own visits to the sacred sites in chronological order; he neither presents a systematic itinerary nor details legends and stories about the monuments. He does, however, employ some of the formulas and phraseology of the "pilgrim book" genre.


—S.C.F.

IGNATIOS, patriarch of Constantinople (4 July 847–23 Oct. 858; 23 Nov. 867–23 Oct. 877) and saint; baptismal name Niketas; born Constantinople ca.797/8, died Constantinople; feastday 23 Oct. He is sometimes called Ignatios the Younger (ho neos) to distinguish him from the 1st-C. church father Ignatios Theophoros. After the deposition of his father, Emp. Michael I Rangabe, in 813, Ignatios, together with his brothers, was castrated and forced to take monastic vows. He became hegumenos of three monasteries that he had founded on the Princes’ Islands. In the aftermath of the Iconoclast controversy, Empress Theodora appointed him to succeed Methodios I as patriarch without convening an elective synod, since she wanted to avoid stirring up enmity between the Stoumites and the moderates. Ignatios found a modus vivendi with the Stoumites but aroused the opposition of the moderates led by Gregory Asbestas. The patriarch’s position deteriorated when Caesar Bardas took power and exiled Theodora; deprived of her support, Ignatios was forced to resign.

He was replaced by Photios, who had to give some guarantees to the former patriarch and his followers, but the guarantees were soon broken; the appointment of Asbestas to the see of Syracuse became the external cause of the clash. Ignatios, who had been temporarily exiled by Bardas to the island of Terebinthos, was allowed to return to his mother’s palace in the capital. He remained moderate, but the Ignatians attacked Photios and attempted to draw Pope Nicolas I to their side. At first Nicholas was reluctant to support them, stating that Ignatios had been elected noncanonically, but eventually the pope used this conflict as a means to intervene in the affairs of the church of Constantinople.

In 867 Basil I, in his search for a Western alliance, restored Ignatios to the patriarchal throne and banished Photios, but Ignatios refused to yield to the papacy; he managed to draw Bulgaria into the Byz. ecclesiastical orbit and probably sub-
jected the young church in Moravia to Constantinople. This active anti-Western policy of Basil I and Ignatios made senseless their antagonism to Photios; the latter was released from exile, succeeded Ignatios after his death, and contributed to the sanctification of Ignatios. A unique mosaic portrait of Ignatios preserved in Hagia Sophia was probably created shortly after 886. The vita of Ignatios by Niketas David Paphlagon is permeated by hatred for Photios and contains more derision of Photios than eulogy of Ignatios.


IGNATIOS OF NICAEA. See IGNATIOS THE DEACON.

IGNATIOS OF SMOLENSK. See IGNATIUS OF SMOLENSK.

IGNATIOS THE DEACON, writer; born ca. 770-80, died after 845, if the kanon on the Forty-Two Martyrs of Amorion (ed. V. Vasilievskij, P. Nikitin, p. 80.44) ascribed to “Ignatios” belongs to him and not to one of his numerous namesakes. A pupil and collaborator of Patr. Tarasios, Ignatios was ordained by him deacon and became skewophylax; after Tarasios’s deposition (806) Ignatios sided with the Iconoclasts and was later elected metropolitan of Nicaea. He later regretted this change of heart. At some point he became a monk on Mt. Olympos.

The Souda lists his works, including the vitae of Tarasios and Patr. Nikephoros I, funeral elegies, letters, and (now lost) iambics against Thomas the Slav. On a stylistic basis Sevcenko attributed to him the vitae of Gregory of Dekapolis and George of Amastris (in Iconoclasm 121-25). Probably Ignatios also wrote several poetic works, such as verses on Adam (a dialogue between Adam, Eve, and the Serpent), verses on Lazarus and the rich man, moral sentences in alphabetical order; the existence of other Ignatios prevents certain identification. A member of the generation that followed Theophanes and Theodore of Studios, Ignatios revealed interest in the ancient heritage, esp. in Sophocles and Euripides (R. Brown.

ing, REG 81 (1968) 405-07), and emphasized the rhetorical adornment of his speech. Litšč (Ocherki 404-05) hypothesized that Ignatios was represented with Patr. John VII in a caricature in the Kludov Psalter.

Ed. For list of his works, see Tsaatkaim-Lexikon 360-61.


- A.K.

IGNATIUS, PSEUDO-., conventional name for the author of the interpolations made perhaps ca. 360-380 in the text of the letters of St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch (died ca. 107). The interpolations mainly concern the role of the bishop. The interpolator appears to be a follower of Arrianism, and various candidates have been proposed, for example, Akakios of Caesarea (died 366), Eunomios, Silvanos of Tarso (O. Perler, HistJu 77 (1958) 73-82), and Julian of Halikarnassos. It is possible that he is to be equated with the author of the Apostolic Constitutions.


- B.B.

IGOR, prince of Kiev, successor of Oleg; died 945. In 941 Igor led a fleet of small boats (monoxyla) against Constantinople. Byz. ships under command of the patroikios Theophanes met them at Hieron on 11 June and prevented Igor from attacking the capital. He probably left for Kiev after this failure, but the boats from Rus’ remained in the area for two months, plundering the Bithynian coast (from Pontic Herakleia to the border of Paphlagonia, according to the vita of Basil the Younger). The government of Romanos I recalled some troops of John Kourkouas from the eastern frontier and dispatched Theophanes with a fleet; he used Greek fire and on 15 Sept. destroyed the boats of the Rus’ near the Thracian coast; the remnant of their army headed homeward by land. According to common scholarly opinion, in 943 or 944 Igor again launched his forces against Byz., but Byz. envoys met the army at the estuary of the Danube; after negotiations a new treaty was signed that provided Kiev merchants with less favorable conditions than
those established in the treaty signed by Oleg. Soon thereafter Igor was murdered while collecting tribute from the Drevljane, a neighboring tribe.


—A.K.

IKONION (Ikonov, now Konya), city of Pismia in the mid-4th C., metropolis of Lykoania from ca.370, incorporated into the Anatolikon theme in the 7th C. The execution of Isaurian prisoners in 354 at Ikonion provoked the great Isaurian revolt. St. Thecla was believed to have miraculously saved Ikonion from a later Isaurian attack. Its first metropolis was St. Amphilochos. From the 8th to 10th C., Arabs frequently attacked Ikonion and its neighboring fortress, Kabala. Plundered by the Turks in 1689, Ikonion was the scene of the revolt of Roussel de Bailleul. It fell to the Seljuks in 1084 and flourished as their capital. The city was briefly occupied by the Crusaders in 1097, its suburbs were ravaged by Manuel I in 1146. Most of its Byz. monuments, including the 11th-C. Church of St. Amphilochos, have disappeared, but the Byz. fortress of Kabala and the rock-cut churches of Sile, both in the immediate vicinity of the city, survive.


—C.F.

ILARION (Hilarion), author of *Discourse on Law and Grace* (Slovo o zakone i blagodati) (ca.1049) and a *Confession of Faith* (ca.1051?), metropolitan of Kiev (1051–ca.1054). The *Discourse*, the most sustained and erudite rhetorical work of Kievian Rus' (see Rus', Literature of), celebrates the conversion of Rus' within the context of sacred history: the Grace of Christianity superseded the Law of Moses, just as Sarah the free woman superseded Hagar the bondmaid, and reached Rus' through the divinely inspired free choice of Vladimir I. The homily ends with an *enkomion* to Vladimir and a prayer for the land of Rus'. The *Discourse's* language, typology, style, and structure owe much to Byz. rhetoric and exegeses, leading to conjecture that Iliarion read Greek (F. Thompson, *Slavica Gandensia* 10 [1983] 67–102). Influence from Czech literature is also possible (N.N. Rozov, *TDRL* 23 [1968] 71–85). The appointment of Iliarion, the first native metropolitan of Kiev, by Prince Jaroslav of Kiev and the composition of the Discourse are sometimes interpreted as anti-Byz. acts. The circumstances of Iliarion's election are unknown, however, and the Discourse, proclaiming Vladimir to be a "likeness of Constantine the Great," manifestly presents Byz. as the cultural prototype rather than as a political or ecclesiastical threat.


—S.C.F., P.A.H.

ILIAD. See Homer: *Troy Tale*.

ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN (vôdotoi), also called *spouriai*, were, according to the *Codex Justinianus*, children both to a concubine (see Concubine), an unmarried woman, or a prostitute (see Prostitution); progeny from the union of a free woman and slave were also considered illegitimate. Illegitimate children were legally deprived of the right to inherit from their father, but had the same relationship with their mother as legitimate children. The classical jurists did not give serious attention to this discrepancy; it was Justinian I who corrected the situation by making the father liable for supporting his children by a concubine. In novel 89 he considered ways of legitimizing *nôthoi*: the most recommended method was to adopt them to the corpus; another valid method was to assign a "charter of dowry" to the mother of a *nôthos*, whether she was freeborn or a freedwoman, or the testamentary statement of a man who had fathered only illegitimate children that they were his heirs. High-born mothers were prohibited by both civil and canon law from making gifts of any sort to their natural children; legitimate offspring were thus protected from any form of disinheritance (J. Beaucamp, *CahCM* 20 [1977] 158).
Later Byz. law essentially retained the rules established by Justinian. In the 13th C. illegitimate progeny still had no right to inherit if there were legitimate descendants, even if they were collateral descendants (A. Laiou, FM 6 [1984] 295f).

Patr. Nikephoros I considered the case of a father’s refusal to recognize his natural son (PG 100.468B); the tribunal had to determine whether they had a physical resemblance; if not, the child was proclaimed ekphyllos, “without family.”

Despite such disadvantages, some nōthoi (usually the children of emperors and courtiers) reached high positions, like the parakoimomenos Basil the Nothos (son of Romanos I), and children of Manuel I and Andronikos I. Illegitimate sons might serve as important hostages, and several illegitimate daughters of emperors were married to foreign rulers as diplomatic pawns.


A.K., J.H.

ILLOS (Ἰλλός), rebellious general of Zeno; died fort of Papyrios (Paperon), Isauria, 488. An Isaurian by birth, Illos together with his brothers Aspalios and Trokoudos supported Zeno’s rise to the throne. In 474 he fought successfully against the barbarians in Thrace; the same year, however, he switched his allegiance to Basiliskos, who sent him to besiege Zeno in Sbide, an Isaurian stronghold; there he again changed sides (Theophanes explains this saying that Basiliskos failed to fulfill “promises”) and helped Zeno recover his throne. He became patrickios and magister militum and, according to Malalas, administered the empire. Zeno’s wife Ariadne and mother-in-law Verina conspired against Illos unsuccessfully in 477 and 478; as a result, Verina was banished. In 479 Illos suppressed the revolt of Verina’s son-in-law Marcellian. In the winter of 481/2 Ariadne organized a third plot against the general. During the assault on him, Illos lost an ear. In 483–84, while in Antioch, Illos prepared a revolt against Zeno; at this time he gained the support of Verina, who crowned his ally Leontios. They were defeated by Zeno’s magister militum John the Scythian in 484 and took refuge in the fort of Papyrios (J. Gottwald, BZ 36 [1936] 88f). Illos and Leontios held out for four years. They were eventually betrayed and executed. With regard to religious policy Illos appealed to the Orthodox against Zeno’s Monophysite tendencies, but he was also sympathetic toward paganism. The soothsayer Pampereios was his adviser during the rebellion. A district in Constantinople was known as ta Illov, and his house there became a church of St. John.


T.E.G.

ILLUMINATORS of Byz. MSS are rarely documented in colophons or otherwise. The common term for an illuminator was zographos, “painter” (I. Ševčenko, DOP 16 [1962] 245, n.6), but probably around the 9th C. another term, chrysographos, “one who writes in gold,” appeared—first mentioned in an obscure author, Meletios the Monk, from the theme of Opsikon (PG 64:1309B).

A few illuminators are known by name: Pantoleon and his team; Theodore of Caesarea, who wrote and illuminated the Theodore Psalter in 1066; Michael Koresis, who “wrote in gold” a Georgian Gospel book in the late 12th/early 13th C. (E. Takaichvili, Byzantium 10 [1935] 659ff). In verses accompanying a dedicatory miniature, the monk Theophanes claimed to be the donor, scribe, and illuminator of the Melbourne Gospels, but donors often took credit for making the object of their generosity. Finally, in the late 14th C. Theophanes “the Greek,” described as an illuminator of books and a painter of churches, was asked to paint a leaf to be inserted in a MS. The practice had long been used by Byz. illuminators, but became increasingly frequent in the Palaiologan era. Generally the scribe wrote the text of the MS, leaving space for the illuminator, who made a preliminary underdrawing, applied the gold ground, and then began to paint, concluding with the faces. (See also ARTISTS.)


R.S.N.

ILLUSTRIS (ἱλλοῦστριος), the highest title of senators in the late Roman Empire. The term was used as a vague epithet much earlier, but acquired a specific technical meaning in the last quarter of the 4th C. First it was bestowed on major officials such as praetorian prefect, ur-
BAN PREFECT, MAGISTER MILITUM, CONSULS, and PATRIKIOL, and eventually on all senators. In the 6th C. the most important illustres were called gloriosi. Not being a hereditary title (Guiland, Institutions 1:66f.), it provided certain privileges, both fiscal (immunity from certain obligations) and ceremonial. The term remained in use in the 7th C. Maximos the Confessor (PG 91:644D) addressed a correspondent as “magnificent illustri,” and the Miracles of St. Demetrios (ed. Lemerle 1:161.7) speak of the “so-called illustrioi.” The term illustri does not appear in the taktika, although both legal and hagiographic texts (until the 11th C.) equate the title PROTOSPATHARIOS with it (e.g., A. Sigalas, EEBS 12 [1936] 355.12–13).


ILLYRICUM (᾿Ιλλυρικῶν), a Roman province in the northwestern part of the Balkans. In the 4th C. attempts were made to create a prefecture of Illyricum, encompassing Pannonia, Macedonia, and Dacia. After 395 this vast territory was divided into Illyricum occidentale and Illyricum orientale with capitals at Sirmium (?) and Thessalonike, respectively. Latin was the lingua franca in western Illyricum. Beginning in the 2nd C. Christianity spread through western Illyricum, the two metropolitan sees, Salona and Sirmium, being of principal importance.

In the 5th to 7th C. Illyricum underwent various invasions by Ostrogoths, Huns, Lombards, and Avars; Slavnoi (second half of the 6th C.); Serbs and Croatians (7th C.); and, after 680, Bulgars, who began to play a decisive role in Illyricum. The ancient cities declined and assumed a rural character (V. Popović in Palast und Hütte [Mainz 1982] 545–66). Those townships that survived were forced to come to terms with new masters (by paying tribute). During the reign of Justinian I, western Illyricum was under the rule of Constantinople, with the center of Illyricum as a whole at Justiniana Prima and, for a time, probably at Sirmium. According to the vita of David of Thessalonike the capital was transferred from Sirmium to Thessalonike; whether it was in fact from Sirmium (Lemerle, Miracles 2:50) or from Justiniana Prima (A. Vasiliev, Traditio 4 [1946] 115–47) is difficult to determine. It is unclear how long Illyricum continued to exist, but by the 9th C. it had been replaced by the theme of Thessalonike; the name Illyricum lost its precise meaning and was used as a descriptive designation for the region of Dyrrachion (as in the Alexiad of Anna Komnene), including Serbo-Croatian territory.

Ecclesiastically, the former Illyricum occidentale remained under the direct authority of the pope. In the 8th C., however, the Iconoclast emperors tried to subordinate it to Constantinople—according to M. Anastos (Sibi 9 [1957] 14–31) in 732/3, according to V. Grumel (RechScRel 40 [1952] 191–200) two decades later. The papacy never recognized this act. By the end of the 9th C. the Byz. founded the theme of Dalmatia, but they had to abandon the region by 1069; they briefly held it again from 1165 to 1180 (Ferluga, Byzantium 141–49).


'IMĀD AL-DĪN, more fully Muhammad ibn Muḥammad al-Kāṭib al-Īsfahānī, Arab writer, poet, diplomat, and chronicler; born Īsfāhān 1125, died Damascus 1201. In 1175, following a colorful career in the service of the 'Abbāsids and of Nūr al-Dīn, ‘Imād al-Dīn joined Saladin to become his ardent friend, counselor, chief diplomatic secretary, and chronicler. After Saladin’s death, ‘Imād al-Dīn returned to private life and devoted himself to literary work. His tomb adjoins that of Saladin.

‘Imād al-Dīn’s books, Qussian Eloquence on the Conquest of Jerusalem and The Syrian Lightning, constitute firsthand sources on Saladin’s wars and politics, with frequent references to his relations with the Byz. Although only the third and fifth parts of The Syrian Lightning have survived, its first (?) part is preserved in al-Bundārī’s abridgement, The Splendor of the Syrian Lightning. Equally important is ‘Imād al-Dīn’s The Assistance of the Weak, the first history of the Great Seljuks. It is based on the lost Persian memoirs of Anūshīrvān ibn Khālid (died 1137), which ‘Imād al-Dīn rendered into Arabic. Its precious information on
the Seljuk penetration and conquest of Asia Minor includes a lengthy account of the battle of Mantzikert. In addition to the full version, extant in a unique MS in the Bibliothèque Nationale, al-Bundârî's abridgment (1226) survives. İmâd al-Dîn also produced a voluminous anthology of 12th-C. Arab poets. As a rule, a virtually untranslatable, overly flowery style characterized İmâd al-Dîn's work. Al-Bundârî's abridgments strip away the stylistic redundancies but retain all the facts.


**LIT.** H. Massâ, *EF* 3:1157f. — A.S.E.

---

**IMBROS (Ἰμβρος, mod. Imroz), island in the northeastern Aegean Sea that, along with Tenedos, controls the entrance to the Hellespont. In late antiquity Imbros was part of the province of Achaea (Hierokl. 649.2), and by the 9th C. it almost certainly was part of the theme of the Aegean Sea. Although not specifically mentioned in *De thematibus*, Imbros provided a primary line of defense for Constantinople against the Arabs. Assigned to the Latin Empire after 1204, it was effectively controlled by Venice; after 1354 it was in the hands of the Genoese descendants of Francesco Gattilusio. By the time Cyriacus of Ancona visited Imbros in 1444, the island was again Byz. and his guide was the Imbriot Michael Kritoboulos. The latter asked Mehem II to grant the island independence after 1453, but it was assigned to the Gattilus of Lesbos. In 1460 Imbros was part of the appanage given to Demetrios Palaiologos, former despot of the Morea. A bishop of Imbros, not mentioned previously, was raised to archiepiscopal status by Manuel II (Notitiæ CP 18.157); he was a metropolitan (21.75) after 1453.


---

**IMITATION (μιμησις) was considered by the ancient theoreticians as an important element of intellectual activity. The imitation of Attic culture was recommended both in late antiquity and in Byz. The Byz. rejected innovation, and even great minds, such as John of Damascus, emphasized the imitateness of their works. Mimesis could have different aspects: direct imitation, such as the Christos Paschon, which is a pastiche of existing verses by ancient poets; writing in the style of a predecessor, like dialogues imitating Lucian. Rhetorical exercises on ancient or biblical topics and borrowing of the stock elements of ancient literature or patristics or using overt or concealed citations were also practiced. Materials that were borrowed or imitated included not only writings of the remote past but works of more recent Byz. authors as well. Sermons, saints' vitae, and historical works teem with such stock elements and citations. The ideological underpinning of mimesis can be found in the declarations of ecumenical councils, such as that in Trullo, which embraced adherence to "the ancient types" (Rhalles-Potlotes, *Syntagma* 2:493-3).
The purposes of imitation were diverse: the author could, by engaging in imitation, demonstrate how well versed he was in literature; he could also, by referring to the knowledge of his audience, stimulate reminiscences and create allusions. He could, by making parallels with biblical or Roman history, stress the eternity of certain phenomena or contrast present times with the glorious (or infamous) past. Truly skillful imitation consisted in employing the same general pattern to emphasize certain details or distinctions or to produce, from the available "bricks," a completely new idea and image. Imitation could also have the force of parody. Byz. literature produced an enormous amount of purely imitative, plagiaristic material, but in talented hands mimesis could become a powerful vehicle of expression. Imitation, then, was not purely servile but an intrinsic part of Byz. culture.

Even while it must be distinguished from customary observance of canonical forms, imitation in the visual arts was more central than in literature to the working methods of craftsmen and more pragmatic in purpose. Using established church plan types, builders replicated venerable models, sometimes with the intention of evoking associations with loca sancta and pilgrimage sites. Painters such as Kallierges could copy entire compositions, yet adaptation and the "quotation" of elements, rather than wholesale appropriation, were more characteristic practices. When an ancient treasure like the Paris Psalter was tapped some 250 years after its creation, its miniatures were not merely copied but made the basis for the invention of new images.


A.K., A.C.

IMMUNITY, a concept borrowed from the terminology of western European feudalism to denote a privilege granted by the emperor that forbade state officials from entering the beneficiary’s domains and performing certain fiscal, judicial, and administrative functions there. Ostrogorsky, among others, viewed exkousseia as synonymous with immunity. On the basis of the exemption formulas found in documents, he concluded that, during the 10th-12th C., immunity implied fiscal rights, that is, freedom from taxation, and that only in the 14th-15th C. did judicial immunity develop, that is, the right for privileged landlords, lay and religious, to judge their paroikoi. Ostrogorsky limited this right, however, to low justice. While fiscal immunity did exist in Byz., though to an extent perhaps not as widespread as in the West, there is some question as to whether judicial immunity existed at all. Some scholars in fact consider the application of the Western medieval concept of immunity to Byz. as inappropriate and misleading and prefer the more limited concept of exemption.


IMPERIAL CULT. Worship of the divinity of the emperor, which had begun as a means for Greek cities to assimilate their relationship with the Roman Empire (S. R. Price, Rituals and Power [Cambridge 1984]), culminated in the adoption of Hellenistic divine kingship by the Tetrarchy. Constantine I’s conversion excluded outright sacrifice to imperial divinity, although ambiguities persisted (e.g., the temple to his family erected at Hispellum [ILS, no.705]). On the local level, priests of the imperial cult probably shed religious functions but continued their political role in city and provincial assemblies well into the 5th and 6th C., esp. in Africa (F. M. Clover in Romanitas-Christianitas [Berlin 1982] 661-74). In the capital, the emperor’s status as God’s representative on earth maintained and even expanded aspects of the imperial cult, esp. the sacredness of imperial persons and institutions concretized by ceremony and by divinizing epithets. Although Constantine avoided divus for his person, his successors revived the custom, whence arose the Byz. usage of theios for the imperial person and institutions and xakra for documents. Proclamations of the emperor and his haloed image, the image’s privilege of asylum and placement on church altars, the custom of receiving objects from the emperor with covered hands, silence, incense, and lighted candles in his presence stemmed ultimately from the imperial cult and characterized Byz. rulership. The church itself transformed and fostered the imperial cult, as posthumous consecratio gave way to elaborate Christian funerals (S. Price in Canadine-Price, Rituals 56-105), imperial obits were commemorated in the Synaxarion of Constantinople,
and the emperor obtained unique liturgical prerogatives reflecting his sacral status.


**IMPOST BLOCK**, a stone block shaped like an inverted, truncated pyramid, placed on the capitals of columns destined to carry an arcade. The impost block probably evolved from the Roman practice of projecting short entablature spurs over capitals of columns placed in front of walls, as at the Porta Aurea of the Palace of Diocletian at Split. The capitals of the paired columns of S. Costanza, Rome, support a short entablature block that functions as an impost block. According to Deichmann, the mature form had its origin in the 5th-C. Greek East, but fully developed impost blocks appeared by ca.400 in Italy at S. Giorgio Maggiore in Naples and in the Basilica Ursiana in Ravenna. Impost blocks, often spolia, were used in Byz. architecture as late as the 14th C. They were placed directly on column shafts in the cisterns of Constantinople and, on a smaller scale, appear directly on columns or posts dividing windows, e.g., at Daphni, Hosios Loukas, and on the exterior of the Holy Apostles, Thessalonike. The impost block is frequently decorated with elaborate patterns of acanthus leaves and Christian symbols. In the 5th C., the impost block and capital merged to form the impost capital.


**IMPOST CAPITAL**, a uniquely Byz. capital created possibly in Constantinople by merging the function of the impost block with the mid-5th-C. forms of the Corinthian capital. The merger was facilitated by the development of the Corinthian capital into cup- and kettle-shaped forms, covered with abstract floral ornament incised and drilled, rather than carved, into the block; in both shape and decoration this late Corinthian capital approached the form of the more geometrically conceived impost block. Some impost capitals show a much diminished impost block on top; some exhibit small volutes at the base or at the top, faint reminders of the Ionic capital. The stages in this development from the mid-5th C. to its climax in Justinian I’s Hagia Sophia have been traced by Strube (infra). The creation of the impost capital marks the end of the classic capital and the appearance of a new form that carries the eye more fluently from column shaft to the arches above.


**IMRU’ AL-QAYS.** See Qays.

**INCANTATION** (ἐπιγονή), a magic song recited over a person or a charm to effect a cure, fend off evil, transfer evil to another, or evoke an erotic response in a member of the opposite sex. Incantations were similar in format, whether of Christian, pagan, or syncretistic provenance. The reciter of the incantation invariably summoned an angel or daimon, without which the charm was believed ineffective. Byz. writers often mention incantations in connection with magic, but seldom quote the actual words used. Canon 36 of the Council of Laodikeia (4th C.) forbade Christian clergics to invent or recite incantations. In the 12th C. Balsamon and Zonaras commented on the practice. Many examples of incantations survive on magical papyri, metal sheets, and small objects. An il]illiterate but dramatic 7th-C. incantation on an amulet calls upon Beliar, the inventor of the evil eye, to flee in the name of Christ from the limbs of the owner (who was perhaps paralyzed?) (*CIG* 4, no.9065). Syncretic incantations often used the names of apocryphal angels of Jewish tradition and “barbaric words.” Pagan incantations are reported in Anatolia and Sicily as late as the 7th–8th C.

INCARNATION (σάρκωςις or ἐνσάρκωςις) refers to the appearance of the Logos in the history of salvation (σωκονομία), distinguished from his generation within the Godhead. It is the classical formula of those Christologies oriented toward John 1:14, "And the Word became flesh." It is distinguished from a Christology that lays emphasis on the Preexistent One "becoming man" (en-anthropēsis—cf. Gal 4:4). The Logos-sarx model, which distinguishes theologians in the ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL, competed with the Logos-anthropos model of the ANTIOCHENE SCHOOL. When the twonatures formula of the Council of CHALCEDON was accepted by the imperial church, the difference lost meaning since flesh in this Christology no longer implied a theological devaluation of the soul and human freedom of CHRIST. It meant, rather, the full reality of human existence as it was assumed by the Logos without sin (Heb 4:15: cf. FREE WILL). Sarx refers not to the sinful, fleshly existence of fallen humanity (in the Pauline sense), but to human nature as such: to the logos, not the tropos tes hyparxeos. In some texts one encounters the view that this sarx is not an individual reality, but MANKIND as a whole. Soteriology finds its basis in the incarnation, or assumption of the flesh, by the Logos.

Iconoclastic Views on Incarnation. Debate over the relevance of the Incarnation to the depiction of Christ on icons was a key feature of the polemic on ICONOCLASM. The Council at Hieria (754) declared that the "illicit" craft of the painter violated the doctrine of the Incarnation, attributing to artists the notion that they painted the image of the flesh alone (Mansi 13:256A), which, in truth, cannot be separated from the Logos.

INCENSE (θυμίαμα), resins, esp. frankincense from the gum resin of the boswellia tree, that produce fragrant smoke when burned; also the smoke thereof. Incense, imported primarily from southern Arabia, held an important place in Roman medicine and in the imperial cult; it became therefore for Christians a symbol of pagan worship, and church fathers (Tertullian, Eusebius, Augustine) rejected its use (W. Müller, RE supp. 15 [1978] 761–64). A change in the Christian attitude toward incense began by the end of the 4th C. Ephrem the Syrian refers to it; John Chrysostom mentions its use in processions to martyrs' shrines and even in church; and Christian censers of the 4th C. have been found. In the liturgy, incense is burned over charcoal in fixed burners or, more usually, in portable censers.

Christian use of incense is (1) fumigatory, as perfume, as at funerals; (2) honorific, when objects (such as icons, gifts, or the altar), or persons are censed in veneration; (3) exorcistic, chasing away evil spirits, as when the church is incensed at the beginning of a service; and (4) oblationary, when burnt in offering, as a sign of prayer or propitiation, a notion found esp. in the Syrian and Coptic traditions. In Byz. usage only ministers in major orders (deacon, priest, bishop) cense at services. In Constantinople incense was carried in processions at the EUPHRASIT or a LITEN, etc. At VESPERS incense is burned (in conjunction with Ps 140:2) as a sign of penance and prayer. At the SUNDAY resurrection vigil of festive orthos (Taft, Liturgy of the Hours 280f, 288f) it symbolizes the service of the MYRPHOROCH.


INCEST (καταμαθία, lit. "mixing of blood," a term unknown in ancient Greek; Lat. incestus) was treated in different manners in Roman and in Oriental law, the latter condoning matrimonial relations between close relatives. In the 3rd C. Roman jurists, yielding to the Oriental system, distinguished between marriages with lineal relatives that were considered illicit and collateral marriages that were permissible although not recommended (Digest 23:2:68). The attack on incestuous marriages began with Diocletian's law of 295 (F. Klingmüller, RE 9 [1916] 1248) who proclaimed them "barbarian monstrosities" and threatened execution as punishment. Diocletian's attitude toward incest was supported by the church fathers (for instance, BASIL THE GREAT, ep. 180, ed. Y. Courtonne 2 [Paris 1901] 88–92, more closely defined by canon 54 of the Council in Trullo) and civil legislators; special attention was paid to consecutive marriages of a man to two sisters and a woman to two brothers as well as marriage to a niece. Though the threat of the death penalty appears in some laws (e.g., Constantius II in 342—Cod. Theod. III 12.1), other legislators lessened the punishment.

The extension of the concept of incest de-
INCISED WARE. See Sgraffito Ware.

INCUBATION. The practice of spending the night at a sacred precinct, pagan or Christian, until the god or saint of the shrine appears to the suppliant in a dream and cures him of disease, injury, or insanity, has continued from antiquity to the present day. Pagan temples often had dormitories, but Christian churches usually allocated an aisle of the basilica to those seeking cures. Pagan incubation endured throughout the 5th C. Constantine I suppressed the shrine of Asklepios at Aegae in Glicia but other sites continued to function, among them the temple precincts at Epidaurus in Greece (at least until 354) and the temple of Isis at Menouthis on the Nile Delta (until the 5th C.). The temple, dormitory, and sacred spring of the Asklepion in Athens probably housed a Christian healing cult from the second half of the 5th C., and the inscription “Saint Andrew” (J.S. Cregan, A.E. Raubitschek, Hesperia 16 [1947] 29) permits the hypothesis that the basilica was dedicated to the apostle Andrew. Incubation became popular in Christian churches in the 6th C., as the Acts of Sts. Kosmas and Damianos attest. Incubations at rural martyria developed as a social protest against the incompetence of, and high fees charged by, physicians. Among places where incubation was practiced in the 7th C. were the basilica of St. Isidore on Chios and the martyrion of St. Artemios in Constantinople. Miraculous healing by incubation is attested throughout the Byz. period; in the 14th C., for example, a man was exorcised of a demon by sleeping next to the coffin of the patriarch of Constantinople, Athanasios I (A.M. Talbot, Faith Healing in Late Byzantium [Brookline, Mass., 1983] 18f., 78–80).


—F.R.T.

INDIA (‘India’) maintained both economic and political relations with the late Roman Empire. Eusebius of Caesarea relates that Constantine I received ambassadors from India, allegedly as an acknowledgment that his sovereignty extended to the ocean; according to Philostorgios, Constantine dispatched a certain Theophilos to India, where he found some Christian followers of the apostle Bartholomew. The Indians also sent embassies to Emp. Julian—probably in connection with his preparations for war against Persia—and Malalas mentions an Indian ambassador to Constantinople ca.530. Late Roman coins, esp. those of Arcadius and Honorius, have been discovered in India.

Trade with India, testifed to by Kosmas Indikopleustes, took four routes: via the Euphrates and Persian Gulf to Taprobana (Ceylon); via the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean; by overland caravan routes via Persia; and by caravan travel north of the Caspian Sea and across Central Asia. The primary exports from India were spices, incense, and probably precious stones: “the wealth of India,” according to the Vita Basilii, decorated the chapel of St. Clement in the Great Palace.

Kosmas provides some factual information about India, but from antiquity onward many legends were created about this distant land; India was portrayed as the home of pious and wise gymnosophists (a reflection of the Brahmans). Nonnos of Panopolis wrote an epic poem on the god Dionysos’s expedition against India and his victory over the Indian king Deriades, achieved with the help of a fleet summoned from Arabia.

After the Arab conquest of the Near East in the 7th C., Byz. contacts with India were severed. Knowledge of India’s location grew vager and it was often confused with Ethiopia ("the inner
INDIANA of earlier sources. Byz. legends (Barlaam and Ioasaph, Alexander Romance, Vita of Makarios of Rome) dwelt on the miraculous features and extreme piety of India, a country located somewhat near Paradise. John of Karpathos wrote a tract addressed to Indian monks, but for him India was a nebulous notion. Photios expressed an antiquarian interest in India by including in his Bibliotheca (cod. 72) the description of the country by the 5th-c. B.C. author Ktesias—full of legendary data such as the manticora, a beast with a human face, and people with dogs’ heads. Psellus (Scripta min. 2:10.2–5) ridiculed a man who allegedly traveled to Egypt, Ethiopia, and India. Some Indian influences reached Byz via Persian, Syriac, or Arabic sources: thus Symeon Seth produced a Greek version of the Kali-la wa-Dinna and Planoudes a tract entitled Calculation According to the Indians.

Personifications of India or representations of its inhabitants have been recognized in floor mosaics and the Barberini ivory. These are usually identified by their double-horned fillets; more certain attributes are the tigers that accompany the women on a silver plate in Istanbul (Rice, Art of Byz., pl. 43).


—A.K., A.C.

INDICATION (ινδικτιων or έπιδεύματος), initially an extraordinary tax in produce imposed by the emperor in order to meet specific needs. It was regularized on a yearly basis by Diocletian (five-year cycle) and finally under Constantine I became a 15-year cycle (starting in Sept. 312) during which the amount of the indication was to remain unchanged. In spite of this, extra indications (extraordinariae, superinditiones) were occasionally imposed. Because the fiscal and calendar years coincided (1 Sept.–31 Aug.), the word indication acquired a chronological meaning that it kept after losing its fiscal one: it indicated one year within the 15-year cycle, without specifying which cycle. According to K.A. Worp (Archiv für Papyrologie 33 [1987] 91–96), indication-dating in the papyri was not a result of the edict of 472 but became mandatory after Justinian I’s novel 47 of 537. In spite of its lack of absolute chronological precision, the Byz. used indication dating in everyday life and in administration. In order to calculate the indication corresponding to a given year of the Christian era, add 3 to the year, then divide the total by 15; the remainder is the indication (if the remainder is zero, the indication is 15).


—N.O.

INFAMY (ἀτιμία), the deprivation of honor, appears in Justinianic law as a penalty for wrong or unseemly conduct, such as not obeying trade regulations, disgraceful behavior in the army, misconduct in family relations, and certain criminal offenses. Infamy brought with it the restriction of certain rights or privileges, for example, the right to act as witness. The Ecloga (2:8.1) considers as atimos the widow who enters a second marriage before completing the 12-month term of mourning—she would lose any right to her former husband’s property. The Book of the Eparch (e.g., 18:5) punishes infringement of trade relations with flogging, cutting off the hair, a parade of infamy (thriambos), and exile. The public disgrace of infamy was used in political and religious struggles (e.g., to humiliate monks during Iconoclastic persecutions): the victims, sometimes made to ride backward on an ass or mangy camel, were preceded by a herald announcing their crime; their faces might be blackened, and they were ridiculed, beaten, or pelted with stones by the crowd. The parade could be followed by exile (e.g., Patr. Euthymios) or even execution (Emp. Andronikos I).


—A.K.

INFANCY OF CHRIST, specifically the period from the Annunciation through the Flight into Egypt (Mk 1:18–25, 2:1–23; Lk 1:26–55, 2:1–52; Protoevangelion of James, chs. 11–21). Christ’s infancy was illustrated esp. extensively during the centuries of the Christological contro-
verses (4th–7th C.): cf. S. Maria Maggiore in Rome (5th C.); Cathedra of Maximian and St. Sergius, Gaza (6th C.); Monza and Bobbio Am-pulliae. These cycles include numerous apocryphal scenes from the Protoevangelion that enhance their miraculous, theophanic content. With the exception of churches in Göreme and the huge, byzantinizing churches in Kiev, Norman Sicily, and Venice with their vast wall spaces, the Infancy cycle was reduced in 10th- through 12th-C. monumental painting to its major liturgical feasts: Annunciation, Nativity, Presentation of Christ (Hypapante). Likewise liturgically inspired is the 11th-C. Sinai icon conflating the many events celebrated on 25 Dec. (Nativity, story of the Magi), 26 Dec. (Flight into Egypt), and 29 Dec. (Massacre of the Innocents) (K. Weitzmann, Icons from South Eastern Europe and Sinai [London 1968] 23). Only certain densely illuminated Gospel and Lectionary MSS of the 10th–12th C. retained lengthy narrative cycles (Frieze Gospels; Athos, Dion. 587, 11th C.—Treasures 1, figs. 247–52, 260). Palai-ologan art saw a rich resumption of Infancy imagery in both monumental painting (Chora) and the MSS illustrating the Akathistos Hymn (J. Lafontaine-Dosogne, Byzantion 54 [1984] 671–702).


-A.W.C.

INFANTRY (πεζικών). Modestly equipped and slow to move, Byz. infantry nevertheless fulfilled an important defensive role in support of ca-
vality. It secured routes, guarded fortresses and encampments, and provided a mobile base for cavalry on campaign. Infantry was also indispensible for sieges and in terrain unsuited to cavalry. Foot soldiers were usually deployed in a square formation that they maintained in battle, on the march, and in camp. To judge from the totals given in the stratagima, infantry made up the bulk of the the army, outnumbering the cavalry by a ratio of 2:1 or 3:1. Three types of infantrymen are distinguished: heavy infantry armed with spears and swords, protected by corselets, caps, and shields; archers; and light infantry, armed with javelins and slings. A fourth type, menaulatos, armed with a heavy pike (see Weaponry), was created in the 10th C. for use against armored cavalry (E. McGeer, Diptycha 4 [1986–87] 53–57). Byz. and Armenians were preferred as heavy in-
fantry, while foreign mercenaries (such as the Rus') served as light infantry. The 10th-C. Escurial Taktikon mentions the hoplitarches or com-
mander of the infantry force in expeditionary armies and his subalterns, the taxiarhchai (also chilarchai), who commanded units of 1,000 men (Oikonomides, Lister 335f).

The sources offer scant details about the eco-
nomic status of infantrymen. A 12th-C. his-
torian (Zon. 3:506.3–8) lists them below cavalry and above sailors in levels of military service (strat-
tea); it seems likely that they were drawn from the poorer stratiotai who could at least afford the simple equipment used by infantry (W.T. Treadgold in Okeanos 624f). LIT. E. McGeer, "Infantry versus Cavalry: The Byzantine Response," R.E.B 46 (1988) 135–45. —E.M.

INFERTILITY (ατταιωσις) was considered by the Byz. as a terrible misfortune; there are abundant stories of barren couples who sought the help of physicians, holy men, shrines, or magic in order to overcome this condition. A passage in Digenes Akritas (Grottaferrata version VII 180–88, ed. E. Trapp, p.342) evoked the grief of the childless Digenes and his wife Eudokia as they prayed daily for a baby. The vita of Antony the Younger indicates the enormous sums paid to doctors to cure barrenness. Amulets were a popular means of increasing fertility. Men's sterility could also be remedied by a saint as evidenced by John Moschos's tale (PG 87:2977D–2980A) about a precocious baby who at the age of three weeks was able to point out his father, who was previously thought to be sterile. The biblical prototype of the barren Sarah rewarded with fertility only at a venerable age was often used in hagiographical texts.

—J.H., A.K.

INGOTS (μαξα, μαξια, massar), fixed weights of metal cast into bars or related shapes for convenient transportation and distribution. Gold, silver, and copper coins and bullion collected as taxes at provincial treasuries were melted and formed into ingots. These were weighed and stamped by officers of the Comes Sacrarum Largitionum before being sent to mints for the striking of coins. As the solidus was struck 72 to the pound, it is supposed that mints were issued with gold bars of this weight. Numerous gold and silver ingots
survive from the late 4th C., particularly from the Western Empire; they often bear one or more stamps, similar to the silver stamps applied to objects. Occasionally found together with imperial anniversary dishes, these ingots may (like large no dishes) have been used to pay military and other government personnel.


—M.M.M.

INHERITANCE. See Heir; Succession.

INITIALS, ORNAMENTAL. Compared with Latin scribes, Greek copyists, always more faithful to ancient traditions, were slower to enlarge and decorate initial letters. In the 6th C., small initials were filled with miscellaneous designs or outlined with dots. In contrast, the 9th-C. Paris Gregory contains large jeweled and floriated initials, accompanied by birds and snakes, and an epsilon with a blessing hand, later a common motif. Small figural initials also appear in the period, but the apogee of the decorated letter was in the 11th and 12th C. The 11th C. saw inventive combinations of animals, but it was the influential painters of the 12th-C. MSS of James of Kokkinobaphos who established long-lasting conventions for zoomorphic initials. Figural initials began to depict narrative scenes as well as single figures of the text’s author or narrator. Particularly in lectionaries, the person represented may belong to a larger group displayed about the page, thus pictorially uniting the entire surface. Figural initials are less common in the MSS of the Decorative Style and all but disappear in the Palaiologan period, but zoomorphic initials continue to be used for centuries.


INK (μέλαν, μελάνιον) in antiquity was made of soot; this durable black ink is still very well preserved on papyri. In Byz. MSS various kinds of inks with metallic components are to be discerned, a brown gallnut ink being one of the most wide-spread. For writing on purple codices, silver or gold ink was used. Sometimes other colors such as light blue or greenish also occur in MSS. Red ink serves to emphasize a heading (lemma), initials, or other prominent words, letters, or text passages. Purple ink has a particular function in imperial documents: the emperor signed with purple ink, and the head of the imperial chancellery, the kanikleios, wrote logos in a designated spot, also using purple ink. This official therefore wore an ink bottle attached to his garment, as is sometimes seen in miniatures. Some antique ink bottles and a few Byz. ones have been preserved, among them a silver bottle with metrical inscription in the treasury of the cathedral at Padua.


—W.H.

INN. Privately owned inns (pandocëria, lit. “accepting everything”) in both town and countryside provided accommodations for all kinds of travelers and their animals. John Chrysostom (PG 56:111.50–53) states that pandocëria were established everywhere along the roads so that travelers and beasts of burden could stop and rest. Nicholas Mesarites in the 12th C. vividly described an inn in the small kastellion of Kyr George near Nicaea (A. Heisenberg, Quellen und Studien zur späthistorischen Geschichte [London 1973] 2.2 [1923] 40f): his companion awoke in the morning, kindled a fire in the hearth from the previous day’s ashes, put an earthenware pot on an iron tripod, and began his breakfast, holding the meat in his left hand and cutting it into pieces with a knife, washing down the meat and bread with wine, while poor Mesarites suffered from the smoke that filled the room. Inns were not only places to sleep, eat, and drink, but also to find sexual pleasures: the mother of Theodore of Sykeon worked as a prostitute in a country inn (Vita, ed. Festugière, vol. 1, ch. 3.6–14) and, according to legend, Helena, the future mother of Constantine I, was a whore in an inn owned by her father (AB 77 [1959] par. 2.3). The vita of Andrew the Fool refers to brothels as “inns of fornication” (PG 111:652C).

The remains of a late Roman inn survive today,
17 km southwest of Urfa: there are three rock-cut caves, two of which were animal stables, and a cistern; the rooms for travelers were in a separate structure, now destroyed. An inscription, probably of the 3rd C., identifies the site as "an inn [pandocheion], well, and caves" built by Aurelius Darius, governor of Osrhoene "so that travelers may enjoy refreshment and repose" (C. Mango, Oxford Journal of Archaeology 5 [1986] 223–31).

Distinguished from pandochea, which were profit-making establishments, were xenodochia, guesthouses founded in a spirit of philanthropy to offer Christian hospitality. The mitaton for Syrian merchants in Constantinople was a type of inn as well. The world as a temporary abode was compared to an inn by Didymos the Blind (PG 39:780D) and other authors. —A.K., A.M.T.

INNOCENT II (Gregory Papareschi), pope (14 Feb. 1139–24 Sept. 1143). He was the scion of a noble Roman family, whose election to the papacy led to a schism within the curia; his adversaries elected antipope Anacletus II from a rival family of the Pierleone, who was supported by Roger II of Sicily. Innocent sought German assistance, but Conrad III was slow to act; the papal expedition against Roger ended in Innocent's defeat and capture and the treaty of Mignano (27 July 1139), in which the pope recognized Roger as king.

Innocent disapproved of the claims of Emp. John II Komnenos on Antioch; in a letter of 28 Mar. 1138 he excommunicated the emperor and prohibited Latins from serving in the Byz. army. Several months later, however, the pope changed his position and opened negotiations with John in an effort to establish friendly relations with Byz. No positive results were achieved.


INNOCENT III (Lothar of Segni), pope (from 8 Jan. 1198); born Anagni 1160/1, died 16 July 1216. The collapse of German power after the death of Henry VI in 1197 allowed Innocent to accomplish the moral and administrative restructuring of the Roman church and to acquire great influence throughout the Western world. He also tried to expand papal jurisdiction over Armenia and Bulgaria. He worked toward union with the Greek church on condition that Byz. recognize papal primacy, but in the beginning, at least, he was willing to discuss differences in rite.

The organization of the Fourth Crusade put the problem in a new light: at first Innocent apparently hoped to use the Crusader army against the Saracens in Sicily (E. Kennan, Traditus 27 [1971] 246–48). Even though the pope supported the German king Otto IV (1198–1218), the rival of Philip of Swabia, he accepted Philip's appointee Boniface of Montferrat as leader of the expedition. The Crusaders' capture of Zara created a new political and moral dilemma. The pontiff disapproved of the attack on a Christian city but recommended continued collaboration with the Venetians, whose resources were necessary to execute the plan (A. Andrea, I. Mottiff, BS 33 [1972] 6–25). M. Zaborov (VizVrem 5 [1952] 152–77) argued that diversion of the Crusade toward Constantinople was Innocent's own scheme; this may be an exaggeration, but the Latin seizure of Constantinople in 1204 seemed to be a political success for the reformed papacy.

Innocent's predecessors usually denied Constantinople's claim to the status of patriarchate. Now, with Constantinople in Western hands, Innocent endorsed the Greek concept of five patriarchates and associated Constantinople with the activity of the apostle John. However, he had to accede, although reluctantly, to the election of the Venetian Thomas Morosini as Latin patriarch of Constantinople. The pope sent legates (Peter Capuano, Benedict) to Constantinople, where they had debates with the Greek clergy: although their words were conciliatory, they in fact demanded that the Greeks conform to Latin doctrine and rite. The Greek hierarchy was restructured and put under the jurisdiction of the Latin church, and Latin monastic orders expanded in the empire. These measures failed to achieve church union, however, and Innocent soon began to treat the Byz. as heretics and schismatics. In 1213 Innocent received letters from certain Greek monks who complained about the Cistercians. The latter had acquired the Chortaites Monastery, near Thessalonike, from Boniface of Montferrat; later, Henry of Hainault, the Latin emperor of Constantinople, installed Greek monks there, but in 1212 the Cistercians, armed with Innocent's mandate, expelled them. Although the pope ordered
Cardinal Pelagius of Alban to investigate the situation, the Chortaites monastery remained in Cistercian hands, and by 1223 its owners had even been granted the monastery of the Holy Archangel in Negroponte (E. Brown, *Traditio* 14 [1958] 78–81).


INNOCENT IV (Simbaldo Fieschi), pope (from 25 June 1243); born Genoa ca. 1200, died Naples 7 Dec. 1254. Innocent carried the war against Frederick II to its climax. In the summer of 1244 the pope fled to Lyons to organize a coalition against Frederick. In 1245 he convened the First Council of Lyons. His aim was to sever Sicily from the German kingdom, and in 1252 he tried to offer Sicily to Richard of Cornwall (son of King John of England) and to Charles I of Anjou. His Eastern policy was determined primarily by two factors: the need to protect the remnants of the Latin state in Palestine, esp. after the Crusaders’ defeat at Gaza in 1239, and to secure assistance against Frederick. In March or April of 1245 Innocent sent Andrew of Longjumeau to negotiate with the Egyptian emir Fakhr al-Din; in a letter of 15 Aug. 1246, Fakhr al-Din claimed that atrocities in Jerusalem had been committed without the knowledge of the Ayyubid sultan and promised to repair demolished buildings and to support pilgrimages, which were lucrative for the Ayyubids (K.-E. Lupprian in *Das heilige Land im Mittelalter* [Neustadt an der Aisch 1982] 77–82).

Innocent also sought alliance with the Mongols (K.E. Lupprian, ST 291 [1981] 48–56). He worked for a union with "schismatics" and "heretics" under papal jurisdiction: in a letter of 22 Mar. 1253 he blamed the Catholics on the island of Melos for going too far in rapprochement with the Greeks, but he was ready to recognize some differences in rite if the Eastern church would accept papal primacy. The Nicene emperor John III Vatatzes was eager to reach an agreement and to receive the pope’s assistance against the Latin empire of Constantinople (P. Þavoronkov, *VizVrem* 36 [1974] 113–16), but the negotiations were interrupted by the deaths of John and Innocent in 1254.

Thus, the Byz. did not appreciate innovation and claimed to have stuck to tradition. Imitation or repetition of the standard authorities was praiseworthy. The idea of plagiarism did not exist. Reforms were usually couched in terms of the restoration of the past rather than of innovation: Psello, while criticizing Isaac I Komnenos for drastic changes, referred to God who did not create the world instantaneously but took an entire week (*Chron.* 2:121, par.62–9–12). In the same vein Gregoras (Greg. 2:796.2–12) censured the Zealots in Thessalonike for their rule that had no precedents, aristocratic or democratic, and was

---

INNOVATION (καινοτομία), in the narrow sense, as used by theologians, primarily of the 6th–7th C., described the new doctrine of the miracle of Incarnation. Kainotoma is defined by Maximus the Confessor (PG 91:1313C) as Christ’s assumption of “our flesh without semen” and the Virgin’s giving birth without desolation. More often the word was used in a broader sense of novelty and breach of tradition and applied predominantly to heretical doctrines or even rebellions. According to Psellus (Chron. 1:103, par.27.14), many of his colleagues called the revolt against Michael V “a senseless kainotoma,” while in Kekaumenos kainotomia designates illicit actions or illegal gain (A. Kazhdan, *VizVrem* 36 [1974] 156) rather than unexpected damage (G. Litavrin, *VizVrem* 36 [1974] 170). Accordingly, the expression kainos theologos, “new theologian,” had a pejorative connotation (P. Wirth, *OrChr* 45 [1961] 127f.), and Niketas Stethatos spoke ironically about new teachers or a new prophet (neos prophetes) (A. Kazhdan, *BS* 28 [1967] 4, n.8). The customary title “the New Theologian” given to the mystic Symeon is a misinterpretation—he was Symeon the Younger, the theologian (H.-G. Beck, *BZ* 46 [1953] 57–62).
not even a "new species" derived from existing forms but emerged spontaneously as a "strange ochlocracy." This negative attitude toward innovation does not mean that Byz. culture totally lacked originality. For example, there were remarkable novelties of both content and style, esp. in monumental painting, in and after the 9th C.

—A.K., A.C.

INSANITY, a disease that was viewed by the Byz. in a contradictory manner: some people with abnormal behavior were proclaimed holy fools, but insanity and esp. the epilepsy confused with it were interpreted as caused by demons. Accordingly, the Byz. lost the classical definition of epilepsy as "holy disease," or hiera nosos, a term transferred to leprosy (A. Philipsborn, Byzantion 33 [1963] 223f).

Byz. theoreticians generally hearkened back to the notions of Galen that madness was the result of too much black bile, causing the diseased imbalance of humors called melancholy (cf. Alex. Trall. 1:590–617). A second Galenic concept was the idea of the three pneuma (Vital, Psychic, and Natural) that also caused madness when balance among the three was disturbed; one meets continual reference to "passions" (esp. those of lust) as particularly engendering insanity. Galen's Passions and Errors of the Soul (ed. W. de Boer [Leipzig-Berlin 1937]) provided a model of sorts, from which many Byz. physicians derived their basic concepts of madness, although numerous cases of pure insanity had clear records of cure through religious miracles, not medical or pharmaceutical treatment. As treatment of insanity, saints used exorcism and incubation in special churches.

—J.S.

INSCRIPTIO. See Acts, Documentary.

INSCRIPTIONS, LAPIRARY, are incised or carved in relief on stone or marble, the letters sometimes heightened in color. They may be divided into two periods: the first from the 4th to the 7th C., the second from the 7th to the 15th. In the first period epigraphy continues to play the same role, closely tied to city life, that it had played under the pagan empire; in the second period its scope becomes more restricted. We may divide stone inscriptions (sing. τίτλος, τίτλου) into the following principal categories:

1. Funerary inscriptions are very numerous in the first period and are found on stelae, sarcophagi, loculi, and other forms of burial. Persons of high status are often commemorated in hexameter. There is a wide spread of lower-class epitaphs (artisans, shopkeepers, soldiers, minor clergy, etc.) recording the name of the deceased and his/her father; place of origin (often providing evidence of migration); occupation; length of life; date of death (day of the week, month, indiction), seldom in absolute terms (i.e., by consulship, regnal year, or local era in the Eastern provinces). Sometimes curses are added against anyone making unauthorized use of the tomb; the price paid for it may also be mentioned. There is a particularly full series of epitaphs from Korykos, another from Tyre. Constantinople with its environs, Corinth, and other places have also yielded a fair number.

In the second period epitaphs become much rarer and those of ordinary persons almost nonexistent, which suggests that they were buried in unmarked graves. This development may account for funerary graffiti, such as those scratched on the columns of the Parthenon in Athens, separated from the place of burial. As for persons of rank, there is a tendency toward longer and longer verse epitaphs, inscribed on the sarcophagus or on slabs attached to an arcosolium.

2. Honoric inscriptions on statue bases or accompanying the portrait of a prominent person (emperor, official, charioteer), usually in verse, were still fairly common in the first period (many preserved in the Greek Anthology), but absent in the second.

3. Building inscriptions appear on public monuments and works of fortifications, seldom on private houses. This category continued into the second period, while undergoing considerable contraction.

4. Inscriptions recording edicts and tariffs were practically absent in the second period, the latest known example perhaps being the grant of a salt pan to the Church of St. Demetrios at Thessalo-
nike by Justinian II (688/9). The conciliar "edict" of Manuel I of 1166 (C. Mango, DOP 17 [1963] 315–30) is essentially a religious text.

5. Acclamations addressed to emperors and circus factions are usually introduced by the formula Nika he tyche. They are absent in the second period.

6. Boundary stones are practically absent in the second period, except for those delimiting the Byz.-Bulgarian frontier (Beševliev, Inscriften, no.46). Milestones along public roads appear to cease in the 5th C.

7. Inscriptions regarding rights of ownership or the place (topos, thesis) occupied by persons in a theater, a market, or even a church form another category. They are absent in the second period.

8. Religious texts, invocations, and curses are also the subject of inscriptions.

---

LIT. Corpus inscriptionum graecarum, 4 (Berlin 1877).

---

INSIGNIA (σημεῖα), characteristic emblems used to express symbolically the social and political position of an individual or an institution. Byz. only embryonically developed the heraldry of hereditary familial coats of arms so typical of Western feudalism, but it did establish systems of personal, institutional, and imperial insignia. The word semeion was also used to designate both a standard or banner (e.g., a Persian semeion placed on a tower—Chron. Pasch. 554.8–9) and a theological symbol, such as the sign of the cross, baptism, or a miracle.

Personal insignia are known primarily from seals that depict images of Christ, the Virgin, the cross, and various saints, the most popular of which were military saints (George, Demetrios, and Theodore), the Archangel Michael, and St. Nicholas; more developed scenes (e.g., the Annunciation) appear rarely. The saint is considered a patron (often the owner of the seal was named after him), but it is not yet clear to what extent the owner consistently used the image of his patron saint and accordingly whether the semeion should be considered a genuine emblem. Some patterns of usage are evident: thus, generals frequently adopted military saints as patrons, whereas civil functionaries preferred Michael and Nicholas. Seals reveal a certain consistency and continuity of semeia for local churches; thus, the metabolics of Ephesus had as their patrons either the apostle John or the Virgin.

The emblems of officials are better known. The Notitia dignitatum represents the insignia of important office holders ca.400; thus, the emblems of the praetorian prefect of Illyricum were the codicillus (diploma of appointment) with imperial portrait, the so-called theca (i.e., pen case and ink pot), and a horse-drawn state coach reserved for the use of the prefect (P.C. Berger, The Insignia of the Notitia Dignitatum [New York–London 1981] 25–37). Later insignia are listed in such texts as De ceremoniis of Constantine VII or in pseudo-Kodinos.

Insignia can be divided into symbolic emblems (as represented in the Notitia dignitatum or on coins) and real objects. The latter encompassed costume including footgear, the crown, weaponry and horse trappings, the throne, and symbols of authority or piety, such as the scepter, sphaira (orb), and askia. The form and color of these garments and objects differed, reflecting the hierarchical ladder. Thus, in pseudo-Kodinos, the despotes was granted the privilege of wearing the skadios covered with pearls, with a veil bearing the name of the owner embroidered in gold; the sebastokrator had a gold and red skadios with gold embroidery (syrmateion), but no pearls are mentioned; the megas domestikos wore a klapoton (not syrmateion) skadios, that is, one decorated with small golden squares in the shape of a nailhead; the megas doux wore a klapoton skadios, but without a veil, and so on.

In the late 6th C. the Kleruologion of Philotheos divided all functionaries into two major categories: those who were invested with some form of insignia (brabeion), and those who were appointed by the word of the emperor. Among official insignia Philotheos mentioned the charte (codicil); a golden staff; the fblatorion, a cloak secured with a fibula; a golden chain; a golden whip decorated with precious stones; and a sword ornamented with gold and ivory plaques.

Imperial regalia, partly developed from the insignia of Roman magistrates (e.g., consuls), partly derived from the East, partly created anew, were above all characterized by the exclusive right to use the color purple (while green and blue were the colors of certain high-ranking officials). A special costume decorated with gold, pearls, and precious stones distinguished the emperor from
his entourage. The order in which the different elements of imperial costume (divetesion, chlamys, skaramangion, etc.) were put on was prescribed by court ceremonial, and the usage of a particular garment was usually linked with carrying particular objects (scepter, etc.). The ceremonial also prescribed a change in the imperial regalia at certain stages of processions and receptions. The different elements of the regalia varied in importance: the crown and chlamys always held pride of place, whereas the scepter and shoes (tzangia) probably assumed significance only by the 10th C. Different crowns and garments were employed for different festivities.

The Byz. saw a symbolic meaning in various insignia: the sphaira designated the universal power of the emperor, the akakia his mortality and submission to Christ. A poem of Christopher of Mytilene (no. 30.12–26) gives an example of the symbolic interpretation of the insignia that belonged to the eparch of Constantinople: his simikinthion ("apron," probably the lorias) symbolized the uninterrupted series of his good works; the tawny orange boots his divine paths; the white horse his shining virtue; and the brazen bosses of his horse trappings, which were alloyed with gold, symbolized his generosity, since he distributed gold and bronze among the needy.


INSPIRATION commonly designates the workings of a (divine) spirit. In Christianity it refers particularly to the Holy Spirit who acts on the authors of the Bible. Their works, according to 2 Timothy 3:16, are "inspired by God" (theopneustos, a Hellenistic term to indicate the phenomenon of "divine rapture," "divine emotion," and ecstasy) and an operation of divine empneusis. The books of the Bible are not the work of man, but prophecy (2 Pet 1:20–21): this is the term preferred by the church fathers to describe the Bible as the work of God. Therewith, inspiration also means the influence of God on the prophets, and then the Apostles (to be distinguished from the possession of the Spirit in Christ: Nicholas of Methone, ed. A. Demetrakopoulos, Ekklesiastikse Bibliothek, vol. 1 [Leipzig 1866; rp. Hildesheim 1965] 199–218), and the saints; finally it includes all "charismas," inspirations of God, and esp. enthusiastic experiences. Certain writers, esp. hagiographers, emphasize that they are or are said to be humble sinners who function only as the tool of the Holy Spirit. The notion of inspiration serves primarily and largely to maintain authority, and so in Byz. one speaks of the inspiration of the councils, the church fathers, or the ecclesiastical canons. Finally, in the political sphere, there is inspiration of the emperor, who, crowned by the Holy Spirit, rules through the Holy Spirit's inspiration. (See also SOPHIA.)


INSTITUTES. Promulgated by Justinian I through the constitution "Imperatoriam" of 21 Nov. 533 and compiled at his order by the law professors THEOPHILOS and DOROTHEOS, under the direction of TRIBONIAN, the Institutes are at once a textbook in four books and law. As a textbook they are closely modeled, in the arrangement of the material, on the Institutes of the jurist Gaius (2nd C.), from which many of their texts are derived. The writings of the classical Roman jurists—mostly in their form as preserved in the Digest—and Justinian I's own constitutions also served as sources. Justinian explicitly endowed the Institutes with the force of law in the introductory constitution "Imperatoriam" (ch.7). A Greek paraphrase of the Institutes that resulted from the law course of Theophilos served as a "quarry" for later Byz. legal textbooks (Psello, Synopsis legum) and legal lexika (adet), because of its pedagogical arrangement of the most important legal topics (personae, res, actiones) on the one hand, and its numerous explanations of Latin legal terms on the other. Various fragments from Greek revisions of the text of the Institutes—which are more or less similar to
the Theophilos text—are found in legal MSS and can even be detected in the *Hexabiblos* of HARMENOPOULOS.


INTAGLIO, conventional term denoting a subcategory of glyptics (carved hardstones), on which, in contrast to CAMEO, the design is incised. Preferred stones were jasper, carnelian, haematite, and rock crystal, for any of which glass might occasionally be substituted. The technique is most characteristic of ring bezels and cone SEALS, where it was essential to their sealing function, and of pendant amulets, where it was apparently valued for its beauty and, perhaps, for its similarity to Greco-Egyptian gem amulets (Bonnier, *Studies*, nos. 294–97, 334–39). Intaglios were far less popular among the Byz. than among the Romans or Saracens, and their technical quality relatively inferior. Monograms were preferred for sealing intaglios, while various biblical scenes, icons, or magical creatures or symbols might appear on the amulets. Relatively common during the 5th–7th C., gemstone intaglios are rare thereafter, although the occasional appearance of fine figural specimens from succeeding centuries attests to preservation of the tradition, probably among craftsmen who regularly incised metal, whether for ring bezels, cone seals, coin dies, or *bouloteria* (see Sealing IMPLMENTS).


-G.V.

INTELLLECT (*νοεῖ*), the human mind, was conceived in accordance with ancient Greek metaphysics as the immaterial or spiritual cognitive faculty, referring to unity and transcending the differences of rational discourse, “reconciling all oppositions” (BASIL THE GREAT, ep.8.g, ed. Couronne 1:39.11–13). Although the *nous* functioned in a different way from sensorial perception (Maximos the Confessor in scholia on pseudo-DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE), ANASTASIOS OF SINAI (ed. Uthemann, *Viae Dux* 2.566–67) defined it as the “contemplative perception” (*αισθησις theoreitike*) that brings forth the LOGOS in the unity of language and thought. Differentiated from the SOUL, *nous* is a divine spark in the soul possessing the capacity of knowing God. It is the instrument of contemplation that prepares the human way to perfection, but needs constant purification, since it can be obscured and coarsened by sin. *Nou* was metaphorically represented as light, eye, and charioteer.

Pseudo-Dionysios speaks of angelic intelligences or powers as *noe* (pl. of *nous*). The Byz. also employed the terminology of PLOTINOS who considered the divine Intellect as the first emanation of the One. The epithet *nous* was applied both to the Father whose Son was “the Logos of the Nous” and to the Son.

For the Origenists of the 6th C., Christ was the “self-alienating Nous” who is to come, at the end of time, for the salvation of fallen spirits “in various bodies and under various names.” All intelligent beings or *noe*, before the aversion or disgust that is caused by their vision of God and leads them to apostasy, were but “one substance, one force, one energy,” and they will acquire such status again at the end of time owing to their unity with God the Logos and the loss of any individuality. Only one *nous* had preserved his union with God the Logos in the vision of God, namely one that at the end of time will be revealed as Christ in multiple forms in order to initiate the *apokatastasis*, that is, the restoration of the original unity. In this teaching on the beginning and the end of time, the metaphysics of the intellect becomes a cosmological myth and drama; this teaching overlaps with Gnostic speculations that resolve the entire cosmos and all its species in a single undifferentiated unity; in other words, alienates them. A contrasting view is represented by the hierarchical world view of pseudo-Dionysios. In the tenets of Byz. mystics and in the doctrine of the Trinity one can see the merging of these two tendencies.

-K.-H.U.

INTELLECTUALS in the late Roman period were connected primarily with the urban environment: they received their training in universities and occupied positions as teachers, lawyers, rhetori-
cians, physicians; they were members of the local aristocracy or belonged to its milieu. Alongside them two new groups of intellectuals developed, theologians and officials. The crisis of the late antique polis was accompanied by the disappearance of the urban "intelligentsia"—cultural activity ca. 800 was concentrated around monasteries, not the curia as it was in antiquity. The encyclopedism of the 9th–10th C. contributed to the development of a secular intelligentsia, but through the 11th C. intellectuals were primarily state and church bureaucrats, closely connected with Constantinople and its administrative machinery. Professional intellectuals came to the fore in the 12th C., but even in this period their careers were often crowned by appointment to a bishopric. Nevertheless, intellectuals of the 12th C. argued that they held a specific social position and had a right to remunerations granted by the state, church, or private patrons. The increasing social importance of the medical profession (A. Kazhdan, DOP 38 [1984] 43–51) also reflects this shift. Ševčenko's analysis of the status of late Byz. literati (infra) demonstrated that the court of Constantinople continued to be the center of intellectual life, even though more than half of the writers can be assigned to the ecclesiastical sphere; only a few were of humble origin.


**INTELLIGENCE, MILITARY AND POLITICAL.** Surrounded by hostile powers and peoples, the Byz. state constantly required political and military intelligence to defend itself and to expand its influence beyond its borders. The De administrando imperio (10th C.) outlines the interests served by political intelligence, such as desirable alliances, trade routes, and diplomatic strategy, and by counterintelligence, used to awe foreign ambassadors with Byz. power and to withhold state secrets from them. Information was channelled to the logothetes tou dromou from many sources, including merchants, travelers, former prisoners of war, embassies, and Christian communities outside the empire.

Military men paid close attention to the equipment, skills, tactics, and character of various enemies; their observations were recorded in the Strategikon of Maurice (bk.11) and the Taktika of Leo VI (bk.18) with suggestions on how best to adapt to each one. The De velitatione (10th C.) describes the surveillance of the frontiers by local units, which monitored enemy invaders to ascertain their strength and intentions; the necessity of reconnaissance while on campaign is repeatedly emphasized in the Strategika. In preparation for offensive expeditions, merchants were sent into enemy lands to collect information (De cer. 657.3–12), and grudging tribute to their effectiveness comes from Ibn Hawqal, who criticized the Arab authorities' inattention to them (Configuration de la terre, tr. J.H. Kramer, G. Wiet, vol. 1 [Paris 1964] 193).


—E.M.

**INTEREST (tòkos, lit. "child").** According to the law of Justinian I, there were two sorts of interest: based on a contract (agreement, stipulation); automatically owed by law in some kinds of transactions, such as interest on debts to minors or to the fisc or owed by an official of a society if he used the society's funds for his own purposes. The 8th-C. Ecloga does not mention tokos; in the early 9th C. Emp. Nikephoros I abolished all forms of interest (Theoph. 488.11) with the exception of interest due to naukleroi (probably on account of their occupational risk). Basil I also prohibited interest as contravening Christian ethical values. Leo VI, however, revoked this prohibition in novel 83, since "the average man is unable to attain such heights of morality and must abide by human, not divine laws."

Maximum interest was defined by Basil. 23.3–74 in accordance with Justinianic law: the normal rate of interest was set at 6 percent, but the illosstrioi could not ask more than 4 percent, whereas merchants were allowed 8 percent, increased to 12 percent if they were involved in maritime operations. In novel 83 Leo VI allowed only a standard 4 percent rate of interest. Peira 19.1 gives a higher rate: regular interest was 6 nomismata per pound (litra) of gold, while argyropratai could charge 8 nomismata; protospatharioi were limited to charging 4 nomismata. Since in
the 11th C. there were 72 nomisma to the pound, the rates were 8.3, 11.1, and 5.6 percent, respectively. Circa 1400 much higher rates of 15 and 26.6 percent are found in the decisions of Patr. Matthew I. (See also USURY.)


-A.K.

INTERIOR SPACE, the depiction of an enclosed area, was generally of little concern to artists in Byz. and was left to the spectator's understanding of a scene to supply. Thus in the Rossano Gospels no physical distinction is made between the room in which Judas returns the silver and the yard in which he hangs himself. Painters normally declined to define the area in which an event took place, even one specified in a text as occurring indoors. Scenes calling for an interior setting, such as the Last Supper or the Dormition of the Virgin, were furnished with a summary architectural backdrop, occasionally supplemented with a swag, signifying an interior space, thrown over a wall or swung between piers. Other symbolic devices of this sort include open doors, thrones, altars, and tables. Even in the 14th C., when there is some evidence for the reuse of Late Antique motifs and of loans from the West, ancient Roman and new Italian perspective schemes were ignored; interior spaces became ever more elaborate and ever less rational.


-A.C.

INTERLACE, a regular pattern formed of two or more interwoven or plaited bands, usually as a filler or border ornament. In contrast with the technical precision achieved through the use of compass and ruler in many Latin examples, Byz. versions of interlace, particularly in MSS. seem to have been composed freehand. Again unlike Latin interlace, Byz. examples are usually symmetrically constructed along an axis. In this they also differ from the arabesque, an overall decorative pattern based on stylized leaf- and scrollwork developed by the Arabs that appears in Byz. by the 10th C. As a twisted rope pattern or in the form of large and usually regular medallions alternating with smaller circles, a simple interlace formed of two strands was ubiquitous throughout the Byz. period; multiple band interlace also appears, particularly in works produced in or influenced by Italy. Interlace was esp. popular in MSS, textiles, and metalwork.

Simple, two-strand interlace is often referred to by scholars as guilloche. It appears on capitals and moldings, as at the Nea Moni on Chios, as well as in MSS from the 6th C. (Vienna Dioskorides) to the end of the Byz. period, as it was particularly popular as a text divider.


-L.Br.

INTERPOLATIONES. When charging the compilers to assemble the Digest, Justinian I authorized them to make alterations, where necessary, to the texts of the classical jurists (Cod. Just. I 17.1.7). He also allowed "editorial" interventions of this sort in the compilation of the Codex Justinianus ("Constitutio Haec," ch.2 = CIC 2, p.1). These interpolations into the original texts, though intentional, are discreet; they have promoted considerable research aimed at reconstructing the original versions of the texts. The writings of the Antecessores occasionally aid in the detection of the interpolations both because they were sometimes based on older stages of the text (Thalalios) and because they were composed with knowledge of the pre-Justinianic legal situation. Conscious interpolations, which actually change the content of a text, are rarely encountered in Byz. legal literature after Justinian. In the Basilika the texts of the Corpus Juris Civilis were incorporated usually without any intentional alterations. In some cases, however, interpolations of the original texts of Justinian can be observed in the Basilika. These interpolations correspond to several innovations in law that Leo VI decreed in his novels (M.Th. Fügen, SubGr 3 [1892] 23-35).

INTERPRETER (ἐρμηνευτής or διερμηνευτής), official on the staff of the LOGOTHESES TOU DROMOU; in the Palaiologan period they were under the command of the megas diermeneutes and the praitor tou demou. Bury (Adm. System 93) identified them with the interpretes diversarum gentium in the officium of the MAGISTER OFFICIORUM. Some interpreters, such as the protospatharios Krinites in the mid-10th C., performed diplomatic duties. The corps of professional interpreters existed through the whole history of Byz., even though the sources rarely mention their participation in later embassies (I. Medvedev, VizVrem 33 [1972] 132, n.18). The gambros and diermeneutes Loukas Notaras took part in negotiations with the Venetians in 1448 (Reg 5, no.3516; MM 3:224.16). Besides participating in embassies, interpreters served as translators for negotiations in Constantineople and compiled documents in foreign languages. The epithe megalas was applied to the term in the 12th C. (first mention ca.1160) to designate the chief interpreter. On seals one finds the titles of the interpreters of the Romans, Bulgarians, Varangians, and English (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 469–71; Zacos, Seals 2, no.706).


EXCERPT. Excluded from the inheritance as long as their parents were living. If some or all of the children of the deceased had died, leaving children, the latter divided up the portion of the inheritance allotted to their parents. If the deceased had no descendants, then his parents and his siblings inherited equal portions. Grandparents of the deceased succeeded to the inheritance only if no siblings or parents survived. If there were no such (living) relatives left, the estate was divided among the stepsiblings of the deceased (who had only one parent in common with the deceased), followed by all collateral relations. Before the year 548 (Nov. Just. 127), spouses could inherit from their deceased partner only when there were no relatives at all. Thereafter, providing they had children and did not remarry, they were given equal ranking with the children, that is, they could inherit, together with the children, an in capita portion. Adopted children were treated like legitimate children. Illegitimate children inherited from their mother and, together with her, one-sixth of their father's estate, provided that the deceased did not leave a wife or descendants from a legitimate marriage. If there were no eligible heirs at hand, the inheritance fell to the state.


INTESTATE SUCCESSION (ἡ κληρονομία ἐκ ἀδιαθέτου) occurs when a deceased person has left no will. If the problems that necessarily arise in this case—the appointment of an heir and division of the inheritance—are resolved by the norms of inheritance law, then intestate succession is equivalent to legal inheritance. This was the situation in Byz., where, with the exception of a few small changes (as, e.g., the trimoira), the late antique regulations on legal succession established in final form by Justinian I remain binding. These regulations provided that a deceased person be succeeded in the first place by his children, who took his place collectively and in equal shares. If there were grandchildren, they were

INVENTIVE (ψόγος), with ENKOMION, constituted the genre of EPIDEMIC ORATORY, according to the authors of rhetorical textbooks (e.g., Rabe, Prolegomenon 58.15). Even though Libanius produced several PROGYMNASMATA of inventive, only APHTHONIOS (Progymnasmata, pp. 27–31) included a separate paragraph on the psogos. Later commentaries on both Aphthonios and HERMOGENES (e.g., Rabe, Prolegomenon 75.4–5) likened the pairing of enkomion—inventive to judicial speeches of accusation and defense (APOLOGY). The term psogos, having a pejorative sense (blame or censure), was not employed for titles of inventives; thus, Libanius entitled his inventive (or,46) simply “Against (kata) Florentios.” The genre of inventive was popular in Byz. society, the major subject of blame being inclination toward paganism (see also POLEMIC, RELIGIOUS), as in the pamphlet on Choi-
rospakhites by Arethas of Caesarea (1:200–12). The style of invective was sometimes very crude, consisting of accumulated curses, as in Constantine of Rhodes, who ardently formed very long composites, such as “Helleno-worshiper-Christ-blasphemer.” Elements of invective could penetrate even hagiography; thus Niketas David Paplagos transformed his vita of Patr. Ignatios into an invective against Photios. Twelfth-century invective (Anacharsis, the “biography” of a certain Bagoas by Basilakes) had a moral rather than religious emphasis, and later invectives form a parallel to Italian humanist invectives of the 15th C. (P. Canivet, N. Oikonomides, Diptycha 3 [1982–83] 21–25).


INVENTORY. Inventories, variously termed Breibion, apographe (Pantel. no.7-4), katastichon (Lauro 3, no.146.42), etc., often accompanied wills and lists of donations. They contain important information on relics, icons, textiles, manuscripts, bookbindings, and a great variety of liturgical vessels. Among the most important inventories are the following:

Inventory (5th–6th C.) of a church at Ibion, Egypt (H. Leclercq, DACL 7.1:1408–25)
List of regalia and relics in the Church of the Pharos and other chapels in the Great Palace at Constantinople (De cer. 640.1–641.5)
Will of Eustathios Bolias (1059)
Diataxis of Michael Attaleiates (1077)
Inventory of the monastery of Petrizzo in the typikon of Gregory Pakourianos
Inventory of the monastery of S. Pietro in Spina, Calabria (after 1135), ed. Montafacon, Pal. Graeca 403–07
Inventory of the Kecharitomene nunnery, ca.1120–30
Inventory of the Xylourgou monastery on Mt. Athos (1142), in Pantel., no.7
Two inventories (May 1192, 13 Oct. 1202) of the so-called Palace of Botaneiates near Kalybia, ed. MM 3:x–xv, 55–57

Inventory of the monastery of St. John, Patmos (1200), ed. C. Astruc, TM 8 (1981) 15–30
Inventory of the possessions of the monastery of the Virgin at Skoteine in 1247
Will (1330/1) listing bequests of Neilos, founder of the monastery of the Prodromos on Mt. Athos, Docheiair., no.17
List of icons, Gospel books, and textiles in the monastery of the Virgin Gabaliotissa at Vodena, given to the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos in May 1375 (Lauro 3, no.147)
Patriarchal inventory of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople (1397), MM 2:566–70
Inventory of the Eleousa monastery at Veljusa (1449), ed. L. Petit, IRAIK 6 (1900) 114–53


INVOCATION. See Acts, Documentary.

INVOCATION. See Epiclesis.

IOANNIKIOS (Ioannikios), saint; born in the village of Marykaton, near Lake Apollonia, Bithynia, perhaps between 752 and 754, died in the monastery of Antidion, 3 Nov. 846 (J. Parigore, EO 4 [1900–01] 75–80); feastday 3 or 4 Nov. He was probably of Slavic origin (Ph. Malingoudis, Hellenika 31 [1979] 494–96). As a peasant boy Ioannikios herded swine; at 19 he joined the army and later fought courageously in the battle of Markellai (summer 792) against the Bulgarians. After the Byz. defeat, he withdrew to Bithynian Mt. Olympos, wandered across Asia Minor, lived in solitude, and finally took the monastic habit. An ardent Iconodule, Ioannikios was compelled by Leo V’s persecutions to flee to Mt. Alsos. Later, Ioannikios supported Methodios I and helped him attain the patriarchate.

Ioannikios’s vita is preserved in two versions and in a reworking by Symeon Metaphrastes. One hagiographer, Sabas (perhaps author of the Life of Peter of Atra), claims to have known Ioannikios (AASS Nov. 2.1:376f) and inserts a number of chronological indications, not always sound (e.g., it is questionable that Ioannikios was already 40 at Markellai). Peter, the second ha-
The text appears to discuss the historical figure of Ioannina, who is associated with the monastery of St. Ioannikios and the city of Ioannina. The text also references the chronicle of Ioannina and the reign of Thomas Prejubović, who ruled from 1366/7 onwards. The text mentions the historical significance of Ioannina and its location in the Byzantine Empire, as well as its cultural and political importance.

**Representation in Art.** The saint is depicted as a monk, and in miniature paintings he is sometimes associated with the image of a mountain; in two MSS of the *menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes, this mountain is accompanied by the female personification of Mt. OLYMPOS.

**Sources.** AASS Nov. 2.1:332–435, PG 116:335–92.


**IOANNINA** (*Ioánnina*), city of northern EPIROS, situated on a peninsula on Lake Ioannina; the unnamed “well-fortified polis” built by Justinian I for the citizens of ancient Euroia (Prokopios, *Buildings* 4.1.39–42) can probably be identified as Ioannina. The name Ioannina, however, appears only in the 9th C. as a suffragan bishopric of Naupaktos (Notitiae CP 7:580). Anna Komnene mentions Ioannina three times without any comment. In 1082 it was temporarily taken by the Normans. After 1204 Venice claimed the city, but control fell to the despotate of Epiros, and the theme of Ioannina was created in 1225. Besieged by Nicaean troops after the battle of Pelagonia in 1259, Ioannina remained in Epirot hands until 1318, when it was taken by the Byz. and raised to metropolitan status (E. Chrysos, *Dodone* 5 [1976] 337–48). In Feb. 1319 Andronikos II issued a chrysobull (Reg 4, no.2412) listing the privileges of the citizens of the *atey* Ioannina: elements of local administration, exemption from trade duties and military obligations outside the city, confirmation of city customs and of its possessions. This chrysobull is a unique document describing city immunity.

Ioannina fell to Stefan Uroš IV Dušan ca.1348 and passed to SYMEON UROȘ after 1355. Thomas Prejubović ruled in Ioannina from 1366/7 onwards; his tyrannical reign is described in the *Chronicle of Ioannina*. In his struggle against the Albanians Prejubović called upon the Ottomans in 1380. Frightened by Albanian attacks, the citizens acknowledged Carlo Tocco as ruler, and he transferred his summer residence there. In 1430, however, soon after his death, Ioannina was ceded to the Turks.

Little is left of the Byz. monuments of Ioannina. According to K. Tsoures (EpChron 25 [1983] 132–57), the walls on the so-called acropolis of the Demotikon Mouseion and the city walls were built in the 10th C.; the acropolis of Iç Kale in 1082; in 1204–15 the city walls and acropolis of the Demotikon Mouseion were reconstructed; in 1367–84 additional fortifications were erected, including a tower with the inscription of Thomas (evidently Prejubović).


**IOASAF OF VIDIN,** Bulgarian bishop and writer; fl. ca.1375–1400. Ioasaf was a monk in a monastery at or near Vidin. At the request of Prince Ivan Sracimir of Vidin, he was ordained metropolitan of Vidin in Sept. 1392 in Constantinople by Patr. Antony IV. He was sent on a diplomatic mission to Târnovo shortly after the city fell to the Ottoman Turks in 1393 and returned to Vidin with the relics of Sts. Philothea and Petka (Paraskeve). His panegyric on St. Philothea is preserved in the Rila Panegyrikon, copied in 1479 by Vladislav Gramatik. It follows the stylistic model of the panegyrics of Evthimij of Târnovo. Although the work contains many hagiographical clichés, it also provides much information on the condition of Bulgaria at the beginning of Turkish rule.


**IOEL.** See Joel.
IONIAN SEA (Ἰόνιον [Ἰόνιον] πέλαγος), the closed waterway between Greece and Italy, separated from the ADRIATIC SEA on the north by the straits of Otranto. The Ionian Sea provided the major communication link between Byz. and the West: ships generally sailed up the coast of Greece, before either crossing west to Italy or continuing up the Adriatic to DYRRACHION, RAVENNA, and VENICE. In Italy the Ionian Sea bordered on Calabria and Apulia. The seven larger islands of the Ionian Sea, the so-called Heptanesos, were KERKYRA, Paxos, Antipaxos, Leukas, Ithaca, Kephalaenia, and Zakynthos. In late antiquity Kerkyra and Leukas belonged to the administrative sphere of Epiros, Kephalaenia and Zakynthos to the province of Achaia; accordingly, the northern islands were in the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Nikopolis, the southern islands under Corinth. It is probable that the theme of Kephalaenia, established before 809 (Oikonomides, Listes 352, 364), combined the islands of the Ionian Sea. The islands changed hands in the 13th–14th C. (despotate of Epiros, Manfred of Hohenstaufen, Charles I of Anjou) but from the end of the 14th C. the northern group was under Venice, while the southern group belonged to the house of the TOCCO.


IPHIGENEIA, ancient Greek goddess of fertility, later a heroine, the daughter of King Agamemnon. According to pseudo-Nonnos (PG 36:989D-992A), Iphigeneia had to be sacrificed by the Greeks in Aulis in order for them to obtain favorable winds for their voyage to Troy; she was miraculously replaced, however, by a doe (elaphos; see DEER) and transferred to the Tauri in Scythia where she ruled as the priestess of ARTEMIS, sacrificing all foreigners to the goddess. The same myth is told by NONNOS OF PANOPOLIS and by Malalas, Nonnos (Dionysiaka 13:186) mentioning also "the empty barrow of Iphigeneia" near Athens.

The theme of Taurian inhospitality was popular in Byz. literature, the Tauri/Tauroscythians usually being identified as the Rus'. The myth of Iphigeneia herself attracted some Christian literati; thus Gregory of Nazianzos, in his funeral panegyric of Basil the Great (PG 36:504B), after listing some legendary hunters (Artemis, Orion, Actaeon), mentions "the virgin replaced by a doe," a story that he is ready to accept as not completely fabulous. It is not clear why he used in this case such Christian terms as parthenos and elaphos (sometimes perceived as a symbol of Christ himself) and whether or not he had in mind the Old Testament legend of the sacrifice of Jacob. On the other hand, the phrase in his speech against Julian (PG 35:592A), "the sacrifice in Troy of the royal girl," has no Christian allusions and probably does not refer to Iphigeneia, who was sacrificed in Aulis.

An ivory panel of the 10th-C. Veroli casket (London, Victoria and Albert Museum) depicts the sacrifice of Iphigeneia at Aulis (Weitzmann, infra, fig. 214). The iconography is probably derived from an illustrated MS of the plays of Euripides.


IRAN, or Persia, a state that occupied territory from the frontier of the Roman Empire to the borders of India. Called the Parthian Empire under the Arsacid dynasty, it preserved a shaky balance of relations with the Roman Empire in the 1st–3rd C., the frontier being largely defined by the Euphrates. In 226 the dynasty of the SAŞANIANS terminated the rule of the Parthian Arsacids and shaped a powerful empire that rivaled Rome and Constantinople until the 630s. Even though warfare dominated the relations between the two empires, there was also lively cultural exchange, active trade (see SILK ROUTE), and exchange of envoys. Christianity (notably Nestorianism) was entrenched in Iran, Persian cults (esp. Mithraism) and ideological movements (Manichaenism) penetrated into the Roman Empire, and certain features of the Roman fiscal system and court ceremonial can be attributed to the influence of the Persian administrative system.

After the Arab conquest of Iran (ca.633–50) the country was incorporated into the caliphate; subsequently, when the 'Abbásids established their capital in Baghdad (750), Iran became its core territory. The caliphate preserved the Sassanian
fiscal system and the old type of officialdom, but changed the language of bureaucracy to Arabic. By the end of the 10th C. Islam replaced Zoroastrianism as the religion of the majority of Persians. The political decline of the caliphate permitted the formation of independent Persian dynasties—the Tahirids (810–73) in Khurāsān, the Saffārids (887–900) in Seistan and Khurāsān, the Sāmānids in Bukhāra, and finally the Būyids (Buwayhids) in western Iran (935–1055) and Ghaznavids (977/8–1187) in the east. During the first half of the 11th C. most of these princedoms fell into the hands of the Great Seljūks of Baghdad. In the 12th C. the Mongols conquered the territory of the former Sasanian realm, and in 1258 Hūlāgu seized Baghdad, ending the rule of the ʿAbbāsids there and founding the state of the ʿIlkhāns, which paid nominal homage to the Great Khan in China. In 1335, with the death of the last ʿIlkhān, Abu Saʿīd, the Mongol dynasty of Persia came to an end and the country was divided between several minor dynasties. Timur again united it, but only temporarily; soon after his death, the Persian part of his enormous empire was occupied by the Turkomans before being conquered by the Ottomans.

The Palaiologan emperors of Constantinople and the emperors of Trebizond engaged in trade and diplomatic relations with various rulers of the former Persian territory, ʿIlkhāns, Timurids, and Turkomans, and Byz. scholars of the 13th–14th C., like Gregory Choniades, had contacts with their Persian colleagues. (For the literature of medieval Iran, see Persian Literature.)


IRENE (Εἰρήνη), feminine personal name (meaning “peace”). Irene, a daughter of Zeus, was the personification of peace in antiquity; the word was used, at least in Ptolemaic Egypt, as a personal name. In late Roman society the name was rare and had a mythological tinge: Justinian I dedicated to Irene (Peace) and Sophia (Wisdom) the greatest churches in Constantinople. There are many martyrs of this name, but it is difficult to determine when the accounts of their passions were produced; in the tale of Licinius’s daughter Irene, who was baptized by Timotheos (St. Paul’s pupil), it is clearly stressed that her given name was Penelope and she was christened Irene by an angel. Only one Irene is mentioned by Sozomenos (Sozom., *HE* 1:1:14–5), and that in a legendary context: her father, St. Spyridon, made her talk after her death and burial. No Irene is listed in *PLRE* 1–2 and Prokopios knows only the Church of Irene. The first Irene mentioned by Theophanes the Confessor (*Theoph. 410.1*) is the Khazar princess, who married Constantine V and was given the name Irene. Thereafter, the name became more frequent: Skylitzes names four Irenes, Niketas Choniates seven. In the late acts of *Laurav*, vols. 2–3 (13th–15th C.), 36 Irenes appear, and the name holds fourth place among women. As in the case of the wife of Constantine V, a number of foreign-born empresses took the name Irene upon their marriage to a Byz. emperor, perhaps to symbolize peaceful relations between the two nations (cf. *Berta of Sulzbach; Irene-Yolanda of Montferrat; Adelaide of Brunswick, married to Andronikos III*).

IRENE, empress (797–802); born Athens ca.752, died Lesbos 9 Aug. 803. In 768 Constantine V brought Irene to Constantinople, where she was crowned and married to Leo (IV). In 771 she gave birth to their only child, Constantine (VI). Irene was a devoted Iconophile; a rumor circulated that Leo discovered two icons in her possession and thereafter refused to sleep with her (Cedr. 2:19:117–20:3). After Leo’s death in 780 Irene ruled as regent for Constantine for ten years. During this period Irene was cured of a hemorrhage by the waters of Pege; she presented rich gifts to the Church of the Virgin there and set up mosaic portraits of herself and her son (AASS Nov. 3:880BC). In 790, when the army refused Irene’s demand for precedence over him, Constantine deposed her, and she resided in the suburban palace of Eleutherios until recalled in 792. In 797 she dethroned and blinded Constantine, thus becoming the first female Byz. autocrat, but was herself toppled by Nikephoros I in 802 and exiled to Lesbos.

During her regency and rule Irene relied on advisers like the eunuchs Staurakios and Aetios and weakened the empire militarily by removing
IRENE DOUKAINA

IRENE DOUKAINA, wife of Alexios I Komnenos, empress (1081–1118); born Constantinople ca. 1066, died 19 Feb. 1123 (W. Hörandner, ed., Theodoros Prodromos: Historische Gedichte [Vienna 1974] 188 and n. 23) or 1133 (Skoulatos). Daughter of Andronikos (son of the Caesar John Doukas) and Maria of Bulgaria, Irene married Alexios ca. 1078. Between 1083 and 1098 she bore him Anna, Maria, John II, Andronikos, Isaac, Eudokia, Theodora, Manuel, and Zoe (Kleinhroniken 1:55f). Although the marriage sealed the alliance of the Doukas and Komnenos families, at his accession Alexios (urged by his mother Anna Dalassene, and perhaps attracted to Maria of "Alania") hesitated to crown Irene. After a week, demands by John Doukas and Patr. Kosmas I forced her coronation, but she remained overshadowed by Anna Dalassene until the latter's retirement. Although Anna Komnene draws an admiring picture of her parents' relationship, the fact that from 1105 Alexios frequently insisted that Irene accompany him on campaign shows that he hesitated to leave her to intrigue in Constantinople. When Alexios was on his deathbed, Irene pressed him to name Anna's husband Nikephoros Bryennios as heir. After John II's accession, although she had not joined the conspiracy of Anna and Bryennios, Irene was forced to retire to her convent of Kecharitomene. Noted for her charity and intellectual accomplishments, she probably inspired Bryennios's history and patronized or corresponded with literary figures such as Manuel Straboromanos, Theophylaktos of Ohrid, Michael Italikos, and Theodore Prodromos. Her portrait appears on the Pala d'Oro.


—C.M.

IRENE, CHURCH OF SAINT. According to tradition, this church of Constantinople was already a Christian church before Constantine I enlarged it and gave it the name of Eirene (Peace). Before the inauguration of Hagia Sophia in 360 it served as the cathedral of Constantinople. By the 5th C. the two churches were contained within the same precinct, served by the same clergy, and regarded as forming the complex of the patriarchate. Burned down in 532, St. Irene was rebuilt by Justinian I. Destroyed by the earthquake of 740, it was reconstructed, probably by Constantine V. The church was never turned into a mosque, but became an arsenal after the Turkish conquest. The second largest standing church of Constantinople, it has the form of a domed basilica with a flat, second dome covering the west bay. The lower part of the building is Justinianic, whereas most of the upper part dates from after the earthquake of 740. The Turks altered the colonnades. The apse contains a mosaic cross of the Iconoclastic period; further remnants of mosaic remain in the narthex and nonfigural painting is extant in the south aisle.


—P.A.H., A.C.
IRENE OF CHRYSOBALANTON, 10th-C. abbess; saint; feastday 28 July. According to her anonymous hagiographer, she was born in Cappadocia ca.845 and died in Constantinople ca.940. The account of her life as presented in her vita is as follows: born to a rich and influential family (related to the Gouber family of Constantinople), she was sent as a girl to the capital to participate in a BRIDE SHOW designed to find a wife for Michael III. After arriving too late, she entered the convent of Chrysobalanton; within three years she became the hegoumene, despite her youth. She is depicted as an ideal ascetic, an efficient administrator of her convent, and as a preacher who attracted crowds, esp. women of the senatorial class. On one occasion she intervened with the emperor to save the life of a kinsman who was accused of a conspiracy against the throne. She reportedly died at age 97 without showing any signs of advanced age.

The vita of Irene (BHG 952) was probably produced in the late 10th C. during the reign of Basil II; Rosenqvist (infra), who points out inconsistencies in the chronology of events, concludes that the biography should be treated as a work of fiction and terms it a “hagiographic novel.” The vita is an important source for Byz. magical practices and attitudes toward sexuality, since Irene had to deal with the frustrated passion of one of her nuns, who had abandoned her fiancé, as well as with a lovesick vinedresser. The Life depicts the triumph of image worship; churches were decorated with icons on their walls and on panels of bronze, silver, and gold. When Irene appeared to Emp. Basil I in a vision, he sent a protovestarios to her convent with an artist to paint the abbess’s portrait, so that the emperor could confirm that the woman in his vision was really the hegoumene of Chrysobalanton.

SOURCE and LIT. The Life of St. Irene Abbess of Chrysobalanton, ed. J.O. Rosenqvist (Uppsala 1986), with Eng. tr. --A.K., A.M.T.

IRON (σιδηρός), the commonest metal. M. Lombard (Les métaux dans l’ancien monde du Ve au Xle siècle [Paris–The Hague 1974] 125, 149f) notes that the eastern part of the Roman Empire had two major centers of iron working: the region of Trebizond and Sinope and the area around Bosra, Damascus, and Tyre. After the latter region was lost in the 7th C., Byz. needed constantly to import iron. Another productive area was Noricum. Iron was a strategic metal that could not be exported (J.-P. Sodini, Ktima 4 [1979] 85). Unlike precious metals, however, small amounts of ore were available in many places. When Edessa was besieged in 502/3 each household was obliged to deliver 10 pounds of iron. In the 9th C. the proasteion of Tzampouros (in the Trebizond region) sent iron annually to the nearby monastery of St. Phokas (A.I. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, VizVrem 12 [1906] 140.10–12). Stefan Uroš IV Dušan’s chrysobull of 1347 imposes a yearly payment of 600 INGOTS (mazia) of iron on local smithies or siderokausia (Lavra 3, no.128.33). As precious objects iron ingots are mentioned sometimes.
in lists of monastic properties (five siderou mazaea—Pantel., no.7.28) or in wells (four syderon komatia—Xerop., no.9A.15).

Iron could be worked with comparative simplicity. Traces of primitive iron metallurgy have been found even in rural areas of the Crimea of the 8th–9th C. (A. Jakobson, Rannesrednevekovye sel’skie poselenija Jugo-Zapadnoj Tavriki [Leningrad 1970] 164–68). It is unclear whether smiths knowingly hardened iron into steel by the addition of carbon; the tempering of iron by plunging it into water is mentioned in both classical and Byz. sources.

The most important use of iron was in the production of weapons. Iron tools, such as hammer, tongs, and anvil, were primarily used to work metal (Koukoules, Bios 2:1:218f); other tools were used for wood (borer, plane, etc.) and stone. Each household normally had wooden, bronze, and iron utensils (Lastra 1, no.59.49), and an inventory of 1142 lists various iron agricultural implements belonging to the monastery of Xylourgoú: hoes, plows, sickles, axes (Pantel., no.7.27). Iron tie rods were employed to strengthen buildings (A. H. S. Megaw, DOP 18 [1964] 296). Doors and gates were made of iron, as well as anchors, chains, candlesticks, coin dies, sealing implements, and so on. Some minor iron objects have been found in excavations, for example, at St. Polyeyktos in Constantinople and in Corinth: locks and keys, nails, dowels, clamps, etc. (Davidson, Minor Objects 137–40, 199–203).


-M.M.M., L.Ph.B.

IRRIGATION (αρδευμα). A hot climate and frequent droughts led to a constant concern in Byz. about water. A developed irrigation technique, which made use of various water-lifting devices (water screw, suction pump, compartmented wheel, bucket chain, etc.), existed in the Roman Empire, primarily in Egypt and, paradoxically, in the Western provinces (Oleson, infa 285–91); data referring to Syria, Palestine, or Greece are scanty—for instance, a water-driven wheel with compartmented rim on a mosaic of 469 from Apameia. The Price Edict of Diocletian several times mentions water mills, but not water-lifting machines. Asia Minor and Greece relied more upon collecting water in cisterns than irrigating lands by canals and water-lifting gears, even though such terms as “conduit” (amara) and “water pipe” (ache- tos) are common in Greek texts. Eusebios of Caesarea (PG 20:1345B), when speaking of ardeuma, means “the winter downpours.” The tytikon of the Kosmoteira monastery in Bera describes a complex construction for collecting water that went from the spring via a conduit to a receptacle protected from the sun and dirt. In other cases, as described in Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoos, a cistern might be filled by special water bearers. Water was used for irrigation (ardeia) of vineyards and gardens (e.g., Chin., no.54.30–31) or olive groves, as well as for water mills; a case on Crete around 1118 describes a conflict between a mill owner and farmers tilling the “irrigated cho- raphia” (MM 6.9614–22) who were deprived of water by construction of the mill.

The Byz. did not build great canal networks. Justinian dreamed of a canal project between the Melas, a tributary of the Sangarios, and the harbor of Nikomedea, but the idea was abandoned (F. G. Moore, A.J.A 54 [1950] 108–10).


-A.K., J.W.N.

ISAAC I KOMNENOS, emperor (1057–59); born ca.1007, died ca.1060 or 1061. After his elevation by fellow generals rebelling against Michael VI, Isaac was crowned on 1 Sept. 1057. He rewarded his supporters. The populace obtained the desired officials for their organizations, and Patr. Michael I Keroularios gained more authority. Isaac’s purpose was to refill the treasury and so revive the army and the empire. A histamemon (Grierson, Byz. Coins, no.919), representing him standing with unsheathed sword, gave great offense because it violated the tradition of the emperor as a man of God. Isaac regularized tax collections; he pitilessly pursued debtors to the state. Monastic landholding was restricted, and donations by previous emperors to individuals were annulled. He pruned the bureaucracy’s excrescences. Psellus criticizes his haste and harshness. Salaries of officials, esp. senators, were reduced, yet Psellus asserts that Isaac had to rely on himself and other civil bureaucrats. Keroularios’ challenge forced Isaac to remove him (8 Nov.
ISAAC II ANGELOS, emperor (1185–95, 1203–04); born ca.1156, died Constantinople 28/9 Jan. 1204. He had a bookish education (Nik.Chon. 365,72–74) but no deep intellectual interests. After he resisted the order of arrest issued by Andronikos I, he was acclaimed emperor by the people of Constantinople on 12 Sept. 1185. Despite his noble birth, Isaac relied on bureaucrats (notably Theodore Kastamontes, Constantine Mesopotamites, and Demetrios Tornikios) to support him against aristocratic rebels such as Alexios Branas. He sold governorships and other offices but also chose some officials on merit. His attempts to make his favorite monk, Dositheos, patriarch of Constantinople proved unsuccessful. Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 442,33–443,82) expatiates on Isaac’s “mad passion for erecting huge buildings.” The emperor added baths and apartments to the Great Palace and Bakhchernai and created artificial islands in the Sea of Marmara, but he also razed the Genikon and the monastery of Mangana and looted the Nea Ekklesia.

Isaac preferred a life of ease at court, yet willingly campaigned in person when necessary. After defeating the invasion of William II of Sicily, he arranged to take Margaret, daughter of Béla III, as his second wife (his first is unknown). The tax levied for the wedding raised discontent among the Vlachs and Bulgarians, which Peter of Bulgaria and Asen I exploited. From ca.1186, Isaac was involved in continual warfare with them; he was repeatedly defeated. The section of the Third Crusade led by Frederick I Barbarossa did much damage as it passed through Byz.; only by timely concession did Isaac avoid an attack on Constantinople. He succeeded in making peace with Venice, Genoa, and Pisa. Around 8 Apr. 1195, near Kypsella, noble conspirators led by Alexios III overthrew and blinded Isaac. After Alexios fled in 1203, the courtiers brought Isaac to rule jointly with his son Alexios IV. He soon became senile or demented, and, conveniently for Alexios V, died of natural causes.

ISAAC KOMNENOS, basileus of Cyprus (1184–91); born ca.1155, died Iconion 1195/6. Grandson of Isaac, brother of Manuel I, he was sent (ca.1174/5) as governor to Cilicia, where the Armenians captured and imprisoned him. About 1182, he was passed to Bohemund III of Antioch. Andronikos I, influenced by his mistress ‘Theadora, Isaac’s aunt, ransomed him with the Templars’ help. About 1183 or 1184, Isaac falsified imperial letters appointing him governor and went to Cyprus. Once accepted, he proclaimed himself basileus; his coinage shows him wearing imperial garb (Hendy, Coinage 136–42). The uniformly hostile sources charge him with tyrannical acts rivaling those of Andronikos I: murders, maimings, abuse of wives and virgins, confiscations of property, harsh taxation. About 1186 or 1187, Isaac II Angelos dispatched a fleet to regain Cyprus, but Isaac Komnenos defeated the troops on land while his ally, the admiral Margaritone of Sicily, overcame the Byz. fleet. Cyprus’s conquest by Richard I Lionheart ended Isaac’s tyranny. Released ca.1194 after imprisonment in Acre and Margat, Isaac went to Iconion; from that base he sought to arouse Turkish and Byz. opposition to Alexios III. He was allegedly killed by poisoning.

ISAAC OF ANTIOCH, 5th-C. Syriac writer. His writings, of Monophysite cast, are often confused with those of Isaac of Amida, who was Orthodox and lived in the first half of the 5th C. (died before 461). More than 200 poetical works are attributed to the two Isaacs, but it is still unclear exactly which works are to be attributed to which Isaac. Isaac of Amida wrote works on the capture of Rome in 410, on the city of Constantinople (ca.441), and on the earthquake in Antioch in 459. Isaac of Antioch is particularly noted for a lengthy poem on the parrot which chanted the Trisagion with the addition “Who was crucified for us”; he also wrote exhortations to monks on repentance and the perfect life.


ISAAC OF NINEVEH, Syrian mystical theologian; fl. ca.680. Born in the region of Qatar on the Persian Gulf, Isaac became a Nestorian monk and eventually bishop of Nineveh (i.e., Mosul); five months later, however, he abdicated and went to live in the mountains of Ḥuzistan in southwestern Iran. He reportedly lost his sight during his studies. Isaac composed (in Syriac) treatises, dialogues, and letters on ascetical and mystical topics. Probably in the 9th C. some of his works were translated into Greek by the monks Patrikios and Abramos, of the Lavra of St. Sabas in Palestine. The translators tried to make Isaac more acceptable to Orthodox readers by eliminating some of his references to suspect authors, such as Evagrios Pontikos, and replacing them with references to more official church fathers. Isaac presented the way of salvation as consisting of three stages: repentance, purification, and perfection. The fear of Hell serves as a strong stimulus in the search for righteousness. Isaac rarely thinks in terms of deification but speaks of seeing God as if in a mirror, an ancient image in Syriac religious writing. Prayer plays the major part in Isaac’s ideal behavior. His works were used by some Byz. writers (e.g., Peter Damaskenos, Sy-

ISAIAS (Ἡσαῖας), one of the four major (i.e., longer) prophets. Much read and interpreted by the Byz., there are surviving commentaries on the Book of Isaiah attributed to, among others, Eusebios of Caesarea, Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret of Cyrhus. The major significance of Isaiah was seen in his prophecy, interpreted as foreseeing Christ’s advent. “Isaiah is the most divine of all prophets,” says Theodoret (PG 81:216A), “... since he clearly predicted everything—the benediction coming from Abraham and David, the birth of the Savior by the Virgin, various miracles and healing, the envy and rage of the Jews, the passion and the death, the resurrection from the dead, the ascent to heaven, the choice of the apostles, and the salvation of all nations.” In contrast, Chrysostom mentions “Isaiah’s prophecy about Christ” only in passing, but strongly emphasizes “the ready tongue and sublime character” of the prophet and his great concern for ordinary people with whom he sympathized and whose sufferings he shared (PG 56:11.12–25). The Synaxarion of Constantinople (9 May) included Isaiah as a martyr whose relics were allegedly brought to Constantinople and placed in the Church of St. Lawrence near Blachernai; here Isaiah worked miracles, esp., according to legend, for ordinary people—a laborer in a vineyard, a fisherman, a silversmith, etc. (H. Delehaye, AB 42 [1924] 257–65).

Representation in Art. Images of Isaiah among the Old Testament prophets are frequent in monumental art, where he is usually depicted as an old man, with long gray hair and beard. His principal appearances in a narrative context are
connected with the biblical Odes. In the Paris Psalter, for example, these are illustrated individually: the first (Is 26:9–20) literally, with Isaiah flanked by personifications of Night and Dawn; the second (Is 38:10–20) in a straightforward narrative supplemented by a personification of Prayer. Isaiah’s martyrdom, based on an apocalyptic legend, is represented in the Paris Gregory (Omont, Miniatures, pl.49) and his prophetic vision (Is 6), in which a seraph places a hot coal upon his mouth, in MSS of Kosmas Indikopleustes.


—J.I., A.K., J.H.L.

ISAURA (Ἰσαύρα, mod. Zengibar Kalesi near Bozkr), ancient capital of Isauria, flourished until the 4th C. when it lost its status as city and bishopric because it was a center of Isauran unrest. Zeno restored both and assigned it a new name, Leontopolis. A mint was established at Isauro in 617/18 during the campaigns of Herakleios against the Persians. Thereafter Isauro disappears from history, but the bishopric still existed in the 11th C. From the site, but contains Hellenistic fortifications that show Byz. repairs; four churches, including a large basilica with a tower and an octagonal church; and numerous inscriptions. Isauro is sometimes confused with Isauropolis on the north side of the Taurus.


—C.F.

ISAURIA (Ἰσαυρία), mountainous district of southern Asia Minor, inhabited by tribes who lived in small towns, long resisted central control, and frequently descended to ravage the adjacent plains. Although the Constantinopolitan government considered these tribes barbarian and brigands, they formed the core of the imperial army in the 5th C. Isaurians were famed as builders who sent their teams as far away as Constantinople and Syria, and probably as gardeners, their most popular saint being Konon the Gardener. Diocletian joined CILicia Tracheia to the Isaureian homeland to form the province of Isauria, whose capital was Seleukeia; the western part was detached in 370 and assigned to Lykaonia. Because of constant danger from the tribesmen, Isauria was frequently governed by a military commander (comes); this situation became permanent after 535. The region was severely afflicted by revolts and military conflicts in the late 4th C., and in 493–66, after the Isaurean victory over Germanic mercenaries, the Isaurians spread throughout Asia Minor. Calm prevailed when an Isaurean chief, Zeno, was emperor (474–81) and Isauro saw much construction. Troubles resumed in the late 5th C., continuing until Anastasios I finally crushed the tribes in 497. These wars were the impetus for widespread fortification. The coast of Isauro was always important for trade, which was still active in the late 7th C., the date of seals of Kommerkariaoi of Isauro (one of them—Zacos, Seals 1, no.158—combined this office with the military position of stratelates). Thereafter, the coast suffered greatly from Arab raids. Isauro was absorbed in Anatolikon, then became a separate kleisoura called Seleukeia under Theophilos, as part of his efforts to strengthen the frontier. Romanos I promoted it to a theme ca.930. Divided into coastal and interior regions, it had a garrison of 5,000. The ecclesiastical province of Isauro long survived, though called Pamphylia after the early 10th C.; the cult of the local saints Thekla and Konon attracted pilgrims. According to legend, Leo III was an Isaureian, Konon by name.


ISAURIAN DYNASTY, family that ruled from 717 to 802 and included Leo III, Constantine V, Leo IV, Constantine VI, and Irene; it was so called because a probable interpolation in Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 391.6) says that its founder, Leo III, came from Isauroi, although he was actually born in Syrian Germanikeia (K. Schenck, BZ 5 [1896] 296–98). The 15th-C. notion that the Isaurean dynasty was able to revive the empire as a result of its military and administrative reforms was questioned by Ostrogorsky (infra). The dynasty is most closely associated with imperial support for Iconoclasm, which Leo III introduced, Constantine V enforced, and Irene suspended. Despite the siege of Constantinople by Maslama in 717 and the campaigns of Hārūn
AL-RASHID, the Isaurian dynasty resisted the Arabs and stabilized the border with the caliphate in eastern Asia Minor. In Italy, however, RAVENNA was lost to the Lombards, and the Franks successfully challenged waning Byz. authority.


P.A.H.

ISIDORE (Ἰσίδωρος), jurist, ANTECESSOR, one of the eight addressees of the Constitutio Omnem of Justinian I from the year 533. He composed a Greek paraphrase of the CODEX JUSTINIANUS, several fragments of which (esp. those of book 8, titles 53–56) have been preserved among the scholia to the BASSILICA. Also transmitted there under his name are fragments of a paraphrase of the DIGEST (concerning book 22, titles 3–5).

ED. Heimbach, Basil. 6:61f, 64-69.
LIT. Scheltema, L’enseignement 29f, 40-42.

A.S.

ISIDORE I BOUCHEIRAS (Βούχειρα or Βούχείρας; cf. Tinnefeld, infra 160, n.1), Palamite patriarch of Constantinople (17 May 1347–Feb./Mar. 1350); born Thessalonike between ca.1300 and 1310, died Constantinople. Eldest of ten children, Isidore was educated in Thessalonike and then went to Athos to study with Gregory Sinaites. Around 1325 Turkish attacks forced his return to Thessalonike, where for ten years he led a hesychastic circle. Circa 1335 he was tonsured by Gregory Palamas on Athos; he accompanied Palamas to the local council of Constantinople of 1341 (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF). He was elected metropolitan of Monemvasia the same year but was never consecrated. In 1344 he was deposed and excommunicated by JOHN XIV KALEKAS because of his Palamite views.

With the victory of JOHN VI KANTAKOUZENOS in 1347, Isidore was restored to favor; he was elected patriarch, performed the second coronation of John VI and the marriage of JOHN V PALAIOLAGOS. He also appointed Palamas as metropolitan of Thessalonike. His brief patriarchate was uneventful; he was taken ill in Jan. 1350, composed a final testament, and died soon thereafter. Isidore was noted as a hymnographer, but none of his poetry has survived.


A.M.T.

ISIDORE OF KIEV, metropolitan of Kiev and all Russia (1436–39); born Monemvasia ca.1385, died Rome 23 (J. Gill, LThK 5 [1660] 788) or 27 April 1463 (Gill, infra 76). Educated in Constantinople, Isidore became a monk in the Peloponnese. In 1417 he returned to the capital, where he was subsequently made hegoumenos of St. De-
metrios monastery. He served as ambassador for John VIII Palaiologos to the Council of Basel in 1434. After his elevation to the metropolitan see of Kiev, Isidore attended the Council of Ferrara-Florence and signed the decree of union. Shortly thereafter he was appointed cardinal and sent to Moscow as a papal legate. On his return to Moscow in 1440 (Krajcar, infra 387), however, Grand Duke Basil II (1425–62) imprisoned him for his Unionist sympathies. He managed to escape to the West, where he devoted his remaining years to various papal missions on behalf of the Union of the Churches. One such embassy brought him to Constantinople, where he proclaimed the union (12 Dec. 1452). When the city fell several months later, he was imprisoned but again escaped. In 1459 Pope Pius II (1458–64) appointed him Latin patriarch of Constantinople. His literary output, in contrast with his rather active ecclesiastical and diplomatic career, was small. Some of his correspondence and speeches (at Basel and Pavia) have been published.


ISIDORE OF MILETUS, architect associated with Anthemios of Tralles in the design and construction of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople; died before 558. He issued a revised edition of the works of Archimedes, wrote a commentary on Heron of Alexandria’s treatise On Vaulting of the late 1st C., and invented a compass with which to construct parabolas. One of his students, Eutokios of Askalon, commented on Archimedes, while another added book 15 to the Elements of Euclid. Isidore consulted with Anthemios and Justinian I on the problem of flooding at Dara.


ISIDORE OF PELOUSION, ascetic and writer; saint; born Alexandria between 360 and 370, died after 433; feastday 4 Feb. Isidore lived as presbyter and monk in a monastery near Pelousion on the Nile. Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos (PG 146:1249–53) calls him a pupil of John Chrysostom, which perhaps should not be taken literally. The Souda dubs him philosopher and rhetorician, while his Orthodoxy, erudition, and style are commended by Severos of Antioch and Photios (ep. 207.18–19, ed. Laourdas-Westerink, 2:107). Much of this praise is merited by his 2,000 or so surviving letters, originally collected at the Akoinetoi monastery in Constantinople according to U. Riedinger (ZNTW 51 [1960] 157), a pseudonymous work by some Akoinetoi monks. The prime interest of the letters is theological, revealing Isidore as a careful, rather than hysterical, opponent of heresy, rebutting Arianism and Manichaeanism in elegant Greek, while addressing Cyril of Alexandria on the hypostatic union and also warning against contemporary tendencies toward Monophysitism. Isidore is equally level-headed on biblical exegesis (resisting extreme allegorism) and on ascetic and moral principles. A lost work, Against the Hellenes, may have shown him in a less temperate mood. Some of his letters were translated into Church Slavonic (I. Dujcev, BS 23 [1962] 327f).


ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, bishop of Seville (from ca.600); prolific author and churchman in Visigothic Spain; born in Byz. Spain? ca.570, died 636. His attitudes toward the Visigoths and Byz. appear to have been complex. In Constantinople, Leander, his brother and predecessor at Seville, had negotiated an alliance between Byz. and the Visigothic usurper Hermenegild (579–84) and become friends with the papal aposcriarius Gregory (the future Gregory I the Great) as well as a correspondent of Patr. John IV Nestéutes. How far Isidore’s Etymologies, or Origines (ed. W.M. Lindsay [Oxford 1911])—the basic encyclopedia of the medieval West—reflects contemporary
reality is controversial, but it certainly records the Visigothic destruction of Byz. CARTAGENA (15.1.67; cf. H.J. Diesner, Philologus 119 [1975] 92–97) and mentions the Byz. ship type durcon (dorkon, 19.1.10; cf. D. Claude, Der Handel im westlichen Mittelmeer während des Frühmittelalters [Göttingen 1985] 47). Both recensions of the aggressively pre-Gothic The History of Goths, Vandals, and Suevi narrate the Goths’ confrontations with the Byz.—sometimes called simply milites—from the 4th to 7th C., particularly the contest for southern Spain. Events in the History are dated by the provincial era and the regnal year of Byz. emperors. Isidore cites the burden of Byz. taxation as a cause of loyalty to the barbarians (ch.15). His chronicle draws largely on VICTOR TONNENSIUS but implicitly develops an anti-Byz. theme (M. Reynellet, MEFR 82 [1970] 363–400); its final section notes Byz. events from Justin II to Herakleios, including Avar attacks, strife between factions, and the loss of “Greece” to the Slavs (P. Charanis, BZ 64 [1971] 22–25). The literary biographies of Famous Men treat Latin authors of Byz. Spain, Justinian I, JOHN OF BICLAR, Victor Tonnensius, and Patr. John IV of Constantinople.


ISIDORE OF THESSALONIKE. See GLABAS, ISIDORE.

ISIDORE THE YOUNGER, architect; fl. mid-6th C. He was the nephew of ISIDORE OF MILETUS and chief architect (mechanopoioi) of the commission responsible for rebuilding the dome of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, after its first collapse in 557 (Prokopios, Buildings 2.8.25; Agath. 5.9). Of his work there remain in situ 12 ribs in the north and south sectors of the present dome (the west sector exhibits the restoration of Trdat, 986–94; the east sector, the restoration of 1347–54). The younger Isidore’s dome is about 6 m higher than the original; his work shows greater care and precision than was exercised in later restorations. Isidore the Younger collaborated with John of Constantinople in building new fortifications at ZENOBIA on the Euphrates, and he may be the Isidore named in an inscription of 550 from Chalkis ad Belum (IGLSyr 2 [1939] nos. 348–49).


ISLAM, POLEMIC AGAINST. Attacks on Islam were written by both Christians living within the caliphate and those in Byz. territory. The polemic produced in Arab-controlled lands was predominantly apologetic and decreased after the 11th C. Byz. polemic, on the other hand, continued until the end of the empire, and its goal was refutation rather than apology. The amazing success of the Muslims in the 15th C., however, diverted the focus of the discussion; the defeat of the Christians was certainly to be explained not by the superiority of Islam but by the sins of the Greeks.

Vestiges of early polemic are attributed to the 8th C., but their MS tradition is questionable. The letter of Leo III to the caliph ‘Umar II (717–20) survives only in translation (the Armenian version is preserved in Ėlōwond), and among works on the subject by JOHN OF DAMASCUS only a chapter in his book On Heresies seems to be authentic, albeit interpolated. THEODORE ABU-QURRA tried to defend Christianity in a pragmatic form accessible to his Muslim audience. NIKETAS BYZANTIOS launched an attack on Islam; he was followed by the monk Bartholomew of Edessa. The most important polemicists of the later period were John VI Kantakouzenos, who composed a treatise against Islam, and Manuel II, who wrote a Dialogue with a Persian.

Earlier Byz. polemic relied primarily on hearsay information about Islam, and John of Damascus was content to ridicule outlandish legends. Niketas Byzantios, on the other hand, studied the Qur’ān, probably in a Greek translation. The discussion concentrated on theological, moral, and political problems. The central theological problem was the consistent monotheism of Islam that could not be reconciled with the Christian concept of the Trinity and the incarnation of the Logos. The Christian apologists responded that such an approach deprives God of his reason (Logos) and spirit, and implicitly severs the link between mankind and the Godhead; Niketas called the God of Islam holosphairos, “all-spherical,” or holosphyros, “solid,” emphasizing matter as his essence. In the
field of morality, Christian apologists stressed the superiority of the Christian monogamous family over Islamic polygamy and sodomy; they also criticized the hedonistic tendencies of Islam as reflected in its image of Paradise. Another Christian argument was the defense of the thesis of free will against the belief in predestination that contributed so much to the idea of the Islamic holy war.

Politically, each side tried to demonstrate the lack of unity in its adversary: the Muslims criticized the Christians for being split into 72 races, while the letter of Leo III asserts that Islam is torn apart by schisms more serious than those that used to rage in the Christian world. While defending the truth of their religion, Christian apologists affirmed that MUHAMMAD was a false prophet and a licentious man and that the Qur’ân was a false book. The Byz. church required Muslim converts to anathematize the God of Muhammad, the prophet himself, the caliphs, and some tenets of Muslim dogma. Manuel I, who settled many Turks in Byz. territory, encountered strong resistance from the clergy when he tried to have the anathema of the “solid” (holosphyros) God of Muhammad deleted from the catechetical books.

With difficulty he prevailed and an anathema against Muhammad and all his teachings was substituted (Nik.Chon. 219.51–219.70).


—A.K.

ISLAMIC INFLUENCE ON BYZANTINE ART. Islam as a religion and political entity had an impact on Byz. as early as the mid-7th C., but it hardly affected the arts during the Umayyad Caliphate, which adopted Byz. forms rather than transmitting its own. Although scholarly opinion is divided on these issues, early Islam may also have had some effect on the changes in coinage introduced by Justinian II and on Iconoclasm. No significant impact of a new Islamic art was in fact possible before the appearance of techniques, styles, and subjects that were consciously and formally new and different from Byz. ones or before the growth of centers of taste, production, and consumption that could compete with Constantinople and the other major cities of the empire.

The usually accepted time for the appearance of a coherent new Islamic art is the end of the 8th C. when BAGHDAD, the recently founded ‘Abbâsid capital, began to outstrip Constantinople in wealth and resources. Later, CORDOBA, Cairo (al-Fustât), and many other North African, Syrian, Mesopotamian, and Iranian cities developed as centers of artistic production competing with both Baghdad and Byz. The preponderant impact, however, would always be from the East, as the Islamic world inherited from Sasanian Iran the partly real and partly mythic function of representing to the Mediterranean world the exotic East and because more consistent—friendly or hostile—Byz. relationships existed, with Eastern rather than Western Muslim societies. The most important post-‘Abbâsid Islamic dynasties and periods for which significant official or commercial contacts with Byz. can be assumed or shown to have had artistic components are the Fâtimid, the Seljuks, and, from the 13th C. onward, the Turkish beylûks of Anatolia, among whom the Otomans became the most prominent.

A chronology or typology of the impact of Islamic art on Byz. is difficult to establish, but some specific examples outline its probable pattern.

One of the earliest examples is the palace of Emp. Theophilos in Constantinople with its wild animals, automata in the shape of birds or lions, and garden of artificial trees made of precious metals. According to textual descriptions, this palace was similar to ‘Abbâsid palaces in Baghdad. Ruins of a palace on the Asian side of the Bosporos (possibly Bryas) with a domed audience hall can also be related to a sequence of partly earlier Islamic palaces (S. Eyice, CahArch 10 [1959] 245–50). Possibly, however, these Byz. or Muslim examples and the stories around them simply derive from the same antique sources.

More complete series of objects with Islamic motifs appear during the Macedonian and Komnenian periods, and in fact down to the Latin conquest of 1204. Textiles, esp. silks, use roulades with animals or hunting scenes typical of Islamic and earlier Iranian designs, just as clothing, esp. official or expensive costume, tends to adopt “oriental” cuts and motifs. Ceramic vessels and tiles used for the decoration of buildings
pick up several techniques (sgraffito, splash, luster imitation) developed in the Muslim world and at times even some of their motifs. Enamels used on the crown of Constantine IX and on the Pala d’Oro show dancers and hunters typical of Islamic objects, even though the technique itself is not Islamic. A rather remarkable series of silver objects with courtly and other scenes found in Central Russia has been interpreted as Byz. but contains many Islamic features (Darkević, Svetsko ieskusstvo 232).

The imitation of Arabic writing, esp. its angular style known as Kufic, becomes a common decorative motif in Greek churches; this type of ornament has been called “pseudo-Kufic.” By 1200, according to Nicholas Mesarites, a palace known as the Mouchroutas (probably some misunderstanding of the Ar. mahrātah, “cone”) or “Persian house” stood to the west of the Chrysotriklinos; it was covered by a stalactite dome with paintings. A curious glass cup looted by the Venetians in 1204, now in the Treasury of S. Marco in Venice, contains, next to beautifully copied antique motifs, the imitation of an Arabic inscription so well done that it seems legible (Le trésor de Saint-Marc de Venise [Paris 1984] 180–83). The underwater excavations at Serçe Liman off the coast of southern Turkey (G. Bass, JGS 26 [1984] 64–69) uncovered a Byz. ship, probably of the 11th C., carrying thousands of objects in glass and other techniques originating from the Byz. Empire as well as Iran, Syria, Egypt, and perhaps even China. As early as the 11th C., a donor in a Cappadocian church is represented wearing a turban (Thierry, Nouvelles Églises, pl.94).

Such examples could easily be multiplied and from the 9th C. onward traces of Islamic influences are found in Byz. Nevertheless, in comparison with the art of other Christian groups in western Asia (Armenians, Georgians, Syrians, Copts), who were under Islamic political domination, Byz. art was less consistently affected. Islamic influences hardly ever occur in religious art and never affect style and expression, the formal means by which Byz. art differentiates itself from other medieval traditions. In other words, Islamic forms played almost no role in the Byz. visual expression of Christianity.

Islamic themes are most apparent in the secular art of emperors and in many aspects of material culture. There are several explanations for this phenomenon. One is that, in the 8th–12th C., Islamic artisans and a Muslim patronage developed, originated, and sponsored a large number of technical inventions in ceramic, textiles, glassmaking, and metalwork; these were, for the most part, easily transmissible and improved the quality of objects used in daily life. The ship of Serge Liman was one example of a widespread trade in practical objects and, wherever these objects were made, they share the very Islamic objective of enhancing the potential of everyday activities. Both Byz. and Islam used the same Late Antique sources, and resemblances are therefore sometimes misleading. What Muslim princes introduced into the language of imperial art is an emphasis on representations of pleasure (dancing, singing, music, hunting) as an expression of power and wealth. Thus, the Islamic impact was first thematic, then functional or technical, and more rarely formal.

In a phenomenon somewhat similar to the impact of classical art, Islamic elements appear as significant components of Byz. art in the 9th–12th C., when the Byz. felt strong enough to incorporate such exotic themes as seemed interesting. Islamic influence is less immediately apparent in later times. When Byz. was weaker, its material culture more consistently shared with neighboring Turkish or Turkified establishments; the maintenance of an unadulterated Christian art was an unwritten necessity for self-identity and survival.


–O.C.

ISOCHRISTOS. See ORIGEN.

ISRAEL (Ἰσραήλ), the chosen people of the Bible. The etymology of the name was explained by the church fathers as either “seeing” (“the mind seeing God” in Makarios the Great, PG 34:880B) or “conquering” (Justin Martyr, PG 6:765D). The church fathers distinguished the old Israel, whose rejection of Christ caused their subsequent sufferings, from the new chosen people, the Christians; Israel became a designation of the church and also of the Byzantines. In Byz. rhetoric of the
12th C. the image of Israel often appears in a context of expectations: after present miseries “the new Israel” will be elevated by the “wise architect,” just as the old Israel was liberated by Moses (e.g., Nikephoros Basileakes, ed. Garzya 61.34–62.3). Niketas Choniates, while describing the defeat at Myriokephalon (Nik.Chon. 188.19–26), recalls “a seed left for Israel,” so that God’s inheritance should not utterly disappear.

In Old Testament illustration the chosen people were often seen as allusions to Byz. ideology and current events. Triumphs and epiphanies experienced by leaders such as David, Moses, and Joshua frequently include assemblages of men, women, and children; elaborations upon their respective biblical accounts, these suggest the fortunes of the Byz. themselves. The Crossing of the Red Sea, depicted in MSS such as the Bible of Leo Sakellarios, was interpreted as the living Christian’s entry into the Promised Land through the grace of baptism. The ode (Ex 15:1) sung by the Israelites on this occasion is prescribed in De cer. (610.3–5) as appropriate to the celebration of triumphs over the Arabs and received special attention in aristocratic Psalter illustration. The theme is translated from a particular historical setting to a transcendentral plane in the liturgy. Most developed among such biblical metaphors is the Joshua Roll, which has been interpreted as an epic of Holy Land conquest by Nikephoros II Phokas or John I Tzimiskes (M. Schapiro, GBA 35 [1949] 161–76), even though neither of these emperors ever reached Palestine. —J.L., A.K., A.C.

**I斯塔克里, Al-**, more fully İbrahim ibn Muḥammad al-I斯塔克rí, geographer and cartographer of Persian origin who wrote in Arabic; born I斯塔克 lí near ancient Persepolis) late 9th C., died Baghdad after 952. His Routes and Kingdoms (written 933–50) is the earliest surviving work of the systematic school of Islamic geography (see Arab Geographers). It is based partly on the now lost Maps of the Regions by al-Balkhî (died after 926), on written and oral reports as well as al-I斯塔克rí’s own observations as a traveler throughout the Islamic East. Beginning with a map of the world, it then concentrates on Islamic territory, dividing it into 20 regions with maps, and includes a map and brief description of the Mediterranean. It is unclear whether he traveled in the Mediterranean regions. His first maps of Egypt and North Africa were criticized and updated by his junior continuator, ibn Hawqal. Several later cartographers redrew al-I斯塔克rí’s maps. His work was extensively used by later Arab and, more particularly, by Persian and Turkish geographers.

His information on Byz., the frontier regions (prior to the Byz. capture of Melitene, 934), and the Mediterranean is less detailed than that of ibn Hawqal, the latter often entirely superseding it in this respect. It is, however, still valuable for Byz.’s northern neighbors, particularly the Khazars, Rus’, Slavs, and Bulgarians.


**İstanbul.** See Constantinople.

**Isthmos.** See Corinth; Hexamilion.

**Istria** (Istria), peninsula extending into the northeastern Adriatic Sea, part of the Roman provincia Venetiarum et Histriae, which bordered on Dalmatia to the south. The Tabula Peutingeriana presents Istria as an area of numerous cities. The region lay south of the mainstream of barbarian raids and retained its Roman character until the end of the 6th C. Ostrogothic domination (493–539) did not leave substantial traces in the material culture, and excavations on the peninsula have uncovered both Byz. coins of the 6th C. and traditional Roman houses (G. Bordenache in Rendiconti. Accademia d’Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti, Napoli 34 [1959] 177–96). The restoration of Byz. rule in Istria in the mid-6th C. was of short duration: the Lombards invaded it in 568 and gradually reduced Byz. territory to the littoral. In 680 the Lombards took Friuli and established the border between themselves and the empire; the remaining Byz. section formed a part of the exarchate of Ravenna until the fall of the latter to the Lombards in 751. Thereafter Istria constituted an independent administrative unit under the authority of a local tribunus but was not a theme (FeVluga, Byzantium 68–70).

Archaeological excavation has revealed the precarious situation in Istria during the Lombard, Avar, and Slav invasions: on the one hand, tombs
of soldiers, for example, a cavalryman from Brežac of ca.600; on the other hand, strongholds with rural population, some of them episcopal centers (Pola, Parentium, Tergeste, etc.). In Parentium (Porfeci), Bp. Eufrasius completed a complex of ecclesiastical buildings in the 6th C. The slavization of Istria began at the end of the century; there were two streams of Slavs—Slovenians (in the north) and Croatians. The Roman population maintained its position primarily in the region of Pola; while cemeteries of the 7th–8th C. are predominantly pagan, several churches were built during this period (e.g., St. Sophia in Dvograd dated by a lost inscription to 770).

In 788 Charlemagne took Istria and, in the treaty of Aachen (812), made Byz. formally renounce this territory. Eventually Istria became a base for Venetian penetration of the Balkans.


- I.Dj.

**ISTROS.** See Danube.

**ISTVÁN II.** (Stephen), king of Hungary (1116–31); born ca.1100/1, died 1 Mar. 1131. Son of Kálmán (Coloman, r.1095–1116), István was a rival of his uncle Álmos, who (with his infant son Béla) had been blinded by Coloman. At the start of István’s reign, Álmos fled to Constantinople, where Alexios I and John II supported him. Around 1127, because of a trade dispute or because John refused to yield Álmos, the Hungarian king raided Byz. territory, destroying Belgrade, and plundering Niš (Naissus) and Servida. Around 1128 John responded with an expedition that took Chramon (Kama) and the land between the Sava and the Danube and defeated the Hungarians north of the Danube. Once he had withdrawn, the Hungarians retook Chramon and destroyed Braničevo. John returned (ca.1129) and rebuilt Braničevo. Although István’s plans were betrayed, John was forced to withdraw. Around 1129 or 1130 peace was concluded between István and John.


- C.M.B.

**ITALIC PAPYRUS,** incorrect representation in writing of the high front vowel i, and in a wider sense incorrect representation of vowels, in Medieval Greek. Greek orthography became fixed in the classical period and was not modified to take account of the radical phonological changes, particularly in the vowel system, which took place between Hellenistic and Byz. times. Papyrus documents show frequent confusion of ei and i by the 2nd C. B.C. and of η and i a little later. Confusion of ω and υ appears from the 1st C. A.D. Confusion of both of these with i is infrequent before the 9th C. The outcome is that from the 9th C. ι, η, ι, ι, ο, ι, and ι represented the same sound and were frequently substituted for one another in writing. In the same way ο and ο, αυ and ι were confused. Manuals of orthography laid down rules for correct spelling of words containing these phonemes. The ordinary man, however, cared less about accuracy than the schoolmasters, and incorrect substitution was common in documents, MSS, and even in inscriptions and on the seals of high officials throughout the Middle Ages and later. The reason is that most copyists carried their text from exemplar to copy in the form of an auditory image, which they then wrongly translated into visual symbols in the act of writing. Although these errors rarely gave rise to misunderstanding, occasionally they caused serious corruption, often worsened by the attempts of subsequent copyists to make sense of the text they found in their exemplars. Thus συν οικισμον becomes συνιστησων, τι ου των becomes τοιοισων, and δαιτα becomes δε τα.


- R.B.

**ITALOS, JOHN.** See John Italos.

**ITALY.** (Italia). In the 4th–5th C. the dioecesis Italica consisted of two vicariates: the regio annonaria (with its capital at Milan), encompassing the provinces of Venetia-Istria, Emilia-Liguria, Alpes Cottiae, and Raetia, and the regiones urbicariae (capital at Rome), composed of Tuscany-Umbria, Picenum-Flaminia, Campania, Samnium, Calabria-Apulia, Lucania-Bruttium, Sicily,
Sardinia, and Corsica. The traditional assumption that Italy went through an economic crisis in the 4th–5th C. has been questioned; ancient municipia survived in Italy at least through the 6th C., and agricultural production remained stable in the Annonarian vicariate in northern Italy (L. Ruggini, *Economia e società nell’Italia annonaria* [Milan 1961]); K. Hannestad (*CEB*, vol. 2 [Belgrade 1964] 155–58) assumes that after the crisis of the 4th C. Italian agriculture flourished under Ostrogothic rule.

In the 4th and 5th C. Rome (and later Milan) served as the residence of the Western Roman emperors. The Western emperor was at first the colleague and often the younger brother of the (senior) Eastern augustus (Maximian Herculeus under Diocletian, Constans I under Constantius II, Valentinian I and Gratian under Valens, Honorius under Arkadios) but subsequently became an independently elected ruler. The authority of the Western Roman emperors in Italy ended in 476 with the overthrow of Romulus Augustulus by the Herulian Odoacer. Soon thereafter, in 488, the Ostrogoths invaded Italy;
by 493 they took Ravena and established their kingdom. Under Theodoric the Great the Ostrogoths enjoyed de facto independence of Constantinople but still acknowledged its suzerainty. The economic and social changes of the Gothic period (493–555) are as yet inadequately understood. Archaeological evidence in conjunction with the works of Cassiodorus, however, indicates a general separation of Italy from the unified Mediterranean economy and the emergence of regional economies throughout the peninsula. Justinian I expended great effort to restore Byz. rule over Italy; his lengthy war against the Ostrogoths caused much hardship for the local population. After the Byz. reconquest, Justinian’s measures, esp. the Sanction Pragmatica, were aimed at restoring the prewar situation and latifundia of Roman landowners, which had been partially seized and divided by the Goths and their Italian allies. Byz. rule in Italy was soon challenged; in 568 the Lombards invaded Italy and quickly occupied its northern part. The Byz. retained Ravena and Venice in the north and Apulia, Calabria, Lucania, and Campania in the south. Sicily was able to repel the Lombard attacks and also stayed in Byz. hands. The remaining Byz. possessions formed an administrative unit—the EXARCHATE of Ravena. Gradually, a third factor emerged on the scene—the Papacy, which expanded its jurisdiction in Sicily and elsewhere.

The political makeup of Italy changed again during the 8th C. Byz. lost Ravena to the Lombards in 751, but strengthened its position in southern Italy and esp. Sicily, transferring their ecclesiastical jurisdiction to Constantinople and confiscating the papal estates; the territory was substantially hellenized and firmly incorporated into the Byz. administrative system based on THEMES. The Lombard kingdom became decentralized, resulting in the establishment of several independent duchies (Benevento, Salerno, and later Capua); in the mid-8th C. its northern part was conquered by the Franks, who became a new factor in the struggle for hegemony in Italy. Relying on Frankish support, the papacy rejected Byz. suzerainty and gradually formed an independent state (by 800).

Arab raids, which began (in Sicily) as early as the mid-7th C., increased in the 8th and 9th C. and forced the Byz., popes, Franks, Lombard rulers, and semi-independent cities (NAPLES, AMALFI, GAETA, Venice) into an anti-Muslim alliance (although in some cases Italian cities and principalities preferred the support—or peace terms—granted by the Arabs). The alliance was not effective, however, and by the beginning of the 10th C. Sicily was essentially lost to the Arabs. In the 10th-C. political struggles, two major powers predominated in Italy: Byz., which retained firm control in southern Italy, and the Ottonians, who inherited Frankish claims and interests in Italy. Before 969 the Byz. KATEPANATE of Italy was created, later (ca. 1040) replaced by the doukaton of Italy. The administrative term Italia, which was used in Greek sources synonymously with Longobardia, did not include Calabria and Sicily; thus Argyros, son of Melo, was titled “doux of Italy, Calabria, Sicily, and Paphlagonia” (Falkenhagen, Dominazione 48–63). At the same time the term could be applied to the whole peninsula (without Sicily) and to the Frankish kingdom of Italy.

Abundant Greek and Latin private documents reveal much about the southern Italian villages of the 9th–11th C. They did not employ the open field system; the peasantry paid rent predominantly in kind; free and semifree peasants were numerous; and villages often concluded contracts with the lords that fixed payment amounts and defined the rights of peasants (M.L. Abramson, VizVrem 7 (1953) 161–93).

In the 10th C. neither Germany nor Byz. was sufficiently successful at subjugating Italy; the early 11th C. saw a peaceful but unstable situation interrupted by the short-lived campaign of George Maniakes. In the same century appeared a new power that replaced both the Byz. and the Arabs—the Normans, who established their state in southern Italy and Sicily. At the same time another new factor emerged, namely, the commercial cities of northern Italy (Venice, Genoa, Pisa, etc.), which eventually came to dominate trade in the eastern Mediterranean. In the 12th C., Byz., for the last time, attempted to recover its possessions in southern Italy. The empire often had the support of Italian cities (Ancona, Milan, Venice), but the Norman resistance, the lack of mutual understanding with the papacy, and esp. the powerful interference of the German emperors made the Byz. efforts fruitless.

The conquest of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade in 1204 deprived Byz. of its status as a
world power, making any further intervention in Italy impossible. In contrast, Italian republics began to penetrate the territory of “Romania”; they had been granted commercial privileges and tax exemptions since the late 10th C., but during the 12th C. Byz. maintained control over the Italian colonies and skillfully played off their rivalries. The defeat of 1204 opened up the Levant to the Venetians, who together with the Genoese exercised domination over both Constantinople and the Byz. provinces. Sicily, esp. under Charles I of Anjou, served as a base for hostile operations against Byz. Both Italian trade domination and the transformation of Byz. into a source of food supply for Italy contributed to the empire’s growing poverty, although individual Greek merchants and artisans maintained their activity and operated with substantial capital. Cultural contacts between Byz. and Italy developed in the 14th and 15th C., with Greek books and scholars penetrating the Italian intellectual milieu. The Ottoman threat fostered discussion of a political and religious alliance, but Italian military assistance remained insignificant and could not prevent the fall of the empire to the Turks.


A.K.

ITINERARIUM PEREGRINORUM (Account of the Pilgrims’ Journey), a Latin history of the Third Crusade probably written by an English Templar in the Holy Land (at Tyre?) between 1 Aug. 1191 and 2 Sept. 1192, and certainly before 1194 (H. Möhring, Innsbrucker historische Studien 5 [1982] 149–67). In addition to firsthand experience and oral sources, the author used a lost account of the Crusade of Frederick I. The Itinerarium Peregrinorum describes Frederick’s crossing of the Byz. Empire and his difficulties with Isaac II’s Pechenegs and Bulgars (291.20–296.7), insisting on Greek inferiority and their hatred of innocent Latins (292.12–293.9). It also treats the conflict with the Seljuk sultanate (296.11–300.6) and Greek fire (323.20–324.18). Between 1216 and 1222, Richard, canon and later prior of Holy Trinity, London, revised the Itinerarium Peregrinorum and combined it with a Latin translation of the Estoire de la guerre sainte (History of the Holy War), material from Roger of Hoveden, and a lost English account of the Crusade to produce a new version (ed. W. Stubbs, Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I, vol. 1 [London 1864; rp. 1964]).


M.McC.

IVAJLO, Bulgarian tsar (1278–79). Known to the Byz. as Lachanas (“cabbage”), he was a swineherd who believed that he had a mission from God to save Bulgaria from the Tatars. A series of victories brought him broad popular support. He overthrew Constantine Tich in 1277, but Turchino held out under Tich’s wife Maria (Nicol, Kantakouzenos 19–20, no.15). She preferred to marry Ivajlo and bring him to the throne, rather than allow her uncle Michael VIII Palaiologos to impose his own nominee. She was overthrown while Ivajlo was away fighting the Tatars. He inflicted a series of defeats on the Byz. armies sent to support John Asen III (1279–80), but was forced to turn to the Tatars for help. Khan Nogay had him murdered at a banquet.


M.J.A.

IVAN III, grand duke of Moscow and Vladimir (co-ruler from 1450, prince from 1462); born 22 Jan. 1440, died Moscow 27 Oct. 1505. Son of Basil II, Ivan substantially expanded Muscovite territory during his reign, annexing both Great Novgorod (1478) and the principality of Tver’ (1485). In 1472 Ivan took as his second wife Sophia Palaiologina, niece of Emp. Constantine XI. Thereafter he occasionally called himself “tsar” and began to use the emblem of the two-headed eagle on his seals. In 1492 Metr. Zosima referred to Ivan as a “new Constantine” and called Moscow a “new city of Constantine.” In the aftermath of the fall of Constantinople to the Turks, Ivan assumed the role of defender of Orthodox Christianity and declared (in 1470) that the patriarch of Constantinople had no jurisdiction over the church of Moscow. Current scholarship (Obolsensky, Commonwealth 364–67; Meyendorff, Russia
IVAN ALEXANDER, Bulgarian tsar (1331–71). Descended from the Asen dynasty on his mother's side, Ivan Alexander reached the throne as a result of a coup d'état supported by a faction among the boyars. Throughout his reign he strove to prevent formation of an anti-Bulgarian coalition in the Balkans. Allied from 1332 with Stevan Uroš IV Dušan, Ivan inflicted a severe defeat on the Byz. in that year and regained some territory south of the Balkan range. During the Byz. Civil War of 1341–47 he supported John V Palaiologos against John VI Kantakouzenos and as a result added to his dominion a number of towns north of the Rhodope mountains, including Philippopolis. Later his hostility to Byz. led him to ally himself with the Ottoman Turks and with their help to recover several fortresses on the Black Sea coast. In 1365, however, he was defeated by Amadeo VI of Savoy and the Hungarians, both of whom supported papal plans for church union. He maintained good relations with Dubrovnik and Venice. His policy of giving parts of his kingdom as appanages to his sons contributed to the fragmentation of the Second Bulgarian Empire and to its inability to resist Turkish pressure. A notable patron of literature and art, Ivan made Tîrnovo the seat of a flourishing Slavic literary culture, which later influenced the development of Russian culture. Several MSS written and illuminated for him survive. He was married twice, to Theodora, daughter of the Romanian prince Ivano Basarab, and later to Sarah-Theodora, a converted Jew.

IVANKO (Iβαγκιος), nephew of Asen I (Akrop. 1:21.1f) and founder of an independent Bulgarian principality; died after 1200. In 1196 Ivanko assassinated Asen. Niketas Choniates attributes this murder to Ivanko’s involvement in a love affair with the sister of Asen’s wife. He also suggests (Nik.Chon. 471.86) that Ivanko was possibly incited by the sebastokratōr Isaac Komnenos. Ivanko’s attempt to establish his power in Tîrnovo failed: Asen’s brother, Peter of Bulgaria, besieged the city, and, lacking assistance from Byz., Ivanko had to flee to Constantinople. There he was betrothed to the emperor’s granddaughter Theodora and received the name Alexios. Alexios III appointed him governor of Philippopolis. Around 1198 or 1199 Ivanko proclaimed his territory independent, allied himself with Kalocsan, and assisted a Cuman raid into Macedonia. After some unsuccessful expeditions against Ivanko (during which the protosprotar Manuel Kamitzes was taken captive), Alexios III lured him into a trap (1200). Deceived by a false oath, Ivanko entered the imperial camp, where he was immediately seized. His brother Mitos (Mitja?) fled, and Ivanko’s ephemeral principality in Rhodope was annexed by Byz.

IVERN MONASTERY, Iberian (Georgian) establishment on the northeast coast of the peninsula of Mt. Athos, approximately 4 km from Karyes. Until between 1010 and 1020 Iveron (Iβηρον) was called the “monastery of the Iberian” or “of Euthymios”; thereafter it was called the “lavra of the Iberians.” The first Georgians to come to Athos were John the Iberian and his son EUTHYMIOS THE IBERIAN, who entered the Great Lavra of Athanasios in the 960s before moving to nearby kellia. In 979/80 the ascetic/general John Tornikios, after winning a battle over the rebel Bardas Skleros and amassing vast amounts of booty, returned to Athos to found a new lavra for Iberians at the site of the monastery “tou Kie-mentos.” At this time Tornikios received the Kołobu Monastery from Emp. Basil II. Under the first hegoumenoi—John the Iberian (980–1005), Euthymios (1005–1019), and Euthymios’s cousin George (1019–29)—a scriptorium was established for the translation of Greek religious texts into Georgian and the copying of Greek and Georgian MSS. Thereafter Iveron continued to be an important center of Byz.-Georgian cultural interaction and the dissemination of texts in Georgian. In the mid-11th C. the translator and hagiogra-
pher George Mt'ac'mindeli served as hegoumenos. The number of monks at the monastery reportedly grew to 300, and Iveron initially owned more land than Lavra. In addition to extensive properties on Athos, Iveron had possessions in Chalkidike, the Strymon valley, and Thessalonike.

Throughout the Byz. period there was rivalry at Iveron between the community of Greek monks, who were in the majority, and the Georgians; the two groups celebrated the liturgy separately. The Georgians were in authority in the early period, and held their services in the katholikon, even though they were outnumbered. In the 14th C., however, the Greeks gained dominance at Iveron; an act of 1356 (RegPatr, fasc. 5, no.2396), noting that the Greek monks were "more numerous and capable," stated that the hegoumenos was to be Greek and that the Greeks were entitled to hold their services in the principal church. Although it appears no typikon was ever written, chapters 34-70 of the vita of John and Euthymios, which describe the organization of Iveron, resemble a monastic rule.

The archives contain over 150 documents of Byz. date; those published to date (the earliest is of 927) deal primarily with sales and donations of property; they provide valuable information on the topography and prosopography of Macedonia. The will of Kale Pakouriane (of 1090) contains a long list of liturgical vessels and textiles given to the monastery. Iveron's library preserves a major collection of 337 Byz. MSS, in addition to 86 Georgian MSS, including unique hagiographical codices. The most important Byz. books are cod. 463, a lavishly illustrated 12th-C. copy of Barlaam and Ioasaph (Treasures 2:60-91, 306-25), and the 13th-C. Gospel book cod. 5 (ibid. 34-53, 296-303).

The katholikon, which has undergone numerous restorations and modifications, was originally built in 980-83 and is one of the oldest surviving Christian structures on Athos. Dedicated to the Virgin, it is a cross-in-square church, with side chapels added later. Its pavement probably dates to the mid-11th C.


IVERPOULOS, JOHN. See PETRITZOS MONASTERY.

IVORY (élephas), made from elephant tusks, the principal organic material used in the creation of ceremonial and useful objects, icons, and appliqués for furniture and doors. Dependent on commerce with Africa and India, the availability of ivory varied greatly, although the appeal of its exotic origin and lustrous nature never waned. Its reputation in late antiquity as an imperial material is indicated by the barbarian offering of a giant tusk on the Barberini ivory. In fact, from the beginning of the 4th C. until at least the mid-6th, ivory was relatively cheap: in Dioscorides' Price Edict, its cost per pound is one-fortieth of an equivalent weight in silver.

Abundant statuettes, caskets and boxes for medications and other items, and decorative plaques were carved in Egypt and exported, as were the 8 stools and 14 chairs sent by Cyril of Alexandria to the court of Theodosios II. Egypt as a source of worked ivory (as against bone carving), which is attested by both papyri and excavations, had been contested but is now confirmed by finds at Abū Minā (J. Engemann, JbAChr 30 [1987] 172-186). By the 4th C. ivory was also carved in Constantinople. An edict of 337 (Cod. Theod. XIII 4.2) includes ivory workers in a list of artisans who were exempted from civil obligations so that they might improve their craft and teach it to their children—a clause that suggests the means by which techniques were transmitted. The widespread manufacture of ivory diptychs is apparent from an edict of 384 (ibid. XV 9.1) forbidding all but ordinary consuls to issue them. While many consular diptychs can be ascribed with certainty to Constantinople, the place of origin of the cathedra of MAXIMIAN and the so-called five-part diptychs remains disputed, as does that of the scores of surviving pyxides (see pyxis) decorated with pagan or Christian subjects. While the consular diptychs can be precisely dated, other pre-Justinianic ivories cannot.

It is probable that Constantinople's access to ivory was disrupted in the late 6th and 7th C. There is no evidence for ivory carving in the
ensuing “Dark Age,” although such activity has been claimed for Christian workshops in Syria-Palestine. When the ivory trade resumed—possibly no earlier than the reign of Leo VI—East Africa was in Arab hands. Thereafter, ivory was a coveted substance, used in the fabrication of far fewer types of objects than before the 7th C. and generally reserved for sacro-political emblems and ecclesiastical artifacts. The aulic connections of the material are epitomized in a relief in Moscow (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinskulpt. II, no. 35), apparently made in direct response to the beginning of Constantine VII’s sole rule in 945. The dates of other pieces with imperial images and/or inscriptions are disputed, but their function is perhaps indicated by three relatively large triptychs. Few in number compared to the more than 200 smaller icons that survive, they are much more elaborately carved and may have been revered in private chapels of the imperial court and the urban elite. The only ivory staurotheca (ibid., II, no. 77) has a later inscription that says it was used by an emperor Nikephorus (Botaneiates?) to put the barbarians to flight.

Many ivories were sent to the West, where they were applied to the covers of books, the contents of which provide termini ante quem for these plaques. Such exports continued until ample Western access to raw ivory, occurring in and after the 11th C., put an end to this commerce. No Byz. pieces have been shown to belong to the 12th C., a period when emperors and other dignitaries commissioned their portraits in other expensive materials. This absence suggests that supplies of ivory were diverted at their source to the West. Substitutes were then prized: John Tzetzes records his gratitude for a “Russian-carved” inkwell (or inkstand?) made of walrus (or narwhal) tusk that he received from Leo, metropolitan of Dorostolon (J. Shepard, ByzF 6 [1979] 215–21). Only one object with imperial likenesses, a tiny circular box at Dumbarton Oaks that depicts members of the family of John VIII, can be attributed with confidence to Palaiologan craftsmen.

No ivories are listed in preserved wills and very few in monastic inventories and typika. Nothing is known of modes of production. Since the corpus of Goldschmidt and Weitzmann, pieces dated to the 10th and 11th C. have been divided into five groups, supposed to be the products of different ateliers, but there is no basis on which to assume the existence of workshops in this medium other than the fact that craft practices were transmitted to successive generations. That ivory workers also carved bone and steatite is a more plausible hypothesis, given the technical, iconographical, and formal resemblance between products in these three media. A late reference to ivory is made by Anna Komnene (An.Komm. 1: 112.21f) who compares the grace of her mother’s hands to ivory carved by some artificer. For this workman she uses the generic term technites, whereas in late antiquity this craft had been practiced by specialists known as elephantourgoi.


IZBORNIKI (lit. “Selections”) of 1073 and 1076, the two earliest extant dated nonliturgical MSS from Rus’; also known as the Izborniki of Svyatoslav (i.e., Jaroslavič of Kiev, 1073–76) from the eulogy in the 1073 MS and the colophon in the 1076 MS. The 1073 Izbornik (Moscow, Hist. Mus. Sinod. Sobr. 1043) contains a translation of a Greek florilegium close to that of Vat. gr. 423 and Paris, B.N. Coisl. gr. 120. The 1073 MS is one of more than 20 MSS of this translation. The core of the work is a version of the Erotapokrisis ascribed to Anastasios of Sinai. It is flanked by briefer theological, rhetorical, and chronological articles by, for example, Michael Synkellos, Theodore of Raithou, George Choiruboskos, and Patr. Nikephoros I. Its prototype was Bulgarian: the enkomion to Svyatoslav was originally addressed to Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria (but cf. L.P. Žukovskaja, ed., Drevnerusskij literaturnyj jazyk v ego ot-nosenii k staroslavjanskomu [Moscow 1987] 45–62).

The 1076 Izbornik (Leningrad, Publ. Lib., Sobranie Ermitažnoe 20) is the only complete MS of its type and does not reflect an equivalent Byz. florilegium. Rather it contains extracts from previous Slavonic translations, at least in part via previous Slavonic compilations (including passages from the florilegium represented in the 1073 Izbornik). In character it is gnomic and hortatory, with substantial segments of, for example, Ecclesiasticus, the Centuria ascribed to Patr. Gennadios I, the Sententiae ascribed to Hesychios of Jerusalem, John Climax, Agapetos, and Apos...
PHTHEGMATA PATRUM. Some of its sources are unidentified, and its provenance—Kievan or Bulgarian—is disputed.


IZMARAGD (from Gr. σμάραγδος, “emerald”), a compendium of ethical instruction compiled in Rus’, probably in the early 14th C., initially in 88 chapters. The precepts in Izmaragd, aimed mainly at laymen and priests, concern the life of a Christian in society: marriage, work, relations with authority, charity, and the blessings derived from reading. The sources of Izmaragd overlap with those of other Slavonic compilations (the Izborniki of 1073 and 1076, Zlatostrij, Zlatoust) and include translated extracts from pseudo-Chrysostom, the Centuria ascribed to Patr. Gennadios I, the Pandektes of Antiochos and of Nikon of the Black Mountain, Ephrem the Syrian, Anastasios of Sinai, pseudo-Athanasios, Ecclesiasticus, the vita of Niphon of Constantia, and Barlaam and Ioasaph. Izmaragd also contains works ascribed to Kirill of Turov, Feodosij of Pečera, and Serapion of Vladimir. A second version in 165 chapters probably dates from the late 15th C. It draws on a similar range of sources (though only 50 chapters are borrowed directly from the first version), with additional material from Palladios, John Moschos, and the Dialogues of Gregory I the Great.

JABALA, the first attested Ghassānid chief in the service of Byz.; died ca.528. Around 500 he appeared as a warrior in occupation of the island of Iotabe, which had been captured in the reign of Leo I by Amorkesos. After hard-fought battles, Romanos, the energetic doux of Palestine, was able to force Jabala out of Iotabe and restore Byz. rule. In the general settlement with the Arab tribes who attacked the frontier, Anastasios I concluded a peace with the Ghassānids in 502 that made them the dominant federate group in Orions. Jabala remained the principal figure in Byz.-Arab relations for another quarter of a century. The Ghassānids became staunch Monophysites, a fact reflected in the appearance of the Monophysite firebrand Simeon of Beth-Arsham at Jabala’s camp in Jābiya ca.520, invoking the extension of aid to the Christians of Najran and South Arabia. Jabala probably died at the battle of Thanuris (528) while fighting in the Byz. army against the Persians.

LIT. I. Shahid, The Martyrs of Najran (Brussels 1971) 272-76.

JACOB BARADAUS (Βαραδαύς, Syr. Burde’ana, “man in ragged clothes”), Monophysite bishop of Edessa (from 542/3); born Tella, Osroene, ca.500, died Kasion, near the Syro-Egyptian frontier, 30 July 578. He was the organizer of the Monophysite church, called Jacobite after him. In 527/8 the monk Jacob went to Constantinople, where he became a favorite of the empress Theodora and also gained the support of the Arab chieftain Ḥarīth ibn-Jabala (AReTHAS). When Ephraim of Antioch (527-45) launched a severe attack against the Monophysites, Theodora urged Theodosios, Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, to consecrate two bishops in Syria to counterbalance Ephraim’s activities—Theodore in Bostra and Jacob in Edessa (542/3).

According to John of Ephesus (PO 19:154), Jacob’s diocese extended over most of the East, where the Monophysite cause had been severely weakened by Justinian’s persecution. Jacob was tireless in his missionary activity, appointing Monophysite bishops in many cities, including Chios, Ephesus, and Antioch. Although much of his work was in Asia Minor and along the coasts of the Mediterranean, most of the bishops were drawn from Syrian monasteries, giving the Monophysite hierarchy a distinctly Syrian character. Justinian attempted to arrest Jacob, but he was frequently in disguise (hence his sobriquet) and was never caught. Some of Jacob’s letters, written originally in Greek, have survived in Syriac.


JACOBITES, Syrian MONOPHYSITES, followers of JACOB BARADAUS. Although Monophysitism had individual followers from the time of the Council of CHALCEDON, the movement was not given firm institutional form until the missionary activity of Jacob Baradaeus beginning ca.542. The Jacobite church traced its roots to Patr. Theodosios of Alexandria (535-66), who consecrated Jacob. Although many Jacobite churches were established in Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands, the hierarchy of the church was made up largely of Syrian monks who brought with them their language and spiritual ideals. Jacobite missionaries spread their teachings as far as Persia, but their real centers were the villages and monasteries of Syria, and many bishops lived in desert monasteries rather than cities. The Jacobite church survived the Persian and Islamic conquests, although with decreased numbers, into modern times.


JACOB OF SARUG (or Serugh), Syriac poet and theologian; born Curtam, near Sarug on the Euphrates, ca.451, died Batnan 29 Nov. 521. Edu-
icated in the Nestorian school of Edessa, he nevertheless became a follower of Cyril of Alexandria. He served as cherepiskopos in the district of Sarug and in 519 was elected bishop of Batan. Jacob's religious creed was attacked by his contemporaries: Nestorian chroniclers characterized him as a turncoat who accepted the beliefs of the ruling emperor (P. Krüger, OstkSt 13 [1964] 15–32); an anonymous Monophysite accused Jacob of falling at the end of his life into a horrible heresy, that is, the creed of Chalcedon (P. Krüger in Weg-zeichen [Würzburg 1971] 245–52). In his works Jacob did not follow the final formula of Chalcedon but taught that the incarnate Christ was “one nature out of two.”

A prolific author, Jacob left homilies in prose and verse as well as numerous letters; not all of these have survived. He interpreted Scripture in an allegorical or typological manner: Moses had to place a veil over his face after the Theophany on Mt. Sinai because the Israelites were not mature enough to receive the divine truth; it was removed, according to Jacob, after the Incarnation that allowed the world to see the Son of God openly (S. Brock, Sobornost 3 [1981] 70–85). The theme of the Incarnation attracted Jacob: he perceived it symbolically as “three wombs”: Mary’s womb, the womb of the Jordan (baptism), and the womb of Sheol (death, or the baptism on the cross), and discovered the prefigurations of these baptisms in the Old and New Testaments (S. Brock, OrChrAn 205 [1976] 325–47). A man of Christian culture, Jacob strongly opposed any remnants of classical civilization and sharply criticized theatrical performances (W. Cramer, JbAChr 23 [1980] 96–107).


—T.E.G.

JACOB'S LADDER, a ladder ascending to heaven seen by the Hebrew patriarch Jacob during his dream (Gen 28:10–22). John Chrysostom (PG 59:454–55), Theodoret of Cyrhhus (Histoire des moines de Syrie, ed. P. Canivet, A. Leroy-Mol-ingen, vol. 2 [Paris 1979] 216, ch.27.1.4–5), and others interpreted it as a metaphor for the ascent to God. As an image for the Virgin, it figures in the Akathistos Hymn; the biblical account was read at the Great Feasts of the Virgin (Birth, Annunciation, Dormition).

Representation in Art. The ladder was illustrated already by the 4th C., for example, at Dura Europos and the Via Latina catacomb, and appears in 5th- and 6th-C. Genesis MSS and the Octateuchs. It was the explicit model for illustrations to the Heavenly Ladder of John Climacus, and icons based on this text. Jacob is shown ascending the ladder on the Brescia Casket (Volbach, Elfenbeinarbeiten, no.107), depicting the ascent to God rather than the details of the Old Testament account. In Palaiologan painting (e.g., in the CHORA) the ladder appears as a prefiguration of the Virgin (S. Der Nersessian in Underwood, Kariye Djami 4:334–36).


—J.H.L., C.B.T.

JAMES (λακωβος). Three individuals named James were associated with Jesus; as a result there has been confusion over their identities. (1) The apostle James Major (“the Great”), the son of Zebedee, was the elder brother of the apostle John; he preached in Palestine, was beheaded, and was commemorated on 15 Nov. and 30 Apr. (2) The apostle James Minor (“the Less”), son of Alpheus, was martyred by clubbing and was commemorated on 9 Oct. (3) James, the “brother of the Lord” (adelphotheos), was Christ’s half-brother. He became the first bishop of Jerusalem, was martyred when the Jews pulled him from the height of the Temple, and was commemorated on 23 Oct. The last two Jameses are sometimes conflated.

The Epistle of St. James in the New Testament is usually attributed to James adelphotheos; John Chrysostom wrote a commentary on this epistle (PG 64:1039–52). Several other works were ascribed to this James: the Protevangelion of James, a homily on the Dormition (actually a compilation of John I, archbishop of Thessalonike [M. Jugie, Po 19 (1926) 344–438]), and a dialogue with John the Theologian on the departure of the soul (Anecdota graeco-byzantina [Moscow 1893],
ed. A. Vassiliev, 317–22). The ancient liturgy of St. James is also traditionally ascribed to the brother of the Lord. James was praised by various authors, including Andrew of Crete, Hippolytos of Thebes, and Niketas Paphlagon. The center of his cult in Constantinople was the Church of the Virgin Mary in Chalkoprateia.

**Representation in Art.** James the *adelphotheos*, although not an apostle, was conflated with them in artistic representations: James Major and James Minor often wear his episcopal robes, and his white hair sometimes replaces their brown hair. The figure of James Major—known with his brother, John, as “thunder-voiced”—illustrates Psalm 76:19 in several marginal Psalters; here, as in the scene of their calling, both are beardless youths. In the scene of the Transfiguration, James Major is brown-haired; it is as a mature man with brown hair and beard that he is shown preaching at Psalm 19 in the marginal Psalters and at his martyrdom in a MS in Paris (B.N. gr. 102—H. Kessler, *DOP* 27 [1973] pl.1).


—J.I. A.K., A.W.C.

**JAMES OF KOKKINOBAPHOS** (an unidentified monastery), the author, probably of the 12th C., of six homilies on the Virgin. Nothing is known of his life. A. Kirpičnikov (*Letopis* 2 [1892] 255–80) identified him with another James, the author of letters addressed to the *sebastokratirissa* Irene Komnene; this identification remains debatable. The homilies are devoted to the life of the Virgin from her conception to her visitation with Elizabeth. They are preserved in two deluxe MSS, Paris, B.N. gr. 1208 and Vat. gr. 1162, probably from the second quarter of the 12th C., which were profusely illustrated by the major atelier then active in Constantinople. Their numerous initials, both floral and zoomorphic, and their elaborate headpieces are hallmarks of this atelier, which also produced the Codex Ebnerianus.


—R.S.N., A.K.

**JANISSARIES** (γιανισταρι). According to the traditional etymology, a term deriving from the Turkish yeni çeri, “new army,” which was the Ottoman sultan’s personal army or Kapıkulları (lit. “slaves of the Porte”), the troops of the palace. The army of the Janissaries was the result of the devshirme (Turk. “collection, recruiting”), an Ottoman institution, namely the periodical levy of Christian boys living within the sultan’s territories (*dhimmi*) for training to fill the ranks of the Janissaries and later to enter palace service or the administration. The same term is used in the earliest Ottoman sources with the meaning of *pencik*, that is, the collection of the fifth part of the prisoners, an old Islamic institution, called by the Byz. πεμπτον (Kantakouzenos) or πενταμορφία (Chalkokondyles) and by the Latins *pemdensity* (Venegro-Cretan text of 1402). The earliest reference to the *devshirme* as an institution applied to the sultan’s subjects appears in the Life of St. Philotheos of Athos, apparently composed in the second half of the 14th C. (B. Papoula, *SiōdostF* 22 [1963] 259–80), and in a sermon of Isidore Glabas, metropolitan of Thessalonike, delivered in 1395 (S. Vryonis, *Speculum* 31 [1956] 433–43). The Greek term *gianitarioi* also designated the Christian guards of the Byz. emperor ca.1437. In that case it probably constituted the Greek rendering of the Latin or neo-Latin *ginetarii, ganetalioi, janizeri, etc.*


—E.A.Z.

**JARMĪ, AL-**, more fully Muslim ibn Abī Muslim al-Jarmī, Arab official and warrior who wrote books on Byz. based on information obtained as a prisoner of war; fl. 9th C. His biography is only known from al-Maṣʿūdī, who describes him as an eminent man in the Arab-Byz. frontier region. He was captured by the Byz. ca.837 and was released in 845. His writings on Byz. are now lost. They were used by ibn Khurdaḏbeḥ, Qudāma, and al-Maṣʿūdī (and probably ibn al-Faqih, ca.900). According to al-Maṣʿūdī (*Tanbih* 191), al-Jarmī was well informed on Byz. His writings dealt with historical, political, administrative, topographical,
and strategic matters as well as the northern neighbors of Byz. Al-Jarmi’s description of Byz. themes and other aspects of the Byz. army and administration are extremely accurate and detailed, forming the core of practically all such accounts in Arab geographers. Of special importance are his descriptions of routes into Byz. Asia Minor and practical instructions on the suitable times for raids into Byz. territory.


JAROSLAV (Ierosothlápos), prince of Kiev; son of Vladimir I of Kiev; baptismal name George; born 978, died Kiev 20 Feb. 1054. Victorious in his war for the succession, Jaroslav became the ruler of all Rus’ in 1036. In 1037 he began to construct the new city of Kiev on the Constantinopolitan pattern, with its own “Golden Gate” and stone churches. The Cathedral of St. Sophia (see Kiev) contains a fragmentary fresco of the founder Jaroslav and his family. His victory over the Pechenegs turned their main raids toward the Danube and the Byz. provinces. In 1043 he sent a naval expedition of about 400 vessels and up to 20,000 men against Constantinople; defeated in the Bosporus by the Byz. general Theophanes, the fleet returned home with serious losses. Six thousand warriors lost their boats, but reached shore and were taken prisoner; many were blinded. The attack on Constantinople can be seen as either a belated attempt to support George Maniakes or a trade conflict. The peace treaty of 1046 restored the alliance, sealed by the marriage of Constantine IX’s daughter to Jaroslav’s son, Vsevolod.

In 1051, after Jaroslav nominated Iarion as metropolitan of Kiev, the bishops of the Russian eparchy elected and consecrated him, basing their action on the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles. Although they ignored the designate and consecratory rights of the patriarch of Constantinople, Byz. jurisdiction itself was not in question since, no later than 1054, a Greek named Ephraim who bore the title of protopráedros ton protosynkellon was metropolitan of Kiev.


JEREMIAH (Iesemías), one of the four great prophets, also considered to be the author of the Old Testament Book of Lamentations; feastday 1 May or 4 Nov. (Halkin, infra 111). Origen wrote commentaries on both books (Jeremiah and Lamentations), offering an allegorical rather than a “historical” interpretation; thus in some cases (e.g., Werke 3 [1983] 5,8) he discarded the exegesis of Jeremiah as a reference to Christ and insisted on explaining his words as allusions to mankind’s moral infamy. After John Chrysostom and esp. Theodoret of Cyrhus, the image of Jeremiah as prophet of Christ’s advent became entrenched in Byz. The Synaxarion of Constantinople and the imperial Menologion of the 11th C. (Halkin, infra) have Jeremiah announce to the Egyptian priests the fall of their idols and the birth of the Savior in the manger. Byz. legend ascribed to Jeremiah a miraculous power to expel asps (identified as crocodiles). He is described as a short man with a sharp-pointed beard. His memory was celebrated in the Church of Apostle Peter, near Hagia Sophia (Janin, Églises CP 398).

Representation in Art. Images of Jeremiah are found principally among the prophets in monumental art and in the Prophecy Books. The depiction of Jeremiah with long dark hair and beard in Florence Laur. 5,9 (late 10th C.) is one of the most monumental images of Byz. illumination, but his book offered little to the repertoire of narrative iconography, even in contexts such as the Sacra Parallela.


—J.L., J.H.L., A.K.

JERICHO (Ierikhó, Hebr. Yeriho), ancient city in the southern Jordan Valley that flourished during the late Roman period: the Madaba mosaic map represents it with ramparts, gates, and palm trees. By 325 Jericho was a bishopric. After the earthquake of 551 Justinian I ordered the repair of its churches of Elisha and the Virgin; the latter is identified as a large 6th-C. basilica uncovered at Tell Hassan. The remains of successive churches of the 4th–9th C. were discovered at Khirbat en-Niţla, as well as an 8th-C. synagogue. The city became a monastic center, with a hospital and
several hospices; a mosaic floor with a Nestorian inscription was found. Among the city’s attractions for pilgrims was Elisha’s spring.

Jericho was destroyed by Persian and Arab invasions and became a village; John Phokas (ch. 20) describes the area as countryside covered with gardens and vineyards, but Constantine Manasses (ed. K. Horn, BZ 13 [1904] 333–280–87) saw only a stifling sandy valley. The Crusaders built a castle and Church of the Trinity at Jericho.


—G.V., Z.U.M.

Jerusalem, more fully Eusebius Hieronymus, biblical exegete and translator, saint; born Stridon in Dalmatia 331 (Kelly) or ca. 348, died Bethlehem 30 Sept. 420. Jerome was early exposed to both classical and Christian culture at Rome, being baptized and studying under the scholar Donatus. Years of travel and asceticism in the West and East followed. He learned Hebrew as a hermit in the Syrian desert. Jerome was ordained at Antioch, where he studied Greek and heard Apollinaris lecture. A visit to Constantinople in 381 acquainted him with Gregory of Nazianzos. Back in Rome he became secretary to Pope Damasus (366–384), also functioning as spiritual and worldly adviser to wealthy Roman ladies, such as Melania the Younger. After the death of Damasus, renewed travels ended at Bethlehem where he ruled a newly founded monastery and devoted himself to scholarship.

Jerome’s translation of the Bible into Latin (Vulgate) is preeminent among his writings. Voluminous biblical commentaries are enriched by the secular learning brought to bear on sacred texts. Equally important for his contemporaries were his De viris illustribus (On Famous Men) of 392, a catalog of 135 Christian authors, both Greek and Latin, from St. Peter to himself, and his Latin paraphrase and expansion of the Chronicle of Eusebius of Caesarea, a world history from the birth of Abraham to 325, with much emphasis on chronology and synchronization of events. His many letters mirror the social and intellectual life of the times. He also wrote vituperative attacks on heresies and heretics, the fruit of his passionate involvement against Arianism, Origenism, and Pelagianism. Jerome’s famous dream, in which God invited him to choose between Cicero and Christianity, crystallizes the dilemma of how to reconcile the old Roman culture with the new Christian religion.


—B.B.
city, of which the empire's Christians were scarcely aware.

This changed dramatically in 326 when, according to tradition, HELENA reached Jerusalem. The year before, Bp. Makarios of Jerusalem had secured permission from Constantine I at the Council of NICAEA to destroy the Capitoline temple. While removing the foundations, in Helena's presence, workmen uncovered an empty tomb which was identified as that of Christ. A rock nearby was taken to be Golgotha. This discovery created a sensation among Christians and quickly stimulated PILGRIMAGE from as far away as the western provinces. Constantine ordered a basilica (which became the city's episcopal see) constructed just to the east of the tomb. Retaining its Roman plan, Aelia now became a Christian city and, in common parlance, was once again called Jerusalem or “the Holy City.” An outpouring of public and private wealth gave the city's topography a Christian appearance. Besides the complex surrounding the Holy SEPULCHRE, Constantine built the Eleona church on the MOUNT OF OLIVES and a great basilica in BETHLEHEM. By the end of the 4th C. the Roman noblewoman Poimenia had financed the Ascension Church (Imbomon) near the Eleona, and unknown benefactors the Church of the Apostles on Mt. Sion and a church in Gethsemane. Bishops such as Cyril of Jerusalem became the most powerful men in the city. Constantine enforced Hadrian's edict excluding Jews from Jerusalem but permitted them entrance to mourn the destruction of the Temple—in Christian eyes salutary proof of Christianity's triumph. With similar symbolism but opposite intentions, Julian the Apostle lifted the Hadrianic ban and resolved to rebuild the Jewish Temple. Work began in 362/3 but was soon suspended. Christian pilgrims to the Temple Mount were shown the bloodstains of Zacharias there (Prot-evangelion of James 23.2–3) as well as the standing Herodian retaining walls (of considerable height) and the various underground chambers said to belong to Solomon's palace. By the end of the 4th C., virtually the entire pagan population had embraced the victorious faith. By 381–84, when EGERIA visited Jerusalem, asceticism had struck root, and monks and consecrated virgins, many from abroad, formed an important part of the populace. Mainly Western ascetic communities existed on the Mount of Olives by 375, and a decade later ST. JEROME and his protegé Paula founded rival monasteries in Bethlehem. Immigrant ascetics like MELANIA THE YOUNGER helped the city's economy with generous endowments to churches, monasteries, and XENOCHAEA.

Like PALESTINE as a whole, Jerusalem profited from traffic in RELICS. Rich in ordinary “blessings” (see EULOGIA), Jerusalem also possessed the wood of the TRUE CROSS; bits of it, acquired for a price, or stolen, or given as presents, soon made their way across Christendom. Similarly, Bp. JOHN II of Jerusalem took control of the relics of St. Stephen the Protomartyr, which came to light in 415. In 420 or 421 John's successor dispatched Stephen's right arm to Constantinople, in return for which Theodosios II sent money to Jerusalem and dedicated a gem-encrusted cross on Golgotha.

Melania influenced ATHENAIOS-EUDOKIA, consort of Theodosios, who first came to Jerusalem on pilgrimage in 438/9 and then, exiled from the court, settled permanently (ca.443–60). Eudokia endowed monasteries, founded hostels for pilgrims and the poor, and built churches to the Virgin at Siloam—on the south flank of Jerusalem's eastern spur—and perhaps at the Sheep Pool, the latter commemorating Mary's birth. Eudokia's Basilica of St. Stephen, north of the city, remained the largest church for a century. Above all, the exiled empress built a new fortification wall whose defensive perimeter finally incorporated Mt. Sion and the southern suburbs as far as Siloam. In the mid-5th C., Jerusalem reached a pinnacle of population and wealth unequaled since the Herodian period. Despite this, CAESAREA MARITTIMA held primacy among the sees of Palestine until 451, when Bp. JUHENAL of Jerusalem secured the patriarchate (see JERUSALEM, PATRIARCHATE OF).

After Constantine and Eudokia, Justinian I ranks as Jerusalem's third imperial benefactor. He built the Nea Ekklesia of Mary Theotokos, the city's largest church, and extended the main colonnaded street south to its west façade. This completed the urban plan of Jerusalem as depicted on the MADABA MOSAIC MAP.

In 614 the Persians besieged and captured Jerusalem with heavy destruction and loss of life, gave the city over to the Jews, and carried off the True Cross (Expugnationis Hierosolymae AD 614 re-
censiones arabicae, ed. G. Garitte, 2 vols. [Louvain 1974]). Herakleios forced the Persians to withdraw; the return of the city’s talisman is variously dated to 629, 630, and 631 (V. Grumel suggests 21 March 631 [ByzF 1 (1966) 139–49]); within the decade, however, Jerusalem fell to the Arabs. About March 638, after a long siege, Patri. Sophronios surrendered Jerusalem to the Caliph ‘Umar, who refrained from praying at the Lord’s Tomb and thus preserved the site for Christianity. The Muslims, who likewise called Jerusalem “the Holy City” (al-Quds), built their shrines, the Dome of the Rock and the al-Aqsa Mosque, on the Temple Mount. Christian pilgrimage continued on a smaller scale. In 1009 the mad Fatimid caliph al-Hakim leveled the Holy Sepulchre, but Constantine IX soon restored it (R. Ousterhout, JSAH 48 [1989] 66–78).

The Crusaders entered Jerusalem in 1099 and established the Kingdom of Jerusalem (see JERUSALEM, KINGDOM OF). Europeans ruled the city from 1099 to 1187 and from 1229 to 1243, gave the Church of the Holy Sepulchre its present form and built the Gothic Church of St. Anne. They turned the Dome of the Rock temporarily into a church, the Templum Domini, and the knightly Order of Templars established itself in al-Aqsa. Despite subsequent rebuilding, the Old City today retains the urban plan of the Roman and Byz. periods.

In art, biblical exegesis, and theology a celestial Jerusalem paralleled and sometimes reflected the terrestrial city. Conforming to biblical prophecies about Jerusalem, this conception became an archetype of the human soul, of the Christian church, and of individual church buildings. It provided an image of paradise, as in Revelations 21–22 and the 10th-C. vision of the Monk Kosmas (Synax.CP 111–14), where the heavenly city with golden streets and a palace could equally be Constantinople, sometimes called by the Byz. the New Jerusalem.

Pilgrimage Sites. In addition to the Holy Sepulchre, six sites in Jerusalem were of special interest to pilgrims.

1. The House of Caiafas, where part of Jesus’ trial took place and Peter denied him (Mt 26:57–75), was east of Mt. Sion. Peter’s repentance (Mt 26:75) was remembered there in the early stationary liturgy of Holy Thursday. By the 6th C. at the latest, a church of St. Peter replaced “ruins” of at least the house and continued to be a focus of interest through the Latin Kingdom.

2. The Garden of Gethsemane, just east of the city, was the site where Jesus prayed (Mk 14:32–42) and was betrayed by Judas (Mk 14:43–50). Early pilgrims used Gethsemane as a place of prayer. By the late 4th C. a church was built there; probably the earthquake of 746 destroyed it. Sources refer to a rock or a cave of the betrayal. The Breviarium, Patri. Eutychius of Constantinople, and the Piacenza Pilgrim held that Jesus had a supper at Gethsemane; Eutychius distinguishes this “first supper” from the “second” meal at Bethany (Jn 12:2) and the “third,” that is, the Last Supper (see LORD’S SUPPER). A certain Theodosius set the WASHING OF THE FEET at Gethsemane, which was also identified with the tomb of the Virgin’s DORMITION.

3. The Praetorium, or residence of Pontius Pilate (Mk 15:16), was in fact in the area of the Tower of David, but the place pointed out to Byz. pilgrims was in the Tyropoean Valley. A church existed there from the mid-5th C., decorated perhaps with murals depicting the narrative of Mark 15:16–20. From the 6th C., pilgrims were shown the stone (with footprints) upon which Christ stood during his trial, Pilate’s seat, and a portrait of Christ.

4. The Sheep Pool (pool of Bethesda, John 5:2) was located near the east gate of the city. Excavations have shown that the site was originally a pagan healing shrine; porticoes enclosed its two pools during the Roman period. By the mid-5th C. a “Church of the Sheep Pool” was on the spot, with a courtyard overhanging the pools. It was the locus sanctus not only of the healing of the paralytic (and preserved his couch), but also of the birth of the Virgin.

5. Siloam was a pool on the south side of the city where Jesus sent the blind man to wash and be healed (John 9:7). A traditional healing shrine, it was enclosed by a square colonnade in Roman times, and, in the 5th C., marked by a church that attracted the sick (PIACENZA PILGRIM, Travels 24) seeking the EULOGIA of the waters. Remains of both stages have been found by excavation.

6. The Tower of David, on the site of the present Citadel, is portrayed on the Madaba mosaic map as two towers to the right of the west entrance to the city. The name was applied generally to the originally three-towered fortress built there
by Herod the Great, where Byz. pilgrims believed David had composed or recited the Psalms.


—R.G.H., G.V.

JERUSALEM, ASSIZES OF, designation given to a group of treatises, chiefly of the 13th C., which record the procedures, customs, and laws of the kingdom of JERUSALEM; some of the royal laws (“assizes”) incorporated data from the 12th C. The principal group of treatises, composed in Old French by Jean d’Ibelin and others, relates to the usages of the High Court of the kingdom, which judged cases involving the king and his barons. These represent Western feudal law, interpreted by the baronial jurists as to weaken royal power. A second, smaller group of treatises records the practices of the Court of Burgesses, esp. that at ACRE, which tried cases involving nonnobles, chiefly merchants. Of these latter treatises, the Livre des Assises des Bourgeois was strongly influenced by a Provençal compilation ultimately deriving from the Codex Theodosianus. Because these codifications continued in use on Cyprus, parts of them were translated into Greek for the benefit of the formerly Byz. inhabitants. Jean d’Ibelin’s treatise influenced the Assizes of ROMANIA.


—C.M.B.

JERUSALEM, KINGDOM OF, Crusader state that existed from 1100 to 1187. Following the Crusaders’ capture of Jerusalem in 1099, the kingdom was established with the coronation of Baldwin I, 25 Dec. 1100. Its kings claimed suzerainty over other Crusader leaders, the princes of ANTOCH and the counts of EDessa and TRIPOLI. While Byz. claimed sovereignty over some Crusader states in Syria-Palestine, only in the reign of Manuel I was an effort made to assert supremacy over the kingdom. In order to secure assistance against Nur al-Din and Saladin, Baldwin III and Amalric I sought an alliance with Manuel. The latter’s patronage at Bethlehem is commemorated by the mosaicist EPHRAIM in a Greek inscription (1169). But Byz. exercised no real sovereignty over the kingdom. Initially, the Greek Christians of Palestine accepted Crusader rule. By 1187, however, those in Jerusalem were sufficiently alienated to be willing to help Saladin take the city (2 Oct. 1187). After the Third Crusade, the kingdom was reestablished at ACRE.


—C.M.B., A.C.

JERUSALEM, PATRIARCHATE OF. The see’s prestige, as the original mother church of Chrystendom, was first formally recognized at NICAEA I (canon 7). The extensive building program and support of the emperors, beginning with CONSTANTINE I, were crucial in its eventual rise to patriarchal status. Despite Nicaea’s acknowledgment, however, its incumbents remained subject to the metropolitan see of CAESAREA MARITIMA (under the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of ANTIOLH), which had precedence as the capital of the administrative province of Palestina Prima. Finally, at the Council of CHALCEDON, Jerusalem was ranked fifth as an independent patriarchate with power of jurisdiction over the three provinces of Palestine: Caesarea, Skythopolis, and Petra (cf. S. Vailhé, ROC 4 [1899] 44–57), comprising 59 bishoprics. The skillful diplomacy of Patri. Juvenal was largely responsible for this change. Still, the new patriarchate never became a force in church politics or achieved the prominence of the other major sees. Its decline began with the Persian attack on the city (614) and its conquest by the Arabs (638), when most of the bishoprics disappeared. Vacancies, as in the other patriarchates under Muslim rule, were frequent, although in 1027 an agreement with the caliph allowed the installation of imperial candidates. Jerusalem kept direct relations with Rome, and, during and after the events of 1054, was not automatically anti-Latin. Nonetheless, with the arrival of the Crusades and the establishment of a rival LATIN PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM, relations with the Latins gradually deteriorated. Many of the patriarchs during this period lived as exiles in Constantinople.

LIT. Papadopoulos, Hierosolym. G. Fedalto, “Liste vescolii del patriarchato di Gerusalemme I. Gerusalemme e Pa-
The chapter on the guild of the argyropratai in the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch refers frequently to chrysochooi; the relationship between the two terms is unclear. Chrysochooi were specifically prohibited from working in their own houses and had to set up their workshops on the Mese. They were also forbidden to purchase more than one pound of uncoined gold (bullion) at a time. Sjuzjumov (Bk. of Eparch 136) considered the chrysochooi jewelers and the argyropratai inspectors who controlled the sale of precious metals, jewelry, gems, and so forth, while Stöckle thought that the argyropratai were both jewelers and inspectors.


JEWELRY (κόσμος, lit. “ornament”). Byz. jewelry continued Greco-Roman traditions but was also influenced by Eastern decorative and nonfigural types, with an admixture of local elements wherever in the empire it was produced. The forms of objects made by jewelers in Rome, Constantinople, Athens, Antioch, or Alexandria thus varied considerably. Byz. jewelry may generally be distinguished by its extensive use of color, usually achieved with gems or enamels. In his preface to the best-known medieval handbook on artistic technique, the Western monk Theophilus (ca.1110–40) specifically associates color with the Greeks. This 12th-C. notice is late witness to a tradition reverting to the 3rd or 4th C., when niello, seems first to have been applied to gold and silver. But the association of gems and ornament with Byz. in the Western mind persisted at least down to the time when German envoys to Constantinople in 1196 pointed out that they were not “worshipers of ornaments and garments secured by brooches suited only for women” (Nik.Chon. 477.82–83).

Our knowledge of Byz. jewelry comes from examples found in treasures, accounts of items that have not survived, and illustrations in mosaics, painting, textiles, metalwork, and MS illumination. The procession of female saints in the mosaics of S. Apollinare Nuovo, Ravena, shows matching sets of hair ornament, earrings, necklace, bracelet, rings, and belt fittings. Gold plaques and gems were sewn on clothing, and antique coins were incorporated into other items.
of personal adornment. The importance of precious stones is indicated by their frequent imitation in the borders of miniatures in MSS and on mosaic pavements and wall panels as much as by the jeweled walls in depictions of the heavenly cities of Bethlehem and Jerusalem, and gem-encrusted thrones, crosses, liturgical vessels, and book covers.

Byz. jewelry is further characterized by the extensive use of Christian iconography and sacred objects, worn thus for protection as well as ornament. These pieces could incorporate an inscription or symbol, an image, a cross or Christogram, or be carried in an enkolpion, an invention of the Byz. Jewelry was not only an outward symbol of faith or wealth but also served as a badge of office. Special fibulae, rings, and belt buckles, awarded by the emperor and often inscribed, indicated status within the civil service or the army. Belisarios rewarded his soldiers with arm-bands and torques (Prokopios, Wars 7.1.8). Jewelry was also made to adorn and protect animals. Floor mosaics show race horses wearing jeweled trappings and hunting dogs with gem-studded collars. Apotropaic devices (e.g., ivy leaf, swastika, sunburst, crescent) as well as Christian symbols decorate charms and amulets worn by animals.

A great variety of techniques was used in the manufacture of jewelry. Gemstones were mainly polished. They might then be drilled and/or carved as a cameo or engraved as a seal. Metal might be cast or worked in repousse, then have added niello, enamel, or engraving, or be cut into opus intarsiale. It could also be made into a simple wire, which was worked as filigree or drawn through successively smaller holes in a wooden or metal board. This wire was used in fine gold work and incorporated into textiles.

While members of the imperial court adorned themselves with crowns, necklaces, great ropes of pearls, and large gems, ordinary people also had access to the work of jewelers. Their products, known from archaeological excavation, were usually made of gilded bronze imitating gold or had colored glass paste simulating gems in rings and earrings. Bracelets in this category tend to be fairly plain; there are surprisingly few traces of necklaces, with the exception of fragments of chain and ornaments, such as amulets or crosses, that may have been suspended on the chain. Glass bracelets—a form of jewelry probably invented for the mass market in Roman times or intended as a substitute for ivory or precious metal—are found in large numbers, sometimes in contexts that suggest local manufacture.

Because of the mixture of styles in many pieces, dating is often hard to establish. Gems were often set into a new ring or even recarved. Antique coins included in jewelry provide only a terminus post quem for dating. An inscription on an item often helps, as may controlled excavation. Representations of jewelry in datable works of art can also provide a base for comparison.

In very broad, general terms, the evolution of Byz. jewelry was from simple to complex, from light to heavy, from small to large, but these criteria must be applied with care. Earrings started out in the 4th C. as simple hoops and, by the 10th–12th C., were open filigree work with multiple projections in a three-dimensional form. They were complex but light. Bracelets changed from narrow, solid, or cutwork bands to wide, hinged bands, sometimes worked in repoussé. Necklaces developed from simple chains or strands of beads, made of polished and drilled stones and pearls, to more complex forms with multiple hanging elements. Early gold and silver gem-mounts were made in an openwork technique; by the 11th–12th C. they were solid and rather heavy in appearance. In all cases, however, the combination of influences listed above must be studied along with techniques used in cutting stones by wheel or burin, types of enamel, working of metal (e.g., cast, opus intarsiale, granulation), and methods of working links in a chain. The study of this technology is still at a very early stage. When sufficient context is lacking, as is often the case with “mass-produced” work—the so-called costume jewelry of gilded bronze and glass—one can only try to fit such pieces as far as possible into this general typology.


JEWISH ART AND ARCHITECTURE. The influence of Jewish art and architecture on the history of Byz. art is a much debated problem. The fact that, in spite of Exodus 20:4, Jews had
developed artistic practices by the 1st C. B.C. allows the possibility that Jewish models helped shape Christian art, which first arose only in the late 2nd/early 3rd C. Key to the whole discussion has been the synagogue at Dura Europos (before A.D. 256), the only Jewish monument with an elaborate program of narrative and symbolic art. According to Weitzmann (K. Weitzmann, H.L. Kessler, The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art [Washington, D.C., 1990]), the paintings at Dura were derived from an illustrated Septuagint, from which, in turn, came motifs and compositions in Christian art that strikingly resemble the Dura paintings. Since direct evidence of illustrated Jewish MSS in late antiquity is lacking, however, other scholars have inferred other means of transmission (oral or literary tradition, the tradition of monumental art itself, or of certain minor arts [finger rings], etc.) or have argued against the possibility of any influence at all. H. Brandenburg (q IntCongChrArch, vol. 1 [1978] 331–60), for instance, has described the Christian and Jewish arts of Late Antiquity as arising out of the *koinē* of the late Roman world, this common source accounting for their similarities. After the 6th C. evidence of Jewish artistic practices in Byz. virtually disappears.

—W.T.

**JEWISH LEGENDS, ILLUSTRATION OF.** Ever since the discovery in the 1930s of the synagogue at Dura Europos with its extensive decorative program of anthropomorphic religious scenes, art historians have enthusiastically debated the possible existence of biblical and nonbiblical illustration among hellenized Jews of late antiquity and its potential role in the formation of Early Christian Old Testament iconography. The accepted approach has been to isolate nonbiblical iconographic elements among Christian Old Testament picture cycles and to match them with their appropriate textual tradition within the vast body of Jewish legends. Thus, the hitherto unexplained “court official” going through a gate in the miniature of Joseph's promotion by Pharaoh in the Vienna Genesis (ed. Gerstinger, pl.32) is identified on the basis of Jewish legendary texts as Potiphar hurrying home to tell his wife of Joseph’s exaltation (O. Pächt in Festschrift Karl M. Swoboda [Vienna 1959] 219). Usually left unresolved, however, is whether the sources were visual or textual—that is, by way of lost Jewish art or by way of Jewish textual traditions adopted by and popularized among Christians. The Potiphar legend cited above, for example, is attested in several Christian authors whose works were popular at the time and in the region (Syria-Palestine, 6th C.) where the Vienna Genesis may have been produced (H. Näf, Syrische Josef-Gedichte [Zurich 1923] 73–75).

—G.V.

**JEWISH LITERATURE** used by Byz. Jews and Christians included the Hebrew Bible, Hellenistic apocrypha—in Judeo-Greek translation—Jubilees (Little Genesis), and Old Testament and some New Testament pseudepigrapha. Along with the Greek works of Josephus and Philo, these influenced subsequent Byz. language, style, and culture. After A.D.70, Jews wrote down and further developed their oral tradition, which was encyclopedic for internal Jewish intellectual and social concerns. This Hebrew and Aramaic literature included Mishnah (2nd-C. code) and Talmud (3rd–5th-C. commentary); responsa; midrash (ethical and historical folklore, e.g., “Throne and Hippodrome of King Solomon”); apocalypse (e.g., 10th-C. Hazon Daniel, which comments on emperors from Michael III to Constantine VII); mystical works (e.g., Eben Saphir, a 14th-C. kabbalistic and Aristotelian commentary on the Bible that includes contemporary historical data); numerous commentaries on the Bible; and oral tradition by Rabbanite and Karaite Jews. This extensive literature contains valuable linguistic and historical material for Byz. studies, esp. the demotic translations of biblical books, bilingual dictionary aids, and extant marriage contracts. Of particular interest are Megillat Ahimaa, an 11th-C. family chronicle from southern Italy in rhymed prose; Sepher Yosippon, a unique 10th-C. history of ancient Israel based on the Vulgate and Hegesippus, which Judah ibn Moskoni of Ohrid reedited and expanded (ca.1356); a Hebrew translation of pseudo-Kallisthenes' Alexander Romance; and
abbreviated Hebrew translations of nonextant Byz. chronicles that preserve unique historical data. A prolific religious and secular poetic tradition followed Jewish patterns and contemporary styles. Secular studies include monographs on medicine, astronomy, mathematics, and philosophy, esp. by Shabbetai Donollo (913–ca.982) and Shemaryah Ikrītī (1275–ca.1355), who castigated Byz. philosophers for failing to understand Creation. A number of valuable historical sources are extant, such as Benjamin of Tudela and Jacob ben Elia’s unique account of 13th-C. persecutions in Epipos and Nicaea.


**Jews** (Ἰουδαῖος, Ἰβραῖος), also called Israelites, term used for the ancient inhabitants of Judah and Israel as well as for Byz. citizens who practiced Judaism. Byz. Jewish history has two aspects: the history of the Jews in Israel, where their autonomy was recognized, and that of the Jews of the Greek-speaking diaspora, where they formed an integral part of the Byz. population.

**The Jewish Community of Israel.** This community was organized under a bureaucracy of scholars headed by a nasi, called in Greek “patriarch of the Jews.” After the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D.70), Jews established new administrative centers in the Galilee (Usha, Sephoris, Tiberias), where they flourished until the 7th C. Christian-Roman legislation periodically restricted their right to hold slaves, proselytize, build new synagogues, work for the government, teach in public institutions, or serve in the army. These discriminatory laws, summarized in the codes of the 5th–6th C. and epitomized in the Ecloga and Basilica, were designed to limit the Jews’ enfranchisement, separate them from Christians, and support the view that God rejected the Jews. Rabbinic leadership also erected social barriers to preserve the Jewish community. Christian imperial policy in Palestine paralleled these restrictions and emphasized the church’s claim as the New Israel: churches and monasteries were built on biblical holy sites, and Hadrian’s ban on Jewish settlement in Jerusalem or its environs was periodically enforced. During the Muslim conquest, Sophronios still argued that Jews had no right to settle in Jerusalem; they were allowed, however, to mourn one day a year (9th of Ab) at the ruins of the Temple (the Byz. city dump) as a demonstration of God’s rejection of Old Israel.

The ability of the Jews to survive the Christian onslaught in their own land slowly deteriorated despite sporadic revolts (most important of which was in 351) and an attempt to rebuild the Temple with Julian’s permission. In 429 the office of nasi was recognized as vacant by Theodosios II; as a result the autonomous central Jewish leadership in the empire was effectively abolished. Justinian I clashed with the Jews on many fronts. His Code repeated a number of Jewish liabilities and introduced new restrictions. He also interfered with Jewish religious practices (Nov.146; Prokopios, Buildings 6:11:22). Jews fought alongside the Vandals and the Ostrogoths against Byz. attempts to reconquer the Western Empire; they participated also in the Nica revolt in Constantinople and the rioting of 580. Justinian ended their autonomous rule of Jotaba (ca.535), which had lost its independence under Anastasios I (498). They rebelled in 556, again in 578 (together with Samaritans), and assisted the Persian conquest of Palestine in 614–17. Herakleios slaughtered many in revenge after his reconquest and even forcibly baptized Jews, despite his promise to Benjamin of Tiberias not to harm them.

**The Jewish Diaspora.** The Jews flourished in both commercial and administrative centers and in smaller locales. Their quarter, called Hebraike, was usually located near the market and running water. Many of these communities dated from the Hellenistic period, for example, Berroia in Macedonia, Patras, Thessalonike, Crete; many are known from southern Italy: Bari, Oria, Siponto, Venosa, Otranto. Jews also lived in Ioannina, Ohrid, Kastoria, Adrianople, Serres, Mistra, Nicaea, Attaleia, Ephesus, and Philadelphia. Benjamin of Tudela visited some 25 Byz. Jewish communities and describes Patras, Krissa, Thebes (2,000 inhabitants), Corinth, Chalkis, Armiyo, Drama, Kallipolis, Constantinople (2,500 inhabitants), and the islands of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, and Rhodes. Modern scholars extrapolate Benjamin’s unique population data (approximately
9,000) to a Byz. Jewish population ranging from 12,000 to 100,000 based on differing interpretations of his numbers (individuals, heads of families, families, or guild members) and adding locales not mentioned. In Constantinople Jews lived at various times along either shore of the Golden Horn (e.g., Hebraike shala and Pera) and in the Chalkoprateia and Vlanka quarters. Under the Palaiologoi, some Byz. Jews obtained Venetian and Genoese privileges and lived in their quarters. Jews worked as dyers and weavers (silk and wool), tanners, furriers, smiths and glassmakers, wholesale and retail merchants both international and local, real estate agents, physicians, translators, scribes, and agriculturalists.

The Jewish communities, led by rabbis appointed with government consent, enjoyed autonomy in religious and social affairs. The rabbi was chief judge and spokesman for the community and in larger cities was assisted by various functionaries (e.g., teachers, ritual slaughterers) supported by a communal tax system. The community supplied social services: education, care of the sick, dowries for orphans, burial in a Jewish graveyard, etc. Part of the communal taxes went to the government, although whether there was a special Jewish tax is undetermined despite much scholarly speculation. Financial support to the nasi was diverted after 429 to the imperial treasury and called aurum coronarium. When and if this tax was abolished is uncertain. Jews contributed to the archiphereikitai of the Sanhedrin in Israel, which flourished until the Muslim conquest, and to the 10th- and 11th-C. academies.

Jews regularly immigrated into the empire from Muslim and western Christian lands. These immigrants rapidly became culturally assimilated and strongly identified with Byz. culture, although there was occasional social tension with native Jews. There was close contact with Khazaria, whose Jewish kings welcomed refugees from Romanos I's persecution of Jews, and later with Crimean Karaites. The attitude of Jews toward Byz. was ambivalent. Predating Christianity in many Greek-speaking areas, they now lived among a triumphant, arrogant, and multiethnic Christian population whose literature, religion, liturgy, and art derived in part from Jewish sources. They experienced anti-Semitism through imperial policy, intellectual snobbery, and ecclesiastical polemic. Byz. religious art, save for canonical Old Testament figures and scenes, confined representations of Jews to such pejorative contexts as among the Damned in the Last Judgment. There were Jewish scholars with whom Christians (e.g., Platon) studied privately and who occasionally responded through biblical commentary and liturgical verse; they were forbidden, however, to insult Christianity. Their doctors, skilled in Greek and Arabic medicine, treated the general population: an Egyptian Jew was physician to Manuel I. Yet Byz. ecclesiastics consistently denigrated Jewish doctors: even though 9th- and 10th-C. hagiography shows some respect for Jewish doctors, it expresses suspicion of their education and disdains for their religion.

Occasional debates with Christians are recorded; some may have led to conversion, which the church heartily encouraged. Still, few voluntary conversions are attested, the most famous being CONSTANTINE THE JEW; Makarios, spiritual adviser to Manuel II; and possibly ROMANOS THE MELODE. The Byz. church consistently opposed forced baptism of Jews (such as those effected by Herakleios, Leo III, Basil I, Romanos I Lekapenos) for theological reasons and upheld the right of Jews to practice their ancestral religion. Jews replied to imperial persecution by identifying with Esau/Edom, the biblical adversary of Israel. In nearly every century, but esp. during periods of international tension, there were messianic hopes for and occasional movements toward the repatriation of Jews to an independent Israel. The fall of Constantinople in 1453 was marked both by such messianic expectations and by a moving Hebrew lament for the city.


JOB ('Iàwà). To judge by the number of surviving MSS, the Book of Job, an account of the suffering of an innocent man, was read significantly more in Byz. than in the West. Origen led the church fathers in distinguishing three types of just man, represented by Noah, Daniel, and Job. A CATENA on Job was compiled, probably in the 6th-C. circle of Prokopios of Gaza. The COMMENDATIO ANIMAE
includes Job, and references to him in hagiography were frequent. For instance, the Life of St. JOHN ELEEMON (ch. 28) compared the saint to Job in his virtuous response to catastrophic loss. The monk Niketas patterned the opening of his Life of St. PHILARETOS THE MERCIFUL on the Book of Job (L. Rydén, 17 CEB, Major Papers [Washington, D.C., 1986] 542f).

**Representation in Art.** The scene of Job on his dung heap (Job 2:8) was widely illustrated, occurring already in the 4th C. (e.g., sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, died 359) and as the frontispiece to Job in the 7th-C. Syriac Bible of Paris (B.N. syr. 341) and the 10th-C. Bible of LEO SAKELLARIOS. It occasionally appears later in monumental art (e.g., Hagia Sophia, Trebizond). After the Psalter, Job was the most frequently illustrated Old Testament book in Byz. A large group of catena MSS were illustrated with an extensive cycle. These fall into an early group (Patmos 171; Vat. gr. 749; Venice, Marc. gr. 538, dated 905; Sinai gr. 3) and a more numerous group of 12th- through 14th-C. MSS. All contain a dense narrative illustration interspersed with the text of Job 1 and 2—the subject of lengthy comments in the catena—and a repetitive, formulaic treatment of Job’s discussions with his visitors. The miniatures in the first group, esp. Sinai gr. 3, treat the setting illusionistically, which suggests an early model; the Patmos Job may be a product of the years of Iconoclasm.

Job is usually represented as a patriarchal figure with long white hair and beard, cut short in due course (Job 1:20). His youthful appearance in the Leo Bible may be explained as a misunderstanding of this shaven-headed type. Job may also appear as an ancestor of Christ, even as a king, owing to the SEPTUAGINT conflation of Job with JObab, King of Edom (Job 42:17d, Gen 30:32–33).

**JOEL** ('Iωλ), compiler of a world chronicle beginning with Creation and ending in 1204; fl. first half of the 13th C. The work is basically a list of rulers (Jewish, Oriental, Roman, and Byz.), their length of reign, and the cause of their death. The period from the reign of Alexios I Komnenos to 1204 is treated most briefly; the rapid changes in ruler from Manuel I’s death to 1204 demonstrate the inevitability of the blow of divine justice in the form of the Latin conquest. Joel is perhaps also the author of an unpublished THRENOSES on the Latin conquest of Constantinople.

**JOHN** ('Iων), Semitic personal name (etym. “God’s grace”). The name appears in the Old Testament in the form Ioana (1 Chr 3:15, 26:3, etc.); in the New Testament, Johns play an important role, esp. JOHN THE BAPTIST and JOHN the apostle. From the end of the 4th C. onward we meet the name in Rome and Asia Minor (O. Seeck, RE 9 [1916] 1743–47; PLRE 1:459), at first infrequently—Ammianus Marcellinus does not mention a single John. Then the name acquired popularity. Sozomenos cites 11 Johns, including the Baptist and the Apostle—second only to EuSEBIOS (14); in Prokopios there are already 32 Johns, followed far behind by THEODORE (11) and PAUL (10). The name maintains its dominance in Theophanes the Confessor (67), but in Skylitzes.
(48) and Anna Komnene (14) John is second to Constantine, with 60 and 15, respectively. In the acts of Athos, however, it remains dominant: *Lavra*, vol. 1, encompassing the 10th–12th C., lists 90 Johns ahead of Nicholas (42) and George (41), while *Lavra*, vols. 2–3 (13th–15th C.) includes 350 Johns and 275 Georges. John was the third most common imperial name and the most frequently used by patriarchs of Constantinople (14 individuals). In panegyrics the typical epitaph of John was *charitonymos*, "named after grace"; another, "the son of thunder" (after Mk 3:18) was applied specifically to the apostle. By the 12th C., if not earlier, the composite Kaloioannes ("good John") was created.

A.K., A.M.T.

**JOHN**, apostle and saint; often called John the Theologian; feastdays 26 Sept., 8 May, and others. The son of Zebedee, he was considered to be the author of the fourth Gospel and of three epistles in the New Testament canon; already in the 3rd C. Dionysios of Alexandria had rejected the possibility of John's authorship of the Apocalypse (Book of Revelation). His Gospel was widely commented on: Origen compiled a lengthy commentary in order to refute the views of the Gnostics; he was followed by Didymos the Blind, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Ammonios of Alexandria, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The major problem for exegesis was the difference between John and the three synoptic gospels, so that some doubts concerning its authenticity were expressed, esp. by the so-called *alogen*: Epiphanius of Cyprus censured this heresy and tried to show that the Gospels did not disagree. Nonnos of Panopolis compiled a metrical paraphrase of the Gospel of John. The epistles attracted less attention.

John was popular in hagiography and homiletics; numerous apocryphal acts as well as homilies survive, among others by pseudo-Chrysostom, Andrew of Crete, Cyril of Alexandria, and later writers such as Constantine Akropolites, Palamas, and Makarios Chrysokophalos. Byz. legend made John a grandson of Joseph the Carpenter and thus nephew of Jesus; after Mary's Dormition he preached throughout Asia Minor and was exiled by Domitian to the island of Patmos. Frustrated by the apostasy of his disciple (a local bishop who became a robber), John attempted suicide by poison, but the cross he wore negated its effect. From Patmos John went to Ephesus where he worked miracles and died peacefully. At least eight churches in Constantinople were dedicated to John (Janin, *Églises CP* 264–70).

**Representation in Art.** John has two guises in art: young and beardless as the beloved disciple; white-haired, balding, and long-bearded as the visionary evangelist. As the disciple, John appears in scenes of his calling, his mother's plea, the Transfiguration, Last Supper (see Lord's Supper), Crucifixion, and at Christ's tomb. In this guise, he is indistinguishable from the young disciple who witnesses Christ's actions in countless scenes. John barely figures in Acts illustration and his further imagery draws on apocrypha: his prominent role in the Dormition of the Virgin; his voyage to Patmos (Codex Ebrnerianus, fol. 302v), where he dictated his Gospel under divine inspiration; and his self-burial at Ephesus (Menologion of Basil II). As an evangelist, John is shown seated before a desk (see Evangelist Portraits) or standing and dictating to his secretary, Prochoros—an image also drawn from his apocrypha. Consistently in the latter composition and sometimes in the former, the divine inspiration he receives is shown by an arc of Heaven or the Hand of God. In Paris, B.N. gr. 93, the hill behind him becomes a mandorla, stressing his ecstatic condition. The frontispiece of a lectionary in the Skeouphylakion at Iviron, Athos, likens him to Moses on Sinai (Xynigoroupolis, *infra*, pl.54). Only rarely (e.g., Moscow, Univ. Lib. 2280, fol. 347r, of 1078) is he portrayed as the author of the Apocalypse.


—J.L., A.K., A.W.C.

**JOHN I**, patriarch of Antioch (429–441/2). Before his elevation John had been a student at Antioch with Nestorios. Although John disapproved of his friend's repudiation of the title Theotokos and even wrote to him counseling moderation, he supported him against Cyril of Alexandria in the ensuing controversy over Nes-
TORIANISM. John’s unintentionally late arrival for the opening of the Council of Ephesus (431) prompted Cyril to proceed with Nestorios’s condemnation. This resulted in a countercouncil, in which the Antiochian delegation headed by John had Cyril condemned. The moderates of both parties, however, desired peace and, in 433, signed the so-called Symbol of Union that ended the schism. In effect, John implicitly agreed to the condemnation of Nestorios in return for Cyril’s toleration of Antiochian terminology regarding the duality of the nature of Christ. Also, both men accepted the legitimacy of the term Theotokos. Nevertheless, their more extreme followers rejected the settlement. The resulting tension led directly to the “Robber” Council of Ephesus (449) and the Council of Chalcedon. Some of John’s correspondence with Proklos of Constantinople, Cyril, and Theodosios II dealing with the Nestorian dispute has survived.

ED. Letters—ACO 1,1,1:93–96. 119; 1,1,4:7–9. 33: 1,1,5:124–35; 1,1,7:84, 146, 151–61; III, IV, passim.
-A.K.

JOHN I, pope (from 13 Aug. 523); born Tuscany, died Ravenna 18 May 526. In 525/6 the Ostrogothic ruler Theodoric the Great sent John to Constantinople as head of a delegation to protest imperial measures against the Arians. After the end of the ARAKIAN SCHISM Emp. Justin I sought rapprochement with Rome and arranged a spectacular welcome for the pope: the wording of the Liber pontificalis humilavit se pronus suggests that the emperor performed prosynesis. John celebrated the Easter liturgy in Constantinople, while Patr. Epiphanius (520–35) was relegated to a secondary role in the service. All of this made Theodoric suspicious, and, despite the success of John’s mission, he detained the pope in Ravenna where he died several days later. The recorded details of John’s imprisonment and martyrdom appear to be fictitious.

-A.K.

JOHN I, archbishop of Thessalonike, politician, writer, and local saint; died ca.630 (Stiernon) or ca.649 (Jugie). John participated in the defense of Thessalonike against the Avars and Slavs and was responsible for introducing the feast of the Dormition to that city. He wrote the first version of the miracles of St. Demetrios and several homilies, among which those on the Dormition were the most popular. In them John, having promised to remove all heretical elements from the narrative of Mary’s death, placed an unusual emphasis on the filial affection of Christ for his mother. He also stressed St. Peter’s primacy over the other apostles.

-A.K.

JOHN I DOUKAS, sebastokrator of Thessaly (1267/68–1290); born Epirus ca.1240?, died 1289 or earlier. He was the illegitimate son of Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epiros and half-brother of Nikephoros I Komnenos Doukas of Epiros. Married to the daughter of the Thessalian VLAH chieftain Taron, John led a contingent of Vlach troops to support his father at the battle of PeLagonia (1259). According to George Akropolites (Akrop. 170,5–9), John surrendered to the Nicene commander after the Epirot army fled in despair. Pachymeres (Pachym., ed. Failer 1:119–21), on the other hand, relates that John treacherously agreed to attack the Latin forces after being insulted by William II Villehardouin. After the battle John repented his actions and returned to his father.

Upon Michael II’s death (1266 or 1268), John’s rule over Thessaly was confirmed, with its capital at Neopatras. Although Michael VIII Palaiologos married his nephew to John’s daughter and granted John the title sebastokrator in the effort to secure an alliance, John became an implacable enemy of the Byz. emperor. He defeated an imperial army sent to besiege Neopatras (1272–73), entered into commercial agreements with the Angevins, and ardently opposed the UNION of the CHURCHES. He convened a synod at Neopatras in 1277, attended by anti-Unionist exiles, which anathematized Michael VIII and Patr. JOHN XI Bekkos (R.-J. Loeneretz, OrChP 31 [1965] 374–408). It was on a campaign against John in 1282 that Michael VIII fell ill and died. The Church
of Porta Panagia near Trikkala, built by John in 1283, contains portraits of the sebastokrator and his family (A. Orlandos, ABME 1 [1935] 8, 33–35).


JOHN I TZIMISKES (Τζιμισκής), emperor (969–76); born Chozana, Armenia, ca.925, died Constantinople 10 Jan. 976. John was a general of Armenian origin; according to Leo the Deacon (p.92.1–5), his name was an Armenian version of the Greek Mouzakites, meaning “of short stature.” He was related to the Kourkouas family; his mother was the sister of Nikephoros II Phokas; and his first wife Maria was the sister of the magistros Bardas Skleros. John first distinguished himself under Constantine VII by capturing Samosata in 958. He was the staunchest supporter of Nikephoros II but later changed sides. Head of an aristocratic coup, he murdered the emperor on the night of 10/11 Dec. 969 with the help of Nikephoros’s wife Theophano. Yielding to the demands of Patr. Polyeuktos, John banished Theophano; he then married Theodora, Constantine VII’s daughter and the aunt of the legitimate emperors, Basil II and Constantine VIII. Acting in close concord with the church, John cancelled Nikephoros’s legislation against church land ownership. Two rescripts (sigillia) of 974 and 975 manifest John’s flexible policy toward monastic land ownership: although his fiscal functionaries proclaimed the necessity of restoring “to the emperor” state-controlled peasants who fled to the dynatoi and onto church property, they permitted a number of peasants to remain on monastic proastelia “by virtue of previous chrysobulls.”

John conducted an energetic foreign policy: he repelled Svjatoslav from Bulgaria (971), subduing part of this country; concluded an alliance with Otto I (972); and fought successfully in Syria. In 970/1 the patrikios Nicholas, a eunuch, defeated the Fatimids army near Antioch (P. Walker, Byzantium 42 [1972] 431–40), and in 975 John led a victorious campaign into Syria, forcing Damascus to pay tribute and capturing Beirut. The unsuccessful siege of Tripoli, however, was a setback, and John’s claim of conquests in Palestine (in a letter to the Armenian king Ašot III) does not find support in Arabic sources (P. Walker, Byzantium 47 [1977] 301–27). Matthew of Edessa preserves a legend that at the end of his reign John returned the crown to Basil II and retired to a desert monastery (M. van Esbroeck, BK 41 [1983] 71); on the other hand, there were rumors that he had been poisoned by Basil the Nothos.

Apart from his coins, only one portrait of John is known. The Madrid Skylitzes MS, however, richly illustrates his career with 41 miniatures, including his conspiratorial arrival at the Boukoleon palace, arranged by Theophano, and her subsequent expulsion—both by boat. John’s triumphal entry into Constantinople in 971 (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzès, fig.221) shows him accompanied by a horse-drawn icon of the Virgin.


JOHN II, bishop of Jerusalem (386/7–417), succeeding Cyril of Jerusalem; born ca.356. He was a monk in Jerusalem before his election to the episcopate. His Origenist sympathies were denounced by Epiphanius of Salamis, both in a sermon delivered in his presence in Jerusalem in 392 and in two letters, one of which survives in a Latin translation made by Jerome. His pro-Origenist position also caused John to break with former friends such as Theophilos of Alexandria when the latter switched from support to condemnation of that belief.

John may be the author of the five Mystagogical Catecheses, addressed to neophytes in Easter week, that form part of the collection of Cyril of Jerusalem’s 24 catechetical lectures. One MS does attribute them to John, others give joint credit to Cyril. Possibly John revised these lectures, which Cyril had written and delivered.


JOHN II, metropolitan of Kiev (ca.1077–89), of Greek origin. A writer on canon law, John was praised in the Povest’ vremennykh let for his
erudition (PSRL 1:208); the belief that he was the uncle of Theodore Prodromos is probably incorrect (A. Kazhdan in Okeanos 357f; S. Franklin, BS 45 [1984] 40–45). John addressed a letter (with a treatise on the azymes appended in the Greek version) to the (anti-)pope Clement III (1080–1100) and wrote a set of Canonical Responses to the monk James. The letter focuses on Latin "innovations," mainly as listed in the 867 encyclical of Photios (Saturday fasts; the eating of cheese, eggs, and milk during Lent; celibate clergy; confirmation exclusively by bishops; the filioque), but with additional emphasis on the azymes. The tone is firm but conciliatory. John’s Canonical Responses treat miscellaneous practical difficulties encountered by the propagandists of Byz. Christianity in Rus’; pagan customs in public and private life, marriages and other contacts with non-Orthodox foreigners, and the proper behavior and organization of the clergy. John’s main source is the Nomokanon of 14 Titles, but the suggestion that he was responsible for its translation (R.G. Pichoja, ADSV 11 [1975] 133–44) is tenuous. Some scholars believe that John composed the extant office to Boris and Gleb.


—S.C.F.

JOHN II KOMNENOS, emperor (from 15 Aug. 1118); born Constantinople 13 Sept. 1087, died near Anazarbos 8 Apr. 1143. John succeeded his father Alexios I against the wishes of Irene Doukaina and Anna Komnene; the latter conspired on behalf of Nikephoros Bryennios. Byz. historians describe John’s reign only briefly. His domestic policy is little known. Austere in manner, John tried to regulate even the costume of his courtiers; he was nonetheless tolerant and eschewed maiming as a punishment. He entrusted military command to noble relatives but put civil administration in the hands of men of obscure origin, such as John of Poutze and Stephen Meles, the logothetes tou dromou. John centralized the ad-

ministration of the army and navy and for this purpose charged the state treasury with maintaining vessels and their crews, previously the burden of the maritime regions (Lemerle, Agr. Hist. 234–36). He founded the monastery of the Pantokrator and wrote its typikon. The dynastic sense that underlay this foundation also prompted other works, including a lost mosaic of John mourning his dead father whose victories were depicted (Magdalino-Nelson, “Emp. in 12th C.,” 126–30). A mosaic in Hagia Sophia portrays John, his wife, Irene, and, to one side, his son, Alexios.

John capitalized on Alexios I’s military successes. Most of John’s wars were in Anatolia, esp. against the Danismendids (he captured Kastamonu and Gangra after the death of Ghazī in 1134). He subdued the Rubenids of Cilicia (1137) and made Raymond of Poitiers his vassal (1138), but the ensuing campaign from Antioch to inner Syria failed before the walls of Aleppo and Shayzar. In the northwest, John crushed the Pechenegs in 1122 (not 1123 as in B. Radojičić, ZRVI 7 [1961] 178) and defeated the Serbians and Hungarians in 1127–29 (not 1125 as in Radojičić, 182f). He attempted to annul Venice’s privileges but in 1126 was forced to yield to a Venetian expedition. Theodore Prodromos was John’s official eulogist. Allegedly John died in a hunting accident, but one cannot rule out the possibility of assassination (R. Browning, Byzantium 31 [1961] 229–35).


JOHN II KOMNENOS. Portrait of the emperor and his wife Irene; mosaic, Hagia Sophia, Istanbul.
JOHN III KOMNENOS, emperor of Trebizond (1280–97); born ca.1262/3. died Limnia, near Trebizond, 16 of 17 Aug. 1297. Son of MANUEL I KOMNENOS of Trebizond, John succeeded his brother GEORGE KOMNENOS as ruler of Trebizond. He initially incurred the anger of the Byz. emperor Michael VIII by styling himself “emperor and autokrator of the Romans.” Michael sent frequent embassies to the “ruler (archegos) of the Lazes,” as Pachymeres (Pachym., ed. Bekker 2:270.9) calls John, to criticize his wrongful use of the imperial title. In 1282 John went to Constantinople and married Michael’s daughter Eudokia, receiving the Byz. title despotes; he then changed his imperial title to “emperor and autokrator of all the East, the Iberians, and the transmarine provinces.” The chief events of John’s reign were the siege of Trebizond in 1282 by the Georgian king David IV (V) and the brief usurpation of the throne in 1284/5 by John’s half-sister Theodora (M. Kuršanskis, REB 33 [1975] 187–210). John was a patron of the SOUMELA monastery.

LIT. Miller, Trebizond 27–32. PLP, no.12106. –A.M.T.

JOHN III, patriarch of Antioch (4 Oct. 996–July 1021). His surname Polites perhaps derives from the fact that he was a native of Constantinople. Originally chartophylax of Hagia Sophia, he was elevated to the see of Antioch by Emp. Basil II following the abdication of Agapios (978–96). Since John feared that, before he reached his sede, his predecessor might attempt to recover the throne, he agreed to be consecrated in Constantinople and thus to renounce (in writing) his right to be ordained by the metropolitan of Antioch. This questionable act, by which Antioch became ecclesiastically subject to Constantinople, was later revoked by Patr. Peter III, but it is not known with what success. The practice probably continued.

During his tenure John also chose to surrender to Orestes, patriarch of Jerusalem (986–1006), the annual sum of money sent by the church of Georgia to Antioch for the preparation of the Holy Chrism, which the Georgians now received from Jerusalem. John did not, however, abandon his privilege of confirming the KATHOLIKOS of Georgia, or the right to be commemorated by the Georgian episcopate in the liturgy. An extract of John’s only known work, Responda de baptismo, addressed to Theodore of Ephesus, was published by Allatius. This reply was probably written while John was still chartophylax; normally, canonical questions requiring no synodical decision were referred to this official.

ED. L. Allatius, De aetate et interstitii in collatione ordinum (Rome 1638) 215.

JOHN III SCHOLASTIKOS, patriarch of Constantinople (31 Jan. 565–31 Aug. 577); born Sirnis near Antioch ca.503 (L. Petit, DTC 8 [1947] 830), died Constantinople. First a lawyer (scholastikos) in Antioch, in 548/9 he was sent to Constantinople as apokrisarios of the patriarch of Antioch. Justinian I, shortly before his death, selected John to replace EUTYCHIOS as patriarch. John crowned Justin II and supported his policy. John of Ephesus presents the patriarch as an eager anti-Monophysite who ordered persecution of the Monophysites through all the provinces; John of Nikiu, on the other hand, ascribed to him a book, Mystagogia, that allegedly dealt with a single substance of Christ, both divine and human (Beck, Kirche 423). Photios (Bibl., cod.75) mentions a catechetical sermon of John on the Trinity, delivered in 567/8, that was refuted by John PHILOPONOS; the doubts of W. Kroll (RE g [1916] 1792) concerning this evidence are not valid. Probably while still in Antioch, John composed the SYNOGOGE OF FIFTY TITLES. Haury (infra) identified him with John Malalas on the basis of the similarity in names, origin, and scanty biographical data. Although possible (Hunger, Lit. 1:314ff), the identification is far from certain.


JOHN III VATATZES, emperor of Nicaea (from ca.15 Dec. 1221); born ca.1192, died Nymphaion 3 Nov. 1254. He married Irene, daughter of THEODORE I LASKARIS, and ca.1244 Constance
JOHN IV KOMNENOS, emperor of Trebizond (1429–1459/60?); born before 1403 (Kursansiskis) or ca.1404/5, died 1460. Son of Alexios IV Komnenos and Theodora Kantakouzene, as a youth he murdered his mother's suspected paramour and rebelled against his father. He then fled to Georgia, where he married the daughter of King Alexander I (1412–42). In 1427 he went to Kaffa and in 1429 returned to Trebizond where, with Genoese assistance, he overthrew his father and had him assassinated (V. Laurent, ArchPon 20 [1955] 138–43). John's reign was preoccupied with defending Trebizond against the continuing onslaughts of the Turks, both Turkmans and Ottomans. He evidently favored union with Rome in hopes of Western assistance against the Turks (A. Bryer, ArchPon 26 [1964] 395f.). After the fall of Constantinople, the Ottomans attacked Trebizond by land and sea in 1456 and forced John to pay tribute to Mehmed II. By his second wife, a Turk, John had a daughter Theodora whom he married to Uzun Hasan, chief of the White Sheep Turkmans, in exchange for the Turkoman pledge to defend Trebizond against the Ottomans (M. Kursansiskis, ArchPon 34 [1977–8] 77–87).


—A.M.T.

JOHN IV LASKARIS, emperor in Nicaea (1258–61); born Nymphaion? 25 Dec. 1250, died ca.1305. He was the only son and heir of Theodore II Laskaris, whom he succeeded in Aug. 1258. The boy's rights were progressively set aside by Michael VIII Palaiologos. Once the latter had recovered Constantinople, he felt secure enough to have John blinded on Christmas Day 1261 and confined in the fortress of Dakibye on the south shore of the Sea of Marmara. Patr. Arsenios Autoreianos excommunicated Michael in protest. This prompted the people around Nicaea to rise up in support of apretender claiming to be John. The rebellion was quickly crushed, but a strong current of support for the Laskarid cause endured, esp. in Asia Minor. When Andronikos II Palaiologos visited Asia Minor in 1284, he found it politic to placate those with Laskarid sympathies by visiting John in his dungeon and begging forgiveness for what his father had done. With John's death, the Laskarid cause withered.

(“Anna”), an illegitimate daughter of Frederick II Hohenstaufen. His succession was opposed by Theodore's brothers, who had Latin backing. John defeated them at the battle of Poimanein in 1224 and was able to drive the Latins out of northwestern Asia Minor, thus rounding off the Nicaean territories in Asia Minor. His bid to secure control of Adrianople, the key to Thrace, was thwarted by Theodore Komnenos Doukas. Only in 1234 was John able to establish a permanent bridgehead in Thrace, thanks to an alliance concluded with John Asen II. The latter's death left a power vacuum in the southern Balkans, which John was quick to exploit. An astute campaign made him master of the region in 1246 and brought him his greatest prize—the city of Thessalonike. His remaining years were devoted to protecting and extending his European territories and seeking ways of recovering Constantinople.

When alliance with Frederick II Hohenstaufen brought him little material reward, he turned to the papacy in 1248. He was willing to make unprecedented concessions over papal claims to primacy in the hope that the papacy would withdraw its backing for the Latin Empire of Constantinople, but these plans came to nothing. Still, John had created the conditions that made the eventual recovery of Constantinople possible and had turned the Nicaean Empire into the strongest power of the region, with territories stretching from the Turkish frontier to Albania. At the end of his reign his relations with the aristocracy were soured by the need to secure the succession of his son Theodore II Laskaris. In 1252 he had the leader of potential aristocratic opposition, Michael (VIII) Palaiologos, arraigned on a charge of high treason.

John III was a ruler of the highest ability and of great tenacity of purpose. Remembered as “a kind and gentle soul” (Akrop. 1:103.19–20), he was revered after his death as a saint by the Greeks of Asia Minor (D. Constantelos, Kleronomia 4 [1972] 92–104). He was buried in the monastery of Sosandra near Nymphaion.


—M.J.A.
away. A cult seems to have grown up around John; the Russian pilgrim Stefan of Novgorod recorded that in the mid-14th C. it was centered on the monastery of St. Demetrios at Constantinople, where his body was to be seen (I. Ševčenko, *SüdostF* 12 [1953] 173–75).

Lit. Polemis, *Doukai* 111, no.76. —M.J.A.

**JOHN IV NESTEUTES** (Νηστεύτης, "Faster"), patriarch of Constantinople (12 Apr. 582–2 Sept. 595); born and died Constantinople. According to the *Synaxarion of Constantinople* (*Synax.C.P.* col. 7.22), he was a coiner by profession, then joined the clergy and was elected patriarch. The legend preserved by Theophylaktos Simokattes (Theoph.Simok., bk.7,6,4) described him as living in extreme poverty, owning only a wooden pallet, thin blanket, and plain cloak. John was very close to Emp. Maurice, whose son Theodosios was crowned at the age of four and a half by the patriarch. John fought against heresies and, despite Maurice’s resistance, introduced capital punishment for magicians. His claims to the title of ecumenical patriarch led to a conflict with Pope Pelagius II (579–90) and Gregory I.

Little of his writing is preserved; his long speech on penitence, temperance, and chastity (PG 88:1937–78) is a collection of citations from John Chrysostom. Several penitentials are preserved under John’s name (a *Kanonarion, the Akolouthia and Order for Penitents* [PG 88:1889–1918], and the *Indoctrination of Nuns* [PG 88:1889–1918]), but all three are spurious, having been written several centuries later.


**JOHN IV (V) OXITES**, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (ca.1089–1100); died after 1100. All we know about John before his patriarchate is that he was a monk; the conclusions of Ch. Papadopoulos (*EEBS* 12 [1936] 361–78) should be treated with caution. Appointed patriarch before Sept. 1089, he remained in Constantinople until 1091. John’s situation in Antioch under Seljuk rule was miserable, esp. during the Crusaders’ siege of the city; after their victory he had under his jurisdiction both the Greek and Latin clergy of Antioch. Eventually he was charged with plotting to surrender the city to the emperor, left for Constantinople, and in Oct. 1100 officially renounced his patriarchate. John retired to the Hodegon monastery but incited the hatred of the monks and probably moved to the island of Oxeia (Princes’ Islands), where he was later buried.

John’s works had a clear political imprint. In 1085 or 1092 he issued a treatise on *Charistikia*, which he blamed for the decline of monasticism. He also wrote a diatribe accusing Alexios I of responsibility for all the internal and international problems of Byz. His invectives were addressed also against those who possessed “cities within the cities” (P. Gautier, *infra*) and esp. against tax collectors, whereas he lamented the plight of poor peasants, merchants, and craftsmen (p.33.19–22). John also wrote a treatise on *azymes*, possibly in connection with the Byz. dispute against Peter Grossolano in 1112.


**JOHN V KATHOLIKOS**, patriarch of Armenia (897–925) and historian; born Drasxanakert mid-9th C., died Vaspurakan soon after 925. As katholikos, John (Arm. Yovhannes) played a role in diplomacy both between the Bagratid Armenian kings and their Armenian rivals, and between Armenia and both Byz. and Muslim rulers.

The first third of his *History* is primarily a résumé of earlier sources. John developed the concept of the strong royal power of the Bagratid dynasty and justified it by reference to the Bagratids’ succession from previous royal houses (M.O. Darbinian-Melikian, *IFŻ* [1982] no.2, 119–25). The *History* contains the earliest Armenian reference to Bagratid descent from King David of Israel, although earlier Moses Xorenac’i had claimed a Jewish origin for that family. The main part is an eyewitness account of John’s own times and of his role in Armenian politics. It includes a letter to him from Nicholas I Mystikos, patriarch of Constantinople, and one from John himself to
Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, written in 914. The History is the most important source for the reigns of Smbat I and his son Ašot II.


JOHN V PALAIIOLOGOS, emperor (1341–91); born Didymoteichon 18 June 1332, died Constantinople 16 Feb. 1391 (cf. Barker, Manuel II 8of, n. 214). During his 50-year reign John faced numerous rebellions and a civil war; he actually ruled only about 30 years. Nine years old at the death of his father ANDRONIKOS III (1341), John came under the control of his empress-mother ANNA OF SAVOY, Patr. JOHN XIV KALEKAS, and Alexios Apokaukos. The same year John VI KANTAKOUZENOS was proclaimed emperor at Didymoteichon and began the Civil War of 1341–47. After the victory of Kantakouzenos, John married the usurper’s daughter Helena and remained in the background until he forced Kantakouzenos’s abdication in 1354. Shortly thereafter his mosaic portrait was set up in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople (Mango, Materials 74–76, fig. 97).

During the 1350s and 1360s John attempted to gain Western assistance against the Turks. To this end he journeyed in 1366 to Hungary (J. Gill, BS 38 [1977] 31–38) and in 1369 to Rome, where he declared his personal conversion to Catholicism. On his way home he was detained in Venice because of his debts and was forced to promise the cession of Tenedos to the Venetians (R.-J. Loenertz, REB 16 [1958] 217–32). After the Serbian defeat at MARICA (1371), John realized the necessity of seeking an accommodation with the Turks and became an Ottoman vassal. His remaining years were troubled by the rebellions of his son ANDRONIKOS IV (1373, 1376–79) and grandson JOHN VII (1390). To conciliate his heirs, John had to allocate to them appanages and divide the empire into semi-independent principalities, while he retained rule in the capital.


JOHN VI KANTAKOUZENOS, emperor (8 Feb. 1347–3 Dec. 1354 [A. Failler, REB 29 (1971) 293–302]); born ca.1295, died Mistra 15 June 1383. The son, probably posthumous, of a Peloponesian governor of the aristocratic KANTAKOUZENOS lineage, John Kantakouzenos was about the same age as ANDRONIKOS (III) PALAIIOLOGOS and was his close friend until the emperor’s death in 1341. His first known title was that of megas papias (1320); he became megas domestikos ca.1325. He supported Andronikos’s rebellion against his grandfather (1321–28) and was his principal general and adviser during his reign.

After Andronikos died, leaving a nine-year-old heir, JOHN V PALAIIOLOGOS, Kantakouzenos failed to secure the regency. His power struggle with ANNA OF SAVOY, Alexios Apokaukos, and Patr. JOHN XIV KALEKAS ended in the Civil War of 1341–47, and Kantakouzenos was proclaimed co-emperor at Didymoteichon (26 Oct. 1341). Thanks to his extraordinary wealth (in land and livestock), the support of landed magnates in Thrace and Thessaly, and military aid from Serbs and Turks, Kantakouzenos eventually emerged victorious. On 21 May 1346 he was crowned at Adrianople and in Feb. 1347 entered Constantinople. He was crowned a second time (21 May) and married his daughter Helena to John V.

During his brief reign Kantakouzenos crushed the Zealots in Thessalonike (1349) and supported PALAMISM at the local council of Constantinople of 1351 (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF). The relatively peaceful relations between John V and John VI lasted until 1351; in 1352 a new civil war broke out. Although Kantakouzenos used Ottoman troops (who established themselves at KALLIPOULIS, their first European foothold), he was defeated by John V, who assumed sole power (M. Živojinović, ZRVI 21 [1982] 127–41). After his abdication Kantakouzenos became the monk Ioasaph, retiring first to the MANAGA monastery, then to CHARISIANES. He made at least two trips to MISTRA, where his son MANUEL KANTAKOUZENOS was despotes (1347–80). He continued to influence both political and religious affairs until his death (cf. Lj. Maksimović, ZRVI 9 [1966] 119–93; J. Meyendorff, DOP 14 [1960] 147–77).

He also devoted himself to the preparation of his lengthy memoirs, the Historiae, one of the
John VI Kantakouzenos. Portrait of the emperor at the Council of 1351. Miniature in a manuscript of his works (Paris gr. 1242, fol. 5v); 14th C. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

Principal sources for the first half of the 14th C. in four books he treated events from 1320 to 1356, drawing on personal reminiscences and perhaps on a diary. The remarkable homogeneity of composition is a result of the subordination of the historical material to an overall structural theme. He used this very subjective work to justify his own actions and policies and to present himself as a tragic hero and as the central figure of events. At the same time his history is a useful complement to the account of Nikephoros Gregoras. The bias of Kantakouzenos is offset by the author's first-hand knowledge of events, his precise chronology, and citation of original documents. His work is characterized by a belief in ananke (necessity) and tyche (fate or fortune); he believed that his eventual defeat was not caused solely by human factors, but by transcendent and cosmic forces. Kantakouzenos wrote in a simple style marked by the absence of rhetoric. His work was influenced by Thucydides (T. Miller, GRBS 17 [1976] 385–95, and H. Hunger, JÖB 25 [1976] 181–93) and includes an unusual number of speeches.

Kantakouzenos also wrote treatises attacking Islam and Judaism, and pro-Palamite theological works, refuting John Kyparissiotes and Prochoros Kydones. Portraits of Kantakouzenos as emperor and monk survive in a deluxe MS of his theological writings, Paris, B.N. gr. 1242, fols. 5v and 123v.


—A.M.T.

John VII, pope (1 Mar. 705–18 Oct. 707). Greek by birth, he was the son of a curator sacri palatii named Plato who moved to Rome from Constantinople. John inherited from his predecessors the problems of the canons of the Council in Trullo, which Pope Sergius I had refused to sign. Emp. Justinian II took up the issue, sending copies of the canons to the pope and urging him to approve those that were acceptable and reject those that were not. John returned them without emendation or signature, causing the author of the Liber pontificalis to accuse him of cowardice. A fresco in the Church of S. Maria Antiqua in Rome, commissioned by John, may reflect his acceptance of the canons, however; instead of the Adoration of the Lamb of God, it represents Christ in human form. The canons of Trullo were not formally accepted in Rome until the pontificate of Constantine I (708–15). Both the frescoes in S. Maria Antiqua and the mosaics of John’s oratory in Old St. Peter’s are generally attributed to Byz. artists (M. Andaloro, RIASA 19–20 [1972–73] 185f). The latter program included John’s portrait, today preserved in the Vatican grottoes, offering his foundation to the Virgin clad as a Byz. empress.

JOHN VII GRAMMATIKOS (the Grammarians), patriarch of Constantinople (21 Jan. 837?–4 Mar. 843 [V. Grumel, *EO* 34 (1935) 162–66, 506]); born Constantinople late 8th C., died western shore of Bosporos before 867. John was born to a family (perhaps of Armenian origin) whose name is variously given as Morokardanos, Morocharymios, and Morocharyanos. He began his clerical career ca. 811–13 as an anagostes in the Hodegon monastery; according to Photios (hormily 15, ed. Laourdas, 140.25–27) he was also an icon painter. Three letters addressed to him by Theodore of Studios are further proof of his original Iconodule position (V. Grumel, *EO* 36 [1937] 186). The epithet grammatikos indicates that he was respected for his learning. By 814 he had become an Iconoclast and was chosen by Emp. Leo V to head a committee to collect a florilegium of patristic texts in support of Iconoclasm, in preparation for the local council of 815 in Constantinople (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF), which again condemned the veneration of images. He was rewarded with the post of hegoumenos of the Sergios and Bakchos monastery, which served as a center where recalcitrant Iconodules were “rehabilitated.”

John had a reputation for persuasive rhetorical skills, and debates with him became a hagiographical *topos* of the second Iconoclastic period. Under Michael II, John tutored the crown prince Theophilos and is usually credited with inculcating strong Iconoclastic sympathies in his pupil. Upon Theophilos’s accession to the throne, John became synkellos, and went on an embassy to the Arab caliph al-Ma’mun, probably in 829/30. Little is known of his actual patriarchate; he was deposed in 843 as a preamble to the restoration of images, excommunicated, and exiled from Constantinople. In some of the marginal Psalters, John is depicted as the principal adversary of the Orthodox patriarch Nikephoros I who, as a pendant to St. Peter crushing Simon Magus, tramples John underfoot (Grabar, *Iconoclasm* 226–28, 287f., figs. 150, 155). John was probably the compiler of a collection of Gnomai that served as the major source for the *Gnomologia* of John Georgides (A. Kambylis, *JÖB* 37 [1987] 95, n.1).


-A.M.T., A.C.

JOHN VII PALAILOGOS, emperor (1390); born ca. 1370, died Thessalonike 22 (23?) Sept. 1408. According to E. Zachariadou (*DOP* 31 [1977] 339–42), he was also called Andronikos. Eldest son of Andronikos IV, as a small child he developed a grudge against his grandfather John V, who partially blinded him and his father after the latter’s rebellion. John viewed himself as rightful heir to the throne and opposed his uncle Manuel II, who had “usurped” his claim to the empire. Upon Andronikos’s death in 1385, John inherited his appanage in Selymbria. In April 1390 he seized Constantinople with Genoese and Turkish support and reigned briefly until his deposition in September. After a reconciliation with Manuel, John served as his regent from 1399 to 1403 and was entrusted with the defense of Constantinople against the siege of Bayezid I. The capital was saved by Bayezid’s defeat at Ankara in 1402; the next year (3 June 1403) John signed a treaty with the Turks whereby the Byz. regained Thessalonike. His triumphal entry into the city and his family may well appear on a tiny ivory at Dumbarton Oaks. Shortly after Manuel’s return from the West, John was made “basileus of all Thessaly” and despotes of Thessalonike, where he spent his final years quietly.

John was married to Irene Gattilusio, daughter of Francesco II of Lesbos. The union produced one son, Andronikos V, who predeceased his father. John thus died without an heir, leaving the lineage of Manuel unchallenged in its claim to the throne.


-A.M.T., A.C.

JOHN VIII, pope (14 Dec. 872–16 Dec. 882); of Roman origin. John was elected despite the future pope Formosus’s opposition, which continued during the first years of John’s pontificate. John faced the Arab invasions of southern Italy, often
supported by the rulers of Gaeta and other small Lombard principedoms; the pope built a navy to deter the Arabs, and until the death of Louis II the anti-Arab war proceeded successfully. After 875, however, Emp. Basil I was the most effective ally. The situation was complicated since John actively tried to establish papal control over Moravia (by supporting Methodios), Croatia, and Bulgaria. At a council in Constantinople in 879/80, the pope's legates were coerced into yielding: they joined the rehabilitation of Photios (the legend of the "second Photian schism" under John is a forgery—F. Dvornik, Byzantion 8 [1933] 425–36) and also had to accept Byz. claims over Bulgaria, although the pope still tried to influence the Bulgarian khan Boris I. Defeats by the Arabs, who gained a stronghold at Garigliano and burned Monte Cassino, as well as failures in Bulgaria and Moravia, gave new impetus to the opposition to the pope. The Annals of Fulda preserve a rumor that John was murdered.


John VIII Chrysostomites (Χρυσοστομίτης), or Merkouropolos (Μερκούριόπωλος), patriarch in Jerusalem (ca.1098–1106/7; on the name see B. Englezakis, Byzantion 43 [1973] 506–08). Although his personality and patriarchy remain obscure, John must be identified with the anonymous metropolitan of Tyre who fled his own see to Jerusalem and was subsequently elevated to patriarch succeeding Symeon II (cf. Xanthopoulos in PG 146:1196D). Despite the Crusaders' election of a Latin patriarch, John continued in his office. In 1107/8 he went to Constantinople, where he was recognized as the legitimate patriarch of Jerusalem (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.986). Grumel suggests that his patriarchate ended before 1122.

Of the three treatises on azymes attributed to him, only the last two are from his pen; the first is probably by Eustratios of Nicaea. An unpublished work on the origins of the schism of 1054 may be his, although this seems rather doubtful (cf. J. Darrouzès, REB 21 [1963] 54).

John is sometimes confused with John IX of Jerusalem, who was present at the local council of Constantinople of 1156–57—the only known evidence of his patriarchate (I. Sakkelion, Palaioke bibliotheke [Athens 1890] 327). Englezakis has tentatively suggested that it was John IX who was actually John Chrysostomites, the monk mentioned in the tytikon of the monastery at Koutzovente in Cyprus. One of these two Johns wrote the "dual" vita of John of Damascus and Kosmas the Hymnographer, which includes a rare attempt to evaluate Kosmas's literary activity.


John VIII Palaiologos, emperor (1425–48); born 17/18 Dec. 1392 (cf. Barker, Manuel II 104 n.28), died Constantinople 31 Oct. 1448. Eldest son of Manuel II and Helena Dragash, he was made co-emperor before 1408 (Oikonomides, "Ivory Pyxis" 332–34) and became autokrator on 19 Jan. 1421 (F. Dölger, BZ 36 [1936] 318f). He was the effective ruler during the final four years of Manuel's life and succeeded him in mid-1425. John took active part in two successful campaigns in the Peloponnese. During his reign the Byz. regained control of most of the Morea and began to expand into Attica and Boeotia. Nonetheless, Thessalonike fell to the Turks in 1430 and, after the Turkish campaign of 1446, the Morea had to pay tribute to the sultan.

John pursued a policy of seeking rapprochement with the West in order to stave off further Ottoman advances. He was eager to achieve Union of the Churches and personally participated in the Council of Ferrara-Florence, where he signed the decree of Union. After his return to Constantinople in 1440, however, he found much popular opposition to the decisions of the council. Moreover, the Crusade of 1444, a reward for the Union of Florence, never reached Constantinople, but was crushed by the Turks at Varna. John died without ever implementing the Union. Despite three marriages, he was childless and was succeeded by his brother, Constantine XI.

John appears as co-emperor with his father in the Louvre MS of the works of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite (Spatarakis, Portrait, fig.93) and,
again identified as *basileus*, with his first wife, Anna of Moscow, on the so-called Large Sakkos, probably sent to Moscow between 1411 and 1417. A number of portraits by Western artists (miniatures and bronzes) commemorate John's visit to Italy (ibid., figs. 21–22, 178–79).


**John VIII Xiphilinos,** patriarch of Constantinople (1 Jan. 1064–2 Aug. 1075); born Trebizond ca.1010, died Constantinople. John was born to the Xiphilinos family, which was reportedly of humble origin. After an education in Constantinople, he joined the circle of John Mauropoulos and Psello and was granted the post of nomophylax of the law school in the capital. J. Cvetler's hypothesis (Eos 48.2 [1956] 297–328) that Xiphilinos composed the novel on the foundation of the law school does not prove valid. In the late 1040s Xiphilinos fell out of favor with Constantine IX and was attacked by a certain Ophydas who accused him of "freethinking." Psello defended Xiphilinos and praised his love of knowledge. When Constantine (III) Leichoudes was replaced as mesazon by the eunuch John ca.1050, Xiphilinos and friends were forced to leave Constantinople. Xiphilinos took the monastic habit and was—unlike Psello—content with his new situation; he soon began to retreat from the "emancipated" ideals of his youth. This created a tension in his relations with Psello, who, even in his enkomion of Xiphilinos (Sathas, MB 4:421–62), was unable to refrain from criticism, conventional though it may be.

After the death of Leichoudes, who had become patriarch (1059–1063), Emp. Constantine X (allegedly at the recommendation of Psello) summoned Xiphilinos from Mt. Olympos and appointed him patriarch. Under the difficult conditions of the growing Seljuk menace, Xiphilinos tried to establish union with the Armenian church. He also abolished a decision of Patr. Michael I Kerouarios prohibiting metropolitans who resided in Constantinople from electing in the capital new bishops for vacant sees (N. Oikonomides, *REB* 18 [1960] 55–78). Xiphilinos wrote a number of legal works—according to W. Wolska-Conus (*TM* 7 [1979] 13–53), scholia to the Basilika, Tractatus de creditis, de peculius, and Meditatio de nudis pactis. He also wrote the *Miracles of St. Eugenios.*


**John X,** pope (Mar./April 914–June 928); born Tossignano in the Romagna, died Rome 929. He owed his elevation to the noble Roman family of Theophylact. The major problem he had to face was the Arab threat; to fight them John advocated an alliance of Rome, Lombard princeoms in Italy, and Byz. In Aug. 915 the allies captured the Arab stronghold of Garigliano. In 920 John's legates attended the council in Constantinople where the Tomos of Union was signed; the next year, the envoys of Romans I Lekapenos and Patr. Nicholas I Mystikos were sent to the pope to suggest that contacts between Rome and Constantinople be reestablished (Nicholas, ep.53). John, however, taking advantage of the tense situation in the Balkans resulting from the war with Symeon of Bulgaria, tried to force papal influence on both Dalmatia and Bulgaria: in 925 Tomislav convened a synod in Split under John's direction (F. Šišić, *Pregled povijesti Hrvatskoga naroda* [Zagreb 1962] 123); Zlatarski (*Ist.* 1.2:507) surmised that the pope had promised to recognize Symeon's imperial title and the autocephaly of the Bulgarian church. John was deposed and imprisoned by Marozia, Theophylact's daughter.


**John X Kamateros,** patriarch of Constantinople (5 Aug. 1198–Apr./May 1206); died Dydimotheichon June 1206. A member of the Kamateros family, John was related to the empress Euphrosyne Doukaina Kamatera, wife of Alexios III Angelos. Well versed in classical literature, his training included rhetoric and philosophy. After holding a series of ecclesiastical positions, he was chartophylax when chosen as patriarch to succeed George II Xiphilinos. Between 1198 and 1200 he exchanged letters with Innocent III on the question of papal primacy; he attacked the filioque clause and asserted that Rome held first place in the pentarchy not on account of the
apostle Peter but because it was the imperial capital in the early Christian centuries. John intervened with Alexios III to gain the release of the banker Kalomodos. After Alexios's flight in July 1203, and the accession of Isaac II and Alexios IV, John continued to serve as patriarch. According to Western sources, he and Alexios IV submitted to the authority of Innocent III that same year. When Constantinople fell to the Crusaders in 1204, John took refuge at Didymoteichon. Theodore I Laskaris invited him to Nicaea to join the government-in-exile but John refused, perhaps because of old age.


-A.M.T.

JOHN XI BEKKOS, patriarch of Constantinople (26 May 1275–26 Dec. 1282); born Nicaea? between 1230 and 1240, died in fortress of St. Gregory on the Gulf of Nikomedea, March 1297 (V. Laurent, EO 25 [1926] 316–19). First mentioned as chartophylax of Hagia Sophia (1263–75), John twice served as Michael VIII's ambassador: to Stefan Uroš I in Serbia in 1268 and to Louis IX in Tunis in 1270 (L. Bréhier in Mélanges offerts à M. Nicolas Iorga [Paris 1933] 139f). At first John opposed plans for the Union of the Churches and in 1273 was imprisoned; after further study of the Latin fathers, he changed his views and was released from prison. He became head of the Unionist party and was soon chosen patriarch. Throughout his patriarchate John supported Michael VIII, but he urged the emperor to be more lenient toward his opponents. As a result of this dispute John temporarily withdrew from the patriarchate between March and August 1279. He was deposed after Michael's death and thereafter bore the brunt of attacks from the anti-Unionist party that then came to power: in Jan. 1283 a synod at Constantinople formally charged him with heresy and banished him to Prousia. He was again condemned at the Council of Blachernai in 1285 (see under Constantinople, Councils of), by the tomos of Gregory II of Cyprus and imprisoned, together with Constantine Meliteniotes and George Metochites.
denied Barlaam of Calabria and exonerated Gregory Palamas.

After the rebellion of Kantakouzenos and his coronation at Didymoteichon, the patriarch excommunicated his former patron and became regent for John V Palaiologos, whom he crowned in Nov. 1341. He then turned against Palamas and threw his support to the anti-Palamite Gregory Akindynos. In 1344 he excommunicated Palamas and deposed Isidore (I) Bocheiras from the see of Monemvasia. By 1346 the tide began to turn against John, after the murder of Alexios Apokaukos and Kantakouzenist victories in the Civil War of 1341–47. On 2 Feb. 1347, just before Kantakouzenos entered Constantinople, John was deposed by Anna of Savoy and condemned by the synod (G. Dennis, JÖB 9 [1960] 51–55). He was briefly exiled to Didymoteichon but then returned to Constantinople, where he died.


Lit. RegPatr, fasc. 5, nos. 2168–2270. PLP, no. 10288.

-A.M.T.

JOHN AKTOUARIES, or John Zacharias, chief physician at court of Andronikos II Palaiologos; born ca. 1275, died after 1328. When first mentioned in 1299 in a letter from George Laka- penos, John was studying medicine in Constantinople; sometime between 1310 and 1323, he received the title of aktouarios. He corresponded with Michael Gabras and taught astronomy to George Oinaiotes (S.I. Kourouses, Athena 77 [1978–79] 291–386; 78 [1980–82] 237–76).

One of John's teachers was Joseph the Philosopher, to whom he dedicated his treatise On the Workings and Illnesses of the Spirit of the Soul. The last of the great Byz. physicians, John was well acquainted with the medical classics and Greek literature and philosophy. The Method of Medicine, written for his friend Alexios Apokaukos, is generally based on Galen, but the work is innovative on colics from lead poisoning, whipworm infestations, and the combination of several techniques of bloodletting. John's Urines, a masterpiece of Byz. diagnostics, is divided into four basic parts: various urines and their physiological characteristics; diagnostics; etiology; and prognosis (K. Dimitriadias, Byzantinische Urosekope [Bonn 1971] 55–64). John's meticulous gradations of colors, consistency, sediments, and floating substances in given levels of the urine flask (amis, Lat. matula) are in a MS diagram (Ideler, infra 2:22). Much of his work is still unpublished.

Ed. De spiritu animali, De urinis, and De diagnosi in PhysMedGr 1:312–86; 313–192; 358–469.


–J.S., A.M.T.

JOHN ALEXIOS III KOMNENOS. See Alexios III Komnenos.

JOHN ANAGNOSTES, early 15th-C. writer. Nothing is known of his biography; the name Anagnostes is probably not a family name but an indication of the clerical rank of reader. John lived in Thessalonike during the siege of Murad II in 1490, and composed a brief eyewitness account (Diegesis) of the failure of the city's Venetian occupiers to resist the Turkish onslaught. The most recent editor of the Diegesis, G. Tsras, believes that John's account breaks off suddenly with the entrance of the Turks into Thessalonike, and that it was completed ca. 1453 by an editor who also composed the Monody on the fall of Thessalonike that has been attributed to John. The narrative is presented in literary language, but in a simple, straightforward manner, with precise details. A. Kazhdan (BZ 71 [1978] 301–14) has pointed out similarities between the account of John and the narrative of John Kaminiates, which is traditionally assigned to the 10th C.


–A.M.T.

JOHN ASENII II, Bulgarian tsar (1218–41); born ca. 1195/6, died 1241. John was the eldest son of Asen I, one of the founders of the Second Bulgarian Empire. In 1207, when the Bulgarian throne was seized by his cousin Boril, John was forced to flee to Galicia (Galitza), but he overthrew his rival in 1218. He was married to a Hungarian
princess and was content to allow the Bulgarian church to remain under papal auspices. On the strength of his Western ties he put himself forward in 1228 as a regent for Baldwin II. The Latins of Constantinople rejected his offer, confident in the truce they had concluded with his erstwhile ally, Theodorus Komnenos Doukas. This was the prelude to the latter's invasion of Bulgaria in 1230, but John defeated and captured him at the battle of Klokotnitsa. An inscription John had erected at Tūnovo soon after recorded that his conquests stretched from Adrianople in the east to Dyrrhachion in the west and set out his claim to the lordship of Constantinople. He now styled himself tsar of the Bulgarians and the Greeks, reviving the claims of Symeon of Bulgaria.

Seeking patriarchal status for the Bulgarian church, John turned to John III Vatatzes. The Nicaean emperor was willing to arrange this in return for a joint undertaking against the Latins of Constantinople. This alliance was sealed by the marriage of John's daughter Helena to Theodorus II Laskaris, heir to the Nicaean throne. The head of the Bulgarian church was duly accorded patriarchal rank by a church council meeting at Kallipolis in 1235 (I. Tarmanidis, Cyrillicmethodianum 3 [1975] 28–52). The allies launched an assault on Constantinople. Such concrete gains as there were, however, went to the Nicaeans. John was therefore happy to come to an understanding with the Latins of Constantinople, until the sudden death of his Hungarian consort in 1237 convinced him that he was guilty of perjury; he hastened to make peace with the Nicaeans. In yet another turnabout he married Irene, daughter of Theodorus Komnenos Doukas, whom he allowed to return to Thessalonike. These vacillations were forced upon him by the large-scale settlement in his territories of Cumans, seeking refuge from the Mongols. They presaged the collapse of the Bulgarian state which followed his death.


-M.J.A.

JOHN CHRYSTOSM (Χρυσόστομος, "golden-mouth"), bishop of Constantinople (26 Feb. 398–20 June 404); saint; born Antioch between 340 and 350, died Komana 14 Sept. 407; feastday 13 Nov., translation of his relics 27 Jan. Born to a rich family, John received an excellent education, esp. under Libanius and Diodorus of Tarsos. He became a monk and retired briefly to the desert, then returned to Antioch, where he was ordained deacon (981) and priest (986) and became a popular preacher. Invited to Constantinople to succeed Nektarios as bishop, John became involved in a series of political struggles, acting in opposition to court favorites (Eutropios), the growing power of the Arian Goths mercenaries (Gainas), the increasing influence of Alexandria (Theophilos), and Empress Eudoxia. His invectives against the latter, whom he called "Jezebel" and "Herodias," proved fatal to his career; deposed at the Synod of the Oak at Chalcedon in Aug. 403, then briefly recalled after popular riots in the capital in his favor, he was banished in 404 to Koukousos in Armenia and died three years later during a move to a harsher exile.

John's reputation as orator was sustained throughout the Byz. millennium. Almost all of his voluminous writings have survived, in approximately 2,000 MSS; in addition a large number of spurious works bear his name. For example, the liturgy attributed to Chrysostom is not his work. The greater bulk of his oeuvre consists of exegetical homilies on particular books of the Old and New Testaments, the majority of them belonging to his Antiochene period. The preserved texts are often from his stenographers' notes rather than his own hand and are sometimes accompanied by a later polished version. John emphasized the historical and literal meaning of biblical texts, disdaining allegorical interpretations; he was also concerned to show how they could furnish spiritual guidance for everyday life. He used these homilies, esp. those on the New Testament (in particular the 90 on Matthew), as vehicles for attacks on Arianism, also combatting the Anomaean views of Eunomios in a series of sermons entitled On the Incomprehensible Nature of God. John was more distinguished as an orator than as a theologian. He used vague terms when discussing the hottest controversies of his time: thus he spoke of the unity of the natures in Christ without a clear definition of the union (henosis); he avoided the term theotokos although he stressed Christ's love of his mother; his attitude toward original
institution. His 21 homilies titled *On the Statues*, rebuking the Antiochene mob for overthrowing the imperial effigies in 387 in protest against a new tax, complement the account by Libanius and are of great value to secular and social historians (R. Browning, JRS 42 [1952] 13–20).

The first biography of John (by Palladius of Helenopolis?) appeared in 425, in the form of a fictitious dialogue in Rome between an anonymous Eastern bishop and the deacon Theodore (BHG 870). Several other vitae were also produced (F. Halkin, *Douze récits byzantins sur Saint Jean Chrysostome* [Brussels 1977]).

**Illustration of the Homilies of Chrysostom.** Unlike the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos, those by John were never codified in a standard edition and reproduced in numerous illustrated versions. Consequently, illuminators approached their task independently. Illustrations may provide commentary (Athens, Nat. Lib. 211) but more often represent the subject of the sermon. As author, John is depicted in the pose of an evangelist and is sometimes represented as inspired by Paul or Luke, shown leaning over his shoulder. In a Palaiologan portrait added to a 12th-C. MS (Milan, Ambros. A 172 sup.), John’s scroll changes into a stream of water for the faithful, an example of the fountain of life used also for other church fathers in late frescoes and MSS. The characteristic features of John, his sunken cheeks and high forehead, became exaggerated in the Palaiologan period.


**JOHN ELEEMON** (ʼΕλεήμων, “the merciful”), Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria (from 610); saint; born Amathous, Cyprus, died Cyprus 619/
born to a noble family, but the traditional view that his father was the patrikios and strategos Theodore is the result of a misinterpretation. John received a good education and served in the army but retired and became a monk. His identification with John of Melitene, whose poem is in the chronicle of Skylitzes (Skyl. 282f), is wrong (M. Bibikov in Bulgarsko srednovkovie [Sofia 1980] 65f).

John's epigrams contain abundant material concerning Byz. wars against Bulgaria and the Rus', as well as internal revolts. His favorite hero is Nikephoros II. He describes John I, who murdered Nikephoros and destroyed images of him, as transformed by this crime from a lion into a hare, trembling before his subjects and frightened by false dreams. This "Macbethian" theme of retribution is accompanied by a Christian indifference to the material world: after a few unhappy years of rule the emperor found rest in a grave only three cubits long.

John's general outlook is pessimistic: he foresees a political crisis, onslaughts of barbarians, peasant poverty, earthquakes, and a menacing comet. He praises his father but is very critical of conjugal ties. In his enkomion of the oak, the theme of a mother's love for her offspring is strongly emphasized (A. Littlewood, JÖB 29 [1980] 133-44). An erotic theme is treated allegorically: the lover whom a girl asked for some water symbolized Christ assuaging a moral thirst. Besides epigrams and progymnasmata, John produced hymns and odes dedicated to the Virgin and speeches on Gregory of Nazianzos and St. Pantelemon. The so-called Paradeisos, a collection of monastic epigrams, was apparently by John (P. Speck, BZ 58 [1965] 333-36). C.A. Trypanis hypothesized that a fresco in Kalenderhane Camii presents John's portrait (in Meletetama ste mne me Basileiou Lauorda [Thessalonike 1975] 301f).


JOHN ITALOS (Ιταλός), philosopher; born southern Italy ca.1025, died after 1082. John moved to Constantinople ca.1049, attended the lectures of Psellos, and polemicized with him. Supported by Michael VII and some civilian
officials, he replaced Psellus as hypatos ton philosophon. He fell into disfavor under Alexios I, however, and was condemned at a trial in 1082. Although the anathemas of 1082 accuse John of heresy and paganism (Gouillard, “Synodikon” 57–61), his own works present a rather moderate philosophy; accordingly, some scholars (such as N. Kečkemédi) describe John as a radical reformer, whereas P. Joannou, P. Stephanou, and L. Clucas emphasize his Christian orthodoxy. Thus his condemnation may have been caused by John’s bad character (stressed by Anna Komnene), political considerations, or his attention to classical philosophers, above all Aristotle. Whatever John’s own views were, his works and his trial demonstrate that he and his contemporaries discussed key philosophical problems such as the eternity of the cosmos, the existence of universalia, the existence of matter and physis (“nature”). John apparently also refuted the Neoplatonic thesis concerning the dialectic emanation of the world from the One.


—A.K.

JOHN KLIMAX (or ὁ τῆς Κλίμακος, “of the Ladder”), also called Scholastikos or Sinaiotes, theologian and saint; born before 579, died ca.650 (F. Nau, BZ 11 [1902] 35–37); feastday 30 Mar. His biography is barely known. According to his encomiast Daniel of Raithou, John received a general (enkyklios) education (and possibly was a scholastikos), but at age 16 took monastic vows, lived as an anchorite at the foot of Mt. Sinai, and eventually became the hegoumenos of the Sinai monastery.

Klimax’s major work, The Ladder of Paradise, or The Heavenly Ladder, summarizes the experience of the desert fathers as reflected in the Apophthegmata patrum. It is an unsystematic presentation of vices and virtues, in scenes and more often in direct indoctrinations and definitions; they do not form a hierarchy of modes of behavior and are only superficially connected with the concept of the ladder. John ends by quoting 1 Corinthians 13:13, saying that the three greatest virtues are faith, hope, and agape (Christian love), of which agape is the worthiest. Even though the monastic status is considered as supreme, the layman is not excluded from salvation if he avoids theft, falsehood, hatred, etc. (PG 88:640C–641A). John refers to angels and demons and to biblical personages, but never mentions the Virgin (S. Rabois-Bousquet, S. Salaville, EO 22 [1923] 450).

John’s style ranges between enigmatic obscurity and aphoristic simplicity of presentation; almost hymnic is the cadence of his repetitive definitions (“Penitence is the revocation of baptism. Penitence is a contract with God concerning the second life,” etc.—PG 88:764B). Metaphors and similes are abundant, often borrowed from animal mythology (e.g., a snake struggling against a deer). The Ladder was extremely popular; the text was commented on by scholars including Photios (G. Hofmann, OrChrP 7 [1941] 461–79) and translated in the West and in the Slav countries.

thios Boilas, also contains his will in which he mentions that he owned two copies of the Ladder.


JOHN LYDOS, scholar, bureaucrat, and writer; born Philadelphia (Lydia) 490, died ca.565. Well versed in Latin in addition to his native Greek, John came to Constantinople in 511 in search of a post in the palace ministries; he attended philosophy lectures in the interim. He owed the first of several appointments to the praetorian prefect Zotikos, a fellow countryman. John served 40 years in the civil service, earning the admiration of Justinian I, which helped him acquire a professorial chair. After retirement (ca.551) he settled down to a literary life.

His major work is On the Magistracies, a history and description of late Roman bureaucracy. The treatise is both interestingly antiquarian and a mirror of the social and intellectual life of his day, characterized by John's scholarly confidence (esp. his Latin expertise) and vicious attacks on high officials, notably John of Cappadocia, whose infamy he helped to secure. Continuity between the Roman past and the Byz. present is a major theme. The work is enriched by many digressions on scholarly matters, esp. philological. Also extant are On the Months, a history of calendars and feasts, again stressing continuity from Rome to Byz., and On Omens, a historical survey of divination and related matters that has earned John the label of last astrologer of the old world (Bandy, infra, xxix). Panegyrics on Zotikos and Justinian, a history of the latter's Persian war, and some poetry are lost.


LIT. T.F. Carney, Bureaucracy in Traditional Society: Roman-Byzantine Bureaucracies Viewed from Within (Lawrence, Kansas, 1971), with Eng. tr. of Magistracies. C.N. Tsirpanlis, "John Lydos on the Imperial Administration," Byzantium 44

John’s Roman Republic material. John was also a source for the Epitome of Zonaras (M. diMaio, Byzantion 50 [1980] 158–85).


JOHN OF BICLAR, bishop of Gerona and historian of the Visigoths; born Santarem (Scallabis) in Lusitania, died Spain ca.621. John is said by Isidore of Seville to have been a Goth, but this is nowhere evident in his work. Having been educated in Greek and Latin at Constantinople, he returned ca.576 to Spain, where he fell foul of the Ariani persecution of the Visigothic king Leovigild (568–86), resulting in ten years of exile and harassment. John subsequently founded a monastery at the now unidentifiable site of Biclar in Spain, drawing up the house rules for the brothers it attracted. He wrote a Latin chronicle, covering the years 567–90. Its narrative of Visigothic history is relatively impartial; in addition the chronicle is a valuable source for such matters as the military objectives of Justin II and Tiberios I and the former’s religious policies (Av. Cameron, SchH 13 [1976] 53f).


JOHN OF BRIONNE, Latin emperor of Constantinople (1231–37); born ca.1170, died Constantinople March 1237 (J.M. Buckley, Speculum 32 [1957] 315–22). This scion of a great French noble family enjoyed enough experience for several lifetimes: king of Jerusalem (1210–25), a leader of the Fifth Crusade, papal marshal, father-in-law and enemy of Frederick II Hohenstaufen, and finally emperor of Constantinople. Contemporaries admired his prowess and the elegant figure he cut. It was almost a matter of course that the barons of the Latin Empire of Constantinople should turn to him in 1228 when they were seeking a regent for Baldwin II. John
agreed to take up the defense of Constantinople, on condition that he be made emperor, with Baldwin succeeding him on his death. Terms were duly ratified in April 1229 at Perugia; Venice provided him with transports for his expedition. He reached Constantinople in autumn 1231 and was crowned emperor. His arrival aroused extravagant hopes that he might be able to restore the fortunes of the Latin Empire. A strike into Asia Minor had some success, but it pushed John III Vatatzes into an alliance against him with John Asen II. John organized a successful defense of Constantinople over the years 1235–36, but died soon after.

M.J.A.

JOHN OF CAESAREA, or John the Grammarian, early 6th-C. priest and theologian. His biography is unknown, and it is not clear whether his Caesarea was located in Palestine or Cappadocia. John was the first Neo-Chalcedonian. In 514–18 he wrote an *Apology* for the Council of Chalcedon in which he tried to harmonize Chalcedonian doctrine with the ideas of Cyril of Alexandria. The book consists of three parts: John's conciliatory teaching; an analysis of Cyril's position; criticism of Severos of Antioch. John rejected the Monophysite argument against the idea of two natures of Christ that allegedly implied that the whole Trinity would have to have been incarnated and introduced the concept of the “characteristic hypostasis” of Christ in which these two natures were united. Severos responded in a long *Refutation* that is preserved only in Syriac. Other works include tracts against the Akephaloi and Aphthartodocetism, homilies against the Manichaean, exegetics of the Gospel of John. He is probably to be identified with John the Orthodox, the author of a *Dialogue with a Manichaean*.


-A.K.

JOHN OF CAPPADOCIA (Καππαδόκων), high-ranking official; born Caesarea (Cappadocia) probably before 500, died Constantinople after 548. When Justinian I first met him in 520, John was the clerk of a *magister militum praesentalis*. Named praetorian prefect before 30 Apr. 531, John held the position (except from 15 Jan. to mid-Oct. 532) until May 541. He was energetic, astute, and clever, yet critics denounced him as drunken, gluttonous, debauched, brutal, and unscrupulous. John was said to be corrupt and excessively powerful, esp. because he economized on the military budget by removing many soldiers from military registers; he largely suppressed Latin, reduced the *sportulae* (see Synethae) of bureaucrats, and allegedly supplied faulty provisions to a naval expedition against the Vandals. Nikau rioters forced John’s temporary removal on 14 Jan. 532. He was consul in 538. In May 541 Empress Theodora succeeded in deposing him and confiscating his fortune and palace. John was first banished to Kyzikos and ordained as a deacon, but was then accused of murdering Bp. Eusebios of Kyzikos. Ignominiously deported to Antinoopolis in Egypt, John was allowed to return to Constantinople after Theodora died in 548, but only as a priest. Despite his faults, John was a principal force in the smooth functioning of the bureaucracy, most notably the efficient collection of taxes and the imposition of fiscal control.

-W.E.K.

JOHN OF DAMASCUS, theologian and saint; born Damascus ca.675 (according to J. Hocke, ca.650), died Lavra of St. Sabas 4 Dec. 749 (S. Vailhé, *EO* 9 [1906] 28–30; this precise date is suspect) or more probably ca.753/4; feastday 27 March, with variations. His vita, written by John VIII Chrysostomites, patriarch of Jerusalem, or by John IX, describes him as a member of an influential Arabo-Christian family, the Manṣūr, who controlled the financial administration of the caliphate. John received an excellent education together with his adoptive brother Kosmas the Hymnographer. Both became monks of the Lavra of St. Sabas. Patr. John V of Jerusalem (705–35) ordained John priest.

John was the greatest Eastern systematizer of Christian dogma. His major work, *Pege gnosseos* (The Fountain of Knowledge), consists of a terminological introduction ("Philosophical chap-
John wrote many polemical works, esp. against the Iconoclasts: accordingly the Council of Hieria (754) anathematized him as a supporter of the Saracens and teacher of impiety. John developed the Orthodox theory of images by categorizing six types of icon: the natural image as originating from the prototype; the idea (ennoiá), preexisting in God, of things; man as imitation (mimesis) of God; visible objects aiming at the representation of the invisible; corporeal objects that symbolize and presage the future; and objects reminiscent of the past.

John also worked as moralist, exegete, hagiographer, author of sermons, and hymnographer. Some works ascribed to him are spurious, however, including a speech against Constantine V (actually by John of Jerusalem), the Sacra Parallelæ, and Barlaam and Ioasaph. John was very popular in the West (J. de Ghellinck, BZ 21 [1912] 448-57), in Slavic lands, and in the Near East, where Theodore Abu-Qurra continued his traditions. The Arabic vita of John was written at the end of the 11th C. by the monk and priest Michael; the oldest Greek Life, by John of Jerusalem, was probably produced in the first half of the 12th C., although B. Hemmerdinger dates it before 969 (OrChrP 28 [1962] 422f).

JOHN OF EPHESUS, Syriac historian, born near Amida ca.507, died Chalcedon 586 or 588 (P. Allen, Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 10 [1979] 251-54). John was a Monophysite leader in Constantinople in the time of Justinian I, under whose orders he was sent in 542 as a missionary to the Ephesus region. Around 558 he was ordained bishop in Syria by Jacob Baradaeus. John preached against Jews and Montanists in Asia Minor and in 545/6 upbraided pagans, aristocrats, and intellectuals in Constantinople. After Justinian's death John was jailed for anti-Chalcedonian activities.

John wrote an ascetical tract titled Lives of the Eastern Saints. It recounts the stories of 58 holy men and women who lived in the Syriac-speaking milieu in John's own day, affording a rare glimpse into the world of the religious life of the Monophysite community. Of his Church History, written from a Monophysite point of view, only the third part survives in its entirety, covering the years 571-86. Sections of the second part are recoverable from the excerpts quoted by pseudo-Dionysius of Tell Mahrë, Michael I the Syrian, and Elias bar Shinâya. The History contains important evidence, for instance, on Slav invasions (A. Djakonov, VDI [1946] no.1, 20-34).


JOHN OF EPIPHANEIA (Syria), 6th-7th-C. historian. John was a lawyer, apo eparchon, and an adviser to Gregory, patriarch of Antioch (570-93). John wrote a history in formal continuation of Agathias, its main theme being the long war (572-92) between Byz. and Persia, culminating in the flight of Chosroes II and his restoration by Maurice. Only one fragment of this history survives, containing the introduction and beginning of the first book. Evagrios Scholastikos, a kinsman (5.24), states that John's work was not yet available to him in the 590s when he was writing his own history; this may either mean

---


it was in progress or published but not yet physically accessible.

ED. FHG 4:273–76.
LIT. Hunger, Lit. 1:312f.

JOHN OF EUBOEA, mid-8th-C. writer. His biography is barely known; the only ascertained fact is that he wrote one of his sermons in 744 (PG 96:1504D). In the lemmata of his authentic works he is called “the monk and priest of Euboea (or Euoia),” whereas in some spurious texts he appears as a bishop of Euboea. Because no such bishopric existed, Dölger (infra 7–9) located John in Eupoia/Euaria, a bishopric near Damascus (or in Eupoia in Epiros), but probably he was not a bishop (Halkin, infra 227).

John’s œuvre is not clearly determined. Some works by John of Damascus have been ascribed to him (J.M. Hoeck, OrchrP 17 [1951] 98, n.2), and vice versa. He wrote some sermons on Gospel themes—Mary’s conception, the resurrection of Lazarus, the massacre of the innocents—the last perhaps inspired by contemporary events. He also wrote the earliest extant legend of Paraskeve. John’s authorship of the so-called Religious Dispute at the Court of the Sasanians was rejected by E. Bratke (TU 19.3a [1899] 97).

LIT. Beck, Kirche 502f.

JOHN OF KARPATHOS, theologian. His biography is unknown, his dates questionable. Because Photios’s Bibliotheca (cod. 201) mentions John’s work, we know John lived before the 9th C. Some MSS (including the 9th-C. Jerusalem, Gr. Patr. Sabait. 408) call him bishop of Karpathos (an island between Crete and Rhodes). He may be the “John of Karpathos” who signed the decisions of the Council of 680. John had high repute, was sometimes characterized as a saint, and his works were included in the Philokalia.

Besides spurious texts (some actually by Elias Ekdikos), two collections of admonitions (centuria) bear John’s name: Consolations to the Monks of India and Theological and Gnostic Chapters. John understood asceticism as a constant struggle against demons. Vices—such as vainglory, gluttony, avarice—dwell in the inferior parts of the soul, and the monk’s task is to purge them and to develop his intellect (logistikos or nous): while the imperial treasury contains gold, the monk’s treasure is his knowledge of the intelligible. Although he refers primarily to the Bible, John is familiar with Stoic terminology; he also quotes Plutarch and uses Pythagoras, “whom the Greeks admired more than any other philosopher,” as an example of the virtue of silence.


JOHN OF NAPLES, deacon and author of a continuation (762–872) of the Deeds of the Bishops of Naples. The Deeds mirrors the position of Naples between Byz. and the West as its focus shifts from events in southern Italy—particularly the Arab advance—to Constantinople. The Deeds’ anonymous first section, composed sometime between about 834 and 849 according to Achelis (but cf. B. Bischoff, Mittelalterliche Studien, vol. 3 [Stuttgart 1981] 29, n.124), treats bishops and buildings from the beginnings to 754 using jejune
local sources augmented by the Liber pontificalis, Paul the Deacon, Gregory of Tours, etc. Although this author favored icons, his mutilated account of the Iconoclast Constantine V as a lion hunter, dragon slayer, and victor over Artabasdos is quite positive (S. Gero, GRBS 19 [1978] 155–59). Only a fragment survives of a second continuation by subdeacon Peter.

John’s Translatio S. Severini (BHL 7658) and Acta S. Januarii, Sosii et aliorum (BHL 4134–35) describe the Arab depredations. He may also have written the Acta Maximi Cumani, and, with the help of an unknown Byz., he certainly adapted into Latin a number of Byz. hagiographical works, including the Vita of Euthymios by Cyril of Skythopolis (ed. F. Dolbeau, MEFRM 94.1 [1982] 315–36), a Life of Nicholas by Patr. Methodios I (ed. P. Corsi, Nicolaus 7 [1979] 359–80), and a Passion of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia, offering eloquent testimony on the cultural orientation of Naples in his lifetime.


—M. McC.

**JOHN OF NIKIU**, Egyptian bishop and chronicler; fl. late 7th C. Little is known of his life save that as bishop of Nikiu he was appointed overseer of all the monasteries, but was suspended from the priesthood because he caused the death of a monk whom he had disciplined. Probably after this incident John wrote a chronicle along conventional Byz. lines, beginning with Adam and ending with the immediate aftermath of the Arab conquest of Egypt. Thought to have been originally written in Greek with some sections in Coptic, it survives in two late Ethiopic MSS. The Ethiopic text, translated from Arabic in 1602, is in deplorable condition. Sections are missing, and some chapter headings are unrelated to the contents of the chapters. How faithful the Arabic and Ethiopic translations are to John’s original cannot be determined; the Ethiopic version indicates influence from traditional Arabic historiography. For the period of the Arab conquest, the *Chronicle* remains the earliest and only eyewitness account, antedating the earliest Arab accounts by almost 200 years.


—D.W.J.

**JOHN OF POUTZE** (ἐκ Πούτζης), tax collector; fl. 1120s-1157. John served John II and Manuel I as general superintendent of revenue collection (logistes megistos—Nik.Chon. 54.76, probably megas logariastes) and protonotarios of the dromos (Kresten, “Styppieotes” 84f). During John’s reign, he was scrupulously upright and an unrelenting collector of revenue; he convinced John II to divest the taxes raised for the navy into the general treasury and pay for ships only when needed. To preserve his position under Manuel, John totally changed his style, greedily enriching himself and his family. The stories of his glutony and avarice told by Choniates (56–58) reflect oral traditions that survived among the bureaucrats of Constantinople.

lit. Ahrweiler, Mer 230–33.

—C.M.B.

**JOHN OF RILA**, Bulgarian monk and saint; born near Kjustendil between ca.876 and 880, died 18 Aug. 946; feastdays 1 July, 18 Aug., 17 Oct. After leaving the monastery where he had taken his vows, he lived for many years as a hermit in the Struma (Strymon) valley and on Mt. Vitoša. He founded a monastery at Rila in the mountains east of the upper Struma ca.930–31. In 941 he returned to the eremitic life near his monastery. His reputation for holiness spread far and wide during his lifetime and after his death; as a result his remains were taken first to Sofia, then to Hungary, and finally to Tarnovo, before being returned to Rila. Many vitae of John were written, but none is contemporary. The oldest Slavonic vita was composed before 1183. A mid-12th-C. Greek Life by George Skylitzes survives only in Slavonic translation. The most widely copied Life is that by Patr. Evtimij of Tarnovo, which makes critical use of earlier material. John’s only surviving work was a spiritual testament establishing rules for his monastery (ed. Ivanov, 136–42). His cult is widespread in the Orthodox world, and he is represented in many Byz. and post-Byz. wall paintings and icons.

—R.B.

JOHN OF SARDIS, name of several metropolitans of the city. The first of them, a corresponding member of Theodore of Studios, participated in the Council of 815 (J. Pargoire, EO 5 [1901-02] 161). C. Foss (Byzantine and Turkish Sardis [Cambridge, Mass.-London 1976] 66) distinguishes him from John II, a victim of the Iconoclasts. In an unpublished text Demetrios of Kyzikos praises their homonym, who lived before 950, for his knowledge of divine and human sciences (Laurent, Corpus 5.1:263). Two seals of John are dated in the second half of the 11th C. Another John signed the minutes of the Council of 1147 (PG 147:500C).

It is unclear which of them, if any, can be identified with the author of the Commentary on the Progymnasmata of Aphthonios, which in the 14th-C. Vat. gr. 1408 is ascribed to John of Sardis. Beck (Kirche 510) sees in him the contemporary of Theodore. Foss identifies him with John II, whereas Rabe (Commentarium, xvi) places him in the second half of the 10th C. In any case this commentary was known to John DOXOPATRES (2nd half of the 11th C.), who also mentions John’s scholia on Hermogenes. In his commentary John used commentaries on Aristotle and progymnasmata produced in the 5th–6th C. According to Hunger (Lit. 1:78), this points to a survival rather than revival of the knowledge of antiquity; if, however, John lived ca.950, this thesis should be reconsidered. A John of Sardis also wrote hagiographical works (BHG 2151, 1334).


—A.K.

JOHN OF SKYTOPOLIS. See JOHN SCHOLASTIKOS.

JOHN PATRIKIOS, appointed by Emp. Leontios in 697 to lead a naval expedition against the Arabs in North Africa. John recaptured Carthage and several surrounding towns, but in 698 ‘Abd al-Malik sent a superior fleet, forcing him to retreat for supplies and reinforcements to Crete, where mutinous supporters of Tiberios II killed him.


—P.A.H.

JOHN PETRICI (of Petritzos), the most notable translator of Greek philosophical texts into Georgian; died Georgia soon after 1125. John was educated in Constantinople, a pupil of Psellus and John Italos. He spent approximately 20 years after 1083 at the Georgian monastery of Petritzos at Bačkovo. He then returned to Georgia, to the monastery and academy at Gelati founded by David II/IV the Restorer. His translations include works of history (Antiquities of Josephus Flavius), theology (John Klimax), and most importantly numerous philosophical texts (Aristotle, Topika and On Interpretation [which have not survived], Nemesios, On the Nature of Man, and Proklos Diadochus, Elements of Theology [with an original commentary]). These are slavishly literal. John’s desire to establish a Georgian tradition of philosophy, reconciling Aristotelian, Platonic, and Christian thought, ultimately failed because of the obscurity of his own writings and lack of interest among his countrymen, but his efforts had a significant impact on later Georgian philosophy. His translation and commentary on Proklos were rendered into Armenian in 1284.


—R.T.

JOHN ROGER. See Rogerios, John.

JOHN SCHOLASTIKOS, Neo-Chalcedonian theologian, bishop of Skytopolis (ca.536–50). John tried to reconcile the statements of the Council of Chalcedon with the teaching of Cyril of Alexandria but was attacked by a strictly dyophysite anonymous writer in a treatise with the title Against Nestorios that concealed its real purpose. Photios (Bibl., cod.95) suggests that the author was Basil of Cilicia; in a later passage (cod.107) Photios says that Basil was a Nestorian who borrowed from
Diodoros of Tarsos and Theodore of Mopsuestia but avoided a direct attack on Cyril. John answered the anonymous writer with a tract entitled Against Those Who Have Cut Themselves off from the Church, criticizing also Eutyches, Dioskoros, and other Monophysites. Since all of these works are known only in fragments, the real substance of the dispute is hard to establish (E. Honigmann, Évèques et évêchès monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle [Louvain 1951] 80f). John was subsequently involved in Orthodox polemics against Severos of Antioch and the Orthodox Monophysites. He was also the first scholiast on the writings of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite (PG 4:15–432, 527–76), attempting to exploit him for Orthodox beliefs; his commentaries, translated into Syriac ca.800, were preserved along with those of Maximos the Confessor.


JOHN SIKELIOTES, orator; fl. ca.1000. At the order of Basil II, John Sikelioites delivered in the Pikridion monastery a speech (RhetGr, ed. Walz 6:447:24–26) that is now lost. His identification with John Doxopatres was rejected by H. Rabe (RhM 62 [1907] 581, n.1). John is known primarily as a commentator of Hermogenes; his scholia to Ailios Aristides have also been discovered (F.W. Lenz, Aristeidesstudien [Berlin 1964] 99, 114).


JOHN SIKELIOTES, purported chronicler. Krumbacher (GBL 386–88) admitted reluctantly the existence of John, identifying him with the "Sikelioites didaskalos" mentioned in the preface to Skylitzes (Skyl. 3.18). This second John Sikelioites is, however, a result of palaeographical "corrections" by Andrew Darmarios in the 16th C.: Darmarios introduced John’s name in the title of the chronicle by George Hamartolos and probably on the MS of the chronicle ascribed to Theodore Skoutariotes as well.


JOHN SMBAT ('Ioσβανέιτης, Arm. Yovhannēs Smbat), son of GAGIK I; BAGRATID king of Armenia (ca.1017/20–1040/1). His authority was challenged from the start by his brother Asot IV the Brave, with whom he was forced to divide the lands of the kingdom of Ani. Thanks to these quarrels, Giorgi I, the ruler of the newly united kingdom of Abchasia and Iberia, was able to capture John Smbat, whom he released only after the sack of Ani and the surrender of several border fortresses. When Emp. Basil II advanced in 1022 to complete the Byz. annexation of the lands of David of Taby/Tao and laced waste to Iberia, John Smbat tried to conciliate the emperor: the childless king sent the katholikos Peter Getadarj to Constantinople with his testament in which he willed his realm to Byz., keeping only a life tenure with the title of magistros. The death of Basil II delayed the implementation of this agreement, but when John Smbat died, Emp. Michael IV demanded the immediate fulfillment of the testament, which became the legal basis for the Byz. annexation of the kingdom of Ani in 1045.


JOHN THE ALMSGIVER. See John Eleemon.

JOHN THE BAPTIST, precursor (prodromos) of Christ, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, a relative of the Virgin Mary. Three episodes of his life were held to have a special significance: the appearance of an angel predicting John’s birth, his baptism of Jesus and prophecies concerning the role of Jesus, and his arrest by Herod and his beheading. In Christian tradition John occupies an exceptional place, his life being described in apocryphal gospels and acts, homilies, and hymns. In monastic literature John appears as an ideal type of monk. He was the object of great veneration. In Constantinople alone at least 36 churches and monasteries were dedicated to him, of which the most famous was the Stoudios; others were Lips, the Prodromos in Petra, in Sphorakion, etc. The monastery of Phoberou on the Asiatic shore of the Bosporus was also dedicated to the Prodromos. Various relics were connected with the
cult of John, esp. his head (of which several examples are mentioned in various texts) and hand. Among authors who wrote on John were Sophronios of Jerusalem, Leontios of Constantinople, Theodore of Studious, John Maurpous, Maximos Holobolos, Thomas Magistros, Neilos Kabasilas, and Manuel II.

Feasts of John the Baptist. The conception (syllepsis) of John (Lk 1:5–25), commemorated 23 Sept., was the original Byz. civil New Year and beginning of the church calendar until ca. 462 when the indiction was shifted to 1 Sept. Not found originally in Jerusalem, the conception feast may be of Constantinopolitan origin and is undoubtedly the original feast of John in the capital. It initiated the course-reading of Luke in the Evangelion. Neither this feast nor the Nativity (genethlion) of John on 24 June had any special liturgical solemnity.

More important was the 29 Aug. commemoration of his beheading (apotome tes timias kephales) described in Mark 6:14–29. Celebrated in Jerusalem ever since the 5th C. (Severos of Antioch, PO 36:358–66) and at the Studious monastery from the 10th C., this feast was to acquire greater solemnity than the other two with the gradual substitution of the Palestinian Sabaitic Typika for the Typikon of the Great Church after 1204. The beheading is one of but two Byz. feasts that are also days of fasting.

Representation in Art. Longhaired and progressively more haggard, John is generally represented in art wearing a prophet's pallium and often the fur mantle of Elijah since he was called a new Elijah (Mt 11:14). From the 11th C. onward, he manifests his role as ascetic exemplum by wearing the fur melote of the desert ascetic or the monastic mandyas. Depicted first in catacombs in scenes of the Baptism of Christ (see EPIPHANY), he appears independently by the 6th C. (Cathadera of MAXIMIAN, where he displays a lamb, recalling Jn 1:36). Stories of his life, death, and relics were being depicted by the 9th C. (e.g., an icon described by Theodore of Studious, PG 99:768AB). In post-Iconoclastic art, John is represented more frequently than anyone except Christ and Mary. Richly illustrated Gospel books depict his birth, naming, ministry, recognition, baptism of Christ, imprisonment, and death. Evangelia illustrate the discoveries (inventiones) of his relics; cycles of his ministry and baptisms accompany the homily on baptism of GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS and adorned the baptistery of HAGIA SOPHIA in Constantinople (ca. 1200); and semicannical cycles of his life and relics were depicted in churches (Babić, Chapelles annexes 121, 138, 140, 162, etc.). John appears as the classic third member of the DEESIS and in scenes of the Anastasis. In Palaiologan art, narrative cycles of John are further elaborated, and when John is shown in Paradise, he is given angels' wings (M. Tatić-Djuric, Zbornik Narodnog Muzeja 7 [1973] 39–51).


—J.I., A.K., R.F.T., A.W.C.

JOHN THE EVANGELIST, MONASTERY OF. See PATMOS.

JOHN THE EXARCH, Bulgarian writer and translator; died probably between 917 and 927. His fine knowledge of Greek and his familiarity with Byz. theology and philosophy suggest that he was educated in Constantinople, where he may have been sent by Tsar Boris I. From the late 9th C. he was a member of the circle of intellectuals at Preslav under the patronage of Tsar Symeon and held the office of exarch of the Bulgarian church; the functions of this office are unknown.

By 893 he had already translated substantial excerpts from John of Damascus's On the Orthodox Faith. This entailed the creation of a new technical vocabulary and a means of expressing abstract concepts in Old Church Slavonic, the difficulty of which he recognized and discussed perceptively. His Šestodnev, written somewhat later, was based on the Hexaemeron of Basil the Great and his Greek commentators, and the On the Constitution of Man of Meletios the Monk. By adding much material of his own, John made the Šestodnev a kind of encyclopedia of medieval Orthodox cosmology and culture. It contains interesting information on Bulgaria in the author's time, such as the long description of Symeon's palace in book 6. He also wrote a series of festal sermons.
John helped create medieval Slavonic literature. His wide knowledge, his command of classical rhetoric, and his occasional poetic lyricism gave him great influence both on southern Slavic literature and on the early literature of Rus'.


---

JOHN THE GRAMMARIAN. See JOHN VII Grammatikos.

JOHN THE ORPHANOTROPHOS, politician; died Lesbos 13 May 1043. He was a eunuch and belonged to a family of money-changers (G. Litavrin, VizVrem 33 [1972] 39). Psellos (Chron. 1:44 no.18.5–7) says John advised Basil II. He supported Romanos III even before the latter's coronation. Romanos made him senator and praspositos. He aided the emperor in his conflicts with nobles such as Constantine Diogenes and Constantine Dalassenos. John promoted his brother to the throne as Michael IV and thereby gained control of civil and military affairs, even though he was only orphanotrophos (Beck, Ideen, pt.XIII [1955] 329, n.1). Aristakes Lastivertc't declares that John was entrusted with pronoia and legal documents of the palace (K. Juzbašjan, VizVrem 16 [1959] 24–28); he probably became kourator of Mangana. During a famine, John purchased grain from the Peloponnesos and Hellas for Constantinople. In 1037 he vainly attempted to dismiss Alexios Stoudites and to become patriarch himself. Skylitzes (Skyl. 397:52–57) preserves a story of his healing by Nicholas of Myra. Because of Michael IV's advancing epilepsy, John arranged the succession of Michael V, but upon his accession Michael replaced John as imperial favorite by his brother Constantine, who then exiled John. The accession of Constantine IX finally ruined him. He was sent to Lesbos and blinded, and he soon died. The chroniclers emphasize John's greed and harsh taxation while Psellos depicted him vividly (Jenkins, Studies, pt.IV [1954] 15); closely following the text, the illustrated Madrid Skylitzes (Grabar-Manoussac, Skylitzès, nos. 504–51) pays elaborate attention to John's domestic intrigues.


---

JOHN UGLJEŠA (Ουγκλεσις in the Greek sources), Serbian despotes of Serres (from before 1366), called autokrator in a Greek act of 1369; died Černomir on the Marica River 26 Sept. 1371. The brother of Vukašin, he began his career at the court of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, whom he probably served as hippokomos or groom. After Dušan's death in 1355, Uglješa served his widow Helena in Serres and became de facto ruler of the southeastern region of Dušan's empire, including Christopolis, Philippi, Drama, and Zichna. Drama was probably the inheritance of his wife Helena, the daughter of Caesar Vojhna, who was governor of Drama. It is not clear if John Uglješa is to be identified with the grand voivode Ouglesis, who signed an act that is probably to be dated to 1358 (Koukoumen, App. IIC, p.231).

Mt. Athos was also within the territory controlled by Uglješa and he made lavish donations to several monasteries, esp. Hilandar, Koutloumousiou, and Vatopedi. In 1371 he reached a reconciliation with the patriarchate of Constantinople by agreeing to condemn the policy of Dušan, "the alleged autokrator of Serbia and "Romania," who had unjustly seized cities belonging to the jurisdiction of the Byz. state and patriarchate (MM 1:562.11–25). In Jan. 1371, Sabas, protos of Mt. Athos, granted to Uglješa a small monastery (monydrion) called Makrou (or Makre) for the retirement of the despotes, bestowing upon this monydrion the rank of a great monastery (Xén.oph., no.31). Uglješa did not have the opportunity, however, to retire to Athos since he and his brother were defeated by the Turks that same year at the battle of MARICA, and both fell on the battlefield.

The Greek epitaph of his sister Helena, the spouse of the powerful Serbian lord Nicholas Radonja, survives in the chapel of St. Nicholas on Mt. Menoikeion (S. Suboćić, S. Kisas, ZRVI 16 [1975] 161–81). Uglješa's wife Helena became the nun Jefimija, the first Serbian poetess.

JOHN VLADISLAV, ruler of Bulgaria (1015–18); died near Dyrrhachion Feb. 1018. Son of Aaron, one of the Komitopouloi, he survived the massacre of that branch of the family by Samuil of Bulgaria on the intervention of Samuel’s son Gabriel Radomir. After Samuel’s death, Gabriel Radomir ruled what remained of Bulgaria, until he was killed by John, perhaps at the suggestion of Basil II. A truce between Basil and John was soon broken. John procured the murder of John Vladimir, ruler of Duklja (Dokleja), Samuel’s son-in-law. In a vain effort to seize Dyrrhachion, John was killed. His wife Maria surrendered Ohrid, herself, her sons (Traianos, Radomir, and Klement), and six daughters to Basil; three other sons, Prousianos, Alosianos, and Aaron, yielded later.


C.M.B.

JONAH (Iovan), one of the 12 Minor Prophets. The Book of Jonah recounts his stay “for three days and three nights” in the belly of a great fish rather than his prophecy of days to come. Exegesis of the Book of Jonah was very popular in the 3rd–5th C., Jerome’s commentary forming the peak of it; much later Theophylaktos of Ohrid interpreted the book of Jonah (PG 126:905–68). The explanation went two ways: an allegorical-anthropological approach explained the narrative as indicating the material wickedness of mankind (Jonah on his boat is the soul imprisoned in the body), the Christological approach emphasized the similarity of Jonah’s fate and the story of Christ, Jonah being a prefiguration of Christ and of his descent to Hades. Different authors ascribed to Jonah different attitudes toward the Ninevites: in the sermon of Pseudo-Athanasiyas, Jonah is full of sympathy for the sinners of Nineveh, whereas Basil of Seleukeia makes him hate them and expect their chastisement.

Representation in Art. Artistic depictions of Jonah appear very early, as in the late 3rd-C. sculpture group in Cleveland (Age of Spirit, nos. 365–68). Representations of Jonah were esp. popular in the catacombs and on sarcophagi because of his role in the Commendatio animae. The theme remained well known through its repetition in Psalters, as an illustration to the Ode of Jonah. The soteriological content of the book and the typological parallel drawn by Jesus himself (Mt 12:40) ensured its continuing popularity in MSS of the 10th–14th C., including the Menologion of Basil II (W. Nyssen, Frühchristliches Byzanz [Trier 1978] 75–79, 160), MSS of Kosmas Indikopleustes (Kosm. Ind. 1:152, figs. 25–26, 2:222–25), and the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos (Omont, Miniatures, pl. 20). Jonah also appears on the Bresca casket. Frequently Jonah is depicted among the prophets in monumental art, usually portrayed as bald, often with a short gray beard.


A.K., J.H.L., C.B.T.

JORDAN (Iordan), river in Palestine; more specifically, a locus sanctus on the river about 8 km north of the Dead Sea, where two biblical events were commemorated: the Baptism of Christ (see Epiphany) and the assumption of Elijah into heaven. Pilgrim veneration at the site included baptism and immersion: the Piacenza pilgrim observed this ritual on Epiphany. A pillar marked the spot, and a church founded by Emp. Anastasios I was nearby. John Phokas (ch. 22), who calls Jordan “the holiest among rivers” in honor of the mystery of Christ’s baptism, lists three monasteries in the area: those of Kalamon, of Chrysostom, and of John the Baptist, the last rebuilt by Manuel I. In contrast to Phokas, Constantine Manasses (ed. K. Horna, BJ 13 [1904] 333.288–93) had a negative attitude toward the Jordan, criticizing its muddy and foul-tasting water.

Representation in Art. Male personifications of the river occur frequently in images of the Baptism of Christ and in the Joshua Roll and some Octateuchs containing scenes of Israelites carrying the Ark of the Covenant across the Jordan; more rarely the personification of the
river appears in the context of Elijah’s ascension. Like antique river-gods he often carries an urn; sometimes he is labeled merely potamos (“river”). Jordan assumes a variety of forms: on a 6th-C. medallion at Dumbarton Oaks he appears as two figures—his twin sources, Ior and Dan, emerging from shells. He may be represented as a youth, as on the cathedral of Maximian, or, as at Daphni, as a mature man. In the marginal Psalters Jordan is either a squatting, fully clothed individual or a half-naked divinity seen from the rear. In monumental painting of the 13th–15th C., he is more active, sometimes straddling one or more dolphins.


JORDANES, Latin historian; died June/July 552?, according to Wagner (infra 29). Of partly Gothic origins, Jordanes was notary to Gunthigis-Baza, chieftain of the Goths. His later resignation from this position was probably connected with his “conversion,” an event of debated significance: a switch from Arian to Orthodox views, taking of monastic vows, or simply retirement have all been suggested.

Circa 551 Jordanes produced a three-part history. The Romana is composed of two sections: the De summa temporum (now lost), a universal chronicle extending to the reign of Augustus; and a Roman history from Romulus to 550/1. It is dedicated to a certain Vigilius, probably not the pope of that name. Of much greater significance is the Getica, a history of the Goths up to 551, composed at the behest of a certain Castalius. Written in faltering Latin, the Getica is abridged from the lost Gothic Histories of Cassiodorus and derived from many first- and second-hand sources, including Priskos of Panion and Ammius Marcellinus (B. Baldwin, RBPH 59 [1981] 141–46). It is a fascinating source for barbarian history and society, including a notable portrait of Attila; it also offers (e.g., ch.143) brief but vivid glimpses of Constantinople. Jordanes writes with a clear pro-Byz. bias: for him Constantinople is the urb, the East is nostrae partes (“our regions”), and Jus-


—B.B.

JOSEPH, son of Jacob; biblical patriarch. In the Hellenistic apocryphal Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, he became the type of the “good man” who both loves (and fears) God and loves his neighbor. Byz. literature presented Joseph primarily as a paragon of chastity, emphasizing his behavior toward the wife of Potiphar, whose advances he rejected; this topic is developed, among others, in a homily of Basil of Seleukeia (PG 85:112–25) and another ascribed to John Chrysostom (PG 56:587–90). A second theme connected with Joseph is the apocryphal confession of Joseph’s wife, Asenath, the daughter of a different Potiphar (P. Batiffol, Studia Patristica [Paris 1889–90] 39–86).

Representation in Art. Depictions of Joseph arose from Byz. interest in the long narrative of his fluctuating fortunes (Gen 37:2–50:26), rather than his status as a patriarch. This is reflected in the uneven distribution of the material—extensive in 5th- and 6th-C. Genesis MSS and on the cathedral of Maximian (S. Tsuji in Synthronum, 43–51), but sparse after Iconodasm, with the exception of some cycles (as in the Octateuchs) or scenes (e.g., the Khudov Psalter’s illustrations to Ps 104:17, 21, 23) based on early sources. There are also some puzzling analogies, such as the full-page miniature with a lengthy Joseph cycle in five registers in the Paris Gregory and the Joseph cycle in the narthex frescoes at Sopočani. Joseph was esp. popular in Byz. Egypt.

JOSEPH, husband of the Virgin Mary. In New Testament apocrypha, such as the Protoevangelion of James, Joseph plays a limited number of marginal roles. The church fathers mention him occasionally in the context of his marriage, which they praised. The story of Joseph the Carpenter is told in a Coptic devotional text of probably the end of the 4th C.; the original Greek version is lost (S. Morenz, Die Geschichte von Joseph dem Zimmermann [Berlin 1951]). A feast of Joseph was unknown in the Greek church, but he was commemorated on the Sunday after Christmas.

Representation in Art. Generally absent from early Christian art, Joseph assumed his peripheral, but thereafter abiding, place as spectator in images of the Nativity on 5th-C. ivories (Vollbch, Elfenbeinarbeiten, no.119); the cathedra of Maximian enlarges this role to include his first dream and the Flight into Egypt. Based presumably on the Protoevangelion, scenes such as Joseph’s flowering rod and trial by water appear in 10th-C. Cappadocia. Joseph is represented, unusually, with his sons and the tools of his trade in the illustrations of the homilies of James of Kokkinobaphos, which dwelt on Joseph’s reproaches to the Virgin. Consistent with a passion for narrative detail, events involving Joseph in Mary’s life down to the Annunciation were favored in Palaiologan painting. The fullest such cycles are in St. Clement, Ohrid, and in the Chora (J. Lafontaine-Dosogne in Underwood, Kariye Djami 4:184–94).

JOSEPH I, patriarch of Constantinople (28 Dec. 1266–9 Jan. 1275; 31 Dec. 1282–Mar. 1283); died Constantinople 23 Mar. 1283. Joseph served as anagnostes for over 30 years (1222–54) and was married for eight. In 1295/60 he became superior of the Lazaro monastery on Mt. Galesios. He succeeded Arsenios Autoreianos as patriarch of Constantinople, after the latter refused to retract his excommunication of Michael VIII Palaiologos for the blinding of John IV Laskaris. Joseph, who was Michael’s spiritual confessor, pardoned Michael in 1267, thus aggravating the Arsenite schism. He crowned Andronikos II as co-emperor in 1272 but would not agree to Michael’s plans for Union of the Churches at the Council of Lyons. In 1273 he swore an oath never to accept Union under the conditions imposed by Rome (V. Laurent, EO 26 [1927] 396–407), and early in 1274 he retired to the Peribleptos monastery in Constantinople. He formally resigned the next year. After Michael’s death and the deposition of the Unionist patriarch John XI Bekkos, Joseph returned briefly to the patriarchate but was soon forced to abdicate because of poor health. R. Macrides (Byz. Saint 79–81) rejects Laurent’s claim that Joseph was “canonized” by Gregory II; he was recognized as “confessor” but never received popular veneration.


JOSEPH II, patriarch of Constantinople (21 May 1416–10 June 1439); born Bulgaria? ca.1360?, died Florence 10 June 1439. Of Bulgarian background, Joseph was allegedly John Asen, an illegitimate son of John II Šisman (1371–93), last tsar of Bulgaria (V. Laurent, REB 13 [1955] 131–34); I. Dujčev (REB 19 [1961] 333–39) suggests, however, that his father may have been Ivan Alexander. Because he restored the monastery of Christ Philanthropos in Constantinople, Laurent also hypothesizes that Joseph’s mother was a Greek of the Philanthropenos family. Nothing certain is known of his biography until he was appointed metropolitan of Ephesus ca.1393. Patriarch under Manuel II Palaiologos and John VIII, he was a supporter of Union of the Churches. J. Nikolov (BBulg 4 [1973] 202–12) hypothesizes that Joseph attended the Council of Constance in 1416–17. Despite ill health, the long-bearded octogenarian was a major figure at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (V. Laurent, REB 20 [1962] 5–60); his realistic portrait, possibly by an Italian artist, is attached to a list of patriarchs in Paris, B.N. gr. 1783 (Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.177). With regard to the controversial filioque clause and the Procession of the Holy Spirit, Joseph took the position that the prepositions δια and ἐκ were equivalent, and therefore the teachings of both churches were correct. He
died of dropsy before the end of the council and was buried in Florence at the Church of S. Maria Novella.

ED. AASS Aug. 1:185f.
LIT. Gill, Personality 15–34. PLP, no.9073.

—A.M.T., A.C.

JOSEPH RHAKENDYTE (Ῥακένδυτης, "wearer of rags," one of the terms for a monk), also known as Joseph the Philosopher, learned monk and physician; born Ithaca ca.1260? (PLP) or ca.1280? (Stiernon), died Thessalonike ca.1330. Of modest background, he was a monk in Thessalonike and on Athos before coming to Constantinople ca.1307. In 1320 Joseph was an emissary from Andronikos III to Andronikos II. He was four times nominated as patriarch, but always declined. He belonged to a group of literati that flourished in Constantinople under Andronikos II and included among his friends and correspondents Nikephoros Choumnos, Nikephoros Gregoras, and Theodore Metochites, who wrote a funerary enkomion of him. Joseph was a man of wide-ranging concerns, including philosophy, rhetoric, physics, mathematics, astronomy, and theology. Like many 14th-C. intellectuals he was interested in medicine; he was the teacher of John Aktouarios and healed Michael Gabras of an eye affliction. About 1324 he retired to a mountain near Thessalonike, where he spent his final years.

Joseph is best known for his Encyclopedia, a compendium of knowledge that included rhetoric, mathematics, music, and theology; only the section on rhetoric has been published. He also wrote hymns (G. Pentogalos, Hellenika 23 [1970] 114–18) and prayers.

ED. RhetGr, ed. Walz, 3:467–569.

—A.M.T.

JOSEPH THE HYMNOGRAPHER, saint; born Sicily (Palermo, according to E. Tomadakes) between 812 and 818, died Constantinople ca.886 at age 70; feastday 3 Apr. The dates ca.810–83 have also been suggested, but Stiernon (infra 248–53) questions the traditional chronology of Joseph’s life. Brought by his parents to the Peloponnese, Joseph fled to Thessalonike, became a monk, then moved to Constantinople. Captured by Cretan Arabs on his way from Constantinople to Rome, he managed to return from Crete to Constantinople. In the capital he founded the monastery of the apostle Bartholomew. As a supporter of Patr. Ignatios, he was exiled by Photios to the Crimea; after his return, he was appointed patriarchal sketophylax.

Joseph belonged to the poetic school of Stouarios. He contributed much to the transformation of the kanon from loosely linked paraphrases of Old Testament canticles into a unity wherein a single thought is skillfully worked out and varied in all the odes. Joseph was among the first to reduce the number of stanzas in the kontakion compatible with acrostic poetry. Some of his hymns were dedicated to saints of his own time, such as his spiritual father Gregory of Dekapolis, Peter of Athos (D. Papachryssanthou, AB 88 [1970] 27–41), and Theodora of Thessalonike (Des Klerikers Gregorios Bericht über Leben, Wunderthaten and Translation der hl. Theodora von Thessalonich, ed. E. Kurtz [St. Petersburg 1902] 82–86). The authorship of the latter raises problems since Theodora died in 892, that is, after the traditional date of Joseph’s death. Tomadakes (infra 273–85) established a list of approximately 400 works by Joseph; their attribution, however, is not always certain. Vitae of Joseph were written by his contemporary, Theophanes (whose identification with Theophanes of Sicily has been disproved), and later by the deacon John; John’s attitude is more pro-Photian than that of Theophanes (G. da Costa-Louillet, Byzantion 25–27 [1957] 822). A puzzle with regard to Joseph’s biography is the silence about him in the Life of Gregory of Dekapolis, since Joseph’s hagiographers present him as Gregory’s closest friend.

Representation in Art. As a melode, Joseph appears at Lagoudera, a standing monk carrying a roll. In the parekklesion of the church of the Chora Monastery, he occupies a pendentive and writes at a desk like an Evangelist; his scroll bears the words of his kanon for the Akathistos Hymn.


—A.K., D.C., N.P.S.
JOSEPH THE PHILOSOPHER. See Joseph Rhaklndytes.

JOSEPHUS FLAVIUS ('Iωσητος), Jewish priest, historian, and apologist; fl. ca.38-after 100. His works written in Greek (Jewish War and esp. Jewish Antiquities) were among the most important sources for the Byz. interested in the ancient history of Palestine. They were designated authoritative by Eusebios of Caesarea and broadly used by chroniclers: for John Chrysostom, Josephus was, after Plato, his favorite pagan author (S. Krawczynski, U. Riedinger, BZ 57 [1964] 8); in the section of Constantine VII's Excerpta titled On Virtues and Vices Josephus is quoted 119 times, while the Souda preserves over 200 citations. Greek MSS are known from the 10th C. onward, but Photios had already read several of Josephus's works in the 9th C. Probably in the 9th or 10th C. an epitome was compiled, later used by Zonaras. Josephus was considered a stylistic model by Photios, Gregory Pardos, and Theodore Metochites, and was imitated by some Byz. authors (e.g., Niketas Choniates). Several works were falsely ascribed to Josephus by church fathers and Photios, among them the so-called 4th book of the Maccabees and On the Essence of the Whole (Photios, Bibl., cod.48).

Josephus was early translated into Latin; a translation of the War is ascribed to Rufinus, a translation of Antiquitates was arranged by Cassiodorus; an epitome of the War, the so-called Hecesippus (4th C.), has been wrongly attributed to Ambrose. Latin versions of Josephus have survived inter alia in a papyrus of the 6th–7th C. and a 9th-C. parchment MS. A recension of Josephus, the so-called Sepher Yosippon, was produced in Hebrew. Syriac, Slavic, Armenian, Georgian, and Arabic translations are also known.


Representation in Art. Joshua's encounter with an archangel (interpreted as the archistrategos Michael), his battles with the men of Ai, and his arrest of the sun's course at Jericho were all depicted in the Octateuch, while the first of these events is represented on a fresco surviving from the Theotokos church at Hosios Loukas. While the angel here is preserved only in fragments, the fully armed figure of Joshua parallels the emphasis on his generalship in the Joshua Roll and on ivories of the 10th C. An equestrian statue in the Forum Tauri in Constantinople was held by some to represent Joshua's miracle at Jericho (Nik.Chon. 649.58–64).

Lit. L. Rost, W. Werbeck in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, vol. 3 (Tübingen 1959) 873f. —J.I. A.C.

JOSHUA ROLL (Vat. Palat. gr. 431), a unique 10th-C. example of a parchment roll (10.64 m long) with continuous horizontal illustration of episodes in the first 10 chapters of the Book of Joshua. The text, written along the bottom and often omitting words or phrases, is subservient to the miniatures. These are painted in a wash technique, unusual in Byz., that reserves much unpainted parchment. Against this neutral ground, landscape, personifications, and above all the exploits of Joshua, the archetypal Old Testament general, are depicted in pastel-like color against trees and rocks painted in a soft-edged, almost Pompeian manner. This style, like the Palestinian setting of the iconography, could fit the manner of painting in the reign of either Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos or Nikephoros II Phokas: the exploits of Joshua could allude to the exploits of Nikephoros II or John I Tzimiskes. Scenes of the Hebrew general's triumphs, including acts of proskynesis and calcatio required of the enemies of Israel, depict ceremonies imposed on Arab leaders in mid-10th-C. Constantinople (McCormick, Eternal Victory 160–62). C. Mango (ActaNorv 4 [1969] 126) and others suggest that the Joshua Roll is a copy of an original celebrating the victories of Herakleios. Previously believed to be a conscious imitation of a monument like the Column of Trajan, it has been interpreted by Mazal
JOSHUA THE STYLITE, an Edessan of unknown date who was a priest and a monk at the monastery of Zuqin near Amida. He is known only through a scribal note of uncertain date in the 9th-C. MS Vat. Syr. 162, which contains the unique copy of the Chronicle of pseudo-Dionysios of Tell Mahre. It has been suggested that Joshua is the author of a Syriac chronicle included en bloc in the Chronicle of pseudo-Dionysios of Tell Mahre that covers the years 495–506, with some earlier events being mentioned, such as the revolt of Illlos and Leontios in 484. The chronicler wrote as an eyewitness, probably before 518. The independent Chronicle of the Persian War, as some scholars call it, carries its own title, The History of the Time of Troubles in Edessa, Amida, and all Mesopotamia. The subject matter is largely an account of battles between the Roman and Persian empires under Anastasios I and Kaväd, and the work is an indispensable source for the history of Persia at this period. It is still unresolved whether Joshua was the author of the independent 6th-C. chronicle, or the author of the 8th-C. Chronicle of pseudo-Dionysios, or the scribe who copied the 9th-C. MS. It has been customary to adopt the first option and to speak of the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite.


Jovian (Ioúbiavós), more fully Flavius Jovianus, Augustus (from 27 June 363); born near Singidunum 331, died Dadastana, Bithynia, 17 Feb. 364. Possibly of barbarian origin, he was commander of the protectores et domestici under Emp. Julian; he was well known among the soldiers as son of the comes domesticorum and son-in-law of the magister militum. After Julian died on his Persian campaign in 363 and the praetorian prefect Salutius refused the purple, Jovian was chosen emperor—according to Amnianus Marcellinus at the initiative of a small group of common soldiers. Although Jovian was able to repel Persian attacks, the situation of the army, suffering from hunger in the Tigris region, and the threat of political rivalry in Constantinople caused Jovian to sign a treaty with the Persians whereby

(infra) as an innovation intended to express in a classical manner the military ethos of the Macedonian era. On the verso of the MS are 13th-C. excerpts from church fathers and a later set of building accounts. The roll was in Padua by the early 15th C. and is today arbitrarily cut into 15 sheets.


A.C.
he surrendered Mesopotamia and the strategic cities of Nisibis and Singara. He died unexpectedly on his way back to Constantinople.

Jovian differed from the pagan Julian in both appearance and behavior: tall with blue eyes, he was a gourmand and enjoyed wine and women. His education was modest, although he tried to play the role of patron. He was a Christian but tolerant of pagan beliefs. The assertion of Christian writers that he abolished the anti-Christian legislation of Julian seems to be false. His peace treaty with the Persians was regarded as ignominious by pagan authors (e.g., Ammianus Marcellinus) and criticized by Christians in Antioch; more distant writers, however, from Gregory of Nazianzos to Augustine, considered it necessary or even a gift of Providence.


-J.E.G.

JUDAISM, the religion of the Jews, strictly monotheistic and primarily concerned with social justice, ethics, and family purity. Its liturgy at home and in the synagogue, based upon the Hebrew Bible and Jewish literature, taught a political redemption by a messiah. Dietary laws required a painless slaughtering of domesticated animals, health inspection, and complete removal of blood; use of unleavened bread at Passover; separation of meat and milk; no pork; and close supervision of wine, cheese, and clothing. Males were circumcised eight days after birth. Biblical tradition required ritual ablutions and postmenstrual bath. The Jewish calendar (soli-lunar) celebrates every Sabbath and New Moon with liturgical and Pentecostal readings. Annual holidays include New Year, Day of Atonement, Tabernacles, Passover, Pentecost, 9th of Ab (to mourn the destruction of the Temple), and Feasts of Maccabees and Esther. Byz. deplored the observance and practices of Judaism, yet it was necessary to practicing Jews to demonstrate that God rejected and abandoned them, and because their voluntary conversion was both a proof of the truth of Christianity and a prerequisite for Christ's return. The Bible was read in Hebrew and Aramaic until Justinian I responded to Jewish reformers (nov. 146) by mandating use of the Septuagint and vernacular translations. He also forbade deuterosis (oral commentary) and denial of Christian doctrines. Palestinian Jews responded by developing ppyut that poeticized oral laws and by muting potentially political expressions in the liturgy. Orthodox and heterodox Christians occasionally relied on the Jewish calendar to date Easter: Justinian legislated that Passover follow Easter (Prokopios, SH 28.16–18). Biblical and postbiblical Judaism influenced the symbolism (Temple as prefiguration of the Church), theology, ecclesiastical calendar, liturgy, and practice of Byz. Christianity through borrowings and converts. The tradition of magic, apocalyptic, and mysticism in Judaism paralleled that of contemporary Christian society.


-J.E.G.

JUDAS ISCARIOT (Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαρίωτης), the apostle who betrayed Christ. Byz. tradition dealt with him primarily in commentaries on Acts. He came to represent the epitome of treachery and of monetary greed; his suicide by hanging, accompanied by bloating limbs and the gushing out of his bowels, became the typical death of the sinner. Orthodox authors compared the end of Arius (although he did not commit suicide) with Judas's foul death. Sermons devoted to Judas are rare (e.g., a short homily by pseudo-John Chrysostom, PG 61:687–90); ROMANOS THE MELODE, however, wrote an emotional poem permeated with horror at the false disciple's impious action. Some clauses in charters appoint "the fate of Judas" as the punishment for breach of contract.

Representation in Art. Judas figures throughout Byz. art in the Lord's Supper, the Betrayal of Christ, and scenes of his attempts to return the silver and of his suicide (Mt 27:3–5). The Betrayal appears already in the very earliest Passion cycles on 4th-C. Roman sarcophagi. Scenes of his remorse, first depicted in the 5th C., become frequent in the 6th; also in the 6th C., the standard composition of the Lord's Supper first appears. In none of these is Judas vilified and the same temperament extends into later periods, when Judas is portrayed as slender and young. In the Last Supper, he is distinguished—if at all—only by his
JUDEA, WILDERNESS OF, term for the rocky and sparsely inhabited region south of Jerusalem and Jericho and west of the Dead Sea as far as Arad and Elusa, which became the principal area of monastic settlement in late antique Palestine. The first monastic founder in the area was St. Chariton in the 4th C.; other lavras were founded in the 5th C. by monks such as St. Euthymios the Great, from whose settlement Christianity spread among the Arab tribes of the Parembole (the region of Palaestina I, northwest of the Dead Sea); St. Sabas, whose monastery housed a famous library and scriptorium; Sts. Gerasimos, Choziba, Kalamon, and others. These monastic houses were the centers of the Greek and later Arabic literary and spiritual life of the Chalcedonian patriarchate of Jerusalem, and several benefited from imperial patronage. In the 5th–7th C. these monasteries and their monks were visited by writers, such as Cyril of Scythopolis, John Moschos, and others. They maintained their integrity in the face of Arab raids while under Roman rule, but after the Arab conquest of Palestine some were destroyed, while others changed the language of their culture from Greek to Arabic.

JUDGE. In the Kletorologion of Philothoeus the generic term kritai designated several high-ranking officials who enjoyed judicial as well as administrative and financial rights: the eparch of the city, quaestor, and epiton deeseon, and their staffs. Some other functionaries had their own law courts and presided over litigation; since the archontes, as Balsamon puts it, were often incompetent in legislation, special assessors (symponoi), also called kritai, were attached to them. In 539 Justinian I tried to create a body of professional judges, diatetai of the agora (nov. 82.1). This institution seems to have fallen into desuetude; in the Ecloga the term krites appears only once, in a biblical quotation (164.74). The thematic judges of the 10th–11th C. were administrators of provinces, whereas politikoi and litoi kritai functioned as assessors. In the 10th-C. Taktikon of Escurial, however, the college of professional judges, the kritai tou Hippodromou and kritai of the velum, reappeared, and soon thereafter Constantine IX Monomachos reintroduced legal education. These judges probably had their tribunal at the Hippodrome. The judge of the velum remained active through the later period, when new categories of professional judges, such as kritai katholikoi and kritai tou phossatou, also appeared.

JUDICLUM QUINQUEVIRALE, a tribunal in the late Roman Empire consisting of the urban prefect and five senators chosen by lot; it was convened under special circumstances to determine whether senators were guilty of capital offenses. The judicium quinquevirale was still a living institution in Italy in 506, but did not exist in Constantinople, thus reflecting the greater social status of senators in the West.

JUGUM (ξύρων, lit. "yoke"), initially a unit for measuring land, supposedly according to the plowing capacity of a yoke of oxen (about 12,616 sq. m of first quality arable, about 15,104 sq. m of second quality). In the context of Diocletian’s reform of the fiscal system, the jugum was a unit
of account used for taxing land in the system of capitatio. As a measure of tax liability for equitably distributing the annona obligations among taxpayers, jugum could correspond to surfaces varying according to the land's quality or to the kind of cultivation: for example, one fiscal jugum could correspond to 6,300 sq. m of vines, about 25,000 sq. m of first quality arable, or 50,000 sq. m of second quality arable, etc. (See also Zeugariion.)

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 75, 78f. Goffart, Capit 32–35.

N.O.

JULIAN (Ἰουλιανός), sometimes called "the Apostate," emperor (from 361); born Constantinople May/June 332, died on campaign on the Persian frontier, 26 June 363. He was the son of Julius Constantius (half-brother of Constantine I) and the half-brother of Gallus. In 337 his father and many relatives were murdered, probably at the order of Constantius II. Julian was sent to Nikomedea and then to Cappadocia, where he grew up, entered minor Christian orders, and perhaps finally embraced paganism. As a young man he studied at Nikomedea and Athens. In 355 Julian was summoned to court and made caesar; he was put in charge of the western provinces that were threatened by revolt and pressure from the Alemanni and Franks, against whom he was remarkably successful.

When Constantius ordered Julian to dispatch his troops to the eastern frontier in 361, they revolted and proclaimed Julian as emperor. Negotiations failed but Julian became sole emperor when Constantius died on 3 Nov. 361. Julian then set about to restore traditional Roman society and undo the innovations he associated with the house of Constantine. The most famous aspect of this policy was his attempted revival of paganism. Julian's paganism was practical (it was to imitate the organization and social policies of contemporary Christianity), but also influenced by magic and charlatans like Maximos of Ephesus. Julian's law excluding Christians from the teaching profession was condemned even by pagans. Julian's Persian expedition was initially successful, but he was unexpectedly struck and killed by a spear from an unknown assailant and his policies died with him.

To contemporary and later Christian authors Julian was the personification of evil. Gregory of Nazianzos, Cyril of Alexandria, and Ephrem the Syrian all wrote against him. Sozomen records a thoroughly legendary account of his life, and Malalas, the Chronicon Paschale, and the Life of St. Basil (falsely attributed to Amphilochios of Ikion) build upon the story. Attention to the apostate remained keen in the 9th C., when an extended sequence of miniatures in the Paris Gregory (fols. 374v, 409v) culminates in the legend (based on the Chronicon Paschale) that Julian was slain by St. Merkourios.

Two statues in Paris and a head on Thasos, as well as ivory and bone statuettes and an engraved gem in Leningrad (H. von Heintze in Studien deschmann 2:31–41), have been identified as likenesses of Julian. Contemporary sources describe Julian as short and heavy, with a thick neck, animated eyes, and a philosopher's beard, features that are confirmed by sculpture and numismatic portraits (Volbach, Early Christian Art, pls. 48f, 52). He is usually shown wearing a priestly diadem and a philosopher's mantle. Julian was the author of voluminous correspondence, and tracts such as the Missopogon, Against the Galileans, and the satirical dialogue The Caesars.


JULIAN OF ASKALON, 6th-C. architect known only as the author of the treatise On the Laws or Customs in Palestine. It remains debatable whether Julian's treatise was an unofficial work or a collection of police prescriptions to regulate building activity. Julian defines the location of, and distances between, industrial buildings (bakeries, ceramic kilns, glass shops, etc.), bath houses, private buildings, stables, inns, etc.; regulates gutters and sewers and the planting of trees and vineyards. The main purpose of the tract was to preserve beauty and light in the city. The text is transmitted
in a Geneva MS, Bibliothèque publique et universitaire 23, in the appendix to the Book of the Eparch. A similar MS evidently served Harmeno-
poulos, because the chapters from Julian’s work incorporated into his Hexabiblos are inscribed—
wrongly—with the word eparchikon. Harmeno-
poulos incorporated all of Julian’s texts contained in Geneva 23, except for the prooimion (Harm. 2.4.13–25, 25–44, 47–51, 75–80, 82, 83, 85–88; all other chapters of title 2.4 are, contrary to prevailing opinion, excerpted from other sources). Individual chapters of Julian’s treatise show similarities with the pre-Justianianic Syro-Roman law-
book, which did not, however, serve as a direct model.


—M.Th.F.

JULIAN THE EGYPTIAN, 6th-C. poet. De-
scribed in the lemmata of his epigrams as apo hypaton and apo hyparchon (APO EPARCHON), he has been identified by Av. and Al. Cameron (JHS 86 [1966] 12–14) with the praetorian prefect of 530–
31. Julian may be the consul to whom Priscian dedicated his Institutiones grammaticae. The Greek Anthology preserves about 80 of his epigrams, thanks to their inclusion in the Cycle of Agathias; he may also have published a collection himself.
Most of his poems are anathematic, sepulchral, and ekphrastic, only rarely erotic. They are con-
ventional in subject and style but sometimes give tantalizing glimpses into contemporary events, notably the Nika Revolt of 532 and the attempted coup of Hypatios with whom Julian was somehow involved.

ED. AnthGr, see index. Eng. tr. in Paton, Greek Anth., see index.

ion 47 (1977) 42–64.

—B.B.

JULIANUS “ARGENTARIUS,” banker in Ra-
venna and founder of the Church of S. Vitale; f. second quarter of 6th C. He may have come from the East: from the form of a monogram in the gallery of this church, Deichmann (infra) deduced that Julianus was Greek or Greek-speaking. The banker’s sponsorship is noted in several Latin inscriptions and Greek monograms in the church; Ecclesius, bishop of Ravenna (522–32), is named in these inscriptions as having ordered Julianus to construct and decorate S. Vitale. According to Agnellus of Ravenna (chs. 57–59), Julianus began this work after Ecclesius returned from an embassy to Constantinople (together with Pope John I) in 526. The same source reports that Julianus spent 26,000 solidi on the project, but also, improbably, relates that he founded the churches of S. Maria Maggiore and S. Stefano in Ravenna. Julianus was the patron of S. Apollinare in Classe, where an inscription records his spon-
oship, and the now-destroyed S. Africisco in Ravenna that he cosponsored with a certain Ba-
cauda, sometimes said to be his brother-in-law. The absence of any dignities attached to the bank-
er’s name in the inscription suggests that he acted as a private individual, not as an official of the church or state. For this reason he cannot be identified with the figure in court costume in the
bema mosaic of S. Vitale, standing between Justinian I and Archbp. Maximian, who dedicated the church in 546.


-A.C., A.K.

JULIUS NEPOS, the last Western emperor recognized by Constantinople (19 or 24 June 474–28 Aug. 475); died near Salona 9 May 480. Julius was the nephew of Marcellinus, the nearly independent ruler of Dalmatia. He was on good terms with Leo I and married a relative of the empress Verina. Julius apparently inherited his uncle’s power in 468 and was given the title of magister militum of Dalmatia. In 473/4 Leo I (or those acting for the minor Leo II) sent him to Ravenna to depose the usurper Glycerius, who had succeeded Anthemios. Glycerius was arrested near Rome or Ravenna. Overthrown by the magister militum Orestes, Julius fled to Dalmatia. Orestes then placed his young son Romulus Augustulus on the throne in Ravenna. Romulus was never recognized by the Eastern court, and Julius was therefore still the legitimate Western emperor. In 477 he tried to persuade Zeno to help him regain the throne, but the emperor was content with the rule of Odoacer in Italy and did not go beyond a symbolic gesture, being afraid of Julius’s connections with Verina and Basiliskos. There is a vague statement by Kandidos suggesting that after 476 Julius was accepted in Gaul as a legitimate ruler; at any rate he retained control of Dalmatia until his murder, which was probably arranged by Glycerius.


-T.E.G.

JURA IN RE ALIENA, concept of Roman law denoting limited rights of ownership. Roman law developed a system of these jura in re that encompassed servitudes (servitus), usufruct, superficies, emphyteusis, and several forms of limited dominium such as a husband’s right to dotal land, conditional rights of owners (as in the case of heirs appointed under certain conditions), a right to an object of litigation, a right of the pledgee (if the debt was not paid), etc. The jura in re were based on contract or (infrequently) on an administrative act.

In post-classical law, since the notion of ownership became confused, the concept of jura in re was lost (Kaser, Privatrecht 2, par.238 II), but the reality of a lesser degree of ownership evolved. Gorecki (infra) considers as jura in re five types of land (mostly abandoned) on which neighbors, the village community, or the state established temporary rights. Byz. documents mention the rights of neighbors to enter adjoining property to eat—but not remove—grapes and other fruit, to graze their livestock, to collect firewood, to fish, etc. Unlike Roman jura in re, these unsystematized Byz. rights were based not on contract but on custom—ethos or synethenia (A. Kazhdan, JÖB 39 [1989] 15-17).


-JURIJ DOLGORUKIJ, prince of Suzdal; son of Vladimir Monomach; born ca.1090, died Kiev 15 May 1157. Dolgorukij, or Long-Arm, is a sobriquet used only since the 16th C. Jurij (George) laid the foundations of the new principality between the Oka and Volga rivers. Byz., the princes of Galitza, and the Cumans supported his claim to the throne of Kiev. In a long struggle against his nephew, Izjaslav of Kiev, who was aided by Hungary, Jurij managed to reign in Kiev three times: 28 Aug. 1149–early summer 1150, Sept. 1150–March 1151, and from 20 March 1155. His second wife, whom he married in the 1150s, was possibly a Byz. Jurij rejected Metr. Klim Smoljatić, who backed his rival Izjaslav. When Klim was elected, the rights of the patriarch of Constantinople and endemousa synodos were ignored, and thus Jurij sought a new metropolitan in the Byz. capital. Constantin, an erudite theologian, was consecrated in fall 1155, arrived in Kiev in summer 1156, and, with Jurij’s support, started to purge the clergy. The church of Rus’ was effectively split until 1159 since some bishops did not recognize Constantine’s jurisdiction.
JURISTIC PERSONS, a conventional legal term, not found in Roman law, that applied the term persona (or caput) only to human beings. Nevertheless, both Roman and Byz. law had to deal with corporate bodies (microstructures) endowed with rights and liabilities: village communities, municiapia, and guilds. There are documents showing that the village community owned land and acted collectively in court; similar evidence concerning municiapia and guilds is vague and questionable. Churches, monasteries, and charitable institutions also acted as juristic persons: they owned properties, could inherit movable and immovable property, sue, and be summoned to trial. More complex is the question of whether the emperor’s patrimonium was considered a juristic person distinct from the state: the Byz. recognized a distinction between state (demosios) property and the emperor’s (basilikos) property, treasury, etc., but it is unclear whether this difference in terms had any significance in everyday practice.

JUSTIN I (Ἰουστῖνος), emperor (from 9 July 518); born Bederiana (province of Dardania) ca.450 or 452, died Constantinople 1 Aug. 527. The son of a poor peasant, Justin migrated to Constantinople ca.470, joined the army, and made a military career; he participated in wars against the Isaurians and Persians and helped to suppress the revolt of Vitalian. After Anastasios I died, Justin was proclaimed emperor by the army and factions; Prokopios suggests that Justin’s election was a result of his crafty use of money given to him to bribe soldiers to support another candidate, Theokritos. After his accession Justin executed a group of influential aristocrats, including Vitalian and Theokritos, deposed others, and brought back from exile those banished by Anastasios. Justin stopped Anastasios’s imbalanced religious policy, accepted the Chalcedonian course, and put an end to the Akkadian schism. Justin made an alliance with the papacy—Pope John I visited Constantinople—and gained authority in the West. Relations with the Ostrogoths became strained in the last years of Theodoric, however, and persecution of the Arians reached its peak in Byz. Justin enjoyed peaceful relations with the Persia of Kavad I but endeavored to surround Persia with Byz. allies such as Lazica, the Huns, the Arabs, and Ethiopia. In 526 he waged an unsuccessful war against Persia.

Prokopios presents Justin as dull, boorish, and illiterate (he allegedly used a stencil to sign documents); it is generally thought that Justin’s nephew Justinian (I) was the actual master of the empire. Justin’s wife was Lupicina Euphemia. The painter Marinos of Apameia depicted the story of Justin’s arrival in Constantinople on the walls of a public bath.

JUSTIN II, emperor (from 15 Nov. 565); nephew of Justinian I; died Constantinople 4/5 Oct. 578. As a young man, Justin became kouropalates; his marriage to Sophia, Theodora’s niece, strengthened his position. Justin’s elevation (described in detail by Corippus) was achieved by a narrow group of functionaries within the palace. After the election he probably authorized the execution of his rival Justin, son of Germanos. Justin’s international policy was unsuccessful: he attempted to surround Persia with his allies (Turks, Ethiopians), refused to pay the stipulated tribute (H. Tertulianus, BZ 76 [1983] 292–301), and waged a war against Chosroes II in 572 that led to territorial losses. In the West the victory of the Avars and Lombards over the Gepids opened the Lombard way to Italy in 568; the Avars under Baian invaded the territory south of the Danube; in Spain the Visigoths seized some cities. Domestically, Justin tried to emulate Justinian, but his legislation was on a small scale; his most important law was the reinstatement of divorce by consent. His artistic patronage suggests the coalescence of Christian ideology and the traditional imperial cult, a synthesis expressed in the much-restored silver cross that he sent to Rome, bearing portraits of the augusti flanking the Lamb (Rice, Art of Byz.,

LIT. A. Vasiliou, Justin the First (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).


JUSTINIAN (*Iouostuinianós*), general; son of Germanos and Passara; born Constantinople after 525, died Constantinople 582. Justinian fought the Slavs in Illyricum in 552. In 572, he supported an Armenian rebellion against Persia. Three years later, as supreme commander of the army against the Persians, he won a great victory over Chosroes I at Melitenes; he seized enormous booty but was unable to retain Armenia. Apparently Justinian hoped to succeed Justin II, but was frustrated by Tiberios (I). Justinian participated in the intrigues of Sophia against Tiberious late in the reign of Justin II (578), but failed and, after contritely giving Tiberios 1,500 pounds of gold, made peace with him. Between 579 and 581 another conspiracy of Justinian was discovered, in which Sophia hoped to raise him to the throne. Germanos, who married Tiberios’s daughter Charito, was raised to caesar by Tiberios, and may have been Justinian’s son. Justinian was less successful at court intrigue than warfare in the field. He was a competent military commander, but his ambitions were a destabilizing element in the reigns of Tiberios and Maurice.


JUSTINIAN I, emperor (from 1 Aug. 527); given name Flavius Peter Sabbatios; born Bederiana (province of Dardania) ca.482, died 14 Nov. 565 (*PLRE* 2:648). The nephew of Justin I, Justinian made a brilliant career under his uncle, who appointed him co-emperor on 1 Apr. 527. Prokopios of Caesarea describes Justinian as an individual of medium height, with a round face ruddy even after two days of fasting (*SH* 8.12), an approachable and gentle man who never showed his anger and who, in a quiet voice, would order the death of thousands of innocent men (*SH* 13.1–3). Justinian was simple in his tastes, indifferent to splendor, able to work day and night, and crafty in displaying sympathy and even tears.

A man of low origin, Justinian came into conflict with the aristocracy. He was surrounded by energetic, unscrupulous, but loyal people who did not belong to the upper crust of society—his wife Theodora, his nephew Germanos, the generals Belisarios and Narses, and the administrators John of Cappadocia and Tribonian. The aim of his policy was to create a strong empire, based on a unified administrative system and a single creed, encompassing the whole Mediterranean and ostensibly brilliant. To this end he promulgated the *Corpus Juris Civilis*. To increase the state’s income, he often guided reform of the tax system: he developed the emphyteusis, tried to eliminate the difference between *adscripticii* and slaves, and developed land ownership of the fisc. He also subsidized the development of trade and attempted to find new trade routes circumventing Persia. Among secrets acquired by the Byz. under Justinian was that of silk production.

Justinian was personally involved in theological disputes; he sponsored the fifth ecumenical council and pressured Pope Vigilius. Proclaiming the principle that the emperor’s will is law, Justinian suppressed political and ideological resistance, quashing the movement of the Samaritans and the Nika Revolt.

He built or reconstructed more than 30 churches in Constantinople alone (G. Downey, *ArtB* 32 [1950] 262–66) including that of the Virgin of Pege, at the site of a spring whose waters he believed had cured him of a kidney ailment, and above all Hagia Sophia, the altar cloth of which, according to Paul Silentiarios, both images of hospitals and other foundations of Justinian. Legends concerning his role in the construction of the Great Church, including the revelation of its plan to him by an angel, are collected in the *Patria of Constantinople*. Justinian’s equestrian statue stood in the Augustaion; extant contemporary portraits of the beardless emperor are preserved in S. Vitale and S. Apollinare in Classe in Ravenna. A 9th- or 10th-C. mosaic in Hagia Sophia shows him bearded, presenting his foundation to the Virgin.
Justinian's international policy was intended to restore authority over the western part of the Roman Empire: North Africa was occupied in 533–34, Italy only after a long and costly war in 535–56; in Spain his army was able to occupy only some coastal areas. The situation in the East was more dangerous, and Chosroes I managed to seize several regions; tactics on the Danube were defensive and the empire ensured peace by paying tribute and stationing troops on the frontiers to repel invading bands.

Justinian's evaluation has been contradictory since Prokopios, who sometimes debases Justinian and at other times praises him highly. The problem is whether Justinian attempted to retain obsolete institutions that wasted the resources of his country or established enduring values that laid the foundation for the long existence of a mighty empire. (See genealogical table.)


JUSTINIAN II, emperor (685–95 and 705–11); born Constantinople ca.668, died Damatrys 7 Nov. 711 (Grierson, “Tombs and Obits” 51). He was son of Constantine V and Anastasia; an improbable tradition places his birth in Cyprus (De adm. imp. 47). He had a daughter by his first wife Eudokia. Justinian became emperor on Constantine's death, but may have been crowned co-emperor as early 681/2. He soon sent Leontios against the Arabs in Armenia and encouraged the Mardaites to raid Lebanon, forcing 'Abd al-Malik to make peace in 688; in 693, however, the Byz. had to evacuate Armenia after being defeated in Asia Minor as a result of the desertion of the Slavic chief, neboulos, and his troops. After campaigning in Sklavinia in 688 he formed the kleisoura of the Strymon and probably the Hellas theme and resettled captives in the Op-sikon. A fresco in the Church of St. Demetrios in Thessalonike may commemorate his arrival (acc. to A.A. Vasiliev, OrChP 13 [1947] 355–68, but denied by J. Breckenridge, BZ 48 [1955] 116–22). His resettlement of Kyzikos with Cypriots in 690/1 was part of grander colonization schemes (Charanis, Demography, pt. III [1961], 143f).

Ardently Orthodox, Justinian convoked a synod in 686/7 that confirmed the rejection of monothelitism. He also persecuted the Paulicians, tried to subordinate Armenia to Constantinople's jurisdiction in 689/90, collaborated with Patr. Paul III (688–94) to introduce reforms at the Council in Trullo, and tried to arrest Pope Sergius I for rejecting the Trullan acts. Justinian introduced the first images of Christ on the coinage and moved the emperor's image to the reverse (J.D. Breckenridge, Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II [New York 1959]). His building projects included additions, such as the Triklinos, to the Great Palace. Heavy taxation and excesses by the eunuch Stephen the Persian prompted Leontios to dethrone and mutilate Justinian in 695; thereafter he was nicknamed rhinotmetos (“cut-nose”) and reportedly wore a gold nose. Exiled to Cherson, he sought help from the Khazar khagan, whose sister married him in 703 and took the name Theodora.
Justinian regained the throne with help from Tiberios in 705, and crowned Theodora (the first foreign-born Byz. empress) and their infant son Constantine I (708–15) at Nikomedes and supported him against a revolt in Ravenna by the local archbishop and nobility. In 711 Justinian met Pope John VII (J.D. Breckenridge, BZ 65 [1972] 364–74). In 711 Justinian met Pope Constantine I (708–15) at Nikomedes and supported him against a revolt in Ravenna by the local archbishop and nobility. In 711 he launched an expedition against Cherson, perhaps to punish the city for ill-treating him in exile but more likely to halt Khazar advances in the Crimea. The fleet revolted and proclaimed as emperor Philippikos, who forced Justinian to flee Constantinople for Asia Minor, where he was killed by Elías. His body was thrown into the sea, but his head was exhibited in Rome and Ravenna.


JUSTINIANA PRIMA (Ἰωστιωνωνὴ Πρίμα), city in the province of Dardania in Illyricum, founded by Justinian I near his birthplace of Tauresium. Although its location has been much discussed, it is now usually, identified as the site of Carin Grad, 45 km south of Niš. The city was deliberately chosen to become a great urban center; although it was off the major roads, its proximity to quarries facilitated large-scale construction. According to Prokopios (Buildings 4.1.17–27), Justiniana had an aqueduct, churches, great stoa, beautiful fountains, streets, baths, marketplaces, and shops. Justinian planned to transfer the seat of the praetorian prefect of Illyricum to his new city and promoted it to the ecclesiastical capital of western Illyricum. In 535 he made the archbishop of the city autocephalous, but in 545 he yielded to the protests of Pope Agapetus and accepted papal jurisdiction over his new foundation (B. Granić, Byzantium 2 [1925–26] 123–40). Justiniana was captured by the Avars and Slavs, who invaded the area in the early 7th C. The archbishopric of Justiniana is unknown after 602; in the 12th C. the bishops of Velbuđo and then the archbishops of Ohrid assumed the title of archbishop of Justiniana Prima (G. Prinzing, BBulg 5 [1978] 269–87).

The ruins at Carin Grad extend over several acres of land, including an acropolis and a lower town. The polygonal acropolis contained the cathedral, an adjoining baptistery, and perhaps the bishop's palace. On the slope below, the unfortified town had a colonnaded main street, a circular piazza, bathhouses, and more churches. Most of the construction dates from the reign of Justinian, the acropolis being built ca.530, the lower town somewhat later. Despite the city's grandiose plan, column capitals from the site are crudely carved and in a style that was out of date by the time the city was founded (Krautheimer, ECBArch 267). The latest coin hoard discovered at the site dates to 613, and the latest single coin to 615.


– A.K., I. Dj., A.C.

JUST PRICE (δικαίως τιμητί), Lat. justum pretium). The concept of just price, like that of monopolies, was derived from the general idea of state control of the economy: Diocletian introduced the term in a simplified form in a law of 285 (Cod. Just. IV 44.2) and established maximum prices of various goods in his Price Edict. Control over prices and measures formed a dominant characteristic of Byz. commerce, and the Book of the Eparch limited rates of profit and prohibited merchants and artisans from raising prices above "the necessary level" (e.g., Bk. of Eparch 10.2). Especially substantial was the control over the price of grain.

The Byz. did not develop the theory of just price to a point equivalent to that of Western teaching; nevertheless the concept permeated agrarian legislation of the Macedonian dynasty: the legislators indicate that many dynatoi, partly by coercion, partly owing to the unsettled conditions in the wake of the famine of 927–28, had acquired lands of the poor either by ignoring legal restrictions (e.g., Protimēsis) or by paying a price below the one that was standard or "just." In such cases, the poor might recover their property within 40 years from the date of sale, and Basil II even abolished this 40-year prescription; in some cases a refund was required as reimbursement for im-
provements made upon the restored lands. The just price could be set on the basis of an official estimate, as in the case of KLASMA (N. Oikonomides, FM 7 [1986] 162f), or reflect market conditions.

Lit. Kazhdan-Constable, Byzantium 44f. —A.J.C.

JUVENTAL (Ἰουβενάλιος), patriarch of Jerusalem (ca.422–58); saint; feastday 2 July. His lifelong ambition was to raise his suffragan diocese into a patriarchal see, independent of Antioch and the metropolitan of CAESAREA MARITIMA, to which Palestine was canonically subject. Juvenal's appointment of the Arab chief Aspebetos (Peter)—at the request of St. EUTHYMIOS THE GREAT—as the first bishop of an Arab camp (Parembolae), has sometimes been seen as a violation of the rights of Caesarea. Juvenal's claims for Jerusalem were rejected at the Council of Ephesus (431) despite his alliance with Cyril of Alexandria against the Antiochene Nestorios, patriarch of Constantinople. Although Cyril failed to support Juvenal strongly, Juvenal still sided with Egypt at the "Robber" Council of Ephesus (449) by voting with the Alexandrian Dioskoros to restore Eutyches. At the Council of Chalcedon (451), however, Juvenal sided with Constantinople by endorsing Dioskoros's deposition. As a result, the three PALESTINES were detached from Antioch to create the patriarchate of Jerusalem. When Monophysite monks faithful to Dioskoros and Eutyches rebelled on Juvenal's return to the holy city, he was forced to call in imperial troops before he could enjoy his new status as Jerusalem's first patriarch.

KABALLARIOS (Καβαλλάριος), a family of high-ranking officials and courtiers active ca.1250–1350. The name, meaning “cavalryman, knight,” must be of Latin origin. The connection of the Kaballarioi with Constantine Kaballourios, strategos of the Kibyrrhaioi in 1043 (Skyl. 432.13–14), and Maria (?), sister of Constantine Kabalouros (E. Branousse, EEBS 33 [1964] 61.14), founder of the Strobelos monastery, mentioned in a charter of 1079, is unclear. Circa 1258/9 Basil Kaballarios belonged to the higher echelon of society: his marriage to Theodora Tarchaneiotissa was approved by Theodore II but annulled by Michael VIII. Alexios Kaballarios (or Kaballares), domestikos of the imperial table and governor of Thessalonike (died 1279/4 in battle), was Michael VIII’s cousin; Michael Kaballarios was megas konostoulos ca.1277 when John I Doukas defeated him at Pharsala. Several Kaballarioi supported Andronikos II and were listed among his oikeioi: esp. Bardas Kaballarios, who participated in the proceedings against Andronikos III the Younger, and Bardas’s son Mark, who insulted Andronikos III at the walls of Constantinople in 1327. Later, in 1343, Theodore Kaballarios, a partisan of John VI, was captured by Momčilo. The Kaballarioi were related to the Tzamblakones. The Kaballarioi are distinct from the Kaballeropoulos, who throughout the 14th C. served as civil functionaries (Constantine, a judge; George, an interpreter) and clergymen.

Lit. Laurent, Corpus 2, no.127. PLP, nos. 10024–56.

—A.K.

KABALLAROPOULOS. See Kaballarios.

KABASILAS (Καβάσιλας; etym. unclear), a noble lineage known from the reign of Basil II onward. The founder, Constantine, was a foreigner and Basil’s servant. In 1042 Empress Theodora appointed him strategos. In the 11th C. several members of the family were governors: Nikephoros in Thessalonike ca.1022; Constantine (Theodora’s protégé?), doux of the West in 1042; another Kabasilas, doux of Vaspurakan under Michael IV; and Alexander, doux of Skopje ca.1080 (Seibt, Bletisiegel, no.125). Alexander supported Nikephoros III and in Alexios I’s reign was demoted to a low position. From ca.1200 some Kabasilai were prominent church leaders, including a metropolitan of Dyrachion, a bishop of Grebena, and an archbishop of Ohrid ca.1259, all of whom were named Constantine. In the 14th C. the Kabasilai occupied important court positions: Demetrios, megas papas in 1347–69; Theodore, logothetes tou stratiiotikou ca.1317; Alexios, megas konostoulos ca.1339. The family produced several writers: Neilos Kabasilas, his nephew Nicholas Chamaetos Kabasilas, a scribe Demetrios Kafikes Kabasilas. Intellectuals of this family often occupied ecclesiastical posts. The Kabasilai also served in provincial administration and possessed lands in Chalkidike, Thessalonike, and elsewhere.


—A.K.

KABASILAS, NEILOS, theological writer; born Thessalonike? ca.1300, died 1363. Because Kabasilas evidently bore the baptismal name of Nicholas, he has sometimes been confused with his nephew Nicholas Chamaetos Kabasilas. Kabasilas taught in Thessalonike, where Demetrios Kydonas was among his pupils; later he served in the government of John VI Kantakouzenos in Constantinople, and then became a hieromonk (after 1353). From 1361 to 1363 he was metropolitan of Thessalonike, but apparently never took up residence in his see.

Kabasilas wrote Palamite and anti-Latin theological treatises, including an Antigrama against Nikephoros Gregoras (ed. G. Papamichael, Ekkl-Phar 11 [1913] 66–75) and an essay titled On the Procession of the Holy Spirit. In the latter treatise


---

**KABASILAS, NICHOLAS CHAMAETOS**, writer and theologian; born Thessalonike ca.1322/3 (Loenertz, *intra* 226), died Constantinople? after 1391. Born to a noble family, he adopted his mother's name of Kabasilas in preference to his patronymic Chamaetos. After beginning his studies in Thessalonike with his uncle Neilos Kabasilas, he moved to Constantinople for further education. He was a Palamite and Kantakouzenist, who joined the entourage of John VI Kantakouzenos after the latter's victory in the Civil War of 1341–47. He may have been a candidate for the patriarchate in 1353. He never married; it is likely that he eventually became a monk (Angelopoulos, *intra* 69–74). His final years were devoted to theology and philosophy.

Kabasilas was a scholar of widely ranging interests, including rhetoric, astronomy, law, and theology. He had a fierce social conscience, as evidenced by his treatise titled *On Usury* addressed to Anna of Savoy (ed. R. Guillard in *Eis mnemen Spyridonos Lamprou* [Athens 1935] 269–77), in which he used moral arguments to criticize the practice of usury (M. Poljakovska, *ADVS* 13 [1976] 83–96). His ideal monarch is based on Plato's ruler: he should be strong, educated, and just. Kabasilas is esp. vocal in the defense of the right to property and in his condemnation of injustice (M. Poljakovska, *ADVS* 12 [1975] 104–16). His *Discourse Concerning Illegal Acts of Officials against Things Sacred* attacks unspecified laymen who confiscated monastic property for defense needs, such as restoration of fortifications, construction of naval vessels, and recruitment of soldiers. Most scholars now accept I. Ševčenko's thesis that the latter discourse was not directed against the Zealots in Thessalonike, as was earlier believed; the identity of Kabasilas's adversaries is, however, still under discussion. Kabasilas also wrote spiritual treatises, such as *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy* and *The Life of Christ*. He was a mystic who emphasized prayer (cf. G. Podskalsky, *OstkSt* 20 [1971] 17–42).


---

**KABBADION** (καββάδιον), a caftan, probably of oriental origin, called the "costume of the ethnokoi" by Philotheos in 899 (Oikonomides, *Listes* 177.32–179.1), but a standard article of imperial and court costume by the 14th C. Among the officeholders who wore the kabbadion were the despotes, the megas doux, the megas logothetes, and the megas myrtaiates (pseudo-Kod. 146.2, 153.18, 154.16–17, 166.13–14). To judge by the portrait at Chora of the megas logothetes Theodore Memochites, who is wearing a bluish-green caftan, the garment had long full sleeves, was belted, and had a gold-embroidered collar and borders along the sleeves and hem; unlike a tunic, the kabbadion apparently fastened down the front, and the twin front edges of the garment were also adorned with gold. The kabbadion of Alexios Apokaukos in Paris, B.N. gr. 2144, fol.11r (Spatharakis, *Portrait*, fig.96), has tight sleeves and is decorated with roundels containing heraldic lions. According to pseudo-Kodinos (pseudo-Kod. 146.2–3, 153.18, 274.13–14), a kabbadion could also be violet or red and adorned with pearls. The texts suggest that it was worn over the skaranikon.


---

**KAFFA** (Καφάς in *De adm. imp.* 53.170), ancient Theodosia, a strategic post on the southeastern
coast of Crimea along the passage from the Black Sea to the Azov Sea. Taken by the Huns in 380, it was ruled by the Alans in the 5th–6th C., by the Khazars in the 7th to 10th C., and then came under Cuman and (after 1229) Tatar rule. As a result of Genoa’s alliance with Byz. (treaty of Nymphaion, 1261) and with the approval of the Tatars (the allies of Byz.), ca.1266 the Genoese established a colony in Kaffa, which soon became the greatest trading center in eastern Europe, handling the traffic of Eastern and Western goods. By 1380 Kaffa had secured control over other Italian colonies in the region: Cembalo (Balaklava), Vosporo (Bosporos), Matraga (Tmuturokan), Lo Capa (on the estuary of the Kuban), and Sebastopolis.

The Genoese repelled the attempts of the empire of Trebizond to penetrate Kaffa: an attack of several Greek ships from Sinope and Trebizond in 1313 caused some damage to the merchants of Kaffa, and friction continued throughout the first half of the 15th C. The war with Venice (1350–56) was won by the Genoese who thus established their hegemony in the Black Sea. After the treaty of 1347 Kaffa enjoyed cooperation with the Tatar rulers of Crimea. Its prosperity decreased when Timur captured Tana, thus curtailing Kaffa’s trade with the Caucasus, Central Asia, India, and China. By 1475, when it was taken by the Ottomans, Kaffa was still a large city numbering 8,000 households, that is, about 40,000 inhabitants.

Kaffa was a customs point and a center trading in commodities such as slaves, grain, hides, furs, silk, and fish. Besides Italians its mixed population included Greeks (there were Greek churches and two Greek monasteries in Kaffa), Armenians, Rus’, Muslims, and Jews. Before 1437 an ecclesiastical metropolis subordinate to Constantinople was organized in Kaffa, but this soon passed into the hands of supporters of Union of the Churches (E. Zachariadou, ArchPont 29 [1968] 280–93).


KAINOTOMIA (κανονομία, lit. “innovation”). In the context of law the word usually means new buildings that might interfere with another’s rights or public interest. Already in classical Roman law various legal remedies were available to the neighbors of a person erecting a building to counter disturbances from building construction (cf. esp. Basil. 58.10). To these private legal remedies, which were intended for individuals, a constitution of the emperor Zeno (Cod.Just. VIII 10.12, Basil. 58.11.11) added a kind of general building regulation in the interest of public safety; it prescribed the distances between, and heights of, new buildings. Zeno’s constitution was confirmed by Justinian I and extended to all cities of the empire (Cod.Just. VIII 10.13, Nov.Just. 63 = Basil. 58.11.12,14). The regulations involving distances between buildings, esp. with reference to a sea view, remained in force, as the Peira 50.5 shows. The treatise of Julian of Askalon contains numerous other safety regulations to be observed with regard to kainotomia, affecting industrial premises as well. The most extensive compilation of all Byz. building regulations is given in the Hexabiblos of Harmenopoulos (2.4). The word was also used to designate theological, fiscal, or political innovations, usually with negative overtones.

—M. Th. F.

KAINOURGION. See Great Palace.

KAIOUMOS (Καιούμος), theologian; first half of the 7th C. He is known only from an anonymous brief edifying story preserved in several MSS from the 11th C. onward. Reportedly Kaioumos was an anchorite who lived at the “bay of St. Antony,” on the shore of the Red Sea near Klysmo; he moved from there to Ammochostos, Cyprus, where he stayed in seclusion. He was summoned as an arbiter in the case of a certain Philentolos, son of Olympios: a rich and generous man, he helped the poor and even founded a hospital, but had “the passion of fornication.” After his death, a local council was convened, presided by Archbp. Arkadios (before 625–641/2), to debate Philentolos’s posthumous condition. According to Kaioumos, Philentolos was saved from Hell by his charitable deeds but was not admitted to Paradise because of his sin; his soul had to remain with those of unbaptized children. The status of the pious sinner was not considered provisional, and
Kaioumos did not introduce the idea of Purgatory. Kyrris connects Kaioumos's explanation with some passages in the Qur'an.

source. F. Halkin, "La vision de Kaioumos et le sort éternel de Philentolos Olympiou," AB 69 (1945) 62–64.


-A.K.

KAISARIANE (Καίσαριανή), monastery on Mt. Hymettos near Athens. In antiquity probably a sanctuary of Aphrodite, the site was converted to Christian use in the 5th or 6th C. The monastery must date to ca. 1100, when the surviving church was built; it is mentioned in the correspondence of Pope Innocent III (T. Neroutsos, DÉE 3 [1889] 103–05) but apparently remained in Greek hands after the Fourth Crusade since in 1210 Michael Choniates addressed a letter to its Orthodox hekoumenos (Mich.Akom. 2:311). The katholikon is a cross-in-square with half-hexagonal apses; south of the church is a bath, apparently contemporary with the katholikon but later turned into an oil press. The narthex and frescoes in the katholikon, along with the other buildings of the monastery, are post-Byzantine. To the west are the remains of a large early Christian basilica with semicircular apses, over which a smaller domed church was built, apparently in the 10th–11th C. To the south of this are the ruins of a single-aisled church, probably built during the Frankish period.


-T.E.G.

KAISARIS, PSEUDO-, name given to the author of four dialogues (Erotapokriseis) masquerading as the work of Kaisarios (died 369), who was the younger brother of Gregory of Nazianzos, holder of various official positions and a court doctor. They are dated by both Dujčev and Duprey (infra) to the first half of the 6th C. Many of the questions are of a religious nature, seeking greater understanding of the Holy Trinity and Scriptures in order to combat heresy. Pseudo-Kaisarios, a Monophysite, polemizes against Jews, Arians, and Origenists and may be connected with Severos of Antioch. Perhaps a quarter of the questions are on scientific matters, such as queries about thunder and lightning, rainbows, the nature of fire, and the changing length of days and nights. Several passages on the Slavs and other inhabitants of the Danube region are of particular interest, as perhaps the earliest written testimony about the Slavs (Dujčev, Medioevo 1:23–43).

The dialogues owe palpable debts to such authors as Epiphanius of Salamis, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nyssa. They also exist in a 10th-C. Slavonic translation, which contains more questions than the extant Greek text but also lacks some passages that survive in Greek.


-B.B., A.M.T.

KAISERAUGST TREASURE, a group of silver objects and coins of the first half of the 4th C., unearthed in 1961–62 inside the fort of Castrum Rauracense at Augst (Augusta Raurica) near Basel. Now in the Römermuseum, Augst, it contains 64 domestic objects, one fragment (Hackensilber), three ingots with stamps of the usurper Magnentius applied at Trier after Jan. 350, and 186 coins and medallions dating between 294 and 350. Among the objects are 14 serving plates and bowls, four goblets, and 41 spoons and small implements (one with a Christogram). Other items include a gilt- and niello-inlaid extending lampstand, a statuette of Aphrodite, two plates with elaborately decorated central medallions and rims—one with an Achilles cycle in relief and the other with a seascape and hunting scenes in gilt and niello inlay; a rectangular plate with inlaid panels depicting Ariadne, Bacchus, and Erotes. According to inscriptions on their bases, the Achilles plate was made in Thessalonike and a fluted plate in Naissos. An association of this opulent and pagan imagery with the emperor Julian was once supposed. Yet, some objects bear graffiti mentioning a P. Romulus and a Marcellianus, both identified as officers serving Magnentius, who perished at the battle of Mursa on 28 Sept. 351; the treasure is therefore thought to have been buried between Jan. 350 and Sept. 351.
KALAMANOS (Καλαμάνος, Kalamanos), a noble family of Russo-Hungarian origin. The founder, Boris, was a son of the Hungarian king Coloman or Kálmán (1095–1116) of the house of Arpad and Evfimia, the daughter of Vladimir Monomach. He arrived in Byz. from Rus’ during the reign of John II and married a relative of the emperor (Arete Doukaina, according to V. Laurent). He died in battle in 1155. The sebastos Constantine Kalamanos, governor of Cilicia, was defeated and captured in 1164 by Nur Al-Din. Laurent (Bulles métr., no. 439) dated a seal of a Kalamanos, sebastos and doux, to the end of the 12th C. The family possessed a mansion in Constantinople, and ca. 1200 one of them was a lord of the Sampson district. Thereafter no Kalamanos occupied any prominent position.


-A.K.

KALAMATA (Καλαμάτα, name derived from ancient Kalama), city in Messenia with a fertile hinterland, near the Gulf of Messenia. It was located a little to the north of Kalami and was built on the site of ancient Pharai. Unimportant in antiquity, Kalama is generally ignored by the Byz. sources: only the vita of St. Nikon ηο Μετανοητή (ed. Sullivan, ch.31.7) mentions it. The 12th-C. geographer al-Idrīsī describes it as a large and populous city. At least five surviving churches dating to the 11th–12th C. suggest considerable activity in this period: among these the Church of the Holy Apostles and another known under the name of St. Charalambo have a cross-in-square plan. Kalama was conquered by William I of Champlite in 1205 and given to Geoffrey I Villehardouin; William II Villehardouin was born and died there. The city was taken by the neighboring Slavs in 1293 or 1295; in the 14th C. its territory included the castles of Nesi and Maina. It remained a possession of the principality of Achaia until the end of the principality in 1428, when it came briefly under Byz. control. In the second half of the 15th C. and later it was contested between the Ottomans and Venetians. Kalamata is mentioned as a bishopric only in post-Byz. times.

The castle of Kalama was the acropolis of ancient Pharai and was fortified sometime during the Byz. era; according to the Chronicle of the Morea (Greek version, ed. Schmitt, p.116.1711–14), it was not in a condition to withstand a siege in 1205. The Latins rebuilt the castle substantially, giving it a double circuit of walls.


-T.E.G.

KALAMBAKA. See Stagia.

KALAMAS (κάλαμος, “reed”), a measure of length equal to the late Roman akania (άκαινα) of 10 podes (see Pous). Later, the kalamos was used for measuring vineyards; originally one kalamos meant the simple distance between two vines, subsequently also the double or triple distance. According to the metrological treatises, vineyards were evaluated in two or three categories of quality: the worse the quality the greater the distances between two vines. From the time of Michael IV, 1/4 basilike spithame was added to the kalamos used in measuring vineyards of the best quality.


-E. Sch.

KALAPHATES (καλαφάτης), caulker, a craftsman who made ships watertight by filling in their joints and seams with pitch. The term is unknown in classical antiquity but appears in papyri of the 6th–8th C. (Preisigke, Wörterbuch 1:727). Liutprand of Cremona uses this Greek word and defines it as a navium compositor (lit. “arranger” of ships—Koder-Weber, Liutprand 44). Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De cer. 675.4–6) distinguishes naupegesis, shipbuilding proper, from kalaphatesis of the same boats. Emp. Michael V, surnamed Kalaphates, was the son of a caulker, according to Psellos, who provides a precise description of this craftsman’s work (Chron. bk.4, ch.26.12–15, vol. 1:65).

Lit. H. & R. Kahane, RB 1.4:410f.

-A.K.
KALAVRYTA (Greek: Καλάβρυτα, “beautiful spring”; Colovrate, etc., in Western texts), city in the borderland between Achaia and Arkadia, located in a high and nearly inaccessible plain near ancient Kynaitha, unknown after the 3rd C. (E. Pieske, RE 11 [1922] 2479–82). The name Kalobrata appears first in the Partitio Romanae (A. Carile, StVen 7 [1965] 219.47). In the mid-13th C. it formed a barony consisting of 12 fiefs; the baron of Kalavryta was in the list of 12 peers of the seigneur of Morea (Jacoby, Feodalitate 24f); the barony of Kalavryta was in the hands of the family of Durnay. In 1270–74 Greeks again held Kalavryta, and by the end of the 13th C. the Greek nobles Jacob Zassy (Tzausios?) and his cousin Photios dominated the city. Around 1400 the Hospitaliers attempted to seize Corinth, Kalavryta, and Mistra, but the expedition failed because of the resistance of the local population. In the 15th C. Kalavryta served as one of the residences of the despotai of the Morea, and in 1429 the marriage between Thomas Palaiologos and Caterina, daughter of Centurione Zaccaria, took place at the village of Kastikoi near Kalavryta.

The Frankish castle of Tremola, mentioned by numerous sources, stands in a ruinous condition above the modern town; there is a single gate, no trace of flanking towers, a keep, and a subterranean chapel of St. John. A false tradition attributes foundation of the monastery of Hagia Lavra at Kalavryta to the 10th C., but it is probably post-Byz.

-T.E.G.

KALE (Greek: Κάλη), feminine personal name (etym. probably “good”). The name is extremely rarely attested in early texts. A judicial decision of 952 mentions a woman “called Kale” (Lavra 1, no.4.11). A noble lady Kale, who as a nun took the name Maria, issued a will at the end of the 11th C. (FGBullg 7 [1967] 70–78). In later centuries the name became very popular, esp. in the peasant milieu: vols. 2–3 of Lavra list 57 Kales, second only to Maria (69); the acts of Xeropotamou mention 75 Kales (compared with 95 Marias); in the acts of Esphigmenou there are 50 Kales, compared with 66 Marias. Noblewomen with this name are also known (e.g., PLP, nos. 103/11–12).

-A.M.T.
KALENDERHANE CAMII, large church in Constantiople, situated near the east end of the so-called aqueduct of Valens. Built in part over a bath of the 4th/5th C., as revealed by archaeological investigation, it exhibits a complex structural history. Most of the standing structure (a cross-in-square covered by a dome) is of the late 12th C., but the east end is partly of the 6th and has yielded a wall mosaic of the Presentation of Christ in the Temple (6th/7th C.). An added chapel at the southeast corner is decorated in fresco and includes a fragmentary cycle of the life of St. Francis painted during the Latin Empire. Previous attempts to identify Kalenderhane with the Church of St. Mary Diaconissa or that of Christ Akateleptos have been abandoned. A fresco of the Virgin Kyriotissa over the central door between the two narthexes suggests a dedication to her.


KALLATIS (Καλλατίς), also Callatis, Greek city on the Black Sea, south of Tomis; mod. Mangalia, in the Rumanian district of Constanța. Excavations have revealed the city wall of the late 3rd C. that served probably to the early 7th C. (F. Preda, Universitatea București, Analele, seria Istorie 17 [1968] 27–36). The city seems to have flourished in the 4th–5th C. Near Kallatis, a necropolis was investigated: most of the tombs were of the 4th C. and more than 60 coins from the period of Constantine I through Theodosius I were found, whereas later finds were rare (one coin of Theodosius II and one of Justinian I). Ceramics, glass, belt buckles, and other objects were also primarily of the 4th C. There is no reason to date those burials without objects exclusively to the 6th C., as did C. Preda (A. Dierkens, Latomus 40 [1981] 466).


KALLIERGES, GEORGE, artist, called "the best painter in all Thessaly" in the dedicatory inscription (1315) of the Church of the Anastasis at Berroia in Macedonia. These frescoes suggest that Kallierges (Καλλιέργης) was familiar with the mosaics of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Thessalonike, where his presence is attested by a bill of sale (Chil., no.84,63) dated 9 Oct. 1322. The attribution to Kallierges of frescoes at St. Nicholas Orphanios in Thessalonike, and of others on Mt. Athos, is less secure. Kallierges' name also occurs in the title of an epigram by Manuel Philæs (Carmina, ed. Miller, 2:25, epigram 11).


KALLIKANTZAROI. See CALEND.

KALLIKLES, NICHOLAS, physician and poet; first half of the 12th C. Although Kallikles (Καλλικλῆς) is mentioned by several of his contemporaries (Theophylaktos of Ohrid, Prodomos, Gregory Pardos), all we know of his biography is the report of Anna Komnene that Kallikles attended Alexios I's deathbed in 1118. Kallikles' epitaph of John II was reportedly written before the emperor's demise, but probably close to 1142. Besides panegyrics of rulers (Alexios I, his wife Irene, John II), Kallikles produced epigrams praising various aristocrats: he stressed their wealth and noble origin, but eulogized martial prowess only in the epitaph of the sebastos Rogerios (no.19), who is explicitly said to have come "from the land of the Franks," i.e., Normans (M. Mathieu, Byzantion 23 [1953] 137–40). Kallikles' contemporary Prodomos fully developed the genre of aristocratic poetic eulogy. Some of Kallikles' epigrams are dedicated to various artifacts, such as no.2 on an icon of Christ deposited in the Pantokrat monastery; accordingly some inscriptions preserved on reliquaries have been ascribed to Kallikles (E. Voordeckers, L. Milis, Byzantion 39 [1969] 456–88). E. Lipšic and R. Romano consider Kallikles as the probable author of the Timarion.

ED. Carmi, ed. R. Romano (Naples 1980).


KALLIMACHOS AND CHRYSORRHOE (Καλλιμάχος καὶ Χρυσορρόη), romance in 2,807 unrhymed POLITICAL VERSES, written possibly in the early 14th C. by a nephew of Michael VIII,
Andronikos Palaiologos, who also wrote a *Dialogue against the Jews* (an epigram of Manuel Philes ascribes to Andronikos a romance very similar to *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe*). Though his language admits a number of loan words and vernacular features, the author is well grounded in learned rhetorical practice (e.g., the use of anaphora). Describing the tribulations besetting a pair of lovers, *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe* combines features from the romances of antiquity (particularly from the *Aithiopika of Heliodorus*) and those of the 12th-C. revival (elaborate *ekphrasis* of buildings and gardens) with elements of folk-tale: testing of three brothers, a *dracon* ("ogre"), a witch with a magic apple, etc. The author of *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe* has crafted a work of Byz. court ceremonial (*proskynesis*, court attendants, etc.) and official procedures onto a traditional fairy tale.

ED. Le Roman de Callimaque et de Chrysorrhoe, ed. M. Pichard (Paris 1956), with Fr. tr.


—E.M.J., M.J.J.

**KALLINIKOS** (Καλλίνικος, also Leontopolis, Ar. al-Raqqa in modern Syria), Byz. city in Osroene on the left bank of the Euphrates near the more ancient foundation of Nikephorion, which had declined by the 4th C. (Jones, *Cities* 221f). A well-fortified commercial city (Amm. Marc. 23.3.7), Kallinikos, together with Nisibis and Artaxata, became a legally designated trading post with the Persians (*Cod. Just.* IV 63.4). Kallinikos was rebuilt by Leo I and received his name in 466. The city played an important part in the Persian wars. In 542 Chosroes I took Kallinikos and led its citizens to Persia, having razed the city walls (Prokopios, *Wars* 2.21.30–33), which Justinian I later rebuilt (idem, *Buildings* 2.7.17). A local tradition maintains that Empress Theodora erected a monumental column there and rebuilt a Monophyseite monastery (*Michael I the Syrian, Chronicle* 2:419–20). On retreat from their march to Ctesiphon in 580, Maurice and his army checked a Persian attack at Kallinikos (Theoph.Simok. 3.17.8–11). The Arabs took Kallinikos in 636–37 (Donner, *Conquests* 150f); in 772 the ‘Abbasid caliph al-Manṣūr built nearby the new city of al-Rāfiqah, on a horseshoe-shaped plan; remains of its walls still stand.


—M.M.M.

**KALLINIKOS** (Καλλίνικος), traditionally but probably wrongly (H. Wada, *Orient* 11 [1975] 25–34) considered the inventor of *Greek fire*. According to Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 354.13–17), Kallinikos fled in 673/4 from Heliopolis in Syria (or perhaps Egypt) to Constantinople, where his use of "sea fire" was crucial in defending the city against the Arab siege of 674–78.


—P.A.H.

**KALLIPOLIS** (Καλλίπολις, mod. Gelibolu, Gallipoli), city on the European shore of the Sea of Marmara at the north end of the HELLESPONT. In late antiquity it was a suffragan bishopric of Thracian Herakleia. In 324 the caesar Crispus defeated the fleet of Licinius off Kallipolis. A 9th-C. historian (Theoph. 102.24–26) relates that in the 5th C. Attila reached Kallipolis and Sestos and conquered all of the cities and fortresses in the area.

Justinian I restored the walls of Kallipolis, but little is known about the city thereafter until the Crusaders began to use it as the starting point for their expeditions to the East (An.Komm. 3:159.12–16). The town was not large—a 12th-C. historian (Kinn. 201.21) describes it as a coastal *polisma*. From the 13th C. onward, the crossing from Kallipolis to Lampsakos became more common, replacing that of Abydos-Sestos. In 1205 the Venetians occupied Kallipolis, but in 1234/5 John III Vatatzes reconquered the Thracian coast.

In 1304 Kallipolis served as the headquarters of the Catalan Grand Company; later Kantakouzenos found the town a convenient base from which to repel "barbaric" invasions. In 1331/2 Umur Beg led an unsuccessful attack on Kallipolis. In 1352 the Ottomans took the fortress of Tzimpe, north of Kallipolis, and, after a violent earthquake on 2 March 1354, captured the city.
It was recovered in 1366 by Amadeo VI of Savoy who restored it to the Byz. on 17 June 1367; Andronikos IV returned it to the sultan, however, on 3 Sept. 1376. Kallipolis was the major Ottoman naval base crucial for their European operations; Venice endeavored on several occasions to capture it or to obtain free passage through the strait, but in vain.


-A.K.

KALLISTHENES, PSEUDO-. See Alexander Romance.

KALLISTOS I, patriarch of Constantinople (June 1350–14 Aug. 1353; 1355–63); died Serres Aug. 1363. Kallistos spent his early career as a monk on Athos; he was a disciple of Gregory Sinaiates and accompanied him on journeys to Constantinople and Paroria. In the 1330s he was a hieromonk at the Athonite skete of Magoula; in the 1340s he moved to Iveron, where he eventually became hegoumenos. Elected patriarch in 1350 under John VI Kantakouzenos, he presided over the local council of Constantinople of 1351 (see under Constantinople, Councils Of), which reaffirmed Palamite doctrine. In this capacity his portrait has been recognized in two MSS (Spatharakis, Portrait, figs. 90, 92). He remained loyal to John V Palaiologos; in spring 1353 he refused to perform the coronation of Matthew I Kantakouzenos and withdrew from the patriarchate. After his replacement by Philotheos Korkinos, he joined John V on Tenedos. When John V regained the throne, Kallistos also resumed his patriarchate. He died during a mission to the Serbs to seek military assistance against the Turks.

Kallistos was a staunch defender of the privileges of the patriarchate of Constantinople; he excommunicated the Serbian patriarch ca.1352/3 for being too independent (V. Mošin, Glasnik Srpske Pravoslavne Crkve 9 [27] [1946] 192–206) and also forced the Bulgarian patriarch to recognize the supremacy of Constantinople in 1361/2 (RegPatr, fasc. 5, no.2442). He wrote a number of works, including Lives of Gregory Sinaiates and St. Theodosios of Türovo; the latter survives only in a Bulgarian translation. He was also the author of homilies (64 according to Gones), among which is an enkomion for Patr. John IV Nesteutes. The homiliary attributed to Kallistos in Slavic translation is the work of Patr. John IX Agapetos (1111–134; D. Gones, Palaeobulgariaca 6 [1982] no.2, 41–55; C. Milovanović, ZRVI 22 [1985] 149–63).

Ed. MM 1:295–448. For list of other works, see Gones, infra.

Source. A. Failler, La déposition du patriarche Calliste I°, REB 41 (1973) 5–163, with Fr. tr.


KALOJAN (Lat. Calojoannes) or Ioannitza, younger brother of Asen I and Peter; ruler of Bulgaria (1197–1207); died near Thessalonike Oct. 1207. In 1188 Kalojan was sent as a hostage to Constantinople but escaped to Türovo ca.1190; after Peter's assassination he inherited power. Beginning in 1199, he launched attacks against Byz.; he found support among independent "princes" such as Ivano and Dobromir Chrysos as well as some rebellious Byz. magnates. Kalojan conquered Konstantia, Varna, and a major part of Macedonia. The treaty of 1202 with Alexios III confirmed his acquisitions. For support against Byz., Kalojan turned to Innocent III and, in 1204, the pope's envoy Leo crowned Kalojan as king; Kalojan, however, assumed the title of emperor of Bulgaria and Vlachia. The Bulgarian church accepted Rome's jurisdiction and the archbishop obtained the title of primate. The Fourth Crusade changed the balance of power in the Balkans and compelled Kalojan to seek an alliance with the Greek aristocracy against the Crusaders. On 14 Apr. 1205 the allies, with Cuman help, destroyed the Latin army and captured Emp. Baldwin of Flanders. To exploit his success, Kalojan invaded Thrace; after the death of Boniface of Montferrat, he besieged Thessalonike. The Cuman chieftain Manasras murdered Kalojan outside the city. The Byz. hated Kalojan, who called himself Rhomaiktonos or "killer of the Rhomaioi," for his cruelty in imperial territory (Akrop. 1:23.18–19). They gave him the name of Skylotoannes (John the dog) and claimed that Kalojan was slain by St. Demetrios himself. I. Dujčev (infra 180f), however, hypothesizes that Kalojan died of disease (pleurisy). His skeleton may be the one found in the Church of the Forty Martyrs, Türovo, with a signet ring inscribed in Cyrillic
“Kalojhan’s ring.” There is also a seal of “Kaloen” the tsar of the Bulgarians (N. Mušmov, BS 4 [1932] 135–38).


KALOMODIOS (Καλομοδίας), a money-changer or banker of Constantinople, also engaged in long-distance trade (Nik.Chon. 523f); fl. ca. 1200. Officials of Alexios III arrested Kalomodios to strip him of his wealth. Next morning a riotous crowd, presumably organized by his fellow bankers, forced Patr. JOHN X KAMATEROS to intercede for Kalomodios; he was released unharmed. –C.M.B.

KALOPHEROS, JOHN LASKARIS, rich merchant, landowner, and diplomat; a friend of Demetrios Kydones; born between 1325 and 1330, died in Cyprus 1392. The connection of Kalopheros (Καλόφερος) with the house of Laskaris is unclear. In contrast to Kydones, he sided with John V Palaiologos during the Civil War of 1341–47, but he later came into contact with the Kantakouzenos family and married Maria, daughter of Matthew I. The marriage so angered John V that Kalopheros was forced to flee from Constantinople in 1362/3. He had well-established links with Western courts and converted to Catholicism; his second marriage (1367?) to Maria de Mimars (died 1369/70), the widow of a noble Cypriot, John de Soissons, confirmed these ties. In concluding the nuptial agreement Kalopheros handed over to his wife the colossal sum of 243,567 besants of Cyprus (Jacoby, infra 191) and received in exchange the usufruct of her estates. Kalopheros served as political adviser and envoy in Rome and Venice and participated in military expeditions launched by the Cypriot king Peter I Lusignan, but he was arrested in Cyprus ca.1370 after Peter’s death. In 1371 Kalopheros left Cyprus and settled down in Avignon to serve the pope. Nevertheless he retained connections with Greece, having married in 1372/3 Lucie le Maure, daughter of Erard, seigneur of Arkadia; he traveled several times to Rhodes, Cyprus, and Peloponnesos and continued his correspondence with Kydones. He acquired first Genoese and later (in 1388) Venetian citizenship; soon thereafter he left Venice for Cyprus, where he died. His brother Maximos was protosynkellos in Constantinople in 1365 and hegoumenos of the Diomedes monastery in 1374.


KALOPHONIC CHANT. See Teretismata.

KALOPODIOS (Καλοπόδιος, lit. “beautiful foot” [Irmscher, infra] or “boot-tree” [Aerts, infra]), an enigmatic functionary in the reign of Justinian I. Theophanes the Confessor and the Chronicon Paschale relate the so-called Acta of Kalopodios (“Acclamations against Kalopodios”)—a dialogue in the Hippodrome between the imperial mandator and the Greens; the latter describe as their oppressor the koubikarians and spatharios Kalopodios “who is at the boot-maker’s shop (tangaria).” Both chroniclers consider this dialogue a prelude to the Nika revolt. P. Maas (BZ 21 [1912] 28–51), followed by Baldwin (infra), hypothesized, however, that the passage appeared in the wrong context in a source common to both chronicles and should be related to a later episode; A. Čekalova (ADSV 10 [1973] 225–28) linked it with the Nika revolt. Even though the name of Kalopodios appears in some contemporary texts (e.g., praiopositos Kalopodios in 558/9), the relationship of the Kalopodios of the Acta to his namesakes cannot be ascertained. Kalopodios could be a pseudonym concealing a better-known individual: Karlin-Hayter (Byzantion 43 [1975] 87f, 107) saw Narses in Kalopodios, Aerts recognized John of Cappadocia, but neither hypothesis can be proved.


KALOTHETOS, JOSEPH, Palamite apologist and hagiographer; died after 1355/6. Sometime before 1336 Kalothetos (Καλόθετος) became a monk at the Athone monastery of Ephigmenou, where he met Gregory Palamas and came under the
influence of his teachings. He lived later in Thessalonike and Constantinople, and became superior of an unspecified monastery. An ardent supporter of Palamas, he participated in the local council of Constantinople of 1341 (see under Constantinople, Councils of) against Barlaam of Calabria and wrote numerous treatises defending Palamite doctrine. His nine Antirrhetics were directed against Gregory Akindynos, Patr. John XIV Kalekas, Nikephoros Gregoras, and a member of the Gabras family. He also wrote vitae of Patr. Athanasios I of Constantinople and Gregory of Nikomedia as well as an enkomion of Andrew of Crete. Kalothetos emphasized the love of hesychia in these saints and portrayed them as forerunners of Palamas and the hesychastic movement. His writings abound with classical allusions; he even gave to Barlaam and Akindynos the names of characters from Plato’s Republic.

ED. Ioseph Kalothetou Syngrammata, ed. D.G. Tsames (Thessalonike 1980).

LIT. PLP, no. 10615. –A.M.T.

KALYMMATA (κάλυμμα, lit. “cover”), a small cloth used in the liturgy as a veil for covering the eucharistic elements: the diskokalymma covers the paten, the poterokalymma, the chalice; kalymmata are also known as little aeres. The liturgical function of the kalymma and its association in liturgical commentaries with the swaddling clothes and winding sheets of Christ determined its physical appearance. Extant Byz. kalymmata, all gold and silk EMBROIDERIES, depict the Communion of the Apostles (see LORD’S SUPPER) and related themes: the diskokalymmata in Halberstadt (of the sebastos Alexios Palaiologos, ca. 1185–95[?]) and Castell’ Arquato (early 14th C.) show Christ administering the bread, while their corresponding poterokalymmata show him administering the wine. The Divine Liturgy is shown on the kalymma in the Benaki Museum, Athens (14th C.), and the Melismos (see FRACTION) on the Hilandar kalymma (14th C.). Kalymmata are often recorded in wills (e.g., that of Eustathios Boylas and inventories (e.g., Patmos); gold-embroidered kalymmata (kalymmata chryssokladarika) are mentioned in the Acts of Lavra (Lavra 3, no. 147.10).


KAMACHA (Κάμαχα, sometimes Kamachon or Kamachos, mod. Kemah), a fortress of the upper Euphrates about 40 km west of Keltzene, was important during the border wars between Byz. and the Arabs. First taken by the Arabs in 679, it frequently changed hands until the mid-9th C., after which it remained Byz. until 1071. According to Constantine VII, Kamacha was a tourma of Koloneia that Leo VI united with Keltzene to create the theme of Mesopotamia. Although Kamacha thereafter disappears from secular texts, it remained metropolis of a diocese called Armenia until the 11th C. The site contains a sizable castle with walls of several undated periods.

LIT. Honigmann, Ostgrenzen 56f. N. Sevgen, Anadolu Kaleleri (Ankara 1959) 212–15. –C.F.

KAMÁL AL-DÍN. See IBN AL-DÍM.

KAMARIOTES, MATTHEW, writer, scribe, and teacher; born Thessalonike, died Constantinople 1490. Kamariotes (Καμαριώτης) came to Constantinople during the final years of the Palaiologan dynasty and studied with Gennadios II (II) Scholarios, who dedicated to him a treatise on Aquinas. His father, who was a priest, and his brother were killed during the Turkish conquest of the capital. Kamariotes became megas rhetor at the patriarchal school, where he taught philosophy and rhetoric. He wrote a variety of works, including a monody on the fall of Constantinople and the death of his father. His interests included astronomy (treatise on a solar eclipse, a commentary on the treatise of Gregorius on the astrolabe), hagiography (enkomion of Sts. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzos, and John Chrysostom), and rhetoric (a summary of the Progymnasmata of Aphthonios and summary of Hermogenes). He also attacked Plethon. The commentary of Kamariotes on the letters of Synesios of Cyzene is unpublished. He copied MSS of Aristotle, Proklos, Hermes Trismegistos, and the Batrachomyomachia (C. Auc. Scriptorium 10 [1956] 100–02 and H. Saffrey, Scriptorium 14 [1960] 340–44).

KAMATEROS (Καματηρός, fem. Καματηρά; etym. “hard-working,” perhaps “a laboring ox”), a family of Constantinopolitan functionaries known from the 9th C., when the spatharokandidatos Petronas Kamateros supervised construction of the stronghold of Sarkel (ca.833). His identification with Petronas, the empress Theodora’s brother, cannot be assumed. The 10th- and 11th-C. Kamateroi were predominantly judges and fiscal officials. The rise of the Kamateroi begins with Gregory, who, according to Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 9.16–22), was not of a noble or rich family but accumulated his wealth as a provincial tax collector. In 1094 he served Alexis I Komnenos as secretary; later he was logothetes ton sekreton. He married Irene Doukaina, a relative of the Komnenoi. The 12th-C. Kamateroi occupied topmost positions: John the sebastos and logothetes tou dromou was Manuel I’s favorite ca.1158; Andronikos the sebastos was eparch and droungarios tes viglas at least until 1176; his son Basil—logothetes tou dromou during Isaac II’s reign—was still influential at the court of Theodore I Laskaris; Basil’s sister Euphrasyn Doukaina Kamatera married Alexios III. Some Kamateroi were high ecclesiastical officials: Basil, patriarch of Constantinople (1183–86); John X Kamateros, patriarch of Constantinople (1198–1206); John, archbishop of Bulgaria after 1183. Several were literati: the above-mentioned sebastos Andronikos was a theologian who wrote Hiera Hoplotheke (Sacred Panopy), a refutation of heresies; John Kamateros (same as the patriarch of Bulgaria?) wrote astronomical treatises (see KAMATEROS, JOHN); another John was a rhetorician at Isaac II’s court. Many Kamateroi were literary patrons. An inscription mentions a certain Nikos (12th C. or later) as the founder of the monastery Tao-Pentele near Athens. Although loyal to the Komnenian dynasty, the Kamateroi became staunch supporters of Andronikos I. From the 13th C. onward, the Kamateroi played no political role.


KAMELAUKION. See Crown.

KAMINIADES, JOHN, author of the Capture of Thessalonike, a description of the Arab siege of the city in 904. Kaminiai (Καμηνιάδης) claims to have been a cleric and koukouleitios in Thessalonike and an eyewitness of the Arab attack. The book, preserved only in late MSS (15th-16th C.), consists of two sections: one on the city and its trade (R. Nasledova, VizVrem 8 [1956] 61–84) as well as the Slavic tribes in its vicinity (R. Nasledova, VizVrem 11 [1956] 82–97) and one on the
Arab attack. Vivid details and ironic presentation of his own behavior make Kaminiates' work unique among the literary compositions of the 10th C. (V. Christides, BZ 74 [1981] 7–10). Moreover, various inconsistencies in realia and chronology make Kaminiates' authenticity suspect: perhaps the Capture of Thessalonike was composed in the 15th C., on the eve of the Turkish capture of the city, or immediately after the Turks sacked it in 1430 when interest in the events of 904 must have been revived.


KAMION. See TUNIC.

KAMOLIANAI (Καμολιαναί), bishopric in Cappadocia (Notitiae CP 1.77); according to Kedrenos (Cedr. 1:685.2) a village in Cappadocia. A legend known from Zacharias of Mytilene and a sermon of pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa (probably ca.600–750) describes the appearance of an acheiropoietos image of Christ in Kamolianai. Zacharias says that it was found (at an unspecified date) floating in a fountain by a pagan woman named Hypatia; pseudo-Gregory reports that Christ himself, accompanied by all the heavenly powers, appeared to Bassa-Aquilina, wife of the toparches of Kamolianai (in the reign of Diocletian), washed and dried his face, and disappeared, leaving behind his image on a towel. Zacharias refers to two acheiropoietos copies of the image—one in Caesarea of Cappadocia, another in the village of Dioboulion, near Amaseia; in contrast, pseudo-Gregory relates that the image was transferred from Kamolianai to Caesarea under Theodosios I.

Kedrenos states that in 574 the image was brought from Kamolianai to Constantinople. Probably during the reign of Herakleios there appeared in Constantinople another acheiropoietos that had been brought from Melitene: according to a later legend, it was given to a widow, the paterikia Maria. One of these acheiropoietoi served as the imperial palladium and was carried into battle against the Persians by the generals Philippkos and Priskos.

SOURCE AND LIT. Dobschütz, Christusbilder 40–60, 123*–34*, 34**–28**. Belting, Bild und Kult 66–69. –A.K.

KAMPAGIA. See Footwear.

KAMYTZES (Καμύτζης), a family name of unclear etymology: N. Bees (EkklPhar 3 [1909] 234f) derived the name from Gr. kammya, "close the eyes," but it could also be of Turkish origin. P. Gautier considered Kamyres, an envoy of the Seljuk sultan Süleyman to Alexios I in 1083, as a founder of the family (ReB 27 [1969] 256, and with a slight change in his "Blachernes" 259). The first incontestable Kamytses (according to Gautier, either Kamyres himself or his son or nephew) was Eustathios, chartularius of the stables in 1094 and later doux of Nicaea. Theodore Prodomos dedicated an epitaph to Constantine Kamyts, whose wife was Maria Komnene, daughter of Constantine Angelos and granddaughter of Alexios I. Manuel the protostrator, Maria's son, was a cousin of Isaac II and Alexios III; Andronikos I's general, Manuel eventually supported Isaac II with lavish donations and fought against Alexios Branas. In 1199 he was captured by Ivanko; rather than ransom Manuel, Alexios III used this opportunity to confiscate his wealth. Ransomed by Dobromir Chrysos, Manuel joined his revolt against the emperor. The Partitio Romaniae mentioned the estates of the Kamytsai, who were among the four greatest landowners. Pachymeres (Pachym., ed. Failler, 1:93.12) included the Kamytsai in his list of the noblest families of the 13th C., but no Kamytses is known to have held a high post at this time except for George Kamytsoboukes, doux of the Thracian theme in 1241. A Hilandar inventory (A. Soloviev, SemKond 10 [1938] 32) mentions an enigmatic Kamytses Komnenos (dates unknown).

The name was still in use in the 14th–15th C., but not in an aristocratic milieu: a certain Kamytses illegally received a considerable sum of money after the death of a megas oikonomos of Docheiariou; supposedly he was a citizen of Thes-
KANABOUTZES, JOHN, 15th-C. writer. Kanaboutzes (Kαβαβουτζης) was a teacher and corresponded with John Eugenios. In 1446 he guided Cyriacus of Ancona around Palaia Phokaia. He is best known for a commentary on Dionysios of Halicarnassus dedicated to Palamede Gattilusio, lord of Ainos and Samothrace (1431–55), and his brother Dorino, lord of Mytilene. Kanaboutzes emphasized the role played by Samothrace in the foundation of ancient Rome. He also compiled a table of the length of days throughout the year, calculated for the latitude of Palaia Phokaia (A. Diller, Byzantion 42 [1972] 257f).

ED. Ioannis Canabutzei magistr i ad principem Aeni et Sama thracies in Dionysium Halicarnasensem commentarius, ed. M. Lechnerdt (Leipzig 1890).

KANANOS, JOHN, known only as the author of a vivid eyewitness account of the siege of Constantinople in 1422 by the sultan Murad II. Kananos (Kανανος) begins with conventional apologies for his inadequate education and the deficiencies of his style; he notes that his narrative is not for scholars, but for ordinary people like himself. Indeed for the most part his account is couched in simple and colloquial language, including a number of Western military terms. Kananos provides a precise chronology of the assault as well as detailed descriptions of Ottoman techniques of siegecraft and Byz. methods of defense. He attributes to the intervention of the Virgin the failure of the major assault launched on 24 Aug., and claims that even the Turks saw her defending the ramparts.

LIT. Hunger, Lit. 1:482–84. PLP, no.10891.

KANANOS, LASKARIS, 15th-C. Byz. traveler who left a very brief vernacular account of his journey to northern Europe. The three pages preserved in a 16th-C. MS (Vienna, ÖNB, hist. gr. 113, fol. 174r–175r) may be a fragment of a larger work. Kananos’s trip probably took place in 1438/9, and may have had some connection with the Council of Ferrara-Florence. His particular interest in the silver coinage of Stockholm and the alleged barter economy of Bergen suggests that he may also have been a merchant.

Kananos traveled to major Baltic seaports, such as Danzig, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Bergen, where he noted the continual daylight in summer. He also visited Livonia and Latvia. From England he sailed to Iceland, which he described as the “island of fish-eaters,” and suggested that it should be identified with Ptolemy’s land of Thule.

LIT. PLP, no.10892. Hunger, Lit. 1:519.

KANDIDATOS (κανδιδάτος, from Lat. candidus, “white”), a dignity. In the late Roman Empire the term denoted a member of a unit of imperial bodyguards who wore white uniforms—candida turba, a white band, as Corippus describes it (In Praise of Justin 3.161). The Chronicon Paschale attributes the origin of the term to Gordian III (238–44), but the first reliable mention comes from 350 (O. Seeck, RE 3 [1899] 1468). Justinian I began his career as a kandidatos. Patr. Nikephoros I (Nikeph. 8.3) spoke of kandidatos as a dignity (axia), and in the Kletterologion of Philotheos kandidatos occupies the place below the strator. On sealed the title of kandidatos is usually connected with subaltern offices both in the army and in the civil service. The title disappeared, according to Oikonomides (Listes 298), after the mid-11th C.; the title spatharakandidatos continued in use up to the 12th C.


KANDIDOS (Κάνδιδος), secretary (hypocratheus) to some leading Isaurians, historian; born Isauria “Trachia,” fl. 5th–6th C. He composed a History in three books of the period 457–91, of which only a summary by Photios (Bibl., cod.79) is pre-
served. It stressed Eastern events but no doubt contained an account of the expedition of 468 against the Vandals mentioned by the Souda. As is to be expected, Kandidos provides useful information on the Isaurian emperor Zeno (E.W. Brooks, EHR 8 [1893] 209–38). He emphasized intrigues and conspiracies at court. Some scholars assign to Kandidos a number of fragments in the Souda that are anonymous or credited to Macehos of Philadelphia. Photios lambasts Kandidos’s style for its linguistic and syntactical innovations, its complex sentences, wild etymologies, and overall harshness and dissonance but approves of his orthodox defense of the Council of Chalcedon.


KANIKLEIOS (κανικλείος), also epī tou kanikleioi or chartularius tou kanikleioi, one of the emperor’s private secretaries; the post is known from the 9th C. onward. Anastasius Bibliothecarius (see Dolger, infra 50) defines praepositus caniculi as warden of the imperial inkstand with purple ink. This seemingly menial duty gave the kanikleios the opportunity to intervene in the formulation of imperial chryseobulls and in actual decisions. Therefore the position was often held by important officials. Under Michael III, Theoktistos was kanikleios and logos tetes tou dromov; Nikephoros Ouranos held the post of kanikleios in the 10th C., as did Theodore Styppeiotes under Manuel I; Styppeiotes was a very influential official (O. Kresten, JOB 27 [1978] 49–103). The kanikleios Nikephoros Choumnos was characterized by Gregoras (Greg. 1:241.1–5) as mesazon. The last known kanikleios was Alexios Tzamplakon ca. 1438. It is generally assumed (Bury, Adm. System 117) that the kanikleios had no staff; Kresten (69f), however, notes that in the 12th C. Michael Glykas served as grammaticos of the kanikleios.


KANISKION (κανίσκιον, “small basket”), a “voluntary” donation by paroikoi to their lord, esp. to a monastic institution. Some 11th-C. docu-

ments identify a kaniskion as a round loaf of bread, a half-measure of wine, and a modios of barley (Pantel, no. 3.31, cf. Esphig., no. 5.32). By the late 13th C., Christmas, the day before Lent, and Easter were the recognized times of giving kaniskia (Esphig., no. 7.9). Ostrogorsky suggests that by this time kaniskion could be transformed into a payment in cash.

In ecclesiastical usage kaniskia were the various donations of money, grain, wax, and other items offered by the faithful on specific occasions such as requiems and festival days (Balsamon, PG 137:41C). These optional gifts had also become obligatory. The gift mentioned in a lost typikon of Constantine IX (Reg 1, no. 923) should probably be identified with kaniskia: on the occasion of their wedding, the groom had to pay the bishop one nomisma, and the bride had to give 12 pecheis or cubits (see Pechys) of cloth. Kaniskion differed markedly from the general binding tax known as kanonikon.


KANKELLARIOI (κανκελλάριοι, from Lat. cancellarius), a late Roman official, the assistant of a praetorian prefect. In existence probably from ca. 400 onward, by the 6th C. kankellarioi became the most influential officials in the prefect’s bureau (O. Seeck, RE 3 [1899] 1456–59). In the Kletorologion of Philotheos the kankellarioi as well as the protokankellarioi fulfill modest secretarial functions in various central departments—those of the eparch of the city and quaestor, in the genikon and sakellion. According to the De ceremoniis, kankellarioi used to recite Latin chants during the emperor’s procession to Hagia Sophia; Bury (Adm. System 77) suggests that this was because of their familiarity with Latin. The seals of kankellarioi are dated to the 6th–8th C., while in the 9th–11th C. protokankellarioi and basilikoi kankellarioi are known. A 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 200.88–201.89) considered kankellarios a Western term and equated it with the Greek logothetes.

LIT. Laurent, Corpus 2:648–51.

KANNABOS, NICHOLAS, emperor for a few days in 1204. Chosen emperor by the populace
of Constantinople ca. 27 Jan. 1204, while Alexios IV ruled at Blachernai, Kannabos (Κανναβός)—an intelligent and warlike youth, says Niketas Choniates—held Hagia Sophia. After the fall of Alexios IV, popular favor swung to Alexios V. Around 2/3 Feb., the latter’s troops seized and imprisoned Kannabos.

-C.M.B.

KANON (κανών), a term with several meanings in Byz. Greek.

**Hymnographic Term.** The kanon was a set of verse paraphrases that during the 8th C. gradually replaced the nine biblical canticles previously chanted during the orthros; at the same time the kanon ousted the kontakion from its dominant position in that service. A kanon is theoretically made up of nine odes (or more usually eight, since the second ode is used only during Lent), each providing a poetic variation and meditation on the theme of the equivalent canticle (e.g., ode 1 reflects on Moses’ song of thanksgiving, Ex 15:1–19; ode 9, the Theotokia, reflects on the Theotokia’s hymn of praise [the Magnificat] in Lk 1:46–55, 68–79). Each ode is made up of an heirmos (see HEIRMOLIGION) and several additional stanzas (TROPARIA) that follow the melody and rhythmical pattern of the heirmos; a different heirmos is used for each ode. The odes are often linked together by an acrostic relevant to the day on which the kanon was to be sung. The kanon was sung in three sections (odes 1–3, 4–6, 7–9) with additional hymns, including the abbreviated kontakion, between the sections. Why the kanon with its elaborate and varied musical settings should have replaced the more straightforward kontakion is still not clear. Although Andrew of Crete (died 740) is often considered the originator of this form, several kanones can be attributed to Patr. Germanos I, an older contemporary. Other notable writers of kanones include John of Damascus, author of the Easter Kanon; Kosmas the Hymnographer; and Joseph the Hymnographer. Kanones continued to be written until the last years of Constantinople.


**Fiscal Term.** This type of kanon (δημοσιος κανών, δημοσίου) was the basic tax on land and on those who cultivated it (see DEMOSIOS). In order to calculate the kanon, officials first established the theoretical “value” of the land or person to be taxed and then determined the kanon, which was 1/24 (4.166 percent) of the value. Thus one gold nomisma was the demosion of 24 modii of land of first quality, or of 48 of second quality, or of one farmer owning a pair of oxen, a zeugaratos (Schilbach, Met. Quellen 59.22–60.7). To the kanon were added the appropriate PARAKOLOUTHEMATA and thus was calculated the final amount of the tax (aritmonion) to be paid in CHRAGMA. One-twelfth of the normal tax (libellikon demosion) was claimed for lands that, having been abandoned for 30 years, had become the property of the state (KLASMA) and were sold for development. Exemption from this basic tax was granted very rarely and only through a special procedure (involving the inscription of a special entry in the fiscal records, sometimes done with the red ink reserved to the emperor). In the 14th C. the basic tax on land (TELOS) was calculated at a flat rate of 1 hyperpyron for 50 modii of land (regardless of its quality, except for extreme cases) or for 6 modii of vines (Lemnos, 15th C.). Between 1404 and 1415 the telos was replaced in Chalkidike by the burdensome haraxe, a tax that survived in the region from the earlier Ottoman occupation (Oikonomides, “Ottoman Influence” 1–24).

(For kanon as a type of law, see CANON LAW and CANONS.)


-KANONIKON (κανονικόν), an ecclesiastical tax first mentioned in the 11th C., levied annually on all LAINY in the diocese for the bishop’s maintenance. Under Alexios I the amount of produce and money due from each village was determined by the number of hearths in it (Reg 1, no.1127). Although the tax due was precisely defined by imperial legislation, it was not always possible to collect it, as Balsamon indicates (PG 138:1005D). Resistance to the tax (in addition to hard times or famine) may have been the reason; for until then such tributes from the faithful—essentially the
offering of the first fruits—were largely voluntary. Previous imperial and canonical legislation had emphasized the spontaneous, noncompulsory nature of such contributions. The kanonikon was also imposed on priests (the levy was one nomisma annually) and eventually on all monasteries except stauropegic foundations (RegPatr, fasc. 3, nos. 1179, 1180, 1185). A consecration tax was a further source of episcopal revenue; in the 11th C. a precise scale of tariffs for each ordination was established (RegPatr, fasc. 2, no.851).

LIT. E. Herman, "Das bischöfliche Abgabenwesen im Patriarchat von Konstantinopel vom XI. bis zur Mitte des XIX. Jahrhunderts," OrchrP 5 (1939) 434–513. —A.P.

KANSTRESIOS. See Kastresios.

KANTAKOZENOS (Καντακουζηνός, fem. Καντακουζηνή), a noble lineage whose name derived from the toponym Kouzenas near Smyrna. The first known Kantakouzenos was Alexios I's general who campaigned against the Cumans in 1094. The 12th-C. Kantakouzenoi were predominantly military commanders endowed with high titles such as sebas (John, killed at Myriocephalon, 1176; Andronikos, doux of Mylassa and Melanoudion ca.1175) and caesar (John, married to Isaac II's sister Irene). None is known as a civil servant or church official. The Partitio Romaniae names the Kantakouzenoi among the greatest landowners. They flourished again after 1250: Michael, megas konostaulos (died 1264), was Michael VIII's general; the sebastokratorissa Irene Kantakouzena married Constantine, the emperor Michael's younger brother; another Kantakouzenos served as governor of the Peloponnesos ca.1286–94. His son became Emp. John VI. John's son Matthew (I) was also proclaimed emperor; Manuel Kantakouzenos, the second son, was granted the title of despotes and administered Constantinople in 1348–49 and the Peloponnesos from 1349 to 1380. Helena (1333–96), John VI's youngest (?) daughter, married John V Palaiologos and became empress. The despotes John and sebastokrator Demetrios, Matthew's sons, apparently succeeded Manuel as rulers of the Peloponnesos and disputed control over this region with the
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**SELECTED GENEALOGY OF THE KANTAKOZENOS FAMILY IN THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES**

Kantakouzenos, m. Theodora Palaiologina Angelina Kantakouzene

**JOHN VI KANTAKOZENOS** m. Irene Asanina

**MATTHEW I KANTAKOZENOS** m. Irene Palaiologina

**MANUEL KANTAKOZENOS,** m. Irene Palaiologina

Andronikos, m. Maria Niképhoros II of Epirus

Theodora, m. Orhan

Helena, m. John V Palaiologos

John, despotes, sebastokrator

Demetrios, m. Theodora

Helena, m. Luis Fadrique, count of Salona

Maria, m. John Laskaris Calópheros

George, Andronikos, m. Théodora, m. Maria, m. John Laskaris Kalópheros

Andronikos, m. Thomas

Irene, m. George Brankovic

Thomas, m. David I Komnenos of Trebizond

Helena, m. king of Georgia

daughters

Theodore, Manuel, Thomas, Demetrios

daughter

daughter

daughter

daughter

son m. daughter of Loukas Notaras

Based on Nicol, Kantakouzenos.
Palaiologoi. John was childless, but the progeny of one of his brothers played an important role in the 15th C.: George (who also assumed the Turkish name Sachatali) served the despotes Constantine Palaiologos (the future Constantine XI) but eventually settled in Serbia; George’s brother Andronicus, the last megas domestikos, was killed soon after the capture of Constantinople in 1453; their sister Irene (died 1457) married George Branković, and the third brother, Thomas (died 1463), also served the ruler of Serbia; another sister, Helena (died 1463), was the second wife of David I Komnenos of Trebizond (1458–61); the third sister (name unknown) may have become queen of Georgia.

The Kantakouzenoi were related to many aristocratic families such as Palaiologoi, Asan,Philanthropenos, Raoul, Tarchaneiotes, and Phakrases. In the 14th–15th C. the Kantakouzenoi were active primarily as military commanders and landowners. Some are known as patrons of arts and letters, for example, the despotes Manuel Kantakouzenos (PLP, no.10981) who founded the Church of Christ Zoódotes at Mistra. (See genealogical table.)


**KAPER BARADA** (Brad in mod. Syria), large village (kome) in the province of Syria I under jurisdiction of Antioch. Situated northeast of Telalissos (Qal‘at Se‘man) in the Jabal Seman, part of the northern Syrian limestone massif that lies north of the Antioch-Chalkis-Berroia road, Kaper Barada stands on a principal north-south route crossing the Jabal. Olive presses and warehouses indicate the source of prosperity of this village (2 sq. km), which contained, in addition to craft workshops, urbanlike amenities of the 2nd–3rd C. (bath, inn, meeting house [andron], shops) and imposing buildings of the 4th–6th C. (three churches [one replacing a temple], two monasteries, a large residence). Although evidence cited by Tchalenko to suggest that Kaper Barada was a civil administrative center in the 5th–6th C. is ambiguous, the village undoubtedly dominated its region as a commercial center, comparable with Kaper Pera to the south.

LIT. Tchalenko, Villages 1:90, 296 f. 387 f. 398, 430; 2, pl. CXXXIII.

**KAPER KORAON TREASURE,** a group of 56 silver liturgical vessels of the 6th–7th C. that has been reconstructed from four separate treasures known by the names of Hamâh (29 objects), Stuma (five objects), Riha (five objects), and Antioch (17 objects including the Antioch “Chalice”), all found ca.1908 southwest of Aleppo in northern Syria. Several pieces are inscribed with dedications naming the Church of St. Sergios of the village of Kaper Koraon, which has been identified with the modern village of Kurin, 5 km from the well-attested find-spot at Stuma. Four objects now in the Istanbul Museum were confiscated by the Ottoman authorities; antiquities dealers at Aleppo acquired the rest of the hoard, which they divided. The Hama and Antioch Treasures were thus created for sale ca.1910 and the remaining items found separate buyers. Today the objects from Kaper Koraon are dispersed in museums in Baltimore, Washington, New York,

**KAPER KORAON TREASURE.** Silver paten (“Riha” paten) from the Kaper Koraon Treasure; between 565 and 578. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C. The paten is decorated with the scene of the Communion of the Apostles.
The dedicatory inscriptions name up to 50 donors, including a kourator of an imperial domain, an argyroprates, and a magistrianos (see Agentes in Rebus). Fifteen objects have silver stamps that date the majority of the donations to 540-640. Although some objects from Kaper Koran are well decorated, nearly all are very lightweight (hence relatively cheap) and therefore similar to contemporaneous silver treasures from other villages.


M.M.M.

KAPER PERA (Ar. al-Bāra in modern Syria), large village (kome) in Syria II under Apameia on the Orontes. Situated in the Jabal Zawiya, part of the northern Syrian limestone massif north of Apameia, Kaper Pera stood on an east-west route joining Seleukeia ad Belum, on the Mediterranea, and Arta, at the edge of the eastern Syrian plain. The expansion of Kaper Pera in two centuries to a populous site 1,000 by 500 m in size was explained by Tchalenko in terms not just of its varied agricultural yield (wheat, vines, olives) but of its success as a regional processor and international exporter of olive oil. Its 5th- and 6th-C. buildings include at least five churches and four monasteries, a large market, multistoried oil factories, oil reservoirs, well-decorated houses, and impressive tombs. Kaper Pera retained its importance until the end of the Crusades.

Lit. Tchalenko, Villages 1:889-90, 430f; 2, pl. CXXXVII.

M.M.M.

KAPNIKAROS (καπνικάρος, from kapnikon). This rare term, synonymous with aktemon, appears only in the 1073 praktikon for Andronikos Doukas (Patmou Engrapha 2, no.50.311-15) that distinguishes two groups of kapnikaroi: those with donkeys who, as exkoussatoi, paid 1/2 nomisma for the synone and kapnikon and those without donkeys who paid 1/4 nomisma (i.e., apparently they paid only the kapnikon). In an abbreviated form, nicarius, the term survived in 14th-C. Frankish Morea (A. Kazhdan, VizVrem 32 [1971] 258), where nicarius had a more precarious position than paroiroi.


M.B.

KAPNIKON (καπνικόν, from kapnos, “smoke”; in Malal. 246.18, “smoke-hole, hearth”); a tax that was identified by some scholars (e.g., Dölger, Beiträge 51) as late Roman capitation; this identification, however, does not prove valid. It is first mentioned by Theophanes (Theoph. 487.1) as a levy collected from the paroiroi of charitable institutions and monasteries. In the 9th C. the so-called kapnikon was paid in the insignificant amount of 2 miliaria, possibly from a household (Theoph. Cont 54.3-7). In some sources of the 10th-11th C. it appears together with synone, which itself is an obscure tax. The cadaster of 1073 establishes that well-off paroiroi had to pay 1 nomisma for their synone and kapnikon (Patmou Engrapha 2, no.50.312-13), but the poorer peasants seem to have paid 1/2 nomisma for kapnikon only (e.g., no.50.142-47). In the lists of exemptions, however, kapnikon appears with or without synone, but in the context of supplementary charges such as oikomodion, aerikon, kastroktisia, etc. (Lavra 1, nos. 38.37, 44.30). Manuel I’s chrysobull of 1153 exempted Hagia Sophia from kapnikon, metretikon (charge for measuring), and “other charges levied for the sake of tax collectors” (Zepos, Jus 1:379-44-46). Kapnikon is defined in the edict of 1158 (Zepos, Jus 1:384.29-31, 453.36-38) as a charge for anagrapheis and praktores. It is impossible to prove that the rare tax called kapnologion in later documents is the same tax as kapnikon. (See also HEARTH TAX.)


M.B.

KARABISIANOY (Καραβισιάνοι; from karabos, “ship”), name of the first regular and permanent fleet of Byz., probably established by Constantine IV after the Arab siege of Constantinople (672-78). It is first mentioned in the Miracles of St. Demetrios, ca.680, in a context that shows that it could be deployed rapidly in the Aegean. It was commanded by a strategos (also called strategos ton ploimaton) whose headquarters may have been on the island of Keos; his sphere of activity extended to the Mediterranean and the Black Sea and his
subordinates included the droungarios of the Kibyrrhaioi. The Karabianoi are last mentioned in 711; they apparently proved inadequate during the Arab siege of Constantinople in 716–17 and were replaced by a new naval organization, the Kibyrrhaioi theme. Karabianoi never constituted a theme.


--C.F.

KARAHISAR GOSPELS. See Gospel Book.

KARAHISAR SCRIPT. See Decorative Style.

KARAITES ("Scripturalists"), Jewish sect that emerged in Babylonia from the followers of Anan ben David, an alleged 8th-C. descendant of King David. In principle they rejected the Talmud of normative Jewry, resurrected prerabbinic customs and absorbed Islamic influence. Therefore Byz. Jews denigrated them as foreigners and condemned their differing rules for calculating holidays, for marriage and divorce, and for the ritual slaughter of animals. Karaites rejected until after 1453 the use of candles to light the Sabbath eve. Individual Karaites who immigrated to Byz. after the 10th-C. reconquest of Syria were generally treated as Jews by the Byz., who however recognized Karaite autonomy by allowing them to have separate neighborhoods. Tobias ben Moses (mid-11th C.) was the first intellectual leader of Byz. Karaites. Their literature, for example, Judah Haddasi’s *Eshkol Ha-Kopher*, polemicizes against rabbinic Jews and the Byz. government, which they identified with their ancestral enemy Edom (which Jewish tradition long equated with Rome). Karaite literature of the 12th C. shows a familiarity with Greek scholarship and contemporary philosophy and contains important glosses on Byz. society and language. Later leaders included Aaron ben Joseph (ca.1250–1320), a Crimean physician, biblical commentator, and editor of Karaite liturgy; Aaron ben Elijah of Nikomedea (ca.1328–56), philosopher, codifier, and biblical commentator; and Elijah ben Moses Bashyachi (ca.1420–90), whose law code *Addereth Eliahu* manifested a rapprochement with rabbinite Jews. Karaites maintained strong intellectual and economic ties with coreligionists in the Crimea.


--S.B.B.

KARAMAN, the oldest Turkish emirate in Asia Minor, named after its founder Karaman (Karaμανός), who emerged ca.1260 in Ermenek, when confusion prevailed in Anatolia after the Mongol invasion and the resulting internal strife in the Seljuk sultanate. During the war between the Mongols and the Mamlūks of Syria and Egypt, in which the former were defeated near Elbistan in 1277, the emir of Karaman, who had allied with the Mamlūks, conquered Ikonion, established a Seljuk prince there and became his vizier. For the first time Turkish was used as the official language in this short-lived state abolished by the Mongols. Despite persecution by the Mongols, the Karamanids were able to push back the Cypriot king Henry II "of Lusignan" (1285–1324), who tried to capture Alanya at the end of the 13th C. After the collapse of the Mongol regime in Anatolia, the Karamanids made Ikonion their capital and considered themselves heirs of the Seljuks. Most probably ca.1375 they put an end to the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia. At approximately the same time a struggle began between them and the Ottomans for supremacy over Anatolia, which brought the Karamanids into contact with the Ottomans' enemies, the Byz. and other Christians. In 1448 the Karamanids captured Korykos, a possession of the king of Cyprus. After repeated campaigns the Ottomans finally annexed Karaman in 1475.


--E.A.Z.

KARANTENOS, MANUEL, deacon and magistrates of philosophers; fl. ca.1200. In his treatise *On Philosophy and Rhetoric*, Karantenos (Karaμανός) restricted the role of rhetoric to the technical means for presentation of arguments and expressed doubts as to its moral value; he himself used his speech in memory of St. John the Evan-
gelist to praise the saint's homonym, Patr. John X Kamateros. The works of Karantenos, studded with banalities, show but superficial knowledge of ancient authors. He wrote letters (to Constantine Kaloethes, fables, poems (one ascribed in a different MS to Prodromos). It still remains questionable whether Karantenos can be identified with the grammaticos Manuel Sarantenos, the author of an oration delivered at the festival of Lazarus Saturday, and subsequently with Patr. Manuel I Sarantenos (1217–22), an identification accepted by Laurent and Criscuolo.


—A.K.

KARBEAS (Kαρβεάς), Paulician leader of the mid-9th C. died probably in 863 at the Byz. victory of Porrison. Karbeas began his career as a protomandator of Theodotos Melissenos, the strategos of Anatolikon, but fled to Asia Minor ca. 843 with some 5,000 followers from the persecution of the empress Theodora. He established himself on the upper Euphrates, probably collaborated with the Muslim emir of Melite, and founded a separate principality that comprised the centers of Amara, Argoous, and Tephrike as capital. The end of Karbeas's career is not recorded, and scholars have expressed doubts on the participation of Karbeas in the disastrous war of 863 with Byz., which destroyed the emirate. The epic of Digenes Akritas may have preserved his memory in the figure of the Muslim Karoes, the uncle of Digenes' father the emir, but this is impossible to prove.


—N.G.G.

KARÎM AL-DÎN, more fully Maḥmûd ibn Muḥammad Karîm Al-Dîn of Aksaray, Anatolia, high fiscal official in the late Seljuk divan and author of the history Musamarat-ı ahhar (Entertainment of the Chronicles); fl. 1300. This historical work, in Persian, of which only part four is original and important, continues the court chronicle of Ibn Bībî. As an eyewitness and high fiscal official he chronicled the series of events that led to the political and economic collapse of the Seljuks of Rûm in the early 14th C. The decline was accompanied by the rise of nomadism, the weakening of İlkhanid suzerainty, and the proliferation of "armies" of tax farmers. The upheaval was frequently accompanied by physical destruction and the flight of urban and rural populations. Though all segments of sedentary society in Anatolia suffered, the damage to the Christian communities was irreparable; their consequent decline as reflected in the patriarchal synodal acts is explained in this very perceptive Muslim source. He notes that the rapacious tax farmers who destroyed the Seljuk fiscal system did not even know what the jizya (poll tax on non-Muslims) was, even though it had been the single largest source of revenue in the land. He also speaks extensively of the Greek element in the court of İzz al-Dîn Kaikâus II in the mid-13th C.


Lit. Vryonis, Decline 183, 224f, 243–48, 464ff. —S.V.

KARIN. See Theodosiopolis.

KARIYE CAMII. See Chora Monastery.

KARS (Käposé), Armenian fortress and town in the district of Vanand in northeast Anatolia. It was founded in antiquity, but first became important as one of the successive Bagratid capitals (928–61). Conflict over its control first arose in 937 when the prince of Archasia attempted unsuccessfully to have its new cathedral consecrated according to the Orthodox rather than the Armenian rite (Asolik, 3:7). In 962 Ašot III granted Vanand to his brother Mušel, who established a secondary Bagratid dynasty with Kars as its capital. The city grew rich on trade between Ani and Karin (Theodosiopolis) and became an important cultural center under its last king, Gagik-Abas (1029–65), whose portrait has been preserved in the Gospel illustrated for him (Jerusalem, Arm. Patr. 2556; S. Der Nersessian, Armenian Art [London 1982] pl.75) The Seljuk threat, however, caused Gagik-Abas to cede the city to Byz. in 1064/5 in exchange for estates in Cappadocia, and the kingdom of Vanand was added to the theme of Iberia. The Turks retook Kars, however, before the empire could establish control over it.


K'ART'LI'S CXOVREBA. See Georgian Chronicles.

KARYESES (Karpes, Kapea, lit. "nut trees"), now a small village in the center of the peninsula of Mt. Athos; it was the site of the Protaton and served from the 10th C. as center of the monastic federation. In the vicinity of Karyes were a large number of kellia, some belonging to the Protaton, others to Athonite monasteries. This ensemble of kellia was called the laura ton Kareon, with its central church being a 10th-c. basilica dedicated to the Virgin.

Among the kellia was a group founded by St. Sava of Serbia to house monks coming from Hilandar to Karyes on official business. One kelliōn, dedicated to the Palestinian St. Sabas, was designated for two or three monks. In a typikon of 1197 or 1199 (ed. Meyer, Hauptturkunden 184–87) Sava of Serbia specifically exempted the kelliōn from the jurisdiction of the protos of Athos or hegoumenos of Hilandar to assure the security of its sacred furnishings. The typikon also provided that the hegoumenos and monks at Hilandar were to elect the epistates or supervisor of the kelliōn. Although brief, the typikon includes dietary and liturgical regulations, with emphasis on recitation of the Psalter.

Lit. Prot. 116f, 120f. —A.M.T.

KARYTAINA (Karpitaina, name either of Slavic origin or derived from Arkadian Gortyna), city and powerful fortification above the Alphais River commanding the major routes through the interior of the Peloponnesos. There is little evidence of Karytaina before the 13th C.; reused architectural material has led Moutsopoulos (infra) to suggest a 12th-C. church inside the castle. Under Frankish domination, however, Karytaina was the major center of Skorta, one of the great baronies of the principality of Achaia. The first baron was probably Renaud de Briel, followed by his brother Hugues, whose son Geoffrey was the lord of Karytaina featured prominently in the Chronicle of the Morea, and whose possession of Karytaina allowed him to defy the prince of Achaia. The castle fell to the Byz. of Mistra by 1320 and lost its military importance thereafter, although the city on the hillside flourished in later centuries.

The castle crowning the impressive hilltop is completely Frankish in date. Above an extensive circuit wall the fortress itself forms a large triangle; it has a single entrance with barbican, flanked by a tower. On the interior is the palace, a rather simple structure of three rooms built over an enormous cistern. A fortified tower-habitation south of the fortress has been dated to the mid-15th C. The surviving bridge across the Alphais below Karytaina was probably built by the Franks
but revered by a certain Raoul Manouel Melikes (PLP, no.17788) in 1439/40.


KASANDRENOI, or Kassandrenos (Κασσανδρανοι), a family name that probably originated from the toponym KASSANDREIA; the name is frequent among peasants of the region (Lavra 4:284). The landowner Kasandrenos in Chalkidike is attested in a charter of Iveron ca.1094; a charter of 1112 (Docheiari., no.3:13–14) mentions two Kasan-
drenoi, evidently members of the local administration in Thessalonike: the proedros Leo and mag-
istros Theodore. The family was still connected with Thessalonike in the 14th C.; a rich Thessa-
lonian, Alexios Kasandrenos, corresponded with Demetrios Kydones ca.1355; another Kasan-
drenos, logariastes of the court in 1317–20, pos-
sessed lands in the vicinity; Demetrios Kasan-
drenos, a native of the region (died 1362 or a little later), supported John VI and Matthew I Kan
takouzenos; in 1359 he moved to Mistra. He and his daughter, Maria Kanabina Kasandrense, were active patrons of literature and art; Demeti-
arios ordered a Plutarck MS (Milan, Ambros. D 538 inf.), and Maria was a patron of the Bronto-
cheion monastery in Mistra and the Mangana monas-
tery in Constantinople (D. Bassi, Rivista di filo-
logia e d’istrazione classica 26 [1898] 394–96). An
archon Manuel Kasandrenos was active ca.1381, and Kasandrenos Palaiologos (died 1439 on Eu-
boca) participated in the Council of Ferrara-Flor-
ence.

Lit. PLP, nos. 11309–21. —A.K.

KASSANDREIA (Κασσανδρεια). In the late
Roman period Kassandria was a polis and bish-
opric on the site of ancient Potidaia in the Mac-
edonian CHALKIDIKE at the neck of the Kassandra/ Pallene peninsula. It was sacked and destroyed by the Huns in 539/40. Justinian I built a cross-wall at the entrance to the peninsula as the bulwark of the region (Prokopios, Buildings 4:3.21–25). By the 10th C. it reappears in the sources as a town (polichnion—Itiv., no.10.9, later kastron—Dionys., p.118), probably under the command of an archon (Itiv., no.10.13–14) and a bishopric suffragan of
Thessalonike (Notitiae CP 7.301). The fertile land
of the peninsula attracted both the citizens of Thessalonike and the monks of Mt. Athos who
established estates there and exported grain and
other products by sea. A 14th-C. historian (Greg. 1:245.11–13) characterized Kassandrea as a polis
that used to be famous but at his time was aban-
donned. Kassandria was temporarily occupied by
the Catalan Grand Company and served as their
operational base in the winter of 1307/8. Before
1407 John VII built walls “over the old founda-
tions” to protect the peninsula (Lavra 3, no.159.15–
20) and conferred upon several monasteries a part of the state income from land there. In 1419
the kephale of Kassandria, Stephen Radenos, re-
turned to the monastery of St. Panteleemon a
village in the peninsula (Pantel., no.18). During
the Venetian occupation of Thessalonike, ambas-
sadors from Kassandria included among their
complaints to the Republic that the peninsula had
not been sufficiently fortified (N. Svoronos in
Lavra 4:59, no.272). It was probably seized by the
Turks ca.1430.

Lit. E. Oberhummer, RE supp. 4 (1924) 877f. N. Svor-
31–33. —T.E.G., A.K.

KASSIA (Κασσία), also Kassiane, Ekasia, and
other forms of the name, poet; born 800 or 805
(Rochow) or ca.810 (Beck, Kirche 519), probably
in Constantinople, died between 843 and 867.
According to a legend preserved in SYMEON LO-
GOTHETE she competed in the BRIDE SHOW to
select the wife of THEOPHilos but lost to Theo-
DORA. Rochow rejects this legend but believes
that the letters of THEODOROS DE STOUDIOS to “kandi-
datissa Kassia” were addressed to the poet; if this
identification is correct, then Kassia staunchly
supported icon veneration. She was a nun and
founder of a convent in Constantinople.

Various liturgical hymns are preserved under
Kassia’s name; it is not always clear whether they
belong to her or to other hymnographers such as
KOSMAS THE HYMNOGRAPHER (G. Schirò, Diptycha
1 [1979] 303–14). Her troparion To the Harlot
(included in the Triodion) is dedicated to the
A series of iambic gnoma deals with ethical
ideals and weaknesses (friendship, foolishness, etc.)
as well as with specific feminine qualities, includ-
ing beauty; they ignore the norms of ancient
prosody (P. Maas, *BZ* 10 [1901] 54–59) and stress personal antipathies. “I hate,” Kassia reiterates; she hated particularly the illiterate fool who claimed to be knowledgeable, esp. if this fool were “a youth of royal house” (perhaps alluding to her rejection by the young Theophilos).


-A.K.

**KASTAMON** (Κασταμόν, mod. Kastamonu), a fortress commanding the upper Amnias valley in northern Paphlagonia; never a bishopric. The ancestral home of the Komnenoi (Alexios I’s grandfather Manuel Erotikos had his estates in the neighborhood), Kastamon first appears in history when Isaac I Komnenos was proclaimed emperor in 1057. When Alexios I visited Kastamon in 1075, however, the site was desolate from Turkish attacks. It fell to the ĐANIȘMENDIDS before 1101, when the Crusaders were defeated nearby. Kastamon was a frequent goal of the campaigns of John II Komnenos, which briefly restored Byz. rule, but it fell permanently to the Turks in the second half of the 12th C. The substantial castle of Kastamon contains stretches of Byz. walls.


-C.F.

**KASTAMONITES** (Κασταμονίτης), a family name. The name, and perhaps the family itself, originated from the town of KASTAMON. The first firmly dated Kastamonai lived during Alexios I’s reign, but certain family members known from 11th-C. seals (the protospatharios Theodore, the patrikios Nikeyphoros, the vestes Constantine) probably preceded Alexios. The Life of St. MELETTI S THE YOUNGER mentions Michael Kastamonites, an affluent late 11th-C. proprietor in Hellas, but is silent about his titles or offices. At least one Kastamonites, Niketas, was Alexios I’s general, doux of the fleet; involved in a plot against Alexios, he lost his position. His identification with the protoproidos Niketas Kastamonites of 1094 (Gautier, “Blachernes” 257) is not certain. Sometime in the 11th C. an unknown family member founded the KASTAMONITOU MONASTERY on Mt. Athos. Their position declined in the 12th C.: Leo was a dependent *anthropos* of Isaac Komnenos in 1152; John Kastamonites served as a patriarchal secretary; another Kastamonites participated in the embassy of 1170 to Pope ALEXANDER III and to Genoa. The Kastamonaitai reached their zenith in the late 12th C. because of their relationship with the Angeloi. Theodore Kastamonites, Isaac II’s uncle, served as *logothetes ton sekron*; Constantine was *parathalassites* ca. 1203 (*Patmou Engrapha* 2, no. 60.35–36); and Eustathios was imperial *vestiari* sometime between 1195 and 1199 (nos. 56.16, 59.13). They apparently possessed lands in the Smyrna region (Ahreweiler, “Smyrne” 170f), at least by 1234, and served in the local ecclesiastical hierarchy, for example, Stephen Kastamonites, *chartophylax* of Smyrna from 1257 to 1267 (*PLP*, no. 11374). Later Kastamonaitai are rare; some may have acquired their name from the Kastamonites monastery.


-A.K.

**KASTAMONITOU MONASTERY**, located in the interior of the peninsula of Mt. ATHOS, between the monasteries of Docheiariou and Zographou. Virtually no documents survive from the Byz. period, so little is known of its history. Dedicated to St. Stephen, Kastamonitou (*Kastamounitou*) was founded in the mid-11th C., probably by a native of Kastamon in Paphlagonia or a member of the Kastamonites family. Until the 14th C. it was a modest establishment, inhabited by Greek monks.

After a fire in the 1420s, Kastamonitou was restored through the generosity of the Serbian general Radić, attracted numerous slavophone monks, and remained prosperous until ca. 1500. The present monastery is of modern (18th or 19th C.) construction, and officially called *mone tou Konstaomonitou*. The library contains 40 MSS of Byz. date (Lampros, *Athos* 1:36–42). The dates of three supposedly Byz. wonder-working icons in the monastery’s church have not yet been established.


-A.M.T., A.C.

**KASTORIA** (Καστορία, “place of beavers,” orig. name of a lake), fortified polis (Skyl. 355.25) or *kastron* (An.Komn. 2:41.7–12) in western Mace-
donia or Thrace. Anna Komnene described it as located on the top of a hill, on a promontory projecting into the lake of the same name. The city appears first in the description of Bulgar-Byz. wars at the end of the 10th C. By 1018 it was occupied by Basil II. Kastoria was probably founded near late antique Diokletianopolis, built by Diocletian. According to Prokopios (Buildings 4.3.1–4), Diokletianopolis was situated near Lake Kastoria; since it was destroyed by barbarian assaults, Justinian I transferred the city to the mountainous and narrow promontory “and gave it an appropriate name.” Whether this name was Justinianopolis is not clear from Prokopios. As Diokletianopolis the city appears in Hierokles and (anachronistically) in Constantine Porphyrogenetos (De them. 2.38, ed. Pertusi 88).

In 1082/3 the Normans occupied Kastoria but in Dec. 1093 Alexios I recaptured the fortress. In the 13th–14th C. the “great polis” Kastoria (Kantak. 1.451.1–2) was at the center of political struggle in the Balkans. First, as a possession of the despotate of Epiros, Kastoria was attacked by the Nicaeans; John III Vatatzes took it temporarily in ca.1252 but Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epiros reconquered it ca.1257. Michael VIII won a skirmish near Kastoria in 1259 and seized it after the battle of Pelagonia. In the beginning of the 14th C. Kastoria was in the hands of John II of Neopatras; he titled himself doux of “Great Vlachia and Kastoria.” Then (until 1332/3) Kastoria was within the “fief” of Gabrielepoulos. Andronikos III managed to annex the city but Syrgiannes in 1334 surrendered it to Stefan Uroš IV Dušan. It was finally taken by the Serbs in 1342/3 (Fine, Late Balkans 301), and the truce of 1350 (Reg 5, no.2967) lists Kastoria among the holdings of Dušan. After Dušan’s death Symeon Uroš made Kastoria the center of his principality. Thomas Preljubović and the Albanian family of Musachi claimed rights to Kastoria, but in the mid-1380s it was captured by the Ottomans.

Kastoria had a significant Jewish population; the Jewish scholar Tobia ben Elieser of Kastoria wrote a commentary on the Torah during the reign of Alexios I (J. Perles, BZ 2 [1893] 574ff). A. Epstein (Gesta 21 [1982] 21–29) surmises that the frescoes in the Mavriotissa monastery near Kastoria reflect anti-Semitic sentiment.

The bishopric of Kastoria is known from the 10th C. Its bishop was protothronos-suffragan of Ohrid.

Monuments of Kastoria. The relative wealth of this regional trading center is reflected in the number of medieval churches preserved from the late 9th/early 10th C. onward. No dated dedicatory inscriptions survive. The chronology of Kastoria’s monuments depends on masonry techniques and the style of the surviving frescoes; it must therefore remain tentative. The Koumpelidi, a domed triconch, Hagios Stephanos, and the Taxiarships, both minute basilicas, may be ascribed to ca.900. The Anargyroi, another basilica, appears to have been built and first decorated in the early 11th C. and then redecorated at the end of the 12th C. by a patron named Theodore Lemnites. One of the painters involved in phase two of the decoration apparently also worked at Kurbinovo. Nikephoros Kasnitzes, magistros, funded the construction and decoration of the single-naved church of St. Nicholas in the 3rd quarter of the 12th C. The nave has a cycle of the Great Feasts as well as a handsome proskynesis icon of the patron saint of the church with the portrait of the donor. A cycle of the life of St. Nicholas appears in the narthex. Shifts in painting style suggest that metropolitan trends were familiar to painters working in Kastoria. The particularities of the cloisonné brickwork used in the construction of all these churches, however, reflects the strength and continuity of the local building tradition.


KASTRESIOS (καστρεῖσιος, Gr. equivalent of Lat. comes et castrensis sacri palati), imperial courtier, usually a eunuch, in charge of the emperor’s quarters and provisioning. The post is mentioned first in 319 and last in 612. The vita of DANIHEL THE STYLITE (26.20–21) describes a certain Gela- nios, who was kastresios of the divine table (trapeza)
under Leo I; he possessed an estate near Constantinople. The *kastresios* of the imperial table reappears in the *De ceremoniis*. W. Seibt (BZ 72 [1979] 38) suggests that in the 7th C. the *epi tes traææes* assumed the main duties of the *kastresios*.

The *kastresios* should probably be distinguished from the *kastresios*; in the 10th-C. Taktikon of Benešević (Oikonomides, *Lisies* 251.23), he is listed as a patriarchal official between the *protonotarios* and *referendarios*. He occupies the same position in the synodal lists of the 12th C. (Darrouzès, *Offiæia* 100) and kept functioning as a member of the patriarchal chancery to the end of the empire.  

LIT. O. Seeck, *RE* 5 (1899) 1774f. — A.K.

**KASTROKTISIA** (*kastraktision*, lit. "construction of fortresses"), a fiscal charge, one of the *epeææai*, according to a chrysobull of 1349 (*Docheiar.,* no.25.10). It is first attested in the charter of John Chaldos of 995 (*Ivir.*, no.8.13) exempting the monks of Kolobou from *kastroktisia*, *mitaton*, providing forage and *prosodion* (?), and other *epeææai*. In chrysobulls of the late 11th C., *kastroktisia* is cited along with the construction of roads and bridges (e.g., *Patmou Engræpha* 1, no.3.96, *Laure* 1, no.39.38) and probably designated an actual state corvee. It is unknown when it replaced the late Roman *munera*, which were levied primarily in specie.

Although frequent in later chrysobulls, *kastroktisia* is rarely mentioned in *praktika*. A fragment of a *praktikon* from the end of the 13th C. (*Espig.*, no.7.8) mentions *kastroktisia* of 1.5 nomisma, that is, 1.7 percent of the *oikoumenon*. Forced labor was probably employed in the construction work: in describing Stefan Uroš IV Dušan’s refortification of Berroia in Macedonia in 1350, John Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 3:124.21–24) states that more than 10,000 men worked there; the historian adds that they were assembled from the entire country of the Serbian kral’. To what extent this Serbian episode can be applied to Byz. remains unclear. By the 14th C., however, *kastroktisia* probably began to lose its technical meaning: lists of privileges sometimes include it in a paramilitary context, together with shipbuilding, *mitaton*, and *aplektton* (e.g., *Laure* 3, no.1.18.90–92), sometimes with *psomozemias* and *angareias* (*Xrop.*, no.8.17–18), but sometimes it is associated with nonmilitary and nonconstruction charges such as *orike* and *ennomion* (*Espig.*, no.22.32). On the other hand, a different charge, the *phloriatikon*, known in the Peloponnese in the 15th C., was used for the reconstruction of fortresses (E. Vranoussi, *EiBalk* 14 [1978] no.4:81–83), and the revenue from the *abiotikion* could be used to repair a city (D. Bagiakakos, *Athena* 65 [1961] 199).


**KASTRON** (*kastrateon*), also *kastellion* and *phrou*ron, fortress or citadel. Since *fortifications* became the main external sign of cities, the term *kastron* came to denote the city as a whole. It was applied even to such relatively large places as Ephesus, but never to Constantinople. In the strict sense, *kastron* designated a fortified settlement, usually on a hilltop, distinct from the open lower town or *emporion*. *Kastron*, however small, played an important role in Byz. defense; the state paid particular attention to them, requiring the population to build and maintain them (*kastroktisia*). In the 11th C., when the need for defense against the Turks was paramount, *kastron* were assigned for life to individuals who assumed the obligation of maintaining and defending them. On the death of the concessionaire, the *kastron* returned to imperial control; normally it was put in the charge of a *kastrophylax*.


**KASTROPHYLAX** (*kastrôphylæc*), commander of a stronghold, appointed by the emperor; he was responsible for the maintenance and repair of a *kastron* and for preserving order (*apotibigisis*) within its walls (*Sathas, MB* 6:644.19–23). A 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 188.20–22) lists them, together with *prokatæmenoi*, as administrators of *poleis*. The office is attested from the second half of the 11th C. (N. Oikonomides in *Polychronion* 417, n.12), but is more frequently mentioned from the 13th C. onward. Some kastrophylakes presided over small *kastron* (e.g., *Patmou Engræpha* 2, no.70.20); others administered cities such as Smyrna, Thessalonike, and Serres. Their functions are poorly documented in available sources; in 1290 a kastrophylax of Smyrna assisted the *prokatæmenoi* in a civil trial. Their social po-
sition was not of a high rank, and even the kastro-
phylakes of Thessalonike (Demetrios Talapas—
Docheiar., no.48 verso, 5) and Serres (Leo Azan-
ites—Guilou, Ménetée, no.34.65—66; Demetrios
Arethas—Koutoul., no.33.90) did not come from
families of the high nobility. They were sometimes
landowners (Lavra 2, no.90.122).

LIT. Angold, Byz. Government 266f.

—A.K.

KATAKALON (Κατακαλῶν, more rarely Κατα-
καλός), a noble lineage, known from ca.900, when
Leo Katakalon was domestikos of the scholae. In the
10th—11th C. some were governors: Katakalon, strategos of Thessalonike; Demetrios Katakalon,
katépano of Paradounavon. Probably some family
members assumed the name of Maurokatakalon
(the “Black Katakalon”); they were military com-
manders in the 11th C. and esp. in the reign of
Alexios I (e.g., Nicholas, his son Marianos, Greg-
ory). As a result of intermarriage with a number of
aristocratic families, many members of the Kaka-
kalon family bore double names: KATAKALON
KEKAUMENOS and Katakalon Klazomenites in the
11th C., Katakalon Bryennios and Katakalon Eup-
herbonos in the 12th C. An anonymous epitaph
praised John Bryennios Katakalon, a soldier re-
lated to the KOMNENOS and married to a daughter of
a sebastos of the lineage of PalaioLOGoi and
Doukal. Constantine Katakalon Eupherbonos,
among the most prominent of Alexios I’s gener-
als, was doux of Cyprus ca.1100. His son Nikepho-
ros married Maria, Alexios I’s daughter. Two of
their sons, Alexios and Andronikos, occupied high
posts in the mid-12th C.; ca.1162 Andronikos
became governor of Cilicia. Another Andronikos
Katakalon served as military commander of Al-
exios III. Later the family declined into obscurity
(PLP, nos. 11413—29).

LIT. Winkelmann, Quellenstudien 171f. N. Bănescu, “Sceau
de Démétrius Katakalon, katépano de Paradounavon,” EÖ
39 (1940) 157—60. D. Polemis, “Anepigraphoi stichoi eis
ton thanaton Ioannou Bryenniou tou Katakalon,” EEBs 35

—A.K.

KATAKALON KEKAUMENOS (Κατακαλῶν
Κεκαυμένος), general; died after 1057. He was
originally from Koloneia and was not an aristocrat
by birth (Skyl. 483.15f). His identification with
KEKAUMENOS, author of memoirs, is not estab-
lished. Apparently sent to Sicily with MANIAKES in

1038, he defended Messina. In 1042 Michael V
appointed Katakalon commander of troops com-
battling an uprising in Constantinople. He was
vestes and archon of the Danubian cities ca.1043,
governor of Ani and Iberia, stratelates of the East
can.1050, and doux of Antioch ca.1056. In 1043 he
defeated the remnants of the expedition of JA-
roslov of Kiev against Constantinople. Anony-
mous verses call him “the light of the Thessalians”
and praise him as victor over the Scythians and
Hungarians (K. Dyobouioniotes, NE 16 [1922] 53—
56). He eagerly supported the uprising of ISAAC
I in 1057 for which he received the title of kouro-
palates. G. Litavin (RESEE 7 [1969] 455—68) sur-
mises that Isaac appointed him strategos of Ko-
loinea. Katakalon is the hero of the last section of
Skytizes’ chronicle (Skyl. 406—500—A. Kazhdan,
IFZ [1975] no.1, 207f.; J. Shepard, REARM 11
[1975—76] 269—311), and Katakalon’s recollec-
tions may have served as a source for Skylizes.

LIT. N. Bănescu, “Un duc byzantin du XIe siècle: Kak-
a tumor Kekaumenos,” BSHA 1924 25—36. Kazhdan,
Arm. 31f.

—C.M.B., A.K.

KATAPETASMA (καταπέτασμα), a veil or cur-
tain separating the sanctuary from the nave. Use
of katapetasma is confirmed from the 6th C. in
Egypt and Syria (cf. G. Khouri-Sarkis, Orient syrien
20). The Byz. practice of suspending katapetasma
over the templon door developed from a monas-
tic custom attested from the 12th C. (Nicholas
of Andida, PG 140:445C); occasional references
to the katapetasma in the sources, esp. inventories,
indicate its slow acceptance. Except for some early
Coptic textiles, which might have served as katu-
petasma, all extant katapetasma date after 1453.
The decorative ciborium curtains represented in
the Menologion of Basil II and elsewhere can also be called katapetasma (Symeon of Thessalo-
nike, PG 155:341C).

LIT. C. Schneider, “Studien zum Ursprung liturgischer
Einzelheiten östlicher Liturgien: I. Katapetasma,” Kyrios
1 (Konigsberg-Berlin 1956; rp Graz 1966) 57—79. Mathews,

—A.G.

KATAPHLORON (Καταφλώρον), a family name
that possibly originated from a monastery of St.
Phloros (Florus); the formerly accepted spelling
Kataphloros has been rejected by P. Wirth (BZ 56 [1963] 235f; idem, Eustathiana [Amsterdam 1980] 51), but is retained by V. Laurent in Corpus, vol. 2. The first known Kataphloron was probably John, protosphatharios and commander (archegetes) of the West, whose seal is usually dated to the epoch of the Komnenoi (Guillard, Institutions 1:394); the title of protosphatharios, however, died out by the early 12th C., and its application to the commander of the Western army indicates an earlier date, perhaps the 10th C. A certain Kataphloron was appointed governor of Mesopotamia in the late 1030s; Psellus’s information (Sathas, MB 5:459.18–20), however, does not indicate whether he was a judge or a strategos. John Kataphloron served in 1079 as anagraphheus of Smolena, Thessalonike, and Serres (Lavra 1, no.39.1); the editors considered him a strategos, an office that does not accord properly with his fiscal duties; Dolger (Diplomatik 348, n.4) read strateutes (soldier). Other known members of the Kataphloron family were not in the military: one was praktor in 1089 (Lavra 1, no.50.36–37); another, Nicholas, was magistros ton rhetoron (P. Wirth, CLMed 21 [1960] 213f); Mark was patriarch of Jerusalem ca.1190–95. John went to Venice in 1195 as Alexios III’s envoy; in 1199 he or his namesake served as grammatikos. Eustathios of Thessalonike was probably Nicholas Kataphloron’s nephew (V. Laurent, REB 20 [1962] 218–21). Seals of the 11th–12th C. record an aseketes (Laurant, Corpus 2, nos. 109, 115) and a mystolektes (no.156) of this family.

—A.K.

KATAPHRAKTOS (καταφράκτος, from καταφράσω, “cover up”), an armored horseman mounted on an armored horse. Cataphractarii or ciblanarii were created by the Romans during the 3rd–4th C. in response to their Sasanian enemies (J.W. Eadie, JRS 57 [1967] 161–73). The Strategikon of Maurice portrays 6th-C. heavy cavalrymen, equally adept with lance or bow, wearing knee-length coats and riding horses protected by thick felt coverings (Strat. Maurik. 1.1–2, pp. 74–84). Nothing is heard of them again until the 10th C. when Nikephoros II Phokas developed heavy cavalry anew. His Praecepta Militaria describes kataphraktoi wearing lamellar or mail coats bolstered by padded surcoats, gauntlets, leg- guards, and iron helmets, with an iron mace or a saber as their main weapon. Their horses were protected by carapaces made of felt or thick hides. The kataphraktoi were deployed in a wedge-like formation of 400–500 men with mounted archers in the middle. They identified the location of the enemy commander and aimed their charge at a steady pace directly at him, while regular cavalry units on their flanks followed up the attack. Al-Mutanabbi gives a vivid description of the kataphraktois in a poem about a battle of 954 (Vasiliev, Byz. Arabes 2.2:333) and Leo the Deacon (Leo Diac. 78.21) refers to Phokas’s preparation of “all-iron horsemen,” noting their effect at Tarso in 965 (59.2–22) and in the Balkan campaigns of John I Tzimiskes in 971 (140.10–13).

Heavy cavalry are not specifically attested during the 11th C. but in the 12th C. Manuel I Komnenos enthusiastically adopted the panoply and tactics of European knights (who charged in line with their lances leveled at the enemy) and staged Western-style tournaments (Nik.Chon. 108.53–110.94; cf. S. Lampos, NE 5 [1908] 15–18); the practical effect of these horsemen against the evasive Turks was minimal (R.P. Lindner, JÖB 32.2 [1982] 207–13). Byz. heavy cavalrymen continue to appear in the 13th–14th C., but Western mercenaries supplied the bulk of such cavalrymen in Nicaean and Palaiologan armies.


—E.M.

KATARTARIOS (καταρτάριος, from katarismos, “furnishing”), craftsmen involved in the manufacture of silk. According to the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (ch.7), katartarioi prepared (katarizin) metaxa, but their precise function is unclear since the meaning of metaxa in this passage is uncertain: if it means cocoons, then the work of katartarioi was reeling, that is, bringing together the filaments from several cocoons to form uniform strands called “raw silk”; if it designates the raw silk itself, then the katartarioi were responsible for the next stage of silk production, forming the raw silk threads into more substantial yarn. Subsequent degumming or scouring gave the silk fibers a brilliant, pearly sheen. R.S. Lopez (Speculum 20

The functions of katartarioi overlapped to a certain extent with those of silk merchants (serikopratai), who sometimes permitted katartarioi to purchase metaxa directly from foreign merchants. This privilege was extended only to wealthy katartarioi; those who were poor (as well as metaxarios, whose status is unclear) had to buy their raw materials from silk merchants. The sale of metaxa was strictly controlled by the eparch: katartarioi had to be listed in the eparch’s register and provide the authorities with testimony concerning their status and moral rectitude. The guild of katartarioi occupied a lower rank than that of the silk merchants, and some katartarioi strove to gain admittance to the guild of silk merchants; to achieve this goal they had to promise to stop manufacturing silk.


KATECHOUMENA. See Gallery.

KATEPANO, or catepanate, a conventional scholarly term to designate the Byz. territories in Apulia that were placed under the administration of the katepano. The katepanate was established by Basil Boioannes after his victory over Melo in Oct. 1018 and existed until Feb. 1042, when Argyros, son of Melo, was proclaimed princeps and dux Italiæ. The Normans who began to penetrate this region in 1041 referred to it as Capitanata.


KATEPEANO (κατεπάνο, deriving from the Gk. adverb epano, “above” [A. Jannaris, BZ 10 (1901) 204–07]), a term used from the 9th C. to designate certain officials: the katepano of the basilikoi in the Klerotogion of Philotheos, the katepano of the marines on a 10th-C. seal (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.962), the katepano of imperial workshops, the katepano of imperial titles (axiomata) in the 11th C., etc. Constantine VII’s identification of the katepano as magister militum (De adm. imp. 27.69–70) is a mere anachronism. The term was often used to denote a commander of a military unit, such as Mardaëtes, and was identical with strategos. By the end of the 10th C., katepano became primarily the designation of governors of major provinces, esp. Italy (Falkenhausen, Dominazione 46–59) and Mesopotamia, in the 11th C. Bulgaria (Litavrin, Bulgaria i Vizantiya 264–73), Antioch, etc. The term in the sense of the governor-doux disappears after 1100, but it continued as a name for local officials, at least in Smyrna in the 12th C. and in Trebizond in the 14th. Accordingly, the term katepanikon, known in both Macedonia and Asia Minor, was used for small administrative units. The term katepanate, often employed in scholarly literature, is not found in Byz. sources, although the Normans created the word Capitana- ta as a designation for southern Italy.

KATHOLIKON, modern Greek term for the main church in a monastic complex; the term does not appear in Byz. sources, although the term *katholike ekklesia* is occasionally found (*Prot.*, no.14.17; *Iviron*, no.15.44). The Byz. normally referred to the principal church as the *naos* or *ekklesia*. Since the liturgy could be said only once a day in any given church, monasteries often contained several small churches and chapels in addition to the centrally located *katholikon*, which was usually dedicated to the patron of the monastery. The Council in *Trullo*, canon 59, required baptisms to be celebrated only in *katholikai ekklesiae*; here the term seems to mean the principal churches of a diocese, as it does in Eustathios of Thessalonike (*Eusth. Thess.*, *Capture* 116.35).

KATHOLIKOS (adj. *katholikós*, universal), Greek term that as noun designated in the 6th C. the archbishop of Persia (*Kosmas Indikopleustes* 2.2.14–15, ed. Wolska-Conus 1:307). In Syriac and Armenian the term appears already in the 5th C.: in the acts of the Council of Seleukeia-Ctesiphon of 410, the bishop of Seleukeia is named *katholikos*, as is the bishop of Arsacid Armenia in the vita of *Mesrop Maštoc*. The heads of the churches of Georgia, Caucasian Albania, and esp. Armenia as well as the Nestorian patriarch were called *katholikoi*. From the 12th C. onward, certain Armenian bishops (of *At’amar*, *Sis*) claimed this title.

The term was applied also to the superior ("the general abbot," *archimandrite*) of a group of monastic communities, e.g., in the region of Amaseia (Beck, *Kirche* 137); in the early 4th C. it was used to denote secular superintendents of finances of large territorial units, *dioeceses* (*Eusebios, VC* 4.36.3, ed. F. Winkelmann, p.134.12).

KATRARES, JOHN, writer and scribe from Thessalonike; fl. 1309–22. It can be deduced from his writings that Katrares (*Katrapros, Katraprios*) was interested in classical philology and was a member of the literary circle that flourished in the early 14th C. around Demetrios Triklinios and Thomas Magistros. He specialized in the copying of ancient works, such as Homer’s *Iliad*, Proklos’s commentary on the *Timaeus* of Plato, the
works of Strabo, and Theon’s commentary on the *Canons* of Ptolemy.

Katrarees composed a satirical poem of 222 ana-
creontic verses attacking the Bulgarian writer
Neophytos Momitzilas or Prodromenos (PLP, no.
19254). He called Neophytos a *Boulgar-albanito-
blachos* and criticized his ignorance of classical
literature, his greed, and his ambition to become
patriarch. The poem includes some Slavic and
perhaps also some Albanian words as examples of
the barbaric speech of Neophytos. Katrarees
also wrote a play in dodecasyllabic verse, of which
unfortunately only a short 37-line fragment sur-
vives; this literary effort, highly unusual in Byz.,
was clearly modeled on *Euripides*. F. Jürss
(BZ 59 [1966] 275–84) has established that Katrarees
was not the author of three dialogues (*Hermippus*,
*Hormodatos*, and *Mousokles*) that had been attri-
buted to him in the past.

G. de André, J. Irigoin, W. Hörandner, “Johannes Ka-
trarees und seine dramatisch-poetische Produktion,” *JÖB* 23

LIT. Turyn, *CodVat* 124–30. *PLP*, no.15444. Hunger,
Lit. 1:510: 2:95, 147f, 251.

---

KAUSSIYEH CHURCH. See Antioc.

KAVÁD (Καβάδης), king of Persia (488–531),
father of Chosroes I; born 449, died 13 Sept. 531.
He succeeded his uncle Valas as king, but from
496 to 498 lived in exile among the *Ephtalites*.
He fought a largely unsuccessful war against Byz.
(502–06), ended by a seven-year truce negotiated
by Keler. Kavád sought the support of Justin I
in securing the succession of Chosroes I by having
the emperor adopt him. After this plan failed,
relations with Byz. deteriorated in disputes con-
cerning Lazika and Iberia. War broke out in 527
and lasted until Kavád’s death. According to Pro-
koplos (Wars 1.6.19), he governed Persia well since
“in shrewdness and action he was second to none.”

diplomatikes scheis* *Byzantion* kai *Persias keos ton ΣΤ΄* aiona

---

KAVÁD-SHİRÚYA (Καβάδης Σιρόνης), Persian
king (Feb.–Sept./Oct. 628), died Ctesiphon from
poison or in an epidemic. The son of Chosroes
II, Kavád-Shirúya connived to imprison and mur-
der his father and immediately sent an ambas-
sador to Herakleios’s military camp in Ganzak
(arrived on 3 Apr.). The new king asked for
peace and promised to release the prisoners of
war and to send back the fragments of the True
Cross; some sources even present him as a crypto-
Christian (Mango, “La Perse Sassanide” 109f). His
premature death and the succession of his young
son, Ardashir III, weakened Byz. influence in
Persia and impelled Herakleios to use *Shahr-
baraz* as a tool of Byz. interests.

LIT. Christensen, *Sassanides* 497f. N. Oikonomides,
“Correspondence between Heraclius and Kavadh-Sior in

---

KAYALLA. See Christoupolis.

KAY-KHUSRAW I, Ghiyáth al-Dín (*Γεοβατίνης*),
Seljuk sultan of Ikonion (1194/5–97 and 1205–
11); died near Antioch on the Meander 1211.
Youngest son (by a Greek mother) of Kilic
Arslán II, Kay-Khusraw received *Souchopolis* ca.1188,
then briefly held Ikonion. In 1196 he ravaged the
Meander Valley and carried off about 5,000 cap-
tives. Driven from Ikonion, the sultan sought refu-
uge at the court of Alexios III. He married a
daughter of Manuel *Maurozmes* and resided with
him; Akropolites (Akrop. 1:14.14) says he
was baptized. Regaining his throne, he created a
principalty on the Meander for Maurozmes and
helped Theodore I Laskaris consolidate his rule
(Akrop. 1:11.2–4). Pressing toward the Medi-
terranean, he took Attaleia in Mar. 1207. Around
1209, Kay-Khusraw allied himself with Henry of
Hainault. Around 1210 he was joined by the
refugee Alexios III and used the latter’s claim to
the Nicaean throne as a pretext to attack The-
dore. Early in 1211, Kay-Khusraw pushed down
the Meander but was intercepted by Theodore I
with an army strengthened by 800 Latin knights.
While most of the Latins fell, Theodore slew the
sultan in a duel reported in a contemporary ora-
tion by Niketas Choniates (*Orationes* 172.1–10).


---

KAYSERI. See Caesarea.
KEBRA NAGAST ("Glory of the Kings"), an Ethiopic collection of legends compiled in the 14th C. by a certain Isaac of whom nothing is known. According to the colophon, Isaac translated this work from his Arabic copy, which, in turn, had been translated from Coptic. Budge (infra) assigns the composition of the Coptic original to the 6th C. The work summarizes many biblical books (with particular emphasis on the queen of Ethiopia and her marriage to Solomon) and contains some data concerning the events of the 6th C., for example, the Ethiopian alliance with Justin I, who allegedly met ELESBOM in Jerusalem; Shahid (infra) suggests that these events are presented in the Kebra Nagast in a manner similar to the version of the BOOK OF THE HIMMAYITES. Monophysite in its core, the Kebra Nagast preserves a hostile attitude toward "Rome" (Constantinople) for having deserted the right faith and prophesies that a Persian king will destroy Rome and carry away the apostate together with his horse.

TR. W. Budge, The Queen of Sheba and Her Only Son Menyelek (London 1922).


KECHARITOMENE NUNNERY, founded in Constantinople in the early 12th C. by the empress Irene Doukaina, wife of Alexios I Komnenos. Dedicated to the Theotokos Kecharitomene (Κεχαριτωμένη, "full of grace"), the convent was located in the northern section of Constantinople, adjacent to the male monastery of Christ Philanthropos, which Irene also founded (before 1107). The two institutions were separated by a wall but shared a common water system. The convent is known primarily from the lengthy and detailed typikon drafted ca. 1110 on the model of the typikon of the Euergetis Monastery. Kecharitomene was originally designed to house 24 nuns; the possibility of an expansion to 40 nuns was foreseen. The rule was strictly cenobitic; the nuns did not have separate cells, but slept in a common dormitory. Irene imposed a rigorous rule of enclosure; absolutely no men were permitted to enter the convent except for two priests, the oikonomos, and the spiritual confessor (all four of whom had to be eunuchs), and the physician, who had to be a eunuch or elderly. Adjacent to the nunnery Irene built comfortable apartments to serve as a residence for female members of the imperial family; they were permitted to have servants. It was here that Anna Komnenē retired after the death of her husband and wrote the Alexiad. The convent continued to function as late as the 15th C. when it was visited by the Russian deacon Zosima. No buildings survive.


KEDRENOS, GEORGE, 12th-C. historian; his biography is unknown. The chronicle of Kedrenos (Κεδρηνός), Synopsis historion, encompasses history from the creation of the world to 1057. It is a compilation based on pseudo-Symeon Magistros, Theophanes, and George Hamartolos; from 811 onward Kedrenos slavishly follows John Skylitzes; until the recent publication of Skylitzes, Kedrenos was used by scholars as a substitute.


KEGEN (Keyērēs), a Pecheneg ally of Byz.; died 1050. A tribal leader, he quarreled with Tychar, the Pecheneg chief. Around 1045 or 1046 Kegen became an ally of Constantine IX. He was baptized and made a patrikios. He and his supporters received three Danubian fortresses and used the opportunity to plunder Tychar's followers. After crossing the Danube (apparently 15 Dec. 1046–13 Jan. 1047), Tychar and his tribes were defeated and settled near Serdica (before Apr. 1047). His followers rebelled (1048) and occupied an area between the Danube, the Balkan range, and the Black Sea, while Kegen's people kept themselves separate. To deal with the crisis, Constantine summoned Kegen and his army to Constantinople. There three Pechenegs assaulted him. They later convinced Constantine that Kegen had intended to plunder the city, and the emperor had him
imprisoned. In 1050, after repeated Pecheneg victories over imperial forces, Constantine released Kegen and sent him to divide and conquer his compatriots. No sooner had he arrived than he was cut to pieces.


KEKAUMENOS (Κεκαυμένος), author of a book of advice; born southern Macedonia; between 1020 and 1024, died after 1070. His biography is little known. Kekaumenos’s identification with the general Katakalon Kekaumenos is now rejected by the majority of scholars. He was of mixed Armenian and Slavic origin. In 1041 he participated in an expedition against Peter Deljan, in 1042 he witnessed the deposition of Michael V, and eventually he held an administrative position in Greece. The thesis that he belonged to the military aristocracy, as recently emphasized by Litavrin (infra), cannot be proved.

Kekaumenos wrote a unique moralistic work known under the conventional titles Strategikon or Precepts and Aneides and sometimes considered to be composed of two independent pieces. It is an indoctrination in “proper” behavior, addressed both to his sons and to those in various positions in society: emperors, generals, civil functionaries, patriarchs, provincial magnates, toparchs. The social orientation of Kekaumenos’s advice remains under discussion. According to Litavrin, he expressed the views of the military aristocracy; according to Kazhdan, those of civil officials. The main tendency of his ethics is circumspection and apprehension: man lives in a dangerous and hostile world and cannot trust anyone; neither friends nor servants are reliable. Abstract admonitions are combined with vivid stories (often the experiences of Kekaumenos’s relatives) about military ruses (in their style very close to John Skylitzes) and everyday cunning. The work also contains abundant information on political events, esp. in the Balkans, Armenia, and on the Byz.-Arab frontier.


KELER (Κέλερ), or Celer, official of Illyrian origin, consul (508); died after 520. Magister officiorum (503–18), he was named commander in the East with Areobindus and Hypatios. He conducted several years of successful campaigning, freeing Roman cities and devastating Persian territory. He was the principal negotiator of a seven-year truce, signed in 506, the reward for which was undoubtedly the consulsiphip. In 511 he supported Anastasios I against Patr. Makedonios II (496–511) and put down crowds opposed to the emperor’s Monophysite policies. Keler reluctantly accepted the accession of Justin I in 518, did not attend the emperor’s elevation (A. Vasiliev, Justin the First [Cambridge, Mass., 1950] 82), and had to retire from the post of magister officiorum. In 519/20, however, he corresponded with Pope Hormisdas concerning the end of the Akarian Schism. He is an example of a talented and loyal official, competent in both civil and military matters, upon whom the emperor could depend (see John Lydos, De mag. 3.17).


KELIA (Κέλλια, lit. “cells”), the largest Early Christian monastic settlement in Egypt, near the western edge of the Nile Delta. Approximately 1,600 individual dwellings have been identified; most of them were built from the 6th to 8th C., and inhabited until about the 9th C. Each unit contains separate rooms for two monks, an oratory, a reception room, and a kitchen. Usually there is also a well and a garden, all surrounded by a wall. Many have their own defense tower (jawsaq), and some even a small church. In the two main settlements, two large complexes (Qasr Wakhāya and Kūm ʻĪsā South I) have been excavated, regular units which later served as community centers of the lavra. They have towers, refectories, and several churches. The earliest church, a single-aisled chapel of ca.400, stood in
Kūm Īsā South I. By the late 8th C. most of the monks had abandoned their little cells and moved into these larger units. The site of Kellia is rapidly disappearing, threatened by encroaching agriculture.


-F.G.

KELLION (κελλίον) or kella (κέλλα, κέλλη), interchangeable terms for several types of monastic cell. (1) A cell in a koinobion, housing one or two (Typikon of Euergetis Monastery, ed. P. Gautier, 67.917) monks. In their cells monks slept, prayed, and read; recited certain offices privately; and, where appropriate, did handwork. They were forbidden to eat or keep food in their cells. Aristocrats who retired to a monastery sometimes had a suite of kellia (Typikon of Kecharitomene Nunnery, ed. P. Gautier, 137.2102). (2) A monastic cell at a lavra; a monk who lived in a lavra (in contrast to a koinobion) was frequently called a kelliotes. (3) The cell of a hermit. (4) A small monastery, as on Mt. Athos, the kellia of the late Antony (Prot. 86, n.245).

Lit. Meester, De monachico statuto 70-72, 99f., 309f.

-A.M.T.

KELTZENE (Κελτζένη, mod. Erzincan), a fortress and region (anc. Keliseene) on the north branch of the Euphrates in eastern Anatolia. A tourma of Chaldia, Keltzene was combined with Kamacha by Leo VI to form the theme of Mesopotamia. Keltzene was a base of Romanos IV during his expedition against the Turks, to whom it fell after the battle of Mantzikert (1071). Its bishop, attested in the late 9th C. as "suffragan of Kamachos," became metropolitan by the end of the 10th C. (Notitiae CP. 8.60); his see contained 21 suffragans. In the 14th C., under an independent Muslim ruler whose subjects were mostly Armenian, Keltzene was in frequent relation with the empire of Trebizond.


-C.F.

KENARIOS (κενάριος), an official whom Seibt considered as a subaltern to the epi tes trapezes or a stage in the transformation of the kastresios to epi tes trapezes. The kenarios is mentioned in very few documents: a seal from ca.800, a letter of 896. According to Seibt, an Armenian David (Dawit), a translator of Greek in the first half of the 9th C., was also hypatos and kenarios of the imperial trapeza.


-A.K.

KENCHREALI (Κεκνχρεαί), eastern port of Corinthis on the Saronic Gulf. The site flourished in late antiquity, reflecting the volume of trade between Corinthis and the East. Particularly significant is a building identified as a temple of Isis on the southern harborworks; according to the excavators this building was being lavishly restored when the city was devastated by an earthquake, probably in 375. A series of Egyptian glass panels in opus sectile had been brought to the site, perhaps for decoration of the Isis temple, but the warehouse in which they were stored sank in the earthquake and the panels were never used. They depicted Nilotic scenes and two remarkable portraits of Homer and Plato. A passage in Claudian (In Rufinum 2.190) suggests that both the harbors of Corinthis were burned by Alaric. Later a Christian basilica was constructed near the former temple. Coin hoards found at Kenchreai have been taken as evidence of the Slavic invasions in the 580s (R.L. Hohlfelder, Hesperia 49 [1979] 89-101; East European Quarterly 9 [1975] 251-58). The so-called Iconoclast notitia seems to list Kenchreai as a bishopric (Notitiae CP. 7.36: Kiknipeos in the text, a correction suggested by N. Bees), but this is unlikely. Scattered references show that the harbor continued to be used as late as the early 15th C.; Manuel II used it as his base for reconstruction of the Hexamilion. Pottery from the excavations spans the entire Byz. period and the latest coin find is a Venetian issue of the doge Antonio Venerio (1382-1400).


-T.E.G.

KENTARCHOS (κένταρχος), subaltern officer in the army and fleet. The Taktika of Leo VI (4.11) defines the kentarchos, or hekatontarchos (Lat. centurio), as commander of a hundred men; the same
definition is given in the Naumachika of the para-
koimo.renos Basil (ed. A. Dain, 4.2, pp. 66f). The
first mention of the term is in an early 9th-C.
chronicler (Theoph. 287.7), who states that Pho-
kas was kentarchos in 602 when he revolted against
Maurice; the chronicler’s source, Theophylaktos
Simokattes (Theoph.Simok. 296.13), however,
called Phokas hekatontarchos. The term was in use
in the 9th and 10th C. The Kleitorologion of Philo-
theos mentions the kentarchos in various military
contingents and themes, under the command of the
droungarios tes viglas, as well as civil kent-
tarchoi in the vestiarion. They served also in the
fleet.Nikephoros Ouranos (Naumachika, ed. A.
Dain, 7, p.73) mentions the kentarchos of a drom-
on and a seal of the 10th C. belonged to Chris-
topher, spatharios and kentarchos of the imperial
fleet (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.988). The word ken-
tarchia (Taktika of Leo VI 16.4) designated a mili-
tary unit. Basil II, in his novel of 996 (Zepos, Jus
1:265.25), while accepting the definition of the
dynatoi suggested by Romanos I, added to their
number also the protokentarchoi—"as a matter of
fact, we recognize them as dynatoi."

LIT. Ahrweiler, Mer 169.

KENTENARION (κεντηνάριον), a weight of Ro-
man origin (centumpondium, centenarium) equal to
100 logarikai litrai [= 32 kg]. The term talanton
was used synonymously in some classicizing texts.
From the mid-6th C. kentenarion often meant a
quantity of 100 logarikai litrai of gold or gold coins.
Rarely, kentenarion was used as a unit of 100 mo-
doi or as a synonym with litra.

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 109.174. G. Dagron, C. Mor-
risson, "Le Kentenarion dans les sources byzantines," RN®

KEOS (Κέος, mod. Kea), island in the Aegae-
atic Sea southeast of Attica; in late antiquity it was
part of the province of Achaia. Mention of Keos
in Byz. times is rare. In 710/11 when Pope Con-
stantine I was journeying toward Constantinople,
Byz. officials gathered on the island quae dicetur
Caea to meet him; among them was Theophilos,
strategos of the fleet (Caravissani) (Lib.pont. 1:390).
Michael Choniates, who found refuge on Keos
after 1204, described resistance to the Venetians
by inhabitants of the island; Keos remained in-
dependent until 1211. Soon after 1261 the proto-
strator Alexios Philanthropenos attacked several
Aegaean islands, including Keos, and ca.1279/80
Licario of Karystos, a Byz. mercenary, captured
it (Jacoby, Φεόδαλτι 69). The Venetians retook
Keos by 1301, and the island was divided among
noble families (Giustiniani, Ghizzi, Sanudi) under
the suzerainty of Venice. They held Keos until
1566.

A three-aisled Early Christian basilica has been
discovered, probably constructed on the site of a
temple of Demeter (Pallas, Monuments paléochrétiens
202). The major settlement was at the ancient site
of Ioulis, where a fortress was constructed in the
13th C., and probably rebuilt in the 15th C.
(J.-C. Poutiers, ByzF 11 [1987] 389). The Church of
the Holy Apostles at Kato Meria has frescoes of
the 13th C. The bishop of Keos was a suffragan
of Athens (Notitia CP 3.689).

LIT. Ahrweiler, Mer 308-57. I. Psyllas, Historia tes nesou
Keos (Athens 1921). Ch.P. Demetropoulos, Hoi ekklesies tes
Keos (Thessalonike 1982-83).

T.E.G.

KEPHALAIOS. See Chapters.

KEPHALAION (κεφαλαίον, chapter, item, or ar-
ticle). In addition to referring to the literary genre
of Chapters, kephalaion was a fiscal term desig-
nating articles of taxation in general. Lexical simi-
ilarity with the Latin capitatio led some scholars
(e.g., G. Ostrogorsky, SemKond 5 [1932] 320) to
believe that kephalaion was the poll tax. Although
the term could be used for taxes in general ("no
new kephalaion must be introduced"—Xénoph.,
no.29.21) or for the description of the entire
amount of taxes paid by a monastery (Actes de
Philothee, ed. W. Regel, E. Kurztz, B. Korabev
[St. Petersburg 1913; rp. Amsterdam 1975] no.6.13-
15), there is no evidence of its use to mean poll
tax. Nor did its cognates such as kephaliographon
(MM 4:318.19) or kephaletion (a special tax im-
posed upon Jews?) have this meaning. Kephalaia
were also "chapters" of fiscal cadasters (kódidix)
in which a single tax unit was registered.

LIT. Dölger, Beiträge 49f. Kazhdan, Agrarnye otnošenija
147-49. Svoronos, Kadastre 21f.

A.K.

KEPHALAS (Κεφαλάς, from κεφαλή, "head"), a
family known from the early 10th C., although
not in the elite: a priest Constantine Keph alas compiled an anthology (see KEPHALAS, CONSTANTINE). Nothing links later members of the Keph alas family to him. Leo Keph alas, son of Alexios I’s doulos, became a prominent military commander and ca.1086 katepano of Abydos. Alexios I endowed him with lands that were transmitted by a chrysobull of 1089 to Leo’s children. In 1115 Nikephoros, Leo’s son, donated his lands to the Lavra of St. Athanasios on Athos; Nikephoros’s relative, Theodore Keph alas, was hagoumenos of the Lavra. A certain Keph alas was an influential provincial functionary in the 1180s. The family was still active but not prominent in the 14th C.: a Keph alas was kommerkiarios in 1332; Gregory Keph alas was first ostiarios in 1285; Keph alas Laskaris is called imperial doulos in 1373. Charters connected with Leo Keph alas’s estates are published in Lavra 1, nos. 44–45, 48–49, 60. The reading of Keph[alas] on an 8th-C. seal of a certain Basil (Winkelmann, Quellenstudien 158) is questionable.


KEPHALAS, CONSTANTINE, compiler of a collection of epigrams; fl. ca.900. His biography is unknown; he is identified with protopapas (palace chaplain) Constantine Keph alas mentioned by chroniclers (e.g., TheophCont 388.24) as active in 917. For his collection Keph alas (Kefalas) used ancient anthologies, some epigrams (Agathonias), and texts that the magistros Gregory of Kampsia (in Macedonia) copied down from inscriptions during his travels in Greece and Macedonia. The work is typical of 10th-C. encyclopedism (Lemerle, Humanism 310). Keph alas’s collection was frequently used in the Souda and enlarged by the anonymous editor of the Anthologia Palatina (see Greek Anthology). The original version of Keph alas’s collection is not preserved.


KEPHALE (kefalή, lit. “head, chief”), from the second half of the 13th C. through the end of the empire, a term of colloquial origin denoting the highest functionary of provincial administration. From the middle of the 13th C. the office of kephele (kephalatikon) gradually replaced that of the doux. By the 14th C., the kephele was the combined civil and military administrator of the primary provincial administrative unit, no longer the theme but a much smaller area called a katepanion, usually no larger than the immediate environs of a kastron. The title kephele, found almost exclusively in documentary sources, remained an epithet of function—hence, the participial common forms, ho kepheleis(is)khemon and ho eis kepheleis heuriskomenos—and never became a courtly, hierarchical rank; thus, most kepheleis also possessed courtly ranks. While most kepheleis were governors of kastria, their jurisdictions varied, sometimes extending over islands or groups of villages. On the other hand, during the 14th C., perhaps as an attempt to maintain central control over the provinces, some kepheleis (katholikai [“general”] as distinguished from merikai [“local”] kepheleis) had jurisdiction over larger areas, sometimes entire provinces. These katholikai kepheleis were usually related to the emperor or were members of very prominent families. During the later 14th C. the katholikai kepheleis generally disappeared as the areas where they were found, the Morea, Thessaly, and Thessalonike, became appanages.

Lit. Maksimović, ByzProvAdm 117–66. —M.B.

KEPHALENIA (Kέφαλ(λ)εια, also Kephalonia), island in the Ionian Sea. In late antiquity it was part of the province of Achaia and metropolitan see of Epiros I. Its political significance increased after Byz. had lost northern Italy, since Kephalenia became the major base of communication with Sicily and southern Italy and a strategic center against Arab attempts to penetrate the Ionian Sea. Information about the administrative structure of Kephalenia is confused, Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De adm. imp. 50.85–87) asserting that Kephalenia was a tovra of Longobardia until Leo VI (?) transformed it into a strategos; he also affirmed (De them. 7.1–2, ed. Pertusi 91) that Kephalenia had never been a theme. On the other hand, all the taktika, beginning with that of Uspsenskij, list the strategos of Kephalenia, a Latin chronicler mentions its strategos Paulos in 809 (MGH SS 1:196f.), and various seals of its strategoi are preserved, some of which are dated to the 8th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 919, 2657, 3200). Other functionaries in Kephalenia
were the *kommeriarios* of Hellas, the Peloponnesos, and Kephallenia (no.1865); the *protonotarios* (no.1561); and the *tourmarches* (Laurent, Méd. Vat., no.96)—all attested in the 9th C. By that time a group of the *Mandartai* was resettled in Kephallenia (*De cer.* 668.8—10) and the island served as a place of exile for political prisoners (Theoph. 372.8).

The final Byz. retreat from Italy diminished the role of Kephallenia. The island was administered by a judge-*kritis* (*Zacos, Seals* 2, no.674). In 1085 the Normans unsuccessfully besieged the main city, in 1126 it was plundered by the Venetians, and in 1185 taken by William II of Sicily and lost to the empire. The Orsini held it as a fief from Venice, in 1357 it came definitively under the power of the Tocco. The Turks occupied Kephallenia in 1479, but in 1500 it was seized by Venice.

In antiquity there were four cities on the island and these survived into late antiquity: Samos presumably as capital and Panormos (mod. Phiskardo) with civic status. From circa the 8th C., the main settlement had moved to Hagios Georgios, a defensible site near the center of the island. A survey of the island drawn up for the Latin bishopric in 1264 provides many details of topography and agrarian relations (ed. Th.S. Tzanemetatos, *To praktikon tes Latinites episkopos Kephallenias tou 1264 kai he epitome autou* [Athens 1965]).


**KERAMION** (κεράμιον) or *keramidion* (κεραμίδιον), the Holy Tile, a relic that had the features of Christ impressed on it through contact with the *Mandylion*; it is a unique example of one *acheiropoietos* producing another. Legends about its origin vary, one deriving it from Edessa, the other from Hierapolis in Syria; in both cases the Mandylion was hidden away between tiles, which received the miraculous impression. According to various traditions, either Nikephoros II Phokas in 966 or John I Tzimiskes in 974 removed the Holy Tile from Hierapolis (N. Eliséeff, *Et* 2 6:379) and took it to Constantinople where it was housed in the Pharos chapel of the *Great Palace*. The Keramion, an early representation of which occurs at Lagoudera, was never a common theme; it generally serves as a pendant to the Mandylion, often between the pendentives of a church, or side by side with it, as in a 12th-C. MS of John Klimax (Martin, *Heavenly Ladder*, fig.231). It does not occur on icons, probably because it had no feast in the church calendar.


**KERASOUS** (Κερασούς, mod. Giresun), city of the Black Sea coast, west of Trebizond, important as a port and the terminus of a road to Koloneia and the interior of Asia Minor. Kerasous was seat of a *kommeriarios* (usually of Lazika, Kerasous, and Trebizond) in the late 7th C. (*Zacos, Seals* 1, nos. 164, 178f) and of the imperial *kommerkia* in the 730s (*Zacos, Seals* 1, no.250). In the 11th C. it may have had a local scriptorium that produced the Kerasous Gospels, whose illustrations show some Armenian characteristics. Under the empire of Trebizond, Kerasous was the headquarters of a *bandon* and the western bastion against the Turkomans. In Sept. 1301 the Trapezuntine emperor Alexios II Komnenos defeated them at Kerasous; his victory was eulogized by Stephen Sgouropoulos who also mentions the construction of the local fortress. The fortifications show two main periods, the first probably of 1301; they were maintained until the Turkish conquest in 1461.

Kerasous was a suffragan bishopric of *Neokaisareia*, first attested in 431; by 1079 it was a metropolis without suffragans. Its church was in close contact with that of Alania (N. Bees, *Arch-Pont* 16 [1951] 255—62).


**KERATION** (κεράτης, Lat. *siliqua*), lit. the seed (bean) of the carob or locust tree (*Ceratonia siliqua*). It was widely used in the Near East as a unit of weight, with slight variations of standard from one region to another. The Greco-Roman *keration* was 0.189 g and the pound (see *litra*) was reckoned at 1,728 keratia, that is, 12 oungi of 144 keratia each. The *solidus*, 1/72 of the pound
and 1/6 of the ounce, weighed 24 *kerattia* so that the *keration* became, as 1/24 of the solidus, a unit of account. It was also a unit of fineness for gold, that is, the English *carat* or 1/24 part, since the solidus was of pure gold and therefore 24 carats fine.

—Ph.G.

**KERČ.** See BOSPOROS, Cimmerian.

**KERIMADDIN OF AKSARAY.** See Karīm al-Dīn.

**KERKYRA (Κέρκυρα, Corfu, with many variants, archaistically known as Phaiakia, etc.), island (and its primary city) in the Ionian Sea. The ancient city, on the east central coast, was an important way-station in the journey between Constantinople and the West; it was destroyed by the Goths in the 6th C. but was probably resettled soon thereafter (I. Papademetriu, *StB* 6 [1940] 340). Constantine Porphyrogennetos (De them., 7.5, ed. Pertusi, p.92) mentions only Homeric Kerkyra, the kingdom of Alcinous. Some legendary data are preserved in the vita of St. Arsenios of Kerkyra, probably compiled by George Bardanes, which mentions a "Scythian" attack on Kerkyra in the mid-10th C. Skylitzes (Skyl. 385,57–58) relates that in 1093 the Saracens burned Kerkyra. According to Anna Komnene (An.Komm. 1:57,14–15), Robert Guiscard seized the "well-fortified polis of Korypho" in 1081, but the island resisted the Normans and probably remained semi-independent, under the command of its *dous*; at any rate, Bohemund, after his flight from the East, felt secure on Kerkyra. During the expedition of 1147 the Normans, supported by a local population irritated by heavy taxes, again captured Kerkyra. After a long siege Manuel I took Kerkyra in 1149, hoping to use it as a base for an attack on Sicily. In 1204 the Venetians seized the island. In 1214 Kerkyra fell under the control of the despotate of Epiros and in 1246 the *despotes* Michael II Komnenos Doukas renewed an earlier grant of considerable autonomy to a collegium of 33 priests, maintained by most of the island's Western rulers. In 1259 Michael II granted Kerkyra as dowry to MANFRED of Sicily and by 1272 the island was under the control of CHARLES I of Anjou. In 1382 Kerkyra was in Navarrese hands and in 1386 it was ceded to Venice. After the fall of Constantinople and the Morea many Byz. fled to Kerkyra.

According to legend (*Synax.*CP 633,6–18), the church of Kerkyra was founded by two disciples of St. Paul, Jason of Tarsos and Sospatros of Achaia, who erected there a shrine of Stephen the First Martyr; its bishops participated in councils from 325 to 787. They were suffragans of Nikopolis, then of Kephalenia. In the 11th C. Kerkyra was elevated to the rank of metropolis (Laurent, *Corpus* 5,1:618); the seals of several metropolitans from the 11th to 13th C. are preserved. A Latin archbishop is attested first in 1228; the Orthodox were meanwhile under the authority of a protopapas.

In the ancient city, about 2 km south of the modern center, are the remains of the five-aisled basilica of Jovian (Iobianos), dated to the 5th C., rebuilt in the 12th C. as a single-aisled church, and several other churches of various dates. The cross-in-square Church of Jason and Sospatros, *katholikon* of a monastery, was built ca.1000. Approximately 17 km northeast of the town is the Chapel of St. Merkourios, dated by an inscription of 1074/5 ascribing construction and decoration to the patronage of the *droungarios* Nicholas and his brothers. P. Vucotopoulos (CahArch 21 [1971] 151–80) saw in the frescoes of this and other churches on the island elements of the style of *Hosios Loukas*, reflections of Kerkyra's role as a station between Greece and Italy. Fortications at Angelokastron on the west coast have been dated to the 11th/12th C.


**KEROUARIOS (Κηρουλάριος), a family name meaning "candlemaker." P. Gautier (*REB* 27 [1969] 342) suggested that Keroularios was not a family name but merely the sobriquet of a single man; the name, however, was applied to several family members, and the patriarchal catalog (V. Laurent, *EO* 35 [1936] 76f) describes Patr. MIchael I as belonging to the Keroularioi—as Constantine III belonged to the Leichoudai. Psellos (Scripta min. 1:318f) praised the family (perhaps ironically) as an ancient lineage, the descendants of Herakles. The first known Keroularios was a high financial official in the early 11th C. Two of
his sons plotted against Emp. Michael IV in 1040 and were exiled; one eventually became Patr. Michael I. Peira 65:2 relates a litigation between a certain Keroularios and his brother's widow; since Peira is very unlikely to reflect a case after 1040, this Keroularios must not be the patriarch but rather an older relative (A. Kazhdan, ByzF 12 [1987] 711). Two of the patriarch's nephews were high-ranking civil officials. One of them, Constantine, Psellus's correspondent, was megas droungarios tes viglas and acquired the title of sebastos; Psellus knew him also as a land and slave owner. The case of his will was under investigation by Nikephoros III (Reg 2, no.1054). Constantine and his brother Nikephoros supported Isaac I Komnenos in 1057. Eudokia Makrembolitissa was the patriarch's niece, and her husband, Constantine Doukas, has also been called the patriarch's nephew. Michael, Constantine Keroularios's son, was like his father droungarios tes viglas; he was Alexios I's gambros (by a niece); he seized his father's fortune, to the detriment of his younger brothers, and Alexios sanctioned his actions in 1082. Several documents of the period, including a charter of 1109, mention Michael, sebastos and logothetes (Lavra 1, no.58.24); Tzetzes also mentions him. According to Tzetzes, Constantine's daughter married a tax collector named George, Tzetzes' own grandfather (P. Gautier, REB 28 [1970] 217-19). Although the Keroularioi appear to have been mostly civil functionaries, an epigram ridicules a strates Keroularios, son of a candle merchant (K. Dyobouniotes, NE 16 [1922] 45-13-14).


**KEtos.** See Jonaih.

**Keys.** Two kinds of key-lock systems, sliding and turning, were used in Byz. The sliding key-lock system was the earlier and mechanically more complex. Its distinguishing feature is a bit composed of raised teeth attached at right-angles to a rectangular shaft. The bit is passed in a rotating motion through the lower extremity of an L-shaped hole in the lock plate. It is then raised until its projecting teeth displace from the bolt a series of pins or tumblers held in place by a spring. Once engaged in the perforations, the key is used to draw the bolt along horizontally, out of its seating. A high level of security was afforded by the fact that only a bit with teeth precisely matching the perforations in the bolt could be raised into those holes and thereby force out the restraining pins. Such locks were esp. preferred and popularized by the Romans, with whom they are customarily associated. That they remained in use in Constantinople at least until the 6th C. is clear from the marble doors in the South Gallery of Hagia Sophia; their carefully sculpted lock plates reveal a sliding key mechanism of surprising accuracy and detail.

The turning key, simpler than the sliding key, was the more popular key-lock system in Byz.; in appearance and mechanics it resembled the old-fashioned skeleton key still in use today. The turning key is inserted through a narrow vertical slit in the lock plate and then rotated so that its panel or bit will lift, release, and ultimately advance or retract a bolt that is held in place by a spring. Only a bit of the proper height and depth will successfully engage the bolt; occasionally, restraining bars or "wards" are set within the lock chamber that further require that the bit have corresponding notches in order to rotate. Nearly all surviving turning keys are bronze, with a movable joint between barrel and hoop. Hoops vary in design (including quatrefoils, zoomorphic motifs, and beads), as do bits, although the technical simplicity of the latter presupposes the use of seals for additional security. Indeed, some turning key hoops bear ring bezels with incised sealing devices. (See also Locks and Padlocks.)

Lit. Vikan-Nesbitt, Security 2-5. —G.V.
KHAČATUR (Χαχάτουρος, Χαχάτουρος) in Greek sources, Arm. Խաչատուր, Byz. general, Armenian by birth, whom Romanos IV appointed doux or katepano of Antioch in 1069. After the deposition of Romanos, Khačatur sided with him against Michael VII but fought unsuccessfully, was taken captive by Andronikos Doukas, son of Caesar John, and probably perished in 1072. His identification with the Armenian Pekht or Bekht (doux of Antioch in 1065 according to Matthew of Edessa, in 1069/70 according to Ibn al-Aṣim) has not been proved. H. Grégoire (AIPHOS 2 [1934] pt.1, 459–63) suggested that reminiscences of Khačatur were reflected in the image of Asator in the fifth book of the Turkish epic Said Battal.


KHAĞAN (χαγάνος), title used by Central Asiatic peoples to designate the holder of supreme political authority. According to some scholars the word was borrowed by the Turkic peoples from the Juan-Juan (a group of Asian Avars) with this specific sense. Byz. authors use this title to refer to the rulers of the Avars, Turks, Khazars, and Bulgarians; in the Latin Annales Bertiniani, sub anno 839, the term is applied to the prince of the Rus'. It is also utilized in the corpus of the so-called Orkhon inscriptions of the Gök Turks. Mongols used a version of this word, and it was adopted by the Ottoman sultans as well.


KHÁLID (Χάλεδος), more fully Khálid ibn al-Walíd; a prominent early Muslim commander and conqueror of Byz. Syria who was known as "the Sword of God." An early opponent of Muḥammad, Khálid converted to Islam in 627 or 629. He participated in an expedition to Mu'ta in 629, where the Byz. commander Theodore defeated him. According to Arabic sources, Abū Bakr sent Khálid to conquer al-Hira in Iraq in 633, which he accomplished, but non-Muslim tradition knows nothing of this conquest. Khálid crossed the desert to assist beleaguered Muslim armies in Syria in 634. He surprised the Byz. defenses and conquered Bostra, contributing to the Muslim victory at Ajnādayn and the first Muslim conquests of Damascus and Emesa. He participated in the battle of the Yarmuk and in the second and final conquests of Damascus and Emesa. 'Umar removed him from supreme command, but he participated in other expeditions against the Byz. in northern Syria.


KHÁQANÍ, more fully Afdal al-Din Ibrāhīm Khāqānī, a panegyric poet who wrote in Persian; born Azerbaijan 1121/2 or 1126, died Tabrīz 1199. His mother was for a while an adherent of the Nestorian creed, and Khāqānī displayed an interest in and knowledge of Christianity that was unusual in the East. He lived in Shirwan, which was under the supreme rule of Georgian kings, and in an ode he praised the king of Georgia, Demetrios I (O. Vilčevskij in Issledovanija po istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka [Moscow-Leningrad 1960] 56–60). He traveled much, but his career was not successful. In 1159 he was put in prison. In 1184 he fled from Shirwan, hoping to go to Khūrāsān, but was forced to return to Tabrīz, where he spent his remaining years.

In a poem addressed to Manuel I Komnenos, Khāqānī mentions his visit to Constantinople and describes the religious discussions that took place in the Byz. capital ca.1166 concerning the relationship of the Father and the Son. When Andronikos (I) Komnenos came as an exile to Georgia and participated in the battle of 1173 against the Rus', Khāqānī praised his high qualities and offered him his services.


KHAZARIA (Χαζαρία), the land of the Khazars. The term was applied to the Khazar khaganate, which Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos places near Rhosia, Zichia, Alania, Black Bulgaria, the land of the Uzes, and Lebeda where the Hungarians had dwelt. In the episcopal notitias the term designates a Khazar bishopric under either the metropolitan see of Gothia (see Notitiae CP,
no.3:777–79), or possibly under the guidance of the archbishop of Cherson; the latter is mentioned in a letter of Patr. Nicholas I Mystikos (ep.68.12–21). In Greek texts of the 14th and 15th C. Khazaria means the “Crimea” and, accordingly, Italian documents call the peninsula “Gazarie.” Skylitzes’ evidence (Skyl. 354.90–94) that in 1015/16 Basil II sent a fleet to Khazaria and, with the help of the Rus’, captured “the archon of the land,” George Tzoules, refers not to the Khazars (thus Moravci, Byzantinoturcica 1:82f), but to a revolt in Cherson (E. Skržinskaja, VizVrem 6 [1953] 266f).

-O.P.

KHALUDOV PSALTER. See Psalter.

KIBOTOS. See Noah’s Ark.

KIBYRRHAIOTAI (Ки́йрра́йотаї). First and most important of the naval themes, Kibyrhraithiotaı originally designated part of the fleet of the Karabianoi under a droungarios attested in 698. With the dissolution of that fleet, Kibyrhraithiotaı became a theme; its strategos is first mentioned in 734. Kibyrhraithiotaı comprised the coasts of Asia Minor from Miletos to Cilicia, together with the interior of Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, and parts of Isauria. This region provided raw materials, supplies, and recruits for the thematic fleet, which protected the coast and was used for campaigns against the Arabs. The coast of Kibyrhraithiotaı was so devastated by Arab attacks that large areas became depopulated and only a few fortified cities and naval bases (Attaleia, Syllaion, Seleukeia) survived. The strategos of Kibyrhraithiotaı was a naval commander whose main subordinates were the katepano of the Mardaiotes, the ek prosopou of Syllaion, and the droungarios of Kos. He commanded 70 ships and about 9,000 men from his headquarters, which was apparently at Attaleia; his salary was 10 pounds of gold. The fleet of Kibyrhraithiotaı, which declined in importance with the expansion of the central fleet of Constantinople, is last mentioned in 1043. Subsequently Kibyrhraithiotaı denoted a civil province under a krites or, in the late 12th C., a doux. The theme of Mylasa and Melanoudion replaced it in the reign of Manuel I. Most of its territory (except Lycia) had fallen to the Turks after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071.

Lit. Ahreweiler, Μερ 81–85, 131–35. A. Pertusi in De them. 149–53.

-C.F.
KIEV (Κίοβα, Ківь, Κυ(γ)εβοβ, Киёбос, etc.), town on the middle Dnieper. Constantine VII mentions Kiev (which he also calls Sambatas in De adm. imp. 9.8–9; A. Archipov, Voprosy russkogo jazykoznaniya 5 [Moscow 1984] 220–49) as the main base for the expeditions of the Rus’ to Constantinople. Exports from Constantinople and the Crimea to and through Kiev included coins, glass, and amphorae with wine and oil. From the mid-10th to the mid-12th C. Kiev was in effect the capital of the Rus’ and the main channel for political, economic, and cultural contacts with Byz.: the metropolis of “Rhosia” was established at Kiev in 988–89; the seals of the princes and metropolitan men were inscribed in Greek; Greek builders constructed a number of churches (see below). Kievian writers also produced a substantial proportion of the extant literature of Rus’ (see Rus’, Literature of) during this period. From the mid-12th C. the political authority of Kiev was generally limited to its own principality: Izjaslav II (1146–54) was an ally of Géza II of Hungary against Manuel I, Galitza, and Suzdal’. Kiev retained its status as the ecclesiastical capital, however, even after its sack by the Mongols (1240) and the rise of Lithuania and Moscow.

Monuments of Kiev. Several churches in Kiev were the work of Greek builders: St. George, St. Irene, the Annunciation, and the Church of the Dormition (1073–76) in the monastery of the Caves. The Cathedral of St. Sophia was begun by Jaroslav in 1037 at an intersection in front of the city’s main public square. Poppe (infra) showed that the original mosaic and fresco decoration was completed by the time of its first consecration in 1046. An elaboration of a Byz. cross-in-square church plan, St. Sophia was a five-aisled building with 13 domes. Local features included the superimposed (and originally open) external galleries, the tall drums of the domes and two towers to the west, painted with unusual scenes of hunting and the hippodrome. The church was much enlarged in the 17th C. Without textual evidence, Lazarev (infra) ascribed St. Sophia’s iconographical scheme to Ilarion. The mosaic Pantokrator in the dome and the full-length Virgin above the Communion of the Apostles (see Lord’s Supper) in the apse are normal components of a Byz. church program of decoration, while the figure of Pope Clement I is due to relics obtained by Vladimir I. Lazarev suggested that the mosaic of Christ as a tonsured priest was included in response to a heresy that denied the authority of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Rus’, but the same image is found at Nerezi. The frescoes include portraits of the founder and his family and scenes from the life of St. George, Jaroslav’s patron.


—S.C.F., A.C.

KILIC ARSLAN I, Seljuk sultan of Anatolia (ca.1092–1107); died on the Khabur River 5 June 1107. Son of Süleyman ibn Kutulmus, Kilic Arslan (Κατίζης του λαός) ruled Iznik (Nicaea) and other possessions of his father. He concentrated his efforts on the east, leaving II Khan and Tza-Chas to oppose the Byz. While Kilic Arslan was combatting Danışmend (see Danişmandids) in eastern Anatolia, the First Crusaders and Byz. took Nicaea. Kilic Arslan’s wife, a daughter of Tzachas, fell into Alexis I’s hands. The Crusaders defeated Kilic Arslan at Dorylaion. Alexios seized western Anatolia, and the sultan made Iconion his capital. Kilic Arslan joined with Danışmand to destroy the Crusade of 1101 as it marched through Anatolia. Hostility to Bohemund drew the sultan and Alexios together and, in 1106, Kilic Arslan sent Turkish troops to assist Alexios against the invading Normans. The death of Danişmand enticed Kilic Arslan to renew his aggression in eastern Anatolia, and he died fighting Sultan Muhammad, son of Malikshāh.

Lit. C. Cahen, EI2 5:109f.

—C.M.B.

KILIC ARSLAN II, Seljuk sultan of Iconion (1155–92); born ca.1115, died 1192. Son of Mas‘ûd I, Kilic Arslan and his Türkomans harassed the withdrawal of Manuel I from Antioch (1159). Manuel’s efforts at revenge (1159–60) proved ineffectual and in 1161 the rulers made peace. In 1161 or 1162 Kilic Arslan was magnificently entertained in Constantinople. After the Seljuk sultan acquired most of the Danişmandid territories, Manuel, urged by the refugees Dhu’l-Nūn (a Dan-
KINGS, BOOKS OF. The two Books of Kings that follow the two Books of Samuel are sometimes grouped together as the four Books of Kings. Thus, 1–2 Samuel of the RSV is 1–2 Kings of the Septuagint, and 1–2 Kings of the RSV is 3–4 Kings in the Septuagint. A single illustrated Byz. MS of all four Books of Kings survives—Vat. gr. 333, from the third quarter of the 11th C., with 104 images. (Only three other Byz. MSS devoted entirely to Kings survive—Rahlfs, Verzeichnis 382–85). The text of Kings includes the David narrative, illustrations of which are widespread in Byz. art at all dates, and certain other popular scenes, such as the Ascent of Elijah. Vat. gr. 333 may thus be the sole survivor of a once-flourishing genre of illustrated MSS of Kings, from which the popular scenes are derived (thus, Weitzmann, Studies 55–57), or a hapax, exploiting well-known scenes and stock formulas.

The fragments of a 5th-C. Latin MS of Kings, the Quedlinburg Itala, with full-page miniatures interspersed with the text, is often cited as a parallel. The interpretation of this MS, however, is also problematic, for it contains detailed instructions to the artist that may imply that its cycle was invented ad hoc. Further, most of the Itala cycle is unrelated iconographically to Vat. gr. 333. The system of illustration in Vat. gr. 333 is at first consistent, with one miniature per chapter, but

KILNS (κεραμεικοί φούρνοι) for the production of ceramics have been discovered at Byz. sites of all periods, both by chance and in controlled excavation (list in R.M. Cook, BSA 56 [1961] 67, supplemented by Megaw and Jones, infra 296, n.3). Most kilns were cylindrical structures made of clay and broken tiles, with a crude dome; the firepit was underneath the firing chamber, the two sections being separated by a floor pierced with numerous holes to allow the heat to rise and fire the pots. Excavated examples show that pottery was left to harden before being placed in the kiln, and it was commonly fired twice. Many pots contain marks that show how they were stacked in the kiln. From the 14th C. onward, tripod kiln (or stacking) supports were commonly used to separate pieces; they leave telltale marks on the bottom of the vessels.


KINDA, an Arab tribe that moved in the orbit of the Ḥimyarites in South Arabia and in the 5th–6th C. appeared as the dominant power in central and north Arabia. Although primarily an Arabian peninsular power, Kinda had strong connections with Byz. from ca.500 until the Muslim conquests. The tribe’s first recorded contact with Byz. occurred at the battle of Baradān (5th C.) between the Kindite Hujr and the Ṣalḥid chief Ziyād ibn-al-Habūla, who was a client of Byz. Around 500 the Kindite Arethas mounted an offensive against Byz. through his sons Ma‘di-Karib and Hujr, and in 502 he concluded a treaty or foedus with Byz. In the 520s the same Arethas appears as the phylarch of Palestine who, after quarreling with the doux Diomedes, was killed in north Arabia in 528. Ultimately Qays became phylarch of two of the three Palestines. Thus, the Kindites formed part of the Arab phylarchate of Oriens and maintained federate status until the Muslim conquests. The foremost poet of pre-Islamic Arabia was a Kindite prince, also named Qays, one of whose most famous odes records his journey through Oriens to Constantinople.


-/A.Sh.
KINNAMOS, JOHN, historian, *grammatikos* (secretary) of Manuel I, participant in several of Manuel’s campaigns; born before 1143, died after 1185. Niketas Choniates (Nik. Chon., p.331.1) mentions his involvement in theological discussions at the time of Andronikos I. The title of the book of Kinnamos (Κίνναμος) is corrupt (P. Wirth, *Byzantion* 41 [1971] 375–77): Kinnamos himself calls it *chronikai* (p.230.22); the ending is missing in the single 13th-C. MS (copied several times in the 16th–17th C.), which probably presents an impaired version of the original. Kinnamos’s history encompasses the period 1118–76; his portrait of John II’s reign closely resembles that of Choniates; later, however, the two historians diverge (A. Kazhdan, *BS* 24 [1963] 4–31). Kinnamos is Manuel’s panegyrist and supporter of the idea of the universal empire (M. Frejdenberg, *VizVrem* 16 [1959] 50); accordingly, he is more intolerant toward the Crusaders than Choniates. His philosophy of history is strictly deterministic. Nothing, he says, depends on men (p.24.2–4), and *tyche* (“necessity or providence”) appears in his narration as arbitrarily determining events. Kinnamos is strangely lukewarm toward aristocratic qualities (Kazhdan, *Gosp.klasc* 411) but very attentive to military technique, stressing that Manuel’s reforms in this area made “Roman warriors” better than the Germans or Italians (p.125.13). Kinnamos also wrote an *Ethiopinia*, probably under the influence of Nikephoros Basilakes.


KIRIK OF NOVGOROD, monk of St. Anthony’s monastery in Novgorod; born 1110. Kirik is the author of a tract on chronology dated 1136 and perhaps of the chronological data in the *Novgorod Chronicle*’s entry for the same year. The tract consists of a summary of the years since Adam, based on a Byz. short chronicle using the Alexan-
KITROS (Κητρος), fortress and bishopric in Macedonia, on the site of ancient Pydna. The original name was used by Byz. authors who wrote in an antiquarian vein: for example, Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Thess., Opuscula 259.74) mentions the truffle (hydna) from Pydna (a play on words) as a delicacy for monks. Little is known of the secular history of Kitros; according to a 14th-C. historian (Kantak. 2:382.11), there was a pyrgos and a garrison in "Pydna."

Kitros was under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Thessalonike; although it was in last place ca.800 (Notitiae CP 3.276), by the 10th C. Kitros (or Pydna) was listed as the first suffragan of Thessalonike (ibid. 7.297). The earliest known bishop was Germanos in 879. An anonymous bishop of Kitros corresponded with Theophylak- tos of Ohrid. John of Kitros was a canonist of the late 12th or early 13th C. (Darrouzès, Offisia 172–74). The ecclesia Citerensis and its officials are men-

KITI, 7 miles southwest of Larnaka in Cyprus, site of the Church of Panagia Angeloktistos. The main body of the church is a domed, cruciform structure of the 11th C., built on the remains of an earlier basilica of which the apse is the main surviving part. The conch of the apse still houses the fragment of a 6th/7th-C. mosaic decoration, the best preserved of the three apse mosaics on the island (with the Panagia tes Kyiras near Livadia and Lythrakomi). The mosaic shows the standing Virgin holding the Christ child in her left arm, and flanked by the archangels Michael (on the left) and Gabriel (on the right) who appear to be walking towards her with orb and scepter in hand. The figures, all nimbed, stand against a gold ground framed at the edge of the apse with a border of fountains emerging from acanthus clusters flanked by ducks, parrots, and stags. Unusually, the Virgin is identified in an inscription as "Hagia Maria."

KITRILL (Cyril), bishop of Turov; died before 1182. Kirill is thought to be the author of didactic homilies in Slavonic on ecclesiastical and monastic life, a cycle of sermons for the period from Palm Sunday to the Sunday after Ascension Day, a weekly cycle of prayers, and a kanon. In his works Kirill amplifies, with florid and emotive rhetoric, themes from his Byz. reading. For example, for the Sunday after Easter he adapts allegories of spring from Gregory of Nazianzos (A. Vaillant, RES 26 [1950] 34–50; Ju. Begunov, Zbornik istorije književnosti 10 [1976] 69–76), while his allegories for monasticism in the homiletic Epistle to Basil are derived from Barlaam and Ioasaph (I.N. Lebedeva, Povest’ o Varlaame i Ioasafe [Leningrad 1985] 85–88). Most of Kirill’s identifiable sources can be traced to extant Slavonic translations, though there is disagreement as to whether he also knew and used Greek texts (Ju. Begunov, BS 35 [1974] 186f; F. Thomson, Slavica Gardensia 10 [1983] 66–69). Oblique allusions in Kirill’s homily On the Soul and the Body (an allegorical expansion on the theme of “the lame and the blind”) imply that Kirill took the side of Patr. LOUKAS CHYROSBERGES against the ecclesiastical initiatives of ANDREJ OF BOGOJUBOVO (ca.1165–69).

DRIAN ERA; a guide to paschal computation based on the Constantinopolitan era; a section on the division of hours, possibly a later accretion (but see E. Piotrovskaja, TODRL 40 [1985] 379–84); and an autobiographical colophon, which includes synchronic data from the year 1196 and in which the “Greek tsar” (JOHN II KOMNENOS) is mentioned before the local prince.

Kirik is probably also to be identified with the Kirik who, in the mid-12th C., recorded the responses of various bishops in RHOSIA on questions of canon law. The responses indicate the practical problems of applying Byz. precepts to local life. They chiefly concern ritual and behavior. The major source is the Bulgarian translation of the NOMOKANON OF 14 TITLES, with further material derived from pseudo-JOHN IV NESTUTES and other penitentials (F.J. Thomson, Palaeobulgariaca 11 [1987] 23–45).


KIRILL (Cyril), bishop of Turov; died before 1182. Kirill is thought to be the author of didactic homilies in Slavonic on ecclesiastical and monastic life, a cycle of sermons for the period from Palm Sunday to the Sunday after Ascension Day, a weekly cycle of prayers, and a kanon. In his works Kirill amplifies, with florid and emotive rhetoric, themes from his Byz. reading. For example, for the Sunday after Easter he adapts allegories of spring from Gregory of Nazianzos (A. Vaillant, RES 26 [1950] 34–50; Ju. Begunov, Zbornik istorije književnosti 10 [1976] 269–76), while his allegories for monasticism in the homiletic Epistle to Basil are derived from Barlaam and Ioasaph (I.N. Lebedeva, Povest’ o Varlaame i Ioasafe [Leningrad 1985] 85–88). Most of Kirill’s identifiable sources can be traced to extant Slavonic translations, though there is disagreement as to whether he also knew and used Greek texts (Ju. Begunov, BS 35 [1974] 186f; F. Thomson, Slavica Gardensia 10 [1983] 66–69). Oblique allusions in Kirill’s homily On the Soul and the Body (an allegorical expansion on the theme of “the lame and the blind”) imply that Kirill took the side of Patr. LOUKAS CHYROSBERGES against the ecclesiastical initiatives of ANDREJ OF BOGOJUBOVO (ca.1165–69).
tioned several times in the correspondence of Pope Innocent III.


—A.K.

KLADAS, JOHN, an important and prolific composer; fl. late 14th–early 15th C. He is frequently cited in MSS as either John the Lampadarios or simply the Lampadarios (see Singers). In his treatise, Manuel Chrysaphes mentions Kladas (Kladas) as the last of five major Byz. composers of kalophonic oikoi (see Teretismata). His chants first appear in musical anthologies (Akolouthiai) copied toward the end of the 14th C. and became even more numerous in MSS from the early 15th C. His compositions appear in almost all collections of music for the liturgy and hours. They are considerably longer and have a wider vocal range than do settings by earlier 14th-C. composers.

LIT. G.I. Papadopoulos, Symbolai eis ten historian tes par'heinem ekklésiasites mousikes (Athens 1890) 274f. Comos, Communion, 77f, 184-86. PLF, no. 11739. —D.E.C.

KLASSMA (kla-stma, lit. “fragment”), real property escheated to the fisc because of the disappearance of its taxpaying owner. The term appears in documents from the 10th C., when it was already a component of well-established fiscal procedures, through the early 12th C., after which it was superseded by the analogous term exalemma. Since in the 10th and 11th C. the state was interested in maintaining the integrity of the village community, property on which taxes had ceased to be paid did not immediately devolve to the fisc; rather, the land was granted a sympatheia for a 30-year period after which time, unless orthosis took place, the land became klasma, was fiscally separated from the village community, and was disposed of as the state wished, through sale, donation, lease, etc. The Klassma that had been granted to cultivators, while under sympatheia, was sold at its normal price and the new owner henceforth paid the tax on the property at 1/12 the normal assessment; klasmatata located in depopulated areas, lacking labor, or which needed to be recultivated before cultivation, sold at a reduced price, taxed at 1/24 the normal assessment for 15 years, then raised permanently to 1/12.

Even with these inducements, the significant capital outlay needed to acquire klasma meant that although peasants could invoke the right of protimesis in sales of klasma (Zepos, Jus 1:203-3-33; 4:18.12-14), there was a tendency for dynatoi and monasteries to acquire such land, thereby contributing to the decline of the village community and an independent peasantry. There are several documents on sales of klasma in the area of Thessaloniki in the 10th C.


—M.B.

KLEISOURA (klei-soora, lit. “defile”), a territorial unit, usually smaller than a theme, sometimes part of a theme, but preserving a certain independence; the commander of a kleisoura was a kleisourarches. Most kleisourai were located in the East (Seleukeia, Charsianon, Sozopolis, etc.)—in the West only Strymon was called a kleisoura. Normally the status of kleisoura was transitional and former kleisourai became themes. The first mention of kleisoura as an administrative unit is from 698/9: Tiberios II sent a monostrategos “to the area of Cappadocia and of the kleisoura” (Theoph. 371.11-12). They are not mentioned after the 10th C.


KLERIKATON (kler-ikato-n), defined in the late 12th C. as the liturgical office to which a cleric was ordained as priest, deacon, or anagnostes, as distinct from the administrative post (archonikion) to which he might also be appointed (Balsamon, ed. Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 3:386.1). The term was commonly used in later centuries to designate a piece of church property (also called klerikostasion, klerikotopion), which such a cleric held, as klerikoparokhos, from the bishop in return for his liturgical services. The institution, if not the terminology, existed from at least as early as the beginning of the 11th C. and provided the basic living of the lower “parish” and cathedral clergy. Roughly analogous to the Western beneficium, the klerikaton differed in that its recipient paid a modest rent (telos) and might receive a salary. Since, moreover, he was likely to be married, there was
a constant tendency for *klērikata* to pass to non-
derclerical heirs and thus to become alienated from
the church’s estate.


---

**KLETORION** (κλητόριον, from *klesis*, “invitation”), term designating both a banquet (esp. in the imperial palace) and a hall where a banquet was to take place. The word *deipnokletorion* was occasionally used as a synonym.

LIT. Oikonomides, *Listes* 27, n.29.

---

**KLETOROLOGION OF PHILOTHEOS.** See PHILOTHEOS, KLETOROLOGION OF.

---

**KLIM SMOLJATIĆ,** monk; metropolitan of Kiev (27 July 1147–55, 1159); and a figure of controversy in Russo-Byz. ecclesiastical and cultural relations. In the ecclesiastical controversy Klim (Clement) was elected metropolitan, at the instigation of Izjaslav of Kiev, by a synod of local bishops and without confirmation by the patriarch of Constantinople. The rift with the patriarchate lasted until Jurij Dolgorukij took Kiev and Klim was replaced by the Greek Constantine. The cultural controversy concerns Klim’s *Epistle* to a certain Thomas, in which he refutes the charge that he had pursued vainglorious “philosophy” by citing Homer, Aristotle, and Plato rather than Scripture. The charge is probably a polemical *topos*, rather than evidence for any direct knowledge of the classics in Rus’ (apart from translated extracts in *florilegia*). His own exegetical demonstration draws chiefly on *Theodoret of Cyrhus* and other translated commentaries, though it has been suggested that Klim shows an awareness of Byz. *schêdocraphia* and that the label “philosopher” (cf. also *PSRL* 2:340) implies that he was educated in Constantinople. His *dubia* include homilies and some of the canonical responses recorded by *Kirk* of Novgorod.


---

**KLIMA** (κλίμα, “region”), a word that could designate a district in a city, a part of a province (GEORGE OF CYPRUS, for example speaks of four *klimata* in Isauria), or an ecclesiastical diocese. Specifically, the proper, plural form Klimata denoted the theme of Cherson: the 9th-C. Taktikon of Uspenskij explicitly refers to the “strategos of the Klimata,” and Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos speaks twice of the “kastra of the Klimata” near Cherson (*De adm. imp.* 42:8, 72). The Toparcha Gothicus, in an enigmatic passage, mentions the town of Klimata, the localization of which has been hotly debated (I. Ševčenko, *DOP* 25 [1971] 155–60).

From ancient geographers and astrologers the Byz. inherited the concept of seven *klimata*, or zones of the earth, each of which was dominated by a corresponding planet. The *Chronicon Paschale* gives an elaborate list of the *klimata*: (1) Libya; (2) Egypt; (3) Mauritania, Judaea, Arabia; (4) Syria, Mesopotamia, Medeia; (5) Italy, Greece, Asia Minor, Armenia; (6) Gallia, Dalmatia, Thrace, Trebizond; (7) the region around the Borysthenes (Dnieper). Kosmas Indikopleustes rejected the idea of seven *klimata* as contradicting Christianity, but attempts to reconcile astrology and Christian faith in questions pertaining to the *klimata* continued well into the 19th and 14th C. (Nikephoros Blemmydes, John Katrares).


---

**KLIMENT OF OHRID,** Bulgarian writer (probably a native of Macedonia); saint; fl. late 9th–early 10th C.; feastdays 27 July, 22 Nov. A pupil of CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER and METHODEIOS and thoroughly familiar with Byz. ecclesiastical literature, he accompanied them to Moravia where he spent some 20 years, perhaps interrupted by a visit to Rome in 867–69. Returning to Bulgaria in 885, he was sent by Tsar Boris I to Kutmičevica in Macedonia (exact location uncertain) as bishop and remained there until retiring
KLOKOTNICA, battle that took place on 9 March 1230 (Zlatarski, Ist. 3:349), close to the present-day town of Khaskovo in Bulgaria, on the main road from Adrianople to Philippopolis. Although THEODORE KOMENOS DOUKAS had made a treaty on oath with JOHN ASEN II, the Greek ruler invaded Bulgaria in order to secure his northern flank. The Bulgarian tsar opposed him with a scratch force of CUMANS, but spurred on by belief in his moral superiority—he reportedly hung Theodore’s written oath on his standard—he won a complete victory, capturing Theodore along with his chief men. He then made a triumphal progress through Theodore’s territories. John Asen II returned in April to Tūrnovo, where in gratitude for his victory he founded the Church of the Forty Martyrs of Sebastea, on whose feastday the battle occurred. He sent out governors and tax-collectors to administer his extensive conquests, but left the more distant parts in the hands of local lords. Although Thessalonike eluded him, for the time being Bulgaria was the dominant power in the Balkans.


—M.J.A.

KNEELING (γονυκλωσία), a posture of PRAYER. Kneeling was originally considered penitential, as distinct from standing (stasis), a sign of the Resurrection (anastasis). Kneeling was thus prohibited on Sunday, later on Saturday, and from Easter through the end of Pentecost vespers, at which time it recommences with the special gonyklisia rite. This rite, of Palestinian origin, goes back to the 5th C.; it is unknown to the Tyrikon of the Great Church, though found in the later Sabatic Typika.

Kneeling or prostration (proskynesis, melanoia) for prayer after psalmody, standard practice in cathedral vigils and monastic hours from the 4th C. onward, was also considered an important element in ascetic exploits: hagiographers describe their heroes prostrating innumerable times in succession. It was imposed as an epitimion; thus Theodore of Stoudios (PG 99:1661CD) requires laymen who communicate with heretics to kneel 50 times in a row—rated a minor epitimion.


—R.F.T., A.C.
KOCHLIAS. See Hippodromes.

KODINOS, PSEUDO-, conventional name of the anonymous author of the Treatise on the Dignities and Offices, compiled, according to Verpeaux (infra 27–30), between 1547 and 1568. The treatise presents the hierarchy (taxis) of functionaries' titles and offices, a description of their costumes and functions, of the feasts celebrated at the court and of the ceremony of coronation as well as the duties and the ceremony of promotion of certain dignitaries (domestikos, adnomiastes, sebастократor, etc.). The chapters on ecclesiastical offices were arbitrarily added by Andrew Damarinos in the 16th C. Along with official information pseudo-Kodinos included some personal recollections or those of his informants as well as passages derived from various chronicles. More complex is the question of several sections very close to the work of John VI Kantakouzenos; Verpeaux suggests the use of common sources. Two works of different centuries were also (falsely) attributed to Kodinos: the main version of the PATRIA OF CONSTANTINOPLE and a chronicle terminating in 1453 (Kleinchroniken 1:1:121–55)—all three of these works are often transmitted in the same MSS.


-A.K.

KODIX (kódx, from Lat. codex), cadastral register in book form drafted by the office of the GENikon. The term appears in Basil II's novel of 996 establishing the validity of only those land delimitations (periorismoi) that are based on the kodikoi (sic) of the genikon or on other appropriate documents (Zepos, Jud 1:267.11–14). They formed tax lists of particular regions (enoriai), divided into kephalai (chapters), each kephalasion dealing with a subregion (a village), itself divided into a succession of stichoi. They were revised at perhaps 30-year intervals. Individuals and institutions dispensed copies of kodikes, the so-called isokodika (e.g., Docheiar., no.1.18, 26). Some extracts from kodikes survive: the so-called cadaster of THEBES (Svoronos, Cadastre 11–19), fragments from a cadaster of Boleron and Strymon (Ivir., no.39; Dölger, Schatz., no.65), a quotation from a cadaster of Thessalonike (Lavra 1, no.39.5–8), an extract from a cadaster of Trebizond (Vazelon, no.106) from the end of the 13th C.

The term kodix disappeared after 1204, being replaced by praktikon, which was considered a copy "from the imperial book of the thesis compiled by the apographeis" (Zogrt., no.44.490, 66–67) or of the grand thesis (Dionys., no.21.2). The Chronicle of the Morea (ed. I. Schmitt, vv. 1908–10) also mentions a "book that listed everyone's tenures granted in ownership and possession."

Lit. Dölger, Beiträge 97–102.

-M.B.

KOIMESIS. See Dormition.

KOINE (κόινη διάλεκτος, "the common language"), the common Greek of the Hellenistic world, which displaced the old local dialects as the language of administration and of prose literature. In origin a variety of expanded Attic, with many Ionic and other elements, Koine was used as a lingua franca between city states in the 4th C. B.C. It became the current language of the cities founded by Alexander and his successors in Asia and Africa, and the normal vehicle for prose literature until the rise of Atticism in the late 1st C. B.C. and the 1st C. A.D. The Septuagint and the New Testament were written in Koine. Technical writing often continued to use Koine, which underwent progressive changes including restructuring of phonology (see Phonetics and Phonology) and morphology and extension of vocabulary by derivation, composition, and linguistic borrowing, esp. from Latin. In the Byz. world Koine continued to be used for subliterary writing: popular saints' Lives such as those of Cyril of Skythopolis (6th C.); anecdotes of ascetics such as The Spiritual Meadow of John Moschos (early 7th C.); chronicles such as those of John Malalas and Theophanes the Confessor; archival works such as the De administrando imperio and De ceremoniis of Constantine VII; and medical and other technical treatises. Koine represents one pole of Byz. diglossia, of which the other is represented by Atticism. The normal spo-
KINOBIOS (κοινοβιος, lit. "common life"). monastery housing a community of monks or nuns and emphasizing a communal and egalitarian way of life. Koinobioi in their earliest form were created by PACHOMIOS in Egypt, for example, at TABENNISI. Basil the Great greatly preferred cenobitic monasticism to eremitism, stressing the advantages of a mutual support system and the possibility of economic self-sufficiency. He required stricter discipline for the monks, and insisted on manual labor. Five novels of Justinian I established the koinobion as the norm but did permit eremitism for the chosen few. THEODOROS OF STUDIOS and ATHANASIUS OF ATHOS continued to emphasize the importance of the cenobitic tradition. In the later centuries of Byz., however, koinobia tended to develop into communities of landowners rather than of working brethren.

In a cenobitic monastery all of the monks theoretically followed the same schedule for working, praying, eating, and sleeping, with variations permitted only to accommodate the different types of work each performed. They slept in individual cells or (rarely) in a common dormitory but were all supposed to eat the same food in the refectory. Clothes, tools, and other items were owned in common and distributed as necessary. The cenobitic life stressed obedience to the superior or HEGOUHENO, and adherence to the rules of the TYPIKON, including regular attendance at services and avoiding contact with the outside world (esp. members of the opposite sex). The koinobion resembled a spiritual family, in which the monks or nuns were linked by a spirit of brotherhood or sisterhood.

Contemporary critics of Byz. monasticism, like Eustathios of Thessalonike, Balsamon, and Patr. Athanasios I, reveal the conflicts between individualism and the cenobitic ideal. Hegoumenoi in particular were accused of eating special food and living in luxury; Balsamon (PG 138:176CD) commented that monks surpassed their male brethren in "observing communal diet and habitation," and that true cenobitism was rare in male monasteries. Although virtually all monks and many monks did obey the principle of monastic STABILITY and remained in the same monastery for life, some holy (and not so holy) men in search of more rigorous ASCETICISM viewed their residence in a koinobion only as training and preparation for the more arduous life of a hermit. Throughout the Byz. era there continued to be discussion over which form of monastic life was superior; the typika, for example, strongly favored cenobitism.

KIMOHEI (κοιμωση), the chant that accompanies the rite of communion. Originally a responsorial psalm, it later acquired elements, such as the final DOXOLOGY and refrain, called apolytikion (Mateos, Typticron 2:285.313–4), of antiphonal psalmody. The entire cycle of koinika, 26 texts each assigned to one or more occasions in the liturgical year, was almost fully developed by the 9th C.: its scope and function are indicated in the Typticron of the Great Church. However, the music for these chants is documented only from the 12th C. onward, though there is reason to believe that the three Church Slavonic music books known as the Uspenskij, Blagoveščenskij, and Sinodal'nyj Kondakaria preserve Byz. melodies of a more archaic form than any transmitted in Byz. MSS.

KINSKONOH (κοιμωση), a collection of magical recipes compiled in the 3rd or 4th C. that remained in use throughout the Byz. era; in the 14th C., for example, their use was condemned by Patr. Athanasios I (ep.69.81) and by the synod of 1371 (MM 1:544.17–18); the synodal decision of 1371 also mentions a tetradon.
by an astrologer, Demetrios Chloros (RegPatr, fasc. 5, no.2572), compiled on the basis of the “Koitrannis” and containing invocations of demons, magical formulas, and magical names.

LIT. D. Kaimakis, Die Kyranident (Meisenheim am Glan 1976).

F.R.T.

KOITON (κουτών, Lat. cubiculum), bedchamber, esp. of the emperor. The “chief of the koon” became the designation of the chamberlain: thus Palladios of Galatia addressed his sponsor Lau- sos as “the praitposi of the most pious koon” (PG 34:1259A), the Greek translation of praepositus sacri cubiculi. Basil the Great (ep.79.11, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol.1 [Paris 1957] 181) speaks of two “great officials”—the eparch (praetorian prefect) and ho peri ton koiton, the latter probably to be identified as the castrensis sacri palatii Demosthenes (PLRE 1:249). Philostorgios (HE 10.6, ed. Bidez 1872) mentions servants “in the koiton,” a term synonymous with koitonitai. By the 9th C. the chief of the koiton was called the parakoiomomenos. Oikonomides (Listes 301) distinguishes hoi epi tou koitonos, the servants of the imperial bedchamber proper, and those of the cubiculum, the corps of eunuchs of the palace. Constantine VII (De adm. imp. 50.51–53) uses the phrase “the koon guarded by God” for the treasury in which the pakton of Slav tribes was deposited.

A.K.

KOITONITES (κοιτωνιτης), courtier whose function was to serve in the koiton, the emperor’s bedchamber. The distinction between the koitonites and the koubikoularios is not clear. Guillard (Institutions 1:269) asserts that the koitonites existed at least from the end of the 8th C.; he bases this on a 19th-C. scholar’s chronology for a seal (Schlumberger, Sig. 526) that is in reality of the 11th C. (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.780). The duty of the koitonites was to lock the door of the koiton (Leo Gramm. 250.22–23). Oikonomides (Listes 305) considers koitonitai as subalterns of the parakoiomomenos. On seals of the 11th C. one finds koitonites (e.g., Laurent, Corpus 2, no.217) and much more often epi tou koitonos; the latter combined his title with various court or civil offices (praitpositos [see Praepositus Sacri Cubiculi], logothetes, ephikos [see Eikon], judge, etc.). A 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 176.6–11) relates that the parakoiomomenos of the koiton was the chief of the servants of the imperial bedchamber and of the koitonarioi; probably the latter term replaced koitonites.

A.K.

KOKKINOBAPHOS, JAMES OF. See JAMES OF KOKKINOBAPHOS.

KOLLOUTHOS (Κολλουθος), poet; born Lykopoli, in Egypt, fl. 5th–6th C. According to the Souda he lived in the reign of Anastasios I (491–518), who may well have been the recipient of one of his lost verse panegyrics. Lost also are his epics, the Kalydoniaka in six books, and the Persika, the latter perhaps contemporary in theme. His surviving work is the Rape of Helen, 394 hemistichs influenced more by the language than the metrics of Nonnos of Panopolis. In the 15th C. one of its MSS (Milan, Ambros. Q 5 sup.) was rediscovered by Bessarion in the monastery of St. Nicola di Casole near Otranto (L. Labowsky, Bessarion’s Library and the Biblioteca Marciana [Rome 1979] 9, 11f). One matter of accidental interest is his presumed use of Latin poets, notably Catullus.


B.B.

KOLLYBA (κόλλυβα), boiled wheat, which, along with raw vegetables, constituted the diet of 5th-C. monks who refused to touch bread (pseudo-Palladios, Vita Chrysostomi, ed. P.R. Coleman-Norton, p.127.3–4). It was recommended that everyone eat kollyba on the first Saturday in Lent. The term also refers, as it did in antiquity, to special cakes made of boiled wheat with sugar, dried raisins, pomegranate seeds, nuts, herbs, etc.; these symbolized the human body and were distributed to the congregation, usually in remembrance of the dead (e.g., the typikon of the Kecharitomene nunnery, ed. P. Gautier, REB 43 [1985] 119.1767). The typikon of the Pantokrator monastery (ed. P. Gautier, REB 32 [1974] 43.241–42) indicates that three baskets of kollyba were required for a single distribution. In vernacular
KOLOBOU MONASTERY, founded by the monk John Kolobos (Κολόβος) between 866 and 883. It was situated near Hierissos, just outside the precinct of the Holy Mountain of Athos, on the isthmus that links the peninsula with the mainland, but its fortunes were closely linked with the development of Athonite monasticism. John Kolobos was one of the early anchorites on Athos and an associate of St. Euthymios the Younger. Circa 866, when the danger from Arab attacks increased, Kolobos led a group of disciples to refuge on the mainland, first to Siderokasua, and then near Hierissos. Here he founded the monastery that bore his name and was dedicated to St. John the Baptist. It was apparently the first koinobion in the immediate vicinity of Athos, anticipating by almost a century the advent of cenobitic monasticism to the Holy Mountain itself. The monastery of Kolobou is first mentioned in 883 in a sigillum of Basil I that guarantees the rights of its monks. The monastery owned substantial estates and was involved in frequent property disputes with the inhabitants of Hierissos and Athonite monks. Its prominence continued until 979/80, when it was absorbed by the newly founded Iviron Monastery.


KOLOSSAI. See Chonai.

KOLYBAS, SERGIOS, protonotarios and imperial secretary, rhetorician; fl. late 12th C. Kolybas (Κολυβᾶς) wrote two speeches addressed to Isaac II and delivered in 1193 (not in 1186 as they are dated by Dujčev), almost at the same time as the speech of George Tornikios. Kolybas's speeches concern the revolt of Asen I and Peter of Bulgaria; he stressed that Peter concluded a truce with Byz., whereas Asen was still fighting against the empire.

Ed. Regel, Fontes 280-300.
Lit. Dujčev, Proučavanja 77-81. —A.K.

KOLONEIA (Κολώνεια). There were two cities of this name in Anatolia.

1. Koloneia on the Lykos in interior Pontos. Now Şebinkarahisar, Koloneia was a stronghold on a main route to the east; rebuilt by Justinian I, it was attacked by the Arabs in 778 and 940. Koloneia appears as a military district commanded by a doux Kallistos ca.838 (A. Kazhdan, Byzantion 56 [1986] 155f) and a strategos by 863; a seal of the 9th/10th C. calls the commander of Koloneia archon. For Constantine VII Koloneia was a small theme, named for its powerful and steep fortress, the polisma of Koloneia. In 1057, the tagmata of Koloneia and Chaldia supported the revolt of Isaac I Komnenos, and in 1068 Koloneia was controlled by the rebel Crispin. It fell to the Turks after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071 but was briefly retaken by the Byz. in 1106. Koloneia was a bishopric under Sebastia; by 879 it became autocephalous and in the 11th C. was made a metropolis. The region was the center of the Paulicians in the 7th-9th C. The site contains an imposing fortress with citadel and keep of several periods from Roman through Ottoman.

2. Koloneia in Cappadocia. Located at the edge of the central Anatolian plateau, this Koloneia, now Aksaray, was important as a road junction and aplekton where armies gathered for expeditions to the south and east. Koloneia was a suffragan bishopric of Morissos through the 11th C.; it preserves no Byz. remains.

Lit. 2. TIB 2:207f. —C.F.
sent him against the Persians as a replacement for PHILIPPIKOS, and Komentiolos gained a decisive victory at Sisarbanon, near Nisibis; he captured the fortress of Akbas. When CHOSROES II fled to the empire, Komentiolos and DOMITIANOS were in charge of the king, and Komentiolos restored him to the throne. Recalled to the Balkans, Komentiolos was routed in 598 by the Avars and fled to Drizipetra (Thrace), where the citizens prevented his entry; thereafter the city succumbed to the barbarians. Together with Priskos he held command in the area of the Danube; they were unable to stop the Avar invasion. During the revolt of Phokas, Komentiolos was assigned to defend the walls of Constantinople but was seized and executed.

Theophylaktos Simokattes, the main source on Komentiolos, is hostile to him, describing the general as a coward and even a traitor: thus the battle near Drizipetra is presented as a treacherous act to punish unruly soldiers. To be distinguished from Komentiolos is another Komentiolos, a brother of Phokas; he revolted against Herakleios (Kaegi, “New Evidence” 311–23).


—W.E.K., A.K.

KOMES. See Comes.

KOMES HYDATON (κόμης ὑδάτων, lit. “count of the waters”), subaltern official of the GENIKON mentioned in the Kleorologion of Philothoeos. The komes hydaton was in charge of aqueducts, as is clear from the letter of Theodore of Kyziko to Constantine VII in which the bishop asked the komes to provide him with “wintry water” to satiate his “summery thirst” (NE 19 [1925] 276.18–29). Dölger (Beiträge 90, n.9) surmises that his duty was to collect the tax on canals and aqueducts, which is mentioned in the Basilika (Basil. 16.1.27). He is perhaps to be identified with the logothetes ton hydaton.

—A.K.

KOMES TES KORTESES (κόμης τῆς κόρτης), official on the staff of a strategos, probably a civil official with judicial and police duties. Constantine VII (De cer. 489.17–21) states that the name originates from the word korte (tent), since the duty of the komes was to pitch the imperial tent during a campaign. The author of the vita of GEORGE OF AMASTRIS (ed. Vasil’evskij, Trudy 3:45.5–16) calls him “the shield-bearer of the korte” and stresses the Italian origin of the term. Several seals of this komes are preserved, dated mostly to the 8th and 9th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 1422, 1495, 1530A); the legends on certain seals indicate the province in which the komes tes kortes served: Peloponnesos (Zacos, Seals 2, no.936), Macedonia, Chaldia, and so on. The earliest mention of the komes tes kortes in narrative sources is a letter of THEODORE OF STUDIOS (PG 99:1232A) of 817/18; the vita of Theodore reports that Leo V ordered the strategos of Anatolikon to send the komes tes kortes to flog the holy man (PG 99:296B). In the vita of George of Amastris the komes tes kortes has responsibility in a criminal case, and Constantine VII mentions the komes together with protonotarioi (De cer. 489.2–3). Komites tes kortes appear in the lists of provincial functionaries from 995 (Ivtr., no.8.10) to 1088 (Palmou Engrapha 1, no.6.61), usually after the chartoularioi of the dromos and of themes. The last references to komites tes kortes are in the 12th C. in the Alexiad of Anna Komnene and in a letter of 1116.


—A.K.

KOMES TES LAMIAS (κόμης τῆς λαμίας), an enigmatic functionary of the genikon mentioned in the Kleorologion of Philothoeos; the name has been connected with the Latin laminallamna, meaning, among other things, gold or other precious metals, and interpreted as one who “had to do with bullion and mines” (Bury, Adm. System 89). The usual opinion that the komes tes lamias is to be identified with the comes metallorum per Illyricum first mentioned in 365 and known to the Notitia dignitatum (O. Seeck, RE 4 [1901] 659) cannot be either proven or rejected. On seals of the 9th through the 11th C. the komes tes lamias bears the titles of spatharios, strator, or protospatharias, and sometimes combines his office with that of the epi ton oikeiakon (see Oikeiakos) or the megas chartoularios of the genikon (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 401–06; Zacos, Seals 2, no.829).

lit. Haldon, Praetorians 593, n.978.

—A.K.
KOMES TON TEICHEON (κόμης τῶν τείχων, τείχων, or τοῦ τείχους, lit. “count of the walls”), commander of a military body responsible for the defense of the Long Wall and the adjacent area. Bury (Adm. System 568) without convincing proof connects this office with the vicarius of the Long Wall who was introduced by Justinian I and soon replaced by the Justinianic praetor for Thrace. The first mentioned komes ton teichon (named archon tou teichiou by Theoph. 401.1 or ton teichon by Nikeph. 56.4–5) was Niketas Anthrax who was executed in 718/19. The term seems not yet established in the taktika of the 9th and 10th C.; in the late 9th C. the Kletorologion of Philotheos calls him sometimes domestikos and sometimes komes. A 10th-C. historian (Genes. 4.46–47) describes him as “one entrusted with the care of the Walls.” The functions of the komes ton teichon are not clearly defined: he belonged to the domestikoi and could even combine his post with that of the domestikos ton Noumeron. The komes ton teichon supervised the prison of Chalke and participated in guarding the palace. The office of domestikos ton teichon is mentioned by pseudo-Kodinos in the 14th C., but the last known komes ton teichon was probably the 11th-C. patriarchos Melias, whom Christopher of Mytilene (ed. Kritz, no.16.27) calls the archon of the walls. Oikonomides (Listes 337) surmises, contrary to Guillard, that the office is mentioned also in the Peira. The staff of the komes ton teichon was identical to that of the domestikos ton Noumeron.


KOMETOPOULOI (Κομητόπουλοι), the sons of the comes Nicholas and his wife Ripsime—David, Moses, Aaron, and Samuel of Bulgaria. Asolik plainly says that the Kometopouloi (“Komsajak”) were Armenians from the district of Derjans. They headed a revolt in Bulgaria against Byz. power. Where and when this revolt began are the subject of discussion. An 11th-C. historian (Skl. 255.73–80) says that the sons of Peter of Bulgaria, Boris II and Romans, left Constantinople ca.970 in order to oppose the revolt of the Kometopouloi; John Geometres in a poem titled On the Kometopouloi, playing on the word for comet and the name of Kometopouloi, connects the revolt with the appearance of a comet (perhaps in 968) and the death of Nikaphoros II Phokas in 969 (A. Leroy-Molingen, Byzantion 42 [1972–73] 410f). Nevertheless W. Seibt thinks it impossible that the revolt started in 969; he refers to another passage in Skylitzes (Skl. 328f) in which the revolt of the Kometopouloi is set at the time of the death of John I Tzimakes in 976. Also disputed is whether the revolt encompassed only Macedonia or took place in northeastern Bulgaria, eventually to be united with the movement in western Bulgaria. P. Petrov (B Bulg 1 [1962] 137–42) hypothesized that the account by the 15th-C. Polish historian...
Długosz about the revolt of Peter and Bojan in Bulgaria in 976 is to be connected with the activity of the Komotopouloi. David and Moses died soon after 976, and Aaron, probably, on 14 June 987 or 988. Samuel remained alone at the helm of the Bulgarian state.


-A.K.

KOMMERKIARIOS (κομμερκιάριος), a fiscal official, probably the successor of the late Roman comes commerciorum, the controller of trade on the frontier. The Notitia dignitatum mentions only three comes commerciorum: for Oriens, for the area on the Danube and the Black Sea, and for Illyricum (O. Seeck, RE 4 [1901] 643f). The first mention of kommerkiarioi is found in fragmentary inscriptions of a law promulgated by Anastasios 1. The seals of kommerkiarioi show that they were stationed in many places on the frontier, apparently supporting the statement of Prokopios (SH 25.5) that Justinian I installed customs stations “at each strait” and sent two archontes to each location to collect tolls. G. Millet’s attempt (Mélanges offerts à m. Gustave Schlumberger, vol. 2 [Paris 1924] 303–27) to consider the early kommerkiarioi as the emperor’s merchants is questionable.

The [genikos] kommerkiarioi farmed out his office at public auction for one or two years; his functions have been understood as those of a duty collector or of a quartermaster general of the army or of an entrepreneur (or association of entrepreneurs) who obtained the monopoly of silk trade and silk production, initially for all the empire, then for one or more provinces. The kommerkiarioi had special seals for their merchandise, displaying the image of the emperor(s), the indications for which each seal was valid (ranging from 673/4 to 832/3), and naming the warehouses (apothekai, concentration and redistribution points) of the province(s) under their jurisdiction. For a short period in 695–97 and permanently from 730/1 to 832/3, these special seals do not mention individual kommerkiarioi but rather bear the impersonal expression “of the imperial kommerkia,” presumably because these were offices run by state employees who may have exercised general control over the merchandise and collected duties.

After the mid-8th C. these offices appear only in Thrace and Macedonia. From the end of the 7th C. the significance of kommerkiarioi decreased; the late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philothemos cites them only as subaltern officials in the genikon. These officials, called [imperial] kommerkiarioi, had jurisdiction over themes or ports as well as the function of controlling imports and exports and collecting some duties.

On seals of the 9th to 11th C., kommerkiarioi are seen to control larger territorial units, such as Chaldia or Cyprus, or to operate in trade centers such as Abydos, Erythrai, and Cherson; sometimes, like Joseph, abydikos and kommerkiarioi of Thessalonike and Kephalenia (Zacos, Seals 2, no.1075), they functioned simultaneously in towns far removed from each other. Some kommerkiarioi, such as the kommerkiarioi of the Bulgarians (ibid., no.910) and kommerkiarioi of Preslav (no.1043), were inspectors of trade in the northern Balkans.

They held court titles, such as mandator or protospatharios of the Chrysotriklinos, but could have specifically “commercial” offices such as metretes or “measurer” (no.627). A seal of a megas kommerkiarioi of the West, titled spatharokandidatos, is datable to the second half of the 10th C. (no.809).

At least until 1196 (Lavra 1, no.67.61), kommerkiarioi appear in chrysoobulls as collectors of kommerkion, but the author of the vita A of Athanasios of Athos (ed. Noret, par.10.13–15) already identified a kommerkiarioi as the Byz. equivalent of praktor.


-A.K. N.O.

KOMMERKION (κομμέρκιον), a term with two meanings in Byz.

1. Commercium was the late Roman name of some frontier cities where exchanges with foreign merchants were authorized; their activities were supervised by the comes commerciorum.

2. Kommerkion was a tax on merchandise that appears in the sources around the year 800. It has been understood as a circulation and sales tax, paid at the customs and a replacement of the octava; it was collected on all merchandise.
imported into the empire (including some prisoners of war destined to be sold as slaves) and, inside the empire, on merchandise reaching Constantinople by sea. Its rate was 10 percent ad valorem (thus also called dekate), until the mid-14th C., when John VI reduced it to 2 percent.


KOMNENE, ANNA, historian; born Constantinople 2 Dec. 1083, died ca. 1153/4. Eldest daughter of Alexios I, Anna Komnene (Κομνηνή) was betrothed to Constantine Doukas, son of Michael VII, who was regarded as the heir to the throne; after his premature death she married Nikephoros Bryennios. In 1118, with the support of Irene Doukaina, she schemed in order to obtain the throne for her husband, but the success of John II forced her to retire to the Kecharitomene Nunnery, although she became a nun only on her deathbed.

In the monastery Anna was a patron of scholarship and wrote (after 1148) the Alexiad, a long panegyric of her father, whose reign she contrasted to the rule of her nephew Manuel I. As in Bryennios’s history, Anna started with the background of Alexios’s victory; Bryennios, however, praised the leading noble families equally, while Anna concentrated on her father’s deeds. Proud of the ancient heritage of Byz., she was very conservative and disapproved of the radical ideas of both John Italos and the Bogomils. Although Anna’s chronology is inconsistent (Ja. Ljubarskij, VizVrem 23 [1963] 47–56), and the facts sometimes distorted, the Alexiad is an important source, esp. for the history of Alexios’s wars and international relations. A talented writer, Anna often created images (e.g., for Robert Guiscard) of depth and complexity; many scenes are emotionally vivid. The Alexiad was paraphrased in the vernacular. Anna’s eulogy by George Tornikios provides us not only with her moral characterization, but also with a physical portrait.


KOMNENE, IRENE, sebastokratorissa, wife of the sebastokratōr Andronikos Komnenos (Manuel I’s brother); born ca. 1110, died Constantinople soon after 1151/2. After her husband’s death in 1142, the ambitious Irene came into conflict with the young Manuel I. She was exiled to the Princes’ Islands, and her enormous fortune was confiscated. When she returned, she was then accused of being involved in a plot against Manuel I (in 1148) and after a short banishment was placed in the Pantokrator monastery. Irene was the patron of literati in the capital (Prodromos, Manganeios Prodromos, Tzetzes, Manasses) and corresponded with the monk Jacob. The poets praised her wealth, beauty, cleverness, and her courageous independence in opposition to Manuel I. Irene’s sons John and Alexios became Manuel’s favorites, and Alexios Komnenos controlled the government during Alexios II’s minority; her daughter Theodora was married to Henry of Babenberg, another daughter Eudokia was Andronikos I’s mistress.


KOMNENE, MARIA (the Porphyrogennete), daughter of Manuel I and Bertha of Sulzbach; born Constantinople Mar. 1152, died Constantinople July 1182/early 1183. She was heiress-presumptive until Alexios II was born. About 1163 she was betrothed to the future Béla III of Hungary. Despite the betrothal, in 1166 or 1167 Manuel offered her hand to William II of Sicily, whose regents declined the offer. After Alexios II’s birth, her engagement to Béla was terminated. In 1171 or 1172 Manuel betrothed her to William II, but she never left for Italy. In 1177 or 1178, Manuel offered her hand to confirm an alliance with the Montferrat family; early in 1180 Renier of Montferrat married her. She received the title kaisarissa (i.e., wife of the caesar); with her forceful personality, she easily dominated him. After Manuel’s death, dissatisfied by her lack of influence on the regency for Alexios II, Maria started a conspiracy (Feb. 1181). When it was detected in March, she and her husband fled to
Hagia Sophia, whence she waged war on the regency’ soldiers. She urged the future Andronikos I Komnenos to advance on Constantinople. In May the patriarch arranged peace and she and Renier returned to the palace. After Andronikos took Constantinople, she allegedly was poisoned.


KOMNENIAN DYNASTY, family that ruled from 1081 to 1185. The first of the Komnenoi to ascend the throne was Isaac I, but the dynasty really commenced with his nephew Alexios I. Exceptionally in the history of Byz. the first three members of the dynasty, Alexios, John II, and Manuel I, held power for a full century. The 12th C. was comparatively stable. Alexius quashed political and ideological resistance and, apart from the rivalry within the family of the Komnenoi, the century did not see serious rebellions or riots. The minority of Alexios II and the usurpation of Andronikos I, however, reopened political conflict. The Komnenoi stabilized the international position of the empire despite severe pressures from Seljuks, Normans, the Crusaders, and Venice. The economy revived; art and literature flowered even if the term Komnenian Renaissance cannot be used without qualification. Evaluation of the dynasty is contradictory. On the one hand, V. Vasilievskij propounded a theory (developed by G. Ostrogorsky and modified by P. Lemerle) that, by accepting Western feudalism, the Komnenian dynasty destroyed original Byz. institutions and caused the decline of the empire, while on the other, A. Kazhdan and R.-J. Lille emphasize the positive effect of Komnenian policy.


KOMNENODOUKAS. See Doukas.

KOMNENOS (Komnenos), name of a noble lineage, deriving from village of Komne (Psellos in Sathas, MB 4:407.20–21); K. Amantos (Thrakika 10 [1938] 232f) located it in Thrace despite the explicit evidence of Attaleiates (Attal. 58.11–13) that they were among those who were noble and famous in the East; in the mid-11th C. their estates were situated in the Kastamon region. The Komnenoi are known from the reign of Basil II onward: the protospatharios Nikephoros governed Vaspurakan, the patrikios Manuel Komnenos Erotaikos was strategos autokrator of the East. His son Isaac (I) became emperor in 1057. In the 11th C. Komnenoi were landowners (cf. Peira 44.1) and military commanders: John, Isaac I’s brother, was domestikos ton scholon, as was his son Isaac; another son Manuel was protostrator; the third son, Alexios (I), became emperor in 1081. The Komnenoi were intermarried with aristocratic families (Dassanou, Doukai) and foreign dynasties—Bulgarian and Georgian.

After the establishment of the Komnenian dynasty, the Komnenoi and families related to them by marriage acquired almost all of the highest military posts and were granted the highest dignities newly invented by Alexios I: according to a very approximative calculation, 90 percent of the topmost elite from 1118 to 1180 consisted of Komnenoi and their relatives (I. Sorlin, TM 6 [1976] 374). The Komnenoi were also active as provincial governors in Cilicia and the Balkans. Only rarely were they in the civil service: the parakoimomenos John reportedly administered “the state affairs” under John II; Stephen was megas droungarios; Alexios and Constantine served as imperial pinkernes. These civil servants were all distant relatives of the emperors. Only one relative was in the church hierarchy: Adrianos, Alexios I’s nephew, who after a career as ruler of the “Chalybes,” a tribe on the eastern frontier, became archbishop of Bulgaria in 1143 under the name of John; Hilarios, proto of Athos ca. 1110, who is called a relative of Alexios I, is a very obscure figure.

The role of the Komnenos family in cultural life was limited: Anna Komnene received her education against her parents’ will; the other writers in the family were a certain sebastokrator Isaac (or Isaac Porphyrogennetos—see Komninos, Isaac), who composed several theological works, and Alexios, who produced some poems. More important was the role of the Komnenoi as patrons, esp. certain women, such as Anna and the sebastokratorissa Irene Komnene. Great landowners, they founded several churches and monasteries: Kosmosoteira at Bera, Kecharitomene,
and Pantokrator in Constantinople. A 12th-C. epigram states that a John Komnenos, son of a sebastokratōr, built a monastery instead of a mansion (Lampros, "Mark. kod." [1911] nos. 50–51); the protostrator Alexios is called the founder of the Church of St. Nicholas in Manastir (F. Barišić, ZRVI 8.2 [1964] 20f).

The role of the Komnenos family declined in the late 12th C. due to the anti-aristocratic policy of ANDRONIKOS I; his contemporary, David Komnenos, governor of Thessalonike in 1185, was treated by Eustathios of Thessalonike and Niketas Choniates as a symbol of cowardice and lack of martial prowess (K. Barzos, Makedonika 20 [1980] 30–47). Nonetheless, the name of Komnenos retained its spell and was widely used as a sort of royal title by various dynasties from the late 12th C. onward: ANGELOI, VATATZES, and the rulers of Trebizond (GRAND KOMNENOS) who claimed affinity with the Komnenoi. In the second half of the 13th C. several members of the Komnenos family held relatively modest posts, for example, the megas domestikos Theodore Angelos Komnenos ca.1287 and a sebastos George Doukas Komnenos mentioned on a 13th-C. seal. A branch of the family was established at this time in Ikonion and is attested by an inscription (P. Wittek, Byzantion 10 [1935] 505–15). (See genealogical table.)


KOMNENOS, ISAAC, name of a writer or of two writers of the 12th C. (1) Under the name of Isaac Komnenos the Sebastokrator have survived three philosophical treatises. They are based on works of PROKLOS that are preserved only in the Latin translation of WILLIAM OF MOERBEKE. Proklos—and following him, Komnenos—studied problems of providence, evil, and necessity. (2) A certain Isaac Komnenos the Porphyrogennetos was the author of two short works on HOMER. In the first (The Omissions of Homer), Komnenos laments that Homer did not mention some episodes of the Trojan War; the second essay, On the Characters of the Hellenes and Trojans Who Were at Troy, characterizes the war’s heroes. Probably the author used the same sources as did Tzetzes, such as MALALAS.

Identification of these writers is difficult since in the 12th C. there were several men named Isaac Komnenos the sebastokrator, and some of them were born in the purple. Because the sebastokrator Isaac, brother of Alexios I (see preceding entry), commissioned a florilegium of patristic writings in refutation of LEO OF CHALCEDON (Beck, Kirche 612), authorship of the philosophical treatise has sometimes been attributed to him. Isaac, the son of Alexios I, has been proposed by F.
Uspenski (IRA1K 12 [1907] 29f), followed by O. Jurewicz (Andronikos I. Komnenos [Amsterdam 1970] 39f), as the author of the Homeric commentaries. This identification is based on the statement in Isaac’s typikon for Kosmosoteira that he composed (syntetaches) a book including verses and ekphrasis (see KOMNENOS, ISAAC THE PORPHYROGENNETOS), and the alleged stylistic similarities between the commentaries and the typikon, but neither Uspenski nor Jurewicz gives examples for comparison. The question remains open.


LIT. 1. Barzos, Genealogia 1:79, 255.


KOMNENOS, ISAAC THE PORPHYROGENNETOS, the third son of Alexios I; born Constantinople 16 Jan. 1093, died soon after 1152. Caesar during his father’s reign, Isaac was granted the title of sebastokrator by his brother John II whom he supported in the latter’s conflict with their mother Irene Doukaina and sister Anna Komnene in 1118. The alliance of the brothers, however, was of short duration: ca. 1130 (according to Kurtz, in 1132) Isaac, together with his sons Andronikos (the future emperor) and John, fled to Amîr Ghażâ, the Danîşmendid sultan of Ikonion (died 1134) and attempted to create a broad coalition against John II including the Turks, Constantine Gabras of Trebizond, Leo I of Cilician Armenia, and Foulques of Anjou, the king of Jerusalem (1131–43). Isaac also went to Palestine and visited some pilgrimage sites in the Holy Land. When the coalition failed, Isaac negotiated with John II and returned to Constantinople in 1138, but the peace was soon broken: in 1139 Isaac’s son John again fled to the Turks and Isaac was exiled to Herakleia Pontike. After John II’s death in 1143, Isaac supported his nephew, the sebastokrator Isaac, but this proved to be the wrong choice, and it was another nephew, Manuel I, who managed to seize the throne. Isaac (the son of Alexios I) continued, however, to dream of imperial power, and according to Kinnamos (Kinn. 53f) he tried to take advantage of Manuel’s difficulties and assume his place on the throne. After 1150 Manuel forced Isaac to go into retirement; in 1151/2 Isaac founded the monastery of Kosmosoteira at Bera for which he wrote a typikon.

Isaac is represented on a mosaic in the church of the Chora monastery (Underwood, Kariye Djamı 1:45–48, no.6): it is believed (R.G. Ousterhout, The Architecture of the Kariye Camii in Istanbul [Washington, D.C., 1987] 21) that he was the ktetor of Chora and had a tomb built there for himself before removing it to the church of the Kosmosoteira (N.P. Ševčenko, GORThR 29 [1984] 135–40). The date for Isaac’s reconstruction of Chora suggested by Ousterhout (ca.1120) is based on Kurtz’s date of his flight from Constantinople and is probably too early. Isaac also restored the Church of St. Stephen in Constantinople and made it into a hospice for the monks of the Kosmosoteira who visited the capital (Janin, Églises CP 473).

During the short period of peace between John II and Isaac, Theodore Prodromos addressed to Isaac an enkomion (E. Kurtz, BZ 16 [1907] 112–17) and a eulogy in hexameters (ed. Hörandner, no.42); some verses were written as if spoken by Isaac (Hörandner, nos. 40–41, cf. also E. Kurtz, BNJbb 5 [1926–27] 44–45). Isaac has been identified as the paraphraser of the Letter of Aristeas (a preface to the Old Testament) preserved in the Seraglio Octateuch, and as the patron of this deluxe MS (J. Anderson, DOP 36 [1982] 84–86). In his typikon (ed. L. Petit, IRA1K 13 [1908] 69,6–8) Isaac states that he “composed (syntetaches) a book with hexameter, iambic, and political verses, in addition to letters and ekphrasis,” a passage normally interpreted as alluding to his authorship of the book, although it could conceivably refer rather to a compilation. He may have been the author of commentaries on Homer ascribed to an enigmatic Isaac Komnenos the Porphyrogenetos (see the preceding entry on KOMNENOS, ISAAC).


KOMNENOS, JOHN, or John the Fat (Ilog ūs), usurper on 31 July 1200 (not 1201, as previously believed). He was the son of Alexios Axouch and Maria Komnene (Barzos, Genealogia 2:117–35), who was a granddaughter of John II. Contrary
to V. Laurent (EO 32 [1933] 52f), Pachys was John's sobriquet, not a family name; he had nothing in common with an undistinguished Pachys family known predominantly from 14th-C. sources. John was involved in a plot, probably organized by Alexios Mourtzophlos (the future Alexios V). Conspirators broke into Hagia Sophia, swore an oath to restore the empire to its former borders, and acclaimed John as emperor; thereafter the crowd pillaged the palace and churches. Alexios III Angelos, who at that time resided in the Blacknai Palace, sent troops under the command of Alexios Palaiologos; they sailed in boats to the Great Palace and easily cleared the Hippodrome of John's supporters. He surrendered and was executed on the spot. The unsuccessful usurpation served as the subject of several contemporary orations by Nicholas Mesarites, Nikephoros Chrysoberges, Euthymios Tornikios, and Niketas Choniates.

Lit. Brand, _Byzantium_ 122–24, 347f. — A.K.

**Konstantin Kostenečki** (Constantine the Philosopher), Bulgaro-Serbian teacher and writer; born Kosteneč (on the Marica River) ca.1380, died after 1431. He studied at the Petritzos monastery under Evtimij of Tūrnovo and his pupil Andronikos. After the Turkish sack of Plovdiv (Philippopolis) in 1410, Konstantin migrated to Serbia, where the despotes Stefan Lazarević welcomed him. He devoted himself to teaching and writing, interrupted by a visit to the Holy Land and diplomatic missions to Timur and Ottoman sultans. Konstantin encouraged the reform of Serbian Slavonic in accordance with the principles established by Evtimij. He wrote a treatise on orthography, surviving in two redactions; a Life of Stefan Lazarević which is rich in historical, geographical, and ethnographical information (Dujčev, _Medieval_ 3:366–71); and a Pilgrimage to Palestine that is mainly derivative of _hodoiporiai_ to Edem, Greek travel guides for _pilgrimage_. Konstantin also translated Theodoret of Cyrrhus's _Commentary on the Song of Songs_ and possibly other Greek texts. Konstantin introduced to Serbia the rigorous philology and literary sophistication which his teachers had learned from 14th-C. Byz.


**Konstantin Mihaílović of Ostrovica**, a native of Serbia, captured by the Turks at Novo Brdo in July 1455 and forced into military service as a janissary until the Hungarians recaptured him in 1463. Konstantin also claims to have participated in the siege of Constantinople in 1453, as one of the Serbian contingent sent by the despotes George Branković. His _Memoirs_ were probably written in Serbian, though they survive only in Czech and Polish versions in MSS and printed editions dating from the 16th C. onward. The Czech version is probably closer to the original; the Polish is translated from the Czech (A. Danti, _RicSlav_ 16 [1968–69] 126–62). Chapter 26 treats the siege of 1453. Konstantin's account con-

**Konstantia.** See Constantia.
centrates on the Turkish maneuvers, particularly
the feats of engineering in conveying ships across
land and in breaching the walls. He stresses the
"treachery" of Mehmed II in breaking his truce
with Constantine XI.

ED. Konstantin Mihailović, Memoirs of a Janissary, Czech
text with Eng. tr. B. Stolt (Ann Arbor 1975). Memoiren eines
Janitscharen oder Türkische Chronik, tr. R. Lachmann (Graz-
Vienna-Cologne 1975).

-KONSTANTIN OF PRESLAV-

KONSTANTIN OF PRESLAV (Constantine of
Bulgaria), medieval Bulgarian writer and bishop of
Preslav; late 9th-early 10th C. A pupil of
Methodios and thoroughly familiar with the Greek
language and Byz. religious culture, he may have been
among the pupils of CONSTANTINE THE PHIL-
OSOPHER and Methodios sold into slavery and
ransomed by a Byz. official. Konstantin lived
in Bulgaria from before 893 to ca.910. His works
include a translation of Athanasios of Alexand-
ria's homilies against the Arians (906), a Gospel
commentary (Užitěl’no evangeliu) consisting mainly
of translations of homilies of John Chrysostom
and Cyril of Alexandria, a short explanation of
church organization and liturgy based largely on
the works attributed to Patr. Germanos I, a world
chronicle from Adam to 893 drawing entirely on
Byz. sources (Bulgaria is mentioned only in connection
with the death in battle of Emp. Nikepho-
ros I), an edifying acrostic poem, the earliest sur-
viving Old Church Slavonic poetic text, an Office
in honor of Constantine (Cyril) and Methodios,
and several liturgical hymns. Konstantin displays
little originality of thought, but considerable skill
in adapting Church Slavonic to the expression of
theological, philosophical, and other abstract ideas,
as well as some poetic feeling. His works were
influential in Serbia and later in Russia.

ED. Ažbučnata molitva v slavjanske literaturi, ed. K.M.
Kuev (Sophia 1974). V.N. Zlatarski, ed. "Naistarijat istoričeski
trud v starobulgarskata knjizina," Spisanie na Bulgarskata
Akademija 27 (1923) 132–82.

Lit. Antonini, Konstantin, episkop bulgarskij, i ego Užitěl’no
evangeliu (Kazan 1885). E. Georgiev in Istorija na bulgarska
Kuev in Rečnik na bulgarska literatura (Sophia 1977) 2:238f.
T.G. Popov, Triodni proizvedenije na Konstantin Preslavski
(Sofia 1985).

-KONTAKION (kontáko’s), a sermon in verse,
usually celebrating major feasts and saints. From
the late 5th to 7th C. it was chanted during the
Orthros by a preacher or psaltes (singer) and
choir. It consists of an introduction (the prooimion
or koukoulion), followed by a varying number of
oikoi (stanzas) connected to the prooimion by a
refrain; the oikoi are linked by an acrostic as well
as by their shared and complex metrical structure,
which is based on patterns of corresponding
stressed syllables. An heirmos (model stanza)
beings each kontakion and indicates its melody and
metrical pattern, which differ for the prooimion
and for the oikoi.

Though antecedents for several of the konta-
kion’s most striking features can be found in Greek
homiletic practice of the 3rd–4th C., the first authors of the kontakion were drawing on Syriac
forms of poetic sermon (the Memra, a metrical
sermon; the Madrasha, which used a refrain and
acrostic; and the Sugita, a sermon in dialogue
form), particularly as developed by Ephrem the
Syrian, whose work also existed in Greek
versions. The high point in the composition of the
kontakion was reached in the mid-6th C. by Ro-
manos the Meleode. The Akathistos Hymn may
also date from this period. Other writers of kon-
takia, older contemporaries of Romanos, include
Kyriakos and Domitios, of whom little is known
but their names.

The dominant form of hymn, the kontakion
was gradually superseded during the 8th C. by the
recently devised kanon. Kontakia continued to be
written until the 9th C. (e.g., by Joseph the Hym-
ographer), but the vigor had gone; eventually
the kontakion, reduced to its prooimion and first
oikos only, became simply a hymn to be inserted
after the sixth ode of the kanon. At their liveliest,
kontakia use bold imagery and vivid, almost the-
atrical dialogue that dramatically recreates the
scriptural texts set in the liturgical calendar.

ED. C. Høeg, Contararium Ashburnhamense (Copenhagen
1956).

Lit. Mitsakis, Hymnographia 171–353. J. Grosdidier de
Maton, Romanos le Mélodie (Paris 1977) 3–156. Szövérffy,

-KONTOSTEPHANOS (Kontостефованос, "short
Stephen," fem. Kontостефованиа), a noble family
the first known member of which was Stephen,
domestikos of the West under Basil II, whose nick-
name was "due to his short stature" (Skyl. 331.33–34).
Involved in intrigues, Stephen fell victim to
Basil’s wrath and was beaten by the emperor. Nothing more of the Kontostephanos family is recorded until 1080, when the Turks captured Isaac, a military commander. The Kontostephanoi played an important role throughout the 12th C., predominantly as commanders of the fleet: admiral (thalassokrator) Isaac fought unsuccessfully in 1107/8; Stephen fell during the siege of Kerkyna (1149); Andronikos, megas doux of Manuel I, led the fleet against Egypt in 1169; John was the admiral (nauarchos) of Isaac II. They also served as governors of Crete (Alexios ca.1167, Stephen in 1193, Nikephoros in 1197) and of several other provinces. The Kontostephanoi intermarried with Komnenoi, Doukai, Angeloi, and other noble families and possessed large estates. There is no evidence of their participation in cultural life. Their position declined after 1204, although they are mentioned in the list of noble families in the poem on Belisarios. They owned property in Constantinople, on Lemnos, and elsewhere, were related to noble families such as Laskaris, and obtained some government positions: for example, a certain Kontostephanos was commandant of the fortress of Garell in Thrace in 1343. Among later Kontostephanoi were a teacher (John, ca.1358), a scribe (Philamoulis, ca.1413–16), and a monk (Dionysios, ca.1365).


KONYA. See Ikonion.

KORAN. See Qur‘ān.

KORIUN. See Mesrop Maštoc’.

KORMČAJA KNIGA (lit. “The Pilot’s Book” according to current etymological interpretation, cf. Gr. pedalion), a term attested from the 13th C. for Slavic collections of ecclesiastical and secular law of both Byz. and Slavic origin. Three or four “families” of Kormčaja are distinguished, named after their most important or most familiar MSS or after their place of origin (not in all cases undisputed).

1. The Old Slavonic (or “Bulgarian”) Kormčaja, the best MS of which is the Efremovskaja Kormčaja of the 12th C. (Drevneslavjanskaja kormčaja XIV titulov bez tolkovanij, ed. V.N. Benešević, vol. 1 [St. Petersburg 1906, rp. Leipzig 1924]; vol. 2 [Sofia 1887]). Its core is the Syntagma of Fourteen Titles without commentary.

2. The “Serbian” redaction, translated by Sava of Serbia ca.1219? (complete text—Raškijs MS of 1305), with variants in the Ržanska kormčaja of 1284, which includes the commented Synopsis canonum.

3. The “Russian” (Novgorodskaja or Sofijskaja) Kormčaja of the 13th C., which has the complete text of the canons with commentary.

As a fourth family some cite the Ustijuščaja (or “Moravian”) Kormčaja (Magnae Moraviae fontes historici, ed. J. Vašica et al., vol. 4 [Brno 1971] 147–98, 205–363), which contains selected passages from the Synagoge of Fifty Titles in translation. The Russian Kormčaja was widely disseminated in Russia and was supplemented by numerous original Slavic texts.


KORONE (Kopóyn, Coron, anc. Asine), city in the southeast corner of Messenia in the Peloponnesos. The city had civic status in late antiquity (Hierokl. 647.15), and a fragment of Diocletian’s Peace Edict was discovered there. By the time of the Slavic invasions the site was probably strongly fortified. At some undetermined date the people of ancient Korone (modern Petalidi) moved to Asine, and the name was changed. By the early 9th C. a bishop of Korone is attested as a suffragan of the archbishop of Patras (Reg 2, no.371), and Laurent (Corpus 5.1, no.646) dates to the 9th C. the seal of Prokopios, bishop of Korone. Like Methone, Korone profited from the pilgrimage traffic and the growth of east-west trade from the 11th C. onward. After the Fourth Crusade Korone was granted first to Geoffrey I Villehardouin, who ceded it to Venice in 1209; ca.1300 it was under the authority of Monemvasia. The Greek peasants of the hinterland of Korone seem to have had a favorable status in comparison with their counterparts in the Morea: they could hold land, in addition to their unfree tenure (stasia), and
could dispose of this land freely without recourse to the commune.

The imposing fortress on the sea, although substantially rebuilt by Venice, is essentially Byz., probably to be assigned to the 6th–7th C. Within the fortress are the remains of a basilica, presumably of the same date.


KORYKOS (Kórykos), coastal city of CILICIA whose rich architectural and epigraphical record compensates for the deficiencies of the late antique sources, which state only that Justinian I restored the local bath and poorhouse. Five major churches, richly decorated basilicas of varying style, reflect considerable activity ca.480–550, and 636 funerary inscriptions, of which 393 name occupations, allow the social and economic structure to be reconstructed. The population included manufacturers and sellers of a vast range of products. As an important port near the frontier, Korykos became headquarters of a droungarios of the KIBYRHALIOTAI; one such droungarios, Apsimar, became emperor as Tiberios II. The troops from Korykos were called Kourikiotai (Theoph. 370.24, Nikeph. 40.2). Korykos was later incorporated in the theme of SELEUKIA. Circa 1100, after a brief Turkish occupation, Alexios I rebuilt Korykos, which was described by his historian daughter (An.Komn. 3:45.22–30) as formerly well fortified but recently ruined. By that date the city consisted of a castle whose concentric walls occupied a small part of the ancient site. It was lost to the Armenians in the late 12th C. The castle manifests several stages of construction, some perhaps as early as the 7th C.


KOS (Kós), island in the Dodecanese north of RHODES. In late antiquity it was second city of the province of the Islands. The bishop of Kos was suffragan of Rhodes; bishops of Kos participated in various councils from that of NICAEA I (325) onward (R. Janin, DHGE 13 [1956] 927). An 8th-

KOSMAS I, Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria (from ca.727); died 768. After the Arab invasions, the Chalcedonian see of Alexandria remained vacant until the accession of Kosmas. He had the approval of both the emperor and the Muslim ruler. In 742/3, according to Theophanes (Theoph. 416.13–16), Kosmas abjured the doctrine of MONOHELETISM, which had held sway in Alexandria since the time of HERAKLEIOS. It is, however, doubtful that the patriarch himself had been a Monothelete. The chronicler's brief account may be a confused reference to the formal recognition of Alexandria as an Orthodox see by the other patriarchates.

KOSMAS AND DAMIANOS, also called the anargyroi, legendary saints. The cult of Kosmas and Damianos apparently developed by the 5th C. in Constantinople, where, according to local tradition, two churches (in Zeugma and Kosmidion) were dedicated to them ca.440 (Janin, Églises CP 284–89). According to certain sources (e.g., Synaxarion of Constantinople and John Xiphilinos the Younger, nephew of Patr. John VIII), there were three pairs of anargyroi doctors called Kosmas and Damianos: (1) the sons of a certain Theodote from Asia, who died natural deaths and were buried in Pherema (feastday 1 Nov.); (2) the saints executed by Carinus (283–85) in Rome (1 July); and (3) the saints who originated from Arabia and were martyred in Cilicia under Diocletian and Maximian (17 Oct.).

Numerous authors produced stories of miracles performed in Constantinople by Kosmas and Damianos that were used by Sophronios of Jerusalem, such as the sick being healed by incubation in the church atrium and porticoes. The patients included people whose piety and morals seemed questionable: a Jewess, an ardent fan of the Hippodrome, and a dissolute woman. The veneration of Kosmas and Damianos spread beyond Constantinople; their legends were rewritten by various writers such as Andrew of Crete, Peter of Argos, Theodore II Laskaris, and a certain Maximos ca.1300. The legends are preserved also in Syriac, Coptic, Georgian, Armenian, and Latin.

Representation in Art. Portraits of the two saints abound, standing side by side, often in the company of other anargyroi such as Panteleemon; they are mature men with spare dark beards, clad in tunics and phelonia and carrying the tools of their trade. One composition shows them facing each other and receiving the gift of healing in the form of a medical bag offered by the hand of Christ (Menologion of Basil II, p.152); at the Holy Anargyroi church at Kastoria, a similar composition depicts Christ extending them crowns. Few narrative cycles of their lives have survived, though there is a vita icon with 12 scenes that comes from their church at Kastoria, some frescoes in that church and at Mistra, and occasional miracle scenes in lectionaries or menologia. The Arabian pair celebrated Oct. 17 are shown with turbans or being beheaded (Menologion of Basil II, p.120).


KOSMAS AND DAMIANOS MONASTERY, also known as the Kosmidion. The original church, dedicated to the martyrs Kosmas and Damianos, was built during the reign of Theodosios II in the suburbs of Constantinople; numerous miracles were ascribed to this shrine. An attached monastery is first attested in the 6th C. Because of its vulnerable location outside the walls, in present-day Eyüp, the church was destroyed in the Avar attack of 626. It was, however, restored by the 8th C. In the 11th C. Emp. Michael IV Paphlabagon was responsible for major improvements at the monastery; he provided bathhouses, lawns, and fountains, in addition to commissioning the rebuilding of the church and its decoration with mosaics and marble revetment (Psellus, Chron. 1:72f). It was to this monastery that, suffering from terminal illness, he retired in Dec. 1041; he received the monastic habit on the day of his death. He was buried in the church he had restored. The monastery of Kosmas and Damianos is mentioned frequently in sources of the Palaiologan period and apparently survived until 1453. It should be distinguished from the contemporary nunnery dedicated to the same saints, which was restored in the late 13th C. by the Dowager Empress Theodora, widow of Michael VIII.


KOSMAS INDIKOPLEUSTES, Alexandrian merchant and (perhaps) later a monk, who traded in Ethiopia and the Red Sea, possibly also in India and Taprobana (Ceylon); fl. first half of 6th C. These travels are described in his Christian Topography, a work that provides much valuable information about Byz. trade with Africa and Asia, Christianity in Persia, and exotic flora and
fauna. His central purpose is to refute both Ptolemaic astronomy and the contemporary synthesis of Christianity and Aristotelianism in favor of a system that permitted the literal acceptance of the Bible, the world being shown to resemble the tabernacle of Moses. Kosmas wrote as a Nestorian follower of Theodoret of Mopsuestia at the apogee of the Three Chapters controversy, tilting primarily at John Philoponos. Given the involvement of Justinian I, the book comports a political undertone. Because Kosmas alludes in his text to illustration, a 6th-C. prototype is assumed for three richly illustrated MSS: Vat. gr. 699 (9th C., ed. Stornajolo), Sinai gr. 1186 (11th C., P. Huber, Heilige Berge [Zurich 1980] 56–115), and Florence, Laur. plur. 9.28 (11th C.). Although their pictorial content varies, each contains more than 50 miniatures invaluable for the study of cosmology, astronomy, and zoology. Biblical sequences emphasize the equipment of the Temple, the Exodus itinerary, and the prophets. Kosmas also wrote a commentary on the Song of Songs in four books, to which a few fragments on the Psalms might belong.


—B.B., A.C.

KOSMAS MAGISTROS, jurist; died after 946. Kosmas was the nephew of Photios and probably was the compiler of Romanos I's novel of 934. Two statements (ipsephoi) of Kosmas have survived as an appendix to the Synopsis Basilicorum. The first, a regulation pertaining to the division of land, has been erroneously interpreted as proving there were periodical distributions of peasants' allotments in Byz.; in fact, it deals with resolving litigation over land (Ostrogorsky, Steuergemeinde 40f). Some monastic acts (Prot., no.6.7–8, of 943; Ivoir., no.4.27, of 982) make reference to thisipsephoi of Kosmas. The second ipsephos is a definition of the rights of paraikoi who settled on the land of a bishopric: the paraikoi had no right to alienate or hand down the land granted to them and on their departure could claim only the construction materials of their houses. Weiss (infra) considers this definition proof of the continuity of the status of the late antique coloni liberi. Kosmas was in correspondence with Arethas and Niketas Magistros and was sent with John Kourkouas in 946 to negotiate with the Arabs of Tarsos for the return of prisoners (TheophCont 443.1–12).

ED. F. Uspeenskij, V. Beneševič, Vazelonskie akti (Leningrad 1927) xxxv–vi.


KOSMAS THE HYMNOGRAPHER, poet and saint; according to Detorakes, born Damascus ca.675, died Maiouma ca.752; feastday 15 Jan., later shifted to Oct. Adopted by the father of John of Damascus, he was educated together with John by a certain asekretis (also Kosmas by name?), a captive from Constantinople. A monk (in the Lavra of St. Sambas), Kosmas was elected bishop of Maiouma, near Gaza, ca.734/5. Together with John, Kosmas defended icon veneration.

Under the name of Kosmas are preserved various hymns on church festivals (PG 98:459–524), a kanon on the Elevation of the Cross (H. Tillyard, BZ 28 [1928] 29–32), a kanon on St. George (A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, BZ 14 [1905] 520–25), as well as scholia on Gregory of Nazianzos (PG 38:341–680). Th. Detorakes (EEBS 44 [1979–80] 223–30) emphasizes that Kosmas was influenced not only by Gregory but also by Romanos the Melode. Kosmas liked to use cosmic images (abyss, fire, clouds) and sharp contrasts; his language teems with archaic words—all leading to an impression of lofty solemnity. Kosmas enjoyed a high reputation and was praised in various vitae (sometimes together with John of Damascus), akolouthia, and epigrams.

From the 14th C., the portrait of Kosmas, along with those of John and two other hymnographers, sometimes adorns one of the penedives of a dome. Seated in the pose of an Evangelist, writing his hymns into a book, Kosmas is clad as a monk, not a bishop, and often wears a sort of turban characteristic of images of Palestinians (e.g., Underwood, Karye Dyami, vol. 3, pl.225). He has a full, dark beard.

KOSMAS THE PRIEST, Bulgarian writer of the second half of the 10th C. Nothing is known of his life, but he probably lived and worked in Preslav. He wrote a treatise against the Bogomils. In the first book he sets out critically the religious and social views of the new heretics and seeks to refute them. In the second book he attacks the higher clergy, the monks, and the rich, whose neglect of their religious and social duties, he declares, encourages the spread of the heresy. Kosmas’s treatise is a priceless contemporary source on the early development of Bogomilism. It also contains valuable observations on the changing economic and social structure of Bulgaria at that time. He is an intelligent and observant critic, a sharp polemicist, and a vivid and colorful writer. His treatise was much read in medieval Rus’, where it provided a model for polemics against local heresies.


KOSMAS VESTITOR (Космас Веститор), writer. According to Beck, he lived between 730 and 850, but A. Wenger (REB 11 [1953] 299f) dates him in the mid-8th C. He wrote an enkomion of John Chrysostom (K. Dyobouniotes, EEBS 16 [1946] 151–55) and five enkomia on the translation of Chrysostom’s relics to Constantinople (K. Dyobouniotes, EEBS 2 [1925] 55–89). In the fourth of these enkomia Kosmas emphasized that Theodosios II was forced by Patr. Proklos to return Chrysostom’s body from exile and to apologize before the oikumenikos didaskalos (see Didaskalos) for the long delay. The Virgin was also of interest to Kosmas. He dedicated a discourse to her parents Ioakeim and Anna (PG 106:1005–12) and produced four homilies on the Dormition, preserved only in a 10th-C. Latin MS, probably of Italian provenance. Although Kosmas borrowed some passages from Patr. Germanos I, he differs from him in details and emphasizes the parallelism of the earthly lives of Mary and Christ; he includes later legends such as the translation of Mary’s robe, the famous talisman of Constantinople, to her church at Blachernai.

ED. A. Wenger, L’Assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VIe aux Xe siècle (Paris 1955) 315–33.

KOSMIDION. See Kosmas and Damianos Monastery.

KOSMOSOTEIRA MONASTERY. See Bera.

KOSOVO POLJE (Перине Косов), “Field of the Blackbirds,” a valley in southern Serbia between Priština and the Laba River; site of two battles, in 1389 and 1448.

On 15 June 1389 a coalition of Serbs, Bosnians, Albanians, and others under command of the Serbian prince Lazar fought a battle there against the Turkish army of Murad I that had invaded Raška; possibly some Greek vassals of the sultan were summoned. According to the contemporary Florentine Cronaca volgare, Murad’s army was 140,000 men strong while Lazar had only 70,000 soldiers. The actual course of the battle is shrouded in legend and contradictory historical narratives. A Russian traveler, the deacon Ignatij of Smolensk, in his diary written a few years after the battle noted only the rumors that both Lazar and Murad were killed. Demetrios Kydones, in a letter to Manuel II (ep.396), alluded to this event; S. Cirkočić (ZRVI 13 [1971] 213–19) hypothesized that in another letter (ep.398) Kydones celebrated this battle as a victory over the Turks. The Cronaca volgare gives a detailed description of the battle: the author says that Lazar together with some valiant men penetrated the Turkish camp; one of them wounded Murad, and the sultan died on the third day, after ordering the execution of Lazar and his companions. The chronicle presents the war as a defeat for the Turks who fled home after the battle. King Tvrtko of Bosnia, in his letters, described Kosovo as his victory and praised “twelve loyal lords” who assassinated the sultan. Serbian chroniclers and hagiographers concentrate on the heroic deeds of Lazar.

In contrast, the Turkish sources of the 15th C. (A. Olesnici, Glasnik srpskog naučnog društva 15 [1935] 59–98) characterize the battle as won by the Turks—either by Murad (they place the as-
sassination of Murad at the very end of the battle, with the assassin rising from among the corpses and taking the sultan by surprise) or by his son Bayezid after the father’s assassination. Only in the 15th-C. sources does the name Miloš Kobilić appear as the sultan’s assassin. Byz. historians of the 15th C. give disparate descriptions of Kosovo: Sphrantzes briefly presents the Turkish version, Doukas eulogizes the assassin of the “tyrant,” and Chalkokondyles analyzes the distinction between the Turkish and Greek views of Kosovo.

Although the battle is usually described as a Turkish victory, both armies suffered enormous losses, and scholars such as Fine (Late Balkans 408–11) and Emmert (infra) regard the battle as more of a draw. The immediate consequences of the battle were that Serbia became an Ottoman vassal state (by the end of 1389) and the Balkan peninsula was opened to further Ottoman expansion. Probably shortly after the battle the Serbian epic tradition began to take shape, praising and lamenting Lazar and Miloš, and transforming the events into a noble moral victory, the source of subsequent Serbian resistance against the Turks.

The second battle of Kosovo, on 17–19 Oct. 1448, resulted in a victory by Murad II over Hunyadi a few years after the defeat of the crusading expedition at Varna.


KOTYAION (Κοτγαίων, mod. Kütahya), city of Phrygia, at a strategic road junction; site of an exceptionally powerful fortress. A city of the Opiskion theme, Kotyaion occasionally appears in history as a place of refuge or exile; Romanos IV was blinded there in 1072. Byz. lost it ca.1082 but recovered it for a brief while. A suffragan bishopric of Synnada, Kotyaion was made metropolis in the early 9th C. It rose to greater prominence after its recapture by the Seljuks in 1182 or 1183. The extensive fortifications of Kotyaion, with more than 70 towers, are well preserved. Their first stage, of the early 9th C., consisted of a double wall that made extensive use of spolia. This was replaced by more massive structures of ashlar with bands of brick, apparently of the 12th C. No other Byz. remains survive.


KOUBIKOULARIOS (κουβικουλάριος, from Lat. cubicularius), a general term to designate palace eunuchs who waited upon the emperor, the servants of the sacrum cubiculum. Guillard (infra 269) distinguishes them from the kortonitai, suggesting that the koubikoularioi were noble personages. In the late Roman Empire they were emancipated slaves imported primarily from Persia or the Caucasus. They were very numerous. In the 6th C. Empress Theodora’s retinue consisting of patrikoi and koubikoularioi was estimated at 4,000 (Malal. 441.9–10). They stood under the command of the praepositus sacri cubiculi and primicerius (Jones, LRE 1:566–70).

Abundant seals of the 7th–9th C. present the koubikoularioi as fulfilling specific duties at court, those of parakaimomenos, primikerios, epites trapezes, and ostiarios. They were engaged in financial administration as sakellariori and charitous; especially indicative is the 8th-C. seal of an anonymous koubikoularios of the imperial bedchamber (koiton) and chartourios of the imperial vestiarion (Zacos, Seals 1, no.1093); koubikoularioi also served the orfanotrophoi, koukatores, and so on. They played an important role in imperial ceremony. At the same time koubikoularioi received posts as governors and army commanders as well as diplomatic assignments. Special koubikoularioi were attached to the empress (sometimes female koubikoulariai are mentioned) and co-emperors. It seems that Pope Leo I introduced the office of ecclesiastical cubicularius, in imitation of the imperial koubikoularios, to celebrate the cult of the apostles Peter and Paul (M.A. Cavallaro, Athenaeum 50 [1972] 158–75). Guillard (infra 280) thinks that the office of koubikoularios existed until the 13th C. but Oikonomides (Listes 301) asserts that it disappeared by the second half of the 11th C. The term spatharokoubikoularios was a combination of spatharios and koubikoularios; his function was to escort the emperor. Some seals of this dignity are dated to the 11th/12th C. (e.g., Seibt, Bleisiegel, no.44).


–A.K.
KOUBOUKLEISIOS (κούβουκλείσιος), imperial title conferred on patriarchal chamberlains. In the Kletorologion of Philotheos (151.19–21), they follow the emperor’s koubikouarios, thus forming an ecclesiastical parallel to the latter. The title is first mentioned in the minutes of the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 (Mansi 13:213E) and often appears on seals of the 9th–11th C.; it probably did not survive the 11th/12th C. The 10th-C. Taktikon of Benešević distinguishes two groups of kouboukleisi: priests and deacons. As an honorific title, kouboukleisios sometimes appears in combination with the offices of chartophylax, skewophylax, oikonomos, etc.; some kouboukleisi were monks. In the 9th C. the emperor granted the title; under Michael I Keroularios the patriarch bestowed it. Sometime between 1052 and 1056 Keroularios gave the title to a deacon of Antioch (RegPatr, fasc. 3, nos. 860–61).


—A.K.

KOUKOULION. See Costume.

KOUKOUZELANT, JOHN, composer, theoretician, singer, teacher, scribe, maistor, monk at the Lavra on Mt. Athos, and saint; born Durrachion late 13th/early 14th C., died before ca.1341; feast day 1 Oct. His vita has survived in various recensions, the earliest being Thessalonike, Blatadon 46 (1591). There is evidence that his last name was Papadopoulos, Koukouzelas (Κουκουζέλας) being a nickname, and that his mother was Bulgarian. Most frequently, however, he is referred to simply by the epithet, “the maistor.” Two copies of Koukouzelas’ edition of the Heirmologion, dated 1392 and 1399, survive. His famous didactic chant, “Ison, oligon . . . ,” is first recorded in Athens, Nat. Lib. 2458 (1336) and has been transcribed by G. Dévai; it exists also in many later MS versions.

Most of his music is transmitted in musical anthologies (Akoulouthai; see Papadike). His compositions demonstrate new and innovative features: melodic expansion, troping (textual and/or musical additions to a preexisting verse or verse-setting), textual expansion, and greater vocal ranges. Forming a bridge from the musical tradition of the 13th C., his work appears to have provided the impetus for a new repertory and for musical developments that were to be continued by his contemporaries and successors.


—D.E.C.

KOUPHISMOS (κουφήσμος, lit. “alleviation”), a temporary tax-relief on property owned by a member of a village community. The term appears in only two sources. The Treatise on Taxation (ed. Dölger, Beiträge 119.19–30) describes kouphismos as a well-established fiscal procedure, which a tax inspector could perform when a member of the village community abandoned his stichos. If the individual was known to be living nearby and was expected to return eventually to his property and if the tax inspector thought other villagers would simply abandon their stichoi if required to shoulder the tax burden of the member who had fled, the inspector could temporarily reduce the tax burden on the abandoned stichos until the original owner returned, at which time the property’s full tax liability was restored. The principal differences between kouphismos and sympatheia were that kouphismos involved only a partial reduction of the tax, and that, if the owner returned, the property’s full tax liability was immediately restored. Further, unlike sympatheia, kouphismos had no time limit for the owner’s return, nor does kouphismos appear to lead to klasia. As with sympatheia, property that had received kouphismos could not be sold or confiscated. The brief explanation of kouphismos in the 11th-C. (?) Zavorda Treatise on Taxation (J. Karayannopoulos in Polychronion 323.63–67) is unclear.

Lit. Ostrogorsky, Steuergemeinde 26f, 78f. Svoronos, Cadastre 120.

—M.B.

KOOURATOR (κουράτωρ), term that in the late Roman Empire was still applied to a city magistrate (curator civilitatis); it was eventually replaced by the defensor civitatis (E. Kornemann, RE 4 [1901] 1809–11). From the 6th C. the term acquired the meaning of the manager of imperial
estates (probably "kouratoreia"); the first known "kourator" was Anatolios in 557. This functionary seems to have administered imperial domains that were previously under the direction of the cames rerum privatuum. "Kourotares" of the late 6th C., esp. Magnos, who controlled the domain of Marina (near Attaleia) and of Hormisdas (near Antioch), seem to have been very influential people (D. Feissel, TM 9 [1985] 465–76). In the 9th C. the management of domains was divided among several independent kourotares: the taktika of the 9th and 10th C. mention the megas kourator and kourator of the Mangana. Eventually the megas kourator was replaced by the oikonomos of "pious houses" or euageis oikoi (Oikonomides, Listes 318), who is still known in the 10th C. (R. Browning, B. Laourdas, EEBS 27 [1957] 155–90).

In the 11th C. the epiphet megas was applied to the heads of individual kouratoreiai: 11th-C. seals belong to the megaloi kourotares of Eleutherion (Zacos, Seals 2, no. 1019), Myrelaion (no. 1017), or Kanikleon (no. 132). Imperial charters from the 11th C., however, mention simple kourotares "of the house of Eleutherion and of Mangana." A kourator of the palace of the lord Romanos is known from a seal (V. Laurent, BZ 33 [1933] 351f); also on a seal a kourator of the New Estate (Ktima) is named (Zacos, Seals 2, no. 184).

A seal (Zacos, Seals 2, no. 813) belonged to a megas kourator [of the properties?] of Antiochos, probably of one of two districts in Constantinople of this name or of local churches. Some kouratoreiai were connected not with pious institutions but with particular territories: an imperial kourator of Tzouroulon is mentioned in an inscription of 813 (I. Ševčenko, Byzantion 35 [1965] 564–74); a seal of the megas kourator of Mytilene (Mytilene) is dated in the first half of the 11th C. (Zacos, Seals 2, no. 252).

Kourotares of the domains of the augusta are also known (Seibt, Bleischiegel 193f). Some kourotares were in the logothetion of the dromos (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 485–88). Kourotares continued to exist in the 12th C., since Patr. Loukas Chrysoberges prohibited the clergy from holding kouratoreiai and overseeing the estates of the archontes (PG 138:89A). The staff of the megas kourator included clerks, simple kourotares of palaces and estates, xenodochoi, and episkeptitai.

The term kourator also designated the archontes ton ergodosion; kourotares of imperial ateliers, esp. those dealing with silk production, are known from seals of the 9th–11th C. Ecclesiastical kourotares are mentioned on seals (e.g., Laurent, Corpus 5, nos. 1620–22) and in charters, for example, Michael, "bishop's kourator" in 1071 (Lavra 1, no. 35–59).


KOURATOREIA (κουρατορεία), also kouratorikon, term used from the second half of the 6th C. to designate a particular group of imperial desmesnes. Probably the simplification of the administration of imperial desmesnes encouraged use of a term to refer to this administration as a whole. A 9th-C. historian (Theoph. 487.2–4) accuses Emp. Nikephoros I of confiscating the best lands of the euageis oikoi and transferring them to "the imperial kouratoreia" while the taxes remained on the pious institutions. The office of the megas kourator is known from the end of the 6th C. through the 10th C. (Oikonomides, Listes 318). From the mid-9th C. onward, the administration of the crown lands expanded and grew more complex. Basil I founded the office of the kourator ton Manganon, which was obliged to provide the emperor's household with necessary goods. In 934 a kouratoreia of Melitene was created; a kouratoreia of Trychina was located in Lydia (De cer. 462–7). Other 10th–11th-C. kouratoreiai were Eleutherion, Myrelaion (identical with that of the palace of the lord Romanos [1]), Kanikleon, New Estate. Probably other heads of imperial estates (provincial kourotares, eporphos of imperial kouratoreiai, episkepittai, ktematinos) were connected with this institution. On the other hand, the directors of certain imperial workshops were also called kourotares.


KOURION. See CYPRUS.

KOURKOUAS (Κουρκούας), a family name of Armenian origin (Arm. Gurgen). Theophanes Continuatus relates that a certain Kourkouas—first name, Romanos (Skyl. 140.44)—a wealthy
and arrogant man, plotted against Basil I. John Kourtoukas was domestikos ton Hikanaton (TheophCont 426.20); his grandson, also John, became domestikos ton scholon in 923 and successfully fought the Arabs: he captured Melitene on 19 May 934 and in 944 took Edessa. His brother Theophilos was also a general. John’s son Romanos was domestikos ton scholon in the West. Romanos’s son John, domestikos ton scholon in the East, fell in battle against the Rus’ in 971. Theophilos’s grandson, John (I) Tzimiskes, became emperor. Another John Kourtoukas was katepano in Italy in 1008. Intermarried with the Phokas and Skleros families, the Kourtoukas family belonged to the highest echelon of the military aristocracy. After Basil II their role declined: Romanos, who married the daughter of the last Bulgarian tsar, was accused of plotting against Constantine VIII and blinded. The family shifted to the civil service (Mich. Ital. 53–56) and in the 12th C. held important ecclesiastical posts: Michael (II) Kourtoukas became patriarch of Constantinople (1143–46).


KOURTOUKAS, JOHN, general, the closest supporter of Romanos I; died after 946. After serving as droungarios tes viglas, he was promoted ca. 921 to the post of domestikos ton scholon and sent to subdue the rebellion in Chaldia (Adontz, Études 217f). From 926 on Kourtoukas fought on the eastern frontier; despite several defeats, mostly by Sayf al-Dawla, he managed to seize Melitene (19 May 934). His invasion of Mesopotamia in 942/3 led to the siege of Edessa in 944. This siege had enormous political and religious significance, since Kourtoukas received the mandaion in Edessa and sent it to Constantinople. Kourtoukas was dismissed after Romanos I’s deposition. His military exploits were praised by a certain protospatharios and judge Manuel in a historical work (now lost) in eight books; Kourtoukas was considered “a second Trajan or Belisarius.”


KOUROPALATES (κουροπαλάτης), a high-ranking dignity. In late antiquity the cura palatii designated a subaltern official in charge of construction and order in the palace; his rank in the 5th C. was spectabilis, rarely iuveris. The situation changed when Justinian I appointed his nephew, the future emperor Justin II, to this post; thereafter kouropalates became a title conferred primarily on members of the imperial family and foreign princes (Armenian, Georgian, etc.). In the taktika of the 9th and 10th C. kouropalates follows the Caesar and nobilissimos; it retained its exceptional character in the 10th C. when Emp. Nikephoros II granted this title to his brother Leo Phokas. In the 11th C. it was conferred on several generals outside the imperial family, for example, Katakalon Kekaumenos. The significance of the title declined considerably in the 12th C. when the dignity of the protokouropalates was introduced. Although pseudo-Kodinos, himself a kouropalates, mentions the title, it was not widely used in later centuries. According to the Kletorologion of Philothoeos, the insignia of the kouropalates was a red chiton with a cloak and girdle; at the beginning of the 9th C. the color associated with this dignity seems to have been purple, by the end of the 11th C. green (Oikonomides, Lístes 96, n.49). A seal of the kouropalattissa Maria is dated by Seibt in the early 12th C.


KOURTIKIOS (Κουρτίκιος), also Kourtikes, a family name of Armenian origin (K’urdik). The family founder surrendered his town, Lokano, to Basil I and settled in Byz. territory; in 913 another Kourtikios, “the Armenian,” supported the revolt of Constantine Doukas. Michael Kourtikios, imperial admiral (nauarchos) in Attailea, participated in the rebellion of Bardas Skleros (976–79) and commanded the rebel fleet. Basil Kourtikios was among the oikei of another usurper, Nikephoros Bryennios, in 1077; later he became Alexios I’s general. The family belonged to the toponym aristocracy of the 11th C.: the Kourtikioi intermarried with Doukai, Palaiologoi, and Komnenoi. Constantine Kourtikios is said to have been betrothed to Theodora, Alexios I’s daughter. This union was dissolved, however, and ca. 1105 a certain Kourtikios was involved in the plot of Anemas against Alexios I. The family’s position declined
in the 12th C.: except for a seal devoid of information (Laurent, Bulles métr., no.64), only Nicholas Kourtikes is known, a modest functionary in the Mylassa theme (MM 4:329.20–21), active in 1143 (according to Ahrweiler, “Smyrne” 128f) or possibly at the end of the 12th C. In the 12th C. a branch of the family is attested in Armenian Cilicia. The Kourtikai recovered for a short period in the 13th C. John Doukas Kourtikes, a relative of John III, served as governor of the Thrakesian theme in the 1230s. The family possessed lands in the Smyrna region (Ahrweiler, supra 140f). In 1271 Nicholas Kourtikes was kas-trophylax on Kos (PLP, no.13597).

LIT. Kazhdan, Arm. 14–17, with add. in Laurent, Corpus 2, no.1179. PLP, nos. 13594–97. —A.K.

KOUTLOUMOUSIOU MONASTERY, located near Karyes on Mt. AThos and dedicated to Christ the Savior. Although a forged document in its archives claims that Alexios I founded Koutloumousiou (Koultoumousiou, Koutoumlousiou) in 1082 (P. Lemerle, BCH 58 [1934] 221–34), the monastery is first mentioned in a document of 1169, and appears to be a 12th-C. foundation. The monastery’s unusual name, derived from the Turkish patronymic Kutulmuş, suggests that a christianized descendant of the Seljuk prince Kutulmuş (died 1063) may have retired to Athos and established a monastic complex. The monastery was small and poor in resources until the 14th C. when it increased to 40 monks and acquired substantial properties in Macedonia (near Serres and on Chalkidike) and in Wallachia. It reached its peak under the hegoumenos Chariton (ca.1362–ca.1381), who attracted the patronage of Wallachian voivodes, which was to continue well into the period of Turkish rule. As a concession to the Wallachian monks who came to reside at Koutloumousiou, Chariton was forced ca.1371 to institute an idiorrhythmic regime that lasted until 1856. In 1393 Koutloumousiou became a patriarchal monastery. In 1428 the monks of Koutloumousiou took over the virtually abandoned buildings of the nearby monastery of Alopou (Alipiou). Thereafter, the two monasteries were united under one hegoumenos.

The archives preserve 47 documents of Byz. date (1012–1447?), mostly of the 14th C., while the library contains ca.187 MSS of the 15th C. or earlier (Lampros, Athos 1:270–318; Politis, Kat-aloi 1–71).

SOURCE. P. Lemerle, Actes de Kutulmus ² (Paris 1988).


—A.M.T.

KRATEMA. See Teretismata.

KRITAI KATHOLIKOI (KRITAI KATHOLIKOI, lit. “universal judges”), a college of judges, secular and ecclesiastical, which served as a supreme court in the Palaiologan period. In 1296 Andronikos II created a tribunal of 12 members consisting of ecclesiastics and senators; its decisions could not be appealed. In 1329 Andronikos III replaced this tribunal with the college of four judges called kritai katholikoi; one of them was supposed to be a bishop (Greg. 1:437.23). The first four kritai katho- likoi are known by name: Joseph, bishop of Apros; the archdeacon and dikaiophylax Gregory Kleidas; the megas dioiketes Glabas; and the literatus (?) Nicholas Matarangos. In 1336/7 a scandal erupted, the kritai katholikoi were accused of corruption, and only Matarangos was acquitted; the scandal is reflected in a letter by the protasekretis Leo Bardales (Ševčenko, Soc. & Intell., pt.VIII [1949], 247–59) and in an apology of the condemned judges (G.J. Theocharides, BZ 56 [1963] 69–100).

In 1398 (?) Manuel II formulated the principles of their activity: all subjects and all cases came under their jurisdiction; the plaintiff was obliged to present his case in written form; after the hearing the judges had to deliberate in seclusion and to follow the opinion of the majority; if necessary, the judges could request the participation of experts. Under their authority were taboulari-oi, who were not allowed, however, to act independently (E. Schilbach, BZ 61 [1968] 44–70). Besides the imperial kritai katholikoi, provincial kritai eventually appeared, in the Morea (Zakythi- nos, Despotat 2:129–31), Lemnos, Thessalonike, Serbia (G. Ostrogorsky in Mélanges offerts à René Crozet, vol. 2 [Poitiers 1966] 1317–25), and Tre- bizond.


—A.K.

KRITES. See JUDGE.
KRITES TOU PHOSSATOU (κριτής τοῦ φωσ-
σατοῦ', lit. "judge of the moat"), a military judge,
an office known from the end of the 13th C. when
the sebastos Constantine Cheilas occupied this post
(MM 4:272.13–14); his seals are preserved (Lau-
rent, Corpus 2, nos. 1193–94). Guillard suggests
that the krites tou stratopedou (office held by Michael
Attaleiates) was the predecessor of the krites tou
phossatou. In pseudo-Kodinos the krites tou phos-
satou is a modest functionary following the akolou-
threnos on the hierarchical ladder; his duty was to
make decisions in cases of disputes of soldiers
over horses, weapons, or booty (pseudo-Kod.
184.25–31). In reality, this judge's functions were
broader: on the one hand, kriai such as Constan-
tine Cheilas presided over cases related to land,
while on the other, the krites could be a military
commander promoted, like Alexios Diplobatas-
tes, to the post of megas hetairiarches (PLP, no.5510).
A certain Maurophoros is identified in 1348 as
the krites tou phossatou of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan
(Soloviev-Mošin, Grčke povijesti, no.18.68–69). No
krites tou phossatou is known after the mid-14th C.

LIT. Guillard, Institutions 1:528f.  —A.K.

KRITOBoulos, MICHAEL, historian; died
Constantinople? ca.1470. Kritoboulos (Κριτό-
βουλο-
ς) first appears in the sources in 1444, when
Cyriacus of Ancona visited him on the island of
Imbros. Kritoboulos recognized the inevitability
of the Ottoman conquest of Byz. and sought an
accommodation with the new rulers of the Ae-
gean; in 1456 Mehmed II made him governor of
Imbros; he remained in this position until 1466,
when he fled to Constantinople after the Venetian
occupation of the island. He survived the plague
of the following year, but probably died soon
thereafter.

His History in five books covers the period 1451–
67 and focuses on the Turks; it begins with the
reign of Mehmed II and is dedicated to the sultan.
Kritoboulos gives a flattering portrait of Mehmed,
whose deeds he compares with those of Alexander
the Great. Kritoboulos regularly referred to the
sultan as basileus and autokratōr; he emphasized
Mehmed's interest in classical antiquity to make
him a worthy successor of the Byz. emperors.
Kritoboulos used Thucydides as a model for his
History (P.D. Mastrodemeters, Athena 65 [1961]
158–68), which is full of classical allusions and
archaizing language. It is possible that the his-
torian Kritoboulos is to be identified with the his-
torical writer Michael Kritopoulos, who composed
an unpublished homily on the Passion of Christ.

ED. Crisobuli Imbriotar Historiae, ed. D.R. Reinsch (Berli-
New York 1983), Eng. tr. C.T. Riggs, History of Mehmed the
Conqueror (Princeton 1954), Germ. tr. D.R. Reinsch, Mehmet
II. erobert Konstantinopel (Graz-Vienna-Cologne 1986).

LIT. Hunger, Lit. 1.149–503, PLP, no.13817. V. Grecu,
"Kritobulos aus Imbros," BS 18 (1957) 1–17. G. Emrich,
"Michael Kritobulos, der byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber
Mehmeds II.," Materialia Turcica 1 (1975) 35–43. Z. Udal-
'cova, "K voprosu o social'no-politicheskix vizhjadax vizi-
97.

KROIA. See ALBANIANS; SKANDERBEG.

KRUM (Κρούμ), Bulgarian khan (ca.802–14);
died Pliska? 13 Apr. 814. Early in his reign Krum,
himself from a Pannonian clan, exploited Char-
lemagne's destruction of the Avars to consolidate
the northwestern region of BULGARIA. Hostilities
with Byz. flared in 807, when Emp. Nikephoros
I conducted an abortive campaign into Thrace;
in 808, when a Bulgar force ambushed a Byz.
army at the Strymon; and in 809, when Krum
captured Serdica. In 811 Nikephoros invaded
Bulgaria, despite Krum's entreaties for peace, and
on 20 July sacked Pliska, plundering Krum's own
palace. On 26 July, however, Krum trapped and
destroyed the Byz. army in a mountain pass; Ni-
kephoros was slain (Krum reportedly made his
skull into a drinking cup), and his son Staurakios
was mortally wounded. Krum soon captured De-
veltos and resettled its population in Bulgaria. In
the summer of 812, he seized numerous Mac-
donian and Thracian towns and forts, including
Anchialos, Berroia, and Philippopolis. Krum urged
Michael I to renew the treaty of 716 between
Tervel and Theodosios III and stormed Mesem-
bria upon the emperor's refusal. In 813 he re-
turned to Thrace, on 22 June routing the Byz.
army at Versinikia. Krum then marched on Con-
stantinople, where he was wounded in an assas-
ination attempt organized by Leo V. Enraged,
Krum devastated Constantinople's environs and
captured Adrianople, deporting its inhabitants to
Bulgaria; Byz. hagiographical and liturgical texts
commemorate the martyrdom of 377 captives (E.
Beševliev in Polychronion 90–104). Death from a
hemorrhage ended preparations by the "new Sennacherib" for an assault on Constantinople in 814.


-P.A.H.

KTEMATINOS (κτηματινός), a functionary probably responsible for management of imperial estates (ktetares). The evidence—in narrative sources of the 10th C. and on a seal (St. Maslev, Izu-InstBülgIst 20 [1955] 446, no.2)—is scanty. Perhaps the office was created when the megas kourator began to lose his significance and his department was divided into several independent bureaus.


-A.K.

KTETOR (κτήτωρ), founder (ktistes), patron, or owner of an ecclesiastical institution (a church, monastery, gerokomeion, ptochotropheion, etc.) and its properties. The ktetor's right (ktetorikon dikaios) could originate with the foundation itself (whether he built the institution from scratch or merely restored it), be inherited, or be acquired as a privilege; it could be held for a lifetime or for two or three generations. The ktetor (who under certain circumstances might also be called ephoros, pronoetes, epikouros, authentes, etc.) could be a layman, a clergyman, or an ecclesiastical institution. The conditions of the ktetorikon dikaios—drawn up in a "contract" called a typikon, diataxis, or diatyposis—included spiritual rights (the performance of memorial services, the name of the ktetor being included in the brevon of the church), administrative privileges (e.g., the right to appoint the hegoumenos), and revenues as well as obligations: maintenance and embellishment of the premises, providing oil for the lamps, care of the sacred vessels, etc.

Recognized in Justinianic law and papyri, the ktetorikon dikaios was popular in Byz. since it met both pious requirements and the need for a relatively stable form of investment, church property being less vulnerable to confiscation than secular estates. Nikephoros II Phokas in 964 tried unsuccessfully to limit the founding of new mon-

asteries, ordering that pious donations instead be channeled into the repair of older, run-down institutions. The system of charistikon, common in the 11th and 12th C., was an offshoot of the ktetorikon dikaios. KtetoD rights existed down through the 15th C., long after the term charistikon had fallen into disuse.


-A.K.

KUFIC, PSEUDO-. See ISLAMIC INFLUENCE ON BYZANTINE ART.

KUMLUCA TREASURE. See SION TREASURE.

KURBINOVO, site in Macedonia of the Church of St. George. Nothing is known about the patrons of this church, but an inscription on the back of the altar indicates that the decoration of the monument was begun on 25 April 1191. A wooden roof covers the single nave; there is an apse at the east and a narthex at the west. The mortared rubble fabric of the building was externally plastered and painted in imitation of the cipionne brickwork found, for example, at Kastoria. The interior is elaborately painted with the GREAT FEAST CYCLE. The Kurbinovo master was probably one of the artists who worked on the second phase of decoration in the Church of the Anargyroi in Kastoria. The style of the paintings conforms to the sinuous forms characteristic of late 12th-C. MONUMENTAL PAINTING, although the exaggerated features of the figures and the stark tonal contrasts of their flesh lend the images an expressive intensity lacking in painting of this period outside of Macedonia.

Lit. Hadermann-Misguich, Kurbinovo.

-AJ.W.

KÜTAHYA. See KOTYAIION.

KUVRAT (Koβrapos, according to Moravskik, Byzantinoturcica 2:161f), khan of the Onogur Bulgars; died after 642. Patr. Nikephoros I mentions his revolt against the Avars and alliance with HERAKLEIOS; Kuvrat was granted the title of pa-
trikos. John of Nikiu relates that Kuvrat was brought up and baptized in Constantinople, and staunchly supported MARTINA. V. Beševliev (BBulg 5 [1978] 229–36) tried to separate these pieces of evidence and saw in a second Kuvrat a commander of the troops in Cappadocia. Theophanes the Confessor calls Kuvrat the ruler of Great Bulgaria (occupying the steppe north of the Black Sea); Nikephoros lists his sons, one of whom was ASPARUCH. H. Grégoire (Byzantium 17 [1944–5] 88–118) identified Kuvrat with the Koubre (Lemerle, Miracles 2:143–60) who revolted against the Avars; this revolt, however, should be dated in 680–85 and does not fit Kuvrat’s chronology. It also remains unclear how Kuvrat could “revolt” against the Avars, whose territory lay farther to the west. Werner (infra) hypothesizes that Kuvrat was buried near Poltava and that the hoard of precious objects found at MALAJA PEROŠČEPINA belonged to him.


W.E.K., A.K.

KYDONES, DEMETRIOS, statesman, scholar, and translator; born Thessalonike ca.1324, died Crete ca.1398. Dispossessed of his family’s wealth by the uprising of the Zealots in his native city, Kydones (KYDÔN) entered the service of John VI Kantakouzenos in 1347 and held the position of mesa- zon until the emperor abdicated in 1354. After a brief retirement his political career continued during the reigns of John V and Manuel II, whose mentor he became. Kydones consistently supported a policy of resistance to the Ottoman Turks and sought a military alliance with the rulers of western Europe through the mediation of the papacy.

Kydones opposed the theology of Gregory PA- LAMAS and wrote several anti-Palamite treatises. He studied Latin and translated into Greek theological works by Augustine, Anselm of Canterbury, and Thomas Aquinas, as well as Ricoldo da Monte Croce’s Reftuation of the Koran. After studying and translating Aquinas’s Summa contra gentiles and parts of his Summa theologicae, Kydones became a defender of Thomism. His brother, the hiero- monk Prochoros KYDONES, also translated parts of the Summa theologicae and used Thomist arguments in his refutations of Palamas’s theology.

Kydones converted to Roman Catholicism ca.1357 and supported John V’s profession of faith made in Rome before Pope URBAN V in 1369. His pro-Latin and Thomist sympathies were shared by a number of younger followers, many of whom became DOMINICANS.

Despite his preference for a theology based on Aristotle, Kydones admired the works of PLATO. He successfully imitated the Platonic idiom, esp. in his coinrespondence, an important source containing over 450 letters. His other writings include several political speeches, apologies, sermons, and polemical works dealing with theology.


KYDONES, PROCHOROS, monk and anti- Palamite theologian; born Thessalonike ca.1333/4, died Constantinople 1369/70. Younger brother of Demetrios KYDONES, he went to Athos as a youth and took monastic vows at the Great Lavra. Circa 1364 he became a priest. After the return of PHILOTHEOS KOKKINOS to the patriarchate in 1364, Kydones became embroiled with the superior of the Lavra because of his opposition to PALAMISM and was expelled from the monastery in 1367. He went to Constantinople, where he was formally condemned by the permanent synod in 1368 (RegPatr. fasc. 5, no.2541), defrocked, and excommunicated. He died shortly thereafter.

Kydones knew Latin, and made accurate and elegant Greek translations of works of AUGUSTINE, BOETHIUS (D. Niketas, Hellenika 35 [1984] 275–315), and part of the Summa theologicae of Thomas AQUINAS (A. Glycofridou-Leontsini, Nicolaus 3 [1975] 429–32). His principal work, On Essence and Energy, was the first Byz. treatise to be strongly influenced by Aquinas; it was attacked by John (VI) Kantakouzenos in (his unedited) Antirrhetes. Kydones also wrote an Apologia, which was directed to Philotheos, and other anti-Palamite works.
KYNEGETIKA. See OPPIAN.

KYNOKEPHALOI (Κυνοκέφαλοι), men with dogs' heads, a fabulous tribe located by ancient geographers either in Libya or in India. A detailed description of Kynokephaloi was given in the Indika by Ktesias, a summary of which is preserved in Photios’s Bibliotheca (cod. 72). Following this account, they appear in MS illustration as associates of Hekate. Christian authors also used the legend of the Kynokephaloi—for example, the vita of Makarios of Rome, the Alexander Romance, and Tzetzes (Hist. 7:705–07), who directly refers to Ktesias and calls the Kynokephaloi righteous people. According to the vita of Makarios (ed. A. Vassiliev, p. 139, 22–30), they were gentle, wore no clothes, and lived with their children and wives in animal dens, under rocks. The Alexander Romance states only that the Kynokephaloi were able both to speak and to bark (thus differing from Ktesias who says they were unable to use human speech) and that Alexander killed several of them.

KYPARISSIOTES (Κυπαρισσιώτης), a family name probably derived from the toponym Kyparission, found in both Constantinople and the provinces. The earliest Kyparissiotes was apparently Leo, spatharios and strategos of Chios (Schlumberger, Sig., p. 196); the combination of the title of spatharios and the office of strategos does not permit a date later than the 10th C. In 1088 the protonotariats John and his son (also a protonotarius) served in the department of the genikon (Patmou Engraphe 1:49G. 305). The family is again attested in the 14th C.: John Kyparissiotes was a philosopher and writer (see KYPARISSIOTES, JOHN); another Kyparissiotes, an oiketes of Matthew I Kantakouzenos, is mentioned as a good-for-nothing soldier but an educated man. The family still belonged to the intelligentsia in the 15th C., when Kosmas Kyparissiotes was active as a hymnographer ca. 1493.

KYPARISSIOTES, JOHN, anti-Palamite theologian; born Kyparissia (Messenia) or Constantinople? ca. 1310, died 1378 or shortly thereafter. A supporter of Gregoras, Kyparissiotes became the principal theoretician of the opponents of Palamism. He was eventually forced to flee from Constantinople to Cyprus, where Demetrios Kydones sent him a letter (ep. 35) in 1371. He then moved to Rome; in 1376/7 he traveled from Avignon to Rome as a member of the entourage of Pope Gregory XI (1370–78) and received an average monthly stipend of ten florins (A. Mercati, BZ 30 [1929/30] 496–501). He may have converted to Catholicism at this time and came under the influence of Scholasticism. It is not clear whether Kyparissiotes is the “kalos Ioannes” described by Kydones (ep. 190) as returning to Constantinople in 1378/9; if not, he probably died in Rome.

Kyparissiotes wrote two major works: the Elementary Exposition of Theological Texts, preserved only in the 16th-C. Latin translation of Francisco Torres, and five books titled Against the Heresy of the Palamites. Nine hymns to the Divine Logos are also attributed to him.

KYPSELLA (τα Κύψελλα), ancient city in Thrace, mod. Ipsala, where the Via Egnatia met the Herson River, not far from the sea. A bishopric by 553, it became an autocephalous archbishopric in the 7th C. It appears in Byz. sources of the 12th C. as the “valley of Kypsell” (Kinn. 191.8), a place where nobles and the emperor went hunting (Nik.Chon. 30.31–33, 450.58–62) and stayed in tents (p. 369.60). A 14th-C. historian (Greg. 1:229.6–7) calls Kypsell a polichnion. It was prob.
ably the emperors' hunting residence where impor-ta-nt meetings could take place. Thus, in Ky-
pella occurred the refusal of the demands of Pe-
ter of Bulgar-ia and Aser I that led to the revol-
t of the Bulgarians and Vlachs at the end of the 12th C. Isaac II was deposed and blinded in Kyp-
sella.

The valley of Kypsel-la played a significant stra-
tegic role during the Pecheneg invasions (An.Komn. 2:107f) and esp. during the conflict with the Bulgarians and Vlachs at the end of the 12th C. In the winter of 1208/9 the army of the Latin emperor Henry of Constantinople crossed the frozen Hebros near Kypsel-la (Astracha, Rho-
dopes 46). Later writers barely men- tion the place.

Nevertheless, Kypsel-la preserved its position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Demoted to the status of simple bishopric during the Latin occupation and adjoined to the metropolis of Rosion in the late 13th C. (V. Laurent, EO 26 [1927] 146, no.18), it reappears as an archbishopric in the 14th C. In 1324 the archbishop of Kypsel-la was obliged to pay 16 hyperpera annually to the patriarchate of Con-


KYRANIDES. See KOIRANIDES.

KYRIAKOS (Κυριακός), author of a kontakion on the Raising of Lazarus; fl. 6th C.? Kyriakos was probably an older or younger contemporary of Romanos the Melode, whose hymns his resemble in style and treatment. S. Pétrides (EO 4 [1900] 282–84) identified him with the anachoretēs Kyri-
akos (448–556), an equation that has not found much support.

Ed. C.A. Trypanis, Fourteen Early Byzantine Can
tica (Vien-
na 1968) 79–85.


KYROS (Κύρος), poet and official; born Pan-
opolis, Egypt, died 457. When Kyros came to Con-
stantinople during the reign of Theodosios II, he was already well known for his literary accom-
plishments. Probably through the patronage of the empress Athenas-Eudokia he was appointed urban prefect ca.435 and praetorian prefect by Dec. 439, holding both prefectures simulta-
neously for two years. Kyros rebuilt much of the capital after a disastrous earthquake in 437, ar-
ranged for the illumination of major city streets and shops, and attended to the fortifications of the city; he built a church of the Theotokos in a region of the city called ta Kyrou after him (Janin, CP byz. 378f). Kyros also conducted negotiations with the Epithalites and Armenians. The reli-
gious belief of Kyros has been the subject of some dispute, but he apparently became a Christian and followed the religious orientation of Patr. Proklos. Circa 443 he earned the enmity of the eunuch Chryspahios. He was deposed and con-
secrated bishop of Kotyai-on. The sources are di-
vided about the later career of Kyros and whether he continued as bishop. He was a devotee of Da-
niel the Stylite. Kyros's poetry is highly clas-
sicizing; he laments in his verses that he was a

KYROS | 1163
man of affairs rather than a simple shepherd and
complains of the “harmful drones” who harassed him.
His fame as a poet and wise man survived in later
Byz. times.

LIT. Al. Cameron, “The Empress and the Poet: Pagan-
ism and Politics at the Court of Theodosius II,” YCS 27
Gregory, “The Remarkable Christmas Homily of Kyros
Panopolites,” GRBS 16 (1975) 317–24. –T.E.G.

KYROS (Κύρος), patriarch of Alexandria (from
631); died Alexandria 21 Mar. 642. Bishop of
Phasis in Kolchos, he was one of the initiators of
MONOENERGISM. Herakleios and Patr. Sergios
promoted him, and in 631 he came to Alexandria as
Chalcedonian patriarch and dioiketes of Egypt. He
reached an accord with some Monophysites on the
basis of the formula of Monoenergism, despite
the resistance of SOPHRONIOS, the future patriarch
of Jerusalem (synod of Oct. 631—Butler, infra
185). This aroused discontent among both
Monophysites and Chalcedonians and even led a group
of the Gaianites (supporters of APHTHARDOCEO-
TISM) to attempt to assassinate Kyros. Theopanes
the Confessor accuses Kyros of paying annual
tribute to the Arabs (after the battle at Yarmuk?)
to preserve Egypt from invasion. When ‘Amr ad-
vanced against Egypt, Kyros fled to the island of
Rawda (Roda) and reluctantly agreed to submit to
the Muslims. Herakleios recalled him and re-
jected the treaty. Kyros returned to Alexandria
with a fleet on the orders of MARTINA (14 Sept.
641) and arranged a treaty with ‘Amr on 8 Nov.
641. The overthrow of Martina and the sufferings
of Egypt under the Muslims showed Kyros the failure
of his policy and may have contributed to his
death.

mann, “Agypten und Byzanz vor der arabischen Errobe-

KYROS AND JOHN, healing saints; feastday 30/
31 Jan. Supposedly Kyros was a physician in Al-
exandria, John a soldier attracted to Egypt by
Kyros’s fame; they were executed during Diocle-
tian’s reign. There is no evidence of them until
the 5th C., when CYRIL of Alexandria found their
relics, which he transferred from Alexandria to
Menuthis. SOPHRONIOS described their cures and
claimed to have been healed by the pair. Accord-
ing to him the local cult of Isis disappeared and
her temple sank into the sand, whereas Kyros and
John were successful. They worked their miracles
inside the church by INCUBATION; sometimes they
recommended the local bath. Some contemporar-
ies expressed doubts concerning their sanctity; a
certain Athanasia noted that their martyrdom was
not documented; the physician Gesios asserted
that their healings were not miraculous but con-
formed to the prescriptions of Hippocrates and
Galen. Sophronios made Kyros and John reject
both ancient values and ancient medicine; he rep-
resents them as more hostile to the medical profes-
sion than KOSMAS AND DAMIANOS (T. Nis-
ken, BZ 39 [1939] 355f.), and some of their rem-
edies are ostentatiously antimedical. After the Arab
conquest of Egypt in the 7th C., their cult shifted
to Constantinople and Rome; an Arabic legend
treats the saints’ healings in Monemvasia (P. Pee-
ters, AB 25 [1966] 233–40), unless the Monufasia
in the Arabic MS is a distorted form of Menuthis.

Representation in Art. Kyros is depicted some-
times middle-aged, as one of the ANARGYROI,
sometimes as an elderly monk holding a little
white jar; John is middle-aged, clad in court cos-
tume.

SOURCES. Los Thaumata de Sofronio, ed. N. Fernandez
Marcos (Madrid 1975). Fr. tr. A.-J. Festugière, Sainte Thècle,
saints Côme et Damien, saints Cyr et Jean (extraits), saint Georges
Cyri et Iohannis Vitae formis,” AB 57 (1939) 68–70.

LIT. BHG 459–479i. P. Maraval, “Fonction pédagogique
de la littérature hagiographique d’un lieu de pèlerinage:
il’exemple des Miracles de Cyr et Jean,” Hagiographie,
um den Kult von Menuthis,” in Pisciculi: Studien zur Religion
und Kultur des Altertums, Franz Joseph Dölger . . . dargeboten
(Münster 1939) 117–24. J. Duffy, “Observations on So-
phronius’ Miracles of Cyrus and John,” JThSt n.s. 35 (1984)
71–90. K.G. Kaster, LCI 5:2f.

KYZIKOS (Κύζικος, now Balkiz near Erdek), city
on the southern coast of the Sea of Marmara, at
the head of routes leading into Asia Minor. Dio-
cletian made Kyzikos metropolis of the province of
Hellespont, headquarters of a legion, and site of
an imperial mint. The usurper Prokopios took
it in 365; an earthquake destroyed half the city in
539. The Arabs occupied Kyzikos from 671 to
678 during their attack on Constantinople. To
repair the devastation, Justinian II installed Cyp-
riot refugees there in 688 and named the settlement Nea Iouustinianopolis. In 1078, Kyzikos was base for the attack of Nikephoros Bryennios on Constantinople, and in 1090 and 1113 it briefly fell to the Turks. After ravaging the area in 1204, the Latins rebuilt Kyzikos in 1206; John III Vatatzes recaptured it around 1225. Kyzikos was headquarters of the Catalan Grand Company in 1303–04. Orhan captured it soon after 1335. Kyzikos was the metropolitan bishopric of Hellespont. Its region contained numerous monasteries, notably Megas Agros, the home of Theophanes the Confessor (C. Mango, I. Ševčenko, DOP 27 [1973] 248–67).


-C.F.
LABARUM (λάβαρον, perhaps derived from Celtic "llafar," "eloquent," or rather laureum [vexillum], laurel standard), Christian military standard first attested by Eusebius of Caesarea (Eusebius, VC 1.31) and characterized as a "cross-shaped sign." This may have been the standard devised by Constantine I prior to the battle of the Milvian Bridge, as ambiguously described by Lactantius (Lactant. De mort. pers. 44.4-5; see Barnes, Constantine & Eusebius 306, n.146). The colossal statue of Constantine in the Basilica of Maxentius may have held the labarum (Eusebius, HE 9.9.10 and VC 1.40.2; see A. Alfeldi, The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome [Oxford 1948] 42). In later representations the labarum was generally shown as a standard with christogram, or, as held by Honorius on an ivory diptych (Delbrück, Consular-dipytchen, no.1), with an inscription alluding to Constantine's victory.


LABIS. See Spoons.

LABOR (πόνος, also ἐργάζεσθαι) was ambivalently viewed by the Byz. On the one hand, it was considered suffering or punishment for the original sin of their ancestors; on the other hand, those who labored were blessed by Christ. Two main perceptions of labor were developed in Byz.

1. Labor was considered an ascetic discipline, as a means of self-subjugation and as a path to spiritual enlightenment. Monastic communities—in the rules of Basil the Great and Theodore of Stoudios, in monastic typika, in hagiographical writings—praised labor from this viewpoint. We can question whether such an attitude toward labor was actually characteristic of monks—at any rate, criticism of monks for their idleness is not infrequent in Byz. literature (e.g., Eustathios of Thessalonike)—but such was the theoretical view.

2. A "rationalistic" perception was elaborated by such writers as Michael Choniates and Eustathios of Thessalonike. For Michael Choniates, labor is valuable not in itself but for its results; the beauty is in creation or in gain but not in the work itself. Eustathios speaks of labor as the natural condition of mankind, satisfying both bodily and spiritual needs; men work to avoid the hunger which is the reward of idleness, yet this same labor is pleasing to God. St. Philotheos of Opsi- kion, he stresses, happily worked with his own hands and considered "noble toil" as a worthy pursuit for man. In the aristocratic ideal of behavior, however, there was a place for war, hunting, games, and cultural pleasures, but not for work.


LABOR DISPUTES can be divided into two categories: (1) broadly, the collective actions of workers as a pressure group and (2) in a narrower sense, disagreements between an employer (ergodotes) and his contractors (ergolaboi), who in the 10th C. were equated with tekhnitai. Examples of pressure groups are the fabricenses of imperial factories in the 4th C. who were politically very active (L.C. Ruggini, SetStu 18 [1971] 169-76). In later centuries the workers in state factories were also sometimes used as a political force, as when imperial weavers helped to foil the usurpation of the kouropalates Leo Phokas in 971 (Leo Diac. 146.20-147.3).

The second kind of labor dispute involved arguments over the quality of the work performed (the worker was responsible for defects caused by his incompetence or negligence), work stoppages
(contractors had to pay a fine for the suspension of work), poor working conditions, and esp. wages. Since a portion of the wages could be advanced, some contracts (e.g., P. Grenf. II, 87, a. 602) required that the advance payment be returned with interest if the workers did not complete the given task. Conflicts were to be resolved through the expertise of arbitrators (Bk. of Eparch, ch. 22.2), but in case of a deadlock workers used strikes as their last resort. An inscription from Sardis of 459 testifies to such a strike of construction workers. An 11th-C. historian (Atal. 204.5-6) mentions that the misthioi in Rhaidestos demanded a salary increase during the inflationary period under Michael VII. An ordinance by Emp. Zeno of 483 prohibited contractors and workers in Constantinople from organizing a boycott of an employer; this law was extended by Justinian I to the provinces in 531 and later included in the Basilika; the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch also punishes work stoppages.


LACHANODRAKON, MICHAEL, general; died Markellai 20 July 792. Appointed strategos of the Thrakesion theme in 766/7 by Constantine V, Lachanodrakon (Λαχανοδράκων) actively supported Iconoclasm and esp. persecuted its monastic opponents. In 771, "imitating his teacher" Constantine (Theoph. 445.3-4), he summoned to Ephesus monks and nuns from his theme and threatened to blind and exile those who refused to marry. In 772 he confiscated all monastic property in the Thrakesion and gave proceeds from its sale to Constantine, punished those who possessed relics, and ultimately prohibited anyone in the theme from being tonsured. Lachanodrakon was a talented general. In 778 he commanded a multi-theme army (including the troops of Tatza-tes) that invaded Syria and besieged Germanikeia, although Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 451.19-20) says that Lachanodrakon was bribed by the Arabs to withdraw. In 780 he ambushed an Arab army in the Armeniakon and in 782 destroyed at Darenos in the Thrakesion one-third of the army of Harsun al-Rashid. His Iconoclastic sympathies may have led Irene to remove him as strategos (Bury, LRE 2:485). Lachanodrakon was a close adviser to Constantine VI and in Dec. 790 helped him depose Irene by securing the support of the Armeniakon army. As a magistros (Theoph. 468.1) Lachanodrakon died at the battle of Mar- kellai while campaigning with Constantine against the Bulgarians.

Lit. Gero, Constantine V 125f. 154. —P.A.H.

LACTANTIUS, more fully Lucius Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius, Latin Christian writer and teacher; born probably in Africa ca. 240, died ca. 325. A pupil of Arnobius, Lactantius was appointed by Diocletian to teach rhetoric at Nikomedea. Already a Christian when the persecution of 303 began, he lost his position, leaving ca. 305 to spend some years in Gaul or Africa. When very old he was asked by Constantine to tutor his son Crispus, a post that gave Lactantius some court influence. Of his two most important extant works the Divine Institutes seeks to persuade men of letters of the moral superiority of Christianity; it is the earliest systematic account of Christian morality in Latin. The other, On the Deaths of the Persecutors, covers the period from Nero to Galerius and Maximinus Daia. Its extreme celebration of divine vengeance is new to classical literature, while its combination of secular narrative and praise of God is reminiscent of 2 Maccabees (J. Rougé, StP 12 [Berlin 1975] 135-43). The work, chronologically sound and sometimes citing imperial edicts verbatim, is a particularly important source for the period 303-13. Lactantius's essays, The Workmanship of God and On the Wrath of God, also survive. Perhaps he wrote the poem Phoenix. Ten books of letters and some possibly pagan pieces—Symposium, Grammaticus, and a verse account of his trip from Africa to Niko- medea—are lost.


LAGOUDERA, in the Troodos mountains of CYPRUS, site of the Church of the Panagia tou Arakos. This structure of three bays, a central dome, and a single apse follows a plan common among the small mountain churches of the island. The pointed arches suggest a construction date in the second half of the 12th C.; the narthex and heavy protective roof are not part of the original structure. The first phase of the fresco decoration includes a Virgin and Child and two registers of frontal bishops in the apse and the lower fragments of a figure enthroned between angels on the south wall of the nave. The second phase includes the rest of the sanctuary and all of the nave (the group on the south wall was overpainted). Dedicatory inscriptions indicate that the second phase was completed in December 1192, through the patronage of Leo tou Authentou (or tou Authentos). Leo's special veneration for the Virgin is evident not only in the dedicatory verse accompanying the fresco icon of the Theotokos tou Arakos, but also in the emphasis on her life in the decoration of the nave. On the basis of a fragmentary inscription and stylistic traits, Winfield identified the painter of the second phase of decoration as Theodore APSEUDES. These frescoes exhibit the stylistic characteristics of late 12th-C. MONUMENTAL PAINTING.


LAITY (pl. λαίκοι from laos, people), term denoting the nonclerical element of the Christian community, in contrast to its CLERGY. Unknown in the New Testament, the term was used by Clement of Alexandria, and in the 3rd C. the laity was differentiated not only from the clergy but also from the ordinary faithful: they formed an elite of males married only once who were allowed to baptize and officiate in the absence of clergy. When the monastic movement started, the monks were at first considered laymen. Some ministerial functions (esp. those of ANAGNOSTES) were assigned to the laity. In the 4th–5th C. the distinction between the laity and clergy became sharper. First, the monks formed a special category separate from the laity; then the formal rite of ordination drew a stronger line of demarcation between the clergy and laymen: the latter received a special place in church and were prohibited from entering the sanctuary; they were forbidden to baptize and discouraged from teaching. Gradually, all groups of Christians except the clergy and monks were subsumed into the category of laity.

The differentiation between the laity and clergy in Byz. remained less sharp than it was in the West: CELIBACY was a requirement only for the higher clergy; the consecrated wine was never forbidden to the laity; country KLERIKOI were barely distinguishable from PASEIKOI in terms of their social status. The church prohibited the clergy from performing military service and from fulfilling state offices, but the ban was often ignored in practice. On the other hand, some imperial dignitaries held ecclesiastical offices, while laymen, as CHARISTIKARIOI and KTEORES, exercised authority over ecclesiastical institutions.


—A.F., A.K.

LAKAPENOS, GEORGE, writer and grammarian; fl. ca.1297–1310/11, died before 1315. Lakapenos (Ἀλακάπηνος) was probably a pupil of Maximos PLANOUDES and was active in literary circles in Constantinople under Andronikos II. About 20 of his letters survive, accompanied by EPIMERISMS and addressed to Andronikos and John Zarithes, Michael Gabras, and the physician JOHN AKTOUARIOS. This collection was preserved in a number of MSS because it was used for instructional purposes. He also prepared a selection of 264 of the letters of LIBANIOS, and wrote grammatical notes and commentary on books I and II of the IIiad and on the Encheiridion of Epictetus.

ED. Georgii Lacapeni Epistulae X priores cum epimerismis editae, ed. S. Lindstam (Uppsala 1910). Idem, Georgii Lacapeni et Andronici Zarithae epistulae XXXII, cum epimerismis Lacapeni (Göteborg 1924).


—A.M.T.

LAKEDAIMON (Λακεδαιμών), ancient name applied by Byz. authors to both the region of La-
konía (Lakonike) in the southern Peloponnesos and to its capital, ancient Sparta (A. Basilikopoulou-Ioannidou, *LakSp* 4 [1979] 4–6). The extensive expanse of Roman Sparta was contracted in late antiquity and a limited area (ca. 650 × 300 m) was fortified; the foundations of three churches of this period have been found (Ch. Bouras, *JÖB* 31.2 [1981] 621f.), as have various objects, including clay lamps of the 6th C. (A. Oikonomou, *LakSp* 9 [1988] 286–92). The Synedhemos of Hieroikles (Hierogl. 647.8) lists Lakedaimon as the “metropolis of Lakonike.”

The *Chronicle of Monemvasia* (ed. Dujčev, 12.95–96) is the only text that reports that the Lakones (variant Lakedaimonitai) left their city under pressure of the Slavic invasions and settled in Sicily; Nikephoros I rebuilt the polis of Lakedaimon and had a “mixed population”—Thrakessioi, Armenians, and the enigmatic Kapherioi (*ibid.*, 22.196–99)—settle there. The early history of the bishopric of Lakedaimon is puzzling: the first known bishop, Hosios, is attested in 458; then, in 681, when the city was supposedly abandoned, a bishop “of the polis of Lakedaimonii” is mentioned (Mansi 11:674C). In the notitia the bishopric of “Lakedeon” in the Peloponnesos (*Notitiae CP* 3:744) appears ca.800, and the later *Synodikon of Lakedaimon* begins probably ca.843 (R. Jenkins, C. Mango, *DOP* 15 [1961] 236).

The vita of the 10th-C. saint NIKON HO “METANOIEITE,” who lived in Lakedaimon, provides rich information about the city and its environs, including the existence of a Jewish community and pagan Slavs; it is, however, not certain whether the evidence of the vita can be taken at face value. At any rate, the identification of a church excavated in Sparta with one built by Nikon is probably incorrect (P. Vocotopoulos in *Praktika tou A’ Diethnous synedriou Peloponnesiouk spoudon* [Athens 1976] 273–85). The 12th-C. geographer al-Idrisi described the city as large and flourishing. A new bridge in the kastro of Lakedaimon is mentioned in an inscription of 1027 (D. Zakythenos, *Hellenika* 15 [1957] 99.4–5), a bath of the 11th–12th C. has been excavated in Sparta (Ch. Bouras, *ArchEph* [1982] 99–112), and coins of Constantine VII and polychrome ceramics have been found on the acropolis (A. Stauride, *Peloponnesiaka* 15 [1982–84] 186). Lakedaimon was elevated to the status of metropolis on or about 1 Jan. 1083 (V. Laurent, *REB* 21 [1963] 136–39).

In the early 13th C. the Franks took Lakedaimon, apparently without any difficulty, and it came under the control of the principality of Achaea; William II Villehardouin spent the winter of 1248–49 there and in 1249 began construction of the castle at Mistra, west of the city. Lakedaimon remained the urban center until warfare beginning in 1263 caused the inhabitants to flee to the greater safety of Mistra. Lakonian frescoed churches include St. George at Longani,
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In the early 13th C. the Franks took Lakedaimon, apparently without any difficulty, and it came under the control of the principality of Achaea; William II Villehardouin spent the winter of 1248–49 there and in 1249 began construction of the castle at Mistra, west of the city. Lakedaimon remained the urban center until warfare beginning in 1263 caused the inhabitants to flee to the greater safety of Mistra. Lakonian frescoed churches include St. George at Longani, dated 1375 (A. Orlandos, *EEBS* 14 [1938] 461–81), and St. Nicholas at Agoriane, built ca.1300 (M. Emmanouel, *DChAE* 14 [1989] 107–50) and painted by Kyriakos Phrangopoulos (as attested by an inscription). According to the *Chronicle of the Morea*, Lakedaimonia was a large town with towers and a good city wall. Under the Franks there was a Catholic bishop, last attested in 1278, when he was forced to flee, just as the Orthodox bishop of Lakedaimon moved his residence to Mistra.


LAKHMIDS, the Arab dynasty that flourished in Hira on the lower Euphrates for three centuries before the rise of Islam. Through their clientship to Persia, the Lakhmids became involved in the Byz.-Persian wars and in those of the various Arab foederati who were clients of Byz. One of their 4th-C. kings, Imru’ al-Qays, went over to Byz. and was installed in the province of Arabia; another, al-Nu’mân, visited St. Symeon the Stylite the Elder in Syria ca.413–20. His son, Mundhir, fought against Byz. in the Persian war of 421–22. Toward the end of the 5th C. al-Nu’mân’s operations against Byz. served as a prelude to the Persian war (502–05) of Anastasios I. It was Alamundar, however, who posed the greatest threat to Byz. for some 50 years (503–54); ca.530 Justinian I centralized federate Ghassanid power in the Orient to rival him. Alamundar’s successors sent embassies to Justin II and Tiberius I in Constantinople. Originally pagans, by the end of the 6th C. the Lakhmids had become Nestorians. The dynasty ended ca.600, and Hira fell to Muslim arms in 633.

LAKONIA. See Lakedaimon.

LAMB OF GOD. Sheep and lambs figure among Christianity's earliest symbols. In 3rd-C. funerary art, they represent believers or believers' souls: pastoral images of Paradise inherited from antiquity and Christ's designation of his followers as sheep together served to make sheep a widespread image of the Christian's desire to be a lamb in Christ's celestial fold. Common symbols by the 4th C., sheep sometimes act out biblical scenes in works of the 4th–6th C. Because Christ himself had been likened by John the Baptist to the sacrificial "Lamb of God" that takes away the sins of the world (Jn 1:29) and was the Lamb of the Apocalypse (Rev 14–21), he, too, is shown as a lamb from the 4th C. onward. Signifying the eternal triumph achieved through his sacrifice, the image of Christ as the Lamb of God is first found below triumphal scenes like the Traditio legis or Christ acclaimed by the Apostles; the Lamb stands on the mount of Paradise flanked by apostle-lambs, forming a symbolic, celestial counterpart to the figural scene above. Slightly later, as the focus of larger cycles, the Lamb of God appears enclosed in the wreath of eternal triumph. In Western art from the 5th C. onward, Christ as lamb is incorporated into Apocalyptic imagery. In Byz. art, the Lamb of God is rarer and adheres to the passage in John. It vanishes after the 7th C., presumably because the council in Trullo explicitly proscribed it. (See also Amnos.)


LAMBOUSA TREASURE. See Cyprus Treasure.

LAMIA (Água), ancient city in southern Thessaly, whose name still survives in Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 2.42, ed. Pertusi, p.88). Some remains of the late antique city (a basilica, coins, and an inscription of the 4th C., a marble slab of the 7th C., etc.) were found on the acropolis and in its vicinity; the remains of city walls on the acropolis are thought to be Justinianic. But already at that time Lamia was in decline, and the Tabula Peutingeriana does not mention it. The bishopric of Lamia, suffragan of Larissa, is known from 431 onward.

Occupied by the Slavs, Lamia reappears from the 9th C. under the name of Zetounion, probably of Slavic origin (from živo, "grain"): Vasmer, Slaven 105. Lamia-Zetounion was an important fortress guarding the approach to Thermopylae. Basil II chanced to observe there the traces of a bloody battle between Nikephoros Ouranos and Samuel of Bulgaria (Skyl. 364,76–78). In the 12th C. Benjamin of Tudela counted 50 Jewish families in Zetounion. After 1204 the Templars temporarily held the city and rebuilt its ramparts. By 1259 it was again in Greek hands, but in 1318 the city was seized by the Catalans, who seem to have retained it until 1391. The Acciauoli dominated Zetounion for several years, but Bayezid I demolished it in 1394. In 1403–26 the Byz. held the fortress, then the Turks recaptured it. A short chronicle (Kleinchroniken 1:251, no.49) says that in 1444 Constantine (XI) Palaiologos captured Thebes and attacked Zetounion.

LIT. TIB 1:283f. Abramea, Thessalia 141–43. –A.K.

LAMPS. Ceramic lamps of essentially ancient type are attested in considerable number from the 4th to 7th C. These were generally mold-made, of oval shape, with a filling hole for oil in the center top and a wick hole at one end opposite the handle. The surfaces of the lamps were commonly decorated, normally with simple motifs, but occasionally with Christian symbols and scenes: crosses, Christograms, David and Goliath, or Christ trampling the beasts (Age of Spirit., nos. 352, 471). Until the 7th or early 8th C. clay lamps represented the most common lighting device (C. Mango, JÖB 32.1 [1982] 254f) in both private houses and cemeteries, where they have been found in abundance. Lamps were often left on tombs, either as part of the burial ceremony or as votives that were left burning. They were widely exported, above all from North Africa (A. Ennabli, Lampes chrétiennes de Tunisie [Paris 1976]). Lamps from Asia Minor, Attica, Palestine, and Sicily did not travel as far, but all were imitated by local workshops; molds, too, were exported and also
LAMPSAKOS (Λάμπσακος), ancient city on the eastern shore of the HELLESPONT facing KALLIPOLIS. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 4:29, ed. Pertusi, p.69) names it among the notable poleis of OPSIKION, but this is evidently anachronistic. Lampsakos was a bishopric suffragan to KYZIKOS and perhaps an emperor’s epi-skepsis (Schlumberger, Sig. 198); it left no trace in secular history, however, until the 13th C., when John III Vatatzes, after reconquering this district from the Latins, constructed a harbor in Lampsakos. The Latins and the empire of Nicaea fought over the city, but in 1235 John III firmly established Greek authority there. The Turks seized it, but in 1359 the papal legate Peter Thomas destroyed the fortress of Lampsakos with Venetian and Rhodian galleys and Greek assistance.

A Latin survey of Lampsakos composed in 1218–19 gives a detailed description of the town, the categories of its inhabitants, and the taxes they paid to their Venetian lords. According to this survey there were 173 households in Lampsakos—60 urban and 113 peasant; the urban households paid only 24 percent of all land taxes; in addition they probably paid taxes for mills, salt pans, boats, and fishing nets. Nothing is known of manufacturing in Lampsakos; Islamic sources testify to its export of ceramics (Vryonis, Decline 13, n.60).


LAMPSAKOS TREASURE, dated to the 6th or 7th C. and found ca.1847 at LAMPSAKOS on the Dardanelles. Now divided among museums in Istanbul, London, and Paris, it is composed of 25 silver objects and two pieces of gold jewelry. The formation of this treasure of domestic silver plate over the period of a century is indicated by the six objects dated by silver stamps: a lampstand (527–65) similar to one in the MYTILENE TREASURE, a polykandelon (577), and four bowls (613–30) akin to the set in the SUTTON HOO TREASURE.

made from imported lamps. In addition to shapes, even the marks of foreign potters were reproduced (K.S. Garnett, Hesperia 44 [1975] 173–206).

In the 8th C. the ancient tradition of lamp-making died out and lamps of a different type became predominant. These were either hung by a cord or equipped with a stand, in which case the lamp was a simple open cup, pinched at one end for the wick, placed on a ceramic stand, usually conical or cylindrical, sometimes with a drip cup below; these lamps/lampstands were usually glazed.

Glass lamps were also popular but, being very fragile, have left little trace in the archaeological record. Lamps of bronze and silver were used in wealthy households and esp. in churches (see LIGHTING, ECCLESIASTICAL).


–A.C., T.E.G.
The bowls bear the monogram of a certain Menas, probably a late owner of the treasure. The find included silver furniture revetments (table rim and stool, the latter similar to one in the Concestři Treasure), a large niello-inlaid plate decorated with a personification usually said by scholars to be of India but probably that of Africa, and two sets of spoons: one with names of the Apostles and another, of elegant design, with quotations from Vergil inscribed in Latin as well as the “Sayings of the Seven Sages” and witticisms, in Greek.

**LAND ROUTES.** Both Asia Minor and the Balkans were traversed by a number of major routes that formed a communications network used by the army, the *demosios dromos* (public post), traders, and travelers. Smaller roads led to the major routes. In the Balkans, there were two major routes, one from Belgrade to Niš (Naissos) and then either through Sofia and Philippopolis to Constantinople or through Skopje to Thessalonike. The other major route was the Via Egnatia, running from Dyrrachion to Ohrid to Thessalonike and eventually to Constantinople. With minor variations, these were the routes taken by the Crusaders. According to al-Idrīsī, it took six days to travel from Dyrrachion to Ohrid and seven days from Ohrid to Thessalonike. In the 10th C., a leisurely journey from Thessalonike to Belgrade took eight days (De adm. imp. 42:15–18).

The major Asia Minor routes ran from northwest to southeast, while secondary roads ran from north to south. The most important military road led from Nicaea to Malagina to Dorylaion to Sani- ana, where it divided into three branches, eventually leading to Tarsos, Nikopolis and Koloniea, Theodosioupolis, and Meltene. The second traverse road went from Malagina to Dorylaion to Ikonion to the Cilician Gates. While these routes were of great military importance, those leading from north to south were also significant for travel and commerce. (See also Sea Routes and Silk Route.)

**LANDSCAPE AND BUCOLIC IMAGERY.** Compared to those of Roman wall paintings and floor mosaics, early Byz. landscapes present fragmented images of reality. On silver plates of
the 6th and 7th C. the countryside is divided into discrete planes, while the Great Palace pavement juxtaposes pastoral and urban scenes without division. From the 6th C. landscape no longer existed for its own sake, but as the context for sacred events; thereafter mountains are either terraced massifs or series of coulisses, and rivers are controlled by personifications or angels, as in the Miracle at Chonai, but not by gravity. Conventional rocks and trees serve as framing devices, while serrated ranks of improbable plants decorate rather than characterize a panorama. In the Menologion of Basil II identical caves represent the grotto of the Nativity and that of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus. Even in such secular MSS as the pseudo-Opian in Venice, a quickly drawn tree and a serpentine groundline serve to indicate the setting of a hunt; vegetation tends to grow above or below but rarely out of the features of a landscape. The bucolic miniatures in illustrated copies of the homilies of John of Euboea and Gregory of Nazianzos likewise subscribe to these formulae and lack the paradisiacal connotations that such imagery had in the Catacomb or on sarcophagi. In late Byz. monumental and miniature painting, mountains become more precipitous and vegetation even more unearthly. Carrying such tendencies to the extreme, in the Pantanassa at Mistra the human presence is dwarfed by landscapes, just as in ritual and domestic settings it is overwhelmed by fantastic architecture.


LAND SURVEY (γεωδαισία). In the late Roman period the measurement (metresis) of land was the basis for imperial tax assessment and for the determination of land ownership and yield capacity. Professional geometrai, chiefly from Egypt whence comes most of our preserved evidence, are abundantly attested in papyri and ostraka (e.g., SB I 5174.19 [dated 512] and SPP III 83.2). They sometimes worked at public expense (demosios geometres) and in tandem with the tax assessor (gnoter: P. Cair. Pres. 8.3–4 [dated 323]); customary payments by surveyors to the tax collector (pagarches) are also attested (P. Ant. II 96.4–5). Surveyors measured with the same type of rope (schoinion) as had been noticed by Herodotus (bk.2, ch.6), and with a square quadruple-plumbbob device, an example of which survives in the London Science Museum (O.A.W. Dilke, The Roman Land Surveyors [Newton Abbot 1971] 49). They apparently worked less according to the theoretical treatises of the agrimensores than by rules of thumb for adding up measured fractions of an area to give a total area (U. Wilken, Griechische Ostraka [Munich 1899; rp. Amsterdam 1970] 1:774–80). Results survive in two papyrus cadastrers from the 4th C. and one from the 6th C. According to Justinianic law (Nov. Just. 128.4), the measurements (demosios apographe) determined the amount of tax liability, which was transferable with the land.

The Byz. did not continue to use the Roman system of precise measurement of land: even though Heron's treatise on geodesy was known in Byz., the work of John Pediasmios shows how poorly Heron was understood. To measure the borders of an allotment, the Byz. used either a rope (schoinion) made of hemp or a kalamos, an instrument of reed or wood. Neither had a standard size: the schoinion could be of 10 or 12 orgyia, while the kalamos varied in length from 6 to 14 imperial spithamai. The application of different measures depended on local traditions and, in theory, on the character of the land under survey (arable land, vineyard, etc.). Lefort calculates, on the basis of the survey of Radolibos in 1103, that correct estimates of the area of allotments occurred in only 16 percent of the cases. Two principal methods were used by Anagaphes. In the first system, called en kataomais, the land was divided into a series of smaller parcels, each of approximately regular form. The sides of each were calculated in schoinias, and the result was calculated by the formula (a + c)(b + d)/8 where a and c are upper and lower boundaries, called kephale (head) and pous (foot), respectively, and b and d side boundaries (pleurai). The individual results were then totaled, giving the area in modii. Another method was kata to hologyron, in which the entire length of the boundary was measured, and 1/10 was subtracted from the total; the remainder was divided by 4, and the quotient
multiplied by itself. Lefort’s observations show that only square parcels/allotments could be measured correctly.


-A.K., L.S.B.MacC.

LANGUAGE. The later Roman Empire was a multilingual society. Latin was both the vernacular and the official language in the West, though pockets of non-Latin speech survived in the Pyrenees and elsewhere. In the East the situation was more complex. The imperial administration and the army used Latin. Greek was the vernacular tongue in most regions and was, in general, the language of culture and civic administration. In Syria-Palestine and Mesopotamia, Syriac, Arabic, and Coptic were widely spoken, and in Egypt, apart from Alexandria, Coptic (see COPTIC LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE) was spoken by most people. On the fringes of the empire other languages such as Armenian, Arabic, and Berber were spoken. Bilingualism was common. With the loss of most of the Western Empire to Germanic states in the 5th C., the role of Latin steadily diminished in the East, until by the early 7th C. Greek had replaced it as the imperial language. A generation later the Arab conquests removed most of the Syriac, Arabic, and Coptic speakers, and eventually the Latin speakers of North Africa, from Byz. control and left Greek as the dominant language in all domains of public and private life. Byz. society was never monoglot, however. In Constantinople and other cities Latin, Armenian, Georgian, Syriac, Slavonic, and Arabic and, in the later period, Italian, French, and other western tongues were heard. Armenia, annexed in the 10th–11th C., retained its own language (see LANGUAGES, NON-GREEK).

Byz. Greek, like other languages of high culture, functioned at different levels. The language spoken by all classes in informal situations, and by the uneducated majority in all situations, was, like other spoken languages, subject to slow but continuous change. Many of the patterns of Modern Greek phonetics and phonology, morphology, and syntax were already established by the late 6th C., and most of them by the 10th. On the other hand, all official, public, or written com- munication, including LITERATURE, was in a archaising, imitative, and fossilized form of Greek, which owed its prestige to its classical and patristic models and was maintained by a highly conservative educational tradition. In principle literary Greek had two levels: one a version of the KOINE Greek of the Roman Empire, often used in technical writing, the other an imitation, successful to varying degrees, of either the language of Attic literature of the 5th/4th C. B.C. or of the ATTICISM of rhetoricians of the SECOND SOPHISTIC (the two models were not always clearly distinguished). A recent study (I. Ševčenko, JÖB 31.1 [1981] 289–312) proposes a threefold classification of Byz. literary language. Ability to use archaising Greek, esp. its articulating variety, was a mark of both intellectual and social distinction. Clearly the uneducated only partly understood much of this Byz. literary Greek, often because of the content and style as well as the linguistic form. However, the communication gap must not be exaggerated. VERNACULAR and literary Greek were varieties of the same language, not different languages.

The principal changes in spoken Greek during late antiquity and the early Middle Ages may be divided among four main categories.

1. PHONETICS AND PHONOLOGY: loss of many distinctions between vowel phonemes and of distinctions of vowel length; development of voiced and aspirate plosives into voiced and unvoiced fricatives; and supersession of tonal accent by stress accent. In addition traditional ORTHOGRAPHY, which ignored these changes, became historic rather than phonetic.

2. MORPHOLOGY: restructuring of consonant-stem noun paradigms as vowel-stem paradigms; restructuring of personal pronouns; fusion of middle and passive voices; loss of the optative mood and of the perfect and pluperfect tenses; replacement of the future tense by periphrastic constructions; some restructuring of personal endings of verbs; and loss of the dual number in nouns and verbs.

3. SYNTAX: replacement of the dependent infinitive by subordinate clauses; growth of parataxis as an alternative to subordination; construction of all prepositions with the accusative case; loss of the dative case; and development of a range of compound prepositions.

4. VOCABULARY: development of new derivational
suffixes and obsolescence of many in earlier use; proliferation of new compound nouns, adjectives, and verbs, including types of compound infrequent or absent in earlier Greek; loss of many older vocabulary items; adoption of many loanwords, initially from Latin and later from Italian and French as well as occasional borrowings from Arabic, Slavic, etc.

The conservative purpose of Byz. language teaching by Grammatikos and rhetor emerges from treatises on orthography and prosody, from the extensive commentaries on the Grammar of Dionysios Thrax, from the epimerisms on Homer and on the Psalms, and from prescriptive lexika of "Attic" words, as well as from the critical observations of Byz. writers. Photios in his Bibliotheca regularly censured writers who in his view were insufficiently "Attic." Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos criticized a work on court ceremony because the writer's knowledge of Greek was inadequate. Patr. Nicholas IV Mouzalon suppressed a Life of St. Paraskeve, arguing that it was written "in vulgar language by some peasant." Symeon Metaphrastes organized the rewriting of many earlier saints' Lives in archaizing language for liturgical use. Nikephoros Choumenos proclaimed imitation of ancient models—among which he included the works of the church fathers—as the only path to literary excellence. Writers who used a less than rigorously purist Greek often defended their choice on the ground that they were addressing uneducated readers, that their subject was not sufficiently elevated, that their work was for private use or that they themselves had not had a literary education. Examples are Leontios of Neapolis in his Life of St. John Eleemnon, Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos in his De administrando imperio, Theophanes Chrysobalantes in his medical encyclopedia, Michael Psellos in his introductory treatises in 15-syllable verse, Kekaumenos in his Strategikon, Philip Monotropos in his Diodotra, and John Kananos in his narrative of the siege of Constantinople in 1422.

From the 13th C. educators increasingly emphasized the importance of archaizing and imitative Greek. New textbooks and commentaries on classical authors and new prescriptive lexika were composed. A new and critical interest was displayed in the linguistic and literary heritage of ancient Greece. At the same time, however, some earlier literary texts, such as the Mirror of Princes of Agapetos and the Histories of Anna Komene and Niketas Choniates were paraphrased in a level of language closer to the spoken Greek of the period. More significantly, for the first time a body of literature, mostly anonymous, appeared in a language which eschewed archaism and reflected, though neither faithfully nor systematically, the speech of the urban society of the empire. It is mostly literature of entertainment—romances, pseudohistory, animal allegories, animal epics, popular moralizing and devotional works—and is almost exclusively in 15-syllable political verse, for which no classical model existed. All serious literature and most prose was the preserve of the archaizing literary tongue. A reading—or listening—public that no longer valued archaism must have existed, however. These two apparently contradictory tendencies, purism and the use of the vernacular, were part of the reaction of Byz. intellectuals and Byz. society to the dismemberment, impoverishment, and humiliation of the empire after the Fourth Crusade. They represent a new emphasis on Hellenic identity and culture in the face of the growing power of Westerners and Turks (see Hellenism).

Within the general framework of Byz. Greek diglossia, professional and other groups had their own special languages, sometimes marked by extensive lexical borrowing from other languages (see Borrowing, Linguistic). Thus, long after serious knowledge of Latin had become rare, lawyers used many fossilized words and phrases of legal Latin. Sailors in the late Byz. period evidently took over many Italian maritime terms and so laid the foundation of the post-Byz. lingua franca. Medical writers of the 14th–15th C. often interlarded their texts with Arabic and Persian loan words, thus reflecting the growing prestige of Muslim medicine. Local dialects existed, but little is known about them in the Byz. period.

In spite of the obsession with linguistic purism shown by teachers and writers from the 9th C. onward, inscriptions in churches and other public places and on the personal seals of lay and ecclesiastical officials, as well as both official and private documents, often display gross errors of orthography and grammar. Atticism was the concern of men of letters. Men of power could dispense with it.


—R.B.

LANGUAGES, NON-GREEK, were important in the polyethnic late Roman Empire. Latin was not only spoken throughout the western Mediterranean but remained the language of bureaucracy in Constantinople until the 6th C. and of the army even later. Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, and Georgian had their areas of indigenous population, and bilingualism remained a common phenomenon. In the 7th C., when the Syrian- and Coptic-speaking provinces were lost to the Arabs, and most Latin-speaking regions in the West passed from Byz. control, the use of Latin in administration was abandoned. At the same time Slavic settlers occupied most of the northern Balkans and much of mainland Greece. The Slavs in Greece were largely hellenized by the 10th C., but those further north retained their linguistic separate- ness even after these regions were reincorporated in the empire. Armenian immigration into Asia Minor and Constantinople became massive after the Arab conquest of Armenia in the mid-7th C. and continued for centuries. Yet the idea of the superiority of the Greek language remained dominant, and non-Greek languages were often treated as barbaric. Unlike western Europe, however, Byz. never embraced the concept of an exclusive language.

Literature in non-Greek languages was written in Byz. territory, and the Byz. church permitted the use of Slavonic, Georgian, Syrian, and other tongues in the liturgy. Certain ethnic and religious groups (Jews, Italians, and others) lived dispersed among the Greek populace but retained their languages within their communities. Knowledge of foreign languages by educated Greek speakers was more common in frontier zones, such as Cherson, Thessalonike, and Antioch, than in Constantinople; despite the boasting of John Tzetzes, his knowledge of Latin, Persian (Turkish), Scythian (perhaps Cuman), Alan, Arabic, Slavic, and Hebrew was very poor. Some revival of the knowledge of foreign languages is evident from the 11th C. Latin was studied in law schools and by diplomats. Several scholars studied and translated Arabic, Syriac, and Persian, and professional interpreters participated in embassies and in the receptions of foreign potentates at the court of Constantinople. (See also TRANSLATION: Other Languages into Greek.)


—R.B., A.K.

LANX. See PLATES, DISPLAY.

LAODIKEIA (Λαοδικεία), name of two cities in the eastern Mediterranean region, one in Anatolia, the other on the coast of Syria.

LAODIKEIA IN PHYRGIA, city at a strategic road junction near modern Denizli in Turkey, made capital of Phrygia Pacatiana in the early 4th C. Laodikeia was a major center of textile production and seat of a council in 380. Inscriptions and a sparse archaeological record suggest continuity through the late 6th C. Laodikeia, a city of the THRACESION theme, was taken by the Seljuks after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071. It became an important frontier post after its recapture by the Byz. in 1096 and was the goal of frequent, sometimes successful, Turkish attacks. John II Komnenos retook it in 1119 and built new walls; at the time of the Second Crusade in 1148 it was isolated in territory controlled by the Turks and administered by a doux. When Manuel I recaptured it in 1160, the city was not densely populated or well fortified, but spread out in villages (Nik.Chon. 124.13–15). The Third Crusade of 1190 found Laodikeia surrounded by the Turks; it was the last Byz. outpost on the road east or south. Laodikeia was apparently the capital of the ephemeral theme of Meander, mentioned in 1198 and 1209. In 1206 it was taken by Manuel Maurozomes, ally of the Seljuk sultan, and remained under Turkish control until 1256, when it was surrendered to Byz., which held it only a few years. Laodikeia was the ecclesiastical metropolis of Phrygia "Kapatiane" (Byz. form of Pacatiana).

LIT. Ramsay, Cities 1:15–25. Foss, "Twenty Cities" 484.

—C.F.
LAODIKEIA IN SYRIA (Ar. al-Lādhiqiyah [or Lattakia]), seaport in northern Syria; Ammianus Marcellinus (Amm.Marc. 14.8.8) lists Laodikeia, Apameia, and Seleukeia as the most prosperous cities in Syria. It was famous for its linen industry, book production, and the skill of its charioteers. Justinian I separated Laodikeia from Syria I and made it the capital of the province of THEODORIAS. Bishops of Laodikeia are known from the 3rd C. onward; by the 5th C. it was an autocephalous metropolis, but even after Justinianic reform it remained under the ecclesiastical administration of Antioch. Prokopios (Buildings 5.9.31) mentions the city's Church of John the Baptist, rebuilt under Justinian.

Laodikeia was taken ca.640 (?) by a lieutenant of Abū Ubayda al-Jarrah, sent from Emesa (Donner, Conquests 154). The inhabitants had to pay a fixed tax and retained their church. In 718/19 a Byz. fleet attacked Laodikeia and burned it. Nikephoros II Phokas seized the city in 968. Basil II appointed a certain "Karamuruk" governor of Laodikeia in 980, but he was captured by the Muslims and beheaded in Cairo. Michael Bourztes suppressed a Muslim revolt in the city. At the end of the 11th C. the Seljuks occupied Laodikeia, but in 1098 it fell to Raymond of Toulouse, who delivered it to Alexios I Komnenos (Ljubarskij, VizVrem 23 [1963] 49f). It changed hands several times thereafter; in the treaty of DEVOL (1108) TANCRED handed over Laodikeia to Byz. Throughout the 12th C. the city was the object of contention between Crusaders and Muslims. From 1197 to 1275 it remained in the hands of the Franks and then fell under Egyptian rule.


M.M.M.

LAPITHES, GEORGE, Cypriot writer and opponent of Gregory PALAMAS; fl. ca.1340–49. Lapithes (Δαπιθος), whose name was said to derive from the river Lapithos, was a wealthy property owner who used some of his personal fortune to ransom Christian prisoners from the Turks. He knew Latin and, seeking to refute Catholic doctrine, engaged in theological debate at the court of Huges IV de Lusignan (Greg. 3:27–38). He was a versatile writer, with interests in astronomy, theology, philosophy, and ethics. Among his few works that have survived is a lengthy poem in political verse on man's duty toward the state, society, and his family.

Although geographically separated from the protagonists in the Palamite controversy, Lapithes used the power of his pen to support Nikephoros GREGORAS, Gregory AKINDYNOS, and other anti-Palamites. He also corresponded with BARLAAM OF CALABRIA, to whom he addressed a series of philosophical questions or aforai (R.E. Sinkewicz, MedSt 43 [1981] 151–217).


LARGESS (λαργήτιον from Lat. largitio), the ceremonial distribution of gifts, esp. by the emperor. The term largitio designated every kind of generosity. A law of Constantine I of 321 (Cod Just. V 16.24) mentions an object received by a wife due to the largitio of her husband. The term was expanded to imperial philanthropy in general, and a special department of largess was created under the Comes sacrarum largetionum. This department dealt with the distribution of coins.
among the populace, and special coins with the legend liberalitas Augusti (on a coin of Constantius II and one of Magnentius the legend reads largitio) were minted. On the occasion of the emperor's succession to the throne, birthday, or triumph, the emperor or his officials distributed coins (the ceremony of sparsio) to the public; sometimes largess was tossed from a chariot to people in the streets or in the Hippodrome. Special silver largitio dishes might also be handed out by the emperor on special occasions; they are attested from the 4th to 7th C. At the new year, consuls distributed synethelai of ivory diptychs and silver vessels containing gold solidi. Gradually the church assumed the function of care for the needy, although some traces of state largess remained: thus, in the 11th C. Christopher of Mytilene (ed. E. Kurtz, no. 30.23–26) proclaims that the bronze phalara on an eparch's horse reflect the generosity of the man who hands out bronze and gold among the poor. Imperial largess was confined primarily to the palace and its officials, however; the patriarch, clergy, senate, and army were granted presents at coronations and other feasts.

**Representation in Art.** Depictions of ceremonies of largitio and sparsio have a long tradition in Roman imperial art and continued to be used from the 4th to 6th C. On the Arch of Constantine in Rome, in one of the contemporary frieze scenes facing the Forum Romanum, the emperor is shown handing out coins to senators assembled around him. The people receive their allotment from government officials. There are also two gold solidi, one of Constantius II (ca. 355) and the other of Valentinian I (364), that represent the sparsio: the emperor riding in a chariot scatters coins that are shown falling from his right hand. Consular distribution of largess to the populace is suggested by the sacks of gold coins shown on 5th-C. diptychs; on 6th-C. examples slaves pour such sacks into the arena where the consular games took place. Later Byz. art does not depict scenes of public largess but represents the emperors' gifts to God, that is, the church. On two mosaics in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, for example, the emperors Constantine IX Monomachos and John II Komnenos appear holding a money bag and offering it to Christ and the Virgin, respectively (for ill., see John II Komnenos).

**LARGITIO DISHES, SILVER,** type of object manufactured by or for the state for distribution as largess by the emperor on certain state occasions. By law, at imperial accessions, from at least 360 until 527, each soldier received five solidi and one pound of silver, the latter being in the form of ingots or dishes, both of which could bear imperial silver stamps. Largitio dishes were decorated with the name and/or image of the emperor whose accession, anniversary, or victory was being celebrated. Surviving examples include several series of up to six identical plates or bowls made for Licinius in five different cities (see also Munich Treasure) as well as various dishes issued by Constantius II, Valentinian I, and Theodosios I. Among the two bearing the image of this last emperor is the "Missorium" (dated 388), now in Madrid, which is thought to have been made in Thessalonike. While no imperial largitio dishes survive from the 5th–6th C., their distribution—like that of medallions—continued, as

LARGITIO DISHES, SILVER. Missorium of Theodosios I (388); silver. Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid. Theodosios is shown handing a codicil to an official. To the emperor's right sits his son Valentinian II, to his left his son Arkadios.
is witnessed by Corippus (ed. Av. Cameron, 4.105–12, 142–47, 186–90) in connection with Justin II’s consulship of 566. Silver plates celebrating the consuls of Flavius Eusebius (347 or 359) and Ardabur Aspar (434) (PLRE 1:308; 2:135; DACL 4.1, fig.3784 [cols. 1189–90]) have also been found. The sizes and, to a certain extent, weights of the David Plates correspond to those of large dishes, and they may have been distributed by Herakleos ca.630 to celebrate his victory over the Persians in 628.


M.M.M.

LARISSA (Λαρίσσα), administrative and ecclesiastical center of Thessaly, located on the right bank of the Peneios River, at the junction of major Thessalian routes. The city suffered from an attack by the Ostrogoths at the end of the 5th C. but was rebuilt under Justinian I. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 2.41, ed. Pertusi, p.88) lists Larissa as one of 17 poleis in the eparchia of Thessaly; in the 8th–9th C. it functioned as the metropolis of Hellas (Notitiae CP 2.40). In the 10th C. it fell victim to Bulgarian attacks; in 986 Samuel captured Larissa and carried away to Prespa the relics of St. Achilleios (allegedly the first bishop of Larissa). An inscription of 1006/7 mentions the patrikios Gregory, strategos of Macedonia and Larissa; G. Litavrin (in Kek. 415) thinks that Gregory administered Hellas and Macedonia, whereas Oikonomides (Listes 358) relates this evidence to another Larissa, a tourma of Sebastia in Cappadocia. Larissa was involved in the rebellion of 1066; in 1082/3 Bohemund besieged Larissa but failed. After 1204 Boniface of Montferrat gave the city to the Lombards; a rebellion there in 1209 was quelled by Emp. Henry of Constantinople. After 1204 Larissa was seat of a Latin archbishop, but by 1222 a Greek, Kalospites by name, was elected Orthodox bishop; Patr. Manuel I Sarantenos, residing in Nicaea, did not acknowledge the election by the local clergy. In the 13th C. Larissa belonged to the despote of Epirus, but by 1393 it had fallen to the Turks.

Larissa on the Peneios should be distinguished from Larissa Kremaste in Phthiotis, near the sea, which became an episcopal see named Gardikon. A Byz. castle has survived on the ancient acropolis; nearby is Frankekklesia, with remains of a Latin church of the 13th C. (F. Stählin, RE 12 [1925] 840–45). (For Larissa in Syria, see Shayzar.)


LASKARIS (Λάσκαρις, fem. Λάσκαρινα), a family name known from the mid-11th C.; also called Tzamantouras (Pachym., ed. Failier 1:91.21). The most probable etymology of Laskaris is from a Persian word meaning “warrior” (F. Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch [Marburg 1895; rp. Hildesheim 1963] 183), but the first known members of the Laskaris family, mentioned in the will of Eustathios Boilas (1059), were simple peasants. In 1180 Michael Laskaris was one of the most influential inhabitants of Thessalonike (M. Goudas, EEBS 4 [1927] 215, no.88b.2); another Michael Laskaris, perhaps his descendant, conspired in 1246 in Thessalonike against Demetrios Angelos Doukas (Akrop. 1:79.26). The connection of these individuals, of both rural and urban background, with Theodore I Laskaris is unclear. The Laskarid dynasty reigned from 1208 to 1258 over the empire of Nicaea, but in fact John III Vatatzes was Theodore I’s son-in-law, not a direct heir. Naturally, Theodore I’s brothers played an important role: Constantine, who in 1204 was considered a candidate for the throne, probably perished in 1211; his brothers George, Alexios, and Isaac were granted the title of sebastokrator (B. Ferjančič, ZRVI 11 [1968] 171–74). Other brothers, Michael and Manuel, exiled by John III, regained their influence at the court of Theodore II; later the protosebastos Manuel was imprisoned by Michael VIII Palaiologos, but Michael Laskaris retained the new emperor’s favor and even received the nominal title of megas doux (Guilland, Institutions 1:548). In 1234 or 1249 a certain Constantine Laskaris was doux of Thrakesion (Ahrweiler, “Smyrne” 145).

In the 14th–15th C. their role diminished, although Manuel was domestikos of the Western scholae ca.1320 and Alexios megas hetairiarches in 1369/70; more frequently members of the Laskaris family appear as local governors, imperial courtiers, and great landowners. Neither their role in ecclesiastical administration nor their cultural contribution was significant: John Pegonites Laskaris was a composer (see Laskaris, John);
the writers John Ryndakenos Laskaris and Constantine Laskaris were active in Italy in the second half of the 15th C. The funerary portrait of a late member of the family, Manuel Laskaris Chatzikis, is found in an arcosolium in the narthex of the Pantanassa at Mistra, dated by inscription to 1445. He is shown full-length, wearing a skiaion (G. Millet, Monuments byzantins de Mistra [Paris 1910], pl.152.4; idem, BCH 23 [1899] 138–40, no.XXXV). (See genealogical table; see also Byzantium, History of: Empire of Nicaea.)


-A.K., A.C.

LASKARIS, JOHN, composer and musical theorist; fl. Crete first half 15th C. Venetian archives yield some biographical details about Laskaris: he was born possibly in Constantinople and trained there as a singer, but moved to Crete (probably between 1410 and 1420), where he maintained a school and taught singing to young boys. Laskaris also wrote a short theoretical treatise entitled The Interpretation and Parallelogram of the Art of Music, which discusses the Byz. modal system. Although he was not a prolific composer, his works were copied in MSS down to the 19th C.


-D.E.C.

LAST JUDGMENT (κρίσις), the main event of the Second Parousia or Second Coming of Christ. Although Byz. theology emphasized the theosis (deification) of redeemed man rather than reward for ethical behavior, it elaborated—in polemics against Stoicism and Gnosticism and their concept of self-salvation—the idea of cosmic judgment at the end of time. This idea, however, created problems of correlation with individual judgment after death, esp. from the 7th C. onward: thus, Andrew of Crete (PC 97:1289C) states that it is beyond our capacity to investigate the status of the soul after its separation from the body.

The Last Judgment presupposes the resurrection of all men in their body and their reward in accordance with their sins or virtues: those who have followed the divine way are united to God in their adopted sonship and will dwell in Paradise, whereas sinners are doomed to Hell. Some Greek authors (Romanos the Melode, Gregory
the hagiographer of Basil the Younger) depicted the second parousia as a dies irae, emphasizing the punishment and the suffering of sinners, whereas others expressed the expectation that God's mercy would forgive at least some of our sins: thus Anastasios of Sinai (PG 89:1112–16) believed that a sincere and tearful repentance on the deathbed could redeem even a robber. Gregory of Nazianzos stressed that a man was condemned not by an external authority but by his own sins (PG 35:944D–945A). Christ will be the judge whose terrifying visage will urge all to tell the truth; apostles will assist him; the judgment is to take place in the valley of Josaphat, between the Temple and the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem. Manifold portents will precede the judgment and when the dead are resurrected the angelic trumpets will summon them to the tribunal. Based on the heavenly ledgers, the deeds of each person will be evaluated, and souls will be weighed on the balance scales. Then the sheep will be separated from the goats, and the righteous will enjoy eternal bliss while sinners are condemned to eternal suffering. The image of the Last Judgment is evidently derived from real judiciary proceedings; its resemblance to public trials was adduced, for example, by John Chrysostom (PG 58:554.53).

In patristic and Byz literature the Last Judgment is sometimes represented as preceded by the Psychomachia, the struggle between the demons and angels for the soul of the deceased. According to Cyril of Alexandria (PG 77:1073C–1076A), the soul passes five teloneia (tollhouses) and gives account for its sins to the phorologoi (tax-collectors), that is, demons; at the same time, angels are supplicating for the man's exemption from trial and condemnation (pseudo-Athanasios, PG 27:665C). Accordingly, Gregory of Nyssa buried his parents next to the tombs of the Forty Martyrs, hoping that these saints would intervene with God on their behalf on the day of resurrection (PG 46:784B).

The artistic representation of the Second Coming and the Last Judgment was considered instrumental for conversion, since it prompted in viewers a fear of eternal damnation (TheophCont 164.8–16). A variety of routes and dates have been proposed for the development of this iconography in art. Its evolution was essentially complete by the 11th C., when it appears in the Paris Frieze Gospel (B.N. gr. 74, fol. 51v) as well as in mosaic and fresco decoration (Panagia ton Chalkeon, Thessalonike).


G.P., A.C.

LAST SUPPER. See Lord's Supper.

LÁSZLÓ I, also known as Ladislas (Blađíslav boś in Kinn. 9.24), king of Hungary (from 1077); Catholic saint; born Poland 1046/7, died Nitra 29 July 1095; feastday 27 June. Having acquired military laurels as a duke under his brother King Géza I, László was elected king and soon thereafter had to deal with the insurrection of his young cousin, Salamon. The latter found support first in Germany and then with the Cumans; defeated and forced to resign, Salamon participated in a Pecheneg expedition against Byz. in the spring of 1087. László fought successfully against the Cumans and acquired a popular image that was, in many aspects, influenced by that of Byz. military saints. His annexation of old Croatia (down to the Adriatic Coast) in 1089, after the death of the Croatian king, brought László into contact with Byz. Dalmatia was temporarily rescued from Hungarian expansion because, in 1091, Alexios I urged the Cumans to invade Hungary, so that László had to return from the south. In that same year an attack of the Norman fleet, encouraged by Alexios I and under the command of Gottfried of Melf, occupied Cetina and Krk in Dalmatia. Synods held under László strengthened Roman observances in the Hungarian church. Kinnamos mistakenly speaks of Álmos and István II as László's sons—Álmos was the brother and István the son of Kálmán (Coloman), László's nephew and successor. Kinnamos also relates that László's daughter Piroska (Irene) married John II and praises her virtue. She was regarded as the founder of the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople.


J.B., A.K.
LATERNAN SYNOD, convened by Pope Martin I in Rome’s Lateran Basilica in October 649 to denounce MONOTHELETISM. The synod’s Latin acts bear the signatures of 106 bishops who condemned the Ἐκθεσις and the Typos of Constans II. Riedinger has shown, however, that the Latin acts were translated from the Greek original. This suggests the acts were essentially a fraud prepared in Rome, probably in the circle of the Greek-speaking pope Theodore I (642–49) and Maximos the Confessor; the Latin acts were presumably presented to the synod for ratification by Theodore’s successor Martin I as an attack on the patriarch of Constantinople and, indirectly, Constans II.

ED. R. Riedinger, ACO² 1.
—M.McC.

LATERCULUS. See POLEMION SILVIO.

LATIN was in late antiquity the language of the army, law, and central administration throughout the Roman Empire as well as the vernacular in the western provinces and in the Balkans north-west of a line running from the Adriatic near Dyrrachion to the Danube delta. The foundation of Constantinople as the new capital brought many Latin speakers to the East and made the study of Latin for a time an attractive alternative to a Greek literary education and a path to an official career. Theodosios II established public professorships of Latin in Constantinople. Refugees from Ostrogothic Italy and Vandal Africa strengthened the Latin element in Constantinople in the late 5th C. The grammarian and poet Priscian, the historian Marcellinus Comes, and the poet Corippus all belong to this Constantinopolitan Latinity.

As the Western world passed out of Byz. control, however, knowledge of Latin became less relevant and rarer in the East. Though the Codex Justinianus and Digest were published in Latin, most of Justinian’s Novels are in Greek, and Greek translations of the Codex and Digesta were made for teaching purposes in his lifetime. Hērakleios in the early 7th C. abandoned Latin for Greek in the imperial titulature. Lawyers preserved some knowledge of Latin, often superficial, from the 8th to 11th C., and Constantine IX’s novel establishing a law school in Constantinople prescribes the teaching of Latin. From the 11th C. onward, closer, if sometimes hostile, contact with the West led to increasing knowledge of Latin in leading Byz. circles; Romanus III spoke Latin and Psellos claimed some knowledge of it. Still, cultural arrogance usually marked Byz. attitudes to the West and its language.

The Fourth Crusade and the division of the empire between Western powers strengthened Greek antipathy to Western culture. A few intellectuals and statesmen, however, began to see that Byz. had something to learn from the West. Maximos Planoüdes translated works of Cicero, Ovid, Augustine, and Boethius, and Demetrius and Prochoros Kydones in the later 14th C. translated the two summæ of Thomas Aquinas. Latin inscriptions occur widely in illuminated MSS of the 13th C., although the best known of these have been linked to a lectionary of 1298 rather than to the period of the Latin conquest of Constantinople as previously supposed. Latin incipits of the Gospels appear on codices held by Evangelists depicted in a number of 13th-C. books (Chatzimicolau-Paschou, CBMG 2, no.5). Bilingual Gospel books and a richly illustrated psalter (C. Havice, Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 26 [1984] 79–142) are also preserved. By the 15th C. some knowledge of Latin was common in Constantinople and widespread in regions under Western rule such as Crete, Cyprus, Chios, Attica, and the Ionian islands, but religious dissension and bitter historical memories precluded deeper understanding except among a limited group of Byz. intellectuals.


—R.B., A.C.

LATIN CHURCH IN CONSTANTINOPLE. See DOMINICANS; FRANCISCANS; LATIN EMPIRE; THOMAS MOROSINI.

LATIN EMPIRE, name conventionally applied to the political successor of the Byz. state founded at Constantinople on 13 Apr. 1204 by the LATINS
of the Fourth Crusade; it lasted until 25 July 1261. Contemporaries called it Romania or Imperium Constantinopolitanum. The Latin Empire claimed sovereignty over all former Byz. territory. While it sought to control its vassal states established in Greece (the kingdom of Thessalonike, the principality of Achaea, the duchy of Athens), it rarely exercised authority outside of Bithynia and eastern Thrace.

After the capture of Constantinople, a committee of 12 electors (six Venetian, six others) chose as emperor Baldwin of Flanders; when he vanished into a Bulgarian prison (1205), his brother Henry of Hainault became regent, then (once Baldwin’s death was known) emperor. The most capable of the Latin rulers, Henry secured the allegiance of Thessalonike, Athens, and Achaia and conciliated his Greek subjects. Upon his death (1216), the barons selected Peter of Courtenay, husband of Henry’s sister Yolande, but Peter, captured (1217) by Theodore Komnenos Doukas, perished in an Epirote prison. Yolande ruled until her death in 1219. She was eventually succeeded by her son Robert of Courtenay (1221–28). His successor was his brother Baldwin II; because Baldwin was too young to rule, John of Brienne became emperor (1231–37). As emperor, Baldwin II (1240–61) had to spend much of his time in western Europe in quest of assistance. (See table for a list of rulers of the Latin Empire.)

The Latin Empire retained many Byz. institutions. Wearing purple boots, the emperor was crowned in Hagia Sophia according to a modified Byz. ritual. He bestowed Latin versions of Byz. titles, such as cesar, sevastocrator, and protovestiarius, along with Western dignities such as seneschal and constable (B. Hendrickx, Byzantina 9 [1977] 187–217). In reality, the Latin Empire was a feudal state. Three documents formed a “constitution,” which each new emperor was required to uphold: a treaty between the Venetian and non-Venetian Crusaders (Mar. 1204) that provided for election of a Latin emperor and division of the spoils; the Partitio Romaniae (Sept./Oct. 1204); and a treaty (Oct. 1205) that regulated the Venetians’ relations to the emperor. A council of Venetian and other barons had an effective veto over the emperor’s actions.

To succeed, the Latin Empire needed to reconcile the Greek population to its rule. Constantinople and the smaller towns were for the most part inhabited by Greeks, who initially welcomed the Crusaders. A few Byz. nobles joined the Latins: briefly, Michael I Komnenos Doukas, before leaving to found his state in Epiros; permanently, Theodore Branas, influenced by his relationship with Agnes of France. Emp. Henry won the affection of the Greeks. The fairness of his decisions was celebrated. He appointed Branas ruler of Didymoteichon and Adrianople and tolerated Orthodoxy. His Greek subjects even fought for him against Byz. armies. Later emperors ignored the Greeks; Baldwin II vigorously repudiated the charge of having any Greek members in his council. The emperors relied on their Western vassals—chiefly French, who owed military service for their holdings—and on mercenaries.

Within the Latin Empire, Venice occupied a special position. Although entitled to extensive territories, Venice concentrated its rule on the islands and principal ports. A substantial portion of Constantinople belonged to Venice, which regained all the rights and exemptions it had enjoyed under Byz. Thus, the Venetians paid no commercial taxes, although those who held fiefs were obligated to the usual feudal duties. The Venetians were governed in Constantinople by a podestà and council who, with the leading barons, formed the emperor’s council. The Venetians’ power to veto imperial actions was reinforced by their near-monopoly of commerce and their control of the only fleet that could provide naval support for the Latin emperors. The podestà was closely controlled by the government of Venice.

Under the preconquest agreement of Mar. 1204, whichever party, Venetian or non-Venetian, did not gain the office of emperor was entitled to choose the patriarch of Constantinople. Thus, in 1204 the Venetians designated their own clerics to form a cathedral chapter for Hagia Sophia; the clerics then elected Thomas Morosini as patriarch. Pope Innocent III presently approved this election and granted papal recognition (previously denied) to Constantinople as a patriarchate. He and his successors sought to loosen Venetian control over the church in the Latin Empire, and until 1261 most later patriarchs were designated by the pope. Although the higher clergy was Latin, the parish priests largely remained Greek. Many refused to recognize the Latin patriarch but turned to the Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople re-established at Nicæa. The Franciscans and Do-
MINICANS won some converts and sponsored some church's decoration, notably a cycle of the life of St. Francis at Kalenderhane Cami.

In its early decades, the principal foes of the Latin Empire were to its west. When the Bulgarian Kalojlan offered alliance to the victorious Crusaders, the Latins arrogantly rejected him. Kalojlan defeated and captured Baldwin I, then killed Boniface of Montferrat in battle. Kalojlan's death allowed Emp. Henry to maneuver among the rival Bulgarian claimants Boril, Slav, and Strez; Henry married his illegitimate daughter to Slav and ca.1213 or 1214 himself married a daughter of Boril. The Greek rulers of Epirus were usually rivals, sometimes allies, of the Latin Empire. In 1224 Theodore Komnenos Doukas took Thessalonike, only to fall victim to the revived Bulgaria of John Asen II. The latter appropriated most of the Latin Empire's European territories and boasted in an inscription at Turinovo that the empire survived only by his permission.

Initially, the Crusaders despised the Byz. state re-created at Nicaea; they repeatedly defeated Theodore I Laskaris. But after John Asen's death (1241), John III Vatatzes acquired the territory the Bulgarians had taken from the Latin Empire; his domains enveloped the Latins to the east and west. Only transfusions of funds from western Europe, papal support, and the Venetian fleet preserved Constantinople. Unable to hire sufficient knights, the Latin Empire became so debilitated that even Pope Innocent IV was prepared to accept a Byz. recovery of Constantinople if Vatatzes would acknowledge papal supremacy. When in July 1261 the Venetian fleet departed for an expedition in the Black Sea, the army of Michael VIII Palaiologos was admitted to Constantinople by the citizens. Constantinople again became the Byz. capital, and Baldwin II fled to the West, where the empty title of Latin Emperor lingered through most of the 14th C.


---

### Rulers of the Latin Empire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin of Flanders</td>
<td>1204–1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry of Hainaut</td>
<td>1206–1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter of Courtenay</td>
<td>1217 (–1219?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolande</td>
<td>1217–1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert of Courtenay</td>
<td>1221–1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Brienne</td>
<td>1231–1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin II</td>
<td>1240–1261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### LATIN PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM

Established by the Crusaders in 1099 because the Orthodox patriarch Symeon II had fled. Westerners regarded the patriarch as the primate of the kingdom, subject to the pope's supervision, rather than as an independent patriarch in the Eastern tradition (Y. Katzir in *Crusade and Settlement* [Cardiff 1985] 169–75). A line of Orthodox patriarchs of Jerusalem continued at Constantinople. Orthodox monasteries, notably St. Sabas, survived in Palestine. By ca.1164, as a result of Manuel I's alliance with the kingdom of Jerusalem, Orthodox clerics reappeared at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre beside the Latin canons (H.E. Mayer, *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem* [Stuttgart 1977] 406f). That they outlasted Manuel's death is doubtful. After the Third Crusade, the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem resided at Acre.


---

### LATIN RITE

Conventional denomination of the religious usages, liturgical, canonical, monastic, etc., of the Roman Catholic churches, fully Latin only when the gradual shift from Greek to Latin was completed in Rome in the second half of the 4th C. Rome had a more pluralistic liturgical policy than the Byz. church, and there were several Latin rites besides the Roman, which originally prevailed only in the area around Rome, in southern Italy, and the islands (Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica). The rest of Italy had distinct local uses, not only in metropolitan sees like Milan (the Ambrosian rite) and Aquileia but also in over 40 other
centers. Roman uses gradually came to predominate throughout Europe in the 8th–9th C. under the Carolingian and Ottonian emperors.

Within the territory of the Byz. Empire the Latin church predominated in Byz. Italy (except for the very south), in North Africa west of Cyrenaica up to the Arab conquest, and in Pannonia, Illyricum, and Thrace. There were Latin churches in Constantinople and environs, Latin monasteries in Jerusalem, even an Amalfitan monastery on Mt. Athos. The Latin rite continued in peaceful coexistence with the Byzantine rite until the 11th C., when the Norman descent into Byz. Italy and the Crusades, esp. the imposition of a Latin Empire and church at Constantinople in 1204–61, made the Latin rite a threat to the Byz. (C.A. Frazee, BalkSt 19 [1978] 33–49). But even in times of tension, Latin churches had usually remained open at Constantinople and Catholics and Orthodox were admitted to communion in each others’ churches right through the 12th C. Eastern clergy in Palestine, Italy, and Cyprus submitted to Latin jurisdiction, and Latin priests could be ordained by Greek bishops even after 1204 (PG 119:959–64).

The Byz., more concerned with ritual uniformity than the Westerners, first impugned Armenian and Roman uses at the council in Trullo: for example, Saturday Fasting (par. 55—Mansi 11:969 AB). The dispute over the filioque arose in the 9th C., but more acrimonious still was the controversy over azymes in the time of Patr. Michael I Kerouarios. Michael induced Bp. Leo of Ohrid to write a letter to Bp. John of Trani fiercely attacking such Latin practices as Saturday fasting, azymes, and not singing alleluia in Lent (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.862). In a letter to Patr. Peter of Antioch, Kerouarios expanded the list of accusations: the Latins shave, they eat strangled things, their monks eat meat, they sing the Great Doxology wrongly, they add the filioque to the Creed, they allow two brothers to marry two sisters, they put salt in the candidate’s mouth at baptism, they impose clerical celibacy, their bishops wear rings, etc. (ibid., no.866). To all this one can add the dispute over whether salt should be used in baking the eucharistic bread (Latins yes, Byz. no [PG 120:837BC; 126:233D, 236A; 155:265]). The azyme dispute remained alive until the end of Byz., providing a large corpus of Byz. polemical writings (J.M. Hanssens, Institutiones Liturgicae de Ritualibus Orientalibus, vol. 2 [Rome 1930] 141–56).

In the 14th C. a new dispute arose, over whether the formula of the eucharistic consecration in the anaphora was the Words of Institution (“This is my body, this is my blood”) or the epiclesis. Though a far graver issue, this dispute provoked much less polemical writing than had the azyme controversy. It was dealt with by Mark Eugenikos (PO 17:426–34), Symeon of Thessalonike (PG 155:733–40), and, most masterfully and objectively, by Nicholas Kabasilas in Explanation of the Divine Liturgy, chs. 29–31. But in spite of the polemics, contacts between the two rites were frequent, and Latins studied, translated, and even adopted Byz. liturgical texts for their own use (S. Gero, GOrThR 25 [1978] 81f).

Actually, the differences between the rites were more those of language, form, and ethos; more of ceremonial and its mystagogic interpretation than of substance. Both rites had Eucharist—but the Latin rite anaphora had no consecratory epi- clesis to the Holy Spirit, and the Latins used azymes, did not add ΖΕΩΝ to the chalice, from the 12th C. refused the chalice to the laity, and then gradually abandoned giving communion to infants. Both rites celebrated the other sacraments—but the Latins admitted baptism by as- persion and pouring, whereas the Byz. required triple immersion. The Latin rite also separated confirmation from baptism, did not marry by crowning, did not have seven priests to celebrateunction, ordained to more minor orders, etc. Both had the full cycle of hours, but the Latin rite office had a monastic stamp, centered on the recitation of the psalmody, where the Byz. hours had received a massive infusion of liturgical poetry in the period after the first phase of Iconoclasms. The Latin rite is viewed as extremely sober and conservative (cf. E. Bishop, Liturgica historica [Oxford 1918] 1–19); the Byz. rite underwent far more development and change. Whereas the Byz. rite had undergone theological enrichment as a result of the early dogmatic controversies over the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit and had a decided Trinitarian thrust (L. Gillet, Questions liturgiques et paroissiales 9 [1924] 81–90), the Latin rite remained more Christological in its orientation.


—R.F.T.
LATINS (Λατίνοι, Latini). Latin was a term originally describing ethnic origin (the habitants of Latium) that was adopted by Roman law to designate certain groups of people with restricted legal rights; thus Junian Latini were manumitted slaves who were free during their lifetime but reverted to slavery at death, so that their property went to their patrons as peculium. Justinian I abolished the status of Latin in 531 (A. Steinwenter, RE 12 [1925] 922).

The Greek term Latinos—in a different meaning—reappears in Byz. sources from the 11th to 12th C.: absent from Theophanes or Skylitzes, it is found frequently in Anna Komnene, John Kinnamos, and Niketas Choniates. A patriarchal decision of July 1054 (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no. 869) normally uses the phrases “Italian language” and “Italian characters,” and only in a section translated from Latin does the term Latinos appear. Latinoi became a generic appellation for Western peoples. The introduction of the term in Byz. Greek reflects a new Byz. perception of the unity of the Western world that had been treated in earlier centuries as a conglomeration of ethne, tribes, each having its place within the empire. The granting of Byz. court titles (see DIGNITIES AND TITLES) to foreign princes (Western, Slavic, Caucasian, etc.) symbolized this worldview. The assumption of the imperial title by Charlemagne in 800 signaled the first crack in the concept of the universal Roman Empire; first the emperors of the Franks, then the rulers neighboring the Byz. (Germans, Bulgarians) came to rival the basilieus, and the popes asserted their primacy over the ecumenical patriarch.

Late Roman ideology cherished the image of a united Mediterranean, even though an economic and cultural breach began to develop as early as the 4th C., and by the 7th C. the linguistic unity was totally disrupted. Contacts between East and West continued in the form of embassies and pilgrimage, whereas commercial, literary, and artistic exchange became sporadic. Only in a few regions (primarily in Italy) did the two cultures meet on a regular basis.

In the 11th and 12th C. the interconnections between Byz. and the “Latin” world intensified. The colonies of Italian merchants on Byz. soil became sizable. Eustathios of Thessalonike counted 60,000 Latins in Constantinople (Eust. Thess., Capture 34.2–3); they received concessions more significant than those the Rus’ had enjoyed in the 10th C. Western mercenaries occupied an important position in the Byz. army, and the Normans (as well as the English and Germans) replaced contingents from Rus’. Matrimonial connections between the Byz. and Latins became more frequent: the genealogical tables published by Grumel (Chronologie 363f), although incomplete, demonstrate a drastic difference between the matrimonial policy of the Macedonian dynasty (867–1056) and that of the Komnenoi (1081–1185). In the first table only two foreign marriages are recorded—with a Bulgarian and a Kievan ruler. The second table has 15 foreign marriages, of which only one (the earliest) is with an eastern princess (from the Caucasus). The others are with Latins: six with nobles from the Crusader states, three with France (and Montferrat and Montpellier; the two marriages of Agnes of France are counted as one), three from Hungary, one each from Germany and Austria. Cultural exchange also became regular, esp. in the sphere of theology that contributed so much to the definition of “national” identity. Literary interchange is less evident: however, the epic of Digenes Akritas was known in the West, and the mutual influence of Western and Byz. erotic romances is plausible. In the realm of art, Byz. impact on the West intensified from the 10th C. on, esp. in the period of the Crusades (see ART AND THE WEST).

After the capture of Constantinople in 1204 by the Fourth Crusade (the Norman invasion of 1185 prepared the way), the era of a peaceful, if unstable, balance of power ended. The Latins came to be viewed as oppressors of the Byz. From the Latin viewpoint, Byz., which in the 12th C. had seemed to be a country of great wealth, was perceived from the 14th C. onward as impoverished and unable to pay its debts. Byz. was an easy prey for bold invaders or even discontented mercenaries such as the Catalan Grand Company. The divergency in religious belief and practice, focusing more and more on questions of rite, increased. A modus vivendi with the Latins could not be reached despite individual attempts to relieve tensions; the cohabitation of Greeks and Latins and emergence of mixed population groups (e.g., Gasmoulo) in areas such as the Morea; the active literary interaction that resulted in such works as the Chronicle of the Morea, the Chronicle of the Tocco, and Greek chivalric romances; and an urgent
need for Western military assistance against the Ottoman invasion.

The stereotype of the Latins as it was established by 1204 included such features as religious divergence (esp. with regard to the Filioque and AAZymes but also differences in vestments and haircut of the clergy, fastdays, etc.), arrogance and greed, military prowess, and disdain for literacy. A few Byz., however, were sufficiently enlightened to distinguish the “good” Latins from the “bad” ones, and in the 14th C. a strong current of pro-Latin sentiment developed in some cultural circles (e.g., around the Kydone brothers).


—A.K.

LATOMOU MONASTERY. See Hosios David.

LATRINES (sing. ἀθέδρων). The building of latrines, together with the installation of PLUMBING, such as sewers, gutters, and water pipes, was subject to strict regulations that were introduced to ensure public and private amenities. The legend of ARIUS described his death in a latrine (A. Leroy-Molinghen, Byzantion 58 [1968] 105–11), in some versions in a public toilet. John Moschos (PG 87:3:2897) relates that the archbishop of Thessalonike, Thalelais, also died in a latrine, and his partisans found him with his head down the hole (solem). The legend of the building activity in Constantinople of the architect Euphratlas portrayed him as concerned with sewage systems. According to a vita of Constantine I (AB 77 [1959] 87.30–36), a system of sewers was built in Constantinople through which was channelled “the waste from latrines and slaughterhouses.”

Legal texts give evidence that in private homes latrines were built in the courtyard and each was provided with drain pipes and gutters. Harmanopoulos in the Hexabiblos (Harm. 2:4.78), repeating the building regulations of Julian of Askalon (cf. Ja. Sjuzjumov, ADSV 1 [1960] 3–34), described two types of cesspool (koprodochion): one with thick stone walls; the other simply dug out of the earth. The first type had to be at least 3 ells (pechies) distant from a neighbor’s wall; the second no less than 6.5 ells. Washing facilities (christeria) could be constructed in a courtyard, provided they caused no harm to neighbors (Harm. 2.4.79). In crowded apartment houses sanitary conditions were poorer. The law (Harm. 2:4.71) forbade throwing human waste from upper floors, yet John Tzetzes, who was living on the second floor of a three-story building, complained that the 12 children and the pigs of a decoan who lived upstairs “urinated so much that they produced navigable rivers” (ep. 18, p. 33.5–16). For chamber pots the Byz. used special vessels (amis, etc.) made of clay, glass, and even silver and gold (Koukoules, Bios 2:276). Dreams about latrines occupy an important place in the Oneirokritikon of Achmet ben Sirin (pp. 30.11–28, 62.3–63.21): images of urinating or evacuating one’s bowels in various places were interpreted as portents of good or bad fortune.

Archaeological Evidence. The large public latrines of Roman and late Roman date continued in use until the 6th–7th C., but apparently not beyond (Scranton, Architecture 68). At Corinth a private house of the 6th–7th C. had a latrine located immediately off the main room (ibid. 19–21), while simple unlined pits, probably in courtyards or behind houses, have been identified as Byz. latrines. Latrines are frequently found in towers and under stairs of fortifications, and elaborate arrangements were often made for them in Crusader castles (e.g., at Saranda Kolones in Paphos).


LATROS (Δάτρος), anc. Latmos, monastic center in Caria, northeast of Miletos. Its numerous forts, fortified monasteries, and hermits’ caves were located on islands in the lake of Herakleia (Bafa) and immediately to the east on the slopes of Mt. Latros (Beşparmak); most remain anonymous. The early history of Latros is obscure. According to local tradition, Latros was settled in the 7th C. by monks fleeing the Arab invasion of the Sinai. The
hegoumenos Isidore attended the Second Council of Nicaea in 787. When the monk Paul, later called Paul of Latros, came to the region in the early 10th C., three monasteries already existed there: Kellibara, the Savior, and Karya. Paul founded the Stylos (named probably in honor of the apostle Paul, the “pillar” of the church), which was dedicated to the Theotokos. Leo VI granted the monastery a proasteion and other lands (MM 4:324.11–15). A fragment of the Latros cartulary containing about 15 documents from 987 to the mid-13th C. has survived (MM 4:290–329; B. Pančenko, IRAIK 9 [1904] 142–45). These acts deal important is the case of the peasants of the village of Sampson (MM 4:290–95, a.1217—see Reg 3, no.1693), which sheds some light on the institution of morte.

In the 11th C. Christodoulou of Patmos was hegoumenos of Stylos as well as protos of Latros’s monastic confederation. Latros flourished during the empire of Nicæa; in 1222, 11 monasteries were under the authority of its kathegoumenos and archimandrite (RegPar, fasc. 4, no.1231), a title disputed between the superiors of Stylos and Kellibara. By the end of the 13th C., however, Latros was in decline as a result of Turkish encroachment; Kellibara with only nine monks was merged with Michael VIII’s new foundation of St. Demetrios in Constantinople. By the 14th C. Latros disappears from the sources.

Restle (Wall Painting 3, pls. 542–43) has assigned a mid-6th-C. date to the wall paintings in the so-called Pantokrator Cave. Painted Gospel cycles in a cave chapel at Yediler—probably to be identified with Kellibara—and in the Stylos have been variously dated in the 11th–13th C. The Stylos also contains scenes of the funeral of Paul and other scenes from the saint’s life.


LAUSIAC HISTORY. See Palladios.

LAUSIASKOS (Λουσιακός), a hall (triklinos) in the Great Palace constructed under Justinian II. It was located near the Triklinos of Justinian and the Chryso-triklinos and was connected by a bronze gate with the kitchen, situated probably under the private chambers of the emperor. The aristeion, the emperor’s private dining room, was also located nearby. The connection of the Lausiakos with the banquet-kitchen area suggests that the oiketarioi of Lausiakos were involved in the organization of banquets. The Lausiakos played a role in the palace ceremonies as a place through which various processions passed. Some emperors (Leo V, Theophilus) used it for administrative meetings and theological discussions. Manuel I is said to have restored and adorned the Lausiakos.


LAUGHTER (γέλως) was defined by MELETTIOS THE MONK (PG 64:1137B) as “agitated movement of the facial muscles or a broadening of [the same] muscles caused by the motion of internal organs.” While antiquity accepted laughter as a positive emotion and considered it a proper quality of Homeric gods, the church fathers, esp. Jerome and Basil the Great, rejected laughter. Laughter, for Jerome, was a sign of ungodliness and would be punished on the Day of Judgment. According to Basil (PG 31:961C), it was incompatible with a Christian vocation—Christ, he said, never laughed. More tolerant of laughter was John Chrysostom, who distinguished between permissible and excessive laughter. Monastic communities were particularly hostile to laughter. The church fathers, however, accepted laughter as an expression of spiritual joy and as derision of the pagan world and of mundane objects.

Despite all these invectives against laughter by the ecclesiastical establishment, the Byz. enjoyed a good laugh at their banquets (with professional mimes as entertainers) and elaborated such genres of humor as satire, parody, and puns. They believed that laughter possessed magic power; for example, late Byz. vernacular literature depicted the dance of laughter as a magical means against death. Thomas Magistros includes the expression “broad laughter” (i.e., not thundering) in his Lexicon (Elogia vocum atticарum [Hildesheim–New York 1970] 293.4).


—A.K.
LAVRA (λαόρα), a type of monastery. The word originally meant a narrow lane or an alley in a city (Athanasiós of Alexandria, PG 25:764B); Eu- stathios of Thessalonike, who was often critical of monasticism, adds that the word spodesis(lavra) (lit. “streetwalker”) meant a whores (Kazhdan-Frank- lin, Studies 152). Evagrius Scholastikos (HE 1:21, ed. Bidez-Parmentier, 29.24–25) defines a laura as a monastery in which everyday life (diaita) is individual, but social life (politeia) is directed to the common purpose of loving God.

In a laura a group of dispersed monastic cells (kellia) was associated with a central complex containing a church, refectory, common hall, and various outbuildings (storerooms, stables, bakery). The monks lived as solitaries during the week, occupied with prayer and manual labor, but owed obedience to a hegoumenos and assembled on weekends at the laura to attend services together and to obtain food and materials for their handwork. A laura thus represented a compromise between eremitic and cenobitic monasticism.

Cyril of Skythopolis, when describing Palestinian monasticism, usually contrasts the laura and the koinobion, although he sometimes notes the transformation of a laura into a koinobion “in accordance with God’s will” (p.58.29). By the 8th C., however, the difference between the terms seems to have disappeared. In later centuries, on Mt. Athos, the term laura was applied to the larger monasteries (Great Lavra, Iveron, and Vatopedi) and to Karyes. Lavrai were almost invariably established in remote rural locations, but on rare occasions the sources refer to urban and suburban monasteries as lavrai, e.g., the laura of Kaisarios in 9th-C. Rome (AAAS Nov. 4:662F) and the monastery of St. Michael at Analpous, referred to as he tes lavras tou archistrategou mou (Pachym., ed. Bekker, 2:203.6).


LAVRA, GREAT (ἡ μεγίστη Λαόρα), also called the Lavra of Athanasios, monastery located near the southeastern tip of the peninsula of Mt. Athos. It was founded by Athanasios of Athos in 963, with the financial assistance of the general and future emperor Nikephoros (II) Phokas, who intended to retire to the Holy Mountain. Although called a laura, the monastery was really a koino- bion with which a limited number of hesychasts were associated. Athanasios’s typikon permitted only five monks to live in kellia outside the Lavra. As soon as the kitor Nikephoros became emperor, in July 963, the Lavra obtained the status of an imperial monastery. In 964 Nikephoros issued three chrysothele on behalf of Lavra, guaranteeing its independence from ecclesiastical authorities, limiting the number of monks to 80, and providing it with an annual grant (solemnion) of 244 gold pieces and a quantity of wheat. Athana- sios supervised the construction of a large monastic complex, including a Church of the Theotokos, cells, a kitchen, refectory, hostel, and waterworks.

The number of monks soon increased to 120, and by mid-11th C. reached 700. In 1045 the typikon of Constantine IX Monomachos specified that the hegoumenos of Lavra had precedence over all other hegoumenoi, even the protos; Lavra re- tained this primacy in perpetuity. Lavra remained an imperial monastery: in 1052 the monks of Lavra asked Constantine IX to appoint an influential patron to the monastery in order to protect it from any new fiscal burdens (kainotomiai, epe- reiai) that might be imposed by local archontes (Lavra 1, no.31.24–25). In response the emperor sent a praepositas, the chief of the kytón, and the kanikleios John to carry out the mission.

The increase in Lavra’s estates, which were signifi- cant in the 11th–12th C., came to a halt under Latin rule. After the mid-13th C., however, the monastery continued to acquire further property: in 1259 Michael VIII confirmed the properties of Lavra and added the village of Toxompos; Andronikos II was even more generous to the monks. At the same time Patr. Athanasios I attempted to put Lavra under the control of the patriarchate. Lavra was evidently involved in the political and religious conflicts of the second quarter of the 14th C., having as its hegoumenoi such luminaries as Philotheos Kokkinos and Gregory Palamas. On the other hand, some dis- sident elements penetrated into the monastery, although the information about their activity is obscure: thus Andrew Palaiologos, one of the Zealot leaders, ceded a portion of his property to Lavra; the Latinophile Prochoros Kydones was connected with the monastery; and in the 1360s the case of a certain Moses Phakraces (a favorite of Philotheos Kokkinos) shook the community
and required the patriarch's intervention; unfortunately, we do not know the basis of the charges against him. The internal problems were aggravated by military threats: the raids of the Catalan Grand Company were followed by the Serbian occupation of Mt. Athos, and then the brief establishment of Ottoman authority in 1877. In the early 15th C. Manuel II still had some prerogatives over Lavra and levied a third of the charatation (the Turkish tax harae). In 1430, Thessalonike and all of Mt. Athos were finally conquered by the Ottomans.

The rich library of Lavra contains over 2,000 MSS, of which about 800 are of Byz. date. The archives of Lavra are also a precious resource for the Byzantinist, since they contain 172 acts dating before 1453.


Architecture of the Lavra. The katholikon of the Lavra, begun in 962/3, consists of a cross-domed core enlarged into a triconch by the addition of apses to the cross-arms. The naos is covered by a dome on piers. Two parekklesia flank a deep narthex that, in 1814, replaced the original inner and outer narthexes. The church's bronze doors were made in Constantinople ca. 1002 (Ch. Bouras, *JÖB* 24 [1975] 229–50). The exterior of the church is rather austere with little embellishment. Directly in front of the church and sharing its axis is a phiale and, further away but still on the same axis, the refectory or trapeza. The church plan type used here for the first time, and called the Athone type by some scholars, was emulated in later monastic churches in northern Greece and the Balkans.


Art Treasures of the Lavra. The Lavra possesses the richest collection (about 30) of icons of Byz. date on the peninsula: outstanding are panels of St. Panteleemon of the first half of the 12th C. and an early 14th-C. mosaic icon of John the Evangelist (Furlan, *Icune a mosaic*, no.18). A double-sided icon of the Anastasis and Pentecost is now in Leningrad (*Iksusstvo Vizantii* 3, no.473). The monastery's collection dates back at least to the early 11th C., when Kosmas, a former ekklesiarches of the Lavra, ordered a portrait of St. Athanasios from the Constantinopolitan painter Panteleon. The treasury also contains a silver cross supposedly donated by Nikephoros II Phokas (A. Grabar, *CahArch* 19 [1969] 99–125), the so-called Phokas lectionary (K. Weitzmann, *Sekond* 8 [1936] 83–98), and a gold paten of Thomas Preljubović. The luxurious late 11th-C. evangelion in the Lavra treasury or skewophylakion (K. Weitzmann, *Byzantine Liturgical Psalters and Gospels* [London 1980] pt.XI [1936], 83–98) has full-page miniatures of three of the Great Feasts within wide ornamental borders. It may have been an imperial gift, though not, as tradition has it, from Nikephoros II Phokas. The Lavra library includes many other illustrated Gospel books and evangelia of the 11th and 12th C.


LAVRATON. See PORTRAITS AND PORTRAITURE: Imperial Portraits.

LAW, CANON. See CANON LAW.

LAW, CIVIL. The totality of the laws and rules of the empire; it comprised private law (the law of persons, things, succession, obligations) as well as criminal law and public law. Justinian I (*Institutes* 1:2:1) distinguishes *jus civilis*, as a system of laws established in a particular state, from the *jus naturale* that is common for all mankind; the idea of natural law was not disregarded by the Byz., but their major categories were civil law and canon law.

The foundation of Byz. civil law was the Justinianic *Corpus Juris Civilis*, which summarized the achievements of Roman jurisprudence. Written mostly in Latin, the *Corpus* was paraphrased in Greek by the antecessores, and their translations were used in the later legislative books *Epanagoge*, *Prochiron*, and *Basilika*. Another set of legislative works diverged to some extent
from the Corpus—thus the Ecloga introduced a new approach to the laws of marriage and to criminal law, and the Novels of Leo VI tried to change regulations that were obsolete and contradicted contemporary reality. The legislators of the 10th C. (Romanos I through Basil II) tackled problems arising from the contemporary situation in the countryside. Later emperors dealt with new issues, such as the marriage of slaves (Alexios I), or tried to reorganize legal procedure.

The works of jurists stayed mostly within the framework of the Corpus: they produced indices (synopseis) to the Basilika (e.g., Tepoukeitos), excerpts, treatises on specific questions (e.g., De peculius, De actionibus), and general surveys (Harmenopoulos). Some jurists, however, illustrated the general principles of the Basilika with examples drawn from their own practice (Peira) or described their cases at length (Demetrios Chomatenos, John Apokaukos).

Unlike Western countries, Byz. had very few texts devoted to customary law (see Custom): to this category belonged the Farmer’s Law and the Book of the Eparch as well as miscellaneous texts regulating fiscal and administrative activity (treatises on taxation, Taktika). Byz. customary law is reflected primarily in documents, such as contracts and purchase deeds, in monastic Typography, in wills, in the decrees of emperors and their officials, in patriarchal charters, etc. The scarcity of available information means that literary sources, such as patristic texts, later romances (P. Pieler, JOB 20 [1971] 189–221), or hagiography (G. Bourdara, To dikaia sta hagiologika keimena [Athens 1987]), assume a considerable importance.

The study of Byz. civil law has hitherto focused on the Justinianic Corpus; later legal texts are used primarily to fill in gaps in the Corpus tradition or to clarify difficult passages. The analysis of Byz. civil law as actually practiced is still rudimentary, and the legal significance of surviving documents has been appreciated only for the papyri and the acts from Byz. Italy (M. Amelotti in SBNG [Galatina 1983] 184). The general assumption, then, has been that the Byz. regulated their lives by the norms of Roman law, an assumption that is supported by the tendency of the Byz. themselves to treat both the Basilika and the Corpus as valid legislative collections. However, under the cover of Roman law some more or less substantial changes were taking place in the following areas:

1. Emphasis was put on the decisive role of the state and the emperor as its representative. The emperor was proclaimed not only "the living law" (as early as Justinian I) but also the sole source of all administrative authority (thus the scholion to Basil. ser. B. 9:3839, abrogating Basil. 60:46.1). He acquired supreme right to the land so that any parcel that he entered could be declared imperial property (PG 114:1156A).

2. The principles of public law prevailed over those of private law. Thus, ownership came to be treated as an accessory to the tax payment, and freedom interpreted as exemption from taxation.

3. The role of the church increased. Its rules became moral obligations, esp. as civil law began to converge with canon law. Its right to succession was confirmed, and the church was granted—like the state—a third of an intestate inheritance (abiotikon). The Epanagoge even suggested the concept of two equal powers, that of emperor and patriarch; at any rate, the patriarchal court was given the right of appeal over civil court decisions.

4. The bonds of marriage were strengthened, and the formality of marriage rites increased.

5. Slavery was moderated: not only did the church encourage manumissions, but the family of a slave was given legal status.

6. The rights of neighbors were developed—both as protimesis and as a responsibility for the taxes of the neighboring allotments; the Roman principle superficies solo eedit ceased to exist. At the same time various forms of partnership were encouraged.

7. Elements of semifudal law were introduced—in the division of property (pronoia, charistikion) and in the status of the dependent peasantry (paroikoi).

8. The written form of contract tended to replace the oral form; stipulations degenerated into a vague kind of written guarantee; the number of witnesses deemed necessary increased.

9. Legal procedure lost its flexibility, and rigid lists of penalties were introduced.

10. Many subtleties of Roman law were forgotten, and its strict terminological distinctions obscured; jurists repeated traditional Roman legal terms often without understanding their significance.

The history of Byz. civil law can be tentatively divided into several periods: from the 4th to the early 7th C. Roman law dominated; in the 7th to
early 9th C., the period of the Ecloga and the Farmer’s Law, there were attempts to attach some customary, biblical, and Near Eastern rules to the remnants of Roman law; the mid-6th–10th C. was the period of encyclopedism and “accumulation”—“pure” Roman law was restored in the Basilika and similar legislative books, and numerous treaties were issued to regulate court life, military organization, trade activity, and the fiscal system; during the 11th–13th C. there was a revival of legal activity in the form of commentaries on normative texts—the most independent legal minds of the period were Eustathios Rhomaios, Balsamon, and Chomatemos—and the need for scrutinizing practical cases was appreciated. In the final period, the tendency toward systematization again prevailed.


——A.K.

LAW, PUBLIC. The 6th-C. principle, “public law is that which concerns the affairs of the Roman state, private law that which concerns the interests of individuals” (Digest 1.1.1.2 = Basil. 2.1.1), was a distinction made in the law schools with few theoretical or practical implications; nor can a requirement for a legal-theoretical clarification of the relationship of public law and private law that is of any significance be established for the following period. The lack of such reflection is explicable from the circumstance that the precise demarcation of public law from the entire mass of norms is only considerable when consequences are connected with it, that is, with regard to legislative competence, jurisdiction, justiciability, and the friction of private law and public law. As long as every legal norm drew its legitimacy from the emperor, and he was not restricted with regard to the composition and execution of norms—as was the case in the entire Byz. period—then any division of Byz. law into public and private law was artificial. A consideration of Byz. law with regard to the existence of public law can therefore make no concepts that are specific to the Byz. period but can employ only the terminology in use since modern times. The latter understands by public law: (1) the law of state organization, that is, the distribution of the areas of supreme command (taxation, police, army, jurisdiction, economic control, etc.) among certain “organs” of the state; (2) administrative law, that is, the rules governing the execution of laws through these designated organs.

If the fundamental principles of both these areas are laid down in law, this definition is called a “constitution.” In these areas the late Roman period up to and including Justinian I was legislatively the most productive. Book 1, titles 14–57, and books 10–12 of the Codex Justinianus, as well as approximately half the novels of Justinian I, are concerned with the subject of public law. This legalization of political measures, which is based on the motto (armis et legibus gubernare) and relies on the efficiency of the administrative apparatus executing the law, did not persist in Byz.: the emperors increasingly renounced the legislative regulation of state organization and administration. Notable legislative undertakings are represented by the Book of the Eparch and titles 2–11 of the Epanagoge (which remained an experiment). For the rest, apart from sporadic legislative attempts in the area of public law, only jurisdiction remains of lasting interest.

The diminishing legislative activity in the area of public law does not mean that Byz. had no normative notions concerning good state government and state administration. Such concepts are rather to be reconstructed from sources such as the Mirrors of Princes, the Notitia Dignitatum and the Taktika, the De ceremoniis and De administrando imperio as well as the admittedly rare deliberations of jurists such as Chomatianos. Whether the normative concepts transmitted in this matter should be entitled an (unwritten) “constitution” is still under discussion.


——M.Th.F.

LAW, ROMAN, heavily oriented towards practice, was determined and developed first by professional jurists and later increasingly by the legal statements of the imperial chancery. By the order of Justinian I this law was made definitive in the so-called Corpus Juris Civilis. Both this Corpus
and the Novels of Justinian I make claim—at least in the sphere of private law—to reproducing a uniform law of the empire that is firmly bound to Roman tradition and that in principle recognizes neither regional nor time-specific peculiarities. This conservative and exceedingly reverent attitude toward Roman law was assumed by later Byz. emperors in their legislation and by jurists in their composition of law books. In spite of certain deviations from the Roman tradition—sometimes conscious, sometimes involuntary (e.g., the regulation of customs by Leo VI or the creation of really new law through the agrarian legislation of the 10th C.)—there never ensued any fundamental criticism of Roman law. On the contrary, efforts can be observed to reappropriate this temporarily (esp. in the 7th and 8th C.) forgotten or neglected law.

The discrepancy between “official” Byz.-Roman law and the law as practiced is most obvious during the last two centuries of Byz. The charters reveal that fundamental concepts of Roman law had over the course of time either become virtually meaningless (e.g., servitus) or were misunderstood or reinterpreted (e.g., ownership, possession). Roman law lived on as a theoretical claim and in its terminology, but with the changed conditions of life and the disappearance of a highly professional class of jurists, the original meaning of its terminology and the specifically juristic thinking in these categories was largely lost.

Reception of Roman Law. The reception of Roman law is an expression that designates the discovery and revision of Roman law—in the form of the Corpus Juris Civilis—in the states of western Europe from the 12th C. onward, as a result of which Roman law became the basis of their legal system. There was no comparable reception of Roman law in this sense in Byz., where it had never been entirely lost and was assumed to be continuously present and valid. Nevertheless, a kind of “reappropriation” of Roman law, which had been translated into Greek in the 6th C., did take place, in two significant steps: first, through the anakatharsis ton palaion romanon (Schminck, Rechtsbüchern 33–38, 65f), that is, the preparation of the complete text in the Basilika; and second, through a substantial reworking of the content, particularly in the 11th C. The latter was achieved through a decision-making practice reflecting Roman legal dogma (petra); through reinforced use of the oldest available law texts, namely the writings of the Antecessores, which were inserted as scholia to the Basilika text; through the transmission of the Latin juristic language in teaching (Psellos) and in Latin-Greek legal lexika (glossae—Lexica juridica byzantina, ed. L. Burgmann et al. [= FM 8 (1990)]); as well as through the systematic presentation of the rules of Roman law in treatises (De peculiis, Meditatio de nudis pactis, Tractatus de creditis).


LAW, VULGAR, an expression coined by the legal historian E. Levy to characterize the law of the late Roman Empire in the West. The expression refers not only to the formal elements of a legal principle (its outward, linguistic form) but also to its substance (the consistency and precision of the regulation). It derives its notional content as a “low level of style” from a notional opposition to a “higher level of style,” initially that of classical Roman law. The expression has been extensively adopted by legal/historical scholarship and serves to characterize varying phenomena. Thus, it is used to contrast rural provincial phenomena of a linguistic or material kind from the legal standard of the capital (“provincial law”: e.g., the law of the Byz. provinces in Italy); to designate special ethnic law (“folk law”: forms of law of the Slavs and Armenians living on Byz. territory) as opposed to state and imperial law; to contrast simply structured reflections on law with the complex works of more exacting, educated men (e.g., the Synopsis Minor versus the Synopsis Basilicorum); and to compare different levels of legal culture (e.g., the Ecloga versus the law of Justinian I). Since the term vulgar is both vague and, as a rule, used in a perjorative sense, its application should be accompanied by a statement of the criterion for evaluation and an exact description of the related phenomena.

LAW IN ITALY, BYZANTINE. With the Sanc-tio Pragmatica of the year 554 (Appendix 7 to the Novels of Justinian I [= CIC 3:799–802]), the validity of the Roman-Byz. law contained in the Corpus Juris Civilis was extended to the reconquered Italian regions. In the course of the later history of southern Italy and Sicily the continued existence of Byz. law is documented in various types of sources. The Byz. origin of the material is most evident in the Prochiron Legum, which was produced on Italian soil. Whether other law books, esp. the Ecloga ad Prochirum mutata, also originated in Italy is disputed. Nevertheless, that many Byz. legal texts were at least known in medieval Italy is attested by the large number of legal MSS of southern Italian provenance. The use of Byz. law by the Greek-speaking population of southern Italy is indicated by the fact that the documents share a set of institutions (e.g., hypobo-lon, theoretron, protimesis) with the law of the Byz. Empire. Other institutions used both in Byz. and in southern Italy and Sicily may merely have a common basis in Roman law. As for Norman-Staufen legislation, both the Assises of Ariano of 1140 (L. Burgmann, FM 5 [1982] 179–92) and the constitutions of Melfi of 1231 (cf. T. von der Lieck-Buyken, Die Konstitutionen Friedrichs II. [Cologne-Vienna 1978]) are based on Roman law, but the latter esp. shows clear traces of post-Justinianic Byz. law (e.g., nose-cutting as punishment for adultery; the prohibition against the acquisition of land by monasteries; formal regulations for marriage).


LAW IN SLAVIC COUNTRIES, BYZANTINE.

Byz. law was introduced into Slavic lands along with Orthodox dogma and liturgy in the wake of Byz. missionary work in the area. In Great Moravia part of the Synagoce of Fifty Titles was translated into Slavonic by Methodios himself. The Zakon Sudnyj Ljudem may date from the same time, even if its place of origin remains controversial. Bulgaria and later the Slavic mon-asteries on Mt. Athos must have played a large role as centers for the translation of legal literature. From the 11th C. onward, most texts were reaching Rus’, where they were assembled in collections such as the Kormćaj Kniga and supplemented in time by additional translations. The Byz. legal literature available there ultimately included the commentaries of the canonists of the 12th C., the Pandektaia of Nikon of the Black Mountain, numerous novels, synodal acts and treatises (esp. on marriage law), the so-called Mo-saic Law, and, from the sphere of secular law, the Ecloga, the Prochiron, and the Painter’s Law (Zemledelčeskij zakon). Under Ste-fan Uroš IV Dušan, who proclaimed himself "Tsar of the Serbs and Greeks," Byz. legislation was imitated in Serbia and translations were made of the Syntagma of Matthew Blastare as well as of the short compilation of civil law known as the "law of Justinian."


LAW IN THE EAST, BYZANTINE. A part of early Byz. Canon Law survived among the Eastern churches after their separation from the church of Constantinople in the 5th C. But with the exception of Georgia, where an adaptation of the Nomokanon of the Fourteen Titles was made in the 12th C., the new post-Chalcedonian canons were received in the East only with great reservation. The oldest Syriac translations of Byz. sec-ular law texts likewise stem primarily from pre-Justinianic sources, namely the Syro-Roman law-book and the Sententiae Syriacae, two collections of Roman provincial law of Eastern origin dating from the 5th C.; the Greek originals are lost. The Syro-Roman lawbook was widely disseminated in the Christian East in several languages. Moreover, Byz. legal texts of secular content were received almost everywhere. At the end of the 12th C., Nersès of Lambron made an Armenian translation of the Ecloga with its Appendix as well as the Nomos Stratiotikos and the so-called Mo-
SAIC LAW. Coptic ecclesiastical law collections of the 13th and 14th C. contained, among other things, the Ecloga with Appendix and the Prochiron; the date of composition of the Arabic translations is uncertain, as is the possibility that they were transmitted via the Melchites.


LAW SCHOOLS. The system of private education in law typical of the early Roman Empire was replaced, during the late Roman Empire, by a system of state universities. Theodosios II, in the constitution of 27 Feb. 425, prohibited legal education “within private walls” and organized a law school in Constantinople supported by the state. There was another reputable law school in Berytus. Some professors of these law schools are known by name: Theophilos, Dorotheos, Thalelaios, and so on. The program of legal education, as prescribed by Justinian I, included a year for the study of the Institutes, three years more for the Digest, and the fifth year for the Codex Justinianus. Since knowledge of Latin was declining in Constantinople, the teachers (antecessores) suggested the Indices—Greek adaptations—and translations of these texts provided with protheorai (examples or digressions); paragraphai, or notes; and finally interpretation of “the books themselves,” paraphrased in Greek. The method of erotapokriseis was widely used.

From the 7th C. onward, this elaborate system was abandoned, even though some scholars (e.g., W. Wolska-Conus, TM 8 [1981] 531–41) claim uninterrupted continuity of legal education. The Book of the Eparch refers to nomikoi and teachers within the framework of a corporation of notaries. While knowledge of law was often claimed to be something every Rhomaios had to possess, and professional lawyers are known at least in the 11th and 12th C., jurisprudence remained an element of general (primarily urban) culture rather than professional erudition. The state-sponsored schools in Constantinople (those of John [VIII] Xiphilinos and Michael Psellos in the mid-11th C.), probably parts of the so-called University of Constantinople, appear to have been short-lived, connected with an individual scholar, rather than with an institution.


LAWYER (σωμήγορος, Lat. advocatus). Advocati (sometimes called scholastikoi) acted as legal advisers, while nomikoi drew up contracts. In the late Roman Empire, advocati formed associations in major cities (Constantinople, Alexandria, etc.). The membership in these colleges was limited; thus, Leo I decreed (Cod.Just. II 7.17) that the prefecture of Illyricum should have 150 lawyers. Their honorarium was fixed in Diocletian’s Princ. Edict as 250–1,000 denarii. Ammianus Marcellinus wrote an angry tirade against advocati who “sow the seeds” for all sorts of quarrels and “sharpen their venal tongues to attack the truth” (Amm.Marc. 30.4.9–19), underscoring not only the rivalry between lawyers but their clashes with judges. It has been conjectured (by R. Taubenschlag in Festschrift Fritz Schulz [Weimar 1951] 192) that the role of lawyers was reduced as that of judges grew.

From the 11th C. onward, however, Greek texts again often mention lawyers. Constantine IX’s novel on the law school in Constantinople prescribes the formation of two categories of jurists—notaries (tabonarioi) and synegori; Balsamon states that synegori are organized into a college led by a primikerios and receive their salary (siteresia demosika) from the state (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 1:160.15–21). A novel of Manuel I expresses indignation at the endless speeches in court of synegori, which delay the proceedings (R. Macrides, "Justice" 126.54–59); the same novel calls for synegori to be assigned to the courts (138.217–26, 180, n.208). Sometimes there was rivalry between lawyers and canonists (M.T. Fögen in Cu- pido legum 65). The term nomotribounmenoi in Chomatenos apparently refers to those who are experts in legal knowledge.

LAZAR, prince of Serbia (from 1371); born Pri-pleac near Novo Brdo ca.1329, died Kosovo Polje 15 June 1389. Son of Pribac Hrebelenjanović, logothetes of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, Lazar married Milica, a descendant of Stefan Nemanja’s son Vukan, and gained control over northern Serbia following the death of Stefan Uroš V. Using diplomacy, dynastic marriage, and military force (in alliance with the Bosnian ban Tvrtko), Lazar expanded his principality to Braničevo, Niš, Kru-ševac, and Novo Brdo, gaining control also over the mines of Rudnik. These victories, however, made him a vassal of Hungary. In 1375 reconciliation with the Byz. church in Constantinople was achieved over the matter of the separate Serbian patriarchate, which had been proclaimed at Peć in 1346. Lazar refused to acknowledge the suzerainty of Hungary in 1382 and attacked and plun-dered Belgrade, which was under Hungarian control. He had, however, to avoid a confrontation with Sigismund of Hungary when the Ottoman threat to Serbia worsened. Murad I invaded Serbia and defeated Lazar in 1389 at the battle of Kosovo Polje, in which both rulers lost their lives. As a result the Ottomans gained suzerainty over Serbia.

The cult of Lazar as martyr commenced shortly after his death. In Serbian popular tradition, the historical prince Lazar and the legendary martyr of Kosovo are intertwined. The Kosovo cycle glorifying the victory of the heavenly over the earthly kingdom is the finest of epic poetry. Lazar built St. Stephen’s church (Lazarica) at Kruševac (ca.1375) and the Ravanica monastery (1381) as his mausoleum. His best preserved portrait is in the Ljubostinja monastery, the foundation of his wife.

Lit. O knezu Lazaru: Navični skupi Kruševca 1971 (Belgrade 1975); D.J. Trifunović, Srpski srednjovekovni spisi o knezu Lazaru i Kosovskom boju (Kruševac 1968); R. Mihaljić, Lazar Hrebelenjanović, istorija, kult, predanje (Belgrade 1984).

LAZAR OF P'ARPI or Lazar P’arpeci, Armenian historian; born in P’arpi below Mt. Aragats, fl. second half of the 5th C. Brought up with Vahan Mamikonean in Georgia after the suppression of the Armenian revolt of 450/1, Lazar later wrote a ‘History of Armenia’ dedicated to Vahan, who in 485 was appointed governor (mazrpan) of Armenia by the shah of Iran, Balâsh.

Łazar presents his work as the “third” history of Armenia, following those of Agathangelos and pseudo-’Pawstos Buzand. It falls into three sections: the life and work of Mesrop Maštoci, a version of the war against Persia parallel to the account of Ežiše, and the career of Vahan Mamikonean from the Armenian defeat of 451 to his appointment as mazrpan in 485—the prime source for this period.

The original version is extant only in fragments, the complete surviving text being a revision of uncertain date. A letter addressed to Vahan (of uncertain authenticity) describes Łazar’s Greek education.


LAZAROS, painter, a Khazar according to the Liber Pontificalis (Lib. pont. 147); saint; died Rome after 28 Sept. 865, although Janin (infra) questions this date; feastday 17 Nov. The entry in the Synaxarium of Constantinople (Synax.CP 231–34) describes Lazaros as a monk and painter from an early age; a defender of images, he became a victim of Iconoclast persecution when he was punished by having his hands burned. Released at the behest of Empress Theodora, he fled to the monastery of the Prodromos tou Phoberou where he painted an icon of John the Baptist. After Theophilos’s death he painted the icon of Christ Chalkites, according to Theophanes Continuatus (TheophCont 103.19–21). A supporter of Patr. Ignatios, Lazaros played the role of diplomat: he participated in a mission to Pope Benedict III (855–58); According to the Synaxarium, he died during a second mission to Rome. J. Raasted (Cahiers de l’Institut du moyen-âge grec et latin 37 [1981] 124–38) identified him with a certain La-zaros, who sent a letter (after 858) to his “spiritual lord master.” The attribution by M. Šćepkina (Miniature 297–99) to Lazaros of the illustrations in the Khudov Psalter lacks any documentary support.
LAZAROS, patriarch of Jerusalem; died after Apr. 1368. Soon after his election to the patriarchate (date unknown), Lazaros left for Constantinople to have his appointment confirmed by Andronikos III. In his absence, however, the monk Gerasimos slandered him and succeeded in having himself elected patriarch. When Andronikos died, the matter had not yet been decided. Nevertheless, during the Civil War of 1341–47 that followed, Patr. John XIV Kalekas recognized Gerasimos. For his part, Lazaros favored Kalekas’s opponent, John VI Kantakouzenos, and was responsible for crowning him emperor (21 May 1346) in Adrianople (Kantak. 2:564.10–18). After Kantakouzenos’s victory, Lazaros was recognized (sometime between May and Aug. 1347) as the lawful incumbent. Still, only in the second half of 1349, when Gerasimos was expelled from Jerusalem, was Lazaros able to take possession of his see.


LAZAROS SATURDAY, a feast celebrated on the Saturday before PALM SUNDAY in commemoration of the raising of Lazarus (JN 11:1–45). Together with Palm Sunday, Lazarus Saturday separates LENT from HOLY WEEK. Egeria describes a procession on this day leading from Jerusalem to Bethany with two stations: one at a church on the road, where the bishop’s procession is met by the monks and people, and the second at Lazarus’s tomb in Bethany. Surprisingly, neither the lections at these stations nor Egeria herself make reference to the actual raising of Lazarus. Talley (Liturgical Year 176–89, 203–14, 234) argues convincingly that this theme on Lazarus Saturday in Constantinople cannot be traced to Jerusalem, but probably originated in Alexandria instead.

On Lazarus Saturday, the emperor and his court went to the Church of St. Demetrius, where the emperor gave out palms and silver crosses (De cer. 170f). In the 14th C. he celebrated the feast at the monastery of St. Lazarus instead (pseudo-Kod. 246:13–20). Teachers in the Patriarchal School of the 12th C. delivered enkomia of the patriarch on this day.

One of four occasions for BAPTISM in Constantinople, Lazarus Saturday was characterized by a complete baptismal liturgy performed in Hagia Sophia (Mateos, Typicon 2:62–65). At the conclusion of orthros the reading of Acts began and the patriarch descended to the baptistery where he baptized the candidates and anointed them with chrism. Then a psalmist intoned Psalm 31 and led the neophytes into the church to the chant of the psalmody, for the continuation of which he mounted the ambo. At a signal from the deacon
the psalmody was broken off and the reading resumed with Acts 8:26, after which the liturgy began with the antiphons.

**Representation in Art.** The standard Byz. composition of the Raising of Lazarus first emerged in the 6th C. (Rossano Gospels, fol.13): with Lazarus's sisters Mary and Martha at his feet and disciples behind him, Christ is shown gesturing toward the shrouded corpse of Lazarus, which stands at the mouth of a cave or small building (aedica) at the right, surrounded by onlookers. One, holding his nose against the stench, supports Lazarus while another holds the sarcophagus lid. This composition displaces an earlier one—showing a youthful Christ waving a thaumaturgic wand toward a shrouded corpse in an aedicula—that recurs more than 100 times in funerary art of the 3rd to 5th C. The Byz. composition underwent some modifications: 11th- through 12th-C. versions may show an embroidered hood over Lazarus's head or a sarcophagus at Lazarus's feet, and the noseholder may be shown unwrapping Lazarus; some 13th-C. examples show Lazarus sitting or lying in the sarcophagus; and 14th-C. renditions combine Lazarus in his sarcophagus with cave and aedicula. In some 11th- through 12th-C. MSS and mural paintings, Lazarus appears as a bishop, reflecting the legend that he became bishop of Kiton in Cyprus (C. Walter, REB 27 [1969] 197–208). The **Typikon of the Great Church of Constantinople** calls Lazarus "friend of Christ," and homilies present him as proof of the rewards to be had from friendship judiciously conferred.


---

**LAZIKA** (Λαζικόν), at first the southwest region of ancient Colchis lying along the east shore of the Black Sea and including the mouth of the Phasis River; Lazika hence has often been confused with Tzanika. In the 4th C., the Lazes extended their suzerainty northward toward Abchasia and Svaneti (Svania) to form a kingdom, with Archaiopolis as capital, which commanded some of the Caucasian passes. Lazika then came to the attention of Byz. and trade was initiated; the Laz kings received their regalia (see SIGNIA) from Byz. even though they paid no tribute (Prokopios, Wars 2.15.2). Increasing Byz. interference in the region and the building of the fortress of Petra on the coast of Lazika provoked the Persians to invade the country in 542 and capture Petra. The protracted Lazic war (549–56) ended with the reestablishment of Byz. control in the area under the terms of the Peace of 562 (Menander Protector, fr.6.1, ed. Blockley, 80.474); the Laz tribes graduated southwestward, however, so that the toponym Lazika was increasingly identified with the southeast shore of the Black Sea as far as Trebizond. Byz. maintained control of Lazika until the revolt of the patriarch Sergios in 697 opened the way for the Arab invasion of Lazika early in the 8th C., their capture of Archaiopolis, and the islamization of the previously Christian Lazes. The diocese of Trebizond was officially named that of “entire Lazika” through the 14th C. (Notitiae CP no.20.33).


**LEAD** (μολύβδος), probably from Trebizond, Macedonia, and northern regions of the Balkans, was broadly employed in Byz. In a list of craftsmen supplementing Constantine I's law of 337 (Cod.Theod. XIII 4.2, Cod.Just. X 66.1) are mentioned workers in lead (plumbarii) that in the Greek translation is rendered molybdourgoi, even though ploumaroi (sic) are named as well (Basil. 54.6.8). Lead was added to copper alloys to improve their casting properties (B. Iatrides, Archaiologa 1 [Nov. 1981] 73f). The metal's low melting temperature also allowed simple lead objects to be produced domestically: thus in Cherson in the 9th and 10th C. fishermen made weights for their nets at home, and lead blanks were found in several other houses (A. Jakobson, Rannesrednevekovuyj Chersones [Moscow-Leningrad 1959] 322–25). The softness of lead made it a perfect material for seals, and its weight lent itself to carpenter's plumbets. Scribes used it to make RULING PATTERNS on MSS.

Lead was used for roofing to protect domes and vaults (L. Petit, IRAIK 13 [1908] 59–33–34) from rain and for manufacturing water pipes. It strengthened the piers of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople (Prokopios, Buildings 1.1.53). Lead sarcophagi with Christian motifs were produced in Syria/Palestine from the 4th C. onward, continu-
ing an older industry based in Sidon. Lead was used by goldsmiths in repoussé work and for the production of cheap amulets and crosses (Harrison, Sarachane, nos. 621–23) as well as for pilgrimage ampullae (Ch. Bakirtzes, JØB 32:3 [1982] 523–28).


LEARNING. Erudition was divided in Byz. into two categories: “our” paideia, that is, Christian doctrine; and “outside” (exo, thyrathen) sophia, the classical (pagan, Hellenic) erudition. Attitudes toward education were ambivalent. On the one hand, church fathers and authors of saints’ vitae in high style disparaged secular wisdom, and writers such as Symeon the Theologian contrasted the knowledge attained through reading with the revelation granted by God, and were suspicious even of knowledge of the Holy Writ (Kazhdan, “Symeon” 37). Knowledge was not included among the four basic virtues that should adorn the ideal emperor, according to the basilikos logos; its place was taken by good sense (phronesis). On the other hand, the same ecclesiastics who criticized secular wisdom tried to show their familiarity with that wisdom; learning also formed an essential part of the system of secular values, and higher education was often a prerequisite for an administrative career.

The Byz. curriculum encompassed primarily the classical language (grammar), eloquence (rhetoric), and philosophy or logic; the quadrivium included the complementary disciplines of arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. Psellus (Sathas, MB 5:352.6–10) claimed to have studied every science (mathema), that is, rhetoric, geometry, music, rhythmic, arithmetic, stereometry (spathireke), law, the sacred science (hieratike), theology. Prodromos, however, in the vita of Melletios the Younger of Myoupolis (ed. Vasil’evskij 42:16–21), contrasted the study (paideia) of Holy Scripture with “unnecessary” disciplines—the “outside” philosophy, rhetoric, physics, astronomy, geometry, and arithmetic. Gregory II of Cyprus distinguished between two major divisions of secular knowledge, logic and physics (PG 142:381A).

— A.K., I.S.

LEASE. See Mistrhosis.

LEATHER. The processing of leather does not seem to have attained much importance in antiquity. Not only are terms for leatherworkers in Egyptian papyri (Fikhman, Egitet 29f) infrequent and of uncertain meaning, but most of the artisans listed by Fikhman as working with leather are in fact furriers, saddlers, and shieldmakers. In Rome of the late 3rd to early 4th C. only a few inscriptions mention the guild of tanners—corarri (E. Kornemann, RE 4 [1901] 458).

In Byz., on the other hand, leather processing and the manufacture of leather products became one of the most widespread artisan professions. Leather was used not only for footwear but also for certain types of cloaks, harnesses, tents and shields (for the army), and parchment. New words for leatherworkers, such as skytergates (PG 92:1377A) and skyloergos (PG 37:1235A) appear in the vocabulary of 4th–7th-C. authors. The division of labor was relatively elaborate, comparable only to the complexity of silk production. The Studios monastery in the 9th C. had tanners (byrseis), leather processors (dermatopoioiuntes), shoemakers (skyteis and similar terms), hypodematorrhaphoi (sandalmakers?) dyers of footgear (skytoleusopoioiuntes), and makers of parchment (Dobrokonskij, Feodor 1:412f). The 10th-C. Book of the Eparch strictly distinguishes between harnessmakers (lorotomoi), tanners, and malakatarioi (“softeners”), but omits shoemakers.

In the Palaiologic period Constantinopolitan Jews played a major role in leather processing. Italian merchants brought hides and furs to Constantinople for processing, and leather goods were produced for export. In the 14th C. Constantinopolitan leatherworkers were allowed to work in Dubrovnik, one of the main centers of trade in cattle and sheep (B. Krekić, Dubrovnik [Raguse] et le Levant au Moyen-Age [Paris 1961] 217).


— A.K.

LEBOUNION, MOUNT, site of a battle on 29 Apr. 1991. Lebounion (Λεβούνιον) was a hill located near the mouth of the Marica (Hebros) River; the plain at its base was the scene of a decisive victory of Alexios I over the Pechenegs. The Cumans supported Alexios. When he de-
layed battle, awaiting the arrival of Western re-
forcements, the Cumans insisted on immediate
engagement; since Alexios feared a Pecheneg-
Cuman alliance, he was forced to fight. The Byz.
and Cumans advanced at dawn in a crescent against
the Pechenegs, who sheltered themselves and their
families behind their covered wagons. At the out-
set the Pechenegs were weakened by desertion to
the Cumans. The conflict lasted much of the day;
neighboring peasants brought water to relieve the
thirst of the Byz. soldiers. The struggle ended,
according to Anna Komnene (An.Komm. 2:142f),
in a terrible massacre, including women and chil-
dren, although some prisoners were taken. A 12th-
C. historian (Zon. 3:740f) records that the surviv-
ing Pechenegs were settled in the MOGLENA theme.
Pecheneg power was broken; Anna Komnene re-
ports a fragment of a popular song: “For lack of
one day, the Scythians missed seeing May.”

LIT. M. Győri, “Le nom de Vlachoi dans l’Alexiade d’Anne
Comnène,” BZ 44 (1951) 241–52. — C.M.B.

LECHAION. See CORINTH.

LECTIONARY, a general term for various lit-
turgical books containing lections intended for
reading in liturgical services. Most have lists ap-
plied indicating the feasts, both fixed and mo-
bile, of the church calendar, with their proper
lections. A true lectionary gives the full text of
the lections, not just inceptit-desinit tables (tables of
beginning and concluding phrases).

The earliest complete lectionary covering the
entire liturgical year is that of Jerusalem, trans-
mitted through the 5th-C. Early Syriac lectionary
(F.C. Burkitt, ProcBrAc 10 [1921–23] 301–39), the
5th-C. Armenian lectionary (A. Renoux, PO 35–
36), the 5th–8th-C. Georgian redactions (M.
Tarchischvili, CSC 188–89), and the 6th-C.
Palestinian Syriac lectionary of the Old Testament
and Epistle lections (A.S. Lewis, A Palestinian Syriac
Lectionary [London 1897]). This Jerusalem lec-
tionary is of major importance for the history of
Byz. feasts, calendar, and lectionaries. The Byz.
calendar, fixed probably before 700, gave rise to
a new disposition of lections based largely on the
Jerusalem system, rather than the earlier lection
system of Antioch (Ehrhard, Überlieferung 1:25–
35).

The oldest Byz. lectionary MSS are from the
9th C. The two major types of lectionary were the
EVANGELION, which contains Gospel passages, and
the PRAXAPOSTOLOS for the other New Testament
passages. Other lectionaries were the PROPHETO-
LOGION for the Old Testament lections; the aposto-
loevangelion, containing both Epistles and Gospel
readings; and the anagnostikon, a rare book con-
taining all the Old and New Testament lections,
found in Philotheon 6, an 11th-C. MS on Mt.
Athos (Lampros, Athos 1:151, no.1769).

LIT. Y. Burns, “The Historical Events that Occasioned
Perikopenordnungen des ersten Jahrtausends (Münster 1921).
A. Rahlfis, “Die alttestamentlichen Lektionen der griechi-
schen Kirche,” Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der
— R.F.T.

LECTIONES (ἀναγνώσματα), liturgical readings,
drawn exclusively from the Bible for the Eucha-
rist, for other services drawn occasionally also
from hagiographical (see SYNAXARION of Constan-
tinople) or patristic writings and conciliar decrees.
Lections, collected into various types of lection-
aries, are a major component of liturgy, esp. of
vigils. Byz. hours had no daily scripture lections;
the lections were added on feasts in accordance
with Palestinian practice.

Developed lection systems first appear in the
5th-C. lectionary of Jerusalem. The Byz. system,
based originally on that of Antioch, later under-
went Jerusalem influence. This synthesis took place
probably before 700. At first there were lections
only for Saturdays and Sundays. Weekday read-
ings were added as Eucharist was extended to
weekdays, not earlier than the 7th C., and then
only in monastic usage. The TYPikon of the
GREAT CHURCH still lacks these weekday lections,
and the earliest Byz. lectionaries (9th C.) have no
weekday lections outside the Easter season.

Lections were either “select,” that is, chosen for
their suitability to the feast—this system was used
esp. for the fixed feasts, the MENAION cycle—or
“continuous,” that is, lections read day after day
more or less in the order in which they occur in
the Bible text. This latter system was used for
most of the mobile cycle of the church CALENDAR.

In cathedral services, the Gospel was usually
read by the deacon, other readings by the anagnostes; though on some more solemn occasions (Easter and other solemn vigils; sometimes at late), the patriarch or bishop or, in his absence, the priest, proclaimed the Gospel. At monastic hours, readings were done by the monks themselves, most of whom were not ordained.


LECTOR. See anagnostes.

LEGAL SCIENCE. In order to speak of Byz. legal science one must allow to be considered as science the production of texts that have as their subject the meaning of legal norms and their relation to each other. There was a legal science of this kind among those individuals attached to law schools and to the judiciary. Excluded from legal science, on the other hand, are the producers of norms (legislation), the collectors of norms (authors of law books), or the producers of normative models (production of formulae: the notaries). Legal science pursued either a pedagogical purpose (teaching) or served the decision-making process (judgments, legal statements). For all the periods of the empire in which such a legal science can be demonstrated (4th–6th and 10th–13th C.), it is characterized by the following methodological features: stringent “philological” commitment to the basic text; a marked use of “juristic logic,” that is, deductions that can be reconstructed by formal logic, whose premises are not secured and are susceptible to rhetoric (e.g., analogy and inverted deduction); the use of hermeneutic techniques (etymology, explanation according to significance and object of the norm); and the use of rhetorical figures of speech and models of presentation. Since the legal scholars were also familiar with juristic dogma—understood as the sum of the transmitted and accepted legal statements both legislative and judicial in origin—the differences between these and today’s European or Anglo-Saxon juristic techniques are minor.

LEGATARIOS (λεγατάριος), subaltern official in several departments both civil and military; neither taktika nor the De ceremoniis define his functions. More is known about the legatarios of the eparch of the city who had to oversee the foreign merchants in Constantinople. The attempts to identify the latter legatarios with either the symponos or the logothetes tou praitoriou (e.g., M. Ja. Sjuzjumov in Bk. of Eparh 249) are not correct; these two officials were the emperor’s appointees, while the legatarios was appointed by the eparch (Oikonomides, Listes 314, n.156). The legatarios is known also in the sekretos of the logothetes tou stratiorikou and under some military commanders.

LIT. Stöckle, Zünfte 90–92.

LEGATON (λεγάτον), in contrast to the appointment of an heir, was the separate donation of single pieces or portions of the deceased’s estate, with the consequence that the heir (or heirs) was charged with the distribution of the legacy. Any heir, including the church and pious institutions as well as such incertae personae as “the poor,” could be the recipient of a legaton. The legaton was executed by the legatee at the expense of the heirs by means of a lawsuit. The heirs were protected by the Lex Falcidia against the overburring of the estate with legata. In the post-Justinianic period, esp. in practice, exact distinctions were often no longer made between the appointment of an heir and the apportioning of a legaton, so that the question of who was to be considered the heir and who the legatee cannot always be clearly answered. A further consequence is that the Lex Falcidia and the legal expedients that safeguarded against exclusion from a will (the right to a legitimate portion) merge with one another to a great extent. The process of this development has not yet been the subject of detailed research. The term legaton also acquired the specific connotation in Byz. of a gift given to manumitted slaves (e.g., Laura, no.1.22 [a.897]) and as such appears in several saints’ lives that describe pious acts of manumission.


LEGES FISCALES, conventional name for a collection of regulations concerning taxes and the rights of holders of adjacent properties. Compiled
from the Greek versions of the Corpus Juris Civilis, it was divided into five titles, with 233 chapters in all. Apart from the Prochiron and the collection of novels by Theodore of Hermopolis (end of the 6th C.), its immediate sources are uncertain; the Basilika were probably not used. The intitulatio, which mentions Leo VI and his brother Alexander, offers a trustworthy basis for the dating of the collection to the early 10th C. but does not prove it was an official promulgation.


—L.B.

LEGES MILITARES. See Nomos Stratiotikos.

LEGITIMACY, POLITICAL. Roman constitutional vagueness encouraged Byz. inventiveness in justifying the possession of political power, the main themes of which permeate imperial propaganda. Despite their stability, the weight accorded to each theme changed, reflecting ideology and the political structure. Six forms of legitimacy proved most enduring.

1. Legitimacy based on military success (e.g., triumphs), reckoned as revealing divine approval, was fostered by political survival and the emperor's original connection with military command.

2. Civic legitimacy came from the emperor's political civility (e.g., the ostentatious refusal of minor perquisites of absolute power), as long as Roman republican traditions still carried weight. This legitimacy was transformed in the emperor's role as lawgiver and benefactor, for example, in his philanthropy.

3. Historical legitimacy derived from the Roman character of Byz., combined with the Byz. mentality's attachment to the old and to taxis.

4. Dynastic legitimacy emerged as aristocratic lineages coalesced. It explains the epithet porphyrogennetos, commemorative coinage of the Isaurians (DOC 3.1:9) or Anna of Savoy, and the use by John III Vatatzes of the Doukas surname and his treatment of Andronicus I as his grandfather.

5. The unique status of Constantinople made into a source of legitimacy the possession of the capital itself and all that went with it in terms of resources and the legitimizing power of the ceremony. For example, failure to take Constantinople doomed the revolt of Thomas the Slav, and Kekaumenos (Kek. 268.8–13) insisted victory belonged to the emperor who controlled the capital.

6. Religious legitimacy was indispensable. Divine election justified usurpation or its repression, and the emperor's personal piety and orthodoxy confirmed and allowed his Christomorphic rulership. This development peaked in late Byz. with, for example, the appearance of anointing at the coronation.

Components of legitimacy often converged: for example, lineage, Romanness, and religion combined when emperors claimed genealogical descent from St. Constantine (e.g., Basil I) or ancient Roman nobility (e.g., the Doukai, anonymous preface to Bryen. 67.21–69.4).


—M.McC.

LEISURE (σχολή), as a form of philosophical behavior, designated in antiquity both scholarly discussion and scholarly speculation on nature and "origin." Church fathers denounced the ancient concept of philosophical leisure: Basil the Great (PG 29.429A) condemned "the evil leisure of the Athenians" that was still being imitated by his contemporaries, who were trying to invent new concepts and thus fell within the embraces of "dirty and evil spirits." He contrasted this leisure to "a good and beneficial schole," which was, in the words of Athanasios of Alexandria (PG 27:216D), "the cognizance of God." Schole was thus transformed into an emphasis on contemplation, which became an important part of ascetic exercises.

—A.K.

LEKAPENOS (Λεκαπηνός, fcm. Λεκαπηνή), or Lakapenos, a family of Armenian stock. Its founder, Theophylaktos Abakistos or Abastaktos, rescued Basil I in a battle in 872 and was rewarded with a piece of imperial land, perhaps in the region of Lakape that gave the family its new name. Theophylaktos's son became Emp. Romanos I Lekapenos, his sons were proclaimed co-emperors, and the youngest, Theophylaktos, was appointed patriarch. The oldest brother, Christophor Lekapenos, died in Aug. 931; on 16
Dec. 944 Stephen and Constantine deposed their father, but they were in turn arrested on 15 June 945, exiled, and eventually murdered. For several decades the Lekapenoi maintained a leading position: Romanos I's illegitimate son Basil the Notios, the parakoimomenos, administered the empire during Basil II's youth, and Christopher's son, Michael the Raiktor, gained the high title of magistros. Thereafter their role declined: from the 11th C. only a single family member is known—Constantine, whose seal mentions neither his title nor office (Laurent, Coll. Orghidan, no. 446). In the 14th C. George Lekapenos was a writer, landowner, teacher, and official of a mediocre rank. (See genealogical table.)


LEKAPENOS, GEORGE. See Lekapenos, George.

LEMBIOTISSA (Λεμπιώτισσα), or Lembos, a monastery dedicated to the Virgin, located halfway between Smyrna and Nymphaion. It existed by 787 when Theodore, hegoumenos of Lembos, signed the acts of the Second Council of Nicaea; its history thereafter until the 19th C. is obscure. Restored and richly endowed by John III Vatatzes, it flourished until 1307, when it was apparently attacked by the Turks and burned.

A kodix or cartulary of Lembiotissa survives in a Vienna MS (ÖNB, hist. gr. 125) that preserves copies of about 200 private and official acts dating from 1192 to 1294 (Dölger, infra 295) or probably even from as early as 1133 (Ahrweiler, "Smyrne" 128). This collection permits the establishment of the list of Lembiotissa's hegoumenos between 1223 and 1293 (Dölger, infra 302–06) and contains data concerning the topography and administration of the Smyrna region, the activity of the episcopal chancery, and esp. the structure of the village-estate. The possessions of Lembiotissa were located in Smyrna and in several villages. In no case was Lembiotissa the sole owner of these villages. In the villages can be found properties of various secular and ecclesiastical landowners, independent and dependent peasants (e.g., a paroikos who had two masters simultaneously, peasants under pronoia); some allotments were tiny (1–3 modia), and many owners held property in several different villages. The kodix also provides data about the price of fields and vineyards, taxes, and rent, esp. the epiteleia.

Source. MM 4:1–289.

LEMMATA (λημματα), designation (occasionally attested already in antiquity) of the title usually placed at the head of a work or a chapter. It is often written in characters different from those of the text (i.e., in minuscule MSS the lemmata are often written in uncial, and vice versa) and also in ink of a different color (usually red). Sometimes a scribe forgot to add the lemma (and initial letters) to a text so that the work remained without title (aneleipographos) until a later copyist invented a new one.

Normally the lemma contains the author's name (sometimes, however, only in the formula tov au- tou, "by the same," which is misleading) and details about contents, occasion, and (esp. in the case of letters) the addressee. Sometimes the lemma provides the only information at our disposal about the writer and the historical context of the work, Byz. texts being mostly tacit in this respect. On the other hand the reliability of the lemma is always relative, because it is not formulated by the author himself, except in the case of autographs. Cases of pseudepigraphy occur time and again; they are often due to the attempt to gain a higher price for the MS by means of an attractive author attribution.


LEMMOS (Λήμnos), island in the northern Aegean Sea that controlled the passage between Constantinople and Thessalonike; its capital was Hephaisteia. In late antiquity it was listed among the cities of the province of ACHAIA (Hierokl. 649.1); by the 9th C. it was part of the theme of the Aegean Sea. Ahrweiler (Mer 127, n.6) hypothesized that in the 10th C. Lemnos was under the command of the strategos of Thessalonike, but her reference to Skyl. 368.78 does not support this view. Neither do we have any proof that Lemnos was an important shipyard: a donation of 1016 (Lavra 1, no.20.79) only mentions a certain Andrew, a homeowner or former epeiktes of the island, and a purchase deed of 993 identifies the protospatharios and exaristes ("rigger") Michael as a friend of Athanasios of Athis (Lavra 1, no.10.23-25)—his whereabouts are not indicated.

The island was sacked by the Saracens in 902 and remained for several years a focus of anti-Arab naval operations. After 1204 Lemnos was placed under the authority of the Latin Empire but was reconquered by Michael VIII (Greq. 1:98.16). The loss of Asia Minor made Lemnos important as a source of food (monasteries of Mt. Athos had properties on Lemnos), as a political force (the inhabitants of Lemnos supported Andronikos III against Andronikos II—Kantak. 1:150f), and as a prize in the struggle for power (John VI Kantakouzenos gave it first to his brother Manuel, then to his son Matthew Kantakouzenos—Kantak. 3:312.1-8). The island was demanded by Alfonso V of Aragon (1416-1458) as the price of his aid for Constantinople, and offered by Constantine XI to Giustiniani Longo if he would help to repulse the Turks. After 1453 Lemnos was given briefly to the Gattilusi of Lesbos, then granted as part of an appanage by Mehmed II in 1460 to Demetrios Palaiologos, former despotes of the Morea. It was finally conquered by the Ottomans in 1479.

The bishop of Hephaisteia attended the Council of Nicaea in 325. A part of Eastern Illyricum, the island was under the jurisdiction of Rome until the 8th C. Lemnos became an archbishopric in the 9th C. and metropolis during the Civil War of 1341-47. The Latin conquest seems not to have affected the position of the Greek bishops of the island.


LENT (τεσσαρακοστή, lit. “fortieth [day]”), a period, ideally 40 days in duration, of penance and fasting in preparation for Easter. This period is also called “Great Lent” to distinguish it from the three lesser Byz. lents, those preceding the Nativity of Christ, the Dormition of the Virgin Mary, and the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul on 29 June (the last Lent extends from the Monday following the Sunday after Pentecost until the vigil of the Apostles’ feast).

The first sure evidence of Lent occurs in Festal Letter II of ATHANASIOS of Alexandria, from 330. By the end of the 4th C. a prepaschal Lent was in practice almost everywhere, an outgrowth of the preparation for Baptism at Easter. Lent later
became also a penitential preparation for the reconciliation of penitents during Holy Week. But growth was not uniform, as evidence from Jerusalem, Rome, and Egypt shows: Egypt, for instance, once had a six-week post-Epiphany fast in imitation of Jesus’ postbaptismal fast.

The duration of Lent and the ways of calculating it have also varied. Originally the whole period lasted six weeks. Where Saturdays and Sundays were not fast days (except for Holy Saturday), this amounted to only 36 days of fasting in Lent plus Holy Week; thus these days were called “the tithe of the year.” Soon literalism and the desire to have 40 actual fast days led in the 6th–7th C. in Constantinople to the addition of another, pre-Lenten tyrine, or “Cheesefare Week” of fasting that, with the six weeks of Lent plus Holy Week, makes a total of eight weeks, each with five fast days, 40 in all.

Lenten liturgical legislation first appears in canons 45 and 49–52 of the Council of Laodikeia in 380 (Mansi 2:571 CE), and Lenten liturgy is already highly developed in Jerusalem by 384, as the diary of Egeria reveals; other evidence is provided by the contemporary homilies of Cyril of Jerusalem and by the 5th-C. Armenian lectionary. Byz. Lenten liturgy, later codified in the liturgical book called the triodion, is seen in the TyRikon of the Great Church, in later monastic typika as well as in the Klerorologion of Philotheos and other ceremonial books (De cer., bk.1, chs. 28–30; pseudo-Kod. 221–24). Many Lenten sermons have survived: the preacher usually used the season of Lent to expose the vices of his flock and to suggest ways for moral improvement.

—A.K.

LEO I, called the “Butcher” (Μακέλλας) or the “Great” (probably not because of his piety but to distinguish him from Leo II, the “Little,” his grandson), emperor (from 7 Feb. 457); of Bessian origin, born in Illyrian Dacia ca. 400, died 18 Jan. 474. A low-ranking officer commanding a garrison in Selymbria and a personal servant (kourator) of Aspar and his son, he was chosen by Aspar as emperor upon Marcin’s death. Aspar saw Leo as a compliant tool through whom he could exercise power. Leo was crowned by Patr. Anatolios (449–58)—the first case of imperial coronation by a patriarch. Leo’s reign witnessed natural disasters (a fire in Constantinople in 465, earthquakes) and religious conflicts (Timothoe Αιλουρος in Alexandria, the attempt of Peter the Fuller to seize the see of Antioch). He was forced to lower taxes and curb official abuses. Aspar defeated the Huns in 468, and the Danubian provinces enjoyed relative prosperity; the situation in the East was quiet. Attempts to control Italy led to military coups when the army, commanded by Ricimer, proclaimed as augustus Majorian, Anthemius (both Leo’s nominees), and Glycerius (whom Leo refused to recognize and replaced with Julianus Nepos). The maritime expedition of 468 against the Vandals failed due to the incompetence of its commander Basiliskos.
By 468 Leo started to liberate himself from the control of Aspar and the Goths, using the Isaurians under Zeno as a counterweight to them. Leo married his daughter Ariadne to Zeno. In 471 Aspar and his son Ardabourios were murdered. Orthodox tradition depicts Leo and his wife Verina as pious sovereigns devoted to the cult of the Virgin. Thus, in a 10th-C. MS (ed. A. Wenger, *REB* 10 [1952] 541), they are said to have ordered a gold soros for a relic of the Virgin’s clothing (here *peribolē*; see *Maphorion*), placing above it an image of Mary enthroned and adored by members of their family. (See genealogical table.)


-T.E.G., A.C.

**LEO I THE GREAT**, pope (from 29 Sept. 440) and saint; born end of 4th C.? in Volterra? Tuscany, died Rome 10 Nov. 461; Greek feastday 18 Feb. Leo contended with barbarian assaults on Italy: in 452 he participated in an embassy to Attala and persuaded him to withdraw from Italy; in 455, while Petronius Maximus tried to flee from besieged Rome, Leo negotiated with the Vandal Gaiseric and convinced him to spare the city from fire. Another problem was the growing power of the Eastern churches—Leo joined Constantinople against Alexandria. He opposed NESTORIANISM and in an epistle to Patri. FLAVIAN of Constantinople defended the thesis of the two natures of Christ. The main problem he faced, however, was the relationship of the church to the state: Leo propagated the idea of close collaboration between the two authorities and emphasized the divine principles of the imperial power.

He developed the concept that authority and obedience were dialectically interwoven and that the emperor, while obedient to God, was to be the master of his subjects (H. Arens, *Die christologische Sprache Leos des Grossen* [Freiburg im Br. 1982] 698f).

Loyal to Valentinian III, Leo sought the support of Constantinople, where he established his *apocrisiarius* as intermediary between Rome and the emperor. Leo did not approve of the idea of convening the Council of CHALCEDON, but he submitted to the emperor’s will and worked supportively; he only required unconditionally that his legates should preside over the council (M. Wojtowytzsch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I.* [Stuttgart 1981] 331f). Leo developed the idea of primacy but supported canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon. The ICONOPHILES respected Leo, and in the 9th C. THEODORE GRAPTO composed a *kanon* in his honor (E. Bouvy, *EO* 1 [1897-98] 172). His Greek vita, vague in its contents (C. Van den Vorst, *AB* 29 [1910] 400-408), was probably compiled on the basis of a poem in political verse (R. Goossens, *Byzantium* 6 [1931] 427-32). Leo’s lengthy letter dated 11 June 453 to THEODORET OF CYPRUS where the pope vouchsafes the orthodoxy of Theodoret’s views is, probably, a mid-6th-C. forgery produced in the vein of Western reaction to the affair of the THREE CHAPTERS, or a revision of the authentic text (R. Schieffer in *Antidoram. Hudle aan Dr. Maurits Geerard* [Wetteren 1984] 81-87).


-A.K.

**LEO II**, “the Little” (ο  μικρός), emperor (473-74); born ca.467, died Constantinople 17 Nov.? 474. Since Leo I had no sons, he of necessity looked to his grandson Leo, the child of his daughter Ariadne and her husband Zeno, to continue his line. In the fall of 473, shortly before Leo I died, he proclaimed his six-year-old grandson as cesar and then augustus. Early the next year, immediately after the death of Leo I, the child emperor crowned his father Zeno in the Hippodrome, with the approval of the senate (Feb. 474); the boy died a few months later. Latin
writers (Victor Tonnensis, Isidore of Seville) accuse Zeno of murdering his son. In any case, after the boy’s death a conspiracy developed against Zeno in which Leo I’s widow, Verina, played an active role; she then changed her mind, however, and warned Zeno about the plot.


-A.K.

LEO II/I (Arm. Lewon), successor of his brother Ruben III as RUBENID prince Leo II (1187–1198/9), then first king of Armenian CILICIA as Leo I (1198/9–1219). Leo successfully fought the Turcomans and the Seljuks and allied himself with the Crusaders through his successive marriages to Isabel of Jerusalem and Sybil of Cyprus. The consolidation of his principality and the failure of ecclesiastical discussions with Byz. after the death of Emp. Manuel I led him to turn for recognition to the Holy Roman Empire. Although the death of Frederick I Barbarossa and cautious negotiations with Rome toward a union of churches were setbacks, Leo was crowned king at Tarsos on 6 Jan. 1198/9 (the date is still disputed) in the presence of both the local Byz. metropolitan and the archbishop of Mainz; from the latter he received the royal insignia in the name of Emp. Henry VI of Germany. This investiture was apparently approved by Alexios III Angelos who also sent Leo a crown.

The reign of Leo marked the political apogee of the Cilician kingdom, as he gained the support of the Hospitallers and the Teutonic knights to whom he granted extensive domains. He likewise encouraged Western traders, who enriched the country. Relations with the Crusader states deteriorated, however, as a result of his protracted and vain attempts to secure the principedom of Antioch for his half-Latin grandnephew Raymond-Ruben. Soon after Leo died, the resentful Armenian nobles murdered his Latin son-in-law and forced Leo’s daughter Zabel to marry Het’um I, which initiated the new Het’umid dynasty in 1226.


-N.G.G.

LEO III, emperor (717–41); founder of the ISAVIAN DYNASTY; born Germanikeia ca.685, died Constantinople 18 June 741. His baptismal name was perhaps Kônôn. Some scholars accept Byz. reports that place Leo III’s early career in the East, but most believe Theophanes the Confessor’s account (Theoph. 391.5–11) that Leo was reared in Mesembria, where his family had been resettled under Justinian II. Theophanes also reports that in 705 he was entitled spatharios after donating 500 sheep to Justinian and that he followed Justinian to Constantinople and rose to prominence, being sent to the Caucasus to secure the Alans against the Arab-backed Abchasians (M. Canard, REArm 8 [1971] 353–57). Leo was named strategos of the Anatolikon by Anastasios II, after whose deposition he joined forces with Artabasdos to force the abdication of Theodosios III. Leo entered Constantinople on 25 Mar. 717 and secured his throne by resisting the siege of Maslama and suppressing revolts by the Sicilian strategos (718) and Anastasios (719).

Throughout his reign, Leo was concerned with the defense, organization, and unity of the empire. He raised taxes to repair the land walls of Constantinople (Foss-Winfield, Fortifications 53, 82, 100). He campaigned against the Arabs in alliance with the Khazars and Georgians; his victory at Arroinon in 740 ended their advance in Asia Minor. Leo’s administrative actions included the creation of the ThRAKESION and KIBYRRHAIOTAI themes, and the droungarion of the AEGEAN SEA; he may also have raised CRETE to the status of theme. His ELOGA was an important revision of Justinianic law. Possibly raised as a Monophysite, Leo as emperor insisted on Chalcedonian religious uniformity, persecuting Montanists and Jews to the point of forcible conversion. In 726 he inaugurated imperial support for ICONOCLASMS (Anastos, “Leo III’s Edict” 5–41) and in 730 convoked a SILENCE to ratify an edict condemning icons. This provoked Patr. GERMANOS I, whom Leo deposed. It also brought conflict with popes Gregory II (see EUTYCHIOS, exarch of Ravenna) and Gregory III. The origins of Leo’s Iconoclasm are obscure. There is no evidence that Muslim actions (see YAZID II) or Jewish circles stimulated these views, as hostile Byz. writers charged. He had the support of some high clerics, esp. in Asia Minor, but their degree of influence is unknown. He himself referred to biblical prohibitions against images.

Leo increased taxes in Sicily, Calabria, and Illyricum in 732/3; he may have transferred these territories from papal to Byz. jurisdiction (M. An-
astos, SBN 9 [1957] 14–31), although this more likely occurred under Constantine V (Ostrogorsky, History 170, n.1). He also had to subdue a revolt from Hellas and the Cyclades (Th. Korres, Byzantia 1 [1981] 37–49). He crowned his wife Maria in 718 and their son Constantine (V) in 720.


—P.A.H.

**LEO III**, pope (26/7 Dec. 795–12 June 816); probably of humble origin. Beck refutes the theory that Leo’s father Atzupios was a Greek (Ideen, pt.VII [1969], 131–37), suggesting the man’s Arab origin. Leo scrupulously respected Frankish sovereignty over Italy: he immediately notified Charlemagne—not the Byz. emperor—of his election and, no later than 798, went beyond Hadrian I by adding the Frankish ruler’s regnal years to his own in dating documents. On 25 Apr. 799 a faction including Hadrian’s relatives attacked Leo, who escaped to Charlemagne at Paderborn. Restored by the Franks, Leo crowned Charlemagne emperor in St. Peter’s on 25 Dec. 800; his action, which perhaps reflected Frankish rejection of Empress Irene’s legitimacy, resulted in the creation of a rival empire in the West with lasting political implications. The ensuing controversy with Constantino ple was settled only in 812 when the envoys of Emp. Nikephoros I accepted a new treaty issued jointly by Charlemagne in Aachen and Leo in Rome, and Patr. Nikephoros I was finally allowed to send Leo the customary synodika. Leo did not act on the suggestion of Theodore of Studios that he convene a council with regard to the Moechian Controversy, but Theodore’s biographers credit the pope with a role in its resolution. When ca.807 a dispute about the filioque arose in Jerusalem between Frankish and Greek monks and Charlemagne’s court backed the Franks, Leo accepted the Greek view and sought theological support from the patriarch of Jerusalem. Michael Sikelkellos was sent to Leo ca.813 by Patr. Thomas of Jerusalem, but the embassy was detained in Constantinople.


—M.McC., A.K.

**LEO IV THE KHAZAR**, emperor (775–80); born Constantinople 25 Jan. 750, died Strongylo 8 Sept. 780. He was the son of Constantine V and his Khazar wife, Irene, and was thus nicknamed “the Khazar.” Crowned co-emperor in 751, Leo was married to Irene in Dec. 769. Soon after his accession Leo crowned their son Constantine VI as co-emperor, prompting a conspiracy in favor of his five half-brothers (including Caesar Nikephoros), which he easily suppressed. Little is known of Leo’s reign. He was active against the Arabs, sending campaigns into Syria in 776 and 778 under the command of Michael Lachanodrakon but could not prevent major incursions into Asia Minor in 776, 779, and 780 (the last by Harun al-Rashid). Leo supported Iconoclasm but actively persecuted Iconophiles only in Aug. 780, when he had a number of court officials beaten, tonsured, and imprisoned. He died of a fever while campaigning against the Bulgarians.


—P.A.H.

**LEO V THE ARMENIAN**, emperor (813–20); died Constantinople 25 Dec. 820. He was the son of the patriarch Bardas (Genes. 26.75), who was of Armenian descent (Toumanoff, “Caucasia” 151). Raised in the Anatolikon theme, Leo served in 803 under strategos Bardanes Tourkos, possibly as protospatharios. He deserted Bardanes for Nikephoros I, who named him commander of the Foederati and gave him two palaces in Constantinople (Janin, CP byz. 137, 331f). Nikephoros later exiled him, perhaps because Leo had enriched himself illegally or perhaps because Leo sympathized with the rebel Arsaber, whose daughter Theodosia Leo had married. Michael I recalled Leo and named him hypostategos of the Armeniakon theme, then strategos and patriarchs.

Leo was acclaimed emperor after the battle of Versinikia and crowned by Patr. Nikephoros I on 22 July in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople. The accession of the Bulgarian khan Omurtag and the death of the Abbassid caliph Harun al-Rashid permitted Leo to rebuild towns and defenses in Thrace. He restored Iconoclasm by appointing
a preparatory commission under John (VII) Grammatikos, deposing Patr. Nikephoros, and convoking, in 815, a local council in Constantinople (see under Constantinople, Councils Of) that renounced the Council in Trullo and rehabilitated the Council of Hieria (P. Alexander, DOP 7 [1953] 35–66). Because of his Iconoclasm, Byz. sources are hostile to Leo, accusing him, among other things, of stoning the recently restored image of Christ at the Chalké and thus of emulating Leo III. He was, however, an excellent general and enjoyed a reputation for fairness and honesty. He made competent military appointments, including Michael (II), Thomas the Slav, and Manuel. He also fortified Constantinople’s walls at Blachernai. Leo was assassinated in church on Christmas Day by supporters of Michael II; his body was publicly exposed in the Hippodrome before being buried on Prote.


LEO VI, co-emperor (from 6 Jan. 870), emperor (30 July 886–912); born Constantinople? 19 Sept. 866 (V. Grumel, EO 35 [1936] 331–33), died Constantinople 11 May 912. Second son of Basil I, Leo was called the Wise or Philosopher (Dölger, Byzanz 201, n.13). An educated man who dabbled in literature, he was perceived by the next generation as a prophet and a sage. The officialdom of the capital supported him, his major counselors

Leo VI. Emp. Leo VI the Wise on his deathbed. Miniature from the illustrated manuscript of the Chronicle of John Skylitzes in Madrid (Bibl. Nac. vitr. 26-2, fol.116v); 12th C. Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid.
being Zaoatzes, the eunuch Samonas, and the eunuchs Constantine; Leo sought the support of aristocratic families such as Phokas and Doukas, but also tried to keep them at bay, thus provoking serious conflicts (e.g., the revolt of Andronikos Doukas). His ecclesiastical policy was parallel: Leo was supported by patriarchs such as his brother Stephen (886–93), Zaoatzes’ nominee Antony II Kauleas (893–901), and Leo’s spiritual father Euthymios, whereas he deposed Photios and was in conflict with Nicholas I Mystikos, esp. over his fourth marriage. Leo hoped for political reconciliation: he delivered a speech praising his father but at the same time arranged a solemn translation of the body of Michael III to Constantinople. Leo’s administration was active in codification and in establishing political “order”: the Basilika, the Novels of Leo VI, the Book of the Eparch, and the Kletorologion of Philotheos were published; and under Leo’s name a book on military tactics, the Taktika of Leo VI, was produced. The lack of a male heir and the premature death of his first three wives, Theophano, Zoe (daughter of Zaoatzes), and Eudokia Balane, undermined Leo’s search for stabilization. When finally his concubine Zoe Karbonopsina gave birth to Constantine VII, instead of stabilization a severe struggle over the Tetrarchy of Leo resulted.

Leo’s international policy was more or less unsuccessful: in 896 Symeon of Bulgaria defeated the Byz.; in 902 Taormina was lost and in 904 Leo of Tripoli sacked Thessalonike; the Rus’ prince Oleg attacked Constantinople in 907; and in 912 the fleet of Himerios was annihilated. Leo did not trust aristocratic generals and preferred to negotiate with his neighbors by sending envoy such as Leo Choiropakte. He was compelled to accept the papacy’s intervention into domestic church affairs.

The Madrid Skylitzes MS richly illustrates the events of Leo’s reign (Grabar-Manoussac, Skylitzes, nos. 242–72). In the Paris Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos (Omont, Miniatures, pl.XVI), Leo is portrayed as a youth of about 15 with his mother Eudokia Ingerina and brother Alexander. The best known and most controversial image of Leo is over the central door of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, where he appears in Proskenesis at Christ’s feet. N. Oikonomides has argued that this mosaic is an image of penitence, set up at the order of Nicholas Mystikos following the council of 920, which posthumously pardoned Leo’s tetragamy (DOP 30 [1976] 151–72).


- A.K., A.C.

LEO IX (Bruno of Egisheim), pope (from 2 Dec. 1048, crowned in Rome 2 Feb. 1049); born Alsace 21 June 1002, died Rome 19 Apr. 1054. Leo strove to create a strong and independent papacy based on a reformed clergy; among his advisers were Hildebrand (later Pope Gregory VII), Humbert (later cardinal of Silva Candida), and Peter Damiani. A relative of the imperial house, Leo was nominated as pope by Henry III of Germany, but it is unclear how long this collaboration continued; at any rate, Germany did not help Leo against the Normans, and Leo had no choice but to seek the support of Byzantium and the Byz. governor in South Italy, Argyros, son of Melo (D. Nicol, infra 8). In May 1053 Leo himself led a small expedition against the Normans, but before Argyros could join him the pope was defeated at Civitate (18 June) and captured; the Normans kept him prisoner for 9 months. While in captivity in Benevento, Leo corresponded with Emp. Constantine IX and Patr. Michael I Keroularios, and in Jan. 1054 a Roman embassy left for Constantinople in an attempt to create an anti-Norman coalition. The history of this embassy is obscure and the nature of related Latin documents, including the Donation of Constantine and their Greek translations, is questionable (H.-G. Krause in Aus Kirche und Reiche: Festschrift für Friedrich Kempf, ed. H. Mordek [Sigmaringen 1983] 131–58). The mission failed despite Constantine IX’s desire to reach an agreement; it is probable that Argyros played a treacherous role by inciting the Byz. authorities against the pope. Leo returned to Rome on 12 Mar. 1054 a broken man, and died before the abrupt end of negotiations (see Schism). The
question of whether his vita was written by Humbert (H. Tritz, *StGreg* 4 [1952] 246–72) or not (H.-G. Krause, *DA* 32 [1976] 49–85) is under discussion.


—A.K.

**LEO GRAMMATIKOS.** See **SYMEON LOGITHETE.**

**LEONARD OF CHIOS,** Dominican eyewitness to the fall of Constantinople; born Chios 1395/6, died probably Genoa, 1459. After studies in Italy, Leonard became archbishop of Mytilene (1 July 1444), where he enjoyed close relations with the GATTILUSIO lords of Lesbos, as reflected in his *De vera nobilitate* (On True Nobility [Avellino 1657]). He joined ISIDORE OF KIEV and a papal delegation at Chios and arrived with them at Constantinople on 26 Oct. 1452 to realize ecclesiastical union. Although captured by the Turks in the conquest, he managed to escape to Chios, whence he dispatched a report to Pope Nicholas V (16 Aug. 1453) that describes the conquest in a fashion hostile to the Byz. and Venetians but favorable to the Genoese. It survives in the Latin original and a Venetian (G. Lanuschi, *Excidio e presa di Costantinopoli*, ed. G.M. Thomas, *SBAW* 2 [1868] 1–38) as well as a vernacular Greek translation (ed. G. Zoras, *Chronikon peri ton Tourkon Sultanon* [Athens 1958] 79.17–94.3; cf. Gy. Moravcsik, *BZ* 44 [1951] 428–36). Leonard returned to Italy ca. 1458 to work for a counteroffensive against the Turks and probably died there.


—M.McC.

**LEONTIOS,** (Λεόντιος), Eastern usurper; born Dalisados, Isauria, died at the fort of Papyrios (Paperon), Isauria, 488. A military commander (*magister militum*), whom Emp. Zeno sent to oppose the rebellion of I1LOS in 484, he was persuaded to join the rebels. Leontios was crowned at Tarsos on 19 July 484 by the empress VERINA, who claimed the right to nominate the emperor. The rebels were defeated by Zeno’s troops at Antioch in Sept. 484 and were besieged at the fort of Papyrios. After a four-year siege they were betrayed and executed.


—T.E.G.

**LEONTIOS,** presbyter of Constantinople and homilist; fl. 5th or 6th C. He is to be distinguished from the 6th-C. theologian LEONTIOS OF BYZANTIUM as well as from Leontios the monk who lived sometime between the 6th and 8th C. and wrote a homily on the birth of John the Baptist (C. Datema, P. Allen, *Byzantium* 58 [1988] 188–229). Nothing is known of the biography of Leontios the presbyter, although Datema and Allen lean towards placing him in the mid-6th C. In the MS tradition 11 homilies are attributed to him; the editors assign another three to his pen on the basis of stylistic and lexical arguments. His homilies were written for specific feast days, on such topics as Job, the birth of John the Baptist, Palm Sunday, and Pentecost. He wrote in a vivid style, making use of monologues and dialogues; his vocabulary is rich and varied, including numerous rare or unattested words. His works are distinguished more by their rhetorical skill than for their theological subtlety.


—A.M.T.

**LEONTIOS,** emperor (695–98); died Constantinople 15 Feb. (?) 706. A *patrikios* of Isaurian origin, Leontios was appointed *strategos* of Anatolikon, apparently by Constantine IV. In 686 Justinian II sent him against the Arabs in Armenia and Georgia, where he campaigned effectively but with great cruelty. In 692 Justinian imprisoned him in Constantinople, perhaps as punishment for Arab victories in Asia Minor. In 695 he was released and appointed *strategos* of Hellas but, aided by the Blue Faction, whose extermination Justinian was rumored to be plotting, and Patr. Kallininos I (693–705), he seized the throne. Byz. sources call him Leontios but his coinage and references in Western sources indicate that he ruled officially as Leo. Little is known of his activities as emperor. When the Arabs cap-
tured Carthage in 697, he dispatched a fleet under John Patrikios to recapture North Africa. He was clearing Constantinople’s Neorion harbor of debris in 698 when the bubonic plague struck. He was overthrown that year by Tiberios II, who mutilated his nose and imprisoned him in the Dalmatou monastery. After retaking Constantinople in 705, Justinian II paraded Leonios through the city and beheaded him in the Hippodrome.


LEONTIOS OF BYZANTIUM, theologian; died ca.543. Establishing his biography depends on a series of identifications: one of them, as LEONTIOS OF JERUSALEM, is now rejected; another, as a collaborator of St. Sabas who traveled with his teacher to Constantinople in 531 and from whom Sabas separated when he learned of Leonios’s Origenist inclinations, is strongly supported by Evans (infra). Scholars differ in their judgment of the doctrine of Leonios: traditional opinion is that Leonios was a staunch supporter of the Chalcedonian creed, whereas Evans views Leonios as a follower of ORIGEN and esp. EVAGRIOS PONTIKOS. The focal point of Leonios’s theology was the search for a solution to the problem of the two natures and two hypostases in the incarnate Christ: in his book Against the Nestorians and Eutychians, Leonios rejected both the Nestorian and the Monophysite concepts. Even though his search for a philosophical definition of relation and substance harked back to Origen and Plato (A. de Halleux, RHE 66 [1971] 983–85), Leonios’s perception of Christ differs from that of Evagrius: in Evagrius the intellect is not united with flesh in essence, in Leonios the person is the ontological principle of union of both natures (S. Otto, BZ 66 [1973] 97). Leonios frequently used the term enhypostatos, “existing in an hypostasis,” to characterize the status of the natures of Christ, saying, “There is no nature that is not hypostatized.” For Leonios the being-in-hypostasis is not a relation (as in Evagrius) but a reality.

Leonios also wrote two treatises, Solution of the Arguments of Severos and Thirty Chapters, which attack SEVEROS of Antioch. A pamphlet entitled Against the Forgeries of the Apollinarians is of disputed authenticity. The tract On Sects, ascribed in some MSS to Leonios, has also been attributed to THEODORE OF RAITHOU and to THEODORE ABU-QURRA.


LEONTIOS OF JERUSALEM, ecclesiastical writer; born ca.485, died ca.543. Leonios used to be confounded with his contemporary, LEONTIOS OF BYZANTIUM, but is now generally recognized as a separate person. It is probable that this Leonios, a moderate Chalcedonian monk, attended as spokesman for his fellow Palestinian brethren the meeting convoked at Constantinople ca.532 by Justinian I in search of reconciliation with Severos of Antioch and the Monophysites. He was also present in the same capacity at the council of 536 in the capital that anathematized Severos, Anthimos, and other Monophysite leaders. He is now acknowledged to be the author of two tracts, Against the Nestorians and Against the Monophysites; these are the works of a neo-Chalcedonian whose Christology was frequently expressed in the language of CYRIL of Alexandria and also of moderate Monophysites.


LEONTIOS OF NEAPOLIS (on Cyprus), bishop; 7th-C. hagiographer. His dates of birth and death are unknown. Leonios penned both a Life of St. JOHN ELEEMON (in 641–42), based on materials collected by JOHN MOSCHOS and SOPHRONIOS of Jerusalem, and one of ST. SYMEON OF EMESA; another biography, that of the Cypriot saint Spyridon, is lost. A conflated text of the Lives of John by Moschos-Sopfronios and Leonios was used by SYMEON METAPHRASTES. Leonios’s professed intention in the Life of John was to stress themes omitted by Moschos and Sophronios, also to provide an account in a Greek style plain enough for
uneducated readers to understand. Some notice is taken of secular events of the time, although Mango (infra) warns against using it as a historical source. The chief importance and pleasure of the Life is its information on everyday life in Egypt in the 7th C. Also preserved are some fragments of his Speech Against the Jews (PG 93:1597–1609), in which veneration of icons is shrewdly upheld by appeal to Old Testament texts against Jewish objections (L. Barnard in Iconoclasm 8, 11).


LEONTIOS SCHOLASTIKOS, 6th-C. author of about 24 epigrams (some individual ascriptions are uncertain) in the Greek Anthology via the Cycle of Agathias. There has been much speculation over the precise identity and career of Leontios (Leóntios), rendered largely fruitless by the plethora of Leontios in the period; a sample possibility is to equate him with the lawyer Leontios who helped Tribonian in the compilation of Justinian’s Digest. His short poems (six lines at most), unremarkable in language and meter, mirror various aspects of Byz. society, esp. what have been called the permitted pleasures of baths, chariot-rides, and mimes; only one epigram is erotic. His descriptions of works of art include important testimony on portraits of officials, for example, an eparch of Constantinople and a koukikoulos (bk.16, nos. 32–33). Al. and Av. Cameron (JHS 86 [1966] 15) take the Peter of one poem (bk.7, no.579) to be Peter Patrikios; if this identification is correct, Leontios provides an account of that dignitary’s death from a fatal fall in the theater.


—B.B. A.C.

LEO OF CHALCEDON, a prelate who, between 1081 and 1091, opposed the secularization and the melting down of church treasures by Alexios I Komnenos. Leo’s opposition forced the emperor to back down temporarily (1082). The resumption of confiscations and the leniency of the patriarch and other bishops toward imperial policies led Leo to break communion with the patriarchate (1084). In 1086 the synod indicted and deposed him. The emperor published a decree (semeioma) justifying the secularization (Reg, vol. 2, no.1130). Eventually, Leo was reconciled with the church at the local council of Constantinople of 1094, held at Blachernai (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF).

The debates of the case involved the decree of the Second Council of Nicaea (787) about “worship” (latreia) due to God alone, and the “relative veneration” (proskynesis schetike) due to images. This “veneration” was seen as ultimately directed to the “prototypes,” not the materials out of which
images were made. Leo maintained, however, that a secular use of the material was equivalent to blasphemous disrespect for the image, and therefore the prototype. By assuming a body, the Logos had assumed a “form,” represented materially on an icon. The “form” was thus integrated in his divine person. Leo finally accepted the position that since “worship” was not addressed to the material image, the urgent needs of the state could be met at the expense of church treasures.


J.M.

LEO OF CONSTANTINOPLE, APOCALYPSE OF, text written in the tradition of Daniel and preserved in late MSS (from the 14th C. onward). One MS (Venice, Marc. gr. 11,101) identifies the author as Patr. Leo Stypes (1134–49), whereas another calls him the priest Leo. The Apocalypse of Leo reflects the views of a monastic milieu—the monks are the only social group that as a whole will enter paradise. Maisano (infra) distinguishes two versions of the Apocalypse: one of the 9th C., another of the 12th C. (he denies the authorship of Leo Stypes). The first version is anti-Iconoclastic, but at the same time very critical of Empress Irene, whose pious successor Constantine was not her son but a newcomer from Arabia. The second version contains some anti-Bogomil polemic (e.g., the rejection of their view of Enoch and Elijah as emanations of the Old Testament God). It remains questionable whether the first version was in fact a 9th-C. work.


A.K., J.L.

LEO OF OHRID, 11th-C. polemician. A former chartophylax of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, he became autocephalous archbishop of Ohrid after 1025. He was the spokesman of Patr. Michael I Kerouarios in debates between Byz. and Latin clergy in southern Italy, giving the controversies a universal dimension. In a letter (1053) sent to the Italian bishop John of Trani, but addressed “to all the bishops of the Franks and to the most respected pope,” Leo for the first time shifted the religious estrangement between East and West toward liturgical and disciplinary issues, basing his attack either on Scripture (the Latins were eating strangled meat, with blood, contrary to Acts 15:20), or on the canons of the Council in Trullo (fasting on Saturdays), or on simple differences of usage (chanting Alleluia during Lent). His major argument, however, was directed at the Latin use of azymes in the Eucharist. Two other letters of Leo expand on the same issues. Transmitted to Rome, the first letter of Leo provoked a sharp answer, written by Cardinal Humbert, initiating a whole series of exchanges, including the fateful mission of Humbert to Constantinople, and mutual anathemas (1054).


J.M.

LEO OF SYNADA, metropolitan, synkellos, diplomat, and writer; born ca.940. His biography is known only from his letters. These are addressed to the emperor (Basil II), whom Leo calls the Scythian and “antarctic” (ep.54.12), alluding to his Bulgarian campaigns, and also to various church and secular officials (ep.13 is addressed to the kanikheiros who is at the same time strategos, i.e., to Nikephoros Ouranos). Darrouzès dates the letters to the 990s, but if his identification of the addressee of Letter 25 with Christopher of Mytilene is valid, then some of the letters must be later. Mild humor and sarcasm fill the letters and esp. Leo’s will, written at the age of 66 (in which he calculates the number of his sins at 48,180). The most important part of Leo’s correspondence describes his embassy in 996–98, together with a certain Kalokyros, to Rome, where in his own view Leo acted boldly in support of the antipope (whom Leo calls Philagathos), although he despised him personally. In his letter to Patr. Sisinios (996–98), he boasts that Rome is now in the
hands of the “great emperor” (ep. 11.18–19). Leo mentions also his mission to “Frankia” (Aachen, according to Schramm) to negotiate a political marriage. One letter to the emperor (ep. 43) is valuable for his description of agriculture in the Synada region, where neither olive trees nor grapes grew, and instead of wheat the soil produced barley.


A.K.

LEO OF TRIPOLI (Arabic names Rasiq al-Wardami and Ghulam Zurafa), probably a MARDAITE from Attaleia, who was taken captive by the Arabs, converted to Islam, and became a commander of the Arab fleet. In 904 Leo set off against Constantinople. The suggestion that he captured Attaleia en route to Constantinople is an error arising from Arab sources’ confusion of Thessalonike and Attaleia. After taking Abydos, Leo diverted from his original goal and led his fleet toward Thessalonike; after a three-day siege in July (A. Kazhdan, BZ 71 [1978] 302), he sacked and pillaged the city. In 912 Leo and another Arab admiral, Damian, annihilated the fleet of HIMERIOS; in 921/2 Leo headed again for the Aegean Sea and devastated Lemnos, but was defeated by John Radenos, patrikios and droungarios of the fleet.


A.K.

LEO SAKELLARIOS, addressee of two letters from the Anonymous Teacher (R. Browning, B. Laourdas, EEBS 27 [1957] 161f) whose student he was; died before 943. Browning (Studies, pt. IX [1954], 434) suggests that the last datable letter in the collection is of 931, but C. Mango (infra) dates the letters to Leo shortly after 940. Mango identifies him as Leo, patrikios, praitpositos, and sakellarios, the patron of the illuminated Bible in the Vatican (Vat. Reg. gr. 1). The MS is a very large (41.0 × 27.0 cm) codex with 18 full-page miniatures intended as frontispieces to the books of Genesis through Psalms; some are, however, misplaced, and Canart (infra) has stressed the lack of overall planning and the uneven relationship between the miniatures, illuminated initials, and text. Each of the miniatures is enclosed in a border containing epigrams referring to the scene within. T. F. Mathews (OrChrP 43 [1977] 94–133) sees a close theological relationship between the epigrams and the miniatures, some of which are related to pictures in the Paris Psalter and the Octateuchs. The dedication miniatures show Leo, a eunuch, presenting his book to the Virgin (fol. 2v), as well as a kathegomenos, Makar, and Leo’s brother Constantine, founder of the monastery for which the Bible was most likely intended, in proskynesis before St. Nicholas (fol. 3r).
LEO THE DEACON, historian; born ca. 950 in Kaloe at Timolos (Asia Minor), died after 992 or 994. Leo received his education in Constantinople and became a palace deacon. His History encompasses 959–76 and includes some episodes from the beginning of Basil II’s reign, e.g., the disastrous expedition against Bulgaria in 986 in which Leo participated. His sympathies lie with Nikephoros II Phokas: quite possibly Leo, like Skylitzes, used a chronicle of the Phokas family that is now lost. The History criticizes Basil II (S. Ivanov, VizVrem 43 [1982] 74–80), whereas an enkomion of Basil attributed to Leo is full of flattering phrases (M. Sjuzjumov, ADSV 7 [1971] 138f); the difference can be explained either by the conventions of genre, by a change in Leo’s attitude, or by the existence of two homonyms at Basil’s court.

Leo’s worldview in the History is pessimistic: Providence determines success and righteousness, Tyche is made responsible for failures and injustice. Antiquity interests Leo: his paradigm is Agathonias rather than Theophanes the Confessor. His ethnography is archaic: the empire of the Romans seems to him surrounded by Huns, Scythians, Mysians, even Troglodytes, and the Rus’ are descendants of Achilles. Leo is bold enough not merely to compare his heroes to ancient personages but to equate them: Nikephoros II is a new Herakles, John I a new Tydeus. Leo rejected the contrast of the hero and villain. Three major personae of his story—Nikephoros, John, and Svjatoslav—are not embodiments of either virtue or evil but courageous warriors who nonetheless have their failings. The narrative is not a survey of sequential events but a unity of momentous episodes graphically presented. Leo tends to describe not only the actions but also the physical appearance of his major heroes. His history concentrates on men’s affairs; women, even Theophano, are pushed to the background.


LEO THE KOUROPALATES. See Phokas, Leo.

LEO THE MATHEMATICIAN, or Leo the Philosopher, scholar; born ca. 790, died Constantinople? after 869. After years of education (on Andros) and travels, Leo became a teacher in Constantinople. He came to prominence due to the interest of the caliph Ma’mūn in his studies; although invited to Baghdad, Leo remained in Constantinople. He constructed a system of beacon lights to carry messages about Arab raids (V. Aschoff in Deutsches Museum, Abhandlungen und Berichte 48.1 [1980] 1–28). The cousin (or nephew) of the Iconoclastic patriarch John VII Grammatikos, Leo was elected metropolitan of Thessalonike (840–43). After the defeat of Iconoclasm, he taught at the Magnaura school; Constantine the Philosopher may have been one of his pupils (I. Ėvěenko, AHR 79 [1974] 1533).

Leo assembled a library of which we know partly from his epigrams, partly from his notes on several MSS (Ptolemy, Archimedes, Plato); he encouraged the study of ancient mathematics and philosophy. V. Laurent proposed Leo as the author of a homily on the Annunciation that is full of antiquarian details (ST 232 [1964] 281–302). The central episode of the homily, however, the healing of a deaf-mute Jewish girl by the Virgin and St. Demetrios (whom she recognized since she had seen their icons displayed in a baptistery [p.301.146–49]), is inconsistent with Leo’s role as an Iconoclast bishop. Legends preserved by George Hamartolos, Symeon Logothete, Theophanes Continuatus, and others present Leo as an astrologer able to predict the future who knew how to raise abundant crops, played a significant part in the surrender of Amorion in 838, and built the automata adorning the imperial palace. Contemporaries regarded Leo as a “Hellene.” The attribution of the work of Leo and his namesakes, Leo VI and Leo Chiorosphaktes, is sometimes difficult.

LEO THE PHILOSOPHER. See Leo the Mathematician.

LEO THE PHYSICIAN, medical encyclopedist; traditionally dated to 9th C. but possibly as late as 12th–13th C. (cf. R. Renehan, DOP 38 [1984] 159, n.5). Leo is known for two works, Epitome on the Nature of Man, culled from a similar tract by Meletios the Monk, and Epitome of Medicine, a rather good summary in seven books of medical theory, therapeutics, and surgery (cf. Bliquez, “Surgical Instruments” 190f). Only occasionally does one detect Hippocrates and Galen in the latter work, and information is reduced to an extremely clipped format.


—J.S.

LEO TUSCUS, official translator (imperatoriarum epistolæarum interpess); fl. between 1160 or 1166 and 1182. A Pisan, brother of the theologian and author Hugo Eteriano, Leo was in Constantinople during Manuel I’s controversy with Demetrius of Lampe. While accompanying Manuel on campaign in Bithynia and Lykaonia (ca.1173–76) Leo sent his brother his translation of the dream book of Achmet ben Sirin. About 1173–78, Leo translated the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom with texts from the Hologogion and the Apostolos for the use of the Aragonese envoy Ramón de Mon(t)cada; he intended to make the Orthodox service comprehensible to the Western visitor.


—C.M.B.

LEPROSY (λέπρα, i€r€a χόρος). PAUL OF AEGINA (bk.4.1–2) presents the fullest Byz. account of “leprosy,” although his description includes psoriasis and related skin diseases as well as what modern medicine would call leprosy. Often be-
Romanus, sent it into slow decline. During the 5th C., the city endured the encroachment of sand dunes, heavy winter flooding, and the destruction of its walls by the Vandals. In 523 Leptis was sacked by the tribe of Leuathai. When Byz. forces entered the city in 533 it was partially covered by sand dunes and virtually depopulated. Justinian I made Leptis the seat of the dux of the limes of Tripolitania and constructed a new defensive wall that enclosed the port and old forum quarter. He is also credited with rebuilding the “palace” of Septimius Severus, probably the Severan forum, dedicating a church to the Mother of God (undoubtedly the 6th-C. church erected in the Severan basilica), and constructing four smaller churches (one of which is perhaps the 6th-C. church on the north side of the circular piazza, another the church erected in an early 2nd-C. temple). It was at a banquet at Leptis that the dux Sergios slew the chieftains of the Leuathai, precipitating a second major conflict between the Byz. and Mauri (543–48). As part of the reorganization of the prefecture of Africa (ca.585–91), Tripolitania, including Leptis, was attached to the diocese of Egypt. The subsequent history of Leptis is unknown, although it was perhaps abandoned by the time of the first Arab invasion of Tripolitania (643), since it is not mentioned in any accounts of the Muslim conquest.


LESBOΣ (Λέσβος), island in the northeastern Aegean Sea; its major cities were Mytilene (also Mitylene, a name also used for the entire island) and Methymna. Archaeological evidence reveals that in late antiquity Methymna had shrunk and shifted from the seashore to a position near the walls of the acropolis. In 802 the empress Irene was exiled to Lesbos, where she died. An important point on the sea lanes to Constantinople, Lesbos served as the gathering place for the fleet of Thomas the Slav (TheophCont 55,20–21). Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 17,24, ed. Pertusi, p.83) considered Lesbos part of the theme of the Aegean Sea; in the 11th C. it was under the command of the kourator of the dioikesis of Mytilene (An.Komm. 2:110,18–19). Tzachas occupied Mytilene, but Methymna remained a base for resistance against him. In the 12th C. the Venetians plundered Lesbos several times. After 1204 it was granted to Baldwin of Flanders. Reconquered by John III Vatatzes after 1224, the island was in 1354 given to the Genoese corsair Francesco Gattilusio, whose descendants ruled Lesbos until 1462. Archbishops of Mytilene and of Methymna are listed as autocephalous (Notitia CP 1:51, 1:58, etc.); Mytilene was raised to metropolitan status by the early 10th C. (7,678) and Methymna by the 12th C. (13,785).

Lesbos is esp. rich in the remains of churches from late antiquity: S. Charitonis (ArchDelt 23 [1968] 10–62) recorded some 54 individual churches from this period. The castle of Mytilene is largely Byz. in date (B. Petrakos, ArchDelt 31 [1976] 152–65).


LESNOVO MONASTERY. See GAVRIIL OF LESNOVO.

LESSER ARMENIA. See CILICIA, ARMENIAN.

LETTER. See EPISTOLOGRAPHY.

LETTER OF THE THREE PATRIARCHS, an iconodulic Greek text that has survived in several MSS, the earliest of which is in uncial script of the 9th C. (Patmos 48). A lemma to this letter states that it was compiled by Christopher of Alexandria (805–36), Job of Antioch (813/14–844/5), and Basil of Jerusalem (820–45, other dates have also been suggested) and sent to Emp. Theophilus in Constantinople; it was supposedly written in Jerusalem during a major council in Apr. 836 attended by 185 bishops, 17 hegoymenoi, and 1,153 monks and was devoted to the question of icon worship. In the 10th-C. Narration on the Image of Edessa, the Letter is mentioned but the names of the patriarchs are confused: Job is said to be “of Alexandria,” Christopher “of Antioch.” The authors of the Letter claim the apostolic origin of holy icons created earlier than the Gospels and describe miracles worked by a mosaic of the Adoration of the Magi in Bethlehem (ed. Duchesne,
infra 283f) and by icons in Alexandria, Cyprus, Constantinople, and on Lemnos.

The improbably large number of alleged participants in the council of 836, the unreserved praise of the victorious emperor Theophilos (Iconoclast though he was), and the overly expressed desires to reunite the patriarchates with Byz. (all three being under the authority of the caliph) make the authenticity of the Letter dubious. It was probably a political document created in the 9th C., after Theophilos's death (when a tendency to rehabilitate him emerged), at a time when several victories over the Arabs contributed to the illusion of an imminent reconquest of the lost eastern provinces. Eutychos of Alexandria was not familiar with the Letter but spoke instead of an epistle sent to Theophilos by Sophronios I, patriarch of Alexandria (836–59).


LEWOND, or Leontios, Armenian historian; fl. late 8th C. Nothing is known of him save that he was an eyewitness of events after 774 and wrote a History covering the period 632–789. It was commissioned by Bagratid Sapuh, son of Smbat, governor of Armenia 761–75. Although the History concentrates on Muslim control over Armenia, it also contains valuable information on the Byz.-Arab conflict in the 7th–8th C. The History includes a long letter, supposedly sent by Emp. Leo III to the caliph 'Umar II, which defends the Christian faith. This version of the letter is an Armenian composition added later (Gero, Leo III 153–71).

LEX AQUILIA (Ἀκούλιος νόμος), a plebiscite initiated by a certain Roman tribune, Aquilius, probably in the 3rd C. B.C., which in the course of time developed into a comprehensive law regarding injury to things (including animals and slaves) and, eventually, bodily injury to free men. The (private) action based on the Lex Aquilia was aimed at simple compensation or, when the perpetrator denied the charge, double compensation (Institutes 4:3; Digest 3:2; Cod.Just. 3:35; Basil. 60:3). Special regulations applied in cases where the injury was caused by a slave or an animal (see Noxal Actions). Although the “Akouiliou” (as the Lex Aquilia came to be known) was maintained in learned legal literature, in the rural sphere liability for the injury or death of animals was regulated differently and varied according to the case (see esp. Farmer's Law).

LEX FALCIDIA, a law of the Roman republic (40 B.C.) that was intended to secure for the heir or heirs a certain portion of a testator's property. To this end the encumbrance of the deceased's
estate with *legata* was permitted only to the extent of three-quarters of the value of the inheritance, so that one-quarter remained for the heirs. If the testator had encumbered this quarter as well, all *legata* were proportionately reduced. As "heirs" in the legal sense, they were considered the heirs instituted by the testator in a will. Following the dissolution of Roman family order from the 3rd C. onward, increasingly only children, parents, and siblings were still accepted as heirs. At the same time the limitations on the arrangements of the testator were gradually extended to all arrangements "in case of death," that is, besides the *legata*, mainly to *fideicommissa* and gifts *mortis causa*. The *quarta Falcidia* thereby became a legitimate portion. Justinian I regulated the law of legitimate portion thoroughly and thereby increased it for children (*Nov. Just. 18, 115*). It is unclear whether the legitimate portion for parents was to remain one-quarter and whether the portion for siblings was to be maintained at all.

Later sources deal almost exclusively with the legitimate portion for children, which was practically the only important inheritance portion, now called *ho Phalkidios*; it amounts to a third of the parental estate if there are up to four children; if five or more, half of the parental estate is divided. The net fortune (*kathara ousia*) serves as a basis for calculation. The portion of the property that comes under assessment (1/3 or 1/2) is divided according to the number of children. If the testator had undertaken many arrangements, difficult problems of calculation could occur, for which Byz. legal literature has left a series of special treatises, most of them still unedited.


LEXICON VINDOBONENSE. See Lopadiotes, Andrew.

LEXIKAI, lists of Greek words, often rare or unusual, with explanation of their meanings. The earliest Byz. *lexikon*, falsely attributed to Cyril of Alexandria and probably compiled in the 5th/6th C., exists in many different recensions (M. Naoumides, *ICS* 4 [1979] 94–135). It includes words from classical literature and biblical words, and was primarily intended for use in the teaching of rhetoric.

The 9th-C. revival of learning led to the compilation of the earliest *etymologika* and the *Lexikon* of Photios, which drew both on commentaries on classical texts and on the debris of *lexika* from classical antiquity. These latter were of three main types: (1) descriptive lists of rare words or meanings occurring in classical literature (e.g., the *Lexikon* of Hesychios of Alexandria); (2) prescriptive lists of "correct" words or meanings drawn up by Atticists such as Aelius Dionysius, Pausanius, Phrynichos, and Moiris; and (3) etymological lists explaining the true meanings of words by their supposed derivation, based on the assumption that the structure of language reflects that of the universe. Byz. lexicographers used all three types. The *Souda* is a combination of *lexikon* and biographical dictionary compiled from a wide variety of classical and later sources. The longest Byz. *lexikon* and the most frequently used and copied—more than 100 MSS survive—is that of pseudo-Zonaras, compiled in the first half of the 13th C., perhaps by Nikephoros Blemmydes, for educational use. The renewed classicism of the late 19th and early 14th C. stimulated the compilation of new prescriptive Atticist *lexika*, one attributed to Manuel Moschopoulos, the other by Thomas Magistros.

In addition to general *lexika*, the Byz. used and compiled short specialist *lexika* (e.g., botanical, geographical), as well as a *Lexikon of Synonyms* by pseudo-Ammonios, which distinguished between words of similar meaning. Byz. *lexika* are of interest both for their information on Byz. attitudes and for the fragments of lost classical and later works which they contain.


—R.B.

LEX RHODIA. See Rhodian Sea Law.

LIBADARIOI (Ἀλβαδάριοι, fem. Ἀλβαδαρέα), a family considered by Pachymeres as one of the greatest in the mid-13th C. Their connection with
the Libadas family, one of whom, Demetrios, was an official (in the department of the megas logiastes?) in 1186 (Patmou Engraphe 1:92–94), is unclear. The Libadarioi held high court and military posts. A certain Libadarios, related to the Mouzalon family, was appointed pinkernes by Michael VIII, and his daughter married Michael’s son, Theodore Palaiologos. Another Libadarios, megas chartularios and strategos of Tralles, was defeated by the Turks ca.1280. A different Libadarios was protosvestiaries and later megas stratopedarches and governor of Neokastra near Smyrna ca.1295; he fought successfully against Alexios Philanthropenos. Some Libadarioi were patrons of monasteries: Libadarea, wife of a megas stratopedarches, founded a nunnery in Thessalonike before 1326; ca.1300 Theodore Komnenos Libadarios established a monastery dedicated to the Virgin, which Manuel Philes praised, and also commissioned the painted decoration of a monastery of St. George near Servia. The Libadarioi should probably be distinguished from the Limpidares/Limpidarios family, known as commanders of the army and fleet in the 14th C. (PLP, nos. 14940–41).

LIT. PLP, nos. 14856–62. — A.K.

LIBADENOS, ANDREW, ecclesiastical and imperial official in Trebizond and writer; born Constantinople between 1308 and 1316, died after 1361. After schooling in Constantinople, Libadenos (Λιβαδένος) had the opportunity at age 12 to serve as undersecretary on an embassy to the Mamluk sultan in Egypt (sometime before 1328). During this journey he also made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. At some point after his return to Constantinople he was appointed apographeus of the island of Tenedos. About 1335, motivated by the desire to study astronomy, he went to Trebizond, where he spent most of his remaining years in the service of the metropolitan (as chartophylax) and of the Grand Komnenos (as a notary). His career was troubled by bouts of ill health and the civil strife that plagued the Trapezuntine Empire. Libadenos is last mentioned in 1361.

The primary source for his life history is the autobiographical Periogiesis (Geographical Description), which relates events down to 1355. He also composed an enkomion of St. Phokas, verses to the Virgin, and a horoscope for the year 1336. His writings reveal some familiarity with ancient authors and abound in citations of the Old Testament, New Testament, and church fathers.


LIBANIOS (Λιβανίος), rhetorician and teacher; born Antioch ca.314, died Antioch ca.393. Libanios was educated at Antioch and Athens. After brief professorial tenure in Athens, Constantinople, and Nikomedea, he returned in 354 to an official teaching post in Antioch for the rest of his life. He accepted an honorary praetorian prefecture from Theodosios I in 383. Nostalgic for what then passed as classical culture, he clung to paganism and was devastated by the premature death of Emp. Julian, about whom he wrote sympathetic orations. Libanios preferred coexistence to confrontation and taught and mixed with men of both faiths, including Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzos, and John Chrysostom. Outside the political mainstream by choice, he championed many an individual and municipal cause in 64 speeches (the first was his autobiography) and 1,600 letters. He was an eloquent spokesman for the material and cultural aspiration of the curiales, but also a critic of social oppression. More pedagogical are his school declarations and similar model exercises. Libanios tried to write in pure Attic, with results that are now viewed as tortuous but were much admired by Byz. stylists.


LIBELLESIOS (Λιβέλλησιος or Λιβέλλησιος), according to the Kletorologion of Philotheos a subaltern official in the department of the quaestor.
Bury (Adm. System 77) thought that the *libellesios* was a successor of the late Roman *libellensis*, who performed secretarial functions in the *scrinium libellorum* and in other bureaus (A. von Premerstein, RE 13 [1927] 24–26). In the 10th C. the term *libellos* designated a document connected with assignment of a *klasma* (e.g., Prot., no.5.37) and it is probable that the *libellesios* had specific notarial duties: a seal of the 11th C. belonged to a certain John, *libellesios* and imperial notary (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.210). Döger (Diplomatik 69) hypothesized that the *libellesios* made notes on petitions addressed to the emperor, while Ljubarskij (Psell 275) surmised that he composed imperial acts; neither of these theories has any substantive basis. The *libellesios* played a role in palace ceremonial, serving as the mouthpiece of the Augusta (De cer. 418.20–22). There were also provincial *libellesioi*-notaries: for example, Nicholas, *libellesios* and *symbolaioi*raphos in 897 (Lavra 1, no.1.34); Nicholas, *koubouklelesios* and *libellesios* of Thessalonike in 982 (Ivir. 1, no.479); Stephen, *libellesios* and *primikerios* of the *taboullarioi* in Thessalonike in 1097 (Lavra 1, no.5.42). In contrast to this evidence, the anonymous *libellesios* addressed by Psellos (Sathas, MB 5:451.26) was a high-ranking functionary of the civil administration. Peter Libellisios, a well-educated inhabitant of Antioch in the second half of the 11th C., mastered both Greek and Arabic learning, but it is not clear whether *libellesios* was his job or his family name.

Lit. Oikonomides, Lists 322. —A.K.

**LIBER DIURNUS** (lit. “day book”), anonymous collection of papal letter formulas and documents from the 6th to 8th C. preserved in three slightly distinct MS versions from the early 9th and 10th C. Many formulas recur wholly or partially in letters of contemporary and later popes, and the formulation and topics of the letters shed much light on ecclesiastical affairs of Byz. Italy and relations between the *Papacy* and Constantinople. Much like the De ceremoniis, the Liber diurnus includes a list of addresses and subscriptions appropriate to papal correspondence with the emperor and high officials of Constantinople and the provinces (ed. Foerster, infra 181f). A number of the documents reveal the local historical situation, reflecting for instance the care of bishops disorganized by enemy action (82f), or procedures for petitioning the emperor (112f) or the exarch (113–21) for confirmation of papal elections, as well as attesting local bishops’ anti-Monotheletism and loyalty to the emperor (136f; cf. 138) or prayers for his triumph (e.g., 164).


**LIBERIUS**, pope (from 17 May 352); died Rome 24 Sept. 366. The pontificate of Liberius coincides with the upsurge of Arianism supported by Constantius II. The Arians required Liberius to condemn Athanasius of Alexandria. After a long struggle Constantius achieved this condemnation at the Council of Milan in 355; since Liberius refused to submit, he was exiled to Berroia and replaced by Felix II (355–65). Liberius finally yielded and after a time was allowed to return to Rome as Felix’s colleague—the witty Romans exclaimed that they now had two parties and two colors, as in the circus (Theodoret of Cyrrhus, HE 2.17.5–6). The death of Constantius in 361 allowed Liberius to retreat and find common ground with the Homoousians, who leaned toward a slightly revised formula of the creed of the Council of Nicaea. Liberius was popular in Rome, esp. as founder of the Basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore. In the hagiography of the 6th C., however, he is presented as a traitor, while Felix II is depicted as a firm supporter of Orthodoxy.


**LIBER PONTIFICALIS** (Pontifical Book), prime source on Byz., the *papacy*, and Italy that records pontificates from Peter to the late 9th C. The initial section was compiled in the 6th (Duchesne) or early 7th C. (Mommsen), relying on general historical sources whose value ranges from poor (down to Gelasius I and from Vigilius to Benedict I) to excellent (Anastasius II to Silverius). The Liber pontificalis consistently drew from papal archives information on munificence by and under each pope from Silvester onward, whence
splendid data on Byz. monuments of Rome (H. Geertman, *More veterum* [Groningen 1975]) and imperial grants from Constantine I to Constantine V (Reg 1, no. 310). From Pope Honorius I, biographies were composed by contemporaries in the papal entourage (e.g., Anatasius Bibliothecarius) and even published during the subject’s lifetime. While the structure of each biography remains essentially the same (name, geographical origin, parentage, length of reign, writings, significant historical events, constructions, gifts, death, burial), the length, detail, focus, and reliability vary greatly from life to life (e.g., O. Bertolini in *La storiografia altomedievale* [= SetStu 17] [Spoleto 1970] 387–455) or even within different parts or recensions of the same life. Thus one recension of the Life of Gregory II pays more attention to Byz. than the other, supplying details on the future pope’s theological discussion with Justinian II (ed. Duchesne, *infra* 1:396.8–11), Byz. cooperation with the Lombards, and the usurpation of Tiberius Petasius (ibid. 407.19–409.9). Countless later historians of religious institutions, such as Agnellus and the deacon John of Naples, took the Liber pontificalis as their model. The continuations from Pope John VIII to Urban II, the so-called Liber pontificalis of Pierre Guillaume (ed. J.M. March [Barcelona 1925]), rarely touch on Byz.


LIBISTROS AND RHODAMNE (Λίβιστρος καὶ Ῥοδάμην), an anonymous romance (about 4,500 unrhymed political verses, in the longest of several discrepant MSS). Because both Theodore Meliteniotes (died 1393) and Mazaries (*Journey to Hades*, ca. 1415) refer to the poem, it must be dated to the 14th C. Libistros and Rhodamne is formally the most sophisticated of the Byz. “popular” verse romances of chivalry: a first-person narrative by Klitobos, traveling companion to Libistros, starts in medias res and covers both the adventures that Libistros describes to him and also the hazards he and Libistros experience together as they seek for Rhodamne. Although written within the tradition of the novels of late antiquity and those of the 12th C., Libistros and Rhodamne has much in common with *Kallimachos* and *Chryssorhoe* and Belthandros and Chrysanta including elaborate ephrasesis of buildings, witches, and magic horses as well as Latin princes and Frankish hairstyles that reflect a mixed Frankish-Greek society, such as that of the Morea.


LIBRA. See Litra.

LIBRARY (βιβλιοθήκη). Libraries underwent a substantial change during late antiquity: municipal libraries disappeared and the public libraries organized by Constantius II (*Themistios, Orationes* 1:84–87) and Theodosios II were state institutions. Byz. libraries could be imperial (such as the one in 15th-C. Constantinople described by Pera Taufur), patriarchal, monastic, or private. As Wilson (*infra* 281) stresses, “the university of Constantinople has left no trace of a central library,” though Constantine IX’s foundation charter for the School of Law makes provision for one. Some libraries had inventories, several of which (e.g., the catalog of the library of the monastery on Patmos) have survived. The books had shelf-marks (e.g., at the library of the Great Lavra on Athos) and were placed on shelves accordingly. Some libraries had their own scriptoria and professionals to repair and bind books (*L. Politis in Wandlungen* [Waldsassen-Bavaria 1975] 285–92). Data concerning the size of libraries are rare: in the early 13th C. the Patmos library had approximately 330 books; the library of Lavra possessed about 960 MSS. Most libraries, esp. private ones, were much smaller (e.g., the library of Eustathios Boilas in the late 11th C. contained 81 books).

The contents of libraries differed significantly: a 6th-C. papyrus list of ten books given to a monastery contains a chronicle and biblical, patristic, and hagiographical texts (R. Dostalová, *Byzantina* 13.1 [1985] 535–47); the inventories of
Later monastic libraries were similar. The library of the patriarchate of Constantinople reportedly possessed a special chest of heretical books. The private library varied according to the individual: men like Libanius read widely in classical poets and rhetoricians (A. Norman, *RhM* 107 [1964] 158–75); the bibliophile Arethas of Caesarea acquired primarily secular classics. John Konnenos Synadenos (late 15th C.), son-in-law of Michael VIII's brother and uncle of John VI Kantakouzenos and Andronikos III, collected religious books. George Palaiologos Kantakouzenos (mid-15th C.) owned a library at Kalavryta that included Herodotus and Prokopios. (See also Mousieion and Library of Alexandria.)


**LIBRI CAROLINI** (Books of Charles), treatise containing a violent theological attack on the Second Council of Nicaea of 787 and the cult of icon veneration, prepared ca. 790–93 in the name of Charlemagne by his entourage, particularly Theodulf of Orleans. The Libri Carolini was evidently revised and then abandoned because of the reluctance of Pope Hadrian I to condemn the council. The aggressively formulated refutation of the Byz. council survives in the original MS (Vat. lat. 7207) and still bears in the margins what may be notes of Charlemagne’s oral comments (A. Freeman, *Speculum* 46 [1971] 608–12). The Libri Carolini expresses polemical outrage at the relics of the imperial cult embedded in Byz. etiquette and official jargon (1.1–4) and assails the role of imperial portraits in Byz. public life (3.13). The treatise was motivated in part by imperfect Latin translation of the original Greek acts (latreia [worship] of God and prosknēsis of icons were both rendered as *adoratio*, whence the charge of idolatry) and in part by political and military competition with Constantinople, perhaps aggravated by a perceived rapprochement between the Papacy and Constantinople (G. Arnaldi in *Culto cristiano, politica imperiale carolingia* [Todi 1979] 61–86; cf. P. Speck, *Kaiser Konstantin VI*, vol. 1 [Munich 1978] 163–65, 185f).


**LICARIO** (*Ikápios* of Greek sources), Italian adventurer in the service of Michael VIII Palaiologos; dates of birth and death unknown. From a Veronese family that settled in *Negroponte* (Euboea), Licario incurred the displeasure of the Lombard rulers of the island through his liaison with a noble widow and fled to a castle near Karystos. The chronology of his career is uncertain; Loenertz (*ByzFGr* I 558–70) has proposed the following sequence of events: in 1271 Licario offered his services to the Byz., became an imperial vassal, and seized several castles on Euboea. After taking Karystos in 1276–77, he was rewarded by Michael VIII with the whole island as a fief and with a noble Greek wife. He eventually conquered all Euboea except for Chalkis and restored to Byz. control a number of Aegean islands: Skopelos, Skyros, Skiathos, Amorgos, Keos, Santorini, and Lemnos. In 1276 Licario was appointed *megas konsta naulos*, the next year *megas doux*. In 1279/80 he captured John I de la Roche, duke of Athens, and Giberto da Verona, triumvir of Euboea, and brought them triumphantly to Constantinople. Thereafter he disappears from the sources.


**LICINIUS** (*Alkínios*), more fully Valerius Licini anus Licinius, augustus (308–324); born Dacia ca. 265, died Thessalonike spring 325. Friend and perhaps praetorian prefect of Galerius, he was named augustus at the Conference of Carnuntum in 308 and held power in the East. In the succeeding civil wars Licinius allied with Constantine I and married his half-sister Constantia in 313. He proclaimed toleration of Christians in his territory at an early date (see *Edict of Milan*), and the struggle with Maximinus became a contest
between monotheism and polytheism. Just before going into battle Licinius had his men recite a prayer to the “Great Holy God”; he was then victorious. After May of 313 Licinius was supreme in the East as Constantine was in the West. By 316 relations between the two emperors had deteriorated and there was open war in the Balkans. From this time onward Licinius sought the support of pagans and openly harassed Christians in his domain. War broke out again in 324. Licinius was defeated, first in Thrace, then at Chrysopolis in Bithynia on 18 Sept. Licinius abdicated the next day. He was sent into exile in Thessalonike, where he was subsequently executed.


-T.E.G.

LIFE EXPECTANCY. The evidence of skeletal material from archaeological excavations suggests a mean age at death of about 35 years for the Byz. population. Women usually died earlier than men, primarily because of the higher mortality associated with childbirth and, possibly, poorer food. The anthropological findings are corroborated by the evidence of funerary epitaphs (Patlagean, Pawreté 95–100) and praktika (Laiou, Peasant Society 296). Byz. longevity was comparable to that of Iron Age Greece and lower than that of classical Greece, when the mean age at death was 45 years for men and 36 for women. Nevertheless, the Byz. definition of old age (geras) was similar to the modern conception; it began about 60. Anyone living into his 70s was considered to have exceeded the allotted biblical life span of 70 (Ps 90:10) and to have entered “extreme old age.” Literary evidence indicates that many Byz. did have long lives. Thus, the average life span of the Komnenian emperors was 61, of the Macedonian 59, and of the Palaiologan 60. Scholars also tended to live into their 60s or 70s (A. Kazhdan, ByzF 8 [1982] 16f). Saints reputedly lived longest, often into their 80s or 90s; in fact there seems to be a correlation between old age and sanctity.


-T.A.M.

LIGATURE, term used in palaeography and epigraphy. It describes the linking together of letters to save space and time. Gardthausen (Pala-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epigraphy</th>
<th>Minuscule MSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma ) = OY</td>
<td>( \gamma = o )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| \( \tau \) = TP | \( \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \) = \( \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \)
| \( \tau \) = TH | \( \delta \) = \( \delta \) |
| \( \xi \) = \( \epsilon \tau \) | \( \epsilon \tau \) |
| \( \rho \) = \( \epsilon \rho \) | \( \epsilon \rho \) |

Ligature. Sample ligatures.

laeographie 2:53) classifies ligatures into primary, secondary, and tertiary examples. In primary ligatures, letters are combined but preserve their essential elements; in secondary ligatures two letters are united so that they share a common element; in tertiary ligatures three letters are joined. In epigraphy there are examples of eight letters combined together. Occurring relatively infrequently in uncial MSS, ligatures became common in cursive and minuscule script.

-A.M.T., A.K.

LIGHT (φῶς). Byz. terminology for light can be classified into two distinct areas: liturgy and spirituality, which of course are interdependent. From the time of Justin the Philosopher and Ignatius of Antioch baptism was designated primarily as “illumination” (phutismos). Epiphany, the preferred day of baptism, bore the name “Festival of Lights” or “Lights” (J. Ysebaert, Greek Baptismal Terminology [Nijmegen 1962] 157–78). The light (the Sun) is naturally Christ, as expressed in the thanksgiving hymn of the eucharistic liturgy (Phos Hilaron) and in Christmas hymns. Every weekday should be concluded with a thanksgiving for the light. The illumination of spiritual man through Christ is the favorite theme of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite and Symeon the Theologian. John Climacus (Scala paradisi 26, PG 88:1020D) described the angels as the light of the monk, and monastic life as the light of all men, while Gregory Palamas incorporated the vision of the (transfigured) light in his doctrine of energies and assigned it first rank in spiritual life.

Light in Art. In the visual arts light is not so much the medium of visual perception as a token of sanctity or majesty. Illumination is almost always an emanation from a divine source, created by God (Gen 1:3) or projected by a sacred figure.
As in the narthex mosaic of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, the enthroned Christ often carries an inscription identifying him as the Light of the World (Jn 1:9) and he is invariably treated as a source of light, even if this is conveyed by reflections from his skin and brilliant vestments. The sun and moon, when represented, rarely cast light, although an arc of heaven, inhabited or not, frequently illuminates the upturned face of a holy man (e.g., in the Menologion of Basil II [Cutler-Nesbitt, Arte 230]). Recipients of sacred light are shown blinded (St. Paul), bowled over (the apostles in the Transfiguration), or, like the face of Moses, reflecting the glory of God. The marked 14th-C. interest in the depiction of light has been connected with Palamite vision.

Formally, light is as often a decorative device spun over the surfaces of objects as an element contributing to their substantiality. In mosaic and fresco its impact is registered by the liberal use of white; on silver and ivory its effects are heightened by burnishing. In sacred pictures light normally descends from above, illuminating the upper surfaces of the faces and limbs of figures. But there is no suggestion of a specific source, and the various parts of an image are lit independently. The play of light and shade is determined more by conventional means of suggesting plas- ticulty than by the search for a consistent effect. During and after the 11th C. the drapery of sacred figures is enlivened with chrysography (see illuminators), brilliant splashes of gold emitting rays over adjacent surfaces of the fabric. The highlights on faces, hands, and drapery in early Palaiologan painting are later broken into short parallel strokes; vestments seem to crackle electrically. This is part of an apparent effort to give physical form to radiance, an attempt most palpable in images of the Ascent of Elijah and of the Transfiguration.


pose, often carried a wide range of connotations (G. Galavaris, BMGS 4 [1978] 69–78). Though the church fathers tried to restrict the lavish display of lights in churches, it is evident from accounts in the Liber pontificalis that by the late 4th C. ecclesiastical lighting had become remarkably elaborate. A novel of Justinian I of 538 (67 pr.) stressed the importance of providing revenues for the maintenance of lighting in a church. Textual evidence and dedicatory inscriptions show that many lighting fixtures were the votive offerings of both church officials and laymen.

Polykandela with glass lamps were the dominant lighting devices before the 8th C. The earliest types are crown-shaped with dolphin-brackets supporting glass lamps (Greece and the Sea [Amsterdam 1987] no.150). Three other sorts of silver polykandela are found in the Sion Treasure: circular, cross-shaped, or in the form of a rectangular tray. Openwork silver lamps (kaniskia) were employed in churches along with lamps of solid metal; the altar was illuminated with floor candelabra and lampstands as well (Mango, Silver 96–101). In Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, cross and disk-shaped polykandela are recorded, along with boat-shaped lamps and tree-shaped chandeliers (Paul Silentarijos).

From the 9th C. onward, ecclesiastical lighting
increasingly relied on candles. *Polykandela*, some of them in silver, continued in use. In the 12th C. the *choros*, a polygonal structure carrying *polykandela* or lamps and candles, was introduced in domed churches. Floor candelabra in pairs (*manoulia*) were employed in front of votive icons, sometimes furnished with disks with extra candle-holders for the major feasts. Metal beams carrying candleholders (*lamnai*) were employed over the temple epistyle and icon frames. Oil lamps with one or more lights (*kandelai*) were suspended before votive icons of Christ and the Virgin, under the dome, over the holy altar, and before the bema doors. Lanterns enclosing as many as ten lamps were employed for the illumination of open spaces around the church during processions. A number of monastic *typika* provide explicit instructions for the lavish illumination of churches on major feasts and the anniversaries of the deaths of the founders.


—L.Ph.B.

**LIGHTING IN EVERYDAY LIFE.** Private houses were illuminated by small windows (*photagogia*) by day, and lighting devices (*lychnia*) after dusk. *Lychnia*, along with a couch and table, were considered the most essential furnishings of a house (vita of Basil the Younger, ed. Vilinskij, 1:300.32–33). In the late Roman period, the lamp (of clay, metal, or glass) remained the major lighting device. Even though literary texts continue to mention lamps through the entire Byz. period, archaeological evidence shows that clay lamps practically disappeared after the 7th C. They were replaced by candles. Certainly palaces and rich houses were brightly illuminated, esp. during banquets. Monastic authorities disapproved of candles in cells—thus Lazaros of Mt. Galesios regarded a monk who lit a candle in his cell as dead in the eyes of God (AASS Nov. 3:549AB); John Moschos tells the legend of a monk who did not need artificial light because he was able to read in the dark (PG 87:2998A).

Streets in large cities of the 4th–6th C. had artificial lighting: *kyros*, the prefect of Constantinople, installed lighting devices on major thoroughfares of the capital after 437, and Theodosios II imposed a tax on houses and shops in the area of the Baths of Zeuxippos to maintain the luminaria (*Cod. Just. VIII* 11.19). Apparently, the system fell into decay even in Constantinople: the Synaxarion of Constantinople (*Synax.CP* 231.35–39) records that near Hagia Sophia it was so dark that people needed a torch to walk at night. The Book of the Eparch (*Bk. of Eparch* 19.3) required shopkeepers to switch off lighting devices (*lebetia*) in the evening; legend has it that Leo VI was arrested and beaten by a watchman when he decided to walk at night. Yet lights were used in public buildings (bathhouses, amphitheaters) and in special situations—in lighthouses, on boats, for optical signals (see Beacons), and in warfare.


—A.K., L.Ph.B.

**LIKANDOS.** See Lykandos.

**LIMBURG AN-DER-LAHN RELIQUARY,** the most resplendent extant example of a Byz. *staurotheke*, that is, a container for a fragment of the True Cross. It consists of two chronologically distinct parts unified, however, by the common use of silver-gilt, enamel, and gems. The front displays images of the Deesis, developed to include the archangels Michael and Gabriel, the 12 apostles and military saints, as well as an inscription in which Basil the Notos is given the title of *proedros*, thus indicating a date after 963. Basil claims responsibility for the work in verses that relate its splendor to the beauty of Christ who died on the wood contained in the reliquary. In the same spirit, the back is decorated with a foliate cross. The reliquary itself was set within an inner, cruciform compartment, surrounded by seraphim, cherubim, and other heavenly powers represented on the lids of compartments labeled for relics of Christ (such as the towel with which he washed the apostles’ feet), of the Virgin, and of St. John the Baptist. An inscription on the frame for the Cross names two emperors, Constantine (VII) and Romanos (probably I, but possibly II). They are said to have crushed the barbarians as Christ shattered the gates of Hell. In 1207 the reliquary was brought from Constantinople to the West by the Crusader Heinrich von Ulmen.

Made by Absens

Limburg an-der-Lahn Reliquary. Interior of the box with the setting for the cross reliquary and compartments for various other relics. Cathedral Treasury, Limburg an-der-Lahn.


—M.E.F., A.C.

LIMES, a Roman term designating the boundary, esp. the system of frontier fortifications that was developed in Britain, Upper Germany, RAETIA, the Danubian provinces (PANNONIA, SCYTHIA MINOR), the eastern provinces (SYRIA, PALESTINE), and AFRICA from the 2nd C. onward. Different in different areas and periods, the fortifications of the LIMES have not yet been properly categorized. Their major elements include palisades, earthen walls, ditches, wooden towers, and forts. Under Diocletian (or earlier) appeared the castella, or quadriburgia, of the so-called Diocletianic type — relatively small forts, square in plan, with square angle- and interval-towers that saddle the curtain walls (J. Lander in Roman Frontier Studies, ed. W.S. Hanson, L.J.F. Keppie, vol. 3 [Oxford 1980] 1051–60). On the Middle Danube, Valentinian I organized active construction of new fortifications but, after the catastrophe at Adrianople in 378, the LIMES was restructured: forts became smaller, while towers of smaller size were abandoned and replaced by larger ones (S. Soproni, Die letzten Jahrzehnte des pannonischen Limes [Munich 1985] 98ff.). Attempts to fortify the frontier took place again under Anastasios I and Justinian I; among the new forts and walls erected at this time were the LONG WALL in Thrace and the fortification in southwestern Crimea. New forts were constructed on the Lower Danube in the second half of the 10th C.

From the 4th C. onward, the settled garrisons of LIMITANI were placed along the LIMES. Farming communities were transplanted to the LIMES to guarantee the upkeep and provisioning of forts (M. Gichon in StMlRom 1 [1967] 191ff). Eventually, the LIMITANI themselves became settled farmers. The LIMES was also a factor in the increased activity of artisans in the frontier districts (A. Rădulescu in StMlRom 2 [1977] 387–92).


—A.K.

LIMISA (Ksar Lemsa), site of one of the best-preserved Byz. quadriburgia (four-towered forts) in North Africa. Its position on the Oued Maarouf along the southeastern slope of the Tunisian doral served to guard against MAURI incursions into the province of AFRICA PROCONSULARIS. The fort itself is undated. Diehl (L’Afrique 205–10) proposed a Justinianic date. Pringle (infra), drawing attention to an inscription referring to the construction of a turris in the reign of Maurice and found 1 km east of Ksar Lemsa, suggested that inscription and fort belong together (in which case turris would refer to the fort itself). P.-A. Fevrier (Revue de l’Occident Musulman et de la Méditerranée 35 [1983] 35), however, rejected the link between the two on the grounds that the inscription refers to a singular turrin, unlikely to be anything more than an isolated tower. Apart from a reference to
an *episcopus Limnicensis* at the council of 646, nothing else is known of the settlement’s history.


**LIMITANEI** (from Lat. *limes*), late Roman Empire frontier soldiers, as opposed to the mobile army of the comitatenses. The origin of *limitanei* is unclear; the *Historia Augusta* (ed. Hohl, 1:298.5-6) asserts that Severus Alexander (222-35) assigned conquered land to the *limitanei*, but O. Seeck (*RE* 2.R. 1 [1920] 917) rejects this statement as a forgery. A 6th-C. historian (Malal. 308.17-19) says that Diocletian built fortresses on the eastern frontier and stationed *limitanei* there. The term *ripenses*, or *riparienses*, was used between 325 and 400 for frontier soldiers on the Danube, from Scythia to Pannonia Secunda, but from 369 onward (*Cod.Theod. XII* 1.56) the term was replaced by *limitanei*. Cavalry and infantry *limitanei* formed units under the command of a *dux* (see Doux), with normally two legions in each province, while auxiliary troops were under the command of the governor of the province. Less privileged than *comitatenses*, the *limitanei* had to serve 25 years; they received *annona* in kind for nine months a year and money for three months; from the second half of the 4th C. the entire *annona* was commuted to cash. Officers tried to secure most of the pay for themselves and, according to Themistios (ed. Schenkl, Downey, 1:207.1-19), urged soldiers to make their living by plundering the vicinity. *Limitanei* were peasant soldiers, and Justinian (*Cod.Just. I* 27.8) describes their duty as “defending the castles and towns of frontier districts and tilling the soil.” Enrollment in the border troops was hereditary, from father to son. By the 6th C. the *limitanei* grew inefficient, and Prokopios (*SH* 24.12-13) reports that Justinian deprived them of the “name of warriors.” The system disappeared after the old *limes* was overrun by barbarians, and the last mention is probably for 586.


**LINE AND CONTOUR**, the essential means by which form is defined in the artistic theory of the church fathers and later Greek writers. Eusebius of Caesarea (PG 20:1545C) objected to the making of holy images on the grounds that delineations (*skiaographiai*) and the colors added thereafter are inanimate; John Chrysostom (PG 51:247-49) describes the creation of imperial portraits in terms of white lines sketched around their figures. “Shadowy outline” (*apokrisma*) was, for Andrew of Crete (PG 97:1213C), the first step that painters took before applying color. According to Ignatios the Deacon in his vita of Tarasios (418.10-14), additions were the work of the master and his companions after the master had drawn the black sketch that “announced the design.” These views accord with practice. A standard technique of *mosaic* decoration was the outlining of figures with courses of tesserae; wall painters imitated this method. Ivory craftsmen defined carved figures with contours before cutting away superfluous material, while the technique of *enameling* called for both contour and interior lines. This emphasis on linearity militated against *plasticity* and substituted for the classical aesthetic a manner that was characteristically Byz.


**LINEAGE.** The nuclear family became the cornerstone of Byz. society by the 8th C.; even earlier the Roman concept of *gens*, with its inner links and family *names*, was in a state of decline. The extended family, living together in a single household (e.g., the three-generation family of St. Philiparetos the Merciful) continued to exist, but on the other hand there is no evidence of the concept of lineage as a community based on kinship and mutual support. So far as can be judged by the history of the Heraklian dynasty in the 7th C., family links were considered dangerous and burdensome rather than supportive. The reappearance of lineage can be dated to ca.1000; after this date family names are abundant in sources; certainly some lineages (Skleros, Phokas, Doukas) were established a century earlier.

**LINCOLN COLLEGE TYPIKON.** See Bebaisas Elpidios Nunnery.
From the end of the 11th C., lineages became the basis of political organization and, unlike the 7th-C. emperors, the Komnenoi and later Palaiologoi were supported by an expanded network of kinship. The Byz. lineage of the 12th–15th C. remained, however, a loose social grouping: it was not strictly patrilineal—the relatives on the maternal side were not excluded from the lineage; it had no common property; the tracing of lineage to a common ancestor (going back to the traditional heroes of Greek legends or Roman aristocratic families) and not to mythical founders of the particular lineage was in an incipient phase. The concept of princely rule as the “property” of a lineage (the principle of the Merovingians or Kievan Rus’) was never developed in Byz. —A.K.

LINEN. Even though the cultivation of flax is hardly mentioned in the Geoponika (2.40.3), it played a significant role in Byz. agriculture: stored in the proasteion of Baris, for example, in 1073 were wheat, barley, beans, and flax seeds, or linokokkoi (Patmou Engrapba 2, no.50.119–20), a term that frequently appears in later documents (e.g., Patmou Engrapba 1, no.11.27; P. Schreiner, JOB 27 [1978] 219–27). The seeds were processed in special ergasteria, called linelaiotribika (Lavra 3, no.168.4–5), and made into oil (linelaion). A chrysobell of 1088 distinguishes the seeds from the linarion, or flax fibers (Patmou Engrapba 1, no.6.55), whereas a chrysobell of 1086 considers linarion as a kind of seed (Lavra 1, no.48.41–42).

The fibers of flax were used to produce textiles. In the late Roman period Egypt was the traditional center of the linen industry: the spinning of linen thread was often a household industry there (e.g., Palladius, Hist.Laus., ed. Butler, 21.19–20, 86.10–12). The linen thread was then given to linen weavers, linojphi (e.g., T. Nissen, BZ 38 [1938] 367.27–28). After Egypt fell to the Arabs in the 7th C., linen cloth was imported to Constantinople primarily from Bulgaria and the regions of Strymon, Pontos, and Kerasous. The linen merchants, othonioprazi (also called mithaneis), purchased the linen cloth and resold it to either vestioprazi or any would-be purchaser on condition that the linen would not be sold yet again. The othonioprazi also dealt in bambakina (cotton?) tunics. The 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (ch.9) distinguishes the othonioprazi from linen weavers, who were prohibited from selling their wares in ergasteria but had to carry them around “on their shoulders” to peddle them. The profession of linen merchant was evidently held in some contempt—a 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 484.69) was indignant that some of these merchants (along with money changers) were granted noble titles.

Linen cloth was used primarily for tunics and burial shrouds but could be of varied quality and function. Some fine linen was used to make tablecloths (TheophCont 204.1–2); a court decision of 1384 lists various objects used in a bedchamber, including a red linen pillowcase (linokoukoulon) whose value was estimated at 4 hyperpers (Docheiar., no.49.29); Niketas Choniates (74.43–44) mentions “gold-laced” linen produced in Thebes. In the 9th C. the widow Danelis reportedly brought various textiles from the Peloponnese: among them were linomalatarias (fine fabrics) and plain soft linen as well as cloths “finer than cobwebs,” each of which could be folded and fit inside a burluhs (TheophCont 318.15–18).

The place where flax was worked was called linobrocheion, and it is possible that in the 13th–15th C. the use of the lord’s linobrocheion became a coercive obligation, a banality.


LIONS (sing. λέων) were rare in Byz., esp. after the loss of the southern provinces in the 7th C. In the early centuries they were exhibited in the Hippodrome, and tame lions performed in street shows (John Chrysostom, PG 54:591.35–40), earning money for their keepers; in the later period we hear of lions with iron collars kept in cages (Nik.Chon. 349.94–95). The taming of a lion was a typical subject of early hagiography: lions were represented not only as caring for holy men and women in the desert, but even digging a hermit’s grave after his solitary death (Deux versions grecques inédites de la Vie de Paul de Thèbes, ed. J. Bidez [Gand 1909] 28–33).

Despite its rarity, the lion, “the fierce and imperial beast” (PG 54:699.10–11), played an important role in Byz. imagery. Although it is doubtful that the Byz. actually hunted lions after the 7th C., the hunting and slaughter of lions were standard topics in imperial iconography, a tradi-
tion that joined with David’s killing of the lion (1 Sam 17:34–36) to produce the perennial theme of the Old Testament shepherd-king protecting his flock; one of the David Plates and much Psalter illustration are the best-known examples of this confluence. The victories over lions (or panthers?) by Digenes and his father, described in the Digenes Akritas, have rather legendary features. Traditional proverbs and sayings based on the Bible, Aesop, and other texts present the lion as a mighty beast that, however, could suffer from a mosquito or whose fangs could be broken. The Byz. perception of the lion was ambivalent: on the one hand, it was the symbol of Christ and the basileus as powerful victors; on the other hand, it was a roaring beast, the symbol of impurity, particularly associated with the Iconoclast emperors, Leo III and Leo V. In the Diegesis ton tetrapodon zoon the lion, as the ruler of the animal kingdom, is the protector of predators.


LIPARI (Λιπάρις), main island of the Aeolian archipelago, port on the route from Sicily to Rome. According to archaeological material (ceramics, coins, inscriptions), the island seems to have been quite well populated until the end of the 5th C. The lack of later material may be attributed to the partial desertion of the island following the eruption of the local volcano in the late 7th or 8th C. The Arabs conquered and devastated the island in 835–38. Seat of a bishop, suffragan of the metropolitan of Syracuse, Lipari was a famous place of pilgrimage because of the relics of the apostle Bartholomew, venerated there from the 6th C. onward. It was also a place of banishment for political exiles from late antiquity to the early 9th C. No Byz. monument survives in Lipari.

LIT. L. Bernabò-Brea, Le isole Eolie dal tardo antico ai Normanni (Ravenna 1988). —V.x.F.

LIPARITES (Λιπαρίτης), a family name of Iberian (Georgian) origin. The founder of the family, Liparit IV, duke of Trialei, was the chief Caucasian ally of Byz., who in 1048/9 commanded the Iberian troops that fought together with the Byz. army against the Seljuk. Taken captive, Liparit was soon released by Tughrul Beg. After long involvement in Georgian feuds, he was encouraged to leave Georgia, went to Constantinople, took the monastic habit under the name of Antony, and died between 1062 and 1064. His sons Ivane and Niania served the empire (Niania died in Ani, whereas Ivane returned to Georgia), but later some descendants of Liparit joined the Seljuk. One branch of the Liparites family, however, remained in Byz.: in 1177 Basil Liparites was a judge; an anonymous 12th-C. epigram mentions Bardas Liparites; according to Laurent (Coll. Orghidan, no.248), Constantine Liparites served as kommerkiarios in the 11th C.


—A.K.

LIPS (Λύψ, lit. “the southwest wind”; also Libes/Libas [on a seal]), the last name or a sobriquet of a 10th-C. family of Constantinopolitan dignitaries. There is considerable confusion about the biography and chronology of the best-known member of the family, Constantine Lips. According to the chroniclers, Constantine was a contemporary of Leo VI and restored a monastery in Mardosangaris (a region of Constantinople) near the Church of the Holy Apostles. A legend has it that he invited the emperor to the inauguration (enkainia) of the monastery, but a “wind called lips” blew up, destroying houses and churches and forcing the guests to scatter (Leo Gramm. 280.7–14). The monastery restored by Constantine has been identified as Fenari Isa Camii (see Lips Monastery), whose 10th-C. church preserves a fragmentary verse inscription stating that a certain Constantine dedicated the church to the Mother of God. C. Mango and E. Hawkins (DOP 18 [1964] 299–301) supplied the additional words “hetaireiarches Lips” in their conjectural reconstruction of one of the fragments. The traditional date of the inauguration, 907/8, is arbitrary, based on the false chronology of pseudo-Symeon Magistros. Constantine participated in the revolt of Constantine Doukas in 913 and fell in the battle at Achelous in 917.

Constantine VII (De adm. imp. 43.42–76) describes a Constantine, the son of Lips, who was protospatharios and domestikos of the hypourgia (an assistant of the epies trapezes) and (by 952?) anthypatos and megas hetaireiarches; he went at least three times as an envoy to the Armenians and
married his daughter to an Armenian notable who bore the Arabic name of Abu Ghanim. Mango (supra) argues that Constantine Porphyrogennetos has erroneously made this man his own contemporary and that the passage refers to the Constantine Lips of the early 10th C.

According to the *Patricia of Constantinople*, the Lips who was *patrikios* and *droungarios* of the fleet founded a monastery and a xenon during the reign of Romanos I and Constantine VII; Mango again suggests that the patriarchical tradition is in error and that this refers to the events of 907.

The *patrikios* Bardas, the son of Lips, conspired against Romanos II in 962 (Skyl. 250.65–66). Thereafter the name disappears.


—A.C., A.K.

**LIPSANOTHEK**, a conventional term applied to a small number of surviving objects thought to have contained relics, thus functionally indistinguishable from reliquaries. The word is most frequently used of a late 4th-C. (?) ivory box in Brescia (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, no.107), the lid and sides of which are carved with scenes from the Old Testament, New Testament, and Apocalypse. Neither its form nor iconography requires that it was originally used for relics. A smaller box in Venice (ibid., no.120), with liturgical scenes, has perhaps a better claim: from the 4th C., the Eucharist was celebrated over relics kept under the altar. This box was found, with relics, below the altar of a church at Samagher, near Pola. A composite icon, formerly known as the Stroganov Lipsanothek (*Ishusstvo Vizantii* 2, no.538), was equipped in the 11th C. and later with scenes of the Passion in enamel, portraits of saints in gilded silver, and now-empty compartments, inscribed with the names of St. John Prodromos, John Chrysostom, and others, intended for relics.


—A.C.

**LIPS MONASTERY** (Fenari Isa Camii), founded in the Lycus valley in the western part of Constantinople probably by Constantine Lips; it is traditionally believed to have been inaugurated in June 907. Whether the 10th-C. monastery was for monks or nuns is not known. The sophisticated church of 907, dedicated to the Virgin, is related in design to the Nea Ekklesia. Its cross-in-square naos (see *Church Plan Types*) has five domes (the main one supported on now-missing columns), and lateral chapels. Fragmentary inlaid icons found at the site may have served in the additional chapels of the upper story. The interior was decorated with mosaic (now lost), glazed tile, and some of the most important surviving examples of 10th-C. sculpture—the apse mullions, cornices, corbels, etc. Some of these employed “orientalizing” motifs in relief on marbles, of which many are spolia (reused tombstones, etc.).

The Dowager Empress Theodora Palaiologina (died 1303), widow of Michael VIII, restored the monastic complex, attaching a second church, dedicated to St. John the Baptist, to the south side of the 10th-C. church, as a mausoleum for the Palaiologan family, including Theodora herself, her mother, a daughter, and a son (Andronikos II). This church is wider than the 10th-C. building and boasts a much more ornate exterior, its multifaceted apses adorned with round-headed niches and decorative brickwork. Its interior has been much altered, but the dome, supported on piers at the corners of the naos with intervening pairs of columns, and 16 arcocelia survive. The graves are distributed through the naos, the narthex, and the groin-vaulted ambulatory that wraps around the south flank of the newer church and connects it at the west to that of Lips. This pretentious complex was built to emulate the Pan-tektrator Monastery, the mausoleum of the Komnenoi.

The *typikon* of Theodora (composed between 1282 and ca.1300), which survives in a deluxe MS (London, B.L. Add. 22748), indicates that the 13th-C. monastery was designed to house 50 nuns. Sphrantzes (Spfr. 34.22–24) notes that in the late 14th C. Lips was one of the larger nunnerys in Constantinople. Theodora and her mother endowed the convent with substantial properties in Asia Minor (near Pergamon and Smyrna), Thrace, Macedonia, and Constantinople itself, with certain revenues specified for the upkeep of an attached, 12-bed hospital with a staff of 21, including a priest, three doctors, and three pharmacists.

SOURCE. H. Delehaye, *Deux typica byzantines de l'époque des Paléologues* (Brussels 1921) 106–36;

LIRIS. See Garigliano.

LITANY (λειταγεία), a series of short liturgical petitions, usually voiced by a deacon, that precede an oration, and to which the congregation replies with a fixed response, most commonly Kyrie eleison, one or more times. Litanies first appear in late 4th-C. Greek texts in the region of Antioch. Structurally they are a development of the primitive invitation to prayer (Taft, East & West 154–56), in which the diaconal biddings are addressed to the praying community and the prayer to God is the people’s response. There are three Byz. litanic types, all known as early as the 4th C.: the synapte; the synapte meta ton aiteson (with demands), which has the concluding “angel of peace” biddings, originally a litany of dismissal, to conclude a service or part thereof; and the ektene, or “intensive litany,” originally used in stational processions (LITE).

LIT. Mateos, Typikon 2:279, 293, 304, 320. Taft, Great Entrance 311–49.

LITE (λιτή), a liturgical procession of clergy and people to a designated church or “station” for the celebration of a feast. In Jerusalem, these processions were limited to Holy Week; in Rome they occurred during Lent; in Constantinople they were spread throughout the church year and connected with saints’ days and major events in the history of the capital and were accompanied by antiphons and litanies. Initially, litaī served to combat heresy or plead for some special favor: the remission of sins, cessation of an earthquake, the lifting of a siege, a miracle, or to commemorate the original lita in the day when these favors were granted. There is evidence for lita in Constantinople as early as the 4th C., when John Chrysostom introduced nocturnal processions to counter those of the Arians (Taft, Liturgy of the Hours 171–73).

In the Typikon of the Great Church, there are 68 lite days, with the emperor participating in 17 of them, and the patriarch in 32. These services had a major influence on the development of the Byz. liturgy (R. Taft, OrChrP 43 [1977] 360–69). The term lite can also refer to a short service comprising a litany and prayers celebrated during a procession of this kind.

LITERACY was more widespread in Byz. than in the medieval West, esp. in cities, where elementary education was widely available, and in monasteries, where a knowledge of reading was required of choir brothers and sisters. Functional literacy was usually a prerequisite for any administrative or spiritual career. During late antiquity, attitudes toward the book changed drastically: instead of being a vocational necessity, it became a tool of religious education and a symbol of power (G. Cavallo in L’imperatore Giustiniano [Milan 1978] 235). Egyptian papyri show more illiterate persons in the 6th than in the 5th C., but the difference is primarily due to the insignificant number of 5th-C. documents (R. Calderini, Aegyptus 30 [1950] 15). Even some monastic superiors in the 6th C. were unable to sign their names (R. Merkelbach, ZPapEpig 39 [1980] 291–94). This explains why Justinian I’s novels prohibit an illiterate person from being elected bishop (Beck, Ideen, pt.III [1966], 72). Documents from the Athos archives, which sometimes bear crosses instead of signatures, indicate the existence of illiteracy, but a statistical analysis has not yet been done (N. Oikonomides, DOP 42 [1988] 167–78). Despite this general esteem for literacy, two emperors (Justin I and Basil I) were reportedly illiterate, and several illiterates climbed high on the bureaucratic ladder: for instance, when Leo VI appointed the brave sailor Podaron protospatharios of the phiale, the emperor ordered a judge of the hippodrome to assist him, since Podaron was illiterate (De adm. imp., 51.100–102). Especially in the countryside, “where education and knowledge were on a low level,” illiteracy created difficulties for the functioning of law and administration; thus Leo VI, in his novel 43, permitted the use of oral testimony in villages to authorize wills.


LITERATURE. The Byz. term closest in meaning to our concept of literature was logos, denoting the totality of texts written in artful language; hence these texts would compose the totality of knowledge, that is, they might include scientific,
legal, medical, and other texts. This perception of Byz. literature as inclusive of all forms of writing (pis'mennost', Schriftum in Russian and German terminology) is retained by the best modern scholars, such as Krumbacher, Hunger, and Beck. Attempts have been made, however, to distinguish between the entire body of writing produced in the Byz. era and literature in the narrower sense (A. Kazhdan, JÖB 28 [1979] 1–21; J.-L. van Dieten, HistZ 231 [1980] 101–9).

Traditionally, Byz. literature has been divided into three categories: secular works in the "pure" (artificial) language, literature in vernacular, and theological literature. This categorization is illogical, however, because it is based on two different principles (language and contents), and because the distinction between secular and theological literature or between pure and vernacular dialect is often too conventional. For example, the classification of hagiography as a theological genre and the Digenes Akritis and Stephanites and Ichnelates as vernacular works is debatable. I. Ševčenko (JÖB 31.1 [1981] 289–312) suggested a different classification, whose core is the existence of three levels of style (high, middle, and low), reflecting social and educational levels of writers and their public. Ševčenko's levels of style, however, are too close to the levels of grammar, and therefore limited, neglecting questions of imagery, composition, characterization of the hero, etc.; and these levels of style remain static throughout time.

Questions of language, geographical distribution, and chronology also need to be considered in treating Byz. literature. Traditionally, the framework of Byz. literature has encompassed works written in medieval Greek regardless of the place of their creation, that is, including Arab Syria (John of Damascus) and Norman Italy (Eugenios of Palermo). The mid-6th C. is sometimes chosen as a starting point, mainly on the formal and technical ground that 19th-C. textbooks on ancient literature extended their coverage to ca.550. This date does not coincide, however, with the traditional periodization of Byz. history (see Byzantium, History of) or art. In this article, Byz. literature is defined as having been written between the early 4th and mid-15th C.

Until recently, Byz. literature was considered to have had little aesthetic value and was viewed either as an inferior continuation of its Greco-Roman and patristic or biblical models, or (as far as vernacular works are concerned) praised for the qualities that made it a predecessor of modern Greek literature. In fact, medieval authors in both East and West did develop new ethical values and aesthetic approaches, for example: (1) "objectivization" of the author, whose external modesty and avowed lack of cultivation stood in sharp contrast to his proud self-conception as possessing final truth; (2) a shift from the spoken word toward the book, that is, from public oral presentation toward individual reading, that led to the extinction of the theater, a predominant genre of classical literature, and the limitation (at least temporary) of rhetoric; (3) presentation of the dramatis personae as allegorical rather than "real" figures, so that the hero became an embodiment of all moral values and the antihero a bearer of all vices; (4) sympathy for humankind, which transformed the author from a dispassionate observer of human deeds and errors, virtues and vices into one deeply involved with human sorrows and sufferings; and (5) the idea of the stability and immutability of the cosmos and man, which was reflected in the preservation of obsolete and artificial language, in imitation (mimesis), in the consistent relating of the present to the past, so that the events and personalities described were interpreted as reproductions of ancient events, biblical or patristic models. These principles were connected with general trends of Byz. culture. They were neither created in an instant at the beginning of Byz. history, nor did they remain unchanged or unopposed during the thousand years of the empire, but they formed the mainstream of Byz. literature.

Although some ancient genres survived, the system of genres was restructured. Ancient drama was criticized for immorality and replaced by the emphatically repetitive world of liturgy; poetry, also a predominantly oral form of literature, was either attached to liturgical purposes (hymn) or remained, at least after the 7th C., at the fringe of literary life, mainly as epigram. Epic gradually vanished. The tendency to inculcate official moral and political values fostered the flourishing of genres such as sermon, hagiography, gnoma, and admonitions. The sphere of personal human relations remained underdeveloped, and accordingly epistolography was consistently restricted to trivial formulas and standardized situations, and lyrical poetry was limited. Historiography,
the other hand, flourished: the Byz. were more interested in clashes of collective forces (Iconoclasts, Turks, etc.) than individuals (autobiography was a rare genre).

Byz. literature can be divided into the following phases of development:

1. *Predominance of antique traditions* (4th–mid-7th C.), including such genres as lyrical poetry (Gregory of Nazianzos) and epic as well as elements of paganism. Literary works were created in several languages (Greek, Latin, Syriac), and Greeks such as Ammianus Marcellinus or Claudian happened to be the most significant Latin writers of the period, while Romans the Melode, a Syrian or Jew, made a major contribution to the development of ecclesiastical poetry by using some oriental literary techniques. The major goal of the greatest writers (John Chrysostom, pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, Prokopios of Caesarea) was to express new approaches, a new vision of the universe and man, of society, and expectations for the future in traditional literary forms bequeathed by the glorious past; among others Nonnos of Panopolis (or a contemporary of his) tried to reconcile Christianity with the inherited poetical forms in a poetic paraphrase of the Gospel of St. John. Less spectacular but more innovative were attempts in hagiography and chronicles to produce “modest” stories of miracles and miracle-workers who acted partly in a completely new setting, the desert (Apophthegmata Patrum), and partly in the traditional milieu of the urban community, whose values, however, they rejected (Symeon of Emesa).

2. *Period of relative silence*, the “dark ages” (mid-7th C.–ca.800), when some significant theologians were still active (Maximos the Confessor, Germanos I), esp. in Syria after the Arab conquest (John of Damascus), whereas hardly any historiography and hagiography were produced.

3. *Revival of the 9th–10th C.* (see Encyclopedism), starting with the development of minuscule handwriting and the transliteration of texts written in uncial. Its first stage (800–850) was predominantly monastic and ecclesiastic, represented by such writers as Theophanes the Confessor, Theodore of Stoudios, Ignatios the Deacon, Niketas of Amnia, and the poet Kassia, even though some figures of the revival such as Patr. Tarasios and Nikephoros I began their careers as lay officials. After George Hamartolos, however, there was no monastic writer of importance until Symeon the Theologian (ca.1000), and lay and ecclesiastical functionaries dominated the field. The most conspicuous feature of the period is the assembling of the ancient heritage: the edition of old masters such as Homer, Plato, Aristotle, and the tragedians; issuing collections of texts (Greek Anthology) or excerpts (sponsored by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos), lexiika, and bibliographical entries (the Bibliotheca of Photios). Even hagiography was put in order, both externally, by the assemblage of texts for liturgical purposes (Symeon Metaphrastes); and internally, when to the eccentric heroes of early vitae (desert fathers, prostitutes, women in male disguise, holy fools, stylists, etc.), which continued to be read, were added a few new types of hero, such as the generous almsgiver Philaretos the Merciful, the good matron Mary the Younger, and monks and nuns indoctrinating and obediently submitting to monastic discipline (Theodora of Thessalonike, Irene of Chrysobalanton). Theophanes the Confessor attempted to create a new type of historical writing: he adhered to the annalistic principle, and presented history as an eternal conflict between Good and Evil.

4. *Period of the 11th–mid-13th C.*, here conventionally called pre-Renaissance (see Renaissance), seems to be a contradictory period: on the one hand, the literati reacted against the encyclopedistic emphasis on order and were involved in a search for personal and even mystical experience (Symeon the Theologian); on the other hand, ancient tradition was used, not only as a source of excerpts, but as a means for understanding reality (Eustathios of Thessalonike). The idea of expressing the author’s personal experience was reborn (Psellos, Prodomos), and writers began to be openly proud of their talents. A new image of man was introduced, as one who united in a single person the positive qualities of the hero and negative qualities of the antihero (Psellos, Niketas Choniates). Topics of sexuality, including love and nudity, were presented (even if rarely) side-by-side with officially sanctioned chastity, and from the 12th C. onward the genre of romance was revived, following Hellenistic models. A new chivalric ideal was developed, both in official rhetoric (Theophylaktos of Ohrid) and historiography (esp. Nikephoros Bryennios) and in the epic of Digenes Akritas. A new type of literati emerged: neither
monk nor bureaucratic functionary, but a professional poet or intellectual, claiming poverty (Prodromos, Tzetzes), or a “university” teacher (Michael Italikos, Eustathios). Vernacular began to be used sparingly as a language of literature. Some old genres, including hagiography, went temporarily out of fashion. The Byz. were becoming less “serious”—mild humor, puns, self-mockery on the part of the author are all encountered in the period. Even the problems of artistic creativity were hotly discussed (Michael Choniates).

5. Final period (13th–15th C.) characterized by a revival of hagiography, an increasingly tragic perception of history (Chalkokondyles), a sense of incompetence in comparison with antique predecessors (Metochites), and introduction of the topic of failure and the defeat of the hero (John VI Kantakouzenos). Former confidence in God’s perpetual assistance and in final victory over the barbarians was lost. Contacts with Western literature increased: the late Byz. romance was influenced by Western chivalrous literature. The heroes of works produced in regions of Latin domination (Peloponnnesos, Epiros, Crete) were Latins or heavily latinized seigneurs (Chronicle of the Morea, Chronicle of the Tocco). A small group of authors, mostly converts to Catholicism, learned Latin and began the translation of both ancient and medieval Latin writers into Greek; a few emigrated to Italy, where they taught Greek and encouraged the translation of ancient Greek literature (primarily philosophy) into Latin. The perception of social injustice became sharper (Alexios Makrembolites), esp. in vernacular fables. A tendency to bring narrative “closer to the earth” led to the poetization of human weakness and vice (Stephen Sachilikes). On the other hand, the tendency to preserve the “dead” language along with classical stylistics remained quite strong, and the authors of this vein (Plethon, Bessarion) had great influence upon the Italian Renaissance.


LITERATURE, DIDACTIC, works written to instruct or convey facts (rather than to entertain—as in historiography, hagiography, or romance—or fulfill a ceremonial purpose); of necessity a large and diverse group. Categories of writing that can be classed under this heading include handbooks written for use in the schoolroom on, for example, grammar or meter (cf. schoedogphía, epimerismós, erotapokriseí, proymnasmata, lexíka) as well as on music, legal terms, etc.; a number of these were in political verse (for example, by Michael Psellos and John Tzetzes) or the rhythms of religious literature (e.g., the grammatical kanones of Niketas of Serres), presumably as a mnemonic device. Also to be classed as didactic are works written on such subjects as astronomy, mathematics, medicine, philosophy, and natural science.


LITHOSORIA (τὰ Λιθόσωρα), battle site of unknown location. In Oct. 774 Constantine V learned that the Bulgar khan Teleféric had dispatched an army of 12,000 to capture Berzitia and resettle its populace in Bulgaria. Berzitia’s whereabouts and ethnic composition are unknown; the inhabitants may have been Slavs dwelling in Byz. territory. Constantine promptly raised a large army (reportedly 80,000 strong) and fell on the Bulgars at Lithosoria, winning a “great victory” (Theoph. 447-23) and returning to Constantinople in triumph. It is unclear whether the name Lithosoria (“stone piles”) indicated an actual town, a natural landmark, or an artificial marker of the border between Byz. and Bulgaria.


LITHUANIA (Λιθουάνια, τὰ Λιθουαδα) originated as a state in the mid-13th C. It expanded under Gedymin (1316–41) and Olgerd (1345–77) into the principalities of Smolensk and Kiev, becoming a rival to Moscow and Tver* for control over Russia, and under Vitovt (1392–1430) expanded further along the lower Dnieper to the Black Sea. Byz. policy focused on the issue of church organization. Until 1386 Lithuania was officially pagan: Byz. sources refer to its inhabitants and
esp. the king as fire-worshipers (e.g., Greg. 3:514.7–9; MM 2:12.21, 117.32–33), and in 1364 Patr. PHILOTHEOS KOKKINOS canonized victims of Olgerd. There was, however, an Orthodox population. A metropolis may have been established as early as 1299–1300, although the only well-attested incumbents are Theophilos (ca. 1315–30), Theodoret (1352–54), Romanos (1355–62), and Kiprian (1375–81). Such appointments split the see of “Kiev and all Russia,” of which Lithuania began to be considered an independent part, characterized in the title of the Polish king as Lithorhosaia, i.e., Lithuania-Rossia (MM 2:280.22). In an ekthesis of Andronikos II it was stated that Andronikos and Patr. John XIII Glykys transformed to Lיתבoda, the district (enoria) of “Great Rossia,” into a metropolis (Notitiae CP, no. 17.89). This action could be seen as antagonistic toward Moscow. In 1386 Lithuania and Poland came under the sole rule of Jagiello (1377–1432), who converted to Catholicism. Laonikos Chalkokondyles (Chalk. 1:125.3–19) described Lithuania as a vast Catholic country with a distinctive language (Ditten, Russland-Exkurs 96f).

LITOS (λίτος, “simple”), term applied to a certain category of titled dignitaries. In describing the future emperor Marcian as a stratiosites litos, Theophanes (Theoph. 104.2) uses the word in a non-technical sense of “common, plain.” In the taktiaka of the 9th C. and 10th C. the term appears as a synonym of the apratos to characterize a dignitary without function. In descriptions of MSS, the term litos seems to describe uncial script.

LITRA (λίτρα, Lat. libra), unit of weight of various sizes.

1. The most important Byz. measure of weight was the logarikhe litra (“pound of calculation”), established by Constantine I in 309 or 310 as the basis of the monetary system: 1 logarikhe litra of gold = 72 solidi or exagia = 12 oungiai = 1,728 keratia = 6,912 sitokokka = 1/100 kentenarion. The exact weight of the logarikhe litra is disputed; its theoretical norm seems to have been slowly debased from approximately 324 g to 319 g. The logarikhe litra is normally simply called litra, but it could also be termed chrysothikhe (gold) or thalassia (maritime) litra; sometimes in classicizing texts it is called mnu or even talanton. The logarikhe litra could also be a measure of land: 1 logarikhe litra = 1/40 thalassios metron.

2. The souallia litra was a special unit reserved for weights of oil or wood = 4/5 logarikhe litra = 256 g; 30 soualialai litrai of olive oil = 1 thalassion metron.

3. In regions such as Cyprus and Trebizond, which had regular contact with Islamic lands, a special argyrike (silver) litra of 12.5 logarikhe oungiai (= 333 g) existed alongside the other units. It was apparently related to the Arab raif of 337.6 g.

4. In the later period various “pounds” of local circulation were in use, partly of Arab, Italian, or Turkish origin.

Lit. Schilbach, Metrologia 277f. – E. Sch.

LITTLE ENTRANCE (ἡ μικρὰ εἰσόδος), ritual procession that introduces the liturgy of the Word, in which the deacon, accompanied by the priest(s) and servers, carries the evangelion from the altar into the nave and through the templon back to the altar. It symbolizes Christ’s coming as logos and is a ritual remnant of the entrance of clergy and people into church at what was once the beginning of the liturgy. At first accomplished in silence, this procession was embellished in the 6th C. with a prayer and antiphonal psalmody with two refrains, first the Trisagion, then, under Justinian I, the monogenes.

At the solemn pontifical Eucharist, celebrated by the patriarch or a bishop, the Little Entrance remained a true introit procession until at least the 12th C. (Taft, “Pontifical Liturgy” 105–10): the patriarch, waiting in the narthex, recited the introit prayer evoking the vision of the heavenly sanctuary as the Imperial Doors of Hagia Sophia stood open before him and he gazed down the nave. The entrance of the patriarch, accompanied by the chanting of the introit antiphon (Ps 94), sung as the procession moved forward, presaged the appearance among the people of the Heavenly Celebrant himself.

On entering the sanctuary, the patriarch kissed the endyte and reverenced the altar with candles.
and incense while the Trisagion was sung; he then went to his throne in the apse for the Lections. When the emperor participated, he joined the patriarch in the narthex and proceeded with him down the nave of the church and into the sanctuary where he offered gifts (De cer., bk.1, ch.9, ed. Reiske 64f). An imperial entrance procession of this sort has been depicted in the mosaics of San Vitale in Ravenna.

Called by Maximos the Confessor “entrance of the people with the bishop” (PG 91:688D) and by Patr. Germanos I “entrance of the Gospel” (Germanos, Liturgy, par.24), it was only later called “Little” Entrance (Diakysis of Philotheos Kokkinos, Hæi tres leitourgikai kata tous en Athenais kodikas, ed. P. Trempelas [Athens 1935] p.6) to distinguish it from the Great Entrance.


-LITURGICAL BOOKS are of two kinds: books that contain liturgical texts actually used in the services, and books that regulate how those texts are to be used. The texts themselves comprise fixed and variable elements.

Books of the “ordinary,” or invariable, part of the Liturgy are the archieratikon and euchologion, for the use of the bishop and presbyter; the diakonikon, for the deacon; and the horologion, for monks, choir, or anagnostes at the liturgical hours. Books of the variable, or “proper,” parts include the various types of lectionary; anthologies of sermons (panegyrikon, menologion); and the synaxarion and the Psalter (the antiphonarion and psallerion, see Psalmody), used for the eucharistic service and for liturgical hours by deacon, anagnostes, and the singers. The oktoechos, triodion, and pentekostarion, books for the mobile feasts of the church calendar, are hymn books for the use of the choir, as is the menaion for the fixed feasts.

These last four books are the result of liturgical changes in the post-Iconoclastic period, when new texts composed for the developing poetical form, the kanon sung during orthros, supersede older compositions such as the acrostic kontakion. The separate liturgical books that contained these older compositions, namely the kontakarion, stichera- rion, tropologion, and hieirologion, were thus rendered obsolete.

The liturgical typikon governs the services and, when the multiple “propers” conflict, regulates which is to prevail. The diataxis is a book of rubrics, telling the celebrants what to do when, esp. at the celebration of Eucharist. The distinction between liturgical books is often blurred, that is, material in one book may appear in another as well. Other liturgical books are but extracts of those already mentioned (for leitourgikon, hieratikon, hagiasmaterion, see Euchologion).


-R.F.T.

-LITURGICAL DIPTYCHS. See Diptychs, Liturgical.

-LITURGICAL HOURS. See Hours, Liturgical.

-LITURGICAL PLATE. See Paten and Asteriskos.

-LITURGICAL ROLLS. See Rolls, Liturgical.

-LITURGICAL VESSELS (σκεύη λειτουργικά) and related objects formed part of the church treasures. From at least the 4th C. onward they comprised several main categories of objects used for the rites of the Eucharist (chalice, paten and asteriskos, spoons, ewers for wine and water) and baptism (basin for water, flask for oil). Other objects (e.g., the rhhipidion, Gospel book cover, reliquary, cross, censer, chernixostenon, and lighting fixtures)—often of valuable materials—used in the church were not essential to the performance of the liturgy. Although liturgical vessels are known in glass, precious stones, and marble, they were most often made of precious metal, sometimes gold but mainly silver, the earliest extant set in the latter metal being the 4th-C. Durobrivae Treasure from Roman Britain (K.S. Painter, The Water Newton Early Christian Silver [London 1977]). By the 10th–11th C., chalices and patens were also made of tinned copper (e.g., DOCat 1, nos. 89–90).

While liturgical vessels and objects of the 4th–7th C. bore dedicatory inscriptions, those made
LITURGICAL VESTMENTS

LITURGICAL VESTMENTS. See ENCHEIRION; EPIGATION; EPIMANIKIA; EPITRACHELION; OMOPHORION; ORARION; PHELIONION; POLYSTAURION; STICHARIION.

LITURGICAL YEAR. See Year, Liturgical.

LITURGY (λειτουργία, lit. "service"), in the New Testament a life of service modeled on Jesus' self-giving; also, church services (sacraments, esp. EUCHARIST, BAPTISM; other AKOLOUTHIAI) that memorialize this mystery in obedience to Jesus' command.

Liturgical ceremonies involve the symbolic use of sensible objects such as BREAD, WINE, water, OIL, salt, CANDLES, INCENSE, ICONS, furnishings (ALTAR, baptismal font), vesture (ecclesiastical costume, baptismal robe), edifices (church, BAPTISTRY, sketeophylakeion), and ritual GESTURES or actions such as ANOINTING, blessing, signing, bathing or washing, imposition of hands, touching, kissing, dressing or stripping, eating, processions, proskynesis, KNEELING, and other postures. These objects and signs have an agreed-upon meaning expressed in the formulas that accompany the ritual. Though rooted in natural symbolism, the prime significance of liturgical symbols derives from their New Testament transformation into signs of God's saving work in Jesus (e.g., the LORD'S SUPPER, the bath of baptism). Secondary symbols and gestures (e.g., the baptismal anointings) were added later to explicate this core.

The liturgy was usually presided over by a minister in priestly orders (bishop or presbyter) and directed by a deacon who regulated the gestures and posture of the congregation via instructions (DIAKONIA) and announced the intentions of their prayer (LITANY). The liturgical system of a church, comprising the totality of its particular rites and usages, is also called a "rite" (LATIN RITE, BYZANTINE RITE).

Liturgical ceremonies contain both fixed and variable elements. The "ordinary" is the basic skeleton that remains invariable regardless of the day, feast, or season. The texts of the ordinary express a service's changeless purpose; for example, VESPERS is always evening prayer. The "proper" comprises those pieces (LECTIONS, HYMNS, PSALMS, refrains, etc.) that vary with the day, feast, or season. Christmas Vespers is evening prayer in commemoration of the Nativity. The texts of the proper are contained in a variety of different liturgical books.

In Byz. the term liturgy refers specifically to the ritual of the Eucharist, often called the Divine Liturgy (he theia leitourgia) of which there were two parallel Constantinopolitan formularies, attributed to JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, who seemingly elaborated an existing anaphora of the Apostles, and to BASIL THE GREAT, who is believed to have authored at least one of the redactions of the anaphora named for him (A. Raes, REB 16 [1958] 158–61; G. Wagner, Der Ursprung des Chrysostomusliturgie [Münster 1973]). Each formulary comprises 19 PRAYERS (euchai), the main one a borrowed Antiochene-type ANAPHORA (Chrysostom's from Antioch, Basil's from Cappadocia), elaborated and embedded in a common ritual setting and structure of DIAKONIA, lections, psalmody, and chants. Ten of these prayers are later additions common to both liturgies.

The liturgy of Basil predominated in Byz. until ca. 1000, when that of Chrysostom took over; the liturgy of Basil was thereafter celebrated only ten times a year (Sundays of Lent; 1 Jan.; Thursday
and Saturday of Holy Week; and the vigils of Nativity and Epiphany, the two feasts with para-
mone). Byz. authors claim, dubiously, that this change occurred because the Chrysostom liturgy was shorter.

In its full form, largely complete by the 12th C., the liturgy had four major parts: (1) the pro-
thesis rite, or preliminary preparation of the bread and wine; (2) the enarxis, or introductory service of three antiphons, litanies, and prayers (Mateos, La parole 27–90); (3) the Liturgy of the Word, which opened with the Little Entrance and Trisagion, comprising scripture lections interspersed with psalmody and concluding by li-
tanies and prayers (ibid., 91–173); (4) the Liturgy of Eucharist, which opened with the Great En-
trance and included the preanaphoral rites, anaphoral dialogue, anaphora, precommunion (includ-
ing fraction, zeon), communion, thanksgiv-
ing, and dismissal.

The early liturgy, described in the homilies of John Chrysostom at Constantinople in 397–404 (van de Paverd, Messlittenie 425–535), was a clas-
sical late antique Eucharist whose texts had been marked by the Arian controversy and the defini-
tions of the First Council of Nicaea. In the 5th–6th C., esp. with the construction of Hagia So-
phia, the liturgy became “imperial,” acquiring greater ritual splendor. This period witnessed the addi-
tion of the Creed and three important chants: Trisagion, Monogenes, Cherubikon.

In the 5th–7th C. the liturgy was esp. marked by the developing Constantinopolitan system of stational services (J. Baldovin, The Urban Character of Christian Worship [Rome 1987] 167–226). In such a system the entire city was “liturgical space,” and the principal liturgy of a feast, held at a predetermined “station” (synaxis), was preceded by a procession (liti) up to 10 km long. Though frequent in the 6th–7th C., such processions later took place in Constantinople only on certain im-
portant occasions. Several elements of the first half of the liturgy, however—the opening of the synapte litany, the three antiphons, the Trisagion and its accompanying prayer, and the ektene litany after the Gospel—derive from these processions.

Other developments include the addition of litanies to cover the priests’ silent recitation of the prayers and, in the 9th–12th C., the evolution of the prothesis rite and the addition of certain for-
mulas to the preanaphoral rites. Much of this later development was the retroinfluence of mystagogic interpretations of the liturgy as a representation of Jesus’ early life (see Commentaries).

Especially characteristic of the liturgy are the introits, or entrances, which open and symbolize the two major parts of the service. The Little Entrance symbolizes Christ’s coming as Word (Logos); the Great Entrance prefigures his coming in the sacrament of his body and blood. Both these foreshadowings are fulfilled in two later appear-
ances—when the deacon proceeds to the ambo for the proclamation of the Gospel, and when the priest comes out to distribute the consecrated gifts in communion—thus completing the symbolic structure of the liturgy.

As the liturgy underwent increased monastic influence, esp. after Iconoclasm and after the Latin occupation of Constantinople, these ritual processions were gradually compressed; once functional entrances, they were increasingly con-
finned to the interior space of a church and re-
duced to purely symbolic ritual turns that end where they began. The churches themselves be-
came smaller and smaller, and the ritual more private, retreating into the enclosed sanctuary, as the templon evolved into the iconostasis. The synthronon, once elevated so that the clergy could see and be seen, disappeared from the apse; lections and sermons became a ritualized formality, and communion, the point of the whole lit-
urgy, became a dead letter as fewer and fewer communicants approached to receive the sacra-
ment.

The Stoudite typika introduced into the liturgy some usages from the monastic hours (e.g., the typika [see Presanctified, Liturgy of the] and the apolysis, or dismissal); the mid-14th-C. diaita of Patr. Philotheos Kokinos and the Sabaitic typika fixed the final ceremonial and use of the liturgy in Byz.


RIFF. M. Liutprand of Cremona (also Liuoz and other forms), Lombard statesman and historian; born ca.920, died before 20 July 972 (?), certainly
before 5 Mar. 973. Liutprand was raised at the court of Hugh, king of Italy (927–47), became a deacon at Pavia, and served in Berengar II's (950–61) chancery before defecting to Otto I and probably joining his chapel (958–61; homily delivered there, ed. B. Bischoff, Anedota novissima [Stuttgart 1984] 24–34). Liutprand accompanied Otto to Italy, received the bishopric of Cremona, helped depose two popes, and figured prominently in Otto's service (962–70; cf. his Book of the Deeds of Otto). Liutprand knew a surprising amount of Greek (J. Koder, infra, against B.S. Karageorgos, Liutprandos ho episkopos Kremones hoi historikos kai diplomatès [Athens 1978]); Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl. CLM 6888 suggests that Liutprand or members of his milieu were among the first Westerners to use Greek minuscule. Liutprand's father and stepfather had conducted embassies to Constantinople (927 and 942), and Liutprand visited Byz. at least three times (Koder, infra 60). His embassy (17 Sept. 949–31 Mar. 950 or later) on Berengar's behalf brought him familiarity with the Byz. court and friendship with Constantine VII; Liutprand may have supplied data for De administrando imperio, ch.26 (De adm. imp. 108–12; cf. R.J.H. Jenkins, ibid., 2:83–87). His second embassy (4 June–2 Oct. 968), which was supposed to settle relations in Italy and obtain from Nikephoros II Phokas a Byz. bride for Otto II, was a failure. Whether Liutprand participated in the embassy of 971 that brought Theophano to Otto II is unknown.

Liutprand's knowledge, acute observation, and literary talent combine with a quicksilver personality and polemical or humorous distortions to produce a penetrating—often disingenuous—account of Byz. diplomacy, court politics and ceremonial, and daily life. His Antapodosis (Tit for Tat), an unfinished history of Byz., Germany, and Italy (888–949) composed between 958 and 962, began as literary retribution against Berengar. Despite muddled chronology, its anecdotal account is rich in Byz. data. Descriptions of events from before Liutprand's lifetime derive from oral sources—possibly in Constantine VII's milieu—or lost written sources shared with surviving Byz. historians. The Antapodosis reports, for example, the claim that the Nea Ekklesia was Basil I's expiation for murdering Michael III (bk.1, ch.10 [ed. Becker, p.9.1–20]; cf. bk.3, chs. 33–34 [pp. 89.21–90.5]), the nocturnal security of Constantinople (1.11 [pp. 11.3–13.6]), Byz. relations with Italy (2.45 [pp. 57.17–58.7]; 2.52–54 [p.62.4–25]; 3.22–38 [pp. 82.9–22]; 5.9 [pp. 134.33–135.9]; 5.14–15 pp. 137.8–139.4, esp. on the Rus'), and with Romans (1.50 [pp. 141.16–145.19]), while book 6 (pp. 152–58, apparently incomplete) glowingly describes Liutprand's first embassy to Constantinople.

Liutprand's Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana (Narrative of an Embassy to Constantinople) testily depicts the second embassy in a report to Otto I (possibly intended as propaganda against Byz.—M. Lintzel, Studien über Liutprand von Cremona [Berlin 1933] 35–56; cf. W. Ohnsorge, BZ 54 [1961] 28–52). Its accurate portrait of daily life (e.g., food, ch.20 [p.185.15–21]), Nikephoros II, his court, its acclamations, ceremonies (e.g., the Pentecost procession and banquet, chs. 8–13 [pp. 180.14–183.12]), and personalities (Leo Phokas, Basil the Nothos) is infused with sarcasm and malevolent interpretation, perhaps inspired in part by Liutprand's earlier warm relations with Constantine VII.


-M.Cc.

LIVESTOCK. The Byz. raised horses, oxen, water buffalo, camels, donkeys, mules, swine, sheep, and goats. Cadastral records of the late Roman Empire suggest a serious understocking, in some regions at least (C.E. Stevens, CEH 1:95). Later the situation changed: already in the Farmer's Law cattle breeding apparently took priority over the cultivation of the soil. In the 12th C. the pilgrim Daniel Igumen was astonished at the amount of stock he saw on Patmos, Rhodes, and Cyprus, and the Norman jongleur Ambroise emphasized the abundance of victuals, cattle, fowl, and wine on Cyprus (M.J. Hubert, J.J. La Monte, The Crusade of Richard Lion-Heart [New York 1941] 92, 106f). Especially rich in cattle and flocks were lands in Anatolia east of the Sangarios (PaphLAGONIA, Cappadocia, Lykandos, etc.) and in Bulgaria. The evidence of bones found in excavations in Bulgaria indicates that by the 12th C. there
was, at least in some areas, an increase in the percentage of cattle among the livestock, which suggests a higher level of agricultural production (Z. Vukarova, Slavjano-bulgarsko selisce kraj selo Popina [Sofia 1956] 89). Leo of Synada (ep.54.28–34) reports that Pylae in Asia Minor was a center of livestock trade in the 10th C.; it was chocked with pigs, asses, cattle, horses, and sheep—all destined for the capital. As late as the 14th C. great landowners such as John VI Kantakouzenos possessed enormous herds in Thrace.

Livestock were used for dairy products (esp. cheese) and meat, for pulling carts and plows, and as beasts of burden. The animals also provided valuable manure for enriching the soil. In certain areas of Asia Minor, as attested by Leo of Synada (ep.43.9–11), dung mixed with straw was burned in place of wood.

–J.W.N., A.K.

LIPIOS (λιπίος), liege; a Byz. term appropriating the Western feudal concept of liege-homage, applied during the 12th and 13th C. to Westerners with whom the emperor established a personal bond, yet not used in his relationships with Greek subjects of the empire. The first Greek source to use the term lizios is the Alexiad (An.Komm. 3:125.28–30). In the account of the treaty of Devol in 1108 between Alexios I and the defeated Norman prince Bohemund, the latter promised to be faithful to the emperor as “the liege-man (lizios anthropos) of your scepter” and to give him assistance against all enemies of the empire, as was his duty as a vassal (oikeses kai hypocherrios). In recognition of this, the principality of Antioch was granted to Bohemund as an imperial fief (R.-J. Lilie, Byzanz und die Kreuzzfahrerstaaten [Munich 1981] 67–69). Among the lizoi of the 12th C. were princes such as Raymond of Poitiers and Ladias of Bohemia and high-ranking functionaries such as Roger “Sclaus” and Theorianos; in the 13th C. the wealthy kaballarios Syrgares (possibly Sir Harry), a pronoia holder in the area of Smyrna, was titled lizios. The term could be used for a designation of collective vassalage: thus the citizens of Ancona acknowledged themselves as lizoi of Manuel I (Nik.Chon. 201.13); in 1273 Michael VIII recognized the Genoese of Galata as “his men (idioi) or lizoi, as one of them might say” (Pachym., ed. Failler 2:471.8). The term seems to have disappeared thereafter.

–M.B.

LOAN (δανείον), the conveyance of money or other movable things on the understanding that the recipient will return to the donor analogous objects in the same quantity. The loan differs from a loan for use (chresis, commodatum), which had as its object the mere use of things (movable or immovable) given on condition that they be returned as such. Moreover, the loan for use was free of charge, while the loan proper had to be repaid. Technically speaking, a misthosis (locatio-conductio) fell between a loan and a loan for use, since, in that case, a remuneration (misthos) was paid for a transmission of use that did not lead to ownership. Justinianic law preserved these older Roman distinctions quite exactly, as did the legal texts of the 9th–11th C. (e.g., Basilia, Prochiron, Michael Attaleiates) and Constantine Hemenopoulos. However, as the dearth of surviving loan-formulas shows, practice appears to have been otherwise. The actual situation is unfortunately poorly understood, since the Byz. credit system which was closely connected with loan contracts, has been examined only from papyri down to the 7th C. It is therefore unclear to what extent the circumstances assumed by Justinian I in novel 136 (a.535) on bankers’ contracts actually held true for later periods. The regulations found in the Book of the Eparch for jewelers (ch.2) and bankers (ch.3) yield scarcely any information about business transactions. The 11th-C. tractatus de credits deals less with the nature of credit than with rules governing the precedence of various claims secured by pignus (e.g., claims on the dowry or claims of the state, etc.) and is, moreover, completely academic. Yet a case handled by Demetrios Chomatenos (no.92) shows that the practice of obtaining a loan to cultivate a field in the 13th C. differs little from that found in the Hellenistic papyri. The remuneration paid for a loan was called interest (tokes).

–D.S.

LOCKS AND PADLOCKS. In addition to sliding and turning key-lock systems to secure doors and cabinets, the Byz. made extensive use of portable
padlocks. Only a limited number survive, but many are represented near the broken doors of Hades in images of the Anastasis. Most are "spring padlocks," so-called because the bolt is held in place by iron flange-springs that expand inside the lock chamber until, like barbs on an arrow, they cannot be removed. The bolt-flanges are compressed and the lock opened by means of a sliding key, which consists of an open circular or rectangular bit attached at right angles to a long, narrow shaft. The bit is fitted over the end of the flange and then pressed forward to compress it and release the bolt. Most spring padlocks are barrel-shaped, although some are adapted to animal forms (e.g., bulls and horses).

Lit. Vikan-Nesbitt, Security 6f. –G.V.

LOCULUS, the shell-like grave often found carved into the walls of the corridors and cubicles of catacombs. The loculi of the Roman catacombs were usually no larger than the space needed to set one body parallel to the wall; on occasion, however, loculi were intended to house more than one burial. In the catacombs and tombs of the eastern Mediterranean, and often in the Jewish catacombs, loculi were set perpendicular rather than parallel to the wall. After the burial of the body, the loculus was covered with a marble or terra-cotta plaque, usually bearing a prayer and an identifying inscription, and sealed with cement.

Lit. P. Testini, Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri cristiani in Roma (Bologna 1966) 135f. –W.T.

LOCUS SANCTUS (αγιός τόπος), literally, a “holy place”; practically, the goal of the pilgrim; the term hagios topos is attested on pilgrims’ ampullae. Because sanctity was believed to be physically transferable, and objects or places thus sanctified were deemed worthy of adoration and contact, Christians were impelled toward pilgrimage. A locus sanctus might be the site of a biblical event—those of the Old Testament greatly outnumbering those from the New Testament—or the home of a famous relic or a saint; some holy sites, like that of St. Menas, were popular healing shrines, with only loose religious associations. The most famous loca sancta were those in Palestine associated with the birth, miracles, and esp. the Passion of Christ, although lesser sites in great variety dotted the entire eastern Mediterranean. With the expansion of pilgrimage in the 5th–6th C., the choice and sequence of loca sancta to be visited in and around Jerusalem came to be fixed. Indeed, the visit itself involved a kind of protocol, which would typically include prayers, Bible readings, physical contact, and, when possible, participation in the appropriate liturgical service. The entire process would be facilitated by local guides, guide books and maps, and, perhaps, by an Onomastikon (such as that of Eusebius of Caesarea), a volume giving the local names for sites. Loca sancta influenced art in two ways: through the often grand and innovative architectural monuments that sprang up along the pilgrims' routes, and through the various eulogiai in which the travelers brought home with them.


LOCUS SANCTUS MARRIAGE RINGS, conventional label for a closely interrelated series of 6th- and 7th-C. octagonal gold marriage rings bearing scenes from the Palestinian Christological Cycle on the facets of the hoop. All but one show on the bezel the crowning of the bridal couple by Christ and the Virgin (see Rings, Marriage; Marriage Crowns). That they served as amulets—probably directed toward successful procreation—is suggested by their octagonal design (Alex. Trall. 2:377-20), by their Christological cycle (traditionally associated with amuletic pilgrimage eulogiai), and by the inscription from Psalm 5 on one example, "Thou hast crowned us with a shield of favor." (See also Marriage Belts.)

Lit. Vikan, "Art, Medicine, and Magic" 83. –G.V.

LOGARIASTES (λογαριαστής), financial official who functioned primarily as controller of expenses. The term is not mentioned in the Taktira of the 9th and 10th C. and is first attested in 1012 (N. Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 140). Guillard (infra 102) refers to a seal of a logariastes of the 10th/11th C., but the date is later (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.400). Logariastai served in various departments—the vestiarion, the sekretion of the sarkelarios (on seals of the 12th C.), in the genikon (in an act of 1088), etc. Logariastai also served in provincial administration, in monasteries, and on
the estates of private individuals. The office of the megas logariastes was created by Alexios I and is mentioned for the first time in 1094; at the beginning he served as the general controller, along with the sakellarios, but eventually replaced him. In two documents of 1196 (Lavra 1, nos. 67–68) the dikaiodotes and megas logariastes Nicholas Tripsychos acts as the president of an important tribunal (P. Lemerle, REB 19 [1961] 264f).

Logariastai are known up to the 15th C., the megas logariastes until the 14th. In the 14th C. a special logariastes of the aule (court) had the task of paying salaries to certain courtiers. The duties of the enigmatic logariastes of the chrysobulls (Laurent, Corpus 2, no. 229) are unclear.


LOGARIKE, PALAIA AND NEA (lit. "the old and new [methods of tax] accounting"), a treatise on taxation that has survived in a single MS of the late 12th C. (Paris, B.N. gr. 1670). It was written after the death of Alexios I, either between 1118 and 1120 (Hendy, infra 50) or in 1134/5 (Svoronos, infra 108, n. 2). The treatise consists of two sections. The first describes the method of estimation of surtaxes (parakolothemata) in proportion to the sum levied as demotion (kanon); the second part contains several reports (hypomnestika) of the fiscal officials of the early 12th C. and Alexios’s lyesis, or responses (rescripta). The task of the fiscal department as reflected in the treatise was to reconcile the actual situation in the provinces with the new principles created by the monetary reform of Alexios I. He required that instead of the miliareson a nomisma had to be collected, the so-called trachy palaion, which served as the basis for estimating the parakolothemata; the latter could be collected in copper coins.


lit. Hendy, Coinage 50–64. Svoronos, Cadastre 81–118.

LOGIC, a philosophical discipline concerned with distinctions between types of arguments (syllogisms) and their constituent elements (terms and propositions or premises) and with the conditions for formal validity in arguments. It developed in Byz., as it had in late antiquity, essentially in the form of glosses, commentaries on, and paraphrases of the logical corpus of Aristotle, the Organon (including the Categories, On Interpretation, Prior and Posterior Analytics, Topics, and On Sophistical Refutations). Neoplatonism had already made substantial contributions to the field. Porphyry wrote an influential introduction (Eisagoge) to the Organon; his commentaries (which included elements of Stoic logic), together with the commentaries produced esp. by members of the Neoplatonic school of Alexandria (in particular Ammonios, John Philoponos, David the Philosopher, and Elias of Alexandria) on various parts of the corpus, constituted, with the commentaries by Alexander of Aphrodisias and the paraphrases by Themistios, the foundation of work on Aristotelian logic. A long series of Byz. commentators and paraphrasers contributed to this scholarly tradition, among them Photios, Michael Psellos, Michael of Ephesus, Eustratios of Nicaea, Theodore Prodromos, Sophonias (late 13th C.), Theodore Metochites, Leo Magentenos (14th C.), George Pachymeres, John Pediasimos, and Manuel Holobolos. Because much of the Byz. material has not been properly edited or examined, it is not possible at present to write the history of the Byz. contribution to the science of logic.

Logic was considered by the commentators of the Alexandrian School as the instrument (organon) of philosophy and was thus taught at the beginning of the curriculum. This remained the case in Byz.: a training in philosophy would normally include (and sometimes go no further than) study of the elements of logic. Didactic summaries were therefore produced by the Alexandrian commentators; those by David and Elias esp. were distilled further in the Dialectics of John of Damascus and in Photios’s Amphilochia. Later Byz. synopses of logic include those by Psellos, John Italos, Blemmydes’ Compendium of Logic, and the collections of Joseph Rhakendyes and John Chortasmenos.

As logic clearly belonged to pagan philosophy, the Byz. attitude to it was as to philosophy in general. The teaching and use of logic could be justified on the grounds of the New Testament teaching that “every perfect gift is from above” (Jas 1:17) and that logic in particular is useful in the refutation of error. This approach, suggested by John of Damascus, was exemplified later in Eustratios of Nicaea’s claim that Christ used syl-
logisms. Logic also suffered, however, from movements of rejection of pagan learning, esp. in the context of conflict with a Latin Scholastic theology characterized by logical formalism. Some Byz. intellectuals, however, found merit in such theological use of logic. The logic of Latin Scholasticism was made available in Planudes' translation of Boethius and Gennadios II Scholario's translation of Peter of Spain. Byz. thinkers influenced by Neoplatonism stressed the inapplicability of logic to transcendent realities and in particular to God. For speaking of God another kind of "logic" was appropriate, the logic of negation (apophatic logic) as formulated by pseudo-Dionysios, which went beyond the limits (and principles) of logic properly speaking.


-D.O.M.

LOGOS (λόγος, lit. "word, reason"), a philosophic concept, broadly used in Stoicism and by Philo and accepted by early Christian theologians, interpreting Christ as the Logos of John 1:1–8. Origen took over the concept of the Logos as a mediator standing between the creator and the created world, "the idea of ideas," that was elaborated in Platonism (see Krämer, infra) and corresponded to Philo's Logos and the image of the divine INTELLECT in Plotinos. The "Word of the Father" was equated with the Son of God (the second person of the TRINITY), the term Logos having various connotations and associations: primarily, the idea of revelation, reason, and will as well as creation and redemption.

The concept of the Son-Logos, however, produced certain difficulties: was the Son's substance the same as the Father's? How could one reconcile the idea of the Logos being generated by the Father with the thesis of the preexistence of the Logos? What was the relation between the divine Logos and the human nature of the incarnate Christ? Is the Logos-reason the property of the Godhead (as in MONARCHIANISM) or a distinct hypostasis? If the Logos is distinct from the Father, does it mean that the Godhead could have been construed without the Logos-reason? After long disputes these problems found their solution in the concept of the TRINITY and of Christ's possession of two NATURES in one hypostatic union.

Some pre-Nicaean theologians, and sometimes later ones (e.g., Severianos of Gabala), interpreted the Logos's work of redemption in categories of priesthood: the Logos, in his capacity of high priest, would offer sacrifice to God. On this basis, in the 12th C., Soterichos Panteugenos rejected the traditional formula concerning the Eucharist as implying that the Logos was both offering and receiving the sacrifice; in contrast, Nicholas of Methone responded that the hypostatic union allows us to consider God as performing the human act of offering and the divine act of receiving.


-K.-H.U.

LOGOTHESION (λογοθήσιον), the bureau of a LOGOTHETES. In the 6th C., however, in Justinianic legislation (Nov. 128.17–18), the term referred to municipal income outside the control of the praetorian prefect. By the beginning of the 9th C. the word acquired the meaning of a bureau: the vita of Niketas of Medikon (died 824) mentions a clerk of "the so-called logothesion" (AASS, Apr. 1, p.XX D [see back of vol.]). Usually the term was accompanied by a specification, such as logothesion of the genikon (Theoph. 367.23). Seals of chrotouarios of the logothesion of the genikon are known from the 8th C. onward (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 354–55); the logothesion of the stratiotikon is also common on seals, while the logothesion of the dromos and of the "herds" (see LOGOTHETES TON AGELON) are mentioned infrequently. Charters of the 10th and 11th C. mention logothesia but there is no evidence that the term survived much after this date. The usual designation of a department in 12th-C. charters is sekrēton. In the ecclesiastical administrative system, according
to a prostagma of 1094, the “five logothesia” were supreme offices of the patriarchate (Darrouzès, Offikia 59).

LOGOTETES (λογοθέτης), generic term that in the taktika of the 9th and 10th C. designated a high official (one of the sekretrikoi) at the head of one of many departments with primarily but not exclusively fiscal functions. The origin of the office is unclear: it has been connected by various scholars with Roman numerarius, scriinarii, or rationales; the term was used in papyri (Preisingke, Wörterbuch 3:139) and by church fathers for subaltern officials and auditors. The Notitia dignitatum does not include the term, but it was common in the 6th C. as a designation for fiscal controllers on various levels of the administrative ladder. The seals of simple logothetai are dated predominantly to the 6th or 7th C. (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 269–71). A radical change in their status occurred around the 7th C. when the office of praetorian prefect lost its importance and individual departments became independent; the chiefs of some of these (dromos, genikon, stratotikon, and agelai) were called logothetai (see Logothetes tou Dromou, Logothetes tou Stratotikou, Logothetes tou Ageloon). Alexios I tried to coordinate the civil administration under the control of a single official—the logothetes sekeretion who was later replaced by the megal logothetes. The bureau (sekeretion) of a logothetes was called a logothesion through the 11th C. The term logothetes was used for other functionaries, such as the logothetes tou praitorion. Patriarchal logothetai acquired special importance after the 12th C. (Darrouzès, Offikia 359–62). Metropolitan logothetai seem to have had judicial functions (MM 6:99.14–15, a.1118; Ephig., no.28.22, a.1387).


LOGOTETES TON HYDATON (λογοθέτης τῶν ὑδατῶν, lit. “logothetes of the waters”), an obscure functionary mentioned only once: a late 11th-C. historian (Attal. 107.15–16) relates that the logothetes ton hydaton Basil Maloses was taken captive at Mantzikert in 1071. The functions of this logothetes are not clear; Ahrweiler (Structures, pt.II [1961], 250) identified him with the parathalasites, Oikonomides (Listes 314, p.153) seems to equate him to the komes hydaton.


LOGOTETES TON AEGELON (λογοθέτης τῶν ἄγελων), supervisor of the state herds of horses and mules. The office is first mentioned in the mid-9th-C. taktikon of Upenskij, while some seals of logothethai ton aegelon are dated by Laurent to the 8th–9th C. It is generally agreed that the logothetes ton aegelon succeeded the praepositus gregum of the 4th C., although there is no direct evidence of the link. According to the Kletorologion of Philotheos, estates in Asia (i.e., western Asia Minor) and Phrygia were under the control of the logothetes of the herds. Strangely enough, Philotheos included the logothetes ton aegelon in the category of stratarchai rather than as a sekretikos like the other logothetai. The role of the logothete of herds probably increased during the 10th C. and reached its zenith by the end of the 13th C. when several men of importance, including Theodore Metochites, held the post in turn. The staff of the logothete of the herds in the 9th–10th C. consisted of protonotarioi of Asia and of Phrygia, administrators of mitata (estates), and komites; seals also mention the ek prosopou and chartoularioi of the department.


LOGOTETES TON DROMOU (λογοθέτης τοῦ δρόμου), head of the sekeretion of the dromos, known since the 8th C. D.A. Miller (infra 469) identifies the first logothetes tou dromou as Leo, ca.762, while Guillard (infra 46) suggests that Gregory, an ambassador to the caliph in 742, was also logothetes tou dromou. The office derived from the curious cursus publici praesentalis, a subaltern official under the magister officiorum in charge of the public post. When the logothesion of the dromos became an independent department, probably in the 7th C., its chief acquired new duties: some
LOGOTHETES TOU PRAITORIOU (λογοθέτης τοῦ πραιτορίου), coadjutor of the eparch of the city. The office is mentioned in the mid-9th-C. taktikon of Uspenski and in the late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos, but not in later taktika. A 10th-C. historian (TheophCont 470.13–17) relates that Romanos II appointed as the eparch’s assistants two symponoi, the second of whom (the spatharokandidatos and judge Joseph) is also called logothetes tou praitorion. The last logothetes tou praitorion mentioned in literary texts is the askeireis Leo in 1023 (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.933, with an incorrect date). Seals give a broader chronological range for the existence of the logothetai tou praitorion—from a John of the 7th/8th C. to Constantine Bringas of the 11th C. The title of the logothetes tou praitorion was usually spatharios or spatharokandidatos; since the Praitorion was one of the major prisons of Constantinople, the logothetes presumably assisted the eparch on police and judicial matters.


LOGOTHETES TOU STRATIOTIKOU (λογοθέτης τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ), a high-ranking official. The only direct evidence for his functions is in a 10th-C. ceremonial book (De cer. 698.13–15), according to which the logothetes tou stratiotikou controlled exemptions and reestablishment of taxes on the households of soldiers. The hypothesis (of, e.g., E. Stein, Traditio 7 [1949–51] 149) that this logothete dealt with the levy of troops, the construction of fortifications, and military expenditure cannot be proved. The first attested logothetes tou stratiotikou was Julian, a participant in the Third Council of Constantinople in 680; the logothete Eustathios, known from a seal (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.529) probably lived earlier, at the beginning of the 7th C. The commonly accepted view that a logothetes tou stratiotikou is mentioned in the Chronicon Paschale (Chron.Pasch. 721.8) under the year 626 is a mistake—the text speaks of the patrikios Theodosios as a logothetes in general, not specifically as a logothete of “soldiers.” The early logothetai tou stratiotikou seem to have fulfilled fiscal duties; in any case the patrikios Eulampios was logothetes of the sakelle (see Sakellion) and of the stratiotikon (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.533). By the 11th C. logothetai tou stratiotikou combined their functions with those of a judge. The office disappeared after 1088. Among the known logothetai tou stratiotikou was Symeon Logothete (I. Ševčenko, DOP 23/4 [1969/70] 215f). The staff of the logothetes tou stratiotikou included chartoularioi of the central bureau and of the themes and the tagmata, legatarioi, mandatores, and various clerks (the protonotarioi attested on seals probably correspond to the protokankellarioi of the taktika); on seals from the end of the 10th C. appears the megas chartoularioi of the logothetes tou stratiotikou (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos.554–58), who is unknown to the taktika.

LONGI TEMPORIS PRAESCRIPTIO (ἡ τοῦ μακροῦ χρόνου παραγραφή, lit. "exception taken on the basis of too long a time"), possession by prescriptive right, a legal basis for the acquisition of another person's property. The longi temporis praecriptio was originally the objection countering a plaintiff's claim for the return of his property from the possessor, if the plaintiff had failed to make his claim valid in time. By the period of Justinian I, the longi temporis praecriptio had changed from a procedural objection to an independent ground for acquisition through possession (dia τις chronias nomes despozein), equivalent to usucapio. With the constitution Cod. Just. VII 31.1 (Basil. 50.10.4), Justinian stipulated that movable things can be acquired by longi temporis praecriptio after three years of possession, immovable things after ten years, or, in the absence of the owner, after 20 years. In special cases the time limit is extended to 30 or 40 years. According to Justinian's novel 9 (a.535), things that belong to the church, monasteries, and pious institutions—as long as they do not come under the res religiosae and are thereby completely excluded from possession by prescriptive right—can be acquired only after 100 years; according to novel 111.1 (a.541) and novel 131.6 (a.545), however, this can be done after 40 years. The 40-year longi temporis praecriptio was incorporated into the Basilika (5.2.14, 5.3.7).

The other prerequisites of possession by prescriptive right also remained binding in the following centuries: in order to be able to make the longi temporis praecriptio valid, the possessor must be in good faith, that is, consider himself the rightful owner, and the object must have come into his possession lawfully, that is, not through theft, use of force, or arbitrary seizure.


-M. Th. F.

LONGOBARDIA (Λαογραβδία, Λαογουβαρδία), Byz. geographic term that designated those parts of Italy dominated by the LOMBARDS. Theophanes (Theoph. 464.4-5) distinguished between Longobardia (the principality of BENEVENTO) and Great (Megalae) Longobardia, the Lombard kingdom. Constantine VII emphasized that "all of Longobardia was in the possession of the Romans when Rome was the imperial capital" (De adm. imp. 27.3-
6) and that Basil I again conquered "all of Longobardia," which in Constantine's time belonged to the emperors of the Rhomaioi (De them., ch. 11.42–44, ed. Pertusi, 98). The term was used ambiguously: in the strictest sense of the word, Longobardia was a Byz. theme that comprised roughly the modern province of Apulia and the northeastern parts of the Basilicata, but in a broader sense it also encompassed the Lombard principalities of Benevento, Capua, and Salerno as well as the duchies of Naples, Amalfi, and Gaeta. These were practically independent states, governed by their own princes and dukes; they recognized the Byz. emperor as their suzerain, but they did not pay taxes to Byz. and were not administered by Byz. officials. The origin of the Byz. theme of Longobardia is not clear: N. Oikonomides (REF 23 [1965] 118–23) hypothesized that from 876 on Longobardia was a tourma of the theme of Kephalena and that by 891/2 it was under the command of a strategos who jointly administered several regions (Macedonia, Thrace, and Kephalena as well as Longobardia). A distinct strategos of Longobardia is attested from 911 onward. In 938 and 965 Longobardia seems to have been united (temporarily?) with Calabria. The theme of Longobardia was abolished ca. 965 and replaced by the katepanate of Italy.


-V.V.F., A.K.

LONG WALL (Μακρόν Τεῖχος), also called the Long Walls or the Wall of Anastasios I (Theoph. 233.9), a system of fortifications erected west of Constantinople and extending a distance of two (Prokopios) or four (Ibn Khurdadhbeh) days' journey. The remains of walls that lie about 65 km from Constantinople and extended from Selymbria to the Black Sea have been identified as the Long Wall; R.M. Harrison (infra) calculates their length as 45 km. The southern half has disappeared, but the well-preserved central and northern sections indicate that the wall was 3.30 m thick, and the height in the best preserved parts is up to 5 m. The wall was made of hard, pinkish mortar with nodules of brick in a technique markedly different from that used to build the walls of 5th-C. Constantinople (no use of brick courses, a continuous arcade of several blind arches built into the rear face). The wall had towers (rectangular and polygonal), forts with gateways (in the area of fort D several 6th-C. stamped bricks were found), and an outer moat. The date of construction is under discussion: B. Croke (infra) asserts that the Long Wall was originally constructed by Anastasios, whereas M. Whitby (infra) suggests that it was first built after 447, damaged by the earthquake of 478, and repaired by Anastasios between 495 and 505. The wall proved ineffective (probably because of its length and the lack of a sufficient garrison to man it) and was many times penetrated by invaders, beginning in 559. According to the preface to novel 26 of Justinian I, there were two vicarii of the Long Walls: one for military affairs, the other for civil administration. In later centuries the commander responsible for the defense of the wall was the komes ton teichon.

The term Long Walls was also used of other fortifications, possibly of the Chersonese in Thrace and the tmes Tauricus in the Crimea (A.L. Jakobson, Srednevekovny Krym [Moscow-Leningrad 1964] 153f).


LOPADION (Λοπάδιον, now Ulubad), fortress in northwestern Asia Minor on the Rhynndakos River, about 20 km south of the Sea of Marmara. Lopadion was important for its bridge that carried the main highway eastward from Kyzikos. It first appears as the site of a xenodocheion in the letters of Theodore of Studios. A strategic point and substantial market town, Lopadion was the scene of fighting between Alexios I and the Turks; it rose to prominence in 1130, when John II built a powerful fortress that became the base for his campaigns in Asia Minor. The French and German contingents of the Second Crusade met there in 1144; the Latins held it in 1204 and 1211–20. In the early 14th C. it was a frontier post against the Ottomans; Orhan took it in 1335. Lopadion, not previously attested as a bishopric, became an archbishopric in the early 12th C. The surviving walls are the work of John II Komnenos.
-C.F.

**LOPADIOTES, ANDREW**, man of letters and teacher in Constantinople; fl. ca. 1300–30. Apparently a pupils or colleague of Manuel Moschopoulos, Lopadiotes (Λοπαδιώτης) was the addressee of 14 letters (Florence, Laur. S. Marco 358) probably written by George Oinaiotes. Lopadiotes was the author of a panegyrist, now lost, of an epigram on the crucifixion, and of a lexic of Attic Greek, conventionally called the Lexicon Vindobonense. Although a mediocre compilation mainly from Harpokration, the Souda, Manuel Moschopoulos, and the Lexicon of pseudo-Zonaras, it nonetheless contains otherwise unknown fragments of Sophocles and Pherekrates as well as quotations from Maximos of Tyre and Himerios, which show better texts than those of the surviving MSS. These must have been taken from some now-lost lexikon or gnomology. Used by Varino Favorino in 1523 for his Greek-Latin dictionary, the Lexicon was lost sight of until 1851.


-R.B.

**LORD'S SUPPER.** Christ's celebration of the Eucharist was commemorated in three different images.

1. The *Last Supper* (Deipnos) depicts the Gospel narrative; it shows Christ and his disciples reclin around a semicircular "sigma" table (Ravenna, Sant'Apollinare Nuovo; Rossano Gospels, fol.3r), with Christ at the table's left cusp, often with John leaning against him, and Judas reaching for food. This image survived with few alterations throughout Byz. art.

2. The *Communion of the Apostles* (Metalepsis kai Mitadosis ton Apostolon), a liturgical composition, presents the 12 Apostles standing to either side of an altar table and receiving communion from Christ, who is often depicted twice, offering bread to one group and wine to the other. Found initially on 6th-C. patens (Kaper Koraon Treasure) and MSS (Rossano Gospels, following the Last Supper), this composition adorns the wall of the altar chamber in churches after the 11th C. (Kiev, St. Sophia; Hagia Sophia in Ohrid). When deacon angels join the scene, it becomes not only Christ's establishment of the Eucharist, but the archetypal, celestial Eucharist celebrated in Heaven by the angels, of which the earthly meal is a reflection.

3. The *Divine Liturgy* (Theia Leitourgia) elaborates the celestial Eucharist. First seen in an 11th-C. liturgical roll (A. Grabar, *DOP* 8 [1954] 174, pl.10) and incorporated from the 13th C. into cupola imagery, the Divine Liturgy shows Christ officiating at an altar to which thrones angels, some bearing chalices and balancing patens on their heads as do the deacons in the Great Entrance.

-A.W.C.

**LOROS** (λωρος, from lorion, a strip of leather), a long scarf, esp. the heavy stole about 5 m long and studded with precious stones worn by both the emperor and empress. A vestige of the Roman *trabea triumphalis* (the toga of consuls), the loros was arranged in an X over the upper body; one section then fell straight down the front, while the other came from behind the right shoulder to cross the chest and drape over the left arm (as on the coins of Justinian II). In the 10th–11th C. the garment was provided with a hole and could be pulled on over the head, though the long end was still brought horizontally across the body in front and draped over the left arm (P. Griers, *DOP* 20 [1966] 248f). The emperor wore the loros on certain festive occasions (e.g., Easter), over the *divetesion*. According to Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, the loros symbolized the cross as the instrument of Christ's victory (*De cer.* 638.5–9); its convolutions eventually led to its symbolizing the winding sheet of Christ.

The term loros occurs in the 6th C. as a gilded shoulder-strap (John Lydos, *De mag.* 2.2, p.84.13); in the 14th C. the word was still used on occasion to designate leather (e.g., leather whips in pseudo-Kod. 181.30). The "pale" that Robert de Clari states was worn by Baldwin of Flanders for his coronation in the Church of Hagia Sophia in 1204 was probably a loros, even though the Byz. emperor was not himself in the habit of wearing the loros at his own coronation.

A loros could be worn also by certain very high
dignitaries on the occasion of the Easter banquet (Philothoës, ed. Oikonomides, *Listes* 201.24); archangels in attendance upon Christ are thus often represented wearing the loros. Scarves of lighter material could also be referred to as loroi, for example, the loros that constituted the badge of authority of an eparch.

A special arrangement of the empress's loros, evident in 11th-C. imperial portraits, gives it a shieldlike shape over the lower body (M. Soteriou, *EEBS* 23 [1953] 524–30). This section was once mistakenly thought to be a separate garment, specifically the thorakion mentioned in texts (W.H. Rudt de Collenberg, *MEFRM* 83 [1971] 263–361).

**LOROTOMOS** (λωροτόμος, “thong-cutter”), craftsmen who worked in leather. The word appears, although rarely, in late Roman papyri (Fikman, *Epiget* 50). In the 5th C. (?) the lexicographer Hesychios of Alexandria explained the term as being synonymous with skytotomos, shoemaker, but according to the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch, the lorotomoi produced not footgear but harnesses and saddles. The harnessmakers were subordinate (hypotassomenoi) to the eparch and fulfilled services for the demotion or state (ch.14.1); on the other hand, they were exempted from certain payments. If they were required for the emperor's service, they were put under the command of the protospatharios, but in this case they were entitled to some remuneration (kertos) from the imperial treasury. It is not clear whether these statements reflect the particular status of the guild or only the specific approach of the legislator in this chapter.

**LOUIS VII** (Λούδοικος), king of France (1137–80); born 1120 or 1121, died Paris 18 Sept. 1180. He was a leader of the Second Crusade (1147–49). Taking with him Queen Eleanor of Aquitaine (whom the Byz. called “Gold-Foot”), he followed Conrad III through the central Balkans. While Louis's army was encamped outside Constantinople, Bp. Godfrey of Langres suggested capturing the city. Unlike Conrad, Louis met formally with Manuel I in the palace at Constantinople. After Louis's soldiers attacked the tables of the money-changers set up for the Crusaders' use east of the Bosphorus, Manuel demanded homage from the French nobles and pledges to restore any conquered, formerly Byz. towns in Asia. In return, Manuel offered gifts, supplies, and guides. Reluctantly, Louis allowed the oaths (Oct. 1147).
The French blamed the Byz. for Turkish attacks in Aratolia. When Louis returned from Palestine (spring 1149) on a Sicilian ship, his vessel joined a Sicilian fleet raiding the Peloponnesos. Intercepted by the Byz., Louis’s ship escaped capture only by displaying the banner of the French king, a Byz. ally; Eleanor and others were briefly held captive by the Byz. In 1180, Louis’s daughter Agnes married Manuel’s heir, Alexios II.

---

**LOUIS OF BLOIS**, count of Blois, Chartres, and Clermont; born 1171, died near Adrianople 14 Apr. 1205. Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 539.90 and elsewhere) purposely metathesized the name from Λούγιος to Δούλιος, from dolos, treachery. Among the first to enroll in the Fourth Crusade, Louis was one of its leaders. He favored the diversion to Constantinople and participated in the conflicts of 1203. During the attacks on Constantinople in Apr. 1204 he was confined to bed with fever, but was able to participate in the coronation of Baldwin of Flanders. Louis received Nicaea as a duchy and sent his vassals Peter of Bracieux and Payen d’Orleans to occupy it, while remaining in Constantinople. When Kaloyan invaded Thrace, Louis fell in battle against him.

_Lit._ Longnon, _Compagnons_ 79–84.
---

**LOUKAS CHRYSOBERGES**, patriarch of Constantinople (between Aug. and Oct. 1157–between 19 Nov. 1169 and Jan. 1170); died Constantinople. A member of the Chrysoberges family, Loukas was a monk before his election to the patriarchate. Gregory Antiochos, in an unpublished speech, relates that Manuel I took Loukas from the monastery of Pege (Kazhdan-Franklin, _Studies_ 1971). As patriarch, Loukas had to cope with various ideological movements; he participated in the second synod on the case of Soterichos Panteugenos, and Antiochos claims that Loukas achieved a reconciliation. Then he tried to curb the popular heresy of Demetrios of Lampe. He presided over several sessions of the local council of Constantinople of 1166–67 (see under Constantinople, Councils of) to confirm Manuel I’s edict on the discussion of the statement of John 14:28, “My Father is greater than I”; several theologians (the deacon and kastrinios Samuel, the deacon Basil of ta Hagiopanta, etc.) were condemned and deposed. Loukas attempted to restrict the lease of ecclesiastical lands, prohibited the combination of secular and ecclesiastical offices in a single person (Darrouzès, _Offikia_ 81), and tried to expand church jurisdiction over certain cases involving laymen (e.g., control over illegal betrothals). Unlike Alexios Stoudites, Loukas in 1166 prohibited marriages between relatives of the seventh degree (A. Kazhdan, _Vizvrem_ 24 [1964] 84–90; D. Simon, _FM_ 1 [1976] 123–25), a decision that could be used against the intermarriages of noble families. Documents presenting negotiations between Loukas and Andrej of Bogoljubovo concerning the establishment of a metropolitan see in Vladimir survive only in late Russian versions (N. Voronin, _Vizvrem_ 21 [1966] 29–50).

---

**LOUKAS THE STYLITE**, saint; born in the village of Attikom, Anatolikon, traditional date 879, but probably ca.900, since he was about 30 during the great famine (of 927/8?), died Chalcedon 11 Dec. 979. Born to a well-to-do family of peasant-soldiers, at age 18 Loukas participated in an unsuccessful military campaign against the Bulgarians; at 24 he became a priest but remained several years more in the army. Loukas aspired to an extreme asceticism, not only rejecting family and friendship but also despising the earth and life itself (Delehaye, _infra_, 198.20–23); he ate only wild herbs, slept on the ground, and wore chains. He retired to the monastery of St. Zacharias on Olympos; later he moved to Constantinople where he spent his final 42 or 44 years standing on the column of Eutropios in Chalcedon.

The author of Loukas’s Life claims to have known the “earthly angel” for 27 years, and the vita (preserved in a single 11th-C. MS) may have been produced very soon after Loukas’s death. The hagiographer is fascinated by Constantinople and its churches but is far removed from the Constantinopolitan elite; he mentions people of high rank only rarely (Patr. Theophylaktos, the magistros Basil Petinos). Loukas’s associates were
predominantly clerics, merchants, low officials, fishermen, and nautkleri; special attention is paid to medical services (e.g., the hospital of Euboulos), which allegedly could not compete with Loukas’s healing gift.

**Representation in Art.** Portraits of Loukas are rare: he is probably the anonymous stylite whose image, unaccompanied by any text, follows that of Daniel the Stylite in the Menologion of Basil II (p.238). The saint’s column is built on a sort of platform out in the water, evidently a reference to the Bosporos. His church is visible on the shore.

SOURCE. Delehaye, Saints styli 195–237.


-A.K., N.P.S.

**LOUKAS THE YOUNGER** (of Stiria), saint; born in village of Kastorion, Phokis, before 900, died Stiris 7 Feb. 953. Born to the family of a well-to-do peasant, Loukas soon came into conflict with his relatives, who could not accept his generous habit of giving away all he could to the poor. After his father’s death he ran away to Athens, where he became a monk. He lived as a hermit in several different places in the Peloponnese and Phokis: Bulgarian and Hungarian raids often forced him to move. A hegoumenos even criticized his penchant for “rustic” (agrotikos) manners and avoidance of ecclesiastical organization (ed. Kremos 32.II.5–10); Loukas applied to an archbishop of Corinth for permission to celebrate the Eucharist in his hermit’s cell without a priest (ed. Kremos 41.1.37–41). His Life was written after 961, probably during Basil II’s reign; the anonymous author focuses on the provinces: although he mentions some monks traveling to Italy (ed. Kremos 34.I.8, 53.II.19–20), Constantinople remains beyond the scope of his attention. The hagiographer deals much with illnesses and miraculous healings and strongly emphasizes the saint’s sexuality: once during a winter storm Loukas let two women sleep in his cave with him and his disciple Pankratios and was as unaffected as a stone or log or a boy with his mother; another time Loukas sent Pankratios to cure a sick woman by rubbing a special ointment on her naked body (ed. Kremos 55f). Neighboring peasants covered Loukas’s grave with bricks; after six months the monk and eunuch Kosmas adorned the place. Later the monastery of Hosios Loukas was built on the site.

**Representation in Art.** Though portraits of Loukas are rare, the portrait type seems to have been established soon after the saint’s death: he appears in the narthex of the Church of Hosios Loukas as an orant monk in a koukoullion, or hood, with a rich brown beard; he is again shown as a relatively young man in a MS of the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes (Messina, Bibl. Univ., San Salvatore 27, fol.58v).


**LOVE.** Besides philia, friendship, the Byz. mainly used two words to designate love: eros and agape. Eros had a pagan connotation, as the name of a mythological god of love, and the term played a substantial role in Platonist and Neoplatonic philosophy. Agape, on the contrary, was connected with a Christian milieu (S. West, JThSt 20 [1966] 228–30). The Byz., however, did not see the distinction between eros and agape as one of carnal and divine love, respectively; both eros and agape could express positive (divine) or negative (diabolic) qualities. The Byz. condemned carnal love (see SEXUALITY) as inspired by the Devil, esp. forms of sex such as prostitution and homosexuality, and recommended limitations in conjugal sex, but they expanded the terminology of love (passion, desire, wedding, marriage) to describe the relationship between God and man, thus making possible the allegorical interpretation of erotic romance as the soul’s yearning for God. The term eros could designate God’s love as a suprasensible quality that binds together “dissimilar similarities” (Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, PG 31:144A); it could also mean man’s passionate love (“fire”) for God and divine beauty. Agape, comprising both these meanings, had also the special connotation of charity and of the community based on love (i.e., of the Church).

Many Byz. texts praised fraternal love, love between parents and children, and conjugal love, although the lyrical expression of passion is rare (e.g., Prodromos, ed. E. Legrand, REGr 4 [1891] 72). The extremes of love and of jealousy were usually condemned, but many cases of extramarital love (e.g., Constantine IX and Skleraina, Andronikos I Konnenos and Theodora) were de-
scribed by contemporaries with warmth and sympathy.


—A.K.

LOVEČ (Λοβετζέ; Old Slavonic Lovć; Lat. Melta), city on the upper course of the river Osüm (Assam) in northern Bulgaria, on the route from the Danube to the Mediterranean via the Trojan Pass and Philippopolis. During the uprising of Peter of Bulgaria and ASEN I (1185–87), Loveč was an important fortified position defending the approaches to Tūrnovo. The Byz. besieged it unsuccessfully for three months; by a treaty signed there in 1187, they formally recognized the Second Bulgarian Empire. A colony of Dubrovnik at Loveč is evidence of its role in Balkan trade. Ruins of a 13th- or 14th-C. basilica survive. In 1393 Loveč was captured by the Ottoman Turks and by 1430 was capital of a vilayet. The nearby monastery of the Virgin was a center of transmission of Old Slavonic literature.


—R.B.

LUCANIA (Λουκανία), province bounded, according to Diocletian’s reform, by Salerno and the rivers Bradano and Lao. Together with the ager Bruttius (the present Calabria) Lucania formed Regio III of Italy, governed by a corrector, who was resident in Reggio-Calabria. The territory was conquered by the Lombards during the late 6th–7th C. After the Byz. recovered Italy in the late 9th C., the eastern part of Lucania was integrated into the new theme of Longobardia, whereas the western part continued to belong to the principality of Salerno. Originally the area was not densely populated, but because of Arab raids on Calabria during the second half of the 10th C. many Greeks from the south migrated to Lucania. In 1042, for the first and only time, a Byz. strategos of Lucania is mentioned, active in the kastron of Merkourion in the Lao valley. The extent of his theme, the name of its capital (Casano, Ionio, or Tursi?), and the date of its creation are unknown. The Normans conquered the territory ca.1045–60; their administration did not preserve a province called Lucania.


—V.v.F.

LUCIAN (Λουκιανός), Greek sophist and satirist; born Samosata ca.120, died ca.180. He is the author of some 80 pieces, chiefly in dialogue form, which have survived in more than 150 MSS. The earliest MS, containing a 6th-C. Syriac translation of On Calumny, dates from the 8th or 9th C. The Souda, incorrectly dating him to the time of Trajan and calling him a blasphemer, slanderer, and atheist, says that he was killed by dogs and would burn in Hell for slandering Christ. He is further reviled in the scholia by ARETHAS OF CAESAREA, who heaps abusive epithets on him. By contrast, Photios (Bibl., cod.128) praises him for ridiculing the pagan gods and for his clear and expressive style. His works were much admired and imitated by later Byz. writers. Three Byz. imitations of Lucian, the Philopatris, Charidemos, and the Timarion, are included in many MSS of the 15th–16th C. as works by Lucian himself. His works were influential in the development of three popular literary genres: satirical dialogue, the imaginary voyage, and the dialogue of the dead. The Journey of Mazaris contains elements of all three genres. Of the 53 epigrams ascribed to Lucian, all but one are preserved only in the Greek Anthology.


—K.S.

LUCIAN OF ANTIOCH, presbyter of Antioch, martyr, and saint; died Nikomedéia 312; feastday 15 Oct. One of the pupils at the theological school that he founded in Antioch was ARIUS; hence Lucian is credited with being an inspiration of the Arian heresy. In this connection, the second of four creeds proposed at the local council of Antioch of 341 may go back to him. Only fragments of his own writings survive; one in the Chronicón Paschale attests to Byz. interest. Lucian’s most enduring work was his revision for style and content of the Greek Bible, and his version of the
New Testament is generally thought to be embodied in the one used in Byz. A vita of Lucian was written by Philostorgios (Kirchengeschichte, ed. J. Bidez, F. Winkelmann [Berlin 1981] 184–201).


-B.B.

LUKE, saint; feastday 18 Oct. According to Byz. tradition, he was the author of the third Gospel (written under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit) and of the Acts. Luke’s Gospel was commented upon by Origen, Titus of Bostra, and Cyril of Alexandria; some commentaries—those of Eusebius of Caesarea (D.C. Wallace-Hadrill, HTHR 67 [1974] 55–63), Apollinaris of Laodikeia, Theodore of Herakleia, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Photios—are known primarily from later catenae, one of which was compiled by Niketas of Herakleia. The commentaries of Euthymios Zigabenos and Theophylaktos of Ohrid, surviving in a direct tradition, are compilations.

Eulogies of Luke were produced by various writers, including Andrew of Crete, Niketas Paphlagon, and Philagathos. A certain Gregory of Syracuse (in the 7th C.)? wrote a kontakion on Luke (E. Mioni, BollBadGr n.s. 1 [1947] 208f) and Symeon Metaphrastes included Luke’s vita in his collection. Luke’s biography does not contain abundant miracles or dangerous travels—he is presented as a well-educated man who, in Greece and Egypt, studied disciplines such as grammar, poetry, rhetoric, logic, and ethics, but was never strong in philosophy (PG 115,1129B). He was a physician and painter, who died peacefully in Achaia; his relics are said to have been transferred to Constantinople by St. Artemios, under Constantius II. Antony of Novgorod mentions a Church of St. Luke in Constantinople. Legend has it that Luke was the first artist to paint the Virgin’s portrait. The monasteries of Hodegon and Soumelà claimed that the icons of Mary in their possession were Luke’s work.

Representation in Art. Although white-haired in the 6th-C. Cambridge Gospels (F. Wormald, The Miniatures in the Gospels of St. Augustine [Cambridge 1954] pl. II), Luke appears in most Byz. author portraits as a youth with brown, curly hair, hollow cheeks, and a wispy beard. He is usually shown writing in front of a desk (see Evangelist Portraits). He is occasionally accompanied by Paul who supposedly inspired his Gospel, and more often by Theophilus, his patron. In some MSS, his portrait prefacing his Gospel is paired with a miniature of the birth of John the Baptist or the Annunciation; that preceding the Acts may be accompanied by the Ascension (Codex Ebnerianus, fol. 23r). Traditionally numbered among the Apostles, Luke is occasionally represented as suffering a martyr’s death (K. Weitzmann in Books & Bookmen, fig. 56).


LUPERCALIA (Λυπερκαλία), a festival of the Roman imperial and late antique periods, celebrated 15 Feb. at the Lupercal, a cave on the Palatine Hill in Rome. The Lupercalia lasted through the 5th C. and beyond. In a letter of 494, Pope Gelasius I denounced a certain Andromachus who, along with other residents of Rome, celebrated the Lupercalia “according to the primeval custom.” Gelasius alludes to men performing sacrifices, a procession of boys dressed in the skins of sacrificed goats, and general debauchery. Andromachus, though a Christian, believed the cult practice would aid the fertility of the soil; to counter this conviction, Gelasius cites the plague that struck Rome when Emp. Anthemius (467–72) arrived in the city in the wake of the Lupercalia. The Lupercalia never became firmly established in Constantinople; it is last mentioned there by John Lydos, who refers to it as a fertility ceremony for “increasing the fruits” (De Mensibus, ed. R. Wuenisch, 83,7–8).


LUPUS PROTOSPATHARIUS. See Annals of Bari.
LUSIGNANS (Λουκουνίας), a noble family from the county of Poitou. The younger sons of Hugh VII of Lusignan, Aimery and Guy, gained importance in the kingdom of Jerusalem in the 1180s. Guy became king in 1186 as the husband of Sibyl, daughter of Amalaric I. In 1187 he was defeated and captured by Saladin. In 1192 Richard I Lionheart made him regent of Cyprus, recently taken from Isaac Komnenos. Guy died in 1194. He was succeeded by his brother Aimery, who was crowned king of Cyprus in 1197 and king of Jerusalem in right of his wife Isabel (daughter of Amalaric I and Maria Komnene). Aimery’s descendants (by a previous wife) ruled Cyprus until 1489. In the 13th C. several were also kings of Jerusalem and retained that title after 1291.


LUXOR (Πόλις κάστρων), Pharaonic temple in Upper Egypt that Diocletian turned into a military camp in 297. The headquarters (principia) occupied a room behind the hypostyle hall, in which are preserved traces of several Tetrarchic wall paintings with military scenes and, in the apse (often misunderstood as the apse of a church), the deified emperor with his three colleagues. The camp was apparently in use until the Persian invasion (616–20). The earliest church in Luxor dates from the late 6th C. and is built outside the camp directly beside the main gate. It is a typical Egyptian basilica with a tripartite sanctuary and a secondary triumphal arch.


LUXORIUS, author of approximately 90 poems (some individual ascriptions are debatable) in the Latin Anthology; fl. 5th–6th C. Their internal evidence suggests that he lived in or near Carthage during the reigns of the last Vandal kings Hilderic (529–50) and Gelimer, although some scholars put Luxorius earlier. Superscriptions to two poems contain the titles vir clarissimus and spectabilis, perhaps honorary in acknowledgment of his status as grammaticus. Luxorius may be identifiable with the Lisorius who wrote a treatise on orthography. His poems, in different meters on various subjects, owe much to their classical models, notably Martial, whose taste for physical deformity and moral perversion Luxorius often reproduces. Overall, however, they provide a valuable glimpse into the Vandal society overthrown by the Byz. reconquest of Africa, esp. with his epigrams on charioteers and mimes.

LUXOR TREASURE, dated to the 5th–7th C. and discovered in 1889 in a small church built inside the Temple at Luxor. Now in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, it is composed of ten silver objects (a cross, three patens, fragments of five vessels, and a chain). While the processional cross is similar to contemporary examples found elsewhere (e.g., Kaper Koraon Treasure, Phela Treasure), the patens, formerly described by Strzygowski as book boxes but correctly identified by Hellenkemper, are unusual in being rectangular (like the secular lanx [see Plates, Display]), rather than circular like a paten and asteriskos. Two of the three dedicatory inscriptions, on the cross and two patens, mention, in addition to the donors, a priest and two different bishops, the latter perhaps successive holders of the see with authority over the village of Luxor.


LYCHNIKON. See Vespers.

LYCIA (Λυκία), the rugged southwestern region of Asia Minor, characterized by forested mountains and a long coastline. Because of its numerous harbors and its location on the sea route
between Italy or Constantinople and the east, Lycia prospered from trade. It contained numerous small cities, but never supported a large population. Lycia became a separate province under Constantine I, with its metropolis at Myra. It was esp. prosperous in the 6th C.; an abundance of remains (e.g., Holy Sion) attests growth in city and country at that time, notably in the regions of Myra and Makre. At the same time, however, banditry and other disturbances afflicted the interior. In the 7th C., Lycia became part of the Kibyrhiaotai theme, but continued to exist as an administrative and customs unit through the early 8th C. (Zacos, Seals, 1, no.225). Mentions of Lycia after the 8th C. refer to the ecclesiastical province or the geographical region. Prosperity ended with the onset of Arab raids in 655 and their continuation through the 9th C. Many coastal towns were abandoned; others became fortresses. Recovery in the 10th C. produced the remarkable church of Dere Ağa, but most settlements remained small. Lycia flourished briefly under the Komnenoi before falling to the Turks in the late 12th C.


—C.F.

LYDDA. See Diospolis.

LYDOS, JOHN. See John Lydos.

LYKANDOS (Λυκανδός), also Likandos, fortress in the Antitaurus Mountains, southeast of Elbistan. When Melias assumed command of the area in 903, he found the castle in ruins and the adjacent plain deserted. He rebuilt the castle, which became the headquarters of a kleisoura in 908 and of a theme by 916. Its strategic location, commanding a route through the mountains, gave Lykandos considerable importance in the foreign and civil wars of the 10th C. Its administration was sometimes combined with that of Melitene or Tzamandos. “Retainers (agouroi) of Likantos” are mentioned in Digenes Akritas (p.203.1968). The area had an Armenian population. Although effectively lost to Byz. after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071, Lykandos formed part of the territory granted by Alexios I to Bohemund in 1108. Lykandos was apparently never a bishopric. It contains remains of a substantial castle, probably the work of Melias.


—C.F.

LYKAONIA (Λυκαονία), the southern part of the central Anatolian plateau, an arid, treeless plain bounded by hills and mountains. The country is generally unproductive and had a sparse population whose main centers were around the edges of the plain. It contains, however, much grassland suitable for pasture, and the adjacent mountains are rich in minerals. In the reforms of Diocletian, the north of Lykaonia was assigned to Pisidia and the south to Isauria. Lykaonia became a separate province ca.370, with its civil and ecclesiastical metropolis at Ikonion. As a result of Isaurian raids, Leo I appointed a comes as military commander of Lykaonia beside the civil governor. When this proved inadequate, Justinian I in 535 created a praetor with full civil and military powers. This, too, failed, and in 553 a dux, or biokolytes, was appointed as military governor to maintain order. The civil province of Lykaonia was absorbed in the Anatolikon theme, though kommeriaroi of Lykaonia were still active at the end of the 7th C. A tourmarches of Lykaonia and Pamphylia is attested in the late 9th C. Lykaonia contains many Byz. monuments, notably the churches of Binbirkilise and an extensive network of fortresses.

LIT. TIB 4:54–57.

—C.F.

LYKOSTOMION (Λυκοστόμιον), a town (chora) in the estuary of the Danube mentioned in some portulans from the 14th C. onward (P. Nästurel, SCIV 8 [1957] 296f). Its location is uncertain; O. Iliescu (RevIsl 25 [1972] no.3, 435–62) located Lykostomion in Periprava, on the river-branch Kilia. Ahrweiler (Mer 89, rev. by P. Nästurel, RESEE 4 [1966] 649f) identified it with the Lykostomion to whose archon, Thomas, Photios ded-
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LYONS, SECOND COUNCIL OF. This council was convened (7 May—17 July 1274) to establish the Union of the Churches and liberate the Holy Land. Actually, this “union” was little more than the consummation of a political deal between Pope Gregory X and Emp. Michael VIII Palaiologos. Rome was to receive the ecclesiastical submission of the Byz. church, while in return Michael was to be rid of Charles I of Anjou and his threat to reconquer Constantinople. Michael’s three representatives swore obedience to the Roman church and its faith by accepting papal primacy, purgatory, and the filioque. (Ironically, the last issue, which had divided the churches for centuries, was first pronounced dogma at the Council of Lyons.) The Byz. church, strictly speaking, was never a participant in the negotiations. The Byz. delegates at the council simply acknowledged a profession of faith previously signed by the emperor alone. Predictably, most of the Byz. population actively opposed the union. Despite Michael’s ruthless persecution and his imposition of John (XI) Bekkos as Unionist patriarch, the resistance drew from all sections of society, including monks, laity, and clergy; Arsenites (for religious but also for dynastic reasons); and even members of the imperial family. Equally hostile were the separatist Greek states, Serbia, and Bulgaria, to which the emperor’s own anti-Unionist sister had fled. These regions quickly became centers of anti-Unionist propaganda. Still, the settlement survived until Michael’s death, when the local council of Constantinople of 1285, under Patri. Gregory II, officially repudiated it (see under Constantinople, COUNCILS OF).

LYRIC, poetry in form song, originally intended to have an instrumental accompaniment. Scant use was made in Byz. of the wide range of complex lyric meters, based on syllable quantity and not stress, developed in the classical world (the KATOMYOMACHIA of Theodore Prodromos, a parody of the ancient tragic form, is a partial exception). Only Anacreontics were employed to any extent in their classical form (e.g., by Gregory of Nazianzos and Synesios of Cyrene), but they soon became a stressed eight-syllable line used largely for ecclesiastical purposes, as in the odes of Sophronios of Jerusalem. Vernacular lyrics in political verse exist independently in the Erotopaignia (Love Songs) and were also incorporated in romances such as Libistros and Rhodamen and the Achilleis.

—A.F.

—E.M.J.

LYTHRANKOMI, 34 miles northeast of Famagusta, Cyprus, site of the Church of Panagia Kanakaria. The church is a three-aisled, three-apsed basilica preceded by a narthex, with domes over the central bay of the narthex, the third and fourth bays of the nave, and the bema. Narthex, aisles, and nave are otherwise barrel-vaulted. After the original structure, with only one apse and a timber roof, was completed—probably at the end of the 5th C.—the church underwent three extensive renovations. Traces of wall painting dating from the 9th/10th C. to ca.1500 are found in narthex, nave, and aisles (scenes of Christ’s life, St. George), but the true glory of the edifice was the mosaic in the apse (dating between 525 and 550), one of the three apse mosaics on the island.


—A.K.
to have survived until modern times (with Kiti and the Panagia tes Kyras near Livadia). Unfortunately it was recently detached from the apse of the church and partly destroyed. The mosaic showed the seated Virgin and Child in the center of the conch, isolated in a great mandorla and flanked by palm trees and archangels; busts of the apostles in medallions form the principal outer border. The program of the apse has been explained by Megaw in terms of the Chalcedonian doctrine of the dual nature of Christ—with the boldly frontal and axial Theotokos embodying the human nature of Christ, and the enveloping mandorla expressive of the divine—and is thought to have been derived from Constantinople.


-W.T.
MA’ARAT AL-NUMĀN TREASURE, dated to the 6th or 7th C. and found ca.1945 in a village just south of Ma’arat al-Nu’mān, southwest of Aleppo (BERRIOA) in northern Syria, is composed of five objects and about 14 plaquettes, all of silver. It is now divided among museums in Paris, Baltimore, and Toledo, Ohio. This heterogeneous collection of objects (two crosses, a spoon, a box, a plaque) does not represent the essential liturgical vessels of a church and may be part of a treasure, unlike other contemporary church silver treasures that seem to be complete. Of interest, however, are the large votive plaque portraying one of the Symeon the Stylites and the set of tiny votive plaques, the use of which may continue a pagan custom of offering ex-votos to Asklepios in thanksgiving for healing.

Lit. Mango, Silver, nos. 67–72. -M.M.M.

MABBUG. See Hierapolis.

MACCAEBES (Μακκαβαῖοι), Jewish family that led a revolt against the Syrians in the 2nd C. B.C. The Byz. included all four Books of the Maccaebes in the Old Testament, thus giving special emphasis to the expansive account of the torture and death of Eleazar, seven unnamed brothers, and their mother (4 Macc 5:18, and cf. 2 Macc 6:18–7:41). The Synaxarium of Constantinople (Synax. CP 859f) names Eleazar, the mother Solomonis, and his brothers Abibos, Antoninos, Gourias, Eleazar, Eusebonas, Samonas, and Markello. All nine, loosely termed the Maccabees, were regarded as saints and protomartyrs in Byz. (cf. Gregory of Nazianzos, PG 35:912–33). Churches were dedicated to the Maccabees, for example, two in Constantinople (Janin, Églises CP 313f), and they appear already in the 7th-C. frescoes at S. Maria Antiqua, Rome. The feast of their martyrdom was celebrated on 1 Aug. and included by Symeon Metaphrastes, taking 4 Maccaebes as a text. The feast was illustrated both in calendar-based icons and MSS. An illustrative cycle is found in many MSS of Gregory’s homilies, but follows the biblical account (in 4 Macc), not the homily text. In the Bible of Leo SAKELLARIOS the frontispiece to Maccabees was placed not at the start of the book, but facing 4 Maccabees. In the 4th C. a martyrion of the Maccabees was built in Constantinople, just outside Galata.


- J.H.L., C.B.T.

MACEDONIA (Μακεδονία), in antiquity a region between Thrace and Epiros comprising the watersheds of the Haliakmon and Varadar rivers. Central Macedonia is a large plain dominated by the city of Thessalonike, with Serres and Philippi in the east and Kastoria, Berroia, Ohrid, and Prespa in the west. In the 4th C. Macedonia was a province in the diocese of Moesia; by the time of the Notitia Dignitatum it was divided into Macedonia Salutaris and Macedonia II. This administrative structure was retained in the 6th C: Hierokles calls Thessalonike the capital of Macedonia I and Stobi that of Macedonia II. Constantin VII Porphyrogennetos anachronistically described Macedonia I as an eparchia (under a consularis) containing 32 cities and Macedonia II (under a hegemon) as having eight cities.

In the late 6th–7th C. much of Macedonia was occupied by Slavs, resulting in cultural bifurcation: Slavs controlled the countryside and upland regions while Byz. retained possession of most of the towns. Byz. reconsolidation began in the 8th C. A new administrative unit, the theme of Macedonia, was created in 797–801, according to P. Koledarov (IzvInstBülgist 21 [1970] 219–43). Theophanes (Theoph. 475.22) mentions a mono-strategos in Thrace and Macedonia active in 801/2. At the same time, a 9th-C. seal of Leo, spatharios and tourmarches of Macedonia (Zacos, Seals 1, no.2147), shows that Macedonia was first a tourma of Thrace. In 813, however, the patrikios John Aplakes served as strategos of Macedonia. Several seals of various strategoi of Macedonia belong to the 9th C. The office of the strategos of Macedonia
is mentioned in the earlier taktika but not in the Taktikon of the Escurial of 971–75 (Oikonomides, Listes 355); the theme of Macedonia was probably replaced by that of Larissa—at any rate, a strategos of “Larisa and Makaidonia” in 1065/7 founded a church in Tao (K. Juzbašan in Elinističeski Blšnij Vostok, Vizantiya i Iran [Moscow 1967] 115).

In Byz. terminology of the 10th-12th C. the name Macedonia was applied to Thrace: thus, Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 6.22–24) calls Adriano polesi the richest and strongest polesi of Macedonia, and Basil I, born in Thrace, was founder of the “Macedonian” dynasty. A 13th-C. historian (Akrop. 23.3–16) lists Philippopolis, Heracleia, Rhaides, and many other Thracian polesi as located in Macedonia. On the other hand, a 14th-C. historian (Greg. 1:524.18, 3:99.15, 100.7) distinguishes Thrace from Macedonia, and Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 3:104.20) sees Macedonia as a region that included Thessalonike (N.P. Andriotes, BalkSt 1 [1960] 147).

After 1204 all of Macedonia fell under the control of Boniface of Montferrat, king of Thessalonike. The area was invaded by Kalojan and conquered by Theodore Komnenos Doukas of Epiros in 1222, then by John III Vatatzes ca.1242. The Chalkidike became a base for the Catalan Grand Company in 1307–08 and much of Macedonia fell to Stefan Uros IV Dušan ca.1345. The Ottomans conquered Macedonia in the late 14th C., although some cities held out into the early 15th C. The metropolitans of Macedonia were the bishops of Thessalonike and Philippopoli; they were under the authority of the papacy until 732/3, afterward under that of Constantinople.

Culturally, Macedonia formed a single unit, although the settlement of Slavs created some division, and the successive Bulgarian and Serbian states contested political control with Byz. Thessalonike dominated the south and Ohrid, from the 9th C., the north. Macedonia was the center from which Byz. culture reached the Slavs of the Balkans. Both Thessalonike and Ohrid developed cultural forms of their own, and one may speak of distinctly Macedonian styles of architecture and painting, although these were always strongly influenced by Constantinople and individual styles developed in many rural parts of Macedonia.


Macedonian Dynasty (867–1056). Byz. dynasty founded by Basil I, who came from an Armenian family that settled in Thrace or Macedonia. According to a legend, originated probably by Photios, the family was descended from the Arsacids, but in fact Basil’s parents were simple peasants. He advanced rapidly thanks to his extraordinary physical strength and boldness, murdering his rival, Caesar Bardas, and then his protector Michael III, whose former mistress Eudokia Ingerina was Basil’s wife.

The Macedonian dynasty included direct male descendants of Basil I: his sons Leo VI and Alexander, a grandson Constantine VII, a great-grandson Romanos II, and Romanos’s sons Basil II and Constantine VIII. During the minority of Constantine VII the imperial functions and the emperor’s title were assumed by Romanos I, who tried to establish his own dynasty, that of the Lekapenoi; his attempt failed. During the minority of Basil II and Constantine VIII imperial power and the emperor’s title were bestowed upon Nikophoros II Phokas and John I Tzimiskes. Although Constantine VIII died in 1028 without a male heir, the dynasty was continued by a series of emperors, Romanos III Argyros, Michael IV, Michael V, and Constantine IX, all of whom were related to the Macedonian dynasty through ties of marriage or adoption by Constantine VIII’s daughter, Zoe. This emphasis on continuation of the dynasty demonstrates the strength of the ruling family in the 10th and 11th C. Michael V’s attempt to depose Zoe led to his overthrow; the dynasty became extinct only after its last member, Theodora, died childless. (See genealogical table; on the achievements and policies of the Macedonian emperors, see “Age of Recovery and Consolidation” under Byzantium, History of.)

Macedonian Renaissance. See Encyclopedia; Renaissance.

Machairas, Leonios, Cypriot chronicler attached to the court of the Lusignans; born Cyprus ca.1380, died after 1432. In 1401 Machairas (Μαχαίρας) was secretary to Jean de Nores (PLP, no.20722), in 1426 he was responsible for wine distribution in Cherokita (in southern Cyprus), and in 1432 he went on an embassy to the Turkish ruler in Laranda in Asia Minor.

The prose chronicle that Machairas composed on the history of Cyprus begins with a summary of ecclesiastical history from Constantine I onward. His account becomes much more detailed with the reign of Peter I Lusignan of Cyprus (1359–69) and continues to 1432. The chronicle of Machairas was derived from a combination of Western and Greek written sources, oral tradition, and personal reminiscences. It reflects the viewpoint of a patriotic and Orthodox Cypriot, who was at the same time a great admirer of the Lusignans, while despising the Genoese. Machairas was bilingual and wrote in a 15th-C. Cypriot dialect with numerous loanwords, esp. from French. His work bears few traces of the learned Byz. language or literary tradition, but contains elements of folklore and popular storytelling.


-A.M.T.

Machairas Monastery, founded in the mid-12th C. on a mountain near Tamasos (or Tamassia) in central Cyprus; it continues to function at the present. The early history of the monastery of Machairas (Μαχαίρας, “swordmaker”), which was dedicated to the Theotokos tou Machaira, is known only from the typikon (typeikon dia-
taxis) composed in 1210 by Neilos, bishop of Tamasia. It began as a hermitage established by two Palestinian monks, Neophytos and Ignatios. After the death of Neophytos, Emp. Manuel I granted Ignatios the mountain and an annual income of 50 nomismata to build a small monastery and chapel; the independence of Machairas was guaranteed (Tsiknopoulllos, infra 111f). After 1172 the complex was greatly enlarged under the leadership of Ignatios’s disciple Neilos, who accumulated considerable property and received a tax exemption and 24 paroikoi from Emp. Alexios III Angelos (Tsiknopoulllos, infra 17.1–4). Neilos also founded a nunnery in Tamasia and provided it with a rule that has not survived.

The typikon, modeled on that of the Euergetis monastery in Constantinople, begins with instructions for the celebration of services; it then provides a detailed description of the administrative structure of Machairas. An unusual feature was the appointment of two oikonomoi, one to supervise internal affairs and the other to supervise agricultural activity on its estates. Other monastic officials included two docheiarioi, an ekklesiarch, a cellarer, and a disciplinary officer (epistemonarches). Neilos devoted particular attention to record keeping and other provisions to guard against fraud. He specifically forbade the entrance of women and the education of lay children at the monastery.


MACROBIUS, more fully Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius, Latin writer of 4th/5th C., perhaps the Theodosius who was praetorian prefect of Italy in 430 (Al. Cameron, JRS 56 [1966] 25–38). His Commentary on the Dream of Scipio, a Neoplatonist exposition of Scipio Africanus’s epiphany in Cicero’s De re publica, was very influential in medieval times. The Saturnalia, whose dramatic date is 17–19 Dec. 384, although itself perhaps not published until after 410, comprises seven books (with lacunae at the beginning and end of some) of antiquarian polymathy, couched in the traditional form of a symposium. Hosts and participants include prominent pagans (e.g., Symmachus) and the Vergilian commentator Servius. Virgil himself is the central topic, cast in the superhuman form that anticipates his role in Dante. The Saturnalia is a piece of classical and pagan nostalgia, studiously ignoring Christianity and contemporary troubles. A third work, *On Dissimilarities and Similarities between Greek and Latin Words*, survives only in medieval excerpts.


-M.B.

MADABA (Μᾶδαβα, Ar. Mādābā in modern Jordan), city and bishopric in the province of Arabia, under the jurisdiction of Bostra; it flourished in the 6th–7th C. Lying to the east of the pilgrimage site of Mt. Nebo, Madaba itself had at least 12 churches. Subjects of the numerous floor mosaics uncovered in Madaba include a map of the Holy Land (MADABA MOSAIC MAP), Hippolytos and Phaedra, Achilles and Patroklos, Herakles, a Dionysiac procession, hunting scenes, city Tyches, and a personification of Thalassa (the last in a Church of the Holy Apostles of 578). An inscription records the restoration of a cistern by Justinian I. Other dated inscriptions of building and paving are of 562 and 603/4 (the cathedral), 595/6–607/8, and 663 (the Church of the Virgin, by the “people of this polis of Madaba”).


-M.M.M.

MADABA MOSAIC MAP, a late 6th-C. topographical pavement depicting the Holy Land, set into the transept of a church at Madaba in Jordan. The major surviving fragment (10.5 × 5 m) shows the area from the Jordan Valley to the Nile; dominating its center is Jerusalem, directly in front of the apse. Based on a Roman road map and the *Onomastikon* of Eusebius of Caesarea, supplemented by a few Jewish and later Christian sources, the mosaic provides a graphic guide to Old and New Testament sites. Although small towns are represented only by conventional structures, larger cities are laid out with surprising
detail in bird's-eye view; in Jerusalem five of the ten churches shown can be identified. There are indications of vegetation as well, and, in many cases, enough information to judge the relative importance of the various Loca Sancta in the 6th C.


MAENADS, ecstatic and frenzied women in Dionysos's retinue, who in their madness dance and devour raw flesh. Allusions to maenads are found in late Roman literature both pagan and patristic: thus, Basil the Great (PG 31:189BC) in his list of women's vices speaks of maenadic misbehavior—drunkenness, fornication, insolence, etc., while the vita of John Klimax (PG 88:600B) describes the sword of obedience as extinguishing maenadic tyranny. Nonnos of Panopolis, in the Dionysiaka, presents maenads as zealous warriors in the great Indian war launched by Dionysos, but he also describes them (34:352–56) as discarding their manly character and once more becoming women who refuse to do battle and return to the distaff and spindle. Christian authors explained their omophagia (devouring raw flesh) as merely a commemorative rite, in commemoration of the day when, according to the legend, Dionysos was torn to pieces (E.R. Dodds, HThR 33 [1949] 165). Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 321:20–26) compares Andronikos I Komnenos and his courtesans to Dionysos and the maenads.

By the 10th–11th C. the maenad had become a generic figure in art, adapted to a specific situation by the attributes that she holds (Weitzmann, infra, figs. 114, 157). Thus divorced from their original context, they lent their form to the dancers on the crown of Constantine IX (Rice, Art of Byz., fig.134).

Lit. Weitzmann, Gr. Myth. 129f, 179f. —A.K., A.C.

MAGIC. See Adoration of the Magi.

MAGIC (μαγεία). In Byz. usage synonymous with sorcery (γυμεία), magic was a normal phenomenon in the life of late Roman society. It served two major goals: to explain "supernatural" forces (dreams, visions, extraordinary natural phenomena, constellations of celestial bodies) and to influence them (or prevent their effect) through special prayers, amulets, and the assistance of demons. The position of Christianity toward magic and divination was ambivalent: on the one hand, holy objects (relics, icons, liturgical objects) and holy persons (both living and dead) were granted the ability both to explain and to control the activity of supernatural powers. On the other hand, traditional magic was condemned and perpetrators of magic could be burned alive (e.g., A. Leroy-Molinghen in Rayonnement grec 286f).

The church distinguished between the holy man or woman who relied upon divine aid, and the magician who, however powerful, acted with demonic assistance. Magic was to prove inferior in any confrontation with genuine divine power: magical creatures dissolved before the sign of the cross, the books of the Holy Writ, or a sincere prayer, and sorcerers (like medical doctors) had to yield to the greater power of a saint. Another distinction, an internal one, lay in the nature of the act performed: the sorcerer concentrated on fulfilling sexual desires, producing ludicrous situations or objects, creating fake riches or secular knowledge, and inflicting harm, whereas the saint acted as healer and protector of men and animals, and countered the eruption of the evil forces of the cosmos (earthquakes, flood, locusts, etc.). The struggle against magic is one of the main topics of hagiography (H.J. Magoulias, Byzantium 37 [1967–68] 228–69).

The ambivalent attitude toward magic was typical even of intellectuals: Niketas Choniates records numerous cases of the efficient exercise of sorcery (the magic power of letters and words, hypnotic effects, knowledge of the future) but condemns them as futile, unchristian activities. The church fought against sorcery until the very end of the empire (e.g., C. Cupane, JÖB 29 [1980] 237–62), but various forms of magic were nonetheless accepted in Byz. daily life (the idea of beneficial and harmful days, dream interpretation, fortune-telling) and even in criminal procedure (ordeal by hot iron, the examination of an alleged thief by a "magic eye").


MAgICANS (μάγοι), sorcerers (goetai), and witches existed in both urban and rural society and in all social and economic classes of the late Roman Empire; pagans and Christians alike appealed to them for help: the vita of George of Choziba (7th C.) mentions a wrestler who reported to a magician to alleviate the effects of poison, and the sorcerer Albicierus helped the young St. Augustine find a silver spoon. Political trials, esp. numerous in the 4th C., were often interwoven with accusations of sorcery, and political biographies of this period frequently include a magician’s attack.

In the Hippodrome of Constantinople (5th–9th C.), members of the factions paid magicians to destroy the charioteers of their enemies. High officials suffering from maladies attributed them to the sorcery of magicians hired by their competitors for rank and promotion in the imperial administration; these officials recuperated at monasteries like that of St. Hypatios at ROUPHINIANAI in Bithynia, where the saint’s blessings and EULOGIAI were thought to counteract sorcerers.

The nature of INCANTATIONS (preserved in Egyptian papyri), inscribed AMULETS, and magic books all presuppose literacy among sorcerers. Their ability to procure papyrus and metal for amulets suggests the financial viability of their profession. In popular belief, magicians were usually, but not always, connected with Egypt.

Christianity viewed the magician as a rival of the holy man, and hagiography encouraged the negative image of the sorcerer, usually described as a Jew, heretic, or heathen, who might direct hordes of locusts against tilled fields, practice poisoning, make love potions, and own magic books full of spells against men, animals, and houses. Nevertheless, practitioners of sorcery were active until the end of the empire. Tradition endowed even some biblical personages (SOLOMON) with witchcraft and power over demons. The Iconoclast JOHN (VII) GRAMMATIKOS was proclaimed magician par excellence, and in the Khludov marginal Psalter he is shown being trampled by Patr. Nikephoros I, just as the nearby figure of the sorcerer Simon Magus is trampled by St. Peter (fol. 51v).

— F.R.T., A.C.

MAGISTER EQUITUM. See MAGISTER MILITUM.

MAGISTER MILITUM (στρατηγόλάτης), commander in chief of the armies in the late Roman Empire. According to a historian of the 5th–6th C. (Zosim. bk.2.33.3), Constantine I removed the praetorian prefect from military command, entrusting the scholae palatinae to the magister officiorum and the regular army to the strateletes of the cavalry and of the infantry; the Latin terms, magister equitum and magister peditum, are known only from the period after Constantine. The distinction between the two kinds of troops, mounted and foot, was more theoretical than real. Constantius II created three posts of local magistri militum for both troops: for Oriens (350/1), Gallia (355), and Illyricum (ca.355). The next step in the division of military power occurred in 364, when the empire and the army were split between Valentinian I and Valens.

Thereafter several magistri militum existed in both the West and East, some at court (magistri praesentales) and some in the provinces (A. Hoepfner, Byzantion 11 [1936] 483–98). Theodosius I tried to reduce the number of magistri militum, and Arkadios attempted to abolish them altogether, placing military power in the hands of the eunuch Eutropios, but the post was soon reestablished. The distinction between cavalry and infantry disappeared by 370, when the title of magister utrius militiae was introduced, although the former designations continued to exist; in the West the magister peditum seems to have dominated.

The magistri militum were recruited mainly from Germanic peoples, in the 4th C. often from the lower strata, in the 5th primarily from princely families. Besides direct military functions and the right of conscription, magistri militum possessed judicial authority over their officers. Western magistri militum (like STILICHON) held supreme power; in the 5th C. they either appointed emperors or gained the throne themselves. In the East the
The service costume of magistri militum in the 5th C. consisted of a sword, lance, chlamys (a richly embroidered tunic), and, at least on the diptych of Stilicho, a shield decorated with the emperors' busts.


—A.K., A.C.

MAGISTER OFFICIORUM (μάγιστρος τῶν ὀφθαλμών), master of the offices, the head of the central civil administration in the late Roman Empire. The office (first mentioned in 320) was created by Constantine I with the aim of restricting the praetorian prefect. Originally, the magister officiorum had under his control three chief scrinia (bureaus), the agentes in rebus, and the scholae palatinae, although he never exercised military functions. The increasing role of the agents and the imperial bodyguards enabled the magister officiorum to become the central figure at court, a member of the consistorium with control over the cursus publicus, the state police, diplomatic negotiations, and armament factories.

The master of offices had judicial powers and some authority over everyday affairs in the palace, tending the lamps and introducing people to the consistorium. To some extent he collaborated with the quaestor but had no influence over fiscal services. The attempt to assign military functions to the magister officiorum failed in the West, but in the East he acquired control over the limitanei and the border strongholds. Under Justinian I the struggle between the praetorian prefect (John of Cappadocia) and magister officiorum (Tribonian to 535) ended in the defeat of the latter official. In the 7th C. the magister officiorum was most functions (Bury, Adm. System 29); the domestikos ton scholon assumed command over the bodyguard, and the office of magister officiorum eventually involved only the conduct of imperial ceremony. Although in the late 9th C. Stylianos Zaatuzes was occasionally called magistros ton ophthikon, from the 9th C. the office of magister officiorum in reality ceased to exist and magistros became merely a title.


—A.K.

MAGISTER PEDITUM. See Magister Militum.

MAGISTROS (μάγιστρος), a high-ranking dignity. The word is etymologically connected with the Latin magister officiorum, but the Byz. magistros had nothing in common with the late Roman functionary. The first certain mention of magistros as a title is in the late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philothoés, who places magistros above the anthypatos. Bury (Adm. System 30) notes the omission of magistros from the mid-9th-C. taktikon of Uspenskij, but Oikonomides (Listes 47) considers this a scribal error. There were several magistroi, one of whom was called protomagistros: Stylianos Zaatuzes, among others, was granted this title. The number of magistroi was fewer than 12 at the beginning of the 10th C. but reached 24 by the time of the embassy of Liutprand of Cremona. Simultaneously, the title began to lose its significance. It probably disappeared by the mid-12th C.; a 14th-C. ceremonial book in verse (in pseudo-Kod. 398.124) mentions it among obsolete dignities. One of the last magistroi bore the name of Rousopoulos, indicating his ethnic origin (Seibt, Bleisiegel, no.124). The female title magistress is also known—a seal of the magistress Maria Bryennissa is dated by Seibt (Bleisiegel, no.119) to ca.1080. The term magistros, usually in the vernacular spelling maistor, was also used to designate a craftsman or teacher.


—A.K.

MAGNAURA (Μαγναūρα, from Lat. magna aula), ceremonial hall situated on the periphery of the Great Palace of Constantinople, east of the Augustaion. It had the form of a basilica with apses
to the east and two lateral aisles supporting galleries. In the central apse stood Solomon’s Throne flanked by lions. The west façade opened onto a courtyard planted with alleys of trees. The Magnaura had, therefore, approximately the same situation and the same architectural form as the Senate House rebuilt by Justinian I (Prokopios, Buildings 1.10.6–9), and one may wonder whether they were one and the same, the more so as the Senate House is never mentioned after the reign of Justinian.

The Magnaura was restored by Herakleios after 628 (AnthGr 9:655). It was later used for receptions of foreign ambassadors, who were impressed by the hall’s automata. In the reign of Michael III the Magnaura became the seat of a school. It was also the normal venue on occasions when the emperor addressed the people. These considerations indicate that the Magnaura was easily accessible from outside the palace. Another Magnaura was located in the suburb of Hebdomon.


MAGNENIUS (Μαγνένιος), more fully Flavius Magnus Magnentius, usurper (from 18 Jan. 350) and augustus (from 1 Mar. 350); born Amiens ca.303, died Lyons 10/11 Aug. 353. Of Germanic origin, Magnentius rose in the army to the position of comes rei militaris in charge of the palatine legions. He conspired with the comes rei privatae Marcellinus and overthrow and killed Constans I. Gaul, Britain, and Spain joined him. Taking advantage of the absence of Constantius II on the eastern frontier, Magnentius marched toward Illyricum. The Roman aristocracy tried to organize resistance, proclaiming Nepotianus as emperor on 3 June 350. In Illyricum the general Vetrario was elevated on 1 Mar. 350 as “saluator rei publicae”; he attempted to negotiate between Magnentius and Constantius. Magnentius defeated Nepotianus and had him executed. He enacted some measures against the wealthy that caused senators to flee to Constantius and Vetrario. Although himself a pagan, Magnentius planned an alliance with the Orthodox in Egypt against the Arian Constantius.

In 351 Constantius appeared in Illyricum, where he gained the support of Vetrario. His attempt to enter northern Italy failed and in the summer of 351 Magnentius marched via Siscia to Sirmium, near which, at Mursa, he was defeated in a bloody battle on 28 Sept.; 54,000 soldiers reportedly perished. Magnentius then withdrew to Gaul, where Constantius again defeated him (end of summer 353) at the battle of Mons Seleucus. Magnentius soon thereafter took his own life. The empire was united under Constantius II.


MAGNESIA (Μαγνησία, now Manisa), city of Lydia in western Asia Minor, at the foot of Mt. Sipylos. Magnesia became important in the 12th C. It developed further under the Laskarids when it was functionally capital of the empire of Nicaea, whose rulers resided nearby at Nymphaion and maintained their treasury and mint at Magnesia. In the 13th C. Magnesia was a market for local and foreign trade and site of an imperial palace. It was the center of a rich agricultural district that contained the important monastery of Sosandra founded by John III Vatatzes. Theodore II received the Seljuk sultan at Magnesia in 1257, and Michael VIII was there confirmed in power in 1258. By the late 13th C., Magnesia was increasingly exposed to attack. It was the base of Michael IX’s campaign against the Turks in 1202, during which it withstood a long siege. In 1304, Magnesia was used by the Catalan Grand Company, who so oppressed the citizens that the gates were shut against them; the city resisted their consequent attack. In 1313, the Turks of Saruhan took the city. Magnesia was a suffragan bishopric of Ephesus, frequently contested with Smyrna. Remains of the walls and citadel appear to be the work of John III.


MAIN (Μαίνη in the Chronicle of the Morea, Fr. le Grande Magne), castle in the Mani region in southern Greece. Although the castle is mentioned frequently in texts of the 13th–14th C. and was one of the major strongholds ceded to
the Byz. by the treaty of Constantinople in 1262, its precise location is still disputed (P. Kalonaros, *HellCont* 3 [1939] 375–80). Some have identified it with Zarnata, but this seems unlikely, while others have suggested Tigani on the west coast (N.B. Drandakes et al., *PraktArchEl* [1978] 183–91).


---

**MAISTOR** (μαίστωρ), one of several vernacular forms of the classical *magistros* (Lat. *magister*). While *maistros* was used (by authors or by later scribes) to describe the *magister militum* or *magister officiorum*, *maistor* was understood (e.g., in the *Souda*) to mean teacher. The word was extended to designate the leader of an atelier or team of artisans; thus it is applied to Gerontios, a woodworker and “the best of his profession,” by Theodoret of Cyrhus. Texts included in the *Patria of Constantinople* mention *maistores* and their apprentices (μισθιοί). The term *protopomatōr* designated the head of a guild. It could also refer to an expert performer and teacher of sacred chant (pseudo-Kod. 190.7, 359.20); the most famous of them, John Koukouzelis, is frequently cited in the MSS simply as “the maistor.” *Megas maistoras* was the Greek translation of the title of the head of a Western monastic order.


---

**MA杰STAS DOMINI** (Lat., lit. “Majesty of the Lord”), the conventional name for a highly synthetic visual image showing Christ’s majesty at the end of time. Blending elements from the various apocalyptic and prophetic visions (Is 6:1–4, Ezek 1:4–28, Rev 4:2–9), it shows Christ—youthful, mature, or as the Ancient of Days—right hand raised in speech and book in left hand, enthroned on a rainbow in a mandorla from which project the four beasts and often the wings studded with eyes, the fiery chariot, and angels. It is first seen in the apse of Hostos David, Thessalonike, where prophets witness to Christ in a paradisiac landscape; in *Bawt* (Chapels 26, 51); at *Saqqâra*; and on an icon at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai (Weitzmann, *Sinai Icons*, no.B.16). The inscriptions used in these early versions indicate that the image owes its particular blend of elements to invocations of Christ’s majesty in the liturgy. Popular in the 9th–10th C., the image appears in Cappadocian apse compositions of the Prophetic Vision, reflecting the Iconophile emphasis on visions as proof of the visibility of God. Komnenian Gospel books use the image as a frontispiece, invoking the Gospel prefaces that discuss “him who sits upon the Cherubim.” The *Majestas Domini* recurs in Palaiologan miniature and icon painting in versions showing both the youthful
Christ with prophets, as at Hosios David, and the lone, mature Christ.


—A.W.C.

MAJORIAN (Μαύριανος), more fully Flavius Julius Valerius Majorianus, Western emperor (1 Apr. 457–2 Aug. 461); died Liguria 7 Aug. 461. Of an Italian senatorial family, Majorian served in the army under Aëtius, but retired temporarily before 451. In 454 Valentinian III recalled Majorian to court. After the emperor's murder he was considered a possible successor. He served as a high military commander under Petronius Maximus and Eparchius Avitus and cooperated with Ricimer in the overthrow of Avitus in 456. In 457 he was appointed magister militum, probably by Leo I, then acclaimed by his troops as augustus, and on 28 Dec. recognized by the senate in Ravenna. Leo I accepted him as emperor by May 458. Majorian tried to support the urban curiae, improve the system of taxation, and enhance the old Roman virtues. He had to deal with a threat in Gaul, where he found strong opposition (B. Czúth, _Acta classica Universitatis scientiarum Debreceniensis_ 19 (1983) 113–22), and in Africa, which had been conquered by the Vandals; Prokopios preserved a legend that Majorian visited the court of Gaeseric incognito (G. Max, _BS/EB_ 9 (1982) 58–63). Majorian prepared expeditions against the Vandals in 460 and 461, but in both cases Gaeseric attacked the Roman ships before they set out and the attempts failed. In 461 Majorian was deposed and executed by order of Ricimer.


—T.E.G.

MAJUSCULE. See UNGIAL.

MAKARIOS/SYMEON, or pseudo-Makarios, monastic writer who probably lived in Mesopotamia or eastern Anatolia at the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th C. Makarios/Symeon has become the conventional name for this author, whose works include 50 _Spiritual Homilies_ that were attributed to the 4th-C. Egyptian monk Makarios the Great in some MSS. Certain pieces by this author have also been assigned in the MS tradition to "Symeon," identified by Dörries (infra) with the Symeon who was the leader of the Messalian heresy condemned by the Councils of Side (390) and Ephesus (431).

In addition to the homilies Makarios/Symeon wrote the _Great Letter, erotapokriseis_, and collections of _logia_. His works emphasize the constant spiritual struggle toward perfection and the supreme importance of prayer. Messalian elements (others prefer Gnostic) have been detected in the mystical nature of the _Homilies_, esp. as there are verbal accords with the Messalian _Ascetic Book_. Makarios/Symeon was also influenced by Basilian monasticism and by Gregory of Nyssa. The works of Makarios/Symeon were translated into Syriac, Arabic, Georgian, Latin, and Church Slavonic.


—B.B., A.M.T.

MAKARIIOS OF PHILADELPHIA. See CHRYSOKEPHALOS, MAKARIIOS.

MAKARIIOS OF ROME, saint; principal feast-days 23 Oct., 19 Jan., and others. Son of a Roman senator named John, Makarios ran away from home during his wedding, which had been arranged by his father. According to his Life, the angel Raphael led him to the ends of the earth, where he lived in a cave in peace with wild beasts. Makarios's vita takes the unusual form of a traveler's romance: three monks—Theophilus, Sergio, and Hygeinos—set off from a monastery in Mesopotamia to see the edge of the sky "at the iron pillar." The sober description of their route via Jerusalem to Ctesiphon gives way later to images of fabulous rivers, mountains, animals, and people in India and farther east. Finally they encountered Makarios, his body hidden by his white hair, his fingernails and toenails as long as a leopard's claws. He briefly told the monks his story and explained that they were not allowed to
proceed further, since 20 miles from Makarios's cave were two walls—one of iron and another of bronze—surrounding Paradise. Many MSS from the 11th C. onward preserve the legend; the editor, A. Vassiliev, proposed a dubious *argumentum ex silentio*—that the legend originated in the 5th–6th C. since it does not mention the Arabs. The legend is very important for reconstructing early medieval geographic perceptions.

**Representation in Art.** One of the very rare portraits of this saint is that in the *MenoLogion of Basil II* (p.334), where he appears as an elderly monk standing alongside *Makarios the Great*; the two are celebrated together on 19 Jan.


–A.K., N.P.S.

**MAKARIOS THE GREAT,** or Makarios the Egyptian (to distinguish him from Makarios the Alexandrian or Politikos), saint; born Upper Egypt ca.300, died Sketes ca.390; feastday 15 or 19 Jan. He became the leader of an eremitic group in Sketes (WADI NATRUN) in which the monks lived in separate shelters and gathered only for worship and guidance from the leader. He was ordained in 340. As a supporter of the Nicene policy of Athanasios, he was exiled under Loukios, the Arian bishop of Alexandria.

The anecdotes about Makarios stress his strict asceticism and ability to work miracles. His ascetic practice aimed at complete detachment from bodily functions: for example, *Palladios (Lauzisci Histo-ry 18.28*) recorded that Makarios had not spat since he was baptized. Many writings in Greek as well as in Syriac, including the works of pseudo-Makarios/Symeon, were incorrectly attributed to him.


–J.A.T.

**MAKEDONIOS CONSUL,** 6th-C. poet. The Greek *Anthology* preserves 43 of his epigrams, coming from the *Cycle of Agathias*. They are mainly anathematic, ekphrastic, erotic, and satirical, largely unremarkable in subjects and style. J.A. Madden (*Mnemosyne* 30 [1977] 153–59) detects evidence of Christian belief in one poem (bk.9, no.649), but the sentiment is entirely neutral and commonplace (B. Baldwin, *Mnemosyne* 37 [1984] 451–53). Makedonios (*Makedonios*) has been identified both with a former referendarius reported by Malalas and Theophanes the Confessor to have been purged for paganism in 529, and with a *vir illustris* who was an imperial official of 531; reconciliation of the two is not impossible. Since his name is not in the official *fasti*, his consulate must have been honorary.

**Lit.** B. Baldwin, *"The Fate of Macedonios Consul,"* *Eranos* 79 (1981) 145ff.

–B.B.

**MAKIN, AL-**, more fully Jirjis al-Makin ibn al-‘Amid, Christian Arab historian; born Cairo 1205 (or 1203?), died Damascus 1273. Following in the footsteps of his Coptic father, al-Makin became a civil servant of the Ayyubids in Damascus. After a long and eventful service (he was twice thrown into prison), al-Makin spent the rest of his life in that city. He composed a universal chronicle in Arabic entitled *The Blessed Collection*. The first part of this work begins with Adam and ends with the eleventh year of the rule of Heraclios. The second part covers the period of Islam, beginning with Muhammad and ending with 1260. It refers to Muslim contacts with the Byz., e.g., the confrontation at Mantzikert, which consists of an abbreviated version of the account found in *Sibt ibn al-Jawzi* (C. Cahen, *Byzantion* 9 [1934] 618). The work of al-Makin was used by the famous Egyptian Muslim historian al-Maqritzī as his main source of information about the Christians.


–A.S.E.

**MAKRE (Μάκρη,** anc. Telmessos, now Fethiye), coastal city of western Lycia. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (*De them.* 14.16, ed. Pertusi 78) still knew it as the "famous *polis* Telmessos," but in a notitia of ca.800 it appears as "Telmessos or Anastasiopolis" (*Notitiae CP* 2,310). The name *Telmessos* disappears from notitiæ by the 10th C., when the name *Makre* emerges (*Notitiae CP*, p.
MAKREMBOLITES (Μακρεμβολίτης, fem. Μακρεμβολίτισσα), a family of civil functionaries, probably of Constantinopolitan origin; Makros Embolos ("Long Portico") was a district in Constantinople. The first known Makrebolites, whose death LAZAROS OF MT. GALESIOS predicted (AASS Nov. 3:539E), apparently lived in Constantinople. John Makrebolites, a conspirator against Michael IV in 1040, belonged to the aristocracy of the capital: he married the sister of MICHAEL I KEROURARIOS, and his daughter, EUDOKIA MAKREMBOLITissa, wed Constantine X Doukas. The Makrembolitai remained influential in the 12th C.: Demetrios was Manuel I's envoy to Conrad III and Louis VII in 1146–47; John served as megas droungarios tes viglas in 1157; Eumathios, sebastos and eparch (died ca.1185), was a grandson of Eudokia's nephew, according to his epitaph by Theodore Balsamon (K. Horna, WS 25 [1903] 182f). Both John and Eumathios are known by their seals (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 896, 1041). Theophyllaktos of Ohrid corresponded with a certain Makrebolites, archon of Frespa (on his name, G. Litavin, IzvInstBülglst 14–15 [1964] 521), and characterized him as a man who skillfully acquired alien property. Some family members also held high ecclesiastical posts: Theodore was metropolitan of Methymna in the early 12th C. (Laurent, Corpus 5–3, no.1798). The Makrembolitai corresponded with some literati. Eustathios or Eumathios Makrebolites wrote the romance On Hysmine and Hysminias. Alexios Makrebolites was a writer in the 14th C. (see MAKREMBOLITES, EUSTATHIOS AND MAKREMBOLITES, ALEXIOS).

LIT. PLP, nos.16951–53.

—A.K.

MAKREMBOLITES, ALEXIOS, writer; died after 1349 or 1353. All that is known of his life is that he was in the service of the exisotes Patrikioi (a financial adviser of John VI Kantakouzenos) and was a teacher and member of a group of literati. His works include orations on the Genoese War of 1348–49 and anti-Jewish and anti-Islamic polemics. His worldview is tragic, portraying a society torn between the poor and wealthy people, whose moral principles are perverse (M.A. Poljakovskaia, ADSV 8 [1972] 95–107; 10 [1973] 251–54); the Genoese exploit the empire, the Turks incessantly attack it, and gloomy omens portend the imminent end of the world (Eadem, ADSV 18 [1981] 135–40; 11 [1975] 87–98). A realist who was well aware of the decline of Byz., Makrebolites attributed the success of the Ottomans to their moral character, in contrast to the sinful Byz., who oppressed the poor. Makrebolites' language is rhetorical, and concrete interpretation of his work is difficult. Lj. Maksimović (ZRVI 20 [1981] 99–109) suggests that "the rich" in Makrembolites' Dialogue between the Rich and the Poor (of 1343) are financiers in the milieu of Alexios Apokaukos. At any rate, the Dialogue is not a revolutionary manifesto, and Makrebolites looks to intermarriages between rich and poor as the solution for social inequality. Eschatological lamentations about the plight of the empire in his threnos on the collapse of the dome of Hagia Sophia are harmonized with the expectation of the advent of Christ. Makrebolites drew on the Bible rather than classical authors for literary allusions. In his commentary on Lucius or the As of Lucian he allegorically interprets the text as a story of salvation through toil and purification (M.A. Poljakovskaia, VizVrem 34 [1973] 137–40).

ED. AND LIT. I. Ševčenko, "Alexios Makrebolites and his 'Dialogue between the Rich and the Poor,'" ZRVI 6 (1960) 187–228, with Eng. tr. S.I. Kourouses, "Hai antiép...
MAKRINITISSA MONASTERY, a 13th-C. Thessalian foundation dedicated to the Theotokos of Oxeias Episkepses ("of swift visitation"). Only fragments of the original buildings now survive in the village of Makrinitsa on the slopes of Mt. Pelion near Volos. The monastery of Makrinitsa (Μακρινίτισσα) was established in the early 13th C. by Constantine Maliasenos, the ruler of Demetrias, and is first mentioned in a document of February 1215. The monastery’s status as a stauropos region was challenged on several occasions by...
the bishops of Demetrias but reaffirmed by Patr. Germanos II and Arsenios. Constantine eventually became a monk at Makrinitissa and died there ca.1256. His son, Nicholas Maliasenos (PLP, no.16523), succeeded him as second η τετορ and by 1266 had retired to Makrinitissa as the monk Ioasaph. The monastery flourished in the 13th C., acquiring several μετοχια, including the Hijarion monastery at Halymyros.

In 1271/2 Nicholas also founded the Nea Petra monastery at nearby Dryanoubaina, together with his wife Anna Kommene Doukaina Maliasene. Dedicated to St. John the Baptist (Prodromos), it was also located on the slopes of Mt. Pelion, above the modern village of Portaria. Nea Petra was originally a nunnery, to which Anna retired between approximately 1274 and 1276 as the nun Anthousa, but within a few years it was converted into a male monastery. The monastic complex still survives, but the original Byz. church has been replaced by a 19th-C. structure. The monastery was a σταυροπεδιον under patriarchal jurisdiction; it was exempted from paying taxes and from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Demetrias.

A deluxe illuminated MS of 1282–86 (Turin, cod. gr. 237), which preserved a copy of the charters of both monasteries, was destroyed by fire in 1904; it contained a portrait of Nicholas-Ioasaph and his wife (Spaetharakis, Portrait 188f., 248, figs. 141–42). The cartulary provides important information on the properties of the Maliaseni and on sales and donations of land to the two monasteries, in addition to recording their disputes with the bishops of Demetrias (B. Pančenko, IRAIK 9 [1904] 173–81).


MALAGINA (Μαλάγινα, later Μελάγγεια), district of Bithynia in the central Sangarios valley. Malagina first appears in history when Empress Irene sent an army there against the Arabs in 786. In 798 Arabs captured the royal saddle and horses at Malagina; they attacked again in 860 and ca.875. Malagina was the site of the main imperial stables where mounts were obtained for campaigns in the east. The first aplekton on the road to the frontier, it was where the strategoi of Thrakesion and Opsion joined imperial expeditions. In 1074 John Doukas had his palace in the vicinity, and in 1145 Manuel I restored its central fortress of Metabole after a Turkish attack. Manuel gathered troops at Malagina for his attack on Dorylaion in 1175. Its people supported the pseudo-Alexios against Alexios II. Malagina became the center of a province administered by a δοχεια στρατότεχνης in the late 12th C. (Angold, Byz. Government 245). Attested as an archbishopric in the 12th C., Malagina became a metropolis under the Laskarids. Its powerful fortifications, overlooking the Sangarios near Pamukova, show two periods, probably of the 7th and 12th C.


MALAJA PEREŠČEPINA TREASURE, a group of more than 200 gold and silver objects as well as weapons and clothing, found in 1912 on the banks of a tributary of the Dnieper River, near Poltava in the Ukraine. The finds included Byz., Sasanian, and Avar pieces and others of disputed origin. The oldest Byz. object is a silver pater with control stamps of Anastasios I and an inscription noting that it was "renovated" by Bp. Paternos, possibly the early 6th-C. bishop of Tomis (Iskusstvo Vizanti 1, no.142). Other finds included silver utensils with stamps of Emp. Maurice, a massive gilded silver amphora (early 7th C.), and 69 solidi from Maurice to Constan II (V. Kropotkin, Klady vizantijskh monet na territorii SSSR [Moscow 1962] no.250), indicating a date after the mid-7th C. for the burial of this diverse assemblage. Effenberg (infra) suggested that the objects came from a grave rather than a hoard; others have argued for and against the thesis that it belonged to a Khazar or Bulgar leader such as Kuvrat.

MALAKES, EUTHYMIOS, metropolitan of Neopatras (from before 1166), writer; born Thebes ca. 1115, died before 1204. Malakes (Μαλάκης) was related to the Tornikioi (his sister probably married the logothetes Demetrios). He belonged to the circle of the Patriarchal School in Constantinople and was closely connected to intellectuals such as Eustathios of Thessalonike, whose monody Malakes eventually wrote, and Michael Choniates. In his speeches he praised the military exploits of Manuel I and the heroism of Alexios Kontostephanos; he ridiculed those who climbed the social ladder without acquiring the values of friendship and love for motherland and family (Bonis [1937], infra 62f); he criticized the “chief tax collector” (architelles) Bardas for his cruelty (p. 50.23–25). As a metropolitan, he tried to impose discipline on the monks of his diocese. Malakes’ rhetoric remained conventional, although he introduced some vivid features in his portrait of Manuel: the emperor carried stones for the construction of Dorylaion; during expeditions he slept on straw, using his shield for a pillow and his armor for a blanket (Bonis [1941–48], infra 533.25–28, 538.1). Darrouzès (“Notes” 155–63) attributed to Malakes three speeches published by Papadopoulos-Kerameus (Noctes Petr. 142–87) under the name of Euthymios Tornikios, Malakes’ closest friend and author of a monody on Malakes.


LIT. G. Stadtmüller, Michael Choniates, Metropolis von Athen (Rome 1934) 306–12 (184–90). — A.K.

MALALAS, JOHN, chronicler; born ca. 490, died 570s. The name Malalas (Μαλάλας) means rhetor or scholastikos in Syriac. Malalas was educated in Antioch and evidently worked there as a bureaucrat; he probably moved to Constantinople in the 530s or soon after 540. The city of Antioch figures prominently in his Chronicle, an 18-book world history covering the Creation to the era of Justinian I. The sole Greek MS breaks off in 585; the narrative may have subsequently been extended to 574 (E. Chrysos, JÖB 15 [1966] 147–52). Book 18, which describes the reign of Justinian, shows more interest in Constantinople and fewer hints of Monophysite sympathies than the rest of the chronicle; it seems grafted on, either by the author himself, with his views and residence changed, or by another. The suggestion of J. Haury (BZ 9 [1900] 337–56) that the author be identified with John III Scholastikos, patriarch of Constantinople, is now rejected.

The work is important as the first Byz. universal chronicle; as such it exercised great influence, as it was also translated into Church Slavonic (M. Černyševa, Vizvrem 44 [1983] 221–26) and Georgian. It is of great linguistic interest, written largely in an undemanding vernacular (presumably for a popular audience), a refreshing change from Atticist pretensions. One positive aspect of the chronicle is the constant and unusual citing of sources by name, esp. in books 1–14, although many look secondhand. Books 15–18 derive more from oral sources and the author’s personal experience. Greek mythology is constantly rationalized. The Justinianic section seems often to be based on imperial propaganda, giving the official point of view (R. D. Scott, DOP 39 [1985] 99–109).


— B.B.

MALATYA. See Melitene.

MALCHOS OF PHILADELPHIA (probably in Syria), successful sophist in Constantinople; fl. 5th–6th C. Malchos (Μαχός) wrote a history called Byzantika, whose contents are uncertain. Most of the extant fragments come from the Excerpta de legationibus of Constantine VII (see Excerpta). Other fragments from the Souza, with and without his name, are variously ascribed to Malchos or to Kandidos Issauros, whose his-
tory covered Leo I and Zeno. The surviving excerpts, emphasizing Eastern events, do much to justify the enthusiasm of Photios (Bibl., cod. 78), who thought Malchos a paradigm of historical writing in style and content. Photios was, however, cool towards Malchos's religious position, observing that he was "not outside the Christian faith," a comment that has led various scholars to label Malchos a Neoplatonist, a pagan, or a flirter with heresies, but that may only mean that he was studiedly neutral on all religious issues.


MALEINOS (Μαλείνος), a family probably originating from Charsianon (Ch. Loparev, VizVrem 4 [1897] 558–69), although S. Papadimitriou considered the name non-Greek (VizVrem 5 [1898] 734). In 866 the first known Maleinos, the general Nikephoros, crushed the mutiny of Smbat, a close relative of Caesar Bardas (TheophCont 680.15–20). Eustathios Maleinos was also a general; his grandson evidently administered Cappadocia for many years in the mid-10th C. (L. Petit, ROC 7 (1902) 551.6–9). Constantine's brother Michael Maleinos was an influential church leader and the spiritual adviser of Nikephoros II Phokas, his nephew (see MALEINOS, MICHAEL). Another Eustathios, one of the richest Byz. magnates, fought in 976 against Bardas Skleros but in 986 effectively supported Bardas Phokas. Basil II, impressed by his wealth, took Eustathios to Constantinople, confined him, and after his death confiscated the Maleinos estates. Eustathios is thought to be the patron of a silver-gilt Sion, a shrine or relicary now in the cathedral treasury at Aachen; only the first name is inscribed. According to E. Honigmann (AIPHOS 4 [1936] 268–71), Arab itineraries for Asia Minor note the Maleinos estates that stretched from Klaudiopolis to the Sangarios River for about 115 sq. km. Several seals of the Maleinoi of the 11th C. have survived; they bore titles of patrikios and proedros; Niketas Maleinos was hypatos and strategos in the mid-11th C. (Seibt, Bleisiegel 274f). Thereafter the Maleinoi lost the role of military commanders: in 1084 Stephen Maleinos was a modest landowner in Thessalonike (Lavra 1, no. 45.8), and, under Andronikos I, Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Thess. Capture 56.15) described a certain Maleinos as noble, although Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 296.76–78) considered him neither noble nor rich.

A branch of the family existed in Calabria: a protospaharios Gregory Maleinos, perhaps a relative of Neilos of Rossano, served in the Byz. administration in the 10th C.; family members were landowners, administrators, and church leaders in 11th- and 12th-C. Calabria (Falkenhauen, Dominatione 154f). The family is unknown in late Byz.

LIT. Winkelmann, Quellenstudien 191. -A.K., A.C.

MALEINOS, MICHAEL, saint; baptismal name, Manuel; born Charsianon ca. 894, died Mt. Kyninas, Bithynia, 12 July 961. Born to the noble MALEINOS family, he received the title of spatharocandidatos at an early age. At 18, however, he left the imperial court and retired to the monastery of Kyninas, where he served as a waiter (trapezites). After his father's death Maleinos ceded his vast property to his brother Constantine and lived several years on a rock and then in an isolated location. In 921 he returned to cenobitic life: first in the monastery of Xerolimne, then ca. 925 in Kyninas, where he became priest and hegoumenos. He had great influence on Nikephoros II Phokas, who was his nephew, and on Athanasios of Athos.

His Life was written by a Theophanes, whom L. Petit identified with the Theophanes mentioned in the Life as a calligrapher and the disciple of Maleinos for 40 years; at any rate, the Life was apparently written by a contemporary. The author eulogizes the aristocracy: he criticizes Romanos I and describes with pride the Maleinos genealogy. He depicts social conflicts, such as an attempted murder of Maleinos by the monk Kyriakos. Theophanes included several visions, one of which concerned the Byz.-Bulgarian war; since the victory in the dream is ascribed to the black dog and the man in black dress (i.e., to Bulgarians), it is probable that Theophanes wrote before the Byz. victories over the Bulgarians under John I Tzimiskes.

MALIASENOS (Μαλιασένος, fem. Μαλιασένη), a 13th-C. noble family in Thessaly, confused by some scholars with the Μέλισσενοι. The Maliasenoi may have been related to the sebastos Nicholas Maliase[s], a participant in the council of 1191. Constantine Maliasenos supported Michael I Komnenos Doukas of Epirus and married his daughter. Constantine's son Nicholas changed sides, married Anna Palaiologina, Michael VIII's niece, ca.1267, and became imperial gambros. Nicholas (monastic name Ioasaph) and Anna built or rebuilt several monasteries and churches in Thessaly, including Μακρινίτισσα and Nea Petra. In 1274 Anna became a nun under the name of Anthousa; she died probably before 1276. Slabs from her elaborate sarcophagus, identified by its inscription, are preserved at Nea Petra and at Ano Volos. A portrait of Nicholas and Anna in a collection of monastic charters (Turin, cod. gr. 237) was destroyed by fire in 1904 (Spatahrakis, Portrait 188f, 248, figs. 141-42).

MALTAN (Μελίτη), island lying 80 km off the southeast coast of Sicily. Probably ruled by the Vandals from ca.455 until it was taken over by the Ostrogoths at an uncertain date. It was conquered by the Byz. ca.535. By 592 it was the seat of a bishopric within the Sicilian province, initially under papal jurisdiction, but transferred to the patriarchate of Constantinople ca.756. Although attached to the administration of Sicily, it had its own doux by 637 (Nikeph. 25.23). G. Schlumberger's association of the seal of an archon kai drourigrarios (ReGr 13 [1900] 492, no.209) with Malta has led to the suggestion that, owing to its strategic position and excellent harbor, a fleet was stationed there. Archaeological evidence is scanty and in Byz. sources Malta figures most often as a remote place of exile. Probably after a series of Arab attacks it fell to the Aghlabids from North Africa on 29 Aug. 870. Destruction of Christian sites and near complete Islamicization followed; a Byz. attempt at reconquest ca.1050 failed. Even after its conquest by the Norman count Roger I in 1090 the Islamic presence remained strong.

MALIKSHÁH (Μαλικσή), Seljuk sultan (1073–92); born Aug. 1055, died Baghdad Nov. 1092. Son of Alp Arslan, Maliksháh ruled Iran, Iraq, and northern Syria and claimed control over the Turkomans in Anatolia. In 1074 Michael VII, seeking an alliance, exchanged embassies with Maliksháh, while Psellos wrote a treatise on the Incarnation addressed to Maliksháh, praising his tolerance. The alliance proved ineffective. About 1086 or 1087, after Abu'l-Kásim had secured possession of Nicaea, Maliksháh sent Bursuk with an army against him. He also sought alliance with Alexios I, who, however, chose to support Abu'l-Kásim. In 1092 Maliksháh sent Buzan to Anatolia to subdue Abu'l-Kásim and proposed the marriage of the sultan's son to a daughter of Alexios, restoration of Byz. territory in Anatolia, and aid against the Turkomans. Alexios declined the marriage proposal; his embassy to Maliksháh was frustrated by the latter's death. The ensuing fragmentation of Seljuk territories allowed the First Crusade's success and the Byz. reconquest of parts of Anatolia.

MAMAS (Μάμας), saint; feastday 2 Sept. The earliest panegyrics by Basil the Great (PG 31:589–600) and Gregory of Nazianzos (PG 36:620f) are devoid of factual information: they only call Mamas a poor shepherd; Gregory reports that Mamas, who used to milk the deer, “now pastures the people of a metropolis.” The so-called encyclical passio, preserved only in Latin (although the authors assert that it was written in Greek), develops the theme of Mamas's pastoral life among animals: when he was arrested and thrown to wild beasts, the lions and leopards knelt at his feet. The passio locates Mamas in time and space: supposedly puer (servant?) of T[h]jaumasios,
an absolutely unknown bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, he was about 17 when he was discovered in the wilderness, brought to trial, and executed in the reign of Aurelian (270–75). A Greek legend describes Mamas as born in Gangra, son of a senator named Theodotos, and martyred at age 15. The legend of Mamas is also known in Syriac and Armenian versions.

**Representation in Art.** There are several different types of images of Mamas, the type varying with the context in which the portrait appears. Plain portraits show him clad in a short tunic and long cape, with a crook or a knife in his hand, sometimes standing among sheep. In the Menologion of Basil II (p.5) and other calendar cycles, the martyrdom of Mamas is chosen (he is speared in the stomach). In illustrated MSS of the works of Gregory of Nazianzos, Gregory’s homily on Mamas is frequently accompanied by the image of the shepherd boy, kneeling to milk a doe or merely seated among animals on a hillside (Galvaris, Liturgical Homilies 100–93). The images of Mamas astride a lion may reflect eulogiai distributed at his shrine (A. Marava-Chatzenikolaou, DChAE 2 [1960–62] 131–36).

**Source.** H. Delehaye, “Passio sancti Mamnetis,” AB 58 (1940) 126–41.


- A.K., N.P.S.

**MAMAS, MONASTERY OF SAINT**, located in the southwestern section of Constantinople near the gate of Xylokerkos. Byz. tradition assigned the original foundation of the monastery variously to Pharasmanes, a chamberlain of Justinian I (Zon. 3:300.23–26), or to Gordia, the sister of Emp. Maurice (Preger, Scriptores 3:274.4–5). The church served as a private mausoleum for the family of Maurice, containing the tomb of the murdered emperor and his wife.

By the late 10th C. Mamas had fallen into decline and was restored under Symeon the Theologian. According to tradition, he served as hegoumenos for 25 years; ca.996–98, however, a group of monks briefly rebelled against his authority. By the mid-12th C. the condition of the monastic complex had deteriorated once again, reportedly on account of the abuses of charistikarioi. It was rescued by the mystikos George Kappadoke, who rebuilt the monastery and secured a chrysobull from Emp. Manuel I Komnenos declaring its independent and self-governing status. In 1158 the hegoumenos of Mamas, Athanasios Philanthropenos, composed a typikon of 48 chapters based largely on the 11th-C. typikon of the Euergetis monastery. Although the monks were theoretically limited in number to 20, 29 signed the typikon. The monastery is last attested in 1399.


- A.M.T.

**MAMIKONEAN (Mαμικωνιανος),** leading family of early Armenia, said to have been descended from the Čenq. The latter were traditionally identified with China, but recent scholarship has identified them with either the Tzans of the Caucasus or an Asiatic group in the vicinity of the Jaxartes. During the 4th and 5th C., the Mamikoneans were hereditary commanders-in-chief (sparapet`) of the Armenian forces and royal tutors (dayeakk`). As such, they were able to play kingmaker for the dynasty of the Arsacids (pseudo-P`awstos Buzand, bk. 5, chs. 37–44) and were Persian viceroys after the fall of the dynasty. Their domains included T`ayk`/Tao and Tar`on and they inherited lands belonging to the Church at the death in ca.438 of the last hereditary patriarch, through the marriage of his only daughter to Hamazasp Mamikonean.

Politically, the Mamikoneans usually sided with Byz. despite occasional compromises with the Persians and the Arabs. In 368/9, Mušel Mamikonean collaborated with imperial troops to replace Pap on the Armenian throne. The 5th- and 6th-C. revolts of Vardan I and II Mamikonean served Byz. interests because they were directed against Persia and because Vardan II sought refuge in Constantinople after his defeat, even though Justin II's promised help had not come. Vardan's unsuccessful revolt and flight were repeated by
Grigor Mamikonian in 748, during his revolt against the Arabs.

From the 7th C. onward, the power of the Mamikonians waned. They lost command of the army and their lands to the rival Bagratids. The death of Musel Mamikonian in battle against the caliphate ca.772, the subsequent murder of his sons, and the marriage of his daughter to the Arab freebooter Jahhaf marked the end of the main line in Armenia, though some minor branches survived.

Even though Greek texts do not employ the family name of Mamikonian, many scholars (e.g., Toumanoff, Adontz) have suggested that certain Byz. noble families of Armenian origin (Mosele, Artabasdos, even Phokas) were descendants of the Mamikonians. The Mamikonian connection was also ascribed to some emperors, such as Heraclius and Philippikos, Empress Theodora, and her brother cesar Bardas. Attractive though it is, this thesis cannot be proven for want of sources.


MAMISTRA. See Mopsuestia.

MAMLÜKS (Μαμουλικοι, from Ar. mamluk, "slave"), a dynasty of sultans that ruled over Egypt from 1250 to 1517 and in Syria from 1260 to 1516. The Mamluks originally were Turkish slaves who formed the bodyguard of the Ayyubid sultan in Cairo. Taking advantage of the crisis caused by the Crusade of Louis IX (1249-50), the Mamluks murdered the last Ayyubid sultan Turanshah in 1250 and seized effective political control; for a period of ten years, however, they installed a series of nominal Ayyubid rulers, among them a woman Umm Khalil Shadjar al-Durr. The real founder of the Mamluk sultanate was Al-Zahir Baybars (1260-77), who established his position by defeating the invading Mongol army of Hulagu at ‘Ayn Jalut, near Nazareth, in 1260. Baybars and his immediate successors subdued independent lords in Syria, conquered Crusader fortresses such as Caesarea and Antioch, and finally drove the Crusaders from their last stronghold at Acre (‘Akka) in 1291. The sultanate remained a great power through the mid-14th C., when al-Nâṣir Hasan (1341-51, 1354-61) tried to play the role of an autocratic ruler; thereafter incessant usurpations and Turco-Mongol attacks created a precarious situation, and in the early 16th C. the sultanate fell to the Ottomans.

The Mamlûk sultans were natural allies of Byz. in the confrontation with the Latins and Turks. The treaty of 1281 (M. Canard, Byzantion 10 [1935] 669-80), signed by Michael VIII and Kalâwûn (1279-90), established eternal peace between Constantinople and Cairo and guaranteed security of both envoys and merchants. Exchanges of ambassadors continued under Andronikos II Palaiologos; Andrew Libadenos served as undersecretary on one of these embassies, sometime before 1328. In 1349 John VI dispatched to al-Nâṣir Hasan an embassy led by Lazaros, patriarch of Jerusalem, and Manuel Sergopoulos, asking for the reestablishment of a Greek quarter (Harat al-Rûm) in Cairo, protection of the Christians in Jerusalem, release of captives, etc. (Reg 5, no.2950). Sometime between 1425 and 1428 John VIII corresponded with the sultan Barsbay (1422-38), seeking an alliance against the Ottomans (Gy. Moravcsik, VisVrem 18 [1961] 105-15). Nonetheless there was occasional persecution of Christians in Mamlûk lands. At the beginning of the 14th C. Theodore Metochites wrote a Logos (no.12) on the neomartyr Michael who had been recently executed in Egypt, just at the time of a Byz. embassy (ed. H. Delehaye, AASS Nov. 4 [1925] App. 670-78).


MAMRE, OAK OF (Μουμμηνη ε δρυς, also called Τερεβυδων, lit. "turpentine tree"), the locus sanctus near Hebron associated with the Philo- xenia of Abraham when he provided hospitality to the three angels. Eusebios of Caesarea (De- monstr. evang. 5:9,7, ed. Heikel, Eusebius Werke
MA’MÜN (Μαμούν), caliph of the ‘Abbāsīds (813–33); born Sept. 786, died Tarsos 7 Aug. 833. He was the son of Hārūn al-Rashīd. Under Ma’mūn the study of ancient Greek works enriched the caliphate’s flourishing cultural life. Ma’mūn esp. patronized philosophy and science, funding translations of such authors as Aristotle and Ptolemy into Syriac and Arabic and sending to Constantino- nople and Sicily for MSS. He unsuccessfully attempted to have Leo the Mathematician visit Baghdad (Lemerle, Humanism 174f). For most of his reign Ma’mūn avoided direct attacks on Byz., although he supported the revolt of Thomas the Slav. In 829/30 he received the embassy of John VII Grammatikos. Hostilities flared in March 830, when Ma’mūn led an army into Byz. territory, probably pursuing the general Manuel and reacting against Byz. support for the Khurramites led by Bābak (J. Rosser, Byzantina 6 [1974] 265f). With his brother Mu’tasim in 831 Ma’mūn launched another invasion, during which his son al-‘Abbās defeated Emp. Theophilos. Ma’mūn refused the emperor’s peace entreaties and in July 833 invaded Asia Minor, where he died, having proclaimed Mu’tasim his successor.

MANAZKERT. See Mantzikert.
MANDAEANS (from Aramaic manda [γνώσεις], "knowledge"), a sect whose teachings are based on Gnosticism, also known as Nasoreans or St. John Christians; it apparently already existed in Syria in the 1st and 2nd C. and still survives today in Iraq and Iran. Teachings of the Mandaeans, contained in works such as the Ginza (Treasure), are dualist and resemble MANICHAEISM: the soul is imprisoned in the body and will be freed by Manda d’Hayé, a personification of the “Knowledge of Life.” Mandaeans stressed frequent baptism and paid special honor to John the Baptist, causing some scholars to argue that they were disciples of the Baptist. The Mandaeans were opposed to practices such as celibacy and baptism in still water. Their historical importance lies in their survival as a group, allowing insight into a living Gnostic tradition that is otherwise largely extinct.


-T.E.G.

MANDATE (ἐντολή, mandatum), a transaction whereby an authorized person (the mandatory) was empowered and obligated to act for another. A mandate was issued when the mandatory was to appear, on behalf of the person who authorized him, before a court, state authorities, or at a transaction. There seems to have been no attempt to work out any theory of legal representation. Therefore, the distinction is fluid between the representative in court (entoleus, cf. Nov. Just. 71) who appeared for a single case and the administrator of an estate (epitropos, procurator) who served for a long time or even continuously on another’s behalf in various ways. The custom of entrusting by will a close relative or spouse with the administration of the estate for the survivors led in the post-Justinianic period to a type of mandatory known as an epitropos, whose role must be variously interpreted according to context: as guardian, administrator, or executor of a will (see Peira, 15; Iuvi. 1, no.12.8–12, a.1001; Laura 3, no.160. 1–2).

-D.S.

MANDATOR (μανδάτωρ), subaltern official employed for special missions. The taktika of the 9th and 10th C. distinguish between imperial mandatores and those of high-ranking military and civil functionaries; a seal records the mandator of the LOGOTHETES TOU DROMOU (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.472). The term mandator is first used in a 9th-C. chronicle (Theoph. 182f) for Justinian I’s spokesman during the Nika Revolt of 532. Mandatores also had police functions—according to the (late 10th-C.?) vita two of them were sent to arrest MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR (PG 90:109C). The seals of imperial mandatores are of the 7th–9th C. (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 257–68); mandatores are also mentioned in the mid-9th-C. taktikon of Uspenskij and in the late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos. In chrysobulls of the end of the 11th C. mandatores of the dromos function as guides for foreign envoys (e.g., Laura 1, no.48.45). The chief of the mandatores was called protomandator; a seal of the protomandator George Pekoules is dated to the 11th C. (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.256). The office of mandator disappeared thereafter; according to Guiscard (Institutions 1:597), it was replaced by tzaousios.


-A.K.

MANDORLA (lt., lit. “almond”), a conventional term for the aureole shown surrounding an entire figure to indicate the presence of the power of God. Usually almond-shaped, it may be round for seated figures. Seen first in 5th-C. art—Old Testament scenes at S. Maria Maggiore, Rome; apse of Hosios David, Thessalonike—it then envelops Christ in scenes of his Transfiguration and Ascension and the Virgin in Glory in 6th-C. art. Rooted in Jewish and Antique literary images, the mandorla unites ideas of enveloping light and enveloping, protective cloud. Applied initially to varied instances of the “glory of God” (Septuagint doxa—W. Loerke, Gesta 20 [1981] 15–22), it was eventually restricted to Christ and the Virgin Mary as a sign of their celestial glory. It surrounds the figure of Christ in the Anastasis from the 10th C. onward and in the Dormition from the late 12th C. In Palaiologan art, the mandorla was
understood primarily as light and was extravagantly developed in images associated with Ἑσυχασμ, as in, for example, the miniature of the Transfiguration in Paris, B.N. gr. 1242 (Rice, Art of Byz., pl.39).


MANDYAS (μανδύας), originally a light Roman cloak (attested from ca.200), resembling the chlamys. Both Hesychios of Alexandria and Eustathios of Thessalonike assert that it originated with the Persians. The term came to designate the long, dark, plain cloak worn over the monastic tunic by both men and women. Hanging from the shoulders, it opens in front and stretches down to the knees; it is fastened at the neck and below the waist by drawstrings. According to monastic typika, a new mandyas was distributed to monks every two years (P. Gautier, REB 32 [1974] 65-610). The term mandyas can also refer to the cloak that is worn by a bishop except when he dons the omophorion to celebrate the liturgy; the episcopal mandyas may be more elaborate, with embroidered panels at its four corners from which spread rays called potamoi (“rivers”). In the 14th C., the emperor donned a gold mandyas during the coronation (pseudo-Kod. 261.3).


MANDYLON (μανδύλιον), the Holy Towel, a precious acheiropoiētos said not only to have been an authentic likeness of Christ but one which Christ himself willingly produced. It was thus often cited both as proof of the reality of his incarnation—as it had been in contact with his body—and as justification for the iconophile position: Christ thereby endorsed the making of his images.

The existence of the Mandylon is first mentioned in the 6th C. According to one of several versions of the story, Abgar, a 1st-C. king of Edessa, had fallen ill and begged Christ to come and cure him; instead, Christ gave the King’s messenger a towel that he had pressed to his face and that retained the impression of his features. (In some reports Christ sent a letter instead. Both relics were honored in Edessa.) The king was cured by the miraculous image, which, after being lost and then miraculously rediscovered, remained in the city even after its conquest by the Arabs. In 944, John Kourkouas besieged Edessa and obtained the Mandylon as a condition of his withdrawal. The Mandylon was carried in a triumphal procession to Constantinople that same year to the Pharos chapel in the Great Palace. Its arrival is described in the Story of the Image of Edessa (PG 113:421–54) attributed to Emp. Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, and the event was celebrated thereafter annually on 16 Aug. (V. Grumel, AB 68 [1950] 135–52). The Mandylon may have been one of the relics purchased by King Louis IX in 1247 and taken to Paris; these were housed in the Ste. Chapelle until lost during the French Revolution.

The extent of the influence exerted by the relic on other images of Christ after its arrival in Constantinople remains to be explored. Its original aspect can be reconstructed through its many copies. Although Christ's features on the Mandylon are those of the Pantokrator, the Mandylon image is not a bust: it shows the nimbed head of Christ and part of his neck, but not his shoulders. The face is painted as though imprinted on a horizontal fringed strip of white cloth, which is sometimes woven with a diaper pattern or stripes of ornament. The earliest surviving example is on a 10th-C. icon at St. Catherine’s monastery, Sinai, celebrating the Abgar story (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons B.58).

As the Story of the Image was incorporated into the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes, some 11th-C. illustrated MSS of the menologion also contain images of the Mandylon and even short narrative cycles illustrating the story of the relic and of its arrival in the capital. Longer cycles appear in the 14th C.: on a scroll in the Morgan Library (S. Der Neressian, IzvBülgArchInst 10 [1936] 98–106; Illuminated Greek MSS, no.56), on ten silver panels that frame a 14th-C. painted icon of the Mandylon in Genoa (Grabar, Revêtements, no.35), and in the Serbian church of Matejić (V. Petković, PKJIF 12 [1932] 11–19). A curious miniature in the Madrid Skylitzes MS shows Emp. Romanos I receiving and embracing the Mandylon, here represented not as a piece of im-
printed cloth but as the disembodied head of Christ resting on a towel (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzès, fig. 158).

In monumental painting, the Mandylion was a popular theme in all quarters of the empire and beyond, including Cappadocia (N. Thierry, Zografa 11 [1980] 16–18) and Georgia (T. Velmans, Zografa 10 [1979] 74–78). It has no fixed place in church decoration, but often forms a pendant to the keramion. The Mandylion image was also known in the West where, with certain differences of detail (Christ’s neck is not included, the crown of thorns is eventually added), it developed as the "Veronica."


-N.F.S.

MANFRED, king of Sicily (1258–66); born 1232, died Benevento 26 Feb. 1266. The illegitimate son of Frederick II Hohenstaufen, Manfred was elected king of Sicily in 1254 after the death of his half-brother Conrad IV. He was not crowned until 1258, however, after overcoming papal opposition. Manfred continued his ancestors' policy of conquest of the Balkans. Although his sister Constance-Anna was married to JOHN III VATATZES, Manfred abandoned his father's alliance with the empire of Nicea after the death of THEODORE II LASKARIS and formed a coalition with the despotate of Epiros. On 2 June 1259 he married Helena, daughter of Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epiros (M. Dendias, EpChron 1 [1926] 219–94). Michael confirmed Manfred's possession of coastal lands that he had previously seized in Albanian Epiros. Manfred joined the anti-Nicene alliance of Michael and WILLIAM II VILLEHARDOUN and sent 400 German knights to fight at Pelagonia, but did not himself participate in the battle (D.J. Geanakoplos, DOP 7 [1953] 101–41). After the defeat of the coalition, the victorious MICHAEL VIII PALAIOLLOGOS offered to marry Manfred's sister Anna, but she refused. Manfred was killed at Benevento in battle against CHARLES I of ANJOU, who succeeded him as king of Sicily. Manfred's daughter Constance was married to Peter III of Aragon, thus providing the latter with a claim to Sicily (see SICILIAN VESPERS).


-A.M.T.

MANGANA, region of Constantinople, named after a depot of military engines (μαγγανα), situated on the east declivity of the Acropolis hill. The family of Michael I Rangabe owned a mansion there, transformed by Basili I into a crown domain with far-flung landed possessions to defray the expenses of the imperial table. Constantine IX Monomachos developed the area: he built a monastery of St. George, a palace (later destroyed by Isaac II), and a hospital, and established a law school there. The monastic church, cloister, and surrounding garden were constructed on a lavish scale by Constantine, who was subsequently buried there in 1055. The imperial court visited the church annually on 23 Apr., the feast of St. George. Constantine IX granted the "pronoia of Mangana" to the future patriarch CONSTANTINE (III) LEICHOUDES, but the meaning of the term pronoia here is debatable (A. Hohlweg, BZ 60 [1967] 291–94).

After brief occupation by Latin monks during the 13th-C. Latin Empire of Constantinople, the monastery was restored to the Greeks under Michael VIII. JOHN VI KANTAKOUZENOS lived at Mangana for a while after his abdication. Greek monks continued to inhabit Mangana until 1453, when Turkish dervishes occupied it. Soon thereafter the monastic complex was destroyed to accommodate the fortified circuit of the seraglio. Archaeological exploration has revealed a complex of substructures among which the remains of the Church of St. George are recognizable.

During the 14th C. the monastery housed the relics of Christ's Passion, which attracted numerous visitors, including pilgrims from Rus'. It held second place in the hierarchy of Constantinopolitan monasteries. A number of MSS have survived from its library; at least two were copied at Mangana in the 14th C.

MAGLABITAI (μαγλαβιταί), member of the maglabion (lit. "cudgel"), a detachment of imperial bodyguards (along with the hetaireia). Manglabitai preceded the emperor at ceremonies and had to unlock certain doors of the palace every morning. They were armed with swords (De cer. 576.1). The first mention is in the 9th-C. vita of Philaretos the Merciful—his son John was saptários and manglabites. The etymology is under discussion: M. Canard (Byzantion 21 [1951] 495, n.1) has associated the word with the Arabic mijlab, a whip, while others have suggested the combination of Lat. manus, "hand," and clava, "cudgel" (De adm. imp. 5.161–62); the verb manglabizo was used for flogging (Ph. Koukoules, Thessalonikes Eustathio tu laographika [Athens 1950] 2:114, n.6). The term rabdouchou, "bludgeon-carriers," in the vita of Ignatios the Deacon (PG 105:529C), was probably a synonymy for manglabitai.

Manglabitai fulfilled special assignments, sometimes to kill or capture an imperial adversary; because of their closeness to the ruler they would occasionally be involved in conspiracy against him. Their commanders, sometimes called epi tou manglabiou or protomanglabitai, held a high position in the 10th C., whereas a simple mangabites could be illiterate (Laura 1, no.16.49. a.1012). According to Oikonomides (Listes 328), imperial manglabitai disappeared by the end of the 11th C. On the other hand, manglabitai of the Great Church are known only from seals of the 11th–13th C. (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, nos. 142–43).


—A.K.

MANI (Μάνη, Μάανη), the mountainous central "finger" of the Peloponnese extending southward into the Cretan Sea and terminating in Cape Tainaron (Matapan). The region has an unusually rough and rocky terrain formed by the southern reaches of Mt. Taygetos, which plunges sheer into the sea at many points; as a result it tended to be isolated from the rest of the peninsula, and its population has a tradition of resistance to control by a central authority.

In the 4th and 5th C. the Mani was ravaged by invasions of Goths and Vandals, and also suffered from severe earthquakes. In the late 6th C. began the invasions of the Slavs, some of whom settled permanently and came to be known as the Ezeritai and Melingoi. According to Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp., 50.71–75), the Maniots were ethnically Greek ("the descendants of the ancient Romans who even to this day are called 'Hellenes' by the local inhabitants") and retained their allegiance to the Byz. Empire during the period of the Slavic invasions. Byz. political control over the Mani was reasserted in the 9th C.; the Mani was part of the theme of the Peloponnese. In the 13th C. the Mani was briefly under the control of the Franks who constructed great castles at Passava and Maina; by the 1262, but their authority over the region remained nominal. The Ottomans added Mani to their territory after the fall of Mistra in 1460.

Christianity penetrated into Mani by the 5th C. and at least four churches built there in the 5th and 6th C. are known. Nonetheless, there must have been considerable reversion to paganism during the time of Slavic settlement in the peninsula, and Constantine VII states that Maniots were considered by some [Christian] "local inhabitants" as idol worshipers; he says that they were converted to Christianity by Basil I. Strangely enough, the conversion of the Maniots is not mentioned in the Vita Basilii, and missionaries (notably Nikon ho "Metanoite") were active in the Mani in the 9th and 10th C. The churches built in the 10th C. and thereafter are remarkable for their number and their state of preservation, although it is unclear whether this should be attributed to the wealth of the area in Byz. times or to its modern isolation. Most of these churches are small versions of the cross-in-square plan although local features, such as the vault of the nave projecting into the narthex, are evident, as at St. Theodore, Vamvaka, dated by inscription to 1075. Among the most elaborately painted are the Church of Hagios Strategos at Voularioi (12th C.) and St. Nicholas at Kambinari near Platsa, whose first program of decoration was commissioned by Constantine Spanes, military governor (itaousios) of the region in 1337.
MANI (Μάνης), religious leader and founder of Manichaeanism; born Babylonia 14 Apr. 216, died 2 Mar. 274 or 26 Feb. 277. According to a legend, he was flayed alive by authorities of the Sasanian state and his “passion” or “crucifixion” lasted 26 days. The Byz. had a negative view of Mani and regarded him as a particularly noxious heretic rather than as the founder of a separate religion; some theologians (e.g., Aphrahat) admitted, however, that he did recognize the unity of the Godhead. His name was derived by the Byz. from the verb mainomai, “to be furious or mad” (e.g., Titos of Bostra, PG 18:1077 B). The Byz. legend of Mani, differing from that of Muslim sources, is developed in the Acta Archelai; some details were added by Epiphanius of Salamis, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cedrenos, etc. According to this legend, Mani’s real name was Skythianos; in the days of the apostles, he settled among the Saracens; his wife, an Egyptian prostitute, urged Mani to go to Egypt, where he met a certain Terebinthos who became his disciple and recorded Mani’s doctrines in four books—Mysteries, Chapters, Evangelion, and Treasure. Epiphanius relates that Mani-Skythianos was killed when a roof fell on his head; Cyril locates his death in Judea; Sokrates (HE 1.22.4) states that Terebinthos assumed the name of Buddha.


—T.E.G., A.K.

MANIAKES, GEORGE, general and usurper; died Ostrovo near Thessalonike between Apr. and early June 1043 (Shepard, “Russians Attack” 174, n.4). Of low birth, Maniakes (Mavákës) impressed even his opponents by his great size, courage, and military skills. In 1030, as strategos of Telouch, he saved his town from Arab attack; in 1031 or 1032, as strategos of the cities of the Euphrates (Samosata in Yahya—V. Rozen, Imperator Vasiliì Belgaroboec [St. Petersburg 1883] 72), he won Edessa and sent to Constantinople Jesus’ purported letter to Abgar (see MANDYLION). He governed Vaspurakan ca.1034 or 1035. About 1037 Michael IV sent him to Italy as strategos autokrator. In 1038 he attacked Sicily with forces that included Varangians (with Harold Hardrada) and 500 Normans. Maniakes conquered eastern Sicily. But in 1040, falsely accused, he was recalled and imprisoned in Constantinople. Released by Michael V, he went as katepano to subdue the Normans in southern Italy (arrived Apr. 1042), where he behaved with great cruelty. His feud with Romanos Skleros (their estates abutted in Anatolia) culminated when the latter influenced Constantine IX to recall Maniakes (Sept. 1042). Outraged, Maniakes rebelled, crossed to Dyrachion (Feb. 1043), and marched on the Byz. capital. He fell at the moment of victory; his head was paraded through Constantinople. Maniakes’ career is depicted at length in the Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzēs, nos. 500f, 519–21, 545–47). Descendants of his former troops, called Maniakatai, are attested in the late 11th C. (An.Komm. 2:117:3); a protostatharios George Maniakes (the same or a grandson?) held land in central Greece (Svoronos, Cadastre 69). K. Konstantopoulos (EESB 9 [1932] 123–28) denies that the seal published by G. Schlumberger (L’époque byzantine [Paris 1905] 3:457) belonged to Maniakes.


—C.M.B., A.C.

MANIAKION. See TORQUE.

MANICHAEANISM, a system of belief that spread throughout the Roman Empire, the Near East, and as far east as China; the remnants of Manichaean writings have been found in Tebessa (Theveste), North Africa (P. Alfaric, Revue d’histoire et littérature religieuses 6 [1920] 62–98), in Fayyum, and in northwestern Turkestán (E. Chavannes, P. Pelliot, JSAV 18 [1911] 499–617). The system was allegedly formulated by the Persian religious leader Mani. It was uncompromis-
ingly dualistic and grew out of Zoroastrianism; the latter, however, presented the primal conflict between Light and Darkness primarily as that of the forces of nature, whereas Manichaeanism emphasized the struggle of ethical principles—Good and Evil; while Zoroastrianism was optimistic, Manichaeanism tended toward pessimism. It was influenced, at least in its western manifestation, by Gnosticism and Judeo-Christianity.

The search for the roots of evil made Manichaeanism popular: even Augustine was temporarily an adherent (A.I. Sidorov, *VDI* [1983] no. 2, 145–61). According to Manichaean teaching, the history of the cosmos consists of three periods: the past when the Spirit was not yet mixed with Matter; the present when these two principles are mixed, creating tension and conflict; the future when Evil (Darkness) and Good (Light) will be separated in two different zones, Good in the north and Evil in the south. Each of the two principles has its king—the Father of Light and the Prince of Darkness; the Prince of Darkness is surrounded by demonic forces, whereas Light sends its divine emanations—the Mother of Life, the Friend of Life, the Friend of Light, or Demiurge, the Messenger of Salvation, the Longing of Life, Jesus the Luminous, who suffered on earth and whose apostle Mani opened the final way to salvation. Adherents of Manichaeanism were divided into grades (the Elect and the Hearers), each professing different levels of asceticism. Manichaeanism maintained eschatological expectations: the sect was to spread and prosper until all light (except for a tiny bit) was liberated and this would be followed by a universal confession lasting 1,468 years and leading to the triumph of Good.

Manichaeanism met strong opposition from both Zoroastrianism and Christianity. The Neoplatonist Alexander of Lykopolis (ca. 300) wrote a treatise against Manichaeanism and many Christian theologians followed suit: Serapion of Thmuis, Titos of Bostra, Epiphanius, Germanos I, John of Damascus, and others; the *Acta Archelai* was the major refutation of the sect. Christian criticism of Manichaeanism was based on the idea that there can be only one principle, monas, and not two; Evil is not a being but the lack of existence, and Matter is not necessarily evil since it brings forth good fruit: otherwise, as John of Damascus points out (*Contra Manichaeos* 76.3–6, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 4:392), the Pantokrator would surely have destroyed it. The Christian law codes regard Manichaeanism as the most noxious of heresies, but the testimony of St. Ephrem and Mark the Deacon show that Manichaeism remained strong in Syria and Mesopotamia. The Byz. systematically identified later dualistic movements (Bogomils, etc.) as Manichaean, although there was probably no direct link between them.


—T.E.G., A.K.

**MANIERA GRECA.** See Art and the West.

**MANKAPHAS, THEODORE,** nicknamed “Morotheodore” (“Theodore the Fool”); fl. ca. 1188–1205. Apparently a prominent personage of Philadelphia, ca. 1188 Mankaphas (Μάνκαφας) secured the allegiance of its inhabitants and neighboring provincials, took the imperial title, and minted silver coinage. I. Jordanov attributed a series of billon trachy coins found in Bulgaria to Mankaphas, but E. Pochitonov (BS 42 [1981] 52–57) assigns these to the contemporary Peter of Bulgaria. Grierson (Byz. Coins 235f) and Hendy (*Economy* 439) ascribe them to Mankaphas.

Isaac II besieged Mankaphas in Philadelphia (June 1189), but the advance of Frederick I forced a compromise: Mankaphas gave up his imperial title and offered hostages but retained control in Philadelphia. Basil Vatatzes, *doux* of Thrakias, forced Mankaphas ca. 1193 to flee to Kay-Khusraw I at Ikonion. The sultan allowed him to recruit Turks with whom he ravaged southwestern Anatolia. Isaac persuaded the sultan ca. 1194 to sell him Mankaphas, on condition that Mankaphas suffer no corporal punishment. Mankaphas was imprisoned, but by 1204 free and again powerful in Philadelphia. Following the Fourth Crusade, he created an independent state around Philadelphia. Mankaphas brought a large force to counter Henry of Hainault, who had occupied Atramyttion, but was defeated on 19 Mar. 1205. Mankaphas soon lost his territories to Theodore I Laskarès.
MANKIND. The unity of the human race is the presupposition in Byz. theology for Christology, soteriology, and the doctrine of theosis. The prototypes of this unity are Adam and Christ who, along with creation and the incarnation, are cited as the inner basis for the unity of the human race. In some Christological texts one encounters the view that the "human reality" (commonly called sarx) of Christ assumed by the Logos is the "full human nature," that is, humanity as a whole, and not a particular human individual. The latter would be considered a person, but one cannot present the humanity of Christ as a human person without falling into nestorianism.

LIT. H.C. Baldry, The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought (Cambridge 1965).

—K.-H.U.

MAN OF SORROWS (ἡ ᾔκρα ταπεινώσις, lit. "the peak of humiliation," from Is 53:8). Known in the West as the Imago Pietatis, or the Christ of Pity, this image shows the upper body of Christ naked, upright in a sarcophagus, arms visible only to the elbow and hanging down at his sides (or, from the 14th C., crossed), eyes closed, his head bent in death. The cross is placed directly behind him in the background. Essentially a combination of elements drawn from scenes of Christ's Passion, particularly his deposition and entombment, the theme existed as a separate image as early as the 12th C. (e.g., an icon from Kastoria [Holy Image, no.9]) and was a response to developments taking place in the Holy Week liturgy, notably that of Good Friday, over the course of the 11th and 12th C. The importance of the Virgin and her laments in this liturgy inspired a pendant image, that of the mourning Virgin; often the two were paired as wings of a diptych or on either side of a bilateral icon, esp. in the 14th C. The association of the icon type with Good Friday is reflected in images of St. Paraskeve the Elder, who holds an icon of the Man of Sorrows. The image of the Man of Sorrows was used in MSS of the Decorative Style group to accompany the Gospel passages read on Good Friday and deco- rated some Epitaphios textiles. It was also used in monumental painting in a more strictly Eucharistic context, for example, in the Pastophoria, esp. the prothesis (S. Dufrenne, REB 26 [1968] 297–310). It appears on mosaic icons; one of the earliest of these (ca.1300), housed in Santa Croce in Rome, gave birth to the long tradition of the image in the West.


—N.P.S.

MANUALION. See LIGHTING, ECCLESIASTICAL.

MANPOWER. It is generally accepted (even though there is no direct data from demography) that the economic crisis of the later Roman Empire was caused by a decrease in manpower that affected both military institutions and the economy. It is argued that the government tried to solve the former problem by recruiting foreigners, primarily Germanic mercenaries and foederati; it dealt with the insufficiency of farmers, craftsmen, etc., by attaching the coloni to the soil, the tradesmen to their guilds, and the curiales to their cities. It is also generally accepted that in the 7th–9th C. the crisis of manpower was overcome and that by the 10th C. the empire had "an ample demographic reservoir" (Vryonis, infra); the hypothesis of Russian Byzantinists (V. Vasil'evskij, etc.), who proposed that this demographic upsurge was a result of the settlement of the Slavs in Byz., is now rejected for lack of evidence. One can affirm, however, a significant shift of population by the mid-7th C. from the city to the countryside that may have contributed to the increase of manpower within the fiscal and agricultural sector.

It is also assumed that from the 11th C. onward a new crisis of manpower developed as a consequence of social (the growth of great landownership) and ethno-geographical (primarily, the Turkish invasion) causes. This assumption can be challenged, however, since the growth of urban centers in this period seems certain, whereas the desertion of the countryside is questionable, at least up to the 14th C., when the praktika provide the earliest dependable data for southern Mace-
donia. Even in the 14th C., however, the land was not less valuable than the workers, and the great landowners tended to acquire rather than dispose of deserted or escheated fields. The constant influx of foreigners and refugees from the regions occupied by the Turks helped to preserve a certain balance of manpower.


MANŞUR IBN SARJÜN, high-level administrator in Damascus; a member of a prominent Syrian Melchite family; died after 696. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 365.23–24) mentions a certain Sergios, son of Manşur, “general logothetes” in the reign of Justinian I. Probably promoted to a high post by Maurice, Manşur (Mavrotp) retained his position at the time of the Persian occupation of Damascus in 613. When Heraclius entered Damascus in 630, he required Manşur to pay again “100,000 dinars” that the city had already given in taxes to the Persians. Manşur’s dislike of Heraclius intensified from that moment. According to Eutychios of Alexandria, Manşur still held his position at the time of the Muslim invasions in 635. The Byz. general Vahan attempted to secure provisions from Manşur in the summer of 636. Manşur claimed that the city’s resources were insufficient. Eutychios says that Manşur subsequently created a ruse, using noisy civilians in the night to frighten encamped Byz. soldiers. In that case, Manşur contributed to the disorder of the Byz. army on the eve of the battle at YARMUK. Possibly, however, this incident is confused with a different group of military actions prior to the first Muslim capture of Damascus in 635. Manşur surrendered Damascus to the Muslims, for which he was allegedly excommunicated. His son Sarjûn ibn Manşur was public and private secretary to Caliph Mu’awiya and a friend of Caliph ’Abd al-Malik. Manşur’s grandson was JOHN OF DAMASCUS.


MANTZIKERT (Manzikert, Arm. Manazkert), city north of Lake Van. Already an important episcopal see in the 4th C., Mantzikert was the site of a council of union between the Armenian and the Syrian churches in 725/6 and is still recorded as an episcopal see in the 11th C. The 9th–10th C. marked the apex of Mantzikert’s prosperity as a military and trade center and as the site of a mint under the Arab Kaysite emirs. In 968/9, however, the Byz. retook and razed the city, later granting it to David of Tayk’/Tao. It reverted to the empire at his death in 1000.


MANTZIKERT, BATTLE OF (Aug. 1071), the first encounter of the Byz. with the regular army of the Seljuk sultan Alp Arslan. The battle is described in various Greek sources (primarily Attaleiates and Nikephoros Bryennios) as well as by oriental (Michael the Syrian, Matthew of Edessa, Sibt ibn al-Jawzi) and even Western historians (William of Apulia); their information is, however, contradictory. After victories in skirmishes with separate Turkish bands, the emperor Romanos IV in the spring of 1071 led an enormous expedition into Anatolia to clear the eastern provinces of the Seljuks. His army included numerous foreign contingents (Franks, Rus’, Pechenegs, Uzes, Caucasians) and was, according to the late Muslim historians, 200,000–400,000 strong; Cheynet (infra) lowers this figure to roughly 60,000. For Alp Arslan’s army the Muslim sources give 15,000. The armies met on 19 or 26 Aug. someplace on the road between Mantzikert and Chlïat (mod. Ahlat).

Romanos evidently underestimated his adversary. He divided his forces and sent the Norman general Roussel de Bailleul and Joseph Tarchaneiotes to Chlïat; they did not participate in the battle, however, but fled westward as soon as the fighting began. The first phase of the battle was a cavalry attack by the Byz. The Turks retreated, feigning flight, then suddenly turned, entrapping and annihilating their pursuers; the main portion of the Byz. army attacked the Seljuks, forced them to withdraw, and safely returned to their camp. The next day Alp Arslan
managed to attract some contingents of the Uzes to his side, but he was far from victory and suggested a truce; Romanos’s conditions, however, were unacceptable to the Turks. When fighting resumed, the Byz. army advanced in the center, under command of Romanos himself; but at that moment Andronikos Doukas, the emperor’s old rival, spread the rumor that Romanos had been defeated. Doukas then fled from the battlefield and caused a general retreat. Romanos was surrounded and fought desperately but was taken captive. One reason for the Turkish victory was their skillful use of mounted archers (W. Kaegi, *Speculum* 39 [1964] 105f).

The battle itself was not such a great disaster as it is usually presented by modern historians. The Byz. had insignificant losses, and Romanos was chivalrously treated by Alp Arslan and signed an honorable peace. His enemies in Constantinople, however, took advantage of Romanos’s captivity to proclaim a new emperor, Michael VII Doukas. The uncertainty of the political situation enabled the Seljuks to occupy rapidly the larger part of Asia Minor.


—A.K.

**MANUEL**, Armenian general who served both Byz. and the Arabs; died 27 July 838 (W. Treadgold, *DOP* 33 [1979] 182ff). Manuel was *protostrator* under Michael I; Leo V appointed him *patrikios* and *strategos* of the Armeniakon theme, where he apparently served also under Michael II. In late 829, after the accession of Theophilos (not before, as suggested by E.W. Brooks, *BZ* 10 [1901] 297), Manuel fled to the Arabs, apparently fearing court intrigues. In 830 he campaigned for Ma’mūn with Byz. captives against the Khurramites. The embassy of John VII Grammatikos to Ma’mūn in winter 829/30 was likely intended to recall Manuel, who returned to Byz. territory in autumn (J. Rosser, *BS* 37 [1976] 168–71). Theophilos made him *magistros* and *domestikos ton scholion*. Manuel campaigned with Theophilos in 837, when they took Zapetra. Wounded on 22 July 838 at the disastrous battle of Dazimon, Manuel died five days later and was buried in his palace in Constantinople by the cistern of Aspar (Janin, *CP Byz.* 384). Some scholars, identifying Manuel with a *magistros* Manuel who was apparently the uncle of Empress Theodora, believe that Manuel survived the battle, became *protophagos* of the army, served as tutor to Michael III, and died ca.860 after saving Michael’s life in another battle at Dazimon (rejected by F. Halkin, *Byzantion* 24 [1954] 9–11).


**MANUEL I KOMNENOS**, emperor (1143–1180); born Constantinople 28 Nov. 1118 (Barthos, *Genealogia* 1:205, n.13), died Constantinople 24 Sept. 1180. Youngest son of John II and the Hungarian princess Irene. Manuel was proclaimed heir to the throne in Cilicia, even though his elder brother
Isaac was still alive. Manuel reached Constantinople on 27 June but required time to establish his rights; he was probably not crowned until 28 Nov. One of the most contradictory figures among the Komnenoi, chivalrous and courageous, Manuel imitated a Western way of life and therefore contemporaries considered him a Latinophile. He used Latins as soldiers and diplomats rather than as generals, however; some of his military commanders were of Turkish origin. His willingness to appease the Turks is revealed in his negotiations with Kilic Arslan II and in his attempts to find a conciliatory formula relating to “the god of Muhammad.”

At the same time Manuel endeavored to entrench himself on the Mediterranean coasts in Cilicia and Antioch. In 1158–59 he subdued Tòros II and Renaud of Châtillon. Efforts to gain suzerainty over the kingdom of Jerusalem became meaningless after the failed siege of Damietta (1169). The Second Crusade caused Byz. difficulties but did not change the situation in Asia Minor. Thereafter Manuel had to face a coalition of Normans, Serbs, Hungarians, and Kievan. Manuel experienced some successes. He allied himself with Conrad III against the Normans, placed Bàla III on the Hungarian throne, and, probably with the support of Jurij Dolgorukij, gained a footing on the Sea of Azov (A. Kazhdan in Okeanos 346–48). His temporary success aroused opposition in the West, esp. when Frederick I Barbarossa succeeded Conrad. Although a Byz. invasion of Italy failed (1155–57). Manuel financially supported the Lombard League against Frederick (1167) and negotiated with the pope for the Western imperial crown (P. Classen, Ausgewählte Aufsätze [Sigmaringen 1983] 147–70, 176–83). Relations with Venice worsened: Manuel favored Pisa and Genoa (G. Day, Journal of Economic History 37 [1977] 289–301; idem, Byzantion 48 [1978] 393–405) and on 12 March 1171 he arrested Venetians throughout the empire, confiscating their property. An expedition against Kilic Arslan also failed. Manuel was defeated at Myriokephalon. He repelled attacks on the Meander valley and Kladiaupolis in 1180 (P. Wirth, BZ 59 [1957] 68–73), but lacked resources for a new, large-scale war.

Manuel’s domestic policy experienced difficulties. He had to contend with rivalry within his own “clan.” His brother Isaac, the sebastokratirissa Irene Komnene (widow of another brother), and esp. the future Emp. Andronikos I caused trouble. Manuel sought support in the church, helping its struggle against heretics such as Soterichos Panteugenos and Demetrios of Lampe. His piety is suggested by a MS of the acts of the council of 1166, devoted to the nature of Christ, in which the emperor and empress are portrayed (Papararaki, Portrait, fig.155). As a sort of Christological pun on his name, Manuel placed the image of Christ Emmanuel on his coins. He reestablished the office of hypatos ton philosophon as an intellectual censor. But Patriarch Michael III would not tolerate his pro-Western inclinations, and the emperor had to give in (at least according to the Dialogue between him and the patriarch), as later he had to compromise on his attempt to conciliate potential Muslim converts. Many contemporary writers, esp. John Kinnamos and Eustathios of Thessalonike, glorified Manuel, whereas Niketas Choniates, while praising his energy, stressed his failures and immorality. At the end of Manuel’s reign, the seeds of a crisis were sown; the minority of his heir, Alexios II, troubled by hostile factions, brought catastrophe closer.

Manuel was married twice: to Bertha of Sulzbach and after her death to Maria of Antioch. Manuel was the greatest patron of art of his dynasty. Creations such as the refectory in the monastery of St. Mokios, Constantinople, decorated with images of his ancestors, and the triklinia he built at the Blachernai and in the Great Palace, both filled with history painting, epitomize the Komnenian use of art for political and dynastic purposes.


MANUEL I KOMNENOS, emperor of Trebizond (1237/8–Mar. 1263). Although data concerning his reign are scarce, it is plausible that Manuel, like his contemporary John III Vatatzes of Nicaea, was successful in fortifying his small state. Panaretos calls him warlike and fortunate, while Joinville, a historian of Louis IX (1266–70), describes Manuel as great and rich (Histoire de Saint Louis, ed. N. de Wailly [Paris 1867] 346f). Even though Manuel was compelled to pay tribute
to the Seljuks, and after 1243 to the Mongol Ilkhaids, Trebizond remained independent; Manuel minted coins and styled himself autokrator. In 1253 when Manuel’s envoys met Louis IX at Sidon, the French king attempted to attract the Trapezuntine emperor to an alliance with the Latin Empire against Vatazès. Manuel refused, however, to join the Latins. By 1260 he agreed to a tentative compact with Nicaea, gaining such privileges as the right of the Trapezuntine metropolitan to appoint local bishops (RegPatr, fasc. 4, no. 1351).

Manuel married three times. Two of his wives, Anna Xyloloe (died 1245 or 1250) and Irene Syrikania (who survived him), were of local noble families that evidently supported Manuel, while Rusudan (died before 1253) was a Georgian princess. Anna bore to him Andronikos II, his successor (1263–66); Rusudan produced Theodora, who usurped the throne in 1284/5; and Irene gave birth to GEORGE KOMNENOS and JOHN II KOMNENOS.

The date when Manuel built the Church of Hagia Sophia near Trebizond is unknown. A fresco portrait, sometimes identified as the emperor, survived in the church until the 19th C.


MANUEL II PALAILOGOS, emperor (1391–1425); born Constantinople 27 July 1350, died Constantinople 1425 probably on 21 July (Barker, infra 383ff, n. 161). Second son of John V Palaiologos and Helena Kantakouzene, Manuel was named co-emperor and heir to the throne in 1373 after the rebellion of his older brother ANDRONIKOS IV. When Andronikos again rebelled and seized the capital, Manuel was imprisoned in Constantinople from 1376 to 1379, together with his father and younger brother THEODORE (I) PALAILOGOS. In 1381 John V was forced to recognize Andronikos IV as his heir. Manuel, excluded from the succession despite his loyalty to his father, established himself as independent emperor in Thessalonike (1382–87). He defended the city against the Turks until it was forced to surrender in Apr. 1387. When John VII claimed the throne after the death of his father Andronikos IV, Manuel again supported John V and succeeded him as emperor in 1391; the next year he married Helena Dragash and was formally crowned (cf. Majeska, Russian Travelers 416–36).

Manuel’s career was marked by alternating policies of accommodation with the Turks and the search for Western military aid to fight them. As an Ottoman vassal he had to accompany sultan BAYAZID I on campaign in Anatolia in 1391. From 1399 to 1403 Manuel visited western Europe, seeking assistance against the Turks who were besieging Constantinople (1394–1402). His search was fruitless, but the Turks withdrew after the defeat of Bayazid by Timur at Ankara (1402). Manuel was an energetic ruler who went on campaigns, conducted diplomatic negotiations, and supervised the reconstruction of the Hexamilion at the Isthmus of Corinth (1408, 1415). He suffered a stroke in 1422 and died three years later as the monk Matthew.

Manuel had a penchant for study and literary discussion and left a significant corpus of writings: correspondence, theological treatises, rhetorical exercises (including a description of a tapestry in the Louvre), a funeral oration for his brother Theodore (Paris, B.N. suppl. gr. 309), etc. His 68 surviving letters are of particular interest; although rhetorical in style, they provide information on the Turkification of Asia Minor, the campaigns of Bayazid, Manuel’s visit to Europe, and contemporary literary circles and criticism. Manuel, Helena Dragash, and their sons John (VIII), Theodore, and Andronikos are depicted in the MS Louvre, Ivoires 100, a copy of the works of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite (Spatharakis, Portrait 139–43). According to its colophon, written by Manuel Chrysoloras, the emperor sent the book to the monastery of St. Denis, near Paris, in 1408, a few years after his visit there. He is also portrayed in the manuscript of the funeral oration for his brother (ibid. 233f).


MANUEL III KOMNENOS, emperor of Trebizond (20 March 1390–1416); born 16 Dec. 1364, died 5 Mar. 1417? (Bryer-Winfield, Pontos 208 n.191). Son of Alexios III Komnenos, Manuel was connected with the Georgian royal family by his first marriage in 1377 (M. Kuršanskis, BK 34 [1976] 118–21) to Koukalan-Eudokia (died 1395), daughter of David VII, and with the Byz. nobility through his second marriage to Anna Philanthropene. Manuel ruled the empire of Trebizond during the troubled years of the Mongol invasion of Anatolia. In 1402 he provided the Mongol khan Timur with 20 galleys to support his campaign against the Ottomans. After Timur defeated BAYEZID I at the battle of Ankara that same year, he did not annex Trebizond but forced it to pay tribute, as noted by the Castilian envoy CLAVIRO during his visit to the city in 1404. Manuel was on good terms with the Venetians, confirming their trade privileges in 1391; relations with the Genoese were less amicable. In 1401 Patr. Matthew I censured Manuel for simony because he tried to secure the election of the hieromnkh Symeon as metropolitan of Trebizond (RegPatr, fasc. 6, n.3236). About 1409/10 Emp. MANUEL II PALAIOLLOGOS of Constantinople sent Manuel of Trebizond a copy of some of his writings (ed. Dennis, 150–53).

Lit. Miller, Trebizond 61, 70–79. PLP, no.12115. A.M.T.

MANUEL ANGELOS, emperor at Thessalonike (1230–ca.1237); born 1186 or 1188, died ca.1241. A younger brother of THEODORE KOMNENOS DUKAS, he escaped capture at the battle of KLOKOTNICA in 1230 and secured control of Thessalonike with the connivance of the victor JOHN ASEN II, whose illegitimate daughter, Maria Beloslava, Manuel had married in 1225. He held the rank of DESPOTES, but affected the imperial title and prerogatives, which left him open to ridicule. To protect the church of Thessalonike from Bulgarian claims, he first sought papal backing, but then turned to the Nicaeans patriarch. In 1232 the longstanding breach with the church in Nicæa was healed (A.D. Karpozilos, The Ecclesiastical Controversy between the Kingdom of Nicæa and the Principality of Epiros [1217–1233] [Thessalonike 1973] 87–95). John Asen II released Theodore ca.1237. In vain Manuel looked for help from GEOFFREY II VILLEHARDOUIN, prince of Achaia, whose suzerainty he was willing to recognize. Forced into exile in Attaleia, Manuel was able to return in 1239 with Nicaean backing. He recovered control of parts of Thessaly and came to terms with his brother, but died soon afterward.


MANUEL KANTAKOUZENOS, despotes of the Morea (25 Oct. 1349–10 Apr. 1380); born ca. 1326?, died Mistra. Second son of John VI Kantakouzenos, he served briefly as governor of Berroia (1343–47) and Constantinople (1348). In 1348 Manuel was named ruler of the despotate of Morea, newly created by his father. He assumed his duties in late 1349 upon his arrival in the Peloponnesh. He was a capable and conscientious governor who successfully established order among the rebellious local Greek archontes, who both fought each other and joined in revolt against the despotes. When John VI abdicated in late 1354, John V Palaiologos attempted to replace Manuel with two governors, Michael and Andrew Asan. Manuel, however, successfully resisted their efforts to take control of the Morea and was eventually confirmed in his position by John V. He maintained amicable relations with his Latin neighbors in the Peloponnesh, esp. with the principality of ACHAIA. In the 1360s he even joined a Greco-Latin alliance to combat the ever-increasing danger of Turkish attack on the Peloponneshes. Manuel encouraged the immigration of ALБANians to settle as farmers in the depopulated Morea and to serve as mercenary soldiers. He sponsored the construction of the Church of Hagia Sophia at Mistra.


MANUELATION (νόμισμα μακονηλάτου), one of several terms (cf. T БΙΚΕΠHALON) used in the late 12th and early 13th C. for the one-third HYPERPYRON or electrum TRACHY, a denomination last struck in any quantity under Manuel I and taking its name from him. It is more common in its Latin form (manuellatus or variant) than in Greek.

Lit. Hendy, Coinage 19f, 23, 27, 225f. Ph.G.
MANUMISSION (ἀπελευθέρωσις, also eleutheria pscharrou). The concept of emancipation was well developed in classical Roman law, to which late Roman emperors introduced some alterations: thus Constantine I (Cod. Theod. IV 7.1) simplified manumission by allowing masters to give liberty to their slaves by making a public statement in a church (in ecclesia); Justinian I established that all valid manumissions made slaves cives Romani; according to another Justinianic law, the slave became a citizen if a will appointed him heir to his master even if it did not mention his liberation. Justinian stressed that emancipation was irrevocable. Slaves who became priests or monks, undertook military service, received imperial dignities, suffered from certain cases of mistreatment, or informed against a master’s murder or a counterfeiter had to be freed.

Byz. law preserved the Roman principles of manumission. Acts of emancipation are known from formularies (Sathas, MB 6:617f.), charters of manumission (A. Kazhdan, Šrednie veka 17 [1960] 319f.), wills (e.g., of Eustathios Boilas, Eustathios of Thessalonike), and hagiographical texts. They usually stressed that SLAVERY IS AN INSTITUTION contrary to the law of nature and that freedmen were transformed by emancipation into Roman citizens with freedom to travel; sometimes acts of manumission also provided slaves with LEGATA. In practice, freedmen remained in a state of dependency on their former masters, although some emancipated slaves (esp. those of the emperor) might climb high on the social ladder.


A.J.C.

MANUSCRIPT. See Book Illustration and Illumination; Codex; Palaeography.

MANUSCRIPT TRADITION, term describing the systematized relationship between extant MSS of a given text. The purpose of the study of MS tradition is to approach as closely as possible the original form of the text, and to study the history of the copying and editing of the text in the Byz. and immediately post-Byz. periods. The author’s original is scarcely ever available, except in the case of charters and similar documents and very occasional autograph copies of works by Byz. authors. The study of the MS tradition proceeds by elimination of MSS that can be demonstrated, by internal or external evidence, to be copied directly or indirectly from other extant MSS; it then goes on to try to construct a “family tree” or STemma of the latter based on shared textual variants and finally aims to reconstruct the common ancestor or archetype of all surviving MSS.

Some texts have been preserved in almost uniform copies with only minor deviations and scribal errors; others show a complex MS tradition, sometimes reflecting different versions by the author as well as reworkings by later scholars or copyists (variant recensions or redactions). Documents may survive in the original, in official copies close to the original, in private and often much later copies (the text of which may have been deliberately “doctored”), and in paraphrases in narrative sources. Inscriptions sometimes survive only in later copies or paraphrases. The indirect MS tradition includes translations into foreign languages, sometimes made from an original much older or better than surviving MSS, catenae, and quotations; polemical works may contain citations from “nonconformist” texts later destroyed or lost. The results of the study of the MS tradition are usually presented in the form of a stemma codicum, a list of MSS to be eliminated, and a critical apparatus, in which the variant readings of significance for the constitution of the text are recorded.


A.K., R.B.

MAP, WALTER, Welsh courtier and raconteur; born ca.1140, died 1 Apr. 1209/10. Map studied at Paris, became a royal clerk to Henry II (1170s), participated in Lateran Council III (1179), and was chancellor of Lincoln by 1186, canon at St. Paul's, London (1192), and archdeacon of Oxford (1196/7). From ca.1181 to ca.1193 he composed De nugas curialium (Courtiers' Trifles), a collection of entertaining anecdotes and satirical tales. The semimythical Byz. that emerges is rich in silk and gold (bk.5, ch.5 [ed. James et al., p.450]) but degenerate. A garbled, unfinished history of the
later Komnenoi describes how Andronikos I (his wickedness outdid Nero: 5.3 [p.410]) gained access to Constantinople through the "gate of the Dacians" and criticizes the Byz. knightly class for having lost its prowess after the Trojan War; Western emigrés at Constantinople are "fugitive phalanxes" of inborn vice (2,18 [pp. 174–78]). Map retells the legend of the "whirlpool of Satalia" (Atteleia) apparently brought back by Crusaders (cf., e.g., Roger of Hoveden, Gesta, ed. Stubbs, 2:195–96), in which the necrophiliac Byz. knight appears as the "haunted shoemaker of Constantinople" who, to win his love, became a robber baron and emperor (4,12 [pp. 364–68]).


MAPHORION (μαφοριον), a garment covering the head and shoulders, mentioned in papyri of the 4th–6th C. (Preisigke, Wörterbuch 2:55); the term was occasionally used for an element of monastic dress for men and women (PG 34:1220A, 87:3688A). A civil official, such as the praisos tieatos of the Senate, could wear a maphorion, which apparently covered his head and entire body (De cer. 529.20–22). The inventory of the Petritzos monastery (P. Gautier, REB 42 [1984] 123.1736–37) lists seven maphoria, some of silk and one bearing an image (outlined?) in pearls.

A distinguishing feature of the costume of noble women, the maphorion became the traditional attire given the Virgin Mary and holy women in artistic representations. The Virgin's maphorion or "veil," usually blue, brown, or purple, may be decorated with gold dots or pellets in the form of a cross; the maphorion of Eve is generally red.

Whether the maphorion of the Virgin is the same article of clothing as the Virgin’s “robe” is unclear. George Hamartolos (ed. de Boor 2:617.5–10) says that the Virgin's robe (esthes) was found in Jerusalem by a pious Jewess and deposited in the Blachernai Church during the reign of Leo I. The deposition of the honorable robe was celebrated annually in Constantinople on 2 July (Synax.CP 793.5–9). In the text of the Synaxarion of Constantinople, the pious Jewess was replaced by two patrikioi and Jerusalem by a village in Galilee. Pseudo-Symeon Magistros, in the 10th C., relates that it was the maphorion preserved at Blachernai that Photios used in 860 as a talisman to repel an attack of the Rus’ (TheophCont 674.23), whereas other versions of the chronicle (Leo Gramm. 241.8, TheophCont 827.6) have omophorion instead. In the 14th C., Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos was familiar with the version of the Synaxarion but characterized the relic of Blachernai as a shroud—entaphia spargana (PG 147:69D), peristolia (401D)—that was preserved there alongside a part of her girdle and headgear.


MAPPA (μαππα), a badge of consular authority, the white handkerchief that the consul tossed as a signal to begin the circus games; the word was also transferred to the games or races themselves (e.g., Malal. 412.13). On consular dipthschs the consuls are often depicted holding the mappa in their right hand and a scepter in their left (e.g., Delbrück, Consularldiptyschen, pls. 2, 6, 16, 20, etc.). A special official, the mapparios, was introduced; his role was to strike a gong (semantron) as the signal to begin the games (pseudo-Chrysostom, PG 59:570.7–8). Kedrenos (Cedr. 1:297.15–19) states that the mapparios picked up the cloth after the consul threw it. In a burlesque presentation of games ca.1200, the mapparios was responsible for starting the foot races (Nik.Chon. 509.10–19).

By the 6th C. the emperor assumed the consular function of giving the signal to start the games, and thus the mappa became a symbol of imperial authority: on coins of Phokas and Constans II the emperors are depicted holding the mappa in a raised hand as if ready to throw it (DOC 2.1:87). A. Alfoledi (MDA/I RA 50 [1935] 34–36) hypothesized that the transfer to the emperor of the function of throwing the mappa was connected with the change of the circus factions from sporting organizations into political bodies. By the 8th C. the mappa was replaced by the akakia in representations on coins (DOC 3.1:133).

LIT. M. Restle, Kunst und byzantinische Münzsprägung (Athens 1964) 143. —A.K.

MAPS. See CARTOGRAPHY; MADABA MOSAIC MAP.
MAQDISÎ, AL- (al-Muqaddasi), more fully Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Maqdisî, traveler and Arab geographer of the systematic school (see ARAB GEOGRAPHERS); born Jerusalem 946, died ca.1000. His Best Classification for the Knowledge of Regions (published q86, revised q89) is a comprehensive regional, economic, and human geography of the Islamic world. It is based mostly on his observations and interviews during extensive travels in Muslim lands; he only infrequently incorporates material from earlier geographers, despite his familiarity with these and his “extensive research in various royal libraries.” His varied experience included witnessing Byz.-Arab naval warfare.

Although his scheme deliberately excludes non-Muslim lands, he refers to Byz., “for some Muslims reside in Constantinople and knowledge of routes thereto is needed for envos, ransomings of prisoners, military expeditions, and trade.” He refers to Byz. treatment of Muslim prisoners of war: if skilled, they would be forced to work; they could also attend races in the Hippodrome as spectators. He describes several routes through Asia Minor including two through “the country of the Maleinos family.” He considers Constantinople as possibly smaller than Baṣra, reiterates certain popular notions about the Byz. capital, and contemptuously calls the emperor “the dog of the Rûm.” He ignores Tarsos and the other towns, “since they are in Byz. hands.”


MAQŘĪZĪ, AL-, more fully Taqī al-Dīn Abūl-ʿAbbās al-Maqřīzī, Arab writer, teacher, jurist, and preacher; born Cairo 1364, died there 9 Feb. 1442. In the 1420s, following a multifarious public career in Egypt and Syria, al-Maqřīzī retired to Cairo and devoted the rest of his life to extremely prolific literary activities. Thorough analysis and copious quotations from earlier authorities characterize his works. They cover a wide chronological and topical range mainly focused on Islamic Egypt. Best known is his monumental work, Admonitions and Observations on the History of the Quarters and Monuments. It deals with the historical geography and archaeological legacy of Egypt, placing special emphasis on the topography of its capital cities. No less important are al-Maqřīzī’s contributions in the field of political history, for example, his history of the Fāṭīmid and his chronicle of Egypt from 1181 to 1436, which refer to Egyptian contacts with the Byz., the Crusaders, and other non-Muslim peoples. His literary legacy also includes major biographical works and specialized treatises dealing with economic crises in Egypt, numismatics, and metrology.


MARAŞ. See GERMANIKEIA.

MARBLE (μάρμαρος), generic name for any number of limestone varieties in crystalline state capable of taking a high polish. Hard, durable, and costly, marble was the favorite material for ostentatious architecture and sculpture in antiquity. Diocletian’s Price Edict lists 19 varieties (M.H. Ballance, JRS 60 (1970) 134–36). The most important and popular marble in Byz. times came from the quarries of Prokonnesos. It is characterized by its white color, with bluish-grayish veining, and was shipped throughout the Mediterranean world (see MARBLE TRADE). Following Roman practice, the Byz. continued to use multicolored marbles, most impressively in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople. This spectacular display captivated Paul Silentiarios, who devoted much space to the description of different types of marbles and their sources. Production and widespread use of marble declined after the 6th C. but never disappeared, while the use of spolia became common. Aesthetic fascination with polychrome marble interiors continued to be attested, as, for example, by the description in the Vita Basilii of the so-called Kainourgion built by Basil I in the Great Palace. Equally telling is the widespread practice in and after the 11th C. of using fresco to emulate marble revetments.

MARBLE TRADE. Difficulties of shipping heavy material such as marble required above all that quarries be located near rivers, coast, or on islands. Half-finished sarcophagi, architectural elements (basket capitals), and even statues have been found at Prokonnesos; these partially worked marbles were exported in specially built boats. The shipment of prefabricated marble is remarkably attested by the cargo of columns, capitals, etc. contained in a wreck off Marzamemi, Sicily (G. Kaptan, *Archaeology* 22 [1969] 122–33). Both underwater archaeology and texts (e.g., Lemerle, *Miracles* 239.18–240.19) inform us of ships carrying prefabricated marble furnishings for churches and stopping at North African ports. In much of the central and western Mediterranean, the Roman marble trade had come to an end by the mid-7th C., but Phrygian onyx and Thessalian verd antique, among other stones, still supplied Justinian I’s huge building programs, and as late as ca.670 a North African bishop was able to buy an ambo, a ciborium, and other marbles for his church from ships trading along the coast (ibid., 1:235f). Similar imports are reported in the *Vita Basii* but, thereafter, claims of such imports all but vanish from the sources. Only objects such as the “serpentine” (i.e., Lakonian green porphyry) medallion, inscribed with the name of (Nikephoros) Botaneiates and now in London (Beckwith, *ECBA*, fig.208), support the belief that small amounts of semiprecious stones may have continued to be transported. Outside such luxuries, the medieval marble trade consisted largely of spolia, most notoriously in the case of Venetian loot from Constantinople in and after 1204.


MARCELLINUS COMES, 6th-C. Latin chronicler; born Illyria, perhaps near Skopje. After coming to Constantinople to seek his fortune, Marcellinus served Justinian I as kancellarios be-

fore the latter’s accession in 527 and subsequently received the rank of comes and title of vir clarissimus. These honors may have been rewards for his writing. He composed a chronicle extending initially from 379 to 518 in formal continuation of Jerome, later adding a sequel down to 534: a second supplement to 548 is not by him. The viewpoint of his chronicle is eastern, its focus Constantinople. Apart from providing many interesting and important details, Marcellinus stands out as seemingly the first perpetrator of the notion of the fall of Rome in 476 (B. Croke, *Chiron* 13 [1983] 81–119). Cassiodorus, who recommends Marcellinus’s chronicle as the best of the Jerome continuators, also mentions two lost works, *The Description of Constantinople and Jerusalem*, an apparent travelogue, and *On the Nature of Eras and on the Locations of Places*, of uncertain subject, but pronouncedly Christian.


dal raids, Marcian limited himself to sending an embassy to the Vandals asking for the return of Eudoxia, Valentinian III's widow, and her children who had been captured by the Vandals. He refused to send tribute to Attila and managed to divert him westward; after Attila's death Marcian's generals defeated Hunnic troops and settled peoples that had been subjugated by the Huns on the northern frontier of the empire.

The Byz. preserved a favorable impression of Marcian's reign as a pious ruler he was compared to Constantine I and Theodosios I; Theophanes the Confessor describes his rule as a golden age. Legends relate predictions Marcian received that he would be emperor. His marriage with Pulcheria was praised for the preservation of her virginity. He reportedly participated on the very eve of his death in a 10-km religious procession.

MARDAITES (Μαρδαίται), a people inhabiting the Amanus mountains and the Taurus region in the 7th C.; called Jarajma in Arabic sources (M. Moosa, Speculum 44 [1969] 597-608). The origins and ethnic composition of the Mardaites are obscure; they may have been Armenian (Bartikjan, infra) or Persian. They were Christian, probably Monophysite or Monothelete. In the late 650s the Arabs hired the Mardaites to guard the border north of Antioch, but they more often served Byz. interests. In 677 their invasion of Syria "as far as Jerusalem" (Theoph. 357.5), probably directly supported by Constantine IV, forced Mu'āwiyā to raise his siege of Constantinople and agree to a disadvantageous treaty. A decade later the Mardaites, encouraged by Justinian II, again invaded Syria and compelled 'Abd al-Malik to renew Mu'āwiyā's treaty, but 'Abd al-Malik stipulated that Justinian resettle them in Byz. territory. They were likely removed to Epiros, Kephalonia, the Peloponnesos, and Asia Minor, where they later served prominently in various thematic fleets (Ahrweiler, Mer 399ff). Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 363.19-20) condemned Justinian for evacuating the border regions, but many Mardaites remained and continued to raid Arab territory. In 707/8 Maslama captured their stronghold of Jarjuma and resettled numerous survivors throughout Syria. He allowed them to remain Christian but pressured them into the army: the Mardaites fought under him in Iraq in the early 720s.


MARGARIT (from Gr. μαργαριτας, "pearl"), a collection of homilies by John Chrysostom in Slavonic translation, esp. popular in Eastern Slavic territory. Greek collections of patristic "pearls" vary in their composition, but the Slavonic Margarit is consistently based on a stable group of 39 homilies, supplemented in some redactions. The homilies are from Chrysostom's On the Incompre- hensible Nature of God (PG 48:701-48), Against the Jews (PG 48:843-56, 871-942), On Lazarus (PG 48:663-1016), On David and Saul (PG 54:675-708), and the possibly spurious On Job (PG 56:563-82). The earliest extant Eastern Slavic MSS of the Margarit are from the 15th C., though the translation is thought to date from at least the 13th or 14th C.

-S.C.F.

MARGINAL PSALTERS. See Psalter.

MARIA (Μαρία), Mary (in the New Testament also Mariam), feminine personal name derived from Hebrew. Frequently used in the New Testament (Virgin Mary, Mary Magdalene, and some others), it means "she who commands," according to John of Damascus (Expos.fid. 87,50, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:200). Rare in the 4th C. (PLRE 1:558), it became more common in the 5th (PLRE 2:720-22), esp. among ladies of Spanish, African, and Italian connections. E. Patlagean (in Byz. Aristocracy 25f) notes that the name was rare
in early provincial epitaphs. Theophanes the Confessor mentions only three Marias (including the Virgin), but later the name became the most popular: eight Marias in Skylitzes (more than Theodora and Irene) and seven in Niketas Choniates (as many as Irene and more than Theodora). In the later acts of Laura, vols. 2–3, Maria holds uncontested first place. —A.K.

MARIA OF "ALANIA," more correctly, of Georgia, Byz. empress (1071/3–81); born ca.1050, died after 1103. Born Martha, daughter of Bagrat IV of Georgia, and distinguished for her beauty, Maria came to Constantinople ca.1066 to wed the future Michael VII. The marriage, between ca.1071 and 1073 or earlier, produced one child, Constantine Doukas. On Michael VII's fall, Maria fled with her son to the Petron monastery and then, to protect his position, agreed to marry Nikephoros III. Her favor was sought by Isaac and Alexios Komnenos (the future Alexios I); she adopted the latter and rumor magnified their relationship. When Nikephoros disinherited Constantine Doukas, she supported the Komnenoi, who promised to restore her son's rights. Her warning (Feb. 1081) that their plot had been discovered precipitated their revolt. When Alexios occupied Constantinople, she remained in the palace a week, until the coronation of Irene Doukaina. Although adopting a nun's habit, Maria apparently maintained a court at the Mangana Palace; she patronized Theophylaktos of Ohrid and Eustratios of Nicæa. Anna Komnene was in her care (ca.1090–94) as her son's betrothed. Alexios ignored the part Maria had in Nikephoros Diogenes' plot to kill Alexios in Maria's villa (early 1094). Thereafter she may have entered a convent; Theophylaktos wrote to her at Prinkipo. In 1103 a Georgian synod offered her greetings. Maria appears with her first husband in a psalter in Leningrad, on the Khakhouli triptych, possibly executed for her coronation, and with either Michael VII or Nikephoros III in the rich Chrysostom MS in Paris, B.N. Coislin 79 (Spatharakis, Portrait, figs.10f).


MARIA OF ANTIOCH, Byz. empress (from 1161); born 1140s, died Constantinople 1182/3. Daughter of Raymond of Poitiers and Constance of Antioch, called "Maria" by William of Tyre, but "Marguerite" in the Lignages d'Outremer (RHC Lois 2:446), Maria was sought in marriage by Manuel I after the death of Bertha of Sulzbach. The marriage, 25 Dec. 1161, cemented his alliance with Antioch. After Manuel's death, Maria nominally became a nun, Xene, but, as principal regent for her son, Alexios II, effectively ruled the empire. Despite her beauty, her foreign origin and devotion to Latins alienated the populace of Constantinople. Still youthful, she chose Alexios Komnenos the protosebastos as her chief minister and allegedly her lover. After the victory of Andronikos I, Maria sought help from Béla III of Hungary. Andronikos used her letters to Béla to secure her condemnation. Once her son signed her death warrant, she was strangled.


MARICA. See Hebros.

MARICA, BATTLE OF (26 Sept. 1371), crucial victory of Ottoman Turks over the Serbs. After the unsuccessful attempt of the Byz. emperor John V to obtain Western military assistance, despite his personal conversion to Catholicism in Rome in 1369, Patr. Philotheos Kokkinos proposed an anti-Ottoman alliance of the Orthodox states—Byzantium, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Russia. This plan was welcomed by the Mrnjačević brothers, king Vukašin of Macedonia, and the despotes John Uglješa of Serres, as their territories were directly endangered by the Turkish advance. Uglješa sent an embassy to Constantinople to negotiate a joint campaign against the Turks, but Byz. delays forced Uglješa and Vukašin to set out alone against the Turks in Sept. 1371, with armies numbering perhaps 70,000 men. Approaching from two directions—Vukašin following the Marica valley and Uglješa crossing the Rhodope mountains—they camped on the right bank of the Marica (Hebros) River at Černomen (modern Ormenion in Greek Thrace), some 25 miles upstream from Adrianople. During the night of 25–26 Sept. the beylerbeys of Rumelia, Lala Şahin, made a surprise attack on the Serbian army. After a
fierce battle, the Serbs were totally routed; Vukasín and Uglješa were among the many who fell on the battlefield.

The consequences of the Serbian defeat at Marica were of far-reaching importance: for the Serbs, the principality of Serres ceased to exist and Vukasín’s heir Marko Krkaljević became a Turkish vassal; for the Turks, it opened the way to the West and made possible their eventual conquest of Serbia and Bulgaria; for the Byz., it was a turning point shortly after which John V Palaiologos became a vassal of the sultan and the empire a tributary state of the Ottomans.


MARKINA (Mápîva), known as Margaret in the West, late 3rd-C. martyr and saint; feastday 17 July. Marina was executed under Diocletian in Pisidian Antioch. Her legend ascribes to Marina victories over a dragon and Satan.


MARKINA, in Greek versions Maria, legendary saint; feastday 8 or 12 Feb. According to the legend, after her mother’s death Maria followed her father Eugenios to a cenobitic monastery, where she lived disguised as a boy named Marinos. When sent on assignment with three other monks, Marina was accused of impregnating the daughter of an innkeeper. Marina did not deny her “guilt,” accepted the punishment, and raised the infant. Only when she died did the monks learn that “abba Marinos” was a woman.

The origin of the legend is obscure. Clugnet (infra) hypothesized that the original was Latin and that Maria lived in the 5th C. in the area of Tripoli, Syria. Richard (infra), on the other hand, considered the Greek vita antiqua as the closest to the original; it bears a strange title—*The Life and Deeds of Eugenios and his daughter Maria*. The original redaction appeared in a written form, Richard thinks, between 525 and 650. It was translated into Syriac, Latin, and probably Armenian, whereas the Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions are based on oral tradition and differ substantially from the Greek original. Richard established the existence of several revised Greek versions: the vita rescripta, the vita aucta, etc. Contrary to the opinion of Clugnet, none of them was Metaphrastic. A Sicilian vita of the 12th C. calls the heroine Marina (as do Latin texts) and places her birth in 1062 in the “poor village of Skanion” (Sicily).

**Representation in Art.** The death of Marina and the revelation it brought is depicted in the Menologion of Basil II (p.394) and in the “imperial” menologion MS in Moscow (Hist. Mus. gr. 183, fol.47r).


MARK, saint; author of the second GOSPEL; feastday 25 April. Early tradition presents him as Peter’s translator, who wrote the Gospel “according to Peter’s instruction” (Eusebios, HE 6.25.5); in later tradition, he is “Peter’s son and companion of the keeper of heavenly keys” (PG 100:1185A). Church fathers commented little on Mark.Probably after 500 a certain Victor of Antioch compiled a commentary on Mark that is, in fact, a collection of exegetical explanations on Matthew and Luke by John Chrysostom, Titus of Bostra, Cyril of Alexandria (to whom, in some MSS, the whole work is attributed), Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others. Acts 15:39 links Mark to Barnabas and his mission to Cyprus.

Byz. legends connect Mark primarily with Egypt: he worked wonders and healing miracles in Alexandria, became the first bishop there, and died as martyr at an Easter festival (PG 115:168C). The cult of Mark in Alexandria is attested in the 4th C. In 828 two Venetian merchants transferred Mark’s relics to Venice (only his head is said to have remained in Egypt), where the basilica of San Marco was erected in his honor; Mark became the patron of Venice. In Constantinople Theo-
dosios I built a Church of St. Mark, which was
reconstructed by Romanos I. Several sermons were
devoted to Mark; among their authors are a deacon
and chartophylax Prokopios (8th C.?) and Symeon
Metaphrastes. Hagiographers describe Mark
as a man of modest stature, with a long nose, thick
eyebrows, and large beard; "the virtue of his soul
outshone his physical quality" (Synax. CP 630.6–
11).

Representation in Art. Mark is depicted most
often in the context of evangelist portraits as
a robust, mature man with dark brown hair
and beard. Occasionally shown standing or en
buste, he is usually seated and writing, dipping his pen,
or pausing with his hand on the lectern rising
from his desk (see Writing Desk). Sometimes a
second figure joins him; after the 9th C., the
accompanying figure is Peter. In 16 surviving
codices, a miniature of the Baptism of Christ (see
Epiphany) accompanies Mark’s portrait. His martyrdom
is depicted in cycles of the deaths of the
apostles. Scenes of his life are rare outside of
Venice, but a group of ivories representing
aspects of his biography has been considered to be
8th-C. Byz. work (Weitzmann, “Grado Chair” 43–
91).

–J.L., A.K., A.W.C.

MARKELLAI (Μαρκέλλαι), a stronghold near
the Bulgar-Byz. border; it is variously called a
phronesion (Nikeph. 56.26–27) or kastron (Theoph. 467.28). Its exact location is under debate,
although it can probably be identified with the ruins
of Hisarlük, near Karnobad in Bulgaria (Dujčev,
Proučvaniša 19). The stronghold played an impor-
tant role during the Bulgar-Byz. wars of the 8th
and 9th C.: Constantine V defeated the Bulgars
there in 756, in 792 Constantine VI fortified it
but was routed by the khan Kardamos, and in
811 Emp. Nikephoros I reached Markellai during
his march to Pliska. It is probable that sometime
thereafter Markellai was destroyed; a 12th-C. his-
torian (An.Komm. 2:105.27–29) mentions a valley
between Iambol and Goloe where the Pechenegs
pitched their tents near "the so-called Markella."

Lit. Dujčev, Medioevno 3:57–62, 670. V. Beševliev, "Ein
verkannter thriakischer Ortsname," Izvstija na Institut za
Bulgarski izik 16 (1968) 75–77. G. Taverdet, "Au sujet du
–A.K.

MARKELLOS OF ANYKRA, bishop of Anykra
(by 314) and opponent of Arianism; born ca.280,
died ca.374. While Markellos (Μάρκελλος) was a
stalwart Nicene in 325, his attack a decade later
on the Alien Aristios the Sophist included charges
against Eusebius of Caesarea, who responded at
once with counter-accusations of Sabellianism.
A synod at Constantinople in 336 condemned,
deposed, and exiled Markellos. Over the next
decade the ensuing theological seesaw had him re-
stored in 337, deposed in 339, restored in 343
after proving his orthodoxy to the councils of
Rome (340) and Serdica (343), and finally de-
posed and exiled in 347. He was condemned as
a heretic in 381 in canon 1 of the First Council
of Constantinople.

Little remains of the voluminous writings as-
crbed to him by JEROME (De viris illustribus 86). The
Profession of Faith required of him for the
council at Rome survives, but only fragments of the
diatribe against Aristios. He is probably the author
of the tract On the Holy Church ascribed to
ANTHIMOS OF NIKOMEDIA (Richard, Opera minora
2, no.33). Markellos attacked Arianism as poly-
theistic, himself expounding the theory that the
Logos was only in God before the Creation and
will likewise be only in God at the redemption,
being consubstantial with the Father but ungen-
erated and not a person, unlike Christ the Son.

Ed. Profession of Faith and fragment of attack on Asten-
os—ed. E. Klostermann, G.C. Hansen in Eusebii Werke,
Nicomediensis episcopi et martyr is de sancta Ecclesia," in
G. Mercati, Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Rome
1901) 87–98.

Lit. J.T. Lienhard, "Marcellus of Ancyra in Modern
cellos of Ancyra, a Neglected Father," in Epektasis: Milanges
des Markell von Anykra," ZKirch 75 (1964) 217–70; 79
(1968) 3–42; 83 (1972) 145–94.
–B.B.

MARKELLOS THE AKOIMETOS, saint; born
in Syrian (?) Apameia ca.400, died near Constan-
tinople before 484; feastday 29 Dec. Born to a
family of noble birth (*eupatriides*), Markellos was educated in Antioch and worked as a calligrapher in Ephesus. He was invited to Constantinople by Alexander, founder of the wandering community of Akimetoi, the “sleepless monks”; when the group settled at Irenon on the Bosphorus, Markellos became archimandrite of the Akometoi monastery (before 448). He became involved in political and religious struggles and fought against Monophysites and Arians; with Patriarch Gennadios I, Markellos headed the demonstration in the Hippodrome ca. 470 against an attempt to proclaim Patrikios, son of Aspar, Caesar and heir to the throne (Dagron, *infra* 316–18). In 463 Markellos helped to found the Studios Monastery.

The anonymous Life of Markellos, written in the mid-6th C. according to Dagron (p. 278), tends to play down the involvement of the Akometoi and Markellos in Messalianism and Nestorianism, and to emphasize his orthodox activity. The author describes Markellos’s role as an organizer of monastic life; helped by a generous grant by a certain Pharetrius, “the first in the great council,” he built a spacious chapel, lodgings for the brethren, a hostel for strangers, and hospitals (p. 297.12–18). The service according to the rite of the Akometoi (akolouthia ton akometon) was broadly spread at this time. Markellos worked many miracles, for example, assisting the wife of the deacon Eugenios during a difficult childbirth. Symeon Metaphrastes (PG 116:705–46) slightly retouched the original Life.

LIT. *BHG* 10272–1028. — A. K.

MARKET (*âyôpa*), also *phoros*. The term market in modern, Western economic parlance denotes both the area in which buyers and sellers meet and the establishment of prices through the forces of supply and demand. The Byz. terms designate the place where transactions occur, either in a specific, geographic sense, or in the more general sense of marketplace; they can also refer to an occasion for carrying out transactions. Thus, according to a chronicle (*TheophCont* 87.16–17), the emperor Theophilus went through the agora checking on the price of commodities; Basil I built a church for the use of those who frequented the “agora that was named Phoros” (ibid. 339.1–5).

In the general sense of marketplace, the term is employed, for instance, in Attaleiates (Attal. 270.8), where Nikephoros III Botaneiates is acclaimed by, among others, the most important people of the agora, or in Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Thess., *Opuscula* 223.38–40), where he accuses some monks of frequenting the agora more than the church.

The term is frequently encountered in the sense of an occasion for carrying out transactions. Note- worthy in this respect is the fact that markets could be impermanent, occasional, or periodic. Kekaumenos (Kek. 184.12 and 32) uses the term *phoros* interchangeably with *paneygiris* to denote a market established on a single occasion. The Book of the Eparch talks specifically of the “established market-days” (2.3, cf. 9.7), on which transactions are to take place. While the distinction between market and fair is blurred in such cases, the terms for market generally denote a more permanent and more frequent institution than the fair.

Byz. cities had specific areas where commercial activities were concentrated. In Constantinople, the main market was along the Mese (Guillaud, *Topographie* 2:69–79).

The role of the market as a mechanism of price formation was considerably tempered by the fact that, for much of Byz. history, the price of important commodities was regulated. While there is evidence of negotiated price formation in every period, it was certainly in the Palaiologan period, and probably also in the 11th–12th C., that the regulatory role of the state decreased and prices were, to a considerable extent, formed in the marketplace. Attaleiates (Attal. 200–04) suggests that grain prices in Rhaedestos were being formed through the mechanism of supply and demand before the reforms of Nikephorites, while some evidence of reaction to prices by sellers and buyers may be found in a text by Psellos (A. Kazhdan, *Byzantion* 53 [1983] 550). — A. L.

MARKIANOPOLIS (Μαρκιανόπολις), Roman city in Bulgaria at Reka Devnia, about 30 km west of Varna on the road to the Danube. In the late 4th C. Markianopolis was a base in the war against the Visigoths and was for four years the residence of Valens. Two fierce battles were fought outside its walls in 376 and 377. Justinian I restored the
city walls as part of the defenses of the northern Balkans. Captured and sacked by the Avars in the third quarter of the 6th C., Markianopolis seems to have remained a military post until its final abandonment at the end of the century. The site was never reoccupied. There are substantial remains of a single-nave basilica of the 4th or 5th C., rebuilt and enlarged in the 6th, and of several churches of the Justinianic period.


R.B.

MARKIANOS OF HERAKLEIA (in the Pontos), geographer, probably of the 4th to early 5th C. His biography is unknown. He himself names three of his works: Periplus of the Outer Sea, an epitome of Artemidorus of Ephesus, and an epitome of Menippus of Pergamon, the last two being ancient geographers who had described the Inner Sea (Mediterranean). Markianos depended heavily upon his classical predecessors. In the Periplus of the Outer Sea, after some general deliberations about the size of the tripartite world (Asia, Libya, and Europe), he describes the “right” sections of the world, from the “Arabian Gulf” to the Indian Ocean, and then the “left” sections, from the Persian Gulf via India to the gulf of the “fish-eating Sinai,” that is, the Chinese (GGM 1:537.15). The second half of the book deals with the ocean from Spain to Britain. Of Markianos’s other works only fragments survive.

Lit. GGM 1:515–76.

A.K.

MARKO KRALJEVIĆ (lit. “king’s son”), eldest son of the Serbian kralj (king) Vukašin and popular folk hero; died Rovine 17 May 1395. Following Vukašin’s death in 1371 at the battle of Marica, Marko inherited his father’s title and his territories in western Macedonia. At the same time he was forced to become an Ottoman vassal; as such he took part in the battle of Rovine against Mircea of Wallachia and fell together with Constantine Dragas. He was the kletor of Markov Manastir near Skopje and the Holy Archangels Church near his capital Prilep; portraits of Marko and of his father are preserved at both sites.

Although the historical sources on Marko are rather limited, he became the most famous hero of the epic poetry of the Serbians (and other Balkan Slavs). Endowed with supernatural strength, valor, fearlessness, and a sense of justice, he and his single-handed victories are the subject of hundreds of folk songs and ballads. A number of toponyms in the Balkans also bear his name.


J.S.A.

MARK THE DEACON, a disciple of Porphyrios of Gaza and allegedly his hagiographer; fl. 5th C. According to the vita of Porphyrios, Mark was originally from the province of Asia. He came to Jerusalem, where he supported himself by working as a calligrapher. After entering the service of Porphyrios, in 395 he accompanied the newly appointed bishop to Gaza, where he himself became deacon. Thereafter he was the constant companion of Porphyrios in his struggle to convert the pagans of Gaza and close their temples.

There has been considerable discussion of the authorship of the vita of Porphyrios. According to its most recent editors, Grégoire and Kugener, its compiler was not Mark, but someone who worked much later, ca.600, virtually copied the preface to the Religious History of Theodoret of Cyrthhus, and suppressed Porphyrios’s heretical sympathies with Pelagianism. The compiler did, however, use a diary written by Mark and preserved the true pattern of events. Whoever the author, the biography is valuable for its description of pagan-Christian tensions, as well as social life and backstairs intrigue at court and church. It is lucidly and vividly written, almost novelistic. The vita is known in a Georgian version, which, according to P. Peeters (infra), derives from a lost Syriac original. Mark claims (ch.88) to have commemorated Porphyrios’s debate with the Manichaeeans in a separate book, but no such work survives.

MARK THE HERMIT, or Mark the Monk, ascetic writer to whom at least 14 works are ascribed in Greek and oriental (Syriac and Arabic) tradition; it is still unclear whether they were works of a single or different authors. Even though Mark was often cited by the church fathers (Dorotheos of Gaza, John of Damascus, Theodore of Studios, etc.), his biography is unknown. GEORGE HAMARTOLOS (599.5) names the ascetic Mark, together with Neilos and Isidore of Pelousion, among the pupils of John Chrysostom—but this evidence seems suspicious. On the basis of his works Mark has been variously dated between the end of the 4th and the 6th C. and situated in Palestine or Egypt; however, there are no data for a convincing conclusion.

The most important point of Mark's doctrine is his rejection of Messalianism, even though he retained some vocabulary of pseudo-Makarios/Symeon; he esp. underlined the perfect nature of baptism in the spiritual struggle against sin. A treatise On Melchizedek or Against the Melchizedekites denounces a sectarian view widespread in Egypt and Phrygia that claimed Melchizedek was the son of God rather than human (O. Hesse, *OrChr* 51 [1967] 72–77). Mark's tract *Against the Nestorians* maintains the notion of hypostatic union; though recognizing the Nestorians as heretical, his tone is one of compromise between Orthodoxy and its opponents. Some later theologians, including Photios, accused Mark of Monophysite leanings.


B.B., A.K.

MARMARA, SEA OF (Πρωτοντίς), a small sea between Thrace and Asia Minor. Two straits, the Bosphorus and the Hellespont, link it with the Black Sea and the Aegean, respectively. The transformation of ancient Byzantine into Constantinople, capital of the empire, increased the significance of the Sea of Marmara as a trade route and the importance of the ecclesiastical centers on its shores. Thracean *Heraclia* and Se-

LYMBRIA on the northern shore and *Lampsakos* and *Kyzikos* on the southern shore were important harbors and customs points on the way to Constantinople. Of the Marmara islands the most important were *Propontis* (whose marble quarries gave the sea one of its names) and the *Princes' Islands*. A group of churches and monasteries (the Archangels at Sige/Syke, Medirion, Pelike, Polichnion/Polychronia, etc.) survived on the southern shore. In the 9th C. the enigmatic office of "archon of the monasteries on Propontis" (PG 105:532B) existed or was created by Photios for one of his favorites. In Feb. 764 Theophanes the Confessor observed an unusual phenomenon—the Sea of Marmara was covered with ice so that children could walk to its islands.


A.K.

MARONEIA (Μαρώνεια), city in Thrace on the Aegean Sea near Lake Ismaris, midway between the Nestos and HEBROS rivers. Mentioned by Ammianus (Amm.Marc. 27.4.13) as the second city of RHODES, it appears anachronistically in Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 2.36, ed. Pertusi, p.88) as a city in the theme of MACEDONIA. The data on Byz. Maroneia are scanty: a lead seal of the 11th–12th C. defines it as a *kastron* (K.M. Konstantopoulos, *Thrakika* 4 [1933] 35–39). More is known about the ecclesiastical history of Maroneia: it was an autocephalous archbishopric of Rhodope at least from the 7th C. onward (Notitiae CP 1.45); a notitia indicates that after the death of Andronikos III, "in the time of havoc," it was transformed into a metropolis (17.122.23). It changed status thereafter, being called an archbishopric in a document that may date to 1369 (MM 1:471.12), but a metropolis in 1405 (RegPatr, fasc. 6, no.3270). A mutilated document, perhaps of 1371, referring to the invasions of "godless peoples" that ravaged and burned "the beautiful land" of Maroneia relates that the archbishop of Maroneia was transferred to the "widowed" metropolis of Mesembria (MM 1:594.2–19). Some seals of archbishops of Maroneia have been published (Laurent, *Corpus* 5.1, no.819; Zacos, *Seals* 2, no.546).
MARONITES, a Christian sect in Lebanon. Their early history is obscure. P. Dib believes that they originated from the disciples of the priest and anchorite Maron who lived in Syria II and corresponded with John Chrysostom ca. 405; Maron's exploits are described by THEODORET OF CYRUS. In contrast, M. Moosas asserts that this Maron of the early 5th C. had no connection with the future Maronites; he also denies that a letter of 10 Jan. 518 signed by Alexander, priest and archimandrite of St. Maro, and describing an attack of "rustics" sent by SEVEROS of Antioch against his monastery, is related to the early phase of the Maronite movement. The first indisputable data concerning the Maronites come from DIONYSIOS OF TELL MAHRE (9th C.) and EUTYCHIOS OF ALEXANDRIA (10th C.) who speak of their activity in the 7th and late 6th C., respectively. John of Maron, who may have been the first Maronite patriarch, lived in the 7th C. (sometime between 630 and 707), according to Breydy (infra 1985 76). Many of his works in Syriac survive.

It is plausible that the Maronite politico-religious community was established in the period of the Persian invasion and subsequent Arab conquest of northern Syria when the patriarchs of Antioch sought refuge in Constantinople. The religious affiliation of the Maronites is also under discussion: Dib insists on their orthodoxy, their support of the Chalcedonian creed, and their alliance with Rome, whereas Moosa considers them to be predominantly Mononitherite. The Maronites supported the Crusaders' effort to gain control of the Holy Land. WILLIAM OF TYRE relates that they abandoned their ancient Mononitherite "heresy" and united with the Latin patriarchate of Antioch in 1187—evidence rejected by Dib.

MAROULES, or Maroulles (Μαρουλλός, fem. Μαρουλλίνα), a family name that according to V. Laurent (EO 30 [1931] 481–84) was of vernacular origin, signifying a vegetable merchant (cf. maroulion, "lettuce"). The first known Maroules ("the son of Maroules") was domestikos ton Hikanaton under Constantine VII (TheophCont 389.5); Skylitzes conveys his first name, Olbianos (Skyl. 203.88). Another Maroules was katepano of Italy in 1060/1 (Falkenhausen, Dominazione 98). The family did not hold military offices in the 12th C.; the protonotarios Basil attended the council of 1143; John owned a seal that calls him doulos of Manuel I. Several family members served in church administration: Constantine was in charge of a patriarchal sekretos (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, no. 135); another Constantine (?) Maroules was metropolit of Thessalonike (Corpus 5.1, no. 458); John (or Constantine) was exarch in Miletos (MM 6:153–17; cf. Patmou Engraphe 2:142f) in the beginning (Laurent: the second half) of the 13th C.; Alexios was chief of the sakellion in Smyrna in 1274 (Ahrweiler, "Smyrne" 114). The 14th-C. members of the Maroules family were generals and courtiers: the megas archon Maroules led an army against the CATALAN GRAND COMPANY (Pachym., ed. Bekker, 2:424.2); a purchase deed of 1312 mentions the sebastos Maroules as a landowner (Xerop., no. 16.9); Phokas Maroules was domestikos of the imperial table ca. 1328–41; he also founded a convent of the Theotokos in Constantinople before 1341 (MM 1:221–26; 2:424.16–18). A charter of 1384 names John Maroules archon (Doecheiar., no. 49.10). Demetrios Maroules was an "honorable physician" in Thessalonike ca. 1322. Peasants of several Athonite monasteries often bore the related name of Maroulas.

MARRIAGE (γάμος). In Roman law marriage was originally a relationship based on the husband's domination over the wife (manus) and later a relatively "free marriage" (i.e., union of equals in which divorce was permissible). The radical

SOURCE. Jean Maron, Exposé de la foi et autres opuscules, ed. M. Breydy, 2 vols. (Louvain 1988).

-A.K.
Christian sects (Marcionites, Gnostics) attacked marriage as contrary to the Gospels, as fornication, and as the work of the devil. Mainstream Christianity had to work out a compromise between the complete rejection of marriage and the Roman legal concept of "free marriage" following St. Paul’s dictum that "it is better to marry than to burn" (1 Cor 7:9). Late Roman legislation shifted back and forth on the question of the permanence of marriage and the possibility of divorce; Justin II in a novel of 566 still maintained the traditional view that divorce could be allowed with the agreement of the two partners. The principal changes occurred (probably under the influence of customary law) by the 8th C., and were formulated in the Ecloga. The major aspects of the change were restriction of divorce, strengthening bonds of property within the family, and balancing the rights of the mother and father regarding their children. Later came the prohibition of concubinage.

Church fathers considered marriage a divine institution established for the procreation of children and the prevention of fornication. The consent of the bride and groom, and often of their parents or guardians, was necessary for marriage, although in romances marriages were sometimes performed without parental approval. A formal marriage rite or wedding was required for the conclusion of a marriage; eventually under Alexios I, the distinction between marriage and betrothal was limited. The minimum age for marriage was puberty, reckoned as age 12 for girls and 14 for boys; normally, the husband was older than the wife. Second marriages were permitted (for lay persons), while a third was undesirable and required an epitimion (see remarriage). The marriage of eunuchs was prohibited by Leo VI, and the marriage of slaves was considered illegal until the 11th C. (see slavery). There were various marriage impediments, based on reasons of religion, consanguinity, or affinity. Although highly regarded, marriage was considered inferior to virginity, and canon law required celibacy of monks and bishops; second marriages were prohibited for priests.

The metaphor of marriage was frequently used in Byz. imagery: the church was identified as the bride of Christ, and individual women committed themselves in marriage to the immortal bridegroom Christ (Brock-Harvey, Women 71,165).


MARRIAGE BELT, apparently one of the customary gifts from groom to bride. Unlike the marriage ring and marriage crown, it was associated with the nuptial chamber, rather than the wedding ceremony (A. Amiand, La légende syrienne de saint Alexis, l’homme de Dieu [Paris 1889], 12f). Two gold specimens survive, at Dumbarton Oaks (DOCat 2, no.38) and in the de Clercq Collection; both date to the later 6th/7th C. and are said to have been found in Syria. Each consists of repoussé medallions—many small ones with Dionysiac figures or Tyche (de Clercq) and two large ones at the center that depict the dextrarum junctio (see Marriage Rite). Their iconography is that of marriage rings, with Christ as officiating priest.

Marriage Belt. Marriage belt; gold, late 6th to 7th C. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.
as are their inscriptions; the Dumbarton Oaks example bears "From God, Harmony, Grace, Health," while the de Clercq medallion is inscribed "Wear in Good Health (Hygienousa phori [sic]), Grace of God." Their emphasis on health and their association with the bridal chamber suggest that these marriage belts had an amuletic role in facilitating conception and childbirth.


-G.V.

MARRIAGE CROWNS were usually designated by the generic term for crowns, stephanoi. A. Vogt's (De cer., vol. 1:225) strict distinction between imperial crown (stemma) and nuptial crown (stephanos) does not prove valid: in the chapter on the marriage (stephanon) of the augusta, the despotai are said to have been crowned with the stemma (bk. 1, ch. 50[41], vol. 2:17.15). The habit of crowning newlyweds was known by the end of the 6th C.; describing the marriage of Maurice, Theophylaktos Simokates (Theoph.Simok. 57.17–19) notes that stephanoi were employed. Wedding crowns appear on the bezels of 6th- through 7th-C. marriage rings as well as in later MS illumination (e.g., the marriage of Constantine IX and Zoe in the Madrid Skylitzes—Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzes, no.542). Generally, they appear to be wide, simple bands (of metal?), which is consistent with the only known surviving set, in the Byzantine Museum, Athens (P.A. Drossoyianni, JÖB 32.3 [1982] 529–38). These tin-plated copper crowns have an arch bearing a cross over the forehead; each carries an invocation and a quotation from a psalm sung as part of the marriage ceremony. The so-called Akolouthia of Betrotthal and Marriage (preserved in MSS from the 10th C. onward) prescribes that two crowns be set on the altar, together with a glass wine cup that the bride and groom were to share; after they express their wish to marry, the priest girds a sword around the waist of the groom and puts crowns on the heads of the pair as symbols of imperial power (P.N. Trempelas, Theologia 18 [1940] 120–23). The crowns would be hung over the marriage bed for seven days.


MARRIAGE IMPEDIMENTS. Marriage with certain categories of people was prohibited; enumerated in Byz. law books mainly under the rubric "On Forbidden Marriages," these people included Jews, heretics, clerics, guardians, rapists, adulterers, those marrying for the third and fourth time (see TOMOS OF UNION), and, above all, relatives. Impeded relatives were at first defined by their kinship designations on a case by case basis. From the 11th C. onward the general rule prevailed that all blood, adoptive, and spiritual relatives to the 7th degree of relationship (see RELATIONSHIP, DEGREES OF) were prohibited categories (to the 6th degree for those related by marriage). Important sources for the development of the topic are canons 53, 54, and 98 of the Council in Trullo, title 2 of the Ecloga, and acts of the patriarchs Sisinnios II, Alexios Stoudites, Michael I Keroularios, and John VIII Xiphilinos, as well as novels of the emperors Alexios I and Manuel I Komnenos. That the topic was of great relevance is attested by the existence in many MSS of various different treatises dealing with it; John Pediasiemos and Matthew Blastares were esp. concerned with the subject.


MARRIAGE RITE (stephanomai, lit. "crowning") consisted of two separate parts: BETROTTHAL (mnesieta), and crowning, originally with a garland, later with a MARRIAGE CROWN of precious metal, which is the marriage proper. Crowning was a traditional element of pre-Christian weddings; hence Christians first discouraged it as pagan, but accepted it by the 4th C., interpreting it in a Christian sense as the crown of victory over concupiscence (John Chrysostom, PG 62:546.51–52). Crowning became a customary part of the ecclesiastical ceremony by the end of the 6th C. (Ritser, Marriage 136). After the rite of betrotthal, stephanoma follows with the synapte, three prayers, the crowning itself, lections (Eph 5:21–33, Jn 2:11), the ektenes litany, another prayer, the synapte with atetes, Our Father, a prayer, the ritual procession, removal of the crowns, concluding blessing, and prayers. Some early MSS also have a blessing of the nuptial chamber. The nuptial blessing and crowning were restricted to first marriages up until the 8th C., when the prohibition
against second marriages was relaxed and the church extended its control over all Christian marriages. Only in this period does the ritual take shape. Gradually the church’s nuptial blessing became the only acceptable Byz. form of marriage, extended even to slaves by the 11th C. The legislation accompanying these developments is an important part of Byz. jurisprudence (Ritzen, *Mariage* 127–213). From the 11th C. onward, legislation reserved nuptials to the bishop or, with his permission, a priest, though the stipend went to the bishop according to the *typikon* of Constantinian IX Monomachos (*Reg* 2, no. 923). There is a commentary on the rite by Symeon of Thessalonike (PG 155:503–16).

**Representation in Art.** The earliest depictions of Christian marriage appear in the 5th C. They show the couple with joined right hands, the gesture of the *dextrarum junctio* common in Roman rite, which symbolized *concordia*. The celebrant is now Christ, replacing the personification of Concordia. He places his arms around the shoulders of the couple. A solidus of Pulcheria and Marcian with this image was struck to commemorate their marriage. The same composition appears on marriage rings and a marriage belt of the 6th–7th C. in Dumbarton Oaks (E. Kantorowicz, *DOP* 14 [1960] 1–16). On the 7th-C. *David plate* on Cyprus, Saul stands as the celebrant between David and Michal, but he is no longer embracing them. From the 11th C. onward the celebrant places crowns on the heads of the couple, for example, Saul marrying David and Michal in the Psalter MS, *Vat. gr. 752* (fol. 2v: E. De Wald, *The Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint*, vol. 3.2 [Princeton 1942] pl.4). When Christ is placing his hands on the crowns of imperial couples, it cannot be determined from the images alone whether a marriage or a coronation is commemorated. Certain scenes in the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes are unambiguously marriage ceremonies. The essential elements in these scenes are the bishop or patriarch who is celebrating the marriage rite, the couple, and the marriage crowns (*stephanoi*) either already on the heads of the couple or about to be placed there by the bishop. In the miniature of the marriage of Zoe and Michael IV Paphlagon (fol. 206v) the marriage crowns are joined by a cloth band. Michael also holds Zoe by the wrist, a late example of the *dextrarum junctio*. (For the secular celebration of marriages, see *Wedding*.)


—R.F.T., I.K.

**MAR SABA MONASTERY.** See Sabas, Great Lavra of.

**MARTIN I**, pope (July 649–July 653) and saint; born Todi, Tuscany, died Cherson 16 Sept. 655; feast day in the Greek calendar 13 Apr. Martin served as papal *apocrisiarius* in Constantinople, where he supported MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR against official Monotheletism (W. Peitz, *Hist* 38 [1917] 213–36, 429–58). When he was elected pope, Martin did not receive confirmation from EMP. CONSTANS II. Martin immediately took steps to find backing in Palestine by dispatching John of Philadelphia as his vicar; he summoned the LATERAN SYNOD in 649 to reject the *Typos* of Constans II. Constans considered these actions political treason and sent the exarch OLYMPIOS to arrest the pope. Olympios, however, made peace with Martin and soon proclaimed himself emperor. The new exarch Theodore Kalliopas entered Rome with an army and forced Martin to submit; the pope was brought to Constantinople on 17 Sept. 653 and tried on 19 Dec., charged with conspiring with Olympios and sending money to the Arabs who were attacking Sicily. His attempt to discuss the *Typos* was not permitted. Condemned to death, Martin was instead exiled to Cherson, whence he sent letters lamenting his fate. The Greek church proclaimed Martin a martyr; the history of his ordeal was described probably by Theodore Spoudaios (R. Devreesse, *AB* 53 [1935] 49–86).


—A.K.

**MARTINA**(*Mortrīnai*), empress; second wife of HERAKLEIOS; born ca. 598; died probably Rhodes, after 641/2. The niece of Herakleios, Martina
married him after the death of Fabia/Eudokia in 613/14. Patr. Sergios I protested that the marriage was incestuous, and the Greens insulted the emperor when he appeared with Martina in the Hippodrome. Martina produced perhaps ten children, some of them retarded, a fact her enemies interpreted as evidence of God’s wrath. Martina was Herakleios’s supporter, adviser, and assistant, accompanying him on military expeditions and exercising important influence on his policy. His will left her co-ruler with his son by his first marriage, Herakleios Constantine, and Martina’s son Heraklonas, but the people refused to acknowledge the will of Herakleios. Herakleios Constantine’s premature death and Heraklonas’s minority gave Martina the reins of power, but she was unable to suppress the opposition of the senate and army: the revolt of Valentinos Arasakuni led to her deposition. She was accused of poisoning Herakleios Constantine, her tongue was slit, and she was banished to Rhodes.


W.E.K., A.K.

MARTYR (μάρτυς “witness”), a saint who gave his or her life for the Christian faith. Despite the obvious similarity between the Christian image of martyrs, on the one hand, and Jewish veneration of the just or certain Greek mythological themes, on the other hand, the cult of martyrs was a new phenomenon developed by the early church. Moreover, the New Testament use of the word “witness” is not directly linked to the later tradition (N. Brox, Zeuge und Märtyrer [Munich 1961]); the traditional meaning of the word was apparently established by the late 2nd C., whereas the first epistle of Clement still uses the verb martyrein in the sense of “testify.” Tertullian (ca.150–ca.230) and Cyprian (ca.200–58) stressed the difference between red and white (bloodless) martyrdom, between martyr and confessors, while the literary genre of martyrion emphasized the ordeal and execution of martyrs. The cult of martyrs was a reaction to persecution, and its purpose was the heroization of real and legendary victims. Emp. Julian tried to compromise the cult of martyrs, presenting it as an imitation of pagan cults. Later, Byz. theologians expanded the concept of martyr (or martyrlike attitude and martyrlike glory) to other types of holy man (D. Balfour, Sobornost 5.1 [1983] 20–35).

Representation in Art. A saint was designated as a martyr in art by holding a small cross in one hand. Scenes of martyrdom (see Hagiographical Illustration), frequently preceded by scenes of torture, are esp. developed in Calendar cycles, where, along with routine beheadings, there are depictions of death by beating, stoning, drowning, crucifixion, incineration, dismemberment, etc., all rendered with considerable devotion to detail.


A.K., N.P.S.

MARTYRION (μαρτύριον), a term that refers both to a martyr’s shrine (Eng. martyry) and to an account of a martyr’s life.

Shrine. A martyrion was a building or shrine erected over the grave of a martyr or on a site connected with the life of Christ or a saint. The earliest martyr—Christian successors to pagan heroae—were simple shrines erected at the graves of martyrs, such as the aedicula at the supposed tomb of St. Peter on the Vatican Hill in Rome. Monumental martyrion appeared ca.300 as in the large baldachinlike structure that sheltered the “Tomb of St. John” at Ephesus. After 312, monumental martyrion were erected in large numbers throughout the Christian world. Grabar (infra) showed that the architectural form of martyrion derived largely from that of Roman funerary monuments. Many martyrion were centrally planned—circular, as in the Anastasis rotunda in Jerusalem; octagonal, as in the structure sheltering the Grotto of the Nativity in Bethlehem; or cruciform, as in the Martyrion of St. Babylas near Antioch. The basilica form was also used for martyrion, for example, the Holy Sepulchre basilica in Jerusalem; at the Constantinian Church of St. Peter in Rome, the transept functioned as a martyrion. Martyria continued to be erected in later periods, as in the case of St. Euphemia in Constantinople, actually a palace converted into a chapel to accommodate the saint’s relics in the early 7th C. The distinction between martyrion and regular churches was gradually lost, beginning in
the mid-4th C., with the first translations of relics to churches that were not specifically built as martyria.


-LIT.

- A.K.

-LIT.


-LIT.

-M.M.M.

MARTWAZI, AL- (Marvazi), more fully Sharaf al-Zaman Taher al-Marwazi, Arab author and court physician of Malikshah; fl. late 11th–early 12th C. His Properties of Animals (written ca.1120) contains a brief chapter on Byz., among other nations. Based partly on earlier Arabic reports, it refers to the Byz. military hierarchy. His descrip-
tion of Constantinople—its walls, gates, statues, Hagia Sophia, imperial palace, role of the empress, sports in the Hippodrome—supplements that of Harun ibn Yahya. He also refers to Byz.'s northern and western neighbors and the survival of Hellenistic learning. His reference to Muslim merchants, rather than prisoners, at Constantinople seems indicative of the contemporary situation.


MARY MAGDALENE ("of Magdala"), saint, one of the MYRRPHOROIKI; main feastday 22 July. Her tomb was located in either Jerusalem or Ephesus, whence her relics were transferred to Constantinople at the order of Emp. Leo VI. Her cult in Byz. never attained the stature it had in the West, where Mary was identified with both Mary of Bethany (sister of Lazarus) and the anonymous sinner of Luke 7. She was praised, however, by numerous authors, from Gregory of Nyssa to Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, and most highly in the Greco-Italian tradition of pseudo-Theophanes Kerameus (probably Philagathos), which celebrates Mary as the first to see the risen Christ and thus as the "apostle of apostles." In art as in literature, the earliest Eastern works singling out Mary from the other Myrrphoroi have Western associations (Noli me tangere on the Crusader façade of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem, and in MS Kiev, Academy of Sciences, gr. 25. [Cart, Byz. Illumination, fig.12B11] where it is paired as in Western literature, including pseudo-Theophanes, with the Doubting of Thomas). From the early 13th C. onward (Mileševa), Byz. art gives Mary a central place in images of the deposition from the cross. Her softly colored garments do not distinguish her from the other Myrrphoroi.


MARY OF EGYPT, saint; feastday 1 Apr. Her chronology cannot be established. A singer in the Church of the Anastasis in Jerusalem, Mary fled to the desert, taking a basket of vegetables that lasted 17 years, according to the Life of Kyriakos by Cyril of Skythopolis (ed. E. Schwartz 223f; Fr. tr. A.J. Festugière, Les moines de Palestine [Paris 1963] 50f). Before her death Mary told her story to the monk John, who showed her grave to Cyril. Moschos tells a similar tale (PG 87:3049). The story was reworked by Sophronios of Jerusalem (his authorship is denied by Beck, Kirche 435), who dramatized the story, apparently using the Life of Paul the Hermit by Jerome. John was replaced by another narrator, Zosimas; Mary became a licentious woman from Alexandria who suddenly converted to Christianity when a supernatural force prevented her entrance into the Church of the Anastasis; a lion appeared to dig her grave. The author retained certain details; for example, his Mary survived 17 years on three small loaves. This legend stressed the vital topic of repentance, absent in the earlier version. The story of Mary was included in the collection of Symeon Metaphrastes and retold by many writers, for example, Manuel Holobolo and Manuel II. The legend is known also in Syrian, Armenian, Latin, and other versions.

Representation in Art. The figure of Mary is distinctive: gaunt and bony, with long unkempt white hair and no headcovering, she is sometimes depicted without any clothes at all, and her body is covered with hair or sores. In church programs she appears either among the holy women or opposite the bishop Zosimas, who holds a paten and a spoon with which he offers her communion. The latter scene often occupies a position near the apse (e.g., at Asinou). In the Theodore Psalter (fol.68r), Zosimas extends to her his mantle.


MARY THE YOUNGER, saint; born Armenia (?); before 866 (?), died Biyze ca.902/3; feastday 16 Feb. Mary was the youngest daughter of an Ar-
menian family that moved from Armenia to Constantinople during the reign of Basil I. She married a certain Nikephoros, droungarios and eventually tournarches, and followed him to Byz. The intrigues of Nikephoros's relatives made him jealous of Mary; finally he beat her fatally.

Mary's anonymous Life, preserved only in 14th-C. MSS, was probably written at her monastery in Byz. Its date of composition is usually assigned to the 11th C., since the hagiographer refers to Basil II; Beck (Kirche 565), however, places it soon after 903; in this case, the reference to Basil II is an interpolation. The hagiographer also dwells on the fate of two of Mary's sons and describes miracles performed at her tomb. The Life conveys important information about Byz.-Bulgarian relations up to the death of Symeon. A new type of saintly woman, Mary is a modest matron and housewife who apparently worked no miraculous deeds while alive; rather, the author stresses her works of charity. The hagiographer, quite reasonably, comments that many people may doubt Mary's sanctity; he insists, however, that posthumous miracles at her tomb demonstrate her sainthood. The Church of Hagia Sophia in Byz had an inscriptions mentioning the "life-containing tomb" of Mary (C. Mango, ZRVI 11 [1968] 11f); probably it was the cathedral church in which Mary's corpse supposedly remained uncorrupted for 25 years until transferred to a private chapel. The Life describes Mary's appearance in a vision to an artist in Rhaistatos; she ordered him to paint an icon of her. The icon was sent to Byz., and the hagiographer stresses its resemblance to Mary (p.699BC).

source. AASS Nov. 4:692-705.


MASON (λιθοξόος), worker in stone or marble. In late Roman texts the term lithoxos designated both a stoneworker and a stonemaster in a quarry, but primarily had the connotation of sculptor (and in a Christian context specifically a maker of idols). Gregory of Nyssa (PG 46:737D) referred to a carpenter who made wooden statues of animals and a lithoxos who carved stone plaques as if they were soft silver. In inscriptions the term lithoxos designated both a workman who installed decorative stonework and a builder (Robert, infra 33). In the 5th-6th C. Isaurian masons were esp. famous: they built the Church of St. Sabas ca.501, the monastery of St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger between 541 and 551, and repaired the dome of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople ca.558. They formed teams that traveled considerable distances and were a close-knit group, caring for their companions if they fell ill (see Building Industry). Inscriptions from Cilicia mention marble masons: marmarios once (MAMa 3, no.683) and frequently marmararioi; esp. noteworthy is the epitaph of the marmarios Stephen, the son of the marmararios Konon (MAMa 3, no.721). They are also attested in inscriptions from Greece, Cappadocia, Lydia, and other places. From ordinary masons should be distinguished experienced marbleworkers, such as a certain Leonstios who worked in a luxurious house in Antioch ornamenting walls with marble plaques and setting a beautiful, perhaps multicolored marble floor (vita of St. Thekla, ed. Dagron, ch.17.3-6, p.334).

The scanty evidence from later centuries indicates that a lithoxos was an ordinary craftsman: thus Symeon the Theologian (Traités théologiques et éthiques 2 [Paris 1967] 166.142-48) lists a litho-
xoons (ed. reads limxoons) side by side with other such artisans as a jeweler and a smith and equates him with a tekon (carpenter). In the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (ch.22.1) marmarioi were regular construction workers.


Masons’ Marks. Masons incised letters, monograms, and nonverbal signs on blocks of stone and other architectural members either in the quarry or at the time of their use in construction projects. The collection, let alone the study, of such masons’ marks is in its infancy, for example, most of the ca.1500 such marks found by R. van Nice at Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, remain unpublished. Marks served a variety of purposes, more often functioning as invocations or records of the name or place of origin of a mason or his workshop than as assembly marks. There were also stamps on bricks, probably having a similar function.


—A.K.

MASONRY. See Ashlar; Brickwork Techniques and Patterns.

MASSACRE OF THE INNOCENTS. See INFANCY OF CHRIST.

MASTOTS. See Mesrop Maštoc’.

MAS'UD I, Seljuk sultan of Ikonion; died between Apr. and Sept. 1155. Son of Kilic Arslan I, Mas'ud (Мас'уд) deposed his brother Shakhanshah (between 1116 and 1118) but had to flee to Constantinople (ca.1125/6) from his brother 'Arab. Restored with Byz. aid, Mas'ud received Byz. refugees: Isaac, brother of John II (after 1130), temporarily, and Isaac's son John (1140), permanently. Overshadowed by the Danishmends, Mas'ud emerged after 1140 or 1142 as the leading Anatolian Muslim ruler. When, in response to Turkish ravaging in western Anatolia, Manuel I attacked Ikonion (1149), Mas'ud's forces outside the city prevented a siege. Mas'ud and Manuel made peace (1147) to confront the Second Crusade. In 1152–54, Mas'ud received Byz. subsidies to attack T’oros II in Cilician Armenia, but was unsuccessful.

—C.M.B.

MAS'UDI, al-., more fully Abū’l-Hasan ‘Ali ibn al-Husayn, al-Mas'udi, Arab historian; born Baghdad 893?, died al-Fuṣṭat Sept./Oct. 956. Concerned with the broader theoretical implications of social and cultural phenomena, al-Mas'udi spent much of his life traveling. He journeyed east to India, visited Arabia and East Africa, and spent his last 30 years in Syria and Egypt, where he did most of his writing. He gathered much information on other lands and cultures during these travels.

Only two of his 36 Arabic works survive: The Meadows of Gold and Mines of Gems, a discursive world history from Creation to 947, and Elucidation and Overview, a historical and geographical digest. Both books range over many topics and reflect his keen interest in other cultures. Of these, Byz. is of first importance, due to Mas'udi’s intense interest in Christianity and his admiration for the empire’s political power and venerable tradition of institutions and administration. Mas'udi speaks at length about the imperial and ecclesiastical history of Byz., describes Constantinople and the empire’s lands, lists the themes and other administrative divisions, and discusses Byz. relations with the Muslim world, the Bulgars, Khazars, Rus’, and the West. He treats matters of commerce and culture, as well as the usual military and diplomatic affairs. His accounts, remarkably objective, are well informed and esp. important for events of his own times.


—L.I.C.

MATASUNTHA (Ματασούνθα), Ostrogothic queen; daughter of Amasuntha; born ca.518, died after 551. While a young girl, she was married against her will to Vitiges in 536/7. More
Roman than Goth in upbringing and culture. Matasuntha became the center of the senatorial opposition to Vitiges, whom she disliked. In 538 she started negotiations with John, the Byz. commander in Ariminium. rumor even accused her of burning Ravenna’s grain when Belisarios besieged the city. After Ravenna fell, Vitiges and Matasuntha were brought to Constantinople as prisoners of war. When he died, she married the widowed GERMANOS; this marriage was intended to symbolize the unity of Justinian’s court and the AMALI. Wroth (Western & Provincial Byz. Coins, xxxvi–xxxvii) attributed to Matasuntha some silver and bronze coins with monograms; these, he surmised, were struck in Constantinople in 550 during the preparation for Germanos’s expedition to Italy. These coins are now considered (W. Hahn, FelRav 1 [1979] 64) to have been issued by Mastinas, the client king of Mauretania (ca.535).


Mathematical Problems, Textbooks Of. The earliest collections of problems in mathematics appear in Byz. in a series of epigrams preserved in the Greek Anthology under the name of Metrodoras, a grammarian of the early 6th C. (Heath, Mathematics 2:441–43); this is followed by a 7th- or 8th-C. papyrus found at Akhmim.

The only other known Byz. mathematical problem books were written under the influence of an oriental tradition that goes back to India. These works are an anonymous collection of the early 14th C. and a “letter” of 1341 to Theodore Tzabouches from Nicholas RHABDAS. Another anonymous treatise, written after 1453, also belongs to this oriental tradition. The late Byz. problem books deal with cases of construction work, financial transactions, etc., and contain substantial data for economic history (K.-P. Matschke, Jahrbuch für Geschichte des Feudalismus 3 [1979] 181–204), as well as for the history of language (E. Kriaras, ByzF 3 [1968] 141–56).


LIT. H. Hermelin, “Arabic Recreational Mathematics as a Mirror of Age-Old Cultural Relations between Eastern and Western Civilizations,” Proceedings of the First Interna-

Mathematics in Byz. encompassed four fields: arithmetic (including notation), geometry, optics and catoptrics (that portion of optics dealing with reflected light), and metrology. The Byz. used mathematics in their studies of astrology and astronomy, for the computus (to establish the date of Easter), and for financial transactions and architectural construction (see Mathematical Problems, Textbooks Of). The Byz. placed great importance on number symbolism, esp. in the spheres of theology, art, and architecture.

Arithmetic. Teachers at Alexandria, like AMMONIOS and John PHILOPONOS, used the Introduction to Arithmetic of Nikomachus of Gerasa (fl. ca.100) as their text. This work also provided the basis for the arithmetical portions of the Quadrivium of 1007/8 (with the addition of Euclid) and of that by George PACHYMERES; it continued to be widely read in the Palaiologan period. Nikomachos’s book (but not its Byz. commentaries) was translated into Latin by BOETHIUS and into Arabic by Thabit ibn Qurra.

The only other early Byz. work on arithmetic, a reaction against Nikomachos, is the 5th-C. Handbook of the Introduction to Arithmetic, composed by DOMNINOS of Larissa (in Syria), who together with PROKLOS had studied with Syrians. Domninos also wrote a brief tract on removing one ratio from another, the Pos esti logon ek logou aphelein.

Thereafter there is a gap in the tradition until the 9th-C. scholar LEO THE MATHEMATICIAN, who studied arithmetic (among other subjects) with a teacher on Andros, and later taught arithmetic and geometry in Constantinople. According to Theophanes Continuatus (TheophCont 185–90), his fame reached the Arab caliph al-Ma’mun, who consulted him on problems of geometry and astronomy. His library included works of Euclid, Apollonios of Perge (on conics), PROKLOS the Neoplatonist (on geometry), and Archimedes (Le- merle, Humanism 195–204).

In the 10th–12th C. the only traces left of the study of arithmetic are in the Quadrivium of 1007/8, which should remind us that arithmetic was always included in the school curriculum even if no original treatises were being composed, and from the mid-11th C. a short piece by PSELLOS,
the *On Numbers*. Unlike astronomy and astrology, Byzantine mathematics in this period seems not to have experienced any influence from Islam.

During the Latin occupation of Constantinople, however, there was written in 1252 a treatise on the use of Indian numerals entitled *The So-called Great Computation according to the Indians* (A. Allard, *RHT* 7 [1977] 57–107). It is not clear whether this is based directly on an Arabic source (it transliterates some Arabic technical terms and uses the epoch of the Hijra in an example) or on some Latin version of one, such as the *Book of the Abacus* of Leonardo of Pisa (who is known to have visited Constantinople). In any case, this anonymous text was the main source of *The So-called Great Computation according to the Indians* of Maximos Planudes, to which supplements were added by Nicholas Rhabdas and Manuel Moschopoulos (ed. A. Allard, *Le grand calcul selon les Indiens* [Louvain-la-Neuve 1981]).

The last arithmetical tradition in Byz. was that of the *Arithmetic* of Diophantos of Alexandria, which deals with problems we now classify as algebraic. The commentary of Hypatia on the *Arithmetic* is now lost but may be the source of Psellos’s letter concerning Diophantos. There now survive only six of the original 13 books in Greek; four others have recently been discovered in an Arabic translation by Qustâ ibn Lûqa (see J. Sesiano, *Books IV to VII of Diophantus’ Arithmetica* [New York 1982]), which shows that a more complete MS survived until at least the late 9th C. Nikephoros Blemydes had read Nikomachos and as much of Diophantos as his teacher understood; Pachymeres paraphrased the beginning of the *Arithmetic* in his *Quadrivium*; Planudes commented on the first two books, and in the 14th C. both Rhabdas and Demetrios Kydones refer to Diophantos. (For further scholia, see A. Allard, *Byzantion* 53 [1983] 664–760). One should also note the treatise on magic squares, *Exposition for Finding Square Numbers*, addressed by Manuel Moschopoulos to Rhabdas, and the treatise of Isaac Argyros on finding square roots.

**Geometry.** The tradition of Byz. studies of geometry was, of course, based on Euclid. The *Elements* were commented on by Pappos (bk.10), Proklos (bk.1), Simplicios (bk.1), and Isaac Argyros (bk. 1–6), while Barlaam of Calabria wrote an arithmetical explanation of book 2. The *Data* was commented on by Marinus. Both of these works of Euclid were revised by Theon. The *Elements* was the basis for the geometrical sections of the *Quadrivium* of 1007/8 and for that by Pachymeres.

From the corpus of Archimedes, the *On the Sphere and the Cylinder, On the Measurement of a Circle*, and *On Plane Equilibria* were commented on by Eutokios, who also explained books 1–4 of Apollonios’s *Conics*. Also largely in the form of explications of the theories of earlier mathematicians is the *Collection* of Pappos. A younger contemporary of Pappos, Serenos of Antinoeia, also wrote a commentary on Apollonios’s *Conics*, but it is unfortunately lost. There do survive from his hand two related treatises, *On the Section of a Cylinder* and *On the Section of a Cone*. Also in the tradition of conic sections is Anthemios of Tralles’ *On Burning Mirrors* of which we possess only a fragment.

Aside from the numerous scholia, esp. on the *Elements*, virtually the only other known Byz. treatise on geometry is a work on triangles, based on Heron, that Isaac Argyros composed in 1367/8. It is remarkable that none of the brilliant advances in geometry made by the Arabs ever reached Byz.

**Optics and Catoptrics.** The principal Byz. texts on these subjects are Theon’s recession of Ptolemy’s *Optics* and the pseudo-Euclidean *Catoptrics*, which Heiberg (infra) conjectured to be the work of Theon. The *Quadrivium* of Pachymeres (3, 59–76) used the original Euclidean form of the *Optics*. An older contemporary of Theon was Damianos, the son (or pupil) of Heliodorus of Larissa, who composed the *Chapters of Optical Hypotheses*.

**Metrology.** The mathematical aspects of metrology derive from the traditions of Heron’s *Geometry, Stereometry*, and *On Measures*. These include the pseudo-Heronian *Geodesy, the Synopsis of Measurement and Division of the Earth* of John Pediasimos, Isaac Argyros’s *Method of Geodesy*, and George the Geometer’s *On Geodesy* as well as several anonymous texts (see J.L. Heiberg, *Heronis Alexandrini Opera*, 5 [Leipzig 1914] lxvi–cxii). A large number of other metrological texts exist, including a poem attributed to Psellus (ed. Schilbach, *Quellen Met.* 116–25).


**MATINS.** See Orthros.
MATRIMONIAL LEGISLATION. From the 4th C. outward marriage, more than any other institution, was the subject of both secular and ecclesiastical regulations. The two generally complemented one another and conflicted only in exceptional cases. Most of the norms of matrimonial legislation originate in Roman law and are widely expounded in all parts of the Corpus Juris Civilis and in the Basilika (books 28–30) as well as in minor compendia. Collections of relevant canons were assembled, esp. in the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles (9.28–30, 13.2–4), the commentaries on which also include other relevant material. The principal concerns of matrimonial legislation were the age of the betrothed couple (see Betrothal), marriage impediments (title 2 of the Ecloga), divorce, remarriage, and new marriage rites (title 16 of the Epitome). Even if the main principles of matrimonial legislation were apparently widely known and respected, the legal rules were presumably often and easily disregarded through oikonomia.


MATTHEW (Ματθαῖος), named Levi before his conversion; evangelist and saint; feastday 16 Nov. Author of the first Gospel, he was one of the apostles and preached to the Jews in their native tongue, according to Eusebius of Caesarea (HE 3.24.5–6); Eusebius (HE 6.25.4) quotes Origen to the effect that Matthew had written his gospel “in the Hebrew language.” Matthew’s Gospel was the object of lengthy exegesis, esp. by Origen and John Chrysostom; catena also include fragments of Apollinaris of Laodikeia, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, Photios, and several other theologians. Later, Euthymios Zigabenos and Theophylaktos of Ohrid compiled commentaries on Matthew. Matthew’s biography was developed in apocryphal acts of apostles and in homilies (among the authors are Niketas Paphlagon and Symeon Metaphrastes); hagiographers paid special attention to Matthew’s transformation from a tax collector (an abominable profession) into a disciple of Christ. They describe his widely ranging travels, which included Persia and Ethiopia. More modestly, the Synaxarium of Constantinople (Synax. CP 227–30) limits Matthew to a journey to Hierapolis in Syria; he is said to have died there peacefully. Matthew’s cult in Byz. did not flourish: he had no shrine of his own in Constantinople, and his memory was celebrated in the Church of St. Peter, near Hagia Sophia.

Representation in Art. In Evangelist Portraits Matthew is depicted as a vigorous gray-bearded. Usually he is shown writing before a desk (see Writing Desk), but sometimes he stands (Nelson, infra, figs. 62–63), a posture used in some MS illuminations to distinguish Matthew and John, who were disciples of Christ, from Mark and Luke, who were not. Matthew may be accompanied by an angel or image of Christ—the latter en buste or as the Majestas Domini (Nelson,
infra, fig. 40)—to indicate that Christ inspired the Gospel, or by a youth, perhaps James the brother of Christ, who supposedly translated Matthew’s Gospel into Greek. In 17 MSS, a miniature of the Nativity accompanies the portrait of Matthew. The scene of his conversion (Mt 9:9; Lk 5:27-31) is illustrated in several densely illuminated MSS and occasionally in wall painting. His ministry and martyrdom appear in cycles of the lives and deaths of the apostles.

ED. J. Reuss, Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche (Berlin 1957).
—J.J., A.K., A.W.C.

MATTHEW I, patriarch of Constantinople (Oct. 1397-1402; 14 June 1403-10 Aug. 1410); born ca.1360 or earlier, died Constantinople. At age 15 Matthew entered the Charsianites monastery in Constantinople under the spiritual guidance of the hegoumenos Markos (PLP, no.17017) and of his successor Neilos Kerameus, the future patriarch. After Neilos’s death (1388), Matthew succeeded him as superior of the monastery. In 1387 Matthew was made proedros of Chaledon but not consecrated; he was then appointed metropolitan of Kyzikos (MM 2:108-11). Thus, when he became patriarch, he was attacked by his enemies, Matthew of Medea and Makarios of Ankyra, for unlawfully holding the position of bishop three times. He was also accused of negotiating with the Turks during their siege of Constantinople in order to secure his own position, a charge that Matthew rejected as slander (MM 2:263-67). He was briefly deposed (summer 1402-June 1403) by a synod composed of four metropolitans but reinstated by Manuel II upon his return from Italy (G.T. Dennis, ByzF 2 [1967] 100-06). Matthew remained hegoumenos of the Charsianites monastery throughout his patriarchate and in 1407 wrote a typikon for the monastery as part of his last will and testament (H. Hunger, BZ 51 [1958] 294-303).


MATTHEW I KANTAKOUZENOS, co-emperor (1353-57); born ca.1325, died Mistra 1383 or 1391. Eldest son of John VI Kantakouzenos, Matthew in 1341 married Irene Palaiologina, granddaughter of Andronikos II. He followed a military career and supported his father during the Civil War of 1341-47. Angered when John VI failed to recognize him as heir after his own coronations in 1346 and 1347, Matthew declared his independent rule over eastern Thrace. John then granted him this territory as an appanage. John finally agreed to grant Matthew the title of co-emperor in April 1353. Patr. Kallistos I resigned in protest. The coronation was performed in Feb. 1354 by a newly elected patriarch, Philotheos Kokkinos. Tensions between Matthew and his brother-in-law John V Palaiologos increased after John VI’s abdication in Dec. 1354. The rivals for the throne were at war in 1355-56. In 1356 Matthew was captured by Serbs and handed over to John V, who held Matthew until he renounced his title of emperor at Epibatai in 1357. In 1361 Matthew moved to the Morea, where he spent his remaining years (A.C. Hero in Okeanos 280-87). He assisted his brother, the despotes Manuel Kantakouzenos (1349-80), in the administration of the province and briefly succeeded him as despotes in 1380-81. He wrote some insignificant commentaries and addressed two treatises on religion and philosophy to his daughter.

ED. “Matthaiou basileos tou Kantakouzenou Logoi anekdotoi dyo,” ed. I. Sakkellion, DIFE 2 (1887) 425-39. For further list, see Beck, Kirche 791.

MATTHEW OF EDESSA (Matt’os Urhayec’i), Armenian historian, priest in the large Armenian population of Edessa. Of his life nothing is known, save that he was an eyewitness of events in the Crusader principality of Edessa in the early 12th C. His detailed Chronicle begins in 952 and reaches 1136. It is of prime importance for Byz.-Crusader-Turkish history in Cilicia and northern Syria. Gregory the Priest (otherwise unknown) continued the narrative to 1162.

Matthew says that he took eight years to compile his work from written and oral sources, which he does not identify. The narrative proceeds strictly chronologically, events being grouped together
year by year according to the Armenian calendar. Like many Armenians, Matthew was ambivalent toward Byz. He praises individual emperors (notably Basil II) for their policies or characters but blames the Greeks for destroying the unity of Armenia and thus causing Turkish success in Anatolia. The attempts of the Byz. to impose Chalcedonian orthodoxy he denounces, yet he calls Constantinople a city under divine protection.

ED. Patmuli’yan (Jerusalem 1869; Vakarpap [Ejmiaclin] 1898), Chronique de Matthieu d’Edesse, tr. E. Dulaurier (Paris 1858).

LIT. Adontz, Études 141–47. A. Lüders, Die Kreuzzüge im Urteil syrischer und armenischer Quellen (Berlin 1964) 17–21.

-R.T.

MATTHEW OF EPHESSUS. See Gabalas, Manuel.

MATTHEW OF KHAZARIA, late 14th-C. poet. A hieromonk from the monastery of Kyriou (in Constantinople or Bithynia), Matthew was sent to Crimea in Aug. 1395 by Patr. Antony IV as exarch of KHAZARIA (MM 2:492.26–29). He wrote a poem of 15-syllable verses on the “city of Theodore,” most probably Dory. It takes the form of a dialogue between a visitor to Crimea (the poet) and the “city of Theodore.” The stranger praises the city’s site and splendid buildings, but asks why the place seems deserted. The city replies that she has suffered for years from enemy attack and siege (probably the campaigns of Timur). The poet concludes with edifying reflections on the transience of material things; therefore man should concentrate on his spiritual salvation. The poem is couched in literary language, but frequently lapses into vernacular syntax, morphology, and vocabulary, esp. when necessary to conform to the meter.


LIT. Hunger, Lit. 2:148. PLP, no. 17309.

- A.M.T.

MATZOUKA (Ματζουκά), bandon of the empire of TREBIZOND, consisting of the valleys immediately south of the coast that control routes to the interior. The region was dominated by the landholdings of the monasteries of Peristera, Soumela, and Vazelion and inhabited by Greek-speaking peasants. These tough mountaineers saved Trebizond from Turkish attack in 1283 and 1361 and retained considerable independence after its fall. Besides the great monasteries and numerous castles, remains consist of modest village churches in a vernacular late Byz. style, many of them decorated with paintings of conventional types. The region is important for providing a great range of unpretentious buildings that illustrate rural conditions.


- C.F.

MAUREX (Μαύρηξ), also Maurix, Maurikas, a Byz. family that flourished in the 11th and 12th C. Its founder, whose first name is unknown, was a common sailor from Herakleia Pontike. According to Italian chroniclers, in 1066 and 1067 a certain Ma(m)bica commanded a fleet attacking Robert Guiscard; WILLIAM OF APULIA (p.240.99) calls him dux of Alexios I’s fleet. Bryennios (Bryen.197.19–24) says that his naval experience made Maurex indispensable and the emperors conferred upon him enormous wealth; he controlled a local militia consisting of his slaves and servants. In 1082 he was in charge of the navy dispatched to intercept Norman communications between southern Italy and the Balkans (An. Komm. 1:148.30–31). He is usually identified as the Michael Maurex who was titled strategos of Chios, magistros, katepano of Dyrrhachion, etc., on several seals of the 11th C. (Selbt, Bleisiegel 168–71), but narrative sources do not confirm that the naval commander Maurex held these ranks.

In the 12th C. Constantine Maurikas was prator of the Peloponnese and Hellas (Laurent, Bulles métr., no.305); John Maurikas, in the mid-12th C., was a konupalates (Guilland, “Europalate” 209). More complicated is the case of a certain Maurexius, a servant (familiaris) of Manuel I who was granted special powers during the expedition of Andronikos Kontostephanos to Egypt in 1169; William of Tyre (PL 201:791A) states that at the end of his life Manuel I entrusted him with the administration of the empire. No Greek source confirms this, nor is it known whether Maurexius belonged to the Maurex family. The traces of later family members are scanty: in 1280/1 a cer-
MAURI (Mαυροίς), Moors. From the 3rd C. onward this term was used primarily to designate the semiromanized peoples in North Africa who inhabited the area extending from the Syrtic Gulf to the Atlantic Ocean (Austuriani, Baquates, Leuathai, Mazikes, Musones, Quinquegentanei, Tyndenses, etc.). Mauri was also used in late Roman military jargon as a synonym for rebels. Both senses of the term are employed by Prokopios and Corippus in their accounts of the 6th-C. wars between the Byz. army and Mauri tribes in the North African provinces of Tripolitania, Byzacena, and Numidia.

The conflicts were precipitated by Byz. efforts to wrest control over the southern parts of these provinces from various Mauri tribal coalitions that, in some instances, had formed a series of loosely defined Mauri-Roman "kingdoms" during the 5th and early 6th C. Although generally successful militarily, the Byz. were unable to establish full control over the Mauri, and in 547 the Mauri crushed the army of John Troglita. To offset this, treaties of alliance and friendship, grants of administrative autonomy, and other diplomatic measures were employed to ensure the loyalty of the tribes. To protect against razzias the Byz. also constructed numerous fortifications in towns on the edge of Mauri-controlled areas and along seasonal north-south migration routes used by the pastoral tribes (e.g., Limissa). Finally, efforts were made to convert those tribes that were still pagan.

The relative success of Byz. efforts to assimilate the Mauri was demonstrated during the Arab invasions of Africa in the 7th and 8th C. when, according to the Arab sources, the Barbar (the Arabic term for the Mauri, from which the word Berber is derived) were frequently found in alliance with the Romani (i.e., Romans). Indeed, there is a growing body of epigraphic, archaeological, and numismatic evidence that points to a substantial Romano-Christian element among the Mauri in the 6th and 7th C.


Maurice (Mαυρίκιος), emperor (13/14 Aug. 582–23 Nov. 602); born Arabissos ca.539, died Chalcedon 27 Nov. 602. A legend makes him Armenian (P. Charanis, Byzantium 35 [1965] 412–17), but the question of his ethnic origin remains unresolved. Maurice came to Constantinople as a notary and made a career as military commander; Tiberios I appointed him caesar (in summer 582) and heir to the throne. After his predecessor's death Maurice married Tiberios's daughter Constantina. Evagrius describes Maurice as simple in private life and undemanding in his diet; however, yielding to the taste of the Constantinopolitan population, Maurice arranged splendid festivities at his wedding and upon entering the consulate. In the Karianos portico that he had built in 571 (Theoph. 261.13–15) at the Blachernai, Maurice had painters depict his life story up to the time of his accession. In 596 he set up his statue in a courtyard at the Magnaura.

Maurice tried to diminish Justinianic centralization; he introduced the exarchates and in 597 wrote a will, planning to divide the empire among his three sons. The circus factions revived after long inactivity (Y. Janssens, Byzantion 11 [1936] 499–515). Maurice used able generals (Philippikos, Priskos, Komentilos) and diplomats (Domitianos) and was so successful in the war against Persia that Chosroes II acknowledged dependence on Constantinople. In the West the situation was worse: the Lombards continued to encroach upon Italy, and under Gregory I the papacy grew more independent; attempts to ally with the Franks against the Lombards failed. The situation on the Danube border became dangerous because of Avar pressure and rebellious armies that felt themselves underpaid and overburdened. The revolt of Phokas led to the overthrow of Maurice, his execution, and that of his male relatives.


MAURITANIA (Mauratia). From the 1st C. A.D., Mauritania designated that part of North Africa extending from the border of Numidia (the Ampsaga River) to the Atlantic. Originally, Mauritania was divided into two provinces: Caesariensis to the east and Tingitana to the west, the
border between the two formed by the Mulucha (mod. Moulouya) River. Diocletian detached the eastern part of Caesariensis to form the new province of Sitifensis. Following the Byz. reconquest of Africa (533), Justinian I called for the reestablishment of the "two Mauritanias." The fact that Mauritia Sitifensis was not recovered militarily until 539 led Pringle (infra) to argue that the second Mauritia was Gaditana, the northern coastal strip of Tingitana around Septem, which was held by the Byz. after 533. This hypothesis, however, overlooks the fact that Justinian’s script was intended to serve primarily as a blueprint for the future, not as a reflection of the existing extent of Byz. control in Africa in 534. Moreover, since the prefecture of Africa was modeled on the Diocletianic diocese of the same name, which included Sitifensis but not Tingitana (the latter attached to the Spanish dioceses), it is arguable that Sitifensis was the second Mauritia.

A further problem in the case of Sitifensis arises from Prokopios’s inclusion of Sitifis in Numidia (Buildings 6.7-9), thereby leading Y. Duval (Latomus 29 [1970] 157–61) to conjecture that by 554 Sitifensis had been absorbed into Numidia. There is no evidence, however, that Sitifensis was ever more than a civil province (see Prokopios, Wars 2.20.30). As with parts of Africa Proconsularis, it is more likely to have formed part of the large military province under the dux Numidiae. Byz. control of Caesarea and Rusgumia in Caesariensis is attested in the late 6th C., but beyond that time nothing is known; Septem in Gaditana remained in imperial hands until seized by the Arabs in 711.


MAUROKATAKALON. See Katakalon.

MAUROPOUS, JOHN, writer; born Paphlagonia ca.1000, died Constantinople after ca.1075–81, according to Ja. Ljubarskij (BBulg 4 [1973] 50f). Mauropos (Μαυρόπους) was a teacher in Constantinople, a court rhetorician under Constantine IX, metropolitan of Euchaita (ca.1050–75), then a monk in the monastery of Prodromos in Petra in Constantinople. He claimed the leadership of young intellectuals (such as his pupil Psellos), who tried to direct the policy of Constantine IX; in 1047 Mauropos courageously petitioned the emperor to acquit the participants in the rebellion of Leo Tornikios. The chronography Mauropos wrote was destroyed because of its political heterodoxy (Lagarde, no.96). Socially, Mauropos was antimilitaristic: he contrasted imperial justice and omnipotence with the frenetic activity of barbarians and rebellious generals doomed to lose in the end. Mauropos paved the way for the use of rhetoric as a means of political influence. His speeches dealt with the most important events of political life. After being forced to leave Constantinople ca.1050, Mauropos concentrated on religious topics, producing kanones and saints’ lives; his antiaristocratic tendencies are revealed in his praise of the foot soldier St. Theodore Teron whose festival was celebrated in Euchaita. A forerunner of Psellus, Mauropos sought to introduce vivid images into his speeches, letters, and epigrams and eagerly defended ancient writers, such as Plato and Plutarch, against charges of atheism (Lagarde, no.43). His speeches are also a valuable source for the history of Byz. relations with their northern neighbors, even though their vague imagery makes some of their data disputable (e.g., J. Shepard, JÖB 24 [1975] 61–89; A. Kazhdan, JÖB 26 [1977] 65–77). Psellus’s very conventional enkomion of Mauropos (Encomio per Giovanni piissimo metropolita di Euchaita, ed. R. Anastasi [Padua 1968]) is lacking in concrete information.


MAUROZOMES (Μαυροζώμης), a noble family of the 12th C. The etymology of the name is “black broth” (Koukoules, Bios 6 [1957] 494); the name is preserved in the toponymy of the Peloponnesos, and it is possible that the family originated from this area. Theodore Maurozomes was one of the favorite generals of Manuel I and was briefly chief of the imperial secretaries under Andronikos I; John Maurozomes led an army from
the Peloponnese to the relief of Thessalonike in 1185 (Brand, Byzantium 59, 61, 165).

Circa 1200 Manuel Maurozomes was, according to Ibn Bīṭī (tr. Duda 30), one of the great “caesars” of Byz. When the Seljuk sultan Kay-Khusraw I went into exile in Constantinople, he married the daughter of “a great patrikios” (according to Rashid ad-Dīn and Gregoire Abūl-Faraj); the name of the sultan’s father-in-law, Manuel Maurozomes, is provided by Niketas Choniates and Ibn Bīṭī. Probably before the fall of Constantinople in 1204, the sultan fled to the “island” or “fortress” of Manuel and from there went to Ikonion; both Kay-Khusraw and Manuel were stopped in Nicaea, since the “basileus” (Constantine Laskaris or Theodore I Laskaris?) had already signed a treaty with the Seljuk ruler. They managed to escape, and eventually Kay-Khusraw resumed power and appointed Manuel to a high position. Manuel fought unsuccessfully against Theodore I, but under Seljuk pressure the emperor acknowledged the jurisdiction of Maurozomes (as a Turkish vassal) in the basin of the Meander, including Chonai and Laodikeia. The family, although Christian, retained influence in Ikonion until at least 1297, when the funerary inscription of a certain John Komnenos Maurozomes was erected there (P. Wittek, Byzantium 10 [1935] 505–15).


MAUSOLEUM (ἡρῴων), a monumental tomb. Late Antique mausoleums, like those of Diocletian at Split and Helena at Rome, were domed structures with centralized plans, providing space for visitors and for memorial services. Mausoleums of pagan rulers were freestanding while those of Christian rulers were generally attached to a church. Three centrally planned 5th-C. mausoleums survive in Constantinople (Eyice, infra 117–30). The tradition of building such structures continued at least into the early 7th C., when four small, polygonal mausoleums were attached to the newly completed Church of St. Euphemia (R. Naumann, H. Belting, Die Euphemia-Kirche am Hippodrome zu Istanbul und ihre Fresken [Berlin 1966] 49–55). The most important mausoleums in the Byz. world were those of the emperors attached to the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. Four imperial mausoleums adjoined the church: the Mausoleum, or “Herōon,” of Constantine I, a domed rotunda; the “North Stoa” and “South Stoa,” two small mausoleums of uncertain form completed by ca.405; and the cruciform Mausoleum of Justinian I. With the change in custom to burials within narthexes and parekklesia sometime after the 6th C., the practice of erecting separate buildings as mausoleums was abandoned. The function of the so-called Mausoleum of Galla Placidia in Ravenna is debated.


MAVIA (Mavia), queen of the Arab foederati in the 4th C. and wife of an anonymous federate king; he was probably a Tanūkīd. After her husband died (ca.375), the treaty or foedus with Byz. automatically lapsed and Mavia revolted. She was an Orthodox Christian and her revolt against the Arian emperor Valens assumed religious aspects. She took the offensive, attacking Phoenicia and Palestine. In pitched battles she twice defeated Byz. generals, and Valens sued for peace, agreeing to the consecration of an Arab, St. Moses, as the bishop of Mavia’s foederati. Her daughter married Victor, the magister equitum for Oriens; subsequently Mavia sent troops that participated in the Gothic war in Thrace and successfully defended Constantinople against the Goths after the battle of Adrianople (378). Difficulties arose with Theodosios I and, after a second revolt, Ricimer crushed the Arabs in 383, when Mavia’s rule probably ended. Two Christian inscriptions, found outside Anasartha in Syria, may refer to Mavia and her daughter. Arabic odes composed on the occasion of Mavia’s victories are the first recorded Arabic poetry in Oriens.


MAXENTIUS (Μαξεντιος), more fully Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maxentius, son of MAXIMIAN and emperor (306–12); born ca.286, died Rome 28 Oct. 312. Although ignored by the arrange-
ments of Diocletian for the succession in 305, he married Maximilla, daughter of Galerius. After Constantine I's assumption of the imperial title in 306 Maxentius was proclaimed by the praetorian guard and the people of Rome. At first he avoided the title Augustus, but assumed it by early 307. Maxentius called on the assistance of his father, who returned from retirement and aided in the defeat of Severus, after which Maxentius controlled Italy and Africa. He initially allied with Constantine, who was married to his sister Fausta. The alliance was broken, however, when Maximian denounced his son and fled to Constantine's court. Left out of the reconstituted Tetrarchy at the Conference of Carnuntum in 308, Maxentius faced revolt from Domitian Alexander and the threat of Licinius, who had been appointed to accomplish his suppression. Maxentius attempted to win popular support through religious toleration and an active building program, but military needs forced heavy financial burdens on inhabitants of territories he controlled. Although he was certainly not the tyrant pictured in later Constantinian propaganda, his rule became more arbitrary and unpopular. In 312 Constantine anticipated Licinius and invaded Italy; Maxentius was defeated at the battle of the Milvian Bridge, during which he perished. The villa at Piazza Armerina in Sicily was probably built by Maxentius.


Maximian, full name Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maximianus, Diocletian's co-ruler and caesar (285), Augustus (286–305); born Sirmium (?) between 240 and 250, died Massilia 310 (before 21 July). Born to a peasant family, Maximian (Mαξιμιανός) was fellow-soldier with Diocletian and made a military career under Aurelian and Probus. His wife was Evropia, a Syrian. Diocletian elevated him to the dignity of emperor, and Maximian ruled in the West, his residence being Milan. He was faced with barbarian incursions across the Rhine, a revolt of Bagaudae in Gallia, and the revolt of his subordinate Carausius, who occupied Britain and northern Gallia but was defeated in 293.

In May 305 Maximian was persuaded by Diocletian to abdicate; he was succeeded by Constans. The death of the latter in July 306 created a shaky situation in the West and allowed Maximian's interference in the political situation. First he assisted his son Maxentius (proclaimed emperor in Rome) against the Augustus Severus, who fled to Ravenna but soon surrendered (before 1 Jan. 307?); then he sought an alliance with Constantine I the Great (married to Maximian's daughter Fausta) against Maxentius. Constantine, however, did not recognize Maximian's claims to the title of Augustus, so Maximian took advantage of Constantine's preoccupation with a war against the Franks and revolted in 310. His rebellion was unsuccessful, however. He was forced to retreat to Massilia, where he surrendered; soon thereafter he was found hanged.

Later tradition was hostile to Maximian. He suffered damnatio memoriae and his statues were destroyed. Christian legends present him as persecutor of the faithful, even though the persecutions in the West were not as severe as those in the East under Diocletian.


Maximian, archbishop of Ravenna (546–553); born Pola 498, died Ravenna 22 Feb. 553. From his native city, where he was a deacon, Maximian went to Constantinople. Shortly after his consecration on 14 Oct. 546 by Pope Vigilius at the orders of Justinian I and Theodora (Deichmann, Ravenna, 1:14), Maximian dedicated the Church of St. Vitale in Ravenna, where he is portrayed in mosaic. He had built a church at Pola and, during his tenure of the see of Ravenna, built a Basilica of St. Stephen near S. Vitale and another of St. John outside Ravenna; he dedicated the Church of Sant'Apollinare in Classe on 9 May 549. The Liber pontificalis of Agnellus records Maximian's donation of vessels for chrism, an endye, and other gifts to the see of Ravenna.

Cathedra of Maximian. The cathedra is a thronelike object preserved in the Archiepiscopal Museum, Ravenna, and the only nearly complete piece of ivory furniture to survive from the Byz. era. It is now generally accepted as having been made for Maximian because of a monogram on the front that resolves as MAXIMIANUS EPIS-
other aspects of style vary greatly from one group of panels to another. Its size (124 cm high) and manner of construction—the ivory panels were attached to one another without the often postulated wooden core—imply that the object could scarcely have functioned as an episcopal throne. It has also been suggested that it served as a display stand for a Gospel book. Nothing is known of the cathedral’s presence in Ravenna before the 17th C.


**MAXIMUS DAIA**, or Caius Galerius Valerius Maximinus (Daia was part of his original name and was not used in his official title), Augustus (from 310); born Illyricum ca. 20 Nov. 270, died Tarsos summer 313. The nephew of Galerius, Maximinus (Μάξιμου) was named by Diocletian as Caesar on 1 May 305. He ruled the prefecture of Oriens. At the Conference of Carnuntum in 308, despite the protests of Galerius, Maximinus was not elevated in rank, but was proclaimed Augustus by his troops in 310 (on 1 May according to C.H.V. Sutherland, Roman Imperial Coinage 6 [London 1967] 157). His proclamation, along with that of Constantine I, meant the effective end of the Tetrarchy. Upon the death of Galerius he seized Asia Minor, gaining popularity there through tax relief. Despite Galerius’s edict of toleration, Maximinus continued to persecute the Christians. He formed an alliance with Maxentius, and, after the battle of the Milvian Bridge, Constantine ordered him to cease the persecution. In 313 Maximinus attacked Licinius. He was defeated in Thrace. He fled eastward and then committed suicide.


**MAXIMOS KAUSOKALYBITES** (Καυσοκαλύβητος), saint; born Lampsakos 1270 or 1285, died Mt. Athos, 13 Jan. 1365 or 1380. Maximos was an Athonite hermit who carried to an extreme the monastic ideal of poverty. He was reputed to
own only the clothes on his back and to have foraged for his food. His epithet, the “hut-burner,” derives from his practice of periodically burning down his thatch hut and moving to another site.

Maximos first took monastic vows on Mt. Ganos at age 17. There followed years of restless wandering and pilgrimages to the shrines of Constantinople and Thessalonike. In Constantinople he refused to enter a monastery and became a holy fool living in the streets. He finally settled on Mt. Athos; after a few years of submission to the cenobitic discipline of Lavra, he lived as a solitary until his death at 95. Maximos’s astonishing prophecies and feats of asceticism attracted to Athos disciples and famous visitors, including the emperors John V and John VI, Patr. Kallistos I, and Gregory Sinaites. He was a staunch hesychast and opponent of Gregory Akindynos. Four different vitae of Maximos were composed during the century after his death (BHG 1236z-1237f); the most detailed is that of Theophanes, prohegomenos of Vatopedi; another was written by the monk Niphon. The Athonite skete of Kapsokalyvia, founded in the 18th C., is named after him.

source. F. Halkin, “Deux vies de S. Maxime le Kapsokalybe, ermite au Mont Athos (XIVe s.).” AB 54 (1936) 38–112.

—A.M.T.

MAXIMOS OF EPHESUS, Neoplatonist philosopher; born Smyrna? ca.300, died Antioch 371/2. He was confused in the Souda with an almost unknown Maximos of Epirus or Byzantine. Maximos, who belonged to the school of Iamblichos, contributed much to the introduction of elements of divination and wonder-working into philosophy. His colleagues called him a “theatrical miracle-monger” and related how he made a statue of Hekate laugh and caused the torches she held in her hands to burst into flame (Eunapius, ed. Wright, infra 434.4–19). His works have not survived; from incidental references we know that he commented on Aristotle. Maximos’s attempt to deliver public declamations proved a failure. He did not adhere to the ideal of the philosopher-hormit, but preferred interaction with people and making money.

The young Julian chose Maximos as his teacher and developed his belief in Platonism under the influence of Maximos. After Julian’s accession to the throne, Maximos joined the emperor in Constantinople, became his favorite, acquired enormous wealth, and accompanied him on the Persian expedition. Julian’s death curtailed the career of Maximos: he was brought before a court and sentenced to an exorbitant fine; he considered suicide, but was frightened after his wife poisoned herself. Partially rehabilitated, he began lecturing on philosophy and thus recovered much of his wealth and his reputation as fortune-teller. His interpretation of an oracle as predicting for Emp. Valens a strange death without burial resulted in Maximos’s arrest and execution.


—A.K.

MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR, theologian and saint; baptismal name Moschion; born 580. According to the 10th-C. enkomion by a Stoudite monk, Michael Exaboulites (W. Lackner, AB 85 [1967] 312), Maximos was born in Constantinople, whereas his Syriac biography by Maximos’s contemporary George of Reșaina, a hostile document but concrete in detail, places his birth in the village of Hefsin east of Lake Tiberias. Maximos died on 13 Aug. 662 in the kastron Schiomari, near the frontier with Alania (R. Devreesse, AB 46 [1928] 42). Michael calls him the son of noble and pious parents (PG 90:69A), but George describes his father as a Samaritan merchant and his mother as a Persian slave girl. After his stay in the monastery of “Palaia Lavra,” Maximos was part of the entourage of Sophronios of Jerusalem and eventually became asekretis at the court of Herakleios (W. Lackner, JÖB 20 [1971] 64). Condemned for his religious views, Maximos fled to Africa ca.630 and energetically fought against Monotheletism. He supported Pope Martin I in 649 and was accused by Constans II of treason. He was exiled in 655 to Bizye in Thrace and in 662 to Lazica, where he died. His feast day was celebrated on 21 Jan., the translation of his relics to Constantinople on 13 Aug.
Maximos was a prolific author. His major works are Mystagogia, The Book of Asceticism, Questions to Thalassium, and The Chapters on Love. He was influenced first by Origen (whom he later refuted), then by pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite. The idea of the perfect human nature in Christ forms the core of the theology of Maximos; it allows the deification of man—the ultimate goal of man’s creation. Man as microcosm has a middle position between the extremes of creation; his task, interrupted by the Fall, is to overcome the trichotomy of mind, soul, and body, to ascend via the image of God to likeness with God. The human will plays a decisive role in man’s ascent to God by suppressing the vices of self-love, gluttony, fornication, etc. (Maximos developed the hierarchy of vices of Evagrios Pontikos), and by achieving the state of virtuousness and reintegration with Christ.

The anthropocentric theology of Maximos is reflected in his concept of the Church: it is not only the “type” and icon of God, but also of “the spiritual man,” man in his turn being “the mystical church” (PG 91:684A). Unlike pseudo-Dionysios, Maximos did not emphasize the hierarchical structure of the church, but its hypostatic unity: the church is a single house, “not divided into its constituent parts” (PG 91:683D). These concepts of the atomization of the human will and the unity of the cosmos made Maximos one of the most “Byzantine” philosophers; his works, nevertheless, were translated in the West (I. Boronkai, ActaAntHuni 24 [1976] 307–33).


MAXIMUS (Maξiμος), more fully Magnus Maximus, usurper (383–88); died Aquileia 28 Aug. 388. Of Spanish origin, he was perhaps related to Theodosios I. He rose in the army and com-
manded troops in Britain under Gratian. He was proclaimed Augustus by his troops probably in the spring of 383 (V. Grumel, REB 12 [1954] 18f). The assassination of Gratian followed soon after; as a result all of Gaul came under the control of Maximus. Theodosios I and the court of the young emperor Valentinian II at first acceded to the rule of Maximus. The new Augustus posed as a champion of Orthodoxy and had his praetorian prefect conduct a hearing that led to the condemnation of the heretic Priscillian and his followers, a process that was attacked by Ambrose of Milan and Martin of Tours as inappropriate for the state. Tempted by the weakness of Valentinian II, he invaded Italy in 387, forcing the court to flee to Thessalonike. Theodosios I finally marched westward and defeated Maximus in two battles. The rebel was apprehended and killed at Aquileia.


–T.E.G.

MAYYĀFĀRIQĪN. See Martyropolis.

MAZARIS (Maξaπος), author of a satirical dialogue entitled Journey to Hades, addressed probably to Theodore II Palaiologos; fl. ca.1414/15. Mazaris was associated with the court of Manuel II before 1399 but then fell into disgrace. In imitation of Lucian, the satire describes conversations in Hades with recently deceased imperial courtiers. The first part of the work, composed between Jan. and July 1414, is primarily a dialogue between Mazaris and Manuel Holobolos, a former imperial secretary who had been dismissed. Mazaris heaps abuse not only on garrulous, adulatory bureaucrats and corrupt judges, but also on incompetent doctors and immoral monks and nuns. Part II of the satire, written in 1415 after Mazaris moved to the Peloponnese, attacks the various nationalities that comprised the Moreote population, including “greedy” Italians, “bloodthirsty” Slavs, “contentious” Jews, and “deceitful” Albanians. He also satirizes the rebellious local toparchs. Besides providing valuable prosopographical data, the satire contains information on Manuel’s reconstruction of the Hexamilion in 1415. S. Lampros (BZ 5 [1896] 63–73)
suggested that Mazaris might be identified with the monk Maximos Mazaris, who wrote grammatical canons, and/or with Manuel Mazaris, who composed a legend of St. Irene (PLP, nos. 16121–22).


-M.A.T.

MAZDAK, Persian heresiarch; born Madariya? or Nisa ca. 450, died 528/9 or, according to O. Klima (Charisteria orientalica [Prague 1956] 135–41), in 524. The movement that took his name originated in the preaching of Zaradust, whom Christensen (infra) identified as a certain Bundos who lived in late 3rd-C. Rome and then returned to Iran; Klima, however, placed Zaradust in the 5th C. Mazdakism attained its greatest political success through its influence on the Sasanian ruler Kavād and on some of his social legislation. Mazdak evidently became the head of a Mazdakite “church,” and took an active part in the dynastic politics between Kavād’s sons, Kāvūs and Chosroes. Simultaneously the radical social doctrines of the sect, which attacked the strict caste system and the established power of the Zoroastrian clergy, brought about violent social uprisings in which the peasantry violated the purity of the social classes and the property of the wealthy nobility. This led to brutal retribution; Mazdak and the Mazdakite leaders were slaughtered and the movement was dispersed. It went underground, however, and survived the destruction of the Sasanian Empire. Many Greek historians (Prokopios of Caesarea, Agathias, Theophylaktos Simokattes, Theophanes) wrote about this movement, which they described as Manichaeanism without mentioning the name of Mazdak.


-M.A.T.

MEASURES. Byz. units of length, surface, volume, weight, and time originated in late antiquity. Although through the 6th C. some measures were in widespread use (e.g., the litra, modios, and sextarius), there was no coherent system throughout the whole empire. Rather the systems that had existed historically in the various regions were employed. A coherent system of specifically Byz. measures developed gradually in the period after Justinian I, owing to the requirements of the central fiscal system. The authorities constantly emphasized that official measures be used properly, and standard measures were frequently set up in towns and villages for public observation. From the 12th C. Italian merchants were allowed to use their own measures in the Latin quarters of cities.

Three measures were of central importance. The basic measure of weight was the logarike litra of approximately 920 g, the primary unit of length was the pous of 31.23 cm, and the main measure of volume was the megarikon of 102.5 liters. For measuring the surface of fields, the Byz. used measures such as zeugaron (yoke) and modios (a unit of grain capacity), along with linear measures such as schoinion or orgyia. In theory, measures formed a strict system, but in practice their interrelations varied within a wide range.

-M.A.T.

MC’XET’A, capital of Georgia (4th C. B.C.—A.D. 5th C.), and an important Georgian religious center. Many of its churches commemorate St. Nino’s trials and miracles and her role in the conversion of King Mirian (265–342) to Christianity. A 4th-

C. (?) chapel commemorates Nino’s refuge in the governor’s garden. The Samt’avro (lit. “governor’s residence”) monastery, with an impressive 11th-C. domed cruciform katholikon, was built around this chapel. The Church of Džvari (“cross”) replaced the large cross Nino had erected on a mountain overlooking Mc’xet’a. It is a tetraconch like St. Hrips’imè at Væarşapat and dates sometime between 586 (or 587) and the late 7th C., depending on the identity of the donor, Stephen, lord of K’art’li (W. Djobadze, OrChr 44 [1960] 114–27).

The church of Sveti C’xoveli (lit. “light-giving pillar”) is a domed basilica (begun in 1010) that replaced at least three earlier churches; its name refers to a cedar pillar that miraculously glowed and floated into place in the first church at Mc’xet’a after originally proving impossible to move. Reliefs of bulls’ heads (5th-C.?) are incorporated in its 18th-C. gateway.

LIT. R. Gverditingali, Mechina (Tbilisi 1962).

-M.A.T.
Parallel to the official measures were units of only local validity whose origin often cannot be determined. In part, these were special measures, developed by the necessities of trade or craft, for example, special measures for the salt trade, different yards for the woolen, cotton, or silk industries. Often these local measures were introduced through contacts with foreign peoples, esp. Muslims and Italians. With the advance of the Ottomans, some Turkish measures were introduced, just as Byz. measures were adopted in the Ottoman Empire. (See also METROLOGY.)


MEAT (κρέας) constituted a substantial part of the Byz. diet; from the 7th C. onward it is probable that the proportion of bread decreased, whereas meat and dairy products acquired greater importance (A. Kazhdan, ByzF 8 [1982] 117–20). The most popular kind of meat was lamb (see SHEEP); Symeon Seth recommended particularly the meat of year-old animals. Goat meat is mentioned, among others, by Liutprand of Cremona (J. Koder, T. Weber, Liutprand von Cremona in Konstantinopel [Vienna 1980] 90f), who did not enjoy the "fat goat" served at the imperial court in Constantinople. Pork was considered a coarse food, whereas the chine of beef appears in Niketas Choniates as a staple of imperial banquets and of the Crusaders. The Book of the Eparch, with its special chapters on butchers and vendors of swine, shows the extent of the meat trade in Constantinople. The meat of domestic animals (see LIVESTOCK) and domestic fowl was supplemented by fish from fishing and meat obtained through the hunting of wild animals—esp. venison (although it was not recommended during summertime) and the flesh of hare and wild boar.

Meat was roasted (sometimes over an open fire) or boiled. It might be served with various sauces, usually vinegar and honey or wine and honey. Lamb or mutton was sometimes cooked in a casserole with garlic, onion, and leeks. Pseudo-Kaisarios describes a special cooking method allegedly used by herders who would put meat into a glass vessel enclosed in dried dung and leave it in the sun (PG 38:928.39–45). To preserve meat for storage or transportation, it was dried, smoked, salted, or pickled. The Byz. also made lard and prepared sausages (neura) that were sold in the shops of grocers.

Ascetics avoided eating meat at any time; it was never consumed in monasteries by monks. Abstinence from meat was enjoined for laymen on days of fasting. Canon law forbade the consumption of blood and of animals killed by strangling.


MEDALLIONS, a term customarily applied to coins of the Roman Empire through the 6th C. that are exceptional either in their types, or in being of unusually fine workmanship, or in lacking some feature of normal coins (e.g., the S C for Senatus Consultum on bronze coins of the early empire), or through being multiples of more frequently used denominations. Those of the early empire are for the most part of bronze, but from the late 3rd C. onward medallions are normally of gold or silver. Either they are high denominations of current coins, so that some scholars prefer to term them multiples, or they perpetuate some obsolete denomination, such as the aureus struck 60 to the pound in contrast to the solidus struck 72 to the pound, presumably because the entitlement of some official to receive such a coin had been established when it was in normal use. Money medallions reached their heyday in the 4th C., with great variety in thematic content; in the 5th and 6th C. they became rarer and none later than the reign of Phokas is known. The field of the obverse was reserved for a depiction of the emperor, customarily a head or half-bust in profile. A range of reverse types is found: the emperor standing alone, between captives, on horseback, or in a quadriga; the seated figures of Roma and Constantinopolis; or a seated figure of either of these alone.

It was formerly believed that all medallions were made specifically for presentation to individuals or for distribution on such occasions as accession, anniversaries, and victory or consular celebrations. Some were certainly made for such purposes and have often survived elaborately mounted in pectorals or other pieces of jewelry. Others, however, are found mixed in hoards with ordinary coins and clearly were part of the regular currency.
MEDICAL SERVICES, MILITARY. Soldiers wounded in battle were rescued by men specially appointed for this task. The Strategikon of Maurice (Strat. Maurik. 2.9, pp. 126–28) instructs that eight to ten unarmed men be reserved to follow each unit to help unhorsed or wounded soldiers. Called deopotatoi, these men attached an extra stirrup to their saddles to enable both rider and injured man to mount the horse and ride to safety. They also carried flasks of water to relieve the thirst of the wounded men. The deopotatoi received one nomisma for each man saved. The 10th-C. De re militari assigns the task of transporting wounded men back to Byz. territory to one of the army’s service units (ed. Dennis, Military Treatises 324.20–21), but exactly where the wounded were taken and what care they received is not recorded.

Physicians (therapeuta or iatroi) are listed among the nonmilitary personnel accompanying the army in 6th- and 10th-C. Strategika. Sections of the medical treatises of Oribasios and Paul of Aegina cover military medicine, esp. fractures and extractions; Prokopios (Wars 6.2.25–32) describes the skillful extraction of an arrowhead from a wounded man by military surgeons.


—E.M.

MEDICINE. Byz. physicians inherited the tradition of Greco-Roman medicine; Hippocrates and Galen were always considered basic sources of medical knowledge in Byz. Scholars such as Oribasios, Aetios of Amida, Alexander of Tralles, and Paul of Aegina created medical encyclopedias that both demonstrated their knowledge of classics and prepared for an anthropological approach to the tradition. When in the 9th C. a new interest in ancient science became evident (Wilson, Scholars 85–88), medical MSS were not among the most popular; Lemerle (Humanism 341) places the revival of the genre of medical treatises in the 10th C. Even though post-7th-C. medical authors—Meletios the Monk, Leo the Physician, Symeon Seth, Theophanes Chrysobalantes, Nicholas Myrepos, and John Aktouarios, to name only a few—are unavailable in reliably edited texts, and thus it is premature to pronounce final judgment, clearly Byz. doctors did not simply parrot and transmit their written sources verbatim, but used them carefully, rearranging, truncating, and supplementing them with contemporary experience. Close examination of Aetios of Amida’s use of Galen’s notions of drug theory, for example, shows how Aetios chose precisely those passages that would explicate the Galenic idea of “drugs by degrees,” a classification system of pharmaceuticals that would be standard in medicine until the 18th C. Greco-Roman was a predominant, albeit not the only, tradition of Byz. medicine; among others, Seth shows traces of Arabic experience, and Myrepos’s treatise contains some recipes from Salerno and others of Eastern origin.

Practical medicine was on a high level according to medieval standards: Hospitals existed not only in Constantinople, but also in the provinces. Thanks to Byz. Pharmacology, many diseases received sophisticated treatments, and the medical tracts of Alexander of Tralles and Paul of Aegina show the variety of drugs prescribed for ailments of the chest, heart, digestive system, and other organs. Byz. Surgery also existed on a high plane; listings of Surgical Instruments suggest specialized expertise, perhaps derived from the known instances of dissections and autopsies performed by Byz. physicians and surgeons (L.J. Bliquez, A. Kazhdan, BHM 58 [1984] 554–57; R. Browning, BHM 59 [1985] 518–20). Byz. medicine knew professional specialization, including as separate branches obstetrics and gynecology, ophthalmology, dermatology, and dentistry. Practicing physicians worked sometimes in the mold of ancient traditions, sometimes in adaptations of those traditions to newer theories, esp. in innovative aspects of medical diagnosis such as uroscopy (John Aktouarios) and pulse lore.

Nonprofessional medicine existed alongside medical theory and practicing professionals. Oribasios was not the first to prepare a simplified summary of medicine for a friend, but his Synopsis for Eunapius suggests the range of drugs and elementary remedies available to the nonphysician in the 4th C. Various nonmedical authors
throughout the long history of Byz. also show comprehension and an interest in the best medicine of their day: for example, *Prokopios* describes the plague in the reign of Justinian I (542); *Photios* summarizes several medical authors, including Dioscorides, certain works of Galen, Aetios of Amida, and Ctesias; Psellos in his *Chronography* recounts the illness and death of Romanos III, with details based on personal knowledge of technical medical theory as well as a close acquaintance with the approaches of practicing physicians in the 11th C. Similarly the account by Anna Komnene of the death of Alexios I shows a long-standing awareness of therapeutics and medical theory; the writings of John Tzetzes contain much classical medicine and medical theory embedded as analogy, allegory, and allusion; many of the jokes in the collection called the *Philogelos* are medically informed; and many ecclesiastical writers could be added to this list of secular authors who indicate that interest in medicine permeated all levels of Byz. society.

Magical means were also valued, not only at the quasi-Christian *healing* shrines, but also in the writings of the finest physicians, exemplified by the occasional prescriptions of amulets by Alexander of Tralles (6th C.) for certain illnesses. Astrological medicine enjoyed many centuries of respect, as documented in the texts collected as the *Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum*. Many of these works are paralleled by those of pure medical magic in the *Papyri graecae magicae*, generally in Greek, Coptic, and demotic from late Roman and Byz. Egypt.

The rich panoply of Byz. medicine has its counterpart, very poorly known, among the Sasanians before their collapse in the Arab conquest of Mesopotamia in the 7th C.; although classical Arabic medicine derived many of its precepts from the Byz., the links through Syriac remain only murky. The kuriakon, much as the later borrowings in medieval Armenian medicine from Byz. practice and sources reside in partially edited Armenian MSS. In western European medieval medicine, Byz. influence came in the form of redactions and truncated translations of specific topics, esp. uroscopy, the theory of pulses, and distilled Greco-Roman medical concepts ultimately derived from the Hippocrates and Galen.

---

**MEDIKION MONASTERY**, a center of resistance to Iconoclasm in Asia Minor. Medikion (Μηδίκιον) was founded in the 780s by the monk Nikephoros, .5 km south of the Bithynian village of Trigleia (Turk. Tirilye) and 2 km from the Sea of Marmara. Nikephoros restored a ruined Church of St. Michael at the site; when he signed the acts of the Second Council of Nicaea in 787, however, he referred to the monastery as “St. Sergios of Medikon.” The monastery reached its peak under the saintly Nikephoros (died 813) and his successor, St. Niketas (died 824), an iconodule confessor. Both hegoumenoi were buried in the narthex of the Church of St. Michael. In the 11th C., when Medikon was granted to Michael Psellos as a *charistikon*, it was also called the monastery of the Holy Fathers (Hagion Pateron).

Although Medikon disappears from literary sources after the 11th C., it continued to function as a monastery until the modern period. The basilican church, the north aisle of which was separated from the nave by square piers, was razed in the mid-20th C.


---

**MEDIMNOS.** See Modios.

---

**MEDITATIO DE NUDIS PACTIS** (Μελέτη περὶ υψιων συμφώνων), lit. “Essay on Bare Contracts,” i.e., on informal agreements), a legal treatise composed in the mid-11th C. Its anonymous author, probably the Basilika scholastik Nikaeus (H. J. Scheltema in *Études offertes à Jean Macqueron* [Aix-en-Provence 1970]). 595–97), argues against an adversary, probably John (VIII) Xiphilinos, for the higher merit of the writings from Justinianic times (esp. the *Digest* and the scholia of the jurist Stephen that elucidate it), over the Basilika. The treatise, which was presumably occasioned by a real lawsuit between a monastery and a *protopatharios* over the binding force of an informal
agreement (nudum pactum, see Pacta), is of great importance for the question of the exclusive validity of the Basilika in the 11th C.


MEDITERRANEAN SEA. As late as the 4th C., the Mediterranean continued to be an "inner sea," totally surrounded by the territory of the Roman Empire. It was the only sea for Greeks, the eso thalassa (Aristotle) as opposed to the eso thalassa or ocean; for the Latins the mare internum, intestimum, or nastrum. The term mare mediterraneum did not appear until the 3rd C.; Isidore of Seville used it in the early 7th C. (O. Maull, RE 15 [1932] 2222). The Byz. did not have a general term for the Mediterranean, although they used special names for its parts—the Aegean, Ionian, Tyrrhenian, (or Tyrrhenian), Sikelikon, Kretikon pelagos.

Roman control of the region of the Mediterranean began to disintegrate in the 5th C. when the Germanic tribes—Visigoths, Vandals, and Ostrogoths—occupied the western parts of the Ostrogoths. Politically independent, the Germanic kingdoms retained, to a certain extent, the feeling of belonging to a cultural entity through Latin language, court ceremonial, some features of municipal organization, visual art, and coinage. The renovatio imperii Romani by Justinian I was based on the continuing perception of Mediterranean unity. As late as 663 Constans II attempted to transfer his capital from Constantinople to Syracuse, in the middle of the Mediterranean. His murder, accompanied by the mutiny of Mezizios, manifested the end of Byz. sovereignty over the Mediterranean. Two factors enforced the disruption of the former unity: the Arab conquests and increasing Arab domination of the sea, and the proclamation of a second—Frankish—empire in the West (see Franks). Until the end of the Byz. Empire the Mediterranean was an area of rivalry between various political forces, including the Normans, Italian republics, the papacy, Spain, and even distant England.


MEGALOSCHEMA. See Schema.

MEGARIKON (μεγαρίκον), also magarikon (MM 6:244.1) and madarikon (Xerop. no.9A.16), the name of a large clay vessel, originally probably made in Megara, in charters usually juxtaposed with pithoi. Megarika of honey (Laur. 1, no.54.14) and of wine (Laur. 1, no.34.34) were used as fiscal units; in an act of 1196 (Laur. 1, no.67.81–82) the customs toll for the transportation of wine (given in megarika, pithoi, or barrels) to Constantinople is established as every tenth vessel. Metrological treatises define a megarikon as 6 thalassioi modii (= 102.503 liters), but emphasize that in trade megarika of different volumes were used as well. A megarikon may be either a liquid measure or a dry measure of grain. The imperial kalathion, mentioned in a charter of 1339, may perhaps be identified with a megarikon of grain.


MEGAS DOMESTIKOS (μέγας δομέστικος), supreme military commander (after the emperor). The origin of the office is not clear; apparently the megas domestikos replaced the domestikos ton scholon, but both offices existed side by side for a time. The date of this replacement is also unclear. The title of a certain Galen, primkerios of the megas domestikos (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.945), on a seal of the 9th–10th C. is suspicious. Guillaume doubts that domestikos major (the term applied by Liutprand of Cremona to Nikephoros II Phokas) was an official title, but in the Skrifter incertus (339.20–21) the magistros, megas domestikos, "and other patrikioi" form the closest entourage of the emperor. By the mid-11th C. the titulature was well established, and John, the brother of Isaac I Komnenos, bore this title.

Henceforth the office of megas domestikos, megas domestikos of the scholai, and megas domestikos of the army are regularly mentioned; Laurent (Corpus 2, 2:499f), however, denies that it was a permanent rank before 1204. In the 11th–12th C. the megas
domestikos could command the separate armies of West or East, but it seems that in the 13th C. this distinction was abolished. The place of the megas domestikos in the hierarchy is also unclear: in the 13th C. it seems to have been below the protovestiaro and megas stratopedarche, but in the 14th-C. pseudo-Kodinos it is one of the highest ranks, following directly after Caesar. The megas domestikos also had an aulic function, waiting on the emperor at banquets. The office-title existed until the end of the empire.


MEHMET I (Μοχουμέτ; Μοχεμέτ in Doukas), Ottoman sultan (from 1413; born 1389?, died Edirne 21 May 1421. A younger son of Bayezid I, he was sultan of Ottoman Rumeli and Anatolia (1413–21). After the battle of Ankara on 28 July 1402, Mehmed established himself at Amaseia. He officially attained his father’s throne only in 1413, after a series of struggles with his brothers Isa (died 1409), Süleyman Çelebi (died 1411), and Musa (died July 1413). His sovereignty was again challenged in 1416, when Mustafa (allegedly his brother) and Cüneyd (beylerbeyi of Rumeli) led an abortive rising in Rumeli.

Mehmed’s relations with Constantinople from early 1411 to his death were usually peaceful. Manuel II Palaiologos aided him in his war against Musa, and in 1413 a pact was concluded in which Mehmed evidently reaffirmed the terms of the 1403 treaty. Thereafter serious tensions arose only in 1415, when Manuel rebuilt the Hexamilion Wall in the Morea, and again in 1416, when Manuel gave asylum to the refugees Mustafa and Cüneyd.

Mehmed’s image in contemporary Byz. sources is far from negative. The historian Doukas, for example, lauds his friendship with the Palaiologoi as genuine and states that he was sympathetic to Christians.


MEHMET II (Μουχαμέτ and similar forms), seventh Ottoman ruler (1451–81) and conqueror of Constantinople, whence his epithet Fatih (conquerer); born Edirne 30 Mar. 1432, died near Gebze 3 May 1481. He was the third son of Murad II and his slave Hatun bint Abdullah. Mehmed doubtless ascended the throne with dreams of taking Constantinople, something his kinsmen Bayezid I, Musa, and Murad II had attempted but failed. Still, he preserved amicable relations with Constantine XI into autumn 1451. Then, however, Constantine hardened Mehmed’s resolve by threatening to support the claims of Orhan, a grandson of Süleyman Çelebi, and the emperor’s ward in Constantinople. Soon thereafter Mehmed systematically prepared for his assault on Constantinople, beginning with the construction of Rumeli Hisar (Apr.–Aug. 1452).
Mehmed began the siege on 6 Apr. 1453 and directed it with energy and tactical ingenuity (see Constanti- nople, Siege and Fall of). After Constantinople fell to the besiegers on 29 May 1453, Mehmed allowed his troops a day of plundering and then assumed full control. He immediately began "the greater war"—transforming the ravaged city into a vital new capital, a project that engaged him the rest of his life.

As sultan in Istanbul, Mehmed established there a court and pattern of society fully consonant with developed Turco-Islamic tradition. The conquered were fitted into that framework. Greeks remained prominent in Mehmed's Istanbul; indeed, many of the communities he forcibly transferred to Istanbul throughout the period 1453—79 were Greek. Largely to assure their stability and to cultivate their loyalty, he secured the election of the staunchly anti-Unionist Gennadios II Scholarios as patriarch (Jan. 1454). Mehmed evidently had an eclectic curiosity about the culture of the Greeks. He discussed Christian precepts with Gennadios and was interested in the history and monuments of Constantinople. Greek MSS, including Homer's Iliad, were copied in his scriptorium (J. Raby, DOP 37 [1983] 15—34).

Precisely how Mehmed's installation in Istanbul changed his self-perception as a ruler is speculative. The conquest certainly heightened his sense of himself as a great military hero, akin to Achilles and Alexander the Great, whom he admired. It is implausible, though, that he regarded himself as heir or successor to the Christian Roman emperors. More likely he viewed his victory in terms of the prophesied triumph of Muslims over Christians in Kostantiniye (Ar. name of Constantinople)—his rule therefore supplanting rather than continuing the previous tradition. Few conquered Greeks, reciprocally, conceived of Mehmed as a new "emperor of the Romans" in the spirit of Ammianus, who lauded the sultan as such in his 1466 letter. Contemporary Greeks, whether pro- or anti-Unionist, typically regarded Mehmed's conquest of Constantinople as a catastrophe and like Doukas viewed the sultan as a consummate tyrannos at best, and Antichrist at worst. His conquest of the despotate of Mistra in 1460 and of Trebizond in 1461 sealed that perception. On the contrary, Kritoboulos highly praised Mehmed for his personal qualities (justice, generosity, courage) as well as for his patronage of trade, craftsmanship, and building activity (Z. Udal'cova, VizVrem 12 [1957] 172—83).


—S.W.R.

MELANIA THE YOUNGER, saint; born Rome 383, died Jerusalem 31 Dec. 459; feastday 31 Dec. Born to a rich and noble family, Melania (Μελάνη) was married at age 13 or 14 to Valerius Pinianus, son of a former Roman prefect. Perhaps influenced by her grandmother, Melania the Elder (see F.X. Murphy, Traditio 5 [1947] 59—77), Melania pursued ascetic ideals, and, after the early death of two children, the couple decided to live in chastity. The decision of Melania and Pinianus in 404 to sell their enormous properties (located in Italy, Spain, Sicily, Africa, etc.) met resistance from both the senate and the slaves of their Roman proasteia (Vie, pars. 10—11), but Melania finally received permission to liquidate her estates, with the help of Serena, wife of Emp. Honorius. After 406 Melania and Pinianus left for Sicily, Africa, and then Jerusalem, where Melania built a cell for herself on the Mount of Olives as well as a nunnery and monastery. Melania had personal contacts with Egyptian monks and with great ecclesiastical leaders such as Augustine, Palladius of Helenopolis, Cyril of Alexandria, and Paulinus of Nola. In 436 she visited Constantinople and urged her uncle Volusianus to convert to Christianity.

Her Life was probably written by an ardent Monophysite, Gerontios (died 485), who supervised Melania's monasteries in Jerusalem after her death. It survives in Greek and Latin versions, which probably derived from a common Greek prototype (A. d'Ales, AB 25 [1906] 448—50). It was reworked by Symeon Metaphrastes. The activity of Melania and her family is attested by many contemporary observers, primarily by Palladius of Helenopolis. John Rufus also mentions her in his Syriac Life of Peter the Iberian. Melania is usually portrayed in art as a nun.
MELANODION. See MYLASA AND MELANODION.

MELBOURNE GOSPELS. See THEOPHANES.

MELCHITES (Μελκίας, from Syriac malkāyā, "imperial"), or Melkites, members of the Chalcedonian church in Syria and Egypt, areas generally dominated by MONOPHYSITES. Between the murder of Proterios, the first Chalcedonian bishop of Alexandria, in 457 and ca.537/8 there was only an irregular Chalcedonian presence in the Syrian and Egyptian ecclesiastical hierarchy, but from the time of Justinian I until the Arab conquest Chalcedonian patriarchs were normally resident in Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Usually supported by imperial troops, the Melchite clergy ministered to a largely urban and Greek-speaking populace, while the countryside was mostly Monophysite. After the Arab conquests of the 7th C. the Melchites lost most of their official support; frequent vacancies in the hierarchy occurred and bishops often lived in Constantinople. The Melchite communities were, however, given a special position under Islam and were regarded as Byz. enclaves within the caliphate. During the Crusades and the subsequent Latin domination of Syria and Palestine many bishops fled their sees. Among Melchite authors were George of Martropolis and Constantine and Leo of Harran; on the whole, however, Melchites contributed little to SYRIAC LITERATURE, which was dominated by Monophysites (A. van Roey, Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 3 [1972] 125-53).


MELEAGER, in Greek mythology a mighty hero. Malalas (Malal. 165f.), referring to a play of "the wise Euripides," relates that Meleager killed a terrifying boar that ravaged the land of Calydon and gave its skin to Atalanta, whom he loved. Meleager's father Oeneus became enraged and threw into the fire a twig of olive upon which—magically—Meleager's life depended. Tzetzes (Hist. 7:61-70), who quotes Homer and a certain Sotirchios, evidently knew only the first part of the myth—the killing of the Calydonian boar.

An image of Meleager and Atalanta at rest after a hunt on a silver plate of Herakleian date in Leningrad (Iskusstvo Vizantii 1, no.136) lacks any reference to the boar. Atalanta is shown hunting boars with Orion in a miniature in Venice, Marc. gr. 479 (Weitzmann, Gr. Myth. 115f, fig.191).

MELENKIS. See MELNIK.
MELETIAN SCHISM. There were two Meletian schisms in the 4th C., one in Egypt, the other in Syria.

MELETIAN SCHISM IN EGYPT. This schism, sometimes called the First Meletian Schism, was incited by Meletios of Lykopolis in Upper Egypt (died after 325). During the persecution of 306 he condemned Christians who hid from the authorities; in defiance of the state, he demanded the resumption of the liturgy. He founded a "church of martyrs" that excluded the lapsi (the "fallen," i.e., those who yielded in the face of persecution), was thrown into jail, and released only after the toleration edict of 311. His moral authority enabled Meletios to attract many partisans—by 325, 28 bishops supported him and he was able to challenge the position of the patriarch of Alexandria. The struggle against Arianism prompted Alexander of Alexandria to a policy of reconciliation with the Meletians, but Athanasius of Alexandria took a strong stand against the dissidents. The argument was political rather than ideological, and soon the Arians began to side with the Meletians; thus Pistas, a friend of Arians, was consecrated a Meletian bishop; the new allies accused Athanasius of beating Meletian bishops, murdering one of them, and using a Meletian liturgical vessel for secular purposes. The significance of the Meletians decreased in the 5th C., but some trace of them is still distinguishable in the 8th C.


MELETIAN SCHISM IN SYRIA. The second Meletian Schism originated in Antioch, where in the mid-4th C. the community was split between the Arians and the supporters of the Council of Nicaea; the latter were, in turn, divided into two parties. Both orthodox groups united around Meletios, who was elected bishop of Antioch in 360, but was soon deposed and exiled by Constantius II. In his absence the Nicaeans (called "Eustathians" after Eustathios of Antioch), with the strong support of Athanasius of Alexandria, elected in his stead the priest Paulinos; when Julian allowed Meletios to return to Antioch, three bishops claimed the see.

A theological difference emerged between the Meletians and Eustathians: according to the Eustathians ousia and hypostasis were identical and God possessed one ousia/hypostasis and three prosopa, which the Meletians regarded as Sabellianism (see Monarchianism); in their view God was one ousia in three hypostases, a position that the Eustathians equated with Arianism. The Cappadocian Fathers sided with Meletios, and his two banishments by Valens only contributed to his authority. Rome and Alexandria supported Paulinos and his successor Evagrios. Meletios presided over the First Council of Constantinople in 381, which approved his formula. Reconciliation with the Eustathians took place in 413.


MELETIOS THE MONK, physician and medical writer; his dates are unknown, but he is usually dated to the 9th C. He lived no earlier than the 7th C., and perhaps as late as the early 13th C. (M. Morani, La tradizione manoscritta del De natura hominis di Nemesio [Milan 1981] 147–55). He was a monk at the monastery of the Holy Trinity in Tiberiopolis (in the Opsikian theme). On the Constitution of Man (Perti tes tou anthropou katastheus) is his treatise on human anatomy and physiology, composed almost entirely of excerpts from earlier authors such as Galen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Nemesios; his latest source is Maximos the Concestor. Much of his importance lies in his preservation of passages from the lost works of ancient medical writers such as the 2nd-C. Soranus of Ephesus (R. Renehan, DOP 38 [1984] 159–68). The treatise survives in a number of MSS and was highly regarded in the late Byz. period.


MELETIOS THE YOUNGER, also called Meletios of Myoupolis, saint; born in village of Moutalaske, Cappadocia, ca. 1035, died in monastery of Myoupolis, Boeotia, ca. 1105; feastday 1 Sept. At age 15 he left his village for Constantinople, where he took the monastic habit; he then moved
to Boeotia to live in the eukterion of St. George near Thebes. After long pilgrimages to Palestine, Rome, and perhaps Spain, he moved to Mt. Myopulis, on the border between Boeotia and Attica, and Patr. Nicholas III consecrated him priest. By ca. 1081 Melletios acquired the Symboulion monastery (Hosios Melletios) nearby and received from Alexios I an annual donation of 422 gold coins.

Melletios’s biography was recorded by Nicholas of Methone and Theodore Prodromos; both Lives are rich in political events and emphasize Melletios’s connections with members of the elite. The two authors do not always agree in their facts and chronology, and their approaches differ. Thus Nicholas stresses Melletios’s concern for his community: he protects the monastery from fire and drives rabbits from the monastery garden. Prodromos introduces more entertaining elements, for example, a more elaborate description of Melletios’s travels; he alone tells of a noble Theban lady who attempted to seduce Melletios; only Prodromos describes (and criticizes) the extreme mortification of the flesh by a certain Noah, son of a Constantinopolitan noble.


MELIAS (Μελιάς; Ar. Malih al-Armani, Arm. Melh-mec [Mleh the Great]), general; died 934. Melias was an Armenian prince who moved to Byz. during the reign of Leo VI, participated in the battle at Bougarophygon, and served thereafter in Asia Minor. He probably supported Andronikos Doukas in his rebellion, and after the failure of the insurrection sought refuge with the emir of Melitene. Circa 908, when Leo pardoned the participants in the aristocratic conspiracy, Eustathios Argyros was appointed strategos of Charsianon, and Constantine Doukas came back from the caliphate. Melias returned, too, with a group of Armenian chieftains, became tourmarches of “Euphratia,” and eventually founded the kleisoura of Lykandos, which served as a base for operations against the Arabs. In 912 he successfully repelled an Arab attack on the “fortress of Malih al-Armani,” in 915 invaded Arab territory as far as Maras, and ca. 930 temporarily occupied Meli-}

tene. The descendants of Melias wielded power in the same area until the late 10th C.; the domestikos ton scholon Melias participated in the campaigns of John (I) Tzimiskes and was killed at the walls of Amida in 973.

In the Cappadocian church known as the Pigeon House at Cavusin, an inscription mentions Melias (a contemporary of Nikephoros II Phokas), apparently the same person. He is shown as a nimbed, equestrian figure with a long spear. It is uncertain whether Melias here is to be understood as a patron of the church or merely as an aide to Nikephoros Phokas and his family, who are depicted in the north apse. It has been suggested that the figure of Melias “the Great” was reflected in the personage of the apelates Melementzes mentioned in the epic of Digenes Akritas.


-A.K., A.C.

MELINGOI (Μηλιγγοί), also Milingoi, one of two groups of Sklaenoi in the Peloponnese. Both their origin and the etymology of their name are obscure (D. Georgacas, BZ 43 [1950] 301–27). The Milingoi lived on the western slope of Mt. Taygetos, near the Ezerital. They are first mentioned by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp. 50) as paying 60 nomismata in tribute; after they rebelled, in the reign of Romanos I, their payment was increased to 600. The author of the vita of Nikho “Metaneiteit” (ed. Sullivan, ch.62.4–5) identifies them as the ancient Myrmidones (whom the Byz. often connected with the Scythians). The Chronicle of the Morea relates that William II Villehardouin bestowed on the “great droungos of the Milingoi,” as a proud mountain people, the right to exkoussela from any service except military assistance (A. Vasiliev, VizVrem 5 [1898] 434f). Inscriptions of the 14th C. in this area mention the Milingoi: an inscription of 1331/2 from Oitylon (Vitlyo) in Lakonia speaks of the founding of the Church of St. George by Constantine Spani and Larinkas Slabouri who were Milingoi; Constantine Spanes (evidently the same person) founded another church in 1337/8 according to an inscription at Kampinari located nearby—he was the tzavosios of the droungos of the
Melingoi. Thus the Melingoi preserved an independent enclave although they adopted the Greek language, espoused Christianity, and fulfilled some services to the emperor as well as, from the 13th C. onward, to Frankish lords.


MELISENDE, PSALTER OF. See Crusader Art and Architecture.

MELISMOS. See Fraction.

MELISSA (Μέλισσα, lit. "Bee"), a ghost title of a sacro-profane florilegium compiled probably in the 10th or 11th C. in two books and 176 logos (chapters). The author drew upon an interpolated copy of the 10th-C. florilegium of pseudo-Maximos the Confessor and a version of the SACRA PARALELLE. For secular sententiae he used a gnomologium of Democritus-Isocrates-Epictetus and gnomai of Theognis; the source of the last five chapters is unknown. In each chapter the quotations are presented in hierarchical order: Old Testament, New Testament, church fathers, secular authors. The first book focuses on the themes of virtue and vice and of pious behavior (attitudes toward almsgiving, humor, etc.); the second deals with political roles (emperors, bishops, judges) and social structures (lords and slaves, family, etc.). Traditionally, Melissa is considered to be the work of a certain ascetic, Antony, allegedly called Melissa (Beck, Kirche 643); Richard (infra) demonstrated that the first editor (C. Gesner in 1546) invented both the name and title, the Bee being a common designation of anonymous florilegia of proverbial sayings. In the surviving MSS, all incomplete, the work is anonymous or attributed to John of Damascus. The Melissa was translated into Slavonic with the title of Pčela.


MELISSENOS (Μελισσηνός, fem. Μελισσηνή), a noble family for which two questionable genealogies were produced in the 16th and 17th C. Makarios Melissenos in his chronicle traced the family from Michael Melissenos, patrikios and relative of Emp. Michael I Rangabe (Sphr. 270.12–20); a treatise probably written by the metropolitans Nikephoros Melissenos describes in detail all the descendants of Michael's son, the magistros Leo (S. Lamprós, NE 1 [1904] 191–202). According to more dependable sources, the first known Melissenos was the patrikios Michael, governor of Anatolikon under Constantine V. His son, Theodore Kassiteras Melissenos, became patriarch of Constantinople as Theodotos I. From the 9th through 11th C. the Melissenoi were primarily military commanders and governors of themes (Koloneia, Anatolikon, Philippopolis, Antioch); Leo (I. Jordanov, BBUig 8 [1986] 183–87) and Theognostos participated in the rebellion of Bardas Phokas. The family remained in power in the mid-11th C.: Theognostes Melisinos [sic] served as katepano of Mesopotamia (D. Theodoridis, BZ 78 [1985] 363f), and Maria Melissene held the title of zoste patrikia (Seibt, Bleisiegel 260–62). Nikephoros Melissenos, who married Eudokia Komnene, belonged to the family through the maternal line. In 1080 he rebelled against Nikephoros III but submitted to Alexios I Komnenos, who gave him the title of caesar; he had possessed estates around Dorylaion, but later Alexios allowed him to settle in Thessalonike; he was called despotes both by Theophylaktos, the archbishop of Ohrid, and on a seal. The 12th-C. Melissenoi served in the civil administration. According to later sources, Andrew Melissenos moved during Alexios I's reign to Crete, where he founded a local branch of the family. The 13th-C. Melissenoi were known as landowners in the Smyrna region (Ahrweiler, "Smyrne" 172). Nothing is said of their role in cultural life. (See also MELISSENOS, MAKARIS.)


MELISSENOS, MAKARIS, metropolitan of Monemvasia; died Naples 1585. A rich landowner in the Morea, Makarios Melissourgos was involved in an anti-Ottoman plot after the battle of Lepanto (1571) and was forced to flee to Naples to the Spanish court of Philip II. There Makarios changed his name to Melissenos and produced a series of forged documents, such as a chrysobull
MELITENIOTES, THEODORE, patriarchal official and writer; died 8 Mar. 1393. By 1360 Meliteniotes (Μελιτηνιώτης) had held the positions of deacon, didaskalos ton didaskalon, and megas sakellarios; from 1368 to 1393 he was also archdeacon of the palatine clergy. Meliteniotes was Palamite and anti-Latin; in 1368 he signed the Tomas condemning Prochoros Kydones. He corresponded with Makarios Chryssekephalos (R. Walther, JÖB 23 [1974] 223–27), Joseph Bryennios, and Demetrios Kydones.

Meliteniotes was a prolific writer with wide interests. He compiled a manual of astronomy based on Ptolemy, Theon, and Persian sources, titled the Three Books on Astronomy or Tribiblos, of which only the preface has been published (PG 149:987–1001). He also wrote a gargantuan and derivative commentary on the harmony of the Gospels (Diatessaron) in nine volumes, of which three are preserved (C. Astruc, TM 4 [1970] 411–29). It has been calculated that the entire work would have run to 2,500 folios. F. Dölger hypothesized (APhOS 2 [1933–34] 315–30) that Theodore Meliteniotes was also the author of a lengthy allegorical poem, On Temperance, by a certain Meliteniotes. The poem, in 3,062 15-syllable verses, contains echoes of Byz. romances such as Digenes Akritas (V. Tifitxoglu, BZ 67 [1974] 1–63) and Libistros and Rhodamine.


MELKITES. See Melchites.

MELNIK (Μελνικός, Μελένικος, mod. village of Melnik in southwestern Bulgaria), a fortress in the eastern valley of the Strymon River in Macedonia. The name is of Slavic derivation, although some S. Kyriakides (Makedonika 3 [1953–55] 404–7) has attempted to connect it with an (unknown) eponym, Melenikos. Melnik is first mentioned by an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 351.83–87), who states that in 1014 it was a Bulgarian phourion in Zagoria, built upon a rock and well fortified.

Melnik acquired particular significance after the Crusade of 1204. Kaloyan captured it and resettled Greek inhabitants of Philippopolis in Melnik; soon afterward, probably in 1207, Alexios Slavos, governor of Melnik, proclaimed the town independent of Bulgarian rule; Henry of Hainault conferred upon him the title of despotes. Alexios supported first the Latins in their war against Bulgaria; later he switched his allegiance to THEODORE KOMNENOS DOUKAS of Thessalonike. In the second quarter of the 13th C. Melnik’s position became difficult because of conflicts between Bulgaria, Epiros, and the Latin Empire. Alexios disappears from the sources after 1229, and the town was evidently recovered by the Bulgarians.

In 1246 John III Vatatzes took the fortress and appointed the future emperor Michael (VIII) Palaiologos as its governor. A revolt in Melnik, led by a Bulgarian named Dragota, was quelled by Theodore II Laskaris in 1255—with the supernatural help of the two Sts. Theodore, according to a legend preserved by Theodore Pediasimos (F. Dölger, IzvBulgArchInst 16 [1950] 275–79). Little is known of the later history of Melnik. In the mid-14th C. it belonged to the Serbs and was a metropolis.

Some medieval buildings survive in Melnik, including a private aristocratic house (S. Georgieva, D. Serafinova, Palaeobulgaria 3.2 [1979] 37–54) and the Church of St. Nicholas (L. Mavrodinova, Cúrkvata sveti Nikola pri Melnik [Sofia 1975]) in which a wall painting of the 13th C. and a Greek inscription of the sebastos Vladimir, brother of the sebastos Frankos, were preserved. These frescoes are now in the Archaeological Museum in Sofia. Two coins found in the church have been attributed to Manuel I. Two other churches in Melnik have dated fresco programs of the late 15th C.


MELODIA (Μελοδία), personification of Melody, usually shown as a companion of David the musician. In aristocratic Psalter illustration she appears in the guise of a Muse seated on a rock beside the Psalmist and appearing to inspire him. The same figure in the 11th-C. Psalter, Venice, gr. 565, is inscribed he synesis (“intelligence”).

Lit. Cutler, Aristocratic Psalters, nos. 9, 27, 32, 37, 39, 44, 45. —A.C.

MELOTE. See John the Baptist.

MEMNON (Μέμνων), bishop of Ephesus (ca.428–40), dominant figure at the Council of Ephesus in 431 as ally of Cyril of Alexandria and opponent of Nestorios. He closed the churches of Ephesus to the supporters of Nestorios and helped to organize massive demonstrations in favor of Alexandrian theology. Although temporarily deposed and arrested by imperial troops, Memnon retained his see after the reconciliation between Cyril and John of Antioch in Apr. 433 (see NESTORIANISM). A determined supporter of the rights of his church against the encroachments of Constantinople, he maintained his own position against potential rivals partly through terror.


MEMORY as an ability to enrich one’s knowledge was underpinned by an educational system oriented toward memorizing the Psalms and other biblical texts; the learning of liturgical responses
and prayers also trained the memory. Antiquity highly valued memory, and accordingly Ammianus Marcellinus (Amm. Marc. 16.5.8) praised Julian for his enormous "jar of memory." The Byz. tendency toward imitation (mimeisis) and topos favored the use of memory, and literati often boasted of their incredible powers of recall: Psellos bragged that he had memorized the whole of Homer, and Tzetzes stated that after having sold his library he was still able to quote its books from memory. Even the works of contemporary writers were memorized: Michael Italikos informed Prodromos that he had met a priest who knew by heart all the prose writings and iambics of Prodromos (R. Browning, BBulg 1 [1962] 282). Inexact quotations of the Bible and classics probably can be explained by the fact that they were cited from memory.

- A.K.

MENAION (μηνική, from μήν, "month"), a set of 12 liturgical books, one for each month, containing the variable hymns and other texts (lectiones, synaxarion notices, kanones) proper to vespers and orthis of each feast of the fixed cycle, that is, those feasts that fall on a fixed date in the church calendar. Although the cycle of feasts itself had been established since the 10th C., and earlier rudimentary "proppers" had been contained in the tropologion—of which several 11th-C. MSS are extant (A. Wade, OrChrP 50 [1984] 451–56)—and in collections of stichera and kanones, the first systematic menaia with hymnography for each day of the year appear only in MSS of the 11th–12th C.

When a movable feast lands on a day with a fixed feast, the menaion "propers" have to compete with those of the triodion, the pentekostarion, and the oktoechos (comparable hymn books for the mobile cycle). Their relative precedence in such cases is regulated by the liturgical typikon.


MENANDER PROTECTOR historian; born Constantinople?, fl. late 6th C. Described by the sources as protiktor, he was probably a protector domesticus or palace guardman. Menander (Μένανδρος) himself says (fr.1) that he preferred the pleasures of Constantinople to the legal career planned and financed for him by his father but was rescued for historiography from involvement in the circus factions by the accession of Maurice and the rewards open to men of letters. He produced a History for the period 558–82, in formal continuation of Agathias. More than 70 fragments are preserved in the Excerpta de legationibus of Constantine VII (see EXcerpta) and the SOUDA; several unattributed notices in the latter may also belong to him. Though exhibiting some of the vices of the age and the genre, and perhaps unduly concerned with Eastern events at Western expense, his work has considerable virtue, esp. a willingness to research documentary sources and reproduce them without excessive Atticism: fragment 6.1 provides a detailed account of the negotiations for the peace treaty of 561 between Justinian I and Chosroes I. As a scholiast on Strabo noted (Paris, B.N. gr. 1393), Menander is good on Persian ethnography. Closer to home, he is balanced on Justin I, informatively favorable to Tiberios I, an encomiast of Maurice. His aggressive Christianity is manifest in an epigram on the Persian martyr Isbozetes (fr.13.3, also Greek Anth. 1.101); a possible new fragment describes importing relics of the True Cross to Constantinople.


MENANDER RHETOR, or Menandros of Laothoe, (on the Lykos River), fl. late 3rd C. According to the SOUDA, Menander's works included commentaries on HOMOGENES and Minucianus. Two treatises on EPIDEICTIC oratory survive in incomplete form under his name, though they were probably written by different authors. These give rules for speeches on formal occasions, dealing with topics not included in Hermogenes' text.
books but nevertheless very important in the schools of the SECOND SOPHISTIC and later. The first treatise, Division of Epideictic Speeches, discusses hymns to the gods and heroes, and enkomia of cities and states. The second and more influential, On Epideictic Speeches, contains the rules for the basilikos logos, epithalamation, prospho- netikos logos, monody, etc. Speeches of this sort were central to Byz. ceremonial Rhetoric.

 Despite a relatively limited MS tradition, Menander’s treatises, with their slightly cynical sense of what was appropriate, remained a fundamental rulebook and influenced Byz. authors of all periods. A private letter of the 6th/7th C. (P. Berol. 21849) lists Menander’s techne among some books required (H. Maehler, GRBS 15 [1974] 305–11). Both Chorikios and Prokopios of Gaza were indebted to Menander, and later rhetoricians, such as John of Sardis, John Doxopatres, and Joseph Rhakenides (in the Synopsis of Rhetoric) all draw on Menander’s treatises. Further evidence of Byz. attitudes toward Menander comes from the MSS: in the second treatise they present the chapters in varying sequences, suggesting divergent practice in different Byz. schools. Substantial textual variants in some MSS are best taken as proof that later teachers of rhetoric thought it worthwhile to try to improve Menander’s text.

–F.M.J., N.G.W.

MENAS (Μενάς), legendary saint; feastday 11 Nov. According to Romanos the Melode, Menas was an Egyptian who served in the army in Phrygia under Diocletian, proclaimed himself Christian in a theater, and was executed. Both Krumbacher and Delehaye (infra) assume that Romanos used an earlier, now lost passio. Several versions of Menas’s martyrdom survive, one ascribed to Athanasios of Alexandria; to embellish the story, one hagiographer used the homily of Basil the Great on Gordios. In these panegyrics Menas is variously said to have been martyred in Kotyaiion, Phrygia, in the second year of Diocletian (295) or in Alexandria under Maximinus. In a later legend the idea of Menas’s noble origin was introduced (A. Kazhdan, Byzantina 13.1 [1985] 667–71). The cult of Menas originated in Egypt, but spread beyond its boundaries. A collection of tales, some of which are ascribed to Timothy, patriarch of Alexandria, relates Menas’s posthumous miracles, including the story of a virtuous Jew (P. Devos, AB 78 [1960] 275–308). Another legend reports that Menas’s coffin swiftly floated to Constantinople; the relics were allegedly rediscovered at the time of Basil I. Menas was venerated particularly as a protector of pilgrims and merchants. Another Menas is celebrated on 10 Dec. along with Hermogenes and Euphrastes.

**Representation in Art.** Images of Menas have been preserved in stone and ivory as well as on the Menas Flasks; probably all reflect originals in his shrine at Abu Mina. Menas is portrayed as a young orans in a short tunic, flanked by two camels. His martyrdom by the sword and his effigy standing within his shrine receiving pilgrims are carved on a 6th-C. ivory pyxis in the British Museum (Age of Spirit., no.5.14). In the Menologion of Basil II (p.174), he is celebrated along with three other martyrs—Viktor, Vikentios, and Stephanos—and beheaded; in illustrations to the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes, all the men are shown wearing court costume, while Stephanos is omitted.


–A.K., N.P.S.

MENAS, patriarch of Constantinople (13 Mar. 536–24 Aug. 552) and saint; born Alexandria, died Constantinople; feastdays 25 and 27 Aug. Menas began his career as a priest and xenodochos of the hospice of Sampson in Constantinople. A legend ascribes to him the healing of Justinian I from a dangerous disease. He was ordained by Pope Agapetus I and tried to preserve good relations with Rome, fighting against the Monophysites and the Origenists. In 544 Menas supported Justinian’s edict against the Three Chapters and was temporarily excommunicated by Pope Vigilius’s legate in Constantinople. By 547–48 the pope agreed to condemn the Three Chapters and the pope’s name was restored to the diplotych of Constantinople ahead of the name of Menas (Malal. 484.11–13). In 550, however, Vigilius again excommunicated Menas.
titled ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH (S. Vailhé, \textit{EO} 11 [1908] 66f) and archbishop of “Constantinopolitan Rome” (Dölger, \textit{Byzanz} 94, n.37). Menas supported Justinian in his building activity: he came in an imperial carriage to dedicate both Hagia Sophia and the Church of the Holy Apostles and dedicated the Church of St. Irene in Sykai together with Apollinarios, patriarch of Alexandria.

To Menas was ascribed a speech addressed to Vigilius concerning the one will of Christ that was used by adherents of MONOHELETISM; at the Council of 680 the codex was investigated and proclaimed a forgery (F. Dickamp, \textit{Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert} [Münster in Westfalen 1899] 69). The short vita of Menas (\textit{BHG} 1272) is anonymous and lacking in information. Beck (\textit{Kirche} 408) hypothesizes that it was written by a contemporary.

\textbf{LIT. RegPatr, fasc. 1, nos. 232–43. R. Janin, Bibl.sanct. 9:318f. –A.K.}

**MENAS FLASKS**, the largest subcategory of pilgrims’ AMPELLAE, issued from the 5th to the 7th C. at the famous complex of St. Menas at ABU MINA. Made of clay, with a round, flat body, a projecting neck, and a pair of large handles, these crude, mass-produced vessels were used by pilgrims to carry home miracle-working EULOGIA waters, which were dispensed from cisterns at the shrine. Examples have been discovered throughout the Byz. Empire and beyond its frontiers. Most are between 6 and 15 cm in height and bear figural compositions impressed on the front and back. Menas is usually shown in the ORANS attitude, flanked by a pair of kneeling camels. A workshop for the production and storage of such flasks was discovered at the site.


**MENOIKEION, MOUNT**, located east of SERRES. Menoikeion (τὸν Μενοικείον) was the site of a monastery of the Prodromos, founded ca.1275 by the monk Ioannikios (died ca.1300), future bishop of Ezivai (Ezeva). He was succeeded as superior by his nephew, the hieromonachos Ioakeim (died 1333), who eventually became bishop of Zichnai. Ioakeim enlarged the complex, adding the church and refectory, obtained patriarchal status for the monastery (1321), and greatly increased its properties so that it became one of the wealthiest in Macedonia. In 1304 he enlisted the patronage of Simonis, wife of Stefan Uroš II Milutin of Serbia; in 1332 megas domestikos John (VI) Kantouzenos succeeded her as patron. Stefan Uroš IV Dušan was also a benefactor of the monastery after his conquest of Serres in 1345. Though in debt and disrepair under Ottoman domination, the monastery survives to this day.

The typikon of Ioakeim, revised in 1332, stressed the cenobitic life and denied anchorites entrance to the monastery. Under its unusual collegial system of administration, the hegoumenos acted in concert with a council of monks. The early archives of the monastery are preserved in 19th-C. copies of two 14th-C. cartularies (I. Dujčev, \textit{REB} 16 [1958] 169–71). About 50 charters (primarily privileges conferred by Andronikos II, Andronikos III, and Dušan) as well as Greek translations of Turkish documents survive: they give lists of the monastery’s properties and reveal the history of its acquisitions. Of special interest are data concerning oikonomiai in the region and the prosopography of local landowners. Numerous MSS produced in the monastery’s scriptorium also survive (L. Politis in \textit{Wandlungen, Studien zur antiken und neueren Kunst} [Waldsassen 1975] 278–95).

The katholikon, a domed basilica, was built in the early 14th C. The frescoes in the naos date from the period of Dušan and his successors, particularly John Ugješa, despotes of Serres (1365–71). A portrait of Dušan and his family together with the kktor Ioakeim, who was shown offering a model of his church to a winged John the Baptist, survived in the exonarthex until at least 1761. The chapel of St. Nicholas that contains the grave of Ugješa’s sister, Helen, was decorated with frescoes commissioned by her husband Nicholas Radosja between 1358 and 1364. I. Djordjević and E. Kyriakoudis (\textit{Cyrillomethodianum} 7 [1983] 167–234) proposed that these paintings, as well as others in the outer narthex and some frescoes in the chapel (behind the apse of the katholikon) representing the Prodromos and his father, Zacharias, were executed by artists from Thessalonike who went on to work at Hilandar and Vatopedi on Mt. Athos.

Menologion of Basil II (Vat. gr. 1613). This MS, the most lavishly illustrated of all Byz. liturgical MSS, was made sometime after 979 (S. Der Nersessian, Byzantium 15 [1940–41] 104–25) for the emperor Basil II, whose name appears in a dedicatory poem on p.XII. Its text is not in fact a menologion at all, but a version of the Synaxarion of Constantinople for the months of September through February. It has 430 miniatures, one on nearly every page, all with gold background; 15 miniatures lack textual notices and two both their text and title. The absolute balance here between text and image is unparalleled in any other calendar cycle; each occupies half a page, and just as each miniature, regardless of content, has been composed to fit a prescribed space, so each Synaxarion text has been modified so as to take up exactly 16 lines on the page. The miniatures include several illustrations of the Great Feasts, the translation of relics, and figures of prophets and saints standing before elaborate architectural settings or in exquisite landscapes. But the vast majority are scenes of martyrdom and torture, astonishing as much for their level of violence as for their extreme refinement of execution and the absence of caricature.

Symeon’s texts, many reworked or abridged, were reassembled once more in the 11th C., to form the so-called “imperial” menologion. In this version, each vita is followed by a set of verses acclaiming the emperor; the acrostic of these verses in each case spells “Michael P.,” thought to be the emperor Michael IV Paphlagon. Some MSS of the “imperial” menologion were illustrated in the 11th C.; the illustrations are careful copies not of the miniatures found in MSS of Metaphrastes’s menologion—the source for the texts—but of those in the Menologion of Basil II (S. Der Nersessian in Sbornik . . . V.N. Lazareva 94–111).


—A.M.T. A.C.
Each miniature is accompanied in the margin by a name in the genitive case; these names, eight in all, are often preceded by the words 'tov zographou ("by the painter") and are presumed to be names of the artists (PANTOLEON, George, Menas, Symeon, Michael the Younger, Nestor, Michael of Blachernai, and Symeon of Blachernai). If this Pantoleon is identical to the painter Pantoleon attested elsewhere, then the Menologion would date to the early 11th C. and be contemporary with the Psalter of Basil II (Venice, Marc. gr. 17, now dated to ca. 1005 by A. Cutler, Arte Veneta 31 [1977] 9–15).

The illustrated "imperial" menologia of the 11th C. were clearly meant to imitate the Menologion of Basil II. Their miniatures are exact copies of those in the Basil MS, attached to a different set of texts.

---

**MENOUTHIS.** See KYROS AND JOHN.

**MENTESHE (Μανταχίας, Μενδεσίας),** a Turkish emirate that emerged from the breakup of the Seljuk sultanate of Rûm. It occupied the fertile plain of the river Meander and extended up to the cape of Makre (Fethiye); its main cities were Miletos, Mylassa, and Mugla. The emirate was probably founded by a certain Sal(am)pakis, who fought successfully against the Byz. and ca. 1280 conquered Tralles. His successor was probably Mas'ud, who allied with the Genoese and attacked the Hospitallers on Rhodes and the surrounding islands in 1311. In the 1330s Menteshe, after repeated naval raids, reduced the lords of many Aegean islands and territories to the status of tribute-paying vassals. The emirate established commercial relations with Venetian Crete ca. 1300 and concluded with it at least seven treaties, which mention several exported staple goods: agricultural products (mainly cereals), livestock and related products connected with the nomads (cattle, horses, hides), and slaves. During the Crusades against the Aegean emirates (in 1333/4 and in
Menteshes appeared more willing to side with the Christians than with its Turkish neighbors. The emirate was temporarily annexed by the Ottomans from 1390 to 1402 and permanently in 1421.


**MERARCHES** (μεράρχης), military officer, mentioned in military treatises of the 6th C. He commanded a cavalry division (meros) in the assault line. In the Strategikon of Maurice (86.12), the merarches is ranked between the strategos and doux. The Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 109.9) equates merarches with tourmarches, as does the Tahtika of Leo VI (ch.4.8; PG 107:701C). In effect the two offices were merged. Bury (Adm. System 42) suggests that in a theme, in addition to two tourmarchai, there was a merarches who commanded the third brigade but had no geographical district under his administration. The seal of a merarches of Knossos (Schlumberger, Sig. 201) contradicts this hypothesis.

LIT. Oikonomides, Listes 109, n.65. –A.K., E.M.

**MERCENARIES** (μισθοφόροι) were hired by the Byz. throughout their history to secure needed manpower or skills. Germanic mercenaries, attracted by wages and the prospect of advancement, had played an influential role in the late Roman army, and cash taxes obtained from the population in lieu of military service were used to pay for them (Jones, LRE 619–23). The expense, coupled with the recruitment of the provincial armies (themata) from local and transplanted populations, reduced the demand for mercenaries between the late 7th and 9th C. The 10th and 11th C., however, witnessed the partial transformation of the Byz. army from an indigenous to a mercenary force. This change in manpower is attributed to the commutation of personal military service (strategia) into cash taxes used to hire mercenaries and the loss of Anatolia in the 11th C., depriving Byz. of its prime source of soldiers.

The multinational armies of the 10th C. amazed the Arabs (Vasiliev, Byz. Arabes 2.2:333, 339); 11th-C. chrysobulls list a wide range of peoples, now including Western soldiers (J. Shepard, Traditio 29 [1973] 53–92), in Byz. service, while Turkish mercenaries became prominent in Komnenian and Nicaean armies. Food and other necessities (perhaps also lodging) were obtained for them from the empire’s population through the mitaton. So widespread was the use of mercenaries that in the 12th C. Benjamin of Tudela declared that the Greeks no longer participated in warfare. In the 14th C. Byz. hired companies of soldiers (such as the Catalan Grand Company) and attempted to retain their services by bestowing rights of pronoria (N. Oikonomides, TM 8 [1981] 353–71).

Mercenaries served in separate corps and used their own weaponry and methods of warfare, although the Byz. sought to keep these troops under their overall command. The most famous corps was composed of the Varangians who served Basil II as an expert fighting force; foreign corps also served as bodyguards for emperors who could not trust their own soldiers.

LIT. S. Vryonis, “Byzantine and Turkish Societies and their Sources of Manpower,” in War, Technology and Society in the Middle East, ed. V.J. Parry, M.E. Yapp (London 1975) 126–40. –E.M.

**MERCHANT** (ἐμπόρος), also pragmatelutes, denoting a middleman, that is, one who made his living primarily through buying and selling merchandise (Cod. Theod. XIII 1.13). In the period through the 6th C., the sources show the existence of a considerable number of merchants engaged in both wholesale and retail trade; recent scholarship has stressed the importance of differentiating between independent middlemen and traders who acted as agents of the state or of the large landowners who disposed of their surplus directly to the consumer. In this period, some rich merchants are attested, both in Alexandria (where one of them is said to have had a fortune of 275 pounds of gold) and in other parts of the empire, as, for example, the merchant from Askalon mentioned in John Moschos (PG 87:3068AB). Merchants, however, occupied a relatively low social position; they were not allowed to hold important offices. The size of their enterprises and their capital was also small relative to that of great landlords. Patrician sources are suspicious of the profession of the merchant, since they consider trade an occasion for sin (e.g., John Chrysostom, PG 64:436C).

In the 7th–10th C. the tendency toward self-sufficiency reduced the role of the merchant, although there is no doubt of the continued existence of middlemen, such as the rich merchant
from Chios mentioned in the Miracles of St. Artemios. The Rhodian Sea Law (ch.11.11) shows merchants sailing with their wares and even gives evidence of large and precious cargoes being sent by ship. The Book of the Eparch (ch.11.1) reveals the close connection between trade and manufacturing; candlemakers, for example, sold their wares in their own shops. The state controlled some prices and legislated against "unreasonable profit" (ibid., ch.10.2). By the time of Basil II, merchants in regional and local markets appear significant enough to give rise to legislation concerning their participation in fairs (Reg 1, no.783). Their formal social status remains low, the Basilika (6:1.29) forbidding them access to the senate.

In the 11th C. the merchants of Constantinople acquired both wealth and, for a while, important social status. They were clearly a powerful group, courted by emperors such as Constantine IX, Constantine X, and Nikephoros III Botaneiates; they gained access to the senate, a privilege soon rescinded by Alexios I Komnenos. In the 12th C. merchants had no share in political power; nevertheless, some continued to prosper, as, for example, the money-changer Kalomodios. According to Benjamin of Tudela, Byz. merchants in this period sailed as far as Barcelona and Montpellier; they were in search of profit, as noted by Constantine Manasses (ed. Mazal, bk.9, fr.178). The competition of Italian merchants and the changes brought about by the Fourth Crusade also modified the position and the role of the Byz. merchant.

In the Palaiologan period Byz. merchants engaged primarily in local and medium-distance trade, sometimes independently and in competition with the Italians, sometimes in cooperation with them. Unlike earlier periods, the aristocracy participated heavily in trade, both as investors and as merchants. Women were important as retail traders (A. Laiou, JIB 31.1 [1981] 233–60), esp. in cloth, but also in alimentary products. They are attested in that role almost continuously, from the time of John Chrysostom until that of Ibn Battuta (p.160) who wrote that in the "bazaars" of Constantinople "the majority of artisans and sellers . . . are women." In the Palaiologan period, we also find women investing in shops and in relatively long-distance trade.


MERIAMLIK (now Ayatekla), site of the shrine of St. Thekla outside Seleukeia in Isauria. Egeria, on her pilgrimage in 384, noted several monasteries and the church of the saint, all surrounded with walls for protection against the Isaurians, whose attacks in the early 5th C. caused the church treasure to be removed to Seleukeia for safekeeping. The site contains two major churches: a richly decorated basilica built over the cave where St. Thekla allegedly descended into the earth, dated to ca.375 with redecoration in the 6th C., and a rectangular church with a central tower and an atrium with a large exedra. This latter church, similar in plan to Alahan Manastiri and others of the region, was apparently dedicated by Emp. Zenon. Meriamlik also contains a necropolis basilica, a bath, and remains of fortifications. Its history after the 6th C. is unknown.


MERISMS (μερισμός, lit. "division, apportionment"), term used in the Farmer's Law, par.8, in which the review was permitted of a merismos that had turned out to "wrong certain people in their lots (skarphia) or lands." The text has been interpreted (among others by Lipšic, infra) as evidence of the periodic redistribution of land in village communities of the 7th and 8th C. Kosmas Magistros, however, in the 10th C. applied the term to the division of lands that had been previously used by villagers in common (e.g., as pastures); this interpretation is supported by a charter of 943 referring to the judgment of Kosmas Magistros (Prot., no.6.7–8) and regulating the border between Mt. Athos and Hierissos. E. Lipšic (in
Zemledel'českij zakon, ed. I. Medvedev [Leningrad 1964], 148) suggests that the changes made between the 8th and 10th C. were so significant that it is impossible to apply Kosmas's judgment to the interpretation of the Farmer's Law. Even from the Farmer's Law, however, one cannot conclude that there was periodic redivision of the land: on the contrary, par.32 of this document speaks of the merismos of "an undivided place."


MERKOURION, mountainous area in northern Calabria. Merkourion comprised the valley of the Lao, one of whose confluent streams is still called Mercurion. The kastron of Merkourion, which no longer exists, gave the name to the homonymous eparchia, which might have been a tourma of Lucania. In the 10th C. the area was famous for its monastic settlements—"a new Thebaid"—which are mentioned in several Calabrian saints' Lives.


MERKOURIOS (Μερκούριος, Mercurius, Mar Qurios), saint; feastdays 25 and 26 Nov. His cult is attested by Theodosios Archidiaconos (6th C.) in Caesarea, Cappadocia (Itineraria Hierosolymitana, ed. P. Geyer [Leipzig 1898] 144). By that time a legend had spread (narrated in Malalas, John of Damascus, and Eastern sources) that ascribed to Merkourios the posthumous exploit of killing Emp. Julian. The Greek passiones preserved in 10th-C. and later MSS present Merkourios as a courageous warrior whom the emperor Decius appointed stratopedarches for his heroic deeds against the barbarians (Symeon Metaphrastes calls them Scythians); later Decius executed Merkourios for his Christian beliefs. The legends about Merkourios's martyrdom and his assassination of Julian were united only by Nikephoros Gregoras. Some Syriac texts regard Merkourios as one of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia. In the West the cult of the Cappadocian Merkourios seems to have been conflated with that of Mercurius of Eacleum, Apulia (feastday 26 Aug.), whose relics were transferred to Beneventum in 768 (H. Delehaye in Mélanges Godefroid Kurth, vol. 1 [Liège 1908] 17–24).

Representation in Art. Merkourios was one of the most popular military saints; his portraits in full armor abound in wall paintings and appear on 10th-C. ivories. In MSS of the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes, he is more commonly dressed in court costume. He is young, with short brown curly hair and an incipient beard. His martyrdom by beheading is occasionally depicted in menologia, and his assassination of Julian (who has fallen from his horse and is speared by the mounted Merkourios) appears in the 9th C., in the Paris Gregory (fol.409v).


MEROBAIDES, FLAVIUS, 5th-C. general, senator, and Latin orator. Of Frankish origin, Merobaudes evidently moved to Spain, near the Baetis River. By 435 he was in Ravenna, where he achieved literary and military distinction at the court of Valentinian III. The inscription on an honorific statue at Rome (435) records his titles (vir spectabilis, comes sacri consistorii), honoring also his eloquence and military achievements. Merobaudes himself speaks of attaining the maximus honor, either the patriciate (which would have involved a trip to Constantinople) or an honorary consulate. In 443 he began successful campaigns against rebels in Spain but was recalled because of hostile court intrigues. Apart from the De Christo (Anthologia latina, ed. F. Buecheler, A. Riese, vol. 1.2 [Leipzig 1906] no.878), probably though not certainly his, his occasional pieces in prose and verse honor mainly his patron Aetius and Valentinian, the imperial family being celebrated in ekphraseis of mosaics that depicted them. These ekphraseis survive primarily in a damaged palimpsest MS of the 5th/6th C. Now his work is valued more for its historical information about Aetius and Ravennate art than for its literary quality.


MESARITES, NICHOLAS, writer; born ca. 1163/4, died after 1214. By 1200 Mesarites (Μεσαρίτης) held high ecclesiastical office—skewophylax at the Pharos church in Constantinople. He left the capital for Nicaea after his brother John died (5 Feb. 1207) and became metropolitan of Ephesus and exarch of Asia. In 1214 he headed an embassy to Constantinople for talks with Cardinal Pelagius; the dialogues with the Latins ascribed to him in this connection appear to be forgeries (G. Spiteris, OriChrAn 204 [1977] 181–86). Mesarites belonged to the “school” that questioned the traditional values of Byz. rhetoric and tried to create new aesthetic principles. His speech on the revolt of John Komnenos the Fat differed drastically from those of other contemporary orators (Nikephoros Chrysoberges, Euthymios Tornikios, and Niketas Choniates) as a result of his interest in vivid details and in his own role in the events. In the preamble he parodied the conventions of Byz. writing, including the traditional theme of working under pressure from a friend: according to Mesarites, he wrote his work because people in the street wearied him with their incessant inquiries. In the same way Mesarites described his journey from Pylae to Nicaea, or the fine food with which he was regaled in Constantinople. In his picture of the Church of the Holy Apostles he depicted Christ and his disciples in motion and asserted that he even sensed the smell of the sea—in sharp contrast with the conventional, rigid, and motionless presentation by his predecessor Constantine of Rhodes. Mesarites respected education deeply and described the school at the Holy Apostles in detail, but he disliked pedantry, abhorred the brutality of teachers, and derided the “quotational” method of argument.


MESAZON (μεσαζων), the emperor’s confidant entrusted with the administration of the empire. The word in the plural form mesiteuntes and with a nontechnical sense of “principal administrators” is used first by a 10th-C. historian (Genes. 61.90–91). In the 11th–12th C. the term mesazon became a semiofficial designation, Constantine (III) Leichoudes being the first to hold the rank. The title could be bestowed on any high official, such as the logothetes ton sekreton or kanikleios. Under the Palaiologoi the office of mesazon was institutionalized, even though pseudo-Kodinos does not assign it a specific rank on the hierarchical ladder; he knows, however, that the megas logothetes was supposed to fulfill the mesastikion, the duty of mesazon. A 15th-C. historian identified the mesazon with the Turkish vezir (Douk. 141.26). Describing the appointment of Demetrios Kydones in 1354, Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 3:285,5–9) emphasized that he lived within the palace not only because of imperial favor but also because, as mesazon, he was needed by the emperor “day and night.” Among the mesazontes of the 13th–14th C. were Theodore Mouzalon, Nikephoros Choumnos, Theodore Metochites, and John Apokaukos. The last known mesazontes in Constantinople were Loukas Notaras and Demetrios Palaiologos Kantakouzenos (Nicol, Kantakouzenos 193) in the 15th C. The office existed also at the courts of Morea, Epirus, and Trebizond; the mesazon of Trebizond acquired the epithet megas.


MESE (Μέση, lit. “middle [road]”), the central avenue of Constantinople. It started from the Milion, the initial milestone of the empire. The Milion was located on the Augustaeon square, in front of Hagia Sophia (its precise location has not yet been determined). A grandiose structure with a dome supported by four arches, it was adorned with imperial statues, including Constantine I and Helena holding a cross and guarded by the Tyche of the city; nearby were the equestrian statues of Trajan and Theodosios II (Janin, CP byz. 103f). In the part of the Mese called Philadelphia (according to tradition in honor of Constans I and Constantius II, whose statues were erected there), the street forked: one branch continued northwest, parallel to the Golden Horn,
toward the Gate of Adrianople; another angled southwest, ending at the Golden Gate; one section of this avenue branched off (after the walls ofConstantine) and led to the Gate of the Source (Pege).

The Mese connected the major public squares (forums or agora) of the city: after the Augusteion came the Forum of Constantine (sometimes simply called the Phoros), which was not rectangular like Roman forums but, according to the Patria, imitated the shape of the Ocean or of Constantine’s tent, that is, it was circular in shape. The Phoros was adorned with a marble arch, porphyry columns, and statues, including Constantine and Helena holding a cross, and the Tyche of the city holding the modios as a symbol of correct weight (or perhaps the modolos crown as conjectured by Dagron, CP Imaginaire 185, n. 1115). Michael I Rangabe ordered the hands of the Tyche to be cut off as a deterrent to popular revolts. Next came the Forum Tauri or the square of Theodosios I with the emperor’s statue atop a column and various other monuments; the remains of a marble structure (probably the triumphal arch of Theodosios) were found during the excavations of the square. The location of the Forum Amastrianum has not yet been identified. The texts place it between Philadelphia and the next square, the Forum Bovis (of the Bull), that is, at the beginning of the southwestern branch of the Mese. It contained many pagan statues, among others Zeus-Helios on a chariot of marble, and a pyramid with two bronze hands holding the modios. The Forum Bovis (on the southwestern branch of the Mese) took its name from an enormous bronze head of a bull brought from Pergamon and placed there; the square was adorned with porticoes and statues, among which were again Constantine and Helena with a cross. The last forum, the square of Arkadios, was located on the Xerolophos hill and adorned with a column, surmounted by a statue of Arkadios, and surrounded by the statues of other rulers (Theodosios II, Marcian, etc.).

Along the entire Mese were numerous churches and monasteries, of which the best known were the Holy Apostles, St. John Prodromos of Petra, Chora, Kecharitomene, and Christ Philanthropenos (on the northwest branch), and St. Mokios, Studios, and Dalmatou (in the area of the southwest branch). Various public buildings (e.g., Basilike), baths (of Zeuxippos), palaces, and mansions were constructed along the Mese. Fountains, cisterns, porticoes, statues, and other monuments (e.g., the Anemodoulion) also lined the course of the Mese. At the same time, the Mese was the main commercial center of the city, with depictions of the modios indicating the state control over merchants: workshops of jewelers, candle makers, fur-merchants, and bakers (Artopolia), and so forth were located in its vicinity, while the Makros Embolos connected the Artopolia (between the Forum of Constantine and the Forum Tauri) with the harbors of the Golden Horn. Some squares (Amastrianos, Forum Bovis) functioned as marketplaces and also as places of execution.

The avenue (esp. its southwest branch) served as the major artery for imperial processions and triumphs. The emperor usually entered the city through the Golden Gate and then paraded toward Hagia Sophia, being acclaimed at several “stations,” mainly the forums. For these processions the guilds were obliged to decorate the Mese and clean the streets and strew them with flowers.


**MESEMBRIA** (Μεσημβρία: Bulgarian Nesebûr), city on the Bulgarian Black Sea coast, 35 km northeast of Burgas, on a small rocky peninsula linked to the mainland by a narrow causeway. Prosperous in Hellenistic times but declining under Roman rule, in the 7th–8th C. Mesembria became an important Byz. naval and military base, a place of exile, and the seat of a bishop. From this period or earlier can be dated two basilicas, including the three-aisled Old Metropolis built of coursed rubble with brick arcades. Captured by Krum in 812, Mesembria had returned to Byz. allegiance by 860 and continued to play a significant role as a Byz. base. In 1078 a revolt broke out in the city, led by one Dobromir, presumably a Bulgarian. At the end of the 12th C. Mesembria was incorporated in the Second Bulgarian Empire but frequently changed hands in the following two centuries. Despite political instability, the city developed economically; the many late Byz. churches—some built under Byz. patronage, some under Bulgarian—bear witness to its prosperity. Mesembria remained in Bulgarian hands until in 1367 it was captured, sacked, and returned to Byz. control by Amadeo VI of Savoy. Thereafter it remained a Byz. city until 1452, when Constan-
tine XI ceded it to Janos Hunyadi. In Feb. 1453 Mesembria surrendered to the Ottoman Turks, only three months before the capture of Constantinople.

Many medieval buildings survive, including the two basilicas and seven churches dating from the 11th to 14th C. Especially notable is St. John Aleitourgetos, which, like other churches at Mesembria, is elaborately decorated on the exterior with ceramic ornament in the manner of Apokaukos’s church at Selymbria. A cross-in-square building, its ruined bema and prothesis chamber retain fragmentary frescoes depicting liturgical scenes. Many of the late Byz. defense works are still visible.


—R.B., A.C.

MESOPOTAMIA (Μεσοποταμία, “land between the rivers”), geographical name of all the territory between the Euphrates and Tigris rivers. The name was also used to refer to both a province and a theme in the Byz. Empire.

PROVINCE OF MESOPOTAMIA. From the 4th to 7th C., Mesopotamia was a civil and ecclesiastical province of the diocese of Oriens. It extended from the province of Osroene north and east toward the Tigris and Chaboras rivers. The capital of the province and seat of the doux of Mesopotamia with authority over the local limitanei was Nisibis until the mid-4th C. Following Julian’s defeat, Jovian ceded to Persia by the treaty of 363 Nisibis, Singara, and lands beyond the Tigris that had been gained by Diocletian in 296–97. Thenceforth the provincial capital was Amida and the doux of Mesopotamia was stationed at either Constantina or, later, Dara; other cities included Martyropolis and Kephas.

War with Persia resumed under Kavad, thus compelling Anastasios I to found Dara and fortify other cities; the work continued under Justinian I. In the early 6th C. Mesopotamia was subdivided into three civil and/or ecclesiastical provinces: to the north was Armenia IV, with its capital at Martyropolis; south of the Tigris was Mesopotamia, with its capital at Amida; and below that was southern Mesopotamia, whose capital was at Dara and which had jurisdiction over the Tur ‘Abdin. Maurice’s alliance with Chosroes II in 591 allowed Byz. to recover certain territories (including Dara) lost to Persia in 573, but the new war (from 605 on) led to further territorial losses until Herakleios destroyed the power of Persia between 623 and 628. Between 633 and 640 the region fell to the Arabs.


—M.M.M.

THEME OF MESOPOTAMIA. The Byz. theme of Mesopotamia was organized to the northwest of the province of Mesopotamia. The date of its formation is unclear: it is usually accepted that Mesopotamia was created between 899 and 911 (Oikonomides, Listes 349). There is, however, a seal of the strategos of Mesopotamia probably dating from 825/6 (Zacos, Seals 1, no.284). Still called a strategos in the 10th-C. Taktikon of Benešević, the commander of the theme became doux before 971 or 975. In the 11th C. the theme was commanded by Armenians (Gregory Magistros and his son Vahram); Michael VII tried to reestablish Greek administration in Mesopotamia (Skabanovitch, Gosudarstvo 198). By the end of the 11th C. the Seljuks had conquered the region.


—A.K.

MESOPOTAMIA TES DYSEOS (Mesopotamia “of the West”), Byz. military district mentioned in the Escorial Taktikon (Oikonomides, Listes, p.269,16). It was probably situated in the Danube delta and/or between the lower Danube and the Dniester, comprising territory conquered from Svyatoslav by John I Tzimiskes in 971. Partly re-conquered by Samuel of Bulgaria, the territory was later incorporated in the new Byz. theme of Paristrion. The name may be a translation of “Atelkouzou” (De. adm. imp. 38,30, 40,24; i.e., Old Hungarian Etelkúzú, “between the rivers”). The Byz. fortresses of Capidava and Pâcuilul lui Soare probably formed part of its defenses. Its capital may have been Little Preslav.

LIT. N. Oikonomides, “Recherches sur l’histoire du Bas-Danube aux Xe–XIe siècles: La Mesopotamie de l’Occident,”
MESOPOTAMITES (Μεσοποταμίτες, fem. Μεσοποταμίτισσα), a family probably originating from Mesopotamom in Epiros (Moritz, Zunamen 2:34, n.1) or a place called Mesopotamia. The family became prominent in the 11th C. as military commanders: Basil, Alexios I's general, was praised by William of Apulia as an experienced warrior; George was deus of Philippopolis. Manuel I's contemporary, Nicholas Mesopotamites, was extolled by an anonymous poet for adorning the Virgin's icon (Lampros, "Mark. kod." 185, no.366.16). In the late 12th C. the Mesopotamitai occupied important posts in the civil administration: Constantine the kanakeios, Isaac II's favorite, was eulogized by Nikephoros Chryssoberges in an unpublished speech (Kazhdan-Franklin, Studies 226f). As a result of the protection of Empress Euphrosyne Doukaina Kamatera, Constantine acquired the highest place in the administration of Alexios III, along with his two (unnamed) brothers; Constantine had an ecclesiastical career as well, and Patr. George II Xiphilinos granted him special permission to serve both state and church. Later he fell from imperial favor and ca.1196-98 was appointed metropolitan of Thessalonike to remove him from the court; he remained metropolitan until sometime between 1222 and 1228. Several Mesopotamitai were civil officials at the end of the 12th C., including Michael, protonobelissimos hypertatos in 1195. Joseph Mesopotamites was imperial secretary, close to the circle of the Crown Prince Theodore Laskaris, but in 1253 he fell into disgrace and came under investigation (Angold, Byz. Government 163). The Mesopotamitai played a substantial role in church administration: Mesopotamites Konstomeres was metropolitan of Neopatras in the early 13th C.

Some Mesopotamitai bore the name not because they belonged to this family, but because they were monks of the Mesopotamon monastery in Epiros, which is attested in the 11th C. G. Astruc-Morize (Scriptorium 37 [1983] 105-59) suggested that Isaac Mesopotamites, the owner of several MSS produced in the mid-13th C. and metropolitan of Smyrna ca.1261, was a monk at Mesopotamon.


MESOTHYNIA. See Bithynia.

MESROP MAŠTOC', inventor of the Armenian script; born Tarōn mid-4th C., died Vafarşapat 17 Feb. 439 or 440. He is known as Maštoc' in the earliest sources and as Mesrop in the 8th C. and later. Modern writers often combine the names.

After an early career at the Armenian court Mesrop Maštoc' became a hermit. By the end of the century he was engaged in missionary activity in outlying areas, accompanied by a group of disciples. Encouraged by King Vram-Shapuh and Patr. Sahak, he sought help in northern Syria to compose a script. Circa 400, with the help of a Greek calligrapher, Rufinus, he created the Armenian alphabet at Samosata. This was based on the Greek alphabet with extra letters intercalated. The first book translated was the Proverbs of Solomon. (See ARMENIAN LITERATURE.)

According to his pupil and biographer Korjun, Mesrop Maštoc' also invented scripts for Georgian and Caucasian Albanian; this is not confirmed by non-Armenian sources. Mesrop Maštoc' spent the rest of his life in missionary activity and in organizing with Sahak the first groups of translators.


MESSENGER, the ascetic and pietistic movement of the Messalians (Μεσσαλιανοί, from Syriac mslyn, "praying people"), also termed Euchitai; it probably originated in Mesopotamia in the 4th C. and spread to Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor. The Messalians never formed an institutionalized sect, nor did they develop any doctrine or create a hierarchy (J. Gribomont in Epektasis [Beuchesne 1972] 611). They expressed the feelings
of radical groups within Christianity: they believed that a demon is encamped in man’s soul and that neither baptism nor other sacraments suffice to expel him; only the “baptism of fire” or spiritual purification can liberate men from the power of evil (A. Guillaumont in Mélanges d’histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech (Paris 1974) 517–23); the instrument of purification is first and foremost prayer, through which man attains freedom from passions and the Holy Spirit descends upon him. The leading exponent of Messalianism was Makarios/Symeon.

Attitudes toward Messalians were ambivalent: on the one hand they were criticized by Ephrem the Syrian, Epiphanius, and later theologians such as John of Damascus and Euthymios Zigabenos; they were condemned by local councils in Side and Antioch in 390 and at the Council of Ephesus in 431. On the other hand, some church fathers such as Eustathios of Sebasteia and Gregory of Nyssa described them with sympathy; extreme monastic asceticism in Syria and Mesopotamia had much in common with Messalian practice.

Both names, Messalians and Euchitai, appear in later antithetical polemics: Psellos composed a dialogue against Euchitai in Thrace who worshiped Satan (M. Wellenhofer, BZ 30 [1929–30] 477–84), and Patr. John XIV Kalekas attacked the “modern Messalians” (Beck, Kirche 712). Evidently, these Messalians had no direct connections with the extremist movement of the 4th–7th C.


—T.E.G.

MESSINIA (Μεσσηνία), a region in the southwestern Peloponnesos bordering on Elis, Arkadia, and the Taygetos mountain chain. The data from the period of the Roman Empire are scarce; among a few inscriptions with names of emperors, the latest is what may be a milestone from Haliartos mentioning Constantine I and his sons (Inscriptions Graecae 5.1 [Berlin 1913] no.1420); some large estates existed in the western valley (U. Kahrstedt, Die wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit [Bern 1954] 220–34). The name of the city of Messene is still to be found in Hierokles, and the Peloponnesian bishopric of

“Mossina” appears in a notitia (Notitiae CP 3:766). In the 7th–8th C. the territory was invaded by the Slavs, who left some traces of their language in local toponymy. Thereafter the name Messinia disappears from the sources, with the exception of certain archaising writers such as pseudo-Sphrantzes, who speaks of the Messeniac Bay (Sphr. 278.23, 280.4–5). Korone, Methone, and, to a lesser extent, Kalamata were the most important cities; remains of several Byz. and Frankish monuments survive there and elsewhere in Messenia. The most significant fresco program is that at the Church of the Virgin Zoodoschos Pege at Sama- rina, painted ca.1200 in a style that is already emerging from late Komnenian formulas (C. Scheven-Christians, Die Kirche der Zoodoschos Pege bei Samari in Messenien [Bonn 1980]).


—A.K., N.P.S.
Muslim support against Roger (Chalandon, Domination normande 1:192–96).

Greeks continued to play a role in Messina after the Norman occupation: the archives of the monastery of S. Maria di Messina contain Greek documents beginning with a deed of purchase dated 1076/7 as well as Latin acts, the earliest of which is the grant of bishop Robert of Triona and Messina of 1103. The typhikon of the monastery of the Savior (S. Salvatore) in Messina was compiled in Greek by the archimandrite Loukas in 1131. In the 13th and 14th C. merchants from Messina were active traders in the East.

Monuments of Messina. Destroyed by an earthquake in 1908 and by bombardment in World War II, Messina has only a few extant medieval monuments. The earliest survivors are S. Annunziata dei Catalani (12th C.) and, outside the city, S. Maria near Mili San Pietro, founded by Count Roger I around 1092. On the site of the destroyed Basilian monastery of S. Salvatore is the Museo Regionale, displaying objects from the buildings ruined in 1908, including byzantinizing mosaics from S. Gregorio (13th C.); the sarcophagus of Loukas, archimandrite of the Patir monastery (died 1175); and a marble icon of the Hodegetria copied from an 11th-C. exemplar in Istanbul.


METALLURGY, the extraction of metals from their ores, normally at sites near mines. The metal was then formed into INGOTS (mazia) which were sold to smiths for fabrication into metal objects.

Iron. Ironmaking in the Roman period was often divided into two states, roasting and smelting. Crushed iron ore was roasted in open furnaces, with wood as fuel, to remove excess water or carbon dioxide. The roasted ore was then smelted, at a higher heat, in small furnaces, using charcoal as fuel. The resulting spongy mass of iron was then alternately hammereded and heated to produce ingots. Remains of furnaces and slag heaps have been found at numerous archaeological sites, for example, in the Crimea (A. Jakobson, Srednevekovye sel'skie poseleiniya Jugo-Zapadnoj Tavriki [Leningrad 1979] 164–68), and in Capidava, Pâciului lui Soare, and Dinogetia (E. Zah, Pontica 4 [1971] 191–207). It is sometimes said that before the 14th C. only wrought iron was made, and that the temperatures in the furnaces could not be raised sufficiently high to produce molten cast steel. In the 5th or 6th C. the lexicographer Hesychios of Alexandria explained the word kalathos as a vessel in which iron was melted (R. Halleux, Le problème des métalx dans la science antique [Paris 1974] 197).

Copper. After being smelted from its ore, it was alloyed with tin to form bronze or with zinc to form brass.

Silver and Gold. Silver and gold were extracted from lead and other base metal ores by a process called cupellation. They were heated in a furnace to a temperature of about 1,000 degrees centigrade and oxidized with air from a bellows. The extracted metal was very soft and hence was usually alloyed with copper. Sometimes gold nuggets could be panned from streams and needed no further refinement.


—A.M.T., A.K.

METALWORK. The metals most used in Byz. were GOLD, SILVER, BRONZE, LEAD, and IRON. Imitations of gold and silver were obtained by applying gold, silver, and tin leaf to other metals. Related metallic effects were gained by glazes and glosses added to ceramics, while glass objects copied those in metal—eventually, perhaps, replacing some domestic gold and silver plate. Precious metals were sometimes counterfeited, and therefore a touchstone was used by the silversmith to test for purity. Metals were obtained from mines but were also recycled, particularly for coins. At least in the 4th C., metals were transported by the state in the form of ingots. State metalworking extended to gold, silver, and bronze coins, gold Medallions, Largitio Dishes, Jewelry, Weapons, and Armor (including ceremonial armor embellished in gold and silver by the Barbaricarii) and, apparently, from the 4th to the 7th/8th C., certain silver objects marked with imperial Silver Stamps. Lead seals were produced for civil, military, and ecclesiastical officials of all
ranks. Public and private metalworking establishments functioned simultaneously: the Book of the Eparch (Bk. of Eparch 2.1, 11) refers to the independent ergasteria of silver- and goldsmiths in Constantinople and stipulates that the chrysochooi be grouped together on the Mese. Coppersmiths (see Smith) were apparently located near the Chalkoprateia church.

Byz. metalwork generally preserved Roman techniques, with the notable exception of the manufacture of large-scale bronze statuary, which had ceased by the early 7th C. Techniques that did continue included the application of hammered sheets of gold, silver, and bronze to furniture and architectural members as metal revetments and the related treatment of doors. The survival of advanced metalworking techniques is suggested by the existence of automata. Smaller scale Byz. metalwork included the production of gold plates used from the 8th C. onward in making enamels; domestic plate, household fittings (see Tools and Household Fittings), utensils, and liturgical vessels in silver and bronze produced by both hammering and casting techniques; and forged iron tools. Gold and silver objects display diverse techniques of decoration, for example, raising decoration from the reverse (repoussé) or from the front (engraving and chasing) and openwork (as on the Antioch “Chalice”); embellishments, included gilding and inlaying of details in niello and encrustation with gems or enameled plaques. Techniques used for jewelry were likewise varied.

In contrast to the investigation of 4th–7th C. silver and bronze, so far very little scientific research has been undertaken on works of the 9th C. and later (M. Cagiano de Azevedo, BICR 9–10 [1952] 23–40). It is clear, however, that the size and weight of cast bronzes was reduced and silver usually employed only in thin sheets after the 9th C.; in the 15th C. Bessarion complained that metalwork was no longer to be expected in Byz. The account in De ceremoniis of the preparation for the Cretan campaign of 960–61 is extremely useful for the list of implements and weapons it provides, for some information about their cost and the quantity, as well as for the cost of lead, copper, and tin valued in the ratio of 4:18:34 (De cer. 675.14–15, 676.2–3). Alchemical MSS may someday provide clues to the composition of alloys, methods of refining metals, and casting and gilding; for the time being they have been insufficiently studied. (See also Metallurgy.)


—M.M.M., L.Ph.B.

METAMORPHOSIS. See Transfiguration.

METANOIA (Metánoia), female personification of Repentance (see Penance), associated with David’s remorse for his sin with Bathsheba (2 Sam 12). Metanoia occurs in the Paris Psalter and related MSS (Buchthal, Paris Psalter, figs. 8, 54) and embodies the sentiment physically conveyed by the king’s attitude of proskynesis. Metanoia is depicted as a classicizing figure, garbed in a chiton and raising one hand to her chin in the Antique gesture of meditation or mourning.

—A.C.

METAPHOR (μεταφορά, lit. “transference”), a compressed simile in which two objects are juxtaposed by analogy. Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Comm. II. 4:523 [1242.33–35]) states that poetry requires “unusual imagery” (terastion), citing as an example Iliad 21:388, “heaven trumpeted.” “Had [Homer] said ‘heaven thundered,’ it would not have the effect of a paradox,” comments Eustathios. In the wake of antique classification, the Byz. used metaphors aimed at the animation of the material world (apo empsychon eis apsycha), so that, for example, arrows would be called bloodthirsty. Especially important was metaphor in relation to religious objects or persons worthy of veneration: the Virgin was the new Eve, ekklesia, a well, crown, rose, burning bush, rod of Aaron, closed garden, and so on; the cross (according to Germanos II) was the throne of God, a ladder to heaven, the imperial scepter, the altar, the couch of the Lord, and so on (PG 140:637B–640A). The effect of metaphors was enhanced by their agglomeration, exaggeration, and conjunction with puns. On the other hand, traditional and “stable” metaphors (e.g., “time rides by”) were not perceived as such. Vestiges of popular everyday metaphors, including references to sexual and bodily functions, are infrequent in “pure”
METATORION (μετατοριόν; also mitatorikon, etc.), a room in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, and perhaps other churches. The term first appears in Theodore Lector (127.26–27), who relates that some conspirators attacked Patriarch Euphemios (489–95) “in front of the metatorion.” According to the Narrative on the Construction of Hagia Sophia (Pregler, Scriptores 104.1–3), Justinian I erected a metatorion, that is, a chamber (koiton), paneled with gold, where he might rest whenever he went to the church. In the Book of Ceremonies Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos often mentions the metatorion as a chamber in the Great Church that “the lords” enter during great feasts (De cer. 566.1–4); after taking communion in a chapel, the emperor moved into the metatorion (88.10–11); here he changed his clothes (192.18–19) and took breakfast together with his megistanes and senators (18.2–4). This implies that the metatorion was a substantial space housing a suite consisting of a narrow triklinos (the place for breakfast), the metatorikon proper, and a koiton (194.21–23). The precise location of the metatorion is not clear: Constantine variously describes it as situated near the bema and altar (17.12, 145.16–17), behind the gate of the narthex (64.4–5), or in the gallery (157.16); even more enigmatic is the evidence of chroniclers (e.g., TheophCont 370.18–20) that when Nicholas I Mystikos prohibited Leo VI from entering Hagia Sophia, the emperor went to the metatorion “via the right side.”

This diversity of evidence in the sources has resulted in diversity of scholarly opinions: there is disagreement as to whether there were one, two (Dagron, *CP Imaginaire* 256, n.192), or even three (Strube) metatoria; and whether it was housed in the southeast exedra (Majeska, *Travelers* 228) or in the south nave (Strube), or inside or outside the church (D.F. Beljaev, *Byzantina* 2 [St. Petersburg 1893] 128). In the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes the term is attached to a domed structure in which Leo VI reads Samonas’s attack on icons (Grabar-Manoussacas, *Skylitzès*, no.268). Attempts to identify certain parts of excavated churches as metatoria (D. Pallas, *EEBS* 20 [1950] 295–307) are highly hypothetical (P. Lemerle, *REB* 10 [1952] 185).

METEORA (from μετέωρος, “floating in the air”), a group of monasteries built on rocky spires in northwestern Thessaly near Stagai. The spectacular outcrops of this region, from 200 to 300 m high, are formed of eroded conglomerate and riddled with caves that provided shelter for the hermits who first settled there. Organized monasticism developed quite late at Meteora; its first attested establishment was the early 14th-C. skete at Doupiane under the supervision of a protos. A number of Athonite monks moved to Meteora to escape Turkish pirate raids. The oldest surviving church is the katholikon in the rock-cut monastery of the Hypapante, built, according to a later inscription, in 1366/7. Its well-preserved decorative program (T. Velmans, *La peinture murale byzantine à la fin du Moyen Age* [Paris 1977] 2017) includes painted local bishops such as Achilleios of Larissa and Oikoumenios of Trikka. The most important monastery at Meteora was the Great Meteoron, dedicated to the Transfiguration and founded by Athanasios of Meteora in the late 14th C. The second founder of the Meteoron was John-Ioasaph Uros (1373–1423), son of Symeon Uros, “emperor” of the Serbs and Greeks in Thessaly; he eventually became head or “father” of the Meteoron. The cross-in-square church that he founded in 1388 now serves as the bema for the 16th-C. katholikon. The monasteries of St. Stephen and St. Nicholas Anapausas were also founded in the late 14th C., Hagia Trias in 1476; the Church of St. Nicholas Anapausas, built in 1527, has frescoes by Theophanes of Crete. Other monasteries, including Barlaam, Roussanou, and Prodromos, were post-Byz. foundations of the 16th C. when the Meteoras were at the height of their prosperity and provided a bastion of Orthodoxy during the Turkish occupation of Greece.


—A.M.T. A.C.

**METHODIOS**, bishop of Olympos in Lycia, perhaps also of Patara, Philippi, and Tarsos; saint (martyred ca. 311); feastday 20 June. His one extant work is the *Symposium* or *On Chastity*, a dialogue in which ten maidens extol their purity, in contrast to the celebration of Eros in Plato’s *Symposium* (T. Miller in *Antičnost’ i Vizantija* [Moscow 1975] 175–94). Two main themes are Origenist asceticism and Irenaeus recapitulation. Attached as postlude is his *Partheneion* (Maidens’ Song—The Greek title perhaps deliberately recalls Alcman), a hymn to Christ, Mary, and the Church (virginity again the connecting theme), in iambic strophe with acrostics and refrain, the first Greek fore-runner of the kontakion. Methodios was also an active polemicist, attacking Origenist notions of the human body and time in a treatise on the resurrection (*Aglaothron*) and Gnostic fatalism in an essay on free will (I. Dujčev, *Balcanaica* 8 [1977] 115–27); extracts from the Greek text survive. His Plotinian view of time and his development of a dualism between historical and eternal existence, akin to Plato’s form-matter dichotomy, have been seen as a critical influence on the theology of the *Cappadocian Fathers* (B. Otis, *DOP* 12 [1958] 118–20). Other works, mainly scholarly exegesis of Old Testament lore, survive only in Church Slavonic translations. The lost work most to be regretted is probably his refutation of Porphyry. (See also *Methodios of Patara, Pseudo-*.)


—B.B.

**METHODIOS**, missionary to the Slavs and saint; born Thessalonike ca. 815, died 6 Apr. 885; feastday 6 Apr. His baptismal name was perhaps Michael. The brother of Constantine the Philosopher, Methodios began his career as an administrator, serving as archon of a “Slavic prin-
cipleship" in Macedonia. About 850 he abandoned his wife and withdrew to Mt. Olympos in Bithynia, where he eventually became hegoumenos of the "Polychron" (= Gr. Polychronios?) monastery and perhaps was ordained a priest. He may have accompanied Constantine on his trip to Khazar in 861. Emp. Michael III sent Methodios and Constantine to Moravia in 863. The extent to which Methodios helped Constantine create the Glagolitic alphabet and translate Greek texts into Church Slavonic is unclear. He journeyed with Constantine to Rome in 867, and in 869 Pope Hadrian II consecrated him bishop.

Returning to Pannonia and Moravia in 870, Methodios was arrested by the Franks, tried, and imprisoned in Swabia. After being released in 873, he worked hard to organize a native church in Moravia, despite pressure from the Franks, who forced him to go to Rome in 879 to defend his orthodoxy. He returned to Moravia in 882 via Constantinople, where he obtained support for his efforts from Photios. According to his Life, probably written by Kliment of Ohrid, in 884 he completed translating the Bible. Other translations attributed to him after Constantine’s death include “patristic books,” the Synagoge of 50 Titles of John III Scholastikos (see Nomokanon), and a kanon for the office of St. Demetrius. The many liturgical works available in Church Slavonic after his death, including the Triodion, Heirmologion, and Oktoechos, may have been translated under his direction. He may also have composed Constantine’s vita.


METHODIOS I, patriarch of Constantinople (4 Mar. 843–14 June 847) and saint; born Syracuse second half of 8th C., died Constantinople; feast day 14 June. A son of influential parents, Methodios went to Constantinople to continue his education but instead entered the Chelonakkos Monastery in Bithynia; he subsequently became hegoumenos either there or in another monastery. After 815 Methodios traveled to Rome, probably as a representative of the deposed patriarch Niképhoros I; upon his return in 821, he was arrested and exiled by the Iconoclast government. Released in 829 he assumed importance at the court of Theophilos; elected patriarch after the latter’s death, Methodios was instrumental in the restoration of icon veneration in 843 (see Triumph of Orthodoxy). Difficult political problems ensued: while Methodios tried to be moderate toward former Iconoclasts, the radical Stoudites urged him to inflict severe punishments on heretics; they criticized Methodios for his defense of the opportunistic patriarchs Tarasios and Nikephoros. These attacks by the extremists forced Methodios to excommunicate and confine some intransigent monks (I. Doens, C. Hannick, JÖB 22 [1973] 93–102). The patriarch’s attitude toward the West is poorly known; it is worth attention that his name was inscribed in the Reichenau Liber confraternitatum alongside that of the local abbot Heito who resigned in 822/3 (H. Lowe, DA 38 [1982] 341–62).

A well-educated man, Methodios is known as a copyist of MSS (P. Canart in Palaeographica, Diplomatica et Archivistica I [Rome 1979] 343–53) and a writer; his own writings include polemical, liturgical, and hagiographical works (e.g., biographies of Theophanes the Confessor and Euthymios of Sardis), poetical kanones, and homilies. The authorship of some works attributed to Methodios (e.g., a vita of St. Nicholas) remains contested. The vita of Methodios (BHg 1278) is anonymous and poor in information.


relatives of Alexander the Great); and prophetic, describing the Arab conquest and their future defeat by the Byz. The consensus is that the text was written in Syriac (even though Syriac MSS are of later origin), probably in Mesopotamia, although M. Krivov (VizVrem 44 [1983] 215–21) hypothesizes that it was produced in a milieu of Syrian refugees in Byz. Apocalyptic in its essence, the text is hostile toward the Arabs and full of anticipation of their defeat. The major difficulty in its interpretation is the statement that the Byz. victor over the Arabs will issue forth from the Ethiopian sea: M. Krivov (VizVrem 38 [1977] 120–22) interprets this as an indication of a Greco-Ethiopian alliance against the Arabs, P. Alexander (ADSV 10 [1973] 21–27; AHR 73 [1968] 106ff) as a replacement of the traditional expectation of Ethiopian triumph by the hope of Byz. victory. The Latin version is known from MSS of the 8th C. In Byz. the prophecy became esp. popular from the 14th C. onward—the Greek version survives in four redactions in 14th–17th-C. MSS.


METHONE (Μεθώνη), or Modon, city of Messenia in the far southwest corner of the Peloponnesos, an important naval station on the route between the Aegean Sea and Italy. Attested as a city in late antiquity (Hierokl. 647.17), it was visited by Belisarios on his way to North Africa in 533. Methone apparently survived the Slavic invasions more or less intact, and it was undoubtedly strongly fortified. The city suffered considerably from Arab devastation in the 9th–10th C., although it did receive refugees from other parts of the empire; in 881 the Byz. admiral Nasar donated the booty he took from the Arabs to the church of Methone (TheophCont 304.13–14). The city apparently prospered during the 11th–12th C., but it also became the lair of pirates, and the Venetians attacked it in 1125 and destroyed the walls. Methone played a crucial role in east-west trade and it was one of the ports that Alexios III opened to Venetian traders in 1198. To many of the Crusaders the Peloponnesos was known as the isle de Modon (Robert of Clari 111), reflecting the central role the city played for many Westerners; Geoffrey I Villehardouin landed at Methone in 1204 and began his conquest of the Peloponnesos there. The Partitio Romaniae, however, granted Methone to Venice and, along with Korone, Methone remained under Venetian control (despite struggles with the despotate of the Morea) until 1500, when it fell to the Ottomans.

The bishop of Methone was originally subject to Corinth (Notitia CP 3.762), but by the 10th C. he was a suffragen of Patras (7.551). The best known bishops were St. Athanasios of Methone (late 9th–early 10th C.) and Nicholas of Methone, who provided an interesting contemporary description of the city (J. Draseke, BZ 1 [1892] 445). The Venetian overlords retained the Greek bishop of Methone, who in 1301 was under the jurisdiction of Monemvasia (Laurent, Corpus 5.1.482).

The walls of Methone are primarily Venetian in date, but they are mostly built on Byz. foundations and many Byz. spolia are used in them. Near the city is a Christian catacomb of St. Onouphrios, similar to some in Sicily and southern Italy, dating from the 4th C. (D. Pallas, ArchEph [1968] 119–73).


METHYMNA. See Lesbos.

METOCHION (μετόχιον), a monastic establishment (usually small), subordinate to a larger independent monastery. The word is not found in papyri and was probably not in use before the 9th C. Metochia were frequently founded in the countryside near monastic properties located at some distance from the monastery, to facilitate the supervision of the estates. They were also established in cities as an urban base of operations for the monastery and as a residence for monks visiting the city for business or other purposes.
As few as one or two monks might live in a metochion on a permanent basis; they were under the jurisdiction of the hegoumenos of the controlling monastery and followed its rule. A metochion had its own church or chapel, and sometimes, as at the Skoteine Monastery, owned a significant number of liturgical books and sacred vessels. Especially in the later period, a monastery in decline might be transformed into the metochion of a more prosperous monastery; an example is the monastery tou Hagiopatitou, which was transformed in 1257 into an agrus belonging to another monastery (Koutloum, no.2.8).


METOCHITES (Μετοχιτής), an important family of the Palaiologan era whose name derived from METOCION (cf. also modern Greek metochites, “monk of a metochion”). George Metochites (born ca.1250) was archdeacon in Constantinople (1276–82) and went as an ambassador to several popes between 1275 and 1278. A supporter of the Union of the Churches and friend of Patriarch John XI Bekkos, he was dismissed and imprisoned in early 1283. While in prison, where he died in 1328, he wrote several theological works, including the so-called Dogmatic History, in which he relates the theological controversies that followed the Council of Lyons in 1274.

His son Theodore (see METOCHITES, THEODORE), the renowned statesman and writer, had five sons, who also took part in administration, esp. as governors and generals: Demetrios Angelos Metochites (fl.1326–55); Nikephoros Laskaris Metochites (megas logothetes, 1355–57); Michael Laskaris (ca.1326); Alexios Laskaris Metochites (megas domestikos, 1355–69); and the fifth son whose name is unknown. Theodore’s daughter Irene married John Palaiologos (caesar, after 1325). The exact relationship of some other, later members of this family is unknown: Manuel Raoul Metochites in Mistra (1362–80), correspondent of the writer Manuel Raoul; Laskaris Metochites (megas chartoularios in Thessalonike, 1373–76); Andronikos Metochites (archon in Thessalonike, 1421); and Demetrios Palaiologos Metochites, megas stratopedarches (1444–53) and gover-

nor of Constantinople, who died together with his sons during the Turkish conquest of 1453.


METOCHITES, THEODORE, statesman, scholar, and patron of the arts; born 1270, died Constantinople 1332. Son of the pro-Unionist George Metochites, he followed his father into exile in Asia Minor in 1283. Despite this serious handicap to a future government career, Metochites, who maintained orthodox views, came to the attention of Emp. Andronikos II in 1290 because of his unusual scholarly attainments and entered imperial service. The cursus honorum of Metochites included the positions of logothetes ton agelon, logothetes ton polemarchon (1295), logothetes tou genikou (1305), and megas logothetes (1321). He was also

entrusted with the delicate negotiations for the marriage of Michael IX to Rita-Maria of Armenia (1295) and of the child-princess Simonis to the Serbian king Stefan Uroš II Milutin (1298/9). From 1305 onward Metochites held the important office of Mesazon, or prime minister, replacing his rival Nikephoros Choumnos. Because of his close ties with Andronikos II, he shared in the elderly emperor’s downfall in 1328. He was imprisoned, his palace destroyed, and his vast wealth confiscated. After a miserable period of exile in Didymoteichon, he returned in 1330 to Constantinople, where he ended his days as the monk Theleptos at the monastery of Chora.

Statesman by day, Metochites devoted his evenings to scholarly pursuits. He was a prolific and versatile author, who wrote commentaries on Aristotle, miscellaneous essays, an Introduction to Astronomy, orations, hexameter poems, and hagiographical enkomia. All of his writings except his letters are preserved; much remains unpublished, however, because of his notoriously obscure style. Metochites devoted much attention to classical antiquity, writing essays on ancient Greek history and comparing Demosthenes to Ailios Aristides. He was somewhat overwhelmed by the ancient heritage, arguing that nothing was left for his generation to write about. He was conscious of the decline of the empire, realizing that Byz. was one in a series of world empires; like a living organism it had periods of growth, prosperity, and decay. He emphasized the instability of human life, but hoped to gain immortality through his literary endeavors.

Metochites was an avid collector of books. The scope of his library is reflected in the allusions to more than 80 ancient authors in his writings. He donated his library to the Chora monastery, whose church he restored between 1316 and 1321. His mosaic portrait is preserved in a lunette panel in the church’s inner narthex.


METROKOMIA (μητροκομία, lit. “mother-village,” perhaps formed on the model of metropolis): a rare term that designated a type of rural district. Interpretation of the term varies: a privileged village (Gelzer, Verwaltung Ägyptens 75, 78), administrative center of a region-pagus (A.C. Johnson, L.C. West, Byzantine Egypt [Princeton 1949] 325), tax district (Lemerle, Agr. Hist. 8, n.2). The term is known from inscriptions in Syria (e.g., Dittenberger, Orientis 2, n.609) and Egypt (no.769, the reign of Diocletian) but not from papyri. The edict of 415 (Cod. Theod. XI 23.6) established that only fellow villagers (convicani) could possess lands there and no patrocinium could be imposed upon metrokomiari. The term reappears in 10th-C. legislation: a novel of Romanos I (Zepos, Jus 1:201.5–8) refers to an “old law” (probably that of 415) forbidding sales of land to persons other than the inhabitants of the same metrokoma; a novel of Constantine VII of 947 (1:217.15–18) allows the purchase of land only by fellow villagers (synchronai) and, in case of emergency, by villages (choria) of the same metrokoma or kometoura. The term was not employed in charters.

METROLOGY, the study of the measures used for length, surface, volume, weight, and time, along with the relationships among these. This study is based on various literary texts, including both theoretical works and practical texts, and on surviving items such as coins, weights, and buildings (all of which presuppose standards of measurement). A primary problem in the interpretation of the texts is the use of one term for different measures and, vice versa, the use of different terms for the same measure; in addition, it is frequently difficult to distinguish between theory and practice and to determine which standards were actually in effect at a given time. This is exacerbated by the existence of numerous local systems, many of which had no connection with the official standard. In addition, Byz. systems of measurement grew out of ancient practice, and many ancient names survived when the medieval reality had changed totally. The state maintained control over measures and, although standard measures were commonly made available to the
public to facilitate trade and commerce, they are not always easy to determine today.


—E. Sch.

**METRON** (μέτρον), measure of capacity of liquids; synonymous terms are mistaton, mitro, and mirro (lt.). Different metra were used depending on whether wine and water or oil was being measured and on the purpose of measuring.

1. From the 9th C. onward the most important wine measure was the *thalassion metron* (generally called simply *metron*), of 1/10 *megarikon* (= 10 minai = 10.25 liters), which can be filled with 30 *logarikai litrai* of white wine or 32 *logarikai litrai* of water. Besides this standard measure, other *metra* are preserved: the *annonikon metron* (= 2/3 *thalassion metron* = 6.8 liters), the *monasteriakon metron* (= 4/5 *thalassion metron* = 8.2 liters), and other *metra* of local validity.

2. For oil the *thalassion metron*, sometimes called *elaikon metron* or simply *metron* (= 1/12 *megarikon* = 1.5 *lageria* = 8.52 liters), can be filled with 30 *soulailai litrai* or 24 *logarikai litrai* of olive oil. Its ratio to the corresponding wine measure is 5:6.

LIT. Schilbach, *Metrologie* 141–53.

—E. Sch.

**METROPHANES** (Μητροφάνης), politician and writer; metropolitan of Smyrna (ca.857–80). A staunch supporter of Patr. IGNATIOS, Metrophanes was exiled in 860. According to F. Dvornik (in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 9 [1967] 758), Metrophanes went to Cherson, where he met CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER and Methodios on their way to Khazaria; he eventually informed ANASTASIUS BIBLIOTHECAIUS that Constantine had discovered St. Clement's relics. Restored after Photios was deposed, Metrophanes refused to recognize Photios in 879/80 and was excommunicated by the pope's legates. His letter to Manuel, *logothetes tou dromou*, is an important source for the struggle between Photios and Ignatios (Dvornik, *Photian Schism* 43f). Metrophanes also wrote an *enkomion* of St. Polycarp of Smyrna, several exegetical works (the *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* is preserved only in Georgian), an Anacreonic hymn on the Trinity (Mercati, *CollByz* 1:443–51), etc.

ED. Mansi 16:413–20. For list of other works, see Beck infra.

LIT. Beck, *Kirche* 543f.

—A.K.

**METROPOLITAN** (μητροπολίτης), the head of the episcopate in an ecclesiastical territory normally coinciding with a civil *provincia* (eparchia). The title, first employed by NICAEA I, is derived from the capital (metropolis) of the province, in which the metropolitan-bishop resided. This administrative division of the church (already fully developed by the 4th C.) was officially sanctioned at Nicaea I. The same council also legitimized the metropolitan's right to confirm all episcopal elections within his territory (canon 4). The ordination itself was to be performed by all the bishops of the province. As supervisor of his territory, the metropolitan convoked and presided over the provincial synod, which as a rule was held twice yearly (cf. Nicaea I, canon 5). Some bishops without suffragans were nevertheless given the title metropolitan, and some metropolitans (e.g., of Athens, Thessalonike, Ephesus) were also called archbishops.


—A.P.

**MEZIIOS** (Μεζίζιος, Arm. Mžež), an Armenian probably of the princely Gnuni house (Toumanoff, "Caucasia" 135); *patrikios* and *komes* of the Opsikion; usurper. He accompanied CONSTANS II to Italy and in Sicily was proclaimed emperor following Constans's murder in 668. The revolt of Mezizios ended in early 669, but scholars disagree on the circumstances. Most accept the report of Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 352.4–7) that Constantine IV personally led a fleet to Sicily, where he captured and executed Mezizios and his father's murderers. Others (following E.W. Brooks, *BZ* 17 [1908] 455–59) believe the Liber pontificalis (*Lib.pont. 1:346*) that troops from Italy and Africa suppressed the rebellion and sent Mezizios's head to Constantinople. Mezizios's son John also revolted against Constantine IV but was defeated and killed.


—P.A.H.
MICE (sing. μῦς) were treated in Byz. literature as despicable and abhorrent. Their skin was ugly (vita of Basil the Younger, ed. Veselevskij 2:143.14–15); they spoiled food and destroyed books and even works of art (Christopher of Mytilene, epigram 103; Michael Gabras, ep.359). Eustathios of Thessalonike, with mild irony, described the bold foraging of mice that he was unable to stop. Mice belonged to the underworld, where they prospered, according to the Timarion. In the Katomyomachia (War of the Cat and the Mice), by Theodore Prodromos, they represented the political underworld with its vocal demagogues. Mice are treated in a different, philosophical vein in the oriental material included in Barlaam and Ioasaph (ed. G.R. Woodward, H. Mattingly, 188.9-13): two mice—one white and the other black, symbolizing day and night—gnaw the roots of the tree of human life.

The appearance of a mouse, weasel, or snake in a house was viewed as an omen in ancient times (PG 36:1024Α), but firmly rejected by John Chrysostom (PG 64:741Α). The author of the Geoponika (1:3.13) believed that the squeaking of mice forecast a storm; he was also familiar with the magical prescription against an invasion of mice (one had to glue to a rock a sheet of paper with a special appeal to mice), but he did not believe in its effectiveness. There is also a 15th-C. treatise on getting rid of mice (E. Kakoulides, Hellenika 16 [1958–59] 119–25).


MICHAEL (Μιχαήλ), Hebrew personal name (lit. “who is like God”). It occurs in the Old Testament as a common name, but in the New Testament only twice—for the archangel. Unknown in Greek and Roman antiquity, the name appeared in the second half of the 5th C. (PLRE 2:762f) but remained extremely rare. Prokopios of Caesarea mentions only the archangel Michael, and in Theophanes the Confessor there are but five Michaels, including the archangel. No saints of this name are known before the period of Iconoclasm. From the 9th C. onward the name became popular: in Skylitzes there are 44 Michaels, following only Constantine (60) and John (48); it holds fourth place in Anna Komnene, after George; fifth place, after Theodore, in Niketas Choniates.

It retains fifth place in the acts of Laura: in those of the 10th–12th C., the name Michael stands between Constantine and Nikephoros, and in later ones between Nicholas and Theodore. From the 9th to the 13th C. it was a popular imperial name; nine emperors were called Michael. Four patriarchs of the 11th through early 13th C. bore this name.

—A.K.

MICHAEL, archangel and saint, feastdays 6 Sept. (Miracle at Chonai) and 8 Nov. (Synaxis ton Asomaton). Michael is mentioned twice in the Old Testament (Dan 10:21, 12:1) as the helper of the people of Israel; he is called an angel (or archon in a variant reading). He also appears twice in the New Testament, in the Epistle of Jude (v.g), where he is described as disputing with the devil over the body of Moses, and in Revelations 12:7–9 where he fights a dragon; in Jude he is specifically referred to as an archangel.

In Byz. Michael was venerated, primarily in western Asia Minor, as a wondrous healer whose activity was closely associated with sacred springs: a church dedicated to Michael in Germa WAS famous for its healings with “holy waters.” Even more famous was Michael’s church at Chonai, a center of pilgrimage, connected with the miracle performed there by Michael (see Chonai, Miracle at). At Pythia, not far from Constantinople, Justinian I enlarged a church of Michael built on the site of a temple of Apollo famous for its hot spring (Janin, Églises centres 85). There were nearly two dozen sanctuaries of Michael in and around the capital, many of them going back to the 6th C. (Janin, Églises CP 337–50).

From the 9th C. onward, Michael was esp. venerated as the commander (archistrategos, taxiarcho) of the heavenly host who brought his troops to the aid of the imperial armies; hence he was particularly cultivated by the emperor in the latter’s role as military commander. The classic visual image of this aspect of Michael is his appearance before Joshua in military garb on the eve of Jericho (e.g., Joshua Roll, sheet IV). A victory attributed to the intervention of Michael is related in the Latin Apparitio S. Michaelis in Monte Gargano, translated into Greek by the 10th C. (S. Leanza, VetChr 22 [1985] 291–316).

In monumental painting, Michael stands as an archangel with Gabriel, both dressed in imperial
robes, alongside Christ or the Virgin or flanking a doorway. Michael is also presumably the angel shown weighing souls in images of the Last Judgment.

Many incidents of angelic intervention in the Old and New Testaments came to be attributed to Michael, and eventually a cycle of miracles was developed, for example, the 9th-C. narration of the deacon Pantoleon (BHG 1286; cf. F. Halkin, Inédits byzantins [Brussels 1963] 147–52). Illustrated cycles of the miracles of St. Michael, attested from at least the 11th C. (Psellos, Scripta min. 11:120–41), were essentially biblical cycles involving the angels and archangels to which were added more recent miracles performed by Michael (S. Koukiarès, Ta thaumata-empaniseis ton angelon kai archangelon sten byzantine tekhne ton Balkanion [Athens 1989]). In 1076 the Church of St. Michael at Monte Sant’Angelo in Italy ordered bronze doors from Constantinople to be adorned with 23 scenes involving Michael and Gabriel; an equally lengthy cycle devoted entirely to Michael adorns the bronze doors of the 13th-C. Church of the Virgin at Suzdal.


MICHAEL I ANGELOS. See Michael I Komnenos Doukas.

MICHAEL I KEROUARIOS, patriarch of Constantinople (25 Mar. 1043–2 Nov. 1058); born between 1005 and 1010, died Heliopolis, 21 Jan. 1059. A member of the senatorial family of Kerouarios, Michael was involved in 1040 in a plot against Emp. Michael IV; to avoid a greater punishment, he became a monk. He was restored to imperial favor by Constantine IX, who appointed him patriarch after the death of Alexios Stoudites. Kerouarios, who inherited the rigorism of Symeon the Theologian, was in conflict with liberal intellectuals like Psellus and his companions while enjoying the strong support of the Constantinopolitan population; the downfall of the “liberal” faction vindicated his position.

In the early 1050s the tension between Byz. and Rome increased. The controversy centered around the question of the Azymes. The papacy tried to attract to its side Peter III, patriarch of Antioch, but he, albeit more moderate than Kerouarios, supported the Byz. point of view. When the papal legate Humbert arrived in Constantinople for negotiations, Constantine IX was anxious for an alliance that was necessary to resist the Norman penetration into southern Italy, but neither Humbert nor Kerouarios was ready to agree. Niketas Stehathos served as the patriarch’s mouthpiece, and a collection of texts, the so-called Panoplia, was produced, attributed to Kerouarios by A. Michel (but see Timnefeld, infra 109–14). The tract On the Azymes also does not belong to him (J. Darrouzès, REB 25 [1967] 288–91). The conflict reached its peak in the reciprocal excommunications of Humbert and Kerouarios (16 July 1054). After the rupture Kerouarios started using the title of Ecumenical Patriarch on his seals (Laurient, Corpus 5.1, no. 16), but the schism was not yet final.

Through his victory over Constantine IX in this conflict, Kerouarios acquired exceptional influence in Constantinople; Empress Theodora wanted to depose him, but was powerless. Kerouarios ran the government under Michael VI and achieved the transfer of power from Michael VI to Isaac I Komnenos. Soon his relations with Isaac worsened, and the patriarch even threatened to destroy the emperor “like an oven he had made.” Isaac had the backing of the military, however, and easily attracted the support of intellectuals who were at odds with the unyielding patriarch. Isaac ordered the arrest of Kerouarios and his deportation from the capital (where Kerouarios could count on the support of the population). When Kerouarios refused to abdicate he was put on trial, with Psellus acting as his main accuser. The trial was supposed to take place outside of the capital in an unknown location in Thrace, but Kerouarios died on the way. It has been suggested that the silver revetment of a cross in the Dumbarton Oaks collection was commissioned by Kerouarios (R. Jenkins, E. Kitzinger, DOP 21 [1967] 233–49), but C. Mango (CahArch 36 [1988] 41–49) has rejected this hypothesis.


A.K.
MICHAEL I KOMNENOS DOUKAS (more commonly but imprecisely called Michael I Angelos), ruler of Epiros (1205–15); died Berat, Albania, 1215. An illegitimate son of the sebastokrator John Doukas, Michael was a cousin of the emperors Isaac II and Alexios III Angelos, but never used the Angelos family name himself. He is first mentioned in 1190 as a hostage of Frederick I Barbarossa. Before 1204 he was dux and anagrapheus of the theme of Mylassa and Melanoudion. After the fall of Constantinople to the Fourth Crusade, Michael briefly entered the service of Boniface of Montferrat, but then went to Epiros to lead the resistance of the Greek inhabitants against the Latins. He acted as an autonomous ruler but did not assume the title of despotes, as used to be thought (Nicol, Epiros II 2f). It is not clear whether the Michael who was defeated by the Franks at a battle in southern Messenia in 1205 was Michael of Epiros (R.-J. Loeper, *Byzantium* 45 [1973] 377–81, 388f). From his capital at Arta, he expanded his territory into Thessaly, taking Larissa in 1212. By 1214 he had recovered Dyrrachion and Keryra from the Venetians. At the time of his murder in 1215 Michael controlled all of northwest Greece from the Gulf of Corinth up into Albania, thus laying the groundwork for what would become the despotate of Epiros.


MICHAEL I RANGABE (Ῥαγγάβη), emperor (811–19); died 1 Jan. 844 (Grierson, “Tombs and Obitis” 56, n.168). Son of the patrikios Theophylaktos (PG 105:489C), Michael became kouropalates under Emp. Nikephoros I, having married (before 794) the emperor’s daughter Prokopia. She bore him three sons—Theophylaktos, Staurakios, Niketas (see Ignatios)—and two daughters—Georgos and Theophano (PG 105:492AB). After campaigning with Nikephoros in July 811 and surviving the disastrous encounter with Krum, Michael became emperor on 2 Oct., when his brother-in-law Staurakios abdicated in his favor. The elevation was engineered by the domestikos ton scholon Stephanos with the blessing of Patr. Nikephoros I, who made Michael vow in writing to uphold Orthodoxy and respect clerics.

“Completely honest and equitable but incapable of managing matters” (Theoph. 499.32–500.1), Michael undertook a reaction against Emp. Nikephoros I, reversing his fiscal austerity with lavish donations to churches, monasteries, and charities and recalling his exiled opponents, including Leo (V). Although rejecting the claims of Charlemagne to the imperial title, in return for capturing Byz. territory in Italy Michael recognized the Frankish ruler as basilicus and tried to marry Theophylaktos to one of Charlemagne’s daughters. Michael was keenly interested in religious affairs, ending the Moechan Controversy and urging Patr. Nikephoros to correspond with Pope Leo III. He was heavily influenced by Theodore of Studios, who convinced him in 812 not to make peace with Krum. His failure to check the Bulgars gave rise to a conspiracy on behalf of Caesar Nikephoros, which Michael easily suppressed, but after his defeat at Versiniki he abdicated in favor of Leo V on 11 July. His sons were castrated, and Michael became a monk on the Princes’ Islands, taking the name Athanasios. His son Niketas, after becoming the patriarch Ignatios, transferred Michael’s body to the monastery of St. Michael at Satyros in Bithynia.


MICHAEL I THE SYRIAN, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch (from 1166); historian; born Melitene 1126, died 1199. Prior to his election Michael was a monk and the archimandrite of the monastery of Bar Saumā. His major work is the fullest, most comprehensive chronicle in Syriac, surviving in a single MS of 1598. The *Chronicle* is composed of 21 books in chronological order from Creation to 1195. There are three columns per page, presenting religious history, secular history, and extraordinary events, respectively. At the end are lists of kings, priests, patriarchs, emperors, and Muslim rulers as well as chronological tables. For the earlier parts Michael used as sources such chroniclers as pseudo-Dionysios of Tell Mahre and John of Ephesus. Michael provides abundant
data on Byz.-Arab rivalries after the rise of Islam and about the course of events in the Eastern patriarchates, esp. in the 12th C. when he was an eyewitness. His data on Byz. relations with Armenia, Syria, and Crusaders are also important.


S.H.G.

MICHAEL II, emperor (820–29); founder of the Amorian dynasty; born Amorian, died Constantinople 2 Oct. 829 (Grierson, “Tombs and Obits” 56). Born of humble parents, Michael advanced through an army career in the Anatolikon, marrying Thekla, the thematic commander’s daughter, who bore him Theophilos. In 803 he served under Bardanes Tourkos but deserted to Nikephoros I, who appointed him komes tes kortes and gave him a palace in Constantinople. During the reign of Michael I, Leo (V) made Michael the Amorian his own protosтратor. Once Leo became emperor, he named Michael domestikos of the exekoubitoi with the rank of patrikios; Leo was also godfather to one of Michael’s sons, probably Theophilos. Yet in Dec. 820 Leo arrested Michael on charges of treason and sentenced him to death. Michael escaped execution when his fellow conspirators assassinated Leo and acclaimed him emperor. Michael was crowned by Patr. Theodotos on 25 Dec.

As emperor Michael weathered the revolt of Thomas the Slav with help from Omurtag, but he could not prevent the Arabs from taking Crete between 824 and 827 and invading Sicily ca. 827. In 824 he supported Iconoclasm in a letter to Louis the Pious (Mansi 14:417–22); opponents accused him of favoring Athisanai and of being a Sabattian. Yet he prohibited public discussion of Iconoclasm and restored Iconophiles (but not Patr. Nikephoros I) whom Leo V had attacked; he persecuted only the future patriarch Methodios (I), who had conveyed to Michael a letter of Pope Paschal I defending images. Michael’s marriage ca. 829 to Euphrosyne, the daughter of Constantine VI and then a nun, was denounced as uncanonical by Theodore of Studios.

S.H.G.

MICHAEL II ANGELOS. See Michael II Komnenos Doukas.

MICHAEL II KOMNENOS DOUKAS (called Michael Angelos in narrative sources), ruler of Epiros and Thessaly (from ca.1230); born ca. 1206; died between Sept. 1266 and Aug. 1268 (B. Ferjančić, ZRVI 9 [1966] 29–32). A bastard son of Michael I Komnenos Doukas, he went into exile after his father’s murder. He established himself as ruler of Epiros after the capture of his uncle Theodore Komnenos Doukas in 1230 at the battle of Klokotnica. Marriage to Theodora Petrallhaina (see Theodora of Arta) brought him the support of the powerful Petrallphas family, which favored closer ties with the empire of Nicea. This culminated in 1238 with the personal visit by Patr. Germanos II to Arta and with the grant of the rank of despotes by John III Vatatzes ca. 1249 (Nicol) or 1252 (Ferjančić).

In 1256, as the price of the marriage of his son Nikephoros Angelos to a Nicaean princess, he was forced to surrender the key positions of Servia and Dyrrachion. It was too high a price. Thereafter Michael sought to check the Nicaean advance. One by one he recovered the towns and fortresses lost to the Nicaeans. The recovery of Thessalonike seemed to be within his grasp. To this end he allied with Manfred of Sicily and William II Villehardouin. Mutual suspicion wrecked the alliance. A Nicaean army defeated the allies completely at the battle of Pelagonia (1259). Although Michael had to flee to the Ionian islands, the Nicaean occupation of Epiros was so unpopular that he was soon able to return and drive the conquerors out. He finally came to terms with Michael VIII Palaiologos in 1264. His achievement was largely negative: he insured that Epiros would never be fully reincorporated in the restored Byz. Empire. He was buried in the monastery of the Blachernai, just outside Arta.

S.H.G.


M.J.A.
MICHAEL III, emperor (842–67); born 19 Jan. 840 (L. Rydén, Eranos 83 [1985] 182, n.30), died Constantinople 23/4 Sept. 867. Son of Theophilos and Theodora, Michael was crowned co-emperor as an infant in 840 but had no real authority under Theodora’s regency (842–56). In 855 Theodora arranged a bride show and married him to Eudokia Ingerina. At age 16, with help from Caesar Bardas, Michael deposed the regents Theodora and Theoktistos and became sole ruler on 15 Mar. 856 (W. Treadgold, DOP 33 [1979] 190). Byz. sources, writing largely to justify Basil I’s murder of Michael, portray him as a dissolute emperor engaging in drinking bouts, horse races, and religious burlesques, while ignoring state affairs. Yet modern scholars have shown that he was not inactive, esp. in military affairs, and, with capable advisers such as Bardas, Patr. Photios, Petronas, and Basil, his reign had important achievements (A.A. Vasiliev, Byz.-Metabyz. 1 [1946] 237–48; Jenkins, Studies, pt. 1 [1948], 71–77).

Under Michael III the Arabs were held in check. In 859, during his first military campaign, he unsuccessfully besieged Samosata. In 860 an attack on Constantinople by the Rus’ forced him to break off a campaign in Asia Minor, but in 863 he played an important role in defeating ‘Umar, emir of Melitene (G. Huxley, GRBS 16 [1975] 443–50). He rebuilt Ankyra and refortified Nicæa. He sponsored the mission of Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios to Moravia and the baptism of Boris of Bulgaria. Yet he was easily influenced by associates: Michael permitted Basil to assassinate Bardas in 865 and crowned him co-emperor in 866, but shortly thereafter Basil had him murdered in his bedroom at the palace of St. Mamas. Michael’s body was buried in Chrysopolis, but Leo VI (perhaps Michael’s son by Eudokia Ingerina) removed it to the Church of the Holy Apostles, Constantinople (Grierson, “Tombs and Obits” 57).

The revival of monumental painting in Michael’s reign has generally gone unrecognized. Theophanes Continuatus credits him with having “the empress’s wardrobe” in the Great Palace decorated with religious images. Michael’s own likeness was set up in the Chrysotriklinos, along with those of Christ and the Virgin (AnthGr, bk. 1, no.106). The inscription around the apse mosaic of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, implies his participation in this major enterprise.


- P.A.H., A.C.

MICHAEL III, patriarch of Constantinople (Jan. 1170 [V. Grumel, REB 1 (1943) 258]–Mar. 1178); died Constantinople. A relative of the metropolitans of Anchialos (his customary designation “of Anchialos” is incorrect), he made an ecclesiastical career in Constantinople as the chief of the patriarchal chancery and then protoexdikos. Around 1165–67 he was promoted to the post of Hypatos Ton Philosopher; in his inaugural speech (which is incidentally important as a source for Byz.-Hungarian relations [Browning, Studies, pt.IV (1961), 173–214]), Michael emphasized as his purpose the struggle against rationalistic (“heretical”) views. As patriarch he continued condemnation of the non-Orthodox interpretations of John 14:28 that had been rejected by the Council of 1166 under Patr. Loukas Chrysoberges. He tried to improve the discipline of the clergy: he confirmed the strict division between civil and ecclesiastical offices (V. Laurent, EO 33 [1934] 309–15), forbade bishops to ordain clerics from other dioceses, and established—according to the principle of oikonomia—steresis for deposed deacons lest they become wandering beggars (S. Trojanos, FM 6 [1984] 205–18). Loyal to Manuel I, Michael published on 24 Mar. 1171 a tomos prescribing the oath of fidelity to the emperor’s heir.

Michael’s attitude toward Rome is a subject of discussion: traditionally (e.g., V. Grumel, EO 29 [1930] 258–64) the Dialogue of Manuel I and Michael on the Union of the Churches, in which Michael expresses consistently anti-Latin views, has been considered authentic; J. Darrouzès (REB 23 [1965] 79–82), however, redated the text to the 13th C., probably without sufficient foundation. Negotiations with Pope Alexander III continued but were unsuccessful, even though the pope reduced conditions for reunion to a minimum. R. Ljubinković (Starinar 20 [1969] 191–
204) attributed to Michael's patriarchate the MS Paris, B.N. gr. 880, which has an evident anti-Latin tendency. Negotiations with regard to union with the Armenian church by Michael's envoy Theorians also failed.


MICHAEL III ŠIŠMAN (Σισμανος), Bulgarian monarch, son of Šišman, despotes of Vidin; born before 1292, died Velbuzd after 28 July 1330 (?). Elected tsar by a council of boyars after the death of Georgij Terter II (1222), he brought the war against Byz. to a successful conclusion. In 1224 Michael married Theodora, daughter of Michael IX and widow of Tsar Theodore Svetoslav. In the Byz. civil war of the 1320s he first supported Andronikos III against his grandfather Andronikos II in 1237 but in the following year changed sides and besieged Constantinople. After the defeat of Andronikos II, Michael concluded an alliance with Andronikos III, directed against the growing power of Serbia. Defeated and captured at the battle of Velbuzd, Michael died of his wounds. Shortly afterward he was succeeded by his nephew Ivan Alexander who reversed Michael's policy by making a lasting alliance with Serbia.

LIT. Fine, Late Balkans 268–75. A. Burmoy, "Istorija na Bulgaria na vremeto na Šismanovite," GSU FIF 43.1 (1946–47) 1–58. —R.B.

MICHAEL IV PAPHLAGON, emperor (1034–41); died Constantinople 10 Dec. 1041. Member of a family of money-changers of Paphlogonian origin, he was introduced to the Empress Zoe by his brother, John the Orphanotrophos. Michael became Zoe's lover and, when Romanos III was murdered, he was proclaimed emperor (12 Apr. 1034). The short-lived resistance of Patr. Alexios Stoudites was ended by a generous donation. Michael, an honest and unsophisticated man who suffered from epilepsy, was pushed into the background by John, whose policy favored the highest civil functionaries. John aimed to increase the state's monetary income: the aerikon was introduced, and taxation in kind in Bulgaria was replaced by payment in specie. Morrison ("Dévaluation" 6) stressed that the devaluation of Byz. coinage began in Michael's reign. These policies incited resistance of both the aristocracy (Michael faced the opposition of Constantine Dalassenos and plots of the Keroularioi) and the provincial population, esp. the rebel Peter Deljan. The military successes of George Manakes collapsed after his recall from Sicily, and Stefan Voislav established the independence of Dukla (Diokleia). Michael actively supported the church, partly in hope of a cure for his epilepsy. John strove to retain the predominance of the Paphlogonian family; childless, Michael proclaimed as heir his nephew, the future Michael V. With immense personal effort, Michael led a successful expedition against Deljan; soon after celebrating a triumph in Constantinople, he resigned, received the tonsure, and died. His conspiracies and death are illustrated in the Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzés, nos. 505–66, fig.243).

Michael V Kalaphates, emperor (1041–42). Son of Stephen, a caulkier (whence Michael's nickname), and the sister of Michael IV, he was adopted by Zoe and named Caesar and heir ca. 1035. Three days after Michael IV died, Zoe proclaimed Michael emperor, while he pledged to respect her. Once in power, he banished John the Orphanotrophos, released John's opponent Constantine Dassenas, and sent George Maniakes to Italy as katepano. He enforced strict justice. Relying on the advice of his uncle, the nobelissimos Constantine, Michael determined to exile Zoe. He confirmed his popularity with the masses in several processions (Easter, 11 Apr. 1042, and the following Sunday). Once Zoe had left, he claimed that she had plotted against him. On 19 Apr. a widespread popular uprising occurred. Houses and chapels built by his relatives were destroyed and the Great Palace besieged. Despite aid from his uncle and Katakalon Kekaumenos, the mob broke through the walls. At dawn, 21 Apr., Michael and Constantine fled from the palace to Stoudios, whence both were soon dragged, blinded, and dispatched to monasteries. Constantine IX sent Michael to Chios.


Michael VII Doukas, emperor (1071–78); born ca. 1050, died Constantinople ca. 1090. Eldest son of Constantine X, he ruled as co-emperor with Eudokia Makrembolitissa and Romanos IV Diogenes. After the latter's capture, the caesar John Doukas put Michael on the throne. Possibly slow mentally, Michael was an inactive ruler. He was a pupil of Psellus, who composed treatises for the emperor and ends his Chronographia with a eulogy of Michael and his family. In Michael's name, an alliance was made (ca. 1074) with Robert Guiscard, whose daughter Olympias (Helena in Byz.) was betrothed to Michael's son Constantine. In 1073–74 negotiations with Pope Gregory VII for reunion came to nothing. Administrative power passed to Nikephoritzes, whose severe fiscal policies made Michael unpopular. Plundering Turks beset Anatolia, while rebels (Nestor, Roussel de Bailleul, Nikephoros Bryennios, and the future Nikephoros III Botaneiates) devastated Asian and Balkan provinces. Consequently, Michael's coinage was seriously adulterated (Morrisson, "Dévaluation" 8–12), while the diminution of the modios of grain by a pinakion, without a reduction in price, earned Michael the nickname "Parapinakes." When Botaneiates' victory became certain, Michael abdicated (31 Mar. 1078) and entered a monastery; his wife Maria of "Alania" married the victor. Michael was subsequently named metropolitan of Ephesus but paid only one brief visit there before returning to his mon-
astery. Numerous portraits of Michael survive, the most important on the enamels of the Khakhouli triptych (with his wife) and on the Holy Crown of Hungary (with his son); these objects exemplify Michael’s use of art as dynastic propaganda (Wessel, *Byz. Enamels*, nos. 37–38).

---

**MICHAEL VIII PALAILOGOS**, emperor (1259–1282); born 1224 or 1225, died in village of Pachomios, Thrace, 11 Dec. 1282. Son of the *megas domestikos* Andronikos Palaiologos, Michael descended from three imperial families and founded the long-lived dynasty of the Palaiologoi (1259–1453). He embarked on a successful military career, but his loyalty to the Nicene emperors **John III Vatatzes** and **Theodore II Laskaris** was questioned on several occasions. Michael took advantage of the power vacuum left by Theodore’s premature death (Aug. 1258) to usurp the throne. After joining an aristocratic conspiracy to murder George Mouzalon, regent for the child emperor **John IV Laskaris** (Sept. 1258), Michael succeeded Mouzalon as regent and was named *megas doux* and, on 13 Nov. 1258, *despotes*. He was crowned co-emperor in Nymphaion sometime after 1 Jan. 1259 (P. Wirth, *JOB* 10 [1961] 91). He further secured his position by his victory at Pelagonia over an anti-Nicene coalition (summer or fall 1259) and the recovery of Constantinople from the Latins by his general Alexios Strategopoulos in July 1261. On 15 Aug. 1261 Michael entered Constantinople and soon received a second coronation. After ordering the blinding of **John IV** (Dec. 1261), he became sole emperor, but was excommunicated by Patr. Arsenios.

The early years of Michael’s reign were devoted to efforts to repopulate the capital and to begin the restoration of damaged churches, monasteries, and public buildings. He also set about the construction of a fleet and strengthening of the fortifications of Constantinople, esp. the sea walls. The considerable expense of his program of reconstruction necessitated a devaluation of the hyperpyron. His concern for justice is shown by a *prostagma* threatening appropriate punishment for imperial officials found guilty of maladministration (L. Burgmann, P. Magdalino, *FM* 6 [1984] 377–90).

Michael’s foreign policy focused on the use of skilful diplomacy to ward off Latin attempts to regain Constantinople. His primary motive in agreeing to Union of the Churches at Lyons (1274) was to forestall the projected invasion of the empire by **Charles I of Anjou**. At the end of his reign, 1282, Michael again averted Charles’s imminent attack on Constantinople by helping instigate the anti-Angevin rebellion known as the *Sicilian Vespers*. Michael also formed an alliance with the Mongol khan Hulagu against the Mamluk ruler Baybars and Berke of the Golden Horde. After Berke defeated the Byz. in 1264–65, however, Michael was forced to join the alliance of the Golden Horde and Egypt (G. Vernadskij, *SemKond* 1 [1927] 73–84). Although Michael was responsible for several important military and diplomatic accomplishments, he neglected his Anatolian frontier, permitting the Turks to increase their strength; moreover, his Unionist religious policy alienated his subjects and the majority of the clergy. At his death he was refused the final rites of the Orthodox church.

---


Although Michael was a brave and energetic soldier, his military campaigns were notoriously
unsuccessful, with the exception of some victories over the Bulgarians in 1304. He opposed Roger de Flor, leader of the Catalan Grand Company, and may well have arranged his assassination in Apr. 1305. Two months later Michael suffered a humiliating defeat at Apros at the hands of the vengeful Catalans. After being defeated again in 1311, this time by the Turks, Michael was relieved of responsibility for the defense of Thrace. He predeceased Andronikos II, dying at the age of 43, reportedly of grief over the accidental murder of his son Manuel (Greg. 1:286.6–12). Michael died in Thessalonike, where he had restored the basilica of St. Demetrios.

---

MICHAEL (ASTRAPAS) AND EUTYCHIOS, two, or possibly three, wall-painters working in Macedonia and Serbia, ca. 1295–1317. The names of Michael and Eutychios are preserved in inscriptions in four churches: the Virgin Peribleptos (now St. Clement) at OHRID, the Bogorodica Ljeviška at PRIZREN, St. NIKITA at Banjani, and St. George at STARO NAGORIČINO. Some scholars distinguish Michael, who signed with Eutychios in the last two of these churches, from Astrapas, who so signed his name at Prizren. But the inscription "the hand of Michael tou Astrapas" appears on the sword of St. Merkourios at the Peribleptos and it is possible that Astrapas ("lightning") was merely the nickname of a speedy painter. However that may be, the hands of Michael and Eutychios are effectively indistinguishable, the style of both exhibiting strong chiaroscuro and heavy drapery marked by hard folds. The painter John Astrapas, mentioned by Demetrios Triklinos, is thought to be a member of the same family, supposedly of Thessalonican origin. Michael and Eutychios also painted icons (P. Miljković-Pepe, JÖB 16 [1967] 297–309).

---

MICHAEL ITALIKOS, writer; died before 1157. Michael taught rhetoric and philosophy in Constantinople and was later appointed the didaskalos of physicians; probably in 1126 or 1137 he participated in an embassy to Rome. He also taught the Gospels in the Patriarchal School. After 1143 he became metropolitan of Philippiopolis where, in 1147, he successfully reconciled CONRAD III with the Byz. A paradigm of the Byz. intellectual, Michael proudly assured Empress Irene Doukaina that administrative offices were better filled by intellectuals than by illiterate "logariastai and pronoetai" (Gautier, infra 94f). He mocked the fashion of tracing genealogies back to mythological Greek kings (Kazhdan, Gasp.klass. 48f) and praised "logical feasts" at which "philosophical venison" would be served along with "physiological hare" and "musical swan" (Gautier, 156.4–
8). Michael corresponded with members of the ruling elite, with intellectuals such as Theodore Prodomos, and with several physicians. His speeches-addressed to John II Komnenos (see U. Criscuolo, Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università Macerata 5-6 [1972–73] 541–52) and Manuel I convey important information on contemporary political events.


-A.K.

MICHAEL OF EPHESUS, philosopher and commentator on Aristotle. His biography is obscure and his dates disputed. K. Praechter (BZ 31 [1931] 1–12) asserted that Michael lived before 1040. If, however, “the wise man from Ephesus,” who worked on Aristotle until he ruined his eyesight, can be identified with Michael (Darrouzès, Tor nikés 283.9–11 and n.70), then the date of his life should be shifted to ca.1100. Probably a member of the circle of Anna Komnene, he was instrumental in the revival of Aristotelianism in Constantinople in the 11th and 12th C.

Michael commented on Aristotle’s zoological works (Michael’s commentary on the Generation of Animals was wrongly attributed to John Philoponos—CAG 14:3) as well as the Nicomachean Ethics, Politics, Rhetoric, Sophistical Refutations (wrongly attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias; CAG 2:3) and the short psychological works (i.e., Parva naturalia). The commentary of pseudo-Alexander on the Metaphysics is doubtless Michael’s as well (Preus, infra 12). His commentaries contain allusions to the contemporary situation, including criticism of the emperor (E. Barker, Social and Political Thought in Byzantium [Oxford 1957] 140f) and a discussion of education in Constantinople where, lacking guidelines for the teaching of youth, fathers taught them according to their own understanding (CAG 20:6:10.11–13).


-A.K., M.W.T.

MICHAEL RHETOR, mid-12th-C. writer, nephew or protégé of a metropolitan of Thessalonike, perhaps Basil of Ohrid. He made a career as a teacher at the Patriarchal School at Constantinople (didaskalos of the Gospels and magistros ton rhetoron) and patriarchal proteikas. In 1156 he supported Soterichos Panteugenos and was condemned with Nikephoros Basilakes but soon thereafter submitted a confession “of his errors” (ed. L. Allatius, De ecclesiis occidentalis et orientalis perpetua consensione [Cologne 1648] 691). Michael delivered three speeches to Manuel I with important information about the coalition of the Normans and Hungarians and imperial warfare against Serbia; he mentions the Second Crusade and conveys unique evidence about Manuel I’s plans for an expedition to the Azov Sea (A. Kazhdan in Okeanos 345–47). Since it mentions a Sicilian attack on the “northern shores of the Roman empire” (Regel, Fontes 156.13), one speech may have been delivered after 1158 when the Normans approached Constantinople, i.e., after Michael’s confession. Michael’s description (ekphrasis) of Hagia Sophia (the end of which is lost) presents the architectural and sculptural elements (not mosaics) and interprets the building symbolically as a reflection of the cosmos: the beholder is invited to see the entrance, the “heaven” above, the sides of sparkling stone, and the floor which is a “sea, out of which the holy sanctuary has been scooped.”


-A.K.

MICHAEL SYNKELOS, homilist, grammarian, and saint; born Jerusalem ca.761, died Chora monastery in Constantinople 4 Jan. 846. Of “Per sian” (Arab) origin according to his vita, Michael entered the Lavra of St. Sabas ca.786 and was ordained a priest; ca.811 he became Synkellos of the patriarch of Jerusalem. Patriarch Thomas sent Michael to Rome ca.815 to solicit financial assistance and to discuss theological and political problems. En route Michael was arrested in Constantinople as an Iconodule and suffered persecutions under Leo V and then under Theophilos, as a

In Edessa ca.811–13 Michael wrote a treatise on syntax, based on ancient grammarians; the earliest Byz. book preserved on the subject, is divided into eight chapters, from the noun to the conjunction. Michael treated the problem of the word, rather than the relation between words. His terminology is sometimes determined by extra-grammatical influence—thus the noun is defined as “essence (ousia) acting or suffering” (par.6). Especially popular from the 13th C. onward, Michael’s work survives in approximately 100 MSS. Besides the Treatise, Michael composed homilies and enkomia on saints (his authorship of the story of the Forty-two Martyrs of Amorion is questionable); a polemical account of the origins of Islam incorporated in the Chronicle of George Hamartolos (697.12–702.9) may be his work. He also wrote liturgical hymns and an anacreontic poem on the restoration of images. Michael was eulogized by an anonymous contemporary hagiographer, and later by Nikephoros Gregoras.

MICROCosm (μικρός κόσμος, lit. “small world”), the world in miniature. In patristic literature man is described as a microcosm in that he possesses in himself all the elements of the macrocosm; a unity of visible and invisible components, of body and soul. The latter is conceived as the essence “lying on the borders” (methrios) between the spiritual and the material, which serves as the mediator of a natural synthesis (Maximos the Confessor) and as “the bond (syndesmos) of the entire creation” (Kosmas Indikopleustes). Created by God, man is like the world, “a miniature world within the larger one” (John of Damascus, Exp. fidei 26.25–26, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:76), a unity of elements subject to the law of transience (John Italos, Quaestiones quodlibetales, par.70, ed. Joanou, p.118). The doctrine of the microcosm represents the attempt to develop an anthropology in the framework of a metaphysic of participation and sympathy, in cooperation with a holistic psychological conception; as Proklos states, “The essence of man is found in his soul” (In Alchibadem 1.18.4, ed. L.G. Westerink, 8).

The Church Building as Microcosm. The concept of microcosm in Byz. was extended to the church building, and thus the domed church as a reflection of the universe is a leitmotif in liturgical exegesis and ekphrasis. Following a cluster of Syriac commentaries (Ephrem the Syrian, Jacob of Sarug), the Byz. interpretation of this relationship is fully articulated in the so-called church history of Patr. Germanos I (“the church is a heaven on earth”) and implicit in church programs of decoration in and after the 9th C.

Michael Višević (τοῦ Βοσεβούτζη), prince of Zachlumia from ca.910; died ca.932? or after 949. He was the ally of Symeon of Bulgaria in his struggle against Byz. Constantine VII reports that his relatives came from the area of the river Visla (De adm. imp. 33.16–18). In 912 Michael arrested Peter, son of the Venetian doge Orso II, who was returning from Constantinople with rich presents, and sent him to Symeon. In 917 Michael informed Symeon about the mission of the strategos of Dyrrachion, Leo Rhabdouchos, who was trying to form a broad coalition against Bulgaria; Symeon acted promptly and won the battle at Achelous. In 926 Michael crossed the Adriatic and sacked Siponto (10 July) in Byz. Italy. He also sought an alliance with the papacy; in 924 papal legates summoned a council in Spalato (Split) and addressed Michael and Tomislav of Croatia, condemning the use of the Slavonic language in liturgy. After Symeon’s death (or before, according to Zlatarski, Ist. 1:2:479), Michael was reconciled with Byz., acknowledged the sovereignty of the empire, and was granted the titles of antihypatos and patrikios.


MICROCosm (μικρός κόσμος, lit. “small world”), the world in miniature. In patristic literature man is described as a microcosm in that he possesses in himself all the elements of the macrocosm; a unity of visible and invisible components, of body and soul. The latter is conceived as the essence “lying on the borders” (methrios) between the spiritual and the material, which serves as the mediator of a natural synthesis (Maximos the Confessor) and as “the bond (syndesmos) of the entire creation” (Kosmas Indikopleustes). Created by God, man is like the world, “a miniature world within the larger one” (John of Damascus, Exp. fidei 26.25–26, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:76), a unity of elements subject to the law of transience (John Italos, Quaestiones quodlibetales, par.70, ed. Joanou, p.118). The doctrine of the microcosm represents the attempt to develop an anthropology in the framework of a metaphysic of participation and sympathy, in cooperation with a holistic psychological conception; as Proklos states, “The essence of man is found in his soul” (In Alchibadem 1.18.4, ed. L.G. Westerink, 8).

MICROCosm (μικρός κόσμος, lit. “small world”), the world in miniature. In patristic literature man is described as a microcosm in that he possesses in himself all the elements of the macrocosm; a unity of visible and invisible components, of body and soul. The latter is conceived as the essence “lying on the borders” (methrios) between the spiritual and the material, which serves as the mediator of a natural synthesis (Maximos the Confessor) and as “the bond (syndesmos) of the entire creation” (Kosmas Indikopleustes). Created by God, man is like the world, “a miniature world within the larger one” (John of Damascus, Exp. fidei 26.25–26, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:76), a unity of elements subject to the law of transience (John Italos, Quaestiones quodlibetales, par.70, ed. Joanou, p.118). The doctrine of the microcosm represents the attempt to develop an anthropology in the framework of a metaphysic of participation and sympathy, in cooperation with a holistic psychological conception; as Proklos states, “The essence of man is found in his soul” (In Alchibadem 1.18.4, ed. L.G. Westerink, 8).


**MICROSTRUCTURES**, small social groupings, a modern scholarly term for classifying those societal units that were relatively stable and locally limited, conscious of their existence, and thus determined by law or ritual. Byz. microstructures included family, lineage, village community, guild, confraternity, monastery, and, to some extent, town community. A special feature of Byz. microstructures was their "atomistic" character: the family was the main social unit, while the links of lineage, guild, or *polis-municipium* remained relatively loose.


**MILAN** (*Mediolanum*, Lat. Mediolanum), residence of the praetorian prefect of Italy and of certain emperors (Maximianus, Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosios I) in the 4th c. Ausonius praised Milan as the fifth-largest city of the world after Rome, Constantinople, Carthage, and Trier. In Feb. 313 Constantine and Licinius met in Milan to elaborate common religious policy. Milan became ecclesiastical metropolis of most of northern Italy, its most famous bishop being AMBROSE. The city declined following the transfer of the imperial court to Ravenne in 402; the see lost part of its jurisdiction to Ravena and Aquileia. A major mint in the late 4th c., its coin production declined ca.404, ceased completely ca.420, and resumed on a much reduced scale from the last years of Valentinian III to 498.

The city was sacked by the Huns in 452 and was contested by the forces of ODOACER and THEODORIC THE GREAT between 489 and 491 but recovered under the OSTROGOTHS. In 538 Milan's leading citizens declared in favor of the Byz. cause, and in retaliation the Ostrogoths razed it in 539. Following Frankish raids in the 550s Milan was restored by NARES but fell to the Lombards on 3 Sept. 569; its bishop fled to Genoa, where his successors remained until ca.650. Under Carolingian and later Ottonian rule, Milan remained a connecting point with Byz.: in 1001 its archbishop Arnulf was sent to Constantinople by OTTO III. It is possible that the Pataria movement of 11th-c. Milan originated under the impact of Byz. dualist sects. In 1112 Peter GROSSOLANO, archbishop of Milan, visited Constantinople to discuss the FILIOQUE and other theological problems. In the 1160s, while involved in war against FREDERICK I, Milan sent two legates to Constantinople for negotiations; Emperor Manuel I promised financial support for Milan's restoration but required an oath of *fidelitas*.

**Monuments of Milan.** In the 4th and 5th c. Milanese art and architecture were more inventive and diverse than those of any other Western city, even ROME. S. Lorenzo, a uniquely ambitious tetraconch related in plan to 5th-c. churches in Syria, was probably an imperial foundation and is to be identified with the "Basilica Portiana," sequestered from St. Ambrose by Valentinian II. The niches of its octagonal chapel of S. Aquilino contain late 4th- to early 5th-c. mosaics that depict Christ as philosopher and as HELIOS; in the vestibule are fragments of a large apocalyptic composition. Churches sponsored by St. Ambrose were materially more modest but interesting for their symbolism. The Basilica Apostolorum (rebuilt as S. Nazaro) was a cross-shaped cemetery basilica that signified the faith in general resurrection for all who were buried in Christ. In the octagonal baptistery of the cathedral, Ambrose added a verse inscription that explained the regenerative symbolism of the number eight. A portrait of Ambrose is included in the 5th- to 6th-c. mosaics in the chapel of S. Vittore in Ciel d'oro at S. Ambrogio; although posthumous, it is a highly individualized image that clearly attempts to "portray" him in the modern sense.


**MILDENHALL TREASURE**, dated to the 4th c. and found in 1942 near Mildenhall in Suffolk, England. Now in the British Museum, it represents a medium-size collection of domestic silver plate. The treasure is composed of 27 silver objects (four plates, eight bowls, two goblets, five ladies, eight spoons), many elaborately decorated and some (goblets, ladles) bearing a resemblance
to pieces in the CARPATHOE TREASURE. The mixture of pagan and Christian elements in the decoration resembles much domestic silver of the period: a set of three plates (one large, two small) displays Dionysiac scenes; three bowls have emblems of Alexander the Great, his mother, and a hunter, respectively, while three spoons are inscribed with a CHRIStOGRAM. The names Pas- centia and Papitdeo appear on two spoons and that of Eutheros is scratched on a plate. It has been suggested that the last-mentioned individual was Emp. Julian’s praeceptor sacri cubiculi of that name (355–61 [PLRE 1:314]) who, as owner of the treasure, presented it to Lupidicus, the ma- gister equitum for Gaul (ibid. 1:520), before the latter’s departure for Britain in 360. 


MILEŠEVA, a monastery in southwestern Serbia, near Prijevoj, founded ca. 1220 by Prince Vladis- lax, son of King Stefan the First-Crowned. The katholikon, dedicated to the ASCENSION, has a Byz. ground plan: a nave with short cross arms for the choir, a single dome on pendentes, and three semicircular apses. The frescoes were probably executed before 1228; they reflect a standard Byz. church program, though the selection and distribution of the scenes is unusual. Along with portraits of the founder and his ancestors, the narthex contains a portrait of an unidentified Byz. emperor, possibly John III Vatatzes, standing near Constantine I the Great and Helena, his holy forebears; this is the only example in a Serbian church of a Byz. emperor thus acknowledged as overlord. Two artists were responsible for the frescoes; both were probably Greek, for they used a technique for rendering volume—the juxtaposition of red and green tones—otherwise employed only by the most sophisticated and classi- cizing Byz. painters. The backgrounds are either blue or ochre, the latter covered by gold leaf with imitation mosaic cubes drawn upon it. These frescoes are important for any study of the antecedents of Palaiologan painting, as few Byz. monum- ents have survived from this period. The marble sarcophagus of Vladislaw is preserved in the nave beneath his portrait; an exonarthex with two side chapels and frescoes of the Last Judgment was added ca. 1236 to house the tomb of St. SAVA OF SERBIA.


MILESTONE (μιλιον, Lat. miliarium), a stone post placed on a highway to indicate distance. Thou- sands of Roman milestones have been found from North Africa to Britain to Arabia; they were cy- lindrical columns made of limestone, granite, etc., usually 2–3 m high and set on a square base. They regularly bear inscriptions in Latin or Greek, some in praise of emperors, including those of the 4th and 5th C. (e.g., a milestone erected under Theodosios II and Valentinian III in 435—CIL 17.2, no.53). Apparently no milestones of the 6th C. or later have survived. The marking of dis- tances, measured in Milia (about 1,480 m), started from the Milion in Constantinople (see MESS). Milestones are an important source not only for studying the system of roads, but also for late Roman imperial propaganda. After the triumph of Christianity in the 4th C. certain milestones were provided with Christian symbols (e.g., the cross) and inscriptions.


MILETOS (Μίλητος), city on the Aegean coast of Asia Minor, now Balat (from Gr. Palatia). Its excavated remains show that Miletos flourished in the time of Diocletian, when much building and restoration took place, then fell into a decline; ancient buildings collapsed and small, shoddy structures, which disregarded the regular urban plan, were constructed over and within the ruins. The reign of Justinian I brought recovery as shown by a new cathedral, restored baths, and drainage of the harbor, works owed to the influence at court of a native son, HESYCHIOS of Miletos. New fortification walls of the 7th–8th C., which ex- cluded much of the ancient city and used the theater as their citadel, indicate a drastic contrac-
tion; small houses were built over the ruins within the circuit. Eventually, perhaps in the 12th C., Miletos withdrew entirely within its ancient theater, which was provided with a new citadel. It consequently took the name Palatia, for the people of the time thought the theater had been a palace. Miletos, which was originally a city of the Thrakesion theme, was briefly occupied by the Turks after Mantzikert and after the reconquest assigned to the theme of Mylasa and Melanoudion in the 12th C. By then it was a small township referred to as a *chora* (Pamou Engrapha 2, nos. 64.15, 73.9) or even *klima,* "estate" (op. cit. 2, no.66.1); it possessed no separate administration except for fiscal officials called *praktores.* It fell to the Turks of Menteshe ca.1285.

Suffragan of Aphrodisias, Miletos became an autochthonal archbishopric by 536, and a metropolis under Manuel I. The monastic center of Latros was northeast of Miletos.


---

**MILIARESION** (μιλιαρήσιον, from Lat. milliarensis), a name applied in the 4th C. to silver coins struck 72 to the pound and having in terms of bronze coins a value of 1,000 half-scripula or obols (J.-P. Callu, *RN* 22 [1980] 126–30). Byz. sources of the 7th–11th C. use it for the basic Byz. silver coin reckoned 12 to the solidus. Thus, *miliareion* was the Byz. name for the hexagram in the 7th C., and, afterwards, for the coins of a broad, thin fabric introduced by Leo III in 720 and characteristic of the 8th–11th C. (Numismatists, however, generally use the term *miliareion* for the latter coin only.) These coins seem initially to have been struck 144 to the pound, giving them a theoretical weight of 2.27 g, but in the Macedonian period they were heavier, probably 3.09 g (108 to the pound). Miliareia ceased to be struck in 1092, as a result of Alexios I's coinage reform, and the name survived as a money of account, 1/12 of the nomisma. The denomination was subsequently revived as the *basilikon.* Western documents apply the derivative term *millerès* to various types of Muslim silver coin.


---

**MILION** (μιλιόν), a measure of distance originally meaning 1,000 Roman double-steps (*passus*), also called *stathmos* or *semeion.* Byz. metrolological tables calculate 1 *milion* as 7 or 7.5 *stadia,* respectively 4,200 and 4,500 "feet" (see Pous), that is, approximately 1,312 m and 1,404 m; the figure of 7.5 *stadia* is also given in the *Treatise on Taxation* (Dölger, *Beiträge* 113.8–9), but John Tzetzes gives 4,600 "feet." On the other hand, both the *Treatise on Taxation* and Constantine Harenopoulos define 1 *milion* as 750 geometrical or 840 simple *orgyat* (= 1,581 and 1,574 m, respectively). As longer measures of distance, an *allage* of 6 *milia* and *hemeresios dromos* of approximately 90 *milia* were used. The classicizing *stadium* and *parasanges,* although mentioned in the *Treatise on Taxation,* were not employed in everyday life.

(For the Milion in Constantinople, see *Mese.*)


---

**MILITARY RELIGIOUS SERVICES** on a regular basis date from the early 4th C., when Constantine I granted his Christian soldiers leave to attend Sunday liturgy. By the mid-5th C. military chaplains are found in the army (Jones, *LRE* 632f), and priests are commonly listed among the army's nonmilitary personnel in 6th- and 10th-C. *strategika*; St. Loukas the Stylist (10th C.), for example, was a military chaplain who conducted services for soldiers each Sunday (Delehaye, *Saints stylites* 201.14–25). Liturgical books were brought along on imperial campaigns (*De cer.* 467.4).

Religious rituals were an integral part of the army's daily routine. According to the 10th-C. *Praecepta militaria,* matins and vespers were held daily, and the soldiers sought repentance through prayer and tears; anyone failing to participate was severely punished. Before battle the soldiers were enjoined to resolve their differences, to fast, and to confess their sins before taking communion—measures intended to reinforce morale, to dispel anxiety and the fear of death, and to secure God's favor. Other prebattle rituals included the blessing of standards and weapons. After battle, proper services for the dead were
observed and thanksgiving for victory was offered, esp. following such notable successes as the triumph of John Tzimiskes over the Rus' in 971 (Skyl. 300.65–67).


—E.M.

MILITARY SAINTS, a group of saints (including George, Demetrios, Nestor, Theodore Toten, Theodore Stratelates, Merkourios, Prokopios) conceived and represented as armed soldiers. The evolution of the image of military saints consisted in the militarization of their roles: from civic official to warrior, from soldier to general, from foot soldier to mounted knight. The chronology of this development, however, cannot be established with precision. Some earlier martyrs contained the theme of the Christian's renouncing the military profession and proclaiming himself a fighter for the king of heaven; later this "antiwar" attitude disappeared. The miracles worked by military saints included, besides "normal" ones, actions such as the defense of cities and providing assistance to armies. The military saints cannot, however, claim an exclusive prerogative to military deities: the Virgin Mary, the apostle Andrew, and some other saints were also active as military protectors of the Byz. The military aristocracy often chose military saints as patrons and placed their images on seals; the Komnenian dynasty introduced figures of Demetrios, George, and Theodore on coins.


—A.K.

MILL (μύλος). A mill powered by oxen, mylikon ergasterion zoikinon (typikon of Petritzos monastery, ed. P. Gautier, REB 42 [1984] 43.392–93), was the predominant device for grinding grain in the Roman Empire. In a law of 364 an average bakery is described as having animals and slaves. This form of mill continued to exist in later centuries: the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (ch.18.1) also mentions the animals that turn the millstones, and in the 11th C., on the ground floor of the Constantinopolitan mansion of Michael Attaleiates, was a mill driven by a donkey. The typikon of the Kosmosoteira monastery at Ber (p.60.25–26) forbade strangers access to the monastery's onomoi, mills powered by donkeys.

The hand mill (cheiromylos) was also known: a thief stole the quern that Loukas the Younger kept in his hut (E. Martini, AB 13 [1894] 103.30–31); such querns were carried in the wagon trains of campaigning armies (Taktika of Leo VI 5.6). A most unusual example is the geared mill turned by Samson in an illustrated Octateuch (Vat. gr. 747, fol.251r [II]).

Water mills (hydromylones) were used in late antiquity: a 5th-C. mill was excavated at the agora of Athens. The axle ran between the sockets from the wheelrace to the pit in the mill room; on the shaft, where it crossed the pit, a vertical tympanum was set, meshing with the larger horizontal tympanum whose vertical shaft moved the millstone. In Rome, mills on the Janiculum powered by water from an aqueduct are attested in the 4th–6th C.; when the Goths in 537 stopped the flow of water through the aqueduct, the Romans tried to set up floating mills on the Tiber. Byz. texts water mills are common from the Farmer's Law to the documents of the Palaiologian period; evidently they became the principal type of mill. Water mills were of two types, the winter mills that worked only when streams were in full spate and the "year-round ergasteria" (e.g., MM 4:7:7). A water mill is included in the floor mosaic of the Great Palace at Constantinople (Great Palace, 1st Report, pl. 41).

Windmills (anemomylones) appear infrequently in documents, but they evidently existed in the 14th C.: thus, a praktikon of 1304 mentions a windmill located near a water mill (Laura 2, no.99.39). The same praktikon indicates that peasants could own shares of a windmill (ibid., no.99.54, 152).


—A.K., J.W.N., A.C.

MILUTIN. See Stefan Uroš II Milutin.
MILVIAN BRIDGE, span over the river Tiber in Rome, site of the battle of 28 Oct. 312 where Constantine I the Great defeated Maxentius. Prior to the battle, according to both Eusebius of Caesarea and Lactantius, Constantine had some sort of religious experience, attributed at least in later times to the Christian God. The emperor put signs on his troops' shields or devised standards (labarum) that reflected that experience. Maxentius cut off the approaches to Rome, including the Milvian Bridge, but constructed a temporary bridge of boats and came out to fight. Constantine's victory and the death of Maxentius made him sole emperor in the West and consolidated the position of Christianity (see Eclect of Milan); it was also an important precedent for Christian concepts of triumph. The battle is depicted on the Arch of Constantine; a relief from Caesarea in Mauritania often said to show the battle probably does not. The patrician comparison between the battle and the crossing of the Red Sea was exploited on sarcophagi and preserved in Byz. art. In the Paris Gregory (fol. 440r), the miniature depicting Constantine's victory places the bridge over a Tiber painted red.


MINERALOGY. Contrasted with the careful classification of "stones" in Theophrastus's work of ca.300 B.C., Byz. lapidaries concentrated almost always on their magical and medical properties, a tendency foreshadowed by sections of the Hippocratic corpus as well as the record of medical stones and metals by Dioskorides. When Aetios of Amida wrote his medical encyclopedia, the topic of medical stones had become subsumed within a large, popular genre of magical and mythological lapidaries, represented in the extant texts of "Orpheus," called On Stones (Orphoeos lithika, ed. G.N. Giannakes [Ioannina 1982]). Under the name of Zoroaster survive fragments of lapidaries, closely related to certain passages in the magical papyri (The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, ed. H.D. Betz [Chicago 1986] vol. 1) as well as to On Stones by Psellos. Also related are some of the Greek works on alchemy. The astrological properties of "stones" are linked with seasonal herbs, likewise of major importance, in some tracts purported to be by Hermes Trismegistos as well as many sections in the texts of Byz. astrology. Byz. authors sought to discover the connections of "stones" and their growth in the earth with pharmacology and magic; although precious and semiprecious gems were emphasized, the study of "things mined" (including coral, magnetite, and amber as well as the expected opal, topaz, emerald, gold, silver, and copper) entailed an ever more detailed collection of data, used to provide efficacy in astrological or alchemical medicine and pharmacy. (See also Gems, Amulet, and Mines.)


MINES (μεταλλα) operated in various areas of the Roman Empire and are often mentioned and described in the sources; some of them ceased to function, at least temporarily, in the late 3rd C. (J. Ramin, La technique minière et métallurgique des anciens [Brussels 1977] 13). For the late Roman period, there is information about both public and private mining operations throughout the empire. Edmondson (infra) has argued that at this time larger mining districts declined, the emphasis changed to smaller-scale exploitation of mines, and there was less direct government control of mining operations. Although many miners were

MIMESIS. See IMITATION.
freemen (Sodini, “L’artisanat urbain” 101), widespread use was made of criminals (and prisoners of war), since legislation of the 4th and 5th C. prescribed work in the mines as punishment (in metallum damnare). This legislation, preserved primarily in the Codex Theodosianus, was repeated in the Basilika and by Harmenopoulos, but these later repetitions may be anachronistic. In the Balkans in late antiquity mines were under the supervision of the comes metallorum for Illyricum. There is very little information on Byz. mines from the 7th to 12th C., much more data (primarily from non-Byz. sources) for the 13th–15th C. Vronis (infra) has argued that the silence of the Byz. sources does not mean that mines ceased to function on Byz. soil, but that Byz. historians did not consider this sort of information important.

Iron was widely available: mines are attested in Syro-Palestine, Anatolia (Trebizond, Sinope), the Crimea, the eastern Danube region (Capidava, Pačuiul lui Soare, Dinogtea), Macedonia, and Noricum. In the Roman period major centers of copper production were located in the West (M. Lombard, Les métaux dans l’ancien monde du Ve au XIe siècle [Paris–The Hague 1974] 13–15); the mines of Euboea were exhausted, and those of Sinai and neighboring areas ceased to be exploited after the 3rd C. Among the sources of copper after the 6th C. were Cyprus, Pontos, and the Caucasus; old bronze was also recycled. A decrease in bronze coinage is evident from the beginning of the 7th C. but it is hard to determine to what extent this was connected with a decline in copper mining.

The ancient sources of gold in Macedonia, Thrace, and Asia Minor were practically exhausted by the 6th C. even though the traditional expression “the gold-rich Pactolus” (in Lydia) was still used proverbially. Gold was brought to Byz. from Armenia: in the 6th C. Prokopios (Wars 1.15.18) cites the strongholds of Bolon and Pharrangin in Persarmenia as places where the metal was extracted, and in the 9th C. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 179.7) speaks of golden mines (chrysorychia) in the Armenian mountains. Gold came also via Axum: Kosmas Indikopleustes (2:51f) describes how Axumite merchants visited the land of Sasou (Yu. Kobiščanov, PSb 111 [1964] 94–112) to exchange meat, salt, and iron for gold ingots called tanchara. Gold was also mined on Mt. Pan-

gaion in Thrace, and nuggets were found in the auriferous streams of the Rhodope Mountains.

Silver was likewise mined in widespread regions of the empire. The mines in Attica (at Sou- nion, Laurion, and Thorikos) were in operation in the 5th–6th C. (G. Fowden, JHS 108 [1988] 55 and n.43). In the 6th C. Paul Silentarios (vv. 679–80) noted that silver used in the decoration of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, came from Sounion and Mt. Pangaión. Other silver mines were located in Armenia and Cyprus; esp. in the late Byz. period silver was obtained from the Caucasus and Serbia (e.g., at Novo Brdo).

Numerous toponyms of small settlements deriving from the terms for iron and copper—for example, Sidera (Xénoph., no.19.35), Sidereas (Lavra 2, no.111.11), Sideropetra (Lavra 2, no.90.210), Siderokastron (Solovjev-Mošin, Grčke povele, no. 28.44), Siderokauseia (Ephig., no.15.19, etc.), Sideronin (Vazelon, no.12.3), Chalkobounon (Xénoph., no.4.17), Chalkopagas (Lavra 3, no. 122.12)—probably reflect the expansion of medieval mining; it is noteworthy that toponyms connected with gold and silver (save for large towns like Chrysochoris) are extremely rare—for example, the rivulet Argyroba (Lavra 2, no.108.899).


A.K., A.M.T.

MINORITES. See Franciscans.

MINTS. Byz. coins were at some periods minted only at Constantinople, but more often there were one or more provincial mints as well. Only in the early period (4th–8th C.) were the mints commonly indicated on the coins. Where explicit mintmarks are absent, identification is highly conjectural.

The pattern of minting in the later Roman Empire was set by Diocletian, who brought all mints under the direct control of the state. The great size of the empire made the centralized
manufacture of coins impossible, so provincial mints were created, patterned closely upon the civil dioceses. Minting was controlled through the praetorian prefectures, but the directors of the mints (procuratores monetarum) came under the jurisdiction of the comes sacrarum largetionum. Closely geared to the needs of the state and army, minting was to some degree sporadic, gold and silver coins in great quantity being required at intervals for accession donatives and quinquennial distributions.

A mint-mark forming part of the design on a coin identified the mint by abbreviating its name (e.g., RM for Roma), often adding SM (for Sacra Moneta) or the standard abbreviation for the technical term for refined gold (OB, obryzum) or silver (PS, pusulatum). Also, as most mints were divided into officinae, this was indicated as well, normally as a Greek numeral (from A to I = 1–10). In the third quarter of the 4th C. the minting of gold was centralized in the palatine officium of the comes sacrarum largetionum, so that coins of this metal were struck only when and where the emperor was in residence. After the accession of Arkadios, the eastern emperor rarely left Constantinople; in consequence the formulae CON and CONOB (COMOB in the West) became the distinctive mark of gold coins, used even when the gold was minted elsewhere. This was notably the case after Justinian I’s reconquest of the West, for this resulted in the opening or reopening of imperial gold mints at Carthage, Ravenna, and Rome. The little silver that was then being struck came from the same mints. At the same time there were many provincial mints for copper, with mints and officinae normally identified on the coins as they had been in the 4th C.

The reign of Herakleios saw a change, for in 628–29 all provincial mints other than Alexandria were closed. Whether such a situation could have lasted, given the difficulty of transporting heavy copper coins over large distances, is impossible to say, for Syria and Egypt were lost to the Arabs within a few years. But dies were occasionally sent out from Constantinople to enable minting to be carried out at Thessalonike, and in the West a plethora of mints existed down to the time of the loss of these provinces.

In later centuries the bulk of coins was struck at Constantinople. Nicholas Mesarites vividly describes the dirt and noise in which the mint em-

ployees worked in his account of their role in the revolt of John Komnenos in 1200 (Mesarites [ed. Heisenberg] 25.32–26.9). Provincial mints were opened from time to time, as administrative or military needs dictated, but since mint-marks were no longer employed—even CON did not last beyond the reign of Leo III—their products can be separated from those of the capital only by iconographic or stylistic differences, and the locations of the mints themselves can be determined only by the evidence of find spots or, in the case of coins struck by usurpers, by our knowledge from other sources of where these usurpers were in power (e.g., Isaac Komnenos in Cyprus). The main provincial mint was normally Thessalonike, to which Hendy would assign all copper folles with rulers’ names struck between 1059 and 1092 (leaving the Anonymous Folles to Constantinople). This mint was supplemented in the 12th C. by one in central Greece, perhaps at Thebes. Later coins can sometimes be attributed to Thessalonike by their peculiarities in style or fabric, confirmed occasionally by a preference for representations of St. Demetrios or of an emperor, or an emperor and another saint, holding a building inscribed with the name of the city. Trebizond was a mint under the Gabradas and again from the 13th C. onward under the emperors of Trebizond; Nicaea and Magnesia were imperial mints at various times in the 13th C. The mark ΦΑΔΦ identifies a group of 14th-C. trachea struck at Philadelphia—Pegolotti refers to perperi di Filadelfe (S. Bendall, Schweizer Münzblätter 34 [1984] 3–8).


MINUSCULE, the script used from ca.800 to copy MSS. It evolved in the 7th or 8th C. from the cursive script. The oldest dated minuscule MS is the Usfenski Gospel Book from 835. In book production the minuscule had such advantages over the uncial as greater compactness and greater speed of writing, combination of letters by ligature, and (later) frequent abbreviations. The use of accents and breathings (at first intermittent, later regular) led to greater legibility and more reliable texts. In the 9th–10th C. it served for the transliteration (metacharakterismos) of Greek uncial MSS, including antique works: examples of metacharakterismos are the codices com-
missioned by Arethas of Caesarea, e.g., the Euclid MS of 888 (Oxford, Bodl. D’Orville 301), or the Plato of 895 (once on Patmos, now Oxford, Bodl. Clarke 59). The hypothesis that minuscule script originated in the Studios Monastery in Constantinople has been met with skepticism by N. Wilson (Scholars 66). The new Sinai finds (1975) suggest that an early form of minuscule was in wide use in the Palestine region between 800 and 850.

Minuscule is written without regard for the regular separation of words; it is contained within four parallel lines, with upstrokes and downstrokes. Among the typical features of early minuscule are (1) the angular breathings (in the form of a truncated eta; (2) the iota adscriptum (i.e., written on the line next to the preceding letter), a feature that continues into the 11th C.; and (3) writing the letters on the ruling line (later, the letters are written under the line). As early as the late 9th C. letters from the majuscule alphabet, for example, gamma and kappa, were reintroduced into the minuscule, at first at the end of lines. H. Hunger has proposed the term “pearl script” to characterize the style of minuscule that flourished esp. in the 10th and 11th C. (H. Hunger in PGEB 202). In the 12th C. the enlargement of the circumflex and certain letters changed the appearance of the written page. In the second half of the 13th C. was introduced a cursive form of minuscule (called beta-gamma style by N. Wilson and Fettaugenmode [“blob of fast style’”] by H. Hunger), alongside the traditional or archaising minuscule, which imitated 11th-C. models. The bookscript of the 14th C. is characterized by a more calligraphic style, called “Metochites style” by Hunger after the style of deluxe MSS containing works by this author (e.g., Vienna, ONBL phil. gr. 95), and by the development of the HodEgon style. The earliest Greek printed books (and to a great extent modern ones as well) adopted the 15th-C. minuscule letters for their type.


MIRABILIA. See Paradoxography.

MIRACLES (sing. θαυμα), extraordinary events, either beyond the range of corporeal nature or extremely unlikely. Perceptible to the senses, miracles were believed to have been produced by God or—with divine support—by a saint as a sign of the supernatural. A miracle is to be strictly distinguished from extraordinary phenomena produced by demons or magic. The miracles caused directly by God were viewed primarily as punishing humans for their sins (fire and brimstone poured on Sodom and Gomorrah, the Egyptian plagues, drowning the Pharaoh in the Red Sea) or predicting danger, whereas the Virgin Mary and the thaumaturgic saints were thought to work a broader range of miracles: healing (including exorcism); rescues from shipwreck, captivity, or enemy attack; creating abundance instead of shortage (of bread, wine, and oil); assistance in travels (esp. in crossing rivers); entering or escaping from locked buildings; sending messages and documents with extraordinary speed; prophecy; revealing men’s concealed thoughts and actions (esp. theft); incorruptibility of the corpse.

The saints work miracles thanks to the grace they have received from God who distributes among them aspects of his power, sometimes allotting a saint a geographical region and a particular field of action; they usually act in response to human petition and prayer. “This world of saints,” says G. Dagron (Vie et Miracles de sainte Thècle [Brussels 1978] 95), “is closely modeled on the empire (served by) functionaries.” Saints differ from pagan gods and miracle workers in that they do not need material objects to achieve their goals—they act primarily by purely spiritual force and psychic contact, by word (prayer), gaze, and gesture.

Collections of miracles are usually divided into those worked during the saint’s life and posthumous ones; the latter are either described at the end of the vita or form special treatises (miracula), such as those of Sts. George, Demetrios, and Nicholas.

The Byz. sometimes evinced a critical attitude toward miracles—not in principle, but in specific cases. Some extraordinary phenomena, such as earthquakes, found a natural explanation, and hagiographers often complained of their audience’s scepticism about miracles; contemporaries, for instance, questioned both the authenticity and divine character of the miracles of Kyros and John.
**Representation in Art.** When a miracle performed by a saint parallels a Gospel event, the biblical iconography was adopted with a minimum of alteration (see Hagiographical Illustration). Depictions of exorcisms or healings performed by holy men, for example, generally show the saint standing before the afflicted person and raising one hand in a sign of blessing; the visual association with the figure of Christ is far from coincidental. Miracles that are not paralleled in the Bible were less apt to be chosen for illustration; where they do exist, the complex events were often reduced to what could be rendered by means of simple formulas. Miraculous or posthumous appearances are not signaled in any particular way: the saint just turns up in person to take part in the scene. Woven into the fabric of regular vita cycles, miracle scenes are rarely illustrated independently. One exception, however, is a temple beam at the St. Catherine monastery on Mt. Sinai, which illustrates a sequence of posthumous miracles of St. Eustathios.


**MIRACLES OF CHRIST.** Of all the episodes of Christ's ministry, his miracles are the most frequently depicted. The earliest Christian art of the Catacombs draws almost exclusively on his infancy and miracles. Especially widespread are the Marriage at Cana and the Feeding of the Multitude, often paired as prefigurations of the Eucharist; the water miracles (Jn 4:5–30; 5:2–9: 9:1–7, see healing of the Blind Man), associated with Baptism; and the healing miracles, associated with conversion. By the 6th C., the miracles had been assembled into cycles (Sant’ Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna). The 10th-C. Göreme churches of Tokali Kilise and St. Theodore, Sousam Bayrii (Restle, *Wall Painting* 2, figs. 71, 88–91, 105; 3, figs. 374–84) retain such sequences, but few miracles are represented in the following century and a half other than those that became major liturgical feasts, such as the miracle of the Raising of Lazarus (Jn 11:1–46; see Lazarus Saturday), or those included in the Frieze Gospels. Miracle scenes reappear in the later 12th C. and become prominent again in the discursive imagery of the Palaiologan period: CHORA; Athos, Iveron 5 (*Treausres* II, figs. 11–39); monastery of St. Nikita at Çučer; Stara Nagoričina.


**MIRCEA THE ELDER,** or Mircea the Great (called Myrzas [Μυρζάς] or Miltzes in Byz. sources), prince of Wallachia (from 1386); died 31 Jan. 1418. In Byz. terminology he was referred to as voivod of Blachia, archegos of the Moesi or “Moesians” (Doukas), or tyrannos of Dacia (Chalkokondyles). Mircea joined the anti-Turkish alliance but was defeated at Kosovo Polje. When Bayezid I invaded Wallachia, Mircea organized a partisan war against him (Chalk. 1:73f) and on 17 May 1395 routed the Turks and their Slavic vassals at Rovine. Despite the victory, Mircea had to acknowledge the suzerainty of the sultan. The next year Mircea, in alliance with Sigismund of Hungary, marched against the Turks, but the allies lost the battle at Nikopolis on the Danube. Mircea had to give up Dobrogea, which he had recently annexed. The Turkish defeat at the battle of Ankara in 1402 reversed the situation: Mircea formed a coalition with Sigismund and Stefan Lazarević against the Turks, in 1404 supported the revolt of Constantine and Fružin in Bulgaria (P. Petrov, *IzvInst-BülgIst* 9 [1960] 187–214), and again occupied Dobrojudja. The Ottoman prince Musa sought Mircea’s support against his brother Süleyman Çelebi and until Musa’s death in 1413 Wallachia enjoyed relative security. It was surrendered to the Turks either in the last years of Mircea or, according to R.-S. Ciobanu (*RevIst* 39 [1986] 764–73), after 1419/20.


**MIRROR OF PRINCES,** conventional term borrowed from Western medieval literature to describe a text offering advice to a ruler. Although drawing on common principles of statecraft, Mirrors are distinct from basilikoi logoi, because they offer elements of criticism rather than pure adulation. Hunger (infra) considers the speech of Synesios titled *On Kingship* as the earliest Byz.
MISKAWAYH, Abū ‘Alī Ahmad ibn Muhammad, Arab historian; born ca.942, died 16 Feb. 1030. Of obscure background, a secretary under the vizierate of the ‘Abbāsids, he later served the Būyids in Rayy, where he held several positions, including curatorship of a private library. An enormously learned man, he was esp. interested in philosophy, medicine, and alchemy. He wrote on medicine, philosophy, and religion and was a respected littérature and poet. He disdained the contemporary Greeks but admired the classical thinkers and firmly advocated religious toleration.

His best-known work is The Experiences of the Nations, a history from Creation to 980. Its first volumes are based on Miskawayh’s predecessors. As he sometimes preserves material from works now lost, his accounts of the Persian wars under Maurice and Herakleios and of the Arab conquests in Syria are of interest. From 951 on he provides original material informed by keen critical observation and access to extensive library resources and official circles. He repeatedly relates Byz. successes in the frontier wars of the 10th C., and also describes diplomatic negotiations and contacts, in particular the magnificent reception for Byz. ambassadors in Baghdad in 917.


—L.I.C.

MISIMIYAH. See Phaini.

MISSIONS. Christianity was a missionary religion from the time of the apostles, esp. St. Paul. Missionary activity received added importance in the 4th C. when the concept developed that the late Roman Empire and christianized territory were co-terminous (see OIKUMENE); hence, the conversion of non-Christians was a boon to the empire. Thus, the state was frequently involved in missions and often used missionaries as agents of imperial policy. Byz. missions can be divided into three categories: those in which military intervention was used to support the spread of Christianity, those that were part of a diplomatic effort, and those conducted by individuals, who were sometimes officially supported, sometimes on their own.

In the 4th–5th C. Orthodox bishops such as Porphyrios of Gaza spread Christianity among pagans, but missions to people outside the empire were undertaken largely by Arians, Nestorians, and Monophysites, whose activities within Byz. were limited; Ulfilas was the primary missionary to the Goths while Nestorian missionaries traveled as far as China. The great age of Orthodox missionary activity began in the 9th C., inspired in part by the Rus’ attack on Constantinople in 860, and leading directly to the mission dispatched by
Photios to Boris I of Bulgaria and that of Con-
stantine the Philosopher and Methodios to
the Moravians. Missionary centers were estab-
lished at Ohrid, Preslav, and other cities, where
Slavic priests were trained in Byz. Christianity.
Missionaries were also sent to the Alans and other
peoples of the northern Caucasus and to Hun-
gary. The greatest success of Byz. missionaries
was the conversion of Vladimir I of Kiev in 988.
Missionaries such as St. Nikon ho “Metaneite”
worked within the frontiers of the empire for the
conversion of pagan peoples settled there.

Characteristically, Byz. missionary activity worked
“from the top down” by focusing first on the
rulers and leaders of society who then arranged
the conversion of their people en masse, although
missionaries also worked consistently among the
people after the “official” conversion. The tradi-
tional view that Byz. missionaries normally oper-
ated on the premise that people should be ad-
dressed in their own language, and hence the
Scripture, liturgy, and writings of the Fathers
were translated into local languages, has recently
been questioned (I. Ševčenko, infra 19 and n.38).
Forced hellenization was sometimes attempted,
esp. when Byz. achieved direct political control
over the missionary area. Byz. practice, however,
led in most places to the emergence of native
“national” Christianity, strongly influenced by Byz.
models but culturally and administratively sepa-
rate.

Lit. I. Ševčenko, “Religious Missions Seen from Byzant-
(1967), 649–74. C. Hannick, “Die byzantinischen Missi-
onen,” in Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte, II, 1. Die
F. Dvornik, Byzantine Missions among the Slavs. SS.
Constantine-Cyril and Methodius (New Brunswick, N.J.,

T.E.G., I.S.

MISSION TO THE APOSTLES refers to two
distinct Gospel episodes: Christ’s mission to the
newly assembled 12 Apostles (Mt 10:1–42, Mk
6:7–11, Lk 9:1–5) and his farewell to the 11,
recounted in Luke 24:50 as a parting blessing and
elsewhere (Mt 28:18–20, Mk 16:15–18) as a final
mission. Two compositions existed, one showing
a frontal Christ flanked by two groups of six
disciples, the other showing him to one side. Each
composition could be applied to either episode,
although, where both compositions appear in the
same MS, the accompanying text reveals that the
symmetrical one is meant to represent the fare-
well. This is confirmed in the wall paintings in
Cappadocia (Tokali Kilise, Göreme—Ristie, Wall
Painting 2, pl.108), where the Ascension is con-
flated with the symmetrical image of the Mission.
Paul often appears as one of the disciples, and
the farewell scene always depicts 12, not the can-
onical 11, to show that the scene signifies Christ’s
mission to his Church. Miniatures of the Mission
preface certain 11th- through 12th-C. Gospel
books, illustrating the call to evangelize that the
Gospels fulfill. Unknown before the 9th C., the
image becomes rare again in Palaiologan art.

Lit. A.W. Carr, “Gospel Frontispieces from the
Commnenian Period,” Gesta 21 (1982) 10–11. Colwell-
Willoughby, Karahissar 2:363.

A.W.C.

MISSORIUM. See Plate, Domestic Silver and
Gold.

MISTHIOS (μισθος), also misthotos (from misthos,
 wage), terms that in papyri denoted hired workers
(Fikman, Emodern 109). Misthios appears once in the
FARMER’S LAW (par.34) as a designation of a
hired shepherd, and hagiographers, drawing upon
John 10:12, often speak of a misthotos who, unlike
a good shepherd, abandons the sheep and runs
away. The Book of the Eparch describes misthioi
misthotoi as journeymen in the guilds of metaxopra-
tai and serikarioi: they signed contracts with their
masters for not longer than a month. In the
Treatise on Taxation (ed. Dölger, Beiträge 115.41)
as well as in the vita of Basil the Younger, a misthios
is a peasant who resides and works in a PRO-
asteion in which the owner does not live. St.
Christodoulos of Patmos, in the typikon of 1091,
is probably referring to this category of people
when he speaks of laymen who work five days a
week for his monastery and return home for the
weekend. Ecloga 8:2 applies the term misthios to
the poor freeman who worked to repay debt or
ransom. Late Roman texts contrasted misthios/mis-
 thotos with misthotes, tenant or contractor, but Byz.
jurists confused these terms: the Basilika used the
word misthotos for both contractor and free colonus
(E. Popescu in Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte

The terms are infrequent in later documents
and appear usually in conjunction with douleutes
MISTHOSIS (μισθωσις), a form of lease. Byz. legal sources designate as misthosis a series of legal transactions involving the transference of something or the performance of a job for pay (misthos). The term corresponds to the Roman/Justinianic locatio-conductio and to the Hellenistic misthosis. The tenure of a vineyard, the rent of a house, and the completion of a piece of work are all accordingly designated as misthosis. Since the labor of an individual can also be given over to another person in exchange for payment, the service and work contract was also classified as misthosis. The term (cf. Digest 19.2) is maintained in the Basilika (20.1) and even into the 14th C. (cf. Harm. 3.8) in collections of legal norms.

In practice, however, this uniformity quickly dissolved; the notion of ownership was not distinctly outlined, so that by the post-Justinianic period the distinction between misthosis and a loan was difficult to establish and misthos and tokos (see Interest) became interchangeable. Not only land lease in general but also its specific form, emphyteusis, could, as the Peira 15.17 shows, be characterized as misthosis. Even charistikon could be treated in this way (Peira 15.9), although there the absence of payment meant the transaction was closer to a loan. The collapse of the old concept was finally caused, on the one hand, by the great number of new transactions of transmission—which fluctuated between privilege, donation, transfer of rent-collection rights, among other things—and, on the other, by the reduction of free contracts for paid labor on account of the numerous institutional dependent and bondage relationships.

In place of misthosis new terms appeared such as pakton, aktos paktotikon (Sathas, MB 6:622.25), or paktotike symphonia (624.2–3), or nonspecific older words such as ekdosis or homologia. Only misthos held its ground as a term for “rent” (Dionys. no.14.5), for “payment for a job” (Meyer, Haupturkunden 105.5f), for “salary” (Prot. no.7.115), etc. In the 13th–15th C. the Byz. probably still distinguished between credit, tenure relationships, and service contracts as phenomena in their everyday life. However, it cannot be said at the present time whether in the consciousness of the jurists a uniform “act of transmission” had taken the place of the differentiated contract-typology or whether simply a collapse of the tradition of legal culture had occurred.

MISTRA (Μυστρας or Μυστράς), fortress and city in the Peloponnese, on a hill west of Sparta, at the foot of Mt. Taygetos; it was capital of the despotate of Morea. Mistra first appears in the sources in the 13th C. William II Villehardouin built a castle there shortly after his capture of Monemvasia; its purpose was to secure the plain of Lakonia from the Slavs of Taygetos. In 1262, after the battle of Pelagonia, Mistra was surrendered by the Franks to Byz. From 1262 to 1348 Mistra was ruled by a strategos, called kephale, who initially changed every year (until 1308) and who ruled all the Byz. Peloponnese. During this period, and esp. after the Frankish victory at the battle of Makryplagi (1264?), there was considerable insecurity in the region and the inhabitants of Lakedaimon moved for greater safety to a city built under the fortress at Mistra. From 1348 to 1460 Mistra was seat of the despotes of the Morea. The city witnessed a remarkable cultural renaissance, including the teaching of PLETHON (at Mistra ca.1407–52), and attracted artists and architects of the highest quality. The city surrendered to Mehmed II on 31 May 1460.

The castle at Mistra is perched at the top of a hill that has precipitous slopes except on the east. The circuit wall has only one tower, above the ascent, and a single entrance. The keep occupies the height of the hill. The castle seems entirely Frankish in construction, but the walls of a chapel in the keep do not bond with the surrounding masonry; this may be evidence of earlier Byz. construction on the site (N.B. Drandakes, 10 CEB 1 [Athens 1954] 154–66). The city is surrounded
by a fortification wall and divided into two sections, an upper and a lower, each pierced by several gates.

The palace of the despotai was located on one of the few flat spaces at Mistra, in the upper city at the highest point where running water was available. It is composed of an L-shaped complex of buildings constructed in several stages from the 13th to 15th C., all arranged around a monumental open space (S. Sinos, *Architettura* 17 [1987] 105–28).

The oldest part, perhaps inaugurated already by the Franks, was a rectangular block with a single barrel-vaulted room on the ground floor and painted windows above. To this was attached a two-story residential section built in the second half of the 14th C., with six contiguous rooms on the second floor and an arched portico along the rear, the roof of which formed a balcony overlooking the wide valley. In the early 15th C. a new wing was built at right angles to the previous structures; it had a large audience hall on the upper floor and a two-story external portico along the wall facing the square.

The houses at Mistra are among the best-preserved examples from Byz. (A. Orlandos in *Art et société à Byzance sous les Paleologues* [Venice 1971] 75–82). The great houses resemble the palace, with large halls on the upper floor and storerooms at street level; many of them have balconies looking out over the plain.

**Churches of Mistra.** Seven of the town’s churches, dating from the late 13th to the early 15th C., have been preserved. Their plans are varied and show an awareness of contemporary trends in Constantinople, though one particular plan survives nowhere else and may be a local invention. Their masonry, for the most part a sober cloisonné (see brickwork techniques and patterns), exhibits in some cases lively patterns of a Constantinopolitan type. Much of the interior stone carving consists of *spolia*, mostly medieval, robbed probably from buildings in the city of Sparta. Frankish elements appear frequently in such architectural details as pointed windows but do not affect the actual church plans; similarly, Western elements invade individual frescoes but never the overall program of decoration. The latter follows the general course of late Byz. monumental painting, with a growing emphasis on liturgical themes and extended secondary cycles, esp. those of Christ and the Virgin, at the expense of hagiographical cycles and the isolated portrait.

The earliest of the surviving churches is that of St. Demetrios, the metropolitan church built in the second half of the 13th C. as a wooden-roofed
basilica. A marble inscription suggests the involvement (in 1291/2?) of the metropolitan Nikephoros Moschopoulos, but the church and some frescoes at its eastern end may actually precede him (M. Chatzidakis, *DChAE* 9 [1977–79] 143–79). The church was renovated (in the 15th C.) to adapt its elevation to the model of a nearby church, the Afendiko. Its original fresco program, though severed in its upper reaches by the renovation and not absolutely uniform in date, shows a standard feast cycle in the central part and more discursive cycles (miracles of Christ, life of St. Demetrios, miracles of Sts. Kosmas and Damianos) in the aisles and *pastophoria*.

Roughly contemporary are the two churches of the Brontocheion monastery founded by the *protoyskellos* Pachomios, who became the monastery’s *hegoumenos*. One, dedicated to the Sts. Theodore, was begun between 1290 and 1295; it is the latest in date of the surviving octagon churches represented by Daphni and Hosios Loukas and was inspired perhaps by the Church of Hagia Sophia at Monemvasia. Considerably more space is allotted to fresco decoration than is usually the case in the churches of this type: there is a feast cycle, a Passion cycle, and a Virgin cycle. A second church, known as the Aphendiko, was built in the monastery shortly afterward (by 1311); it is dedicated to the Virgin Hodegetria. This building was to exert a great influence on later church design at Mistra. Its plan is that of a cross-in-square superimposed on a basilica with galleries: one large dome covers the center bay of the nave, with four smaller domes over the four corners of the galleries and another over the narthex. The plan has affiliations with earlier plans such as those of Bize or Dere Ağız, but whether it represents a conscious revival of earlier forms, is a late survivor of a lost genre, or even an innovation peculiar to Mistra, is hard to determine (H. Hallensleben, *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 18 [1969] 105–18).

The church was surrounded on three sides by porticoes; this and certain other architectural and masonry details (such as the marble dado inside) reveal a debt to contemporary works in Constantinople and Thessalonike. The fresco decoration shows a fine sensitivity to the various elements of the church plan and makes a clear division between the primary program (in the cross-in-square parts) and the secondary cycles (miracles and Passion of Christ, liturgical themes), which are relegated to the aisles, narthex, and galleries. A fresco of the Baptism is esp. rich in vignettes of daily life (D. Mouriki in *Okeanos* 459–61). In a room at one end of the narthex are painted texts of *chrysobulls* in favor of the monastery.

The Church of the Virgin Peribleptos was built into the face of the cliff, at the opposite end of town from the Brontocheion. Though there are portraits of the founders inside the church, the figures are not named, and there are no other documents or inscriptions by which to date it or explain its location. It is generally attributed to the third quarter of the 14th C. Its architecture, which had to be adjusted to the uneven terrain, is essentially a traditional cross-in-square, with the dome resting on two, instead of four, columns; the fresco program is characterized by a preponderance of eucharistic themes spreading from the main apse into the *pastophoria*, by an unusually extensive cycle of the childhood of the Virgin, and by multfigured feast compositions in dramatic landscapes.

Two other two-column cross-in-square churches are also 14th C. in date. Hagia Sophia, which inscriptions reveal was founded by the *despotes* Manuel Kantakouzenos, probably as a palace church, later became the *katholikon* of a monastery, possibly the patriarchal monastery of Christ Zoodotes known from a document of 1365. The Evangelistria Church (late 14th–early 15th C.) differs from others of this type in having a galleryed narthex, and, unlike most other churches in Mistra, it preserves a good deal of contemporary sculptural decoration.

A large number of these churches have separate chapels attached to the main body of the church. The generally funerary character of these chapels is evinced by the tombs they house and the fresco portraits of noble families adorning them.

The latest of all the churches is the Virgin Pantanassa. The church (or at least its altar) was consecrated in 1428; various inscriptions in the church name the *protostrator* and *mesazon* John Phrangopoulos as its founder. The architecture imitates that of the Aphendiko, but the corner domes barely project above the roof. Festoons decorate the apses, pointed arches frame some windows; and further signs of Frankish influence can be seen in the prominent bell tower. The fresco decoration, based on that of the Periblep-
tos, survives in its original state only in the upper stories; it involves familiar feast compositions richly enhanced by genre details, some deriving from antique formulas and others, especially townscapes, showing considerable Western influence.


**MITATON** (μιτάτον, also μητάτον, from Lat. metor, “to measure off,” “pitch camp”), a term with several meanings in Byz. Greek.

**Kind of Inn.** In the minutes of the council of 536 and 681, mitaton designated “lodgings.” In the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (ch. 5), where the term is also rendered oikos ton mitaton, the word mitaton acquired a specific meaning—the inn in Constantinople for Syrian merchants where they stored their goods after having paid a rental fee, enoikion. At the mitaton the textile merchants (prandiorpatai) divided up the wares that they had purchased collectively from the Syrians. Linen merchants, on the other hand, were forbidden to buy cloth “from the mitata.” Sjuzjumov suggests that mitata were transformed into trading stations of foreign merchants.


**Fiscal Term.** Mitaton was also a kind of eperela, the character of which remains under discussion. The word appears with this sense in a Justinianic novel (130.9), and later in documents, most commonly chrysothulls, from 974 to 1384/5, in which privileged landowners are exempted from this burden. The earlier texts speak of the kainotomia of mitaton (Lavra 1, no. 6.23, Iur., no. 2.33), then the more neutral term “imposition” (epithesis or katalhesis) emerges. In all periods, evidence for its active imposition is rare. The term usually seems to mean the obligation on private individuals to quarter military and state officials (e.g., in the diatikos of Attaleiates, ed. P. Gautier, REB 39 [1981] 105.125–26). However, passages in Andronikos II’s 1319 chrysothull for Ioannina (MM 5:82.22–5) and his 1307 chrysothull for the sees of Berat and Kanina (P. Alexander, Byzantium 15 [1940–41] 181.79–81) led Maksimović (Byz. Proc/Admin 157–60) to conclude that, at least in the 14th C., mitata were forced sales of grain, at a price below that which was customary, for the needs of kephalai and perhaps for armies in transit.


**Kind of Ranch.** In Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De cer. 458.19), the term mitaton refers to state-supervised ranches located in “Asia and Phrygia” that supplied mules and horses for the imperial army. The officials in charge were called the dioiketai of the metata (Laurent, Corpus 2, no. 593), protonantarios of the metaton of Asia (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 3077A), or protonantarios and episkopites of Phrygia (no. 3115).


**MITHRAISM,** the cult of the Iranian sun-god Mithra. The first traces of Mithraism in the Hellenistic world (Egypt, Koinagene) date to the 3rd–2nd C. B.C.; it spread widely across the Roman Empire, esp. in the frontier provinces (North Africa, Pannonia, Dacia, Syria, etc.). The cult of Mithra, popular among soldiers, was supported by Aurelian and Diocletian, but then declined despite an attempt to revitalize it under Julian. After ca. 400 it disappeared, even though the erudite Michael Psellus evoked the name when accusing monks of Chios of having introduced alien rites and mysteries.

The Mithraic cult was celebrated in temples (mithraeum), usually subterranean, which were ornamented with reliefs showing Mithra slaying a bull. The ritual comprised banquets of bread and wine, as well as baptism through water and blood. The birthdate of Mithra was given as 25 Dec., after the winter solstice. Attempts at a rapprochement between Mithraism and Christianity were already being made in late antiquity (e.g., by Porphyry), but the similarity between the two is superficial, as Mithraism was predominantly a nature religion in which the idea of resurrection and salvation remained undeveloped.

Source: F. Cumont, Textes et monuments relatifs aux mystères de Mithra, vol. 2 (Brussels 1896).

MODALISM, a modern concept in the history of dogma, used from the 19th C. onward to designate a form of MONARCHIANISM that sharply distinguishes between the mode of God's manifestation in the history of salvation (OIKONOMIA) and the one wholly transcendent God; Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are understood as different persons or manifestations of God. The Father is depicted as the creator and lawgiver of the Old Covenant; the Son as the redeemer; and the Spirit as the paraclete and perfecter.

K.-H.U.

MODE (ἡχος), a system of melodic formulas for Byz. chant, the Oktoechos being the collection of eight modes that forms the compositional framework of Greek and Latin medieval music. Each mode has a restricted set of melody types peculiar to it that can be employed in many different combinations and variations. Byz. theorists refer to the eight sets as Modes I–IV Authentic and I–IV Plagal, a terminology borrowed in early Western treatises.

The origins of the oktoechos are obscure. It appears to have little in common, apart from nomenclature, with the ancient Greek tonal system. Some scholars have speculated that its beginnings lie in Near Eastern musical and philosophical traditions. The authenticity of an 11th-C. MS of John of Maiuma's Plerophoriai (ca.515), which alludes to "the music of the oktoechos," is questionable. Also doubtful is the allegation that an anthology of hymns by Patr. Severos of Antioch was an oktoechos. It does seem certain, however, that by the late 7th C. the eight-mode system had become established within the Greek liturgical world, and the attribution of its organization to John of Damascus, while not totally accurate, may contain some historical fact. In any event, he contributed significantly to the formation of a liturgical book called the oktoechos that contains the variable hymns of the hours throughout the church year, beginning with the first week after Easter.


MODELS AND MODEL-BOOKS. Literary sources suggest that painters employed earlier works of art as models for their creations. Basil the Great (PG 31:493A) speaks specifically of artists who
“copy icons from icons,” while Symeon Metaphrastes (PG 116:657B) uses the image of skilled painters depending upon an archetype. Such texts do not explain the transfer of design from a mosaic or fresco in situ to another mosaic or fresco geographically far removed, nor the recurrence in miniatures of designs executed earlier in monumental art. Accordingly, scholars have suggested the use of model-books, motif-books, and iconographical guides. The oldest surviving example of this last genre, the Painter’s Manual (Hermeneia) of Dionysios of Phourna (infra), written ca. 1730–34, may incorporate Byz. practices, as may the working drawings of post-Byz. painters (L. Bouras in Holy Image 61–63). Cartoons (anthibola), the preparation of which Dionysios describes, were made from existing works and may bear some relationship to drawings from the periphery of the empire that are said to reproduce Byz. works of art (Buchthal; Der Nersessian, infra). Like the descriptions of Oulpios the Roman, some such sketches may be based on, rather than be the basis of, images. But identification of their function raises even more difficult problems than the fact of their rarity.

The use of model-books by Late Antique floor-mosaicists has been vigorously denied (P. Bru- neau, RA [1984] 241–72). Yet Paulinus of Nola and Sulpicius Severus exchanged pictureae for use in the decoration of churches that they were building. Hagiographical allusions to architects’ sketches abound and the 8th-C. vita of St. Pancratios of Taormina has its hero set out for the West from Palestine equipped with chartia (panels? papyri?) and two volumes containing the “pictorial story (eikonike historia) of the Old and New Testaments.” Both general iconographical guides and sets of specific motifs have been suggested as means whereby images were disseminated in the 12th C. (E. Kitzinger, The Mosaics of Monreale [Palermo 1960] 56f, 84). Use of the Cotton Genesis as a source by the mosaicists of the narthex of S. Marco in Venice remains the only plausible example of a richly illuminated MS serving as a guide to the creation of a monumental cycle.


—A.C.

MODESTY, TOPOS OF, a typical feature of authors’ self-characterization in the prefaces (rarer in the closing parts) of their works; it is also found in the colophons of scribes. The topos was well known in antiquity: Quintilian advocated its use, Lucian made fun of it, Menander Rhétor gave its rules. The Byz. used various epithets of modesty (παιδεύοντης) or self-deprecation: hamartolos (sinner), athlios (wretched), akathartos (dirty), amathes- tatos (illiterate), agroikos (boorish), and so on; even an author as excellent as Basil the Great might deplore his astheïa (weakness). George Hamar- tolus calls himself worthless and states that he has no knowledge “of scientific inquiry and systematic treatment of secular [affairs]” (ed. C. de Boor, 1:1.11.11–14); Theophanes the Confessor admits his ignorance (Theoph. 4.2–3); the author’s incompetence is mentioned in the preface of almost every saint’s vita.

This modesty, however, is only one side of the coin: it is introduced as an antithesis to the truth and clarity that are the author’s major objective. The same George “the Sinner” forgets his modesty when he states that his “poor booklet” presents the unadorned truth in concise and clear form (p.2.6–8). The anonymous hagiographer of Loukas the Stylist takes a further step: after complaining of his weakness and faintheartedness and expressing his desire to remain silent, he boldly announces that his vita is “a work of divine force and a gift granted by the superior power” (ed. Délehaye, Saints stylites 195.7–17). The modest and untutored writer considered himself a tool in the hands of the Holy Spirit. From the 11th C. onward we sometimes encounter the author’s frank appraisal of his talent, for example, in Psellos and Tzetzes, but the topos of modesty continued in scribal colophons and other writers.


—A.K., I.Š.

MODIOLOS (μοδίολος, lit. “little pot”), a gold imperial crown mentioned by several 10th-C. au- thors and, after a long interval, by Patr. Germanos
II in the 13th C. (A. Kazhdan, JÖB 38 [1988] 339f). According to Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De cer. 414.17, 432.15), this type of crown was offered to Leo I in 457 and to his grandson Leo II in 473. It was also worn by empresses (Genes. 5.64–67). If the emendation of Dagron (CP imaginaire 185, n. 115) is correct, the statue of Tyche in Constantinople bore a modiolos as well. The scanty source evidence does not permit a clarification of the constitutional role of the modiolos; most probably, it was given by the senate to the emperor during the coronation ceremony.


-A.K.

MODIOS (μόδιος), a unit of measurement for both grain and land, of varying quantity. A normal Roman (or Italic) modius equaled 20 librae (litrai, pounds) of wheat, the modius castrensis in the 4th C., 30 librae. There were various kinds of modioi in Byz. The sea (thalassios) or imperial (basilikos) modios equaled 40 logarikai litrai, or 17.084 liters; the monastic (monasteriakos) modios, 32 logarikai litrai, or 13.667 liters; the revenue (annoniakos) modios, 26.667 logarikai litrai, or 11.389 liters. E. Schilbach assumes that the so-called large (megas) modios equaled 4 sea modioi and identifies the cross-signed (staurikos) modios with the revenue modios. He also assumes that there was a special modios for trade, which he identifies with the public (politikos) modios mentioned in Byz. sources and with the Italian maggio (mozo) di Romania. He equates this with 18 sea modioi.

The sea modios was mostly used as a measurement for the land modios. Synonymous terms are sowing (sporimos) modios and geometric (geometricos) modios. The following equation is established: 1 modios = 2 sq. schoinia = 40 logarikai litrai of wheat seed = 200 sq. orgyiia, that is, 888.73 sq. m; in some cases 1 modios is equated with 288 sq. orgyiia, or 1,279.78 sq. m. From the 13th C. stremma was synonymous with modios. In some classicizing texts the term medimnos was used instead of modios.

Use in Documents. Both treatises on taxation and acts recording actual practices (cadasters, charters) measure land in modioi without specifying what type of modios was in use. Another difficulty that Byz. land surveyors faced was the transition from linear measurements to modioi as square measures (G. Litavr, VizVrem 10 [1956] 101–03). Some inconsistencies in measurement force scholars to assume that in certain cases large modioi were employed, in other instances small modioi (Svoronos, Cadastre 128, n. 1). Difficulties sometimes appeared insurmountable: thus officials who compiled the praktikon of Kephallenia confessed that they were unable to “measure in modioi” (modiologesai) 36 small pieces (komatia) of land (Th. Tzannetatos, To praktikon tes Latinikes episkopes Kephallenias tou 1264 kai he epitome autou [Athens 1965] 47:253); in other cases a komatis could be expressed in modioi (e.g., MM 6:159.8–9). Definition of an allotment as komatis (“piece”) or loris (“strap”) is typical of Trebizond (e.g., F.I. Uspenskij, V. Beneševič, Vazelonške akty [Leningrad 1927] no. 143), where they were sometimes calculated in psomiaria; Schilbach (Metrologie 127) identified psomiarion as the sea modios. The capacity of boats was also measured in modioi (e.g., Ptomou Engrapha 1, no. 7.14), likewise without specificaion.


-E. Sch., A.K.

MODON. See Methone.

MOECHIAN CONTROVERSY (from μοεχία, “adultery”), a religious, political, and legal dispute (795–811) over the second marriage of Constantine VI. In 795 Constantine divorced his wife Maria to marry his mistress Theodote, Maria’s koubikouloarea. Constantine’s mother Irene reportedly encouraged him in order to undermine his authority; Constantine claimed that Maria had tried to poison him. Patr. Tarasios initially opposed the marriage, since no emperor had ever divorced his wife, but acceded when Constantine threatened to restore Iconoclasm (PG 99:1048–53). The wedding, performed in Sept. 795 by Joseph, aikononomos of Hagia Sophia and superior of the Kathara monastery, angered many churchmen, who considered the marriage uncanonical and broke off communion with Tarasios. Constantine tried to appease Plato of Sakkoudion and Theodore of Studios, but in 797 he had them beaten and exiled. After Constantine’s de-
throne that same year, the monks returned and were reconciled with Tarasios, who then deposed Joseph of Kathara.

In 806 Patr. Nikephoros I revived the issue by rehabilitating Joseph, probably because Emp. Nikephoros I wished to reward him for mediating during the revolt of Bardanes Tourkos in 803. By 808 Archbp. Joseph of Thessalonike (Theodore’s brother) refused to communicate with the emperor and patriarch. In 809 a synod confirmed Joseph of Kathara’s restoration, anathematized those who refused to apply oikonomia to the affair, and reduced Archbp. Joseph to priest. The monks of the Stoudios monastery rejected the “adulterous” synod and were persecuted. Michael I ended the affair in 811 by restoring the Stoudites and deposing Joseph of Kathara. The Moechian Controversy greatly enhanced the prestige of the monastic clergy and further differentiated “rigorists” from those who favored oikonomia in theological dispute.

LIT. J. Fuentes Alonso, El divorcio del Constantino VI y la doctrina matrimonial de San Teodoro Estudia (Pamplona 1984).


—P.A.H.

MOESIA, Roman province on both banks of the Lower Danube. When, in the 3rd C., the territory north of the Danube was evacuated by the Romans, Aurelian created DACIA Ripensis between Moesia I (formerly Superior) and Moesia II (Inferior); later, SCYTHIA MINOR was separated from Moesia II and Dardania from Moesia I. Diocletian developed the system of forts and watchtowers in Moesia I, so that in the 4th C. the province was relatively quiet, the mainstream of barbarian invasions moving through neighboring PANNONIA.

Mócsy (infra) hypothesizes that the 4th C. in Moesia I was a period of growth for larger estates that belonged to urban landowners; they were situated farther south from the LIMES than the smaller villas of the previous period. The pressure of the Huns made part of the Roman population abandon Moesia I and search for refuge in the mountainous areas in the south. By the mid-5th C. Naissus replaced the Danubian towns as the center of trade with the Huns.

Archaeological investigation of Roman cities in the territory of Moesia II (IATRUS, NOVAE, etc.) shows that urban life in this area ceased to exist by the mid-7th C., sometimes as a result of a catastrophe (invasion of the Avars and Slavs), sometimes of a slow decline. Byz. authors of the 11th–15th C. applied the ethnic term Mysoi primarily to the Bulgarians, but also to the Pechenegs and Hungarians (Moravcik, Byzantinoturcica 2:207–09).


—A.K.

MOGLENA (Móglene), a region in southeastern Macedonia. Circa 1015 Moglena was a Bulgarian territory administered by an archon Elizet (Skl. 352.33–34). Captured by Basil II, it formed a theme first attested in 1086 (Lavra 1, no.48.6) and a bishopric mentioned in a chrysobull of 1020. The Lavra of Athanasios obtained lands in Moglena and ca.1196 had a dispute with local straitiai and the bishop of Moglena’s paroikoi when they refused to pay rent (dekaiteia) to the monastery (Lavra 1, no.69). Another conflict arose ca.1181 when the monastery contested the rights of Cumans who were granted pronosai in Moglena (Lavra 1, no.65). In 1205 Moglena was conquered by Kalojan.


—A.K.

MOKIOS (Mókios), legendary saint whose memory was celebrated on 11 May, the day of the foundation of Constantinople. According to his martyrion (written probably after the 6th C.), Mokios was born in Amphipolis, fought against idolatry, suffered during Diocletian’s persecutions, and was decapitated at the decision of the curia (bouleuterion) of Byzantium. His cult became popular in Constantinople at an early date; by the 5th C. Sozomenos (Sozom., HE 8:17.5) mentions his shrine there. Later tradition ascribes the foundation of the church to Constantine I himself, who allegedly constructed it on the site of the temple of Zeus (or Herakles).

The location of the church and the monastery of St. Mokios is not yet precisely established. It was probably situated near the cistern of Mokios
built on the seventh hill, beyond the walls of Constantine and not far from the Golden Gate. It is questionable that the church collapsed in the reign of Leo III, as alleged, but a section of it was destroyed in the 9th C. and sumptuously restored by Basil I. It was a place of important court ceremonies; on 11 May 903, during a customary procession to St. Mokios, Leo VI was attacked and wounded in the church. The memory of various martyrs was celebrated at St. Mokios, which also housed the relics of St. Euthymios the Younger. Still splendid at the beginning of the 13th C., the church was in ruins at the end of the 14th C. when John V used its stones to repair the walls near the Golden Gate.


LIT. Janin, Églises CP 354–58.

—A.K.

MOKISSOS (Μωκισσός, now Viranşehir), a city in western Cappadocia at the foot of the Hasan Dağ southeast of KOLONÉIA. Justinian I rebuilt the ruined city, renamed it Justinianopolis (a name last attested in 692), and elevated it to the rank of ecclesiastical (though not civil) metropolis, with an eparchia that stretched south of the Halys River. The bishopric survived under its original name through the Byz. period, without playing any role in history. The extensive site, which lies in a protected valley, contains the remains of nine churches (mostly standard basilicas, one cruciform), streets, and unidentified civic buildings.


—C.F.

MOLDAVIA (called Pogdania or Bogdania [Boydaia] by the 15th-C. Greek historians Sphrantzes and Chalkokondyles, probably from the name of the mid-14th-C. prince Bogdan [H. Ditten in BBA 5 (1957) 94f]), geographic term designating the territory north of the Lower Danube, in the basin of the Dniester, Prut, and Siret rivers. The term Moldavia is found in vernacular texts, such as the Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans, and Moldoblacchia appears in ecclesiastical nomenclature (Notitiae CP, no.21.181); both terms are probably later than 1453.

In late antiquity Moldavia was populated by Daco-Getans and remained in the sphere of Roman economic and cultural influence. From the 4th C. onward, Moldavia was a passage zone for many barbarian tribes (Germanic, Hunnic, Avar, etc.); at the end of the 6th C., Slavs began to settle there. Byz. impact diminished and the area seems to have been cut off from the empire until the 10th C., when Byz. coins and objects penetrated into Moldavia. Archaeologically distinct in the 7th C., the autochthonous and Slavic cultures were probably merged in the 8th C. Byz. coin finds decrease again in the 11th C., as first the Pechenegs and then the Cumans became the dominant factor on the Lower Dniester. It is possible that Rus’ tribes of Tıvertians and Ulichians gained control of the area, whereas the ethnic origin of the Brodniks (who are mentioned in the same area in the 12th–13th C.) is still controversial.

In the mid-13th C. Moldavia was occupied by the Tatars and lost its connections with Byz. In the 14th C., Hungary established its power over Moldavia and between 1359 and 1365 the country achieved independence.


MOMČILO (Μομτζίλος), Bulgarian soldier who fought on both sides in the Byz. Civil War of 1341–47 and was rewarded with the titles of despotes (by Anna of Savoy) and sebastokrator (by John VI Kantakouzenos); died Peritheorion 7 June 1345 (Bartusis, infra 209). In his youth Momčilo was a hajduk (bandit) who plundered both Byz. and Bulgarian territories. He then served in the army of Andronikos III, but fled to Stefan Uroš IV Dušan and then joined the rebel Kantakouzenos in the early winter of 1343/4, at the time of his unsuccessful siege of Peritheorion. Kantakouzenos entrusted to Momčilo the Merope district, where he raised 300 horsemen and about 5,000 foot soldiers. He turned against Kantakouzenos, however, forcing him to flee. He briefly aided the loyalist forces of the regency, changed allegiance again, and then in the summer of 1344 pro-
claimed his independence. He captured Xanthelia and assembled an army of 3,000 horsemen. He was soon defeated at Peritheorion, however, by Kantakouzenos and his Turkish ally Umur Beg, and died in this battle. Momčilo became a hero of South Slav epic, a brigand of monumental proportions, victorious in legendary battles against the Turks.


**MONARCHISM** (from μονάρχια, “one rule, monarchy”), a term designating certain theologies of the 2nd and 3rd C. The term *monarchia* was used already before the Christian era, esp. by Philo, and then chiefly by the Apologists to designate the theistic view of *monotheism*. Generally, a distinction is made between “dynamic” and “modalistic” Monarchism. The former is a characterization of Adoptionism, while the latter is used to describe so-called Sabellianism. The Sabellian heresy eventually becomes that which is generally understood by the terms Monarchism and Modalism. It is consciously opposed to the doctrine of the Logos presented in the Gospel of John and the Apologists, and esp. to the notion of mediator (subordinationism) that was applied in the middle-Platonic doctrine or theology of principles encountered, for example, in Origen, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are simply different modes by which the one God appears in the history of salvation (οἰκονομία). The proponents of this effort to interpret the data of the New Testament in the framework of Hellenistic concepts of divine epiphanies, so as to preserve the monotheism inherited from the Judaic tradition, were Sabellios, Noetos of Smyrna, and Epigonos (called Praxcas in the West).

In the genealogies of heresies so common in Byz., 4th-C. theologians connected Marcellus of Ankyra with Monarchism, while in the 6th C., the same charge was made against Severos of Antioch and the Jacobites. Protestant dogmatists of the 19th and early 20th C. largely overestimated the significance of modalistic Monarchianism and presumed a background of religious ideas directed against the philosophical tradition.


**MONARCHY.** See Autokrator; Taxis.

**MONASTERY** (*μονή*), complex of buildings housing monks or nuns (see also Nunnery). The term is used primarily for a koinobion, lavra, or an idiorrhythmic monastery. Byz. monastic architecture was standardized at a fairly early date, with many of the common elements appearing at Sohag in Egypt, Qal‘at Sem‘ān in Syria, and St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai. A monastery was often contained within strong defensive walls, along the inside of which were located the dormitories of the monks, stables, workshops, and storage buildings. These surrounded an open space, with the principal church (the katholikon) at its center. In front of the church was the phiale. One side of the enclosure, most commonly that facing the church, was occupied by the refectory (*trapeza*). Other buildings could include a bath and an infirmary.

Monasteries varied greatly in size, ranging from a minimum of three (later eight to ten) monks to several hundred (A.-M. Talbot, *GotThR* 30 [1985] 4f, 18–20). They were located in both town and countryside but were most numerous in Constantinople and the Holy Mountains such as Mt. Olympus and Mt. Athos. A. Bryer estimated that about 1,000 different monasteries are recorded in the Byz. sources (*SChH* 16 [1979] 219f, n.3), about one-third of them in Constantinople (a statistic perhaps skewed by the nature of the available sources).

There were no monastic “orders” as in the West; thus the organization of each monastery varied and was prescribed by its typikon. There were nonetheless some connections between monasteries, for example, between those on the same holy mountain or between a monastery and its smaller affiliated establishments, the metochia. The *typika* of some monasteries were closely modeled on those of earlier foundations. Monasteries were variously classified as imperial, patriarchal (see Stauropegion), or episcopal, and as private or independent.

In general each monastery had a superior (hegoumenos), steward (οἰκονόμος), sacristan (ἐκκλεισάρχης), and other officials charged with supervision of the refectory, treasury, and archives. Most monasteries possessed agricultural lands and other properties that provided food for the monks and revenues to maintain the buildings.
and operations of the monastery. (See also MONASTICISM.)


-M.J., A.M.T.

MONASTERY, DOUBLE (δυπλοῦν μοναστήριον), a monastery housing two separate but adjacent communities of men and women, under the direction of the same superior, and supported by the same sources of income. Because of the dangers posed by such close proximity of monks and nuns, double monasteries were officially prohibited as, for example, by novel 123.36 of Justinian I (556). The ineffectiveness of his legislation is demonstrated by the continuing existence of double monasteries, such as the one presided over by St. Anthousa in the 8th C., which allegedly housed 900 monks and nuns (C. Mango, AB 100 [1982] 401–09). The Second Council of Nicaea (787) forbade any future foundations of this sort (can. 20). Circa 810 Patr. Nikephoros I went a step further and closed all double monasteries.

The Palaiologan period saw a resurgence of these institutions. Some of the foundations, such as the monastery of Philanthropoupos Soter established in Constantinople by Irene Choumnaina, were designed so that the family of the founder could remain close even in monastic seclusion (R. Trone, BS/EB 10 [1983] 81–87). Patr. Athanasios I attacked the practice (RegPatr, fasc. 4, no.1747) but is known to have founded two double monasteries himself, Nea Mone on Mt. Ganos and the monastery on the hill of Xerolophos in Constantinople. Because of disputes over the division of labor, the latter monastery was partitioned in 1383 by Patr. Neilos Kerameus and its property distributed to the two communities of monks and nuns (MM 2:80–83).


-M.J., A.M.T.

MONASTICISM (from μονάζειν, “to live alone”), a life devoted to worship, practiced by monks and nuns. Monasticism was an essential part of the social and religious fabric of the empire, affecting the life of every Byz. and playing a spiritual, economic, philanthropic, and cultural role. Initially a lay movement, monasticism first appeared in the late 3rd C. when Christians began to retire to the Egyptian desert for solitary lives of asceticism and prayer. Among these early desert fathers was Antony the Greater, whose biography by Athanasios of Alexandria provided a model for future generations of monks. In the 4th C., as the hermits attracted disciples, communities of monks and nuns developed. Pachomios wrote a rule for these semicenobitic Egyptian monastic communities (see PACHOMIAN MONASTERS), which added to the celibacy and poverty of the hermits the virtue of obedience to a superior. He also emphasized regular religious services and manual labor. From Egypt monasticism spread to the laras of Syria and Palestine (Wilderness of Judaea) and to Anatolia, where Basil the Great composed the Long Rules, which were to provide the basic foundation of Byz. monasticism. Basil strongly favored cenobitic monasticism (see KINOBION) over eremitism and advocated that the monastery should be a community of self-sufficient working monks. He urged moderation in asceticism and endorsed the establishment of urban monasteries.

The first monastery in Constantinople was Dalmatou, founded in the late 4th C. Thereafter monastic institutions proliferated rapidly in both town and countryside. By 536 there were almost 70 monasteries in the capital. A number of holy mountains developed, where both eremitic and cenobitic forms of monasticism were practiced. The tradition of the monastery as a working community was realized in its most ideal form at the Stoudios monastery in the early 9th C., thanks to the reforms of Theodorus of Stoudios.

Late Roman emperors, esp. Justinian I, conferred upon monasteries particular economic privileges (the right to inherit from private citizens, the prohibition against confiscation of their properties, beneficial forms of renting out their lands), but, nevertheless, until the 9th C. monasteries remained predominantly modest landowners, more often rewarded by solemnia than actual land donations; it is plausible to surmise that during Iconoclasm many monasteries even lost their buildings and liquid assets. In the 10th C. monasteries began to acquire substantial amounts
of immovables. They accumulated fields, vineyards, pastures, livestock, mills, fishponds, saltworks, urban rental properties, and workshops through purchase and through the donations of emperors and private pious benefactors. Monasteries also received gifts of cash and precious liturgical objects from the faithful in exchange for old-age pensions (adelphia) or posthumous commemoration. Monastic wealth was further increased because of the customary exemption of monasteries from payment of state taxes (exkousseia).

Nikephoros II Phokas, who endorsed the concept of the “poor monastery” and strongly supported Athanasios’s foundation of the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos, tried unsuccessfully to curb the growth of monastic estates. In 964 he issued an edict restricting further acquisition of land, esp. by monasteries that lacked sufficient manpower to cultivate the estates they already owned. His decree was overturned, however, by his successor John I Tzimiskes, and monasteries continued to expand their possessions. However, in the Partitio Romanae of 1204 only the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople is listed among the major landowners of the empire. There are copious documents from the end of the 13th C. to the 15th C. recording monastic acquisitions of land in southern Macedonia, Trebizond, on Aegean islands, etc.—but since almost all of these documents survived in monastic archives, the result is a distorted perception of the exclusive role of monastic lordship in late Byz. In reality, the state managed to curb the growth of monastic estates, and after 1371 distributed a substantial part of monastic lands among soldiers.

One feature of Byz. monasticism was the individualism of many monks and their disregard of the canonical principle of monastic stability; this was esp. true of holy men, many of whom moved frequently from one monastery to another or alternated between a cenobitic monastery and a hermit’s kellion. Another manifestation of this trend was the development of idiorrhythm monasticism in the 14th C. Unlike the West, there were no established “monastic orders”; rather, each monastery was a unique foundation with its own rule or typikon, although some monastic rules imitated earlier models.

The most important function of monasteries was to provide a haven from the world where pious men and women could devote themselves to the vita contemplativa (theoria) in the search for their own salvation and the salvation of those for whom they prayed. Monasteries also played a philanthropic role, by offering a refuge to social outcasts or those in need of assistance: orphans, the elderly, the maimed or disfigured, the mentally ill, battered wives. (They also served as a place of imprisonment or exile for deposed emperors and patriarchs, and unsuccessful rebels or political rivals.) In addition to accepting people in distress as members of their community, monasteries used some of their resources to run philanthropic institutions, increasingly performing functions that had been in the purview of the state. A number of monastic complexes included hospitals, gerokomeia, and xenodocheia; they also regularly distributed food, money, and clothing to the needy. Owing to the relative stability of monastic property, many keteres considered monastic institutions a convenient place for “investment” and granted them lands in exchange for certain rights (sometimes hereditary). On the other hand, emperors and patriarchs endowed upon some lay people or ecclesiastical institutions benefits similar to those enjoyed by keteres (charistikion).

In contrast to the West, education was not a function of the Byz. monastery, except for the training of a few children destined for the monastic life. Monasteries did, however, play an integral role in the intellectual and cultural life of the empire. Establishments like the Studios and Hodegon monasteries in Constantinople housed scriptoria that produced manuscripts for both internal and external use. A. Cutler (BZ 74 [1981] 328–34) has estimated that in the 10th and 11th C. about 50 percent of scribes were monks, in the 14th C. about 25 percent. Although most monastic libraries were modest in size and restricted in scope to the Scriptures, hagiography, patristics, theology, and liturgy, a few, like Chora, had some secular holdings. Literacy was required of choir brothers and sisters; many devoted themselves to study of the Scriptures, and a number became writers, esp. of hymnography, hagiography, and theology. In the first half of the 9th C. monks and nuns formed the majority of literati; for the 14th C., I. Ševčenko (Society, pt. I [1974], 72) has calculated that more than 25 percent of the literati were monks.
Monasteries had a significant impact on the development of Byz. theology and spirituality. Many leading theologians and churchmen who wrote on doctrine, liturgy, and mysticism were monks. Monks played a key role in the ecumenical councils of the 4th and 5th C.; they were prime supporters of icons in the debate over Iconoclasm and defended Orthodoxy against attempts at Union of the Churches. The mysticism of Symeon the Theologian in the early 11th C. and the Hesychasm of the monks of Athos in the 14th C. profoundly affected the evolution of Orthodox tradition. A number of monks had a chance to influence ecclesiastical policy through their promotion to a bishopric or the patriarchate (see Constantinople, Patriarchate of).

Even though monks were the leading icons in veneration in the 8th–9th C., there is little firm evidence to link monks with the production of art. Normally, teams of outside architects and artists were hired to build and decorate monastic complexes, and in many cases even MSS copied in monastic scriptoria were illuminated elsewhere, esp. when the miniature was on a separate page. Nonetheless, monasteries were great patrons of art and architecture. Most surviving Byz. churches were once monastic churches, and many icons, MSS, liturgical vessels, and the like were originally made for monasteries or were eventually donated to and preserved in monasteries.


MONEMVASIA (Μονεμβασία, lit. “single entrance,” Malvasia and Malmsey in Western sources), a fortified city on an isolated rock that lies just off the coast of the southeastern Peloponnese. It is called a kastron by Paul of Monemvasia in the 10th C. (AASS May 5:426B). Evidence for its early history is scanty. It is mentioned first by Hucburt, who described it as located in a “Slavic land.” Theophanes (Theoph. 422.29–30) speaks of Monemvasia only once, relating that the plague of 746/7 arrived there from Sicily and Calabria. A colophon of the MS Vat. Palat. gr. 44 mentions a certain Leo who was “taboularios of Monobasia” in 898 (P. Nikolopoulos, LakSp 5 [1980] 227–46). On the other hand, later legends, preserved in the Chronicle of Monemvasia, pseudo-Sphrantzes, and other sources, claim that Monemvasia was founded ca.582/3 (P. Schreiner, TM 4 [1970] 471–75) and that it obtained metropolitan status from Maurice. In fact, however, a simple bishopric of Monemvasia is known from 787; it was probably a suffragan of Corinth and not Patras, as a literary tradition asserts (Laurent, Corpus 5:1:430). In the 12th C. Monemvasia served as a naval station in wars against the Normans, who in 1147 failed to seize it.

Monemvasia was the last stronghold in the Peloponnesos to acknowledge the supremacy of the Franks in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade: it fell to William II Villehardouin in 1248 after a two-year siege. In 1262 the Byz. recovered Monemvasia as a result of the Treaty of Constantinople and the next year the Byz. fleet secured control of the surrounding territory; as a naval base it was administered by a komes (Ahrweiler, Mer 361). Michael VIII granted certain privileges to Monemvasia, but the authenticity of Andonis II’s chrysobull of 1301 is questionable (P. Schreiner in Praktika B’ Diethnous synedriou Peloponnesiakon spoudon 1 [1981–82] 160–66). Michael VIII elevated Monemvasia to a metropolis that was later moved from the 34th place in the hierarchy to the 10th; the 16th-C. list of the metropolitans of Monemvasia is evidently a forgery (Dölger, Diplomatik 383f). In 1384 Theodore I Palaiologos, despotes of the Morea, offered the city to Venice, but the powerful Mamonas family prevented the donation. In 1460 Monemvasia came under papal authority, in 1462/3 it was ceded to Venice (B. Kričić, ZRVI 6 [1960] 131–35), and in 1540 it fell to the Turks.

The impressive walls of Monemvasia are largely Venetian, but they are everywhere built on Byz. foundations. The Church of Hagia Sophia in the upper citadel has a breathtaking location at the edge of a sheer cliff. It is a domed octagon of the type and scale of Hosios Loukas and Daphni; it was probably constructed ca.1150, though E. Stikas (LakSp 8 [1986] 271–376) argues that it was founded by Alexios I. It has frescoes of the 13th C.

An important 14th-C. icon of the Crucifixion
was removed from the Helkomenos Church to the Byzantine Museum in Athens (A. Xynopoulou, Peloponnesiaka 1 [1955] 23–49; Catalog of the Ekthesis gia ta hekato chronia tes Christianikes Archeiologikes Hetaireias [Byzantine Museum, Athens, 1984] no.8). The church itself preserves a carved lintel of ca. 1000.


MONEY-CHANGER. See Banker.

MONGOLS (Μογγούλιοι), also called TATARS, an Asian people who, under the leadership of Genghis Khan (died 1227) and his successors, created an empire stretching from the Baltic to the Pacific Ocean. While its capital was in Karakorum, two appanages separated from it in the west: the Golden Horde (with a center at Saray on the Volga) and the empire of the Ilkhas in Persian territory. In the north the Mongols defeated the Cumans in 1233 and obliged them to seek a refuge in Byz.; they conquered Kiev Rus' by 1240 and penetrated Dobrudja. In the south the Mongols captured Baghdad in 1258, but were halted by the Mamlûks at ʿAyn Jalût on 3 Sept. 1260.

In Anatolia, Trebizond had to acknowledge its dependence on the Mongols and pay tribute to them, while the empire of Nicaea retained a more independent stance. At first, the Nicaean emperor John III Vatatzes supported the Seljuks of Rûm against the Mongols, but, after the Seljuk defeat at Kösedağ on 26 June (or 2 July) 1243, he tried to maintain friendly relations with both powers. His successors continued this ambivalent policy. In 1265 Michael VIII Palaiologos sent his natural daughter Maria to Karakorum as a wife of the great khan Hulegu; the khan died before her arrival, however, and Maria was married to his son Aqaq. The monastery of the Theotokos Pana-giotissa in Constantinople, of which Maria was a patron (Janin, Églises CP 213 f.), became known as "St. Mary of the Mongols." Another Maria, illegitimate daughter of Andronikos II, married Toktay, khan of the Golden Horde, toward the end of the 13th C. It is probably this Maria, rather than Michael's daughter, who appears as the nun Melania in the Church of the CHORA MONASTERY (Underwood, Kariye Djami 1:46f), where she is described as "the lady of the Mongols." Despite this intimacy, Mongols are never represented in Byz. art, in contrast with Crusader art, where distinctly Mongol features are given to one of the Magi on an iconostasis beam at the St. CATHERINE monastery on Sinai (K. Weitzmann, DOP 20 [1966] 63f). Michael VIII also managed to preserve friendly relations with NOGAY in the north. Nup- tial connections continued in the 14th C.: Andronikos III gave his daughter in marriage to Özbeg, the khan of the Golden Horde. The Mongols remained tolerant toward the Christian church and, in Saray, a bishopric was established under the jurisdiction of Constantinople.

Timur temporarily united the Mongol Empire. He crushed both the Mamlûks and Ottomans, and his victory at the battle of ANKARA in 1402 postponed the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople. After Timur's death the empire dissolved. Its last vestige in contact with Byz. was the khanate of the Crimea, founded ca. 1430, which was supported by the Genoese of Kaffa. After 1475 the southern coast of the Crimea came under direct Ottoman administration.


MONK (μονοχός), a man who renounced the world in order to devote himself to a life of asceticism and prayer. In Byz. there were various types of monks: (1) the cenobites, who lived and ate together in a communal society, the koi- nobion; (2) the lavriota or kelliota, who lived in separate cells but came together for common worship (see LAVRA, KELLION); (3) IDIORMTHYMIC monks; (4) anchorites or HERmits, who lived alone in an isolated location; and (5) wandering monks. The minimum age for adoption of the habit varied from monastery to monastery but averaged around 18; many men, however, became monks
at a later stage in life, often after being widowed. Some categories of individuals (e.g., eunuchs, young boys, fugitive slaves) were denied or limited permission to become monks. After a novitiate that could range from six months to three years, the novice took vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience. The monastic profession was symbolized externally by the tonsure, the monastic habit (schema), and the adoption of a monastic name (which usually, but not necessarily, began with the same initial letter as one's baptismal name). In theory monks were supposed to remain in the same monastery for life (see Stability, Monastic), but in practice many of them wandered from one monastery to another, or left a koinobion to become a hermit (often as a temporary stage).

A monastery had two sorts of monks: the literate choir brothers, responsible for singing the daily offices, and the uneducated brethren who were servants (diakonetai) and did much of the manual labor. This hierarchical division of the monks into two classes was also reflected in their different food and dress, their seating in the refectory, even their place of burial in the cemetery. Members of the nobility who entered monastic life were frequently accompanied by servants and lived in a suite of rooms rather than a single cell. Prospective monks customarily made substantial donations to the monastery at the time of their admission; despite their vows of poverty they were allowed to retain some personal property after they took the monastic habit. In addition to the daily round of prayers and manual labor, monks might engage in intellectual endeavors such as study of the Scriptures, copying of MSS, or composition of hymns and hagiographical works.


MONOCONDYLE, a conventional scholarly term formed from the classical Greek adjective μονοκόνδυλος, “having but one joint” (said of the thumb). The term designates a word or a short sentence written in a single, uninterrupted line drawn without lifting the pen from the parchment or paper. The monocondyle sometimes deliberately obscures the name or signature. Synodal decisions were signed by bishops in the form of a monocondyle (examples survive primarily from the post-Byz. period); the imperial chancellery used monocondyle notes written over two glued-together sheets of a document to prevent the addition of forged insertions.


—A.K. MONOCYCLIC AND POLYCYCLIC, terms central to recension theory, specifically as it is applied to the study of illuminated MSS. The former designates a MS whose miniature cycle coincides both in substance and extent with the limits of its accompanying text. A polycyclic MS, on the other hand, is one whose original set of pictures has been supplemented by one or more series of images, each originally created for its own text and having its own recensitional history. Each may also carry traces of the style of the model from which it was drawn. Weitzmann labels as polycyclic a number of the finest extant Byz. MSS, including the Paris Gregory, whose original, comparatively small set of homely pictures, he suggests, was enriched by excerpted picture cycles deriving ultimately from, for example, an illustrated Genesis, a Book of Kings, a Gospel book, etc.

Lit. Weitzmann, Roll & Codex 193–205.

—G.V. MONODY (μονοψίδια), a short unrelieved lament, intended to comfort the bereaved by sharing their grief. It differs from epitaphios in not being part of the actual funeral ceremony.


—E.M.J. MONOENERGISM (from μόνος and ἐνεργεo, “one energy”), a conventional scholarly term to describe a theological movement of the 7th C. Its core was the assumption that Christ had a single energy attributed to his individual hypostasis. This idea was implied in Monophysitism (one nature presumes a single “activity”), but even pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite (PG 3:1077C) spoke of a “new theandric activity (theandrike energia)” in Christ, a phrase that was broadly used (misused, from the Orthodox point of view) by the
Monothelites. The Neo-Chalcedonians (see Neo-Chalcedonism) seem to have been close to the development of the notion of a single activity, but the movement fully arose as an attempt at political unification of the Chalcedonians and Monophysites in the face of the Arab threat.

Kyros of Alexandria attempted in 633 to reconcile the two parties on the basis of the formula “the single Christ and Son operating as God and man in the single theandric activity” (Mansi 11:565D). Sophronios, the future patriarch of Jerusalem, remonstrated against this formula, and during his discussions with Patr. Sergios I of Constantinople they came to a compromise: both phrases “single activity” and “two activities” were prohibited—instead, one had to speak of “the single Son acting upon both divine and human [things].” Both parties assumed that Christ was theokinetos, “moved by God.” Pope Honorius approved of the compromise and in his letter to Sergios spoke of “una voluntas” of Christ. Sophronios soon rekindled discussion, but since the Ekthesis issued by Emp. Heracleios in 638 banned the energia formulas, the debate subsequently focused on the problem of the single will (Monothelitism).


–T.E.G.

MONOGENES, HO (ὁ μονογενὴς, “the only-begotten”), TROPAION that sums up the teaching of the early councils on the Christian economy of salvation in terms drawn from their creeds (J.H. Barkhuizen, BZ 77 [1984] 3). It was probably unknown in Constantinople before 519, for it is not mentioned in the disputes that year over the theopaschite clause, “One of the Trinity was crucified,” which it paraphrases.

Justinian I introduced the Monogenes into the liturgy of Constantinople in 535/6 (Theoph. 216.23–24). The Orthodox attributed its text to Justinian himself; the Monophysites to Severos of Antioch. Both Orthodox and Monophysite churches used it, probably from the attempted reconciliation of 533/4.

Found at the beginning of the Eucharist in Armenia, Syria, and Egypt, its first certain attestation in the Byz. Eucharist is in the 9th-C. Latin version of the so-called Church History of Patr. Germanos I by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (actually a commentary on the liturgy). It served as refrain of the third antiphon on ordinary days; on feasts the Monogenes was a variant refrain of the second antiphon (Mateos, Typikon 2:308, 313f.). It was intoned by singers standing beneath the ambo of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.


–R.F.T.

MONOGRAM, the combination of a number of letters that form, when read in the correct order, a name, a title (or name and title), or an invocation. The Byz. monogram normally contains all letters of the name or word(s) in question (a repeated letter, however, is only used once). Sometimes abbreviations are used, as in the case of the Christogram, and the symbols for authors’ names in marginal notes in MSS. Monograms are found on elements of architecture, silver objects—here both to identify the donor by name and title and to serve as control stamps (see Silver Stamps)—ornaments, ivories, coins, and esp. seals. They occur abundantly from the 6th to 8th C., become rare in the 9th to 12th C., and reappear again in increasing number in the Palaiologan period, in MSS, on book bindings, and esp. on architectural elements. The most common forms are the block or box-type monogram where the letters are joined together in the form of a quadrangle, and (from ca. 550 onward) the cruciform monogram where the letters are placed at the extremities of a cross.

Monogram. Sample monograms. Above: block or box-type monogram signifying “of Paul”; below: cruciform monograms signifying “Mother of God, help.”
The arrangement of the letters seems to follow primarily aesthetic principles; attempts to discover underlying rules have failed. Hence the decipherment often proves difficult and in many cases remains ambiguous.


W.H.

MONOMACHOS (Μονομάχος, lit. "fighting in single combat," fem. Μονομάχινα), the name of a family of functionaries, perhaps related to the Monomachatoi and Monomachiti. The first occurrences of the name are questionable. The 9th-C. Life of Ioannikios refers to an Iconoclast bishop of Nikomedea whom it calls "monomachos or rather theomachos" (AASS Nov. 2:1:432B), that is, a fighter against God; monomachos, which prompted a pun, is here to be taken as a proper name. A patrikios Niketas, during Irene’s reign, took the sobriquet Monomachos. An addressee of Leo Chirospaktes was a son of patrician Niketas Mon[omachos]; unfortunately, the reading of the name is conjectural. Another Monomachos, a functionary who supervised monasteries ca.921, was mentioned by Nicholas I Mystikos (ep.963). The family flourished in the 11th C. when the son of a judge Theodosios became Emp. Constantine IX Monomachos. The Monomachoi had property in Constantinople and functioned primarily as judges (e.g., Pothos, protospatharios and judge of the Hippodrome). Despite their warlike name and the frequent use of the image of St. George on their seals, the only member of the family who is known to have been connected with the military administration was George Monomachatos, doux of Illyricum (Dyrrhachion) during the reign of Nikephoros III; Alexios I dismissed him, and George fled to Serbia but eventually was granted amnesty. A female relative of Constantine IX (Maria or Anastasia?) was married to a prince of Rus’ and gave birth to Vladimir Monomach.

The family played no role under the dynasty of the Komnenoi, but emerged again at the end of the 12th C.; George Monomachos, for example, was an official of maritime administration (Patmou Engrapha 2, no.59.27). The family is attested in Asia Minor from the beginning of the 15th C. A John Monomachos lost his fortune in Philadelphia when it was besieged by the Turks in 1304; he then moved to Thessalonike, where he exercised military functions and belonged to the entourage of Nikephoros Choumnos; later he became intimate with Alexios Philanthropenos and accompanied him to Philadelphia in 1324 (H. Ahweiler in Philadelphia et autres études [Paris 1984] 9–16). The Monomachoi were still active in the first half of the 14th C., when George Monomachos and esp. his brother Michael, eparch and grand konostavlos, were generals. In Jan. 1333 Michael received a praktikon granting him the oikonomia of 50 hyperpera in the villages of Chantax and Nision—an exceptional case of a recorded donation of a pronoia to a secular person (Zogr., no.29). He died before 1346. Another George Monomachos was an architect (oikodomos) in Thessalonike ca.1421 (Dölger, Schatz., no.102).


W.H.

MONOPHYSITISM, religious movement that originated in the first half of the 5th C. as a reaction against the emphasis of Nestorianism on the human nature of the incarnate Christ. The term Monophysite (Μονοφύσιτης), from monos (one) and physis (nature), is, however, of later origin: it appears in Anastasios of Sinai (7th C.) and John of Damascus (8th C.) when the heat of the Monophysite dispute was long over. On the other hand, some roots of Monophysite views can be found before the 5th C., for example, in Apollinaris of Laodikeia. As a theological doctrine, Monophysitism was an attempt to find a solution to the problem of the God-Man relationship in Christ: if before the Incarnation the divine nature of the Logos existed separately, it came into contact or union with the human nature after the Incarnation. What kind of union was thus created? Was the divine nature only in an apparent unity with the man in Christ while the human nature prevailed? Was it a real mixture? Did the divine nature engulf the human nature so that only one physis remained? Philosophically and
theologically the questions were difficult to answer. The Monophysites suggested two responses: the so-called real Monophysites (the followers of Eutyches) inclined to accept the doctrine of the union of natures, whereas the moderate or “verbal” Monophysites (the partisans of Severos of Antioch) construed the physis as close to the concept of prosopon or hypostasis and saw in Christ a new physis, possessing both perfect divine and perfect human qualities.

The Monophysite dispute began in the 440s. The initiators of the movement were Eutyches and Dioskoros, patriarch of Alexandria, who developed some formulations originally made by Cyril of Alexandria. After a short-lived victory at the so-called Robber Council of Ephesus (449), the Monophysites were condemned at the Council of Chalcedon (451) that elaborated the dyophysite (or Chalcedonian) formula. The movement continued with varying degrees of success, Emp. Anastasios I supporting the Monophysites, Justin I favoring the Chalcedonians, and Justinian I vacillating between the two dogmas. The controversy was accompanied by severe persecutions of both parties, banishment of leaders, destruction of churches, etc. In the 7th C. the state and church tried to find a compromise in the form of Monothelitism.

Theological and philosophical differences were exacerbated by political, social, and cultural factors: the most evident of them was the rivalry of Alexandria with Constantinople and Rome. It seems also that the rural population of Egypt and Syria supported Monophysism partly as a protest against oppression, partly due to local traditions: the belief in a deity who died and was then resurrected was well entrenched in Egypt and Syria, and in these provinces the addition to the Trisagion (“We believe in God who died for us”) was received sympathetically. Monophysitism in its earlier stages seems to have been allied with the state, and only from the late 6th C. onward did the increasing persecutions alienate the Monophysites and make them potential supporters of foreign enemies, like the Arabs. As a symbol of local independence the Monophysite churches that were established in Syria and Egypt, and the separation of Christians into the Melchite and Jacobite sects intensified political and cultural disension in these lands. Monophysitism was accepted by the Armenian church.


-A.K.-

MONOPOLY (μονοπώλιον), the exclusive privilege of trading specific goods, existed in Byz. in two forms: state monopolies and rights granted (or farmed) to particular persons/organizations. Leo I prohibited officials from granting monopolies in any place or city for any kind of goods except salt (Cod. Just. IV 59.1, 4.73); Zeno outlawed monopolistic production of clothing, fish, and other commodities and underlined the illegality of collusion among construction workers, teachers of crafts (ergodidaskaloi), and bath attendants (Cod. Just. IV 59.2, 4.483; Basil 19.18.2).

The question of state monopolies has been hotly disputed. J. Nicole (Le livre du préfet [Geneva 1904] 292–94), who developed a concept of Byz. as a paradise of monopolies and privileges, viewed monopolies as a factor that helped destroy the Byz. economy; in contrast, both A. Andreades (Byzantion 9 [1934] 171–81) and G. Mickwitz (Die Kartelfunktionen der Zünfte [Helsinki 1936] 207f) denied the existence of state monopolies and acknowledged only a state regulation over commerce that was allegedly beneficial for tradesmen. Prokopios twice (Wars 2:15.11, SH 25.11) mentions “the so-called monopolies” established by governors on the frontier with Lazika and in Alexandria: the governors prohibited all trade activity by merchants and acted as kapeloj of all goods. While “all goods” is apparently an exaggeration, in some spheres (esp. the silk trade) the existence of a state monopoly is probable; N. Oikonomides (DOP 40 [1986] 33–50) assumes that by the 9th–10th C. this monopoly loosened. Albert von Aachen (RHC Occid. 4:311D) testifies to the presence of state monopolies at the end of the 11th C., saying that only the emperor could sell wine, olive oil, wheat, barley, and other victuals throughout the entire empire; Attaleiates’s description of the monopoly in Rhaedestos (Attal. 202.5) likewise reveals state privilege in the grain trade. On the other hand, the report (Skyl. 277.44–
5) that Nikephoros II Phokas traded in “imperial grain” during a famine is not sufficient to assert the existence of a monopoly at that time. Other state monopolies included the emperor’s exclusive rights over objects of **purple** and **gold** as symbols of his power and the production and use of some types of weapons (e.g., **Greek fire**).


**MONOTHEISM** in Christianity was perceived as a refutation of polytheism (“Hellenic deception”) and Judaic absolute or consistent monotheism (John of Damascus, *Exp. fidei* 7.28–30, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:17). The rejection of polytheism was a relatively easy task, even though Nicholas of Methone still found it necessary to discard Proklos’s polyarchy of gods, and Plethon attempted the revival of Olympic deities. Disassociation from Judaic absolute monotheism was a more difficult problem, solved by the concept of the Trinity. Absolute monotheism created an unbridgeable gap between God and mankind, whereas the triune God, one in substance and numerical in hypostases, provided the possibility for intercourse with humans, a possibility realized in the double nature of Christ that formed the cornerstone of the doctrine of salvation. Besides the Trinitarian and Christological controversies that required sophisticated definitions of substance and hypostasis, the concept of the Trinity implied a danger of confusion with “TRITHEISM.” Nicholas of Methone (Anaptyxis, p.10.13–16) pointed out that pagan gods are a multitude (plethos) and differ from each other, whereas within the Trinity there is no difference (diaphora) but one *ousia*, power, energy, will, glory, kingdom.

In modern times Peterson (infra) argued that monotheism was a political ideology closely connected with the idea of the unique Roman Empire; the introduction of the concept of the Trinity brought an end to this connection. Although plausible for the West, this alleged disruption did not occur in Byz. (F. Dölger, *BZ* 36 [1936] 225f) where the concepts of monarchy and monotheism remained interwoven, even though in some cases political slogans could be perverted, as happened during the riot of 668 when the army, referring to the Trinity, demanded that Constans II establish the collective rule of three brothers. —A.K.

**The Monotheistic Structure of the Trinity.** The Byz. concept of God was monotheistic; nevertheless they believed in the Trinity, that is, in God the Father, the Son or Logos, and the Holy Spirit, who were of common substance, although of three hypostases. The “common” (koine) substance or substance “shared in common” was understood as follows in the theology of the Cappadocian Fathers: that in thought or in contemplation there was a difference (diaphora) and not a distinction (diairesis) between the persons of the Trinity. Gregory of Nazianzos (PG 36:348A) emphasized that the term diairesis had to be applied with caution lest their unity and their difference be obscured. The “difference” was a sufficient condition for countability or number (arithmos), the concept developed by MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR (Balthasar, *Kosmische Lit.* 104–09). “We venerate monarchy,” said Neilos KABASILAS (ed. M. Candal, *OrChrP* 23 [1957] 252.17–20), “We believe in one God, one not numerically—this would be a Judaic baseness—but one by nature; numerically God is not one but three.” When the Byz. spoke of “one Godhead and one *ousia,*” they meant a monad that stood beyond any number, that is, was not countable (e.g., JOHN ITALOS, *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, par.63, ed. Joannou, p.87.95).

After Trinitarian monotheism was established in disputes against ARIANISM, in opposition to the notions of MONARCHIANISM and ADOPTIONISM, it faced a challenge from DUALISM, which posed the question of the limits of God’s power: if there is only one Lord of the created world, what is the cause of evil? Byz. theologians had to refute the old idea expressed particularly by the MANICHAEANS and some heresies possibly drawing upon them (PAULICANS, BOGOMILS) that there is an opposition between the realm of light (or God) and that of darkness (or matter); the anti-Manichaean arguments and the principles of monotheism were formulated, among others, by JOHN OF CAESAREA in his *Dialogue with a Manichaean* (*Opera* 58f, 245f).


**MONOTHELETISM** (from µονός and θέλημα, “one will”), scholarly term designating a 7th-C.
theological movement. It inherited the problems raised by Monoenergism after the ban of the  
energeia formulas in 638. The new phrase, “a single will (thelema) in Christ,” was suggested by  
Patr. Sergios I of Constantinople and developed by his supporters such as Makarios of Antioch  
and Pyrrhos. The emperor Herakleios saw Monotheletism as a means of compromise between  
Chalcedonians and Monophysites and proclaimed it in the Ekthesis of 638. The main opponent of  
Monotheletism was Maximos the Confessor who elaborated the concept of a variety of wills: the  
natural will, he argued, is a property of nature, and therefore desires good; free will (proaréisis)  
means a choice and therefore presupposes the possibility of error or sin; finally, boulessis is imag-  
ninative desire (phantastike orëxis—PG 91:133B). Christ, having two natures, had to have two na-  
tural wills.

The Typos of Constans II (648) forbade discussion of the controversy, but Maximos defied the  
edict. He was exiled, as was Pope Martin I who supported him. The Council of Constantin-  
ople in 680 condemned Monotheletism and its adherents. Emp. Philippikos repudiated this con-  
demnation and tried to revive Monotheletism, but when he was overthrown the movement finally  
disappeared.

vain 1985) 35–45.

T.E.G.

MONREALE, Sicilian town 18 km southwest of Palermo, site of the abbey church of a monastery,  
chartered by William II on 15 Aug. 1176; also a cathedral. It is essentially a magnified version of  
his grandfather’s Cappella Palatina in Palermo, which Monreale overlooks. The figural mosaics in  
the nave, aisles, transept, and three apses are generally ascribed to Byz. craftsmen because their  
style is similar to that of late 12th-C. monumental painting in Cyprus, Macedonia, and other centers of Byz. art. According to Demus (infra), so huge a body of decoration would have taken 50  
mosaists five to six years to complete, and new scenes had to be invented to extend the standard  
repertoire. The decoration includes an unusually detailed Old Testament narrative in the nave;  

MIRACLES OF CHRIST in the aisles and transept; and in the main apse a bust of the PANTOKRATOR,  
the Virgin Panachrantos, apostles, and saints. Some of the miracle scenes were composed on Greek  
rhetorical principles and may directly reflect the sermons of Philagathos (Maguire, Art and Elo-  
quence 80–83). In the sanctuary are two portraits of William in imperial dress, crowned by Christ  
and again, as in a Byz. donor portrait, offering his foundation to the Virgin.

W. Krönig, The Cathedral of Monreale and Norman Architecture  
—D.K., A.C.

MONTANISM, the heresy of the Montanists (Montanistoi), also called Kataphrygians, followers of a certain Montanus who preached in Phrygia in the 2nd C. Their theology did not differ substantially from Orthodoxy, although some church fathers (e.g., Didymos, PG 39:881B) accused “thick-witted Montanists” of teaching the doctrine of the identity of the members of the Trinity. The main particularities of Montanism were: an emphasis on the exclusive role of the “new prophets” (Montanus and two women, Priscilla and Maximilla); attacks on the established  
church and its concessions to the pagan state; stress on asceticism and rejection of marriage;  
eschatological expectations; and veneration of a deserted city, Pepouza in Phrygia, as the new  
Jerusalem. John of Damascus (Haeres. 49, ed. Kotter, Schriften 4:33f) noted the role of women among the Kataphrygians—not only did they dominate the group and serve as priests, but Priscilla taught that she had had a vision of Christ “in a female  
shape.” According to Epiphanius of Cyprus (Panarion 48.14.2), Montanists were numerous in Cap-  
padocia, Galatia, Phrygia, Cilicia, and Constantinople; they were also known in the West, as far  
as North Africa and Spain.

Both state and church persecuted the Montanists. John of Ephesus reportedly went to Pepouza  
where he burned their place of assembly and destroyed the relics of Montanus and the two  
prophetesses (S. Gero, JThSt 28 [1977] 520–24). According to a 9th-C. historian (Theoph. 401:22– 
27), Leo III ordered that Montanists be forcibly baptized in 721/2; they responded by gathering  
“in the houses of their deviation” and burning themselves to death. Montanism may have sur- 

vived in Byz. into the 9th C.
MONTECASSINO (μονή του Κασίνου), monastery south of Rome, founded in 529 by St. Benedict of Nursia. After destruction by the Lombards (581) and the Arabs (889), the monastery was finally reestablished by Abbot Aliginus ca.950. Though officially patronized by the Western emperors and not in Byz. territory, the abbey, which owned possessions in Apulia, was favored throughout the 10th–11th C. by the strategoi of Longobardia, the katepano of Italy, and the Byz. emperors themselves. Montecassino was closely associated with Greek monasticism: ca.980–95. 

NEILOS OF ROSSANO lived with some 60 disciples in Valleruce, a metochion of Montecassino; some Benedictine monks from Montecassino migrated to Mt. Athos, Jerusalem, and Mt. Sinai. A Greek monk from Calabria, Basil, was abbot of Montecassino from 1036 to 1038. During the Norman conquest of southern Italy Abbot Desiderius (1058–87) actively supported the invaders, who bestowed lavish donations on the monastery. Nevertheless, between 1076 and 1112, Michael VII and Alexios I sent sumptuous gifts to the abbots of Montecassino, hoping for their mediation in the conflict with Rome and with the Crusaders (Reg 1, nos. 1006, 1207f., 1262–64). In 1206, after the Latin conquest of Constantinople, Montecassino was given the monastery of S. Maria de Virgiottis (tes Euergetidos) outside the walls of Constantinople (Janin, Églises CP 181).

Monuments. Montecassino is one of the few places in Italy where written sources attest the activity of Byz. craftsmen. According to the chronicler Leo of Ostia, when Desiderius rebuilt its main church (1066–71), he sent to Constantinople for mosaics to decorate the sanctuary vaults and the pavement; perhaps ca.1070 a monk was dispatched to Constantinople to commission precious fittings and liturgical furniture, including the elements of a bronze and silver templeton (J. Shepard, BSIEB 9 [1982] 233–42) and a gold and enamel altar frontal. The new basilica also incorporated bronze doors that Desiderius had commissioned in Constantinople for the old church ca.1065. Of these expensive Byz. objects only some pieces of the nave pavement and 15 plaques from the bronze doors survive; nevertheless, much has been written about Montecassino as a source of Byz. artistic influence in Rome and southern Italy (see Sant’Angelo in Formis; Salerno), and certain illuminated MSS made in the monastery’s scriptorium have been said to reflect the work of Byz. artists (H. Toubert, MEFRM 83 [1971] 187–261).

Leo of Ostia wrote that “since magistra latinitas had left uncultivated the practice of these arts for more than 500 years,” Desiderius had a number of young monks trained in mosaic-making and in the arts of silver, bronze, iron, glass, ivory, wood, alabaster, and stone. It is not clear whether all of these arts were considered Byz. or taught by Byz. craftsmen, and it is usually overlooked that Amatus of Montecassino attributes the pavement to “Greeks and Saracens.” Unquestionably Montecassino was a unique showcase of imported Byz. objects in southern Italy; yet modern scholars may have overestimated its role as a center of diffusion of Byz. artistic practice.


V. F., D. K.

MONTH (μήν). Ancient local systems and local names of months (Egyptian, Syriac, Attic, Macedonian, etc.) continued well into the late Roman period, but from the 5th C. onward they were replaced by Roman names; only on the outskirts of Byz. civilization were other denominations and systems in use—Armenian, Jewish, and Islamic. In Egypt, Egyptian month names were used until 641; their use by Christians continued even after the Arab conquest. Late Byz. antiquarians (Phymeres, Theodore Gazes) tried to revive Attic names of months (with slight variations), but this scholarly conceit never extended to documents and was rarely used by historians. In the Roman/Byz. calendar the reconciliation of the cycle of lunar months with the 365-day solar year was achieved by having 12 fixed months of uneven length and by intercalating one day to a given month every four years. Plethon suggested a reform of the calendar, introducing numerical designations for the months (instead of Roman or Attic names): the first was to begin after the winter solstice; the year was to be composed of 12 months, a 13th month being intercalated.
whenever the 12th month did not extend to the winter solstice (M. Anastos, *DOP* 4 [1948] 188–90). Plethon also suggested the division of the month into four parts to simplify the institution of new holy days invented by him. Within each month individual days were sometimes designated according to the traditional Roman calendar as being a certain number before three fixed points in the month—Kalends (1st), Nones (5th or 7th), and Ides (13th or 15th). However, the continuous reckoning system (1st, 2nd, etc.) eventually became the norm.


**MONTHS, PERSONIFICATIONS OF.** In the literary sphere a series of texts appears from the 11th C. onward, describing the personified months and the actions (mainly agricultural) appropriate to them; these texts fall into two groups according to whether or not dietary regulations are included. The chief representative of the first group is a set of *dodecasyllables* attributed to Theodore Prodromos (W. Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos: Historische Gedichte* [Vienna 1974] 55), in which the months address the reader directly, giving equal space to seasonal activities and to diet (the rules for which derive from the medical handbook of Hierophilos of Alexandria, 3rd C.). The chief example of the second group is the set of short *ekphrases* found in the romance *Hysmine and Hysminias* (at 4:5–18) of Eustathios Makrembolites, where the months are described in terms of the Late Antique culture, which Eustathios is apparently recreating (March wears military dress, carries sword and bow, etc.). Both groups are reflected in subsequent shorter texts lacking the pseudo-antiquity of Makrembolites; these are usually in verse and anonymous, though one set of dodecasyllables was written by Manuel Philes. The most significant of the later texts are the vernacular descriptions in *Libistros and Rhodame* (ed. J. Lambert, [Ms E, 1017–1107] pp. 116–23), influenced by Makrembolites, and *Ta eidea ton dodeka menon* (The Forms of the Twelve Months), in turn influenced by *Libistros* and accompanied by illustrations. In most of the texts the year begins in March, though in some (e.g., *Ta eidea*) it starts in September.

**Representation in Art.** While Late Antique images of the months drew on astronomy, local cults, and folklore, Byz. cycles were generally much more restricted. Certain ancient symbols were retained: the consul representing January in floor mosaics at Argos (G. Akerström-Hougen, *The Calendar and Hunting Mosaics of the Villa of the Falconer in Argos* [Stockholm 1974]) and GERASA is also preserved in the Vatican Prolemy (Vat. gr. 1291). By the 11th C. this image had been replaced by one of feasting on a boar, as in Octateuch illustration, where the Months are shown beside tombs to suggest the longevity of Abraham’s descendants. In Late Antique art such personifications occurred in many media, whereas in Byz. they were confined to MSS, appearing as marginal vignettes in the Vatican MS of John Klimax (Vat. gr. 394) or as atlantes decorating *canon tables* in Gospel books. Here these figures represent labors, corresponding to descriptions of the Months in Eustathios Makrembolites. Novel variations on this iconography occur as late as the illustrations in the *typikon* of the Church of St. Eugenios, Trebizond (Athos, Vatop. 1199), written in Feb. 1346 (Strzygowski, infra).


**MONTPELLIER,** commercial center in Languedoc, founded in the 10th C. The first significant contact between Montpellier and Byz. was the marriage of William VIII of Montpellier and Eudokia, the niece of Manuel I Komnenos, in 1178 (Barzos, *Genealogia* 2:346–59; W. Hecht, *REB* 26 [1968] 161–69). The arrangement was not part of the emperor’s original plan: Manuel had hoped to marry his niece to the brother of Alfonso II of Aragon (see *Catalans*) but, to the surprise of the imperial embassy that arrived in the kingdom, he was found to be already wed. It was probably on the advice of Alfonso that William was proposed as an alternative bridegroom. The marriage was ultimately a failure for all of the concerned parties but particularly for Manuel, since Montpellier was at that time a minor political power far too immersed in its own local affairs to advance Byz. diplomatic policy.
The only other evidence of significant interaction between Montpellier and Byz. is found in a series of notarial acts from Montpellier dating between 1293 and 1348 that reveal considerable commercial activity between Montpellier, Constantinople, and unspecified ports in "Romania." The major item of export from Montpellier to the empire was Languedocien and French cloth, particularly woolen items. The Genoese at Pera seem to have acted at times as intermediaries in the process. In return for cloth, the Montpellier-erains sought luxury products as well as alum, skins, and wax. In 1327–28 and 1333, when poor harvests occurred, Montpellier also imported grain from the Black Sea area. The absence of notarial sources after 1348 is probably a reflection of a decline in commerce between Montpellier and the empire caused by internal problems within the empire, the economic depression in the West brought on by the onset of the Hundred Years War in 1337, and the arrival of the Black Death at Montpellier in 1348.

**MONUMENTALITY**, a quality of massiveness and, by implication, of realism normally associated with renderings of the human figure. Primarily a function of scale and proportion, in Byz. painting it was achieved also through plasticity and a sense of setting in space. Monumentality is not necessarily absent in relief sculpture, the minor arts, or book illustration: it is found in many ivories and Ms illustrations of the 6th and 9th–10th C. Nor is a progressive chronological decline from the truly monumental—still apparent in much Late Antique ivory and silver—to its negation in late Byz. art an acceptable view of stylistic development, since monumentality is strikingly evident in, for example, the massive figures, drapery, and architectural settings at Sophia. But such works constitute exceptions. As most *ekphraseis* make clear, to the Byz. eye the monumental was the result not of classical techniques but of a work's brilliance and ability to engage the emotions of the spectator. —A.C.

**MONUMENTAL PAINTING** in Byz., comprising frescoes and mosaics, can be divided into three periods: the 4th–8th C., the 9th–12th C., and the 13th–15th C.

**First Period (4th–8th C.).** If there was a theme common to the development of monumental painting in the 4th–8th C.—a period of great artistic diversity—it is the adaptation of Roman modes of decoration to the new contexts and imagery of Christianity. Style and medium were transformed, and mosaic became the preferred form of mural decoration. The scarcity of evidence, with random chronological concentrations and geographical distribution, makes understanding the period as a whole difficult. Most evidence survives in two main functional contexts: in churches and their ancillary structures such as chapels and baptisteries, and in tombs, esp. the catacombs; important remains also survive in a number of houses and palaces.

The invention of a variety of schemes for ornamenting the surfaces of a room ranging from the naturalistic or illusionistic to the fantastic and abstract was an important contribution of ancient Roman wall painting. Painters continued in the 4th–8th C. to use many of these methods, with emphasis given to one style or another at certain periods. At the beginning of the 4th C., and in contrast to the immediately preceding era, dominated by a highly abstract style of wall design, the preferred mode of wall painting was illusionistic, with the fictive architectural membering of walls and ceiling (columns, coffering) and the imitation of opus sectile. An important document of the period survives in Trier (ceiling traditionally dated to the time of Constantine I) where the figures, too, have a tangible, natural quality that has earned them the label "classical" (I. Lavin, *DOP* 21 [1967] 97–113). Much painting also survives in Rome (Via Latina Catacomb; Catacombs of Domitilla, Petrus, and Marcellinus); scattered remains are found elsewhere (Aquila, Ephesus).

The simple and rational architectural systems of the early 4th C., however, became progressively more complicated and illogical (with painted coffers curiously out of joint as, for instance, at Stobi) in the later 4th and 5th C. Similarly the depiction of the human form gradually lost its organic unity. In late 5th–C. Rome, Ravenna, and Thessalonike, walls and ceilings frequently bore ornamental strips or a lattice of lines and complex patterns drawn from textiles (Rotunda of St.
George, Thessalonike). During this period a formula for the decoration of the basilica emerged that would prove vastly influential in the Middle Ages (a single large image in the conch focused on the figure of Christ or the Virgin; files of narrative scenes in rectangular panels in the nave).

In the era of Justinian I the framework of mural decoration was richly articulated with floral and geometric motifs (S. Vitale, Ravenna) in an attempt to evoke illusionistic schemes of the past but with curious contradictions (regarding, for instance, the distinction between frame and field—Kitzinger, infra 81–98). A more severe, abstract mode soon replaced this richly ornamental style (St. Catherine on Sinai, S. Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna). In the Church of St. Demetrios, Thessalonike, and S. Maria Antiqua, Rome, of the 7th and 8th C., the subdivisions of walls—often no more than thin strips of color—were determined more by the needs of individual figures and scenes (monumental icons) than by a sense of the framework as a unified composition.

The Early Christian use of vault mosaics persisted into the 4th C., as in the Mausoleum of Constantia, Rome, but with the lower reaches of the wall reveted in opus sectile. The mausoleum clearly illustrates how the progressively less logical schemes of decoration of the period used the unique resources of the medium: patterns of strewn flowers and fruit on the ambulatory vault, first developed for floor mosaics, here appear in mosaic on the ceiling (H. Stern, DOP 12 [1958] 157–218).

Probably from the time of Constantine onward, mosaics decorated the apses and perhaps even the entrance walls of great basilicas of Rome (S. Sabina). Often though not always (S. Maria Maggiore), wall paintings covered the nave walls. The preference for mosaic owed in no small part to the luminous qualities of the medium, deemed particularly appropriate to the depiction of the heavenly realm. Consequently, gold emerges as a dominant element of decoration particularly for the conch, as if sheathing the curved surface of the apse with light. Contemporary inscriptions (as at S. Stefano Rotondo, Rome) often commented on the effect. In many later churches, such as S. Vitale in Ravenna, mosaic was limited to the bema.

Regarding secular mural decoration in the 4th–8th C., little is known. Some houses of the period, painted notably with imitation opus sectile, survive in Ostia and Ephesus. The wall decoration of the great Palace in Constantinople is known only from literary descriptions. The two paired images of the Anastasis and the Virgin and Child in the corridor beside the nave of S. Maria Antiqua in Rome, dated to the reign of Pope John VII, may have been painted as part of the redecoration of the palatine palace, which John VII assumed as his residence, and may reflect contemporary palace decoration in the East (P.-J. Nordhagen, BZ 75 [1982] 345–48).

During the period of Iconoclasm (726–843), painting of sacred images was forbidden; it is known from both literary sources and surviving decoration that in some churches the figures of holy personages and biblical events were replaced by pictures of trees, flowers, birds, and animals as well as crosses.


Second Period (9th–12th C.). A sequence of dominant metropolitan monumental painting styles can be observed between the restoration of images in 843 and the fall of Constantinople in 1204. Of course, a range of stylistic alternatives was always available to Byz. artists.

A number of post-Iconoclastic figural mosaics from the late 9th/early 10th C. surviving in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, show stoutly proportioned, flatly patterned figures that have an eminently legible presence. These are found in the room over the vestibule (870s?), the bishops in the nave tympanums (3rd quarter of the 9th C.), the lunette of the central portal (900s?), and the portrait of Emp. Alexander (ca.912). The figures in the Ascension in the dome of Hagia Sophia in Thessalonike are similar. Frescoes in this style found in the provinces indicate the artistic hegemony of the capital (e.g., Ayvalı Kilise in GÜMÜ DERE; Hagios Stephanos, KASTORIA; S. Pietro, OTRANTO). No extant monumental works in Constantinople can be dated with assurance to the mid-10th C. The lavish wall paintings of the New Church of Tokali Kilise in GÖREME suggest, however, that the highly classicizing style found in manuscripts such as the Paris Psalter and the Joshua Roll had a monumental equivalent.

A series of mosaic programs from the early and
mid-11th C. (Hosios Loukas, the Nea Mone on Chios, and St. Sophia in Kiev) suggest that a style characterized by simple, organically articulated figures isolated on a plain ground developed in the capital concurrently with the Great Feast cycle (see Church Programs of Decoration). A very similar style is found in the crypt frescoes of Hosios Loukas (early 11th C.). Frescoes elsewhere in the empire continue to reflect the responsiveness of the provinces to metropolitan developments, as indicated in the dramatically hard-edged figures in monuments such as the Panagia ton Chalkeon in Thessalonike and the apse decoration of Eski Gümüş. The notion that this is a particularly “monastic” style has been appropriately dismissed (C. Mango in Habitat, structure, territorio [Galatina 1978] 45–62).

From the mid-11th C., the dogmatic clarity of monumental images is dramatized by a new emotional content. The master of the frescoes of Hagia Sophia, Ohrid, lent his images intensity through the expressions of his figures and his juxtaposition of contrasting shades. Whether this master had metropolitan connections, as did his presumed patron Leo of Ohrid, is debated. The imprint of the same aesthetic is, nevertheless, found in other parts of the empire and in Italy, contemporaneously at Karabaş Kilise in Soğanlı, later at Asinou and, with less sophistication, in the Mavriotissa at Kastoria and in Sant’Angelo in Formis. The mosaics of the main porch and main apse of St. Marco in Venice, dated by Demus to the late 11th/early 12th C., show a similar formal clarity though they lack emotional expressiveness. The mosaics at Daphni suggest a concurrent revival of a classicizing figural style. Not only are the figures organically convincing, but there are intimations of a pictorial middle ground, a novelty in post-Iconoclastic painting. Classicizing conventions of figural representations appear in the frescoes of Veljusa and in the mosaics of the Cappella Palatina and the Martorana in Palermo and of Cefalù, which, like the Venetian mosaics, have been ascribed to Byz. artists.

In the second half of the 12th C. an elaborate, linear manner developed. No monumental examples survive in Constantinople with the exception of a fragmentary angel in Kalenderhane Camii. The Annunciation icon at St. Catherine’s on Sinai ascribed to ca. 1170–80 has been treated as a metropolitan representative of this style. Its chronological position may be suggested by datable frescoes in the provinces. The painted figures at Nerezi refine the emotional expressiveness introduced earlier in the frescoes at Ohrid. At Nerezi the forms are elongated and their drapery elaborated with multiple complex folds, while the settings for the narrative images remain uncluttered. In the frescoes at Kurbinovo and phase two of the Anargyroi in Kastoria, this elegant expressiveness is carried to an extreme. Less emotionally wrought versions are found contemporaneously elsewhere: Monreale in Sicily, the Enkleistra of St. Neophytos and Lagoudera in Cyprus. The relatively homogeneous development of monumental painting in Byz. between the late 9th and late 12th C. as well as the restricted programmatic framework within which stylistic change evolved reflect the highly centralized nature of the empire. The decentralization of the empire that was to result from the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204 would fundamentally disrupt the traditions of craftsmanship and patronage that informed Byz. art.


Third Period (13th C.–1453). Though few monuments survive, written sources testify to the existence of considerable artistic activity in Constantinople in the years between the restoration of the Byz. Empire in 1261 and 1300. Some older churches were restored (St. Andrew in Krisei), and others, such as the church dedicated by the empress Theodora Palaiologina to St. John the Baptist (south church of the Lips Monastery) or the north church of the Virgin Pammakaristos, were built anew. The churches founded by Nikiforos Choumnos and his daughter, Irene Choumiana, and by the patriarch Athanasios I are not preserved, nor are the wall paintings in the Church of the Theotokos ton Magoulian or the works of Modestos, the painter who decorated the katholikon of the Theotokos tes Panagiotissess (1266). Nothing survives of the mosaic portraits of Emp. Michael VIII and his family that once adorned the Church of the Virgin Véristéptos in Constantinople.
The Deesis mosaic in the south gallery of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, however, preserves the basic features of what may be called the "first Palaiologan style": the larger scale of figures, the three-dimensionality, the rich shading of each particular form. The use of earlier classicizing models in this period results in a more convincing depiction of space and a better knowledge of anatomy. Drawing their inspiration from works as old as the 5th–6th C., the artists of Constantinople created a distinctive stylistic vocabulary in works such as the MS of the Acts and the Epistles in the Vatican (Vat. gr. 1208) or the Gospels produced before 1300 in a scriptorium patronized by a "Palaiologina" (Buchthal-Belting, Patronage). The new style was immediately developed in monuments at some distance from the capital, such as the frescoes of Sopočani in Serbia (1263–68).

The next generation concentrated less on monumental forms and complementary colors and more on the dramatic aspect of their subjects. The frescoes of the Protaton monastery on Mt. Athos, of the Virgin Peribleptos at Ohrid, of the mosaics of the Paregoretissa at Arta (1290) announce the main features of the so-called second or mature Palaiologan style, which reached its full development only in the second decade of the 14th C. in the mosaics and frescoes of the Chora monastery in Constantinople and in the mosaics of the Holy Apostles in Thessalonike, and the frescoes of the Church of Christ in Berroia. This "mature" Palaiologan style is marked by the introduction of a multitude of figures into each composition, an intensity of feeling conveyed by gesture and movement, a new sense of plasticity achieved by gradually lightening the tone of a color on the drapery, and a new sense of space enhanced by elaborate background architecture. The artists of this period also loaded their images with multiple narrative and symbolic meanings. Such painted metaphors and allusions, used rarely in Komnenian painting, became the standard mode of expression after 1300. Other important extant monuments of this period are found in Mistra and in the churches painted by Michael (Astrapas) and Eutychios. The style also appears in both painted and mosaic icons as well as in miniature painting.

The style was not accepted everywhere, however, and it was not easily mastered by provincial artists. While artists trained in the larger urban centers followed more classical traditions, mannerist exaggerations appeared in provincial monumental painting toward the middle of the 14th C. (cf. esp. some frescoes from Lesnovo, near Stip, and some Greek island churches).

After the civil wars of 1321–1328 and 1341–1347 ended, artists of Constantinople tried to impose a new, "heroic" style featuring monumental figures of saints with powerfully rendered bodies, whose cheeks were covered by tiny white parallel lines to symbolize a transcendent light. These idealizing portraits of calm and powerful saints should perhaps be viewed as a response to the growing threat of Ottoman domination. The frescoes in the Peribleptos and Pantanassa churches at Mistra, in the naos of Dečani, and at Andrea (1389) probably most closely reproduce the style as it was practiced in the capital. Some icons also are painted in this manner (i.e., the Great Deesis in the Hilandar monastery on Athos of ca.1360, the Pantokrator in Leningrad of 1363, the Thaumato Latomou in Sofia of ca.1371, and the Pantokrator on Lesbos of the third quarter of the 14th C.). This late Palaiologan style did not spread quite as widely as had the previous ones, but characterizes the monuments of the "Morava" school in Serbia, the Church of Calendžica in Georgia (painted by Manuel Eugenikos), and the works of Theophanes "the Greek". During the 15th C. a new artistic center emerged in Candia (Crete), where Byz. masters produced vast quantities of icons and frescoes based on early 14th-C. models.


C.R.

MONZA AMPULLAE. See Ampullae, Pilgrimage; Monza and Bobbio, Treasures of.

MONZA AND BOBBIO, TREASURES OF. The Cathedral of St. John the Baptist at Monza, founded by Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, and the abbey of St. Columban at Bobbio, built by her husband Agilulf (r.590–615) and his
son Adaloald possess important collections of pilgrim tokens and ampullae from the Holy Land. The lead flasks, formed in molds, were made to contain oil from lamps that burned in the Christian sanctuaries of Jerusalem and the region of Bethlehem; such provenances determine their description as pilgrimage ampullae. They are decorated with images of the Virgin enthroned, scenes from Christ’s infancy, ministry, and Ascension, as well as symbolic representations of the Crucifixion and the memorial aedicula on Golgotha. Although the Bobbio fragments are less well preserved than those at Monza, they are of interest because their iconography includes such unusual subjects as the “Navicella” (the ship, emblematic of the Church, from which the apostles watched Christ walk on the water). Sun-baked clay pilgrim tokens illustrate the Flight of Elizabeth (Bobbio) and the Virgin at the spring (Monza).

At Monza three lead boxes contain fragments of wood and bone; 25 glass flasks and a small black glazed amphora from Rome are said to have held oil from lamps in the catacombs. Five palm-shaped purses may also have contained relics. Finally, Pope Gregory I sent Theodelinda’s infant son Adaloald a gold True Cross relicuary of which the original niello and gold low-relief panels may survive under a modern crystal cover. Gregory probably received the relicuary when he was apocrisiarius at the Byz. court. Three late antique ivory diptychs at Monza include one representing Stilicho, his wife, and their son.


MONZA VOCABULARY, a list of some 65 Latin or Italian words with the Greek equivalents, written in the Latin alphabet, added on the final page of a 10th-C. Latin MS in the Biblioteca Capitolare of Monza, near Milan. The Monza vocabulary is written in a rough Carolingian minuscule of approximately the same date as the MS to which it is appended. Difficult to read, and often more difficult to interpret, the Monza vocabulary is important because of the early Italian and vernacular Greek forms that it records. It was apparently constituted through questioning of a Greek speaker, perhaps a clergyman in northern Italy. No evidence links the Monza vocabulary with the Greek spoken in southern Italy. Like the bilingual Psalters and similar texts, the Monza vocabulary attests to interest in and elementary knowledge of Greek in the West in the early Middle Ages.


MOORS. See MAURI.

MOPSUESTIA (Mo(μ)psuestia, Crusader name Mamistra, Turk. Misis), civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of CILICIA II (under Antioc). Justinian I rebuilt Mopsueia’s bridge over the Pyramos and in 550 called a council whose records reveal the exceptional power of the imperial representative, the comes (or strateletes). The city is said to have been destroyed by Herakleios when the Arabs advanced (they first took Mopsueia in 637), leaving a no-man’s-land between Antioc and Mopsueia. The region remained desolate from raids of the MARDATES. In 703, the Arabs took Mopsueia and transformed it into a base against Byz., whose attacks it frequently met. John (I) Tzimiskes captured Mopsueia in 965. In 1085, it became part of the ephemeral state of Philaretos Brachamios; from 1097 to 1133, Mopsueia was generally controlled by the Crusaders, who appointed a Latin archbishop. John II captured Mopsueia in 1137, but Manuel I had to reconquer it in 1159, when it became his main base in Cilicia. Soon after, the Armenians gained control of Mopsueia, first as Byz. vassals, then (after 1173) as independent princes.

The most remarkable Byz. remains are the elaborate mosaics of a probably 5th-C. building—a church rather than a synagogue. These include Noah’s Ark and a unique cycle of the deeds of Samson (E. Kitzinger, DOP 27 [1973] 133–44).


MORA, or Morhra (Mórrha), also called Achridos, a mountainous region in the eastern RHODOPE. The toponym Achrido appears in the Alexiad.
(An.Komn. 1:151.23), while Mora is a later appellation, esp. frequent in Kantakouzenos. The area was dotted with fortresses—called astea, phouria, or polemnia in the Greek sources (Čer- nomen on the Marica, Ephraim, Ouistra, Con- stantia, and others). According to Kantakou- zenos (Kantak. 3:251.19–22), the inhabitants of Mora bred livestock and took their herds to Chalkidike for the winter. Achridos-Mora, to- gether with Melnik, probably formed a part of the principality of the despotes Alexios SLAVOS but was then conquered by Theodore Komnenos Doukas of Epiros. In 1255 Alexios Doukas Philanthropenos, leading a Nicaean army, captured a stronghold in Achridos (not near Ohrid, as stated by Polemis, Doukai 168), and was appointed the commander of garrisons in Achridos and Tsepaina (Akrop. 1:119.11–16). Mora was a point of contention during the mid-14th C.


—A.K.

MORAVIA (Mopēa, also in Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos as Great [Megale] Moravia and the country of Svjatopluk), state that arose in Pannonia in the early 9th C. after the dissolution of the Avar khaganate. It reached its apex under the princes Rastislav and Svatopluk but was crushed by the Hungarians in 906.

Archaeologists have discovered in Moravia remnants of at least 18 churches of the 9th C. (e.g., those of “Na Valách” and “Na Špitálkách” in Staré Město), some of which are of the Byz. inscribed cross type, with a dome over the nave; Byz. jewelry and silk; and a gold coin of Michael III. It is quite plausible that some economic and political relations between Moravia and Constantinople began in the first half of the 9th C.

Excavations at Mikulčice show that the Moravians were pagan in the 7th–8th C. but thereafter converted to Christianity. The first missionaries active in Moravia were monks from Bavaria ca.800. Prince Rastislav, who was probably fearful of growing German influence in his country and a possible Germano-Bulgarian alliance, requested missionaries from Constantinople in 862. The Byz. sent CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER and METHO- DIOS in response. After Constantine’s death and the departure of Methodios, an “archbishop of Moravia” named Agathon (probably a supporter of Patr. Ignatios) was active in the country ca.873–79, but Latin missionaries came to dominate there. Constantine VII erroneously calls Moravia unbap- tized (De adm. imp. 40.33). Byz. retained some ecclesiastical connection with Moravia even after Hungarian settlement there.


MOREA (Mopēa), alternative name for the Pe- loponnesos. The origin and etymology of the name is obscure, and attempts to derive it from Slavic more, the sea, were rejected by Vasmer (Slaven 2). Others see in the name a Latin corruption of the Greek Romia, “land of the Romans.” The most common derivation is from the name of the mulberry tree (morea), whose leaf is similar to the shape of the peninsula. The bishopric of Moreon first appears in a notitia of the 10th C. (Notitiae CP 7:554) or in an addition to this text; at any rate, a seal of Theodore, a bishop of Moreon, is dated by Laurent (Corpus 5,1, no.656) in the 11th C. V. Laurent’s conjecture (REB 20 [1962] 186) that the bishopric was created by Nikephoros III is purely hypothetical. The bishopric of Moreon was a suffragan of Patras. Its location is uncertain, probably in Elis, near the promontory Ithys (A. Chatzes, BNJbb 9 [1932] 65–91). It remains unclear whether and how the local to- ponym Moreon was transformed into Morea and from the 13th C. onward became the designation of the Peloponnesos as a whole, or specifically of its western coastal regions. In the 15th C. MAZARIS jokingly and artificially connected the name, which he reads as Mora, with words such as moros, death.


MOREA, DESPOTATE OF (1349–1460). As a result of the Fourth Crusade, the Frankish con- quest of the Peloponnesos (or MOREA), and the establishment of the principality of ACHAIA, the Byz. lost all control over southern Greece from
1205 to 1262. After William II Villehardouin's defeat at Pelagonia, however, and his cession of several fortresses to the Byz. by the Treaty of Constantinople (1262), the Byz. regained a foothold in the Peloponnesos. During the ensuing century the Greeks reconquered the southern portion of the peninsula from the principality.

Soon after he ascended the throne, John VI Kantakouzenos created the despotate of Morea as an autonomous province under imperial suzerainty. He sent his son Manuel Kantakouzenos to the Morea as its first despot in 1349 to reestablish order in a province troubled by dissident archontes. Manuel's long rule brought a measure of peace and prosperity to the region. Shortly after Manuel's death in 1380, John V Palaiologos made his son Theodore I Palaiologos despot; thereafter the despotate was an appanage ruled by a member of the Palaiologan family. By 1429 the despotate gained control of the entire Peloponnesos by a combination of warfare and marriage diplomacy and eliminated the principality of Achaia. Its final years (1429–60) were marked by conflict among the sons of Manuel II (Theodore II Palaiologos, Constantine XI Palaiologos, Thomas Palaiologos, and Demetrios Palaiologos) over the rule of the despotate and devastating attacks by the Ottoman Turks, who were only temporarily thwarted by the construction of the Hexamilion wall (1415) to defend the Isthmus of Corinth. After 1447 the despotate of Morea became a tribute-paying vassal of the Ottoman sultan. The despotate briefly survived the Turkish conquest of Constantinople; its capital of Mistra fell to the Ottomans on 29 May 1460. (See table for a list of the despotai of Morea.)

The economic basis of the despotate was agriculture (esp. wine, olives, and raisins) and the production of salt and silk. An influx of Albanian immigrants provided the manpower for farming in the region, which was severely depopulated by constant fighting. The Albanians also served as mercenaries in the army. Trade was controlled by the Venetians, who also defended the coasts. The despotate of Morea was the site of the final flowering of Byz. culture, esp. at Mistra, where many churches were built and decorated with frescoes. The court of the despotai attracted numerous intellectuals, most notably the philosopher-reformer Gemistas PLETHON.


-A.M.T.

**MORPHOLOGY**, study of the structure of words; in Greek, the study of nominal and verbal inflections and paradigms. Byz. grammarians adopted the analysis and classification of these features worked out by Alexandrian grammarians and given canonical form by Herodian and did not take into account the changes in Greek morphology over the centuries. This traditional prescriptive morphology is represented by the Canons of Thedosios of Alexandria (4th–5th C.) and Theognostos (9th C.), the epimerisms of George Choiroboskos, and the eretemata of late Byz. grammarians. Meanwhile radical changes occurred in the morphology of spoken Greek. In noun paradigms most consonantal stems were restructured as vowel stems, for example, μήτηρ was replaced by μητέρα, declined like χώρα; thus the ancient third declension was virtually eliminated (H.-J. Seiler, Glotta 37 [1958] 41–67). In verb paradigms the personal endings of imperfect, first aorist, and second aorist became identical, the future was replaced by various periphrases, the perfect and pluperfect became aorist equivalents and were gradually eliminated, the

---

**Despotai of the Morea**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Kantakouzenos</td>
<td>1349–1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Kantakouzenos</td>
<td>1380–1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore I Palaiologos</td>
<td>1381–1407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrios Kantakouzenos</td>
<td>1383–1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore II Palaiologos</td>
<td>1407–1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alone</td>
<td>1407–1428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with brothers Constantine and Thomas</td>
<td>1428–1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine (XI) Palaiologos and Thomas Palaiologos</td>
<td>1443–1449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Palaiologos and Demetrios Palaiologos</td>
<td>1449–1460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Grumel, Chronologie 375, and Zakythinos, Despotai.
MORTARY (δήμων). Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Comm. II. 3:168.11–14) defined a mortarium as “a round cylindrical [sic] stone or a hollow vessel made of stone or wood, in which pulse or other objects were ground.” In addition to their use in the preparation of food, mortaria were employed to manufacture drugs and colors, or to mix metallic powder; querns or “hand mills” for grinding grain were also known. Roman clay mortaria are found throughout the West, but in the eastern Mediterranean they seem to have been replaced by vessels of stone and marble. However, a group of large clay mortaria (diam. approximately 50 cm; weight approximately 11 kg) of the 3rd and 4th C. has been found in Syria. All share the same basic form—flat base, high flaring wall, broad, slightly downturned rim with spout—and all are stamped on the rim with a maker’s name or trademark (e.g., “of Kassianos”; see STAMPS, COMMERCIAL). The center of manufacture has been archaeologically identified as Ras el-Elasit, on the Syrian coast north of Laodikeia.


MORTAR, a bonding material made of slaked lime, sand, and crushed brick (ranging from dust to small pieces) used in thin beds to bind courses of ashlar blocks or in thick beds to bind courses of bricks. Mortar was also mixed with irregular pieces of stone to form the concretelike core of walls faced on both sides with ashlar blocks and brick. When used with brickwork, mortar beds are normally 5–6 cm thick. Since Byz. brick is 4 cm thick, a Byz. brick structure has more mortar than brick—the reverse of Roman brick construction. This lavish use of mortar probably contributed to the excessive warping and settling of the structure as the mortar dried. The “rubble” mortar used as the core of walls is friable and weak; it was thus avoided in piers designed to carry great weight. In the 6th C. the pointing of mortar beds resulted in smooth concave surfaces recessed behind the leading edge of the brick; later pointing created a flat surface more deeply recessed above than below.


MORTE (μορτή, lit. “portion”), a term denoting the (usually) in-kind rent paid by a PEASANT on agricultural land belonging to the state or to a private landowner. The land leased was called hyppomortos ge (Chil., no.92.162). Morte is found predominantly in 13th- and 14th-C. documents referring to monastic and state lands in Asia Minor. It may be equivalent to PAKTON and the more common terms dekateia (see TITHE) and dekaton (“tenth”), although in some 15th-C. praktika the dekateia appears to be a fixed levy in specie, based on the total land owned (i.e., not merely leased) by monastic PARAOKI, which was paid to the monastery that held them (N. Svoronos in Laura 4:170, n.659). In the 13th C. the difference between ownership and renting for morte was obscured, and tribunals had to investigate whether peasants were paying tax or morte; the “contract” of morte could pass from one generation to another (Kazhdan, Agrarnye otnoseniya 129f).


MORTUARY CHAPEL. See PAREKKLESION.
Mosaic: The Baptism of Christ; mosaic, early 11th C. Northwest squinch of the katholikon of the monastery of Hosios Loukas, Phokis.

MOSAIC (ψηφιδωτόν, μοναστיכון), the most elaborate and expensive form of mural decoration (see Monumental Painting) employed by the Byz. With the toleration of Christianity in the 4th C. and the beginning of the construction of churches, the use of small cubes (tesserae) as an artistic medium was no longer limited to floor mosaics. It was deemed more appropriate for depictions of sacred personages and biblical events to be placed on the walls and ceilings of churches than on floors where they might be walked on. The gradual shift to mosaic for mural decoration made possible the use of a greater variety of more fragile materials for the tesserae; in addition to the multicolored stone and marble typical of floor mosaic, artists used brick or terra cotta, semi-precious gems, and opaque colored glass. Gold and silver tesserae were produced by sandwiching foil between layers of translucent glass. Tesserae varied much in size, the smallest being used for modeling faces and other important details. Often following preliminary, painted guidelines, the mosaicists impressed these tesserae into a setting bed, itself laid over previous plaster strata. While tesserae could be produced in a small local workshop, as at Masada in the early 5th C. (Y. Yadin, IEJ 15 [1965] 102), mosaic decoration on a large scale presupposes huge financial investment and industrial organization. The mosaic in the apse of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople required almost 2.5 million tesserae “smeared,” as Photios said, “with gold” (Cutler-Nesbitt, Arte 106). Depending on the size of the tesserae used, a mosaicist could cover up to four square meters per day (I. Logvin, Kiev’s Hagia Sophia [Kiev 1971] 16).

In contrast to fresco technique, mosaic is an essentially additive medium, contributing materially to the dominance of line and contour. This inherent linearism could be overcome only by the use of microscopic cubes, such as are found in miniature mosaic icons of the 11th C. and later. Despite this limitation, mosaic was, at its best, a medium of great subtlety, involving hundreds of shades of color.

In late antiquity, wall mosaics were subordinate in extent to floor mosaics and were restricted to such surfaces as domes and the conches of apses until the 6th C. During the reign of Justi-
nian I a new model was established at Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, paved in marble but with its upper surfaces sheathed with “the glitter of cut mosaic” (Paul Silentiarios—ed. Friedländer, *Kunstbeschreib.* 245.647). Mosaic was more widely used in this period than it was to be ever again; the finest 6th-C. examples survive at the monastery of St. Catherine at Sinai, Poreč, and Ravenna; others are found at Dyrarachion, Gaza, and at several sites on Cyprus. Mosaic was soon to become an important Byz. export. Thus in the early 8th C. the Arabs imported from Constantinople “40 loads of mosaic cubes” and a number of workmen for the decoration of the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus (H.A.R. Gibb, *DOP* 12 [1958] 225–29), while Pope John VII seems to have employed Byz. mosaics for his oratory in St. Peter’s, Rome (P. Nordhagen, *ActaNorv* 2 [1965] 121–66).

By the late 8th C., holy figures executed in mosaic were a common feature of sacred decoration: the author of *Stephen the Younger* complained that the images of birds and beasts set up by Iconoclasts in the Church of the Blachernai to replace a Gospel cycle left the building “altogether undecorated” (PG 100:1120 C). The economic revival of the 9th and 10th C. saw the frequent use of mosaic in the churches and private chapels of Constantinople. It was also the model of luxury in palace decoration, attested for the Kainourgion at the Great Palace built by Basil I (*TheophCont* 332.14–335.7) and in the epic of *Digenes Akritas*.

Mosaic was the technique chosen for imperial portraits in Hagia Sophia for three centuries (9th–11th) and was favored in the 12th C. by Manuel I for scenes of history painting (Nik. Chon. 206.48–52). In emulation of the empress Helena, the same emperor may have sent mosaic cubes and even craftsmen such as Ephraim to Bethlehem for the Church of the Nativity. Clavičio describes mosaics (of the 12th or 13th C.?) in both the church and cloister of the Peribleptos Monastery in Constantinople, as at St. George of Mangana. It is also known that large areas of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople were decorated by Eulalios in the 12th C. The 11th and 12th C. in general represent a high watermark in work in this medium. The decorations of Hosios Loukas, the Nea Mone on Chios, and Daphni witness to the transport of artists and materials over great distances. In the early 11th C. small and mosaicists were sent to Kiev for the embellishment of St. Sophia (A. Poppe, *JMedHist* 7 [1981] 41–43), and local workmen were taught the craft. A similar importation probably prevailed during the protracted decoration of San Marco in Venice, and mosaicists figure among the other craftsmen brought from Constantinople in the 11th C. by Desiderius of Monte Cassino. The extent to which Byz. artists participated in the 12th-C. mosaic decoration of Palermo and Monreale remains in question.

From the 13th C. onward mosaic was used only in the most lavish enterprises at Constantinople and, exceptionally, at Arta. While the mosaic of the Deesis in Hagia Sophia (late 13th C.) may have been an imperial commission, later programs, such as those at the Chora and Pammakaristos in Constantinople and the Holy Apostles in Thessalonike, were generally sponsored by the bureaucratic or ecclesiastical elite, often in conjunction with fresco decoration. The last major mosaic undertaking in the capital was at Hagia Sophia following the partial collapse of the dome in 1346. Shortly after 1355 the Pantokrator in the dome was restored, and images of John V Palaiologos, John the Baptist, and the Virgin were installed on the great eastern arch (Mango, *Materials* 66–76, 87–91). The mosaics on the eastern arch, covered by plaster for centuries, were rediscovered in 1989.


-A.C.

**MOASIC LAW**, more fully titled “Excerpts from the Law Given by God through Moses to the Israelites,” a collection of passages from Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy that is preserved in dozens of MSS from the 11th C. onward, usually as an appendix to the *Ecloga*. The compilation cannot be earlier than the 8th C. Out of the 50 chapters of the compilation, about 20 deal with marital and sexual problems; among other topics are theft, murder, witnesses, loans, just weights and measures, charity, etc. The
MOSCHABAR, GEORGE, a second name possibly Psyllos (Ψύλλος) or Psyllates (Ψυλλάτης), a relentless opponent of UNION OF THE CHURCHES; fl. second half of the 13th C. Moschabar (Μοσχάριος) is attested in 1281 as didaskalos tou Evangelio and from 1283 to 1286 as chartophylax. Before Michael VIII died, Moschabar fought against Union anonymously. His Dialoge with a Dominican on the Procession of the Holy Spirit (1277–78), another work on the same subject, still unpublished, and the Antiirhetic Chapters that refute the work of Patr. John XI Bekkos date from this time. After the restoration of Orthodoxy, Moschabar openly opposed Bekkos and his supporters (Pachym., ed. Bekker 2:98:18–99:3). His relations with the new patriarch Gregory II of Cyprus deteriorated quickly. Moschabar was instrumental in bringing about Gregory’s resignation in 1289 and wrote a certification of Gregory’s Orthodoxy in exchange for the abdication (PG 142:129AB).

MOSCHOPoulos, MANUEL, writer and philologist; nephew of the bibliophile Nikephoros Moschopoulos; born ca.1265?, fl. Constantinople ca.1300. A student of Maximos PLANoudes, Moschopoulos (Μοσχόπουλος) became a commentator on and perhaps editor of classical Greek poets. Virtually nothing is known of his biography, except that in 1305/6 he became involved in a plot, fell into political disgrace, and was imprisoned.

Moschopoulos was a versatile scholar, who wrote a book on Greek grammar (Erotetmata grammatic) with an appendix on schedographia (J.J. Kea-

MOSCHOPoulos, NIKEPHOROS, bibliophile and bishop during the reign of Andronikos II; died between 1322 and 1332. He was named titular metropolitan of Crete by 1285, but could not reside in his see because of the Venetian occupation of the island. He was subsequently made PROEDROS of Lakedaimon (Sparta) ca.1289. In 1291/2 he restored the Cathedral of St. Demetrius at Mistra (M.I. Manousakis, DChAE 4 1 [1959] 70–79). He also built windmills and planted vineyards and olive groves in the countryside nearby. Whenever possible, however, Moschopoulos preferred to live in Constantinople. In
1296 the emperor sent him to Venice on a diplomatic mission; in 1303 he served as imperial emissary to Patr. John XII Kosmas, who had just resigned his throne. In 1305 Patr. ATHANASIUS I forced him to return to Mistra.

Like his more famous nephew, the philologist MANUEL MOSCHOPoulos, Nikephoros was a scholar and admirer of classical literature. He possessed a library so extensive that it took four horses to transport it; he copied some codices himself (E. Gamillscheg in Byzantios 95–100), commissioned the copying of others, and was generous in his donations of MSS to monasteries. Among his books were a copy of the Odyssey and a 10th-C. MS of the homilies of Chrysostom. Moschopoulos apparently also engaged in hymnography; E. Papa-eliopoulou-Photopoulos attributed to him an akolouthia on John Cassian (Diptycha 2 [1980–81] 119–45).


—A.M.T.

MOSCHOS, JOHN, sometimes nicknamed “Ekuratas”; monk and writer; saint; born Gilicia (P. Pattenden, JThSt 26 [1975] 41, n.1) between 540 and 550 (S. Vailhé, EO 5 [1901–02] 108), died Rome Sept. 619 or more probably Constantinople in 634. The prologue to his book, written by a contemporary, records that Moschos (Μοσχός) lived in and visited various monasteries and ascetic centers in Judea, Syria, and Egypt. After the Persian capture of Jerusalem (614), he sailed to the “great city of the Rhomaioi,” that is, Constantinople, where he lived as patriarch-in-exile of Jerusalem. Before his death he entrusted the incomplete version of his book, The Spiritual Meadow (Leimon or Leimonariou) to his pupil and fellow traveler, SOPHRONIOS, the future patriarch of Jerusalem (H. Chadwick, JThSt n.s. 25 [1974] 41–74). This work, which was dedicated to Sophronios, consists of short edifying anecdotes about monks and hermits, in the tradition of the APOLPHETEGMATA PATRUM. Its contents and pleasantly unaffected Greek ensured the wide later circulation described by Photios (Bibl., cod.199), who mentions variously sized EKDOSEIS. Translations were made into Arabic, Latin, and Church Slavonic. As with other similar hagiographies, the work provides a wealth of information both for linguists (E. Mihvec-Gabrovec, Études sur la syntaxe de Ioannes Moschos [Ljubljana 1960]) and for those interested in the social and intellectual history of his day. It also innocently spotlights, sometimes horribly, the emotional and sexual repressions of its ascetic subjects. Together with Sophronios, Moschos produced a revision of the vita of JOHN ELEEMON.


—B.B.

MOSCOW (Μοσκόβια), town in the Volga-Oka basin, capital of a principality that, though subject to the MONGOLS, emerged in the 14th C. as the major rival to Tver’ and LITHUANIA for control over Russia. Moscow was in contact with Byz. from the early 14th C., though it is not mentioned explicitly in Byz. sources until 1380 (MM 2:12.12), when Ivan II (1353–59) was designated the great rex and all Russia, while Symeon of Moscow (1341–53), in a letter of John VI Kantakouzenos in 1347, is called the great rex of all Russia (MM 1:263.27). The route from Moscow to Constantinople via the Don and the Azov Sea is described by IGNATIJ of SMOLENSK. Muscovite princes contributed regularly toward the repair of monuments in Constantinople (e.g., in 1347, 1364, 1398; cf. Greg. 3:199.24–200.9). Byz.-Muscovite diplomatic activity focused on the metropolis “of Kiev and all Russia.” Metr. Peter (1308–26) transferred his actual residence to Moscow, and most of his successors followed suit. The official residence, however, was moved in 1354 at the order of Patr. PHILOTHEOS KOKKINGS from Kiev only to Vladimir-on-the-Kliaz'ma, which was regarded as the senior principality (Greg. 3:15.14–17). Philotheos and ANTONY IV used their involvement with the metropolis to sustain the semblance of Byz. authority, an authority that was lost when Moscow rejected the Council of FERRARA-FLORENCE. Byz. artists (THEOPHANES “the Greek”), worked in Moscow from the mid-14th C., as did writers associated with the Hesychast movement (KIPPRIAN, EPIFANIJ PREMUDRYJ, PACH-
MOSELE (Μωσηλέ), or Mousele, a family name of Armenian origin. In 791 Alexios Mosele, the first known droungarios tes viglas, supported Constantine VI against his mother Irene and was rewarded with the post of strategos, but was soon arrested and blinded. Theophilos proclaimed another Alexios Mosele heir to the throne, married him to his daughter Maria, and made him caesar. After military successes in Italy, Alexios was accused of a conspiracy against Theophilos and soon retired to a monastery. The family maintained its importance in the 10th C., when another Alexios Mosele served as droungarios tou plomou under Romanos I, and Romanos Mosele obtained the high title of magistros under Constantine VII. Basil II, however, mentioned in an edict that Romanos’s descendants had fallen into extreme poverty. Family members of the 11th C. are known only from several uncertain seals, one of which belonged to the imperial notary John Mosele (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.208); in the 12th C. Michael Mosele married a noble lady related to the families of Mélissenos and Xeros. In Constanti-

nople there were both an oikos and a monastery of Mosele; H. Delehaye (AB 14 [1895] 161–65) suggested that a school was located in the oikos, a hypothesis rejected by Lemerle (Humanism 283, n.6); the monastery existed until the 14th C.

Lit. Kazhdan, Arm. 106; Janin, Études CP 358f; Winkelmann, Quellenstudien 155f, 176f, 184f. —A.K.

MOSES (Μωσῆς), biblical legislator and prophet; the ideal king, according to PHILO; feastday 4 Sept. One of the tasks of Christian theologians was to demonstrate that Christ was much more than “a new Moses”: Moses not only predicted the advent of Christ but “using obscure ridges shed some light on the Trinity” (pseudo-Basil of Seleukeia, PG 85:136C). Human history was construed as consisting of three stages: a period of natural law, one of Mosaic law, and one of Grace and the New Testament. God sent Moses, says Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Thess., Opuscula 17f), and Moses issued “a better law” that his contemporaries were unable to grasp in full. Gregory of Nyssa wrote a Life of Moses (ed. Simonetti, infra); its first book is a historical commentary on the events related in Exodus and Numbers, stressing the miraculous, rejecting naturalistic explanation, and suppressing shocking detail; the second, much longer, book is an allegorical and spiritual reading of the life of Moses as the soul’s journey to liberation. The Byz. also found the story’s romancelike details attractive: Moses’ miraculous rescue from the river, the wonders he worked, his flight to the country of Madiam, and his military success. Moses’ Crossing of the Red Sea was interpreted as a prefiguration of the triumph of Christianity and paralleled Constantine I’s victory at the Milvian Bridge.

Representation in Art. Images of Moses are found in many contexts. As the protagonist in events of Exodus and Deuteronomy, Moses recurs in narrative art, such as the Octateuchs and two excerpted passages: the Odes of Moses (Ex 15:1–19; Dt 32:1–43) included and illustrated in Psalters. A New Testament setting is provided by the Transfiguration account (esp. Mt 17:3), in which Moses and Elijah appear beside Christ. Moses is represented as an idealized beardless youth (e.g., in the Vatican MS of Kosmas Indikopleustes) and as a white-bearded patriarch (e.g., apse mosaic of St. Catherine’s, Sinai). A single 12th-C. icon at Sinai with 20 narrative scenes from the life of Moses in the frame is probably to be explained by a local cult (Weitzmann in Place of Book Illum., figs.20–21). A characteristic 12th-C. innovation is a woeful Moses with sunken cheeks (e.g., Soteriou, Eikonos, no.161), a type further developed in the 13th C. by the addition of a short beard and heavily lined features to create an entirely different portrait type (ibid., no.175).


MOSESDAY, Arab saint of second half of 4th C.; feastday 7 Feb. According to Sozomenos (Sozom., HE 6.38.5), he was a holy man and miracle worker who lived in the desert. When the Orthodox Arab queen Mavia revolted against the Arian Valens
ca. 375–78, she insisted during negotiations with the emperor that the Orthodox Moses be consecrated as the bishop of her foederati. Valens finally agreed to this condition, and Moses was taken to Alexandria to be consecrated by Loukios, the Arian bishop of the city. Moses refused, however, to be consecrated by an Arian, and was subsequently taken to the “mountain” where the rite was performed by Orthodox bishops in exile. Moses then returned to Mavia’s foederati and engaged in missionary activity among the Arabs. By some scholars he is identified with Moses the Black (J.M. Sauget, Bibl. Sanct. 9:652–54).

–I.A.Sh.

MOSES DASXURANC’I (or Kalankatuac’i), Armenian historian (fl. 10th C.?) of whose life nothing is known. His History of the Caucasian Albanians ends with the attack of the Rus’ on Partaw in 914. Although based on many previous Armenian sources, this History is valuable as a prime source for Caucasian Albania and its relations with Armenia, Iran, and Georgia.

Moses focuses on the history of the church in that area of the Caucasus; he claims Albania was converted no later than Armenia. References to Byz. are few, but the campaigns of Herakleios, the schism of the Eastern churches after the Council of Chalcedon, and the travels to Constantinople and Rome of Stephen (later bishop of Siwnik’) are given some prominence. Also included is a lengthy description from about 660 of the holy sites in Jerusalem (E.W. Brooks, EHR 11 [1866] 93–97).


–R.T.

MOSES OF BERGAMO, or Moses de Brolo, Latin translator from northern Italy who was in imperial service at Constantinople ca. 1130; died after 1157. Moses probably participated in John II Komnenos’s Danubian campaigns, lived near Constantinople’s Venetian quarter, and was selected over Burgundio di Pisa and James of Venice to interpret the debate of Anselm of Hav-}


–M.McC.

MOSES XORENAC’I (“from Xorean [or Xoren],” an unknown town, in Armenian tradition, “the father of history.” The reliability and date of his History are still debated. This important work, the first attempt to give a coherent account of Armenian history from the settlement of the country in the days of the giants down to the death of Mesrop Maštoc’ in 439, became the standard version.

In book 1 Moses correlates the legends about the origins of Armenia (also found in Sebols as the “Primary History”) with the biblical genealogies and the events of world history as known from the Chronicle of Eusebios of Caesarea. In book 2 the role of Armenia between Rome and Parthia is expounded; here the Jewish War of Josephus served as a prime source. Based on the works of Agathangelos and pseudo-Pawstos Buzand the narrative continues to the death of Trdat, first Christian king of Armenia. Book 3 describes the predicament of Armenia between
the Byz. emperors and the shahs of Sasanian Iran. It ends with a lament over the end of the Arsacid monarchy and the removal of the patriarchate from the family of Gregory the Illuminator.

The author claims to have been a pupil of Maštoc' and to have studied in Alexandria and Constantinople. If so, the History contains many anachronisms. Nor is it quoted or mentioned until after 900. Its emphasis on the preeminent role of the Bagratids and the down-playing of the Makoneans has led many to believe that it was written when the former rose to power and the latter declined—in the 8th C.

Moses (whoever he was) was very widely read in Greek theological and secular literature, but he used Armenian renderings of nearly all foreign sources. As a historian Moses was the first Armenian to develop an explicit philosophy of historiography. He speaks of himself as an “anti-quarian,” anxious to preserve information about past deeds of great men. His values are those of a landed aristocracy where valor is assessed on the basis of martial accomplishments, and rank depends on hereditary standing. Frequently Moses speaks of the importance of veracity and elegance in historical writing, and emphasizes that “there is no true history without chronology,” but he had no hesitation in interpreting his sources quite tendentiously.

Several other works have been attributed to Moses Xorenac’i. Among them a unique Geography dates to the 7th C.; based on Pappos of Alexandria, it briefly describes the entire world, with expanded information on the provinces and political geography of Armenia (R. Hewsen, REArm. n.s. 4 [1967] 409–53; S.T. Eremyan, Hayastane est Ašarhaç’oç’e [Erevan 1963]). A book of rhetoric (chérai) said to be by Moses is more difficult to date. It is based on Apiṭhonos and other Greek rhetorical writers, but adduces biblical and Christian examples to illustrate traditional Greek themes (A. Baumgartner, ZDMG 40 [1886] 457–515; R. Sgarbi, Rendiconti, Accademia di scienze e lettere, Classe di lettere e scienze morali e storiche, Istituto Lombardo 103 [1969] 78–84).


MOSQUE (μακριήδιον), Muslim building for worship. The earliest mosques are difficult to identify because they may lack definitively distinguishing architectural features; the mihrāb niche begins to be present only with the caliphate of al-Walid in the early 8th C. A possible north Syrian or Coptic/ Ethiopian Christian influence on early mosque architecture is much debated.

In areas newly conquered by Byz. some churches were converted to mosques, or possibly even divided, temporarily, into areas for Muslims and Christians. A 6th-C. guest house in the monastery of St. CATHERINE at Sinai was converted into a mosque; it contains a minbar dated by inscription to 1106. Some of the earliest surviving mosques on former Byz. territory include that at BOSTRA as well as the controversial and rebuilt so-called Mosque of ‘Amr in Fusṭāt (Old Cairo). In areas that Byz. recaptured from Muslims, mosques were usually closed and the Muslim population ousted or annihilated.

In Constantinople a mosque was protected by treaties with the Fatimids in the 10th–11th C. (M. Canard, Journal Asiatique 208 [1926] 94–99); epigraphical evidence raised the question of similar Fatimid protection for a possible mosque in Athens (G.C. Miles, Hesperia 25 [1956] 329–44). A mosque in Constantinople is again mentioned in the 14th and early 15th C. Which Muslim sovereign’s name would be mentioned in prayers at this mosque was always controversial.


MOSYNOPOLIS (Μοσυνώπολις), town in Thrace on the Via Egnatia; it is called a kastron in the typikon of Pakourianos, “cité” or “ville” by Villehardouin. It was built on the site of late Roman Maximianopolis (ancient Porsulae) at the foot of Mt. Papikion. The archbishop of Maximianopolis is listed in the notitiias of the early 10th C. as suffragan of Traianopolis (Notitiae CP 7,598). Basil II used Mosynopolis as an operational base for his Bulgarian wars. In the 11th C. the town was a bandon of Boleron. Anna Komnene knew
Mosynopolis as a center of Manichaean activity. It played an important part in military operations at the end of the 12th through the beginning of the 13th C.: the Normans took it in 1185, and it was ravaged by Kalojan. Whether the town recovered after this blow remains unclear: its name appears as part of the title of the works of Bole-ron and Mosynopolis in 1317 (Guillou, Métracée, no.7.26), and a synodal decison of 1347 mentions the return of the bishopric of Mosynopolis from the jurisdiction of Xantheia to that of Traiano-polis (MM 1:260.18–21). Asdracha (infra 106) argues that Mosynopolis was in ruins by the 14th C., identifying it with the "old polis of Mesene, destroyed many years ago" mentioned by Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 2:429.14–15).


- T.E.G.

**MOTION, THEORY OF.** The theory of motion developed in antiquity primarily by Aristotle was modified by the Byz. in several ways. First, John Philoponos rejected the Aristotelian theory that a moving missile was pushed by both the thrower and by the surrounding air that was forced into motion by the agent; instead he introduced the theory of impetus, or "kinetic power," which was transferred from the thrower to the projectile (S. Sambursky, The Physical World of Late Antiquity [London 1962] 74–76). Then, John of Damascus (Dial. 45.9–19. ed. Kotter, Schriften 1:129f) suggested a detailed categorization of types of motion: in essence—birth and destruction; in size—growth and decrease; in quality—alteration; in space—circular and linear movement.

The theological concept of motion was developed in the struggle against Proklos, who considered the First Principle as immovable and the soul as self-moving, autokineto. In contrast, the church fathers saw in the Trinity the source of all motion. There were two main theological concepts of motion: one, still connected with Neoplatonic emanationism, construed motion in terms of rest (mone), procession (proodos), and return (epistrophe); Nicholas of Methone (Anaptixis 43.3–4), however, perceived return not as a circular energy (as Proklos) but going the same way as the proodos. He also emphasized the ethical element in proodos-epistrophe: the creature that is to return not to itself (as in Proklos) but to God has free will to act according to nature or to go against nature and to join Satan and his demons who have no access to epistrophe. Another view is presented by Maximos the Confessor, who replaced the Proklean terminology with another triad—being, power, and energy (or action)—thus stress-
being the category of rest to which both being and action belong (Armstrong, Philosophy 492–505).

A.K.

MOUNTINITZA. See Boudonitzza.

MOUNT OF OLIVES (Ἑλαμών, ὄρος τῶν Ἑλαμών). On this steep hill overlooking Jerusalem from the east is located the cave associated with the Ascension teachings of Christ, where he “prayed with his disciples and handed down to them the mysteries of perfection” (EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA, Demonstr. Evang. 6.18.23, ed. Heikel, Eusebii Werke 6:278.25–28); from the nearby hillock, with its “divine footprints,” it was believed that Christ rose into heaven (EGERIA, Travels 43.5). Constantine I built a basilica here, the apse of which incorporated the cave. By the late 4th C. a circular, colonnaded structure open to the sky marked this locus sanctus where pilgrims could collect eulogia dust. In the vicinity were many lesser churches, monasteries, and nurseries. Golgotha and the Mount of Olives reportedly were the scene of the vision of the Cross in 351 on the eve of the victory of Constantius II over the usurper Magnentius in Pannonia.


G.V., Z.U.M.

MOUSAIO (Μουσαίος), poet; born Egypt?, fl. 5th–6th C. Mousais is described in some of his MSS as a grammarian (grammatikos). Nothing else is known of him, though he might be the Mousais addressed in two letters from PROKOPIOS OF GAZA. An epyllion Hero and Leander is extant, which shows Mousais to be a follower of NONNOS OF PANOPOLIS and influenced by PROKLOS. Gelzer (infra [1967] 136) interprets the poem as a Christian Neoplatonist allegory, but this position is not universally accepted. Mousais’s presumed use of the Heroïdes of OVID is of interest in the tracing of Byz. awareness of Latin literature. The attribution to Mousais of the anonymous poem on Alphaeus and Arethusa (AnthGr, bk.9, no.362) is debatable.


B.B.

MOUSEION AND LIBRARY OF ALEXANDRIA. The Mouseion was a center of scholarship and letters; its members received a stipend and many engaged in teaching. The Library, with its librarian and staff, was probably housed in separate premises. Both were founded and funded in the 3rd C. B.C. by Ptolemy II Philadelphos. They continued to enjoy official support throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The Library was reputed to contain 400,000 volumes, that is, papyrus rolls (L.E. Lödberg, Eratos 3 [1899] 166). Its history in the later Roman Empire is obscure. Probably the collection of the "great library" was moved by the 4th C. to a "daughter" branch in the temple of Serapis; at the end of the century it was visited and described by APHthonios. It remains under dispute whether the Mouseion was destroyed in 391/2 when the temple of Serapis was razed to the ground (J. Schwartz in Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles [New Haven, Conn., 1966] 97–111); at any rate, the Mouseion is not mentioned by any writer after Aphthonios. The final destruction of the Library may have been caused by ‘Amr ibn al-‘As, the Arab general, when he conquered Alexandria in 642. One must view as apocryphal, however, the story that ‘Amr, in response to John Philoponos’s plea that it be spared, observed that if the books agreed with the Qur’an they were superfluous, and if they disagreed with it they were pernicious and had to be destroyed.


A.K., R.B.

MOUZALON (Μουζάλων, fem. Μουζαλώνιστα), a family whose first member is known from an 11th-C. seal—Theodora Mouzalonissa, "archon-
tissa of Rhosia” (Ch. Loparev, Vizvrem 1 [1894] 160). She has sometimes been considered the wife of Oleg Svyatoslavich, prince of Tmutorokan, but possibly her husband was a Byz. governor of Rhosia on the Cimmerian Bosporos. In the 12th C. the family produced Nicholas IV Mouzalon, patriarch of Constantinople, and Constantine, a patriarchal notary (Benesević, Opisaniće 1:290.3–5). The Mouzalon family reached its zenith in the 13th C. when they were regarded as originating from Atramytton (Pachym., ed. Failler 1:41.10): Theodore II Laskaris appointed his childhood friend, George Mouzalon, megas stratopedarches, his brother Andronikos megas domestikos, and another brother, Theodore, protokynegos; after Theodore II’s death George became regent for John IV Laskaris but was overthrown by Michael VIII Palaiologos; both George and Andronikos were murdered in 1258 (see Mouzalon, George). Only Theodore retained influence with Michael VIII and the post of logothetes ton genikon, but since he disagreed with the emperor on religious policy, he was flogged (by his own brother). Later he became Andronikos II’s adviser and favorite; his daughter married the emperor’s son Constantine. The Mouzalons regained their position in the army: Stephen Mouzalon was megas droungarios and led the negotiations with the Catalan Grand Company; George Mouzalon, hetairiarches, commanded a troop of Alans but was defeated by the Turks at Bapheus in 1902.


MOUZALON, GEORGE, regent of the empire of Nicaea (1258); born ca.1220, died Nymphaion 25 Aug. 1258. He and his brothers were the boyhood companions of Theodore II Laskaris. They were by all accounts of non-noble origin. As emperor, Theodore raised them to the highest offices of state, making George megas domestikos first, and then protovestarios, protosebastos, and megas stratopedarches. Imperial favor earned them the hatred of the great court families, which intensified when they were given aristocratic brides. George married into the Kantakouzenos family. Appointed regent by Theodore II for his young son John IV, George faced the hopeless task of trying to placate the aristocracy led by Michael (VIII) Palaiologos. Latin mercenaries under Michael’s command murdered George along with his brothers during a commemoration service for the late Theodore at the monastery of Sosandra near Nymphaion.


MOUZALON, NICHOLAS. See Nicholas IV Mouzalon.

Mu’awiya (Mu‘āwiya) ibn Abū Sufyan, caliph (661–80) and founder of the Umayyad Caliphate; born Mecca between 600 and 610, died Damascus Apr. 680. A brilliant administrator and general, Mu‘awiya served as a secretary to the prophet Muhammad and then participated in the conquest of Syria, notably the capture of Caesarea Maritima (640/1). As governor of Syria and Palestine, Mu‘awiya retained the native bureaucracy: Greek continued as the language of record; Byz. images and inscriptions appeared on coins minted in Damascus; and Christians occupied leading offices, esp. those concerning finances. Yet he aggressively attacked Byz. by aiding rebels like Saborios and conducting direct assaults. He sent annual raids into Asia Minor and Armenia, leading some himself, and received permission from Caliph ʿUthmān to build a fleet, with which he captured Cyprus (649), Rhodes (654), and Kos (654), and in 655 defeated Constans II in the “Battle of the Masts” at Phoenix (mod. Finike in Turkey). Mu‘awiya’s struggle with ʿAli for the caliphate forced him in 659 to sign a three-year truce with Constans requiring weekly payments of 1,000 solidi, one slave, and one horse (Reg 1, no.239).

After becoming caliph Mu‘awiya’s renewed conquests—Kyzikos (670) and Smyrna (672)—culminated in a great siege of Constantinople (674–78). Byz. use of Greek fire and attacks by the Mardaites forced him to withdraw and negotiate a 30–year treaty stipulating annual Byz. payments of 3,000 solidi, 50 hostages, and 50 horses (Reg 1, no.239). As caliph, Mu‘awiya was tolerant of Christians and rebuilt the ruined cathedral of Edessa (679).

MUHAMMAD (Μουάμματς, מואמה, etc.), prophet of Islam; born Mecca, tribe of Quraysh, ca.570, died Madina, 8 June 632. Among the most controversial aspects of Muhammad's life and thought is the extent to which he had contact with Christians and was influenced by them and by Christian (and Jewish) ideas. In sūra 30 of the Qur'ān, titled al-Rūm, Muhammad showed concern for and expressed optimism about the survival and welfare of Byz. in its war with Persia. Muslim traditions allege that Muhammad dispatched messengers to various contemporary sovereigns, including HERAKLEIOS, to call them to Islam. Muhammad's first expedition against Byz. territory ended in the battle of Mu'ta (628), a serious Muslim defeat. The earliest reference to Muhammad in a Byz. source is found in DOCTRINA JACobi SUPER BAPTIZATI, ca.634–35. The aims and reasons for Muhammad's policy against Byz, late in his life are poorly documented and controversial. His conception of Christians as 'people of the Book' enabled his successors to concede them protected status. Hostile and inaccurate traditions about Muhammad exist in Byz. sources, even though some may draw on Christian Oriental and even Muslim texts.


MULES. See Beasts of Burden.

MUNDIR, AL-. See ALAMUNDARUS.

MUNICH TREASURE, dated to the 4th C. and found ca.1973 at an undetermined site "in the eastern [Roman] empire." Now belonging to the Bayerische Hypotheken- und Wechsel-Bank in Munich, it is composed of nine silver objects (eight bowls and one plate), five of which are larigitio dishes made ca.921/2 in three different centers and noteworthy as the only such collection yet found in the East. Three bowls have in their centers struck, coinlike portraits—one of LICINIUS and two of his son Licinius II, the caesar, inscribed with acclamation of the latter's fifth anniversary. Two of these bowls (one of the emperor and one of his son) have silver stamps thought to refer to a mint workshop of Nikomedia. The third such bowl, of the son, has a comparable stamp for the mint of Antioch. Two other bowls have incised inscriptions: one acclimating the tenth anniversary as caesar of CRISPUS and CONSTANTINE II and the other bowl the fifth anniversary of Licinius II. The former bowl has a pointillé inscription referring to Naissus and the latter, one of Antioch. As Naissus had no mint, Baratte (infra) suggests that the bowl was manufactured in a state treasury. The close similarity of objects made in different centers for different emperors—and their ownership by one individual—indicates a tightly organized system of larigitio manufacture and distribution. The owner is thought to have been an official who buried the objects at the time of the overthrow of Licinius by Constantine I in 324.


MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION was inherited by the late Roman Empire from antiquity, but by the 4th C., imperial administration came to predominate, and civic self-government was restricted to small hereditary oligarchies, the curiales. Their organ was the boule (Lat. curia), the city council, which consisted of curiales and exercised certain rights of justice; administered city estates; and oversaw food supply, building activity, public games, education, and medical care. It was also responsible for paying imperial taxes. During the 5th and 6th C. all of these forms of urban administration fell gradually into the hands of the emperor's agents. In the 7th C. municipal administration declined as the city ceased to be the leading social institution; this change was reflected later by a novel of Leo VI abrogating the boultai. At the same time the local bishop became responsible for certain aspects of urban affairs. In the 11th and 12th C. some forms of self-government were reestablished in provincial towns. Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Thess., Opuscula 92.1–58) mentions an annually elected magistrate who was constantly active in the marketplace and city council (bouleuterion), and Michael Chroniates describes with some derision noisy assemblies that discussed common affairs. Under the Palaiologoi certain cities, such as Ioannina, Kroya, Phanarion, and Monemvasia, received imperial charters that guaranteed their privileges, including elements of
municipal administration. In Byz., however, the conduct of urban affairs was strictly limited not only by imperial administrative omnipotence but also by the power of local landowners and the church.


—A.K.

**MURAD I (Μουράτ, Αμουράτ, etc.), Ottoman sultan (1362–89); son of Orhan and his Greek wife Nilüfer Hatun; born 1326?, died Kosovo Polje 15 June 1389. Under Murad the Ottoman beylik evolved into an empire stretching from the Balkans to central Anatolia. As this transpired, the Palaiologoi one by one became Murad's tributary princes—partly to avert total conquest, partly to gain his aid in times of dynastic struggle. John V became Murad's vassal ca.1372–73, following the Turkish conquest of Adrianople (1369) and the battle of the Marica (1371). Murad's posture toward John vacillated opportunistically. In 1373 Murad and John V cooperated closely in crushing the joint rebellion of their sons SAVCI Beg and Andronikos IV. In 1376, however, Murad aided Andronikos in unseating John V and Manuel II, receiving in turn KALLIPOLOS (1377), which the Turks had lost in 1366. When John V and Manuel recovered power in 1379, it was likewise with Murad's aid, for which he received larger annual tribute. Murad's later relations with John V and Andronikos IV (installed as Murad's vassal in Selymbria 1382–85) were generally stable.

Throughout the period 1383–87, Murad's chief Byz. antagonist was Manuel, who was ruling in Thessalonike and refusing accommodation with the Turks. This hostility ended in 1387 when the Thessalonians surrendered to Hayreddin Pasha, and Manuel later made his submission to Murad. THEODORE I PALAIOLOGOS, Manuel's brother and despotes of Mistra, also became Murad's vassal in 1387. At that point, the sultan regarded all the leading Palaiologoi as coordinate members of his state and as sources of revenue and military manpower. Having this network of control, Murad never attempted direct conquest of Constantinople. The Palaiologoi preserved their alignment with Murad in his final years and did not participate in the uprising of the knez LAZAR. This uprising led to the Battle of Kosovo Polje, during which Murad was assassinated.


—S.W.R.

**MURAD II (Μουράτης and other forms), Ottoman sultan (1421–51); eldest son of MEHMET I; born Amasya (AMASEIA)1404, died Edirne (Adrianople) 9 Feb. 1451. In his reign Murad had important dealings with Emps. MANUEL II, JOHN VIII, and CONSTANTINE XI. Murad's relations with Manuel were chronically tense. In Aug. 1421 Manuel failed to restrain John from launching Düzme Mustafa in a revolt against Murad. Düzme Mustafa claimed to be a son of BAYEZID I and had been imprisoned in Constantinople since 1416. John expected in return territorial concessions, esp. Kallipolis. In Jan. 1422, however, Murad crushed Düzme Mustafa and then moved to chastise the Palaiologoi, opening attacks upon Thessalonike and Constantinople in June. After his 24 Aug. general assault on Constantinople failed, Murad soon lifted that siege. Meanwhile Manuel attempted to undermine Murad by supporting the claims of Murad's brother in Anatolia, Küçük Mustafa. Murad eliminated this Mustafa sometime in 1423 and retaliated by dispatching Tural-han Beg to ravage the Morea (late May-June). The continuing siege of Thessalonike so reduced its citizens that the despotes Andronikos surrendered the city to Venice (formalized July 27, 1429), further enraging Murad. Early in 1424, Manuel finally concluded peace with Murad, conceding territory and promising tribute of 100,000 hyperpyra yearly.

Murad's relations with Byz. were more stable throughout the period 1424–46. John VIII formally abided by the 1424 pact. Murad's 1430 conquest of Thessalonike strengthened his hold over Macedonia and then Epirus, but thereafter he conducted his European campaigns in the northern Balkans. John's frequent maneuverings for Western help in the 1430s and his absence from 1437 to 40 to attend the FERRARA-FLORENCE Council provoked Murad's suspicions but occasioned no breach. The emperor, moreover, played no visible role in the Crusades that Murad faced in 1443–44; indeed, John dutifully congratulated Murad following his victory at VARNA. Murad's
posture stiffened after 1444, however, when the despotes of Mistra Constantine (XI) Palaiologos rendered Murad’s vassal, duke Nerio II Accia-juoli of Athens, tributary to himself. Murad replied in 1446 by invading the Morea, after which Constantine became tributary to Murad.

In the turmoil following John VIII’s death (Oct. 1448), Murad supported the despotes Constantine’s succession, and concluded a peace pact with him in March 1449. This pact governed their relations down to Murad’s death in 1451.


-S.W.R.

MURDER (φόνος). Byz. law retained the criterion for murder of Roman law, which required evidence of intention to kill, determined by the weapon used (Basil. 60.39–51,13,17). Punishment for the intentional killer differed according to his social status: for the entimoi (persons of rank), banishment and confiscation of property; for the etulelos (commoners), death. The intentional killer of this law corresponded to the category of he-kouios phoneus of Byz. legal texts, but Byz. law also introduced divisions within this category (Troianos, Poinalios 6–10). There were several mitigating factors in the application of the death penalty for intentional killers. The murderer could avoid prosecution for the crime by paying a settlement to the victim’s family (Basil. 11.2.2; 60.53–1). Further, the church saved the lives of intentional killers through asylum. A few cases of killing preserved in excerpted form in the Peira (63.24–28) show that the murderers who had not sought asylum received corporal punishment or the death sentence (commuted to hard labor in the mines), while those who were under the church’s protection had their property divided between their family and the victim’s family.

Better sources for the circumstances in which murders occurred are the confessions preserved in the writings of Demetrios Chomatenos and John Apokaukos from 13th-C. Epiros. These are cases of spontaneous attacks provoked by trespassing on property or insults to personal honor. Although they do not provide a full range of murder cases, they do give examples of everyday murder in rural communities and show that even the innocent needed protection from civil officials, who moved in and confiscated property at the first opportunity (see Phônion).


-M.R.J.

MUSA (Musa, Musa, etc.), more fully Musa Çelebi, younger son of Bayezid I; died near Sofia 5 July 1413. Between 1410 and 1413 Musa attempted to establish himself as Ottoman sultan at the expense of his brothers Süleyman Çelebi and Mehmed I. In 1410–11, he eliminated Süleyman and gained control of Rumeli. After campaigning in Serbia, he waged war on Byz. to punish Manuel II for having supported Süleyman and to recover losses suffered in the peace of 1403. Both Thessalonike and Constantinople were besieged, the latter probably from spring 1411 to summer 1412. In response, Manuel first tried to undermine Musa by supporting the claims and maneuvers of Süleyman’s son, Orhan. This failed, and by summer 1412 Manuel had allied with Musa’s brother Mehmed, who was based in Anatolia. Musa foiled Mehmed’s first efforts to crush him, but on 5 July 1413 was defeated, captured, and then strangled at Mehmed’s command south of Sofia. By this victory, Mehmed reunited Ottoman territories in Rumeli and Anatolia and ended the dynastic strife that had weakened the Ottomans vis-à-vis Byz. and others since 1402.

Byz. sources depict Musa as intensely anti-Christian and notoriously cruel. His siege of Constantinople evoked renewed outpourings of devotion to Mary, the city’s patron; among these is Manuel II’s dolorous Hymn to the Theotokos. According to the historian Doukas, Musa assaulted Constantinople out of religious zeal and a desire to wreak vengeance on the Palaiologoi for having incited Timur to liquidate Musa’s father, Bayezid.


-M.S.W.

MUSIC. Apart from the acclamations, no music survives from Byz. that is not directly connected with the liturgy. Secular music is frequently described by Christian authors and historiographers (see Musical Instruments; Musicians; and Singers), but its styles, genre, and form are unknown. Hence, modern scholars use the phrase
“Byz. music” to refer to the medieval sacred unaccompanied chant of Christian churches following the Eastern Orthodox rite and to a certain group of ceremonial songs in honor of the emperor, the imperial family, and high dignitaries of the Orthodox church. This music is undeniably of composite origin, drawing on the artistic and technical productions of antiquity as well as on Jewish music, and was inspired by the plainsong that evolved in Alexandria, Antioch, and Ephesus.

MSS with symbols to indicate melodic movement (see Neumata and Notation) appeared only from the 9th C. onward, so our knowledge of the earlier period has to be gleaned from Typika, patristic writings, and medieval historians. The evidence suggests that hymns and psalms were originally syllabic or near-syllabic in style, stemming as they did from congregational recitatives. Later, as monasticism developed—first in Palestine and then in Constantinople—and with rites and ceremonies taking place in magnificent new edifices (such as Hagia Sophia in Constantinople), trained choirs of singers, each with its own leader (the protopsaltes for the right choir, the lampadarios for the left—offices common in Byz. churches but unknown at Hagia Sophia before 1453 [see Singer]) and soloist (the domestikos or kanonarch), assumed full musical responsibilities. Consequently, after ca.850 the tendency arose to elaborate and ornament the music, leading to a radically new melismatic and ultimately kalophonic style (see Teretismata).

Byz. musical notation passed through several stages of evolution before the fully diastematic system (which indicated step by step the direction of the melody) emerged ca.1175. Earlier forms were memory aids, cueing the singer along a familiar melodic path; they remain undeciphered today. The mature, diastematic Round Notation, readily convertible into the modern system, represented a highly ingenious complex of interrelationships among a handful of symbols that enabled composers to convey a great variety of rhythmical, melodic, and dynamic nuances.

The Orthoechos provided the compositional framework for Byz. psalmody and hymnody. For all practical purposes, this system of modal organization was the same for Latins, Greeks, and Slavs in the Middle Ages. Each mode is characterized by a deployment of a restricted set of melodic formulas peculiar to that mode, which constitutes the substance of the hymn. While these formulas may be arranged in many different combinations and variations, most of the phrases of any given chant are nevertheless reducible to one or another of this small number of melodic fragments.

Psalmody and hymnody are represented in Byz. MSS by both florid and syllabic settings. Byz. syllabic psalm-tones display extremely primitive features, such as the rigidly organized four-element cadence, which is mechanically applied to the last four syllables of the verse, regardless of accent or quantity. The florid psalm verses, such as those for the Eucharist, which first appeared in 12th- and 13th-C. choir books, demonstrate a simple uniformity in motifs that transcends modal ordering and undoubtedly reflects early congregational recitative.

A special position, however, was accorded to nonbiblical hymnody, within which the generic term Troparion came to signify a monostrophic stanza, or one of a series of stanzas, in poetic prose of irregular length and accentuation. The development of larger forms began in the 5th C. with the rise of the kontakion, which found its apotheosis in the work of Romano in the Melode. In the second half of the 7th C., the kontakion was supplanted by a new type of hymn, the kanon, initiated by Andrew of Crete and developed by John of Damascus and Kosmas the Hymnographer.

Another kind of hymn, important both for its numbers and for the variety of its liturgical uses, was the sticheron. Proper stichera, accompanying both the fixed psalms at the beginning and end of vespers and the psalmody of Lauds in the orthros, exist for all the feasts of the year, the Sundays and weekdays of Lent, and the recurrent cycle of eight weeks in the order of the modes, which begins with Easter. Their melodies, preserved in the Sticherarion, are moderately elaborated and varied, contrasting with the more rigidly syllabic tradition of the Heirmologion. Nevertheless, all forms and styles of Byz. music, as exhibited in the early sources, are strongly formulaic in design. Only in the final period of its development did composers abandon this procedure in favor of the highly ornate kalophonic style. The most celebrated of them, one entirely representative of the new school, was John Kououzeles, who organized the new chants into larger anthologies called Akolouthiai (see Papa-
This final phase of Byz. musical activity provided the main thrust that was to survive throughout the Ottoman period and still dominates current Orthodox musical practice.

There exist a few Byz. theoretical documents on music, which are usually philosophical, frequently speculative, and rarely concerned with specific problems. The more conservative ones simply reproduce late classical statements on harmony and symmetry from the writings of Plato, Aristoxenos, and Ptolemy, without acknowledging contemporary practice; such are the Quadrivium of George Pachymeres and the three-volume Harmonika transmitted under the name of Manuel Bryennios. Other treatises are simply catalogs of neumata and melodic formulas. The oldest of these, found in the 10th-C. MS Athos, Lavra T.67, lists rudiments of the tonal and modal systems together with the names and graphic representations of early musical signs. Of the discursive statements, the earliest, known as the Hagiotopolites (12th C.), contains observations about the modes and the intonation formulas. It is followed by a Papadike, the dialogue attributed to John of Damascus that begins Ego men o paides, the treatises of John Laskaris, Manuel Chrysaphes, and Gabriel Hieromonachos.


**MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS (μοσικά ὀργάνα).** The number, kind, and function of musical instruments in Byz. is not fully understood. No instrumental music survives and the nature of accompaniment for songs—whether it followed the vocal line faithfully or indulged in heterophonic embroidery—is unknown. Written texts give lists of names, rather than descriptions of musical instruments, and it is difficult to establish the relation between the terms and the pictorial evidence preserved in MSS, ivories, and metalwork. John Chrysostom (PG 55:532f; 62:112.12–14) mentions various terms, all known from ancient sources: kymbalon (cymbal), aulos (flute), tympanon (drum), salpinx (trumpet), psalterion (harp), kithara (harp), syrinx (pipe). In Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De cer. 379.7, 381.11) are cited cheirôkymbalon (cymbal) and pandoura (lute); in a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 172.9–20), anakara (cymbals) as well as horns and trumpets made of silver; Libystratos and Rhodamne (ed. J. Lambert, p.315,3168) adds seistron (metallic rattle) and baukion (trumpet). The distinction between some of these terms is unclear.

Pictorial data are provided mostly by mythological scenes (flutes, harps, cymbals, etc.); by the illustrations of the Psalms (e.g., Cutler, Aristocratic Psalters 39, 49, 73f), in which David is often represented playing a harp or a lyre; and esp. (if it is indeed of Byz. origin) by the 12th-C. silver vase from Berezovo (V.P. Darkevič, Svetsko iskusstvo Vizanti [Moscow 1975] 163–77), the medallions of which show musicians playing stringed instruments (both plucked and bowed), flutes, trumpets, cymbals, and a drum.

Musical instruments played little if any role in liturgy, but occupied an important place in palace ceremonial, noble entertainment (as described in Digenes Akritas), and as accompaniment to dances. At wedding celebrations, such as those described in the dialogue Anacharsis (260:65–67) and by Choniates (Nich. Chon. 494.7–8), string and wind instruments (including the kithara, pektides [angle harps], lyre, and aulos) and cymbals were played. The description in a 14th-C. ceremonial book of the Christmas Eve procession in Constantinople reveals the existence of a small imperial band (pseudo-Kod. 197.12–19). The musicians (paigniotai), who stood behind the clergy and were separated from the crowd by standard-bearers, consisted of trumpeters (salpinktai), horn players (bykinatores), cymbal players (anakaristai), and pipers (souroustitai). According to pseudo-Kodinos, musicians using "smaller instruments" were not part of the band. Horns, trumpets, and cymbals—played singly or in concert—were used in battles (Strat.Maurit. 2.17; Nich. Chon. 381.31–32), as were tympana (Leo Diacon. 24.17, 36.6).

Both the repertory and construction technique of Byz. musical instruments were heavily based on ancient tradition, although some innovations were made under Eastern and/or Western influence, such as use of drums and bowed string instruments. One of the most imposing instruments was the organ.

Actual examples of Byz. musical instruments are extremely rare. In Corinth the wooden body of a lyre (10th or 11th C.) has been discovered; the bowl would have been covered by a sound-
board (of leather or wood), on which strings would be fastened; neither has survived (Ph. Anogeianakes, DCHAE 3 3 1962/3 115–25).


-D.E.C., A.K.

MUSICIANS (μουσικοί). While vocal music and singers were sponsored and encouraged in ecclesiastical circles, instrumental musicians in Byz. were accorded little recognition. Indeed, most references to instrumental music-making in the early period condemn the practice. Rhetorical outbursts by church fathers, such as John Chrysostom ("Where aulos players are, there Christ is not," PG 62:389,52–53), were strengthened by strict ecclesiastical legislation. Legal tradition denied baptism to aulos and kithara players unless they renounced their trade (APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS 8:2,9; Epiphanius of Salamis, PG 42:832A), and a 4th-C. Alexandrian law set excommunication as the penalty for a cantor who learned to play the kithara. This vehemence against instrumental musicians is primarily explained by the association of musical instruments with sexual license, luxurious banquets, and the immorality of the theater (J. McKinnon, Current Musicology 1 [1965] 69–82). Nothing more is known about the social status of musicians and no names of players have been preserved. Descriptions of musical performances at receptions and processions in the writings of Constantine VII and pseudo-Kodinos (see MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS) suggest that, in later periods, musicians were given certain official duties, though nothing about their training or the scope of their activities is known. In the dialogue ANACHARSIS (218–25), the art of instrumental performance is considered a feature of noble breeding. Finally, while the folk music tradition must have been vigorous, no source describes the musician’s role in it. The most interesting representations of Byz. musicians are on the medallions of the silver vase from Berezovo (in the Urals), now in the Hermitage (Inv. ω 3) (V.P. Darkevič, Svetskoe iskusstvo Vizantii [Moscow 1975] nos.117–33).

Lit. Wellesz, Music 91–97. -D.E.C.

MUTANABBĪ, AL-, more fully Abū-al-Ṭayyib Ahmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Mutanabbī, Arab poet and warrior; born Kūfa 915, died Iraq 965. He joined the entourage of SAYF AL-DawlA at Aleppo from 948 to 957, and accompanied the Ḥamdānīd ruler on most expeditions, including the almost annual campaigns into Byz. territory between 950 and 957. Thereafter, court intrigue forced him to leave Aleppo, and his unfulfilled ambition to become governor of some province led him to the courts of Egypt and Persia. He was killed by marauders on his way to Baghdad.

His odes on Sayf al-DawlA’s war against Byz., besides their artistry, are valuable historical documents. Of his almost 300 known poems, about 20, some fairly long, are devoted to Sayf’s Byz. campaigns, and two or three refer to Byz. envoys or otherwise bear on Byz.-Arab relations. Though containing poetic hyperbole, his poems, with historical notes by various commentators, provide valuable and often specific details of campaigns and their sequence of events, itineraries, toponymy, names of Byz. personages, actual battles, and the reactions of combatants, as with the battle of AdatA (al-Ḥadath), 30 Oct. 954. In addition, he often throws light on the strength and weakness of Ḥamdānī war efforts and public relations, and supplements the reports of historians and other literary sources on the Byz.-Arab encounter.


-A.Sh.

MUṬΑṢIM (‘Abṣūrāk in the story of Forty-two Martyrs of Amorion), caliph of the ʿABBĀSIDs (833–42); born between 795 and 797, died 5 Jan. 842. He was the son of Hārūn al-Rashīd. Under his brother MAʿMūN, Muṭaṣim campaigned against Byz. in Asia Minor. After his accession in Aug. 833 he defeated the Khurramites, who fled to Theophilos with Theophobos. He sought peace with Byz., but Theophilos sacked Zapetra (reportedly Hārūn’s birthplace) in 837. In 838 Muṭaṣim led a great expedition into Asia Minor that defeated Theophilos at Dazimon on 22 July,
seized Ankyra, and on 12 Aug. captured Amorion (the birthplace of Theophilus's father, Michael II). Many captives were sold as slaves, but a group of murdered officers became celebrated in hagiography as the Forty-two Martyrs of Amorion.


- P.A.H.

MUTILATION. Like all bodily punishments, mutilation was economical to execute and in addition stigmatized the person punished without actually violating taboos against killing. It was so commonly used in late Roman criminal justice—which left the choice of penalty largely to the appropriate officials—that Justinian I was compelled to forbid its abuse (Nov. Just. 134.13), without entirely renouncing it. It became a crucial part of the penal system of the Ecloga: in cases of major theft, counterfeiting, and the infliction of severe bodily harm, the culprit's hand was cut off; in cases of perjury, the tongue. For sacrilege the punishment was blinding; for bestiality, castration; for adultery, cutting off the nose. Many of these punishments more or less reflected the nature of the offense. In the 7th C. mutilation was widely used in political struggles to prevent a possible usurper from seizing the throne; the case of Justinian II shows, however, that this preventive measure was not always successful. In the case of saints, mutilation of the body, whether voluntary or inflicted by persecutors, might actually have served to sanctify it. In certain cases the wealthy were fined for crimes for which the poor were given corporal punishment. Corporal punishment was also applied as an administrative measure—for refusal to pay taxes or violation of trade regulations.

Mutilation is in obvious discord with Christian morality. Some scholars, however, considered its application as a humanitarian act allegedly substituting for the capital punishment of pagan Roman law.


- A.K.

MYLASA AND MELANOUNDION (Μυλά(σ)σα, Μελανουδίου), theme of southwestern Asia Minor first attested in 1143 as the theme of Mylasa. Under Manuel I, when it replaced the parts of Kibyrrhaiontai still under Byz. control, it received the name Mylasa and Melanoudion. It also comprised the region of Miletos. The theme, commanded by a doux, is frequently mentioned in the documents of the Lembotissa monasterly; it survived until Byz. rule in the area ended in the late 13th C. In 1259, Theodore Kalothetos was doux of Mylasa as well as Thrakesion (Ahrweiler, infra 146f). The theme was well defended; it preserves the remains of numerous Byz. fortresses (W. Müller-Wiener, IstMitt 11 [1961] 8–24), notable among them the walls of Melanoudion, ancient Heracleia ad Latnum, which date to the 13th C., and the fortified monasteries of Latros. The town of Mylasa, now Milas, contains no significant Byz. remains.


- C.F.

MYRA (Μύρα, now Demre), metropolis of Lycia. Myra flourished in late antiquity: walls were constructed under Marcian (AnthGr, bk. 15, no. 2), and the whole city was rebuilt by Justinian I after the earthquake of 529. Although the civic monuments of Myra are poorly known, remains of its port, Andriake, indicate substantial growth in the 6th C. Myra was subject to frequent devastations by Arab raids during the 7th–8th C. Building activity in city and port indicate recovery in the 11th C., interrupted by Turkish and Latin attacks, then yielding to desolation and Turkish conquest in the late 12th C. Myra's major monument, the Church of St. Nicholas of Myra, was a cross-domed basilica built over the ruins of a Justinianic church, perhaps in the 8th C. During the 11th–12th C., when it was an important pilgrimage center, it was redecorated and enlarged. The fortress on the acropolis shows two periods, probably of the 7th–8th and 12th C. The region of Myra contains numerous stone churches (notably the monastery of Holy Sion), chapels, and entire villages that indicate considerable prosperity in the 6th C. and general decline or abandonment thereafter.


MYREIAION, MONASTERY OF (Bodrum Camii), located west of the Forum Tauri in Constan-
tinople (see Constantinople. Monuments of). The origins of Myrelaion (Μυρέλαιον), allegedly named after an icon of the Virgin that exuded myrrh, are obscure. Before 920 it came into the possession of Romanos I Lekapenos, who either built or acquired a mansion constructed over the remains of a vast 5th-C. rotunda (R. Naumann, IstMitt 16 [1966] 199–216). Romanos added a church (probably between 920 and 922) and converted the complex into a nursery; he himself and several members of his family were buried there, contrary to the practice of previous emperors, who were buried at the Church of the Holy Apostles. Endowed with estates in Asia Minor and Greece, the Myrelaion convent housed several illustrious inmates, including the wife and daughter of Isaac I. By 1315 it had evidently been converted into a male monastery (Hunger-Kresten, PatrKP, no.10.106–07). It is last mentioned in Byz. sources in 1400.

Constructed entirely of brick, the Myrelaion church is a cross-in-square structure built over a lower story as to bring it to the same level as the mansion. In the Palaiologan period the substructure of the church was used for burials. Myrelaion was transformed into a mosque, probably under Bayezid II (1481–1512), and took its name, Bodrum Camii (“cellar mosque”), from the substructure of the church. Badly restored in 1964–65, Myrelaion was recently refurbished for use as a mosque.


MYREPSOS. See Perfumes and Unguents.

MYREPSOS, NICHOLAS, probably the author of a late Byz. compilation of pharmaceutical recipes, collected into a work called the Dynameron and attributed to “Nicholas.” Nicholas Myrepos (Μυρηπός, lit. “preparer of unguents”) has been traditionally identified with the Nicholas who was chief physician (aktouarios) at the court of John III Vatatzes in 1241 (Akrop. 63.13–15). Modeled after the much more modest Antidotarium of Nicholas of Salerno (just under 150 recipes), the Dynameron has 2,656 recipes, arranged in 48 classes based on pharmaceutical properties; of particular interest are the 87 kollyria, “eye salves” (E. Savage-Smith, DOP 38 [1984] 1851, 51 enemas, 98 ointments, 12 recipes for narcotics, and 15 recipes for powders and salves to repel insects. As in the Properties of Foods by Symeon Seth, one observes Arabic influence in the Dynameron: musk, camphor, and senna are mentioned frequently. This text became the major source of Byz. pharmacy and pharmacology available in western Europe; Nicholas of Reggio translated it into Latin (14th C.). A copy of the Dynameron, together with botanical and astronomical texts, was completed in Aug. 1339 by the priest Kosmas Kamelos, exarch of the metropolitan of Athens, for the physician Demetrius Chloras (Paris, B.N. gr. 2243). Its miniatures include a doctor holding a vial, his patient on crutches, a pharmacist and an assistant mixing drugs (Spatharakis, Corpus, no.251, fig.451).

Lit. F. Lat. tr., only—Medicamentorum opus in sectiones quadraginta sectum, digestum, ed. L. Fuchs (Basel 1549).


MYRIOBIBLION. See Bibliotheca.

MYRIOKEPHALON (Μυριοκέφαλον), site in Phrygia east of Choma that gave its name to a battle of 17 Sept. 1176 between Byz. and the Seljuks. After strengthening the frontier by re-fortifying Dorylaion and Soublaion (see Choma), Manuel I Komnenos decided to break the power of Kilic Arslan I. He set out with a huge army in the summer of 1176, marching past Laodikeia, Chonai, Choma, and the ruined fortress of Myriokephalon. The sultan, whose offer of peace had been rejected, occupied the long and narrow pass of Tzibritze on the route of the Byz. army. Meanwhile he sent irregular troops to harass the Byz. forces and scorched the earth before them. When Manuel and the army entered the pass on 17 Sept., they were overwhelmed by the Turks, who descended from the heights and inflicted such catastrophic losses that Manuel contemplated abandoning the army in secret flight. Since Turkish losses were also considerable, the sultan made peace, demanding only that Manuel’s new fortifications be dismantled. The battle was de-
scribed in detail by Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 178–191), who blamed the emperor for the defeat, and by Manuel himself in a letter to the English king Henry II. Manuel's account tried to soften the effect of the disaster, which had shaken the West and allowed Frederick Barbarossa to assume an insolent position toward the weak "king of the Greeks."

In the last years of his reign, however, Manuel I managed to improve the situation: he did not dismantle Dorylaion (as he had promised after the battle), and he successfully repelled Turkish attacks such as that against the city of Klaudioupolis (P. Wirth, BZ 50 [1957] 68–73). Nonetheless, the battle had decisive effects: Byz. plans to gain supremacy over the Seljuks were abandoned; the frontier was seriously weakened (Dorylaion and Kotyaion, its major bastions, were in Turkish hands by 1182); and the whole area was exposed to raids and nomadic occupations that made it Turkish by the end of the century. The battle is incorrectly named, for it was fought not at Myriokephalon but in the pass of Tzibritze, whose location has been established north of Lake Eğridir in Pisidia.


**MYRROPHOROI** (μυροφόροι, lit. "unguent-bearers"), a term sometimes applied to the half-dozen women who placed themselves at the service of Christ (cf. Synax.CP 789.7–18) but more usually confined to the women who brought spices to Christ's tomb on Easter morning. According to Matthew 28:1–9, Mary Magdalene and Mary, the mother of James, came to look at Jesus' grave. The resurrected Christ met them and greeted them saying *Chairete,* and they clasped his feet, falling prostrate before him. In art, the Myrrophoroi are depicted most often at the empty tomb. In Early Christian art, the tomb is usually shown as a round structure recalling the rotunda of the Anastasis at the Holy Sepulchre, and there may be two women (Mt 28:1–7; Sancta Sanctorum Reliquary) or three (Mk 16:1–10; Baptistry at Dura Europos). Thereafter, except in rare instances illustrating John 20:11–2, there are but two. The round tomb is replaced after the 8th C. by a cave: the angel sits on a stony block before it, often with soldiers at his feet and grave clothes visible in the entryway, while the women huddle at the left. Sometimes one woman turns to flee, suggesting the vivid emotions found in the description by Nicholas Mesarites of a mosaic in the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. The Myrrophoroi appear in certain other scenes: sitting mourning on the ground beside Christ's sarcophagus, prostrate before the risen Christ, or—very rarely—in the scene of Christ's encounter with Mary Magdalene in the garden. (See also **Appearances of Christ after the Passion.**)


**MYRTAITES** (μυρταίτης), an enigmatic office or title mentioned in the 14th-C. ceremonial book of pseudo-Kodinos: the myrtaïtes occupied a low rank on the hierarchical ladder, between the sebastos and prokathemenoï of towns, whereas the megas myrtaïtes followed the domestikos of the Western themes; their functions are not defined. The myrtaïtes is rarely mentioned in other sources: the myrtaïtes George Doukopoulos probably signed an act of donation of 1311 (Doeicheir., p.117); in 1328 Maria, wife of the myrtaïtes George Prokopios, concluded an agreement with the monks of Hilandar (Chil., no.117); Mazaris twice refers to wise statements of a certain myrtaïtes Andronikos (ed. A. Smithies [1975] pp. 10.14, 26.3) who died before 1414.


**MYSTAGOGIA.** See Commentaries.

**MYSTERION** (μυστηριον), term used to designate any of a number of secret cults of Greco-Roman antiquity, such as the Eleusinian mysteries, Mithraism, and veneration of Isis. Enormously varied, *mysteria* included three major features: worship of the divine Mother Earth (as Demeter at Eleusis), the tendency to replace rigid dogma with the "religion of sentiment," and the search for salvation. Even though rooted in primitive and oriental cults, later mystery religions formed an atmosphere in which early Christianity developed. The notable similarities between Christianity and the mysteries were early recognized and indignantly rejected by early Christian authors: Tertullian accused *mysteria* of imitating Christianity. A more
sophisticated position was taken by CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, who summoned believers to join the new mysteries of the Logos. Despite the difference between pagan secret cults and the Christian mysteries of the Trinity, Incarnation, and Salvation, the terminology of mysteries, as used by the church fathers, esp. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM and pseudo-DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE, served to describe the ineffability of God and the salutary interventions of God in history. This terminology was applied to LITURGY ("frightful mystery"), SACRAMENTS, and revelation, and permeated Christian symbolism with its images of the mysteries of the cross (esp. exalted in the apocryphal Acts of the apostle Andrew), of BAPTISM, of the symbolic presentation of Christ as HELIOS and the Church as Selene, the moon.


—A.K.

MYSTICISM in Byz. is a notion of immediate experience or intuitive knowledge of the divine that surpasses rational, logical perception and knowledge as well as “normal” religious consciousness. Apart from the title Mystical Theology and formulas derived therefrom in pseudo-DIONYSIOS THE AРЕOPAGITE, the term mystikos, in contrast to the Western tradition, is not used as a technical term in the East. In ORIGEN (In Johannem 1.30.29), the Cappadocians, and later church fathers, however, it occurs in the context of apophatic theology, and its attainment is seen as an intellectual or “ecstatic” act. The reference point of the Byz. mystic was intellectual “vision” attained through pure prayer by mature individuals (monachos, monotropos) who have surpassed the two stages of practice and contemplation (theoria physique). This is exemplified in EВAGRIOS PONTIKOS whose influence on monastic spirituality, particularly in the tradition of Sinai, persisted in spite of his condemnation as an Origenist and his intellectualism, which contrasted with the Areopagite’s “mystical theology,” involving ecstatic union granted through grace. These facts are firmly rooted in the synthesis of MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR, which integrated the Evagrian “movement out of the world and out of the self” (ekdemia) with the ecstatic experience of the Areopagite.

In the 11th C., with SYMEON THE THEOLOGIAN, a new element comes to the fore in the history of Byz. mysticism. Following DIADOCHOS OF PHOTIKE and JOHN KLIMAX, Symeon developed the doctrine that divine activity can be spiritually and sensually perceived; without experience and feeling, the mental and spiritual life dies. What had been casually treated by his predecessors became for Symeon the basis of his spirituality. This spirituality prevailed on Athos in the 14th C. owing to the influence of GREGORY SIANITES and led in HESYCHASM to the belief that “vision” or “mysticism” can be learned by everyone; it also resulted (in contrast to tradition) in a high esteem for the visionary elements, esp. of certain experiences of light, attainable through concentration and breathing techniques. From the time of Symeon onward, particularly in texts on the hesychastic “method of prayer,” meditation receives scant attention, but in the sacramental mysticism of Nicholas KABASILAS it finds its appropriate place once again.


—K.-H.U.

MYSTIKOS (μυστικός, lit. “secret, private”), high-ranking functionary. The office is known from the second half of the 9th C., when Leo CHIROSPHAKTES was mystikos of Basil I (G. Koliá, *Léon Chirosphatés* [Athens 1939] 127.96). Dölger (*Diplomatik 64*) considered the mystikos as a secretary for the emperor’s private correspondence, whereas Oikoñomides (*Listes 324*) viewed the mystikos as a judicial official; in any case, the mystikos was very close to the emperor and could also carry out the duties of protasekretis, judge, and chief of the imperial kórtos. Known mystikoi include several well-educated people such as the future patriarch NICHOLAS I Mystikos and Theodore DAPHNOPATES. The office existed until the 15th C.

The term served as a basis for the formation of the names of additional offices: in 1057 the protomystikos John Xeros was assigned to preside over a legal case (*Pantel.*, no.5.8); the terms mystographos
and mystolektai are often found on seals. The mystographos, who follows the mystikos in the 10th-C. taktikon of Escurial, may have been the assistant of the mystikos; he also fulfilled notarial and judicial duties. First mentioned in an inscription of 911/12 (Grégoire, Inscriptions, no. 302), this office seems to have disappeared after 1100. Among mystographoi there were also scholars such as John Mauroposium. Mystolektai, known primarily from seals of the 11th–12th C., served also as courtiers (primikierios and koitonites), notaries, and judges.


MYTILENE. See Lesbos.

MYTILENE TREASURE, dated to the 7th C. and found in 1951 at Krategos, on the island of Lesbos, 8 km south of Mytilene. Now in the Byzantine Museum, Athens, the treasure is an example of domestic silver plate made up as a set, unlike the First and Second Cyprus Treasures and the Lampsakos Treasure, which were formed over several generations of owners. The Mytilene Treasure is composed of 17 silver objects (four plates, two trullae, a ewer, a lampstand, a lamp, eight spoons), 21 pieces of gold jewelry, a bronze stamp with two monograms, 32 gold coins of Phokas and Herakleios, and bronze coins of 565–610. Except for the spoons, the vessels all bear silver stamps of 605–630. Although occasionally described as liturgical vessels, the large naked Aphrodite on one trulla handle is sufficient to indicate a profane use for the whole treasure, given the homogeneity of craftsmanship and date.


—M.M.M.
NABLUS. See Neapolis.

NAG HAMMADI, site near the Nile north of Luxor where a collection of Coptic MSS produced in the 4th C. was discovered in 1945. The MSS are now in the Coptic Museum in Cairo. The collection consists of 52 tractates in 12 papyrus codices plus part of a thirteenth. The book covers were stiffened with papyrus letters and documents, some dated, and these indicate that the collection was buried ca. 400. All tractates were translated from Greek into Coptic. Gnostic thought, Hermetic and popular philosophy, and orthodox Christian devotion are represented in the collection.

The collection constitutes the most important single source for the study of Gnosticism without the filter of Christian heresiologists. The burial of the MSS close to an important monastic center (Pbow, the monastery of Pachomios) may also illuminate the mixture of orthodox and heterodox belief in early monasticism. Wisse (infra) has argued that the common thread in the tractates is a belief in asceticism as the highest expression of religious faith.

ED. Nag Hammadi Studies (Leiden 1971—). The Nag Hammadi Library in English 5 (San Francisco—Leiden 1988).


NAGYSZENTMIKLÓS (now Sinnicolau Mare, Rumania, close to the Tisza and Maros rivers), a place where in 1799 a treasure of 23 gold vessels (jugs, bowls, etc.) ornamented with reliefs was found; the objects are now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. Both the original provenance (Avar, Bulgarian, Hungarian?) and the date (700–900?: Z. Kadar, Folia Archaeologica 13 [1961] 117–28) of this domestic plate are debated; the pieces probably came from different workshops. Traces of the Greek world are few: scenes probably from Greek mythology (e.g., Zeus carrying off Ganymede) on two jugs; Christian symbols (the cross) on several bowls; Greek inscriptions; and a Turkic inscription in Greek letters. Byz. techniques such as granulation, filigree, and niello are absent.


NAISSUS (Náissos, Serb. Niš), Roman city on the river Nišava, near modern Niš in southeastern Yugoslavia. In describing Naissus, Priskos of Panion considered it a polis of Illyria, while under Justinian I the city belonged to Dacia mediterranea. Constantine I often stayed in Naissus and adorned it with many buildings. In the mid-4th C. it was an important center in the imperial power struggle: in 350 the magister peditum Vetriciano was proclaimed emperor in Naissus, and in 361 Julian briefly stopped there before his march on Constantinople. In 441 the Huns destroyed the city. Justinian I allegedly restored Naissus, but it was seized and ravaged by the Avars. According to numismatic evidence, the city fell to the Avars ca. 613/14 (V. Popović, CRAI [1980] 248). At Jagodina mala, near Niš, a necropolis of the 4th–5th C., containing hundreds of tombs with sarcophagi and inscriptions, and a basilica have been found.

In the medieval period, the city is called Nais(s)os or Nisos (e.g., in Niketas Choniates). In donations of Basil II, it is termed a Bulgarian bishopric. In 1072 Constantine Bodin made the city the center of his anti-Byz. struggle. Located on important routes leading to Hungary and to Serbia, Naissus was “rich and populous” in the 12th C. (Kinn.
NAJRÂN, major caravan city in western Arabia that mediated trade between South Arabia and the Mediterranean. The Christianization of Najrân in the 5th C. drew it spiritually into the orbit of Byz., and Monophysite Christianity finally prevailed in the city; a Monophysite bishop is attested in the early 6th C. Around 520 the Himyarite king Yusuf persecuted the city, but a Byz.-Axumite military expedition avenged ARETHAS and the other martyrs of Najrân and made South Arabia a Christian country for some 50 years. The city's martyrion was an important place of pilgrimage. The rise of Islam signaled the decline of Najrân. Around 630 a deputation of Najrânites came to Muhammad at Medina and concluded a treaty, which left them free to practice their Christianity but made them pay tribute. Later, the caliph 'Umar ordered the Najrânites to evacuate their city; most of them settled in Syria and Iraq.

NAKOLEIA (Νακόλεια, mod. Seyit Gazi), an ancient and medieval city in the highlands of Phrygia. The river Parthenios (mod. Seyit Su) made the area fertile, and it is plausible that in the 3rd C. there were imperial estates nearby (C.H.E. Hespels, The Highlands of Phrygia, vol. 1 [Princeton, N.J., 1971] 185). The city played an important political role in the 4th C.: in 366 Valens defeated the usurper PROKOPIOS at Nakoleia and forced him to take refuge in the woods (the area was later deforested); in 399 Nakoleia was the center of the revolt of TRIBIGILD. In 782 the kastron of Nakoleia was temporarily seized by the Arabs (Theoph. 456.5–22).

Constantine, bishop of Nakoleia, was one of the initiators of Iconoclasm in the reign of Leo III. Soon thereafter, Nakoleia was evidently elevated to the rank of archbishopric—it has this status in the notitia of Nicholas I Mystikos (Notitiae CP, no.7.82). A metropolitan of Nakoleia is listed among the participants in the council of 1066 (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.896) but is in last place among the metropolitans. As a metropolis without suffrags, Nakoleia existed through the 14th C. (Notitiae CP, no.19.86).


NAMAAN (Namaan, Ar. al-Nu'mân), 6th-C. Ghassânid king, the son and successor of Alamundar; not to be confused with the last Lakhmid king, al-Nu'mân (580–602). In 582, after the exile of Alamundar, four of his sons, the eldest of whom was Namaan, revolted and ravaged imperial territory. Emp. Maurice attempted to install a brother of Alamundar in the phylarchate, but the candidate died almost immediately. Maurice tried to persuade Namaan to renounce Monophysitism and resume the war against the Persians, offering to recall his father from exile in return. Upon Namaan's refusal to change his doctrinal position, Maurice ordered his arrest and had him join his father in Sicilian exile. When news of Namaan's misfortune reached the Arab foederati, they divided into 15 groups, each under
a phylarch, and some even joined the Persians. Thus, religious sectarianism finally brought about the downfall of the Ghasṣānids and destroyed the effectiveness of the defense system in the East.

LIT. Gubert, Byz. avant l’Islam 236–59. —I.A.Sh.

NAMES, FAMILY. See Prosopography.

NAMES, PERSONAL. A rough division can be made into three categories: family names (patronyms), given or baptismal names, and monastic names. In the late Roman period the ancient custom of accepting a kinship name (nomen gentile), such as Aelius or Flavius, survived. However, this tradition was sharply criticized by the Christian writers: John Chrysostom (Sur la vaine gloire et l’éducation des enfants, ed. A.M. Malingrey [Paris 1972] 146.648–53) urged Christians to give their children the names of saints, rather than of ancestors. I. Kajanto (in L’onomastique latine [Paris 1977] 419–28) has demonstrated that after the 4th C. the nomen gentile disappeared from inscriptions (with the exception of some areas in Africa). Family names are absent in Theophanes the Confessor and are exceptionally rare on seals of the 8th–10th C. (A. Kazhdan, ZRVI 11 [1968] 521). A few names of aristocratic lineages (e.g., Skleros, Doukas) are known from the 9th C., but as a typical phenomenon they appear only after 1000. The inheritance of family names was never strictly established and children could bear not only their mother’s patronymic, but also that of their maternal grandmother; in some noble families brothers might each bear a different family name.

From the period of the 11th–12th C. we know primarily the family names of the ruling lineages. They can be divided into two groups: the military aristocracy and the civil nobility. The family name of military aristocrats often originated from relatively obscure toponyms (villages, fortresses) in Asia Minor and Syria (Botanantes, Arbanenos, Dalassenos, Dokeianos, etc.), whereas among the civil nobility we encounter names derived from trade professions (Pantechines), quarters of Constantinople (Akropolites, Makrembolites), provincial towns (Choniates), and monasteries (Manouelites). Also typical of this group are names emphasizing positive qualities, such as Aoinos (“drinking no wine”), Kalothes (“of good character”), or Eirenikos (“peaceful”), as if the nobility of second rank tried to compensate itself. Peasant names are preserved mostly in Praktika of the 14th C. from Macedonia (A. Laïou, BMGS 1 [1975] 71–95). Sometimes commoners assumed pompous names, such as Komnenos or Synadenos, probably reflecting their (former?) links of dependency. Usually, however, their names differed from those of noble lineages: some have a Slavic or Vlach origin, some are derived from crafts (Chalkeus, “smith”; Raptes, “tailor”; etc.).

It is not always possible to draw a line between the given and family name, since some given names (both foreign and native) were transformed into family names (e.g., Roger, Rogerios). In the earlier period the distinction between the given name and the nomen gentile appeared blurred. In any case, in the 4th C. old names were frequent—among the most popular names in Ambianus Marcellinus are Claudius, Florentius, Severus, Ioulianus, Marcellus, Maurus, Maximus, and Sallustius; only one name, Eusebios, can be interpreted as Christian. The situation changed by the time of Prokopios of Caesarea, in whom the most frequent names are John, Theodore, Paul, Theodosios, Peter, Leontios, and Alexander. In the late Roman period, given names were primarily of biblical origin or indicated piety or other virtues—esp. Eusebios, but also Akakios, Euphemia, or Theodore. In subsequent centuries, however, few biblical and “virtuous” names of the late Roman period remained popular; John and Theodore were the most striking exceptions, while Eusebios, Paul, and Peter lost their popularity. The names of other apostles (Luke, Andrew, Matthew, Thomas, etc.), were never frequently used.

On the other hand, the group of “imperial” names grew more and more fashionable: Basil and Leo—imperial by etymology—as well as Constantine and later Romanos, Alexios, and Manuel. The names George and Demetrios were probably used on a more “democratic” level; in any case, in vols. 2–3 of the acts of Laura (13th–15th C.) John, George, and Demetrios are the most frequent names. Among feminine names (the number of registered cases is much lower, and therefore conclusions even more difficult) Maria became the most popular, probably after the 9th C. The formation of new names contin-
ued—the feminine name KALE became fashionable in the late centuries; also several feminine names ending with the letter omega (Ioanno, Leonto, etc.) were introduced. Among masculine names, later formations such as Xenos, Peros, Stamates, Stanos, Panagioties, and Strabioanannes never became very popular.

Pachymeres (ed. Bekker 2:276f) describes a procedure for selecting the name for a newborn baby. Andronikos II already had several sons when a daughter was born to him. A group of experienced and pious women were delegated to choose the most appropriate and protective name. They set out the icons of the twelve apostles and lit candles of equal size in front of each. Since the candle of the apostle Simon burned longer than others, the girl was christened SIMONIS, a very rare name.

Certain families favored specific given names: the KONTOSTEFAVNOI liked Stephen, Alexios was esp. popular with the KONNENI, Michael with the BOURTZEES family, etc. It is unclear, however, whether the baptismal name was transferred from grandfather to grandson or from uncle to nephew, or whether there was no strict rule of transmission.

Assumption of the monastic habit was accompanied by the alteration of names. Usually the monastic name began with the same letter as the baptismal name, for example, Andronikos II Palaiologos assumed the monastic name Antony. However, this principle was not mandatory: Constantine PSELLOS became the monk Michael. It is quite plausible to suggest that many names were used almost exclusively as monks’ names, at least in the later centuries; thus in Lavra, vols. 1–3, Bartolomaioi, Gabriel, Gerasimos, Dionysios, Isaias, Theodoulos, Iakobos, Ioannikios, Leonios, Makarios, Meletios, Nikodemos, Niphon, and Sabas are names limited to monks. Some early emperors changed their names at the time of their coronation to a more imperial name (e.g., Artemios became ANASTASIOS II). It was also customary for foreign princesses to take new Greek and Orthodox names when they married Byz. emperors; examples are BERTHA OF SULZBACH and Adelaide of Brunswick (wife of Andronikos III), both of whom became IRENE.


NAOS (ναός, lit. “temple”), a church, strictly speaking the core of a Byz. church; it was commonly domed. From the symbolic point of view, the naos was the earthly embodiment of the Christian universe. Functionally, the naos was the area where the congregation assembled for services and where sermons were delivered from the AMBO. Though descended from the nave of 4th-through 6th-C. basilicas, the naos is distinguished from it by its form, function, symbolism, and CHURCH PROGRAM OF DECORATION. The naos is frequently preceded by a NARTHEX and separated from the BEMA by a TEMPLE SCREEN. It was often flanked by subsidiary spaces such as aisles, ambulatories, or LATERAL CHAPELS.


NAPELS (Ναύπαλαι), from antiquity a city and port in Campania. It apparently remained prosperous in the 4th and 5th C. (J. d’Arms, Romans on the Bay of Naples [Cambridge 1970] 116–64). Constantine I repaired both the forum and aqueduct; Valentinian III built a new system of fortifications in 440, when the city center evidently shifted to the northeast, away from the sea. In the mid-5th C. Bp. Notrianus built a bath bearing his name that was still standing in the 9th C. In the same period Bp. Vincentius added a dining hall (accurbitum) to the episcopal palace. On the other hand, imports to Naples from the Near East and Africa declined during the later 5th and 6th C.

Naples suffered during the Gothic war of Justinian I. In Nov. 536 Belisarios captured and sacked the city; subsequently it was besieged by Totila and surrendered in 543. After Narses’ victory over Teia (end of 552), Naples and its region came under the control of Constantineople. The city was threatened by the Lombards, who appeared at its walls in 581 but could not capture
it. According to Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De adm. imp. 27.49), Naples, as well as Gaeta and Amalfi, escaped occupation by the Lombards. During this period, control of some of the city’s secular buildings passed, at least temporarily, into the hands of the bishop: in 598 Pope Gregory I (ep.9.76) wrote to the bishop of Naples ordering him to return control of the city gates and aqueduct (which was still functioning) to secular officials.

In the 7th–8th C. the administration of Naples underwent a militarization, the indix Campaniae being replaced by the dux. Naples enjoyed autonomy without formally renouncing allegiance to Constantinople. The Neapolitan mint replaced the image of the emperor on its coins with that of the local saint Januarius, and in 763 the city acknowledged the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome. The seals of 8th-C. archbishops of Naples have Latin, not Greek legends (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, nos. 918–19).

In 838 Naples concluded an alliance with the Arabs and assisted them in capturing Messina in 842/3. The Normans did not conquer Naples until 1139; the city played an important role in the Norman state, eventually becoming capital of the kingdom of Sicily.

Naples has several catacombs, the largest of which is S. Gennaro (St. Januarius) on Capodimonte, representing a characteristic series of 3rd- through 10th-C. frescoes and mosaics rivaling those of Rome. The baptistery of the old Cathedral of S. Restituta, S. Giovanni in Fonte, is decorated with important mosaics that most scholars attribute to Bp. Soter (362–408).


NARRATIO DE REBUS ARMENIAE. Originally composed in Armenian ca.700, this text is known in its entirety only in a Greek translation made before the 11th C., the Diegesis. It describes from a pro-Chalcedonian viewpoint the relations between the Armenian and Greek churches: the Council of Nicaea, the rejection of the Council of Chalcedon by the Council of Duin in 555, attempts at reunion in the 6th and 7th C., and their final failure. The 9th-C. Georgian catholikos Arsen used it in a work on the Armeno-Georgian schism. It was known to later Armenian writers, but the original (which does not represent the "official" Armenian position) has been lost.

ED. G. Garitte, La Narratio de rebus Armeniae (Louvain 1952).

NARRATIONES, more fully notationes animae utiles (διηγήσεως ψυχωφελείας), conventional designation of a subgenre of hagiographical literature. They originated in the eremitic milieu of the Egyptian desert, primarily among Coptic-speaking monks. J. Wortley (in Kathegtria. Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for her 80th Birthday [Camberley 1988] 313) estimates that 700–800 tales were produced between ca.375 and 650. Then there was a gap until the mid-10th C. when Paul of Monemvasia wrote a series of edifying stories. Some anonymous novelettes can also be included in this group, such as the story of Sergios, a demotes (member of a demos) in Alexandria (ed. J. Wortley, Les récits édifiants de Paul, évêque de Monemvasie [Paris 1987] 125–37). The last stories of this genre were produced ca.1000.


NARSAI OF EDESSA, or Nares, Nestorian theologian; born region of Ma‘alta, near Mosul, ca.399, died Nisibis? between 502 and 507. He was later called "the tongue of the Orient" and "the harp of the Holy Spirit." Narasi studied and taught in Edessa, but after the death of Ibas of Edessa (in 457) the climate in the city changed, and eventually (in 471?) he was driven out by hostility to his Nestorian views. He then took refuge in Nisibis, where he taught in the "academy" at the invitation of his bishop Barsauma. A Syriac catalog by 'Abdisho bar Berikā attributes to Narasi exegetic works on the Old Testament, a liturgical treatise, and 360 sermons in verses (memre). The authenticity of his exegetical and liturgical works is questionable, but of his memre more than 80 are known in Syriac (not all yet published). These sermons
treat biblical, liturgical, moral, and theological problems; one of them was devoted to great teachers—Diodoros of Tarsos, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorios. The theology of Narsai is not original, being based primarily on Theodore of Mopsuestia—his role was to compile and clarify the essence of Nestorian tenets. His work probably influenced Kosmas Indikopleustes and Nestorian writers of the 9th and 10th C.


—A.K., B.B.

**NARSESES** (*Narşē̂s*), general; born Persarmenia 480 (Agennius, ch.95, but see Stein, *Histoire* 2:356) or 490 (A. Lippold, *infra* 870), died Rome 574. After early life at court, Narses, a eunuch, participated in the suppression of the *Nika Revolt*. As imperial commissioner to Alexandria, he removed and exiled Gaianos and restored his rival Theodosios as patriarch in 535. Justinian I promoted him to praepositus sacri cubiculi in 538 and sent him to Italy with a large army to vanquish the Ostrogoths. Rivalries with Belisarius permitted the Ostrogoths to retake Milan and resulted in the recall of Narses to Constantinople. In 545 he campaigned against the *Aetnæ* in Thrace. Six years later he received supreme command of all Byz. forces in Italy. He brought to Italy another large army, which included Herulians he had recruited, fatally crushed Totila at Busta Gallorum in 552, and pursued the retreating Ostrogoths and their new king Teia south to Mons Lactarius, where he decisively defeated them and systematically reduced remaining Ostrogothic strongholds. In 553–54 Narses repulsed a Frankish-Alemannic invasion of Italy by the chieftains Leutharis and Butilinus. Narses occupied northern Italy, organized its defenses, and concluded operations against external foes by 562. In 566 he suppressed a Herulian rebellion. In 567 he was removed from military command, yet he probably remained in Italy until his death. Narses was diplomatically skillful, operationally and tactically efficient, and, in religious sympathies, probably Monophysite.


—W.E.K.

**NARSSES**, general; died Constantinople 605/6. After serving as commander at Constantina in 588, Narses was appointed by Emp. Maurice to lead the expedition to aid the restoration of Chosroes II in 591 after the deposition of the previous Byz. commander, Komentiōlos. Narses defeated the Persian rebel Bahram and remained *magister militum* of the East until Germanos replaced him in 600. Narses was military commander in Byz. Mesopotamia when Phokas overthrew Maurice. Narses revolted against Phokas in late 603, seized Edessa, and wrote to Chosroes II, encouraging him to open hostilities against Phokas. The relationship of Narses to the false Theodosios, son of Maurice, is uncertain. It appears that there was no unanimity of support for Narses at Edessa: Severos, bishop of Edessa, opposed this rebellion and was therefore killed by mob action. Narses' revolt seriously embarrassed Phokas, who first sent Germanos against both Narses and the Persian forces of Chosroes II. After an initial Persian victory over Germanos, who perished, Phokas sent the eunuch Leontios against Narses, but he failed to quell the rebellion; Persian successes, however, caused Narses to flee to Hierapolis. Phokas replaced Leontios with his nephew Domentziolos, *kouropalates* and *magister militum* of the East, who successfully negotiated Narses' surrender on sworn promise of personal safety. Domentziolos handed Narses over to Phokas, who had him disgraced in the Hippodrome and burned alive.


—W.E.K.

**NARESES.** See also NARKSES.

**NARTHEX** (*náρθη̂s*), a vestibulelike space preceding the *naos* in a Byz. church. Functionally and formally distinct, the interior walls of the narthex were commonly embellished with a special decorative program. This often emphasized the funerary function of these spaces. From the 4th through 6th C. the narthex was a large oblong
hall in which the preparation of the liturgical entrances into the naos took place. After the 9th C. the narthex became proportionally reduced in size, but the number of its functions, including baptism and commemoration of the dead, increased. In the 13th and 14th C. the narthex was often the site of church councils. Not every Byz. church had a narthex, but it appears to have been a common feature. Occasionally a narthex was added to an existing church; in a limited number of cases a second narthex was added in front of the first, as in monastic churches from the 11th C. on (e.g., the south church of the PANTOKRATOR monastery in Constantinople; the main church of the Nea Moni on Chios; the main church of Hosios Loukas). In such cases, in contrast to the exonarthex the inner narthex is referred to as the endonarthex or esonarthex.


---

**NATIVITY** (ἡ γέννησις), the birth of Jesus, or Christmas, 25 Dec., one of the 12 Byz. GREAT FEASTS, seen first in the West at the beginning of the 4th C. By the 4th–5th C. it was celebrated everywhere except by the Armenians. In the East Jesus' birth was originally commemorated at EPIPHANY, but the Nativity was celebrated in Antioch and environs by 376, in Constantinople by 380, and in Asia Minor by the end of the 4th C., though Palestine adopted it definitively only in the 6th C. (M. van Esbroeck, *AB* 86 [1968] 368–71).

The Nativity is one of the most splendid feasts of the church calendar. It is solemnized by the

**NASAR** (Νασάρ), *patrikios* and *droungarios* of the fleet under Basil I; his name was Basil according to the vita of Elias the Younger (p. 36.481f). In 880 (Vasiliev) or 879 (Guilland) the emperor sent Nasar with an enormous fleet to repel Arab ships pillaging in the KEPHALENTIA and Zakynthos region; Arab sources calculated his fleet at 140 battleships, whereas the vita of Elias puts the figure at 45. When many of his rowers deserted, Nasar was forced to halt at Methone; however, severe measures taken by Basil I restored discipline. Nasar attacked the enemy and won a night battle (probably along the western shore of Greece), and then moved to Sicily; he captured so many Muslim boats with precious merchandise that the price of olive oil in Constantinople fell sharply. Nasar supported successful operations of Prokopios and Leo Apostyppes in southern Italy and routed an Arab squadron at Cape Stelai. His success contributed much to the restoration of Byz. authority in southern Italy, although Sicily was lost after the fall of Syracuse in 878. A brilliant Greek victory over the Arabs is mentioned in a letter of Pope John VIII dated 30 Oct. 880.


---

**Nativity.** The Nativity of Christ; mosaic, late 11th C. Southeast squinch in the church at Daphni. Below the scene is a lunette with the bust of St. Gregory, bishop of Akragas. Under the arch to the left is the figure of the holy deacon St. Euplos.
two Sundays preceding the feast and the following Sunday and has a 40-day preparatory fast; a five-day forefeast, the longest in the Byz. calendar; a paramone vigil as at Easter and Epiphany; a following synaxis 26 Dec.; and an afterfeast of six days. The 10th-C. Nativity festivities in Hagia Sophia, which included the pannychis vigil, are outlined in the Typikon of the Great Church (Mateos, Typicon 1:134–36, 145–70).

The Nativity was also one of the most heavily charged days of the imperial ceremonial (De cer. 128–36), filled with receptions, visits of dignitaries and factions, promotions, the veneration of relics, honors rendered with candles at various sanctuaries, all done in solemn procession, the final one to Hagia Sophia, where the emperor joined the patriarch in the narthex and made the little entrance with him. The day’s ceremonies continued with various visits in the company of the patriarch.

Byz. sermons for the Nativity stress that it celebrates not a past event but the ever-present mystery of salvation first manifested in Jesus’ birth. Jesus must be born in each Christian, each one must receive him in communion as the manger received him in Bethlehem.

Representation in Art. Initially including just child, manger, ox, and ass (the beasts variously interpreted but always present), the image of Christ’s birth developed by the 6th C. into a presentation of his incarnation as an epiphany unifying human and divine. Two compositions emerged, both associated with the Holy Land. One, drawing on imperial imagery, showed the enthroned Virgin and Child between acclaiming Magi or shepherds and Magi (Monza and Bobbio Amplulae). The other, more narrative (Sancta Sanctorum Reliquary), showed the star (not the star of the Magi but of Num 24:17), Joseph and the midwife Salome as witnesses (see Protoevangelion of James), the reclining Virgin, and the Child in a masonry manger before a cave, recalling the block altar and cave setting at Bethlehem. Slowly, the narrative version incorporated the imperial elements. By the 8th C., Salome was displaced by the motif of the infant’s bath, traditional in pagan and imperial nativity scenes (P. Nordhagen, BZ 54 [1961] 333–37), and at Castelseprio, the acclaiming shepherds were added to the scene at the cave. The cave scene became standard after the 9th C., with the addition of choirs of angels and the Adoration of the Magi, in accord with their liturgical celebration on Christmas Day.


---

NATURAL PHENOMENA (sing. σημεῖον, θεοσημεῖον), such as eclipses of the sun and moon, the appearance of comets and brilliant stars, earthquakes, floods, etc., were recorded by Byz. historians and chroniclers, who considered them important events and therefore provided significant details about their occurrence and the effect they had on people. Generally such phenomena were attributed to divine providence. Comets, eclipses, dust storms, etc., were believed to be portents of impending catastrophes or of political and dynastic change—the death of a ruler, a rebellion, military defeat, and the like. On such occasions the faithful were called to repentance in order to appease the divine wrath (cf. John Mauroposal, Or. 185, ed. Lagarde 165–78). Alongside the popular beliefs and the superstitions connected with them, there were also attempts to provide a scientific explanation, such as in the Peri dixoeméion by John Lydos (De ostentis, ed. C. Wachsmuth [Leipzig 1897]) and the Synopsis ton physikon of Symeon Seth (ed. Delatte, AneidAth 2:16–89). Still greater popularity was enjoyed by the various practical handbooks (such as Seismologia, on earthquakes, or Brontologia, on thunderstorms), which dealt with the prognostic element in natural phenomena.


---

NATURE (φύσις). The terminology of the ancient Greeks survived in Byz. in the term physis, which is everything in the world that belongs to the realm of matter insofar as it is provided for man, and not something created by man (through his thechnē, or culture, customs, and laws). Therefore, it also includes everything that actually exists, the totality of objects and the state of affairs to which any judgment must exactly conform.
The term not only designates everything that exists, that grows or takes place in the "natural world" apart from human intervention, but it can also be used to designate the process of production itself.

The early church rejected the Stoic view that nature is the creative cause and principle of the world. This implies that nature has been reduced to a theological concept, inasmuch as it is nothing other than creature or the result of God's creation. Nonetheless, if when speaking about nature one focuses on its power to generate, then this can easily become a natura naturans in which the reference to God is no longer essential, but redundant; nature is an unseen force that can be grasped by the mind only. It is conceived, as in Aristotle’s Physics, as the dynamic principle of reality, a concept encountered, for example, in Michael Psellos (De omnifaria doctrina, par. 57).

The synthesis of Plato and Aristotle, together with the view of nature as the demiurge, led for John Italos only to difficulties (Quaestiones quodlibetales, pars. 65–66, 93, ed. Joannou, pp. 99–101, 149f) that he judged to be the result of a failure to distinguish between natura naturans (physis heautes poietike) and natura naturata (physis as apoteloumenon eidos). If one conceives nature as immaterial, "then one speaks not of nature, but of the soul," namely, of the World-soul or the third hypostasis of Plotinos, which cannot be accepted by Christianity as a principle of cosmology. On account of the difficulties resulting from the concept of nature he outlined, Italos asserted that only the concept of nature presented by the church fathers remained (i.e., nature is conceived as substance and species). But if nature is defined as dynamis, it means the Platonic program of mathematical description of the world, that is, its actual scientific description (John Italos, ibid., 42, p. 53). In a specific sense the term physis was applied to the divine "nature," the "common denominator" of the Godhead encompassing three hypostases: accordingly Christ, after the Incarnation, was construed as possessing both divine and human natures—the concept denied by the Monophysites. (For nature in the sense of the material world surrounding man, see Environment.)


- K.-H. U.

NAUKLEROS (ναυκληρός, Lat. navicularius). By the 4th C., transport of passengers and goods by sea was arranged through navicularii, or state-employed shipowners, who financed the construction, manning, repair, and operation of merchant vessels. Men of means sufficient to bear these costs were attracted by the privileges and tax/toll exemptions granted to navicularii, since freight itself paid only a low percentage of the profit. Apart from private commerce, navicularii saw to such state requirements as the shipping of grain to Rome and Constantinople or the delivery of foodstuffs and supplies for the army. They belonged to a state guild and received government reimbursement for ship or cargo losses honestly incurred.

By contrast, the Byz. naukleros appears in 7th-C. sources as an independent ship's captain, or sometimes simply a merchant, who commissioned ships, hired crews, and was responsible for shipping tolls (Ahrweiler, Mer 61); he had no state-imposed obligations. Legal texts note that the naukleros contracted cargo and passengers (for which he received freight and carrying charges) and was liable to merchants and passengers for damage, risk, or losses (W. Ashburner, The Rhodian Sea Law [Oxford 1909] cxxx–cxxxvii).


NAUMACHIKA (Ναυμαχική). Five treatises on naval warfare in Milan, Ambros. B 199 sup., form the corpus of Naumachika, comprising book 19 on naval warfare and a few excerpts from book 20 of the Taktika of Leo VI; instructions on fording rivers from the Strategikon of Maurice (Strat. Maurik. bk.12B, ch.21); a 6th-C. treatise on naval tactics attributed to Syrianos Magistros; and a short outline of naval terminology and tactics dedicated in a prefatory poem to the parakoimomenos Basil the Notos. The dedication to Basil, commemorating his successful expedition against Samosata (C.M. Mazzucchi, Aevum 52 [1978] 304–06), fixes the date of the compilation of the Naumachika as 959. The paraphrase of Leo and Syrianos by Nikephoros Ouranos in his Taktika rounds out Byz. writing on naval warfare.

The Naumachika show that the tactics of the Byz. navy were elementary and not much differ-
ent from classical practice. The Byz. put their heavy ships in the center of the line and lighter ships on the wings, advancing in a crescent-shaped formation. They aimed both to break through the enemy line in the center (diekplous) and envelop it from the outside (periplous), using Greek fire, archers, and ballistic weapons to disable enemy crews before boarding their ships.

ED. A. Dain, Naumachica (Paris 1943).


**NAUPEKTOS** (Naupaktos, Venetian Lepanto), city on the western part of the north shore of the Gulf of Corinth, commanding the entrance into the gulf. In the 4th C. it was the most important harbor between Corinth and Oaxa (W.A. Oldfather, *RE* 16 [1935] 1994); in the *Tabula Peutingeriana* Naupaktos and Evanthia/Oianthea are the only cities named in western Lokris. It was a bishopric suffragan to Corinth, then probably to Athens, and after 900 an independent metropolis. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 5.12, ed. Pertusi, p.89) lists it as a *polis* of the theme of Hellas, Skylitzes (Skyl. 411.57) as a site in the theme of Nikopolis. Naupaktos was the seat of a *strategos* ca.1025; its *strategos* George died during a revolt and all his property was seized by the inhabitants; Constantine VIII punished the rebels and blinded the metropolis (Skyl. 372.73–80). In 1040 Naupaktos was the only city of the theme that survived the attack of *Deljan* and his army. There is little information on its economy: in the 12th C. Benjamín of Tudela found a community of 100 Jews there; a seal of an *exaristès* ("rigger," man in charge of a wharf?) of Naupaktos of the 9th C. is known.

After 1204 Naupaktos formed part of the despote of *Epiros*, but in 1294 it was given to *Philip I of Taranto*, beginning the city’s long period of Western domination. In 1361 Naupaktos fell into the hands of the Catalans, and the city passed from one Western power to another for several decades until the Venetians conquered it in 1407; thereafter they used Naupaktos to safeguard their trade through the gulf against the growing power of the Turks. They strongly fortified the city, but it surrendered to Bayezid II in 1499.

The present walls of the acropolis, of the lower city, and of a small harbor are works of the Venetians, built on ancient and Byz. foundations. A possibly five-aisled basilica has been excavated in the lower city, and another can be surmised from the various marble fragments discovered in the acropolis. Additional Byz. sculpture and inscriptions have been found throughout the city, but, aside from these, little of Byz. Naupaktos survives.

**NAUM OF OHRID,** Bulgarian priest, scholar, and saint; born ca.890, died Sveti Naum 23 Dec. 910; feastdays 20 June, 17 July (Bulgaria), 27 July (Russia). A close companion of CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER and Methodios in their mission to Moravia, Naum was ordained priest in Rome by Pope Hadrian II in 868. When Constantine the Philosopher died in Feb. 869, Naum returned to Moravia with Methodios. After Methodios’s death and the collapse of the Byz. mission, Naum was imprisoned, but finally made his way, along with KLIMENT OF OHRID and Angelarius, to Bulgaria in 886. Naum directed a group of translators and writers in Preslav. In 893 he succeeded Kliment as teacher and evangelist in Macedonia, first at Devol, then ca.900 in Ohrid, and finally ca.905 in the monastery that he founded on the southeastern shore of Lake Ohrid, now Sveti Naum. He became a monk on his deathbed. It is difficult to identify Naum’s personal share in the early Slavonic translations and original works produced in Preslav and in Macedonia. The authenticity of a *kanon* on the apostle Andrew is indicated by an acrostic. A 10th-C. Slavonic Life of Naum and a somewhat later Greek Life as well as a Greek *akolouthia* by Constantine *Kabasilas* (13th C.) survive.


NAUPLIA (Ναύπλια, also Nauplion, medieval Anapli, in Western texts Napoli in Romania), city in the ARGOLID, port of Argos. Through most of its history it shared the fate of Argos; under the later Roman Empire it had no independent status. The acropolis was fortified, and its main gate to the lower town, built into later walls, still survives. The city rose to prominence by the 11th C., undoubtedly as a result of its maritime position; an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 386.60) reports that ca.1033 a strategos resided there (Bon, Πελοπόννησος 78, n.2; cf. D.A. Zakythenos, EEBs 17 [1941] 250f). Prosperity at Nauplia is suggested by the large number of churches built in the vicinity in the 12th C., although regulations drafted by Leo, bishop of Argos and Nauplion, for Hagia Mone at AREIA show that ca. 1143 the area around the city was threatened by pirates. Nauplia was one of the cities in which the Venetians were given special trading privileges in 1198. The fortifications of Nauplia allowed it, like Argos, to hold out against the Franks until 1212. Nauplia fell under the nominal control of the duchy of Athens, and came under Venetian rule in 1388.

Nauplia shared a bishopric with Argos, as is stated in both the vita of Peter of Argos (ed. Ch. Papaikonomos, par.9, p.64.1–9) and a letter of Theodore of Nicaea to Basil of Corinth (Darrouzès, Epistoliers 7.43.16–18, p.315).

Nerio ACCIAIUOLI bequeathed a monastery to the local bishop at Nauplia and a sum of money for the construction of a hospital, but these buildings are otherwise unknown. Habitation at Nauplia during the medieval period was probably concentrated in the upper city, with a port and harbor facilities in the lower area. The spacious western fortifications, built on ancient foundations, probably represent the Byz. city; to the east is an area added by the Crusaders, while the easternmost part of the fortifications as well as the wall around the lower town were erected by the Venetians. The remains of a probably Byz. church have been excavated on the citadel, and the Church of Hagia Sophia just under the walls may date to the Frankish period.

NAVARRESE COMPANY, army of professional mercenaries from Navarre and Gascony that controlled part of Greece from 1378/9 to 1402. Originally in the service of Don Luis of Evreux, brother of Charles II (the Bad) of Navarre (1349–87), the band occupied DYRRACHION in 1376 to support Don Luis’s claim to Albania. After Don Luis’s death (1376), the Navarrese sold their services to a variety of claimants to power in Greece. Two companies briefly entered the service of the HOSPITALLERS in 1378 and went to Morea. One of these units, led by John de Urtubia, took THEBES and Livadia from the CATALANS in 1378 or 1379 (G. Dennis, OrChrP 26 [1960] 42–50) but failed to conquer Athens. The Navarrese invasion seriously weakened the Catalans, however, so that Athens fell ten years later (1388) to the ACCIAIUOLI.

Most of the Navarrese entered the service of Jacques de Baux, claimant to Achaia (1373–83), to press his claims to the Morea. They succeeded in conquering the western Peloponnese, from Vostitsa (Aigion) to Kalamata. After Jacques’s death, the Navarrese effectively controlled the principality of ACHAIA under the vicars-general Mahiot de Coquerel as imperial bailie (1381–1386/7) and Pierre Lebourd (Peter Bordo) de St. Speran as imperial vicar (1387–96); from 1396 to 1402 the latter bore the title of prince of Achaia. The Navarrese fought principally against the Acciaiuoli and THEODORE I PALAIOLOGOS for control of the Peloponnese. In 1401 Pierre de St. Speran joined the Turks for raids against Korone and Methone. The history of the Navarrese in Greece ends with the death of Pierre de St. Speran (1402).

NAVICULARIUS. See NAUKLEROΣ.
NAVIGATION was restricted by climate and Byz. control of the sea; naval technology remained limited. Since the Byz. ship was usually small with a shallow keel, designed essentially for coastal cruising, the Byz. remained cautious mariners, "touching dry land with the oars" (THEOPHYLAKTOS OF OHRID, ed. GATIER, 2:139.28-29). Sailing speeds reached 6 to 8 knots. The introduction of the triangular lateen sail by the 7th C. provided easier handling in bad weather and greater flexibility in catching the wind, but steering by compass, developed in the 13th C., and the stern rudder, important innovations in deep-sea sailing, came into widespread use after the decline of the Byz. navy. ASTROLABES were discussed in theoretical treatises, but their practical application is unattested.

As in antiquity, sailing was normally restricted to the good weather months between April and October. The prevailing northerly winds made sailing north to south fairly rapid and easy, but approaching Constantinople from the south was often difficult and time consuming. A series of way stations (HORMETERIA, TOPOI SKALOMATOS) dotted the Byz. littoral for fleets in need of provisions or awaiting favorable conditions (AHRWEILER, MER 419-25). Sailors steered point to point, by landmarks, beacons, and ports, or by sun and stars when out of sight of land. Naval commanders required knowledge of the winds, seasons, and stars to navigate the fleet (TAHTKA OF LEV VI 19.2). DE CEREMONIIS (467.9-12) lists books on the seasons and weather compiled for sailors (R.H. DOLLEY, MARINER'S MIRROR 37 [1951] 5-16) and supplies a table of distances between Constantinople and Crete (G. HUXLEY, GRBS 17 [1976] 295-300), but local pilots were also used; in 960 Nikophon Phokas relied on sailors from the island of Karpathos to guide his invasion fleet over the open seas to Crete from his last way station in Asia Minor (ATTLA. 224.14-22). Other guides to navigation were the PERIPLUS AND PORTULAN.

LIT. H. ANTONIADIS-BIBIOU, ÉTUDES D'HISTOIRE MARITIME DE BYZANCE: A PROPOS DU "THÈME DES CARAVISIENS" (PARIS 1966) 26-29. -E.M.

NAVY (πΛΩΙΜΟΝ). In the 6th C., Byz. warships gained control of the sea by recapturing Carthage and destroying the VANDAL fleet; the navy became a police force operating from Constantinople and Mediterranean bases. In the mid-7th C., however, the incursion of Slavic pirates and the development of Arab seapower by Mu'awiya forced a naval reorganization; the fleet of the KARABISI-ANOI was created to defend the Byz. littoral and the approaches to Constantinople. Following its dissolution under Leo III, regional fleets whose costs were borne independently by the naval strategy were organized in the exclusively maritime themes of KIBYRRHAIOTAI (by 732), AEGEAN SEA (by 843), and SAMOS (by 899). The imperial fleet (BASILIKON PLOIMON) was based at Constantinople under the DROUNGARIOI KOU PLOIMOU to protect the Byz. capital; it also undertook expeditions to which the thematic fleets contributed ships and men. The navy achieved its greatest successes in the 10th C., esp. in the destruction of the fleet of the Rus' in 941 and in the reconquest of Crete (961) and Cyprus (965).

The navy declined during the 11th C. The thematic fleets disappeared; by the 12th C. naval command, financing, and recruitment had been centralized at Constantinople (N. OIKONOMIDES, TM 6 [1976] 146f), where a small flotilla still patrolled. Under John II Komnenos, taxes raised for maintaining the navy were diverted into the imperial treasury; from then on, fleets of varying sizes were constructed on an AD HOC basis, and alliances (see, e.g., NYMPHAION, TREATY OF) were sought with Venice and other naval powers to obtain ships and manpower for expeditions. Although the Komnenian and Nicaean navies enjoyed several successes, the Venetians and Genoese steadily took control of the Aegean until even the Byz. themselves acknowledged the superior seamanship of the Italians. The last major Byz. fleet was built by Michael VIII Palaiologos but disbanded by his successor Andronikos II Palaiologos. Later, however, Andronikos III's small navy, under the command of the MEGAS DOUX ALEXIOS APOKAUKOS, enjoyed success against the Genoese, and John VI Kantakouzenos built a small flotilla, but complete control of the seas had passed to the Italians and Turks by the end of the 14th C.


NAXOS (Νάξος, also Naxia), island in the central Aegean Sea, in late antiquity part of the province
of the Islands (Insulae). Its later fate is poorly known: texts of the 10th C. mention Naxos as a station on the way from Constantinople to Crete (e.g., AASS Nov. 4:227E); according to John Kaminates (59.07), it paid phoroi to "the inhabitants of Crete." Naxos may have been capital of an ephemeral theme of Dodekanese in the later 12th C. In 1205–07 Marco Sanudo seized Naxos and the adjoining islands, creating the duchy of Naxos (or duchy of the Archipelago) that was considered as held from the Latin Empire. In 1248 suzerainty over Naxos was ceded to William II Villehardouin; the Byz. reconquest of the Aegean islands in 1263–76 under the command of Alexios Philanthropenos failed at Naxos, and after 1278 the duc became a vassal of Charles I of Anjou. The duchy remained independent until the Turkish conquest in 1566 (with short periods of Venetian tutelage: 1494–1500 and 1511–17). The Latin occupation of Naxos led to the introduction of feudal law based on the assizes of Romania; nevertheless, as late as the 16th C., the indigenous population continued to use Byz. laws of marriage and ownership, while the impact of Italian law was limited to terminology.

The bishop of Naxos was originally a suffragan of Rhodes (Notitiae CP 1:429). In 1083 the see was united with that of Paros (as Paronaxia: RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.929) and shortly thereafter was raised to metropolitan status (Notitiae CP 11:84).

Remains of early Christian basilicas are found throughout the island, representing a wide variety of architectural styles, and there are even more churches of the 9th–14th C. (Pallas, Monuments 207–15; B.K. Lamprounoudakes, PraktArchE1 [1982] 253–59); many have full fresco programs, with esp. fine examples dated from the 13th C. Non-representational decoration in some churches has led to their identification as Iconoclastic (A.G. Basilake, DChAE 4 [1962–3] 49–74; but see D.I. Pallas, JOB 23 [1974] 306).


NAZARETH (Ναζαρέθ), village in Galilee in which the Virgin reportedly received the Annunciation from the angel Gabriel, and where Jesus spent his childhood. The area remained completely Jewish at least up to the reign of Constantine I, when it was noted that the town had no Christian population and no church (Epiphanios of Salamis, Panarion, 30.11.9–10). Excavations at Nazareth have uncovered the remains of a basilica dedicated to the Virgin (later the Annunciation) and dated to the beginning of the 5th C. Below the basilica were fragments of a synagogue. Egeria saw at Nazareth only "a big cave in which Mary had lived" incorporating an altar, and a garden "in which the Lord used to dwell." The Piacenza Pilgrim indicates that in his time the house of Mary was a basilica. He describes the area as exceptionally fertile.

Nazareth was conquered by the Arabs in 636, but al-Mas'udi mentions a church held in great veneration. This building is described at length by later pilgrims, such as Danil Igumen and John Phokas: within the church was an entrance to a cave incorporating a cell where the Virgin was said to have lived with the Child. At the site of the Annunciation a black stone cross was set in white marble. Under the Crusaders Nazareth remained a small town, but church building continued. Some architectural fragments of the 12th-C. Church of the Annunciation have survived, including five well-preserved capitals. In 1187 Saladin seized Nazareth. Legend has it that the house of Mary was miraculously transferred from Nazareth to Fiume on 10 May 1291, and in 1295 to the town of Loreto in Italy.

The term Nazaraios or Nazinaios, meaning "Nazarene" or "man of Nazareth" (cf. Mt 2:23), was applied to Christians in general, and specifically to Christ and monks, esp. hesychasts (cf. Souda, 3:434).


NAZIANZOS (Νάζιανζος, now probably Nenezi), a minor station (stathmos) on the highway that led across Anatolia to Palestine; according to Sokrates (Sokr., HE 4:11.9), "a shabby polis" near Caesarea. It became a bishopric ca.325. After its bishop Gregory died in 374, his son, Gregory of Nazianzos, administered the see. The bishopric was suffragan of Caesarea, then Tyana, eventually Mokissos. Romanos IV transformed Nazianzos
into a metropolis. It fell to the Turks after the battle of MANTZIKERT in 1071. Remains of the site are insignificant.


- C.F.

NEA ANCHIALOS, modern name for Thessalian or Phthiotic Thebes (Θήβαι Φθώντες), a city in central Greece on the Pagastic Gulf south of Volos. In late antiquity it was the third city of the province of Thessaly and its major port. The ancient city centered on the upper acropolis, while the early Christian city lay in the plain near the sea on the site of ancient Pyrasos. The city prospered from the 4th to the 7th C. when it was the dominant town on the Pagastic Gulf. It was destroyed by a great fire at the end of the 7th C.; there is evidence of some rebuilding immediately after the fire and again in the 9th C., but the city never fully recovered and its place was later taken by Halmiros. The bishop of Thessalian Thebes, amply attested in the epigraphic and documentary evidence, is last mentioned in the 8th/9th C. (Notitiae CP 3.672). The latest evidence of Nea Anchialos is a coin hoard of the early 9th C.

Nea Anchialos is best known because of the many churches excavated there (nine basilicas have been found). Basilica A, dedicated to St. Demetrius, was the episcopal church, a three-aisled basilica similar to the Acheiropoietos Church in Thessalonike, with an atrium possibly flanked by towers; it was built sometime in the late 5th or early 6th C. Basilica B, the so-called Elpidios Basilica, has a similar chronology; Basilica G, called the “church of the archiereus (bishop) Peter” on the basis of an inscription of the mid-6th C. discovered at the site, has elaborate floor mosaics and is part of a vast ecclesiastical complex; its earliest phase dates to the late 4th or early 5th C. Basilica D, dated to the 7th C., was a cemetery church located outside the city walls. Excavation of the harbor revealed places for anchorage (P. Lazarides, PraktArchEt [1973] 33). A burial epitaph for a Jew, written in Greek letters, has been found (E. Deilake, ArchDelt 29.2 [1973–74] 548).


- T.E.C.

NEA EKKLESIAS (lit. “new church”), built in the Great Palace by Basil I and completed in 880. Situated a short distance east of the Chrysotriklinos, the Nea was covered by five domes, probably one in the center and one each over the four corners. It was dedicated to Christ, the archangel Michael (and Gabriel?), the prophet Elijah, the Virgin, and St. Nicholas, which implies four chapels in addition to the main altar. The decoration was particularly sumptuous: the chancel screen, synthonon, and altar table were revetted with silver, the floor was of opus sectile, the domes were roofed with bronze tiles. The atrium was adorned with two fountains of precious marble (TheophCont 325–29). The church had its own clergy and played an important part in patronite ceremonies. Converted into a monastery by the 12th C., the Nea was robbed of many of its ornaments by Isaac II. During the Latin occupation it served as a pataline chapel. It survived the Turkish conquest and was probably destroyed in 1490.

The New Church was described in detail by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos or someone from his milieu in the Vita Basilii. Beginning with F. Combebis, scholars had believed that the ekphrasis of an unnamed church in the 10th homily of Photios referred to the Nea until Jenkins and Mango (infra) demonstrated that the 10th homily could not have been produced later than 864 and was related to the consecration of another church, that of the Virgin of the Pharos. E. Bolognesi (StMed 28 [1987] 83–98), however, reassigned Photios’s ekphrasis to the Church of the Virgin Hodegetria. The problem needs further investigation.


- C.M.

NEAI PATRAI. See Neopatra.

NEA MONE (Nēa Mōnē, “new monastery”), the name of several Byz. monasteries. Two of the most important were on Chios and in Thessalonike.

NEA MONE ON CHIOS, dedicated to the Virgin, was founded shortly before 1042 by the local hermits Niketas and John (and, according to tradition, Joseph). Constantine IX, the monastery's
principal benefactor, conferred abundant privileges and lands on Nea Mone. His chrysobulls and sigilla, as well as the charters of later emperors (the last of Andronikos II in 1289), are important for the study of large landownership, exkouseia, status of peasants, and the taxation of Jews, primarily in the 11th C. Outside of Chios, the monastery owned property in Asia Minor and Thessaly. Nea Mone was exempted from episcopal jurisdiction and was granted the right to invite any bishop for the ordination of priests and deacons.

According to tradition (confirmed by architectural analysis), the present church was built during the reign of Constantine IX. Within walls built in recessed-brick technique, the naos is laid out as a small square below a tall segmented dome (now restored) on an octagonal drum. Outer and inner narthexes and a low bema form distinct parts of the structure. All except the first are internally sheathed with local red marbie and mosaics that, like the overall design, are said to be of Constantinopolitan origin. Mouriki (infra) suggests that the mosaic decoration was begun after 1049 and finished before Constantine’s death. Less restored than those of Hosios Loukas and Daphni, the mosaics atypically include an orant Virgin in the apse and eight Great Feasts in the deep squinches of the drum. The inner narthex cupola contains the oldest known example of the Virgin guarded by military saints and martyrs. The monastery’s defense tower and cistern are also of the 11th C. The refectory contains a table inlaid with marble of probably the same period.


NEA MONE IN TESSALONIKE was founded between 1360 and 1370 by Makarios Choumnos on the site of the earlier imperial palace, south of the Arch of Galerios. G.I. Theocharides has identified it with the church now dedicated to St. Elias (Makedonika 5 [1961-63] 1-14). Originally dedicated to the Theotokos, it housed 15 monks, two novices, and two postulants at the time of its foundation. Sometime before 1374 Makarios was summoned to Constantinople to serve as hegoumenos of the Studios monastery. He was succeeded at Nea Mone by his disciple, the hieromonk Gabriel, who would later become hegoumenos of the Chora monastery, metropolitan of Chalcedon and then Thessalonike. Gabriel supervised the completion of the construction of the church. Nea Mone was granted the status of an imperial and patriarchal monastery and was thus exempt from the jurisdiction of the local metropolitan. According to Ignatij Smolensk, who visited in 1405, Nea Mone was one of the most flourishing monasteries in Thessalonike. At this time its monks were also involved in bitter disputes over property with the Akapniou Monastery in Thessalonike. Nea Mone is known to have survived until at least 1432. Although the monastery’s archive is preserved at the Great Lavra of Athos, there is no proof that Nea Mone became a metochion of the Lavra, as Theocharides asserted.


-Α.M.T.

NEA PETRA MONASTERY. See MAKRINITISSA MONASTERY.

NEA PHOKAIA. See PHOKAIA.

NEAPOLIS (Νεάπολις, biblical Sichem, Nablus in Israel), city in the province of Palestina I under CAESAREA MARITIMA and bishopric under the patriarch of Jerusalem, noted for its Church of the Theotokos built on top of Mt. Garizim, site of an ancient Samaritan shrine. At the request of Bp. Terebinthios, this large octagonal church was erected by Emp. Zeno after the Samaritan uprising of 484 and garrisoned. A tetraptugia circuit wall was added by Justinian I after another uprising in 529, when he also provided for the restoration of five shrines. A cruciform church surrounding Jacob’s well at Neapolis was sketched by the pilgrim Arculf (see ADOMAN) in 670.

NEBO, MOUNT, mountainous region in Jordan (called Abarim in Dt 32:49) overlooking the Dead Sea's north shore, a place of PILGRIMAGE. Early Christians identified its ridge, called Siyagha ("monastery") in Aramaic, as the place where Moses viewed the Promised Land before his death (Dt 34:1–6). In 384 EGERIA saw only a small church "with a place for a tomb" (Égérie, Journal de Voyage, ed. P. Maraval [Paris 1982] ch.12.1, p.172), no doubt the 4th-C. triple-apsed memorial chapel (cella trichora) excavated by Saller (Saller-Schneider, *infra*). About 470 PETER THE IBERIAN (Life, ed. Raabe, 82f) visited a large church surrounded by cells, which is probably the three-aisled basilica and monastery complex—one of the largest in the region—likewise exposed by Saller. Circa 600 a Theotokos chapel and baptistery were added. Mosaic pavements display geometric, floral, and animal motifs, and a panel before the apse of the Theotokos chapel has a unique mosaic plan of the Jewish Temple. In 1976 Piccirillo (*infra*) discovered an earlier pavement, dated 531, beneath the basilica's *diakonikon*, this one with pastoral and hunting scenes.

The town of Nebo (Khirbet el-Mekhayaat), about 4 km southeast of Siyagha, had four 6th- and 7th-C. churches with spectacular mosaic pavements; surviving portions depict scenes of daily life, allegories, and donor portraits. One shows Earth personified as a woman.


-K.G.H.

NEBOULOS (Néboulou), military commander of Slavic or perhaps Bulgar origin (Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* 2:210). In 693 Justinian II formed a special force of 30,000 troops from the Slavs settled in Opsikion in 688. As its ARCHON he appointed Neboulos, chosen "from the nobles" (Nikeph. 36.24), and campaigned with this army against the Arabs at Sebastopolis "by the sea" (E.W. Brooks, *BZ* 18 [1909] 154–56). After initial success Justinian was defeated when Neboulos, bribed by the Arab commander, deserted with most of his troops. According to Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 366.21–23), Justinian retaliated by massacring the remaining Slavs and their families. The Arabs settled Neboulos and his men in Syria.


- P.A.H.

NECKLACE (περιδερασίαν). As opposed to the TORQUE, which was worn by men, women's necklaces consisted of several kinds of chains, from simple loops to complex braids, either undecorated or with additional elements. PENDANTS might be added, similar to those used in earrings. Gold coins or medallions were often reused in necklaces, but until the 7th C. the commonest type seems to consist of beads of cut gemstones, glass paste, or pearls, interspersed with single loops of chain. Contemporaneous, and gradually becoming more common, were more complex chains, esp. types with openwork gold disks or links (Brown, *infra* [1984], pls. 1–6, 12–18). The construction of the jeweled collars—worn, for example, by the female saints in S. Apollinare Nuovo and by Theodora's companions in S. Vitale, RAVENNA—is difficult to identify: although necklaces with *cloisons* (thin strips of gold) containing single large gems were made in the Hellenistic period, the form seems to disappear until the 11th or 12th C. Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 443.78–80) accused Isaac II of making necklaces and torques with jewels taken from crosses and Gospel books.


-S.D.C., A.C.

NEGEV (Negeβ), area of PALESTINE III (Sautari) extending south of the Dead Sea to the Gulf of 'Aqabah. Its territory included PETRA (the capital); the cities of Mampsis, Birosaba, and Elusa; and the settlements of Nessana, Sobata (Shivta), and Oboda. Despite the scarcity of narrative sources, the economy and culture of Negev in late antiquity has been well studied on the basis of archaeological remains, inscriptions, and the Nessana papyri. Agriculture flourished in Negev in...
the 4th–7th C., thanks to irrigation. The land produced grapes, wheat, barley, olives, dates, and almonds. There were three types of landowners: the church, individual farmers, and limitanei. The region also benefited from the trade route that led north from Aela on the Gulf.

From ca. 300 active fortification of the sites helped to protect them from Bedouin attack. Christianity penetrated the Negev by the 4th C., but Elusa is the only bishopric attested by external sources—its bishops participated in some councils of the 5th and 6th C. The region was thoroughly christianized, however, in part under the influence of the neighboring Sinai peninsula. Numerous churches of the 5th–9th C. have been excavated in Mampsis, Nessana, Oboda, and Sobata. The earlier churches have a single apse, while churches with three apses are a later development; some were decorated with floor mosaics and reliefs.

The area began to decline, at least at Mampsis, ca. 500. Building activity in Oboda had stopped by the beginning of the 7th C. In 636 the Arabs conquered Negev. Urban life continued in some places until ca. 700, then died out, and the desert replaced orchards and vineyards.


NEGROPONTE, Italian name for Euboea, probably originating from Euboeas via a distorted form of Egripus. In 1204 the Venetians gained control of the ports of Karystos and Chalkis, while the rest of the island was first given to a Frankish baron, James II of Avesnes. After his death Negroponte was partitioned, in 1209, among three Veronese lords, who in turn acknowledged Venetian suzerainty. Venetian power grew on the island, but the rough terrain allowed considerable independence for the minor Frankish nobility, while Venice used Negroponte as a base for its operations in the Aegean. Pirates from Negroponte ravaged much of the east coast of Greece in the 13th to 14th C. From 1322 onward, the Turks began to attack isolated areas on Negroponte, and in July 1470 the island fell. Under Latin domination the church of Negroponte was an important outpost of papal power. The name Negroponte was indiscriminately applied to the entire island, to its capital Chalkis, to the Frankish lordship, and to the Venetian administrative unit.


NEIGHBOR (γείτων, πλησιάζων), a person or juristic person owning or holding property in close spatial proximity to another property, or a member of the same fiscal unit, as opposed to a stranger (xenos). In Byz. it was a well-established principle that neighbors enjoyed specific privileges such as the right of protimesis by reason of anakoinosis, “enclave” (e.g., Esphig., no. 30.11) or plesiasmos, “coming near” (e.g., Docheiar., no. 43.12), as well as jura in re aliena. On the other hand, neighbors as members of the same fiscal unit (metrokonia, village community) shared collective tax liabilities (epible, allelengyion). One of the most common ways of identifying properties in the praktika was by naming the owners of neighboring properties (e.g., choraphion plesion tou Basileiou).


NEILOS KERAMEUS (Κεραμεύς), patriarch of Constantinople (Mar./Apr. 1380–1 Feb. 1388); baptismal name Neophyto; born Thessalonike, died Constantinople 1 Feb. 1388. An ardent Palamite, Neilos took the monastic habit at the Chiasmiseites monastery in Constantinople in 1354; his spiritual master was the hegoumenos Markos (PLP, no. 17017), for whom he drafted a monastic rule. After Mark’s death, Neilos succeeded him briefly as superior before being made patriarch. He apparently continued to serve as hegoumenos throughout his patriarchate. Shortly before Neilos’s death, he bequeathed the monastery to the future patriarch Matthew I.

Around 1380 Neilos and the synod drafted an important document defining imperial rights in ecclesiastical affairs (V. Laurent, REB 13 [1955] 5–18). In 1383 he divided the double monastery
of Patt. ATHANASIUS I (MM 2:80–89). A collection of 43 of his homilies (heavily influenced by John Chrysostom) remains unedited. He also wrote enkomia of Gregory PALAMAS and Anthimos of Crete.


LIT. RegPetr, fasc. 6, nos. 2696–843. PL P, no. 11658.

-A.M.T.

NEILOS OF ANKYRA, also called Neilos the Ascetic, theologian and saint; died ca. 430; feast-day 12 Nov. According to the Synaxarium of Constantinople (Synax CP 217:4–6) and Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos (PG 146:1256A), he served as eparch of Constantinople under Theodosius I and then left for Sinai together with his son Theodoulos. These data are now considered as legendary; they are based on a romance, entitled Diegema ta (Narrations), which describes the adventures of Neilos and Theodoulos on the Sinai peninsula. Various works have survived under the name of Neilos (CPG 3:6043–84), both in Greek and other languages (Syriac, Armenian, Latin, etc.). Distinction between the different Neiloi is difficult, but it is usually accepted that there were two of them—
one of the author of the ostensibly autobiographical Narrations, and another who wrote letters, treatises on monastic life, commentaries on the Song of Songs (R. Browning, REB 24 [1966] 107–14), etc. A number of “heretical” writings, notably those of EVAGRIOS PONTIKOS, have been preserved under his name.

Two of the works ascribed to Neilos are the most important and the most controversial: the Narrations and a corpus of 1,061 letters. The Narrations contains rich ethnological data about barbarian tribes that lived between Arabia and Egypt and knew no craft, trade, or agriculture, sustaining themselves only by the sword (ch. 3.1, ed. Conca, p. 3.1–5). J. Henninger (Anthropos 50 [1955] 81–148) considered Neilos’s ethnological observations untrustworthy, whereas V. Christi des (Byzantium 43 [1973] 39–50) argued that his data on Bedouin stoneworship and sacrifices of camels and humans are accurate. The corpus of letters has suffered from editorial corruption, perhaps in the 6th C. when it was well known; many of the titles of the letters addressed to illustrious officials have now been unmasked as anachronistic additions. Al. Cameron (GRBS 17 [1976] 181–96) considers the bulk of the correspondence genuine, even though edited by an admirer of Neilos, while Ringshausen (infra) sees in the correspondence the work of a different author. The major themes of his letters are the imitation of Christ as the way to perfection, practical advice for seekers of spiritual guidance, and allegorical interpretations of biblical texts; discussions of Christology and refutations of ARIANISM also appear. Letter 4.61, to Olympiodoros the eparch, praises the value of depicting biblical scenes on church walls to instruct the illiterate but criticizes the use of hunting scenes (H.G. Thümmel, BZ 71 [1978] 10–21).


-B.B., A.K.

NEILOS OF ROSSANO, also known as Neilos the Younger, saint; born ROSSANO in Calabria ca. 910, died GROTTAFERRATA 26 Sept. 1004. An orphan from an illustrious family, after a chaotic youth Neilos abandoned secular life (and his child) for the ascetical life of Italy’s “New Thebaid.” He came under the guidance of PHANTINOS THE YOUNGER in the region of Merkourion. He secured the monastic habit despite governmental prohibitions, which may evidence the antimonastic attitude of ROMANOS I after the novel of 934. In the early 950s Neilos returned to the neighborhood of Rossano, where he founded the monastery of St. Adrian. Around 980, fleeing admirers and Muslim raiders, he moved north to MONTECASSINO, where he and his followers lived about 15 years at the daughter house of Vellelucce. Then, disenchanted by laxity, Neilos and many of his monks moved to Serperi, near Gaeta. Shortly before his death he founded the monastery of S. Maria di Grottaferrata.

Neilos’s career marks the high point of Italo-
Greek monasticism. He was a talented scribe. His hymns are elegant. A disciple commemorated him in a vita that is remarkable for its style and substance, describing not only Neilos's rigorous asceticism but also Italo-Greek monasticism in general. By vividly contrasting Neilos with Byz. notables, the Montecassino monks who greeted him as "another Benedict," the decadent Lombard princess Aloara, and Emperor Otto III, the vita reveals not only the saint's charismatic power but also the power of Byz. culture.


NEILOS THE ASCETIC. See NEILOS OF ANKYRA.

NEKTARIOS, bishop of Constantinople (June 381–27 Sept. 397); born Tarsos. He was a member of the senate when Gregory of Nazianzos retired from the see of Constantinople; Diodoros of Tarsos included Nektarios in the list of candidates presented to Theodosios I, who selected Nektarios despite the fact that he had not yet been baptized and stood at the very bottom of the candidate list (Sozom. HE 7.8.1–6). Nektarios was a politician rather than a church leader and worked in close contact with Theodosios. He presided over the Council of 381 in Constantinople that condemned the Council of Arias (see under CONSTANTINOPE, COUNCILS OF), but thereafter Nektarios endeavored to achieve reconciliation. He tried to increase the authority of Constantinople without entering into a conflict with Rome and Alexan-

dria: even though the Eastern bishops refused to participate in a council planned by Pope Damasus in 382, Nektarios appealed the pope by subscribing to Western theological tenets. In 394 the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch peacefully attended a local synod in Constantinople. Nektarios probably extended the jurisdiction of Constantinople over Thrace; bishops of Asia Minor and even distant Bostra began to seek his arbitration in their litigations. Nektarios reformed the system of Penance, abolishing the office of a permanent confessor and permitting a believer to partake of the sacraments from a priest of his/her choice.

A homily on St. Theodore is preserved under the name of Nektarios (PG 39:1821–40). Palladius of Galatia (Laus. Hist., ch. 38, ed. Butler, 117.5–6) characterized him as "the most dialectical [in disputes] against all the heresies." An enkomion of Nektarios by an unknown grammaticos, Leo of Sicily, is preserved in an unpublished 14th-C. MS (BHG 2284).


NEMANJID DYNASTY, Serbian royal family (ca.1165/68–1371). Its founder was STEFAN NEMANJA. The ten successive rulers increased in stature from župan of Raška to emperor of the Serbs and Greeks, in the person of STEFAN UROŚ IV DUŠAN. The branch of Nemanja's son Vukan ruled in ZE타. During the 200 years of Nemanjid rule, the borders of Serbia expanded into Byz. territory as far south as the Gulf of Corinth. Through marriage, the Nemanjids became related to dynasties in Constantinople, the despotates of Epiros, the Bulgarian Empire, the kingdom of Hungary, and the kingdom of Naples and to the doges of Venice. The opening of silver mines in the 13th C. secured economic prosperity, which provided the financial base for military success. The Serbian church became an independent archbishopric, first headed by Nemanja's youngest son SAVA OF SERBIA. All the Nemanjids built ecclesiastical foundations, churches, and monasteries such as Djurdjevi Stupovi, Žiča, Studenica, Hilandar, Mileševa, Morača, Sopočani, Gradac, Arijle, Gračanica, Dečani, Peć, Holy Archangels near Prizren, and Matejić. The genealogical tree of the Nemanjid dynasty, styled after the Tree of Jesse, is painted
Genealogy of the Nemanjic Dynasty (ca. 1167–1371)

Stefan Nemanja

- Vukan
- Stefan the First-Crowned
  - m. (1) Eudokia, daughter of Alexios III Angelos
  - m. (2) Anna, daughter of Enrico Dandolo
- Rasko (Sava)
  - m. Anna, daughter of Theodore Komnenos Doukas
  - Vladislav
    - m. Belošava, daughter of John Asen II
      - tsar of Bulgaria
    - Predislav (Archbishop Sava II)
      - m. Helena (of Anjou?)
  - Stefan Uroš I
    - Dragutin
      - m. Catherine, daughter of Istvan V of Hungary
    - Stefan Uroš II Milutin
      - m. (1) Helena, daughter of John I Doukas, sebastokrator
        - m. Elisabeth, daughter of Istvan V of Hungary
      - m. (3) Anna, daughter of George I Terter, tsar of Bulgaria
      - m. (4) Simonis, daughter of Andronikos II Palaiologos
  - Stefan Uroš III Dečanski
    - m. (1) Theodora, daughter of Smilac, tsar of Bulgaria
    - m. Maria Palaiologina, daughter of John Palaiologos
      - and Irene Metochites
    - Stefan Uroš IV Dušan
      - m. Helena, sister of Ivan Alexander
    - Stefan Uroš V
      - m. Anna, daughter of Alexander of Wallachia

Information provided by J. S. Allen.

Rulers of the Nemanjic Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Nemanja</td>
<td>ca. 1165/68–1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan the First-Crowned</td>
<td>župan 1196–1217, king 1217–ca. 1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Radoslav</td>
<td>ca. 1228–ca. 1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Vladislav</td>
<td>ca. 1234–1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Uroš I</td>
<td>1243–1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Dragutin</td>
<td>1276–1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Uroš II Milutin</td>
<td>1282–1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Uroš III Dečanski</td>
<td>1321–1331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Uroš IV Dušan</td>
<td>king 1331–1345, tsar 1345–1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Uroš V</td>
<td>1355–1371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in the churches at Gračanica, Dečani, Peć, and Matejić. (See table for a list of Nemanjic rulers; see also genealogical table.)


J.S.A.

NEMESIOS (Νεμέσιος), late 4th-C. bishop of Emesa in Syria, a successor of Eusebius of Emesa. His treatise on anthropology, entitled On the Nature of Man, in which he attempts to fuse a Platonizing doctrine of the soul with Christian revelation, was much exploited by John of Damascus in his Exposition of the Orthodox Faith (bk. 2, chs. 12–99) and by Meletios the Monk in his synopsis of Christian and pagan ideas on the
human constitution. The treatise was translated into Armenian and Latin; Thomas Aquinas was a notable Western user. The content is more philosophical and scientific than theological, albeit the exegetical methods of the Antiochene School come through, and there is an obtruded mention of contemporary controversy over hypostatic union. Nemessios’s use of classical Greek science is highly eclectic, adopting or rejecting Plato and Aristotle according to the needs of the moment; many other sources are adduced, notably scientific writers from Epicurus to Galen.

The tract of Nemessios is an exalted praise of the human being as a perfect creature between the corporeal and incorporeal worlds, a microcosm (mikros kosmos, “little universe”). The human being possesses both the incorporeal soul—the major part of which is reason and which is preexistent (like Plato’s idea) and eternal—and the body, consisting of perishable matter. Its most beautiful member is the eye. Optimistically, Nemessios stresses free will, creativity, wisdom, and the ability to foresee the future, and admonishes man not to fear death, since only sinful death is evil.


—B.B.

NEO-CHALCEDONISM, a conventional scholarly term to designate a theological movement of the 6th C. The goal of the Neo-Chalcedonians was to overcome the problems posed by the Christological formula accepted at the Council of Chalcedon in 451; this dyophysite formula, which stressed the existence of two natures in Christ, did not sufficiently clarify the character of the union between the divine and the human in the incarnate Logos. Whereas Nestorianism shifted eastward, to Persia and the Syrian borderlands, the Monophysites maintained an active presence within the empire and kept accusing the strict Chalcedonians, predominantly those of Constantinople, of Nestorian tenets. Some theologians, such as Nephalius (C. Moeller, _RHE_ 40 [1944–45] 73–140), John of Caesarea, and Leontios of Jerusalem, tried to find a compromise between Chalcedonians and moderate (“verbal”) Monophysites; although they accepted the 12 anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria and the statement that “one of the Trinity has suffered,” they tried not to separate the human principle from the divine _phys_ of Christ but emphasized the _synthesis_ (“combination,” the term also used by the “verbal” Monophysites) and hypostatic (but not “natural”) unity of the two principles.

Political considerations (the search for reconciliation) brought into the Neo-Chalcedonian camp both ecclesiastical leaders, such as the patriarchs of Antioch Anastasios (559–69) and Gregory (569–93) (P. Allen, _Byzantium_ 50 [1980] 13–16), and emperors, such as Justinian I. The official acceptance of their views at the Council of Constantinople in 553 was followed by an “anti-Nestorian” reaction—the condemnation of the Three Chapters. A compromise with the Monophysites, however, was not achieved.

_NEOKAISAREIA_ (Neokaisareia, Turk. Niksar), city of Pontos in the Lykos Valley on one of the main northern routes across Anatolia. Famed for its first bishop, Gregory the Thaumaturge, Neokaisarea became the civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of Pontus Polemoniacus. Although struck by earthquakes in 344 and 449, Neokaisarea’s powerful fortress remained suitable as a refuge when Chosroes I attacked _Sebastia_ in 575. Thereafter its history is obscure until the 11th C., when it was attacked by the Turks, who first sacked it in 1068 and captured it after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071. The Gabrades restored Byz. power in the 1080s, but by the end of the century Neokaisarea fell to Danismend. The Turkish epic _Danismendname_ preserves the memory of these struggles. The imprisonment of Bohemund here provoked the unsuccessful Crusade of 1101. After failing to take Neokaisarea in 1140, John II Komnenos brought back many inhabitants of the region and settled them in securely Byz. lands. Neokaisarea contains a mas-
sive and well-preserved fortress, some of whose walls are certainly Byz.

LIT. Bryer-Winfield, Pontos 107–10. —C.F.

NEOKASTRA (Νεόκαστρα), one of the themes in the empire of Nicaea. Its origins are obscure: Niketas Choniates applies this term, meaning “new castles,” to a group of phrouria (Chliara, Pergamon, and Atramyttion) in northwestern Asia Minor that stood under command of a harmostes sent from Constantinople; they paid taxes to the imperial treasury (Nik.Chon. 150.53–56). On the other hand, the chrysobull of Alexios III of 1198 and the Partitio Romaniae list the “provincia” of Neochestron/Neocastri separately from Atramyttion, Chliara, and Pergamon. George Akropolites (Akrop. 28.3–8) describes Neokastra as a theme along with Kelbianon, Chliara, Pergamon, Magidia, and Opsikion. He includes in Neokastra the village of Kalamos (in the north?), but Ahrweiler’s thesis (infra) that it encompassed also Magnesia and Sardis is only hypothetical (Pachym. [ed. Bekker, 2:220f] contrasts Neokastra and Sardis). Neokastra was administered by a doux; one of these administrators, Libadarios, supported Andronikos II against Alexios Philanthropenos in 1296. Ahrweiler suggests that Constantine Nestongos was the last known doux of Neokastra ca. 1304.


NEOPATRAS (Νεόπατρας, also Neai Patrai, anc. and mod. Hypate), Thessalian city in the Spercheios Valley, east of Lamia. The name Hypate was used by Prokopios and Hierokles; Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 2.42–43, ed. Pertusi, p.88) knew it as Hypate “which is now called Neai Patrai.” In the 12th C. Basil of Ohrid (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 5:393.1–2) stated that Symeon, bishop of Neopatras, was transferred to Laodikeia “in the days of Leo VI and Photios (sic),” but we do not know whether the new name was used in 9th-C. documents or only applied by Basil. The seal of Euthymios Malakes designates the bishopric as “Patrai Helladikai” as distinguished from Patrai Katotero (i.e., of the Peloponnese: Laurent, Corpus 5.1, no.769).

The city was perhaps abandoned at the time of the Slavic invasions and until 1204 is known only as an ecclesiastical center—by the 10th C. it was already a metropolis with one suffragan, increased to 12 in the 12th C. It played a greater role after 1204, first under Latin control, then within the despotate of Epiros. After the battle of Pelagonia Neopatras fell to Byz., but by the end of the 13th C. it was under the authority of independent Thessalian doukes. Circa 1309 John II of Neopatras married Irene, the illegitimate daughter of Andronikos II, and styled himself “the lord of the lands of Athens and Neai Patrai and the doux of Kastoria” (Nicol, Epiros II 74f). The Catalans seized Neopatras in 1319 and retained the city when almost all their possessions had been lost. In 1394 the Ottomans captured Neopatras.

Remains of the largely 13th-C. castle with keep are south of the modern town, on the site of the ancient acropolis. In the town are remains of a three-aisled basilica and in the Church of St. Nicholas spolia of Byz. buildings with an inscription of proedros Demetrios Katakalon, the ktetor of the Church of Hagia Sophia (P. Lazaredes, ArchDelt 16 [1960] 164–66).


NEOPHYTOS ENKLEISTOS (Νέοφυτος Ενκλειστός), Cypriot monastic writer and saint; born Leukara, Cyprus, 1134, died after 1214; feastday 24 Jan. At age 18, he left his poor family and was tonsured at the monastery of John Chrysostom on Mt. Koutzoubendes; there he worked five years in the vineyard, received some education, and became subascanzant (parekklesiarches). Then he left the monastery and traveled through Palestine. After his return to Cyprus, when he was about to journey to Latros, Neophytos was arrested, robbed of two nomismata (the price of the fare), and barely escaped imprisonment. He endeavored to become a solitary hermit but had difficulty getting permission: in 1159, when he withdrew to a cave near Paphos, the local bishop ordered him to receive disciples. Although Neophytos spent some time as a recluse (enklestos), he was closely connected with the monastery of Enkleistra, which he had founded and provided with a typikon (second version in 1214). He wrote various books on ecclesiastical subjects (panegyrics, catecheses,
NEOPATONISM, a modern term for the philosophy of Plotinos and of the philosophical schools that he inspired, which flourished principally at Athens and Alexandria through the 6th C. Like his immediate predecessors ("middle" Platonists), Plotinos sought in the dialogues of Plato a systematic philosophy. Taking advantage of Aristotelian and Stoic ideas, he reached conclusions of some originality and cogency. The material world he saw as a unified whole, organized and sustained by soul (psyche), which acts as the transmitter to matter of form inspired by models found in another radically different type of reality corresponding to Plato's realm of Forms (or Ideas). This is a reality from which soul itself derives; it is outside space, time, and body and is the object of thought and the very activity of a transcendent divine intellect or mind (nous). This intellect and its object of thought, as multiple, presuppose in turn a first principle, the "One," which as prior to ("beyond") being (the Forms) and intellect transcends the knowable and the speakable; at the same time it must also be that from which all else, in descending hierarchical order (nous, psyche, material world), must derive its existence, each level existing from and in orientation (epistrophe) to the level above it.

The lowest level, matter, although ultimately derived from the One, as that which receives form, must remain impassible and is therefore absolute evil, according to Plotinos. It also gives rise to moral evil in souls that become engrossed in the material world and forget their original nature and mission as a progression outward from the realm of divine intellect as expression of the perfection and power of the One. Man's happiness depends on orientation toward and a return (ascent) to the One; PHILOSOPHY is the method required for achieving this "assimilation to God" (Plato, Theaetetus 176b). This flight from the world is balanced, however, by a desire to communicate perfection and reform the lesser, a desire that can show itself in political as well as personal life.

Plotinos's pupil Porphyry did much to publicize this philosophy and also to antagonize Christian leaders (on the difficult relations between Neoplatonism and Christianity, see PHILOSOPHY). Porphyry's pupil Iamblichos founded a school in Syria that influenced Emp. Julian and stimulated a revival of Platonism at Athens, the principal figures of which were Syrianos, Proklos, Damaskios, and Simplicios. Proklos's pupil Ammonios became head of the Neoplatonic school at Alexandria, with which were associated Asklepios, John Philoponus, Olympiodorus of Alexandria, Elias of Alexandria, David the Philosopher, and

Stephen of Alexandria. The Neoplatonic schools developed Plotinus's philosophy in various ways, integrating much of Aristotle’s logic, physics, and ethics in the curriculum, elaborating and modifying Plotinus’s metaphysics and “harmonizing” it with the revelations of the Chaldean Oracles (which included theurgical rites) of the Egyptians, Orphics, Homer, and Hesiod. In 529 Justinian I severely curtailed the activity of the Academy of Athens and provoked a temporary exile of seven philosophers at the court of Chosroes I in Persia. The school at Alexandria continued, however, possibly thanks to some cooperation with church authorities. Besides determining the form in which philosophy (and in particular logic) was taught in the earlier part of the Byz. period, as exemplified by Maximos the Confessor and John of Damascus, Neoplatonism was later revived as a philosophy by Michael Psellos and by Plethon.


-D.O’M.

NEREIDS, sea nymphs, daughters of the sea god Nereus, one of whom was Thetis, mother of Achilles. They are often mentioned in late Roman epic: thus, Quintus of Smyrna (3:662) speaks of the “deathless Nereids” and frequently alludes to Thetis and other Nereids plunging into the depths of the sea. Nonnus of Panopolis calls Ino “a Nereid who has charge of untumultuous calm” (Dionysiaka 10:124–25), alluding to the nymphs’ function as helpers at sea. Elsewhere he describes a Nereid seated upon a dolphin and paddling with her wet hand (Dionysiaka 1:72–75) or a Nereid in long flowing robes who drives unbridled the bull of Zeus, which walks upon the waters (1:101–03). In Byz. hagiography the function of helping at sea was transferred from Nereids to plain dolphins, as, for example, in the vita of Basil the Younger.

In modern Greek folklore, Nereids have assumed an important role, and their name is linked to the vernacular nere, “fresh water.” In contrast to “bodiless” angels Nereids are imagined in corporeal form, working mischief upon men, women, and children. Byz. sources reveal neither the date nor the manner of this transformation of Nereids into water demons.

Lit. Lawson, Folklore 130–46. -A.K.

NEREZI, site in Macedonia of the Church of St. Panteleemon. According to an inscription over the entrance, the church was founded in 1164 by Alexios Komnenos, son of Theodora Porphyrogennete and scion of the Angelos family (Ostrogorsky, Byz. Geschichte 166–82). The building, constructed of irregularly cut stone and brick laid in thick mortar beds, has a domed cruciform core. Arches, vaults, and ornamental details are realized in brick. The corner bays to the west are separate chapels opening from the narthex; those to the east function as pastophoria. Frescoes of the original foundation were discovered on the walls of the church when it was cleaned in 1923. Included among the scenes from the cycle of the Passion of Christ is one of the earliest examples of the Threnos in monumental painting. In the narthex and narthex chapels are sequences of hagiographical illustration. The expressive temperament of the frescoes, like those at Kurbinovo and Kastoria, is characteristic of Macedonian monumental painting in the later 12th C.


NERSÉS. See also Nares.

NERSÉS I THE GREAT, saint, great-great-grandson of Gregory the Illuminator, and hereditary patriarch of Armenia (353?–373?). Nersés was a dominant figure in the history of the Armenian Church, though the precise dates of his pontificate are still debated. Consecrated at Caesarea in Cappadocia, as were most of his predecessors, Nersés may have been known to his contemporary, St. Basil the Great, with whom he is occasionally confused in Armenian sources. The council called by him at Aštšat (ca.354) introduced a number of Byz. usages into the Armenian church. Nersés is particularly renowned for his many charitable foundations possibly influenced by those of Eustathios of Sebaste. Nersés probably headed the embassy sent to negotiate a peace
between the Persians and Byz. in 358, but his opposition to the arianizing policy of Constantius II and of the Armenian kings led to a long exile from ca.359 and his eventual murder. The tradition that he was present at the First Council of Constantinople (381) is clearly apocryphal. The refusal of Caesarea to consecrate the successor of Nersès presumably broke the link between it and the Armenian church.

LIT. Garsóan, Armenia, pts. V–VII. —N.G.G.

NERSÉS OF LAMBRON, Armenian churchman, author, and translator; born 1153 at Lambron in the western Taurus, died Cilicia 1198. Son of the lord of Lambron and a member of the Het’umid family, at age 22 he became Armenian archbishop of Tarsos. He was important in the ecclesiastical and political life of Armenian Cilicia, and promoted friendly relations with the Greeks and Crusader states. The Oration he delivered at the Synod of Hrom-klay (the patriarchal see) in 1179 reflects this irenic spirit. In 1190 Prince Leo II/I Rubenid sent him to meet Frederick I Barbarossa, but the emperor had drowned before Nersès reached Seleukeia, and his heir, Henry VI, was reluctant to crown Leo. Alexios III Angelos, anxious to prevent an Armenian entente with the Latins, promised the crown to Leo, and in 1197 Nersès traveled to Constantinople for preliminary negotiations but was disillusioned by the Byz. A scholar and literary figure, he sought out texts as yet unavailable in Armenian, notably in the Greek and Latin monasteries on the Black Mountain. His translations include the Benedictine Rule, the Syro-Roman Lawbook, and a version of the Revelation of John. His more noteworthy original compositions include commentaries on the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, 12 Minor Prophets, the liturgy; an elegy on NERSÉS ŠNORHALI; letters; and homilies.


NERSÉS ŠNORHALI (“gracious”) or Klayec’i (“from Hrom-klay,” the patriarchal see in Armenian Cilicia); born Covk’ (near mod. Elazig) 1102, died Hrom-klay 15 Aug. 1173. A member of the Pahlavuni family, he was a brother of the katholikos Gregory III (1113–66) and himself became katholikos (1166–73).
In 1165 Nersès initiated discussions with the protostrator Alexios Axouch, concerning union of the Greek and Armenian churches. The exchange of views between Cilicia and Constantinople was continued on the Greek side by Theorianos, and after Nersès’s death by his nephew Gregory Tzav on the Armenian side, but eventually came to nothing.

Nersès is esp. renowned for his religious poetry. His longer works include Lament on the Fall of Edessa (to Zangi in 1144), Jesus the Son, and On Faith. His Encyclical Letter is ironic toward the Greek church, and his letters are important for their exposition of the Armenian theological tradition.


R.T.

NESEBUR. See Mesembria.

NESAAN (‘Auja al-Hafir in Israel), settlement in the Negev situated on a trade route between Gaza and Sinai; it was fortified and garrisoned (421–22?) with “very loyal Theodosians” by Theodosius II (?). An inscription records that another building was constructed there under Justinian I and Theodora. Churches were built there in the 5th and 6th C., and the excavators believe that the fort of Nessaan was converted to a monastery in 598–605. In 601/2 three more churches were built with the donations of various laymen whose names are inscribed on individual architectural elements. Excavators also found the Nessaan papyri, literary papyri, and several archives dating from the 6th to late 7th C.


-M.M.M.

NESAAN PAPYRI, Greek, Latin, and Arabic documents and literary material found in 1935–37 at Nessaan in the Negev, constituting one of the few papyri finds outside Egypt. Nessana was a Byz. military and ecclesiastical outpost, located on the trade and pilgrimage routes; the town remained prosperous until well after the Arab conquest. The papyri date from the early 6th to the late 7th C., although there is a gap ca.600–70. The documentary papyri come from the archives of the garrison, the noble families of church dignitaries, and the later Arab administration. They include contracts, accounts, receipts, requisitions, sales, loans, documents of family law, and ecclesiastical and private letters. The literary papyri comprise school texts including a bilingual Vergil glossary and Latin Aeneid codex, a legal text, and theological works including New Testament books, the “Abgar letter,” hagiography, homilies, and catechetical writings. Presumably they were studied in the monastic school at Nessaan. As a whole the Nessana papyri illustrate the flourishing of a Byz. Palestinian town and its decline in later Umayyad times.
NESTONGOS (Νεστόγγος), a family of probably Bulgarian origin that entered Byz. service after 1018. Some seals of 11th- and 12-C. Nestongoi are known, including the nun Xene (Laurent, Corpus 5.3, no.2014). The family is also mentioned in the typikon of the PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY in Constantinople. Although they were related to JOHN III VATATZES, two of them conspired against the emperor: Andronikos escaped to the Turks, but his brother Isaac was arrested, blinded, and mutilated. However, the Nestongoi retained prominence: Theodore II reportedly planned to make George Nestongos his son-in-law.

Under the Palaiologoi the Nestongoi held important posts and possessed much landed property. The family intermarried with the DOUKAI; many of its notable members bore the combined name of Doukas Nestongos, such as Alexios (governor of Thessalonike and pin kernes in 1267), Constantine (parakoimomenos tes megales sphendones and governor of Nyssa ca.1280–84), a megas he taieriarches (first name unknown) and primikierios tes aules in 1304, Roger de Flor’s enemy. Another Doukas Nestongos served Stefan Uroš IV Dušan (Ostrogorsky, Serska oblast 98). Several other Nestongoi are known, from Michael (a relative of Michael VIII, protosebastos and great enemy of the ARSENITES) to Laskaris Nestongos (an official in 1385). Eudokia Nestongonissa, the wife or widow of a megas papias, appeared in 1315 as an aunt of Andronikos II. The hymnographer Nestegon, who composed an office on PALAMAS, may have belonged to the family.

NESTORIANISM (Νεστοριασμός—THEODORE LECTOR, HE 111.1), theological doctrine developed in the first half of the 5th C. by Nestorios (who gave the name to the movement), supported by DIOCELOTUS OF TARSOS and THEODORE OF MOPSUETIA. Nestorianism was directed against the partisans of APOLLINARIS of Laodikeia; the Nestorians also considered Cyril of Alexandria as an Apollinarist, and probably the most dangerous one. While the Monophysites (see MONOPHYSITIS) emphasized the union of two natures in Christ, a union in which the human nature seemed to have been engulfed by the divine physsis, the Nestorians underscored the human principle in Christology. Although they repeatedly asserted (and to some extent believed in) their adherence to “the Orthodoxy of Pope Leo the Great and Patr. Flavian,” they preferred the term synaphea (conjunction) to the Orthodox henoosis (unity) to designate the relationship between the two natures in Christ; they denied the hypostatic unity of Christ, accepting only the prosopic unity—two hypostases in one prosopon; they rejected the epi-
that Theotokos for the Virgin, replacing it with Christotokos, the mother of Christ.

Opponents accused the Nestorians of acknowledging the existence of two distinct Sons of God—a charge that they jealously denied—but they evidently put more stress on Christ's humanity than did the Chalcedonians. Accordingly they paid greater attention to the problems of will and ethics in their soteriology, which resembled Pelagianism; man's active role in overcoming his sinfulness was so striking in Nestorian belief that their opponents ascribed to them the view that Christ did not lack the capacity to sin but liberated himself by the effort of his will.

Defeated and condemned at the Council of Ephesus in 431, the Nestorian bishops rejected the alliance concluded by Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch in Apr. 433 and the election of Attakos to the see of Constantinople; they established a separate church, which received its form and its name at the Synod of Seleukeia-Ctesiphon in 486 (W.F. Macomber, OrChrP 24 (1958) 142–54). The Nestorian church gained a firm foothold in Persia and in some regions of Syria and spread its influence to northern Arabia and eastward to India, Central Asia, and China; it probably was popular among merchant communities in the Persian and later the Arab world and beyond. Their main theological schools were active in Seleukeia and Nisibis. The Nestorian synod of 612 formulated a doctrine incompatible with the tenets of Chalcedon, since it accepted two hypostases in Christ but a single prosopon and rejected the term Theotokos. The theologians of Nestorianism developed the concept of seven sacraments but did not include marriage in this number; they did consider the "sign of the cross," however, as a sacrament.


A.K.

NESTORIOS (Νεστορίως), bishop of Constantinople (10 Apr. 428–22 June 431); born Germanikeia ca.381, died Egypt after 451. Nestorios entered the monastery of St. Euprepios at Antioch and may have studied with Theodore of Mopsuestia. In Antioch he earned a reputation as an orator and was summoned by Emp. Theodosios II to Constantinople. There he acted as a rigorous moralist, preaching against games and theaters; in his criticisms he offended Pulcheria. He showed himself to be a fierce opponent of Arians and Novatians but supported Pelagian bishops deposited in Italy. The major controversy incited by Nestorios resulted from his objection to the term Theotokos for the Virgin: he pointed out the difficulty in accepting the idea that Mary gave birth to God, but he was opposed by Cyril of Alexandria and Pope Celestine, who stressed soteriological concerns rather than exactness of philosophical definition (H.J. Vogt in Konzil und Papst [Munich-Paderborn-Vienna 1975] 97). The Council of Ephesus in 431 condemned both sides, trying in vain to suppress the controversy, stimulating instead the movements of Nestorianism and Monophysitism. Nestorios was exiled to his monastery at Antioch, then to Petra, and finally to the Oasis in Upper Egypt. Before his death he accepted the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon.

Sokrates (Skr. HE 7.92) asserted that Nestorios only appeared to be eloquent and educated but that he did not understand "the ancients." In general, Nestorios was a victim of his Monophysite and Orthodox adversaries and his works were destroyed within the empire; only a Syriac translation of his Bazaar of Herakleides and some fragments (in Greek, etc.) exist, although Gennadius of Marseille Believed many of his writings. Whether Nestorios was essentially Orthodox (M.V. Anastos, DOP 16 (1962) 117–39) or not (G. Jouassard, RHE 74 (1979) 346–48) is still under dispute.


T.E.G.

NESTOR OF THESALONIKE, saint executed by Maximian in Thessalonike; feast day 26 or 27 (Synax.CP 167) Oct. According to a legend in-
included in the passio of St. Demetrios of Thessalonike. Nestor, a Christian youth, killed in single combat Lyaios, Maximian’s favorite, with the help of the “god of Demetrios,” thus infuriating the emperor and causing his and Demetrios’s execution. Strangely enough, Nestor plays an active part in the early passio of Demetrios, whereas Demetrios himself is restricted to a passive role. The Synaxarion of Constantinople (Synax.CP 1671) and the Menologion of Basil II (PG 117:129AB) include short notices on Nestor. Some enkomia (e.g. by Joseph of Thessalonike [762–852]) on Nestor are preserved.

Representation in Art. Nestor’s association with Demetrios (his feast is independent but celebrated on the same day) means that his portrait is sometimes included when only that of Demetrios is actually warranted (e.g., menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes, Vienna, ÖNB hist. gr. 6, fol. 3v). A depiction of his beheading accompanies his notice in the Menologion of Basil II (p.141 of facs. ed.), while other episodes of his life, such as his murder of Lyaios, are illustrated in Demetrios cycles. Nestor, a young man with somewhat unruly dark hair, is reckoned one of the military saints, and dressed accordingly.


—A.K., N.P.S.

NEUMATA (νεύματα, sing. νεύμα), graphic symbols (see Notation) representing one or more musical notes attached to sacred words. The use of signs to designate melodic movement for Byz. liturgical texts may be traced back at least to the 9th C. The ekphthetic signs, those in lectionaries, are used sparingly, usually at the beginnings and endings of sentences. They indicated the manner of recitation without specifying actual pitch or offering further details about the melodic contour.

Other neumatic signs evolved and developed in the 10th–15th C. Two stages may be distinguished: (1) neumata of the 10th–12th C., believed to originate in the prosodic signs or accents of the Alexandrian grammarians (recent scholarship has divided this stage into two types—the so-called Chartres notation using complex signs to stand for entire groups of notes and the so-called Coislin notation designating each melodic step by a separate sign); and (2) neumata of the 12th–15th C., in which each sign specifies the precise interval between one note and its neighbor. The neumata that move in steps are called somata (“bodies”) and those that leap are called pneumata (“spirits”).


—D.E.C.

NEW TESTAMENT (Καινή Διαθήκη), the second part of the Bible, consisting of the Gospels, Acts, the Epistles of Paul and other apostles (James, Peter, John, and Judas [the so-called catholic epistles]), and the Apocalypse attributed to John. The New Testament canon was formed during the 2nd–4th C. and its contents were finally established by Athanasios of Alexandria in his 39th Easter letter of 367; dispute concerning the canon (esp. Apocalypse) nonetheless persisted. The text of the New Testament was preserved primarily in parchment codices, either together with the Old Testament, as a separate book, in its separate parts (Gospel book, etc.), or in the form of the lectionary.

Church fathers understood the word diathèke to mean a covenant between God and his people. The old covenant established by Moses culminated in the work of John the Baptist. Christ established a new covenant that passed from Israel to the “new Israel,” the Christian community. Thus the New Testament, without annulling Mosaic law, reflected a higher level of relation between God and man. John Chrysostom (PG 51:284–2–5) compared the Old Testament with a mother’s milk and elementary education, while the New Testament offered solid food and philosophy. In the words of Maximos the Confessor (PG 90:677CD), the Old Testament raised the body to the soul, thus impeding the mind’s descent to the body; the New Testament led the body to God, purifying it by fire.


—J.L., A.K.

NEW TESTAMENT ILLUSTRATION. New Testament imagery forms the basis of Byz. art as we know it. Within the New Testament, the Gospels predominate. The Apocalypse, accepted as
canonical only in the 14th C., never entered the liturgy, and its imagery was rarely exploited. The Epistles were illuminated at most with portraits of the various authors and an occasional scene from their lives. Acts had a coherent tradition of illustration, but this survives in only three Byz. cycles. Imagery from the Gospels was enriched by the apocrypha, not only the Protoevangelion of James, which narrated the early life of the Virgin, but also the 7th-C. homilies based on the Transitus Mariae (a group of texts on the Dormition of the Virgin) describing the Passion and Anastasis, the lives of those Apostles treated sparsely in Acts, and the apocalyptic texts associated with Peter and Ephrem the Syrian.

The most distinctive creation of Byz. New Testament illustration was the depiction of the Great Feasts, each one the image of an event designed to stand not only for the event itself but for the Church feast that—by celebrating it—made it perennially present. Fully developed by the 10th C., these images constituted a ready pool of stable, well-understood compositions available for use in countless contexts. The feasts are the staple of monumental painting; along with the single figure, they dominate icon painting; they appear on ivories and steatites used for private devotion; they adorn jewelry. They provide the most consistent body of material for illuminated MSS, accompanying the texts for each feast in liturgical books of all kinds, in homiletic compilations and in Gospel books, even though several of these images—notably the Anastasis for Easter—draw primarily on apocryphal texts. They signal the importance of the liturgy for the shaping of Byz. art.

First Period (4th–6th C.). Historically speaking, New Testament imagery is rooted in the pan-Mediterranean art of early Christianity and is inseparable from it. In Dura Europos no less than in Rome, New Testament imagery was at first limited to iconic scenes, primarily of the Miracles of Christ, that served along with Old Testament vignettes of salvation from death as signs of the saving power of the Christian faith. The triumph of the Church in the early 4th C. generated a wave of eschatological images analogous in their iconography to imperial triumphal art. These gave new focus to scriptural imagery, presenting Christ's life as a triumphant victory over death and a path to sovereignty. The ensuing century saw a radical expansion not only in subject matter, which now embraced both Gospels and Acts, but in physical setting, as a public, monumental art began to emerge. The eschatological themes moved up into apses and domes ("Tomb" of Galla Placidia in Ravenna; Rotunda of St. George and Hosios David in Thessalonike). The Gospel episodes were gathered into coherent cycles. First among these was the Infancy of Christ, followed by his Miracles; the Passion, still usually without the Crucifixion, developed by the early 6th C. in response to an emerging emphasis on the sacrificial as well as the triumphal aspect of Christ's humanity.

Second Period (6th–7th C.). In the eastern Mediterranean, ample material survives to allow focused study of 6th–7th-C. Byz. art. By this time, New Testament imagery was quite fully developed. With few exceptions, the thematic material of all subsequent compositions had been established; lengthy Gospel cycles already appeared in MSS and monumental painting. Narrative was not the primary function even of the lengthy cycles, however. Typology is overt—witness the prophets who accompany the scenes in the Sinope and Rossano Gospels; the scenes of the Infancy of Christ are amplified by apocryphal vignettes emphasizing the union of human and divine; at Sant'Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna, the cycles reflect both liturgical usage and Christological thought. The miniatures of the Rabbula Gospels, some simple and some richly interpretative, also reflect the multiplicity of levels on which this art is intended to function. Significant for the future in this respect are the compositions of Christ's Epiphanies found on the Monza and Bobbio Ampullae. Incorporating elements of the pilgrimage sites, they connoted the sites themselves; they also conveyed theological messages; above all, they stood for the theophanies represented—to see one was to see the event's divine meaning revealed. In several cases, they inaugurated imagery that would eventually become standard for the depiction of the Great Feasts.

Third Period (8th–12th C.). The quantity of surviving Eastern Christian material dwindles during the Arab expansion and Iconoclasm, and an extensive artistic tradition reasserts itself only in the later 9th C. The intervening centuries, labeled the era of Iconoclasm, produced a slow, fundamental realignment of Byz. that goes far beyond Iconoclasm itself. The Byz. culture that emerged was dominated intellectually by a small,
Constantinopolitans aristocracy; its art served the interests of the highly centralized church and state, whose patterns the provinces echoed. This centralization is reflected sharply in the 10th-C. codification of liturgical books and the attendant development of the powerful liturgical icons. A new, courtly composition of the Last Judgment emerged. Small, usually vaulted, private churches were in favor; the extensive Gospel cycles of the old, congregational churches, though retained in some cases, suited these interiors less well than condensed cycles; by the 11th C. one finds the "classic" system of condensed imagery: the hierarchic decoration based primarily on the feast icons. The plenitude of Early Christian Gospel and Acts imagery was, however, maintained in MSS that became a reservoir for the variations that constantly vitalized the classic system.

Throughout the arts, imagery focused ever more sharply on the life of Christ, esp. his human death in the Passion and its reenactment in the liturgy. The exegetic intellectuality of MSS like the Paris Gregory gave way to an expressive devotional imagery of strong personal appeal. This developed in conjunction with the affective amplification of Holy Week ceremonies in the liturgies of private monasteries. To the Passion cycle were added emotive extrabiblical scenes (Threnos, Man or Sorrows), and episodes in the Infancy of Christ were invested with poignant foreshadowings of his death. Mary acquired new prominence. This development must have taken place to a fair extent in MSS and above all in icon painting, which expanded in both numbers and iconography in the 12th C. Later 12th-C. monumental cycles also abandoned the classic repertoire of feast scenes in favor of more sacramental themes.

Fourth Period (13th–15th C.). Like Gothic art, the imagery of the Palaiologan period is visually detailed and intellectually intricate. Few of the images are actually new, though they are used in new contexts. Thus familiar scenes of the life of the Virgin now illustrate the Akathistos Hymn for the first time. The Akathistos appears more often in monumental painting than in MSS; this is not surprising, as the illuminated MS nearly vanished as a vehicle for New Testament imagery in the 14th and 15th C. Monumental painting, by contrast, displays cycles of unprecedented length and detail. These, again, draw largely on extant images, but assemble and amplify them. Long, coherent cycles develop around secondary themes like the ministry of John the Baptist, the trial of Christ, or the preparation for the Crucifixion; analogies such as that between Christ's descent into the humidity of the cave at birth, into the depths of the sea at Epiphany, and into the darkness of Hell at death are visualized more vividly; and typological parallels like the Prefigurations of the Virgin are developed with unprecedented fullness. Perhaps most distinctive in Palaiologan imagery is its use of allegory, as in the image of the Virgin Zoodochos Pege (see PEGE). Rare in Byz. art before the 14th C., allegory becomes a major Palaiologan contribution to post-Byz. iconography.


Nicæa (Nikaa, mod. Iznik), city in Bithynia. One of the greatest Byz. cities, capital of an empire in the 13th C., and seat of two ecumenical councils (see Nicæa, Councils of). Nicæa prospered from its location on major trade and military routes and its control of an extensive fertile territory. In late antiquity, it was a large, powerfully fortified city filled with civic and private buildings laid out on a regular plan. It was a major military base—site of the proclamation of Valens as emperor and of the revolt of Prokopios—and seat of an imperial treasury where tax revenues were deposited. Earthquakes in 363 and 368 combined with the growth of Constantinople provoked decline; many civic buildings fell into ruin, to be rebuilt by Justinian I. During these centuries, the church of Nicæa flourished: Valens made it a metropolis independent of its ancient rival NikomeDEIA; conflicts between the two sees flared at the Council of Chalcedon, originally planned to meet in Nicæa.

After a period of obscurity, Nicæa frequently appears in the 8th C. and later as a powerful fortress: in 715, it was the refuge for Emp. Anastasios II, and in 716 and 727 it resisted Arab attack; the city was a major bulwark on the highway that led to Constantinople. Damage from the siege of 727 was compounded by an earthquake in 740. Nicæa, base for the revolt of Artabasdos, became capital of Opsikion in the 8th C. In the 10th C., Nicæa was a center of administration and trade, with a Jewish community and an im-
perial xenodocheion. Rebels sought to control it as a strong point near Constantinople: Bardas Skleros, Isaac I Komnenos, Nikephoros III Botaneiates, and Nikephoros Melissenos all fought in and around Nicaea. When Melissenos joined Alexios I in the West in 1081, he left Nicaea to his Turkish allies, who soon assumed control. Nicaea was thus capital of the first Turkish state in Asia Minor until the First Crusade captured it in 1097 after a long siege, their first victory in Asia and the only time in history that Nicaea succumbed to direct assault rather than blockade. Alexios I took control of Nicaea from the reluctant Crusaders and defended it against the Turks. In 1147, Nicaea was the supply base for the abortive Second Crusade and in 1187 unsuccessfully revolted against Andronikos I.

After the fall of Constantinople in 1204, Nicaea at first took an independent position, but recognized Theodore I Laskaris in 1206; he was crowned there in 1208. From that date until 1261 Nicaea served as capital of the empire (see Byzantium, History of: Empire of Nicaea), although John III Vatatzes resided in Nymphaion and Magnesia; it was also the seat of the patriarch and home of many illustrious refugees, notably Niketas Choniates, Nicholas Mesarites, and Nikephoros Blemmydes. Laskarid Nicaea was the scene of frequent synods, embassies, and imperial weddings and funerals and became a center of education, notably under Theodore II Laskaris, who founded and endowed an imperial school. After the recapture of Constantinople, Nicaea declined in importance and prosperity. Neglect of the eastern frontier provoked a serious revolt in the region in 1262, and in 1265 the whole city panicked on rumor of a Mongol attack. In 1290 Andronikos II arrived on a tour of inspection and restored the walls, but the region remained defenseless against a new foe, Osman. Nicaea held out until 1331, when it fell to the Ottomans after a long blockade. When Gregory Palamas visited Nicaea in 1354, its Christian population was severely depleted.

The well-preserved walls of Nicaea, completed in 270, manifest numerous styles of construction representing constant rebuilding, notably in the 8th, 9th, 12th, and 13th C. Originally a single rampart 5 km long with 80 towers, built of rubble and brick, the walls were raised and strengthened before being transformed by John III, who added an outer wall and a moat. The most noted of Nicaea's churches was the monastery of Hyakinthos, known in modern times as the Church of the Dormition. A rectangular structure with a cruciform nave surmounted by a dome on massive pillars and separated from the aisles by arcades, it manifests affinities with a group of cross-domed basilicas and appears to date to the late 6th C. The church was decorated with mosaics whose images, replaced by the Iconoclasts, were restored after 843. It was rebuilt and redecorated after the earthquake of 1065 and stood until 1924. The surviving basilica of Hagia Sophia in the center of the city, probably site of the council of 787, preserves traces of its elaborate marble decoration. Most renowned in the 13th C. was the Church of St. Tryphon, scene of a miracle in which lilies bloomed out of season on the annual festival of the saint, Nicaea's patron. The recently discovered ruins of the church are no longer in evidence. Surviving remains of two other 15th-C. churches have not been identified. Civic buildings have not been preserved, with the exception of the Roman theater, abandoned and used as a quarry and dump after the 7th C. The 15th-C. city is known in some detail, from the enkomia of Theodore Laskaris, delivered before John III ca.1250, and of Theodore Metochites, addressed to Andronikos II in 1290. Although the speeches are filled with extravagant rhetoric, they give an image of the city in its regional context and show that churches, monasteries, charitable institutions, palaces, and houses shared the area within the walls with extensive open spaces.


NICAEA, COUNCILS OF. Two ecumenical councils were convened in Nicaea.

Nicaea I. The first ecumenical council (20 May or 19 June—ca.25 Aug. 325) was convened by Emp. Constantine I to deal with the controversy
over Arianism. No account of its proceedings survives except a list of 20 canons issued by the council, its creed, and a synodal letter excommunicating Arius. The exact number of bishops in attendance is unknown. Various authors give figures between 200 and 300, while church tradition fixes the number at 318 (E. Honigmann, Byzantion 11 [1936] 429–49; idem, Byzantion 20 [1950] 63–71). The council’s creed—probably a revision of the baptismal formula used in Jerusalem—was the first dogmatic definition of the church to have more than local authority. Rejecting Arius’s ontological subordination of the Son to the Father, the council defined the incarnate Logos as consubstantial or homoousios with the Father. This definition’s implication is vital: for Christ were not fully divine, as Arianism proclaimed, then man could not hope to share in divine life or salvation. Even so, the nonscriptural homoousios clause adopted by the council was to cause doctrinal disunity down to 381. The council also dealt with the computation of Easter by ordering its celebration on the Sunday after the full moon following the vernal equinox. Finally, among its disciplinary regulations, canon 6 is important for its recognition of the jurisdiction of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. This canon, in effect, marks the origin of the patriarchates.


Nicaea II. Under the patronage of Empress Irene and the presidency of Patriarch Tarasios, this council (24 Sept.–13 Oct. 787) of 350 bishops, including two papal legates, brought to an end the first period of Iconoclasm. Irene’s plan to reverse her predecessor’s policy, however, was momentarily thwarted when soldiers sympathetic to Iconoclasm dissolved its first meeting in Constantinople (31 July 786). Only in the following year (24 Sept.) did the council meet again, this time in Nicaea, where all sessions took place, except its eighth and last formal session held in Constantinople in the Magnaura palace. Its dogmatic decree condemned the “pseudo-council” of Hieria (754) and formally defined the degree of veneration due to images. Its justification of the cult was based, above all, on the reality of Christ’s historic incarnation: the visible and paintable incarnate Christ permitted and, indeed, required pictorial representation. The council carefully distinguished between legitimate veneration due to icons (proskynesis) and absolute worship (latria) due to God (Mansi 13:377–82. The latter, if directed to images, was declared unlawful, a form of idolatry. Indeed, even in the case of proskynesis, the true object of honor was never the image, but that which was depicted. Unlike Pope Hadrian I, who approved the council, Charlemagne, for ulterior political motives (though the faulty Latin translation of the Acta did not help), had it condemned at Frankfurt in 794. Final approval by the West was given in 880. The council is the seventh and last ecumenical council to be recognized as such by the Byz. church.


NICAEA SCHOOL OF MANUSCRIPTS. See Decorative Style.

NICANDER. See Nikander.

NICCOLÒ DA MARTONI, a notary from Campania, the author of Latin memoirs recounting his trip to Jerusalem (June 1394–May 1395). His description is precise and full of personal observations, although his accounts of historical events are sometimes confused. Niccolò visited Cyprus, islands in the Aegean Sea, Alexandria, Mt. Sinai, Jerusalem, Athens, Corinth, Patras, Corfu, and other locales. He describes trade, the quality of wine, ancient monuments (e.g., the Acropolis of Athens), churches, relics, feasts, and legends.

ED. L. Le Grand, ”Relation du pèlerinage à Jérusalem de Nicolas de Martoni,” *ROL* 3 (1895) 566–669.


—A.K.
NICHOLAS (Νικόλαος), personal name. Known in Greek antiquity, the etymology is evidently "victorious people" or "victorious with the people," but in the Roman period the word was used to designate a variety of date sent from Syria, allegedly by Nicholas of Damascus, to Emp. Augustus (Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai, bk.14:652a). The name was infrequently used in the secular milieu of the 5th C. (PLRE 2:789), one of the few examples being the rhetorician Nicholas of Myra. It was more popular with the clergy, esp. in Lycia of the 5th and 6th C. (W. Enslin, RE 17 [1937] 360f). Prokopios (Buildings 1.6.4) mentions a church of Priskos and Nicholas in Constantinople, but not a single man of this name. Nicholas does not appear in Malalas either, but Theophanes the Confessor has three: the saint of Myra, a former deacon, and a "heretical" hermit. After the 9th C. the frequency increased: Skylitzes has 13 Nicholas, Anna Komnene six, and in acts Nicholas are even more numerous. In Lauda, vol. 1 (10th–12th C.), Nicholas (42) are second only to John and in Lauda, vols. 2–3 (13th–15th C.), they hold fourth place, ahead of Michael and Theodore. No emperor bore the name, but four patriarchs between the 10th and mid-12th C. were called Nicholas.

NICHOLAS I, pope (from 24 Apr. 858) and saint; born between 819 and 822, died Rome 13 Nov. 867; feastday 13 Nov. He was born to a noble Roman family. As pontiff, Nicholas resolved to establish papal primacy over secular and ecclesiastical power in both the West and East. As his ideological vehicle Nicholas used the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and effectively exploited political crises in Lorraine, France, Italy, and Byz. In 861 Nicholas managed to depose John of Ravenna (H. Fuhrmann, ZSavKan 75 [1958] 353–58). The conflict between the Byz. patriarchs Ignatios and Photios gave the pope an excuse to interfere in the internal struggles of the Byz. church. Nicholas sent Zacharias of Anagni and Radoald of Porto to Constantinople to investigate the matter; at the Council of 861 in Constantinople they sided with Photios but failed to secure the return of Sicily, Calabria, and Illyricum to Roman jurisdiction. In 863 Nicholas changed his policy, accused Radoald and Zacharias of exceeding their authority, and proclaimed that Photios was uncanonically elected. In its turn, the Council of 867 at Constantinople deposed the pope. Nicholas attempted to take advantage of the success of Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios in Moravia and invited them to Rome. Nicholas also tried to attract the support of Boris I of Bulgaria; Anastasius Bibliothecarius was the pope's staunchest supporter, although it is questionable to what extent he dictated Nicholas's policy. Evaluations of Nicholas range from an enthusiastic panegyric (J. Roy) to the debunking of his policy as a complete failure (J. Haller).


NICHOLAS I MYSTIKOS, patriarch of Constantinople (1 Mar. 901–1 Feb. 907, and May 912–May 925); born Italy 852, died 15 May 925. A friend of Photios, Nicholas fell into disfavor after Photios's dismissal in 886 and sought refuge in the monastery of St. Tryphon, near Chalcedon. Leo VI, his former schoolmate, brought him out of the monastery, appointed him mystikos, and eventually made him patriarch. Soon, however, Nicholas proved recalcitrant: he opposed the tragicomy of Leo and supported the rebel Andronikos Doukas. Replaced by Euthymios as patriarch, Nicholas was exiled to his own monastery of Galakrenai, near Constantinople, but later returned to the patriarchal throne, probably before Leo's death on 11 May 912. Regent after Alexander died in 913, he parted company with the Doukai and after some vacillation sided with Romanos I. Nicholas's restoration as patriarch incited a fierce struggle within the church between his supporters and those of the deposed Euthymios; reconciliation was finally achieved in 920, with the Tomos of Union.

Nicholas's correspondence is a first-rate source for the history of ecclesiastical affairs and of Byz. relations with southern Italy, with Bulgaria under Symeon of Bulgaria, and with the Caucasus region. Nicholas also wrote several canonical works and a very conventional homily on the capture of Thessalonike by the Arabs in 904. Like Photios, Nicholas was a man of critical mind who dared to reject the authority of Old Testament quotations (ep.32.459–64) and to limit the Byz. principle that
the emperor is an unwritten law (ep.32.89–92;304–05). But he lacked originality in his theology and ethics, stressing the traditional view of the instability of the world and praising traditional values such as righteousness, moderation, and caution.


-A.K.

NICHOLAS III (Giovanni Gaetano Orsini), pope (from 25 Nov. 1277); born Rome ca.1215 (according to R. Sternfeld, Der Kardinal Johann Gaetan Orsini [Berlin 1905] 315f), died Sorano 22 Aug. 1280. CHARLES I OF ANJOU was the major threat to the security of papal territory, and Nicholas dealt with him circumspectly. Accordingly, he pursued a cautious policy toward Emp. Michael VIII; thus he refused to excommunicate the allies of Charles in Thessaly and Epirus, but at the same time prevented Charles from attacking Constantinople. After receiving the embassy that the emperor had sent to Nicholas's predecessor John XXI (1276–77), the pope gave the envoys several letters addressed to Michael, his son Andronikos (II), and Patr. John XI Bekkos. While praising the Byz. for accepting union at the Council of Lyons in 1274, Nicholas imposed new requirements; he insisted on a truce between Byz. and Charles. The orders dictated to the pope's muntii were even harsher—Nicholas was very negative toward the Byz. position of maintaining the Greek rite. Runciman argues that Michael made an agreement with Peter III of Aragon (1276–1285) against Charles and bribed Nicholas to join this alliance. Anti-Union resistance in Byz. grew, but Michael dispatched a new mission to Rome to continue negotiations; when the envoys arrived, however, Nicholas was already dead.


NICHOLAS III GRAMMATIKOS, patriarch of Constantinople (Aug. 1084—Apr./May 1111); died Constantinople. According to an unpublished enkomion by Nicholas Mouzalon, Nicholas Grammatikos was educated in Constantinople and lived in Pisdian Antioch (where he probably took the monastic habit). He left this city ca.1068 when it was endangered by Turkish raids (J. Darrouzès, TM 6 [1976] 163, n.4). In Constantinople he founded the monastery dedicated to John the Baptist and called tou Lophou (Janin, Églises CP 418f). After several years Alexios I chose him to replace the deposed patriarch Eustathios Garidas (1081–84). Nicholas inherited several difficult problems: he sided with the emperor in the case of Leo of Chalcidon and in the struggle against heretics, esp. the Bogomils, but he was more cautious in the conflict between provincial metropolitans and the central administration (Darrouzès, Offkia 53f, 65). Despite the vehement opposition of the clergy of Hagia Sophia, he supported Niketas of Ankyra against the emperor's right to promote metropolitans and he tried to restrict the influence of the chartophylax. Nicholas was also concerned about ecclesiastical discipline: he ordered the eviction of the VLACHS from Mt. Athos and dealt diligently with the regulation of fasting (J. Koder, JOB 19 [1970] 203–41).

The political situation prompted Nicholas to seek a union with Pope Urban II. V. Grumel (EO 38 [1939] 104–17), however, ascribed to Nicholas a letter addressed to Symeon II of Jerusalem in ca.1089, in which the patriarch refuted the Latin views concerning the filioque, azymes, and primacy. On the contrary, J. Darrouzès (REB 23 [1965] 43–51) considers it a fake as well as the letter devoted primarily to disciplinary differences such as marriage of priests, fasting on Sunday, portable altars with relics, etc. (J. Darrouzès, REB 28 [1970] 221–37).

Some images previously identified as representing Theodore of Studios may depict Nicholas.


-A.K., A.C.

NICHOLAS IV MOUZALON, patriarch of Constantinople (Dec. 1147–March/April 1151), born ca.1070, died 1152. A member of the Mouzalon
family, Nicholas probably began his career as dī-
daskalos of the Gospels (BASILAKES, Orationes 79.16–
19). Alexios I sent him to Cyprus as archbishop but in ca. 1110 Nicholas abdicated. He spent 37
years in the Kosmidion monastery (see KOSMAS
AND DAMIANOS, MONASTERY OF SAINTS). Nicholas
addressed to Alexios I a treatise on the Procession
of the Holy Spirit (Zeses, infra 309–29) in which he
refuted the concept of the FILIOQUE. Nicholas’s
election as patriarch aroused a fierce dispute about
the canonical validity of occupying a second see
after resigning a first. Basilakes (not an anonymous
rhetorician—as Zeses asserts, p.238) and
NICHOLAS OF METHONE defended Nicholas’s elec-
tion, whereas ZONARAS opposed it. Faced to re-
tire from the see of Constantinople, Nicholas died
soon thereafter. As patriarch Nicholas succeeded
Kosmas II (1146–47), who was involved in (or
accused of) BOGOMILISM, and tried to suppress
popular influence on ecclesiastical culture, e.g.,
he ordered the burning of the vita of PARASKEVE
OF EPIBATAI. Although in principle he supported
the strict prohibition of marriages between close
relatives, Nicholas was lenient with regard to arist-
tocratic families (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.1029). Be-
sides theological works he wrote a poetic defense of
his abdication from the see of Cyprus that con-
tains vivid pictures of both his journey to Cy-
prus and the tragic situation on the island.

ED. S. Doamidou, “He paraítesis Nikolaou tou Mouza-
lonos apo tes archiepiskopes Kyprou,” Hellenika 7 (1934)
109–50 (cf. E. Pezopoulos, EEBS 11 [1935] 421f.; P. Maas,

LIT. RegPatr, fasc. 3, nos. 1027–35. Th.N. Zeses, “Ho
patriarches Nikolaos IV Mouzalon,” EEThSPTh 23 (1978)
233–330.

NICHOLAS V (Tommaso Parentucelli), pope (from 6 Mar. 1447); born Sarzana 15 Nov. 1397,
died Rome 24 Mar. 1455. The conquest of Con-
stantinople by the Turks occurred during his ponti-
ticate, and some of his contemporaries (e.g.,
Enea Silvio Piccolomini, the future Pope Pius II)
accused Nicholas of insensitivity toward the fate
of the Eastern Christians and the mighty strong-
hold on the Bosporos. The pope’s position was
determined by several factors: his involvement in
a war in Italy, the indifference of European rulers,
and a general perception of the Greeks as schismaticos. The last Greek mission, headed by
Manuel Angelos Palaiologos, arrived in Venice in
Nov. 1452. In response, Nicholas wrote to Con-
stantine XI on 29 Jan. 1453 stating that aid was
conditional on Byz. acceptance of UNION OF THE
CHURCHES (W. Deeters, QFI/ArCh 48 [1968] 365–
68). The papacy did, however, make certain ges-
tures: in May 1453 Nicholas dispatched ISIDORE
OF KIEV to Constantinople with 200 men; on 28
Apr. 1453 the pope appointed Jacopo Veniero
commander of a fleet intended to rescue the be-
sieged Constantinople. The ships had not yet left
Venice, however, when Constantinople fell. The
negotiations about organizing an expedition against
the Turks continued, but the majority of Euro-
pean princes ignored the summonses occasionally
issued by the pope or the German emperor. A
Renaissance pope, Nicholas collected many Greek
MSS and supported Greek scholars who had im-
migrated to Italy.

LIT. K. Pleyer, Die Politik Nikolaus V. (Stuttgart 1927). C.
Marinescu, “Le pape Nicholas V (1447–1455) et son atti-
tude envers l’Empire byzantin,” 4 CEB (Sofia 1953) 331–
42. R. Guillard, “Les appels de Constantin XI Paleologue
à Rome et à Venise pour sauver Constantinople (1452–
1453),” BS 14 (1953) 226–44.

NICHOLAS OF ANDIDA (in Pamphylia; Beck
[Kirche 645] suggested Sandida), late 11th-C. theo-
logian. He wrote a treatise on AZYMES probably
as a result of a dispute he had had with the Latins
on Rhodes (ca.1095–1099?). He also wrote a li-
turgical work, Protheoria, a shorter version of which
is preserved under the name of Theodore of
Andida. In the Protheoria Nicholas constantly re-
ferred to the liturgical usage of Hagia Sophia in
Constantinople, which he tried to imitate in his
diocese. Interpreting the liturgy symbolically, he
wanted to see in it the representation not only of
the passion, death, and resurrection of Christ but
also of all the acts of his life, both public and
private. Nicholas also insisted on the polyvalence
of liturgical ceremonies, each of which, according
to Nicholas, could signify two or three different
facts. A short verse summary of the Protheoria is
attributed in several MSS to PSELLOS (P. Joannou,
BZ 51 [1958] 3–9); Darrouzès, however, questions
this attribution.


LIT. R. Bornert, Les commentaires byzantins de la divine
Darrouzès, REB 25 (1967) 286.

-A.K.
NICHOLAS OF KERKYRA, writer, metropolitan of Kerkyra; fl. ca.1100. He was a participant in the council of 1117 concerning Eustatios of Nicæa. Nicholas wrote a lengthy commentary on Maximos the Confessor, with a verse prologue. His letter of abdication (a genre developed by Patr. Nicholas IV) presents the author as an honest man in a rotten world whose only hope is life in a desert. In enigmatic lines (p.33.76–78) Nicholas contrasts himself, an objective writer, with “the daughter of the emperor,” who praises everything; did he mean Anna Komnene? Nicholas describes human nature bitterly, dwelling particularly on the perfidy of a false friend (p.37.202–03). Lampros identified Nicholas with the anonymous bishop of Kerkyra to whom Theophylaktos of Ohrid addressed two letters; these, dated in 1105–08, describe military and domestic difficulties in the Balkans.

ED. S. Lampros, Kerkyraïka anekdota (Athens 1882) 23–41.
LIT. P. Gautier in Théophylacte d’Achrida, Lettres (Thessalonike 1986) 88–90. —A.K.

NICHOLAS OF METHONE, theologian, bishop of Methone (from ca.1150); born early 12th C., died between 1160 and 1166. His life remains obscure. As panegyrist of Manuel I, Nicholas consistently developed the concept of unity of state and church; not only a victorious general in the east, north, west, and at sea (Logoi dyo, p.6.7–8), but a benefactor of the church as well (p.45.17–20), Manuel himself resembled vigilant saints (p.43.17–20). Nicholas dreamed that Manuel would unite the Western and Byz. churches (p.8.23–27). Unity within the church was Nicholas’s focal concern. He criticized the Bogomils and strictly opposed the transfer of Nicholas IV from the see of Cyprus to Constantinople. Nicholas fought for the perception of the unity of God: he polemized against the filioque, fearing it would lead to denigration of the Second Person of the Trinity, and he emphasized the equality of the Holy Spirit with regard to the divine essence. He rejected the innovations of Soterichos Panteugenos. Stressing the unity of Christ in the act of the Eucharist, Nicholas reproached Soterichos for raising the dispute at a time of danger from barbarians (p.44.1–4,70–72). Nicholas opposed Neoplatonist philosophy; in his refutation of Proklos (J. Draseke unjustifiably questioned Nicholas’s authorship of this work—BZ 6 [1897] 55–91), his method of argumentation was an appeal to the Fathers rather than logic. Optimistic despite all the dangers, Nicholas believed that “our time” could produce genuine piety and dedicated a vita to a contemporary saint, Meletios the Younger.


NICHOLAS OF MYRA, legendary saint; feastday 6 Dec. His cult is mentioned several times in the vita of Nicholas of Sion, who lived near Myra (chs. 8.9. 57.25–26. 76.1–2); the latter’s death is conventionally dated to 10 Dec. 564, even though MSS give different and inconsistent dates. Many of Nicholas’s miracles are the subject of separate stories: for example, On the Three Stratelatai (or stratopedarchai), which was cited already by the priest Eustatios of Constantinople at the end of the 6th C.; and On the tax, in which the administrative and fiscal terminology (chrysobull, sympathia, protonotarios, chartoularios) that is used indicates probably a date of composition in the 9th or 10th C. Sometimes legends about Nicholas’s miracles are combined in groups, as the so-called Three Miracles. Some stories link Nicholas with Constantine I the Great, thus placing the saint’s activity around 300: he appeared to Constantine in a vision and convinced him to release three stratelatai who had been falsely accused of treason and sentenced to death; he visited Constantine on behalf of Myra and received from the emperor a chrysobull exempting the city from taxation (A. Kazhdan in Aphtheroma Svoronos 1:135–38). One of the Three Miracles reflects the raids of Cretan Arabs in the Aegean and should be dated to the 9th or even 10th C. (A. Kazhdan, Byzantion 54 [1984] 176–82).

Surprisingly, a saint who was not martyred for his faith, left no theological writings, and was almost unknown before the 9th C. thereafter
Nicholas, some comprising 16 or more scenes, were very popular in monumental painting and on icons from the 12th C. onward. They emphasize scenes of consecration, the miracle at sea (from the life of Nicholas of Sion), and various episodes of the story of the three generals, a story that revealed the remarkable powers of Nicholas as intercessor.


NICHOLAS OF MYRA, rhetorician; born Myra ca. 430 (not between 410 and 412, as previously believed), died after 491. Nicholas belonged to the school of Gaza and was a teacher in Constantinople, where his brother held a high administrative position. There is no evidence that Nicholas was Christian. The Progymnasmata is his sole surviving work; his other works (Declarations, The Rhetorical Skill) are known only by title. Nicholas was used, directly or indirectly, by some Byz. commentators on rhetoric, such as John of Sardis, John Doxopatres, and Maximos Planoudes.


NICHOLAS OF OTRANTO, southern Italian writer and diplomat; abbot of the monastery of St. Nicholas in Casole (from 1219/20); born Otranto between ca. 1155 and 1160, died Casole 9 Feb. 1235. His monastic name was Nektarios. Nicholas served as interpreter to Benedict, legate of Innocent III to Byz. in 1205–07, and to cardinal Pelagius of Albano in 1214/15. His third visit to Byz. is known only from a letter of his friend George Bardanes. On that occasion Nicholas traveled to Nicaea, probably in 1225 on behalf of Frederick II (G. Weiss, BZ 62 [1969] 369). Nicholas was a Grecophile who wrote in Greek such works as The Art of the Scalpel (a collection of writings on astrology and geomancy); an anti-Jewish dialogue; three anti-Latin syntagmata, treatises on the differences between the Greek and Latin churches with regard to the Filioque, Azyges, etc.; letters; and poems. He also translated some Greek liturgical texts into Latin and corresponded with Greek ecclesiastics. In his dealings with Rome he defended the Greek clergy in Apulia and Calabria. Another Nicholas of Otranto, a Greco-Italian poet and son of Nicholas’s friend and disciple.
Nicholas of Stoudios, monk, politician, and saint; born Kydonia, Crete, 793, died Constantinople, 4 Feb. 868. Educated in a school directed by the Stoudios monastery, Nicholas became a staunch supporter of Theodore of Stoudios, whom he accompanied into exile in Metopa in 815. After the restoration of icon veneration in 843, Nicholas was appointed hegoumenos of Stoudios (846–49), but as a result of ecclesiastical struggles he had to retire. He was then recalled (853) but retired again in 858 in protest against the election of Photios as patriarch. He lived in various places, refusing any reconciliation with the Photians. After reinstating Photios, Basil I entrusted Nicholas once more with the leadership of Stoudios (867).

Nicholas was a renowned scribe. He copied several MSS, including the Uspenskij Gospel Book of 835 (Leningrad, Publ. Lib. gr. 219), the oldest dated minuscule MS. His vita, which was written by an anonymous Stoudite monk ca.915–30, contains substantial information about the second period of Iconoclasm, the struggle between the Photians and Ignatians, and the rebellion of Thomas the Slav. It also includes Nicholas’s prediction of the defeat of Nikephoros I by the Bulgarians in 811 and the story of a pupil of Nicholas who participated in this campaign; contrary to I. Dujčev (in FGH Bulg 4 [1961] 25–27), there is not sufficient reason to identify Nicholas of Stoudios with a different Nicholas, the straitotes, whose legend is contained in the Synaxarion of Constantinople. E. von Dobschütz (BZ 18 [1909] 71f) considered the vita anti-Photian and biased, whereas F. Dvornik (Photian Schism 240) found that it exuded “an atmosphere of peace.”


Nicholas Orphanos, Church of Saint, early 14th-C. church located in the northeastern part of Thessalonike just inside the eastern walls. It was presumably named after its founder or patron, who is otherwise unknown. The original church, now surrounded by later aisles on three
sides, was a simple single-aisled building with a gabled roof and coursed stone and brick construction; brick decoration was used, esp. in the upper parts of the eastern and western ends. Earlier impost capitals were reused in the interior and the original carved templon survives. The interior is almost completely covered with frescoes contemporary with the construction of the church; these include feast scenes, scenes from the Passion, the lives of St. Gerasimos and St. Nicholas of Myra (Śevchenko, Nicholas 42f, pl.23.0–23.13), and liturgical cycles such as illustrations of the Akathistos Hymn and a calendar cycle. To the west of the church are remains of the entrance to the monastery to which it once belonged.


- T.E.G.

NICODEMUS, GOSPEL OF, an apocryphal gospel or commentary (hypomnemata), produced in the 5th C. or even after 555, attributed to Nicodemus. Nicodemus, a Pharisee, is mentioned in the Gospel of John (Jn 3:1–10, 7:50–51) as having shown some support for Jesus. The Gospel consists of two independently written parts: the Acts of Pilate and Christ's Descent into Hell. The first section, known already to Epi-phanios of Salamis, was produced probably in the 4th C. to counter the fake Acts of Pilate issued as anti-Christian propaganda by Maximinus Dalai; Pilate is made to witness the trial, Crucifixion, and interment of Christ. His Acts are accompanied by a description of the meeting of the Sanhedrin (in which Nicodemus played an active part) that testified to the reality of the Resurrection. The second section presents Christ's victory over Satan and Hades, the liberation of Adam, and Adam's encounter in Paradise with Enoch and Elijah, who are granted eternal life and are prepared to fight and kill the Antichrist. The question of the original language is under discussion; Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic (the Coptic church praised Pilate as a saint and martyr), Georgian, Slavonic, and other versions have survived. The notion of an early Byz. illuminated Nicodemus cycle and the long-supposed derivation of the Anastasis image from it have recently been rejected (A. Kartsonis, Anastasis: The Making of an Image [Princeton 1986] 10–16).


--- J.I., A.C.

NIELLO (Lat. nigellus), a mixture of sulphur and silver or other metal. It was used for coloristic effect on metal objects, esp. silver domestic and display plate, finger rings, liturgical vessels, etc. Niello's black color contrasts effectively with gold, bronze, and silver to create salient linear effects and inscriptions. Although usually replaced by ENAMEL in and after the 10th C., it was in use as late as the 14th C. (Treasury S. Marco, no.28). If the term enkausis is correctly translated as niello, this medium was also employed on a large scale on the beaten silver floor of Basil I's Elijah chapel in the Great Palace (TheophCont 330.14).

--- A.C.

NIGHT (νύξ). In patristic vocabulary "night" was a metaphor for spiritual darkness and, in a broader sense, for sin, misfortune, and uncertainty. John Chrysostom (PG 59.309.28–41), referring to the apostle Paul (Rom 13:12), considered the present time as night "since we dwell in darkness" and tried to demonstrate that Paul's saying did not contradict the words of Christ (Jn 9:4), who spoke of the present as daytime and of the future as night, "when no one can work."

Representation in Art. The personification labeled Night depended not upon patristic imagery but on Antique models. The Late Antique form of an aged female with wings and a black cloak, found in the Ambrosian Iliad, is replaced in Psalter illustration with a younger woman holding a star-girt veil over her head (Cutler, Aristocratic Psalters, figs. 155, 177, 253). In this guise, as in Octateuch illustration, she supervises the Crossing of the Red Sea. Night appears in the Paris Psalter and elsewhere as the partner of Day but of Dawn (Orthros), who is depicted as a child: Dawn holds her blazing torch upright while Night lowers hers. The figure of Night here resembles Antique images of Selene and Hekate (Buchthal, Paris Psalter, fig.40) and is blue-skinned. Her identity is sometimes indicated in Job MSS by a dark aureole.

--- A.C., A.K.
NIKA REVOLT, uprising in Constantinople (11–19 Jan. 532); the name (lit. “Conquer!”) was the cry of the rioters. The Greens started the mutiny at the Hippodrome; it remains questionable, however, whether the “Acclamations against Kalopoulos” (see KALOPODIOS) refer to this event. The riot was provoked by Justinian I’s severe fiscal policy and the exhortations of his advisers; at the core of the discontent lay fear of a general tendency toward centralization and an assault on the traditional privileges of the factions and the senate (A. Čekalova, VizVrem 32 [1971] 24–39). Soon the Blues joined the Greens, and many senators supported the riot. Justinian ordered arrests of some members of both factions, but this drove the crowd to violence. The rioters attacked and burned government buildings, slew guards, and released the imprisoned; among the destroyed edifices were Hagia Sophia, the Chalke, the Church of St. Irene, the baths of Zeuxippos, and a part of the Augustaion. Urged to yield, Justinian removed the hated John of Cappadocia, Tribonian, and Eudaimon, prefect of Constantinople. As the unrest continued, Justinian ordered Belisarios and a troop of Goths to attack the mob, but they could not quell the movement. On 18 Jan., Justinian tried to negotiate with the mutineers from his kathisma in the Hippodrome, but the crowd rejected his promises and arranged the coronation of Hypatios, Anastasios I’s nephew. In consternation Justinian was ready to leave Constantinople but was stopped by Empress Theodora, who urged him to act. Belisarios and Moundos attacked the Hippodrome and bloodily crushed the revolt. According to Prokopios of Caesarea and Malalas, 30,000–35,000 people were killed. Hypatios and his brother Pompeios were executed on 19 Jan.; thereafter many others were killed or exiled, their property confiscated. The races were stopped perhaps until 537, and, until the reign of Constantine V, the activity of the circus factions remained largely ceremonial.


NIKANDER, didactic poet of the 2nd C. B.C. who composed the Theriaka, concerning remedies for bites from poisonous animals, and the Alexipharmaka, about poisons and their antidotes. The earliest and best MS of Nikander is Paris, B.N. suppl. gr. 247, written and illustrated in the 10th C. Most images depict directly the subject matter of the texts, snakes, scorpions, and plants, and plausibly derive from early sources. Human figures, incorporated into some compositions, demonstrate the effects of the poison or illustrate the author’s mythological allusions. Thus the mention of Orion occasions a representation based upon the constellation figure. The text, popular in Byz., was paraphrased in illustrated MSS of Dioscorides in Vienna and New York and accompanied by scholia in some MSS (M. Geymonat, Scholia in Nicandri Alexipharmaca [Milan 1974]). Planoudes produced a MS containing both poems.

LIT. Weitzmann, Roll & Codex 144f., 167. J. Weitzmann-Fiedler in Age of Spirit. 248f. —R.S.N.
NIKE (Lat. Victoria), in Greek mythology the winged goddess of victory. Late Roman authors (e.g., Himerios, ed. A. Colonna, or.65:29–30; Nonnos of Panopolis, Dionysiake 2:205–07) call her a daughter of Zeus. In Rome Victoria became a symbol of the emperor’s victorious might. The triumph of Christianity led to a heated controversy about the Altar of Victory, which was finally destroyed in 382; the image of Nike turned out, however, to be resilient. At the beginning of the 5th C. the cult of Victoria was still alive in Rome, as attested by Claudian (Al. Cameron, Claudian [Oxford 1970] 237–41). On coins of Herakleios (Grierson, DOC 2.1 [1968] 269) is the globos with Nike, who crowns the emperor, and Grierson suggests (DOC 3.1 [1973] 227) that the inscription “Jesus Christ conquers” on 8th-C. coins is a conscious adaptation of the “Victoria Augusti” of earlier solidi.

It is plausible that the Angel replaced the winged Nike in Christian imagery and that the idea of the victorious cross replaced that of the victorious emperor (McCormick, Eternal Victory 4, n.12). The attitudes and costumes of Nikai on such monuments as the Arch of Constantine are faithfully reproduced in the angels on the Barberini ivory and similar compositions.


NIKEPHORITZES, correctly Nikephoros (allegedly nicknamed because of his youthful among the officials of Constantine IX), principal minister of Michael VII; both Boukellarios, died 1078. During the reign of Constantine X, Nikephoritzes, a eunuch, was twice sent away from court to govern Antioch, allegedly because he had slandered Eudokia Makrembolitissa. During Eudokia’s reign, he was imprisoned; Romanos IV released him and sent him to Hellas as praetor. Upon Michael VII’s accession, Nikephoritzes was appointed logothetes tou dromou. He soon displaced other ministers, even the caesar John Doukas. Nikephoritzes’ administrative ability was grudgingly recognized by contemporaries; he was admired only by Kekaumenos. Attaleiates, who suffered from Nikephoritzes’ policy of fiscal se-}

verity, retails stories of his greed, corruption, and disregard for the empire’s well-being. In establishing a central warehouse (phoundax) at Rha- destos, Nikephoritzes planned to assure Constantinople’s grain supply, tax the grain trade, and provide places for his supporters. Attaleiates’ claim of consequent inflation and scarcity seems exaggerated (I. Karayannopoulos, Byzantina 5 [1973] 106–09). Nikephoritzes recreated the corps of Athanatoi and employed the Turks against Roussel de Bailleul. His charistikon, the Hebdomon monastery, became the focus of his personal estate and revenues. At the accession of Nikephoros III, he fled to Roussel. He was seized and tortured to death lest he regain power.


NIKEPHOROS (Νικηφόρος), personal name. As an epithet meaning “victorious” or “bringing victory,” it was applied to several deities or personifications of ancient Greek mythology and also used, although rarely, as a given name. It remained infrequent in the secular milieu of late antiquity; PLRE gives only one example (2:781). Nikephoros the koubikoudarios, on an inscription from Lydia of the 5th–6th C. At the same time, at least two bishops of this name are known (W. Ensslin, RE 17 [1937] 312). Prokopios does not mention a single Nikephoros, but in Theophanes the Confessor they are relatively numerous (12), as many as Sergios, Theodosios, and Andrew. The name reached seventh place in Skylitzes, right behind Basil and Theodore, and fifth place in Anna Komnene, after Michael. Relatively frequent in the acts of Laura, vol. 1 (10th–12th C.), where Nikephoros edges out Basil and Theodore, the popularity of the name plummeted to eighteenth place in Laura, vols. 2–3 (only 20 individuals). Even more indicative is the case of the collection of acts of Docheiariou: it contains only six Nikephoroi of the 12th–14th C., all of them belonging to the upper echelon of society. In the acts of Esphigmenou, four Nikephoroi, monks of the 11th C., are listed; in addition, we find in the
praktikon of ca.1300 widows of two Nikephoroi (peasants) and a boy of this name.  

NIKEPHOROS, caesar; died on island of Aphasia in the Sea of Marmara after 812. Son of Constantine V by his third wife Eudokia, and half-brother of Leo IV, Nikephoros was crowned caesar in 769. Along with his full brothers—the caesar Christophoros and the nobilissimi Niketas, Anthimos, and Eudokimos—Nikephoros was often the center of opposition to Leo, Irene, and their son Constantine VI. In 776 Leo crowned Constantine as co-emperor and extracted a general oath that Constantine alone would be accepted as emperor. Bypassed in the succession, Nikephoros and his brothers mounted a conspiracy but were denounced to Leo, who spared them.

After Leo’s death in 780 several senior officials, including the logothetes tou dromou Gregory, favored Nikephoros over Constantine, but Irene arrested and exiled them and forced the caesars and nobilissimi to be tonsured, ordained, and made to celebrate the liturgy publicly. Discontent with Irene’s return to power and Constantine’s defeat at Markellai in 792 spurred imperial guards to elevate Nikephoros, but Constantine blinded him, slit his brothers’ tongues, and imprisoned them in the monastery of Therapeia. After Irene deposed Constantine in 797 they sought sanctuary in Hagia Sophia and were there proclaimed emperors, but Irene’s adviser Aetios persuaded them to surrender and exiled them to Athens. In 799 Akameros, “the archon of the Slavs in Belzeta,” and thematic troops from Hellas hoped to elevate one of the five, but Irene imprisoned Nikephoros on Panormos island near Constantinople and blinded his brothers. Fearing a pro-Iconoclastic conspiracy on their behalf, in 812 Michael I moved them to an island in the Sea of Marmara, where they eventually died.

In deposing Irene, the conspirators may have wanted to prevent her proposed marriage to Charlemagne, but more likely they were seeking to block the ambitions of Irene’s adviser Aetios. Although an excellent administrator whose economic and military policies strengthened the empire, Nikephoros is characterized by Theophanes as avaricious, lecherous, tyrannical, even heretical. The “evil notions” of Nikephoros included a general increase in taxes, the extension of the kapnikon to paroikoi of ecclesiastical institutions, the abolition of Irene’s tax remissions, a tax on slaves purchased beyond Abydos, the implementation of the allelengyon, taxes on inheritances and treasures, and a state monopoly on loans with interest. He raised more troops by requiring village communities to underwrite poorer peasants’ military service and stabilized sailors’ income by requiring them to purchase uncultivated land. His financial measures permitted a building and re-fortification program. He established his own law court at the Magnaura to expedite judicial proceedings.

Nikephoros hellenized Greece by transplanting families from Asia Minor to Sklavinia in 810 (Charanis, Demography, pt. XIII [1946], 75–92) and extended Byz. administration westward by creating the themes of Thessalonike, Dyrrachion, Kephallenia, and possibly Peloponnesos (Oikonomides, Lists 350, 352). The election of Patr. Nikephoros I and the revival of the Moechian Controversy provoked religious opposition, esp. from Theodore of Studios. The policies of Nikephoros sparked rebellions (by Bardanes Tourkos and Arsbair); in 807 he dispatched a fleet to quell a revolt in Venice. He could do little against the Arabs and signed a humiliating treaty with the ‘Abbasid caliph Harun al-Rashid. He rejected Charlemagne’s claims to the imperial title, but could not stop the capture of Venice by Pepin in 810. He took the field several times against the Bulgarians and was killed in battle with Krum. Nikephoros was succeeded (very briefly) by his son Staurakios and then by his son-in-law Michael I Rangabe, who was married to his daughter Prokopia.

NIKEPHOROS I, emperor (802–11); born Seleukeia ca.760, died 26 July 811. Nikephoros was of Arab ancestry, according to an oriental source (E.W. Brooks, EHR 15 [1900] 743). He began his career as patrikios, senator, and logothetes tou genikou under Irene. On 31 Oct. 802 Nikephoros was proclaimed emperor by several high civil officials.


NIKEPHOROS I, patriarch of Constantinople (12 Apr. 806–13 Mar. 815), historian, and saint; born Constantinople ca. 750 (Beck, Kirche 489) or 758 (Alexander, infra 54), died monastery of St. Theodore near Chrysopolis 5 Apr. 828. Son of the asekretis Theodore, Nikephoros followed to Nicaea his father, who had been exiled by Constantine V for icon veneration. When Nikephoros returned to the capital, he served as the secretary of the emperors (probably Irene and Constantine VI); then he retired, left Constantinople, and founded several monasteries on the eastern shore of the Bosporos. Circa 802 he came back and was appointed director of the largest poorhouse in Constantinople.

After his election as patriarch in 806, Nikephoros faced serious problems: he had to appease Theodore of Stoudios and his supporters who took advantage of the continuing moechian controversy to undermine imperial authority. Nikephoros failed, and the state applied radical means to silence the stubborn Stoudites. In 815, yielding to Stoudite pressure, Nikephoros had to move to a more consistent stand; he refused to sign the decisions of the Iconoclast council and was exiled to one and then to another of the monasteries he had founded. He wrote several books defending the cult of icons, ca. 814 the Apologeticus minor, and in 818–20 three Antirhetikos. His major task was refutation of those texts that the Iconoclasts used as the basis of their tenets. Nikephoros dismissed the authenticity of the passages they cited from Eusebios of Caesarea and Epiphanius of Salamis. Like Theodore of Stoudios, Nikephoros looked to the pope for support against the emperors.

The Historia Syntomos (Breviarium) of Nikephoros (written probably between 775 and 787) exists in two versions. It describes the events of 602–769 and forms a parallel to the Chronography of Theophanes the Confessor; like Theophanes, Nikephoros presents events from an anti-Iconoclastic viewpoint. Nikephoros, however, does not follow an annalistic system. His geographical terminology is more precise than that of Theophanes, and Nikephoros pays less attention to Constantinople. Nikephoros’s brief Chronographikon is a list of rulers from the creation of the world to 829; it was very popular and was translated into Latin (by Anastasius Bibliothecarius) and into Slavic languages (E. Piotrovskaja, Viz Vrem. 37 [1976] 247–54). The vita of Nikephoros was written by Ignatios the Deacon, who praised his hero’s policy of compromise.


NIKEPHOROS I, metropolitan of Kiev (Dec. 1104–Apr. 1121). He was of Greek origin, but his early career in Byz. is unknown. In Rus’ Nikephoros was conspicuous in nurturing the local church and in advising the local rulers. In 1108 he added Feodosij of Pechera to the synodikon and on 2 May 1115 he helped translate the relics of Boris and Gleb. Four works are ascribed to him, all probably written in Greek, though only Slavonic versions survive (cf. Metr. John II). Nikephoros himself admitted to not speaking Slavonic. The works are (1) a homily for the Sunday before Ash Wednesday (perhaps in fact by Nikephoros II, ca. 1183–1201); (2) a letter to Prince Jaroslav Svatopolković listing the errors of the Latins; (3) a letter to Vladimir Monomach on the same topic, largely reproducing a list attributed to Metr. Doma (ca. 1065–76); and (4) a Lenten epistle to Vladimir Monomach, in which Nikephoros discourses on the three properties of the soul (reason, feeling, will) and on its servants, the five senses. The philosophical exposition turns into an allegory for princely rule and then into practical instruction for Vladimir. Nikephoros is also conjecturally associated with Vladimir in an inscription in St. Sophia in Kiev (S.A. Vysockij, Srednevekovye nadpisi Sofii Kievskoj [Kiev 1976] 48f). V.L. Janin attributes to him Greek seals of “Nikephoros of Rhossia” with the effigy of the Virgin (Aktovy pečati drevnej Rusi X–XV vv., vol. I [Moscow 1970] 48f).

NIKEPHOROS I KOMNENOS DOUKAS, of the Angelos family, ruler of Epiros (ca.1266/8–ca. 1296/8); born ca.1240, died Epiros between 3 Sept. 1296 and 25 July 1298 (D.M. Nicol, RSBS 1 [1981] 251–57). Eldest son of Michael II Komnenos Doukas, he was granted the title of despotes by John III Vatatzes ca.1249–53 and in 1256 married John's granddaughter Maria (died 1258). He accompanied his father to the battle of Pelagonia and resisted Michael VIII's encroachment on the Balkans. After Michael II's death Nikephoros divided Epiros with his half brother John I Doukas, retaining for himself "Old Epiros" from Ioannina to Naupaktos together with the islands of Kerkyra, Kephallenia, and Ithake. Despite his second marriage to Anna, a niece of Michael VIII, in 1264/5, Nikephoros remained an adversary of the emperor, acting in alliance with Charles I of Anjou, whose vassal Nikephoros acknowledged himself to be (14 Mar. 1279). At the beginning of the war against Michael VIII had some limited success. Nikephoros recovered Butrinto, which he delivered to Charles, but in 1281 the allies were defeated at Berat. Michael's death reopened hope for reconciliation, and the basilissa Anna traveled to Constantinople to negotiate a truce. By that time, however, a substantial part of Nikephoros's possessions were already in the hands of the Italians and the rest under the sway of Constantinople. Nikephoros's daughter Thamar (Caterina) married Philip I of Taranto in 1294.

NIKEPHOROS II PHOKAS, emperor (963–69); born ca.912, died Constantinople 11 Dec. 969. Son of Bardas Phokas, Nikephoros replaced his father in 954 as domestikos ton scholon and led the Byz. offensive in northern Syria; in 957 he captured and razed Hadat. In 960 he attacked Crete and in March 961 seized Chandax from the Arabs. After Romanos II died prematurely, Nikephoros claimed the throne but was opposed by the civilian officialdom, headed by Joseph Brin- gas; in April 963 Nikephoros withdrew from Constantinople to Cappadocia, where he was proclaimed emperor on 2 July at the instigation of John (I) Tzimiskes. Nikephoros's army, the military aristocracy, the church hierarchy under Patr. Polyeuktos, and the people of Constantinople supported him. After breaking Brinagas's resistance, Nikephoros entered Constantinople on 16 Aug. 963.

Nikephoros's policies reflected the interests of the army and military aristocracy. In 967 he restricted the peasants' right of protimesis, which had been introduced by Romanos I. In another novel he increased threefold the minimum size of the holding of a stratitotes, linking this change with the introduction of heavy armament. He considered Kataphraktoi the core of the new army. On the other hand, he tried to limit the

NIKEPHOROS II, despotes of Epiros (1356–59) and komes of Kephallenia; born ca.1328/9, died in Acheulian region, spring 1358 (Soulis, Dušan 113–15) or 1359 (Nicol, Epiros II 136f., n.47). Son of John II Orsini (ruler of Epiros 1323–ca.1337) and Anna Palaiologina, Nikephoros was a child when his mother poisoned his father and assumed the regency for her son. When the Byz. launched a campaign to recover Epiros (1338), Nikephoros took refuge in the Morea with Catherine II of Valois, titular Latin empress of Constantinople (1308–46). After his return to Epiros, however, he was forced to capitulate to John (VI) Kantakouzenos. He was betrothed (1340) to John's daughter, Maria, and received the title of panhypersebastos from Andronikos III. The marriage took place in 1342. Nikephoros was given the title of despotes by John VI in 1347 and in the following year commanded a cavalry unit that defended Constantinople against Genoese attack. In 1351 he was appointed governor of the Thracian Hellespont.

After John V regained control of the empire in 1355, Nikephoros succeeded in recovering his ancestral dominions in Epiros and Thessaly. Sometime after 1355 he briefly repudiated his wife for a politically expedient marriage with a sister of Helena, widow of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, but then recalled Maria. Soon thereafter he was killed in battle with the Albanians.

NIKEPHOROS II, despotes of Epiros (1356–59). Born ca.1328/9, died in Acheulian region, spring 1358 (Soulis, Dušan 113–15) or 1359 (Nicol, Epiros II 136f., n.47). Son of John II Orsini (ruler of Epiros 1323–ca.1337) and Anna Palaiologina, Nikephoros was a child when his mother poisoned his father and assumed the regency for her son. When the Byz. launched a campaign to recover Epiros (1338), Nikephoros took refuge in the Morea with Catherine II of Valois, titular Latin empress of Constantinople (1308–46). After his return to Epiros, however, he was forced to capitulate to John (VI) KANTAKOUZENOS. He was betrothed (1340) to John's daughter, Maria, and received the title of PANHYPERSEBASTOS from ANDRONIKOS III. The marriage took place in 1342. Nikephoros was given the title of DESPOTES by John VI in 1347 and in the following year commanded a cavalry unit that defended Constantinople against Genoese attack. In 1351 he was appointed governor of the Thracian Hellespont.

After John V regained control of the empire in 1355, Nikephoros succeeded in recovering his ancestral dominions in Epiros and Thessaly. Sometime after 1355 he briefly repudiated his wife for a politically expedient marriage with a sister of Helena, widow of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, but then recalled Maria. Soon thereafter he was killed in battle with the Albanians.

NIKEPHOROS II, emperor (963–69). Born ca.912, died Constantinople 11 Dec. 969. Son of Bardas Phokas, Nikephoros replaced his father in 954 as domestikos ton scholon and led the Byz. offensive in northern Syria; in 957 he captured and razed Hadat. In 960 he attacked Crete and in March 961 seized Chandax from the Arabs. After Romanos II died prematurely, Nikephoros claimed the throne but was opposed by the civilian officialdom, headed by Joseph BRINGAS; in April 963 Nikephoros withdrew from Constantinople to Cappadocia, where he was proclaimed emperor on 2 July at the instigation of John (I) Tzimiskes. Nikephoros's army, the military aristocracy, the church hierarchy under Patr. POLYEUKTOS, and the people of Constantinople supported him. After breaking Bringas's resistance, Nikephoros entered Constantinople on 16 Aug. 963.

Nikephoros's policies reflected the interests of the army and military aristocracy. In 967 he restricted the peasants' right of PROTIMESIS, which had been introduced by Romanos I. In another novel he increased threefold the minimum size of the holding of a STRATITOTES, linking this change with the introduction of heavy armament. He considered KATAPHRAKTOI the core of the new army. On the other hand, he tried to limit the
wealth of the church and in 964 prohibited land donations to ecclesiastical institutions; he supported Athanasios of Athos, whom he mistakenly regarded as a proponent of the "poor church." Nikephoros continued his offensive against the Arabs: in 965 he took Cyprus, Tarso, and Mopsuestia; in 969 Michael Bourztes seized Antioch, and soon thereafter the Byz. captured Aleppo. Nikephoros attempted reconciliation with Otto I the Great, but refused to pay tribute to Bulgaria and attempted to crush his neighboring rival with the assistance of Svjatoslav of Kiev. At the end of his reign he lost popular support, in part owing to the strict fiscal policy of Leo Phokas; nonetheless the image of Nikephoros as the "people's king" and genuine hero remained in contemporary literature, such as Philopatris or John Geometres. Nikephoros was murdered by an aristocratic plot of his former supporters (John Tzimiskes, Michael Bourztes) with the help of his own wife Theophano. Apart from coins, the only known portrait of Nikephoros is in a 15th-C. Cretan (?) MS (S. Lampros, NE 1 [1904] 61).


NIKEPHOROS III BOTANEIATES, emperor (1078–81); born 1001/2, died ca.1081 (E. Tsolakes, Hellenika 27 [1974] 150ff). Originating in Phrygian Lampe, Nikephoros claimed kinship with the Phokas family. From the reign of Constantine IX on, he was an active general, aiding the uprising of Isaac I Komnenos. When Nikephoros Bryennios rebelled in the Balkans, Botaneiates revolted in Anatolia ca. Oct. 1077; he had active supporters within Constantinople. With Turkish aid, he advanced and defeated the troops of Michael VII near Nicaea; after Michael abdicated, he entered Constantinople (3 Apr. 1078) and received the imperial insignia. His coronation followed on 2 July (2 June, according to Polemis, "Chronology" 71). About 1179 he married his predecessor's wife, Maria of "Alania" (B. Leib, 6 CEB [Paris 1959] 1:129–40). Already elderly, Nikephoros was ineffectual; he relied on his freedmen Boril and Germanos and on Isaac and Alexios Komnenos. Nikephoros's extravagant generosity to his supporters (praised by his eulogist Attaleiates) compelled him to reduce official salaries and debase the nomisma to 8–9 carats (Morrisson, "Dévaluation" 8, 15ff). While Turks plundered the Asian suburbs of Constantinople, Nikephoros was preoccupied with the rebellions of Bryennios, Nikephoros Basilakes, Nikephoros Melissenos, and finally the Komnenoi. When Alexios I Komnenos seized Constantinople, Nikephoros abdicated (4 Apr. 1081) and entered the Peribleptos monastery, which he had restored. He is identified by inscription as the emperor receiving the sumptuous Chrysostom MS, Paris, B.N. Coisli. gr. 79; I. Spatharakis (Portrait, fig.69) argued that the inscription is secondary and that the portrait originally depicted Michael VII.


C.M.B., A.C.

NIKERITES, LEO, late 11th- to early 12th-C. general and patron of the arts. A eunuch, Nikerites (Nikepritēs) was brought up among soldiers (An.Komm. 2:93.17–18). He rose through the ranks, first as anthypatos and strategos of the Peloponnesos. He is described as protoprodos and anagrapheus of the same theme on a seal (Laurent, Méd. Vat., no.110). After defeating the Pechenegs at Lebounion in 1091 he was made doux of Paris-trion. The colophon of the richly illustrated Job MS (Vat. gr. 1231) that Nikerites commissioned names him as nobelissimos, megas doux, and apographeus of Cyprus. A lost Octateuch, produced to his order in Nov. 1103, calls him protonobilissimos and oikeios anthropos (of Alexios I). He was still alive in 1117, fighting the Turks at Lopadion.


NIKETES (Nikētēs), personal name. The similar form Niketes (lit. "winner") that was bestowed upon Julian as an epithet (SIG 2:906B: an inscription from Magnesia) is attested in Greek antiquity. In the mid-4th C. the name Niketes was still found (PLRE 1:629); in the 5th C. the form Niketas appeared (PLRE 2:781f), but infrequently. Like Nicholas and probably Nikephoros, Niketas seems to have been popular in the late Roman
eclesiastical, rather than the secular, milieu (W. Ensslin, RE 17 [1937] 317). Only one Niketas is listed in Prokopios, but Theophanes the Confessor has 11 and Skylitzes 16 Niketases. The name is rare in acts, esp. of the later period. The name was borne by two patriarchs of Constantinople, but by no emperor.

-A.K.

NIKETAS, general; died 629. A cousin of Heralkeios, Niketas commanded troops in the rebellion (609) that reconquered Cyrenaica and Egypt from Phokas. In Egypt Niketas decisively defeated Phokas’s general Bonosos, who fled in early 610. Then Niketas invaded Palestine. He became patriarch and praetorian prefect, and doux in Egypt; in effect he was civilian governor until 619, when the Persian conquest forced him to flee to Constantinople. Niketas befriended Patr. John Eleemon of Alexandria. From Palestine Niketas brought the Holy Sponge and the Holy Lance to Constantinople, where they were venerated in ceremonies on, respectively, 14 Sept. and 28 Oct. 612. Heralkeios appointed Niketas komes of the exkoubaitoi on 5 Dec. 612 and sent him to replace general Priskos at Caesarea. The Persians defeated Niketas in the vicinity of Antioch in 613. He returned to Africa, where he was exarch from 619 to 628/9. Heralkeios was fond of Niketas and erected a statue to him. Niketas’s daughter Gregoria married Heralkeios Constantine. The last exarch of Africa, Gregory, probably was a son of Niketas.


-W.E.K.

NIKETAS BYZANTIOS, surnamed also Philosopher and Teacher (didaskalos), theologian of second half of 9th C. His life remains obscure. Under his name are preserved several polemical works: against the Monophysitism of the Armenians, against Islam, and against the Filioque. Niketas’s anti-Latin polemics are relatively mild.


-A.K.

NIKETAS DAVID PAPHLAGON, writer of the late 9th to early 10th C. Despite attempts to distinguish several writers of this name (J. Darrouzès, REB 18 [1960] 128ff.), it now seems established that he was a single but very prolific author (A. Kazhdan in Due vizantjskie chroniki [Moscow 1959] 125f.; Jenkins, Studies, pt.IX [1965], 241–47). A pupil of Arethas of Caesarea, he joined his teacher in opposing the tetragamy of Leo VI; in a letter (ep.87) he describes the pressure exerted by Pope Nicholas I to persuade him to support the emperor. When Arethas, after some resistance, accepted the dispensation, Niketas distributed his goods to the poor and fled to Thrace. He was arrested, brought back to Constantinople, and imprisoned. Freed at the initiative of Euthymios, he lived two years in seclusion, probably under Euthymios’s control.

Niketas wrote about 50 enkomia of saints, a treatise on the calculation of the approaching end of the world, a Commentary on the Psalms, and other works. In his Commentary Niketas introduced original features, e.g., moral exhortations attached to every psalm. Although drawing upon pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, he reduced the complex hierarchy of the world to a simple contrast between the humble position of man and the omnipotence of God. Typical of Niketas is his animosity toward musical instruments. In hagiography, Niketas deviated from the traditional laudation: his vita of Ignatios is a pamphlet against Photios; he was also accused of issuing a pamphlet against Leo VI and Euthymios. Moreover, he was charged with heresy for allegedly proclaiming himself God or Christ; this probably means that, contrary to his Commentary, he emphasized the divine nature of man.


-A.K.

NIKETAS MAGISTROS, high-ranking official, writer; born Larissa, Thessaly, ca.870, died after 946. Westerink hypothesizes that his last name
was Eladikos or Helladikos. In 919 Niketas supported Romanos I and married his daughter Sophia to Romanos’s son Christopher Lekapenos. In 928, accused of plotting to replace Romanos with Christopher, he was exiled to Hellasponit, where he owned land. From there he sent letters to Constantine VII and various members of the elite (such as Kosmas Magistros). The letters are very conventional and poor in information. One interesting reference is to the iron ore carried by the Hermos River to the sea, which casts it onto the shore; the local people produce iron from this “sand” (ep.5.12–24). His correspondence is full of allusions to ancient mythology and literature; thus, Homer is quoted more frequently than the Old Testament. Westerink identifies Niketas with the author of the vita of Theoktiste of Lesbos. A line of an unknown grammaticos Euphemios, quoted in De Thematibus (De them. p.91.37–42), refers to Niketas as having “an arrogant Slavic face.”


NIKETAS OF AMASEIA, canonist and metropolitan (second half of 10th C.). His life remains obscure. At the end of the 10th C. Niketas wrote a treatise on the election of metropolitans, probably to refute an anonymous treatise dated 963–69. Contrary to the anonymous writer, Niketas defended the primacy of the patriarch of Constantinople over metropolitanans and his right to preside over their elections. Where the anonymous writer interpreted canon law literally, Niketas appealed to Byz. reality: he contrasts the metropolitan “who does not even have a drown-garios under his power” with the patriarch who rules the capital and is the father of the emperors and the senate (p.160.10–16). This discussion is an important reflection of the struggle between centripetal and centrifugal forces within the church.

ed. Darrouzès, Ecclés. 160–75, with Fr. tr.


—A.K.

NIKETAS OF ANKYRA, 11th-C. canonist and metropolitan, mentioned in two documents of 1038 and 1072 (although it is not sure that both refer to the same person). Darrouzès ascribed to him five anonymous treatises: On Ordination, On Councils, On Elections, On the Right of Resignation, and On Prohibited Marriages. The attribution is questionable (A. Kazhdan, Viz.Vrem 30 [1969] 285), esp. since a marginal note ascribes one of these pieces to another 11th-C. author, Demetrios of Kyzikos. The first four treatises, unlike the one on marriages, develop a consistent theme: the power of the bishop is higher than that of the emperor (p.214.5–8). The author—whoever he was—also criticizes the patriarch, whom he calls an octopus clinging to rocks (p.200.23–24), whereas he should be a mother concerned for her children, the metropolitanans. The author’s ideal is a council of metropolitanans and lay archontes to advise the emperor (pp.202.30–204.6).


NIKETAS OF HERAKLEIA, theologian; born ca.1050, died after 1117 (not 1093–1100, as stated in Beck, Kirche 651). Neither his career nor the exact composition of his oeuvre is yet established. He was nephew of a metropolitan of Serres and held the post of didaskalos of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. In 1117 Niketas, already metropolitan of Herakleia, was among the accusers of Eustathios of Nicaea. He corresponded with Theophylaktos of Ohrid; J. Darrouzès has proved that Niketas did not correspond with Niketas Stethatos (Nicetas Stethatos, Opuscules et lettres [Paris 1961] 19–21). Niketas’s main work is catenae to the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John as well as a commentary on Gregory of Nazianzos. Niketas also wrote several grammatical poems and possibly 13 canonical responses addressed to Constantine of Pamphilon, a suffragan of Herakleia (A. Pavlov, Viz.Vrem 2 [1895] 160–76).


lit. J. Sickenberger, Die Lukashänten des Niketas von Hera-

—A.K.
NIKETAS “OF MARONEIA” (or rather a nephew of the bishop of Maroneia in Thrace), theologian; fl. first half of the 12th C. Niketas served as chartophylax of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and from 1192/3 on as archbishop of Thessalonike. He wrote six dialogues between a Greek and a Latin on the procession of the Holy Spirit, in which he, as a supporter of the imperial tendency to UNION OF THE CHURCHES, defended the Western point of view. The dialogues, mentioned already by Hugo Eteriano, were used and refuted by later authors; according to Bessarion, Niketas was fighting for the “donkey’s shadow,” since he accepted the idea of filioque, but refused to make a corresponding addition to the symbol of the creed (PG 161:329A). The possibility of identifying Niketas with Niketas of Thessalonike, author of several canonical responses and a short treatise on the marriage of slaves, remains open. Even less probable is his identification with the author of the Life of St. Demetrios (11th C.?), suggested by A. Sigalas (EEBS 12 [1936] 317–60).


-A.K.

NIKETAS OF MEDIKION, Iconodule monk; saint; born Caesarea in Bithynia ca.760, died near Constantinople 3 Apr. 824; feastdays 3 Apr., 6 Oct. After a short period of eremitic life, Niketas joined the small Bithynian monastery of Medikon, which had been founded by a certain Nikephoros of a well-to-do Constantinopolitan family. Niketas became a priest and, after the death of Nikephoros in 813, was made hegoumenos. At the beginning of the second period of Iconoclasm, Leo V exiled him to the kastron of Massalaia, but Niketas soon reconciled with the Iconoclast patriarch THEODOROS I KASSITERAS; criticized by Theodore of Studios, Niketas recanted and was anewed anew to the island of Glykeria. Michael II released Niketas, but he did not return to Medikon. After his death his body was brought to Medikon to repose in the tomb of Nikephoros.

A certain Theosteriktos wrote his vita, probably between 829 and 840; E. von Dobschütz (BZ 18 [1909] 81–83) hypothesizes that this vita was revised in the Stoudite milieu and was intended to celebrate the ideological victory of Theodore over Niketas. Although conventional and badly informed about the activity of Niketas, this vita contains precious evidence about ICONOCLASM (Constantine V’s comparison of the Virgin, after she gave birth to Jesus, with an emptied purse [ch.28]; Leo V’s discussion with the Iconophiles). The author of the second vita is an unknown John of the monastery of St. Elias. In synaxaria Nikephoros and Niketas are sometimes confused (F. Halkin, AB 88 [1970] 13–16).

Representation in Art. The Menologion of Basil II (p.94) contains a portrait of Niketas. He is depicted as a monk holding the round icon of Christ that he had refused to let the emperor burn.


NIKETAS OF THESSALONIKE. See Niketas “Of Maroneia.”

NIKITA, MONASTERY OF SAINT, situated northeast of Skopje between the villages of Banjani and Čučer. The monastery was restored by the Serbian king STEFAN UROŠ II Mилутин; its church was begun before 1303 and was offered to the Hilandar monastery on Athos before 1308, according to charters of Milutin and a letter of Andronikos II (M. Živojinović, HülZb 6 [1986] 60– 72). The church is constructed of stone and brick in cloisonné (see BRICKWORK TECHNIQUES), its fa- çade richly ornamented with niches and brick arches; it has a cross-in-square plan, with a single dome. The frescoes preserved in the lower zones may date before 1308 or be as late as 1320; the names of two artists, Michael (Astrapas) and Eutychios, are inscribed on the shield of St. Theodore Teron on the south wall. P. Miljković-Pepek (Mihail i Eutihij 51–56) believes the two merely supervised the work. The program is essentially Byz.: scenes in the nave include the miracles and parables of Christ, and standing figures
of saints (including Stefan Nemanja and Sava of Serbia). The figures are more elongated and drier than in other works by these masters, and the compositions are more complicated, incorporating numerous participants and highly developed architectural backgrounds (e.g. the Miracle of Cana and the Expulsion of the Money Changers from the Temple). The damaged frescoes on the vaults were restored in 1483/4 by Greek painters.


-G.B.

NIKI (Νική), city in Arkadia, in a fertile plain, on the site of ancient Tegea. Both the etymology and the origin of Nikl are uncertain: the name may be derived from the bishopric of Amykleion (under the jurisdiction of Patras) mentioned in notitiae (Notitiae CP 13,536) and in the vita of Nikon ho “Metanoeite.” On the other hand, the Aragonese version of the Chronicle of the Morea claims that William II Villehardouin founded it in the mid-13th C. Nikl was the center of a Frankish barony; the “Women’s Parliament” of 1261, following the battle of Pelagonia, met there. The Byz. destroyed Nikl in 1296 but did not occupy the area immediately, and the city was not restored. The population retreated to the mountains where two strongholds were created, Mouchli and Cepiana (Tsepiana).

The remains of at least four Early Christian churches have been investigated in the area of ancient Tegea. A fine mosaic floor, probably of the late 5th C., once adorned the basilica built by a certain Thyrsos. It represents the terrestrial world, and includes images of the Four Rivers of Paradise and personifications of the Months (Maguire, Earth & Ocean 24–28). Few remains of the medieval city survive; in the late 19th C. traces of a rectangular fortification wall were still visible (H.F. Tozer, JHS 4 [1883] 222f), but these have disappeared. The Church of the Dormition, built in the 11th or 12th C. and cruelly restored in 1888, is a cross-in-square with five domes, unusual in the Peloponnnesos at this date. The parliament of 1261 met in this church. There is no evidence that Nikl had a palace. In Mouchli there are remains of a small fortress, houses of the 14th–15th C. (N.K. Moutsopoulos, Byzantina 13.1 [1985] 321–53), and several ruined churches including a 14th-C. Church of the Virgin (idem, Peloponnesiaka 3–4 [1958–59] 288–309). Cepiana has a Church of the Panagia Gorgoepekoos similar to that of the Virgin at Mouchli.


- T.E.G., N.P.S.

NIKOMEDEIA (Νικομήδεια, now Izm), city of Bitinia, the residence of Diocletian and his successors until 330. The foundation of Constantinople brought decline, but Nikomedia remained a provincial capital and seat of a philosophical school headed by Libanius. Ruined by the earthquake of 358, Nikomedia never really recovered, though Justinian I restored some public buildings and the highway eastward. The vita of St. Theodoret of Syrkon reveals many details of local topography and economy; Nikomedia had a group of influential scholarii, a weapons factory (founded by Diocletian), a poorhouse, and numerous churches and monasteries. Its location on the main road to the capital made Nikomedia a major military base: it played a role in the campaigns of Herakleios, Justinian II, Leo III, and Artabasdos and was defended against Arabs and Paulicians. As a commercial center Nikomedia was headquarters of kommerkiarioi in the 8th–9th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 1411A, 1599). Its bishop Theophylaktos (ca.800–15) built a complex of poorhouse and monastery, and an imperial xenodocheion was established by the 9th C. Nikomedia became the capital of Optimatōi but was described by Ibn Khurdadbeh as ruined, no doubt because the huge ancient city by the harbor had been abandoned as Nikomedia withdrew to a defensible hilltop. As the Turks advanced toward Constantinople after their capture of Nicæa in 1081, Nikomedia was the base for Alexios I’s attempts to retain control of the coastal regions. The First and Second Crusades both stopped there; Odo of Deuil described it as a city whose lofty ruins were overgrown with thorns and brambles.

Nikomedia saw much fighting after 1204. At first it was controlled by Theodore I Laskaris, who defeated David Komnenos of Trebizond nearby; by 1206, however, the city fell to the Latins, who, finding its walls in ruins, fortified the Church of Hagia Sophia as their main castle. A treaty of 1207 returned Nikomedia to Theodore and its fortifications were demolished, but the
Latins regained it and held it until ca. 1240. Nikomedea was exposed to the attacks of Osman, who inflicted a severe defeat on the Byz. at nearby Barheus in 1302; after that, the agricultural population took refuge within the walls and the Turks ravaged the district. In 1304 and 1330, Nikomedea was blockaded and threatened by starvation; on the latter occasion John (VI) Kantakouzenos rescued it with his fleet. The city finally fell to Orhan in 1337. Nikomedea preserves much of its fortifications, the long city walls of Diocletian, and the medieval hilltop fortress, which appears to be of the 12th–14th C.

As a metropolitan bishopric Nikomedea played a major role under Eusebius of Nikomedea, but later yielded in importance to Nicaea.

LIT. Janin, Églises centres 77–104. —F.F.

NIKON "HO METANOEITE" (μετανοείτε, "you should repent"), saint; born in district of Polemoniaka, Armeniakon, ca. 930; died Sparta ca. 1000; feastday 26 Nov. Son of a provincial landowner, Nikon (Νικώ) ran away from home and spent 12 years as a monk at the monastery of Chryse Petra (between Pontos and Paphlagonia). After wanderings in the "eastern regions," he went to Crete in 961; he spent seven years preaching Christianity to the island's inhabitants, many of whom had converted to Islam during the Arab occupation. He then traveled in Greece, finally settling down, probably in the early 970s, in Sparta. There he founded a monastery next to the marketplace and near a stadium. Nikon's view of life was pessimistic: he stressed the vanity of existence, compared life with smoke and childish games, and called for repentance as the seminal way to salvation.

His vita, probably written in the mid-11th C., consists of two parts, the biography and posthumous miracles. The hagiographer, a hegoumenos of Nikon's monastery, may have known the holy man personally and may have witnessed some of the miracles. The vita is consistently provincial in approach: predominantly local nobles or minorities (Spartan Jews, Melingoi, etc.) are mentioned, and the central authority is condemned for entrusting power in the provinces to the worst and cruelest functionaries (ch. 58, ed. Sullivan, p. 184. 18–20). The vita contains valuable information about church construction and decoration, as well as the legend of a Constantinopolitan artist commissioned by a Peloponnesian grandee, John Malakenos, to paint a posthumous portrait of Nikon; the artist found himself unable to paint the icon solely on the basis of a verbal description and only supernatural assistance helped him. The hagiographer has borrowed from the 10th-C. Life of Loukas the Younger.

Representation in Art. Portraits of Nikon, found most frequently in Greek churches, begin to appear not long after his death (e.g., at Hostios Loukas), and are probably based on the icon commissioned by Malakenos. The saint is characterized by monastic clothing, dark slightly wind-blown hair low over his forehead, and a full dark beard.


—A.K., A.M.T., N.P.S.

NIKON OF THE BLACK MOUNTAIN, Melchite ecclesiastical writer; born Constantinople ca. 1025, died in monastery of St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger, near Antioch, between ca. 1100 and 1110 (Nasrallah, infra 152) or in monastery of Roidiou (Solignac, infra 319). According to his own testimony in the Taktikon, Nikon was born to a family of archontes and served in the army under Constantine IX. He then retired from the world, was tonsured by Luke, former metropolitan of Anazarbos, and settled in the monastery that Luke had founded on the Black Mountain north of Syrian Antioch. After Luke's death, Nikon met with hostility from the other monks when he attempted to impose monastic discipline, and he was eventually forced to leave. After attempting to found his own monastery, he settled in the monastery of Symeon the Younger on the Wondrous Mountain. When the Seljuks conquered Antioch in 1084, he moved to the monastery of the Virgin of the Pomegranate (Theotokos tou Roidiou).

Nikon compiled the Pandekta, a collection of statements by the councils and church fathers concerning canon law that was to serve as a compendium for wandering monks. His Taktikon, in 40 chapters, is also a collection of authoritative texts on canonical and liturgical problems and includes a typikon for the monastery of Roidiou.
Nikon's works were soon translated into Arabic and Church Slavonic.


—A.K.

NIKOPOLIS (Νικόπολις, lit. "city of victory"), the name of several cities and a theme.

NIKOPOLIS IN EPIROS, on the Ambrakian Gulf, in late antiquity capital of Old Epiros (Hierokl. 651.4). In 362 the rhetorician and high official (consul) Claudius Mamertinus lamented the decline of Nikopolis and praised Emp. Julian for its restoration. The city flourished in the 5th and 6th C. The walls of the city, constructed at the end of the 5th C., are well preserved and stand in some places to nearly their full height. Five Early Christian basilicas have been uncovered, all of the 5th–6th C. Basilica A (Doumetios Basilica) is a three-aisled structure with transept; it has mosaics representing the Earth surrounded by Ocean, with many varieties of flora and fauna and inscriptions (Maguire, Earth & Ocean 21–24). Basilica B, the so-called Alkison Basilica with five aisles, has mosaics, one of which (in an annex east of the church) names the bishop Alkison. Attacked by the Vandals in 474/5 and the Ostrogoths in 551, Nikopolis was restored by Justinian I. Its fate at the time of the Slavic invasions is uncertain. Constantine Arkopolites, in the vita of St. Barbaros, describes an attack of the Hagarones on Aitolia and the polis Nikopolis "that is called locally Maza" (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Analekta 1:408.16) during the reign of Michael II, but the accuracy of this late hagiographic evidence is doubtful. Nikopolis is identified as a metropolis in earlier notitiae, but seals of the 8th–9th C. refer only to an archbishop (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, nos. 670–72).


—T.E.G.

THEME OF NIKOPOLIS, located in southern Epiros and Aitolia, founded probably between 843 and 899 (it is first mentioned in the Klerorologion of Philotheos), possibly after 886; its capital was NAUPAKTOS. The seal of a tournarches of Nikopolis (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 2576) must have preceded the creation of the theme; another seal, of Joseph, epoptes of Nikopolis and an official in the Peloponnese (no. 2068), suggests that the region (tourma?) of Nikopolis was part of the Peloponnese before the creation of the theme. Seals of the strategoi of Nikopolis are also known, the earliest dating to the second half of the 9th C. (no. 2620). Nikopolis was a maritime base in the struggle for southern Italy, and the troops of the Mardattai were stationed there, at least in the 10th C. Nikopolis fell within the Bulgarian orbit in the 10th C.: ca.930 the Bulgarians invaded the theme; in 1046 its population revolted against Constantine, murdered a tax collector, and joined Peter Deljan. A chrysobull of 1198 mentions the "provincia" of Nikopolis and specially notes the existence in it of episkepseis belonging to private persons, churches, and monasteries. After 1204 the region from Dyrachion to Naupaktos came under Venetian control; by 1214 it was conquered by Michael I Komnenos Doukas of Epiros and became part of the despotate of Epiros.


—T.E.G.

NIKOPOLIS ON THE DANUBE, Nikopolis ad Istrum or ad Haemum (the Balkans) was a Roman city in Moesia south of IATRUS on the Danube, located near the modern Bulgarian village of Nikjup. Constantius II settled in the Nikopolis region a group of baptized Goths (Goti minores) who remained loyal to the empire during the 4th–5th C. Its bishops are recorded in 458 and 518. Justinian I is said to have rebuilt the city, and it is mentioned in both Hierokles and Simokattes. Archaeological excavations, however, have revealed the abandonment of ancient Nikopolis already by the 6th C.—ceramics later than the 4th C. are rare; roughly built structures were constructed in the agora in the 4th C.; only one building inscription can be dated in the 4th–5th C.; and coins of the 6th C. are absent. The old city territory of 21.55 hectares was abandoned in favor of a fortification of 5.7 hectares with strong towers erected along the south wall of ancient Nikopolis. Within this "annex" there are indications of only two small buildings. After Simokattes, Nikopolis disappears from written sources.

The name was transferred to a town on the Danube, modern Nikopol. A Hungarian legend ascribed its foundation to Herakleios (G. Seure,
NIKOPOLIS, CRUSADE OF, a great international expedition in 1396 designed to free the lands of eastern Christendom from Muslim occupation. This Crusade was mounted primarily at the instigation of Sigismund of Hungary (1387–1437) in reaction to the Ottoman conquest in 1390 of Vidin, which was under Hungarian suzerainty. The Crusade was given added impetus by the appeals of Manuel II for Western aid (Douk. 79.15–81.10) after Bayezid I began the siege of Constantinople in 1394. In Feb. 1396 Manuel and Sigismund signed an anti-Turkish alliance; the Byz. emperor promised to send ten galleys to the Danube to assist the expedition. In the end, however, the Byz. played no military role in the Crusade because of the blockade of their capital.

In Sept. 1396, a multinational Christian army besieged the key Ottoman fortress of Nikopolis on the south shore of the Danube. The number of Crusaders was variously reported, between 16,000 and 130,000; the lower figure is probably correct (Rosetti, infra 633–35). A battle ensued on 25 Sept. when Bayezid arrived to relieve the siege. The Crusaders were decimated. Only a few notable escapes by ship or were released afterward by the Turks in exchange for ransom. The failure of the Crusade was a bitter disappointment for the Byz., as Bayezid intensified his blockade of Constantinople soon after.


NILE (Νείλος), Egypt's only river; hence in Greek and Coptic texts sometimes referred to simply as "the River" (e.g., Ex 7:15–18). It was identified with the biblical river Gihon, the river of Paradise that flows through the land of the Ethiopians (Chron. Pasch. 1:52.14; Zon. 1:22.6–8; Cedr. 1:24.6). The source of the Blue Nile in the highlands of Ethiopia, where annual rains accounted for the inundation of Egypt, was known (e.g., Athanasios of Alexandria, Life of Antony, ch. 32). The source of the White Nile was said to be in mountains farther south, probably based on information gathered from indigenous traders. No Byz. traveler records visiting either site. Olympiodorus of Thebes (ed. Blockley, fr.35) explored the Nile in Lower Nubia, and Prokopios (Wars 1:19.28–29) describes its distance from Axum and mentions the stone gorge (Baṭn al-Hagar) south of the Second Cataract. The Expositio totius mundi (descr. 34–36) describes the Nile valley as provider of grain to Constantinople and extols the benefits of the annual inundation for agriculture. In view of the importance of the yearly inundation, measured by the Nilometers, the Egyptian church (both Monophysite and Chalcedonian) conducted special annual liturgies to bless the Nile waters and pray for a good level of flooding (L. MacCoull, JThS 40 [1989] 129–35).

Often depicted in art, the Nile appears on textiles (Age of Spirit., nos. 150, 172), floor mosaics (no.252), and in opus sectile (Ibrahim et al., infra nos. 1–12) as a swamp people with nereids, dolphins, and nude boys hunting water fowl, with the occasional crocodile or hippopotamus. On early reliefs (Age of Spirit., no.157) and an ivory pyxis (no.170), the river is embodied as a bearded male figure against a background of lotus. Chorikios of Gaza (Chorik.Gaz. 40.18–23) stresses that the Nile is depicted at St. Stephen's at Gaza not as a personification, "the way painters portray rivers," but with "distinctive currents and symbols." Practical aspects of the Delta are represented by a water wheel on a tomb fresco in Alexandria (Age of Spirit., no.250) and a Nilometer on a trulla in Leningrad with control stamps of Emp. Anastasios I (Dodd, Byz. Silver Stamps, no.1). In medieval art the swamp is replaced by a rushing stream. The 12th-C. Octateuchs (e.g., Vat. gr. 746, fol.153r, unpub.) show the stream in which the infant Moses was found as attended by a woman in a maphorion, while in the atrium mosaic of St. Mark's at Venice
Made by Absens

DEMUS, Mosaics of S. Marco, vol. 2, pl. 313) it flows vertically downward from the standard male 11th–12th-C. personification of rivers.


—D.W.J., A.C.

NIMBUS (Lat., lit. "cloud"), a halo. In literary texts the term turns up infrequently; in the 4th C., Servius, in his commentary on Vergil, defined nimbus as divine brilliance, and later Isidore of Seville described nimbus as light surrounding the heads of angels (K. Keyssner, RE 17 [1937] 598f). The Greek term, phengeion (from φέγγος, "radiance"), may refer to metal nimbi that were applied to icons from the 12th C. onward. Thus, an inventory of Veljusa monastery describes a large icon of the Virgin and Child that had two enamel and silver-gilt haloes (L. Petit, IRAIK 6 [1900] 118.23–119.1) as well as other icons with silver haloes. In 1365 a priest was condemned for removing and selling a phengeion from an icon of the Theotokos (MM 1:475.9–10). In the 15th C. Symeon of Thessalonike spoke of circle-like phengia that on holy icons emphasized the grace, brilliance, and energeta of God (PG 155:869B); according to Symeon (col.408D), the eagle, one of Byz.'s important symbols, could also bear the phengeion.

Representation in Art. Artists depicted the nimbus as a colored disk encircling the head of a prominent figure. Christian art inherited it from antiquity, where it had distinguished gods, heroes, personifications, and—from Constantine I onward—the emperor, displacing the rayed corona of Sol invictus. The nimbus enters Christian art slowly, and during the 4th C. is restricted almost exclusively to Christ, the LAMB OF GOD, the PHOENIX, and the emperor. In the 5th C., its use is extended to angels, prophets, the Virgin Mary, and apostles. Simultaneously, Christ's nimbus is ever more consistently differentiated from a CLASSICISM. By the 6th C., saints, too, were awarded the nimbus, as were certain patrons and bishops (7th C.); some prominent living persons were depicted with a square nimbus. By the 9th C., it had clearly become a sign of sanctity rather than mere prominence and had vanished from any but sacred figures and emperors. Though nimbus means cloud, it was not shown as nebulous. Sharply delineated, it was usually conceived as light and gilded, though it could also be brightly colored, jeweled, or even highly decorated.


—A.W.C., A.K.

NIPHON (Νιφων), patriarch of Constantinople (9 May 1310–11 Apr. 1314 [cf. V. Grumel, REB 13 (1955) 138f]); born Berroia, died 3 Sept. 1328 (cf. Dmitrievskij, Opisanie 3:377). Niphon was hegumenos of the Lavra on Mt. Athos in 1294 (V. Laurent, REB 28 [1970] 101) and then became metropolitan of Kyzikos sometime before 1303, when he led that city's defense against the Turks. Although ca.1309 he was accused of theft and simony by Patr. ATHANASIUS I, he was chosen to succeed Athanasios on the patriarchal throne because of his moderate position on the ARSENITE controversy (V. Laurent, BSHAcRoum 26 [1945] 251–56). Indeed, the schism was healed at the beginning of his patriarchate. Niphon greatly increased patriarchal revenues by appropriating the administration of several wealthy sees, after deposing their bishops on charges of simony (V. Laurent, REB 27 [1969] 219–28). In 1314, however, Niphon was himself deposed on charges of simony and retired to the PERIBLEPTOS monastery in Constantinople. He took his revenge on Andronikos II, who had failed to rally to his defense, when in 1328 he advised Andronikos III to force his grandfather to retire. Contra Tafrali (Thessalonike 87), he was never archbishop of Thessalonike but was a patron of the Church of the Holy Apostles, constructed there during his patriarchate (J.M. Spieser, TM 5 [1973] 168–70, nos. 20–22).


—A.M.T.

NIPHON, monk who spent most of his life in hermitages on the Holy Mountain; saint; born Loukovi, Epiros, 1315, died Mt. Athos 1411; feastday 14 June. Son of a priest, he demonstrated a
proclivity for monasticism even as a young child. At age 10, he left home to be trained by his paternal uncle, a monk at the monastery of St. Nicholas of Mesopotamia (in Epirus). After receiving the tonsure and ordination as a priest, a desire for hesychia led Niphon to Mt. Athos. There he lived in a succession of isolated retreats, at first as a disciple of an elderly hermit, later himself attracting youthful disciples. For a few years (ca. 1360) he shared his solitary existence with Maximos Kausokalybites, whose vita he later composed. This work reveals Niphon as an author of little training and no literary talent.

Niphon represents a common type of late Byz. holy man, who eschewed the cenobitic life, preferring the challenge of the hermitage. Allegedly endowed with the gift of prophecy and miraculous powers, he was reputed to have lived to the venerable age of 96. An anonymous vita of Niphon (BHG 1371) was written by a contemporary Athonite monk.

SOURCE. F. Halkin, "La vie de Saint Niphon ermite au Mont Athos (XIVe s.)," *AB* 58 (1940) 5–27. —A.M.T.

**NIPSISTIARIOS** (*νηπίστιαριος*), a eunuch whose function was to give the emperor a basin to wash his hands in before he left the palace or before other ceremonies. The basin was of gold with precious stones; the nipsistiaros wore a robe with a design (?) of a basin (*schemati phialiou*) as a symbol of his service. In the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos the nipsistiaros holds the lowest position among the palace eunuchs, but the vita of Patriarch Euthymios (Vita Euthym. 51.4–7) describes Samonas as rising from the post of *koubikoularios* to nipsistiaros. The earliest mention of nipsistiaros is on a seal of the 7th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 873). The post is not included in the 14th-C. ceremonial book of pseudo-Kodinos.


**NIŠ.** See Naissus.

**NISIBIS** (*Νησίβις*, Ar. *Naṣībīn*, now Nusaybin in Turkey), city in MESOPOTAMIA on the Mygdonios (mod. Jaghjaghah) River. A bone of contention between the Romans and Persians, Nisibis also became the major center of Roman trade with the Sasanians and, from 540, with the pre-Islamic Arabs (Stein, *Histoire* 2:519f). It was the strongest fortress on the frontier, and the Persians repeatedly stormed it in vain. According to legend, it was saved in 338 by the prayers of its bishop Jacob, who incited swarms of insects against the besiegers. In 350 the Persians dammed the Mygdonios and assaulted the walls from their ships; they attempted to send elephants and cavalry through breaks in the ramparts, but the animals became stuck in the muddy river bottom. Jovian’s peace treaty of 363 surrendered Nisibis, empty of its inhabitants (as stipulated by the treaty), to Persia. Despite Byz. attempts to regain Nisibis during the 6th C., the city remained Persian. It was taken by the Arabs in 639. The Byz. reappeared in the area in the 10th C.: John Kourkouas took Nisibis in 942; the Armenian general Mlehs (see MELIAS) captured it on 12 Oct. 972 (D. Anastasievic, *BZ* 90 [1929/30] 403f). It continued to change hands up to the Ottoman conquest.

Until 363 the administrative metropolis of the province of Mesopotamia, Nisibis was the seat of the *doux* of Mesopotamia, a bishopric under the jurisdiction of Amida, and a center of Christian culture, even though pagan cults apparently survived there under Persian rule. Ephrem the Syrian was active at Nisibis but had to move to Edessa in 363. In 489 the School of Edessa was expelled by Zeno and reestablished at Nisibis, where a small school was already present. Its statutes, which survive in Syriac, reveal its character: the core of the curriculum was historical exegesis of the Bible on the principles laid down in the Nestorian interpretation of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Written sources record church construction: Jacob of Nisibis built the Great Church (i.e., cathedral) in 313–20; its baptistery with elaborate sculpture—erected, according to its Greek dedicatory inscription, in 359 under Bp. Volagesos—survives.


**NIZĀM AL-MULK**, originally known as Abū ʿAli al-Hasan, Persian statesman; born near Tūs in Khorasan 10 Apr. 1018, murdered 14 Oct. 1092 near Siňa, on the way from Iṣfāhān to Baghdad. As supreme vizier of the Seljuk court he supplied to the Seljuks, who had only recently arrived in
Iraq, the older political traditions and wisdom that the new conquerors needed to rule their empire. At the request of the sultan Malikshāh, he composed, ca.1091, in Persian, the political treatise Šiyāṣatnāma (The Book of Government), intended as a guide for the running of the state, the management of the nomads, and suppression of religious heresy. Organizing his work around 50 chapters/principles, the author draws on a bewilderingly rich historical repertoire that includes Achaemenids, Alexander, Sasanians, and the Islamic and Turkic worlds in order to illuminate the principles of political conduct. Of particular interest for Byzantinists is his description of the ghulām or page system. Niẓām al-Mulk also relates a legend about the caliph Muṭṭasim (833–42), who allegedly was taken captive to Rum but later led a successful expedition, routed a “Caesar,” sacked and burned Constantinople (? , probably Amorion), founded a mosque there, and released a thousand men from captivity.


NOAH (Nōe), biblical patriarch; hero of the story of the Flood and builder of the Ark. Noah was a righteous man and the progenitor of a new race, according to Philo. He was interpreted by the church fathers as a prefiguration of Christ: Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of Christ as “the true Noah” (PG 33:981A) and Cyril of Alexandria as “the truest Noah,” baptism being the antitype of the flood (PG 69:65B). In the same vein, Asterios of Amaseia (PG 40:448C) exclaimed that Christ in the tomb resembled Noah in his ark and thus put an end to the flood of impurity and granted us the baptism of resurrection. Another episode of Noah’s life, his drunkenness and self-exposure, became a classical example of the evils of wine. Some church fathers, however, excused Noah: Ambrose (ep.28:12) says that Noah was not ashamed of his nakedness because he experienced spiritual joy. The episode was elsewhere used as an anti-Jewish polemic: Ham’s attitude toward his father’s drunkenness was identified with the Jewish treatment of the Cross, while Shem and Japheth symbolized the Gentiles who honored Jesus. Some elements of Noah’s story are reflected in the First Book of Enoch.

Representation in Art. Noah was more often represented in terms of the events of his life than those of his character or personality. In the catacombs, as in floor mosaics of the 5th–6th C., emphasis was placed on NOAH’S Ark. Simultaneously, however, other events of his life appear in the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome and in the Cotton and Vienna Genesis MSS. Later cycles, such as in the Octateuchs or the mosaics of the Cappella Palatina and Monreale in Sicily, probably reflect early models of related type.


NOAH’S ARK (κιβωτός τοῦ Νῶe), the ship built by Noah at the time of the Flood, on which he saved humankind and all species of animals from extinction (Gen 6–9). It was early seen as a prefiguration of the church, which provided the means of salvation (e.g., Didymos the Blind, PG 39:696A–B). The tripartite division of the Ark (Gen 6:16) was considered a reference to the Trinity (e.g., by Athanasios, PG 28:1064A). That it carried within it Noah, the righteous man judged worthy of salvation, led to a further connection of the Ark, like the Ark of the Covenant, with the Virgin (e.g., Theodore of Stoudios, PG 96:689B), for the Virgin brought forth Christ, the new Noah. This symbolism was visualized in the lost Kosmas/Physiologos MS of Smyrna (Kosm. Ind., 1:96f), where the image of the Ark on the waters was combined with the Virgin and Child enthroned.

The Ark is depicted as a chestlike structure in the Cotton Genesis, and also in the Octateuchs, in which, however, it appears as a boat under construction. Its tripartite division is emphasized in the monumental zigguratlike Ark of the Vienna Genesis, and in a simpler version with sloping sides found in the Vatican MS of Kosmas Indikopleustes. In the floor mosaic at Mopsuestia the Ark appears as a flat-topped chest with four legs (H. Buschhausen, JÖB 21 [1972] 57–71, fig.2).


NOBELISSIMOS (νοβελίσσιμος), a high-ranking dignity. The Latin equivalent nobilissimus appeared in the 3rd C. as an imperial epithet; according to a 5th-C. historian (Zosim. bk.2.39.2), Constantine I introduced it as a title for some
members of his family, ranking below that of Caesar. In disuse for some time under Justinian I (who was himself nobelissimos under Justin I), it was applied again to Herakleios's son Martin and later to Niketas, son of Constantine V. In the Klerotologion of Philothoeis nobelissimos occupied the place between Caesar and Kouropalates. While a 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 444.5–6) described his costume as consisting of a golden cloak (chlaina) and diadem (stephanos), the later sources do not mention a diadem and the De ceremoniis ascribes to him a green or red cloak (Oikonomides, Listes 97, n.51). Until the mid-11th C. the dignity of nobelissimos was reserved for members of the imperial family (e.g., Michael V's uncle Constantine), but from the end of the 11th C. it was given to supreme military commanders; the future emperor Alexios I was the first among them. In 1074 the title was promised and eventually conferred on Robert Guiscard. Inflated through the 12th C., the title served as the basis for new formations such as protonobelissimos and protonobelissimoypertatos (e.g., Seibt, Bleisiegel 288–97). The title was in use in the 12th C. and survived—contrary to Dölger's hypothesis—until the Palaiologan period (V. Laurent, EO 38 [1939] 362–64).


NOGAY (Nojyòj), a Mongol prince, commander in the expeditions of the Golden Horde against Persia in 1262 and 1266; born first half of 13th C., died 1299 near the Dnieper. In 1265, summoned by the Bulgarian tsar Constantine Tich to help fight the Byz., Nogay crossed the Danube; the army of Michael VIII Palaiologos fled in panic, and the Mongols ravaged Thrace. Michael had to seek Mongol support and gave his illegitimate daughter Euphrosyne as wife to Nogay, a match that probably allowed Michael to retain some authority in Dobrudja. Nogay helped the Byz. overthrow the popular Bulgarian leader Ivaïlo in 1279. In Bulgaria Nogay established de facto Mongol rule. In Nogay's day the Mongols, Byz., and Mamlûks formed an alliance opposed to both the Latins and Persia. Nogay was tolerant toward Christianity.

Nogay perished amid internal strife in the Golden Horde: he had placed Tokay on the throne in 1290, but in 1297 Tokay rebelled against the omnipotent prince. After initial success Nogay was defeated in battle and killed by a soldier of Rus'.


NOMIKOS (νομικός), a scribe or secretary. The Klerotologion of Philothoeis gives the name of nomikos to subaltern officials of the eparch of the city; according to the Book of the Eparch (1.13) the nomikos or paidodidaskalos nomikos was the teacher of law elected by the taboularioi. Nomikoi are often mentioned in an ecclesiastical context; e.g., John Moschos speaks of a nomikos of the church of Alexandria (PG 87:3073AB). In acts of the 11th–14th C., ecclesiastical nomikoi appear preparing documents, esp. deeds of purchase. There was probably a local distinction of terminology—taboularioi were primarily scribes in the bureaus of Constantinople, Thessalonike, and Serres, whereas in Hierissos, Miletos, and Smyrna nomikoi were more common. Nomikoi fulfilled various ecclesiastical offices, some connected with their notarial duties (protekdikos, archdeacon, bibliophylax, etc.). They are known also as scribes of books (e.g., J. Darrouzès, REB 8 [1950–51] 180). A. Dain (REB 16 [1958] 166f) published a formulary for the appointment of an ecclesiastical nomikos.


NOMINA SACRA. See Abbreviations.

NOMISMA (νόμισμα), a word meaning "coin" generally, but specifically used of the standard gold coin of 24 keratia which formed the basis of the late Roman and Byz. monetary system. It was thus identical with the coin called in Latin a solidus. From the late 11th C. onward the standard gold coin was more commonly termed an hyperpyron.

—Ph.G.

NOMODIDASKALOS. See Nomikos.

NOMOKANONES (νόμοκανώνες), compilations of secular laws (nomoi) and ecclesiastical regulations (kanones; see Canons), the two most important components of canon law. Such compila-
tions, for which the terms nomokanon (and nomokanonon) are attested from the 11th C., were undertaken over and over again from the time of Justinian I into the post-Byz. period. By far the most important collection of this kind was the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles. Much less frequently copied is the Nomokanon of Fifty Titles, in which the Synagoge of Fifty Titles is enlarged by the inclusion of excerpts from the Corpus Juris Civilis. These excerpts derive mainly from the Collectio 87 Capitulorum; several fragments are also taken from the paraphrase of the Justinianic novels by Athanasios Scholastikos of Emesa. This nomokanon was compiled possibly toward the end of the 6th C. in Antioch. Among the other nomokanones, the Syntagma kata stoicheion of Matthew Blastares is particularly notable.


-A.S.

NOMOKANON OF FOURTEEN TITLES, the most frequently copied of all nomokanones, and the most important source of canon law. Zacharia von Lingenthal conjectured that the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles proper was preceded by a Syntagmata of Fourteen Titles compiled ca. 580, which included only the material contained in the canons but had the Collectio tripartita as an appendix. According to E. Honigmann (Trois mémoires posthumes [Brussels 1961] 49–64), this Syntagma was compiled by the patriarchs Eutychios and John IV Nesteutes. It is commonly believed that the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles proper was created in the time of the emperor Herakleios by Anonymous, ”Enantiphanes,” who integrated into this Syntagma parts of the Collectio tripartita and other texts going back to the Corpus Juris Civilis. In a second prologue, composed by Photios and dated to 882/3, it is stated that the canons that had been issued in the interval would be taken into account; most of these are in fact contained in this reworking.

At first the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles merely made reference to the canons; their full texts, arranged in chronological order, were given only in a section following the Nomokanon. Later, however, the full texts were sometimes integrated into the Nomokanon. According to a third prologue composed by a certain Theodore (Bestes) and dated 1089/90, he added secular law texts from the Basilika and other sources that had hitherto been cited in the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles only in part. Familiar with this reworking, Theodore Balsamon composed—probably in 1177 and the following years—a similarly structured ”commentary” (introduced by a fourth prologue) in which he mainly addressed the question as to whether the law texts cited in the Nomokanon had been taken over into the Basilika. Of the various versions mentioned, that of the 9th C. in particular was translated into Slavonic at an early date.


-A.S.

NOMOPHYLAX (νομοφύλαξ, lit. “the guardian of law”), an office originated by Constantine IX in 1043 (E. Folliero in Studi in onore di Edoardo Volterra, vol. 2 [Milan 1971] 657–64). 1045 (N. Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 134), or, more probably, 1047 (J. Lefort, TM 6 [1976] 284). The future patriarch John (VIII) Xiphilinos was the first to hold the office. Constantine IX created the nomophylax as president of the law school in Constantinople; enrolled him among senators; gave him the “chair” right after the epitikon kriseon; and established his annual roga at 4 litrai plus a silk robe, imperial presents on Palm Sunday, and undefined benefits or siteresia (A. Salač, Novella constitutio saec. XI medii [Prague 1954] 25, par. 11). He could be demoted only in a few strictly limited cases. Psellos describes him as the president of the court, the strategos of the judges, and the leader of the laws (N. Oikonomides, FM 7 [1986] 190).

The office quickly changed character after its creation, and, according to Darrouzes (Officia 314), became a position between the state and church administration. In the 12th C. the post was held by several renowned canonists such as Alexios Aristenos, Neiios Doxopatre, Theodore Balsamon, and in the 14th C. Constantine Harmenos-Poulos. In the 14th C. there were both civil and ecclesiastical nomophylakes; the ecclesiastical nomophylax occupied a position equal to the dikaiophylax.
NOMOS GEORGIKOS. See Farmer’s Law.

NOMOS NAUTIKOS. See Rhodian Sea Law.

NOMOS STRATIOTIKOS (Νόμος Στρατιωτικός; Lat. Leges militares, “Soldier’s Law”), a collection of approximately 55 regulations, mainly penal and disciplinary, for soldiers.

Manuscript Tradition. The extensive MS tradition offers numerous recensions from which the original text cannot be reconstructed with certainty; the source-references for the headings are unclear (“Rufus”), imprecise (“Taktika”), or incomplete (“49th book of the Digest, title 16”). One sequence of 15 chapters, which occurs in a nearly identical form in the Strategikon of Maurice (1.6–8), forms a unit; the rest of the chapters originate in the Corpus Juris Civilis. Two groups can be distinguished: the first compiled possibly as early as the end of the 6th C., the other attached only later, certainly by the middle of the 8th C. The Nomos stratiotikos is found in one variant version of the Appendix of the Ecloga and appears in the supplements to later law books, often alongside the Farmer’s Law and the Rhodian Sea Law. A few MSS of the Taktika preserve a recension of the Nomos stratiotikos wherein the collection is expanded and provided with references to the Basilika.

Content of Regulations. The code embodies the basic principles of military law: to enforce discipline and to expel or reject undesirables. Crimes committed in wartime, such as insubordination, desertion, cowardice, or looting (see Booty) were punishable by death. Punishment for crimes in peacetime or violations of conditions of service were lighter, often entailing expulsion from the army with the attendant loss of privileges associated with military service. Anyone guilty of a civil offense was deemed ineligible for enlistment. The code effectively defines the reach of military as opposed to civil jurisdiction—only in cases of adultery were soldiers turned over to civil authorities.


NONNOS, THEOPHANES. See Chrysobalantes, Theophanes.

NONNOS OF PANOPOLIS, one of the many poets who came from late Roman Egypt. The life of Nonnos (Νόννος) is obscure; his career is usually dated to the first half of the 5th C. (B. Baldwin, Eranos 84 [1986] 60f). His major work is the Dionysiaka, detailing in 48 hexameter books the exploits of Dionysos in India. The composition of the Dionysiaka is “linear,” with each episode connected to the next without any coherence in space and time (M. Riemschneider, BBA 5 [1957] 68–79); situations and images recur steadily. The epic is unified by a consistent perception of the world as manifold (poikilos), changing, and unstable (W. Fauth, Eideos poikilon [Göttingen 1981]). The agglomeration of synonyms and riddelike metaphors creates the impression of an enigmatic world, and, according to Averincev (Poetika 136–49), resembles the style of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite. Nonnos was interested in the founding of cities (he tells the story of Kadmos, mentions Byzas, the eponym of Byzantium); he relates the foundation-myth for the law school of Berytus and expresses his faith in the civilizing mission of Rome. Themes of Astrology, prophecy, and eros permeate his work. Nonnos possibly composed a hexametric paraphrase of the Gospel of John (see K. Smolak, JÖB 34 [1984] 1–14).


NONNOSOS (Νόννοσος), writer of the first half of the 6th C. Nonnosos wrote a narrative (now lost), perhaps in the form of a memoir, recounting his adventures in Ethiopia and central and south-
ern Arabia during a diplomatic mission for Justinian I (530/1); his father and grandfather had been similarly employed by Anastasios I (502) and Justin I (524). Nonnrosos's specific task was to bring to Constantinople a certain Qays, ruler of Kinda (I. Kawar, BZ 53 [1960] 57–73); Nonnrosos subsequently journeyed to Axum. According to Photios (Bibl., cod.3), sole source for his book's existence, Nonnrosos emphasized his own courage during hair-raising adventures. Arabian religion, the local pataois, elephants, and pygmies were some of the features of his narrative. His work may have been used by Malalas and Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 141–44).

—B.B.

NORICUM, Roman province northwest of Pannonia, divided by 304/5 into two: Noricum Ripense (major centers, Lauriacum and Ovilava) and Noricum Mediterraneum (capital, Virunum). Noricum Ripense, bordering on the Danube, had a more military character than Noricum Mediter-
raneeum, which was protected on the north by the Alps. The dux of Noricum Ripense directed both civil administration and the garrisons along the limes. The 4th C. was a period of relative pros-
perity: Noricum had flourishing villas (some sur-
vived until the end of the 5th C.), mines were explored, and new buildings were constructed in Virunum and other places. Christianity penetrated into the province, but pagan shrines (esp. that of Isis Noreia) remained active. In the 5th C. the area was systematically plundered by barbar-
ians; the population sought refuge in fortified castles. Eugippius in his vita of St. Severinus described the precarious situation of Noricum at this time. Nevertheless, Christianity became firmly established and many small churches were built throughout the region.

Noricum Ripense was abandoned by the “Romans” in 488, but Odoacer retained control over southern Noricum. In the 6th C. the Franks and Lombards competed for dominance in the area and Justinian I had to cede it to the Lombards; at the beginning of the 7th C., the Avars and Slavs penetrated Noricum and urban life ceased. Evidence of urbanism can be found only in Celeia and even there it is on a very limited level.


Personal bis zum Ende der römischen Herrschaft (Vienna 1969).

NORMANS (“Northmen”), western European term for Nordic people, known as Vikings in Scandinavia, Varangians in Kievan Rus', and Frankoi in Byz. From the end of the 8th C. to the 11th C. the Normans plundered and often settled in various countries from Iceland to Kie-

ven Rus'. In 860 Normans sacked Pisa and, ac-

According to legend, seized and burned Luni, which they mistook for Rome.

The Norman occupation of southern Italy began in 999 or 1016/17. They first penetrated there from Normandy as mercenaries of Byz. or Lombard princes, then formed several principalties that Roger II united into a kingdom. Despite the successes of Byz. generals such as Basil Boloannes

and George Maniakes, the Normans occupied Byz. themes in Italy between 1040 and 1071.

From 1060 to 1072 the Normans conquered Sicily. Their victory in Italy was the result of a turbulent situation in which various forces (Greeks, Germans, Arabs, the papacy, Lombard rulers of Salerno, Capua, etc.) were contending and also the strength of the Norman army. Still peasants

under their chieftains in the 10th C., the Normans at the same time acquired the military techniques of knights. Norman alertness and their use of

ruses often impressed their adversaries.

The Normans in Italy were closely connected with Byz. During the first century of Norman rule large sectors of their administration were run by

Greeks, even former Byz. officials. Many Norman nobles entered Byz. service: in the 11th C. some acted as semi-independent military commanders (Hervé Frankopoulos, Roussel de Bailleul), whereas in the 12th C. they penetrated the Byz.

aristocracy, some (Rogerio, Petralphai, Raoul) even marrying into the imperial family. In the 12th C. Normans constituted the most populous group of Westerners in the Byz. elite (Kazhdan, Gosp. klas. 214). On the other hand, the Normans

exploited Byz.'s precarious situation and tried to establish their command in the Balkans—first in 1081–85 under Robert Guiscard, who was fi-

nally defeated by Alexios I. Bohemond successfully attacked Dyrrachion in 1107–08 and had to sign the treaty of DEVOL acknowledging his
Norman Rules of Sicily

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger I, brother of Robert Guiscard, count of Sicily</td>
<td>1072–1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger II, count of Sicily</td>
<td>1101/5–1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Apulia and Calabria</td>
<td>1127–1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King of Sicily</td>
<td>1130–1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William I</td>
<td>1154–1166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William II</td>
<td>1166–1189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tancred of Lecce</td>
<td>1189–1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William III (died ca. 1198)</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

allegiance to Byz. During the constant wars of the 12th C. Normans even sent a fleet against Constantinople; in 1147–48 Roger II's fleet devastated central Greece and the Peloponnese, and the Normans carried off many Byz. silk weavers to Sicily. The Normans' major success was the capture of Thessalonike in 1185, but they were soon routed by Alexios Branas. Another region in which the Normans attempted to create a principality was Antioch, reconquered during the First Crusade. At the end of the 12th C. relations between the Normans and Byz. improved as a result of common animosity toward Germany: the Byz. supported Tancred of Lecce against Henry VI of Germany until Tancred's death; in 1194 Henry (husband of Roger II's daughter Constance and therefore a legitimate heir to the throne) was crowned king of Sicily, thus ending the rule of the Norman dynasty.


NOTARAS, LOUKAS, megas doux (1449–1453); born Constantinople, died Constantinople June 1453. Son of Nicholas Notaras (Nolaras), a wealthy courtier and ambassador of Manuel II, Loukas Notaras served the last three Byz. emperors and was related by marriage to the imperial family. He called himself Cambros of the emperor. S. Runciman (Polychronion 447–49) has suggested that his wife was a daughter of John VII. In 1424, Notaras accompanied George Sphrantzes on an embassy to Murad II; he served as mesazon under John VIII and Constantine XI (J. Verpeaux, BS 16 [1955] 272). In 1441 he commanded the ship on which Constantine sailed to Lesbos to marry Caterina Gattilusio. Notaras did business with Italian merchants, entrusted his money to Italian bankers, and became a citizen of Genoa and Venice (Oikonomides, Hommes d'affaires 19f, 120f). Despite his Italian ties, he was a rabid anti-Unionist and was recorded by a hostile source (Douk. 329) as preferring Turkish conquest to Union of the Churches. Notaras took an active part, however, in the defense of Constantinople during the Ottoman siege of 1453. According to pseudo-Sphrantzes (Sphr. 406, 432–34), Notaras was accused of treachery by Giustiniani Longo and sought an accommodation with the sultan after
the fall of Constantinople; nonetheless, he and his sons were executed. In 1470 a certain John Moschos wrote a eulogy of Notaras attempting to vindicate him from charges of treason (ed. E. Legrand, DICEE 2 (1885-86) 413–24).


NOTARY, an official whose duty was to register transactions and certify documents. He bore various names (e.g., notarius [Lat.], taboullarios, tabellion, symbolographos, nomikos), which changed their meaning over the course of time. Late Roman notarii were primarily stenographers who recorded the minutes of important meetings, while taboullarios were officials found in numerous departments in the capital and the provinces, often involved in fiscal operations. "Imperial taboullarios" appear on seals of the 6th–7th C. (e.g., Zacos, Seals 1, no.914).

From the 6th C. onward, however, the major function of taboullarios became the preparation of documents (a function reflected in the term symbolographos), and the guild of taboullarios, as described in the Book of the Eparch (ch.1), was a private body under the control of state authorities. The taboullarios were required to have a legal education, excellent command of Greek, and good handwriting. Their guild was more closely involved than others in the state hierarchy: the dean of the notaries was called primikeros; taboullarios were given ranks of precedence and their participation in imperial processions was clearly emphasized, but their clientele was private, including noble families, monasteries, euageis oikoi, and old-age homes.

From taboullarios should be distinguished notarii (sometimes with the epithet "imperial"), who are known primarily from seals and who served in various government departments (genikon, vestiarion, dromos, etc.) as scribes and secretaries. In the Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzes, no.414) a figure identified as a notarios is shown writing a letter dictated by John I Tzimiskes. Probably by the 14th or 15th C. notarii assumed the role of public notaries rather than that of secretaries, even certifying state treaties.

In the 19th C. and later the nomikoi, who had previously been lawyers and teachers of law, drafted documents. They probably differed from taboullarios only in that they were located in provincial chanceries, taboullarios primarily in Constantinople and some other large cities.


—A.K., A.C.

NOTATION. Until the introduction of musical signs (neumata) in the 9th C., the church relied on oral tradition for the transmission of its chant repertory. Initially, musical notation was used as only an aid to oral transmission, to establish continuity between the oral and written traditions. The question of why musical notation appeared at that particular time has no simple answer, but surely the rapid growth in hymnography and the concern for preserving ancient practices were contributing factors.

Two varieties of Byz. notation were developed to accommodate two different styles of chanting. One, a lectionary or ekphonic notation for the biblical lessons, was in use by the 8th or 9th C. and continued until the 12th or 13th C. Simply a memory aid, it supplies only a part of the information needed to reconstruct the melodies. Unless an explanatory manual is found, this notation will continue to defy precise transcription. The other, a melodic notation for hymns and psalms, is found in the following important collections: the Heirmologia, the Sticherarion, the Asmatikon, the Psaltikon, and the Akolouthia (or Papadike).

Before ca.1175, Byz. melodic notation was stenographic; the singer was expected to interpret the signs by applying certain established rules (generally unknown to us, but absolutely familiar to him) in order to provide an accurate and acceptable rendition of the music. After ca.1175, the more complex and explicit notation, operating on mathematical principles, rather than on melodic conventions, provided the singer with all the graphic material necessary to execute the chant correctly.
NOTITIA DIGNITATUM, a (probably) official list of all civil and military offices of both halves of the late Roman Empire. The purpose of the Notitia seems to have been to order the precedence of officials, but it records offices actually held rather than honorary titles. The primicerius of the notaries in each half of the empire was supposed to update the Notitia, but changes were not made consistently and partial revisions resulted in substantial contradictions in the surviving text. The exact date of the extant version is debated: Hoffmann assigns the military lists of the Western section to the reign of Honorius and those of the Eastern part to Theodosios II; Clemente distinguishes three strata, that of Theodosios I, a revision at the time of Stilicho, and another ca. 425–29 (see also W. Seibt, Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Mitteilungen 90 [1982] 339–46). Many sections of the Notitia contain shield emblems (insignia) of various offices that are usually thought to represent an official pictorial register, although R. Grigg (JRS 73 [1983] 132–41) demonstrated their inaccuracy and questioned their official character.

NOTITIAE EPISCOPTUM (sing. τάξις or ἐκθέσεις), lists of ecclesiastical dioceses. The dioceses are arranged in hierarchical order: first metropolitan sees, then autonomous archbishoprics, and finally bishoprics in clusters, each of which makes up a metropolis. The earliest surviving notitia of Constantinople is that of pseudo-Epiphanius, probably compiled during the reign of Heraclios. Three others belong to the 8th and 9th C., several to the 10th C., and the latest (twenty-first) notitia in the edition of Darrouzès (infra) is of the Turkish period. Gerland (infra, 18) hypothesized that the original document, called by him the Urnotitia, might have been created by the end of the 4th C. The lost notitia of the patriarchate of Antioch was reconstructed by E. Honigmann (BZ 25 [1925] 60–88) on the basis of later Greek, Latin, and Eastern sources. The lists of notitiae are not always consistent with the signatures in the minutes of church councils—in the 12th C. the discrepancies are insignificant, in the 14th C. more substantial owing to the general political unrest of the period; one can conclude that the lists of notitiae were traditional and lagged behind actual changes in the hierarchy.

Attempts have been made to interpret the lists in terms of political and economic history: K. Amantos (11 CEB, Akten [Munich 1960] 21–23) emphasized that the notitiae reflect the decline of Christianity, esp. in the East, during the Arab and Turkish invasions; Ostrogorsky (Byz. Geschichte 109–13) asserts that the notitiae “correspond fairly closely to the actual situation” and demonstrate the survival of urban centers in Asia Minor in the 7th C. and later. On the other hand, I. Snegaroff (IsvInstBülgIst 6 [1956] 647–55) is very cautious in assessing the usefulness of notitiae to clarify the process of Christianization of the Balkans in the 7th C.


NOTITIAE DIGNITATUM, ed. O. Seeck (Berlin 1876).

NOTITIAE URBIS CONSTANTINOPOLITANAEE, an anonymous Latin description of Constantinople compiled ca. 425–30 during the reign of Theodosios II. It consists of a preface, a list of 14 regions indicating the most notable buildings and local officials, and a recapitulation stating that Constantinople possessed 5 palaces, 14 churches, 8 public baths and 153 private bathhouses, 4 squares (foras), 5 warehouses (horrea), 2 theaters, 2 mime theaters (husoria), a hippodrome (circus), 4 cisterns, 322 vici (“wards”), 4,388 houses (domus), 17 docks (gradus), and 5 slaughterhouses; also mentioned are 2 senate houses, the Augustaem, Capitolium, a colosseum, and so on. The local officials named include 13 curatores (the 14th region had no curator), 14 slave-policemen (vernaculi), 560 volunteer firemen (collegiati), and 65 night guards (vicomagistri). This notitia is the document on which calculation of the population of 5th-C. Constantinople is primarily based.

NOTITIAE EPISCOPTUM, ed. O. Seeck (Berlin 1876) 227–43. Germ. tr. F.W. Unger, Quellen der byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte (Vienna 1878) 162–69.
NOUMERA. See DOMESTIKOS TON NOUMERON.

NOUS. See INTELLECT.

NOVAE (Nőßars), a Roman city of MOESIA II, on the right bank of the Danube; it was located near mod. Svištov in Bulgaria. Archaeological excavations reveal a change in the urban plan in the early 4th C., probably after the rebellion of soldiers in 316/17 (T. Sarnowski, Archeologia 30 [Warsaw 1979] 119–28): the central square with its principia (headquarters) was transformed into a forum, but the Roman network of streets and public buildings with porticoes continued to determine the shape of Novae. Coin finds are esp. abundant between 330 and 378 (K. Dimitrov, Pulpudova 3 [1978] 199–203), but economic activity was substantial through the 5th C.: from the end of the 4th C. onward, at least four basilicas were constructed (S. Parnciki-Pudeiko, Archeologia Polona 21–22 [1983] 269). By 430 Novae was a bishopric. Justinian I tried to maintain the city, but after ca.600 the name Novae disappears from written sources; a seal with a nimbate bust and the monogrammatic name (possibly Celtic) METR[O]NOU or MERT[I]NOU (L. Mrozewicz, Archeologia 32 [Warsaw 1981] 82, no.19) is probably to be dated in the second half of the 6th C. (not the 6th–8th C.).


NOVATIONISM, a rigorist Christian sect, named after Novatianus (died 257/8), a Roman priest. He refused the readmission of lapsi, those who had renounced their faith in the face of the Decian persecution (250–51); his followers formed a separatist community. Calling themselves katharoi (the pure), groups of Novatians sprang up throughout the empire, but they were particularly strong in Africa, Asia Minor, and Constantinople. More schisms that heretics, the Novatians modeled themselves closely on the practice of the contemporary church, although they continued to hold that serious sin after baptism could not be for-}

given. They agreed with the Orthodox on the question of Arianism, and the emperors generally hesitated to persecute the sect, whose members were commonly admired for their piety. In the 4th C. the Novatian leadership apparently became more lax, and some sect members separated from the group, calling themselves Protopaschites because of their method for calculating the celebration of Easter. Novatianism lost much of its vigor in the 5th C., but the sect survived at least until the early 7th C.


NOVEL (peepō, Lat. novella [constitutio], lit. a “new [decree]”), the term for an imperial edict. Known from the 4th C. onward, it was specifically applied to ordinances issued after the CODEX THEODOSIANUS and then to the Justinianic Novels (see NOVELS OF JUSTINIAN I) promulgated after the CODEX JUSTINIANUS. The term fell out of use after Justinian I, but reappeared at the time of the “reception” of Justinianic law and was used in the collection of laws issued by Leo VI (see NOVELS OF LEO VI). The emperors of the 10th C., from Romanos I (Reg 1, nos. 595, 628) to Basil II (Reg 1, nos. 772, 783), used the term relatively often; less frequent in the 11th to first half of the 12th C., it became popular with Manuel I (Reg 2, nos. 1341, 1398, 1467, 1535). From this time onward, more general expressions, such as novel or edict (see EDICTUM) were replaced by specific terms, such as chrysobull, proctagma, horismos (Dölger, Diplomatik 122). If we disregard the two cases in which the archaizing historian Pachymeres used this term (Reg 3, no.2040; 4, no.2159), the only novel known from the late Byz. period is the law of Andronikos II of 1306 on ABOTIKION, regulating intestate succession (Reg 4, no.2295).


NOVELS OF JUSTINIAN I. The laws published by Justinian I after the completion of the CODEX JUSTINIANUS were designated as novellae constitutiones or new constitutions. In contrast to the other
parts of the Corpus Juris Civilis they were issued for the most part in Greek, and, in contrast to the concise language of the Digest and Institutes, they are accompanied by a considerable use of rhetoric and extensive justifications and legitimations. Justinian intended to publish the novels as an "official" compilation; this did not occur, however, perhaps due to the death of Tribonian. The novels are thus transmitted only in private collections; the most extensive, which contains 168 novels (some of which are by Justinian’s successors) as well as 13 edicts, is the basis of modern editions. Recensions of the novels from the 6th or 7th C. exist in Latin in the so-called Authenticum and the Epitome Juliani, in Greek in the Syntagma of novels by Athanasios Scholastikos of Emesa, and the collection of novels by Theodore Scholastikos. The greater part of the texts of the Justinianic novels was incorporated into the Basilika.

ED. CIC, vol. 3.

M. Th. F. NOVELS OF LEO VI, a collection of 113 undated imperial ordinances issued by Emp. Leo VI and addressed mostly to Stylianos Zaoutzes. The first novels are devoted to ecclesiastical affairs, then follow the laws involving individuals (marriage, dowry, manumission, adoption). After novel 66 no system can be ascertained. It is unclear whether they were published as an entire corpus or one after another; in any case, a 10th-C. MS containing only 12 novels has been recently discovered (N. van der Wal, Tijdschrift 49 [1975] 257–69). Since Zaoutzes died in 899, the novels must have been issued before this year. N. van der Wal and J. Lokin (Historiae iuris Graeco-Romanie delineatio [Groningen 1985] 86) suggest that they were published after the Basilika, although they contain no direct references to the Basilika. M. Th. Fögen (SubGr 3 [1989] 23–35) argues instead that the novels were issued one by one, while the codification of the Basilika was in progress, to meet problems which arose from the discrepancies between Justinianic law and contemporary needs and customs.

The purpose of the novels was to "cleanse" the legal system and abrogate legislation that had become obsolete (G. Michailidès-Nouaros in Mne-mosynon Perilektoù Bizoukidou [Thessalonike 1960–65] 27–54). It is not yet clear to what extent it was a real program and to what extent an academic exercise. M. Sjūzjumov (VizVrem 15 [1959] 33–49) viewed the novels as coherent legislation directed at the needs of large flourishing cities, encouraging private ownership, trade, loans, and partnerships, but ignoring the situation in the countryside.

ED. P. Noailles, A. Dain, Les Novelles de Léon VI le Sage (Paris 1944), with Fr. tr. C.A. Spulber, Les Novelles de Léon le Sage (Cernăuți 1934) 3–121, with Fr. tr.

-A.K.

NOVGOROD (Нао́городь or Невгородь), town on the upper Volkhov; initially a northern base for the Rus' (earliest reference: De adm. imp. 94) and a prosperous commercial center until the end of the 15th C. A 15th-C. historian (Chalk. 1:122.18–21) speaks of Novgorod as an aristokratia, more prosperous than the other Russian cities. Direct and transit trade with Constantinople was most intense in the 10th–12th C. (esp. exports to Novgorod of glass, walnuts, boxwood, and amphorae of wine and oil). The bishopric was founded ca.990 and its incumbents gradually acquired a status somewhat apart from the other bishops of Rus'; the title "archbishop" was used sporadically from the mid-12th C.; in 1285 Novgorod refused the metropolitan of Kiev the right to overrule judgments of the archbishop, a right that Kir-rian—supported by ambassadors from Patr. Anto-ny IV—tried unsuccessfully to reclaim. Cul-tural ties with Byz., however, were close: the Cathedral of St. Sophia (1045–50) was built by Byz. craftsmen, and it probably included doors made in Constantinople (one of two sets of doors erroneously labeled “Chersonian”—see S. Beljaev in Dreminaja Rus’i slaviane [Moscow 1978] 300–10); the 12th-C. bishops had their seals inscribed in Greek; Byz. liturgical silver from Novgorod is preserved, as are the working notes of a Greek icon painter active in Novgorod ca.1200 (B. Kolčin et al., Usad’ba novgorodskogo chudožnika XII v. [Moscow 1981]); and travelers and pilgrims from Novgorod produced accounts of the holy places of Constantinople (e.g., Antony of Novgorod).

NOVICE (παροφόρος), in the earlier period also called archarios or neopages, a person undergoing a period of probation before receiving the tonsure and taking the monastic habit. In the earliest years of monasticism both Pachomios and Basil the Great prescribed a brief but unspecified trial period for those wishing to take the monastic habit. The legislation of Justinian I (novs. 5, 132.5) and canon law (canon 5 of the Council of Constantinople of 861) ordained that this probationary period should range from six months to three years; some typika specify that the length of the trial period depended on the social rank, age, and experience of the future monk or nun, being shortest for members of the nobility. In the case of gravely ill novices, the trial period was waived and tonsure was immediate.

The minimum age for entrance into a monastery was about 16–18; in some cases younger boys and girls could be admitted. Thus, the typikon of Christodoulos of Patmos allowed boys (paidia) to be brought up at the monastery; if they decided to take permanent vows, they could later be tonsured (MM 6:83.10–12). Usually beardless youths were not allowed to live in the monastery and resided in monastic proasteia. Other categories of individuals who could be denied admission to a monastery were eunuchs, fugitive slaves, and criminals; some hegoumenoi were reluctant to admit children seeking to enter monastic life against the will of their parents. On the other hand, a lavish donation (apotage, prosenexis, anathema, etc.) might enhance one’s chances of admittance, although Balsamon protested against the practice of tonsuring in exchange for a gift of money (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:632.19–28).

The novice sometimes continued to wear secular garb until the time of his or her tonsure; Blastares even imposed a fine on those who donned the monastic habit before the end of the novitiate. Balsamon prohibited a rasophoros to return to secular life and to marry (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:746.13–14). Novices were usually assigned to an experienced monk or nun (anadochos) as a spiritual mentor when Symeon the Theologian entered the Studios monastery, he placed all his possessions at the feet of his father pneumatikos and was given a place to sleep under the stairs near his master’s cell.


NOVIODUNUM (Νοβιοδόνος, mod. Isaccea in Rumania), a Roman naval station in Moesia II, on the right bank of the Danube. Archaeologists have discovered the north wall of the fortress, with one large rectangular and seven semicircular towers; a second rampart was built in the 4th C. Baths (one from the 4th C.) and a basilical building were also excavated. Several Christian martyrs are connected with Noviodunum, among them Menerius or Menedemus (E. Polaschek, RE 17 [1937] 1194). A series of coins dated through the reign of Emp. Phokas confirms the functioning of the stronghold to the beginning of the 7th C. It was rebuilt during the reign of John I Tzimiskes. Byz. coins of the late 10th–13th C. have been found as well as seals, including one with the name "despos: Isaakios," probably Isaac II (G. Stefan, Dacia 9–10 [1941–44] 482). Near Isaccea, an 11th–12th-C. cemetery was excavated that yielded Byz. coins (of Romanos III and Michael IV) and Byz. glass, bronze, and silver objects (I. Vasilii, Peuce 9 [1984] 107–41). Noviodunum seems to have been an important point on the Byz. defensive system of the Danube in the 11th–12th C. Tatar coins and objects of the 13th–14th C. testify to their presence in Noviodunum.


NOVYE SENŽARY, a town near Poltava in the Ukraine where in 1928 a "hoard" (in fact, objects from a tomb) was found; the objects disappeared during World War II. The "hoard" contained seven solidi (the latest dating to Constans II, probably before 646), weapons and armor fragments (from a saber and a coat of mail), arrowheads, harness items, a glass goblet and bowl, and gold and silver revetment. The glass vessels and a gold ring were probably of Byz. provenance. The location of this tomb, perhaps that of a nomad.
warrior, is very close to that of the “hoard” of Malaja Perščepina.


NOXAL ACTIONS (νοξαλία ήγωγαι, from Lat. actiones noxales), suits against the owner of a delinquent slave, in which the owner—providing the delict had occurred without his knowledge or consent—could avoid paying compensation or penalties by surrendering the slave (noxae datio) to the person who had suffered the damage. The same option existed in cases of damage by quadrupeds (Institutes 4.8–9; Digest 9.1.4; Basil. 60.2.5). Whether the option was actually exercised in Byz. remains in doubt (despite the evidence of Peira 61.5).

Lit.: Kaser, Privatrecht 2:430–33. – L.B.

NUBIA, general designation for the region on Egypt’s southern border beginning at Syene (Aswan) and following the Nile and Blue Nile basins to an undetermined point above Soba where it bordered on the kingdom of Axum. Circa 530, the “kinglet” (basiliskos) Silko consolidated power in the north by subduing the Blemmyes. In the 6th C., Nubia was divided into three kingdoms: Nobatia in the north, Makuria in the middle, and Alodia in the south. Both Justinian I and Theodora sponsored separate Orthodox and Monophysite missions to convert Nubia between 530 and 580. The readiness to accept missions from Byz. may have stemmed from efforts to check Axum, whose Christian ruler, a sometime Byz. ally, had devastated the earlier Meroitic kingdom. The Nubian kingdoms were subject to strong influences from the emerging Coptic church of Egypt, but not to the utter exclusion of Greek Orthodoxy. The Arab conquests cut off Nubia from further contact with Byz., but Greek continued to be used in inscriptions and Byz. influences on church art are generally acknowledged. The two northern kingdoms, united ca.710, remained independent and Christian until 1323. The kingdom of Soba survived until the 15th C. Islamization followed upon their conquests.

Robert de Clari relates that at the court of Isaac II and Alexios IV he saw a Nubian king (“li rois de Nubie”) who visited Jerusalem and Constantinople and was planning to continue to Rome and Spain. He ruled over a Christian people who dwelt far south of Jerusalem, baptized their children, and branded with a hot iron the sign of the cross on their brows. This pilgrimage took place ca.1203, and the king can probably be identified as Lalibela, the Ethiopian ruler of the second half of the 12th C. known for his pilgrimage to Jerusalem and active construction of churches (B. Hendrickx, Byzantina 13.2 [1985] 893–98; cf. B. Rostkowski in P. van Moorsel, New Discoveries in Nubia [Leiden 1982] 113–16).


– D.W.J., A.K.

NUDE, THE. Unlike classical authors the Byz. tried to avoid describing the naked body: a typical example of Byz. caution is Niketas Choniates’ reference to the statue of Athena in Constantinople, which he praises for being covered with a heavy garment. Byz. costume concealed rather than exposed the body. Contrary opinions were rare: thus Symeon the Theologian, in a hymn, proclaimed that Christ is present in every limb of the human body, even in the genitalia, and that therefore we should not be ashamed of our bodies. The History of Choniates contains no less than 17 words for various organs of the body connected with sexuality and excretory activity. Hagiographical texts often describe the apprehension experienced by pious men before the naked female body and praise holy men who showed themselves indifferent toward nakedness: John Moschos tells a story about a priest who was unable to baptize a beautiful Persian girl until John the Baptist sealed his body from the navel down with the sign of the cross; the priest then baptized the girl without even noticing that she was female (PG 87:2853D-2856B). Suppressed interest in the human body is sometimes revealed by criticism of classical and Islamic imagery.

In Byz. art, the nude is marked less by its rarity than by its cautious treatment. The nude form that is customary in Greek and Roman art survived in late antiquity—as on an ivory diptych in Ravenna (Volbach, Elfenbeinarbeiten, no.125) where Jonah is shown naked and fully sexed under the gourd—but in Byz. art was employed in greatly reduced numbers or else dressed, as in the same scene in the Menologion of Basil II (p. 59). Similarly, Christ appears naked in the baptistery
mosaics of Ravenna, his genitals visible through the Jordan, while in and after the 9th C. his groin is obscured. No matter what the period, it is the identity and function of the nude that seems to have determined the frankness with which the body was treated. Some images of female martyrdom, for example, depict mutilated breasts, and women in Last Judgments are suckled by snakes or frogs.

The pudenda are usually concealed by other parts of the body or by foliage in Creation scenes; where they are exposed, as on a ivory-clad casket in Cleveland, Adam and Eve, expelled from Paradise, have identical genitalia. The Byz. knew Hellenistic works of art with naked eros, such as the Tetrapleuron (Nik. Chon. 648.52—54) preserved until the 15th C. in Constantinople; putti on some Byz. boxes are shown fully exposed.

Nudity could suggest an equation with sin and sickness: Job is covered with sores until he finds the true path. Similarly, the desolation of the Good Samaritan in the Rossano Gospels (fol.7v) is denoted by his nakedness. Conversely in a scene that called for nudity, the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia are normally shown half-clothed. Generally, the naked body is treated diagrammatically, emphasizing such linear features as the spine and the diaphragm, though in deliberately classicizing works such as the silver Meleager and Atalanta plate, dating from the reign of Heraikleios, its volumetric qualities are observed.


A.C., A.K.

NU'MÁN, AL-. See NAMAAN.

NUMBERS. The Greek notation used to represent numbers consisted of the 24 normal letters of the Greek alphabet plus three archaic letters. The 27 resulting characters were arranged in three series of nine numbers each: units, tens, and hundreds. The three archaic letters were digamma (normally written in MSS as Ψ and from this form known as stigma), kappa, and sampi (see Table). The addition of diacritical marks produced further sets of three series of higher ord-

ders. Thus each of the above 27 numbers is multiplied by 1,000 by the addition of a stroke to the lower left; e.g., gements is replaced by a special symbol, e.g., α = 1000 and θ 800,000. In this way numbers of any magnitude could, in theory, be expressed symbolically. In fact, the highest numbers normally in use were products of the members of the first set and 10,000. In order to express these products one wrote the smaller number above the letter M; for example, Μ = 50,000 and Μ = 8,000,000.

Fractional numbers were written as unit fractions in the manner of the Egyptians, except for 2/3, half. There was also a special symbol for 1/2, V or. Since the numerators of the fractions were always 1, they did not need to be expressed. An integer number was often distinguished from a unit fraction by placing a bar over the integer, an acute accent after the fraction; e.g., δ = 4 and δ' = 1/4. Fractions whose numerators were not 1 were analyzed as the sum of several unit fractions; e.g., δ'η' = 1/4 + 1/8 = 3/8.

From antiquity the Greeks had also employed their letter numbers for 1 through 50 to express the sexagesimal place value system introduced into astronomy by the Babylonians. In this system each place represents a power of 60, a positive power to the left of zero and a negative to the right. The absence of a number in any place was represented by the symbol 0; in pure sexagesimal writing this could not be confused with the integer number represented by omicron, 70, since no number higher than 59 could ever be written in any place. Thus, the motion of Saturn in 30 days, for instance, would be written: αο ιτ ιε μι ιδ κκ ιο

λ = 1 + 0 × 60⁻¹ + 16 × 60⁻² + 45 × 60⁻³ + 44 × 60⁻⁴ + 25 × 60⁻⁵ + 30 × 60⁻⁶.

In the middle of the 13th C. the Indian decimal place value system was introduced into Byz. together with the ten symbols necessary for writing it. The older systems coexisted with this new one until after 1453; and, of course, the sexagesimal system continued to be used in astronomy, horology, and trigonometry.

D.P.
NUMBER SYMBOLISM AND THEORY. Numbers played an important part in Pythagorean and Neoplatonic philosophy, and Christian theologians inherited the problem of the transition from the monad of God to the multitude in the created world. The mystery of the Trinity (three hypotheses of one nature) and the mystery of Christ (two natures united in one hypostasis) formed the bridge from the One to the cosmos and multifarious mankind. Then the question arose whether the number as such was a substance or only the form/measurement. John of Damascus, in his polemics against the Monophysites (Aceph. 4.3–6, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 4:412), rejects the idea that number is the principle (*archê*) of division; it is rather a “heaping up” or “pouring forth” of individual “monads,” and thus union and not division (*Jacob.* 50:2–3, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 4:124). John used the argument to support the doctrine of the unity of two natures in Christ.

The Byz. ascribed a particular significance, sometimes mysterious or magical, to various numbers, esp. one (one God, one cosmos, one basileus), two (two natures in Christ), and three: besides the Trinity, they observed an angelic hierarchy divided into three orders, the three days of Christ’s entombment, triple immersion at baptism, three kinds of law (of nature, of Moses, and of grace), etc. Four characterized the elements, quarters of the world, and cardinal virtues; seven indicated perfection (seven virtues); eight, as the cube of two, was an ideal number. For John Lydos and many astrologers thereafter the numbers three, nine, and forty defined the stages of conception, mortality, the progress of the soul, and liturgical commemoration (G. Dagron in *Temps chrétien* 419–30). Symbolic interpretation was popular in rhetoric and used for political propaganda. For instance, at the beginning of Constantine IV’s reign, the army demanded that he proclaim his brothers Tiberios and Heracleios emperors; the request was justified in terms of number symbolism. The soldiers announced, “We believe in the Trinity, we will crown three rulers” (Theoph. 352.15f).

Number symbolism also played a pervasive role in art and architecture: obvious allusion to the Trinity is made in triple apses, naves, and doors. Biblical descriptions of the four corners of the world, rivers of Paradise, and winds were staples of book illustration, and fivefold symmetry an essential aspect of the *Nea Ekklesia* and the *Pen- tapyrignon*. The varying number of apostles at different times in Christ’s earthly life was interpreted in a hymn on the cathedral of Edessa as underlying the architectural form of its members. Eight sides, symbolizing the Resurrection, were traditional for baptismal fonts, while the ideal church, according to the 5th-C. *Testamentum Domini*, included a baptistery 21 cubits long “for the total number of the prophets” and 12 cubits wide “for a type of those . . . appointed to preach the Gospel.”


-A.K., A.C.-

NUMIDIA (*Novumidia*), a province situated to the west and south of *Africa Proconsularis*. Under Diocletian, Numidia was divided into two provinces: Numidia Militana, comprising the military frontier in the south, and Numidia Cirtensis, the Tell and High Plains around Cirta. In 314 this arrangement was abandoned and the province reunited. Numidia was remote and not particularly wealthy. This atmosphere bred in the province a fervent conservatism and resistance to central authority, manifested by the Donatist movement and within it the Circumcellions. In 435 Numidia was ceded to the *Vandals*. Although returned to the imperial government in 442, the eastern and southern parts of Numidia evidently remained under Vandal control. In the late 5th C. *Mauri* tribes from the Aures Mountains sacked Thamugadi and frequently raids as far as Cirta, renamed Constantina.

Byz. authority over the province was established through a series of campaigns (534–41) under Justinian I. The *dux* of Numidia exercised a substantial circumscription, which probably included parts of *Mauritania* and the proconsular province. The military importance of Numidia is evidenced by the fact that some holders of the office went on to become *magistri militum* of Africa. Numerous forts were built under Justinian to secure Numidia against the largely autonomous tribes, although no conflicts are recorded after ca.571.

A Latin inscription from Thamugadi mentions the construction of a church, sometime between 642 and 647, by Gregory *patricius* (presumably Gregory, the exarch) and John, *dux* of Tigisis,
the last reference to Byz. official activity in Numidia. The first Arab incursion in 682 resulted in a Mauri-Byz. victory at Thabudeos, but by then imperial authority in Numidia was in name only.


NUMISMATICS (from νόμισμα), the study of coins and of coinlike objects such as coin weights (exagia), tokens, jettons, and medals. In practice, Byz. numismatics is limited to coins and coin weights, for there are no Byz. medals or jettons, and while objects have been published that may have served as tokens, their nature is uncertain and they have yet to be systematically studied. In like manner the discipline does not include Byz. gold and lead bullae, although these resemble coins in metal composition and in design; bullae form the domain of sigillography. Byz. coins become available to scholars through coin finds, the study of which is almost a specialized subject in itself.

Byz. numismatics is in one respect simple, since for most periods coins have survived in large numbers and the great majority can be assigned to specific emperors. Many of the copper coins from 559 to the end of the 7th C. even bear regnal or indictional dates, and this is occasionally the case for coins of other metals. But the scholar is hampered by the total absence of mint records and the paucity of commercial documents, so that it is often not known how the coins of different metals were related to each other or even what some of them were called. A statistical study of the proportions of coins struck by the same dies in particular samples of coin allows one to determine, within a wide margin of error, the number of dies originally used for issues and, consequently, their comparable sizes. The attempts, however, of some numismatists (e.g., O. Metcalf, Byzantium 37 [1967] 288–95) to turn these into absolute figures with the help of coin-output information from other countries and periods has not met with universal acceptance.

Coins of a single denomination and issue were theoretically uniform in weight and fineness. Weight was originally defined in terms of the number (e.g., 72 for the solidus) struck to the Romano-Byz. pound (see Litra). As absolute uniformity was impossible in practice, coins were always a little above or below the average figure; the limits of authorized variation were probably very small in the case of gold coins, less for silver, and probably undefined for copper, where individual specimens of the same issue and in good condition can vary by as much as 50 percent. Original weights are best ascertained by constructing a frequency table of the weights of a number of actual specimens and determining where the largest concentration occurs, but because surviving coins are always worn, even if only slightly, the result will fall short of the original theoretical weight. A further allowance, necessarily somewhat subjective in character, has consequently to be made for wear. Figures for fineness are usually difficult to ascertain. The purity of gold was in the past usually checked by the touchstone, and specific gravity methods, commonly used today, give results sufficiently accurate for scholarly purposes, but more refined procedures (neutron activation, X-ray fluorescence) are employed when possible. Direct chemical analysis is usually avoided, except for copper and silver coins of little value, because of the inevitable injury to the coins.

Because the state issued the coins, their inscriptions and designs could be used for propaganda purposes and they sometimes throw light on imperial claims or policy. (See also “Thematic Content” and “Language” under Coins.) One may instance the introduction of the full title basileus Romaion on the silver miliareis after Michael II recognized Charlemagne as basileus (but not Romanos) in 812, and that of the title orthodoxos on coins of Michael VI (1056–57) and Isaac I (1057–59) in the decade following the breach with Rome in 1054. The way in which emperors were represented shows the way in which they wished their subjects to see them and elucidates the evolution of imperial costume and insignia (G.P. Galavaris, MN 8 [1958] 99–117). From the 9th C. onward coin types often consisted of representations of Christ and of the Virgin and other saints, and because these can be dated with greater certainty than most other works of art, the variety of types used and their evolution can be of great value to the art historian.

NUMMUS (νομίμιον), a Latin term meaning "coin" but often used for a specific denomination. In the period of the Tetrarchy it was apparently the official name of the large bronze coins of approximately 10 g, which numismatists have long been accustomed to term folles. In the 5th–6th C., nummus was the name of the lowest denomination in circulation, a tiny, ill-struck copper coin weighing approximately 1 g that in a document of 445 was reckoned 1/7,200 of the solidus but more frequently was 1/6,000 or 1/12,000. The usual reverse type was an imperial monogram, but its identity as a unit is shown by some nummi of Justinian I bearing instead the letter A (= 1). The denomination ceased to be struck at Constantinople in the late 6th C. and in North Africa during the 7th C., but it remained notionally in use as a money of account, 1/6,000 of the solidus, or sometimes as a generic term for small change (νομίμιον λεπτοὶ—Psellus in PG 122:956A).


NUN (μοναχή, καλόγραια), a woman who renounced the world and entered a cenobitic nunery. As was the case with monks, women could become nuns at several stages of life, as young maidens or as middle-aged and elderly widows. Women donned the monastic habit for many reasons: a true vocation, gratitude for a miraculous cure, loneliness, or illness. It was quite usual for women to take vows when they were widowed or when their husbands were confined in a monastery; in the convent they found both spiritual and material support for their old age.

Rules on the duration of the novitiate (see Novice) varied from convent to convent; the canonical length was three years, but this was reduced to six months or a year for mature and experienced women of proven character. The minimum age for final profession was normally 16. At the time of her vows it was customary for a nun to take a new name, usually beginning with the same letter as her given Christian name, for example, Theodora—Theodoule. The nun’s habit consisted of a black tunic (the himation), an outer cloak (the mandygas), and veil or headcovering (the skepe). Nuns were divided into two classes: the literate Nun. Nuns of the convent of the Virgin Bebaia Elpidios. Miniature in the typikon of the Bebaia Elpidios nunnery (Lincoln College, Oxford, gr. 35, fol. 12r); 14th C. Bodleian Library, Oxford.

were assigned to service as choir sisters; those unable to read were responsible for housekeeping duties.


NUNNERY (γυναικεία μονή, γυναικωνίτης). The development of female monasteries paralleled that of their male counterparts. Among the earliest 4th-C. convents were a large nunnery in Egypt organized in accordance with the precepts of Pachomios and a nunnery founded in Asia Minor by Makrina, based on the rule of her brother, Basil the Great of Caesarea. Nunneries represented a relatively small proportion of Byz. monasteries, perhaps 15 percent, and in later centuries were concentrated in Constantinople,
where they esp. attracted women from aristocratic and imperial families. Convents were prohibited on Athos and Meteora and discouraged on the other holy mountains.

Typika are preserved for six nunneries, including Kecharitomene, Lips, Bebaias Elpidos, and the convent founded by Neilos Damillas; their rules are similar to those of male monasteries, and emphasize the ideal of the koinobion. The typika enjoin strict enclosure and segregation of the sexes, and a twofold division of the community of nuns into choir sisters and those responsible for housekeeping duties. The officials are also similar, for example, superior (hegoumena; see Hegoumenos), steward (oikonomos), cellarer, and treasurer. In contrast to monasteries that had resident hieromonachoi to conduct services, nunneries had to bring in priests from outside. Unlike male establishments, nunneries supported few intellectual or artistic pursuits (A.M. Talbot in Okeanos 604–18). The important function of convents was the refuge and support they provided to women with a true vocation, and to the sick, widowed, and elderly. (See also Monastery, Double.)


NÜR AL-DIN (Nuradīn), atabeg of Aleppo and (from 1154) Damascus and (from 1169) nominal ruler of Egypt; born Feb. 1118, died Damascus 15 May 1174. Son of Zangi, he succeeded his father at Aleppo and devoted himself to fighting the Crusader states. In 1151 he and Mas'ud I seized the remnants of the county of Edessa, which belonged to Manuel I. In Nov. 1158 Nur al-Din's envoys attended Manuel's humiliation of Renaud of Antioch at Mopsuestia; Manuel sent a friendly embassy that reached Nur al-Din in Mar. 1159. Manuel needed Nur al-Din to oppose the Crusaders in the princedom of Antioch, so that the latter would rely on Byz. aid. Thus, while in Apr.–May 1159 Manuel, Baldwin III, and Renaud advanced toward Aleppo, negotiations with Nur al-Din continued. In May 1159 Nur al-Din re-leased several Crusader leaders and thousands of other captives. He and Manuel agreed to support the Danişmendids against Kilic Arslan II; cooperation continued until 1161. In 1164 Nur al-Din crushed an alliance, which included Constantinian Kalamanos (Byz. governor of Cilicia), and captured Kalamanos.


NYMPHAION (Nymphaión), a monumental fountain set against a wall articulated with niches, often decorated with columns and statuary. The nymphaion was adopted from Roman architecture, though its original association with pagan nymphs was lost by the late 4th C., when the term meant no more than a fountain. The Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae of ca.425 list four nymphae in Constantinople. Of these the most important was the Nympheum Maius, which functioned as the termination of the Aqueduct of Valens in the Forum Tauri; it survived as late as the mid-16th C. In addition to decorating public places, nymphae were sometimes incorporated into the atria of churches. A large nymphaion occupied the west side of the atrium of Basilica A at Philippi (ca.500), taking over the function of the traditional smaller kantharos (fountain).


NÜR AL-DIN (Novpādīn), atabeg of Aleppo and (from 1154) Damascus and (from 1169) nominal ruler of Egypt; born Feb. 1118, died Damascus 15 May 1174. Son of Zangi, he succeeded his father at Aleppo and devoted himself to fighting the Crusader states. In 1151 he and Mas'ud I seized the remnants of the county of Edessa, which belonged to Manuel I. In Nov. 1158 Nur al-Din's envoys attended Manuel's humiliation of Renaud of Antioch at Mopsuestia; Manuel sent a friendly embassy that reached Nur al-Din in Mar. 1159. Manuel needed Nur al-Din to oppose the Crusaders in the princedom of Antioch, so that the latter would rely on Byz. aid. Thus, while in Apr.–May 1159 Manuel, Baldwin III, and Renaud advanced toward Aleppo, negotiations with Nur al-Din continued. In May 1159 Nur al-Din re-leased several Crusader leaders and thousands of other captives. He and Manuel agreed to support the Danişmendids against Kilic Arslan II; cooperation continued until 1161. In 1164 Nur al-Din crushed an alliance, which included Constantinian Kalamanos (Byz. governor of Cilicia), and captured Kalamanos.


NYMPHAION (Nymphaión), a monumental fountain set against a wall articulated with niches, often decorated with columns and statuary. The nymphaion was adopted from Roman architecture, though its original association with pagan nymphs was lost by the late 4th C., when the term meant no more than a fountain. The Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae of ca.425 list four nymphae in Constantinople. Of these the most important was the Nympheum Maius, which functioned as the termination of the Aqueduct of Valens in the Forum Tauri; it survived as late as the mid-16th C. In addition to decorating public places, nymphae were sometimes incorporated into the atria of churches. A large nymphaion occupied the west side of the atrium of Basilica A at Philippi (ca.500), taking over the function of the traditional smaller kantharos (fountain).

Nymphaios, Treaty of

from the 12th C., Nymphaios became archbishopric in the 13th C. The council of 1234 convoked in Nicæa to discuss church union was transferred to Nymphaios (RegPatr, fasc. 4, nos. 1273–76).

Nymphaios contains the well-preserved palace of the Laskarids, a rectangular structure of four stories, built outside the city, apparently by John III. Its first floor, which has large windows and three rooms, was evidently the main reception area; upper floors, similar in plan, were reached by a monumental exterior stairway. The palace was built of rubble faced with regularly alternating ashlar and brick bands; it was roofed with timber. The castle above the town is Byz. with several phases of construction, mostly of the 13th C.


Nymphaios, Treaty Of. This agreement between Byz. and Genoa was signed in Nymphaios on 13 March 1261 and ratified in Genoa on 10 July 1261 (just one month before the Byz. reconquest of Constantinople). The text has survived only in two Latin versions. Main articles of the treaty established a permanent alliance of the two powers, and both parties vowed not to conclude separate peace with Venice; a Genoese flotilla of up to 50 battleships was to be placed at the disposal of the emperor but at his expense; the Genoese received trade privileges, including marketplaces in Ephesus, Smyrna, Atramytton, and—after the reconquest—in Constantinople; their property received legal protection (also in case of a shipwreck); their conflicts were to be judged by Genoese consuls.

The treaty was directed against Venice and was advantageous for the Genoese, who before 1261 had not done much business with Byz. but traded actively with northern Africa, Provence, and the Levant. In the 1250s their commercial position in these regions became endangered and Genoa was in search of new markets—the alliance with Byz. opened up to them not only Asia Minor and eventually the Balkans, but also the Black Sea and new routes east and north. Michael VIII Palaiologos, who was striving to recover Constantinople

NYMPHS, in Greek mythology female spirits of nature, esp. of water and trees. Faithful to classical mythology, Himerios, in his epithalamios to Severos (ed. A. Colonna, or. 9:255–58), introduces a band of nymphs dancing together with Nereids (the sea nymphs) and dryads (the tree nymphs), with satyrs, Pan, Dionysos, and Aphrodite herself. Nymphs, esp. naiads (water nymphs that live in springs and streams) and hamadryads (wood nymphs), frequently appear in the Dionysiaka of Nonnos. As early as the 4th C. (Himerios, or. 66.12–13) tree nymphs (dryads and hamadryads) began to be equated with “mountain-haunting demons,” and later the image of the nymph as a beautiful female spirit disappeared from Byz. literature. In painting she is almost as rare, appearing only in the most classicizing of contexts: a blue-skinned nymph spies on David the musician in the Paris Psalter (fol. 1v).

However, the Greek word nympha also meant bride, and the image of the bride (the Church as Christ’s nympha) occupied an important place in Christian symbolism. Visual transformations of this sort include the midwives at Christ’s nativity modeled, according to Weitzmann (Gr.Myth. 206), on the nymphs who wash the newborn Dionysos.

NYSSA (Nousa), name of two cities notable in Byz. times.

1. City in northwest Cappadocia, south of the Halys near the village of Harmandali. This city entered history when Gregory of Nyssa was its bishop (372–76, 378–ca.386). Nyssa was de-
strove by the Arabs in 838 but was restored by the time Leo VI transferred the *topoteresia* (garrison post?) of Nyssa from Cappadocia to Char-sianon. The Turks took it after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071. The site contains only some remains of its fortifications. Many bishops and one archbishop are mentioned on seals of the 7th–11th C.; they may have come from this Nyssa or Nyssa in Lydia (see below).

2. *City in Lydia* on the north bank of the Meander, now Sultanhisar. A bishopric throughout the Byz. period, it played no role in history, but preserves substantial remains of the late antique city as well as fortifications that appear to be of the 7th/8th C. It fell to the Turks ca. 1282.


—C.F.
OATH (ἀρχαῖος). As an assertion of the truth, a strengthening of an agreement, or a guarantee of future conduct, the oath was widely used in the private and public life of the Byz. Theological discussions concerning the New Testament prohibition against oaths (Mt 5:33–37) appear to have resulted merely in the avoidance of “superfluous” oaths, in the use of oathlike formulas, and the release of the higher clergy from having to swear oaths. In the area of “state law,” oaths of office and the closely related oaths of fealty were routinely administered. Emperors required the latter from individuals as well as from social organizations or groups: the oath of fealty often served not only to secure the power of the reigning senior emperor but also to establish dynastic succession (cf. Theoph. 449f). From the Crusaders came oaths of allegiance. The emperor himself often resorted to oaths to strengthen political and even international agreements; the corresponding documents were sometimes referred to as horkomotika. In the area of trial law the Romans used a profuse variety of oaths, some of which fell into disuse; yet Empress Irene’s pious attempt at abolishing the witness-oath ultimately failed. The oath laid upon one party to a litigation by the other or imposed by the judge was deemed an indispensable form of proof. As a rule an oath was sworn on a Gospel book, often inside a church. The oath formula varied; there were specific oaths for Jews (Patlagean, Structure, pt.XIV [1965], 137–56). Perjury was considered a serious crime whose punishment was sometimes left to God as the injured party, sometimes threatened in full severity by the earthly powers.


—L.B.

OBELISK OF THEODOSIOS, conventional name for the Egyptian obelisk of Tuthmosis III (1490–1436 B.C.) brought to Constantinople from Karnak no later than the reign of Constantine I and erected on the spina (central axis) of the Hippodrome in 390 under Theodosios I. It rests on a late 4th-C. sculpted marble base, which is slightly more than 7 sq. m. Reliefs on all four sides of the main part of the pedestal show the emperor and his court attending the games. The emperor’s central position, and the frontally or symmetrically disposed guards, prisoners, and spectators about him all suggest a ceremonial rather than a realistic intent for the imagery. On the lower part of the base Greek and Latin inscriptions relate how the obelisk was raised in 32 days when Proklos was eparch of the city, probably to mark Theodosios’s victory over MAXIMUS and Victor (extinctis tyrannis) in 389; other reliefs on this part of the base depict the mechanics of its erection (H. Wrede in IstMitt 16 [1966] 178–98). As the best-preserved secular monument of its period in the city, the obelisk base is usually treated as a key work of the Theodosian “Renaissance” (see SCULPTURE). Its political interpretation has been less developed by scholars, although M. McCormick (Eternal Victory 45f, 116) has placed its erection and inscriptions in the context of imperial triumphs.


—A.C.

OBLIGATION. See PROSPHORA.

OBLIGATION (ἐνοχῇ), in Roman law, the relationship between two people in which one (debtor) was obliged to furnish some sort of payment or other effects to the other (creditor). Grounds for an obligation were initially classified according to categories of basic human interaction (peaceful or
aggressive) into obligations that had been agreed upon (ex contractu) and those that resulted from an injury (ex delicto). Through the definitions and distinctions worked out by the jurists, this initial concept was developed into a general liability scheme for CONTRACT and DELICT obligations, whose fundamental idea is that not every case of damage should require compensation nor should every agreement lead to contractual responsibilities. The limitation is accomplished technically through the establishment of certain acts and the corresponding right to bring suit (ACTION). Byz. legal science preserved this concept in principle in the Justinianic period (whether—and, in that case, how—it also differentiated and transformed it is extremely controversial) and revived it again in the 10th–11th C. Juridical practice, not at all unsupported by imperial legislation (e.g., Cod. Just. VIII 37.10; Nov. Leo VI 72), went, at least in the area of contract obligation, in another direction and finally decided to recognize the binding nature and enforceability of every contract whose agreement and nonfulfillment were demonstrable (pacta sunt servanda). The delict obligations degenerated, since Byz. criminal law recognized not only public punishment but also the payment of compensation, and because civil and criminal procedures were handled according to very similar regulations and before the same judicial bodies.


D.S.

OBOL. See FOLLIS.

OCTATEUCH ("Οκτάευχος, lit. “eight-book”), the first eight books of the Old Testament comprising the Pentateuch together with Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. These existed as a separate volume from at least the 9th/10th C., the date of the earliest, unillustrated example preserved. Six illustrated Octateuchs survive, one of which, the 11th-C. Florence, Laur. Plut. 5.38, has miniatures only as far as Genesis 3 (Expulsion from Paradise) and is not closely related to the other five MSS. They were made in the mid-11th C. (Vat. gr. 747), the 12th (formerly Smyrna A.1, Istanbul Topkapı gr. 8, Vat. gr. 746), and the late 13th (Athos, Vatop. 602). Their importance lies in their

OCTATEUCH. Miniatures from an Octateuch manuscript (Vat. gr. 747, fol.251r); 11th C. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. The miniatures depict Sampson destroying the temple of the Philistines and the death of Sampson.
extensive cycle of about 375 miniatures, distributed throughout the eight books, but most numerous in Genesis. They range from common scenes, such as the Crossing of the Red Sea, to unique illustrations of obscure texts, such as the Daughters of Zelophehad Given Their Inheritance (Jos 17:3–6) in which the land is surveyed and measured with chains. Some scenes may offer visual clues to the realities of everyday life in Byz.

The relationship of the MSS to one another and to the 10th-C. Joshua Roll is complex and controversial. Around the Octateuch MSS, Weitzmann arranged examples of related iconography to create a recension, often referred to in studies of Old Testament illustration. He believes it existed already by the date of the paintings at Dura Europos and derived from the milieu of hellenized Judaism. It is questionable, however, whether the early existence of one or even several scenes related to the Octateuch, as at S. Maria Maggiore in Rome (432–40), should be taken to imply the existence of the entire Octateuch cycle, as exemplified in the surviving MSS. Detailed studies of small groups of scenes in the Octateuch MSS have been made (e.g., those of the Creation and those related to the Kosmas Indikopleustes MSS—C. Hahn, CahArch 28 [1979] 29–40), but an investigation of the entire cycle is still awaited. Two of the MSS, Vat. gr. 746 and 747, remain largely unpublished.


Octava (ὀκτάβα, from Lat. “the eighth part”), a tax mentioned in several laws of the Codex Justinianus from 227 to 457–65. The term must designate a charge of 12.5 percent, but it is difficult to determine whether it was a tax levied in the portorium (harbor), that is, a predecessor of the later kommerkion, or, as Millet (infra) suggested, a sales tax. Another difficulty is the high rate of the octava: Millet, contradicting his own theory, demonstrated that the regular sales tax in Egypt was only 2 percent; the normal customs tax in the Roman Empire was also 2 or 2.5 percent (F. Vittinghoff, RE 22 [1953] 380), significantly lower than the octava. Antoniadis-Bibicou (infra 73) theorizes that in the late Roman Empire the difference between the tax on merchandise and customs duties was confused and the same official was entrusted with the collection of both. A tax collector called octavarius or oktahereos appears in laws and in an inscription of the 4th–5th C. (Grégoire, Inscriptions, no. 10) in which he seems to be somehow connected with the storage (?) of kommerkion.


ODE. See Kanon; Odes.

Odeljan, Peter. See Deljan, Peter.

Odes, certain songs or prayers in song form (i.e., Odes/Canticles), principally from the Old Testament, were central in the liturgy and offices. Three are gathered together at the end of Psalter MSS, emphasizing the liturgical/devotional character of that book. The selection of odes varies, but includes a basic nine (Ex 15:1–19; Dt 32:1–43; 1 Kg 2:1–10; Hab 3:2–19; Is 26:1–20; Jon 2:3–10; Dan 3:26–45; 52–88 [LXX numbering]; Lk 1:46–55; 68–79). Why further odes such as those of Hezekiah (Is 38:10–20) and Manasses (apocryphal) were added in certain MSS is unclear, although it implies a variety of liturgical usage. Some illustrated MSS, such as the Khludov Psalter, show by the minuscule rescript (12th C.? of the original 9th-C. text of selected odes that the book’s usage changed over time.

Illustration. The illustration of odes is an important aspect of Byz. Psalter illustration. Weitzmann has suggested that the illustrations to the odes, like the texts themselves, were taken over from their original context, i.e., in MSS with illustrations to Exodus, Deuteronomy, etc. The subjects selected for representation are usually popular narrative compositions (e.g., Crossing of the Red Sea, Three Hebrews in the Fiery Furnace), or single figures of the “composer” of the song (e.g., Hannah, Habakkuk) making a gesture of speech or prayer.
ODESSOS. See Varna.

ODOACER ('Oδοακρός), also Odovacer, ruler of Italy (from 23 Aug. 476); born ca.433, died Ravenna 16 March 493. Of Hunnic or Skirian origin (B. Macbain, ClPhil 78 [1983] 323–27), he became leader of the rebellious Germanic troops who overthrew Romulus Augustus in 476. His position, domestic and foreign, was controversial. He was proclaimed king (rex) by the barbarians, but on the official inscription commemorating restoration of the Coliseum the title is omitted. Odoacer wanted to receive the recognition of Constantinople and sent Zeno the regalia of the deposed Western emperor, but Zeno was reluctant to give his approval, remembering Odoacer’s earlier correspondence with the rebel Illus. Thus, Zeno gave Odoacer the title patrikios, but advised him to accept the authority of Julius Nepos. The murder of Julius Nepos relieved the ambiguous situation, and Odoacer punished the assassins and seized control of Dalmatia. Zeno tried to incite the Rugians against Odoacer, but in a preemptive attack (487) Odoacer defeated them and sent gifts from the booty to Zeno, still hoping for a reconciliation (M. McCormick, Byzantium 47 [1977] 212–22). Zeno then invited Theodoric to invade Italy; the Ostrogoth leader defeated Odoacer in a difficult campaign and besieged him in Ravenna. The two antagonists seem to have agreed to share the rule of Italy, but Theodoric had Odoacer murdered. Odoacer and his wife Sunigild were Arians (W. Lackner, Historia 21 [1972] 763f).


ODO DEUILL, French Benedictine monk; born ca.1100, died 8 Apr. 1162. Of modest origins, Odo became Abbot Sugier’s confidant and abbot of St. Corneille in Compiegne (1150) and St. Denis (1151). He served Louis VII as secretary and chaplain on the Second Crusade, during which he composed De protectione Ludovici VII in Orientem (On the Journey of Louis VII to the East), a history filled with sharp observations of Byz. laced with religious hostility (e.g., pp. 54–56, 68–70). The account was intended as a guide for future expeditions, whence his careful attention to Byz. food supplies (e.g., pp. 28–30, 76–82) and his insistence that Byz. treachery ruined the Crusade (e.g., pp. 12–14). His position made him privy to confidential deliberations, e.g., on negotiations with Manuel I (pp. 26–28) or an assault on Constantinople (pp. 58, 68–72). He records differences between Byz. and French etiquette and costume (pp. 24–26; proskynesis, called polychoria, is performed for all Byz. grandees, p.56), music (p.68), and coinage and exchange rates (pp. 40, 66). He describes the Latin suburb of Philippopolis (p.42), the imperial pleasure pavilion outside Blachernai (p.48), and Byz. magnates’ richly decorated private chapels (pp. 54–56). He also gives a magnificent description of Constantinople (pp. 64–66).


ODYSSÉUS, in Greek mythology king of Ithaca and the central figure of the Odyssey. After the Trojan War he wandered many years in hostile seas, endured hardships, and was finally reunited with his wife, Penelope. Church fathers gave an allegorical interpretation to the voyages of Odysseus as a journey of the soul across the earthly sea; Odysseus bound to the mast (while exposed to the songs of the Sirens) was compared to Christ on the Cross. The adventures of Odysseus were the subject of many Byz. interpretations (Malas), paraphrases (A. Ludwich, Zwei byzantinische Odysseus-Legenden [Königsberg 1808]), and vernacular poetry (Beck, Volksliteratur 191). In the 12th C. Byz. writers started to emphasize the cunning and versatility (pokhilia) of Odysseus, in addition to his endurance. For Niketas Choniates, Odysseus exemplifies the talented and wretched Andronikos I Komnenos, while Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Comm. II. 2:540.3–14) gives a similar characterization of Odysseus: he is not just “inventive,” not only a boxer and wrestler, but also a peasant wielding the sickle, helmsman, carpenter, hunter, diviner, cook, provider of medicine (or poison), rhetorician, and astrono-
mer—qualities that appear in the portrait of Andronikos by Choniates.


-A.K.

**ODYSSEY.** See Homer.

**OFFERTORY.** See Prophora.

**OFFERTORY TABLE** (τράπεζα προσφορών), a round, rectangular, or lunate sigma-shaped slab, already in pagan times used as a secondary altar or for sepulchral purposes; in Christian use these tables were often inscribed with the names of martyrs. Between the 3rd and early 7th C. most were carved in marble or colored stone (Sodini-Kolokotsas, *Aliki II* 194—206). Sigma-shaped tables derived from the traditional shape of Roman banquet tables and were decorated with friezes showing scenes of hunting and animal combat. Christian versions emphasized soteriological themes such as Jonah, the sacrifice of Isaac, and the Raising of Lazarus; these are thought to reflect examples in precious metals. Another important group of sigma tables is characterized by a border of 6—17 lobes (*Age of Spirit*, no.575). The general form of these slabs is retained in examples in the refectories of the Great Lavra and Vatopedi on Mount Athos (Orlandos, *Monast. Arch.*, figs. 64—67).


-L.Ph.B.

**OFFICES** (ἀξία διὰ λόγου, also ὄφικινα, ἀρχαι, ζώναι), high administrative positions, to be distinguished from dignities (titles), although sometimes the borderline is difficult to draw and some offices were in fact transformed into titles. The late Roman offices are listed in the *Notitia dignitatum*; the late 6th-C. *Klerorologion of Philotheos* records 60 offices that he divides into seven groups: strategoi, domestikoi, judges, sekretai, demokratai (leaders of demoi), stratarchai, and "others." Strategoi and domestikoi had primarily military functions; judges, sekretikoi, and demokratai were civil officials; while various stratarchai and "others" had military, police, or civil duties. Some offices were only honorary titles. An additional group of offices was held by the court eunuchs who kept order in the palace. The term *offikialios* that in the late Roman Empire designated only subaltern officials was by the 9th C. expanded to include all functionaries, probably with the exception of strategoi. The term *offition* was in use also within the ecclesiastical hierarchy, where it denoted the administrative charge as opposed to the clerical order granted by a sacramental ordination.


-A.K.

**OFFICES, MONASTIC.** See Hours, Liturgical.

**OFFICINA**, a Latin word meaning "workshop" and in a technical sense a subdivision of a mint. Many late Roman and Byz. coins of the 3rd—8th C. bear numerals or other marks showing, presumably for control purposes, in which officina they were struck. Such a mark, when the system became fully organized in the course of the 4th C., usually took the form of a Greek number placed either at the end of the reverse legend or in the field. These marks vary in number according to the importance of the mint and the metal of the coins; the 6th-C. mint at Constantinople, for example, had ten officinae for gold solidi but only five for coins of copper. The use of numbered officina marks ended in the 8th C.; although in the 12th—15th C. some coin series bear privy marks in the form of letters or symbols in the field, or exhibit small differences in design that seem to indicate subdivisions of a mint, it is unclear how far these corresponded to the officinae of earlier times. On one issue of folles of Constans II of 642—43 the officina numerals are accompanied by the letters ΩΑ, presumably for ὄψικινα (ophikina), although this Greek form of the word is not otherwise known.


-Ph.G.

**OGHUZ.** See Turkomans; Turks; Uzes.
OHRID (*Αχρίς*), city in southwestern Macedonia, located on the northeastern shore of a large lake. Archbishop Theophylaktos of Ohrid (died 1108) wrote that ca.900 the city was a center of the building activity of Kliment of Ohrid, but no independent source verifies this late evidence. The city is first mentioned in 11th-C. sources: a Byz. historian (Skyl. 353.61–62) wrote that the palace of the Bulgarian *basileis* was erected there. Ohrid was probably the capital of the empire of Samuel of Bulgaria and of the Bulgarian patriarchate. In 1019/20 Basil II occupied it and made it one of four *kastra* (together with Prespa, Mokros, and Kitzabis) of the autocephalous Bulgarian archbishopric (H. Gelzer, *BZ* 2 [1893] 42.13)—but the name “metropolis of Achris” emerges only in a late notitia (*Notitiae CP* 17.30). The 12th-C. author Anna Komnene (An. Komn. 3:84.13–14) considered the name Ohrid as a barbarous term for the ancient lake of Lychnidos; neither she, however, nor Michael of Devol, in his supplement to Skylitzes (Skyl. 358.94–95), who mention both the lake and the city of Lychnidos, equate Ohrid with the city of Lychnidos, which was a bishopric in the 4th–5th C., replaced in the 6th C. by Justinianna Prima (it is unknown after 519—M. Fluss, *RE* 13 [1927] 2114f). Another—evidently fictitious—12th-C. tradition claimed Ohrid as the successor of Justinianna Prima (G. Prinzling, *BBulg* 5 [1978] 269–87). In the 13th C. Ohrid was contested between Bulgaria and Epiros; returned to Byz. control, it was then conveyed to Stefan Uros IV Dušan by the treaty of Aug. 1334 and fell to the Turks in 1394.

The letters of the city's two most prominent archbishops, Theophylaktos and Demetrios Chomatenos, reflect the changing situation of the church in Ohrid: in the 11th C. the archbishop tried in vain to secure imperial support against the local officials; in the 13th C. his successor defended the privileges of the archbishopric against the patriarchate in Nicaea.


**Monuments of Ohrid.** The Cathedral of St. Sophia in Ohrid, perhaps originally built in the 10th C. by Boris II, seems to have been rebuilt as a domed basilica and redecorated in the 11th C. by the archbishop Leo of Ohrid. A Great Feast cycle decorates the nave; in the conch of the apse an enthroned Virgin holds Christ in a shieldlike mandorla; Christ officiates at the Proskomide below. The liturgical nature of the *bema* program is emphasized by the unusual sequence of scenes from the lives of Abraham and Sts. Basil the Great and John Chrysostom on the bema walls (A. Epstein, *JÖB* 21 [1981] 315–29). In the chapel above the *diakonikon* are scenes of the martyrdom of the Apostles and, on the exterior west wall of the nave, a scene of the *Philoxenia* of Abraham (12th C.?). The outer narthex-portico with its flanking domed bays was added in 1313/14.

The Church of the Virgin Peribleptos (now St. Kliment), was built by the *megas hetaireia* Progonos Sgouro and his wife Eudokia in 1294/5, according to a fresco inscription over the entrance (J. Ivanov, *Bulgarski starini iz Makedonija* [Sofia 1931; tp. 1970] 38, no.8). The domed cross-in-square plan includes a tripartite sanctuary and a narthex covered by a central domical vault flanked by groin vaults. The masonry consists of alternating stone and brick courses, the latter arranged in lively decorative patterns; the main apse has niches. The program of wall paintings contains, along with scenes typical of contemporary Byz. church decoration, a Passion cycle and Gospel scenes in the upper zones, the life of the Virgin in the lower zone of the nave, and the life of John...
the Baptist in the diakonikon. On the walls and vaults of the narthex are PREFIGURATIONS of the Virgin, the Vision of Christ as Angel (based on the Easter Homily of Gregory of Nazianzos), an image of the winged John the Baptist, and illustrations of the Nativity Hymn attributed to John of Damascus. In the wall painting in the south vault of the narthex the souls of the righteous are held in the HAND OF GOD. The frescoes are the first documented work of the artists MICHAEL (ASTRAPAS) AND EUTYCHIOS, whose names are inscribed on depictions of military saints painted on the west dome piers.

The large number of small-scale scenes and the extended narratives (e.g., the DORMITION), the developed compositions involving elaborate architectural backgrounds, and the numerous participants with their exaggerated gestures mark a mature Palaiologan style, although the crude red and blue colors and the over-voluminous bodies reveal a provincial variant. The same painters were responsible for icons made for the iconostasis at a somewhat later date (Ascension, Dormition, etc.); these are now housed in the nearby Gallery of Icons. During the later 14th C. the church was enlarged with side chapels and outer aisles (ambulatory wings) and adorned with new frescoes and icons (V. Djurić in ZbLikh/umet 8 [1972] 143–45). The remains of St. KLEMENT OF OHRID were transferred here at the end of the same century.

Other surviving medieval monuments in Ohrid include the Virgin Bolnička (14th and 15th C.), the Virgin Čelnica (9th C.), St. John the Theologian-Kaneo (1270s or 80s?), Old St. Clement (14th C.), Sts. Constantine and Helena (1365–67), St. Naum (originally a triconch of the 9th C., rebuilt as a cross-in-square church), and St. Nicholas Bolnički (14th C.).


OIKEIADOS (oikeiados), a term used in the Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Lists 191.27) for the emperor’s close relatives. It is probable that the epithet oikeiados was linked to the honorific title doulos: a man titled oikeiados would call himself the doulos of his majesty. By the end of the 12th C. it became a semi-official title; thus, in 1196 a logothetes ton sekretos is called oikeiados of the emperor (Lavra 1, no. 67.24). It was in use through the 15th C., applied primarily to civil dignitaries such as the papias (Dionys., no. 2.11), krites (Xerop., no. 26.29), or megas chartoularios (Docheiar., no. 23.7). Sometimes it was employed as sufficient characterization without additional titulation (Docheiar., no. 49.1; Dionys., no. 3.5). Maksimović (Bys.ProcAdmin 22–25) considers oikeiados as men in a kind of vassalage to the ruler.


OIKEIADOS. See Doulos.
OIKISTIKOS (οἰκιστικός), an enigmatic functionary of the genikon mentioned in the late 9th-C. Klerorologion of Philothkos and the 10th-C. Taktikon of Escurial. E. Stein (ZSavRom 49 [1929] 506), who previously connected the oikistikos with the late Roman numerarius scrinii operum, later rejected this view, indicating that the word oikistikon was used in the papyri in the sense of "account." A treatise on taxation (Döfler, Beiträge 91) describes the oikistikos as an official who had among his duties the registration of tax exemptions (logismoi); in this connection an 11th-C. seal names a certain protovestes Stephen, "oikistikos of the new orthoseis" (Nesbitt, infra, no.4). Oikonomides (Listes 319) suggests that the oikistikos was connected with the administration of the oikoi (imperial domains). By the 11th C. the oikistikos became chief of an independent department, perhaps called oikistike sakelle, mentioned on a seal of the 11th/12th C. (V. Laurent, BZ 33 [1933] 356f; cf. Iwir. 1:160). Oikistkoi and their protonotaries are mentioned in the lists of officials in 11th-C. chrysobulls, for the last time in 1088 (Patmou Engrapha 1, no.6.67). Both seals and charters (MM 4:316.8) show that the 11th-C. oikistikos had judicial functions in various themes (Thraakesion, Boukellarion, Armeniakon, Chaldia).


OIKOMODION (οικομόδιον, Slavic komod), a tax probably originating from the principal tax of the Bulgarian fiscal system under Samuel of Bulgaria (one modios of wheat and one of millet per household possessing a pair of oxen: Skyl. 412.67–73), which was continued in Bulgaria by Basil II. From the 11th C. onward (first mention 1019), it is attested throughout Byz. and appears to have been a regular yearly secondary tax; in the 14th C. it was roughly proportionate to the main land tax (telos) (1/2 modios of wheat [Gr. sitos] and 1/2 modios of barley [Gr. kriitha] for an annual telos of 1–3 hyperpyra: hence the name sitokritos). It is often mentioned together with the oinometrion, which must have had a similar meaning but concerned wine.


OIKONOMIA (οικονομία, lit. "husbandry"), a term with three primary meanings in Byz. First, it referred to the wise or responsible management, "stewardship," or administration of something, sometimes synonymous with pronoia. Second, oikonomia was that component of doctrine dealing with the divine plan of salvation or Incarnation history (Eph 1:9–10), in contrast with the study of the Trinity, which is theologia proper. The theological concept of oikonomia was based on the idea of relationship between righteous God and sinful man that required God’s dispensations of grace and mercy culminating in the "economic" sacrifice of the Son. God’s oikonomia operated through sacraments and revelations. Western theology emphasized God's justification in the action of oikonomia (via grace), whereas the Orthodox stressed man’s participation in the divine being, deification (theosis), the direct encounter of man with the Holy Spirit, the mystical redemption, rather than the principles of Roman law that attracted early Western theologians (A.E. McGrath, Iustitia dei, vol. 1 [Cambridge 1986] 3f).

Finally, oikonomia referred to moral concession as opposed to the rule of order or taxis (Ahrweiler, Idéologie 129–47). In Byz. canonical literature oikonomia is understood as the canonical power of the church by which, under certain circumstances, the strict letter of ecclesiastical law was relaxed. Its purpose was to avoid the severity of the law, to eliminate the obstacle to salvation caused by a rigid legalistic implementation. Thus it was not understood as a legal norm, as dispensatio, the Latin Western translation of the term denoting simple exception or dispensation from a law. Indeed oikonomia, according to Nicholas Mystikos, was ultimately an "imitation of the divine mercy" (ep.32, 236.379–80). This prudent disposition of church stewardship, which aims at the general well-being of the Christian community and each individual—as long as doctrine or truth is not compromised—prompted the church to recognize the episcopal dignity of repentant Iconoclast bishops (except those who had initiated the heresy) and to receive them to its communion (Mansi 12:1030); or, as in the case of the tetragamy of Leo VI, to "economize" by accepting Leo as a penitent following his fourth marriage, to Zoe Karbonopsina (RegPatr, fasc. 2, nos. 625–29).

There were frequent debates concerning the meaning of oikonomia (e.g., during the Moechian
CONTROVERSY and the “tetragamy” affair). Monastic rigorists, like THEODORE OF STOUDIOS, maintained that oikonomia could be admitted only in connection with repentance of the transgressor and a formal cancellation of the act, performed uncanonically. Others adopted a more lenient attitude, but the principle of oikonomia was never denied by anyone.


—A.P.

OIKONOMOS (oikonomos), a cleric, usually a priest, responsible for managing the property, income, and expenditure of a see or religious foundation. The Council of Chalcedon (451) required every bishop to appoint an oikonomos from his clergy and not to administer the affairs of his see in person (canon 26). The ruling was repeated and elaborated by the Second Council of Nicaea (787), which extended the requirement to monasteries (canon 11).

Under Justinian I, the Great Church of Constantinople was served by nine oikonomoi, each with a subordinate staff of CHARTOULARIOI (Cod. Just. I 2:24). Of the nine, it was presumably the head of the “home office” (enokion skrhimon) who evolved into the single patriarchal oikonomos of the 9th C. and later. By the 10th C., the appointment came increasingly under imperial control, being granted even to laitymen until Isaac I formally renounced the right to appoint. By this time the epithet megas had become attached to the title. Byz. lists of patriarchal offices always name the megas oikonomos as the patriarch’s highest-ranking subordinate; however, this precedence was not contested and became something of an honorable anachronism after 1204, with the decline and occasional redundancy of the office.

Oikonomoi were also attached to large public churches of Constantinople such as St. Mokios (TheophCont 365:21–23). The institution was also widespread among imperial foundations, both monastic and otherwise. The NEA EKKLESIA had its own oikonomos and the PANTOKRATOR complex had four.

The oikonomos or steward of a monastery was a senior monk responsible for the management of its properties, esp. agricultural estates, and the maintenance of monastic buildings. He was usually ranked second in the hierarchy of a monastery and often became hegoumenos. The oikonomos of a convent might be a eunuch priest (KECHARITOMENE), a layman (LIPS), or a nun (DAMILAS, BEBAIAS ELPIDOS). The oikonomos at Lips was paid an annual salary of 36 gold pieces, plus an allotment of wheat, barley, and wine.


OIKOS (oikos), a term with a number of meanings, primarily referring to the house and household, but also used in a hymnographic context.

1. Oikos as a Fiscal and Economic Term. The basic meaning house was applied in a broader sense to the aristocratic mansion in urban and rural areas (such as the oikos of DIGENES AKRITAS), in contrast to oikema, the term regularly employed in praktika and other documents for a peasant dwelling; when used in this manner, oikos is virtually synonymous with PROASTEION. J. Gascou (TM 9 [1985] 28–37) views the 5th–6th-C. Egyptian oikos as a “seminublic institution,” representing a delegation of the state’s fiscal authority, whereas later Byz. law emphasized the privacy of the oikos: “No one can be dragged out of his private oikos,” states the scholiast to the Synopsis Basilicorum K. II:45 (Zepos, Jus 5:323.17). Oikos might also mean household, the house of God (i.e., a church), or an imperial (theos) estate. EUGAEIS OIKOI were pious institutions. Metaphorically, the word could be applied to the entire community of the faithful: “We are one oikos,” says SYMEON THEOLOGIAN (Hymn 15:127), “the house of David” (15:118).

2. Oikos in an Astrological Context. In this sense, oikos means the domicile of a planet, or planetary house. According to Malalas (Malal. 175:6–9), the mythical Erichthonios constructed a hippodrome that reflected the structure of the cosmos, that is, had the sky, the earth, and the sea; its 12 gates conformed to the 12 oikoi of the Zodiac. Hephaistion of Thebes often speaks of oikoi of planets
(Mars, Venus, etc.), indicating their correspondence with the signs of the Zodiac.  

3. Oikos as a Hymnographic Term. Finally, oikos also meant a stanza of a kontakion; the initial letters of each oikos, which were built on the same metrical pattern throughout the kontakion, normally formed an acrostic, either alphabetic or giving the author's name. Originally meaning any stanza of the 20 to 30 forming the complete text, the term eventually referred to the second element of the reduced form of the kontakion consisting only of the koukoulion, or prooimion, and one stanza, the oikos. This combination of kontakion and oikos was sung after the sixth ode of the kanon during the Orthros.


OIKOUMENE (οἰκουμένη, lit. "the inhabited [earth]")], an ancient concept that had various meanings in Byz. The word oikoumene was used, as in antiquity, to designate the earth as a whole: thus Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust.Comm.II. 2:496.16-17) stated that Poseidonios and Dionysios Periegetes envisaged the oikoumene as spherical, Demokritos considered it elongated, and Hipparchos trapezoidal. Byz. astronomy accepted the concept of a spheric earth, and Photios (Bibl., cod.35) defended—against Kosmas Indikopleustes—the image of a spherical cosmos.

Oikoumene also referred to the inhabited or civilized world, an area identical with the Roman Empire or the region of the Mediterranean Sea; remote areas were described as located beyond the oikoumene (e.g., Greg. 2:992.15-16). Already in patristic literature the word acquired a specific Christian connotation: the oikoumene was the world as the scene of Christ's activity and of the celebration of the Christian sacraments, which were performed not in a single city or in a single "theater" but in the whole oikoumene (Photos, ep.284, ed. Laourdas-Westerink 3:69.2300-02). Accordingly, the title of ecumenical patriarch (oikoumenikos patriarches), adopted by the archbishop of Constantinople in the 6th C., expressed his claim to primacy in the Christian church that led to a serious conflict with Rome. Fewer political repercussions arose from the title oikoumenikos didaskalos (see Didaskalos), arrogantly assumed by one of the principal teachers of theology in Constantinople.


OIKOUMENIOS (οἰκουμένιος), 6th-C. biblical exegete, author of the earliest Greek commentary on the Apocalypse. The text of his exegesis was not discovered until 1901 by F. Diekamp. He was identified by S. Petrides (EO 6 [1903] 308ff) as the comes Oikoumenios who was the addressee of two letters of Severos of Antioch. He is called rhetor and philosopher in the MSS of his commentary. He notes at the beginning that he wrote his commentary more than 500 years after the completion of the Apocalypse, that is, ca.550. His identification with the 10th-C. bishop Oikoumenios of Trikka in Thessaly is now rejected.

His interpretation of the Apocalypse is mostly metaphorical and oriented to the future, but in some passages he refers to the events of Christ's life: thus the sun-clothed woman who gives birth to a male child is interpreted by Oikoumenios (as by many others) as the symbol of the Virgin and Jesus. More original (and distinct from the exegesis of Andrew of Caesarea) is his interpretation of the thousand-year reign of Christ. It is construed not as a period in future but as a metaphorical description of the day of the first parousia: only then, says Oikoumenios, was the devil fettered, but after Christ's crucifixion he was again set free. Unlike Origen and Eusebios, Oikoumenios did not consider Augustus as a peacemaker but rather as "the beast," that is, the devil; Oikoumenios believed that the new era of human history began with "the pious Constantine."


OIKOUMENON (οἰκουμένον), a fiscal term, synonymous with telos, stoichikon telos (e.g., Zogr., no.29.76), or oikiaon telos (Guilou, Ménecée, no.35.42, 45); sometimes telos designated an in-
dividual payment while *oikoumenon* meant the sum charged to a fiscal district.

Lit. Ostrogorsky, *Feodalité* 311f. — A.K.

**OIL (έλαιον),** usually made from olives, was one of the most important ingredients of the diet; vegetables were eaten with oil or cooked in oil: thus, Symeon Seth speaks of lentils cooked with oil, garum (a fermented fish sauce), and salt (115.16–17), and of truffles cooked in oil with pepper and garum (109.7–8). Strict ascetics are said to have abstained from oil; normally oil was avoided on fastdays or as penance (Theodore of Studios in PG 99:1724C). In addition to its use in food preparation, oil was employed in the concoction of medicines and ointments and as a fuel for lamps (in the illumination of churches, palaces, houses, etc.); Eustathios of Thessalonike (PG 136:640A) relates that in lighthouses wax and oil were burned in glass vessels that protected them from the wind. Sailors followed the custom of pouring oil onto stormy seas to calm them (Koukoules, *Bios* 5:338, 380).

The word *elaion* was expanded to include “fish” oil (from dolphins) and mineral oil. The *Geoponica* (9.18.1–2) mentions *elaion* produced from terebinth, sesame seeds, and nuts. Oil was also pressed from flax seeds (see *Linen*) and from various fruits and flowers (G. Litavrin, *VizVrem* 31 [1971] 267).

In liturgical practice *anointing* with sacramental oil was administered before or after baptism, and the sacrament of *unction* entailed anointing of the sick for healing and/or the forgiveness of sins. Individuals seeking miraculous healing often anointed themselves with oil sanctified by proximity to a saint’s relics or tomb; anointment was also part of the ritual of *coronation*. The development of the symbolism of oil was enhanced by the similarity of the word *elaion* to *eleos*, mercy: thus it symbolized mercy and grace, and related concepts such as cheerfulness, good works, spiritual riches.


**OINAIOTES, GEORGE,** writer of first half of 14th C. Together with his older kinsman George Galesiotes, he prepared a vernacular paraphrase of the *Imperial Statue* of Nikephoros Blemmydes.

Oinaiotes (*Oionouòtηs*) was identified by S.I. Kourouses (Gabalas 99–121) as the anonymous author of the so-called Florentine collection of 179 letters (Florence, Laur. S. Marco 356). His correspondents included Theodore Metochites, Andrew Lopadiotes, and John Gabras. To date only four of the letters have been published (G.H. Karlsson, G. Fatouros, *JÖB* 22 [1973] 297–18). Although many of his letters are rhetorical exercises, others describe topics such as his illnesses, his vineyards, his problems as a landlord, a trip to Mt. Ganos (where he had close ties to the monks), and his intellectual pursuits, such as borrowing books by John XIII Glykys. His classical education is reflected in frequent citation of ancient authors, esp. Homer, Plato, and Aristotle. Oinaiotes was interested in astronomy and received instruction from a physician (*aktourarios*), perhaps John Aktourarios, according to S.I. Kourouses (*Athena* 78 [1980–82] 260–69).


**OINOMETRION** (*oíoμέτριον*, lit. “a measure of wine”), a secondary tax mentioned in several *praktika* of the early 14th C. A chrysobull of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan of 1346 issued for the monastery of Iveron exempted the monks from “the recently introduced *oinometrion*” (Solovjev-Mošin, *Grčke povelje*, no.6.42), thus indicating a relatively late date for its appearance. The *oinometrion* was levied in proportion to the tax called *telos* (usually one *metron* [local measure] for each nomisma of the tax) and is listed in the *praktika* together with the *oiKomodion*. Dölger (Byzanz 258f) hypothesized that both surtaxes were collected by tax officials for their services in measuring grain and wine, respectively; his hypothesis was rejected by J. Bompaire, who considered *oinometrion* as a rent for vineyards. It may also have been a rent in kind imposed on peasants, the amount of which depended not only on the size of their vineyards but on intangible factors. A fragment of a *praktikon* of the late 13th C. (Esphig., no.7.8) calculates *oinometrion* in cash and places it after *kastrokTisia*, not *oiKomodion*; it should perhaps be interpreted as evidence that in the early 14th C. the tax changed its nature, and payment in kind replaced that in money.
OKTOECHOS (ὀκτώηχος, lit. “eight-toned”), a liturgical book containing the hymns of daily Orthros, Vespers, Eucharist, and Saturday meseoniktikon (see Hours) for the mobile cycle for every day of the year except for Lent, Easter, and Pentecost, which are covered by two other books, the triodion and the pentekostarion. A “proper,” or set of hymns for each of the seven days of the week in each of the eight different musical modes, that is, 56 “propers” in all, the oktoechos cycle takes eight weeks to complete, one mode per week, and is repeated throughout the year from All Saints’ Day (the first Sunday after Pentecost) until progressively replaced by the triodion during Lent. This complete cycle of the “Great” or “New” Oktoechos is now known as the Parakletike, the term oktoechos being reserved for the Sunday hymns. When the oktoechos cycle overlaps with the menaion or the triodion, the liturgical typikon regulates which hymns will be sung.

The name oktoechos was used for these hymns from at least the 11th C. The oldest oktoechos poetic pieces were originally scattered in disparate collections of kanones, stichera, and kathismata, of which MSS of the 8th–9th C. have survived. Anthologies of oktoechos hymns for Sundays date from the 8th C.; those of the weekday cycle were added later. Though St. John of Damascus contributed to the Oktoechos and is often named as its author, the book was completed only after his death. There is only one surviving illustrated Oktoechos, a MS of the decorative style group (Messina, San Salvatore 51). Its eight miniatures, all of which include the figure of John of Damascus, accompany the stichera anastasima.

-R.F.T., N.P.S.

OLD KNIGHT (Ὁ Πρέσβυς Ἰππότης), 14th-C. poem, possibly written in Cyprus. This anonymous compilation in Greek unrhymed political verse of the opening episode of the French prose romance Guiron le Courtois was drawn probably from the compilation of Rusticiano da Pisa (1272–98). Only 306 lines, at a purist language level, survive. The episode describes the arrival of Branor le Brun (the Old Knight) at King Arthur’s court and his challenge to the younger knights of the Round Table—Palamedes, Gauvain, Galahad, Tristan, etc.

LIT. Beck, Volksliteratur 138.
-E.M.J., M.J.J.

OLD TESTAMENT (Παλαιά Διαθήκη), the first part of the Bible. It was inherited by Christians from the Jews and available to them in the so-called Septuagint, the translation by 70 (or 72) “wise men”; other translations (by Theodotion, Aquila, Symmachos, etc.) survive only in insignificant fragments. The Greek Old Testament includes the Hebrew canonical books (the Penta- teuch; historical books; poetic books, such as the Psalter and Proverbs of Solomon; and the books of Prophets) and the so-called deuterocanonical books. The authority of these last works was questioned by major church fathers such as Jerome and John of Damascus, but the Western church accepted the canon in full. Jugie (infra) demonstrated that, down to the Council of Ferrara-Florence, the Byz. did not reject the canonicity of the deuterocanonical books; at least this point never emerged as a subject of discussion between the two churches.

The text of the Old Testament survives in complete editions (sometimes together with the New Testament; esp. famous are the 4th-C. uncial MSS, Codex Vatitanus, Sinaiacus, and Alexandrinus) and in separate collections (Occtateuch, historical books, Psalter, Prophets). The validity of the Old Testament was questioned by certain heretics, but the official church emphasized its inspired character. Its prohibition of idolatry created special difficulties for the Iconophiles. The Old Testament occasioned broad exegetes, homilies, and paraphrases as well as APOCRYPHA. Among many others, Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos wrote poems on the Old Testament and on the later history of the Jews, while Matthew of Ephesus (Manuel Gabalas) used several of its books (Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes) for “the moral education of the soul” (S. Kourouses, Manouel Gabalas [Athens 1972] 167).
OLD TESTAMENT ILLUSTRATION. Study of the Byz. contribution to Old Testament illustration raises both practical and theoretical problems. The material is widely dispersed and still only partially known; despite the existence of photographic collections a significant part remains relatively inaccessible. This situation makes it difficult to gain a thorough knowledge of even the surviving material. In addition, what has been published has sometimes been selected on the basis of theories that have influenced the choice of illustrations, as well as interpretations drawn from them.

The Byz. illustrated some scenes and figures of the Old Testament because these had already been adopted, like the text itself, by the Christians of the first centuries. Thus many of the most familiar Old Testament scenes, such as the Crossing of the Red Sea or Jonah and the Whale, were already widely known by the 3rd or 4th C. These compositions remained substantially the same throughout the Byz. period. That some of these illustrations originated in Jewish art has been strongly argued, and that some contain elements of Jewish exegesis is certain; but the syncretistic nature of religious cults, esp. in this crucial period, and the possibility of parallel developments, must be taken into account, esp. in view of the fact that later synagogue FLOOR MOSAICS sometimes reflect the decoration of churches. Clearly many Old Testament scenes and figures (as those of the New Testament) were derived quite simply from formulas in contemporary Hellenistic-Roman art, along with other visual sources.

Some Old Testament scenes—esp. those cited in the Commendatio Animaæ—were popular initially in funerary contexts, such as catacombs or sarcophagi, as suitable images of a hoped-for salvation in Christ. This is characteristic of the 4th–6th C., and to a large extent they were replaced by Christological resurrection scenes. In early monumental art the Old Testament was also important, notably in the great basilicas of Rome, where scenes were selected to prefigure and parallel the New Testament story. In the 9th C. and later, this monumental role almost disappears, with the exception of anomalies such as the mosaics of the Cappella Palatina at Palermo and Monreale, where the basilica nave was probably used in a deliberately archaising way. The one distinctively Byz. development of the scheme was in the use of the Old Testament PROPHETS in the upper parts of churches as hierarchically arranged foretellers of the Gospel.

The situation in MSS is rather different. With the exception of GENESIS illustration, the pre-9th C. evidence is scanty and restricted, though thereafter it is relatively full and diverse. This body of illustration can be further enriched if account is taken of Old Testament scenes that have, metaphorically speaking, migrated from the Old Testament itself to MSS such as the Christian Topography of Kosmas Indikopleustes or the Sacra Parallela. The origin of such scenes, however, remains controversial.

To judge from the MS evidence, which is the most plentiful, the Byz. rarely if ever thought in terms of a unit of text, or of illustration, called the Old Testament. Only a single MS survives that suggests an overall plan for its illustration: the Bible of Leo Sakkarios. Typically the Byz. thought in terms of smaller units: the Octateuch, Psalter, Prophet book, or Job, for example. These represent the convenient volumes in which the Old Testament circulated. They were illustrated, and probably used, in different ways.

Traced over the centuries, the illustration of narrative themes from the Old Testament seems to follow two curves with contrasting profiles. In the public domain, exemplified by the decoration of the walls of churches and monasteries, the 4th–6th C. probably represents a peak, the 9th–12th C. certainly was a trough, and the 13th–14th C. a second peak. This is to be explained by the emphasis after Iconoclasm on large-scale images of the principal events of Christ’s life, whereas those in the 13th–14th C. preferred far more numerous images on a smaller scale, as exemplified by the Joseph cycle in the narthex at Sopočani and the Elijah cycle in the prothesis at Moraca. By way of contrast, in the private domain represented by the illustration of books, it is the...
9th–12th C. that represents the peak of popularity. This fluctuation suggests that the Byz. perception of Old Testament illustration would have been significantly different in, for example, the 5th, 10th, or 14th C., even if its iconography remained substantially the same. That there is any direct connection between the decline of interest in Old Testament illustration in monumental art and its rise in MSS is improbable. It appears to be part of the general pattern of Byz. art.


J.H.L.

OLEG, ruler of Rus'; died after 911. Norman by birth, Oleg succeeded Rurik in Novgorod (in 879 according to the Primary Chronicle) and later subdued the territories to the south. Khazar documents relate that Oleg (named HLGW in the texts), incited by Romanos Lekapenos (?), sacked Tmutarakan (N. Golb, O. Pritsker, Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century [Ithaca-London 1982] 104–05). Golb and Pritsky (pp.61–71) questioned the traditional opinion that Oleg captured Kiev and dated this event to the time of Igor, ca.930. The Primary Chronicle, sub anno 907, describes Oleg's expedition against Constantinople and the treaty concluded between him and Byz.; the text of the treaty is also cited later in full and dated in 911/12. (The majority of scholars now reject the assumption of two separate treaties.) The treaty guaranteed the rights of Rus' envoys, merchants, and mercenaries in Byz.; exchange of captives; and extradition of state criminals.

The silence of the Greek sources about Oleg's expedition has caused a heated discussion of its historicity: H. Grégoire insisted on the legendary character of the chronicle's evidence (La Nouvelle Chio 4 [1952] 281–87), whereas G. Ostrogorsky (SemKond 11 [1940] 47–63) and many other scholars considered it reliable. R. Jenkins interpreted a passage in pseudo-Symeon Magistros describing the "Ros-dromitai" as referring to Oleg's expedition (Speculum 24 [1949] 403–06), but the passage is too vague to warrant any firm conclusion.

LIT. A.N. Sacharov, Diplomatija drevnej Rus (Moscow 1980) 83–180. V.D. Nikolaev, "Svidetel'stvo chroniki Psevdo-


A.K.

OL'GA, princess of Kiev ("Elaia in Greek sources, Christian name Helena); died 11 July 969. Wife and, from 945, heiress of Igor, Olga tried to develop trade and political relations with Byz.; both her baptism and her journey to Constantinople should be placed within this framework. The evidence concerning both events is, however, contradictory. Her journey took place in 946, according to G. Litavin (Istorija SSSR [1981] no.5, 173–83), or in 957, according to the traditional view. G. Ostrogorsky (Byzanz und die Welt der Slaven [Darmstadt 1974] 35–52) suggested that Olga was already Christian when she traveled to Constantinople and was received by Constantine VII; so she must have been baptized in Kiev in 954/5. D. Obolensky (GotTH 28 [1983] 157–71) and J.-P. Arrignon (in Occident et Orient au Xe siècle [Paris 1979] 167–84) hypothesize that Olga's baptism took place in Kiev after her return from Constantinople; B. Phidias (EEBS 39–40 [1972–73] 630–50) insists that she was baptized in Constantinople during her journey, although Constantine VII, who described her visit in detail (De cer. 594–98), did not mention the fact. In any case, Olga's visit to Constantinople did not lead to a strong alliance; in 956 she sent envoys to Otto I the Great, and Libutius was appointed bishop in the country of the Rus'.


A.K.

OLIVE (ελαια). Olives provided a staple food, and, when crushed in an olive press, yielded cooking oil and oil for lamps. Until the Arab conquest, Syria was the major area of olive production, replaced from the 7th C. onward by a narrow strip along the Aegean littoral in Asia Minor and Greece as well as southern Italy, but not in Anatolikon (Leo of Synada, ep.43.7–8). English historians of the 12th C. report that no other place in the world produced so many olives
as the southern Peloponneseos (H. Lamprecht, *Untersuchungen über einige englische Chronisten des zwölften und des beginnenden dreizehnten Jahrhunderts* [Torgau 1937] 117). The Farmer’s Law does not mention the olive tree. In the acts of Athos, olive trees are infrequent, the climate of Macedonia being too severe for olive cultivation (Laiou, *Peasant Society* 26), and the *praktika* only rarely mention 2–6 trees in single households. More numerous were olive trees in the Smyrna region; thus, a small monastery of St. Panteleemon in 1292/3 possessed 150 olive trees located both inside and outside the monastery walls (MM 4:57.15–16); a donation and a sale of 44–46 trees are mentioned (MM 4:116.30–31, 137.26); in the theme of Mylassa and Melanoudion an entire “olive proasteion” is attested (MM 4:320.22). Olive trees can be grown in poor soil and on rocky terrain; sometimes soil under them was irrigated (MM 4:130.13–15), although they can be grown without irrigation. Besides restrictions caused by temperature, the olive tree has other disadvantages: its fruit is produced only in alternate years and, when picked, is easily bruised.


-A.K., J.W.N.

OLIVER, JOVAN, semi-autonomous Serbian prince; died after 1355, probably as the monk John Kalybites, whose death on 20 Jan. was noted in a 14th-C. Serbian Gospel (R. Grujić, *Glasnik Skopskog naučnog društva* 11 [1932] 233–37). Of Greek origin, Oliver (ο Ἐλπίδωρος) held a series of positions at the Serbian court that he described in a Serbian inscription in the Lesnovo monastery (see Garnil of Lesnovo): grand kephale (čelnik), grand “servant” (sluga), grand stratopedarches (vevod), grand sebastokrator, and grand despotes of the entire Serbian land and of Pomorie by the will of Kralj (King) Stefan (probably Stefan Uroš IV Dušan). The date when he received the title of despotes has been a matter of discussion: J. Fine (*Late Balkans* 343, n.3) argues that the title was granted ca.1340 by Dušan, while B. Ferjančić (*Despoci* 159–66) prefers 1347 and John VI Kantakouzenos. It has been suggested that by 1340 Oliver married Maria (Mara) Palaiologina, widow of Stefan Uroš III Dečanski. He obtained control over the province of Ovče Polje, on the border between Byz. and Serbia, was the ally of Kantakouzenos during the Civil War of 1341–47, and acted as his patron at Dušan’s court. On some of Oliver’s coins his name is accompanied by that of Dušan or of Stefan Uroš V; others bear his name alone, suggesting that after Dušan’s death Oliver gradually gained independence.


-A.K.

OLYMPIAS (Ὀλυμπίας), saint; born Constantinople between 361 and 368, died Nikomedea 25 July 408; feastdays 24, 25, and 29 July. Born to an aristocratic family, in 386 Olympias married Nebridios, prefect of Constantinople, who soon died. When she refused to take as a second husband Elpidios, a relative of Theodosios I, the state
confiscated her property, restoring it in 391. Olympia possessed estates in Thrace, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, as well as mansions in Constantinople, and used her wealth to support the church and esp. John Chrysostom. Ordained deaconess by Patr. Nektarios, she founded a convent near Hagia Sophia. After Chrysostom's exile, Olympia refused to accept his successor. She herself was banished to Nikomedea, where John wrote her several letters of consolation before her death (Lettres à Olympias, ed. A. Malinqui [Paris 1947]). She was buried at the monastery of St. Thomas of Brochthoi on the Asiatic shore of the Bosporos.

Destroyed during the Nika Revolt of 532, Olympia's convent was rebuilt by Justinian I and inaugurated in 537. Under the pressure of an early 7th-C. Persian invasion, Sergia, hegoumene of the convent, received permission from Patr. Sergios I to transfer Olympia's remains to her nunnery; she then wrote an account of the translation of the relics of the convent. The fate of the convent is unknown. The deeds of Olympia are briefly narrated by Palladius in both his Laurusia History and the Dialogue on Chrysostom's life; her anonymous vita was based on the same sources.


A.K.

Olympiodorus of Thebes (in Egypt), 5th-C. historian, poet, and philosophy enthusiast. For 40 years Olympiodorus traveled adventurously around the world with a parrot that could dance, sing, and speak his name. In 412 he went on an embassy to the Hunnish king Donatus; the latter's subsequent death has raised suspicion that Olympiodorus procured it. The next decade saw him in Athens and back in Egypt. His secular history, written in Greek, was a source for Philostorgios, Sozomenos, and (evidently) Zosimos. It covered the period 407–22 in 22 books and was dedicated to Theodosios II. Photios (Bibl., cod.860), the sole source of the extant 46 fragments, is harsh on Olympiodorus's lack of style and form; nor did his militant paganism endear him to the patriarch. Olympiodorus certainly violated some classicizing canons, notably by including unadorned Latinisms. His preference for facts and figures over stylistic flights, making him the most scientific of late Roman historians, can hardly be praised too much. Possible samples of his poetry are the line quoted in fragment 43 and the contemporary epic Blemmyachia, preserved in P. Berol. 5003; he is known (fr.35-2) to have visited the Blemmyes.


B.B.

Olympios (Olimpios), exarch of Ravenna (from 649); he was a kouvikularios sent to Italy by Constantine II with orders to secure approval of the TypoΣ of Constans II and, if possible, to arrest
Pope Martin I. Olympios arrived in Rome by 1 Nov. 649 and found the Lateran Synod still assembled. Despite his coercion, the bishops refused to confirm the Typos. According to the Liber pontificalis (Lib. pont. 1:339), when the frustrated Olympios tried to have Martin assassinated at mass, God blinded his spatharios at the crucial moment; Olympios was consequently reconciled with Martin. His subsequent actions are obscure, but later accusations against Martin suggest that Olympios rebelled against the emperor. Perhaps in 651 Olympios reached an accord with the Lombard king Rothari (L. Hartmann, Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter, vol. 2.1 [Gotha 1900] 244). The Liber pontificalis, however, says only that some time after making peace with Martin, Olympios collected his army and “set off to Sicily against the Saracens dwelling there,” that his army was devastated (perhaps by plague), and that Olympios himself died from disease. Most scholars believe that in 652 Olympios crossed over to Sicily to oppose Arab invaders. When and if he actually reached the island is uncertain, and Stratos (JÖB 25 [1976] 63–73), pointing out the problems of an Arab presence in Sicily at this time, proposed that in fact Olympios intended to attack Byz. forces in southern Italy.

Lit. Stratos, Byzantium 3:104–11, 275f. —P.A.H.

OLYMPOS, MOUNT, in Bithynia, modern Ulu Dağ, alt. 2,327 m, a holy mountain southeast of Prousa that was an important monastic center, esp. in the 8th–10th C. It is occasionally called the "mountain of the monks" (oros ton kalogerou). The term Olympos ("Olympos") was sometimes extended to include monastic communities in the plain of Prousa, primarily to the north and west as far as the Sea of Marmara. During the first centuries of Christianity Olympos was inhabited only by a few hermits; the first monastery was established by the 5th C. Over the centuries the region is known to have included about 50 monasteries, only one of which (Peristerai) appears to have been female. The monasteries had no formal connection and, with the exception of Agauros, which had four or five dependencies or metochia, were quite independent of each other. Unlike Athos and Latros, it was not a monastic federation headed by a protos of archimandrite.

The monks of Olympos were active in the struggle against Iconoclasm; many of the signatories of the acts of the Second Council of Nicaea (787) were hegoumenoi of monasteries in this region. As a result a number of the communities suffered persecution, esp. under Leo V, and were forced to disperse, at least temporarily. Because of their isolation the monasteries of Olympos suffered from Arab raids in the 9th C. An important group of monasteries continued to function on Olympos in the 10th C., and it occupied first place in the lists of holy mountains established by historians of this period (Genes. 58.21–22, TheophCont 418.23, 430.18–19). Romanos I sent two centenaria of gold to the monks of Olympos (TheophCont 440.3–4). Leo VI and his son Constantine (VII) made a pilgrimage to the mountain (TheophCont 463f); in the 11th C. disgraced officials (e.g., the protosevastarios Symeon during the reign of Michael IV [Skyl. 396.28–32] and Michael Psellos in 1054) retired to Olympos. The growth of Athos and the invasion of the Seljuks inflicted a blow on Olympos, but separate monasteries in this area were still known in the 14th C.

Among the monasteries of the region were Atroa, Medikion, Peleke, Chenolakkos, Helenou Bomon, Sakkoudion, and the lavra of Symboloi(a). Many monastic saints, such as Plato of Sakkoudion, Theodor of Studios, Ioannikios, the patriarch of Constantinople Methodios, and Euthymios the Younger spent part or all of their careers at Olympos.


OLYNTHOS ("Olynthos"). city in the Chalkidike, north of Potidaia. The late antique and medieval periods are known primarily from excavations. A coin of Justinian I suggests that the settlement survived at least through the 6th C. Late Roman remains were also discovered nearby, at Hagios Mamas south of Olynthos (D. Robinson, G. Mylonas, AJA 43 [1939] 69), including a fine undated column decorated with reliefs, and at Mariana, north of Olynthos (a coin of Constantius II, a tower, traces of a wall: D. Robinson, AJA 37 [1933] 602). The settlement revived in the 11th C.: coins, pottery of the 11th–14th C. similar to that of Thessalonike (infra 5:285–91), and iron objects.
have been discovered. The 12th-C. Church of St. Nicholas had mosaic pavement.


T.E.G.

OMAR. See ʿUmar.

OMOPHORION (ὑμοφόριον), a long scarf, a vestment that only bishops were permitted to wear. It was about 3.5 m long, made of white wool, linen, or silk, and decorated with embroidered crosses. It was worn over the PHELOION, looped loosely over the shoulders so that one end hung down in front and one in back. It was said as early as the 5th C. (letter 1.136 of Isidore of Pelousion, PG 78:272C) that the *omophorion* must be made of wool, not linen, since it represented fleece of the lost sheep that Christ the Good Shepherd raised on his shoulders to carry back home—the bishop thus assuming the role of Christ among his flock. Hence, at that point in the liturgy when the text of the Gospel was to be read, the bishop was required to take off the *omophorion* out of respect for the voice of Christ, the true shepherd.


N.P.S.

OMURTAG (‘Oμωρτάγ), Bulgar khan (814/15–ca.831), son of Krum. Omurtag ended Krum's hostilities, most probably in 816 (W. Treadgold, *RSBS* 4 [1984] 213.20), by concluding with Leo V a 30-year peace treaty; its contents are partially preserved in a Proto-Bulgarian inscription (no. 55) erected by Omurtag. The agreement defined the boundary between Byz. and Bulgaria; required the temporary evacuation of frontier fortresses, probably to permit construction of the “Great Fence of Thrace” (J. Bury, *EH* 25 [1910] 283); stipulated the Byz. surrender of Slavic fugitives from Bulgaria; and arranged for the exchange of captives. Michael II probably revalidated the treaty, perhaps in 820 (Proto-Bulgarian inscription no. 43) or possibly later, in return for Omurtag's decisive intervention in 822 on Michael's behalf against Thomas the Slav (*TheophCont* 65.7–13). Despite evidence that he martyred Byz. captives taken in 813, Omurtag enjoyed harmonious relations with Byz. and instead contended successfully with the Franks for control of the Slavs in Pannonia. During his reign Byz. influence on Bulgarian court culture increased: Omurtag's inscriptions are written in Greek, often containing Byz. titles and formulations as well as the *indiction* dating system; his ambitious building program, including the reconstruction of Pliska, reflects Byz. architectural schemes and techniques.


P.A.H.

ONEIROKRITIKA (ὄνειροκρίτικα), eight popular handbooks on dream interpretation surviving from the Byz. era. Two are anonymous (Paris, B.N. gr. 2511 [ca.1400], Paris, B.N. suppl. gr. 690 [11th C.]), while others are ascribed to the prophet Daniel, Astrapyschos, Achmet ben Sirin, Germanos (I or II?), and Manuel II; another is assigned to Patr. Nikephoros I, although the same work is attributed to both Gregory of Nazianzos (Milan, Ambros. O 94 Sup.) and Athanasios of Alexandria (Venice, Marc. gr. 608). These fictitious designations of authorship are designed to lend credibility and prestige. The handbooks date from the 9th to 11th C., although the dream book attributed to Daniel may be as early as the 4th C.

Reflecting the Byz. belief in the divinatory and divine nature of dreams, the *oneirokritika* played an integral role in Byz. *magic*, superstition, and *divination*. The masses used the dream books, while the upper classes consulted professional dream interpreters (for such sessions, *erōtemata*, see *oneirokritikon* of Achmet, 15f). The format in all *oneirokritika* is uniform: the listing (usually alphabetical) of dream symbols, followed by their various interpretations. The reader selected the proper interpretation by comparing the dream's content with his circumstances, for instance, social status, occupation, and physical condition. The interpretations derived from literary motifs, mythology and religion, cultural traditions, hypothetico-deductive reasoning, antinomies, puns, and, most importantly, the interpreter's unconscious associations, based on his cultural values and conditioning. Accordingly, these interpretations provide a wealth of information on Byz. culture and society, for example, popular natural science,


—S.M.O.

ONOMASTICS. See Names, Personal; Prosopography.

ONOUFRIOS (Ονούφριος), saint; a hermit who is believed to have lived ca.400; feastday 12 June. According to the legend he started his spiritual career as a monk in a cenobitic monastery in Hermopolis, near Egyptian Thebes; then he fled to the desert, lived 60 years in solitude, and died there. The author of his Life presents himself as Paphnoutios, a monk who allegedly wandered in the desert and came across Onouphrios, a naked and hairy man who told Paphnoutios the story of his life and deeds. It remains uncertain whether he can be identified with the anachoretic Paphnoutios who lived in the region of Herakleopolis, near Thebes (Festugiére, *Hist. monachorum* 102–10). The Life is poor in concrete data; the author emphasizes that during his long stay in the desert Onouphrios received “the immaculate communio
n” from an angel (p.28D). Later Onouphrios was praised by a certain Nicholas Sinaiotes (perhaps in the 9th C.) and by *Theophanes of Sicily*, *Philes*, and Patr. *Philotheos Kokkinos*. Coptic, Arabic, Armenian, and Latin versions of Onouphrios’s Life also survive.

Representation in Art. The desert father with his immensely long white beard is generally depicted naked, his entire body covered with hair or with some desert plant shielding his private parts. Sometimes he wears a loin-cloth made out of palm fronds. His encounter with Paphnoutios is illustrated in a 12th-C. fresco at Veljusa.


—A.K., N.P.S.

OPHELEIA (ωφελεία, lit. “aid”), a secondary tax mentioned primarily in *praktika* of the 14th C. and once in a chrysobull of Michael VIII of 1275 (Xerop., no.10.43). In documents the term opheleia usually followed the οικουμενον and was equivalent to 10 percent of it, although a lower rate was possible: thus a *praktikon* of 1321 established the opheleia at 1 nomisma and the οικουμενον at 35, that is, only 3 percent (Xenoph., no.15.21–22). The purpose of *opheleia* is not indicated in the *praktika*: Dölger (Schatz. 191) hypothesized that it was introduced for the use of public roads and equipment; he also identified opheleia with *sitarkia* and *zeugaratikion* (Dölger, *Byzanz* 257, n.88). Neither theory can be proved.


—A.K.

OPISTHOTHELEIA (ὀπισθόθελεια), a rare term designating deferred payment, back taxes. The term was first used by a 4th-C. historian (Theoph. 489.27) who related that in 810 Emp. Nikephoros I demanded *opisthoteleiai* from *archontes* for eight years. The *Treatise on Taxation* (ed. J. Karayannopoulos, *infra* 322,30–38) describes the method of imposition: if in the process of conducting an *orthosis* an *epoptes* granted a tax alleviation (symathetia) and deleted several *stichoi* from the cadaster, his successor after a certain lapse of time could suggest to the peasants of the same *chorion* that ownership be restored; in this case they had to agree to pay *opisthoteleia* for three years. If they refused, the fiscal official (*epoptes*) gave ownership of the land in question to a third person (a higher bidder?). The payment of *opis
hoteleia* could be substantial in a litigation over an estate (Peira 36.24, 58.5). After the 11th C. only Harmenopoulos mentions this type of ar
rears.


—A.K.

OPPIAN, author of the *Halieutika*, a didactic epic on fishing; born Korykos in Cilicia, fl. late 2nd C. *George the Synkellos* (431.2) rightly dates O
ppian to the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Oppian was a school author, widely read and fairly often quoted
by the Byz. In the 5th C. a prose paraphrase of *Haiioutika* appeared. There was considerable interest in Oppian in the 12th C. *Ptochoporodromos* (4:215–24), for example, criticized his family for advising him to read Oppian rather than becoming a baker. John Tzetzes wrote a commentary on Oppian (A. Colonna in *Lanx satura Nicolao Terzaghi oblata* [Genoa 1963] 101–04) as perhaps did Eustathios of Thessalonike (A.R. Dyck, *GPhil* 77 [1982] 153f). Constantine Manasses composed a *Life of Oppian* in 15-syllable verse, which is considered the oldest surviving vita (A. Colonna, *BollCom* 12 [1964] 33–40). It includes anecdotal material preserved in Sozomenos (Sozom. *HE* praef. 6), where the emperor Caracalla offered Oppian a golden coin for each verse of his poem. In the Palaiologan period Maximos Planoudes included Oppian in his collection of epic poetry (Florence, Laur. gr. 32.16).

The Byz. attributed to Oppian two more didactic epics as well (Souda 3:547.15–20), the *Kynegetika* (on hunting) and the *Ixeutika* (on catching birds with birdlime), which were actually written by pseudo-Oppian (born in Apameia on the Orontes in Syria, fl. early 3rd C.). The *Ixeutika* is now lost, but the *Kynegetika* is preserved among others in a richly illuminated MS of the third quarter of the 11th C. (Venice, Marc. gr. 479—J.C. Anderson, *DOP* 32 [1978] 192–96). The majority of the miniatures illustrate specific aspects of hunting, but a smaller group have mythological subjects and attest to medieval attitudes toward antiquity. This MS belonged to Bessarion. Two post-Byz. copies in Paris (B.N. gr. 2736, 2737) are dependent upon it.


-P.A.A., R.S.N.

**OPPIDO** (*Ωππίδος*), a town and Greek bishopric in the *tourma* of Salines in Calabria. A rich archive of Greek charters of 1050–64/5 from this bishorpic, also named Hagia Agathe, contains 47 documents that shed light on the administration, ethnic character, and economy of this region of Byz. Italy: the *tourma* was divided into *droungoi*; the center of a *droungo* was a *chorion* protected by a tower (*pyrgos*). Oppido itself is described as an *asty* or *kastron*. The population bore primarily (70 percent) Greek names; these “Greeks” included Armenians and probably Turks. Latin names made up 17 percent and Arabic names 13 percent of the total. The economy of the region was agrarian, the acts listing fields, vineyards, fruit trees, mulberry trees; the production of salt is also mentioned. The cultivation of olives was unknown. There is some evidence of a village community. Each landholder’s possessions were scattered, but it remains disputable whether such scattered holdings were often (or ever) extensive (A. Kazhdan, *VizVrem* 37 [1976] 273).


- A.K.

**OPSAROLOGOS** (*Όψαρολόγος*, lit. “Fish Book”), a short *anonymous* animal epic in prose, of uncertain date and context, satirizing late Byz. legal processes. King Whale presides over a court before which Mackerel has been denounced for conspiracy; Mackerel is found guilty and shorn of his beard. Surviving in one MS only (Escorial Ψ IV 22), this *fable*, with its knowledge of technical terminology for court procedures, has much in common linguistically and thematically with the *Porikologos*.

*ED.* Das mittelgriechische Fischbuch, ed. K. Krumbacher, *SBAW* (1903) 345–80, with Germ. tr.

*LIT.* Beck, *Volksliteratur* 178f.

-E.M.J.

**OPSIKION** (*Όψικιον*), one of the four original themes of Asia Minor in the 7th C., derived its name from the Latin *obsequium*, denoting a body of *comititates*. Their headquarters was *Ankyra*, from which their *komes* commanded the troops of all northern Asia Minor from the Dardanelles to the Halys. The theme, perhaps attested in 626, certainly existed by 680. Opsikion played a major role in history from the 7th to the 6th C.: in 715 it revolted and installed Theodosios III as emperor; it was the base for the revolt of *Artabasdos*, its former commander, in 742; its *komes* David suffered blinding for opposing Constantine V in
766; and its troops supported Michael II against Thomas the Slav in 821. In the mid-8th C., Optimatón and Boukellaroní were detached to become separate themes. Thereafter, Opsikion stretched from the Dardanelles to the edge of the central plateau, its capital was Nicæa, it had an army of 6,000, and its general was paid 30 pounds of gold. In the 12th C., the western part was called "Opsikion and Aigaion"; the theme apparently survived under the Laskarids.


OPSONION (ὀψωμίων). In addition to their pay (roga) soldiers on campaign received provisions in kind (Theoph CONT 265.8–12), called either opsonia or siteresia (Delehaye, Saints stylites 201.14–18), together with fodder for their horses (chortasmata). These provisions were distributed monthly (Skyl. 426.19; Kek. 276.24–278.1) or at the beginning of a campaign (De cer. 695.2–3). Opsion or siteresia referred also to a provisions allowance granted in cash to soldiers; an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 487.34–38) relates how Michael VI Stratiosnikos sent Nikephores Bryennios and John Opsaros to the Anatolikon theme with money to be distributed among the soldiers as their siteresia. In a wider sense, siteresia, stratistikhe opsonia, opsinnas (and other terms) came to mean soldiers’ salaries (Attal. 60.19) or, in effect, the entire expenditure necessary to equip and sustain a soldier (Ahrweiler, Mer 149). However, opsonia or siteresia were not restricted to the military but could also mean payments in cash or kind to monasteries (e.g., Labra 1, no.7.39–40, 62.13) or the salaries of civil officials.


OPTIMATOI (Ὄπτιματοι), theme of northwestern Asia Minor, comprising the region opposite Constantinople, including both sides of the Gulf of Nikomedeia (L. Robert, JSav [1979] 286–88) and stretching inland past the Sangarios. Its capital was Nikomedeia. Optimatoi derived its name from the Latin optimum, a term used in the Strategikon of Maurice to designate an elite corps of foederati, perhaps of Gothic origin. Originally part of Opsikion, Optimatoi appears as a separate theme in the late 8th C. According to 9th-C. Arab geographers, it contained the city of Nikomedeia and three fortresses, and had a force of 4,000. These were not regular troops but were employed to serve the army, caring for pack animals and mules (De cer. 475f). When the imperial troops of Constantinople went on campaign, an optimatós was assigned to each. Constantine VII consequently describes Optimatoi as having nothing in common with the other themes. Its commander was a doméstikos who ranked below all the thematic strategoi. Seals of the 8th and 9th C. give him the title strator, spatharios, or prosopatharios; in the Klitorologion of Philotheos he is, however, antypatos patrikios. Unlike the other themes, Optimatoi was not divided into tourmai and droungoi. The theme long survived: John III Vatatzes reconstituted it after retaking the region from the Latins in 1240.

Lit. A. Pertusi in De them. 130–33. Haldon, Praetorians 96–100, 213. Angold, Byz. Government 244f. —C.F.

OPUS ALEXANDRINUM. See Pavement.

OPUS INTRASSILE (lit. "pierced work"), a means of fashioning gold and silver akin to fretwork or filigree. The craftsman started with a solid band of metal and cut away part of the material. The cutting pierced the band to produce an openwork design, often displaying simple geometric forms, busts, or figural scenes. The technique is known from at least the 3rd C. and was particularly popular for bracelets and pendants. It was also used for small plaques intended to be sewn on clothing or a piece of fabric.


OPUS LISTATUM. See Brickwork Techniques and Patterns.

OPUS MIXTUM. See Brickwork Techniques and Patterns.

OPUS SECTILE (σκούτλωσις, συγκοπή, μαρμάρωσις), inlay—usually of marble, but sometimes mother of pearl and/or glass—cut into shapes following a geometric or figural design, applied to walls and floors. Elaborate figured wall deco-
ration in this medium was used in the 4th C. (G. Becatti, *Edificio con opus sectile fuori Porta Marina [= Scavi di Ostia 6] [Rome 1969]), and crates of glass opus sectile for a sanctuary of Isis were found at KENCHREAI. HAGIA SOPHIA (Constantinople) preserves vast expanses of opus sectile in rinceau patterns; an opus sectile panel with a jeweled cross is located above the west door. Wall decoration in this expensive medium was, however, usually geometric, as in the bemas of S. Vitale, RAVENNA, and POLEZ (A. Terry, *DOP* 40 [1986] 147–64). Painted imitation of opus sectile was ubiquitous on walls in provincial buildings.

From the 4th to the 6th C. opus sectile was more widespread, if less varied, on floors than on walls. It was usually laid in rectangular panels of simple geometric designs in colored marbles or white marble and slate. More luxurious than floor mosaic, opus sectile frequently paved sanctuaries, while mosaic was used in less important areas of the church.

Wall decoration in opus sectile appeared only occasionally after the 6th C., for example, at DAPHNI and the CHORA MONASTERY, although its painted imitation was widespread. An 11th-C. opus sectile icon of St. Eudokia was found at the LIPS MONASTERY. Opus sectile floors were common in major Byz. churches of the 10th–12th C., such as the PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY, Constantinople. They differ from earlier floors in having large scale curvilinear designs, parts of which are filled in with intricately laid small pieces and sometimes figures.


—R.E.K.

**ORACLES** (∝ρητημοί), divinely inspired prophecies or individuals who uttered oracular responses. Oracles were still being given in the 4th C. Theodoret of Cyrrhus notes that Emp. Julian consulted the oracles at DELPHI, DELOS, Dodona, and elsewhere before his invasion of Persia (T. Gregory, *Classical World* 76 [1982–83] 290f). Porphyry in his lost treatise *On the Philosophy of the Oracles* collected many anti-Christian oracular utterances, among them a prediction that the cult of Christ established by St. Peter would last only 365 years (H. Chadwick in *Mémorial A.J. Festugièrè [Geneva 1984] 125f*). An oracle at Didyma (HiERON), declaring that it could give no truthful utterance until unimpeded by Christians, served to justify the persecutions of Diocletian. Porphyry, as well as other Neoplatonists, found in the so-called CHALDEAN ORACLES (logia) the foundation of their world view. Christianity rejected the pagan oracles, claiming them to be the work of witches and demons, but tried to appropriate the tradition of renowned oracles: churches were erected on the sites of ancient temples famous for their oracles and Christian writers circulated bogus oracles, such as the one in which the Apollo of Kyzikos confessed that his temple was now the house of the Theotokos. The Jewish SIBYLLINE ORACLES were revised to convey a Christian message. A set of oracles attributed to Emp. Leo VI was popular in Byz. (C. Mango, *ZRV 6* [1960] 59–93), and Byz. apocalypses made use of the genre.

Oracles mentioned in sermons or homilies attributed to GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS and JOHN OF EUBOEA (or John of Damascus) were depicted as statues in MSS of the 11th and 12th C.; these include the figure of Apollo (that at Dodona and of the Kastalian spring at Delphi), and the oracle consulted by King Cyrus in the Persian capital. One, called the Despoina Pege and prefiguring the Virgin, is represented as a
Byz. empress. Sometimes clusters of oracle figures are shown dancing, playing instruments, or falling in the manner of idols. Thoroughly medieval in detail, these images still suggest some awareness of classical statuary.


—F.R.T., A.K., A.C.

ORANS, or orant (Lat., lit. “praying”), the name given to the early Christian posture of prayer: the body upright and frontal, and the open hands lifted to shoulder height to either side. Used to represent piety on many 3rd-C. pagan and Christian sarcophagi, the posture was adopted for innumerable catacomb figures, whether tomb owners or Old Testament characters (e.g., Daniel) depicted at the moment of their salvation from death. Though rare after the 8th C., when prayer was shown by the inclined profile posture of proskynesis, the orant posture was retained throughout Byz. art for the Virgin Mary in the form often known as the Virgin Blachernitissa or Virgin Platynera.


ORARION (ὁράριον, ὁράριον), a narrow white stole of silk (originally linen) worn as a vestment by deacons when officiating; it rests on the left shoulder and hangs down in front and back. Its name derives probably from the Latin orarium, a cloth for wiping the brow. Its liturgical use is attested by the late 4th C. (Council of Laodicea, canons 22 and 23, ed. P.-P. Joannou, Fonti. Fas cico IX. Discipline générale antique [IVe–IXe s.] 1:2. Les canons des Synodes Particuliers [Grottaferrata 1962] 199f), though we have no sure artistic representations before the 9th C. (Paris Gregory). The orarion symbolized the humility of Christ, who washed the feet of the disciples and dried them with a towel (Isidore of Pelousion, PG 78:272C), and at the same time the wings of angels. A homily attributed to John Chrysostom describes deacons running in the church with fine linen cloth on their left shoulder in imitation of angels; they expelled catechumens who were not allowed to see the fatted calf being eaten (PG 59:520.17–27). The orarion often had woven into it the words of the deacons’ pronouncement from the Trisagion, “Hagios, hagios, hagios.” Its two ends also symbolized the Old and New Testa ments. In the modern rubrics for the liturgy attributed to Chrysostom, the deacon is required to present the orarion to the priest before vesting and to kiss it while putting it on.


ORB. See Sphaira.

ORDEAL. The use of ordeal as a means to prove the guilt or innocence of an individual is mentioned in sources of the 13th C.: Demetrios Chomaticenos (Zephy, Jus 7:531f) and John Apokaukos (M.T. Fogen, RJ 2 [1983] 83–96) testify to its use in private cases, while George Akropolites and Pachymeres mention the use of ordeal at the treason trial of the future emperor Michael VIII. There were two major kinds of judicial ordeal: single combat and holding a red-hot iron. Ordeal by combat is also mentioned in the romance of Phlorios and Platzia-Phlora (P. Piefer, JÖB 20 [1971] 216f). Before enduring ordeal by hot iron the suspect had to spend three days in fasting; his hands were bound to prevent the application of ointments. The ordeal consisted of walking three paces while holding a piece of red-hot iron. Ordeal was considered a barbaric practice and was probably borrowed from Westerners (either before or after 1204).

Appeal to divine judgment was also common in Byz. in the case of the election of a bishop or hegoumenos or solution of a theological controversy and often took the form of depositing two or three pieces of paper (inscribed with names or statements) in a church or on a saint’s relics. A 14th-C. historian (Greg. 1:166.14–29) relates that during a religious dispute in Atramytton (1283?) the parties agreed to determine the truth by setting fire to two documents containing their creeds; each party expected its biblos to remain undamaged but both burned to cinders.

ORDERIC VITALIS, Benedictine historian; born Shropshire 16 Feb. 1075, died St. Evroul, Normandy, on 3 Feb., in 1142 or later. Orderic’s Historia ecclesiastica, initially a history of his abbey, grew into a universal chronicle focusing on Norman achievements; the original MSS show how Orderic continuously (ca.1114/15–1141) revised the text. Orderic had access to wide-ranging information and strove for accuracy, although chronological mistakes were made. He conflates traditions on the Norman establishment in southern Italy (2:56–64, 98–104), but his information improves after monks from St. Evroul migrated to St. Eufemia in Calabria (e.g., 2:100–02). He described Anglo-Saxon emigration to Constantinople and connected Michael VII’s fall with resentment of the power of the senate (2:202–04). His monastery provided oral sources (e.g., on the pilgrimage of Abbot Thierry [1050–57] to the Levant, 2:68–74; on Normans with family ties to St. Evroul who participated in Robert Guiscard’s war with Byz., 4:10–38). Independent recasting of oral testimony may explain a parallel with Anna Komnene (4:36–38; cf. Alexiad 1:156.15–157.2). For the First Crusade he depends mostly on Baudry of Bourgueil, but, despite semidependent overtones, Orderic adds details attributable to personal connections (e.g., on Nicaea, 5:50–59; Hugh Bune’s service with Alexios I, 5:156–58; Alexios’s role in releasing Arpin of Bourges from prison thanks to Byz. merchants in Cairo, 5:350–52). He also treats Bohemund’s siege of Dyrrachion (6:100–02), Constantinople’s relations with the Crusader states (6:128–32, 502–08), and an insurrection on Byz. Cyprus (6:130–32).


ORDERS, MINOR. See ACOLYTE; ANACONSTES; SUBDEACON.

ORDINATION. See CHEIROTHESIA; CHEIROTONTIA.

ORGAN (ὀργανον). The organ was not used in the Byz. church, but did play an important part in imperial ceremonies, such as banquets, chariot races, weddings, and processions (cf. the organ depicted in the miniature, Entry of the Ark into Jerusalem, in the Vatican Book of Kings [Lassus, Livre des Rois, fig.85]). For these purposes the instrument was decked out in gold and costly decoration. Most sources refer to the bellows-type organ. An Arabic source (al-Maṣʿūdi) suggests that three (or two) bellows fed air into a large reservoir below the pipe-chest. The Blue and Green FACTIONS at court each had an organ, but the instrument otherwise remained a rarity. At his palace the emperor had both automata and true organs, in which at least one emperor (Theophilos) took an interest. Nothing is known of the pipework, sound, compass, precise function, or repertory of the organ in the Chrysotriklinos of the Great Palace or indeed of any others, though one 9th-C. source, the Arab Hārūn ibn Yahyā, does refer to “60 copper pipes” in what appears to have been a large table organ. Byz. organs sent as gifts to the West helped revive interest in the instrument. Organs became objects of visual as well as aural show, eliciting wonder for their intricate technology and respect as extravagant diplomatic gifts or signs of royal power—a notable example being the organ sent to the Frankish king Pepin in 757.


D.E.C., A.C.

ORGYIA (ὀργια), name of several units of length and measures of land.

1. The shorter orgyia of 6 podes (= 96 daktyloi = 1.87 m) had its origin in the ancient Greek orgyia of 1.89 m. Called also haple (simple) orgyia, it was used in commerce and handicraft.

2. A longer orgyia of 9 basilikai spithamai (= 108 daktyloi = 2.10 m) was commonly used in the measurement of land. This orgyia had its origin in the ancient Philetairic orgyia of 2.10 m. Out of concern for the taxpayers, Michael IV ordered the use of a longer orgyia (9.25 basilikai spithamai = 111 daktyloi = 2.17 m) for fields of best and middle quality, while the orgyia of 9 spithamai was retained for fields of poor quality. The orgyia used in measuring land was sometimes called geometrike or basilike orgyia.

3. From the 14th C. onward the use of different orgyiae of local validity can be demonstrated, sometimes called kanna (lt. canna).

On the basis of setting marks for the columns
in the Church of St. John at the Studios monastery, and other calculations, T. Thieme (in *Le dessin d'architecture dans les sociétés antiques* [Leiden 1985] 291–308) suggested that the basilica had been planned using two modules within a system of *orgyia* and *daktylai*.


**ORHAN** (Ὀρχάνης), second Ottoman ruler (1326–62); born 1281?, died 1362. During 1326–27, Orhan incorporated what remained of Byz. Bithynia north and west of the Sangarios River. As his father Osman lay dying, Orhan conquered *Prousa* (6 Apr. 1326), henceforth his capital. He then began a general northeastern advance, which Andronikos III tried but failed to oppose in June 1329. *Nicæa* surrendered to Orhan (2 Mar. 1331), but *Nikomedia* held out until 1337.

After 1345 Orhan was often entangled in Byz. dynastic politics. In May 1346, he married Theodora, daughter of John VI, and remained an ally of the Kantakouzenoi until 1357. Four times he dispatched Turkish troops into Europe to assist them (1348, 1350, 1352, 1356). During the final conflicts between Matthew I Kantakouzenos and John V Palaiologos from 1352 to 1356, Orhan simultaneously supported the initiatives of his eldest son, Süleyman Pasha, in conquering and settling southeastern Thrace. During 1357–59, Orhan adopted a conciliatory policy toward John V to gain his help in rescuing Halil, his youngest son by Theodora, from Phokaian pirates. Orhan favored an engagement between Halil and John V’s daughter Irene, which occurred in Constantinople in summer 1359, following the boy’s ransom. This liaison, however, produced no lasting peace (İnalçık, “Edirne” 189–95). With Orhan’s assent, Turkish expansion in Thrace resumed late in 1359 and continued throughout the rest of his reign.


**ORIBASIOS** (Ὀρίβασιος), physician; born Pergamon ca.325, died after 395/6. Oribasios received early training from Zeno of Cyprus, a famous iatri Sophia, as *Eunapios of Sardis* relates in his short biography of Oribasios. While young Julian was confined to Asia Minor, Oribasios became a close friend of the future emper. In 355, Julian took Oribasios to Gaul with him as personal physician and librarian. An extant letter from Julian to Oribasios (358/9) shows that Oribasios supported Julian’s religious policies. A Byz. legend, found in the vita of Artemios and in Kedrenos, records that Oribasios brought from Delphi to Julian an “oracle” describing the desperate situation of the shrine (T. Gregory, *GRBS* 24 [1984] 355–66). Julian had ordered Oribasios to summarize *Galen*, a task completed after 361; these *epitomei* have not survived. Oribasios also composed a medical synopsis, partially extant. He accompanied Julian on the Persian expedition (363) and was present at the emperor’s deathbed: later Oribasios recorded events of that campaign in a private *Synopsis for Eunapios*. Emperors in the following decade forced Oribasios into exile, but he returned to Constantinople by the mid-470s.

Oribasios established the method for using ancient medical authors: quoting verbatim from carefully cited works and pairing each quotation with another of similar content, not necessarily from the same tract or author, as is seen in his streamlining of Galen’s writings. Oribasios’s version of Galen generally was followed by Aetios of Amida and Paul of Aegina and was the form in which Photios knew Galen’s works. Arabic physicians used Oribasios in translation, and by the 5th C. he was rendered into Latin. Oribasios ensured Galen’s enormous influence on later Byz., western medieval, and Arabic medicine.

**ORIENS** (Ὀρίες), diocese of the Eastern Prefecture from the 4th to 7th C., administered by the *comes Orientalis* at Antioch and comprised of the provinces of Syria I and II, Theodoria, Phoenicia Maritima and Libanensis, Arabia, Palestina I, II, and III, Isauria, Cilicia I and II, Euphratensis and southern Euphratensis, Osrohoen, Mesopotamia and southern Mesopotamia, Armenia IV, and, until 536, Cyprus. Egypt was removed from Oriens and made a separate diocese by Valens. Oriens was an important military, commercial,
industrial, and agricultural region that also included notable intellectual and university centers, esp. in Syria and Palestine. Orients ceased to exist as an administrative unit in the 7th C., with the disappearance of the office of the praetorian prefect and the reorganization of provinces into themes.


ORIGEN (Ὀρεγένης), surnamed Adamantios, theologian; born Alexandria? ca.185, died Tyre? probably 254. A professor of the Alexandrian School from ca.202, he was excommunicated in 231/2 but found refuge in Caesarea Maritima, where he continued his teaching career. His traditional identification with the Neoplatonist Origen, a disciple of Ammonios, is not valid (K.O. Weber, Origenes der Neoplatoniker [Munich 1962]).

Origen was a very prolific writer (Jerome claims that Origen produced 2,000 works), but because of the later condemnation of his teachings most of his works survive only in fragments or in Latin translation. Origen laid the foundations for the further development of Christian theology by introducing such concepts as homousios, theanthropos (God-man), and hypostasis. He treated the questions of sacraments and eschatology and the doctrines of angels and demons, the soul, and sin. He developed allegorical or typological exegesis of Scripture and in polemics against Celsus defended the truth of Christianity. His First Principles is the first systematic treatment of Christian theology, and the Dialogue with Heracleides is a rare case of a stenographic record reporting a lively discussion of the Father-Son relationship. Unlike Clement of Alexandria, Origen proceeded from the idea of God, not the Logos, and he understood the Trinity hierarchically, so that Jerome accused him of subordinationism (a charge that Athanasios of Alexandria refuted); he emphasized the unity of the soul and the human body in Christ after the Incarnation so that Christ’s soul lost the possibility of sin; he taught the preexistence of souls and the eschatological apokatástasis (restoration) when all individuals will be purified.

Discussions about Origen’s theology began immediately after his death, and his student Pamphilios of Caesarea defended Origen from his critics. Then, ca.400, Epiphanius of Salamis and Theophilos of Alexandria attacked him, while John of Jerusalem and Rufinus of Aquileia supported him. In addition to being accused of subordinationism, Origen was attacked for believing in the preexistence of souls and for terminological inconsistency. Some of his tenets were accepted by Egyptian and Palestinian monks who stressed the ascetic and mystical elements of his teaching; extreme supporters of his ideas claimed that in the final account each intellect is equal to Christ (hence their name isochristoi); a more moderate group (protokristoi) taught that Christ is above other intellects; their opponents claimed that the protokristoi introduced Christ’s humanity as the fourth hypostasis in the Trinity. In 542/3 Justinian I issued an edict condemning Origen and his work, and anathemas were signed by Pope Vigilius and certain patriarchs. The isochristoi were condemned by the Council of Constantinople of 553; Origen was also named by the council, linked not to the isochristoi but to the affair of the three Chapters.


ORIGINAL SIN (πρωτατορικὴ ἁμαρτία), the hereditary sin to which every human being is subject at conception as the result of the sinful choice of Adam and Eve. Because of the ancestral fall of man, predisposition to evil is already present in infants and can increase as the person matures, owing to his or her personal guilt (an idea particularly stressed by Augustine). As a result of original sin, all humanity remained excluded from paradise until the “original virginity” (the expression of a certain John the Monk, sometimes confused with John of Damascus, PG 96:1405C) of mankind was restored by the incarnation. In individual cases it is BAPTISM that cleanses man from the defilement of original sin (e.g., pseudo-Athanasios, PG 28:636A).

From the legal point of view the Byz. church accepted the same teaching about original sin as did the Latin church, and the canonists Zonaras and Balsamon formulated the doctrine in accordance with Augustine. Byz. theologians, however, with rare exceptions (e.g., Prochoros Kydones),
provided different emphases. In strong contrast to Gnosticism and esp. Manichaeanism, they (esp. John of Damascus) stressed that man’s nature remained, even after the Fall, an image or icon of God, whereas the likeness (homoiooma) to God, based on grace, was lost and could be recovered only by ascetic purification and union with God. Adam’s sin had an impact on all members of the human race, not in terms of personal guilt but as a punishment imposed collectively on mankind for the generic human sinfulness revealed in individual sins. Photos even considered the concept of original sin heretical (J. Gross, BZ 52 [1959] 304–20), while Symeon the Theologian interpreted it as removing oneself from the vision of God and from deification (J. Gross, BZ 53 [1960] 47–56). All in all, the concept of original sin was elaborated in Byz. less systematically than in the more legalistic West.


—G.P.

ORIKE (ὀρκεική), a supplementary or secondary tax of uncertain nature mentioned in many chrysobulls of the 14th C. In 1318 Andronikos II granted a certain George Troulenos ownership of an estate in the region of Serres and exempted xenoi (“aliens”) and eleutheroi settled on this land from all state epereiai save for sitarkia, kastroktisia, orike, phonos (phonikon), and treasure trove (Guillou, Menécée, no. 8.15–17). A series of documents conferred upon the monastery of Menoikeion, mostly by Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, exempts the monastery from orike, as well as sitarkia, kastroktisia, and (sometimes) ennomion; Dušan’s chrysobull of 1345 (no. 39.31–34) contains a longer list that also includes ennomion on beehives, the tithe on sheep and swine, and pathenophthoria. Charters from other archives sporadically mention the orike: in 1327 Andronikos II exempted the monastery of St. Nicholas near Serres from payment of sitarkia, kastroktisia, orike, and mitaton on their yokes of oxen (doulika seugaria), adding, however, that sitarkia must be paid to the fisc (Chil., no. 113.28–33). Dušan exempted the monasteries of Philotheou (Actes de Philotheée, ed. W. Regel, E. Kurtz, B. Korabliev [St. Petersburg 1913; rp. Amsterdam 1975] no. 9.75), Esphigmenou (Esphig., no. 22.32), and Iveron (Solovjev-Mošin, Grčke povelje, no. 7.92) from orike; the orike is always listed together with kastroktisia. Finally, the chrysobull of 1342 issued at the request of the Bulgarian tsar Ivan Alexander abolishes the payment of sitarkia, orike, and kastroktisia levied in the amount of 50 hyperpera (Zogr., no. 31.21–25). It is thus plausible to hypothesize that the orike was a charge somehow connected with Slav territories. There is no direct evidence that it was a tax on hilly pastures (so Dölger, Schatz. 146f), an interpretation based solely on etymology.

A praktikon of 1321 mentions a (different?) charge called oreiatikon (Lavra 2, no. 109.970,985) that was paid by the whole district (periokhe) together with ennomion. The sum seems to have been insig- nificant.

LIT. Solovjev-Mošin, Grčke povelje 473f. —A.K.

ORNAMENT (κόσμος). The most important categories of ornament in Byz. are floral patterns (including “inhabited” vine and acanthus rinceaux), animal figures, interlace, and the medallion style, originally a special case of interlace, in which tangent or interlaced circular medallions enclose other motifs, often human or animal figures. While these types are to some extent characteristic of every Byz. art form, except perhaps icon painting (though icons often received elaborately ornamented metal covers), the most lavish and innovative ornament is found in floor mosaics, textiles, and architectural sculpture. The major achievements in these areas date from the 5th to 6th and 10th to 12th C., but through their influence on other media and in later centuries, they effectively set the pattern for the historical development of Byz. ornament.

Floor mosaics of the 4th–6th C. display a repertory of floral and geometric forms essential to the development of interlace, which reached an advanced level of complexity in the 5th C., as in the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem. Complex interlace seems to have lost popularity in the 6th C. but survived to influence the 8th-C. development of Islamic ornament. Another important mosaic pattern was the inhabited rinceau, frequently used in borders, and, in the 6th C., as a large-scale floor decoration in its own right (C. Dauphine, Art History 1 [1978] 400–23). Medallion compositions, which the most stylized of the rinceaux closely resemble, first appear in the 6th C.
at Beth Sh’an (see SLYTHOPOLIS) and Kabr Hiram, although they derived from earlier forms of interlace. The medallion style occurs in almost every medium, exercised a major influence on the arts of western Europe and the Islamic world throughout the Middle Ages, and was transmitted to China and Japan. Its influence is explained by its extreme adaptability, in terms of purpose as well as medium: not only a pattern in itself, it was a way of incorporating figures or even entire scenes into an ornamental scheme without diminishing their pictorial integrity.

Tessellated pavements passed out of fashion by the 7th C. and OPUS SECTILE became and remained the favored technique of luxurious floor decoration. Opus sectile preserved many of the interlace and medallion patterns developed in floor mosaics (PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY, Constantinople); it was instrumental in transmitting these patterns to the West (S. Marco, VENICE). The fullest expression of the medallion style is to be found, however, in SILK textiles. In TEXTILES, as in mosaics, the medallion style derived from interlace patterns traceable at least as far back as the 4th C. Coptic tapestries display a variety of ornament, including floral and interlace patterns that closely parallel those found in mosaics.

The ornament of architectural members as well as of borders and HEADPIECES in illuminated MSS was largely floral, sometimes in the form of GARLANDS or PALMETTES. Although its formal basis was once again Greco-Roman, antinaturalistic tendencies predominated. By the 6th C. the dominant style was close textured and often deeply undercut, with strong contrasts of light and shadow and an emphasis on delicately carved forms that combined sharpness with fluidity (St. POLYEUKTOS and HAGIA SOPHIA, Constantinople; S. Vitale, RAVENNA). Even further conventionalized by the 10th C., these forms were then freely combined with interlace and medallion patterns (HosiosLOUKAS, Theotokos church and katholikon).

A uniquely Byz. contribution to architectural ornament was the use of rectangular stone plaques with motifs in low relief (T. Ulbert, Studien zur dekorativen Reliefplastik des östlichen Mittelmeerraumes [Munich 1969]). The motifs included lozenges and other simple geometric shapes, crosses, small-scale interlace and medallion compositions, and ANIMAL combats featuring both real or exotic creatures; these animals also appeared singly or symmetrically paired. The earliest examples date from the 6th C. but derive from 4th- and 5th-C. RELIEF sculpture, and ultimately from Roman sarcophagi and architectural decoration. Originally applied to parapets and chancel screens, in later centuries both older and contemporary plaques were set in the walls of buildings, such as the old Metropolis church in Athens and S. Marco in Venice (Grabar, Sculptures II, pls. LXV—LXX, XLVIII—I—LI). These carvings embody what is perhaps the most important principle of Byz. ornament: that a pattern need not cover and transform an entire surface but could be set off from its surroundings as a self-contained unit in the manner of a picture. Both figures and rather complex interlace patterns were treated in this way, recalling earlier floor mosaics in which interlace was confined to panels rather than carpeting the entire floor.

This restraint, together with the popularity and longevity of the medallion style, suggest, if not a rejection of intricacy as the basis of ornamental design, a tendency to subordinate it to an easily readable scheme. Nevertheless, despite a general tendency toward greater elaboration and fantasy beginning around the 12th C., containment and comprehensibility characterize much of Byz. ornament throughout its history. Indeed, they are arguably the features which most clearly distinguish Byz. ornament from the contemporary styles of western Europe and the Islamic world.

What we see in Byz. ornament is not necessarily what the Byzantines themselves saw. They valued craftsmanship and luxurious materials, but seem to have had a special regard for naturalistic effects. These were achieved in two ways: through actual representations, as of flowers or vines, and through the materials themselves, esp. the colored marbles used in opus sectile. The latter were not only praised for their intrinsic beauty, but frequently evoked comparison with rivers, gardens, and other natural features.

Many Byz. ornamental themes demand, or at least admit, a symbolic interpretation. The eucharistic and scriptural significance of the grapevine (Jn 15:1—7) helps explain the prominence of vine rinceaux in church decoration. The same motif was used, however, in synagogues, and to a lesser extent in secular buildings, including private dwellings. SHEEP and DEER had obvious religious connotations (Ps 42:1; Jn 10:7—18), but other
creatures used in ornamental contexts may lack overt significance. No convincing interpretation has yet been advanced for the many scenes of animal combat found esp. in architectural sculpture. Not in itself symbolic, the medallion style with its series of linked frames allowed the incorporation of religious imagery into ornamental patterns. This potential was realized first in the 6th-C. Annunciation and Nativity silk in the Vatican, and thereafter in every ornamental medium throughout the history of Byz. art.


-J.T.

OROPOS (Ὀρωπός, Rupo, Ripo), settlement and fortress on the east coast of ATTICA. Although Oropos was an ancient site, little is known of the medieval settlement until around 1200, when it is attested as belonging to the church of Athens. The fortress may have been built ca.1204. The site flourished in the 13th C., when it had close connections with both Athens and Euboëa. The fortification was probably destroyed ca.1400, when it fell briefly into the hands of Albanians. It remained in Athenian control (until 1456) and was taken by the Turks in 1460. No remains of the fortification survive, but there are many churches in the vicinity, most dating from the period of Frankish domination (A.K. Orlando, DChAE 4 [1987] 29–41; M. Chatzedakes, DChAE 5 [1969] 57–103).

Lit. TIB 1:229.

-T.E.G.

OROSIUS, PAUL, Latin theologian and writer; born probably Braga, northern Portugal, died after 418. Around 412 Orosius migrated to Hippo, where he met Augustine, who sent him to Jerome at Bethlehem. While in Palestine Orosius, who had already made a theological mark with his Commonitorium against the Priscillianists and Origenists, combated Pelagianism at a Jerusalem synod in 415, subsequently defending his own orthodoxy in the Apology. Back in Africa, Augustine set him to work on what is now known as the History against the Pagans, seven books of world history from the Creation to 417. This work was designed to reinforce the argument of the City of God that pagan charges that Rome’s problems were the result of deserting the old gods were unfounded. The work is plainly written, but inevitably derivative (not always honestly) and of little independent value until Orosius reaches his own times. Its influence was ubiquitous (approximately 200 MSS survive), being sufficiently regarded in Byz. for Romans II to present in 959 a copy to Caliph ‘Abd al-Rahman III in Spain, who commissioned an Arabic translation.


-B.B.

ORPHANAGES (ὀρφανοτροφεία). As part of their spirit of PHILANTHROPY, Byz. showed particular compassion for orphans as well as for widows, the sick, poor, and elderly. Some orphans were provided for through ADOPTION, others were cared for in monasteries or in orphanages, which were either independent or administered by a monastery. The director of an orphánotrōphēion was usually called an ORPHANOTROPHOS. The earlier orphánotrōphēia served not only as orphanages proper, but also as hostels, and the boundary between them and xenodochēia was not clearly fixed (Justinian, nov.131.15). The most famous orphanage in Constantinople was that of St. Paul in the Acropolis region, which was in existence by the 6th C. Alexios I Komnenos restored it on a grand scale; the complex also included a school for orphans and refuges for the blind, crippled, and elderly. Orphans stayed in orphanages until old enough to marry; state legislation protected their rights. The sources also refer to a trepho-trōphēion, or “foundling home,” in Constantinople.


-A.M.T., A.K.

ORPHANOTROPHOS (ὀρφανοτρόφος), director of an ORPHANAGE. The term orphánotrōphos is first mentioned in Leo I’s novel of 469 as an office invented by the patrikios Zotos. The earlier orphánotrōphoi belonged to the clergy, and two 5th-C. patriarchs (one of them Akakios) were former orphánotrōphoi. In the provinces the office still re-
mained in the hands of priests and monks, such as the humble monk Kandidos in 1162 (Laura 1, no.64.30). In the capital, however, orphanotrophoi became members of the secular hierarchy; in the 9th-C. taktikon of Uspenskij patrikios and orphanotrophos follows the chartularios of the vestiarion. In the Palaiologan period, Manuel Philes defined orphanotrophos as “the treasurer of imperial means” (Philes, Carmina, ed. A. Martini, no.43.59). Some orphanotrophoi were influential personages: an addressee of Theodore of Studios was the patrikios and orphanotrophos Leo; at the end of the 10th C. the orphanotrophos John was simultaneously judge (krites) of the Armeniakon; John the orphanotrophos administered the empire under Romanos III, Michael IV, and Michael V; Michael Hagiotheodorites was orphanotrophos and logothetes tou dromou in 1166–70, and at the beginning of the 13th C. John Belissariotes was orphanotrophos and logothetes ton sekreton. Thereafter, the office was in decline, and a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 185.17–20) notes that the orphanotrophos had no particular functions.

According to the kletorologion of Philotheos, the staff of the orphanotrophos included the chartoularioi of two orphanages (probably those of Zotikos and of St. Paul in Constantinople), the arkarios (cashier), and kouratores. The orphanotrophos is mentioned in formulas of exemption.


ORPHEUS, mythical musician. In late antiquity Christian apologists like Tatian, Theophilus, and Justin attacked Orpheus as a “false” singer. He was made into a pupil of Moses, who ultimately accepted the God of Israel. On the other hand the story of Orpheus charming wild animals with his song was interpreted as a prefiguration of Christ (Clement of Alexandria, Protreptikon 7.74.3–6) in his role as the Good Shepherd (Eusebius of Caesarea, De Laud. Const. [p.244.14–31]), the new Orpheus outshining the old one. F. Halkin argues that the vitae of St. Mamas and esp. St. Zosimos of Anazarbos pattern the saints after Orpheus: both saints prefer animal to human company; a lion, taught by Zosimos, instructs the persecutor Domitian in Christianity (AB 70 [1952] 249–61). The Byz. also viewed Orpheus as one of the ancient sophoi and quoted often from surviving Orphic fragments (Malal. 72.16–76.9).

In Byz. literature Orpheus and his lyre are used as a metaphor for the power of poetry and music (Theophylaktos of Ohrid, ed. Gautier, 1:353.3). Furthermore, a praised addressee (Arethas of Caesarea, Scripta Minora 2:5.27–6.3) or lamented deceased (Psellus, In Mariam Scleraenam, ed. M. Spadaro [Catania 1984] vv. 103, 111) is favorably compared with Orpheus. Various authors, though, use the Orpheus simile in an unusual way to surprise their listeners. Niketas Choniates (Orationes 129.26–9), for example, in praising Theodore I Laskaris says that the bronze statue of Orpheus, symbolizing the Muses, swelled Alexander’s deeds, thus equating the Macedonian king with the emperor and Orpheus with himself; the story is taken from Arrian. Anna Komnene intends to surpass Orpheus, because he moved only stones, while she will move her readers to tears (An.Komm. 1:7.14–20).

A standard figure in floor mosaics of the 3rd–6th C., Orpheus is found in catacomb painting and on Christian sarcophagi—stages in his eventual assimilation to Christ. The potent singer probably also served as a source for images of David the musician, as in the Paris Psalter. From the 9th C. onward, miniatures in MSS of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos (Weitzmann, Gr. Myth., figs. 82–84) show Orpheus as a lyre-player or harpist without reflecting the scorn attached to him in the text (PG 35:653AB). Likewise on caskets and boxes he ranks among mythological figures without ulterior motive.


ORTHOGRAPHY, the correct writing of words, including both letters and prosodical signs. The sweeping changes in Greek phonology that took place from Hellenistic to late Roman times were not accompanied by corresponding changes in the writing of the language. Hence the correspondence between letters and phonemes was upset: the same sound could often be written in different ways and the same sign occasionally read in different ways. Byz. grammarians therefore com-
posed prescriptive treatises on orthography. They all drew directly or indirectly on Herodian, particularly on passages concerning the correct writing of long and short vowels and diphthongs. Of the Orthography of Oros (5th C.) only a small fragment survives, and that of John Charax (6th C.) is still unpublished. The Canons of the grammarian Theognostos and the partially preserved Orthography of George Choiroboskos are indicative of the revived cultural interest in the 9th C. Niketas of Herakleia set out the rules of orthography in the form of parodies of liturgical hymns as aids to memory (mainly unpublished). Many brief anonymous treatises on orthography for school use survive from the Palaiologan period, the latest being by the future Patr. Gennadius II. The erratic spelling of inscriptions in churches and on seals, as well as in documents, suggests that Byz. society attributed much less importance to correct orthography than its teachers would have wished. The most common of these errors are ITACISM and confusion between ο and a second element in a diphthong and β.


ORTHOSIS (ἄρθωσις, lit. “making straight, correction”), a fiscal procedure of reestablishing taxes on land that had temporarily been exempted from payment. If the heir returned within a 30-year period to the land declared sympatheia, the tax had to be restored gradually, in three stages. If 30 years had already passed and the sympatheia had been transformed into a klasma, the orthosis would not take place. The procedure was performed by the epoptes or probably by a special functionary called orthotes. The data on orthosis and orthotai are preserved in documents of the 10th to 12th C., primarily in the treatise on taxation published by Ashburner and then by Dölger.


ORTHROS (ἀρθρός), Byz. matins, a daybreak service to consecrate the day to God. Along with vespers, orthros was one of the two principal and original hours of both the cathedral and monastic offices.

In cathedral usage (see Asmatike Akolouthia), the service of orthros began in the narthex and proceeded to the bema in stages (Mateos, Typicon 1:xxiii–iv; 2:309–10). After several antiphons of psalms and canticles (eight on weekdays, four on Sundays), each preceded by a prayer, the ministers entered the nave to the chant of a troparion. The cathedral psalmody of lauds, comprising the Benedicite canticle of Daniel 3:57–88 (festive), Psalm 50(51) with troparion, Psalms 148–150, the Great Doxology (festive), and the Trisagion, was celebrated at the ambo. At solemn festive orthros, during the singing of the Trisagion the patriarch made his solemn entrance and went to the bema for the Gospel lec-
tion and concluding litanies.

The orthros of the Palestinian monastic horologion, gradually adopted by the Stoudite monks of Constantinople from the 9th C. onward, is characterized by its poetic kanon of nine odes based on the ten biblical canticles. Originally the canticles themselves were chanted, but the poetic kanon ultimately supplanted them outside of Lent, except for canticle nine, the Magnificat (Lk 1:46–55). The full kanon was meant to be chanted only at the Sabatic agrypnia or Saturday all-night vigil, but eventually became a fixed element of daily orthros outside of Lent. In Stoudite usage the kanon was interrupted after the third or sixth ode for a lection from the church fathers or Lives of the saints (Arranz, Typicon 381f).

In the final stage of its development, this hybrid office, a fusion of cathedral and monastic usages, was further modified in the Sabatic typika, esp. in the distribution of the psalmody. Characteristic of Sabatic orthros is the reading of the entire Psalter plus all nine odes of the kanon at the agrypnia.


OSMAN (‘Atmán, ‘Ormán, etc.), son of the Turkoman beg Ertogrul and progenitor of the dynasty of the Ottomans; died Söğüt 1326. Osman succeeded Ertogrul ca.1282 as leader of a mixed following of Kayi clansmen and other ghazis (see Turks), whose territory centered on Eskişehir (formerly Dorylaion) and Söğüt (south of the San-
and his economy was still substantially pastoral. In the early years of his rule, Osman's posture toward the neighboring, largely autonomous Greek lords varied between peaceful coexistence and conflict. By the late 1280s and 1290s, however, Osman and his warriors were conducting more determined assaults into the interior of Byz. Bithynia. The smaller fortresses of southern Bithynia were variously captured or incorporated, and by 1301 Osman was besieging Nicaea and harrying Prousia. This provoked a counteroffensive led by the hetaireiarches Mouzalon, whom Osman defeated on 27 July 1302 at Baphius (in Turkish sources, Koyunhisar). This victory assured a Turkic settlement in Bithynia, but did not result in his speedy conquest of its strategic centers. Osman's pressures on Prousia, Nicaea, and Nikomedea continued intermittently throughout the next quarter century. Shortly before his death, Prousia capitulated to his son, Orhan.

Osman welded his inheritance and conquests into a powerful principality, with Turco-Islamic institutions deriving from the Seljuk legacy. It quickly came to rival the other Anatolian beyliks, and by the death of Murad I in 1389 had evolved as a Eurasian empire.


OSRHOENE (Ὄσρηονην), civil and ecclesiastical province of the diocese of Oriens from the 4th to 7th C.; it extended east from the Euphrates River as far as the province(s) of Mesopotamia. The name of Osrhoene is that of the kingdom of a local Arab dynasty (ca.130 B.C.–A.D. 214 or 240—Segal, infra 9–15) and is thought to derive either from their tribe, the Oshroeni (Jones, Cities 215f) or their capital, Orhay (Edessa). The relatively flat land of Osrhoene was cultivated and also offered grazing for herds belonging to Arab nomads. The province was crossed by trade and military routes, and its 4th–7th-C. history was dominated by the Byz.-Persian wars. In addition to its capital, Edessa, it contained 18 cities including Constantina, Kallinikos, Kirkesion, and Batnae/Sarug as well as Carrhae/Harran. The last remained a center of paganism into the 9th C. (Jones, Cities 206).


OSTIARIOS (ὀστιάρος, from Lat. ostiarius, "doorkeeper"), a palace eunuch whose function was to introduce dignitaries to the emperor or empress; at the same time, the term was used as a title. A legend preserved in the PATRIA OF CONSTANTINOPLE mentions a certain ostiarios Antiochos as a contemporary of Justinian I; a seal of the 7th C. bears the name of the koubikouarios and ostiarios Theodesios (Zacos, Seals 1, no.2939), and John, an imperial ostiarios and logosethes of the stratiotikon, participated in the council of 787 (Mansi 12:1051D). The title of ostiarios was conferred on various functionaries, in the 11th C. often on notaries and protonotaries: Psellus sent a letter to John, ostiarios and protonotarii of the dromos (Sathas, MB 5:373.1–2); the ostiarios Bardas Olympianos was imperial protonotarios (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.172). At the end of the 11th C. a certain Nicholas in Calabria was first ostiarios and later protonotarios (C.A. Garufi, ASIStic 49 [1928] 32f).

Although some earlier editors had dated certain lead seals of ostiariai as late as the 13th C., Oikonomides (Listes 300) thinks that the office did not survive the end of the 11th C. The ecclesiastical ostiarios was a deacon; John of Kitros (ca.1200) denied that the post could be held by an anagnostes (Darrouzès, Offilia 539). There could also be ostiarioi in the service of high dignitaries.


OSTRAKA (sing. ὀστρακον), pottery shards (and sometimes limestone flakes) used as writing material, most often for short texts such as tax receipts and private letters between monks. They also carried accounts, orders for payment, lists of names, memoranda, commodity labels, and writing exercises. The archives of the bishops Pesynthiaios of Coptos and APA ABRAHAM contain numerous ostraka bearing requests for ordination from clerics in minor orders. Ostraka were also
used for biblical, patristic, and other literary texts (e.g., the homilies in W.E. Crum, H.E. Winlock, *The Monastery of Epiphanius*, vol. 2 [New York 1926] 56–66), liturgical texts, hymns, prayers, and magical texts. Cheap and ubiquitous, *ostroka* thus provide evidence both for the extent of literacy and for economic and social history throughout late antiquity.


OSTROGOTHS (Οὐστριγοθοί), a branch of the Goths, earlier known as the Greuthingi, who occupied the lower Don basin in the 4th C. Their king, Ermanaric, committed suicide when attacked ca. 375 by the Huns, of whom they remained tributaries in Pannonia until 454. In the late 5th C. their kings Valamer, Thiudimir, and Theodoric the Great alternated between being loyal foederati of the empire and ravaging Illyricum. After besieging Constantinople in 488 they were sent to Italy by Zeno to overthrow Odoacer, after whose death in 493 Theodoric became the most powerful ruler in the West with his capital at Ravenna. The Ostrogothic regime achieved peace and prosperity and, despite their Arianism, maintained good relations with the Roman senate and papacy until ca. 523. After the death of Athalaric in 534, the murder of his mother Amalusuntha by Theodahad gave Justinian I a pretext to invade Italy. In a long, bitterly fought war they suffered initial losses under Witigis, then recovered most of the Byz. gains under Totila. Their main forces were defeated by Narses in 552. Some survivors were deported to the East, while others made common cause with the Lombard invaders of Italy.


- T.S.B.

OTRANTO (Οὗποδες), port in southern Apulia, commanding the shortest route across the Adriatic Sea to Avlona. During the Gothic War Otranto was an important garrison town and naval staging post. A bishop is recorded in 595 and a tribune in 599. It remained Byz. throughout the 7th C., fell to the Lombards sometime after 710 and at some point after its recovery by the Byz. in 758 was the residence of a *doux*. In the 9th C. Otranto withstood Arab attacks, but after the reconquest of the rest of Apulia in 876 it lost its administrative role to Bari. It remained important as a port of entry for troops and officials as well as an autocephalous archbishopric, probably created soon after 876, which lacked suffragans until allocated Acervena, Gravina, Matera, Tricarico, and Tursi in 968. Otranto’s Jewish community was sizable; archaeological finds, including glazed wares and coins, suggest a flourishing economic life. Until 1055 Otranto resisted the Norman advance. Re-captured in 1060, it fell again in 1064 and was finally taken in 1068 by Robert Guiscard, who used it as a base for operations against Byz. territory. Although a Latin archbishop was installed by 1067, the Greek clergy and rite remained preponderant until the late 14th C. and the Terra d’Otranto continued to be a center of MS copying and literary production. Particularly important was the monastery of S. Nicola at Casole, which was founded in 1099 and whose most distinguished abbot (from 1219) was the scholar Nicholas of Otranto. Both city and monastery were sacked by the Turks in 1480.

Monuments of Otranto. The Church of S. Pietro at Otranto is a good example of Byz. provincial art. In plan it resembles the Calabrian cross-in-square churches at Stilo and Rossano, but it differs in elevation, having a single dome rather than five. Corner bays are covered by east-west barrel vaults. It was decorated with frescoes, of which there are at least two layers. The later paintings may be 12th-C.; H. Belting (*DOP* 28 [1974] 12–14, 22) dates the earlier ones to the 10th C., stressing their *retardataire* quality and attributing them to the same workshop as the cave paintings at nearby Carpinignano Salentina.


- T.S.B., D.K.

OTTO I THE GREAT, German king (936–62), emperor (2 Feb. 962–973); born 23 Nov. 912, died Memleben 7 May 973. After stabilizing the situation in Germany, Otto invaded Lombardy in 951; later, under the pretext of helping Pope
John XII (955–64), he entered Rome, where he was proclaimed emperor. His Italian policy and esp. his proclamation as emperor raised the political problem of the relationship between the German and Byz. empires: that is, which could rightly claim to be the successor of the Roman Empire. Vying with Byz., Otto intended to build up the town of Magdeburg as a rival to Constantinople (H. Gringmuth-Dallmer, BBA 49 [1983] 26–29). He attracted former Byz. allies in southern Italy, Salerno, and Benevento and tried to invade the theme of Longobardia. Nikephoros II Phokas tried to solve the conflict by peace negotiations and sent Otto an embassy in the winter of 966/7. After the negotiations failed, Nikephoros led an army against the Germans in the summer of 967; Otto, afraid of impending war, sent the Venetian envoy Domenico to Constantinople to ask for peace (S.A. Ivanov, VizVrem 42 [1981] 94–96). Otto was acknowledged as basileus of the Franks (not Romans), and the political alliance was confirmed by the betrothal in 972 of Otto’s heir, Otto II, to the Byz. princess Theophano. Otto’s expedition against southern Italy in 968 proved a failure.


A.K.

OTTO III, king of Germany (crowned Aachen 25 Dec. 983) and Western Emperor (crowned Rome 21 May 996); born near Cologne July 980, died Paterno near Civita Castellana, north of Rome, 23 Jan. 1002. Son of Otto II and Theophano, Otto (Οὔτος) was guided by his mother from Otto’s death (989) until her own. He esteemed ascetics highly, esp. Neilos of Rossano. He valued his Byz. heritage and styled himself Imperator Romanorum, a translation of the Byz. emperor’s title. Widukind of Corvey had earlier expressed German claims to imperial majesty which Otto sought to realize. He proclaimed a Renovatio Imperii Romanorum, while adopting Byz. court ceremonial and Byz. forms for his documents and seals. He was the only German emperor who tried to make Rome his capital. He rejected the Donation of Constantine as a forgery, in order, in Byz. fashion, to assert his superiority to the papacy. Thus he appointed his cousin Gregory V as pope and his former tutor as Sylvester II (999–1003). Otto sought a Byz. bride; the embassy of Leo of Synada failed but a subsequent envoy brought a princess (possibly a daughter of Constantine VIII), who reached Bari at the time of Otto’s death.


C.M.B.

OTTOMANS (Ἀτμάνες, Ὀθμάνοι), a Turkish dynasty ruling first over an emirate, later over an empire that replaced Byz. Its name derives from its founder Othman (Osman). The earliest contemporary reference to him appears in Pachymeres, who reports that in 1302 a Turkish chief-tain, “Atman,” defeated a Byz. army at Baphius and invaded the region near Nikomedea with his troops. A silver coin struck by Osman confirms later sources that give his father’s name as Ergoghrul. The cradle of the Ottomans was the Söğüt region, west of the Sangarios River; established there during the dissolution of the Seljuk state, they began to wage holy war (jihad) against the Byz. In 1326 they captured Prousia, which they made their capital; Nicaea fell in 1331, and Nikomedea in 1337/8. Annexing the emirate of Karasi gave them access to the Aegean Sea ca. 1348.

During the Civil War of 1341–47, Osman’s successor, Orhan, offered military aid to John VI Kantakouzenos, married his daughter, and largely contributed to his victory, but Orhan’s uncontrolled troops devastated Byz. territory. In March 1354, when an earthquake destroyed the walls of Kallipolis, the Ottomans occupied this strategically important fortress; with it as a base, they expanded into the Balkans. In 1366 Amadeo VI of Savoy sailed to assist Byz. and expelled the Ottomans from Kallipolis, which was restored to the Byz.; but in 1371 the Ottomans defeated the southern Serbs at the battle of Marica, and soon reduced the Byz. emperor to a tribute-paying vassal. Around this time Murad I appointed a military governor (beylerbey) of the European territories and established him in Philippopolis. In 1376 Murad compelled Andronikos IV to surrender Kallipolis. The Ottomans undertook large-scale operations in the Balkans in 1383, conquered Sofia with its surrounding territory ca. 1385, and overran Macedonia, with Thessalonike sur-
rendering in 1387. Finally they defeated the Serbians and Bosnians at Kosovo Polje in 1389. (Some scholars, however, consider the battle at Kosovo a draw.) Systematic colonization followed the conquest; Turkish colonists were settled among the old local population, nomads were transferred from Anatolia to Europe, Islamic religious foundations (waqf) were established, and the sultan granted lands to cavalry officers as timar (the approximate equivalent of the Byz. pronoia).

In 1390 Bayezid I annexed the Turkish Anatolian emirates of Aydin, Saruhan, Mentesh, and others, and the city of Philadelphia. In 1391 he conquered the Kastamon region and marched against Sebastia; he used his Christian vassals in campaigns directed against Muslims. Attacks against his European frontier obliged him to cross to the Balkans, where he undertook several military operations, mainly against the Hungarians. He besieged Constantinople and in 1396 annihilated a crusading army at Nikopolis. Returning to Anatolia, he continued his conquests, which, esp. after the occupation of the caravan city of Keltzene, provoked the intervention of the Mongol khan Timur; the latter's army defeated the Ottomans at the battle of Ankara and captured the sultan in 1402. Timur restored the Turkish emirates occupied by the Ottomans, while Bayezid's son Süleyman Çelebi, established in Adrianople, concluded a treaty with Byz. and other local Christian powers, which involved important territorial concessions on the part of the Ottomans.

After ten years of dynastic strife, Sultan Mehmed I restored unity in 1413. Social turmoil continued as shown by the revolt of sheyh Bedr ed-din, who preached equality between Christian and Muslim. The Venetians profited from this and destroyed the Ottoman fleet at Kallipolis in 1416, but the Ottomans conquered the strategically important port of Avlon (1417), campaigned successfully against Wallachia (1417), and reannexed some of the Anatolian emirates. Under Murad II Timur's successors exercised pressure in Anatolia and protected the emirate of Karaman, which resisted Ottoman supremacy successfully. In the Balkans the Ottomans' main opponents remained the Hungarians under King Sigismund. In 1430 the Ottomans retook Thessalonike and annexed the city of Ioannina. In 1439 they occupied Serbia, including the silver-producing region of Novo Brdo. They twice defeated the Hungarians under Hunyadi, at Varna (1444) and Kosovo Polje (1448). These victories consolidated Ottoman power and prepared for the conquest of Constantinople by Murad II's successor, Mehmed II, in 1453. From the early years the bases of the Ottoman state were the religion of Islam and the dynasty of Osman. Christian slaves converted to Islam played a most important role: they constituted the sultan's personal guard (Janissaries); if proved worthy, they gained the highest offices in the imperial palace and the administration. Most of the sultans' mothers were slave girls of non-Muslim origin. The Byz. disapproved of the easy social ascent among the Ottomans, but high Ottoman officials were proud of their humble beginnings.

The Byz. generally scorned the Ottomans as adherents of a false religion (see Islam, Polemic against) and as cultural inferiors (S. Vryonis, GRBS 12 [1971] 263–86). The Ottoman impact on late Byz. institutions and cultural patterns was minimal, just as Byz. influence on Ottoman institutions and elite culture was circumscribed. Cultural interchange at the folk level, however, was more extensive, esp. during the Tourkokratia period (S. Vryonis, DOP 23–24 [1969–70] 253–308).


OTTO OF FREISING, Latin churchman and historian; born between ca. 1111 and 1116, died 22 Sept. 1158. Half-brother of Conrad III and uncle of Frederick I, Otto studied at Paris (ca. 1127/8–1133), became a Cistercian (1132), was named abbot of Morimond and bishop of Freising (1138), and participated in the Second Crusade. In his Historia de duabus civitatibus (History of the Two States, 1143–46) Otto interpreted the history of Byz. in an Augustinian way as the translation of the empire from Rome to the Greeks (Byz.) to the Franks. He describes there various events of the period, for example, the campaign of John II
Komenos against Antioch (ed. Hofmeister, pp. 354f) and an Armenian embassy to the pope (pp. 360–63).

Otto undertook the Chronica, or Gesta Frederici, at Frederick’s request and finished the first books by summer 1158; his chaplain and secretary Rahewin (died before 11 Apr. 1177), who completed Otto’s work (bks. 3–4; before Feb. or June 1160), pays less attention to Byz. The Chronica describes the Byz. embassy on the marriage of Bertha of Sulzbach to Manuel I and the embassy of Wibald, the attack of Roger II on Greece (1,35 [pp. 53f]), the Second Crusade (1,35–47 and 62–64 [pp. 54–67, 88–91]), Byz. subversion in southern Italy (2,49–52 [pp. 156–59]), a Hungarian victory over Manuel (2,53 [pp. 159f]), and the plot of a kaniklesios (Theodore Stypeiotes) against him (O. Kresten, JÖB 27 [1978] 61f).


-M.McC.

OUNGIA (ovyyía), unit of weight derived from Lat. uncia = 1/12 litra. Accordingly, the oungia, as 1/12 of the logariké litra of 320 g, weighed 26.7 g, and the oungia, as 1/12 of the soudia litra of oil (256 g), weighed 21.3 g. Many weights representing an oungia or its multiples have been preserved.

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 181f.

- E. Sch.

OURANOS, NIKEPHOROS, official and writer; died after 1097. Ouranos (Oúparos) was involved in the negotiations between Constantinople and Baghdad over Bardas Skleros; a contemporary Arab report describes him as an intimate of Basil II and an enemy of the Notos (H. Amedroz, D. Margoliouth, The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate, vol. 6 [Oxford-London 1921] 23–35). He was a civil functionary (kaniklesios) and held the title of magistros; the diatyposis of Athanasios of Athos records his appointment as lay guardian of the Lavra. It was his military career that made him famous. As archon of the West he annihilated the forces of Samuel of Bulgaria at the river Spercheios in 997, and as governor of Antioch after 999 he repulsed unruly Arab tribesmen (1000/1), campaigned in Armenia (1001/2), and fought the rebel al-Asfar (1005–07).

Some of his surviving letters are devoted primarily to the topics of service to the emperor, friendship, and family affairs—mother, sister, and younger brother, but not wife or children—and contain occasional details of his military activities. Leo of Synada, who sent him a letter, belonged to the same circle of civil functionaries (ed. M.P. Vinson, ep.13 and commentary p.102). Ouranos's
Taktika (written ca. 1000), still only partly edited, is largely a paraphrase of earlier sources, but chapters 56 through 65 represent a revised and expanded version of the Praecepta militaria, including firsthand material based on his campaign experience along the eastern frontier. A. Dain wrongly considered chapters 63 through 74 to have been copied from a part of the Praecepta militaria now missing. Ouranos also composed poetical and hagiographical works.


—E.M.

OUSIA. See Substance.

OVČE POLE (Ευτζάπολις), called Neustopolis by George Akropolites, a district in Macedonia, in the basin of the Upper Vardar. It is first mentioned by an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 459.82), who relates that in 1048 the governor of Bulgaria, Basil the Monk, settled thousands of Pechenegs in the valleys of Serdica, Niš (Naisius), and Ovče Pole. They later participated in a military expedition in Asia Minor but revolted against Byz. (J. Shepard, JOB 24 [1975] 77). In the mid-13th C. Ovče Pole acknowledged the supremacy of the empire of Nicaea, but at the end of the century it was in Serbian hands: Stefan Uroš II Milutin acquired this territory, and it is cited in his treaty with Charles of Valois (brother of the French king Philip IV) of 1308. Later it belonged to the principality of Jovan Oliver and, after Dušan’s death, was governed by Constantine Dejanović. In 1395 the area was occupied by the Turks.


—A.K.

OVID (Publius Ovidius Naso), Roman poet; born 43 B.C., died a.d. 17. His mythological epic Metamorphoses influenced directly or indirectly a number of late antique poets, such as MOUSAIOIS and NONNOS OF PANOPOLIS. Malalas mentions that Ovid wrote on Phaethon. In the 13th C. interest in Ovid was revived. MAXIMOS PLANODES made complete prose translations of the Metamorphoses and Heroïdes (entitled Epistolai, or Letters). His master copies (in part autograph) are preserved in Vat. Reg. gr. 132 and 133. A 14th-C. MS in Naples (Bibl. Naz. 2 C 32) contains excerpts from Ovid’s amatory works, possibly based on a complete translation produced by Planudes himself or by one of his pupils. Some words in the text that could be considered obscene were modified. Despite this “moral” censorship, the works of Ovid found readers: in PHLORIOS and PLATZIA-PHILLA (ed. Kriaras, Mythostomata 183 [p. 144]) the hero learns much from the Book of Love, probably by Ovid (Beck, Volksliteratur 149, n. 3), and some stories from the Metamorphoses penetrated into Greek folktales (E. Kenney, Mnemosyne 16 [1963] 57).


—P.A.A.

OWNERSHIP (διευκονισια) denotes the full right to dispose of a thing at will; in other words, not only to have it and to use it (as in possession) but also—unlike possession—to be able to dispose of it during one’s lifetime or at death. Ownership can be obtained by various means of acquisition. The owner can demand the return of the object from a third party with an in rem actio (he epi to pragmati agoge); this procedure is called rei vindicatio (Gr. ekdikeisis) (Basil. 15.1).

Although the dogmatic principles of Roman law regarding acquisition and the return of property were maintained in Byz., at least in their Justinianic version, when it comes to the sale of property entirely new regulations for plots of land (immovable things) were introduced by the agrarian legislation of the 10th C. Furthermore, as the documents from the 13th C. onward reveal, the concept of property had effectively changed, despite the continuation of the old legal rulings. Where property rights over a piece of land had once been absolute and indivisible, there were now several proprietorial-like arrangements involving various persons or institutions (the state, landlords, paroikoi) in its sale or inheritance.
Limitations on Ownership. Roman law imposed various limitations on ownership (such as servitudes), and Byz. law took a further step in restriction of individual ownership. These limitations had various characteristics: state ownership or, at least, a broad range of fiscal restrictions was superimposed over individual ownership; neighbors, relatives, and the village community enjoyed certain rights over individually owned land; the church—at least, in the later centuries—acquired certain rights such as a part in the Abiotikon; the lands of peasants (such as paroikoi) were subject to the control of great landowners. The complicated net of overlapping rights obscured the strict distinction between ownership and possession typical of Roman and Byz. law. Accordingly, the alienation of land was subject to serious limitations: the state prohibited the alienation of certain categories of land (e.g., those of the stratiotai); it introduced the concept of the just price; relatives and neighbors were granted the right of protimesis; the transfer of ownership required confirmation. Even though acts of confirmation are rarely mentioned, cases are known in which a functionary confirmed the transaction of free possessors/owners as well as cases in which the lord confirmed peasant transactions.


-A.K.

OXYRHYNCHUS (Ὀξύρυνχος, Bahnasa, Coptic Pemje), town in Upper Egypt, a bishopric from 325, famous for its sculpture and numerous papyri (see Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Oxyrhynchus Sculpture). The city, a center of both classical and monastic culture, was home to the Apion dynasty. Today it is a desolate area, with many modern houses built of reused ancient material.

Historical sources mention a large number of churches and monasteries in Oxyrhynchus and its environs, of which none can be identified save for a few funerary chapels. Excavations in the cemetery have yielded many decorated limestone blocks from several different tombs; there are capitals, nche-heads, friezes, archivolts, etc., all roughly datable to the 5th and early 6th C. Recently the remains of a small monastic settlement were found in nearby Kūm Nadūra (northwest of Samalūt). It contained a three-aisled church, probably of the 7th C., and several small houses.


-O.G.

OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, many thousands of Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Arabic literary and documentary texts found in the rubbish mounds of Oxyrhynchus (Bahnasa) in Middle Egypt, beginning with the excavations of Grenfell and Hunt in 1897. Dating from the first Ptolemies to well after the Arab conquest, they constitute the richest single find of papyri known. Besides previously unknown works of classical literature, the Oxyrhynchus pieces include the sayings of Jesus from the Gospel of Thomas; a history (the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia); Old and New Testament books and apocrypha; Christian hymns, prayers, and liturgical texts; and a 6th-C. calendar of saints’ feast (P.Oxy. XI.1357). Documents illustrating the Byz. period include the archive of the Apion family. Documentary texts come from every genre: letters, accounts, tax rolls and receipts, petitions, sales, leases, wills, and items from every aspect of public and private life. As well as illustrating social, economic, and religious history, they show the changing nature of Greek as it was written and spoken in Egypt during late antiquity.


-O.S.B.MacC.

OXYRHYNCHUS SCULPTURE, conventional term applied to a large body of limestone carvings—for the most part architectural in origin and pagan in iconography—from in or near Oxyrhynchus in Egypt. Most come from a vast pagan (later Christian) necropolis outside the city; early pieces (3rd–4th C.) are grave stelae, usually with a standing or seated boy, while 5th–6th-C. pieces tend to be niche heads, arches, capitals, and other items from underground grave chapels. Dionysos
(with grapevines) was esp. popular, being employed within an eschatological context fundamentally similar to that of earlier Roman sepulchral art (apotheosis of a mortal; anticipated joys of afterlife). Stylistically, however, these pieces are typically Coptic in their technical simplicity and crude expressiveness (see Coptic Art and Architecture). Many pieces are displayed in the Greco-Roman Museum, Alexandria; some of the numerous chance finds, which are now in American and European museums, have been substantially restored.


—G.V.
PACHOMIAN MONASTERIES, a group of monasteries for men and women. They were founded by PACHOMIOS in the first half of the 4th C. in Upper Egypt, first in Tabennesi, then in Pbow, which became the center of the community. Monasteries possessed lands, as shown in many papyri, and paid taxes. According to the Rules attributed to Pachomios (but written, probably, in the next generation), the monks formed Koinoboria and divided their time between divine service (with celebration of the eucharist twice a week, on Saturday and Sunday) and productive work; the large monasteries were separated into “houses” and groups of artisans (linen weavers, tailors, carpenters, cloggers, etc.). The organization of labor was strictly centralized and controlled from above. Rich landowners joined the community, such as Petronios, the first successor of Pachomios, and Theodore (died 368), another of Pachomios’ associates and later the superior of the community. Reading and the copying of books were encouraged (C. Scholten, JbACHr 31 [1988] 144–72).

The community prospered in the late 4th and 5th C., gradually replacing the charismatic leadership by a formal organization, but declined under Justinian I. It exercised substantial influence on monastic communities in Palestine, Asia Minor, and Italy.


—A.K.

PACHOMIOS (Gr. Παχομιός, from a Coptic word meaning “eagle”), leader of the earliest cenobitic Christian monasteries in Egypt and saint; born Upper Egypt ca.290, died Pbow 346; feastday 14 May in West, 15 May in East, 9 May in Coptic church. Born to pagan parents, Pachomios was conscripted into the army (312/13), where he encountered Christians and converted. After leaving the army, he sought guidance in asceticism from an experienced monk, Palamon. Then Pachomios gathered a group of disciples who, at first, followed the eremitic pattern of separate work and devotions. A charismatic leader, both a visionary and a gifted organizer, Pachomios imposed more structure in the monks’ work by assigning them specific tasks; he also required attendance at pray-

in Novgorod, Moscow, the Trinity monastery of St. Sergej, and the Monastery of St. Kirill of Beloozero. Most of Pachomij’s voluminous writings are vitae and eulogies of eastern Slavic holy men. Very few, however, were initially composed by Pachomij himself (a notable exception being his vita of Kirill of Beloozero); usually he revised the work of others (e.g., the vita of Sergej of Radonež by Epifanij, the vita of Varlaam Chutynskij). Most modern assessments accuse Pachomij of vacuous verbosity and of preferring generalized rhetoric to particular evocation or description. Nonetheless, his versions survive in vast numbers of MSS: he helped to establish the cults of several native saints and to produce a “standard” style for hagiography in Rus’. Pachomij was also a scribe: autograph copies survive of a Psalter (1459), a Palejja of 1445 (see Palaija), and a translation from Symeon the Theologian (1443).

ED. Pachomij Serb i ego agiografskie pisaniya, ed. V. Jablonskij (St. Petersburg 1908) appendices; rp. with introd. by D. Čizevskij, Pachomij Logofet: Werke in Auswahl (Munich 1963).

ers at specific times. Fully communal life was established in nine monasteries for men and two for women in *Tabennesi* and vicinity. In 330 he founded a monastery at *Pbow*, which later became the administrative center for the *Pachomian Monasteries*.

The letters of Pachomios are preserved in a Latin translation by Jerome; Greek versions of some letters and Coptic fragments are known as well. Jerome also translated the *Rules* ascribed to Pachomios, though the text now available was probably produced after Pachomios’s death. Pachomios remained indifferent toward Trinitarian discussions of the 4th C.; his relationship with the Gnostic community of *Nag Hammadi* (located near Tabennesi and Pbow) is unclear.

His vitae have survived in three traditions: a Sahidic text, the so-called *Vita Prima* in Greek, and the Latin translation by Dionysius Exiguus from another Greek Life (*Vita Altera*). Lefort (infra) suggested that they were based on a lost Coptic vita; Halkin (infra) considered the *Vita Prima* as the only text chronologically close to the time of Pachomios.


—J.T., A.K.

**PACHYMERES, GEORGE**, patriarchal official and historian; born Nicaea 1242, died Constantinople? ca.1310. After receiving his early education in Nicaea, Pachymeres (Παχυμέρης) went in 1261 to the capital, where he studied with George Akropolites. He became a deacon and member of the patriarchal clergy. In 1277 he served as didaskalos tou apostolou. Eventually he received the ecclesiastical position of *protehdikos* and the civil post of *dikatophylax*.

Pachymeres is best known for his detailed—and for the most part reliable—history of the reigns of Michael VIII and Andronikos II, covering the period 1260–1308. Much of his account is based on eyewitness observation; he places special emphasis on the ecclesiastical controversies that divided the empire. The archaizing style of Pachymeres is notoriously difficult to comprehend; he is noted for reviving the use of Attic names for the months (cf. G.G. Arnakis, *BNJ* 18 [1945–49] 144–53). His chronology has occasioned problems for modern researchers (cf. A. Failler, *REB* 38 [1980] 5–103; 39 [1981] 145–249). Pachymeres is generally regarded as an objective historian, but he does reveal his own opinions. Thus, he was critical of Michael VIII, singling out his irascibility and hypocrisy, and hostile to Pap. Athanasios I of Constantinople because of his intolerance and rigidity, traits shared by his monastic supporters (Pachym., ed. Bekker 2:148f). Pachymeres was a perspicacious observer who fully realized the pathetic condition of the declining empire and was interested in the motives of the protagonists and the causation of events. He believed that *tyche* was the determinant force of history (Pachym., ed. Bekker 2:228.15–229.1).

Pachymeres was also a scholar and writer of wide-ranging interests, including philosophy, rhetoric, mathematics, and law. He composed *Progmnasmata* (*RhetGr*, ed. Walz, 1:549–96) and 13 *meletai* on rhetoric (ed. J.F. Boissonade, *Georgii Pachymeris Declamationes XIII* [Paris 1848; rp. Amsterdam 1966]). In addition he wrote a compendium of Aristotle and a quadrivium.


—A.M.T.

**PACTA** (πάκτα, from Lat. *pactum*). In the Roman system of obligation by contract, *pacta* assumed the important function of denoting the mass of agreements from which no obligations resulted (*pacta nuda*). Justinianic legislation and the jurisprudence of that time still proceeded in principle from this concept. In the meantime, however, the quantity of nonbinding (“nude”) *pacta*
had been reduced to a negligible number, so that the decisive practical difference between *pactum* and contract, namely actionability, had virtually disappeared, and the differentiation appears artificial. Nevertheless, the concept of *pacta* was revived as late as the 11th C. and was supported in a manner faithful to the textual transmission (see *Meditatio de nubis pactis*). In contractual practice the *pacta* converged with the (written) contract of the law of obligations mainly because the classical *stipulation* degenerated into a mere clause used for all kinds of agreements. Consequently and symptomatically, under Leo VI the qualification *nudum pactum* was applied to documents that have no penal stipulation (*nov. 72*). Leo’s measure, which allowed the penal clause to be replaced by other means of achieving the desired effect—for example, by affixing the sign of the cross or an invocation—was revised by Romanos II (*Zepos, Jus* 1:244–46), but the theory of *pacta* did not thereby regain its practical relevance.


—D.S.

**PÂCUIULUI SOARE**, a Byz. fortress on a Danubian island east of DOROSTOLON in southwestern DOBRUDJA (near mod. Ostrov in Romania); its Byz. name is unknown. Evidence of late Roman habitation is scanty. The latest coin found is one of Maurice; the settlement was evidently abandoned ca. 600. John I Tzimiskes restored the fort and constructed a harbor, probably to defend Dorostolon from attacks by the Kievan fleet. Excavations discovered a strong wall (6 m broad at the foundation), the material for which was brought from several quarries in the area (P. Diaconu, E. Zah, *Dacia* 15 [1971] 289–306). The poorly preserved ruins include a large ashlar stepped landing on the southeast side, flanked by two square towers. To the northeast a tower, with one curved side and one straight side at an obtuse angle, presents the least possible obstacle to ice floes. Soon Pâcuilui lui Soare lost its military character and the population concentrated in a smaller area.

The town flourished during the 11th C.—more than 500 Byz. coins from Romanos III to Alexios I have been found on its territory; thereafter, only sporadic coins of Alexios III, John III Vatatzes, and Andronikos II are recorded as well as some of Epirot and Latin rulers. People lived in semisubterranean habitations and were engaged in fishing and trading activity. A potter’s kiln of the 11th C. (S. Baraschi, *SCIV* 25 [1974] 461–79) and various arms and household utensils of bone, also of the 11th C. (P. Diaconu, S. Baraschi, *Dacia* 17 [1973] 351–59), demonstrate the local craftsmanship. Of Byz. origin are some ceramics, glass vessels, and *enkoptia*; on some amphoras there are potter’s stamps as well as Cyrillic graffiti. Some objects found in Pâcuilui lui Soare are of Kievan and Pecheneg origin. Probably at the end of the 11th C. a fire destroyed the town and in the 12th C. it was severed from Byz. In the 13th and 14th C. Bulgarian (and from the end of the 14th C. onward Rumanian) coins dominate among the finds.


—A.K., E.C.S.

**PAENULA** (*φαινόλης, φελόνης*), a heavy cape or traveling cloak made usually of linen or wool, pulled on easily over the head like a poncho. Sometimes it had an attached hood. Originally a garment worn primarily by slaves, peasants, and soldiers, its simplicity and practicality assured it such popularity in the late antique period that it ultimately replaced the *toga* as an everyday costume and was worn even by senators in late 4th-C. Constantinople (*Cod. Theod.* XIV 10.1). The mosaic figures in the Rotunda of St. George in Thessalonike are shown wearing the *paenula*. It is considered to be the source of one important liturgical vestment whose use was reserved to priests and bishops, namely the *phelonion*, the chasuble of the Latin church.


—N.P.S.

**PAGANISM** was a living force in the 4th-C. empire, supported by some parts of the senatorial aristocracy (primarily Western), intellectuals, and the rural population, whereas the main strength
of Christianity came from the lower and middle classes of the city. Although it is hard to generalize, it seems indicative that in Kyzikos the city council asked Emp. Julian to restore Hellenic temples, but the workers of the state woolen factories and the "techmitai of coins" supported the local bishop (Sozom. HE 5:15.4-6). There were three main streams in the paganism of the late Roman Empire: political, intellectual, and cultic. Political paganism stemmed from the religious indifference of the army, a constant influx of Germanic and related warriors, and the influence of the senatorial aristocracy.

The most overt resurgence of paganism took place under Julian. Its political power became evident in the case of the Altar of Victory and in the revolt of Eugenius. Quite a number of pagans were active at the imperial court in the 4th and 5th C.: Themistios, Symmachus, Flavius, and the eparch Kyrkos, to name only a few. Intellectual paganism flourished in the 5th C., which produced such scholars as Proklos and Pamprepios, the historians Olympiodoros of Thebes and Zosimos, and the poet Claudian. A series of decrees issued by Emp. Theodosios I, culminating with the edict of 392, attempted to crush paganism by prohibiting sacrifices and other cult practices. This caused the closing and/or destruction of many temples. Pagan cults continued to survive, however, esp. in the countryside, despite these prohibitions.

In the 5th C. Isidore of Pelousion (PG 78:344A) asserted that in his era "Hellenismos" had disappeared, defeated by the passage of time, by many efforts and weapons, and by reason. His statement was premature, however, and Justinian I still had to struggle against paganism. He tried to eradicate paganism at the intellectual level by closing the pagan Academy of Athens in 529 and attempted to stamp out remnants of pagan religious practice, esp. by using inquisitionary missions such as that of John of Ephesus (J. Irmscher, Klio 63 [1981] 683-88). Thereafter paganism survived either as a component of Christianity, in the form of classical tradition or as an educational vehicle, or in the form of cult tradition. Christian churches were built, for example, on the location of former pagan shrines and the cult of saints was continued at sites of pagan healing.

At the end of the 7th C. paganism as such was preserved predominantly at the level of everyday life, as "pagan" habits—feasts, magic, and as-

trilogy, theatrical performances, and pagan oaths—and in the clothing of law students (I. Rochow, Klio 60 [1978] 495f). Some forms of pagan cult are attested to in 9th-C. Maina (De adm. imp., 50.71f), and vestiges of "pagan" habits were criticized by 12th-C. canonists and by the 14th-C. patriarch Athanasios I (RegPatr, fasc. 4, no.1738). These vestiges of paganism may have been reinforced by Byz. contacts with nonbaptized peoples, such as the Pechenegs. On the other hand, accusations of paganism were an effective method of attacking intellectuals involved in the study of antiquity.


A.K., A.M.T.

PAGOMENOS. See Pepagomene.

PAIDEIA (παιδεία), term that in the Hellenistic and Roman world designated education or training; church fathers (e.g., Methodios of Olympus, Eusebios of Caesarea) retained it to denote pagan education, often in contrast to Christian education based on the Gospels (PG 18:137B). In the wake of the Septuagint and New Testament semitizing usage, they also employed the term in the sense of chastisement or corrective training; God would chastise the Christians for the purpose of their moral discipline. From patristic times onward, authors distinguished between "our" (Christian) paideia as moral and religious training (cf. A. Moffatt, in Iconoclasme 87) and "external (exo, thyrathen) paideia," meaning secular education (Lemerle, Humanism 39). The word thyrathen itself could be used as a noun, (e.g., Nik.Chon. 907.77). At the same time, the Byz. inherited from the Second Sophistic the expression enkyklios paideia/paideusis with a more technical, if polyvalent, meaning: George Akropolites (Akrop. 1:46.13-15) equated it with the study of grammar; Psellos (Sathas, MB 5:147.12-14), on the other hand, speaks of enkyklios paideia as elementary education preceding the study of grammar.

PAINTERS’ GUIDES. See Models and Model-books.

PAINTING. See Fresco Technique; History Painting; Icons; Monumental Painting.

PAKOURIANOS (Πακούριανος, Arm. Bakourian, Georg. Bakuriani), aristocratic Byz. family that made its first appearance in 988 in the army of David of Tayk’/Tao and occupied important administrative positions down to the 13th C. The best-known member is Gregory Pakourianos, who took part in the defense of Ani against the Seljuks in 1064. His career as an imperial dux in the East was cut short by the Turkish advance, but his support of Alexios I earned him the office of megas domestikos of the West and the title of sebastos, with vast estates in the Balkans. He founded a Georgian monastery at Petritzos and supported the monastery of Iveron on Athos. Gregory defended the Balkans against the Normans and died in battle against the Pechenegs in 1086. The facts that the sources sometimes call him an Armenian and sometimes an Iberian; that the typikon for his monastery was composed in Greek, Georgian, and Armenian; and that he signed it in “Armenian characters,” while referring to himself as an Iberian, have led to heated debate over the origin of the family. The most likely explanation is that it belonged to the mixed Armeno-Iberian Chalcedonian aristocracy, which dwell in the border district of Tayk’/Tao.


PAKTON (πακτόν, from Lat. pactum, “contract, agreement, treaty”), a word with several meanings in the Byz. era. (1) The term was used to describe an agreement between rulers, esp. a treaty (usually in the plural: e.g., pakti tes eirenes, “peace treaty”). (2) It also referred to tribute (e.g., pakti chrysio), such as that paid by Byz. to neighboring rulers, and was most commonly used in this sense by Byz. historians of the 9th through 11th C. (3) Also called choropakton, the term is found in documents and denotes the yearly rent or rental fee, normally in specie, paid to the owner or possessor of property (land, fishing rights, mills [nylopaktion], etc.) for the use of that property. The term pakton was employed in regard to land leases between private parties as well as between a private individual (lessee) and the state (lessor). When the state was landlord the distinction between pakton and telos blurred. (For rates of the pakton, see Rent.)

The term ampelopaktion, ostensibly a rent on vineyards, is encountered frequently during the 13th and 14th C., usually in connection with xenoparoi, that is, new or alien cultivators. There was an official called paktoles, for example, on the seal of Nicholas, chartoularios and paktoles of Paphlagonia (Zacos, Seals 2, no.619).


PALACE (παλάτιον), an official residence, such as the residence of the emperor. The term derives from the Palatium complex on the Palatine Hill in Rome, the only official dwelling of the Roman emperors until the late 3rd C.; subsequently the term entered general use.

Imperial Palaces. During the Tetrarchy and on into the 4th C., establishment of new capitals (Antioch, Milan, Trier) brought about the proliferation of imperial palaces. The Great Palace in Constantinople, begun by Constantine I, is the final product of that age. Other, later palaces built in Constantinople included the 5th-C. Boukoleon and Hormisdas palaces, the 10th-C. Myrelaion palace, the 11th-C. Mangana palace, the 12th-C. Blachernai palace, and the late 13th-C. Tekfur Sarayi. Emperors also built palaces away from Constantinople: for example, the 6th-C. Rheigion palace (A.M. Mansel, 6 CEB, vol. 2 (Paris 1951) 255–60) and the 9th-C. Bryas palace (S. Eyice, Belleten 23, no.89 (1959) 79–111).

On the basis of archaeological and textual evidence, the historical development of palace architecture is marked by characteristic changes in the relationship between the building and its urban setting. Initially (4th–6th C.), the complex was open toward the city, continuing Roman practice. Decline of cities (7th–8th C.) brought about the emergence of the fortified palace, reflecting a growing concern for security provided not only by city walls but also by those of the complex.
itself. In the 13th and 14th C. the urban palace-block made its appearance. Probably under Western influence, in Byz. (e.g., Mistra) the type was characterized by continued segregation of the building from the urban environment.

**Palaces of the Nobility.** It is not clear when the nobility began to build palacelike mansions: one 12th-C. historian (Zon. 3:767.6–8) inveighs against the relatives of Alexios I who erected oikoi as large as a *polis* and luxurious as a palace, while another (Kinn. 266.7–9) relates that dignitaries decorated their mansions with *history painting* and scenes representing the emperor’s hunting exploits. The palace described in the poem Diogenes Akritas was an elaborate complex that included a large garden, bathhouse, church, and main building, which was decorated with biblical and classical figures rather than an “imperial” program.


While the typology of palace churches may be in doubt, their functional identity is not. From the time of Justinian I onward, they constituted regularly identifiable components of Byz. palaces. The archaeological evidence for such buildings is meager, but the literary sources are abundant. A large number of churches is recorded within the Great Palace in Constantinople between the early 9th and mid-11th C.: those of Christ, the Virgin, and the Archangel Michael are referred to as having been built by Emp. Theophilos, while the palace church of St. Anne is attributed to Leo VI. Palace chapels of the Savior, Prophet Elijah, Archangel Michael, St. Peter, St. Paul, St. John the Evangelist, St. Barbara, and the Nea Ekklesia were built by Basil I. A 12th-C. (?) description of an imaginary palace also locates a chapel—dedicated to St. Theodore—in its midst (Digenes Akritas, ed. Trapp, 334, G VII 104–05 [3242–43]). The Church of St. George, next to the monastery and palace of Mangana in Constantinople, was built by Constantine IX (Psellos, Chron., vol. 2:61, par.185.3); its remains have been archaeologically ascertained (R. Demangel, E. Mamboury, Le quartier des Manganes [Paris 1939] 19–37). The Bodrum Camii in Istanbul has been identified as the chapel of Romanos I Lekapenos; it stood next to his Myrelaion palace, no longer extant (C.L. Striker, The Myrelaion (Bodrum Camii) in Istanbul [Princeton 1981]).


PALACE GUARD. See Hetaireia.

PALA D'ORO. A pal(ka) was the cloth that covered an altar in early Christian and medieval churches. Also called an antependium, it was sometimes replaced by panels in precious metals, either covering the four sides of the altar or attached only to the altar’s front face. In 1105 Doge Ordelaf Falier (1102–18), one of the founders of San Marco in Venice, ordered the enamel Pala d’Oro from Constantinople for the main altar of his church, perhaps as a replacement for the 10th-C. silver and gold antependium of Doge Pietro I Orseolo (976–78). By 1209, when six feast scenes and the archangel Michael were added to the top, the Pala (measuring 2.1 × 3.5 m) was placed on the main altar, perhaps in imitation of the gold, jeweled (and enameled?) panel on the high altar of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, that Robert de Claris described after seeing it in 1204. In 1342–45 the Pala was remounted in its present Gothic frame.

The imagery on Falier’s Pala is arranged in typically Western fashion. Christ is enthroned in a large tondo within an inscribed frame, surrounded by the four evangelists. Above, angels and tetramorphs honor the Hetoimasia; the Virgin and the Pala’s patrons—Falier and an Empress Irene (whose identification has been the subject of much discussion)—are placed below, between two inscription panels of 1342–45 that describe the work’s history. It is likely that, originally, Irene was accompanied by her husband. The “wings” display three tiers of prophets, apostles, and angels paying homage to Christ. Twenty-seven “framing” panels depict the lives of Christ and St. Mark and portraits of six locally venerated deacons—Lawrence, Vincent, Stephen, Eleutherius, Peter of Alexandria, and Fortunatus.

The program of imagery resembles the decoration of palatine chapels of the Komnenian era, beginning perhaps in an expanded decoration of the chapel of the Virgin (of the Pharos?) in the Great Palace of Constantinople, and imitated elsewhere, often with Latin adaptations, in the royal churches of Norman Sicily, esp. the Cappella Palatina in Palermo. When Falier ordered the Pala, he seems to have intended to set such an imperial program on the main altar of his palatine chapel.


PALAEOGRAPHY (lit. “ancient writing”), like codicology, is an autonomous field of study, as well as an auxiliary discipline of philology and history. It studies the development of the Greek script in Byz. MSS and documents (see Diplomatics) in its cultural context. It takes its name from the pioneering monograph of B. de Montfaucon, Palaeographia graeca (Paris 1708; rp. 1970). Gardthausen (infra) divided palaeography into Buchwesen and Schriftwesen; the recent tendency is to replace the term Buchwesen by codicology, with the emphasis on the place of the book in Byz. civilization. A sound knowledge of palaeography
enables a text editor to read and date Byz. MSS and to establish the stemma of a given work.

The reading of MSS presents certain difficulties, such as the need to decipher abbreviations, contractions, and ligatures; tachygraphy, monograms, and palimpsests create additional problems. In most MSS, esp. early ones, words were not separated, accents and breathings were omitted or used intermittently, and punctuation was apparently arbitrary. Other problems in deciphering or reconstructing texts are damaged MSS, with folios or parts of folios missing, worm-holes, ink blots, and even modern tape repairs.

The script of Byz. MSS can be roughly divided into two categories, the uncial, or majuscule, and the minuscule, subdivided into the cursive and minuscule intended as calligraphy. An obstacle to the study of the development of uncial script is the lack of any securely dated MSS for the formative period (4th–8th C.); the only firmly dated uncial text (which is also the earliest dated book MS) is the Vat. gr. 1166 of the year 800. Thus the reconstruction of the development must be hypothetical.

After the introduction of minuscule as a book script, uncial survived until the 11th C., but it became specialized for scriptural and liturgical texts. It was used continuously for lemmata (headings) and sections to be emphasized.

Minuscule scripts differ in levels of formality and elegance, ranging from that of a scholar's autograph copy for private use to that of a deluxe codex skillfully written by a professional scribe. Minuscule MSS are more likely to bear a date (the earliest dated one is the Uspefski Gospel book, Leningrad, Publ. Lib. gr. 219, of 835); their colophons sometimes have precise chronological indications, sometimes only certain elements of a date (indiction, month, etc.). Those MSS that are securely dated help reconstruct the evolution of the script and thus indirectly determine the chronology of undated MSS. Palaeographers have attempted to classify bookscripts into certain styles that can be roughly dated, for example, “pearl script” (10th–12th C.), “Fettaugenmode” (13th C.), and “Metochites style” and “Hodegon style” (14th C.). The use of an archeaizing script, which revives or preserves features typical of an earlier period, may, however, complicate the dating of some MSS; for instance, the calligraphy of some late 13th-C. codices imitates the “pearl script” that flourished earlier. Statistical methods have been used to evaluate the reintroduction of uncial letters into minuscule at the very end of the 6th C., but the usefulness of these statistics for dating is still open to question. Another problem in dating MSS is the conservative character of codices copied in the provinces. Paper MSS can be dated more precisely through their watermarks.

Another objective of palaeography (and codicology) is to establish the MS’s provenance. Individualized handwriting was rare in Byz., and relatively few MSS have colophons identifying particular scribes. The minuscule script is strongly formalized up to the 12th C.; more individual features begin to appear only in the 13th C., at the end of which period it becomes possible to recognize the autographs of Byz. scholars such as Maximos Planoudes, Demetrios Triklinios, and Nikephoros Gregoras. The method of attribution of hands is in general the same as that used for dating: listing MSS of individual scribes and comparing unsigned MSS with those whose copyist is known.

Some MSS are known to have been copied in particular scriptoria, and again the similarity of production (format of the book and page, composition of quires, ruling patterns, type of handwriting, illuminations) permits the assignment of a MS to a specific scriptorium. The palaeographer must be cautious, however; typical features in the script or codicological features, such as the ruling patterns, may not be restricted to one region. In contradistinction to Latin palaeography, where the study of regional writing is advanced, Byz. palaeographers have not been able to establish many centers of book production, owing mostly to the dearth of evidence. Only for southern Italy and Cyprus, from where a large number of codices have survived, is it possible to study special regional characteristics on preserved MSS.

A part of the palaeographer’s task is the study of peripheral information contained in the MS: some of it comes from the scribe himself (e.g., colophon, table of contents, some scholia); some, esp. on autograph MSS, from the author, who thereby reveals, for example, his methods of commenting and his practice of textual criticism. Remarks from scribes, readers, and owners sometimes convey data on the production of the book (such as its price) or its history (such as changes of ownership); they may also express a reader’s attitude to a work. On occasion, successive owners
and readers of the book made marginal notes or additions on blank folios that have an independent value.


---

Palaia (παλαιά, "old," paleja in Slavonic), a narrative of events from the Creation to Daniel, based on paraphrased and apocryphal versions of Old Testament episodes and supplemented with passages from, in particular, Josephus Flavius, Gregory of Nazianzos, Andrew of Crete, and Theodore of Studios. The Palaia was therefore compiled not earlier than the 9th C. Similar in concept to the Latin "historiated" Bibles (cf. M. Gaster, Ilchester Lectures on Greeko-Slavonic Literature [London 1887] 147-208), the Palaia is often termed "popular," though few Greek MSS survive (Krumbacher, GBL 398, 1139). It was evidently more widespread among the Slavs. Three Slavonic translations of the Palaia, all entitled Palaia, survive: two are Bulgarian, one is Serbian, though most of the extant MSS are Eastern Slavic and derive from a lost 13th-C. Bulgarian version. The name Palaia was transferred to an unrelated and larger Slavonic compilation that includes extensive commentaries (Palaia tokolvaja) and that in some versions continues the historical narrative down to the death of Romanos I Lekapenos (Palaia chronografiščeskaia). This additional narrative is mainly derived from the chronicle of George Hamartolos and is cited in the Povest' vremennyh let.


---

Palaiołogos (Παλαιολόγος, fem. Παλαιολόγια), a noble family; although palaiołogos meant "junkman," the Byz. believed that the family possessed ancient ancestors. The first known Palaio-

logos was Nikephoros, general and governor of Mesopotamia under Michael VII; his son George, an experienced military commander, was the staunchest supporter of Alexios I. The 12th-C. Palaiologoi were primarily generals (George, megas hetaireiarches in 1166 [O. Lampides, Byzantion 40 (1970) 393-407], Alexios-Antony, megas doux) and governors of provinces (Michael of Thessalonike in the first half of the 12th C., Nikephoros of Trebizond ca.1180); it is possible that the hetaireiarches George's father was Alexios and held the post of megas domestikos at the end of Alexios I's reign. None of the Palaiologoi served in the civil administration. They were wealthy, but little is known of their estates; they acted, however, as monastic patrons. George was praised as the sponsor of a monastery close to Triaditza-Sofia in which he ordered the depiction of the archangel Michael; he and his son the sebastos Alexios were also portrayed there (Lampros, "Mark. kod." 143, no.213 tit.). The Palaiologoi were interrelated with the Komnenoi, Doukai, and Angelo; Alexios Palaiologos (perhaps George's son?) married Irene, Alexios III's daughter; he subdued the rebellion of 1200 in Constantinople and was proclaimed despotes and heir to the throne.

The Palaiologoi retained their high position after 1204; Andronikos, Alexios's son, was megas domestikos, and in 1259 his son became emperor as Michael VIII and founded the Palaiologan dynasty. After the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261, the extensive family took possession of vast estates throughout the empire. Their mightiest rivals, the Kantakuzenoi, were defeated by John V Palaiologos by 1354, and by 1382 they were ousted from the Peloponnesos. A fierce struggle for power ensued, however, within the house of Palaiologos. In 1376 Andronikos IV rebelled against his father John V and arrested him; only on 1 July 1379 did John V and his heir Manuel II manage to reconquer Constantinople. Andronikos IV and his son John VII were recognized as legitimate rulers over Selymbria and several other districts but were not appealed; on 17 Sept. 1390 John VII again seized Constantinople but had to yield to Manuel II. The Peloponnesian branch of the Palaiologos family was loyal to Constantinople but independent: by the time of John VIII, the Peloponnesos was ruled by three of his brothers, the despotai Theodore II, Constantine (XI), and Thomas Palaiologos; since John VIII died childless (Theodore died
Based on Cheynet-Vannier, *Etudes* 186; table at end of Nicol, *Last Centuries*, with modifications; and PLP.
before him), Constantine succeeded him as the last Byz. emperor; he was killed during the Ottoman assault on Constantinople.

The Palaiologoi searched desperately for a Western alliance: they attempted to restore the unity of the church and favored marriages with Western princes and princesses; ANDRONIKOS II married Anna of Hungary and then IRENE-YOLANDA OF MONTFERRAT; ANDRONIKOS III married Irene (Adelheid) of Braunsweg and ANNA OF SAVOY; Andronikos II’s son Theodore married Argentina Spinola and became marquis of Montferrat in 1305 (A. Laïou, Byzantium 38 [1969] 386–410). The Palaiologoi also married their children to the rulers of Serbia, Bulgaria, Trebizond, and Epiros. SOPHIA PALAIOLOGINA, daughter of Thomas Palaiologos, became the spouse of IVAN III of Moscow. (See genealogical table; see also Byzantium, History of: “Empire of the Straits.”)


—A.K.

PALAISTE (παλαιστή, lit. “palm of the hand”), a unit of length = 4 δακτυλοί = 1/4 pous = 7.8 cm. Synonymous terms are gronthos, pygme, tetartion (as 1/4 pous), and triton (as 1/3 imperial spithame).

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologia 18.

—E. Sch.

PALAMAS, GREGORY, theologian, archbishop of Thessalonike (1347–59), and saint, canonized in 1368; born Constantinople ca. 1296, died Thessalonike 14 Nov. 1359. Though destined by his aristocratic background for imperial service, Palamas (Παλαμᾶς) chose the monastic life instead and went to Athos in 1316. After a brief stay at Vatopedi and then at Lavra he joined the skete of Glossia. In 1326 Palamas was ordained a priest. He then continued the life of prayer, which the hesychasts of Athos had taught him, in a number of hermitages. In 1336 he entered into an exchange of letters with BARLAAM OF CALABRIA. His objections to Barlaam’s syllogistic reasoning quickly became a matter of controversy involving both church and society, esp. after Barlaam attacked Palamas and the monastic spirituality of HESYCHASM on Athos. Most of Palamas’s literary production is devoted to this cause (often referred to as PALAMISM) that the church supported and endorsed in the Constantinople local councils of 1341, 1347, and 1351 (see under Constantinople, Councils of). In addition to the monks of Athos and numerous bishops, Palamas’s staunchest supporters included JOHN VI KANTAKOUZENOS and the patriarchs Isidore I, Kallistos I, and Philotheos Kokkinos (the last mentioned wrote an enkomion of Palamas).

Still, during the CIVIL WAR OF 1341–47, Palamas was imprisoned by Patriarch JOHN XIV KALEKAS and his ideas condemned. This censorship, however, was primarily politically motivated, for Palamas was a known sympathizer of Kantakouzenos. Indeed, he was initially unable to enter the city of Thessalonike, to which he had been appointed archbishop (1347), because anti-Kantakouzenist zealots still occupied it. Generally, the party opposed to Palamas was confined to some bishops, the humanist Nikephoros Gregoras, Gregory Abidynos, and the later small circle of Byz. Thomists led by the Kydones brothers.

In addition to his two Apodeictic Treatises, the Hagiorite Tomos, and his Triads in defense of hesychasm, Palamas wrote numerous tracts, letters, and sermons dealing with hagiography, liturgy, asceticism, and prayer. The detailed account of his brief captivity (1354–55) among the Turks of Asia Minor and his conversations with them and the so-called Chionai is striking for its impartial view of Christians living under Turkish rule and of the Turks themselves (cf. A. Philippidis-Braat, TM 7 [1979] 109–222).


—A.P.

PALAMEDES. See OLD KNIGHT.
PALAMISM, the teaching of Gregory Palamas. Its characteristic feature is the distinction between the inaccessible and unknowable essence of God and his uncreated energies. Its goal—expressed most fully in Palamas’s *Triads*—was to give an objective theological foundation to the theory and practice of monastic contemplation or hesychasm. Palamism affirms that the aim of contemplative prayer is the vision of the uncreated light of God, exemplified by the light that shone about Christ at his Transfiguration on Mt. Tabor (Lk 9:28–36; cf. *Triads* 3, ed. Meyendorff, 574–83). By means of this deifying light or energy, salvation or deification (theosis) is realized. Because the contemplative is able to experience God’s own uncreated grace (*energeia*), as distinct from his essence which is unknowable, the heschast encounters the living God directly (*Triads* 1:115.4–5). Therefore, communion with God himself—knowledge of him through his authentically divine operations or energies—is possible and, indeed, accessible to human experience (*Triads* 3:599.22–23). Man, though a creature, was made to participate in God.

This affirmation places Palamism squarely within the development of Byz. theology and its quest for salvation. For both Palamism and Greek patristic theology are soteriologically determined. This is clear from the great Christological debate of the 4th–5th C. with its insistence that the gulf between God and man had been bridged by the Incarnation. Indeed, the focus of this controversy was not theological speculation but salvation, with man’s ascent to God and communion with him—made possible through the hypostatic union of the incarnate Word. That is, Christ’s assumption of the fullness of our humanity makes deification possible. In Byz. theology (as with Palamism) real and immediate knowledge of God in Christ is thus ultimately rooted in the Orthodox Christology of Chalcedon (*Triads* 1:193.4–18). Hence the 14th-C. Byz. church approved the Palamite distinction, despite the formal Aristotelian objections of Barlaam of Calabria that the distinction was an innovation incompatible with the divine simplicity. Hence, too, the Palamite rejection of the opposition of Nikephoros Gregoras, since this also was based on a formal “rationalism” shared in part with Barlaam.

Palamas’s essentially apophatic approach to theological truth has often been viewed as incompatible with Thomism—or as an obscurantist mysticism systematically opposed to secular learning. Palamas, however, was only insisting that knowledge of God could not be reduced to a rational exercise alone, that is, to the dialectic reasoning of scholasticism with its exclusive endorsement of Aristotle. He held that only the mind transfigured or illuminated by grace can know God. Palamas, quite simply, found unacceptable the degree of authority assigned by scholasticism to Greek philosophy—“its pretension to be adequate to the Christian mystery” (Meyendorff, *Palamas* 240).


The Dispute over Palamism. Palamism was established in the mid-14th C. as the official teaching of the Byz. church in spite of strong opposition from men such as Barlaam of Calabria, Gregory Akindynos, and Nikephoros Gregoras. The basic philosophical differences (K. Ware, *ECHR* 9 [1977] 46–51), both ontological and epistemological, could be expressed in two questions frequently discussed by church fathers: how could the gap between God and man be bridged, and how could the incomprehensible God be known by man. An excessive simplification of the problem by some heschastas of the early 14th C. (including influential Athonite monks), who asserted the possibility of seeing the divine uncreated light, led to criticism by Barlaam who identified hesychasm as Messalianism, as eliminating the distinction between the Creator and his creation. Barlaam’s emphasis on the distinction between God and man endangered the concept of deification and consequently of salvation; Palamas had to defend the traditional view by introducing certain innovative definitions.

Akindynos, another critic of Palamism, denied the existence of a middle being (a “noncreated minor [deity] or inferior noncreated [being]”) and stressed the simplicity of God who admits of no distinctions except the properties of the three persons. John Kyparissiotes affirmed that Palamas had introduced a fourth nature (*physis*), and
Barlaam treated the light of Tabor as an image, *indolma*. Up to this point the Palamite dispute remained within the sphere of Greek theology; Prochoros Kydones, however, employed in the anti-Palamite discussion the means of Latin scholastics and tried to prove that in a perfect being *ousia* should coincide with *energeia*.

In response to this criticism the Palamites attempted to modify some flawed formulations of their teacher in order to circumvent the accusation that Palamism introduced higher and lower deities and in order to stress the simplicity of God. Philotheos Kokkinos emphasized the patristic tradition of the concept of uncreated grace, in order to invalidate the identification of Palamism as Messalianism; he states that the real Messalians are those who assumed the possibility of a union with God without such grace, who viewed grace only as a property of the thinking nature. Gennadios II Scholarios accepted this modified form of Palamism.

The social and political role of Palamism has not yet been elucidated: M. Sjuzjumov’s (VizVrem 23 [1963] 262–68) interpretation of Palamism as the voice of the masses against Italian commercial exploitation is evidently simplistic, but Palamas’s alliance with Kantakouzenos and his supporters deserves attention.


A.K.

**PALATIA.** See Miletos.

**PALEJA.** See Palai.

**PALERMO (Πάνωρμος),** from antiquity a city of northwest Sicily, originally on the coast. During the Middle Ages the sea level retreated, and the old city walls are now relatively far from the sea. The city fell to the Vandals in 440 and to the Ostrogoths in 491. During Belisarius’s reconquest of Sicily in 535/6, Panormos was the only city that effectively resisted siege by land, but the Goths surrendered when the fleet from Constantinople was about to attack (Prokopios, Wars 5.5.12–16). It remained in Byz. hands until the 9th C. A seal of a Byz. *horreiaros* of Panormos has been published by Zacos and Nesbitt (*Zacos, Seals* 2, no.634), but it is unclear whether it refers to Sicilian Panormos or to another location of the same name. The bishop of Panormos was suffragan of Syracuse; Neilos Doxopates gives this hierarchy in his notitiae (*Notitiae CP*, no.1448–49), although it was anachronistic by his time.

Palermo was one of the first Sicilian cities to be taken by the Arabs (in Aug.–Sept. 831). It flourished under the Muslims and maintained its status as capital of Sicily after the Norman conquest of 1072. Ibn Hawqal provides a detailed description of Palermo (Balarj) at the end of the 10th C.

**Monuments of Palermo.** Two foundations in Palermo demonstrate the Siculo-Norman court’s ambivalent admiration (colored by rivalry) for the imperial artistic culture of 12th-C. Constantinople: the Cappella Palatina (lit. “palace chapel”) of Roger II and the Church of St. Mary built by Admiral George of Antioch. The latter came to be called “La Martorana” after the nearby Benedictine nunnery founded by Gaufredus de Marturanu. The extensive *mosaic* decoration in both churches must have been at least begun by imported Byz. craftsmen, as Sicily had no contemporary tradition of the craft.

The Cappella Palatina has a southern Italian architectural design (a triple-apsed basilica with a cupola on stepped squinches before the main apse) and an Islamic *muqarnas* ceiling in the nave. The cupola mosaics depict the standard Byz. Pantokrator with ranks of angels below; they are dated by a Greek inscription to 1143. The chronicle attributed to Romualdo II, archbishop of Salerno, mentions mosaics made under William I: these may be the Old and New Testament scenes in the nave and aisles, which Demus and others attribute to Sicilian pupils of Roger II’s Byz. craftsmen.

La Martorana, while characteristically Sicilian in silhouette, is entirely Byz. in plan: a four-columned cross-in-square, with a dome on squinches over the central bay. Influenced by the mosaics of the Cappella Palatina and perhaps by those of Cefalù, the decoration of the Martorana dates between 1143 and 1151, when George of Antioch died. The program includes a seated Pantokrator in the dome with four angels in *proskynesis*, the Nativity and Dormition on a lower vault, and founders’ panels showing George of Antioch and Roger II.

Maguire (infra) has shown that the choice and
position of scenes in both churches were affected by Byz. rhetorical conventions, familiar from homilies. B. Cappelli (BollBadGr n.s. 16 [1962] 77–93) proposed the intervention specifically of Philagathos, but for this, as noted by Kitzinger, there is no proof.


—A.K. D.K.

PALESTINE (Παλαιστίνη) in the 4th–6th C. included the coastal plain from Mt. Carmel south to Raphia on the Egyptian frontier, the Galilee and the Golan in the north, the Jezreel valley, the hill country of Samaria and Judea, and the Great Rift valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea. When Diocletian reorganized the Limes in this region, he moved the Tenth Legion from Aelia Capitolina (see Jerusalem) to Aila at the head of the Gulf of Aqaba and transferred the southern part of the province of Arabia, including Petra and the Negev desert, to Palestine. The dux Palaestinae commanded the Tenth Legion and other forces of the limes Palaestinae. At first a single consular stationed at Caesarea Maritima headed the civil administration, but by 358 the former parts of the province of Arabia had been separated to form Palaestina Salutaris. After another subdivision ca. 400, Salutaris became Palaestina III, with its capital at Elusa; the Galilee, the Golan, the Jezreel valley, and several trans-Jordanian cities belonged to Palaestina II (capital at Skythopolis); and the rest was renamed Palaestina I (capital at Caesarea). A consular governed each province until 536, when Justinian I promoted the governor at Caesarea to proconsul (Anthypatos), gave him supervision over the two remaining consulars, and regulated his relations with the dux (nov.109, pr., par.1).

Justinian promoted the governor because he presided over “the province in which our Lord Jesus Christ . . . appeared on earth,” a factor that likewise explains why Palestine prospered under the Christian Empire. More farm sites and villages were inhabited than ever before, and the volume of pottery recorded in archaeological surveys exceeds that of any other period. The imperial journey of Helena in 326 created enthusiasm for pilgrimage, esp. among the wealthy. In the 5th C. prominent refugees (e.g., Melania the Younger, Athenais-Eudokia) settled permanently, devoting their fortunes to hospitals and churches. The emperors too made generous donations; the sale of relics brought in further funds. In creating prosperity, this infusion of new capital overshadowed other economic developments, such as the colonization of the Negev and the booming market for Gaza wine.

The cities of Palestine (e.g., Caesarea Maritima, Jerusalem, Skythopolis, Neapolis, Gaza) generally reached their peak in population and built-up area in the late Roman period, while maintaining a classical appearance with new colonnaded streets, civic basilicas, and aqueducts. The density of construction was extraordinary, even in the towns and villages. Most churches were single- or triple-apsed basilicas, but in the 5th–6th C. some centrally planned churches were modeled on the Church of the Anastasis at the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.


Before Constantine, there had been only isolated Christian communities in Palestine, notably at Caesarea, where martyrdoms had taken place under Diocletian and his successors, and at Jerusalem. Bp. Cyril of Jerusalem (died 387) led the christianization of his city. St. Hilarion (mid-4th C.) encouraged the spread of monasticism and brought the new religion to the Negev. By the 5th C. monasteries were numerous but most influential were the Judean desert lavrae of Sts. Euthymios the Great, Saba, and others described by Cyril of Skythopolis. These holy men also converted the many Arabs of Palestine to Christianity, both the desert Bedouin and the Arab villagers.
The metropolis of Caesarea ranked first among the approximately 50 sees of Palestine until 451, when Bp. Juvenal of Jerusalem secured primacy in Palestine and the patriarchate (see Jerusalem, Patriarchate of) by adopting the Christological formula of Chalcedon. This incensed the largely Monophysite monks, whose revolt, supported by the exiled Empress Eudokia, had to be put down by force.

After St. Porphyrios of Gaza destroyed the Zeus Marnas temple at Gaza (probably in 402), little is heard of paganism but, despite conversion and the influx of foreigners, Christians may have remained a minority in the Holy Land until the Muslim conquest. Samaritans were concentrated around Neapolis and their sacred mount, Gerizim, but were also numerous in other parts of Palestine. According to Prokopios (SH 11.27–30) most of the tenant farmers in Caesarea’s territory were Samaritans. Excluded from Jerusalem and most of Judaea, the Jews inhabited the coastal plain and esp. the Galilee, the Golan, and a belt extending from the Dead Sea to the Mediterranean. Numerous synagogues have been excavated, many of them basilicas with niches for the Torah shrine oriented toward Jerusalem, modeled on Christian churches. Despite sporadic imperial legislation against them, both groups prospered in Byz. Palestine, the Jews sufficiently to create the culture reflected in the Palestinian Talmud and other rabbinic literature. Nonetheless, persecution and legal disabilities caused Jewish revolts in 351–52 and again ca. 440. The Samaritans, although they were assimilated readily enough to enter the army and civil service in large numbers, rebelled in 484, when Zenon destroyed their synagogue at Mt. Gerizim, and again in 529 and 555. The authorities crushed these rebellions, deporting many Samaritans to the Persian Empire, but in 578 both Jews and Samaritans revolted once more.

When the Persians invaded Palestine in 614, the Jews and other minorities welcomed them; most cities, with the notable exception of Jerusalem, opened their gates. Renewed Byz. administration, following the end of Persian rule in 628, lasted only a decade. The Muslims first attacked Palestine in 634 and defeated the imperial forces decisively on the Yarmuk River in 636. Jerusalem fell in 638, Caesarea not until 640 or 641/2.

The Muslims abolished Palaestina III, but Palaestina I survived as the Jund Filastin and Palaestina II as the Jund al-Urdunn. Ramla, a new city, became the capital. Many Christians fled, but neither those who remained nor the Jews were persecuted. Pilgrimage continued on a reduced scale except for brief episodes of repression in the 11th C. under the caliph al-Hakim and the Seljuk. In 975 John I Tzimiskes claimed to have penetrated Palestine and briefly occupied some northern cities, including Caesarea but his army did not penetrate so far south. In 1099 the Crusaders seized the Holy City and established the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem (see Jerusalem, Kingdom of).


K.G.H.

PALESTINIAN CHRISTOLOGICAL CYCLE, conventional name for a series of nine scenes from the life of Christ found in various degrees of completeness on a variety of 6th–7th-C. pilgrim eulogiai, as well as on several types of contemporary amulet. The cycle includes the Annunciation, Visitation, Nativity, Adoration of the Magi, Presentation in the Temple, Entry into Jerusalem, Crucifixion, the Myrophoroi, and the Ascension. It appears on pilgrimage ampullae, the Sancta Sanctorum Reliquary, and (as individual scenes) on pilgrim tokens; it is also found on contemporary silver amuletic armbands, octagonal gold marriage rings, and (as individual scenes) on gold fibulae and pendants. The cycle documented the sacred origin of the eulogia contained in the ampullae, reliquary boxes, etc., and it was thought to give magical power to the amulets. Some scenes, such as the Entry into Jerusalem, were developed from traditional Roman iconographical topoi, while others, like the Myrophoroi, were specifically Palestinian, insofar as they reproduce details associated with specific loca sancta.


G.V.
PALIMPSEST (παλίμψητος), a parchment MS used for a second (or even third) time in copying a text. The reason for reusing the parchment was the dearth of writing material. The parchment leaves were washed and the old text scraped off. The scriptura superior was written either parallel to the scriptura inferior or at a right angle to it; in the latter case the reading of the scriptura inferior is easier. Sometimes palaeographers use ultraviolet light to aid in deciphering a palimpsest MS. The scriptura superior provides a terminus ante quem for the erased text and indicates the literary preferences of the later scribe or scriptorium. Replacement of a classical or a secular Byz. author by a Christian text is the rule (e.g., Ephrem over the De Ceremoniis of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos), but the opposite occurs as well (e.g., Pindar over a sticharion). Many palimpsests have a southern Italian origin, owing to the poverty of southern Italian centers of book production.


—E.G.

PALLADIOS (Παλλάδιος), writer, bishop of Hel- lenopolis in Bithynia (ca.400–406), bishop of Aspu in Galatia (from ca.412); born Galatia ca.363, died Aspu ca.431. A pupil of Evagrios Pontikos, he spent the years 388–400 in Alexandria, Nittia, Kellia, and Palestine. Exiled from Bithynia in 406 as a supporter of John Chrysostom, he traveled the next few years in Egypt, Palestine, and perhaps India before returning to his new bishopric. His account of early Egyptian monasticism, the Laustiac History, is so named from its dedicatee Lausus, koubikoularios of Theodosios II. Written ca.419, it combined the traditions of biography and the APOPHTHEGMATA PATRUM into an engaging mixture of the credulous and the critical (W. Telfer, JThSt 38 [1937] 379–83). Palladios is candid on monkish weaknesses and does not harp on asceticism. The work was translated into Latin by Rufinus of Aquileia and into Oriental languages, including Coptic. The authorship of his other major work, the Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom, written ca.408, is questioned; it is modeled after Plato’s Phaedo and defends John against Theophilos of Alexandria. Also surviving under his name is a treatise titled On the Races of India and the Brahmins, the first of whose four sections, describing an Egyptian scholar’s journey to India, may be genuinely Palladian (B. Berg, Byzantion 44 [1974] 5–16).


LIT. E. Magheri Cataluccio, Il Lausaikon di Palladio tra semiotica e storica (Rome 1984).

—B.B.

PALLADIUS (Παλλάδιος), epigrammatist, grammarian, and teacher at Alexandria; born 319 (Bowra) or 360 (Franke), lived at least 72 years. Numerically at least, he dominates the GREEK ANTHOLOGY with approximately 150 epigrams (he is variously assigned and denied some anonymous items), partly because he assembled a collection of his own work. His poems portray a poor schoolmaster driven to misogyny by a nagging wife. His nihilism and habit of lampooning important officials may have gotten him into some trouble with the authorities. His talent is for the short poem (18 lines at most) in elegiacs, iambics, and hexameters; he was an inveterate punster. Both pagan and Christian sentiments have been detected in him (M. Bowra, ProcBrAc 45 [1959] 255–67), but overall he may be described as a poet between the two worlds of dying paganism and triumphant Christianity, equally uncomfortable in both.


—B.B.

PALLADIOS (Παλλάδιος), writer, bishop of Hel- lenopolis in Bithynia (ca.400–406), bishop of Aspu in Galatia (from ca.412); born Galatia ca.363, died Aspu ca.431. A pupil of Evagrios Pontikos, he spent the years 388–400 in Alexandria, Nittia, Kellia, and Palestine. Exiled from Bithynia in 406 as a supporter of John Chrysostom, he traveled the next few years in Egypt, Palestine, and perhaps India before returning to his new bishopric. His account of early Egyptian monasticism, the Laustiac History, is so named from its dedicatee Lausus, koubikoularios of Theodosios II. Written ca.419, it combined the traditions of biography and the APOPHTHEGMATA PATRUM into an engaging mixture of the credulous and the critical (W. Telfer, JThSt 38 [1937] 379–83). Palladios is candid on monkish weaknesses and does not harp on asceticism. The work was translated into Latin by Rufinus of Aquileia and into Oriental languages, including Coptic. The authorship of his other major work, the Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom, written ca.408, is questioned; it is modeled after Plato’s Phaedo and defends John against Theophilos of Alexandria. Also surviving under his name is a treatise titled On the Races of India and the Brahmins, the first of whose four sections, describing an Egyptian scholar’s journey to India, may be genuinely Palladian (B. Berg, Byzantion 44 [1974] 5–16).


LIT. E. Magheri Cataluccio, Il Lausaikon di Palladio tra semiotica e storica (Rome 1984).

—B.B.

PALLIUM. See Himation.

PALMETTE. See Himation.
as well as of decorative borders in wall mosaics, monumental painting, and sumptuary arts of all periods. A rounded form with large petals, often termed the “Sasanian” palmette, was perhaps derived from Near Eastern art. It frequently appears in textiles and is extremely common in 10th-C. MSS and enamels. The “split palmette” is a related motif with two symmetrically branching floral elements extending from a central stem and often enclosing other motifs.


R.E.K.

PALM SUNDAY (Κυριακή τῶν βαΐων), the Sunday before Easter. One of the dominical Great Feasts, Palm Sunday commemorates Jesus’ triumphal entry into Jerusalem and the beginning of his Passion. The event was solemnized in 4th-C. Jerusalem with a procession of the faithful bearing palms or other branches, a usage that had passed to the rest of the East by 518 and is still attested in the 10th-C. Typikon of the Great Church (Mateos, Typikon 2:66). Later Byz. practice generally has only a blessing and distribution of branches and candles at orthros (Dmitrievskij, Opisanie 1:542.10–11).

The imperial ceremony for this feast was elaborate. On the eve, the emperor went to the Church of St. Demetrios, where he distributed palm branches and silver crosses to members of the senate and others before entering the palace church, the Virgin of the Pharos, for vespers. In this latter church he took part in the liturgy on the day of the feast; he also held a banquet in the Chrysotriklinos (De cer., bk.1, chs. 31–32; Philotheos, Kletor. 197.6–26). According to a 14th-C. ceremonial book, the gallery along which the emperor passed on the way to orthros was festooned with branches of myrtle, laurel, and olive (pseudo-Kod. 224.5–226.21).

Source. Mother Mary, K. Ware, trs., The Lenten Triodion (London-Boston 1978).


R.F.T.

Palmette. Common palmette designs. (a) classical palmette; (b) “Sasanian” palmette (Vat. Barb. gr. 449, a.1153); (c) split palmette (Escorial Ω-1-16, a.1293); (d) split palmette (St. Polyeuktos, Istanbul).
PALMYRA (Πάλμυρα, Syriac Tadmor, Ar. Tadmur), city and bishopric situated in an oasis in eastern Syria, in the province of Phoenicia Libanensis. Palmyra was formerly the capital of the ephemeral kingdom of the Arab queen Zenobia, which the Romans conquered in 273. Thereafter it lost out to Nisibis as a principal trading center. The city was restored between 293 and 303 by Diocletian as a military stronghold of the eastern frontier, which it remained until the 7th C. In 527 Justinian I restored Palmyra, including its churches and public buildings (demosia), and placed there the doux of Emesa with a garrison (Malal. 426.1–5). According to Prokopios (Buildings 2.11.10–12), the emperor ordered repairs to the walls (H. Seyrig, Syria 27 [1950] 239–42) and the provision of an adequate water supply. There are in Palmyra the remains of two basilical churches (A. Gabriel, Syria 7 [1926] 88–90) and of Christian paintings in the temple of Bel, which, like that of Baalshamin, was converted into a church in the 5th or 6th C. (J. Leroy, CahArch 15 [1965] 17–20). Excavations in the military area known as the “Camp of Diocletian” reveal on that side of the city a decline in urban life in the late 6th or early 7th C. The wide “Via Praetoria” was encroached upon by humble dwellings and reduced to a narrower (3.7 m) road (K. Michałowski, Palmyre [Warsaw 1963] 41), and public squares such as the Roman Tetrapylon were transformed into residential areas (Idem, Palmyre [Warsaw 1962] 541). Palmyra fell to the Arabs in 633 or 634 (Donner, Conquests 121–26), but Byz. coins continued to circulate there for some years, as indicated by a hoard of gold coins ranging from Phokas to Constans II (641–68).


PALUDAMENTUM. See CHLAMYS.

PAMMAKARISTOS, CHURCH OF HAGIA MARIA (Turk. Fethiye Camii), monastic church at Constantinople, probably founded in the 12th C. by a John Komnenos. After 1261 it came into the possession of the protostrator Michael Tarchaneiates GLABAS (died ca.1305), who was buried there in the south parekklesion built in his memory by his widow Maria. Around 1455 Gennadios II Scholarios chose the Pammakaristos as the seat of the Greek patriarchate; it remained such until 1587, when the Turks confiscated it and converted it into a mosque. A document of the second half of the 16th C. describes a number of tombs and relics there, as well as inscriptions of the 12th–13th C. (P. Schreiner, DOP 25 [1971] 220–41). As preserved today, the building consists of the main church of the 12th C., greatly altered, the south chapel of ca.1305–10, and a U-shaped
ambulatory that contained many of the tombs. The chapel is decorated with mosaics; remnants of wall painting in the south arm of the ambulatory preserve typological allusions to the Virgin, including the Closed Door.

LIT. H. Belting, C. Mango, D. Mouriki, The Mosaics and Frescoes of St. Mary Pammakaristos (Fehtise Camii) at Istanbul (Washington, D.C., 1978). —C.M.

PAMPHYLIA (Παμφύλια), the coastal plain of southern Asia Minor, ca. 100 km long, surrounded by an arc of the Taurus Mountains. This well-watered and fertile area, prosperous from olives, sheep, and trade along the coast and with the interior, supported several large cities (Attaleia, Side, Syllaion). Constantine I made Pamphylia a separate province with Perge as its capital. Leo I appointed military commanders in Pamphylia to resist attacks of the Isaurians. The ecclesiastical structure was more complicated, with intercity rivalry provoking a 5th-C. division into two provinces with Side and Perge as metropolitan sees. Pamphylia was absorbed into the Kibyrrhaiotai theme in the 8th C., but remained a separate military and administrative unit: the tourmarches of Pamphylia and Lykaonia appears in the Klerotologion of Philothoeos, and 9th-C. seals (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 2198, 3228) mention a tourmarches and an ek prosopou of Pamphylia. Extensive remains indicate considerable prosperity, esp. in the 6th C. Subsequent Arab attacks severely afflicted the cities of Pamphylia; some were abandoned, others became fortresses. After the battle of Mantzikert in 1071, Byz. control rarely extended beyond Attaleia.

LIT. W. Ruge, RE 18.3 (1949) 354–407. —C.F.

PAMPREPLOS (Παμπρέπλος), scholar and statesman; born Panopolis 29 Sept. 440, died at fortress Paprius, Isauria late Nov. 484. Up to age 32 Pamprepios was a poor poetry-writing grammarian in Egypt. Emigration to Athens brought him a more lucrative post as well as association with the pagan Neoplatonists. A fistfight (to which he was prone) caused him to move in 476 to Constantinople, where his pretensions to learning and magic impressed many, notably Zeno’s high official Illos, who procured him public funds and students. The titles of quaestor, patrikios, and (honorary) consul followed in 479. A lucky prediction further endeared him to Illos, whose favorite he became. In 484 he encouraged and joined Illos’s revolt against Zeno. Upon their defeat he hid with the other rebels who, exasperated by the now high failure rate of his predictions and suspecting him of treachery, executed him. His career, commemorated by (among others) Damaskios, ultimately belies the ascription to him by Malchos of Philadelphia of great political acumen. Accusations of licentiousness, treachery, unscrupulousness, and vanity may partly be a pious reaction to his militant paganism. The Souda credits him with various epic poems. Surviving hexameter fragments on the patrician Theagenes and a spring or autumn idyll may well be his; other ascriptions are insecure.


PAN, in Greek mythology, a god of flocks and pastures who is usually depicted in the company of nymphs and satyrs. Nonnus of Panopolis (Dionysiaka 42:258–61) relates the myth of Pitys, the nymph of the fir-tree, who fled over the mountains to escape marriage with Pan. Eventually, Pan assumed a universal significance. Servius, the 4th-C. commentator on Vergil, states that Pan is the god of all nature (wherefrom allegedly comes his name meaning in Greek “all”): he has horns, the symbols of sun rays; the spotted fawnskin of his breast designates the starry sky; and his goatlike legs indicate the stability of the earth (R. Herbig, Pan [Frankfurt am Main 1949] 67). His cult in the Egyptian desert is testified to by Roman inscriptions up to the 4th C. (A. Bernard, Pan du désert [Leiden 1977] 271).

The church rejected with indignation the worship of the divine half-goat with whom various lascivious stories were connected: Philostorgios (HE, ed. Bidez-Winkelmann, 41.5–16) hypothesizes that the ancient Greeks must have developed their conception of Pan (as a combination of a goat and monkey) from seeing a hybrid monster
like the one sent to Emp. Constantius II by the
king of the Indians.

For painters Pan was the embodiment of lust.
He appears as an ithyphallic idol (Weitzmann,
Gr. Myth. fig. 89) or as a horned, goat-legged, and
winged demigod in the act of accosting Aphrodite
(Furlan, Marciana 5, fig. 48b). —A.K., A.M.T., A.C.

PANAGIA. See Virgin Mary.

PANAGIARIÓN (παναγιάριον, from παναγία,
“the all-holy [Virgin]”), a small liturgical paten
(see Paten and Asteriskos) 5–15 cm in diameter,
decorated with a representation of the Virgin,
often in an orans attitude. Panagiaria were
intended to carry the bread offered to the Virgin
by monks during a meal or in the course of the
orthros service (Symeon of Thessalonike, PG
155:661–64). The earliest known example, in the
Hilandar monastery on Mt. Athos, is made of jasper
and has been attributed to the 10th–11th
C. (B. Radijković, Les objets sculptés d'art mineur en
of gold is recorded in the will of Theodore Sar-
anenos of 1326 (G.I. Theocharides, Makedonika
supp. 2 [Thessalonike 1962] 20,53). Examples of
the 14th C. display the Virgin surrounded by
prophets, angels, or apostles in compositions
evoking the incarnation (Kalavrezou, Steadte 204–
08). In the 15th C. the panagiario was trans-
formed into a pyxis or pendant made of two
shallow disks, one of them showing the Virgin
and the other the Trinity. This form of panagi-
ario is often worn by high church officials.
—L.P.B.

PANAGIA TON CHALKEON, church in
Thessalonike. The Panagia ton Chalkeon (Παναγία
ton Χάλκεων, lit. “Virgin of the bronze-smiths”),
was constructed in 1028 (and not in 1044) by
Christopher, governor (katepano) of the theme of
Longobardia, his wife, son, and two daughters, as
indicated by an inscription over the west door.
An arcosolium in the middle of the north wall
was probably originally Christopher’s tomb. An-
other inscription inside the church says that the
founder had constructed the building “for the
forgiveness of his sins.”

The church is of the cross-in-square type, on
four columns; there are three domes, one central
and two over the double-storied narthex, all rather
high in elevation. The exterior of the church is
built entirely of brick, with rectangular pilasters
on the lower level, rounded half-columns above.
The roofline of the west end of the church is
scalloped, while the other arms of the church have
gabled roofs. All the arched openings and blind
arches have two, three, or four setbacks, enhanc-
ing the sculptured effect of the exterior. The
church has connections with Constantinople (e.g.,
the exterior decoration recalls the Myrelaion
church) and with central Greece (e.g., interior,
window treatment), but the overall style is prob-
ably local. In the interior is preserved much of
the original carved marble decoration as well as
frescos of the 11th and the 14th C. The 11th-C.
Ascension in the dome, Last Judgment in the
narthex, and positioning of the Crucifixion and
Anastasis scenes near the tomb develop the fun-
erary character of the program (A. Tsitouridou,
include an illustration of the Akathistos Hymn

Lit. D. Evangelides, He Panagia ton Chalkeon (Thessal-
nike 1954). Krautheimer, ECBArch 373f. K. Papadopoulos,
Die Wandmalereien des 11. Jahrhunderts in der Kirche Panagia
ton Chalkeon in Thessaloniki (Graz-Cologne 1966). Janin,
Églises centrales 383f. A. Tsitouridou, He Panagia ton Chalkeon
(Thessalonike 1975).
—T.E.G.

PANARETOS, MICHAEL, chronicler of the
Grand Komnenoi of Trebizond; born Pontos?
c.1320, died ca.1390. Panaretos (Παναρέτος) spent
his career in the service of Alexios III Komnenos
and by 1363 held the titles of protosebastos and
protonotarios. He participated in numerous mili-
tary campaigns with the emperor and twice visited
Constantinople, in 1363 and 1368. His personal
involvement with the court of Trebizond ended
in 1379.

The chronicle of Panaretos is the unique nar-
native source for the history of the empire of
Trebizond; it covers the period 1204–1390. The
events of 1340–90, to which Panaretos was an
eyewitness, are more detailed than those covered
in the early pages of the chronicle. The narrative
concentrates on the events of official life: wed-
dings, burials, military expeditions. The manner
of storytelling is annalistic, with serious attention
to chronology and official titularitie.
language is close to the vernacular. The author sometimes mentions his own involvement in affairs (e.g., sub anno 1361 “I was among the archons”), but tries to avoid personal interpretation of events. Since the data provided by Panaretos are unique, verification of his reliability is difficult. A 15th-C. writer added to his chronicle a very brief description of events between 1390 and 1426.


LIT. Hunger, Lit. 1:480ff. PLP, no. 21651. —A.M.T.

**PANDEKTES.** See Antiochos Strategos.

**PANEAS.** See Panias.

**PANEYRIC.** See Enkomion.

**PANEYRICI LATINI**, general title for a dozen addresses to emperors preserved in the MS discovered by Giovanni Aurispa in 1433. First is Pliny’s panegyric of Trajan, clearly the school model for later efforts. The other 11 all relate to Gaul, nine from the period 289–321, the remaining two datable to 362 and 389, thus suggesting that some Gallic rhetorician assembled the collection in the late 4th C. In chronological order (modern enumerations vary with different editions) these are, by name: two addresses by Mamertinus to Maximian, at Trier in 289 and 291; Eumenius from Autun to Constantius Chlorus in 298 in gratitude for his appointment as professor of rhetoric and school organizer; Nazarius’s encomium on the absent Constantine I the Great in 321; another Mamertinus’s thanks to Julian for his consular appointment in 362 at Constantinople; Drepanius honoring the victory of Theodosios I over Maximus. The other addresses, mainly delivered to Constantine in Trier, are anonymous, perhaps by Eumenius, and datable to the years 297, 307, 310, 312, and 313. Apart from Mamertinus’s somewhat poetical address to Julian, the overall style is Ciceronian à la Pliny. Their tone is uniformly unctuous, every ruler being a superhuman hero. Yet as with modern propaganda, solid history can be teased out of them, while taken together they constitute a mirror of provincial classicism.


**PANEYRIC.** See Fair.

**PANHYPERSEBASTOS** (πανυπερσέβαστος), title created by Alexios I. It was conferred on several members of noble families such as Katakalon-Euphrenbœni, Kontostephanoï, and Taronitai (L. Steiron, *REB* 23 [1965] 223, n.12). A seal of John Dalassenos (before 1196) calls him despotes and panhypearsebastos (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.2721). A 14th-C. ceremonial book places the panhypearsebastos immediately after the megas domestikos and notes that the two were equal (pseudo-Kod. 136.1–2). Before he became emperor, John (VI) Kántakouzenos was panhypearsebastos. The Komnenoi and their successors introduced other epithets and titles based on the root of sebastos, such as sebastos, sebastohypertatos, and even protopan-sebastohypertatos (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.2747). —A.K.

**PANIAS** (Πανίας, also Paneas, Ar. Bâniyās), rarely called Caesarea Philippi (i.e., the Caesarea of Philip, son of Herod), ancient city in Phoenicia southwest of Mt. Hermon, near an old sanctuary of Pan. Pilgrims were attracted to Paneas by a sculptural group thought to represent Christ healing the woman with the issue of blood. Eusebios of Caesarea (*HE* 7:18.2–4) describes the bronze statue as a genuflecting woman stretching her hands toward a man in an elaborate cloak at whose feet grew a strange plant with the power to cure all diseases. Reportedly the woman herself had erected this image. More likely the group represented a pagan divine healer reclaimed by the Christians (G. Hölscber, *RE* 18 [1949] 599ff). Eusebios also mentions painted images of Christ, Paul, and Peter in Panias. The fate of the bronze group is often mentioned by later writers. According to Sozomenos (Sozom. *HE* 5:21.1–9), Julian replaced it with his own statue, which was destroyed by fire from heaven. Philostorgios (Philostorg., *HE* 7.3, p.79.1–7) relates that the inhabitants of
Pankras, also Panikos, a late antique city on the north shore of the Sea of Marmara near Rhaeidotis. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 1.50, ed. Pertusi, p.86) lists it among the poleis of Thrace or Europe. A bishop of Panion or Theodosiopolis (Nova) was known in 536 (ACO 3:116.53). In Byz. sources Panion appears either as a polis or kastron (e.g., TheophCont 615.2; Attal. 249.4). In 813, when Krum ravaged Thracean towns, Panion was one of the few that the Bulgarians were unable to conquer (I. Ševčenko, Byzantion 35 [1965] 573). The people of Panion participated in the revolt of Thomas the Slav and did not surrender even after Thomas’s death; the city was captured only after an earthquake destroyed its walls. In 1064/5 Panion again suffered from an earthquake (Attal. 90.1). Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 621.1–2) relates that Venetian ships plundered Panion in 1205. In the partytio Romanae the civilitas Panido was ascribed, together with Rhaeidotis, to the district of Chalkidike and handed over to the Venetians. In 1206 Kaloyan destroyed Panion and resettled its inhabitants on the banks of the Danube (Akrop. 23.10–14).


Pankrailia (Pangkáleia), a plain northeast of Amorion, scene of one or two battles (978–79) during the revolt of Bardas Skleros. Leo the Deacon (Leo Diac. 169f) says Bardas Phokas first encountered Skleros’s army at Pankrailia, a “plain fit for cavalry.” Phokas was defeated, but in a subsequent conflict he triumphed (locale unspecified). Skleros was forced to flee to the Arabs.

Psellos (Chron. 1:5–7) describes a battle with a single combat that resulted in Skleros’s flight. Skylitzes (Skyl. 324–27) reports a first defeat for Phokas near Amorion and a subsequent one at Basilika Thera. Then, with Georgian forces supplied by David of Tayk’/Tao, Phokas overcame Skleros at Pankrailia, which Skylitzes wrongly places near the Halys. The battle featured a duel between the generals in which Skleros was wounded; his bloody horse, dashing through his own men, so alarmed them that they took flight. Skleros withdrew to the Arabs. P.M. Tarchichvili (BK 17–18 [1964] 95–97) has shown that contemporary Georgian sources located the decisive battle at Sarvenis (which he identifies as Aquae Saravenae or Basilika Thera, north of Kaisareia). Skylitzes’ final battle at Pankrailia (duel included), he argues, is a fictionalized duplication of the first one. But Aquae Saravenae (mod. Kırşehir, northwest of Kaisareia and near the Halys) must be distinguished from Basilika Thera (mod. Sarıkaya) (F. Hild, M. Restle, TIB 2:143f, 156f). Yahyá (ed. Kratchkovsky and Vasiliev, PO 23.3:375, 399) gives the date of the first battle as 19 June 978 and of the second as 24 March 979.


Pankratios of Taormina, a legendary disciple of St. Peter, the first bishop of Taormina; martyr and saint; feastdays 9 Feb. and 9 July. The existence of his cult in Sicily is attested by Gregory I the Great, who relates that in 591 a church in Messina was dedicated to “Pancratius.” According to the vita of Pankratios (Pangkraitos), written by a certain Evagrios (otherwise unknown), Pankratios was originally from the Antioch region, lived in a village in Pontos, accompanied St. Peter on his journeys, and came to Sicily, where he converted the governor of the province to Christianity and was eventually murdered by pagans. Evagrios describes an episode that seems to reflect the struggle over icon veneration: the apostle Peter reportedly summoned a painter, Joseph by name, and ordered him to make icons of Christ, Peter himself, and Pankratios; Pankratios then used these icons in his mission. The episode with the painter Joseph was known to Theodore of Studious (PG 99:1135A) and employed in his defense of icons. Whereas Patlagen
PANNONIA (Pannonia), Roman territory south of the Middle Danube that was divided between 293 and 296. Under Diocletian, it was made up of four provinces: Pannonia I (capital, Savaria), Pannonia II (capital, Sirmium), Savia (capital, Siscia), and Valeria (capital, Sopiana). Archaeological data indicate that the 4th C. was a period of flourishing estates, when large-scale grain production began; from the end of the 3rd C. onward wine was also produced. The uniformity of the construction of new villas prompts the hypothesis that they were imperial properties (M. Biró, ActaArchHung 26 [1974] 52–54). Building activity, predominantly of military character, continued through the time of Valentinian I, although the political role of the Pannonians in the empire seems to have decreased (J. Fitz, L'administration des provinces pannoniennes [Brussels 1983] 91).

Starting at the end of the 4th C., Pannonia lay open to barbarian invasions. A part of the Roman population emigrated southward. The minting of coins stopped after 395. The cities were in decline, as shown by systematic excavations carried out in ancient Gorsium: already some 4th-C. graves were located on the site of older houses. Sopiana has a church with a fresco painted probably after 380, but traces of the 5th–6th-C. settlement are insignificant (Gy. Székely, ActaAntHung 21 [1973] 340–42). The first waves of invasion were merely passed through Pannonia en route to Italy, but the Huns lingered in the region a while, according to the treaties of 425 and 433 as foederati. In 434–41 Attila occupied Pannonia. In 455 Eparchius Avitus restored Roman power in Pannonia II. Excavations show that Roman customs still continued in some parts of the province until the 6th C., when avarai settled in Pannonia. Eventually, the territory formed a part of Moravia and finally was occupied by the Hungarians.


- A.K.

PANOPOLIS. See Akhmid.

PANSELINOS, MANUEL, wall-painter sometimes associated with the decoration of various monasteries on Mt. Athos and esp. with that of the PROTATON, ca.1300. This tradition is no older than the 17th C.; in the 18th C., Dionysios of Phourna claimed that Panselinos (Πανσέληνος) was from Thessalonike and that rules for the proportions of figures in his Hermeneia (see Models and Model-books) derived from Panselinos. Panselinos has recently been tentatively identified with Michael (Astrapas) or a member of his family, but there is no substantive evidence for the artist's existence.


- A.C.

PANTECHNES, CONSTANTINE, metropolitan of Philippopolis; fl. ca.1191. He was the author of an ekphrasis in which he vividly described hunting with hounds, falcons, and tame leopards.


Lit. Hunger, Lit. 1:186.

- A.K.

PANTELEEMON (originally Pantoleon or Panteleon), saint, one of the anargyroi; born Niko- medea, died ca.305; feastday 27 July. Theodoret of Cyrhus first mentions a feast in honor of Panteleemon, though not all MSS preserved Panteleemon’s name (PG 85:1035B). According to a later passio, Pantoleon was the son of a pagan senator, Eustorgios, and studied medicine with a famous physician, Euphrosynos. A Christian priest, Hermolaos, persuaded him that neither Asklepios nor Hippocrates nor Galen nor “other gods worshiped by the emperor Maximian” (Latyšev, infra.
41. 16–17) had ever existed; Pantoleon was taught to heal the sick by invoking Christ's name. Pantoleon's miraculous cures brought him fame as well as Maximian's anger. Supernaturally aided, he endured tortures: when he stepped into a vat of boiling lead the fire was immediately extinguished and the lead cooled; wild beasts in the arena knelt at his feet, and the executioners' swords melted like wax. Because he prayed for his torturers, he received a new name (Παντελεήμων), "all-merciful." When he was finally beheaded, milk, not blood, gushed from his neck, and the olive tree under which he was murdered became covered with fruit "from the roots to the crown."

Panteleemon's cult was popular in both West and East: his passio was translated into Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Armenian; in Byz. Andrew of Crete (or Niketas David Paphilagon), John Geometres, Symeon Metaphrastes, and Constantine Akropolites eulogized Panteleemon.

**Representation in Art.** Portraits of Panteleemon abound in church decoration; his adolescent features recall those of St. George, but he holds a little pyramidal physician's box and a scalpel instead of a lance (e.g., at Nerezi). Various cycles of scenes from his life have been preserved (at Nerezi, on a Sinai vita icon, and in MSS of the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes), but the choice of scenes and their iconography differs from monument to monument, so that it seems unlikely that any widespread iconographic tradition was ever in existence.


---

**PANTELEEMON** (painter). See PANTOLEON.

**PANTELEEMON MONASTERY**, also called Rossikon, a Rus' establishment on Mt. Athos. The present large complex of the Rossikon, situated north of Daphne on the southwest shore of the Athone peninsula, is of modern construction. Rossikon had its origins in two Byz. monasteries, the Theotokos of Xylourgo and St. Panteleemon (Παντελεήμων), also called "of the Thessalonicon can," which merged in the 12th C. The Xylourgo monastery (present-day skete of Bogoridica or Theotokos) was located in the northwest part of the peninsula and inhabited in the 11th C. by monks from Rus'. The monastery of St. Panteleemon (present-day Palaionomastero), located halfway between modern Rossikon and Karyes, was founded in the late 10th C., probably by Leontios of Thessalonike. It owned a dock and tower (pyrgos) at the site of modern Rossikon. St. Panteleemon fell into decline in the 12th C. and was virtually deserted by 1169, when it was occupied by the Rus' monks of Xylourgo. The prosphorion of Athos gave St. Panteleemon to the Rus' on condition that they restore and fortify the complex. The Rus' hegoumenos assumed the leadership of both St. Panteleemon and of Xylourgo, which was designated an annex (paramonasterion). The reorganized monastery took the name of "the monastery of the Rus' honored with the name of St. Panteleemon" (mone ton Rhoson eis onoma timomen tou hagiou Panteleemonos). Panteleemon prospered, esp. during the period of Serbian domination over Athos, receiving substantial estates from Serbian princes (cf. M. Živojinović, ZRVI 23 [1984] 167–69). Many of these properties were lost, however, after the Turkish conquest of Macedonia in the 15th C.

The archives contain 20 Byz. acts (dating between 1030 and 1430), 15 Serbian documents (1349–1429), as well as later Russian and Moldavian acts. The acts include a detailed inventory of 1142 listing the movable properties, for example, sacred vessels, of the Xylourgo monastery (Pantel., no.7:44–59); a chrysobull of Andronikos II (1311) confirming the Panteleimon monastery's title to properties in Thessalonike and Chalkidike, and guaranteeing certain fiscal immunities; and a chrysobull of John V (1353) granting the monastery properties in the Strymon region. Panteleimon also owned lands on Lemnos. Approximately 169 Greek MSS of Byz. date are preserved in the library (Lampros, Athos 2:280–461), most notably cod. 6, a richly illustrated copy of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos. The church formerly possessed a steatite panagiarion inscribed with the name of Alexios III of Trebizond (Kalavrezou, Steatite, no.132).

**Sources.** Actes de Saint-Pantéléémon, ed. P. Lemerle, G. Dagron, S. Čiriković (Paris 1982).


- A.M.T., A.C.

PANTEOLLRIA. See Patellaria.

PANTEPOPTES MONASTERY, located on the fourth hill of Constantinople overlooking the Golden Horn. Founded before 1087 by Anna Dalassene, the Pantepoptes (Παντεπόπτης, "all-seeing") was dedicated to Christ. Although it was a male establishment, the founder retired to private apartments there shortly before her death. Patr. Theodosios Boradiotes was confined there temporarily in 1181 after the revolt of Renier of Montferrat. In 1204, during the final Crusader attack on Constantinople, Alexios V Mourtzouphlos used the Pantepoptes as his headquarters because of its useful vantage point. In 1266 the monastery was taken over by Benedictine monks, but Greeks returned after 1261. The Pantepoptes continued to function until at least 1453, although it is apparently not mentioned by Russian pilgrims in the Palaiologist period; after the Turkish conquest its church became the still-extant mosque of Eski Imaret Cami. The church has a cross-in-square plan and an unusual U-shaped gallery over the narthex. An outer narthex was added probably in the Palaiologist period. The exterior brickwork includes such decorative features as maenander patterns and sunbursts.


PANTEUGENOS, SOTERICHOS, 12th-C. theologian. A deacon of the Great Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, then patriarch-elect of Antioch, Panteugenos (Παντευγενός) became the major figure in theological debates on the nature of Christ's sacrifice. A statement (semeiomata) by a synod meeting on 26 Jan. 1156 directed a condemnation against those who affirmed that the sacrifice of Christ was offered to the Father alone, and not to the other two persons of the Trinity (PG 140:153C). Dissatisfied with the decision, Panteugenos published a Dialogue defending the views condemned in 1156; he faced, however, a refutation by Nicholas of Methone.

A new synod, presided by Emp. Manuel I, was held at the Blachernai Palace on 12 May 1157. The earlier decision was confirmed (PG 140:192A), and Panteugenos renounced his previous position. The Synodikon of Orthodoxy included five anathemas against the condemned doctrines. The synod affirmed that the hypostasis of the incarnate Logos "offered" the sacrifice according to the humanity assumed by him and "received" it according to his divinity, together with the Father and the Spirit. The decision referred to a prayer of the Byz. liturgy addressed to Christ as "the one who offers and the one who is offered."


- J.M.

PANTOKRATOR (παντοκράτωρ, lit. "all-sovereign"), an epithet of God. Used in the Apocalypse of John and by some early theologians (F. Bergamelli, Salesianum 46 [1984] 439-72), it was employed by Athanasios of Alexandria in his polemics against the Arians, who considered the Son of God as a dynamis and denied him the title of Pantokrator (PG 25:472B, 26:80A). In Byz. the term was applied both to God in general and separately to the individual persons of the Trinity, esp. to the Father; the epithet emphasized rule over the whole, in contrast to the kosmokrator or "world-ruler," the title of the Devil. When applied to Christ, the concept of Pantokrator was closely interwoven with the image of the kingship of Christ who was Pantokrator both by nature, as the Son, and—against the Arians—by his role as redeemer. The term is often used in symbols of the Creed (PG 28:1581B, 1589A) and in liturgical texts. Strangely enough, the term is lacking in the list of divine names compiled by Theodore II Laskaris (PG 140:764-70) that includes almost 700 epithets, but there are many synonyms. (For the Pantokrator in art, see Christ: Types of Christ.)


- G.P.

PANTOKRATOR, MONASTERIES OF. Several Byz. monasteries were dedicated to Christ as Pan-
Pantokrator, the most important being in Constantinople and on Mt. Athos.

**Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople**, a large monastic complex founded in Constantinople by Emp. John II Komnenos east of the Church of the Holy Apostles on the slope of the fourth hill. The three parallel and contiguous church buildings survive to the present under the Turkish name Zeyrek Kilise Camii. One of the churches, dedicated to St. Michael (the Asomatos), was intended as a funerary chapel for members of the Komnenos family. John II and his wife Irene were buried there, as were his son Manuel I and daughter-in-law Berta of Sulzbach. In front of Manuel’s tomb was the slab on which it was believed Jesus had lain after the Deposition from the Cross, brought by Manuel from Ephesus in 1169/70. Two Palaiologan emperors, Manuel II and John VIII, also found their final resting place at Pantokrator.

The south church, dedicated to the Pantokrator, is the most important four-column, cross-in-square church preserved in the capital. The huge columns of red marble, probably spolia, are lost today, as is most of the stained glass, which was supposedly in its east window; much of the figured opus sectile pavement remains. Panels in its templon screen came from the Constantinopolitan Church of St. Polyeuktos. The slightly smaller north church, where women were admitted, was dedicated to the Virgin Eleousa. Here faint traces of the original mosaic decoration are preserved.

John II’s *tyikon*, composed in Oct. 1136, provides explicit directions for the ceremonial in the three churches (e.g., ecclesiastical lighting, commemorations of the deceased), and the administration of the monastery (election of *hegoumenoi*, diet and clothing of monks, etc.). It housed 80 monks, of whom 50 were choir brothers and 30 serving brothers. The complex included a 50-bed hospital and a *gerekmecon* for 24 elderly men. The emperor also constructed a leper hospital at some distance from the monastery. Pantokrator was richly endowed with estates in Thrace, Macedonia, the Peloponnese, the Aegean and Anatolia, and six smaller monasteries in the Asiatic suburbs of the capital.

The monastery was occupied by the Venetians between 1204 and 1261; it was then restored to Orthodox monks and continued to function until 1453. Only a few of its *hegoumenoi* are known, including Makarios Makres.


**Pantokrator Monastery on Athos.** Dedicated to the Transfiguration, this monastery is located on the northeast coast of the peninsula, halfway between Vatopedi and Iveron. Although its foundation has traditionally been attributed to the reign of Alexios I Komnenos or to the 13th-C. general Alexios Strategopoulos, the monastery is not mentioned in any sources until the second half of the 14th C. It was evidently founded in 1357 (Gones, *infra* 89f) by the brothers Alexios (a *megas primikeros* in 1357, who became *megas stratopedarches* in 1358) and John (*protosebastos* in 1357, promoted to *megas primikeros* in 1358); their family name is unknown, but they were related to the Palaiologoi. Ostrogorsky’s (*Sabra deli, vol.* 4 [Belgrade 1970] 615–24) identification of John with the *megas primikeros* John who was the son of Demetrius Palaiologos has now been rejected (*PLP*, no. 21484). The huge icon of Christ that they presented to the monastery is now in Leningrad (*Iskusstvo Vizantii* 3, no. 947). By 1394 the monastery held 15th place in the Athonite hierarchy. Sometime before Jan. 1394 Pantokrator was destroyed by fire and subsequently rebuilt with the assistance of Emp. Manuel II. In 1396 Patr. Antony IV reconfirmed its status as a patriarchal monastery.

Pantokrator had properties on Thasos, Lemnos, and Chalkidike, and a *metochion* called Beltzista near Serres. The 13 documents published by L. Petit range in date from 1357 to 1398 (plus an earlier act of 1107) and include the testament of the founder John (1384). The library of Pantokrator preserves 120 Byz. MSS, including the famous 9th-C. marginal psalter, Pantokr. 61 (Dufrenne, *L’Illustration* 1). From this collection, too, came the Psalter and New Testament of ca. 1084, now Washington, Dumbarton Oaks 3 (Cutler, *Aristocratic Psalters*, no. 51). In the *katholikon* are some frescoes of the 14th C., including a Deesis, the Dormition, and some figures of saints.

**Source.** *Actes du Pantokrator*, ed. L. Petit, *VisVriem* 10 (1903) suppl. 2.
PANTOLEON, painter; fl. 1001–16. Pantoleon’s name occurs more frequently than that of any other artist beside the miniatures in the MENOLOGION OF BASIL II; he was perhaps head of the atelier that decorated this MS. Cutler suggested that Pantoleon’s hand is also apparent in a Psalter (Venice, Marc. gr. Z 17) prepared for the same emperor. Pantoleon is mentioned in both versions of the Life of St. ATHANASIUS OF ATHOS (ed. Noret, A par. 254–36; B par. 78.24–33) as a resident of Constantinople who painted two icons of the saint probably for Antony, later hegoumenos of the Panagioi monastery. In this account, Pantoleon is said to have been at work on an imperial commission.

PAP (Lat. Para), Arsacid king of Armenia (368/9–374), son and successor of ARSACK II/III. This is probably not the Papa mentioned in the Letters of Basil the Great as was once thought. Pap was educated under Roman auspices at NEOKAIASAREIA, where he had taken refuge at the time of the Sasanian conquest of Armenia ca. 363. Valens sent him back to Armenia with an army commanded by the dux and comes rei militaris Terentius. Once reestablished on the Armenian throne, Pap apparently continued to support the Romans against the Sasanians, whom his armies thrice defeated, but he quarreled with the powerful nobles of his own kingdom and esp. with the clergy, which opposed his arianizing policy. Pap contrived the murder of the patriarch NERSES I THE GREAT and was murdered in return, apparently with the con-
nivance of the Roman commander. Latin and Armenian sources disagree sharply on his character: he is praised by Ammianus Marcellinus who bewails his murder as an unspeakable crime, while the Armenian sources portray him as dedicated from birth to the powers of evil.


PAPACY, bishopric of Rome. Early Christian communities used the term PAPAS (father) as a title of affectionate respect, esp. for priests and bishops; from the 4th to 7th c., the term was often used for the patriarch of Alexandria and other bishops. The title is on record in Rome from the 4th c.; from the 6th it was increasingly used specifically for the bishop of Rome.

By the 4th c., the papacy was the West’s leading bishopric and the only one included among the five major sees that formed the PENTARCHY. The First Council of Constantinople, held in 381 (see under CONSTANTINE, COUNCILS OF), explicitly recognized the papacy’s primacy, and the popes took advantage of the struggle between Alexandria and Constantinople to gain supremacy within the church hierarchy. Pope Leo I, in particular, advanced Rome’s claims to primacy throughout the empire in the 5th c.

With Justinian I’s reconquest of Italy in the mid-6th c., Rome entered the Byz. political and cultural sphere, where it remained until the mid-8th c. While papal claims to ecclesiastical primacy continued, the ability of the papacy to thwart Constantinople’s political and religious policies decreased. Byz. emperors deposed Pope Silverius in 537 and convicted Martin I of treason in Constantinople in 653/4; in the 6th c. the bishop of Constantinople assumed the title ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH. While the apocrisiarius represented the papacy in Constantinople, in Italy the exarch usually confirmed papal elections of the 7th and 8th c. (see LIBER DIURNUS).

Persian and Arab invasions of the early 7th c. triggered large-scale immigration of the Eastern ecclesiastical elite into Italy, causing a substantial hellenization of Rome’s clergy, with the result that from 678 to 752, 11 of 13 popes were Greek-speaking. Theology (see LATERAN SYNOD), art (see ROME), liturgy (see SERGIUS I), and literature (see Zacharias) reflect the new Greek orientation, as the papacy developed a Byz.-style bureaucracy and court. In the 8th c., papal opposition to Iconoclasm, combined with resistance to increased taxation, provoked Byz. confiscation of the papal estates in southern Italy and Sicily and subordination of ILLYRICUM to the patriarchate of Constantinople. Constantinople’s grip on central Italy loosened, however, and increasing Lombard pressure forced the papacy to seek an alliance with the Carolingians. When Pope Leo III conferred the imperial crown upon Charlemagne in 800, it symbolized Rome’s independence from Byz. control.

The LIBER PONTIFICALIS records imperial grants that contributed to the landed wealth of the papal patrimonies in the 4th to 8th c. (from CONSTANTINE I to CONSTANTINE V). Originally encompassing estates in Africa, Gaul, Sardinia, and Corsica as well as Italy, their administration became highly centralized under Gregory I. Loss of the overseas territories and Lombard encroachment fostered concentration of papal lands in central Italy, expanded by Carolingian grants under Hadrian I. By the 9th c., the papacy was one of Italy’s most powerful princeps and a major factor in international relations. Nicholas I effectively exploited the situation, trying to subordinate the newly baptized Slavs of Moravia and Bulgaria to Rome, to regain jurisdiction over Illyricum, and to establish control over the church of Constantinople.

This active policy of the 9th-c. popes was short-lived: Nicholas met an energetic opponent in Patri. Photios, while Arab incursions and the weakening of Frankish power again forced his successors to seek alliance with Byz. Involved with domestic difficulties, the 10th-c. papacy temporarily ceased efforts to claim primacy over the Eastern churches.

By the mid-11th c. the papacy believed itself strong enough to reassert universal claims, although the papacy and Constantinople were natural allies against the Normans. The first step in this papal expansion was the conflict between Patri. Michael I Keroularios and Cardinal Humbert in 1054; more dramatic than substantial, the conflict did not cause a real schism, although the dispute highlighted essential theological, administrative, and ritual differences between the Eastern and Western churches.

Church reform, moral improvement of the
clergy, and the development of effective administration in the late 11th to 12th C. significantly enhanced the political influence and ideological authority of the papacy. The power of the German kings in Italy was curbed (partially with the help of the growing Italian communes), and in 1095 Pope Urban II proclaimed a crusade intended to unify Western Christianity against the infidel Muslims. Despite serious friction, Byz. was at first an ally of the Crusaders, and theological dialogue, frequently in a spirit of reconciliation, occurred. A definitive rupture came only in 1204 when the Fourth Crusade unexpectedly turned against Constantinople. The role of Innocent III in this event is uncertain, although the capture of Constantinople and the establishment of Latin rule was beneficial for the papacy, which had long sought to establish control over the Balkans.

This success, however, was undermined by various forces and did not last. On the one hand, papal power in the West was weakened after the 13th C., when it had to face not the universal aspirations of the German emperors, but the nascent national states, which were able to exploit the same elements that the papacy had used in its own behalf: the growing medieval towns and the local church. The external sign of papal defeat was the “Babylonian captivity” of 1309 to 1377, when the popes were exiled to Avignon, where they came under French control. Another factor was the growth of Turkish power: the Crusaders were losing their foothold in the Levant, and Byz. territory was drastically shrinking. The war against the infidel required enormous amounts of money and manpower, while the Crusading movement was declining. Finally, the papacy underestimated Byz. resistance to Union of the Churches and was not willing to yield any significant point to win the sympathy of the Greek people. The condition for union was the full subjugation of Byz. to papal jurisdiction, theology, and rite; a few emperors were willing to accept these terms, but failed to gain popular support for their policies. The Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1439 brought only superficial unity and minimal assistance from the West: the papacy was not able, and did not seriously try, to save Constantinople in 1453.


— A.K. M. McC.

PAPADIKE (Παπαδική), a late Byz. anthology of musical settings, both simple and florid, for hymns, psalms, and other chants used in the liturgy and the liturgical Hours. John Koukouzeles is believed to have first edited this kind of volume, which also bears the name of Akolouthia, Mousikon, Anthologia, or Psaltike. Along with compositions by Palaiologan composers, the earliest 14th-C. papadike preserve vestiges of 12th- and 13th-C. Constantinopolitan repertories; a handful of these, both early and late, contain musical treatises. Fourteen MSS of the Papadike from the 14th C. and nearly three times that number from the 15th C. are extant. Chants in the kalophonic style predominate. This style is chiefly recognizable by its use of the meaningless teretismata and by its demanding virtuosity.

In modern scholarship, the term Papadike usually refers to a short, elementary manual of musical notation that introduces the musical anthologies of chant from the 14th C. onward. The text underwent many modifications; by the 15th C., at least four different versions of the Papadike existed, varying in completeness and order of contents. Typically, the manual consists of lists showing (1) the neumata and their interval value; (2) the “great hypostases” (subordinate ornamental signs); (3) the Phthorai; and (4) small musical examples describing the function and value of the neumata. Following this may be various diagrams undoubtedly intended for use when teachers introduced their students to the neumatic and modal systems. Many sources also include a varying number of short, ad hoc exercise melodies that served as a bridge between the theory and its application to actual singing.


—D.E.C.

PAPAS (πάπας, παπᾶς, παππας, “father”), used widely in the Byz. church as a title of respect and affection for the clerical rank of priest (e.g., Malal. 361.8, 362.5). It emphasizes the spiritual relationship between priest and congregation. As early as the 3rd C., however, the word was also commonly
applied to bishops in both East and West (Gregory Thaumaturgus, PG 10:1020A). In Egypt the bishop of Alexandria was regularly styled papa (PG 20:648C), possibly as early as 231 (PG 111:982D–983A). Only gradually was the term applied solely to the bishop of Rome (see PAPACY). Although it is attested for the Roman bishop in the 4th C., only in the 6th C. does the custom become more general. Even then, however, papa was still occasionally used for other Western bishops as well (cf. Avitus of Vienne, PL 59:299). It was indeed not until the 11th C. that the title was for the first time restricted exclusively to the bishop of Rome by Pope Gregory VII.


PAPER, writing material that gradually came to replace PARCHMENT. Considered inferior to parchment because it was less durable, paper came into wide use because it was cheaper. Palaeographers distinguish between two kinds of paper imported into Byz. oriental or bombycine (βομβύκινον, βομβύκινον, βαμβακινινον, βαμβακινινον, the names coming from the cities of Membij and Baghdad, respectively) and occidental. Both types of paper were made from rags or vegetable fibers. Oriental paper was smooth, brownish, glued with starch, and had no watermarks; Western paper was yellowish or white, thick, rough, glued with gelatin, and had watermarks. The size of the two kinds of paper and the pattern of wires used in the manufacture also differed. The question of whether paper was manufactured in Byz. itself is still open; N. Oikonomides argues that papermakers are attested in Constantinople ca.800 (in PGEB 397f).

Paper was introduced to the Byz. world by the Arabs, who had learned the secret of its manufacture from Chinese prisoners of war captured at Samarkand in 751. The oldest preserved Greek MS written on oriental paper is Vat. gr. 2200, copied ca.800, probably in Damascus; this paper, however, did not come into common use in Byz. territory until the 11th C. The institute of the library of the monastery of Attaleiates, for example, lists eight books on paper and six on parchment. The earliest surviving paper MS copied in Byz. is from 1105 (Vat. gr. 504). Paper was also used for documents; the earliest preserved example is a chrysobull of 1052. The latest Byz. MSS on oriental paper date from ca.1350.

Occidental paper was first imported to Byz. in the 13th C. from Italy, where the oldest paper mill was at Fabriano (in Ancona). By the late 14th C. Italian paper had completely supplanted its oriental counterpart. The dimensions of a sheet of occidental paper average 290 × 450 mm. Folios were formed by folding these sheets in two, four, eight, etc. Stocks of paper were used soon after purchase (3–5 years), which helps to date books on paper provided with watermarks. Modern technology (e.g., analysis by electron microscope, neutron activation, and betagrapy) can also assist in dating.


PAPHLAGONIA (Παφλαγονία), region of northern Asia Minor between GALATIA and the Black Sea, consisting of a narrow coastal strip and isolated but rich interior valleys that produced timber and grain; its metropolis was GANGRA. Diocletian created a separate province of Paphlagonia. In 535, Justinian I merged Paphlagonia and the adjacent Honorias, assigning them to a praetor with civil and military powers. Persian, then Arab attacks reached Paphlagonia occasionally in the 7th–8th C. After being part of Osrioni, Paphlagonia became a separate theme in the early 9th C. Its strategos commanded 5,000 men and five fortresses; he was paid 10 pounds of gold. A katepano was apparently in charge of the fleet. Most of Paphlagonia was lost to the Turks after Mantzikert in 1071; the Crusade of 1101 met disaster in Paphlagonia; the campaigns of John II, 1130–35, were more successful, but brought no lasting gains. The coast remained Byz.: in 1205, David Komnenos of Trebizond established a realm called Paphlagonia, which stretched from Sinope to Herakleia Pontike. Theodore I Laskaris seized the western parts as far as Amastris in 1214; they became the Laskarid province of Paphlagonia. The region was lost to the Turks or Genoese by the late 14th C.

Lit. A. Pertusi in De them., 136f. —C.F.
PAPHOS. See CYPRUS.

PAPIAS (παπίας, word etymologically connected with παπάς, father, priest), eunuch in charge of the buildings of the palace. The first mention in narrative sources is for the year 780, when a certain Jacob, protospatharios and papias, was arrested by Leo IV (Theoph. 453.10–11; Bury, *Adm. System* 124f, however, treated this papias as a proper name). The seal of the papias Peter has been dated by the editors (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no. 2821) to 550–650. The papias was primarily the janitor of the palace—his duty was to keep the keys and open the gates; he also kept the keys of the palace prison (Kinn. 234.10–12). The cooperation of the papias was important for any conspiracy: thus, the papias played a decisive role in the plot of Michael II against Leo V. When Basil I plotted Michael III’s murder, the hetaireiarches Artabasdes snatched the keys from the papias and let in the conspirators.

The papias was responsible for the maintenance of the buildings. His staff consisted of diaitarioi or hed domarioi (who served in weekly relays in charge of various rooms of the palace), loustai, kandelaptai, kamenades, and horologoi, who were responsible for the baths, lighting, heating, and horologia, respectively, and zarabi (functions not clear). To this personnel, presented in the *Kleitorologion of Philotheos, Oikonomides* (Listes 306, n. 100) adds the minsourator, who was in charge of the emperor’s tent during military expeditions. The papias was assisted by the deuterous. He also played a part in imperial ceremony, both inside and outside the palace; thus, on 1 Aug. he carried a cross (from the palace treasury) through the streets of Constantinople, visiting houses of the wealthy and collecting from them a fee of some sort (De cer. 723.17–19). In addition to the papias of the Great Palace there were papias of the Magnaura and Daphne palaces; the latter was created by Michael III. From the 13th C. onward megas papias became an honorific title conferred on members of noble families, including the future emperor John VI Kantakouzenos.


PAPYRI. See ANTINOÖPOLIS PAPYRI; APHRODITE PAPYRI; APOLLONOS ANO PAPYRI; ARABIC PAPYRI; NESSANA PAPYRI; OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI; RAVENNA PAPYRI.

PAPYROLOGY, an auxiliary discipline dealing with texts written on papyrus (and ostraka), most often in Greek, Latin, and Coptic. (Hieroglyphic and demotic texts are usually dealt with by Egyptologists, as they come largely from periods earlier than the Greco-Roman; on the other hand, Syriac, Aramaic, Arabic, and Pahlavi papyri usually fall to specialists in Semitic, Christian Oriental, or
Persian philology.) As most papyri originate in Egypt, papyrology often becomes largely synonymous with study of the history and culture of late Roman Egypt.

In the 18th and much of the 19th C. the occasional papyri found by *sebakh* (fertilizer) diggers or hunters for Pharaonic treasure in Egypt were regarded merely as curiosities. With the great Fayyūm finds of the late 1870s (brought to the Archduke Rainer collection in Vienna) interest in these documents arose. In the 1880s and 1890s papyrology really began, with excavations by Petrie and Grenfell and Hunt specifically intended to search for papyri. Their spectacular success brought to light classical literature, unknown sayings of Jesus (from the *Gospel of Thomas*), and countless administrative and taxation records, as well as documents of daily life. Nearly continual discovery of papyri since then has augmented the raw material of the field and sparked its growth into an international discipline, producing ongoing publications of source material and historical interpretation.

Papyrology is founded above all on the reading of papyrus texts. Often the papyrus needs conservation before its surface can be read: flattening sheets, unrolling rolls, even taking apart cartonage (the "cardboard" that mummy cases are made of) by means of enzymes, or, as in the case of the Tebtunis papyri, unstuffing mummmified crocodiles. The papyrologist acquires palaeographic skill through practical immersion in texts written in all sorts of hands. Papyrology has greatly enlarged our knowledge of Koine and biblical Greek, of the Latin used by Roman soldiers in the provinces, and of the several dialects of Coptic, both in everyday usage and in literature.

The types of papyrus document are as numerous and as varied as the activities that helped keep society functioning. They can be public documents, such as imperial rescripts, tax rolls, cadasters, registered property declarations, birth and death certificates, or transactions executed by a government official. Even more numerous are private documents, such as transactions of family law (marriage and divorce contracts, wills, inheritance arbitrations), sales, leases, loans, labor contracts, pledges and deposits, orders for payment, and of course letters. The great abundance of these documents provides an unparalleled depth and breadth of knowledge of late Roman Egypt. Both the factual content and the phraseology of papyrus documents illuminate the historical milieu from which they came, providing material for both administrative and religious history. Bureaucracy, the differing legal systems, the interrelationship of city and countryside, and the preoccupations of both pagan and Christian religion are vividly alive in the papyri.

Literary papyri are likewise natural witnesses to the state of culture in Egypt at any given point. Classical authors, scriptural, liturgical, and patristic literature, practical science and magic—all fall within the domain of the literary papyrologist. The state of education can be gathered from school exercises, while the presence of literary papyri in the midst of documentary archives (e.g., the Cairo Menander codex) attests to the reading preferences of the literate bureaucrat and the ordinary citizen. Biblical papyri form a field all their own, being by far the earliest textual witnesses available to the critic, and reflecting the different families of texts and the early versions and lines of transmission. The Gnostic papyrus codices from NAG HAMMADI and the Manichaean literature from Egypt have given rise to specialties of their own.

Papyrology has by now its own working tools, including lexica, dictionaries of proper names, handbooks and standard collections, palaeographical albums, compilations of corrections to previously published texts, and specialized periodicals and monograph series. The data of papyrology are helping to revise our understanding of such fields as chronology, comparative Roman and Greek law, the economic history of the 4th—5th C., and the religious history of early Christianity, Gnosticism, and Manichaeanism. There are still many more extant papyrus texts than there are editors to make them available to historians and students.


**PYRAMUS**, the principal writing material of the ancient world and late antiquity, made from strips of the pith of an Egyptian reed plant (*Cyperus papyrus*). The manufacture and sale of papyrus was a large-scale industry in Egypt throughout its
history, until well after the Arab conquest. Papyrus came in all grades and was used for every purpose, official and private, and in every format, from roll to codex. It provided a tough and long-lasting writing surface. Most extant texts, literary and documentary, on papyrus were preserved in Egypt (though not all were written there): other discoveries have been made at Dura Europos and in Israel. Some medieval papyrus was produced in Sicily. Papyrus was not superseded in the West by parchment until the later 9th C. or in the East by paper until about the 10th C. It continued to be used by the papal chancery until the 12th C. and by the imperial chancery at least until the mid-9th C. (F. Dölger, BZ 48 [1955] 467–70). The discipline that studies texts on papyrus is called papyrology.

—L.S.B.MacC.

PARABALANI (παραβαλανεῖς, “bath attendants,” sometimes, incorrectly, παραβολάννοι, “those who disregard their lives”), hospital attendants and minor clerics who were often fanatically loyal to their ecclesiastical superior. Because their work with the sick exposed them to constant danger, the parabalani were often drawn from desperate elements in society; they were occasionally used by bishops in violent encounters with their opponents. They are best known at Alexandria but appear to have been organized also at Constantinople and probably elsewhere. They were evidently involved in the murder of Hypatia in 415 and provided much of the violence used by Dioskoros at the “Robber” Council of Ephesus in 449. Because of the danger they posed to public order, their numbers were limited by law, first to 500 and later to 600 (Cod. Theod. XVI 2.42 and 43 [anno 416, 418 = Cod. Just. I 3.18]).

—T.E.G.

PARABLE (παραβολή). In the theory of rhetoric, a comparison that differs from an example by including within its scope both animate and inanimate nature (Martin, Rhetorik 122). The term could designate a simple simile as in Theodoret (PG 80:581 A-B): “He delivered a parable . . . calling himself a dead dog.” The word was applied to Christ’s fables, which were told to illustrate his teaching of the heavenly kingdom and were broadly interpreted by several church fathers, esp. Origen and John Chrysostom. According to Origen, Christ used parables of which the popular masses were apt to understand only the external form, whereas the disciples perceived the internal significance. Therefore, the parable acquired the sense of a spiritual truth expressed in the form of a riddle or a short story, esp. of a saying that contained a hidden meaning and required an interpretation.

—A.K., E.M.J.

PARADISE (παράδεισος, lit. “garden”), Eden, a place created by God for Adam and Eve from which they were later expelled. According to Byz legends, it was situated in the east, far beyond India and even beyond the Ocean. Pseudo-Basil the Great (PG 30:64B) describes it as a place of marvelous beauty, brilliance, and security, knowing neither winds nor hail, free from humidity, heat, and cold. Hagiography and related texts preserve numerous visions of paradise, which
variously appears as a garden surrounded by a high gilded wall with marvelous gates (vita of Basil the Younger, ed. Veselovskij, 1.46.5–9) or as a palace full of light and fragrance (vita of Andrew the Fool, PG 111:736C), with traditional Byz. court ceremonial (Mango, Byzantium 151–53). In art, paradise was represented as a garden set against a starry sky, with flowers, animals, and sometimes a jeweled cross at its center. Although the Bible presumes that Adam and Eve, before the Fall, dwelt naked in paradise, some 12th-C. Octateuch MSS show the ancestors of mankind clothed before the Fall, for example, in the scene of the naming of the animals (H.R. Broderick, Byzantium 55 [1985] 250–54). Paradise is also termed (and depicted in painting) as the heavenly Jerusalem, and, as a component of the Last Judgment, on a site in which sit the Virgin and Abraham with the souls of the elect around him. Admission, through a gate guarded by a seraph, was granted by St. Peter.

A traditional view, represented by, among others, Anastasios of Sinai and Photios, depicts paradise as a happy and blessed place where the pious live in the expectation of the realm of heaven, which will be established after the Second Coming of Christ (Parousia). Some church writers, however, distinguished paradise from the earth and located it either in heaven or between earth and heaven. Niketas Stethatos in a special treatise titled On Paradise and in related letters (ed. J. Darrouzès, 154–291) asserted that after the Incarnation the earthly paradise ceased to exist, that Christ dwells not in paradise but in heaven, and that we can speak only of an intelligible paradise whose spiritual plants give us the sensation of delight.


PARADOXNAVON. See Paristrion.

PARADOXOGRAPHY. an ancient literary genre devoted to descriptions of mirabilia, marvelous or miraculous objects. The word paradoxographos was invented by Tzetzes (Hist. 2.154), who placed the paradoxographos Anthemios of Tralles (6th C.) on a par with scientists such as Archimedes and Heron. The genre of mirabilia existed in antiquity and continued into the 4th or 5th C. Philo of Byzantium wrote a short rhetorical tract on the seven wonders of the world (W. Kroll, RE 20 [1941] 54f).

From the 7th C. onward the Byz. maintained an interest in paradoxography. Claudius Aelianus was often quoted, and several collections of ancient paradoxographers were made, such as Vat. Palat. gr. 398 (10th C.) and the compilations of several anonymous paradoxographers, conventionally called Paradoxographos Vaticanus, Paradoxographos Florentinus, and Paradoxographos Palatinus. Original Byz. works of this genre are not numerous: Theophylaktos Simokattes produced a dialogue entitled On Various Problems of Nature, in which he discussed some memorable phenomena of zoology and alchemy; similar questions were treated in his collection of letters. The Paradoxical Readings by Psellus is related to paradoxography
only by its title, being rather a collection of prescriptions against pain, conception, theft, and snakes.

Elements of paradoxography can be found in different genres: hagiography (esp. the vita of Makarios of Rome), historiography (e.g., the description of exotic animals, such as that of the elephant and giraffe by Attaleiates), treatises on geography (A. Delatte, BAcBelg 18 [1932] 189–222), and commentaries such as one on Gregory of Nazianzos ascribed to Kosmas the Hymnographer. The Byz. developed a negative attitude toward famous ancient marvels; thus, Eustathios of Thessalonike asserted that piety is more precious than the foolishness of the Colossus of Rhodes and the pyramids that only cast long shadows (Eust.Thess., Opuscula 193.38–50).


PARADYNASTEUON (παραδυναστευών), semi-official term derived from antiquity (probably Thucydides) and designating an imperial favorite placed at the head of an administrative unit. Used in late Roman texts in a vague sense of “having great authority” (e.g., Philostorg., HE 3.12; Theodoret of Cyrus, HE 2.12.1), it preserved the same meaning in Theophanes the Confessor (e.g., Theoph. 76.25). It is not found in the Taktika of the 9th–10th C. but is applied by 10th-C. chroniclers to such men as Stylianos Zaoutzes or John Mystikos ca.913. The term is common during the Komnenian period and continued to be used by antiquarian writers such as Constantine Akropolites and Nikephoros Gregoras, but was then replaced by mesazon.


PARAKOIMOMENOS (παρακοιμώμενος; lit. “sleeping at the side of the emperor”), the guardian of the emperor’s bedchamber, the highest office conferred on eunuchs; he probably replaced the praepositus sacri cubiculi. The origin of the office is obscure: the story of the parakoimomenos Euphratas, an adviser of Constantine I, is legendary. A 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 285.17) mentions a parakoimomenos of Maurice, but this may be anachronistic. It is also uncertain whether Stephen, sakellarios and “the first eunuch” under Justinian II (not Maurice, as in Guillard, infra 204), was parakoimomenos. The first secure reference is Theophanes’ mention of koubikularioi and parakoimomenoi in 780 (Theoph. 453.11–12); at that time there were several parakoimomenoi simultaneously and their position was not very elevated. Under Theophilos, the parakoimomenoi Scholastikos also held the modest title of ostiarios. Some seals (earliest, 650–750, Zacos, Seals 1, no.1395) show that the duties of the parakoimomenoi were usually combined with those of the epi tes trapezes (no.2394) or koubikularios (nos. 2379, 2529; Seibt, Bleisiegel, no.52); at least one of these parakoimomenoi-koubikularioi was appointed strategos (of Sicily).

The situation began to change in the mid-9th C., and in the 10th C. the office acquired enormous significance, when men such as Samonas, Joseph Bringas, and Basil the Notchos were parakoimomenoi. The post continued to be important in the 11th C., when the eunuch Nicholas was parakoimomenos and Domestikos ton Schol. The office seems to have declined in the 12th C. The position was entrusted primarily to eunuchs, though there were some exceptions in all periods: the future emperor Basil I held this post and in the 12th C. some parakoimomenoi were bearded. In the 14th C. the office was divided: the parakoimomenos of the hoiton preserved the old functions of the emperor’s bodyguard, while the parakoimomenos of the sphendon controlled the state seal. The latter played an important administrative role; among others, Alexios Apokaukos held the post. There is no information about parakoimomenoi in the 15th C. A seal (Zacos, Seals 1, no.1699) attests a female parakoimomene, evidently a servant of the empress.


PARAKOLOUTHEMATA (παρακολουθήματα), generic term indicating the surtaxes that were added to the kanon. Their amounts varied with time; all started as exceptional contributions and were later incorporated in the main tax. (1) Dikeraton, i.e., an increase of two keratia (1/12) for every nomisma of kanon; this surtax, first invented by Leo III in order to repair the walls of Constantinople, was regularized by Nikephoros I. (2)
Hexafollon, a surtax of six folleis per nomisma (an increase of about 1/48, liable to variation depending on the amount of the basic tax), may have been initiated under Leo VI. (3) Synetheia, a sportula initially imposed for the benefit of the tax collector: it was 1/12 of the kanon, but the percentage decreased when the tax grew. (4) Elatikon, a flat and relatively low contribution destined to cover the expenses of the tax collector’s suite. The last two were incorporated in the tax in the early 12th C. Moreover, the tax collector and his suite received from each taxpayer a “basket” (kaniskon) in kind (one loaf of bread, one modios of barley, one chicken, 1/2 measure of wine—or multiples of the above—according to 11th-C. rates).

Lit. Svoronos, Cadastre 81-83. —N.O.

Parakyptikon (παρακυπτικος τεικον, lit. “fit for peeping through”), an imperial loge, a place from which the emperor could observe the area beneath him. In the De ceremoniis, the term “parakypkon of the altar” (De cer. 88.5) of the Church of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos refers to a vantage point in the gallery from which the emperor could observe the service; in the plural, parakyptika (342.2-3, 364.19-20), it designated a loggia in the kathisma of the Hippodrome from which the emperor watched the games.

Lit. Strube, West. Eingangssette 81-86. —A.K.

Paralytic, healing of the. See Miracles of Christ.

Paramonarios. See Prosmonarios.

Paramythetikos (παραμυθητικος λογος), a speech of consolation, intended to comfort the bereaved by praising the dead (see epitaphios).


Paraphylax (παραφυλαξ), “chief guardian” (cf. Theodore of Stoudios, PG 99:1232B). The Kleroteriogion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Lists 161.15) mentions paraphylakes of kastra among officers of low rank. They also appear in 11th-C. lists of exemptions as functionaries of the fisc or of the commonwealth (koinon), either among low-ranking military officers (Patmou Engrapha 1, no.6.61) or those involved in provisioning the army (?), such as synonarioi and ocriarioi (e.g., Laura 1, nos. 33.97-98, 36.32-33). Paraphylakes are mentioned on numerous seals of the 7th-9th C., e.g., paraphylakes of Crete, Thessalonike, Nicaea, of the “Theologian” (probably Ephesus), and esp. Abydos. A functionary of low rank (titled apoeparchon on earlier seals, and then hypatos, strator, or spatharios), he combined his function with that of the kommerkarios, less frequently with the chartoularios of the genikon and with archon. There is no reason to identify the paraphylax as a kommerkarios or abrydikos—his duty was probably to command irregular forces in provincial towns and to supervise public order.


Paraskeve of Epibatai, or Paraskeve the Younger, Slavic name Petka; saint; feastdays 13, 14 Oct. She is believed to have lived in the 10th C. Her Life, written by a peasant, possibly in the vernacular, was ordered burned by Patr. Nicholas IV Mouzalon; he commissioned a certain deacon Basilikos to create an official version of the saint’s Life. Church Slavonic texts, including the vita by Evtimij of Tûrnovo, may preserve traces of this official version. Using Evtimij’s text, Matthew of Myra wrote the Greek Life of Paraskeve in 1605-20. The legend’s central episode concerns a certain George who saw a vision of Paraskeve as an enthroned queen and was ordered to bring her relics from the Church of the Apostles in Epibatai to a new location in Tûrnovo, a mission that he fulfilled ca.1230. An inscription with the name of Paraskeve found in Carevac, Tûrnovo, makes it possible to locate a church dedicated to her.


Paraskeve of Ikonion, the “great martyr”; feastday 28 Oct. She was a predominantly Russian saint, the patron of brides and family life. The origin of her cult remains obscure.

PARASKEVE THE ELDER, saint; feast-days 26 July, 8 and 9 Nov. Paraskeve (lit. “Friday”) supposedly lived in the 2nd C., propagating Christianity and even converting the emperor Antonius. JOHN OF EUBOEA wrote a pasist of Paraskeve, and later Constantine AKROPOLITES composed her eulogy. She is represented in a miniature accompanying an Easter homily in the 9th-C. PARIS GREGORY (fol.285r; S. Der Nersessian, DOP 16 [1962] 202, pl.3), standing alongside HELENA; she carries symbols of the Passion of Christ (lance, sponge, nails, and a container for the vinegar), an early reference to Good Friday and the cult of the cross.


PARASPONDYLOS, LEO, high-ranking official; died after 1057. The name Paraspodylos (Παρασπόνδυλος, or, in Skyl. 479.16, Strabospodylos, “a crook”) is probably a sobriquet. Seemingly, Leo sprang from the family of the Spondylo, one of whom, Michael, served as doux of Antioch and participated in the campaign of GEORGE MANIakes in Sicily (Falkenhausen, Dominatione 74). An official under Michael IV, Paraspodylos became the chief of civil administration with the titles of synkellos and protosynkellos during the reigns of Theodora and Michael VI. When Paraspodylos rejected the demands of the leading generals in 1057, a rebellion developed that led to the deposition of Michael VI and accession of ISAAC I. Paraspodylos was dismissed and probably tonsured. Attaleiates (Attal. 52.1–10) lauds him as an excellent administrator who contributed greatly to the establishment of good government. Psellos (Chron. 2:74, ch.6.15–19) was more restrained in his judgment of Paraspodylos, emphasizing primarily his uncourteous speech yet eloquent gestures. While Paraspodylos was in disfavor, Psellos supported him and on his behalf addressed Paraspodylos’ principal enemies—Isaac I and PATR. MICHAEL I Kerouarios.


PARASTAS (παραστάς, lit. “standing beside”), term usually meaning pilaster, anta, or jamb. Eusebios (VC 3:37) uses the term parastades, however, to describe the twin aisles on each side of the nave of the Golgotha basilica in JERUSALEM (H. Vincent, F.-M. Abel, Jérusalem 2:1–2 [Paris 1914] 160f).

—N.E.L.

PARASTASEIS SYNTOMOI CHRONIKAI (lit. “Brief Historical Notes”), an anonymous work describing the monuments of Constantinople. The work is preserved in a single MS (Paris, B.N. gr. 1936) of the 11th C. The text is often corrupt and hard to understand. Parastaseis has traditionally been dated between Leo III (717–41), who is named in the text, and 829; the text, however, mentions an “emperor of our day” who must be one of Leo’s successors, and 829 is based only on an argumentum ex silento. Cameron and Herrin date the work to the beginning of the 8th C. and consider it as a kind of scholarly work; both conclusions are questionable. The book is a collection of grotesque anecdotes with references to nonexistent or anachronistic sources (e.g., Herodotus as the source for the story that Constantine I murdered his son Constantine—instead of CRIPUS, who was actually killed). Parastaseis should rather be interpreted as a political pamphlet directed against the cult of Constantine I that was being developed under the Iconoclast emperors and their successors; at the same time it reflected the dispute over icons, telling numerous stories about the miraculous power of pagan statues (occasionally called “icons”), which—unlike Orthodox icons—did not work beneficial miracles but brought injury and death.


LIT. Dagron, CP imaginaire 29–48. –A.K.

PARATHALASSITES (παραθαλάσσιται, lit. “by the sea”), a judge in control of those sailing on the sea (Pepia 51.29); the parathalassites was in charge of the seashore and the port of Constantinople, esp. of the import of goods and the payment of tolls. According to the obscure evidence of an anonymous chronicle (F. Cumont, Anecdota Bruxellensia [Ghent 1894] 27.11–12), Justinian I introduced the kommerkon of the straits and the office of parathalassites. In the late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 113.22) the parathalassites appears as a low-ranking functionary in the bureau of the eparch of the city.
Liutprand of Cremona (Antapodosis 3.26) mentions a paratallassites among the offices filled by Romanos I after his victory over Leo Phokas—paratallassites is last in the list, below spatharoiot and spatharokandidatoi. The seals of the 11th–12th C. confer on the paratallassites higher ranks—up to protoprodros and kouropalates—probably indicating the increasing importance of the office. Ahrweiler surmised that the paratallassites disengaged himself from the control of the eparch of the city and in the 11th C. attained equality with the eparch and the logothetes of the genikon, while Laurent (Corpus 2:625) was very cautious on this point. By the end of the 12th C. the office became collegial. The paratallassites is not mentioned in the 14th-C. ceremonial book of pseudo-Kodinos. In addition to the paratallassites of Constantinople there were also provincial paratallassitai (N. Oikonomides, TM 6 [1976] 133, n. 44).


PARCHMENT (μεμβράνα, περγαμηνή, σωμάτιον, διθέρα, δέρμα, χάρτης), writing material prepared from the skin of animals such as the cow, sheep, goat, or donkey. The skin was washed in lime, cleaned, stretched in a form, and scraped. The hair side and flesh side of the skin had different colors. The kind of animal skin used and the various techniques of treatment explain the divergent appearance of various parchments.

A coarse parchment distinguishes southern Italian MSS. Maximus Planudes preferred parchment that was thin and very white, but not treated with egg white (eps. 100, 106). Parchment dyed with purple was reserved for the emperor.

Expensive and scarce, parchment was sometimes unavailable. An animal skin yielded only two bifolia (i.e., eight pages), and the supply of parchment was seasonal, being more abundant in spring when lambs were slaughtered. Arethas of Caesarea paid between 6 and 8 nomismata for sufficient parchment to produce a volume of about 490 folios (N. Wilson in Books & Bookmen 1–4). This scarcity prompted the reuse of parchment MSS as palimpsests.

The oldest preserved large Greek parchment codices are dated to the 4th C.; they are Gospel and Old Testament MSS, the Codex Sinaiticus (London, B.L. Add. 43725), and the Codex Vaticanus (Vat. gr. 1209). From the 5th C. onward, paper increasingly replaced parchment as writing material, but parchment MSS continued to be produced for rich patrons.


PARDOS, GREGORY, writer, metropolitan of Corinth after 1092 (V. Laurent, REB 21 [1963] 290f); baptismal name probably George; born ca.1070, died 1156 (but cf. U. Begares, BZ 81 [1988] 247f). Pardos compiled several works on rhetoric and grammar: On Dialects, Commentary on Hermogenes, On Speech Construction, Introduction to Speechwriting (D. Donnet, Bulletin de l’institut historique Belge de Rome 37 [1966] 81–97). The treatise On Tropes, published under his name, should be attributed rather to the 1st-C. B.C. Tryphon (M.L. West, CQ n.s. 15 [1965] 230–48). The traditional view that Pardos lacked originality is now to be rejected (J. Glucker, Mymnose 23 [1970] 137f). Pardos applied the technique of schedographia, using a section of a “set text” progressively for examples, as he explained the principles of grammar; he referred to contemporary poets such as Kallikles, Prodomos, and Tzetzes. Pardos also produced commentaries on religious poetry as well as his own religious epigrams.


PAREKKLESION (παρεκκλήσιον), generic name for a subsidiary chapel. Such chapels appear in ecclesiastical architecture of the 4th–5th C. with a great variety of forms, functions, and dispositions. From the 10th to 12th C., the number of chapels in churches increased. These have a variety of plans, usually occur in symmetrically disposed pairs, and are carefully integrated into the overall architectural scheme. From the 13th to 15th C., parekklesia were not as elegantly planned and were often no more than large rooms attached to the flanks of existing churches. Such is
the case at the church of the Chora monastery, a long, apsed rectangular structure built for funerary purposes. Another important example of the period, also sepulchral in nature, was built in the form of a small cross-in-square church on the south flank of Hagia Maria Pammakaristos.

—M.J.

PARENZO. See Poreč.

PARIS, son of Priam, Greek mythological hero famous for his judgment of three goddesses—Hera, Athena, and Aphrodite—and his subsequent abduction of Helen, which led to the Trojan War. This mythological episode was completely reinterpreted by Malalas (or, more probably, his source), who presented Paris as a young man of proper upbringing who wrote a hymn praising Aphrodite as an allegory of epithymia, "desire." Desire, says Malalas, produces everything—children, wisdom, prudence, and the arts. This allegorical interpretation of the Judgment of Paris was developed by Tzetzes, who treated the mythological episode as utter nonsense. Manasses, however, knew the allegorical version, although he did not care for it. The poem of Hermoniakos on the Trojan War reflects the attitudes of both Tzetzes and Manasses to this episode.


—A.K.

PARIS GREGORY (Paris, B.N. gr. 510), an illustrated MS containing the Homilies of St. Gregory of Nazianzos plus some of his letters, a few miscellaneous writings, and Gregory the Presbyter’s vita of the saint. It was produced between late 879 and 883 in Constantinople for Basil I, probably as a gift from Photios. Five miniatures preface the volume; of its 52 texts most were originally preceded by miniatures, and all by elaborate headpieces. In addition, the MS has over 1,600 gold or decorated letters, the oldest surviving examples of Byz. painted initials.

The miniatures, often composed of three or four rows of images, incorporate over 400 different scenes. Few illustrate Gregory’s sermons literally: most provide commentaries on the text, either pictorial exegesis (mostly typological) or visual polemic connecting the theme of the sermon with contemporary events (the textually unmotivated image of the First Council of Constantinople [381] buttressed the Greek position in the filioque debate with Rome during the patriarchate of Photios). Some miniatures flatter the imperial recipient of the MS (the Joseph page should be read as an analogy of Basil’s ascent to the throne), while others echo specific interests of Photios and his circle.

Though the exegetical role for the images was one favored in this period, the Paris Gregory provides unusually sophisticated examples. The iconography of the individual scenes, on the other hand, remains generally conservative, and there was no attempt to make the miniatures stylistically homogenous.


PARIS PSALTER (Paris, B.N. gr. 139), the best-known example of Byz. Psalter illustration, long supposed to be typical of the genre but now recognized as being exceptional in size (approximately 37 × 26.5 cm) and in the beauty of its script and wealth of full-page illumination. Beyond the text and Catena, it now contains eight miniatures devoted to the life and person of David and six (originally nine?) illustrations of the Odes. The David pictures emphasize the virtues of the ideal emperor, often through the presence of personifications, both classical and Christian: H. Buchthal (JWarb 37 [1974] 330–33) proposes that the book was made for the future emperor Romanos II at the behest of his father, Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos. The hypothesis that it is a copy remains unproven, but there is no doubt that the MS stands at the head of a long line of smaller and later books that emulate its body of illustration. The Psalter’s ornament is most closely related to a MS in Moscow, Hist. Mus. gr. 60 (= Vladimir 140), of the year 975. The long-standing thesis that its miniatures are later insertions has recently been challenged (J. Lowden, ArtB 70 [1988] 250f). Certainly the book as we now have it was available ca.1000 when some of its minia-
atures were adapted for Psalters now at the Vatican and Mt. Sinai (H. Belting, *JOB* 21 [1972] 17–38). It was acquired by the French ambassador in Constantinople in 1557–59.


---

**PARISTRION** (Παριστρίων), a designation of the territory south of the Lower Danube, used in narrative texts of the 11th and early 12th C. Skylitzes (Skyl. 457.32) relates that a certain Michael was archon of the Paristriai poleis; the Conti nuator of Skylitzes (SkylCont 166.16–17) speaks of a vestarches Nestor “who was called doux of Paristria,” and Anna Komnene mentions Paristrion four times in connection with invasions of the Pechenegs and Cumans in Dobrudja. Official documents, however, use the term Paradounakis, as on the seals of the vести Symeon (V. Zlatarski in *Șișičev zbornik* [Zagreb 1929] 143–48) and of Katakalon (N. Bănescu, *EO* 35 [1936] 405–08) and the will of Eustathios Boilas of 1059 (Le merle, *Cinq études* 41), while Anna Komnene (An.Konn. 2:155.8) gives the title doux of Paradounabon to Leo Nikerites.

The origin of the administrative unit (katepanaton or doukaton) of Paristrion-Paradounavis is obscure. Bănescu was inclined to think that Paristrion existed from the time of John I Tzimiskes, whereas Zlatarski thought that it was created only in the mid-11th C. In any event, it did not exist at the end of the 12th C., when Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 127.89) applied the name Paristrion to the region of Branicevo and Belgrade.


---

**PAROIKIA** (παροικία), a “local” church and its district, under the authority of a bishop. The term was in use from the 3rd C. to designate both an episcopal district and a parish of the Western type.

LIT. Beck, *Kirche 83*.

---

**PAROIKOS** (παροίκος, lit. “one who lives nearby,” “stranger” in the Septuagint), the general name for the dependent peasant in Byz. from the 10th C. through the end of the empire, analogous, but not identical, to the serf (see SERİF) of medieval western Europe. While the word paroikos is of classical origin, it appears only infrequently in Byz. sources before the 10th C., thus rendering the word’s evolution far from clear. The New Testament employs paroikos to mean a temporary resident or foreigner, and consequently, through the 11th C., the word often implied a recent settler. Since a constitution of Anastasios I (Cod.Just. I 34.1) speaks of georgoi (see COLONI), paroikoi, and emphyteutai (see EMPHYTEUSIS), while a novel of Justin II (Zepos, *Jus* 1:2.8–9) speaks of georgoi, misthotai, and emphyteutai, there is perhaps an equivalence between paroikos and misthotes (see MSTITHAS). Anastasios (Cod.Just. I 2.4) forbade application of the paroikikon dikaios (“law of the paroikoi”) to church property; in the Latin version
of Justinian I’s novel 7.1, this is rendered as *colonoarium jus*. The reference in Theophanes (Theoph. 486.30) to the *paroikoi* of charitable foundations, churches, and imperial monasteries suggests that *paroikoi* were settlers on the properties of large landowners.

From the mid-10th C. onward, references to *paroikoi* became very common, with *paroikoi* appearing as a growing section of the peasantry, gradually overtaking the previously dominant independent peasant of the village community. According to a decision of Kosmas Magistros and the Peira (152–3), *paroikoi* were peasants who received land to cultivate based on an agreement with the proprietor; they could neither alienate the land, nor make any claim on it should they leave or should the proprietor ask them to leave; after 30 (or 40) years they could not be removed from the *stasis*, though this heralded no change in their status or obligations to the proprietor. On the other hand, evidence from the 11th C. onward indicates that the status of *paroikoi* was becoming hereditary, and the obligation of *paroikoi* to their lords usually appears less as a simple rent, than as a collection of state charges and *corvées* required by the lord instead of by the fisc. The nature of the dependent status of *paroikoi* remains ambiguous. During the 13th and 14th C., when almost all peasants appear to have been *paroikoi*, there is still evidence of communities of *paroikoi* acting as a corporate entity and of individual *paroikoi* often acquiring and alienating *gonikon* land.


---

**PARORIA** (*Paroú̂ria*, lit. “borderlands”), site of a group of monastic communities that flourished in the 14th C. on the frontier between Byz. and Bulgaria. The location of Paroria has been much disputed; the tendency of recent scholarship is to identify Paroria with the Strandža mountain range on the border between present-day Turkey and Bulgaria, although F. Halkin (*Byzantion* 31 [1961] 119, n.1) argues that it is impossible to specify a precise site. Gregory *Sinaítes* moved to Paroria ca.1330 and founded four lavras, the largest on Mt. Katakeryomene. Tsar Ivan *Alexander* became the patron of this lavra, providing funds to build a church, cells, and tower. Gregory brought with him the Athonite tradition of *hesychasm*, which he transmitted to both the Greek and Slavic monks who flocked to the region (A.-E.N. Tachíos, *Cyrillomethodianum* 7 [1983] 118–22). Among the distinguished monks who had their spiritual formation at Paroria were David Dishipatós, Theodoros of Túrnovo, Romylós of Vidin, and the future patriarch Kallistos I.


---

**PAROS** (*Paros*), island in the Cyclades, west of Naxos, separated from the small island of Antiparos by a narrow strait. Under Diocletian Paros formed part of the province of the Islands. It was famous for its marble (K. Fiehn, *RE* 2.R. 3 [1929] 2269). Inscriptions of the late 3rd and 4th C. describe Paros as a “splendid *polis*” and mention city officials such as the *protos* of the *polis* and the *gymnasiarchos* (O. Rubensohn, *RE* 18 [1949] 1830f). The bishop of Paros was suffragan of Rhodes; seals of its 11th-C. bishop Constantine have been published (Laurent, *Corpus* 5.1, nos. 710–11). At the end of the 11th C. a combined metropolis of Paronaxia (Paros and Naxos), without suffragans, was established (*Notitiae CP* 11.84).

Paros suffered from Arab attacks in the 9th C., and in the early 10th C., according to the vita of *Theoktiste* of Lesbos, it was deserted and visited only by hunters. There seems to have been revival by the 12th C.—at least a hoard of Byz. copper coins from Manuel I to Alexios IV was found at Naoussa (S.McA. Mosser, *A Bibliography of Byzantine Coin Hoards* [New York 1935] 57). After 1204 the island fell to the Venetian Marco I Sànnulo and became part of the duchy of Naxos; despite an attack by the fleet of Alexios Philanthropenos in 1263, Paros remained part of the duchy until its dissolution ca.1579.

Abundant remains testify to the prosperity of the island in late antiquity (e.g., A.K. Orlandos, *PraktArchEt* [1960] 245–57); the most important church is the Virgin Hektontaptylian in Parokia, perhaps built in the 4th C. with four free-standing cross-arms and rebuilt in the 6th C. with a dome (A.K. Orlandos, 6 *IntCongChrArch* [Vati...
can 1965] 159–68). Frankish castles are preserved at Naoussa and Paroikia and on Antiparos.


**PAROUSIA** (παρουσία, lit. “advent,” sometimes δευτέρα παρουσία), Christ’s Second Coming, presented (and described) in connection with Matthew 24 by Cyril of Jerusalem (PG 33:869–916) and others. Although parallel to the first advent (the INCARNATION), the Second Parousia differs from it in that it will be Christ’s coming in glory, a victory over the ANTICHRIST, the “restoration” of the cosmos, and resurrection of the dead. Special signs will distinguish Christ from the Antichrist, esp. “the brilliant sign of the cross” that was formerly the instrument of the crucifixion, while angels with trumpets serve as heralds, ceremonial attendants, and escorts. The main event of the Parousia will be the LAST JUDGMENT.

In his sermon, Cyril criticized Markellos of Ankyra, who denied that Christ would reign “after the end of the world,” since the Logos who had proceeded from the Father and then had returned to him ceased to exist as an individual being. Accordingly, the First Council of Constantinople (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS) or added to the Confession of Faith a sentence—directed against Markellos—that “the kingdom of Christ will have no end.” Later homilies combined the theme of the Parousia with a portrayal of the Last Judgment and/or HELL or with exhortations to do good works.

In artistic representations Parousia found its expression in the image of the HETOIMASIA, or the throne prepared for Christ’s coming.


**PARRHESIA** (παρρησία), literally, “freedom of speech.” In a secular context this came to mean (from the 4th C. onward) the license allowed a privileged official or orator to offer cautious advice or reproof to an emperor, and so, by extension, the right to have access to the emperor (cf. MIRROR OF PRINCES). In a religious context the term comes to mean a confidence in dealing with God and men that is drawn from faith and a righteous life, and that belongs in particular to saints.


**PARTHENOPHTHORIA** (παρθενοφθορία, lit. “corruption of virgins”), a judicial fine, considered a part of aërikon, ostensibly imposed for rape, probably of unmarried girls, and perhaps for related crimes (abduction, etc.). The term appears almost exclusively in the exemption clauses of chrysobulls from the second half of the 13th through the 14th C. as one of a very small number of rights and privileges (sometimes called demasiaka kephalaia [“public chapters”] and including PHONIKON and the TREASURE TROVE) that the state usually reserved for itself and did not grant to landowners.

LIT. Solovjev-Mošin, *Grčke povelje* 477–79. —M.B.

**PARTITIO ROMANIAE**, one of the fundamental documents of the LATIN EMPIRE, published Sept.—early Oct. 1204 (Heyd, Zakythinos, Carile) or 12 Apr.—9 May 1204 (Oikonomides). After the Fourth Crusade’s conquest of Constantinople, a committee of 24 (12 Venetians, 12 non-Venetians) apportioned lands to the Latin emperor, the Venetians, and other Crusaders. The emperor was to have a quarter of the empire, the others three-eighths each. Each party received territory in both Thrace and more remote lands. The list of places and districts in the *Partitio Romanae* derives from Byz. documents, esp. tax registers, as is demonstrated by its use of Byz. technical terms. The *Partitio* lists separately the lands of some great landowners: the Kontostephanoi and Kamytsai in the Meander valley, the Raoul near the Kallipolis peninsula, and the Branas and Katakouzenos families in the Peloponnnesos. Lands belonging to Empress Euphrosyne Doukaina Kama tera (in Thessaly) and to her daughter Irene (in the Peloponnnesos) are also mentioned. Oikonomides argues that the *Partitio* was created on the basis of the final tax-levises received by Alexios IV (Sept. 1203) and that the areas omitted in the text were already outside imperial control in 1203.
PARTNERSHIP (kouwònia). In Roman and Justinianic law (Digest 17.2.31) societas or koinonia referred to the partnership of two or more people entered into by private contract, founded for the realization of common profits and for division of losses. It is carefully distinguished (Digest 17.2.31) from communio (common ownership, Digest 10.3), which could come into being through a societas (when there was newly acquired property or profit) or without it (e.g., where there were several survivors after a death who shared the inheritance). Later law did not introduce a Greek term to correspond to communio and spoke only of to koinon pragmà (cf. Basil. 12.1.2). In spite of the risk of confusion—since the individual partner as well as the individual owner of common property was called a socius (koinoñes)—later law appears to have maintained consistently the difference between partnership and common ownership (cf. Eclaga 16.2; Nov. Leo VI 103; Peira 21). In particular, various other forms of common ownership such as the village community, guild community, or monastic community (e.g., the koinotes tou Hagiou Orous) were not treated according to the rules of the law of partnership or common ownership, indicating that the norms cited for the koinonia were important mainly for partnerships for commercial gain, while the old proscriptions on sharing remained in force for common ownership. A formula for the division of pieces of land has survived (Sathas, MB 6:631f). In monastic documents koinonia and its derivatives appear only in the sense of "togetherness."

Examples of Partnerships. Some evidence for Byz. partnership is preserved in several papyri of the 6th C. and in various later documents, some of them Italian. A contract between two carpenters of 568 establishes a partnership of labor, not capital; the partners had to share the profits equally after deducting their expenses; they also agreed to work with the efficiency expected of craftsmen of Antinoe. Partnerships of the 14th–15th C. involved a workshop, a boat, salt-pan (in Thessalonike); these partnerships were of limited character and of relatively short duration; the partners kept separate accounting books. Textbooks of mathematical problems often deal with the foundation and dissolution (dialysis) of trade associations.

PASCHAL II (Rainerius), pope (from 13/14 Aug. 1099); born Bieda di Galeata, Romagna, died Rome 21 Jan. 1118. The main problem during Paschal's pontificate was the struggle against the German kings Henry IV and Henry V. The pope was taken prisoner in 1111 and was forced to submit; he later repudiated his decision and was compelled to leave Rome, to which he returned to die a week later. When Paschal fought for papal primacy, it was against the Western emperor and the councils (U.-R. Blumenthal, ArchHistPont 16 [1978] 67–92) rather than Constantinople.

The evidence concerning Paschal's relations with Alexios I is preserved in Western chronicles in a legendary form. According to them, Paschal supported Bohemund of Antioch against Byz.—whether he acted consciously or was deceived by Bohemund remains unclear. Albert of Aachen reports that in 1102 a certain Manasses, bishop of an unknown Barzenona, denounced Alexios before the pope. This prepared the way for Bohemund's arrival in 1105, when his desire to start a new crusade met with enthusiastic response from Paschal. Bohemund's expedition directed against Byz. failed in 1108. The Chronicle of Montecassino reports that in 1112 the Byz. emperor suggested union of the churches to Paschal in exchange for his coronation with the crown of the Western Empire, for which he was ready to enter Rome. P. Classen (JMedHist 3 [1977] 207–12) denies the historicity of the Chronicle. Some negotiations did occur, however, and Paschal's utter humiliation by Henry V and his negotiations were followed by the mission of Peter Grossolanus to Constantinople.

---

PASchal ChronIcle. See Chronicon Paschale.

PASSIO. See Martyrion.

PASSION OF CHRIST, a term encompassing the last episodes of his life from the Agony In the Garden of Gethsemane to the CRucifixion. The Passion (παθός, “suffering”) was a sacrifice that Christ accepted voluntarily, and it resulted in the redemption of mankind from the damnation of ORIGINAL SIN. Having rejected at an early period the docetic teaching that the Passion was only an appearance of suffering, Christian thought encountered the problem of whether it was the human or divine nature of Christ that experienced the Passion. Pseudo-Athanasios of AlexandrIa, in his Dialogue on the Holy Trinity (PG 28:1253D–1256A), refuted the views of ApollinarIs of LaodiKeia that it was the Logos who had suffered and proclaimed the concept that Christ (Logos) had borne the Passion “not by his nature but by oikonomia,” or because of his sympathy with mankind. Some Old Testament images—the paschal lamb, the sacrifice of Isaac, Daniel in the lions’ den, Jonah and the whale—served as prefigurations of the Passion, and ritual fasting was perceived as a preparation for the Passion. The cult of the cross emphasized the liberating role of the Passion, and martyrs were construed as imitations of Christ so that it is often difficult to distinguish the historical event of martyrs’ deaths from hagiographical interpretation of the acts of martyrs as a repetition of Christ’s suffering. Christ’s Passion incited manifold literary works (P. PseuToNkas, Hai peri staurou kai pa-thous tou Kyrivou homiliai [Thessalonike 1975]), e.g., Christos Paschon.

Representation in Art. The events of Christ’s Passion—including all of Holy Week (Entry into Jerusalem through Anastasis) or only Holy Thursday through Easter (Last Supper through Anastasis)—were depicted less frequently in Early Christian art than either the Infancy of Christ or his Miracles, but they constitute the very heart of post-Ikonoclastic imagery. Initially, Passion scenes emphasized Christ’s triumph over death and entry into kingship, as on 4th-C. “Passion” sarcophagi, where scenes of his betrayal, arrest, and trial accompany triumphal motifs like the cross flanked by birds, the Entry into Jerusalem, or the Traditio Legis. Sacrificial scenes, esp. the Crucifixion, appear only in the 5th C., and then sparingly. Passion cycles of the 6th C. (Rossano Gospels; Sant’Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna), though dwelling on Christ’s humanity, omit the Crucifixion, and the Monza AMPULLAE show the crucified Christ in the triumphal form of an imago clipeata. The fully developed Crucifixion scene appears late in the 6th C. (Rabbula Gospels, fol.137r). Three icons at Sinai dated to the 7th–8th C. (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, nos. B32, B36, B50) isolate Christ, Mary, and John in a composition thereafter standard for Crucifixion icons. Christ is shown dead, emphasizing his sacrifice.

The theme of God’s human death dominates post-Ikonoclastic Passion imagery, generating compositions of great physical and emotional poignancy. Monumental cycles of the 10th and 11th C. focus on the Great Feasts, but MSS, ivories, and panel paintings develop a rich vocabulary of satellite images. The marginal Psalters are especially interesting, showing already in the 9th C. the elevation of the cross, Christ receiving the vinegar, the lance-thrust, and—in the 11th C.—Christ ascending the cross. Other powerful compositions created in the 10th–11th C. were inspired by sermons and hymns: the Deposition from the Cross, the Holy Women mourning Christ’s body (see Myrrophoroi), the Virgin’s lament over it (the Threnos), its anointment on the stone of unction, Mary fainting beneath the cross. Such imagery was incorporated in the 11th-C. monastic liturgies, which in turn generated the great Komnenian Passion icons: the Virgin Eleousa, the Man of Sorrows, the Virgin of the Passion. During the 12th C., emotionally charged scenes like the Deposition, Threnos, and Entombment penetrated the liturgically focused monumental cycles (see Nerezi), and late 12th-C. Gospel books assembled extensive Passion cycles. Yet lengthier cycles emerged in Palaiologan mural painting, esp. in Serbian churches, where the Passion unfolds in some 20 scenes.


—G.P., A.W.C.
PASTOPHORIA (παστοφόρια). In the singular form, in the Old Testament, the term denoted the treasury and the priests’ quarters in the temple of Solomon. Pastophoria are first mentioned in the 4th-C. Apostolic Constitutions (2.57.3) and described as a sacristy consisting of two parts located at the eastern part of the church building.

In scholarly literature the term is used to designate two auxiliary chambers within a church building used as sacristies, the diaikonikon (or skewophylikion) and the prothesis. They commonly flank the apse and sometimes form with it the tripartite sanctuary. This arrangement appears to have had its origins in northern Syria. The term diaikonikon, found in authors from the 4th C. onward, designated the sacristy where sacred vessels were kept; it was used by deacons, thus explaining its name. In the early period it could be a separate building, as in the vita of Sabas by Cyril of Skythopolis (102.4). The term skewophylikion (lit. “place to keep the vessels”) appears by the 7th C.; it may also have originally been a separate building. The prothesis was the eucharistic bread, the table on which the offertory was performed, and the sacristy on the north side of the bema where the eucharistic elements were prepared. The name diaikonikon came to be restricted to the corresponding sacristy south of the apse, used for purposes that varied from place to place. Liturgical commentaries interpreted the prothesis rite as representing the self-emptying of Jesus (kenosis: Phil 2:5–11) in his birth and death, and the prothesis chamber as an analogue of Bethlehem and Calvary (PG 140:429C–432A; 155:348AC). In Palaeologan art, accordingly, it was sometimes decorated with an image of the dead Christ or Man of Sorrows. Pastophoria were accessible from the aisles of the church and communicated directly with the apse or bema. They account for the triple apses typical of Byz. churches from the 9th C. onward.


Paten and Asteriskos (δίκος, ἀστερίς, lit. “little star”) were essential liturgical vessels: the first was a flat plate with high sides, which held the bread of the Eucharist, while the second was a raised metal “star,” which stood on the plate and supported a protective veil (diskokalymma) over the sacrament. The author of the church history ascribed to Germanos I compared the paten to the hands of Joseph of Arimathea and Nikodemos who removed Christ’s body from the cross and to the circle of heaven... enclosing Christ the intelligible sun” (ed. N. Borgia, ch.98, p.31.11–16).

The earliest extant example of the paten is in the 4th-C. Durobrivae Treasure, of the asteriskos in the 6th-C. Sion Treasure. Many silver patens bearing prominent dedicatory inscriptions and large engraved crosses survive in the Beth Misona Treasure, the Kaper Koraon Treasure (which also has two patens showing the Communion of the Apostles), and other treasures. The paten also functioned with the chalice with which it was verbally linked— as a diskopoterion—from at least the 7th C., when an archdeacon is known to have obtained such a set in Constantinople for the monastery of St. Theodore of Sykeon (vita, ch.42.1–5).

Patens from the 10th C. onward often display a lobed border reminiscent of early Christian offering tables (Treasures 3:20) and a eucharistic inscription quoted from the Liturgy of St. Basil. A gold paten found in Preslav is decorated with a cross, while others depict Christ, the Last Sup-
per, the Crucifixion, the Man of Sorrows, or a church’s patron saint. An elaborate example in Venice (Treasury S. Marco, no. 18) is carved in alabaster and mounted in gilded silver with enamel, rock crystals, and pearls. A superb paten in Halberstadt Cathedral is made of repoussé silver (Rice, Art of Byz., no. 136), while ordinary examples were of beaten bronze with engraved decoration. Gold or silver gilded asteriskoi are recorded together with patens in inventories. Other asteriskoi were of bronze.


M.M.M., L.P.B.

PATERIK (from Gr. paterika), Slavonic name for any of various hagiographic and apophthegmatic collections. The translated pateriki include versions of the Spiritual Meadow of John Moschos (Sinaiski Paterik), the Lausiac History of Palladios of Galatia (Egipetski Paterik), and anonymous Apopthegmata Patrum (Skitskij Paterik and Azbučno-Ierusalimskij Paterik); see M. Capaldo, W. Veder in Polata kûnigos’niaja 4 [March 1981] 26–78. In the literature of Rus’ (see Rus’, Literature of) the Paterik of the Kievian Caves monastery contains tales of the monastery’s history and inhabitants; it was ostensibly compiled as a correspondence between Bp. Simon of Vladimir and the monk Polikarp in the mid-1220s. Polikarp cited Sinaiskij Paterik and Skitskij Paterik, and the work also echoes motifs of other translated pateriki, as well as Ephrem the Syrian and perhaps some pseudoepigrapha (G. Lenhoff, Russian History 10 [1983] 141–53). The Kievian Paterik gives some information on Greeks in Kiev, esp. those hired from Constantinople to build and decorate the monastery’s Church of the Dormition (founded 1073); it also refers occasionally to Byz. internal affairs (e.g., on Jews in the empire). Despite its reliance on Byz. literary models, the Kievian Paterik contains substantial quasi-historical narratives dealing with specifically Kievian society.


S.C.F.

PATERIKA (paterikai, usually as an adjective with βιβλία, “[the books about] the fathers”), a designation of hagiographical texts often of apopthegmatic type without special differentiation; the term was in use by the 7th C., when Leontios of Neapolis related that John Elemon “read many paterika.” According to Theophanes the Confessor, Constantine V burned many monastic books and paterika, as well as relics. The Typikon of St. Sabas mentions paterika for the whole year. The term was taken over by Church Slavonic as PATERIK.

LIT. H. Gelzer, Leontios von Neapolis (Freiburg-Leipzig 1893) 184ff.

A.K.

PATER PNEUMATIKOS (pater pνυματικός), spiritual father or confessor. In principle, only priests and hieromonachi were permitted to hear confession, but in fact simple monks also served as confessors, as emphasized in the Letter on Confession of Symeon the Theologian (ed. K. Holl, Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum [Leipzig 1898] 110–27). Thus in the mid-10th C. Paul of Latros heard a peasant’s confession and imposed on him a penitence of three years (vita, ch.32, pp.142f). It was customary for the hegoumenos of a male monastery to serve as confessor to his monastic community, even if he was not a priest (although this latter practice was contrary to canon law). At nunneries, on the other hand, the hegoumenes was prohibited from hearing confession (even though in the typikon for the Kecharitomene nunnery [ed. Gautier, 53.600] she is termed meter pneumatike), and a priest came from outside to hear the nuns’ confessions. The Kecharitomenetypikon (p.59.721–26) specified that all the nuns were to have the same confessor and that he should be a ēunuch. He was also responsible for conducting the election of a new hegoumenes. At the Lips nunnery the confessor (who could be either a solitary or a cenobitic monk) usually came once a month for three days, but would make extra visits if the need arose (Typikon, ed. Delehaye, chs. 11–13). At this
convent the spiritual father was also charged with the investigation of an incompetent or unworthy mother superior. The relationship between a hightborn nun and her pater pneumatikos is well illustrated by the correspondence between Irene Choumnaina and her two successive spiritual directors in the 14th C.

Symeon the Theologian strongly emphasized the role of the pater pneumatikos and promoted the veneration of his spiritual father, Symeon the Eulabes. This cult of individual, personal, extra-hierarchical relations between the spiritual father and son elicited criticism from the patriarch of Constantinople, and Symeon the Theologian was temporarily sent into retirement. Some monks served as the spiritual advisers of secular dignitaries and emperors, for example, Ioannikios in the case of Alexios I Komnenos (An.Komm. 1:323–5).


-A.M.T.- A.K.

PATIR (Πατήρ; cf. W. Holtzmann, BZ 26 [1926] 341-32), site in Italy of the Greek monastery of S. Maria, about 8 km west of Rossano; usually called the New Hodegetria of Rossano. It was founded during the early years of the 12th C. by the Calabrian monk Bartholomew of Simeri, whose vita (BHG 235) describes the life of anchorites in the mountains near Rossano and the establishment of Patir. The patron of the monastery was the admiral Christodoulos, a high official of Greek descent at the Norman court of Sicily who was titled protonobelissimos. Despite the resistance of the Greek archbishop of Rossano, Nicholas Maleinos, Bartholomew placed the new foundation under the protection of Rome and was granted privileges by Pope Paschal II (in 1105) as well as by Norman authorities. Nevertheless Bartholomew did not sever all ties with Byz.; his hagiographer relates that he visited Alexios I in Constantinople and received there gifts—icons, MSS, and sacred vessels. The hagiographer also reports that a rich patriarchiis donated the monastery of St. Basil on Mt. Athos to Bartholomew.

Throughout the 12th C. Patir had an important Greek scriptorium. Many MSS from the monastery are now in the Vatican Library. The documents from Patir’s archive (the earliest is of 1083) are scattered through various collections. The monastery functioned until 1806.

Art and Architecture. The church of Bartholomew’s monastery survives. It is characteristically Norman, with three basilicas. A 16th-C. description mentions frescoes in the central cupola, which seems to have been since replaced. The fragmentary mosaic pavement is dated by the inscription of the mid-12th-C. Abbot Blasius.

-V.v.F., D.K.

PATMOS (Πάτμος), island in the Dodecanese, near the coast of Asia Minor. Little known in antiquity, Patmos was reputedly the place where the exiled St. John the Apostle (also called the Theologian) wrote the APOCALYPSE (Rev 1:9–10) and, according to one tradition, the Fourth Gospel (N. Sevchenko, in I. Moni Haghtou Ioannou tou Theologou—900 Chronia istorikes martyrias [Athens 1989] 169–78). In the 10th C. (?) John Kaminiates (57.10–13) described Patmos as a waterless island where the Arab fleet stopped on its way back from Thessalonike. In 1088 Alexios I gave Patmos to Christodoulos of Patmos, who founded the monastery of St. John the Theologian there (see below). A land survey of the late 11th C. calculates the area of Patmos as 3,860 modioi (an incredibly low figure), of which only 627 modioi were arable and only 160 could be plowed by oxen (Dölger, Beiträge 86f).

From the end of the 11th C. onward Patmos was the object of many attacks, e.g., of Tzachas ca.1090 and of Spanish Arabs during the reign of Manuel I. The Diegesis of a Patmian monk, Theodosios, relates that Philip II of France stopped at Patmos in 1191 and offered 30 golden Arabic coins as a gift to the monks. Patmos was taken by the Venetians in 1207. Following the fall of Constantinople, the Ottoman sultan Mehmed II in Aug.–Sept. 1454 granted privileges to “Matyos” (Matthew), metropolitan of Myra and kathegoumenos of Patmos, delegating him to collect the island’s taxes. In 1461 the monastery came under papal patronage (G. Hofmann, OC 11 [1928] 48f).
Monastery of St. John the Theologian. Despite the official encouragement and privileges granted to Christodoulos by Emp. Alexios I, the initial settlement of monks on the uninhabited and waterless island in 1088 was troubled. Christodoulos immediately began the construction of the monastery and its high defensive walls on a mountain peak dominating a view of the harbor. He composed three sets of rules for his new foundation: the Hypotyposis (1091), the Diatheke (Testament), and the Kodikellos (1093). Discontent among his followers, however, led him to abandon the island in 1092 and move to Euboea. Only after his death in 1093 did monks return with his body and resume work on the monastery. The earliest structures, the domed cross-in-square katholikon and the refectory, are unpretentious in design and masonry and use a considerable amount of early Christian spolia; none shows any signs of imperial involvement. The monastery, which had become stauropgal by 1132, began to flourish in the 12th C., aided by the customs exemptions granted to its boats, the revenues from its properties in Asia Minor, Crete, and nearby islands, and the growing fame of St. Christodoulos's relics, which reportedly possessed healing power. Its hegumenoi went on to high posts elsewhere (Leon-tios became patriarch of Jerusalem between 1174 and 1176). The monastery's increased connection with larger metropolitan centers in this period is confirmed by the sophisticated style and program of the fresco decoration of the refectory and of the chapel that was built ca.1185 onto the south flank of the church and dedicated not to the Virgin but to Leontios (D. Mouriki, DChAE 4 14 [1987–88] 205–63). Around this time the refectory was vaulted and repainted (still other frescoes there belong to the late 13th C.), the esonarthex of the church was built, and possibly also the exonarthex and the tomb chapel of St. Christodoulos off its south end. An inventory drawn up in 1200 attests to the existence of the monastic library in this period: about 330 MSS are listed, along with numerous icons, metalwork objects, and ecclesiastical vestments (ed. C. Astruc, TM 8 [1981] 15–30). Other catalogs also survive, from 1355 and 1382. The monastery apparently had its own scrinium. The rich archive of the acts of Patmos contains many imperial privileges, land surveys, and private acts revealing the economic growth of the monastery in the 12th–13th C.

A cave located down the hillside from the monastery came to be associated with the writings of St. John and gradually emerged as a second focus of interest on the island. A fresco in the cave showing John dictating to Prochoros dates from the late 12th C.

Though the wealth of the monastery and the fame of Christodoulos's relics drew the attacks of pirates, Arabs, Turks, and various Westerners, and though the monastery underwent hard times in the late 13th–15th C., it was never taken by force; this, plus its renewed prosperity in Ottoman times, has meant that its rich archives, dating back to the 11th C., and its collections of relics, icons, church treasures, and MSS have been preserved to a remarkable degree.

source. Patmos Engrapho, vols. 1–2.


T.E.G., N.P.S.

PATRAS (Πάτρας), city in the northwestern Peloponnesos, at the mouth of the Gulf of Corinth. Its location, astride important east-west commercial routes, and the cult of St. Andrew gave it significance. It apparently survived the Slavic invasions, remaining in Byz. hands; ca.805 the city was saved from an attack by Arabs and Slavs, reputedly through the intervention of St. Andrew, thereafter the Slavs were obliged to maintain officials and envoys passing through Patras so that the metropolis was exempted from this burden (De adm. imp. 49.65–75). The noble widow Danelis accumulated a considerable fortune there and possessed numerous slaves. She greeted Basil (I) as the future emperor when he was sent to Patras by Michael III on state business (Theoph.-Cont. 226–28).

The bishop of Patras, originally suffragan of Corinth, was elevated to metropolitan rank, perhaps ca.805; from that time he is identified as metropolitan of Achaia (Notitia CP 2.39) and he was able to contest control of the Peloponnesos with his former superior. By the early 10th C. the bishops of Sparta, Methone, Korone, and Bolaine
were subject to Patras (7.549–55). The bishop also had unusual political and economic power.

The Crusaders took Patras in 1205 and created a barony there under the jurisdiction of the principality of Achaia. The Latin archbishopric of Patras was established ca. 1207. In 1267 the last baron, William II Aleman, sold his fief to the Latin archbishop of Patras for 16,000 hyperpers. From then until the early 15th C. the bishop was effectively an independent prince. At that time Venetian influence grew and they temporarily held the city; Constantine (XI) Palaiologos took Patras in 1430, but in 1460 it fell to the Turks.

Near the modern Church of St. Andrew is a subterranean fountain decorated with polychrome marbles; coins of the 4th C. and a tomb were found associated with it. Also known in Patras are a hagiasma of the 15th C. and an Early Christian basilica. The fortification of the citadel was probably carried out by the 6th C., although there was considerable rebuilding in the 13th and 15th C.


PATRIA (πατρία), the name of a literary genre devoted to local topography, monuments, history, and legends. The term appears first in Kallinikos of Petra, who lived under Diocletian and wrote On the Patria of Rome, fragments of which have survived. The 5th–6th-C. patria of Tarsos, Anazarbos, Berytus, and Nicaea (by a certain Claudian), those of Thessalonike, Miletus, Tralles, Aphrodisias, and Nakle in Syria (by Christodoros of Koptos), patria of Hermopolis and of Alexandria by Hermias of Hermopolis and Horapollon, respectively, are mentioned in various sources (Photios, the Souda) but lost. Several Isaurika were composed by Pamphotepos, Kandidos, Christodoros, and Kapiton. Traces of works of this genre can be found in Agathias, Malalas, and some other writers. After the 6th C. the genre of provincial patria disappeared, but the local chronicle of the capital seems to be represented by the Patria of Constantinople.


PATRIA OF CONSTANTINOPLE, or Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum, conventional titles of a collection of texts devoted to the history and the monuments of Constantinople. It contains the patria of Constantinople by the “illustris” Hesychios of Miletos, revised in the 10th C.; the Parastaseis Symtomoi Chronika; the patria of ca. 995; the Story of the Construction of Hagia Sophia, written between the reign of Justin II and 995, probably in the 9th C.; and a topographical survey dedicated to Alexios I. To this group is related a post-Byz. text called “A Miraculous Story,” probably by John Malaxos, about the column of Xerophos in Constantinople (J. Paramelle, G. Dagron, TM 7 [1979] 491–523). The patria contains unique information about the origins of Constantinople and about its monuments, but sometimes fact is difficult to distinguish from Constantinopolitan legend. According to Dagron, the political purpose of the patria was to glorify the city and to debase the emperor, who does not appear in these texts either as the master of the Hippodrome or of Hagia Sophia, two major imperial strongholds according to De ceremoniis. In the patria the emperor is portrayed not in the midst of sumptuous ceremonial but as a private, “domesticated” individual whose main function is as a chronological indicator.


PATRIA POTESTAS (ἐξουσία). Under Roman law, the descendants of a pater familias, even if of age, remained under his authority until the father died or until he emancipated them. In the Byz. period, the personal aspect of the patria potestas was essentially reduced to the principle that an hypexousios (i.e., someone subject to authority) can marry only with the father’s consent (cf., e.g., Peira 1.1), but when it came to property rights, the principle was maintained that those subject to
authority could not acquire their own property except for a part of the peculium (cf. Ecl. 16, Epanagoge 31, Prochiron 22, Tractatus de peculiis). The post-Justinianic sources provide no certain information on the manner, the reason, and time of the release from patria potestas, though they suggest that the patria potestas ends with the attainment of majority. Whether marriage brought with it the release from patria potestas remains controversial: the Prochiron (26.7) repeats the old law, by which even a married (minor?) son was still subject to the patria potestas, but novel 25 of Leo VI defines a son of the house as already emancipated if he lives an independent life with the (tacit) agreement of the person in authority; this should hold even when he is not married. At marriage a daughter is transferred from the patria potestas of her father (cf. Peira 49.9) to that of her husband, from which she is released if her husband goes bankrupt (cf. Peira 25.9 and 38.6) or if the marriage is terminated (cf. Peira 38.9 and 45.8).


PATRIARCHAL SCHOOL, sometimes called the “Patriarchal Academy,” modern term for an academic institution organized in Constantinople in the 12th C. Its foundation was laid in 1107 by Alexios I, who established three positions for didaskaloı: the teachers of the Gospel, of the Apostle, and of the Psalter. These presumably taught theology, mainly to future clergy or monks. Probably by the mid-12th C. the office of the maistor ton rhetoron was added. The Patriarchal School was located in Hagia Sophia; it is not clear whether some adjacent church schools, in which grammar inter alia was taught, were connected with it. The didaskaloı, who belonged to the corps of deacons of Hagia Sophia, often ended their careers as bishops in the provinces.

The question of the existence of the Patriarchal School prior to 1107 has been hotly debated. Some scholars (e.g., Dvornik) assume the uninterrupted existence of a theological academy from the days of Constantine I to 1453. As Lemerle (Humanism 105–07, 211–14) has demonstrated, however, the evidence for an earlier foundation of the Patriarchal School, such as the use of the term oikoumenikos didaskalos, is questionable; so too is Dvornik’s hypothesis of a Photian reorganiza-

tion of a previously established Patriarchal School (AB 68 [1950] 108–25). Moreover, the story of Leo III’s execution of 12 didaskaloı has been shown to be an iconodule legend. Darrouzès thinks that the Patriarchal School flourished in the 12th C., but that some didascalic offices were previously in existence. Clearly the patriarchate must have had some institution for training clergy, though its nature may have changed through time.


PATRIARCHATES. The term and its cognate “patriarch” were originally used to designate prominent and respected members of the episcopate (PG 36:485B). In the 6th C., the title of “patriarch” acquired its precise canonical sense by being applied particularly to the incumbents of the five major sees (Justinian I, nov.123.3). The term patriarchate (πατριαρχείον) designated in the 6th C. the residence of a patriarch (Malal. 468.7) and, thereafter, patriarchal see (e.g., pseudo-John of Damascus, PG 95:332C-D).

A general trend toward ecclesiastical centralization—the practice of grouping several provinces under one central authority—began in the 4th C. The bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch were in fact exercising supra-metropolitan jurisdiction beyond the limits of their own frontiers or adjoining provinces before 300. The status of these sees, however, was first recognized de jure canonico by Nicaea I (canon 6). In 381, at Constantinople I (see under Constantinople, Councils of) this list was modified to include the dioceses of Thrace (Herakleia), Pontus (Caesarea in Cappadocia), and Asia (Ephesus) headed by “exarchs of dioceses.” Likewise, the council decided to place Constantinople, as the newly emerging capital of the empire, second after Rome in order of precedence (but without extending its jurisdiction), while Alexandria was given third place (canon 3). In effect, the church was modeling its own organization on the civil diocesan division of the empire—the principle of political accommodation sanctioned earlier by Nicaea (canon 4). In the words of the church historian Sokrates, the council had “constituted patriarchs” (Skr. HE 5.8). This terminology was premature, since the primates of these dioceses were
in fact called exarchs. Besides, even though the canonical foundations for the erection of patriarchates had been laid, the system was not yet fully in place. This was achieved at the Council of Chalcédon (451) when Thrace, Pontus, and Asia were placed under the jurisdiction of Constantinople, while Jerusalem was added to the list (canon 28). The number of patriarchates was thus restricted to five and a precise order of precedence established: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem.

The decision of 451 resolved the bitter struggle for hegemony among the sees; nonetheless, it also created a new rivalry. Alexandria had not in fact abandoned its claims to preeminence in the East. Hence its repeated and often successful attempts to thwart the rise of Constantinople. Therefore, canon 28, confirming Constantinople’s jurisdiction over its neighboring territories, was a de facto challenge to Egypt’s pretensions. Scholars are equally agreed (Dvornik, Hermann, Jugié, Meyendorff) that the canon was not intended to deny Rome’s honorary primacy among the patriarchates. Even so, a new rivalry, between Rome and Constantinople, was now generated. Fearing that Constantinople’s new status might undermine its own position, Rome refused to ratify the canon. The Roman position emphasized that the “Petrine” criterion of apostolicity alone, that is, the founding of a see by Peter, was to determine patriarchal status. The idea of hierarchy of patriarchates was accepted by the secular authority, and Justinian I (nov. 131.2) placed Rome at the first place and Constantinople at the second, without mentioning other patriarchal sees. The struggle for primacy between Rome and Constantinople grew stronger, when the bishop of Constantinople claimed the epithet of the ecumenical patriarch. Political independence of Rome from Byz. contributed to its success in the struggle for primacy, however; therefore, by the 11th C. Byz. theoreticians elaborated the theory of pentarchy—the nominal equality of five patriarchates—even though by this time oriental patriarchates (Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem) had lost their significance and could not compete with Rome and Constantinople.

Besides the five traditional patriarchates, some new ones were created. In the West the title of patriarch was only a solemn epithet, and the patriarch of Aquileia/Grado (since the 6th C.) was not the pope’s rival. In the East new patriarchates emerged either in non-Orthodox churches (e.g., Armenian) or in Orthodox lands as a symbol of their political independence from Constantinople, as in Bulgaria (mid-13th C.) and Serbia under Stefan Uroš IV Dušan.


PATRIKIA ZOSTE. See Zoste Patrikia.

PATRIKIOS (πατρικιός), high-ranking dignity etymologically connected with the Roman status of patricius. The dignity of patrikios was introduced by Constantine I as an honorific title without specific administrative functions; according to a 5th-C. historian (Zosim., bk.2.40.2), the patrikios was placed above the praetorian prefect. The importance of the patrikios increased in the West, where the title was bestowed in the 5th C. on powerful magistri militum and in the 8th C. on Frankish kings. It had less importance in the East, where Justinian I made it available to all illustres. In the taktika of the 9th and 10th C. it occupies the place between anthypatos and protospatharios; in the 8th–10th C. this dignity was granted to the most important governors and generals. Depreciated thereafter, patrikios disappeared after the beginning of the 12th C.

Theodosios II tried to disqualify eunuchs from this title but in the late 9th-C. Kleroterologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 137.18) eunuch patrikioi hold a high place, before the strategoi. The insignia of the patrikios was an inscribed ivory tablet. The title of protopatrikios is attested between 364 and 711 (A. Karamaloude, Symmeikta 5 [1989] 161–68). The title patrikia designated the spouse or widow of a patrikios (Seibt, Bleßiegel 258–60), with the exception of Zoste Patrikia, which was a specific female dignity.


—A.K.

PATRIOTISM (φιλοστράτια). Local patriotism was inherited from the Roman Empire, persisted in hagiography’s literary conventions (vitae sometimes praise a saint’s birthplace), and spurred
rhetorical ekphrases early and late in the empire’s history, for example, Prokopios of Gaza and the Nikaeus of Theodore Metochites. It possibly nourished the Patria of Constantinople, which may be a local Constantinopolitan reaction to imperial power (Dagron, *CP imaginaire* 17–19), and may underlie geographic family names. Awareness of Romania, a new cultural-political identity, fostered a second, transregional patriotism that drew on loyalty to the emperor, anti-barbarism, a sense of Byz.’s atemporal universality closely connected with its Christianizing mission, and shared cultural traditions. While the emperor’s primordial role remained constant—the dialogue Philopatris (The Patriot) is mostly concerned with loyalty to an emperor, not to Byz.—the contribution of the other elements changed; for example, the Christian component merged with anti-barbarism and became a militant hatred of “infidels” like Jews and Muslims (e.g., the “Christ-loving tagmata” of Constantine VII, ed. R. Vári, *BZ* 17 [1908] 75–85) and later of Latin or Armenian Christians.

The West perceived Byz. “Greekkness” from the 8th C. and, refurbished by the Macedonian revival, Hellenism slowly gained strength in Byz. patriotism. Sheer survival against overwhelming odds added a providential dimension: Byz. was “the only empire God has fixed indissoluble on earth” (Nicholas I Mystikos, ep.25.105–07). This combined with a sense of divine election and cultural superiority—theirs was the language of the Apostles and Homer—to swell Byz. arrogance toward the barbaroi (see Barbarians), even Orthodox ones. Expressions of patriotism peaked during crises (e.g., after Alaric’s sack of Rome or the Latin sack of Constantinople), but late Byz. decline provoked a crisis in patriotism—how could the chosen people of an eternal empire be so maltreated by God (C.J.G. Turner, *BZ* 57 [1964] 346–73)? The response came in Pletnon’s relativizing the destiny of the empire (limited for Pletnon to Greece and the capital, according to Beck, *Ideen*, pt.VI [1960], 91f) and the more traditional view of catastrophe as chastisement for sin. The latter reinforced Orthodoxy as a kind of surrogate patriotism allied with Greek culture, which, by its anti-Latin hatred, undermined the emperors’ diplomatic efforts to seek union with the West in order to halt the Turkish advance.


---

**PATROCINIUM VICORUM** (lit. “protection of estates”), a specific type of social patronage whereby a rural cultivator placed himself under the protection of a powerful patron (patronus), who received in exchange cash or (more commonly) possession of his client’s land. It developed out of (and by the 4th C. largely displaced) the urban *patrociniun civilitatis*. Patrons included military officials, civil bureaucrats, large landowners, and curiales; clients generally comprised free peasants or free *coloni* (*Cod.Theod.* XI 24.1), although *adscriptiici* and even slaves are also attested (*Cod.Just.* XI 54.1). Clients enjoyed patrons’ influence in law courts, and *coloni* invoked their protection in disputes with landlords (Libanios, *On Patronage* [ed. Harmand 17–20]). Above all, patrons could reduce their clients’ tax liabilities by pressuring officials of the fisc or—in the case of curiales—by controlling local assessment. The exact nature of the *patrociniun vicorum* remains the subject of considerable discussion, in particular whether it led to the transformation of free peasants into serfs of their patron or simply signified the transfer of properties that had been under the control of curiales to great landowners not restricted by urban organization (A. Kzhizhan, *VDI* [1953] no.3, 102f).

The central government initially refused to accept the legality of *patrociniun vicorum*, instead prohibiting it as a form of tax evasion (*Cod.Theod.* XI 24.4). Consequently, ties of patronage often assumed the guise of a (nominal) sale of land to the patron who, in turn, leased it back to his client; after the client’s death, however, his holding normally reverted to the patron, while his heirs became *coloni* (Salvian, *De gubernatione dei* in *MGH AuctAnt* 1:62f). Emp. Honorius legalized possession of lands acquired *sub patrocinio* prior to 397 and made patrons responsible for their clients’ *capitatio*. They were barred, however, from obtaining new lands in rural villages, and this prohibition was periodically renewed as late as Justinian I (nov.17).


---

"Made by Absens"

---

"Made by Absens"
PATRONAGE, SOCIAL (προστασία, Lat. patroncium). A system of patron-client relationships developed in the late Roman Empire; Libanius delivered a special oration On Patronage, while imperial legislation vainly endeavored to prohibit the practice (see Patrocinium Vicorum). The word prostasia was also employed with the non-technical meaning of support and protection (e.g., the vita of Patr. Euchthios, PG 86:2349D) and, metaphorically, for the protection of angels.

In later centuries there is evidence for the existence of various forms of patronage (usually not designated by the term prostasia), such as the dependency of anthropoi, friendship (philia), and esp. bureaucratic and imperial favoritism: thus Eustathios Boilas calls the local governor and his family "patrons or lords" (authentai); Psellus considered a man without influential patrons to be insignificant and boasted of the patronage he exercised for his friends. Clientele might also form a private "army" or hetaireia, although Byz. rhetoricians seem to have been looser and less stable than their Western counterparts. The terminology of patronage was largely modeled on servile (douloi) or household (oikeioi) relations. The term prostasia itself survived into the late Byz. period, being applied primarily to the supervision of ecclesiastical and monastic institutions (Docheir., no.6.72, after 1118; Lavra 3, no.138.16, a.1560).


PATRONS AND PATRONAGE. No Byz. equivalent existed for these terms, although epithets such as donor (doter) and entrepreneur (entalmatikos) are occasionally found; in modern usage, the concept of patron implies much more than the legal status of the term kteor. The provision of funds to build or decorate a monument, to construct a charitable institution, or copy a MS may have been a gesture little different from a grant of land, but this in no way disqualifies patronage as an activity considered significant in its own time and as a field of modern study. Patrons made major contributions to art, architecture, literature, and social welfare (philanthropy) throughout the history of the empire. The term patron is used here to denote an individual who conceived of a work, paid for its manufacture, or fundamentally affected its design. Yet founder and funder were by no means always the same person, so that the term patron may apply to one or more of the stages of creation.

Patronage of Art and Architecture. Beyond the expense of a monument and thus its degree of elaboration, it is often hard to identify the nature of the patron's intervention. Reflecting a cultural attitude toward production, literary sources attribute the creation of a work not to the architect or artist, but to an individual in political or monastic authority (Theodore Psalter) or to the purveyor of funds necessary to its undertaking. The Menologion of Basil II credits the emperor, rather than its scribe or painters, with "having created a book truly like unto heaven." Similarly, in an inscription at Kastoria, the patron Theodore Lemniotis, addressing the anargyroi to whom his church was dedicated, declares "I paint the pictures of your miracles."

The patron was not always the source of ideas, much less of the details in a work. A donor's wishes were more likely to be expressed in its content than in its manner of fabrication. Basil the Nothos sponsored MSS in radically different "styles." Particularly in small communities, where commissions were insufficient to justify a resident artist, a patron would have to rely on distant craftsmen or itinerant artists who, albeit ready to adapt schemes of decoration to his wishes, brought with them their own manners of working. Even on objects for personal use, subject matter did not always reflect an individual's choice. The iconography of lead seals—the most "private" of commissioned objects—could be and was dictated in part by the tradition of a family and social group. In monumental painting, the presence of locally revered saints might indicate regional rather than personal devotion. Images containing the portrait of the patron—a favorite means of advertising an act of donation, veneration, or supplication—were as much determined by social convention as by the taste of an individual. Communal and cooperative patronage, phenomena observed in 6th-C. Palestine, 11th-C. Cappadocia and southern Italy, and 14th-C. Crete, might face all but a donor's name from the work that resulted.

Nonetheless, the wishes of a mighty patron could carry great weight. The size and splendor of Jus-
tinian’s Hagia Sophia, it has been suggested, were a response to *Anicia Juliana’s* Church of St. Polyeuktos, while the Persian-looking sculpture found at the latter site might as well be an expression of personal taste as proof of the influx of foreign craftsmen.

The *personifications* of Megalopsychia (“magnanimity”) and *Love of Foundation* (*pathos tes phi-loktistou*) in Anicia’s Dioskorides MS reflect Aristotelian ideas of *virtue*, in which acts of patronage are duties required of the powerful. Similar attitudes are found in Gregory of Nazianzos’s funeral oration on his father, a builder. But, progressively, Christian notions of philanthropy supplemented and then replaced classical impulses. By the 6th C., when the perpetuation of one’s name was recognized as a main incentive to church building (proem to Justinian, nov.67), visions and miracles (*Prokopios, Buildings 1.6.6*) were as likely to impel creation of a building as love of earthly renown.

Whatever its cause, widespread construction of churches and monasteries stimulated employment and the circulation of goods (*Patlagean, Pawreté 196–203*). Professed motives for patronage—penance for a sin, thanksgiving for a cure, the desire for saintly intercession, or hope of one’s own and one’s relatives’ salvation—display remarkable consistency whatever the medium, place, or period in which they were expressed. Widely as well as personally felt, such sentiments led to buildings and objects in which, material value aside, social distinctions are virtually invisible. Whether a man was a member of the civil or military aristocracy, whether a dignitary came from the eastern provinces or the capital, his rank and origin were revealed not in the work that he sponsored, but in the inscriptions that it might bear. Conventionally these subscribe to the topos of *modesty* and often show that a sponsor was content to be identified as a “restorer” or “second founder” (*anakainistes*). On the other hand, Eumathios Philokales and others were proud to confess responsibility for building a church “from the very foundations.”

Patronage ran in families. Between ca.540 and 640 the lineal descendants of four or five clans continued to offer silver to their church at *Kaper Koraoön*. From the 10th C. onward, deceased family members were assembled in mausoleums (in Constantinople, for example) as they had foregath-
ered in life. In 12th-C. Kastoria successive generations of Lemniotai beautified the foundations of their predecessors. Beyond these microstructures, ethnic and other narrow groupings focused patronage at a particular site: Gregory *Parourianos* excluded Greeks from his foundation; *An-dronikos Palaiologos, despotes* of Thessalonike, supported the cloister of *Dionysios* on Mt. Athos because he saw it as “a monastery of our kindred.” Since conspicuous veneration was a socially approved habit, such displays entailed both ethical and paradigmatic consequences. Local priests seem always to have emulated their metropolitan superiors in this respect; from the 11th C. onward provincial magnates did likewise. When, in the 14th C., imperial sponsorship of art and architecture all but disappeared, its place was taken by commissions of aristocrats, bureaucrats, and monks.

From the 12th C. onward, women, usually of noble birth, emerged in number as patrons.

The donations that funded construction or embellishment varied widely in scale. “Even the poorest” member of a congregation was expected to offer at least one pound of silver, according to *Séveros of Antioch (PO 222:247)*. Almost contemporaneously, *Julianus “Argentarius”* spent 26,000 solidi on S. Vitale in Ravenna. The exceptional sum of 288,000 solidi expended on Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, in 532 is put into perspective by the fact that his first consulship (521) cost Justinian the same amount and by the supposition that a “normal church” was built for 14,400 solidi (*Hendy, Studies 201*); a small provincial church might cost much less (100 solidi: *AASS Mai. III:9*B). By no means were all offerings monetary: the people of Sparta collected building materials for a church for *Nikon ho Metaneitē,* while local *archontes* hired masons and gave him land and two antique columns. Some founders actually supervised the construction of their buildings, a scruple that led to the death of *Athanasiós of Athos*.

The role of most patrons in their commissions is usually undetectable and, where recorded, often mythical. Direct complicity is probable in the Bible of *Leo Sakkarios*, where the man’s verses as well as his likeness are prominent. Yet the degree to which *Photios* or *Leo of Ohrid* participated in the works associated with their names remains problematic. The desire of Khan Boris I for a hunting scene is plausible; his change of mind
and the picture of the Second Coming that ensued are best explained by Theophanes Continuatus (TheophCont 163.19–164.17) as the result of divine intervention. Part of the obscurity attaching to the creation of works of art, as against those of literature, lies in the nature of the medium: unlike writers, painters left no author's dedications or expressions of gratitude.

**Patronage of Literature.** The role of the patron of literary texts is relatively well known, thanks to their dedications and colophons. The emperor is often supposed to have played a leading role; in hagiographical texts there are many hints that they were commissioned by hegoumenoi of monasteries dedicated to particular saints. A change in the nature of patronage is evident in the 9th and 10th C.: patrons such as Arethas were more concerned with copying of MSS than with original creativity. In the 11th and esp. the 12th C., with the shift from the author-functionary (both secular and ecclesiastical) to the professional but begging author, the question of patronage acquired special significance: the uppermost echelon of the aristocracy assumed this role, alongside the emperor. It remains uncertain whether patrons of the 12th C. (many of them noblewomen, such as Anna Komnene or the sebastokratorissa Irene Komnene) were surrounded by circles of literati or acted strictly as individuals (Mullett, infra); at any rate, relations between a poet and his patron often lasted for years and reveal an enduring fealty, as in the case of Manganioke Prodomos. In the 14th C. the emperor's and court's monopoly of patronage was challenged by provincial aristocrats (Sevchenko, Soc. & Intell., pt.1 [1971], 69–92).

**Paul,** formerly named Saul; apostle and saint; feastday 29 June. He was considered in Byz. as the author of 14 epistles included in the New Testament. These epistles were broadly commented on by John Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyrus (their texts survive in full) and by many writers whose exegeses of Paul are known only from catenaes (Didymos of Alexandria, Eusebius of Emesa, Apollinaris of Laodikeia, Theodoret of Mopsuestia, Severianos of Gabala, etc.). The eventful life of Paul—his execution of Stephen the First Martyr, conversion on the road to Damascus, travels, martyrdom—inspired various apocryphal works: forged correspondence with Seneca, acts, and homilies. The major problem concerning Paul's reputation in Byz. was his relationship with Peter, who early became a symbol of Rome and the papacy. The Byz. insisted on their equality, called them both koryphai (princes of the apostles), and celebrated their feasts together; in addition to their common feastdays, Paul was celebrated on 1 Sept., in honor of his vision and conversion. On the other hand, Paul was esp. respected by sectarians, such as the Marcionites and Paulicians. Niketas Choniates stressed that Andronikos I was particularly fond of Paul's epistles and quoted them often.

Hagiographical tradition presents Paul as a bald man, three cubits tall, with gentle eyes and a white
complexion. John Chrysostom devoted several homilies to him to show that he was more significant than the heroes of the Old Testament: unlike Noah, he built his ark not of planks but epistles and saved not his family but the whole oikoumenè. Other eulogies of Paul were compiled by Proklos of Constantinople, Leo VI, Niketas Paphlagon, etc.

**Representation in Art.** Bearded, brown-haired, and balding, Paul joins Peter as the first of the apostles to exhibit a distinct iconographic type. He appears with Peter en buste on 4th-C. commemorative medals and gold glass as well as in scenes of his arrest and of the TRADITIO LEGIS on "Passion" sarcophagi. Scenes involving Paul but not Peter first appear in the 5th C.: Florence, Carrand Diptych (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, no.108); murals in San Paolo fuori le Mura (Rome).

His presence among the apostles, esp. in depictions of episodes preceding his conversion (e.g., *Appearances of Christ after the Passion, Ascension, Pentecost*), signals the symbolic rather than historical function of the apostles as an image of the church. Paul figures extensively in Byz. *Acts* cycles. These canonical scenes often recur in other contexts: his presence at the stoning of Stephen, his conversion and baptism, his preaching, the episodes at Lystra. He also appears alone or with Timothy in New Testament MSS before the texts of his epistles and occasionally in evangelist portraits of Luke. Noncanonical scenes are rare, although his beheading occurs in cycles of the apostles' martyrdoms, and his ecstatic meeting with Peter seems to have become an image of brotherly accord, appearing independently of other Pauline scenes. Monumental cycles of Paul's life are known only in Norman Sicily (Cappella Palatina, Palermo; Monreale), where Western influence is strong.


J.L. A.K., A.W.C.

**PAUL I**, bishop of Constantinople (ca.337–39; end of 341–beginning of 342; and beginning of 346–Sept. 351) and saint; born Thessalonike ca.300, died Koukousos 351; feastday 6 Nov. Scholars differ in their evaluation of Paul: for Telfer, he is a figure equal in significance to Ambrose of Milan, whereas Dagron attributes to Paul a minor role in events that was subsequently magnified by hagiographical legend. Paul was elected to the see of Constantinople ca.337, but soon replaced by the Arian Eusebios of Nikomedea. After the death of Eusebios, Paul was reelected but ran into resistance from the Arians; the conflict resulted in a popular rebellion in 342 during which the *magister equitum* Hermogenes, the representative of Emp. Constantius II, was killed in a skirmish. Consequently, Paul was exiled to Pontos, as *Athanasios of Alexandria* testifies, or to Thessalonike, as Dagron suggests. Thereafter Paul went to Italy in search of the support of Pope Julius, Athanasios of Alexandria, and the Western emperor Constans I. Under pressure from the West, Paul was reinstated but could not get along with the Arian government. It was probably after the death of Constans that Paul was accused of complicity in the usurpation of *Magnentius* (350–53) and exiled to Koukousos; Dagron hypothesizes that it was the same exile as his deportations to Singara and Emesa mentioned in *Athenasios*. In exile Paul was strangled—as the legend has it, by Arians. The cult of Paul had developed already by the 5th C., as a Constantinopolitan counterpart of *Athanasios*. A summary of his vita is included in *Phiotios's Bibliotheca* (cod. 257); it was reworked by Symeon Metaphrastes.


**PAUL I**, pope (29 May 757–28 June 767); born and died in Rome. Brother and successor to Pope Stephen II (752–57), Paul completed his brother's attempt to reduce Rome's dependence by Byz. and establish a system of Frankish protection. His consecration was delayed because of the opposition of a faction supporting the Byz. alliance, but Paul immediately notified Pippin III, king of the
Franks (751–68), about his election and pledged his loyalty to the pact that Pippin had concluded with Pope Stephen. In Italy, Desiderius, king of the Lombards (757–74), subjugated Spoletto and Benevento and was the major threat to the papacy. Paul tried to convince Pippin to intervene; the Franks, however, avoided military confrontation but by diplomatic means forced Desiderius to return to the pope some lands he had conquered. The threat of a Byz.-Lombard alliance was also real: Emp. Constantine V hoped to attract to this coalition a pro-Byz. party in Rome and some elements in the church of Ravenna, and he started negotiations with Pippin as well. The conflict between Rome and Constantinople focused on the question of Iconoclasm. Paul was an unyielding opponent of Iconoclasm; he supported eastern Iconophiles who emigrated to Rome, and he accommodated Greek monks in the monastery of Sts. Stephen and Silvester, founded in 761. The Byz. attempt to attract the Franks to Iconoclasm failed in 767 when the local synod of Gentilly approved of the Roman concept of the image.


A.K.

PAUL II. See under PYRRHOS.

PAULICIANS (Παουλικάιων, Arm. Pawlikeanк’), sect of Armenian origin that threatened the eastern provinces of Byz. between ca.843 and 879. At this time, the Paulicians had a separate state, with TEBRIZE as its capital. Under Karbeas and then Chrysocheir, they collaborated with the Muslims, raided as far afield as Nicaea, and sacked Ephesus in 869/70. The later history of the Paulicians from the establishment of the state to its destruction by Emp. Basil I and the migration of many Paulicians to Syria, southern Italy, and the Balkans (where they were still found in the reign of Emp. Alexios I) is reasonably well known. In contrast, their earlier history, dates, leaders, and the details of their doctrine remain unclear and highly controversial; some documents are suspect and Byz. and Armenian sources differ. Scholars agree that the sect was Armenian in origin, that it was the probable precursor of the TONDRAKITES, that it was violently iconoclastic, and that it rejected the authority and sacraments of the official clergy to follow its own leaders and practices; everything beyond this is still disputed.

On the basis of the Greek sources, Runciman, Lemerle, and a number of others have traced the Paulicians to a succession of leaders who first appeared in Asia Minor in the 7th C. and established a number of communities and churches and ultimately an independent state. These scholars see the Paulicians as Dualists, heirs of MANICHAEISM, adherents to a Docetic Christology in which the Incarnation was thought to be illusionary. As such, they were accepted as a link in the transmission of these beliefs from the ancient Near East to the Bогоmils of the Balkans and the CATHARS of southern France.

The Armenian sources do not, however, sustain these conclusions, although they do confirm the Iconoclastic beliefs of the Paulicians. These sources know nothing of later Paulician history under Byz. According to them the Paulicians, who are considered followers of Bp. Paul of Samosata (condemned in 280), should be traced back to at least the 5th C. and were “Old Believers” following early Syrian traditions that preceded the hellenization of the Armenian church in the 4th C. In no way Dualists, they were adherents of an Adoptianist Christology (see ADOPTIANISM), which claimed Jesus had been adopted as son of God at baptism; their leaders, none of whom bore the same names as those listed in Greek sources, were thought to have been adopted in the same way and were worshiped as Christs. This original Adoptianist Paulicianism is shown to have survived in Armenia to the 11th C. Byz. Docetic and Dualist “Neo-Paulicianism” was thus a secondary, divergent form developed in the 9th C., probably under Sergios/Tychikos and under the influence of Byz. Iconoclasm.


N.G.G.

PAULINUS, more fully Meropius Pontius Paulinus, bishop of Nola (near Naples) from 409, Latin writer and saint; born Bordeaux 353?, died Nola 22 June 431. Paulinus being of a rich and noble family, his first career was secular, rising from (seemingly) advocate to governor of Campania.
Paul of Aegina, physician; born Aegina, died after 642. Paul spent much of his life in Alexandria, remaining there to teach and practice after the Arab invasion (642). Islamic sources ascribe to Paul three works on gynecology, toxicology, and medical practices and procedures. Only the third, a seven-book summary, has survived, usually called the Epitome of Medicine. Paul intended his Epitome as a general encyclopedia of medicine, borrowing liberally from Oribasios and Galen; in his preface, Paul outlines the important parts of medicine: hygiene and dietetics, the lore of fevers, diseases arranged in a "head-to-toe" manner, diseases that afflict various parts of the body, wounds and bites of poisonous creatures, antidotes for poisons, surgery, and simple and compound drugs. The Epitome’s pharmacy and pharmacology (bk.7), derived mainly from Dioskorides, presents precise synopses of 90 minerals and metals, about 600 botanicals, and approximately 170 animal products employed as pharmaceuticals (J. Scarborough, DOP 38 [1984] 228–32). Greatly valued in Islamic medicine, the Epitome was rendered into Arabic by Ḥunayn ibn Ishaq in the 9th C. Book 6 on surgery (Bliche, "Surgical Instruments") had esp. widespread influence and is embedded in a similar summary by al-Zahrāwī (Albucasis) in the 11th C. Book 3 was translated into Latin in northern Italy ca.800.

O. 2003, 11, 2. 78-97.}


PAUL OF ALEXANDRIA, astrologer; fl. Alexandria 378. Paul was the author of an elementary handbook of ASTROLOGY entitled Introduktion, which he addressed to his son Cronammon. The surviving version appears to be the first edition of the treatise to which has been attached the preface of a second edition. In chapter 20 he gives an example for “today, 20 Mecheir 94 Diocletian,” or 14 Feb. 378. Because of its brevity Paul’s work was a favorite introduction to astrology for Byz. A course of lectures was delivered on it at Alexandria in the summer of 564, almost certainly by OLYMPIODOROS OF ALEXANDRIA (L.G. Westerink, BZ 64 [1971] 6–21). Leo the Mathematician studied the Introduktion in the 9th C., and numerous scholars on it, some of which were compiled in the 12th C. Chapter 28 was translated into Syriac in the early 6th C. by SERGIOS OF RES’AINA (Inedita Siricae, ed. E. Sachau [Vienna 1870] 125f), and chapters 1–2 into Armenian by ANANIAS OF SirAK in the late 7th C. (A.G. Abrahamyan, Ananias Sirakac’u Matenagrul’yune [Erevan 1944] 327–30).

Several scholars have contended that there is a relation of direct dependence between the geographical list in Acts 2:9–11 and Paul’s astrological geography; this view has been refuted by B.M. Metzger (in Apostolic History and the Gospel, ed. W.W. Gasque, R.P. Martin [Exeter 1970] 123–33). Another Paul of Alexandria of the 5th C. was known as an astrologer by Abû Ma’shar (D. Pingree, Centaurus 14 [1969] 172).


PAUL OF KALLINIKOS, early 6th-C. Monophysite bishop of Kallinikos in Osroene. He actively advanced the cause of the Jacobite churches by translating a number of the most important works of Severos of Antioch into Syriac. The one specific date known from Paul’s life is the notice at the end of his translation of Severos’s Against Julian of Halicarnassus, to the effect that Paul completed the translation in the year 528 at Edessa (Vat. Syr. 140, fol.146). Other works of Severos that Paul translated into Syriac are the Philalethes (Lover of Truth), Against the Impious Grammarian, and some homilies and epistles, esp. correspondence with Sergios the Grammarian.

LIT. Baumstark, Literatur 160. — S.H.G.

PAUL OF LATROS, or Paul the Younger, saint; born Eliaia, near Pergamon, died Latros 15 Dec. 955. Paul was the younger son of Antiochos, komes of the fleet. After his parents’ death, he suffered from poverty and worked as a swineherd. After receiving the tonsure he lived in solitude in a cave on Mt. Latros; for a brief period he retired to Samos. Paul gained the respect of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos and Peter of Bulgaria (r. 927–69), who both sent him letters; he was supposedly famous among the “Cretans, Scytheans (the Rus’), and Romans.” Paul struggled against the “Manichaeans” active in Miletos and the area of Kibyrrhaion, and imposed strict discipline upon his disciples, slapping their faces if necessary. Before his death, Paul wrote a monastic rule (a will) for his community.

A vita compiled soon after his death cites numerous eyewitnesses; it also mentions Paul’s “diary,” biblos ton praxeon (Delehaye, infra 58.6–7). A charter of 1196 (MM 4:306.24–27) ascribes this Life to Symeon Metaphrastes and reveals that it was used as evidence during a trial. The anonymous author of the Life emphasizes the theme of food and starvation: Paul is constantly presented as suffering from hunger, eating acorns, or mixing milk with other foods to mask their pleasant taste. The Life also has rich information on cattle breeding, provincial administration, and local lords such as Theophanes of Samos.


PAUL OF MONEMVASIA, bishop of Monemvasia in the second half of the 10th C., the author of a series of brief edifying stories, conventionally titled narrationes. They are modeled on John
Klimax (to whom Paul specifically refers). The particularity of their form consists in their structure: they are stories within a story (similar, e.g., to the vita of Theoktiste of Lesbos), and the narrator of each appears only as a vehicle for reporting the tale of his hero or heroine. The chronological framework of the novelettes is contemporaneous with the author, the emperors Leo VI, Alexander, and Constantine VII being mentioned; the action takes place primarily in Constantinople, rarely in provincial towns (Monemvasia, Larissa in Thessaly); typical characters are monks and nuns, as well as imperial functionaries, foreigners (e.g., an unbaptized Scythian), slaves, and the poor. The stories frequently feature miracles, from resurrection to marvelous birds carrying fruit to a convent. The themes of sexual chastity and of honesty in commercial transactions also occur, and confession of sinful intentions plays an important role.


—A.K.

PAUSANIAS, Greek geographer of the 2nd C., originating perhaps from Lydia or Damascus. His Periegesis (Description) of Greece encompasses Attica, the Peloponnese, Boeotia, and Phokis; in addition to historical and geographical data, it contains some elements of myth and paradoxography. According to Diller (infra [1956]), he was not popular in antiquity. Circa 535 Stephen of Byzantium discovered an early apograph of his text, which he transcribed and used. The uncial text made by Stephen was in turn found centuries later by Arethas of Caesarea and ca.900 copied in minuscule (this suggestion has been challenged by Lemere [Humanism 268, n.111]); it is also possible that Arethas compiled some scholia to Pausanias. Some excerpts from Pausanias are included in the Souda, and a citation of Pausanias, possibly an interpolation, is found in Aelianus. The source of the Souda and Aelianus fragments remains unclear. In the Palaiologan period the codex commissioned by Arethas was known to Planudes and also read by Nikēphoros Gregoras in the library of the Chora monastery. Circa 1400 the codex was brought to Italy and eventually deposited in the San Marco library in Venice. It served as the base for four or five apographs, none of which is earlier than 1450 (A. Diller, TAPA 88 [1957] 169–88).


—A.K.
PAVEMENT (λιθόστρωτον, ἐδάφος). Byz. paving materials vary in size: marble slabs more than 70 cm in length set in mortar or fresh cement; terracotta tiles, a few cm thick, ranging from 10 to 70 cm on a side and set in a masonry bed; or nearly cubic paving blocks ranging from 10 to 25 sq. cm at the surface. The term floor mosaic is reserved for pavements whose elements measure less than 10 cm on a side. Types of pavement popular around the Mediterranean from Hellenistic times continued to appear in Byz. buildings: opus sectile; opus tessellatum, in which the tesserae are cut to uniform shape and size (5–10 sq. cm) and desired patterns are achieved by color and by delineating the contours of figures with courses of tesserae; the so-called opus vermiculatum in which tesserae are cut to varied shapes, very small in size (often less than 5 mm), which allows pictorial decoration similar to fresco painting. An edict of Theodosios II of 427 (Cod. Just. I 8) forbade use of the image of the cross on floors. The white Prokonnesian marble pavement of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, was interpreted as representing Earth, the green porphyry as the rivers (G. Majeska, DOP 32 [1978] 299–308).

PAVLOVKA, village in the region of Rostov, U.S.S.R., where a rich, late 4th-C. tomb was discovered in 1898. It contained an iron sword, a gold buckle, gold ornaments from a belt or harness, and a silver bowl with a stamp depicting a Tyche holding a scepter and orb (Dodd, Byz. Silver Stamps, no.82). These objects are now in the State Historical Museum, Moscow.

LIT. V. Kropotkin, Rimske importne izdelija v Vostočnoj Evrope (Moscow 1970), no.733.

PAWN. See Pignus.

P’AUSTOS BUZAND, PSEUDO-, also Faustus of Byzantium, Faustus Buzanta/Podandos, traditional names for the putative author to whom a History of Armenia of the second half of the 5th C. was attributed. Controversies over the identity and date of the author and the original language of the work have now led to the conclusion that neither the name of the author nor the traditional title of his work is correct. Małchasyanc’ and Perikhanian’s analyses (infra) of the actual title, Buz-

andaran Patmut’iwrk’ (Epic Histories), later altered to Patmut’iwr Hayoc’ (History of Armenia), have shown that the first term, buzand-aran, does not contain the toponyms Byzantium or Buzanta at all, but is rather a term of Iranian origin referring to bardic recitations, followed by the suffix of place -aran. The name of the author is not given. The work is then an anonymous compilation originally composed in Armenian on the basis of local oral tradition, entitled Epic Histories. It dates most probably from the 470s. This compilation, the first attempt to relate Armenian history, covers the period of the later Arsacid dynasty and its relations to Byz. and the Sasanians (from ca.330 to the partition of Armenia between these two powers in ca.387). The work is epic rather than strictly historical in character but has preserved otherwise unknown material on the iranianized social structure of early medieval Armenia, on the Armenian Church, and on the all but lost oral literary tradition. Despite its value, the Epic Histories was not adopted as part of the Armenian received tradition and has been largely ignored until recent times.

ED. [Pseudo] P’awostos Buzandac’woy Patmut’iwr Hayoc’ ie eors dprut’iwrms’ (Venice 1933).


PBOW, cenobitic monastery east of the Nile, about 60 km north of Luxor. Established in 330, Pbow was the second monastery founded by PACHMIOS (Life of Pachomius, ch.54) and became the administrative center of the order. The Pachomian monks gathered there twice a year: to celebrate Easter and, in Aug., to review business at the individual monasteries (ibid., chs. 78, 83). It has recently been hypothesized that the library of Pbow was the place of origin of many Greek and Coptic biblical, Gnostic, and literary MSS.

Excavations at Pbow have revealed the remains of a large 5th-C. basilica (36 × 72 m). The five aisles were separated by rose granite columns, the floor paved with uneven limestone slabs. Underneath, the remains of a 4th-C. basilica were discovered. The basilicas are the oldest and the largest in Egypt (J.E. Goehring in Roots of Egypt. Christ. 252–57).
PECULA (The Bee), the name for three separate Slavonic translations of the Byz. Melissa. The first and most influential translation was produced in Rus', most likely in Kiev or Galitza in the late 12th or early 13th C. Widely copied and cited, it spread to Serbia by the 14th C. and remained popular in Muscovy until the 17th C. The text derives from an interpolated and abbreviated version of the Melissa, shorter than that attributed to Antony (PG 136:765-1244) and arranged in 71 chapters (cf. the Capita theologiae ascribed to Maximos the Confessor, PG 91:719-1018). The closest Greek parallels to this redaction are found in comparatively late MSS. Each chapter of Pčela consists of a string of citations on a particular topic (e.g., virtue, wisdom, rulers, women). The citations are arranged in hierarchical order: first the Gospels, then Acts and Epistles, next the wisdom books of the Old Testament, then patristics, and finally sayings of the “external philosophers” of the ancient world. These meager and corrupt extracts from the classics were virtually the only classical writings to reach medieval Rus’. Pčela also survives in a Bulgarian translation (probably 14th C.) and in a second eastern Slavic translation dated 1599.

PEACE AND WAR. To the Byz., peace and non-violence were ideals rooted in the teachings of the New Testament and church fathers (esp. St. Basil), but in reality they rarely knew prolonged periods of peace. The Byz. considered war evil, but their attitude was tempered by the recognition of its necessity in defending their Christian empire and brethren; thus courage, prowess in arms, and good generalship were praiseworthy attributes in historical figures such as Herakleios and Basil II, or in such legendary figures as Digenes Akritas. The Byz. also bestowed praise, however, on emperors such as Alexios I Komnenos, who avoided unnecessary bloodshed by sparing conquered enemies and using diplomacy to resolve conflicts. Although divine favor in war was sought through military religious services, the cults of warrior saints (see Military Saints), and prayers for the success of imperial expeditions (Darrouzès, Epistoliers 146, 149), Byz. churchmen deplored war, esp. between Christians, and refused to sanction killing; Patriarch Polyeuktos countered the petition of Nikephoros II Phokas to have his slain soldiers declared martyrs with St. Basil’s ruling that soldiers who had killed in battle could not receive communion for three years. The concept of holy war, as practiced by their Muslim enemies and the Crusaders, remained largely foreign to the Byz.; only once was a plenary remission of sin granted to a Byz. army (N. Oikonomides, REB 25 [1967] 115-20, 131-35).

PEACOCKS (sing. ταυώς, ταυώς), splendidly feathered birds considered Oriental (“Persian”) or Hungarian (“Paeonian”) and used for food (Koukoules, Bios 5:70, 408f) or to adorn rich gardens. Represented in the earliest Christian funerary art, the peacock brought multiple connotations from antiquity: of splendid, even paradisiac gardens; of springtime and renewal, since their feathers regenerate in the spring; and of the imperial, as peacocks had been Juno’s bird and bore empresses’ souls to their apotheosis. Used at first simply to give tombs the aura of paradisiac gardens, peacocks were accorded stricter symbolic meanings in 4th-C. art (as spring, paradise, redemption). In the 5th C. they flanked imperial triumphal symbols like the Christogram to create a Christian imperial imagery of eternal triumph in heaven. As images of heavenly splendor, peacocks strut in ornament in every medium of Byz. art; that they continued to carry aulic connotations is shown by the peacock represented in Ioakim’s garden in a Chora mosaic, which signals the regal as well as the saving role of Mary. Peacock feathers were also used to represent the many-eyed wings of Seraphim and often Cheru-
BIM and ARCHANGELS. Accordingly, silver RHIPPIDIA were often edged with incised peacock feathers and likened to angels' wings, which emit prayers as they move.

—A.W.C.

PEASANT. In Byz. peasants were never a homogeneous group. Constantly evolving social and economic conditions created many categories of peasants; thus, it is not a matter of what types of peasants existed in any particular era, but rather what their dominant status was and what the evolutionary trend was in regard to peasants in any era. The leading view is that during the 4th–6th C. there was a decline of the small-holding, free peasant; because of the great demand for MANPOWER, peasants were increasingly tied to the soil as unfree COLONI and ADSCRIPTICI. On the contrary, P. Vinogradov (Srednevekovoe pomest' e v Anglii [St. Petersburg 1911] 98) suggested that the 4th and 5th C. witnessed improvement of conditions for peasants; new sources, for example, the Egyptian papyri and excavations of rural sites in northern Syria, seem to confirm Vinogradov's theory (A. Kazhdan, VDI [1953] no.3, 89–104).

At any rate, in the 7th–10th C. there were free peasants who paid their taxes to the fisc. By the 10th C. peasants were becoming increasingly dependent upon large landowners. The sources of the 10th–12th C. show a great diversity in the terminology describing peasants and their status.

Though the full significance of many of these terms is still obscure, peasants were categorized in accordance with the property, if any, in their STASIS (as ZEUGARATOI, BODATOI, KAPNIKARIOI, AKTEMONES, APOROI) and on the status of dependency, either on a private landowner (as PAROIKOI, DOULOPAROIKOI) or on the state itself (as DEMOSIAROI, EXKOUSSATOI). In the 13th–15th C., while almost all peasants were paroikoi (although other terms such as PROSKATEMENOI, ELEUTHEROI, etc. were in use), there was substantial variance in the sizes of their holdings and degree of personal FREEDOM.

Identified by their short tunics, ornamented leggings, and manual labor, peasants engage in harvesting, fruit farming, fowling, and similar rural pursuits in 5th–6th C. mosaics of the seasons and the miniatures of the Venice Kynegetika (see OPPIAN) as well as in the homilies of GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS.
PEČ (Печ), town in modern state of Kosovo-Metohija, in southern Yugoslavia, on the Bistrica River. First mentioned in the early 13th C. as a village in the župa (district) of Hvostno, Peč was transformed in 1346 into a patriarchate. Constantinople evidently did not acknowledge this title, even after the restoration of the union of the Byz. and Serbian churches in 1375; the Episthema Nea calls the Serbian prelate “archbishop of Peč and of all Serbia” (J. Darrouzès, REB 27 [1969] 40-21), but places him separately from other archbishops, immediately after the patriarch of Tarnovo. Peč was the major center for the production of Serbian literature as well as an important commercial center where a colony of merchants from Dubrovnik lived.

Preserved in Peč is a complex of ecclesiastical buildings, the Patriarchi, the oldest of which is the Church of the Holy Apostles, erected around the 1230s at the instigation of Arsenios, hegoumenos of Žiča. He is credited in an inscription in the apse with sponsoring the wall painting. These frescoes—notably the Deesis in the conch—seem to reflect the intention of Sava of Serbia that the church be a mausoleum for Serbian archbishops. The decoration of the patriarchal complex received special attention during the reign of Stefan Uroš II Milutin, when portraits of the Neimanjës were painted in the former narthex, and again ca. 1330 when the genealogy of this dynasty was depicted in the form of a Tree of Jesse (Djurić, Byz. Fresk., fig.58) for Archbp. Danil II. The same prelate erected the Church of the Virgin shortly before 1337. The fourth church in the complex, that of St. Dimitrije, built before 1324, was not decorated until ca. 1345 under Archbp. Joankije. The Byz. scheme of representing ecumenical councils was here supplemented by images of two Serbian synods.


- A.K., A.C., J.S.A.

PECHENEGS (Печенеги), a nomadic people of disputed origin who moved from Central Asia to the basin of the Volga where they appeared in the late 9th C. After clashes with the Khazars and Hungarians they settled in the steppe between the Don and the Lower Danube. Byz. diplomacy paid great attention to the Pechenegs as commercial middlemen between Cherson and northern sedentary peoples, and as a military force able to check dangerous neighbors of the empire such as the Bulgarians and Ruriks. Yet sometimes the Pechenegs changed sides and attacked Byz. Symeon of Bulgaria persuaded the Pechenegs to march against the Hungarians during the war of 894-96 with Byz., thus securing the rear against an attack. Around 917 Bogas, the strategos of Cherson, organized a coalition with the Pechenegs against the Bulgarians, but the Pechenegs deserted even before the battle at Achelous. Patr. Nicholas I Mystikos (ep.q.110-112) indicates that Symeon sought an alliance with the Pechenegs and proposed several intermarriages. The Pechenegs supported Igor and Svjatoslav of Kiev in their expeditions against Byz. but, finally, the Byz. bought their assistance; the Pechenegs crushed and killed Svjatoslav.

The Pecheneg danger increased in the mid-11th C. Around 1045 a group of Pechenegs, commanded by Kegen, settled in Bulgaria; they served as mercenaries but revolted and were expelled ca. 1050. In 1046/7 another horde crossed the Danube and plundered Thrace but was defeated (A. Kazaian, JÖB 26 [1977] 71-77). In 1059 Isaac I Komnenos routed the Pechenegs. In 1078 they pillaged the district of Adrianopole and in 1087, acting in concert with the Uzes and Cumans, they reached the Sea of Marmara. Alexios I Komnenos crushed the Pechenegs at Mt. Loubunion in 1091 and John II struck the final blow in 1122. A special feast celebrating the victory over the Pechenegs was established in Byz. (Nic.Chron. 27-29).

By the 13th C. they disappeared as an independent entity.

PECHEYS (πέχυς, lit. "forearm"), the cubit, a unit of length, of which two variations are attested. The shorter cubit of 24 daktyloi (= 1.33 podes [see Pous] = 46.8 cm) was used esp. in construction with stone and wood, and was therefore called also lithikos (stone), xylopristikos (wood sawing), pristikos (sawing), tektonikos (builder’s), or generally demosios (public) pechys. The longer cubit of 32 daktyloi (= 2 podes = 62.5 cm) was used for the measurement of fields by the fisc and was therefore called geometrikos or basilikos pechys. At the same time, many other pecheis of local validity were used for measuring various materials (cotton, wool, linen, or silk).


PECULIUM (πεκούλιον), term designating the property of persons under another’s authority. Sons of the family, i.e., persons who remained under patria potestas, and slaves could not, in principle, own property. Nevertheless, the person in authority over them could allot a special kind of property to them, the peculum; it remained the property of the person in authority to the extent that he could revoke it, but it was given to the son of the family or slave to administer. Whatever he earned by means of the peculum reverted to the peculum and, hence, to the property of the person in authority. In addition to this basic type of peculum, the so-called peculum paganum, another type of peculum developed: the peculum (quasi) castrense, the son’s income as a soldier (see Peculum Castrense), as a servant in imperial service, as a cleric, or as the heir of his siblings. The son had property rights over the peculum (quasi) castrense—in contrast to the peculum paganum—as well as the use of it and right of bequeathal. A son could also acquire the so-called aprosporista, which included donations from his mother’s property as well as income from his own work.

Thus the property of the person under another’s authority could consist of three categories, each managed differently. The son managed the peculum paganum to the benefit and burden of the father, and he managed the peculum (quasi) castrense like a person free of authority. The aprosporista constituted “dead” capital until he gained freedom from authority. The legal rulings on the subject of peculum are contained in the treatise De peculius.


PECULIUM CASTRENSE (στρατιωτικὸν πεκούλιον). The 8th-C. Ecloga (16.1) defines peculum castrense as goods (i.e., wages, booty, legacies, etc.) acquired while in military service, which were the soldier’s own to bequeath or dispose of as he wished. It was his right to keep these goods separate from all other income and patrimonial inheritance with no obligation to share them with family or dependents. These privileges and testamentary rights dated from the time of Augustus and were extensively discussed in Roman law (Digest 49.17).

The Ecloga (16.2), however, modifies the exemptions traditionally associated with the peculum castrense, stating that a brother in military service must divide his wages (roga) equally among the household revenues generated by his brother(s) remaining at home in case they decide to separate. Only after 13 years was the soldier entitled to keep any wages he had saved; but equipment, booty, and endowments were still exclusively his from the beginning of his service.


PEDIADITES, BASIL, writer, metropolitan of Kerkyra (from 1201; died Kerkyra ca.1219. Browning ("Patriarchal School" 21) proposed the identification of Basil Pediadites (Πεδιαδηγης) with Basil Hagioapanton, a teacher at the grammatical school of St. Paul, whom a later note calls metropolitan of Kerkyra: Basil Hagioapanton was deprived of his rank as deacon on 24 Jan. 1168 on account of some blasphemous poems he had written, which are now lost (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.1077). Pediadites’ rhetorical activity belonged to a later period: an enkomion of Patr. Chariton (1178–79), a speech to Patr. Niketas Mountanes (1186–89),
and a speech to an unspecified patriarch, perhaps Basil II Kamateros (1183-86)—all still unpublished. From his Kerkyra period we have a letter to Constantine Stilbes describing the difficult conditions on the island (S. Lampros, *Kerkyraïka anêdota* [Athens 1882] 42-49) and an epistle to Pope Innocent III (ed. K. Manaphes, *EEBS* 42 [1975-76] 435-40) protesting against the convocation of an ecumenical council (i.e., Lateran 1215) without the participation of the patriarch of Constantinople.


**PEDIASIMOS** (Πεδιασίμος; etym. “inhabitant of a valley”), a family name. They are known from the end of the 10th C., when Leo Pediasimos supported John I Tzimiskes. Seals, mostly of the 11th-12th C., represent several Pediasimoi, including Basil, *protos* of an unnamed monastery (Laurent, *Corpus* 5.2, no.1930). Apparently in the 14th C. the family lived in the Serres region, where Niketas Pediasimos signed a charter in 1366 as a high-ranking imperial official (*Chil. 1*, no.151.149-50). The writer Theodore Pediasimos was closely connected with Serres, while John Pediasimos, *chartophylax* of Ohrid, was active in the neighboring region (see PEDIASIMOS, THEODORE and PEDIASIMOS, JOHN).


**PEDIASIMOS, JOHN**, known also by the name Pothos; teacher and writer; born ca.1250, died early 14th C. Pediasimos studied in Constantinople, possibly first under Manuel Holobolos, but certainly under George Akropolites, together with George of Cyprus (later Patriarch Gregory II). Shortly thereafter Pediasimos was appointed *hypatos ton philosophon*. A letter of George of Cyprus indicates that Pediasimos also taught at Ohrid, where he was *chartophylax* by ca.1280. If the identification of Pediasimos with the deacon John Pothos, *megas sakellarios* of the metropolis of Thessalonike, is correct, then Pediasimos was in that position by 1284. Probably for pedagogical reasons, he wrote a wide range of works on subjects such as mythology, syllogistic, geometry, music, astronomy, and medicine. His treatise on prohibitive degrees of marriage, written while *chartophylax* in Ohrid, draws on the work of his predecessor Demetrios Chomatenos.


**LIT.** Constantindes, *Education* 117-25. A. Tutton, Dated Greek MSS of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Italy (Urbana-Chicago-London 1972) 75-77, 123. —R.J.M.

**PEDIASIMOS, THEODORE**, writer; fl. early 14th C. Pediasimos received a classical education in Thessalonike and spent at least part of his life in Serres, which may have been his birthplace. His oeuvre includes both secular and religious compositions: *enkonia* of the sun and summer; an *enkionion* of Joseph the Hymnographer (*BHG* 947), which is based not on the 13th-C. version of John the Deacon, but on a certain Theophanes; and letters to friends such as Nicholas Kabasilas, Andronikos Zarides, and Sophianos. His most interesting works are a brief but detailed *ekphrasis* of the cathedral of Serres, which was dedicated to his patron saints, Theodore Stratelates and Theodore Teron (A. Orlando, *EEBS* 19 [1949] 259-71), and an account of contemporary miracles wrought by the two Theodores (*BHG* 1773), which mentions the expedition of Theodore II Laskaris to rescue Melnik (F. Dölger, *IzvBülg.-ArchHist* 16 [1950] 275-79) and the joint Turco-Catalan attack on Serres in 1307.


**PEGAI (Πηγαῖ, now Karabiga)**, city on the southern shore of the Sea of Marmara. Although mentioned in the 9th C., Pegai only rose to prominence in the late 12th C., when it had a large Latin population and was a major trading port. The Latins of Constantinople took Pegai in 1204 with the help of local inhabitants. In 1211, they defeated an attempt of Theodore I Laskaris to regain the city, but it fell to John III in 1225. The Latins briefly recaptured it in 1233. In 1306, when it was blockaded by the Turks, Pegai had received so many refugees that it suffered an outbreak of
plague and famine (Pachym., ed. Bekker 2:415.4–7). It nevertheless held out until 1363 as the last Byz. outpost on the coast of Asia Minor. Pegai, not previously attested as a bishopric, became a metropolitan under the Laskarids. In 1354 the metropolitan of Pegai, whose church was in serious straits because of Turkish attacks, extended his jurisdiction over the vacant see of Sozopolis (MM 1:330f). The powerful walls that protect the peninsula of Pegai are well preserved; they are apparently the work of John III.


PEGE (Πηγή, Turk. Bahkli), ancient sanctuary of the Virgin, located outside the Theodosian Walls of Constantinople, opposite the Silivri gate. It was planted with trees and had a source of water (pege) that came to be regarded as miraculous. There Justinian I built a church and monastery of the Virgin, which later tradition attributed to Leo I. Empress Irene was healed of a hemorrhage by drinking from the source and made rich offerings to the church, including a mosaic representing herself and her son Constantine VI; after the earthquake of 869 Basil I rebuilt the church and decorated it with a cycle of mosaics (*AnthGr* 1:109–14). Burned by Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria in 924, the church was soon repaired and was regularly visited by the emperor on the feast of the Ascension (*De cer.* 108.13–114.9; 774.19–775.6). Next to the church was a palace. The miracles of the “Life-containing Source” (Zoodochos Pege) continued until the 14th C., and were recorded by Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos; he also describes in some detail the church’s fresco decoration (Bénay, *infra* 225, 227). Xanthopoulos himself wrote an *akolouthia* for the feast of its dedication, celebrated in his time on the Friday after Easter, and Manuel Philes and others composed epigrams on the sanctuary and its paintings. In 1422 Sultan Murad II made it his headquarters while besieging Constantinople. The church disappeared thereafter and was rebuilt only in the 18th C. The legend of the half-fried fish that jumped into the source during the siege of 1453 is of late origin.

Liturgical references to the Virgin from the 9th C. onward as the Zoodochos Pege led to the creation of a complex icon designed expressly to convey the meaning of the epithet. Perhaps based on the silver image of the Virgin “epi tes phiales” in the imperial bath area at Blachernai (*De cer.* 554.22–23), the image, which first appears in the 14th C., comprises the bust of the Virgin orans with the Christ Child before her chest (see VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA), here placed into a sort of basin from which flow two streams of water. The flourishing of the icon type is surely connected with that of the monastery of Pege in this period; at Pege the miraculous spring water flowed into a marble basin accessible by staircases inside the church. The monastery itself came to be known as the Zoodochos Pege in the 14th C.


C.M., N.P.S.

PEGOLOTTI, FRANCESCO BALDUCCI, Florentine merchant, employee of the Company of the Bardi ca.1310–ca.1340, politician, “banner bearer” in 1391, and “banner bearer of Justice” in 1346; born Florence before 1290, died after 1347. Pegolotti was the author of the book *Of Descriptions of Countries and of Measures of Merchandise*, more commonly known by the title of the first edition, *La Pratica della Mercatura*. The book was compiled over a long period of time, between 1310 and 1340. While the author was active mostly in western Europe, he was in Cyprus from 1324 to 1329, and again in the 1390s, and became well acquainted with the conditions of trade in the eastern Mediterranean as well as with the route to China. The book provides information about trade with China before the breakdown of the *Pax Mongolica*.

Pegolotti’s book is not the only commercial handbook surviving from the Middle Ages, but it is the most complete. It gives information about the merchandise to be found in various ports of the Mediterranean and the Atlantic, its provenance and quality, about the means of exchange used in various markets, about the exchange rates, and about the weights, measures, and customs duties that were used in each place. There is also discussion of the manufacture of alum in *Phokaia*.
and sugar in Cyprus. An indispensable source for the history of medieval trade, Pegolotti’s book is an equally important guide to the trade and economic activities of the ports of Constantinople, Pera, the Black Sea, and Asia Minor.


—A.L.

PEGONITES (Πεγονίτες), family name of unclear etymology, perhaps connected with the modern Greek pegouni, “chin.” The first known Pegonites is Niketas, doux of Dyrachion under Basil II, who fought successfully against the Bulgarians in 1018. C. Mango (AA 81 [1966–67] 414) identified him with the strategetes of Dyrachion mentioned in an inscription from the Istanbul Archaeological Museum. Psellos wrote the epitaph of his daughter Irene. Probably under Romanos III he commanded Rus’ and other contingents on the eastern frontier of Byz.; H. Grégoire’s hypothesis (Byzantion 12 [1937] 291) that he participated in Isaac Komnenos’s revolt of 1057 is less plausible because of the chronological gap. Another Pegonites was doux of Edessa ca.1065; an 11th-C. seal names Leo Pegonites strategos of Great Preslav (N. Bânescu, P. Papahagi, Byzantion 10 [1935] 602–04). In the mid-12th C. two Pegoniti held fiscal positions: one was praktor of Samos before 1157; another, Constantine, was tax collector somewhere on the Black Sea coast, probably on the Cimmerian Bosphorus, ca.1180. The family regained military positions by the late 12th C.: Alexios, doux of Thessalonike, signed a charter of 1180 (M. Goudas, EBS 4 [1927] 216, no.8B.15); his namesake held the same post ca.1290; and Constantine Pegonites was doux of Berroia ca.1220.

—A.K.

PEIRA (Πείρα, lit. “experience”), a mid-11th-C. collection of excerpts from the statements of verdict (hypomnemata) and special treatises (meletai) of Eustathios Rhomaios. The compendium was compiled by an unknown colleague of Eustathios. The author cut up the texts of Eustathios that were at his disposal—some of which must have been of considerable length—into small fragments that he divided into 75 titles. The titles, which do not follow any identifiable system, contain, in a loosely associated progression, precepts, definitions, and solutions to problems from all spheres of civil and criminal law. Since the author’s intention was to write a textbook (didaskalia), he was particularly concerned with the arrangement and formation of rules. He therefore not only carefully excerpted the laws cited by Eustathios but also tried to deduce a simple rule from the arguments of the judge and to place it at the head of the text fragments. Controversial issues, on the other hand, he summed up only in a cursory fashion, and to a high degree he suppressed the individual features of the cases. It is perhaps precisely for this reason that the Peira was greatly valued in the following period, as one can see from the citations in the scholia to the Basilika and in the works of ChomatenoS and HarmenopoulouS.

ED. Zepos, Jus 4:11–260.


—D.S.

PELAGIANISM, theological system introduced by Pelagius (born Britain? ca.354, died Egypt? ca.420–27) and developed by Celestius and Julian of Eclanum. In the 380s Pelagius was in Rome where he served as the spiritual adviser of the Anicii; according to P. Brown (JThSt 19 [1968] 93–114), his tenets reveal aristocratic tendencies. He attacked the concept of predestination as Manichaean and supported the concept of human free will, the freedom to choose evil or good. Thus, he placed responsibility on man himself, while both grace and ecclesiastical institutions played only an accessory role in the process of salvation. Accordingly, Pelagius required a high moral standard of the Christian community as the union of the elect. Pelagianism was criticized by Augustine, Jerome, and Orosius; Augustine argued that divine grace and the sacraments were the major instruments of salvation. North Africa was the focal point of anti-Pelagian action; Rome’s position was undecided and Pope Zosimus wavered between acceptance and condemnation of Pelagianism.
Circa 412 Pelagius moved to Palestine where he spent the rest of his life. There and in Syria Pelagius found support, partially because of Syrian asceticism and the theological ideas expressed, among others, by Aphrahat (L. Barnard, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 35 [1968] 193–96). In 415 Palestinian bishops acquitted Pelagius after he had mildly denounced the extreme teachings of Celestius. Julian of Eclanum and other Italian Pelagians were supported by Nesterios, but at the Council of Ephesus of 431 both Nestorians and Cyril’s partisans accused each other of Pelagianism, and the Roman envoys were able to secure the condemnation of its teachings; by the 6th C. the sect had disappeared.


**PELAGIA OF TARSOS**, saint; feastday 8 Oct. Pelagia, who was of noble birth, underwent baptism and gave away her cloak to the poor. The son of Diocletian, who hoped to marry her, committed suicide in despair at the news of her conversion, and Diocletian ordered Pelagia to be burned in a bronze bull. The *Menoelogion of Basil II* (p.96) illustrates Pelagia (there commemorated 7 Oct.) being roasted inside the brazen bull. Usener (infra) considered the legend of Pelagia a Christian version of the pagan myth of Aphrodite, the goddess of the sea (pelagos) and love, an interpretation rejected by H. Delehaye (*Les légendes hagiographiques* [Brussels 1927] 187–94).


**PELAGIA THE VIRGIN**, saint; feastday 8 Oct. Pelagia was a young virgin from Antioch who, fearful of being raped by persecutors who came to arrest her, threw herself from a roof. Her death was placed in the reign of Numerianus (283–84). Eusebios of Emesa mentioned her, and John Chrysostom dedicated a homily to her (PG 50:579–84). In the *Menoelogion of Basil II* (p.97) she is shown praying while two men with spears approach her.

**Lit.** *BHG* 1477–1477d. L. Schütz, *LCL* 8:152. —A.K., N.P.S.

**PELAGIUS OF ALBANO,** or Pelagius Galvani, cardinal-bishop of Albano near Rome (from 1213); died Montecassino, probably 30 Jan. 1230. His early life is unknown. He was most likely of Spanish (or Portuguese) origin. Auditor and judge at the curia of Popes Innocent III and Honorius III, in 1214–15 Pelagius came to Byz. as papal legate, with Nicholas of Otranto as his interpreter. He aroused the hostility of the Greek population of Constantinople by closing their churches, an action countermanded by the Latin emperor Henry. Nicholas Mesarites, who represented the Nicaean empire at negotiations between the Eastern and Western churches, left a
detailed description (probably fictitious, according to G. Spiteris, *OrChrAn* 204 [1977] 181–86) of the discussions that took place in Constantinople and then continued (probably under Pontius, bishop of Ilerda) in Herakleia Pontike, where Theodore I Laskaris addressed the participants. Major issues were theological and liturgical differences (filioque and ayzmes), Pelagius's harsh treatment of Greek monks who refused to acknowledge papal primacy, and protocol (Pelagius refused to rise when receiving Mesarites, and the Latins referred to the patriarch as "archbishop of Nicea" or "of the Greeks"). Despite Theodore I's desire for peace, the embassy achieved no results.

In 1218 Honorius III sent Pelagius as papal legate to join the Fifth Crusade. After the initial success and the capture of Damietta (1219), Pelagius arrogantly rejected the peace proposal of the Ayyubid sultan al-Kamil (the return of Jerusalem to the Crusaders in exchange for their retreat from the Nile Delta); eventually, the discord in the Crusaders' camp led to their defeat and evacuation of Damietta in 1221.


**PELAGONIA** (Πελαγονία, mod. Monastir/Bitola), alternative name applied in antiquity to the city of Herakleia Lynkestis in western Macedonia and to the area around it, on the Via Egnatia west of Thessalonike. Pelagonia is listed among the poleis of Macedonia II in Hierokles (Hierokl. 641.5) and Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 2.40, ed. Pertusi p.88). In 11th- and 12th-C. texts it appears as a valley (ta peda: e.g., Skyl. 354.77) or region (William of Tyre 2:13, PL 201:163) suitable for cavalry encampments and for spying on hostile tribes (Nik.Chon. 101.60–64) rather than as a city. A 13th-C. historian (Akrop. 78.21) considers it a chorion. Near Pelagonia, in Boutele, the Bulgarian tsar Gabriel Radomir (1014–15) built his palace, which was burned by Basil II in 1014 (Skyl. 351.2–4).

The bishop of Herakleia Lynkestis was suffragan of Thessalonike in a notitia of ca.800 (*Notitiae CP* 3:260). In the list of Bulgarian bishoprics promulgated in 1020 he is replaced by the bishop of Bouteles, who was granted possession in Pela-

genonia, Prilep, and some neighboring locations (H. Gelzer, *BZ* 2 [1893] 42–27–29); a correspondent and suffragan of Theophylaktos of Ohrid is identified as bishop of Pelagonia, and a notitia, probably contemporary with Theophylaktos, describes Herakleia or Pelagonia (*Notitiae CP* 13.840) as suffragan of Justiniana Prima.

In the 13th C. Pelagonia was contested among various powers: Dobromir Chrysos held it ca.1201; the Latins in alliance with Michael I Komnenos Doukas of Epiros defeated the Bulgarian Strezos in the valley of Pelagonia in 1212 (Zlatarski, *Ist*. 3:307); John Asen II subdued it, and John III Vatatzes occupied Pelagonia. In 1259, Pelagonia was the site of a battle in which the forces of the empire of Nicea defeated an alliance of Epiros, Achaia, and Manfred of Sicily (see *PELAGONIA, BATTLE OF*). Later writers (e.g., Kantak. 1:281.20–22) also consider Pelagonia as a district in which various polichnia were located.


**PELAGONIA, BATTLE OF**, decisive encounter in the valley of Pelagonia, between the forces of the empire of Nicea and a triple alliance of Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epiros, William II Villehardouin of Achaia, and Manfred of Sicily (who did not participate personally, but sent 400 German knights). The battle took place in early summer (D.M. Nicol, *BZ* 49 [1956] 68–71) or fall of 1259 (Geanakoplos). The Western coalition was formed in an attempt to thwart the rising power of Michael VIII Palaiologos, the new Nicene emperor. The alliance was strained, however, by rival ambitions in the Balkans and fell apart on the eve of the battle. According to Gregoras (Greg. 1:74.7–21), Michael II and his son Nikephoros abandoned their allies and fled with many troops, while another son, John the Bastard, joined the Nicene forces. Pachymeres (Pachym., ed. Failler 1:119) adds that John deserted because Villehardouin had taunted him about his illegitimate birth. Thus the Nicene army, commanded by the sebastokratior John Palaiologos, brother of Michael VIII, was able to crush the weakened forces of the allies and capture Villehardouin and 39 Frankish barons. The Nicene
PELEKANOS (Πελεκάνας), site (chorion) in Bithynia on the Gulf of Nikomedea in the plains below Dakibyza (mod. Gebze). In the 10th and 11th C. Pelekanos contained a monastery of the Theotokos and nearby, in Mesampelos, a monastery of St. George. During the First Crusade, Godfrey of Bouillon made his camp there, and Alexios I used it as his base during the siege of Nicaea (An.Komm. 2:226.20, 235.26). Pelekanos was the site of a decisive defeat of the Byz. by Orhan on 10 June 1329. The battle is described by John (VI) Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 1:342–63). When news of the Turkish blockade of Nicaea reached the capital, Andronikos III determined to relieve the city. The Byz. forces under the emperor and Kantakouzenos met the Turks at Pelekanos and were at first successful in a series of skirmishes. As the army withdrew to its camp, however, the Turks attacked and gained a signal victory when the Byz. panicked at news that the emperor had been wounded. The remnants of the army took refuge in the nearby fortress of Philokrene. This failure of the last Byz. attempt to retain control of Bithynia enabled Orhan to capture Nicaea in 1331 and to gain supremacy in the region opposite the capital.


PELEKETE MONASTERY, a provincial center of image worship in western Asia Minor during the controversy over Iconoclasm in the 8th–9th C. Its name, Pelekete (Πελεκητή), “hewn with an axe”), derived from its location upon a steep rock. The date of its foundation is unknown; it clearly was in existence by 763 or 764 when Michael Lachanodrakon, governor of the theme of Thrakesion, attacked the monastery because of its iconodulic stance and burned it to the ground. Some monks, including the hegoumenos Theoste- rikos, were tortured; 38 were arrested and subsequently buried alive at Ephesus. Peleketes was restored by the end of the 8th C., when a certain Makarios served the monastery as scribe, aikonomas, and eventually hegoumenos (BHG 1003). With the second outbreak of Iconoclasm ca.814, Makarios was forced to leave Peleketes and suffered imprisonment and exile; his monks, however, continued their opposition to Iconoclasm even without his leadership. After the 9th C. Peleketes disappears from the Byz. sources.

Most scholars locate Peleketes in Bithynia, 5 km west of Trigleia (Turk. Tırilye), where there are ruins of a monastery of Peleketes, dedicated to St. John the Theologian. It is a rectangular cross-in-square church, with a central apse containing traces of a synthronon and domically vaulted pastophoria.


PELONPONNESOS (Πελοπόννησος), southernmost peninsula of Greece, also known from the Frankish period as the Morea. In late antiquity part of the province of Achaea, the Peloponnese retained its urban character: Hierokles counted 26 cities in the Peloponnese. From the late 6th C., however, building activity in the peninsula practically stopped: it is still unclear whether this economic decline resulted from hostile invasions, primarily Slavic, or “was also caused by a more general phenomenon of decline” (Lemerle, infra 343). The question of the Slavic invasion has been hotly discussed. Slavic penetration in the Peloponnesos is indicated by the evidence of toponyms—M. Vasmer (Slaven) counted 429 place names of Slavic origin in the Peloponnese, although some dozens could be disputed. The Slavs seem not to have occupied the eastern cities, however, and they underwent rapid hellenization, even though in the 14th C. there were independent Slavic communities in the peninsula.

From the late 7th C. the Peloponneseos was part
of the theme of HELLAS, and from the early 9th C. it was a theme in its own right, with its capital at CORINTH: Leo Skleros may have been the first strategos. The coasts of the Peloponnesos were ravaged by Arab pirates in the 9th and 10th C. until the Byz. reconquest of CRETE in 961. After that the peninsula prospered, with plentiful evidence of rich agricultural production, commerce, and industry in cities such as Corinth and PATRAS. Beginning in 1205 the leaders of the Fourth Crusade, notably WILLIAM I OF CHAMPLITTE and GEOFFREY I VILLEHARDOUIN captured most of the Peloponnesos without serious struggle, and the land was divided into baronies, loosely under the authority of the principality of ACHAIA. The conquest was completed by 1248, but the Frankish defeat at the battle of PELOGONIA in 1259 and the surrender of MISTRA and other territories with the Treaty of Constantinople in 1262 initiated the revival of Byz. power in the Peloponnesos—henceforth divided between the despots of the MOREA and the various Frankish states. The Turks first entered the peninsula in 1446 and, except for Venetian strongholds such as NAUPLIA and METHONE, conquered the entire Peloponnesos by 1460.

The bishop of Corinth, originally metropolitan of Hellas and of the Peloponnesos, was challenged, esp. by the metropolitan of PATRAS. Over time the bishops of LAKEDAIMON, ARGOS, and CHRISTIANOUPOLIS also gained metropolitan status.


PELTA (πέλτη, “small shield”), a term conventionally applied to a crescent-shaped cutout ornament with two arch-shaped cutouts meeting at an apex on the inner border. In art such shields are traditionally depicted with Amazons, as in a floor mosaic from APAMEIA. A row of peltai decorate the top of the pediment above the augusti on the missorium of Theodosios I (see LARGITIO DISHES, Silver). Often repeated to form a border or frame, the pelta is common from the 4th to the 6th C., for example, in the Calendar of 354 (H. Stern, PELTA. Common pelta designs. (a) simple pelta; (b) paired peltas; (c) “double axe” motif (Paris, B.N. gr. 54).

Le calendrier de 354 [Paris 1953] 329–31. Pelta was a traditional pattern in Opus sectile and floor mosaics where it is often repeated to form quatrefoils, whorls, waves, or colonnades. It is rare after the 6th C., except in a small, closely related group of 13th-C. MSS, such as Paris, B.N. gr. 54, where it is repeated in borders to form a “double axe” motif.

PEN (κάλαμος, γραφίς). In antiquity the main writing instruments were the stilus (graphis) for writing on wax tablets (with a pointed end for engraving and a flattened one for erasing) and the kalamos for writing on papyrus. While in the West the kalamos began to be replaced by the goose quill from the early Middle Ages onward, in Byz. it remained dominant, and it is possible that goose quills were never used in Byz. The
**PENALTIES**

There were many different penalties in Byz. law, ranging in severity from fines and corporal punishment (whipping, shaving the head, BLINDING, MUTILATION, TORTURE), to EXILE and various forms of the death penalty. Confinement in PRISON was viewed by the law only as military arrest or as detention pending investigation; internment in a monastery was regarded as a form of relegation (milder exile). Often different kinds of punishment were combined; CONFISCATION and INFAMY were generally associated with other penalties. In many cases the law allowed for differentiation in the type and degree of penalty according to the social or financial position of the offender. The final choice of penalty was often left to the appropriate official. A coherent penal system was developed only in the ECLOGA; it competes, in the later legal collections, with the penal prescriptions of the Corpus JURIS CIVILIS. The death penalty, after a high point in late antiquity, was awarded with considerable restraint. Nevertheless, beheading, hanging on a stake (jurea), and even burning were applied in some cases of ROBBERY, rebellion, conspiracy, or grave heresy. Under religious influence, crucifixion as a death penalty was prohibited. The enforcement of penalties was supposed to rest in the hands of the state. When the church, which prescribed its own EPITIMIA, overstepped the strict bounds of its jurisdiction, it tried to forbid the imposition of additional state punishment.


**PENANCE** (μετάνοια, lit. “change of mind”), refers both to the ecclesial discipline that ultimately evolved into the SACRAMENT of penance or confession (exomologesis) of sins, and to the penitential act (epitimion) imposed upon penitents in satisfaction for sin. Though MONTANISM and NOVATIANISM had rejected the possibility that grave sin could ever be forgiven once baptism had taken place, this view was condemned at the First Council of Nicaea. Penance was formally recognized by the Byz. as a sacrament at the Council of Lyons.

The penitential discipline of “canonical penance” was developed esp. for those Christians who had lapsed under the persecution in the 3rd C. In this system, modeled on the catechumenate, those guilty of serious crimes (murder, idolatry, fornication) confessed their guilt, were enrolled in the class of penitents (a class with several grades in some areas like Asia Minor), excluded from communion in the Eucharist and prayers, prayed over and dismissed from services before the prayers of the faithful, and did penance, often for many years, before being publicly reconciled at the end of LENT and received again into communion at Easter.

Monastic practices of confession and spiritual direction by a PATER PNEUMATIKOS led to the spread of private “tariff penances” in which each sin was assigned an appropriate penance. Some Byz. PENITENTIALS containing lists of sins and the corresponding epitimia have survived.

Early EUCALOOGIA provide penitential prayers, but a complete confession rite for the use of monks and laity under the spiritual guidance of
monks—such as the Nomokanon falsely attributed to Patr. JOHN IV NESTEUTES (E. Herman, OrChrP 19 [1953] 80)—evolved only toward the end of the 10th C. and came into general use gradually thereafter. One penitential kanon of uncertain date was richly illustrated, ode by ode, in a MS of the 12th–13th C. (Vat. gr. 1754, Martin, Heavenly Ladder 128–49, figs. 246–77).

Fasting, prayer, alms, forgiveness of one’s enemies, renunciation of judgment and retaliation, or more generally, love of neighbor and of God were commonly recommended as means of metanoia. The gift of tears of contrition for men of all classes occupied a special place in this list. Nikon ho “Metanoëte” made the appeal to repentance the cornerstone of his tenets.

**Representation in Art.** Penitence did not acquire an established iconography in early Christian art despite its sometimes highly dramatic ceremonial, and it remained iconographically indeterminate thereafter. The greatest scene of penitence in the Bible, David rebuked by Nathan, was depicted as an act of proskynesis in Psalter illustration; the same posture is assumed by the emperor in the mosaic above the imperial door at Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, interpreted as Leo VI penitent about his fourth marriage (N. Oikonomides, DOP 30 [1976] 170–72). Proskynesis was in no sense limited to penitence, however, and penitents could assume other poses as well. The monk observing his soul’s judgment in the Psalter MS Athos, Dion. 65, hunches in terror (Treasures I, fig.118); the figures of monks accompanying the Penitential Kanon in certain 12th-C. MSS of John Climacus’ Heavenly Ladder engage in self-mortifying activities (T. Avner, Byzantium 54 [1984] 5–25). It is impossible in the countless images of crouched or praying monks and donors to distinguish penitence as such from a more general imploring.


**PENDENTIVE** (πρίγγωνον). The term may generally refer to anything worn on a chain around the neck or suspended from a ring, such as an enkolpion, a seal, cameo, amulet, or small reliquary. More specifically, the term is used for hanging elements of court insignia and regalia. A gold medallion of Constantius II and the mosaic of Justinian I in S. Vitale, Ravenna, show the emperors wearing a fibula with three pendants of gold or pearls, which identifies their imperial status. A pendant from a 6th-C. Byz. crown, now in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore (ed. A. Garside, Jewelry: Ancient to Modern [New York 1980], no.421), consists of a strip of gold foil with repoussé ornament and inset gems. All images of Justinian and Theodora and many later imperial portraits in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, show them wearing crowns with pendant jewels. Glass pendants were an inexpensive form of jewelry.

—S.D.C.

**PENDENTIVE** (τρίγγωνον), an architectural element used to form the transition between a square and a circle. Prokopios (Buildings 1.1.43–46) saw the pendentive as a spherical triangle presenting its concave face to the center of a square area covered by a dome. Pendentives, constructed of stone or brick, provide surfaces of continuous curvature between arches spanning adjacent sides of the area. Rising to the crowns of these arches they form a horizontal circle on which a drum and dome can be erected. The advantage of the pendentive over such alternative methods as a squinch lies in the purity of its geometric shape, the concavity of its surface (ideal for mosaic tesselae), and the apparent simplicity with which it joins square and circle. Although pendentive domes (i.e., domical vaults of continuous curvature from the base of a pendentive to the crown of a dome) are known in cut stone from the 2nd C. (Gerasa, West Baths; A. Boëthius, J. Ward-Perkins, Etruscan and Roman Architecture [Baltimore 1970] 438, pl.229) and in brick masonry from the early 5th C. (Mausoleum at Side: A.M. Mansel, JDAI 74
PENITENCE. See Penance.

PENTAKOUBOUKLON (πεντακούβουκλον), a room divided in an unspecified manner into five bays, perhaps a tetraconch built around a central space. A "great triklinos" of this name was added by Basil I to the Great Palace, where it adjoined the Portico of Marcian (TheophCont 335-90). Two chapels were attached to it—one of St. Paul, the other of St. Barbara. The epic of Digenes Akritas (ed. E. Trapp, 328, G VII 51-52 [3189-90]) describes, in the hero's palace, cross-shaped halls and strange "pentakoukla [ornamented] with extremely bright and brilliant marble."

PENTAPOLIS (Πεντάπολις, "Five Cities"), name applied to two groups of cities, one in Italy, the other in North Africa.

PENTAPOLIS IN ITALY, a military province in Italy established in the late 6th C. incorporating parts of the civil provinces of Flaminia and Picenum and ruled by a dux based in Rimini. It extended from the river Marecchia north of Rimini to the river Musone south of Osimo; in the west its probable boundary was the Apennine watershed, although it included part of the road corridor south to Rome and at times Perugia. Its name appears to derive from its two groups of cities: Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Senigallia, and Ascona in the north; Urbino, Fossombrone, Iesi, Cagli, and Gubbio in the south. Hence, references occur to two provinces (Pentapolis maritima and Pentapolis annomaria) and to Decapolis. Its social and political institutions were closely linked to...
those of the exarchate of Ravenna, whose exarch appears to have exercised some direct authority over it. Most of Pentapolis was occupied by the Lombard king Liutprand between 726 and 743 and all of it was conquered by Aistulf in 751. Although incorporated into the papal patrimony soon after, the archbishop of Ravenna retained considerable lands and influence.


PENTAPOLIS IN NORTH AFRICA, the five Greek poleis on the coast of the Djebel Akhdar plateau in northeastern Libya. Under Diocletian they were formed into the province of Libya Pentapolis or Libya Superior. Between 390 and ca.450, the province was subjected to frequent attacks by local tribes, particularly the Austuriani (see MAURI), leading to the construction of additional frontier fortifications and the repair of urban defenses. The chronic warfare also contributed to the creation of an independent dux of Libya Pentapolis by no later than ca.470. Although considerable damage was inflicted on the province by the tribal razzias, the letters of Synesios of Cyrene and a recent archaeological survey suggest surprising continuity in the local agrarian economy (see CYRENAICA), perhaps owing to increased ecclesiastical ownership of rural estates. In the late 5th or early 6th C. the provincial capital was evidently transferred from water-starved Ptolemais to Apollonia. Raiding by the Mazikes in the same period prompted Anastasios I and Justinian I to further strengthen urban and frontier fortifications. Some indication of the military stability achieved in the province by the mid-7th C. is revealed by the support given to Herakleios in his revolt against Phokas by both the governor and local tribes.

The church of Pentapolis was subordinate to the patriarch of ALEXANDRIA. The metropolitan of Ptolemais did, however, have the authority to call provincial councils. The bishops of the Pentapolis were strong supporters of Arianism in the 4th C. and Monophysitism in the 5th C. The province was conquered by the Arabs between 642 and 645.


PENTAPYRGION (πεντάπυργοι), a construction with five towers or domes, the central member of which is taller than the four minor domes or towers at the corners. The earliest example is found in the 4th-C. Church of S. Lorenzo in Milan. In the 9th C. the five-domed type appeared in the Nea Ekklesia in Constantinople, emulated in numerous later churches. The form also appears in MSS illustrations and in reliquaries and furniture: most notably, a large cupboard crowned with five towers, built for Emp. Theophilos (829–42), was used to display precious objects in the Chrysotrikilos of the Great Palace.


PENTARCHY (πενταρχία, “the power of the five”). According to the theory of pentarchy, particular authority in the church was invested in five principal sees of Christendom, with honorary PRIMACY attributed to Rome, followed in order of precedence by Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Ultimately, retention of membership in the pentarchy depended on a see's orthodoxy, not on any divine right. The conciliar documents establishing the status of these sees consider their authority the result of ecclesiastical legislation or law (cf. Council of Chalcedon, canon 28). By the reign of Justinian I, when the theory received the endorsement of civil law, the church was already conceived as being governed by a pentarchy of PARCHATES; together they summed up the whole Catholic church (cf. nov.109, prooemium). In the words of THEODORE OF STOUDIOS, this collective earthly authority constituted the supreme pentarchic power of the church (PG 99:1417C). Significantly, he applied the text of Matthew 16:19 equally to all five patriarchs and even described them as the Apostles' five diadochoi, “successors.” The same verse, however, could also be applied to all bishops.

Although Rome's special position within the union was never denied—its presbeia, “privileges,” were always respected—the common authority of the other sees was equally essential. The Byz. view
that a council was ecumenical when all the patriarchates were represented was founded on this principle (Maximos the Confessor, PG 91:352D). The Council of HIÉRIA was thus denied ecumenicity and dogmatic authority by NICÉA II because it lacked this criterion. The absolute equality of all five patriarchs, expressed subsequently by PÉTER III of Antioch and Neilos DOXOPATRES, was a variation of the same idea. Behind it lay the concept of collective primacy enunciated earlier.


PENTATEUCH (Πεντάτευχος, the "five books" or the Law), the first section of the OLD TESTAMENT containing the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Their authorship was ascribed to Moses. The Pentateuch was esp. respected by the Jews, and Greek theologians (e.g., Origen, Theodoret of Cyrrhus) devoted substantial space to it in their Old Testament commentaries. The beginning of Genesis attracted particular attention and was interpreted in many hexaemera. Cyril of Alexandria, on the other hand, wrote a commentary (Glaphyra) on the five books of Moses as a whole; its major purpose was to interpret this text as a prediction of Christ's coming (PG 69:16AB). At the end of the 11th C., Tobia ben Elieser of Kastoria wrote a Hebrew commentary on the Pentateuch, in which he inserted some Greek phrases transliterated in Hebrew letters; he mentions the First Crusade and the Crusaders' cruelty toward German Jews (J. Perles, BZ 2 [1893] 574f).


—J.I., A.K.

PENTECOST (Πεντηκοστή, lit. "the fiftieth [day]"), the day of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles, according to Acts 2. Pentecost refers both to the 50-day period from Easter to Whit-sunday inclusive and to Whitsunday itself.

Pentecost celebrated not an event but a mystery of salvation manifested in several events. The primitive sense of Pentecost as a season symbolic of the new age ushered in by the paschal victory of Christ, in which his glory was manifested, comprised the themes of Jesus' resurrection, ascension, session at the right hand of the Father, and parousia, as well as the descent of the Spirit. The Pentecost season was like a 50-day-long "Great Sunday" and "Eighth Day," and it retained elements characteristic of Sunday and Easter liturgy: there was no Fasting, Kneeling was forbidden, Eucharist was celebrated daily, and Baptism was administered (Mateos, Typicon 2:97–139). Mid-pentecost (mesopentekoste) on Wednesday of the fourth week after Easter received a special commemoration; on this day the emperor went in procession to the Church of St. MOKIOS (De cer., bk.1, ch.17).

The feast's original components eventually split into separate historical commemorations, Ascension and Pentecost Sunday, with emphasis on the latter as feast of the event of Acts 2, a development first noted in the 5th C. Pentecost Sunday, celebrated in all churches of Constantinople, was preceded by a vigil with paramone and pannychis. Then, after orthros the patriarch administered baptism and chrismation in the baptistery of Hagia Sophia. According to the Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 211–19), on both these days the emperor went in solemn procession to liturgy and banqueted following it. The De ceremoniis (De cer., bk.1, ch.9) provides a lengthy description of the imperial celebration of Pentecost.

Kneeling recommenced with the gonyklisia rite. From the 14th C. onward, the liturgy of the Pentecost season, originally contained in the TRIODION, was codified in the PENTEKOSTARION.

Representation in Art. The earliest images of the Pentecost are of the 6th C. (RABBULA GOSPELS, fol.14v; MONZA AMPULLA, no.10—Graber, AMPOLES, pl.17, p.26f). They show rays descending on the 12 Apostles, who stand to either side of the Virgin, her presence signaling the event's significance in Church history. The Pentecost assumed a different form after Iconoclasm, its meaning as an image of the Church conveyed now by the seating of the Apostles on a synthronon-like, semicircular bench with Peter and Paul in the center. The rays emanate from an arc of heaven that sometimes encloses the HETOIMASIA. Below the Apostles stand groups of armed or
exotically clad people representing the “tribes” and “tongues” (phylai and glossai). From the 13th C. onward, the Virgin occasionally reappears (MILESEVA). The phylai and glossai are often replaced by a crowned personification of Kosmas. The Pentecost is depicted on icons; in monumental painting, where it became a major dome composition (Hosios Loukas); in monastic chapter houses (Cutler, infra); and in MSS—accompanying Psalm 66 in marginal Psalters, Homily 41 of Gregory of Nazianzos, and either Acts 2:1-4 or John 7:37 in lectionaries and Gospel books.


PENTEKOSTARION (πεντηκοστάριον), liturgical book of hymnody, continuation of the triodion. The pentekostarion contains the “propers” or variable elements for the 50 day Pentecost season, including Pentecost week and its following Sunday, All Saints’ Day. The name pentekostarion first appears in MS Serres 84, dated 1348.


LIT. P. de Meester, Riti e particolarità liturgiche del Triodio e del Pentecostario (Padua 1943). —R.F.T.

PELAGOMENOS (Πελαγομένος, fem. Πελαγωμένη), on seals frequently Pagomenos, a family of civil functionaries known from the late 11th C., when some Pagomenoi were granted the high titles of sebastophoros and rhaiktor. The Pagomenoi were primarily judges (John in 1082, a participant in the trials of John Italos; John in 1106, a judge of the velum) and notaries (Nikophoros, a notary in the sekretion of the sea in 1188-99; Nikophoros, imperial grammaticos, an envoy to Genoa in 1192). They still held modest posts in the civil administration in the 14th C.: Theodore, protoboularios in 1366; a logosthetes ton agelon (first name unknown). The Pagomenoi served also in church administration: Nikophoros Blembydes sent a letter to Pagomenos, bishop of Nikomedea; John (?) was chartophylax of the bishopric of Hieron in 1214 (MM 6:167-13-14); a megas ekklesiarches and a (patriarchal?) protonotarios were active in the 14th C. A Greek inscription from the Ancona region mentions Theodore Pe pagomenos (1141-86) who took the monastic habit (as Theosteriktos) in a local monastery. Some Pagomenoi of the 13th-15th C. belonged to the intelligentsia: John Pagomenos, an artist on Crete (see ARTISTS); correspondents of PALAMAS and GREGORAS (Nicholas Pagomenos, perhaps the author of an enkomion of the martyr Isidoros) and of HYRTAKENOS and CHORTASMENOS (see, e.g., PE PAGOMENOS, DEMETRIOS); and several scribes.


PELAGOMENOS, DEMETRIOS, writer; fl. first half of 15th C. A member of the PEGOMENOS family. Demetrios Pagomenos was a doctor who lived in Constantinople and corresponded with John CHORTASMENOS, John Eugenikos, and BESSARION. In 1415/16 Pagomenos accompanied Emp. Manuel II on a journey to the Peloponnesos, serving as secretary. He wrote treatises on gout, hawking, and dogs as well as a monody on the death (1433) of Kleope Palaiologina (the former Cleopa Malatesta), wife of THEODORE II PALAIOLOS, despotes of the Peloponnesos. The unnamed emperor addressed in Pagomenos’s works was falsely identified by Vergetius, Pagom einos’s 16th-C. editor, with Michael VIII Palaiologos. Subsequent scholarship has mistakenly asserted the existence of a 13th-C. Demetrios Pagomenos.


PERA. See GALATA.

PERFUMES AND UNGUENTS. The word myron (μύρων) encompasses a variety of products—perfumes, sweet oils, and ungents—usually characterized by their fragrance. The production of perfume was well developed in antiquity and the terms myrepos and myropoles are frequently attested (H. Blümner, Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern, vol. 1 [Gp. Hildesheim 1969] 361). In EVAGRIOS
Zoe, who had a passionate interest in the production of cosmetics and perfumes, set up a "household workshop" in the palace and made her servants toil over hot braziers in her chambers summer and winter (Psellus, Chron. 1:114, par.64.7–19). Patr. Loukas Chrysoberges considered the profession of perfumer dishonorable, since the workshops of myrepsi, like bathhouses, teemed with deception and greed (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 6:343.19–21).

Myrepsiaka ergasteria or perfume workshops are mentioned in several documents of the late Byz. period (Lavra 3, no.123.110; MM 2:525.21). In Thessalonike myrepsi evidently formed a guild: a document of 1320 refers to their exarch (Dölger, Schatz, no.111.30–31).


A.K.

PERGAMON (Πέργαμον, now Bergama), city of northwestern Asia Minor. In the 4th C. Pergamon was an important intellectual center where Aidekos taught Neoplatonic philosophy and "Chaldean wisdom" was popular; MAXIMOS OF EPSHEUS and EUNAPIOS OF SARDIS worked there, and Julian came to study. Otherwise the city seems not to have flourished in late antiquity. Pergamon withdrew to its hilltop acropolis, fortified by Constans II, and became a city of the THRACESION theme. It had an Armenian community and was the home of the emperor PHILIPPPIKOS. It was attacked by the Arabs in 663 and 716. After attacks by the Turks in 1109 and 1113, Pergamon was rebuilt by Manuel I ca.1170 and probably became the capital of NEOKASTRA. Pergamon fell to the Turks of Karasi soon after 1302. It was a suffragan of Ephesus, elevated to metropolis in the 13th C.

Excavations reveal that the city of the 12th–13th C. consisted of small houses, with a few public buildings and churches, built along narrow streets on the slopes of the acropolis. Theodore II Laskaris, who visited Pergamon before 1254, described the insignificance of the buildings of his day compared with the great works of antiquity. Pergamon preserves the remains of its two circuits of walls and of the medieval town.


C.F.
PERGE. See Pamphylia; Syllaion.

PERIBLEPTOS MONASTERY, a monastic community dedicated to the Theotokos he Peribleptos (Περιβλέπτος, “celebrated”), located in the southwestern part of Constantinople. The church was built between 1030 and 1034 by Emp. Romanos III Argyros, who spared no expense in its construction (Psellus, Chron. 1:41–43). Both Romanos and Nikephoros III Botaniates, a later benefactor of the monastery, were buried in the church. In the 11th and 12th C., the Peribleptos monastery was involved in the Bogomil controversy; Euthymios of Armonia, who denounced the Phoundagiates, was a monk at Peribleptos. In 1143 the monk Hilarion, who was condemned for Bogomilism, was confined at Peribleptos. Greek monks continued to occupy the monastery during the first years of the Latin occupation of Constantinople but were replaced by Latin monks some time after 1206.

The Peribleptos was restored by Michael VIII after his recovery of Constantinople, and played a significant role throughout the Palaiologan period. The imperial court visited the church annually on the feast of the Presentation in the Temple. It possessed numerous relics, notably the hand of St. John the Baptist and the head of St. Gregory of Nazianzos, which attracted Russian pilgrims and Western visitors. In 1403 Clavigo tells of paintings on the exterior of the church, (unidentified) imperial portraits in the interior, and the representation of 90 castles and towns in the monastery's domain. Its refectory contained Christological mosaics and the cloister an image of the Tree of Jesse.

Greek monks remained in the monastery until 1643, when the Ottoman sultan granted the monastic complex to the Armenians for the site of their patriarchate; it then took the name of St. George of Psamatia or Sulumanastir. The original 11th-C. church was burned twice, in 1782 and 1872; the present structure is completely modern.

-A.M.T., A.C.

PERINTHOS. See Herakleia.

PERIODEUTES. See Chorefiskopos.

PERIORISMOS. See Praktikon.

PERIPOUS (περιπλοῦς, lit. “sailing around”), a collection of sailing directions, belonging to an ancient documentary genre that survived in late antiquity and was eventually continued in the portulans. The periopen contain data on shorelines, harbors, market towns, and neighboring tribes and their wares. Evidence concerning their authorship and date is usually rare: thus pseudophi’s Periplus of the Erythrean (Red) Sea is usually dated in the 3rd C., but A. Dible (Unsirtentte Daten [Cologne-Opladen 1965] 9–35) asserts that the trade with India described therein was not typical of the 3rd C. and suggests an earlier date. Some periploi, like those of Markianos of Heraclea, were compilative. The Periplus of the Euxine (Black) Sea (not earlier than the first half of the 6th C.) was a mélange of three ancient geographic texts—Menippus, Phprian, and an anonymous periegesis addressed to king Nikomedes; quite rarely the author of the Periplus of the Euxine Sea added a contemporary name for a people or a site. The Periplus of the Euxine Sea gives the distances not in Greek stadion but in Roman miles. The Expositio totius mundi can be considered as a periplos but it is more original and richer in economic data. Another genre of guidebooks, hodosporai, are brief and strongly influenced by Christian tradition; they claim to represent the route from Paradise via India to Rome.


-A.K.

PERI POLITIKES EPISTEMES, an anonymous tract on political theory partially preserved in a Vatican palimpsest and dating from the reign of Justinian I. It is plausibly, though not certainly, equated with the anonymous treatise Peri Politikes, reviewed by Photios (Bibl. cod.37); older identifications of one or both of these with the Peri politikes katastaseos of Peter Patrikios are now rejected. The text described by Photios was a dialogue in six books between the patrikios Menas
and the referendarios Thomas; it advocated, with some criticism of Plato's Republic, the classical Peri-patetic theory of the mixed constitution, a combination of the best elements of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. Only parts of books 4 and 5 survive, dealing with military and political issues. Its emphasis on the senate as repository of the best men has been taken to reflect that body's revival in the 6th C., with connections made with the relevant opinions expressed by John Lydos and Prokopios of Caesarea. The treatise is esp. notable for its use of and familiarity with Latin texts, above all Cicero's De Republica (C.A. Behr, AJPh 95 [1974] 141-49); the elder Cato (A.S. Fotiou, ClMed 33 [1981-82] 125-33), Juvenal, Livy, and Seneca are also adduced.


-B.B.

PERI STRATEGIKEΣ, conventional title for an anonymous treatise on strategy perhaps written around the mid-6th C. during the reign of Justinian I (Dennis) or later (Baldwin). The beginning of the pamphlet and possibly some other sections are missing; 47 chapters are preserved. An initial brief analysis of class divisions delineates the multi-tiered structure of Byz. civilian society and defines the function of each group; this account can be linked with such contemporary discussions as those of Agapetos and the anonymous Peri politikes epistemes. The author then embarks upon a much lengthier discussion of strategy, both offensive and defensive. Drawing both on classical manuals and his own military experience, the anonymous writer, perhaps a retired army engineer, treats such topics as tactics, signal fires, fortifications, siege machinery, armor, and weaponry.

ED. Dennis, Military Treatises 1-135.


-B.B., A.M.T.

PERITHEORION (Περιθεωρίων), a stronghold erected on a hill in the Rhodope Mountains by the shore of Lake Porou. The bandon and the kastron of Peritheorion (in the theme of Boleron) are mentioned in the typikon of Gregory Pakouri-anos (P. Gautier, REB 42 [1984] 37.299-303). The bishopric of Peritheorion or Datos, under the jurisdiction of Traianopolis, is known from the 10th C. onward (Notitiae CP 7.602). A 14th-C. historian (Kantak. 2:197.9-10) asserts that the town (polis) was previously called Anastasiopolis and was renamed Peritheorion by Andronikos III; this identification is evidently incorrect, since Peritheorion had been known earlier and esp. since notitiae of Nicholas I Mystkos listed two separate bishoprics—Peritheorion and Anastasiopolis.

Peritheorion in the 11th C. was an agricultural town. Pakourianos's brother maintained a household (aule) there and Vatopedi possessed a metochion. It was also involved in commerce, and the Venetians had trading privileges in Peritheorion. Like many other Thracian centers, Peritheorion was destroyed by Kalojan in 1206 and its inhabitants were resettled along the banks of the Danube. It reappeared by the 14th C., became a metropolis after 1341 (when Andronikos III fortified it), and played an important role in the civil wars of the mid-14th C. In 1345 Moncilo was defeated outside its walls (M. Bartusis, BS 41 [1980] 209f). The expansion of swampland around Peritheorion forced its citizens to desert the town, probably after 1431, when Bertrand de la Broquière noted its strategic position when he passed through the area.


-A.K.

PERNIK (Πέρνικος), Bulgarian fortress on the upper Struma, on the hill "Krakra," commanding one of the routes from Niš to Sofia. In the 4th-6th C. it was a modest, unfortified town; remains of churches dating from that period have been found. It survived to the time of Justin II. In the 8th C. a Slav village was located on the hill; in the 9th C. it was surrounded by a wall. Contacts with Byz. are indicated by coins from Basil I onward. In the reign of Samuel of Bulgaria Pernik was held by the boyar Krakra, who withstood sieges by Basil II in 1004 and 1016 but surrendered Pernik in 1018. The fortress seems to have flourished in the 11th-12th C., when several churches were built; Byz. coins of emperors up to Alexios III have been found in Pernik as well as seals of
Nikephoros III and several high-ranking officials. The army of Frederick I Barbarossa passed through Pernik in 1189; at the end of that year Stefan Nemanja captured and plundered the fortress. It never fully recovered, although a cemetery of the 13th–14th C. shows that life on the hill continued.


PERSAI (Πέρσαι), “Persians,” the classical ethnic term that designated the population of Iran. The term was used by the authors of the 4th–7th C., who were contemporaries of the Byzantine-Persian wars (Prokopios, George of Pisidia, etc.), and by later writers, such as Theophanes the Confessor who often speaks of “inner Persia,” identifying it as Khurāsān (Theoph. 366.27–484.4). The Byz. knew that the Arabs conquered the territory of the Persians, who subsequently rebelled frequently against their masters, but there is no confusion between the Arabs and Persai in Byz. texts. An 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 442.90–91) clearly notes that the Saracens took over the power of the Persai. From the 11th C. onward, the term was transferred to the Turkic peoples (e.g., Seljuks, Ottomans) and also Mongols; some literati emphasized the identity of the Persai and Turks (e.g., Attal. 105.11), but later (in Eustathios of Thessalonike, Niketas Choniates, John VI Cantakouzenos, etc.) the term Persai was indiscriminately applied to the Turks, whereas the term Tourkoi acquired a different meaning. Various related terms were derived from Persai: Persanai or Persarches, the ruler of the Seljuk; Persarmenoi, the Turks under the rule of the DanisMendids; Persotourkoi/Tourkopersai; Persoscythians, etc. Manuel II’s anti-Muslim treatise bears the title “Conversations with a certain Persian.”

LIT. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica 2:252–55. – A.K.

PERSSEPHONE, or Kore (Lat. Proserpina), in Greek mythology the only daughter of Demeter, whom Hades or Pluto carried off to the netherworld; Demeter was able to liberate her on the condition that Persephone would remain underground part of the year. Another myth is related by Nonnos of Panopolis (Dionysiaka 6:155–76): Zeus, in the form of a dragon, entered the bedchamber of the “Virgin Persephone” and she bore to him Zagreus, the horned baby; Zagreus was murdered and dismembered by the Titans, but he was miraculously resurrected and began his new life as Dionysos. The core of this myth, the triumph of nature over death, contributed to its assimilation by Christianity: the scene of Pluto carrying off Persephone in a chariot while she tries to free herself from his embraces appeared on a Christian sarcophagus.

The rape of Persephone is depicted in a miniature in Paris, B.N. Coisl. gr. 239 (Weitzmann, infra, fig.51), in which Pluto drags Persephone into a chasm.


PERSIA. See Iran.

PERSIAN LITERATURE. The tradition of contacts between Greek and Iranian civilization dates back to the period of the Greco-Persian wars (5th C. B.C.). It is very probable that at that time the literary image of the Greek “enemy” began to develop in Iranian folklore and literature. The principal monuments of old Persian literature (Pahlavi and Sasanian) are apparently lost, even though they still existed in the 6th C.; Agathias (Agath. 4.30) describes Sasanian books on history that he read with the aid of the Syrian monk Sergios. Fortunately, however, the information provided by Sasanian literature on Byz.-Iranian contacts has not been totally lost, since most of it, compiled in a voluminous history, the Khwaddynāmā, was translated into Arabic (abstracts are included in the History of al-Ṭabarî and translations in ibn Muqaffa’ī) and into the Neo-Persian language (Firdausi’s Shah-nāma). The national Iranian legacy in which the Greeks appeared as “enemies” to the Iranian state was retained up to the medieval period. Only when Greece (Byz.) became a Christian state did this attitude undergo a transformation. With the triumph of the new faith in Byz. and its restriction in Zoroastrian Iran, the centuries-old rivalry between the two states became primarily a religious struggle and continued as such when Iran became an Islamic state.

The Iranians living under the ‘Abbāsid caliphate began to develop a national and cultural self-consciousness in the second half of the 9th C. The new Iranian ideology, at once Islamic and national, was expressed in the establishment of quasi-
autonomous states, such as those of the Tahirids and Samanids. This ideology powerfully influenced the rise of a new Persian literature, composed in the Farsi and Dari dialects and written in the recently borrowed Arabic script. Familiarity with Arabic now meant that Persian writers were included in the whole Islamic literary tradition. Persian literature consequently evolved under the triple influences of Islamic scholar, the wider Arabic literary tradition, and the national Iranian legacy. It thus absorbed and perpetuated the content and forms of expression characteristic of each. Works inspired by the Islamic and Arabic legacies include Qur'an commentaries, hadith, and world and local chronicles. Specifically “national” Iranian genres include heroic and epic poetry and folklore. Consequently the image of foreign nations, including “Rum” (Byz.), is highly diverse and varies according to genre.

In Persian literature, the term Rum and its ethnic connotations were derived primarily from Arab geographers. Rum variously signified the ancient Greeks (known also as Yunanî [from Ionians]), occasionally the ancient Romans (known also, just like the people from western Europe, as Farangi [from Franks]), and the Byz. From the 11th C. the term al-Rum (i.e., Rum with the definite article) was used to denote Asia Minor. In addition, theological writers regarded the Rum as descendants of the biblical Yonan (cf. Gen 10:2,4) and/or a certain Romal(n)us (this detail is of Byz./Christian origin). Those writing in national genres, such as Firdausi in the Shâh-nâma and Nizâmî in the Iskandar-nâma, connected the Rum with Alexander the Great, whom they came to view as the national hero not only of Rum, but also of Iran.

Persian geographers derived their data about the land of Rum from Arab geographers and travelers, such as al-Jarmî, Hârin ibn Yahyâ, and al-Qazwînî. In the Hudûd al-‘Alam, for example, the land of Rum is situated on the shores of the Bosporus in the western part of al-ma‘mûra (Pers./Ar. for Gr. oikoumenê). It is described as a prosperous country, divided into 14 nâhiyât or themes, each headed by a sipâhsalâr or governor. The information on Constantinople is also derived from Arab geographers like al-Qazwînî. Authors writing in the national genres, in contrast, generally provide few details (cf. Firdausi, Hâfîz, Jalâl al-Dîn Rûmî, and others). These authors often mention Rum together with other “western” peoples, primarily the “Rus,” then the “Franks” and Bulgarians.

Persian historians were not very interested in Byz. history. Their knowledge of it was essentially limited to the facts of their “common” history, for instance, the Byz.-Persian wars of the 6th C. The fact that Persian historians and writers (e.g., Firdausi, Ballami) deal with these subjects suggests that the Sasanians (and consequently the islamized Persians) primarily claimed to be warriors. Some war themes, for example, the story of the flight of Chosroes II to Byz. and his alleged marriage to Maria, a daughter of Maurice, were in vogue in Persian literature (Firdausi, Nizâmî). The Byz., on the other hand, ignored this subject. In the Persian chronicles there is also a list of Byz. emperors up to Nikephoros II Phokas with a few details about their reigns (Ballami, Baydawi, Banâkiti, Abû Bakr Shabankârî, and the so-called Anonymous of Iskandar). Quite rare in Persian literature are “original data” such as the observations of Ballami on the relations between Bâbak and Theophilos ca.831, and some details on the history of Pontos (e.g., Mu‘in al-Dîn Parwâna and Ibn Bîbî’s description of the capture of Sinope; the works of Aqsaрайî, Abû Bakr Tîhrâni, and Hwagi-Halfâ). Some information on Byz.-Seljuk relations (esp. on the battle of Mantzikert, Romanos IV Diogenes, and Alp Arslan’s victories) is provided by Kâshâni (his text survives in the Arabic translation by ‘Imâd al-Dîn al-Isfâhânî), Bundârî, Naṣîr al-Dîn al-Ṭûsî, and in the 14th-C. anonymous chronicle, Ta‘rih Al-i-Seljuk. In addition there is some “historical data” in poetic texts, such as two qasîdas by Khâqânî (dedicated to Andronikos I Komnenos who in 1173–74 lived at the courts of the shahs of Shirwân) and the qasîda of Mûhî al-Dîn ibn al-Zaki, who describes the conquest of Jerusalem during the First Crusade.

Persian authors rarely distinguished between civil and military officials when describing Byz. administration and the army. They were familiar with the basics of Byz. administration from certain Arabic sources, such as al-Marwazi’s translation of al-Awfi and al-Ahwâzî as cited in al-Biruni. Normally, however, Persian authors mentioned only a few ranks, notably the qaysar (emperor) and biqîr (patrikios). In the Shâh-nâmâ, ibn Bîbî, Aqsaрайî, and Abu Bakr Tîhrâni these officials are, in fact, identical. The confusion of some administrative titles with similarly sounding eccle-
siasitical titles often resulted in erroneous conceptions about the Byz. army. The Byz. fleet was known to the Persians primarily from Arabic sources, but a few eyewitness accounts do exist, for example, Naṣīr-i Khusrau’s report on the use of mirrors in defense against the Byz. fleet. The image of the Byz. army, its might and military genius is more apparent in the national genres, where the Rūm were considered equals since they derived their origins from Alexander the Great and possessed an ancient culture as noble as that of the Iranians. In poetry and folklore Byz. warriors appear as knights, equipped with gleaming weapons, banners, trumpets, cymbals, and the obligatory cross (Shāh-nāma).

In Persian literature the Rūm are distinguished by their Christian faith. The Persian description of Christianity did not differ from that in Arabic literature. Persian sources include information about Christian sects, hermits, the church hierarchy, the ceremony of baptism, and icons. Some features of the Christian cult were regarded favorably. In poetry the dress of the beloved was sometimes compared with the Christian cross or the golden altar of the Christians. In the epic of Amir Arslān, the oath that the Franks swear “in the name of Jesus and Mary” strikes the Persians as persuasive. Sa’dī al-Shīrāzī quotes the Gospels to add force to his words, and other poets such as Ḥāfiz employ allusions from the Gospels. In the Shāh-nāma it is stated that Christianity, like Islam and Zoroastrianism, is one of the defenders of the truth. The same text extols Alexander the Great because he was wedded “in Christian prayer.”

The attitude of Persian writers toward Byz. cultural achievements was ambivalent. In a negative vein, they considered the Byz. to be pale imitators of the ancient Greeks, a view that can be traced to Arab authors. This perception of Byz. inadequacy was heightened because of the empire’s location in the west—in Şīfī thought, the source of all evils. Byz. emperors, moreover, were seen as too harsh. In a positive vein, the Rūm were also viewed as the heirs of the ancient Greeks, and as such werebearers of good. Like the Greeks, they were depicted as skilled musicians, artisans, and even doctors, rivaled only by the Chinese. Persian authors often mention the Rūm as superb painters and describe their icons. Rūm was also considered to be the land of wisdom. The wealth of Byz. was central to the positive image of Rūm, which was popularly depicted as a land rich in gold, jewels, furs, silks, etc., and its luxury products were considered as valuable as those coming from China.

In medieval Persian the term rūmī was associated with certain colors, esp. red (as the rūmī shoes of the emperor), gold (as in rūmī dinars), and white (as in rūmī slave girls). The word rūm often appears as a metaphor for dawn, as in the poetic cliché, “The world has received the adornments of light; the throne of Ethiopians has fled from the ‘Rūm.’”

The influence of Persian literature on Byz. literature was slight, but borrowings are found in the tale of Barlam and Ioasaph and a story from Kar-nāmaq about the birth of Ardashir, son of Bapak. The latter was included by Agathias in his work (Agath. 2.27). There are also some motifs in the Alexander Romance of Persian origin (the apophthegmata of Alexander which are found in the Shāh-nāma and Qabīs-nāma) and in the chronicle of George Hamartolos (95.3–5; cf. Plutarch, Alex. 21). Especially in the Palaiologan period a few Byz. scholars were familiar with Persian treatises on astronomy, some of which they translated into Greek. Medieval Greek borrowings from Persian vocabulary, with the exception of proper names, are relatively rare; examples are țzykanisterion, or polo-ground, from Pers. čowgan, polo-game, and karbantion, caravan, from Pers. karvan, vessel (De adm. imp. 9.27, 45.88f).


PERSON (πρόσωπον, lit. “face”), a term used in Trinitarian and Christological controversies, equivalent to the Lat. persona. The concept of divine prosopon (different from the metaphorical “Face of God” in the Old Testament) appears by the 3rd C., in Tertullian in Latin and Hippolytus in Greek, designating the concrete presentation of the individual; Hippolytus speaks of two prosopa—the Father and Son—and one power (dynamis) of God. The term was used by the adherents of Sabellianism who seem to have spoken in
the vein of MONARCHIANISM of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as being “of the same matter (pragma) and prosopon” (Athanasios of Alexandria, PG 26:732C). They evidently were not consistent in their terminology, however, and Eusebius of Caesarea (PG 24:1016A) ascribes to them the formula “One hypostasis of three persons.” The lack of clear discrimination between SUBSTANCE, NATURE, HYPOSTASIS, and person led many earlier authors to prefer the vaguer use of “three” and “one.” Gradually, in opposition to Sabellios and probably under the influence of ORIGEN and his school, the use of hypostasis—as contrasted with ousia (substance) and physis (nature)—became preferable, although the ANTIQUE SCHOOL, up to the time of Nestorios, applied the term prosopon to describe the unity in Christ as contrasted with his two substances, divine and human.

In usual Byz. terminology prosopon denoted the individual (idikon) as opposed to the common (koinon). This distinction between person and nature, albeit not a domain of philosophical thought, found its place in the formulas of the creed. The anthropological paradigm on which orthodox or Chalcedonian Christology is based contributed to the development of the distinction between the individual that does not exclude the common or communicabile (“participating”), and the individual in itself, or incommunicabile.


—K.-H.U.

PERSONIFICATION, the incarnation in anthropomorphic form of abstract qualities and natural phenomena. Writers of all periods from late antiquity to the end of Byz. used personification as a favored rhetorical device. BOETHIUS presents his Console of Philosophy as a series of dialogues with the lady Philosophia. Classicizing poets of the 5th and 6th C. personified forces such as Aletheia (Truth) and Eirene (Peace), VIRTUES such as Dikaiosyne (Justice) and Sophrosyne (Moderation), and countries (e.g., Aigyptos). Writers of letters and sermons (e.g., PHTHIO) were fond of using personifications as vehicles for the points they wished to make.

In art, such devices were widely favored until the 6th C. Based on literature, these figures of Classical or, more often, Hellenistic inspiration are found in floor mosaics and retained in MSS.

PERSONIFICATION. Personifications from the Joshua Roll (Vat. Pal. gr. 431, sheet XII); 10th C. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. To the left, the reclining male personification of Mt. Ebal; to the right, the seated female personification of the city of Ga-baon.
and other works made for Christian patrons. Antique personifications such as Homenoa (Concord) were preserved only as inscriptions on marriage belts and finger rings; iconographically their role was assumed by Christ. On the other hand, pre-Christian concepts such as the Tyche survived, essentially unchanged in form and meaning, in consular diptychs and MSS. Ancient personifications of disciplines such as Epinoia (Design) and qualities such as Megalopsychia (Magnanimity) and Proneosis (Prudence or Good Sense) appear in the 6th-C. Vienna Dioskorides. Political concepts such as Eutaxia (Good Order), who averts a civil war in Thessalonike (Lemerle, Miracles 1:115.19–116.3), are embodied and intervene in human affairs in the manner of saints seen in visions. On the other hand, an illuminated biblical MS like the Vienna Genesis makes use of pagan personifications such as Nymphs, conceived as the embodiment of springs of water, for what are apparently purely decorative purposes.

Despite a reduction in the absolute number of Classical personifications employed, those that survived were used relatively often in and after the 9th C. and applied to a broader range of situations. In a 9th-C. Chrysostom MS (Athens, Nat. Lib. 2 11) figures representing the Winds announce the resurrection of the dead; these emerge from the earth, which is personified as Ge. Other personifications were deliberately revived in order to evoke the Christian virtues of princes—Sophia and Propheteria accompany David in Psalter illustrations, while Aletheia (Truth) and Tapeinosis (Humility) appear on the crown of Constantine IX. This symbiosis of pagan and Christian personifications thereafter is one of the features of Byz. art. Where a clear preference for one or the other is evident, this is determined by the context and purpose of the work on which they occur: for example, the Theodore Psalter and MSS of John Klimax employ Christian personifications such as Gastrimargia (Gluttony) or purely medieval inventions such as Apothesteia, while textiles made for imperial use depict the Antique figure of the City. The most common manner of their employment is the conversion to Christian purposes of pagan personifications: figures such as Night, Bythos, and Erythra Thalassa participate in the history of the Chosen People; Hades, the Antipodes, and Helios in his chariot lend a Classical aspect to the illustration of verses in the Psalms and Gospels. The repertoire of Palaiologan art was enriched not only by a more widespread use of figures such as Ekklesia and Synagogue but esp. by the return of Antique forms such as Cosmos.


−L.S.B. MacC., A.C.

PERSPECTIVE, the art of delineating objects on a surface so that their positions and sizes display the same relationship as in nature. For Roman and late antique writers perspective was a part of optics and, under the name of skenographia, applied to architectural projection. This involved the sort of distortion evident in the mosaics of the dome of St. George (see George, Rotunda of Saint) at Thessalonike where buildings are represented as if from above but read more correctly when seen from the spectator’s normal position below. Constantine of Rhodes (v. 498) seems to describe such a system in the mosaics of the Church of Holy Apostles at Constantinople. The Hellenistic and Roman use of so-called aerial perspective, in which colors change and tend toward blue as a function of their distance from the spectator, is still present in the backgrounds of such 10th-C. MSS as the Paris Psalter but, in monumental art of this and later periods, is replaced by “inverted perspective,” in which elements to the rear of the picture space are set farther apart rather than closer together as in the linear perspective of the Italian Renaissance.

Such arrangements were, however, far from systematic. The closest Byz. artists came to a consistent application of rules devised to avoid optical distortions was in differentiations within figures represented on curving surfaces. The lower limbs of bodies appearing on vertical planes are rendered much larger than parts of the body above them in vaults. This could result in disproportionately small heads, as in the Virgin in the apse of the Koimesis church at Nicaea (Lazarev, Storia, fig.77); by the Palaiologan period pear-shaped bodies and tiny heads had become stylistic norms. A coherent system of perspective is described by Nikephoros Gregoraz (Astrolabiika, ed. Delatte, AnecdAthen 2:222.19–25): he speaks of “painters
seeking to imitate objects exactly . . . [who] show the length and breadth of lofty buildings contracting somewhat . . . so as to make them visually more plausible.” A theory of “negative” perspective in which the significant (and sacred) area of space lies between the spectator and the picture plane rather than behind the foreground of the image was developed by Demus (infra).


—A.C.

PESSINOUS (Πεσίνους), now Ballhisar, a city in the borderland between Galatia and Phrygia famous for its ancient cult of Cybele, which Emp. Julian attempted to revive during his visit in 362. Pessinous became the civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of Galatia Salutaris ca.399. After receiving a benefaction of some kind from Justinian I, it assumed the name Justinianopolis, which long continued in occasional use. In the late 6th C. Pessinous possessed a Cathedral of Hagia Sophia and a Church of the Myriangloi (“10,000 angels”). The site offers limited possibilities of defense, and Pessinous disappears from history in the 7th C., though until the 14th C. it existed as ecclesiastical metropolis. Some of its suffragans (Germa, Amorion), however, acquired independence. Current excavations have revealed restoration in the early 4th C. and a necropolis in use through the 6th C., but nothing later.


—C.F.

PESSOS. See PiEter.

PETER (Πέτρος), personal name, given by Christ to his disciple Simon (Mk 3:16). The etymology is evoked in his Matthew 16:18: “You are Petros, and on this rock (petra) I will build my church.” The name appeared in texts from the 3rd C. onward—a bishop in Africa ca.256, an “Aurelius Petrus,” governor of Arabia in 278/9. Its popularity increased in the 5th–6th C., esp. among the clergy: W. Ensslin (RE 19 [1938] 1319–35) lists 37 secular Peters of the 3rd–6th C. and 83 clergymen, predominantly bishops. PLRE has four Peters (secular) of the 4th C. (1:691f) and 32 of the 5th and 6th C. (2:864–71); among the latter, one Peter “monk and bishop” occurs. In Theophanes the Confessor, Peter is still a common name: 23 Peters are mentioned, fourth in frequency, following John, Theodore, and Constantine. Thereafter, the popularity of the name decreased radically: in Skylitzes are found only six Peters, including the apostle Peter and two Bulgarians; in Choniates, among four Peters, one is the apostle, two are Vlachs or Bulgarians, and one a crusader. There are nine Peters in vol. 1 of Laura, and only 15 in the more numerous acts of Laura, vols. 2–3 (tied for twenty-first place with Gregorios and Symeon); it is a more popular name in the acts of Iviron, vol. 1 (10th–11th C.), but some of them—Peter, son of Ivan; Peter the Vlach—are evidently of non-Greek origin. Peters are also rare in the late acts of other collections of the archives of Athos.

—A.K.

PETER, also called Simon and Kephas; apostle and saint; feastday 29 June. The Byz. attributed to him two epistles in the New Testament. A legend preserved in Eusebius (HE 2.25.5–6) has him beheaded, together with Paul, in Rome; other versions tell of his crucifixion head-downward. He became the patron of Rome, the place of his martyrdom and burial; in 319–50 the basilica of St. Peter was built there, allegedly on the site of his tomb. The idea of papal primacy, inherited from Peter, was closely interconnected with this cult. At the same time other ecclesiastical centers (Antioch, Caesarea in Cappadocia) claimed Peter as the founder of their sees. In Constantinople, Peter appears primarily as the leader (koryphaios) of the apostles, often venerated together with Paul, but sometimes separately as in a chapel in the Great Palace and in an apostoleion near Hagia Sophia. In this apostoleion were exhibited Peter’s chains, which had miraculously fallen from him when Herod had ordered him arrested.

Peter’s story was developed in apocryphal texts (esp. the Gospel of Peter) and in numerous sermons (e.g., by Asterios of Amaseia, Sophronios, George Akropolites), often together with the story of Paul. They had a common major feastday (29 June);
the feast of Peter’s chains was celebrated on 16 Jan.

**Representation in Art.** The most clearly characterized of the apostles and the first to exhibit a distinct iconographic type, Peter appears from the 4th C. onward with a square white beard, a straight hairline, and (in painting) a blue tunic and yellow himation in both western and eastern Mediterranean art: Roman catacombs, “Passion” sarcophagi, the Sargüzel sarcophagus (Volbach, *Early Christian Art*, fig. 75), an icon at Sinai (Weitzmann, *infra*, fig. 2), and in apses of churches. He accompanies the living Christ, acclaims the risen Christ, and is found in scenes of his own ministry and passion. From the 9th C. onward, Peter heads the assembly of the apostles, appears in Gospel scenes as Christ’s preeminent disciple, dominates Byz. Acts cycles, is portrayed at the beginning of his Epistles in New Testament MSS, and occasionally accompanies Mark in series of evangelist portraits. His imagery is largely canonical, though scenes of his martyrdom occur in cycles of the apostles’ deaths; his ecstatic meeting with Paul was used to symbolize brotherly accord. The only monumental cycles of his life from the 9th–12th C. occur in Hagia Sophia, Kiev, and the churches of Norman Sicily, though Peter appears consistently in Palaiologan mural cycles and often balances Paul in icons hung between the columns of templon screens.


——J.L., A.W.C.

**ROUARIOS** sheds valuable light on the debate leading up to the schism of 1054. His synodical letter to Leo IX (1052) is significant because it offers conclusive evidence that a schism existed before 1054. His discussion of Latin irregularities, about which Keroularios informed him after the embassy of Cardinal Humbert to Constantinople (1054), is notable for its moderation and conciliatory tone. It contrasts sharply with Humbert’s and Keroularios’s own impetuous actions. Peter agreed that Byz. eucharistic practice was preferable to the Latin use of azymes, and he was convinced that the innovation of the filioque was unacceptable. Nevertheless, he insisted that Keroularios’s other charges against the Latins were either exaggerated or trivial and, as such, no obstacle to unity. Finally, his letters show him to have been a compelling advocate of the pentarchy thesis.


**PETER CAPUANO** (sometimes erroneously referred to as Peter of Capua), cardinal-deacon of St. Mary in Via Lata (1192–1201), then cardinal-priest of St. Marcellus; born Amalfi, died 1214. In 1198–99 Peter was legate of Innocent III in France where he promulgated the idea of a new (Fourth) Crusade. Innocent then sent him to the crusading army in Venice. When the conflict concerning the Venetian plan to attack Zara arose, Peter criticized the Venetians, but insisted on the necessity of continuing to support the Crusaders. In 1202 he returned to Rome. He then was dispatched on a mission to Palestine, only to leave the Holy Land and join the Crusaders after he learned about the capture of Constantinople. At a conference with the Greek clergy in Hagia Sophia in Dec. 1204, Peter demanded that the Greeks conform to the Latin rite, disregarding the conciliatory efforts of Innocent that were announced publicly by the new papal legate Benedict in 1205. Peter should be distinguished from another Peter Capuano, a theologian at the University of Paris whom Honorius III appointed patriarch of An-
tioch in 1219, but who never arrived at his see (E. Rey, ROL 8 [1900–01] 140).


—A.K.

PETER MONGOS (Μογγός, “hoarse”), Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria (477–29 Oct. 490). He was apparently consecrated by only one bishop on the death of the Monophysite patriarch Timotheos Ailouros. Because the Chalcedonian Timotheos Salophakialos was still on the throne, however, Peter was forced to go into hiding until Salophakialos died (482). Then, despite Peter’s irregular ordination, Zeno and Patr. Akakios of Constantinople officially received him into communion, on the condition that he accept the Henotikon. His energetic support of this compromise formula failed to satisfy his more extreme followers, however, who demanded a public condemnation of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo. This led to schism, and the extremists (left without a personal leader or head) became known as Akeptaloii (“headless ones”). But Peter’s openly Monophysite exegesis of the Henotikon also alienated those Chalcedonians who were interpreting it in an Orthodox manner. In sum, his politics had the opposite effect from that which the edict had intended. The Roman synods (484 and 485), which condemned the Henotikon and led to the Akakian Schism, anathematized both Peter and Akakios.


—A.P.

PETER OF ARGOS, saint; born Constantinople, died Argos; feastday 3 May. The chronology of ca.850–ca.920 established by Papaoikonomos (infra) needs correction, since the lifespan of 70 cited in the vita is a hagiographical convention, and Peter apparently survived both the Slavic revolt in the Peloponnese ca.922–25 and the great famine of 927/8 (p.66.4–8). The fourth child in a prosperous and generous family, Peter was turreed like his brother Paul. The brothers were close to Patr. Nicholas I Mystikos, who appointed Paul archbishop of Corinth and planned to make Peter protothronos (p.69.16–18), that is, archbishop of Caesarea (not Corinth, as Vasiliev states). If Nicholas chose Peter to replace Arethas, the event may be dated to 912. Peter followed his brother to Corinth, however, and was elected, although reluctantly, bishop of Argos. Peter wrote several enkomia of saints, including Kosmas and Damianos and the 9th-C. Athanasios of Methone (see list of K.Th. Kyriakopoulos, Peloponnesiaka 13 [1978–79] 264f).

Peter’s Life, arbitrarily ascribed by Papaoikonomos to Peter’s disciple and successor Constantin (cf. F. Halkin, AB 69 [1951] 167), was compiled by Theodore of Nicaea (Darrouzès, Epistolières 52). The hagiographer praised Constantinople and devoted special attention to Peter’s protection of the poor. The Life describes an invasion of Cretan Arabs and the conversion of some pagan Slavic tribes; Peter mentions the attacks of Scythians and Hagarenes in his enkomion of Kosmas and Damianos. Laurent published Peter’s seal (Corpus 5.1, no.571).

SOURCES. Ch. Papaoikonomos, Ho polioouchou tou Argouς hagias Petros (Athens 1908).
**PETER OF ATROA.** See Atroa.

**PETER OF BRACIEUX** (Πέτρος ὁ Πράτζης), more correctly, Bracheux, French crusader; died ca. 1210. A vassal of Louis of Blois, from the vicinity of Beauvais, Peter joined the Fourth Crusade at Zara. A warrior of great height and strength, he won even his enemies' admiration. After the installation of Alexios IV, he commanded a detachment lodged in the Blachernai Palace, probably until late 1203. In Apr. 1204 he was among the first to seize a tower on the city wall. Following the city's capture, he went to conquer the region from Pegai to Nicaea for Louis. At Poimanon he defeated Theodore I Laskaris. Recalled in 1205 to oppose Kalojan, Peter was too late for the battle of Adrianople. Thereafter he fought in Thrace and Anatolia. In 1206 he occupied Pegai and Kyzikos, whence he raided Laskarid territory. In 1207, however, a truce compelled him to surrender Kyzikos. After a brief visit to France (1209), Peter returned to Pegai and somehow fell into Theodore's hands. How he died is uncertain; Innocent III's allegation that a Crusader was reportedly flayed alive by Theodore can neither be substantiated nor definitively connected to Peter (G. Prinzing, *Byzantion* 43 [1973] 424, n.4).

**Bulgarian Treaty, Anonymous Treatise on the**), was delivered upon this occasion; the author of the speech was probably Theodore Daphnopates (I. Dujčev, *DOP* 32 [1978] 217–95). The domestic and international situation was strained after long wars. Peter had to deal with the resistance of the Bogomils and schemes of the nobles, including his own brothers John (928) and Michael (930). In addition Bulgarian authority in the west was challenged by Časlav, and the northern frontier was constantly threatened by the Hungarians. This eventually permitted Byz. to change the conditions of the peace treaty: after Maria-Irene's death (ca.969), the Byz. demanded that two of Peter's sons, Boris and Romanos, be sent to Constantinople as hostages; also the Bulgarians were to forbid the Hungarians to cross their territory to Byz. In 966 Nikephoros II Phokas canceled payment of the tribute and incited Sviatoslav against Bulgaria. Overwhelmed by these troubles, Peter died (perhaps from a stroke).

**PETER OF BULGARIA**, cofounder, with his younger brother Asen I, of the Second Bulgarian Empire; baptismal name Theodore; died Turnovo 1197. Following the brothers' successful insurrection, Peter was crowned with gold ca.1185 or 1186. He donned boots of imperial purple and probably adopted the name "Peter" in honor of the earlier Peter of Bulgaria (903–69). E. Pochitonov (*BS* 42 [1981] 52–57) attributes to Peter a series of billion trachy coins found in Bulgaria and issued by a "Theodore." (Grierson, *Byz. Coins* 235f, and Hendy, *Economy* 439, assign these to Theodore Mankaphas.) In 1189, when Frederick I led the Germans of the Third Crusade into Thrace, Peter (called "Kalopetrus" in the *Historia de Expeditione Frederici* offered 40,000 Vlachs and Cumans for Frederick's planned attack on Constantinople and demanded the imperial crown of "Grecia"; indeed, the *Historia* (ed. Chroust, 69,24–25) says Peter "was called emperor of Greece by his followers." Frederick refused both the troops and the title. Circa 1192 or 1193 Peter was won over to alliance with Byz. in opposition to Asen. The rift between the brothers,
however, seems to have been brief; Byz. gained nothing. With Asen's death, Peter returned to lead the Bulgarian state, only to be slain by a fellow countryman.


A.K., C.M.B.

PETER OF COURTENAY, Latin emperor of Constantinople (1217–19?), count of Nevers and Auxerre; born ca.1165. Marriage to Yolande brought him the Latin Empire of Constantinople when Henry of Hainault died in 1216 without direct heirs. Peter went to Rome, where after some hesitation Pope Honorius III (1216–27) crowned him Latin emperor on 9 April 1217. The Venetians ferried his expedition across the Adriatic to Dyrrhachium. His plan was to proceed along the Via Egnatia to Thessalonike. It was a bold attempt to strengthen the western frontiers of the Latin Empire, but it proved foolhardy. Peter was intercepted by Theodore Komnenos Doukas and disappeared. Rumor placed his death in summer 1219, but it may have been earlier since not a word is said about him during the negotiations in 1218 which secured the release of the papal legate captured with him.


M.J.A.

PETER OF DAMASCUS. See Damascenos, Peter.

PETER OF EBOLI (Petrus de Ebulo), southern Italian cleric, magister, and writer; died before July 1220. Peter composed a lost work on Frederick I and a Liber ad honorem Augusti (Book in Honor of the Augustus, ca.1195/6) for Henry VI on his war over southern Italy. His detailed account is bitterly hostile to Tancred of Lecce and openly seeks a reward from Henry for his support. A MS in Bern (Burgerbibliothek 120) preserves Peter's richly illustrated original and depicts Greek notaries (ed. Siragusa, 1:pl.7 and ed. Rota, pl.6), ceremonies (e.g., pls. 7 and 40, the adventus of Tancred and Henry VI into Palermo, complete with musicians), costumes, ships, insignia, military equipment, and castles of southern Italy; some similarities to the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes exist, esp. in the area of siege equipment and tents, but in general the Liber was decorated by more competent and ambitious painters using full pages whether one or more scenes were represented. Peter's poem on the medicinal qualities attributed to various baths along the Campanian coast also seems to have been illuminated (e.g., Petrus de Ebulo, Nomina et virtutes balneorum, ed. A. Daneu Lattanzi [Rome 1962]).


M.McC., A.C.

PETER OF SICILY, author of a Greek treatise entitled Useful History and Refutation of the Senseless and Vain Heresy of the Manichaeans, also Named the Paulicians. He claims to have been Basil I's envoy to Tephrike in 869 (PG 104:1241 AG). The treatise has survived in a single MS, VAT. gr. 511 (of the 11th C., not the 10th C. as previously thought). It is dedicated to an unnamed archbishop of Bulgaria, and the first chapters are probably a separate letter addressed to the archbishop. Peter's treatise contains data on the history and dogmas of the Paulicians; its primary aim was to prove that the heresy was indistinguishable from the teaching of Mani. Since there are several other texts treating the Paulician heresy (by Photios, George Hamartolos, Peter the Hegoumenos), the question of their interrelation has been a topic of discussion. Most contemporary Byzantinists consider Peter of Sicily's tract as the original work that was eventually used by Photios and Peter Hegoumenos; one cannot, however, exclude the possibility that Peter of Sicily, who borrowed much from Cyril of Jerusalem, derived his information from other existing literary texts. It remains questionable whether he had at his disposal the writings of Paulician heresiarchs (e.g., epistles of Sergios, the vita of Sergios).


PETER PATRIKIOS, official, diplomat, and writer; born ca. 500, died Constantinople 565. Probably of Illyrian origin and from Thessalonike (V. Gregor, BZ 40 [1940] 448), Peter earned fame as an eloquent lawyer at Constantinople, where he attracted the interest of Empress THEODORA. In 534 she cajoled Justinian I into sending Peter as envoy to Italy, where he spent three years in an Ostrogothic prison and was somehow involved in the murder of AMALASUNTHA. In 539 Justinian made him magister officiorum, a post he held for the unparalleled term of 26 consecutive years. His other activities included involvement in the THREE CHAPLERS controversy and negotiating peace terms with Chosroes I in 561–62; his documentary account of the latter assignment is preserved in a collection of his writings by MENANDER PROTECTOR (ed. Blockley, fr.6.1). A controversial figure, Peter is described as a fountain of virtue in JOHN LYDOS (De mag. 2.25) but as a boastful windbag by Menander Protector (fr.6.2). He was the first late Roman author to record and write about protocols, beginning with Leo I’s coronation and his reception of foreign embassies (Cameron, Circus Factiones 249f). Some extracts survive in the De ceremoniis (De cer., bk.1, chs. 84–95, pp.386–433), probably from the work that the Souda calls Peri politikes katastaseos, perhaps identical with his study of the magister officiorum’s office mentioned by John Lydos. This work is probably not the anonymous Peri politikes epistemes, the authorship of which until recently has often been attributed to Peter. Peter also wrote a Roman history from the death of Julius Caesar to that of Constantius II (361), of which nearly 20 fragments survive.


PETER THE DEACON, librarian in Montecassino; fl. first half of the 12th C. He was a chronicler and hagiographer of his monastery, notorious for his forgeries. His writings include the Liber illustrium vivorum archiætii Casinensis, the Ortus et vita iustorum coenobii Casinensis, a Liber de locis sanctis, exegetical works, sermons, poems, and letters. Much of his work remains unpublished. He was particularly interested in ancient Roman history, but he had some knowledge (primarily through the works of ANASTASIO BIBLIOTHECARUS) of Byz. He used this information first of all to compose a biography of the local saint Placidus (ed. Rodgers, infra 6–16), allegedly written by a certain Gordianus in Constantinople; Peter refers to libraries of the city of Constantinople (Constantinopolitanae urbis bibliothecae), which contained additional data on St. Placidus. He made Placidus a nephew of Justinian I; the saint died a martyr’s death in Messina at the hands of the Arabs (sic); when his monastery was later destroyed by another Arab raid, Gordianus narrowly escaped being killed. According to Peter, Placidus was invited by Justinian to visit Constantinople, where the emperor promised to confer upon Montecassino a chrysobullium immunitatis; Peter gives a long list of estates granted by Justinian in various provinces of the empire. Peter also provides information on the hierarchy of Byz. Eunuchs, whom he divided into four groups: spadones, falcati, thomii, and inguinarii. The three last terms do not occur elsewhere in Latin.


PETER THE FULLER (Γραφεύς), Monophysite patriarch of Antioch (469–71, 476–77, 482–88); died 488. Peter began his career as a monk in the Akoimeto monastery in Constantinople but quarreled with his brethren and accompanied the future emperor Zeno to Syria. In 469 or 470 he was consecrated patriarch of Antioch even though the incumbent Martyrios was still alive. Peter added to the Trisagion the Theopaschite formula “who was crucified for us,” which soon became the touchstone of Monophysitism. In 471 Peter was deposed and taken to Constantinople. He was restored to the see of Antioch by the usurper Basiliskos but in 477, after the restoration of Zeno, was again exiled, this time to Euchaita. Peter accepted the HENOTRON in 482 and resumed his see until his death.

Some liturgical innovations introduced by Peter
(e.g., anointment of the entire congregation attending the service) have parallels in pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite. This prompted the hypothesis, developed by U. Riedinger (BZ 52 [1959] 281–96), that Peter was the author of the "Dionysian" corpus and that he devoted his many years of exile to this work. Riedinger's thesis has not, however, met with general acceptance.


-P.T.E.

PETER THE HERMIT, leader of the "Peasants' Crusade"; called "Koukoupeter" (Κούκουπετρος) by the Byz. (perhaps from Lat. caculatus, "monk"); born near Amiens ca.1050, died Huy 6 or 8 July 1115. Responding to the summons of Urban II, Peter assembled peasants, burghers, knights, women, and children in northern France and Germany (1095–96). His followers clashed with the Byz. at Niš and suffered heavy losses. To minimize discontent among the "Crusaders," Alexios I's envoys arranged markets for supplies. Peter's forces reached Constantinople on 1 Aug. 1096. Alexios interviewed Peter and gave him money but soon transported his "army" and his predecessor "Walter the Penniless" to Kibotos in Bithynia. At first they purchased provisions but, as their funds failed in mid-Sept., they began plundering (F. Duncalf, AHR 26 [1920–21] 451f).

While Peter returned to Constantinople for assistance, Kilic Arslan I ambushed and killed most of his followers (21 Oct. 1096); Alexios rescued the survivors. Peter participated in the First Crusade until the capture of Jerusalem, then returned to France ca.1099 or 1100 (C. Dereine, Nouvelle Civ 5 [1953] 445f). In Anna Komnene's view, Peter instigated the Crusade to safeguard his pilgrimage after having been frustrated in an attempt to reach Jerusalem before 1095.


-P.T.E.

PETER THE IBERIAN, early Georgian monk and bishop; pre-baptismal name Murvan; born Georgia 407?; died Jamiya, Palestine, 488? Son of the king of Georgia, he was sent at age 12 to Constantinople as a hostage. He fled to Jerusalem ca.430 and became a monk, taking the name Peter. Unlike the Georgian majority, he was a Monophysite and a disciple of Theodosios, the anti-Chalcedonian bishop of Jerusalem, who made him bishop of Maiuma (near Gaza) in 453. Peter spent little time in his see, but his monastery near Maiuma became an important center of Monophysite sentiment. Severos of Antioch studied there. Peter assisted at the consecration of Timotheos Al-louros in Egypt (457) and supported the Heno-tikon of Zeno. A notable representative of the important Georgian community in Palestine, Peter founded the first Georgian monastery in Jerusalem and established several other monasteries and hospices.

The biographies of Peter by John Rufus, bishop of Maiuma (surviving only in Syriac), and Zacharias of Mytilene (lost, save for a Syriac fragment) provide much detail on the early struggle between Chalcedonians and Monophysites in the East. The later Georgian Life distorts Peter's anti-Chalcedonian position, attempting to bring him in line with Georgian orthodoxy. To Peter some scholars have attributed the writings of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite.

LIT. L. M. Lang, "Peter the Iberian and his Biographers," JEH 2 (1951) 158–68.

-P.T.E.

PETRA (Πέτρα), city in Jordan, ancient Nabataean capital and the center of the caravan trade; it was obscured by the rise of Palmyra and Persian success in moving the main trade route to the Euphrates and the Persian Gulf. Byz. coins to the reign of Justin II have been found in Petra (N. Khairy in Petra, ed. M. Linder [Munich 1986] 66), as has a Vandal nummus of Hilderich of the period 523–30 (M. Mackensen in ibid. 189–91). Christianity reached Petra no later than Constantine's reign. About 300 (not later than 314) Petra was transferred from the province of Arabia to Palaestina Tertia and became its capital. In 451 the bishopric of Petra was placed under the patriarchate of Jerusalem. It was probably a center of local ecclesiastical culture; Theodore, bishop of Petra, wrote an enkomion of St. Theodosios Koinobiarches (died 529).


PETRALIPHAINA, THEODORA. See Theodora of Arta.

PETRALIPHAS, or Petraleiphas (Πετραληπας, fem. Πετραλιφανα), an aristocratic lineage of Western origin. The family’s founder was Peter of Alifa (near Caserta, Italy). After the death of Robert Guiscard, Peter joined Alexios I, participated in the First Crusade, and fled from Antioch when Turks besieged it. Niketas Choniates mentions four Petraliphas brothers, soldiers of Manuel I, who were “Franks” by origin and lived in Didymoteichon. The later tradition, preserved in the romance of Belisarios, described the Petraliphas family as an insignificant family from Didymoteichon. At least two members of the Petraliphas family, however, were Manuel’s generals: the sebastos Alexios in 1166 and Nikephoros; perhaps they were among the “brothers” from Didymoteichon. Nikephoros Komnenos Petraliphas, sebastokrator, issued a sigillation for the Xeropotamos monastery (probably ca.1200) to confirm his grandmother Maria Tzousmene Komnenos’s donation (Xerop., no.8). Another sebastokrator, John Petraliphas, was governor of Macedonia and Thessaly under the Angeloi. His sister Maria married Theodore Komnenos Doukas of Epiros. One of his daughters, Theodora Petraliphana (Theodora of Arta) wed Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epiros. Another branch of the family sided with the empire of Nicaea: George Akropolites (Akrop. 58.19–21) mentions John Petraliphas, a courageous warrior, whom John III Vatatzes appointed megas chartoularios ca.1297; identification with the above-mentioned sebastokrator John is questionable. A ridge called Petraleiphes, near Perigardikeia (Macedonia), mentioned in a charter of 1341 (Docheiar., no.20.17), is perhaps a trace of the Petraliphas property in the area.

Lit. Nicol, Epiros I 215f. – A.K.

PETRIC’I, JOHN. See John Petric’i.

PETRION (Πετριών), also called Petria, a region in Constantinople on the Golden Horn as well as the name of a nunnery located near the “Iron Gate” in the Petriion region. The history of the convent remains obscure. Patr. Nikephoros I (Nikeph. 113.20–24) mentions the chapel (eukterion) of St. Euphemia “in the so-called Petriion,” the foundation of which he ascribes to Kastinos, a legendary bishop of Byzantion (mid-3rd C.), that is, before Euphemia’s birth. On the other hand, the Patria of Constantinople (ed. Preger 3:274.15–18) makes Basil I the founder of the monastery of St. Euphemia, of the “tombs in Petrin,” and of a bathhouse, adding that the emperor “tonsured” his daughters there. Later sources usually refer separately to the nunnery of St. Euphemia and that of Petrian/Petria, and Janin (CP byz. 408) distinguishes them, but it is very
probable that they are one and the same. J. Par- 
goire's hypothesis that Gül Cami should be iden-
tified as the monastery of St. Euphemia has been 
rejected (Mathews, Byz. Churches 1281).

The nunnery served as a place of confinement 
or refuge for several empresses and other women 
of the imperial family. Besides Basil's daughters, 
Zoe Karbonopsina was "tionsursed in Petrion in 
the convent of St. Euphemia" (TheophCont 397.13– 
14). In 1031 the Empress Zoe forced her sister 
Theodora to become a nun "in Petrion" (Skyl. 
385.34–36), but she was later released and ascended 
to the throne. In 1078 Maria of "Alania" 
retired to Petrion after the abdication of her first 
husband Michael VII but soon left the nunnery 
and married Nikephoros III Botaneiates (Bryen. 
253.11–14). In 1081 Anna Dalassene and her 
female relations were imprisoned "in the convent 
of Petria" (An.Komn. 1:79.9–11). Thereafter Pet- 
trion disappears from the sources.


PETRITZOS MONASTERY, founded in the late 
11th C. by Gregory Pakourianos, a Byz. general 
of Armeno-Georgian ancestry. Still surviving south 
of Philippopolis, near modern Bâckovo, it is dedi-
cated to the Theotokos Petritzoni (or Petrizioti-
tissa), whose epithet derives from the medieval 
kastron of Petrizos (Πετριτζός). The monastery 
was established for the use of 51 Georgian monks; 
retired soldiers who had served under Pakouri-
anos were its earliest inhabitants. Pakourianos, 
who had no surviving heirs, endowed the mon-
astery liberally with properties located in the themes 
of Philippopolis, Boleron, Serres, and Thessali-
nike (esp. in Stenimachos); both he and his brother 
Apasios were buried at Petrizos.

Its typikon, based largely upon the (lost) rule of 
the Panagiou monastery in Constantinople, was 
composed by Pakourianos in 1083 and includes 
much autobiographical information; it was drafted 
in Greek and Georgian versions, which survive, 
and possibly in Armenian. The typikon emphasizes 
the independence of Petrizos both from the 
authority of the local bishop and from future control 
by members of his family. The document pro-
hibits the residence of any Greek priests or monks 
but requires a notarios able to read and write 
Greek who could deal with the local Byz. civilian 
authorities. Eunuchs and young boys were re-
fused admission, but provision was made for six 
boys to be trained as priests at the nearby and 
dependent monastery of St. Nicholas (I.M. Kon-
dares in Antidoron Pneumatikon: Timetikos tomos 
Gerasiou Io. Komidare [Athens 1981] 162–69). The inventory lists the icons, liturgical books, and 
sacred vessels as well as the livestock that Pakou-
rianos donated to the monastery. He constructed 
three hostel near Petrizos as refuges for travelers. 
By the 14th C. the monastery had lost its 
Georgian character; in 1344 it came under the 
control of Tsar Ivan Alexander and was inhabited 
by Bulgarian monks. After Bulgaria fell to the 
Turks (1393), the monastery became a center of 
Bulgarian culture.

The double church, built between 1074 and 
1083, is the only Byz. structure preserved at the 
monastery. Its upper story contains two wall-tombs 
and is of fine brick construction with occasional 
stone courses. The crypt, with 14 floor-tombs, has 
a Deesis in the apsidal conch and a fresco of 
Ezekiel's vision in the Valley of Dry Bones, bei-
ting the role of the ossuary described in the typi-
kon. The earliest layer of fresco decoration has 
Greek inscriptions and includes six life-size saints, 
among them the Georgians Hilarion and George 
Mt'Ac'Indeli. Ezekiel's vision, like the elaborate 
Last Judgment in the narthex of the lower church, 
may belong to a second campaign of decoration 
under John Iveropoulos (see ARTISTS). The third 
layer includes portraits of Gregory and Apasios 
Pakourianos, shown as kteores, and Ivan Alexan-
der; the latter portrait must have been painted 
between 1344 and 1353. Among rare features of 
the decoration are the Melismos (see FRACTION) 
in the upper church, and half-length portraits 
of saints painted as simulated hanging icons in the 
apses of both stories.

Sources. P. Gautier, "Le typikon du séaste Grégoire 
kon Gregorì Pacurian (Louvain 1954).

Lit. N. Lomouri, K istorì gruzinskogo Petricionskogo mona-
strya (Tbilisi 1981). V. Arutjunova-Fidanjan, Tipik Grgorija 
Pakurianu (Erevan 1978). Lemerle, Cinq études 115–91. S. 
Grishin, "Literary Evidence for the Dating of the Bâckovo 
Ossuary Frescoes," ByzAnt 1:90–100. E. Balakova, Bâckov-
ska kóstnica (Sofia 1977).

PETRONAS (Πετρώνας), general; died 865. 
Younger brother of Empress Theodora and Caes-
ar Bardas, Petronas was of Armenian descent 
(Toumanoff, "Caucasia" 151). He served as droun-
garios tes viglas under Theophilos, who appointed him patricios. The emperor reportedly ordered Petronas to decapitate Theophobos in 840 or 842. On the other hand, a story frequently repeated to illustrate Theophilos's devotion to justice says that the emperor had Petronas publicly stripped and beaten for illegally constructing a building that blocked a widow's view (e.g., Leo Grammatikos, Chronographia, ed. I. Bekker [Bonn 1842] 215,20—216,11). Petronas apparently had little influence during Theodora's regency for Michael III; he helped Bardas depose her in 856. He was named strategos of the Thrakesion theme and given command of an army that raided as far as Samosata and Amida. In 863 Michael appointed him supreme commander of the army and sent him against 'Umar, enir of Miletene. Petronas annihilated 'Umar's army on 3 Sept. at Poson (or Porson) on the border between the Armeniakon and Paphlagonian themes (Grégoire, “Études” 536). After his victory he celebrated a triumph in Constantinople; a chant composed for the occasion is extant (De cer. 1:32f). He became domestikos ton scholon and was entitled magistros. He died while returning from an expedition and was buried in the monastery of Gastria.


PETRONIUS MAXIMUS, Western Roman emperor in 455; born 396, died Rome 31 May 455. Petronius was of noble origin, although nothing is known of his ancestors; Theophanes' assertion (Theoph. 108,22—23) that Petronius was a grandson of the usurper Maximus is not valid. Petronius had a brilliant career, becoming consul, praetorian prefect of Italy, and patricios. He was involved in the plot against general Aetius in 454. After the murder of Valentinian III, Petronius was immediately elected in his stead (17 March), but whether he participated in the conspiracy or was chosen as a weak and honorable representative of senatorial nobility is unclear. In any case Petronius demonstrated his loyalty to Valentinian's traditions by marrying Valentinian's widow and betrothing Valentinian's daughter Eudocia to his own son Palladius. He sought an alliance with the Gallic aristocracy by appointing Eparcius Avitus magister militum and sending him immediately as envoy to the Visigothic court in Toulouse. Petronius did not gain the support of the local Roman population, nor was he able to appease the Vandals; in May 455 Gaiseric appeared with his navy in the estuary of the Tiber and Rome was besieged. While fleeing, Petronius was recognized at the gates and literally torn into pieces by angry inhabitants and soldiers. Contrary to common opinion, Czúth (infra) denies that Petronius cooperated with the Italian senatorial aristocracy.


PHAINA (Φαίνα, Ar. Mismiyyah in modern Syria), city, military post, and bishopric of the province of Arabia under jurisdiction of Bosra, noted for its 2nd-C. "Praetorium," which was converted to a church before 450 and destroyed ca.1890. Built on a centralized four-column plan, the "Praetorium" (whose original function is unknown) has been cited by architectural historians as a possible prototype of medieval Byz. churches. It has been suggested that the centralizing elements were added in the 5th C. to the "Praetorium," which otherwise most closely resembles southern Syrian temples at Erre (es-Sanamen) and Slem, a type of building that influenced in many ways the development of local church architecture.


PHAKRASES (Φακρασῆς), family name of unknown origin, surely not Greek; the name Οἰνοφάγος ("wine swiller"), found in Mazaris (18,30), is obviously a pun based on a supposed etymology Φάγω κρασι. Some members of this family flourished in the 13th—15th C., holding secular and ecclesiastical offices. John Phakrakes (ca.1300), logothetes ton agelon and correspondent of Maximos Planoudes, Gregory II of Cyprus, and Nikephoros Choumnos, is perhaps to be identified with a parakommomenos John Phakrases to whom one MS attributes the metrical Description of Imperial Offices. A certain Phakrasina (Kantak. 1:409,21) was in the retinue of Anna of Savoy in
1330. George Phakrases was a military commander (1342–55) and supported John VI Kantakouzenos; he also wrote an account of the dispute between Gregory Palamas and Nikephoros Gregoras (1355). Manuel Phakrases was an oikeios of John V (1370) as well as of Manuel II in 1409, when he took part in a synod in Constantinople. Demetrios Phakrases lived in Thessalonike as megalas primikerios (1366–77); another Demetrios, also named Palaiologos, appeared as a witness in 1406 (N. Oikonomides in Docheiari. 219). Kantakouzenos Phakrases was an ambassador from Constantinople to John VIII at Florence in 1439. Matthew Phakrases, metropolitan of Settes (1377–1409), was captured by the Turks in 1383, but released four years later; John Chortasmenos esteemed him highly (Chortasm. 102–04). In sum, the Phakrases family was of minor importance, but occasionally appeared in higher positions and was related to nobler families.


PHALER.A. See CHARIOT MOUNTS AND HORSE FITTINGS.

PHANTINOS THE YOUNGER, saint; born Calabria late 9th C., died Thessalonike 14 Nov.? or 30 Aug.? in late 10th C. A master of the ascetical life, Phantinos (Φαντίνος) was at Merkoukion ca.940 when he undertook the spiritual direction of Neilos of Rossano. He reportedly founded three monasteries, including one for women. Believing himself divinely warned of impending Muslim raids, however, he departed for Greece, where he settled at Thessalonike and met Athanasios of Athos.

Until recently, it was generally believed that there were two different saints named Phantinos the Younger: the abbot at Merkourion known to Neilos, and the saint at Thessalonike known to Athanasios. A still unedited 11th-C. Life, discovered by E. Follieri in a Moscow MS (infra), demonstrates that the two traditions refer to the same person.


PHARAN (Φαράν), name of several sites in Palestine and Sinai.

1. The wilderness of Pharán and the mountain of Pharán mentioned in the Old Testament as the site of a divine theophany during the Israelites’ wanderings (Num 10:12, Dt 33:2; Hab 3:3) and with the site of Hagar’s wilderness journey (Gen 21:14, 21).

2. Episcopal see located in the date-palm oasis of the Sinai peninsula northwest of St. Catherine’s Monastery (Wadi Feiran). It was known to Eusebios of Caesarea (Onomastikon) in the early 4th C. The pilgrim Egeria visited the hermits of Pharán on her way to and from the “Mountain of God” of Sinai (Itinerarium 6.1–3). Its 5th-C. bishop, Martyrios, pacified nomad attackers. By the 6th C. it was a fortified site on the Sinai pilgrim route. Its 7th-C. bishop, Theodore, a proponent of Monoeconomic, is probably to be identified with Theodore of Raithou.

3. Monastery northeast of Jerusalem, founded by St. Chariton ca.330 and possibly named after the wilderness Pharán (Shahid, Byz. & Arabs 5th C.) 406). It was a residence of Euthymios the Great in the 5th C. and John Moschus in the late 6th. It produced a patriarch of Antioch, Gregory, in the 6th C. By the 7th C., Pharán disappears from the sources.


PHARMACOLOGY. Drug lore was fundamental in Byz. medicine, much as it was in Greco-Roman medicine. The pharmacetical lists of Oribasios, Aetios of Amida, and Paul of Aegina owe data to earlier lore gathered by Dioskorides, Xero- crates, and Galen, but Byz. physicians were in full command of herbs and drugs, illustrated in the medical books by Alexander of Tralles. Few new drugs were added to the pharmacopeia after Dioskorides’ De materia medica (about 65) and the huge compaction of pharmacological doxography in the drug tracts by Galen, but Byz. doctors shrewdly rearranged aspects of drug theory to make sense of Galen’s often confusing notions of how drugs “worked.” Aetios of Amida’s preface on the theory of drug actions, and Paul of Aegina’s careful catalog of useful drugs (bk.7), show Byz. pharmacology precisely designed to fit neatly into basic treatments of diseases from plauge to
skin rashes. An anonymous tract of somet ime during the 11th–14th C. (G. Litavrin, VizVrem 31 [1971] 249–301) contains dietetic and pharma ceutic advice, including the recipe for the "per fume of the Empress Zoe." Using approximately 700 fundamental simples, derived from plants, animals (including insects), and minerals, Byz. drug lore became the model for later Arab pharmacology. In turn, late Byz. medical summaries, suggested by the works of Symeon Seth and Nicholas Myrepoulos, reflect the influence of Arab pharmaceuticals, esp. imported substances from the Far East. Almost all of the traditional drugs remained standard through the millennium of Byz. medicine, with the repeated employment of opium poppy, the hellebores, blister beetle solu tion, caustic mineral washes, soft emollients manufactured from rose oils, kaolin as an antidote, and hundreds of similar compounds. Noteworthy are the kyphi formulas, incorporated into Byz. pharmacy from the venerated folk medicine of Egypt. Generally drug actions were explained by the old theories of elements, qualities, and hum ors, illustrated by the pharmacy in Oribasios, Aetios of Amida, and Paul of Aegina.


PHAROS CHURCH. See Nea Ekklesia.

PHASIS (Φάσις), a river in Colchis, the modern Rioni, which flows into the Black Sea at Poti. The Laz (see Lazika) first appear in this area at the beginning of the 6th C. Prokopios was personally familiar with the area, which figures prominently in his Wars, books 1 and 4. Later Byz. writers used the term Phasis in this sense (e.g., Nik.Chon. 528.84, 626.59, or Chalk. 1:130.8–9, 2:223.7), but earlier writers often identified the Phasis with the river Araxes (e.g., Theoph. 329.31, Da de adm. imp. 45). This stems from rendering “Basean,” the Armenian district on the upper Araxes, as “Phas ian” in Greek (e.g., Da de adm. imp. 45.44) and Latin (Cosmographer of Ravenna, 69). Phasian e appears in Byz. sources in various spellings (Hombigmann, Ostgrenze 196).


PHIALE TREASURE, dated to the 6th or 7th C. and found before 1955 in Syria or Lebanon, is composed of seven silver objects (two chalices, two patens, a cross and holder, a seal), five of which bear dedications; the church named in two of these is that “of the Theotokos of the village (kome) of Phela.” With the exception of the cross holder, now apparently lost, the objects are divided be tween collections in Bern and Washington. One paten with silver stamps of 577 was given by an extraritor, who may have retired to his native village. The seal, a unique example of an early “cone” seal (see Seals, Cone or Pyramid) in silver, had belonged to a “bishop of Kerania” (Kerynia [Kyrenia] in Cyprus?), perhaps another native of Phela. (See also Treasures, Silver and Gold; Liturgical Vessels.)


PHelonion (φελόνιον), a vestment worn primarily by priests and bishops, the Eastern equi valent of the Latin chasuble. Like the chasuble, the phelonion derives probably from the Roman pae nula. The phelonion is a form of cape, worn over the sticharion and simply pulled on over the head. It was made of wool or silk and could be any number of colors. It was originally circular and hung down nearly to the knees in front and back; the front section was gradually shortened over time, so that the garment became more semi circular in shape and allowed the wearer freer use of his arms (for the form in the 10th C., see the Bible of Leo Sakellarios, fol.3; for the 11th C., the Homilies of John Chrysostom, Paris, B.N. Coisl. 79, fol.2v; Lazarev, Storia, fig.233). In the late 11th C., the phelonion of a patriarch began to be decorated regularly with an overall pattern of crosses and was referred to as a Polystaurion.

Lit. Braun, Liturgische Gewandung 234–47.

PHERRAI. See Bera.

PHIAL. See Glass Cruets.

PHIALE (φιάλη, also called κρήνη, λούτρον), the fountain in the open court ο ι ΑΓΡΙΜΙΟΥ preceding a church; in a secular context, a luxurious palace furnishing (Pregger, Scriptores, 103.4). The term
may also refer to the square, octagonal, or polygonal structure erected over the phiale (Orlandos, Monast.Arch. 110–14).

Church phialai were originally intended for the ablutions of participants in the liturgy. From the 6th C. onward, however, they were also used for the blessing of the waters at Epiphany. Phialai often had the form of a shallow bowl. Two important examples of solid stone are the 5th-C. phiale of St. Demetrius in Thessalonike and that in the outer narthex of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (L. Bouras, Gesta 16.2 [1977] 65). A monolithic phiale (1060) in the Lavra on Mount Athos is the only example retaining an elaborate bronze trough (strobilon) spouting water. Representations of phialai in monumental painting and MS illumination often display troughs ending in a pinecone or eagle finial.

The meaning of phiale in the title protospatarians tes Phailas is unclear. It probably referred to a part of the Boukoleon.


PHILADELPHIA (Φιλαδέλφεια, now Alaşehir), city of Lydia and last Byz. possession in Asia Minor. Philadelphia was significant in the 6th C., when the followers of Proklos called it “little Athens” because of its festivals and temples (John Lydos, De mensibus, bk.4, ch.58); John Lydos, however, described the suffering of his native Philadelphia under John the Cappadocian, whose agents ruthlessly extracted taxes (De magistralibus, bk.3, chs. 58–59). Philadelphia, a city of the Thrakesion theme, was occupied by the Turks after Mantzikert (1071), but was recovered by the Byz. in 1098 and became capital of the theme (by the mid-12th C.), a major bulwark of the frontier, and base for imperial expeditions to the east. The city was a center of resistance to Andronikos I in 1182 and the capital of Theodore Mankaphas. Philadelphia flourished under the Laskarids, when it was administered by a stratopedarches of Philadelphia and Thrakesion. It was a center of trade, with colonies of Venetians (attested in 1188) and Genoese (1342), and was noted for its production of leather goods and red-dyed silk.

In the 14th C., Philadelphia, as the easternmost Byz. city, was frequently attacked by the Turks. Rescued by the Catalan Grand Company in 1304, it was forced to pay tribute to Geremi an after the siege of 1309/10; from 1322 to 1324 it endured a long siege by Geremian and Aydin, the account of which reveals many details of local topography. Two bishops of that era, Theoleptos and Makarios Chrysokephalos, played an enormous role in administering and defending the city. Philadelphia was then a Byz. enclave surrounded by Turkish emirates, prospering through trade and its strategic location. It finally fell to Bayezid I in 1390. Philadelphia, which was a suffragan bishopric of Sardis, became an independent metropolis under Isaac II and metropolis of Lydia in 1369.


PHILAGATHOS, monk of Rossano, author of the so-called Italo-Greek homiliary; baptismal name probably Philippos, family name probably Kerameus; born Sicily or Calabria late 11th C., died mid-12th C. According to C. Cupane (SicGymn 31 [1978] 5), Philagathos “was a monk of an absolutely new type.” Philagathos’s homilies were based not only on patristic tradition, but on classical authors as well, and on the principles of ancient rhetoric. In the 27th homily, pronounced after 1143 according to E. Kitzinger (in Byzantino-Sicula 2 [Palermo 1975] 301–06), Philagathos described the Cappella Palatina in Palermo in detail and praised the founder of the church, Roger II. Like his younger contemporary, Eugenios of Palermo, Philagathos was interested in the Stephanites and Ichnelates of Symeon Seth and produced an allegorical commentary on this text. Possibly Philagathos wrote a commentary on Heliodoros, although Hunger dates this work in the 5th C. (Lit. 2:121). The commentary attempts to use the love story of the Aethiopica as a Christian allegory.
PHILANTHROPENOS (Φιλανθρωπηνός). This family, whose name is etymologically connected with the monastery of Christos tou Philanthropenou in Constantinople, appeared in the mid-13th C.; many of its members held high positions in the army and administration. Alexios Doukas Philanthropenos, a commander in 1255 near Ohrid in the Bulgarian war, who later became protostrator and megas doux, died ca.1275; by his daughter Maria, who married Michael Tarchaneiotes, he was the grandfather of the Alexios Philanthropenos who rebelled against Andronikos II. Later Philanthropenoi, likewise related to the Doukai, included George Doukas Philanthropenos, who was governor of Lemnos and held the dignity of megas hetairiearches in 1346 (Laursa 3, no.126-39-40). Alexios Angelos Philanthropenos bore the title of Caesar and was the real ruler of Thessaly ca.1382–89 (B. Ferjančić, Tesalija u XIII i XIV veku [Belgrade 1974] 265–77). He was succeeded by his brother, Caesar Manuel Angelos (ca.1389–94). One of the most eminent 15th-C. Philanthropenoi was George, who, appointed mesazon by John VIII, accompanied him to the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438/9 (Syropoulos, Mémoires 486–92). Alexios Laskaris Philanthropenos, governor of Patras in 1445, was highly esteemed by Basarion, who sent him a theological treatise. Numerous Philanthropenoi are of interest either for their relationship to other lineages (Kantakouzenos, Palaiologos, Bryennios, Konnenos, Asan, Chounnos, Tarchaneiotes) or because of their profession (epi tes trapezes, megas stratopedarches, megas droungarios, admiral, protasekretis, megas oikonomos, protospaltes). Several women of the family are noted, for example, Anna Kantakouzene Komnene Palaiologina Bryennissa Philanthropene (fl. ca.1390; Nicol, Kantakouzenos 150f).


PHILANTHROPENOS, ALEXIOS, general; born ca.1270?, died after 1323. Second son of the protoevstarios Michael Tarchaneiotes and, through his mother, a member of the Philanthropenoi family, Alexios attained military renown at a young age. In 1293 he was made pinkernes and doux of the theme of Thraxakion and sent to Asia Minor to fight the Turks and regain control of the Maeander region. His campaigns of 1294–95 were marked with successes, such as the reconquest of Miletos and Ancyra. The local population rallied to his support. In late 1295 he rebelled against Andronikos II and ruled independently for a brief period. He was soon, however, arrested and blinded (on 25 Dec. 1295: Kleinchroniken 1:194, 2:214f). Philanthropenos was the son-in-law of Constantine Akropolites and a friend of Maximos Plano-udes, who addressed 28 letters to him. Toward the end of his life he regained imperial favor, thanks to the urging of Patr. Isaia (1323–32). In 1323 he was sent to Philadelphia to help raise the Turkish siege (Greg. 1:360–62).


PHILANTHROPOS SOTER MONASTERY. See Choumnaina, Irene.

PHILANTHROPY (φιλανθρωπία, “love of mankind”) was regarded as an essential divine attribute, which every good Christian was bound to emulate by ministering to Christ in the person of the poor, the sick, the aged, the homeless, and the imprisoned. Philanthropia, incorporating the quality of eleemosyne (mercy or almsgiving), was thus one of the major virtues expected of saints and emperors, the supreme “imitators of Christ.” Emperors took every opportunity to characterize, and justify, their legislation as philanthropic.

The most striking manifestation of philanthropy in Byz. society was the systematic public provision of social welfare and hospitality through a variety of specialized institutions: the hospital (xenon, or, less frequently, nosokomeion), the hospice (xenodochion), the old-age home (gerokomeion), the poorhouse (ptochotrophion), the orphanage (orphanotrophion), and the ecclesiastical welfare center (diakonia). These
institutions, like philanthropy itself, had pre-Christian antecedents, but were essentially the product of the establishment of Christianity in the 4th–5th C. and represented a transformation in the pattern of public benefaction (euergetia) from the ancient ethos of “bread and circuses” to one that stressed the spiritual salvation of both the giver and the beneficiary. Although many such institutions were lay sponsored, and some of the most important depended directly on the emperor (see Churches, Imperial), all were, like monasteries, ecclesiastical units. From the 10th C., indeed, all new foundations of charitable houses were invariably attached to monastic communities.


PHILARETOS BRACHAMIOS. See Brachamios.

PHILARETOS THE MERCIFUL (Φιλάρετος ὁ Ἐλεήμων), saint; born Amneia, Paphlagonia?, died in Constantinople in the monastery of Krisis or Rhodophyllion 792; feastday 1 Dec. Son of a well-to-do peasant. Philaretos supposedly owned the most impressive house in Amneia, 48 or 50 farmsteads (proasteia), enormous herds of livestock, and many oiketai (slaves). He lost his wealth during the Arab invasion; his proasteia were seized by “neighboring magnates” and peasants; and he gradually distributed the rest to the poor. In 788 Maria, the granddaughter of Philaretos, was chosen in a bride show as the spouse of Constantine VI; Philaretos's family moved to Constantinople, where one of Maria's sisters married the patrikios Constantinakios, and another was sent to become the bride of the Lombard king Argouses (Harichis).

The Life of Philaretos was written in 821/2 by his grandson, the monk Niketas of Amneia, as a Byz. version of the story of Job. The hero is a man of exceptional generosity, but he differs from the paragon of philanthropy, John Eleemon, in that John was a politician, directing the patriarchal treasury of Alexandria, while Philaretos was a private citizen who distributed his own possess-

sions, apparently to his own detriment, so that ordinary people, including his wife, considered him a fool. Unlike Symeon of Emesa, however, Philaretos is not a wild eccentric, but a mild and temperate person. The Life bears no traces of anti-Iconoclastic polemics. It is a very important source for 8th-C. agrarian history (J. Nesbitt, *GORThR* 14 [1969] 150–58). The Life is preserved in two versions: Paris, B.N. gr. 1510, a 10th-C. MS, and Genoa, Bib. Franz. 34, 11th C. K. Bonis (in *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* [Berlin 1981] 97) ascribes both MSS to the 12th C. L. Rydén (AB 100 [1982] 485–95) hypothesizes that the Genoa MS preserves the earlier tradition and that the Paris version represents a revision produced in the same milieu as the Life of Andrew the Fool. The Menologion of Basil II (p.218) shows the burial of Philaretos (in the Krisis monastery, according to the text).


PHILES (Φιλῆς, cf. φίλος and the component -φιλής in εὐ-φιλῆς, “well-loved,” etc.), a noble family flourishing only during the 13th–14th C. Theodore, appointed governor of Thessalonike by John III Vatatzes soon after 1246, was blinded in 1255 by his great enemy, Theodore II Lascaris, and therefore in 1258 went over to Michael VIII Palaiologos (Angold, *Byz. Government* 76–78, 82, 289). Theodore’s son Alexios married Maria Palaiologina, second daughter of John Kantakouzenos and Irene Palaiologina and thus niece of the emperor; in 1261 Alexios received the rank of megas domestikos. Campaigning in the Peloponnesos in 1262, he was taken prisoner; he died there a year later (A. Failler, *REB* 38 [1980] 87–96). John Philes, also called Palaiologos, was invested with the function of a protostrator and campaigned successfully against the Turks (before 1314). A learned man, he corresponded with Michael Gabras, who also wrote a letter to Theo-
phylaktos Philes, probably John's son. Another John Philes accompanied the Empress Irene (wife of John VI Kantakouzenos) to Didymoteichon in 1352. By far the most renowned member of the family was Manuel Philes, the poet, to be distinguished from the hymnographer Michael Philes, who probably also lived in the 14th C. (Beck, Kirche 707).


- E.T.

PHILES, MANUEL, court poet under Andronikos II and III; born Ephesus ca. 1275, died ca. 1345. A pupil of George Pachymeres, Philes participated in an embassy to the "Tauroscythians" (Tatars) in 1293 to arrange the marriage of Maria, daughter of Andronikos II, to the khan of the Golden Horde. He also went on a mission to recruit Georgian archers in 1305-06 and claims to have traveled among the "Persians [Turks], Arabs, Indians, and Scythians." He offended an emperor, probably Andronikos II, and was briefly imprisoned. His complaints of poverty, hunger, thirst, and the cold may be a topos. The subjects and addressees of his poems indicate that he had close ties with the imperial family, the aristocracy (he was related to the Melissenoi), and the patriarch.

Philes's poetry, in iambics and political verse, was immensely varied and prolific. It included poems on flora and fauna (e.g., his very lengthy On the Characteristics of Animals, based primarily on Aelianus), his descriptions of an elephant and an ostrich, and two didactic poems on silkworms (Z. Kádár, Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis 1 [1965] 49-55). In a panegyric in honor of John Kantakouzenos, Philes converses with abstract notions such as Reason, Virtue, Truth, and Modesty. He wrote epitaphiai for members of the imperial family and the nobility, an enkomion of Andronikos III (M.I. Gedeon, EkAl 4 [1883] 291f), poems on feasts days, petitions (for a horse, bridle, barley, winter cloak, wine, etc.), accounts of historical events such as the Bulgarian campaigns of 1304 and the Catalan raids in Thrace, and ekphrasis of relics and works of art. His verses provide information on Vlach sheep shearing and the geography of Thrace, Macedonia, and the Adriatic coast. His poems are a good source for prosopography, and for descriptions of icons, icon frames, and books, which show that the patronage system extended to commissioning epigrams to celebrate such artistic creations (Beling, Illum. Bach 18f, 48f). His poetry so closely resembles that of PROCHOPRODROMOS that there has sometimes been confusion between the two.


- A.M.T., A.C.

PHILIP (Φιλίππος), apostle and saint; feastday in Constantinople 14 Nov. He was popular with the Gnostics, who attributed to him one of the Nag Hammadi Gospels addressed to the topic of the mystical marriage of the Perfect (i.e., Jesus) to Sophia. Another Gnostic document connected with Philip is the letter of Peter to him: it contains the invitation to join the apostles and is followed by a description of their questions addressed to the Savior. Byz. legend relates Philip's missionary work (primarily in Scythia and Phrygia) and his martyrdom, together with that of Bartholomew, in Hierapolis. His cult developed from the early 6th C., when his apostoleton was constructed in Constantinople, in the district of Melitadou, by Anastasios I, according to the Patria (Janin, Églises CP 499f). The Acts of Philip (5th C.?) were translated into Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic; later Greek eulogies (e.g., by Niketas Paphlagon, Symeon Metaphrastes) are short on detail and ignore Philip's colorful miracles related in his Acts.

With the exception of a unique icon of the 10th C. (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, no.B.59), where he is shown blessed by Christ, Philip usually appears collegially with other apostles on ivories and in MS illustration. On the Harbaville triptych (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinskulptur II, no.53) and other works, he is indistinguishable, except for his inscription, from Thomas, the other youthful apostle.

PHILIP I OF TARANTO, prince of Taranto (1294–1331), prince of Achaia (1307–13), titular Latin emperor of Constantinople (1313–31); died Naples 26 Dec. 1331. Son of Charles II, king of Naples, and grandson of Charles I of Anjou, Philip inherited the Angevin rights of suzerainty over Frankish Greece (including Achaia, Athens, Naxos, Albania, and Thessaly). By conquest and marriage he sought to expand Frankish territory at the expense of the Byz. and was a continual threat to Andronikos II. His first marriage (to Thamar of Epirus, daughter of Nikephoros I Komnenos Doukas, in 1294) brought him the promise of suzerainty over the despotate of Epiros but ended in divorce in 1309. From his base in Italy and Kerkyra, Philip campaigned twice in Epirus in an unsuccessful effort to make good his claim to the despotate; he also made an expedition to the Morea in 1306. In 1313 he married Catherine of Valois (the daughter of Charles of Valois), who brought with her the titular claim to the Latin Empire of Constantinople. He made plans to reconquer Constantinople, as part of a crusade to recover the Holy Land, but the expedition never materialized. In 1313 Philip relinquished his title of prince of Achaia but remained suzerain of the principality.


—A.M.T.

PHILIP MONOTROPOS (Μονότρωπος, lit. “solitary”), monk and author; fl. ca.1100. He wrote two ascetic works in verse: the Mirror (Dioptra), also known as Tears and Laments (in 1095), and two years later the compilation entitled Sylogue or Dialexis, in the genre of a conversation between the soul and the body; in the later MS tradition the two works formed a single unit. Philip presents the posthumous destiny of the soul and a vision of the Last Judgment. Unlike the Life of Basil the Younger, the presentation of Monotropos has no narrative element, only the lyrical perception of divine punishment and reward (F.

Batjuškov, ŽMNP 273 [Feb. 1891] 333–42). Following Niketas Stethatos, Philip placed the souls of the just not in earthly paradise but in the Kingdom of God in heaven (A. Wenger, BZ 44 [1951] 560–69). The Dioptra became very popular in the 14th C.; it was reworked by a certain Philites and translated into Church Slavonic in Bulgaria (H. Miklas, Stareobílská literatúra 2 [Sofia 1977] 169–81). Some MSS of the Dioptra contain several accompanying texts, including a preamble by Michael Psellos which was used by A. Sonny to date Psellos’s death after 1095 (BZ 3 [1894] 602f); the validity of this attribution has, however, been questioned by J. Darrouzès (REB 32 [1974] 199f).


PHILIP OF SIDE, churchman and writer; born Side, fl. first half 5th C. In the early 5th C. Philip, perhaps accompanied by his relative Troilos, emigrated to Constantinople, where he became a good friend of John Chrysostom, who ordained him deacon. Troilos became a successful orator and teacher, numbering future clerics and men of letters among his pupils, and with friends in high places. Philip, by contrast, failed in three bids for the patriarchate (426, 428, 431).

His major work was titled Christian History (not ecclesiastical, as Sokr. HE 7.27, emphasizes), written between 434 and 439, extending from the Creation to ca.426. To judge from the strong criticisms of Sokrates and Photios (Bibl., cod. 35) of the history’s Asianist style, pretensions to polyphony, shapeless format, purple passages, and chronological deficiencies, Philip was attempting a fusion of various literary genres, pagan and Christian. Apart from the quotation by Photios of the opening sentence, extracts remain only in a 14th/15th-C. MS in Oxford (Bodl. Barocc. 145, fols. 216r–v). The many other works ascribed to Philip by Sokrates, including a refutation of Julian’s Against the Galilaeans, have vanished without a trace.
PHILIP OF SWABIA, king of Germany (1198–1208); son of Frederick I Barbarossa; born 1178, died Bamberg 21 June 1208. In 1197, at the direction of his brother Henry VI, Philip married Irene, daughter of Isaac II and widow of Roger, son of Tancred of Lecce. The future Alexios IV escaped from Constantinople to Germany and spent the winter of 1201/2 at Philip’s court in or near Hagenaun (Alsace). With the evident support of Philip’s ally Philip II of France (M. Zaborov, VizVrem 6 [1953] 228–35), Boniface of Montferrat, leader of the Fourth Crusade, spent Christmas 1201 at Hagenaun; the three almost certainly discussed the possibility of turning the Crusade to Alexios’s advantage. Late in 1202 envoys of Philip reached the Crusaders at Zara; through them, he guaranteed Alexios’s offers, thus bringing about the Crusade’s diversion to Constantinople. Philip believed that, through his wife, he had a claim to the Byz. throne. In May 1203 he promised Pope Innocent III, “If omnipotent God subdues the Greeks’ realm to me or my brother-in-law, in good faith and without fraud I will act to subject the Constantinopolitan church to Rome” (MGH Leges, Sectio 4, 2:9).


C.M.B.

PHILIPPI (Φιλίππος), city of eastern Macedonia, in a rich plain astride the Via Egnatia, slightly inland from its port at Christopolis. It was an important economic and cultural center in the 4th C.; Himeros, in a speech delivered in Philippi probably in 362, praised the city and particularly the purity of the Greek spoken by its population.

At Philippi are preserved the remains of many buildings, esp. of the 5th–6th C., and many tombs both Christian and pagan, with coins through Justinian I (Ch.I. Pennas in Kabala 1:437–44). Basilica A, which was built on a succession of levels rising from forecourt to nave, and Basilica G were decorated with marble and mosaic floors. Basilica B (6th C.) was an enormous vaulted structure with a dome over the central bay; the dome collapsed before completion. The so-called Octagon was built by the bishop Porphyry (mid-4th C.), rebuilt with a mosaic pavement in the late 4th or early 5th C., and inscribed in a square in the early 6th C. (S. Pelekanides, Ergon tes Archaiologikes He- taires [1978] 181–91). It was the cathedral of Philippi and part of a vast complex, including a bishop’s palace, that became the focus of civic life until a fire of the 7th C. (Ch. Bakirtzes in Kabala 2:149–57); according to Pelekanides the cult of the apostle Paul that was centered in the Octagon continued a Hellenistic hero cult (Kabala 1:149–58). Among the Christian monuments of Philippi is an inscription of the 5th C. on the city gates containing fragments of correspondence between Christ and Abgar of Edessa (C. Picard, BCH 44 [1920] 41–69).

The fate of Philippi after the 7th C. is obscure. Slavs settled in much of the surrounding territory. Bulgarian invasions of ca.812 forced Greeks to flee from the “fortress” (achyroma) of Philippi (Theoph. 496.4–5). Two fragments of a Bulgarian inscription dated to the second quarter of the 9th C. survived in Basilica B; one of them mentions the benefactions made to Christians and their ingratitude (Bessleviev, Inschriften, no.14, pp. 163–74). Byz. writers are silent about Philippi except for the author of the Vita Basili who “remembered” Philippi as one of the Macedonian poleis at the time of Herakleios (TheophCont 214.17–18). It was a kastron ca.965/6, when Nikephoros II Phokas organized the repair of its rampart, an event recorded in an inscription (P. Lemerle, BCH 61 [1937] 103–08). The remains of the walls show that during the “Byz. period” (not specified further by Lemerle) some additions to the ancient fortifications were made: a proteichisma, or low external wall; two inner walls strengthening the lines of resistance; and a “donjon,” or medieval castle, as an independent fortified structure (H. Ducoux, P. Lemerle, BCH 62 [1938] 17f).

Philippi was known to al-Ibrāšī in the 12th C. as a trade center. It was an impregnable fortress protected, according to Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 3:328.15–21), by precipitous rocks and swamps. It is rarely mentioned in later sources, although we can assume that Philippi shared the fate of
eastern Macedonia. In 1208 the Latin emperor of Constantinople, Henry of Hainault, defeated the Lombards, who had refused to let him into Christopolis, “in the valley of Philippi.” In 1246 John III Vatatzes held a military council in Philippi (Akrop. 73.8–12). The city survived the attack of the Catalan Grand Company in the early 14th C. but was later taken by Stefan Uros IV Dušan. Gregoras (Greg. 3:564.11–12) describes an expedition of Matthew I Kantakouzenos against the asty of Philippi in 1355; the caesar Voinha, Serbian ruler of Drama, took him captive (Kantak. 3:330.15–18). The city probably fell to the Ottomans in 1387.

The history of the ecclesiastical metropolis of Philippi is also obscure, and the data about it before the 10th C. are questionable; only in the notitiae of the 10th–12th C. is there evidence about it. It probably declined in rank during the Palaiologan period, and Christopolis and Drama ceased to be its suffragans.


PHILIPPIKOS (Φιλιππίκος), general in the reign of Maurice; died ca.613/14. He was married to Gordia, Maurice’s sister, in 584. Philippikos led expeditions into Persian territory in 584 and 585 (and allowed the massacre of Persian captives); he defeated the Persians at the battle of Solachon in 586 and ravaged their border territories in Mesopotamia in 587, but in no campaign could he deliver a decisive blow against the Persians. Maurice’s replacement of Philippikos by Priskos as magister militum of the East caused the mutiny at Monokarton in spring 588. Philippikos’s reappointment to that post in 589 satisfied the soldiers. After Philippikos failed to recover Martyropolis from the Persians, Maurice replaced him with Komentiolos in 589. Philippikos was komes of the exkoubotai at the end of Maurice’s reign, but in 603 Phokas replaced him with Priskos. In 594 Philippikos constructed a monastery in Chrysopolis (Bithynia), known as the monastery of Philippikos, which he dedicated to the Virgin. In the reign of Phokas, Philippikos was tonsured and exiled to this monastery. Briefly recalled to active military command after Herakleios dismissed Priskos in winter 612–13, Philippikos died soon after and was buried in his monastery.


PHILIPPOKOS, emperor (711–13); baptismal name Bardanes; died Constantinople 20 Jan. 714 (Sumner) or 715 (Grierson, “Tombs and Obits” 51f). He was the son of a patrikon Nikephoros from a Pergamene family. By 702/3 Bardanes was prominent enough to be exiled to Kephallenia by Tiberios II. Recalled by Justinian II, he was sent with a punitive expedition against Cherson, where he was acclaimed emperor as Philippikos. Supported by the Khazar khagan and rebellious Byz. troops, he entered Constantinople in Nov. 711. Philippikos’s active support of Monothelitism is often attributed to his presumed Armenian origins (Ostrogorsky). He deposed Patr. Kyros (705–11), appointed John VI (712–15), and convened a council (including the future Patr. Germanos I) that anathematized the Third Council of Constantinople (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF). Philippikos also rehabilitated those (e.g., Patr. Sergios I) whom the council had excommunicated and removed from the palace the council’s inscriptions and representations. A painted stele (or mosaic?) of Philippikos—one of the last public images of its kind to be erected—was displayed in the ZEUXIPPOS. Philippikos was suspicious of statues, allegedly ordering the destruction of one that had fallen on a koubikouarios and of two others that bore inscribed prophecies (Dagron, CP ima

ginaire 134, 145). His military efforts were inconsequential. In 712 he resettled Armenians from Byz. territory to Melitene and Armenia IV, but Maslama took Amaseia, while Tervel devastated Thrace; in 713 the Arabs sacked Antioch of Pisidia. This ineffectiveness probably caused the revolt by officers of the Opsikion in favor of Anastasios II; Philippikos was deposed and blinded on 3 June. He was buried in the Dalmatou Monastery.


PHILIPPOPOLIS (Φιλιππούπολις), Thracian Pulpudeva (Z. Velkova in Pulpudeva 1 (Sofia 1976) 174fl., mod. Plovdiv), city in northern Thrace on the right bank of the Hebrus (Marica) River,
founded in antiquity. Despite urban contraction after the Gothic invasion of 250, Philippopolis remained a major city, and excavations reveal various buildings dating to the 4th C., such as mosaic-floored *thermae* and Christian basilicas. The inhabitants of Philippopolis stubbornly supported the rebellious Prokopios in 365, and in 475/6 erected a laudatory inscription in honor of the usurper Basiliskos. Justinian I fortified it anew.

It was an ecclesiastical metropolis under the jurisdiction of Constantinople. From the 8th C. onward, Philippopolis, located near the Bulgarian border, was a subject of dispute between the Bulgarians and Byz. Krum’s invasion in 813 forced the Christians to abandon the town temporarily. During Basil II’s wars against Bulgaria, Philippopolis was one of the major Byz. strongholds, and the *protostrapherios* Nikephoros Xiphias was appointed its *strategos*. Pechenegs attacked Philippopolis in the mid-11th C., temporarily occupying the city ca.1090. Nevertheless, Philippopolis flourished: in the 12th C. a water reservoir was built on the hill of Nebetetepe in Plovdiv (Ch. Djambov, *Godišnik na Narodnija archeologiški muzej Plovdiv* 6 [1968] 71–81), and the city walls were restored. Philippopolis was the residence of some prominent literati: *Michael Italikos* was its metropolitan and worked effectively to reconcile the knights of the Second Crusade with the population of Philippopolis; Niketas Choniates served as governor of the city. Geoffrey Villehardouin considered Philippopolis one of the three largest cities of the empire. The city sustained damage from Crusader armies passing through it and also from religious conflicts, as it contained substantial Pau- lician and Armenian populations that were persecuted by the Orthodox. It was destroyed by Kalojan in 1206 but soon restored. In 1219 it formed a Latin “ducatum de Finepole.” The Bulgarians captured the city in 1263, lost it to the Byz., and finally regained it in 1323 (when the inhabitants were busy harvesting grain). The Ottomans conquered the city in 1363 or 1364 (B. Cvetkova, *EP* 2:914).

**PHILO**, Jewish philosopher and apologist of Alexandria who interpreted Judaism on the basis of Hellenistic (primarily Platonic and Stoic) philosophy; born ca.20 B.C., died a.d. 50. His extant literary corpus, written in Greek and preserved in Greek and Armenian, consists mainly of allegories and philosophical commentaries on biblical themes, in particular Genesis and Exodus. His synthesis of Greek and Hebrew thought was a significant methodological tool for the church fathers, esp. his idea of God’s wisdom, *logos*, as creating the cosmos through speech (cf. Jn 1:1). Philo’s philosophic mysticism expressed in the *Vita of Moses* influenced Gregory of Nyssa and was well known among church fathers. Photios comments on a number of his works (*Bibl.*, cod.103–04), in particular Philo’s description of the Essenes and Therapeutai, whom both Photios and *George Hamartolos* identified as monastic groups. Photios also considered Philo a convert to Christianity (*Bibl.*, cod.105), based on his embassy to Caligula in Rome, where he supposedly met Paul. Philo’s Greek style was praised by Photios and recommended by Joseph Rhakendytes. His influence was still strong in the 14th C. *Theodore Metochites*, who wrote an essay on Philo (*Miscellanea*, ch.16), quipped, following Jerome (*De viris illustribus*, 11), “Does Philo platonize or does Plato philonize?”

---

**PHILOCALUS.** See Calendar of 354.

**PHILOGELOS** (*Φιλόγελος*, Laughter-lover), a collection of 265 jokes, known in many MSS from the 10th–11th C. onward. It is attributed in MS tradition to Hierokles and Philagrius, whose identity is unknown. The certain *terminus post quem* is 248, since the millennium of Rome is mentioned; the calculation of money in myriads (units of 10,000) points to a date in the 4th–5th C., as does the custom of wearing *trousers*. The presence of eunuchs and the use of blinding as punishment may also indicate the latter date. Some of the jokes, however, such as those which mention the Serapaeum as still standing, may be ancient.

The whole setting of *Philogelos* is urban, with references to city magistrates, elections, theaters, gladiators, public bathhouses, market places, advocates, merchants, etc. The countryside appears only rarely, in the form of the “landlord and his tenants.” Slaves are mentioned in many of the
jokes. The objects of ridicule are scholastikoi ("egg-heads"), misers, men with bad breath, false prophets, inhabitants of Abdera and Kyme—but never peasants. The pantheon of pagan gods is present, while allusions to Christianity, if any, are vague. The jokes are structured on the principle of ridiculous misunderstandings or impossible juxtapositions and analogies, sometimes with sexual overtones.


Lit. A. Thierfelder, RE supp. 11 (1968) 1062–68.

—A.K.

PHILOKALES (Φιλοκάλης, "loving the good," fem. Φιλοκάλινα), also Philokalios, a family name. The first known Philokales is mentioned in Basil II's novel of 996 as an example of an ordinary peasant who rose to the title of protovestarios and acquired the lands of neighboring peasants; Basil ordered the confiscation of the estate of Philokales. The family reappeared in the second half of the 11th C. when Andronikos Philokales served as katepano of Bulgaria ca.1066 (N. Bânescu, BZ 25 [1925] 531). Some family members, including Eudokia Philokalina, proedrissa, are known by the seals of this period (Seibt, Bleisiegel 282f). Gautier ("Blachernes" 241) identified Michael Philokales, eparch and mystikos (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.1039), with Michael (without patronym) mystikos and eparch in 1094. Manuel Philokales was kanikleios in 1094.

Eumathios Philokales, one of Alexios I's ablest generals, served as governor of Cyprus ca.1092–1103 and again ca.1112, led an embassy to the Hungarian court, and defeated the Seljuks ca.1109/10. Some seals name the same Eumathios (or his homonym) megas doux and praitor of Hellas and Peloponnesos: a charter of 1118 dealing with a land dispute on Crete calls him sebastos, megas doux, and praitor (MM 6:96.13–14). Though not a trained soldier, he knew how to entrap his adversary and use war machines, according to Anna Komnene. Probably during his first governorship of Cyprus he commissioned the parekklesion of the Trinity at the monastery of Chryso stomos, near Koutsoverdi, in the northern part of the island. The brick walls, ashar-and-brick dome, and high quality of the paintings at Koutsoverdi, superior to any program surviving from 11th-C. Cyprus, suggest the accessibility to aristocrats, even early in their career, of major craftsmen and the readiness of the latter to work in the provinces. Most of the chapel's paintings remain unpublished.

Some 12th-C. Philokalai held military posts: one was Manuel I's general; another, probably, was doux of Dalmatia in 1178. Others were in civil service, such as the grammaticos Eumathios (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.1192); a certain Philokales, logothetes ton serekton; and Eumathios, eparch under Alexios III, one of the richest men in Byz. and the emperor's envoy. V. Laurent identified a Philokales, megas doux in 1214 (RegPatr., fasc. 4, p.26), with the above-mentioned logothetes, but the information available is too meager and their posts too different for such identification.


—A.K., A.C.

PHILOKALIA (Φιλοκαλία, lit. "love for the good" [in Church Slavonic translated as dobrotolubie]. A term for property improvement (in documents) or for scholarly correction (e.g., Epiphanios of Salamis, [PG 41:220B]), it came to be used as a term for florilegia. BASIL THE GREAT and GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS gave this name to their anthology of the works of ORIGEN compiled ca.360. Under this title, two Greek theologians, Nikodemos of Mt. Athos (1749–1809) and Makarios, bishop of Corinth (1731–1805), issued a collection of ascetic works written by Byz. authors of the 4th–15th C.: Antony the Great, Evagrios Pontikos, Maximos the Confessor, John of Damascus, Symeon the Theologian, Niketas Stethatos, Elias Ekdikos, Gregory Palamas, Markos Eugenikos, Symeon of Thessalonike, and others. John Cassian, who wrote in Latin, is also included, since some of his works had already been translated into Greek during the Byz. period. The Philokalia was published in Venice in 1782 and later on reproduced with some changes (K. Papoulides, Makedonika 10 [1970] 291–93). Paisij Velichkovskij (1722–94) translated the Philokalia into Church Slavonic (St. Petersburg 1793); in the West it was discovered later and used by J.P. Migne while preparing the second half of his Patrologia Graeca.
PHILOPATRIS (Φιλόπατρις ἡ Διδασκόμενος, The Patriot), title of a dialogue preserved among the works of LUCIAN in several MSS. The conversation of Triephon and Critias, full of phrases from genuine Lucianic works, ridicules pagan myths, but at the same time the author scorns (ch.12) the creed of Constantinople ("the son of the father, spirit proceeding from the father") and St. Paul ("a Galilaean with receding hair and a long nose"); the author laughs at astrologers and false prophets also, but in his turn expresses the hope that the emperor will destroy "Babylon," enslave Egypt, and check the Persians and the Scythians (ch.29). Stylistic and chronological grounds preclude the authorship of Lucian, but defining the date and, accordingly, the purpose of the Philopatris is very difficult. Following B. Niebuhr, most scholars have attributed the Philopatris to the reign of Nikephors II Phokas; Ch. Angelide narrowed this date to the period March–Aug. 963 (Hellenika 30 [1977–78] 34–50). R. Anastasi (SicGymn. 17 [1964] 127–44) identified the emperor as Isaac I and even hypothesized the authorship of Psellos. B. Baldwin is pessimistic about the possibility of establishing a firm date for the work: rejecting the arguments in favor of Nikephoros II's reign, he admits that the Philopatris may have been produced in the time of Julian, or Justinian I, or any time thereafter (YCS 27 [1982] 321–44).


PHILOPONOS, JOHN, scholar of philosophy, science, and theology; born ca.490, died after 567, or after 574 (Sorabji). Philoponos (Φιλόπωνος) is a sobriquet meaning "lover of work" and may also refer to the Alexandrian guilds of philoponoi, or church helpers. A Christian who was trained by the Neoplatonist Ammonios. John became a professional grammaticos at Alexandria. A born controversialist, in 529 he attacked the Neoplatonist notions of Proklos concerning the world's eternity in Against Proklos on the Eternity of the World. He also developed a Christian theory of matter, attacking Aristotle's On the World in a treatise (surviving only in fragments) that provoked an elaborate response from Simplikios. John refuted Aristotle's concept of the ousia (substance), later to be called quintessence (the fifth substance), that is, of things immobile or moving circularly round the center of the universe, completely separate from matter and therefore divine; the stars, according to Aristotle, know no upward and downward motions and possess a unique substance that is eternal. John, referring to astronomical observations that the stars have specific motions non-homocentric with the universe, inferred that celestial bodies are not cardinally distinct from terrestrial, have no "quintessence," and are not eternal; he argued for the contingency of the world. John criticized much of Aristotelian science, esp. the ancient philosopher's explanations of dynamics, and proposed his own innovative theories on velocity in a vacuum and on impetus.

In his later years (from ca.553) John, a supporter of Monophysitism, turned to theology; his essay On the Making of the World appears to have been directed against the cosmogony of Kosmas Indikopleustes. A tract of 567, entitled On the Trinity or On Theology, reveals his leanings toward Tritheism, the concept of the separate being of each hypostasis. Several of his theological works, including the Arbiter and the Letter to Justinian, are transmitted in Syriac. John's diverse works included commentaries on Aristotle and treatises on the astrolabe and on grammar. His notice in the Souda, along with the several discussions in the Bibliotheca of Photios variously applauding his style and condemning his heretical opinions, imply an enduring Byz. audience; he was also read in the Arab world.


PHILOSOPHER (φιλόσοφος, lit. "loving wisdom"). This term had a broad range of meanings in Byz.: first of all, it designated pagan philosophers and had two distinct aspects—a false philosopher opposed to Christianity, and a wise man who was versed in the ancient intellectual tradition (also an educated man, a rhetorician, etc.). Philosopha or knowledge was laudable, constituting the "discipline of disciplines," the basis of any intellectual activity, but it could also be frightening, connected with dark forces, as are philosophers in the Parastaseis symtomoi chronikai and to some extent in the Cosmographier of Ravenna—guardians of strange and deceptive legends. Secondly, a philosopher was a person seeking moral perfection, and thus the word became synonymous with monk or ascetic. As defined by Neilos of Ankyra (PG 79:721 B), "philosophy is perfection of morality combined with veneration of the true knowledge of being." Technically, a philosopher was a scholar who studied and taught the disciplines concerned with being, that is, beyond rhetoric and logic, which belonged to the sphere of the sophistes. The term philosophos could apparently also be used as an official title, e.g., on a seal of John, chartophylax [and] philosophos (Zacos, Seals 2, no.780).

A view of philosophoi at work under Constantine VII—teaching pupils at a long table and inspecting their exercise books—is provided by the Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzès, no.329).

Images of Pagan Philosophers. This is the conventional term for a cycle of paintings preserved in some churches. The Painter's Manual (Hermeneia) of Dionysios of Fourni (see Models and Model-books) recommended that images of philosophers be represented together with the Tree of Jesse, beneath the Old Testament prophets. They were considered to be pagan harbingers of Christ's incarnation. Several churches and monasteries—Lavra and Iveron on Mt. Athos, St. Nicholas Spanos (Philanthropina) on an island near Ioannina, Bačkovo and Arbanesi in Bulgaria, and others—contain images of ancient "philosophers." They are dated to the 16th–18th C., although K. Spetsieres (infra) supposes that the artists followed an earlier tradition.

The list of "philosophers" represented includes well-known names not only of philosophers (Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Pythagoras, Philo) but also of politicians (Solon), writers (Homer, Plutarch, Thucydides), scientists (Galien), and prophets (the Sibyl); several names are unknown, for example, Lisitis, Astakor, Xalgis. The images are conventional, with few individual features: the men have luxurious hair and beards and, with some exceptions, wear crowns and rich attire; the Sibyl appears dressed as an empress. The figures are identified by inscriptions not restricted to names but including some Christian statements (e.g., "God is the Reason, Word, Spirit, and incarnate Word [Logos of the Father"). At Bačkovo, the image of Socrates is accompanied by an inscription referring to Christ: "He took his flesh from a Jewish virgin, and was crucified; blessed are those who listened."


A.K., A.C.

PHILOSOPHY, defined by John of Damascus (Schriften, ed. Kotter, 1:56) as (1) knowledge of beings (ontia) qua beings; (2) knowledge of divine and human matters; (3) preparation (melete) for death; (4) assimilation to God; (5) the art (techne) of arts and the science of sciences; and (6) the love of wisdom. These definitions, which had been assembled by the Neoplatonists of the Alexandrian school (Ammonios, David the Philosopher, and Elias of Alexandria), derive from Aristotelian (1, 5), Stoic (2), and Platonic (3, 4) conceptions of philosophy as well as indicating the origin of the word (6). Alongside these school definitions, philosophy as a term could in Byz. have meanings already developed in the patristic period; thus in rejecting the claim of pagan philosophers to provide enlightenment, moral reform, and union with the divine, Christians asserted their religion as the true philosophy as compared to false (pagan) philosophy (he exo philosophia) that inspired heresy. The identification of the Christian way of life as true philosophy was specified further so that philosophy could refer to paradigms of such a life: martyrdom and the monastic ideal. Broader meanings of philosophy as designating eloquence, education, and ency-
clopedia knowledge were also to be found in Byz.

John of Damascus then divides philosophy into two branches, theoretic (dealing with knowledge) and practical (concerned with the virtues): theoretic included physics, mathematics (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and harmonics), and “theology” (= metaphysics: the study of immaterial realities, God, angels, soul); practical included ethics, “economics” (i.e., domestic ethics), and politics. Logic he considers as the instrument, rather than as a branch, of philosophy. This division of philosophy, also derived from later Neoplatonism, remained standard (at least as an ideal) in Byz. and determined the order of a philosophical curriculum that would begin with logic and ethics and progress (in some cases) through physics and mathematics to metaphysics. The first stages of the curriculum, along with rhetoric, constituted the cornerstone of a higher education in Byz.

The question of the existence of a specific Byz. philosophy risks anachronism if it presupposes a modern criterion of what is to count as philosophy. If philosophy is seen as a historical development, it is to be found in Byz. in the interest taken in ancient philosophy and in the efforts to develop and criticize this heritage. This work provided in turn vital inspiration to Renaissance philosophy. Some of the major periods, figures, and themes of Byz. philosophy will be noted here as well as the problem of its relation to Christian religion.

The beginnings of Byz. philosophy may be found in the Neoplatonism of Proklos and his school at Athens and in that of his pupil Ammonios and his school at Alexandria. Not only did these schools establish the philosophical curriculum, but also they made important contributions. Among these might be mentioned Proklos’s theory of the structure and derivation of reality and the philosophical critique by John Philoponos of Aristotelian physics, particularly the notion of a special celestial substance and the doctrine of the eternity of the world, on which subject his debate with Simplikios anticipated the great debate in the Latin West in the 13th C. In the 7th and 8th C., the teaching of logic and ethics continued at an elementary level and in the form established by the Neoplatonic schools, John of Damascus being the best-known example. This presence of philosophy was strengthened in the 9th and 10th C., first by Leo the Mathematician (of Philosopher) who taught philosophy at Constantinople in the 9th C. and then, a century later, by Constantine, “leader of the philosophers,” who was apparently responsible for teaching the theoretical sciences. In the same period Photios produced versions of Aristotelian logic and attacked Plato’s theory of Ideas, which suggested that there were other causes of reality besides God. A greater friend of Plato was Arethas of Caesarea, who was responsible for important editorial work on MSS of Plato and other ancient philosophers.

The renewed efforts of the 9th and 10th C. to revive and strengthen education, including philosophy, bore fruit in the 11th C. Michael Psellos inspired the founding, as part of the new University of Constantinople, of a School of Philosophy by Constantine IX. Psellos headed the school, taught philosophy in all its branches, and was given the honorific title Hypatos ton Philosophon. His description of his philosophical progress (Psellos, Chron. 1:134–38) matches that prescribed by later Neoplatonism. In teaching the branches of philosophy, Psellos attained considerable mastery of them through use, unparalleled in Byz. in its extensiveness, of the philosophical MSS available to him, of which Proklos was his preferred source. Reflections of this reading are found in his short encyclopedia De omnifaria doctrina (Didaskalia pantodape), in his commentaries on Aristotle’s logic and physics, and in a large number of short pieces discussing particular problems raised in part at least by his pupils. Psellos impresses more by his vast erudition and Neoplatonist leanings than by any originality. This latter quality is more evident in his pupil and successor, John Italos, who was more systematic and radical in applying philosophical analysis to theological issues. Italos was succeeded by Theodore of Smyrna, author of an epitome of physics. Italos’s pupil, Eustratios of Nicea, working with Michael of Ephesus and other members of a circle associated with Anna Komnene, produced commentaries on Aristotle’s ethics, physics, and logic.

The court at Nicea ensured that the fall of Constantinople in 1204 did not break the tradition of philosophical learning in Byz. An instance of this continuity is Nikephoros Blemmydes, who produced handbooks of logic and physics. In the period of the Palaiologan revival a large group of scholars who were competent in the various
branches of philosophy and willing to criticize philosophical theories emerged. Pachymeres produced a compendium of Aristotelian philosophy, and paraphrases of Aristotle were prepared by Sophonias (late 19th C.), Leo Magentenos (14th C.), and Theodore Metochites. In addition to reading Plato and some rare Neoplatonic texts, Metochites engaged in scientific polemic with his rival Nikephoros Choumnos, stressing against Choumnos the uncertainty of physics and the disappointing nature of Aristotle's metaphysics; Choumnos, on the other hand, attacked the orthodoxy of Neoplatonic psychology. Metochites' pupil Nikephoros Gregoras shows a knowledge of and sympathy for Neoplatonism (in, e.g., his commentary on Synesios's On Dreams) that is reminiscent of Psellos (whom he uses).

Leading figures of the final period of Byz. philosophy were Plethon, Gennadios II Scholarios, and Bessarion. Plethon proposed replacing Christianity as a theology and political system with Neoplatonism as represented in Proklos and Psellos. These views were attacked as heretical by Scholarios, who was more favorable to the Roman church and to Latin SCHOLASTICISM and found Aristotle more amenable. Bessarion's attempts to mediate the dispute between his teacher Plethon and Scholarios helped bring to the attention of Italian humanists the dispute as well as the philosophical texts that were concerned.

Byz. philosophy is inextricably tied to the question of its relation to Christian doctrine. The question had already arisen in the patristic period and had evoked different responses. At first in competition with philosophical schools, Christians asserted the superiority of their faith in truth and in antiquity: Plato, to the extent he found truth, had read the Bible. This was attacked by the philosophers Celsus and Porphyry, to whom replied in turn Origen, Methodios of Olympos, Eusebios of Caesarea, and others. Despite this conflict and the view of some Christians that pagan philosophy, as St. Paul indicated (1 Cor 1:21, 25; Col 2:8), was superfluous and insidious, Origen and later Christian writers influenced by him still found room for philosophy as a preparation for faith, as a means of deepening understanding of the faith, and as a dialectical weapon to be used against heresies. Platonism in particular seemed to them to come nearest to Christian religion. Julian the Apostate's abortive attempt to revive pagan religion hardened church leaders' attitude to philosophy.

The educational value of pagan philosophy, however, continued to be recognized and tolerated to some extent. Justinian's closing of the Neoplatonist ACADEMY OF ATHENS in 529 and the transposition by pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite of Proklos's metaphysical system into Christian terms both express possible reactions. The link between higher education and philosophy made it difficult in later centuries to dispense with philosophy. Scholars and teachers like Photios and Psellos had to face attacks on their theological orthodoxy as a consequence of their interest in learning. Psellos is a clear case of this ambivalence. In his aggressive program to "revive" and advance philosophical learning he found himself presenting the pagan theology that constituted metaphysics in Proklos. He was, however, careful to note the heretical aspects, distance himself from them (for example in his commentary on the CHALDEAN ORACLES), or discreetly remove them (as did the sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos in his excerpts from Proklos). In a letter to Xiphilinos, Psellos justified the teaching of such pagan philosophy by claiming that it can play a useful role as subordinate to, preparing for, and clarifying Christian doctrine.

Nevertheless, the tension between pagan philosophy and Christianity was not satisfactorily resolved in Psellos. The trial of Italos in 1082 rested on the association of heresy with interest in Greek philosophy and ended at least further talk of the pagan theology of Neoplatonism that had been popularized in some circles by Psellos and that was attacked by Nicholas of Methone in his Refutation of Proklos's Elements of Theology. The logic and physics of Aristotle, however, could evidently still be defended in the 12th C. as more amenable to Christian purposes. More broadly, the debate between proponents of Plato and of Aristotle in Byz. might be regarded in part as a debate about the theological acceptability of philosophy. Neither Plato nor Aristotle could be accepted entirely. To the heresy of Plato's (and the Neoplatonists') concepts—hierarchical subordination of first causes, emanation from these causes, existence of eternal Ideas, divinity and preexistence of souls, metempsychosis—could be opposed the heresies of Aristotle—a God who merely moves the heavens and exerts little providence, eternity
of the world, omission of a future life in ethics. As Aristotle’s logic was the beginning stage and Platonic metaphysics the highest level of the philosophical curriculum, the latter was least familiar and most exposed to the charge of heresy, whereas the former could be integrated more easily as a basic intellectual discipline. Even Aristotelian logic, however, was suspect to those monks whose spirituality opposed them to any form of philosophy, to those opposed to the Roman church and a Latin Scholasticism heavily indebted to Aristotle, and to those who knew some Neoplatonic philosophy and could agree that God transcends all syllogism.


—D.O.M.

PHILOSTORGIOS (Φιλωστόργως), ecclesiastical historian; born Borisso in Cappadocia Secunda ca.368, died ca.439. At the age of 20 Philostorgios emigrated to Constantinople, where he spent most of his life and became a follower of Eunomios. Himself a layman, he wrote in ostensible continuation of *Eusebios of Caesarea* a church history in 12 books covering the years 300–425. Perhaps because of its extreme Arianism, it has survived only in fragments, primarily in the *Passio* of the martyr Artemios (died ca.362), and in an epitome by Photios, who also (Bibl., cod.40) provides a highly critical précis; two complimentary epigrams (*AnthGr*, bk.9:193f) also imply its endurance. His history affords a welcome glimpse into the Arian view of things. Notable items include a mild treatment of the emperor Julian for his recall of Arians and attacks on such orthodox luminaries as Basil the Great, albeit Gregory of Nazianzos was let off lightly. A long section on natural phenomena interprets in apocalyptic vein earthquakes, eclipses, and meteors as scourges of divine anger. One fragment discloses his authorship of a refutation of the philosopher Porphyry and an *enkomion* on Eunomios about which nothing more is known. Philostorgios also wrote a vita of Lucian of Antioch.


PHILOTHEOS, metropolitan of Selymbria; baptismal name Philemon; born Dakibye near Nikomedia, died Selymbria? after 1389. The father of Philotheos was a priest named John who died when Philotheos was 15. The youth was entrusted to the care of his uncle Sabbas, a disciple of Makarios of Constantinople. After completing his education, Philotheos became a monk. He was a supporter of hesychasm and John VI Kantakouzenos. By 1366 he was metropolitan of Selymbria; he remained in this position until at least 1389. In 1366 he anathematized Nikephoros Gregoras, who had been dead for some years (MM 1:490; *RegPatr*, fasc. 5, no.2515).

The most important work of Philotheos is a pro-hesychast treatise in the form of a dialogue between supporters and opponents of Palamas (Patm. gr. 366). He also composed hagiographical works, such as *enkomia* of Agathunikos (martyred at Selymbria in the 3rd C.) and Makarios of Constantinople (died ca.1341). Magdalino (*infra* 315, n.47) has suggested that Philotheos was the author of an oration of Pat. Arsenios, but its editor, P.G. Nikolopoulos, prefers an early 14th-C. date and proposes an attribution to Maximos Planoudes (*EEBS* 45 [1981–82] 406–61). Philotheos was also a scribe, who copied his own works (Kamariotissa 51, now in Istanbul, Gr.Patr.) as well as a *tetraevangelion* dated to 1380 (Princeton Art Museum 57–19).


PHILOTHEOS, KLETOROLOGION OF, a conventional name for the longest and most important of the taktika, i.e., official lists of titles and offices. The complete heading of the treatise reads, “The precise exposé of the order of imperial banquets, of the names and value of each title, compiled on the basis of ancient kletorologia.” The word *kletorologia* (κλητορολόγιον) itself is linked
with *kleis*, "invitation," and *kletorion*, "banquet." The author is known only from this treatise; he was *protospatarios* and *atriklines*. He published the book in 899 and it was immediately confirmed by an imperial *thespisma* (Oikonomides, *Lists* 235.2). The *Kletorologion* consists of four sections: in the first Philotheos presents the philosophy of the work—the definition of various dignities and the distinctions among them; the second lists the highest dignities, esp. those entitled to join the emperor's table—the patriarch of Constantinople, caesar, nobelissimos, kouropalates, basileopator, and *zoste patrikias* as well as magistri, anthypatoi, and *patrikoi* as holders of important offices; the third section, after a short mention of higher ranks, gives a list of *protospatarioi* and lower dignities; the fourth describes how the *atriklines* should arrange the imperial banquet. The court eunuchs, generals, and civil functionaries are included in the general catalog according to their titles; within the framework of a title the order is based on the importance of the office. At the end Philotheos included the *Notitiae episcopatum* by pseudo-Epiphanius. The two complete extant MSS contain the *Kletorologion* together with the *De ceremoniis*, which it concluded.

**PHILOTHEOS KOKKINOS** (Κόκκινος), patriarch of Constantinople (1353–1354/5; 8 Oct. 1364–1376); born Thessalonica ca. 1300, died ca. 1377/8. Born to poor parents, Philotheos worked as a cook for *Thomas Magistros* to pay his tuition. He became a monk and then herimonom on Athos; ca. 1340/1 he returned to Thessalonica as superior of the Philelou monastery. After a spell as superior of the Great Lavra (1344–47), he became metropolitan of Thracian Herakleia (1347–53). A staunch Palamite and Kantakouzenist, in 1353 he succeeded Patri. **Kallistos I** who had refused to perform the coronation of **Matthew I Kantakouzenos**. With the abdication of John VI the following year, Philotheos was deposed and replaced by Kallistos. He returned to the patriarchal throne ten years later after Kallistos's death. His second patriarchate was marked by the canonization of **Gregory Palamas** (1368), the personal conversion to Catholicism of John V (1369), and the reestablishment of partial jurisdiction of Constantinople over the Serbian church. Philotheos was again deposed after the coup of Andronikos IV.

Philotheos was a prolific writer of homiletic, dogmatic, and hagiographical works: he wrote 14 *kephalaia* against **Barlaam of Calabria** and **Akindynos** and 15 *antirrhothikai* against **Nikephoros Gregoras**. He also codified liturgical rubrics for Eucharist and Vespers in two ceremonial books, *Diaforeis* (PG 154:745–66), which became definitive practice in the Greek and Slavic Orthodox world (R. Taft, *DOP* 42 [1988] 191–94). His most important vitae were those of Sabas the Younger (fl. first half of 14th C.), **Isidore I Boucheiras**, and Germanos Maroules (died ca. 1356) as well as a lengthy and informative *enkion* of Palamas. The hymns usually ascribed to him may be the work of Philotheos Sinaites. Philotheos was venerated as a saint within a generation of his death (D.G. Tsames, *EEThSPTh* 22 [1977] 35–52). *Spa-tharakis* (*Portrait*, figs. 91, 92) and others have argued that Philotheos is portrayed in two illuminated MSS.

**PHILOTHEOS OF ATHOS**, saint; born Chrysopolis, Macedonia, died Athos 21 Oct. ca. 1450 at age 84. Philotheos was the son of émigrés who fled Turkish oppression in Asia Minor. By the 1380s, however, the Ottoman yoke reached Chrysopolis, and Philotheos and his brother were recruited for the child-levy (*devşirme*). The boys managed to escape their Turkish captors and sought refuge in Neapolis (probably Kavalla) at a double monastery dedicated to the Virgin. Their widowed mother, Eudokia, became a nun at the same monastery.

After his mother's death, Philotheos left Neapolis for Athos, where he spent some years at the *Dionysiou Monastery*. He decided eventually that
he preferred the solitary life and moved some distance from Dionysiou. His later years were marked by a fervent asceticism, rewarded, according to his hagiographer, with the gift of prophetic vision. His anonymous vita (BHG 1534), probably composed in the second half of the 15th C., is preserved in a 16th-C. MS from Dionysiou.


PHILOTHEOS OF OPSIKION, saint of unknown date; feastday 15 Sept. The only useful source for his biography is the Life of Philotheos by Eustathios of Thessalonike, since the Menologion of Basil II (PG 117:49C) presents a standardized portrayal of Philotheos as priest and wonderworker devoid of any information. The Life of Philotheos is Eustathios's manifesto: he proclaims that the pious life in the world has advantages over the hermitic life. Philotheos did not leave the world; quite to the contrary, he retained his land, wealth, and secular manner of life and possessed everything that is blessed on the earth, but he used his riches to support the poor. The conventional form of the Life sharply contrasts with its unconventional content, and Eustathios presents his point in a vigorous polemic against the traditional monastic ideal. In this respect the Life of Philotheos corresponds to Eustathios's pamphlet, On the Improvement of Monastic Life.


PHILOTHEOU MONASTERY, located inland near the northeast coast of the peninsula of Mt. Athos, not far from Iveron. The origins of Philotheou (Φιλοθέου) are unclear. According to an 18th-C. tradition (D. Papachryssanthou, Prot. 91, n.312), the founder was a certain Philotheos, a contemporary of Athanasios of Athos. A century later Porphyriy Uspeenskiy (Istorija Afon 3.1 [Kiev 1877] 65f; Pervoe putešestvie v Afonskie monastyri i skity 1.1 [Kiev 1877] 399) read a manuscript (now lost?) of a 19th-C. monk of Philotheou who asserted, referring to a codex of the Great Lavra, that his monastery (Phtere or Philotheou) existed in 992, "in the days of St. Athanasios." The first incontrovertible evidence of the existence of Philotheou, however, is an act of 1015 (Ivri. 20.60) that bears the signature of its hegoumenos George, probably the same person as George of the Theotokos of Pteres, who signed an act of 1013 (Ivri. 1, no.18.38).

In the 11th-12th C. Philotheou was a monastery of modest size and its attempts to enlarge its properties were usually curbed by the Lavra; thus in 1046 Philotheou was forced to cede to Lavra metochia of St. Elias and of Atziioannou, and in 1154 the metochion of Kalyka. By the 14th C. Philotheou became an imperial monastery (first attested in 1322) and gained the support of influential magnates (the parents of Theodora Palaiologina Philanthropene, the aunt of Andronikos IV; the protovestarios Andronikos Palaiologos, nephew of Andronikos II; etc.). The monastery enlarged its possessions, acquiring lands both in the valley of the Strymon River and on Lemnos, even though some of its estates were lost owing to an unstable situation caused by continual warfare. From 1346 onward, the monastery enjoyed the patronage of Serbian rulers and received from them certain donations in the katepanikon of Serres and Zichna. Probably in the 15th C. Philotheou acquired some lands on Thasos.

In the mid-14th C. a number of Serbian monks came to the monastery, and in the 15th C. it adopted the idiorrhythmic regime. The monks claimed possession of important relics: according to a late tradition Nikphoros III gave to Philotheou a piece of a nail from the Crucifixion, while the false chrysobull allegedly granted by Andronikos II in 1284 mentions the donation of a reliquary (chrysolektron kibolion) containing the right hand of John Chrysostom.

Because of a disastrous 16th-C. fire, scarcely anything remains of the original Byz. buildings. The library, however, contains 142 Byz. MSS (Lampros, Athos 1:151-69), most notably the 10th-C. illuminated Gospel book, cod. 33. The scriptorium was particularly active in the 14th C. Sometime in the Palaiologan period a monk of Philotheou named Arsenios compiled a Synopsis canonum (Beck, Kirche 711).

PHILOXENIA OF ABRAHAM, the “hospitality” (φιλοξενία) of Abraham to the Lord when he appeared by the Oak of Mamre in the form of three men (Gen. 18:1–18). In the passage, the three are sometimes “they” (v.9) and sometimes “he” (v.10), leading to a Trinitarian interpretation by Byz. commentators (e.g., Prokopios of Gaza, PG 87:364BC). Others were concerned that angels appeared to consume food (e.g., Theodoret, PG 80:177C). Illustrations of the scene are found already in the Via Latina catacomb, and the Trinitarian and eucharistic significance is made clear in the bema mosaics at S. Vitale in RAVENNA (ca.540). The scene is repeated with few variants in later centuries, notably in MSS (e.g., the Octateuchs) and in monumental art (e.g., the Peribleptos at Mistra). Fourteenth-century Russian travelers record that the stone table of the Philoxenia was exhibited in the southeastern exedra of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople (Majeska, Russian Travelers 32, 228).

LIT. E. Lucchesi-Palli, LCI 1:21–23. —J.H.L., A.C.

PHILOXENOS OF MABBUG, bishop of Hierapolis-Mabbug (485–518/19); Syrian Monophysite theologian and saint; born Tahal in Persia ca.440, died Philippopolis 10 Dec. 523. His Syriac name was Aksenaya. Philoxenos (Φιλοξενος) studied in the Nestorian school of Edessa but rejected Nestorianism as well as the Council of Chalcedon. A friend of Peter the Fuller and Severos of Antioch, he became the leading proponent of Monophysitism in Syria; he was successful in the struggle against Nestorianism in the province of Euphratensis. He opposed Flavian who became patriarch of Antioch in 498, eventually obtaining his deposition in 512. Supported by Emp. Zeno and Anastasios I, Philoxenos later lost his position under Justin I, who exiled him first to Gangra and then to Philippopolis.

At the center of his theology stood the problem of salvation: Philoxenos worried that the dyophysite distinction between the divine and human essence in Christ deprived mankind of the way to deification (θεοσία), and therefore he stressed the unity or “becoming” in Christ’s nature: God’s essence, while becoming man, remained immutable; God became man by his will, without changing his nature, on account of his love of mankind. Philoxenos, however, accepted neither Docetism nor Theopaschitism. Personally puritanical and rigorist, Philoxenos was also a strong supporter of Syriac culture: he commissioned a new translation of the Bible into Syriac and wrote exclusively in that language.


PHLORIATIKON. See Kastriktsia.

PHLORIOS AND PLATZIA-PHLORA (Φλώριος και Πλάτσια-Φλόρα). Written in about 1,800 unrhymed political verses in the 14th C., perhaps in a milieu connected with the Acciaiuoli family, Phlorios and Platzipla-Phlora is a reasonably close translation of Il cantare di Fiorio e Biancifiore. This is the Tuscan version (also used by Boccaccio for his Filocolo) of Flore et Blanceflor, a romance of ultimately Eastern origin that was widely known throughout Europe from the 12th C. onward. The plot relates how two lovers, one the son of the ruler of Rome and the other the daughter of a Saracen captive, are raised together and, using native wit and a magic ring, overcome all obstacles (parental opposition, separations, trial by fire, etc.) to live happily ever after in marriage. The romantic world of Phlorios and Platzipla-Phlora is scarcely that of Byz., with Italian loan words to refer to court officials (e.g., siniskalkos, “seneschal”) and the baptism of the hero’s parents into the “orthodox” Catholic faith of the Romans.” Nevertheless, the author is familiar with the Byz. stylistic conventions of the genre (vernacular verse romance) to which the poem belongs; e.g., Phlorios’s ride on horseback resembles a similar episode in Imberios and Margarona, and paternal advice on several occasions echoes that of the Spanes poem.

PHOBEROU MONASTERY, located at Monacheion on the Asiatic shore of the Bosporos, probably near the entrance to the Black Sea. Dedicated to the Prodromos, Phoberou (Φοβερού) was also called Chasmadion, Chamadion, and Machadion. The assertion of the 12th-C. kletor, the monk John, that the monastery was originally a 5th-C. foundation (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, infra 51.26–31), is not confirmed by any source. A church of this name is known to have existed by the reign of Theophilos, when it provided refuge for iconodule monks, such as the painter Lazaros. According to the typikon, the monastery housed 170 monks during the 11th C. but was subsequently ruined, when it was granted as a charistikion.

In Oct. 1112 John began the restoration of the monastic complex, reconstructing the church and cells; he also donated books, icons, ecclesiastical furnishings, and estates. Sometime thereafter he composed for the monks a lengthy hypotyposis, based in part on the 11th-C. typikon of the Euergetis Monastery. The monks were limited to 12 in number and were required to be literate. John’s rule was strict, forbidding the monks to have servants or to take baths. The possession of female animals and the admission of beardless youths was also prohibited. The monastery does not appear in the sources after the 12th C.

SOURCE. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Noces Petr. 1–88.
LIT. Janin, Églises centres 71. –A.M.T.

PHOKAIA (Φωκαία, Ital. Foglia, Turk. Foça), ancient city located at the northern entrance to the bay of Smyrna, near the estuary of the Hermos River. It is mentioned as a city in the Synecdemos of Hierokles and is listed in many episcopal notitias as suffragan of Ephesus and later (from the 10th C. onward) of Smyrna. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, however, omitted Phokaia from his list of the poleis of the theme of Thrakesion. Byz. historians mention Phokaia as a geographical site, without any social or economic characterization: Theodore Karantenos won a naval victory over the fleet of Bardas Skleros in 977 near Phokaia (W. Seibt, Die Skleroi [Vienna 1976] 42); ca.1088 Tzachas conquered Phokaia and made it the base of his maritime operations. It was a commercial port, and Alexios I included Phokaia in the list of coastal towns in which the Venetians were granted privileges.

The importance of Phokaia rapidly increased from the end of the 13th C. after it was ceded by Michael VIII to the Genoese family of Zaccaria and became the center of alum production and trade. Probably sometime between 1286 and 1296 the stronghold of New Phokaia was erected to the north of the old town, which came to be called Ancient (Palaia) Phokaia. The two cities suffered from a naval assault of the Catalan Grand Company in 1307 or 1308 (Lemerle, infra 26, n.1); among the precious objects carried away as loot were, according to local tradition, a piece of the Holy Cross, the shirt made by the Virgin for St. John the Apostle, and the manuscript of the Apocalypse written by St. John himself. Although Andronikos III managed to conquer New Phokaia temporarily (probably in 1336) with the help of his Turkish allies, the cities remained in the hands of the Genoese throughout the Palaiologan period. The Gattilusio family seized control of Ancient Phokaia ca.1402, and a Greek inscription of Dorino I Paleologo Gattilusio, “authentes of Palaia Phokaia,” dated in 1423/4, was found there (F.W. Hasluck, BSA 15 [1908–09] 258ff). In 1455 both towns fell to the Ottomans.


PHOKAS (Φωκᾶς), an aristocratic lineage of Cappadocian origin. Both the theory of Michael Ata-leiates that the Phokas family descended from the Roman Fabii and the assertion of Ibn Al-
ATHIR that they were of Arab stock are legendary: neither can the hypothesis of their Armenian origin be proved. The family founder was a tourmarches ca.872; his son, Nikephoros Phokas “the Elder” (died ca.900), was a successful general who fought against the Arabs in both Asia Minor and Sicily. Throughout the 10th C. the Phokades were great landowners and military commanders and tried to assume supreme power: Leo, the son of Nikephoros, was defeated by the Bulgars at AChelous 20 Aug. 917, then ousted by his rival Romanos I Lekapenos; he rebelled in 919, but failed and was blinded; nonetheless his brother Bardas and Bardas’s sons Nikephoros and Leo remained leading generals in the mid-10th C. In 969 Nikephoros (II) Phokas seized the throne, rewarding Bardas with the title of caesar and Leo with kouropalates. Perhaps at that time a chronicle of the deeds of the Phokas family was compiled: fragments survive in Leo the Deacon and military textbooks. Although the Phokades were restrained after the murder of Nikephoros II in 969, they kept struggling for power: Nikephoros’s nephew Bardas, doux of Antioch, revolted in 987, but after early successes fell at Abydos on 13 Apr. 989; his son Nikephoros perished while rebelling in 1022; and Nikephoros’s son Bardas was blinded by Constantine VIII. The family did not recover until the 13th C. when they were promoted by the Laskarid dynasty: Theodotus, the uncle of Theodore I Laskaris, became megas doux soon after 1204; Michael was stratopedarches in 1234; and a certain Phokas, metropolitan of Philadelphia, was John III’s adviser.

PHOKAS, emperor (from 23 Nov. 602); born ca.547, probably in Thrace (although George Hamartolos, ed. de Boor-Wirth, 662.10, calls him Cappadocian), died Constantinople 5 Oct. 610. Phokas was of modest origin, served in the army, and reached the post of kentarchos (commander of a hundred). One of the most vocal rebels against Komentioulos, he was proclaimed exarch by Danubian troops who revolted in early Nov. 602, after Maurice’s brother Peter refused to rescind orders to winter north of the Danube. The army headed toward Constantinople intending (or pretending?) to proclaim Theodosios (Maurice’s son) or his father-in-law, Germanos, emperor. A mutiny of the Greens made resistance impossible, and Maurice fled with his family. The army crowned Phokas; Maurice was executed.

Upheaval ensued. Chosroes II used Phokas’s “revolution” as a pretext to invade Byz. Persian success impelled Phokas to conclude a peace treaty with the Avars, increasing the tribute he had formerly paid them, but the Slavs, disregarding the treaty, continued to penetrate Thrace and Dalmatia. Domestic affairs were menacing. Revolts of the circus factions erupted in many areas, including Constantinople and Antioch (Ju. Kulakovskij, VizVrem 21 [1914] 1–14). Generals rebelled; esp. dangerous was Narses’ revolt, endorsed by Chosroes II. Phokas’s strict Orthodoxy, supported by Pope Gregory I, prompted religious conflicts; the Persians overtly supported the Nestorians, and the Monophysites in Antioch murdered the Chalcedonian patriarch Anastasios, leading to a bloody revenge. The exarch of Carthage revolted ca.608 and sent a fleet to the East under the command of his son Herakleios; he was joined by Niketas in Egypt. Herakleios moved to the Hellespont, attracted the support of Priskos, and, with the help of the factions, seized Constantinople. On his orders Phokas was beheaded.

Byz. historians described Phokas as an abominable tyrant, and modern scholars have adopted the same attitude (e.g., P. Goubert, OrChtrP 33 [1967] 604–19). V. Kucma (VizOet 3 [1977] 182–94), on the contrary, construed “the civil war and Phokas’s bloody terror” as a period when the power of aristocratic landowners was destroyed and a substantial number of dependent peasants achieved freedom; these measures allegedly prepared “the reform activity of Herakleios.”

PHOKAS, saint; feastdays 21–22 Sept., 22–23 July. His cult is attested by Asterios of Amaseia, who described Phokas as a gardener from Sinope.
who was denounced as a Christian, made to dig his own grave, and then decapitated; Asterios did not indicate the era of Phokas’s martyrdom. Another legend, in an anonymous passio (preserved in a mutilated 10th-C. MS), characterizes Phokas as the son of a “very noble” shipwright from Heracleia Pontike. At the age of ten Phokas performed exorcisms and miracles; he was esp. successful in saving ships. (Asterios also ascribes this function to Phokas the gardener.) Thus, when a ship from Macedonia was in danger of shipwreck near the shore of Pontos, Phokas embarked in a small boat, approached the ship, and threw it his cloak; the storm calmed immediately. Another legend makes Phokas a bishop executed under Trajan. In the 14th C. Andrew Libadenos dedicated a panegyric to Phokas and mentioned a church of Phokas built by “Alexios the Grand Komnenos,” probably Alexios III Komnenos, emperor of Trebizond.

**Representation in Art.** The confused literary tradition is reflected in the images of Phokas. Though the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes incorporates the Asterios text, Phokas is represented as a bishop in one metaphrastic MS (Oxford, Bodl. Barocci 230, fol.3v). The **Menologion of Basil II** (p.58), in accordance with its text for 22 Sept., shows a bishop being beheaded and, in the background, a fire lit to receive his remains; Phokas the gardener was apparently celebrated on 22 July. In ivories and in monumental painting, it is the image of the bishop that is predominant.


**PHOKAS, JOHN,** pilgrim of the 12th C., author of the *Concise Description of the Holy Land*. He accompanied Emp. Manuel I on an expedition to the “sea of Attaleia.” It is unclear whether he should be identified with a certain Phokas who served in 1147 as the guide of the Crusaders to Ikonion (MGH SS 16:5). According to a marginal note on the MS, he was a priest, the son of a certain Matthew who became a monk on Patmos, and he visited Palestine in 1177 or 1195. Phokas’s information is brief but precise and contains sometimes unique evidence, such as the description of the Chasisoi (ch.3), a fanatic Arab sect. Phokas is very sensitive to the beauty of the places described and tolerant toward the Latins. He is well versed in the Bible but also quotes secular writers: Josephus Flavius and Achilles Tatius, the author of an erotic romance.


**PHOKAS, LEO,** kouropalates; brother of Nikephoros II and son of Bardas Phokas; born ca.915–20, died on island of Prote after 970. Constantine VII, seeking the support of the Phokas family, appointed Leo strategos of Cappadocia ca.945; he later became strategos of Anatolikon (ca.955) and of the West. Romanos II promoted him to domestikos of the West and granted him the title of magistros; in 960/1, during Nikephoros Phokas’s expedition against Crete, Leo replaced his brother as domestikos ton scholon of the East. He waylaid Sayf al-Dawla, who had invaded and pillaged the Charsianon region, and routed his army at the Kylinchos pass in the Taurus Mountains. When Nikephoros ascended the throne, he granted his brother the title of kouropalates and entrusted him with the entire internal administration (the functions of the logothetes tou dromou); Leo’s power and his frugal policy contributed much to the rivalry between him and John (I) Tzimiskes. Skylitzes (Skyl. 278.66–68) charged that Leo’s petty greed (kapeleia) was a cause of the general unpopularity of Nikephoros II. When Tzimiskes seized the throne, Leo conspired against him in 970 and was exiled to Lesbos; he schemed again in 971, for which he was banished to the island of Prote and blinded (Skyl. 303.61–62). In a curious fashion Leo the Deacon relates Leo’s blinding twice (G. Wartenberg, *BZ* 6 [1897] 110). In the index to J. Thurn’s edition of Skylitzes (Skyl. p.530), Leo Phokas is divided into three people: Leo Kouropalates; Leo, son of Bardas Phokas; and Leo, brother of Nikephoros II. A miniature in the illustrated Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitziès, no.433, pl.XXXII) shows figures identified as Leo the kouropalates and Nikephoros his son crossing the Hellespont in rebellion against Tzimiskes.
PHONETICS AND PHONOLOGY. The former studies the sounds of a language as produced by the speaker (articulatory phonetics) and as perceived by the hearer (auditory phonetics); the latter deals with the structured relations of the sounds as used to convey meaning, that is, with their significant distinctions and oppositions. Evidence for the phonetics of Greek in antiquity and the Middle Ages is limited and not easy to interpret. Changes in the phonology of the language, however, which began in Hellenistic times and continued into the Byz. period, can sometimes be traced through errors in orthography (such as rascism), transcription of foreign words in Greek and of Greek words in foreign languages, etc. These gradual changes include loss of the distinction between long and short vowels and restructuring of the complex vocalic system of Attic and Hellenistic Koine, resulting in a simple five-vowel system (a, e, i, o, u); reduction of diphthongs to simple vowels; transformation of the consonantal system whereby the unvoiced aspirated plosives (φ, θ, χ) became unvoiced fricatives (f, th, kh) and the voiced plosives (β, δ, γ) became voiced fricatives (v, dh, gh); lability of the final -n; predominance of the element of stress over that of pitch in the accentual system; and consequent loss of distinction among acute, grave, and circumflex accents. The phonology of Medieval Greek was thus already substantially that of Modern Greek. The traditional orthography was in principle retained, and many, but not all, errors of orthography reflect progressive changes in the phonology of Greek over the centuries. The articulatory and acoustic qualities of individual sounds and of suprasegmental features have no doubt changed while the phonological structure remained unchanged, and today vary slightly from region to region of the Greek world.


PHONIKON (φωνικόν), a term attested from the second half of the 13th C. (1259: Esphig., app.A, 11.60–62) in chrysobulls and prakita for monasteries, cities, or individuals, and often mentioned along with parthenophthoria and treasure trove as one of the three kephalaia (capital items) from which recipients of the privilege are not exempt. The precise nature of the phonikon is disputed. According to some scholars it is a fine or tax exacted by the fisc from people in a community in which a murder has been committed (G. Rouillard, A. Soloviev, Mnemosyna Pappoulia [Athens 1934] 221–32; P. Charanis, Speculum 20 [1945] 331–33). M.A. Tourtaglou (To phonikon kai ke apozemiosis tou pathontos [Athens 1960]) interprets it as the punishment exacted from a person guilty of an intentional murder, which consisted of confiscation of a certain proportion of the offender’s property and is known from Byz. law (Basil. 60.39.3, 5; Andronikos II, nov.26 [a.1306]; Zepos, Jus 11:353).

That the phonikon was not, however, a punishment exacted from a murderer seems to be confirmed by one of the few documents that elaborates on the nature of the phonikon, Andronikos II’s chrysobull for Kanina (1307), which shows that the fisc was demanding the phonikon from people who had not committed a murder, that is, neighbors of a murderer or neighbors or relatives of a person who had died accidentally (ed. P. Alexander, Byzantium 15 [1941] 181.83–182.106). This chrysobull and others in which an exemption from the phonikon is granted state that it is an unjust exaction and that only the person responsible for a willful killing and accomplices to the crime should pay the penalty (Lavra 2, no.87.198–88 [a.1298]; 3, no.118.200–09 [a.1329]). Furthermore, a passage in Balsamon’s commentary on the canons shows that the kephalaia were fiscal exactions (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 3:346.32).

It is not clear whether the phonikon became a yearly tax applied to a community without regard for actual cases of murder (Dölger, BZ 54 [1961] 253f). Certainly the above-cited documents do not confirm this. As a fiscal charge on persons not guilty of a killing it had precedents in Byz., as indeed the chrysobull of 1327 for Zographou claims (Zogr. no.26.60–65) and imperial legislation and other 6th-C. sources show.

PHOS HILARON (φῶς ἱλαρόν, lit. “joyous light”), ancient “thanksgiving for the light,” a hymn that
accompanied the lighting of lamps at vespers. Named after its opening words, the *Phos hilaron* is a praise of the Trinity for Christ, true “light of the world” (Jn 1:9) of which the evening lamp was a symbol. Unknown in the *Asmatike Akolouthia*, or cathedral rite of Constantinople, the hymn came to Constantinople only with the introduction of the Palestinian monastic hours, a gradual process that began with the Stoudite reform of the 9th C. (see *Stoudite Typika*). Though cited by Basil the Great (PG 32:205A) for Cappadocia, the earliest actual liturgical witness is the 5th-C. Georgian *lectionary* of Jerusalem.


LIT. Taft, ”Bibl. of Hours,” 286, 393f, 367. —R.F.T.

**PHOTOS** (Φωτός), patriarch of Constantinople (858–67, 877–86), scholar and politician; born ca.810 (H. Ahrweiler, *BZ* 58 [1965] 34ff), died after 893 (R. Jenkins, *DOP* 19 [1965] 244). Born to an influential family, and nephew of Patr. Tarasios, Photos grew up under the shadow of the Iconoclastic persecution (C. Mango in *Iconoclasm*, 139) but at an early age received a high position in the Byz. bureaucracy: he participated in an embassy to the Arabs (in 838, 845, or 855) and was appointed protosecretis. When Ignatios was forced to resign, Photos was swiftly elected patriarch although he was a layman. Michael III and Caesar Bardas supported him, and his correspondence suggests that he was on better terms with the military aristocracy than with civil officialdom (A. Kazhdan, *Speculum* 61 [1986] 897).

Ignatios’s abdication instigated a battle within the church: when the party of Ignatios gained the support of Pope Nicholas I, a conflict with the papacy ensued. After ascending to the throne, Emp. Basil I—who was seeking the support of Italian powers against the Arabs—decided to reconsider the administration’s attitude toward Photos; the council of 869–70 (see under CONSTANTINOPEL, COUNCILS OF) restored Ignatios and banished and condemned Photos. After Ignatios died, Photos was peacefully returned to the patriarchal throne. At the council of 879–80 (see also under CONSTANTINOPEL, COUNCILS OF), he was rehabilitated and reconciled with the pope. In Basil’s conflict with Leo VI, Photos sided with the father; so Basil’s sudden death and Leo’s succession ended Photos’s career. He was dismissed and exiled; his demise went unnoticed by contemporaries.

Versed in ancient literature, Photos did much to revive interest in antiquity. His activity as professor in Constantinople has been questioned by Lemerle (*infra*); I. Ševčenko, however, considers him, along with Leo the Mathematician, among the most prominent teachers in the capital (*AHR* 79 [1974] 153ff). Besides the BIBLIOTHECA, Photos compiled a *Lexikon*, an unsystematic list of notable words and expressions which he collected by casual reading. Photos’s letters, sometimes laudatory, sometimes caustic and dogmatic, are addressed to popes and rulers (the letter to Boris I attempts to influence Bulgarian policy), to military, civil, and church leaders. The *Amphilochia*, also unsystematic, are answers addressed to Amphilochios, metropolitan of Kyzikos, treating both theological problems and secular questions. In his polemical *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, Photos developed arguments against the Latin doctrine of the Filioque. He also wrote a treatise against the PAULINCIANS, based on a similar work by Peter of Sicily. Photos’s homilies contain abundant material for political history (e.g., the first attack of the Rus’ on Constantinople in 860) as well as Byz. art (description of the Church of the Virgin at Pharos, of the image of the Virgin in Hagia Sophia). His authorship of the *Epanagoge* remains unproven.

Contemporary attitudes toward Photos varied greatly. A pamphlet against him was used by Niketas David Paphalagon in his vita of Ignatios and by pseudo-Symeon Magistros; on the other hand, the *Synaxarion of Constantinople* included Photos’s name (*Synax CP* 448.19–23) under 6 Feb., although no vita of him is known. For a long time modern Western scholars, such as Hergenröther (*infra*), saw in Photos the instigator of the schism between Rome and Constantinople and tried to “unmask” his activity, whereas Russian and Greek historians treated Photos as a saint and a humanist. V. Grumel (*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 32 [1933] 432–57) and Dvornik (*infra*) demonstrated that the so-called Photian schism was of short duration.

PHOULLOI (Φουλλοὶ) or Phoulla(i), a city in the Crimea the location of which is disputed; identifications have been suggested with Solkhät (R. Blockley in History of Menander The Guardsman [Liverpool 1985] 275f) and Tepsen' (V. Kropotkin, SovArch 28 [1958] 198–218), both in eastern Crimea, or Çufut-Kale (A. Jakobson, SovArch 29–30 [1959] 108–13) and Kyz-Kermen (E. Vejmar in Archeologicheskie issledovanija srednevekovogo Kryma [Kiev 1968] 45–77), near Bakhchisarai. It was probably located on the trans-Crimean route, approximately halfway between Cherson and Cimmerian Bosphoros.

First mentioned in Menander Protector (fr. 19.21), Phoulloi then appears in the vita of St. John of Gothia, who in 787 was imprisoned in this city; there he baptized and cured the child “of the lord of Phoulloi” (AASS June 7:171B). Miraculously John managed to escape to Amasrias. The hagiographer of Constantine the Philosopher observed that “the nation of Phoulloi” venerated an enormous oak and was ruled by an elder. According to the ecclesiastical notitia of 787–869, the see of the bishop of the Khazars-Chotziroi was situated near Phoulloi or Charasion (Turk. Kara Su, “Black Water”) or Mabron Neron (Notitiae CP, no.3.778), the Greek equivalent of Kara Su. In later notitiae Phoulloi appears as an archbishopric along with Gothia and Sougdaia (ibid., no.7.97–99), but by the 14th C. Phoulloi and Sougdaia were combined into one metropolis (ibid., no.20.12). A metropolitan of Sougdaia and Phoulloi is named in several patriarchal documents of the 14th and 15th C. (e.g., MM 2:42.29), but we know nothing about the fate of the city.

- O.P.

PHOUNDAGIAGITES (Φουνδαγιαγίται), name applied in several Byz. documents to the Bogomils. The name is derived by most scholars from the Greek form of the Latin funda (“a bag”). The heretics supposedly acquired it from their life of poverty, which compelled them to beg for their living. The Phoundagiates are known mostly from a letter written ca.1050 by Euthymios of Akmonia from Constantinople to his compatriots in the diocese of Akmonia in Phrygia. On a visit home, probably in the early 11th C., Euthymios encountered the heretics who, he assures us, had even managed to penetrate into his monastery (Peribleptos) in Constantinople. He describes their zealous proselytism in Asia Minor (in the themes of Opsikion and the Kibyrhatoi as well as in the region of Smyrna) and in the Balkans. His report on their teaching confirms and in places supplements the evidence of Kosmas the Priest. What is new is his description of the prayer meetings of the heretics, his account of their dualistic cosmology, and the statement that they were explicitly forbidden to shed blood. Euthymios’s letter is the earliest document unequivocally linking Bogomilism with the monastic life.

- L. G. Ficker, Die Phundagiaten (Leipzig 1908).

PHOUNDAX (φούνδαξ, from pandocheion, “inn”), a warehouse. An 11th-C. historian (Attal. 202f) describes a phoundax established in Rhaidesostos under Michael VII: it was headed by a phoundakarios under whose authority were appraisers (taxeotai) and dealers in wheat (sitokapeloi), who had their shops (stomai) “in the prison of the phoundax.” The phoundax held a monopoly on trade in grain and other foodstuffs. Direct private purchase from peasants’ carts was prohibited and the sitokapeloi had the right to set prices. According to Attaleiates, the price of grain skyrocketed from 1/18 of a nomisma to 1 nomisma per modios. The state received 60 litrai for leasing the phoundax.

It remains unclear whether the case of Rhaidesostos was unique or whether phoundakes of this kind existed throughout the empire, as for instance in the fortress of Platea Petra in Opsikion in the 10th C., where foodstuffs were stored (TheophCont 421.16–17). It is also uncertain whether the phoundax of Rhaidesostos was the successor of the late Roman apothekai and sitobolones (state grainaries): the sitobolon is mentioned in Palladios, Philostorgios, and John Moschos. In the 12th C. Michael Glykas (570.14–16), describing the famine during the reign of Nikephoros II Phokas, states that the emperor opened “the state
sitothekai" and commanded that the grain be sold at one half nominis per medimnos. The orearios Constantine on the island of Kos (Laurent, Coll. Orghidan, no.11) may have been an official in charge of a horreum or sitotheke/sitobolon.

LIT. Antoniadis-Bibicou, Douanes 185f. Skabalanović, Gosudarstvo 204-96.  -A.K.

PHOURNES, JOHN, theologian, protos of Ganos, a collaborator of ZIGABENOS; fl. ca.1100. V. Laurent identified his seal (EO 32 [1933] 45f). In 1112 Phournes (Φουρνης) participated in the dispute with Peter GROSSOLANO. Rejecting the filloque, Phournes emphasized the monarchical principle of the deity (Demetrakopoulos, 40.7-9) against the alleged ditheia of his opponent. On the other hand, he stressed the equality of the Son and the Holy Spirit, "the hands of the same substance and of the same power" (p.46.1-2). Phournes finished his speech by inviting Grossolano to emigrate to Byz. Patr. John XI used Phournes's work. Phournes also wrote a homily on the Dormition of the Virgin Mary (BHG 1136) and a letter to the monk Gregory Antigonites on liturgical questions (EkAl 4.10 [1882-83] 170f).


PHRANGOPoulos (Φραγγόπουλος, lit. "the son of a Frank"), patronymic of a family (genos, as it is called on a seal) of the 11th-15th C. The Norman Herve FRANKopoulos was the first known member of the family. We cannot be sure that the Phrangopouloi of the late 12th C. (among them Constantine, a naval commander, and John, a court orator) were his descendants. Phrangopoulos are often mentioned on seals and in documents from this time onward, as modest landlords (Espig., no.28.5), monks (Lavra 3, no. 161.46), or officials (Dochier., no.q.22). A Phrangopoulos was involved in a plot against Michael VIII; another family member, George, was doux of Thessalonike at the beginning of the 13th C. Some Phrangopouloi were active in scholarship: Andronicus was a teacher of rhetoric in the mid-13th C., and Manuel studied at the University of Bologna in 1374/5. In 1360-61 John Phrangopoulos, a merchant from Adrianople, was an active trader in Chilia; A. Laiou (AkadAthPr 57.1 [1982] 107, 114) has suggested that he (or a relative) should be identified with the Phrangopoulos who led a rebellion against John VI Kantakouzenos in Adrianople from 1341-46. A later John Phrangopoulos, protostrator and mesazon in Mistra, founded the Pantanassa monastery there in 1428. A splendid ruined mansion in Mistra has been linked with his name on the basis of the letter phi embedded in a slab on the northeast corner of the building. He is probably to be identified with John Phrangopoulos, who was generales of the despotes Constantine Palaiologos in 1444 (MM 3:259.16-17).


PHROURION. See Kastron.

PHRYGIA (Φρυγία), mountainous region of Asia Minor between the Aegean plains and the central plateau, a rough country of great strategic importance because of the highways that passed through it. Phrygia was made a province, joined with Caria, in 297; it became separate in the early 4th C., then was divided into Phrygia Pacatiana in the west (capital LAODIKEIA) and Phrygia Salutaris in the south (capital SYNADA). In 536 Justinian I gave the governor of the former province the rank of comes with civil and military powers and appointed a biokletes of Phrygia to suppress local outbreaks of violence. Both offices were abolished by 553. The territory of Phrygia was divided between two themes (ANATOLIKON and THRAKESTON); it continued to exist, however, as an ecclesiastical province and as a geographical term that frequently appears in the 11th and 12th C., when the region was on the frontier and subject to the incessant attacks of the Turks, to whom its last Byz. outpost fell after 1264. Phrygia contains many Byz. remains, notably fortresses (C. Foss, Survey of Medieval Castles of Anatolia. I: Kutahya [Oxford 1985]) and rock-cut churches (E. Hespels, The Highlands of Phrygia [Princeton 1971] 205-57). Phrygia was an early center of Christianity. It was notorious as the home of a variety of heresies, including MONANTISM, NOVATIANISM, and the judaizing sect of ATHINGANOI; some of them survived into the 9th C.
PHRYGIAN DYNASTY. See Amorian or Phrygian Dynasty.

PHTHORA (φθορά), a Byz. musical sign used within a composition to indicate a change of mode. Each of the eight modes has its own phthora, each being a different form of the letter φ. The earliest known example occurs in a table of neumata on fol.159r of Athos, Lavra Γ.67 (late 10th C.); in musical documents the use of phthorai is extremely limited through the 13th C. From the 14th C. onward, they appear more frequently. Manuel Chrysaphes devotes a large section of his mid-15th-C. treatise to explaining the function and correct use of these signs.


PHYGELA (Φυγελα(λ)α, now Kuşadası), Aegean seaport of Asia Minor. Phygela first appears in Byz. history when St. Willibald (see Hibeburg) visited it in 721; he described it as villa magna. Phygela was a fortified base by 823, when a lieutenant of Thomas the Slav was imprisoned there. It subsequently rose to prominence as a major port, replacing Ephesus, whose harbor was rendered unusable by silting. Phygela, which had facilities for repairing ships and storing material, was the port of embarkation for two expeditions against Crete, of Himerios in 911 and of Nikphoros (II) Phokas in 961. It was still a port in the 13th C., when it was called an emporion. It fell to the Turks of Aydin ca.1905. Phygela was never a bishopric; its remains are insignificant.

LIT. C. Foss, Ephesus after Antiquity (Cambridge 1979) 123f. —C.F.

PHYLARCH (φυλαρχός), title applied from the 4th through 7th C. to a commander of Arab auxiliaries formally allied to the empire (foederati), although it is necessary to distinguish between this official rank and the term’s older, more general meaning of any kind of Arab tribal chief (Ar. shaykh). Each phylarch commanded the Arab auxilia in a different province of Oriens; ca.530 Justinian I subordinated them to the ruling family of the Ghassānids, naming Arethas ibn Jabala “basileus of the Arabs” and supreme phylarch. Sixth-century phylarchs received titles of clarissimus or higher, and both Arethas and his son became patrikios. Around 585, Emp. Maurice disband the centralized Ghassānid monarchy and phylarchate, although Ghassān and its phylarch Jabala ibn al-Ayham continued to act as Byz. auxiliaries as late as 636.

These phylarchs disappeared in the wake of the Islamic conquest, but the word phylarchos is attested later, generally denoting tribal chieftains of various nomadic groups such as Turks (Kinn. 208.7). It appears among the diplomatic titles used to address barbarian rulers (De cer. 679.10), and in the 11th C. the Arab chieftain Apelzarach (al-Hassan ibn al-Mufarrij) is called phylarchos (Kek. 302.13). Since the practice of recruiting Arab auxiliaries had been revived during the 10th C., it is significant that al-Hassan, like the Ghassānids, officially entered Byz. military service, held the title patrikios, and professed Christianity.


PHYSICIAN (ἰατρός, νοσοκόμος). In the later Roman Empire the principal physicians were municipal doctors (archiatris), but private practice also existed and some physicians were itinerant. There were also military physicians: Alexander of Trieres reportedly served 25 years in the army and navy. The palace doctors (archiatris sacri palatii) were members of the state hierarchy, with diplomatic functions (R.C. Blockley, Florilegium 2 [1980] 89–100). Church fathers such as John Chrysostom severely criticized physicians as an element of ancient urban culture. Hagiography also often attacked physicians as greedy and incompetent. An influential rival of the physician was the saint who practiced healing through miracles, exorcism, and incubation. After urban life declined in the 7th C., physicians played a less significant role, being superseded by the “iatroi of the soul” who tended to monopolize medicine. Social acceptance of doctors increased around the 10th C.; from the 12th C. onward they were important in intellectual circles. By then the distinction between a professional doctor and a civil functionary-scholar interested in medicine (Michael Pantechnes, Nicholas Kallikles, etc.) was imprecise.
Physicians who worked at state and church hospitals received a precisely determined salary in cash and kind. Despite prohibitions they also engaged in private practice. The position of "municipal doctor" does not appear in later Byz. Doctors-to-be studied medicine at larger hospitals (cf. V. Grumel, REB 7 [1949] 42–46) or at general schools such as the one at the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. "Philosophers" such as Michael Italikos and Joseph the Rhakendetes often taught medicine. Both monks and priests were active as physicians. Most doctors were of the native population, but some Arabs and Jews were hired as imperial physicians (aktouarios).

Representations of physicians are relatively rare in Byz. art, and when they do appear (e.g., in the Vienna Dioskoreides and the medical compendium in Florence, Laur. Plut. 74.7), they usually offer little evidence of the appearance, equipment, or practice of contemporary medicine. Rare exceptions include a 14th-C. portrait of a physician, allegedly Nicholas Myrespos, in his fully equipped office, and a 15th-C. portrait of Theophilos Protospatharios conducting uroscopy. Additional evidence may be gained from portraits of popular doctors saints (anargyroi), such as Kosmas and Damianos, Kyros and John, and Panteleemon (cf. K. Weitzmann in Books and Bookmen, fig.23), who are often shown with a physician's box and/or instruments of surgery (see also Iatrosophistae).


J.S. A.K., G.V.

Physician's Box, a container specifically for medicines and/or surgical instruments (see Surgery), in use at least to the early 8th C., identifiable by its design and decoration. Like a weight box, it is typically low and rectangular, with a sliding lid (often with a lock) and various internal compartments; examples survive in bronze, wood, and ivory. Earlier specimens might bear images of Asklepios or Hygieia on the lid, while later Christian examples show a cross or the Healing of the Blind Man. Representations of doctor saints in the 5th–8th C. occasionally show them carrying leather pouches of a size and shape appropriate for such boxes (P.-J. Nordhagen, ActaNorv 3 [1968] 58). Generally related is a possibly 7th-C. doctor's instrument case in leather, with attached pyxis, in the Yale University Art Museum; it depicts a doctor saint and tables for mixing medicines, and bears the inscription "Use in Good Health." Although no such boxes or cases specifically for physicians are identifiable from later centuries, representations from the 9th–14th C. of the Anargyroi (esp. Panteleemon) with their paraphernalia suggest that a variety of rectangular and cylindrical containers were then so used (S. Pellecanides, Kastoria, vol. 1 [Thessaloniki 1953] pl.26).


G.V.

Physics. The nonbiological phenomena of the universe were explained by the Byz. in two different types of text. The first consists of commentaries on or expositions of the Timaeus of Plato (for which the only example is that by Proklos) and of Aristotle's Physics, On Generation, On Heaven, and Meteorology, while the second consists of solutions to questions (aporiai) about nature. On the Physics one may cite the paraphrase by Themistios and the commentaries by John Philoponos, Simplicios, Michael Psellos, Michael of Ephesus (lost), and Theodore Metochites; on the On Generation those by Philoponos and Metochites; and on the Meteorology by Philoponos, Olympiodorus of Alexandria, and Metochites. Special works on physics include Elements of Physics by Proklos and his On the Eternity of the World, which later was attacked by Philoponos in his On the Eternity of the World against Proklos (Philoponos wrote another treatise on the same subject Against Aristotle), On Physics by Nikephoros Blemmydes, and part of Theodore II Laskaris's Explanation of the World.

Most original of all these authors was Philoponos, whose belief in Monophysite Christianity led him to argue forcefully against Aristotle's theories of the ether and of motion (see Motion, Theory of), both of which he needed to refute in order to establish his own concept of the unity
of the universe. He also proposed original solutions to problems in Aristotelian physics such as the nature of light (S. Sambursky, *The Physical World of Late Antiquity* [London 1962] 74–76, 113–17, 170–75).

Byz. representatives of the *aporiai* tradition include Stobaios’s *Excerpts on Physics*, Priscianus Lydus’s *Answers to Choresos*, *Synopsis of Physics* by Symeon Seth, Psello’s *De omnifaria doctrina*, *Aporiai* by John Italos, *Epitome* by Theodore of Smyrna, and the so-called *Meteorology* by Eustathios of Nicaea. Discussions of various aspects of physics from different Christian standpoints can be found in such works as the *Hexaemeron* of Basil of Caesarea and of George of Pisidia and the *Therapeutics* of Theodoret of Cyrrhus.

---

**PHYSIOLOGOS** (Φυσιολόγος), Greek bestiary preserved in three major recensions. The earliest was produced in the 2nd C. (U. Treu, ZNTW 57 [1966] 101–04) or 4th C. (E. Peterson, BZ 47 [1954] 60–72), in a Christian milieu, but on the basis of ancient texts. It describes various animals, birds, reptiles, and so on as well as certain plants and precious stones; most of the animals are real but provided with fantastic features, and some (unicorn, phoenix) are mythical. The presentation is poetic and symbolic; the behavior of each animal symbolizes Christ, the devil, or a virtue or vice. Some older legends are transformed to harmonize with Christian doctrine.

The second recension was dated by Sbordone in the 5th–6th C., but B.E. Perry (AJP 58 [1937] 494) sets it in the 11th C. or later; it omits, among others, the chapters on plants and minerals. The third recension is called pseudo-Basilian because it refers to Basil the Great, the author of the *Hexaemeron*. The *Physiologos* affected neighboring literatures enormously: medieval translations into Latin, Armenian, Georgian, Slavic, Syrian, Coptic, and Ethiopic are known.

---

**PHYSIS.** See Nature.

**PIACENZA PILGRIM,** an anonymous Latin traveler who, ca.570, composed the most vivid surviving account of a pilgrim’s visit in Palestine. Seemingly an amalgam of personal experience and secondhand information from guide books (for those sites not visited), it provides invaluable documentation for the *loca sancta* large and small, from northern Palestine into Egypt, including a detailed description of the Holy Sepulchre and its relics. It includes references to remarkable vegetation (e.g., one-pound dates in Jericho), exotic local populations (e.g., Ethiopians in the Negev, with split nostrils and rings on their toes), and to the survival of ancient beliefs and practices (e.g., the use of geodes from Mt. Carmel as amulets against miscarriage). But, most of all, it is an illuminating account of pilgrim piety: of various modes of veneration at the holy sites, of the systematic collection of pilgrim *eulogiai*, of the importance of the calendar as well as the site for the receipt of spiritual power (e.g., the celebration of the *Epiphany* at the Jordan River), and of the increasing importance of relics and icons in the pilgrim’s experience.

---

**PIAZZA ARMERINA,** a town in central Sicily made famous by the discovery, about 5 km to the southwest, of a large and elaborately decorated villa, one of the best preserved of its kind to have survived from the late Roman world. The villa consists of a central peristyle in the shape of an irregular rectangle, around which are arrayed a monumental triple-gated entrance, a bath complex, a basilica, a triconch adjoining an oval court, and several suites of smaller rooms. The rising walls of the villa, of stone-faced rubble, do not generally survive to a great height (often no more than 1–2 m); nonetheless, the villa shelters much of its original decoration, notably wall paintings and polychrome *frescoes* in almost every room. These show a great variety of subjects ranging from the whimsical (sporting *erotes*) to the weighty (the so-called “Triumph of Hercules”),

---


---

**J.S., A.K.**
giving rise to much speculation as to the original function and patron of the complex. The villa has even been attributed to the emperors Maximian and Maxentius (among others), although the matter has never been definitively resolved. The main body of the structure and its decoration are of the early 4th C.


PIER (πεσσός, lit. a pebble used in a board game, by extension any object of cylindrical form; λόφος), the fundamental structural support of arcutae architecture, usually built of ashlar blocks, set dry or with thin mortar beds. Piers are designed to carry the concentrated weight of arches, vaults, and domes (Prokopios, Buildings 1.1.37, 69, 71) and are often used where walls and columns are inadequate to sustain contemplated loads. The imposition of domes in basilicas such as St. John at Ephesus required the insertion of piers at regular intervals, creating a system of bays (Krautheimer, ECBArch, figs. 196–98). Low, oblong piers carry heavy arches over the columnar arcade of Basilica A at Sergiopolis and support the massive arcade at Qalb Lawzah (Mango, ByzArch., figs. 97, 150). In plan, piers may be formed of simple geometric shapes and proportioned like columns; others, sometimes called compound piers, are defined by more complex profiles that often serve to define adjacent spaces (Mango, ByzArch., figs. 109, 115, 143). Byz. builders generally subordinated the structural function of piers to spatial design and masked their surfaces with marble placage, disguising their strength and size; in the stone structures of Syria and Armenia, on the other hand, their size and functions are clearly exposed.


PIETROASELE, a site near Buzău, Romania, on a tributary of the southern Danube. Excavations have discovered the remains of a 4th-C. Roman military camp (coins of Constantius II were found) that was eventually occupied by the Visigoths. In the nearby village of Dara, a rune-inscribed ce-

ramic plate was found (G. Diaconu, Dacia 20 [1976] 269–71). In 1837 Pietroasele yielded a hoard of 22 late Roman objects of which 12 survive, mostly gold, sometimes ornamented with precious stones—fibulae; necklaces; vessels; a patera (flat dish), probably of Antiochene origin, with depictions of a ritual procession, etc. These valuables are dated to the 4th C. and seem to have belonged to the imperial treasury. Rusu (infra) hypothesizes that they were brought to Pietroasele by Gainas when he left Constantinople. The objects are now in the Historical Museum in Bucharest.


PIGNUS (ἐπέχυρον), pledge or pawn. A pignus serves as the security for a credit or for claims that will be payable in the future. The pignus can be negotiated by contract or be determined by law. All salable property can serve as a pignus. In the place of single objects the entire current and future property of the debtor can also be pledged (general pledge). A pignus can, but does not have to be, handed over to the creditor. The so-called propertyless pignus that the debtor can continue to use is commonly called hypotheke (Hypothec) (cf. Harm. 3.5.26): it cannot be alienated by the debtor without the consent of the creditor.

The primary examples of a general pledge determined by law without the need for any special agreement are as follows: in favor of the wife in her claim for the restitution of her dowry against the husband’s property (Cod. Just. V 12.30 = Basil. 29.1.117); in favor of the state for tax demands against the property of the debtor (Cod. Just. VIII 14.1 = Basil. 56.4.17); in favor of the church in its claims over the property of emphyteutai arising from emphyteusis (Nov. Just. 7.3.2 = Basil. 20.2.5); in favor of children against the property of the guardian (Nov. Just. 118.5 = Basil. 37.4.13), or against the property of the mother and her second husband, if a new guardian was not appointed at the time of the remarriage (Nov. Just. 22.40 = Basil. 28.14.13). The large number of these and other legally determined pledges must have greatly limited the availability of land and movable property for credit and sale transactions. Moreover, the existence of (privileged) general
pledges gave rise to problems involving the relative priority of various claims, as is documented in the Tractatus de creditis. —M.Th.F.

PIGS. See Swine.

PILASTER, an engaged pier articulated into base, shaft, and capital, or an imitation of such a pier created by imposing decorative features of base, shaft, and capital upon a properly proportioned projection of a wall. Pilasters often mark the ends of open colonnades set between piers (Mainstone, Hagia Sophia, pls. 46, 48, 55) as well as the flanks of portals. As at the palace of Tekfur Sarayi in Constantinople they articulated façades and were more substantial members than the pilaster strips used, for example, on the Church of the Virgin at Studenica.


PILGRIMAGE (προσκύνησις, lit. "veneration," in Church Slavonic chozhenie, as equivalent of Greek ὄντοπορία, "journey"). Although mandated neither by the Bible nor by the church fathers, pilgrimage developed into an important Byz. religious phenomenon, esp. between the early 4th and the mid-7th C. when, following in the footsteps of Constantine's mother, Helena, vast numbers of Christians journeyed to Palestine to venerate the holy places, or loca sancta. Although Old Testament sites, such as Mt. Sinai, greatly outnumbered those of the New Testament, the latter sites, and especially loca sancta associated with the life and Passion of Christ, were far more popular. Jerusalem alone claimed a half-dozen of Christianity's most famous pilgrimage destinations, and by the 4th–5th C. had developed into an acknowledged circuit of sites (beginning with the Tomb of Christ at the Holy Sepulchre), with scores of churches, monasteries, and hospices. There were citywide processions on the most important holidays of the year (for example, down from the Mount of Olives on Palm Sunday) and a rich variety of commercial fairs and festivals to entertain and exploit the thousands of visitors.

Popular destinations outside the Holy Land (esp. in Syria, Egypt, Asia Minor, and Greece) included Constantinople; shrines of holy men, such as that of St. Symeon the Stylite the Elder at Qal'at Seman; churches of famous martyrs and heavenly powers, such as that of St. Demetrios in Thessalonike or the archangel Michael at Chonai; and sites featuring miracle-working relics and/or waters, such as the cisterns and tomb of St. Menas at Abu Minâ, near Alexandria. Beyond these there were many popular pre-Christian tourist attractions—like the therapeutic hot springs near Gadara and the pyramids of Egypt—which were given biblical associations (the latter claimed as the patriarch Joseph's grain storage bins).

Inspired by the belief that sanctity was transferable through physical contact, Christians undertook pilgrimage for various purposes: to intensify their faith through prayer and revelation, to bring offerings and votives, to obtain healing of physical and/or spiritual diseases, to seek advice, and for penance. Their activities are recorded in travel diaries, such as those of Egeria and the Iacenza Pilgrim; in guidebooks, such as the Breviarius; in hagiographical texts, such as the Religious History of Theodoret of Cyrus; or the vitae of the elder and the younger Symeon the Stylite. Complementing these are the surviving loca sancta structures themselves, and their associated shrines, such as the Church of Constantine and Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, as well as various smaller artifacts like the pilgrimage ampullae.

After the mid-7th C. pilgrims to the holy sites included Greeks (e.g., Epiphanius Hagiopolites, John Chokas); Westerners (e.g., Atulf [see Adomnan] and Willibald [see Hugoberg] in the 7th–8th C., and Seewulf ca. 1102/3), some coming from such faraway countries as Iceland (e.g., Nikulás of Munkatherá in the 12th C.—J. Hill, HThR 76 [1983] 175–203); and Slavs (e.g., Danil Igumen, Žosima). Their diaries and proskovyntaria are important sources for topography, the history of churches and cults, and sometimes even for economic and political history, esp. in Palestine and Constantinople.

Pilgrims—men and women, young and old, rich and poor—came to the Holy Land from every corner of the empire and well beyond; for safety they usually journeyed in groups. Travel by sea was speedier and more comfortable, but overland transit by donkey or on foot (at no more than 30
km per day) seems to have been the rule. Travel was inevitably slow (Egeria was away four years) and dangerous (because of wild animals and bandits); but it could be undertaken at little expense, since pilgrims were cared for as the obligation of the local Christian community, and church- and state-endowed hostels for strangers (Xenodocheia) abounded—as did commercial hotels and campgrounds (e.g., at Qal'at Seman). The indigent and sick were well represented among the travelers, but so also were merchants (who traded as they traveled) and aristocrats (e.g., the noblewoman Egeria), as well as soldiers, bureaucrats, monks, nuns, and theologians (e.g., St. Jerome), and even members of the imperial family (e.g., Theodosios II and Athenaia-Eudokia).

Pilgrims took along Bibles, maps, and guidebooks as well as letters of introduction and transit, to facilitate the crossing of the frontiers and to gain access to the much faster official highway system (the cursus publicus); a local guide might also be needed, to point out obscure sites and/or to deal with hostile natives. The actual encounter with the holy site could take several forms, from direct physical contact (e.g., kissing) to private reenactment of the original sanctifying event (e.g., throwing stones at the grave of Goliath), to ritualized public reenactment (e.g., the stational liturgy in Jerusalem, and the Sunday liturgy in the Holy Sepulchre). The pilgrim might come once, or repeat the encounter many times; at the great healing shrines the sick would rest on mats near the relic, sometimes for years, until a cure was received.

Living holy men were venerated directly, through prayer, the lighting of lamps, and the burning of incense; such encounters may have involved hundreds of conversions at a time as well as subsequent baptisms. Some pilgrims went to die and be buried near an appropriate site, such as the Grotto of the Seven Sleepers, near Ephesus.

Such mobilization of people and wealth, and the concomitant movement of sacred objects, exercised a significant social and economic impact on Byz. This was felt not only in the Holy Land—which between the 4th and 6th C. emerged from relative obscurity to become a spiritual focus of the empire—but also on a number of other centers, including Constantinople, which as a recently founded city had begun its Christian existence “saint-poor,” but as the new capital attracted many
early translations of relics. At the level of popular religion pilgrimage exercised a significant impact first on the developing cult of relics, and from the 5th C. onward on the emerging cult of images. Many of these, such as the Virgin Hodgetria, were at once icons and relics, with reputed links to the Holy Land. Yet pilgrimage was also a powerful force within the official church, since the Jerusalem stational liturgy and festival calendar soon came to dominate the pattern of worship in the Eastern church (see Byzantine Rite).

Pilgrimage also engendered its own distinctive forms of art. Most prominent were the great pilgrimage churches, such as that above Qal'at Seman. Because of its size and opulence, its imperial associations, and its location along a well-traveled pilgrimage route, this monument—like others of its type—exercised a general impact on Byz. architecture. Moreover, within these great churches were often found elaborate shrines housing the foremost local relic. Like the most famous such shrine, the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, most were essentially large-scale reliquaries.

On the level of the minor arts, pilgrimage inspired a wide variety of portable eulogiai, which pious travelers carried home for their amuletic/medicinal powers. Pilgrims also left votives behind; these could either be valuable personal possessions or works of art bearing invocations of thanks or representations of parts of the body to acknowledge specific healings.


PILGRIM MEDALLIONS, conventional term applicable to two categories of pilgrimage artifacts worn on the body. The first consists primarily of pressed-gold medallions—either pendants or fibulae—of the 6th–7th C. Most bear a scene from the Palestinian Christological Cycle; the preponderance of the Adoration of the Magi as well as invocational inscriptions (e.g., “Lord, help the wearer”) suggest an amuletic function related specifically to the pilgrim’s journey. The second category consists almost exclusively of cast-lead pendants from the shrine of St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger (some from the shrine of St. Mamas are also known). Produced after the Byz. reoc-
cupation of the region of Antioch in the later 10th C., Symeon medallions were consciously modeled upon Symeon tokens (see Pilgrim Tokens) but lack the eulogia of blessed earth that was the latter's raison d'être.


PILGRIM TOKENS (σφραγίδα), conventional term applied to a common variety of pilgrims’ eulogia artifacts, designating small pieces (diam. 1–10 cm) of sanctified earth, identifiable by the stamped impression that they bear. Pieces of portable, palpable sanctity, pilgrim tokens were valued for their aпотropaic and medicinal powers. Theodoret of Cyrrhus (Histoire des moines, ed. Canivet—Leroy-Molinghen 21:4.10–13) describes the hill, upon which a certain ascetic named James stood, that was generally believed to have received so powerful a blessing (eulogia) that people came from all sides to carry away prophylactic clumps of dirt.

By far the most common variety of pilgrimage tokens are those associated with the shrine of Symeon the Stylicate the Younger, conventionally called “Symeon tokens.” They survive in at least several dozen examples assigned on historical and iconographic grounds to the 6th–7th C. Approximately 1–3 cm in diameter, they are made of clay from the Wondrous Mountain, Symeon’s pilgrimage shrine near Antioch. According to the saint’s vita, the token was “the eulogia made from dust blessed by him.” Its function was primarily medicinal; it was usually crumbled into dust and applied externally, either dry or in a paste. Symeon tokens are identifiable by the sphiragis (seal impression) that they bear. The saint is shown on his column, flanked by angels with crowns or palm fronds; usually a monk with a censer climbs a ladder toward him. One type bears the inscription “Blessing (eulogia) of St. Symeon of the Wondrous Mountain,” and “Receive, O Saint, the incense, and heal all.” Another, simpler type occasionally shows the Trisagion or the word ἀγαθή (“health”). Lead Symeon medallions, modeled on the earlier clay tokens, were popular during the 10th–13th C. (see Pilgrim Medallions).

Like the Symeon tokens, rarer tokens from other shrines, for example that of the poorhouse of St. Phokas at Cherson (Vikan, infra 14, fig.6), usually show the saint or event that sanctified the site, and the ubiquitous eulogia inscription (“Blessing of . . . ”). Moreover, tokens with various holy figures (e.g., the Virgin and Child) or sacred events (e.g., the Entry into Jerusalem) could be issued from a locus sanctus with which they were not directly related. Like the functionally related pilgrim ampullae, the stamped pilgrimage token was predominantly a phenomenon of the 5th–7th C.


PINAKION (πινάκιον, lit. “small board”), also called tetartion or karta (from It. quarta), measure of volume equaling 1/4 thalassios modios (= 4-3 liters). Since 1 pinakion consisted of 10 logarikai litrai of wheat, the term dekatrion was sometimes applied to it. Accordingly, as a measure of land, the pinakion corresponded to 1/4 modios. In the wheat trade, 1 pinakion = 1/4 of the Byz. modios of trade = 77 liters, and was called mega (large) pinakion. The nickname “Parapinakes” applied to Michael VII refers to this measure and alludes to the emperor’s rapacity.

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 71, 102, 108. —E. Sch.

PINDAR, Greek lyric poet; born Cynoscephalae, Boeotia, ca.520 B.C., died ca.445. Pindar was sometimes called the “Theban lyre” or “a lyric poet” by Byz. writers. The Souda gives an account of his life and work along with several entries from his text. The earliest extant MS (Vat. gr. 1312 of the late 12th C.) of his surviving poems (The Victory Odes) is contemporary with an essay on the Pindaric meter by Isaac Tzetzes and a Pindaric commentary by Eustathios of Thessalonike. Manuel Moschopoulos, Thomas Magistroi, and Demetrios Triklinios edited and annotated Pindar in the 14th C. The question of a Planoudean recension of Pindar is still debated.

The most widely read of the Pindaric poems were the Olympian Odes. Highly regarded for his language, which was considered a model of the poetic koine (Gregory Pardos, ed. Schäfer 12), as well as for the didactic value of his poems, Pindar was used as a school author in Byz. from the 4th to 6th C. (Irigoin, infra [1952] 97), but
from the 7th to the mid-9th C. Pindar was not read (ibid. 121). Some 200 surviving MSS and the numerous citations in Byz. authors such as Ignatios the Deacon (Sevčenko, Ideology, pt.V [1977], 41, n.110) and Psellos attest to his increasing popularity thereafter.

Up to the 4th C. Christian authors made use of Pindaric quotations in a religious context, that is, in support of Christian tenets. The learned Cappadocian fathers and their circle, on the other hand, broke with this tradition by quoting Pindar for purely literary purposes (mostly in their correspondence), whereas the 4th- and 5th-C. hymnographers (Synesios and pseudo-Apollinaris of Laodikeia) reverted to the earlier practice.


—A.C.H.

PINDOS (Πίνδος, also Pydnos, Aitolika Ore, Pyrrenena Ore), mountain chain running north to south dividing Macedonia and Thessaly on the east from Epirus on the west. Two main routes crossed the Pindos from TRIKKALA: northwest across the Metsovo Pass to IOANNINA and southwest either through Porta or across the Korakou Bridge to ARTA. There were important Byz. settlements and monasteries along the eastern foothills of the Pindos, on the edge of the Thessalian plain (e.g., Phanarion, Porta), but the interior of the Pindos was underpopulated. A chrysobull of Andronikos III of March 1336 (Reg 4, no.2825), referring to the praktikon of the anagrapheus Manouses, presents a list of possessions of the bishop of STAGOI that provides valuable information on the topography of the medieval Pindos (Abramea, Thessalia 60).

—T.E.G.

PINKERNES (πικέρνης), cup-bearer, at first a palace eunuch. The word, used already in pseudo-Kallisthenes’ ALEXANDER ROMANCE (L. Bergson, Der griechische Alexanderroman. Rezension B [Stockholm 1965] 184.5 and 9), derives from the verb epikerunymi, “to mix [wine].” Periphrastic expressions, such as the emperor’s oinochoos, arkioinochoos, and kylkiphoros, were also employed to denote the cup-bearer. The late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philothoios listed the emperor’s pinkernes and that of the augusta as courtiers following the papias and his deuteros. The vita of Patr. Euthymios (Vita Euthym. 63.2) mentions an anonymous pinkernes sent by Leo VI on a delicate assignment; in the 11th C. the pinkernes could combine his duties with those of the droungarios tou ploimou (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.965). Under the Komnenoi some bearded men and even the emperor’s relatives were pinkernai. The importance of the post grew significantly from the 13th C. onward, when the pinkernes—like several other functions connected with the imperial table (e.g., the ep it tes trapezes)—became a high honorific title. Personages such as Alexios Philanthropenos and Syrgiannes held the post in the 14th C.

In addition to the imperial pinkernes, John, a patriarchal pinkernes, is attested in the 10th C. (R. Browning, B. Laourdas, EEBS 27 [1957] 187.39), and in the mid-12th C. Constantine, pinkernes of a great landowner Isaac Komnenos (V. Arutjuvna, VizVrem 29 [1968] 66), is known.

—A.K.

PIRACY. Individual acts of piracy were endemic in the eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea in antiquity and the Roman period, the inhabitants of the coasts of Cilicia, Dalmatia, and the Black Sea being particularly active. One may distinguish small-scale piracy, carried out on small boats and from the pirate’s base, from large-scale piracy, carried out on the high seas or against ports. In the Byz. period, piracy was most active when the state’s control over the seas was reduced. Isaurian and Cilician pirates are particularly mentioned until the 7th C. From the 7th to the early 10th C., the Arabs engaged in acts of piracy and corsair raids against the islands and coasts of the Aegean, disrupting commerce and taking captives. CRETE and TARSOUS were pirate bases, as was North Africa; the capture of THESSALONIKE by LEO OF TRIPOLI is noteworthy. With the reestablishment of Byz. control in the 10th C., piracy was greatly reduced. It became endemic again in the middle of the 12th C. (Niketas Choniates speaks...
of the thalassocracy of pirates) and flourished in the 13th–15th C. In this late period, pirates in the Aegean and the Black Sea were mostly Genoese or other Italians, but also Greeks from Monemvasia, Rhodes, and the other islands of the Aegean, and, from the early 14th C., Turks. They preyed on both large-scale and small-scale trade and engaged in the slave trade. Bilateral treaties between Byz. emperors, beginning with Michael VIII, and the Italian maritime city-states did not reduce piracy. In economic terms, piracy, esp. in the later period, functioned as an illegitimate part of the trade system, since pirates sold their booty in the marketplace. It added to the cost of trade and forced Italian merchants to travel in convoys and to develop marine insurance.


—A.L.

PISSIA, Italian maritime republic. Contacts with Byz. are first mentioned in 1098. To obtain a defensive alliance, Alexios I gave Pisa privileges in 1111: annual tribute, a quarter in Constantinople, and a 4 percent konomkion for products imported into Byz. The quarter in Constantinople was lost in 1163, when Pisa supported Frederick I Barbarossa, but restored in 1170. The anti-Latin riot in Constantinople (1182) decimated the Pisan community and provoked retaliation by Pisa. Isaac II subsequently renewed privileges and enlarged the Pisan quarter (1192). In 1204, Pisa suffered great losses in Constantinople and the formerly flourishing community began to decay. Although surpassed by Venice and Genoa, Pisa continued to enjoy its privileges until these were transferred to Florence in 1439.

The Pisan quarter in Constantinople lay along the Golden Horn, between the Neorion and Iskanatissa Gates, and had two churches, a public bath, a hospital, skalai, an embolos, and more than 19 houses. Political and commercial interests were defended by a viscount (vicecomes), who was elected in Pisa and had charge of justice and finance. A prior took care of religious matters and the temporal interests of the cathedral of Pisa in Constantinople. The translation of Greek theological and juridical texts by two Pisan scholars, Bur- gundy and Hugo Eteriano, helped transmit Greek knowledge to the West. Pisan merchants bought wine, clothes, iron, and money; traded oil and slaves in the eastern Mediterranean; and returned with spices, grain, cotton, and sugar.

SOURCE. J. Müller, Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane con l’Oriente cristiano e con i Turchi fino all’anno MDXXI (Florence 1879; rp. Rome 1966).


—C.O.F.

PISIDIA (Πισίδια), region of western Anatolia marked by mountains and lakes, bounded by Phrygia, Lycia, and Pamphylia. Pisdia became a separate province in the early 4th C. with Anti- och as its metropolis. A turbulent region, Pisdia was constantly afflicted by brigandage and revolt. Remoteness made it difficult to control and encouraged a long survival of paganism. By the time of Justinian I, the oppression of troops and officials combined with banditry provoked him to appoint a praetor with full civil and military powers in 535. When this failed, a duces or biokolites was given similar powers, but in 552 this also was suppressed and Pisdia was entrusted to its governor and bishops (Justinian, nos. 24, 145). Pisdia was divided between the Anatolikon and Kybrhadiotai themes by the 8th C. but was for a period considered as a unit. A komecrharioi of Pisdia is attested as late as 720 (Zacos, Seals 1, no.225); the ecclesiastical province long survived. After the battle of Mantzikert in 1071, Byz. control was limited to the western parts around Sozopolis and ceased altogether by 1204.


—C.F.

PISTIKOS (πιστικός), according to the hagiographers of the 6th–7th C. (e.g., Moschos, PG 87:2936D) and the Basilika, an agent to whom a ship was commissioned. The usage remained current to the end of the 11th C., when the will of Christodoulos of Patmos mentioned monastic boats commissioned (pistekeuomena) by certain per-
sons (MM 6:82.6–10). The Martyrion of Bp. Sadoth (martyred under Shāpur II in the 4th C.) speaks of imperial “archontes and pístikoi” in a vague sense of confidential servants (H. Delehaye, PO 2.4 [1907] 449.6–7).

The term basilikos pístikos, however, appears on seals beginning in the 8th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 2376, 2617); the functions of this official are not clear. Pančenko viewed him as an imperial maritime agent; his attempt (IRAIK 13 [1908] 116) to read pístikos in a corrupted line of the Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Lists 113.32) is not convincing (R. Guillard, REB 29 [1971] 15). Some imperial pístikoi served in the department of the dromos (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 489–90). The office of basilikos pístikos is not known after the 10th C.


PITTAKION (πιττάκιον), a term that in antiquity designated primarily a writing tablet. By the 4th C. it acquired the meaning of a short document (e.g., P.Gen. 62), probably with a pejorative connotation; thus, Athanasios of Alexandria (PG 26:800c) speaks of a pittakion allegedly produced at the council in Serdica. Later, it designated a kind of imperial prostaiga, and was esp. popular during the reign of the Komnenoi (Dölger, Diplomatik 5, n.14). The term was also employed for patriarchal documents issued in the form of a letter. N. Svoronos (in PGB 425) asserts that it was reserved for imperial and patriarchal acts, but there are some exceptions. In 1414, for example, the kephale of Thessalonike, Manuel Eskammatismenos, expressed regret that the priest and monk David had not received any of his pittakia (Docheiar, no.54.33).


PLAGUE (λομός), pandemic disease that struck Byz. several times. The earliest clearly documented and detailed description of a plague is of that which occurred in 541–44; Prokopios (Wars 2.22f), John of Ephesus, and Evagrios Scholastikos described it. Even though Prokopios’s account is modeled on Thucydides, clearly the “Justini- anic” plague was bubonic, contrasted with the uncertain diagnosis of earlier pestilences. The disease recurred several times during the 6th to 7th C. A decline of population resulted, although J.C. Russell’s estimate of 50–60 percent (Demography 5.1 [1968] 180) cannot be proved.

The Black Death of 1348–49 was the second major plague. The epidemic in Constantinople was described by John VI Kantakouzenos, who also imitated Thucydides (T.S. Miller, GRBS 17 [1976] 385–95) and Prokopios. A contemporary Arab author, ibn-Khātimah (died 1369), states that the plague started in China and spread through Iraq to the Crimea, Pera, and Constantinople (cf. Dols, infra 42). Rich evidence concerning the 1348 plague in the Balkans is preserved in the Dubrovnik archives; here the Black Death, which caused a shortage of manpower, led to “labor legislation” that established a ceiling for workers’ salaries (A. Kazhdan, Kраткие сбоıенія Института славяноведенія 17 [1955] 43–45).


PLANOUDES, MAXIMOS, scholar and translator; baptismal name Manuel; born Nikomedea ca. 1255, died ca. 1305. Planoudes (Πλανούδης) began his career as a MS copyist and scribe in the imperial palace (1283). Sometime thereafter, he became a monk. Although hēgoumenos of the monastery at Mt. Auxentios, Planoudes lived in Constantinople, where he taught at the Chora monastery, relocating to the Akateleptos monastery sometime before 1301. Prominent men like John Phakrakes and Alexios Philanthropenos sent boys to study with Planoudes, whose pupils included Manuel Moschopoulos and George Lakapenos. In 1296 Planoudes went to Venice on an imperial embassy.

Planoudes is remarkable for his translations of Latin authors, both theological (Augustine, pseudo-Cyprian) and secular (Ovid, Cicero, pseudo-Cato, Macrobe, Boethius). His translations are primarily literary in style and content, unlike those of Demetrios Kydones. Among Planoudes’ scholarly contributions are important edi-
tions and scholia (e.g., Nonnus, Plutarch, Dio-
phantos, Arethas of Caesarea), a collection of
folk proverbs, and a handbook on arithmetic (The
So-called Great Calculation According to the Indians).
His collection of epigrams (the Anthologia Planu-
dea) includes 388 missing from the Anthologia
Palatina (see Greek Anthology). He composed
the panegyric Basilikos at the accession of Michael
IX and left letters detailing the activities of the
ecclesiastical and civil officials, and official intel-
lectual élite.

ED. Epistulae, ed. M. Treu (Breslau 1890; rp. Amsterdam
LIT. C. Wendel, RE 20.2 (1950) 2202–53. W.O. Schmitt,
“Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz: die Übersetzungen des
Maximos Planudes und die moderne Forschung,” JOB 17

- E.A.F.

PLANTS. See Botany.

PLASTICITY, the quality in an image of appearing
to be modeled, and esp. of being monumental
and thus “real.” In classical relief sculpture plas-
ticity was achieved by carefully graduated planes
of recession and the use of undercutting: these
techniques mark the best ivory carving of the
10th C. Similarly, the illusion of solidity in a figure
painted on a two-dimensional surface depends
upon the suggestion of a reciprocal relationship
between light and shade and the presence of
tonal gradations, particularly on flesh and drap-
erly, to represent the gamut between these two
extremes. Striking examples of plasticity are to be
found in early icons preserved at Mt. Sinai, in the
frescoes of Castelseprio, in some miniatures of
the Paris Psalter, and occasionally in monumen-
tal painting of the late 15th and early 14th C.
Elsewhere the illusion of plasticity is imperfectly
conveyed by a “shorthand” system of conventional
highlights and shadows and often negated by the
use of line to define the contours of a figure or
object at the expense of its volumetric properties.

- A.C.

PLATAMON (Πλαταμών), site of a fortress near
the mouth of the Peneios River, overlooking the
wide plain of Pieria to the north and commanding
north-south communication at the entrance to the
valley of Tempe. It was an episkepsis at the end of
the 12th C. and in the 14th C. was termed a
polichne (Kantak. 2:571.19–20). Platamon is men-
tioned for the first time in a chrysobull of Alexios
III in 1198. The fortress was probably rebuilt by
Roland Piscia, who received the site from Boni-
face of Montferrat after 1204. In 1218 it was
taken by Theodore Komnenos Doukas of Epiros
and fell to Michael VIII after the battle of Pele-
gonia in 1259. In 1343, during the civil war,
Platamon first supported John VI Kantakouzenos
but later revolted and recognized John V Palaio-
logs. Some of the zealots from Thessalonike
were imprisoned at Platamon in 1346. Circa 1385
the castle fell to the Turks, who apparently kept
it in good repair. The fortress has a simple plan,
with exterior circuit wall, interior fort, and central
tower or donjon. As preserved, it is completely
Frankish in design. The bishopric of Platamon
and Lykostomion, suffragan of Thessalonike, is
known only from the 14th C. (J. Darrouzés, REB

LIT. A. Bukalopoulos, Ta kastra tou Platamonou kai tes
Horias Tempon kai ho teles tou Chasan Mpampa (Thessalonike

- T.E.G.

PLATE, DOMESTIC GOLD AND SILVER, made
in quantity in the latter metal (300–650), took the
form of display objects, table services, household
articles, furniture fittings, and horse trappings,
most of which continued late Roman forms and
decoration. According to Severos of Antioch (I.
Guidi, PO 22 [1930] 247), households in that city
were well provided in the 6th C. with such silver
objects; many examples have survived singly and
in various silver treasures (e.g., Canoscio Treas-
ure, Lampakos Treasure, Mytilene Treasure).
Silver display objects included statuettes and
display plates that were decorated, often in
relief, with both pagan and Christian subjects.
Table services (ministeria) contained sets of articles
for serving (e.g., a ewer, amphora, platter [misso-
rium], ladles, strainers), drinking (e.g., goblets,
which survive in small numbers), eating (plates,
bowls, spoons), and hand-washing (Chernibo-
Xeston). The numerous plain plates from the 4th
C. to the mid-7th C. were probably dinner plates.
References are made to large Byz. silver dinner
services ca.600: that of a magnate of Edessa is
described in Michael I the Syrian (2:380, 3:13f);
another service was sought by a bishop in Egypt,
according to Leontios of Neapolis (Life of John
ELEEMON, ed. Festugièr, ch. 27.12–13); and a third belonged to a bishop of Auxerre (ed. Adhémar, infra). Among household objects in silver were lighting fixtures and toilet articles of various types for the bath (e.g., mirror, situla, chernibo–

PLATE, LITURGICAL. See Paten and Asteriskos.

PLATES, DISPLAY (πυάκια), popular between 300 and 650, were decorated with an image and, unlike similarly ornamented items of domestic silver plate, were apparently intended for viewing rather than for the serving of food. More survive in silver than in other metals; imitations in ceramic and glass are known. On round plates, the image, usually in relief, was presented in one of two ways: restricted to a central medallion (the Hellenistic manner), sometimes accompanied by a historiated rim, or covering the entire surface (the Roman manner). The less common rectan-
gular plate (lanx) had an inner rectangular “picture” and outer decorated rim. Subjects illustrated were imperial (see LARGITTO DISHES); mytho-

gical, for example, Achilles, Herakles, Bellerophon (see MILDENHALL TREASURE); personifica-
tions, for example, Africa (see LAMPSAKOS TREASURE); pastoral (shepherd, fisherman); hunt-
ing; and both narrative (DAVID PLATES) and sym-

PLATO, ancient Greek philosopher; born ca. 429 B.C., died 347. He was, along with ARISTOTLE, one of the pillars of Greek PHILOSOPHY whose works the Byz. carefully transmitted, despite occasional lapses in interest and some hostility to his thought. Numerous papyri of Plato survive from late an-
tique Egypt. Approximately 260 MSS of Plato, about a quarter of the number for Aristotle, are preserved from the 9th to the 16th C. The dif-

Monophysite John Philoponos commented on the *Phaedrus*. Thereafter the fate of Plato’s texts and of interest in them lay principally in the hands of learned individuals, most of whom were careful to keep a certain distance from the pagan philosopher. In the 9th–10th C., such men were Leo the Mathematician, Photios, and Arethas of Caesarea. Photios (probably) and Arethas (certainly) commissioned copies of Plato that must have played a pivotal role in the transmission. In the 11th C., Psellus and John Italos caused a renewed interest in Plato; later he received the attention of Theodore Metochites. In the 15th C. Plethon reintroduced Plato to Italy where Platonism began a whole new life.

Plato and the Church Fathers. Neoplatonism flourished at the same time that the church fathers were elaborating Christian doctrine. Modern scholarship is strongly divided on the question of their interrelationship: on the one hand, H. Dörrie (*Platonica minora* [Munich 1976] 508–23; *Theologie und Philosophie* 56 [1981] 1–46) considers Platonism a “different religion,” completely distinct from Christianity and therefore unable to influence it; on the other hand, von Ivánka (infra) admits that some Christian theologians had accepted substantial elements of Platonic teaching, whereas others transformed Platonic tenets in accordance with Christian views. This discrepancy is built in part on the ambiguity of the patristic approach to Plato: Epiphanios of Salamis proclaimed Platonism a heresy originating from pagan philosophy and Eastern mystery religions, whereas Eusebius of Caesarea saw in Plato a follower of Moses, and in the 11th C. John Mauropos prayed for the salvation of Plato as a forerunner of Christianity.

Byzantine theologians through Gregory Palamas used Platonic vocabulary, and not only the vocabulary. They shared with Platonism some basic views, such as the idea that the things of the visible world do not exist by and through themselves, but depend on a primary, perfect, and absolute reality; this supreme being is of an infinitely higher value than visible things. There is, however, a cardinal difference between Platonism and Christian doctrine: the Platonic supreme being reveals himself through logical (dialectical) operations, descending through a series of intermediary stages to the preexisting material world, whereas the equal and consubstantial hypostases of the Trinity are divided from the world of things by a gap that can be bridged only by a mystery—Christ who mysteriously combined in himself the perfect divine and the perfect human natures is a phenomenon forming the core of Christianity, but is absolutely alien to Platonism. Also unacceptable to the church fathers was Plato’s thesis of the existence of eternal Ideas that presupposed the preexistence of souls and metempsychosis.


---

**PLATO OF SAKKOUION**, Iconodule monk, saint; born Constantinople ca. 735, died Constantinople in Studios monastery 4 Apr. 814; feastday 18 Apr. Born to a family of functionaries, Plato was orphaned at age 12. He was raised by his uncle, a high-ranking financial official, who taught him the profession of notary and helped him to become a zygostates. In 759 Plato took the monastic habit at the monastery of Symboloi (or Symbola) on Mt. Olympus in Bithynia. He returned to the capital at least briefly in the 770s, but turned down the opportunity to become metropolitan of Nikomedea. In 783, together with his nephew Theodoros of Studios, Plato founded the monastery of Sakkoudion (Janin, *Églises centrales 177–83*) on family property near Mt. Olympus and became its hegoumenos.

Plato was an Iconodule who attended the Second Council of Nicaea (787). In 795 he was imprisoned in Constantinople for his opposition to the second marriage of Constantine VI. After his release in 797, he spent the rest of his life at Studios except for a period in 809 when he was exiled by Emp. Nikephoros I for his unwavering rigidity in the MOECHIAN CONTROVERSY over Constantine’s marriage. Theodore of Studios wrote a funeral oration for his uncle (PG 99:803–50), which is essentially a vita.


---

**PLEDGE.** See Pignus.
PLETHON, GEORGE GEMISTOS, Neoplatonic philosopher; one of the most original Byz. thinkers; born Constantinople ca.1360, died Mistra 26 June 1452. The first 50 years of his life are shadowy. According to his enemy Gennadios II Scholarios, George Gemistos studied with a Jew, Elisha (Elissaios), at the "court of the barbarians," perhaps Bursa, and was exposed to Zoroastrianism. He evidently taught in Constantinople (Mark Eugenikos was his student) until ca.1410, when he was exiled to Mistra by Emp. Manuel II on suspicion of heresy and paganism. He spent the rest of his life at Mistra, where he was rewarded with land grants for various public services and headed the circle of intellectuals that adorned the court of the despotes of Morea.

Although Gemistos played only a nominal role at the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438/9, his visit to Italy (almost at the age of 80) was a turning point in his life. His conversations with Florentine scholars led him to write On the Differences of Aristotle from Plato; his defense of Plato probably inspired Cosimo de' Medici's subsequent foundation of the Platonic Academy. At this time Gemistos adopted the pseudonym Plethon (Πλήθος "abundant," a synonym of gemistos), with its connotation of a "second Plato" (Gr. Δύοτος). He also composed On Virtues and an essay on Strabo (A. Diller, Isis 27 [1937] 441–51). Plethon's final years were spent at Mistra teaching, writing, and engaging in polemics with Scholarios, a defender of Aristotle.

Among the most innovative of Plethon's rhetorical works is his Address to the Despotes Theodore [II] Palaiologos, proposing reforms to improve the condition of the Morea: his suggestions included a highly structured three-class society (manual workers, service workers, and a ruling class encompassing the military), reliance on a citizen army rather than mercenaries, sumptuary laws, and a ban on the import of foreign clothing; these proposals may, however, be mere rhetorical exercises, rather than a revolutionary program. His Address to Manuel [II] urged the exemption of soldiers from taxation and communal land tenure and attacked monks as drones who made no contribution to society. He strongly emphasized the theme of Hellenic patriotism. Plethon's final and most controversial work, the Book of Laws, is a synthesis of Neoplatonism and a belief in the Olympian gods, expressly stating that Zeus is the supreme god, and including prayers, hymns, and a liturgy to the pagan gods. It survives only in fragments, some autograph, as most of the treatise was burned posthumously by Scholarios.


PLETHON (πλήθος), an ancient measure of length mentioned in some Byz. metrological tables but not in documentary texts. From the 11th C. onward the plethron, called also plinthos, was used as a special measure for vineyards (= 600 sq. orgyiai or 600 sq. kalamoii). Depending on the customs of viticulture the plethron varies between 1,184 sq. m and 2,818 sq. m.


PLISKA (Πλισκοβα), first capital of Bulgaria, near the village of Aboba in northeastern Bulgaria. The name is Slavic, but no trace has been found of the presumed Slav settlement. The earliest Bulgarian settlement, traditionally (but without archaeological substantiation) assigned to Asparuch, was doubtless a tented camp. The foundations of two tent-shaped wooden buildings represent a more permanent settlement but cannot be dated. By the beginning of the 9th C. substantial stone buildings surrounded by a defensive wall stood in the center of the area, while an outer line of earthworks revetted with stone 21 km long enclosed an area of 2,300 hectares, which held many Slav-type small square semi subterranean buildings used as workshops, dwellings, market buildings, stables, and places of worship. This was the Pliska of Krum, which Nikephoros I sacked and burned in 811. Omurtag constructed some presumed religious buildings and a new and larger palace, which was a small fortress of beautifully cut stone from nearby Roman sites; the overall design of rectilinear rooms around the perimeter and basilican rooms within shows reliance on late Roman prototypes such as the palace of Diocletian at Split.
After the conversion of Bulgaria in 864 the religious buildings were adapted for Christian use and a large basilica with an attached monastery built (but cf. Mango, Byz. Arch. 301), where the disciples of CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER and METHODIOS continued their work. Pliska’s pagan associations were strong, however, and may have contributed to the anti-Christian revolt after Boris I abdicated in 893. SYMEON OF BULGARIA established a new capital at PRESLAV, and Pliska was gradually abandoned. It remained to the end a vast enclosed camp with scattered buildings rather than a typical medieval city. In 999/1000 the generals Theodorokanos the patrikios and Nikephoros Xiphias the protospatharios captured Pliska for Basil II.


PLOIMOS. See Navy.

PLOTINOS, Neoplatonist philosopher; born 205, died near Rome 270. Plotinos studied philosophy in Alexandria with Ammonios Sakkas. After joining Gordian III’s Persian expedition (243), he set up a philosophical school in Rome, where he had close ties with the Roman senatorial class and with Gallienus. His project of an ideal city (Platopolis), however, was not realized. His pupils Amelius and esp. Porphyry assured the influence of Plotinos’s interpretation of Plato (NEOPATONISM) on the philosophical schools of late antiquity. Porphyry published a Life of Plotinos and edition (the Enneads) of Plotinos’s works, commentaries, and a digest of Plotinian philosophy (the Sentences). Plotinos is quoted by Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret of Cyrirus, Aineias of Gaza, the On the Holy Spirit attributed to Basil the Great, Augustine, Ambrose, Macrobius, and other writers in late antiquity.

Besides this impact on the philosophy, theology, and literature of the late Roman empire, Plotinos may have influenced through his aesthetics the art of the period (Grabar, Fin Ant. 1:115–29). In the 6th C. JOHN OF SKYTHOPOLIS used the Enneads in commenting on pseudo-Dionysios. Theophylaktos Simokattes dedicated a mimetic letter to Plotinos. Michael Psellos made many excerpts from the Enneads as well as from the otherwise lost Commentary on Plotinos of Proklos. The earliest MSS of the Enneads date from the 12th and 13th C., when a Plotinian florilegium was composed.

Plotinos was also read by Theodore Metochites, Nikephoros Choumnos, Nikephoros Gregoras, Plethon, Gennadios II Scholarios, and Bessarion. Plotinos appealed to this select group of Christian intellectuals because of his emphasis on the existence, beyond this world, of an immaterial world (the “fatherland” of the soul), an emphasis that, while avoiding a dualistic opposition of the two worlds, called the soul to a virtuous life that would lead it to transcend its materialistic preoccupations. If Plotinos’s philosophy was not as closely tied to pagan religion as that of his successors (Proklos, for example), it contained certain ideas, esp. concerning psychology, whose incompatibility with Christian doctrine did not escape the notice of some of his Byz. readers.


PLODIV. See Philippopolis.

PLOW (ἀρωτρον). The use of the sole-ard or “scratch” type plow continued from Roman times. Its parts, as identified in illustrations of Hesiod’s Works and Days (for comparison with Roman plows, see K.D. White, Agricultural Implements of the Roman World [Cambridge 1967] 129, fig.104), may be distinguished as follows: gyes (plow beam), istoboeus (yoke beam), echetele (stilt), elyma (share beam), and the hynis (plowshare). The plow beam (well delineated in Venice, Marc. gr. 454, fol.34r) is the curved portion of the plow that unites the share beam with the yoke beam. The share beam, the essential part of the plow, narrowed to a point and was frequently protected by an iron tang to reduce friction and prevent splintering. Attached
horizontally by doweling to the plow beam and through it to the yoke beam, the sole was dragged by a pair of work animals, usually oxen, through the top layer of soil, loosening and depositing it on both sides of the resultant furrow. The exact depth of the furrow was determined by the stilt, while the oxen were controlled by a goad (bouken-tron). By cutting through only the upper layers of soil, moisture was retained below, an important consideration in semiarid regions such as Greece and Anatolia, where winters may be wet but the summers are hot and dry. The sole-ard plow was used in medieval Bulgaria and Wallachia, but perhaps by the 10th C. asymmetrical plows, which cut to much greater depths and turned the slices, were in use north of the Danube. Plows made from tree stumps, with one branch hitched to a team of oxen and another serving as the share, are frequently depicted in the OCTATEUCHS and Job MSS.


PLUMBING AND HEATING. Country houses and those of ordinary townspeople had practically no plumbing; these people got their water from cisterns, wells, or springs, the mouths of which could be lined by stone walls (E. Darko, EEBS 10 [1933] 471f); LATRINES were located outside the main building; and the house was heated by braziers and a kitchen oven. According to TZETZES (ep. 18, p. 33.3–16), even a three-story house in Constantinople could be built without drains, and Michael Choniates (Mich.Akom. 2:235f) describes a country bathhouse in which smoke and soot from the hearth filled the air. More complicated appliances (including HYPOCAUST, the system of ducts under the floor) were in use in urban public BATHS, monasteries, mansions, and palaces. In Corinth numerous short stretches of drains, water channels, and tile water pipes have been discovered (Scranton, Architecture 133). In bathhouses the water was heated in a boiler (kaminion); it also supplied the room with heat through the hypocaust. Monasteries had a system of water-closets (Orlandos, Monast.Arch. 40–42) as well as laundry rooms placed outside main buildings and provided with marble basins for washing, caldrons to heat the water, and stone drains (ibid. 138–43). A special plumbing system was used in wine shops, such as the “Grape Emporium” in Corinth where the floor was reconstructed of Roman marble slabs sealed with waterproofed cement and supplied with a tile pipe leading to a pithos (Scranton, Architecture 74). In Mystra similar devices served to collect wine as well as precious rain water from the roof (A. Orlandos, ABME 3 [1937] 56f).


–A.K.

PLUTARCH (Πλούταρχος), Greek essayist and biographer; born Chaeronea, Boeotia ca. 46, died ca. 120. The so-called Catalog of Lampsias (3rd or 4th C.) lists 227 works of Plutarch that can be divided into two major groups, Lives and miscellaneous writings, or Moralia; 83 of them have survived. In addition are 18 other works as well as fragments of 15 essays not listed in the Catalog. The Souda erroneously attributed the Catalog to Plutarch’s son. In certain MSS a short letter (which is a 13th- or 14th-C. forgery) prefixes Plutarch’s works and repeats this misinformation.

Plutarch was popular with the Neoplatonists (Proklos, Damaskios), rhetoricians (Themistios), and biographers (Eunapios) of the 4th–5th C. Even Latin authors such as Macrobius knew him. Church fathers also used Plutarch: Isidore of Pelousion studied him diligently, and Theodoret of Cyrillus respected Plutarch and believed that he had read the Gospels. In the 6th C. Plutarch was translated into Syriac. After Agathias’s praise of Plutarch (late 6th C.), his name disappeared from Greek texts until the 9th C., when Photios used one volume of a collection of the Lives and approved of Plutarch’s moral principles (Bibl., cod.161, ed. Henry, 2:126.36–38). The oldest extant MSS of the Lives are from the 10th C.; there were probably two editions in two and in three volumes respectively. The Moralia, however, survived only in dispersed groups; it was PLANOUDES who first assembled the previously ignored essays (the so-called Corpus Planudeumum in Paris [B.N. gr. 1671], which also contained the Lives). Some MSS of Plutarch’s Lives have scholia based probably on the notes of Arethas of Caesarea (M. Manfredini, JÖB 28 [1979] 83–119).

Plutarch was highly appreciated and imitated
in Byz. R. Jenkins (Studies, pt. I [1948] 73) hypothesized that Constantine VII’s portrait of Michael III in the Vita Basilii “is a conflation of the worst features of Plutarch’s Antony with a now unidentifiable part of Plutarch’s Nero.” John MAUROPOUS (epigram 43) prayed that God would spare the souls of Plato and Plutarch, whose lives “in word and character adhere closely to Thy laws.” Tzetzes, forced by poverty to sell his books, retained only a volume of mathematical texts and his copy of Plutarch’s Lives. Theodore Metochites relied heavily on the “most learned Plutarch” as a historical source (I. Ševćenko in Kariye Djamii 4:38, 41f).


—A.K., K.S.

POETRY. Byz. poetry may be categorized as either secular or ecclesiastical and within these broad groups by level of language (learned or popular). The rules of Byz. rhetoric frequently blur the distinctions now felt to exist between PROSE and poetry, both as to form and to the subjects appropriate to each medium. Accurate composition in the meters with classical antecedents (chiefly the HEXAMETER, the DODECASYLLABLE, and the ANACREONTIC) was a demanding task. Accomplished writing in archaising forms and language was achieved only by a comparatively small group of literati; their work was comprehended outside that group with difficulty. It is a problem that up to the 11th C. there seems to be no surviving verse likely to appeal to a popular and uneducated audience. In the later period, poetry that was intended to reach a wider audience—those attending a court ceremonial, a half-educated patroness, or a class of children—was frequently composed in the POLITICAL VERSE. Poetry in the popular language was composed almost exclusively in this meter; since much of the surviving popular poetry shows features frequently associated with oral poetry it is likely that much more poetry of this sort was in circulation than is now preserved in written form. RHYME, originally a rhetorical device used sparingly, appears regularly only in couplets in late popular texts. No metrical form was used exclusively for any one purpose; thus in the 12th C. greetings for an imperial victor could be expressed in hexameters, dodecasyllables, or political verse (as well as in prose).

Poetry at both the learned and the popular level of the language served many purposes in Byz. It functioned as a means of expressing personal emotions (nowadays probably perceived as poetry’s major role, but, in a rhetorically conditioned society such as Byz., perhaps the least highly regarded). Under this heading would come the epigrams or short poems (e.g., by GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS, PALLADAS, AGATHIAS, THEODORE OF STUDIOUS, or John MAUROPOUS) on topics ranging from the lighthearted to the serious; one could also include the pleas of PROCHORPRODROMOS or the love songs of the EROTOPAIGNIA or a lament (THENOS) for a captured city.

Poetry was used for the formal expression of appropriate sentiments on official occasions. It received both state and private patronage—for

PNEUMATIKOS PATER. See PATER PNEUMATIKOS.

PNEUMATOMACHOI (Πνευματομάχοι, “those who fought [the divinity of] the Spirit”), referring to those who taught that the HOLY SPIRIT was a created being, the gift of God, rather than God himself. From 362 onward, strict Nicaeans, led by ATHANASIOS of Alexandria, sought to exclude from the church those who held the Spirit to be a created being. In 367 some HOMOIOUSIANS, under the leadership of Eustathios of Sebasteia and Silvanos of Tarsos, stated their desire to maintain the traditional ambiguity of church doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit and to emphasize the charismatic experiences of their ascetic life as the manifestations of the Spirit. By their adversaries they were called Pneumatomachoi, or Macedonians after they had drawn near to the radical homoousian faction, that is, to Eleusios of Kyzikos and Marathonios of Nikomedea, both students of Makedonios of Constantinople (died before 364). The Pneumatomachoi were condemned at the First Council of Constantinople in 381, but survived until Nestorios closed their churches in the 5th C.


—K.-H.U.

PODANDOS. See CILICIAN GATES.
MONODIES, EPISTALAMIA, and speeches of welcome on the return of a victorious emperor as well as for a wide variety of other "occasional verse," such as dedicatory epigrams on church vessels, icons, vestments, etc.

Poetry, esp. in the easily memorable political verse, was also a medium for instruction. Examples include the textbooks written by Psellos for his pupil Michael VII, the anonymous scribedograhical lexika, the genealogical handbook on the Olympian deities by Tzetzes, his verse commentary on the allusions in his letters, the chronicle of Constantine Manasses. Probably closer to the circulating oral material were the CHRONICLE OF THE MOREA and the advice of the SPANIAS poem.

By the 12th C. and later, narrative poetry had become a medium for a literature of entertainment. Texts could be long, as in romances such as Drossilla and Charikles of Niketas Eugeneianos or Belthandros and Chrysanta, the epic romance Digenes Akritis, or the satirical Poulo-logos; or short, as in the TRAGOUIDIA.

At the learned level of the language, all poets (except those working in political verse) were constrained by the literary and formal conventions of the classical past, which dictated grammatical forms, lexical items, and a repertoire of historical and mythological references. They were under pressure to demonstrate their mastery of the linguistic and metrical medium, frequently by the presentation of showpieces before an audience. Thus John Tzetzes feared his rivals' reactions should he misuse the dichotomous vowels or use a non-classical word, and he regretted that a patron compelled him to use the undemanding political verse rather than display his prowess with hexameters (which were barely comprehensible even to the educated).

The regard in which the classical authors of pagan antiquity were held and the need felt to adapt their poetry to a Christian society are demonstrated, for example, by the CENTOS of the empress Atenaia-Eudokia or the anonymous Christos Paschon, where strings of verses from Homer or the tragedians were strung together to form a new theologically based narrative. Nevertheless, despite this high regard and the conservative linguistic pressures of the schools, the major poetical genres of classical literature—Epic, Drama, Lyric—did not persist into Byz. unaltered. Though NONNOS still constructs epic recognizably on the ancient patterns, the Bellum Avaricum of GEORGE OF PISIDIA and Digenes Akritas are epics very different from those of Homer. Though the Kato-myomachia of Theodore Prodromas demonstrates that the classical tragedians were read attentively, the dramatic literature of Byz. was found in the kontakion and other hymns and the liturgy, rather than on the stage. The epigrams of John Mauropous or JOHN GEOMETRES do not use the range of lyric meters available in late antiquity.

Poetry in Byz. was written almost entirely by men (Athenais-Eudokia and Kassia are among the rare exceptions), and by men of considerable education. Though poetry in the popular language must have existed for centuries, it appears first in the 12th C., apparently as a linguistic experiment by educated writers; only from the 14th C. do popular texts of any length survive, but almost all are anonymous and not even the place of composition is certain.


POETRY, ECCLESIASTICAL, verse used during the LITURGY or in religious contexts. Much of the liturgy in the Orthodox church consists of HYMNS; some are brief, such as stichera and TROPARIA, meditations inserted between the verses of a psalm; others are longer, such as KONTAKIA and KANONES, reflections on the nine biblical odes. In all these the lines and oikoi (stanzas) are structured on complex patterns of corresponding stressed syllables, following the rhythms of the spoken language, rather than the artificial long and short syllables of classical Greek prosody; the oikoi are often linked by ACROSTICS. Some religious poetry was written in the classical meters (e.g., by GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS and SYNESIOS OF CYRNE) for private, rather than liturgical, use. Most nonliturgical devotional poetry (like the hymns of SYMEON THE THEOLOGIAN or the penitential alphabets of various authors) used the stress meters, chiefly the POLITICAL VERSE. Though not untouched by the conventions of RHETORIC, ecclesiastical poetry remained generally closer to the spoken than the formal language. Epigrams (dedicatory inscriptions in a variety of meters) were sometimes, esp. in late Byz., attached to icons,
church ornaments, or vestments by their donors; in form they are indistinguishable from secular poetry.

LIT. Beck, Kirche 262–66. — E.M.J.

POETRY, ORAL. Although oral poetry may be studied through references to oral singers and singing, often, paradoxically, the main evidence is from written texts, those showing performance details and stylistic features associated in other cultures with oral poetry. In Byz. independent references are few—a scrappy but continuous series from the 9th C. onward mentioning singers and “heroic songs,” perhaps tragoudia, one or more of which may be reflected in works such as Digenes Akritas. However, most surviving Byz. poetry before the 12th C. is at a learned linguistic and metrical level, composed in writing for an educated audience. Lack of evidence for oral songs for and by the uneducated, however, is not an indication that no such songs existed: the question is whether scholarly analysis can be subtle enough to find them in the centralized and archaising society of Byz.

More particular arguments for the existence of oral poetry derive from vernacular texts from the 14th C. onward: the political verse in which almost all these texts appear, which had had a long tradition at a level despised by the learned; the poems’ diachronic language mixture, resembling the oral language of Homer, which allows metrical flexibility and rapid composition; the high proportion of repeated half-lines or “formulas”; the widely differing versions of texts preserved in more than one MS. Such arguments are accepted in other linguistic environments as signs that surviving texts were deeply influenced by oral poetry. It is unlikely, however, that any Byz. text is a direct record of oral performance.

Oral poetry can take many forms. In Byz. the evidence is clearest for narrative oral poetry, resembling the vernacular romances (e.g., the War of Troy, the Achilleis, Imberios and Margarona, Belisarios, Libistros and Rhodamne) or chronicles, such as the Chronicle of the Morea and the Chronicle of the Tocco. Shorter, lyric oral poetry also existed, however, as demonstrated by the Erotopaignia or the songs embedded in the Achilleis and Libistros and Rhodamne. (See also Acclamations.)


POETS, WANDERING, a conventional term introduced by Cameron (infra) for the “school” of poets of the 4th and 5th C. Primarily of Egyptian origin, they came mainly from Panopolis and the neighboring area (Thebes, Koptos), from Alexandria and even Cyrenaica (D. Runia, Historia 28 [1979] 254–56). To this “school” belonged Claudian, Palladas, Christodoros of Koptos, Olympiodorus of Thebes, Nonnos of Panopolis, Pampropios, Kyros, Triphiodoros, and others. They were professional poets, paid sometimes at the rate of one solidus per line or rewarded with rich spouses; they traveled throughout the empire, taught grammar, and recited their verses in public. Some of them became politically influential and acquired high positions and titles. The majority were pagan, and they wrote primarily in Greek. They worked in such genres as enkomion, invective, epithalamion, epigram, and epic.


POIMANENON (Ποιμανηνών), a small fortified town (polichnion) where a Church of the Archangel Michael was erected (Akrop. 35.1). Ansbert (see Historia de Expeditione Friderici), however, distinguishes between “ypomenon” and “Archangelos,” the town and the castle (MGH SRG n.s. 5 [1928] 72). Poimenon was located south of the Sea of Marmara (probably at modern Eski Manyas) overlooking a rich plain and controlling a major route into the interior. This plain witnessed two battles between the Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Laskarids (see Laskaris). Païen of Orleans and Peter of Bragieux, leading 140 knights (and mounted sergeants), encountered Theodore I Laskaris with a larger force at Poimenon on 6 Dec. 1204. Since the Byz. were unable to withstand the Latins’ onslaught, the Crusaders won a victory that gave them possession of the coastal lands of the Marmara up to Prousa (Villehardouin, 2:112–14, 126–29; Nik.Chon. 601f). After the accession of John III Vatatzes, Theodore I’s brothers Alexios and Isaac deserted to the Latins; in 1224 they led a large Crusader army against the Byz. At
POLEMOS, the Latin knights at first triumphed, but Vataztes rallied his men to victory. Consequently, Vataztes regained most of the Latin Empire's territory in Anatolia and seized footholds in Europe (Akrop. 1:34–36).


POLAND (Δασία, Πόλτζα, Πολανία). Traces of Byz. contact with Poland date from the 10th C. in finds of Byz. coins and perhaps in references by Constantine VII to the Lenzanenoi and to the unbaptized Litzike on the Visla (De adm. imp. 9.10, 33.19). Mieszko received Christianity from Czechia in 966 (see also Polish Literature). His son Boleslav I (ca.995–1025) was made patrikios and possibly caesar by Otto III, and in 1018 he briefly occupied Kiev. Boleslav IV (1146–73), “king of the Lecho, a tribe of Scythians” (Kinn. 84.12–13) participated in the Second Crusade. An anonymous poet of the 12th C. praised Manuel I for his victories over six kings, including those of the Czechs and Poles-Lechoi (Lampros, “Mark. kod.,” nos. 318.13, 320.6–7).

Casimir III (1333–70) annexed most of Galitza and Volynia and wrote in 1370 to Patr. Philotheos Kokkinos informing him that the Polish king, together with his “princes [rhegades] and archontes” of those parts of Rhosia, elected a certain Antony as Orthodox metropolitan, and asking for patriarchal confirmation (MM 1:578.6–12, cf. RegPatr, fasc. 5, no.2622). After Poland's union with Lithuania in 1386 it was on several occasions asked to join an alliance against the Turks: for instance, by Patr. Antony IV in 1397, by Emp. Manuel II in 1412, by the ambassador Manuel Philanthropenos in 1420. The proposal was not adopted until Vladislav III Jagello undertook the Crusade of Varna. A 15th-C. historian (Chalk. 1:124.23–125.2) states that the Poles (Polanoi) spoke a language similar to that of the Russians.


POLEMIC, RELIGIOUS, a branch of theological literature whose purpose was to attack a disputed theological position and justify the attacker's own stance. Unlike INVENTIVE, polemical works were directed primarily against ideologies rather than individuals; the objects of polemic were pagans, Jews, Muslims (see ISLAM, POLEMIC AGAINST), Latins, and heretics. Polemical works took various forms: a collection of essays (panoplia), treatise (antirrhetikos, apology, etc.), dialogue, letter, kephalaia (chapters), elenchos (examination). Among the greatest polemists were John of Damascus, Photios, Nicholas of Methone, John VI Kantakouzenos, and Manuel II Palaiologos. The main features of polemic were exaggeration ad absurdum of the adversary's error and the demonstration of the adversary's deviation from traditional (biblical or patristic) views or repetition of old mistakes. Thus the polemists tried to equate new ideological movements with early heresies condemned by the authority of ecumenical councils and great teachers of the church.

A.K., E.M.J.

POLEMUS SILVIUS, Latin writer; fl. Gaul 5th C. In the biography of his friend Hilary of Arles Polemus is described as a famous author. A chronicle entry for 438 less flattering says he suffered mental trouble after palace service and turned to writing about religion. His List [Laticulus] of Roman Princes, dedicated to Eucherius, bishop of Lyons (ca.434–50), was written in 448–49 under Valentinian III. This calendar-cum-register, which compiles a list of emperors from Julius Caesar to Valentinian III, is useful for its lists of provinces in East and West, sometimes a valuable adjunct to the Notitia Dignitatum. It is much more reliable and (for its day) up-to-date for the West, esp. Gaul, than the East, owing probably to a combination of Polemius's own geographical location and the relative merits of his sources (impossible to ascertain precisely). The work is otherwise something of a ragbag, with pagan material ostentatiously downplayed and miscellaneous remarks on (e.g.) grammar and meteorology inserted.

Ed. T. Mommsen, MGH AuctAnt q.1:511–51.

B.B.

POLEMOS TES TROADOS. See War of Troy.
POLIS (πόλις), the principal term, inherited from antiquity, to designate a city. Other terms applied to the city were asty, polisma, and polichne, which had essentially the same meaning as polis. A larger city, such as Alexandria, Antioch, or Thessalonike, was sometimes referred to as a megalopolis ("great city"), whereas the term komopolis (lit. "country city") was used in narrative sources for a sizable village. Constantinople had a special designation—the "imperial city" or the "Queen of Cities." A. Carile (StVen 7 [1965] 227) suggested, however, that the term polis was employed primarily for Constantinople, whereas other cities were called kastra (he gives the single example of Smyrna [MM 4:9.1]). At any rate, the term kastron seems to have prevailed in Byz. Italy (Falkenhausen, Dominazione 145f), while in Byz. proper both terms were used interchangeably. Even Thessalonike—usually defined as a polis—could be described as a kastron (e.g., P. Gautier, REB 32 [1974] 121.1537). In the 15th C. in addition to polis many terms were used for town, esp. chora and kastro (the vernacular form), and the distinction between them was vague: thus the Chronicle of the Tocco calls Ioanna a polis, chora, and kastro (A. Kazhdan in Bisanzio e l'Italia [Milan 1982] 172).

POLISH LITERATURE. Almost all extant Polish writing from the Middle Ages is in Latin. References to Byz. occur occasionally in annals and chronicles, esp. the monumental compilative history of Jan Długosz (died 1480), who includes an account of the fall of Constantinople in 1453 (I. Dujčev, BS 17 [1956] 329–33; see Konstantín Michailovič of Ostrovia). Indirect evidence suggests that the Slavonic Rite may have been used in Poland until the late 11th C., though both its status and the extent of its proliferation are uncertain. The earliest surviving works in Polish are the fragmentary Sermons of the Holy Cross from the 14th C.; the only work with a clearly Byz. literary connection (probably via Czech Literature) is the hymn Bogurodsca, which cannot be securely dated to before the 14th C. (S. Urbańczyk, Pamiętki literacki 69.1 [1978] 35–70); the relative importance of its native, Byz., and Czech inspiration is a matter of controversy.


-POLITICAL STRUCTURE. Byz. never possessed a written constitution and the forces that did produce political decisions in Byz. present a difficult, shifting picture. Individual elements within the broader political structure grew and changed organically, but the Byz. mentality's obsession with Taxis and with maintaining ancient forms and terms and applying them to new realities conceals development in the articulation of political structure.

The primordial component of political structure was the monarchy, totalitarian in ambition and ideology, absolute in its power to intervene directly in every aspect of Byz. life and government. Typically, other elements of the political structure defined themselves in terms of the precedence, that is, the proximity and nature of their relation to the Emperor. Emperors were usually able to dominate other constituents of the political structure: for example, patriarchs were deposed or humiliated and aristocrats' estates were confiscated. The monarchy was hemmed in by custom and expectations, however, and failure or behavior not consonant with them led to the upheavals that often toppled emperors (A. Kazhdan, Narody Azii i Afriki, no.6 [1966] 52–64, 195). Emperors were particularly limited when several elements of the political structure opposed them, such as when church, bureaucracy, and Constantinople's population coalesced against Michael V. The emperor's personal servants (e.g., kouboukleion) within his palace were influential; when, like Empress Irene or the last Macedonians, emperors wished to govern without interference from the bureaucracy or army, the outsider status of palace eunuchs such as Staurakios or John the Orphans brought them unusual political power.

The Byz. state machinery was extraordinarily developed, efficient, and expensive by medieval standards. It accomplished—or stymied—the emperor's will by regimenting the population, by administering justice, and by extracting taxes that paid for troops and officials. The bureaucracy
created and employed much of the aristocracy and might compete with the emperor for control of the political structure. By a combination of design and historical accident, however, the extreme fragmentation of functions and power (9th–11th C. finances alone—an asset indispensable for revolution—were divided among nine separate officials and subordinate services, each of which reported directly to the emperor [Oikonomides, Listes 312–19]) as well as overlapping jurisdictions, the combination of disparate competences (e.g., logothetes tou dromou), and the fact that offices were held at imperial pleasure made it difficult for the bureaucracy to unite in opposing the emperor. The Senate constituted more a social order of active and retired functionaries than a political body capable of acting on an institutional basis.

The church was a de facto political force within the political structure, but its political power lacked constitutional status. The depositions of Byz. patriarchs suggest that their power was weakened by loose authority over bishops, the emperor's privileges within the church, and the patriarch's physical proximity to him. Nonetheless, the secular church's prestige and role in publicly recognizing the emperor's Orthodox legitimacy gave the patriarchate an influence that could sometimes stalemate imperial power. The monastic church's decentralization diffused the political and economic impact of individual monastic communities, although it could provide a political irritant, as it did during Iconoclasm.

The military enjoyed a privileged place in the political structure and was always a factor to be reckoned with. Yet it, too, divided into separate vertical lines of organization answering directly to the emperor, such as the distinctions among themes with their dispersed geographic basis, tagmata, and palace units like the vigla of the hekairai, whose foreign mercenaries stood outside the social and cultural networks that might have fostered political cooperation with other units. The bureaucracy's role in financing and equipping the troops limited their freedom of action and provoked constant frictions in the provinces, thanks to the army's extensive and ill-defined role in local administration.

Local power was controlled as tightly as possible from Constantinople, whence came the governors, tax registrars, and inspectors; the emperor saw to it that judicial appeals were made from the provinces and the general effect was administration from above. At the same time, however, ethnic colonies within the empire might enjoy autonomy (e.g., sklaviniai). Provincial cities possessed a relatively extensive self-administration, although an imperial governor from Constantinople was often present. The significance of cities in the political structure was greatest from the 4th to the 6th C. and esp. in late Byz., when some were able to extract privileges from the emperor.

The capital as a whole enjoyed unique status within the political structure as a source of legitimacy and as the impregnable reservoir of power. This was where the principal organs of the Byz. political structure were headquartered, esp. when Constantinople acquired an exceptional position thanks to the loss of Alexandria and Antioch. The influence of Constantinople increased as its population and commerce revived.

Although late Roman emperors had feared urban riots and ultimately mastered the factions, demographic collapse neutralized the people, who played little role in the theory and practice of the political structure after the 7th C., as the Byz. notion of demokratia (see Democracy) suggests. Imperial law insisted that popular sovereignty had been transferred definitively to the emperor (e.g., scholion to Basil. 60.46.1) and the people were considered to have fulfilled their political duties when they obeyed imperial commands, paid their taxes, or participated in ceremonies. Just how insignificant they were considered is revealed by the way laos is used unconsciously to refer to the elite and the army (e.g., McCormick, Eternal Victory 71, n.130, 194, n.27).

From Constantine I to the Komnenoi, institutions supplied the key criterion in each social element's relations to the emperor. Even the lowest-born individuals could play a decisive role if they occupied an essential institutional position within the political structure. From the time of the Komnenoi, however, kinship supplanted institutions, as power flowed from family proximity to the emperor.

The late Roman political structure recognized a role for the senate, army, people, and to a lesser degree the church, as is reflected, for example, in imperial acclamation and coronation. Within certain bounds, such as allegiance to the reigning emperor, some diversity of opinion might be tolerated, but it was risky. Diffuse power persisted
in the great cities’ masses and, once the government had settled in Constantinople, emperors paid nervous attention to the factions and the crowds’ acclamations. Nonetheless, even the serious Nika Revolt threatened the throne only when senatorial malcontents attempted to graft a usurpation onto the disturbances. At this time power was securely anchored in the army, which produced a majority of new emperors. The central bureaucracy’s status grew considerably in the 5th C., culminating in the election of Anastasios I and recruitment of subsequent emperors from the palace milieu.

The military crises of the 7th–8th C. brought soldier emperors to the fore, as the state’s dimensions and resources shrank. The central bureaucracy successfully opposed Constans II’s plan to move the capital back to Italy, but theme commanders subsequently dominated the political structure, supplying numerous emperors and usurpers as Constantinople’s population dwindled. The church became mired in doctrinal disputes with political overtones, like Monothelitism and Iconoclasm, and proved unable to thwart the imperial will.

The last great revolt of the themes failed with Thomas the Slav (820–23). The next two centuries were a period of centralization and organization in which the bureaucratic oligarchy and central military command competed for political center stage in Constantinople, reflected in controversy and codification of precedence and ceremony. The church had increased its prestige and ambition after Iconoclasm, but patriarchs who overestimated their political weight were deposed. By the 11th C., Constantinople’s nonsenatorial population was flourishing again and began to claim a political role (S. Vryonis, DOP 17 [1963] 289–314; Lemerle, Cinq études 287–93), esp. through the guilds, some of whose members gained senatorial status on the eve of the Komnenoi.

The Komnenoi and their successors in Nicaea attempted to transform the political structure fundamentally, along the lines of a patrimonial state in which political power was essentially reserved to members of the imperial clan and their family allies. Gradations of the political structure’s hierarchy now reflected the degree of kinship between the dignitary and the emperor. The expansion of the senate was blocked or undone and the church’s growing power was curtailed along with that of the city, which provided so many of its officers.

The Latin Empire’s feudal, centrifugal character spawned autonomous territorial entities on the model of Western principalities, which sometimes united Greek and Frankish lineages and survived the Latin Empire’s collapse. Direct intervention by foreign powers in Byz. internal politics became a permanent component of the political structure.

Paradoxically, the tiny Palaiologan state, with its appanage system, was the most politically decentralized in the empire’s history. Its ambitions far outstripped its capacities. The political structure combined the imperial clan system with a feudalized state. The effort to secure political support degenerated into civil war, and the political structure was further fragmented by attempts to win loyalty through the concession of heritable pronoiai, immunities, and municipal franchises. The political structure failed to integrate the emerging territorial or urban forces, such as Thessalonike’s Zealots. As the emperors’ power base and prestige contracted, that of the church expanded since patriarchal spiritual authority ran much further than the emperor’s writ, allowing patriarchs and dissident factions to paralyze and even alter imperial policy, such as Union of the Churches.


POLITICAL VERSE (πολιτικὸς στίχος, “city verse” or more likely “verse of ill repute”), a 15-syllable meter, based on word-accent, without reference to ancient patterns of long and short syllables. There is an invariable break after syllable 8 and compulsory accents on 14 and either 6 or 8 or both. Each half-line has an iambic tendency to stress even-numbered syllables, increasing in strength toward its end, as shown in the figure.

Byz. commentators derived political verse from ancient iambic and trochaic catalectic tetrameters, but this is uncertain. Political verse first appears around the 6th C. as fragments within other varied verse forms, esp. the kontakion, which may be coincidental (J. Koder, JÖB 33 [1983] 45–56). In surviving texts it was first used consistently, in learned language and at the imperial court, by
SYMEON METAPHRASTES (I. Ševčenko, DOP 23/4 [1969/70] 185—228). It is unwise to assume, however, that the verse was the result of innovation at this cultural level. Whatever its origin, its preservation was only likely within the milieu of Byz. literati, who dominated the dissemination of the written word. Political verse may perhaps have won entry to the court by its similarity to the traditional verse of the Roman TRIUMPH. Much circumstantial evidence points to a popular origin in oral poetry (see POETRY, ORAL), particularly its use by those Byz. scholars who exploited its lack of ancient models and consequent freedom from linguistic conservatism: it was easier to use than prose in addressing half-literate patrons. It was closely connected with the breakthrough of vernacular into writing; in fact it is the verse of almost all Byz. popular poetry surviving in written form. By the 14th C., the connection with poetry at an oral level, which has been stated as a hypothesis for the earlier period, seems all but certain. This fact is confirmed by the dominance of political verse in modern Greek folk song, at least since the first preserved examples from the 16th C.


POLLE TAX (from "poll," head [in men and animals]), a term of English fiscal law conventionally used in discussion of the late Roman and Byz. fiscal system. It means the tax levied on an individual or his animals, rather than on his land or merchandise. According to traditional views, developed in the late 19th C. by V. Vasil'evskij and retained by many modern scholars, the late Roman capitatio (the levy on caput) was a poll tax. After the fall of the Roman Empire it survived in the form of the heathen tax (kapnikon) and appears in late Byz. texts under names connected with the Greek word for head, kephale, such as kephalain and kephalatikon. The existence of the poll tax in the Roman Empire and Byz. has since been questioned: A. Déléage (La capitation du Bas-Empire [Macon 1945] 255) and Goffart (Caput 36, n.19) consider the capitatio not as a tax but as "a method of evaluation"; the equation of the hearth tax with the poll tax is doubted; and many terms interpreted by Vasil'evskij as poll tax turn out to have no such meaning.


POLO. See Sports.

POLOS. See Sphaira.

POLOVTSY. See Cumans.

POLYCYCLIC. See Monocyclic and Polycyclic.

POLEIOS (πολείς), a chant, comprising selected verses from Psalms 134 and 135, sung during the orthros on Feasts of the Lord and several other times during the church year. Preserved in 14th- and 15th C. musical anthologies (Akolouthiai), the earliest musical settings consist of three separate melodic categories: (1) anonymous and traditional repertories that presumably contain the oldest layers of chant; (2) newer chants—personal and individual extensions of the older layers—attributed to various composers active in the 14th and 15th C.; and (3) a collection of kalophonic settings (see Teretismata) for certain lines from Psalm 134, which are also new compositions attributed to specific composers.
POLYEUKTOS (Πολύευκτος), patriarch of Constantinople (3 Apr. 956–5 Feb. 970); born Constantinople ca. 900, died Constantinople. Castrated in childhood, Polyueuktos was a monk when, after the death of Patr. Theophylaktos, he was promoted to the see of the capital. His election is mysterious: not only had a segment of the ecclesiastical hierarchy led by Nikephoros of Herakleia opposed him, but the Lekapenoi were in conflict with Polyueuktos; moreover, Constantine VII, who allegedly had chosen Polyueuktos for his wisdom, modest behavior, and praise of poverty, kept trying to depose the patriarch. One of the first measures of Polyueuktos was the restoration of Patr. Euthymios to the diptychs. In 963, when Byz. was on the verge of civil war, Polyueuktos, acting with the support of the senate, urged Nikephoros (II) Phokas to vow solemnly to preserve the rights of the minor sons of Romanos II. After the victory of Nikephoros, Polyueuktos consistently opposed the new emperor: he protested against the imperial edict concerning the automatic sanctification of warriors fallen in battle as well as his restrictions on monastic property. When Nikephoros was murdered, Polyueuktos demanded from John I Tzimiskes the abolition of all novels promulgated by Nikephoros and the banishment of Theophano, Nikephoros’s widow. After John had accepted these conditions, the patriarch crowned him, stating that the coronation absolved John from the sin of murdering his predecessor. Polyueuktos placed the newly reconquered Antioch under his control: he designated the monk Theodore as patriarch of Antioch and allowed the Antiochene patriarchs to reside in their metochia in Constantinople. When the Germans under Otto I increased their pressure on Rome, Polyueuktos elevated Otranto to the rank of metropolis in 968, viewing it as a point of Byz. ecclesiastical influence on Italy.

POLYKANDELON. See Lighting, Ecclesiastical.

POLYSTAURION (πολύσταυρον), a phelonion or liturgical cape decorated with a design of crosses, first encountered in late 11th- and early 12th-C. images of church fathers (e.g., Vat. gr. 1156, fol. 250v, and at Asinou, M. Sacopoulo, Asinou en 1106 [Brussels 1966] pl.XXIIb); the term first appears in a text in a 12th-C. commentary (Zonaras in Rhalles-Potes, Syntagma 2:260.25). The wearing of the polystaurion may have been originally the prerogative of patriarchs (Theodore Bal-samon in Rhalles-Potes, Syntagma 4:478.26–28), but by the 14th C. its use had been extended to metropolitans as well. Although the phelonion could be of any color, the polystaurion was always white, with black crosses.

POLYEUKTOS, CHURCH OF SAINT, built between 524 and 527 by Anicia Juliana in the Constantiniae quarter of Constantinople (mod. Saracoñane), where she owned a mansion. Inscribed in it was a long epigram (AnthGr 1:10) alluding to this and other unnamed foundations of hers. Despite its magnificence and prominent situation on the street leading to the Church of the Holy Apostles, St. Polyueuktos has no history. A chance discovery of inscribed blocks corresponding to the text of the epigram (1960) led to excavations that revealed the vast substructures of the church with an atrium to the west and an adjoining baptistery and a wealth of elaborate architectural sculpture. The plan of the church at ground level remains uncertain, but certainly it was domed and had several exedrae and a gallery. Before the construction of Hagia Sophia, St. Polyueuktos may have been the most ambitious church of the city. It was abandoned in the 12th C. and robbed of its sculpture both before and after 1204. The so-called Pilastri Acritani, which stand near the southwest corner of S. Marco, Venice, as well as capitals in Venice and elsewhere, come from St. Polyueuktos.


**PONTIFEX**, pontiff, the title of a pagan Roman priest, *pontifex maximus*, assumed by Roman emperors and retained by Constantine I after his conversion to Christianity. Emp. Gratian abolished the title between 375 and 383, but it continued to be used in Constantinople until the 6th C. The title influenced Christian terminology: the phrases *summus sacerdos* and *summus pontifex* were used to render the Greek title *archiereus* and were applied to bishops. In the 2nd C., for example, in Tertullian, the term had pagan connotations and its application had a derisive tone; in the 4th C., however, *pontifex* was a term for a bishop; in the 5th C. Paulinus of Nola characterized the bishop of Hippo as *summus pontifex*. By approximately 378 the title *pontifex religiosis* was applied to the pope of Rome. Pope Leo I used the expression *summus pontifex* for Christ and for himself; he bears the title *pontifex* on an inscription in the Basilica of St. Paul fuori le mura. Isidore of Seville also accepted *pontifex* as *princeps sacerdotum* and an official designation of episcopal rank (PL 82:291 C). The title *pontifex maximus* for popes did not pass into common usage until the Renaissance.


**PONTOHERAKLEIA.** See *Herakleia*.

**PONTOS** (*Πόντος, Lat. Pontus*), a toponym with four Byz. meanings.

1. **The south shore of the Black Sea**, from the Halys River to the Phasis, together with the adjacent mountains and the valleys of the Isis and Lykos. The coastal region is exceptionally fertile and well forested, with rich mineral deposits. It had always been densely populated, while the drier interior contains fewer cities. The whole region is filled with Byz. monuments, most of them from the empire of Trebizond.

2–3. **Two Diocletianic provinces**. The first, Helenopontos (called Diospontos until the time of Constantine I), stretched from Sinope to the Lykos, with Amaseia as its metropolis; the second, Pontos Polemoniakos, was administered from Neokaisareia and reached as far as Trebizond. The ecclesiastical dioceses followed this division. In 535, Justinian I combined these two civil provinces under the moderator Justinianus Helenoponti, who had both civil and military powers. This reform was ephemeral, and the two provinces were restored and existed through the 7th C. Kommerkiarioi of Pontos, however, are attested as late as the 9th C.

4. **Pontica diocese of the Diocletianic system**. The diocese comprised central and northern Asia Minor, with the provinces of Bithynia, Honoria, Galatia, Paphlagonia, Helenopontos, Pontos Polemoniakos, Cappadocia, and Armenia; it was administered by a vicar with headquarters at Amaseia. Its army was commanded by the *dux Ponti et Armeniae* until the mid-5th C., when *duces* of the two provinces of Pontos were instituted instead. Justinian abolished these commands, entrusting the whole region to the *magister militum* for Armenia, the forerunner of the *strategos* of Armeniaikon. The emperor suppressed the diocese in 535, making the vicar the governor of Galatia I with special powers. When this failed, the vicar was restored in 548 with broader authority than before. The diocese ceased to exist in the 7th C. Its territory was divided between the Opsikon and Armeniaikon themes.


**POOR** (*πτωχοί*, also *πενήτες*, *aporoś*, etc.). Byz. law defined the poor as those who possessed less than 50 nomismata (*Prochiron*, 27-13) and distinguished their legal status, so that in some cases a wealthy person was fined while a poor person underwent corporal punishment (flogging) for the same offense. There is only scanty information concerning the number of poor in Byz. society; John Chrysostom estimated their number in Constantinople at no more than 50,000 (PG 60:97.26–27) and (less reliably) as a tenth of Antioch’s population (PG 58:530.10); the 7th-C. patriarch John Eleemon supported more than 7,500 indigents in Alexandria (vita, 348.39). The poor included not only the destitute (*aporoś*) and beggars but underemployed urban laborers (*Pratum Spirituale* [PG 87:3:2888AB]) and small farmers unable to work their lands profitably (Leo VI,
Their diet, primarily cereals and dry vegetables (often in inadequate quantities), was nutritionally deficient, and they appear to have suffered consequently high rates of illness and early mortality. They were often identifiable by their appearance, esp. by threadbare clothing replaced only yearly. For many, shelter comprised rented accommodations near worksites, while homeless beggars congregated—despite imperial prohibition (Justinian I, nov. 80, ch. 5, 1)—in obscure sections of Constantinople, sleeping under arcades during inclement weather (TheophCont 909, 5–6); St. Loukas the Stylist distributed alms to wandering vagabonds in Paphlagonia (ed. Delehaye, Saints stylietes 205, 8–11). Relations between rich and poor were at times marked by overt hostility; some 11th-C. peasants raided neighboring estates (Psellus, Scripta min. 2:82f), while a 14th-C. coalition of poor cultivators and monks opposed John VI Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 2:196, 21–23). A similar antagonism is expressed by Alexios Makrembolites in his Dialogue Between the Rich and the Poor.

Imperial solicitude for the poor formed a salient feature of the (idealized) emperor’s image in Byz. political theory, while poverty provided a model for monastic life and figured prominently in many hagiographical legends. Thus the Byz. always possessed an ambivalent attitude toward poverty, considering it a manifestation of social inferiority but, at the same time, superiority in terms of spiritual values and access to salvation.


POORHOUSE. See PTOCHOTROPEION.

POPULAR ART, conventional term applied to art and artifacts of low inherent value (by material and/or technique) made, assumedly, for the lower echelons of society. Bronze, glass, lead, bone, and terra cotta were its characteristic media, while molds and stamps were often employed for mass production; inscriptions were usually impersonal (e.g., “Lord, help the wearer”). In some instances clear strata in terms of media (and cost) can be charted across an object type (e.g., belt fittings or pectoral crosses in gold, silver, bronze, and lead). Roman sumptuary laws, which restricted some luxury materials (gold rings, amethysts) to certain classes, were not effectively applied in Byz., suggesting that the mechanism of stratification was the marketplace. Some categories of object (e.g., oil lamps and censers) were, because of their utilitarian nature, manufactured primarily in base media (bronze and terra cotta); similarly, pilgrim eulogiai were made in terra cotta not for reasons of economy but because the material itself was valued for its reliclike power, having come from a locus sanctus. Over the centuries kitchen and dining utensils in glass and esp. terra cotta were in great demand, and created industries of their own, including northern Syrian mortaria in the 4th C., North African stamped redware in the 5th C., and graffito ware from various centers in Greece and Asia Minor in and after the 9th C. Especially in the last instance, whole categories of decorative motifs (stylized “Sasanian” plants and animals) were developed which otherwise had little impact on more sumptuous arts.


POPULAR RELIGION, a term used to designate both the body of religious practices existing outside the official liturgical ritual of the Nicaean-Chalcedonian church, and a body of beliefs other than those sanctioned by the definitions (horoi) of the ecumenical councils, the canons of the ecumenical councils and local synods, and the writings of church fathers. Popular religion is not a “vulgar” or popular phenomenon that emerges from the lower orders of society, but a style of religiosity extant in all social strata. Many of its elements, for example, icon veneration and the manufacture and use of Christian amulets, gradually became part of orthodox practices since they contravened no rules.

Byz. Christianity developed on the substrata of civic, rural, and popular Hellenic polytheism and magic, all of which profoundly influenced the new religion. Although Constantine I the Great and his successors transferred confiscated temple lands to local churches and required conversion
to Christianity for economic and political advancement, a Hellenic substratum of PAGANISM often persisted despite conversions: Pegasios, the bishop of Alexandria Troas, for example, continued to maintain temples and idols and to perform sacrifices (JULIAN, ed. Wright, ep.19). The cities were mostly Christian by the late 4th C., though sites like GAZA and Carrhae-Harrān had large pagan populations much longer. The religious transformation of the countryside was slow. Writers such as Shenoute of Attope, Zacharias of Mytilene, and John of Ephesus mention pagan villages in the late 5th and early 6th C. Monks penetrated the countryside to convert villages, a policy that was sporadic until the time of Justinian I, who began bringing urban pagans to trial under the law of 529. The law also threatened confiscation of lands for all who refused baptism, a clear advance over provisions in the Codex Theodosianus, which established harsh penalties for sacrifice, but none for the unbaptized. The result of Justinian’s compulsory conversions was the mixing of old cult practices and beliefs with the Christian: christianization of pagan rite and the emergence of a large, barely catechized population. Here the origins of Byz. popular religion are to be sought.

Evidence for popular religion abounds throughout Byz. Animal sacrifice continued in Anatolia into the period of Ottoman rule. Monks like Nicholas of Sion conducted christianized animal sacrifices to counter this practice, but with mixed results. The defenders of Pergamon sacrificed an unborn fetus during Maslama’s siege of the city in 716/17 (Theoph. 390f). The Appendix (4.20, 21, 23) to the Ecolage of Leo III and Constantine V (ca.750) repeated earlier prescriptions banning sacrifice, but Photios (ep.79) mentions people who sacrificed a dog at a tomb to induce the earth Gê to yield secret wealth. When the attempt failed, they confessed to their bishop. Penalties for sacrifice fell under civil law; renewed prohibitions appear in the Basilika. Neither the canons of the Council in Trullo or later councils, nor the 12th-C. glosses of Balsamon and Zonaras treat the matter.

The Council in TRULLO proscribed many other types of popular religion, however, including Armenian customs, and established penalties (Trombley, “Trullo”). Among the “destructive pagan practices” dealt with by the Council were calendar customs and festivals such as the Brumalia, Calends, Bota, First of March, and New Moon. The canons mention practitioners of divination, including “centurions,” animal leaders, magicians, enagastirmothoi, astrologers, and cloud-drivers (nepthiodoxtai). The latter not only predicted the future from the shapes of clouds, but also used incantations to deliver rain clouds to parched fields. The sixty-second canon condemned the invocation of Dionysos during the vintage cycle. Many of these practices lasted until the time of Balsamon and Zonaras. Balsamon describes the mumming processions at the time of the Brumalia at the beginning of winter, when the fermented wine was poured into jars. The revelers entered churches wearing masks and animal costumes and mocked the clergy and monks. Works of Parody, such as the Synaxarion of the Honorable Donkey, which ridicule both clergymen and the church service itself, reflect a similar attitude toward the official church.

Popular feasts not acknowledged by the church calendar preserved pagan practices. Sorcery was used against persons to provoke sickness and could evoke popular hysteria. Monks like St. Hypatios of Rouphinianai and Nikon ho “Metaneite” used prayers, sacred oil, relics, and amulets to calm the ailing; Theodore of Sykeon aided his possessed patients by scouring the countryside for the sorcerers responsible and by himself exorcising the daimon thought to cause the malady. Saints appropriated other functions and powers claimed by mantic and magicians as well, including dream interpretation, knowledge of the past and future, speed of movement, the summoning of rain clouds, the taming of wild beasts, and marked the perimeters of tilled fields with the cross to protect them from hailstorms, floods, and locusts. Churches were erected at the sites of pagan sanctuaries, and ancient statues were thought to possess demonic power, a belief which pervades the Parasiaseis syntomoi chronikal (See also Demonology.)

POREČ (Parenzo), a village in Croatia approximately 50 km south of Trieste. The mid-6th C. cathedral was built by Bp. Eufrazius (hence, Basilica Eufrasiana) in the style of Ravenna. It is a basilica with conch mosaics in three apses and exceptionally well preserved opus sectile on the main apse wall. Columns and capitals of Greek marble, the latter identical to some in S. Vitale, must have been imported from Byz., as were some parts of the opus sectile; according to A. Terry (DOP 40 [1986] 147–64), the assemblage of mosaic and opus sectile was done by local Adriatic craftsmen.


PORIKOLOGOS (Πορικολόγος, lit. “Fruit Book”), a short anonymous prose text of uncertain date, satirizing late Byz. legal procedures and court ceremonial. All the parts are played by fruit: Grape is denounced before Emp. Quince, who is attended by Protostrator Peach, the Caesar Pistachio, etc. Grape is condemned to be suspended from a tree, beaten, and his blood consumed until men have drunk themselves into a stupor. As the context is now unknown, it is not clear whether Porikologos is a tract against drunkenness or a satire directed against individuals who are concealed behind the fruit figures. Not dissimilar in tone to the Opsarologos, Porikologos’s continuing popularity is attested by many post-Byz. versions as well as by Serbian and Turkish translations.


LIT. Beck, Volksliteratur 177f. –E.M.J.

PORPHYRIUS OF GAZA, bishop of Gaza (from 395) and saint; born Thessalonike ca.347, died Gaza 26 Feb. 420. Porphyrios began his career as a monk in the Egyptian and Palestinian desert (ca.372–82), then went to Jerusalem, where he earned his living as a leather-worker. In 392 he became a priest and three years later bishop of Gaza. The core of the Life of Porphyrios, allegedly written by his disciple Mark the Deacon, involves the bishop’s struggle against paganism in Gaza and his campaign for destruction of the temple of the local god Marnas (identified with Zeus). In Constantinople, Porphyrios gained the covert support of John Chrysostom and attracted the Empress Eudoxia to his cause by predicting to her the birth of a male heir. Her husband, Emp. Arkadios, was reluctant, but Eudoxia arranged for her newborn son, Theodosios II, to sanction the destruction of the Marneion, supposedly on his baptismal day (6 Jan. 402?). Returning with an army commanded by the clarissimus Cynegius (a relative of Cynegius Maternus?), Porphyrios set the Marneion afire and replaced it with a huge church allegedly designed and funded by Eudoxia.


PORPHYRIUS OPTATIANUS, perhaps correctly (the orthography and style are disputed) Pablishio Optatianus sigmo Porphyrios, 4th-C. Latin poet. Porphyrios was an important senator and perhaps a pagan priest from Africa, who in 325 earned his recall from exile by Constantine with a batch of 20 panegyrical poems. He later published these with the addition of seven more addressed to a certain Bassus, perhaps the eastern praetorian prefect of 318–31 and consul in the latter year (T.D. Barnes, AJPh 96 [1975] 173–86). Imperial favor subsequently extended to making Porphyrios governor of Achaia (325–29) and twice (329, 333) prefect of Rome. A fuller career is possible on the plausible but unprovable identification of him with the anonymous official whose horoscope is supplied by Firmicus Maternus (Metathesis 2.29.10–20). His verses (some items in the Latin Anthology may also be by him) are notable only for their structural trickeries, being multiple acrostics and on occasion figurate in the Hellenistic manner.


PORPHYROGENNETOS (πορφυρογέννητος, πορφυρογεννήτης), an imperial epithet meaning “purple-born” and designating a son or daughter born after the father had become emperor. The concept was already familiar in the 6th C. (G. Ostrogorsky, E. Stein, Byzantion 7 [1932] 199; cf. John of Ephesus, HE 3.5.14, tr. Brooks, 199.29–200.5), but the term itself seems to reflect advancing conceptions of hereditary legitimacy and has not been securely detected before 846 (Falkenhausen, Dominazione 12, n.64). It became common in the 10th C., esp. in connection with Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, who described the court ceremonies that attended the birth of a male porphyrogennetos (De cer., bk.2, ch.21, ed. Reiske 615–19). Byz. explained porphyrogennetos either in terms of the parents’ assumption of the purple (Psellus, ep.144, ed. Sathas, MB 5:390.21–27) or by the custom that had empresses giving birth in a purple-decorated structure of the palace, the Porphyra (An.Komm. 2:90.3–19). Both explanations were already current in the 10th C., since Liutprand of Cremona accepts first the latter (Antapodosis 1.6, 3.30) and then echoes the former account (Legatio, 15f). As Psellus’s phrasing suggests and De ceremoniis (cf. F. Dölger, BZ 36 [1936] 148 n.1) confirms, acclamations esp. favored the epithet. The term porphyrogennetos remained in use into the Palaiologan period (pseudo-Kod. 134.17).


PORPHYRY, a hard rock ranging in color from dark red to purple. It was extracted in Upper Egypt until the mid-5th C., when the quarries of the Mons Porphyriticus were abandoned (R. Gnoli, Marmora Romana² [Rome 1988] 122–33). The hardest stone known to antiquity, it appears to have been reserved for imperial use, esp. during the Tetrarchy and the reign of Constantine I. Imperial portraits, sarcophagi, and the column of Constantine in Constantinople represent the most important work in this material. Porphyry was worked by abrasion in Egyptian workshops and displays distinct features that had an impact on contemporary marble sculpture (Kitzinger, Making 9–12, figs. 5, 8). Thus the tetrarchs in Venice and those in the Vatican as well as a bust of Galerius in Cairo (Age of Spirit., no.5) share the wide staring eyes, typical also of FAYYUM POR-

traits, and the summary modeling that is also evident in parts of the Arch of Constantine in Rome and a number of marble sarcophagi in the same city (Kitzinger, op. cit. 22, figs. 35–38). The ornate porphyry sarcophagi of Constantia (the daughter of Constantine I) and St. Helena in the Vatican display pagan decoration, while imperial examples in Constantinople bear only crosses and wreaths. In a letter written from Rome to John VIII, Manuel Chryssoloras recalls seeing enthroned figures of porphyry in Constantinople.


—L.Ph.B.

PORPHYRY, Neoplatonist philosopher, named Malchos at birth; born Tyre 233, died ca.306. Porphyry studied NEOPATONISM first at Athens, chiefly under Longinos, the “living library and walking museum” (Eunapios, Lives of the Sophists 456). He then moved to Rome, where for six years (263–69) he was a disciple of Plotinos, whose works he edited and whose biography he later wrote. Mental illness drove him to Sicily to recuperate. Later he returned to Rome, where he taught Plotinian Neoplatonism for the rest of his life, IAMBlichos being his prize student. His wife Marcella was herself an amateur of philosophy. Not instantly famous (Eunapios remarks that there was no biography of him), he acquired notoriety through his treatise in 15 books Against the Christians (now fragmentary), which was condemned and burned in 448 (T.D. Barnes, JThSt n.s. 24 [1973] 424–42). An unlikely tradition makes him an apostate; any faith would not have survived a beating-up by a Christian gang in Caesarea (Sokr., HE 3.23).

Porphyry wrote some 78 works on a wide range of topics: vegetarianism, grammar, philosophy, rhetoric, science. His philosophical writings include a commentary on the Categories of Aristotle (CAG. vol. 4.1, ed. A. Busse [Berlin 1887]). His Introduction (Eisagoğe) to the Aristotelian Organon was to be an influential schoolbook in both East and West. The traditional ascription to him of a chronicle that much influenced EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA has now been discredited. In sum, Porphyry’s indefatigable preservation of others’ work is
more valuable than his own. Bidez remarks that there is not a thought or an image that one can confidently affirm to be his own.

Porphyry accepted the theory of emanation developed by Plotinos: from the One through its hypostases, Intellect and Soul, to the matter that was unable to exist without form and therefore could not be preexistent. Porphyry, however, put the emphasis on the unity of the universe and on the monistic perception of the Triad. The central point of his doctrine was the soul's search for salvation: it was impossible for the individual soul to be consubstantial with the universal Soul; it was bound with the body, but at the same time, through the phenomenon of epistrophe, open to the god; it desires the ascent to the god with the help of thinking and of will, through faith, truth, love, and hope, but remained fettered by evil decisions, sin, and passions. The ascent is construed as a primarily intellectual operation, although Porphyry assumed (to a lesser degree than Tamblichos) a role for magic and theurgy, esp. for the rank and file.


-B.B., A.K.

PORTRAITS AND PORTRAITURE. Following an overview, this article treats imperial and dynastic portraits, portraits of officials, authors, and donors, and funerary images.

AN OVERVIEW. In ancient Greece and Rome prominent individuals were honored by having their likenesses set up in public. Late Antique and Byz. portraits derive from the Roman traditions of public and funerary portraiture. Numerous portraits in SCULPTURE, predominantly frontal bust-length examples, survive from the 4th–5th C., and the genre continues, to a lesser extent, through the 6th and 7th C. These are mostly of emperors and members of imperial families. Public officials are represented, among others, by the two statues of high dignitaries from Aphrodisias now in Istanbul.

The deceased, too, were honored by the setting up of portraits, carved in relief or painted, in funerary chambers. Since the cult of holy figures was focused on tombs, the Roman practice of having a portrait at the tomb developed into the creation of the images of saints that are known as icons. Verisimilitude here was requisite, since the spirit of the saint was thought in some way to be present in the icon. From the start, icons exemplified the classical notion that a portrait should be generally frontal, bust-length, and a “true likeness,” however that may be understood. Early icons (of the 6th and 7th C.) include the portraits

After the 7th C., the Roman tradition of portraiture continued in the icon, which isolated and presented to the beholder a holy figure as a subject in itself. It is a frontal close-up view of the saint, emphasizing his facial features and costume. When individuals other than saints were represented, they were shown participating in acts of piety rather than presented as portraits. The few exceptions are portraits of emperors, primarily in enamel, that were presented as gifts (e.g., on the Holy Crown of Hungary, the *Pala d’Oro*, or the diadem in Budapest). The icon thus became for all intents and purposes one of the principal vehicles of true portraiture. Sacred portraits were based on what were considered to be authentic models, such as St. Luke’s painting of the Virgin; when no contemporary model of a saint was available, the painter was often said to have been helped by miraculous intervention. Once a likeness or portrait type was accepted, it was subsequently little altered. For this reason, great consistency is found in the portraits of holy figures throughout the centuries.

Beyond the realm of the icon, representations of individuals are generally limited to members of the imperial family, the aristocracy, the educated elite, and ecclesiastical personages. In contrast to the earlier portraits, those created from the 9th C. onward foreground the variety of the Roman media. Portrait statues ceased to be made, perhaps as early as the 7th C. The artists worked in the two-dimensional media of painting and mosaic and in low relief in metal, ivory, and stone. The subjects were usually shown performing one of a limited number of acts (praying, presenting gifts, writing, etc.), for example, the *proskynesis* of the high official at the feet of the Virgin (cod. Lavra A 103, fol. 3v; Spatharakis, *Portrait*, fig.45), of the monk Neophyts Enkleistos at the feet of Christ in the wall painting of his cell in the Enkleistra on Cyprus, or of the nun Theodoul in the south gallery mosaic in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, or Theodoul shown in the Lincoln College Typikon presenting to the Virgin and Child the church of the Bebaia Elpidos convent that she had founded (ibid., figs. 145, 153).

In this later tradition the bust-length portrait is rarely used for contemporary figures, perhaps because such portraits would have seemed too much like icons. The focus, as in icons, is not on accurate physiognomy, though this of course may be achieved; it is on identification of the individual and his status. A person is recognized by a few select physical characteristics (type of beard, hair color, shape of nose) and by insignia or attributes (headaddress, garment, weapons, etc.). The portrait of Basil II as a triumphant general (Marc. gr. Z 17, fol.H1r; Spatharakis, *Portrait*, fig.6) accentuates his military dress and weapons. The emperor Alexander, in the mosaic in Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, stands in full regalia: he wears the *loros* and the crown and holds the orb and *akakia*. In the narthex mosaic of the Chora church in Constantinople, the position of the high court official Theodore Metochites is demonstrated by the elaborate headdress and gold-embroidered coat (*kabbadion*) of his office.

There are also funerary portraits in Palaiologan chapels that again show individuals as donors of the chapel they had built or as supplicants to Christ or the Virgin. In similar fashion a series of miniatures in the 14th-C. Lincoln College Typikon consists of portraits commemorating deceased relatives of the founders of the monastery. The figures are depicted standing frontally and praying to a small image of Christ or the Virgin represented above them.


**IMPERIAL PORTRAITS.** Portraits of emperors survive from all periods in a variety of media, although only coinage offers a historically continuous series. From the late Roman period survive a few heads and full-length statues of emperors: the colossal head of Constantine I in Rome, the over lifesize statue of Marcian or Leo I in Barletta (U. Peschlow in *Studien Deichmann* 1:21–33), the statue of Valentinian II and the head of Arkadios
in Istanbul, the head of the empress Ariadne in the Louvre, and the head of Theodora in Milan. There are a number of portraits in MSS from the 9th through the 15th C. as well as in mosaic, enamel, and ivory. Imperial portraits also adorned wall paintings, marble reliefs, and silver dishes. After the 6th C., with the exception of coins, there are no surviving bust-length portraits, and after the 7th C. three-dimensional sculpture ceases. The sequence of drawings of Roman and Byz. imperial heads in the 15th-C. Zonaras MS (Modena, Bibl. Estense, gr. 122; Spatharakis, Portrait, figs. 115–17, 119, 121–23, 125, 127, 129, 131) is a unique occurrence.

In MSS imperial figures are usually portrayed frontally, with names and titulature invariably accompanying the portraits. Emphasis is placed on the garments. The loros marks a figure as imperial; when the chlamys or the long tunic are worn, they are made imperial by rich ornament and appropriate imperial colors: Nikephoros III Botaneiates is shown wearing all three of these garments in reworked portraits in Paris (B.N. Coisl. gr. 79; Spatharakis, Portrait, figs. 70–72). The emperor wears or carries a combination of imperial insignia, such as the crown, the scepter, the orb and the akakia, so that his imperial status is always unambiguous. A common theme was the investiture of the emperor by Christ, as on the ivory plaque with the portrait of Constantine VII in Moscow. Some imperial chrysobulls, for example, that of Alexios III Komnenos of Trebizond, bore portraits of the emperor.

To ensure that the viewer recognized the figure as imperial, the portraits tended to focus on accoutrements of office rather than individualized physiognomy. Almost all surviving portraits, from the mosaics in Hagia Sophia to those in MSS, are of an official nature and served the emperor as propaganda images. Not all imperial portraits were commissioned by the emperors themselves, inasmuch as gifts to the emperor (e.g., MSS) could also contain their portraits. Depicting the emperor in an official way did not exclude an attempt at likeness: when the 11th-C. Coislin MS (see supra) was relabeled for the emperor Nikephoros Botaneiates, his facial features were painted over those of the previous emperor, Michael VII.

**DYNASTIC PORTRAITS.** Byz. representations of members of a dynasty are found in the same media as imperial portraits. Most common are representations on coins on which the emperor is depicted with one or, more rarely, two of his dynastic successors; both Herakleios and Eudokia Makrembolitissa, for example, are depicted with two sons (DOC 2:2:16–19; 3:779–84). Dynastic representations most often show the imperial couple and the children chosen as successors, not the whole family. In the double-page composition in Paris, B.N. gr. 510, Basil I and Eudokia are represented with Leo and Alexander, the two of their children who had been crowned co-emperors (Omont, Miniatures, pl.XVI). The children, wearing crowns and the loros, flank the emperor. That Leo was the next in succession was immediately apparent to the Byz. viewer, since he is larger than his brother. In mosaic there survive in the south gallery of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, the portraits of John II Komnenos and his wife, together with their first-born son, Alexios.

An unusual case is the illustration in an early 15th-C. MS of the works of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite (Paris, Louvre, cod. Ivoires 100; Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.93), sent as an official gift from Manuel II Palaiologos to the monastery of St. Denis. The image depicts not only the emperor, his wife Helena, and their crowned successor John (VIII), but also the couple's two younger sons, who were not co-emperors. Although the image is official in nature, it is as much a family portrait as an official representation of the dynasty. An elaborate series of family portraits is preserved in the 14th-C. Lincoln College Typikon (A. Cutler, P. Magdalino, CahArch 27 [1978] 179–93).

**PORTRAITURE OF OFFICIALS.** When government or court officials are represented in the company of an emperor, they remain anonymous to underscore the emperor's importance. They flank Constantine I in the adlocutio scene on the Arch of Constantine in Rome, Theodosios I on the obelisk base in Constantinople, and an anonymous emperor attending the games in the Hippodrome in the 12th-C. frescoes in a staircase at St. Sophia in Kiev. In only a few of these cases was the attempt made to depict historical individuals. In the apse mosaic in San Vitale, Ravenna, for example, the officials flanking Justinian I have

---

-I.K.
individual and differentiated facial characteristics, unlike the uniformly treated faces of the soldiers. Only the figure of Maximian, archbishop of Ravenna, is identified by an inscription. The officials in the 11th-C. miniature of Paris, B.N. Coislin 79 (Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.71) are similarly individualized.

From the late Roman period survive a number of statues of officials; they have been found primarily at Ephesus, Aphrodisias, Sardis, Constantinople, and Rome. Many of the statues are of high-ranking magistrates, garbed in togas, and holding a scepter in one hand, the mappa in the other. The similar togate torsos were evidently “mass produced” and then an individual portrait head was attached.

In the Byz. period officials sometimes commissioned their own portraits in MSS or wall paintings to commemorate their role as donors or kletores. Here, a resemblance to the historical individual may be assumed, for instance, the portrait of Leo Sakellarios of the 10th C. in Vat. Reg. gr. 1 (Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.1) shows Leo as an old man with gray hair but beardless, suggesting that he was a eunuch. As in imperial portraiture, the individual’s status or office is explicitly denoted by an accompanying inscription and by his garments and attributes. Thus, Leo’s red and gold embroidered chlamys marks his high office. His brother Constantine, who is depicted in the subsequent miniature (ibid., figs. 2, 4), wears a similar garment, although his position as protospatharios is indicated by the sword he is holding.

When officials founded churches, they frequently had themselves depicted as presenting the church to Christ, the Virgin, or the eponymous saint of the church. The magistros Nikephoros Kasnizes and his wife Anna are shown in the narthex of their church at Kastoria, offering a model to St. Nicholas. An example in mosaic is the portrait of Theodore Metochites as kletor, offering the Chora church to Christ.


DONOR PORTRAITS. The number of donor portraits surviving from different periods attests that it was a common practice to have one’s portrait included in an artifact that one had commissioned. Donor portraits are found in MSS, wall paintings, mosaics, ivories, and icons. The donor commonly assumed a supplicant posture and was identified by an inscription. He was usually depicted holding his gift in his hands, whether a church or a manuscript, and offering it to God or an intercessor. Leo Sakellarios presents his Bible to Christ by handing it to the Virgin, who is interceding on his behalf (Vat. Reg. gr. 1; Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.1), while Basil the protospatharios presents his lectionary directly to Christ (Athos, Koutl. 60; Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.52). In a 12th-C. fresco in the Church of Sts. Kosmas and Damianos in Kastoria, Theodore Lemnites, his wife Anna Radene, and their son offer the church they have built to a standing Virgin and Child.

While most donors were members of the upper class, whether Constantinopolitan or provincial, from time to time they were monks who had
produced the MSS they were offering, (e.g., the monk Theophanes—Melbourne gr. 710/5; Spataharakis, Portrait, fig.43). Emperors were shown as donors in a variety of ways. Justinian I and Theodora in San Vitale offer liturgical vessels for the newly built church. Constantine IX Monomachos and Zoe present money and a document to Christ in a mosaic in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, while in a MS (Vat. gr. 666; Spataharakis, Portrait, fig.80) Alexios I Komnenos offers the Panoplia Dogmatica to Christ as a symbol of his efforts to defend orthodoxy.


—L.K.

**FUNERAL PORTRAITS.** Funeral portraits are most commonly found in connection with the burial site. In Egypt up to the 4th C. the so-called FAYUM PORTRAITS were painted on wooden panels that covered the faces of mummies. Roman traditions also continued at least into the 4th C.: on sarcophagi the deceased were depicted either in medallions or as full figures on the front side; in the catacombs, pictures of the dead were painted on the walls, often in an ORANS position. The first surviving Byz. funeral portraits are in fresco and mosaic and date from the 15th C., although there may have been examples in the tombs that appear in churches from the 11th C. onward. Funeral portraits are usually found on the walls of private chapels built for entombment of the patron and his family. The deceased are shown as donors of their church or as supplicants to Christ or the Virgin. The portrait is placed near or above the tomb, often within the niche containing the tomb (e.g., the portrait of Michael Tornikes and Eugenia in the parekklesion of the Chora in Constantinople). Portraits of deceased individuals may also be of a commemorative nature, as in the mosaic portraits in the Chora of Isaac Komnenos, son of Alexios I, and Maria Palaiologina, who took the monastic name Melane. That the 13th-C. portraits of the despotissa Theodora (St. THEODORA OF ARTA) and her son Nikephoros of Arta were carved on a marble sarcophagus is possibly a result of Western influence.


—L.K.

**PORTS** (sing. λυμή). The relatively small size of Byz. ships and the use of a keel that could be lifted meant that a natural harbor (a well-protected bay, a soft sandy bank upon which to drag boats) was preferred to a complicated system of harbor construction. The jagged coastline of the Aegean Sea, Cilicia, western Balkans, and the Black Sea provided Byz. with plentiful places for mooring, so that not only small towns but even individual monasteries (e.g., on Mt. Athos) possessed their own harbors. The larger ports had more complex equipment, including piers and skalai for landing, loading, and unloading ships, as well as shipyards (neoria), breakwaters, chains to seal off the bay as in Constantinople and Thessalonike, and lighthouses. City walls extended close to the sea to prevent attacks from hostile warships. The larger ports functioned as trade centers, sometimes as places where cargo was transferred for land transportation; they were also customs points, and centers of ship construction. A larger port usually was under the command of an archon. Special harbor dues (limeniatikon, katartiatikon, ska- 

—L.K.
limen was used to designate refuge, peace, or absence of persecution.


PORTULAN (πορτολάνος, Ital. portolano), sailing directions for navigators, the successor to the ancient periplous. The anonymous and undated Brief Measurement of the Entire Oikoumenê (GGM 1:424–26) is too general a survey to be considered a predecessor of true portulans, but the so-called *Stadiasmos* or *Periplous of the Great Sea* (Ibid., 1:427–514), which survives in a 10th-C. MS in Madrid (Bib. Nac. 4701) within the chronicle of Hippolytos, comes closer to the genre: it describes two sea routes—from Alexandria westward, along the North African coast, and from Ptolemais in Syria, via Antioch and the coast of Pamphylia, to Miletos. True Greek portulans are known only from MSS of the 16th C. and have strong similarities to Italian and Turkish portulans of the period; their vernacular language shows the influence of Western, esp. Venetian, vocabulary. The fullest example begins with Corfu (Kerkyra) and describes in detail the Dalmatian coastline, the Ionian islands, the Morea, Crete, the Aegean archipelago, Cyprus, and the route from Rhodes to Karaman. The term portulan is also applied to the regional maps that began to appear in the West in the 13th C. and soon replaced the *mappae mundi* typical of Western medieval cartography.


POSOVES (ποσότης, lit. “value” or “quantity”), a term with three basic meanings in Byz. documents: (1) in general usage, a property’s sale price; (2) rarely, in the 12th C., a synonym for *arithmos* (e.g., *Lauro* 1, no.65.11); (3) in the *Treatise on Taxation* (ed. Dölger, *Beiträge* 117.42), a quota of state revenues given to a grantee to collect from the villages that are not in his ownership; it was measured in money (hence, *noumismathe posotes*). In this latter sense, the term is frequent in the acts of the 13th–15th C., where it indicates the size of imperial grants ceded to individuals (often holders of *pronoia*) or ecclesiastical/monastic corporations. While the *posotes* of *pronoia* grants varied widely, the typical range for a pronoia-soldier in the 1320s seems to have been 70–80 hyperpyra; the *posotes* of monastic holdings in the 14th C. often was several thousand hyperpyra. The *posotes* represented only a quantification of the fiscal revenues (TELOS and state charges) ceded to the beneficiary, not the true economic benefit derived from the grant. Thus, because many imperial grants contained substantial quantities of arable land that seem to have been state-owned and that the grantee evidently rented to peasants, this rent, together with other charges (mill fees, dock fees, kaniskia, oikomodion) that the beneficiary enjoyed as landlord, increased the yearly economic value produced by the grant well beyond the official *posotes* of the oikonomia.


POSSESSION (νομή, κατοχή), in Byz. law, was the effective tenure of one’s own or of another’s object. Possession could be legitimate (based on a lease- or tenure-CONTRACT) or unlawful. A possession was protected against removal or interference by a so-called *interdictum* (parangelma). With this legal means a decision is reached in favor of the “better” owner; this decision was provisional, however, and avoided prejudicing the question as to who was the real owner of the object.

These dogmatic principles, already developed in Roman law, were preserved in Byz. legal literature practically unchanged (Harm. 2.1). The use of the terms *nomo*, katoche, *despotia* in documents is imprecise; the verbs *nemesthai* (possess) and *despozein* (own) are occasionally used synonymously (e.g., Guillou, *Ménécée*, no.40.6–7), and the im-
precise demarcation between possession (often connected with long-term rights of use) and ownership led to numerous legal disputes (e.g., Dölger, Schatz no. 57.7–11). M.T.H.F.

**POSTAL SERVICE.** See Dromos.

**POTTERS’ STAMPS.** See Stamps, Commercial.

**POULTER.** See Ceramics.

**POULOLOGOS** (Πουλολόγος, lit. “Bird Book”), an anonymous poem in nearly 700 unrhymed political verses, dating probably from the late 14th C. Emp. Eagle summons all the birds to celebrate his son’s wedding; at the ensuing feast pairs of birds (Stork and Swan, Heron and Crane, etc.) quarrel noisily over their respective qualities (incidentally revealing some practical aspects of everyday life of the time); quiet is restored only when Eagle threatens to set Hawk and Falcon on them. Written at a vernacular level of the language and including some striking compound words, Poulologos (surviving in seven MSS) enjoyed a certain popularity. Like the *Diegesis ton tetraptodon zoon*, it reflects both long-standing Greek traditions (e.g., the fables of AESOP and the Physiologos of Syntipas, combined with accurate observations on bird behavior) and the literary fashions of western Europe (e.g., the “Debate” poems of 15th-C. France or Chaucer’s *Parlement of Fowles*); no direct Western model is known, however. Though the poem’s satirical elements are directed at human foibles as mirrored in the birds’ demeanor, rather than at particular social problems, the disarray among the characters, as in the *Diegesis ton tetrapodon zoon*, probably refers to the upheavals of 14th-C. life.


**POUND.** See Litra.

**POUS** (πούς, pl. πόδες, lit. “foot”), a unit of length. The foot of 31.23 cm, used in the construction of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, seems to have been standard in the eastern half of the empire (with fluctuations between 30.8 and 32 cm). This foot does not derive from the Roman foot of 29.6 cm, but from the common Greek foot of 31.6 cm. It remains unclear whether different regional podes were in use. The *pous* was divided into 16 daktyloi.


**POVERTY.** See Poor.

**POVEST’ VREMENNYCH LET** (lit. “Tale of Bygone Years”), conventionally known as the *Primary Chronicle* or the *Russian Chronicle*, is a hypothetical prototype extrapolated by modern scholars from preserved chronicles (primarily the Laurentian, Hypatian, and the first Novgorod Chronicle). It was compiled at the Kiev Monastery monastery ca. 1115 from diverse native and foreign sources and arranged according to the Constantinopolitan era (but with the years commencing in March rather than September); it is sometimes attributed to the Kievian monk Nestor. The *Povest’ vremennych let* is the main narrative source for the early history of Rus’ and Rus’-Byz. relations. It includes the only extant texts of the 10th-C. Russo-Byz. treaties, accounts of the attacks by the Rus’ on Constantinople, semilegendary tales about Ol’ga and Constantine VII and about Svyatoslav and John Tzimiskes, and a long composite tale of the conversion of Vladimir I and his sack of Cherson. After the mid-11th C., direct references to Byz. are sparser. The *Povest’* is itself evidence for the reception of Byz. literature in Rus’. Particularly frequent use is made of the chronicle of George Hamartolos (O.V. Tvorogov, *TODRL* 28 [1974] 99–113); among other Byz. authorities cited are the vita of Basil the Younger, Epi-phanios of Salamis, pseudo-Methodios, the Alexander Romance (A. Vaillant, BS 18 [1957] 18–38), Malalas, and various chronological, exegetical, and apocryphal fragments (S. Franklin, *OSP* n.s. 15 [1982] 1–27). The compiler of the *Povest’ vremennych let* employs these texts to locate Rus’ in the context of universal history and trace the development of the Rjurikid dynasty.


—S.C.F.

**PRAECEPTA MILITARIA** (Στρατηγική ἐκθέσεως καὶ σύνταξις Νικηφόρου δεσπότου, Presentation and Composition on Warfare by the Emperor Nikephoros), conventional title of a short military treatise of ca.965 preserved in the same 14th-C. MS (Moscow, Hist.Mus. 436/285) that contains the text of Kekaumenos (B.L. Fonkić, VizVrem 31 [1971] 108–20). Its attribution to “the emperor Nikephoros,” meaning Nikephoros II Phokas, is reliable, confirmed by the listing of “Nikephoros” among the sources for the Taktika of Nikephoros Ouranos (ca.1000); moreover, the Praecepta’s strict instructions on military religious services are in full accord with the ascetic character of Nikephoros Phokas. Ouranos rewrote the text, with slight revisions, as chapters 56 to 62 of the Taktika. The theory that chapters 63 to 74 preserve lost chapters of the Moscow text (R. Vári, BZ 30 [1929/30] 49–53; A. Dain, TM 2 [1967] 370f) must be rejected, however; these chapters instead represent Ouranos’s continuation of the Praecepta, including his own contributions, sections from the De re militari, and classical tacticians.

Written for commanders of expeditionary forces (about 25,000 strong) in the East, the text, in six chapters, prescribes the equipment, deployment, and tactics to be used against the Arabs: the infantry in square formation maintained a strong defensive position, while the cavalry, reinforced by kataphraktor, provided the offensive force. The author presents likely battle situations ranging from skirmishes to pitched battles and recommends the proper response to each one, repeatedly stressing reconnaissance, discipline, and caution. The text concludes with brief remarks on camps, spies, and the army’s religious observances.

ED. “Strategika imperatora Nikifora,” ed. Ju.A. Kula-
kovskij, ZapNIIst-fil 8.s (St. Petersburg 1908) 1–58.  


Dagron-Mihaescu, Guerilla 153f.  

—A.K., E.M.

**PRAEFECTUS MILITUM.** During the 5th C. a deputy of the praetorian prefect was appointed to oversee the provisioning of expeditionary armies; this formerly ad hoc position became permanent during the reign of Justinian I. Prokopios records such an officer (choregos) sent out with an army (Wars 1.8,5) and gives the Greek title as eparchos tou stratopedon (3.11.17). A 9th-C. chron-  
icler (Theoph. 146.22–24) also refers to this officer as a quartermaster and overseer of an expeditionary force.


—E.M.

**PRAEPOSITUS SACRI CUBICULI** (πραιπόστοσ τοῦ ἑυσεβεστάτου κοιτῶν), grand chamberlain, and normally the highest-ranking eunuch in the imperial service. The office was introduced to replace the former a cubiculo, probably by Constantine I, although the first securely identified praepositus sacri cubiculi is Eusebios under Constantius II. Originally under the control of the castrensis sacri palatii (E.A. Costa, Byzantion 42 [1972] 358–87), the grand chamberlain managed the imperial bedchamber, wardrobe, and receptions; he had a staff of koubikoularioi. As the emperor’s confidant, the chamberlain was involved in important state affairs, including diplomatic activities; by the end of the 4th C. he replaced the comes rerum privatarum in charge of imperial estates in Cappadocia, and by the 5th C. he was ranked at the level of quaestor. As a powerful eunuch the praepositus encountered considerable resentment from the aristocracy. By the 5th C. the empress had her own chamberlain. After the 6th C. the office of praepositus sacri cubiculi declined; his functions as grand chamber- 

laien were assumed by the parakoimomenos, and the Greek form of the title, praitpositos, was as- 

signed to eunuchs involved primarily in palace ceremony. The title itself disappeared after 1087 (Oikonomides, Listes 300).


—A.K.

**PRAETEXTATUS, more fully Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, a leader, together with Nicomachus Flavianus and Symmachus, of the Roman senatorial aristocracy; born Rome? in 310 (PLRE) or in 320 (Ensslin), died Rome end of 384. Praetex- 

tatus belonged to a noble family that had houses in Rome and an estate near Baiae and governed
the province of Etruria (Matthews, *Aristocracies* 26). The early career of Praetextatus was one customary for an aristocratic youth, but his fervent paganism checked his advancement. Julian appointed him proconsul of Achaia, and as such Praetextatus supported the local curiae (he is praised in inscriptions from Thespiai and Gortys) and resisted the enforcement of antipagan measures (e.g., Valentinian I’s law prohibiting nocturnal sacrifices). The peak of his career occurred in Rome where he was prefect of the city (367–68) and prefect of Italy, Illyricum, and Africa (384). He participated in many senatorial embassies to the emperor. He protected pagan temples, supervised urban construction, and enforced correct measures and weights. The paganism of Praetextatus was probably more political than ideological; he allegedly said to Pope Damasus: “Make me the bishop of the Roman church, and I shall immediately become a Christian” (Jerome, PL 23:377). He was a priest of the Eleusinian cult. Praetextatus’s justice and liberality are attested by Ammianus and Zosimos. His interest in philosophy is indicated by his translation into Latin of Themistios’s paraphrase of Aristotle’s *Analytics* and his composition of a philosophical tract in the manner of Lamblichos; none of these works survives, however. He is the primary speaker in Macrobius’s *Saturnalia*.

---

**PRAETOR (πρατηρίων),** police and judiciary official during the late Roman Empire (G. Wessenberg, *RE* 22 [1954] 1602–05); the seal of the praetor Thomas is dated by Zacos and Vegleyer (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no. 562) to 550–560. In its Greek form *praetor*, the term reappears in the mid-9th-C. *Taktikon* of Uspeiskij as a provincial functionary under the *strategos*. From the end of the 10th C. the term *praetor*, as a synonym for *krites* (judge), designated the civil administrator of a province. Even though in theory the *praetor* was sharply distinguished from the *doux* or *katepano*, both functions were regularly combined in the 12th C. An early 13th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 330.64–74) ascribes to Andronikos I the “revival” of the “praetorian office,” which meant essentially the appointment of new officials and an increase in their salary. The term seems to have fallen out of use after 1204.

According to Ahrweiler (“Administration” 44), Nikephoros II created the office of *praetor* of Constantinople, a high-ranking judiciary official in the capital. Laurent published several seals of the *praetor* of Constantinople (*Corpus* 2:637–40) and suggested that in the 13th–14th C. he was identical with the *praetor* of the demos; Nicholas Sigeros, the last known *praetor* of the demos, held office in 1352–55 before acquiring the title of *megas hetairiarches* (A. Pertusi, *Leoncio Pilato fra Petrarca e Boccaccio* [Venice-Rome 1964] 48f).

**PRAETORIAN PREFECT (praefectus praetorio, ἐπαρχος τῶν πρατηρίων),** commander of the emperor’s bodyguard under the principate, but from the 4th C. an important regional civil functionary responsible for a praetorian prefecture. The praetorian prefect frequently acted as a kind of vice-emperor and many laws were addressed to him. In the Notitia dignitatum one finds a system of four praetorian prefects, for Gallia, Italy, Illyricum, and Oriens; the prefects were attached not to the emperor’s person, but to fixed areas. The traditional view that they formed a college is not valid (A.H.M. Jones, *JRS* 54 [1964] 78–89). Their responsibilities included taxation, justice, the cursum publicum (see *Drimos*), public construction, grain provision, trade, prices, and higher education. The officials of the praetorian prefect’s bureau were called *praefectiani*, divided primarily into two categories: the *schola exceptorum*, which dealt with political and judicial affairs; and *scriiniarii*, who administered primarily financial matters. The office of the praetorian prefect declined in the turmoil of the 7th C., as it came to be rivaled by the *exarchs* in the West and *logothetai* in the East; the last known praetorian prefect is Alexander in 626. According to Stein (*infra*), some aspects of the office were preserved in Illyricum to the 9th C. The link between the praetorian prefect and the *apo eparchon* who are mentioned in the *De ceremoniis* and in some seals (Laurent, *Corpus* 2, nos. 231, 644) is questionable, *apo eparchon* being an honorary title of minor officials.
PRAIPOSITOS. See Praepositus Sacri Cubiculi.

PRAKTIKON (πρακτικόν, from prasso, "to do, to exact," cf. praktor), an inventory listing the taxes, as well as the demesne land and paroikos households held by a single individual or religious institution, that an imperial tax assessor (apographeus, anagrapheus) either copied from imperial cadastral records (thesis or bibilon) or compiled on the spot to be transcribed later into such records and delivered to the holder. While the earliest known praktikon is from 1073 (for Andronikos Doukas), most belong to the first half of the 14th C. and refer to southern Macedonia. Almost all are inventories of the possessions of monasteries, particularly those on Mt. Athos; only six deal with the possessions of laymen.

Praktika commonly contain the following elements: (1) a delimitation (periorkis) of the boundaries of the demesne lands, (2) a listing of the households of paroikoi with brief data concerning their family and property (stasis), (3) a description of the taxes and supplementary charges burdening these lands and people, and (4) the fiscal and other privileges (exemption, exkousia) that were accorded to the property holder. Sometimes certain elements of the praktikon (e.g., periorkis) exist as separate documents.

During the 12th C., reflecting the ascendancy of the paroikia, collections of praktika supplanted the kodex as the primary form of tax records. An act from the reign of Isaac II speaks of "the public praktika-kodikes" (MM 4:325.34–35). The praktikon and the kodex (or isokodex) had several important differences: while the taxpayer in a kodex did not necessarily occupy the properties in his stichos, the peasant listed in a praktikon, as a rule, did; unlike the typical kodex, the praktikon provides data on the type and size of the taxpayer’s properties, his family or his livestock; and most importantly, while the kodex was a fiscal instrument appropriate to an agrarian society composed of middling and small independent landowners, the praktikon developed out of the need to record the property of large landowners with substantial numbers of dependent peasants.

Because of their vast quantity of detail, much of which lends itself to quantitative analysis, praktika are important sources for the agrarian economy, fiscal practices, social structure, and demography of peasant society, and are esp. valuable in those cases when several praktika cover the same village, allowing the investigation of changes over time. Some Latin and Greek praktika survive from the Morea and Venetian Messenia.

PRAKTOR (πράκτωρ), fiscal official of a low rank in the late Roman Empire. The office continued throughout the Byz. period. Vita A of Athanasius of Athos (ed. Noret, par. 10.13–15) equates the praktor with the koumerkarios; according to Dölger (infra), the praktor inherited the functions of the dioiketes, whom he seems to replace after 1109. The first mention of praktor is by an early 9th-C. historian (Nikeph. 51.5–6), who says that before becoming emperor Theodosius III was praktor of “the state taxes” in Atramyttion. The functions of praktores are not clearly defined in the sources; Theophylaktos of Ohrid complains about their activity and represents praktores primarily as tax collectors, but he also indicates that they measured land “by the leaps of the flea.” In the vita of Gregory of DekaLopolis (55.20–24), Merkouras, praktor of the “state treasury,” is described as confiscating the properties of those who died intestate. Litavrin (Bolgaria i Vizantija 301) distinguishes local praktores from those of the central administration.

In various acts of the 10th–12th C. (the earliest of 984: Ivr 1, no. 6.34) praktores are mentioned as the agents of the fisc; a certain Constantine Doukas was doux and praktor of the themes of Boleron, Strymon, and Thessalonike (Lavra 1, no. 64.60–61). Fiscal praktores also had judicial duties, the role of which increased in the 13th C. (Angold, Byz. Government 258–60). In a chrysobull of 1265 praktores are placed between the doux and the katepano (Lavra 2, no. 72.81). Praktores disappear from the acts after 1264, but a model for-
MULARY of the 14th C. indicates that *praktorés* fulfilled the duty of collecting “the state *akrosticha*” (Sathas, MB 6:627.14–18). Ahrweiler (“Smyrnes” 162) suggests that there were *praktorés* of large domains, e.g., John Theolites or Theololites, who served in 1302 or 1307 as representative of the *parakoimomenos* Nestongos (MM 4:259.12).

**LIT.** Dölger, *Beiträge* 71–75. -A.K.

**PRANDIOPRATES** (πρανδιοπράτης), merchant in Syrian textiles. The term is derived from *prandion* (Lat. *branatum*), “ribbon” or “band.” A 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 232.7–10) relates that the Avars wore long hair tied with *prandia*. *Prandia* are included among the luxury goods, such as purple cloth, gold brocades, pepper, and scarlet or “Parthian” leather, that were transported to Cherson and given to selected Pechenegs in payment for services (*De adm. imp.* 6.8–9).

The guild of *prandiopratai* is first mentioned in the 10th-C. *Book of the Eparch* (ch.5), which states that *prandiopratai* dealt in garments imported from Syria, esp. *chareria* (Ar. *harir*) brought from Seleukeia Pieria; the text lists various other Islamic textiles, but the meaning of the words employed is not always clear. *Prandiopratai* were prohibited from selling clothing produced in the empire (a privilege reserved to the *vestiopratai*); they were also forbidden to deal in dyestuffs and perfumes imported from Syria. The textiles had to be stored in a *mitaton*. The guild (*koïnotes tou systematos* of *prandiopratai*) acquired the imported textiles collectively, with the participation (or assistance) of those Syrian merchants who had lived in Constantinople for not less than 10 years. *Prandiopratai* sold their goods in the *Emboles*. In the 12th C. a decree forbade clergy from becoming members of guilds, such as money changers, *prandiopratai*, or wine merchants (Balsamon in Rhalle-Poties, *Syntagma* 4:469.27–29).


**PRAOTES** (πραότης, “gentleness, mildness”) was considered a virtue by the church fathers: John Chrysostom (PG 59:335.53–58) proclaimed it, together with the synonymous *epitekeia*, to be the quality that best distinguishes humans from beasts and enables them to compete with angels. *Praotes* was not, however, common in the lists of imperial virtues and is absent in *prooimia* to the emperors’ charters (Hunger, *Prooimion* 254); *to praon* (“kindness”) is only incidentally mentioned in the *Imperial Statue* of Nikephoros Blemmydes (ed. H. Hunger, I. Ševčenko, ch.61); the 14th-C. paraphrase replaces the word with *to tapeinon* (“humility”). On the other hand, Plethon (PG 160:876AB) lists *praotes* among the virtues and explains its necessity in terms of human limitations: we cannot rule the souls of other men.

In art, the *personification* Praotes is found in imperial contexts. This Antique female figure attends David’s Anointment in the *Paris Psalter*, where she is shown pointing out the proper candidate to Samuel and thus functioning as an agent of divinity. Similarly clad and nimbed but without identifying inscription, she plays the same role in the *Bible of Leo Sakellarios* and in illustration of the Book of *Kings*; she is omitted in other versions of the scene. In the *Heavenly Ladder of John Climacus*, Praotes is described by Anger as his adversary; illuminated versions of this text put Praotes in medieval garb (a sleeved and belted tunic) and show her in the company of such figures as Simplicity and Placidity, who with Praotes embody the virtues taught by the abbot.

-A.K., A.C.

**PRAXAPOSTOLOS** (πραξαπόστολος), a lectionary used only at *Eucharist*, which contains all the non-evangelical New Testament lections except for Revelation, which was not used in the Byz. liturgy. In the *Typikon of the Great Church*, *praxeis* and *apostolos* seem to be two separate books (Mateos, *Typicon* 2:285f, 314). In MSS, *apostolos* usually designates a lectionary containing only the passages actually read during the service, while the term *praxapostolos* refers to a book with the whole New Testament text except for the Four Gospels and Revelation. The text was arranged, like the *Evangelion*, according to the lection system of the mobile cycle of the church calendar, beginning with the readings for Easter. The sequence was as follows: Acts, the Catholic Epistles in their biblical order, then the Pauline and other Epistles in their biblical order. Fully developed *praxapostoloi* also contain, in appendices, the responsories (*prokeimenon*, alleluia) for the whole
church year and calendars with lection tables (kanonarion and synaxarion) for the mobile and fixed cycles, respectively.


PRAYER (εὐχή), in Christian thought, consciously placing oneself in God's presence by raising mind and heart to him, in thought or in word, expressly or interiorly, speaking and/or listening to him speaking in one's heart. Christian prayer, addressed to God or to one of the Trinity, includes praise, blessing, thanks, confession of faith, and petitions. Prayer at set times later evolved into the hours. The "Our Father," Jesus' model prayer (Mt 6:9–13; Lk 11:2–4), and the command to pray without ceasing (1 Th 5:16–18; Col 4:2; Eph 6:18; Lk 18:1), provide the basis for treatises on prayer by the church fathers.

Prayer could be "bodily," involving gestures (see Liturgy); "vocal," the recitation of set formulas (the "Our Father," Kyrie eleison, Psalmody); or "meditation" (melete), a ruminative reading, esp. of the Bible, but also of patristic Florilegia. The life of Jesus, believed to be the only way to the Father, was a preferred object of meditation. The purest form of prayer was contemplation by means of the nous purified of passions through the practice of asceticism and the virtues. Mystical prayer, produced by divine illumination, described as the "ascent of Sinai" or the "light of Tabor" (see Transfiguration), was an apophatic prayer that rejected images to achieve pure contact with God. This "prayer of the heart" was esp. cultivated by the hesychast monks of Athos in the 13th–14th C., though its origins go back to the earliest days of monasticism.

The only prayer books in this time of widespread illiteracy were the liturgical books used by the clergy and monks. The Psalter, which the monks knew by heart, was the privileged monastic prayerbook. For Byz. laity, prayer was chiefly "bodily" and liturgical. In addition to Sunday worship, they participated in feasts and vigils, and, less frequently, the hours.


PREDESTINATION (προθεσία) is God's universal foreknowledge or his eternally conceived plan, according to which he leads humans to their supernatural end. In a narrow sense, predestination or predetermination is the mystery of God's judgment: which mortals will be doomed to hell and which will be liberated and admitted to paradise. Origen (ed. J.A.F. Gregg, JThSt 3 [1902] 240f) distinguishes proorismos (predetermination) and prothesis as two stages of this mystery: proorismos is a design formed on the basis of God's plan (ennoemata), prothesis is a subsequent step. Connected with the concept of grace, predestination was its preparation, grace being the bestowal of the gift itself. The Greek fathers usually considered salvation as the resultant force of two factors: predestination/grace on the one hand, human free will on the other. Salvation comes, says John Chrysostom (PG 62:12.49–53), "neither from grace (agape) alone nor from our virtue, but from them both... Had it been accounted for only by our virtue, then [Christ's] coming and the whole [mystery of] oikonomia would have been superfluous... Nobody could be saved if grace did not exist." In general, the Greek fathers did not pay much attention to this problem, although John of Damascus dwelt on it in his polemics against the Manicheans (ed. Kotter, Schriften 4:393f), defining proorismos as judgment and sentence of future actions.

The problem of predestination is of greater concern in Augustine's attack on Pelagianism: the Pelagians denied the necessity of supernatural grace and connected salvation with man's own efforts, whereas in Augustine's doctrine God predetermines mankind into two groups, the virtuous and the sinners, the chosen and the damned, and thus brings to realization his foreknown design of historical development.


PREFECTURE, office and sphere of authority of a praefectus, a late Roman functionary, ranging from the highest (praetorian prefect, urban prefect) to local governors (prefect of Egypt), fiscal officials (prefect of the Annona), police of-
fficers (prefect of the night watch, *nykteparchos*), and some military commanders (*praefectus militum*). —A.K.

**PREFIGURATION** (*τύπος*, lit. “form, type”), a vehicle of *exegeisis* for the purpose of establishing Old Testament prototypes of the events of the New Testament. Thus, according to Cyril of Jerusalem (PG 33:849AB), JONAH being swallowed by a great fish was the *typos* of Christ descending into Hell, to “the heart of the earth.” Adam, Moses, and Joshua were also interpreted in *typology* as prefigurations of Christ. The concept of prefiguration was extended to nonbiblical personalities (Emp. Nero as the *typos* of Antichrist) and to objects and actions (*baptism* as a prefiguration of salvation). The idea of prefiguration contributed much to the development of Byz. allegorical and symbolic vision of the world.

In art the most important prefigurations were those of the Virgin. Often cited as the new Eve, the Virgin was also likened to numerous other Old Testament figures and even objects. Many of these parallels evolved from Old Testament readings in the liturgies of her feasts: the high priests before the altar (Ezek 43:27–44:3, read on all her feasts), Jacob’s Ladder, and Wisdom building herself a temple (Gen 28:10–17, Pr 9:1, read on the feasts of the *Birth of the Virgin* and her *Dormition*), the *Burning Bush* (Ex 3:1–8, read for the *Annunciation*), the rod from Jesse’s root (Is 11:1–9, read on Christmas Eve), and the tabernacle of Moses as well as the individual objects brought into the Holy of Holies—the Ark of the Covenant, the *stamnos* filled with manna, the altar for incense that fills the universe with sweet odor, the table for the bread, the seven-branched candlestick (Ex 25–27, 1 Kg 8:1–6, Heb 9:1–7, read for the feast of the *Presentation of the Virgin*).

Other parallels emerge from theological literature: Moses’ staff (Ex 4:2–4), the blossoming rod of Aaron (Num 17:8), Balaam and the star (Num 24:17–19), Gideon’s fleece (Jg 6:36–40), the tongs with the live coal (Is 6:1–8), the closed gate (Ezek 44:2), Mount Sion and the rock that fell from it (Ps 68:16, Dan 2:31–35), and Solomon’s bed (S of S 3:7–8). Though used in literature since the 4th C., these acquire visual form only from the 9th C. onward, first in icons (*Soteriou, Eikones*, pl.54) and MSS: marginal *Psalters* (Mount Sion; Gideon’s fleece at Ps 72), the Bible of LEO SAKELLARIOS (Ark of the Covenant), a Kosmas Indikopleustes MS formerly in Smyrna (tabernacle of Moses), illustrated homilies of JAMES OF KOKINOBAPHOS (Eve, Jacob’s ladder, Moses’ staff and the bush, Aaron’s rod, Gideon’s fleece, Solomon’s bed). These images enter monumental painting in the Palaiologan period, usually in the narthex programs (*Ohrid, Sv. Kliment; Hagia Sophia, Trebizond*), but in the naos at Polško (G. Babić, *CahArch* 27 [1978] 163–78) and in the funerary *parekklesion* at the CHORA.


**PREPENDOULIA.** See *Crown*.

**PRESANCTIFIED, LITURGY OF THE (λειτουργία τῶν προπιγματίων*), a communion service appended to *vespers*, for use on days when there is no *Eucharist*. “Presanctified” gifts—eucharistic gifts that have been consecrated at an earlier Eucharist—were reserved for such occasions. The usage results from the practice of prohibiting the Eucharist, deemed festive, on weekdays during Lent (Council of Laodikeia, par.49, Mansi 2:571 D). Presanctified followed vespers because only one meal, to be consumed in the evening, was allowed those who were fasting, and even communion would break this fast. Thus the full Eucharist, a morning service, could not be celebrated on fast days, and canon 52 of the Council in *Trullo* orders Presanctified to be substituted for it on all days of Lent except Saturdays and Sundays and on the feast of the Annunciation (Mansi 11:968B–C). This is the usage in the *Typikon of the Great Church* (Mateos, *Typikon* 2:315f).

A passage in the *Chronicon Paschale* regarding the year 615 (705.21) is the earliest witness to the use of the Presanctified rite in Constantinople. With the introduction of the *Sabaitic Typika* into the monasteries of Constantinople, elements of Jerusalem vespers—for example, the Phos hilaron—are synthesized with those of Constantinopolitan vespers in the first part of Presanctified to form a hybrid rite.

The attribution of Byz. Presanctified to Pope Gregory I the Great does not antedate the 12th C. The short *diataxis* of the Presanctified (PG
99:1687–90) attributed to Theodore of Studios is, in its present redaction, later in date.

The *typika*, the hour preceding *none*, was originally a Palestinian monastic Presanctified communion service for days without the full liturgy, first found in the 9th-C. *Horologion* MS Sinai gr. 863 (J. Mateos in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, vol. 3 [Vatican 1964] 54f). The Stoudite *typika* borrowed this service, but, since Constantinople already had its own Presanctified service, *antidoron* (blessed but unconsecrated *prophora*) was substituted for communion—*la hagia dora*—at the *typika*, hence its name, “in place of the gift.” By the 11th C., the *typika* was split in two and added to the beginning and end of the Eucharist (*Mateos, La parole 68–71*).


PRESBEUTIKOS. See Basilikos Logos.

PRESBYS HIPPOSITES. See Old Knight.

PRESENTATION OF CHRIST. See Hypapante.

PRESENTATION OF THE VIRGIN (εἰσόδος τῆς Θεοτόκου) in the Temple, one of five Marian Great Feasts, celebrated 21 Nov. It is based not on the Bible, but on New Testament *apocrypha*—the Gospel of pseudo-Matthew 4 and, esp., the *Protoevangelion of James* (chs. 7–8)—that apply to Mary the Jewish custom (Lev 12:2–8) of presenting a male or female child in the temple after birth. The Presentation falls within the pre-Nativity lent (15 Nov.–24 Dec.) and foreshadows the Nativity. The poetry for the feast stresses the theme of Mary as the true temple and “God-bearer” (*theotokos*); the Ark of the Covenant; and the candelabrum bearing Jesus, the light of the world.

Though believed to originate in Jerusalem in the dedication of the Nea (New St. Mary) church under Justinian I (21 Nov. 543), the feast is not found in the Jerusalem *lectionaries* through the 8th C. It appears in Constantinople in the *Typhikon of the Great Church* (Mateos, *Typicon 1:110f*) and in the *Menologion of Basil II* (p.198). In this period, the emperor regularly celebrated the feast in the Church of the Chalkoprateia (*Synax. CP*, 244.33–34); in the 14th C. he went to the Peribleptos monastery instead (pseudo-*Kod. 243.9–12*). Manuel I Komnenos included the Presentation in a list of holidays (*Reg 2*, no.1466). The West received the feast from Byz., apparently via Hungary, ca.1200 (M. Zalan, *EphLit* 41 [1927] 188f).

Representation in Art. The standard composition—first attested in a 10th-C. ivory in Berlin (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, *Elfenbeinskulpt. III*, no.11)—shows a procession consisting of the Virgin’s parents, seven candle-bearing maidens, and the little Virgin. The priest, Zacharias, stands beneath the altar ciborium to receive her, and behind him the Virgin appears again, now seated in the sanctuary receiving bread from an angel (*Protoevangelion of James*, ch.8:1). Varying little in iconography, the scene appears in liturgical MSS, the MSS of *James of Kokkinobaphos*, and monumental painting, where it is found either in the narthex as at DAPHNI or in the naos (LAGOUDERA).


PRESLAV, GREAT (Мегалη Πρεσβλάβα), Bulgarian city on the left bank of the river Tiča (Kamčija), immediately south of modern Preslav, in northeastern Bulgaria. The name is Slavic (Перјељав, “inheritor of glory”?). Founded by Symeon of Bulgaria at the end of the 9th C. as the second capital of Bulgaria, Preslav is on the site of a 6th-C. Roman fortress. Extensive building went on for some 30 years. Preslav consisted of an outer city surrounded by massive earthworks, and an inner or royal city surrounded by a stone wall and containing a palace, administrative buildings, and churches. The outer city held many substantial dwellings, churches (esp. the Round Church, a major monument of Bulgarian art), monasteries, and industrial premises. Excavations have revealed much sculptured decoration, floor and wall mosaics, and decorative ceramics. In a suburb on the right bank of the Tiča were two large monasteries and several churches, and 1.5 km southeast of the city was an *ergasterion* (workshop) that produced decorative tiles. Preslav was captured in 969 by Svjatoslav of Kiev and in 971 by John
I Tzimiskes, who destroyed much of the city and renamed it Ioannopolis. It was reoccupied by the Bulgarians in ca.986 and by the Byz. by ca.1000. Under the Second Bulgarian Empire it remained an important city until its capture by the Ottoman Turks in 1388.


—R.B.

PRESLAV, LITTLE (Προεσθλαβίτζα, Russ. Perejaslavets), Bulgarian city at the mouth of the Danube. Prince Svjatoslav of Kiev considered it an important entrepot for trade between eastern and central Europe and the Byz. Empire, and, perhaps encouraged by Nikephoros II Phokas, proposed in 968/9 to move his residence from Kiev to Little Preslav. It played an important role in the Russo-Byz. conflict of 967–71, but John I Tzimiskes finally recaptured it. I. Jordanov (Ve-kove 12.1 [1983] 58–62) suggests, on the basis of seals found at Great Preslav, that it was renamed Theodoropolis after 971; 11th-C. seals, however, record strategoi and kommerkiarioi of Presvlhabitza, and Skylitzes reports that a Byz. army recaptured Mikra Presvlhaba ca.1000. The last mentions of Little Preslav are in Idrisi and in sailors' maps (portulans). The city appears to have been in decline in the 12th C. For a short time after 971 Little Preslav may have been the administrative center of the katepanate of Mesopotamia tes Dyseos.


—R.B.

PRESPA (Πρεσπα), the name of two adjoining lakes in western Macedonia. Great Prespa Lake is situated at the intersection of the borders of modern Yugoslavia, Greece, and Albania, with most of it lying within Yugoslavia. Little Prespa Lake, separated from the larger body of water by a narrow sand spit, is predominantly in Greece but extends into Albania. A town at Prespa is first attested at the end of the 10th C., when Samuel of Bulgaria temporarily established his residence there and transferred the relics of St. Achilles from Lariissa to Prespa (Skyl. 330.5–9). When the Byz. quelled the rebellion of the Bulgarian George Voitech (died 1073), the German and Norman mercenaries destroyed Samuel's palace in Prespa. The town remained an administrative and ecclesiastical center; however, the letter that Theophylaktos of Ohrid addressed to an archon of Prespa in 1103 (ed. P. Gautier, no.108) requesting that he make sure there was sufficient provision of food for a synod meeting there suggests difficult living conditions. Late Byz. writers (Akropolites, Pachymeres, Gregoras) infrequently mention Prespa (Lj. Maksimovic in Vizlizvori 6:15, n.18).

The date of the now-ruined basilica of St. Achilles on the island of that name in Little Prespa Lake is disputed, but its original construction probably goes back to the time of Samuel. It had three aisles, with nave arcades supporting galleries. In the apse were painted inscriptions (now lost) naming 14 metropolitan seats subject to the archbishop of Prespa (A. Grabar, ZRVI 8.2 [1964] 163–66), and (on a later layer) a bold painted inscription in honor of the Virgin around the base of the conch. Other churches on or near Little and Great Prespa lakes possess frescoes of the 13th and 14th C. (N. Moutsopoulos, The Churches of the Prefecture of Florina [Thessalonike 1966] 9–13).


—A.K., N.P.S.

PRICE EDICT (edictum de pretiis), issued by DIOCLETIAN between 20 Nov. and 9 Dec. 301 (E. Rutschenbusch, ZPapEpig 26 [1977] 193), law that set maximum prices for a wide variety of goods and services, with severe penalties for disobedience. The Latin and Greek texts of the edict are known only from inscriptions found in Asia Minor, Egypt, Cyrenaica, Greece, and Italy; Giachcro (infra) counts 132 fragments, some relatively complete, such as those from Stratonicaea in Caria, Aix-en-Provence (of Egyptian prove-
nance), and Aezanoi. The edict was an attempt to control inflation by imperial fiat. No copies have been found in the West, and it seems that neither Maximian nor Constantius Chlorus published it in their territory. Even in the East it apparently had little effect. Some local governors put forth modified versions; thus Fulvius Aesticus, governor of Caria, issued an order which echoes many phrases of Diocletian’s preface, but emphasizes a fair rather than a maximum price (M. Crawford, J. Reynolds, JRS 65 [1975] 162). The edict is an important source for the study of coinage, prices, industry, trade, and language ca. 300.


PRICES are mentioned in various sources, some of which (such as saints’ vitae) are not reliable, while others (such as chronicles) deal with exceptional cases of inflation. Papyri have abundant information, whereas the late Byz. documents convey almost exclusively data concerning immovable property; even this documentary evidence is tenuous since the quality of the object is rarely indicated.

It is not quite clear which forces, beside market supply and demand, regulated prices. Diocletian’s PRICE EDICT demonstrates an attempt of the state to control prices, and state MONOPOLIES provided a powerful means for such regulation. The idea of the JUST PRICE was presumably operable and not only with regard to land. Moral strictures could be effective: the story is told of a shoemaker who was irritated when a dealer sold his product for a price three times higher than the shoemaker considered just (F. Halkin, Le Corpus Athénien de S. Pachôme [Geneva 1982] 84, par. 23). It is plausible to hypothesize that social status also influenced the price of immovables: thus, lords fixed arbitrary prices when buying the lands of their PAROIKIoi, or lands sold to religious institutions could go for reduced prices (Kazhdan, Agrarnye otnošeniya 156–62).

A general impression is that after the great devaluation of the 3rd C. prices remained relatively constant until the 11th C. G. Mickwitz (Aegyptus 13 [1933] 103), however, calculates that in late Roman Egypt prices declined 30 percent, a development that he connects with the diminishing amount of gold in circulation. Prices vacillated during natural disasters (droughts, severe winters, etc.), sieges, or conscious trade speculation. Chronicles preserve complaints about rising prices under Basil I and Nikephoros II; they seem to have skyrocketed in the mid-11th C. Alexios I managed to restrain inflation, but it again became substantial in the 14th C. The causes of inflation are not yet clear: besides negative factors such as military defeats or debasement of coinage, intensification of the exchange of goods could also contribute to the destabilization of prices. At any rate, the Byz. government finally gave up its attempts to control the level of prices, WAGES, and PROFIT in general.


PRIENE (Πρήνη), town of the Aegean region of Asia Minor near MILETOS whose development can be followed primarily from the archaeological evidence. During late antiquity, although a cathedral church was built, most of the city was in decline, with small houses occupying the public buildings and overriding the regular urban plan. The ancient site was apparently abandoned in the late 7th C. when Priene withdrew to its high fortified acropolis. The lower city was reoccupied during the 11th–13th C. By then Priene was known as Sampson (Σαμφών), a name that also appears in al-Dārī. Sampson was center of an episkēpsis in 1204; it was the capital of the ephemeral state of Sabbas Asidenos, 1204–08. Remains indicate that it consisted of the fortress on the acropolis (rebuilt in the 12th and 13th C.) and a small fort in the lower town with scattered habitations outside its walls. Priene was a suffragan bishopric of Ephesus.

PRIEST (πρεσβύτερος, presbyteros, "elder, venerable man"), originally a member of the council of elders, or "senate," surrounding the bishop. Although the terms "priest" and "bishop" (episkopos) seem to be interchangeable in the New Testament (Titus 1:5–7), the bishop appears as the only head of each community and as the celebrant of the eucharist, with priests acting as advisers, teachers, and administrators. The priest, however, was superior to the deacon (the lowest order among the clergy). By the 4th C. in both town and countryside, resident presbyters were being put in charge of parishes then springing up with the expansion of Christianity and became normal celebrants of the eucharist. Despite this "division of labor," the priest was assigned to his parish by the bishop and was entirely under his jurisdiction. In the main, he could celebrate the liturgy or administer baptism only in churches (katholikai ekklesiai) immediately dependent on the bishop, rather than in private chapels of eukteria (Council in Trullo, canons 31, 59). Permission to officiate in the latter was eventually granted, however.

Although the priest was an influential member of Byz. society, his social position and material status varied (cf. B. Ferjančić, ZRVI 22 [1989] 59–117). His salary as a rule came from the bishop or from the properties of the episcopal district to which he was assigned. In the case of private churches, the founder alone was responsible for the priest's livelihood. This was equally the case for those who were or lived as dependent peasants (paroikoi) on the estate of a wealthy landowner or monastery. Although formal education or training was unknown, knowledge of the faith and the canons and a blameless moral life were considered essential for ordination (Justinian I, no.6, 123). The minimum age of entry into the priesthood, from which women were excluded (PG 104:1025C), was fixed at 30 (Justinian, nov.123; Trullo, canon 14). Unlike in the West, celibacy was never obligatory for priests. Their principal vestments were the sticharion, epi-trachilion, zone (see belt), phelonion, and, from the 12th C., the epimanika and epigonia.


PRIEST OF DIOCLEIA, anonymous southern Slavic author of a Chronicle (Letopis) recounting the history, partly legendary, of southern Dalmatia and neighboring lands from the 6th to 12th C.; fl. mid-12th C. Originally written in Church Slavonic, the Chronicle survives only in a 16th-C. Latin translation and an Italian version of that translation. Its sources are largely local legend, but they include a lost Life of Prince Vladimir of Zeta and a forged bull of Pope Callistus II. The Chronicle is a valuable, if not always reliable, source for the early medieval history of the Dalmatian cities, and also for the last decades of the First Bulgarian Empire and the efforts of Tsar Samuel of Bulgaria to form an anti-Byz. alliance with Serbian principalities.

Ed. Letopis popa Dukljana, ed. F. Stišić (Belgrade-Zagreb 1928).


PRILEP (Πρίλαπος), a stronghold, phourion (Skl. 349-35), or asty (Akropol. 92.1, 149.6) in western Macedonia, probably northwest of modern Prilep (Soulis, Dušan 223, n.154). It is first mentioned in connection with the war of 1014, when Basil II took it from Samuel of Bulgaria. In 1041, when Michael IV was crushing Deljan's revolt, Manuel Ibatzes tried to stop the emperor's army at Prilep but failed. Dobromir Chrysos and his father-in-law, Manuel Kamyzes, occupied Prilep, but in 1292 Alexis III recaptured the fortress (Nik.Chon. 535-90). Prilep played an important role in the conflicts of the 13th C.: Epiros, Bulgaria, and Nicaea in turn obtained it. Prilep was one of the fortified Byz. cities on the Serbian border ca.1300. In 1321 Andronikos II appointed the protostrator Synadenos governor of "the eparchia of Prillapos" (Kantak. 1:87.1). The district remained in Byz. hands until the treaty with Stefan Uroš IV Dušan in 1334 (Reg 4, no.2815), which gave Prilep to the Serbians. Vukašin possessed it ca.1350, and after his death Prilep became the capital of the princ-
pality of Vukašin’s son Marko. Prilep fell under Turkish domination in 1385 (Soulis, Dušan 156) or 1395 (Fine, Late Balkans 424). Byz. coins of the 12th to 14th C. have been found in the region.

LIT. J. Hadji-Vasiljević, Prilep i njegova okolina (Belgrade 1902). B. Babić, Materijalna kultura na makedonskim Sloveni vo svetinata na arheološko istražuvanje vo Prilep (Prilep 1986).

—A.K.

PRIMACY of the papacy, phrase that refers to the supreme authority of the pope of Rome over all bishops. The idea of primacy developed slowly; in the 4th C. the bishop of Rome was considered an equal of the principal Eastern bishops, such as those of Alexandria and Antioch. The growth of Constantinople as an administrative and ecclesiastical center and the rivalry between Constantinople and Alexandria allowed Rome to adopt the position of mediator and to reach the highest rung in the PENTARCHY, with Constantinople assuming the second rank, as seen at the Council of Constantinople in 381 and esp. in canon 28 of the Council of Chalcidon in 451. At the same time, the theory of Roman primacy developed in the 5th C. under Popes Leo I and Gelasius (A.S. McGrade, Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History 7 [1970] 1–45), esp. during the AKALIAN SCHISM.

The cornerstone of the primacy theory was the belief that the Roman church was founded by the apostles Peter and Paul and that the pope was a successor to Peter. From Peter the pope was understood to inherit absolute power, plenitudo potestatis, which at first involved only the church, since the emperor was considered the total master of secular affairs. From the 8th C. onward, however, the popes expanded the idea of primacy to encompass political relations—first with the Byz. emperor, then the German king (H.M. Klinkenberg, ZSavKan 72 [1955] 1–57). The political independence of the papal state was supported by the legend of Constantine I the Great’s baptism by Pope Silvester, who was allegedly rewarded with the DONATION OF CONSTANTINE. The patriarchate of Constantinople opposed the concept of Roman primacy—at first actively, as in the 6th and 7th C. when the bishops of Constantinople claimed the title of ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH; then, in the 9th C., during the dispute between Pope Nicholas I and Patr. Photios, when the latter insisted on the equality of both sees. From the 11th C. onward, the Byz. patriarchs adopted a defensive stance, protecting the independence of Constantinople from subjugation to Rome (J. Darrouzès, REB 23 [1965] 42–88). After 1204 and the split of the two churches, Rome always made recognition of papal primacy a condition of UNION OF THE CHURCHES and of Western military assistance.


—A.K.

PRIMARY CHRONICLE. See Povest’ VREMENNYCH LET.

PRIMIKERIOS (πριμικήριος, Lat. primicerius, “the one whose name stands first on the wax tablets”), the senior member of any group of functionaries (SOUĐA 2286, ed. Adler, 4:195). The term was in use from the late Roman period until the end of Byz. in various spheres.

1. Military primikerioi. These included esp. the palatine guards, primicerii of the domestici, of the scholae, and so on; after the late Roman period there were primikerioi of the vestiaritai, man-glabitai, Vardariotai, and Vrangians.

2. Courtiers, primarily eunuchs. The primicerius sacri cubiculi, mentioned in the Notitia dignitatum, appears in the taktika as primikerios of the koubouleion; from the time of Alexios I onward, there was the post of primikerios of the aule (court). Primikerioi are often represented on seals combining their duties with certain civil services connected with the emperor, e.g., the chiefs of the koiton, the eidikon, and the vestiarion.

3. Civil primikerioi. These included primarily primikerioi of the notaries, who in the Book of the Eparch are called primikerioi of the taboularioi.

4. Ecclesiastical primikerioi. Darrouzès (Offkia 356) distinguishes ecclesiastical primikerioi of notaries from those of taboularioi; primikerioi of taboularioi are also known from several documents of the metropolitan chancery in Serres of ca. 1300 (e.g., Koutloum., no.4; Espig., no.9; Lavra 2, no.102); there were also primikerioi of anagnostai, singers, and other groups.
The difference between the office and the title is not always clear. By the end of the 11th C. the title of *megas primikerios* was introduced; the first known holder was Tattikos. According to the 14th-C. pseudo-Kodinos, *megas primikerios* was one of the highest titles, above the *megas konostavlos* and *megas logothetes*, but in the 15th C. George Sphrantzes considered the title inadequate, although he was satisfied with that of *megas logothetes*. There were *primikerioi* at the court of the Morea.


PRINCES’ ISLANDS (Πριγκίπες νήσου in *SynaxCP* 158,26), nine islands in the Sea of Marmara; the largest are Prote, Antigone, Chalke, and Prinkipo, and the smaller ones Plate, Oreia, Pita, Niandros, and Terebinthos. They were an important monastic retreat—some 12 monasteries from the Byz. period are known—and a place of exile, esp. in the 9th and 10th C. In 809 Theodore of Studios was exiled by Nikephoros I to Chalke and his brother Joseph to Prote. In 813 Michael I Rangabe and his two sons were exiled to Prote, and in 820 Michael II sent Theodosia, widow of Leo V, and her four sons to Prote—she was later transferred with her son Basil to Chalke. In 821 the future patriarch Methodios I was exiled to Antigone, where he was supposedly imprisoned in a cave under terrible conditions. The islands were sacked by the Rus’ in 860; Photios may have been responsible for the subsequent restoration of the monasteries. In 921 Romanos I Lekapenos banished several of his enemies to a monastery on Antigone, and in 944 the emperor was himself exiled to Prote, where he died; in 945 his sons followed him to the islands and then on to other places of exile. In 970 John I Tzimiskes exiled the empress Theophano to Prote and in 1071 Romanos IV Diogenes was mutilated and sent to Prote, where he soon died in a monastery he had founded.

Soldiers of the Fourth Crusade sacked the islands in 1204 and Latin pirates from Crete and Euboea again burned and pillaged them in 1302. In 1412 the fleet of Manuel II defeated a Turkish squadron in the waters north of Chalke. The islands were taken by the Ottomans on 17 April 1453, during the siege of Constantinople.

The Princes’ Islands contain the remains of many monasteries, most of them in ruined condition. On Prote are the ruins of the monastery founded by Romanos IV and some traces of another monastery on the site of the modern Church of the Virgin in the lower town. At the summit of Antigone are the remains of a monastery of Christ (or the Transfiguration), possibly dating from the 9th C.; in the lower town are the ruins of a large cistern. On Chalke is the Church of the Virgin Kamarotissa, a tetraconch building of Constantinopolitan type now assigned to the 11th–12th C. (A. Pasadakis, *ArchEph* [1971] 1–55), although previously dated in the 14th C. The monastery of the Holy Trinity on Chalke has been identified by some as a monastery known to have existed in the early 9th C. and perhaps restored by Photios. The rich MS collections of these latter monasteries were transferred to the Library of the Greek Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul in 1936 (E. Tsakopoulos, *Periographikos katalogos ton cheirographon tes bibliothekes tou oikoumenikou Patriarcheiaou*, vols. 1–2 [Istanbul 1953–56]).


PRINKIPS CHEILAS. See Cheilas.

PRISCIAN, Latin poet and grammarian; born Caesarea (in Mauritania), died Constantinople probably after 530. He studied in Constantinople under a certain Theoktistos and became a teacher of Latin grammar. The most important of his several grammatical works is the *Grammatical Institutions*, 18 voluminous books dedicated to a consul and patrikios named Julian, dealing with accidence and syntax and rich in quotations from early Latin literature; it was widely influential in the Middle Ages. His other grammatical studies included accent and meter, with particular attention to Terence and Vergil; three of these are dedicated to Symmachus, who had been consul in 485.

Priscian also wrote two hexameter poems. One is a translation/adaptation of the *Description of the World* by Dionysios Periegetes, the other a panegyric on Emp. Anastasios I. The panegyric is usually dated between 503 and 513, with Al. Cameron (*GRBS* 15 [1974] 313–16) preferring the former date, while its most recent editor, Chauvet (*infra* 98–107) argues that 513 is more likely. The
eulogy of Anastasios emphasizes his struggle against the Isaurians and contains invective against certain curias for their cruelty to peasants, against corrupt magistrates, and against barbarians. Overall, Priscian’s works argue for a continued Latin-reading audience in the East in the early 6th C.; if, as some think, his addressee Julian is JULIAN THE EGYPTIAN, the poet of the Greek Anthology, a healthy cultural and linguistic interchange is also implied.

Priscian the grammarian is to be distinguished from his homonymous contemporary, the philosopher Priscian of Lydia, who was a student of Damaskios, and one of the philosophers who sought refuge in Persia after Justinian I closed the Academy of Athens.


PRISCILLIAN, bishop of Avila, Spain; born between ca.335 and 345, died Trier 385 or more probably summer 386 (Chadwick, infra 137). Priscillian came into conflict with Spanish bishops, because he expounded Eastern-style asceticism. Condemned at the Synod of Saragossa in 380, he tried fruitlessly to gain the support of Pope Damasus I (366–84) and Ambrose of Milan. Even less successful was his attempt to obtain assistance from the usurper Maximus: after being condemned for Manichaeanism and involvement in black magic, Priscillian was executed. This first execution of a Christian heretic created a wave of protest, even by churchmen such as Ambrose who had refused to support Priscillian. Priscillian’s adherents were active in Spain and Gaul in the 5th C., but his tenets were little known in the East.

Data about Priscillian’s literary oeuvre and teaching are questionable. A parchment codex of the 5th–6th C. in the University of Würzburg contains Priscillianist writings, but it is unclear whether they are his own work or those of his followers. It is also debatable whether he actually propagated the heretical distinctions that were ascribed to him by his adversaries: a distinction between the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New Testament; emphasis on the divine nature of the soul; denial of the perfect humanity of Christ; condemnation of marriage; engaging in the practice of magic and astrology. Many of these accusations resemble those made against Gnosticism and Manichaeanism.


PRISKOS (Πρίσκος), rhetorician at Constantinople and writer; born Panion between 410 and 420, died after 472. In 449, he went unofficially (?) on an embassy to ATTILA the Hun. Then after an interlude in Rome, he traveled to Egypt, visiting Alexandria and the Thebaid. He last appears ca.456 in the East, attached to the staff of Ulpian as Marcian’s magister officiorum. Priskos’s History of Byzantium (perhaps not the original title) survives only in fragments. Its scope is uncertain; he may have written a separate account of Attila. Very influential in Byz., it was much used in the Excerpta de legationibus (see EXCEPTRA) and cited by authors from Evagrios Scholastikos (commending its elegance and erudition) to the Souda; Cassiodorus and thereby Jordanes also exploited it. Priskos can be too rhetorical, his military narratives (esp. sieges) often owing more to literature than to reality. His attitudes, e.g., contempt for barbarians, are often traditional, but strong personal likes and dislikes often make him inconsistent. His meeting with a Greek defector provokes a debate over the respective qualities of justice and life in Byz. and among the barbarians. This occurs in his long account (fr.11) of the embassy to Attila, a narrative rich in ethnographic detail. Western events were evidently less amply treated, but Priskos shows himself well aware of the collapse of the old Roman Empire.


PRISKOS (Patr. Nikephoros 1 calls him Krispos), general; died after 612. Priskos was magister militum under Maurice, who sent him to replace Philippikos in 588; a soldiers’ mutiny forced Priskos to resign. In 592 the emperor put Priskos in
PRISONERS, EXCHANGES OF (ἀλλάγια). Soldiers or civilians taken prisoner by an army were often sold into slavery. In Byz., their relatives usually had to find the funds and make the arrangements for buying them back. Byz. and the Arabs, however, arranged for exchanges of the very numerous prisoners captured in the course of the continuous raids and counterraid of the 9th—10th C. From 844 to 946, ten such exchanges are attested. They were carried out on the Cilician frontier at the river Lamis (west of Tarsos): during a truce, prisoners of either side, one by one, walked across a bridge to liberty and their coreligionists. Another such exchange is mentioned in 966, near Samosata. The exchanges, which involved several thousand prisoners each time, were usually peaceful (only in 905 was the exchange interrupted by the sudden departure of the Byz., probably motivated by a revolt in the empire). The unexchanged prisoners were bought back by the authorities of their country or exchanged later with liberated slaves.


- N.O.

PRISONERS OF WAR (αἰχμαλωτοί) were commonly paraded in triumphal processions (e.g., McCormick, Eternal Victory 147f); thereafter they were normally sold into captivity or retained in prison for ransom or exchange. A novel of John I Tzimiskes regulates the purchase and resale of prisoners by soldiers (Zepos, Jus 1:257f). During the 9th and 10th C., exchanges of captives (see PRISONERS, EXCHANGES OF) between Byz. and Arabs took place with a certain regularity. In other cases, esp. in times of military crisis, foreign prisoners of war might be invited to join the imperial army, and De ceremoniis (De cer. 695.3–14) outlines a procedure whereby Muslim prisoners of war who converted to Orthodoxy were introduced into Byz. households. While Byz. might occasionally make a noble gesture of releasing captives without ransom, examples of cruel treatment of prisoners of war—such as execution or mass blinding—are also attested.

The legal rights of Byz. captured by the enemy were suspended. In classical Roman law both their marriages and wills were voided; over the centuries, however, some of these provisions underwent modification: Justinianic legislation ruled that marriages continued in force as long as a captive spouse was known to be alive; Leo VI in novel 40 allowed prisoners of war to draw up wills while in confinement and in novel 33 prohibited wives of prisoners of war from remarrying in their absence. The same emperor permitted children of two captives to inherit regardless of whether their parents died free or in captivity.

In art prisoners of war are depicted as bound or in proskynesis, as in the Joshua Roll. Exhibited in the Hippodrome, they were a standard feature of imperial triumphs. The theme of captivity was often treated in Byz. literature and formed a topos
of the romance, depicting the separation of lovers taken captive. The cruelty of captors and physical sufferings of captives are described in historical texts (e.g., Theodosios the Monk, John KAMNiates) whereas hagiographers and authors of romances stressed the moral problem—the difficulty of preserving chastity or Christian faith while in captivity. The stories of benefactors ransoming people from captivity and of miraculous liberation of captives by saints (St. Nicholas of Myra, St. George, and others) are common in saints’ vitae. The hagiographer of Neilos of Rossano, however, censured a metropolitan of Calabria who managed to bring many captives from Africa—Neilos reportedly was cross with the metropolitan for his negotiations with the Arabs (AASS Sept. 7:301A).

Lit. L. Amirante, “Appunti per la storia della redemp


—A.J.C., A.C., A.K.

**PRIZREN** (Πριζέριανα), town in modern Yugoslavia, district of Kosovo and Metohija, known from the early 11th C. as a bishopric in Bulgaria and site of a cathedral church. In 1072 it was a center of the revolt of George Vojtech against Byz. (SkylCont 163.13–19). The Serbs, Byz., and Bulgarians disputed control over Prizren during the second half of the 12th and in the 13th C., but in the 14th C. it was one of the most important economic and political centers of the Serbian state: an annual fair was held there, and numerous merchants (Latin, Greek, traders from Dubrovnik, etc.) came to the town. Some Serbian coins were minted in Prizren, and an episcopal see was established there.

**Church of the Virgin Jleviska** (Bogorodica Jleviska). Cathedral church of the bishops of Serbia from the 13th C., the original structure was a three-aisled basilica of the 10th C. (a coin of Romanos I Lekapenos was found in excavations). This building was frescoed in the 13th C.; a figure of the Virgin Eleousa holding Christ (who is called “the one who feeds”) and some Miracle scenes are preserved from this period. According to a brick inscription on the east façade, this original church was restored in 1306/7 by King Štefan Uroš II Milutin, who is referred to as the son-in-law of Andronikos II.

The church is oblong in plan, but in elevation it is an inscribed cross with five domes. The walls, of stone and brick cloisonné (see BRICKWORK TECHNIQUES), are articulated by arches framing gables and windows and other decorative brickwork. The outer aisles have apses at their east end; a high belltower and two side chapels were built over the exonarthex. According to an inscription in the exonarthex, the church was executed by the architect Nicholas, who is believed to have been trained in Epiros.
The wall paintings were done between 1307 and 1313. They reflect a typically Byz. program, and include themes such as the life of St. Nicholas of Myra (Sevchenko, Nicholas, 40f., 241f) and church councils (both in the south outer aisle), episcopal themes particularly appropriate for the decoration of a cathedral. An image of Christ is labeled the ‘protector’ of Prizren. In the narthex, the figures of Milutin and his father stand under a blessing Christ; these royal portraits again echo Byz. models. Earlier members of the Nemajjd dynasty are portrayed on a facing wall. The exonarthex contains wall paintings of the Last Judgment, a long Baptism cycle, the Tree of Jesse, an illustration of the Second Kanon of John of Damascus, the Heavenly Ladder, prophets holding symbols of the Virgin, and personifications of the Old and New Testament.

The paintings are the work of Astrapas, whose name appears alongside that of the architect; he is probably the painter Michael (Astrapas). Though the volume of the human body is still stressed through the juxtaposition of light and shade, the colors are more harmonious here than in the earlier work of Astrapas at the Peribleptos church in Ohrid. Although these frescoes do have some local Serbian features in their program, they are to be considered one of the finest surviving examples of the “second” Palaiologan style (see Monumental Painting).


A.K., G.B.

PROASTEION (proásteion), in classical and patriotic vocabulary “suburb” or “suburban house”; Prokopios (SH 15:36) notes that the nobles of Constantinople spent almost the entire year in their “littoral proasteia,” probably their suburban mansions. In the papyri of the 6th and 7th C., proasteion designated the owner’s country residence without any connection with “suburbanism” (G. Husson, Recherches de papyrologie 4 [1967] 192-96). This sense of the term becomes prevalent in Byz. texts from the 8th C. onward, which mention proasteia located far away from urban centers (Kazhdan, Derevnya i gorod 60, n.13): for instance, Eustathios Boilas founded several choria and a proasteion (Lemerle, Cinq études 22.66) in a deserted region (possibly Cappadocia). The Treatise on Taxation (ed. Dölger, Beitäge 115.39-43) gives a definition of the proasteion: it was an allotment located at a distance from the inhabited center of a village; unlike the agridion, a regular type of “outside allotment,” the proasteion’s owner did not dwell there but it was inhabited by his slaves, misthioi, and the like. Gregory, the hagiographer of St. Basil the Younger, owned a proasteion of this kind, which he visited annually, and where a misthios lived and worked. Philaretos the Merciful, the son of a rich peasant in the Paphlagonian village of Amnia, is said to have had 48 or 50 proasteia (possibly within the territory of a single village), and the widow Danelis possessed 80 proasteia in the Peloponnnesos.

From the end of the 10th C. onward, the term proasteion designated an estate populated with paroikoi: Balsamon (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:595.15-16) speaks generally of the “outside proasteion” inhabited by paroikoi, and monastic charters, from ca.975 onward, list paroikoi living in proasteia (Lavra 1, no.6.14, Iivr., no.2.13-14). Alexios I’s chryseboll of 1104 describes three proasteia of the Lavra of St. Athanasios, which contained approximately 14,000 modioi of land and accommodated 50 paroikoi (G. Ostrogorsky, Istoriiski časopis 5 [1954-55] 19-25). The term, common in acts of the 11th-13th C., is relatively rare in later charters; it may have had the generic meaning of “countryside” as opposed to “polis” (“they built shrines everywhere in cities and proasteia”—Lavra 3, no.167.10, a.1429). The idióstata (lit. “separated”) proasteia or agridion were allotments severed by fiscal officials from the main body of the chorion and levied at a separate, usually reduced, rate. M.Ja. Sjuzjumov (infra), maintaining the classical meaning of the word, considered proasteia-suburbs as major centers of industrial and trade activity.


M.B.

PROBUS, more fully Sextus Claudius Petronius Probus, Roman senator; born Verona? 328 (PLRE) or between 330 and 334 (W. Seyfarth), died Thessalonike 388 or later. Probus belonged to the wealthy and influential Christian family of Ani-
cius and played an important role during the reign of Valentinian I and esp. during the minority of Valentinian II. He was at least four times praetorian prefect and in 371 consul (together with the emperor Gratian). Probus is praised in several inscriptions and esp. by Ausonius; Symmachus corresponded with him seeking his support. He was reportedly well educated. Paulinus, a biographer of Ambrose, relates that his fame reached the Persians. The image of Probus in Ammianus Marcellinus, however, is a kind of caricature. In 375 the philosopher Iphicles, representing Epiros, accused Probus of fiscal oppression in Illyricum, and this probably forced him to retire. He reappeared at court in 383 as prefect of Illyricum, Italy, and Africa. In 387 Probus fled with Valentinian II from Rome when it was endangered by the invasion of MAXIMUS; he died soon after.


PROCESSION (πρόκενσος, προέλευνς), a public parade staged by various social groups (clergy, guilds, students, dignitaries, etc.). This basic element of most Byz. ceremony took its most characteristic form in the emperor’s processions around Constantinople and its environs. Solemn imperial processions to HAGIA SOPHIA for the Eucharist on Great Feasts—which entailed sizable payments to the clergy—and to other shrines apparently reached their classic form by the 8th C. and are documented by De ceremonis, book 1, chapters 1–37 and the Typikon of the Great Church. Preliminary ceremonies within the palace included donning the costume selected for the occasion and formation of the escort. The itineraries of processions changed over time (McCormick, Eternal Victory 216–20); the routes were cleaned and decorated in advance and stations were selected at which the factions would greet with acclamations the emperor, who might walk or ride according to the occasion. Written petitions might be thrown on the emperor’s path. For major processions to Hagia Sophia, a similar ceremony was observed on the return. Special kinds of processions included the triumph, adventus, and profectio. Artistic representations of such events, from the 4th through the 12th C., suggest only minor variations on the imperial adventus ceremony (K. Holm, G. Vikan, DOP 33 [1979] 115–33).

Processions formed a substantial element of private ceremonies such as weddings and funerals. Hagiographical texts describe the processions accompanying the transfer of the coffin of a deceased saint from one church to another, where it was placed in a special chapel; the populace wore white garments and carried candles and torches (e.g., vita of Symeon the Stylite the Elder, ed. Lietzmann, 76.5–10). Processions also accompanied translations of relics and were a constituent element of festivities organized by professional groups or of collective prayers asking for rain, the extermination of locusts, or expulsion of the enemy. (See also LIT.)


PROCHEIRON NOMON. See Harmenopoulos, Constantine.

PROCHIReON, or Procheiros Nomos (Προχείρος Νόμος, Handbook, or The Law Ready at Hand), a law book divided into 40 titles that used to be dated to 870–79 (more precisely 872) but must be regarded as a revision of the Epangoge ordered by Leo VI in 907 (Schminck, Rechtsbücher 55–107). The compiler of the Prochirion is unknown, though a Symatios who is named in the preface to the Epitome legum may have participated in its composition. The aim of the Prochirion was to eliminate the forgeries and adulterations in the Epangoge that were ascribed to Photios. The Prochirion is closer than the Epangoge to their common basic source, the Corpus Juris Civilis. Thirteen chapters of the Prochirion contain new regulations of Leo VI. The work mainly comprises private and penal law. The Prochirion is transmitted in numerous MSS and served as the basis for several other law books, for example, the Hexabiblos of Harmenopoulos.


PROCHIRON AUCTUM (Expanded Handbook), an extensive collection of mostly secular law, divided into 40 titles and 32 (or 33) supplementary titles (paratitla). The compilation, which originated in the first half of the 14th C., is based on the PROCHIRON, whose text—including the order of titles—was essentially retained but expanded through borrowings from various other sources (such as the ECLOGA, the EPANAGOGA, and the BASILIKA). The law book is transmitted in about a dozen MSS—considerably fewer than those containing the legal compendia of Matthew BLASTARES and Constantine HARMENOPOULOS, which originated at approximately the same time.

ED. Zepos, Jus 7:1–361.
—A.S.

PROCHIRON LEGUM (Handbook of the Laws), also called Prochiron Calabriae, a law book in 40 (or 41) titles transmitted in a single MS, Vat. gr. 845. The work of an unknown compiler, it must have been produced in Norman Italy in the 12th C. Sources of the Prochiron legum are a version of the ECLOGA closely related to the ECLOGA PRIVATA AUCTA and a version of the EPSITOME LEGUM, which was enriched by passages of the EPANAGOGA. The special character of the work lies in the fact that its models are not reproduced word for word but in a simplified style and vocabulary.

—A.S.

PROCONSUL. See ANTHYPATOS.

PRODOMOS. See JOHN THE BAPTIST. For monasteries of the PRODOMOS, see MENOIKEION, MOUNT; PETRA MONASTERY; PHOBEROU MONASTERY.

PRODOMOS, MANGANEIOS, conventional name of the 12th-C. author of anonymous poems contained in the 14th-C. MS, Venice, Marc. gr. XI, 22. Up to the end of the 14th C. the poems were attributed to Theodore PRODOMOS, as they closely resemble his works in their contents and technique. There are, however, some difficulties in attributing them to Prodomos. One of the poems apparently alludes to Prodomos as deceased; the biographies as established on the basis of the works of Theodore and of Manganeios Prodomos are slightly different; rhythmic patterns also seem dissimilar. None of these arguments is, however, irrefutable, and the question remains open.

Manganeios Prodomos relates that he served as a poet in the entourage of the exiled sebastokratissa Irene KOMNENE and addressed proud verses to Manuel I in Irene’s name, claiming that she had been unjustly accused. Eventually he returned to Constantinople and tried to acquire Manuel’s favor. He persistently begged Manuel to permit him to enter the monastery of St. George in MANGANA. Poems of Manganeios Prodomos contain abundant historical and prosopographical data on mid-12th-C. Byz.

—A.K.

PRODOMOS, THEODORE, poet at the court of IRENE DOUKAINA and JOHN II; born Constantinople ca.1100, died Constantinople ca.1170?. Prodomos (Προδωμός) developed the genre of poetic panegyric created by Nicholas KALLIKLES and used it to praise the military qualities of both the emperor and noble generals. In a poem on the birth of Alexios, son of the sebastokratior Andronikos Komnenos, Prodomos expatiates on the ideal education for a young aristocrat, on his wealth and his noble origin (Hörandner, no.44). Prodomos also produced prose panegyrics, such as a eulogy of Patr. John IX Agapetus (1111–34) (K. Manaphes, EEBS 41 [1974] 226–42) and a monody on his friend and teacher Stephen Skylitzes (L. Petit, IRAK 8 [1903] 6–14). More than the conventional presentation of the emperor or a virtuous man, Prodomos’s panegyrics are full.
of personal observations and emotions, of gentle lyricism and mockery (even self-mockery). He helped to regenerate the genre of erotic romance. Although his Rodanthe and Dosikles imitated the Aethiopica of Heliodoros, it reflected the realities and political aspirations of his own time (cf. C. Cupane, RSBN 10–11 [1973–74] 147–68); also the Katomymnachia (The War of the Cat and Mice), despite its archaic framework, has contemporary allusions and associations. Prodomos wrote parodies laughing at the shortcomings and vices of everyday life—illiteracy, lewdness, the helplessness of a patient in the hands of a clumsy dentist (ed. G. Podestà, Aeum 21 [1947] 12–21); in a more serious vein he also composed an allegorical description of the 12 months and philosophical and theological works.

The events of Prodomos’s life are little known. His career probably ended with the death of John II. He lost his position of poet laureate and his modest property and lived at the Church of the Holy Apostles, writing occasional verses for the Byz. nobility. Prodomos died as a monk, having assumed the name of Nicholas. He enjoyed enormous popularity; some of his devotees knew his prose and iambics by heart (Michel Italikos, ed. P. Gautier [Paris 1972] 64.1–3). Niketas Eugenianos (along with other contemporaries) lamented Prodomos’s death in monodies, and many of his works were imitated. On the other hand, Prodomos’s authorship of several pieces has been questioned; no convincing evidence proves whether he was the real author of poems conventionally assigned to Ptochoprodromos and Manganeios Prodomos.


PROEODROS (προεδρος), a term used both as a civilian title of rank and as an ecclesiastical title.

Proedros as a Civilian Dignity. According to an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 284.2–4), Nikephoros II Phokas appointed Basil the Nothos as proedros, “an axioma that did not previously exist.” The title was high-ranking; it is mentioned in the mid-10th-C. Taktikon of Benešević (245.3) following the basileopator, but G. Ostrogorsky (ZRV 2 [1953] 56f) considered this a later interpolation; in the slightly later Taktikon of Escurial (Oikonomides, Lists 263.10) it is situated one rung lower, after the zoste patriakia. The dignity of proedros was identical with the office of proedros of the Senate, the promotion to which is described in De ceremoniis. The term implied precedence: proedros of the notaries amounted to the protonotarios; the first proedros of judges (dikaspoloi) is known from an undated seal (Zacos, Seals 2, no.687). The title of proedros (and protoprodromos) was broadly granted in the 11th C. (Kazhdan, Gosp. klas. 107–13) but disappeared after the mid-12th C. The first proedroi seem to have been exclusively eunuchs, but from the mid-11th C. there were bearded proedroi, many from the military aristocracy. In the second half of the 11th C., a proedissa, Maria Philokalina, is attested.

A leaf inserted into a late 11th-C. MS in Princeton (Spatharakis, Portrait 74–76) depicts a proedros John, holding a scroll on which his dedication of a menologion is inscribed. He wears a chlamys perhaps similar to the silk coat of the proedros Argyros, son of Melo, valued at 100 librae of silver in an 11th-C. document (A. Guillou, DOP 28 [1974] 100, 109).


Proedros as an Ecclesiastical Title. In ecclesiastical terminology proedros was generally a synonym for bishop, the supreme officer or “president” of the local church. Every bishop was indeed the natural proedros of his see (Gregory of Nyssa, PG 46:453A). Infrequently, however, the term served as a title for the metropolitan, the superior of an ecclesiastical province (Trullo, chonobi 39). Despite this occasional restriction, the term continued to be used indiscriminately for all dignitaries of episcopal rank until the 13th C. when it acquired a more technical canonical meaning. Specifically, a bishop given a vacant see(s) to hold as a benefice concurrently with his own—kat’ epitdosin—was referred to in the patriarchal acts as the proedros of the vacant see. By virtue of this subvention the bishop in effect became the administrator or director of the second see but not
its effective titular head as no enthronement or installation was involved. Strictly speaking, he could never occupy this throne. The incorporation of such sees was, in fact, provisional, ceasing once a new bishop was elected. Proedros in this absolutely new sense was thus the equivalent of administrator.

Since the word implied a right of precedence, it was sometimes combined with other titles to form honorary offices, such as proedros (or proto-proedros) ton protosynkelon.


PROFECTIO (τα ἐξεντήρια, προπομπη), the ceremonial counterpart of adventus, marking the departure of the emperor, officials, etc., for which the Romans issued coins and developed a specific iconography. Profectio béllica marked the departure of the army or the emperor for war and entailed propitiatory services, distribution of alms, a procession out of Constantinople, and veneration of the emperor’s cross-standard containing a relic of the True Cross (TheophCont 881.5–9; Goar, Euchologion 651–53) and, when appropriate, a blessing for the fleet (Prokopios, Wars 3.12.1–2; Goar, Euchologion 685). A more common form of profectio was the peacetime departure ceremony, which might comprise a liturgical service, citizens’ escort out of the city gates, acclamations, and even panegyrics. It allowed citizens to express their opinion of an administrator: Kekaumenos (Kek. 154.9–11) told his son that he would get a real send-off if he administered his district properly.

LIT. McCormick, Eternal Victory 246–51, 254f. –M.McC.

PROFIT (κέρδος) was evaluated by the Byz. on social and moral grounds. Kekaumenos wrote that “honest” profit was one derived from agricultural enterprise (the simple surplus of goods produced above the demands of the household) and from state salaries; he overtly rejects “dishonest” (and dangerous) sources of profit, such as usury or tax farming. Emp. Theophilos went even farther than Kekaumenos and condemned commercial activity as unworthy of a noble person. The Taktika of Leo VI (15:39) arrogantly dismissed profit-seeking as a motive for any imperial action: “Kerdos,” he said, “is not the objective of Our Majesty in seeking to subjugate Our opponents.”

The Byz. tended to eliminate the uncertainty or risk involved in seeking profit by introducing the idea of fixed profit: the just price restricted in theory the rampant inflation of prices (which in practice could soar during a shortage of goods), and the Book of the Eparch regulated the level of profit; the prohibition on hoarding goods in the expectation of price increases was directed toward the same tendency to fix profits; in practice, however, Byz. managers recommended the purchase of goods at a time of low prices, even once a year. Monopoly as a means to maximize profit also originated with the concept of a “stable” economy, providing the state with a source of income independent of any market fluctuation.


PROGYMNASMATA (προγυμνάσματα), “preliminary exercises” in composition, originally designed to prepare a student for gymnastata, the public performance of complete speeches. They were first discussed by Theon of Alexandria (1st–2nd C.), then by an anonymous author whose work was included in the corpus of Hermogenes, more fully by Nicholas of Myra and esp. Aphthonios. Aphthonios established 14 categories of progymnasmata: (1) fable; (2) diegema, short narrative; (3) chreia, maxim or anecdote; (4) gnome; (5) anaskeue, refutation (of a statement or narrative); (6) katasekeue, confirmation; (7) koinos topos, a general point (usually exemplifying a vice); (8) enkomion; (9) invective; (10) synkrisis, comparison; (11) ethopoia; (12) ekphrasis; (13) thesis, presentation of an argument; (14) tou nomou eisphora, introduction of a law.

Numerous progymnasmata composed by teachers and men of letters survive from the time of Libanius through the last Palaiologoi. Some of the categories acquired independent status as separate genres. According to Schissel (infra), the most popular progymnasmata were ekphrasis and ethopoia, which gave the maximum opportunity for aesthetic expression. Though biblical topics appear occasionally (e.g., in the ethopoia of Nike-
photos Basilakes on the "Words the Theotokos uttered when Christ changed water into wine"), the majority of themes were borrowed from Greek mythology or ancient history. Progymnasmata may have been not mere exercises, but a way to escape the prohibitions of Orthodoxy by choosing non-Orthodox topics (H.G. Beck, Das byzantinische Jahrtausend [Munich 1978] 146f) or using hidden allusions.


PROHOR OF PČINJA, southern Slavic hermit, monk, and saint; fl. mid-11th C.; feastday 15 Jan. Prohor established himself in a cave at Staro Nagořičino near Kumanovo, where he was visited, according to the late tradition, by the Byz. officer Romanos Diogenes, to whom Prohor foretold that he would become emperor. When Romanos did so in 1067 (see Romanos IV Diogenes), he built a church on the site of Prohor's cave, which was restored in the 14th C. During the Pecheneg and Cuman invasions Prohor moved to Pčinja near Vranje. In the late 11th C. a monastery was founded there that became, like those of Gavril of Lesnovo, Ioakim of Osogove, and John of Rila, a center of southern Slavic literature and culture in the 12th C. In the early 14th C., King Stefan Uroš II Milutin restored the Pčinja monastery.


PROKATHEMENOS (προκαθημένος, lit. "president"), the designation of the chief of a bureau. The term appeared in the 12th C. (not the 11th, as in Ahrweiler, "Smyrne" 155, n.106). In 1166 Manuel I listed four major tribunals, whose heads were the megas droungarios [tes viglas], the prokathemenos of the demosiska dikasteria (state courts), protasekretis, and dikaiodotes (R. Macrides, FM 6 [1984] 138.232–24); in 1186 Isaac II entrusted the prokathemenos of the seakra with collecting fines for disobeying the emperor's chrysobull (Patmou Engrapha 1, no.10.25). It is not clear whether the two should be identified, as did Stein ("Untersuchungen" 34). The prokathemenos of a kastron or town is attested at the same time, if the seal of a certain prokathemenos of Maroneia is indeed of the 12th C. In any case, prokathemenoi of towns are often mentioned in the 13th–14th C.: in Smyrna (Ahrweiler, "Smyrne" 155–58), Philadelphia, Drama, Ioannina, Avlon, Kanina, and Dyrrachion. Stein ("Untersuchungen" 24, n. 1) suggests that prokathemenoi were civil administrators, whereas the kastrophylax served as commander of the garrison. Pseudo-Kodinios speaks also of prokathemenoi of palaces, of the imperial koiton and vestiarion—all connected with aulic service.

LIT. Zakythinos, Despotat 2:53, 55f. -A.K.

PROKLOS (Πρόκλος), bishop of Constantinople (from 434 or 437) and saint; died 12 July 446 or 447; feastday 20 Nov. In 425 he failed to secure election to the see of Constantinople on the death of Patr. Attikos, whose secretary he was; he also failed to gain his designated see at Kyzikos in 426. In 428/9 at Constantinople he delivered an episcopal sermon against Nestorios, in which he praised Mary as the Theotokos, developing the notion that she had conceived Christ aurally on hearing the words of the Holy Spirit (T.E. Gregory, GRBS 16 [1975] 321–23). After finally becoming bishop, he effected the transfer of the body of John Chrysostom to Constantinople in 438, one of several attempted acts of reconciliation of the theological factions. He is credited with introducing the Trisagion into the liturgy.

Nearly 30 of his sermons survive, in Greek, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Syriac versions; the authenticity of some is disputed. In the so-called Tome to the Armenians, Proklos defends the Chalcedonian doctrine of two natures of Christ in one hypostasis or person. Although Proklos does not name him, the Tome is directed against Theodore of Mopsuestia. Letter 4, which is preserved in a Latin fragment (PG 65:876f), contains the words "One of the Trinity was crucified according to the flesh," a formula that was discussed in the 6th C. during the controversy over Theopaschitism.


PROKLOS, Neoplatonic philosopher; born Constantinople 8 Feb. 410 or 412, died Athens 17 Apr. 485. Proklos first studied rhetoric, law, and philosophy at Alexandria. In 430/1 he joined the Neoplatonic Academy of Athens, studying Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy with Plutarchos of Athens and with Syrianos, whom he succeeded as head of the school (ca. 437). A life of intensive teaching and writing, interrupted by a year of exile in Lydia, resulted in a large corpus, including commentaries on Euclid, Ptolemy, and Aristotle and on Plato's Alcibiades, Republic, Timaeus, and Parmenides as well as a Platonic Theology and the Elements of Theology.

Proklos developed the philosophy of his immediate predecessors (not enough is known of the latter to permit one to measure the degree of Proklos's originality), giving it a systematic form that became authoritative in the Neoplatonic schools of Athens and Alexandria. Like his immediate predecessors, Proklos saw philosophy as a divine revelation conveyed to man by the gods through oracles (the so-called Chaldean Oracles), prophets, and sages (both barbarian and Greek), including in particular Plato. This revelation is intended to save man by leading him to self-knowledge and a return to his divine, otherworldly origin. The return makes use of theology and sciences such as physics and mathematics that prepare the soul for access to the science of the divine (theology or metaphysics), communicated in Plato's Parmenides, and leading to a union of the soul with the divine that transcends scientific thought. Proklos summarized very successfully the science of the divine in his Elements of Theology, where, following the strict standards of scientific demonstration prescribed by Aristotle and that Proklos found exemplified in Euclid, the various levels of reality transcending the material world are presented: the ineffable "One," the source of all reality; the "henads," an order of gods deriving from the One and acting as causes of what follows; a series of descending levels of lesser gods, "intelligible" and "intellectual," terminating at the level of the human soul and arranged in complicated, mathematically inspired (in particular, triadic) relationships.

Later Influence of Proklos. Proklos's works became standard in the philosophic schools of the period and his authority was assured by a network of pupils that included Marinus, his successor and biographer, and Ammonios. Proklos's ideas were appropriated for Christian theology by pseudo-Dionysios, but attacked by John Philoponos. From the 7th C. onward the name of Proklos disappears from view, to be resurrected in the 11th C., esp. by Michael Psellos and John Italos and also by Eustratios of Nicaea and Michael of Ephesus. The 12th C. became more critical of Proklos: whereas the sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos still copied much of him, Tzetzes, George Tornikes, Niketas Seides, and Prodomos were polemical. Nicholas of Methone wrote Refutation, in which he emphasized the unity of the Trinity as opposed to the Proklean theory of emanation. Proklos again became popular from the 13th C. onward, when George Pachymeres copied, supplemented, and quoted from MSS of Proklos. The Elements of Theology was translated into Georgian by John Petric'i, and William of Moerbeke translated many of Proklos's works into Latin.


D.O.M., A.K.

PROKONNESOS (Προκόννησος, mod. Marmara), the largest island in the Sea of Marmara, close to the city of Kyzikos. It was famous for its marble quarries, which continued production during the late Roman period: in the early 5th C. taxes on the mines and quarries of Docimeum, Prokonnos, and the Troad were levied with a special strictness (Cod.Theod. XI 28.9 and 11), and Prokonnesian marble was used to ornament Constantinople (e.g., Zosimos 2.30.4, ed. Paschoud 1 [1971] 103.25); in the 9th C. "the white stone from Prokonnesos" still served as building material for major monuments (Theoph.Cont 141.17–18, 145.22). The sarcophagi made of fine, blue-tinted, crystalline Prokonnesian marble were known throughout the whole Roman world; in the 4th and 5th C. elaborate garland-patterned sarcophagi were replaced by plain chests without garland pattern (J.B. Ward Perkins, Archaeology 11 [1958] 98–104).
Prokonnesos was the seat of the archbishop of the Islands (Notitiae CP 1.55); 11th-C. seals of archbishops of “Prokonnos” are published (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, nos. 829–30). The island served as a place of exile: Stephen the Younger was banished there in 754; in 1058 Patriarch Michael I Keroularios was exiled there, together with his nephews; Patriarch Arsenios was exiled to Prokonnesos in 1264 and founded a small monastery on the island in the region of Souda; according to a late akolouthia, Emperor Michael VII took the monastic habit at the monastery of St. Timothy on Prokonnesos.


PROKOPIOI (Προκόπιοι), saint; feastday 8 July. According to Eusebios of Caesarea (De mart. Palest. 1.1–2), he was the first Palestinian martyr, beheaded in Caesarea during Diocletian’s persecutions of 303 after refusing to sacrifice to the four emperors. The longer version of Eusebios’s work, preserved in Syriac, Georgian (G. Giritte, Musée 66 [1953] 245–66), and Latin translations, conveys more biographical data: supposedly born in Aelia-Jerusalem, Prokopios was active in Skythopolis as anaghmostat, interpreter in Syriac, and exorcist. These data are included in the first version of Prokopios’s passio, which relates in great detail the martyr’s trial and miracles: the hands of the “speculator” Archelaos were paralyzed when he lifted his sword against Prokopios; Prokopios held burning frankincense in his palm. The second version transforms Prokopios into a different person—the pagan Nenias, son of a synkletike prote in Aelia. Diocleian’s military commander, he was miraculously converted to Christianity. Cyril of Skythopolis and the Chronicon Paschale attest the veneration of Prokopios in Skythopolis and Caesarea; eventually he acquired the features of a military saint. Prokopios’s passio was included in the collection of Symeon Metaphrastes and he was praised by Niketas David Paphalagon (F. Halkin, AB 80 [1962] 174–93), Constantine Arkopolites, and others. A very rhetorical passio of Prokopios of Persia by Hesychios of Jerusalem (H. Delehaye, AB 24 [1905] 475–82) may have been modeled on the passio of Prokopios of Caesarea.

Representation in Art. In artistic depictions it is the military figure of Prokopios that predominates. He wears a maniakhon (see Torque) on 10th-C. ivory triptychs and icons but is clad in full armor by the 11th C. in his many representations in MSS of Symeon Metaphrastes and in monumental painting, esp. in Cappadocia. He is young and beardless, with dark hair curling about his ears. His vision while on horseback of a cross hung in the sky by two chains is illustrated in the Theodore Psalter (fol.85½) and his beheading in one MS of Metaphrastes (Paris, B.N. gr. 1528, fol.86v).


Lit. BHG 1576–1582c. 1584. C. Weigert, LCI 8:229ff. —A.K., N.P.S.

PROKOPIOI, usurper (from 28 Sept. 365); born Korykos ca.326, died Phrygia 27 May 366. Prokopios was related (probably through his mother) to Emp. Julian. First a notary, he was given an important military command by Julian, who may have promised him the succession to the throne. In 363, however, when Julian was killed, he yielded to Jovian; after presiding over Julian’s burial in Tarsos, he went into retirement on his estates in Cappadocia. Once Valens came to the throne in 364, however, he fell under suspicion and subsequently fled to the Chersonese in the Crimea. Broad opposition to the harsh policies of Valens led to the proclamation of Prokopios by troops in Constantinople. He arrested the supporters of Valens and tried to gain the backing of the house of Constantius II, including his widow Faustina. The movement was supported by peasants in Thrace and Asia Minor. In his propaganda Prokopios stressed his legitimacy as Julian’s successor (J.-L. Desnier, Latomus 43 [1984] 606), but lack of resources forced him to levy high taxes, which made him unpopular. The majority of troops either remained loyal to Valens or soon deserted Prokopios’s cause. Prokopios was captured and executed. The revolt, however, continued, and Markello, a former commander under Julian, was acclaimed emperor in Nicaea; he too was soon seized and killed. Chalcedon and Philippopolis held out for a while, but the rebels surrendered after they were shown Prokopios’s head. Thrace was severely punished and some rebels fled to the barbarians.


---

PROKOPIOS OF CAESAREA in Palestine, 6th-C. historian. Prokopios spent his adult life in Constantinople. Until 540 he accompanied the campaigns of Justinian’s general Belisarios (whose secretary and legal adviser [assessor] he became in 527) in the East, North Africa, and Italy. His eyewitness account of the plague shows he was in Constantinople in 542. Prokopios then largely drops from view, his fortunes doubtless suffering from Belisarios’ own vicissitudes. His equation with the Prokopios who was city prefect in 562 has been rightly challenged.

Prokopios’s major work is the Wars, eight books celebrating Byz. victories over the Persians, Vandals, and Ostrogoths. More observer than analyst, Prokopios is conventional in his attitudes toward emperor and society, albeit his preference for secular over religious causation is notable. The Buildings, a eulogy of Justinian’s public works, has some tedious passages, but is valuable for its architectural and social history. Most notorious is the Secret History (Anekdotai), in which Prokopios reshapes his narratives into a vicious, indeed ludicrous, invective against Justinian, Theodora, and other principals of the reign; it can have circulated only clandestinely. All three works were probably written in the 550s, though precise dates are much disputed, and the reasons for his change in attitude toward Justinian are endlessly discussed. The apparent promise (SH 26.18) to write an ecclesiastical history has surprised some, but further calumnies of Justinian seem to be his principal aim.

---

PROKOPIOS OF GAZA, rhetorician and exegete; born Gaza ca.465, died ca.528. Prokopios’s career was spent in his native city. His reputation profits from the glittering funeral tribute of his pupil Chorikios, which emphasizes Prokopios’s student precocity. His Christianity led him into polemics against the Neoplatonist Proklos, along with commentaries on biblical texts. Discernible ideas include preference for a progressive universe over an eternal world and prophetic inspiration rather than ecstasy. Prokopios’s panegyric on Emp. Anastasios I is of value to modern historians, and his approximately 160 letters provide much contemporary information. A monody on Antioch’s destruction by earthquake in 526 is lost. Among his rhetorical set pieces, the description of a mechanical horologion in which a figure of Herakles came out to perform his 12 labors (H. Diels, Über die von Prokop beschriebene Kunstuhr von Gaza [Berlin 1917]) and pictures of scenes from Euripides’ Hippolytus (P. Friedländer, Spätantiker Gemäldezyklus in Gaza [Vatican 1939]) are of most interest to historians of art and science.

The major part of the oeuvre of Prokopios is devoted to commenting on the Old Testament (the Octateuch, Song of Songs, etc.); in the case of the Elenkai, Prokopios’s exegesis of the Proverbs, however, there survives not the original version but “a medieval catena of very bad quality” (Richard, Opera minora 1, no. 17, 1259f.). Prokopios believed that the so-called obscurity of the Old Testament was owing to the failure of previous generations to understand it (PG 87:28C); to clarify the text he collected statements of “fathers” and of other writers, regardless of whether they agreed or disagreed with one another (PG 87:21A). Thus he tried to systematize the patristic heritage and was one of the creators of the genre of catenae.

---


---

PROKYPSIS (πρόκυψις), a term describing both an elevated wooden platform and an imperial ceremony performed on that structure at the Komnenian and Palaiologan court. The emperor mounted the platform behind a closed curtain. On cue, he was brilliantly illuminated, the curtain was thrown open, and an audience of palace
guards, officials, and clergy, which was assembled below, intoned the polychronion (see Acclama-
tions) and appropriate chants. Surviving texts associated with the prokyopsis are filled with sun
and light metaphors, leading some to claim sur-
vivals in them from Hellenistic or Roman solar
cults. A 14th-C. ceremonial book describes the
ceremony as it was performed on Christmas Eve
(pseudo-Kod. 195.11—204.23); it seems to have
been repeated for Epiphany as well as for imperial
CORONATIONS and weddings. Parallels with earlier
KATHISMA ceremonies have been argued, but the
precise origins of prokyopsis remain unclear. A
possible illustration in Vat. gr. 1851, fol. 7r (cf. M.
Jeffreys, Byzantine Papers [Canberra 1981] 101—
15) remains controversial.

LIT. E.H. Kantorowicz, "Oriens Augusti—Lever du roi,"
DOP 17 (1963) 119—77; Spatarkeris, Portrait 214—16. M.
Andreeva, "O cerimonei prokipsis," SemKond 1 (1927)
157—73.

-M.McC.

PRONOES (προνοητής), administrator, super-
visor, esp. of estates; the term was often used in
papyri (Preisigke, Wörterbuch 3:149f) and a novel of
Tiberios I mentions the pronoetes of imperial
domains (Zepos, Jus 1:20.2). This meaning was
preserved to the 10th and 11th C.: the vita of
Paul of Latros (AB 11 [1892] 138.17—18) speaks of
a protospatharios entrusted with the pronoia of
imperial estates, and a sigillum of 1092 mentions
the pronoetes of estates of a sebastokrator (Lavra 1,
no.51.14). Pronoetes could also be the designation
of the user of a charistikon. The protomotorios
of St. George (of Mangana) and pronoetes was the
owner of a seal of the 12th C. (Schlumberger, Sig.
151), and probably Constantine (III) Leiciou-
theses, "the phylax of the pronoia of Mangana
and of the documents" (SkylCont 106.9), held this
post a century earlier. In the 10th—12th C. the
terms pronoia and pronoetes were employed for
provincial administration; pronoetai of Bulgaria,
Samos, Lakedaimon, and Athens are known. Bă-
nescu considered pronoetai as official officials, while
Wasilewski viewed them as governors, although
of a lower rank than the doux or katepano.
The term pronoetes was never applied to the holder
of a private pronoia (Ostrogorsky, Fédalités 18).

LIT. N. Bănescu, "La signification des titres de prairiot et
de pronoetes à Byzance aux Xle et XIIe siècles, "ST 123
(1946) 995—98. T. Wasilewski, "Les titres de duc, de caté-
pan et de pronoétés dans l'Empire byzantin du IXe jus-
qu'au XIIe siècle," 12 CEB, vol. 2 (Belgrade 1964) 236f.
Kazhdan, Agranys oinochoenija 210—13. Oikonomides, "Évo-
lution" 134f.

-P.R.

PRONOIA (προνοια, lit. "care," "forethought"),
in Byz. Greek both a theological and administra-
tive-fiscal term.

Theological Meaning. Pronoia, meaning provi-
dential care, was a concept developed by Byz.
theology in contrast to pagan, esp. Epicurean,
DETERMINISM. The problem was discussed in apol-
ogetic and polemical literature, in erotapokrī-
seis, and in monographs, the greatest of which
are the five tracts by Patr. Gennadios II Schola-
larios. Although the distinction between pronoia
and tyches was not always clear-cut, the concept
of providence presupposed belief in the personal
Godhead who had created mankind as good but
possessing free will and thus able to choose the
path of good or evil. Michael Psellus was the first
to analyze deeply relations between human deliber-
ate choice (proorisis) and divine providence.

In patristic terminology providence often ap-
pears synonymously with (kindness of) God; Eu-
sebios of Caesarea (HE 2.14.6), for example, speaks
of "the all-good Pronoia, philanthropic toward all" that directed the apostle Peter to Rome. The
idea of providential care was, in John of Damascus
and his followers, a momentous argument against
the concept of ontological evil typical of dualistic
tenets. It created, however, another difficulty: Beck
(infra 262) emphasizes the "tragic conflict" in late
Byz. that existed between the concept of provi-
dence and predestination (proorismos), between the
concept of a personal God caring about his "choc-
en people," and the reality of the shrinking world
of Byz., ever oppressed and finally destroyed by
surrounding "barbarians." The rationale for this
paradox, that it was a temporary divine punish-
ment for sinful behavior, became less and less
convincing as Byz. moved toward its demise; the
late Byz. philosophy of history suggested no ratio-
 nale for the fact that providence had seemingly
turned away from the Byz. (C.I.G. Turner, BZ 57

LIT. H. Beck, Vorschung und Vorherbestimmung in der theo-
lologischen Literatur der Byzantiner (Rome 1937). L.G. Benakis,
"Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos in der byzantin-
ischen Philosophie," in L’homme et son univers au Moyen Âge:
Actes du 7e Congrès international de philosophie médiévale (30
août—4 sept. 1982) (Louvain-la-Neuve 1986) 64—75. W.
Lackner in Niképhoros Blemmydes, Gegen die Vorherbestimmung
Fiscal Meaning. Used in a technical sense from the 12th C. onward, pronoia was equated by F.uspenskij and after him by Ostrogorsky with the Western fief, thus forming one of the foundations of the theory of Byz. Feudalism. The 12th-C. data on pronoia are meager and disputable (A. Hohlweg, BZ 60 [1967] 288–308; Jacoby, Société, pt. VI [1967], 479–81). The testimony of Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 208, 23–24) regarding Manuel I’s “grants of paroikoi” to soldiers has frequently been interpreted as pronoia; the term pronoia, however, is not used by Choniates, but appears only in a scholion to the late revision of this passage in the chronicle ascribed to Theodore Skoutariotes (Sathas, MB 7:301, n.1). The latinized term pronoiaios is attested only in the 15th C., and the modern term “pronoia” is a scholarly convention.

In documents of the 13th–15th C., pronoia (sometimes identified with the term oikonomia) is technically a grant of a certain amount (posotes) of tax revenues derived from specific properties and paroikoi households. In fact the holder of a pronoia also acquired the right to the rents on some of the property he was assigned, as well as the labor services of the paroikoi. Occasionally, things such as fishing rights could be granted as pronoia. The pronoia was a conditional grant that at times implied military service, but the precise nature of these conditions is not yet clear. Michael VIII was the first emperor to make pronoia hereditary on a large scale, granting soldiers who gave their lives or otherwise served well the right to leave their pronoia to their sons (N. Oikonomides in Docheiar. 125). In the 14th–15th C. the right to transmit pronoia through one or more generations, though never the rule, became increasingly common and could be granted “with service” or “without service.”

The question of the status of pronoia is also under discussion: Uspenskij described them as feudal knights, and Ostrogorsky saw in them a landowning aristocracy, whereas Lemerle (Agr. Hist. 222–41) emphasized the low origin of, at least, the earlier pronoiais. In any case, some sources indicate that women and church institutions may have been in possession of pronoia–oikononia. By the first half of the 14th C. (and probably already in the late 12th C.) the “collective pronoia” appears, in which a number of persons, particularly a company of soldiers, each possesses his own, rather modest, posotes within a single pronoia (N. Oikonomides, TM 8 [1981] 353–71). The term and concept of pronoia were appropriated by the Latin and Serbian authorities of the Balkans.

In a nontechnical sense, the term pronoia was employed to designate various kinds of “care”—Charistikion, administration of imperial estates or institutions (e.g., of the Mangana monastery), and esp. of provinces (such as Samos, Bulgaria, Athens, etc.). The administrator of such pronoiai was called pronoetes, a term attested at least from the 10th C. onward.


PROOIMION (προοιμίων), preamble or introduction to a document, letter, or literary work, often imitating a classical model. Prooimia to emperors’ chrysobulls were usually written by eminent authors and are important for studying imperial ideology and propaganda. Prooimia to letters sometimes became independent of the main text and fulfilled their own rhetorical purposes (Hunger, Lit. 1:218f). Prooimia to historical works were manifestos of the author; although many points of the preamble were drawn from Thucydides or Lucian, prooimia served as a vehicle to present the author’s position. Prokopios and Agathias stressed their individual attitudes to the events described, whereas Theophylaktos Simokattes furthered his own interests in a complicated two-part preamble that is in the form of a dialogue between History and Philosophy; it contains compliments addressed to Simokattes’ patron, the patriarch, followed by the praise of historiography as the significant creation of reason and a discipline useful to generals and laymen, old and young (I. Citurov in Antićnost i vizantija [Moscow 1975] 204–06).

The antique topos of modesty, already—and incongruously—present in the sophisticated Simokattes, was used by Theophanes the Confessor.
and George Hamartolos (probably under the influence of hagiographical prooimia), but was omitted by Skylitzes who devoted his introduction to an analysis of the faults of his predecessors. Psellus avoided prooimia entirely. The authors of saints' lives composed prooimia that emphasized the hero's significance and the hagiographer's inadequacy; a similar topos also appears in enkomia. Christian themes are frequent, and didactic purposes (usefulness and entertainment alike) are stressed. (For prooimion as a legal term, see Civil Procedure.)


A.K. T.I.S.

PROPAGANDA. Imperial propaganda stressed legitimacy, victory, divine approval, and subjects' loyalty; subtle changes in themes mirror changes in society, for example, the growth of military imagery in the late 11th C. Church propaganda concerned doctrinal tenets (e.g., icons), competing cults of saints, and sometimes rival patriarchs.

The means were diverse. Coins of the 4th–6th C. constantly announced and interpreted political events. From the 7th C. onward, coinage's spectrum of messages narrowed dramatically and its concentration on gold suggests an elite audience. Art—whether posterlike murals or monuments addressing a broad audience, imperial portraits, or insignia granted to officials or client rulers—had an avowed purpose as propaganda (Mansi 13:356B). Ceremony acted out the imperial and religious themes in ritual form, such as triumphs or the Feast of Orthodoxy (see Triumph of Orthodoxy). Publicity stunts reinforced a menaced regime's credibility. Relics were exploited to enhance its religious prestige, as in the translation of the relics of St. Stephen the protomartyr by Theodosios II and Pulcheria (K. Holum, G. Vikan, DOP 33 [1979] 115–33) or Irene's discovery and translation of the relics of St. Euphemia. Even more characteristic of Byz. mentality were faked prophecies planted and "discovered" at a propitious moment, for example, the pagan sage who prophesied the Virgin Birth and his own exhumation after 2,000 years, when Irene and Constantine VI took power (C. Mango, ZRVI 8.1 [1963] 201–07), or the inscription acclaiming John I Tziniskes and Theodora, unearthed in a Constantinopolitan garden (McCormick, Eternal Victory 171, n.162).

Official communiqués provided "sanitized" versions of events and influenced historiography, while laws and prooimia of diplomas trumpet favorite propaganda themes. Panegyrics presented official commentary on events to elite audiences; acclamations or prayers focused minds on orthodoxy or victory, while sermons and hymns delivered propaganda to a wider audience, as when Severos of Antioch celebrated the fall of Vitalian (PO 7 [1911] 710ff, 36.3 [1972] 430–37). Partisan or subversive propaganda, like vernacular songs, taunted Maurice or Theophano (Beck, Volksliteratur 25–28), while religious songs spread Arian doctrines; lamps, adulatory verses, or libelli famosi were set up surreptitiously in public places and might be legally repressed (Cod. Just. IX 56; Basil. 60.63.1), while political tracts like Philopatris circulated among the elite and left traces in historical writing. Ambassadors and missionaries helped spread imperial propaganda beyond Byz.'s borders.


M.McC.

PROPERTY (σύσια, περιονσία, πράγματα, ύπόστασις, all nontechnical terms). All material goods that a person has at his disposal constitute his property. To these belong his claims (from legal transactions) as well as his possession and his ownership of movable and immovable things. This broad concept of property was mainly relevant in Byz. inheritance law: the heir did not inherit single objects but entered into all the testator's rights of whatever kind. "Net" property (kathara ousia or hypostasis) was the property after subtraction of the testator's debts (e.g., Prochiron 32:3).

G. Litavrin (VizOč [1971] 152–68) has demon-
In later centuries, the principle of inalienability, reiterated and extended by church councils, was more frequently invoked against the secularization of church property by emperors and their officials. This was a point on which ecclesiastical opinion, regardless of political necessity, progressively hardened, in reaction not only to major expropriations (e.g., by Herakleios, Alexios I, John V), but also to increased taxation and restrictions on the growth of episcopal and monastic domains (Nikephoros I, Nikephoros II, Basil II). Theodore Balsamon, in the late 12th C., implied that the very taxation of church lands—a matter on which Justinian had made no concessions—was a form of secularization, which the emperor had a duty to alleviate (Rhalles-Poltes, Syntagma 2:594–611).

The excesses, and corrupting effects, of ecclesiastical wealth, esp. in monasteries, were criticized by ascetics, emperors (Manuel I), and leading churchmen (Eustathios of Thessalonike, Patr. Athanasios I). Yet religious poverty (aktemosyne) never became as contentious an issue as in the medieval West or Russia. The canonical theory of sacred property was tempered by a flexibility of practice that, on the one hand, allowed clerics to enjoy private possessions, and, on the other, allowed lay kteores a direct, tangible, and personal return on their religious endowments (see Churches, Private). Moreover, much sacred property, such as imperial churches, constituted state property, and emperors were able to confiscate on a small scale without arousing controversy (Theophylaktos of Ohrid, Letters, ed. Gautier 215,6–10; Tafel-Thomas, Urkunden 1:111f). This and the practice of granting monasteries in charistikion to lay protectors helped to ensure that sacred property was not subject to infinite accumulation, and that churchmen were never entirely responsible for its abuse.


PROPHET BOOK, modern term for a collected volume of the biblical books of the 16 Prophets (see also ProphetoLogiaN.) The prophets were popular with the church fathers, who sought in their words clues to the coming of Christ. Patristic commentaries (already begun by Hippolytos and Origen) were devoted primarily to Isaiah and Daniel, but also to some of the minor prophets,
(e.g., Hosea and Malachi, by Apollinaris of Laodikeia). The books of the 12 minor prophets were systematically commented on by Cyril of Alexandria, from the viewpoint of typology of Christ, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, within the framework of a history of the Jews. John Chrysostom devoted two homilies to the prophets in general, observing their “obscurity,” whereas his homilies on Isaiah primarily treated moral problems. After the 6th C. interest in the prophets decreased. Basil of Neopatras (10th C.?) cited them in anti-Jewish polemics, interpreting them as foretelling Christ’s mission on the earth. Some of the prophets were later cited by Balsamon and Matthew of Ephesus.

The prophet book circulated in Byz. as a convenient single volume, like the Octateuch or Psalter. Seven illustrated examples of the prophet book date from the mid-10th C. (Vat. Chis. gr. R.VIII.54) to the second half of the 13th C. (Vat. gr. 1153). Miniatures are for the most part simple author portraits, with little narrative content. More complex narrative scenes are also found, as in Vat. gr. 755. This MS has an illustration to Isaiah’s Ode that closely follows a famous model in the Paris Psalter and an image of the martyrdom of the prophet, based on the account in the vita by pseudo-Epiphanios and related iconographically to a scene in the Paris Gregory. The relationship among prophet books is relatively straightforward, the text of the oldest supplying the model for the latest MSS. This type of book was probably developed in Byz. only after Iconoclasm, although Weitzmann (Sacra Parallela 133–60, 257) proposed that all images deriving from the prophetic books stem from pre-Iconoclastic examples. (See also Old Testament Illustration.)


PROPHETIC VISIONS. See Visions.

PROPHETOLOGION (προφητολογίαν, sometimes called a prophetaia), Old Testament lectionary of Constantinople, for use during services other than Eucharist, principally at Vespers and Presanctified during Lent and on vigils of the Great Feasts. The prophetologion also contained responsories (prokeimenon), antiphons, stichera, etc., as well as rubrical information proper to the feast. The prophetologion developed in the 7th–8th C. after the Old Testament lection had been eliminated from the Constantinopolitan Eucharist in the 7th C. (Mateos, La parole 131–33) and achieved its final form ca.800; the earliest known MS is the 9th-C. Sinai gr. 7. Old Testament lections for the liturgical hours and Presanctified were gradually incorporated into other liturgical books, namely the Menaion, Triodion, and Pentekostarion, thereby rendering the prophetologion obsolete.


—R.F.T.

PROPHETS, supposed authors or protagonists of 16 books of the Old Testament. The Byz. recognized the four Major Prophets—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel—and the twelve Minor Prophets—Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. The term prophetes, however, was also used for many other Old Testament worthies, for example, Aaron and Moses, Elijah and Elisha, and David and Solomon. This use was sanctioned in the New Testament, esp. Matthew, by the frequent references to Old Testament prophecies of events in Christ’s life. Their most sophisticated application was a typical scheme in Church Programs of Decoration in which a variable number of prophets stand below the Pantokrator in the dome; they usually display texts that provide a theological commentary, often on the Incarnation. Such a scheme was already known in the art of the 6th C., to judge from the rhetorical description by Chorikios of Gaza (Chorik.Gaz. p.7, pars. 17–20) of the Church of St. Sergios. The principal Byz. commentators on the Prophets were Basil the Great, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret of Cyrillus, and at a later date Theophylaktos of Ohrid.

Lit. Lowden, Prophet Books. —J.H.L., A.C.

PROPONTIS. See Marmara, Sea of.
PROSEK (Πρόσακος), Bulgarian fortress (προσακοιον) on the right bank of the Vardar near Demirkapija, first mentioned by Skylitzes (Skyl. 358.88) while recording Basil II’s victory over Bulgaria. It was assigned to the bishopric of Moglena, which owned some paroiokoi there. From the end of the 12th C. Prosek was disputed by several powers: in 1197/8 Dobromir Chrysos seized it; by 1204 it seems to have been controlled by Kalojan. At the beginning of the reign of Boril, Strez, a nephew of Kalojan, established himself in Prosek, but by 1208 he had submitted to Boril. Captured by Serbia in 1327/8, Prosek remained in Serbian hands until the battle of Kosovo Polje, when it passed to the Ottomans.


—R.B.

PROSKATHEMENOS (προσκαθήμενος, “settler” [Laiou, Peasant Society 246]), a term applied to various categories of peasants; according to N. Svoronos (TM 1 [1965] 357, n.155), a collective term meaning “tenant” in general. The word appears in the vita of St. Peter of Atroa (ed. Laurent, La vita rettractata, par.94.1; p.47.5–9) as a synonym for hyperetes (“servant”) and becomes common in later documents, sometimes in a variant form, such as proskathezomenoi (Iovir., nos. 2.18, 10.14). The term could be used independently or formed into a compound with other social and agrarian terms: not only with douleuto paraikoi, paraikoi, ateleis, mithioloi (mistrharnoi), eleutheroi, xenoi, ptochoi, etc., but also with anthropoi, epiokoi, and priests—terms that do not inherently imply dependency. This multiple use of the term reveals its fluidity of meaning and the lack of precision. Smetanin (infra), however, considers proskathemenoi as a specific, large group of dependent peasants, second only to the paraikoi, who either had no land whatsoever or leased it under worse conditions than paraikoi. The term itself and its combination with words denoting the status of “strangeness” indicates that in many cases proskathemenoi were newcomers who in the course of time were gradually transformed into ordinary dependent peasants.


—M.B.

PROSKOMIDE (προσκομιή, offering, offertery. Until the 10th C. the term proskomide was synonymous with anaphora. Thereafter it was used, by synedocche, for the opening formula of the anaphora, called the prayer of the proskomide, in which the priest prays for worthiness to approach the altar and offer the sacrifice (Mateos, La parole 176–79). From the 12th C. the term proskomide is synonymous with prothesis (Laurent, “Prosimide” 126–35; P. Gautier, REB 32 [1974] 45).

LIT. Taft, Great Entrance 350–73.

—R.F.T.

PROSKYNESIS (προσκυνήσις, Lat. adoratio), a common gesture of supplication or reverence in Byz. ceremonial. The physical act ranged from full prostration to a genuflection, a bow, or a simple greeting and concretized the relative positions of performer and beneficiary within a hierarchical order (taxis). Although proskynesis to the emperor occurred under the principe, the revamped Byz. symbolism of absolute rulership lent it new meaning and system. Certain forms of proskynesis, such as those which entailed kissing the emperor’s breast, hands, or feet, were reserved to specific categories of officials. Audiences granted to native or foreign delegations included multiple series of proskyneses at points marked by porphyry disks (omphalia) set in the floor. Until the 10th C., at least, imperial ceremonial avoided proskynesis on Sundays out of reverence for the divinity. As a form of loyalty display, proskynesis had strong political overtones; it recurs in imperial iconography and its importance in imperial ceremonial could sometimes raise delicate diplomatic dilemmas when foreign potentates were involved.

Proskynesis in the sense of prostration was by no means confined to the imperial court. It occurs as a posture of intense prayer, of penance (whence its designation as metanoia), or as a gesture of greeting holy men. Its wide diffusion in society explains, for example, the legend that a great tree bent down to worship the infant Jesus (Sozom., HE 5.21.9), the common pilgrim idiom “venerating the Holy Places” (derived from Ps 131:7), and the gesture’s transformation into a banal formula for concluding letters (e.g., P.Oxy. XVI 1933).

PROSKYNETARION (προσκυνητάριον). The rare Byz. term proskyneterion (προσκυνητήριον), meaning “oratory,” “place of worship,” was applied to places or objects associated with the Muslim cult: the Arabs, say both Theophanes (Theoph. 339.20–22) and Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De adm. imp. 19.10–11), transformed the Jewish temple of Solomon into the proskyneterion of their blasphemy. Niketas Byzantios describes Muslims as turning their faces toward the “proskyneterion of contemplation” as their idol was called (PG 105:720BC).

Despite this pejorative connotation of proskyneterion, the term proskynetarion was coined and acquired two meanings:

1. From the 16th C. onward, it designated travel guides to Sinai or Jerusalem; the term was translated into medieval Russian as pokolen’e (See mann, Wallfahrtslit. 38–41).

2. As a modern, conventional term, it denotes the monumental icon of Christ, the Virgin, or the patron saint of a church; A. Epstein (JBAA 134 [1981] 12–15) proposed that from the 10th C. proskynetaria were set on the piers separating the parts of the templon. Usually in fresco or mosaic, such icons were sometimes carved in stone (Lange, Reliefkone 124f). Their frames were mostly carved in marble, molded in gesso, or simply painted on the surface of the pier; the marble frame consists of a plain or a three-lobed arch or an arched slab on double, often knotted colonnettes (G. Babić, ZbLikUmet 11 [1975] pls. 2f, 9f). Proskynetaria of the patron saint may be found in the narthex or along the nave walls. The term may also refer to the stand of a particularly venerated processional icon (A. Grabar, CahArch 25 [1976] 145).


PROSOPOGRAPHY, an auxiliary discipline dedicated to the study of names of individuals and families in a given historical period. The main sources for Byz. prosopography are these: (1) narrative texts; (2) epistolography; (3) documents, esp. praktika; (4) sigillography; (5) epigraphy (to a much lesser extent than for the Roman Empire); and (6) lists of participants in councils. The sources have serious limitations, since most of them (except the praktika) deal with the upper echelon of society, and the praktika are geographically and chronologically restricted; for some periods (esp. the 7th–9th C.) the data are meager and barely representable. The goals of prosopography may be defined on two levels. The first is establishing lists of persons organized either by family names or by titles/offices; for the late Roman period local lists—for Rome (H. Sorin, Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom [Berlin 1982]), Africa (A. Mandouze, Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire [Paris 1982]), and part of Egypt (J. Diethart, Prosopographia arsinoitica, vol. 1 [Vienna 1980])—are available. The second level is the interpretation of the prosopographical material for history, primarily social history—such problems as structure of the ruling class in the 11th–12th C. (Kazhdan, Gosp.klass. 185–96) and the ethnic and professional composition of rural society in 14th-C. Macedonia (A. Laiou, BMGS 1 [1975] 71–95).

A related discipline is onomastics, the study of the etymology, origin, and patterns of usage of personal names. Patterns of name-change may, for example, reflect the christianization of society.

PROSOPON. See Person.

PROSPHONETIKOS LOGOS (προσφωνητικός λόγος), a formal address to an archon, according to Menander Rhetor (pp. 164–70); Menander describes it as a de facto enkomion, but not a complete one. In the 11th–15th C. the terms proshonomatikos, proshonometerios, and proshonemation designated the speech directed to a high official; Eustathios of Thessalonike addressed to the megas hetairiarches John Doukas a specimen "of talk and proshonemosis."

The term could be applied to a speech to an emperor; thus John Sikeliotes called his speech to Basil II a prosphonetikos logos (RhetGr, ed. Walz 6:447.25–27). More often an improvised address to the emperor was called autoschedios. It apparently differed from the basilikos logos to the extent that the emphasis was not on the ideal qualities of the ruler, but on the specific occasion of the speech.

LIT. Martin, Rhetorik 207. Hunger, Lit. 1:145–47.

PROSPHORA (προσφορά, lit. "offering"), term referring to (1) bread loaves prepared for consecration at the Eucharist and stamped with a seal (see Stamps, Bread); (2) the act of offering these gifts; or (3) the consecrated gifts themselves (van de Paverde, Messiliturie 238, 247–50, 288ff, 457, n.2). Bringing proshorai for the Eucharist, a custom witnessed from the 3rd C. onward, was a privilege and obligation of baptized communicants in good standing; those excluded from communion could make no offering. Proshorai were handed over to the deacons on arrival at church for the liturgy. The deacons then selected which loaves were to be brought to the altar. The selection of gifts before the liturgy was to evolve into a separate rite, the prothesis, and the transfer of these gifts to the altar is later solemnized in the Great Entrance. Various forms of bread and of bread stamps were used for the preparation of the proshora, whence the term "seal" (sphragis) for the eucharistic loaves, though the term properly refers only to the amnos, or central section.


PROSTAGMA (πρόσταγμα, esp. 13th–15th C.) or prostasis (πρόστασις, 11th–13th C.) or horimos or pttakion, synonymous terms designating an administrative order. Technically, they indicate a usually short imperial document (earliest preserved original: 1214) signed with the autograph red menologem and often bearing (until the end of the 15th C.) the wax seal of the emperor (Trapezuntine prostagma as well as horismoi of the rulers of Epiros were signed with an abridged signature; less is known of the prostagma of Serbian rulers). Beyond transmitting orders, prostagma were also used for granting privileges, for legislating and for regulating, for attesting an oath taken by the emperor (horkomotikos prosagma), for appointing individuals to administrative positions, or for granting honorific titles (11th–15th C.; in this they replaced the late Roman probatoriae and the kodikilo, still attested in the 10th C. but none of which have survived). Horimos was also the technical name of documents issued by 14th–15th C. despotai, while pttakion was commonly used to indicate simple letters, often those coming from the patriarchal chancery. The patriarch’s orders and those of the state officials were usually called (para)keleusia, entalma, gramma, etc. and could be signed with a menologem.


PROSTATES (προστάτης), an ancient term meaning "defender" and later "chief, head," was applied to the bishop as protector of the ordinary people (B. Treucker, Politische und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zu den Basilius-Briefen [Frankfurt 1961] 31). In the Book of the Eparch it is employed, along with exarch, to refer to the heads of some guilds—soapmakers, harnessmakers, fishmongers. In other
cases a similar term ἱστάτουμι or the more general προέστος was used. —A.K.

PROSTIMON (πρόστιμον), the penalty for a breach of contract. According to Roman law the prostimon could be agreed upon through stipulation and was to be paid to the contract-partner in case of infringement of the contract. Its main function was to ensure an orderly and punctual payment of debt. The same aim was served by the agreement regarding the fines owed to the state in case of breach of contract. The two kinds of prostima competed in Byz. legal texts for reasons that have not yet been explained. Default on the part of the parties and lack of enforcement by judges (Prochiron Auctum 17.77), which could result when the prostima agreed upon were unreasonably harsh (Peira 45.2), gave the legislator repeated occasion to demand payment of the prostimon (Reg 1, nos. 358, 691; 2, nos. 1083, 1465; 4, no.2295). Also designated as prostimon was the fine imposed by a judge based on his independent assessment as opposed to the fine determined by law. (For the prostimon in the marriage contract, see Arrha Spousalicia.)

—L.B.

Usage in Documents. The term prostimon is common in papyri (Preisigke, Wörterbuch 2 [1925] 415f). Byz. documents establish prostimon in one of their final clauses as a guarantee against breach of contract; the earliest known case is a purchase deed of 897 (Lavra 1, no.1.29). In addition to purchase deeds, prostimon appears in acts of exchange, donation, and guarantee; a chrysobull of 1102 establishes prostimon for transgression of the exxousia (Lavra 1, no.55.85–87). Typical of the chancellorcy of Thessalonike, it appears also in documents from Smyrna (e.g., MM 4:198.20) and Serres (e.g., Esphig., no.9.25, Koutoum, no.7.27). The sum of prostimon varies significantly: a fine of 4 nomismata is known (Chl., no.125.80–81), but in an act of 897 the exorbitant prostimon of 20 litrae is prescribed. The clause establishing prostimon varies; sometimes it is noted that a prostimon was imposed in accordance with the contract and stipulation (e.g., Lavra 1, no.59.67–68); the formula "as prostimon and for the disregard of the revered cross" (Itur., no.26.30) is also found. Prostimon is meant to be a private indemnification, usually given for one party; an act of exchange of 1154, however, stipulates mutual prostimon (Lavra 1, no.63.58). In some documents alongside the private prostimon an (unnamed) state fine is anticipated: it was less than prostimon (an act of 1110 [Lavra 1, no.59.67–68] established it as one-third of the prostimon; often it is not defined in figures, only said to be "in accordance with laws") and collected by various treasuries (sakelle, office of the epi ton oikeiakon, and mainly the vestiarion).

—A.K.

PROSTITUTION (πορνεία), engaging in sexual intercourse in exchange for payment, remained a permanent feature of late Roman and Byz. society, despite urban decline. Prostitutes (pornai, hetairai) flourished in organized brothels (mastropoeia) as well as at baths, theaters, and hippodromes, along with masseuses, dancers, and other female entertainers (cf. Prokopios, SH 9.1–30). They also worked in inns and changing posts along the main highways, e.g., Helena, the mother of Constantine I, and the mother, aunt, and grandmother of Theodora of Sykeon. While laws forbade the exploitation of young girls as prostitutes (esp. Justinian I, nov.14 pr.) and the church regularly condemned prostitution (e.g., Council in Trullo, canon 86), both poor girls working for pimps (pornoboskoi) and more professional theatrical performers (skeniakai) continued to provide sexual services. These circus artists and actresses, attired in silk and gold cloth, bejeweled, and liberally adorned with cosmetics and perfume, often became quite wealthy. Some prostitutes even worked at the imperial court, as during the reign of Andronikos I, who amused himself with courtesans and concubines (Nik. Chon. 321.20–322.41).

The Byz. had a charitable attitude toward repentant prostitutes, even providing "houses of reformation" for those who wished to change their way of life. Best known are the monastery of Metanoia (Repentance) established in the 6th C. by the empress Theodora, herself a former actress and prostitute (Prokopios, Buildings 1.9.1–10; SH 17.5–6), and the convent founded by Michael IV in the 11th C. Saints, esp. holy fools, also endeavored to reform prostitutes on an individual basis (cf. vita of Symeon of Emesa, ed. Festugière, 79.11–14, 88.28–89.18). Some former prostitutes, for example, Pelagia the Harlot and Mary of Egypt, even attained sanctity,
thus symbolizing the power of Christian redemption modeled on Mary Magdalene.

LIT. S. Leontsini, Die Prostitution im frühen Byzanz (Vienna 1989). J. Irmscher, "Die Bewertung der Prostitution im byzantinischen Recht," in Gesellschaft und Recht im griechisch-

protasekretis (πρωταστηρήτης), head of the college of askektai. The first certain mention of proto a secreta (sic) is in the Liber pontificalis (Lib. pont. 1:452.12) under the year 756; later evidence of earlier protasekretis, including Maximos the Confessor under Herakleios (W. Lackner, JÖB 20 [1971] 63–65), may be anachronistic. Seals of the protasekretis are known only from the 9th C. (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 3–4). As chief of the imperial chancery, the protasekretis enjoyed en-

PROTATON (Πρωτάτον), the central administration of Mt. Athos, located at KARYES, in the center of the peninsula, and headed by the PROTOS. The term, first mentioned in 1153, is also used for the monastic community and for the church at the lavra of the Protaton. The central administration was in existence by 958, when assemblies there are first attested. Originally three annual assem-

PROTE. See PRINCES' ISLANDS.

PROTEKDIKOΣ (πρωτεκδίκος), title first attested in the second half of the 7th C., bestowed on a cleric who presided over the ekdikeion, a tribunal composed of a varying number of priests (ekdikoi, ekklesiek dikoi), instituted as a group by Justinián I and attached to Hagia Sophia (G. Prinzing, FM 7 [1986] 14–17). References to the protekdikos are rare until the 12th C. A treatise by Theodore Balsamon reflects a controversy in ecclesiastical circles in the second half of the 12th C. concerning the relative powers and rights of the protekdikos and CHARTOPHYLAX (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma
4530–41). In the last decade of the century, under Patr. George II Xiphilinos (1191–98), the protekdikos was awarded sixth rank among the exokatakoiloí. Sources of the 12th–15th C. describe his function as protecting those who sought asylum in Hagia Sophia, be they debtors, slaves, or people suspected justly or unjustly of murder. It is esp. with regard to the latter that the protekdikos’s activities are documented. In such cases he listened to the confession of the penitent, judged his innocence or guilt, and accordingly set the epitimia in expiation of the sin, handing these to the penitent sinner in a document, the semeion (A. Pavlov, VizVrem 4 [1897] 155–59; R. Macrides, Speculum 63 [1988] 509–38). From the 11th C. the protekdikos is also attested in the provinces, although not in connection with cases of asylum (Lavra 1, no. 35, 53 [a.1071]; Michael Choniates, ed. Lampros 2:313, 14–21).


PROTEUS, minor sea god living on the Egyptian island of Pharos, a wise old man who could transform himself into any imaginable shape. In Byz. literature he is most often a symbol of mutability, usually applied in a negative way (Psilos, Chron. 2:46 [bk.6, ch.152.11]). Less often Proteus is the wise prophet (Niketas Choniates, Orationes 164.30–31). Finally, some traces of allegorical interpretation seem to survive during Byz. times: Proteus in his mutability symbolizes the four elements (Eust. Comm. Od. 1:174f [1503,6–36]).

LIT. H. Herter, RE 23 (1957) 940–75.

PROTHESIS (πρόθεσις, lit. “offering”), the offertory, the preparation of the bread and chalice in a separate liturgical rite before the beginning of the Eucharist. Before the 9th C. there was only the material preparation of the gifts by the deacons in the skenophylakion (see Pastophoria), after which the prothesis prayer was said by the priest or bishop. From the 9th C. the rite evolved into a plethora of local usages (Laurent, “Procomidie” 116–42), and the eucharistic bread (proosphora), interpreted in the liturgical commentaries as an atonity of Christ’s body, came to be related symbolically to the Old Testament amnos, the Lamb of God. As the liturgy, according to these commentaries, mirrors the stages of Jesus’ earthly life, the bread prepared in the prothesis rite came to symbolize the Jesus of both Bethlehem and Golgotha. The 14th-C. diataxis of Patr. Philotheos Kokkins prescribes the use of five loaves of bread: one for the excision of the amnos, representing Jesus, which will be consecrated in the anaphora; the others for commemorative particles cut out with appropriate accompanying formulas in honor of the Theotokos, the saints, the living, and the dead. The term prothesis can also refer to the offering itself and to the table on which the prothesis rite is performed.


PROTHESES CHAMBER. See Pastophoria.

PROTIKTORES (πρωτικτόρες, Lat. protectores), a troop of the emperor’s bodyguards created ca.250, sometimes called protectores domestici. They also served as members of the emperor’s staff and fulfilled special assignments: the arrest and execution of political adversaries, levies and inspections, and supervision of the post and customs. After 400, protiktorei shifted toward court service. According to R. Frank (infra), they were the predecessors of the schola palatina. Whether they survived beyond 600 is unclear; a seal of one is dated 550–650 (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 568). Protiktorei reappear in the late 9th-C. Klerorologion of Philotheos as subaltern officers under the domestikos ton scholon. The De ceremoniis (De cer. 11.20) mentions the “standards” (skeuē) that protiktorei and senators carried in ceremonial processions; Philotheos lists protiktorei along with the bearers of euchia (banners).


PROTIMESIS (πρωτιμησις, lit. “preference”), the right of preemption, or priority, in various property arrangements, usually purchases. The term
is most commonly found in 10th-C. legislation concerning the village community. Although not explicitly employing the term protimesis, novel 114 of Leo VI implies that the right of neighbors to have first refusal on property sales was well-established in Byz.: a person could sell his property to anyone, but his neighbors had six months to object to the sale, reimburse the buyer, and themselves possess the property. Conflicts between traditional practices and more recent legislation led to a detailed clarification of this form of protimesis in a novel of Romanos I: there were to be no restrictions on the gratuitous alienation of property (i.e., as gifts, dowries, bequeathals), but properties sold, leased, or given as legation had to be offered first to five hierarchical categories of privileged acquirers, from co-owning relatives down to simple neighbors (Zepos, Jus 1:203-6-11). That this right of protimesis was an obstacle to the aggrandizement of the dynatoi is seen from a novel of Nikephoros II Phokas that forbade the poor from exercising the right of protimesis when the property of a dynatos was on sale (Zepos, Jus 1:253-55).

While the decline of an independent peasantry and the rise of the paroikia during the 11th C. shows that peasants were ultimately unable to enforce their rights of protimesis, the principle seems to have persisted into the 14th C.: without explicitly employing the term protimesis, the 1319 chrysobull for Ioannina (MM 5:83-18-19) states that properties held by the city's inhabitants could not be sold to any archon or stratiotes unless they were first offered to fellow inhabitants of the city. Protimesis was also used to denote other types of prior rights: for instance, a novel of Nikephoros II Phokas (Zepos, Jus 1:255f) orders that if a stratiotes had sold property not included within his strateia, he could recover it en protimesi by paying a just price; in 995 (Ivir. 1, no.9.57) the right of protimesis to complete construction of a mill was granted by a village community to a man whose father had begun the mill; and in 1384 (Docheiar., no.49.42) protimesis was used to signify a widow's right to the first settlement in the disposition of her husband's estate.


PROTO-BULGARIAN INSCRIPTIONS, from the pre-Christian period of the Bulgarian state (681-864/5). A few brief inscriptions in runes resembling those used by the Orkhon Turks of Central Asia survive; though they cannot be read, no doubt they are in the Turkic language of the Bulgars and would have been unintelligible to their Greek and Slavic-speaking subjects. Therefore, for public communication the Bulgars adopted Greek, the lingua franca of the eastern Balkans, although this is often closer to spoken Greek than to the Byz. literary Greek language. Almost 100 Greek inscriptions of the 8th-9th C., some only fragmentary, have been discovered in the former territory of the First Bulgarian Empire, together with a few in the Bulgar language written in the Greek alphabet. The main types of Proto-Bulgarian inscriptions are res gestae; military inventories; triumphal, building, sepulchral, and commemorative inscriptions; treaties and boundary markers; graffiti; and inscriptions on seals and other portable objects. The earliest Proto-Bulgarian inscription (no.1 a-c), carved on a cliff at Madara beside the gigantic relief of a horseman, recounts early Bulgar-Byz. relations and dates from shortly after 705. Several recount the exploits of Krum. Another (no.40) sets out the terms of a peace treaty with Byz., probably ca.816-17. The best preserved is a building inscription of Omurtag on a column now in a church in Tarnovo (no.55). These inscriptions throw light on the organization of the early Bulgarian state, on military and diplomatic relations with Byz., and on the history of the Greek language.


PROTOCOL. See Acts, Documentary.

PROTOEVANGELION OF JAMES, conventional and incorrect title of a Christian apocryphal text produced probably at the very end of the 2nd C. in Egypt; at any rate, it did not originate in Palestine, since the situation there is presented in a confused form. The Protoevangelion survives in a 4th-C. papyrus (Pap. Bodmer V), several papyrus fragments, and numerous MSS from ca.900 onward. P. Bodmer gives the title The Nativity of Mary (Gennesis Marias). The author, who
presents himself as James, the Lord’s brother, relates the Virgin’s biography, from her miraculous birth to a barren couple Ioakeim and Anna up to the birth of Christ, the arrival of the Magi, and Herod’s wrath. The story was known to Origen under the name *The Book of James*, and probably to Clement of Alexandria; Eustathios of Antioch preserved a detailed résumé of it. The text was included in liturgical collections for the reading on 8 Sept. Syriac, Sahidic Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, Arabic, and Latin versions are known.

**Usage as an Iconographic Source.** Rapidly and widely disseminated, the Protoevangelion fundamentally influenced the imagery of Mary, furnishing Byz. art from the 5th C. onward with numerous Marian images: the story of Mary’s parents, Ioakeim and Anna, with Ioakeim’s expulsion from the Temple for barrenness, his retreat into the wilderness, Anna’s lament, the annunciation to both parents, and their joyful meeting before Anna’s house (paralleled iconographically with the Visitation, but often commemorated as the moment of Mary’s conception); the Birth of the Virgin, her infancy, her blessing by the Temple priests, her Presentation in the Temple and nourishment by angels, and her selection as the one to weave the purple wool for the Temple veil; her betrothal to Joseph, the dual Annunciation at the well and then indoors, and the trial by bitter water; the account of the Nativity in a cave rather than a stable, with the doubting midwife, Salome, and the Adoration of the Magi; and the events befalling the Holy Family during the Massacre of the Innocents (the escape into the mountain of Mary’s cousin, Elizabeth, with her son, John the Baptist; the murder of John’s father, the priest Zacharias, and the election of Symeon to succeed him).

The Protoevangelion provided theophanic events for Early Christian cycles and human and emotional themes for art from the 12th to the 14th C. The two superbly illustrated 12th-C. editions of the homilies on the Virgin by James of Kokkinobaphos, which are based on the Protoevangelion, contain the most comprehensive Byz. Marian cycle. The Protoevangelion is also basic to the cycle of Mary’s life at the Chora.

---


---

**PROTOIERAKARIOS (πρωτοιερακάριος),** the first falconer of the emperor, an office/title known in the 13th-14th C. Guillard is wrong in asserting that Anna Kомнene “speaks of a protoierakarios”; in fact, she only mentions (An.Kомн. 2:117.8-9) a certain Constantine in charge of the emperor’s falcons. A 14th-C. historian (Pachym., ed. Failler, 1.41.13-14) relates that Theodore Mouzalon was appointed protoierakarios, whereas other sources call him PROTOKYNEGOS. The title had a relatively modest place in the hierarchy (after logos thetes tou stratiotitou) and appears rarely in the sources. In 1344 two protoierakariai—Lagoupes and Demetrios Komes—participated in a session of imperial oikoi who endowed estates upon the monastery of Docheiariou (*Docheiar.*, no.23); thus there could be several protoierakariai simultaneously. In the list of pseudo-Kodinos they stood below the megas tzaousios and skoutarios. (See also Hawking.)


---

**PROTOKARABOS (πρωτοκάραβος) is listed among the subordinates of strategoi of maritime themes in the 9th-10th C. and refers to a ship’s pilot or steersman, the rank immediately below a kentarchos, who was the captain of a dromon (Oikonomides, *Listes* 341). Imperial warships had two protokaraboi (the senior of the two was named protos protokarabos) handling the steering oars and commanding the rowers on either side of the ship. During the 10th C. the protokarabos of the imperial dromon customarily became protospatharios tes Phiales as well (*De adm. imp.* 51:188-91).


---

**PROTOKYNEGOS (πρωτοκυνηγός),** the first hunter of the emperor, an office/title known from the 13th C. onward. According to pseudo-Kodinos, the protokynegos had hunters (skylomangoi, probably guardians of hounds) under his command; his function was to hold the emperor’s stirrup when the latter was mounting his horse. Despite
a relatively modest place in the hierarchy (after the *megas logariastes*), the title of *protokynegos* was granted to several important personages, such as Theodore Mouzalon under Theodore II Laskaris; Kontophre-Godefroi, governor of Mesothy- 
nia under Andronikos III; and John Vatatzes in the mid-14th C. The predecessor of the *protokynegos* was probably the *homès tou kynegiou* attested on an undated seal of the *protospalatharios* John, who combined this function with that of *hetair- 
reiaires* (*Zacos, Seals 2*, no. 524).


**PROTO-MAIOLICA WARE**, a type of pottery with a tin glaze and light-colored fabric found throughout the eastern Mediterranean in the 13th to 14th C. It was first thought to have been produced in the Crusader states of the Levant (F. Waage, *Hesperia* 3 [1934] 129–39); a Byz. origin of the ware was later suggested (Morgan, *Pottery* 105–14), but it has now been established that the pottery was made in southern Italy, particularly in the area of Apulia. Small bowls, broad plates, and pitchers are typical forms. The ware is decorated with various colors of glaze, esp. blues, purples, and black; geometric designs as well as figural representations are common. The pottery was exported in considerable quantities and gained supremacy over many Byz. wares in Greece and Syria. The expansion of Proto-Maiolica demonstrates the growth of Western economic power vis-à-vis Byz. and also provides reasonably well-

dated horizons inarchaeological contexts.


**PROTOME** (προτομή), the bust of a human or the front part of an animal, often paired on early Byz. textiles under Sasanian influence and in architec-
tural sculpture. *Protome capitals*, based on Roman and Hellenistic models ultimately of Per-
sian origin, were often employed in 5th- and 6th-
C. churches, particularly for ciboria and tribela. They consist of a zone of acanthus leaves, often of the fine-toothed type, or a zone of stylized floral ornament, or a basket, surmounted by busts of griffins, rams, bulls, lions, or winged horses. Such capitals provided models for medieval revivals, esp. in S. Marco, Venice.


**PROTONOTARIOS** (πρωτονοτάριος), chief of the notaries. Laurent (*Corpus 2* 77) distinguishes two kinds of *protonotarioi*: those of the emperor, also called “proedroi of the notaries of the *despotes*” (no. 165) or *primikerioi* of the notaries (no. 177), and those of the sekreta. Among the other *pro- 
tonotarioi* that of the dromos played an esp. 

important role, serving as deputy of the *logothetes 
tou dromou* (Oikonomides, *Listes* 311); the 

*protonotarioi* of the genikon (Laurent, *Corpus* 2, nos. 384–87) and other *logothetes* are known as well. The *protonotarioi* of the themes belonged to the department of the *sarelion*: they dealt with supply of the army and fleet (*Ahrweiler, *Administration**) 43). A 10th-C. seal was owned by the *osiaires* Gregory who held the office of *protonotarioi* of the “Augustiakos oikos” (*Zacos, Seals 2*, no. 923) that perhaps designates the “private” estate of the augusta. The office of *protonotarioi* was probably created simultaneously with the system of the *logothesia*; their seals belong mostly to the period of the 8th–11th C. Dölger (*Beiträge* 69) sug-

gests that the *protonotarioi* of the themes dis-

appeared after the 11th C.; the *protonotarioi* of the dromos is known at least through ca. 1185 (Nik.Chon. 335.21). Pseudo-Kodinos mentions only one sec-

ular *protonotarioi* whom he places after the *or-

phantrotophos*. N. Oikonomides (*REB* 43 [1985] 170–72) hypothesizes that in the 14th C. the *pro-

tonotarioi* was the emperor’s personal secretary; he also thinks that *Mazaris*, when speaking of the imperial *grammateus*, meant the *protonotarioi*.

The patriarchal *protonotarioi* was an official of 
the second class, below the *exokatakoloioi* (*Dar-

rouzès, *Offikia* 175).


40. – A.K.

**PROTOS** (πρῶτος, lit. “the first [monk]”), head of a group of scattered hermitages and monaster-

ies, as at the holy mountains of *Ganos*, *Latros*,
Metora, and esp. Athos. The beginning of the institution is obscure; it is unclear whether the protos was a modified form of the supervisor of local monastic communities such as the archimandrite or exarch. The evidence of seals (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 1135, 1272A) suggests that protai may have been in existence at least as early as the 7th C.

Papachryssanthou argues that the first protos on Mt. Athos was a certain Andrew, "monk and first (protos) hesychast of the famous Mountain," who is mentioned in an act of Leo VI of 908 (Prot., no.2.17–18). Her hypothesis is based on an ambiguous passage from the vita of St. Blasios (died ca.911/12), who is said to have met at the Studios monastery with the protos and chosen brethren; Papachryssanthou (infra 52, n.64) rejects the logical interpretation that the hagiographer meant the protos of Studios and connected the evidence instead with Athos. The next known protos of Athos was Stephen (ca.958/9), who is mentioned in the vita of Athanasios of Athos; Athanasios himself was protos in 972. The list of protos of Athos established by Papachryssanthou contains 87 names up to 1452. The protos of the Holy Mountain, usually from one of the smaller Athonite monasteries, was elected by an assembly of monks at Karyes; the emperor himself invested him with the staff of authority. Originally the protos served for life, but since the persons elected were of honorable age, the duration of the office was usually no longer than five to ten years; exceptionally, the protos Isaac (I. Mamaslakas, EEBS 36 [1968] 70–80) ruled the community for about 30 years (ca.1316–45). By the end of the 14th C. the system of annual elections was introduced. The institution of protos survived on Athos until the late 16th C.

It is difficult to determine the rights of the protos over the community of Athos: in 972 the Tragos of John I Zimiskes ruled that the authority of the protos was limited by the assembly of hegoumenoi at the Protaton. By the 11th C. the authority of the protos was eclipsed by that of the hegoumenoi of the three major monasteries of Great Lavra, Iviron, and Vatopedi. The protos served as representative from Athos to both civil and ecclesiastical authorities. Assisted by the hegoumenoi, he administered justice and had disciplinary powers over the monks of Athos. He also confirmed the election of hegoumenoi and handed them the staff of office in the name of the emperor. He was responsible for distributing to the Athonite monks the annual pension (roga) from the emperor.

Preservation of the independence of the community was the main political task of the protos. In the 10th C. he managed to limit the role of the bishop of Hierissos in the ordination of priests and deacons on Athos. In theory he was dependent only on the emperor, but he frequently had to deal with the patriarch’s attempts to encroach upon Athonite independence: thus Patr. Nicholas III Grammatikos tried to exercise jurisdiction over Athos, imposing epitimia and excommunications; in the 13th C. the monks of Athos addressed patriarchs asking them to solve property cases on the Holy Mountain; Patr. Athenasios I insisted on the patriarchal investiture (benediction) of the protos together with that of the emperor. Andronikos II in 1312 introduced patriarchal investiture as a rule. Moreover, in 1368 the protos was subordinated to the bishop of Hierissos. At the same time Serbia established its influence over Athos: in the 1350s and 1360s the Serboprotos (Serbian protos) Antony, Dorotheos, and Sabbas signed their documents in Slavonic. Only Patr. Antony IV, from 1392 onward, began to restore the former independence of the protos.


-A.K., A.M.T.

PROTOSEBASTOS (πρωτοσέβαστος), a high title designating the first (protos) of the sebastoi (Zacos, Seals 1, no.2711). It is generally accepted that the title was created by Alexios I, although in a document of 1049 resolving a litigation Domenico Contarini, the doge of Venice, calls himself imperial patrikios and proteosebastos (S. Romanin, Studia documentata di Venezia 1 [Venice 1853] 219f). Among Byz. nobles the first proteosebastos was Michael Taronites, husband of Alexios’s sister; eventually he received the higher title of panhypersebastos. In the 12th C. the title of proteosebastos was conferred on close relatives of the emperor, sometimes the sons of a sebstokrator (L. Stüernon, REB 23 [1965] 224, n.17). In the 14th-C. list of pseudo-Kodinos the proteosebastos ranks between the megas logothetes and pinkernes.
The title was granted to members of noble families such as the Palaiologoi, Tarchaneiотai, Raoul, and Metochitai.

LIT. Raybaud, Gouvernement 180ff. — A.K.

**PROTOSPARTHARIOS** (πρωτοσπαθάριος), the first spatharios, a dignity of the imperial hierarchy; this dignity usually conferred membership in the senate. The first reliable evidence is in 718 (Sergios, protospatharios and stratégos of Sicily [Theoph. 398.7]), the last is in 1115 (Lavra 1, no.60.74), although the title was still known in the 14th C. to pseudo-Kodinos. Seibl (Bleisiegel, no.163) dates a seal of the *protospatharios* Basil Spondyles to the 13th C. Up to the 10th C. *protospatharios* was a high title granted mostly to commanders of themes; in the 11th C. it lost this significance. *Protospatharioi* of the 10th C. were divided into two groups, “bearded” and eunuchs. Some holders of this dignity had special court functions, such as the *protospatharioi* of Chrysotriklinos and of Lausiakos. The *protospatharios* of the basilikoi anthropoi had military or paramilitary functions, while the *protospatharios tes Phiales* had judicial duties. The title was also granted to several foreign princes. The salary of a *protospatharios* was 72 nomismata a year. Constantine VII (De adm. imp. 50.235–56) tells the story of a wealthy cleric Kinas who bought the title of *protospatharios* for 60 liras, a sum 60 times his annual roga (which he received for only two years since he was an old man), indicating that the honor that accrued to this title was more important than its monetary value.

The insign of the bearded *protospatharios* was a golden collar with precious stones; bearded *protospatharioi* carried swords, while eunuchs were garbed in white robes and cloaks adorned with gold. In MS illustrations the depiction of the *protospatharios* varies over time. In the first half of the 10th C. Constantine the *protospatharios*, the brother of Leo Sakellarios, wears a red chlamys edged in gold with a rinceau motif over a white chiton, as well as his sword of office. The *protospatharios* Basil, who was the patron of a 12th-C. lectionary, is shown in a purple chiton under a red chlamys with gold border and tablion, but without a sword (Spatharakis, Portrait 11, 84, 228, figs. 2, 4, 52, 164).


**PROTOSPARTHARIOS TES PHIALES** (πρωτοσπαθάριος τῆς Φιάλης), an enigmatic official appointed as judge of the imperial oarsmen, described in the De administrando imperio (51.46–111) but omitted in contemporary taktika. The meaning of *phiale* (lit. “drinking-bowl” or “basin”) is also uncertain; probably it means a part of the harbor at Boukolion (Guillaud, Topographie 1:256). Until Romanos I only the oarsmen of the emperor's ships were within his jurisdiction, the barge of the augusta being under the control of her “master of the table” (επι τες τραπέζες); Romanos, however, gave the *protospatharios* authority over the barges of the Augusta. Constantine VII (De adm. imp. 51.93–102) relates that a certain Podaron, first oarsman under Basil I, was made *protospatharios* and later stratēgos of Kybyrhainiotai; since he was illiterate, a krites of the Hippodrome was appointed to help him judge the sailors.


**PROTOSTRATOR** (πρωτοστράτωρ), chief of imperial stratores. His major duty in the 9th and 10th C. was to accompany the emperor while on horseback. The first mention of the imperial protostrator refers to 765, when the spatharios and protostrator Constantine, son of the patrikios Bardanes, was among the victims of Iconoclast persecution; in the account of Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 438.15–16) he is almost at the bottom of the list of victims. The *taktika* of the 9th and 10th C. place protostratores on a relatively low rung of the hierarchical ladder. The post, however, seems to have been a good starting place for many careers: the general Manuel began as protostrator of Michael I, and at least two protostratores of the 9th C., Michael (II) and Basil (I), became emperor. A 12th-C. historian (Zon. 3:412.4–5) defined the protostrator as one of the highest officials; ca.1200 Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 600.48) equated him with the Western mariscalculus (marshal).

During the Palaiologan period the protostrator was one of the highest functionaries; he had ceremonial duties and commanded troops. There was one protostrator in the 12th C., but several from the end of the 13th C. onward. Among the renowned protostratores of the Palaiologan period were Alexios Philanthropenos and Theodore.
SYNADENOS. The last protostrator, a certain Palaiologos, perished during the siege of Constantinople in 1453. From the 13th C. onward the distinction between the functions of protostrator and megas doux gradually became blurred.

The staff of the protostrator in the 9th–10th C. included grooms, supervisors of stables, and armophylakes (officials in charge of weapons, according to Bury [Adm. System 118], but responsible for chariots according to Oikonomides [Listes 938]). Besides imperial protostratores there were protostratores of some high functionaries, both in the provinces (the protostrator of Opsikion [Theoph. 383.11]) and possibly in central departments, if Laurent’s reading of a seal, “protostrator of the komes tou staulou” (Corpus 2, no.931) is correct.


PROTOTHRONOS (πρωτόθρωνος), a term derived from thrōnos, a synonym for the episcopal see, and designating the chief or preeminent bishop occupying the first see. Hence its usage by Theodore of Studios to denote Rome’s honorary primacy—the prima sedes within the pentarchy (PG 99:1332B). Ordinarily, however, the title was used for the senior ranked metropolitan in a patriarchate. Thus the prototrones of Antioch, next to the patriarch of the city of Antioch itself, was usually the metropolitan of Tyre. His counterpart in Constantinople was the metropolitan of Caesarea, who alone carried the title in the patriarchate of Constantinople. Since the term was connected with the taxis prokathedrias (order of precedence), the highest ranking suffragan bishop of an ecclesiastical province was likewise called prototrones of his metropolis or province. Indeed, a new autocephalous archbishop was often prototrones of his metropolis prior to his elevation.

Lit. Beck, Kirche 73. –A.P.

PROTOVESTIARIOS (πρωτοβεστιάριος), post for a palace eunuch, second to that of parakoimomenos. The protovestiarios is considered to be the successor to the comes sacrae vestis, keeper of the emperor’s wardrobe; he is first recorded in 412 (Jones, LRE 1:567) and presided over the emperor’s private vestiarion, which differed from the state vestiarion. The early evidence about protovestiarioi is very scarce. Several seals of protovestiarioi of the 8th–9th C. survive (Laurent, Méd.

Vat., no.25; Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 1410, 1634, 1781); none, however, mentions the protovestiarios in association with another title or office. Of the tak-tika from the 9th and 10th C., only the Kletorologion of Philotheos lists the protovestiarios of the despotes (emperor), but it gives no evidence of his functions. The first protovestiarios mentioned in narrative sources is Leo Chamaidarakon (TheophCont 791.1–3), whom Emp. Theophilos dispatched to bring (to the palace?) a candelabrum broken at the time of Leo V’s murder. Neither this assignment nor other cases presented in the texts have anything to do with the imperial wardrobe: in the 9th–11th C. protovestiarioi commanded armies, conducted peace negotiations, investigated conspiracies, and so on. Sometimes, as in the career of Samonas, an individual was appointed first protovestiarios and later parakoimomenos, whose aide the protovestiarios seems to have been.

The role of the protovestiarios increased in the 11th C. when the protovestiarios Symeon was at the same time the domestikos ton scholon under Romanos III; the protovestiarios Constantine (III) Lechoues, the future patriarch, administered the government of Constantine IX. Protovestiarios became an honorific title, and it was conferred on bearded nobles, such as Andronikos Doukas, the son of Caesar John. From the 12th C. onward, many aristocrats and high-ranking dignitaries were granted the title, including some future emperors (Alexios V, John III Vatatzes) and other important politicians (George Mouzalon). In the 14th C. it was one of the highest titles: a Palaiologan ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 135f) relates that Michael VIII appointed his nephew Michael Tar-chaneiotes as protovestiarios, placed him above the megas domestikos, and gave him the exclusive right to the “green garments.” The last renowned protovestiarios was Alexios Asan in the mid-14th C.

In the late 9th C. Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 97.4) mentions the protovestiaria of the augusta as the first of the empress’s female servants; protovestiarioi are also known in the 11th–15th C. (e.g., An.Komn. 1:80.23; MM 2:456.20–34). Protovestiarioi of private persons are attested as well: Lykastos, protovestiarios of St. Philaretos the Merciful, had to carry his master’s purse and distribute money among the poor (vita, ed. Fourmy, Leroy, 149.11–15). The term should not be confused with that of protovestrates.

PROTOVESTIARITES (πρωτοβεστιαρίτης), chief of the vestiaritai or imperial bodyguard. The position probably existed from the 13th C. onward.

PROTO-_________. See also under latter part of term.

PROUSA (Προύσα, now Bursa), city of Bithynia. Rarely mentioned before the 12th C., Prous was appears as a military base in the time of Justinian I, and as the site of a renowned hot spring frequently visited by Byz. emperors. During the Iconoclastic period, Prous was the regional center for the monks of the neighboring Mt. Olympus. The city gained in importance under the Komnenoi, when it was exposed to Turkish attack. It in 1184 it revolted against Andronikos I, who took it in spite of its powerful fortifications. The city, described as built on a hill and surrounded by strong walls (Nik. Chon. 602.8–603.23), was besieged in vain by the Latins in 1204–5. Prous was threatened by Osman in 1302 and bought peace after a siege in 1304. According to Turkish sources Osman surrounded it with blockading fortresses in 1315; it was finally forced to surrender on 6 Apr. 1326 and to pay a tribute of 30,000 gold pieces.

Prous was a suffragan bishopric of Nikomedia; it briefly assumed the name Theopolis in the 7th C. and was made a metropolis by Isaac II Komnenos.


PROVERB (παρομίωνια), a rhetorical device very like a gnome, though not necessarily taken from a literary source. Its general familiarity made it a favored mode of stylistic ornament for writers of the Second Sophistic and subject of collections from the Hellenistic period onward. Proverbs played a role in Byz. literature at both a learned and a popular level. Three main versions of the Hellenistic collections circulated in the Byz. period: that of Zenobios (1st C., an abbreviated alphabetic form of the collections of Didymos and Lucillus Tyrrhaeus), the Proverbs of Plutarch used by the Alexandrians (drawn from Seleukos of Alexandria), and an alphabetical list of Popular Proverbs (1st C., based on Diogenianos). These gave rise to the late Byz. collections of Gregory II of Cyprus, the Rhodonia of Metr. Makarios Chrystokephalos of Philadelphia, and the Ionia of Michael Apostoles. Simultaneously, proverbial expressions, many derived from those in the learned tradition, flourished in everyday speech, as may be seen from quoted examples (e.g., by Eustathios in his account of the fall of Thessalonike or Michael Glykas in his verses from prison). A small collection of these popular proverbs is attributed to Michael Psellus; other larger anonymous collections also survive (complete with theological interpretations). Maximos Planoudes made the fullest such collection, preserved in several MSS.


PROVINCE (provincia, περιφερία), the primary administrative district in the Roman Empire. Since provincial governors acquired dangerous independence in the 3rd C., Diocletian tried to decrease their power. First, the provinces were subdivided (Lactant., De mort. pers. 7.4), with 120 provinces recorded in the Notitia Dignitatum. Second, in some provinces military power was separated from civil administration: the dux (see Doux) commanded the troops, and the praeses performed fiscal and judicial functions. Third, the diocese was introduced as an intermediary unit between the province and the praetorian prefecture. All this created a competition for power, as stressed in Justinian I's novel 24.1. In 585–86 Justinian attempted to restrict this competition and to increase the power of provincial officials: some dioceses (Asia, Pontica) were abolished and the functions of their vicars transferred to provincial governors called comites (see Comes); in several provinces the posts of military commander and civil administrator were combined in the office of praetor. This tendency was further developed by the creation of exarchates and eventually themes, the word eparchia being applied to the theme. Personifications of provinces are among the commonest figures on coins, silver, and MSS.
such as the *Nouitia dignitatum*, often assuming, like cities, the form of a *tyche*.


A.K., A.C.

**PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION** of the late Roman Empire had the tendency to lessen the independence of the *provinces*, partly by decreasing their size, partly by dividing authority between military and civil administration. The reverse policy cautiously started by Justinian I found its realization in the creation of *exarchates* and eventually of large *themes*. By the beginning of the 8th C. the powerful *strategoi* of the themes temporarily gained control over Constantinople, but the power of the themes was slowly diminished in the 9th–10th C. At the same time, several themes could be united under the command of a single administrator, and larger units such as *doukaton* and *katepanate* were created (Ahrweiler, “Administration” 82–91). The emperors of Nicaea managed to subdue the independence of provincial *doukes* by introducing strong administrators within the framework of greater local districts (Angold, *Byz. Government* 257). In the last centuries the empire presented a network of fragmented units, called *themata*, *eparchial*, or *katepanikia*, which were administered by the *kephale* and *apographeus*; these units usually consisted of a town with its hinterland. Simultaneously the larger *appanages* developed, sometimes under the command of a *despotes*, which imitated on a smaller scale the court of Constantinople.


A.K.

**PROXIMOS** (*προξίμος, προέξήμος*, Lat. *proximus*), in the late Roman Empire a civil official in various *scinia* (bureaus). He reappears in the 9th-C. *taktikon* of Uspenskij and *Kleitoriologion of Philoteos*; in the latter he is on the staff of the *domestikos ton scholon*, i.e., a military officer. In the vita of *Stephen the Younger* (PG 100:1169C-1172A) the *proximos* is described as a man armed with a sword who performed police functions. The *proximos* could bear the high title of *patrikios* (*Zacos, Seals* 2, no.691).

In the 11th C. the term was employed to designate teachers in some schools in Constantinople (Lemerle, *Cinq études* 228f); one of them was *Nicetas of Herakleia*. A letter by Psellos (*Scripta min.* 2:30f) is addressed to a *proximos* and teacher *Isaias*.


A.K.

**PRUDENTIUS**, more fully Aurelius Clemens Prudentius, government official and Latin poet; born Saragossa 348, died after 405. Prudentius enjoyed a successful secular career, progressing from rhetoric and law to two provincial governorships and a palace position under *Honorius*. After retiring in 405, he gave the rest of his life, perhaps spent in an ascetic Christian community, to devotional poetry. His works, equipped with biographically informative preface and epilogue, span several genres. Two lyrical collections are the *Kathemerinon* (hymns for specific times of the day) and *Peristephanon* (in praise of individual Western martyrs). Didactic poems include the hexametric *Apologetis* (on the Trinity), *Hamartigenia* (against Dualist views of the nature of sin), and *Psychomachia*, an allegory on virtues and vices vying for the soul. Prudentius’ *Dittochaeon*, hexameter quatrains on 24 Old Testament and 24 New Testament subjects, apparently intended as *tituli* for images on the facing walls of a basilica, is the classic document of the typological system of church programs of decoration. Two books of hexameters against *Symmachus* and paganism (S. Döpp, *JbAChr* 23 [1980] 65–81), datable to 402, probably reflect a final summary of Christian victory rather than his own participation in the *Altar of Victory* controversy of the 380s. No great theologian and not formally a hymnographer, Prudentius is best seen as the first major Christian Latin poet, reshaping Horatian lyric and Lucretian didactic epic to the new purposes. Full-scale poetic use of allegory was his greatest innovation and legacy.


PSALMODY (φαλημοδία), the use of the 150 Psalms of the Bible in worship. The Psalms were initially combined with nonbiblical compositions; later, to avoid the inclusion of heretical hymns, psalmody was restricted to the Psalms alone, until the introduction of antiphons in the 4th C. Psalmody for the Eucharist (antiphons, prokeimena, alleluia, koionikon) is found in a lectionary, that for the liturgical hours in the Psalter.

Psalmsy is either “monastic” or “cathedral.” Monastic psalmody is continuous, that is, it follows the biblical sequence of Psalms and is chanted straight through, either “directly,” as one piece, by a soloist or all the monks together, or “alternatively,” with the monks in two choirs alternating verses. The monastic Psalter, or psalterion, Palestinian in origin, was divided into 20 sections called kathisma; each kathisma comprised three doxai of (ideally) three psalms each, or nine psalms in all. The psalterion also included ten biblical canticles grouped into nine odes as well as fixed chants such as the Phos hilaron and the Great Doxology used in the monastic hours; its earliest surviving MS is Leningrad, Publ. Lib. 216, dated 862. In the psalmody used in the Stoudite monasteries in Constantinople in the period between Iconoclasm and the Fourth Crusade (see STOUDITE TYPKA), the singing of the Psalter was spread over three weeks during the summer, but it was sung once every week in winter and twice a week in Lent. The later usage (see SABATITE TYPKA) supplanted the mitigated summer system with the heavier weekly winter schedule. The Palestinian all-night agrypnia (see Vigil) included the entire Psalter with canticles.

In cathedral psalmody, individual psalms were selected on the basis of their suitability to the service and executed responsorily or antiphonally. The Psalter used for the cathedral rite of Constantinople (see ASMATIQUE AKOLOUTHIA) was called an antiphonariion, since it grouped the psalms into antiphons, 74 or 76 depending on the MS. To these were added 15 odes (Taft, “Mount Athos” 181 n. 19). The earliest extant Psalter of this type, the illustrated Khudov Psalter (see section on illustration under Psalter), already shows signs of Palestinian monastic influence common in Constantinopolitan monasteries from the 9th C. onward.


R.F.T.

PSALTER (φαλημον; lit. “a stringed instrument, harp”), a liturgical book containing the 150 psalms attributed to King David, accompanied by the odes (canticles). Of all the OLD TESTAMENT books the Psalms were the most popular with the Byz. As Athanasios of Alexandria says (PG 27:12 C), “Like a garden, the book of Psalms contains, and puts in musical form, everything that is to be found in other books, and shows, in addition, its own particular qualities.” From the 3rd C. onward, the Psalter became the Christian prayer book par excellence, used during the liturgy in an antiphonal dialogue between the deacon and choir; the themes of individual psalms then served for the development of troparia. Of all scriptural books the Psalter was considered the most powerful weapon against demons (John Moschos, PG 87:3020A). It also was the main textbook of elementary education, was memorized by children, and was the most frequently quoted book of the Old Testament: thus, in Niketas Choniates it provides more than 40 percent of all Old Testament citations.

The excellence of the Psalter was seen in the force of its religious expression: beside the direct expression of human hope the Psalter was interpreted as Christ’s prayers to the Father (and in this case the church was thought to pray with him) or as prayers addressed to the Lord (in this case the faithful were thought to pray to him). Exegesis of the Psalms had a double goal: typological or allegorical analysis based on Christocentric interpretation and the prosopological method (i.e., concern with the identity of the speaker). Since this person was often interpreted as Christ, the distinction between the humanity and divinity of Christ became the focus of exegesis. Among the commentators on the Psalms (preserved only partially in CATENAE) were Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, pseudo-Athanasios, Didymos the Blind, Diodoros of Tarsos, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrhus, and Hesychios of Jerusalem as well as Latin church fathers—Ambrose, Augustine, and others. Much later, Nikephoros
Blemmydes wrote a commentary on the book of Psalms; the monk John commented on the first 15 Psalms. Old Slavonic commentators drew upon Byz. tradition.

**Psalter Illustration.** This developed from the Psalter's special place in both the public liturgical and private spiritual life of Byz. Eighty-five illustrated MSS survive (Lowden, infra), the earliest dating from the 9th C. They have been conventionally divided into two groups on the basis of their illustration: the “marginal” (sometimes tendentiously termed “monastic” or “theological”) and the “aristocratic.”

**Marginal Psalters.** This closely related family of MSS includes the three earliest illustrated Byz. Psalters (Athos, Pantok. 61; Paris, B.N. gr. 20; Moscow, Hist. Mus. gr. 129D [the “Khludov Psalter”]), all usually attributed to the second half of the 9th C. The illustration takes the form of numerous small figures and narrative scenes placed in the broad outer margins of the pages and usually linked to the relevant Psalter text by a system of sigla. Various interpretative methods underlie the pictures; single words or phrases from the title or the text itself may be represented literally or subjected to a Christian allegorical interpretation. In the 9th-C. MSS a further layer of meaning is supplied by images displaying vigorous anti-Iconoclastic propaganda. Thus in the Khludov Psalter the reference to vinegar and gall in Psalm 68:21 is glossed visually first by an image of the Crucifixion and then by a parallel in which the Iconoclast emperor Theophilos and Patr. John VII Grammatikos whitewash an icon of Christ (see Iconoclasms). The few Psalms that lend themselves to narrative treatment (e.g., the Exodus account in Ps 77) are supplied with particularly detailed illustration. Marginal Psalters continued to be made in Byz. into the 14th C. (Baltimore, Walters 739) and after ca.1300 pictorially related examples were produced in culturally related centers (Greco-Latin, Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian: e.g., Berlin, Kupferstichkab. 78.A.g, the “Hamilton Psalter”; Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl. slav. 4, the “Serbian Psalter”).

**Aristocratic Psalters.** These form a less easily defined group. Their chief exemplar is the magnificent 10th-C. Paris Psalter, a truly aristocratic book. Recent research, by emphasizing the large number of these MSS, has also drawn attention to the wide disparities among them and called into question the terminology and grouping. Their illustration is “nonmarginal” and usually consists of one or more frontispiece pictures and major illustrations to Psalms 50, 77, and 151 and the Odes, but there are many exceptions. Some of these images are full-page miniatures. In contrast to the sometimes learned and usually specific images of the marginal type, these are for the most part generalized, isolated, and iconlike.

Other illustrated Psalters (such as Vat. gr. 752 and 1927 and Oxford, Bodl. Canon. gr. 62) stand completely apart in the nature of their commentary-based illustration.

The precise relationships among most of the surviving Psalters and the nature of their debt to sources, esp. from the period before Iconoclasms, are complex and controversial. Recent research suggests that the very nature of the marginal arrangement of the 9th-C. MSS excludes the creation of a book of this type much before 800 (Corrigan, infra). The David Plates, closely related in some instances to the Paris Psalter, emphasize the existence before Iconoclasm of icon-
ographic compositions, which could be taken to presuppose illustrated Psalters of nonmarginal type. Important questions, such as the liturgical (or other) use of these books, still await systematic investigation.


J.L., A.K., J.H.L.

PSALTIKON (ψαλτικόν), a music book containing special chants and verses in a highly ornate idiom to be sung by a soloist (usually the protopsaltes; see SINGERS). While it differs in repertory, style, and function from the ASMATIKON, the two books are nonetheless complementary: together they allow the proper conduct of the musical part of the service. The known copies of the Psaltikon, all from the 12th to 13th C. and most of southern Italian origin, appear to be derived from a single archetype, for they contain the same pieces, arranged in the same order and belonging to the same melodic tradition. Originally these two compilations, the Psaltikon and the Asmatikon, were kept separate, but scribes at the monastery of S. Salvatore in Messina consolidated the contents of the two books ca.1225, combining them with other material to form a new compilation.

ED. C. Haeg, Contacarium Ashburnhamense (Copenhagen 1956).


PSAMATHIA (Ψαμάθια, Ψωμάθια, etc., possibly from psamathos, “sand”; Turk. Samata), quarter in the southwestern corner of Constantinople between the Constantinian and Theodosian Walls. In the 4th–5th C. the area was occupied by aristocratic mansions, which were gradually replaced by monasteries. The three most famous of these were the Studios, the monastery of Patr. Eu- thymios, and the Peribleptos (built 1030–34), the last represented by the Armenian church of Sulu Manastir in whose hagiasma (“holy fountain”) several pieces of Byz. sculpture (now in Berlin) were found in 1897. The best known of these reliefs represents Christ between two apostles (Volbach, Early Christian Art, pl.75) and imitates the style of the Sidamara sarcophagi.


PSELLOS, MICHAEL, intellectual and writer; baptismal name, Constantine; born Constantinople 1018, died after 1081. Born to a family of modest position, Psellus (Ψέλλος) received an outstanding education (one of his professors being John MAUROPUS) and made a career in civil administration. He belonged to a group of young and energetic intellectuals (John [VIII] XIPHILOX, Constantine [III] LEICHOUDES) who had hopes of exercising real power under Constantine IX but had to resign in 1054. Psellus was forced to take the monastic habit at Mt. Olympus. Soon he returned to Constantinople and participated in political life. However, his claim of having played a crucial role under Constantine X, Romanos IV, and Michael VII seems exaggerated; he was rather a court philosopher, holding the title of hypatos ton philosophon. It is possible that Psellus left the capital under Michael VII, lived in relative poverty, and died forgotten by the new generation. The date of his death is under discussion: an arbitrary identification with a certain Michael of Nikomedia dates Psellus’s death to 1078 (P. Gautier, REB 24 [1966] 159–64), whereas an attribution to Psellus of the introduction to the Dioeptra of Philip Monotropos would suggest 1095 as a terminus post quem for his death. In any case it seems that some of his works were written after 1081 (Kazhdan-Franklin, Studies 53–55). Psellus is shown as a white-bearded monk in a miniature in the late 12th-C. MS, Athos, Pantok. 234 (Spatharakis, Portrait, fig.174) that accompanies one of his poems addressed to Michael VII.

Psellos was a polymath whose enormous oeuvre encompasses historical, philosophical, rhetorical, theological, and legal texts as well as a collection of letters; several works attributed to him are spurious, e.g., the so-called De Daemonibus (P. Gautier, REB 38 [1980] 105–94). As a philosopher
Psellos emphasized the role of nature or physis, which, created as it was by God, functions according to its immanent laws, leaving a very limited place for the miraculous. The Chronography of Psellos, which was probably preceded by a very traditional short chronicle (K. Snipes, *JÖB* 32:3 [1982] 53–61), describes the years 976–1078 primarily on the basis of personal observations; Psellos presents events as the result of strong personal conflicts, emotions, and intrigues, leaving no room for divine Providence. As a writer Psellos developed the trends typical of Mauropos and Christopher of Mytilene, but reached a much higher level. Consistently individualistic in his approach, he viewed the world from his own vantage point, sometimes seriously, sometimes ironically. His presentation of himself as actively involved in major affairs is a distortion of historical reality. It even appears that he rewrote the Life of St. Auxentios, modeling it on his own biography.

Psellos rejected the conventional aesthetic of black-and-white judgment, even though he applied this method to his panegyric portraits of Constantine X and Michael VII. He tried to conjure up complex and contradictory images, such as Constantine IX in his Chronography or the monk Elias in his letters; Psellos realized their shortcomings but appreciated both men's vitality and enjoyment of life. His psychological characterizations are rich and varied; he did not even avoid the theme of sexual desire. With rare exceptions, however, his physical descriptions remained conventional and consisted of longer or shorter lists of individual elements (eyes, lips, breasts, etc.). Even the past was perceived by Psellos not as a stream of events, but as a series of images, first of emperors and empresses, but also of their favorites and lovers. Psellos praised friendship (F. Tinnefeld, *JÖB* 22 [1973] 151–68) and was a trustworthy friend, even though he knew that the realities of Byz. life often required submissiveness and compromises with one's conscience. He clearly understood the force of the written word and in a letter to Machetarios, *droungarios tes viglas* (Sathas, *MB* 5:352.25–27), used a promise to include Machetarios in his story as a means to influence his former friend's behavior.


**PSEUDO-________. See under latter part of name.**

**PSOMOZEMIA (ψωμοζημία, lit. "a fine or penalty of bread"), a kind of epereia mentioned in imperial chrysobulls from the end of the 11th C. onward (Lavra 1, no.48.46; Patmou Engrapha 1, no.6.62) and not the mid-12th C. (thus Mutafčićev, *infra*); it probably survived until the 15th C. (Esphig., no.31.10). It was one of the most important secondary taxes, listed usually after the angareia and in some cases even before it (e.g., Xerop., no.8.17–18; Koutloum., no.10.61–62). Theophyllaktos of Ohrid, in a letter of 1092/3 (ep.19.4–7), mentions the priests of Polog (Bulgaria) who had been exempted by a chrysobull from *munera sordida* and psomozemia, but were ordered to fulfill the obligation of psomozemia. The precise meaning of this *epereia*, however, is not elucidated by the scanty evidence of lists of exemption; the etymology implies that the word denoted provisioning [of the army?] with bread.


**PSYCHOMACHIA (ψυχωμαχία, "struggle for the soul"), the term usually applied in patristic literature to the fight for life on the deathbed. Some church fathers raised the question why some righteous people struggled desperately for life while sinners could pass away quietly (pseudo-Athanasios, PG 28:661D; Anastasios of Sinai, PG 89:741B). In modern scholarship the term has been transferred to the contest for the soul between angels and demons: thus Basil the Great (PG 31:432AB) admonishes the faithful to accept death without...**
anxiety—angels and demons will determine the destiny of a soul “as if it were weighed on a pair of scales.” The vita of Basil the Younger describes at length a struggle between angels and demons for the soul of a righteous woman during her ascent to heaven.

In art, the contest for the soul of the deceased entered into the iconography of the Last Judgment, although by no means do all such images include the balance scales. The earliest surviving example is at Hagios Stephanos in Kastoria, the best-known at Torcello. Sometimes scrolls, presumably recording the deeds of the candidate for salvation, are thrown onto the scales (Omont, Evangiles, pl.81); in a striking variation in Athos, Dion. 65 (Stichel, infra), the struggle is for the soul of a living monk.


—A.K., A.C.

PTERYGES. See ARMOR.

PTOCHELEON (Πτοχολέοντος), or “Poor Leo,” a tale drawing on the traditional story of the wise man able to detect excellence in jewels, horses, and women, a motif found throughout Europe and the Middle East from the 12th C. onward. Written in unrhymed octosyllables, the Ptochaleon survives in four versions (most in more than one MS), which vary in length and style. The earliest form is to be dated at the beginning of the 14th C.


—E.M.J., M.J.M.

PTOCHEPHEREION (πτοχοτροφείον), or ptocheion, “poorhouse,” institution that provided hospitality and shelter for the poor and sick (including those suffering from leprosy). Like gerokomeia and xenochoia, ptochophereia was organized by emperors, patriarchs, bishops, or private persons in accordance with the principle of philanthropy. Among the best documented institutions are the ptochophereia established by Michael Attaleiates in Rhaidestos and Constantinople. In theory admittance to poorhouses was strictly determined by age and health; those poor who were able to support themselves were not accepted. The system of adelphaton, however, allowed some relatively well-off people to be admitted to privileged refuges for the elderly. A seal of a 7th-C. ptochotrophos (i.e., the head of a poorhouse) is preserved (Zacos, Seals 1, no.1062). Ptochotrophoi seem to have been influential officials. At least two were promoted to the post of patriarch. Whether they were state or ecclesiastical functionaries is unclear.


—A.K.
PTOLEMY, ancient astronomer, astrologer, and mathematician; fl. Alexandria ca. 130–75. The greatest authority on astronomy and astrology in late antiquity, Ptolemy continued to be regarded as such in Byz. until the Palaiologan period, when some astronomers, beginning with Gregory Chioniades, were persuaded to prefer new parameters and methods of computation derived from Islamic sources. Ptolemy’s most impressive work, in which he presented the astronomical system named after him, was the Mathematical Composition (Syntaxis mathematica), better known as the Almagest. Besides numerous Byz. MSS (including two of the 9th C.), two early commentaries—by Pappos and by Theon—and the Prolegomena—probably by Eutokios—attest to its popularity. There were also two 14th-C. commentators, Theodore Metochites and Nicholas Kabasilas (bk. 3 only).

Of Ptolemy’s other astronomical works, only the Phases of the Fixed Stars and the Canonic Inscription survive complete in Greek. The canons to the Handy Tables are preserved, though the tables themselves were known only in Theon’s version; and of the Planetary Hypotheses, only the major portion of book 1 survives in Greek.

Ptolemy’s astrological work, the Astrological Effects (Apotelesmatika), was known to Byz. both in its original form and in the Treatment (Metacheireisis) ascribed to Proklos. An anonymous commentary on it seems to be of the 3rd C. rather than Byz. The Fruit (Karpos) is not a work by Ptolemy but was translated into Greek from the original Arabic ca. 1000.

The Geography was apparently little read in Byz. until its rediscovery in the 1290s by Maximos Planoudes, who may be the source of the extant maps accompanying the text (A. Diller, TAPA 71 [1940] 62–67). Scholia on the Geography were written by Nikiphoros Gregoras. This renewed interest is epitomized in the detailed polychrome maps illustrating the Geography in the early 14th-C. Venice, Marc. gr. 516 (Furlan, Marciana 4:31–34). These show latitudes and longitudes, indicate rivers, lakes and seas; and employ crenellated emblems for cities. Ptolemy’s Harmonics was also read by scholars of the Palaiologan period—most importantly, George Pachymeres, Gregoras, and Isaac Argyros. The works of Ptolemy were translated into Arabic beginning in the 9th C. and into Latin by such scholars as William of Moerbeke and Eugenios of Palermo.


PULCHERIA (Πούλχερια), Augusta (from 4 July 414), sister of Theodosios II, saint; born Constantinople 19 Jan. 399, died Constantinople July 453; feastday 10 Sept. or 11 July. Orphaned after the death of her father Arkadios, Pulcheria was 15 when she assumed power. She replaced the praetorian prefect Anthemios with Aurelianos and exercised influence on her younger brother Theodosios. Pulcheria was ardently religious: she took a public vow of virginity and urged her sisters to follow her example. She was later (PG 86:165A) credited with having requested from Jerusalem the image of the Virgin supposedly painted by the apostle Luke. Supported by Patr. Attakos, she transformed the court into a convent-like community and supervised the education of the young emperor. Pulcheria was Western oriented. She restored the bust of Honorius in the senate of Constantinople and rejected the pro-Persian policy of Anthemios, thus provoking hostilities with Persia ca. 420 (K. Holm, GRBS 18 [1977] 162). Pulcheria’s influence was challenged by her sister-in-law Athenais-Eudokia and then by Patr. Nestorios, who denied Pulcheria’s right to enter the Holy of Holies (probably 15 Apr. 428). Allied with Cyril of Alexandria, Pulcheria was victorious at the Council of Ephesus in 431, demoting and exiling Nestorios. After the return of Athenais from her trip to Jerusalem (439) and her promotion of the eunuch Chrysaphios, Pulcheria fell from power (441). Her interests were defeated at the “Robber” Council of Ephesus in 449. She thereafter sought alliance with Pope Leo I. The unexpected death of Theodosios in 450 brought Pulcheria again to the forefront. Despite her vow of virginity she married Marcian (the marriage was regarded as nominal) and with his
help and the support of Rome restored Orthodoxy at the Council of Chalcedon, where she made a personal appearance.

LIT. Holm, Theodosian Empresses 79–111, 147–228.  
-T.E.G., A.C.

PULPIT. See AMBO.

PUN (παρονομασία, παράςητος), a figure of speech, discussed by antique rhetorical theory; a play on words, involving the juxtaposition—either obvious or more subtle—of two or more words with similar meaning, or two words similar in form but with different meanings. The punning effect might be achieved by a slight change of the word's form so that the similarity remained recognizable—by the addition or removal of several letters, by using the same root in different grammatical categories (noun, adjective, etc.), or the same word in different grammatical cases. Church fathers, with their concern for explaining the great RIDDLE of the cosmos, took puns seriously: thus JOHN OF DAMASCUS (Exp. fidei, 12.2–3, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:35), developing pseudo-Dionysios's statement (De divinis nominibus 1.3; PG 36:158B-C) that God is "the cause, beginning, existence, and life" introduced a series of puns: "the life of the living, the existence of the existent, etc." A typical form of Byz. puns was the interpretation of the hidden significance of names (Irene as peace, Eusebios as pious, etc.), sometimes by opposition ("Eusebios but truly impious"). Manuel I Komnenos, as a sort of refined Christological pun, placed the image of Christ Emmanuel on his coins.

In addition to using the pun as a tool of interpretation, Byz. authors resorted to it as a device of inventive or playful entertainment: an unpopular or false patriarch might be called "phratarch" (leader of a faction); under the guise of pious fasting (nestieta) Eustathios discovers robbery (lesteia) (Escorial Y II 10, fol.39v); hypocrisy, he says (Eust. Thess., Opuscula 73:40–41), is a delightful-looking (charopon) beast concealing his jagged (karcharon) teeth. A gullible collector of relics was jeered by CHRISTOPHER OF MYTIILENE for buying bones of sheep (probata) instead of those of St. Probas. "What spell or melodies of the Sirens," exclaims Choniates (Nik.Chon. 393.11), "could have lured them toward peace (pros eirenen [pronounced "prosirin"])?" He also relates (p.441f) an obscene joke about Isaac II Angelos, who asked at dinner for some salt (halas), but was deliberately misunderstood by a jester to have asked to try "other (allas) women."

-A.K.

PUNISHMENT. See PENALTIES; TORTURE.

PURCHASE DEEDS. See SALE.

PURCHASES, CONFIRMATION OF, is rarely mentioned in Byz. documents. In 1301 a group of peasants, one of whom is named the anthropos and others the paroikoi of Ammon, sold a chorion to the Ephigmenou monastery; the charter (Espig., no.10.1–5) formulated expressly that they did it "with the volition and permission of the lord (kyrios) Alexios Amnon." In 1331 a certain Doukopoulos confirmed a donation of his paroikoi to a monastery (Docheiar., no.11.1–4). More complex is a case of 1193 when two inhabitants of the chorion of Sillamon or Sillamos on Crete sold two parcels of vineyard to the notary Leo Krestes; the social status of the sellers is not defined in the document but it states that they notified their lord (authentes) the logaristes Michael Chrysosberges (MM 6:125,18–22) about the purchase; they were probably dependent peasants. Even free individuals and institutions needed (always or in certain cases?) a confirmation of their land purchases from the authorities: monasteries regularly asked new emperors for the confirmation of their former acquisitions with the result that imperial chrysobulls often repeated identical lists of purchases and donations. The vita of Cyril Phileotes by Nicholas KATASKEPENOS (ch.47.8) shows that Alexios I considered the lands acquired by Cyril and his brother for a monastery as STATE PROPERTY until the government announced its grant to the monastery, that is, confirmed the acquisition.

-A.K.

PURGATORY (καθαρτηριοιον, πουργατόριον), a place of purification and temporal punishment where souls of those who have died without mortal sin can expiate their venial sins by temporary suffering before entering PARADISE; it is thus a
third locality “between” heaven and Hell. The doctrine of purgatory, rejected by the Eastern church during the theological debates of the 12th C., paradoxically can be traced back in its essential features to Greek patristic theology. The view that punishment serves to improve, which can be found already in Plato, is augmented by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 6.6) in the argument that when the soul is liberated from the body it is open to a gradual increase in knowledge. Origen frequently speaks of a “purifying fire”; by this term, however, he means the inner torment of the soul, which follows from his presupposition of the apo-
katastasis panton, the restoration of all spiritual beings, and so does not imply the existence of a “third place.” Already in the Cappadocian Fathers the expression “purificatory fire” is found.

The idea of a purifying, atoning punishment for the redemption of those who have died was consistent with the simultaneous Admonition to the living to offer intercessory prayer. In the year 1231, after a debate between George Bardanes and the Franciscan Bartholomaeus in Otranto, the question was forced on Byz. theology from a scholastic view. At the Union Councils of Lyons in 1274 and Ferrara-Florence in 1439 (J. Jorgenson, SVThQ 30 [1986] 309–34), the question concerning a “third place” was likewise ignored, that is to say, it remained open. The relevant documents speak only of the essential content of Western doctrine, i.e., of the “poenae purgatoriae (or cathar-tariae).” The opposition between Byz. and the West was more a matter of different mentality (systematic theology in the West versus rhetorical use of Scripture and the church fathers in the East) than of a dogmatic gap.


PURIFICATION, FEAST OF. See ΗΥΡΑΠΑΝΤΗ.

PURPLE (πορφύρα, ἀλουργίς, βλάττα, ὀξήν) in Byz. usage covered a range of red-blue hues, prized for their status value and intimately connected with the imperial office. By extension, esp. in monumental painting and book illustration, purple was frequently used for the tunic of Christ and the Maphorion of the Virgin Mary. Purple pervaded the symbols of imperial power, from the emperor’s costume—where it allowed specta-
tors to spot the key figure in a procession (M. McCormick, JÖB 35 [1985] 1–20)—to the purple ribbons marking confiscated property (Agath. 5.4.2), not to mention the Porphyry disks (omp-
phalia, rotae) on which the emperor stood during ceremonies, the sarcophagi, and the emperor’s signature in purple ink (Cod. Just. I 23.6). In the 4th C., adorare purpuram designated an audience in which the beneficiary enjoyed the privilege of kissing the emperor’s purple garment (W.T. Avery, Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 17 [1940] 66–80). In later centuries children born to emperors were called Porphyrogenietoi, purple parchment is attested for letters to foreign princes, and purple silk cords held the seals hung from imperial documents.

Production of Purple Dye. The highest quality purple dye was obtained from the mollusk called murex, found in the region of Tyre, but also in the waters off the Peloponnesos and adjacent islands. The production of shell-based purple dye continued at least to the 13th C. Its manufacture was very laborious, up to 12,000 shells being needed to produce enough dye for the decoration of a single garment (D.J. Reese, AJA 90 [1986] 183). This best quality of purple was reserved for imperial use (e.g., Cod. Just. IV 40.1; XI 9.3–5), although lesser qualities and imitations circulated freely and abundantly. Diocletian’s Price Edict cites 12 kinds of purple textile, whose unit price ranged from 10,000 denarii (for red wool) to 150,000 denarii (for purple silk). In the late Ro-
man period the state workshops of dyers were based at Tyre, where the weaving also took place; workshops and private guilds existed in Heliopolis and Laodikeia, and in the west in Otranto (6th C.). After the 7th C. purple dyeing seems to have been concentrated in Constantinople.

Control of Purple Textiles. The manufacture and export of high-quality textiles remained tightly controlled. Some purple textiles, the blattia, oxy-
blatta, and hyakintha, were reserved for the em-
peror and his family, whereas cheaper sorts were available (mostly as strips or bands) to others. Faction members at one time wore garments re-
sembling imperial raiment and adorned with blat-
tion only, but, according to a later source, Emp. Tiberios I limited them to a purple hem of two-fingers width (Cedr. 1:688.19–689.1). Leo VI liberalized the sale of purple remnants (nov.80), but relaxations of this sort were limited. When Isaac II allowed his maternal uncle, Theodore Kastamonites, to use a purple cloak and horse trappings and even to sign documents in purple ink, it aroused the indignation of his contemporaries (Nik.Chon. 438.38–45). (See also Color.)


PUTEAL (πυρωτόμιον), a stone or wooden wellhead, sometimes furnished with a basin and a wheel for drawing water. Puteals usually took the form of a column base, cubical or cylindrical, and were sometimes made of reused antique altars or column drums. Polygonal, cruciform, or quatrefoil versions appear in representations of Christ healing the Paralytic and with the Samaritan Woman (Orlandos, Patmos, pls. 8, 33). An elaborately pulateal in Constantinople is decorated with a pair of dragons flanking a human mask, a theme inspired by the so-called Dan amulets (L. Bouras, JÖB 27 [1978] 323–26), while a Cretan example of the late 12th or the early 13th C. is decorated with a foliate cross, a biciporate lion, a griffin, and a hunting scene (A. Orlandos, ArchDelt 9 [1924–25] 188–91). The pulateal of the Holy Well is recorded among the relics of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.

LIT. Koukoules, Bios 4:315–17. —L.Ph.B.

PYLAI (Πύλαι, now Yalova), port on the Sea of Marmara. Pylai derived its name, “the Gates [of Asia],” from its position at the head of one of the main routes into Asia Minor. Herakleios set forth from here against the Persians in 622; in the 9th C. emperors regularly landed at Pylai, where they were met by the domestikos of the Optimatoi. The importance of Pylai was also reflected in the beacon above the town that brought news from the frontier and the imperial xenodocheion established in it. Pylai was a port for shipment of food to the capital: Leo of Synada described it as a wretched village filled with pigs, horses, donkeys, cattle, and sheep waiting to be shipped to Constantinople. In 1071 Romanos IV Diogenes set out from this town on his fatal campaign; the Turks ravaged the district after Mantzikert. Pylai recovered under the Komnenoi and in 1147 received a colony of Greek refugees from Phrygia. By 1199, Pylai, together with Pythia, formed an episkopis, where Venetian traders received privileges, and by 1204 constituted a separate province (D. Zakythenos, EEBS 19 [1949] 4: 25 [1955] 139ff.). The Laskarids maintained Pylai against the Latins; it was their main port for Nicaea. In 1302, however, Turkish attacks were so serious that much of the population took refuge in the Princes’ Islands. It apparently fell to the Turks soon after. Pylai was never a bishopric. Byz. remains survive not in the town but in the nearby hot springs of Pythia Therma, a Byz. resort in all periods.


PYRGOS (πύργος), a fortification tower; other uses of the term are, however, also known (variations are discussed by D. Vagiakakos in Pyrgoi kai kastra, infra 47–49). A pyrgos could be used as a fortified country residence (e.g., St. Basil on Lake Koronia near Thessalonike) or as a fortified residence within an urbanized setting (e.g., at Galatista on Chalkidike—I.A. Papangelos, Chronika Chalkidikes 33–34 [1978] 70). Most commonly a pyrgos formed an integral part of monastic fortification walls, as on Mt. Athos (Orlandos, Monast.Arch. 134–38). It could serve as a belfry (ibid. 127–34) or as a platform for an elevated chapel (D. Piguet-Panayotova, Byzantion 49 [1979] 363–84). Most pyrgoi are characterized by a square plan and smooth exterior faces. A distinctive type appears in the Balkans around 1300: characterized by multiple projecting spur walls on all four faces, it seems to be related to a type of French medieval donjon, though the links between these two developments have been insufficiently studied.

Literary References to Pyrgoi. There are only infrequent references to pyrgoi in monastic documents before the 14th C.; those that are mentioned are primarily “ancient pyrgoi” (e.g., Ivir. nos. 4.49, 29.11) that were used as landmarks. In
the 14th and 15th C., in contrast, the lands of the monasteries of Mt. Athos were dotted with pyrgoi having a double function. They were both fortifications (which sometimes suffered from hostile attacks but were rebuilt to be even “more beautiful and strong”; see Pantel., no.13,3–7) and centers of monastic estates. A praktikon of 1338 speaks of a metochion around the pyrgos (Xenoph., no.25,15), and an inventory of 1409 lists the pyrgoi of Perigardikeia and half of the pyrgos of Ermeleia among the “metochia and ktemata” of Docheiariou. The pyrgoi, like chorion, are described as inhabited by peasants (Docheiar., no.53,2–16) and as such are almost indistinguishable from metochia.


PYRRHON (Thippos) of Elis, ancient Greek philosopher, founder of Skepticism; born ca.365/360, died 275/270 B.C. Kedrenos (Cedr. 1:283) included the followers of Pyrrhon and Sextus Empiricus (2nd C.) as the last school in his list of ancient philosophers; he considered akatalepsia “imperturbability of mind” as the major point of Pyrrhonian tenets. Pyrrhon’s ideas were rejected by many Byz. theologians, esp. Gregory Palamas, since they contradicted the concept of absolute truth; Photios (Bibl., cod.212) is an exception, treating Pyrrhon neutrally or even positively. The term akatalepsia, however, was appropriated by Christian theologians. Thus BASIL THE GREAT (ed. Courtonne, ep.234: 2.12–14) acknowledges the “feeling of akatalepsia” as far as the divine substance is concerned—“we know that the substance exists but not what it is.”


PYRRHOS (Thippos), patriarch of Constantinople (20 Dec. 638–29 Sept. 641; 8/9 Jan.–1 June 654); died Constantinople. A favorite of Heracleios (he was godson of the emperor’s sister) and Patr. SERGIOS I, Pyrrhos was hagoumenos of the monas-ttery of Chrysopolis before becoming patriarch. He supported the Monothelite program of Ser- gios and immediately confirmed the Ekthesis (RegPatr, fasc. 1, no.294). He found himself in a difficult position, however, because of Orthodox opposition directed by Stephen of Dor in Palestine and MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR and because the new pope John IV (640–42) rejected the Ekthesis. The conflict in the exarchate of Africa was exacerbated by the arrival of Monothelite refugees from Egypt, esp. the activity of Monothelite nuns. The death of Heracleios stirred up the rivalry of two court parties: Pyrrhos supported MARTINA and ended up on the losing side. Consequently he laid his episcopal attire on the altar of Hagia Sophia and left for Carthage, without having been canonically deposed.

His successor, Paul II (641–53), was a Mono- thelite who supported Constans II and could not achieve a compromise with Popes Theodore I (642–49) and MARTIN I. The exarch of Carthage Gregory decided to use the conflict to attract the support of Pyrrhos, who still had not been canonically deposed; in 645 Gregory organized a disputation between Pyrrhos and Maximos (PG 91:287–354) as a result of which Pyrrhos converted to Orthodoxy and accompanied Maximos to Rome. Gregory’s death in the war against the Arabs ruined Pyrrhos’s hopes of regaining the patriarchal throne through a military insurrection; on the other hand, the TYPOS OF CONSTANS II brought no peace with Rome. After the death of Paul II, Pyrrhos recanted once more, claiming that he had been forced to renounce MONO- THELETISM by starvation and torture. Finally Con- stans accepted him, but Pyrrhos’s second patriar- chate (654) lasted only a few months. Together with Sergios I he was condemned by the Council of 680.


PYTHIA. See PYLAI.

PYXIS, modern conventional term (from Greek πυξίς, “box”) for a circular or elliptical container cut from a section of elephant tusk. Most are attributed on stylistic grounds to the 5th–7th C.
PYXIS. The Moggio pyxis; ivory, late 5th–6th C. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C. The pyxis is decorated with Old Testament scenes (Moses receives the Law, the Israelites express their awe).

and to North Africa, Gaul, or Syria-Palestine, although the provenance of only two is known. Normally, pyxides do not exceed 9 cm in height, although two examples with Orphic scenes are exceptionally tall (16 cm). Elaborately carved, about 20 examples with pagan iconography and more than 40 with Old and New Testament subjects or, more rarely, scenes of martyrdom, are preserved. The diversity of subject matter represented on the outside provides a few clues as to their function. It has been argued that pyxides with scenes of Christ healing may have been used for medications and that others with the MYROPOROI contained the Eucharistic wine (A. St. Clair, *Gesta* 18 [1979] 127–35) or EULOGIAI; Volbach (infra) suggested that some were containers for incense, as prescribed by the Council of Narbonne (589). Some Christian specimens had locks (now usually missing) or seals; pagan pyxides lacked these precautions. The decoration of many is sufficiently alike to suggest that, rather than being unique creations, pyxides were produced in series. One 10th- or 11th-C. example is known (W.D. Wixom, *Gesta* 20 [1981] 43–49). This is possibly a deliberate archaism since its shape differs from the gilded rectangular boxes held by deacons and angels in monumental painting of the period.

QĀDI AL-NUMĀN, AL-, more fully ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥayyūn al-Tamīmī al-Qādī al-Numān, Arab jurist and historian of the Fāṭimids; born Tunisia ca.904, died Cairo 974. He served this dynasty’s first four caliphs as palace librarian, chief judge, and adviser. Of over 50 works attributed to him, 20 have survived. The chief exponent of early Ismāʿīli jurisprudence and Fāṭimid propaganda, two of his historical works are important for the Byzantinist.

His Opening of the Mission and Beginning of the State, completed in 957, is a contemporary history of the early Fāṭimids, rich in firsthand reports, including information on Fāṭimid expeditions against Byz. Calabria. The Councils and Outings, written between 959 and 970, is a semiofficial compilation based on the author’s intimate knowledge—including detailed minutes—of councils, statements, and decisions of the caliph al-Muʿizz (953–75). Propagandistic in tone and somewhat hagiographic in approach, it sheds important light on Fāṭimid foreign policy, inter-Arab rivalries, and Byz.-Arab relations, for example, naval collaboration between Byz. and the Umayyads of Spain against the Fāṭimids (956–57), the reception of a Byz. ambassador at the Fāṭimid court (S.M. Stern, Byzantium 20 [1950] 239–58), the Byz.-Fāṭimid truce of 957, al-Muʿizz’s refusal to send envoys to Constantinople and his correspondence with both Constantine VII and Michael II, the Byz. expedition against Crete in 960–61 (F. Dachraoui, Cahiers de Tunisie 26–27 [1959] 307–18), and the role of Byz. artisans in Fāṭimid industry.


QALʿAT SEMʿĀN (Telāw纳斯), in Syria northeast of Antioch, the site of a pilgrimage complex built ca.476–90 around the column of Symeon the Stylite the Elder in the limestone massif beside the road running north to Cyrrhus from the Antioch-Chalkis highway. Prominently situated, the complex was approached through a triumphal arch. After Symeon’s death in 459, his body was escorted to Antioch, where a large martyrion was built in his honor, perhaps before 467 (Malal. 369.10–16). The patron and the building dates of the Telanissos shrine remain matters of conjecture, but imperial patronage has been suggested on account of its large scale and lavish decoration. The shrine was cruciform in plan, with four basilical wings fanning out from an octagon surrounding the Stylite’s column. It is uncertain whether or not the octagon, whose span is about 20 m, was originally roofed (with a wooden dome?), but by the 590s it was said by Evagrius Scholastikos to be open to the sky. The capitals of the shrine are of a finely cut wind-blown acanthus type distinctive of northern Syria; marble champlevé-carved revetment plaques, similar to those found at Antioch and Seleukeia Pieria, decorated the walls. An octagonal baptistery was erected a short distance west of the shrine, and a monastery was built in the vicinity. Relatively little is recorded of the site after the 6th C., at the time when Symeon the Stylite the Younger was gaining popularity on the Wondrous Mountain.

The monastery at Qalʿat Semʿān was refounded in the 10th C., before the Byz. reconquest of Antioch in 969. Situated at that period on the Byz.-Arab frontier of northern Syria, the shrine itself was fortified reusing some of its ashlar stone, and the church area was reduced to the eastern basilical arm, where a Greek-Syriac pavement inscription dated 979 records this work. (For ill., see opposite page.)


QALB LAWZAḤ, in Syria, site of large 5th-C. basilical church in the province of Syria I between Antioch and Berroia (Aleppo); ancient name unknown. While its function is unclear (pilgrimage
or village church?), the ashlar limestone church is distinguished architecturally by several typically northern Syrian features: the façade incorporates two symmetrical towers; the nave and side aisles open into each other through an arcade supported by three widely spaced masonry piers instead of the more usual numerous and closely spaced piers or columns; the timber roof was supported by a corbel table; the exterior of the apse was ringed by an engaged colonnade. Equally characteristic is a large sanctuary room to the southeast, which is entered through a wide arch that allowed the public veneration of relics; the sculptural decoration includes continuous ornamented moldings both inside and out, those around the window terminating in volutes.


—M.M.M.

QASR IBN WARDĀN, in Syria, northeast of Ḥamāh; complex of palace, church, and barracks, dated 561–64 and situated in the province of Syria II in the desert Limes; ancient name unknown. It was probably the residence of a military commander (perhaps named George) whose monogram decorates one capital. The large barracks is now largely destroyed, but both palace and church are well preserved. The church is a domed basilica with inscribed apse; the dome is unusual by Constantinopolitan standards for it rests on an octagonal drum, its pendentives are pierced by windows springing within it, and its supporting arches are nearly pointed. The two-story palace had a quatrefoil audience hall similar to that of other Syrian palaces (e.g., at Bostra). In contrast to the ashlar typical of rural Syrian buildings, masonry at Qasr ibn Wardān is composed of three bands of stone alternating with bands of brick, reminiscent of masonry used in western Asia Minor and Constantinople. The site’s builder was probably a Syrian knowledgeable about the architecture of Constantinople.


—M.M.M.
QAYS (Kaiōrōs), Arab phylarch; died ca. 536. He is frequently confused (e.g., Stein, Histoire 2:298f) with the pre-Islamic poet Imrū' al-Qays, about whom fantastic stories are repeated by later Arabic sources (e.g., that he was aided by Justinian I but later killed with a magic cloak sent by the emperor because he had seduced his daughter). Qays was probably grandson of Arethas of Kinda, phylarch in the 520s. After the death of Arethas in 528, Justinian dispatched three embassies to Qays, reports of which are extant (see NONNOSUS). Prokopios ( Wars 1.20.9–13) describes Qays as a murderer and fugitive from his own land. In fact, in the context of war with Persia, Justinian seems to have persuaded Qays to leave Arabia and come to Palestine, where he was given “hegemony” over Palestina I and II ca. 532.


QAZWĪNĪ, AL-, more fully Zakariyyā’ ibn Muḥammad al-Qazwīnī, author of Arabic works on cosmography and geography; born Qazwin (Iran) ca. 1203, died 1283. Often overestimated, he is essentially a compiler, vulgarizer, and plagiarizer (sometimes inaccurate) of earlier Arabic works on geography, travel, and natural history; his fondness for mirabilis should be noted. The fame of his frequently illustrated Cosmography, or Marvels of Creation (‘Ajā‘īb al-Makhlūqāt), apparently reached 16th-C. Russia. His Geography, or Monuments of Countries (Āthār al-Bilād wa Aḥkām al-‘Ibād), arranged alphabetically within each of the seven climates, contains extracts on churches and statues of Constantinople, popular views of Byz. society and monasticism, Rome, Byz.'s northern neighbors, and life in Seljuk Asia Minor, all taken from al-Harawi, ibn al-Fakih, ibn Sa‘id, Yāqūt, and other known Arab authors.


QENNESHRAIN. See Chalkis.

QENNESHRAIN MONASTERY. See EUROPOS.

QUADRIVIVUM, or “mathematical quartet” (ἡ τέσσαρα, μαθηματικής τετρακτύς), term applied to four disciplines (arithmetic, geometry [see Mathematics], music, and astronomy) that formed a group complementary to the main curricula of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic (philosophy). The word tetraktyx was used by the Byz. (e.g., in Ignatios the Deacon’s vita of Patr. Nikephoros I), but the quadrivium never acquired an independent place in Byz. education, even though some textbooks treated the subject. One, written in 1007/8, was later falsely attributed to Psellos (A. Diller, Isis 36 [1946] 132); more elaborate is the Tetrabiblos of George Pachymeres.

Lit.: V. Laurent in P. Tannery, Quadrivium de Georges Pachymerè (Vatican 1940) xvi–xxxiii. –A.K.

QUAESTOR (κοιναίστωρ or κοιναίστωρ) of the sacred palace (Lat. quaestor sacri palatii), high-ranking official of the late Roman Empire, an office created by Constantine I. The quaestor was originally responsible for drafting imperial laws and, together with several other functionaries, dealt with petitions addressed to the emperor. His judicial rights were relatively insignificant, but as the emperor’s closest adviser in legal questions he acquired enormous influence. The importance of the quaestor increased concurrently with that of the magnus officiorum. Tribonian was probably the most significant holder of the office. In 539 Justinian I introduced another office called quaesitor (called also simply quaestor), involving police and judicial power in Constantinople, esp. control over newcomers settling in the capital. After Justinian some quaestors served as imperial envoys: Troianos in 574, Kosmas in 617.

By the 8th/9th C. the quaestor had lost his earlier prestige, some of his functions having been transferred to the logothetes tou dromou, the epi ton deeseon, and others; in the late 9th-C. KlerotoLogion of Philotheos the quaestor occupies 34th place in the hierarchy. He was considered one of the judges and his duties were those of the quaesitor rather than of quaestor sacri palatii—supervision of visitors and beggars in Constantinople, conflicts between tenants and landlords, and so on. While the quaestor in the late Roman Empire did not have his own staff, in the 9th C.
he commanded a large and varied group of officials (antigraphes, scribes, etc.). The quaestor survived at least until the 14th C., when he occupied 45th place in the hierarchy, but this was only an honorary position.


**QUARRIES.** Until the 5th C. the late antique taste for colored marbles was satisfied from the same sources ancient Rome had exploited. No later than 393, private exploitation was forbidden in order to protect the marble monopoly of the state, whose quarries included those of Dokimion and Alexandria in Bithynia (Sodini, “L’artisanat urbain” 101f). Masons used picks, wooden mallets, metal chisels, and wedges to quarry stone, and methods of cutting, splitting, and dressing stone varied little from those of antiquity; even the sophisticated ancient device of a water mill is attested at a quarry in Simitthu (Tunisia). Mango (*Byz. Arch.* 24) suggested that antique quarries, not least those of Prokonnesos, were abandoned by the late 6th–7th C., in part because of a decline in the available labor force. Thereafter, virtually all stone used for construction seems either to have been spolia or locally produced. A hagiographical topos of the 11th–12th C. involves monks miraculously saved from being crushed by stones that they rolled down mountains (PG 127:484A). Some quarrying did continue, as indicated by the words of Psellus on Romanos III’s Church of the Peribleptos in Constantinople: “He hollowed all the mountains.” Despite the testimony of the literary sources on the construction of the Nea Mone on Chios, which state that marble was brought from afar, much of the polychrome stone used was in fact from quarries on the island (Ch. Bouras, *Nea Moni* 148f). Elsewhere, as, for example, in Cyprus, fieldstone was widely used. In the provinces, some ancient quarries were reused while new, neighboring sources were found: both contributed to the fortress at Pâcului lui Soare, where P. Diaconu and E. Zah (*Dacia* 15 [1971] 289–306) found 15 different types of stone issu-
brief remarks on a typical Arab raid into Asia Minor. Based on official records and the reports of al-Jarmi, his account gives details on the numerical strength of Byz. army corps and precisely delineates the territory of each theme and the points of contact between Arab and Byz. territori- 

ED. Book of Revenues—Kitāb al-Khārij wa Ṣindā‘at al-Kitāba, partial ed. M. de Goeye [BGA 6 (1889)], with Fr. tr.

A. Sh.

QUEDLINBURG ITALA. See KINGS, BOOKS OF.

QUINCUNX. See CHURCH PLAN TYPES.

QUINISEXTUM. See TRULLO, COUNCIL IN.

QUINTUS OF SMYRNA, poet of uncertain his- 
tory and date (anywhere from late 3rd to early 5th C.). Quintus (Koivros) predates Nonnos in metrical technique, but the latter's date is also problematic. No external evidence exists; Quintus himself says only that he was a shepherd and lived at Smyrna. The first detail may be only a Hesiodic conceit; the second is generally accepted, though Quintus might have manufactured it as a geo- graphical link between himself and Homer. Quin-
tus's extant work is the epic Posthomerica, 14 books of (as he hoped) Homeric hexameters, bridging the dramatic gap between the Iliad and Odyssey. Almost universally, modern critics deride Quintus for his wooden hexameters, scant vocabulary, and poor imagination, but some passages are vivid, for example, Achilles and the dead Penthesilea. Quintus's seeming knowledge of Vergil, perhaps Ovid as well, is relevant to the general and important issue of Eastern acquaintance with Latin literature. Earlier speculation that he or his son wrote a Christian poem, The Vision of Dorotheos (see DOROTHEOS, VISION OF), has now been rejected (A. Hurst, Actes du Xe Congrès de l'Association Guillaume Budé [Paris 1980] 131).


QUIRE, the basic unit of the codex, consisting of one or more folded sheets (bifolia or diphylia). The quire is called a bifolium (or unio), binio, ternio, quaternio, quinio, etc., according to the number of folded sheets that compose it. The most frequent form is the quaternio (Gr. tetradios) made of four bifolia, that is, eight folia or 16 pages; thus "te-
tradios" became a synonym for quire. In parch-
ment MSS, to ensure that any two facing pages were of the same color and surface texture, the sheets were arranged before folding, alternately hair side upward and flesh side upward. In Greek MSS the first and last pages and the two middle pages of each quire are usually flesh side; this system is sometimes reversed in MSS produced in areas under Western influence, such as southern Italy and Cyprus. Quires of mixed materials can be found in late antique Papyrus codices and in paper codices from the 13th C. onward, leaves of papyrus or paper being reinforced by stronger parchment leaves, for example, in Vat. gr. 644 of 1279/80, where parchment is used for the exterior bifolium and sometimes also for the middle bifolium. Before copying the text, the scribe ruled guide lines with a blunt lead stylus according to a predetermined RULING PATTERN. After copying the text he numbered each quire on the first page, and sometimes also on the last, with a Greek numeral, or wrote catchwords to enable the book-
binder to assemble the quires in correct sequence. Mistakes occurring in bookbinding include arranging quires, or sheets within a quire, in the wrong order, and reversing single sheets or entire

Quire. Diagram of a typical quire. F = flesh side; H = hair side; r = recto; v = verso.
quires. Each of these mistakes results in a different type of disturbance of the text.


—E.G., R.B.

**QUR’AN**, the Islamic scripture, recited (610–32) by Muhammad and preserved since ca. 650 as a fixed Arabic text of 114 chapters (súras) of unequal length. A few loan words from Byz. usage and allusions to the story of the Seven Sleepers and Alexander Romance (Qur’án 18:9–26, 84–98) may indicate aspects of Byz. impact upon Arabia on the eve of Islam.

A Qur’ânic allusion to potential adversaries (48:16) was taken by some commentators to include Byz., but the typically referential and apocalyptic opening of súra 30 on al-Rum (see Rûm) documents the interest and affinity of the early Muslims towards Byz. during the last Byz.-Persian war: "The Byz. have been defeated in the nearer land, and after their defeat they shall be victorious in a few years; on that day the believers shall rejoice in God’s victory . . ." (30:1–6). These and other verses sympathetic to Christians (e.g., 5:85; 57:27), with extensive historical exegesis, modified the otherwise negative image of Byz. in Arab eyes; they were often evoked in later official letters to Byz.

Refutation of the Qur’ân preoccupied Byz. theologians in their polemic against Islam (see Islam, Polemic against). John of Damascus already showed some knowledge of the Qur’ânic text in the 8th C., and Niketas Byzantios composed a systematic, if pedantic, *Refutation (Anatropè)* against it, comparing it unfavorably with the Bible; this tradition continued to the end of Byz. and influenced Europe’s anti-Islamic polemic.


RABBULA, bishop of Edessa (from 412), Syrian churchman and translator; born Qenshrin (Chalkis), near Berroia in Syria, died Edessa 7 Aug. 436. According to his anonymous Syrian biographer, Rabbula was a son of a pagan priest and Christian mother and converted to Christianity as an adult. During the Council of Ephesus (431), at first he supported the party of JOHN OF ANTIOCH, but even before that, in 428, he delivered a speech against THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA and attacked Nestorius as a "new Jew." In the course of the council or a little later Rabbula joined John's adversary, CYRIL of Alexandria, whose ally he remained for the rest of his career, translating Cyril's On the Correct Faith into Syriac. Rabbula's hagiographer presents him as a reformer of church life in Edessa who introduced austerity for the clergy and ordered that the silver dishes being used by clergies should be sold for the benefit of the poor and replaced with ceramic wares. The hagiographer's affirmation that Rabbula was responsible for the translation of the New Testament part of the Peshitta, the Syriac Bible, has been questioned by A. Vööbus and other scholars, who demonstrated that Rabbula's quotations of the Bible do not coincide with the Peshitta. Of his oeuvre, three treatises on the ecclesiastical organization of Edessa have survived as well as a few sermons. His hagiographer mentions 46 letters in Greek sent by Rabbula to priests, princes, nobles, and monks; some of these letters—mostly in fragments—are known, including his correspondence with Cyril.


RABBULA GOSPELS (Florence, Laur. Plut. I, 56), a Syriac MS completed on 6 Feb. 586 by the calligrapher Rabbula at the monastery of Beth Mar John of Beth Zagra, located north of Apameia (M. Mango in Okeanos 405–30). Rabbula, not to be confused with RABBULA OF EDessa, may have been the head of the scriptorium, for, according to the colophon, others worked on the MS. The decoration is clustered at the beginning of the MS (fols. 1–14) in and around its extensive Canon Tables. Accompanying the tables are prophets, evangelists, various plants and animals, and a New Testament cycle. Three full-page miniatures precede the tables and four follow. Miniatures of the Virgin and Child and of Christ with four unidentified figures have analogies in later Greek Gospel books. More unusual is the attention paid to the scenes of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost, and Election of Matthias.


—R.S.N.

RADOLIBOS ('Ραδολίβος, Slav. Radoljubo, mod. Rodolibos), Macedonian village northwest of Mt. Pangaión in the katepanate of Zabaltia that in the 14th C. belonged to the theme of BOLERO, Mosynopolis, Sertes, and Strymon. Archaeological findings indicate the existence here of a modest late Roman village, the name of which remains unknown; nothing is known about Rodolibos in the 7th–10th C. The area evidently was settled by Slavs, who gave their own name to the site, and many peasants in the later Rodolibos bore Slavic names. At the end of the 11th C. the proasteion of Rodolibos was in the hands of the Pakourianos family (G. Litavrin in VizOč [Moscow 1971] 158, 165); Lefort distinguishes it from the komotes (community) of the chorion of Rodolibos. In 1098 the nun Maria, widow of the kouropalates Symbatios Pakourianos, conferred the proasteion on the Athonite monastery of IVERON.

PRAKTIKA of 1103, 1316, and 1341 make possible a reconstruction of the character and history of Rodolibos. The village possessed arable lands
located not far from its nucleus and abundant vineyards (about 126 hectares, according to Le- fort); it was surrounded by pastures and forests. Its population grew significantly—from 122 households in 1193 to 226 in 1316; by 1341, however, the economic situation in Radolibos had deteriorated: total income from the village fell from 350 nomismata in 1316 to 270 in 1341; the pratikia record decreases in the number of oxen and vineyards as well. Wars and the plague probably accelerated economic and demographic decline: in 1464/5 Radolibos contained only 146 households. In 1346 Stefan Uroš IV Dušan exempted Iveron from the tax imposed on Radolibos (which, by this time, had grown to 400 nomismata), and both John VI (in 1351) and John V (in 1357) confirmed this privilege.


—A.K.

RAETIA, a Roman province in the middle and eastern Alps, west of Noricum. At the beginning of the 4th C., it was divided into Raetia I (capital, Curia or Chur) and Raetia II (capital, Augusta Vindelicorum); civil administration was in the hands of two praesides, but the military command was entrusted to one officer, the dux of both Raetias. The economic situation of Raetia in the 4th C. can be studied only on the basis of archaeological data: Overbeck (infra) emphasizes the impoverishment of the province, systematically plundered by barbarians, esp. Alemanni; Henning (infra) gives a more complicated picture—villas continued to exist, sometimes far from any fortified refuge, and luxury objects (even from Africa) were imported; urban life continued although some ancient cities (such as Chur) underwent ruralization. After 389 the northern flatland was ceded to the Alemanni; temporarily recovered ca.430, it was lost after the death of the magister militum Aetius. Some loose links, however, connected Raetia with Ostrogothic Italy as late as the beginning of the 6th C.; for example, Cassiodorus (Variae 1.4) mentions a dux Retilium as a subordinate of Theodoric. The episcopal seat of Chur is known from 451 onward.


—A.K.

RAGUSA. See Dubrovnik.

RAITHOU, monastic site on the southwestern coast of the Sinai peninsula (identified with El Tor or possibly Abu Zenima: I. Ševčenko, DOP 20 [1966] 255f., n.2), first inhabited in the 4th–5th C. by anakoretai, who were harassed by nomad raids and either martyred or dispersed to Palestine and Egypt. Some, however, survived to send a representative to the Synod of Jerusalem in 536, prompting Justinian I to rebuild their lavra. Its late 6th-C. abbot, Daniel of Raithou, wrote the biography of his friend John Klimax.
Theodore of Raithou was a Chalcedonian theologian of the early 7th C. The Arab governor of Egypt is recorded as having requisitioned supplies from Raithou in the early 8th C. (P. Lond. IV 1433.16, 92. 276).

The martyrdom of the 33 monks of Raithou was celebrated annually on 14 Jan. Symeon Metaphrastes assumed the account by Neilos of Ankyra into his menologion, and several illustrated MSS of this text contain scenes of their beheading. This text, as incorporated into the “imperial” menologion (F. Halkin in Mémorial A.-J. Festugière: Antiquité païenne et chrétienne, eds. E. Lucchesi, H.D. Saffrey [Geneva 1984] 267–73), is accompanied in a MS in Baltimore (Walters 521, fol.92v) by an unusually brutal image of the slaughter: the head of a seated monk has been split in two by the axe of a dark-skinned attacker. The image derives from that in the Menologion of Basil II (p.317), where, however, the miniature has been overpainted as a monk with two heads.


—L.S.B.MacG., N.P.S.

RALLIES. See Raoul.

RAOUL (Ῥαοῦλ, fem. Ῥαοῦλαινα), from the 14th C. also Ralles, an aristocratic family of Norman origin; perhaps founded by Rudolfus Peel de Lan (called Raoul by Anna Komnene), Norman ambassador to Nikephoros III, who later fled from Robert Guiscard to Bohemund; no source, however, mentions Rudolfus’s shift to Byz. Even less valid is the hypothesis that Raoul was brother of Roger, Dagobert’s son, another Norman ambassador; Albert of Aix, who describes this embassy (PL 166:415C), does not refer to the envos as brothers and calls Roger alone filium Dagoberti. In 1108 Humbert, Graoul’s (Raoul’s) son and Alexios I’s councilor, signed the treaty of Devil. Fassoulakis’s hypothesis that Leo, the scribe of two MSS of 1139, was Humbert’s brother cannot be proved.

Despite scanty evidence for the Raoul family in the 12th C., its members probably belonged to the social elite: they possessed large estates in Thrace (A. Carile, StVen 7 [1965] 219), and the sebastos Constantine Raoul actively supported Alexios III’s usurpation (1195). The protovestiarios Alexios Raoul was influential at John III’s court and his sons supported Michael VIII Palaiologos: John was appointed protovestiarios and Manuel pinkernes. Manuel and another brother, Isaac, sided with the Arsenites; they lost imperial favor, however, and were arrested and blinded. The family recovered under Andronikos II, when another Alexios Raoul was megas domestikos and one of his sons megas stratopedarches. The Raouls married into the families of Palaiologos, Kantakouzenos, Synadenos, Asan, and others. Yet another Alexios was megas domestikos after 1333 and later emigrated to Serres. Thereafter the Raouls lost significance, except for the Peloponnesian branch of the family, which played an important role in resisting the Turks. The family also produced such literati as Theodora Raoulaina and Manuel Raoul (see RAOUl, MANuEL). Some Raouls accompanied Sophia Palaiologina to Moscow, where they served as diplomats.


—A.K.

RAOUL, MANUEL, also known as Manuel Rhales, writer; born Mistra?, fl. ca.1355-ca.1369. Educated in Thessalonike, he spent at least part of his life in the Morea during the reign of despotes Manuel Kantakouzenos (1344–80). He evidently held a bureaucratic position as grammaticos, until forced to resign by failing eyesight. Three of his 12 surviving letters are addressed to the former emporo, John VI Kantakouzenos, the others to government officials, literati, and an abbot. He makes frequent allusions to classical literature as well as to Scripture. Most of the letters are quite conventional in subject matter, but they do provide some prosopographical data and interesting details of everyday life in the 14th C. Peloponnesos, including the plague of 1361–62, the capture of a friend by bandits, and a fall from a horse that made him lame and prevented him from paying his respects to the emperor.


—A.M.T.
RAOU LAIN A, THEODORA, more fully Theo- dora Palaiologina Kantakouzena Raoulaina, anti-Unionist and bibliophile; born ca.1240, died Constantinople 1300. Niece of Michael VIII Palaiologos and third daughter of Irene-Eulogia and John KANTAKOUZENOS, she married George MOUZALON in 1256 and John Raoul Petraliphas, the *protovestiarios*, in 1261. Widowed a second time in 1274, Raoulaina actively opposed her uncle's Unionist policies and was exiled with her mother. During her imprisonment she wrote a vita of the Iconoclast confessors, Sts. THEODORE GRAP TOS and THEOPHANES GRAP TOS. After Michael VIII's death, she restored the Constantinopolitan convent of St. Andrew in Krisi, where she took monastic vows. A staunch supporter of the ARSENIITES, she arranged for the transfer of the relics of PATR. ARSENIOS from Hagia Sophia to this convent. She also built the small monastery of Aristine to house PATR. GREGORY II OF CYPRUS following his resigna- tion.

Raoulaina was well read in classical literature and possessed an important library. She herself copied a MS of the *Orationes* of Ailios ARISTIDES (Vat. gr. 1899). Her literary circle included NIKephoros CHOUNMOS, MAXIMOS PLANOUDES, and the patriarch Gregory. Buchthal and BELTING (in- fra) suggested that she may have commissioned a group of 15 deluxe liturgical codices, which they assigned to an "atelier of the Palaiologina."


RAOU LAIN A, THEODORA. See RADULF OF CAEN.

RAPE (βιασμός, Lat. *rap tus*) was conceived in Roman law as the abduction of a woman against the will of her parents (A. Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law* [Philadelphia 1953] 667). Legislators of the 4th and 5th C. did not draw a clear line between rape and ADULTERY, and Constantine I in 320 esp. underscored that the consent of the girl should be of no advantage to the rapist (*Cod. Theod.* IX 24.1 pr.). The punishment of the *raptor* (and of the girl if she consented) was death by burning; if she did not consent the girl was nevertheless disinherited. Justinian I intro-duced a major distinction (*Cod. Just. IX* 13.1), retaining execution as the penalty for the *raptor* whereas the violated girl was no longer subject to a fine. Justinian’s ruling was developed in novels 143 and 150, which emphasized that marriage after abduction was not considered as an amelio- ration of the crime, a position that remained typ- ical of canon law. *Ecloga* 17.30 punished the rav- isher with a milder penalty, cutting off his nose. Leo VI, in novel 35, drew a distinction between armed rape (*harpage*) of a woman and unarmed violence; the first case required capital punish- ment, the second mutilation (the loss of a hand or arm). Michael Psellos, in commenting on novel 35, introduced a new principle—the violated girl should be compensated by the entire property of the rapist (G. Weiss, *JÖF* 26 (1977) 91)—an opinion probably based on *Basil*. 60.58.1.

The theme of rape appears in literature and art: the Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussac, *Sklitzes*, fol.208) depicts a woman killing a VAR -angian rapist; John Moschos (PG 87:2892AC) tells the story of a monk incited by the devil—he tried to rape the daughter of a peasant, but she deterred him by saying that “for the sake of a brief pleasure” he would negate all his monastic achievements and drive her to suicide. Digenes Akritas’s rape of the daughter of Haplorrabdes was followed by no penalty except his remorse.

Byz. law distinguished the deflowering (*phthora*) of a girl from rape/abduction; the penalty for *phthora* depended on the girl’s consent or lack thereof and on the age of the virgin (before 13 or after); in such cases marriage was recom- mended. Fines for *phthora* were probably trans- formed into *parthenophthoria*.


RAOU LAIN A, THEODORA. See RADULF OF CAEN.

RAŠKA, the name of the main part of the terri- tory of medieval SERBIA. In Latin sources, begin- ning with Ansbert (see *HISTORIA DE EXPEDITIONE FRIDERICI*), Rassia or Raxia was a designation of Serbia, and in Slavic documents of the 13th C. the expression "the land of Raška" was used, but it disappeared after STEFAN UROŠ I. Greek texts
avoided this term. Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, however (De adm. imp. 32.53), mentions a site (a town?) called Rase between Serbia and Bulgaria; by 1020 a bishopsric of Ras (a town on the river Raška) was established as a suffragan of Ohrid. The stronghold (phorourion) Rason of the 12th C. appears in Kinnamos (Kinn. 12.10, cf. 103.8).


--A.K.

Rastislav, prince of Moravia (846-70); died Bavaria after Nov. 870. Rastislav became ruler with help from the king of the Eastern Franks, Louis the German (843-76), but thereafter resisted Frankish encroachments, esp. in the ecclesiastical sphere. He broke with the archbishop of Passau in the late 850s and sought Italian and Byz. clergy for his subjects. Failing to receive a bishop from Pope Nicholas I, in 862 Rastislav asked Michael III for clerics to organize an independent church using the local Slavic language rather than Latin; he may also have been seeking to counteract an impending Frankish-Bulgarian alliance. Michael sent Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios, who arrived in Moravia in 863 with their disciples (including Kliment of Ohrid). It may have been at Rastislav’s request that Constantine and Methodios journeyed to Rome in 867 to seek papal approval for ordinations and use of the Church Slavonic liturgy in Moravia. Dethroned by his nephew Svjatoplok in Nov. 870, Rastislav was condemned to death at an imperial diet in Regensburg, blinded, and imprisoned in a Bavarian monastery, where he died.


--P.A.H.

Rats. See Mice.

Ravenna ('Pářevna), with its harbor suburb of Classe, a cosmopolitan naval and commercial center; capital of the Italian province of Flaminia et Picenum in the 4th C. Honorius moved the imperial court there from Milan in 402 because of its secure position (surrounded by marsh) and its easy access by river channels to the Adriatic Sea and the River Po. As capital of the Western Empire and residence of the praetorian prefect of Italy, it expanded in size in the 5th C. and saw the building of palaces and churches, esp. during the reign of Valentinian III. Its cathedral was built at the end of the 4th C. by Bp. Ursus, possibly replacing one in Classe, and during the episcopate of Peter Chrysologus (ca.432-50) six sees in Emilia were transferred to Ravenna from the jurisdiction of Milan.

Ravenna’s importance declined in the confused last years of the Western Empire (455-76), but it recovered the role of capital of Italy under Odoacer and the Ostrogoth kings. The court attracted senators and scholars, such as Boethius and Cassiodorus, and Ravenna emerged as an important center of MS copying and literary production. Its church became increasingly rich, with patrimonies as distant as Sicily, and its bishops influential spokesmen for the Roman population. In addition to restoring aqueducts and building a new palace, Theodoric the Great undertook construction of several Arian churches (e.g., S. Apollinare Nuovo). Few catholic churches were built in his reign, but several major ones were begun by his successors.

Justinian I’s general, Belisarios, took control of Ravenna in 540 and throughout the Gothic War it served as a bridgehead for Byz. forces as well as capital of Italy. Bp. Maximian (546-56), well known because of his mosaic portrait at S. Vitale and his ivory throne, was an energetic scholar-priest appointed by Justinian I to promote his ecclesiastical policies in the West; he was also the first bishop of Ravenna to receive the title of archbishop. The see supported the imperial position in the Three Chapters affair against Milan and Aquileia, for which Archbp. Agnellus (557-70) was rewarded with the buildings and property of the Arian church. After the late 6th C. Ravenna remained a center for luxury manufacture and trade, esp. with the Lombard kingdom. Latin literary activity continued in fields such as liturgy, geography, medicine, and hagiography (e.g., the Passio of its legendary patron St. Apollinaris), but the Greek monastic presence was small and no Greek works survive. The 6th-7th C. Ravenna papacy reveal the increasing importance of soldiers and officials, many of Eastern origin. In response to the eclipse of the civilian hierarchy following the Lombard invasion of Italy in 568 the Exarchate of Ravenna was created.
Olympios ca.651–52). Separatist feeling became esp. strong from the late 7th C. (opposition to the arrest of Pope Sergius in 693, resistance to the exarch Theophylaktos ca.701) and led to the brutal punishment of leading citizens by Justinian II ca.709. This provoked the establishment of a citizen militia and the election of an independent duke. In the 720s renewed Lombard expansions, increased taxation, and the beginnings of Iconoclasm in Constantinople under Leo III caused further discontent, leading Ravenna to participate in the general Italian revolt of 727. In 732 Ravenna was captured by the Lombard king Liutprande, but was soon recovered for the Byz. by the Venetians. Lombard pressure on the exarchate continued, and Ravenna fell to the Lombard King Aistulf in 751. It was shortly thereafter incorporated in the papal patrimony and its commercial role declined with the silting up of its harbor and the rise of Venice; it remained important, however, as the seat of a powerful archbishop and its society retained features distinct from those of Lombard and Frankish Italy for centuries.

Monuments of Ravenna. Ravenna’s monuments of the late antique and Byz. period can be divided into three epochs—Late Roman (402–76), Gothic (493–540), and Byz. (to the end of the exarchate)—with a resurgence in the early 12th C. The late Roman buildings include the Baptistery of the Orthodox, with spectacular figural mosaics of ca.450, and the so-called Mausoleum of Galla Placidia, a cruciform oratory probably founded by the empress, who almost certainly was buried not there, but in Rome.

Sixth-century buildings include S. Vitale, S. Apollinare in Classe, and the destroyed Church of S. Michele in Africisco (orig. ad Frigiscus), the apse of which is preserved (much restored) in Berlin. S. Vitale is octagonal, with a dome on eight masonry piers that are connected by two-storied curved colonnades. In design it is the nearest known relative of Ss. Sergios and Bacchos in Constantinople; nevertheless, Krautheimer and Deichmann (infra) suggest that the architect was Italian. Mosaics in the apse depict Bp. Ecclesius (522–32) as donor in the couch and Justinian I (see ill. above) and Theodora on the lower wall (for ill., see THEODORA). Archbp. Maximian consecrated S. Vitale in 547.

S. Apollinare in Classe, erected on or near the...
tomb of Ravenna's first bishop, Apollinarius, was consecrated by the same Maximian in 549. It is a longitudinal basilica with colonnades of imported Greek and Prokonnesian marbles; the unusual apse mosaic shows a symbolic Transfiguration attended by St. Apollinarius. On the wall below are two panels inserted in the 7th C. to commemorate a privilege granted by Constantine IV, whose portrait appears. The mosaic program of the Arian Church of S. Apollinare Nuovo, with its long procession of saints down the nave, was partially redesigned ca. 550 when the church came into Orthodox hands.

In the absence of surviving monumental imagery from 6th-C. Constantinople, scholars have taken the mosaics of Ravenna as paradigms of Justinianic style, even attributing them to Constantinopolitan craftsmen (Kitzinger, infra). Inscriptions attest that S. Vitale and S. Apollinare in Classe were paid for by Julianus "Argentarius," who also contributed to S. Michele in Africisco.

Ravenna enjoyed an artistic resurgence in the 11th and 12th C. In 1112 the apse of the cathedral (Basilica Ursiana) was redecorated with mosaics by a master who, according to Demus (infra), also worked in the apse of S. Marco in Venice. Only fragments of this mosaic survive, as the Basilica Ursiana was demolished in 1733.


Ravenna Papyri, a general designation for the Latin nonliterary archival material originating in the archiepiscopal chancery of Ravenna or sent there from other chanceries of Italy (Rome, Syracuse) in late antiquity. Since they were written in Latin and, unusually, on papyrus, they attracted the attention of early humanists and palaeographers. The documents' contents relate to church privileges and the management of ecclesiastical estates, wills, and donations benefiting churches and monasteries, and heritable leases and sales pertaining to the landed properties of the see of Ravenna. The earlier group of them (about 60 pieces) is dated between 445 and 700, the last certain date being 642/3 or 665/6; then after a gap come the papyri of the 9th–10th C. These later papyri have been less well studied. The Ravenna, or better, Italian papyri are of great importance as sources for legal procedure in late antique society, esp. in dealings with the church, and as illustrating Latin linguistic evolutions in their later stages. They also illustrate the development of the late Roman cursive script as it was used for writing Latin in the West.


Raymond of Aguilers, Crusader historian; fl. ca. 1100. Canon of Le Puy and chaplain of Count Raymond of Toulouse. Raymond participated in the First Crusade and composed a Liber [or Historia] Francorum qui ceperunt Jerusalem (History of the Franks Who Captured Jerusalem) addressed to the bishop of Viviers; he began writing the book with Pons of Balazun, who was killed at Arqah. His perspective on events from 1095 to 1099 reflects his relations with the count Raymond and Ademar, bishop of Le Puy. Raymond describes his Provençal contingent's crossing of the Byz. Empire and their difficulties with the Pechenegs (ed. Hill et al., pp. 36–47). Raymond complains about Alexios I's duplicity (p. 41) and reports Byz. ships' victualing of the Crusaders (p. 108) and the Crusaders' later relations with Alexios (pp. 125f).


Raymond of Poitiers (Πετρεβίος), prince of Antioch; born ca. 1098 or 1099, died near Inab (southeast of Antioch) 29 June 1149. Younger son of the count of Poitiers, Raymond became prince by marrying Constance, heiress of Antioch, in 1136. John II, who had hoped to fulfill the Komnenian goal of regaining Antioch by marrying Constance to the future Manuel I, attacked
Raymond in Aug. 1137, then made peace on condition that Raymond become his vassal. A joint Byz.-Antiochene expedition in Apr.–May 1138 took Bużā‘ah, Ma‘arat al-Nu‘mān, and Kafartāb in northern Syria, but failed at Shayzar. When John entered Antioch and demanded the citadel, rioting townsmen forced him to withdraw. In 1142 John again threatened Antioch, but his death prevented an attack. Manuel's forces ravaged the region in 1144. The danger to Antioch caused by the fall of Edessa compelled Raymond to visit Constantinople (ca.1145), humble himself at John II's tomb, and become Manuel's vassal, but he gained little direct aid. Because his daughter Maria of Antioch subsequently wed Manuel, Raymond was very favorably treated by the historian John Kinnamos.

LIT. C. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la Principauté franque d'Antioche (Paris 1940) 357–84.

-C.M.B.

RAYMOND OF TOULOUSE, called Raymond of Saint-Gilles (hence Ἰσαγγέλης in Anna Komnene); born ca.1041/2, died Mont-Pèlerin near Tripoli ca.28 Feb. 1105. Leading the Provençal contingent of the First Crusade, Raymond reached Constantinople on 21 Apr. 1097. While declining to become vassal to Alexios I, he swore to uphold Alexios's rights, respect his territories, and aid him against opponents (J.H. Hill, L.L. Hill, AHR 58 [1952–53] 522–27). At the capture of Antioch (June 1098), he gained possession of a gate and a portion of the city. Until dispossessed by Bohémond (Jan. 1099), he asserted the emperor's right to the city as a means of safeguarding his own position (J. France, Byzantion 40 [1970] 291f). Following the capture of Jerusalem, Raymond sailed to Constantinople (May/June 1100). With Alexios's support, he joined the Crusade of 1101. When it was destroyed in Anatolia, he escaped with the survivors to Constantinople. Returning to Syria in early 1102, he devoted himself to capturing towns near Tripoli, although the latter remained unconquered at his death. Anna Komnene praises his high character in comparison with the greed and treachery of other crusading leaders.


-C.M.B.

REBELLION (ἐπανάστασις) was considered in Roman law as a grave crime (T. Mommsen, Römisches Strafrecht [Leipzig 1899; rp. Graz 1955] 554f), to be punished by execution unless a special agreement was reached by both parties. The church usually assumed a neutral position toward usurpation, but tended to attribute the success of a rebellion to the emperor's fall from God's grace (S. Elber, RQ 81 [1986] 31–35). A negative attitude toward insurrection pervades Byz. literature: Keaumenos, although he was surely aware of the defeat of numerous emperors by usurpers, emphasized that the ruler of Constantinople always would prevail; he gave his readers advice about how to remain safe during a rebellion and recommended supporting (openly or clandestinely) the legitimate emperor. Niketas Choniates accused his contemporaries of frequent rebellions, contrasting them with Westerners who remained loyal to their kings.

The driving force behind insurrection could be the urban masses (e.g., circus factions in the 6th C.), a mutinous army, the population of a certain province (esp. in the frontier areas), or a dissident religious group. A usurper might be motivated not only by his desire for power, but also by fear of punishment; foreign alliances and support offered by neighboring tribes or rulers played a substantial role. The goal of a rebellion could be usurpation of the throne, defense of an emperor and the concept of dynastic legitimacy, political secession, the removal of an unpopular official, satisfaction of economic demands (alleviation of taxation, grain supply), or religious convictions. The term epanastasis could also be applied to enemy attacks on the empire.

-A.K.

RECENSION THEORY, conventional term for an art historical method that seeks to identify genealogical affinities among disparate narrative picture cycles ultimately derived from the same text. Corresponding iconographic episodes are analyzed with the aim of determining which shows greater fidelity to the text and therefore may be assumed to be the more "original." The goal is to establish stematic relationships among all extant witnesses (including all artistic media) and to reconstruct from them as full and accurate an archetype as possible. Ultimately based on 19th-C.
text-critical practice, this approach was modified and adapted to the analysis of narrative picture cycles by Weitzmann. He distinguished, for example, four distinct recensional traditions for the illustration of Genesis. They are identified by their most famous surviving representatives: the Cotton Genesis, the Vienna Genesis, the illustrated Octateuchs, and the Joseph page (fol.69v) in the Paris Gregory.


RECIPEs survive mainly in treatises describing the nutritious properties of food (see DIET) and the monthly regimen necessary for good health. Some of these recipe collections were produced by known writers, such as Symeon Seth or Nicholas Myrepsos; some were by anonymous or obscure persons whose identification is hardly possible, for example, the treatise of the 11th–14th C. (G. Litavrin, Vl Vrem 31 [1971] 249–301) that was falsely ascribed to empress Zoe. The content of recipes is varied, including formulas for cooking, COSMETICS, PHARMACOLOGY, or even MAGIC. The advice ranges from sound observations to fantastic qualities ascribed to real products. Thus, Seth (De alim. fac. 26f) says that beef, in comparison with mutton, is “cold” and brings forth blood like black bile; therefore it can be recommended only to those who have a “warm” stomach and exercise continually. Pseudo-Zoe’s treatise distinguishes eight kinds of food: sweet, bitter, salty, fat, sour, scalding, astringent, and neutral, and in accordance with this scale recommends them before or after the main course or to people of differing temperament or to the sick. It also provides recipes for growing hair and relieving headaches, and advises writing words on bay leaves to avoid insomnia. —A.K., Ap.K.

RECLUSE. See ENKLEISTOS.

RECORDS (sing. THESIS or παρασημειώσις) of outgoing (and, eventually, incoming) ACTS were kept by most CHANCERIES. The sources mention the imperial record (thesis), in which the proto notarios copied all documents signed by the emperor (14th–15th C.). Actual records (Vienna, ÖNB hist. gr. 47 and 48) survive for the patriarchate (14th C.), which always possessed archives kept by the CHARTOPHYLAX. Similar records (hypomnemata, codices, tomaria, chartia, thesis) were kept by the central and provincial administration, which also registered pertinent documents (katastrosis). In the later Roman Empire, private deeds underwent registration (insinuatio) by the city authorities, but this practice had disappeared well before the end of the 9th C. In later centuries evidence for the existence of recognized notarial minutes or drafts is very scarce and uncertain (cf. Peira 98 and the “notarial minutes” of Vat. gr. 952 in G. Ferrari, SBN 4 [1995] 249–67). Records were usually kept in roughly chronological order (this is partly true for CADAVERS).


RECRUITMENT was both voluntary and compulsory throughout the Byz. period. Volunteers, Byz. and foreign, were attracted to the imperial units (TAGMATA) by cash bounties, salaries, and the prospect of advancement offered by a military career; the state issued their equipment and rations or allowances for their purchase. By contrast, a system of hereditary conscription, the STRATEIA, supplied the manpower for the provincial armies (themata); these soldiers (STRATEGIATAT) equipped themselves but were eligible for salaries (ROGA) and state-supplied provisions (OPSONION) when their forces were mobilized for campaigns. Following the fiscalization of the STRATEGIA after the 11th C., the state issued grants of land (fiscal PRONOIA) in return for military service. The hiring of MERCENARIES and the settlement of warlike foreign peoples in Byz. territory were also common means of recruitment.

Men were eligible for army service between the ages of 18 and 40 with length of service spanning 30 years. The STRATEGIATAT specify youth, size, and strength as the qualities required of soldiers; various nationalities were recommended for particular roles, such as Armenians for heavy infantry
and Rus' as skirmishers in the 10th C. (Oikonomides, *Listes* 336).


**REDEMPTION** (*λύτρωσις*, from *lytron*, “ransom”), the mystery of Christ’s death, which was instrumental for the salvation of mankind. In the Old Testament the concept of redemption, or liberation, had a political tinge—the liberation of the chosen people from the Egyptian captivity. Christianity ascribed to it a cosmic character; although the church fathers considered Christ as typified by Moses, the deliverer from Egypt (e.g., pseudo-Makarios/Symeon, hom.11.6, ed. H. Dörries, 99.82–83), he was more often contrasted with Adam—Christ’s death was to redeem mankind from the state of sin created by Adam’s fall.

Patristic doctrine did not evolve a systematic concept of redemption. The creed of both the First Council of Nicaea and the First Council of Constantinople is limited to the statement that Christ was crucified “for us,” “for our salvation.” The implication is that redemption is both a preconceived act of God the Father who sacrificed his Son because of his love for mankind, and a free act of the Son who underwent the crucifixion to destroy the power of Satan over the world and, in so doing, became the “new Adam,” leading humanity to eternal life. Maximus the Confessor, while emphasizing the existence of human will in Christ, stressed in fact the personal and free commitment of every man in the search for salvation: human persons are called to participate in the human nature of the incarnate Logos, and thus share in deification (*theosis*). (See also *Soteriology*.)


**RED SEA.** See *Crossing of the Red Sea; Pliplous.*

**REFERENDARIOS** (*ῥεφερενδάριος*, from Lat. *referendarius*), term used to denote both a state and an ecclesiastical official.

1. The *secular referendarios*, an office created by Julian, was the emperor’s secretary. Under Justinian I the *referendarios* acquired considerable importance; the number of active *referendarioi* decreased from 14 to 2 (plus one for the empress). The major duty of the *referendarios* was to transmit the emperor’s orders to the *magistros* and to submit the petitions and complaints of subjects to the emperor. General scholarly opinion holds that the *referendarios* disappeared after 600; however, both Laurent (*Corpus* 2, no. 1174) and Zacos and Veglery (*Zacos, Seals* 1, no. 2051) date the seal of John, “the imperial *referendarios* and *dioiketes* of provinces,” to the 8th C. Two other seals of 8th-C. imperial *referendarioi* were published by Seibt (*Bleisiegel*, nos. 89–84).

2. The *ecclesiastical referendarios* was a cleric, normally a deacon, who acted as the liaison officer of the patriarch of Constantinople with the imperial court; one of his major functions was to transmit patriarchal documents to the palace. He also played a key role in all ceremonial occasions involving both emperor and patriarch and was responsible for presenting newly appointed metropolitans and *hegoumenoi* to the emperor. Heraclius’s novel of 612 fixed at 12 the number of *referendarioi* on the staff of the Great Church (ed. I. Konidaris, *FM* 5 [1982] 70.111–12); as in the case of the *skeuophylax*, however, later sources mention only one incumbent, and it is doubtful whether his subordinates—if he had any—continued to hold the same title. This development may have been connected with the appointment of *referendarioi* in provincial sees, which is well attested by the 13th C., and, by the 15th C., seems to have extended to the humblest of bishoprics (see, e.g., N.A. Bees, *Byzantia* 2 [1911] 52.26).


**REGALIA.** See *Insignia.*

**REGENCY,** a political arrangement intended to ensure a family’s hold on the throne when a senior
emperor was precluded from exercising his office. Regency usually arose when a senior emperor died leaving a minor co-emperor. It took two main forms: formal co-rulership by an empress, whether mother (e.g., Martina, Theodora [wife of Theophilos], Anna of Savoy) or older sister (e.g., Pulcheria), or the appointment of one or more guardians (epitropoi). Both options might be combined; in fact, multimember regencies predominated after Martina and Irene, such as during the minority of Michael III or Constantine VII. Co-ruling regents were officially acknowledged on coins, in acclamations, and dating formulas, although empresses usually yielded precedence to the young emperor: Anna of Savoy was an exception (Dölger, Paraspora 208–11).

The makeup of a regency reflected the contemporary political structure, for example, Stilicho, magister militum, as regent for Honorius or Patr. Nicholas I as one of Constantine VII's regents. The precise arrangement might be spelled out in an emperor's will (e.g., Reg 1, no. 216) or a decree (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no. 1120). The regent empress's ability to remarry and thereby upset the arrangement could be limited by her oath (e.g., Eudokia [1067]) or nunhood (e.g., Maria of Antioch [117; N. Oikonomides, REB 21 (1963) 101–28]). Other circumstances led to de facto regency: for example, Justin II's mental illness resulted in the actual exercise of power by Sophia and Tiberios Caesar (the future Tiberios I). Similarly, the senior emperor's long absence on campaign explains, for example, the role of Bonos (or Bonosos) the patrois and Patr. Sergios I under Herakleios or the decree of Alexios I granting administrative power to Anna Dalassene (Reg 2, no. 1073).

Regencies generally spawned political tensions and conflict involving competing regents (e.g., Theoktistos's murder with the connivance of Bardas during Theodora and Thekla's regency for Michael III) or contenders for the throne, such as Romanos I or John VI Kantakouzenos. When the young emperor reached majority—usually at age 16—he sometimes found it difficult to dislodge the empress (e.g., Constantine VI and Irene) or effective regent (e.g., Basil II and Basil the Nothos).


REGGIO-CALABRIA (Ῥήγηα), a port city at the southwestern tip of Italy, the administrative and ecclesiastical center of Calabria. Calabria was considered part of Illyricum and during the Iconoclast controversy remained under the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople. The metropolitan see of Reggio was created probably soon after 800, since archbishops of Calabria are known from the 7th and 8th C. Reggio was captured by Robert Guiscard in 1060. The last Greek metropolitan of Reggio, Basil, was deposed in 1078 (F. Russo, BolβBadGr 7 [1953] 163–78).


RELATIONSHIP, DEGREES OF. The closeness of relationship between two individuals is designated by the term bathmos (degree, corresponding to the Lat. gradus). The degree of relationship is determined by the number of intermediate generations or births (“quot generationes, tot gradus”). For example, father and son are related to one another in the first degree, grandfather and grandson in the second, great-grandfather and great-grandson in the third, that is, in a “direct line” in which the one person (descendant, kation) is directly descended from the other (ascendant, anion). Two people who are related to one another collaterally (ek plagiou) go back to a common progenitor, starting from whom the degrees are calculated; for example, sisters are related in the second degree, an aunt and a niece in the third, cousins in the fourth. The degrees of relationship were of legal importance esp. in the area of inheritance law where those who had a more distant degree of relationship were excluded from inheriting by those who had a less distant degree of relationship to the deceased (see INTESTATE SUCCESSION) and in the area of marriage law, which forbade marriage between certain persons closely related in degree (see MARRIAGE IMPEDIMENTS).


RELICS (ῥα λείψανα), the mortal remains of holy persons, or objects sanctified by contact with them. The first relics venerated by Christians were those of the MARTYRS. After persecution ended in 312,
this veneration was extended to those of confessors, great bishops, “the Fathers,” ascetics, etc. Veneration quickly went beyond “primary relics” or mortal remains to “secondary relics,” such as the instruments of the martyr’s passion, and, with the discovery of the holy places in Jerusalem (see Locus Sanctus), to instruments of Jesus’ Passion, articles of the Virgin’s clothing, etc.

Primary relics were venerated as signs of the victory of Christ’s sacrifice repeated in his saints. Martyria with altars on which the sacrament of that sacrifice (see Eucharist) was renewed were built over martyrs’ graves, and relics were actually enclosed inside the altars. Secondary relics, first opposed, were eventually accepted as instruments through which God had chosen to work. Especially significant was the role of relics in healing.

From the 4th C. onward, holy bodies were exhumed, dismembered, and distributed by solemn “translation” to various local churches, esp. Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople. Constantinople, a newcomer with few native martyrs’ remains from the pre-Constantinian persecutions, worked hard at gathering relics, esp. the instruments of the Passion (two pieces of the True Cross, one brought from Apameia; the pillar on which Jesus was scourged; the crown of thorns; the sponge and Sacred Lance used to pierce Christ’s side). Other relics in Constantinople included the

Relics. Translation of the relics of John Chrysostom. Miniature in the Menologion of Basil II (Vat. gr. 1613, p.353). Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. The relics were translated to the Church of the Holy Apostles, Constantinople, in 438. At the right, Emp. Theodosios II.
Virgin's robe, girdle, and shroud (M. Jugie, La mort et l'assomption de la Sainte Vierge [Vatican 1944] 688–707) and other spurious New Testament relics such as one of the several reputed heads of John the Baptist, the remains of the Holy Innocents and of St. Stephen the protomartyr, plus other miracle-working objects (icons, the columns of Hagia Sophia, etc.). Many of these relics were kept in the Great Palace. They figure predominantly in descriptions of Constantinople and travelers' accounts and were a major attraction for pilgrims (K.N. Ciggaar, REB 34 [1976] 245f).

According to O. Meinardus (OrChr 54 [1970] 130–33), about 3,600 relics of 478 Greek saints are recorded as having reposed in 427 Byz. churches and monasteries and 37 non-Byz. institutions; this figure represents only 12.5 percent of all known saints. Five saints (Charalampos, Panteleemon, Tryphon, Paraskeve the Elder, and George) left more than 100 relics each, or 24.1 percent of all recorded relics.

The translation of relics was sumptuously celebrated and gave birth to a special literary genre: the sermon on translation. Constantine VII wrote one on the translation of the MANDYLION to Constantinople, Theodore DAPHNOPATES delivered another in 957 on the translation of the hand of John the Baptist to Constantinople from Antioch, and KOSMAS VESTITOR dedicated at least five to the translation of the relics of John Chrysostom. The translation itself often became a feast that found its way into the church calendar and was marked by annual processions (LITE) to the appropriate shrine (R. Taft, OrChrP 48 [1982] 159–70).

The attitude of the Iconoclasts toward relics is still under discussion. It is possible that they rejected the veneration of icons and relics alike (Gero, Constantine V 152–65). Their opponents accused them of hating relics, and John of Damascus found himself compelled to provide a justification for the cult of relics. J. Wortley (ByzF 8 [1982] 253–79) has questioned, however, the idea of Constantine V being an active persecutor of relics.

The collection of relics became fashionable and increasingly competitive. Sermons on translations often emphasize how strongly the population resisted the removal of relics, so that supernatural signs were often necessary to reconcile the people to the loss of their holy protector. Trade in stolen relics flourished (P.J. Geary, Furti Sacra [Princeton 1978]). The most notorious thefts were those of the bodies of St. Mark, taken from Alexandria to Venice in 827 (to replace the “Byz.” patron of the city, St. Theodore), and of St. Nicholas, taken from Myra to Bari in 1087. The excesses that characterized relic collection were upbraided by CHRISTOPHER OF MYTiLENE (no.114), who ridiculed a naive monk Andrew who had collected 10 hands of Prokopiou, 15 jaws of Theodore, 8 legs of Nestor, and even the beards of the Holy Innocents murdered in Bethlehem.

During the Crusades, Latin armies despoiled Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Edessa of their relics and the reliquaries that housed them and shipped them home to the West. ROBERT DE CLARI gives a list of those seized in Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade.


- R.F.T., A.K.

RELIEF (ἀναγλυφή), the carving of materials in such a way that depicted phenomena appear in successive zones of space and depth between the surface plane and the background. Notably on sarcophagi and imperial monuments of the 4th and 5th C., relief sculpture is largely figurative, even when displaying the anticlassical rigidity and repetitiveness of the Arch of Constantine in Rome and much carving in porphyry. By the end of the 4th C., as on the OBELISK OF THEODOSIUS I in the Hippodrome at Constantinople and numerous ivories, official art displayed an interest in idealized human form in a style sometimes described as that of the “Theodosian Renaissance” (Kitzinger, Making 32–34). From the 6th C. onward, relief was increasingly limited to an architectural role. Already in use in the Church of St. Polyuuktos, relief in Justinianic monuments established a new koine characterized by antiplastic techniques and a preference for stylized floral ornament.

After the end of Iconoclasm, the sculpture of the Church of the Panagia at Skripou (873–74) still displayed a nonfigurative repertory carved in two-dimensional low relief (A. Megaw, BSA 61 [1966] 25–27). Greater technical ability is evident in the mélange of revived Late Antique themes
and orientalizing floral ornament in the sculptures of the church of Constantine Lips (908) in Constantinople, where preserved reliefs still exhibit traces of gilding and polychrome. The same church marks the appearance of a new type of sculpture, the relief icon. Stone and esp. ivory icons of the 10th C. widely employed relief to represent saints and the Great Feasts; thereafter the technique was applied to enrich the content of sculpture with ornament, heraldic imagery (see COATS OF ARMS), ANIMAL COMBATS, and mythological subjects. These are accompanied by a rising interest in PLASTICITY and carving virtuosity. The last phase of relief sculpture, in Palaiologan Constantinople (H. Belting, MünchJb 23 [1972] 63–100), shows a return to concern with representations of the human figure.

---


---

RELIQUARY (λέγεται, κιβωτίδιον, θήκη), a receptacle for RELICS. The rise of the cult of MARTYRS led to the division and distribution of the supposed earthly residue of the saints, a multiplication which, in turn, necessitated the manufacture of containers for these relics' protection and display. From the 4th C. onward, such vessels were placed within or under ALTARS; their proximity to sacred remains suggested that relics be made of precious materials—above all, gold, silver, and ivory—a sentiment abetted by the desire to honor relics; Leo I placed a garment said to have belonged to the Virgin in a gem-encrusted reliquary casket called a soros. Lavish containers were also requisite when relics were sent as diplomatic gifts: Alexios I is described as having sent such a box, with the respective saints identified by labels, to Henry IV of Germany (An.Komm. 1:135–23–25). At the same time some containers, esp. for souvenirs of a holy site (LOCUS SANCITUS), might be made of humbler materials: the painted wood of the SANTA SANCTORUM RELIQUARY of the lead pilgrimage AMPULLAE. Relics could be enclosed in ENKOLPIA or inserted into much larger receptacles like the 6th-C. throne-reliquary known as the "sedia di S. Marco" (Treasury S. Marco, no.7).

While never attaining the variety of shapes known in the medieval West, Byz. examples included skull-reliquaries (Rückert, infra, figs. 1–7) and containers in the form of ciboria, like one in Moscow bearing the portraits of Constantine X and Eudokia (Ishkustvo Vizantii 2, no.547). This last may have been a receptacle for a relic of St. Demetrios, a genre that is characterized by esp. intricate and often diminutive constructions, decorated with ENAMEL, that include images of the bodies and tombs of Demetrios and his companions (A. Grabar, DOP 5 [1950] 1–28). These are, however, exceptions to a fairly straightforward pattern of development from simple metal CASKETS AND BOXES to ever more elaborate types. Their size varied not as a function of time but of these reliquaries' contents—from the small gabled box depicted in the hands of a bishop on an ivory plaque in Trier (Volbach, Elfenbeinarbeiten, no.143)—itself perhaps part of such a container—to the coffinlike chests, requiring at least two men to carry them, that are represented in the MENOLOGION OF BASIL II (pp. 344, 353). Such caskets had locks and their presence in monastic treasuries is regularly signaled in INVENTORIES. (Most texts refer, nonetheless, to the contents rather than to the container).

Among the preserved reliquaries, examples down to the 10th C. often reproduce the form of SARCOPHAGI. Some have donor portraits and a precious few, such as the Brescia LIPSANOThEK (Volbach, Elfenbeinarbeiten, no.107), represent miracles of Christ and typologically related Old Testament scenes. Toward the end of this period a special type, the so-called staurotheke, was developed for fragments of the TRUE CROSS; more than 1,000 relics of this sort are known (Frolow, infra). Normally these involved an inner receptacle, with a cruciform compartment housing the holy particle, inserted into a rectangular, often jeweled casing inscribed with the donor's name (LIMBURG AN-DER-LAHN RELIQUARY). The uses of such staurothekei are suggested by inscriptions on the back of a cross-reliquary at Cortona (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinskulpt. II, no.77); these inscriptions describe the ivory as having been presented by a skenophylax named Stephen to the monastery where he was raised and note its (later) role as a victory token carried into battle by an emperor named Nikephoros. Customarily such reliquaries bear the images of Constantine I and Helena.
Both functionally and formally, by the 12th C. some reliquaries had coalesced with icons. A dipytch containing the relics of saints as well as their portraits is mentioned in the Patmos inventory of 1200. Just such an object—with the portraits of 28 saints and slots for their remains—is preserved in a dipytch of Thomas Prelijubović. In the case of the Bessarion reliquary, a staurotheke is actually incorporated into the icon.

—M.E.F., A.C.

REMARIAE (δίγαμος) was accepted by the early church, but reluctantly; while the Novatiansists condemned it, Methodios of Olympos (Symposium 3.12, ed. N. Bonwetsch [Leipzig 1917] 41.7–8), quoting St. Paul, stated that *digamia* was not a good action, but preferable to "sexual burning" (*ekpyrosis*). Epiphanius of Salamis (Panarion 59.6) granted a widow the right to remarry as many times as she lost her husband; opinion differs as to whether he permitted remarriage after a divorce resulting from adultery or serious crime (P. Nautin, VigChr 37 [1983] 157–73, rejected by H. Crouzel, VigChr 38 [1984] 271–80). Justinian 1 permitted remarriage with provision for the protection of surviving children and their inheritance (*Cod. Just. V* 9.9). Canon law recognized the legality of *digamia* for widowers and widows, prescribing a year or two of penance as punishment (Rhalles-Potles, Synagma 4:106–30); *digamia* after a divorce was not completely prohibited but condemned by rigorists, as indicated by the Meechian Controversy provoked by the second marriage of Constantine VI. The negative attitude of Byz. moralists toward second marriages is reflected, for example, in Kekaumenos's advice to avoid marrying a widow; he held that tensions with a stepmother were a major problem in remarriage.

The third and fourth marriage of widowers was hotly debated. Irene legislated against a third marriage; Basil I and Leo VI against a fourth. After the dispute over the Tetragamy of Leo VI, the Tomos of Union (920) recognized the lawfulness of second marriages, but restricted third and prohibited fourth marriages; canonists recommended a five-year *epitimion* for the third marriage. Basil the Great (canon 50) branded a third marriage as *porneia* (prostitution or fornication), but 12th-C. canonists referred to civil law, which permitted the third marriage (Rhalles-Potles, Synagma 4:203–05). Balsamon (ibid. 481.14–18) emphasized that childlessness could justify remarriage. The empress Eudokia Makrembolitissa in 1067, just before the death of Constantine X, vowed not to remarry in order to protect the rights of her children and assure the continuity of the Doukas dynasty (N. Oikonomides, REB 21 [1969] 101–28), but then changed her mind. Widows might circumvent matrimonial legislation by taking concubines, a socially valid way of avoiding prohibited unions, but some widows allegedly resorted to murdering their children in order to remarry (John Moschos, PG 87:2929BC).

—J.H., A.K.

RENAISSANCE. The existence of a genuine renaissance in Byz. was denied by A. Heisenberg (HistZ 133 [1926] 393–412), but since then the concept has become popular, esp. with art historians. Some scholars argue that the following renaissances are properly so termed: Macedonian, Komnenian, and Late or Palaiologan. P. Speck (Poikila Byzantina 4 [Bonn 1984] 175–210) introduced the idea of a pre-Macedonian renaissance, and sometimes the terms “Late Roman” (or Theodosian) renaissance and a “renaissance of Justinian” are used. Thus, the label “renaissance” has been applied to practically the entire Byz. millennium, with very insignificant exceptions (we still have no renaissance of the 7th C.). The concept of a perpetual renaissance is contradictory in itself, since a substantial gap is necessary for a renaissance to occur; Heisenberg used this argument of cultural continuity for rejecting a Byz. renaissance. Furthermore, there is always a danger of confusing a simple interest in antiquity (whether we call it continuity or revival) with renaissance.

However one understands this phenomenon of renaissance (the “awakening of the Middle Ages” or the beginning of a new era), one would suppose in it some cardinal changes that go beyond the mere imitation of ancient models. A genuine renaissance requires a particular intellectual milieu, and it is debatable whether such a Florentine-
style milieu existed in Constantinople or Mistra. A genuine renaissance requires a radical shift in both the social position and self-estimation of the master (painter, architect, writer, or scientist) and, again, it is questionable whether such a shift ever took place in Byz. Finally, a genuine renaissance “divinizes” man in his practical activity and in his practical goals, whereas Byz. did not go far beyond the traditional perception of man as a pawn in the hands of God or Fate. It might be more appropriate to apply the term “prerenaissance” to the period of the 11th–12th C., when some significant cultural innovations emerged (A. Kazhdan, Bisanzio e la sua citività [Rome-Bari 1983] 161–81), while recognizing that these innovations were not followed by full-fledged renaissance phenomena similar to those in Italy.


RENIER OF MONTFERRAT, youngest son of William, marquis of Montferrat; born ca.1163, died Constantinople ca.1182/early 1183. William chose Renier as bridgroom for Maria Komnene, Manuel’s daughter, to confirm an alliance between the Montferrats and Manuel against Frederick I Barbarossa. Renier reached Constantinople in Aug./Sept. 1179, and the wedding took place in Feb. 1180. In accordance with Byz. custom, Renier was renamed “John” and given the title CAESAR. He joined his wife (see KOMNENE, MARIA) in her conspiracy against the regents for Alexios II. Renier and his Italian supporters distinguished themselves in the defense of Hagia Sophia (Mar.–May 1181). Renier returned to the palace with Maria, and they were executed by Andronikos (I) Komnenos.


RENT. In common usage, rent is a periodic payment to a landlord or owner for use of land, buildings, etc. A varied terminology (e.g., PAKTON, MORTE, EMPHYTEUSIS) attests to manifold forms of renting, most of which are still somewhat obscure. For agricultural land, rent was paid in the form of cash or as a portion of the harvest. As for rates of rent, while the Farmer’s Law (par.10) states that the owner received 1/10 of the harvest, numerous documents from the 11th–14th C. state, with few exceptions, that the rent for cereal-producing land was 1/3 the harvest or 1 hyperpyron for 10 modii of land. For vineyards, there are few figures; according to a 13th–14th-C. LAND LEASE FORMULARY (Sathas, MB 6:621.10–11), the owner and renter split equally the wine produced. A theoretical average rent may be calculated as 1 hyperpyron per modios of vineyard. The attested rates of the pakton of vineyards, however, are much lower, fluctuating at 1 hyperpyron for 6–8 modii of vineyards—therefore N. Svoronos (in Lavra 4:162) suggested that the ampeleopakton (pakton for vineyards) was not the base rental charge on vineyards but a state surcharge levied on vineyards cultivated by xenobaroi. In practice, rates of rent varied depending on the nature of the renter, whether the state or a private individual, on the social status of the tenant, on local customs, and other noneconomic factors.

In a broader conceptual sense, the word rent is used in two distinct ways by some scholars to designate taxes: (1) “feudal rent” is sometimes used to mean the taxes a PAROIKOS paid to his lord; (2) other scholars (e.g., A. Kazhdan, VizVrem 10 [1956] 48–65) suggest that taxes levied from STATE PROPERTY can be characterized as “centralized rent.” (For rents paid on houses, rooms, and workshops, see ENOIKION.)


REPENANCE. See PENANCE.

RESPRIPUTURE (Lat.) or ινισις (lýsis), a document issued by the imperial or patriarchal CHANCELLY in order to answer a (initially legal) question or request. The rescriptum, on which the emperor wrote the word (re)scripsi (“I have written”), is a late Roman term. The lysis, with the emperor’s red autograph MENOLOGEM and his wax seal, often written on the back of the original request, was not limited to legal questions. It is attested from the 10th–12th C. and was replaced, already in the 12th C., by ordinary PROTAGMATA.
RESPONSA NICOLAI PAPAE, the answers of Pope Nicholas I to 106 (Heiser, infra 79–89) or 115 (Đuđev, infra 3:145) questions posed in 866 by Boris I of Bulgaria. In his responses the pope argued that Roman practices were more suitable for the newly converted barbarians than the strict rules of Constantinople. The Responsa contain unique information concerning both Bulgarian and Byz. customary law, including marriage customs (A. Laiou, RF 4 [1985] 189–201). G. Dennis (OrChrP 24 [1958] 165–74) asserts that the Responsa had no anti-Byz. features, apart from the fact that the pope disapproved of married clergy and refused to recognize Constantinople’s second rank among the patriarchates; F. Dvornik (BS 34 [1973] 41), however, rejects this thesis.

ED. E. Perels, MGH Epist. 6:568–600.

- A.K.

RESURRECTION (ἀνάσσεσθαι). The resurrection of Christ from the dead and the resurrection of all who have died prior to the LAST JUDGMENT are essential components of the Christian faith and are included in all CREEDS and confessions of faith. From the 4th C. onward, the resurrection of Christ was subordinate in theological reflection to the INCARNATION as the decisive “salvific event,” although it continued to be central in the church year (see EASTER), and in liturgy and art.

The struggle with ORIGENISM, esp. in Palestine, concerned primarily the constitution of the resurrected body. The individuality of the latter, that is, its identity with the earthly body, and the idea of the soul’s wandering, which is thereby excluded, was at the center of discussion.

In Byz. statements on the resurrection, the immortal soul is once again united to its own individual body which is now no longer corruptible, but neither is it an astral body, that is, it does not journey to the heavenly spheres as 6th-C. Origenism taught.

To guard against APHTHARTODOCETISM and to maintain the full reality of Christ’s human nature, it was stressed that even Christ’s human body became incorruptible only in his resurrection. This emphasis was also opposed to those theologians from Palestine who took up the doctrines of JULIAN OF HALIKARNASSOS and taught that while corruptibility is the result of Adam’s sin, involving the capacity to suffer and to die, human nature in itself is incorruptible as it is in Paradise: if Christ did save us from death as corruptibility (phthora), he had to be incorruptible (aphthartos).

Finally, the resurrection of the dead was challenged because of the belief in the eternity of the cosmos and the spherical shape of the world; at least, this is how the matter was viewed by KOSMAS INDIKOPLEUSTES (Topographia christiana, 7:1–3:23). Whether or not his attack was intended to answer On the Resurrection of John Philoponos must, in view of the state of the texts, remain open to discussion. The question of the resurrection and the corruptibility of the world was also treated by JOHN ITALOS. (For the Resurrection in art, see Anastasis.)


- K.H.U.

Related to revelation was *epiphanieia*, in which the image more than the word or command was the subject of manifestation. The term encompasses such phenomena as the manifestation of God in the Old Testament, Christ's Incarnation and Second Coming: the appearance of the Holy Ghost at Christ's baptism; appearances of angels, saints, and, by extension, demons. The vision of the divine light in Symeon the Theologian or of the light of Tabor in Hesychasm belongs to the same category of phenomena.


**REVELATION, BOOK OF.** See *Apocalypse*.

**REVEMENT, METAL.** The Romans sheathed furniture in metal, and the Byz. continued to cover both household (see TOOLS AND HOUSEHOLD FITTINGS) and church furniture in gold, silver, and bronze. While gold revetment largely served imperial circles (vita of *Porphyrios of Gaza*, ch.39; *Sozom., HE* 9.1, 4), silver was widely used for this purpose, particularly in churches. Starting with the gifts made by Constantine I to the Lateran Basilica in Rome, it became standard practice to cover the *altar*, *ciborium*, chancel barrier or *templon*, *ambo*, shrines, saints' *tomb*, columns, capitals, and doors in sheets of silver. While only one such set of revetment survives—in the 6th-C. St. Sion Treasure—numerous written references testify to its use in cathedral, pilgrimage, parochial, and other types of churches, in both villages and cities, throughout the empire. The weight of revetment could be considerable, with one ciborium requiring about 2,000 pounds of silver. After the 7th C. references to revetment are fewer, for example, the ciborium of St. Demetrius at Thessalonike described as "silver" in a text of the 7th C. (Lemerle, *Miracles* 1:66.24) is characterized in a text of the 11th C. (7) as made entirely of marble (A. Sigalas, *EEBS* 12 [1936] 332.30). Examples of such revetment are often restricted to imperial patronage, for example, in the palatine chapel described by Photios (*Homily* 10, ch.5)—possibly the Church of the Pharos; in the Great Palace by Theophilos (*TheophCont* 140.8–9), by Basil I (*TheophCont* 325.21), by Constantine VII (*TheophCont* 450.21, 456.9); and in the Blachernai church by Romanos III in 1031 (Skyll. 384.21), whose tomb in the *Peribleptos Monastery*, Constantinople, was covered in gold revetment in 1034 (Claviio, 38); the joint tomb of Sophia-Sosanne, the daughter of Isaac Komnenos the sebastokrator, and her daughter Irene (12th C.) had a silver *periphereion* or border (Lamprós, "Mark. kod." 47, no.85, title). Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, still had extensive silver revetment in the mid-12th C. (C. Mango, J. Parker, *DOP* 14 [1960] 237, 239f, 243f).

Revetment was used for *icon frames* and for certain details on icons themselves, for example, the *nimbus*.

–M.M.M.

**RHABDAS, NICHOLAS ARTABASDOS** (*Pařurδās 'Aptábasdos*), mathematician and grammarian; born Smyrna, fl. Constantinople mid-14th C. He was a contemporary of Manuel Moschopoulos, who dedicated to him a treatise on magic
squares. In 1341 Rhabdas addressed to Theodore Tzabouches of Klaizomenai his more elaborate letter on arithmetical computation (on fractions, square roots of nonsquare numbers, the date of Easter, and business and other mathematical problems). He sent to George Chatzykkes a more elementary letter on the value of the Greek alphabetical numbers, on finger-reckoning, on the four arithmetical procedures, and on the order of numbers in a base-10 system. In this second letter Rhabdas refers to the Great Indian Calculation, which is the So-called Great Calculation According to the Indians of Maximos Planoudes. In fact, several MSS of this work by Planoudes contain two additions attributed to Rhabdas, one on finger-reckoning and the other on the method of nines. Rhabdas also wrote on the computus (O. Schissel, BNJbb 14 [1937-38] 43-59) and compiled a small treatise on grammar for his son, Paul Artabasdos.


LIT. Hunger, Lit. 2:247. PLP, no.1437. -D.P.

RHAIDENTOS (Ῥαϊδεστός, also Rodostos, anc. Bisanthe, mod. Tekirdağ), city on the north shore of the Sea of Marmara. Prokopiōs (Buildings 4.9.17-20) calls it a ‘littoral chorion,’ and a similar epithet, parathalattidios, is found in Niketas Choniates (e.g., Nik.Chon. 448.15). According to Prokopiōs, Rhaidentos was fortified by Justinian I. In 813 the kastōn of Rhaidentos, with its houses and churches, was burned by the Bulgarians (TheophCont 614.24). By the 9th C., Rhaidentos was probably functioning as a port connected with Adrianople; this is suggested by the seals of a certain George, dioiketes of Rhaidentos (Zacos, Seals 2, no.1915). It was an important center of grain trade in the 11th C., controlled by an imperial phōndax. Michael Attaleiates owned properties in Rhaidentos, and he certainly was not the only great landowner in the area; at the end of the 11th C., a noble widow of a certain Batatzes was influential there (Attal. 244.19-21). Rhaidentos was among the Thracian and Macedonian cities that joined the revolt of Leo Tornikios. The city was plundered by Kalojan in 1206 and by the Catalan Grand Company in 1307 and was heavily damaged during the civil wars of the 14th C. Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 1:456.2-6) reports on his victory over Turkish troops who were pillaging the lands around Rhaidentos. In 1382 John Vceded Rhaidentos to Andronikos IV. Rhaidentos was a bishopric under the jurisdiction of Thracian Herakleia and, from the 14th C. onward, a metropolis.


RHAIKTOR (ραϊκτωρ), or rector, high-ranking courtier whose functions were probably to administer the imperial palace; Liutprand of Cremona calls him recto domus. Bury (Adm. System 115) assumes that the post was introduced by Basil I or Leo VI, but Oikonomides (Listes 47.9) restores the title in the text of the mid-9th-C. taktikon of Uспенский. The rhaiktor could be a eunuch or a cleric, even a priest; on the other hand, some high officials combined the title with the functions of stratompedarches or important civil posts, such as logothetes of the genikon (Lavra 1, nos. 10.29, 11.15; Zacos, Seals 2, no.912) or sakellarios (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 722-73). The exact meaning of the title was not clear to Philothées, who included
the rhaiktor along with special axiai in his Kletorologion of 899. The use of the title after the 11th C. is not known. The term was employed in a specific sense on seals of the 7th–8th C., sometimes as rhaiktor of Calabria (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 1477, 2635); it designated the administrator of the patrimonium of the Roman church.


RHAKENDYTES, JOSEPH. See Joseph Rhakendytes.

RHEA, a Greek goddess, early identified with Kybele, the mother of the gods, who was worshiped in Asia Minor. A myth made her the wife of Kronos and mother of Zeus, whom she saved from his father who had eaten his older children. The Christian church rejected this legend as particularly distasteful. In the Dionysataka by Nonnos of Panopolis, Rhea is assigned by Hermes to nurse the baby Dionysos; Hermes calls her “nurse of lions” (9:147). Later Rhea the “Allmother” summons the army for Dionysos’ expedition to India (13:35–42). Tzetzes (Hist. 13:251–56) relates that in antiquity beggars would place an idol of Rhea on a donkey and walk around the countryside, singing and beating on drums, to solicit alms.

The story of Rhea and Kronos was illustrated in MSS of pseudo-Nonnos, Gregory of Nazianzos, and pseudo-Oppian. Rhea is sometimes depicted with her right breast bare (Weitzmann, infra, fig-36).


RHEGION (Ῥήγιον, now the village of Küçük Çekmece in Turkish Thrace [Zlatarski, Ist. 1.1 (1918) 275, n.2]), suburb west of Constantinople; it was on a lake connected by the narrow Myrmex Canal to the Sea of Marmara. Gregoras notes Constantinopolitan prosaulia and prousteia located in Rheigion (Greg. 1:321.3–4). Prokopios (Buildings 4:8.5–17) describes in detail a paved road for carriages and a stone bridge over the Myrmex, both constructed by Justinian I. By the 15th C. the bridge had become dilapidated and the roads to Constantinople swampy (Kritob. 101.1–6).

Rhegion had a port (epineion), which was damaged in the earthquake of 557 (Agath. 167.25), as was a Church of Ss. Stratonikos and Kallinikos (Theoph. 231.23–24). Ships could moor at Rheigion in the 14th C. (Greg. 1:540.5–7).

Because of its proximity to Constantinople, Rhegion was often involved in the political strife of the capital: thus the Green faction welcomed Phokas in Rhegion and invited him to Hebdomon (Theoph. 289.8–10), Maurice came to Rhegion to distribute silver coins among the poor (268.8–9), and in 1329 people gathered in Rhegion to meet Andronikos II (Kantak. 1:426.22–427.4). Rhegion was frequently subject to hostile attacks: Krum burned it in 813, Kalojan pillaged it in 1206. In 1261 Alexios Stratigopoulos camped in Rhegion before capturing Constantinople (Greg. 1:83.18–19). One of the gates in the west wall of Constantinople was called that of Rhegion (or Rhesion, or Polyandros [vernacular Koliandros]; Janin, CP byz. 277f). (For Rhegion in Italy, see Reggio-Calabria.)

Lit. E. Oberhummer, RE 2.R. 1 (1920) 476f. - A.K.

RHE TORIC (ῥητορική), the technique of persuasion through the art of public speaking. It strongly influenced not only orations but other literary genres that often included full speeches—genuine or invented—and used rhetorical figures of speech, descriptive passages (ekphrasis), etc. Rhetorical technique left its imprint on historiography, hagiography, poetry, and epistolography. Ancient rhetoric greatly affected Byz.; the major types of classical oratory were retained, and the teaching of rhetoric was based on ancient handbooks. Especially popular were the corpus of Hermogenes (particularly on forms of styles and classes of arguments) and treatises ascribed to Menander Rhétor, as well as their continuators such as Apithionos (on Progynmasata). Collections of Byz. speeches, preserved in Byz. MSS such as Escorial Y 1190 and Vienna, ÖNB, philol. gr. 321, probably also served educational purposes.

The establishment of the Roman Empire and the later crisis of urban life caused substantial changes in rhetoric. Ancient society was oriented primarily toward oral forms of communication, whereas Byz., while remaining essentially oral, placed more emphasis on the book (Averincev, Poetika 183–209). The 4th-C. church fathers pes-
simistically expressed their wariness of the spoken word (H.G. Beck, *Rede als Kunstwerk und Bekenntnis* [Munich 1977] 29–32). Judicial and deliberative oratory lost importance, and of three major genres of ancient rhetoric only epideictic oratory (esp. the enkomion) seems to have flourished; accordingly, the Second Sophistic first lost its political function and then disappeared, leaving its trace only in the system of exercises. Theological oratory, esp. polemic, developed quickly: its principles, often differing from those of ancient rhetoric, were not reflected in Handbooks or later commentaries on them, even though Byz. commentators tried to equate some theological genres with epideictic ones, for example, homily (sermon) with the traditional diatribe or parainesis. Patr. Germanos II (PG 140.719 BC) distinguished two types of oratory: the judicial, intended to refute opponents’ views by means of antithesis; and the panegyric, to “set in order the desires of the soul” and to create a serene and untroubled state of mind. Such techniques, it has been suggested (Mauguire, *Art & Eloquence*), likewise underlay compositions in religious art.

Stylistically, rhetoric was based on ancient models. Demosthenes and Aelius Aristides remained, at least in theory, the model for orators. Some later authors also became paradigms: among church orators, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzos, and John Chrysostom; among the secular writers, Michael Psellus. Imitation (mimesis) embraced both style and content and the subject matter for pro-gymnasmatia: rhetoric ignored developments in the morphology, syntax, and vocabulary of the spoken language and frequently referred to mythology or Greek and Roman history as well as traditional moral or satirical topics, thus producing a timeless quality and “deconcretization.” Nevertheless Byz. rhetoric, if not rhetorical theory, reveals some substantial changes in aim and method.

The classical ideal of rhetorical saphneia (clarity) was underpinned by the relative simplicity of the language of the New Testament, and later theoreticians such as Photios praised the clarity of authors they had read. This classical virtue, however, was at odds with the perception of the cosmos as mystery, and commentators such as John Sikeliotes and John Doxopatres used the term mysterion to define rhetoric. Obscurity (asaphheia), as Kustas (infra 83–85, 91–93, 188–94) has stressed, became the stylistic principle of rhetoric, which widely used riddles, allegories, and very long composite epithets to represent how language overcomes the enigmatic ineffability of the world. The strength of logic gave way to the strength of emotion: the author’s role was to participate in events rather than explain them to the audience; indifferent to his individuality, he associated himself with his listeners under a faceless “we.” Syllogism ceased to be a powerful weapon; instead the orator turned to the authority of the Bible and church fathers and expected his assertions to be accepted without logical reservations. The fact was precious, not as a piece of reality, but as a vehicle for moral or theological generalizations, hence the accumulation of abstract statements and the lack of detail. On the other hand, J. Onians (Art History 3 [1980] 1–24) suggested that Late Antique rhetorical descriptions of works of art became more specific precisely at the time when artists were abandoning niceties of detail. In both art and literature fact itself was a mimesis, a repetition of past events, so that contemporaries were viewed as “new Josephs” or “new Alexanders.”

Probably to a lesser extent than in the medieval West, Byz. rhetoric was oriented toward disputations. Contests before the logothetes tou dromou formed an important element of rhetorical education, and rhetoricians characterized a speech as an agon (“contest”), even though it was sometimes explained as a contest between the author and the subject of his praise.

Rhetoric together with philosophy formed major disciplines of Byz. education; the maistor ton rhetoron taught at the Patriarchal School in Constantinople. Eloquence, including knowledge of the rules of the school rhetoric, was essential for an administrative career: some youths of poor families, such as Psellus, climbed the social ladder primarily due to their mastery of words. Conversely, ineloquence in a high-ranking official aroused the contempt of his peers. Rhetorical performances had an established place in state and church ceremonial: John Chrysostom had to compete, by the power of his sermons, with such popular events as circus games; the sermon remained a potent tool of ideological propaganda; ceremonial speeches were delivered before the emperor (basilikos logos, prophonetikos logos) and patriarch at set feasts, and speeches
could be heard during the state ceremonies, in church councils, and even in the public places of Constantinople.

Despite the codification of rhetoric with written forms and rules, Byz., like all preindustrial societies, remained largely oral. Literacy at more than a functional level was confined to a small, and chiefly male, segment of the population; silent reading was for a long time exceptional. The evidence is intermittent but persistent that literary compositions were performed orally before an audience up to the Palaio logically period. The rules for rhetoric were originally devised as an aid to fluent public speaking and persuasive communication and continued to be used for this purpose throughout the Byz. period. Nonetheless, rhetoric was equally influential on purely literary compositions. Paradoxically many of the features of Byz. literature that seem to a modern reader particularly redundant and artificial derive from rules developed for severely practical purposes of oral presentation.


A.K., E.M.J., A.C.

RHETORICAL FIGURES, figures of speech or techniques of verbal ornament; Greek rhetoricians divided them into two groups, tropes and figures proper (schemata). The latter—whose number seemed infinite (Alexander in RhetGr, ed. Spengel 3:9.5–9)—were subdivided into figures of reason or speech (logos) and figures of expression or thought (dianoia). Figures of reason were related to the author's attitude toward his text: emphasis on what he will eventually say, an anticipation of what his opponent will say, parrhesia, concession, aporia, ethopoia, etc. Figures of expression included individual grammatical features, omission of conjunctions and prepositions (asyndecon) and of verbs (ellipsis), pleonasm, repetition of the same word (anadiplosis), beginning or ending several clauses of a period with the same word (epanaphora or antistrophe), etc. Late Roman theoreticians produced treatises on figures, following ancient tradition (e.g., Tiberios, 3rd–4th C., On the Figures of Demeosthenes). The Byz. continued to use traditional figures, which served the role of creating intimacy between the orator/writer and listener/reader. A typical feature was the treatment of the speech as an arena of contest between the (weak) author and (excellent) hero of the enkomion. Epanaphora (e.g., chairem, repetition of chaire, "welcome," at the beginning of the clauses) was popular in both prose discourses and in verses.


A.K., E.M.J.

RHETORIOS OF EGYPT, astrologer; fl. early 7th C., probably at Alexandria. His biography is unknown. Rhetorios was the author of an extraordinary collection of excerpts from earlier Greek astrologers, based on what must have been a magnificent library. His date is determined by his inclusion of a horoscope that can be dated 24 Feb. 601 (D. Pingree, Dorothei Sidonii Carmen astrologicum [Leipzig 1976] xiii), and the presumption that he wrote before the fall of Alexandria to the Arabs in 642. This date is consistent with the fact that his collection was available to Theophilos of Edessa in the 8th C. We now possess of it only three epitomes and several sub-epitomes. The main epitomes date from the 9th and early 11th C., while the third is preserved only in a 13th-C. Latin translation.

Rhetorios's treatise shows acquaintance with the writings of numerous scientists and astrologers, including Balbillus (1st C.), Dorotheos of Sidon (ca.75), Ptolemy, Vettius Valens (2nd C.), Antiochus of Athens (3rd C.), Paul of Alexandria, Julian of Laodikeia, and Eutokios. Rhetorios's collection is one of the basic constituents of the compendium put together by Eleutherios Zebelenos, also called Elias, in 1388 under the false name of Palchos. It is also one of the main repositories of 5th- and 6th-C. Byz. horoscopes.


A.K., E.M.J.

RHIPIDION (πτερίδιον, Latin frabellum), a fan widely used in the Mediterranean. A consular diptych of the early 6th C. presents the consul
RHIZA CHORIOU (πυξα χωρίου, lit. "root of a village"), the total gross tax burdening a village community. The Treatise on Taxation (ed. Dölger, Beiträge 114:22–30) defines it as the entire sum of taxes before subtracting the figures for reduced and/or abolished levies (sympatheiai, klasmatia, solemnia, etc.). The problem is whether the rhiza was established on the basis of an actual line-by-line addition of individually calculated stichoi (the principle of the capitatio-jugatio) or was imposed upon the chorion as a global sum by fiscal authorities. The Treatise seems to imply the latter since it juxtaposes the hypotage (the size of the village’s land) with the rhiza and indicates that the epibole equalled the hypotage divided by the rhiza so that the quotient forms the modismos, or the village’s official rate of taxation expressed as number of modioi per nomisma of taxes (Dölger, Beiträge 114:34–115,6).

The term is rare in later documents. In 1089 the monks of Docheiariou feared losing their land since they had no rhiza “on their small possession” at the site called Satoubla, although they had to pay a nomisma for this allotment (Docheiar., no.2.3–5). According to their request, this payment was taken into account in the calculation of the whole demosion of the village of Perigardikea. When, in 1152, the monastery of the Virgin Eleousa (Ve-myusa) received a donation of 12 zeugaratoi, it became evident that the modismos in the area was uncertain, no geometria (proper measurement) was available, and the rhiza had to be established by the emperor’s command (L. Petit, IRAIK 6 [1900] 39–917).


RHODES (Ρόδος), mountainous island in the Dodecanese, off the southwest coast of Asia Minor. Rhodes is also the name of a city (civitas Rhodiorum: Cod. Just. 1 46.6, a.385) on this island; according to the Synkedemos of Hierokles (Hierokl. 686.1), it was the capital of the province of the Islands, administered by a hekemon and containing 20 poleis, including Kos, Samos, Chios, Mytilene, Andros, Naxos, and Paros. Rhodes was a metropolitan see of the Cyclades and had 11 suffragans
(Laurent, *Corpus* 5.1:528–38). From the 7th C. the island served as a frontier station against the Arab fleet: in 654 Mu‘awiyah plundered Rhodes and carried away the remains of the Colossus; a 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 345.9–11) relates that a Jewish merchant from Edessa loaded the bronze from the statue on 900 camels. In 715 the Greek navy revolted on Rhodes and sailed to Constantinople to depose Anastasios II; soon thereafter the Saracens captured the island, but their fleet was destroyed by a storm and by Greek fire. In 807 Hárün al-Rashīd landed on Rhodes; he was, however, unable to take the fortress (*phorourion*: Theoph. 483.7).


Rhodes was a naval station during the Crusades: from 1097 to 1099 Rhodian merchant ships carried supplies to the Crusaders’ camp at Antioch, but then conflicts arose; in 1099 the Pisan fleet had to fight a Byz. naval squadron near Rhodes (*HC* 1:374). Some royal Crusaders stopped at the island on their way to Palestine (Richard I Lionheart) or on the return (Philip II of France). After 1204 Rhodes remained independent under Leo Gabalas and his descendants (A. Sábbides, *Byzantina* 12 [1983] 405–28). It was taken in 1232/3 by John III Vatatzes and ruled by a *kōmes* (Ahreweiler, *Mēr* 317, 361) but was later controlled by the Genoese who, in 1306, received refugees from the Hospitaliers; in 1309 the latter took the island after a two-year siege. The Hospitaliers built powerful fortifications and withstood the Turks until 1523 (A. Luttrel, V. von Falkenhau- sen, *RSBS* 22–23 [1985–86] 317–32); under the rule of the Hospitaliers reasonably peaceful relations prevailed between Latins and Greeks (cf. Greg. 3:12f).

The ancient settlements of the town of Rhodes in the north and Lindos in the east survived into Byz. times. Several Early Christian basilicas have been excavated, esp. in the town of Rhodes (Pallas, *Monuments paléochrétiens* 236–39), and E. Dyggve (*Lindos* [Berlin 1960] 521–28) has argued for continuity of cult (Athena/Virgin) at Lindos. There are also many churches with frescoes of the 13th to 15th C., for example, St. George ho Bardas (1289/90) and St. Phanourios (before 1335/6).

**RHODIAN SEA LAW** (*Nómos va�τικὸs*), a three-part collection of regulations involving maritime law. The third and longest part deals with specific punishable offenses and regulates questions of liability and contribution (Ashburner, *infra cclii–ccllxxx*) in the area of shipping. The second part establishes, among other things, profit-sharing for the crew and shipboard regulations. The first part relates the ratification of the *Rhodian Sea Law* by the Roman emperors. This prologue, which is transmitted in but a few MSS from the 12th C. onward, is considered today a late addition that was inspired by the information—itself rather dubious—contained in the often quite inconsistently transmitted headings. The designation of the collection as *Nomos Rodios* or *Nomos Rhodion* (Rhodian Law or Law of the Rhodians) is an allusion to the Sea Law of Rhodes, which, though famous since antiquity, is hard to place historically (cf. *Digest* 14.2 rubric). Current opinion holds that the *Rhodian Sea Law* was compiled in the 7th or 8th C.; its relationship to the *Ecloga* in content, language, and MS tradition (sometimes it forms a part of its Appendix) is less close than Zachariä had maintained. The idea of an official promulgation of the collection is no longer generally accepted. The *Sea Law* (minus prologue) was received into the *Basilika*—if not from the very beginning, at least early on—as a supplement to book 53.


RHODOPE (Ῥοδόπη), name of several geographical areas in the Balkans.

1. Mountain range separating the coastal plain of Thrace from the interior plain of Philipopolis. Asdracha (infra) uses the geographical term in a broader sense; in addition to the mountainous area (western Rhodope with the fortress of Tsepaina and eastern Rhodope—Maroneia and Mora), it encompasses the system of valleys—the upper valley of the Hebrus (the region of Philipopolis), the lower valley of the Hebrus with the port of Ainos—and the littoral, including Traianopolis.

2. Late Roman province along the Aegean coast of Thrace between Macedonia on the west and Europa on the east. It had seven cities, with Ainos as its capital. The province disappeared in the 7th C., and most of the area was later incorporated in the theme of Bollerion. The ecclesiastical province—often identified with Europa—survived at least until the 12th C. (Notitiae CP 13.772, although the see was then vacant); Traianopolis was the metropolis and Ainos, Anchialos, Kypselia, Maroneia, and Maximianopolis were archbishoprics.

Lit. C. Asdracha, La région des Rhodopes aux XIIe et XIVe siècles (Athens 1976).

RHOMAIOS (Ῥωμαίος), ancient Greek ethnic term for an inhabitant of Rome. When—from Themistios onward—Constantinople came to be called Second, Eastern, or New Rome (E. Fenster, Laudae Constantinopolitanae [Munich 1968] 32f), the population of the Eastern Empire became “Romans.” Since the ancient meaning was also retained, terminological confusion sometimes resulted; for example, NICHOLAS I Mystikos continually referred to the pope as “the archpriest of the Rhomaioi” (Letters, no.28.26, etc.). To avoid this confusion, the Byz. called the Romans “Italoi” and accordingly termed Roman law “Italian knowledge” or “wisdom” (F. Fuchs, Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter [Leipzig-Berlin 1926] 27). The term Rhomaios entered official formulas, such as the phrases “basileus of the Rhomaioi,” used from the 7th C. onward (P. Classen, DA 9 [1952] 115f), and “krites katholikos of the Rhomaioi” (e.g., Lactant 3, no.160.35–36).

While Muslim writers considered Byz. as Rome and used the name Röm for the imperial territory that was annexed by Arabs and Turks, Westerners consistently called the Byz. “Greci” and their emperor “rex Grecorum” (A.D. v. den Brincken, Die “Nationes Christianorum Orientalium” [Cologne-Vienna 1973] 16–76); the same ethnic term is predominant in Slavic literature (V. Tăpokova-Zaimova, EtBalk no.1 [1984] 51–57), a usage that G. Litavrin interpreted as pejorative (17 CEB, Major Papers [Washington, D.C., 1986] 375–77). The Byz. themselves used the word Graikos and its derivatives; this term had had a pejorative connotation in antiquity, but the Byz. reluctantly accepted it while rejecting the term Hellenes that became synonymous with pagans; the term Graikos acquired primarily religious and cultural significance, whereas Rhomaios was used predominantly in connection with the state (G. Tsaras, Byzantina 1 [1969] 146–48).


RHOMAIOS, EUSTATHIOS, judge at the imperial court (ca.975–1034), as had been his grandfather. Rhomaios (Ῥωμαίος) began his career as a simple judge (litos krites) and rose to magistros and droungarios tes viglas. Of his writings—which seem to have consisted primarily of statements of verdict (hypomnemata), counsel’s opinion, and special legal studies (meletai)—only a few pieces have survived in their entirety. A colleague took excerpts from some of his works and arranged them according to subject in a textbook called the Peira. Rhomaios was held in high esteem in his own time, and even more so later, for his legal erudition and his skill in decision making.


RHOPAI (Ῥοπαί), an anonymous treatise on “the divisions of time,” specifically, procedural and other legally significant time limits ranging from one hour to 100 years. Like the treatise De actionibus, the work has its origin in the period of the
ANTECESSORES and was altered and enlarged over the course of later centuries.


RHOSIA. See Rus'.

RHOSIA (Ῥωσία). Rhosia was a term with a variety of meanings in Byz. texts.

1. In the most common Byz. usage Rhosia designates the land of the Rus'. The term is first used by Constantine VII (De adm. imp. 9.42; De cer. 594.18) and occurs frequently thereafter, esp. in documents and seals. In addition, Rhosia occurs with various adjectival modifiers: (a) “outer Rhosia”: a term found only once (De adm. imp. 9.3), perhaps referring to the northern parts of the territory (V. Petruhin, F. Šelov-Kovedjaev, *VizVrem* 49 [1988] 184–190; for a different view see O. Pritsak in *Okeanos* 555–67); (b) “new Rhosia”: a late 11th-C. term, probably referring to the titular metropolis of Černigov (A. Poppe, *Byzantion* 40 [1970] 180f); (c) “little Rhosia”: Galitza and Volynia, esp. under Lithuania and Poland; (d) “great Rhosia”: first used in the 12th C. with reference to the metropolis of Kiev (Notitiae CP, no.13.754), then with reference to all the former lands of Rus’ under the control of Moscow; and (e) “all Rhosia”: from the mid-12th C. onward, usually in the title of the metropolitan to promote the principle of the unity of Rus’.

2. Rhosia is also the name of a town and harbor located, according to al-Idrisi, at a distance of 27 miles from Tmutorkan, on the western or possibly eastern shore of the Cimmerian Bosporos (A. Kazhdan, *Problemy obōcestvenno-politicheskoi istorii Rossii i slavianskikh stran* [Moscow 1963] 93–95). N. Banescu (BSHACRoum 22.2 [1941] 75f) erroneously located it in the estuary of the Don. In the 12th C. Rhosia was one of the Byz. bases in the area, and the administration tried to secure it from the penetration of Italian merchants (Reg 2, no.1488). It is debatable whether the title “archontissa of Rhosia” on the seal of Theophano of the Mouzon family refers to the Byz. harbor town or to Kievian Rus’.


RHYME, in its standard meaning, had no place in the archaizing classical meters of Byz. secular poetry or the system of syllabic correspondences of ecclesiastical poetry. Once classical meters were replaced by verses based on word-accent, however, rhyme was used quite often to point a balance between two lines or two parts of one line, whether the kontakia of Romanos the Melode or the political verse of Theodore Prodromos (W. Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos: Historische Gedichte* [Vienna 1974] 116f). Similar rhyming clauses also appear in prose, for rhetorical effect, from Proklos of Constantinople onward. Systematic rhyme in verse couples is usually considered to have been introduced as a result of influence from French and Italian vernacular literatures, where rhyme is a prominent feature. Rhyme of this sort appears first in Byz. in the work of the Cretan writers Stephen Sachalikes and Marinus Faleri. Rhyme remained confined to vernacular texts and rare until the late 15th C., when romances such as Belisarios and Imberios and Margarona and satire such as the *Synaxarion of the Honorable Donkey* were rewritten in rhyming couples; many of these rewritings were later printed in Venice.


RHYNDAKOS RIVER (Ῥυνδακός, modern Orhaneli in northwest Asia Minor), site of a battle (15 Oct. 1211) between troops of the Latin Empire of Constantinople and Theodore I Laskaris. Henry of Hainault, with perhaps 260 knights, camped on the Rhyndakos, probably near Lopadion. Theodore, who had a large army but only a few Latin knights, lured Henry’s troops into an ambush. Leaving some to guard his camp, Henry charged the Byz. army, which yielded at the first onslaught; the rout and slaughter lasted until sunset. According to his letter of Jan. 1212 (Prinz, “Brief Heinrichs” 415–17), Henry suffered no losses. The ensuing treaty with Theodore (Akrop. 1:27f) reestablished Crusader power in north-western Anatolia.

--C.M.B.

RICHARD I LIONHEART, king of England (1189–99); born Oxford 8 Sept. 1157, died Chalus near Limoges 6 Apr. 1199. While en route to the Holy Land to participate in the Third Crusade,
Richard learned that some of his fleet had been shipwrecked on Cyprus (Apr. 1191). The basileus Isaac Komnenos held Crusaders captive and threatened the ship carrying Richard’s fiancé, bride Berengaria. Arriving in early May, Richard forced a landing, defeated Isaac, and ultimately took him captive. He conquered the island and appropriated the large treasure accumulated by Isaac. Even before Isaac’s capture, Richard married Berengaria at Limassol (12 May). Richard first appointed English justiciars to govern Cyprus, then sold it to the Templars. The latter, with Richard’s consent, sold the island in 1192 to Guy of Lusignan, who did homage to Richard.


—C.M.B.

RICIMER, patrikios, magister militum, and consul (in 459); died 18 Aug. 472. Of mixed barbarian ancestry, he was an Arian. Successful in a campaign against the Vandals in Sicily (456), Ricimer revolted with MAJORIAN and defeated APKHIS AVITUS at Placentia (7 Oct. 456). He agreed to Leo I’s nomination of Majorian but had him executed in 461. Ricimer defended Italy against the Ostrogoths and Alemanni and named as emperor Libius Severus (461–65), who was not accepted in Constantinople; during this period Ricimer was the real ruler of the West. Threatened by the Vandals, Ricimer sought the support of Leo I and in 466 agreed to the elevation of ANTHEMIOS, indicating growing Eastern influence in Italy. Ricimer married Anthemios’s daughter. This alliance led to the disastrous campaign of Basilius against the Vandals in 468. Angered because his enemies were playing a large role in the project, Ricimer refused to take part and may even have conspired in the expedition’s failure. He rebelled against Anthemios in 470 and had him killed in 472. He appointed Olybrius as emperor but died soon thereafter.


—T.E.G.

RIDDLE (αἰνύμα, γρίφος), word-game whose antecedents stretch back to the earliest phases of Greek literature; ancient rhetoricians treated riddles, a kind of TROPOS (Martin, Rhetorik 262), as an elaborate but foolish play on words that aimed at obscuring the sense (RhetGr, ed. Spengel, 3:193.14–16). This negative evaluation of the riddle as a stylistic tool evidently disappeared in the Byz. period: in any case John Doxopatres refers to those who accepted the riddle as a vehicle of expression as well as those presenting “clear objects” (Rabe, Prolegomenon 145.10–14).

Riddles were broadly used by various authors, such as pseudo-DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE and NONNOS OF PANOPOLIS, who were dissatisfied with the traditional sapheneia (clarity) and perceived the world in its complexity as an enigma slowly revealing its solution. The riddle was also a fashionable artistic device in the romance. Always popular in folklore, riddles became a specific genre in prose and verse, used by prominent literati (John Geometres, Psellos, Christopher of Mytilene, John Mauro xpos, Theodore Prodromos, Manuel Moschopoulos). Mainly intended as entertainment, riddles could contain political allusions; thus a riddle of Eustathios Makrembolites hints at the barbarous (?) people of Rhos. Apparently the composition of riddles was also regarded as an educational technique (perhaps akin to the eροταποκρισεις): Nicholas Mesares (G. Downey, TAPHS 47 [1957] 866, 899) mentions that students revised lessons by inventing riddles.

Ed. Byzantina Anigmata, ed. Č. Milовановић (Belgrade 1986), with Serbian tr.


—E.M.J., A.K.

RIHA TREASURE. See Kaper Koraoen Treasure.

RIHÁB (in Jordan), village in the province of Arabia, northeast of Gerasa; its ancient name is unknown. Rihab flourished particularly in the 6th–7th C. At least eight churches have been excavated there, one dated 533, the others 594–635. Twr were built under Persian rule (614–28) and one in 635, the year before the battle of Yarmuk. Seven dedication inscriptions name the archbishop of Bostra as eponymous authority; most name laymen and families as donors.


—M.M.M.
RILA, a monastery in the mountains east of the Upper Strymon River in southwestern Bulgaria. It was founded in the 10th C. by the hermit St. John of Rila. During the 13th and 14th C., the monastery was endowed with lands and privileges by Bulgarian tsars and nobles, and the present site, which is approximately 3 km from the original one, was developed then. The sole remaining medieval structure at Rila is Hreljo’s Tower, a defensive dwelling of a type seen in areas within the cultural orbit of Byz.; the tower (pyrgos) at Hilandar offers a parallel. Hreljo’s Tower is built of stone, with brick used for window arches and spandrels as well as for a long inscription dated 1334/5 naming the nobleman Hreljo, a semi-independent feudal lord (died 1343), as its patron. The lowest story of the tower served as a prison and hiding place; the middle four were used for storage, defense, and living quarters; and the uppermost story contained a vaulted chapel dedicated to the Transfiguration. This chapel is adorned with 14th-C. frescoes in a vigorous, local style; they depict Christ Emmanuel, the life of John of Rila, and illustrations of the last three Psalms, showing groups singing and dancing in praise. The monastery houses an important library and museums of ecclesiastical and secular art.


RINCEAU, ORNAMENT consisting of a continuous foliate scroll with spirals alternatingly reversing direction, usually composed of elongated acanthus leaves that are sometimes supplemented by floral motifs. Vine-scroll rinceaux normally have fewer leaves, meager stems, and bear grape clusters. The scrolls may be “inhabited,” with figures, birds, or animals enclosed within the spirals, a formula apparently described in the Life of St. Stephen the Younger as “swirls of ivy leaves [enclosing] cranes, crows, and peacocks” (PG 100:1120C). Rinceaux functioned as border motifs, decorative fillers or, occasionally, as terminal ornaments. Byz. acquired the fully developed rinceau from the Romans and it remained popular until the 10th C. The elongated acanthus leaves are often interspersed with or replaced by calyces, a stylized form of the leaves at the base of a flower, with a flanged or polylobed end from which the next leaf or calyx emerges (as in the mosaics of 565–77 and the 870s at Hagia Sophia, Constantinople); sometimes the calyces are interspersed with smooth tubular shafts. Rinceaux appeared in all media and were esp. favored in mosaic and metalwork.


RING, FINGER (δακτύλιος, also δακτυλίδιον). Rings were the most prevalent object of personal adornment in Byz. society. Most showed incised devices on their bezels for the production of wax or clay sealings. While the Romans preferred gemstone intaglios with figural devices for this purpose, the Byz. leaned toward metal bezels with incised inscriptions. Early Byz. rings usually bear monograms (DOCat 2, nos. 54–56), while those from the 9th C. onward often bear short invocations (“Lord, help . . .”). More luxurious examples, in gold, name the owner, while cheap bronze imitations end the invocation generically with “the wearer.” Titles, functions, and family names, so characteristic of lead seals, are rare, which suggests that ring signets were used privately, in and around the home. Some rings are incised with well-known iconic images (ibid., no.123) or even with multfigural biblical scenes; many, including the special category of marriage rings (see Ring, Marriage), seem to have been amuletic. This is indicated by the frequency (on early specimens) with which the octagonal hoop appears. For the treatment of colic, Alexan- der of Tralles (Alex.Trall. 2:377) suggests, “Take an iron ring and make its hoop eight-sided and write thus on the octagon: ‘Flee, flee, O bile. . . .’”

RING, MARRIAGE. Rings exchanged by spouses during the marriage rite are a significant subgroup among finger rings. Many were not intended for sealing and only the most luxurious are inscribed with the name of the bridal couple. The marriage ceremony, as documented from the Akolouthia of Betrothal and Marriage, known from MSS of the 10th C. onward (P.N. Trempelas, Theologia 18 [1940] 134.2–4), describes the hus-
RIVERS (sing. ποταμός). After the loss of Egypt and the Nile to the Arabs in the 7th C., the empire retained two stretches of major rivers—the Upper Euphrates and the Lower Danube. These formed its natural frontiers to the east and north, respectively, but offered no aid to unification. Other rivers (Vardar, Strymon, Hebros,
Meander, Sangarios, Halys, etc.) were navigable only in their lower reaches and were not very useful for purposes of communication and transport. Hence, major ports tended to be on the sea rather than along rivers. The Byz. used streams for fishing, to provide water power for mills, and for irrigation.

Most rivers in Greece and Asia Minor are torrents that dry up in summer and flood after heavy rain or snowmelt, not only disrupting roads but inundating fields. A documentary act of ca. 1344 mentions such a flood on the property of the Athonite monastery of Xenophon that the monks tried to stop by erecting a wall (Xénoph., no. 27.24–28). An early 13th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 624.6–10) describes a disaster in 1205; the waters of the Hebroi, swollen by heavy rains, deluged the Latin camp and carried off soldiers, horses, and war machinery.

Christianity rejected the pagan cult of rivers and imagined that rivers were the dwelling place of demons. Gregory of Nyssa, however, observing the continuous flow of rivers, suggested (PG 45:161A) that their movement rather than that of the stars could be the cause of human fate (heimarmene). In Christian cosmology the rivers of Paradise played an essential part, and a river of fire was given the function of punishing sinners and destroying all things at the end of the world.

The “rivers,” lines marked out on the floor pavement of churches, had the liturgical function of guiding the movements of the officiating priest. In Hagia Sophia they were represented by green marble bands; in ordinary churches they could be drawn with chalk (G. Majeska, DOP 32 [1978] 299–308).


- A.K.

ROADS (sing. ὁδός, also ὅρμος, ὁδότα) are often mentioned in official acts or praktika, which distinguish different types of roads: imperial (basilike), state (demosia or demosiake), big (megalé), general (katholike), for transport of wood (xylophoriké), and for wagons (hamaxege). The distinctions between them are sometimes unclear: the combined term “state wagon road” is sometimes used, for example (Lavra 2, no. 108.199). A paved road (plakote) is mentioned in an inventory of perhaps 1044 (Pantel. no. 3.23). Other acts refer to old (palaia), small (mikra), or narrow (estenomene) roads or even to a path (monopatia). If this terminology can be taken at face value, it seems that the Byz. inherited the Roman distinction of public, local, and private roads, although the categories sometimes seem to have been confused.

Roman public roads or highways continued to function along major land routes; among the most important were the Via Egnatia and strategic highways in Asia Minor. Prokopios (Wars 5.14.6–11) praised the Via Appia, which led from Rome to Capua, a five days' journey: it was wide enough to allow two wagons to pass each other and was made of polygonal basalt slabs snugly fitted together. Quite a different road (near Antioch) was described by Emp. Julian (Ep. 98, ed. J. Bidez [Paris 1924] 180.3–11): built on marshy ground, it was rough and made of stones laid without any skill, unlike other highways whose materials were tightly assembled, as in walls. Roads were supplemented by accessory constructions such as bridges and dikes, milestones, military posts, changing stations, and inns. In novel 24.3 Justinian I imposed on governors the duty to repair aqueducts, bridges, ramparts, and hodoi, but it is unclear from the text whether the legislator meant highways or city streets. Probably at a later date the maintenance of roads was assigned to the local population—at any rate, some 11th-C. chrysobulls grant exemption from hodostrasia, building roads, mentioned usually between exemptions from kastroktisia and bridge repair or construction (Pat. mou Engrapha 1, nos. 3.37, 6.48; Lavra 1, no. 48.36). It is surprising that the manuals of military tactics ignore road construction. The frequent complaints about the bad condition of hodoi refer primarily to urban streets that were often in appalling state even from the viewpoint of Western travelers (e.g., Odo of Deuil).

In religious symbolism the hodos held an important place: the path of justice or of the Lord was contrasted to evil ways; Athanasios of Alexandria distinguished between the way of Adam and that of Christ (PG 26:285AB). Christ himself is the Way, and man is a traveler in life who finally returns home at the time of his death.


- A.K.

ROBBER COUNCIL. See Ephesus, Councils of: "Robber" Council.
ROBBERY (ἐρπασίας), theft marked by the application of force, was technically a private offense (delict) and brought with it a corresponding penalty (Institutes 4.2; Basil. 60.17). But when the aspect of violence was emphasized or when other factors were present, robbery was considered a public offense and severely punished. An especially serious form of robbery was brigandage; as a deterrent, brigands were to be brought to death by the furca (lit. "fork," an instrument of execution related to the gibbet) at the place of their seizure (Ecloga 17.50; Basil. 60.51.26.15). To counter gang activity (as in the case of piracy), special paramilitary personnel (e.g., lestodioktai and biokolytai) were appointed, but the blurring of the distinction between pursuer and pursued frequently gave rise to complaints and imperial intervention. The rape or abduction of unmarried women (virgins at first, later also widows and nuns) was also designated as harpastē and severely punished in Byz., where sexual offenses formed a special category only from the time of the Ecloga. (See also grave-robbing.)


ROBERT DE CLARI, French historian of the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1203–04: born Clari (mod. Cléry-les-Pernois), died after 1216. Robert participated in the Fourth Crusade as a vassal of Peter of Amiens. He returned to France, probably in 1205 and, in 1206 and 1213, gave to Corbie relics taken from the Great Palace during the sack, including Passion and other relics in crystal reliquaries, an icon of the Virgin, and other objects (Riant, Exuviae 2:197–99). Robert, whose command of numbers and dates is shaky (Queller, Fourth Crusade 39, 220), offers a soldier's vivid vision of the conquest. He includes descriptions of the Byz. emperor's battle icon (ch.66, pp. 66.49–67.77), the Boukoleon Palace and its relics (ch.82, p.82.19–35), Hagia Sophia (Greek for "Holy Trinity" according to Robert: ch.85, p.84.2–3), the triumphal column of Justinian I (identified as Herakleios, ch.86, p.86.1–18), the Golden Gate (ch.89, p.87.1–6), the Hippodrome, stauary (chs. 90–91, pp. 87–89), and so on. Robert agrees with Villehardouin that the diversion of the Crusade to Constantinople was the result of a series of accidents, not a Venetian plot.

ROBERT OF COURTENAY, Latin emperor of Constantinople (1221–28); second son of Peter of Courtenay; died Clarenza Jan. 1228. In the face of the growing threat from Theodore Komnenos Doukas, Robert tried to maintain the un-
derstanding that his mother Yolande had built up with Theodore I Laskaris. Plans that Robert should marry one of Theodore's daughters foundered with the Nicaean emperor's death in 1221. Robert intervened in the ensuing succession crisis at Nicaea. The Latin army was, however, defeated, which cost the Latins of Constantinople virtually all their remaining territories in Asia Minor. This setback was immediately followed by the loss of Thessalonike in 1224 to Theodore Komnenos Doukas. Robert never recovered from these blows, inflicted in the space of a year. He lapsed into a life of indolence, which so frustrated the barons that they broke into the palace, murdered his mother-in-law, and disfigured his wife. Robert left Constantinople in humiliation and went to Rome to seek papal support. He never returned to Constantinople.

LIT. Longnon, Empire latin 159–68. HC 2:213–16.

-M.J.A.

ROBERT OF FLANDERS ("the Frisian"), count of Flanders (1071–93); born ca.1013, died 12/13 Oct. 1093. Robert made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem ca.1086 or 1087 to early 1090. Supposedly while returning, he met Alexios I. Anna Komnene (An.Komm. 2:105.19–26) places the site at Berroia (Thrace) in 1087, but a meeting in Constantinople or southern Thrace in late 1089/early 1090 seems more probable. Robert (perhaps in return for money) offered fealty to Alexios and pledged to send 500 knights to aid him. About 1090 the 500 arrived; after garrisoning Nikomediea, they were transferred to Thrace to fight the Pechenegs (1091). K. Ciggaar (Byzantion 51 [1981] 44–74) asserts on the basis of an Old Norse tale that the Flemish knights took part in a campaign against Vlachs and Cumans in 1094 or 1095. Robert was the purported addressee of an alleged letter from Alexios I that urged the dispatch of Western knights to defend the empire against Turks and Pechenegs and to rescue Jerusalem (Eng. tr., E. Joranson, AHR 55 [1949–50] 812–15). The letter was probably forged shortly before 1108, but portions of its historical narrative describe the empire's situation in 1090–91 so accurately as to suggest that it was based on an actual letter of Alexios.


ROBERT OF NORMANDY, son of William the Conqueror and leader of the First Crusade; born ca.1054, died Cardiff (Wales) Feb. 1134. Leading Crusaders from Normandy and adjacent regions, Robert crossed the Adriatic in Apr. 1097 and reached Constantinople in May. Stephen of Blois, who accompanied Robert, reports that Alexios I magnificently feasted them both, while providing markets for their followers. Both readily became Alexios's vassals and received rich gifts, then joined the other Crusaders in attacking Nicaea (early June). During the siege of Antioch, Robert spent Dec. 1097–early Feb. 1098 at Laodikeia, which a fleet of English Crusaders had occupied with Byz. support. After participating in the capture of Jerusalem, Robert returned to the West via Laodikeia (Sept. 1099) and Constantinople.


—C.M.B.

ROBERT OF TORIGNY, also Robert de Monte, Norman Benedictine historian; died 23/4 June 1186. Robert entered the monastery of Bec in Normandy in 1128, became prior there ca.1149, then abbot of Mont St. Michel (1154). Circa 1149 Robert revised William of Jumièges' Deeds of Norman Dukes (Gesta Normannorum ducum, cf. E.M.C. van Houts in Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies 1980 [1981] 106–18, 215–20); the new material on Robert Guiscard comes from William of Apulia (M. Mathieu, Sacris erudi- diri 17 [1966] 66–70). Robert's universal chronicle continued Sigebert of Gembloux until 1186. His original contribution begins in 1147; its main focus is Normandy and England, but it includes information on Norman Italy and the Crusader states (e.g., a.1155–58, ed. Delisle, 1:295–316) and Byz., esp. Manuel I's marriage diplomacy (e.g., a.1162, 1:342; a.1167, 2:364). For the years 1179–82, he seems to receive more detailed information from Constantinople—possibly in connection with the marriage of Agnes of France to Alexios II (a.1179, 2:78, 83f)—including the efforts of Andronikos I Komnenos to achieve power,
Andronikos's anti-Latin policy (a.1182, 2:114), and
information on the Seljuk sultanate of Rûm
(a.1182, 2:106f). Robert was also interested in
translations from Greek (a.1152, 1:270; a.1182,

(Rouen 1872–73). L. Bethmann, MGH SS 6 (1844; rp.

lit. R. Foreville, "Robert de Torigni et Choûri," Millénaire
A. Gransden, Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1307
—M.McC.

ROCK-CUT CHURCHES AND DWELLINGS.
Living and worshiping spaces carved from rock
are found throughout the empire. Ascetics seem
to have been particularly attracted to cave-dwelling.
Most commonly these habitations are simply modi-
ﬁed natural caves, though occasionally they are
elaborately carved to resemble built structures.
The process of the discovery and preparation of
such spaces is described in the vitae of a number
of saints, for example, SABAS (ed. Schwartz, ch.18)
in Palestine and ELIAS SPELEOTES (AASS, Sept.
3:864f) in Italy. Large communities of cave dwell-
ers, both lay and monastic, developed where the
geology was particularly favorable. Best known of
these areas is CAPPADOCIA, where towns as well as
ecclesiastical structures were carved in the cliffs
or below ground level. Other signiﬁcant rock-cut
conglomerations are found near Mount LATROS,
in the Crimea, and in southern Italy, particularly
APulia.

lit. L. Giovannini, "The Rock Settlements" in Arts of
Cappadocia (London 1971). C.D. Fonseca, "La città ru-
pestre in Puglia," and C. D'Angela, "Archeologia ed inse-
damenti rupestri medievali," in La Puglia fra Bisanzio e
Monasteries in Byzantine Cappadocia (Cambridge 1985).
—A.J.W.

ROGA ( póya), cash salary, esp. remunerations
paid to members of the armed forces and civil
d service; the term already appears with this mean-
ing in the early 7th C. (Chron. Pasch. 706.10). In
the 10th C. STRATEGOI received 5, 10, or 20 pounds
of gold annually according to which province they
commanded; contemporary thematic soldiers re-
ceived roga every fourth year on a rotating basis
(De cer. 493.20–494.7), and special stipends were
given to participants in expeditionary forces (De
cer. 651–60). Holders of court titles also received
roga. A protospatharios was paid 1 pound of gold
annually, while rogai for higher dignities doubled
at successive levels: hypatos (2 pounds), magistros
(16 pounds), kouropalates (32 pounds). The roga
could be obtained through the purchase of an
ofﬁce or title (see TITLES, PURCHASE OF)—thus
forming a kind of government annuity—and from
the 11th C. regularly accompanied dignities be-
stowed upon foreign rulers. Most, although not
all, rogai were presented to high ofﬁcials and title
holders in a ceremony held in Constantinople the
week before Palm Sunday (SkylCont. 133.18–21);
Michael III ordered 200 pounds of gold objects
melted down and coined for one such distribution
(TheophCont. 173.3–14). The term roga can also
designate cash stipends allocated by the ecclesi-
astical hierarchy or founders of religious houses
to monks or clergy (e.g., will of Eustathios BOILAS,
27:217, 223). (See also WAGES.)

lit. P. Lemerle, "Roga et rente d'État au XIe–XIIe
siècles," REB 25 (1967) 77–100. J.-C. Cheynet, "Dévaluation
der des dignités et dévaluation monétaire dans la seconde
Economy 187–95, 648–54.
—A.J.C.

ROGER I (Póypēs), count of Sicily (from 1072);
born Hauteville, Normandy, ca.1031, died Mileto,
Calabria, 22 June 1101. Roger was the youngest
brother of Robert GUSCARD, who aided his con-
quest of Sicily. There Roger maintained some
Greek monasteries. In 1080 he assisted Pope Ur-
ban II in his effort to heal the schism with Byz.
Roger's support of his nephew Roger Borsa, count
of Apulia, encouraged BOHEMUND to leave Italy
and join the First Crusade.

—C.M.B.

ROGER II, son of Roger I, count (from 1105),
than king of Sicily (1130–54); born 22 Dec. 1095,
died Palermo 26 Feb. 1154. Taking advantage of
the preoccupation of Manuel I with the Second
Crusade (1147), Roger dispatched a fleet that
captured Kerkira and plundered Thebes and Corinth as well as Euboea. His captives included
numerous silk weavers (see SERIKARIOS), who es-
established the industry in Sicily. The recapture of
Kerkira required lengthy sieges (1148–49) by
Manuel and the Venetians. To distract the Byz.,
Roger sent a fleet (ca.1149) that reached Constan-
tinople. The Normans burned wharves at Skoutari and in a defiant gesture shot arrows at the palace. Roger's successor, William I, inherited the conflict.

Among Sicilian monuments sponsored by Roger, the mosaics of Cefalu and the Cappella Palatina in Palermo draw heavily on Byz. sources and perhaps Byz. craftsmen. In the church of the Martorana at Palermo, Roger is depicted as a basilus crowned by Christ.


C.M.B, A.C.

**ROGER DE FLOR**, commander of the Catalan Grand Company; born Brindisi ca.1267, died Adrianople 30 Apr. 1305. Of German extraction (his name Flor is apparently a translation of Germ. Blum), Roger began his career as a Templar but left the Order in disgrace after misconduct at the siege of Acre (1291). He was then entrusted by Frederick II of Sicily (1296–1337) with command of a company of Catalans and Aragonese who fought the Angevins in Italy. After the Peace of Caltabellotta (1302), Roger offered his services to the Byz. in exchange for the title of megas doux and marriage to Maria, niece of Andronikos II. Roger arrived in Constantinople in 1303 with seven ships and about 8,000 mercenaries. After wintering in Kyzikon, he mounted a successful campaign against the Turks. In Aug. 1304, however, Andronikos recalled him because of Catalan looting of the local Greek population. Roger then seized control of Kallipolis and made it his base of operations. In the spring of 1305, Roger was promoted to caesar and offered the position of strategos autokrator in Anatolia. Before leaving on campaign he visited Michael IX at Adrianople where he was murdered by Alan mercenaries, probably at Michael's instigation.


ROGEROS, (Porépios), a noble family of Norman origin. Anna Komnene (An.Komm. 1:55-18) relates that a magnate of Robert Guiscard, "Rogeres," who was a brother of Raoul, deserted to Byz. ca.1080; he is probably to be identified with the Roger (a son of Dagobert) who signed the treaty of Devol in 1108. Kallikles praised Rogerios the sebastes (probably the founder of the Byz. family) as an experienced military commander who fought against "Celts," the Danubian "Scythians," and "Persians." His son by a Dalassen, John Rogerios Dalassenos the caesar (see Rogerios, John), married Maria, John II's daughter; their daughter Theodora married John Kontostephanos. Several Rogerioi had the high title of sebastes: Constantine, John II's contemporary; Andronikos, "son of the caesar," and Alexios (his son?) in 1166; another (?) Andronikos in 1191. Leo Rogerios, "grandson of a sebastes," is mentioned in a 12th-C. epigram as a translator from Latin (Lampros, "Mark. kod." 129, no.113). In 1189 a certain Rogerios Scalo acted as dux of Dalmatia and Croatia (T. Smičkla, Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae, vol. 2 [Zagreb 1904] nos. 163,165), but it remains unclear whether he was a Byz. governor or an independent ruler and whether he was related to the above-mentioned Rogerios. A poem entitled Spáneias addresses the son of the caesar Rogerios. The identification of the caesar with Roger II of Sicily (e.g., by H. Schreiner, ByzF 1 [1966] 295f) and of his son with the dux of Dalmatia proves invalid. Balsamon praised Andronikos Rogerios for the construction of the monastery of the Virgin Chrysokamariotissa.


ROGERIOS, JOHN, caesar; died after 1152, perhaps after 1166. Rogerios was son of Roger, a Norman deserter to Byz., and a Dalassen. On his seal (Laurent, Bulles métr., no.724) and in a poem addressed to him (Lampros, "Mark. kod. 524" 21), he is called Dalassenos (and presumably preferred that name), but Kinnamos calls him Rogerios. Because of his marriage to Maria Komnene, eldest daughter of John II Komnenos, Rogerios became caesar. Following John II's death, and before Manuel I occupied Constantinople, Rogerios plotted to make himself emperor. His many supporters included Prince Robert of Capua,
a Norman refugee then in Constantinople, and his knights. Preferring her brother to her husband, Maria reported the conspiracy to Manuel's agents. Rogerios was lured out of Constantinople and held in a suburb. Sometime (either before or shortly after his wife's death ca. 1146) he recovered his position. In 1152 he held estates and administrative authority in the Strunica-Vardar region (B. Ferjan, *ZRVI* 12 [1970] 193–201). About 1152 he was sent to Antioch to marry the widowed Constance, but because of his age she refused him. He returned to Byz. and died a monk. J. Schmitt's identification of John Rogerios as the addressee of the *Spanesas* has not been proved (Beck, *Volksliteratur* 106f).


ROGER OF HOVEDEN (or Howden), Anglo-Norman historian; died 1201/2, but certainly before 29 Sept. 1202. He was a clerk at the English court (1174–1189/90) who participated in the Third Crusade (J.B. Gillingham in *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic Worlds*, ed. D.O. Morgan [London 1982] 60–75) and was likely parson of Howden (by 1174; active there in the 1190s). He probably wrote the *Gesta regis Henrici II* (Deeds of King Henry II, 1169–92; revised in 1192 or 1193), ascribed to Benedict of Peterborough. Roger carefully reworked (1192/3–1201/2) the *Gesta's* account of 1169–92 into a *Chronica* and continued it to 1201 (D. Corner, *EHR* 98 [1983] 297–310). The revisions prompted by new data imply that each source's material on Byz. requires comparison. Thus the *Chronica* gives the text of Manuel I's letter to Henry II (2:102–04; *Reg* 2, no.1524), while the *Gesta* has only a résumé (ed. Stubbs, 1:128–30). Conversely, the day-by-day journal of Richard I's Crusade, including the conquest of Cyprus (7 Aug. 1190–22 Aug. 1191: *Gesta* 2:112–91) is, despite some additions (e.g., sailing time from Marseilles to Acre: *Chronica* 3:51), abridged in the *Chronica* (3:39–129). So too the document reporting the prophecy on the Golden Gate of a Latin emperor in Constantinople and the treaty of Isaac II Angelos with Saladin appears in *Gesta* (2:51–59), while *Chronica* only summarizes it (2:355–56). Particularly while at court, Roger acquired a wealth of information ranging from news of an earthquake at Catania (a.1164, *Chronica* 1:223) or the marriage of Agnes of France to Alexios II (*Chronica* 2:192; *Gesta* 1:239) to detailed accounts of the marriage of William II of Sicily to Henry II's daughter (*Chronica* 2:97–98) and Conrad of Montferrat's cooperation with Manuel I (*Chronica* 2:194f; *Gesta* 1:243f, 250). Histories of Alexios II, Andronikos I Komnenos, and Isaac II Angelos also appear including an account of Isaac's alleged studies at Paris (*Gesta* 1:251–62; *Chronica* 2:201–08). The apparently eyewitness description of Philip Augustus's return from the Crusade across Byz. includes, for example, a description of Kerkyra, which supposedly provided the emperor with 1,400 pounds of gold annually (*Gesta* 2:194–205; abridged in the *Chronica* 3:157–66).


ROLL (εἰληφάρων, Lat. rotulus, volumen). In antiquity the book was in the form of a roll made of sheets of papyrus pasted together and rolled onto a roll. Writing, usually on only one side of the scroll, was parallel to the long axis. In the 4th C. the roll was generally supplanted by the more convenient codex, but continued to be used in the imperial chancery, for tax collectors' praxis and for liturgical texts (see ROLLS, LITURGICAL). The only major example of a roll richly illustrated along its long axis is the JOSUA ROLL. Artists continued to represent the book in the form of a roll in mosaics and MS illustration, even when the codex format had become preponderant. Most commonly the roll is shown unfurled, in the hands of bishops and esp. of prophets, displaying the incipits of biblical utterances.


—E.G., A.M.T., A.C.

ROLLS, LITURGICAL. Written on sheets of parchement or papyrus that were glued together, liturgical rolls could reach 12 m in length; the text was copied parallel to the narrow side (i.e., at right angles to the long axis or transversa charta:
E.G. Turner, The Terms Recto and Verso [Brussels 1978] 26–51). Frequently the verso of liturgical rolls was also used. L.W. Daly (GRBS 14 [1973] 333–38) suggests that the format of liturgical rolls was inspired by imperial documents. The earliest surviving liturgical roll on parchment (the Ravnenna roll) is probably of the 7th C.

Liturgical rolls survive in large numbers from the 11th C., but only a few have extensive figural decoration. Typically they open with author portraits of Sts. Basil and/or John Chrysostom and may contain floral and zoomorphic initials in the body of the text. Additional figural decoration is varied, each roll emphasizing different aspects of the text. One 11th-C. example in Jerusalem has historiated initials and marginal vignettes, including a representation of Constantine that establishes the provenance; the imagery of another in Moscow pertains to the Studios Monastery in Constantinople. A 12th-C. roll in Athens, Nat. Lib. 2759, depicts Basil and John at the altar of a many-domed church; the illustration resembles the frontispieces of the MSS of James of Kokkino Baphos, while the text’s border is decorated in the manner of 12th-C. imperial scrolls. The numerous liturgical rolls of the Palaiologan period are seldom elaborately embellished, although one has an ornate border with monograms of the imperial family. Rolls figure prominently among the products of the Hodegon Monastery and constitute about one third of the signed works of its best known scribe, Iosaph.


—R.S.N., E.G., A.M.T.

ROMANCE, or novel; a work of fiction that in the ancient and Byz. world narrates, with some attention to the characters’ psychological states, the hazards that a pair of lovers successfully face. The ancient romances (e.g., those of Achilles Tatius, Chariton, Heliodorus, Longus), composed between the 2nd and 4th C. by writers well versed in rhetorical techniques and read, it seems, by a broad spectrum of the literate public, maintained an intermittent readership in the Byz. period. Byz. readers interpreted ancient romances as metaphorical descriptions of the struggle for salvation (S. Poljakova, VizVrem 31 [1971] 243–48); accordingly Metaphrastes used romances to embellish hagiographic plots (S. Poljakova, ADSV 10 [1973] 267–69). In the 12th C. Eustathios Makrembolites, Theodore Prodromos, Constantine Manasses, and Niketas Eugeneianos revived the genre, showing by direct quotation and use of shared motifs that they were well acquainted with their predecessors. Nevertheless, these works (Makrembolites’ written in prose, the others in verse, and all in purist language with elaborate rhetorical devices, e.g., ekphraseis of gardens and buildings) are not merely slavish imitations. Why the romance should reappear at this moment, after six centuries, is a question yet to be answered satisfactorily.

Some romances composed in the 14th C. (all in political verse) show knowledge of the conventions of the 12th-C. works, esp. in their use of ekphraseis (e.g., the Erotokastron [Castle of Love] of Belthandros and Chrysantza and similar scenes in Kallimachos and Chrysorhoo, in Libistros and Rhodame, and the Achilleis). Others, however, are either close translations (e.g., War of Troy and Philorios and Platzia-Philora) or free adaptations (e.g., Imberios and Margarona) of a Western original. Almost all 14th-C. romances reveal by their vocabulary and assumptions that they derive from a mixed Frankish-Greek society, such as that found in the Morea or Cyprus.

Characteristics of these later verse romances (cf. also Belisarios, Romance of, and Digenes Akritas) include a language that, though closer to the spoken than the purist level, presents a range of forms drawn from all stages of the development of Greek; a loose MS tradition, with many variants that are hard to reconcile into one text, even when all MSS plainly descend from one archetype; and many lines and half-lines that are repeated both within one romance and also in others. Explanations for these phenomena have been sought in the incompetence of barely literate authors (Krumbacher, GBL 795f) or the imperfect attempts of educated aristocrats to use the vernacular (Beck). More recently comparisons have been made with similar features in the medieval vernacular literatures of western Europe. There has been postulated a background of orally disseminated traditional literature, which has been shown elsewhere to produce features such as those observed in the Greek context (Jeffreys). Counter-arguments, however, maintain that the repetitions
between texts are due only to the normal literary processes of quotation and plagiarism (Spadaro). The question of the genesis of the 14th-C. romances, and thus also of the audience for whom they were intended, has yet to be fully resolved.


—E.M.J., M.J.

ROMANCE OF JULIAN, a fictional account of the reign of Emp. Julian surviving in two partial Syriac MSS of the 6th or 7th C., now in London (B.L. Add. MSS 1464.1, 7192). The work purports to be Stories of the Kings of Romania by a certain Apołīs, who appears in the work as an official of Emp. Jovian. The author composed the accounts, he says, to aid in the conversion of pagans. Internal criteria suggest that a single author wrote the Romance in Edessa between 502 and 532. In addition to the antipagan and anti-Julian character of the work, the author is at pains to put the Jews in a bad light, as supporters of the apostate emperor. This polemical note suggests that there were still influential pagans and Jews in the environs of Edessa in the first half of the 6th C. Later writers in Syriac and Arabic took the Romance to be a work of history and quoted from it in their accounts of Julian’s reign.


—S.H.G.

ROMANIA, Latin term that appeared in the 4th C. to designate the Roman Empire, esp. in contrast to the barbarian world (F. Clover in Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1977/78 [Bonn 1980] 80f); the term may have originated in a popular and Christian milieu. In the East the Greek term is known from the 6th C.—in a chronicle (Malal. 408.11) and in a vernacular inscription from Sirmium that entreats God to save Romania from the Avars (J. Brunšmid in Eranos Vindobonensis [Vienna 1893] 331–33). In Greek the term Romania also denoted the empire. This “universal” meaning was lost in the West, where it came to be applied to Romagna (the former exarchate of Ravenna). After 1080 Westerners used Romania for either the empire, in accordance with the Byz. tradition, or ROM. in accordance with Muslim usage. In 1204 the name Romania was given to the Latin Empire of Constantinople. As a result, the Byz. virtually stopped using the term in official documents, although there are exceptions, such as a curious “chrysobull” (of 1326–28?) that a certain Konnenos Palaiologos gave to the church of the Virgin Pogoniatiane (in northern Epirus) at the request of “Andronikos, the emperor of Constantinople and all Romania” (D. Zakythenos, EEBS 14 [1938] 293, 7–8). The term was adopted by Stefan Uroš IV Dušan who styled himself the “emperor and autokrator of Serbia and Romania” (e.g., Docheiar., no. 25.22–23).


—A.K.

ROMANIA, ASSIZES OF, conventional name assigned (following the example of the Assizes of Jerusalem) to a collection based purportedly on the “usages and statutes of the empire of Romania,” but actually upon those of the principality of Achaia. The Assizes was a private compilation (between ca.1333 and 1346) written in Old French. Between 1375 and 1400 it was translated into the Venetian dialect, and an officially approved version was published by VENICE in 1452 or 1453 for use in Euboea and other Venetian possessions. The Assizes generally concerns the feudal relationships of the prince of Achaia and his vassals and draws on oral tradition, precedents from the prince’s court, and the treatise of Jean d’Ibelin in the Assizes of Jerusalem. Some clauses deal with the Greek inhabitants and derive from Byz. usages. Thus properties belonging to both Greek landowners accepted into the Moreote hierarchy and peasants (successors of the paroikoi) were, in Byz. fashion, divisible among heirs, while Frankish fiefs
passed undivided. The peasants' conditions of tenure followed Byz. legal prescriptions. Among the Greeks, Byz. customs regarding dowry persisted.


—C.M.B.

ROMANOS ('Ῥωμανός'), personal name (etym. "inhabitant of Rome"). Plutarch (Romulus 2.1) preserved a legend that reversed this etymology and presented Romanos as a son of Odysseus and Circe. Romanos allegedly colonized Rome, and was Rome's eponym. The name was common in Rome and was still popular in the 4th and 5th C. (PLRE 1:768–70, 2:946–49), primarily in the secular milieu, although some 5th-C. bishops named Romanos are known (B. Stech, RE 2 R. 1 [1920] 1066) as well as an obscure martyr and an ascetic in Syria. Romanos the Melode is the only famous ecclesiastical writer of this name. The name, not very fashionable in later periods, had its peak in the 10th–11th C.: in Skylitzes, who lists 20 Romanoi, the name is in eighth place, right after Nikephoros. It is perhaps no coincidence that the four emperors called Romanos all lived in the 10th–11th C. In the acts of Laura the name occurs even less frequently than Peter.

—A.K.

ROMANOS I LEKAPENOS, emperor (920–44); born Lakape ca.870, died on island of Prote 15 June 948. The son of an Armenian peasant (see Lekapenos), Romanos made a career as a naval officer; he was strategos of Samos and eventually droungarios of the fleet. A legend attributes his rise to a successful single combat with a lion. During the regency of Zoe Karbonopsina, he managed to ruin his major rival Leo Phokas and married his daughter Helen to Constantine VII (May 919); he became basileopator, caesar, and was crowned on 17 Dec. 920. The actual ruler of the empire, he crowned his sons Christopher, Stephen, and Constantine co-emperors in order to diminish Constantine VII's role. Acting as a representative of the officialdom of Constantinople, Romanos promulgated a series of laws (novels) designed to protect small landowners against the dynatoi; the date of the first novel, allegedly 922, is questionable; the second one was issued in 934, soon after the great famine of 927/8 and immediately after the rebellion of Basil the Copper Hand. Although Romanos restricted the dynatoi's opportunity to acquire peasants' land and introduced the right of protimesis, he also increased their taxes (TheophCont 443.15–18). He also subdued revolts that occurred in southern Italy, Chaldea, and the Peloponnesos, predominantly in 920–22. Romanos inherited a burdensome war against Symeon of Bulgaria, but after the latter's death the patriarch Theophanes concluded a treaty with Peter of Bulgaria in 927.

Thereafter Byz. started gaining momentum: it increased its influence in Serbia, concluded a treaty with the Hungarians, defeated the fleet of Igor in 941, and persuaded him to sign a treaty in 944. John Koukououas led the offensive against the Arabs. Romanos also kept the church under control. The Tomos of Union (920) brought peace to the church, and the promotion of Romanos's younger son Theophylaktos to patriarch transformed the church administration into a sort of family affair. Notwithstanding all these successes, Romanos was dethroned by his sons Stephen and Constantine on 20 Dec. 944 and exiled to Prote. Constantine VII's victory over the Lekapenoi (27 Jan. 945) did not change Romanos's status; he died as a monk.


—A.K.

ROMANOS II, emperor of the Macedonian dynasty (959–63); son of Constantine VII and Helen; born Constantinople 959, died Constantinople 15 Mar. 963. In Sept. 944 Romanos I married him to Bertha (Eudokia), a daughter of Hugo of Provence, king of Italy (927–47), but after her premature death Romanos married Theophano, who exerted great influence on him. Crowned co-emperor on 6 Apr. 945 (G. de Jerphanion, OrChrP 1 [1935] 490–95), he succeeded Constantine on 9 Nov. 959. He retained Constantine's closest supporters, such as Theodore of Dekapolis and Nikephoros (II) Phokas, but entrusted the entire administration to Joseph Bringas. In his agrarian legislation, Romanos continued the policies initiated by Constantine: in a departure from the principles of Romanos I, he tended to protect the buyer of peasants' and soldiers' holdings rather
than the poor person who was forced to sell his property for an unfair price (Kazhdan, *Derewnia i gorod* 409f). Under Romanos, Nikephoros Phokas led a successful offensive against the Arabs: he reconquered Crete in 960/1, defeated Sayf Al-Dawla, recaptured Germanikeia, and besieged Aleppo.


—A.K.

**ROMANOS III ARGYROS** or Argyropoulos, emperor (1028–34); born ca. 968, died Constantinople 11/12 Apr. 1034. Coming from a noble family, Romanos was *oikonomos* of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, then *eparch of the city*. Constantine VIII, on his deathbed, married his daughter Zoe to Romanos, whose previous wife entered a convent. As emperor, Romanos sought popularity: he treated the church generously, released prisoners, recalled the blinded Romanos Skleros and the exiled Nikephoros Xiphias, and annulled the Allelengyon, which was hateful to ecclesiastics and probably to other landowners. At enormous expense he constructed the monastery of the Peribleptos in Constantinople, gilded the capitals of the Great Church, and, in 1031, lavishly restored the church of Blachernai. He levied heavy taxes in the provinces, but corrupt officials kept much of the revenue. Imagining himself a great general, Romanos forced a quarrel on the emir of Aleppo and in midsummer 1030 (against advice) marched on that city. A defeat brought a hasty retreat to Constantinople. In Syria only the early achievements of George Maniakes illuminated the reign. In vain Romanos tried to continue Basil II’s aggressive policy in Sicily and negotiated with the Western emperor Conrad II (1024–39). Constantine Diogenes and other discontented aristocrats apparently developed plots around Zoe’s sister Theodora. Neglected by Romanos, Zoe favored the future Michael IV and contrived Romanos’s drowning.


—C.M.B., A.C.

**ROMANOS IV DIOGENES**, emperor (1068–71); died Prote 4 Aug. 1072. An Anatolian magnate, Romanos commanded on the Danubian frontier under Constantine X. He had been convicted of conspiring with the Hungarians against Eudokia Makrembolitissa, when she suddenly decided to make him her husband and emperor, 1 Jan. 1068. Although Romanos ruled with Constantine X’s sons Michael VII, Andronikos, and Konstantios as co-emperors, their relatives, led by the caesar John Doukas, feared lest the princes be disinheritied. Romanos constantly had to guard against Doukas plots. Bari, insufficiently supported by Romanos, fell to the Normans. Romanos attempted to reconstruct the Anatolian army from new recruits and foreign mercenaries. In 1068–69, he made two expeditions to eastern Anatolia, but the Turks sacked Ikonion and Chonai while Romanos was in the East. In 1071 Romanos encountered Alp Arslan at Mantzikert. He was taken captive through the treachery of the caesar’s son, Andronikos. Released on condition he yield claims to Armenia, pay a ransom, and assist the sultan in the future, Romanos was treated as a rebel by the Doukas faction. Only the Armenian Khaç’atur came to his aid. Romanos lost the ensuing civil war and, after surrendering, was blinded on the caesar’s orders (29 June 1072—D. Polemis, *BZ* 58 [1965] 65f., 76); he soon died in a monastery.

An ivory panel (now in Paris) depicts an emperor Romanos and his wife Eudokia being crowned by Christ. Since both Romanos II and Romanos IV married Eudokias, the problem of identification and of dating this panel is complex. Goldschmidt and Weitzmann (*Elfenbeinskulpt.* II: 35) argued that the panel portrayed Romanos II, whereas I. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner (*DOP* 31 [1977] 305–25) assigns it to Romanos IV.


—C.M.B., A.C.

**ROMANOS THE MELODE**, hymnographer and saint; born Enessa, died after 555, feastday 1 Oct. A native (perhaps of Jewish background) of Syria, Romanos was deacon in a church in Berytus before coming to Constantinople in the reign of Anastasios I; there he served in the Church of the Virgin in the Kyrou district. Byz. legend has him divinely inspired by the Virgin, so much so that he composed 1,000 hymns; 85 actually survive in his name, of which 59 are probably genuine, though the debate over individual items is endless, there being no sure way of determining
authorship. In particular, the Akathistos Hymn is variously attributed or denied to him. Romanos, while proclaimed a saint and highly honored by the Byz., was not imitated; the genre of kontakion that he developed soon waned in popularity and the church did not accept the hymns of Romanos in the liturgy (the Akathistos is the exception, but its authenticity as the work of Romanos is doubtful).

Romanos's hymns essentially recreate stories from the Old and New Testaments and from hagiography and are often linked with religious feasts; he did not avoid contemporary topics, however, and the hymn On the Earthquake and Fire depicts the Nika Revolt and praises "the new Solomon" (Justinian I) for the restoration of Hagia Sophia. Following the mainstream of Orthodox theology, Romanos does not eschew moderate Monophysitism, emphasizing the divine nature in "divided and undivided Christ." His language is simple, and the tonic system replaced the Hellenic meter. The composition is terse (in comparison with contemporary sermons), with refrains playing an important part and sometimes even expressing the main idea of the kontakion. His oikonomia comes not through contemplation but through action and drama, and accordingly the theme of the Descent into Hell (as the way of redemption) often attracts him; the dialogical structure of many kontakia, addressing pregnant questions to biblical figures, and broad use of irony add dramatic tension. The extent of his debt to Syriac religious poetry has been much debated.


B.B.

ROME ('Ρώμη). In the early Roman Empire of the 1st to 3rd C., Rome was the major city (urbs)—capital of the state, residence of the emperor, site of the senate and the administration, and an economic and cultural center. This status of Rome was undermined by the barbarian invasions and civil disorders of the 3rd C., which required the frequent presence of the emperor near the frontiers, but it was not until Constantine I the Great made his residence at Milan in 312 and then founded Constantinople in 324 that Rome began to lose its unique and exclusive position. Nevertheless, Rome continued to be the first city of the empire with its probable population of just under one million and, more important, as the emergent seat of the papacy. In the 4th C. Rome contained an enormous number of private dwellings and civic buildings: a notitia of this date lists no fewer than 46,602 apartment houses, 1,797 private residences, 11 large and 856 small bath buildings, 1,352 cisterns, and 144 public lavatories.

Rome suffered from a severe earthquake in 422 and from sieges and plundering in the 5th and 6th C.: by Alaric (in 410), Gaiseric (455), Ricimer (472), Totila (546 and 549), and Narses (552). The conquest of Africa by the Vandals in the second quarter of the 5th C. deprived Rome of its major granary and made the city increasingly dependent on Sicilian foodstuffs; as a result there was a decline in the population. At the end of the 6th C. Rome had only 30,000–40,000 inhabitants (Graffunder, RE 2 R. 1 [1920] 1060).

A wealth of material is available for demographic studies of Rome in the 4th to 6th C.: thousands of funeral inscriptions, both pagan and Christian, mostly in Latin, although many Greek and Jewish texts are known. Social analysis of this evidence has only begun, and preliminary observations, such as the decrease in the number of tombs of slaves and freedmen from the 4th C. onward (L. Urdaeh, Classical Journal 60 [1964–65] 276), need to be checked further on the basis of larger samples (e.g., G. Sanders, Latomus 30 [1971] 461). Changes within the ruling class are better documented. The senatorial aristocracy, gradually christianized (e.g., the family of Anicii), retained its position until the 6th C., when it still supported fashionable charioteers and dreamed of creating a university in Rome. By the 7th C., however, it was gradually replaced by military commanders based not in Rome (with its broad economic connections and cultural traditions) but on their estates. These administrators and the commanders of the urban militia eventually formed
a new Roman elite. The troops in Rome were organized along the lines of the Byz. army and exercised considerable influence through their control over offices and military arrangements and by means of the property they accrued.

During the 7th C. a new landholding class emerged that was closely tied to the church through its monasteries and distribution centers (diaconiae) for grain and other foodstuffs. Comprised of small landholders and their tenants and led by local notables, this group formed new local militias that eventually replaced regular Byz. military units. It was in these militias that opposition to Byz. rule was eventually centered. Accordingly, the administration of Rome changed: the senate lost its significance, the urbane prefect was eliminated by the mid-6th C., and Rome was placed under the control of the praetorian prefect of Italy and then of the dux of Rome, who submitted in turn to the exarch of Ravenna. At the same time the role of church administration increased. After 554 the church became increasingly the upholder of civic traditions in Rome. The pope took over the collection of tolls and the repair of public works, while, with the decline of the grain supply, “deacons” attached to churches took over the task of feeding the city’s poor.

Despite lessening political control by Byz., cultural and ideological ties between Constantinople and Rome continued. From the mid-7th C. there was substantial migration of refugees from the eastern provinces, which were under attack by the Arabs. In 645 a group of monks from the Lavra of St. Sabas in the Judean Hills settled on the Little Aventine. A few years earlier (641), a monastic congregation from southeastern Asia Minor was established at Tre Fontane. Nestorians from Syria or Mesopotamia also immigrated to Rome. Refugees brought with them to Rome Eastern relics, feasts, and traditions, including the custom of transferring the bones of martyrs. Iconoclastic elements penetrated as well. A series of popes of Greek or Syrian background continued unbroken from Theodore I to Zacharias in the mid-8th C. The activities of the Greek population, however, were restricted for the most part to the ecclesiastical sphere. Rome remained a Western city even as it assimilated and integrated Eastern influences. Nevertheless, ideology and ritual played a key part in binding Rome to the empire. Imperial documents and coins were seen as symbols of authority. Wall paintings and portable portraits of the emperor were a common feature in late 7th- and early 8th-C. Rome.

During the 7th C. the Roman church came to dissociate itself from Constantinople, largely because of doctrinal differences, and to seek political control of Byz. possessions in Italy as heir of the exarch. Ground was prepared for a rupture with Byz. after the failure of a meeting in Constantinople between emperor and pope in 711, designed to restore theological and political unity. No more successful was the attempt to reorganize Rome and its territory into a Byz. doux. A major break came during the reign of Leo III because of his Iconoclastic policy. Eventually, the concept of a Roman res publica associated with the see of St. Peter was promoted and encouraged by circulation of the spurious Donation of Constantine, but until 772 the papacy continued to date all documents according to the regnal years of the Byz. emperor. Imperial coinage continued to be minted in Rome until at least 776 and probably 781. Although clerical control in the city was becoming steadily more pronounced, imperial titles among the laity, such as consul and dux, remained common, and the lay aristocracy retained a powerful role in Roman society for centuries. Local military officials, although their right to rule based on imperial commissions became less important as links with Byz. weakened, kept their traditional titles and a preference for Byz. culture and remained a powerful influence until the middle of the 11th C.

The Idea of Rome. After Rome lost its position of political leadership in the 4th C., the idea (or myth) that Rome remained the center of the empire survived, but from the Byz. viewpoint it was a Rome transferred to Constantinople. Cassiodorus stated that Emp. Constantine I called Constantinople secunda Roma and placed this name on a marble column, but his report was evidently based on a post-Constantinian tradition; the Greek term New Rome (Nera Roma) is attested no earlier than 381, in canon 3 of the First Council of Constantinople (when Themistios, in 357, contrasted New Rome with ancient Rome it was only as a rhetorical expression and not an official formulation—J. Irmscher, Klio 65 [1983] 434f). In the late 4th C. Gregory of Nazianzos still applied the nonofficial epithets hoptoloteros (“younger”) and neourgos (“new”) to Rome-Constantinople (E.
Fenster, Laudes Constantinopolitanae [Munich 1968] 58). The designation "New Rome" or "Second Rome" in reference to Constantinople became common from the 6th C. onward (in Corippus, the Chronicon Paschale, etc.).

In the West the concept of the relocation of the capital to Constantinople was accepted, but the anonymous 9th-C. author of the Versus Romanæ complained that Rome yielded to the Greeks "nom-en honosque tuus" (W. Hammer, Speculum 19 [1944] 54). Charlemagne entertained the idea of building a city in imitation of Rome (K. Hauck, Frühmittelalterliche Studien 20 [1986] 518). In the 10th C. the Ottonian dynasty established a "Roman" empire, and later the Muscovite ideologists developed the notion of Moscow as the "Third Rome," after Constantinople.


ROME, MONUMENTS OF. As long as Rome remained part of the empire, the emperor was legally responsible for the city's public buildings, and the palace on the Palatine hill was maintained at least until the early 8th C. for possible imperial visits. During the 4th and early 5th C., the tradition of imperial sponsorship of public building was still active, albeit on a reduced scale: Diocletian built new baths; Maxentius, a circus on the Via Appia; the Basilica Nova was begun by Maxentius and completed by Constantine, who also constructed the Arch of Constantine near the Flavian amphitheater and Janus Quadrifons Arch in the Forum Boarium; Constantius II transported an obelisk from Egypt and erected it in the Circus Maximus; Valentinian I rebuilt two bridges and constructed two porticoes; Theodosius I rebuilt one bridge; and Honorius made substantial additions to the walls of Aurelius.

Many buildings were in decay, however, and spolia from them were frequently reused in new buildings, including churches. Imperial legislation designed to curtail the despoiling of public monuments and encourage restoration and repair was largely ineffective, although until the end of the 5th C. some repairs were undertaken by the administration and, occasionally, private senatorial patrons. There is no evidence of a change in this situation under the Ostrogoths, and Justinian I, although encouraging the maintenance of public buildings in the Sanctio Pragmatica of 554, does not seem to have made any financial contributions toward renovation of the city's monuments. By the time of Pope Gregory I the Great, the aqueducts were in a state of disrepair.

In the course of the late 6th through 7th C., responsibility for the repair and maintenance of civic buildings, historically the purview of the emperor and senate, fell increasingly under the authority of the pope. The only secular construction activity known in the period is the rebuilding of the Ponte Salario in 565 and the dedication of the column of Phokas in the Forum in 608, both by Byz. exarchs. Constans II exemplified the policy of imperial neglect or even abuse by despoiling the city of its bronze ornaments and roof tiles on his visit in 667. The ultimate preservation of temples and government structures was mostly through their conversion into churches, beginning with the Pantheon, which was alienated to the pope by Phokas in 609.

The decline of civic building in late antique Rome was offset, to a large degree, by growth in ecclesiastical construction. Constantine I erected numerous Christian basilicas (for donation lists, see Lib. pont. 1:170–83), including one over a shrine believed to be the tomb of St. Peter, another at the tomb of St. Lawrence, and the cathedral (St. John Lateran) and its freestanding baptistry. Except for the baptistery none of these buildings survives, but S. Costanza, the mid-4th-C. mausoleum of Constantine's daughter Constantina, is well preserved. It is a domed rotunda with partly figural mosaics in a surrounding barrel vault; its "double-shell" design is thought to be an ancestor of Byz. edifices such as Ss. SergioS and Bakchos in Constantinople.

After Constantine, imperial patronage of churches in Rome was infrequent. A large basilica over the tomb of St. Paul was begun by Valentinian II, Theodosios I, and Arkadios (S. Paolo fuori le mura, destroyed by fire in 1829); it was completed by Honorius, who also erected a dy-
nastic mausoleum at St. Peter’s (later consecrated as the chapel of S. Petronilla). Theodosios II and his daughter Eudoxia sponsored the basilica of St. Peter in Chains (S. Pietro in Vincoli, extant but remodeled).

Nonimperial Byz. patronage is also little attested. Much has been made of the fact that there were 13 non-Italian popes between 642 and 772, but few can be associated with extant works of art. An exception is Pope John VII, who sponsored paintings and mosaics, the surviving fragments of which are generally considered Byz. (i.e., Constantinopolitan) in facture and style. There were also numerous Greek and Palestinian monasteries in Rome, whose artistic record too is almost nil. Fragmentary paintings at S. Saba on the Aventine are dated by D.H. Wright (BSG Abstracts 10 [1984] 62–64) to two periods, before 726 and after 787; he attributes the later murals to a master from Constantinople. Pope Paschal I (817–24) established a Greek monastery at S. Prassede where, although the architecture of the extant church is strictly Roman, the mosaics are stylistically akin to the 9th-C. Sacra Parallela miniatures, now attributed by Weitzmann to Palestine (Weitzmann, Sacra Parallela 14–25).

It is commonly thought that in the period from the Gothic wars to the so-called Carolingian revival (i.e., from the late 6th to the 8th C.) Rome was not a vital cultural milieu but an artistic province of Constantinople; much Roman painting of this period is defined as Byz., regardless of patronage, by its style. This is esp. true of the fragmentary murals in S. Maria Antiqua, where the so-called palimpsest wall, displaying four strata of superimposed decorations, provides a useful relative chronology. Kitzinger and others discern essentially two trends in these paintings: “Hellenistic” (loosely painted, naturalistic) and “hieratic” (linear, static, and flat), which occur in alternation. The “Hellenistic” style is universally attributed to Constantinople (where it is superbly represented in the floor mosaics of the Great Palace), and paintings in this manner are considered Byz. or byzantinizing. Kitzinger believes that the “hieratic” style likewise emanated from Constantinople; other examples of the style in Rome are the mosaics in S. Agnese fuori le mura (625–38) and the chapel of S. Venanzio at the Lateran (642–49).

Vitae of popes of the 8th and 9th C., beginning with Zacharias (741–52), record the donations to Roman churches of thousands of textiles, often qualified as alexandrina, olistrica, de blatin bizantia, etc. (for the terms, see F. Mosino, BollBadGr n.s. 37 [1983] 61–73). Many are described as having figured scenes (J. Croquison, Byzantium 34 [1964] 577–605), and these textiles (of which only paltry scraps survive) must have been an influential means of transmission of Byz. iconography to the West.

Presumably, icons also were imported, although the five pre-Iconoclastic icons extant in Rome are mostly considered local products: four are of the Virgin Mary, in S. Maria in Trastevere, S. Francesca Romana, S. Maria del Rosario, and the Pantheon; one, called archerospita (sic see ACHEIROPOIETA) in the Liber pontificalis (Lib. pont. 1:443), is of Christ and is preserved in the Sancta Sanctorum at the Lateran. None is surely dated, although it is plausible that the Pantheon icon was made for the building’s conversion in 609.

Unlike Ravenna, Rome has no buildings of purely Byz. design, except perhaps the galleryed basilicas of S. Lorenzo fuori le mura (579–90) and S. Agnese fuori le mura (625–38). Krautheimer has pointed to a number of churches erected just after the Gothic wars that have Byz. features or motifs, possibly reflecting Byz. military construction.

After the political split with Byz. ca.750, most of the monumental art in Rome reverted self-consciously to local prototypes, such as the Constantinian basilicas and the apse mosaic of SS. Cosma e Damiano (526–30). Nevertheless, Byz. traces appear in Roman mosaics. They have already been noted for the 9th C. (in S. Prassede, above). Many scholars believe that the revival of mosaic in 12th-C. Rome was due to descendants of the Byz.-founded workshop of Montecassino. The influence of Montecassino may also be seen in the Byz. bronze door donated in 1070 to S. Paolo fuori le mura, which was by then a Benedictine monastery.


-D.K., R.B.H.

ROMUALD II, archbishop of Salerno (1153–1 Apr. 1181); statesman at the Norman court of Sicily. A universal chronicler (from the time of Christ to 1178), which is esp. useful for southern Italy (1125–78), is attributed to him, although this ascription has been challenged by Matthew
ROMULUS AUGUSTULUS (in texts) or Augustus (on coins), Western emperor (31 Oct. 475—after 4 Sept. 476); died probably after 507 or 511. Romulus (Ῥώμουλος) was proclaimed Augustus by his father Orestes, who was the former secretary of Attila, and magister militum and patrician during the brief reign of Julius Nepos, whom Orestes soon overthrew. The Eastern court never recognized Romulus. When the Germanic troops revolted and Orestes was killed, Odoacer became ruler of Italy and made Romulus formally abdicate. The life of Romulus was spared due to his youth and physical charm: he was given a substantial pension and sent to live in Campania with relatives. Odoacer sent a delegation to Zeno announcing that no new Western emperor was needed, but Constantinople continued to regard Julius Nepos as the official Augustus of the West.

The events of 476 are often considered the end of the Western Empire and of antiquity. They did not, however, produce any real change in the state of affairs and were not viewed by contemporaries as a major turning point.

- M. McC.

ROMYLOS, hesychast monk; saint; born Vidin, Bulgaria, died Ravanica, Serbia, after 1381; feastdays 11 Jan., 1 Nov. Son of a Greek father and Bulgarian mother, he was given the baptismal name of Raikos (or Rousko). To avoid the marriage planned by his parents, he fled to the Hodegetria monastery at Túrnovo, where he took the monastic name of Romanos (later changed to Romylós). He preferred the solitary to the cenobitic life, however, and moved to Paròuria in southeastern Bulgaria, where he became a disciple of Gregory Sinaítes and helped him construct his monastery. On three occasions Romylós was forced to leave his beloved Paroria for the safety of Zagora (near Túrnovo) because of famine and the threat from brigands and Turks.

After a Turkish attack on Paroria, Romylós fled to Athos, where he lived as a solitary near the Lavra. When Athos became endangered after the Serbian defeat at Marica in 1371, Romylós moved on to Avlon. His final journey was to the Serbian monastery at Ravanica. Before 1391 Gregory, a Greek who had been Romylós’s disciple on Athos, wrote his vita (BHG 2384); its contemporary Slavonic version also survives.

- A.M.T.

ROOF (στέγας, ὄροφη). In Byz., roofs were ordinarily flat for houses, trussed over palaces and the broad spans of the naves of basilicas (with shed roofs over the aisles), and conical or domical (in imitation of vaulted masonry domes) over centralized spaces. Roofing material—thatch, tile (ceramic, marble, copper), lead or bronze sheets—
was laid on masonry vaults or timber roofs to protect the structure from the elements. The earliest extant Byz. timber roof is at the monastery of St. Catherine on Sinai, a truss roof with a central vertical joggle post locked into the apex of the rafters at the top and notched at the bottom to support struts angled to meet the rafters at their midpoints. Horizontal tie beams keep the rafters from spreading; purlins laid horizontally on major rafters support lesser rafters on which the roof cover is laid. Eusebius notes the use of lead sheets on the Martyrion at Jerusalem and bronze tile instead of terracotta on the Holy Apostles (VC 3.36.2, 4.58). Thomas I, patriarch of Jerusalem (807–20), restored Modestus's conical roof of the Anastasis, damaged by an earthquake, with 40 beams of pine or cedar from Cyprus (H. Vincent, F.-M. Abel, Jérusalem, vol. 2 [Paris 1914] 220, 244).


ROSSANO (Ῥοσσάνων, 'Ροσσάνων), port city in southern Italy. Prokopios (Wars 7.28.8) describes Rouskiane as the harbor of Touriori, above which a fortress was built by "ancient Romans." In 548, during the Gothic war, Rouskiane surrendered to Totila after a long resistance. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp. 27.49) names Rousianon as one of the strongholds the Lombards were unable to take. Rossano probably served as the base of operations for Nikephoros Phokas the Elder in Calabria in 885/6. At the end of the 9th C. a bishopric was established at Rossano, replacing the see of Thourioi, which is still attested in the 7th C. The bishop of Rossano was a suffragan of REGGIO-CALABRIA. Rossano had a powerful fortress: in 982 Otto II, on campaign against the Arabs in Calabria, left his wife Theophano and the state treasure within the walls of the stronghold. After being defeated, Otto took refuge on a Byz. ship, but fearful of being taken prisoner jumped overboard at Rossano and swam ashore. In the 10th C. the Byz. controlled Rossano but frequently had to deal with local revolts, as in ca.965, when the city rebelled against the magistros Nikephoros. Rossano was one of the last fortresses captured by the Normans during their occupation of Calabria ca.1059.

There were many monasteries in the vicinity of Rossano, esp. at Merkourion, where Neilos of Rossano was active. After the Norman conquest the monastery of Patir was founded. Monasteries of the Greek rite still existed in this region in the 15th C. (M. Adoriso Ambonio, BollBadGr 27 [1973] 91–96).

Monuments of Rossano. Cappelli (infra) counted five extant Byz. churches in Rossano, of which the most important are S. Marco and the Panaghia. The latter (12th-C.? ) is a rectangular building on a terrace, with its original entrance in the long south wall; it has one apse and a longitudinal chapel on its north side. These features constitute a distinctive Calabrian type. S. Marco, by contrast, is a five-domed church, square with four masonry piers in the center: it is the same type as the Cattolica at STILO. Scholars have placed its date between the 9th and the 11th C. Cappelli proposed to identify S. Marco with the oratory of the convent of S. Anastasia mentioned in the vita of Neilos of Rossano. The ROSSANO GOSPELS, now in the Museo Arcivescovile, were not made in Rossano but may have been brought there as early as the 7th C.


ROSSANO GOSPELS, the oldest surviving illustrated Greek Gospel book, now preserved in the cathedral museum at Rossano. A fragment, it contains the texts of Matthew and Mark (up to 16:14), although its illustration draws on all four Gospels. It is written in silver uncial on purple parchment, with incipits in gold, on 188 folios measuring 30.7 × 26 cm. Fourteen miniatures and the frontispiece to the (lost) CANON TABLES depict events in the life of Christ. The page devoted to St. Mark and a personification sometimes said to represent SOPHIA is painted on a bifolium that O. Kresten and G. Prato (RömHistMitt 27 [1985] 381–99) have argued is an insertion of the 11th–12th C., when purple parchment was used in southern Italy. In ten of the miniatures Old Testament prophets are shown holding scrolls inscribed with texts read in the liturgy and pointing to the Gospel scenes illustrated above them. The MS is generally agreed to be a work of the second half of the 6th C., although its place of origin (Syria?, Constantinono-
he founded a separate monastery nearby where he installed Egyptian monks to serve as the clergy for the Apostoleion. This original phase of the monastery was very brief, since it was abandoned after Rufinus’s murder in 395. The monastery quickly fell into disrepair but was restored ca. 400 by Hypatios, who served as hegoumenos until his death in 446. The restored monastery bore the name of St. Hypatios after its second founder and housed 50 monks in the mid-5th C. In 493 the Apostoleion was the site of the Synod of the Oak that deposed Patr. John Chrysostom. Circa 950 Patr. Theophylaktos restored the monastery once again. After the Latin conquest of Constantinople, the monastery was abandoned by its Greek monks for about ten years (ca. 1215–25) and inhabited by Cistercians as a dependency of the monastery of St. Angelus of Pera (E.A.R. Brown, Traditio 14 [1958] 88–90). When the Greek monks returned, the monastery came under the direction of the hegoumenos of St. Paul of Latros. It does not appear in the sources after the 13th C.


A.M.T.

**ROSSLE DE BAILLEUL** (Ῥουσέλιος or Ούρσελιος), Norman mercenary; born Bailleul, Normandy, died Heracleia Perinthos 1078. Roussel fought in Sicily (1069), then led the Norman troops on Romanos IV’s expedition to Mantzikert, but escaped the debacle. In 1073 he quarreled with his commander Isaac Komnenos and departed to establish a base in the Armeniakon. In 1074, at the Zompos Bridge over the Sangarios, he captured the caesar John Doukas. After advancing as far as Chryspolus, Roussel proclaimed John emperor to give his revolt a legal pretext. Assisted by Artuk, Michael VII captured Roussel and John. Ransomed by his wife (probably late 1074), Roussel returned to the Armeniakon to create a state. He levied funds from the cities and fought the Turks. About 1075 the future Alexios I Komnenos induced Roussel’s Turkish ally Tutach (Τούταχ—Byren. 187.6) to betray him. When the people of Amaseia rioted against a levy to pay Tutach, Alexios pretended to have Roussel blinded; thereafter, the populace paid. Roussel was imprisoned in Constantinople until late 1077, when Michael VII released him
to oppose Nikephoros Bryennios. Roussel garrisoned Thracian Heracleia. After Michael's fall, his minister Nikephoritzes fled there to join Roussel. When Roussel died suddenly, rumor blamed Nikephoritzes' poison. Schlumberger (Sig. 660–64) published Roussel's seal.


**ROUTES.** See Land Routes; Sea Routes; Silk Route.

**ROVINE, BATTLE OF,** a fierce but indecisive encounter between the armies of *Mircea the Elder* of Wallachia and the Ottoman ruler *Bayezid I*, which took place on the plain of Rovine in western Rumania (20 km west of mod. Arad) on 17 May 1395 (G. Radojičić, *RHSEE* 5 [1928] 136–39). The outcome of the battle is not clear. Although Mircea apparently won, he still had to acknowledge Ottoman suzerainty over Wallachia and pay tribute. Among those killed in the battle were two Serbian princes who were fighting for Bayezid as Ottoman vassals. They were Marko Kraljević and Constantine Dragaš.


**RUBENIDS (Poufēnov),** first dynasty to rule Armenian Cilicia (1073–1226). The Rubenids descended from a certain Ruben, for whom Armenian sources claim royal descent, though he was more likely a henchman than a kinsman of the last Bagratid king, Gagik II. The original strongholds of the Rubenids were Gobidar (Kopitar) and Vahka in the Anti-Taurus mountains, but Prince T'oros I (1100–29) moved down toward the plain to install himself at Anazarbos. The defeat and capture of his successor Prince Leo I (1129–1137/8) by Emp. John II Komnenos forced the Rubenids to return to the mountains. Leo’s younger son T’oros II was able to control the plain again after his submission to Manuel I Komnenos in 1158. Finally, with the consent of Byz., Prince Leo II (see Leo II/I) was crowned as king of all of Cilicia in 1198 or 1199; he moved the Rubenid capital to Sis in the foothills, where it remained. Subsequently, Rubenid rule in Cilicia was weakened by Leo’s long struggles with the principality of Antioch; when he died in 1219, the crown passed to the Hetumids through the marriage of Leo’s daughter Zabel to Hetum I.


**RUFINIANAE.** See Rouphinianae.

**RUFINUS (Poufēnov),** praetorian prefect and adviser of Theodosios I and Arkadios; born Elusa, Gaul, died outside Constantinople 27 Nov. 395. He was *magister officiorum* 388–92 and used his tenure to increase the importance of that office. In 390 he urged Theodosios to admit his error in the massacre of citizens in the hippodrome of Thessalonike. He was appointed consul for 392. Rufinus was an ambitious and ruthless politician; he hoped to marry his daughter to Arkadios. When Theodosios went to the West in 394, he left Rufinus as the principal adviser to Arkadios. After the death of Theodosios in Jan. 395 Rufinus served briefly as regent for the young emperor. He was accused of encouraging Alaric to attack Greece. He was jealous of Stilicho because of his military power in the West. He was murdered by Gainas on the instructions of Stilicho. A pious Christian, Rufinus founded a monastery on his estate of Rouphinianae. Claudian’s *In Rufinum* is a masterpiece of invective directed against him.


**RUFINUS OF AQUELLEIA,** more fully Tyrannius Rufinus, Latin writer and translator; born at Concordia near Aquileia ca.345, died Messina 410. After studies in Rome, where he met Jerome, Rufinus went to Egypt ca.372, thence to Jerusalem, where a decade later he founded a monastery on the Mount of Olives with Melania the Elder. In the interim, he had studied at Alexandria,
where he was captivated by the Origenism of Didymos the Blind. Returning to Aquileia in 397, he devoted his last years largely to Latin translations of the Greek fathers. The traditional date of his move south to Rome is 407; C.P. Hammond, however, argues that he left Aquileia as early as 403 (JThSt n.s. 28 [1977] 372–429) and went to Sicily ca. 408.

Rufinus’s condensed version of Eusebius’s Church History, supplemented by two books covering the period 324–95, which are either his own work or drawn from the similar (lost) church history of Gelasio of Caesarea, marks the introduction of this genre into Latin. His On Principles provides the only complete version of the First Principles of Origen, some of whose biblical commentaries he also translated. Rufinus’s History of Monks is a collection of anecdotes of Egyptian monks designed to recommend their way of life.


-R.-B.

RUFUS FESTUS. See Festus.

RULES, MONASTIC. See Typikon, Monastic.

RULING PATTERNS. Ruling determines the layout of each page of the codex (number of columns, width, and number of lines of main text, and, where applicable, of the commentary). The ruling was made by the scribe or by a specialized member of the scriptorium by pricking holes with a spiked lead wheel and a circle. Ruling was applied either separately on each folio or bifolium of the quire or only once on and through the top folio to underlying folios. Classification of ruling patterns and ruling systems is important in codicology for localization of scriptoria and dating. Inventories and classification of ruling patterns have been made by Lake (infra) and, more recently, A. Tselikas (Thesaurismata 13 [1976] 297–318) and Leroy (infra).

RÜM, term in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish designating Byzantium (the empire of the Rhomaioi); it also referred to ancient Greece and the Roman Empire. After the Seljuk conquest of Asia Minor in the late 11th C., the conquered territory became the sultanate of Rüm. Under the Ottomans Rüm included the districts of Amasya (Amaseia) and Sivas (Sebasteia). Geographic names such as Rumeli and Erzurum were based on the root of Rüm.


-A.K.
RUMANIAN ART AND ARCHITECTURE. Architectural remains of the early medieval period in the territory of modern Rumania show a dependence on late Roman and Byz. types; 4th-C. Tropaeum had several three-aisled basilicas, as did Histria (4th–6th C.). Treasures found at Conceshti and Apahida (ca.400) comprise silver repoussé vessels decorated with classical themes. Capitals from Tomis (6th C.) belong to the Justinianic impost type.

One of the first dated ensembles is the fortress on the Danubian island of Păcuiul lui Soare, built by John I Tzimiskes around 972. Elsewhere churches show Byz. influence filtered through Bulgaria: the small church in the cemetery of Dinogetia (11th–12th C.) has a central dome over a shallow cruciform space carved out of the thickness of the wall, similar to the east church at Bojana. The narrow rows of rough stone alternating with tripled rows of brick is a crude version of a Byz. building technique. Ceramic finds from the period before the 14th C. include unglazed amphoras and tableware of Byz. manufacture as well as copies they inspired.

In the 14th C., Wallachia and Moldavia achieved political independence from Hungary and, with the appointment of an Orthodox metropolitan of Wallachia (1359), Byz. influence became even more pronounced. The royal church of St. Nicholas-Domneasca at Curtea de Argeș, built before 1352, exhibits a variation of the cross-in-square plan, with the dome resting on large square piers. The sober façade consists of courses of rough stone alternating with tripled bands of brick. The large, wide proportions of the church and the scarcity of windows allow the maximum surface for frescoes, which cover the interior in a continuous layer. In program and iconography, these paintings are astonishingly close to the narthex mosaics of the Chora church.

Byz. influence transmitted via Serbia becomes dominant in the later 14th C. It is attributed to the Serbian monk Nikodemos, who came from Athos to Wallachia and founded several monasteries with churches of a trefoil plan. The monastic church of Cozia (1386) is a domed triconch built of ashlar masonry alternating with tripled bands of brick. The exterior is articulated by pilasters supporting an arcade; round windows in the arcade are filled with interlaced geometric and floral sculpture designs. The frescoes date from the same time as the church. Churches at Cotmeana and Siret in Moldavia, related contemporary triconchs, are decorated with inset ceramic panels, circular and cross-shaped, as well as with dogtooth brick bands.

The Orthodox liturgy even had an impact on buildings of Western type: for example, the Church of St. Nicholas in Rădăuți, the earliest surviving church in Moldavia (1359–65), is a barrel-vaulted basilica, but the four piers in the naos are evidently inspired by the Byz. cross-in-square plan.

Other arts show similar influence from Byz. Graffito bowls of both imported and local manufacture are found everywhere by the 13th and 14th C. Jewelry finds likewise include both imported pieces and copies made locally following Byz. types.

Icons were not produced until the 16th C., but MSS were being copied and illuminated a full century earlier. A Slavonic Gospel book written by Nikodim (1404/5), preserved at Putna monastery, is illuminated with initials and simple headpieces reflecting Byz. ornamental motifs. Manuscripts by Gavril Uric from Neamț—the bilingual Greco-Slavonic Gospels of Alexander the Good (Oxford, Bodl. can. gr. 122) from 1429 and a Slavonic Gospels from 1435/6 (now at Neamț)—have pylon-shaped headpieces and initials decorated with interlace and vegetal designs. Both MSS contain evangelist portraits. The latter MS has its original silver repoussé covers; in the center the front cover is the Anastasis.

Carved wooden doors are preserved at several monasteries. Those of the Annunciation Chapel at Snagov (1453) have three registers of figures: the Annunciation with David and Solomon displaying scrolls on top, two pairs of church fathers framed by arches in the middle, and two equestrian saints under arches below. Slavonic inscriptions frame the doors and fill the arches, but the selection of these figures as well as their style and dress are Byz.

Many fine embroidered liturgical textiles have also been preserved in Rumania. The epitaphios of Neamț, ordered by the hegoumenos Silvan in 1437, was embellished with gold, silver, and pearls, probably in Constantinople. Greek inscriptions identify the figures, while the border inscription is in Slavonic. The eptirachelion of Antim at
Tismana (1370) is decorated with busts of saints in roundels that echo carved and painted motifs of the Morava school.

Art reached its zenith during the 15th and 16th C. Exterior church painting and MS illumination preserve Byz. iconography and the late Palaiologan style to such an extent that the culture has been described as “Byzance après Byzance.”


E.C.S.

RUMANIANS. The origin of this people is enigmatic. Most probably they are descendants of romanized Daco-Getans and hellenized Thraciants, who absorbed some Slavic and other ethnic elements. Written sources are silent on Rumanian ethnogeny, however, and it can be established only on the basis of archaeological data; thus, the results remain tentative and hypothetical. By the 11th C. the Vlachs were mentioned in sources as existing throughout the whole northern Balkan peninsula, but not north of the Danube; there is no reason, however, to date the creation of the first Rumanian “state formations” to the 10th C., as does Ş. Ştefănescu (Dacoromania 1 [1973] 104–13). The hotly debated problem of whether or not the Second Bulgarian Empire was founded by the Proto-Rumanians depends on the interpretation of the term Blachoi in Niketas Choniates—did he mean the Vlachs proper or did he use the term inaccurately, applying it to Bulgarians? The first unquestionable testimonies to the Proto-Rumanian states belong to the 13th–14th C., when the principalities in Dobrudja, Wallachia, and Moldavia were created; the Slavic ethnic substratum as well as Slavic linguistic elements were, at this time, strongly interwoven with “post-Roman” traditions. The young principalities were conquered by the Turks in the late 14th–15th C.


RUS’ (oi’ Pos, sometimes ‘Pós), people from Rhosia, first mentioned in the Annales Bertiniani for 839; the earliest reference in Greek is by Photios (Homilies 3 and 4), who describes their attack on Constantinople in 860. Mention of the Rus’in the vita of George of Amastris may be a later insertion (A. Markopoulos, JÖB 28 [1979] 75–82). The earliest Rus’ were Scandinavians (Vikings of Varangians). Constantine VII, in his description of the Dnieper rapids (De adm. imp.
ports from the Rus’ were furs (J. Martin, *Treasure from the Land of Darkness* [Cambridge 1986] 35–47, 115–18), honey, wax, and probably slaves. Exports to the Rus’, both directly from and through Constantinople and from the Byz. cities on the Black Sea, included amphorae with oil and wine, coins, walnuts, Caucasian boxwood, silks, and glass. The pattern of trade was uneven. Byz. coins circulated in small quantities before ca.950, then regularly until ca.1050, then sparsely until ca.1130, then not at all (T. Noonan, *BS/EB* 7 [1980] 143–81). Some types of glass ceased to be exported in the early 11th C., because the equivalent technology had been acquired for local production in Kiev (Ju. Ščapova, *Vizvrem* 19 [1961] 60–75). It is widely suggested that trade along the Dnieper via Kiev declined in the late 12th C., but finds in the Polock region indicate no significant reduction until the early 13th C. (F. Gurevič, *Vizvrem* 47 [1986] 65–81).

The political focus of Byz.-Rus’ relations, by contrast, did change. By the mid-12th C. Kiev had lost its dominance over the principalities of the Rus’. Galitza, Suzdal’, Novgorod, and Smolensk pursued increasingly independent foreign policies. Manuel I, for example, was supported by Galitza and Suzdal’ against the pro-Hungarian Ijjaslav II of Kiev (1146–54). Exiled princes of the Rus’ from Černigov (1079) and Polock (1130) were received in Constantinople (*PSRL* 1:204, 2:293), while in 1162 the relatives of Andrej of Bogoljubovo were given lands on the Danube (*PSRL* 2:561; Kimm. 232.3–12). Twelfth-century Byz. writers show a particular interest in Galitza and the northern Pontic region, rather than concentrating on Kiev. However, political relations at the highest level were seldom intimate. After the marriages of Vladimir I Svjatoslavič and (perhaps) of his grandson Vsevolod to imperial brides, there is no reliable evidence that any Rjurikid prince or princess married into the imperial family.

Cultural contacts with the Rus’ intensified with the spread of Christianity. In 867 Photios claimed in an encyclical to the Eastern patriarchs, perhaps overoptimistically, that the Rus’ had been converted (ep.2:293–302). This group of Rus’ (cf. *TheophCont* 196.6–7, 342.20) had little connection with the later Rus’ of Kiev and may have operated from settlements on the Black Sea (J.-P. Arrignon, *RES* 55 [1983] 129–37) or from the Azov region (G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia* [New Haven
RUS', ART AND ARCHITECTURE OF

The Byz. tradition was the primary inspiration of "high" art in medieval Russia. While examples of Byz. art penetrated Rus' before the nation's conversion to Christianity, the major Byz. impact began with the official adoption of Christianity in 988 and is most noticeable in the religious arts. A second period of major artistic impact from Byz. can be discerned in the latter part of the 14th C.

The Povest' vremennykh let notes that the newly converted Vladimir I of Kiev returned to his capital from Chersones not only with clergy, but also with books, sacred vessels, and icons. These doubtless served as models for the primitive production of religious artifacts in the newly christianized land. Soon, however, Byz. architects and painters were brought to build and decorate churches. Kiev's Des'jatinnaia ("Tithe") Church (989–96), apparently a traditional Byz. three-nave, cross-in-square masonry edifice surrounded by galleries, was erected by Greek architects. In less important centers, wooden churches seem to have sufficed for practice of the Christian cult. Under Jaroslav of Kiev, however, masonry building burgeoned in Rus'. The ruling city of Kiev was graced with a triumphal "Golden Gate," inspired by the portal of the same name in Constantinople as well as with the Church of St. Sophia. Like this cathedral, the slightly later Dormition Church (ca. 1073) of the Caves Monastery near Kiev, a single-domed, cross-in-square structure with three apses and an integrated western narthex bay, appears to be the work of Byz. architects.

While the major masonry churches in southern Rus'—including the Transfiguration church in

1943) 345–53). M. Brajčevskij (VisVrem 47 [1986] 31–38) asserts that in 863 Photios addressed a letter to the Kiev prince Askold and to the metropolitan of Rus' Michael the Syrian protesting against the activity of papal envoys in Kiev, but there are no serious data to substantiate this hypothesis. The 911 Russo-Byz. treaty assumes that the Rus' were pagan, whereas the 944 treaty refers to a church in Kiev and Constantine VII mentions "baptized Rus" (probably Varangian mercenaries) in Constantinople (De cer. 579:21–22). Ol'ga was herself baptized, but Christianity only became the "official" religion after Vladimir’s conversion in 988. Thenceforth Rus' became an ecclesiastical province of the patriarchate of Constantinople, under the metropolitan of Kiev. The metropolitan was normally a Greek (with few exceptions, such as Ilarion or Klim Smoljatic), as were many of his suffragan bishops (11 bishoprics were established by the late 12th C.—Notitiae CP, no. 13:759–70). The seals of the metropolitan and bishops were inscribed in Greek (V. Janin, Aktovye pechatii Drevniej Rusi, vol. 1 [Moscow 1970] 44–59).

Despite political fragmentation and the Mongol invasion, the metropolitan see retained its unified structure until the 14th-C. expansion of Lithuania and Poland into the lands of the Rus'. A monastery tou Rhos on Athos is first mentioned in 1016; this is probably the monastery tou Xylourgou attested in documents of 1030, 1048, 1070, and 1142, which in 1169 acquired the Panteleimon monastery (Rossikon) on Athos (D. Nastase, Symmeikta 6 [1985] 284–97). There were also Greek monks in Kiev.

For the converted Rus', Constantinople itself became the model of civilization and a place of pilgrimage (see Danil Igunen, Antony of Novgorod). Greek architects, craftsmen, and painters were brought in to build and decorate the major 11th-C. public buildings; Byz. exports now included icons and liturgical silver; some princes of the 11th through early 12th C. had Greek seals (Janin, supra 1:14–42); the art and architecture and most of the literature of the Rus' followed Byz. ecclesiastical patterns, modified to local perceptions and conditions.

This diversification of contacts over the 11th and 12th C. is reflected in the attitudes of Byz. writers, who, while not abandoning the "belligerent Scythian" stereotype, also show a more specific awareness of customs and even language of the

Rus' (A. Kazhdan in Okeanos 354–56). Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 522:28) may call the Rus' Taurocthyians, but he also refers to them as "most Christian people." In modern nomenclature Rus' is usually applied to the territory populated by the Rus', as in Kievian Rus'.


—S.C.F.
Černigov, an elongated, five-domed, cross-in-square church with three apses and two-level arcades at either side of the wide central bay (ca. 1056)—are Byz.-style buildings erected on foreign territory, the same cannot be said of the churches built in the northern city of Novgorod. Its Sophia church (1045), for example, while Byz. in plan and general conception, betrays features deemed characteristic of the architecture of Rus', most notably increased height and pointed domes, that combine to create a pyramidal silhouette, a feature already discernible in the arrangement of the thirteen domes of St. Sophia at Kiev. The unusually tall churches of the St. Antony (1117) and St. George (1119) monasteries near Novgorod are often seen as dramatic examples of a russianizing of Byz. architectural vocabulary in the north. These tendencies, albeit in less radical form, appear, too, in the Suzdal school of architecture, notable also for its broad use of exterior bas-relief decoration (Dormition cathedral, 1158, 1189; St. Demetrius, 1194, both in Vladimir).

Just as architects were brought to Kievian Rus' "from Greece," so too were painters and mosaicists. Like St. Sophia in Kiev, but in a more illusionistic style, both the Dormition church of the Caves Monastery and the main church of the St. Michael "Golden-topped" (Zlatoverchij) Monastery (1108) also had traditional Byz. pictorial cycles in mosaic. Outside of Kiev, however, mosaic remained a medium foreign to the Rus'.. The frescoed churches of Novgorod (Spas Neredica, 1198) and its sister town Pskov (Mirožskij Monastery, ca. 1156) leave no doubt about how thoroughly Byz. techniques and iconographic cycles had been absorbed, either from traveling painters or from pattern books. Illuminated MSS such as the Ostromir Gospel (1057) and Svjatoslav's Izbornik also testify that the Rus' absorbed Byz. conventions in painting.

Byz. icons were copied in Rus' from the time of its conversion to Christianity. No pre-12th-C. panel paintings survive, yet by the 12th C. local schools of icon painting were already fully developed in Rus'. The most important of these was that of Novgorod, where artists imitated Byz. paintings of the Komnenian period, such as the 12th-C. Constantinopolitan icon of the Virgin of Vladimir, but also drew on a strong, almost primitive, local tradition marked by the use of large juxtaposed blocks of bright colors.

The "minor arts" of Rus', particularly jewelry, metal work, and bone, wood, and stone carving, are also heavily indebted to Byz. models, often reproducing Byz.-style figures and scenes in unexpected media, sometimes juxtaposed with fantastic animals from Slavic folklore. Indeed, Byz. influence also affected the popular arts, where one finds not only Byz. figures and scenes reproduced in folk painting along with Slavic pagan motifs, but also bas-relief icons and polychrome wood sculpture imitating traditional Byz. religious painting.

As the Rus' shed the Mongol yoke in the late 14th C., a new Russian state arose, centered on the upper reaches of the Volga river basin. The massive building program of this new state, which would eventually coalesce as Muscovy, attracted Byz. artists who brought to the cities and monasteries of northeastern Russia the latest trends in Constantinopolitan painting. Theophanes "the Greek" stands out among the painters who reinvigorated the long Byz. tradition in Russia. His impact is also visible in the work of Andrej Rublev, a Russian master who combined delicate and highly refined Palaiologan artistic techniques and sophisticated theological concepts with the strong linear traditions seen in Novgorodian painting and thereby created masterpieces of 15th-C. Byz.-style art such as the "Old Testament Trinity" icon.

Byz. art challenged Russian creativity with new ideals, forms, and techniques. The art of medieval Russia was in large part a response to that challenge in the very vocabulary of the Byz. challenger.


**RUS', LITERATURE OF.** The literature of Kievian and Muscovite Rus' chiefly consists of translations from Greek into Church Slavonic (mosty via Bulgaria) and of native works written in a Byz. manner. For the historian of Byz. texts, therefore, material from Rus' can provide important evidence where Greek MSS are sparse or lost. For the cultural historian, however, the literature of Rus' is neither a precise copy nor merely a defec-
tive copy of a Byz. model. In the process of "cultural translation" the authoritative Byz. prototypes were modified in accordance with local resources, experience, and perceptions.

The content of the literature of early Rus' was principally directed toward (1) explaining, justifying, and propagating the precepts and practices of Christianity in its new and sometimes hostile environment and (2) reinforcing the authority of the rulers who sponsored it. Beyond a basic concern for the works needed in the liturgy and in the organization of ecclesiastical and monastic life, the interests of writers were more ethical and ethnic than speculative or antiquarian. They tended to operate through narrative example (chronicle, hagiography: see Povest' Vremennykh Let, Boris and Gleb, Feodosij of Pečera, Paterik, Epifaniy, and Kiprian) and by instruction and exhortation (homilies, canonical instruction: see Ilarion, Vladimir Monomach, Kirill of Turov, Seraphion of Vladimir, Kirik of Novgorod, Nikephoros I, and John II), while virtually ignoring the "philosophical" and rhetorical pursuits of the intellectual elite of Constantinople. Only as an exception did Greek secular narrative (e.g., Digenes Akritas; Stephanites and Ichnelates) penetrate to Rus'.

The writers of Rus' did not identify with the Roman past of the Rhomaioi, had no pseudoclassical paideia, and placed no special value on classical forms of expression. Constantinople itself, however, was a persistent literary presence: apart from accounts of Russo-Byz. relations, there are narratives of the captures of Constantinople in 1204 and 1453 (see Tale of the Taking of Tsar'grad) and several descriptions of the city by pilgrims and travelers (Antony of Novgorod, Stefan of Novgorod, Ignatij of Smolensk, Zosima).


RUŠĂFAH. See Sergiopolis.

RUSSIAN PRIMARY CHRONICLE. See Povest' Vremennykh Let.

RUTILIUS CLAUDIUS NAMATIANUS, 5th-C. Latin writer from a noble family in Gaul, perhaps Toulouse. He served as magister officiorum in the West (412) and prefect of Rome (in 414). His poem De reditu suo (a provisional title) describes his return home (from Rome as far as Luna on the bay of La Spezia) in Oct.–Nov., probably 417 (Al. Cameron, JRS 57 [1967] 31–39). The first book lacks its opening, the second breaks off after only 68 lines, albeit a little is restored by a newly discovered fragment (M. Ferrari, ItMedUm 16 [1973] 15–30). Basically a travel poem in a long classical tradition, Rutilius's piece also exploits the currently fashionable (in East and West) genre of patria, Rome being treated as an exordial eulogy and long valediction. Contemporary matters obtrude, notably an attack on Stilicho in obvious contrast to Claudian, also invectives against Jews and monks. Style and content betray no overt debts to Christianity, but this does not automatically make him a pagan.

SABAITIC TYPika, final generation of liturgical TYPika codifying the neo-Sabaitic rite formed when the monasteries of Palestine, which followed the rite of the Lavra of St. Sabas, adapted the STOUTDITE TYPika to their own needs. The Sabaitic typikon in its final, Athonite redaction became the definitive liturgical synthesis of the BYZANTINE RITE under the hesychasts in the 14th C. The earliest Sabaitic typika are distinguished from Stoudite typika in that they begin with a description of the agrypna or monastic vigil (Dmitrievskij, Opisanie 3:20).


SABAS (Σάβας), saint; born village of Moutalaska in Cappadocia in 439, died in his Lavra 5 Dec. 532. As a boy Sabas was placed in the monastery of Flaviana, near his native village; ca.456 he left for Palestine and was accepted as a disciple by EUTHYMIOS THE GREAT. Subsequently he visited Alexandria, where he met his parents. They tried to persuade him to become an officer in the noumeros of the Isaurians; Sabas refused, however, and having taken 3 nomismata from his parents, returned to Palestine. In 483 (Schwartz, infra 99,10) Sabas established near Jerusalem the Lavra (see SABAS, GREAT LAVRA OF), which attracted monks from Armenia, Isauria, and other remote places. Sabas had to cope with the resistance of certain brethren who finally seceded and built their own koinobion, the New Lavra. Sabas organized at least six other monasteries. He supported the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon, but his journey to Constantinople and attempt to persuade Emp. Anastasios I to abandon his support of Monophysitism proved fruitless. Under Sabas's name is preserved a type of liturgical typikon (see SABAITIC TYPika).

Cyril of Skythopolis wrote his vita, an important source for understanding monasticism in Palestine, where monks were striving for salvation amid danger from Saracens, robbers, and religious dissidents and from which Constantinople appeared very remote. Sabas regularly worked miracles of healing; he was also very close to nature, and a lion visited him in a cave after he was forced by rebellious monks to leave the Lavra. Sabas, an old monk with a long beard, is very often represented in monumental painting in the company of other ascetics, esp. St. Euthymios.


Sacopoulou, Asnou 1061. M. Lechner, LCI 8:296-98.

-A.K., N.P.S.

SABAS, GREAT LAVRA OF (Mar Saba), monastic settlement southeast of Jerusalem, traditionally founded in 483 by the ascetic St. SABAS. After having visited the Egyptian desert, Sabas lived in Palestine as a solitary and attracted disciples who lived near him as anachoretai, thus giving rise to a monastic complex or lavra of modified Egyptian type. The monastery expanded physically with the building of churches and dependencies. It was the intellectual and spiritual center for the patriarchy of Jerusalem and for Palestinian monasticism in general. After serving as a focal point of resistance to imperial MONOTHELETE policies in the 7th C., Mar Saba continued its prominent role in Chalcedonian Christian Palestine even after the Arab conquest, leading the way in the change from Greek to Arabic as the dominant cultural language of the area's Christians. Mar Saba attracted prominent visitors, from CYRIL OF SKYTHOPOULIS, biographer of Sabas, to JOHN OF DAMASCUS; numerous scholars and writers worked in its library, and its scriptorium continued to produce MSS as late as the 11th-12th C., some illustrated (A. Cutler, Journal of Jewish Art 6 [1979] 69). Manuscripts from the Mar Saba library, which numbered more than 1,000 in 1834, are found in many European libraries. The Lavra still exists today.
SABAS THE GOTH, Christian martyr and saint; born in “Gotthia” 334, died 12 Apr. 372; feastday 17 Apr. The account of his martyrdom, written in the form of a letter from the church of Gotthia to the church of Cappadocia, is preserved in two MSS (of the 10th–11th C. and of 912). An uneducated peasant from a Gothic kome, Sabas refused to yield to demands of local magnates and the king (basiliskos) Athanaric to eat meat that had been sacrificed to idols; he was drowned in the Mousaisos River (?). His body was sent by Ounios (Junius) Soranos, dux of Scythia, to Cappadocia. Some hints at these events are found in letters of Basil the Great: in letter 155 (ed. Y. Courtonne, 2 [1961] 80f) Basil addresses a man who was collecting in Scythia the relics of the victims of the new persecutions; in letter 164.1, addressed to Ascholios, bishop of Thessalonike, he mentions “a martyr who came to us from the barbarians dwelling beyond the Istros” (2:98.26–27); in letter 165 he writes that Ascholios honored his motherland (evidently Cappadocia) by sending there “a new martyr who had flourished in a neighboring barbarian country” (2:101.23–25). The letters are dated to 373–374. The discrepancy between the two versions of events, crediting both the dux Junius Soranos and Bp. Ascholios with sending the relics, has not been resolved.


SABELLIANISM. See Monarchianism.

SABIRI (Σαβιροί), a substantial branch of the Huns who appear in the Greek sources as inhabiting the Caucasian region of the Boas River in the 5th and 6th C. The Byz. and Persians bought the alliance of their chiefs with gold as they needed them during their various wars in the Caucasus and Armenia. In 530 the Sabiri furnished 3,000 troops to the forces of Kavad I, and in 550, 12,000 to the Persian general Mermores. The Sabiri were of particular importance to the Byz. and Persians not only because of their military prowess, but also because of a particular technological innovation which they made in siege machinery (see Artillery and Siege Machinery). The Byz. and Persian engineers customarily made battering rams of heavy beam construction, rendering them cumbersome and difficult to maneuver in precipitous terrain. When the Byz. besieged the fortified mountain city of Petra (in Lazika), the traditional battering rams could not be brought into place. Thus they called for Sabiri, who had invented a new light ram, devoid of the heavy structural beams, which could be carried on the backs of 40 men. The central beam of these light rams would dislodge stones in the city wall, and armored soldiers would then pry them loose with picks (Prokopios, Wars 8.11.11–34). This technology was soon adopted by the Persians, who also had recourse to the Sabiri and their battering rams in the siege of the city of Archaiopolis in Lazika.


SABORIOS (Σαβώριος), 7th-C. general and rebel. He was said to be of Persian origin (Περσογενής) by Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 348.29–30) but usually is considered Armenian (Toumanoff, “Caucasia” 149). He is sometimes identified with “Pasagnathes, the patrichios of the Armenians,” who rebelled against Constans II in 651/2 (P. Peeters, Byzantion 8 [1933] 405–23). Saborios was strategos of Armeniakon in 667, when he revolted against Constans II. He sent the stratelates Sergios to Muʿawiyah for aid. Despite the protests of the koubikoularios Andrew, sent to Damascus by the emperor’s son Constantine (IV), Sergios persuaded Muʿawiyah to help Saborios. The revolt soon collapsed. Captured en route to Saborios, Sergios was executed by Andrew. Saborios, waiting at Adrianople (Hexapolis in Asia Minor) for Muʿawiyah’s troops, was preparing to confront an army sent by Constantine when he died accidentally: his horse bolted and rammed his head into a city gate.

Lit. Stratos, Byzantium 3:296–47. —P.A.H.

SACHLIKES, STEPHEN, poet; born Chandax, Crete, ca.1331/2, died there after 1391. Until re-
cently, assigned to the second half of the 15th or early 16th C., Sachlikes (Σαχλίκης) has now been firmly placed in the 14th C. by M.I. Manousakas and A.F. van Gemert (Pepragmena tou D' Diethnous Kretologikou Synedriou, vol. 2 [Athens 1981] 215–31). Details of the life of Sachlikes are known both from Venetian documents and from his autobiographical poem A Curious Tale (Aphegesis para-xenos). He represents himself as the son of well-to-do parents, a youth who dropped out of school, turned to debauchery, and squandered his inheritance, but this may be a literary convention. From archival sources we know that he was a member of the Maggior Consilio of Chandax from 1356 to 1361. He was imprisoned ca.1370/1, perhaps as the result of involvement with a widow; after his release from prison he attempted farming, but was unsuccessful. Upon his return to Chandax, Sachlikes served as a lawyer (diekegoros); he is mentioned in notarial documents in this capacity from ca.1382/3 until 1391.

His poetry, written in the vernacular and political verse, reflects the bitter disillusionment of a disappointed man. Besides A Curious Tale, he composed several poems on his imprisonment. Two of his works, The Pimps (Hoi Archemaulistres) and Council of the Prostitutes (Boule ton Politikon), satirize women of loose morals. Other poems attack greedy and corrupt lawyers and fickle friends who abandoned him during his imprisonment. He finds little consolation in religion and laments the uncertainty of human fortunes. Sachlikes is noted as one of the earliest Greek poets to make occasional use of rhyme.


SACIDAVA (Σκεδέβα in Prokopios, mod. Musait, near Constanţa in Rumania), a Roman fort erected at the end of the 3rd C. (on the site of an older settlement) on the right bank of the Danube, between DOROSTOLON and AXIOPOLIS. The name Sacidava is known from the Notitia dignitatum as well as from a 3rd-C. milestone found south of Axiopolis. Excavations on the hill above Musait have revealed a modest fortress, built of large blocks set in lime mortar mixed with crushed bricks; it was reinforced by rectangular towers. Coins from Aurelian to Theodosios II are numerous (more than 150 examples), whereas there are no coins from the second half of the 5th C. and only ten from the period of Anastasios I to Maurice (G.P. Bordea, SCN 6 [1975] 72–80). C. Scorpan (infra), however, insists on the continuity of Sacidava throughout the 5th C.


-A.K.

SACRAMENTS (μυστήρια, lit. "mysteries"), liturgical rites believed to continue the mystery of Jesus’ saving presence and action in his church through the Holy Spirit. Often described as “ineffable” and “awe-inspiring,” sacraments were interpreted, like the Incarnation of Jesus, as being the visible side of a hidden reality perceptible only with the eyes of faith, windows through which the Sun of Justice (sol justitiae) penetrates this shadowy world (W. Völker, Die Sakramentsmystik des Nikolaus Kabasilas [Wiesbaden 1977] 45–48).

Individual sacraments were not seen as isolated acts but as manifestations of the one divine economy of salvation, which included the entire ministry of the church; the customary list of seven sacraments thus appears in Byz. only quite late, in the Profession of Faith that Pope Clement IV (1265–68) required of Michael VIII in 1267. Byz. authors before this time give varying lists. John of Damascus includes the sign of the cross among the sacraments (Imag. 1:36.9–11, ed. Kotter, Schriften 3:148). Theodore of Studios lists six: baptism, Eucharist, myron (chrism), ordination, monastic profession, and the burial service (PG 99:1524B), though he also knew penance (1504–16), and, apparently, unction (325B). Symeon of Thessalonike (PG 155:177B) lists the by then traditional seven: baptism, chrismation, Eucharist, ordination, marriage (see Matrimonium Rite), penance, and unction. But his contemporary, canonist Ioasaph of Ephesus, rejected the limitation to seven and listed ten: the usual seven plus burial, enkainia, and monastic profession (Kanonîčeskie otvetzy Ioasafa, ed. A.I. Almazov [Odessa 1903] 38).
Byz. liturgical books take no account of the theological distinction between sacraments and other prayers and rituals. They reserve the term mysteria to the Eucharist or the eucharistic species; the euchologion calls other rites, sacramental or not, simply "prayers" or akolouthiai. Byz. sacramental mystagogy reached its classical expression in Kabasila's 'The Life in Christ' (La vie en Christ, ed. M.H. Congourdeau [Paris 1989–]).

Representation in Art. Depictions of the sacraments usually figure in narratives of sacred Scripture and the lives of the saints. The Eucharist is the only sacrament that from the 6th C. is depicted for its own sake. It is represented on liturgical vessels, e.g., the Riha paten (see Kaper Koranion Treasure), and from the 11th C. on it has a place in the apse of the church (see Lord's Supper). In all cases the Eucharist is depicted as the Communion of the Apostles with Christ giving the bread and wine, while the everyday scene of the faithful taking communion is never represented. Scenes of baptism, ordination, and last rites occur frequently in hagiographical illustrations, as in the lives of Gregory of Nazianzos and his father, of St. Basil in the 9th-C. Paris Gregory, or the 11th-C. MS, Jerusalem Taphou 14. Except for the unusual representations in the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes, marriage is represented in a symbolic manner with Christ rather than the priest joining the bride and groom. The rites of confirmation and penance are not depicted.


SACRA PARALLELA (Lat., lit. "Holy Parallels"), a conventional title, introduced by M. Lequien in his edition of 1712, of a theological and ascetic florilegium. No single MS contains the complete text of the Sacra Parallela; the common opinion, however, is that various preserved versions originate from a prototype entitled Hieria (the Sacred), an important florilegium now largely lost, but compiled in the 8th C., probably in Palestine and by John of Damascus. John's authorship, however, is questionable (J.M. Hoeck, OrChriP 17 [1951] 29f) and a 10th-C. MS (Vat. gr. 1558) names the text's authors as "Leontios the priest and [an unidentified] John." Since the earliest fragments are dated in the 9th C., the Sacra Parallela could have been produced in the 8th C., probably to emulate the secular gnomologia of Stobaios.

The Sacra Parallela consists of three books, dealing respectively with God and the Trinity, man, and the theme of virtue and vice; the texts of the first two books are presented in a semialphabetical order (no strict sequence within individual letter-sections), while in the third book material is organized in logical pairs, each virtue followed by a contrasting vice. This third book is sometimes named parallela in MSS. The material is drawn from scriptural texts and church fathers (esp. Basil the Great and John Chrysostom); Philo and Josephus Flavius are also used. Eventually the Sacra Parallela was a source for the florilegium of pseudo-Maximos the Confessor and for the Melissa.

The only illustrated copy of this work and the only illustrated Byz. florilegium known is a MS in Paris (B.N. gr. 923). Very large (35.6 x 16.5 cm), it now contains 394 folios of an original 424. The majority of its 1,658 marginal images are author portraits, but the images draw also on the books of the Old Testament, the Gospels, Acts, and homiletic and historical texts, including a few arranged in short narrative sequences. All are literal illustrations of the texts to which they are attached, with gold lavished on drapery, architecture, and occasionally scenery. The MS has been variously attributed to Palestine, Italy, and Constantinople. Its sloping uncial script suggests a 9th-C. origin, although various attempts at greater precision on stylistic or iconographical grounds remain inconclusive. Several pages with text and illustrations missing in the Palaiologan period were then supplied. The MS was brought from Wallachia to the Bibliothèque Royale in Paris in 1730.


SAacrifice. See Eucharist.
SACRILEGE (ἵεροσυλία), a crime against a sacred person, thing, or place. Sacrilége against persons is mistreatment of an individual who has dedicated himself or herself to God: it ranged from raping consecrated virgins (e.g., Gregory of Nazianzos, PG 37:341B) to the beating and imprisonment of clergy or their arraignment in a secular court, a procedure from which even patriarchs were not protected. Sacrilége against things is the misuse of sacred objects such as the eucharistic elements or icons; the Iconoclasts and Iconodules exchanged accusations of sacrilége, the Iconoclasts accusing their opponents of idolatry, while the Iconodules charged their adversaries with attacking sacred icons. Attempts of the state to confiscate sacred vessels in times of crisis (under Herakleios or Alexios I) were interpreted by the opposition as sacrilége. Simony can also be viewed as a type of sacrilége against things. Sacrilége against places is a violation of a cemetery (see Grave-Robbing) or church. The law of asylum protected churches from violent intrusions, but Byz. authors report many cases of the sacrilegious treatment of church buildings by external enemies, heretics, or warring factions, and historiographers relate stories of divine punishment for sacrilége against places. In theory, ecclesiastical lands were considered inalienable, but the perception of the seizure of church land as sacrileg. contradicted the concept of state control over all lands of the empire, and canon law yielded to pressure from the state. An excessively luxurious lifestyle on the part of clergy was also considered hierosyla (e.g., [pseudo-]Palladios, Dialogus, ed. P.R. Coleman-Norton [Cambridge 1928] 70-4).


SAEWULF, English pilgrim who visited Palestine in 1102–03, probably a merchant by profession. The focus of his Relatio, written in Latin, is Jerusalem and the Holy Land with its monuments and relics, but on the way there and back Saewulf visited Cyprus, some islands in the Aegean, and Byz. cities. His information about these sites combines reality, Christian tradition, and scraps of ancient lore. We learn that “Galienus,” whom Saewulf calls “the most highly esteemed physician,” was born in “Anchos” (in fact Pergamon); that John the Evangelist was banished to Patmos; that Andros was famous for its production of precious silk cloth; and that Smyrna was a great city. The description stops at the “Arm of St. George” (here meaning the Hellespont) and the two cities on its opposite shores, which he calls “the keys of Constantinople,” whence he sailed to Macedonia.


LIT. Beazley, Geography 2:139–55.

SAEGAS. Written mainly in the 13th C. but based on oral tales and poetry composed from the 9th C. onward, the Icelandic sagas often set the exploits of their Scandinavian heroes, such as Harald Hardrada, in Rus’ (Gardariki) and in Constantinople (Mikligard, the Great Town). They rarely provide reliably precise historical information but can corroborate and supplement evidence for events in Byz. and Rus’s, esp. concerning the Varangians. Some of their material and literary motifs probably emanated from a Varangian milieu. Stender-Petersen has suggested that parts of the Povest’ vremennykh let may also derive from Varangian sagas.


SAEGION (σαγιών, Lat. sagum), term used for several varieties of cloak. It could be worn by soldiers: a military treatise of ca.600 (Strat.Maurik. XII B.1.8) prescribed that infantrymen should wear simple belts but no “Bulgarian sagia”; heavy-weight sagia were used as blankets and tents (V.4.3–5). The term could also be used for the cloak of a hermit (John Moschos, PG 87:2908A). In the 12th C. the term appears in the typhikon of the Kecharitomene nunnery (P. Gautier, REB 43 [1985] 75.1013) as a general term for monastic robes. The sagion was also an element of court attire:
according to a 10th-C. ceremonial book, during the procession to the Church of St. Mokios, patri-kioi wore red (alethina) sagia, while protospatharioi had red spekia (De cer. 99.1–3)—the latter being, according to R. Guillard (REG 58 [1945] 196–201), a garment worn beneath the cloak. In the late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Lists 171.18–19), protospatharioi are clad in both sagia and spekia. D. Beljaev (Byzantina, vol. 2 [St. Petersburg 1893] 23f. n.2) suggested that the sagion was a “semi-festive” cloak, shorter than the chlamys. The emperor wore the sagion over the skaramangion (De cer. 192.3–4); it could be purple and have a gold-embroidered border and pearl ornament (ibid. 72.7, 634.14–16). In the Psalter of Basil II the emperor’s cloak, probably a sagion, is blue. E. Piltz (Figura n.s. 17 [1976] 13–26) wrongly associates sagion and sakkos.

Lit. J. Ebersolt, Mélanges d’histoire et d’archéologie byzantines (Paris 1917) 56f. Treitinger, Kaiseridee 25, n.75.

—A.K.

SA'ID IBN BATRÍQ. See Eutychios of Alexandria.

SAILOR (πλώιμος, also πλωτής), the holder of a naval strateia serving in the imperial navy or in the thematic fleets. Sailors fell into two categories: those who actually sailed the ship (rowers, steersmen) and the marines, who fought or launched Greek fire or projectiles against the enemy (Ahrweiler, Mer 397–407). A novel of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos set the minimum property value sufficient to support a naval strateia in the maritime themes of Samos, Aegean Sea, and Kytheraotai at four pounds of gold; such a high value was necessary because these ships, which saw more action, were self-equipped and rowed. Other thematic sailors or those of the imperial fleet (who received salaries) were to have property of at least two pounds of gold to support their strateia (Zos., Jus 1:222.9–223.9). The naval strateia was among the less burdensome, however, falling between maintenance of the public post and infantrymen (Zon. 3:506.3–6); it was fiscalized during the 11th C. before being abolished by Manuel I Komnenos.

—E.M.

SAINT (άγιος), or holy man (δικως), synonymous titles given to Christians who by their death (martyr) or by their perfect life (confessor) made manifest their close linkage with the divine world. The Byz. did not have a formal procedure of canonization until very late in their history, and the acceptance of an individual as a saint was based on local traditions, reflected in the inclusion of the saint in the church calendar and in synaxaria. Essential characteristics of saints were their constant battle against demons and their capacity for working miracles. Saints belonged to all walks of life—from emperors (John III Vatatzes) and empresses (St. Theodora [wife of Theophilos], St. Theophano [wife of Leo VI]), to patriarchs, generals, craftsmen, and peasants, and even to freedmen (Andrew the Fool), converted Jews (Constantine the Jew), and reformed criminals (Moses the Black). Saints of the 4th to 6th C. apparently originated from and were closely connected to predominantly urban milieus whereas, beginning with Nicholas of Sion and Theodore of Sykeon, the countryside and then the capital assumed the leading role in producing saints.

The cult of saints included commemoration of their anniversaries (feastdays, the days of their death), composition of their vitae, dedication of churches to them, veneration of their icons and relics; hymns in honor of the saints and readings from their vitae were included in the office. The saint was considered as the embodiment of Christian virtues, and in popular conception the image of the saint rivaled that of the emperor; the role of the saint was, however, questioned in the 12th C., at least by intellectuals (P. Magdalino in Byz. Saint 51–66). (See also Hagiography and Hagiographical Illustration.)


—A.K.

SAINT’S LIFE. See Vita.

SAINTS’ DAYS. See Calendar, Church; Feast.

SAKELLARIOS (σακελλάριος), the title of both an administrative and ecclesiastical official. The functions of the administrative sakeellarios changed
over the centuries. The first known official of this title was Paul, a former slave, appointed to the post by Zeno (Jones, LRE 3:162, n.7). The duties of the sakellarios in the early period were connected with the care of the imperial bedchamber; the official is simultaneously named spatharios and sakellarios (I. Ševčenko, ZRVI 12 [1970] 3) or koubikoularios and sakellarios (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 737, 739–42, 744, 747). Under Justinian II the eunuch Stephen was appointed sakellarios. Despite the name of the office, which implies that the sakellarios was head of the sakellion, the functions of the sakellarios were not always financial. Heraclios sent the sakellarios Theodore at the head of an army; under Constans II a sakellarios conducted the examination of Maximos the Confessor. Patr. Nikephoros I (Nikeph. 23.12, 37.12–13) calls both Theodore and Stephen “treasurers (tamiiai) of the imperial funds.” This passage indicates that by the early 8th C. the office had acquired fiscal responsibilities, but does not demonstrate (as Bury [Adm. System 85] suggested) that sakellarioi of the 7th C. were already treasurers. A seal of the early 9th C. seems to name the patriarch Basil as chartoularios of the imperial vestiarion and sakellarios (Laurent, Corpus 2, no. 748).

By the mid-9th C. the sakellarios became a general comptroller, a high-ranking official who had notaries at every sekretion. From the end of the 11th C. the epithet megas was added to the designation of sakellarios. Dölger hypothesized that after 1094 the duties of the sakellarios were assumed by the megas logariastes; later, however, the sakellarios was restored. The sakellarios functioned until 1196 (the last mentioned in Lavra 1, nos. 671).

The ecclesiastical sakellarios was a clerical official whose title probably originated in a connection between his office and a cathedral treasury (sakellion) analogous to the connection between the identically named imperial institutions. The patriarchal sakellarios rose to prominence at the end of the 11th C., acquired the epithet megas, displaced the (megas) skeuophylax as the second ranking official on the staff of the patriarchate, and became closely involved in the reform of monastic patronage undertaken by Patr. Nicholas III Grammatikos and Emp. Alexios I. By this time, the office had lost any financial functions it may have had and carried responsibility for the supervision of the monasteries of Constantinople (Balsamon, Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:534.31–32), including, notably, the registration and execution of patriarchal acts entrusting monastic houses to the care of lay patrons (see Ephoros; Charistikon). Perhaps for a time in the 14th C. this role was restricted to convents. By this date, the institution was replicated throughout the provinces. A late 15th-C. act of the metropolitan of Thesalonike shows the local megas sakellarios fulfilling exactly the same functions as his counterpart in Constantinople (ed. P. Magdalino, REB 35 [1977] 285).


SAKELLION (σακέλλιον), or sakelle, or sakellia; terms used for treasury, with three different meanings.

1. Imperial Treasury. The Byz. variously attempted to derive the etymology of the term. Anastasios of Sinai (PG 89:84CD) explained sakella as a Syriac word for “receiving,” while Balsamon (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:534.28–29) defined sakellion (sic) as “management and preservation.” Dölger (Beiträge 25) equates sakellion with the tamieion, that is, the bureau of the comes rerum privatarum. The 7th-C. texts, however, do not have this specific meaning; in the Life of John Eleemon (ch.12.5–9), Leontios of Neapolis speaks of the demosia (state) sakella, to which special taxes would flow, and in the Strategikon of Maurice (2:9.10–11), the sakellion functions as a treasury to reward soldiers freed from captivity. The sakellion was a treasury of money, to be distinguished from the vestiarion. It is generally assumed that the sakellarios was for a while a head of the sakellion, but already in the 9th-C. taktikon of Uspenskij he is distinguished from the chartoularios of the sakelle, the latter having the rank of patriarchios. Besides being a treasury, the sakellion accumulated varied functions, as can be concluded from the list of its staff which included, besides clerks, a zygostates (controller of the weight [of coins]), metretes (controller of measures), directors of philanthropic institutions, and a domestikos tes thymeles, responsible for expenditures on public amusement. By the 11th C. the sakelle was the place where the inventory (brebion) of imperial monasteries and
their properties was registered (Iv. 1, no.9.30). The sekuron was also called the “imperial sakellion,” and its head ho epi sakelliou. The extant sealed covers the period from the 8th/9th to the 11th/12th C. The last mention in written sources is of 1145 (MM 6:105,27).

2–3. Ecclesiastical Usages. Sakellion or sakelle was originally a treasury of the Great Church of Constantinople, analogous to the imperial sakellion. Possibly following imperial precedent, the officials associated with the patriarchal sakellion had, by the 1090s, lost their residual function as treasurers and become responsible for religious foundations under patriarchal jurisdiction: the megas sakellarios for monasteries and the sakelliou (ho sakelliou) for public churches.

Sakelle was also the name given to the jail of the Great Church for clerical offenders, first attested in the 10th C. (Darrouzès, Epistoliers 68.13).


SAKKOS (σάκκος), a form of tunic; the word originally meant coarse sackcloth. In the late Roman empire the sakkos was a symbol of asceticism or penitence; Sakkophoroi, “those wearing sackcloth,” became the name of a group of heretics who practiced an extreme asceticism. It is unknown how and when the word acquired the meaning of the Latin dalmatica, a T-shaped tunic with broad sleeves: it had a slit for the head and extended to the knees.

The imperial sakkos was the equivalent of or successor to the divetesion. According to a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 224.27, 256.25), the emperor wore the sakkos at his coronation at Hagia Sophia (where at one point it was covered by a mandyas), on Palm Sunday, and probably at the prokypsis. On Christmas the emperor wore a black sakkos, interpreted by the same source (201.10–12) as symbolic of the “mystery of imperial power”; this color, however, might reflect the early meaning of the word as the garb of penitence and asceticism.

The sakkos was also a church vestment. According to Balsamon (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:478.26–33, 546.31), the wearing of the sakkos was a patriarchal prerogative, but by the 13th C. it was permitted to certain metropolitans, and its use was eventually extended to bishops as well. As a vestment it was richly ornamented; the most elaborate as well as the earliest surviving example is the so-called Dalmatic of Charlemagne (14th C.). From the 14th C. onward, Christ is sometimes depicted wearing the sakkos in scenes of the Communion of the Apostles in apse decoration.


SALADIN (Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yusuf ibn Ayyūb), sultan of Egypt (from 1169), Damascus (from 1174), and Aleppo (from 1183), and suzerain of Mosul (from 1186); born Takrit 1138, died Damascus 4 Mar. 1193. Having reunified the lands of Nūr al-Dīn, Saladin concentrated on war against the Crusader states. About 1185 Andronikos I allegedly asked him for an alliance. After Saladin conquered Jerusalem in 1187, Isaac II requested his friendship and allowed the recognition of the ‘Abbāsid caliph in the mosque in Constantinople. Saladin’s embassies to Constantinople (1188–89) sought information about the gathering Third Crusade and seemingly encouraged Isaac to resist Crusader armies that passed through Byz. Isaac probably sought favor for Greek Orthodoxy and possibly territorial grants in Saladin’s realm. Isaac therefore tried to destroy the Crusade of Frederick I Barbarossa. In 1190–92 Isaac’s frequent messages to Saladin seem to have gained an ineffective alliance against Isaac Komnenos, basileus of Cyprus. The relationship between Saladin and Isaac justified Westerners in depicting Byz. as pro-Muslim. Saladin founded the Ayyūbid dynasty.


SALAMIS. See Cyprus.

SALE (πρασμα), a legal transaction in which rights of disposal are exchanged for money. In general, all things (movable and immovable, animals) and rights (including state functions and dignities,
the purchase of titles) could be the basis for a sale contract. Limitations arose as a result of various economic, political, and social concerns, for example, with regard to ecclesiastical or military property (stratiotika ktemata), in transactions involving politically sensitive goods (purple dye, weaponry), in the market regulations of big cities, in the protimesis of neighbors, in the prohibition against selling oneself, in the respect for slave families, etc. An admissible sale contract could be either oral or written. In the case of defects in the merchandise, the goods could be returned within six months or a reduction in the price could be demanded within a year. Special regulations governed the purchase of animals in the marketplace (Bk. of Eparch 21.5.6). The seller had to protect the buyer from legal deficiencies (dephension). If the seller did not succeed in the dephension and the item was lost, the buyer was entitled to double the sale price plus the value of improvements made to it (beltosis). Apart from the laesio enormis (or diplaisiastmos: if the sale price was less than half the value of the item), which was operative in every sale, price regulation is documented primarily for transactions involving the provisioning of Constantinople (see Monopoly).

Deeds of Purchase. Some Byz. formularies of deeds of purchase have survived (e.g., D. Simon, S. Troiano, FM 2 [1977] 267–71, 290f) as have actual documents, both originals and copies. The earlier documents are primarily papyri from Egypt, the Albertini tablets, and Ravena papyri; the later ones are charters in monastic archives. G. Ferrari (Byzantinisches Archiv 4 [1910] 100) stressed the uniformity that characterizes Byz. deeds of purchase and their similarity in structure with those from southern Italy; according to D. Simon (in Flores legum H.I. Scheltema oblati [Groningen 1971] 175), this uniformity originated in the 6th C. due to the activity of law schools in Constantinople and Berytus. Byz. deeds of purchase from the 13th–14th C. show certain significant local variations, so that it is possible to distinguish the clauses or sections of documents from chancelleries in Thessalonike, Serres, Mileston, and Smyrna (Kazhdan, Agrarnye otnošenija 28–36).


SALERNO (Σαλερνών, in De adm. imp. 27.4), city in Campania on the southwest coast of Italy. It was captured by the Lombards probably after 625 (T.C. Lounghis, Les ambassades byzantines en Occident [Athens 1986] 107) and formed a part of the duchy of Benevento. By 849 Salerno gained independence and formed a separate duchy. Like Benevento and Capua, Salerno was threatened by Arab attacks and by the end of the 9th C. had to acknowledge Byz. suzerainty. In 887 the Byz. confirmed the possessions of Guaimar I of Salerno within the borders of 849 and conferred upon him the title of patrikios; in 893/4 they even attempted to seize Salerno but failed (Falkenhauen, Dominazione 361f). After a victory over the Arabs at the Garigliano in 915, the Byz. experienced a series of setbacks in the 920s that allowed Guaimar II of Salerno to strengthen his position and subjugate some territories in Lucania.

In the mid-10th C. a new element appeared on the scene in Italy—the Germany of Otto I. Pal- dolfo I Capodiferro of Capua became Otto's vassal and under his rule assembled Lombard lands in central Italy; in 977 Paldolf established his authority over Salerno. After Paldolf's death in 981, however, his great dominion disintegrated, and the inhabitants of Salerno accepted as their ruler the duke Manso of Amalfi (966–1004), an ally of Byz. Otto II besieged Salerno in 982; the city surrendered only after Otto had recognized Manso. Salerno continued to profit from the rivalry of the two empires that enabled Guaimar V (1027–52) to consolidate his rule; he united Capua, Amalfi, and Gaeta under his authority and, acting in concert with the Normans, shook off the last trances of Byz. suzerainty. It was to be only a temporary period of independence, however; Guaimar's son GISULF II (1052–76), after desperate attempts to enlist the support of Amalfi and Constantinople, surrendered his city to the Normans in 1076. Salerno was one of the centers of Byz. cultural influence in Italy, esp. famous for its medical school, which developed Greek traditions.

Monuments of Salerno. The Lombard ruler Archis II (758–87) repaired the city walls, built
a palace, and constructed a church dedicated to SS. Pietro e Paolo (Ward-Perkins, From Classical Antiquity 54, 171f, 197). The cathedral, sponsored by Archbp. Alfanus I (1058–85) and Robert Guiscard, was consecrated in 1084. Byz. bronze doors were donated by Landulfo Butrumile and his wife. Fragmentary mosaics on the east wall of the transept were identified by Kitzinger as the work of Byz.-trained craftsmen from Montecassino; more recently, however, A. Carucci reports restorations that in his opinion reveal that the mosaics must postdate the decoration of Alfanus I, putting the Cassinese connection in doubt.


—A.K., D.K.

**SÁLIHIDS**, the dominant group among Arab foederati in the 5th C., sometimes called the Zokomids. Their history is obscure and it is not entirely clear whence they wandered into Oriens and where they settled. Byz. sources have preserved the name of Zokomos, the first of their chiefs in the service of Byz., while Arabic sources cite Dāwūd (David), one of the last. The Sālihids fought for Theodosios II and participated in his two short Persian wars. They performed their function as christianized foederati until the Ghasànids eclipsed them as the dominant federate power, but they continued as Byz. allies until the Arab conquests. The first recorded instance of Arabic court poetry in Oriens is associated with the Sālihids; it was probably under their influence that a version of the Arabic script was developed in Oriens that made use of both the old Nabatean and new Syriac scripts.

LIT. Shahid, Byz. & Arabs (5th c.).

—I.A.Sh.

**SALLOUSTIOS** (Σαλούστιος), 4th-C. author of a Greek handbook of NEOPLATONISM entitled On the Gods and the World. He has been variously identified with Flavius Sallustius, consul in 363, and with Saturninus Secundus Salustius, praetorian prefect in the East in 361–67, a high political and intellectual confidant of Julian. Either way, his book can be understood as involved with Julian's anti-Christian policy.


—B.B.

**SALONA** (Σάλωνας, mod. Solin in Yugoslavia), a Roman municipium and port in Illyricum on the Dalmatian sea coast. Finds of coins and pottery suggest prosperity in the 4th C. despite the scarcity of building remains from this period (V. von Gonzenbach in Excavations at Salona, Yugoslavia, ed. C. Clairmont [Park Ridge, N.J., 1975] 134f). The mausoleum of Anastasios in the Marusinac cemetery may date as early as ca.300, while the first episcopal basilica, the southern part of Salona’s twin cathedral, may be of the mid-4th C. (Krautheimer, ECBArch 180). The northern church, the basilica urbana, dates to the first quarter of the 5th C. In the 5th C. Salona was in the hands of the Ostrogoths, who contributed to the development of Arianism in the city. Dyggeve (infra) suggests that at least one of the basilicas excavated in Salona was Arian. Salona became a metropolis and in 530 the site of a council, its bishop Honorius being called archiepiscopus. Re-conquered by the Byz. under Justinian I ca.537, Salona was subjected to Slav and Avar attacks, but probably remained inhabited until the 630s (I. Marović in Disputationes salonitanae, vol. 2 [Split 1984] 293–314). Its population then migrated to nearby Split, where the episcopal center was also transferred; the greatly venerated relics of the salonitan martyrs, however, were carried to Rome. Only the mausoleum of Anastasios was able to survive the general destruction of Salona. The site was revived as Solin under Croatian rulers by the 11th C.; some new churches were built and in 1076 King Zvonimir was crowned there.


—A.K.

**SALT** (ἀλάς). This product, essential for the preservation of food and of life, was, in the medieval and early modern periods, an important item of trade and of revenues. In Byz., salt was produced
in salines (halyke), and the state retained rights over its production and sale. An edict of Arkadios and Honorius (398) gave the managers of salines privileges over the sale and purchase of salt in the city of Rome; all others who wished to buy and sell salt could do so only if the managers (mancipes) were intermediaries (Cod. Just. IV 61.11). An edict of Justinian II (Sept. 688) granted to the Church of St. Demetrios, in gratitude for the saint’s help in the wars against the Slavs, the revenues of a saline near Thessalonike (on the west coast of the Thermaic Bay [?]). The saline is called “entirely free,” that is, it paid no taxes to the state; the clergy were exempted from giving contributions from the saline to any military person (Grégoire, infra). There were many salines near Thessalonike in the rest of Macedonia. In 1415 there were in Thessalonike at least two guilds of workers in the saline, who drew an annual salary (Diomys., no.14); they seem to have been quite an important group. Salines were granted by emperors to monasteries (Xénoph., no.1.146). There were also salines on the Black Sea coasts, in Crete, Peloponnesos, and very important ones in Cyprus.

The export of salt to “barbarians” was forbidden (Synopsis Basillicorum K.10.1, Basil. 56.1.11). The first Palaiologan emperors tried to retain or reestablish state rights over the sale of salt. The Venetians and the Genoese could not sell salt from the Black Sea in Byz. territories. They were not even allowed to unload it in Constantinople and Pera (Belgrano, “Prima serie” 116–23). The Venetians were forbidden to buy or sell salt within the empire (G.M. Thomas, Diplomatarius Veneto-Levanticum [Venice 1880; rp. New York 1966] no.73, p.129.14). Salt from the Black Sea and the Italian possessions in Romania was an important item of trade for Venice and Genoa—but they seem to have adhered to the prohibition of selling it in Pera. Alexios Apokaukos made a fortune as manager of the state salt pans, whose revenues he was accused of appropriating (Kantak. 1:118.3–5; cf. Greg. 1:301.12).


Salutovo, a village in the Ukraine near the Siverskij Donec where in 1890–1900 an extensive complex of fortified (120 hectares) and open settlements (villages) were excavated; hence the newly discovered culture (8th–10th C.) was called “Saltovo” (or “Saltovo-Majacky”); Majackoe gorodishe is located at the confluence of the Tichaja Sosna and the Don). At present more than 300 Saltovo sites have been found in a vast territory extending from the basin of the Kama river to Dagestan, the Crimea, and Bulgaria. The two variants of Saltovo culture represent two basic “ethnic” components of the Khazar state: the “Alan” in the northern Caucasus and in the Donec-Don forest-steppe zone, and the “Proto-Bulgarian” (Bulgar) in the steppe zone as well as in the region of Phanagoria (Magna Bulgaria). The Alan type is characterized by large, permanent agricultural settlements (both fortified and open) with semi-subterranean dwellings and by catacomb burials with rich grave goods. The Proto-Bulgarians were nomads or seminomads who had temporary yurt-like dwellings and narrow-pitted burial grounds. They buried the dead with their horses and with only modest offerings.

Two characteristics common to both types of Saltovo culture are a particular yellow pottery made of clay mixed with grass and sand, and “castles” of white sand. 12 of which, including Sarkel, have been found in the Donec-Don region. Some of the pottery and other artifacts display Late Antique forms and subsequently follow contemporary Byz. patterns.


Salutorium, a conventional (Western) term for the reception room located at the entrance to the palace of a ruler, official, or bishop. There is little archaeological evidence for its architectural form. The circular, domed chamber at the entrance to Diocletian’s palace at Split may have been a salutorium, as is also possible for the 5th-C. Myrelaiion rotunda and the rotunda of the Palace of Lausos in Constantinople.

SA LVAGE, RIGHT OF, a medieval custom that allowed the owners of coastal lands to take possession of cargo washed ashore after a shipwreck. The Basilica preserved the regulations of the Digest that prohibited such a seizure: thus Basil. 53.3.23 states that items found after a storm or wreck are not subject to the Longi temporis praescriptio, since they do not “lack an owner” (adesposta). The Rhodian Sea Law (par. 45) permitted the person on shore who salvaged objects from a shipwreck to take as his reward (mischos) one-fifth of them (or of their prices). Cod. Just. XI 6.1 stresses that the fisc has no right to salvaged property; it belongs to its original owner. Actual practice, however, differed from law: Andronikos I opposed the old custom of plundering wrecked ships and introduced a severe penalty for such a crime (Reg 2, no. 1566). International treaties protected ships that foundered in foreign waters: thus, the Russo-Byz. treaty of 911 prescribed that a Greek ship cast ashore in the land of Rus’ should remain safe and inviolate and established a penalty for plundering such a ship.


SA LVATION (σωτηρία), the most generic concept of Christian soteriology, designating the final restoration of mankind to its status before original sin, its deification (theosis). Theodore of Mopsuestia (PG 66:828BC) defines it as “universal liberation from evil which will take place in the future age.” The possibility of salvation was created by the mystery of redemption and is received from God/Christ through the Scripture, sacraments, orthodox belief, and upright life. Whereas Augustine stressed the necessity of the church as an institution for salvation (as an agent officiating at baptism, Eucharist, extreme unction, exorcism), some Eastern theologians (Symeon the Theologian, hesychasts) emphasized the individual way of salvation via moral purification and complete submission to God’s will.

The scope of salvation was discussed by the church fathers. The common opinion was that salvation was offered to all (e.g., Athanasios of Alexandria, PG 25:149C), but the “sons of lawlessness” were not to be saved; Origen, on the other hand, taught that in the final account every body would be granted salvation. It remained unclear when the fate of an individual was decided, whether it was immediately after death, while passing through multiple teloneia (as described in the vita of Basil the Younger), or at the last judgment. Salvation was conceived as related to both soul and body, even though the physical dwelling in Christian paradise was not depicted in such graphic terms as that of Islam. The history of mankind was seen teleologically as a way toward salvation through several stages of development; Christian thinkers dwelt much on the vision of the period preceding the last judgment, but Byz. eschatology did not reach the level of Western concepts.


SA LVIAN, Latin ecclesiastical writer; born Trier? ca. 400, died Marseilles ca. 480. After separation from his wife, Salvian lived on the island of Lérins (off the French Riviera) from ca. 424 and then ca. 439 settled as a priest at Marseilles. His major work is the Governance of God, in the eight books of which he imitates Tacitus in contrasting barbarian virtue with Roman decadence, claiming their invasions to be God’s punishment. Salvian can fairly be blamed for helping to propagate the myth of the noble savage, but his book is full of valuable secular and social history, with much on the collapse of urban life in the provinces, the barbarian impact, and passionate reflections on the poverty of the many and the oppression and decadence of the rich minority. A treatise on almsgiving, variously titled To the Church or Against Avarice, survives, as do nine letters that furnish some autobiographical details.


— B. B.
SĀMĀNIDS, a dynasty of Persian emirs (874/5–999) who ruled in Transoxiana and Persia. From their capital at Bukhara their power eventually reached to the southern shore of the Caspian Sea and the major part of modern Afghanistan. The Sāmanid state had trade relations with Iran, Khazaria, Rus’, and China. Their court was a center of the revival of Persian literature.

In the course of the 10th C. the Sāmanids faced two problems before which they eventually succumbed. First, they relied very heavily on the ghulām system for much of their military power. These Turkish slave troops eventually separated from the state and founded a rival dynasty, the Ghaznavids. Second, the demographic pressure of the Karahānid (Ilek Hân) Turks created a new political threat to the Sāmanid state in the north. Before these two forces the Sāmanid state collapsed in 999, the Karahānids occupying Transoxiana and the Ghaznavids Khurāsān. Of ultimate importance for Byz. was the fact that the Seljuk nomads made their appearance here during the three-way struggle of Karahānids, Sāmanids, and Ghaznavids. In 1040 the Seljuks defeated the Ghaznavids at Dandanaqan, decided the fate of Khurāsān, and intensified the westward progress of the Turkish nomads who would conquer and settle Byz. Anatolia.


SAMARIA. See SEBASTE.

SAMARITANS (from Samaria in the mountains of central Israel), a strictly monotheistic sect, descended, according to the Pentateuch, from the ancient Israelite tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. Led by high priests (Aaronides), Samaritans rejected the prophets and writings of the Hebrew Bible and the centrality of Jerusalem in late biblical and rabbinic Judaism. Normative Jews in turn excommunicated them. Still, Samaritans enjoyed the Jewish status of religio licita until the time of Justinian I. Their primary settlement was near Nablus, with colonies in Egypt, Syria, Thessalonike, and Constantinople. Extremely rebellious toward Byz. policy in Palestine, they revolted frequently (e.g., in 451, 484, 529, 578) and were ruthlessly crushed. Justinian destroyed their synagogues and their altar on Mt. Gerizim and imposed severe restrictions (Cod. Justin. I 5.17) that Justin II renewed in 572 (nov. 144). Mentioned among rioting mobs in Constantinople in 580, Samaritans still appear in Byz. law codes even after Arabs conquered their homeland.


SAMONAS (Σαμώνας), a favorite of Leo VI; born Melitene, ca. 875, died Constantinople? after 908. A captive Arab eunuch, Samonas served in the house of Stylianos ZAOUTZES and launched his career ca. 900 by denouncing a plot of Zaoutzes’ relatives against Leo (the vita of BASIL THE YOUNGER erroneously presented Samonas as para-kimomenos already in 896). Circa 904 Samonas made an enigmatic flight toward the eastern frontier; he was, however, arrested by Constantine Doukas and brought to trial in the senate. Although not acquitted, Samonas managed to regain imperial favor. Jenkins (infra) hypothesized that the flight was a pretense and that Samonas intended to engage in espionage within the caliphate; the sources are too meager to prove it. The episode reflects, however, the conflict between the military aristocracy (the Doukas family) and Leo’s officials. Samonas remained a staunch supporter of Leo VI during the dispute over the tetragamy and was appointed para-kimomenos (probably after the deposition of NICHOLAS I MYSTIKOS). His intrigue against the patrikios Constantine was a failure. With the help of CONSTANTINE OF RHODES, Samonas produced a letter offensive to the emperor and allegedly written by the patrikios Constantine. His plot was discovered, and in 908 Samonas was compelled to take the monastic habit. He is described with an apparent animosity in the vita of both Basil the Younger and Patr. EUTHYMIOS; Janin adopted this negative approach, while Karlin-Hayter characterized Samonas as “a trusted and powerful minister of Leo’s, particularly concerned with Security” (Vita
Samoa's career is recounted at length by John Skylitzes and depicted in a long sequence of miniatures in the illustrated version of this chronicle, Madrid, Bibli. Nac. vitr. 26-2 (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzes, nos. 251–52, 258, 261–63, 267–70).


Samos (Σάμος), island in the Aegean Sea off the west coast of Asia Minor, part of the province of the Islands (Insulae). Excavations have revealed building activity of the 4th C. in the city of Samos: a peristyle house on Kastro Tigani (R. Tölle-Kastenbein, Samos 14 [1974] 83–89) and the bath complex on the site of the former gymnasium, with coins through 352 or 354. In the 5th C. a basilica was erected (ibid. 92–105). The bath was inhabited in the 6th–7th C. (W. Martini, Samos 16 [1984] 264), and a cistern in the Heraion was active to ca. 538 (H.P. Ilsler, MDAI AA 84 [1969] 229). Thereafter many sites along the coast were abandoned, and settlement concentrated in the interior at sites such as Kastrovoune and in the vicinity of Karlovassi. The remains of many churches of the 4th–6th C. are preserved on the island. A 7th-C. fort has been identified at Kastro Lazarou.

In the 7th C. Samos was in an area subject to Arab attacks. A later tradition preserved in Chalkokondyles says that Samos was subdued by the caliphs of Cairo and forced to provide them with ships. The theme of Samos was formed by the end of the 9th C. and is first mentioned in the Klerorologion of Philotheos; it included considerable territory on the mainland, and the capital was Smyrna. It was divided into two tourmai, Ephesus and Atramytion. In the 10th C. Samos was used as a base both by the Arabs in their inroads in the Aegean Sea and by the Byz. for attacks on Crete; Tzachas temporarily occupied the island. Despite all the hardships of warfare Samos flourished in the 12th C.: Daniel Igunmen praises its wealth, esp. in fish, and al-Idrīsī describes it as a pleasant place rich in cows and sheep. In 1204 Samos was granted to Baldwin of Flanders, but it was seized by John III Vatatzes ca. 1225. It was surrendered to the Genoese in 1304, recovered briefly by the Byz. between 1329 and 1346, then ruled again by the Genoese until 1475.

Legends connect the christianization of Samos with St. Paul, but no bishop is known before the 5th or even the 7th C. The bishop of Samos was the first suffragan of Rhodes (Laurent, Corpus 5.1: 530–34). The Church of the Panagia Sarandakialiotissa west of Marathokambos was built by Paul of Latros.


Samosata (Σαμιώτσα), Ar. Sumaysat, now Samsat in Turkey, city on the north bank of the Euphrates. According to Ammianus Marcellinus (Amm.Marc. 14.8.7), it was one of the largest cities of the province of Euphratensis. During the Persian wars Samosata was often a campsite for the Byz. army on the way to Persia, but it did not play any decisive role in events. The city was an important center of Christianity: many martyrs of the 3rd C. originated there as well as Lucian of Samosata, the teacher of Arius, and Paul of Samosata, a defender of the idea of strong episcopal power. Arians prospered in Samosata, and its bishop Eusebios tried in vain to oppose them; killed by an Arian woman in 380, he was allegedly proclaimed a "holy victim" by Gregory of Nazianzos (F. Halkin, AB 85 [1967] 15.10–12). Eusebios's tomb in the cathedral became the center of a cult.

After being occupied by the Arabs in 639, Samosata early became the target of Byz. raids: in 700 the Byz. under Tiberios II took booty and captives in the region of Samosata. Expeditions continued throughout the 9th and 10th C. The 10th-C. Taktikon of Benešević mentions the katepano of Samosata, but it is unclear whether this was Samosata on the Euphrates or Samosata in Armenia (Oikonomides, Listes 360). Samosata was probably a part of the theme of "the poleis on the Euphrates" that existed in the 11th C. In 1070 it was included in the region between Edessa and Antioch controlled by Philaretos Brachamios.

Lit. Honigmann, Ostgrenze 134–37. – A.K.
SAMOTHRACE (Σαμοθράκη), mountainous island in the northeastern Aegean Sea, a city of Macedonia I in the 6th C. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 1.57, ed. Pertusi 86) describes it as part of the eparchia of Thrace. Pseudo-Symeon Magistros (TheophCont 706.4–8) calls it a Thracian peninsula and suggests a fantastic etymology of its name (opulent with beasts and colonized by Samians). Some churches, graves, and minor objects (lamps, weights, etc.) of the 5th–6th C. have been discovered on Samothrace (K. Lehmann-Hartleben, AIA 43 [1939] 141f) as has an inscription mentioning restoration of a bath by Justinian (probably Justinian I: G. Downey, Hesperia 19 [1950] 21f). A biographer of Theophanes the Confessor (who was exiled to Samothrace) describes the island as situated in the sea of Maroneia and calls it a horrible and arid place (Theoph. 2:12.13–16). In 945 Constantine Lekapenos, son of Romanos I, was exiled to Samothrace, where he was accused of an attempt at usurpation and murdered (TheophCont 438.2–5).

After 1204 Samothrace was given to the Latin emperor of Constantinople but returned to Byz. in 1261. Circa 1330 the island was attacked by the emir of Smyrna and Ephesus (Lemerle, Aydin 72f). During the Civil War of 1341–47 John V Palaiologos seized Samothrace together with Lemnos, Imbros, and Lesbos (Greg. 3:226.10–13). Circa 1431 Samothrace was in the hands of Palamede Gattilusio, the lord of Ainos, who built a new fortress there, as witnessed by two inscriptions on its walls. The island, called Sanctus Mandrachi by the Latins, was famous for its honey and goats (Miller, Essays 326f). John Laskaris Rhyniakenos governed Samothrace from 1444 to 1455; the Gattilusio came back for a short time, but in 1456 the Turkish fleet annexed the island.

A papal navy under the command of Cardinal Scarampi, patriarch of Aquileia, was sent to incite a revolt on the island; the Greek archon of Kastro captured Samothrace and it remained under papal jurisdiction until 1459, when it was recaptured by the Turks. In 1460 Mehmed II granted a part of Samothrace to Demetrios Palaiologos, former despotes of the Morea.

SAMPSON. See Priene.

SAMPSON THE XENODOCHOS, legendary saint; feastday 27 June. He is thought by some to be of the 6th C., although the notice on Zotikos in the Synaxarion of Constantinople (Synax.CP 359.44) calls him a contemporary of Constantine I. T. Miller argues that Sampson (Σαμπσων) may in fact have lived in the 4th C. According to his vita, Sampson was born in Rome to a noble family and emigrated to Constantinople during the patriarchate of Menas (536–52), who ordained him to the priesthood. He was also a physician who reportedly healed Justinian I and founded the Constantinopolitan hospital (xenon) that bore his name. Sampson was considered the patron of physicians, who would march in procession on his feastday to the Church of St. Mokios, where his relics allegedly reposed. His vita is known only in the version of Symeon Metaphrastes, which contains abundant information concerning the activity of the xenon in the 10th C. and esp. about the misbehavior of its officials, whom the saint castigated in a posthumous appearance. Later Constantine Akropolites wrote a panegyric of Sampson (unpublished), and Manuel Philes called him a model of generosity. During the Latin occupation of Constantinople the xenon was taken over by the Templars.

In illustrated MSS of the menologion of Metaphrastes, Sampson is portrayed as an elderly priest with a short round beard, holding a book; one of these MSS shows him in a church being laid out on a bier (Paris, B.N. gr. 1528, fol.47v).


SAMSUN. See Amisos.

SAMUEL OF ANI, chronicler and priest. Of his life nothing is known, save that an Armenian patriarch of Cilicia, Gregory (probably Gregory III, 1113–66), requested a chronicle from him. The first part of this chronicle is based on the Canon of Eusebius of Caesarea and on Moses Korenac’i. The second part, from the birth of...
SAMUEL OF BULGARIA, seemingly the youngest of the KOMETOPOULOI; tsar of BULGARIA; died Prilep 6 Oct. 1014. He ruled the area of Ohrid with his brothers, then alone after 987 or 988—as basileus after 996 or 997. He reestablished the Bulgarian patriarchate at Ohrid. Primarily, he struggled for independence against Byz. P. Tivtev (BBulg 3 (1969) 42) hypothesizes that ca.981 Samuel invaded Greece, then (between 982 and 986, according to G. Litavrin, Keh. 512) Thessaly, where he seized Larissa. Exploiting Basil II’s involvement in the struggle with Bardas Sclerios and Bardas Phokas, Samuel expanded his realm. The peak of his success was his victory over Basil at Trajan’s Gate. From 991 Basil waged systematic war against Samuel. Despite the victory of Nikephoros Oumanos over Samuel at the Spercheios River (996 or 997), the struggle was indecisive. Basil tried to attract the Serbs as allies against him (G. Ostrogorsky, Byzantion 19 (1949) 187–94) and made generous promises to Bulgarian aristocrats. From 1001 the Byz. offensive was continuous. Basil invaded the regions of Serdica, Macedonia, Vidin, Skopje (1004), and Dyrachion (1005). The decisive blow fell in July 1014, when Basil annihilated the Bulgarian army at Belasica (Gr. Kleidion); allegedly 14,000 captives were blinded and sent to Samuel. Unable to endure the sight of this sorrowful procession, he died in two days. The controversy over whether Samuel created a Macedonian, West Bulgarian, or Bulgarian state is ahistorical, as it projects modern ethnic distinctions onto the past.


—A.K., C.M.B.

SANCTA SANCTORUM RELIQUARY, conventional name for a small red box (24 x 18.5 x 4 cm) in the Vatican filled with bits of earth, wood, and cloth. Manufactured in Palestine ca.600, it entered the Museo Sacro from the Treasure of the Sancta Sanctorum in the early 20th C. The box contains EULOGIAI from the Holy Land, some of which still have legible labels (e.g., “from Sion”). The inside of its sliding cover bears five scenes of events from the life of Christ. They read from lower left to upper right: Nativity, Baptism, Crucifixion, Myrophoroi, and the Ascension. Their figure style and arrangement parallels that of contemporary Palestinian icons preserved in the monastery of St. CATHERINE at Mt. Sinai. The pictures document the sacred origin of the eulogiai contained in the box, but only in a general way: some eulogiai lack pictures, and vice versa. Not all scenes correspond accurately to the biblical text: the Myrophoroi, for example, shows a complex architectural ensemble modeled on the Holy Sepulchre and the Anastasis Rotunda instead of the rock-hewn cave of the Gospel account. Iconographically, this cycle is part of a group that includes pilgrims’ AMPULLAE, octagonal gold marriage RINGS, PILGRIM TOKENS, and silver amuletic ARMBRANDS. They repeat some or all of a distinctively PALESTINIAN CHRISTOLOGICAL CYCLE developed in the 6th C. in response to the pilgrim trade.


—G.V.

SANCTIO PRAGMATICAE, law issued 13 Aug. 554 by Justinian I, officially at the request of Pope Vigilium but addressed to NARES as well as to the prefect Antiochos. Its aim was the restoration, after the reconquest of Italy, of the Roman order. Preserving the acts of such Ostrogothic rulers as AMALASUNTHA and THEODADH, the Sanctio Pragmatica annulled the measures of Totila: former owners recovered their estates, slaves (including those emancipated by Totila), and herds of cattle; the Sanctio Pragmatica confirmed senators’ titles to their estates and enhanced their control over tenant farmers; it cancelled any contracts extorted on behalf of Totila or his partisans. The Sanctio Pragmatica also restored Roman administration
and the privileges of both senate and church, allowed civilians to be tried only by civil judges, and guaranteed traditional rations and salaries to grammarians, rhetors, doctors, and jurists. It re-established funds for the repair of aqueducts and public buildings. Some local privileges were also emphasized: the election of provincial governors was reserved to local bishops and primates, and governors' salaries were abolished. The law protected landowners from the abuses in coemitto (see Synone), the forced purchase of agricultural products. The Sanctio Pragmatica was similar to the decrees issued after the conquest of Africa in 534; but, unlike Africa, which was a single military unit, Italy consisted of several independent districts. The Sanctio Pragmatica also tried to protect provincial governors from the interference of central departments in tax collection.


SANCTUARY. See Bema.

SANTABARENOS, THEODORE, a supporter of Photios; born Santabarci, Phrygia, died Constantinople between 914 and 919. Santabarenos (Σανταβαρηνός; Sandabarenos in Skylitzes) originated from a "Manichaean" milieu; Caesar Bardas placed him in the Studios monastery, where, after the deposition of Nicholas of Studios, Santabarenos became hegoumenos temporarily; he was expelled from Studios after the fall of Photios. During his second patriarchate, Photios promoted Santabarenos to the post of metropolitan of Euchaita and ca.880 introduced him to Basil I. Santabarenos acquired Basil's favor by showing him—magically—the image of his deceased son Constantine. In the plot against the future emperor Leo VI, Santabarenos played a decisive role, arranging the deposition of Andrew the Scythian as well. Vogt ("Léon VI,," 420f) connects Santabarenos's slandering of Leo with the mutiny of John Kourkouas against Basil I and considers Kourkouas a relative of Photios. Leo's reconciliation with his father (in memory of which a feastday was established on 20 July) and then Basil's death ended Santabarenos's career; he was brought to trial, and Leo personally flogged him. Exiled to Athens, Santabarenos was eventually blinded and then banished to the east. Later Leo recalled him and granted him a pension (siteresion) from the Nea Ekklesia.

Lit. Vita Euthym. 40–53. —A.K.

SANT'ANGELO IN FORMIS, church of the monastery donated to Montecassino by Prince Richard I of Capua in 1072. Located to the northeast of Capua, it preserves an extensive fresco decoration generally believed to be the most authentic extant reflection of the work of the Byz. artists brought to Italy by Abbot Desiderius (1058–87). Sadly damaged by restoration, the murals include a portrait of Desiderius as donor in the apse, three registers of New Testament scenes above the nave colonnades, Old Testament scenes in the aisles, and a Last Judgment on the west wall. It is a reasonable presumption that the church was painted shortly after 1072, but some scholars assign the murals to a later period because of contradictions in the written documentation. In style and quality these paintings are almost unique in their local context; de' Maffei (infra) attributes them to Desiderius's mosaicists, though some may be by local artists emulating Byz. effects. In the porch, which was rebuilt in the 12th C., are paintings in a different style, including an image of the Virgin as queen with a Greek inscription (o despensa theotoke), unanimously attributed to a Byz. painter.


SANTA SEVERINA (Ἄγια Σεβερίνη, Σεβερινώνη), city in Calabria near Crotone. The name of this Calabrian town derives from ancient Siberial; a saint Severina is unknown to the Greek and Roman calendars. The town is first mentioned in 885/6, when the Byz general Nikephoros Phokas the Elder took it from the Arabs. Medieval sources do not confirm the 16th-C. legend that the Greek pope Zacharias originated there. Shortly after the Byz. conquest Santa Severina became a metropolitan see, with Umbriatico, Cerenzia, Gallipoli, and Isola Capo Rizzuto as suffragans. A 10th-C. seal of the metropolitan
Stephen has survived (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, no.912). Between 1060 and 1072 the town was conquered by the Normans. In 1089, its Greek metropolitan submitted himself to the papacy, but as the local population was predominantly Greek, Greeks continued to occupy the see until 1251.

Two extant churches have votive inscriptions in Greek. A rotunda of unknown function (now a baptistery) adjoining the 13th-C. cathedral has inscriptions of Archbp. John and of Theodore, also archbishop or, in the reading of Castelfranchi Falla, exeiparchon. The building is a Late Antique type (resembling S. Costanza in Rome) but almost certainly erected after 885. The old cathedral (rebuilt as the Addolorata) has a foundation inscription of Archbp. Ambrose dated 1036 and an inscription of the spatharokandidatos Staurakios. A third church, S. Filomena, is undocumented but of byzantinizing form, two-storied with a very elongated cupola before the apse.


SANUDO TORSELLO, MARINO (“the Elder”), Venetian businessman, diplomat, and historian; born ca.1270, died after 9 Mar. 1343. Born to an aristocratic Venetian family, Sanudo traveled widely (from 1289 until his last trip to Constantinople in 1333) in the eastern Mediterranean, particularly in Venetian Romania, where his relatives held the duchy of Naxos. He zealously promoted a crusade against Egypt and, to this end, ecclesiastical union with Constantinople. Over the years he revised and expanded his treatise advocating a crusade, Secreta fidelium crucis (Secrets for True Crusaders), whose first version was composed between Mar. 1306 and Jan. 1307. Presented to Pope Clement V, it provided the data necessary for a successful economic blockade of Egypt (e.g., substituting Cypriot or Rhodian sugar for European needs, Secreta 1,1,2 [ed. Bongars 2:245-10]). Book 2 was written in 1312–13 at Clarensa (Chlemoutsi) in the Morea and discussed logistical difficulties facing such an expedition. It also included a short history of the Holy Land that Sanudo later (1318–21) revised and expanded down to 1307 to include a geography of the Levant; Sanudo continued to add marginalia to his copy in later years. The new version was presented to Pope John XXII (1316–34), as the local population was predominantly Greek, Greeks continued to occupy the see until 1251.

Between 1326 and 1333 Sanudo composed a valuable Latin history of the Frankish principalities and Byz. that survives only in a Venetian translation, Istoria del regno di Romania, which sheds unique light, for example, on Michael VIII’s reconquest of Constantinople. Also ascribed to Sanudo is a brief Latin account of the poverty and collapse of the Latin Empire of Constantinople and the efforts of Baldwin II to promote a new reconquest. This work was apparently intended to continue Geoffrey Villehardouin. Perhaps the most remarkable testimony of all comes from Sanudo’s 42 surviving letters (1323–1336/7), addressed, for example, to Andronikos II Palaiologos, the sebastokratior Stephen Syropoulos, and Jerome, Franciscan bishop of Kafka, on church union and an anti-Turkish alliance; they reflect Sanudo’s extensive personal experience and contacts as well as the development of Venetian policy (cf. A. Laiou, Speculum 45 [1970] 374–92).


SAPPHO, Greek lyric poet; born Lesbos ca.600 B.C. Despite an early Christian attack against Sappho as a depraved woman (cf. Tatian, PG 6:875C), Sappho continued to be read by pagan (Julian the Apostate) and Christian (Gregory of Nazianzos) authors alike; most of the preserved fragments of her poems were transmitted through papyri of the 7th C. (BKT V 2). After a period of silence Sappho reappears at the end of the 10th
C., when the *Souda* includes her biography and passages from the original poems, noting that she had been accused of “shameful friendship” with her female companions. Symeon Metaphrastes uses her vocabulary to characterize the beauty of St. Euphemia (S. Costanza, *Orpheus* n.s. 1 [1980] 106–14). Sappho was esp. popular in the 12th C., even though Isaac Tzetzes (Cramer, *Anec.Gr.Paris.* 1:63,20–21) claims that her works had disappeared; it is impossible to say whether scholarly acquaintance with Sappho was direct or derived from reference works. Scholars praised “Sappho’s grace” (Mich.Ital. 158,20) and often used her verses to describe women’s excellence or a wedding celebration. Niketas Choniates (*Orationes* 43,26–28), in good Byz. fashion, evokes Sappho’s *chairetismos* praising the bride and the bridgroom (*nymphaios*—in the original, *gambrus*—but Choniates revised the line). Interest in Sappho diminished after the 12th C., although Planoudes, Moschopoulos, and Meotochites were apparently familiar with her verses (K. Nickau, *ZPapEpig* 14 [1974] 15–17).


--A.C.H., A.K.

**SAQQĀRA**, pagan necropolis of the city of Memphis in Egypt, used for burials well into the Christian period, and a site of a 6th–9th-C. monastery founded by Apa Jeremias. The early monastic community settled in abandoned mausolea; their first church was a modest mudbrick chapel, which was gradually enlarged down to the mid-7th C. The Arab conquest caused many wealthy Christian families to leave Egypt and to abandon their richly decorated mausolea, which the monks dismantled for use in new monastic buildings. Within the necropolis only the so-called Tomb church (building no.1829), the three-aisled superstructure of an earlier hypogeum, remained to serve as the monks’ burial place. The new main church (late 7th C.) was a large basilica with a narthex, a tripartite sanctuary, and an early example of a *khūrus* (choir, narrow transverse hall) before the sanctuary. Spolia of at least five earlier buildings were used to build this church. The new refectory was a three-aisled hall with an attached four-column chapel. (The earlier refectory had only one aisle with two rows of circular benches.) The monks’ cells were collected into larger complexes with an irregular internal organization; the individual rooms within these complexes are often fitted with prayer-niches, and some have fine paintings of saints and famous monks.


--P.G.

**SARACCHANE.** See POLYEUKTOS, CHURCH OF SAINT.

**SARANTENOS.** See KARANTENOS, MANUEL.

**SARCOPHAGUS** (σαρκοφαγός, lit. “flesh-eater”), trough-shaped stone coffin in widespread use for burial of the dead up to the late 5th C. Christians first took up the form, which had roots deep in antiquity, in the 3rd C. and decorated it with the imagery of the catacombs, embodying, above all, a belief in personal salvation. After Christianity was granted toleration ca.311–13 (see EDICT OF MILAN), sarcophagi came to be embellished with more elaborate and varied programs, for example, the TRADITIO LEGIS, including outright quotations from other works of art (e.g., apse decoration). In the middle of the 4th C. the method of producing sarcophagi changed fundamentally. Previously mass-produced and thus widely available to even a relatively modest clientele, they became much less common and were mainly custom-made affairs for the very rich. Thus the later history of the form from the 4th to the 10th C. concerns largely a few extraordinarily luxurious pieces (Vatican, Junius Bassus Sarcophagus; Milan, S. Ambrogio—Volbach, *Early Christian Art*, pls. 41–43, 46f). These were often of PORPHYRY, as for the emperors buried in the HOLY APOSTLES in Constantinople (Grierson, “Tombs & Obits”), which served as an imperial mausoleum until the reign of Constantine VIII.

Later emperors were also interred in sarcophagi. Using the term πορφυρογέμνων (“death receptacle”), Choniates (Nik.Chon. 256,59) reports this manner of burial for Manuel I. The sarcophagus of THEODORA OF ARTA depicts the saint and her son blessed by the HAND OF GOD, but the vast
SARDINIA (Σαρδīνια, Σαρδῶ). Mediterranean island west of Italy. Under Diocletian it formed a province under the command of a praeses. The Vandals occupied it ca. 455. In 466–68 the comes Marcellinus, sent by Emp. Leo I, temporarily drove the Vandals out of Sardinia, but after Marcellinus's murder and the defeat of BASILISKOS in Africa, Leo recognized their right to Sardinia (the treaty of 474). Circa 530, Godas, a former slave of the Vandal king GELIMER, administered Sardinia. He then proclaimed himself king of Sardinia and started negotiations with Justinian I, who was preparing to attack the Vandals of Africa and welcomed the alliance with Godas. Tzatzon, Gelimer's brother, recovered control of Sardinia, but in 534 Carthage fell to the Byz., Tzatzon was killed in battle, and the Byz. commander Cyril brought Tzatzon's head to Sardinia, thus persuading the Vandals to surrender without resistance. During the Gothic war in Italy, TOTILA managed to occupy Sardinia temporarily in 551/2, but soon it was reconquered by John TROGLITA.

Sardinia resisted the Lombard attacks of the mid-7th C. and remained in Byz. hands. An inscription from the reign of either Constans II or Constantine IV praised the emperor as triumphant over the Lombards (S. Mazzarino, Epigraphica 2 [1940] 292–313). By the end of the 7th C. Byz. power on the island was nominal. Theodotos, the hypatos and doux of Sardinia, is mentioned on a seal (of the 9th C.?), and to the 9th C. belongs
the Greek seal of Arsenios, archbishop of Sardinia (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, no. 917). Papal authority over the island was strong from the time of Pope Gregory I. Pope Leo IV, in a letter dated sometime between 850 and 854, demanded that John, archbishop of Cagliari, destroy an altar that had been dedicated to the archangel Michael by the archbishop Arsenios (perhaps the one whose seal was mentioned above), whom the pope accused of heresy. A hoard of Byz. and Arab coins dating to the 9th C. indicates continuing commercial activity on the island (A. Taramelli, NS 19 [1922] 294–96).

Numerous attacks by the Arabs failed to seize Sardinia but resulted in the island’s virtual independence until the early 11th C., when the Arabs finally achieved their goal. In 1016, however, a fleet from Genoa and Pisa defeated the Arabs and expelled them from Sardinia. By this time Byz. control over the island had ended; the precise date and circumstances of the Byz. departure are unknown.

Monuments of Sardinia. Few buildings of the Byz. period survive on the island. All are churches and can be characterized as small in size, constructed of ashlar masonry, and, usually, domed. Among those dating to the 5th and 6th C. the most common form is that of a Greek or Latin cross plan with the crossing surmounted by a dome or tower. Most important among these is the church of S. Saturnino in Cagliari, originally a square baldachinlike structure to which four arms were added in the 6th C. Similar, though smaller, churches are S. Maria at Bonarcode, S. Giovanni at Sinis, and S. Elia at Nuxis. Dating to the 10th C. is S. Giovanni at Assemini, erected according to an inscription by Torkotorios, described as "archon of Sardinia," and his wife. It is a variation on the cross-in-square plan type with L-shaped piers carrying a small dome. Remains of another Byz. church with a tripartite sanctuary have been recently identified at Is Mortorius near Cagliari.


SARDIS (Σάρδεις), civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of Lydia in western Asia Minor, a place of considerable wealth from natural resources and its location on major highways; headquarters of an imperial weapons factory. Sardis was attacked by the Goths in 399 but flourished continuously until the early 7th C. In the 4th C. a philosophical school arose there, known from the works of Eunapios. Excavations have revealed details of late antique urban life, with maintenance of classical public buildings, construction of churches (including a large domed basilica of Justinian I), abandonment of temples, and growth of a new residential district. The gymnasium basically maintained its function, but one hall was taken over by the hellenized Jewish community and became the largest synagogue known in the ancient world; a row of shops was added outside in the 4th C. Some parts of Sardis may have declined in the 6th C. The excavated civic and private buildings perished ca. 616, possibly as the result of a Sasanian attack, and were never restored. The ruined city served as a quarry for the fortress on the acropolis built in the mid-7th C. Medieval Sardis, which consisted of the fortress and small settlements scattered among the ruins, was a city of the Thraesion theme. It was taken by the Arabs in 716, by Tzachas in 1092, and reconquered by the Byz. in 1098. Sardis grew in importance under the Laskarids, who built a five-domed church over the ruins of a 5th-C. basilica. Threatened by the Turks in the late 13th C., its citadel was divided with them in 1304; Sardis definitively fell to Saruhan ca. 1315.


SARKEL (Σάρκηλ), Khazar name that ought to be written "Sarkel," meaning "White House" or "White Tower." A fort on the Don, Sarkel is now identified with the ruins discovered near the township of Cimljanskaja. The early fort existed on the right bank of the Don in the 8th and beginning of the 9th C. and controlled the ford.
crossing the river; its population belonged to the culture of SALTVO. After the destruction of the right-bank fort, the khan of the KHAZARS asked Emp. Theophilus to build the kastron of Sarkel (De adm. imp. 42.22–56). Around 893 the spatharokandidatos Petronas Kamateros (his identification with the general PETRONAS is groundless) came to “the Tanais river” and erected a fortress of bricks baked on the spot with mortar made of tiny river shells. Sarkel had a garrison of 500 men who were relieved annually. The Sarkel of Petronas was on the left bank of the Don. Excavations there brought to light a fort with a citadel, surrounded by walls with towers built of local white bricks of excellent quality. The fort was square in shape, 193.5 by 193.5 m; the walls were 3.75 m thick; the brick stamps differ from Byz. types. Archaeological data show that the fortifications fell into disuse after only a few decades and Sarkel became an ordinary settlement. The fort was destroyed by Svjatoslav in 965, but the settlement there survived until the campaign of VLADIMIR MONOMACH in 1116/17. The early 10th-C. geographer Ibn Khurdadhbeh probably refers to Sarkel when he states that a Khazar governor resided on the Don and collected a tithe from the Rus' merchants (O. Pritsay, Folia Orientalia 12 [1971] 241–59).


SARMATIANS (Σαρματαί), also Sauromatoi, nomadic tribal groups that replaced the SCYTHIANS in the steppe north of the Black Sea. They used the East Iranian lingua franca. Among their tribes were the ALANS. PTOLEMY’S concept of two Sarmatians, the European and the Asian, enjoyed great popularity in the Middle Ages, both in Christian (esp. Armenian) and Muslim geography.

The Sarmatian state was weakened by the GOths in the 3rd C., and the character of the ethnic substrate indicated by the name Sarmatian became confused. A. Vasiliev (Goths in the Crimea [Cambridge, Mass., 1936] 221) suggests that the Sarmatians on the shores of the Maeotis (the Azov Sea) mentioned by Zosimos were Goths. Chronicles of the 4th C. speak of the revolt of slaves against their Sarmatian masters; the latter escaped to the empire and were settled by Constantine I and then Constantius II in Thrace, SCYTHIA Minor, Macedonia, Italy, and other provinces (K. Kretschmer, RE 2 R. 1 [1920] 2547). Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp. 53.2–123) was familiar with the legend of the Sarmatian attack on Asia Minor; when CONSTANTIUS CHLORUS was sent against them, he invited the inhabitants of Cherson to join him in a coalition. Swept up by the Hunnic invasions, some Sarmatians emerged in the early 5th C. in Illyricum, where they are said to have contested Theodoric’s power over Singidunum. The latest event connected with the Sarmatians is their participation in the Lombard march into Italy, mentioned by Paulus Diaconus.

Some Byz. authors (esp. in the 11th–12th C.) used “Sauromatoi” as an archaising term for the Hungarians, Pechenegs, Uzes, and later the Otomans (Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica 2:270) and Tartars. Gregoras, Plethon, and Chalkokondyles identify Sarmatia with “Rhosia.”


SARUHAN (Σαρχάνης), a Turkish emirate that emerged from the breakup of the SELJUK sultanate of Rûm; it was named after its founder. It extended over the region of Nymphai and the fertile plain of Mainomenos/Minemen; its capital was Magnesia, conquered ca. 1313. It exported grain, and there was an important slave market in Magnesia. The lords of Saruhan, whose territories bordered the alum-producing region of Phokaia, extracted an annual tribute from the Genoese established there. This relationship brought them into a rapprochement with the Byz. In 1329 Andronikos III Palaiologos expelled the Genoese lord of Chios, Zaccaria; compelled the Genoese of Phokaia to recognize his suzerainty; and then concluded a treaty with the emir of Saruhan. Around 1335 the emperor signed another treaty with the emir, who gave him military aid against the rebel Genoese governor of Phokaia, Cattaneo; ca. 1358, when John V Palaiologos liberated the Ottoman prince Halil, who had been kept in captivity in Phokaia, another peace treaty was concluded between Byz. and Saruhan with the emir’s children taken as hostages to Constantinople. On the other hand, the Saruhan Turks carried out naval raids in the Aegean, some of
them jointly with the Aydın Turks. The emirate was temporarily annexed by the Ottomans from 1390 to 1402 and permanently in 1410.


**SASANIANS,** Iranian dynasty (226–651) that arose from among other minor dynasties in Parthia recognizing Arsacid suzerainty. Ardashir I (224–40) defeated and slew the last Arsacid monarch, Artabanus V (224), and captured the capital of Ctesiphon. The formation of the Sasanian state replaced the degenerating congeries of insubordinate kinglets, vaguely acknowledging the Arsacids, with a much more powerful empire that henceforth contested control of Mesopotamia, Armenia, and the Caucasus with the late Roman Empire and Byz. Sasanian society was characterized by divine monarchy, an officially authorized version of the Zoroastrian religion, and the seven great Persian noble families, the totality being organized according to a rigidly structured caste system. Internally the system was threatened by Manichaeanism in the early centuries and by the movement of Mazdak.

The long series of exhausting wars with Byz. brought the Sasanians some victories, but no enduring territorial acquisitions. Emp. Julian fell in battle with the Persians, and King Shāpūr II (r. 309–79) was able to sign an advantageous treaty with Emp. Jovian. Peaceful relations in the 5th C. were interrupted by short wars that led to the treaties of 422 and then 442. Kavad resumed warfare in 502. In 532 Chosroes I signed the “eternal peace” with Justinian I but soon reopened military actions. Justinian was compelled to pay tribute; when Justin II refused to continue payments the war broke out again. Emp. Maurice used the internal struggle in Persia in order to establish an alliance with Chosroes II, but the coup of Phokas in 602 created a new excuse for Persian interference in the affairs of Constantinople. The Persian generals SHAHRBARAZ and Shāhn were temporarily victorious, but Emp. Herakleios shattered the Sasanian state; in 628 KAVAD-SHIRUYA was forced to conclude a truce. The land was unable to recover: political troubles, plague, ruin of the irrigation system, and famine caused Sasanian Persia to fall to the Arab armies at Qadisiya (627) and Nihāwānd (642). Under YAZDGHIRD III (died 651) Sasanian rule came to an end. (For a list of Sasanian rulers, see table.)

**Christianity in Sasanian Iran.** Christianity penetrated early into Iran; probably in the 3rd C. some elements of ecclesiastical hierarchy were established, with the center in Ctesiphon. Constantine I’s alliance with Christianity and probably his attempts to gain the support of Christian subjects of the Sasanian state (thus, T.D. Barnes, *JRS* 75 [1985] 126–36) provoked a series of persecutions during the reign of Shāpūr II that were exaggerated in Greek vitae of Persian saints. This anti-Christian wave subsided at the end of the 4th C., and in 410 the first local council was convened in Ctesiphon. Nestorians (see Nestorianism) from the Roman Empire found refuge in Persian cities, and in the 5th–6th C. Christian culture flourished

---

Rulers of the Sasanian Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardashir I</td>
<td>224–240</td>
<td>Bahram IV</td>
<td>388–399</td>
<td>Hurmazd IV</td>
<td>579–590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāpūr I</td>
<td>240–270</td>
<td>Yazdgird I</td>
<td>399–420</td>
<td>Chosroes (Khusrau) II</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurmazd I (Hurmazd-Ardashir)</td>
<td>270–271</td>
<td>Bahram V</td>
<td>420–438</td>
<td>Bahram VI Chobin</td>
<td>590–591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahram I</td>
<td>271–274</td>
<td>Yazdgird II</td>
<td>438–457</td>
<td>Chosroes (Khusrau) II</td>
<td>591–628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahram II</td>
<td>274–293</td>
<td>Hurmazd III</td>
<td>457–4592</td>
<td>(second reign)</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahram III</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Perz</td>
<td>459–484</td>
<td>Kavad II (first reign)</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narseh</td>
<td>293–302</td>
<td>Balash</td>
<td>484–488</td>
<td>Ardashir III</td>
<td>628–629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurmazd II</td>
<td>302–309</td>
<td>Kavad I (first reign)</td>
<td>488–496</td>
<td>SHAHRBARAZ</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāpūr II</td>
<td>309–379</td>
<td>Zaman</td>
<td>496–498</td>
<td>Börändukht</td>
<td>630–631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardashir II</td>
<td>379–383</td>
<td>Kavad I (second reign)</td>
<td>498–531</td>
<td>Yazdgird III</td>
<td>632–651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāpūr III</td>
<td>383–388</td>
<td>Chosroes (Khusrau) I</td>
<td>531–579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in centers such as Nisibis. On the other hand, Persian Christianity began to lose its ascetic radicalism, typical of the earlier period, partly under the pressure of official Zoroastrianism, which was hostile toward eremitism, partly because of the threat of more radical movements, such as Manichaeanism or Mazdakism. The Nestorian church, which enjoyed a relative tolerance and occasionally even the sympathy of individual Persian rulers, expanded its influence eastward to Central Asia and China, but the Arab conquest of the early 7th C. ended the policy of toleration.


SATALA (Σάταλα, now Sadak), city north of Erzincan between the upper Euphrates and the Lykos on the best route across northern Anatolia. Satala was one of the greatest bastions of the eastern frontier through the 6th C. It was the headquarters of a legion and became a bishopric and city of Armenia I. The fortress played a role in Justinian I’s wars with Persia; he rebuilt it completely after the Persian attack of 529. Following its capture by Chosroes II in 610, Satala fell into obscurity, but its bishops are attested through the 11th C. The site preserves the dilapidated remains of Justinian’s fortress, as well as a bath and aqueduct belonging to the civil settlement.


SATIRE, critical treatment in verse or prose, often by way of exaggeration or caricature, of the foibles of individuals, institutions, or society as a whole. Important in classical antiquity, satire was revived in Byz. literature and rhetoric in the 11th C., but remained a minor genre, which could take many forms, including PARODY and ALLEGORY. Intentionality and not literary form determine what is satire. Satire in the learned language often conceals its true target beneath a timeless veil of classicism, which was easily penetrable by contemporary readers. Thus the Charidemos imitates a Platonic dialogue, and both the Philopatris and the Timarion have been mistaken for genuine works of Lucian, despite the clear allusions in the latter to early 12th-C. personages. Mazari’s Journey to Hades betrays its 15th-C. context more directly. The Katomyomachia, probably by Theodore Prodomos, is a parody of classical tragedy with a strong satirical element. Ptochoprodromos’s satires on a nagging wife, a downtrodden monk, and a poor scholar are firmly rooted in their 12th-C. context, without any classicizing veneer. Satirical motifs become prominent in vernacular verse texts of the 14th C., for example, on social contradictions in the Poulologos, Synaxarion of the Honorable Donkey, and Diecesson tetrapodon zoon; on the imperial court and the judiciary in the Porikologos and the Opsarologos; and on the church in the scatological Mass of the Beaarded Man (Spanos).


SATRAPIES (Lat. gentes), conventional name usually given to a group of Armenian autonomous principalities lying along the Euphrates-Artesians River and including Anzitene, Ingilene, Astianene, Sophene, Sophanene, and Balabitene. All the information concerning them comes from Greek and Latin, not Armenian sources. The satrapies passed to the Roman sphere of influence after the peace of Nisibis of 298, though Jovian returned some of them to Persia in 363 (Amm. Marc. 25.7.9). In Roman law, the satrapies originally had the status of civitates foederatae liberae et immunes, their hereditary rulers paying no tribute and receiving their regalia (see Insignia), including the imperial red shoes, from Constantinople (Prokopios, Buildings 3.1.17–27). These sovereign rights were first curtailed after the satrapes’ support of the revolt against Zeno in 485. Thereafter, these rulers were appointed by the emperor, and taxes apparently paid. Finally, a decree of Justinian I in 529 (Cod. Just. I 29.5)
abrogated all rights of the satrapies; novel 31:1.3 (536) combined them to form ARMINIA IV.

-N.G.G.

SATURDAY. See Sunday.

SATYR, zoomorphic companion of DIONYSOS. In his company, and usually that of MAENADS, satyrs are commonplace on late antique silver, textiles, and ivory boxes (Age of Spirit., nos. 122-24, 190). In literary sources they appear mostly as soldiers of the god, in connection with his expeditions to India and his attempt to seize the throne of Thebes. They are called skiritoi (leapers) and come from the land of Bessica (Malal. 43.1-3). In the Vita Basili., the companions of Michael III were compared to satyrs (TheophCont 200.16). Various entries of the Souda mention satyrs. A rare etymology is found in Malalas (Malal. 49.16-17), where satyros in Boeotian dialect stands for metempsychois to a lower corporeal form. Theodore Pro- 
Dromos (Rodanthe and dosikles 4:565-77), within the ekphrasis of a drinking cup, describes a Dio- 

nysiac vintage and the god’s revelry with maenads and drunken satyrs. Though they are almost non- 
existent in post-Iconoclastic art, one satyr appears with warriors on a 10th-C. bone casket in Milan (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinskulpt. l, no.8).

On the Asian shore of the Bosporos, an ancient temple of a satyr gave its name to an EMPORION, a harbor in which the Arab fleet sought refuge in 718. The ruins of the temple were used by Theophilos to build the palace at BRYAS and, probably, by Patr. Ignatios, who constructed in 873/4 a monastery of Michael Archangel “ou Satyrou,” in which he was eventually buried (Janin, Églises centres 42f).

-P.A.A., A.K., A.C.

SAVCI BEG (Σάβσιος, Σαβσίσ), Ottoman prince; died Bursa (formerly PROUSA) 1385 ?. Savci was the eldest son of the Ottoman sultan Murad I and ally of ANDRONIKOS IV, son of JOHN V, in a joint rebellion that contemporary Greek and Italian sources date to spring 1373, when Savci was probably the prince governor of Rumeli. Sometime in 1373, and under obscure circum-
stances, Savci and Andronikos formed a conspiracy to overthrow their fathers and establish themselves respectively as sultan and basileus. Their rebellion actually materialized, it seems, after John V discovered their plans—evidently early in May. Then, on 6 May, Andronikos escaped from Constantinople and hastened probably to Derkos, where he joined forces with Savci. Meanwhile John V appealed to Murad I for help; the latter crossed into Thrace with Byz. help on 11 May and proceeded to Constantinople. On 25 May a battle occurred between fathers and sons in the suburb of Pikridion. Although Andronikos's troops fought well, many of Savci's men defected to Murad and others fled. Savci retreated to Dydymoteichon, while Andronikos submitted to John (30 May). Savci held out until 29 Sept., when Murad captured and blinded him. Contemporary sources do not reveal Savci's end, but imply that he survived his blinding for some time.

Sixteenth-century Ottoman historians date Savci's uprising to 1385; locate it in Bithynia, without mentioning Andronikos IV's role; and claim that Murad first blinded, then executed Savci. The value of this version in conjunction with the early accounts remains speculative.


SAFY AL-DAWLA, Ḥamdānīd lord of Aleppo; born June 916, died Aleppo 25 Jan. 967. After asserting his power over Aleppo and Damascus and failing in his advance against Egypt, Safy al-Dawla concentrated his efforts on invasions of Byz. His first raid in 936 proved a failure, and his war against John Kourkouas had varied success: in 938 Safy al-Dawla advanced into Byz. territory and seized enormous booty, and the next year he attempted to conquer Armenia, but in the 940s Kourkouas began a successful offensive. Kourkouas's replacement by a certain Pantherios (Skyl. 230.44) permitted Safy al-Dawla to win the day: Pantherios was defeated near Aleppo in Dec. 944 (Vasiliev [p.305f] named the domestikos ton scholon not Pantherios, but Bardas Phokas). The Byz. offensive, however, continued under Bardas and Leo Phokas, and the Byz. government tried to attract Egypt as an ally. In 953 Safy al-Dawla achieved a major success when he captured Constantine, son of Bardas Phokas, but in 958 John (I) Tzimiskes defeated the Ḥamdānīd emir near Aleppo. In 962 Nikephoros (II) Phokas seized and plundered Aleppo. Although paralyzed in the hand and foot, Safy al-Dawla resisted and even won a victory near Aleppo, but his death paved the way for the Byz. invasion of Syria and Mesopotamia.


—A.K.

SBEITLA. See Sufetula.

SCALE, a set of gradations in a work of art by which relative position and size, as well as relative theological and political importance, is conveyed to the beholder. Early Byz. artists perpetuated Hellenistic schemes in which figures are too large with respect to their architectural or landscape settings: on his diptychs the consul is many times larger than the figures in the arena below him. Not until the Palaiologan period do relatively tiny figures appear in such contexts, a scale that contributes greatly to the beelting settings in the wall paintings at the CHORA and MISTRA. Images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and emperors generally tower over their ministrants (sometimes with the aid of a throne or footstool). On the Cross, Christ's body dwarfs those who stand below it, while Mary on her deathbed in the Dormition is often much larger than her mourners. Attendants of all sorts are customarily arranged according to principles of hierarchy and isoecephaly. Figures in PROSKYNESIS are invariably smaller than the object of their veneration. On coins as on works of art, the emperor's preeminence over his spouse and heir is indicated as much by his greater height as by their position always to his left.

—A.C.

SCALES. See BALANCE SCALES; COIN SCALES; STEEL YARD.
SCEPTER (σκῆπτρον), a symbol of the power and authority of Roman consuls, which was used by the emperors in their function as consuls. The consular scepter was a staff surmounted by an eagle, as can be seen on consular diptychs (e.g., Delbrück, Consular Mode, pls. 7, 20). The eagle-topped scepter is held by emperors on some coins, the latest examples being Maurice, Phokas, and after a considerable interval Philippikos in the early 8th C. Another type of scepter was surmounted by a cross: A. Alföldi (Schweizer Münzblätter 4 [1954] 81–86) erroneously interpreted a spear in images of Constantine I as a cross-topped scepter, but this type did not come into use until Theodosios II. Scepters seem to have played a minor role in Byz. ceremonial, at least before the 11th C.; when they do occur on coins, they are symbols of imperial authority rather than representations of tangible objects. De ceremoniis applied the term skeptron to insignia borne by various imperial attendants.

The scepter as a real object with various shapes is depicted on coins beginning with Nikephoros II Phokas. Some 11th-C. coins were called skeptrata (Hendy, Coinage 29f). A cross from the treasury of the cathedral at Tournai, decorated with pearls and enamel, was identified by M. Ross as the top of a scepter and dated to the 10th C. (JÖB 9 [1960] 91–95). An ivory fragment from the Dahlem Museum in Berlin, depicting an emperor crowned by the Virgin and accompanied by the Archangel Gabriel, has been identified as the top of the scepter of Leo VI (K. Corrigan, ArtB 69 [1978] 407–16).


SCHEDEOGRAPHIA (σχεδογραφία, σχεδουργία, from schedos, with a postclassical meaning of “note, composition”), a system of educational exercises introduced probably ca. 1000; in any case the young Psellos studied schedographia. It flourished in the 11th and 12th C. and met with severe criticism: Anna Komnene despised schedographia, “the new invention of our generation” (An.Komm. 3: 218.3–25), and Christopher of Mytilene (Gedichte, no. 11) punned on a teacher who was selling schede and thus transformed the school at Chalkoprateia into a schedoprateion, “a composition shop.” According to Garzya (infra), this criticism resulted from the conflict between the old schedographia, which consisted of simple grammatical analysis (word-by-word) of selected texts, and the “new” or “second” schedographia, the writing of short paradoxical compositions, such as the 12th-C. parody, “Notes (schede) of the Mouse.” These playful exercises probably went out of fashion in the 13th C.: a short tract by Manuel Moschopouloς, On the Schede, written before 1288/9, uses for grammatical analysis standardized material drawn from biblical and Homeric topics; another handbook was ascribed to Basil the Great; also a Schedographic Lexicon was produced. Schede used material similar to epimerisms.


SCHEMA (σχήμα, lit. “form, shape”), the habit of monks and nuns, which took two forms: the mikron schema, or “lesser habit,” and the mega schema (or angelikon schema), the “greater habit,” which symbolized the highest level of monastic profession. The monastic costume of the megaloschemos monk was differentiated from that of the mikroschemos by the koukoulion (cowl) and analabos (scapular). The distinction between mikroschemoi (or staurophoroi) and megaloschemoi monks is first mentioned in the Diatheke of Theodorus of Studios, who disapproved of this hierarchical differentiation, “because there is only one habit, just as there is only one baptism” (PG 99: 941C). Most monastic typika ignore the distinction, although there are exceptions: the 12th-C. typikon for the Kecharitomene Nunnerie provides that female novices who wish to be mikroschemoi need wait only six months, whereas those who wish to be megaloschemoi must wait three years. Sometimes a monk took a second monastic name when he became megaloschemos; thus the future patriarch Athanasios I, who was baptized Alexios, assumed the monastic name Akakios but changed it to Athanasios when he donned the greater habit (Theoktistos the Studite, Vita Ath. 4: 24, 10.1–3).


A.M.T.
SCHEMAT. See RHETORICAL FIGURES; TROPES.

SCHILTBERGER, JOHANN, German author of memoirs relating his adventures and travels in the East; born Freising 1380. He participated in the crusade of 1396 and was captured at Nikopolis. In the service of the Turks and (after 1402) the Mongols, he visited Asia Minor, Egypt, and the Crimea; he finally escaped, with other Christian captives, via Batumi to Constantinople (1427), where he stayed three months. Schiltberger described the palace and Hagia Sophia; he expatiated on Greek Orthodoxy and the Greeks' hostility to the Armenians, whom he characterized as "a brave people"; he also emphasized that in Constantinople the emperor appointed patriarchs. The memoirs contain evidence concerning a visit by DEMETRIOS PALAIOLÓGOS to Sigismund of Hungary.


SCHISM (σχίσμα), term found in the New Testament designating a split in the Christian community. Basil the Great of Caesarea applies the term "to those who had separated from the rest for some reasons of church policy and questions capable of adjustment" (PG 32:665A). He distinguishes "schism" from HERESY, a division on doctrinal grounds. Schisms have occurred during the entire history of Christianity, and many within the boundaries of the Byz. world were eventually resolved (e.g., the MOECHIAN CONTROVERSY, the schism between Photios and Ignatios, the one connected with the TETRAGRAM OF LEO VI, the ARSENITE schism). Other ecclesiastical splits became permanent: the deposition of DIOSKOROS of Alexandria at Chalcedon (451), originally motivated by disciplinary reasons only (ACO 2:1:2, pp.41 [237]–42 [238], 124 [320]), resulted in doctrinal division between Chalcedonians and Monophysites.

Most frequently and specifically, the term is applied to the division between the Eastern and the Western churches and the focal incident of 1054. Although, from the beginning of the FİLIOQUE controversy (8th–9th C.), doctrinal elements were involved in the split, so that many, on both sides, spoke of their adversaries' "heresy," there remained, at least until the Council of FERRARA–FLORENCE (1438–39), a substantial consensus on the point that the division was "capable of adjustment" and therefore was covered by the concept of "schism," as defined by Basil of Caesarea. This provided the basis for numerous union attempts.

The existence of different interpretations of both the PRIMACY of Rome and the position of other important Christian centers was evident already in the 4th C. The First Council of Constantinople (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF), representing the Eastern view, attributed to the bishop of the new capital "the privileges of honor next to the bishop of Rome, because that city is a New Rome" (canon 3). A similar sociopolitical definition appears in 451 and is applied to the "old Rome" as well: "The Fathers rightly granted privileges to the throne of old Rome, because it was the imperial city," and now "equal privileges are granted to the most holy throne of New Rome . . . , which is honored with the presence of the emperor and the senate" (Council of Chalcedon, canon 28).

Such statements were obviously incompatible with the view expressed by Roman popes such as DAMASUS (966–84), LEO I (457–74), GELASIAN (492–60), and HORMISDAS (514–23) that the authority of Rome lies with the words addressed by Jesus to Peter (Mt 16:18) and not with the political structure of the empire. The estrangement provoked by such differing views on primacy manifested itself repeated in connection with several ecclesiastical conflicts, for example, the various positions concerning the resolution of the crisis over ARIANISM (late 4th C.) and the diverging attitudes toward the MONOPHYSITES (AKAIAN SCHISM, 484–519). Although some Byz. churchmen (MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR, THEODORE OF STUDIO) occasionally referred to Roman "apostolicity" to gain Rome's support against Byz. emperors, the estrangement was deepened by the political involvement of Pope Stephen II (752–57) with the Franks (754) and the FİLIOQUE dispute begun by Charlemagne. The FİLIOQUE issue added a doctrinal dimension to the jurisdictional conflict between Photios and Pope NICHOLAS I (858–67). Remarkably, however, none of these early confrontations resulted in final schism, because neither side was pushing its position to the point of ultimate rupture.

A substantially new situation prevailed by the
mid-11th C. The *filioque* had been added to the creed in Rome itself (presumably in 1014) and the papal throne was occupied by German popes (since 1046). Formal contacts between the patriarchate of Constantinople—at the zenith of its medieval power—and a decadent papacy were allowed to lapse. In southern Italy, Frankish and Greek clergy were in conflict over discipline (clerical celibacy imposed by the Franks) and liturgy (Latin use of azymes). A reconciliation attempt, sponsored by Emp. Constantine IX, included the invitation of a papal delegation to Constantinople. The total intransigence of both Cardinal Humbert and Patr. Michael I Kerouarios led to mutual anathemas (1054). The anathemas, however, referred to the immediate participants, i.e., the legates and the patriarch, and not to the churches at large, so that relations remained unclear for years. The “reformed papacy” of Gregory VII (1073–85) could hardly have improved the situation; neither could it make concessions to Byz. ecclesiological patterns.

Nevertheless, when legates of Urban II visited Constantinople (1089), the patriarchate, at the request of Emp. Alexios I Komnenos, declared that its files contained no evidence of formal schism and that unity could be restored on the basis of the pope’s confession of Orthodox faith. There is evidence that, in the following years, intercommunion was taking place locally between Latins and Greeks and that many still considered the situation as a temporary quarrel between patriarch and pope. In reality, however, the Latin and the Greek worlds were drifting apart institutionally, culturally, and theologically.

During the Crusades, the estrangement became open conflict. After conquering Antioch (1098) and Jerusalem (1099) and initially recognizing the authority of the local Greek patriarchs, the Crusaders had them replaced with Latin incumbents. After the Crusaders captured Constantinople in 1204, Pope Innocent III condoned the election of the Venetian Thomas Morosini as patriarch of Constantinople. Thereafter the schism could be considered as final, since the Greek pretender to the see, Michael IV Autoreianos, elected in Nicaea in 1208, was recognized as legitimate by the entire Orthodox world. However, negotiations for Union of the Churches—made urgent by the Turkish danger—continued, almost without interruption, during the Palaiologan period. The union councils of Lyons and Ferrara-

Florence failed to overcome either the theological issues dividing the churches or the cultural animosity that opposed the peoples. Only a handful of Greeks were ready to accept the Latin doctrine of the *filioque*, or the “full power” (*plena potestas*) of the pope, as defined in Florence. The fall of Constantinople to the Turks ended negotiations.


**Schoinion** (σχοινίον, lit. “rope”), a measure of length for the survey of land, also called *geometrikon schoinion*, schoinometron, and sokarion.

1. In the survey of vineyards and fields with better soil, the *schoinion* of 10 orgyiai was used; until the time of Michael IV this was 21.1 m, and thereafter 21.7 m. As a measure used by the epoptes, it was sometimes called *epoptikon metron*. A square *schoinion* corresponded to 1/2 thalassios modios = 445 sq. m.

2. For fields with poor soil, or when the summary method of survey by *periorismos* was used, the *schoinion* of 12 orgyiai [= 25.3 m] was used. The corresponding square *schoinion* was 640 sq. m.

Lit. Schilbach, Metrologie 28–30. —E. Sch.

**Scholeae Palatinae**, imperial guard created by Diocletian or Constantine I. According to the Notitia Dignitatum, it included five regiments in the West and seven in the East, each regiment being about 500 men strong. In Constantine’s time they were mainly Franks and Alemanni, although the emperors of the 4th C. required religious orthodoxy from their bodyguards. The *scholeae palatinae* served under the Magister Officiorum both as elite troops and as a vehicle of political control. In the mid-5th C. they ceased to play an active military role and became ceremonial troops, their function of protecting the emperor entrusted to a small body of 300 exkoubitores (see Domestikos ton Exkoubiton). More prestigious than the comitatenses, the *scholeae* attracted aristocratic youths, and posts there were often obtained through purchase. In the early 6th C. Justin I introduced four more regiments, aim-
ing primarily at an increase in state income; Justinian I, however, attempted to send the scholae palatinae, along with the protiktores, into actual battle. The 6th-C. scholae palatinae were billeted in and around Constantinople and were enrolled from the native population. They retained their parade role probably until Constantine V placed them under the command of the domestikos ton scholon; thereupon they became one of the most important tagmata.


- A.K.

SCHOLASTICISM, a system of thought that was a main element of Latin philosophy and theology in the Middle Ages. Its beginnings can be traced to works such as the Monologium and Prosligium of Anselm of Canterbury (1033–1109) and the Sic et non and Theologia christiana of Peter Abelard (1079–1142). As a teaching method, scholasticism submitted problems in philosophy, theology, and the sciences to a rational, dialectical examination that relied principally on the logic of Aristotle. Its goal was to investigate questions from opposing points of view and, by means of logic, to formulate solutions consonant with reason as well as with Christian faith and the patristic tradition.

The scholastic theology of Hugo Eteriano was influential in Christological discussions at the local council of Constantinople of 1166–67 (see under Constantinople, Councils of). Beginning in the 13th C., Greek translations of Latin treatises broadened the influence of scholastic theology in Byz. Scholars including Maximos Planoudes, Ptochos Kydones, Demetrios Kydones, Manuel Kakas, and Gennadios II Scholarios translated works such as Anselm of Canterbury’s On the Procession of the Holy Spirit and On the Azymes, Thomas Aquinas’s Summa contra gentiles and Summa theologiae, Ricoldo da Monte Croce’s Refutation of the Koran, and a number of pseudo-Augustinian works. The theology of Latin scholastic writers, esp. that of Thomas Aquinas (Thomism), became both a tool and an issue in the 13th- and 14th-C. polemical debates in Byz. between supporters and opponents of intellectual and political rapprochement with western Europe.


- F.K.

SCHOLASTIKOS (σχολαστικός). Already in the Roman Republic a “student” educated in rhetoric was called a scholastikos. From the 4th C. onward the term became a title. It was favored by lawyers and rhetors without, however, becoming a technical term for the person who appeared in court or in public in some other way. It is therefore a term that the educated person used of himself; on the basis of his education he could hope to improve his official and social standing. After the 8th C. the term disappears from the sources.


- D.S.

SCHOLIA (sing. σχόλιον), line-by-line commentaries on literary or scientific texts, usually written on the margin of the text to which they refer. Many of them originated from Hellenistic commentaries, the debris of which were gathered and padded out primarily by Byz. scholiasts of the 9th–10th C., notably Arethas of Caesarea. The frequent occurrence one after the other of two or more versions of the same note demonstrates the compilatory character of most of these so-called Scholia Vetera. Some later scholia, for example, those of John Tzetzes or Demetrius Triklinios, show learning and independence of judgment, but most are mechanical and unimaginative compilations. Bodies of scholia exist on Homer (particularly rich), the Attic tragedians, Aristophanes, Plato, Lucian, and many other ancient writers, as well as on scientific texts such as Euclid, Archimedes, Ptolemy, Hephastion of Thebes, the Hippokratik corpus, and grammarians (Diogenes Thrax). The same technique was applied for commenting on the church fathers (catenae) as well as on legal texts, primarily the Basilika. Tzetzes created an original genre of verse commentary (The Histories) on his own letters and added marginal scholia to the poem. Scholia are linked to their text either by a lemma or word from the text standing at the head of each note, or by arbitrary reference signs placed over words in the texts; sometimes the scholiast deliberately used a different script to distinguish scholia from the text (E. Granstrem, VizVrem 13 [1958] 239f). Scholia provide valuable information on ancient literature and science, on lost states of the transmission of the text; they also may contain political judgments and unique data on Byz. history.
SCHOOL (σχολή). In the later Roman Empire there was, in theory, a three-tier structure of schools: the school of letters directed by the grammaticistes, the school of grammar under the grammaticos, and the school of rhetoric. In practice, however, this clear-cut distinction gave way to more complicated gradations, partly due to local circumstances, partly to social differentiation (R. Kaster, TAPA 113 [1983] 323–46). Christian society made only occasional and incidental changes in this inherited pattern. Monastic education provided elementary knowledge to illiterate brethren and to children who intended to become monks and nuns; John Chrysostom’s proposal to entrust secular education to monks met with little success.

While children were often taught to read and write by parents, priests, or notaries, elementary schools, usually with a single teacher, are occasionally attested after the 6th C. The secondary school, which furnished the enkyklios paideia, was private, although the state and church (but not the city) had some control over it. According to the correspondence of the 10th-C. anonymous teacher (see Teacher, Anonymous), he had under his charge students of various ages; the more advanced instructed the younger ones.

The state took over from the polis responsibility for higher education. Theodosios II founded the University of Constantinople, which does not appear to have lasted long. In the mid-9th C. a school of secondary and higher education was established in the palace and revived or re-founded by Constantine VII. Constantine IX founded schools of philosophy and law (see Law Schools) in Constantinople. In the 12th C. a school of rhetoric and theology existed under patriarchal authority, the so-called Patriarchal School. Instances of imperial patronage of higher education are found in the late 13th and 14th C. Most Byz. schools remained as before, however, private or semiprivate.


SCIENTIFIC TRADITION. There are two separate scientific traditions in Byz., those of “high” and “low” science. The first is represented by the “Little Astronomy,” which was taught throughout the existence of the empire, and by the advanced texts on mathematics and astronomy that were taught in the 4th–7th C. in Alexandria, Athens, Constantinople, and the monasteries of Syria. The second is represented by alchemy and astrology, which in the same period were widely practiced in the same intellectual centers, but seldom officially taught. The difference between these two traditions is clearly reflected in the ways in which the texts were transmitted in Byz.

The “Little Astronomy” was taught from a collection of treatises (perhaps originated by Theon, but not put into its present, expanded form before the 6th C.), which is found in a 9th-C. codex, Vat. gr. 204, and at least 28 later MSS. The Vatican codex includes works by Euclid and Eutokios (D. Pingree, Gnomen 40 [1968] 13–17). The more advanced mathematical and astronomical texts are also represented by a series of magnificent 9th-C. copies. Manuscripts of Ptolemy’s Almagest are the uncial Paris, B.N. gr. 2389 and the minuscule Vat. gr. 1594; manuscripts of the Handy Tables, the uncial Vat. gr. 1291 (now claimed
to be of ca. 753 by D. H. Wright [BZ 78 (1985) 355–62] and Leiden B.P.G. 78. The Leiden codex also contains a fragment of six folios of Theon’s Little Commentary on the Handy Tables from another MS written in the 9th or 10th C. The archetypal MS of his Great Commentary is the 9th-C. Vat. gr. 190, which also contains Euclid’s Elements (in their original version) and Data, both with scholia and the latter with Marinus’s commentary as well. Theon’s and Pappos’s commentaries on the Almagest are preserved, though incompletely, in Florence, Laur. 28, 18. The role played by LEO THE MATHEMATICIAN in the production of any of these codices remains very problematic; but in any case they attest to a general reawakening of admiration for these sciences in the 9th C., which the extant copies prove have continued into the 10th (Wilson, Scholares 85f). The transliteration of texts from uncial to minuscule apparently began with scientific MSS.

In the 12th–13th C., however, some of these MSS were taken to the West, and the texts they contained were lost to Byz. Thus the Papal Library at Viterbo included by 1295 Florence, Laur. 28, 18 and Vat. gr. 218; the unique 10th-C. copy of Anthemius’s On Burning Mirrors and the archetype of all other MSS of Pappos’s Collections; two now lost MSS of Archimedes, one of which also contained works by Ptolemy, pseudo-Ptolemy, and Eutokios; MSS of the “Little Astronomy”; part of Theon’s commentary on the Almagest; and the Almagest itself (Jones, “Papal Manuscripts”). Some of these MSS were at Viterbo by 1269 when WILLIAM OF MOERBEKE used them as the basis of his Latin translations.

The efforts of early Palaiologan scholars such as Pachymeres, Planoudes, Metochites, and Gregoras rescued many of the remaining advanced scientific treatises from being lost. They and their successors produced a voluminous treasury of copies of them.

Among the “low” sciences, the alchemical texts were gathered together in a corpus, perhaps in the late 9th or in the 10th C., that is preserved primarily in the 10th-C. codex, Venice, Marc. gr. 299. Most early Byz. alchemy can be recovered only from the Syriac and Arabic translations; the texts were lost to Byz. when the Arabs overran Egypt and Syria in the 7th C.

The case of astrology is much more complicated. Very few late antique astrological texts sur-

vived intact till the 9th C.; one can cite only Ptolemy’s Astrological Effects, the anonymous 3rd-C. commentary on it, Porphyry’s Introduction, Paul of Alexandria’s Introduction, and pseudo-Proklos’s Treatment. Astrological literature was preserved primarily by practicing astrologers, who were few in number in Constantinople in the 7th and 8th C. and who tended to make compendia of material they thought would be useful to their business rather than to preserve texts intact. The practice of making compendia is already evident in the Astrological Effects by Hephaestion of Thebes. Even more important for Byz. astrological collections was the work of Rhetorios of Egypt in the early 7th C. The result is that, though we know that Leo the Mathematician had MSS of Ptolemy, Paul of Alexandria, Hephaestion, and John Lydos, the only 9th-C. astrological MS extant is an incomplete copy of the poems of Manetho and Maximus, Florence, Laur. 28, 27, that was copied by the scribe of the valuable Almagest, Vat. gr. 1594. From the 10th C. survive two codices: Vat. gr. 1453, which contains the pseudo-Proklian Treatment, and an influential compendium in Florence, Laur. 28, 34. Other compendia were produced in the Komnenian period and are now preserved in such later copies as Paris, B.N. gr. 2506; Vat. gr. 1056; and Vienna, ÖNB phil. gr. 115. From them we can gather together, in often transformed excerpts, the scattered fragments of ancient and Byz. astrology, which must be supplemented by the equally scattered material in Arabic compendia.

The last of the Byz. compendia was that concocted by Eleutherios Zebelenos and attributed by him to Palchos, the unnamed “translator from Balkh” once mentioned by Abu Ma’shar. Eleutherios was a prominent member of the School of John Abramios, which systematically rewrote much of earlier classical and Byz. astrological literature between 1370 and 1400; their efforts have thoroughly perverted the texts on which they worked and until recently obscured the history of Greek astrology.

During the 4th to the 7th C. the Byz. taught and preserved the texts of “high” science so that many of them were still recoverable in the 9th C., either to be transliterated from uncial into minuscule or to be translated into Arabic. Though many MSS were lost to Byz. scholars during the Latin occupation of Constantinople, some of them
were by chance preserved in Italy; those remaining were eagerly sought out and vigorously copied under the Palaiologoi. The texts of "low" science fared much worse and present many more difficulties of reconstruction and interpretation. Though alchemy and astrology certainly attracted the interest of the powerful and wealthy from time to time, the practitioners of these sciences were on the fringes of intellectual society and failed to treat the literature they read with the respect that professors and potentates paid to the treatises of the famous scientists of the past. It is not surprising, then, that the astrological works associated with the names of Ptolemy, Porphyry, and Proclus can still be read in their entirety, while those of Vettius Valens, Hephaestion, John Lydos, and Rhetorius cannot.

-D.P.

SCRIBE (καλλιγράφος, lit. "one who writes beautifully"), the copyist of a MS text. COLOPHONS are our main source of information on scribes: the first scribe of an existing codex to be mentioned by name is Nicholas, who copied the Uspeński Gospel Book dated 835. In addition to scribes known only by name and status (e.g., monk or priest), some well-known authors worked as copyists or left us autograph MSS or scholia (e.g., Arethas of Caesarea, Eustathios of Thessalonike, Maximos Planoudes, Nikephoros Gregoras). A. Cutler, on the basis of Vogel-Gardthausen (BZ 74 [1881] 328–34), has calculated that in the 10th–11th C. 50 percent of scribes were monks; he concluded that thereafter the percentage of monastic scribes declined (to 16 percent in the 15th C.), to be replaced by an increasing proportion of laymen (39 percent in the 15th C.). Only a very few women scribes, such as Theodora Raoulina and Irene, daughter of the scribe Theodore Hagiotpites (A.W. Carr, Scriptorium 35 [1981] 287–90) are documented. Some scribes specialized in TACHYGRAPHY or in certain kinds of MSS; e.g., the 14th-C. Ioasaph, of the Hodegon monastery, copied primarily New Testament and liturgical codices. Occasionally a scribe might also paint miniatures (Buchthal-Beling, Patronage 54).

It took a scribe about four months to copy a MS of 350 folios (Devyresse, Manuscriis 50); in the 9th–10th C. Arethas paid 13–20 nomismata for the copying of slightly longer books. A 10th-C. copyist is known to have earned 900 nomismata from 28 years' work (Synax. CP 727.40f). Verse colophons written by scribes stress their inadequacy for the task (see Modesty, Topos or), the hardships of copying a text, and their relief at completing an assignment. The vita of Michael Maleinos (p.566f) tells of a scribe who drove himself so hard to transcribe a book that he suffered a massive hemorrhage. The Rule of Theodore of Studios included a list of punishments for careless monastic scribes (PG 99:1740B–D).


-E.G., A.M.T.

SCRIPT. See PALAEOGRAPHY.

SCRIPTOR INCERTUS (lit. "writer unknown"), conventional Latin title of an anonymous 9th-C. historical work from which two fragments are preserved: one, in Vat. gr. 2014 (13th C.), where it is placed between descriptions of the sieges of Constantinople of 626 and 717 and several hagiographical texts; the second, in Paris, B.N. gr. 1711 (dated 1013), is accompanied in the MS by the so-called chronicle of Leo Grammatikos (see SYMEON LOGOTHETE). Grégoire (infra), on the grounds of stylistic similarity, hypothesized that the two fragments belong to the same chronicle; his hypothesis is commonly accepted, although stylistic similarity is an unreliable basis for identification. The first fragment treats Nikephoros I's unsuccessful expedition against Bulgaria (811); the second describes the reigns of Michael I and Leo V. Both texts give details not in THEOPHANES THE CONFESSOR OR THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS. Grégoire also hypothesized, again on the basis of stylistic similarity, that the fragments formed part of a lost continuation of MALALAS. The date of compilation is questionable: the vividness of the description led to the conclusion that a contemporary wrote it. L. Tomić (ZVRI 1 [1952] 81) dates the text after 864, however, because it alludes to the eventual baptism of the Bulgarians (Dujčev, infra, p.216.83); her critics describe this allusion as a later editorial gloss. Pseudo-Symeon Magistros evidently used the second fragment, but, according to Browning (infra 406–11), there is no trace
of a similar source in the section on the period from Leo III to Michael I.


SCRIPTORIUM, a center for book production. Attribution of Byz. MSS to scriptoria is based on colophons and on palaeographical and codicological evidence; due in part to the dearth of material, however, our knowledge of Byz. scriptoria lags far behind that of Western centers. Best known are the scriptoria located at monasteries, such as STOUDIOS, where the rules of THEODORE OF STOUDIOS included regulations for scribes (PG 99:1740B–D). The protokalligraphos distributed the work; the monks copied the models into quires. Many of the MSS copied at Stoudios (ascetical works, rules of the founder, liturgical books, monastic literature, and commentaries on the Scriptures) were for the use of the Stoudite monks (N.F. Kavrus, VizVrem 44 [1983] 98–111). Other monastic scriptoria accepted commissions from outside clients; some specialized in certain kinds of MSS, for example, deluxe liturgical codices at the HODEGON MONASTERY in Constantinople. Scriptoria also existed at such Constantinopolitan monasteries as the Prodromos in PETRA and EUGERGETIS. Scriptoria outside the capital included those at the monastery of the Prodromos on Mt. MENONEKION or on Mt. Athos, esp. at Lavra, Iveron (J. Irigoin, Scriptorium 13 [1959] 195–204), and Philotheou.

The existence of an imperial scriptorium is attested as early as the reign of Constantius II, who commissioned scribes to copy works of ancient Greek literature (Lemerle, Humanism 58f). Under Constantine VII an imperial scriptorium is also well attested (J. Irigoin, supra 177–81). The best-known private scriptorium is that of the anagnostes Theodore Hagioptetrites, who specialized ca.1300 (perhaps in Thessalonike) in the production of liturgical MSS, esp. of the New Testament (R.S. Nelson, JOB 32.4 [1982] 79–85).

MS decorations aid further in identifying and understanding the nature of the scriptorium. Some scriptoria, such as the Stoudios monastery in the 11th C., maintained resident illuminators, as may be deduced from subscriptions and illuminations. Many, however, worked with independent outside illuminators. Often when MSS related by script are assembled, their decoration differs, and vice-versa, as has been shown for MSS of the 10th–14th C. (R.S. Nelson, The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal 15 [1987] 58f). For example, the scribe Ioasaph of the Hodegon monastery worked with various illuminators in the 14th C. (H. Buchthal, Art of the Mediterranean World AD 100 to 1400 [Washington, D.C., 1983] 157–70).


SCULPTURE (λιθοδοξία, χαλιτική). Sculpture in the round was largely reduced to relief in Byz., with the exception of imperial statuary and that of dignitaries; the last honorific statue to be erected in Constantinople was that of a cousin of Emp. Herakleios ca.614 (Mango in Aphermata Symposion 1:30f). The disappearance of statuary may be connected with a gradual process of dematerialization, also evident in sculpture intended for gardens or tombs. Relief portraits appear already on early imperial monuments: the Arch of Constantine, the columns of Theodosius I and Arkadios, and the Obelisk of Theodosios I, offer examples of high-quality relief.

Tombs containing SARCOPHAGI or sarcophagus slabs provide the best recorded group of 4th- and 5th-C. sculpture, with Rome and Ravenna as the main centers of production; Alexandrian workshops furnished the imperial PORPHYRY sarcophagi. Church furniture, including AMBOS, CIBORIA, and episcopal THRONES, is closely related to architectural sculpture and was often exported from the same Constantinopolitan workshops all around the Mediterranean. Peripheral workshops included Thessalonike, an ambo from there (J.-P. Sodini, BCH 100 [1976] 493–510) being an outstanding example with figural decoration. A gradual shift from the Graeco-Roman heritage toward truly Byz. forms, with a new ornamental
vocabulary partially indebted to Sasanian influence, appears in architectural sculpture (Church of St. Polyeuktos) in the time of Justinian I.

From the 8th C. onward, sculpture in the round was no longer being created, although Byz. writers (the anonymous author of Parastaseis Symtomoi Chronikai, Niketas Choniates) continued to notice Constantinople’s heritage of bronze statues. A new type of monumental sculpture appeared in 10th-C. Constantinople—the relief icon, many extant examples of which were transported to S. Marco, Venice. The development of architectural sculpture can be found in numerous monuments in Constantinople, along the coast of Asia Minor, and in Greece. Late 9th–11th-C. temples, capitals, cornices, slabs, icon frames, and doorframes display a limited vocabulary of crosses, geometric patterns, stylized floral ornament, a few animals or birds, and bosses. From the 12th C., however, a resurgent interest in sculpture is accompanied by increased plasticity and a repertory that now included mythological subjects, heraldic compositions, and animal combat, the human form being only rarely employed, mainly in Palaiologan Constantinople (H. Belting, München 23 [1972] 69–100). The same ornamental repertory is adopted in the rare preserved examples of church furniture and the numerous funerary monuments of the period, mainly built sarcophagi faced with marble slabs. A more ambitious type of funerary monument, dressed in marble, appears in 14th-C. Constantinople, with rich sculptural decoration around the arch of the niche (O. Hjort, DOP 33 [1979] 248–63). (See also Oxyrhynchus Sculpture.)


SCYPHATE, a term often wrongly applied to Byz. concave coins (trachea) of the 11th–14th C. in the belief that the word scyphatus found in southern Italian documents of the 11th–12th C. had this meaning. This word derived not from Greek σκύφως, “cup,” but from the Arabic word shafah, “edge” or “rim” (adjectival shiff), and was used with reference to the conspicuous border of early histamena and not to the concavity that characterized the later coins (P. Grierson, NCChron 11 [1971] 253–60).

- Ph.G.

SCYTHIANS MINOR, a province south of the Danube estuary, separated in the 4th C. from Moesia II. Its autochthonous population was comprised of Daco-Getans, whose material culture dominated the countryside through the 6th C. (G. Scorpan, Pontica 4 [1971] 137–53). Roman villas are also known in Scythia Minor (V.H. Baumann, Ferma romana din Dobrogea [Tulcea 1983]). The numerous cities of Scythia Minor can be divided into two groups: old Greek colonies on the Black Sea (Tomis, which was the capital, Histria, Kallatis, etc.) and Roman fortresses, primarily on the Danube (Dorostolon, Axioopolis, Dinogetia, Noviodunum, etc.). Located away from the main routes of barbarian invasions, Scythia Minor seems to have flourished in the 4th–6th C. Christian inscriptions are abundant. Among leading theologians of the time were the “Scythians” John Cassian and Dionysius Exiguus (I. Coman, Klenonimia 7 [1975] 27–48). A serious threat to Scythia Minor arose at the end of the 6th C., when it was invaded by the Avars and Slavs. The fate of the Geto-Roman population in the 7th C. is under discussion: A. Petre (RESEE 19 [1981] 555–68) insists on its continuity; A. Poulter (in Classical Tradition 198–204) asserts that archaeological data show a material decline of Scythia Minor and a progressive weakening of Byz. control that did not survive the reign of Herakleios.


- A.K.

SCYTHIANS (Σκύθαι), nomadic tribal groups of the Eurasian steppe. Forced out of their habitat north of the Black Sea by the Sarmatians, they temporarily retained Dobrudja, where the Roman province was officially called “Scythia Minor,” and the interior of Crimea; the Scyths, however, were dispersed among the local population.

Byz. writers used the term Scythians as an archaism denoting all nomadic peoples whom they
encountered, beginning in the 4th C. with the Huns (Asterios of Amaseia) and in the 6th C. with Cotrigurs and Utrigurs and the Old Turks. The usage continued throughout the empire’s history; the name Scythian was later applied to the Avars, Khazars, Bulgars, Hungarians, Pechenegs, Uzes, Cumans, Seljuks, Mongols, and Ottomans. Sometimes the term included the Slavs; the Rus’ were also called “Scythians” or “Tauroscythians.” Chalkokondyles (Chalk. 1:8.3–6) uses the term Scythian to designate “the people speaking the same tongue and equipped in the same way” who occupied the territory from the Don (Tanaïs) to Sarmatia (Poland), but indiscriminately transfers this name also to the Tatars.


SEALING IMPLEMENTS. For sealing with lead three items were required: a boulolveron, a blank, and a piece of cord. Blanks were cast in slate molds, as evidenced by examples recovered from excavations at Corinth (cf. Davidson, Minor Objects, pl.134). The molds featured circular wells with grooves; wire was placed in the grooves and when molten lead was poured into a mold it traveled into the wells and hardened into blanks. In the last phases the wire was removed to produce a hollow channel and to accomodate a cord by which the seal was attached to a document. The blank was placed between the two engraved heads of a boulolveron, a pliers-like instrument, and, when pressure was applied to the boulolveron, the blank received the imprint of the dies and the channel closed around the cord. It might be noted that since boulolveria were made from iron—a metal that corrodes relatively quickly after burial—only a small group has survived. Two extant examples (Zacos, Seals 1, pls. 1–4) appear somewhat flattened, suggesting that pressure was applied to a blank, not by squeezing the handles of the boulolveron, but rather by striking one of its heads with a hammer.

For sealing with wax a boulolveron might take the form of either a signet ring or a small stamp. Wax had the advantage over lead in that it could be more easily manipulated; also it added little weight when the owner was away from his desk or traveling. For these reasons, signet rings were used throughout the entire Byz. period for the protection of letters and for the security of such household items as chests and cabinets. (See also Seals, Bivalve and Seals, Cone or Pyramid.)


SEALS, BIVALVE, conventional term for seals with which two incised surfaces of matching dimensions but contrasting devices may be impressed on opposite sides of a single sealing, usually with a cord incorporated. Two variant bivalve types belong to the same family as the signet ring and the cone seal, since they were obviously intended for use with wax, pitch, or clay and produce impressions of comparable size and iconography to those made by rings and cones. One, a clamshell-like seal, is made of bronze and consists of a pair of hinged, shell-like disks with intaglio devices on their inner faces and a suspension loop above. The other, a disk-like seal, is usually made of steatite and has its two devices carved into the opposite faces of a single disk. Both of these sealing implements are characteristically (but not exclusively) of the 10th–12th C., steatite specimens being quite rare. Not surprisingly, both disks and clamshells draw on the same repertoire of sealing devices as contemporary rings, including monograms, invocations, icons, and narrative scenes. Bivalves were used in both the private and public sectors of Byz.; an early specimen found in Sicily, for example, belonged to a notary. Moreover, the imperial wax seal was sometimes referred to as diptychos (“two-fold”; Patmou Engrapha 1, no. 13.42), suggesting that not one but two sides were impressed with seals—very possibly by a clamshell bivalve.

Lit. Vikan-Nesbitt, Security 29f.

SEALS, CONE OR PYRAMID, conventional terms for a seal that was a functional twin to the signet ring, with the intaglio sealing device cut into the bezel-like base of a small cone or pyramid, and with a tiny loop at the apex for suspension. Apparently without antecedent in Western Roman society, the cone seal represents instead an absorption and adaptation, in Byz. Anatolia, of a characteristically Persian sealing implement. Early specimens tend to be of stone (e.g., rock crystal),
with uninscribed figures or animals, while those of the 10th C. or later are almost universally bronze. For the most part they bear standard invocational formulas ("Lord, help..."), although some carry images or zoomorphic motifs. Like signet rings and bivalve seals, cone seals could only have been used with a pliant medium such as wax or clay. Official titles appear only very rarely, which suggests that their primary role was in the home.

Lit. Vikan-Nesbitt, Security 20–23. — G.V.

SEALS AND SEALINGS. Technically speaking, a seal (σφραγίς, Lat. sigillum) is an implement, while sealings are the objects produced, but following common English usage we refer to the object as a "seal" and use the word bulla in the same sense. Seals were made of lead, gold, silver, and wax; they are found to vary in diameter from approximately 15 to 80 mm; most seals, however, range in size from approximately 23 to 28 mm. Seals were used to authenticate the signature of the person responsible for the issuance of a document; they were also used in place of a countersignature, an indication of the responsibility of a senior official for the issuance of a document when he was not present as signator but approved of its issuance by a subordinate. In addition, seals of both wax and lead were employed to preserve the integrity of correspondence. After being folded, a letter was tied with a string, the security of the small bundle assured by the application of a wax seal to paper and string or the placement of the two ends of the string within the channel of a lead seal. Finally, lead seals were used to secure tied bundles, as indicated by numerous seals carrying the imprint of burlap. Lead bullae were used at least as early as the 4th C. (e.g., Seibt, Bleisiegel, nos. 1–5), but such seals are rare; the earliest bullae to be recovered in large numbers are examples of the 6th C. They continued to be employed until 1453, although large collections reflect a significant decline in use after 1200 (possibly because of a shortage of lead or perhaps simply a decline in population).

All segments of society used seals: emperors and their chanceries employed ones made of gold, wax, and lead. We know from pseudo-Kodinos (p.175.26–32) that an emperor would employ wax seals when writing to members of his immediate family, his mother, wife, or son. The use of wax seals in the imperial chancery is exemplified by a wax seal of the sebastokrator Nikephoros Petralphas, still suspended on a document of 1200 (preserved on Mt. Athos at the Xeropotamou Monastery and illustrated in Oikonomides, Seals, fig.10). The use of gold bullae may have originated as early as the 8th C. (Grierson, DOP 20 [1966] 249), but over the course of centuries their method of manufacture underwent alteration. At first they were made in a casting mold, like lead seals; in the mid-11th C. the chancery began to make them out of two separate roundels of gold held together by solder; and in the 14th–15th C. they consisted simply of two thin sheets of gold bound together with wax.

The weight of gold seals was reckoned in solidi and the De ceremoniis (De cer. 686.5–10, bk.2, ch.48) reports that the pope should receive a gold seal equal in weight to two gold coins, but the patri-
SEA ROUTES. From Roman times and through the 6th C., the most important sea routes were those that linked the eastern Mediterranean with Italy, going either from the west coast of Asia Minor to the Greek coast and then along the Peloponnese to Italy and Sicily, or from the southern coast of Asia Minor, Syria, or Palestine to Crete and then to Sicily, or from Alexandria along the North African coast to Sicily to Italy. These east-west routes were significantly disturbed by the establishment of Muslim sea power, after the capture of Crete and Sicily. From then until the 11th C., coastal navigation along the Asia Minor and Greek shores became usual, the Aegean islands playing the role of relay stations. Thus Gregory of Dekapolis sailed from Ephesus to Prokonnesos, to Ainos and Christoupolis. From Thessalonike he continued to Corinth, Reggio, Naples, and finally to Rome (Vita 53–56). Arab sources show a transverse route between Pelusion in Egypt and Constantinople, through the Cretan sea (9th–10th C.), and a route from Tripoli (in North Africa) to Byz. (10th C.). Also important were the Black Sea coastal routes, both along the north-south axis and from Trebizond to Constantinople.

After the 11th C., the east-west routes became open once again, primarily under the influence of the Italian traders. In the Black Sea, navigation in the open sea continued. Ibn Battuta took a Greek ship from Sinope to Vosporo (Kerch) on his way to Kaffa (Travels 1411); the party of Ignatij of Smolensk sailed from Sozul to Constantinople in 13 days in June 1889 (Majeska, Russian Travelers 86–90, 401–03).

As for the length of travel, the vita of Blasios of Amorion gives 12 days between Rome and Methone (AASS Nov. 4:666B), while 20 days from the southern coast of Asia Minor to Bari (in 1087) may have been unusually short. The Geniza documents show 18 days between Alexandria and Constantinople, and in the 12th C. it took 10 days from Constantinople to Cyprus (A.L. Udovitch, SettStu 25:2 [1978] 510–12). The transport of commodities by sea was usually cheaper than by land. (See also Land Routes.)


SEASONS, PERSONIFICATIONS OF. These symbols of the quarterly divisions of the year, like those of the Months, were common as decorative motifs in Late Antique floor mosaics; on occasion they can be interpreted as elements in a cosmic scheme (Maguire, _Earth & Ocean_ 36). On the Parabiazo plate (Age of Spirit., no. 164), the representation of the Seasons as fruit-bearing children associated with Kybele and Attis suggests that they refer to death and resurrection. Similar concerns are evident on sarcophagi (ibid., no. 386) where the Seasons appear as _erotes_. Their role as aspects of a comprehensive attitude toward _Creation_, suggested in the _Ekphrasis of John of Gaza_, received its fullest treatment in art of the 11th C. and later. In most of the illustrated _Octateuchs_, differing versions of the Seasons attend God’s promise to Noah (Gen 8:22): thus in Vat. gr. 746, fol. 57r, _Day_ and _Night_ turn an ovoid wheel containing a sower (Spring), a man gathering flowers (Summer), a thresher (Autumn), and an old man warming himself by a fire (Winter).


SEBASTE (Σεβαστή, Ar. Sebaṣṭiyah, now Shomeron in Israel), city in the province of Palestina I under _Caesarea Maritima_ and bishopric under the patriarch of _Jerusalem_; situated just northwest of _Neapolis_. Called Samaritans in antiquity, the city was rebuilt and renamed Sebaste by Herod. The discovery here during the reign of Julian of John the Baptist’s tomb and relics was the occasion of a pagan riot. Veneration of the relics, and of those of the prophets Elisha and Obadiah found nearby, nevertheless persisted, and Sebaste became a pilgrimage center, with legends claiming it as the site of John’s death. Two churches were built to honor him; a 12th-C. pilgrimage report that one of them, the cathedral, was then being replaced by a Crusader church, while the other (of the 6th C.?), then part of a Greek monastery, had been partly rebuilt in the 11th C. as a Byz. domed church and was remodeled in the 12th C. in mixed Latin and Byz. style. Frescoes from the last two phases have been found. Crowfoot’s association of the second of these phases with restoration in the Holy Land supported by Manuel I Komnenos has been challenged by Hunt, who suggests that these paintings were done by a Byz. artist working in the 1140s for the Knights of the Order of St. John.


SEBASTEIA (Σεβαστεία, mod. Sivas), city of northeastern Cappadocia on the Halys at the junction of major roads; civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of Armenia I from the early 5th C. Justinian I rebuilt its walls, but Chosroes I surprised and burned it in 575. Under Arab attack from the late 7th C., when it appears as a city of _Armeniakon_, Sebasteia became a _kleisoura_ under Leo VI and by 911 a separate theme that stretched
to Tephrike and Melitene before being reduced later in the 10th C.; it subsisted through the 11th C. So many Armenians immigrated to the city in the 10th C. that they predominated in the population: Sebasteia was an Armenian bishopric from 986 and in 1019 was given to Senacherim Arc-runi, whose successors administered it first as Byz. vassals, then independently after 1074 until the Turkish conquest, ca.1090. The last years of Byz. rule were marked by increasing hostility between Greeks and Armenians. The walls of Sebasteia have disappeared, but a Byz. inscribed-cross church survives as a mosque. (See also Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia.)

LIT. Tib 2:274–76.

SEBASTOKRATOR (σεβαστοκράτωρ), word formed from a combination of SEBASTOS and AUTOKRATOR, a title created by Alexios I for his brother Isaac Komnenos. Under the Komnenoi, sebastokrator was the highest title (following that of co-emperor and later despotes) conferred on the emperor's sons and brothers. After 1204 the title was assumed also in the Latin Empire. The emperors of Nicaea bestowed it on some semi-independent (?) landlords such as Sabas Aside- nos. The title sebastokrator was granted primarily to the emperor's relatives. The last known holder of this title is Demetrios Kantakouzenos under John V. The title was used in Bulgaria during the 13th–14th C. (E. Savcheva, EtBalk [1979] no.9, 53–71). Blue was the color that distinguished the sebastokrator, who had the right to sign his documents with blue ink and to attach his seal with a blue silk cord; he wore blue shoes but was allowed to have a coronet in red and a red tunic. The sebastokrator's wife was the sebastokratorissa.


SEBASTOPHOROS (σεβαστοφόρος), an office or title mentioned in the 10th-C. taktikon of Escorial. Oikonomides (infra) suggested that it was introduced between 963 and 975 and conferred primarily on eunuchs. The functions of the sebospophoros are not clear—the etymology of the word implies that he may have carried the emperor's banner. The first sebostophoros was probably Romanos Lekapenos, son of the ephemeral basilus in 944–45. Stephen Lekapenos (Skyl. 258.43–44); other sebastophori included such influential persons as Stephen Pergamenos and Nikephorites. The Georgian hagiographer of St. John and Euthymios the Iberian (P. Peeters, AB 36–37 [1917–19] 20.12–13) defines an anonymous sebastophoros as one of the most significant “princes” of the palace. On seals, sebastophoroi combine their title with relatively modest functions of the logos theton agelon, vestarios, or droungarios ton plomion (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 587, 710, 961). The seal of the monk and sebastophoros Basil (Zacos, Seals 2, no.383) is enigmatic, unless we hypothesize that monachos is his second name or sobriquet like that of Basil Monachos, governor of Bulgaria in the mid-11th C. The title does not appear after the 12th C. In antiquarian texts, such as the Souda or a scholion to the Patria of Constantinople, the term sebastophoroi designates “the district chiefs” (regencia) who performed dances in honor of the emperor.


SEBASTOPOLIS (Σεβαστούπολις), ancient Dioscurias, a fortified town on the east coast of the Black Sea, near the modern Suchumi. Strabo (11.2.14–16) describes the great variety of languages spoken in the area (near the older town of Dioscurias) and Pliny (Natural History 6.5.15) notes that 130 interpreters were needed. Under Justinian I, Sebastopolis and the nearby Pityus (modern Pitunda) were reconstructed (Prokopios, Buildings 3.7.8–9). By the 8th C. a tradition had developed that the apostle Andrew had visited Sebastopolis (F. Dvornik, The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew [Cambridge, Mass., 1958] 208). Until the end of the 8th C. Sebastopolis remained an important base for Byz.

LIT. Iu.N. Voronov, Dioknariada-Sevastopolis-Chum (Moscow 1980) 89–112.

SEBASTOS (σεβαστός, lit. “venerable”), term that in the works of Greek authors of the 1st–2nd C. served to render the Lat. augustus. It reappeared in the 11th C. as an honorific epithet: Constantine IX proclaimed his mistress Skleraina sebaste, and soon thereafter Alexios (I) and Isaac Komnenos
acquired the title. Constantine, nephew of Patr. Michael I Keroularios, was also sebostos before 1081. The term became the foundation of Alexios I’s reform of titles: it served as the root for the highest titles, sebastokrator, panhypersebastos, and protosebastos, and was itself conferred on the nobility, primarily relatives of the Komnenian dynasty—according to Sterion (infra 229), more than 90 percent of sebostoi belonged to the ruling family. The title was debased by the end of the 12th C. (Kazhdan, Gösp. klas. 114f), and in a 14th-C. ceremonial book sebostos occupies a low rank, following the droungarios (pseudo-Kod. 139,30). The formulary of Sathas (MB 6:65,1.6–11) preserves the type of imperial prostatas granting the sebastaton, or the dignity of sebastos. The sebostoi of the 12th C., called pansebostoi sebostoi, formed two groups: sebostoi gambroi and simple sebostoi. The title could be conferred on foreign princes. In the 13th–14th C. sebostoi were the commanders of ethnic units (H. Ahrweiler in Polychronion 34–38). Adopted by the Bulgarians in the 12th C., the term designated, according to P. Petrov (VizVrem 16 [1959] 52–64), the ruler of a district, whereas in Serbia it was known from the end of the 13th C. and used for officials of various functions.


—A.K.

SEBEOS, the author of a 7th-C. Armenian History of Heracleios, according to 11th-C. Armenian writers. The surviving MS of 1672, however—the basis of later copies and of printed editions of “Sebeos”—lacks both title and author’s name. Whether the surviving text is in fact the History of Heracleios by “Sebeos” is unclear. Nevertheless, this history is particularly valuable as a source for the Byz.-Persian wars from the reign of Maurice to the accession of Mu‘awiyah as caliph (591–661). Besides providing information on military and political matters, it describes the unsuccessful attempts of Byz. rulers to enforce a reunion of the churches of Constantinople and Armenia. The beginning of the extant text contains brief sections on the original settlement of Armenia (the Primary History, Moses Xorenac’i) and the early history of Armenia (based on authors as late as the 11th C.). These, however, have no connection with the History of Heracleios.


—R.T.

SECONDARY TAXES. In the Byz. fiscal system, a considerable part was played by various secondary taxes and obligations, theoretically required for a limited time and in order to meet a specific need. They affected the wealthy as well as the poor. Many were outlays in kind or consisted of a service, but often, through commutation, they were turned into payments in money, thereby losing their exceptional character and becoming regular fiscal obligations. Their total burden upon the taxpayer cannot be evaluated with any certainty. Probably under normal conditions the sum of these obligations in the 10th C. was not much heavier than the strateia. Large landowners claimed, often successfully, exemption for their domains, obviously because secondary taxes represented a sizable fiscal burden: because of their exceptional character, secondary taxes were more likely to be claimed arbitrarily, with increased frequency, by tax collectors (mainly tax farmers), and thus could become a major and unpredictable fiscal burden. They were called by pejorative generic names, such as munera sordida (dirty services), bare (burdens), and eperelai (vexations).

First Period (4th to 7th C.). The old taxes in money (unimportant, because of the 3rd-C. crisis) and those initiated after Constantine I’s monetary reform were collected by the office of the comes sacrarum largitionum. The comes also collected such odd taxes as the aurum coronarium (theoretically voluntary but in fact a regular contribution of the cities for the emperor’s accession to the throne) and the aurum oblaticium (a similar payment made by the senate); he also collected city taxes and taxes initiated in the 4th C. such as the collatio globalis (paid by senators proportionately to their property), the collatio lastralis (chrysargyron), and the aurum tironicum, a gold levy in commutation for recruits. The praetorian pre-
Second Period (8th to 12th C.). The taxes collected previously by the sacrae largitiones disappeared almost completely, while the munera sordida considerably increased in number and importance; together with new secondary taxes, they reached a peak in the late 11th C. (very long lists are to be found in imperial chrysobulls granting exemptions), at a time when collectors were predominantly tax farmers. Next to various hearth taxes and tithes are several new secondary taxes, such as the oikomodion, taxes paid for the paroikoi (paroikiatikon), sometimes according to their means (zeugaratiikon, akmemonitikon for aktemones). Moreover, the equivalent of most of the above munera sordida and some new ones are found: the obligation to offer winter quarters to Byz. and (mostly) foreign mercenaries (mitaton) or alternatively to make payment in order to avoid the inconvenience (antimitatikon); the offer of short-term billeting to (aplekton) or residence for (kathisma) military or civil officials; to provide food and forage (diatrophe, ekbole chreion kai chor-tasmaton); mandatory sale of one’s produce to the state at a fixed price (this is the equivalent of the old synone, now called exomesis); requisition of part of the crops for the army or for storage in a fortress (sitarkesis); requisition of horses and mules from the wealthy contributors of a province (monoprosopon); and several corvées—first the angareia, then providing timber or coal, making bread for the army (psomozemia), and building or maintaining roads (hodostrasia), bridges (gephyroktisia), fortresses (kastroktisia), or ships for the navy (karabopoiia, later katergoktisia). Other obligations are directly related to the army: providing or equipping policemen (taxatoi), light soldiers (archers, mounted archers, footsoldiers armed with spears, maces, or axes), or sailors (ploimoi); providing blacksmiths (komodromikon) with nails and horseshoes, etc.

Third Period (12th to 15th C.). The long lists of secondary taxes disappear in the 12th C. but several of these taxes survive with the same or new names, while others are introduced, inspired by new conditions or foreign influence. In the 12th C. appears the zeugoligion, the nature of which is unclear (related to the zeugarion); it is still attested in the 15th C. In the empire of Nicaea, the sitarkia became a very important tax on farmers possessing a pair of oxen, while the agape was presumably paid by those who had none. Most services mentioned above survived well into the 14th C. The Palaiologan period, however, brought several innovations: surtaxes, such as the opheleia (10 percent increase of the oikoumenon of the paroikoi); abiotikion; fiscalized fines such as the aer; and supplementary taxes such as the dimodation, the vigliatikon (service of watchman, which could be commuted to a cash payment), the syndosia (contribution?), the phloriatikon (see kastroktisia), the kapeliatikon (tax on the sale of wine), the kokkiatikon (contribution in grain for the biscuit rations of the fleet at the beginning of the 15th C.), and several other taxes and rights, such as the ones levied for the rights of fishing in rivers or lakes. The number of secondary taxes and corvées dropped drastically in early 15th-C. Chalkidike, where a fiscal system influenced by the Ottomans was established.


—N.O.

SECOND COMING. See Parousia.

SECOND ECUMENICAL COUNCIL. See Constantinople, Councils of: Constantinople I.

SECOND SOPHISTIC (δευτέρα σοφιστική), term introduced by Philostratos (ca.200) to designate the branch of rhetoric that emphasized social and political aspects of life rather than morals and philosophy (Opera, ed. C.L. Kayser [Leipzig 1871; rp. Hildesheim 1964] 2:2f). The term Sec-
and Sophistic is now applied to a literary movement of the 2nd–6th C. closely connected with the cultural activity of urban intellectuals. From the 4th C. onward, sophists such as Themistios were esp. concerned with preserving or even restoring ancient virtues. Unlike Philostratos, Eunapios of Sardis, a biographer of the 4th-C. sophists, presented them as both orators and philosophers, often involved in imperial administration. He also dwelt on the rivalry between various groups of sophists who would accuse each other of tyranny. The chief categories into which each sophist oratory in its developed form could be divided, and its stylistic techniques, were listed in handbooks (Hermogenes, Menander Rhetor, Aphthonios, Nicholas of Myra) that significantly influenced Byz. literary theory. The greatest church orators (John CHRYSOSTOM, Gregory of Nyssa) used these techniques (metaphors of secular origin, bizarre comparisons, alliterations, homooeoteleutae, etc.) in their practice. In Byz. the term sophistes meant an eloquent man, esp. a teacher of eloquence (e.g., Darrouzès, Tornikès 255-30), as well as a shrewd person.


SEKOUNDINOS, NICHOLAS, writer and diplomat; born Chalkis, Euboea, 1402, died Venice, 22/3 Mar. 1464. Born to a Greek family, Sekoundinos (Σεκούνδινος, Lat. Sagundinus) received an excellent classical education. In 1430 he was captured by the Turks during their conquest of Thessalonike. After his release he was appointed by Venice as advocatus curiae at Chalkis (1434–37). Sekoundinos was bilingual in Greek and Latin and served as official translator at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–39). A supporter of Union, he converted to Catholicism after the Council. Following a period (1439–41?) as papal secretary to Eugenius IV, he returned to Euboea as secretary (cancelliere) to the Venetian bailo. In 1453 he became ducal secretary in Venice and spent the rest of his life on missions in Italy, Spain, Greece, and Turkey.

Sekoundinos left a substantial number of works, mostly in Latin and still unpublished. They include 66 letters (addressed mainly to his family and Italian humanist friends); minor treatises on philosophy, theology, and rhetoric; and a summary of Ottoman history, Othumanorum familia, which was commissioned in 1456 by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini. Sekoundinos also translated into Latin ancient Greek authors such as Demosthenes, Onesander (the Strategikos), Plutarch, and Arrian.

ED. For complete list, see Mastrodemetres, infra 115–229.

SEKRETIKOI (ΣΕΚΡΕΤΙΚΟΙ), generic term used in the late 9th-C. Klerorologion of Philotheos to designate one of three categories of civil officials (sekrethoi, judges, demokratai); they included the sakellarios, several logothetai and chartoularioi, protasekretis, epi tou eidakou (see Eidekon), kouratoreis, and orfanotrophoi. Their major, though not exclusive, duties were financial; an obscure passage in an 11th-C. historian about
SEKRETON (σεκρέτον), a bureau or department. The term, in the form secretarium, appeared first in 303 to describe the tribunals investigating accusations against Christians (Lactant., De mort. pers. 15.5); it underscored the secrecy of the procedures, in contrast to the open sessions of regular Roman courts. As these sessions fell into disuse, the term secretarium came to be identified with judicium, the external mark of which was the curtain (velum) used to separate the court from the public. Sekretion was also occasionally used as a term for the consistorium, and in the De ceremoniis it designated the entire body of higher officials. The late 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos (e.g., Oikonomides, Listes 113.24) uses sekretos as a technical term for the bureau of a government official; from it the terms sekretikos and asekretis as well as logothetes ton sekreton (known through the 12th C.) were dervied. A bureau consisted of various subordinate officials, some of whom Philotheos calls chartoularios of the sekretos and imperial notaries of the sekretos.

In the 14th and 15th C. the imperial or katholikon sekretos (cf. kritai katholikoi) designated the supreme judicial court, the decisions of which could not be appealed (Koultoun., no.34.110–11, a.1375); a text of 1334 identifies the imperial sekretos as the tribunal of katholikoi kritai (Esphig., no.19.12). An act of Patr. Joseph II from 1426 juxtaposes the sekretos of the holy basilica and the synodal court (Kastam., no.6.22), and a document of 1377 speaks of the archonies of the imperial and ecclesiastical sekreta (Lavra 3, no.148.8).

From the 7th C. onward the term sekretos was applied to both the patriarchal court or council and the patriarch's council hall; later the patriarchal sekretos was identified with the bureau of the chartophylax (MM 4:310.16–17), but the term could be extended to other departments of the patriarchate.


SELEUKEIA (Σελεύκεια, mod. Silifke), coastal city of Isauria. As ecclesiastical metropolis, Seleukeia was the site of a synod that discussed Arianism in 359. Seleukeia was headquarters of a civil governor and a military commander, comes Isauriae. It was an active port and the site of an imperial factory that manufactured cloth for the army and officials. Local conditions are revealed in the miracles of St. Therla, whose shrine lay outside Seleukeia at Meriamlik. In 616 Herakleios established a mint at Seleukeia during his campaigns against the Persians; its transfer to Isaura in 617 suggests that Seleukeia was taken. Seleukeia was seat of the droungarios of the Kyrrhaisi theme, then capital of the theme of Seleukeia (Isauria). After a temporary loss to the Turks, Seleukeia was recovered and refortified in 1099. It had a prosperous Jewish community in the mid-12th C. and was the base for Manuel I's temporary reconquest of Cilicia in 1159. It fell to the Armenians soon after 1180. Seleukeia contains ruins of a church converted from a temple and a fortress with some Byz. walls.


SELEUKEIA PIERIA (now the two sites of Kapısu and Mağaracık in Turkey), city and bishopric in the province of Syria I and port serving Antioch until at least the 7th C. Seleukeia Pieria was rebuilt and its harbor enlarged in 345/6 by Emp. Constantius II (Theoph. 38.6–7), who was residing at Antioch. In 524, 64 arches and breakwaters of the harbor were altered, and three bridges between Seleukeia Pieria and Antioch were built by Ephrem, comes Orientis (IGLSyr 3, no.1142). Justinian I gave the city a grant in 528 and reduced its taxes to finance the repair of earthquake damage (Malal. 443.8–444.4). In 540 Seleukeia Pieria, like the suburb of Daphne, was untouched by the Persian ruler Chosroes I, who sacked and burned Antioch (Prokopios, Wars 2.11.1). Some pavements of the 5th and 6th C. have been excavated, as has what may have been a large tetraconch cathedral with champlévé marble decoration. During the Monophysite persecution of ca.525 the monastery of St. Thomas near the harbor of Seleukeia Pieria moved to Europos. There are remains of Byz. (4th–6th C.) and Georgian (11th–
SELJUKS. A dynasty named after an ancestor called Seljuk, perhaps a converted Muslim, who, according to Mahmud al-Kashgari (fl. ca. 1075), was a subaşı (chief of the army) belonging to the Turkic nomadic people of the Oghuz. When the great Oghuz migration began in the 11th C. from the region of the Aral Sea toward the West, Seljuk’s successors, profiting from the situation, established their rule in Khurasan and soon conquered Persia. Seljuk’s grandson, Tughrul Beg, at the invitation of the “Abbâsid caliph put an end to the Buyid dynasty and began to rule as sultan in Baghdad, which became the capital of the Great Seljuk state. His successor Alp Arslan defeated the Byz. army at Manzikert in 1071 and captured Emp. Romans IV Diogenes. After this victory and profiting from the dynamic strife in the Byz. empire, the Seljuks established the sultanate of Rûm with Nicæa as its capital; Süleyman ibn Kutlumuş was sent by the government of Baghdad to organize the newly conquered territories but perished in internal strife ca. 1085. Expelled from Nicæa and the coastslands of Asia Minor by the Crusaders (1097), the Seljuks moved their capital to Ikonion. In the 12th C. they had to confront the rival Turkish state of the Danışmendids. In 1176 the Seljuks defeated the Byz. at Myriokephalon; by the end of the century they had succeeded in uniting the whole of Islamic Asia Minor under their rule and, during the first decades of the 13th C., in reaching a remarkable prosperity. Uprheaval began in their territories, however, as a result of a new Turkoman migration because of the Mongol advance toward the West. In 1243 the Mongols defeated the Seljuks near Kösé-Dağ (a region of Sebasteia) and invaded their territories, which remained in continuous turmoil until the first decade of the 14th C., when the sultanate of Rûm disappeared under unclear circumstances. A number of Turkish emirates were subsequently established in the former Seljuk domain, that is, Karaman, Germiyan, Mentesh, Aydın, Saruhan, Karasi, and the emirate of Osman.

SELJYBRIA (Σηλυμβρια, mod. Silivri), city in Thrace on the north shore of the Sea of Marmara, west of Constantinople, inside the Long Wall. Prokopios (Buildings 4.9.12–13) attributes the fortification of Selymbria to Justinian I, and Theophanes (Theoph. 234.3–5) also states that Justinian went to Selymbria “to build the Long Wall.” Selymbria was an important strategic point at the end of the Via Egnatia and is usually mentioned in connection with the passage of armies and processions: the dying Constantine V was brought from Arkadioupolis to Selymbria, where he boarded a ship (Theoph. 448.15–19), and Nicholas I Mystikos (ep.19.42–43) invited Symeon of Bulgaria to come to Herakleia or Selymbria to negotiate peace. Manuel I spent Easter of 1167 at Selymbria on his way to Hungary (Kinn. 265.3–4).

The city acquired special significance during the civil wars of the mid-14th C. John VI Kantakouzenos rebuilt its fortifications, and the remains of his ramparts still stand; in 1345 the wedding of John V’s daughter to the Ottoman sultan Orhan was celebrated in Selymbria. In 1327 Alexios Apo- kaukos was archon of Selymbria (Kantak. 1:258.22), and ca. 1399 a certain Bryennios Leontares acted as kephale of the city (MM 2:401.19–20). In 1382 John V ceded Selymbria, together with Herakleia, Rhaidesostes, and Panion, to Andronikos IV and John VII. In 1453 Selymbria effectively resisted Turkish attack and surrendered only after the fall of Constantinople.

Selymbria is listed in notitiæ as the “archbishopric of Europe,” and from the 12th C. onward as a metropolis without suffragans. Philetäos, metropolitan of Selymbria in the 14th C., noted several churches there, one of which was sponsored by Apokaukos; its ruins were recently discovered.


13th C.) monastic installations above Seleukeia Pieria.


—M.M.M.
SEMANTRON (σήμαντρον), a gong, used in
monasteries in preference to bells. The semantron
was a long piece of iron (sideroun), bronze (chal-
koun), or wood (xylon) that was struck with a hammer
to awaken monks and nuns and to summon
them to services. Monasteries usually had three
semantra, of varied sizes and materials, which
sounded distinct notes and served different pur-
poses. A wooden semantron (aphymisterion) was used
to awaken the nuns at the Kecharitomene nun-
ery and the monks at the Euergetis monastery
for midnight services; at the conclusion of that
service, the “great semantron” (also called a synak-
terion) and one of bronze were struck to signal the
beginning of the orthros service. The large se-
mantron was approximately 2 m in length, and
was sometimes suspended by chains in a tower;
the smaller ones were portable. Sounding boards
of iron or wood are attested from the 4th C.; in
the early period they were called xylon or rhabdos
sidera (“iron rod”). The terms semanter, semantron,
and semantron were used later, from at least the
11th C. onward.

cherches au Mont-Athos III. Phiale et simandare à Lavra,”
BCH 29 (1905) 105–41. Clugnet, Dictionnaire 136f. Arranz,
Typikon 412, 434.

SEMEIOMA (σημειώμα), or semeiosis (σημειώσις),
written report of a judicial decision or verdict,
excerpted from the tribunal’s records (parase-
meissais). It usually contained a list of the delib-
erating officials or judges and was used even for
decisions taken with the participation of the em-
peror or by the ecclesiastical tribunal (synodikon
semeioma). In the 14th–15th C. the term was re-
placed by sekretikon gramma.

Lit. Dölger-Karayannopulos, Urkundenlehre 82, 85–87.
Darrouzès, Officia 482–508. Svoronos, “Actes des fonction-
naires” 426.

SEMISSIS (σημίστρον, from Lat. semis + as, “half
a unit”), in late Roman and Byz. times a small
gold coin weighing 2.78 g and worth half a solidus.
Minted on a modest scale during the 4th–
5th C., semisses were much more important dur-
ing the 6th–7th C. and the first decades of the
8th C. From the 740s onward this coin, like the
tremissis, was only rarely struck in the East, the
latest specimen known being of Basil I. In the
West it continued as a normal element in the
coinage of Sicily down to the fall of Syracuse in
878.

Lit. DOC 3:22.

SEMPAD CONNETABLE. See Smbat the Con-
stable.

SENACHERIM. See Arcurini.

SENATE (σχιγκλητος), supreme and most presti-
gious council of the Roman state, transformed in
the imperial period into an advisory board with
ill-defined rights and duties. Diocletian tried to
deprive the senate of any administrative func-
tions, but many of his measures were revoked by
Constantine I. After the founding of Constanti-
nople, the senate of Rome remained a council of
the urban prefect, with whom the senators
managed the city treasury (arca publica), provi-
sioning of the city, and building activity. In theory
the senate retained the right of legislation, but in
practice it served as a place where imperial edi-
tics were made public. As a body the senators com-
manded respect and even the power to resist
imperial orders, as revealed in the dispute over the
Altar of Victory. Under the Ostrogoths, the
senate and the papacy were the last organized
form of Roman administration in Italy; Justinian
I, however, entrusted the Roman senate with very
limited rights such as supervision of measures and
weights (Sanctio Pragmatica 19). After an em-
bassy to Constantinople in 580 there is no evi-
dence concerning the senate of Rome.

The senate of Constantinople was created by
Constantine I but given only secondary rank, its
members called not clarissimi but clari. Constanti-
tius II in a series of laws of 357–61 made the
Constantinopolitan institution equal to its coun-
terpart in Rome. The senate of Constantinople
survived to the very end of Byz., but it played
mainly an advisory and ceremonial role, often
acting in concert with the consistorium. Leo VI
(novs. 47 and 78) officially abrogated the senate’s
rights to appoint praetors and pass laws. When
the heir to the throne was a minor (as, for example, after the death of Romanos II), the senate could have a voice in the nomination of the regent, but participation of the senate in a regular proclamation of the emperor (even a usurper) was ceremonial rather than meaningful. The actual relationship between the senate and the emperor, who was to convocate the senate and preside over it, depended on the concrete situation. In case of a crisis, the senate could nominate generals and conduct international negotiations; it also possessed judicial power in cases involving high-ranking officials. The number of members of the Constantinopolitan senate in the mid-4th C. is estimated between 50 (Cod. Theod. VI 4-9) and 2,000, the difference probably to be explained as one between the active administrators and the holders of the senatorial rank. In the 11th C. Attaleiates speaks of the myriades of senators, suggesting the growth of the institution, but he does not give precise information about this increase in size (Lemerle, Cinq études, 291).


SENATE HOUSE (Σενάτον, also Sinatón), the name of two buildings in Constantinople, construction of which is usually ascribed to Constantine I, although the Parastasis symptomi chronikai name an unknown Sinatos as a founder of one of them—a typical example of fantastic and arbitrary etymology. There is no evidence that either of these buildings was ever used to house the assembly of senators. One building, located east of the Augustaion, was burned in 404, restored, again destroyed by fire in 532, and rebuilt by Justinian I. The other senate house, a domed structure, was in the northern part of the Forum of Constantine. Both were splendid buildings adorned by numerous statues of emperors and mythological figures (e.g., that of Zeus brought from Dodone); both suffered from several fires and were thereafter rebuilt. The source information on them is frequently confusing (it is not always possible to distinguish to which one a citation refers) and legendary. Thus the Parastasis symptomi chronikai (Parastasis, p.1161) relates that in front of "the so-called Senate of the Forum" was erected a porphyry statue that represented Constantine I with his two sons, Constans and Constans, with three heads and six hands but only two feet; during a fire in the reign of Theodosios II, it was stolen and thrown into the sea; the enraged Theodosios then ordered the senate house to be burned.

LIT. Janin, CP byz. 154-56. Mango, Brazen House 56f.

SENIATOR (συγκλητικοῦ), member of the senate. Although in late antiquity the senate as an institution did not play a dominant role, senators as a body formed the upper stratum of society. Diocletian tried to exclude senators from all but a few state offices, but Constantine I and his successors reversed this policy: they accepted the growth of a senatorial aristocracy in the West, while in the East they encouraged vertical mobility so that stable families of great landowners (such as the Apions) were few. Senators were divided officially into several ranks—illustres, spectabiles, and clarissimi—but as a result of the devaluation of titles only the illustris remained a senatorial prerogative. Justinian I was accused by Pprokopios of Caesarea of anti-senatorial attitudes, and Phokas sought to eliminate the last senatorial families. At any rate, in the 7th–9th C. there is no evidence of senatorial or other aristocratic families of long duration; senators were ephemeral functionaries rather than stable aristocrats and landowners. In 996 Basil II still expressed indignation that certain families remained in power for 70 to 100 years.

By the 11th C. the senatorial class was again institutionalized. It included all high-ranking officials (beginning with protospatharios) and some members of the highest clergy (such as synkellos); senators were obliged to live in Constantinople and participate in palace ceremonial. The term senators also designated the body of civil functionaries as opposed to the military aristocracy. The 11th C. witnessed the upsurge of the civil senators. The Komnenoi, on the other hand, despised the senators and relied on their own relatives (Zon. 3:765.17–18). The same ambivalent attitude toward senators was preserved by later authors: Kantakouzenos both distinguishes senators from the nobles (e.g., Kantak. 2:166.1–3) and considers the nobles (epiphaneis) as a group among the senators (3:23.15).
SEPHER YOSIPPON. See Jewish Literature.

SEPTEM (Σέπτεμ, mod. Ceuta), a Roman castrum (originally Septem Fratres) on the northwestern coast of Africa, on the south side of the Strait of Gibraltar. Septem was seized by Byz. forces in 533. Provided with walls and a naval squadron of dromones under the command of a tribune, its purpose was to guard the strait and keep watch on affairs in Spain and Gaul. Although briefly seized by the Visigoths in 546 or 547, Septem remained in Byz. hands until 711, when it was surrendered to the Arabs by its last governor, Julian. In 641 the empress Martina exiled Philagrios, a former adviser of Heraclios Constantine, to Septem.


SEPTUAGINT. See Old Testament.

SEPULCHRE, HOLY ("Αγιος Τάφος), in Jerusalem, from the 4th C. the most important locus sanctus. It consisted of three elements: the tomb proper with its enclosing circular church (the Anastasis Rotunda); Golgotha (a rocky outcrop about 40 m to the east, separated by an open, colonnaded court); and the Church of Constantine I, a five-aisled basilica to the east of Golgotha, and fronting, through an atrium, on the city’s major north-south axis. This was the principal liturgical meeting place in Jerusalem and the first stop on the pilgrimage “circuit.” Eusebios (VC 3.28) describes the discovery of the tomb under the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and the subsequent building of the basilica, as directed by Constantine. Some years later (ca.350) the conical-domed rotunda was added over the tomb, which was carved out of living rock and embellished with columns, a porch, and precious-metal sheathing. The Golgotha hillock was marked by first a simple cross (4th C.), then, under Theodosios II, a gem-encrusted gold cross. The most important relic associated with the site (from the mid-4th C.) was the True Cross; later, many objects linked with the Passion of Christ (e.g., the sponge and lance) were also venerated there. Major pilgrim eulogia included earth brought to the tomb to be blessed and oil blessed by contact with the True Cross. The latter practice is attested by the pewter ampullae in Monza and Bobbio, which bear imagery consistent with the tomb shrine (porch, grills, “stone rolled away,” etc.) as it existed in the 6th C.


SERAPHIM (σεραφ(ε)ιμ), celestial beings mentioned only once in the Old Testament, in the vision of Isaiah (Is 6:2); he represents them as having three pairs of wings and standing above God’s throne. John Chrysostom, in his commentary on Isaiah, describes seraphim as incorporeal (asomatoid) powers of the heavenly demoi whose name in Hebrew means “burning mouths” (PG 56:70.5–9). Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite defines them as the highest order of the first triad of celestial beings, whereas other church fathers sometimes equated them either with the thronoi, another order of angels (Didymos the Blind, PG 39:545A) or with the dunamei, powers (Gregory of Nyssa, PG 45:348B). The number of seraphim was also disputed: some texts speak of two seraphim only, others of “many.” Origen tentatively expresses the idea (Contra Celsum 6.18.17–22; De principiis 1.3.4) that the two seraphim in Isaiah’s vision are the Son and the Spirit, but this thesis was refuted by Antipater of Bostra (PG 96:505B). The usual epithet of seraphim was hexapterygia (“with six wings”). Ephrem the Syrian called them “of fourfold form” (tetrarmopha).

Under the inspiration of Revelations 4:8, by the 9th C. artists depicted seraphim not as angels but as composite creatures similar to the cherubim: they have six wings, a tiny human face at the center, and human feet. The many-eyed wings are derived from those of cherubim. Like the latter, they occupy pendentives (Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, Panagia ton Chalkeon in Thessalonike). On the Limburg An-der-Lahn Reliquary the seraphim are called exousiai.

LIT. D. Pallas, RBK 3:78–89.
SERAPION (Σαρπιών), bishop of Thmuis in Lower Egypt (from ca.339) and saint; died after 362; feastday 21 Mar. Formerly head of a colony of monks, Serapion was intimate with St. Antony the Great and linked with Athanasios of Alexandria by friendship, patronage, and correspondence. Serapion’s mission to Constantinople in 356 as envoy of Athanasios, with the purpose of countering the Arians and conciliating Constantius II, was a clear failure, since Serapion was soon removed from his see and (probably) exiled.

His treatise Against the Manichaens combats the dualistic theory and Old Testament interpretations of that sect. His theological vocabulary is plain: he speaks of God as theos, father, creator, demurger, avoiding the disputable term homooousios but using the vague homonos. He does not clarify the nature of Christ: it suffices for him to say that Christ had a mortal body similar to ours. Doubts have been cast on the authenticity of the Euchologion, a collection of 30 prayers (B. Botte, OrChr 48 [1964] 50–56). A few letters also survive in Armenian, Syriac (R. Draguet, Mésion 64 [1951] 1–25), and Greek, mainly notes of encouragement to individuals and communities. Sozomenos (HE 3.14) commends his virtue and eloquence, Jerome (De viris illustribus 99) his erudition.


—B.B.

SERAPION OF VLADIMIR, archimandrite of the Kievian Caves Monastery, then bishop of Vladimir-Suzdal’; died 1275. Serapion wrote five extant sermons on the theme of repentance and divine punishment, usually dated ca.1230 (no.1, delivered in Kiev) and 1274–75 (nos. 2–5, in Vladimir). In the first three sermons Serapion interprets misfortunes (an earthquake, the Mongol invasion) as punishment of sins, while in the final two sermons he exhorts his audience to resist pagan magicians, not through trials and burning but with firm faith. There are few learned Greek allusions, although Serapion does reproach his audience for “not hearkening to Basil and Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom” (no. 1) and some of his historical illustrations are possibly derived from Malalas and Josephus Flavius (nos. 4, 5).

ED. Serapion Vladimirs, russkij povestnik XIII veka, ed. E. Petuchov (St. Petersburg 1888).


SERBIA (Σερβία), also called Serbia, a medieval Balkan state (to be distinguished from the Byz. district and bishopric of Servia in Macedonia). In Latin sources it is sometimes called Rascia (Rassia, Raxia), derived from the Slavic name Raška. The term Serbian (see SERBO) appears in 9th-C. Latin texts in the form Sorabi as a description of a people living in Dalmatia (M. Dičić, Srpske zemlje u srednjem veku [Belgrade 1978] 36). In the 10th C., Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, who devoted an entire chapter to Serbia (De adm. imp., 32), called it “the head (kephale) of all the surrounding countries”; he defined it as bordered on the north by Croatia and in the south by Bulgaria (ibid. 30.117–19). It was separated from the Adriatic by Pagonia, Zachlumia, Terbounia, and Diokleia. He notes that Serbia had haspra and was ruled by archontes. The author of the Vita Basilii defines the Serbloi as one of the Scythian (i.e., Slavic) peoples living in Pannonia and Dalmatia (TheophCont 291.1–8). Skylitzes (Skyl. 353.65) uses the term Serbia alongside the archaic Tribalia, which became common in later histories. From the 10th C. onward, however, documents (e.g., Laura 1, no.10.12) employ the term Serboi and in the 14th C. “basiselis of the Serbs” was the official Byz. designation of Serbia.

History. The history of the early relationship between Serbia and Byz. is obscure. According to Constantine Porphyrogennetos, who wrote 300 years after the event, the Serbs accepted the suzerainty of Herakleios and were christianized. More reliable is his evidence about conflicts between the Serbian archon Vladimir and the Bulgarian khan Presian ca.858. In the same century, between 867 and 874 according to Dj. Radojićić (Byzantin 22 [1952–53] 253), the Serbs were converted to Orthodox Christianity, thus coming within the reli-
igious and cultural orbit of Byz. In the 10th C.
SYMEON OF BULGARIA occupied Serbian lands, but
following his death the Serbian prince ČASLAV
managed to establish an independent and unified
country. Under Basil II the Byz. sought an alli-
ance with the Serbs, evidently against the Bulgar-
ian tsar SAMUEL (G. Ostrogorsky, GlasSAN 193

After the Byz. conquest of Bulgaria in 1018,
Serbia became a direct neighbor of Byz. and was
thus compelled to reassess its policy toward the
empire. CONSTANTINE BODIN, after wavering be-
 tween Alexios I and the Normans, took advantage
of the danger faced by Byz. to consolidate Zeta,
Raška, and Bosnia under his power. In the 12th
C. Serbia joined Hungary, Venice, and probably
Kiev in an anti-Byz. coalition. Manuel I defeated
STEFAN NEMANJA and made him a Byz. vassal, but
after Manuel's death Serbia became fully inde-
pendent. Nemanja was the founder of the NE-
MANJID DYNASTY (between 1165 and 1168–1371).

The fall of Constantinople to the Fourth Cru-
sade in 1204 made possible the continued growth
of the Serbian state. In 1217 Nemanja's son STE-
FAN THE FIRST-CROWNED proclaimed himself king
after receiving a crown from Pope Honorius III; in
1219 his brother SAVA OF SERBIA obtained from
the Byz. patriarch and emperor at Nicea recognition
of an autocephalous Serbian archbishopric,
which he headed. In the complicated situation in
the Balkans in the 13th C. Serbian rulers looked
first to the despotate of EPIROS for alliances: King
Radoslav (ca.1228–34) was related to THEODORE
KOMENOS DOUKAS; he signed his decrees in Greek
and minted coins with Greek legends. His succes-
sor Vladislav (ca.1234–43) leaned toward Bul-
garia, while STEFAN UROŠ I (1243–76) joined
Manfred of Sicily in the latter's anti-Byz. coalition.
This alliance was defeated by Michael VIII Pa-
laiologos at Pelagonia in 1259, and the Serbs had
to give up Skopje and some other lands they had
previously occupied.

Serbian kings of the late 13th and 14th C. were
faced with separatist movements by semifuedal
magnates, esp. in Zeta, and had to ward off Byz.
and Bulgarian attacks. The exploitation of silver
mines (at Novo Brdo and elsewhere) provided a
strong economic basis for their expansionist poli-
cies. UROŠ's son STEFAN UROŠ II MILUTIN (1282–
1321) conquered a substantial part of Macedonia
from the Byz., acquiring control over the Vardar
valley. Milutin's successor, STEFAN UROŠ III DE-
ČANSKI (1321–31), defeated a Byz.-Bulgarian co-
alition at Velbužd (1330), but was deposed by a
revolt in Zeta. Medieval Serbia reached its height
under STEFAN UROŠ IV DUŠAN (1321–55), who
was enabled by civil wars in Byz. to pursue an
imperialistic policy toward the empire in Constan-
inople. He created a Byz.-Serbian empire that
dominated the Balkans; in 1346 an independent
patriarchate was established at Peć. Soon after
Dušan's death, however, this empire began to
disintegrate under the ineffectual rule of his son
STEFAN UROŠ V (1355–71), the last Nemanjid.
Local lords took advantage of the increasing
weakness of the central power to form their own
independent principalities.

The advances of the Ottoman Turks in the
Balkans in the 14th and 15th C. were irresistible:
the defeat of the Serbs at Marica (1371) and a
setback at Kosovo Polje (1389) reduced Serbia
to a position of vassalage to the Ottomans. The
various princes and despotai (e.g., STEFAN LAZARE-
VIĆ) were obliged to pay tribute and participate
in Ottoman military campaigns. Like the Byz.
Empire, Serbia enjoyed a brief respite after the
Ottoman defeat by Timur at the battle of Ankara
(1402) and the ensuing civil strife among the
Ottoman claimants to the throne. GEORGE BRAN-
KOVIĆ (1427–56) built the fortress of Smederevo
on the Danube and fought valiantly against the
Turks. Ironically, however, as an Ottoman vassal
he had to send troops to help the Turks at the
final siege of Constantinople in 1453. By 1459,
only a few years after Branković's death, Serbia
was completely occupied by the Ottomans.

Byzantine Influence on Serbia. In contrast to
the Bulgarians, few Serbs settled in Byz. territory
or became assimilated into the Byz. ruling class
or army; one of them was "the nephew of Bak-
chenos," a noble citizen of Trebizond in the early
name SERBOS appears among peasants in southern
Macedonia, such as Serbos, son of Zires, in
1317 (Laura 2, no.104.157). Some Serbs, like Ste-
fan Dečanski and his family, lived in exile in Byz.
On the other hand, a number of Greeks emi-
gressed to Serbia and became a major conduit of
Byz. influence. Several Byz. princesses were given
in marriage to Serbian rulers: Eudokia, niece of
Isaac II, married Stefan the First-Crowned; their
son, Radoslav, married Anna, daughter of Theo-
dore Komnenos Doukas of Epiros; Milutin married a daughter of Andronikos II (Simonis) and Defanska a granddaughter (Maria Palaiologina); George Branković took as his wife Irene Kantakouzene, granddaughter of Matthew I, and his son Lazar married Helena Palaiologina. These intermarriages accounted for the presence of Greek courtiers, ambassadors, and messengers at the Serbian court and constant correspondence between the two countries.

Another avenue for the penetration of Byz. influence into Serbia was through its annexation of Greek territories, esp. under Dušan. At that time Serbia was divided into two regions, with Byz. impact on the fiscal and administrative organization clearly evident in the southern part. The Serbian court adopted Byz. ceremonial and titulature: the royal title became "basileus and autoktator of Serbia and 'Romania'" or in Slavic documents "tsar of the Serbs and Greeks" (Soulis, Dušan 291; Ij. Maksimović, ZRVI 12 [1970] 61–78); high nobility was also granted Byz. titles such as sebastoktora and caesar (B. Ferjančić, ZbFilozFak 11.1 [Belgrade 1970] 255–69; Soulis, Dušan 64f). Greek magnates, such as Jovan Oliver and Thomas Kantakouzenos, a defender of Smederevo (Nicol, Kantakouzenos 182–84, no.70), played an important part in Serbian politics of the 14th and 15th C. Byz. influence on the fiscal system was more complex: some Byz. taxes were accepted, although others were modified. Northern Serbia experienced less Byz. impact than the southern districts (Ij. Maksimović, ZRVI 17 [1976] 101–25). The Zakonik, Dušan's law code, was based on Byz. models. Trade relations are less well documented: the analysis of coin hoards found in the territory of medieval Serbia (I.A. Mirnik, Coin Hoards in Yugoslavia [Oxford 1981] 91–104) shows that a gap between the 8th and 10th C. Byz. coins of the 11th-13th C. are relatively abundant. They disappear in the 14th C., to be replaced by Hungarian, German, Italian, Dubrovnik, and other types of coins.

Ecclesiastical contacts also contributed to the penetration of Byz. culture: Serbian rulers supported monasteries on Mt. Athos, esp. Hilandar, and founded numerous churches and monasteries not only in Serbia, but also in Constantinople (Xenon of the Kral) and Thessaloniki (see Serbian Architecture and Serbian Wall Paintings). Serbian literature was also greatly influenced by Byz., including translations of Greek ecclesiastical works and romances. Biographies of rulers and churchmen, a Serbian literary genre, owe much to Byz. hagiography.

---

**SERBIAN ARCHITECTURE.** The medieval architectural tradition in Serbia was molded by a continuous influx of builders and artisans from the East and West alike. While the predominant and most enduring manner of building derived from the Adriatic littoral, the Byz. mode also played a fundamental role. Imported by invited Byz. architects and craftsmen, such building was related to certain specific moments in Serbia's history and, therefore, to specific patterns of patronage. The first phase of Byz. presence is attested to during the reign of Stefan Nemanja (1166–96). His foundations—St. Nicholas at Kuršumlija and the dome of the Church of the Virgin at Studenica—indicate the presence of Komnenian masters, possibly from Constantinople.

The second, much more strongly pronounced phase occurred during an era of active cultural "byzantinization" of Serbia under Stefan Uroš II Milutin (1282–1321). Churches such as St. Nikita at Ćučer (Banjani), Bogorodica Ljeviška at Prizren, St. George at Staro Nagoričino, and the Church of the Dormition at Gračanica illustrate the scope and skill of the imported masters. While the specific identities of these masters remain obscure, on the basis of regional building practices (spatial planning, structural solutions, building technique, decorative details), their origins can be traced to Thessalonike and Epiros.

The last phase of direct Byz. importation occurred during the reign of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan (1331–55). Church building under his auspices and that of his nobles reveals the strong influence of Constantinople, along with continuing links with Thessalonike. The Church of the Archangels in the monastery of the same name near Prizren, the Church of the Virgin at Matejč, and St. Demetrios at Markov Manastir illustrate the degree of dependence on Constantinople, while the Church of the Archangel Michael at Lesnovo reveals the role of Thessalonike. Subsequent de-
development is characterized by the total assimilation of the Byz. mode into a distinctive regional building tradition.


SERBIAN LITERATURE. The language of medieval Serbian literature is Old Slavonic (see CHURCH SLAVONIC), based on the dialect used in the Thessalonike region in the 9th C. But from the beginning, and increasingly as time passed, Serbian writers introduced features of the spoken language of their own era and region. This is particularly noticeable in the treatment of the reduced and nasal vowels of Old Slavonic. Thus evolved a Serbian Slavonic, distinct from the Slavonic written in Bulgaria or Rus', though all three were easily mutually comprehensible in the Middle Ages.

After the Serbs' conversion to Christianity in the late 9th and 10th C., they took over most of the religious literature translated from Greek by CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER, METHODIOS, and their successors in Moravia and later in Bulgaria. They made further translations in this domain themselves, such as the works of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, translated in 1371 by the monk Isaiah; the homilies of Gregory Palamas, surviving in a 14th-C. MS; the Gospel commentaries of Theophylaktos of Ohrid, translated by the monk Ioannikios for Queen Jelena, wife of King Stefan Uroš I (1243–76); or the commentary on Job by Olympiodotos of Alexandria, translated by the monk Gavrilić for the despotes Stefan Lazarević. The principal centers of writing and diffusion of Serbian literature were HILANDAR on Athos and PEÇ.

Medieval Serbian literature, though Christian, was not predominantly ecclesiastical. The genre that it developed most fully and richly was that of biography of rulers and church leaders. From the beginning, there was rivalry between different ruling houses in the Serbian lands. Even after Stefan Nemanja and his descendants had established themselves as rulers of the Serbian kingdom, internal feuding and territorial disintegration always threatened the unity of the kingdom. To establish and confirm the legitimacy, both political and theological, of Nemanjid rule, and to preserve political unity and national identity, a series of such Lives was written by members or dependents of the ruling house, both lay and clerical. Two of Stefan Nemanja's sons, St. Sava and Stefan the First-Crowned, wrote biographies of their father, who toward the end of his life became a monk in Hilandar and was soon recognized as a saint. A further Life of Stefan Nemanja and a Life of St. Sava were written in the mid-15th C. by the monk Domitijan. Another monk, Teodosije, spiritual adviser of King Stefan Uroš III Dečanski, revised Domitijan's Life of St. Sava in the early 14th C. Archbp. Daniil II composed a series of Lives of Serbian kings and bishops of the 19th and early 14th C., which was later anonymously extended to cover Stefan Uroš III Dečanski and Stefan Uroš IV Dušan. Patr. Daniil III wrote commemorations (pomeni) of Stefan Nemanja and St. Sava, a commemoration and akolouthia on King Stefan Uroš II Milutin, and a long oration (slovo) on Prince Lazar toward the end of the 14th C. Though intended for liturgical use, these works are mainly narrative and biographical. In the early 15th C. Bp. Marko wrote a Life of Patr. Ephraim. About the same time Grigorij Cambek wrote a Life of King Stefan Uroš III Dečanski, and a little later Konstantin Kostenečki wrote a Life of the despotes Stefan Lazarević.

These Lives were, in general, modeled on the rhetorical Byz. Metaphrastic hagiography, though some writers, like Teodosije, were apparently influenced by a more popular, narrative type of Greek saint's Life. These writers, who were all learned men, familiar with Greek literature, were concerned with political history as much as with holiness. They were not merely writing history, they were making it. It is very likely that they sought models in Byz. secular historiography. At any rate the narrative element is more prominent, more detailed, and more secular in tone than in most Byz. saints' Lives.

There was much translation, amounting sometimes to rewriting, of Byz. entertainment literature. The Serbian version of the Alexander Romance of pseudo-Kallisthenes probably dates from the early 11th C. The large number of surviving MSS attests to its popularity. The Troy Tale was probably translated in the early 14th C., though the surviving version is post-Byz. Among other such texts translated or adapted from Greek were Stephanites and Ichnelates by Symeon Seth, Barlaam and Ioasaph, and the Tale of Aseneta (a
romantic account of the love of Joseph for a young Egyptian girl). The story of the 10th-C. Prince Vladimir of Zeta, preserved only in a 12th-C. Latin version, is an original Serbian tale partly modeled on Byz. exemplars. It may well also have drawn on oral narrative poetry sung in one of the courts of southwestern Serbia. That such epic poetry flourished from an early date is certain. "Songs of heroes" were sung at the court of Stefan the First-Crowned. Such songs contributed motifs and attitudes to the royal biographies.

A number of short, unpretentious chronicles was also composed. In the early 15th C. the monk Nikon wrote an account of his pilgrimage to the Holy Land, which is marked by much vivid observation. The proems to the numerous royal and ecclesiastical documents that still survive are often both elegant compositions and expressions of the ideology of those who issued them. A good example is the preem to the testament of Duke Stefan Vukčić Kosača (1436–66). The anonymous funeral oration on the despotes George Branković shows the survival of sophisticated rhetorical literature into the immediately post-Byz. period.


R.B.

SERBIAN WALL PAINTINGS. The wall paintings of Serbia closely parallel developments in Byz. MONUMENTAL PAINTING. From Djurdjevi Stupovi in the 12th C. to the second Palaiologan style of the 14th-C. churches founded by Stefan Uroš II Milutin, when Byz. artistic language thoroughly dominated both Serbian architecture and painting. The use of the Serbian language on frescoes (STUDENTICA) and certain other local Serbian features, such as the cult and image of Stefan Nemanja, first appear toward the end of the 12th C. Royal and episcopal ideology determined the content of many Serbian fresco programs: the fresco icon of the "Virgin of Studentica"; the life of the Serbian saints Stefan Nemanja, SAVA OF SERBIA, and of Arsenije; the "horizontal" genealogies or the family tree of the Nemanjids; the allusions to the "chosen people" and its leaders, etc. The fact that the Nemanjid state included both Greek and Latin church jurisdictions also left its mark on the monuments. Between 1374/5 and 1459, the frescoes of the Morava school show several original features as well as some similarities with frescoes from Mistra.


G.B.

SERBILAS (Σερβιλας), name of a family of civil officials. The first known Serblias, Leo, was sent ca.1053 to Iberia to assess taxes in lieu of performing military service (Skl. 476.52; the editor misread the name as Serbllos—pp. 530, 548; see, however, Kek. 152.31). Some members of the Serblias family served as judges: Michael, proedros, visited Thessalonike in 1062 to resolve litigations (Dölinger, Schatz., no.57.7); others are known from their seals: Nicholas, judge of the Hippodrome (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.542); Peter, judge of Peleponnesos and Hellas; another Peter, judge in Seleukeia (Schlumberger, Sig. 270f); Nikephoros (Laurent, Coll. Orghidion, no.314). Family members served also in fiscal departments, such as John, notary of the genki, at 1109 (Reg 2, no.1247), and Stephen, kommeriaros of Langobardia (Schlumberger, Sig. 218); some served as secretaries: Theodore (Patmou Engrapha 1, no.49a.269), notary in the department of the oikeia, at 1088, and Nikephoros, mystikos in the mid-12th C. John Serblias (Patmou Engrapha 1, no.18.435) served in the imperial chancellery ca.1099. The Serblias family had connections with intellectuals: John Serblias corresponded with Theophylaktos, archbishop of Ohrid; Tzetzes wrote a letter (ep. 18) to the mystikos Nikephoros Serblias describing him as "the eye of the senate" and the descendant of "Caesares Servili." One family member was a pupil of John Italos; according to the Alexiad (An.Komm. 2:37.21–29) he only pretended to be a scholar. Niketas Choniates relates that, after being educated by Italos "in a pagan manner," Serblias threw himself into the sea, exclaiming, "Poseidon, take me" (G.L.F. Tafel, Annae Comnenae Supplementa [Tübingen 1832] 2.5).

A.K.

SERBOI (Σέρβοι, Σέρβοι), a term that first appears in the Geography of Ptolemy (ed. Nobbe, 42,22, bk.5, ch.9.21) to designate a tribe dwelling in Sarmatia, probably on the Lower Volga. The name reappears, in the form Serboi, in Constan-
tine VII Porphyrogennetos and in Theophanes Continuatus, usually in the same context as the
Croations, Zachlumians, and other peoples of Pannonia and Dalmatia (TheophCont 288.17–20).
Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp. 32.1–16) derives the name from the Latin servi,
which he explains as douloi (slaves), a name that the Serbii allegedly acquired as the slaves of Ro-
man emperors. He relates that the Serbii are descended from the unbaptized Serboi who lived in
the place called Boiki (Bohemia?), next to Frank-
ia, and that they claimed the protection of Emp.
Herakleios, who settled them in the province of
Thessalonike. There are no sources to verify Con-
stantine’s evidence. Kekaumenos (Kek. 268.28)
locates the Serboi on the Sava River, apparently
incorrectly.

The first certain data on the state of the Serboi,
SERBIA, begin with the 9th C., and the episcopal
lists of Leo VI mention bishops of Drougoubiteia
and the Serboi. Circa 993 envoys of the Serboi
arrived at the court of Basil II (Lavra 1, no. 10.12).
In the 11th C. there was probably a theme of
Serbia: a seal of Constantine Diogenes, strategos of
Serbea, is preserved, and ca. 1040 Theophilos Er-
otikos was the governor of the Serboi until he was
expelled by Stefan Vouislav, who reportedly con-
quered the territory of the Serboi and became its
archon (Skyl. 408.73–75). T. Wasilewski (ZRVI 8.2
[1964] 465–82) surmised that this theme was the
same as SIRMUM, whereas Dj. Radojičić (GlasSAN
268 [1966] 1–8) thinks that it was RAŠKA, only
temporarily governed by the Byz.

LIT. K. Jirecek, J. Radonić, Istorija Srba, 2 vol. 1 (Belgrade
1978) 68–70. G. Ostrogorsky, Vizantija i Sloveni [= Sabrana
dela 4] (Belgrade 1970) 80f. V. Laurent, “Le thème byzantin
du Serbie au XIe siècle,” REB 15 (1957) 185–95. – A.K.

SERDICA (Σερδική; Slavic Sreddec; mod. Sofia),
city in Bulgaria on the river Iskūr, at the in-
tersection of the northwest-southeast Belgrade-
Constantinople route and a north-south route
linking the Aegean with the Danube. Originally
the capital of the Thracian Serdi, it was raised to
city status by Trajan and under Diocletian became
the capital of Dacia Mediterranea. In 342 or 343
a church council was held there in a futile attempt
to solve the problem of Arianism (see SERDICA,
LOCAL COUNCIL OF). Probably captured by
the Visigoths in the late 4th C., Serdica was sacked by
Attila in 441/2. Refortified in the 6th C., it re-
mained a Byz. outpost during the Avar and Slav
invasions and the early Bulgar expansion. Captu-
tured by Krum in 809, it probably returned to
Byz. control briefly, but it remained in Bulgarian
hands from the time of Boris I until 1018, with a
short interval of Byz. rule in the 970s. In 1018
it became, with the rest of Bulgaria, part of the
Byz. Empire; Serdica saw the passage of the ar-
mies of the First and Second Crusades. In 1194
ASEN I captured Serdica and incorporated it in
the Second Bulgarian Empire. In 1382 it fell to
the Ottoman Turks, who made it the capital of a
beylerbeylık.

The center of the city preserves the ancient
town plan unchanged. Two churches survive from
antiquity. The round Church of St. George was
originally part of an imposing public building,
perhaps baths or an imperial reception hall. The
earliest of its five layers of frescoes dates from the
4th C. The Church of Sveta Sofija, originally
outside of the walls, was destroyed and rebuilt
four times in antiquity; its present form is proba-
bly 6th-C. Its scale bears witness to the impor-
tance of Serdica in late antiquity. STEFAN NEMANJA
was buried in a medieval church on the site of
which the 19th-C. Church of Sveta Nedelja was
built.

LIT. Serdika: archeologički materiali i proučavanja, vol. 1,
ed. T. Gerasimov (Sofia 1964). Serdika, Sredac, Sofija (Sofia
L. Dončeva-Petkova, “Sur la surface habitée de Sredac au
IXe–XIVe s.,” Izba Bulg. Arh. 35 (1979) 111–33. M. Con-
čeva, Ćirkvota “Sveta Georgi” u Sofiji (Sofija 1979). S. Bojad-
žev, Sofijskata Ćirkvva Sveta Sofija (Sofija 1967). – R.B.

SERDICA, LOCAL COUNCIL OF. Constans I
and Constantius II summoned this council in
342 or 343 to settle the dispute that had split the
episcopate into two rival camps after the deposi-
tion of Athenasios of Alexandria (335). The two
groups met separately because the Eastern semi-
Arian party insisted that Athenasios, being de-
posed, could not participate. The Eastern group
therefore confirmed Athenasios’s expulsion from
his see, condemned MARKELLOS OF ANKYRA,
and excommunicated Pope Julius (337–52) for sup-
porting both. The creed of this rump synod was
identical to the fourth creedal statement of the
Council of ANTIOCH (341). Conversely, the West-
ern bishops, headed by Hosius of Cordoba, re-
habilitated Athanasios and acknowledged his orthodoxy. Failing to recognize Markellos's Sabelianism (see MONARCHIANISM), they nevertheless admitted him to communion. They further complicated matters by identifying the term HYPOSTASIS with ousia (SUBSTANCE)—an identification subsequently rejected by the church. This group also issued 20 canons, whose authenticity has sometimes been questioned. Several of the canons recognized Rome's appellate jurisdiction. An accused bishop, however, was to be retried in the province adjoining his own and by its bishops (or the pope's own judges), rather than in Rome or by the pope. Later the West mistakenly attributed these canons to NICAESA I.


—A.P.

SERFDOM, the term used in medieval Western historiography to designate the status of dependency under which the majority of peasants subsisted within the manorial economy of FEUDALISM. In Byz. scholarship, two fundamental issues have arisen. The first centers around the appropriateness of characterizing the colonus and/or the paraikos as serfs. While the colonus had characteristics of both serf and free man, those scholars who argue for the genesis of feudalism at an early period in Byz. see the colonate as a kind of serfdom. Moreover, while most scholars view the paraikia as an institution analogous to serfdom, a number of characteristics of the paraikos (greater mobility, greater freedom to acquire and dispose of property, etc.) argue against equating the two. In fact some scholars claim that the term serfdom, imbued as it is with Western connotations, should be avoided entirely in the Byz. context. The second issue involves whether and to what extent the paraikia and Western medieval serfdom had common origins in the colonate. This question raises the larger issue of continuity within Byz. institu-

tions as well as the question of the similarities and differences in how the “sibling” civilizations of Byz. and Western Europe responded to social and economic changes.

—M.B.

SERGIOPOLIS (Σεργιώπολις, Ar. Rusâfah, 'Pous-

σαφών'), lit. “the city of (St.) SERGIOS,” who, toget-

gether with Bakchos, was martyred nearby under Dio-

letian, when the site was a Roman kastron

known simply as Rusafa. Sergioopolis lies on a

caravan route in the desert of northeastern Syria,

south of the Euphrates River and north of Pal-

myra. An early structure (mnema) “of stone and
clay” that marked the burial place of Sergios and

Bakchos in the necropolis of Rusafa was replaced

later in the 4th C. by a martyrion inside the kastron

(Passio of Sergios and Bakchos, AB 14 (1895)

395–9–14); ca. 431 the archbishop of Hierapolis

spent 300 pounds of gold in erecting another

church, other buildings, and walls. In 454 Theo-

dosios II made Rusafa an independent bishopric

(Mansi 5:915C, 943C), while in 514–18 Anastasios

I made it the metropolitan see, gave it the name

of Sergioopolis, and sent a relic of Sergios from

Constantinople. In 527–42 Justinian I built new

circuit walls, cisterns, houses, stoa, and other

buildings (some of which still stand) and garri-

soned the city. The shrine of Sergios and Bakchos,

now identified with Basilica B, and the tetracouch
cathedral, long thought (erroneously) to have been

the martyrion, were probably built in the first half

of the 6th C. An inscription in Basilica A identifies
it as the Church of the Holy Cross built in 559 by

Bp. Abraham. Between 569 and 581 al-Mundhir

(ALAMUNDARUS), the Ghassânid phylarch, built a

praetorium outside Sergioopolis, and in 604–16

Noman, son of al-Hārith, repaired reservoirs there.

Justinian and Theodora had presented the shrine

with a gemmed cross, which was seized in 540 by

Chosroes I, together with the gold revetment on

the saints’ tomb and other treasures (Evagrios

Scholastikos, HE 6.28). In 591–92 Chosroes II,
giving thanks to St. Sergios for a military victory

and the birth of a son, returned Justinian’s cross

and gave the shrine several gold votive objects. It

has been erroneously suggested that the KAPER

KORAON TREASURE was intended for Sergioopolis;

the only silver objects that can be associated with

the site were excavated in 1982 in the Holy Cross

Church, where they had been buried in 1144.
These include chalices, a paten, and a plate of Gothic appearance; several of the objects have Arabic, Syriac, or Greek inscriptions or Crusader heraldic devices; at least two objects were donated by someone from Edessa. The Church of St. Sergios continued to attract pilgrims until the 12th C. and perhaps later.


---

**SERGIOS I**, patriarch of Constantinople (18 Apr. 610–9 Dec. 638); born in Syria ca.580; died Constantinople. As a young deacon and *phtochotrophos* of the hospices in the harbor of Phykos in Constantinople, Sergios found a patron in Theodore of Sykeon. Shortly after becoming patriarch Sergios crowned Heraclius, thus sanctioning the downfall of Emp. Phokas. He became a staunch supporter of the new emperor, even though he dared to oppose him on occasion: he tried to dissuade Heraclius from marrying his niece Martina (but yielded to the firm desire of the basileus) and resisted the emperor’s attempt to shift the capital to Carthage. Sergios was concerned about finances: in 612 he promulgated the rule that new members of the ever-increasing staff of Hagia Sophia (reaching 600 persons) should not be paid by the fisc; in 621 Sergios approved the emperor’s use of church treasures for the Persian expedition. During the absence of Heraclius the patriarch served as regent and was in charge during the combined siege of Constantinople by the Persians and Avars in 626; their withdrawal was ascribed to the assistance of the Virgin.

Sergios tried to elaborate a theological compromise to promote the ideological unification of the empire: together with Kyros of Phasis (the future patriarch of Alexandria) and Theodore of Pharan he developed the formula of *monoenergism* (693) that was later altered into the concept of one will in Christ (*monothetism*). Sergios defended his position by referring to such ecclesiastical authorities as Cyril of Alexandria and Patr. Menas. His alliance with Pope Honorius I (F. Carcione, *OrChrP* 51 (1985) 263–76) and the idea of one will formed the foundation of the *Exthesis*. The compromise, however, satisfied neither the Chalcedonians (headed by Sophroniou of Jerusalem) nor staunch Monophysites, and the resulting disunity in the eastern provinces facilitated the Arab conquest. Sergios was condemned at the Council of 680. He was possibly the author of the *prooimion* to the *Akathistos Hymn*.


---

**SERGIOS II**, patriarch of Constantinople (June/July 1001–July 1019 [V. Laurent, *EO* 35 (1936) 75f]); died Constantinople. He is called (Skyl. 341,12) a descendant of Photios; Janin (Églises CP 320) identifies Sergios with a monk Sergios, “great-nephew of Photios,” who was a favorite of Romanos I back in 944. The chronological gap makes the identification improbable. Before being elected patriarch, Sergios was *begounomen* of the monastery of Manuel in Constantinople. As patriarch Sergios resisted the introduction of *allelengyion* by Basil II. In 1016, however, he accepted the practice of *charistrikion* prohibited by his predecessor Sisinnios (K. Setton, *APh* 74 (1953) 247). Sergios attempted to restrict the excessive individualism of Symeon the Theologian as reflected in the latter’s veneration of his spiritual father Symeon Eulabes but eventually yielded under the pressure of the magnates of the capital (A. Kaza- dan, *BS* 28 (1967) 8–10). In a solemn encyclical, Sergios prohibited the marriages of close relatives (V. Laurent, *EO* 33 (1934) 301–05), a practice typical of the high aristocracy.

There is an established tradition that under Sergios the church of Constantinople broke with Rome, but already ca.1100 the chartophylax Niketas was unaware of the causes of this conflict (PG 120:717D). According to Michael I Keroularios, Sergios demanded that Pope Sergius IV eliminate the *filioque* formula and after his refusal excommunicated the pope. In the 12th C. John of Jerusalem wrote that it was Sergios who excluded the name of the pope of Rome from the diptychs (A. Michel, *RQ* 41 (1933) 136, n.43).


---

-A.K.
SERGIOS AND BAKCHOS (Σέργιος καὶ Βάκχος), martyrs executed under Maximian, saints; feastday 7 Oct. Sergios was primikerios of the schola gentilium, and Bakchos was sekoundokerios of the same contingent. Accused of being Christians, they were divested of their military uniforms and paraded in female garments throughout the city. Thereafter the emperor sent them to Antiochos, doux of Augustoeuphratesia, “neighboring the Saracen people”—an area that, in fact, was outside Maximian’s sphere of influence. Here they were executed, steadfast in maintaining their Christian beliefs: Bakchos was flogged to death in the kastroν of Barbalisson, Sergios beheaded several days later in the kastroν of Rusafah. THEODOR ET OF CYRRHUS testifies to the existence of the cult of Sergios (PG 83:1093B), and PROKOPIOS OF CAESAREA (Buildings 2.9.3–9) relates that the inhabitants of a site in Euphratesia called it Sergiopolis (see SERGIOPOLIS) after the saint who had helped them repel the Saracens. When the role of MILITARY SAIN TS was ascribed to Sergios and Bakchos is unclear (A. Poidebard, R. Mouterde, AB 67 [1949] 114f). The time of the compilation of their passio is also unknown; 11th-C. MSS preserve it, and SYMEON METAPHRATES reworked it for his collection; various Latin and Eastern versions of the martyrdom survive also.

Representation in Art. The two young saints are depicted clad in court, rather than military, costume, but they do wear the maniakion (see TORQUE) and sometimes hold lances. Portraits exist as early as the 7th C. (icon from Mt. Sinai, now in Kiev [Weitzmann, Sinai Icons no.B.9] and mosaic in the Church of St. Demetrius in Thessalonike) and appear in church programs throughout the Byz. period. The saints are shown being beheaded in the MENOLOGION OF BASIL II (p.95) and in a MS of the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes (Moscow, Hist. Mus. gr. 175, fol.50r).

A.K., N.P.S.

SERGIO S OF REŠ'AİNA, priest and physician; died Constantinople 536. He had studied in Alexandria under John Philoponus and was a typical representative of the bilingual intelligentsia in Syria in the early 6th C. He belonged to the Jacobite church in Syria, but he quarreled with his bishop and sought refuge with Ephraim, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, on whose behalf Sergios was then sent on a diplomatic mission to Pope Agapetus I (535–36), during which he died. The fame of Sergios rests on his translations of medical, philosophical, and theological texts into Syriac. He is particularly remembered for his versions of Aristotelian logical texts, some medical
texts of Galen, and for the first Syriac translations of parts of the pseudo-Dionysian corpus. Some sources also attribute to Sergios the authorship of a tract on the spiritual life.


—S.H.G.

SERGIOS THE confessor, historian and saint; born Constantinople, died after 829 in exile; feast day 13 May. According to the Synaxarion of Constantinople (Synax. CP 682.9–20), Sergios was born to a family of renown. Because he was an ardent Iconophile, the Iconoclast emperor Theophilus, after a public punishment, confiscated his wealth and banished him, his wife Irene, and their children. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus’s identification of Sergios as the father of Photios (BZ 8 [1899] 656. n.2) remains questionable. In the Bibliotheca (Photios, Bibl., cod. 67) Photios briefly describes a historical book by Sergios that probably encompassed events from Constantine V to the eighth year of Michael II; Sergios reportedly wrote not only about wars but also about society (politeia) and ecclesiastical problems. F. Barišić (Byzantion 31 [1961] 260–62) suggested that Genesios and Theophanes Continuatus used Sergios’s history.


—A.K.

SERGIUS I, pope (15 Dec. 687–9 Sept. 701); born Palermo to a Syrian family. He was installed as pope by the personal intervention of the Byz. exarch. Sergius repudiated his legates to Constantinople and refused to accept the Council in Trullo of 691 because several canons contradicted Roman practice (e.g., those that sanctioned the marriage of clergy or exalted the patriarch of Constantinople). The ensuing efforts of Justinian II to have Sergius deported to Constantinople failed and weakened the Byz. position in Italy. Sergius introduced the Byz. feasts of the Virgin—Nativity, Annunciation, Purification (Hypapante), and Assumption—into the Roman liturgy.

LIT. O. Bertolini, Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi (Bologna 1941) 399–408.

—M.C.C., A.K.

SERIKARIOS (σηρικάριος), artisan involved in the production and sale of silk textiles. In late Roman inscriptions the term sericarius or negotiator sericarius designates not a silk manufacturer—as M.T. Schmitter-Picard argues (in Mélanges C. Picard 2 [Paris 1949] 952), since before the 6th C. silk was imported mostly in the form of cloth—but a silk merchant (H. Blümner, RE 2 R. 2 [1923] 1926). Dioecletian’s Price Edict lists sericariorii dealing in various kinds of textiles.

In 10th-C. Constantinople, serikarioi formed a guild that is described in the Book of the Eparch (ch.8). One of their principal activities seems to have been dyeing, but at the same time they worked as weavers and tailors (D. Simon, BZ 68 [1975] 34); at any rate they purchased raw silk and their final product was clothing. Their activity was strictly controlled: they were prohibited from using certain dyes and from making certain kinds of garments (e.g., skaramangia, which were woven and sewn in imperial factories); other types of fabric (e.g., blattia in Persian style) had to be shown to the eparch; a boullotes regularly visited their workshops; and they had to bring their products to the imperial stores (blistareia).

LIT. Bk. of Eparch 181–90.

—A.K.

SERMON (λόγος) or homily (διηγήμα), an ecclesial discourse for instruction, exhortation, edification, commonly in the context of a liturgical service, often commenting on the lections just read. Originally the preacher had to be a bishop, but by the 4th C. the right was extended to priests as well. Later even emperors gave eulogies.

Great preachers were one of the early church’s main attractions. The bishop preached seated on his throne in the nave, or at the ambo, sometimes for as long as two hours (A. Olivar in Liturgica 3 [Montserrat 1966] 143–84). The golden age of sermons in the 4th C. established a tradition of homiletics rooted in theological learning, knowledge of the Scriptures, and of the artifacts of antique rhetoric. Sermons, which customarily opened with a set greeting and concluded with a doxology, comprised several standard types. The majority were commentaries on sacred Scripture. Others were heortological, on a feast; theological, on a point of doctrine; panegyrics, on a saint; eulogies, or funeral orations; socio-ethical, against the circus, theater, orgies, drunkenness, avarice,
or in favor of fasting, prayer, almsgiving, modesty, etc.; occasional, such as John Chrysostom’s homilies On the Statues (PG 49:15–222) or On Eutropius after his Fall (PG 52:391–414); and mystagogic, providing a regular course of instruction during Lent and Pentecost for the catechumenate and neophytes. Sermons would also later provide monastic instruction (e.g., the Catecheses of Theodore of Studios).

By the 6th C., however, the golden age had passed. Sermons in the antique rhetorical tradition were barely understood by the common people, many ministers were no longer capable of composing an adequate sermon on their own, and preaching entered a period of decline. Canon 19 of the Council in Trullo enjoins bishops to preach daily, esp. Sundays, and instructs them to follow the Fathers, “for if they compose their own discourses, a task of which they are sometimes incapable, they may miss what is suitable” (Mansi 11:952D). By the 9th C. a new set of liturgical books appeared: anthologies of sermons (panegyriken, menologion) arranged according to the church calendar, esp. those of John Chrysostom, Proklos of Constantinople, and Gregory of Nazianzos. These books shaped a canon of ecclesiastical rhetoric and eventually filled the need for ready-made sermons. The creation in 1107 of the group of didaskalois of the Patriarchal School by Alexios I and the establishment of a fixed salary for preachers (P. Gautier, REB 31 [1973] 165–201; I. Čičurov, VizVrem 31 [1971] 238–42) were further measures aimed at improving the quality of contemporary sermons.


R.F.T.

SERPENTS. See Snakes.

SERRES (Σέρρες, ancient Siris), city in Macedonia on the Strymon River. In late antiquity a polis of Macedonia I, Serres is mentioned by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them., 1.52–53, ed. Pertusi 86) as a polis in the eparchia of Rhodope. Its first known bishop participated in the council of 449. The history of Serres is obscure until the end of the 10th C., when it played a role in the war with the Bulgarians and one of the Kome-topoulou, Moses, was killed while besieging the city (Skyl. 329, 81). Before 997 Serres was elevated to the rank of metropolis. From the end of the 12th C. onward, it was again at the center of military operations: in 1185 the Normans ravaged its territory; ca. 1195 the Bulgarians defeated the army of the sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos near Serres; Boniface of Montferrat occupied the city; and in 1206 it fell to the Bulgarians. George Akropolites (Akrop. 74ff) writes that Serres, a large city in the past, was destroyed by Kalojan and transformed into a kome with a fortified acropolis, whereas the lower town was protected only by a plain stone wall erected without lime mortar. Serres was recovered by John III Vatatzes in 1246. Its significance grew in the 14th C., when a contemporary historian (Greg. 2:746.14) called Serres “a large and marvelous asty.”

On 25 Sept. 1345 Serres fell to Stefan Uroš IV Dušan. After Dušan’s death, Serres and the surrounding territory formed an independent “principality,” first under Dušan’s widow Helena, and from Aug./Sept. 1365 under the despotes John Uglješa. In this principality Greek was the official language; the Greek oikeioi of the despotes played an important part in the administration; and the links with Constantinople and Mt. Athos remained strong. After the battle at Marica in 1371 Manuel (II) Palaiologos, John V’s son, who ruled in Thessalonike, gained control over Serres. The city finally fell to the Ottomans on 19 Sept. 1583 (Kleinhchroniken 2:326f; P. Nasturel, N. Beldiceanu, JOB 27 [1978] 270). There is some evidence that in the summer of 1397 John VII resided in Serres (D. Bernicolas-Hatzopoulos, BS 41 [1980] 220f).

The well-preserved walls of the fortress date from various periods, with major construction in the 10th and 13th C.; the so-called Tower of Orestes, at the highest point of the fortifications, was built under Dušan, as shown by an inscription (L. Polites, BS 2 [1930] 292). The architecture of the Church of St. Nicholas in the lower town is similar to the Panagia ton Chalkion in Thessalonike and can be dated to the 11th–12th C. The metropolitan church, Sts. Theodore, had a mosaic of the Communion of the Apostles in the apse (cf. that in St. Sophija in Kiev) (P. Perdrizet,
L. Chesnay, *MonPiot* 10 (1903) 122–44). The church itself was burned in 1913, then rebuilt, but fragmentary figures of the Apostles have been taken to Thessalonike; their stylistic affinities with the mosaics of Daphni and the frescoes of Hagios Chrysostomos on Cyprus indicate a date in the very early 12th C. The Church of St. Nicholas within the fortress resembles the Holy Apostles in Thessalonike in construction and is dated to the early 14th C. The nearby monastery of the Prodromos on Mt. Menoikeion was founded in the late 13th C.

---

**SERVIA** (τὰ Σέρβια, also Serbia), city in southern Macedonia controlling the main road between Berroia and Larissa. Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (*De adm. imp.* 32.11) defines Serbila as a site in the theme of Thessalonike where Herakleios (allegedly) settled the “Serblos” in the 7th C. Servia is first attested in the early 10th C. (*Notitiaep CP* 7,300) as a bishopric suffragan to Thessalonike. Two sees of bishops of Servia or Servion (10th and 11th C.) are published by Laurent (*Corpus 5,3, nos. 1729–30*). In Skylitzes (*Skyl. 344.93–12, 364.67*) Servia appears as a stronghold (*phourion*) that several times changed hands during the Bulgarian war of Basil II; the general Xiphias destroyed it in 1018. Kekaumenos (*Kek. 174.18–28, 260.24–26*) and later John VI Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 130.8–131.2) described Servia as a well-fortified *polis* divided into three sections: the *akra*, where the *archon* lived; and the upper and lower sections inhabited by the *politai*. The *strategos* and the *doux* of Serb[ia] are mentioned on several seals of the 11th C. (V. Laurent, *REB* 15 [1957] 189f), but it is unclear whether they were connected with the fortress and bishopric of Servia.

After 1204 Servia was in the hands of the Latins, but ca.1216 it fell to Theodore Komnenos Doukas of Epiros. In 1257 it was ceded, along with Dyrrachion, to Theodore II Laskaris of Nicaea. Circa 1341 Servia was taken by Stefan Uroš IV Dušan. It was besieged by John VI Kantakouzenos in 1350; although the siege ended in failure, a treaty of the same year ceded Servia to Byz. Circa 1393 Servia fell to the troops of Bayezid I.

In their present form the fortifications should be dated to the 19th C., although the towers of the acropolis were probably built under the Serbs. In the upper city are the ruins of a large basilica with three aisles, built in the first quarter of the 11th C., later remodeled, with paintings of the late 12th–early 13th C. There are two other single-aisled basilicas within the city and another at a ruined monastery 3 km to the west.

---

**SERVITUS** (δουλεία), the charge on a piece of land that obliged the owner to tolerate certain uses of, or encroachments upon, his land by another person. “Real servitudes are those that are imposed on the piece of land itself, without time limit, regardless of the current occupant. The owner of the land burdened with a real servitus was required to allow the other person, who was usually, but not necessarily, a neighbor, to drive his livestock over the encumbered piece of land, for example, or to draw water from a source located there, or to drain sewage from his side onto the encumbered piece of land. Personal servitudes are similar to the ownership rights of certain individuals to another’s lands, esp. that of usufruct. This form of servitus ends (at the latest) with the death of the occupant.

With the changing concepts of ownership, esp. as regards immovable things, the servitus declined in importance in the later Byz. period. In the documents the technical term douleia no longer meant a servitus but generally a rather imprecisely defined form of tax liability.

---

**SETH, SYMEON**, scientist and writer; fl. second half of 11th C.; born perhaps in Antioch. His biography is little known; his identification with the *protoevstarios* Symeon who became a monk...
ca. 1034 (Skyl. 396f) is now rejected. According to the lemmata of his MSS, Symeon Seth (Συμεών) was magistros and philosopher, and he mentions his travel to Egypt (perhaps in 1058). Symeon compiled a book on diet based predominantly on ancient tradition; sometimes, however, he refers to everyday practice and Arab recipes. He also produced books on physics and medicine, including a refutation of Galen.

Symeon translated from Arabic and dedicated to Alexios I a collection of fables under the title of Stephanites and Ichnelates. The fables are assembled within an external framework of conversations between the king of India and his philosopher, and between the lion king and his courtiers, among whom two jackals, Ichnelates and Stephanites, are particularly articulate. The characters of the fables are primarily animals, but we also encounter people—merchants, physicians, hunters. The moral principle formulated at the very beginning (ed. Sjöberg 151f) is far removed from Byz. official ethics: there are three sources of happiness—dependence, fortune, good repute, and success. This goal can be achieved by four means: the just acquisition of wealth; good administration of property; generosity toward the needy; and avoidance of sin. Stephanites and Ichnelates was perhaps reworked by Eugenios of Palermo in the 12th C. (Jamison, Admiral Eugenius 18f). The book was popular in the medieval West and in Slavic countries.


LIT. Beck, Volksliteratur 41–45.

SEVENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL. See Nicaea, Councils of: Nicaea II.

SEVERIANOS (Σεβεριανός), bishop of Gabala in Syria, biblical exegete; died before 430. Sometime before 401 he moved to Constantinople, where he enjoyed oratorical fame. In a homily on Epiphany Severianos praised Arkadios and Honorius, the two sons of Theodosios I, "that shining light" (A. Wenger, REB 10 [1953] 47–50). He obtained influence over the empress Eudoxia (Holum, Theodosian Empresses 70f) and played a major role in her struggle against John Chrysostom. His works are primarily exegetical and hom-
iletic; most important are his six homilies on the Hexaemeron. An oration, *On Peace*, extant wholly in Greek (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta* 1:15–26) and in Latin fragments (PG 52:425–28), gives his version of the temporary rapprochement in 401 between himself and Chrysostom. A strict Nicene, Severianos was full of rancor against heretics and Jews (his homily against the Jews—PG 61:793–802).

In his exegesis Severianos, under the influence of Diodoros of Tarsos, followed the principles of the Antiochene School, being outstandingly literal in the interpretation of Old Testament imagery, which he often misuses as science. His oeuvre is mainly preserved under the names of his adversaries (primarily Chrysostom), in *catenae*, and in Armenian (H.J. Lehmann, *Per piscatores* [Århus 1975]), Arabic, Coptic, and Syriac translations; many of them are of disputed authenticity.


---

SEVERINUS, preacher of Christianity in the Roman Danubian province of Noricum at a time when it was about to be overrun by Germanic tribes; saint; died in monastery of Faviani/Mautern on the Danube 8 Jan. 482. His vita was written by his disciple Eugippius. Severinus was an Eastern monk of unknown background who appeared rather mysteriously in Noricum after the death of Attila (453). The attempt of F. Lotter (*infra*) to identify Severinus with the homonymous consul of 461 has not been accepted. His primary mission was to encourage a spiritual revival in Noricum, to introduce monasticism, and to combat Arianism and paganism. He can be seen as an agent of Byz. Danubian foreign policy, encouraging the church, organizing relief work, and restraining the excesses of reluctantly respectful barbarians (notably Odoacer).

---

SEVEROS (Σεβήρος), bishop of Antioch (512–18); born Sozopolis, Pisidia, ca.465, died Xois, Egypt, 8 Feb. 538. Severos was a Monophysite theologian and saint of the Monophysite church. He studied philosophy and law, came under the influence of Peter the Iberian and entered monastic life. In 508 he went to Constantinople to plead for the persecuted Monophysite monks of Palestine; while in the capital he acquired the favor of Anastasios I. In 512 he became bishop of Antioch. He was a tireless administrator, but upon the accession of Justin I, he was exiled and took up residence in Egypt. An attempted reconciliation under Justinian I (535/6) failed, and Severos was condemned by a council in Constantinople in 536.

Severos was the leading spokesman for moderate Monophysitism, rejecting both the Council of Chalcedon and the teachings of Eutyches and Julian of Halikarnassos. Severos understood the divine nature in Christ as his hypostasis or prosopon and therefore professed his single physis, but he accepted that the complete humanity of Christ was distinct from the nature/hypostasis of the Logos; he refuted Julian and considered Christ’s body before the Resurrection as corruptible and Christ as consubstantial with the Father only according to his divinity. However, in Severos this “perfect humanity” did not form a nature or hypostasis but only an annex of the single divine physis.

Frequently accused of pagan tendencies, Severos was cosmopolitan and steeped in the teachings of the Greek fathers. He had no desire to found a regional, rurally based church, yet his teachings were the basis of Monophysite theology. He wrote voluminously, although most of his works are preserved only in a Syriac translation by James of Edessa. His biography by Zacharias of Mytilene survives in a Syriac version (W. Bauer in *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*, ed. G. Strecker [Tübingen 1967] 210–28).

Sextus Julius Africanus. See Africanus, Sextus Julius.

SEXUALITY was pervaded by a hypocritical double standard in Byz. as in other medieval societies. While men appreciated female charms and employed prostitutes and concubines for sexual adventures, they expected moral purity of their female relatives. A rich inheritance of erotic epigrams and romances, preserved and developed in later Byz. editions, extolled the physical pleasures of love, yet girls were expected to guard their virginity until their wedding night and wives were to conceal their physical charms. The contrast between ecclesiastical canons governing morality and popular enjoyment of sex reflected this chasm. Some church fathers considered sexual intercourse an evil necessary for procreation, and therefore condemned all sexual relations designed for pleasure as fornication (porneia): John Chrysostom, however, viewed legitimate intercourse as less important for procreation than for the avoidance of fornication. The church included marriage in the sacraments, but at the same time might recommend partial abstinence as practiced by Cyril Philéotés and his wife, or even complete celibacy.

Throughout Byz. society feminine beauty was admired and women, including virgins, nuns, and prepubescent girls, were regularly seduced; even monks who had taken vows of chastity were occasionally convicted of sexual crimes (M.-H. Congourdeau, REB 40 [1982] 103–16). Moral standards were established more by the imperial court, where emperors might take mistresses, than by celibate bishops. Male descriptions of sex were couched in martial imagery: "a Herculean combat . . . an erotic assault on the female citadel of virginity." In contrast, sexual advances by women, as recorded in daily life or in dreams (S. Oberhelman, BS 47 [1986] 8–24), were usually characterized as a devilish temptation to corrupt men.

Sexual intercourse, as in the mating of Zimri and Chasbi (Num 25:7–18), was depicted fairly explicitly in Octateuch MSS, for example, Vat. gr. 747, fol. 178v. (For Byz. attitudes toward the naked body, see Nude, The.)


—T.E.G.

Sgouropoulos (Σγουρόπουλος, from σγούρος, "curly," + the diminutive -πουλος), a family first appearing in the late 13th C. Manuel, pansebastos, sebastos, and domestikos ton anatolikon thematon (1286–93), apparently corresponded with Michael Gabras ca. 1308. Demetrios, a retainer of John VI Kantakouzenos, was captured by Alexios Apokaukos in 1341. Stephen held the office of protonotarios at Trebizond and wrote six poems, some dedicated to Alexios III Komnenos, emperor of Trebizond (1349–90; Hunger, Lit. 2:1115). By far the best known 15th-C. Sgouropoulos was Demetrios, who copied MSS for Cardinal Bessarion (1443 at Florence) and for Francesco Filelfo (1444–45 at Milan); afterwards he went to Kastoria and Thessalonike. In 1472–73 he corresponded with Theodore Gazes as well as with Filelfo (Gamillscheg-Harfinger, Repertorium, no. 101). Many other known members of this family were clergymen, esp. priests. Of particular note are two 14th-C. composers of ecclesiastical music, George (also domestikos) and John (also deacon—M.K. Chatzegiakoumes, Mousika cheirographa Tourkokratias, 1453–1832 [Athens 1975] 381). A patriarchal document of ca. 1400 mentions a certain Sgouropoulina (MM 2:429.9). Relations to nobler Byz. families are unattested, with the sole exception of Doukas Sgouropoulos, who wrote a codex containing medical works in the 14th C. Their connections to Leo Sgouros and his relatives are not attested.


—E.T.
SGOUROS, LEO, independent lord of Corinth and the Argolid; died Corinth 1207/8. He succeeded his father as an official in Nauplia and ca. 1198 participated in levying a tax on Athens. Circa 1201, after Dobromir Chrysos and Manuel KAMYTZES seized Thessaly, Sgouros (Σγουρός, Fr. Asgur) made himself independent. He captured Argos, killing its bishop, then Corinth, where he flung its metropolitan from the Acrocorinth. Michael STRYPHOS vainly sought to subdue him (1201–02). Taking advantage of the Fourth Crusade’s attack on Constantinople, Sgouros enlisted the piratical inhabitants of Aigina for an attack on Athens. Its metropolitan, Michael CHONIATES, held the Acropolis, but the city was burned; Sgouros marched against Thebes, which immediately surrendered. Advancing into Thessaly (summer 1204), he encountered the fleeing Alexios III and married his daughter Eudokia (already the wife of Alexios V). When Boniface of Montferrat entered Thessaly (autumn 1204), Sgouros retreated to the Acrocorinth, where he defended himself until his death (R.-J. Loenertz, Byzantium 43 [1973] 389–91).

Lit. Brand, Byzantium 152–54, 244f.

SGRAFFITO WARE, perhaps the most characteristic type of Byz. decorated pottery. Sgraffito technique, probably imported from Persia, involved a two-step firing process in which dark clay vessels were first covered with a white slip, usually only on the interior, and given a preliminary firing. Designs were then scratched through the slip, revealing the darker clay beneath, and a vitreous glaze, usually pale yellow or green, was applied. When the vessel was fired a second time the glaze over the scratches appeared darker than that over the white slip. Designs included geometric and decorative motifs as well as figures of birds, fish, animals, and humans; some of the latter have been identified as Digenes Akritas (A. Frantz, Byzantium 15 [1940–41] 87–91). “Incised Ware” involved a variation of sgraffito technique in which the background of the design was cut away, leaving the figure lighter and the background darker. Incised and sgraffito techniques were frequently combined and glaze-painted designs were often added (Painted Sgraffito Ware). Byz. sgraffito ware developed in the 11th C. and reached its high point in terms of quality in the 12th C. It continued to be produced well into Ottoman times. The ware was manufactured at many places throughout the eastern Mediterranean and some specific styles (such as ZEUXIPPOS WARE) have been identified.


SHĀHĪN (Σαχίν), general of Chosroes II; died late 625/67 in campaign in Asia Minor or Persia. Shāhīn led the Persian army that broke Byz. defenses in 611, captured Mardin, Amida, and Martyropolis, invaded Armenia, and penetrated into Cappadocia. He wintered in Caesarea, where Priskos ineptly besieged him but allowed his forces to escape in 612. In 616 Shāhīn led his army across Asia Minor to besiege Chalcedon, where he personally negotiated with Herakleios. Shāhīn’s pressure on Chalcedon forced Herakleios to send three ambassadors to Chosroes with proposals for peace. Shāhīn and his army returned to Persia with the ambassadors, but Chosroes rejected peace and threatened his general. In 617 Shāhīn captured Chalcedon, probably contributing to the fall of other Byz. strongholds in Anatolia. Shāhīn led major armies in 624 and 625. Herakleios fell upon and decisively defeated Shāhīn in 624 after penetrating into Persia. Nar-
ratives of the campaigns of 624–25 are very confused. In 625 (?) Shāhin’s army dissolved between Tigranocerta and Nachisevan in Persarmenia. Fear of Chosroes’ fury at this disaster allegedly caused Shāhin to fall sick and die.


SHAHRBARAZ (Σαρμβαράζ, lit. “Wild Boar of the Empire”), Persian general; Sasanian king (630); died Ctesiphon Apr. 630. In 606/7 he commanded the Persian invasion of Mesopotamia. Profiting from the unstable situation in Byz. after the coup of HERAKLEIOS, Shahbaraz invaded Syria, in 613 occupied Damascus, and in 614 Jerusalem (the attack described by ANTICHOS STRATEGOS) whence the fragments of the True Cross were carried away to Ctesiphon. He probably invaded Egypt ca.616 and took Alexandria in 619. In 622 Herakleios started the counter-offensive (N. Oikonomides, BMGS 1 [1975] 1–9), but in 626 Shahbaraz led an army to Constantinople and besieged the city with the help of the Avars. Then the attitude of Shahbaraz toward Byz. altered because of his growing respect for Herakleios, tensions with CHOSROES II, or his inclination toward Christianity.

Shahbaraz’s position during the short reign of KAVAD-SHIRUYA is unknown, but after the king’s death Shahbaraz met Herakleios at Arabissos in July 629. Herakleios agreed to support the Sasanian general’s efforts to win the Persian throne, and Shahbaraz restored the True Cross to the Byz. Shahbaraz assumed the throne on 27 Apr. 630 with the help of Byz. troops. He supported Christians in Persia, and Niketas, his son, was probably Christian. After three months (or 40 days) Shahbaraz was assassinated in a conspiracy led by Bördündukht, the daughter of Chosroes II. Afraid of Herakleios’s possible intervention, she sent the Nestorian katholikos Išo’yab as envoy to him and acknowledged Byz. tutelage over the country.


SHEEP (πρόβατα) probably constituted the principal kind of domesticated animal in Byz., although it is not always possible to distinguish them from GOATS in the documents; they supplied MEAT, CHEESE, and wool. The flocks of the great landowners were enormous: thus John VI Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 2:185,8) complained that he had lost 70,000 sheep when his property was confiscated in 1341/2. Praktika of the 14th C. show a precipitous decline of flocks: in 1300/1 the village of Gomatou possessed 1,191 sheep and goats, in 1320/1 only 612, and in 1341 a mere 10 animals (Laïou, Peasant Society 174). A peasant household might own up to 300 sheep and goats; the Vlachs were esp. active in sheep breeding. Sheep were particularly suited to the practice of TRANSMANCE; the vita of LAZAROS OF MT. GALESIOS describes large flocks guarded by dogs moving across Cappadocia. This led to the perennial conflict between settled agriculturists and migrating shepherds (J.G. Keenan, YCS 28 [1985] 245–59).

Images of sheep and lambs occupied an important place in Christian allegory: they were a metaphor for Christ, the LAMB OF GOD, and for his flock; sheep were the righteous at the Last Judgment. On the other hand, humanity was referred to as “lost sheep,” and “unbranded sheep” were people untouched by baptism. The laity was com-

SHAYZAR (Σάζαρ, ancient Sizara, or Larissa, now Sayjar in northern Syria), city on the Orontes River, mentioned several times in late Roman itineraria as a station on the Orontes. A bishopric by 325, in the first half of the 6th C. Larissa was the scene of a battle between the Monophysite partisans of Peter of Apameia and local Orthodox monks (Mansi 8:1131D). In 638 its citizens received the Arabs with open arms. From the second half of the 10th C. onward, the Byz. tried to regain Shayzar. Nikephoros II Phokas briefly took the city in 968; Basil II recaptured it temporarily in 994/5 and more lastingly in 999, after destroying its aqueduct. On 19 Dec. 1081 the Muslims obtained the citadel by treaty with a bishop residing in Shayzar. John II Komnenos unsuccessfully besieged it 29 Apr.–21 May 1138. Despite the efforts of the Crusaders, Shayzar remained Arab.

LIT. E. Honigmann, RE 2. R. 3 (1929) 419. Idem, EI 4:288f. —M.M.M.
monly designated as sheep or a flock (promeian), whereas the bishop was called shepherd (pomeni).

-A.K.

**SHENOUTE** (Σενούθιος, lit. “child of God”), hegoumenos (from 388) of a monastery in Atripe (near Sohag, Upper Egypt), now called the White Monastery or the Monastery of Shenoute; born ca.350, died 466 (previously suggested date ca.451) at the White monastery; feastday in the Coptic church 1 July. Born to Christian parents, he entered the White Monastery (ruled by his uncle Pgol) ca.370. Under his leadership the monastery complex grew to approximately 2,200 monks and 1,800 nuns. Strict discipline, including physical punishment, was the rule, and Shenoute introduced a formal vow of obedience as a further means of control. As a strong supporter of Cyril of Alexandria, he attended the Council of Ephesus in 431. He was very active in the area around the monastery: attacking pagan temples, instructing local Christians, and providing shelter for the population during barbarian invasions.

Shenoute spoke and wrote in Coptic (though he probably knew Greek). He left many letters, homilies, and apocalypses written in a vigorous style and dealing mainly with the monastic life and Christian virtue. Early studies of Shenoute (Leipoldt) maintained that he lacked theological sophistication, but recently discovered texts imply understanding of current theological problems. He eagerly polemicized against Gnosticism as it was expressed in the texts of Nag Hammadi (T. Orlandi, HThR 75 [1982] 85–95), and against Nestorianism. Closely connected with the patriarchate of Alexandria, he followed the Christology of Cyril, stressing the divine nature of Christ and the soteriological aspect of Christ’s mission (H. F. Weiss, BSAC 20 [1969–70] 177–209). His pupil Besa composed his Life.


**SHIP** (ναός, πλοιον). Byz. merchant ships were smaller than those of antiquity, although large merchantmen were built to transport grain well into the 6th C. (Rudakov, Kultura 161f). The decreased volume in trade, limited means of investment in shipbuilding, and lack of security on maritime routes after the early 7th C. prompted construction of small, rapid vessels capable of carrying sufficient cargo yet still outdistancing hostile ships. The common name for a merchant ship, dorkon (“gazelle”), refers to its speed. Archaeological excavation of a 7th-C. shipwreck has uncovered a Byz. merchantman of approximately 20 m in length, 5.3 m in width (length to beam ratios were usually 3:1 or 4:1), with a shallow keel and rounded hull, features suitable for coastal sailing and not much more. She had a cargo capacity of 60 tons and room for a few passengers; a crew of six to eight was sufficient for her op-
The earliest confirmation of full frame-first construction is from an 11th-C. wreck. The hull's structure and strength now depended entirely on the inner frame, and frequent caulking ensured impermeability; the once precisely and closely fitted edge-joining necessary in shell construction disappeared from use. As in antiquity, the preferred woods were oak or elm for the frames and keel, and pine, cypress, or cedar for the hull planking. The Byz. were also familiar with the monoxyyla of the Slavs and Rus' (vessels hollowed out from a single tree trunk) no later than 626 (D. Obolensky in De adm. imp. 2:23–25).

Shipbuilders (naupgoi) are mentioned in the sources, as are the Kalaphatai, who caulked the finished ship. Shipyards were spread throughout the empire during the 6th C., but most shipbuilding was concentrated at Constantinople after the 7th C. under the supervision of the eartistai (Oikonomides, Listes 316). Several seals of eartistai (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 733–36) are dated from the 7th to the 10th C. Provincial fleets were constructed locally in the maritime themes (Ahrweiler, Mer 419–39). Most Byz. representations of shipbuilding occur in the context of the construction of Noah’s Ark.


---

**SHIPBUILDING (ναυσιπηγία) in Byz. gradually evolved from the Greco-Roman technique of outer shell construction to full frame-first construction. In shell construction, the keel was laid and the stempost and sternpost fixed to it. The hull was then built up plank by plank, without a preparatory frame. The planks were trimmed and edge-joined by mortise and tenon joints at close intervals to ensure a tight fit. Supporting inner frames were then nailed to the already finished hull, but the ship's strength and impermeability rested in the outer shell, the construction of which required a high level of skilled labor. Archaeological evidence from a 7th-C. shipwreck, however, reveals a hybrid method of construction. Shell construction was used to build the hull up to the water line, then the frames were installed and the thick side timbers (wales) nailed to them to complete the hull structure. The workmanship was not as painstaking as in full-shell construction, but frame construction was simpler, faster, and more economical.**


---

**SHOEMAKER (σκυτεύς, σκυτωτόμος, ύποδηματορράφος, τζαγγάρως, etc.), one of the most common artisanal professions: John Chrysostom includes them in lists of typical crafts (e.g., “builder, carpenter, hypodematorrhapheus, baker, peasant, smith, rope-maker” — PG 61:292.14–15) or an even shorter selection consisting of smith, hypodemorrhaphes, and peasant (PG 58:379:34–35). Another of his lists of craftsmen (PG 54:673:16–18) mentions both hypodemorrhaphes (sandmaker?) and skytotomas, but the distinction between the two is unclear. In the 9th C. Theodore of Stoudios also distinguished the same two kinds of shoemakers among the monk-artisans of his monastery (Dobroklojks, Feodor 1:1412). It is not known how shoemaking was organized in the late Roman Empire. In the vita of St. Pachomios (F. Halkin, Le corpus athénien de Saint Pachomé [Geneva 1982] 84,
par. 23) a shoemaker is described who did not sell the sandals he produced, giving his wares to another person to market—but the available data are insufficient to decide whether this case is regular or exceptional.

From the 12th C. onward, the traditional terms for shoemaker began to be replaced by the word tsangarios (maker of tzangia), a word known already from papyri. It was probably a vernacular expression: Ptochoprodromos (ed. Hesselberg-Pernot, no. 479–89) describes his attempt to become a tsangaras, which ended unsuccessfully when he injured himself with an awl (sougli). Athanasios the tsangares, a monk of the Philotheou monastery on Mt. Athos, signed an act of 1154 (Lavra 1, no. 638), and a damaged and undated document mentions a maistor of tsangarios (Lavra 1, App. 1.9). Tsangarios, along with smiths and tailors, are the most frequently mentioned artisans in late Byz. praktika and other acts; sometimes, however, it is not easy to determine whether the word is used as a family name or as the designation of a profession. The term skytotonos continued to be used as well, however: a 14th-C. historian (Greg. 2:850–29) names carpenters, shoemakers (skytotonos), and smiths as the most typical craftsmen of Constantinople.

Despite the large numbers of shoemakers, the 11th-C. Book of the Eparch does not include a guild for this profession, but only for the harnessmakers (lortomoi). Peira 517, however, considers the shoemaker’s trade, skytotonike, as a somateion. The shoemaker’s trade was regarded with scorn by the Byz. A 10th-C. story about the shoemaker Zacharias (SynaxCP 233:27–33) depicts his profession as so menial that he was poverty stricken. Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 349.17) classifies cobblers, along with tanners and sausage sellers, among the “stupid and ignorant” members of the population of Constantinople.


SHOES. See Footwear.

SHRINES. See Pilgrimage.

SHROUD OF TURIN. See Acheiropoieta.
and can be avoided by righteousness. Along with warnings to reject injustice and violence, the oracles specifically attack idolatry and sexuality. They prophesy the suppression of the cult of Serapis in Alexandria and the cult of Artemis in Asia Minor. Book 8:217–50 contains an acrostic with the first letters of each line spelling the Greek words “Jesus Christ, Son of God, Savior, Cross.”


-F.R.T., A.K.

SICILY. See NEAPOLIS.

SICILIAN VESPERS, an anti-Angevin rebellion that broke out in PALERMO on 30 Mar. (Geanakoplos, infra 364, n. 101) or 31 Mar. (cf. Franchi, infra 7) 1282. It took its name from the first incidents of the revolt that occurred outside the Church of S. Spirito just before the vespers service. The rule of CHARLES I OF ANJOU over Sicily (1266–82) was unpopular. The Sicilians became even more resentful of French domination when Charles began to organize a massive expedition against Constantinople after the Treaty of Orvieto (July 1281) and levied special taxes to support his preparations (W. Percy, Italian Quarterly 22, no. 84 [1981] 75–78). Since Charles’s projected crusade had the blessing of the pro-Angevin pope Martin IV (1281–85), who excommunicated MICHAEL VIII, Constantinople was in great danger. Michael, always the skilled diplomat, negotiated an alliance with Peter III of Aragon (1276–85), who was anxious to seize control of Sicily in the name of his wife Constance, daughter of MANFRED, the previous king of Sicily. Michael sent Peter gold to help equip his fleet for an attack on the island and apparently also gave financial support to conspirators in Sicily (C.N. Tsirpanlis, Byzantina 4 [1972] 299–329). The rebellion spread quickly and Charles was forced to divert his expedition from Constantinople to Sicily. When the Aragonese fleet arrived (Aug. 1281), the Angevins were driven from the island. Thus, Charles’s planned attack on Constantinople was once more postponed and, indeed, never realized. Although Michael VIII’s role in the Sicilian Vespers is debatable, in his Autobiography (ed. H. Grégoire, Byzantium 29–30 [1959–60] ch. IX, 461) he did take credit for being the instrument of God’s deliverance of the Sicilians.


SICILY (Σικελία). Mediterranean island separated from the toe of Italy by the narrow Strait of Messina, forming a link between Italy and Africa. In the 4th C. and the first half of the 5th C., Sicily preserved the major features of ancient economy and civilization: flourishing urban centers (Syracuse, Catania, Palermo, etc.), latifundia of great landowning families, and Latin language and culture. With the loss of Africa to the Vandals in the 5th C., Sicily became a major source of foodstuffs for the city of Rome. By 475, after many attacks, the Vandal king Gaiseric conquered Sicily along with Sardinia and Corsica, but the Vandals had to relinquish the island to the Ostrogoths in 491. In 535–36, during the Gothic war, Belisarius recovered Sicily for Constantinople, and thereafter the island remained under Byz. control, despite a brief invasion by Totila in 550.

Although Justinian I sought to restore traditional forms of Roman law and landownership, there were major changes in Sicily’s agrarian system: the letters of Pope Gregory I reveal an “atomization” (the term of Ruggini, infra) of property and an increase in the number of small and medium-sized allotments. Colonii or rustici of ecclesiastical and senatorial estates were predominantly free peasants who paid rent either in kind or in money and were drafted for military service. There was also a change in urban character: the role of the city became primarily administrative and ecclesiastical; cities also served as fortified refuges for the surrounding population.

Sicily probably formed a Theme by the end of the 7th C. The first strategos is attested ca. 700; the doukaton of Calabria was a part of the theme (Oikonomides, Listes 351). The political significance of Sicily increased esp. between 663 and 668, when the imperial court of Constans II resided in Syracuse. Originally under Roman ecclesiastical jurisdiction, Sicily was severed from it.
CA. 733 and subordinated to the patriarchate of Constantinople. The hellenization of the island was enhanced by the immigration of Greek refugees from Africa and probably the Balkan peninsula in the 7th–8th C.

Arab raids on Sicily began in 652, when the caliph Mu'awiya sent a flotilla to attack the island. Olympios, the exarch of Ravenna, reportedly came to defend Sicily. The Arabs failed to make any permanent conquest and returned home with some booty and captives. The Byz., in their turn, used Sicily as a base for their attacks on North Africa (e.g., an expedition against Carthage in 697). In the 8th C. Muslims attacked Sicily from Africa and from Syria; in the 9th C., a force from Spain joined the effort. In 826 an invasion of Arabs was provoked by the revolt of Euphemios, the Byz. naval commander in Sicily, who offered the Aghlabid ruler of North Africa, Ziyādat-Allāh (817–38), suzerain rights over Sicily on condition that he himself (Euphemios) be governor of the island with the honorific title of basileus. The Arab army met firm resistance at Syracuse, but by 829 managed to establish a foothold in Mazara (on the west coast) and Mineo (in the interior). In 831/2 the Arabs seized Palermo, in 858/9 Enna (Castrogiovanni), in 878 Syracuse, and in 902 Taormina. The ultimate stronghold, Rametta, fell to Arabs in 965.

The last Byz. attempt to recover Sicily, the expedition of George Maniakes in 1038–42, was of short duration. In 1060 the Normans began their invasion of the island; they completed their conquest in 1091 with the capture of Noto. The Norman occupation was followed by the transfer of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Sicily back to Rome and the establishment of the Latin rite; both Greek language and Byz. administrative and cultural tradition survived, however, well through the period of Norman domination. After the Norman dynasty came to an end, Sicily fell under the control of Henry VI of Germany and eventually of Frederick II Hohenstaufen. In the late 13th C. it was under the unpopular rule of Charles I of Anjou; Michael VIII Palaiologos organized a coalition against Charles, but before the alliance took effect the rebellion of 1282, called the Sicilian Vespers, put Charles to flight. Peter of Aragon then assumed control over the island.


—A.K.

SICKNESS. See Disease.

SIDE (Σίδών), city of PAMPHYLIA, a metropolis from the 5th C. Excavation has revealed a detailed picture of urban development. SIDE occupied a peninsula defended by walls restored in late antiquity. Colonnaded streets led from the main gate to the agora and theater, thence past churches and gymnasia to a large basilica on the harbor; the civic buildings were extensively restored by comites and various municipal officials called pater poleos in the 4th–6th C. This period saw the construction of a new bath and of a large complex of cathedral, bishop's palace, and associated buildings. Unfortunately, the chronology of most buildings has not been determined. SIDE also had a synagogue that served its Jewish community. Circa 390 AMPHILOCHEIOS OF IKONION convoked a large council in SIDE to condemn Messalianism. Photios (Bibl., cod.52) read its minutes, which are now lost. G. Ficker (Amphilochiiana 1 [Leipzig 1906] 259f) suggested that the council had convened in the 5th C. and was presided over by Amphilochios of SIDE, a correspondent of Cyril of Alexandria, but his conjecture was rejected (Bardenhewer, Lit 1 3:221, n.4). SIDE flourished through the 6th C. but contracted thereafter, when a new fortification wall included only half the urban area. The Byz. churches of SIDE, which include some of the first examples of the inscribed-cross plan, are tiny compared with earlier churches; one of them was built within the nave of the ruined harbor basilica. Sources of the 11th C. describe SIDE as abandoned.


—C.F.

SIDON (Σίδων), Ar. Saydâ in Lebanon, ancient Phoenician city, noted during the Roman period for its glass industry (R. Dussaud, Syria 1 [1920]
230–34) and factories for purple dyeing. Achilles Tatius describes its inner harbor, where ships could safely winter; the port of Sidon was apparently restored in the 5th–6th C. Roman itineraria define Sidon as a station on the route from Antioch to Tolemais. The law school of Berytus reportedly moved there temporarily after the earthquake of 550/1. Bishops of Sidon are known from 325. In 512 Sidon housed a local synod in which the Monophysites had a majority despite the resistance of Flavian II, patriarch of Antioch (T. Nöldeke, BZ 1 [1892] 333f). The martyrion of St. Phokas at Sidon had an accommodation for pilgrims (Gerontius, Life of Melamia the Younger, ch.58, 242.13]). In 637/8 the city fell to the Arabs without a struggle. Baldwin I of Jerusalem captured it in Dec. 1110 with the help of a Norse fleet; thereafter the Crusaders retained Sidon until Saladin took it on 30 July 1187.


SIDONIUS, more fully Gaius Apollinaris Sidonius, Latin writer, government official, bishop, and saint; born Lyons ca.431, died ca.490; feastday 23 Aug. A scion of wealthy Gallic aristocrats, Sidonius received a classical and Christian education in his native city and at Arles. In 451 he married Papianilla, whose father Eparchius Avitus became Western emperor in 455, celebrated the next year by Sidonius in a verse panegyric. After Avitus’s fall, Sidonius ingratiated himself with the new ruler Majorian, duly celebrating him in verse in 458; he subsequently received offices and a statue was erected in his honor. After Majorian’s fall (461), Sidonius retired to the leisure of his Gallic estates until summoned in 467 on an embassy to Rome before the new emperor Anthemius, to whom he addressed a verse panegyric and who rewarded Sidonius with the prefecture of Rome (468–69). Abandoning this as uncongenial, Sidonius returned to Gaul where ca.470 he was appointed to the see of Clermont-Ferrand. He survived the invasions of the Visigoths, a panegyric to whose king produced his release from imprisonment in 476.

His extant works comprise 24 poems (eight panegyrics, the rest short occasional pieces) and about 150 letters in nine books. A translation of the Life of Apollonius of Tyana is lost. Sidonius can tell a good story well, but his style is less attractive than his content. Though often contemptuous of the barbarians, he provides valuable vignettes of them; while sometimes complacent in the face of impending catastrophe, he was not blinded by classical nostalgia to the contemporary realities and strove to preserve the position of his class and himself by paternalism and compromise.


SIEGE. See Artillery and Siege Machinery; De Obsidione Toleranda.

SIEGE (probably Byz. Σύκιδες or Συκη), site in Byzantium on the Sea of Marmara west of Mudanya, noted for its church of the Taxiarchs, a cross-domed basilica with narthex, exonarthex, and a complex of late additions. The church preserves some of its sculptural decoration and frescoes. A 19th-C. inscription dates it to 780, a chronology that suits its architectural style. As one of a group of cross-domed basilicas, it is important in establishing the development of Byz. architecture in the 7th–8th C. Constantine XI restored it in 1448. Janin (infra) suggests that the church at Sige should be identified with the Church of St. Michael at the Médikion monastery, but the latter seems rather to have been located just south of Trigleia.


SIGILLION (σιγιλλίον), generic term designating a document bearing a seal (but not necessarily any document with a seal) and used by several chanceries. Imperial sigillia (already in 883; few preserved from the 11th C.) displayed in red ink the word sigillio and the emperor’s autograph menologem, but not necessarily his gold seal (this would be a chrysobolion sigillio—see Chrysobull). In the patriarchal chancery, the term sigillium (or sigillum gramma) was used officially first by the mid-13th C. and gradually replaced the
term hypomnema in designating the most solemn document emanating from the patriarch (with his full signature) in order to set in stone an ecclesiastical law or rule (often voted by the synod) or a privilege granted to a bishopric or a monastery. The sigillium (or sigilliodesgramma) of public officials, including judges (for whom the hypomnema was substantiated legal opinion) and tax collectors, was a solemn document confirmed with their lead seal.

LIT. Döğer-Karayannopoulos, Urkundenlehre 112f. Svoronos, “Actes des fonctionnaires” 426f. – N.O.

SIGILLOGRAPHY. Byz. seals, like coins, form an unbroken historical record. Because of the scarcity of Byz. charters, on the one hand, and, on the other, the large number of extant seals, sigillography has long been recognized as an important auxiliary discipline, its place firmly established by G. Schlumberger with the publication of his monumental Sigillographie de l'Empire byzantin (Paris 1884). At least 40,000 seals are extant; almost all of these are lead, only some 30 being gold.

Prospography and Ethnography. Seals have proven invaluable in revealing the existence of people or persons who are not known (or at best poorly known) from written sources. For example, a group of seals has established the presence of a Slavic tribe, the Bichetai, living in the 9th C. within the boundaries of the empire, seemingly in the theme of Hellas (Zacos, Seals 1.2, no.1877). Seals are a major source for compiling and filling out lists of the names of officials, both lay and ecclesiastical, who occupied such varied offices as strategoi of the themes, judges of the Hippodrome, directors of silk factories, and hegoumenoi of monasteries. Thus, the seal of a certain Epiphanius, hegoumenos of the monastery of Patmos, identifies a superior (ca.1130–60) whose name is not otherwise attested (Laurent, Corpus 5.2, no.1279). Seals either supplement information about members of Byz. families or, not uncommonly, are the sole witness of their existence. For example, the Palaiologoi are among the most famous families of Byz., yet several early members are known only from seals, such as the kouropalates Theodore Palaiologos and the nobilissimos Alexander Palaiologos (Cheyney-Vannier, Etudes, pp. 196f, nos. 3, 5).

Administrative Studies. Since provincial affairs are, on the whole, poorly documented in Byz. historical writings, seals of provincial officials can offer unique information. Zacos and Veglery (Zacos, Seals 1.1:211–363) have published some 200 seals issued by kommerkarioi, or impost collectors, a series dating from the later 6th C. to the mid-9th C. Inscribed with the place names where imperial warehouses functioned, these bullae provide invaluable data about trade routes within the empire. A 7th-C. seal with the legend Tes phabrikos Seleukeias testifies to the existence of an arms factory in Seleukeia (Zacos, Seals 1.2, no.1136). Seals deriving from periods of expansion and consolidation reflect successful campaigns along the borders and the installation of Byz. officials in newly acquired territories. In the wake of expansion along the southeastern frontiers, new themes emerged in the 10th C., a development attested by such seals as the bulla of David (?), protospatharios and strategos of Aetos (a region near Edessa; cf. Zacos, Seals 2.1, no.349). The gradual expansion of Byz. along its eastern frontiers in the 10th–11th C. is traceable through seals such as the later 10th-C. bulla of Gregoros, protospatharios and strategos of Leontokome (Zacos, Seals 2.1, no.157), and the mid-11th-C. bulla of Stephen, katepano of Vasprakion (Zacos, Seals 2.1, no.1046). Often seals reveal or confirm documentary evidence about the earlier history of the administration of a region and its elevation from an archontia to a theme; the seal of Bardas, archon of the Strymon (Zacos, Seals 1.2, no.1753), for example, suggests such a development within the theme of the same name. Seals have also proven useful for uncovering administrative groupings. Thus four seals, presently at Dumbarton Oaks and identifying their respective owners as “judge of Chaldia and Derzene,” show that, as occasion warranted in the later 10th–11th C., the administration of justice in these two themes was combined.

Foreign Relations. Bullae also complement written sources regarding relationships between the empire and foreign peoples, as in the case of the seal of the Bulgarian khan Tervel. On this bulla (Oikonomides, Seals 24), Tervel, who, as ally of Justinian II, received the title of caesar in 705, is represented as a Byz. emperor, wearing a crown, ciuasssed, and carrying a shield with a depiction of a victorious horseman. N. Oikonomides (RN 25 [1983] 191–95) has published a 12th-C. seal
struck in the name of the Danismendid ruler Yaghibasan (1142–64); it carries on the obverse a bust of Christ Emmanuel and on the reverse a legend reading in Greek, "Slave of the Emperor, the emir Yaghibasan." The seal vividly confirms the testimony of historical sources that by 1146 Yaghibasan had become an ally of Manuel I.

**Religious Life.** Seals have brought to light a number of diaconates or confraternities (charitable organizations attached to a particular church or monastery), such as the 12th-C. "diaconate of the monastery of Theodore" (Laurent, *Corpus 5.2, no. 1218*) and the 8th-C. "diaconate of the Theokos" (ibid., nos. 1219–20). Since seals often carry on the obverse a depiction of the Virgin, Christ, or a saint, they are useful for gauging the popularity of saints in a given period or even attesting the existence of certain cults, as in the case of the 7th-C. seal of the "diaconate of St. Koronatos" (ibid., no. 1214), affirming devotion to a saint whose cult is little known.

**Art Historical Studies.** Since seals form a continuous historical record, they offer insights into the changes and development of artistic style and iconography. For example, the bullae of the patriarchs of Constantinople provide information on the development of throne types, since either Christ or the Virgin is often depicted seated. With regard to Iconoclasm, a few seals dated to the period of the Iconophile reaction supply an exceptional glimpse of style and iconography in the years 787–815 (Zacos, *Seals 1.2:810–24*). In addition, seals can be profitably consulted regarding early or rare instances of the depiction of a saint, as in the instance of a later 9th–10th-C. seal of the Fogg Art Museum (Laurent, *Corpus 2, no. 53*), which is decorated on the reverse with a bust of St. Himerios, perhaps the sole extant depiction of this 7th-C. martyr.

**Poetical Studies.** Beginning in the 10th C. it became popular for legends on seals to be inscribed in meter. At first, inscriptions were couched in dodecasyllabic verse, but later 15-syllable or political verse was used. Such seals provide a source for research on poetic tastes and style.

**Difficulties of Dating and Identification.** For the dating of seals the sigillographer relies on letter forms, the manner and style in which a seal is decorated, and internal evidence. It is really only on the basis of the latter that a seal can be closely dated, as in the case of the seal of Michael Stryphnos, "grand dux and husband of Theodora, sister of the empress" (1195–1203; Oikonomides, *Dated Seals*, no. 126). Although the family name does not appear, the attribution to this personage, well known from historical sources, is assured both by the information given in the legend and the decoration of the obverse with a depiction of St. Hyakinthos of Amastris; this saint, rarely shown on seals, is found on bullae with Michael's name inscribed in full. It is the exception, rather than the rule, however, that a seal can be securely ascribed to persons known through texts, since often no family name appears, and at the same time the Christian name is a common one, such as John or Constantine, and the person's title is also relatively common. In these cases the sigillographer must rely on the subjective criteria of style and the epigraphic characteristics of letter form; on this basis a seal cannot be dated more closely than to a century or, at best, within fifty years.

**Collections.** The largest collection of Byz. lead seals, consisting of some 17,000 examples, is preserved at Dumbarton Oaks. The next largest is the some 12,000–13,000 lead bullae at the Hermitage in Leningrad. The number of seals in the collection of the National Numismatic Museum at Athens is unknown, but the holdings of this museum are quite extensive (some 2,500 lead sealings were published from this collection by K.M. Konstantopoulos, *Byzantika molybdoboulla tou Athenais Ethnikou Nomismatikou Mouseiou* [Athens 1917]). Smaller collections, numbering fewer than 3,000 sealings, are to be found in the national museums of Vienna, Istanbul, Paris, and Sofia (concerning the last, see N.A. Mušmov in *IzvBülgArchInst* 8 [1934] 331–49). No list of collections is complete without mention of the private collection of approximately 6,000 sealings assembled by G. Zacos (the majority published under the title *Byzantine Lead Seals*, 2 vols. in 4 pts. [Basel-Bern 1972–84]).


—J.W.N.
SILENTIARIOS (σιλεντιάριος), a court attendant whose first duty was to secure order and silence in the palace. The silentarii belonged to the staff of the praepositus sacri cubiculi and stood under the jurisdiction of the magister officiorum. Silentarii are first mentioned in an edict of 326 (Guilland) or 328 (Seeck). By 437 the schola of silentarii in Constantinople consisted of 30 members under the command of three decuriones. Their functions were informal: they served as the emperor’s marshals, calling the meeting of the consistorium (silentium nuntiare), and also guarded the emperor during military expeditions. Low-ranking servants at the time of Constantine I, the silentarii became spectabiles in the 5th C. and their decuriones were illustres in the 6th C. In the late 5th C. a decurion of the silentarii, Anastasios I, was proclaimed emperor. After the 6th C. their role decreased and became ceremonial. In taktika and on seals the term is used as a title, not an office. Oikonomides (Listes 296) thinks that the last datable mention of silentarii comes from the reign of Nikephoros II Phokas, but Guilland concludes that silentarii still existed in the 11th–12th C.


SILK (μέταξα, στηρικον), yarns and textiles made with filaments of the cocoons of several species of moth (esp. the Bombyx mori, which feeds on white mulberry leaves and was cultivated in ancient China). Silk cloths from the Far East reached the Mediterranean already in Roman times, and raw silk and silk yarns imported from China, Central Asia, and India via the silk routes formed the basis for the production of late Roman silks. In 553/4, under Justinian I, actual silk moth eggs were reportedly smuggled into the empire by some monks who had learned the secrets of sericulture (Prokopios, Wars 8.17.1–8); the silk industry thus established eventually came to constitute a major element of the Byz. economy. Silk moths were cultivated first in Syria, then in Asia Minor, southern Greece, and southern Italy; weaving establishments are attested in Phoenicia by the 7th C., and there is archaeological evidence for the existence of silk weaving in Egypt (M. Martiniani-Reber, Lyon, Musée historique des tissus: Soieries sassanides, copies et byzantines Ve–Xle siecles [Paris 1986] 61–97). Additional supplies of raw silk and silk textiles were imported from these countries after they came under Muslim domination.

The center of the Byz. silk industry from the 7th C. onward was Constantinople, though after the 10th C. silk weaving is known to have been practiced in Thebes, Corinth, Athens, and Thessalonike as well. The silks were made either in imperial factories (located both within and near the Great Palace) or in numerous private workshops. The industry was very specialized and, in Constantinople at least, the private production of silk was divided among several different professions, whose members were organized into guilds. Some of these professions are named in the Book of the Eparch: the prandioprates or silk importer, the silk merchant for the raw silk, the katartarios, or raw silk dresser, the serikarios, or silk weaver, and the vestioprates, or silk clothier.

Silks were widely used in Byz. for court and ecclesiastical vestments, and for domestic and church furnishings, such as altar cloths, curtains, and couch covers. Silk yarns were used for a variety of fabrics, including tapestry-woven hangings (see Textiles) and embroidery. Wearing of the finest grades of silks, esp. the purple-dyed ones (see Blattion), was limited to the imperial family and entourage, at least through the 9th C.
Silk was always considered a luxury product; valued on a par with gold and other precious materials (even sold by weight and bought on speculation), its manufacture and trade was controlled, and its quality guaranteed, by the state. Foreign trading of Byz. silks was restricted. Only small quantities were exported to Muslim countries (S.D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, vol. 1 [Berkeley–Los Angeles 1967] 46, 103; vol. 4 [1983] 290–301), and the Venetian, Amalfitan, and other privileged Italian merchants were permitted to sell only lesser quality Byz. silks in Pavia.

Silks from the state workshops in Constantinople were thus greatly coveted both at home and abroad; they were an essential part of official court costume and could also be awarded to loyal followers. As imperial gifts, they were an important element of Byz. foreign policy: since neither western Europe nor the Slavs produced any silk of their own, they turned to Byz. for silks, which they could acquire only in the form of official gifts or tribute (100 skaramangia, for example, were sent annually to Symeon of Bulgaria by Leo VI and Romanos I Lekapenos).

The few extant Byz. silks are found mainly in the church treasuries of western Europe, where they were often used to wrap holy relics; most date from the 10th and 11th C., though pre-iconoclastic silks have also survived. Most likely made in imperial factories and given by the emperor (the names of emperors were woven on several of them), these fabrics amply justify the prestige of Byz. silks attested in the sources. Superb examples of twill weave (a patterned drawloom technique particularly suitable for silk yarn), the silks are characterized by bright colors and bold animal designs (esp. lions, griffins, and elephants in roundels, and eagles); comparable designs are mentioned in Byz. sources. They required great technical dexterity, esp. to achieve the repeats and the complicated outlines. Silks featuring hunting scenes and images of emperors are also known (e.g., the Bamberg tapestry, and the portrait of John I Tzimises on a silk listed in the inventory of the Veljusa Monastery, ed. Petit, 123.17). One of the very rare silks woven with a biblical theme (the pair of Annunciation and Nativity panels in the Museo Sacro of the Vatican) has been variously dated (6th and early 9th C.).


---

**SILK MERCHANT.** In Justinian I’s legislation (*Cod.*Just. VIII 13[14].27) the Latin term for silk merchant is *metaxarius*; in the 10th C. their guild was called that of the *metaxopratai*. The *Book of the Eparch* (ch.6.14) defines their function as purchasing and selling raw silk (*metaxa*); they were prohibited from engaging in silk processing or production. *Metaxopratai* bought raw silk from traders coming “from outside” (from the provinces or a foreign country?) and sold it publicly (“in the forum,” not in their private houses) to buyers who were primarily the *katartarioi* or processors of raw silk. The sale of *metaxa* to Jews or to merchants who would export it from Constantinople was forbidden.

In the chapter on *katartarioi* (ch.7.2) the term *metaxarios* also appears—the reference is to *metaxarioi* who are not on the official register. It is unclear whether they are identical with the *meta-
xopratai or form a group of lower-ranking merchants (i.e., silk traders who do not belong to the guild). Another unclear term is the “so-called melathrarioi” (ch.6.15) who are forbidden to sell “the cleaned raw silk”; it is uncertain whether they are forbidden to deal at all in raw silk, and thus melathrarioi (or lathrarioi, as Sjužjumov suggested) are unauthorized dealers, or whether they are traders in uncleaned raw silk.

Another problem is the relationship between the dealers in raw silk, the metaxopratai, and the silk processors (katartarioi). Discussion has questioned whether the metaxopratai formed a guild of manufacturer-managers who controlled silk processing or whether they were simply a wealthier guild, and therefore katartarioi were anxious to join it.

To be distinguished from the metaxopratai is the serikoprates, a type of silk merchant mentioned in the Book of the Éparch (4.2 and 7). The serikoprates evidently dealt in silk textiles rather than raw silk, since the regulations attest that the vestiopratai bought cloth from either archontes or serikopratai and forbade one person to combine the job of a vestiopratai and a serikoprates. Both Stockle (Zünfte 31) and Sjužjumov (Bk. of Éparch 150) consider the serikoprates identical with the serikarios, an artisan involved in various aspects of silk production, esp. dyeing, and the sale of textiles.

Two 8th-C. seals of a certain Anastasios have been published (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 656–57): on one he is termed hypatos (Zacos [Seals 1, no. 3076] considers the reading of the word questionable) and serikoprates; on the other holoserikoprates. The seals add to the confusion rather than solve it—it remains unclear whether this Anastasios was a state functionary (if the hypatos is a correct reconstruction) or only a private merchant, and whether he traded in all sorts of silk fabric or only in specific varieties of this textile.


SILK ROUTE, the routes through which spices and silk (whose production was a Chinese monopoly until the reign of Justinian I) reached the ports of the Mediterranean. In the 6th C., Kosmas Indikopleustes mentions the existence of two routes, one by sea from China to Ceylon and the other through the steppes of Central Asia to the Persian frontier. The sea route continued through the Red Sea to Ethiopia and eventually to Egypt or Syria.

The land route from China went along the north edge of the Laib Nor desert, or north of the Turfan oasis, and reached the Persian border. By treaties, Nisibis and Dara were important trade posts where the Byz. bought silk from the Persian middlemen. The undesirable dependence on the Persians forced the Byz., at the time of Justinian I, to develop domestic production and to seek to open the northern routes, from the Black Sea to the Caspian and then along a line parallel to the central land route. This, however, was a very difficult route until the 13th C., when the Mongols brought all these areas under their control and made it possible for merchandise to travel safely along it. Chinese silk was first mentioned in Genoa in 1257–59 and must have come from the northern route. Pogolotti mentions the northern route as the safest; it took between 259 and 284 days to travel from the Crimea to Peking. The central and southern routes regained their importance after the mid-14th C.


A.L.

SILK WEAVER. See Serikarios.

SILVAN. See Martyropolis.

SILVER (ἀργυρός, also ἄστημος, ἀσῆμι [e.g., Lustra 3, no.147.2, a.1375]) was the second most precious metal in Byz. The official ratio of gold to silver in the late Roman Empire was 1:18 (according to Cod.Thed. VIII 4.27, 4 solidi were equivalent to 1 libra of silver), and ca.1300 it was 1:14 (Schilbach, Metrologie 125). The proportion of silver obtained from mines and from recycling is uncertain. In the 6th C. no silver coins were struck for commercial purposes and only occasional ceremonial coins were issued in silver. In the 7th C. the silver hexagram was introduced by Herakleios and later on Miliareia were minted, but these played a smaller role than their coun-
terparts in gold and copper. In 13th-C. Trebizond the silver aspron became a common coin, probably due to the area's proximity to Caucasian sources of silver ore.

From the 4th to the 7th C. silver was widely used for furniture revetments. In addition, about 1,500 examples of domestic plate and liturgical vessels survive from the period as single objects or treasures. Nearly all the approximately 300 objects that have been analyzed are of 92–98 percent pure silver. About 200 objects have silver stamps. Many plates, patens, and spoons surpass those of the 3rd C. or earlier in size and weight. Most objects of the 4th–7th C. were shaped by hammering (and occasionally cut into openwork) rather than cast, except for attachments such as handles, which were made separately and soldered into place. Decorative techniques included raised (by repoussé [anaglyphon] or chasing and carving) and incised work as well as the inlay of engraved areas with niello (enkaustis). Further embellishment was provided by partial gilding (diachryson).

It is known from written texts that silver enjoyed many of the same uses after the 7th C., but few examples survive. Silver was employed for the decoration of church pavements and liturgical vessels (of the types in use already in the 4th–7th C.) as well as icon frames (Xénoph., no.1.81–85). Although some domestic plate of silver survives from after the 7th C. and is also cited in texts, little personal jewelry was ever made of silver, except for certain amulets.

Almost no scientific work has been carried out on silver made after the 7th C. Except for the introduction of filigree work (and the cloisonné technique in the Palaiologan period), most of the metalworking techniques from the earlier period (4th–7th C.) continued in use. But the effect achieved was often very different after the 7th C.: silver objects might be completely gilded in imitation of gold, particularly those set with gold enameled plaques and gems, and liberal use was made of ornamental scrollwork.


-M.M.M., L.Ph.B., A.C.

SILVER STAMPS. See Jeweler.

SILVER STAMPS, state control marks impressed on some silver objects between the 4th and 8th (?) C. In the early 4th C. such stamps, giving the place of manufacture (e.g., Nikomededia, Antioch), were applied to some largitio dishes manufactured by the state for distribution by the emperor (see Munich Treasure); the earliest surviving examples were made for Licinius at Naissos in 317. Contemporary with these stamps are those of various types impressed on ingots, bearing the names of places and officials. From 350 onward, gold and silver ingot stamps could include an imperial bust, and two of this latter type (dated 393–95 and ca.425) are composed of four different stamps, one of which features a tyche. Such stamps also appear on silver objects: tyche stamps are attributed to the 4th–5th C. and sets of multiple stamps with imperial busts were introduced under Anastasios I.

As introduced, these multiple control marks included five stamps of different shapes containing combinations of imperial busts, imperial monograms, monograms of the comes sacrarum largitionum, and names of minor officials. By the 7th C., the name of the eparch of the city or some other official apparently replaced that of the comes. The multiple stamps continued to be used into the reign of Constans II. Although Constantinople is not named in the multiple stamps, it is supposed that they were all applied there, although similar stamps (dated 602–10) bear the name of Antioch (Theoupolis). Contemporary with the pentasphragiston (five-stamp) series of control marks is another, likewise giving the emperor's name, which is composed of two stamps, the earliest dated example of which was applied in 541 at Carthage; the other stamps of this type do not name a city.

There are at least seven other types of silver stamps published that are apparently Byz. but belong to none of the above groups; at least one Merovingian imitation of the five-stamp type is known. While it has been assumed that the stamps guaranteed metallic purity, compositional analysis of a wide range of silver objects of the 4th–7th C. has established that stamped and unstamped silver objects were of comparable metallic refinement.

SILVESTRE I, pope (from 31 Jan. 314); died Rome 30 Jan. 335. He played a more significant role in legend than in reality. In the 5th C. the legend spread in both Syria and Rome that Constantine I was baptized not by Eusebius in Nicomedia but by Silvester in Rome; Malalas was familiar with this legend in the 6th C. The date when the legend reached Constantinople is debatable: C. Mango and I. Ševčenko (DOP 15 [1961] 245 and n.14) hypothesize that Silvester’s baptism of Constantine was represented in the 6th-C. Church of St. Pulektus; the first undisputed mention of it is in the epistle sent by Pope Hadrian I to Emp. Constantine VI in the late 8th C. It is not known when the Latin Acts of Silvester, describing his miracles and the baptism of Constantine, were translated into Greek: while in the early 9th C. Theophanes the Confessor only mentions the baptism, in the mid-9th C. George Hamartolos used the Acts abundantly. The legend also connected the Donation of Constantine with Silvester. I. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner (JOB 32.5 [1982] 453–58) notes that Vat. gr. 752 (dated in 1059) included a representation of Silvester, and she suggests that this scene reflected the conflict between Emp. Isaac I and Pap. Michael I Keroularios.


SIMEON. See Symeon; for St. Simeon of Serbia, see Stefan Nemanja.

SIMILE (παραβολή), a rhetorical figure by which an object or action is explicitly compared with another object, etc., often by use of “like” (Eust. Comm. II. 1:371.7–9). Since antiquity Homer was considered as a master of the simile. Eustathios of Thessalonike, who deals much with Homeric similes, indicates that they had three goals (§249.12–13): amplification (auxesis), [emotional effectiveness (energeia), and clarity (saphenia). As similes the Byz. widely used images borrowed from ancient writers, such as “cave” (W. Blum, VivChr 28 [1974] 43–49). “sea” (T. Miller in Antícnost i sovremennost’ [Moscow 1972] 360–69), “harbor,” “banquet” (P. Alexander, VivChr 30 [1976] 55–62), and so forth. A direct comparison with biblical personages and figures of mythology and ancient history was common. Starting with St. Paul, early Christian and patristic texts used athletic metaphors (athlete of Christ, training, etc.) borrowed from pagan popular philosophical diatribe (R. Merkelbach, ZPapEpig 18 [1975] 101–48).

The attitudes of authors toward the use of similes and metaphors were personal: some authors, such as John VI Kantakouzenos, resorted to similes reluctantly, others, for example, his contemporary Nikephoros Gregoras, readily employed them, developing the image into a complete episode. One can speculate that the surrounding milieu influenced the choice of simile: Symeon the Theologian preferred metaphors and similes reflecting court life and commerce, whereas another mystical theologian, Elias Ekdikos, favored military and agricultural similes (A. Kazhdan in Unser ganzes Leben Christus unserem Gott überantworten [Göttingen 1982] 221–39). Different authors might emphasize different aspects of the simile: thus in Psellus or Gregoras similes of the sea bear a predominantly optimistic message, salvation from the storm, whereas in Niketas Choniates the emphasis lies on shipwreck (Kazhdan-Franklin, Studies 263–78).


SIMOKATTES, THEOPHYLAKTOS, civil servant and writer; born Egypt late 6th C. Simokattes (Σιμοκάττης) is called antigraphus and apo eparchon and may be the judge attested in an inscription from Aphrodisias ca.641 (Grégoire, Inscriptions, no.247); he may earlier have served Probus, bishop of Chalcedon. His major work is a history in eight books of the reign of Maurice, whom he also eulogized in a speech at the commemorative funeral organized ca.610 at Constantinople by
Heraclleos. Written in continuation of Menander Protector, his work, though bombastic, chronologically unsound, and neglectful of Western events, is honestly presented and provides an important contemporary account of the period. Letters and documents are cited, while the presentation of Maurice ranges beyond military matters to detailed accounts of imperial ceremonial at Constantinople. Simokattes' geographical horizons extend through the Turkic peoples to China (P.A. Boodberg, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 3 (1938) 223–53). His prefatory dialogue between the personified History and Philosophy elaborates the traditional proemion separating history from other genres (T. Nissen, BNjbb 15 (1939) 3–13.). Simokattes is more overtly Christian than his predecessors, with correspondingly more overt attention to miraculous happenings; he serves as an important halfway house between the so-called Profanhistoriker and Theophanes the Confessor. He also composed a dialogue dealing with natural sciences, a work on predestination once wrongly ascribed to Psellus, and 85 letters on erotic and other traditional sophistic themes that suggest, as does his History, that he was a trained rhetorician.


--B.B.

SIMONIS (Σιμωνίς), daughter of Andronikos II and Irene-Yolanda of Montferrat; wife of Stefan Uroš II Milutin; born Constantinople 1294, died Constantinople after 1336. The marriage of five-year-old Simonis resulted from a difficult political situation for the Byz. on their frontier with Serbia: the Byz. army had been defeated by the Serbs and Andronikos wanted to negotiate a peace treaty. He suggested a marriage alliance to Milutin, who gladly accepted even though it meant repudiating his wife Anna, the daughter of the Bulgarian tsar George Terter. Andronikos had originally planned to betroth to Milutin his sister Eudokia, widow of John II Komnenos of Trebizond; when she refused, Simonis remained the only possibility. Andronikos and Irene-Yolanda insisted on the marriage even though they met with resistance, esp. in ecclesiastical circles. Milutin also had to overcome local opposition since an alliance with Byz. meant the rupture of relations with Bulgaria.

At the end of 1298 (Reg 4, no.2209) Theodore Metochites went as ambassador to Serbia and reached an agreement after long negotiations. The wedding was celebrated that spring in Thessalonike, and April 1299 Simonis left for Serbia. Eventually Irene-Yolanda tried to use Simonis to influence Milutin: Gregoras claims that the empress hoped that the Serbs would conquer Byz. to the benefit of Simonis and her descendants. When Irene learned that Simonis was unable to have children, she tried to make Milutin adopt one of her sons (Demetrios or Theodore) as the heir to the Serbian throne. After Milutin’s death in 1321, Simonis returned to the Byz. capital and took the veil at the convent of St. Andrew in Krisei. She was her father’s confidant until his death. Her fresco portrait is preserved at Gračanica.


-J.S.A.

SIMONY (ἡ τῶν Σιμωνίων αἴφειρος). The act of buying or selling an ecclesiastical office or service (liturgical, judicial, or administrative) by a layman or cleric was characterized in the canons from the 4th C. onward as the “heresy of Simon” (cf. Acts 8:14–24). Canon law specified the punishment of dismissal for all ecclesiastical parts concerned and of excommunication for laymen (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:37.1–5, 217f, 554f, 572f, 690f). Although such acts were repeatedly condemned in canon law until the fall of the empire (Gennadios II Scholarios, ed. L. Petit, X. Siderides, M. Jugie, vol. 4 [Paris 1935] 480.35–38) as well as by civil law (Justinian I, nos. 6.1.5; 123.2.1, 16; 137.2), it is evident that the practice was in fact widespread and indeed "institutionalized."

The evidence comes from the civil and ecclesi-
astical laws that limited the sums of money ("the customary gratuity") given (1) by a cleric to his future colleagues upon his appointment to Hagia Sophia (cf. S. Troianos, Diptycha 1 [1979] 37–52), (2) by a cleric to the bishop who ordained him, and (3) by laymen to clerics who performed weddings. What began as a means of providing an income for the otherwise unsalaried clerics developed into a contribution that was expected. Money that was given to the bishop as kanonikon (Patr. Nicholas IIII defended the custom [Reg. patr. 3, no.942] by referring to I Corinthians 9:7, which considered it unreasonable "to serve in the army at one's own expense"; Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 5:61.9–15) and contributions that were made to clergy "on the occasion of" administering the sacraments were regarded as canonical if the sum was not excessive and was given "by choice of" the donor (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 4:472.2–6, 5:386.23–27).

LIT. E.S. Papagianni, Ta okonomika tou engamou klerou sto Byzantio (Athens 1986) 224–47. –R.J.M.

SIN (ἀμαρτία, ἀμάρτημα). Sin was interpreted by church fathers as a falling away from the good, estrangement from God, and spiritual death of the soul. Christianity rejected the Marcionite and Gnostic concepts that matter or the body is bad and sinful as such, since otherwise a real incarnation would not be possible. The church fathers considered sin the choice of human free will, occurring because of ignorance and weakness (original sin), pride and disobedience, addiction to material pleasures. Passions (pathé) or emotions were distinguished from sin as motives diminishing the use of reason. The healing of sin can be achieved through divine agency with human cooperation, such as penance and confession, almsgiving, pilgrimage, and other good works. Ecclesiastical punishment of sin included excommunication, and suspension of clerics.

The concept of ranking sins by their gravity was developed by Origen (G. Teichtweier, Die Sündenlehre des Origenes [Regensburg 1958]), who categorized them into mortal sins and pardonable vices perpetrated without the full use of reason and free will. By the end of the 4th C. murder, idolatry, and fornication were defined as the three capital sins, and the system of eight vices was developed, primarily by Evagrius Pontikos (in the West, Pope Gregory I listed seven). The question of whether this system drew upon Stoic or Gnostic models is still being debated (S. Wenzel, Speculum 43 [1968] 2f).

John Chrysostom emphasized in his sermons the social and pastoral aspects of sin and conversion and underlined the necessity of subduing the passions and returning to the practice of love of God and one’s neighbor through good works. Later and ascetic authors added little to these principles.


SINAI (Σινά), peninsula north of the Red Sea, between the gulfs of Suez and Ṭaiqba. The region forms a plateau with several high peaks and a few fertile valleys such as Pharan and Raithou; it was populated primarily by seminomadic Bedouin tribesmen. The mountains of the southern plateau were an early object of religious veneration,
and tradition connected this region with Moses' encounter with God and transmission of the Law. Christian hermits began to settle in Sinai in the 4th C.—first in the valleys but eventually on Mt. Sinai proper, where several monasteries were built, including the Batos (Burning Bush), the future Monastery of St. Catherine. Despite the existence of a Roman garrison in Klysma (Suez) that was responsible for the whole area, Arab attacks were frequent and the monks' sufferings provided material for stories of martyrdom. Justinian I is said to have fortified the Batos to protect it from Bedouin raids. Sinai became a center of monastic culture where writers such as John Climacus and Anastasios of Sinai were active; the exploits of Sinaite monks were recorded in several collections (e.g., by Neilos of Ankyra and Ammonios). After the advent of Islam, the threat of Arab invasion compelled the bishop of Pharan to shift his see to the monastery at Mt. Sinai, but this area too fell to the Arabs by the end of the 7th C. Sinai was the goal of many pilgrimages—from Egeria and the Piacenza Pilgrim to Boldensele and Schiltberger and his contemporaries.


—A.K.

Singers (ψαλται), trained vocalists who sang the responses and chants of the liturgy and the liturgical hours. The composition of the choirs at Hagia Sophia in Constantinople is not sufficiently known. According to the 10th-C. Typikon of the Great Church, the singers were divided into two hebdomades, each led by a primikierios. Contrary to what is generally believed, there was neither a protopsaltes (leader of the right-hand choir) nor a lampadaros (leader of the left-hand choir) among the singers at Hagia Sophia before 1453; these ranks were associated with parochial or provincial

Singers. Psaltai at the funeral of St. Nicholas; fresco, 14th C. Church of Markov Manastir, near Skopje.
churches or they belonged to the so-called Imperial Clergy, that is, they were members of the palatine choirs. The 
\textit{domestikos} began the chant by singing alone the \textit{echemeta} (intonation formulas), thus establishing the pitch and the mode of the ensuing chant. In late Byz. times, a \textit{maistor} was chosen to perform particularly elaborate and virtuosic solo items. For secular ceremonies, the 
\textit{acclamations} in honor of the imperial family were sung by two choirs of court officials and laymen (\textit{kraktai}).


\textbf{SINGIDUNUM} (Σιγγίδου, Σιγγίδον, mod. Belgrade), Roman city at the confluence of the Sava and the Danube rivers. In late antiquity the bridge over the Sava River made Singidunum an important station on the Via Egnatia; it also served as a river port for the fleet, but never achieved as high an administrative position as nearby Sirmium. A bishopric in the 4th C., Singidunum was a center of Arianism: Ursacius of Singidunum and his successor Secundianus—supported by neighboring bishops in Mursa, Ratiaria, etc.—resisted the creed of Nicaea until 381. In the 5th and 6th C. Singidunum suffered from invasions by the Huns, Sarmatians, Gepids, and other tribes. Prokopios relates that Justinian I restored the city and its walls, but Singidunum was lost to the Avars in the early 7th C. Its subsequent fate is unknown; when Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos mentions it in the 10th C., he refers to the district “around Singidon and Sermon” (\textit{De adm. imp.} 25.22), but in the same work (40.29, 32.20) calls the city Belegrada or Beogradon, Greek forms of its new Slavic name Beograd (White Town).

As a part of the First Bulgarian Empire, Belgrade came under Byz. rule by 1018. Together with Žemun, Braničevo, and Sirmium, the city was one of the most important strongholds on the Hungarian frontier; it was destroyed and restored several times during the Byz.-Hungarian wars. Many Crusader armies passed through Belgrade on their way to Constantinople. In the 13th–15th C. Serbs and Hungarians fought over the city. In 1403/4 the Serbian \textit{despot} Stefan Lazarević received it as a vassal of the Hungarian king, and Belgrade became the Serbian capital; in 1427 Hungary reacquired it. Hunyadi stopped the Otoman army in 1456 at the walls of Belgrade, but in 1521 the city fell to Süleyman the Magnificent.


–A.K.

\textbf{SINOPE} (Σινώπη, mod. Sinop), major port of Pontos whose double harbor and location at the narrowest point of the Black Sea provided commercial importance and close ties with the Crimea. Its early history is obscure. It appears in written sources in connection with the Black Sea: Justini- nian II used Sinope to reconnoiter Cherson, and a \textit{kommerkiarios} of Sinope and the Black Sea is named on a 9th-C. seal (\textit{Zacos, Seals} 1, no.2894). Sinope was involved in the revolt of Armeniakon in 793, and in 834 \textit{Theophobos} was proclaimed \textit{basileus} of Sinope by “Persian” mercenaries. Sinope lay outside the main Arab invasion routes, though they did attack it in 858. In 1081, the Seljuks captured Sinope along with a sizable imperial treasury established there. Alexios I restored Byz. rule, and Sinope prospered as a well-defended port; it was the base for Andronikos I Komnenos during his activities in the Pontos. The Komnenoi of Trebizond held Sinope from 1204 to 1214, when it fell to the Seljuks; except for a brief Trapezuntine recapture ca.1254–65, it remained under Turkish rule. Sinope was a suffra- gan bishopric of Amaseia. Its main Byz. monuments are the fortifications and a gymnasium.

\textit{Lit. Breyer-Winfield, Pontos} 69–88. –C.F.

\textbf{SION}, conventional name for elaborate silver models of shrines. Three of them can be connected with the Byz. world: one in the Cathedral Treasury of Aachen, in the form of an almost perfect cube with dome, and two in the treasury of St. Sophia in Novgorod (the Great and the Little Sions), in the form of a rotunda, with a cross, evoking that of Golgotha, on the top. The Little Sion is usually considered as consisting of two independent parts that were eventually connected. The Sion of Aachen bears three biblical quotations and a prayer to the Lord to assist Eustathios, \textit{strategos} of Antioch and Lykandos; according to W. Saunders (\textit{DOP} 36 [1982] 211–19), he should be identified with Eustathios \textbf{MALEINOS}
and the object dated 969/70. The Little Sion of Novgorod bears the name of Constantine, megas oikonomos of the Tropaiouchos (i.e., St. George), whom N. Oikonomides (DOP 34–35 [1980–81] 243–46) hypothetically identified as the future patriarch CONSTANTINE (III) LEICHOUDES. The function of Sions is unclear: Antony of Novgorod (Ch. Loparev, PPSb 51 [1899] 19) saw a “radiant bright Jerusalem” carried during the liturgy, together with the rhipidia. The identification of the Aachen Sion as a reliquary (allegedly of Anastasios the Persian) is arbitrary. Nor is it clear whether such shrines in general should be connected with the reputation and form of the Church of St. Sion in Jerusalem disseminated in panegyrics such as that of Patr. John II of Jerusalem, 387–417 (M. van Esbroeck, AB 102 [1984] 124f).


---A.C., A.K.

SION, HOLY (Ἀγία Σιώ), monastery in Lycia established in the reign of Justinian I by the local saint, NICHOLAS OF SION, at his birthplace, the village of Tragalassos in the mountains above Myra. Its fairly uncommon name indicates the close connections between Lycia and Palestine, which developed in part from the visits Nicholas made to Jerusalem. The church soon attracted gifts, most notably the Sion Treasure, lavish silver furnishings of all kinds dedicated by a bishop and other individuals in the late 6th C. The monastery was still functioning in 787 but was robbed of its treasures, probably by Arab raiders who buried them near the sea, presumably preparatory to further transport. The monastery has been identified with a church at Karabel, a domed basilica whose triconch apse and side chapels reflect the influence of Egypt or the Holy Land and whose architecture corresponds to the description in the Life of Nicholas and to the style of the 6th C. The church was richly decorated and contains elements suitable for installation of the surviving silver ornaments. In a late, undated period the central dome collapsed and a smaller rectangular church was built in the ruins.


---C.F.

SION, MOUNT, holy site in JERUSALEM. The Hebrew name was usually interpreted as meaning “watchtower,” but Titus of Bostra (PG 18:1289C) suggested another (false) etymology—“thirsty.” Old Testament tradition identified Sion or Zion (Σιώ) with the city of David on a hill southeast of Jerusalem, but Josephus situated it in the southwest, and this location was accepted by Christian tradition. Several important loca sancta were to be found on Mt. Sion: the upper room to which the apostles retreated after the Resurrection, the place where they waited after the Ascension, and the site of the Pentecost. The house of Caiaphas and the Column of the Flagellation (with imprints of Christ’s hands) were also located on Mt. Sion. By the early 4th C. Sion was believed to be the site of the Last Supper.

In 340, Maximos, bishop of Jerusalem, built a church on the traditional site of the Last Supper, the Church of the Apostles, also called the Church of Mt. Sion; it appears on the Madaba mosaic map. Meager remains of this church have been found, but its plan is not clear. In the 5th C. Sion was enclosed in the city by a wall built by Empress Eudokia, remains of which have been discovered. The medieval “Tomb of David” was constructed in a late Roman building (a synagogue?) and includes a wall with a niche facing north and a mosaic floor.

The church fathers sometimes distinguished Sion from, sometimes identified it with, Jerusalem. The name was often used figuratively. “There are three ways,” wrote Prokopios of Gaza (PG 87:2476C), “to understand Sion and Jerusalem: with the senses; as the pious society of those on earth; as an angelic community (politeia) in heaven.” The term was used to connotate the church, the saints, consummate virtue, and the intellect.


---G.V., A.K., Z.U.M.

SION TREASURE, 6th C., found in 1963 near Kumluca (anc. Korydalla) in Lycia and now divided among collections in Antalya, Washington, and Geneva. It is composed of about 71 items in silver, some being fragmentary (50 objects, 20 revetment sheets, a ring), a copper coin of either Leo I or Zenon, silver-plated bronze pincers, and a gold scepter. Approximately 30 of the objects
have silver stamps dated 550–65, all of which were presented by Eutychianos, the bishop of an unidentified see, to a church generally thought to be that of Holy Sion (see Sion, Holy) founded by Nicholas of Sion between 541 and 565; several objects are inscribed with the name of “Holy Sion.” An alternative opinion holds that the treasure belonged to the cathedral of Korydalla. Of outstanding interest are the metal revetments (for a table, colonnettes, lampstands), some of which were donated by two bishops and other clergy. The gifts of Bp. Eutychianos included five sets of ecclesiastical lighting fixtures (three types of polychandelier, two types of lamps), two amphoras, two censers, and three large patens; the latter apparently served as models for others given by laymen to the same church. The pieces of high-quality metalwork have been attributed to workshops in Constantinople. Boyd (infra) and others have suggested that the treasure may have been buried at the time of Arab raids along the Lycian coast in the 7th C.


SIRMUM (Σίρμιον, mod. Sremska Mitrovica in Yugoslavia), a city on the left bank of the Sava. Late Roman Sirmium was an important strategic point in the region endangered by barbarian invasions; Diocletian made it the capital of Pannonia II and of the diocese of Pannonia. In the 4th C. the area was crucial both in the struggle for control over the Roman Empire and in the defense of the Middle Danube. It was lost to the Huns in 440/1, and thereafter the empire was able to recapture it only for short periods of time. Justinian I, among others, with the help of the Gepids, seized Sirmium from the Ostrogoths in 535, but the Gepids soon occupied it. Byz. controlled Sirmium from 567 to 582, but then lost it to the Avars. The last bishop of the city, Sebastianos, left Sirmium in 582 (V. Popović, REAug 21 [1975] 91–111).

Excavations at Sirmium have brought to light a section of city walls, public buildings (a bathhouse, several warehouses, a hippodrome), villas and apartment complexes (insulae), an urban church, and several chapels outside the ramparts, probably in cemeteries. Until ca.357 there was a mint at Sirmium, producing bronze coinage; numerous coins have been found at the site, most of them struck between 351 and 361 and between 364 and 378 (C. Nixon, JbNumGeld 33 [1983–84] 45–55). From the end of the 4th C. onward, Sirmium began to decline: large public buildings were either abandoned or were not restored after a fire, or were replaced by small houses and shops. In the 6th C. only a minor portion of the old city was populated.

Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp. 25,22, 40,31) twice mentions Sermon (sic) as close to Singidunum. In the early 11th C. it was under the control of the Bulgarian Sermon (a name curiously reminiscent of Sirmium itself), who yielded it to the Byz. general Constantine Diogenes. Diogenes had been archon of Sirmium before Constantine VIII appointed him doux of Bulgaria. Sirmium was an important objective in the Byz.-Hungarian wars of the 12th C., but by then the name designated the district (otherwise called Frankochorion) rather than the city. It remains questionable whether or not Sirmium formed a separate theme (Litavrin, Bolognia 273–78). Its later fate is unknown.


SITARKIA (σταρκία), a secondary or supplementary tax of uncertain nature usually listed among eperetai. Two chrysobulls of 1327 state explicitly that sitarkia was paid from the zeugaria of paroikoi (Zogr., no.26.33–35; Chil., no.113.31–32), and it is sometimes identified with the zeugaratikion (Pantel., no.11.25–26) or an obscure charge called haloniakion (Pantel., no.10.77), which etymologically is linked with the halonion, “threshing floor.” This identification is not certain: a chrysobull of 1342 lists sitarkia among the eperetai from which the chorion of Chantax is exempted and separately indicates that only the Zographou monastery could levy the zeugaratikion on the village (Zogr., no.32.42–54). F. Dölger (BZ 38 [1938] 497) questioned also the identity of haloniakion and sitarkia. Data about the amount of sitarkia are scarce: the chorion of Prebista in 1327 paid 45 hyperpers of sitarkia (Zogr., no.26.35–36). Sitarkia was among those charges that—like phonos (phonikon)—were relatively rarely abolished.
Dölger (Beiträge 59) hypothesized that *sitarkia*, which is attested from the 13th C. onward, replaced *synone* but this cannot be proved. The relation of *sitarkia* to the obligation called “*sitarkesis of fortresses*” (e.g., Patmou Engrapha 1, no.3-33) is unclear.

LIT. Chvostova, Osobennosti 99, n.122, 243f, 249-51.

-SITERESION. See OPSONION.

-SITOKOKKON (σιτόκοκκον, lit. “grain of wheat”), also called *sitarton sporimon*, *kokkositarton*, and *pyros*, a unit of weight approximately equal to that of a grain of wheat: 1 *sitokokkon* = 1/4 keraton = 0.046 g.

The relationship between *sitokokkon* and *krithokokkon* (“grain of barley”) is not clear. Some texts define *sitokokkon* as 1/15 keraton and *krithokokkon* as 1/4 keraton. Schilbach (infra) considers this ratio as resulting from a confusion and equates 1 *sitokokkon* to 1.25 *krithokokkon*. Known only in arithmetical tracts, these tiny measures had no practical significance.

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 186.

-SITOKRITHON (σιτοκριθων, lit. “wheat [and] barley”), a tax introduced by Andronikos II in 1304 (Reg 4, no.2271). A contemporary historian (Pachym., ed. Bekker, 2:492.16–493.12) relates that every peasant was obliged to pay six local *modioi* of wheat and four of barley. This grain was to be sold, and the silver and gold handed over to the *megas doux*. The term appears even before 1304, however, in Andronikos’s chrysobull of 1298, in which various exemptions of the Lavra are listed—from the obligations of *kastrikthia*, the draft of soldiers and sailors, *mitaton* and *aplekton*, *ancaireai*, supply of salt, payment in cash for *sitokrithon* and grapes (Lavra 2, no.89.163–69: cf. *Lavra* 3, no.118.190–95, etc.). The term is often used in connection with the οἶκομωδία when the formula of chrysobull prescribes the donation of “*a sitokrithon staurikon modion*” for each three hyperperra of the *telos* (e.g., Esphig., no.7.17–18, end of the 13th C.). Ostrogorsky (Féodalité 284f) considered *sitokrithon* as a regular secondary tax, whereas J. Bompaire (BCH 80 [1956] 630f) saw in the term simply an indication of the form of tax collection (i.e., in wheat and barley). It is certain, however, that Pachymeres understood the *sitokrithon* as a tax, although imposed only temporarily, to satisfy a specific need of the army.

-LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 186.

-SITULA (κάδος), bucket probably used for drawing water. Such vessels could be worked in various techniques in silver (relief), bronze and brass (*engraved*), and glass (intaglio and openwork), with both profane and sacred decorations; examples survive from the 4th to the 7th C. Two glass *situæ* now in Venice have Dionysiac and hunting scenes, respectively. Four in silver (one in the Concest Treasures buried ca.400, a pair in the Sasso Treasure, and one with stamps of 613–30) have classical and mythological images, while a third (with silver stamps of the 6th C.? found in Albania) has a diaper pattern. Elaborately decorated buckets of the 5th–6th C. have been discovered in various parts of the empire. The best known of these, the *Seccia Doria,* with scenes from the *Itiad,* is possibly from Caesarea Maritima in Palestine; others with hunting and animal scenes and, in some cases, domestic inscriptions, have come to light in Spain and Britain; one, found in Mesopotamia, decorated with crosses, has a dedicatory inscription implying ecclesiastical use (for baptism?). As much could be said of another, 4th-C. bronze *situ,* with *christograms,* and of a lead example from Tunisia, decorated with Christian figures and symbols. Domestic *situæ* are shown in the bath scenes on the Projecta casket in the Esquiline Treasure (Shelton, Esquiline, pl.6). Constans II was murdered with a silver *situ* in a bath in Sicily in 668, as described by Michael I the Syrian (2:450f).


-SIXTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL. See CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF: Constantinople III.

-SKALA (σκάλα, lit. “stairs,” “gangway of a ship,” from Lat. *scala*). From the 5th C. onward, the term was employed to designate mooring stations in Constantinople. The 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (ch.17.3) distinguishes skalai, where fishing boats
were moored and unloaded their catch, from *epo-
chaid, the fishing grounds. According to Leo VI's
novel 102, the *epo-
chaid were often used by part-
nerships (*koimonia) of fishermen. Attaleiates (At-
tal. 278.2—7) gives the vernacular name of *skalai
to the wooden "bulwarks" (*proteichismata) erected
close to the sea in Constantinople where mer-
chants traded with sailors. In the 11th C. Michael
VII attempted to confiscate private *skalai in Con-
stantinople, but his decree was rescinded by Ni-
kophoros III. When the Byz. government began
conferring privileges on Venetian merchants in the
late 11th C., it also granted them *skalai in the
capital.

Probably after the 11th C. the term began to
lose its specific connection with Constantinople;
ca.1300 Manuel Moschopoulos defined *skalai as a
word used by ordinary people (*koimoi) to designate
a place in the harbor where ships were pulled
ashore and secured. Late Byz. documents men-
tion *skalai outside Constantinople, such as a build-
ing in Kotzenos (on Lemnos) constructed by the
monks of the Great Lavra near the seashore "as
*skalai of the boats of monks" (Lavra 2, no.74.77—
78, a.1284).

A tax called *skalatikon had to be paid on *skalai.
A chrysobull of Andronikos II of 1298 lists it to-
gether with other levies on maritime com-
merce—*kommerkion, *antimaolon, and *limniaitikon
(Lavra 2, no.89.194—95).

H. Kahane, "Italo-Byzantinische Etymologien. Scala," 
BNfbb 16 (1940) 33—58. —A.K.

**SKANDERBEG** (Gr. *Σκάνδερμης), Albanian form
of Turkish name (Iskender Beg) of George Kas-
triota, "captain of Albania" (1443—68) and hero
of Albanian resistance against Ottoman conquest;
born northern Albania ca.1405, died Lezhë, Al-
bania, 17 Jan. 1468. Son of John Kastrioti, prince
of Emathia (PLP, no.11400), who ruled in central
and northern Albania, Skanderbeg in his youth
was given to the Ottomans as a hostage after his
father's defeat by the Turks. He converted to
Islam and was educated at the Turkish military
school at Edirne (Adrianople). In 1443 he de-
serted from the Turks, resumed his Christian
faith and returned to his homeland to defend it
against Ottoman invasion. Between 1444, when
he organized the League of Albanian Princes, and
1466 he repelled 13 Turkish invasions. His base
was the mountain stronghold of Krujë (Gr. Kroia),
the home of the Kastrioti family, located north
of Tirana. ALBANIA fell to the Turks only after
Skanderbeg's death. His son was married to Irene
Palaiologina, daughter of Thomas Palaiologos.
There is surprisingly little information about
Skanderbeg in 15th-C. Byz. histories, and one
must use Italian, Serbian, and Turkish sources to
establish his biography.

LIT. J. Radonic, Djaradj Kastriot Skenderbeg i Arbanija u
* XV veku (Belgrade 1942). A. Ducellier, "La façade maritime
de la Principauté des Kastriotes, de la fin du XIVe siècle à
la mort de Skanderbeg," Studia Albanica 5.1 (1968) 119—
36. G. Soulis, "Hai neoterai ereunai peri Georgiou Kastri-
otou Skenderbec," FEBS 28 (1958) 446—57. Studia Albanica
Monacensis. In memoriam Georgii Castriotae Scanderbegi 1468—
Kastrioti- Skenderbeg i nevogata osvoboditelna borba," in
Georgi Kastrioti Skenderbeg (Sofia 1970) 7—32. —A.M.T.

**SKARAMANGION** (*σκαραμάγγιον*), a belted
* tunic with long full sleeves and with slits up the
front and back or sides, probably in origin a
Persian rider's caftan. The word appears in Theo-
phanes (Theoph. 319.17) as a Persian garment.
A *purple skaramangion could be worn only by the
emperor, who might also wear a gold or red one,
while the courtiers wore *skaramangia in a variety
of colors, some even two-toned, as their basic
official dress. The *skaramangion, often worn under
the *sagion, was not considered a particularly cere-
monial garment: the emperor seems to have worn
it whenever he left the palace, and both he and
the officials were instructed to take off their gala
robes and put on their own *skaramangia for ban-
To judge by representations, the *skaramangion was
made of silk and had gold armbands and a gold-
embroidered border running along the hem and
up the slits. *Skaramangia were favored imperial
gifts (Lütprand of Cremona, Antapodosis, ed. J.
Becker, 157f) and could apparently be used as
altar cloths (see *Endynte). It is thought by some
that the 14th-C. term *skaranikon may refer to
the successor to this garment.

LIT. N.P. Kondakov, "Les costumes orientaux à la cour
byzantine," Byzantion 1 (1924) 11—15. P.A. Phouriakes, "Peri
tou etymou tou lexew kou skaramangion, kabbadion, skarami-
kon," Lexiographikon archeion tes meses kai neas hellinikes 6
(1923) 444—73. —N.P.S.

**SKARANIKON** (*σκαρανικόν*), an element of court
* costume. The word appears first as an adjective
in a 12th-C. poem of Ptochoprodromos (ed. Hess-
suling-Pernot, no.1.248) describing a type of headgear, epakanamelaukhis. It is frequently mentioned in the 14th-C. ceremonial book of pseudo-Kodinos. Two interpretations of the term have been suggested: a kind of tunic similar to and replacing the skaramangion, or a hat, specifically the tall, squarish headdress worn by some high officials in Palaiologan portraits, for example, the despotes Theodore I Palaiologos at Mistra, or Alcexios Apokaukos (J. Verpeaux in pseudo-Kod. 145f, n.2). Pseudo-Kodinos, while describing the costume of various dignitaries places skaranikon either between the headgear called skadion, and the caftan, kabbadion, or after both skiadion and khabadion; it is described as red and gold (ehyros-kokkinon), although courtiers of lower rank wore apricot, lemon, or gold-white skaranika; it was embroidered and bore pictures of the emperor either standing or sitting on the throne (pseudo-Kod. 152.1–9, 153.13–17). The origin of skaranikon is obscure: pseudo-Kodinos (206.19–20) claims that it was of "Assyrian" origin, and Ptochoprodromos places it within a Slavic context, while Caratzas (infra) hypothesizes that it was a western (Germanic) garment that penetrated Byz. during the reign of Manuel I.


SKARIPHOS (σκάριφος), a sketch or, in architecture, a ground plan. The 5th-C. architect Rufinus is said in the vita of PORPHYRIOS OF GAZA to have based his outline (thesis) for the cathedral of Gaza on a skariphos sent from Constantinople by the emperor Eudoxia. Plans were often transmitted in visions, such as the one in which St. Martha dictated to a monk the scheme for her chapel at the Wondrous Mountain (AASS May 5:416F). By the 14th C. skariphos had come to mean an artist's brush, as in an epigram of Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos on an image painted by Eulalios (A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, BZ 11 [1902], p.46, n.16, line 1). –A.C.

SKEPIDES (Σκεπίδης), family known in the mid-11th C. Michael Skepides, a protospatharios, is depicted in 1060/1 in Karaba Kilise in the Soğanli valley of Cappadocia and described in an inscription there as responsible for its redecoration. Other members of his family portrayed are Catherine (a nun) and Niphon (a monk). John Skepides, "protospatharios of the Chrysotrikinos, hypatos, and strategos," is depicted as the founder of Gök (Ge-yik) Kilise in the same valley. A strategos, Eustathios Skepides, witnessed a legal judgment in November 1042: A. Guillo (Byzantion 35 [1965] 122) suggests that he may have been an administrator in Lucania.

LIT. Jerphanion, Εγκλήσεις ῥυπεστρες 2:1334–36, 371f. Rodley, Cave Mons. 198–202, 250f. –A.C.

SKETE (σκήτη), also sketes (from asketeria, "monastery," "hermitage"), term designating a small monastery; in the Miracles of St. George (ed. J.B. Aufhauser, 153.23) are listed sketai and monai. The name also commemorates the original Skete, the Egyptian monastic settlement in the Wādī Natrūn. It appears sometimes in Athenian documents of the 14th–15th C. The forged chrysobull of Andronikos II (Xerop. γ.35) equates the terms skete and monydrion. According to the act of the protos Theodosios of 1353 (Lavra 3, no.133.7) the skete of Glossia contained several kollia and hesychasteria (probably cells and hermitages). Manuel II's Typikon of 1406 orders that the "kollia of the sketes" send 100 wooden planks to the protos (Meyer, Haupturkunden 201.4–5)—it is unclear which skete is meant or whether it was a proper name, Sketes. Today 12 sketai survive on Mt. Athos but they are relatively new, not going back further than 1572. Some are idiosyncratic, others cencentric, but there is no evidence that such a distinction existed in the Byz. period. The Russian word skit (hermitage), derived from skete, is attested as early as the 14th C.

LIT. E. Amand de Mendieta, Mount Athos, the Garden of the Panaghia (Berlin-Amsterdam 1972) 202–97. –A.M.T., A.K.

SKETIS. See Wādī Natrūn.

SKEUOPHYLAX (σκευοφυλάς, "keeper of the vessels"), a cleric, usually a priest, appointed to look after the sacred valuables and liturgical vessels of a church. In this capacity, he played an important part in liturgical ceremonial and had a role in the administration of sacred property comparable and complementary to that of the oikonomos. Like the (megas) oikonomos, the (megas) skeuophylax of the Great Church was ap-
pointed by the emperor in the century or so before Isaac I relinquished the right of appointment. The skewophylax ranked next to the oikonomos until the late 11th C., when he was demoted to third place in favor of the sakellarios. The sekretos that he headed, the mega skewophylakeion, employed a number of chartoularioi. This sekretos probably evolved from the epitagma of 12 skewophylakes (four priests, six deacons, two anagnostai) attested on the staff of the Great Church in 612 (ed. J. Konidaris, FM 5 [1982] 66).

The skewophylax of a monastery was a monk or nun (skewophylakissa) entrusted with responsibility for sacred vessels and furnishings. The skewophylakissa of Kecharitomene also supervised the manufacture of wax candles and assumed the duties of chartophylax.


—P.M.; A.M.T.

SKIAION (σκιαίδεον, from σκιά, shadow), a type of hat. In antiquity the term skiaidon designated a sunshade or parasol; according to a scholar on Theokritos and the 5th/6th-C. lexicographer Hesychios of Alexandria, it later acquired the meaning of a conical hat with a broad brim. By the 14th C., according to pseudo-Kodinos, the term skiaion designated the type of hat worn by the emperor and most of his courtiers. Variations in its fabric (gold and red, or gold-embroidered or plainly embroidered) denoted the rank of the wearer (pseudo-Kod. 302.7-14); the skiaion of a despotes was covered with pearl crosses (141.3-4, 147.4-8). Since pseudo-Kodinos states that a megas logothetes should wear a skiaion, it is usually assumed that the headdress worn by Theodore Metochites in his portrait at Chora is such a hat, even though its turban-like shape is difficult to reconcile with the etymology of the term. Metochites' headdress has gold vertical stripes outlined in red. It was apparently made of silk cloth stretched over some kind of internal armature; it fitted tight over the brow but flared out dramatically, curving forward again at the top. Somewhat similar beehive-shaped hats appear in 11th- and 12th-C. representations of both court officials and singers (Sinai gr. 399, Spatarakis, Corpus fig.278). Other scholars have identified the skiaion with the conical or pyramidal hat with broad brim familiar from Italian portraits of John VIII Palaiologos (e.g., on the Pisanello medallion in the British Museum). The skiaion was also an ecclesiastical headdress. Symeon of Thessalonike (PG 155:396BC) states that skiaia were worn by deacons and priests as well as by senators and even the emperor.

LIT. J. Verpeaux in pseudo-Kod. 141f, n.1. Underwood, Kariye Džami 1:42.

—N.P.S.

SKLAVNOI (Σκλαβνίοι), the name of a people north of the Danube. It remains unclear whether their mention in pseudo-Kaisarios is the earliest, since the date of this text is not yet firmly established. The Sklavenoi are described by many authors of the 6th and 7th C. (Prokopios, Menander Protector, Jordanes, Theophylaktos Simokattes)—sometimes together with the Antae, sometimes under the sway of the Avars—as a dangerous force ready to invade Balkan territory. The Strategikon of Maurice presents them as exceptionally skilful in swimming and diving; they operated on foot in guerrilla fashion in marshy or mountainous regions, being also expert archers and javelin throwers. The Miracles of St. Demetrios credits the Sklavenoi with the ability to build and sail dugouts (monoxyla); on the other hand, Simokattes stresses their talent in fighting from fortifications made of wagons. Byz. authors speak of a great number of Sklavenoi; Simokattes even preserves a legend of the Sklavenoi living on the shore of the western ocean.

The last mention of the Sklavenoi is in the 9th-C. vita of Gregory of Dekapolis. In the 9th C. they were considered allies or subjects of the Bulgars, the inhabitants of Sklavinia. In Soviet, Bulgarian, and Serbo-Croatian scholarship, Sklavnoi are uniformly treated as an early Slav tribe.


—O.P.

SKLAVNIA (Σκλαβνία), a region occupied by the Sklavenoi; a stronghold, whether small or large in area, of the frontier military type. The first author to use the term is Theophylaktos
SIMOKATTES (fl. 628–41), referring to barbarian strongholds on the left bank of the Danube.

Each Sklavinia had its own leadership, headed by a čupan (an Avar honorific of Iranian origin), a title replaced in the 8th–9th C. by the more impressive Byz. designation EXARCH OR ARCHON. The Sklaviniae were united in larger units called geneai, tribes, in the same way as the Hunno-Turkic nomadic oγυς = oγυz. Thus the Bulgars of Asparuch, having settled in Moesia ca.679, subjugated there the so-called Seven Tribes of the Sklavenoi. Unlike the steppe oγυς, whose economy was pastoralist, the Sklavinian military colony subsisted by agriculture. Like their steppe counterparts, however, these colonies strove, whenever circumstances permitted, to become independent of their imperial suzerains, be these Avars, Bulgars, or Byz.

It is possible to establish the existence of the following Sklaviniae:

Carnithia (Latin sources of the 8th–9th C.)

Pannonia (Sclavenia in Latin documents of the 9th C.)

Transylvania, where “Geographus Bavarus” (ca.840 places the Eptaradici (lit. “of seven roots”), probably a distorted reflection of the Seven Slavic tribes in Theophanes

Dalmatia, including Carnithia (Carantania; Sclavenia in Latin documents of 871)

Thrace and Moesia (Scriptor Incertus), including Seven Tribes and DROUGOUBITAI

Macedonia (second half of 7th C.; Miracles of St. Demetrios; Theophanes)

Peloponnesos (8th–9th C.; Theophanes; Chronicle of Monemvasia)

Rus’ (first half of 10th C.; Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, De adm. imp. 9.107)

Because of the gradual transformation of the Sklaviniae into ethnic units, ethne, esp. after the collapse of the Avar Empire (796) and the baptism of the Sklavenoi, their original professional military “democracy” gradually gave way to a class of hereditary archontes and their retinues. This resulted in social differentiation and the transformation from corporate to family ownership of the land. The Sklaviniae then became obsolete.

SKLERAINA (Σκλήρανα), probably to be identified as Maria, the daughter of a Skleros and widow of a protospatharios (Peira 50.4). She became mistress of Constantine IX Monomachos, who granted her the title of sebaste and installed her in the palace with his legitimate wife. Empress Zoe. Skleraina used her influence to promote her brother Romanos Skleros; his career, however, remains unclear, since the evidence is insufficient to distinguish between several Romanoi Skleroi of the period. Skylitzes mentions an uprising against Skleraina in 1044. She apparently died ca.1045; Psellos wrote a poem on her death. Constantine IX built a monastery in her memory and placed it under the authority of Lazaros of Mt. Galesios.


SKLEROS (Σκληρός, fem. Σκλήρανα), the name of a noble family. No evidence attests an Armenian origin, although the first known Skleros, a general serving in the Peloponnesos ca.805, came from Lesser Armenia. Several 9th-C. Skleroi were governors of the Peloponnesos (Leo, ca.811) and Hellas (Antoninus Durus, attested in a Hungarian chronicle, Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum, vol. 1 [Budapest 1937] 164); Niketas Skleros was an envoy to the Hungarians ca.895.

The family acquired eminence by the late 10th C.: the magistros Bardas Skleros, one of the ablest generals of John I Tzimiskes, defeated Svato-слав in 971 but later fell from imperial favor and was accused of conspiracy. In 976 the army in Mesopotamia proclaimed Bardas basilieux, and he marched against Constantinople. Victorious in 977, he was defeated in 979 and fled to the Arabs; he rebelled again in 987. Bardas Phokas, another usurper, took him captive. After the death of Phokas, Bardas Skleros kept fighting against Basil II, but in Oct. 989 he was reconciled and was granted lands. He died 6 March 991.

Both Bardas’s brother Constantine and son Romanos were generals; Romanos’s son Basil, magistros and strategos of Anatolikon, and his relatives acted as independent seigneurs on their estates; their arrogance is criticized in Peira. Basil and his wife Pulcheria, sister of the future emperor Romanos III, were exiled in 1033. Their relative
Maria Skleraina and her brother Romanos played an important role in the mid-11th C. Thereafter the significance of the Skloroi decreased; from the late 11th C. they were primarily civil functionaries (the logothetes tou dromou Andronikos, the megas drungarios tes viglas Nicholas, the epi tou deeseon Nicholas) and judges. They did not enter the clan of the Komnenoi and were involved in a scheme against Alexios I ca.1105. Twelfth-century sources rarely mention the Skloroi except for a certain Seth Skleros, blinded ca.1166/7 for involvement with astrology and magic. A 14th-C. Skleros had the title of sebastos (1336) and owned a choraphion in the Serres region.


SKOPJE (Σκόπια), town in Macedonia, on the river Vardar, not far from ancient Scupi, which in the 4th C. was the capital of Dardania and a bishopric; the first known bishop of Scupi, Paregorios, participated in the Council of Serdica in 342/3. The ancient theater stopped functioning in the 4th C. and its site was occupied by small dwellings. Two basilicas of the late 4th C. have been discovered. In the 5th C. Scupi fell into decline; it was destroyed by the earthquake of 518, although some habitation continued there until the early 7th C. (the last coins found in Scupi are those of Maurice, 586). Probably in the 6th C. several fortresses were constructed in the area, for example, that of Markovi kuli (I. Mikulčič, N. Nikuljska, Macedoniae acta archaeologica 4 [1978] 137–50).

Medieval Skopje appears in written sources from the beginning of the 11th C., when the town was conquered by Basil II. Excavations have revealed the existence of a 10th-C. fortress and probably of a lower township of the 11th C. The walls of the fortress were built of small stones held together with mortar, and had round, square, and triangular towers. The walls were reconstructed under the Komnenoi. In the 11th C., Skopje emerged as the capital of the doukaton of Bulgaria (Litavrin, Bolgarija 278) and was frequently a center of anti-Byz. revolts. In the 13th C. it was a bone of contention between Bulgaria, Serbia, Epirus, and Nicaea. From 1282 onward Skopje was in Serbian hands. In the second half of 1298 (Reg 4. no.2209) or in the winter of 1299 (L. Mavromatis, La fondation de l’Empire serbe. Le kralj Milutin [Thessalonike 1978] 43), the Byz. mission headed by Theodore Metochites arrived at Skopje to negotiate the marriage of Simonis with Stefan Uroš II Milutin. Stefan Uroš IV Dušan was crowned at Skopje in 1346. The Turks occupied the city in 1391.


SKOTEINE MONASTERY, a foundation of uncertain location in the diocese of PHILADELPHIA, known only from the diataxis, or rule, composed in 1247 by the hieromonk Maximos, kteor and hegoumenos. The original buildings of Skoteine (Σκοτεινή), a small chapel and cell, were built (in the late 12th C.? ) on a rugged mountainside by Maximos’s father, Gregory. Maximos was among a number of male relatives who subsequently joined Gregory in the monastic life. Under Maximos’s leadership, the number of monks increased to about 20 and facilities were expanded. Thanks to the financial support of an official (allagator) named Phokas and other local patrons, Maximos was able to construct a new church and add a refectory, kitchen, bakery, and water pipes to the complex. Maximos also acquired substantial property through donations and purchase and established five metocheia.

Maximos’s diataxis is distinguished by an unusually lengthy and detailed list of properties owned by the monastery. The inventory of the libraries of the monastery and metochia lists about 130 liturgical and patristic volumes, a surprising number for an obscure provincial establishment. The enumeration of liturgical vestments and furnishings also indicates the substantial wealth of the monastery.


SKOUTARIOTES, THEODORE, ecclesiastical official and metropolitan of Kyzikos (1277–82); born ca.1230. Skoutariotes (Σκουταρίωτης) began
his career as *epi ton deeseon* and deacon and was appointed *dikaiophylax* by Michael VIII Palaiologos in 1270. Ambassador to Rome in 1277, he was deposed from his see in 1282.

He was identified by Heisenberg as author of an anonymous chronicle preserved in Venice, Marc. gr. 407 and copied by John Argyropoulos. This chronicle of events from the creation of the world through 1261 is the work of a compiler who, for the earlier period, apparently used the same source as Zonaras (A. Heisenberg, *BZ* 5 [1896] 182f). For the later period he employed primarily Niketas Choniates and George Akropolites; the additions to the latter are of special value. The author belonged to the circle of Patriarch Arsenios; his additions are important for both the political and economic history of Byz. (V.N. Zavrazin, *VizVrem* 41 [1980] 252–55). Heisenberg’s identification is based, first, on the marginal note in Marc. gr. 407 stating that the book (biblos) is of Theodore of Kyzizos from the family of Skoutarios; this note, however, shows ownership of the MS rather than authorship of the chronicle; a certain Theodore Skoutarios also possessed a MS of Aristotel (D. Harflinger, D. Reinsch, *Philologus* 114 [1970] 28–50). The second argument is the note on a 16th-C. MS (Lampros, *Athos* 1:371, no.3758) asserting that Theodore of Kyzizos wrote this chronicle in detail from the reign of Alexios I and John II to Michael VIII. It is not clear, however, whether we can trust such a late testimony (A. Kazhdan, *IzvInstBulgIst* 14–15 [1964] 529f).


—A.K.

**SKRIBAS** (σκρίβας), a subordinate of the quaesitor, according to the late 9th-C. *Kleitorologion* of Philotheos (Oikonomides, *Listes* 115.7). Bury (Adm. System 76) conjectured that he was a successor to the scriba, a notary in the office of the 5th-C. *magister census*. The skribas of the 10th–11th C., however, was not a notary but a high-ranking official titled *prototheparios* and even *patroklos* (Laurent, *Corpus* 2, nos. 1196–98), who combined his duties with those of the judge of the *velum* or of the Hippodrome. Romanos, *asekretis* and *skribas*, assisted Patr. Eustathios (1081–84) (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.933) or Eustathios (1019–25) (Laurent, *Corpus* 2:670) in a case of an illegal marriage. It is not impossible that Romanos, *asekretis* and *skribas*, the owner of a seal (Zacos, *Seals* 2, no.878), was the same man. The author of a novel of Constantine VII that regulated the *synetia* granted to the *skribas* (N. Svoronos, *La Synopsis major des Basiliques et ses appendices* [Paris 1964] 94, no.8) had difficulty describing the position of the *skribas* whom he defined as a “not full-fledged (ou teλeos) judge related to the thematiko and to antistigmatoi” (Zepos, *Jus* 1:220.17–18).

—A.K.

**SKYLITZES, GEORGE**, mid-12th-C. governor of Serdica under Manuel I. Skylitzes (Σκυλίτζης) or his homonym, *protophoropalates* and imperial secretary, was active in 1166 (PG 140.277B). Yet another George Skylitzes is mentioned in a 12th-C. epigram (Lampros, “Mark. kod.” 186, no.367.4). Skylitzes seems to have carried out the policy of cultural rapprochement between Byz. and the recently conquered Bulgaria: he wrote a Life of St. JOHN OF RILA and *kanones* in his honor (both preserved only in Slavic translations). He also produced two other *kanones* (on St. Demetrius and St. George), iambic poems on the *Hoplotheke* by Andronikos Kamateros, and an *akolouthia* on the
SKYLITZES, JOHN, historian; fl. second half of 11th C. His life remains obscure. S. Antoljak’s doubts concerning the family name of Skylitzes are not valid (14 CEB 3 [Bucharest 1976] 677–82). The title of his Synopsis calls him kouropalates and former droungarios tes viglas. He is usually identified with John Thrakesios, kouropalates and droungarios tes viglas in 1092 (W. Seibt, JÖB 25 [1976] 81f). Skylitzes’ Synopsis historiarum, for the years 811–1057, is conceived as a continuation of Theophanes the Confessor, whom Skylitzes praises in his preambles as the most reliable historian and with whom he contrasts several contemporary authors, including Psellos. Skylitzes uses a variety of sources and sometimes presents contradictory conclusions (e.g., in his attitude toward Nikephoros II). The sections differ stylistically as well: thus, the reign of Michael IV is presented in an annalistic manner (typical of Theophanes), as a series of short and incoherent topics cemented by a sequence of chronological dates, whereas the history of Constantine IX consists of several long excursuses, has few chronological indications, and avoids describing military stratagems, frequent in previous sections. The major hero of the last part of Skylitzes is Katakalon Keraumenos (J. Shepard, REArm 11 [1975–76] 269–311), and it is plausible to suppose that Skylitzes was close to that general.

In its present state the Skylitzes MS in Madrid (Bibl. Nac. vitr. 26–2) comprises 574 miniatures, probably about 100 fewer than its original complement. This body of pictures, adhering for the most part closely to the text, adorns the only surviving illustrated Byz. chronicle in Greek. They are rendered in a variety of styles concurrently practiced in mid-12th-C. Norman Sicily. Whether an original creation or a copy of a Byz. prototype, the MS is a prime source for our visualization of imperial ceremony, weaponry, and transportation by land and sea.

SKYTHOPOLIS (Σκυθόπολις, Hebr. Beth Sh’an or Shean, Ar. Baysân), largest city of northern Palestine and administrative and episcopal capital of Palaestina II. In the 4th C. there were imperial linen workshops in Skythopolis. The theater, with a capacity of 4,500–5,000, was enlarged in the 3rd C.; abandoned for a short time, it continued to function in the 5th and 6th C. (S. Applebaum, Revue biblique 69 [1952] 408–10). The city accommodated pagan, Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian communities, and attempts were made there to translate the liturgy from Greek into Aramaic. While Christian influence continued to grow in the city proper, the only synagogue as yet found is a mere prayer room; outside Skythopolis, however, in Rehov and Beth Alpha, synagogues continued. Greek inscriptions of the 5th C. (N. Zori, IEJ 16 [1966] 123–34), found in a mosaic in the Jewish villa called the House of Kyrios Leonis, but containing Christian formulae, demonstrate cultural and religious symbiosis in Skythopolis. At the same time there could be bitter intolerance, and in 361 the city underwent a wave of anti-
Christian persecutions. At the beginning of the 4th C. the Christian community was under strong Arian influence, but after 340 the see was in the hands of the Orthodox. Coin finds (up to the 8th C.), inscriptions, and archaeological remains testify to the continuing prosperity of Skythopolis; the city walls were repaired in the 6th C. and at least five or six monasteries were active. Outside the city walls survive the remains of the monastery of Lady Mary (Kyria Maria) with mosaic floors of the 6th C., including a zodiac with personifications of the months. The only church at yet discovered is a round centralized building of perhaps the 5th C. on the ancient mound of Tell el Husn, destroyed before 860; rich Christian tombs of the 5th C. have been discovered on Tell el Mastaba. St. Sabas was active at Skythopolis, which was also the native town of Cyril of Skythopolis.

After the Arab conquest of 636 Skythopolis flourished as the center of a province called al-'Urdun (Jordan), until it was destroyed in the earthquake of 747. After being conquered by Tancred in 1099, Skythopolis became the Crusader barony of Bessan; the bishopric was transferred to Nazareth. Skythopolis was taken by Saladin in 1187, and plundered by the Fifth Crusade in 1217.


SLAVERY (δουλεία). In Byz. law, slaves occupied an ambiguous position between human beings and chattel. They were responsible for their own criminal acts, and from the 6th C. the intentional killing of a slave was considered homicide; in most other respects, however, they never achieved any substantial legal personality. Thus they were normally considered incompetent to act as witnesses and could neither be plaintiff nor defendant in civil lawsuits; owners held noxial liability (see NOXIAL ACTIONS) for servile delicts in a manner analogous to those committed by livestock. Themselves considered property, slaves lacked rights of ownership, although they might administer their personal peculium. Leo VI (nov.38) allowed imperial slaves to dispose of their property in wills, but in other cases the incapacity to draft testaments may still have been observed in the 11th–12th C. Slaves were forbidden to become priests or monks without permission (Leo VI, novs. 9–11) and according to classical jurispudence did not possess the right to marry, although it appears that some did obtain Christian marriages that were first officially recognized—over widespread opposition by slaveowners—under Alexios I Komnenos (Ze- pos, Jus 1:343f, 345f).

The most important sources of slaves were prisoners of war and foreign slaves imported into the empire. Children of slaves normally inherited this condition, even if only their mothers were of servile status. Although Leo VI (nov.59) prohibited individuals from selling themselves into slavery, traces of this practice may be observed in later periods (Ze- pos, Jus 1:341f, 344f).

In the late Roman Empire slavery formed an important element in the social and economic structures: Libanius, in his oration On Slavery, presents it as a ubiquitous phenomenon; Justino-anic law constantly deals with the status of slaves; they are mentioned in Egyptian papyri, in the letters of Gaius Apollinaris Sidonius, and in the documents of Ravenna. There is no evidence that during this period servile labor was replaced by that of dependent coloni.

Our knowledge of slavery during the 7th to 9th C. is limited by a paucity of documentation; nevertheless slaves are mentioned in a variety of sources. There are references to douloi and oiketai in the Ecloga in paragraphs concerning manumission, delicts, fornication, and theft of slaves. Hagiographic texts speak of manumissions and runaway slaves; the Farmer's Law mentions slave- shepherds.

During the 10th C. slavery seems to have expanded. Although the story of 3,000 slaves liberated by the widow Danelis appears in a context reminiscent of a fairy tale, an 11th-C. historian (Skyl. 250.56–57) mentions urban mansions and fields filled with slaves after the victories of Niképhoros (II) Phokas in 962; a novel of John I Tzimiskes regulated the sale of prisoners of war into slavery. The vita of St. Basil the Younger reveals that slaves were numerous in Constantinople, where they frequently are found in imperial workshops and in the service of goldsmiths and silk weavers. In contrast, sources of the 11th and 12th C. reflect the decline of slavery, which
was frequently referred to in contemporary acts of manumission as an institution “against the law of nature.” Although later jurists preserved theoretical distinctions between free and servile status, by the 13th C. employment of slaves—except perhaps as domestic servants—largely vanished and the concept of douloi acquired new connotations.

Religious opinion concerning slavery was ambivalent. Gregory of Nazianzos condemned the practice and Eustathios of Thessalonike urged manumission, while Basil the Great tolerated the institution as a necessary evil; although Theodore of Stoudios forbade monks to possess slaves, some monasteries were slaveholders (Zepos, *Jus* 1:252.7). The concept of slavery was also employed with a variety of wider theological meanings: holy men were termed “slaves of God”; writers mention slavery to human passions or to sin.


—A.J.C.

**SLAVONIC.** See ChURCH SLAVONIC.

**SLAVOS, ALEXIOS,** independent ruler of Melnik; died after 1229. A nephew of Kalojan, in 1207 Slavos (Σθαλάβος), who was governor of Melnik, refused to acknowledge Boril as the legitimate tsar of Bulgaria and concluded an alliance with Henry of Hainault, the Latin emperor of Constantinople; he married Henry’s daughter and was granted the title of despotes. Slavos supported the Latins in their war against Bulgaria, but the allies had no success. Then Slavos switched his allegiance to Theodore Komnenos Doukas, the emperor of Thessalonike; the death of his first wife (the daughter of Henry) enabled him to conclude a new marriage, with a relative of Theodore (a daughter of Theodore Petraliphas). The new alliance, however, met with failure. After initial successes, Theodore was defeated at Klokotnica in 1290. The fate of Slavos is unknown: he is mentioned in 1224 in connection with his military operations in Thrace where he assisted Theodore, and in a treaty of 1229 there is a reference to tota terra de Sclave. Zlatarski (Ist. 3:351) hypothesizes that after the battle of Klokotnica Slavos accepted the suzerainty of John Asen II, to whom he was related. —A.K.

**SLAVS.** The name *Slav* (which has no Slavic etymology) appears in the form *Sklavenoi* or *Shtlabenoi* in Greek and Latin sources, probably not earlier than the mid-6th C. All attempts to probe deeper into the past, to establish direct links between the Slavs and previous ethnic groups such as the Scythians, have failed, as have attempts to interpret as Slavic some archaeological cultures (e.g., that of Černjachovo) that flourished in this region at the beginning of the first millennium A.D.

Jordanes (*Getica* 119) distinguishes three tribes (gentes), “offshoots of a single origin”—Venethi, Antes (Antae), and Sclaveni (*Sklavenoi*). He locates the Venethi on the Vistula, the Sclaveni between the Vistula and the Danube, and the Antae from the Dniester to the Don. Since the Byz. of the 6th C. were concerned with the topic of the Slavic invasion, they present them only as potential frontier warriors and not as political, ethnic, racial, or linguistic communities. Of these three gentes the Byz. had to deal only with the last two, for the Venethi dwelled far from the Eastern Empire.

Slavo-Byz. relations can be divided into three periods. The first period roughly encompasses the 6th C. The Slavs were firmly entrenched on the left bank of the Danube and from there attacked the northern Balkans (esp. in 551/2, 558/9, and 580/1). Harrying expeditions of the Slavs, often in concert with Cotrigurs, were limited in scope. Around 559–60 the Slavs began to winter on Byz. soil. After 576 they became part of the Avar military force and the latter’s design for conquest.

The second period (ca.590–800) coincides with the first crossing of the Danube in 594 by Maurice, who moved Byz. military action to Slavic territory. In two or three decades the Avars transformed the bands of Slavic frontiersmen into shipbuilders and formidable amphibious troops. Already in 593, the Pannonian Skladenoi built ships for the Avars as well as a bridge over the Sava River. Around 600 the Slavic fleet was in operation in the Aegean; in 623 they attacked Crete and, in 626, formed the backbone of the joint Avar-Persian attack on Constantinople. It was probably in this
period that Slavic became an attractive lingua franca in the area populated by Sklavenoi, Serbs, Croats, etc.

In this period the Slavs began to settle south of the Danube to form the so-called Sklaviniai. There is no archaeological evidence for Slavic penetration of imperial territory before the end of the 6th C. The ceramics and the semisubterranean houses of the 7th C. considered by archaeologists to be Slavic are found in Moldavia, on the Lower Danube, and, less frequently, in the basin of the Sava. The cartography of these findings allows the hypothesis that Slavic penetration south from the Danube followed two independent routes—via the Lower Danube in the east and from Pannonia to Illyricum in the west. Traces of Slavic culture in Greece are rare: a Slavic cemetery near Olympia, ceramics in Argos and Tiryne, fibulae from Lakonia and Kenchreai, tombs of warriors near the walls of Corinth containing Slavic belt buckles and weapons (K. Kilian, Peloponnesiaka 16 [1985–86] 295–304). It is possible that the majority of the Slavs in this area had undergone (at least partial) hellenization before they formed established settlements.

The Slavs participated in the creation of new political entities in the basin of the Danube. In the former Noricum the realm of Samo emerged (ca.623–58). This had two social strata: the ruling Winidi (Jordanes’ Venethi?) and the inferior stratum of the Sclavi, to whom also belonged the Serbi. Even less is known about the polity called “Volhynia,” a name that survives in al-Mas‘ūdi and in the Kievian chronicle. The polity created in Moesia ca.680 by the Bulgars of Asparuch appeared much more stable. These Bulgars assumed control of local Sklaviniai (esp. those of the “Seven Tribes” and Drogoibitai). Now Thessalonike and its environs, rather than the Danube, was the frontier and focus of Slavo-Byz. relations.

The third period was initiated by the destruction of the Avar realm by Charlemagne and Franco-Bulgar cooperation in pacifying the region. Two types of Slavs appear soon after 800: mobile military colonists who were ready to settle as allies on any sort of frontier within the Byz. Empire, esp. in the Peloponnesos (Ezeraithai and Melingoï, in Asia Minor (esp. in Opsikion, Pontos, and Cilicia), and in Italy; and the former Avar military elite and their retainers who were eager to settle and establish their power over semi-independent princes under Frankish or Byz. sovereignty, for example, in Pannonia or Moravia.

During this period the Slavs converted to Christianity and the Slavic sacred language (Church Slavonic) was created by Constantine the Philosopher and Methodios. The Slavic lingua franca was elevated (along with Hebrew, Greek, and Latin) to the language of an ecclesiastical Greek. Though originally a failure in Moravia where it was introduced, Slavic laid down stronger roots in Bulgaria, whence it expanded to Kiev Rus’ and Serbia.

In the earlier stage, the Slavic rite found the support, albeit reluctant, of the papal court and facilitated the extension of papal jurisdiction over Pannonia, the territory of the former Avar realm and their Sklaviniai successors (with Slavic as the current lingua franca); but soon, in neighboring Nitra and in Split, Latin replaced the Slavic tongue in church services. The situation changed dramatically, however, when the rulers of Bulgaria, at the end of the 9th C., abandoned their Bulgaro-Greek bureaucratic bilingualism and turned to the Slavic lingua franca and the Slavic rite for the needs of both church and state.

In the 9th C. the Slavs exerted an influential force on Byz. territory: at the beginning of the century they besieged Patras, and legend has it that only the supernatural assistance of the apostle Andrew saved the city. After the Byz. victory the Slavs were placed under the jurisdiction of the metropolis of Patras, and the obligation to accommodate traveling imperial functionaries and ambassadors was imposed on them. Various sources speak of Slav rebellions in the Peloponnesos in the 9th and 10th C. The hagiographer of Nikon ho “Metanoite” snobbishly represents the Peloponnesian Slavs as robbers and pagans. Still, in the 14th (and probably 15th) C. some Slav groups dwelled on Mt. Taygetos: they refused to pay taxes but agreed to serve as soldiers. An even more substantial Slav population existed in Macedonia, and the prakthia of various monasteries on Mt. Athos show that many paroikoi in the 14th and 15th C. bore Slavic names. Some Slavs became members of the Byz. elite (esp. after Basil II’s occupation of Bulgaria) or served as mercenaries. Significant traces of Slavic survive in Greek toponyms. The role of the Slavs in Byz. has, however, been exaggerated by some Russian and So-
viet scholars (from V. Vasil’evskij onward) who connected with the Slav penetration the resurgence of Byz. after the decline of the 7th C., the expansion of the peasant community, and military reform; they considered even the Farmer’s Law a document of Slavic customary law.

After the 9th C. Byz. authors rarely used the term Sklaivenoi and its derivatives, and preferred to apply to the Slavs either specific ethnic denominations (Rus’, Bulgarians, Serbs, Chorobtai, Lechoi, etc.) or antiquarian terms such as Scythians, Sarmatians, Illyrians; they seem to have had no concept of the ethnic unity of the Slavs and had only a very vague idea of the unity of the Slavic languages.


**SMBAT THE CONSTABLE**, brother of Het’um I, king of Armenian Cilicia; born Cilicia 1208, died 1276. He was given the title of “Constable” (Sparapat)—an indication of Crusader influence—when Het’um became king in 1226. In 1247 Smbat visited the Mongol capital, Karakorum.

He adapted the secular code of Mxit’ar Goš (compiled in 1184) for westernized Cilician Armenia, and translated the French Assises d’Antioch into Armenian (the original is lost). His Chronicle is important for Byz. and Crusader history; for the period 951 to 1162 it is based on Matthew of Edessa, but for the period down to 1272 it offers original information.

**SMEDEREVO (Σμέδροβον)**, a fortress southeast of Belgrade at the confluence of the Jezava and the Danube rivers, erected in 1428–30. After George Branković lost Belgrade to the Hungarians in 1427, he received permission from the Turks to build this stronghold that was to be his capital; Thomas Kantakouzenos, his brother-in-law, directed the construction work. The stronghold, copied after Constantinople, is triangular in plan, fortified by square towers; the princely residence, the so-called Mali grad (Small Fort), was located in its northern corner. The princely edifices (palace, donjon for a treasury?) were built of wood and are poorly preserved.

On 27 Aug. 1439 Murad II seized Smederevo, but it was returned to Branković in 1444. Hunyadi and Vladislav III Jagellon stopped there on their way to Varna that same year, and in 1448 Hunyadi found refuge in Smederevo after his defeat at Kosovo Polje. In 1449 the Hungarians and Turks signed a treaty in Smederevo, vowing not to invade Serbian territory, but there was only a short respite for the Serbs—Mehmed II captured Smederevo on 20 June 1459.


**SMITH.** In classical Greek *chalkeus* (χαλκεύς) and *chalkotypos* (χαλκοτύπος) were both specific terms for a copper or bronze smith and for a smith in general; the same holds true for *sideres* (σιδήρεις), an ironmonger. Oikonomides (Hommes d’affaires 102, n.199) tentatively differentiates *chalkeis* (smiths) from *chalkotypoi* (founders). Terms for smiths are common in papyri (Fikhman, Egypt 28), hagiography (Rudakov, Kul’tura 144f.), and in later documents. They gave their name to quarters in Constantinople (Chalkoprateia) and in Thessalonike (the region where the Panagia ton Chalkeon church was built). Some smiths became prosperous; for example, the *chalkeus* Matthew in a *praktikon* of the mid-14th C. paid more than 14 nomismata in *enokiaikon* or rent (Guillou, Ménécée, no.35,40–42).

In the regulations for his 9th-C. monastery, Theodore of Studios named specialized artisans who produced metal objects: *machairopoios*, cutler; *kleidopoios*, locksmith; *katenaras*, chainmaker; *ankistras*, maker of fishhooks (Dobrokloškij, Fedor...
Such a division of labor, however, was possible only in a large monastic community and was not typical of Byz. An exceptional case probably was the production of nails: a chrysobull of John V Palaiologos of 1342 mentions ergasteria, tratexotopia, and karpheia (nail factories) in Constantinople (Lavra 3, no.127.144–46), and the Patria of Constantinople (ed. Preger, 236.11–13) cites an area in the capital where small nails (kinthelia) were produced.

Various tools used by smiths are mentioned in hagiographical texts: hammer, anvil, bellows, furnace, tongs. Iron tongs 38 cm long were discovered in Corinthus (Davidson, Minor Objects, no.1444). Excavations in Cherson have uncovered equipment used by founders: stone molds for rings and crosses, ceramic crucibles, ladles for melted metal (A. Jakobson, Rannesrednevekovnyj Cherson [Moscow-Leningrad 1959] 325–30). Several bone-clad caskets (of the 10th–11th C.) depict Adam as a smith, with tongs, hammer, and anvil, while Eve handles the bellows at a forge.


SMOLENOI (Σμόλενοι, also Smolanoi), a Slavic tribal name, probably from Slavic smola, "tar," reflected in Balkan toponymy (J. Zaimov, Zaselvane na búlgarskite slavjani na Balkanskiya poluostrov [Sofia 1967] 170) and also known in eastern Europe (see SMOLENSK). There is no reason to identify the name of Smolenoi with that of Moglena as S. Kyriakides (Byzantinai Meletai 4 [Thessalonike? n.d.] 318–20) suggested. The Smolenoi are first mentioned in a damaged inscription referring to an expedition of the Bulgar khan Persian ca.837 (Beševliev, Inschriften, no.14.9). The localization of the Smolenoi is under discussion: Theocharides (infra) hypothesizes that the Smolenoi settled in a kleisoura that secured the entrance into the valley of the STRYMON; when defeated by Persian they retreated to CHIROPOulis. The inscription, however, provides insufficient basis for such a hypothesis.

By the end of the 11th C. a theme of Smolenoi existed: an act of 1079 is signed by John Kataphloron, strategos of Smolenoi (Lavra 1, no.39.9), and Gregory Pakourianos, in his typikon, lists several documents related explicitly to the theme of Smolenoi. The last mention of the theme of Smolenoi is in Niketas Choniates.

After the christianization of the Smolenoi there was founded a bishopric of Smolenoi, known from notitiae of the 9th–13th C. A priest Theodore Smolenetes lived in the village of Dobrobikeia (in the district of Boleron and Strymon) in the first half of the 11th C. (Iovir. 1, no.30.24).


SMOLENSK (Σμολένσκ), a town on the upper DNIEPER and center of a principality of Rus'. Relations with Constantinople can be traced back to the 10th C., the time of the earliest Byz. coins, glass, and silks found in the region. Constantine VII (De adm. imp. 9.6) mentions Smolensk as one of the places where the Rus' gathered in preparation for their expeditions to Constantinople. Smolensk's most prosperous and influential period was from the mid-12th to the mid-13th C., under Rostislav (ca.1125–59) and his successors, of the dynasty of VLADIMIR MONOMACH. An exceptional number of churches were built during this period. The bishopric of Smolensk (Smoliskon in Notitiae CP, no.13.769) was founded in 1134–36. Its first incumbent, Manuel (a Greek, and possibly the uncle of Theodore PRODROMOS), supported the patriarchate in the controversy over KLIM SMOLJATIČ. In 1370 Patr. PHILOTHEOS KOKKINOS excommunicated Prince Syvatoslav of Smolensk for his alliance with LITHUANIA against MOSCOW (RegPatr, fasc. 5, no.2582).


SMYRNA (Σμύρνη, now Izmir), city on the Aegean coast of Asia Minor. Its late antique history is obscure, with only a few epigrams providing evidence for construction or maintenance of public works. The city walls were restored by Arkadios and Herakleios. MUQAWIYA devastated the city in 654, and the Arabs occupied it in 672/3. Smyrna was a major naval base that gained importance as the harbor of EPHESUS silted up. According to Constantine VII (De them. chs. 16.14–16, 17.15, ed. Pertusi, p.82), Smyrna was a city of the
THRAKESION theme and at the same time capital of the theme of Samos. The city also had an archon, apparently a maritime governor (Ahrweiler, *Mer* 91). Smyrna played a more significant role after Alexios I recaptured it from Tzachas in 1097 and made it a naval base for operations in Asia Minor. It was then put under a dux; by 1193 it was again a city of Thrakesion.

Smyrna had considerable importance under the Laskarids, for whom it was the major military and commercial port, as well as a center of silk production and of education. John III Vatatzes built the powerful upper fortress, still well preserved. Smyrna was then administered by a katepano, later by a prokathomenos. The documents of the Lembotissa monastery reveal considerable information about the region in this period. By 1261 Smyrna had a Genoese colony that prospered into the 14th C. After 1304, the city was capital of Thrakesion but was practically surrounded by the Turks of Aydin, who captured its fortress in 1317. A joint fleet of the Hospitallers, Venetians, Cypriots, and some other Latin rulers of Aegean islands took Smyrna by surprise on 28 Oct. 1344, and the city remained in the hands of the Latins until it was seized by Timur after the battle of Ankara in 1402.

Long a suffragan of Ephesus, Smyrna became autocephalous in 451–57 and metropolis in the 9th C. It had only three suffragans.


SNakes (sing. φίλοι) or serpents. Despite the general interest of Byz., zoological treatises on snakes have not survived. Sporadic information on the snake’s nature is mostly based on ancient authorities. Psellos mentions the display of snakes for entertainment, an ancient practice that continued to his day (A. Karpozilos, *Dodone* 9 [1980] 280–310). Such a performance is illustrated in an 11th-C. illuminated MS of the *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzos (Galavaris, *Liturgical Homilies*, fig.51). The church condemned the performances of snake charmers, usually Gypsies (Rhalles-Potles, *Synagagma* 2:444f).

Christian attitudes to the mythology of the snake were contradictory. Thus, in marginal Psalter illustration a snake represents the venom of sinners, but a snake charmer the voice of the wise (Der Nersessian, *L’illustration II*, fig.116). The Physiologos emphasized the snake’s ability to change its skin and drew from this capability some moralizing examples for human behavior. The Brazen Serpent could even represent Christ. On the other hand, the snake was an instrument of the Devil or an embodiment of the Devil himself. Severianos of Gabala, developing the theme of Genesis, says that the snake in Paradise differed from those serpents that we now despise and avoid; he was Adam’s closest friend and an imitator of human behavior, but at the Devil’s instigation he became the murderer of man (PG 56:485–88). In hagiography the snake appears mostly to challenge the saint’s virtue or miraculous power; hence the slaying of the snake or dragon by saints such as George, Symeon of Emesa, and Elisabeth is presented as a major ascetic deed. In mythological zoology, the deer was granted the ability to kill the snake. Proverbs and gnmat use the image of the venomous snake as a symbol of evil and perfidy.

Snakes are frequently represented in art as conquered by eagles. Identified with dragons, they were also shown without apparent symbolic significance. Images of snakes adorned a great porphyry basin that was once in a garden of the Great Palace of Constantinople and was moved in the reign of Andronikos I to the courtyard of the church of the Forty Martyrs (Nik.Chon. 332:18–22). Dragons were represented on military standards held by drakonarioi.

—Ap.K., A.C.

**Soap** (σαπονίνα) in the modern sense of the word, a soluble washing compound made from the combination of fatty acids with soda and potash, was unknown in antiquity (H. Blümner, *RE* 2.R. 2 [1923] 112–14). Instead the Greeks used nitron, a form of sodium carbonate, which formed a cleansing compound when mixed with oil. Even though Arethas of Caesarea, in his scholia to Lucian, notes that it was the ancients who used nitron in their baths (S. Kougeas, *Laographia* 4 [193] 248), the term nitron continued to be used through the Byz. era. Thus, the 14th-C. *typikon* of the Bebaias Elpidos nunny (ed. Delehaye, 7:45) provided for a monthly distribution of nitron to the nuns to wash their clothes, and Niketas Cho-
niates (Nik.Chon. 149.23–24) described the baths in Constantinople where the patrons applied nitron. The chemical composition of Byz. nitron is unknown.

The word sapo (from Celtic saipo) is used by Latin writers from the 1st C. onward, and Greek sapon appears in a papyrus of the 1st C. B.C. in an unclear context but related to washing (Aegyptische Urkunden der königlichen Museen zu Berlin, vol. 4 [Berlin 1912] no.1058.35). Pliny the Elder (Natural History 28.51) explains sapo as a Gallo-Germanic concoction for giving hair a bright hue; Oribasios (Collectionum medecarum reliquiae, ed. J. Raeder, vol. 3 [Leipzig-Berlin 1931] 45.29–59) defines sapon as a Germanic unguent used in the bath. Bartholomew of Edessa, a writer of the 8th or 9th C., knew the terms saponion and saponion for soap (PG 104:1405B, 1413A). In the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch, saponion is used to designate soap; saeronarii and saaponopratai were the soapers. Another word for soap was gallikon (Gallic soap): Emp. Constans II is said to have smeared himself with gallikon in the bathhouse just before he was murdered (Theoph. 351.29–31). The 10th-C. saaponopratai were prohibited from selling the gallikon (Bk. of Eparch 12.4). Stöckle (Zünfte 39) hypothesizes that the use of gallikon was a privilege reserved for the imperial family.


A.K., A.M.T.

SOAPMAKER (σαπωνοπράτης). In antiquity the substitute for soap (nitron) was available in bathhouses, and the profession of “soap-vendor, nitropoles, is attested to at least in one late Roman papyrus (Preisigke, Wörterbuch 3.133). In the late Roman period soapmakers, saponarii, existed in Italy and in Gaul: thus, a contract of 541 mentions Isaac, vir honestus, saponarius Classis, in Ravenna (J.O. Tjäder, Die nichtliterarischen lateinischen Papyri aus der Zeit 445–700, vol. 2 [Stockholm 1982] no.93.2), and in 599 the corpus of saponarii in Naples asked Pope Gregory I for protection.

The 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (ch.12) devotes a section to the Constantinopolitan guild of sapo-nopratai who were both producers and vendors of soap. Their shops (ergasteria) had to be separated from each other by a distance of 7 peceis and 12 podes (see Pous). Besides the usual restrictions imposed on guilds, soapmakers were forbidden to use animal fat during Lent. A synodal decision of 1490 (MM 2:440.32–34) estimated the cost of a large caldron and a complete set of tools of a saaponarios at 100 hyperpers.


SOCIAL STRUCTURE. Byz. society has been divided into classes and other entities conventionally called microstructures. Some of them were ephemeral or fluid units, constantly forming and breaking up—learned assemblies and schools, bands of hunters, occasional gatherings (e.g., in taverns); they left little trace and can scarcely be studied. Others were more or less stable: family, lineage, village community, guild, town, parish, confraternity, monastery, military unit, ethnic group. Late Roman society inherited ancient municipal organization and elements of traditional lineages-gentes (at least in the form of the system of names). Both aspects seem to have declined by the 8th C., whereas the nuclear family grew stronger and became the cornerstone of Byz. social structure; other microstructures were relatively loose, composed mostly of agglomerations of nuclear families; even the cenobitic monastery was challenged by the familylike eremitic unit, the lavra. The ideal of celibacy as a major virtue contributed to a certain devaluation of family ties and to the profound atomization of society. Vertical social bonds were underdeveloped if compared with the Western feudal hierarchy.

We may assume that this atomization of society and lack of strong horizontal and vertical social bonds accounted for the Byz. concept that a man was primarily the subject of the basileus (his “slave” or “child”) rather than a member of a lineage, township, or village community, or a link in a hierarchical chain of lords and vassals. Vassalage was at a rudimentary stage and the hierarchy one of meritorious ranks conferred by the basileus, rather than one of hereditary titles, lands, and jurisdictions. The system of vertical mobility created a constant flow—although more in theory than in practice. This system was supported by traditions of Roman law that—more often than not rhetorically—proclaimed mankind’s equality before the law and ignored legal privileges of social status, albeit developed in custom. Atomized social structure was supported by a belief in the individual path to salvation propagated.
by such mystics as Symeon the Theologian or the partisans of Hesychasm. Byz. theology pursued the hierarchical world view of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite less energetically than Western theologians. The Byz. clergy was not as sharply separated from the ordinary lay people as its Western counterpart, and the Byz. church did not achieve as great a monopoly on salvation or education as did the church in the West.

The urban revival and the aristocratization of society from the 11th C. onward caused a breach in the traditional social structure and a revision of many conservative values, but the process was too slow and inconsistent. Byz. institutions began to bear greater resemblance to Western feudal society but remained substantially different, and the Byz. never identified themselves with the West.


SOCRATES (Σωκράτης), ancient Greek philosopher; born Athens 469 B.C., died Athens 399. The Souda contains many references to Socrates, preserving a curious mixture of fact and fiction, while the Byz. scholia to Aristophanes’ Clouds add little or nothing to our knowledge of the historical Socrates. The aphorisms attributed to Socrates in Stoaios and the gnomologia (collections of gnoma) are of uncertain age and authenticity. The Gnomologion Vaticanum (a 14th-C. MS) contains 31 sayings attributed to Socrates and one attributed to his wife Xanthippe. Byz. writers were divided in their view of Socrates. Some rejected him as the embodiment of paganism, while others saw him as a critic of pagan society who was repudiated and executed, and thus a man of true wisdom who had anticipated the future truths of Christianity. In paintings of the Tree of Jesse in a group of late Byz. churches in Greece and the Balkans, Socrates is sometimes included among pagan writers and philosophers who had prophesied the coming of Christ. Although the pagans depicted in the Tree are undoubtedly connected with the Prophecies of the Seven Sages (a text formulated shortly before 560 that omits Socrates), the paintings all appear to derive from a 13th-C. Italian archetype and do not represent a survival of Hellenism as some scholars have believed. (For historian, see Sokrates.)


SOFIA. See SERDICA.

SOĞANLI, a valley in CAPPADOCIA. Located between Ürgüp and Niğde on the central Anatolian plateau, the valley is the site of a number of rock-cut churches with frescoes dating from the late 9th or early 10th C. to the third quarter of the 11th C. Two churches are dated by inscription. St. Barbara (dated to a 4th indiction, probably 1006 or 1021) is a single-naved, barrel-vaulted church with a parekklesion. The large apse is adorned with a MAJESTAS DOMINI. Narrative images from the PROTOEVANGELION OF JAMES decorate the south side of the nave vault; iconic representations of the Nativity and Anastasis appear on the north side. Karabaş Kilise is a monastic complex probably founded in the late 9th or early 10th C., made up of four single-naved chapels. The principal northern church was redecorated in 1060/1 by a protospatharios Michael SKEPIDES, a nun Katherine, and a monk Nyphon. The Communion of the Apostles (see LORD’S SUPPER) fills the conch of the apse, and feast scenes as well as portraits of saints and the donors decorate the nave. The style of the frescoes is similar to those of St. Sophia in OHRID. Another member of the Skepides family, John, protospatharios of the Chryssotriklinos, hypatos and strategos, is mentioned in an undated inscription in Geyik Kilise in the same valley. The three churches of the Belli Kilise group are notable for their carved exteriors and for the elaborate subsidiary rooms associated with them; frescoes in this complex probably date to the early 10th C.


SOHAG, town in Upper Egypt at the edge of the western desert, site of the famous 5th-C. monastery of SHENOUTE (Dayr Anbā Shinūṭa). The monastery originally covered several acres; exca-
vations have unearthed sections of the outer wall and traces of buildings. Still standing is the church misleadingly named the “White Monastery,” built ca. 440, one of the largest basilicas in Egypt, with galleries, two narthexes, and a richly adorned triconch sanctuary. In front of the triumphal arch are traces of two additional columns that once bore a secondary triumphal arch, a typical feature of Upper Egyptian triconch churches. Several thousand monks and nuns lived in this monastery under very strict regulations, mainly working in its fields. They slept in common dormitories and had their meals at special hours in the refectory.

A few miles to the north lies another monastery, St. Bishoi (Dayr Anbâ Bishûy), probably a dependent house of St. Shenoute. Its church, although smaller, is of similar plan, and its triconch with semidomes and two stories of columns has remained fully intact; it is datable to the 5th C. The central dome replaced the original pyramidal roof. Farther into the desert lies a small ruined 5th-C. chapel, dedicated to Shenoute.


SOKRATES (Σωκράτης), ecclesiastical historian; born Constantinople ca. 380, died after 439. Sokrates was a lawyer (scholastikos) at Constantinople, where he had been educated by Ammonios and Helladios, two pagan grammarians living there in exile from Alexandria. His Church History covers the period 295–439 in seven books, each one containing the reign of an emperor. There is much emphasis on local events affecting Constantinople, also some unobtruded sympathy for Novatianism. Secular events, including military history, are given due focus. Sokrates is a good critical historian who cites his documentary sources verbatim. He published a second edition (the one that survives) when a perusal of Athanasios of Alexandria convinced him that there were serious chronological errors in his first source, the Latin Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia. The work also survives in an Armenian version (M. Širinjan, Vīz Vrem 43 [1982] 231–41).


SOLEA (σωλεία, σωλεία, σολέα, etc.), in early churches of Constantinople an enclosed procession path leading from the templon to the ambo. After Iconoclasm, when this solea was no longer used, the term is sometimes applied to that part of the raised sanctuary platform (bema) that lies outside the templon. Pseudo-Sophronios interprets the solea in this latter sense, as the river of fire separating sinners from the just (PG 87:3985A).


SOLECISM (σολοικισμός), technical term of grammar, denoting incorrect use of language, usually resulting from ignorance. Roman grammarians distinguished between “barbarism,” in which the error was confined to a single word, and solecism, involving several words. Solecism was thus mainly concerned with syntax. Byz. grammarians repeated this distinction. For Byz. rhetoricians such as the 11th-C. John Doxopatres (RhetGr, ed. Walz, 2:240f.), avoidance of solecism was an element in correct Greek. When the incorrect use was deliberate and made for effect, however, solecism became a feature of style rather than of language, and as such was recognized by Byz. grammarians as a figure of speech. The term could then be applied to ellipsis, pleonasm, or unusual word order as well as to errors of grammar. Byz. writers often charged one another with solecism, and Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 455–44–45) accused Emp. Alexios III of signing any document presented to him, even if it was soleastic. This sensitivity to solecism, real or imagined, is a feature of Atticism, and indicates that the grammar of the literary Greek language was sometimes not fully internalized either by writers or readers.

SOLEMNION (σολέμνιον, "stipend," from Lat. *solemne donum*, "festive gift"), an annual payment of a sum of money granted as a gift by the emperor, took two forms. One kind, a direct grant from the treasury, is attested in 10th- through 12th-C. documents in which its recipient is always the Great Church or a monastery in Constantinople. Another, more important for the history of Byz. fiscal practices, is the *solemmination logismion* described in the *Treatise on Taxation* (ed. Dölger, *Beiträge* 117f). Instead of receiving a *solemmination* from the treasury, the beneficiary received fiscal revenues drawn at their source. This *solemmination logismion* had three forms: (1) The beneficiary had his property tax reduced by the amount of the *solemmination*; (2) a provincial treasury official bestowed the *solemmination* from taxes collected in the province, so that the *solemmination* bypassed the central treasury; and (3) the emperor ordered a certain χορίον to pay its taxes directly to the beneficiary (specifically, to an ecclesiastical institution).

*Solemnia* are mentioned in acts of the 10th–11th C. At the end of the 10th C., the Lavra of St. Athanasios received 600–700 nomismata as *solemnia*, in part from the island of Lemnos and, probably, from the region of the Strymon; it was also granted a *solemmination* in grain (N. Svoronos in *Lavra* 1:61). Constantine IX Monomachos conferred upon Vatopedi a *solemmination* of 80 hyperpyra (M. Goudas, *EEBS* 3 [1926] 125, no.3.5–6), and in 1079 Nikephoros III ordered the *dioiketes* of the Cyclades islands to pay a *solemmination* of 16 nomismata to the monk Arsenios Skenoures and his cells (*Patmou Engropha* 1, no.9.14–15). The principle behind *solemmination logismion* was central in the formation of the *pronoia* and *oikonomia* that later supplanted it.


SOLIDUS, initially the name of Diocletian’s gold coin struck 60 to the Roman pound (see Litra) but more particularly applied to its successor, struck 72 to the pound and weighing 24 siliquae or *keratia*. It was introduced under Constantine I at the mint of Trier in 309. This was gradually extended to the other mints of Constantine’s dominions and under him and his successors became the standard gold coin of the empire. In Greek it was known from the first as a *nomisma*, but numismatists have been accustomed to use the Latin word *solidus* for the coin down to the 10th C., despite the incongruity of this in a purely Greek setting. Though the coin was theoretically of pure gold, there was a slight falling off in fineness in the 10th C., followed by a catastrophic decline between the 1090s and 1080s. Solidi of Nikephoros III were only about 93 percent fine and those of the early years of Alexios I ceased to be of gold at all. A return to good quality gold was made in 1092, with the introduction of the *hyperpyron*. Provincial gold coins, notably those of 8th-C. Italy and of 9th-C. Sicily, had often been of much poorer gold than those of Constantinople. Solidi weighing less than the theoretical 24 carats—the precise figures vary from 20 to 23 carats—had been struck in small quantities in the 6th–7th C., their reduced weight being indicated to users by small changes in design. The purpose of these coins is unknown. In the 10th C. a new class of lightweight solidi came into existence with the creation of the *tetarteron*.


SOL INVICTUS, the invincible sun, was the symbol of Helios in his capacity as protector of the emperor; under Aurelian (270–75) and in the first quarter of the 4th C. the distinction between the *sol invictus* and the emperor himself became confused. The *sol invictus* appears on the coins of Galerius and Maximinus and later, through 325. Sometimes the *sol invictus* is presented on a chariot, with the sphaira, or orb, in his left hand and the right hand upraised; according to Prokopios of Gaza this gesture meant a command to open the gates of the hours. After Constantine I, the image of the solar god-emperor vanishes, whereas the *sol justitiae* (or *sol salutis*), the sun of justice and of salvation, merges with the image of Christ.


SOL JUSTITIAE (“sun of justice”), later also *sol salutis* (“sun of salvation”), usually a symbol and metaphor for Christ, according to late antique and Byz. *exegesis* of Malachi 4:2. The concept arose in an ancient Near Eastern milieu and be-
came widespread in Neoplatonic thought; Philo calls the sun the divine Logos. The classic formulations of Christ as the sol justitiae, "risen with healing in his wings," are in ORIGEN'S Against Celsus ("the One Word, risen like the Sun of Justice"), and in CYRIL of Alexandria's commentary on Malachi ("Christ rises upon the world as the Sun of Justice, of most perfect knowledge, enlightening our eyes and souls"). Also regarded as a type of the risen Christ was the sun "rejoicing as a giant to run his course" of Psalm 19(18):4–5, an emblem of the just law of God. This exegesis, however, posed for Christian theologians the problem of how to distinguish between the worship of Christ and the veneration of the sun, such as that reported to be practiced by the Mancihaeans. A vestige of solar veneration can be seen in the tradition of Christian congregations facing east during the liturgy. In Byz. art the type is usually subsumed into the fusion of Christ with SOL INVICTUS.


—L.S.B.MacC.

SOLOMON (Σῶλομὼν), son and successor of DAVID; king of Israel. Early Christian tradition attributes to Solomon three books of the OLD TESTAMENT (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the SONG OF SONGS) that, according to Origen, formed a unit symbolically reflecting the major elements of human wisdom: ethics (Proverbs), physics (Ecclesiastes), and metaphysics (the Song of Songs). Basil the Great, in his homily on the exordium of Proverbs (PG 31:385–424), praised it as speaking of true wisdom and righteousness. In contrast, Theodore of Mopsuestia considered Proverbs and Ecclesiastes as books that, while canonical, exhibited less inspiration; this view was condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 553. Ecclesiastes caused particular difficulties for exeges, since they had to explain the Epicurean tendencies of this divine book; Gregory of Nyssa solved the difficulty by applying the theory of prosopopoia: Solomon's dialogue was with a hypothetical hedonist interlocutor. A lengthy commentary by GREGORY OF AKRAGAS reveals a knowledge of ancient authors (Aristotle, Philo, the rhetoricians) and a freedom to disagree with renowned church fathers.

The biblical story of Solomon, elaborated in the so-called Testament of Solomon extant in Greek MSS of the 15th to 17th C., is probably already referred to in a Christian text of 400. The Testament relates the construction of the Temple and presents Solomon as ruling over demons, whom he put to work for the Temple. Solomon also received gifts from all the kings of the earth and from Sheba, the Queen of the South.

Representation in Art. Solomon was often paired with DAVID, for example, among groups of Old Testament PROPHETS in monumental decoration and among those awaiting Christ in the Anastasis. Exegetical parallels drawn between David and emperors were sometimes extended to include the emperors' sons as types of Solomon (H. Buchthal, JWerb 37 [1974] 332). In contrast to David, Solomon was usually represented as an idealized, beardless young man; both are dressed as emperors. Solomon appears as an author inspired by SOPHIA (H. Belting, G. Cavallo, Die Bibel des Niketas [Wiesbaden 1979] 46–48) and raised on a shield in a frontispiece to 3 Kings (1 Chr) in the Bible of LEO SAKELLARIOS. As a legendary embodiment of Wisdom, Solomon was named in magic scrolls (Nik.Chon. 146.47–49) and seals.


—A.K. J.I., J.H.L., A.C.

SOLOMON, general of Justinian I; born at Solachon near Dara, died 544 at Cillum, on the border of Numidia and Byzacena. A eunuch, Solomon was Belisarios's domestikos and a commander of foederati during the expedition to Africa in 533–34. He fought well at the battle of Ad Decimum against the Vandals. When recalled to Constantinople, Belisarios left Solomon in command. Successful in the war against the Moors in Byzacena and Numidia, Solomon faced his own soldiers' discontent: he was almost assassinated in Carthage at Easter 536, was unable to quell the mutiny of Stotzas, and fled to Sicily. Belisarios quickly came to Africa and reestablished Solomon's military and civil command, but Solomon was soon replaced by Germanos. Only after the suppression of mutiny in 539 was he restored to
his position as military (magister militum) and civil (praetorian prefect) governor of Africa. Again Solomon had to deal with the Moors and occupied several fortresses. When his troops fled from the battle at Cillium, Solomon kept fighting bravely and was killed. Prokopios of Caesarea, who was his assessor, describes Solomon as a courageous, capable, and energetic commander, although unpopular with the army.


W.E.K., A.K.

SOLOMON, SONG OF. See Song of Songs.

SONG OF SONGS (ᾼσμα ἀσμάτων), a book of the Bible attributed to Solomon, and frequently commented upon by church fathers. Origen established the foundation of its interpretation in his Commentaries and Homilies (preserved mainly in Latin translations by Rufinus and Jerome). He rejected the possibility of a historical exegesis and interpreted the text as an allegory: the bridegroom, Solomon the "peaceable," and the bride stood respectively for Christ and the Church (the Homilies) or the Logos and the Soul (the Commentaries). Gregory of Nyssa refers to Origen in his exegesis of the Song of Songs and follows the principle of allegorical interpretation, even though he does not deny the historical element in the text; the historicity, however, is enigmatic and hard to decipher. The allegorical interpretation remained dominant, with the exception of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who rejected the allegorical meaning of the text and saw in its protagonists the historical Solomon in love with an Egyptian princess. Theodore's exegesis was condemned at the Second Council of Constantinople, and Theodoret of Cyrhus dedicated a tract to its refutation. In the 7th C. catenae on the Song of Songs appeared, which contained sentences ascribed to three theologians—Gregory of Nyssa, Neilos of Ankyra, and Maximos the Confessor—that served as the major source of information for subsequent generations. Psellos wrote a superficial commentary in verse, based primarily on Gregory, and in the 14th C. Matthew I) Kanta-Rouzenos interpreted the bride of the text not only as the Church, but also as the Theotokos (PG 152:997–1084).


A.K.

SOPHIA (Σοφία) was a complex term in patristic vocabulary. As human wisdom it had ambivalent meaning—sometimes connoting a virtue, sometimes sophisticated eloquence devoid of ethical or spiritual content, sometimes vain and "carnal" pseudo-wisdom. In Gnostic thought Sophia was one of the Aeons, a bearer of the female principle:
she was the counterpart to the Father, with whom she produced, by contemplation, divine beings; in the form of Agape-Sophia she was the counterpart to Christ and, in the form of Pistis-Sophia, the counterpart to the Saviour. On the other hand, divine Sophia was construed as an attribute of the Godhead, sometimes even identified with the second or third person of the Trinity. Thus Christ is identified as the Wisdom of God on a 14th-C. icon now in the Byzantine Museum in Athens (Holy Image, no.30).

Representations in Art. In painting, Sophia could be embodied in a great variety of ways. Though female, she may represent Christ or the wisdom that he incarnates. In the catacombs of Karmouz at Alexandria she is a winged, nimbed figure inscribed Sophia I(esous) Ch(ristos), while on 6th–8th-C. seals of officials of the patriarchate of Constantinople, as on those of metropolitans and bishops (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, nos. 49, 703, 931, 951, 956), Sophia holds a cross or vessel before her breast. A miniature in a 9th-C. MS of John Chrysostom illustrates the author's image of Wisdom with Adam holding a lamp that supports a bust of Christ Emmanuel (Meyendorff, infra [1959] fig.2). Sophia was also understood as an imperial virtue. In Psalter illustration of the 10th C. and later she joins Prophethia as a companion of David (Cutler, Aristocratic Psalters, figs. 2, 154, 251, 295).

Z. Gavrilo\'\'c (Zograf 11 [1980] 44–52) extended this political connotation to images of Serbian kings and emperors illuminated with the wisdom of Joseph, Christ, the Virgin, and various church fathers; in such frescoes Sophia is only rarely personified. She is found more often in late 13th- and 14th-C. painting (Prizren, Ohrid, Gra\'canica) where, as a winged being, she incarnates the Wisdom of the Book of Proverbs, ch.9. In these contexts, too, she appears as the companion of one or more of the Evangelists. The Gnostic Sophia is depicted as a female figure on engraved gems and in drawings in magical papyri. Many Byz. churches were dedicated to HAGIA SOPHIA ("Holy Wisdom").


SOPHIA, legendary saint; feastday 17 Sept. Born in Milan, she had three daughters, Pistis, Elpis, and Agape (Faith, Hope, and Charity [Love]), whose martyrdom she was forced to witness in Rome. The beheading of the girls and their burial by Sophia in a common sarcophagus (with heads back in place) is depicted in the Menologion of Basil II (p.43). The vita by Symeon Metaphrastes is illustrated either with portraits of the mother and her daughters or with the execution scene.


SOPHIA, empress; wife of Justin II and niece of Theodora; born before 530, died after 600. Strong-willed, persistent, and ambitious for power, Sophia played a leading role during the reign of her husband, esp. after he had shown signs of mental disease. She was the first empress whose effigy was struck on coins (folles) together with that of the emperor; she similarly appears with him on a silver cross in the Vatican (Rice, Art of Byz., pl.71). Rumor attributed to Sophia the cancellation of arrears in taxation. She strongly supported the handsome Tiberios (I), and promoted him as heir to the throne, but required him to keep his wife away from the main palace; it was said that Sophia planned to marry him. After Justin's death, Tiberios respected Sophia and provided chambers for her in the palace, but called her "mother" and remained with his family. Her hopes dashed, Sophia schemed against Tiberios; he arrested her and confiscated her treasures. At his deathbed he recalled her, and she supported Maurice as his successor. The last mention of Sophia is an anecdote of Theophanes the Confessor, who relates that she and the empress Constantina, at the end of Maurice's reign, presented him with a crown (stemma) that he ordered to be
hung above the altar of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople.


—W.E.K., A.K.

SOPHIA PALAIIOLOGINA (Paleolog), wife of Ivan III of Moscow; baptismal name Zoe; born Morea 1450/1 (V. Tiflooki, BZ 60 [1967] 279–87), died Moscow 7 Apr. 1503. Daughter of Thomas Palaiologos, the last despotes of the Morea, and niece of Constantine XI Palaiologos, the last Byz. emperor, Sophia fled to Keryra in 1460 and then went to Rome. Contrary to the statement of pseudo-Sphrantzes, she was never married to the Roman noble Carraccio (J.B. Papadopoulos, EEBS 12 [1936] 264–68). On the advice of her guardian, Cardinal Bessarion, Zoe was betrothed to Ivan in June 1472 at the Vatican in the presence of Pope Sixtus IV, who hoped to promote Catholicism in Russia. Upon her arrival in Moscow, however, she converted to Orthodoxy. She married Ivan on 12 Nov. 1472, taking the new name Sophia. Sophia bore her husband seven children, one of whom, Basil III, eventually succeeded his father in 1505 after a power struggle. Earlier theories that Sophia’s marriage led to a Russian claim to succession to the Byz. throne and empire are now discredited (Meyendorff, Russia 274). Her patronage of art and architecture brought Italian and Byz. influence to her new homeland.


—A.M.T.

SOPHOCLES, Greek tragic poet; born Athens 496 B.C., died Athens 406. An account of his life and work is given in the Souda, where the number of Sophoclean entries indicates a partiality to him. Fragments of his tragedies are preserved in papyri of the 4th–7th C. The oldest extant MS of Sophocles dates from the mid-10th C., but a revived interest in Sophocles is already evident in Ignatios the Deacon (cf. Browning, Studies, pt.XIV [1968]). In the 12th C. Eustathios of Thessalonike knew well the text of Sophocles, whose debt to Homer he repeatedly identified in his Homeric commentaries. The most widely read of the Sophoclean plays were the triad of Ajax, Electra, and Oedipus the King. Annotated editions of the entire corpus were produced in the 14th C. by Thomas Magistros and Demetrios Triklinos; a recension of the triad by Manuel Moschopoulos is a matter of debate (cf. Wilson, Scholars 246). The number of surviving MSS and the quotations in Byz. authors indicate that among the tragedians Sophocles was second to Euripides in popularity.


—A.C.H.

SOPHRONIOS (Σωφρόνιος), patriarch of Jerusalem (634–38); born Damascus ca.560, died Jerusalem 11 March 638. He was a teacher of rhetoric in Damascus, usually identified with Sophronios the Sophist, although the arguments for this are not fully conclusive. Sophronios then became a monk and, together with his teacher and intimate John Moschos, journeyed widely, visiting numerous monastic centers in Egypt, Palestine, and Rome (H. Chadwick, JThSt n.s. 25 [1974] 41–74). He returned to Jerusalem to join the monastery of Theodosios (ca.619). His uncompromising opposition to Monoenergism in 633 brought him to Egypt and Constantinople, though his courage and dedicated defense of the Council of Chalcedon failed to convince either Kyros of Alexandria or Sergios I of Constantinople. His Synodal Letter, issued in 634 on his elevation to patriarch, is a detailed exposition of his staunch Chalcedonianism. On the whole, his other literary output is hagiographic and homiletic. His 23 Anacreontic Odes in classical meter deal with liturgical feasts. He is also credited with being the author of liturgical texts, including the Office of Blessing of Water on Epiphany. In addition to his enkomion of Sls. Kyros and John, a fragment of his biography of his friend John Eleemon, co-authored with Moschos, has survived. He is an important literary witness to the conquest of Jerusalem by Caliph ‘Umar in 638 (M.B. Kriov, VizVrem 41 [1980] 249–51).


SOPOČANI, located near Novi Pazar in Serbia, site of the Church of the Trinity. Founded ca. 1255 by Stefan Uroš I, it was possibly designed originally as a cathedral church. It then became the katholikon of a monastery and served as a mausoleum for Uroš himself and his parents; he brought the remains of his father Stefan “the First-Crowned” here from Studenica in 1266. A tall, single-aisled basilica with a dome over the crossing, similar to Studenica in its ground plan, the church was built of stone and has a single round apse; its many Romanesque features include corbels under the roofline and sculptured marble portals and window frames. The building was enlarged in the later 13th C. through the addition of two chapels flanking the narthex, then of an open exonarthex and belfry tower to the west (the exonarthex was painted under Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, before 1346); at about this time (1342–47?) two chapels were inserted along the north and south flanks of the naos between the eastern cross-arms and western narthex chapels, and each of these rows of chapels was given a common roof.

The frescoes of the naos and narthex are considered among the great masterpieces of medieval monumental painting. Though the origin of the artists has not been determined, these paintings are crucial for any study of the transition from Komnenian to Palaiologan art, since they were done at a time (probably between 1263 and 1268) for which few monuments exist in Constantinople. The frescoes were executed by an artist still rooted in the rambling narrative linear style of late Komnenian painting (narthex and upper levels of the naos, including pendentives), and in part by artists, probably Greeks, working in a new heroic style (as in the scene of the Dormition of the Virgin on the west wall) whose stately compositions, monumental single figures, and massive architectural forms herald Palaiologan works of the late 13th and 14th C. The backgrounds, as at Studenica and Mileševa, imitate gold mosaic through the use of gold leaf on a yellow ground. The relatively traditional program includes several royal portraits, council and Last Judgment cycles in the narthex, and certain rare compositions again in the narthex (18 scenes from the life of Joseph thought to betray the influence of the vitae of the Serbian royal brothers Stefan Nemanja and Sava written by Domentijan, and a fresco showing the death of Anna Dandolo, the mother of King Uroš I).

Further historical compositions (e.g., the translation of the remains of Stefan Nemanja from Hilandar to Studenica) adorn the southern narthex chapel. The naos chapels were dedicated to Sts. George and Nicholas, respectively, and each was adorned with scenes from the life of the appropriate saint.


SORCERY. See MAGIC.

SOROS (σωρός), a reliquary casket, esp. the two caskets containing relics of the Virgin Mary, and the buildings housing them in Constantinople. Mary’s mantle (esthēs), which became one of Constantinople’s palladia, was allegedly brought to Constantinople from Palestine in 473. Emp. Leo I installed it in a round chapel adjoining the Church of the Virgin of Blacherna. Known as the Hagia Soros, the chapel was inaccessible to laymen; its splendid silver revetment indicates that it was regarded as a reliquary shrine of architectural dimensions. A feastday on 2 July celebrated the relic and its triumphal return to the chapel in 620 after its removal for safekeeping during an Avar raid. The other relic, Mary’s belt, or girdle (zone), was placed in the Chalkoprateia church by Emp. Arkadios, according to legend. By the time of Justin II, it was installed in an architectural soroos of its own. Its translation was celebrated on 31 Aug.; the emperors visited its soroos on the feasts of the Annunciation and Nativity. The icon type of the Virgin Hagiocratissa is associated with this shrine. (See also Maphorion.)


SOROS (σωρός)
SOTEROIOLOGY, the teaching of redemption and salvation. Although Byz. theological controversies dealt primarily with ontological concepts of substance, nature, hypostasis, etc., they were primarily soteriologically oriented, since ultimately they focused on the redemptive work of Christ and sought a radical argument to answer the questions: Why is Christ God? Why is he a man? Why is he a hypostatic union of divine and human natures? These qualities of Christ assured the possibility of man’s redemption. As stated in the Nicaean Creed, the incarnation and death in the flesh of the Logos—who was consubstantial (HOMOIOUSIOS) with the Father—was a voluntary act undertaken for the salvation of mankind. Gregg and Groh (infra) hypothesized that the dispute over ARIANISM revolved around two contrasting models of salvation: in ATHANASIUS of Alexandria, divine grace opened the way to deification (THEOSIS), the consubstantiality of the Logos creating the possibility of human ascent to the kingdom of God; in the doctrine of the Arian first generation, the emphasis lay on the will and choice of the Son, on his action, not his being.

On the other hand, by overstressing either the human or divine nature of Christ, both the Nestorian and Monophysite doctrines endangered the “soteriological balance” announced, for example, in GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS (ep.101). If Christ is seen as too human his identity with God can suffer, if too divine his human connections can be severed. In either case deification would have been unattainable. Only in union with God can mankind find redemption and salvation, as defined in the formula of two natures in one hypostasis of Christ.

The preservation of the particularity of both natures is the leitmotif of Byz. theology, esp. in MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR. This allowed both salvation and healing, the renewal (anakainismos) of the original creature, man’s liberation from the existing mode of sin. Christ as the new Adam is a redeemer and restorer of the sinless state of original mankind.

Many problems are connected with the concept of salvation: the role of the church as an institution and the possibility of individual salvation outside the official church; the material means of salvation and the role of symbols, icons, sacraments, etc., in the process of salvation; the question of whether sinners and demons will be deemed in the final accounting; the question of whether a good action in itself assures salvation.


SOTERIOUPOLIS (Σωτηριούπολις, also Soteropolis), in the 10th C. a kastron on the border with Abchasia (De adm. imp. 42.110), a center of a kleisoura (Zacos, Seals 2, no.948). The 10th-C. TAKTIKON of the Escurial mentions a stratègos of Soterioupolis or Bourzo (Oikonomides, Lists 269.3). From the 10th C. on, Soterioupolis is also known as an autonomous archbishopric (Notitiae CP no.7.87); by the 12th C. it was united with the metropolis of Alania. Its identification with modern Pitsouna or with Suchumi is not valid.


SOUBLAION. See CHOMA.

SOUDA (Σοῦδα), title of a lexikon; the etymology seems to be “fence” or “moat.” Already in the 12th C. the title was misunderstood, and EUSTATHIOS OF THESALONIKE interpreted it as the name of a certain Suidas. Its date of compilation is debatable, certainly later than mid-10th C., probably ca.1000; the problem is whether the reference to the emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII belongs to an authentic text or an interpolation. The entries are organized in alphabetical order, diphthongs (αυ, etc.) being considered as independent letters. Souda explains difficult grammatical forms, rare words, and proverbs, and comments on persons, places, institutions, and even concepts (such as cosmos or physis). The material commented on is primarily ancient or biblical, and medieval data are infrequent; an important exception is the entry on KRUM. Some Byz. topics are mentioned in entries on ancient subjects, e.g., a very critical judgment of Patr. POLYEUKTOS.

Souda is a “compilation of compilations” (Lemerle, Humanism 345), based primarily on such sources as lexika and ETIMOLOGIKA, excerpts from CONSTANTINE VII, collections of Scholia to Homer, Aristophanes, etc. Souda refers not only to ancient
its port with that of Alexandria. However, the Kaffa-Tana alliance supported by the Genoese blocked Sougdaia: PEGOLITI, who visited the Crimea ca.1330, speaks of Kaffa and Tana but does not mention Sougdaia. By the 14th C. Sougdaia was an autocephalous archbishopric and then a metropolis, having incorporated that of PHOULIOI. Its cathedral church was St. Sophia, the foundation of which is dated by later tradition to 793. The legendary story of the capture of Sougdaia by Prince Bravlin of Novgorod, allegedly in the reign of Leo III, is preserved in a 16th-C. Russian MS.


—O.P.

SOUL (ψυχή), the vital life principle in creatures. The Byz. connected the word with verbs meaning “animate, bring to life,” while the Origenists accepted Plato’s etymology from “cool, make solid.” The Byz. had many problems in understanding the soul, such as the nature of its substance. Some perceived the soul in physical terms, as breath (e.g., Didymos the Blind, PG 39:737A) or blood (the notion criticized by Nemesios [PG 40:541B]), but Gregory of Nyssa insisted on a purely intellectual definition of it as ousia noera. Was the soul “simple” or composed of several parts or “faculties,” two, three, or more? Thus MAKARIOS THE GREAT thought that the soul consisted of many “limbs” such as INTELLECT, consciousness, will, aggressive and defensive aspects (PG 34:528B). With regard to the origin of the soul, ORIGEN presented the concept of preexistent souls that “fell” from their politeia, resided in bodies, and would have to ascend to heaven. This concept was refuted by the church fathers, who developed the idea of the created soul, infused into the body; it is generated not from a material seed, but by the will of the creator, without, however, becoming a divine essence.

The soul was considered a guide for the body, giving it life and movement and causing its growth; the Stoic idea that the soul is imprisoned in the body was rejected. The relation of soul to intellect also produced difficulties—was the soul distinct from intellect, as Basil the Great stated (PG 31:204A), or did intellect form a part of the soul?
“The sensory perception of the rational soul,” says pseudo-Maximos (PG 90:1437B), “is its atrium, reasoning its temple, and intellect its supreme priest.” After death the soul retains its identity and is linked to its former body, which it recovers at the future resurrection. Thus the church fathers rejected the concept of metempsychosis as well as the idea of the dissolution of souls in the air.

The soul is made in God’s image, and is in principle the divine indwelling, but the gnomical will of man allows him to choose the way of sin or the way of perfection leading to eternal beatitude. A special problem was the soul of Christ: Apollinaris of Laodikeia denied the existence of a human soul in Christ, asserting that the soul belonged to the “outer man.” In the orthodox view, however, the full humanity of Christ required his possession of a human soul.

The Byz. distinguished perishable “animal” or “instinctive” forces from the human or rational forces of the soul. Man possessed both categories, animals only the first category, and therefore they acted according to nature rather than any desire for virtue or sin. The orthodox theologians accused the adherents of monotheticism of acknowledging in Christ the elements of the animal soul but not of the reasoning and immortal soul.

**Representation in Art.** More concerned with the resurrection of the flesh, as in the Anastasis, artists rarely represented the soul. When they did so, it was as a baby wrapped in swaddling clothes (as the Virgin in the Dormition) or as a naked, youthful body (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinküpft., e.g., II, nos. 1, 16); damned souls in the arms of Hades are depicted similarly (Der Neressian, L’illustration II, fig. 16).

**SOUMELA MONASTERY,** located in a spectacular site on the face of a cliff on the western slopes of Mt. Melas, about 40 km south of Trebizond. The origins of Soumel (Σουμελά), which was dedicated to the Virgin, are shrouded in legend. Pious tradition, going back at least to the 10th C., places the foundation of Soumela in the 4th C. and attributes its establishment to two Athenian monks, Barnabas and Sophroneios, who supposedly discovered in a cave at Soumela an icon of the Virgin painted by St. Luke. The monastery prospered during the reign of the Grand Komnenoi of Trebizond, esp. Alexios III Komnenos who was responsible for the restoration of Soumela in 1360–65. A chrysobull of Alexios of 1364 (MM 5:276–81) lists the properties owned by the monastery in the Matzouka region and characterizes the relations between Soumela and its paroikoi: the monastery had the right of jurisprudence over them, could levy military recruits, etc. The document also granted Soumela immunity (exkousies) from taxes and other financial and military obligations (P. Jakovenko, K istorii immuniteta v Vizantii [Jr’ev 1908] 28–31, 66–70; G. Ostrogorsky, Byzantium 28 [1958–59] 236f). The monastery was called imperial as well as patriarchal and stauropeial.

The main grotto church contains fresco portraits of Trapezunite emperors, including Alexios III and Manuel III Komnenos. The monastery was abandoned in the 20th C.

**SOZOMENOS,** Salamanes Hermeias, ecclesiastical historian who practiced law at Constantinople; born Bathelina near Gaza, 5th C. His Church History, covering the period 324–425 in formal continuation of Eusebios of Caesarea, was dedicated to Theodosios II, whose approval of its content he formally requested. This may imply some competition with the pagan history of Olympiodoros of Thebes, whose work Sozomenos (Σωζομένος) used, and which was also dedicated to that emperor. The final part of book 9, dealing with the years 425–39, is lost; the last datable event mentioned (in the preface) is Theodosios’s trip to Bithynia in 443. Sozomenos drew extensively but critically from his predecessor Sokrates, to whom he is stylistically superior. Though Sozomenos is weak in understanding

---

dogmatic issues, and credulous about miracles, his use of other sources makes the History an important supplement to Sokrates, esp. his detailed account (2.9-14) of the persecution of Christians in Persia under Shâpûr II and his information on the spread of Christianity among Armenians, Saracens, and Goths.


SOZOPOLIS (Σωζόπολις), the name of two cities in the Byz. Empire, one in Thrace, the other in Pisidia.

SOZOPOLIS IN THRACE (anc. Apollonia, mod. Sozopol in Bulgaria), city on the Black Sea, located partially on islands. The ancient name, still used in Ammianus Marcellinus (Amm.Marc. 22.8.43) and the Tabula Peutingeriana, was replaced with a “Christian” appellation, “the city of salvation,” by 431. Sozopolis was among the cities that supported the revolt of Vitalian. Historians from Prokopios onward ignore Sozopolis, but the bishopric of Sozopolis, under the jurisdiction of Adrianople, is regularly listed in notitias. Velkov (infra) identifies three archaeological strata in a basilica excavated in Sozopolis: one of the 5th to 6th C.; one of the 8th to 9th C., to which belong the fragments of a marble ambo; and of the 9th C. and later. In the 9th C. Sozopolis probably formed a tourma; the seal of an anonymous spatharios and tourmarches of Sozopolis has been published, as have three seals of 11th to 12/13th-C. bishops of Sozopolis (Laurent, Corpus 5.1, nos. 720-22). More is known about Sozopolis in the 14th C., when it was a major trade center in the area and Bulgaria and Byz. fought over the rights to the city. According to Manuel Philes, Michael Glabas Tarchaneiotes conquered Sozopolis in 1263 (Zlatarski, Ist. 3.5:04), but at the beginning of the 14th C. it belonged to Bulgaria. Amadeo VI of Savoy captured it in 1366 and then handed it over to John V, together with Mesembria and some other coastal towns. At least five monasteries existed in Sozopolis in the 14th C., some of them built on islands.


SOZOPOLIS OF PISIDIA (mod. Uluborlu), city in southwestern Anatolia, perhaps the successor to ancient Apollonia. Rarely mentioned in late antiquity, Sozopolis was the birthplace of Severos of Antioch and the site of the miracle-working icon in the Church of the Virgin mentioned in the vita of Theodoret of Syr-eon. The city probably re-appears in the 9th C. as the seat of a tourmarches (Zacos, Seals 1, no.2643) or kleisourarches, but in the latter case a conjecture “of Seleukeia” was suggested (Oikonomides, Lites 54, n.35) and in the former Sozopolis in Thrace cannot be excluded. Romanos IV reformed it in 1070. It fell soon after to the Seljuks, but was retaken by John II Komnenos in 1120; it became a strong frontier bulwark, resisting attack until the Seljuks finally captured it in 1180. Sozopolis was a suffragan bishopric of Antioch of Pisidia. Remains of the well-built fortress indicate major construction in the 7th-8th C., with rebuilding in 1070.


SPACE (τόπος, lit. “place”) is defined by Psellos (De omnisfaria doctrina, par. 154.1-2) as the receptacle (dektikon) of a body or of an incorporeal being. From topos Psellos (par. 155) distinguishes chora (usually location or position), which he understands specifically as the distance between numbers or as the portion of space containing something (e.g., the hollow part of a pithos that contains wine).

The word topos had a variety of meanings. The Byz. inherited the Aristotelian concept of topos as container or boundary of three-dimensional bodies. From it they distinguished “intelligible space,” topos noetos, which was a metaphorical or mental container of incorporeal beings, such as angels. Unlike angels God did not exist “in space” since he had no limits; he was his own topos, filling up everything and containing everything (John of Damascus, Exp. fidei 13.2-98, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:37-39).

Simplikios criticized Aristotle’s theory of topos as preoccupied with the “external place” of the
body, that is, its positional relationship to bodies external to it; this led, according to Simplicios, to the axiom of immobility. He suggested the definition of topos as an ordering (taxis), measure, or limit of the concrete situation of the body (H.R. King, *CQ* 44 [1950] 92).

Another perception of space is that of Proklos who identified it with light and considered it to be an immovable, indivisible, immaterial body, soma (CAG 9:612.24–25, see Armstrong, *Philo-phy* 435, n.10), but Nicholas of Methone (Ana-pyxis 92.15–16) retorted that the Infinite (apeiron) is not a substance but a relation. Yet another aspect of space is the problem of its expanse beyond the cosmos. Aristotle opposed the concept of “empty space,” and accordingly Psellos (De om-nifaria doctrina, par.153.4–8) calls it “invisible chaos,” “a fantastic infinite in an infinite place (topos).” In other words, space is endlessly divisible and endlessly expanding only in potentiality and in man’s imagination, but in reality it is finite and limited. Since the concept of apeiron acquired a theological meaning—the characterization of God’s perfect immeasurability—in Gregory of Nyssa, as it already had in Plotinos (L. Sweeney, *Gregorianum* 98 [1957] 515–35; 713–32), any cosmological application of this concept was questionable. The contrast of the spaceless Godhead and the body’s limit is revealed in Christological discussions of God’s describability and Christ’s “circum-scribed” (perigrapton) body.

The third aspect of space as a place for human beings is its ethical qualification, the spatial distinction of good and evil: not only did heaven and hell have different locations, but also earthly locations were endowed with virtue (such as mountains or desert) or vice (such as hippodromes and often urban centers in general).


---

**SPACE AND DEPTH**, concepts of linear distance between two or more points or objects. Means used to suggest depth include inverted perspective, plasticity, landscape (usually lacking a horizon), and devices creating the illusion of an interior space. Generally horizontal extension, like narrative sequence, is indicated by figures or events read from left to right on a shallow “stage” at the picture plane, although either may be overridden by a concern for symmetry. So, too, compositions in which a single or at most a few planes of recession are indicated by rows of figures may be elaborated by a crowd shown tightly packed in vertical perspective or opened up by the insertion of a background scene. The illusion of space is most successful when an image is imposed upon an already convex surface as in an apse or a squinch, but even in such a context recession may be summarily treated by imbricated or overlapping figures. A system of chiastic construction, suggesting deep space behind the picture plane and apparently based on antique models, is evident in the *Joshua Roll* and the *Paris Psalter*. In late *monumental painting*, architectural settings, in themselves irrationally composed, sometimes lend a greater sense of depth to a picture than ever before in Byz. art.


---

**SPAIN** (Ispanavia, also called Iβηρια) was under Diocletian a diocese consisting of five provinces: Baetica, Lusitania, Carthaginensis, Gallaecia, and Tarraconensis; Baetica (with Cordoba as capital) was the most romanized of them. In the 4th C. Spain prospered economically as a center of agriculture, esp. livestock-breeding (Spanish horses were famous), and metallurgy; it exported land, fish, wheat, and oil. Spaniards played a central role at the imperial court under Theodosios I. From the early 5th C. various barbarian peoples began to penetrate into Spain. In Sept.–Oct. 409 the Suevi, Vandals, and Alans invaded the peninsula. In 422 the Roman army under the command of the *magister militum* Castinus was defeated by the Vandals, who then moved southward and occupied Africa. The Suevi stayed behind and tried to establish their rule over Spain, but had to yield to the *Visigoths*, who invaded the peninsula in 456. Visigothic domination was challenged by Justinian I in the 550s, and the empire temporarily established a foothold in the south around Malaga and Cartagena. The Visi-
gothic kingdom of Toledo was conquered by the Arabs in 711.

Christian states in northern Spain (esp. the Catalan) maintained relations with Constantinople; some unsuccessful negotiations to establish marriage alliances with the Komnenoi took place, and by 1200 “Iberian” soldiers were active in Constantinople. In the late 13th C. the Aragonese seized power in Sicily, in 1292 plundered the Byz. coast, and in the early 14th C. endeavored to settle in the Peloponnese; the Catalan Grand Company was a major political and military factor in the Balkan peninsula in the 14th C. In the early 15th C. Pero Tafor visited Constantinople and Trebizond.


SPALATO. See Split.

SPANEAS, conventional title of a didactic poem in the vernacular, preserved in several substantially different versions. Its title in MSS is unclear, and attempts to determine its authorship and original addressee remain unconvinced (S.D. Papadimtriou, Letopis 5 [1900] 337–66); the original may have been produced in the 12th C. The author of Spaneas (unless he is using a rhetorical convention) is an old man, whose career was a failure and who writes from exile, separated from his beloved “son,” the addressee. Spaneas’s advice is trivial, borrowed primarily from Holy Scriptures and a work ascribed to Isocrates; some points, however, could be perceived as genuinely Byz., such as the recommendations to inform on blasphemy and on criticism of the emperor (Legrand, Bibliothèque 1:1:15–26). Interest in warfare and hunting probably reflects the worldview of the Komnenian period. Despite its banality, Spaneas enjoyed popularity; it was imitated by later romances, esp. Phlorios and Platzia-Phlora (G. Spadaro, Diptycha 1 [1979] 282–88), and by Falteri (N. Papatriantaphyllou-Theodoride, Hellenika 28 [1975] 92–101); it was reworked in southern Italy (G. Spadaro, JÖB 32.3 [1982] 281f) and Epiros (G. Zoras, ISBN 1 [1964] 47–77, with ed.) and translated into Serbian before 1332 (Dj. Radović in Studi in onore di Ettore Lo Gatto e Giovanni Maurer [Milan 1962] 563–66).


SPANOS (Σπανός), more properly Akolouthia tou anosiou tragogene spanou (Office for the Impious Goat-bearded Beardless Man). This anonymous parody survives in three versions (two in verse, one in prose), all dating to the first half of the 16th C. Eide neier (infra) argues that the original text was produced in Constantinople in the 14th or 15th C. Spanos closely follows the formal structure of an akolouthia in commemoration of a saint, including vespers and orthros, complete with kathisma, troparia, and epitaphios. The synaxarin imitates hagiographic conventions, describing the birth of the beardless man to a donkey and his lengthy journey to find his paternal uncle, a wild goat, and obtain from him three-and-a-half chin hairs. The author, perhaps a cleric, was familiar with rhetoric and thoroughly versed in the liturgy. His language alternates between hagiographic formulas and a rich and bawdy vernacular vocabulary, which includes numerous extremely long compounds. The work is full of obscenities and sexual allusions and offers an extraordinary example of late Byz. humor.


Lit. Beck, Volkstüteratur 1951. –A.M.T.

SPARSO. See LARGESS.

SPARTA. See LAKEDAEMON.

SPATHARIOS (σπάθαριος, lit. “sword-bearer”), a dignity. In the late Roman Empire the term designated a bodyguard, either private or imperial (M. San Nicolo, RE 2.R. 3 [1929] 154ff). Imperial spatharios, who belonged to the corps of
KOUBIKOULARIOI and were eunuchs, are known from the time of Theodosios II (Jones, LRE 1:567). The Chronicon Paschale (Chron. Pasch. 627.8–9) distinguished the “bearded” Eulalios from the “eunuchs and spatharioi” rather than including him in their ranks, as Oikonomides (infra) thinks. By the beginning of the 8th C. spatharios had probably become a title: Justinian II appointed the spatharios Elias (his future murderer) as governor of Cherson, and he gave the title spatharios to his friend, the future emperor Leo III. The title decreased in importance by the 9th C. It disappeared after 1075, and a 12th-C. historian (An.Komm. 1:95–97) mentions the spatharios as an insignificant person. In the 9th C. the term oikeiakos spatharios could still denote an imperial bodyguard (P. Nikitin, ZapANSt-fil 7.2 [1905] 158–65). (See also PROTOSPATHARIOS.)


SPATHAROKANDIDATOS (σπαθαροκανδιδατος), a dignity, the name formed by combining spatharios and kandidatos. The first mentions of spatharokandidatos, in Sebeos and a letter of Pope Gregory II to Leo III, are dubious, but the title is attested from the first half of the 9th C. Bury's doubts concerning the taktikon of Uspeenskij are rejected by Oikonomides (Lists 52, n.29). In the taktika, spatharokandidatos occupies the place between dishypatos and spatharios. On seals it is connected with subaltern offices such as notary, asekretis, and lower judges. The last mention comes from 1094 (MM 6:94.6 and 11), and the title seems to have disappeared in the 12th C. (V. Laurent, Hellenika 7 [1934] 77, n.3).

LIT. Bury, Adm. System 26f. Seibt, Bleisiegel 326–33. –A.K.

SPECTABILIS (lit. “notable,” Gr. περιβλεπτος [peribleptos]), the second-ranking title of senators in the late Roman Empire, between illustrius and clarissimus. First mentioned in 365, the title was bestowed primarily on proconsuls, vicars, and duces (see DOUX), while the highest functionaries in the central administration, originally ranked as spectabiles, soon acquired the title of illustrius. The term was not used in the Byz. hierarchy; the last mention of peribleptos as a title of an official is in the papyrus of 710 (P. Lond. IV 1542.7) in which it designated a modest functionary in local administration. (For peribleptos as an epithet of the Virgin, see Virgin Hodegetria.)


SPEKION. See Sagion.

SPHAIRA (σφαιρα, sphere, in Prokopios πολος, celestial sphere), the orb, a symbol of imperial power used in the ancient world (e.g., M.R. Alfeld, Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte 11 [1961] 19–32) and adopted by late Roman emperors. On coins the orb was at first depicted as surmounted by a Victory, then—from the time of Theodosios II onward—as a globus cruciger, a globe surmounted by a cross (although the Victory is still occasionally used, as by Justin II). Prokopios (Buildings 2.2.11) describes the equestrian statue of Justinian I in the Augustaon as holding in its left hand a polos, signifying that the whole earth and sea was in servitude (dedoulota) to the emperor. Representations of sphairai are known until the reign of Alexios III Angelos, but not in the empire of Nicsea or during the Palaiologan period; the orb was, however used by the Grand Komnenoi of Trebizond.

It remains under discussion whether the sphaira was a real emblem of power (J. Deér, BZ 54 [1961] 53–85), since it is not mentioned in any of the lengthy descriptions of coronation ceremonies; Grierson and Schramm (infra) argue that it may have been rather a symbolic representation of imperial power over the world. The symbol of the globe was adopted both in the West and in 16th-C. Russia (A. Grabar, HistZ 191 [1960] 344f). It is unclear whether the sphaira reflects a Byz. perception that the earth was round. Sometimes the sphaira was interpreted by the Byz. as an apple (A.R. Littlewood, JOB 23 [1974] 55–57).


SPHENDONE (σφενδόνι, lit. “slings”), term designating anything resembling a sling, including the curved southwestern end of the Hippodrome of Constantinople (Guilland, Topographie 1:375f).
The lexicographer Hesychios of Alexandria (5th/6th C.) considered the word as a synonym of sphragis, seal. A 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 175.26–32) defines sphendone as a seal to make wax sealings that was employed only by the emperor, his spouse, his son, and the dowager empress; other high officials, including despotai and patriarchs, had to employ lead sealings. The sphendone was inserted in a ring (daktylion). It was used for imperial prostatagama. The office of the parakoimomenos of the [grand] sphendone existed from the reign of Michael VIII onward and was conferred upon various noble personages.


A.K.

SPHRAGIS THEOU (“Seal of God”), or sphragis Solomonos (“Seal of Solomon”), interchangeable terms referring to the seal (i.e., signet) ring that, according to The Testament of Solomon (ed. C.C. McCown [Leipzig 1922] 10*), was given by God to King Solomon in order that he might “lock up all the demons” and thereby enlist their aid in the building of the Temple. According to the 6th-C. Breviarium de Hierosolyma (ed. P. Geyer, Itineria Hierosolimitana secundi itineris [Prague-Vienna-Leipzig 1898] 154), this ring was venerated as a relic in Jerusalem. Some text variants describe the signet’s device as the pentalpha; that the early Byz. understood it as such is suggested by the frequency of this device on amuletic rings, pendants, and arm-bands. The sphragis theou appears regularly on the reverses of haematite medical amulets.


G.V.

SPHRANTZES, GEORGE, courtier, diplomat, and historian; born 1401, died Kerkyra 1477/8. As a youth Sphrantzes (Σφράντζης) entered the service of Manuel II; upon Manuel’s death, Sphrantzes joined the entourage of his son, the despotes (and future emperor) Constantine (XI). In his service he undertook numerous embassies to the Turks, Georgia, Trebizond, Morea, and the Aegean islands. He was appointed governor of Patras in 1430, protovestiariotes in 1432, and governor of Mistra in 1446. He was taken prisoner in Constantinople at the time of the Ottoman conquest. After his release by the Turks, he continued to travel widely, in Italy, Serbia, and the Ionian Islands. He ended his days on Kerkyra as the monk Gregory.

The Chronicon Minus, based on the diary of Sphrantzes, covers the period 1415–77. It is a revealing personal memoir that combines annalistic accounts of events with records of the dates of birth (and death) of Sphrantzes’ children. The language of this Chronicon is surprisingly colloquial and includes a number of Turkish and Italian words. It is now generally accepted that the expanded version of this work, the Chronicon Maius, is a 16th-C. compilation of the metropolitan of Monemvasia, Makarios Melissenos (R.-J. Loenertz in Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati, vol. 3 [Vatican 1946] 273–311). M. Carroll argues, however, that most of the “siege section” of the Maius is the work of Sphrantzes (Byzantion 41 [1971] 28–44; 42 [1972] 5–22; 43 [1973] 30–38).


A.M.T.

SPICES (μυρεψικά). In medieval merchant handbooks, the term spezierie designates a large number of items that were used in medicine, perfume making, and embalming, as well as dyestuffs and seasonings. Since many spices, including the most expensive ones, were produced in Southeast Asia and Africa, the term is associated with eastern trade, although among the spices are items such as saffron, produced in the western Mediterranean, and mastic, produced on Chios. For medieval commerce, pepper and ginger were the most important items: of small bulk and very high value, carried primarily on galleys, spices were very lucrative commodities.

Until the 7th C., Byz. territories included some spice-producing areas (Egypt) as well as the ports through which eastern spices reached the Mediterranean. After the loss of the eastern provinces, Constantinople became the most important market within Byz.; Alexandria remained a major outlet throughout the Middle Ages. In the 10th C., the campaign manual of Constantine VII (De cer., [appendix io] vol. 1, 468.15–18) mentions as
items to be carried into the field: Greek incense, frankincense, mastic, saffron, musk, amber, aloe and wood aloe (or eaglewood), cinnamon of first and second quality, and cassia. All of these, and other spices, are mentioned in the Book of the Eparch in the chapter on Myrepsos (ch.10), which suggests that spices reached Constantinople primarily from the area of Trebizond. Symeon Seth lists a considerable number of spices along with their therapeutic qualities. In the 14th C., Constantinople and Pera were important centers of the spice trade as was Cyprus, because Italian traders shunned the Egyptian ports to some extent. By the late 14th C., Alexandria became the major market for spices in the eastern Mediterranean.


—A.L.

SPIRITUAL RELATIONSHIP (πνευμονικὴ συγγένεια) was contracted on a number of ritual occasions, such as baptism (see Godparent), adoption of a child or brother/sister ( adelphophonia), or taking monastic vows. In the cases of baptism and adoption, the spiritual relationship created by the rituals included not only the participants, the sponsor, and sponsored, but also others related to them by blood (see marriage impediments). The language of spiritual kinship could also be applied to relationships not created by a ritual, such as that between a confessor and confessant (V. Christophorides, He pneumatike patrotes kata Symeon ton Neon Theologon [Thessalonike 1977]), superiors and monks/nuns, or between emperors and foreign Christian rulers (Dölger, Byzanz 183–96). The emperor’s spiritual father or confessor could play an important political role (R. Morris in Byz. Saint 46–49).

—R.J.M.

SPITHAME (σπιθαμέ, lit. “space between the thumb and little finger”), a unit of length = 12 daktyloi = 3/4 pous (= 23.4 cm). As an official measure for the survey of fields it was also called basileik (imperial) spithame. Besides this official spithame there existed another spithame of 10 daktyloi (= 19.5 cm) or of 10.33 daktyloi (= 20.8 cm), called the koine (common) spithame.

LIT. Schilbach, Metrologie 19f.

—E. Sch., A.K.

SPLIT (Ἀσπαλάθος, Roman Spalatum), city on the Dalmatian coast on a promontory in Kastelanski Bay, southeast of Salona. The etymology suggested by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp. 29.237) from palatum (palace) is now considered incorrect—possibly, the Greek name was derived from a plant used in the manufacture of perfumes. Sometime before 305, Diocletian built a residence on this obscure site for his years of retirement; it was constructed of local limestone and brick, while marble, mosaic decoration, and statues of sphinxes were imported. Diocletian’s villa was square in plan, had four gates, and was surrounded by limestone walls with square and octagonal towers. Two principal streets (in some places colonnaded) divided the villa complex into four quarters. The villa contained the Mausoleum of Diocletian, a temple, baths, private apartments, and an aqueduct.

After Diocletian’s death Spalatum experienced a period of stagnation; according to the 5th-C. Notitia Dignitatum, it housed a military clothing factory. Excavations have uncovered only modest traces of building activity in the 5th–6th C.; baths were adapted for use as churches, and twin basilicas were erected outside the walls. In the 7th C. the inhabitants began to rebuild Spalatum as a small town: some columns and floor slabs were removed to obtain materials for renovation; the standard of living declined. Then new forms (in construction technique and pottery), reflecting Slav influence, emerged.

Thomas the Archdeacon relates that the inhabitants of Salona, after the destruction of their city in the 630s, fled to Split. The episcopal center was transferred there, and Diocletian’s mausoleum was transformed into the cathedral. Small as it was, Split played an important role in the making of the Croatian state in the 10th–11th C. and as the site of local synods. The archbishop of Split tried to maintain ties with both Rome and Constantinople. Byz. claimed certain administrative rights over this area. From the 11th C. onward Split was several times sacked by the Hungarians and Venetians. In 1420 it finally recognized Venetian supremacy.


—A.K.
SPOLIA, materials taken over for reuse from older buildings, particularly columns, capitals, and other MARBLE. The use of spolia in construction appeared in the early 4th C. and, as the supply of material and means of production diminished, continued throughout the Byz. period. Earlier structures provided builders with inexpensive, ready-made, and easily reusable material. Spolia were often employed in a conscious manner, as in pairing columns of the same material or capitals of the same style. In some Late Antique buildings the use of spolia from pagan temples sometimes symbolized the triumph of Christianity: the author of the vita of Porphyrios of GAZA interpreted the reuse of marbles from the temple of Zeus Marnas at GAZA in the pavement of that city's cathedral as a proper trampling on the remnants of idolatry.

Other materials were recycled from older artifacts simply because they were valuable. Silver was frequently melted down, old mosaic tesserae were saved, seals were recut, and coins (Grierson, Byz. Coins 87f, 204–06) were overstruck. The reuse of Roman cameos and intaglios and of parchment in PALIMPSESTS is easily identified; less so is the removal of gems from crosses and Gospel books for items of personal adornment—a charge leveled at Isaac II (Nik.Chon. 443.78–82).


-M.J., A.C.

SPOONS (κοχλιάρια), of silver, bronze, and bone, served both domestic and cult purposes. Silver spoons were elaborately decorated and plentiful in the 4th–6th C. Treasures of domestic silver plate contain two types of spoon used for eating, the kochliarion with round bowl and pointed handle and the ligula (a Lat. term) with pear-shaped bowl connected by a disk to a handle with finial or having a curved "swan's neck" handle; both kinds were decorated with images, inscriptions, and monograms. Although the ligula-type spoon replaced the kochliarion, the latter word continued to be used in the Greek East (cf. mod. Greek chouliari). Silver spoons of the 6th C. bearing crosses and (in two cases) dedicatory inscriptions form part of the ecclesiastical KAPER KORAOON TREASURE and MA'ARAT AL-NUMAN TREASURE and may be the earliest examples of the liturgical implement called labis, for which contemporary written evidence is, at best, ambiguous. In this period it is unclear if the spoon was used to stir the wine of the EUCHARIST or to distribute wine-soaked bread from the chalice.


SPORTS. Participation in (and attendance at) sporting events was one of the most important forms of entertainment in antiquity. The triumph of Christianity in the 4th C. brought about changes, as the church condemned dangerous sports, esp. those that could prove fatal: gladiators ceased to perform in the 4th C. (G. Ville, P. Veyne, Annales ESC 34 [1979] 651–71). Theodosios I abolished the Olympic Games in 393, but they apparently continued in Daphne, near Antioch, until 521 (J. Keresztényi, Olympiái játékok Daphnéban [Budapest 1962]). Canon law accepted wrestling, boxing, running, jumping, and discus-throwing (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:360.7–8, 4:133.24–26). Running contests were held in the HIPPODROME. Basil I in his youth excelled in wrestling, and John I Tzimiskes is reported to have been outstanding at ARCHERY (Leo Diac. 97.4–10).

Equestrian sports were most common during the Byz. millennium. In addition to HUNTING, three different kinds of contests took precedence over CHARIOT RACES: tzykanion, tornemen, and dzoustra. Tzykanion (from Pers. ishu-gan), a ball game played on horseback, similar to polo, was introduced from Persia and known supposedly from the reign of Theodosios II, who built a stadium (TZYKANISTERION) in Constantinople for the game. Played on an open field, it involved two teams on horseback, equipped with long-handled nets with which they tried to hit a leather ball the size of an apple into the goal of the opposing team (Kinn. 263,17–264,11). It was a sport very popular at the imperial court and among the nobility: Basil I excelled in it (Genes. 89.92–90,3), and John I Komnenos Axouch, emperor of Trebizond (1235–38), was fatally injured while playing in the tzyanisterion at Trebizond (Panaretos, ed. O. Lampside, ArchPoni 22 [1958] 61.15–16).

Tornemen and dzoustra (Greek transcriptions of the Old French tourneimen and joste) were intro-
duced from the West and played according to the rules of Western chivalric encounters. Both derived from mounted warfare and were practiced as a means of military training. In the *tournemen* the participants fought as members of a group, while in the *doustra* the contestants met in individual combat. A 12th-C. writer (Nik. Chon. 108.56–110.91) describes a tournament in Antioch in which Byz. nobles led by Manuel I competed as members of a group against Western knights. In similar fashion a Palaiologan historian (Greg. 1:482.1–483.20) describes the two contests organized by Andronikos III Palaiologos at Dydymoteichon in 1332 to celebrate the birth of his son John.

The horsemanship of famous riders performing in the hippodrome is depicted in the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes: Theodore Krateros in the reign of Theophilos, and Philiaraios in that of Romanos II (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzés, nos. 130f., 352). Jousts and other equestrian sports seem to be parodied on bone caskets of the 11th or 12th C. (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, *Elfenbeinskulpt. I*, nos. 40, 53). (See also Charioteers.)


**SPORTULAE.** See Synethia.

**SPYRIDON** (Σπυρίδων), 4th-C. bishop of Trimitthos on Cyprus; saint; born Askia, Cyprus; feastday 12 Dec. A shepherd, he continued to herd his flock after having been elected bishop. His participation in the Council of Nicaea in 325 is questionable; *Athanasiou* of Alexandria, however, testifies that a certain Spyridon of Cyprus signed the acts of the Council of Sardica (342/3). *Rufinus* knew oral traditions about Spyridon and mentioned two of his miracles: invisible ropes bound the thieves who stole his sheep, and his deceased daughter Irene identified from her grave the site of a treasure she had hidden before her death. Spyridon became popular in Byz. literature. A poem ascribed to his pupil Triphyllios, now lost, is mentioned in the *Souda*; it served as the basis for two 7th-C. vitae, one by Theodore of Paphos (completed by 655) and another possibly by *Leontios of Neapolis*. The vitae describe miracles worked by Spyridon, including his healing of the emperor Constantine I; Theodore’s Life mentions the deacon Stephen, who in 619 was reading a book about Spyridon, and also contains accounts of miracles performed at Spyridon’s tomb. *Symeon Metaphrastes* used the Life by Theodore; Arabic and Georgian vitae also survive.

Though Spyridon is portrayed as a bishop in artistic representations, he wears a special cap as a reminder of his shepherd past. He has a pointed white beard.


—A.K., N.P.S.

**SPYRIDONAKES, JOHN**, rebellious governor; fl. ca.1195–1201. A Cypriot craftsman, allegedly deformed, Spyridonakes (Σπυρίδονάκης) gained favor with Alexios III. After rising to superintendent of the "inner treasury" he was appointed governor of the theme of Smolena. Here (like his contemporaries Dobromir Chrysos, Leo Scourcos, and I万科) he sought independence. About 1201 Alexios’s son-in-law Alexios Palaiologos overran Smolena and drove Spyridonakes to flee to Kaloyan.

—C.M.B.

**SQUINCH**, a half-conical niche, arched or corbeled in brick or stone across the corners of a square bay. The function of the squinch was to create, above a square plan, an octagonal base for a dome, drum, or cloister vault. To smooth the transition from octagon to circle, smaller and shallower squinches were sometimes inserted at the corners of the octagon. Squinches appear in the stone architecture of Syria, Asia Minor, and Armenia, and in the brick superstructures of Hosios Loukas, the Nea Moni on Chios, and Daphni. In these 11th-C. Greek churches, the squinch created a non-Euclidean surface for mosaic compositions, the base of which consisted of flat surfaces set at right angles to one another in the corners of the
naos, while the squinch vault itself united these two surfaces into a quarter sphere at the top. Like pendentives, to which they are aesthetically and programmatically related, squinches were normally adorned with images of the Great Feasts of Evangelist Portraits.


—W.L.

STABILITY, MONASTIC (ισοβροσ ἀκρης), the principle that monks and nuns should remain for life in the monastery in which they took their monastic vows. This idea was enjoined by both canon and civil law. The canons of the 4th and 7th ecumenical councils and commentaries on them (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:225–29, 641f) forbade a monk or nun to leave his or her original monastery, as did civil law (cf. Justinian I, nos. 5.4. 7; 123.42). There were, however, legitimate reasons for a monk to move, for example, if his monastery was closed, if he were needed at another institution, or if a move would promote his spiritual well-being or serve as punishment. The monk had to seek the permission of the hegoumenoi of both monasteries before making the move. If he left his monastery without permission he was excommunicated.

In reality, however, many monks (including those considered holy men) moved frequently from one monastery to another or alternated between a cenobitic and eremitic way of life; nuns, on the other hand, virtually always remained in the same convent for life (A.M. Talbot, GorThR 30 [1985] 14f). Monks might move to escape enemy attack, to find an isolated koimion more conducive to the ascetic life, or to escape worldly glory and live as a hermit (A. Kazhdan, BZ 78 [1985] 50–52). Beck (Jahrtausend 213) has suggested that a common motivation was the individualism of the Byz. monk and the difficulty of obedience to a hegoumenos. Most monastic typika were more realistic than canon law and permitted the admission of monks from other monasteries, although the Pantokrator Monastery required a thorough investigation of the alien monk's past, and certain monasteries prohibited his promotion to the post of hegoumenos (A. Kazhdan, ViZVrem 31 [1971] 57f).


—A.M.T.

STAGOI (Στάγοι, etymology uncertain, mod. Kalampaka), on the site of ancient Aigion, a stronghold (phrourion or kastron) and bishopric in Thessaly known from the 10th C. onward. According to an act of 1169, Stagoi belonged to the theme of Servia. This act (C. Astruc, BCH 83 [1959] 206–46, with add. E. Vranouse, Symmeikta 7 [1987] 19–32) gives a list of the properties of the bishopric (many villages having Slavic names) and exempts the bishop's klerikoparakofoi from diverse levies. John VI Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 1:474.1–9) names Stagoi among phrouria that had belonged to the Gabrielo Polouloi but in 1393 were occupied by John Orsini of Epirus. From the mid-14th C. all of Thessaly was controlled by Stefan Uros IV Dušan, and Serbian kepbalai administered Stagoi. Its bishop was suffragan of Larissa (Notitiae CP 7.574). The first monasteries at Meteora were apparently under the bishop's control, and his rights are confirmed in imperial rescripts of 1336 and 1393 preserved on the walls of the cathedral. The stronghold and the bishopric, however, soon declined and fell under the domination of either the monks or the bishops of Trikala.

Several monuments are known to have existed in Stagoi, among them a Church of St. Barbara, but of these only the cathedral, dedicated to the Dormition of the Virgin, survives. This is a three-aisled basilica, constructed probably in the late 11th or early 12th C. on the foundations of a church from the 4th–6th C.; the (rebuilt) amb, chancel screen, and synthonon of the earlier structure survive in the interior, and there are mosaics under the pavement of the floor. Some late 12th C. frescoes (standing portraits of saints) remain in the south aisle, although most of the decoration is from the latter part of the 16th C. (I. Pispas, Ho hieros naos tes Koimeseos tes Theotokou en Kalampaka2 [Kalampaka 1988]).


—T.E.G.

STAMENA. See Histamenon.
STAMPS, BREAD (σφραγίδες), closely related to commercial stamps, were used to mark bread for ecclesiastical use. Typically 5–10 cm across—and most often made of clay, wood, or limestone—they may be divided into two basic types, depending on the impressed text or image that they bear. Some, intended for eulogia bread (i.e., that which is distributed apart from the Divine Liturgy on specific feastdays), carry an image or text designating the saint to be celebrated, whereas others, intended for the Eucharist itself, bear devices that guided the priest in subdividing the oblation (prosphora), and texts corresponding to the symbolism or wording of the office. Specifically, some stamps are square, inscribed with a cross marked in its quadrants by the letters IC XC NIKA (for “Jesus Christ is victorious”); these evoke the Liturgy of John Chrysostom and closely resemble the eucharistic bread represented in MSS and monumental painting—as in the Church of Hagia Sophia at Ohrid. Others, which are generally larger, bear a dense waffle pattern to facilitate removal of particles in honor of the Virgin, John the Baptist, and other saints; around the circumference of these might be the words recited at the institution of the sacrament: “Take, eat: this is my body that is broken for you.”


—G.V.

STAMPS, COMMERCIAL. A continuation of Roman signacula, these stamps (τύρων) are typically 3–10 cm at their widest and formed in the shape of a rectangle, circle, foot, cross, or crescent. Nearly all have handles, in some instances with their own smaller stamping device; although specimens are known in wood, stone, and clay, the majority are of bronze. Usually much cruder in manufacture than their Roman predecessors, Byz. typoi almost invariably show raised (rather than intaglio) framed devices, consisting of words or phrases, which are usually aligned backward. Private names (e.g., “of John”) are common, as are good wishes (“health,” “life,” “immortality”), references to abundance (“fruits of God”), and apotropaic acclamations (“One God”). Like signacula, commercial stamps functioned primarily within the marketplace as is indicated by some of the inscriptions (e.g., “wine vat,” “pithos key,” “good wine,” “Jesus, may you purify”), by their frequent allusions to prosperity or abundance (Fortuna, Hermes, the caduceus), and esp. from the fact that many parallel stamp impressions are preserved on mortaria, amphoras, amphora stoppers, and bricks. A significant majority of surviving Byz. commercial stamps date from the 4th to 8th C.

A notable exception is a large and homogeneous group of amphora stamps, which are 9th–12th C. in date. Smaller and lighter in manufacture than the early stamps, they come in a richer variety of shapes (quatrefoils, birds, human heads) but bear only a limited range of devices—specifically, a handful of male names, in some cases combined or even repeated on a single stamp (“John, Leo”; “John, John, John”). Their dating and function are revealed by correspondences with impressions on the handles and necks of archaeologically excavated amphoras. The fact that they show only a first name (and neither a place of origin nor date) sets them apart from antique amphora stamps, which may have been used to guarantee volume or quality, or to ensure state control of the wine trade. Yet their homogeneity in design and device and their widespread distribution suggest that they were not simple potters’ stamps, but either those of vintners, to facilitate shipment or storage, or those of established (family?) pottery workshops, to control the manufacture or sale of the vessels.


—G.V.

STAPHYDAKES (Σταφυδάκης), writer; fl. ca. 1320. His biography is totally unknown. His most important surviving work is a monody on an emperor of the Palaiologan dynasty, usually identified as Michael IX (cf. R. Förster, BZ 9 [1900] 381 and S. Lampros, NE 1 [1904] 368–70). This brief oration laments the untimely demise of an emperor who predeceased his father and died in Thessalonike. It is a conventional piece, full of repetitions and empty formulas, reminiscent of contemporary works of the same genre. Two of the letters of Staphydates are preserved (ed. S. Lampros, NE 12 [1915] 8–12), and some unpublished epimerisms (in Vienna, ÖNB, phil. gr. 250, fol. 2011–2071) have been attributed to him.


STAR (ἀστήρ). Ancient and Byz. writers on astronomy divided the celestial bodies into two groups: immovable stars, primarily those combined into 12 groups forming the constellations of the Zodiac, and seven moving stars, or planets, to which also belonged the sun and the moon; a comet could also be defined as a star (e.g., Hephaiston of Thebes, lib. 1:22.14, vol. 1, p.64.20–21). The Old Testament rejected the astral cult, common in Babylonia, and reduced the stars to simple celestial “lamps” that emerged only on the fourth day of the Creation; ancient Greeks and Romans, however, saw in planets and stars divine essences—gods or mythical heroes taken to heaven. Christianity condemned the pagan attribution of divinity to stars and denied their control over human actions, even though rudiments of such a view were preserved by astrology and the planets continued to bear the names of Greek gods. Nevertheless, the attitude toward the stars remained somewhat ambivalent: John of Damascus (Exp. fidei 21.187–88, ed. Kottke, Schriften 2:51) stresses that they are composite and perishable but confesses that “we do not know their nature [φυσις].” Some continued to believe that stars were ethereal bodies, inanimate, and knowing God. Stars assumed an important place in Christian legends: the star of Bethlehem is said to have led the Magi to Christ’s cradle, and Constantine I allegedly saw in the sky the sign of the Cross formed of stars.

Taking various forms (usually four-, five-, or seven-pointed), stars were frequent in carved epitaphs and as signs in early Christian epigraphy and on gems and lamps. In addition to their customary appearance in images of the Adoration of the Magi, they occur in many other scenes of the Infancy of Christ (Volbach, Elfenbeinarbeiten, nos. 129, 133, 169). Connotations of sanctity are implied by the eight-pointed stars adorning the books held by evangelists (ibid., no.152). God’s intervention is suggested by the star in early images of the Raising of Lazarus and divine presence by the stars depicted in the vaults of the “Mausoleum” of Galla Placidia and other buildings in Ravenna; set around the portraits of holy men in the crypt of Hosios Loukas they suggest a celestial vault. Particularly in later versions of the Transfiguration, the Anastasis, and the Dormition, Christ appears in a star-shaped or star-filled mandorla. Only rarely, as on St. De-
Pčinja. The original three-aisled basilica has been combined with a cross-in-square structure having five domes and a narthex. The lower walls are constructed of large well-cut stones, and the upper walls are of stone and brick, enlivened by brick arches and decorative brick designs.

Two artists, Michael (Astrapas) and Eutychios, painted their names in the church; another fresco inscription confirms their involvement and indicates they were at work between 1316 and 1318. The ambitious fresco program includes, along with the usual Byz. themes, scenes of the Passion, Miracles and Parables of Christ, and the Appearance of Christ after the Passion, all in the nave. There is also a life of St. George in the nave, the life of the Virgin Mary in the prothesis, and the life of St. Nicholas in the diakonikon (Sevčenko, Nicholas 42, 243–51). The marble iconostasis, which is original, preserves fresco icons of St. George the “Diassoritis” and the Virgin Pela- gonitissa (see Virgin Eleousa). In the narthex, 365 scenes from the church calendar are illustrated for the first time in Serbian art, and there are portraits of Milutin and his wife Simeon.

The vast number of episodes represented and the didactic character of the cycles as a whole nearly disrupt the balance between narrative and image achieved in the earlier work of these masters (e.g., at Studenica). Milutin appreciated their work nonetheless, for he called on some unidentified masters to repeat the program and style of Stari Nagoričino at Gračanica.


-G.B.

STASIS (στασις, lit. "stand,” also staseion or sta- sion), in fiscal terminology, a homestead, frequently with noncontiguous parcels of arable land; more specifically, the taxable property of a taxpayer, usually a peasant. Through the 12th C., in Kóikes, the stasis of a taxpayer, as described within the Stichos, consisted of the individual taxable parcels of land held by the taxpayer upon which his tēlos was based. The records of the cadaster of Thébes indicate that these parcels were frequently spread throughout a village and, because of property transfers within the chorion, the parcels themselves are often described as having been the stasis or part of the stasis of earlier taxpayers. In 13th- and 14th-C. documents from Trebizond, the word staseis is often used to denote particular geographic areas within a chorion, which, though the names they bear were apparently those of previous individual holders, were often divided among several subsequent tenants. In 11th–15th-C. prakitsa, a stasis (and the evidently synonymous hypostasis and oikostasion) consisted of land (chora- phon, vineyard, garden, etc.), animals (oxen, cows, sheep, etc.), dwellings, and agricultural capital (mills, boats, etc.).

The elements within the stasis could be alienated, divided, and inherited by the peasants. Similarly, through purchase and escheat, landlords often acquired the staseis of their peasants. The meaning of the term hypostatikos (e.g., Lauro 2, nos. 91.1.17; 109.644) is uncertain. Dölger (Sechs Praktika 127) explains it as a free peasant who could exercise rights over his land.


-M.B.

STATE PROPERTY. State land, as distinct from the vast imperial domains and/or the land of the crown, had the following characteristics: (1) the land was given to an individual on the basis of the amount of tax imposed; (2) there was no substantial difference between the state tax and private rent; (3) the state had an unrestricted right of confiscation—according to Symeon Metropolitanus (PG 114.1156A), there was a “bad habit” in Byz. that any land on which the emperor or the empress stepped became imperial property; the owner could be compensated by another allotment or just price; (4) imperial confirmation was needed for the transmittance of a title of private property. Scholars who deny the concept of state property explain these phenomena as equivalent to state sovereignty, the state judicial system and/or as facts limited to the land of the crown. In this context the status of the settlers on state land is crucial: it is unclear whether such categories as Stratiota, Demosiarioi, or ekkous- satoi of the dromos were full owners of their allotments or were conditional possessors of state property.

The concept of state property is in obvious contradiction to the Roman law of free property that was adopted by Byz. legislators. It always remains questionable, however, to what extent
Byz. legal practice complied with Roman legal theory and to what extent state control over private estates (just price, protimesis, arithmos, i.e., number of the peasants allowed to be accommodated, etc.) accorded with the idea of free ownership.


STATAKOS (Σταυράκιος), adviser of Empress Irene; died Constantinople 3 June 800. A eunuch and patrikios, Staurakios was described as “the foremost man of his day and in charge of everything” (Theoph. 456.13–14). He became logothetes tou dromou in 781 during Irene’s regency for Constantine VI. In 782, after Tatzates defected, Staurakios was captured while negotiating with the Arabs and held until a treaty was concluded with Harun al-Rashid. Staurakios campaigned in 783 against the Slavs in Greece down to the Peloponesos and celebrated a triumph in Constantinople in Jan. 784 (McCormick, Eternal Victory 141). In 786 he helped Irene suppress Iconoclasm by disarming imperial guards who had prevented iconophile bishops from meeting in Constantinople. In 790 Constantine conspired to remove Staurakios and in Dec. had him beaten, tonsured, and exiled to the Armeniakon. He returned with Irene in 792 and plotted with her against Constantine. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 471.23–25) says that in 797 Staurakios deliberately undermined Constantine’s authority by frustrating his campaign against the Arabs. After Constantine’s fall Staurakios’s influence with Irene was eclipsed by that of Aetios. When Irene fell sick in Feb. 800 Staurakios moved to seize power but was discovered and arrested. Seriously ill, he instigated a revolt in Cappadocia just before he died.


STAUTAKIOS, emperor (28 July–1 Oct. 811); died Constantinople 11 Jan. 812. Son of Emp. Nikephoros I, he was crowned co-emperor in Dec. 803. Staurakios was “completely unfit in appearance, strength, and judgment for such an honor,” according to Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 480.14–15), who also says that Staurakios raped two beautiful girls. Theophanes’ evident hostility toward Staurakios likely stemmed from his own animosity toward Nikephoros. In Dec. 807 Nikephoros married Staurakios to Theophano from
Athens, a relative of Empress Irene who had previously been betrothed (Theoph. 483.18–19). On 26 July 811 Staurakios was gravely wounded during Nikephoros’s fatal encounter with Krum and was carried to Adrianople, where the domestikos ton scholon Stephanos proclaimed him emperor, despite considerable support for Michael (1) Rangabe, the husband of Staurakios’s sister Prokopia. In Constantinople Staurakios tried to hand over power to Theophano and have Michael blinded, but Stephanos organized Michael’s acclamation with the blessing of Patr. nikephoros I, whereupon Staurakios abdicated and took the monastic habit.


STAUROTON (σταυροτόν), a name first applied in the mid-11th C. to a nomisma showing the emperor holding a scepter in the form of a cross (σταυρός). Later, more famously, it was used for the heavy silver coins (initially approximately 8.5 g, but falling to 6 g) that form the most characteristic feature of the last century of Byz. coinage. They were worth half a (notional) gold hyperpyron. The date of their introduction is uncertain: while they have been generally ascribed to the 1370s, either to John V or Andronikos IV (1376–79)—they figure as istoria in Asqipasaçade’s account of Bayezid’s wedding in 1381/2—some evidence favors treating these as a revival of a type introduced by Andronikos III in the 1390s. The name is difficult to explain, for although the legends on these coins begin with crosses—an unusual feature on Byz. coins—these are not conspicuous in their designs. In Italian commercial documents they are termed stravati [sic]. One-half and 1/8th stavratia were also struck.


STAURONIKETA (Σταυρονικήτα), small monastery on the northeast coast of Mt. Athos that flourished primarily in the post-Byz. era. It was probably founded in the late 10th C. by a Greek monk called “Stravoniketas” (“Squint-eyed Niketas”); this is the name given to the monastery when it is first mentioned in a document of 1013. By the 13th C. the monastery had been destroyed (by pirate raids?) and abandoned; in 1287 its lands and ruined buildings were granted to Koutoulmousiou. It was revived and restored in the 16th C. The present buildings and treasures, with the exception of 79 MSS (Lampros, Athos 1:75–90; Polites, Katalogoi 178–95) and a 14th(?)-C. mosaic icon of St. Nicholas (Furlan, Icone a mosaico, no.27), are 16th C. or later.


STAUROPEGION (σταυροπηγίον, lit. “fixure of a cross”). An act of 1047 mentions stauropegia, and specifically wooden stauropegia (Iv. 1, no.29.11, 84), used as boundary marks. In a liturgical context stauropegon designated a cross fixed by a bishop on the site of a new church (Goar, Euchologion 485, 488). The term was employed primarily for patriarchal monasteries: for example, a sigillium of Patr. Polyueuktos of 964 (MM 5:251.24–30) proclaimed the monastery of the Philosopher, near the village of Demestane, as a patriarchal stauropegon and therefore independent of the metropolitan of Patras and the bishop of Lakedaemonia. The decision of Patr. George II Xiphilinos of 1197 (Rhalles-Potles, Syntagmata 5:102.9–14) and the enkyklika of Patr. Germanos II of 1233 concerning Epirot monasteries (E. Curtz, BZ 16 [1907] 138.38–44) contrast stauropegial communities with those under the jurisdiction of local bishops. Patr. Niphon in 1312 (Prot., no.11.153-55) also did not draw a distinction between stauropegial and patriarchal monasteries. The sigillium of Patr. Antony IV of 1391 (RegPatr, fasc. 6, no.2892), on the other hand, distinguished between them; accordingly Antony, in a sigillium of 1393 (Koutloum., no.40), granting the Koutoulmousiou monastery the status of patriarchal monastery, did not use the term stauropegon; at that time only those monasteries that had been actually founded by the patriarch were considered stauropegial. In 1396, however, Antony gave stauropegial rights to the Pantokrator Monastery on Athos, even though he had not founded it (Pantokr., no.12.33).

Stauropogel monasteries acknowledged the jurisdiction of the patriarch, commemorated him in the diptychs, and paid him the kanonikon. They provided an important source of revenue for the patriarchate; as a consequence Michael VIII, dur-
ing his struggle against Patr. John XI Bekkos, temporarily abolished the right of *stauropigion.


**STEATITE**, a usually green or buff stone, carved into icons or pendants and known to the Byz. as *amiantos lithos* ("spotted stone"). Easier to carve than *ivory*, it is also more fragile; examples are therefore generally more worn and often fragmentary. More than 170 steatite carvings survive, attributed by Kalavrezou (*infra*), with two 10th-C. exceptions, to the 11th C. and later. Many represent Christ, the Virgin, and esp. military saints. Cycles of the life of Christ are concentrated in 12th-C. specimens. From the 14th C. there survive two *patens*, one naming *Alexios* (III) *Komnenos* of Trebizond. Although often technically and formally simpler than ivories—undercutting is little used—steatite may well have been carved by the same hands. Their small size suggests that steatite icons were intended for private chapels, while *crosses, phylakteria* (see *Amulets*), and seals of this material were evidently for personal use. One steatite icon is listed in the inventory of the Eleousa monastery at Veljusa (ed. L. Petit, *IRAIK* 6 [1900] 118, 22–23), and two epigrams of Manuel Philes (*Carmina*, ed. Miller, 1, nos. CCXVIII, CCXIX) are devoted to a steatite of the Virgin.


**STEEL YARD** (*καυμπανος*, Lat. *statera*), a bronze instrument for gross weighing based on the second principle of unequal-arm beams. Invented by the Romans, steelyards are levers having one or more fixed points (fulcra) by which they are held, a shorter arm from which the load is suspended in a pan or by hooks, and a longer arm along which the counterpoise (see *Weights*) is slid until the beam is in balance; scales appropriate to the various fulcra are incised on the facets of the longer arm, which may also bear the owner's name. Steelyards were esp. popular in the 5th–7th C. An unusually large example, discovered in the early 7th-C. Yassi Ada shipwreck (G.K. Sams in G. Bass, F.H. Van Doorninck, Jr., *Yassi Ada [College Station, Tex., 1982] 202–30), is 1.46 m long; with its burst weight of 24 Roman pounds (*litra*), it could handle a load equal to nearly 300 pounds avoidopus.

LIT. Vikan-Nesbitt, *Security* 32ff. —G.V.

**STEFAN LAZAREVIĆ**, prince of Serbia (from 1389; called *krales* in Douk. 39, 12) and *despotes* (from 1402); born ca. 1373, died in village of Glavi near Kragujevac 19 July 1427. A son of *Lazar* who fell at Kosovo *Polje* in 1389, Stefan inherited his father’s territory. He took part in the battles of *Rovine* (1395), *Nikopolis* (1396), and *Ankara* (1402) as an Ottoman vassal; Doukas (Douk. 97, 10–27) describes his heroism at Ankara in contrast to the cowardice of Bayezid I. En route back to Serbia, Stefan stopped in Constantinople, received the title of *despotes*, and soon thereafter (1405) married Helena, daughter of Francesco II *Gattilusio*.

The internal strife among the Ottomans following their defeat at Ankara enabled Stefan to consolidate Serbian territory and to form an anti-Turkish coalition; the Ottoman prince *Stefan Manojević* Čelebi had to acknowledge Stefan’s authority. On the other hand, Stefan accepted Hungarian suzerainty for which he was granted the Mačva region and Belgrade (in 1403/4), which became his capital. He also inherited *Zeta* from his uncle *Balša III* in 1421. In his expansion, however, he encountered resistance from Venice, which claimed rights to the coast of Zeta and negotiated with the sultan against Stefan. In 1421 an alliance between Byz., Serbia, and the Turkish usurper Mustafa was being negotiated, while Venice sought the favor of *Murad II*. In 1424 Stefan participated in negotiations between Sigismund of Hungary (1387–1437) and John VIII Palaiologos and in 1425 tried to bring about a reconciliation between Venice and Hungary. Although he was faced with Turkish attacks from 1425 onward, Stefan nevertheless refused to extradite Mustafa, who in 1427 had fled from Thessalonike to Serbia. His attempts to militarize Serbia for a new war against the Ottomans were ended by his death (J. Kalić, *Istorijski časopis* 29–30 [1982–83] 7–20). Since he died childless, his nephew *George Branković* inherited his land.

Stefan, himself a writer, was a patron of literature and the arts and invited *Grigorij Camblak*
and Konstantin Kostenečki to his court. The latter’s biography of Stefan is an important work of Serbian literature. Stefan built as his mausoleum the Resava monastery (1406–18), where his portrait is preserved.


STEFAN NEMANJA (Nemǎn of Greek sources), grand župan of Raška (i.e., Serbia) and founder of the Nemanni Dynasty; born Ribnica in Doksela, died Mt. Athos 15 Feb. 1199 (F. Barisić, HilZh, vol. 2 [Belgrade 1971] 31–40) or 1200 (K. Jireček, J. Radonić, Istorijska Srba2, vol. 1 [Belgrade 1978] 160, n. 83). He was appointed grand župan (satrapes in Greek terminology) by Manuel I, probably sometime between 1165 and 1168 (J. Kalić in VizIzvori 4:144f, n.135) and ruled until 25 Mar. 1196 (R. Novaković, ZRI 11 [1968] 129–39). With Hungarian and Venetian support, Nemanja rebelled against Byz., at first successfully. In 1172, however, Manuel attacked Nemanja with a large army and forced him to surrender; the Byz. emperor then took the conquered rebel to Constantinople and made a triumphal entry (Kinn. 287.18–288.3). Manuel’s victory over Nemanja was depicted in wall paintings in the imperial palace.

Nemanja was restored to power as a Byz. vassal; in 1183, however, taking advantage of the chaotic situation after Manuel’s death, he rebelled once more and invaded Byz. territory in alliance with Běla III of Hungary. The allies sacked Belgrade, Branicevo, Niš, and Sofia. Nemanja retained control over Niš, where in 1189 he cordially received Frederick I Barbarossa and other participants in the Third Crusade. The župan expanded his territory to the east and south and united Zeta with Raška. He eradicated the Bogomils, whose influence was spreading in Raška. In the early 1190s Nemanja tried to improve relations with Byz.: he married his second son Stefan the First-Crowned to Eudokia, a niece of Emp. Isaac II Angelos, who received the Byz. title of sebastianokrator.

In 1196 Nemanja abdicated in favor of Stefan the First-Crowned, while giving Zeta to his eldest son Vukan to rule. He first retired to the monastery he had founded at Studenica and became the monk Symeon; later he went with his youngest son Sava of Serbia to Mt. Athos and began the construction of the Hilandar monastery, where he died. Nemanja also built the monasteries of Djurdjevi Stupovi and of the Virgin Mary and St. Nicholas in Toplica. His portrait (as Symeon) is represented on the frescoes of many Serbian monasteries. Both Sava and Stefan the First-Crowned wrote biographies of their father.


STEFAN OF NOVGOROD, author of a description in Slavonic of Constantinople’s sacred sites, based on a visit during Holy Week of 1348 or 1349. Stefan traveled “to revere the holy places and kiss the bodies of the saints,” though his privileged reception by Patr. Isidore I Boucheiras and the proostorator Phakeolatos in Hagia Sophia may indicate an additional purpose: to bring a contribution from Rus’ toward repairing the dome that had partially collapsed in 1346, and perhaps to win Byz. support against Muscovite pressure on the Novgorod archbishopric. His silence on the still-damaged dome is problematic (due perhaps to later editing or to the pilgrim’s need for an unblemished description?). Stefan’s work, whose arrangement suggests a series of six or seven daily itineraries, is permeated with a sense of wonder, yet among Eastern Slavic accounts it is also notably vivid and precise. Besides some unique information on monuments (e.g., the monastery of St. Demetrios and its tomb of “Laskariasaf,” probably John IV Laskaris), Stefan also notes details of nonreligious topography (e.g., the harbor of Kontoskalion). His commentaries conflate history and legend, fusing victories over Chosroes II’s allies in 629 and over the Rus’ in 860 and claiming that Theodore of Studios sent books to Rus’. The economic aspect of religious tourism in Constantinople is illuminated by Stefan’s comment that the stingy or impudent pilgrim will have restricted access to relics.


STEFAN THE FIRST-CROWNED, grand župan of Serbia (1195–1217), king (from 1217); born ca.1165, died 24 Sept. 1227. The middle son of
STEVEN UROŠ I (Ošorhos), king of Serbia (1243–76); died in Zachlumia as the monk Symeon probably 1 May 1277. Son of STEFAN THE FIRST-CROWNED, UROŠ succeeded on the throne his deposed brother Vladislav (ca.1234–43). UROŠ had first to cope with the hostile alliance of Bulgaria and Dubrovnik, which continued to pose a threat until the Bulgarian tsar Michael Asen was murdered in 1257. In the south, UROŠ joined the anti-Nicaean coalition of Manfred of Sicily and Michael of Epiros and in 1258 penetrated into Macedonia, occupying Skopje, Prilep, and Kičevo. In the following year, defeated by Michael VIII Palaiologos at Pelagonia, UROŠ lost these lands. In the north, he faced the rivalry of Hungary; after an unsuccessful war in 1268, he negotiated a peace agreement confirmed by the marriage of his older son Dragutin and the Hungarian princess Katalina, daughter of Stephen V. To improve his position in the Balkans, Michael VIII planned a marriage between his daughter Anna and UROŠ’s younger son STEFAN UROŠ II MILUTIN. In 1271–72 the Byz. emperor sent to Serbia Patr. Joseph I and John Bekkos to negotiate this marital alliance. Anna and her large retinue went as far as Ohrid. According to Pachymeres, the envoys were shocked at the sight of the simplicity and primitive conditions of UROŠ’s court (Pachym., ed. Failler, 2:453–57). The embassy returned to Constantinople with no results.

During his reign, UROŠ consolidated his kingdom economically and politically and Serbia became an important power in the Balkans. Using Saxon miners, refugees from the Mongol invasion of Transylvania, he opened up rich mines of silver, gold, lead, copper, and iron. The development of metallurgy intensified trade, with centers at UROŠ’s coastal cities of Kotor, Bar, Ulcinj, and Scutari along with independent Dubrovnik. UROŠ also minted the first Serbian silver coinage. In his later years his son Dragutin, under the pressure of Hungarian in-laws, demanded an appanage and an active role in state affairs. When UROŠ refused these requests, Dragutin rebelled and, with the help of the Hungarian army, defeated his father at Gacko (Hum) in 1276. UROŠ abdicated and died shortly thereafter. UROŠ was the founder of Sopočani, where his portraits are represented together with those of his family.


STEVEN UROŠ II MILUTIN (Μητριωτης), Serbian king (from 1282); died Nerodimije Palace in Kosovo region 29 Oct. 1321. Second son of STEFAN UROŠ I, Milutin succeeded his disabled older brother Dragutin, who abdicated in 1282 but maintained and eventually expanded his appanage in northwestern Serbia. Milutin, whose first wife Helena was the daughter of JOHN I DOUKAS of Thessaly, took an anti-Byz. position from the beginning of his reign; he launched a war against the empire and captured Skopje (1282) and Dyrac, as well as a great part of Macedonia. He repelled the attack of the Bulgarian Šisman of Vidin and managed to appease Šisman’s suzerain,
the Tatar khan Nogay. In 1298 Milutin agreed to change his policy toward Byz., signed a peace treaty, and took Andronikos II’s daughter Sini- 
monis as his fourth wife. Despite a temporary alliance with Charles of Valois in 1308, Milutin remained within the Byz. orbit: during his reign, 
the Serbian court adopted Byz. imperial ceremonial and titulature; Byz. influence increased in Serbia; in the lands he conquered Byz. institutions 
were retained. Milutin looked to Constantinople for support during internal tensions in Serbia when he faced the resistance of his brother Drag 

guin and of his own son Stefan Uroš III Dečanski, the “junior king” administering Zeta. He was able to suppress his son’s revolt in 1314 and 

exile him to Constantinople.

Milutin also sought the support of the church by founding many monasteries and making generous donations to them. His biographer Danilo 
II (Danilo) refers to 15 churches and monastic buildings constructed by Milutin in Serbia, Constantinople, Thessalonike, Mt. Athos, Jerusalem, 
and Mt. Sinai. They include the Xenon of the Kral in Constantinople, Hilandar (main church), Banjska, St. Nikita (Čučerski), Gračanica, Studen 
ica (King’s Church), Staro Nagorično, and the Virgin of Ljeviška in Prizren. Portraits of Milutin are preserved at the last four mentioned 
churches and at Arilje.


—J.S.A.

STEFAN UROŠ III DEČANSKI, son of Stefan Uroš II Milutin, Serbian king (1321–31; crowned 6 Jan. 1322); died in fortress of Zvečan 11 Nov. 
1331. In his youth his father was forced to send him as a hostage to the Tatar khan Nogay, with whom he stayed until 1299. As “junior king” he 
ruled Zeta from 1309. In 1314 he participated in an unsuccessful revolt of Zeta’s aristocracy against Milutin. As a consequence he was imprisoned, 
partially blinded, and exiled with his family for seven years to Constantinople, where he remained under the protection of Andronikos II. Before 
Milutin died, he permitted his son to return to Serbia. According to legend, Stefan miraculously regained his sight after his father’s death in 1321.

After succeeding his father as king, he had to face opposition from his half-brother Constantine and his cousin Vladislav (son of Dragutin), but 
held on to his throne.

Stefan first married Theodora, a daughter of the Bulgarian tsar Smilac. After her death he took as his second wife ca.1324–26 Maria Palaiologina, 
daughter of the panhypersebastos John Palaiologos and granddaughter of Theodore Metochites. During the civil war of the 1320s between 
Andronikos II and Andronikos III, Stefan supported the old emperor and was rewarded with some lands near Prosek. As a result he was in a 
precarious situation following the defeat of Andronikos II in 1328, especially after the victorious emperor Andronikos III formed an alliance with 
the Bulgarian tsar Michael III Šišman in 1330. Stefan, however, defeated this Byz.-Bulgarian co 
alition at the battle of Velburđ that same year and recovered for Serbia some Macedonian cities it had previously lost. Soon thereafter the semi 
feudal lords of Zeta revolted against Stefan; his own son Stefan Dušan, the “junior king” then ruling Zeta, defeated Dečanski and imprisoned 
him (Aug. 1331) in Zvečan, where he soon died. Folk tradition developed his image as a martyr allegedly blinded by his father and strangled by 
his own son.

Stefan started the construction of the church at Dečani, from which he derived his surname; the building was completed by Dušan. His portrait is 
preserved at Dečani, where he was buried. Biographies of Dečanski were written by Grigorij Camblak and Danilo II.


—J.S.A.

STEFAN UROŠ IV DUŠAN, Serbian kralj (from 8 Dec. 1331), basileus and autokratör of Serbia and 
“România” (from Dec. 1345); died 20 Dec. 1355. In his youth Dušan spent seven years in Constan 
tinople with his exiled father, Stefan Uroš III Dečanski. After his return he ruled Zeta as “ju 
nior king” and distinguished himself in the battle of Velburđ (1330). In 1331 he deposed his father 
with the support of the nobles of Zeta.

Dušan devoted his principal efforts to the con 
quest of Byz. lands south of Serbia. First, he 
protected his western frontier by a treaty with
Dubrovnik and established peace with Bulgaria by marrying in 1332 princess Helena, sister of tsar Ivan Alexander. Then, in alliance with the Byz. rebel Syrgiannes Dušan waged war against Andronikos III in Macedonia; seized Prilep, Ohrid, and the Strymon region; and forced the Byz. emperor to sign a truce (24 Aug. 1334), according to which the Serbian kralj retained the lands he conquered. The Civil War of 1341–47 gave Dušan an excuse to intervene again in Byz. affairs. He backed John VI Kantakouzenos in 1342–43, but then, after the latter's success and the appearance of Turkish mercenaries in Macedonia, he shifted his support to John V Palaiologos. In the 1340s the Serbs annexed Epiros, Albania, and Thessaly, so that their power extended from the Danube to the Gulf of Corinth and from the Adriatic to the Aegean. In 1345, after his conquest of Serres, Dušan proclaimed himself emperor of the Serbs and the Rhomaioi; the next year he was crowned at Skopje and his son Stefan Uroš V became "junior king." At the same time the archbishopric at Peć was proclaimed a patriarchate independent of Constantinople.

Dušan's conquest of former Byz. territories intensified the process of the political and cultural hellenization of Serbia: Greek magnates and officials were integrated into the ruling elite of the Serbian empire; the administrative structure and titulature acquired Byz. features; Byz. legal texts were in part translated (Syntagma of Matthew Blastares), in part used as the basis of the new Serbian legal code (Zakonik); Dušan was a benefactor of monasteries on Mt. Athos and himself spent several months in 1347/8 at Hilandar (M. Živojinović, ZRVI 21 [1982] 119–26); the Greek language was used by Dušan's chancellery; and Serbian diplomatics was influenced by Byz. formularies.

Portraits of Dušan are preserved in churches at Peć, Bela Crkva at Karan, Dječani, Lesnovo, Ljubotin, St. Nicholas in Ohrid, and Matejča.


—J.S.A. A.K.

**STEFAN UROŠ V**, also called Stefan Uroš Nejaki, "the Weak," Serbian tsar (from Dec. 1355); died 2 or 4 Dec. 1371. Son and heir of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, he was crowned "junior king" in 1346 at the time of his father's coronation and entrusted with lands in the northern part of Dušan's empire. After he succeeded his father in 1355, he proved unable to control the heterogeneous components of the empire and the centrifugal tendencies of the regional governors. Thus he presided over the disintegration of the empire established by his father and its dismemberment into several independent states (Hum or Zachlumia, Zeta, Serres, etc.), with the result that Serbian territory became more vulnerable to the advancing Ottomans.

Soon after Stefan V became tsar, his uncle Symeon Uroš rebelled unsuccessfully; when the Serbian nobles supported Stefan Uroš at the national assembly in 1357, Symeon established independent rule in Thessaly and Epiros (1359). In 1365 Stefan Uroš appointed as co-ruler the powerful courtier Vukašin, who soon came to dominate the partnership. Other semi-feudal lords at this time were John Uglješa in Sveti and Constantine Dračaš in eastern Macedonia. The internal strife in Braničevo enabled the Hungarians to impose their suzerainty over this province, which then seceded from Serbia. The Byz. took advantage of Stefan's weakness to launch attacks on Serbian territory: they occupied the region of Christopolis and in 1356 Matthew I Kantakouzenos tried to seize Serres, but was taken captive.

Together with his mother Helena, Stefan Uroš built the Matejić monastery. The best portrait of him is in the church at Psača.


—J.S.A.
even though the oldest MSS are not necessarily "better," that is, closer to the archetype. The stemma aims at reconstruction of the author's text (unnecessary in those rare cases in which autographs survive) and tracing, albeit hypothetically, its destiny: thus on the basis of his stemma, J.L. van Dieten suggested that two sequential drafts of Niketas Choniates' History survive, and J. Koder surmised that the hymns of Symeon the Theologian underwent a stylistic pseudo-emendation after Niketas Stethatos had prepared their edition soon after his master's demise.

This method is hardly applicable to vernacular literary works for which the text has been modified substantially, partly by oral tradition: thus we cannot establish the stemma of the Digenes Akritas but must deal with separate and mostly independent versions (not recensions). To a smaller extent, the same phenomenon can be observed in the transmission of popular romances of chivalry and in the development of hymnography and chronography (it is impossible to establish the stemma of the chronicle family of Symeon Logothete because the MSS are authors' versions rather than scribal copies).


STEMMATOGYRION (στεμματογύριον), or stematourgion, as in Ferjančić, a crown worn by a despotes. The term is used only in a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 275.6–14), where the crown is described as being decorated with precious stones and pearls; if the despotes was the emperor's son, the crown had a small arc (kamara) on each of four sides; if he was the emperor's son-in-law, the stemmatogyrion had only one arc in front. George Akropolites (Akrop. 159.9) uses the phrase despotike tainia for the crown of the despotes, while Pachymeres (Pachym., ed. Failler, 2:435.12) is even less specific, referring to the kalyptra (head-dress) of the despotes.

Although attempts have been made to identify as stemmatogyria certain crowns depicted in miniatures (Piltz, infra), such identifications should be viewed as hypothetical.


STENIMACHOS (Στενιμαχος), a site southeast of Philippopolis, in the southern part of modern Asenovgrad, Bulgaria, at the entrance to a gorge of the river Asenica. A chorion in the late 11th C., it is characterized as phrourion and eryma in Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 518.20, 642.70), asy in George Akropolites (Akrop. 121.14), and polis in Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 1:135.19–20). In the 11th C. it belonged to Gregory Pakourianos and is described in detail in his typtikon (P. Gautier, REB 42 [1984] 35.272–78, 111.1532–44, 131.1842): a large village, Stenimachos contained two kastra, estates, and monastic institutions; Pakourianos founded there a xenodocheion that was to be supplied by the village (two modoi of wheat, two metra of wine, seeds, and vegetables every day); he also gave to this xenodocheion a water-mill and a paroikos exempted from regular rents and services but obliged to provide the xenodocheion with water and wood; a panegyris (fair) took place in Stenimachos.

At the time of the Fourth Crusade Stenimachos played a substantial role in wars between the Bulgarians, Latins, and Byz.: IVANKO controlled Stenimachos until Alexios III captured it in 1200. The knights of Renier of Trit were besieged by the Bulgarians in the "strong castle of Estanemac" for 13 months (1205–06); when Renier departed, the fortress was taken by Kalajan. John III Vatatzes conquered it in 1246, but Stenimachos kept changing hands; finally Anna of Savoy surrendered it to the Bulgarians in 1344, but the whole area of Philippopolis was occupied by the Turks in 1364.

Excavations have revealed remains of medieval Stenimachos. With the exception of a necropolis of the 3rd–4th C., the monuments are to be dated in the 12th–14th C. A hoard found nearby contains coins from Alexios I to the imitations of those of the Latin emperors of Constantinople. A lead seal of Alexios I was also discovered. The center of the site formed a stronghold (the so-called fortress of Asen) north of which lay the town proper whose population was involved in both agriculture and craftsmanship (metalworking, production of ceramics, and weaving). The remains of fortresses located nearby on the way to Philippopolis were found on a hill near the
Church of the Archangels and on the slope where the Church of John the Baptist (of the 12th–14th C.) still stands.


—A.K.

STEPHANITATES AND ICHNELATES. See SETH, SYMEON.

STEPHEN (Στέφανος “crown, wreath”), personal name. It existed already in antiquity. The name was widely used in the 4th and 5th C. (PLRE 1:852f, 2:1028–32). The popularity of Stephen the First Martyr no doubt contributed to the spread of this name in the Christian milieu; for example, Sozomenos mentions, besides the first martyr, two ecclesiastics of this name. The growth of its popularity, however, coincided with the period of Iconoclasm; several Stephens were executed during this time, according to legends. Two patriarchs of Constantinople of the 9th–10th C. bore the name. Theophanes the Confessor names 19 Stephens, as many as Paul, and in Skylitzes there are 17 Stephens, more than Niketas. Relatively numerous in Laura, vol. 1 (10th–12th C.), in which Stephen precedes Athanasios and Euthymios and holds twelfth place, the name is very infrequent in Laura, vols. 2–3 (13th–15th C.).

—A.K.

STEPHEN, jurist active in the time of Justinian I, author of a Greek paraphrase (index) of the Digest provided with notes (paraphrasi). A great number of fragments of this work have been preserved, esp. in the scholia to the Basilika. It is unclear whether the detached résumés of passages of the Codex Justinianus attributed to Stephen in the MSS, and commonly assigned to a separate course of his lectures on the Codex, are also taken from what must have been an extensive commentary on the Digest. H.J. Scheltema (Tijdschrift 26 [1958] 9–14) has with good reason connected the text of Reinaich papyrus Inv. 2173 to Stephen’s series of lectures on the Digest.


—A.S.

STEPHAN OF ALEXANDRIA, philosopher; probably born in Athens between about 550 and 555, died Constantinople? after 619/20. According to Wolska-Conus (infra), he is the same person as Stephen of Athens. His teaching activity in Alexandria is attested by John Moschos (PG 87,3:2929D). He was close to the circle of John Philoponos. The hypothesis that Harkleios summoned Stephen to Constantinople and appointed him oikoumenikos didaskalos was rejected by H.-G. Beck (in Polychronion 72f), but found a new supporter in A. Lumpe (CIMed Dissertationes 9 [1973] 150–59). The list of his works is not yet established. Stephen wrote a commentary on several treatises of Aristotle and, probably, on the Introduction by Porphyry; he also wrote an Explanation to the astronomical commentary of Theon. J. Dufvy considers as his main extant works the commentaries on the Prognosticon and Aphorisms of Hippocrates, and the Therapeutics of Galen (in the title of which Stephen is called an Athenian). More questionable remains the attribution to Stephen of some alchemical works preserved under his name. Not authentic is a treatise (apparently of 775) allegedly predicting the destiny of Muhammad’s dynasty. On the other hand, the commentary on Ptolemy ascribed to John Tzetzes in fact belongs to Stephen (R. Browning, CLRev 15 [1965] 262f).


—A.K.

STEPHON OF BYZANTIUM, author of the Ethnika, a list of geographical names complete with related proverbs, oracles, and miracles; fl. probably ca.528–35. There is no external evidence for Stephen; from the Ethnika it has been concluded that he was a Constantinopolitan grammarian who dedicated his book to Justinian I. Constantine VII
Porphyrogennetos seems to be the last scholar who was familiar with the complete text of the *Ethnika*. The *Souda* lexicographers and Eustathios of Thessalonike used the abridgment of a certain *grammatikos*, Hermolaos, who is otherwise unknown; this epitome survives in several MSS of the 15th C. and later. Although drawing primarily on ancient geographers (including Prolemy, Strabo, and Pausanius), grammarians (the 5th-C. Oros of Miletois and others), commentators on Homer (H. Erbe, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliascholien* [Munich 1960] 251–69), and historians (Polybios, etc.), Stephen on occasion gives contemporary names (the Goths, Anastasiopolis, George Choiroboskos); there is always the possibility that such information originated with Hermolaos and that the mention of Choiroboskos is an interpolation. Stephen was a Christian who characterizes Bethlehem as the birthplace “of our God and Savior,” yet he rarely cites Christian authors (Eusebios and Synesios are each mentioned once). Stephen’s geographical knowledge is poor (J. Pargioire, *EO* 2 [1898–99] 206–14), and his etymologies are confused. The significance of the *Ethnika* lies more in its preservation of ancient tradition than in its originality.


**STEPHEN OF SOUGDAIA**, Iconodule bishop of Sougaia (Suroz); saint; born village of Borisa- bos, Cappadocia, ca. 700?, died Sougaia after 787; feastday 15 Dec. Information on his life is found in the *Menologion of Basil II*, the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, and a short Greek *enkomion*, whereas his longer vita is known only in a 15th-C. Slavo-Russian version (preserved in a 16th-C. MS). The data about Stephen are confusing (e.g., whether he was educated in Athens or Constantinople), and the chronology inconsistent: he was supposedly ordained by Patr. Germanos I (early 8th C.), but also sent to Sougaia by Leo V the Armenian (early 9th C.). Probably he was appointed by Leo III, recalled by Constantine V, imprisoned, and released through the intervention of an influential lady, Irene, identified by Vestberg (*infra*) as wife of Constantine V and daughter of Theodore, Khazar ruler of Kerch. The Slavo-Russian version of Stephen’s vita became the object of heated controversy because it mentions an attack of the Rus’ on Crimea led by prince Bravlin; if we believe the vita, this would be evidence of the first attack of the Rus’ on Byz. territory. The authenticity of the vita, however, was denied by G. da Costa-Louillet (*Byzantion* 15 [1941] 242–44); it was supported with qualification by Vasyliev (*Russian Attack* 81–83), but is accepted by Soviet scholars (e.g., Levchenko, *Rus-VizOtn* 50–55).


—A.K.

**STEPHEN OF TARON.** See Asolik.

**STEPHEN SABAITES**, also called Manšur, hagiographer and hymnographer; born Damascus 725?, died in Lavra of St. Sabas in Palestine on 2 Apr. 807 (S. Eustratiades, *Nea Sion* 28 [1933] 601f). Nephew of John of Damascus, Stephen lived in the Lavra from the age of ten, according to his vita written by his pupil Leontios. He wrote the *Martyrdom* (Martyrion) of 20 monks murdered in the Lavra by Arabs in 797 as well as various hymns. He can also be identified with the author of the Life of Romanos the Younger (died 786) that is known in a Georgian translation (P. Pesters, *AB* 90 [1911] 393–427). I. Phokylides (*Nea Sion* 10 [1910] 64–75) distinguished the hymnographer from the hero of the vita by Leontios; Leontios, however, says explicitly that his Stephen produced a *Diegesis* of the pillage of the Lavra (AASS Jul. 3:578B), while the author of the *Martyrdom* states that he also “wove hymns” (*PPSb* 19-3, p.39-29–30). Stephen’s poetry includes *heirmos*, *kanones*, and *idiomela* (i.e., hymns sung to a unique melody) that were dedicated to the Virgin, saints, and festivals. The *kanon* on the translation to Bari of the relics of Nicholas of Myra, preserved under Stephen’s name, cannot be his work on chronological grounds.

STEPHEN THE PERSIAN, chief eunuch and sakellarios under Justinian II. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 367.16–17) describes him as “lordly and authoritative, exceedingly bloodthirsty and cruel.” Initially in charge of administering finances, in 694 Stephen was also made responsible for supervising Justinian’s building projects, including additions to the Great Palace. Stephen’s harsh treatment of contractors and laborers greatly increased popular dissatisfaction with Justinian. Theophanes (367.18–21) also reports that he whipped Justinian’s mother Anastasia while the emperor was away. During the uprising of 695 a mob seized Stephen and dragged him along the Mese to the Forum Bovis, where he was burned alive.


STEPHEN THE YOUNGER, saint; born Constantinople ca.713, died Constantinople 28 Nov. 764 (O. Volk, LTHK 9:1049), a date questioned by G. Huxley (GRBS 18 [1977] 105–07); feastday 28 Nov. A lateborn son of a craftsman, Stephen was baptized by Patr. GERMANOS I. His parents brought him to Mt. AUEXTIANOS, where he lived as a hermit and worked as a calligrapher. After the death of John, his spiritual father, Stephen founded a monastery that became, according to his hagiographer, a center of monastic resistance against the Iconoclastic policy of CONSTANTINE V. Supposedly Stephen advised the monks to flee to the Black Sea, Rome, Lycia, and elsewhere. After his refusal to accept the local council of HIERIA in 754, he was accused of illegally tonsuring an imperial favorite, George Synkletos, brought to Constantinople and executed after long confinement and tortures. Stephen the Deacon, author of Stephen’s vita, notes that he wrote it 42 years after Stephen’s martyrdom (in traditional chronology ca.806).

The vita is full of precious details, for example, the procedure of “washing-away” the monastic habit from George Synkletos. The role of icons is prominent: an icon of the Virgin predicted Stephen’s birth, and icons helped heal a blind man (Sevchenko, “Hagiography” 120). Many passages of the vita were borrowed from the Life of EUThYMios THE GREAT by CYRIL OF SKYPHOTPIS (J. Gill, OrChP 6 [1940] 114–20). The vita influenced many authors who wrote on Iconoclasm, for instance, GEORGE HAMARTOLOS. Another vita was written by SYMEON METAPHRastes.

Representation in Art. The portrait of Stephen differs from those of other monks in that, as the great martyr of Iconoclasm, he holds an icon or icon diptych, which usually bears the bust figures of Christ and the Virgin. At the Enkleistra of St. NEOPHYTOS, he holds a large icon of the type known as the VIRGIN ELEUSA, perhaps meant to represent the famous nearby icon of the Virgin Kykkotissa. Stephen is depicted as still fairly young, with black hair and beard. His death by dragging is illustrated in one MS of the menologion of SYMEON METAPHRastes (Athos, Doch. 5, fol.254r). He is one of the witnesses to the TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY on a 14th-C. icon in the British Museum.


STEPHATOS, NIKEIAS, theologian, monk, and probably, at the end of his life, hegooumenos of STOUDIOS; born 1005?, died Constantinople ca.1090. A disciple of SYMEON THE THEOLOGIAN, Stethatos (Στηθάτος) wrote his vita and published his works. Apparently Stethatos polemized against MICHAEL I KEROUARIOS concerning the right of Stoudite deacons to wear girdles (zonai). In 1054 he participated in the dispute against the Latins, but his tone was relatively moderate; HUMBERT declared that Stethatos eventually yielded and became the legate’s friend (PL 143:1001). Unlike Symeon, Stethatos ascribed great importance to hierarchy: in accordance with pseudo-DIONYSIOS THE REPOPAGITE he regarded the earthly hierarchy as resembling the celestial one. In Stethatos’s theology there is no place for an agonizing search for salvation, as in Symeon: man is the summit of creation, the king of creatures, and, having both soul and body, he mediates between the world and God. The historical Eden is of no avail now; the visible world is a paradise from which man can rise to God by understanding the
symbolism and significance of intelligible objects. Stethatos also wrote discourses against the Jews and Armenians.


-A.K.

STICHARION (στιχάριον), a long tunic with sleeves, the primary vestment of the higher orders of the Orthodox clergy (deacons and above). It was usually made of linen or silk and could be of any color. The sticharion of a bishop was adorned with two pairs of dark vertical stripes called potamoi (see CLAVUS); the sticharion of a deacon was usually plain white, to judge by representations, and was never belted.


-N.P.S.

STICHERARION (στιχήραριον), a liturgical MS with musical notation, containing the stichera for Orthros and Vespers services throughout the year. Three sets of stichera make up the bulk of a complete sticherarion: from the Menaion, from the Triodion and the Pentekostarion, and from the Oktoechos; stichera were also frequently included for special saints' days or feasts of local significance. Presumably because of the sheer mass of material involved, the sets of stichera were often divided into separate volumes. An 11th-C. revision of the sticherarion (with some saints' days removed) continued in use until the 15th C., when more florid melodies replaced the previous syllabic style. Several hundred sticheraria survive, each normally containing about 2,000 stichera.


-E.M.J.

STICHOS (στίχος, lit. "line"), the basic entry in a praktikon or kodix, the smallest fiscal unit and the nucleus of cadastral organization, so called because originally, or customarily, the entire stichos was entered on a single line of the kodix. Stichoi were normally composed of three parts: (1) the name of the taxpayer responsible for paying the tax (in the kodix this was not necessarily the person who actually worked the land; in the praktikon, other members of the taxpayer's household were usually listed as well); (2) a description of the stasis of the taxpayer (in the kodix, only immovable properties are listed; in the praktikon, immovables as well as animals owned by the taxpayer); and (3) the telos the taxpayer owed the fisc (for the kodix) or his lord (for the praktikon). By semantic transference, stichos was occasionally used in the 10th–12th C. to denote the properties themselves.

Lit. Svoronos, Cadastre 22–24.

-M.B.

STIGME. See Hour.

STILBES,CONSTANTINE, rhetorician and poet, didaskalos (teacher) at the Patriarchal School in Constantinople, metropolitan of Kyzikos (under the name of Cyril) from ca.1204. Stilbes (Στιλβης) devoted two (?) poems to fires in Constantinople—those of 1197 and 1198 according to Ch. Loparev (Visioboz 3 [1917] 72–88), whereas Browning considers the verses to be two redactions of the same poem ("Patriarchal School" 27, n.1). His speech to Alexios III (ed. R. Browning, Byzantium 28 [1958–59] 36–40; see J. Darrouzès, Reb 18 [1960] 184–87) describes the political situation of ca.1192/3. Stilbes also wrote a discourse against the Latins and speeches addressed to Patr. George
STILICHON (Στιλίχων), magister militum and virtual ruler of the West (395–408); died Ravenna 22/3 Aug. 408. Son of a Vandal father and a Roman mother, Stilicho rose through the army; married Serena, the adopted daughter of Theodosios I; and commanded the emperor’s troops against the usurper Eugenius in 394. Named magister militum praesentalis in the same year, he used the office as the basis of personal power. Theodosios made Stilicho guardian of his son Honorius in 395, and he had de facto control of both Eastern and Western armies. Stilicho’s campaigns against Alaric in Greece were hindered by rivalry between Rufinus and Eutropios, and Stilicho was briefly declared a public enemy in Constantinople. Named consul in 400 and again in 405, Stilicho put an end to the revolt of Gildo in Africa and forestalled several barbarian invasions of Italy. His daughters Maria and Thermentia married Honorius in turn. Upon the death of Arkadios in 408, Stilicho suggested that he be sent to rule the East, but his enemies convinced Honorius that Stilicho was scheming against the Theodosian house (Zosim. 5.31–34), and he was executed. Stilicho was the archetypal barbarian in the name magister militum who exercised power in the name of a weak emperor.

Stilicho is depicted on one leaf of a Diptych in Monza (Debrück, Consulardiptychen, no.63), with Serena and their son Eucherius on the companion leaf. A challenge to this identification (K.J. Shet-ton, JBAChr 25 [1982] 132–71) is to be rejected.


T.E.G., A.C.

STILO, small town in southeastern Calabria. Owing to the presence of two Greek monasteries, St. Leontios and St. John Theristes (S. Giovanni Vecchio), whose archives have been partly preserved, Stilo is much better documented for the 11th–12th C. than any other medieval Calabrian town. The archive of St. John Theristes (founded by Gerasimos Athoulinos in the mid-11th C.) contains 51 Greek documents, only one of which was issued before the Norman conquest of 1071. This act of 1054 testifies to a division of a significant property among seven parties that seem to have possessed it in common from approximately 900.

The so-called Cattolica at Stilo is probably the best known monument of Byz. southern Italy. The date and circumstances of its foundation are unknown. It is a tiny (7.4 × 7.5 m) five-domed building like S. Marco at Rossano but more refined, with four spoliate columns instead of piers and brick masonry rather than local stone. Suggested datings range from the 10th to the 13th C.; Krautheimer (infra) favors the 10th.


T.E.G., A.K., D.K.

STIPULATION (ὁμολογία), in Roman law, was an oral contract based on the exchange of promises in question-and-answer form; it was unilateral in the sense that it imposed an obligation only on the promiser. It is generally accepted that in the postclassical era the verbal contract lost its previous significance (e.g., Taubenschlag, Law of GRE 396f). F. de Visscher (Eos 48.2 [1956–57] 161–69), however, considers the formulaic clause of the papyri—eperetethesis homologesas, “after being asked, I stipulated”—not as an empty phrase but as local notarial practice.

By the 7th C. the terminolgy of the stipulation was being used in the context of pious donations. For example, in describing the charitable action of a man who “loaned” 50 miliaria to the poor in a church, John Moschos (PG 87.3060A) used the verb rogebem, a typical Latin term for questioning in a stipulation. In later documents one of the formulaic eperotesis (“asings”) became an
element of the guarantee clause: the sellers provided the purchaser “with a full *defensio* and other legal *asphaleia* (guarantee) and *eperotesis*” (*Lavra* 2, no. 83.3–4, a.12902). Another element of the stipulation formula, the *homologia*, was also applied to written contracts—one could “stipulate the deed of purchase” (*Docheiar.* no. 35.25, a.1361).

The names of specific Roman types of stipulation are attested in later documents. A charter of 1081 mentions the Roman *acceptatio* and Aquilian stipulation (*eperotesis*—*Lavra* 1, no. 42.5) that was formerly a means of discharging any debts between two parties; here, however, the terms have a different meaning and describe a regular transfer of ownership for which 24 litrai were paid.

**Lit.** Buckland, *Roman Law* 434–45. —A.K.

**STIRRUP (σκάλα).** The iron stirrup, which was unknown to the Romans, was first mentioned in the early 7th-C. *Strategikon of Maurice* (*Strat. Maur.* p. 80.41–42); it probably entered the empire via the Avars. An ivory in Baltimore (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, no. 86b), now said to be of the mid-7th C., shows an emperor (with bare feet!) using stirrups. On an 8th-C. textile from Mozac, now in Lyons (Beckwith, *ECBA*, fig. 144), given to Pepin by Constantine V, emperors use stirrups as they spear lions. Stirrups occur regularly in post-Iconoclastic representations of riders except, notably, in the 10th-C. *Joshua Roll*.

It should be noted that from the 7th to the 11th C. the stirrup facilitated the rider’s mounting of the *horse*, but did not serve to anchor him in the saddle. The *cavalry* could wield lances and bows well without the use of stirrups.


**STOBAIOS (Στοβαίος),** more correctly John of Stobi in Macedonia, writer; fl. 4th/5th C. For the edification of his son Septimios, Stobaios excerpted Greek literature from Homer to Theodotios, arranging the extracts in a form of anthology (*Florilegium*) under various headings denoting material objects or ethical topics, the whole in four books ultimately divided into two volumes entitled *Eclogues* and *Anthology*. Its pronounced *Neoplatonism* and avoidance of Christian authors suggests a defiantly pagan posture on his part. *Photios* (Bibl., cod. 167) thought it a useful synthesis for those who had read the originals in full, a short cut to learning for those who had not. Byz. used Stobaios extensively (cf. the important 10th-C. MS, Vienna, ÖNB, philol. gr. 67), and his predilections helped to shape Byz. taste, e.g., his weakness for Theognis helped give that poet a particularly rich MS tradition.

**Ed.** Anthology (including Eclogues), ed. C. Wachsmuth, O. Hense, 5 vols. (Berlin 1884–1912).


**STOBI (Στόβι),** a Roman *municipium* in northern Macedonia, in the Vardar valley, on the route connecting Thessalonike with the middle Danube. The ancient city, with its orthogonal street plan, was destroyed in the 3rd C. and replaced by a new urban plan, with a zigzagging main street of varying widths; the ancient theater was abandoned in the 4th C. The zenith of late Roman Stobi is variously dated to the 5th C. (e.g., Kittinger) or the 4th C. (I. Mikulčić in *Palast und Häute* [Mainz 1982] 536). To this period belong six “palaces” (e.g., the so-called Fuller’s house) and
various churches: the episcopal basilica, or that of Bishop Philip; the Old Basilica below the level of Philip's church; the North and Central Basilicas, the latter being erected on the site of a synagogue destroyed between 457 and 474; basilicas outside the city walls, etc. In some basilicas floor mosaics and sculptures were found as well as church furniture, crosses, etc. Geometric pavements in the Old Basilica were laid in two phases. An inscription included in the second-phase work praises a bishop named Eustathios for renewing the church (R. Kolarik, DOP 41 [1987] 295–306).

In 386 Stobi became the capital of the province of Macedonia II (Salutaris). It sustained damage from an attack of the Ostrogoths in 479 and from the earthquake of 518. The splendid "palaces" were replaced by huts. In the 6th C. Stobi ceased to be an urban center, even though its bishops are known until 692, and the refurbishing of the old templon in the basilica of Philip is dated in the 8th C. (I. Nikolajević, ZRV 4 [1956] 157f). Stobi was occupied by the Slavs, whose tombs between the North and Central Basilicas are of the 9th–12th C.

The phourion of Styeion captured by Basil II in 1014 (Skyl. 351.4–5) is usually identified as Stobi; more questionable is Stobi's identification as the Stoumpon attacked by the "Vlachs" ca. 1191 (Nik.Chon. 434.16). B. Saria (RE 2.R. 4 [1932] 51f) hypothesizes that the unnamed "grad" (fortress) in a chrysoobull of 1372–75 (Pantel., p.170: an interpolation in the version B, lines 35–37) may be Stobi, by then possibly in ruins.


STOICISM, philosophical school founded in the 4th C. B.C. by Zeno of Citium, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus, disappeared by the 3rd C. A.D. Its doctrines, however, as conveyed in the works of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius and as assimilated in Neoplatonism and patristic theology remained very much alive in Byz. If the claim, in Stoic physics, that all reality is corporeal and that matter is structured by an immanent god (logos or pneuma) was not acceptable to Byz. Christians, the vision of the cosmos as a complex unified rational whole seemed to some to express the idea of divine providence. Elements of Stoic logic survived in Byz. as incorporated in Neoplatonic interpretations of Aristotelian logic.

It was esp. Stoic ethics, however, that proved popular in Byz. as providing a means for formulating the Christian and in particular the monastic way of life. According to this ethics, virtue (equated with wisdom) is cultivated by the control of our judgment as to what is good and bad. The purpose is liberation from enslavement to our passions (pathē) and to externals, such as riches and fame, which are not in our power and therefore not "goods," but rather "indifferents." The good, or happiness, is then freedom from external influences (apatheia) and control of one's judgment, which alone is in one's power. Continual exercise in correct action and judgment is required by the learner in order to advance toward the ideal of the virtuous life (prokepe).

The adaptability of these ethical concepts and the interest taken in them in monastic circles can be traced in the fortune of Epictetus's Manual, of which a number of Byz. Christian paraphrases, adaptations, and commentaries are known, some attributed to appropriate monastic heroes, St. Antony the Great and Neilos of Ankyra. The popular appeal of Stoic ethics can also be traced in the Byz. fortune of various stoicing moralizing analogies of late antiquity (sayings of the "seven sages," those ascribed to Democritus, etc.) and of the larger excerpts from Epictetus and other Stoic authors contained in Byz. moralizing analogies such as the Loci communes attributed to Maximus the Confessor (PG 91:721–1018) and the Melissa. Byz. scholars also took an interest in the Stoic philosophers: Photios read Epictetus, as did Arethas of Caesarea, who also had a copy made of Marcus Aurelius's Meditations. Latin Stoic sources were used by Barlaam of Calabria in his Ethics according to the Stoics (PG 151:1341–64).


STOTZAS (Στότζος), soldier in the army of Bellarios; retainer (doryphoros) of an officer Martinos; died Thacia (Afrika) end of 545. When the soldiers of the expeditionary force in Africa re-
belled against Solomon on 27 May 536, they elected Stotzas their leader. The main reason for the mutiny was Solomon’s decision to ascribe to the state or the imperial domain lands confiscated from the Vandals that the soldiers wanted to apportion among themselves. Solomon fled to Sicily, but Belisarios managed to drive Stotzas to Numidia. Some Moors and many fugitive slaves joined the revolt. Germanos defeated Stotzas at Scalae Vetteres; he barely escaped. In 544 a few soldiers supported by the Moors rose again in revolt; Solomon soon fell in battle. Stotzas was active in Byzacena and seized Hadrumetum, but soon was killed in single combat by John, son of Sisiniolos, commander of the Byz. troops; nonetheless, the insurgency continued until it was crushed in the winter of 545/6.


A.K.

STUDIOYS MONASTERY (Imrahor Camii), located in the Psamathia region of Constantinople. Dedicated to St. John the Baptist (the Prodromos), the monastery was founded by a certain Studios, not in 463 (as in Theophanes) but before 454 (C. Mango, BMGS 4 [1978] 115–22). Brick stamps uncovered in recent excavations suggest that the church was begun in 450 (U. Peschlow, JÖB 32.4 [1982] 429–33). Its official name was the monastery of the Prodromos ton Stoudiou (τὸν Στουδίου) or en tois Stoudiou. The Studios monastery first attained prominence at the end of the 8th C. during the controversy over Iconoclasm, when it was a bulwark of support for image veneration under the leadership of its celebrated hegoumenos, Theodore of Studios. The rules established by Theodore (catecheses), his diatheke, and other sources (hypotypsis ascribed to Theodore), provide information on the organization of the monastery: the number of monks is calculated at 700 (surely an exaggerated figure, unless it includes monks in outlying Metochia); for their support the monastery was granted (under Empress Irene?) a stipend (basilikoi eisodai); it also possessed lands, gardens, vineyards, water mills, livestock, a wharf with boats, workshops. The monks had to work on the land or in workshops, in the kitchen or refectory, to fish or to tend livestock. The monastery tried to be self-

sufficient. Theodore’s reforms followed the general outlines of the ideal koinobion of Basil the Great, although Basil was not his only source (J. Leroy, Irénikon 52 [1979] 491–506). In the early 9th C. the monastery became a center of intellectual activity, where hymnography and a scrip-
torium flourished (Lemerle, Humanism 137–46).

In the political struggles of the 9th C. Studios maintained an independent position against both the emperor (in the Moechian Controversy) and the patriarch, accusing both Patr. Tarasios and Nikephoros I of inconsistency in their resistance to the Iconoclasts; Patr. Methodios condemned the Stoudite leaders Athanasios and Naukratos, insisting that they should obey the patriarch rather than criticize him. In this situation the monastery sought an alliance with the papacy. After the conflict over the Tetragamy of Leo VI in the early 10th C., the Studios came to an understanding with the emperors and subsequently provided them with candidates for the posts of synkellos and patriarch (Antony III [974–79], Alexios Stoudites, and Dositheos [1189–91]). The monastery also served as a place of confinement for unsuccessful rebels and deposed emperors (e.g., Michael V Kalaphates, Isaac I Komnenos, and Michael VII Doukas). The rules
of Theodore served as a model for the organization of several monasteries, including some on Mt. Athos. The Stoudios played a lesser role under the Komnenoi and entered a period of decline during the Latin occupation of Constantinople. It was restored in 1293 and in the 14th C. held first place among the monasteries of Constantinople.

The original large 5th-C. three-aisled basilica still stands, although in ruinous condition, and is the oldest church surviving in Istanbul. Preceded by a porticoed atrium and a narthex, the nave was flanked by monolithic columns of green marble. Columns with Ionic impost capitals marked the galleries that enclosed the church on three sides. The semicircle of the apse, which was polygonal on its exterior, contained a synthonon. Rich sculptural decoration found at the site (Grabar, *Sculptures I*, 45, 49) included a relief of the Entry into Jerusalem.


—A.K., A.M.T., A.C.

**STOUDITE TYPIKA,** liturgical typika of the Byzantine rite codifying the synthesis of Palestinian monastic and Constantinopolitan liturgical usages begun at Stoudios by the reform of Theodore of Stoudios in 799 and first compiled in rudimentary form after his death (826) in the Stoudite Hypotyposis (Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie* 1:224–38; PG 99.1704–20). Stoudite typika ruled the rite of most Byz. monasteries outside Palestine until supplanted by SABAATIC TYPIKA during the hesychast ascendency on Mt. Athos. Early Stoudite typika are characterized by the fact that the liturgical directions begin with a description of the Easter Vigil (Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie* 1:173, 225, 246). A 12th-C. example, that of the EUGERETIS MONASTERY (ibid. 1:256–656), had great influence on the usages of many other monasteries, esp. on Mt. Athos.


—R.F.T.

**STABRO,** Greek geographer; born Amaseia in Pontos ca.63 B.C., died ca. A.D. 21, but probably after 23 or 26. He wrote two lengthy works, the *Historical Notes* (extant only in a few fragments) and the *Geography*. The latter was well known in the 6th C., when Stephen of Byzantium quoted it abundantly; other contemporary authors (Hesychios of Miletos, Prokopios of Caesarea, Evagrios Scholastikos, Cassiodorus) also mention Strabo. A 6th-C. palimpsest of the *Geography* survives, containing primarily books 8–17. Forgotten in the 7th and 8th C., Strabo was one of those ancient writers in whom interest later revived: a 9th-C. MS (Heidelberg, Palat. gr. 398) contains an epitome of the *Geography* as well as the *Periplus of the Erythrean Sea*, tales of paradoxographers, mythological lore, and other texts. The epitome mentions, among other tribes, the "Scythians or Slavs." A 10th-C. codex (Paris, B.N. gr. 1997) is the earliest medieval MS of the full text of the *Geography*. Two of Psellus's treatises were based on Strabo (F. Lasserre, *AntCl* 28 [1959] 55–61). Eustathios of Thessalonike and John Tzetzes used the *Geography*, but the real explosion of interest in Strabo occurs at the end of the 13th C. From this period several MSS are preserved, and excerpts of the *Geography* included Planoudes, Platon, and Platon's friend Demetrios Raoul Kabakes (S. Lilla, *Scriptorium* 33 [1979] 68–75). Bessarion's library held three Strabo MSS, and Italian scholars of the 15th C. (Guarino, Gregorio Tifernate, Giovanni Andrea Bassi) translated the *Geography* into Latin.


—A.K.

**STABOROMANOS, MANUEL,** writer; born ca.1070. His father, perhaps the *megas hetairiarches* Romanos Straboromanos (*Στραβορωμανος*), fell from favor and had his property confiscated, so that Manuel grew up in poverty. Manuel spent seven years in imperial service and then held some sort of military command. By the time he declared a funeral oration for Michael Doukas, brother-in-law of Alexios I (delivered between 1108 and 1118), he was already *protonobellissimos* and *megas hetairiarches*. Straboromanos took his literary activity very seriously, arguing that
literature achieves three goals: it reveals the internal sense (logos) of events, increases our knowledge of the world, and brings solace.

In addition to the logos of consolation addressed to Empress Irene Doukaina at the time of her brother Michael’s death, Straboromanos composed an elegy of Alexios I. His mainly conventional praise of the emperor contains some concrete details, including unique evidence about the Byz. acquisition of the Cimmerian Bosporos (G. Litavrin, Byzantion 35 [1965] 221–34). Straboromanos perceives Alexios within a broad historical framework: the Roman state, flourishing under Augustus, had no one to fear and therefore plunged into disorder and civil wars, lost Asia and Libya, and retained only a tiny part of Europe; then came the Franks and the Pechenegs. According to Straboromanos, God did not want to destroy “this iron state,” however, and sent Alexios, who reinstated the beauty and power of the empire.


STRATARCHES (στρατάρχης, lit. “general”), a term that in the Kletorologion of Philotheos and the De ceremoniis designated a special category of high officials: HETAIREARCHES, DROUNGARCHES TOU PLOIMOU, LOGOTHETES TON AEGON, protospatharios of the BASILIKOI ANTHROPON, and KOMES TOU STAULOU. Most of these officials held an intermediary position between military dignities and civil functionaries. The conventional meaning of the term was, however, lost, and from the end of the 11th C. stratarches (in Digenes Akratas stratarchos) as well as megas stratarches and panstratarches became honorific epithets of high-ranking generals. The term was applied to the commanders of the past, for instance to Belisarios.

Lit. Guillard, Institutions 1:394f. —A.K.

STRATEGIKA (στρατηγικά), military treatises, also called taktika. The Byz. consulted, copied, and excerpted ancient military writers who were regarded as authorities on different topics, esp. Aelian the Tactician (tactics and terminology), Onasander (generalship), Sextus Julius Africanus and Polyainos (devices and stratagems), and Aineias and Hero (sieges and war engines). Late Roman strategika first appear in the 5th and 6th C. Known authors and works include Ourbikios (a contemporary of Anastasios I); Syrianos Magistros (on naval warfare); an untitled, anonymous tactical handbook (the first leaf is lost; ed. Dennis, Military Treatises 1–136); and the Strategikon of Maurice. The 10th C. witnessed renewed interest in military science; the great military MSS (Florence, Laur. 55:4; Milan, Ambros. 139 [B 119 sup.], among others) date from this period. The Taktika of Leo VI (ca.905), Sylloge tacticorum, Naumachika (both from the 950s), and the Taktika of Nikephoros Ouranos (ca.1000) are lengthy compilations paraphrasing classical and late Roman treatises but containing some contemporary material. Practical handbooks based on firsthand experience stem from the circle of Nikephoros II Phokas and Basil II, including the Praecepta militaria (ca.965), De veltitatione (ca.975), and De re militari (ca.1000). Although some strategika closely follow older traditions, others are valuable sources for the theory and practice of warfare in Byz., the army’s social basis, and the habits and attitudes of hostile neighbors. The production of strategika stopped after Basil II.

The Byz. themselves were convinced of the utility of such works. The Book of Ceremonies (De cer. 407:4–14) recommended bringing tactical treatises along on campaigns, while Kekaumenos urged consultation of strategika in combination with personal inventiveness (Kek. 142.12–18, 148.22–27). The number of strategika attests their widespread popularity; soldiers, often great bibliophiles such as the 11th-C. warrior John Doukas (Psellos, Chron. 2:181–83), avidly collected and read them.


STRATEGIKON OF MAURICE. The attribution of this military treatise to Emp. Maurice is uncertain, but as the Strategikon does not refer to the Arabs it must date from before the 630s. Whereas classical military treatises had emphasized the use of infantry, the Strategikon, the first distinctly Byz. military treatise, is essentially a manual for cavalry warfare, stressing mobile, flexible tactics, and showing the influence of the empire’s eastern
enemies, esp. the Persians, on equipment and skills. The author gives detailed instruction on cavalry training and formations (bks. 1–3, 6), supplemented by diagrams (C.M. Mazzucchi, Aevum 55 [1981] 111–38), and includes sections on strategy (bk.7), attacks and ambushes (bks. 4, 9), and sieges (bk.10). An account of infantry tactics (bk.12) was appended to the original text, but short pieces on encampments and hunting are later additions. The survey of foreign peoples (bk.11) is useful not only for comparative methods of warfare, but also for the social structure and early history of the nomadic Avars, Antae, and Hunnic tribes. The Strategikon demonstrates that up to the early 7th C. Latin was still the language of military commands in Byz. armies (3.5) and the terminology of the text attests the heavy influence of Latin on military Greek.


STRATEGIS (στρατηγις), term infrequently used to designate both the function of the strategos and (as a synonym of theme) an administrative unit under the command of a strategos. A 9th-C. historian (Nikeph. 73.14–15) says that Constantine V summoned sailors and soldiers from “the maritime strategides and other districts”; Constantine VII equated the terms theme and strategis (e.g., De them., ch.2.31, ed. Pertusi, p.88) and frequently used the word strategis for themes such as Mesopotamia, Cappadocia, Lykandos, Charsianon, etc. However, the taktikon of Escurial (Oikonomides, Listes 273.10–14) lists the chartoularioi of the major themes (Anatolikon, Thrakesion, Charsianon), then the chartoularioi of the tagnata and strategides, then the topoteretai of themes, thus implying that at the end of the 10th C. the term referred to an administrative unit smaller than the theme. Anna Komnene also describes relatively insignificant districts, such as Hagios Elias and Borze, as strategides. The Taktikon of Benešević applied the term strategia to the district administered by a strategos.

LIT. Ferluga, Byzantium 30f. –A.K.

STRATEGOPOULOS (Στρατηγόπουλος, from στρατηγός, “general,” + the diminutive -πουλος), one of the noblest families in the empire of Nicea. In 1216 the megas logothetes and sebastos John Strategopoulos presided over a tribunal in the imperial court, when the monks of St. Paul in Latros had a dispute with the inhabitants of the town of Sampson. Constantine, son of the well-known general Alexios (see Strategopoulos, Alexios), was blinded by Theodore II in 1255; three years later he went over to Michael VIII. His wife, a niece of John III Vatatzes, lived until at least 1291. Michael Strategopoulos, perhaps a grandson of Alexios, likewise served as a general: strategos in Herakleia Pontike, he was deposed in 1280 and escaped blinding only through the merciful intervention of the empress. Appointed protostator (1283), he was accused of conspiracy in 1294 and died in prison four years later. His wife was most probably the protostatorissa Anna Komnene Raoulaina Strategopolaina, by whom he had a son, Andrew. Apparently the influence of the family later declined. Simon Strategopoulos is known as a captain of Ioannina in the service of Carlo I Tocco in 1411. About one year later, in the battle of Kranea against the Albanians, he was wounded and his son Paul was captured. In June 1448 Strategopoulos Skantzileres conspired with some other adherents of the late Theodore II Palaiologos against Emp. John VIII (E. Trapp, Byzantina 13 [1985] 962).


STRATEGOPOULOS, ALEXIOS, 13th-C. general. Of aristocratic background, Strategopoulos began his career under the emperor John III Vatatzes with campaigns in Europe. In 1254/5 he commanded a division of the Nicene army at Serres. Under Theodore II Laskaris he fell from favor and was imprisoned; his son Constantine was accused of treachery and blinded. Therefore Strategopoulos supported Michael (VIII) Palaiologos’s usurpation and was promoted to megas domestikos after 1258. He participated in the Nicene
victory at Pelagonia, captured Arta in 1259, and was rewarded with the title of caesar. The culmination of his career occurred in 1261 when he recovered Constantinople from the Latins, almost by accident. En route to Thrace, at the head of 800 Greek and Cuman soldiers, Strategopoulos perceived that the capital was virtually undefended. Taking advantage of the absence of the Venetian fleet on an expedition to the Black Sea, Strategopoulos entered the city on 25 July with the assistance of local Greeks. In 1262 he was captured by Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epiros and delivered to Manfred of Sicily. Michael VIII secured his release by restoring to Manfred his sister, Constance-Anna of Hohenstaufen.

LIT. Geanakoplos, Michael Pal. 92–123. −A.M.T.

STRATEGOS (στρατηγός), ancient term for a general; the term is still used in this sense in the Strategikon of Maurice. In the 8th C. or possibly earlier it came to designate the military governor of a theme who also directed local financial and judicial administration (see Provincial Administration). The strategoi of major themes were the most powerful figures in the empire at the beginning of the 8th C. when they fought each other for the throne of Constantinople. Gradually, however, their power was restricted, and major themes were divided: the mid-9th-C. Taktikon of Usaniskij has a list of 18 strategoi (from Anatolikon to Klimata), while the Klerotologion of Philotheos includes 26. Other limitations on strategoi were their appointment for terms of three to four years, and the prohibition on buying lands in their district. On seals and in narrative sources the title of strategos varies from spatharios to patrikios (I. Sokolova, Bulgarskoto srednovkovie [Sofia 1980] 137–41), rarely magistros. The staff of the strategos consisted of military officers (tournarches and others) as well as officials with civil and police duties. At the end of the 10th C. many new strategoi were introduced, mainly on the eastern frontier, where they commanded small territorial and military units (Oikonomides, Listes 345f); the taktikon of Escurial (ca.971–75) lists about 90 strategoi. Their role decreased through the 11th C.: civil administration was given to thematic judges, and strategoi, as commanders of garrisons and small units, were put under the control of dukes. Later the term lost its technical meaning.

The term strategetes was occasionally used for strategos (Guilland, Institutions 1:395); in the 8th–9th C. monostrategos designated a general commanding several strategoi (V. Laurent, BZ 60 [1967] 186), not a Byz. "marquis," or governor of vast frontier lands (R. Lopez in Mélanges offerts à René Crozet, vol. 1 [Poitiers 1966] 77–80). The term strategos-autokrator, meaning commander in chief, was in use in the 6th C. and reappeared in the 10th–11th C. (Guilland, Institutions 1:382–84); nontechnical expressions such as archistrategos or protostrategos had the same meaning. Hyposstrategos, however, signified lieutenant-general, and could also be used for a strategos in contrast to the emperor as strategos.


STRATEGY (στρατηγία), military art or wisdom, was not clearly distinct from the everyday tactical aims of warfare. The central tenet of Byz. strategy, beginning with the Strategikon of Maurice, was that the outcome of war was dictated by Providence; accordingly, MILITARY RELIGIOUS SERVICES attracted the attention of many strategists. Since God’s will is unfathomable, the unknown or unexpected was always a factor in warfare, meaning that military prowess alone was no guarantee of success; caution thus prevailed over the adventurous, daring combat typical of the Western knight. Byz. strategy derived from two sources: the theoretical tradition of classical tacticians and the general’s own practical experience, esp. the observation of hostile peoples; Byz. Strategika reflect these two approaches.

Although war was considered evil (see PEACE AND WAR), PATRIOTISM and the belief that Byz. was the defender of Christian and classical values fostered the readiness for resistance and counterattack. The Byz. pursued an essentially defensive strategy in campaigns of attrition where partial victories and defeats formed the links of a coherent whole, making diplomacy, reconnaissance, occupation of strategic points or fortifications, and ruses the major means of warfare. During the 6th C. the Byz. discarded the infantry-dominated tactics of the Romans in favor of the rapid, flexible cavalry tactics (esp. the use of mounted archers) of the HUNS and AVARS (A.D.H. Bivar, DOP 26
Belisarios used these tactics to win victories in the East, and they also helped to maintain a mobile defensive strategy after the 7th C. In the 10th C. an offensive strategy was revived, highlighted by the development of the elite corps of *kataphraktoi* responsible for the victories of Nikephoros II Phokas and John I Tzimiskes; the revitalized *infantry* supplied a secure defensive base. In the late period, strategy was restricted by declining manpower. Although Byz. "knights" could contend with Western feudal forces during the 12th and 13th C. in spite of severe reverses (Thessalonike in 1185; Constantinople in 1204), they were powerless against Ottoman encroachment.

Two 11th-C. MSS, Vat. gr. 1164 (Weitzmann, *Studies* 192), and Venice, Marc. gr. 516 (Furlan, *Marciana* 4:54f, figs. 25-27), contain diagrams of such tactics as the cavalry wedge (*emboles hippike*) as well as an encircling maneuver (*hyperkerasis*) and various phalanx formations.


---

**STRATELATES** (*στρατηλάτης*) had two different meanings in the late Roman Empire: first, it designated a general and was used to translate into Greek the term *magister militum*; second, it was a modest title equated to that of the apo *eparchion* in Justinian I’s novel 90. In this capacity the term *strateletes* often appears on seals of the 6th-8th C., sometimes as an “isolated” dignity, sometimes in connection with the relatively low offices of notary, *kommerkarios*, *kouvarot*, *komes*, etc. This meaning was still preserved in the late 9th-C. *Klerotologion* of *Philothios*. In the 10th-11th C. the term was widely used to designate a general or commander in chief, such as the *strateletes* of East or West. At the same time the *tagma* (or phalanx) of the *strateletai* was a select group of common soldiers: thus Bardas Phokas reportedly conveyed his plan of rebellion “primarily to the *tagma* of the *strateletai*” (Skyl. 315,92), and the *strateletes* Polydeuktos in the vita of Neilos of Rossano (PG 120,101B) was at most a low-ranking officer. More complicated is the case of the *strateletes* Alyates (Aleates) from an inscription in Preslav (V. Beševliev, *Spätgriechische und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien* [Berlin 1964] no.254) who seems to be a commander rather than a rank-and-file soldier.


---

**STRATIOTES** (*στρατιώτης*). In narrative texts, *strategika*, and other documents, the term *stratiotes* meant soldier; in legislative texts it denoted the holder of a STRATEIA. *Stratiotai* were sometimes contrasted with peasants (*georgoi*): the NOMOS *stratiotikos* prohibited *stratiotai* from involvement in agriculture or trade, and the TAKTIKA of Leo VI (11.11) described peasants who maintained *stratiotai* and *stratiotai* who defended peasants as the “twin pillars” of Byz. society. *Stratiotai* were listed in muster-rolls as the possessors of *stratiotika* *ktemata* and were exempted from all taxes save the state *kanon* and *aerikon*. They were paid for serving in expeditions and for such labor as building fortresses, roads, bridges, and
ships. Stratiotai were divided into several general categories, such as sailor, infantryman, or cavalryman, and a chrysobull of 1086 lists more specific groups, including archers, spearmen, men armed with maces, etc. (Lavra 1, no.48.40–41).

The exact nature of stratiotai is debatable. G. Ostrogorsky (VfSWG 22 [1929] 131f) linked the establishment of stratiotai as soldier-peasants with the introduction of the thematic system and considered them the backbone of the Byz. army during the 7th through 11th C.; he argued that they were later replaced by mercenaries and holders of a pronoia. P. Lemerle (Agr. Hist. 116–25), on the other hand, denied the existence of such soldier-peasants and held that the stratiotai of 10th-C. legislation provided material support only, whereas effective soldiers were allegedly labeled strateumenoi. The last term, however, is rare, and when found (e.g., Zepos, Jus 1:204.9–10; De cer. 695.18–21) is synonymous with, not opposed to, stratiotai. Both in hagiographical texts (e.g., the Life of St. Philaretos the Merciful) and 10th-C. legislation stratiotai appear as people of modest income, who tilled their land in peacetime and presented themselves with their equipment and horses when called up for campaign. In the 11th C. stratiotai are listed with other privileged groups within the rural population, such as demosiaroi or exkoussatoi tou dromou (Lavra 1, no.33.33–34, from 1060).

The term later acquired two meanings: in the chartulary of Lembtissa stratiotai are modest landowners on a level not much higher than ordinary peasants, and in a 1321 praktikon of the Lavra (Lavra 2, no.109.157) a stratiotai named John Kaseidares appears as a dependent. Yet stratiotai are also mentioned as holders of pronoia and owners of paroikoi, and the term basilikos stratiotai (e.g., Docheiar., no.11.5, from 311) probably applied to them. The basilikos stratiotai may have been titled the emperor’s doulos. Although some stratiotai of the second type did hold pronoiai, it is impossible to identify pronoia-holders as stratiotai.


STRATIOTIKON. See Logothetes tou Stratiotikou.

STRATOPEDARCHES (στρατοπεδάρχης), a term for a military commander, infrequently used in literary texts and papyri from the 1st to the 2nd C. (E. Kiessling, RE 2 R. 4 [1932] 329). From the 5th through the 9th C. the term was a synonym of strategos. The term was applied metaphorically to heavenly generals such as Moses and Eli-
jah (e.g., PG 86:261D). It does not appear in the lists of official functions before the 10th-C. Taktikon of Escurial, which names stratopedarchai of West and East. In 967 Nikephoros II Phokas created an official post of stratopedarches for the eunuch Peter Phokas; according to Oikonomides (Listes 334), it was to substitute for the position of domestikos ton scholon, which eunuchs could not hold. In the 11th–12th C. stratopedarches was one of the official designations of the commander in chief that appeared on seals (Zacos, Seals 1, no.2680) and was bestowed on many bearded generals such as Isaac I Komnenos, the future emperor, and the sebastokrat or Isaac Doukas.

From the mid-11th C. the term megas stratopedarches was used, the first known being George Mouzalon. A 14th-C. ceremonial book places the megas stratopedarches between the protostrator and megas primikarios, and considers him responsible for provisioning the army (Pseudo-Kod. 174.10–13). Under his command were four officers: the stratopedarchai of monokaballoi (cavalry), of tzangrares (crossbowmen), of mourtatoi (“renegades”), and of Tsakones. In reality, however, in the 14th–15th C. stratopedarches was a title, and few individuals titled stratopedarches were actual commanders of troops.


---

STRACTOR (στράτωρ), in narrative sources often hippocromos, “groom,” an office that existed in the Roman Empire. The stratores formed a corps (schola) both at the imperial court and in the service of some high-ranking provincial administrators. Their functions went beyond the simple care of the stable and included purveyance of horses (F. Lammet, RE 2.R. 4 (1932) 329f). Their chief was the komes tou staoulou, later domestikos of the stratores (Theoph. 388.22). Many seals of stratores are preserved, beginning with some Latin ones of the 6th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 391, 2827). It seems that on seals of the 8th and 9th C. the term was used as a title of subaltern officers (tournarches, droungarios) and provincial officials (komes tes kortes, archon of Mesembria, chartoularios of Thrace, protonotarios of Thessalonike). Probably to distinguish them from the actual grooms under the command of the protostrator the latter were defined as stratores of the imperial stratorikon (Kletorologion of Philotheos: Oikonomides, Listes 155,26). The latest mention of strator is in the cadaster of Thebes (Svoronos, Cadastre 11,18), as the title of certain landowners. Strator reappears on an inscription from Cyprus of 1402 in the form of starotors. The term strator was known in the West from 754; R. Holtzmann (Hisil 145 (1931) 301–50) hypothesized that it was introduced under Byz. influence.


---

STREemma (στρέμμα), lit. “that which is twisted, thread”), a measure of land (for both arable land and for vineyards). In the 11th C. the term designated a piece of land, and an act of 1015 speaks of a “few stremmata prepared for planting vineyards” (Iwir. 1, no.20.43f). By the 13th C. the strema had acquired the meaning of a land measure: a charter of 1239 (MM 4:157:27–28) registers the sale of a choraphion “measured at approximately 20 stremmata.” There is no direct data concerning the size of a strema, but an act of the early 14th C. (Xerop. 2615.1153–56) seems to equate strema and modius. A list of tenures of ca.1307 (Dochetar., no.10) employs the term strema exclusively, whereas other practika prefer modios and use strema only as an exception (e.g., Dionys., no.25.78; Guilhou, Ménetce, no.35.63). On the other hand, in deeds of purchase strema appears no less often than modios.


---

STROBILos (Στροβίλος, mod. Aspat or Çift Kalesi), fortress and port on the coast of Caria; never a bishopric. First mentioned in 724, Strobilos rose to prominence when it served as a place of exile or refuge. An important link in the coastal defenses, Strobilos was a bastion of the Kibyrrhaiotai theme; an archon administered it. The Arabs attacked Strobilos in 924 and 1035; the Turks captured it ca.1080. Thereafter, it lay in ruins until the Komnenoi restored it and gave concessions there to the Venetians. It was lost to the Turks of Menteshe in 1269. As one of the few towns of Anatolia that came into existence in the Middle Ages, Strobilos should reveal the appearance of a distinctively Byz. site. It is a small
place on a steep conical hill overlooking the Strait between Kos and the mainland. Remains consist of docks and magazines, scattered habitation on the slopes, a monastery in a cave (mentioned in a document of 1079), and a small but powerful fortress whose Byz. walls, apparently of the 12th C., were extensively rebuilt by the Turks.


—C.F.

STRYMON (Στρυμών), the name of both a river and a theme.

STRYMON RIVER. A Balkan river, now called the Struma, it rises not far from Serdica and flows southward, emptying into the Aegean Sea at Amphipolis. An important road ran through the Strymon Valley from the interior of the Balkans to Serres and the sea; it also served as a significant invasion route in the 7th C. and later. The valley of the Strymon, esp. its eastern part, is the most fertile region of southern Macedonia.


—T.E.G.

THEME OF STRYMON. In the 10th C. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (Dethem. 3.1–5, ed. Pertusi 88f) was not sure whether Strymon was a theme or a kleisoura—he knew only that the district was populated by “Scythians” (Slavs) from the time of Justinian II. It was a region that suffered from Bulgarian attacks in the 8th and 9th C.: in 809 they killed a strategos, archontes, and “archontes of other themes” there (Theoph. 484.29–485.3). The phraseology of Theophanes seems to indicate that the region of Strymon was already a theme by 809, but the strategos of Strymon was unknown to the mid-9th-C. Taktikon of Uspenski and reappears only in the Kleroterogion of Philotheos in 899. The offices of both archon and strategos of Strymon are known from seals of the 9th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 1753, 2659). In the 10th-C. Taktikon of Eserual two themes are listed: Strymon, or Chrysaba (Krusovo), and New Strymon, unknown to other sources and identified by Okonomides (Listes 357) as the region of Bole- ron. The administrative structure of the area was very unstable: at the end of the 10th C. Strymon is described as united with Thessalonike or with Thessalonike and Drougoubitia (Iuvr. 1, no.10.2), in the 11th C. with Boleron. The area preserved a substantial stratum of Slav population. Impor-
tant towns in the Strymon region were Serres, Philippoi, Christoupolis, and Chrysopolis.

After 1204 Strymon was assigned to the kingdom of Thessalonike, but in 1246 John III Vatazzes conquered and restored it as a distinct theme (e.g., Lavra 2, no.71.30). In 14th-C. documents it is usually combined with Boleron and other administrative units or kastra (Thessalonike, Serres, etc.).


—T.E.G.

STRYPHNSOS, MICHAEL, fl. ca.1190–1203. Brother-in-law of Empress Euphrosyne Dou- kaina Kamatera, Stryphnos (Στρύφνος) was chief of the vestiarion in the reign of Isaac II; he became megas doux under Alexios III. For his private profit, he sold the fleet's anchors, sails, and other gear, while oppressing Genoese merchants. Circa 1201–02 he went to Hellas to restrain Leo Sgouro; unsuccessful there, he was still lauded in an oration by Michael Choniates. Because of his maladministration, the Fourth Crusade encountered no opposition from the Byz. fleet. A massive enamelled gold ring, inscribed with his name, is preserved (A. Cutler, JÖB 31.2 [1981] fig.7, following p.764).

—C.M.B., A.C.

STUDENICA, monastery near Ušće, in south central Serbia, founded after 1183 by Stefan Nemanja. Nemanja's son Sava of Serbia became abbot of the monastery in 1208, introducing into Serbia via Studenica the set of rules contained in the typikon of the Euergetis Monastery in Constantinople (Babić, Chapelles annexes 5of).

At least four churches were erected within the monastic enclosure. The Church of the Virgin was begun by Nemanja but completed by his sons after his withdrawal to Mt. Athos. Built of finely dressed local marble as his grave church (Nemanja's body was brought from Athos to Studenica in 1208), the church blends Romanesque and Byz. elements into a new architectural entity: a single-aisled basilica of Italian-Dalmatian type having a byzantinizing dome over the crossing and a large narthex, a façade decorated with pilasters and corbel-table friezes under the eaves, and figural stone carving
on a tympanum over the west door. The narrow cross-arms of the basilica are preceded by a series of recessed arches and resemble Italian porches. The plan and decoration of this royal foundation, the prototype for monuments of the so-called Raška school, was to have a profound effect on later Serbian developments (e.g., MILEŠeva, SOPOČANI, Dečani).

A painted Greek inscription in the dome names the sons of Nemanja along with Stefan himself, and provides the date of 1208/9 for the fresco decoration. What remains of the original program (much of it overpainted in 1569) shows a conscious attempt by the fresco painter to imitate mosaic: in the highest levels of fresco, gold leaf is applied to the background. Lower levels have a yellow ground instead, while the Crucifixion on the west wall has a ground of blue sprinkled with stars. In the latter composition (much of it repainted in the later 13th C. as well as in the 16th), the huge solemn figure of the dead Christ already shows a notable departure from the nervous configurations of late 12th-C. Komnenian art. Serbian, instead of Greek, is used as the language of the painted inscriptions on certain of these frescoes.

An exonarthex was added about 25 years later by Nemanja’s son Stefan Radoslav, and to this narthex were appended two chapels. That on the south side was dedicated to Stefan Nemanja; it was adorned in ca.1233/4 with four scenes from his life, including a representation of the translation of his body from Hilandar to Studenica, the earliest extant historical composition in Serbian monumental painting.

The independent Chapel of St. Nicholas, also located within the enclosure, was probably built about the same time as the Church of the Virgin; it has fragments of frescoes of the first half of the 13th C. akin to those adorning the church at Mileševa.

Another independent chapel within the precinct was known as the King’s Church (“Kraljeva crkva”); it was built by King STEFAN UROŠ II MILUTIN and dedicated to Saints Ioakeim and Anna. A domed cross-in-square in plan, the chapel was constructed in 1313/14, according to an inscription carved on the east façade.

The frescoes were probably executed in 1314. The Pantokrator in the dome is surrounded by the four Evangelist symbols, cherubim with wheels of fire, and the Divine Liturgy (see LORD’S SUPPER). Eight prophets carry scrolls referring to the Resurrection, and 34 busts of the ancestors of Christ refer to the earthly life of the Son of God. The usual Evangelist portraits and ten Great Feasts occupy the pendentives and the upper zone of the walls, while the life of the Virgin Mary is depicted in the lower zone. The portraits of Milutin and his wife Simonis are on the south wall, facing the Nemanjids saints Stefan Nemanja and Sava of Serbia and the Virgin and Child with saints; a parallel is thus drawn between the ancestors of Milutin and those of Christ. The large number of bishops in the sanctuary (in bust, full figure, and officiating) emphasizes the importance of the Orthodox church and its tradition; it includes as recent a figure as EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKE. The modeling in rich tones of ochre, red, green, and white, and the highly individualized heads recall the saints in the lower zone of the Church of St. George at STARO NAGORIČINO, justifying the current attribution of the frescoes of the King’s Church to the artists of Staro Nagoričino, MIHAEL (ASTRAPAS) and EUTYCHIOS.

The ruins of a fourth chapel may be those of a chapel of John the Baptist.


N.P.S., G.B.

STUDENT (φοιτητής). The student had a private relationship with his teacher that was defined and confirmed in special contracts, a sample of which survives in a 14th-C. MS (P. Schreiner, Byzantina 13.1 [1985] 286–88). The contract even regulated the student’s schedule, such as time for sleep and meals. Byz. teachers (e.g., Psellos) often complained of their students’ bad discipline and truancy from school, and they sometimes had difficulty collecting fees from the students’ parents. Nevertheless, the student-teacher relationship could be cordial and stable. Eustathios of Thessalonike, among others, affectionately reminisced about a “holy and great man” who instructed and educated him (Eust. Thess., Oppuscula, p.103.90–93) and about his other wise teachers. Theodore Metochites spoke with deep
affection of his old teacher, Joseph Rhakendytés. Students formed close groups supporting their teachers in their scholarly and personal endeavors. Popular teachers attracted pupils from different parts of the world, and from the 13th C. onward some Greek youths studied at Western universities.

The novel of Constantine IX on the organization of the Law School in Constantinople contains some evidence about the status of students. Admission was available to everyone regardless of origin or social position, and education was free. The legislator stressed that students should refrain from bribing teachers, but he did not prohibit, indeed even recommended, offering presents to the professor after completing the course of education. Students had to pass examinations and received a diploma testifying to their knowledge. A lively picture of the extracurricular activities of students is offered by canon 71 of the Council in Trullo (691/2) and Theodore Balsamon's commentary, as well as by Christopher of Mytilene, poem 196.


STUMA TREASURE. See Kaper Koraon Treasure.

STYLE. This term, as applied to literature and art, has been used in a variety of overlapping senses. In literature it might be defined as "alternative modes of expressing the same (or approximately the same) content" (I. Ševčenko, JOB 31.1 [1981] 289). In both letters and arts it may designate either "levels" of production ("high," "middle," "low") or a particular "ductus" that may be personal or else characterize a genre, a period, or even a geographical area. In Byz. literature the existence of several levels of expression, distinct as they are linguistically and grammatically, and independent of the date of a given group of works, is clearly apparent and was recognized by the Byz. themselves. It is possible to date works of middle or low level by their style; the dating of works written in "high style" is difficult; and the search for an individual style has proved yet more difficult, even in the case of the most famous authors. The task, however, is not hopeless. We are still not clear about the correlation between the style of different "arts" and genres—visual arts and literature, and, within literature, prose and poetry, hagiography and historiography, the so-called monastic chronicle and contemporary history. The concept of levels without reference to time can be applied to art, mostly with regard to the level of skill, some works being naturally more accomplished, others more rustic. The concept is less useful in terms of regional "schools." On the other hand, the existence of period style (e.g., the Komnenian, the "rococo" of the late 12th C., or the Palaiologan) is undeniable in art. The common stylistic points between literature and art are the strength of tradition and the invisibility of individual hands.

The term "style" is normally understood by art historians to be the sum of details—drapery folds, proportion, plasticity, etc.—which, when put together, allow us to date and even to localize an artifact. Style is sometimes viewed as a manifestation of the way an epoch expresses itself in its different arts and modes of thinking (painting, architecture, literature, music, e.g., Baroque style). Such an approach, if applied to Byz., would meet with difficulties, since "styles" in various Byz. arts of a given period are indebted more to devices of the past than to contemporary developments. This approach should be nevertheless tried (one can speak of the Komnenian and Palaiologan periods both in letters and art). Rather than concentrating on "stylistic" or formal qualities of an object, more recent art-historical scholarship, often under the influence of disciplines other than art history, has paid particular attention to the nature and function of that object, or to the social and political circumstances of its creation, and found that these factors strongly affect, if not determine, its form.


STYLE MIGNON (sometimes "Style cloisonné"), modern term for a manner of book illustration current in the third quarter of the 11th C. It is characterized by brilliantly colored, enamellike figures silhouetted against flat landscapes or in-
terioris like stage sets. The key dated examples of this style are a menologion in Moscow, Hist. Mus. 9 (of 1063); the Theodore Psalter (1066); a Praxapostolos, Epistles, and Apocalypse (Moscow, Univ. Lib. gr. 2280) produced for the emperor Michael VII in 1072 and a MS of the Heavenly Ladder of John Klimax (Princeton, Univ. Lib. 16) of 1081. Less precisely dated but related in style are the Paris MS, B.N. gr. 74 (one of the Frieze Gospels), a Klimax MS in the Vatican, gr. 394, and several icons at Mt. Sinai. Their two-dimensional forms have been interpreted as expressing “the ascetic spirit of monasticism” and even the mysticism of Symeon the Theologian, but gold is widely used to separate areas of color in the garments, and normally unmonastic, classical personifications occur, esp. in the Vatican Klimax. The “Style mignon” coexisted with several other contemporary manners of book illustration and has no equivalent in monumental painting of the period.

Lit: Weitzmann, Studies 271–313, Lazarev, Storia 187–89, Spatharakis, Corpus, nos. 78, 80, 92, 100, V.D. Lichacheva, Vizantjskaja miniaturja (Moscow 1977) 15f. –A.C.

STYLITE (στυλίτης), a type of ascetic monk who stood on a platform atop a pillar (stilos), which was connected with the ground by a ladder. Such platforms were open to rain, snow, and winds, although some included a small shelter. To increase their suffering, stylites often wore chains placed so that they formed a cross (e.g., PG 100:1104C, AASS Nov. 3:520C). The purpose of ascending the pillar was to disengage oneself from the sinful world (and from the crowd of pilgrims) and to find tranquility among the “pure” elements; stylites, however, were also involved in political activity, and Daniel the Stylite even descended from his column to lead a demonstrating mob to Constantinople. The movement started in the 5th C., with Symeon the Stylite the Elder, and soon became popular; stylites attracted pilgrims who stimulated the development of trade and innkeeping. Veneration of stylites, which often flourished during their lifetime, took the form of image worship: according to Theodoret of Cyrhrus (Histoire des moines de Syrie, vol. 2 [Paris 1970] 782.19–21), Symeon’s icons adored the entrance to workshops (ergasteria) as far away as Rome, while Daniel’s vita mentions a silver icon of the saint that weighed 10 litrai and was given to a church. Special Symeon tokens (see Pilgrim Tokens) with the image of Symeon the Stylite the Younger were produced for pilgrims (G. Vikan, DOP 38 [1984] 67–73). A few women also joined the movement (H. Delheaye, AB 27 [1908] 391f).

It is plausible that Iconoclasm caused a reduction of stylites; Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 442:18–24) relates the cruel execution of the stylite Peter by Constantine V, and the vita of Theodore of Edessa presents a stylite community as declining in the 9th C. (A. Kazhdan, GOrThR 30 [1985] 473f). From the end of the century the movement again revived; in the 10th C., Loukas the Stylite claimed to be the fifth in the series of great stylites. Some saints spent “only” a few years on columns (e.g., seven by Lazaros of Mt. Galeos) and were closely connected with nearby monasteries. A similar form of extreme asceticism was that of the dendrites who lived in trees, such as David of Thessalonike.

Representation in Art. Stylites were depicted as ancient, white-bearded monks, visible only to their shoulders or waists, atop marble columns; the two Sts. Symeon generally wear the koukoulion, or monastic hood. Hands raised before their chest, the stylites are protected from falling by an iron railing that runs around the large, fancy capital. Many churches are adorned with images of stylites, often painted on piers or other narrow vertical surfaces, so that the painted column resembles a colonnette applied to the pier; when two portraits flank the bema arch in this way, they reinforce its triumphal character. There is sometimes a little door or niche visible in the column shaft, which suggests the existence of an internal stairway, or sometimes an access ladder is shown propped against the column. When the image has room to expand, as on a MS page, however, a flight of stairs or a circular wall pierced by a passageway may be included to either side of the column.

STYPPEIOTES (Στυψειώτης), a family that produced some generals and diplomats from the 9th C. onward. The name is interpreted by H. Moritz (Zurnamen 1:29, 2:42) as derived from a toponym, but is more probably to be connected with Gr. styppeion, "flax or hemp fiber." Kesta (the first known Styppeiotes), *domestikos ton scholon*, died in 883 during an expedition against Tarsos. Michael, *patrikios* under Romanos I, participated in negotiations with Symeon of Bulgaria. Another Michael was general ca. 1116.

From the end of the 11th C. onward the Styppeiotai primarily held posts in the civil administration: Demetrios, official in the bureau of the *megas logariastes* in 1094; Theodore, *hanikleios* of John II and Manuel I, was involved in a plot, deposed, and blinded in 1159. Michaelizes Styppeiotes, mentioned in the *typikon* of the PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY in Constantinople as an intimate retainer of John II, is an enigmatic figure: Anna Komnene (An.Komn. 3:192.5–8) states that Michael Styppeiotes gave Alexios I a slave and barbarian, also called Styppeiotes; perhaps he should be identified with Michaelizes. It is questionable but possible that Patr. Leo Styppe (1134–43) belonged to the family (P. Wirth, ByzF 3 [1968] 254f). A certain Strongylos Styppeiotes served as *vestiariotes* of John III in 1237 or 1252, while Demetrios and Theodore, priests in Constantinople, signed a patriarchal document in 1357.


---

SUBDEACON (βποδιάκονος). As the title indicates, the subdeacon was created to assist the deacon in the performance of his duties. His primary function in the liturgy was to stand guard at the doors during the exit of the *catechumens*. Before the eucharistic celebration he was responsible for preparing the sacred vessels, lighting the altar lamps, and helping the priest dress (Council of Laodikeia, canons 20–22, 43). At the Council in TRULLO the age at which a candidate could enter the subdiaconate was fixed at 20 (canon 15). According to the same council, subdeacons (like the major orders of clergy) could not marry after ordination (canon 3). The Byz. church always viewed the office as a minor clerical rank immediately below the deacon. Western practice, however, differed: by the early 13th C. the office had been raised to major orders. The earliest mention of subdeacon is in the 3rd C.


---

SUBSTANCE (οὐσία). The notion of *ousia* entered the history of Christian THEOLOGY in the 4th C. when the Council of Nicaea acknowledged in its creed the concept of HOMOOUSIOS. Generally the term *ousia* designates the real existent, which in the Aristotelian tradition is called the "primary essence." On the one hand, this is contrasted to the abstract idea or species ("secondary essence"); on the other hand, it is distinguished from accidents. If in the interpretation of the Nicaean Creed proposed by the CAPPADOCIAN FATHERS a distinction is made between the common *ousia* and the HYPOSTASES of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, there is the danger of seeing this essence as a universal, as in the MONARCHIAN interpretation of MARKELLOS OF ANKYRA modified by GREGORY OF NYSSA (R. Hübner in Epiktas: Mélanges Jean Danielou [Paris 1972] 463–90), or of taking it in the sense of the Aristotelian secondary essence as in the TRITHEISM of JOHN PHILOPONOS. Nevertheless, in BASIL THE GREAT and GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS the concept of *ousia* as that which is common (koinon) is joined with Stoic ontology and logic, and in this connection *ousia* signifies the individual: *ousia* is the "subject" (hypoikeimenon)

---

SUANIA (Σουανία), a land at the eastern end of the Black Sea. STRABO (11.2.19) notes that the Soanes controlled the summits of the Caucasus above Dioscurias (SEBASTOPOLIS). The language of the Svan, with Laz and Georgian, belongs to the Kartvelian family.

By the 6th C. the Svan were Christian; Prokopios (Wars 8.2.23) notes that their priests were appointed by the bishops of the Laz, although politically the Svan were independent of them and of the Persians. Suania figures prominently in the Persian-Byz. wars (ibid., 8.14.53, 16.14: MENANDER PROTECTOR, 76–86); its loyalties wavered between Byz. and Persia. Suania was later controlled by Georgian princely houses.


---
that “lies under” the individual characteristics and natural qualities that attach to one substance and not to another.

Neo-Chalcedonism, whose starting point was the Trinitarian terminology of the Cappadocians, interpreted the doctrine of two natures of Christ put forth by the Council of Chalcedon in such a way that nature and substance signify the same thing. Subsequent to this, one observes that the high standard of the Christologies of theologians such as Leontios of Byzantium and Maximos the Confessor, the salient features of which were two radically distinctive modes of individuation (the specific and the hypostatic-personal), could not be maintained. Ousta, or nature, is mostly understood as a simple reality, or that which truly exists (Anastasios of Sinai, ed. Uthemann, Viae Dux, 2.3, lines 6–12; cf. 8.5, lines 120–24). This modified view of Anastasios typifies the level of theological reflection in Byz. as soon as this formula took precedence over the development of thought.

The question of the essence of God, which in the context of apophatic theology and Palamism is inexpressible, directs attention to the energies of God. This theory is encountered also in John Kyparissiotes (PG 152:794A–798C), for example, who followed pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite in teaching that God can be spoken about, but knowledge of God in the created order is attained through inference on the basis of experience, that is, its starting point is taken from his energies or their effects.


SUCCESSION (περὶ διαθέσεων). Byz. law recognized two fundamentally different ways of transferring the property of a deceased person to his heirs. The estate could be distributed through a disposition (diathesis) made during the person’s lifetime that was to become operative in event of death (see Wills) or, when such a disposition did not exist, the estate passed to certain heirs in accordance with the law (intestate succession). Informal agreements could also be made when the dowry was promised for a marriage contract, so that these agreements assume the character of both marriage and inheritance contracts. Since the appointment of an heir was no longer deemed a prerequisite for the validity of a will (as in Roman law) and since legata, fideicommissa, donations in view of death, pious foundations, distributions of money for the good of the soul (psychika), and similar arrangements could be made independently, without being part of a formal will, the will presented itself as only one of many dispositions made “during lifetime and in view of death.” Such private and individual dispositions conflict with succession in accordance with the law, a system of preference by which the children of the deceased and their descendants (= grandchildren) were favored over the parents and their descendants (= siblings), who were in turn favored over the grandparents and their descendants (= uncles/uncles) in the line for inheritance.

Claims on Inheritances and Restrictions on Succession. Byz. law had to deal with certain specific problems involving succession. First of all, Christianity encouraged donations at death to churches and monasteries as well as the distribution of part of the inheritance among the poor. Second, the state demanded a certain part of the inheritance in the form of voluntary grants or as a mandatory obligation (arion). The right to transfer property upon death was not given to slaves, but wills of women and monks are known, and paroikoi were entitled to transfer their lands to heirs, though probably only with the approval of their lords. The right to receive an inheritance could be restricted: various heretics as well as apostates and even children of a mixed marriage with a heretic were excluded from succession, and manumitted slaves might receive only the so-called legata.

Specific types of property had restrictions on succession: stratotita ktemata, for example, could be inherited only by those capable of fulfilling military service. Succession could be restricted by time, though some grants could be made for two or three generations (esp. charistikion). The medieval right of primogeniture had no place in Greek society: Jacoby (Féodalité 35) has emphasized the difference between two systems of succession in the Latin Peloponnesos—Western primogeniture and the local tradition of apportioning the land between all the sons and daughters.


-A.K.

SUCIDAVA (Συκίδα in Prokopios), a Roman fortress located 3 km west of mod. Corabia in Rumania, on the left bank of the Danube, facing Palatiolion (anc. Oescus) on the other side of the river. It was retained by the Romans after Aurelian yielded Dacia to the barbarians. The coins found in Sucidava show an uninterrupted series from Aurelian to Theodosios II. Constantine I the Great restored the citadel of Sucidava and connected it with Oescus by a stone bridge. In the mid-5th C. Sucidava suffered from the attacks of the Huns but was again restored, probably under Justin I, whose coins are found in great quantity in the area, or by Justinian I according to his novel 11. A Christian basilica was constructed in Sucidava in the 6th C. and a “secret well” dug out. Ceramic finds include both autochthonous forms and imports from the Aegean region, Asia Minor, and North Africa (D. Tudor, V. Barbu, 14 CEB 2 [1975] 638). Circa 600 the Byz. garrison left Sucidava.


-A.K.

SUDAK. See SOUGDAIA.

SUDŽA, a tributary of the Dnieper River, beside which, in the village of Bol’shoj Kamenev in the region of Kursk, two “hoards” were found in 1918–19 and 1928 containing objects probably from the tomb of a barbarian “prince.” Among these were a fragment of a bronze bucket, a gold necklace and bracelets, and a well-preserved silver ewer with nine Muses produced ca. 400 (Iskusstvo Vizantii 1, no. 37).

Lit. L. Maculevič, Pogrebnienie varvarskago knjazja v Vostočnoj Evrope (Moscow-Leningrad 1934). Dodd, Byz. Silver Stamps, no. 84.

-A.K.

SUFETULA (mod. Sbeita, in central Tunisia). Among the more prosperous towns in Byzacena, its wealth was derived from olive oil produced on the numerous villas and small farms within its territory. The late 4th and early 5th C. saw the construction of three basilicas (one perhaps be-


SUICIDE (αὐτοκτονία). Even though recent scholarship has rejected the traditional image of a Roman mania for suicide, in the Roman Empire of the 1st–2nd C. suicide was evidently still con-
considered an acceptable and even noble way to solve personal or political problems. Only in the 3rd C. did Plotinòs take a negative stand toward suicide by equating it with murder. Christianity, in its earlier stages, was not hostile toward suicide: Ambrose praised St. Pelagia the Virgin for killing herself after she had been raped. A position critical of suicide was taken by Lactantius and esp. Augustine, who consistently rejected this course of action. At the same time the law changed its perception of suicide, which began to be treated as a confession of depravity. In the East, Palladius of Galatia in the 5th C. still considered suicide a possible means of protecting one’s chastity, but later canon law prohibited killing oneself. A certain ambivalence remained in the literary appraisal of martyrs, who in fact sought death through execution, and of ascetics whose starvation was a slow self-destruction: the righteous could yearn for death as the gateway to union with God, but the moment of death had to remain in the hands of God. The negative attitude toward suicide was enhanced by the image of Judas, who died by hanging himself. The question of the guilt of those who urged others to commit suicide was discussed at the Council of Ankyra in 314; accomplices were condemned to 10 years of penitence.

Documented instances of suicide are indeed infrequent in Byz., a rare example being the scribe Melitas who hanged himself in 303 because he was despondent over his indebtedness (Pachyn., ed. Bekker 2:385–88). The vita of St. Makarios of Pelekete attributed the attempted suicide of a certain Gregory to demoniac possession (P. van den Gheyn, AB 16 [1897] 162.27–34). Unhappy wives sometimes used the threat of suicide by drowning, hanging, or hurling themselves from a high rock to obtain a divorce (A. Laiou, _FM_ 6:309–12), since suicide was considered a worse crime than divorce.


SUIDAS. See Souda.

SÜLEYMAN ÇELEBI (Σουλτάμμαν and other forms), second son of Bayezid I, and ruler (1402–11) over part of the Ottoman realm; born 1377?, died Düğüncü-Ili 17 Feb. 1411. After Timur’s victory over Bayezid, Süleyman Çelebi fled eventually (20 Aug. 1402) to Gallipoli (Kallipolis). He was acknowledged as sultan in Rumeli, but his brothers in Anatolia—Isa and Mehmed I—disputed his claims. He strengthened his position by accommodation with local Christian powers, including Byz. By the peace of Jan.–Feb. 1403, Constantinople recovered Thessalonike and other places and was freed from tribute payments. In 1403–10 Süleyman Çelebi expanded his rule into Anatolia, perhaps eliminating Isa before mid-March 1403 and otherwise holding his own against Mehmed. In Rumeli he generally preserved the status quo.

His position crumbled in 1410–11. Early in 1410, Mehmed dispatched his younger brother Musa to Rumeli, and on 15 Feb. he and his Balkan allies defeated Süleyman Çelebi’s heylerbeyi Sinan at Iambol. Facing disaster, Süleyman Çelebi renewed his accord with Manuel II (late May), possibly marrying then a daughter of Theodore I Palaiologos. He twice defeated Musa the following summer: 15 June at Kosmidion, a suburb of Constantinople; 11 July near Edirne (Adrianople), but the Rumelian Turks then shifted support to Musa, whose austerity and unsufficiency to Constantinople they esteemed. Early in 1411 Musa defeated Süleyman Çelebi’s army near Sofia (Serdica), and he fled from Edirne for Constantinople. On 17 Feb., however, he perished at Düğüncü-Ili—assassinated, or captured and then strangled on Musa’s orders.

Süleyman Çelebi’s passion for drink and debauchery was renowned. The historian Doukas also depicts him as gentle, guileless, compassionate, and generous; Chalkokondyles praises him as a brave soldier. Süleyman Çelebi apparently felt a special reverence for Christ, and some of his fellow Muslims viewed him as overly sympathetic to Christians.


SÜLEYMAN IBN KUTULMUŞ, first Seljuk ruler in Anatolia; died near Aleppo 1086. Son of Kutulmuş (or Kutlumuş), cousin of TUGHRLUL Beg, Süleyman (Σολυμάν) and his brother Mansur were in Anatolia by 1078, where they supported the usurpation of Nikephoros III and gained lands
around Nicaea. During Nikephoros’s reign, Malikshāh sent Bursuk to subdue the brothers. Manṣūr was killed, but Süleyman expanded his domain. The rebel Nikephoros Melissenos granted him Nicaea, Chrysopolis, and other cities. In 1081 Alexios I, in return for aid against the Normans, recognized Süleyman’s boundaries; the Byz. called him “sultan” (Bryen. 303.26), but this term may reflect Turkoman usage rather than an officially conferred title. Circa 1084, abandoning Nicaea to his supporter Abūl-Qāsim, Süleyman moved east, where he seized Antioch from Philaretos Brachamios, only to perish in battle with Malikshāh’s brother Tutuş.

—C.M.B.

SÜLEYMAN PASHA (Σουλίμαν in Kantakouzenos), eldest son of Orhan; died near Bolayır 1357. He was a leader in the earliest Ottoman conquests and settlements in Thrace after ca.1352. Previously he had participated in the conquests of Nicaea (1330), the beylik of Karasi (1334–35), and Nikomedea (1337). After Orhan’s marriage in 1346 to Theodora, daughter of John VI, Süleyman Pasha was thrice dispatched with Turkish forces to assist the Kantakouzenoi (1348, 1350, 1352). In 1352, his troops captured Tzympe near Kallipolis, which they refused to evacuate. On 1–2 Mar. 1354, an earthquake severely damaged fortifications in the Thracian Chersonnese, and many Byz. fled. He quickly seized Kallipolis and other places, which he refortified and colonized with Anatolian emigrants. From these bases he and his ghazis pressed further into mainland Thrace. By his death the Turks had penetrated throughout much of the Marica Valley corridor. He established his headquarters at Kallipolis and Bolayır, where he was buried following a fatal hunting accident.


SULTAN (σουλτάνος). An Arabic word that appears in the Qur’ān with the meaning of moral or magic power; later it took the meaning of administrative power and finally of the possessor of the power (i.e., the ruler). In the 11th C., with the rise of the Seljuks, it became specifically the title borne by strong and independent rulers whose vassals and provincial princes received the title of malik (“king” in Arabic) or šāh (“king” in Persian).

The Islamic world was considered an entity guided by the caliph, the religious spiritual leader, and the sultan, to whom the caliph delegated military and administrative authority. The term sultan appears in late 11th-C. Byz. sources as a loanword from Arabic/Persian, and was used to designate the Seljuk, the Mamlük, and finally the Ottoman monarch. A 14th-C. Byz. view of a sultan is provided by a figure, identified as a sultan in Arabic but as Prolemy in Greek, in a MS in Venice (Furlan, Marciana 4:38–40, fig. 33). He is shown seated cross-legged, but wears a tunic decorated with imperial purple EAGLES.


—E.A.Z., A.C.

SUN AND MOON. The sun (Helios) was a major concern of late antique theology and, in the form of SOL INVICTUS and SOL JUSTITIAE, played a part in Christian cosmological and ethical concepts. In Byz. art the sun and moon are depicted either as schematic heads in circles or as personifications. Both types are found in depictions of the Crucifixion, the most important context in which they occur. Diagrammatic versions of the sun and moon occur on the Barberini ivory, flanking the bust of Christ; they “stand still” beside Jericho in the Joshua Roll. Similarly enduring is the tradition of depicting the luminaries as human busts. The sun takes this form in a 6th-C. pavement at Skythopolis and, four centuries later, in the Paris Psalter where it appears above the ailing Hezekiah. Both Helios and Selene were understood as moving stars. The interchangeability of their position in images of the Crucifixion has been ascribed by J. Engemann (infra) to legends preserved in pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite and elsewhere. In such scenes, as in painted versions of the Creation and Ascension where they are also found, the sun is normally a red male while the moon is a blue female. When sun, moon, and stars appear together as in the Vienna Genesis (Gerstinger, Wien. Gen., pl.29), only the two main luminaries are personified. In this case their presence is justified by the text (Gen 37:9); lacking this basis, their function on the David Plates and elsewhere may witness to their symbolic role in events understood as divinely inspired.


—A.C.
SUNDAY (Κυριακή, “the Lord’s day”), the weekly Christian feastday from earliest times, though some Judaizing Christians continued to observe the Jewish Sabbath, a practice that was condemned by St. Paul and eventually suppressed by the 2nd C. Sunday was not a Christian Sabbath, however; it was an ordinary workday until Constantine I the Great proclaimed it a day of rest in 321, prohibiting all kinds of work except that in the fields and all legal transactions except manumissions. In 386, theatrical and circus performances were also forbidden on Sunday. Judaizing tendencies were a recurring problem, however, and the church fathers (e.g., Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom) criticized those observing Saturday as a day of rest.

Sunday was the day symbolic of the New Age, the day on which the Lord’s Supper is celebrated, sign of the continued presence of the Risen One until he comes again. It was also called “the eighth day,” meaning that as the new day, symbol of the arrival of the final age, it was outside the normal Jewish cycle of time, conceived in multiples of seven. Originally Eucharist was celebrated only on Sunday, and because it was a day of joy, kneeling and fasting were prohibited. In the 3rd C. Christians began to celebrate Eucharist on Saturday too and to prohibit fasting and kneeling on Saturday as on Sunday. In the West, however, Saturday was a fast day, and this became a source of dispute between Rome and Constantinople.

From the 4th C. onward Sunday was celebrated with great splendor in liturgical services focused on the paschal mystery, so that Sunday came to be considered a “Little Easter.” The festivities commenced Saturday night with a Resurrection vigil comprising three antiphons, prayers, the burning of incense in memory of the spices that the myrrh-bearers brought to the tomb of Jesus, and the proclamation by the bishop of the Gospel story of Jesus’ death and resurrection. This was followed at dawn by the customary Orthros and Eucharist and, in the evening, by Vespers. All these elements were integrated into the Byz. Sunday services.

---

SUNDIAL (ἀνάλημμα). Ptolemy described the principles of the sundial in On the Almanac. This work was not known in Constantinople after the late Roman period but is preserved in a Latin translation by William of Moerbeke in 1269.

A number of stone sundials survive from antiquity, at least some of which are probably late Roman. There are fragments of at least five portable sundials from the 4th to 6th C., of which one includes a gearing mechanism to display the calendar (J.V. Field, D.R. Hill, M.T. Wright, Byzantine and Arabic Mathematical Gearing [London 1985] 1–193). (See also Horologion.)

---

SUPERFICIES (ὑπερφον, ἐπουκοδομηθέν, lit. “upper story, built up”), all things built upon or attached to the ground, esp. houses and buildings, but also trees and other plants. According to the Roman principle sanctioned by Justinian I, superficies solo cedut, the ownership of the superficies always fell to the owner of the ground. However, the superficiarius, that is, the one who built on another’s land or cultivated it, was by no means devoid of rights. As long as he acted with the consent of the landowner, either a servitus or an emphyteusis could apply. Both legal institutions ensured the superficiarius a lasting return on his investments; the emphyteusis, moreover, ensured a right like that of ownership with regard to the heritability and the alienation of the superficies. In late Byz. practice the principle superficies solo cedut was generally neglected, so that separate property ownership rights could exist on a piece of land and on its superficies: a mill or chapel, for example, could be disposed of separately from the land.

---

SURETYSHIP (ἐγγύη), a simple and, next to the pignus, the most popular transaction for the security of financial claims of all kinds. It consisted of the written promise of a person, the guarantor, that he would fulfill the claim of the creditor in case of insolvency of the (chief) debtor. The complicated late Roman development culminated in
Justinian I's regulation of 535 (Nov. Just. 4) that remained in force until the end of the Byz. Empire (e.g., Harm. 3.6). The creditor who wished to collect a claim had to apply first to the chief debtor, then to the guarantor, and finally to third parties who possessed objects belonging to the debtor (e.g., pawns). The legal collections associate suretyship with financial loans; therefore the prescriptions on suretyship are found in the tities dealing with "loans" or close by. In practice, however, the setting of sureties occurred in the most diverse cases, for example, the obligation to return a dowry (Peira 65.2), to hand over the father's property (Peira 65.5), to fulfill public or private services (Peira 65.1, 65.15), etc. In the later period suretyship was even involved in obligations that cannot be calculated in terms of money (Hunger-Kresten, PatrKP, no. 89, a. 1325; surety for abstaining from sexual intercourse). Independent formulas are not known, perhaps because suretyship was already absorbed into the legal trans- action between creditor and chief debtor (Dochiar, no. 3-4, a. 1112).


SURGERY. Discussing surgery and its implements in book 6 of his medical encyclopedia, Paul of Aegina gathers Greco-Roman operations and techniques and adds 7th-C. Byz. advances. Several operations are detailed for various wounds, malformations of external structures surrounding the eyes, the surgical correction of pterygium (a growth of the conjunctiva), and couching of cataracts. Paul has sensible descriptions of tooth extraction, surgical correction for ankyloglossia (tongue-tie), tonsillectomy, the removal of the uvula, and a clipped account of tracheotomy quoted from the works of Antyllos (fl. ca. 150). Among dozens of operations, Paul provides detailed instructions for lithotomy (removal of bladder stones), a technique for draining pus in empyema, the surgical repair of enterocoele (intestinal hernia), and embryotomy. Cautery cruelly seals amputations, but excellent methods for splinting, setting, and bandaging fractures, dislocations, and sprains are given. Trephination is recommended for certain kinds of skull fractures, with good results claimed by Paul and his sources. Although later Byz. medical texts devote little attention to surgery, other evidence attests to the continuation of a wide variety of operations. One notable example was the (unsuccessful) separation of Siamese twins in the 10th C. (G.E. Pentogalos, J.G. Lascaratos, BHM 58 [1984] 99-102).

Among the over 200 known Byz. surgical instruments (as distinguished from those of Greek or Roman manufacture) are traditional probes, scalpels, bone chisels and saws, and lancets for venesection as well as sophisticated ear syringes, periosteal elevators, surgical scoops for removing weapons or missiles, variously shaped cauteries, and rectal and vaginal specula. Several MS illuminations (Florence, Laurent. 74.7) of around 900, possibly executed under the direction of the physician Niketas, depict many methods in the Bandages of Soranus (fl. 98-117) and the reduction of dislocations in the Commentary on Hippocrates' Joints by Apollonios of Kition (fl. ca. 50 B.C.). Arabic surgery absorbed much data from Byz. texts, esp. Paul of Aegina.


SURVEY. See Cadaster; Land Survey.

SUSANNA AND THE ELDERS. See Commendatio Animae.

SUTTON HOO TREASURE, dated to the 6th or 7th C. and discovered in 1939 in a burial mound at Woodbridge in Suffolk as part of the grave goods placed between 625 and 650 in the tomb of a king of East Anglia, probably Raedwald, who had been interred inside a ship. In addition to objects of local and Scandinavian manufacture, there are works of late Roman and Byz. silver that include a bowl similar to others in the Mil- denhall Treasure; a large niello-inlaid plate with silver stamps of 491-518, decorated with small busts of personifications of Rome and Constanti- nople; a set of ten bowls similar to the pair in the Lampsakos Treasure; and two spoons, one inscribed "Saul," the other "Paul," once thought to be baptismal gifts. Other works of Byz. manufac- tuire in this treasure that could have reached Anglo-
Saxon England by trade are two bronze bowls of a type often described as “Coptic.”


Suzdal’ (Σωύσταλισ), one of a cluster of towns in northeast Rus’, often linked politically to Rostov and to Vladimir-on-the-Kljaž’ma. Political, commercial, and cultural relations with Byz. grew in the mid-12th C. under the princes Jurij Dolgorukij and Andrej of Bogoljubovo. Byz. silks have been found at several sites in the region (M. Fechner, SovArch 3 [1977] 30–42); Jurij and Andrej were useful allies of Manuel I in that they curbed the effectiveness of the pro-Hungarian princes of Kiev; Andrej, through his patronage of art, literature, and public buildings in Vladimir attempted to create a prestigious cultural center in the Byz. style. The bishopric of Rostov-Suzdal’ was founded in the 1070s (A. Poppe, Byzantion 40 [1970] 193–97). Patr. Loukas Chrysoberges, however, refused Andrej’s request to establish there a metropolitan see independent of Kiev. From ca.1250 the metropolitan of Kiev tended in fact to reside in Vladimir—an arrangement Patr. Philotheos Kokkinos formalized in 1354 (RegPatr, fasc. 5, no.2967), although from 1308 the actual residence of the metropolitan was Moscow. Later Suzdal’ was elevated to an archbishopric. A letter by Patr. Neilos Kerameus of 1381 mentions Dionysios, archbishop of Suzdal’ (MM 2:33:33; on the date—RegPatr, fasc. 6, no.2729). In 1393 Euphrosynos, archbishop of Suzdal’ (MM 2:196.12–13), was in conflict with Kiprian, the metropolitan of all Russia, contesting his jurisdiction over the kastro of [Nižnij] Novgorod and Borodetzion (Gorodec) (RegPatr, fasc. 6, no.2998).


SVJATOSLAV (Σφυνδοσπάδμος), prince of Kiev from ca.945; died at the Dnieper rapids early spring 972. Son of Igor and Ol’ga, Svjatoslav spent his life in military expeditions, leaving the domestic administration to Ol’ga. In the 960s Svjatoslav destroyed the Khazar state, razing to the ground their strongholds Sarkel and Itil. After Niképhoros II Phokas failed in negotia-

SWINE (χοιροί) are usually listed in praktika along with sheep and goats, but they were owned in fewer numbers (usually two to five animals) and by fewer households. Great landowners, however, might possess large herds of pigs—thus John VI Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 2:185.7–8) calculates that 50,000 of his swine were confiscated after he was proclaimed emperor in 1341. Children drove swine to pastures for the entire day, as did St. Ioannikios at age seven (AASS Nov. 2:1:333C). Peasants fed their pigs in oak groves—a decision of Judge Nicholas in 995 relates that the swine grazed on...
chestnuts and acorns in the mountains (Ivir. 1, no. 9, 49–50). A tithe on swine (choirodehatia) sometimes appears in acts together with the ennominon on beehives (Esphig., no. 7, 7), sometimes with the ennominon on sheep and balanistron (Chil., no. 45, 16–17)—evidently, a tax on oak groves. The Byz. considered pork and lard coarse foods typical of boorish villagers.


SYKAI. See Galata.

SYKEON (Συκεών), village in Galatia on the great highway across Anatolia, about 100 km west of Ankara. The road here crossed the Siberis River, over which Justinian I built a strong stone bridge. At that time, Sykeon contained an inn kept by prostitutes; one of these was the mother of St. Theodore of Sykeon. His Life provides considerable information about the district, which was evidently well populated and flourishing in the late 6th C. Sykeon had several churches, the most important the triple-apsed monastery of Theodore with its adjacent chapels. Persians ravaged the district ca. 622; Sykeon does not reappear in history. The site has vanished beneath the floodwaters of a dam.

LIT. Tib 4:228f. —C.F.

SYLLAION (Συλλαίων), city of Pamphylia. An unimportant place in late antiquity, Syliaion first appears in history in 673, when an Arab fleet was destroyed nearby. It gained in importance in the 9th C. as a fortified city and residence of the ek prosopou of the Kibyrrhaiotai theme. John, who held the office ca. 821–29, is best known as St. Antony the Younger. Between 787 and 815, Syliaion became the ecclesiastical metropolis, replacing Perge, then in decline. It played a role during Iconoclasm: Patr. Constantine II (754–66), an active supporter of Constantine V, was bishop of Syliaion, and Antony I Kassymatas came from Syliaion. Otherwise, its history is obscure; it probably fell to the Turks in the 12th C. The site contains a fortified acropolis, probably Byz., and a palace (9th C.).


SYLLOGE TACTICORUM (Συλλογή Τακτικών, Collection of Tactics), a 10th-C. compilation of tactics and stratagems divided into two parts. The first section (1–56) covers a wide range of subjects including generalship, definitions of terminology, measurements, encampments, equipment, formations, and siege warfare; among the compiler’s sources were Onasander (1st C.), the Roman tactician Aelianus, and the Taktika of Leo VI. The second part (57–102) lists devices and mechanisms reputedly employed by famous commanders of antiquity; descriptions of these tactics were based on collections deriving from Sextus Julius Africanus and Polyaenus. This reliance on earlier authorities is balanced, however, by the compiler’s treatment of current warfare in chapters 38 and 39 (on infantry and cavalry equipment) and 46 and 47 (on tactics for cavalry alone or with infantry), in which he presents a detailed outline of contemporary formations and tactical doctrine, esp. on the offensive role of kathpharaktoi and the defensive role of the infantry. These chapters later formed the main source for the Praecepta militaria. Moreover, his comparison of classical and Byz. warfare (30–39) and comments on the differences (33.1, 47.1) reveals the compiler to be a serious student of war.

The date of the Sylloge is uncertain, and the text itself shows signs of being unfinished. The title and index in the only MS (Florence, Laur. Plut. 75–76) attribute it to Leo VI, but these apply to be later additions. References to soldiers and weapons first attested in the mid-10th C., and not found in the Taktika of Leo VI, suggest that the Sylloge was compiled during the reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos.

ED. A. Dain, Sylloges Tacticorum (Paris 1938).


SYMBOLISM, a system of representing intelligible or supraintelligible (unknowable) objects through sensible things. Christian theology dealt with two separate levels of beings: those of the earthly world and those of heaven. The union of
the two levels could be achieved ontologically through miracles, primarily the miracle of Christ who possessed two natures, divine and human. It could also be achieved gnosiologically: not by dint of logical concepts, however, but through a system of signs or symbols. Accordingly, the Byz. tackled the notion of signs, which they divide into allegory, symbol, and prefiguration (typos). The distinction between them could be confused and the terms used interchangeably, but in principle a prefiguration was an object or event that “typified” or foreshadowed a greater event in the future, as Jonah swallowed and disgorged by the sea monster typified Christ’s death and resurrection; allegory is a metaphorical description of a complex phenomenon; and the symbol is a manifestation (theophany) of the divine in a sensible form that allows our ascent to the intelligible and even to the unknowable.

The principles of symbolic theology were developed by the mystical writer pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite. Dionysios taught that there were two ways to transmit information about truth: by logical concepts and by symbols: a symbol is information beyond logic, based on the riddle that reveals and at the same time conceals the truth. Ascent to the truth via symbols presupposes a triad of purification, illumination, and perfection.

Symbolism pervaded many aspects of Byz. life, esp. liturgy, ceremony, and iconography; liturgical space symbolized the cosmos, liturgical actions reproduced the history of salvation, imperial ceremonial was the image of the heavenly order, and the icon a sensible form of the divine. Various problems arose in this connection: thus, one and the same sensible object could serve as a symbol of manifold events and ideas, while, on the other hand, one and the same phenomenon could be symbolized through manifold sensible things. Moreover, the borderline between symbol and being could be vague. For instance, did the Eucharist symbolize the sacrifice of Christ or was each eucharistic act an actual repetition of the sacrifice? Was the icon a symbol of divinity, the Virgin, or a saint, or was it a divinity in itself, wielding its own miraculous power? Was the emperor an image of God or was he and all his environment divine, so that a crime against the emperor was a crime against God? Both interpretations of these contradictory views found their supporters in Byz. thought. The solution, however, lay in the concept of the sign-symbol as an “intermediary” between illusionistic imitation of reality and conventional abstraction deprived of sensible content (V. Byčkov, Estetika poznej antičnosti [Moscow 1981] 267).

In the visual arts, as in literature, symbolism similarly operated at a variety of levels and in a great diversity of contexts. Simplest perhaps were the representations of animals and plants that carried hidden significance: the deer that thirsts because it has swallowed a serpent was a widespread image alluding to the Baptism of Christ. Manmade objects such as a lighthouse were represented, probably to signify the salvific light of Christ. Personifications, too, functioned at different levels of meaning, the relationship between them being explained (or not) by the context. Thus parallels between the divine maker and a human founder were sometimes evoked by the image of Ktisis (Creation); Ananeosis (Renewal), a common embodiment of the notion of restoration as applied to a monument, also evoked the idea of the renewal provided by the eucharistic sacrifice (Maguire, infra 48–53). Biblical persons and events were represented for their significance in terms of typology: the pit into which Joseph was lowered, as on the cathedra of Maximian and other works, was understood as the tomb of Christ, while the burning bush, Aaron’s rod, and the Ark of the Covenant were viewed as prefigurations of the Virgin Mary.


-A.K., A.C.

SYMEON, archbishop of Thessalonike (1416/17–1429) and ecclesiastical writer; born Constantinople, died Thessalonike mid-Sept. 1429. Before his elevation to the see of Thessalonike he was a hieromonk, perhaps at the monastery ton Xanthopoulou in Constantinople. An ardent hesychast, he staunchly defended Orthodoxy and opposed the surrender of Thessalonike to either Venetians or Turks.

Symeon’s works shed much light on both the
SYMEON, MONASTERY OF SAINT

SYMEON, MONASTERY OF SAINT (Dayr Anbā Hadrā), ruined complex on the west bank of the Nile near Aswān, built on the presumed dwelling site of a 4th-C. bishop of Aswān. Except for the caves of some Early Christian anchorites, the visible remains are all Fātimid (11th–12th C.). The 11th-C. church belongs to the domed-octagon type, found in the contemporary architecture of Greece and occasionally in Egypt, where, however, there are two domes, not one. The sanctuary is a triconch comprising the altar chamber and the khūrūs (choros, choir).


–P.G.

SYMEON, MONASTERY OF SAINT

SYMEON, PSEUDO-. See Makarios/Symeon.

SYMEON II, patriarch of Jerusalem (from before 1092); died Cyprus 15 July 1098. Few details of his life are known. Circa 1092 he attended a local council in Constantinople. Shortly before the arrival of the First Crusade he fled to Cyprus to escape the Turkish threat. At the end of 1097 and again on 15 Jan. 1098, he cooperated with the Latins by sending an appeal to the West for help (ed. Hagenmeyer, infra). A short treatise, ironic in tone, condemning the use of azymes is attributed to him. Leib denied his authorship in spite of the MS tradition, but Michel has shown that the tract was Symeon’s reply to a certain Laycus of Amalfi.


–A.P.

SYMEON LOGOTHETE, magistros; writer; fl. mid-10th C. Symeon wrote a chronicle published under various names: Théodosios of Meliten (in fact Melissenos—misunderstood in the 16th C.—O. Kresten, JOB 25 [1976] 208–12), Leo Grammatikos (a scribe of 1019), etc. It is suggested that an epitome from Adam up to Justinian II was the basis of this chronicle; it was continued to 842, coinciding often with George Hamartolos. The chronicle of Symeon proper encompasses 842–948 and consists of three sections different in style and approach: the story of Michael III and Basil I; the story of Leo VI and Alexander, based in part on the “annals” of Constantinople (R. Jenkins, DOP 19 [1965] 89–112); and a description of the period 913–48 based on the author’s personal observations. The chronicle is known in three versions: the original written from a pro-Lecapene position; the so-called Continuation of George Hamartolos, which probably was extended to 963 and originated in the circle connected with the Phokas family (A. Markopoulos, BZ 76 [1983] 279–81); and the chronicle of pseudo-Symeon Magistros. Various continuations of
Symeon’s chronicle exist. It is preserved also in Church Slavonic translation.

Also preserved under Symeon’s name is a poem on the death of Stephen (in 963), son of Romanos I; because this death is not mentioned in the chronicle, V. Vasil’evskij concluded that the chronicle was produced before 963 (VizVrem 3 [1896] 576). Another poem of Symeon, called magistros and logothetes tou stratistokou, is a dirge for Constantine VII (died 959). There is also a series of letters by Symeon, magistros and logothetes tou dromou (a former protasektëtis), unfortunately without any chronological indications: Darrouzès’ insufficient argumentation for a late 10th-C. date is based only on a reference to the name of Bp. Theodégios. In the MS, these letters are mixed with those of Nicholas I Mystikos, thus suggesting a date in the first half of the century rather than at its end. Because throughout the 10th C. many patricians and magistroi were named Symeon (I. Ševčenko, DOP 23/4 [1969–70] 216f.), their identification is tricky, and it cannot be proved that the author of the chronicle was SYMEON METAPHRATES.


SYMEON MAGISTROS, PSEUDO-, conventional name of the author of the anonymous chronicle preserved in a single copy, Paris, B.N. gr. 1712 of the 12th or 13th C. The chronicle begins with Creation and ends at 963; it was apparently completed at the end of the 10th C. It is a compilation based primarily on Theophanes and Symeon Logothete; for the initial section, the author also used Malalas and especially John of Antioch. Particularly important are the traces of an anti-Photian pamphlet which Niketas David Paphлагон probably also used in his vita of Patr. Ignatios. The text of Symeon was translated into Slavonic in the 14th C. Only some sections of the chronicle have been published.


SYMEON METAPHRATES, writer, high official at the end of the 10th C., and saint; died ca.1000; feastday 28 Nov. Mark Eugenikos, who wrongly called him megas logothetes, made the improbable statement that Symeon was born in the reign of Leo VI (cf. H. Delehaye, AB 17 [1898] 450f); an attempt by S. Eustratiades (EEBS 10 [1933] 26–38) to relocate Symeon to the 11th C. contradicts the direct evidence of Ep’rem Mcire, who places Symeon’s acme in the sixth year of Basil II (P. Peeters, AB 29 [1910] 357–59). Yahya of Antioch also regards Symeon as a contemporary of Basil II and Pater. Nicholas II Chrysos-berges (V. Vasil’evskij, ŽMPN 212 [Dec. 1880] 436). Although usually identified with SYMEON LOGOTHETE, the hagiographer apparently belonged to the next generation and worked in a different genre. Symeon composed a hymn to the Trinity (J. Koder, JOB 14 [1965] 133–38), various kanones and stichera, and edifying excerpts from Basil the Great and other church fathers.

His major achievement was a voluminous collection of saints’ Lives (see VITA), systematized in the style of 10th-C. ENCYCLOPEDIA (Lemerle, Humanism 337–39), which Ehrhard characterizes as “a revolution in the field of hagiography” (infra 2:397). Symeon reworked most of the texts he used, to standardize and purify the language (H. Ziliacu, BZ 38 [1938] 333–50; W. Lackner in Byzantios 227–31) and give it rhetorical embellishment. The material was organized according to the feasts of the ecclesiastical calendar. Symeon’s work was highly appreciated by his contemporary Nikephoros Ouranos (Mercati, CollByz 1:565–73), and Psellos dedicated an enkomion to him (Psel- los, Scripta min. 1:94–107).

The texts of the Metaphrastian MENOLOGION, usually arranged in editions of ten volumes each, became standard reading in monastic circles from the 11th C. onward. During the 11th C., these editions were occasionally illustrated, some with frontispieces, others with standing portraits, figured initials, scenes of martyrdom, or even very short narrative cycles accompanying every text.
Few illustrated editions were produced after the early 12th C.


SYMEON OF BLACHERNAI. See MENOLOGION OF BASIL II.

SYMEON OF BULGARIA, tsar (893–927); born between 863 and 865, died 27 May 927. Boris sent Symeon, his third son, to Constantinople to be educated for an ecclesiastical career; in 893, however, Symeon was recalled to replace his elder brother Vladimir as prince of Bulgaria. Imbued with Byz. culture, Symeon became a dangerous rival of the Byz. emperor; he tried first to establish an equality of power between the two states, then to conquer Constantinople and become emperor of the Greeks and Bulgarians. As a pretext for war, Symeon used the transfer of trade with the Bulgarians from Constantinople to Thessalonike in 893. After some successes, Symeon was temporarily checked by the Hungarians (see Hungary); then he won a decisive battle at Boulgarophygon and signed a peace treaty. The second war began again with Symeon’s offensive, probably during the reign of Alexander (A. Kazhdan in Slavjanskiy archiv, vol. 2 [Moscow 1959] 23–29). In 913 Symeon marched toward Constantinople and forced the administration of Nicholas I Mystikos to yield: the patriarch placed on Symeon’s head a sort of crown that symbolized his installation within the Byz. imperial hierarchy. This peace did not last. Either Zoe Karbonopsis broke the promises made by Nicholas, or Symeon decided to take advantage of the shaky situation in Constantinople, and in 914 war broke out again. Symeon crushed the Byz. army at Achealous and Katasyrtae and in 918 reached the Gulf of Corinth. Romanos I Lekapenos, after his coup d’état, endeavored to muster a defense, although the government was ready to agree to pay tribute and yield some territories. In 922 Byz. attempted to create a broad coalition against Symeon (including Armenia and Abasgia) but failed; Symeon’s meeting with Romans in 924 did not lead to a reconciliation. Then Romans arranged resistance against Symeon in the Balkans. After a hard struggle Symeon managed to subdue the Serbs, but in 926 Tomislav defeated a Bulgarian army that invaded Croatia. Soon thereafter Symeon died while planning a new expedition against Byz. His successor Peter of Bulgaria immediately negotiated a peace treaty.


SYMEON OF EMESA, saint, the first of the holy fools whose activity was described; of Syrian origin (from Edessa?); feastday 21 July. His dates are disputed: Evagrios Scholastikos makes him a contemporary of Justinian I, while Leontios of Neapolis places his floruit in the reign of Maurice. After 29 years in the desert near the Dead Sea, Symeon came to Emesa, where he spent the rest of his life. Leontios’s Life of Symeon is an important source for the study of urban life in late antiquity. Leontios created the image of a saint who in his extreme humility played the role of a fool and rejected the traditional values and order of the ancient polis: Symeon supposedly dragged along the streets a dead dog found on a dunghill and even disrupted church services by throwing nuts and snuffing out candles. On the other hand, Symeon’s behavior implied that of Christ himself: he overturned the counters of pastry cooks near a church, struggled against the Devil, worked miracles, foresaw the future, and averted an earthquake. Thus Leontios made manifest the double nature of the holy man. Symeon’s vita is known also in Syriac, Arabic, Georgian, and Slavonic translations.


LIT. BHG 1677–1677zd. L. Rydén, Bemerkungen zum Leben des heiligen Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis

—A.K.
SYMEON THE STYLITE THE ELDER, saint; born village of Sis or Sisa, Cilicia, ca.389, died Qal'at Sem'an near Antioch 24 July 459; feastday 1 Sept. A shepherd as a boy, Symeon later joined the monastery of Teleda but was temporarily expelled because of his extreme asceticism; for example, he wore next to his skin a rope of palm fibers so rough that it cut his flesh. He lived briefly in a dry cistern in the mountains, then in seclusion for three years in a small cell at Telanissos, and then in a circular enclosure on the mountain of Qal'at Sem'an, where he chained his right leg to a stone; he yielded, however, to the chorepiskopos Melitios and permitted a blacksmith to remove the chain. The first stylicate, Symeon acquired considerable fame and was visited by people of many nations: Ishmaelites, Persians, Armenians, Iberians, Spaniards, British, etc. To avoid their attempts to touch him, Symeon had the column built higher and higher, until it reached 16 meters. He preached from the pillar, but evidence

Symeon the Stylicate the Elder. Portrait of Symeon. Miniature in the Menologion of Basil II (Vat. gr. 1613, p.2). Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. The saint on his column is visited by Arabs. To the right, a monk.
of political interference is rare: the Syriac vita (ed. Lietzmann, infra, p. 174f) relates that Symeon forced Theodosios II to cancel his edict restoring synagogues in Syria. When Symeon died, baptized Arabs tried to carry away his coffin, but Arda-bourios, son of Aspar, stopped them. His body was soon removed to Antioch, but the pillar continued to be an object of veneration. The story of Symeon is related by Theodoret of Cyrhrus (A. Leroj-Molinghen, Byzantium 34 [1964] 375–84); in a Greek Life, whose author claims to be Antony, a disciple of Symeon; and in a Syriac Life.

At Qa‘at Sem‘ân are the impressive remains of the shrine enclosing Symeon’s column.

**Representation in Art.** It is difficult to distinguish between images of the two saints called Symeon the Stylite except when they are identified by inscription or clearly connected with a specific date in the church calendar. Inscribed eulogiai have been found showing the hooded bust of the saint on his column, two angels, and the ladder; on bas-reliefs, a dove with a crown replaces the angels (I. Pena, P. Castellana, and R. Fernandez, Les stylites syriens [Milan 1975] 179–95). A 6th-C. silver plaque in the Louvre shows a Symeon, probably the Elder, in conversation with a huge serpent coiled around the column (Age of Spirit., no.529). Symeon the Elder’s commemoration on 1 Sept., the beginning of the church year, assured him a certain importance in liturgical book illustration: his portrait appears as a frontispiece to the volume as a whole (menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes) or to the calendar section of illuminated Gospel lectionaries (Athos, Dion., 587, fol.116r [Treasures 1, fig.237]). A miniature in the Menologion of Basil II (p.2) shows the saint being visited by several individuals, mostly Arabs. In other miniatures his mother and a monk, probably his biographer Antony, are often shown in attendance. Narrative cycles of unusual length are found in a Cappadocian church (Zilve) and in one 11th-C. MS of Metaphrastes, which includes scenes of Symeon’s early years and of his death (Athos, Esphig. 14, fols. 2r–2v [Treasures 2, figs. 327–28]). In the 9th-C. Khudov Psalter (fol.3v; see Psalmers), a basket is being lowered from the saint’s platform by means of a rope.


–A.K., N.P.S.

**Symeon the Stylite the Younger,** saint; born Antioch 521, died in monastery of the Wondrous Mountain 592; feastdays 23 and 24 May. Symeon was born to a family of perfumers originally from Edessa. When his father perished in an earthquake (26 May 526), Symeon left for a mountaneous site called Pila; at age seven he ascended a pillar and became a stylite. Circa 541 he moved to another pillar, atop the Wondrous Mountain; later a monastery was built nearby. Symeon wrote ascetic works and troparia; two of his letters are preserved. John of Damascus attributed Symeon’s Life to Arkadios, archbishop of Constantia on Cyprus, but van den Ven (infra [1962] 1101f) rejects this attribution, suggesting that it was written by an anonymous contemporary of Symeon. Although Symeon’s exploits took place in a deserted mountaneous site north of the Orontes, the author frequently refers to Antioch, describing the Persian siege of 540, the plague of 542, and the earthquake of 557; he worries that the Antiochenses, particularly the elite, are infected with paganism, Manichaeanism, astrological beliefs, and other heresies (par. 161).20–21. Also interested in events in Constantinople, he has Symeon predict that Justin II would succeed Justinian I. He is aware of the Arab world, reporting the death of the Lakhmid al-Mundhir (Alamundarius) in 553. Nikephoros Ouranos re-worked the Life, which is also preserved in several abridged versions (J. Bombara, Hellenika 13 [1954] 71–110) and in Georgian and Arabic translations (J. Nasrallah, AB 90 [1972] 387–89). The monastery produced Symeon tokens (see Pilgrim Tokens), clay and lead images of Symeon, which were popular with pilgrims until the 12th C. (J. Lafontaine-Doosogne, Byzantium 51 [1981] 631). Images of the younger Symeon the Stylite closely echo that of the Elder, so that it is often difficult to distinguish between the two when there is no identifying caption.
SYMEON THE THEOLOGIAN, mystic and saint; born in Paphlagonia in 949?, died near Constantinople 12 Mar. 1022; the chronology of his life seems debatable (Kazhdan, “Simeon” 4–10). H.-G. Beck has questioned his customary epiteth, the “New Theologian” (BZ 46 [1959] 59f; see, however, the retort of B. Krivochîine, OrChrP 20 [1954] 327). According to his biography written by Niketas Stethatos, Symeon was born to a rich family, educated in Constantinople and at 14 [sic] became a senator. Soon, however, he abandoned his career and entered the Stoudios monastery under the supervision of Symeon Eulabes. He then moved to the monastery of St. Mamas, where he was appointed hegoumenos sometime between 979 and 991. The monks opposed him, rebelling in 996–98, and he had serious difficulties with the ecclesiastical authorities: Symeon’s veneration of his spiritual father Symeon Eulabes was proclaimed excessive; forced to resign, he was banished to a small town near Chrysopolis. Under pressure from some magnates in Constantinople, Symeon was recalled from exile and granted land near the capital to build a monastery of St. Marina; here he had some problems with neighboring peasants.

In his Centuria (Chapters), catechises, treatises, and hymns, Symeon developed the concept of an individualistic path to salvation: “Do not ruin your own house,” says Symeon, “while trying to help your neighbor build his house” (Centuria 1.85). Not charity, nor even the sacraments determine one’s salvation, but submission to one’s spiritual father, a constant awareness of one’s humble position, and awe in the face of God that finds consummation in the vision of divine light. Symeon neglects the concept of hierarchy that is so important for Niketas Stethatos and presents man as capable of direct ascent to God. Accordingly he divinizes even the human body, whose every part, even the pudenda, is Christ himself (Hymn 15.141–74). Socially, Symeon’s individualism led to a consistent rejection of friendship and family ties; man stands alone in the world, devoid of hierarchical, institutional, or personal relationships except for obedience to the spiritual father, the emperor, and God. The rich imagery of Symeon’s works is dominated by two typically Byz. themes: palace life centered on the figure of the emperor and the circle of merchants and craftsmen (A. Kazhdan in Unser ganzes Leben Christus unserem Gott übertworten [Göttingen 1982] 221–39).


SYMEON TOKENS. See Pilgrim Tokens.

SYMEON UROŠ, more fully Symeon Uroš Ne-manjić Palaiologos, despotes of Epiros and Akarnania (1348–55), independent ruler of Epiros (from 1359); died after 1369. Son of Stefan Uroš III Dečanski and grandson of panhypersebastos John Palaiologos, Symeon was made despotes by his half-brother Stefan Uroš IV Dušan. He married Thomas, sister of Nikaforos II of Epiros. When, after Dušan’s death (1355), Nikephoros invaded Epiros and Thessaly, Symeon was forced to move his capital from Trikka to Kastoria; in 1356, with the support of his army, he revolted against Stefan Uroš V, Dušan’s son and legitimate heir, and proclaimed himself tsar of the Rhomaioi, Serbs, and Albanians. The Serbian nobles, however, supported Stefan Uroš and defeated Sy-
meon in his attacks on Serbian lands. Following the death of Nikephoros in 1358 or 1359, Symeon took over control of Epiros and Thessaly, where he reigned independently.

Symeon was a major benefactor of the Meteora monasteries; his son John Uros Doukas Palaiologos, who became the monk Ioasaph, continued this patronage, supporting the construction of the monastery of the Transfiguration. Symeon's full-length portrait is represented on the genealogical tree of the Nemanjic dynasty as depicted in a fresco painting in the Church of the Virgin at Peć.


-J.S.A.

SYMMACHUS, more fully Quintus Aurelius Memmius Eusebius Symmachus, writer and statesman; born ca.345, died ca.402. Scion of a wealthy and politically important family at Rome, Symmachus rose through various offices to become urban prefect of Rome (384–85) and consul in 391. He twice backed losing usurpers (383, 392–94), but twice ingratiated himself with Theodosios I, a tribute to the eloquence that even Christian opponents admired. In religion as in politics he backed the wrong horse, losing to Ambrose of Milan the famous struggle about the Altar of Victory removed by Gratian (381). His pagan beliefs were sincere (he was also an assiduous priest) but cannot be divorced from his attempted perpetuation of the cultural life and leisure of a classical Roman. His oratorical fame cannot be tested since only fragments of eight speeches survive; his career suggests that it was deserved. His poetry, polymathy, and promotion of education, praised by Macrobius, Sidonius, and Socrates, must also be more surmised than sampled. About 900 of his letters survive, however, published posthumously by his son, who also memorialized his career in an extant (CIL 6:1699) inscription at Rome. Arranged in ten books, most of the letters are largely empty verbiage, though they mirror the social and intellectual pursuits of Symmachus's milieu. The tenth book preserves the formerly separate relations, his official reports as urban prefect to Valentian II, giving a valuable picture of late Roman bureaucracy in action.


-B.B.

SYMMACHUS, pope (from 22 Nov. 498); born Sardinia, died Rome 19 July 514. A pagan in his youth, Symmachus was elected pope during the AKAHIAN SCHISM with the backing of THEODORIC THE GREAT; the Ostrogothic ruler favored him as an adversary of the supporters of Patr. Akakios. During his pontificate he confronted the resistance of partisans, headed by Laurentius, who favored reconciliation with Constantinople. The senior priests and deacons formed the Laurentian camp, whereas junior priests favored Symmachus. By 501 Theodoric—probably in an attempt at appeasement with Constantinople—shifted sides and supported Laurentius. He convened a synod in Rome to judge Symmachus but the synod refused to try the pope. In 502, at the request of Laurentius, Theodoric sent his envoy Peter of Altinum to Rome to celebrate Easter on the Greek date. Laurentius gained the assistance of Emp. Anastasios I, who wrote to Symmachus accusing him of being a Manichaean and of having conspired to excommunicate the emperor. In his response Symmachus curtly refused any reconciliation with the partisans of Akakios. As a result of his struggle on two fronts Symmachus developed the principle that the bishops of Rome were accountable only to God; this idea was elaborated in pamphlets and in a series of forged documents ascribed to Popes Silvester and Liberius and to the acts of a council in Sinuessa (which were later accepted in the Liber Pontificalis). In 506 Theodoric ordered Laurentius to retire to an estate, and the conflict subsided.


-A.K.

SYMMETRY (συμμετρία) was one of the cardinal notions of BYZ. AESTHETICS, closely connected with the idea that the God-created cosmos possessed "inborn" beauty and Taxis. In the words of
Athanassios of Alexandria (PG 25:76A), “the universe is characterized not by disorder but by *taxis*, not by disproportions but by *symmetria*, not by lack of ornament but by orderly decoration and harmonious array.” The symmetry of the universe is reflected in the bilateral structure of the human body, and this was praised as a simple and ideal relationship revealing *indissociabilis unitas* (Lactantius, *De opificio dei*, ed. M. Perrin [Paris 1974] 10:10–11). Symmetry and harmony were known in classical aesthetics, yet did not occupy a leading position; on the other hand, Psellus consistently emphasizes symmetry and bodily harmony as typical of his heroes. Other related categories were connected with symmetry: proportionality (*me-tron*), balance (*eurhythmia*), and inner *rhythmos*. All these categories had not only physical meaning but a moral connotation as well: “proportional” and “well-balanced” meant at the same time “even tempered” and were contrasted with “ugly” and “disorderly.” Accordingly, Byz. ceremonial, imperial and ecclesiastical alike, was based on symmetrical structures, as for instance the disposition of the *demos* during festal acclamations.

**Symmetry in Art.** Defined as the correspondence in position, size, or shape of the elements of an image, symmetry was an abiding principle of Byz. composition. For aulic representations, such as the imperial PORTRAITS in Hagia Sophia (Constantinople), and sacred images, in single works and composite schemes such as triptychs, artists echoed the philosophical ideas of balance and *taxis*. For Paul Silentiarios and Agathias the symmetry of Hagia Sophia was an essential part of the architects’ achievement. In practice, it is easily recognized in images of the Communion of the Apostles (see Lord’s SUPPER) where, from the 6th C. onward, the apostles approach Christ in two equalitarian files; the “rhyming” figures of Mary and John witness the Crucifixion, while symmetrical groups of patriarchs and kings regard the Anastasis. In and after the late 13th C. asymmetry appears but always as an exception. Thus in the Gospel book, Malibu, J.P. Getty Mus., cod. Ludwig 11 5, while the Ascension (fol.188r) is composed as usual with the figures arranged symmetrically, the Gethsemane miniature (fol.68r) shows the mass of sleeping apostles outweighing the two figures of Christ to the right.


-A.K., A.C.

**SYMPATHIA** (συμπάθεια, lit. “sympathy”), a fiscal term used in the treatises on *taxation* to designate a kind of *tax alleviation*. According to the treatise of St. Nikanor, *sympathia* was established when an allotment of land was abandoned and the *allelegyón* of the *demosion* (see *kanon*) was to be instituted, but instead of imposing the tax on neighbors the *eptpo*es rented out the land. Within 30 years the “heirs” (owners) could return and claim the land; after 30 years, through the procedure of *orthosis*, *sympathia* became a *klasma*. The Venice treatise on taxation (ed. Dölder, 118.21–37) also allows “heirs” to claim the land within 30 years; it contrasts, however, the comprehensive *sympathia* or *holosympatheton*, which encompassed the entire sum of a taxpayer’s *kanon*, and partial *sympathia*, which encompassed only some of his *stichoi*. The author of the treatise distinguishes the *koupismos* from *sympathia* in that in the case of *koupismos* the whereabouts of the owner was unknown (p.119.19–21). The paragraph on the *koupismos* in the treatise of St. Nikanor makes no sense (J. Karayannopulos in *Polychronion* 331), and probably the difference between the two institutions disappeared.

**Lit.** Litavrin, *VisOběžestvo* 206–14.

-A.K.

**SYMPOONOS** (σύμπονος), coadjutor of the eparch of the city. Buzy (Adm. System 70f) considered him a successor of the *adseiores* of the urban prefect. The earliest seal of a *symponos* (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.1049) is dated to the 6th or 7th C. The *symponos* represented the eparch in his relations with guilds; the hypothesis (supported by Sjuzjumov in Bk. of Eparch 238) that there were individual *symponoi* in each guild is rejected by Oikonomides (*Listes* 320, n.189). On seals of the 10th–11th C. the *symponos* receives relatively high titles (mostly *protospatharios*, but even *magistros* and *protovestarches*). The last known *symponos* seems to have been the *spathamokandidatos* Basil who participated in a session of the patriarchal tribunal in 1023 (*RegPatr*, fasc. 3, no.933, with incorrect date). The office is not mentioned by pseudo-Kodinos in the 14th C.

**Lit.** Laurent, Corpus 2:579–99.

-A.K.
SYNADA (Σύναδα, now Şuhut), city of Phrygia at an important highway junction. Although metropolis of Phrygia Salutaris, Synada rarely appears in late antique history. It was occupied by the Arabs in 740. Synada contained a Jewish community from which in the 9th C. came St. Constantine the Jew. The city is best known from the letters of its 10th-C. metropolitan Leo of Synada that claim that the barren region of Synada produced no olives, wine, or wheat; its inhabitants were forced to eat barley, to import necessities from Thrakeion and Attaleia, and to burn dried dung for fuel. These rhetorical complaints reveal a geographical reality but fail to mention the region’s wealth, based on cattle and a strategic location. Another letter shows that Synada continued to function as a center of the marble trade: marble from the nearby quarries of Dokimeion, widely used in late antiquity (notably in Hagia Sophia of Constantinople), was still being quarried, cut, and transported. Synada fell to the Turks after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071. The city was an ecclesiastical metropolis.


SYNADENOS (Συναδηνός, fem. Συναδηνή), a noble family name, deriving from the town of Synada in Phrygia. Setting aside a 9th/10th-C. seal on which the name of Synadenos can barely be read, the first known Synadenos was Philetos, judge of Tarsos, a man close to Nikephoros Ouranos; a contemporary of Philetos is mentioned in Peira 17.19, but the editor, Zachariä von Lingenthal, misinterpreted the name of Synadenos. The 11th- and 12th-C. Synadenoi were primarily military commanders; one held a pronoia in the emporion tou Brachioniou near Constantinople (P. Gautier, RExc 32 [1974] 117.1473–74). They were related to the Botaneiai and later to the Komnenoi; Nikephoros III married his niece Synadene to a Hungarian king or magnate. In the mid-12th C. Andronikos Synadenos was governor (sequentially) of Dyrrhachion, Cyprus, Nis, and Trebizond. After 1204 the Synadenoi opposed the Laskarid dynasty: a young general, Synadenos, was captured by Theodore I Laskaris in 1204; another Synadenos was blinded ca.1225 for participation in a plot.

The Synadenoi acquired importance under Michael VIII: John was megas stratopedarches, his son John megas konostaulos, and another son, Theodore, protostrator; Theodore (died before 1346) supported Andronikos III during the Civil War of 1321–28 and Kantakouzenos against John V, but after 1342 he sided with the latter. The megas stratopedarches John Synadenos (monastic name Ioakeim) and his wife Theodora Palaiologina (as a nun, Theodoule) founded the Bebaia Elpidios Nunnery and are depicted in its typikon. This MS further includes images of their sons, John and Theodore, together with their spouses, and two Asan men married to Synadenai. Other noble families to whom the Synadenoi were related include the Raoul. Their connection to the family of Synadenos Astras is unclear.


SYNAGOGUE OF FIFTY TITLES (Συναγωγή κανόνων εκκλησιαστικών εἰς τίτλους διαρμήνη, “a compilation of ecclesiastical canons divided into 50 titles”), a “systematic” collection of canons organized according to content. The collection reproduces the Apostolic Canons and the canons of the Councils of Nicaea, Ankyra, Neokaisareia, Serdica, Gangra, Antioch, Laodikeia of Phrygia, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon as well as the “canonical” letters of Basil the Great. According to the prooimion of the work, the latter had been overlooked in a comparable collection (not preserved) that was divided into 60 titles. According to a plausible attribution found in several MSS, the author was Patr. JOHN III SCholastikos. The collection probably originated in the mid-6th C., when John was a priest in Antioch. The work was later expanded into a Nomokanon of 50 Titles and translated into Slavonic in the 9th C.

ED. V. Benešević, Ioannis Scholastici Synagoga L. titulorum (Munich 1937).

LIT. V. Benešević, Synagoga v 50 titulov i druge juridisce sborniki Ioanna Scholastika (St. Petersburg 1914; rp. Leipzig 1972). E. Schwartz, Die Kanonessammlung des Johannes Scholastikos [SBAW 1933, no.6].

A.S.
SYNAGOGUE (συναγωγή), a place of assembly for a Jewish community, the primary focus of Jewish religious life after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. A synagogue provided a prayer hall for the recitation and study of the Torah, rooms for sacred meals, a law court, treasury, and guest quarters. While synagogues may stem from the Exilic period (6th C. B.C.), they are attested from the 1st C. A.D. (Mt 13:54, Mk 1:21, Acts 9:20); physical remains from the 2nd through 7th C. are extant in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, and Italy. The central synagogue at Alexandria, destroyed under Trajan, was probably the most impressive; that at Sardis (major phase 320–40) is the most distinguished surviving example. The small synagogue at Dura Europos was, apparently uniquely, decorated with Old Testament frescoes. Synagogues normally served small communities (in the 3rd and 4th C. Tiberias had 13 of these buildings). Ground plans and orientation vary, but common to many is a central, rectangular prayer room, set off from aisles on three sides by columns and entered on the short side from an open columnar court. Benches were provided against the rear walls of the aisles; from the 5th C. a permanent Torah shrine is found on the north long wall, on the east entrance wall flanking the central portal (Sardis), or in the apse facing Jerusalem.

The term applied primarily to the congregation of Jews and to their place of worship (sometimes also to the synagogue of the Samaritans), as contrasted with the Gospel and the church. In patristic literature it also denoted the Christian community, its public worship (synaxis), and its place of worship.


SYNAGOGUE, PERSONIFICATION OF. See EKKLESIA.

SYNAPTE. See Litany.

SYNAXARION (συναξάριον), a church calendar of fixed feasts with the appropriate lections indicated for each one, but no further text. The synaxarion is often appended to a praxapostolos or evangelion. It is rarely illustrated, but one MS, Vat. gr. 1156 of the 11th C., has an image of a saint for each day from Sept. through Jan. as well as scattered ones thereafter (Lazarev, Storia, fig. 205). There also exist “calendar” icons, with portraits of saints and feasts for each day of the year (Soteriou, Eikones, figs. 126–35), that must be based on this type of synaxarion.

The term synaxarion is also used in Byz. Greek for a specific collection of brief notices, mostly hagiographical: the Synaxarion of Constantinople. The Synaxarion of Constantinople was probably formed in the 10th C. (the earliest MSS already include notices on Joseph the Hymnographer and on Patr. Antony II Kauleas [893–901]), and there are Arabic, Georgian, Syriac, and Ethiopic versions. These daily commemorations, which average only about a paragraph in length, stress the martyrdom of the saints and inform us where in the city the commemoration took place. The Menologion of Basil II is, despite its name, an illustrated version of this type of text, as are those icons and frescoes that have images of the martyrdoms of the saints, rather than just their portraits (see Hagiographical Illustration). Some of the frescoes use verses from the metrical calendar of Christopher of Mytilene as captions; these verses had been incorporated into certain recensions of the Synaxarion of Constantinople from the 12th C.

These texts were incorporated into the menaion and the triddion and usually read after the sixth ode of the kanon at orthros. They are not to be confused with the much longer notices, similarly ordered, found in a menologion.


SYNAXARION OF THE HONORABLE DONKEY (Συναξάριον τοῦ τιμημένου γαδάρου), a delightful story telling how the hard-working and ill-treated Donkey outwits the wily Wolf and the cunning Fox, who had planned to make a meal
of him. The work survives in two closely connected versions, both in political verse (one in 393 unrhymed lines; the other in 543 rhymed lines and printed in Venice in 1539), both deriving from a version written probably in the early 15th C. The humor and satire of the piece, given its edge by the animal actors, is directed against unscrupulous clergy who bemuse their simple parishioners with mumbo-jumbo, but in this case receive their just deserts. Though the Wolf and the Fox share the characteristics of their counterparts in similar western European folktales (esp. as developed in the many versions of the Roman de Renart), the details are Greek and no direct Western model is known. By the 12th C. the subject had entered the repertoire of animal forms carved on lintels, capitals, and other relief sculpture in churches. This situation led D. Pallas (EEBS 30 [1960–61] 413–52) to suggest that such figures had apotropaic and specifically Christian significance.


SYNAXIS (συνάξις), an assembly, esp. a monastic or liturgical gathering. Monks on Mt. Athos distinguished between καθολικαί and κοιναί συναξισ, the former being the assembly of selected Fathers to discuss serious affairs, the latter, the gathering of ordinary monks on feast days (D. Papachrysanthou in Prot., p.119). In the APOTHEGMA PATRUM the word synaxis refers to an office of prayer even when not performed in common (PG 65:201CD, 220CD). A synaxis required suitable dress. The same source describes a hermit who was reprimanded by his superior for appearing in church for the synaxis wearing a patched old maphorion (249AB).

In the TYPikon of the GREAT CHURCH the term synaxis refers both to the assembly for the Eucharist and to the shrine or church where the service takes place. Synaxis also refers to the special commemorative services celebrated the day following six of the Great Feasts (9 Sept., 26 Dec., 7 Jan., 3 Feb., 26 Mar., 30 June); the synaxis of the Holy Spirit is celebrated on the Monday after Pentecost.


—A.K., R.F.T.

SYNAXIS TON ASOMATON. See Asomatos.

SYNDOTAI (συνδόται, lit. “contributors”). Theophanes (Theoph. 486.23–26) cites as one of the “great evils” introduced by Emp. Nikephoros I the imposition of a collective payment on the neighbors of impecunious soldiers. If the latter were too poor to equip themselves, these contributors of financial support were termed syndotai. Similarly, in the 10th C. Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (De cer. 695.14–696.1) ruled that any soldier unable to support his military obligations (strateia) should be bailed out by syndotai, that is, contributors from the same community, to provide him with the means necessary to fulfill his military service. As partial supporters of a strateia, syndotai were thus entitled to rights of protomesis if the soldier’s property came up for sale (Zepos, Jus 1:225.18–19).


SYNEKDEMOS. See Hierokles.

SYNERGISM (συνέργης, “cooperation”). In the doctrine of grace, the Eastern concept of the cooperation of God or an angel with man was frequently contrasted with an Augustinian monergism (the absolute priority of divine grace in salvation) and equated to a guarantee of human free will. Byz. theology in fact never accepted the doctrine of original sin to the extent that the ethical striving of man—albeit with the assistance of God (the Holy Spirit)—would no longer be possible. Moreover, the concept always meant the cooperation of God with man, never the converse. In the case of man, therefore, there is a distinction between protairesis (the ability of the soul to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate objects) and desire (epithymia or eros), which by nature is directed toward certain objects. The question is how far the first faculty of the soul requires the help of the Holy Spirit to attain clarity of insight. The objection historically raised on the Protestant side, that the Greek church has not properly grasped the essence of grace, cannot be said, for example, with respect to Gregory of Nyssa.
SYNIESIOS (Συνείης), writer and bishop of Ptolemais; born Cyrene ca.370, died Ptolemais? ca.413. Of a rich pagan family, Synesios studied under Hypatia at Alexandria. After a disappointing visit to Athens, he represented his native city and others at Constantinople from 399 to 402 (T.D. Barnes, GRBS 27 [1986] 93–120), winning tax remissions for them and personal exemption from public duties. In 403 he married a Christian lady who gave him three sons and some faith. In 410 the people of Ptolemais, impressed by his active role against barbarian marauders, invited him to become their bishop, albeit unbaptized. He accepted, provided he could retain both wife and philosophic doubts; Theophilos of Alexandria consecrated him in 411.

Most important of his various writings are nine poems or hymns (a tenth is spurious), a Christian and Neoplatonist mixture in one of the last attempts at the classical lyric meters. A discourse titled On Royalty (at Constantinople, in 400) amid clichés about the ideal emperor, breathtakingly rebukes Arkadios for his “mollusklike” existence. On Providence is a political allegory about events and personalities at Constantinople. Dion, a blend of history and personal apology, defends classical culture against monkish attacks. His 156 letters, dating between 399 and 413, provide much ecclesiastical and secular information about conditions in the Pentapolis.

SYNETHEIA (συνέθεια, lit. custom). The term also had the technical meaning of sportulae, “fees” paid to state officials for their “services.” The system of sportulae was well-established already under Justinian I. Dölger (infra) categorizes several types of officials’ fees of the 6th C.: synetheia

for assistants in central offices; dikastika for judges; synetheiai for collecting taxes; paramythia for quartering and provisioning the troops. This system probably fell into disuse, and in the Ecloga (16:4) the term synetheia designates salary paid by the treasury to officials. It reemerged evidently in the late 9th–10th C. when dignitaries, during the festivities celebrating their appointment, had to pay synetheiai to their colleagues (Oikonomíades, Listes 88, n.28); judges received fees (ektaiatika) from the parties at the trial; and strategoi of western themes were paid synetheiai, not salary. In an imperial ordinance of 1109, synetheia and the related elatikon (a fee for traveling) are mentioned—they were paid to fiscal officials according to a firmly established percentage (1/12 and 1/24, respectively) of the state tax.

Sportulae for functionaries are mentioned in later lists of tax exemptions; a chrysobull of 1298 contrasts epereiai of the fisc and synetheiai of the praktores (Lavra 2, no.89,1213–14). Dölger surmised that various charges were levied for measuring products given in kind (metretikon, oikomodion, oinometrium, etc.); unfortunately, his interpretation is based on the etymology of these terms and direct evidence is lacking. It is also unclear whether taxes like prosodion (lit. "revenue")—P. Lemerle and others in Lavra 1:209f—proskynetikon (lit. "for respect")—levied in 1235 together with the paktun for vivarium (MM 4:18.6)—or kaniskion and antikaniskion can be considered as sportulae.

SYNKELLOS (Συνκέλλος, lit. “living in the same cell”). By the 5th C. the term denoted the adviser and fellow-boarder of a patriarch (or bishop); he lived as a rule with the patriarch, sharing his residence or “cell.” From the 6th C., owing to his influence and importance as the patriarch’s confidant, he frequently succeeded to the vacant patriarchal throne; he came to be viewed as the successor designate of the reigning patriarch in the 10th C., possibly earlier. By then the synkellos was nominated by the emperor (De cer. 530–32) and was considered a member of the senate (Vita Euthymii 23.9,18–19). Although until the 10th C. the title had been limited to priests and deacons, it was thereafter occasionally given to ambitious metropolitans as well. The office was gradually
inflated further to include, among others, the
titles of protosynkellos and proedros ton protosynkello.
This new largely honorary titulature caused the
original office to decline in value. During the
Palaiologan period the megas protosynkellos was none
other than the synkellos of the patriarch.

LIT. Athenagoras of Paramythia, "Ho thesmos ton syn-
kellon en to oikoumeniko patriarcheio," EEB 4 (1927) 3–
38. V. Grumel, "Titulature de metropolites byzantins, I.
Les metropolites synelles," REB 3 (1945) 92–114. Dar-
rrouzès, Offidia 18 f.

-A.P.

SYNKLETOS. See Senate.

SYNOD. See Councils; Endemousa Synodos.

SYNODICON VETUS (Ancient Synodikon), con-
ventional title of an anonymous concise history of
church councils written between 887 and 920,
most probably at the end of the 9th C. It begins
with the synod of the apostles in Jerusalem, in-
cludes ecumenical and local councils up to the
Constantinople Council of 869/70, and describes
the activity of Patr. Photios up to his deposition
in 886. The earlier parts of the treatise are based
on church historians such as Eusebios, Theodoret
of Cyrrhus, and Theodore Lector, and on some
vitae, for example, of Patr. Eutychios and of St.
Sabas. For the period of Iconoclasm the author
used, besides Theophanes and George Hamarto-
los, other, mostly unknown, texts. The conflict
between Ignatios and Photios is represented in a
fashion similar to that of the vita of Ignatios by
Niketas David Paphlagon and reveals strong anti-
Photian sentiments.

ED. The Synodicon Vetus, ed. J. Duffy and J. Parker
(Washington, D.C., 1979), with Eng. tr.
LIT. J.L. van Dieten, "Synodicon vetus," AnnHistCon 12

-A.K.

SYNODIKON (συνοδικόν), sometimes used as an
adjective (synodikon gramma, synodike epistole), a term
referring to a synodal epistle addressed to high
ecclesiastical authorities and presenting the im-
portant decisions of a council; thus Basil the Great,
in epistle 92.3 (Lettres, ed. Y. Courtonne, vol. 1
[Paris 1957] 203–46–47), speaks of "dogmatic de-
cisions defined canonically and lawfully in the
synodikon gramma." The term designated particu-
larly the patriarchal epistles sent to the pope of
Rome (e.g., Malal. 491.21), esp. after the patri-
arch's installation; thus after his cheirotonia Patr.
Tarasios is said (Theoph. 460.23–27) to have dis-
patched synodika and the credo (libellos tes piteos)
to Pope Hadrian I. The term has also been ap-
plied to liturgical documents containing benedic-
tions of dogmas and of church heroes as well as
anathemas against heretics. The word synodikarios
denoted a bishop's secretary, probably in his ca-
pacity of drafting synodika, episcopal documents.


-A.K.

SYNODIKON OF ORTHODOXY, a liturgical
document produced after the Triumph of Or-
thodoxy (843) and before 920, probably on the
basis of earlier synodika. The first part, eucharistia
(thanksgivings), expresses gratitude to the Lord
and praise of those who fought against his adver-
saries, esp. the pious emperors, empresses, and
patriarchs as well as martyrs and confessors. The
second, "negative," part contains ANATHEMAS
against various heretics. From the end of the 11th
C. the church enlarged the Synodikon by including
anathemas of contemporary heresiarchs, such as
Eustratios of Nicaea, Barlaam of Calabria,
Akindynos, etc. The last known recension is of
1439. The Synodikon existed in various versions,
both Constantinopolitan and provincial. Addi-
tions to the 10th-C. text are an important source
for the study of religious and ideological contro-
versies in Byz. According to V. Mošin (infra), an
Old Slavonic translation of the Synodikon was known
in Kievan Rus' by the first third of the 12th C.,
and a new translation was produced in Bulgaria
under Tsar Boril in 1211.

ED. J. Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie," TM
2 (1957) 1–316.
LIT. J. Gouillard, "Nouveaux témoins du Synodicon de

-A.K.

SYNONE (συνομή, Lat. coemptio, "purchase"),
forced sale of commodities to government officials
at a prescribed price. It developed as the coun-
terpart to the monetary commutation (adaeratio)
of ANNONA and allowed supplies previously re-
placed by cash payments to be converted back
into tax in kind when necessary. During the 5th
C., synone lost its original character as an exceptional levy and every landowner became liable for synone in proportion to his normal tax obligation; such purchases were subsequently credited against future assessments (Cod. Just. X 27.2). The term synone can refer to such compulsory sales as late as the late 12th C. (Patmou Engraphe, 1, no.11.25), but from the 10th C. it primarily designates a monetary tax. Contemporary documents mention collection officials called synonarioi (Patmou Engraphe 1, no.2.24, 6.60), and both De ceremoniis (De cer. 695.7) and the Peira (18.2) imply that synone on cultivated lands, together with καπνίκον on rural households, formed the basic agricultural telos; it is not clear, however, whether in every case synone comprised the entire land tax or only a portion of it (Svoronos, Cadastre 139f). It is important to distinguish this tax system—despite the similarities in nomenclature—from its earlier counterpart, based upon the Diocletianic capita-tio-jugatio. In the 13th C., synone is replaced in the sources by sitarkia.


A.J.C.

SYNOPSIS MAJOR. See Synopsis Basilicorum.

SYNOPSIS MINOR (τὸ μικρὸν κατὰ στοιχεῖον, lit. “the little alphabetical [lawbook]”) was a compilation of legal principles arranged in alphabetical order, dating from the end of the 13th C. (S. Perentidis, FM 7 [1986] 253–57). It was so called in contrast to the “large” Synopsis Basilicorum. The compiler drew mainly on the law book of Michael Attaleiates and the Synopsis Basilicorum, which he sometimes excerpted word for word and sometimes paraphrased. A section of the text—with frequent explanations of more recent vernacular legal terms—appears to have been produced by the compiler himself or his contemporaries. The reasons for the selection of particular legal principles and for the choice of the key words used for the alphabetization often cannot be reconstructed. Harmenopoulos integrated a part of the Synopsis minor into his Hexabiblos.


M.Th.F.

SYNOPSIS BASILICORUM, an abridged version of the Basilika. According to its title the Synopsis Basilicorum was an “alphabetically arranged selection and abbreviated version of the 60 imperial books [basilika], with references”; probably produced in the 10th C., it contains approximately one-tenth of the text of the Basilika. The alphabetical arrangement is based on the key words of the headings; under these the author assembled the relevant excerpts from the Basilika with precise textual citations and made reference to additional passages. Because of this arrangement, the Synopsis Basilicorum could be used both to facilitate the use of the Basilika and to replace it in practice as a one-volume abbreviated version. The large number of preserved MSS of the Synopsis Basilicorum, many of which contain scholia and text supplements, attests to its popularity. The Synopsis Basilicorum is usually transmitted with an appendix (which occurs in two forms), consisting primarily of imperial novels of the 10th through 12th C.

Ed. Zepos, Jus 5.


L.B.

SYNTAGMA (σύνταγμα), a term used in patristic literature to designate any treatise or book, esp. those that were scriptural, exegetical, or polemical in content. The term was extended to characterize some collections of canon law: thus, Matthew Blastares wrote an Alphabetic Syntagma (Syntagma kata stoicheion) in 1335. Athanasios Scholastikos of Emesa, in the text of his paraphrase of the Justinianic novels, refers to his work as a syntagma divided into titloi and diataxeis (D. Simon, FM 6 [1984] 4–7); the title of the work (which may or may not be the original rubric) is, however, “Epitome of the diataxeis of the Novels [issued] after the Codex.” Zachariä von Lingenthal conjectured that a Syntagma of Fourteen Titles preceded the Nomokanon of fourteen Titles.


A.K.

SYNTAX, the rules governing the combination of words in sentences, and the study and classification of those rules. Ancient Greek syntax was studied in particular by the Stoics and expounded most authoritatively by Apollonios Dyskolos (2nd C.). Byz. grammarians largely adopted his defi-
nitions and concepts; they contributed scarcely anything of their own, partly because they dealt exclusively with the learned literary language to the neglect of the living spoken tongue. The most noteworthy among them were Michael Synkellos, Niketas of Herakleia, Gregory Pardos, Maximos Planoudes, and Patr. John XIII Glynkys. They all based their study on parts of speech rather than on types of sentence. The syntax of spoken Greek developed in new directions during the Middle Ages, foreshadowing the patterns of Modern Greek. All prepositions came to be used with the accusative, and a number of new compound prepositions developed (πάνω ἀπό, ἀνά·
μετα σε, μαζί μέ, etc.); the dative case was eliminated and the range of uses of the genitive restricted; participial phrases were replaced by subordinate clauses; proleptic infinitive clauses were replaced by subjunctive clauses introduced by να; considerable use was made of quasi-subordinate paratactic clauses introduced by κει (cf. English “try and come” = “try to come”). All these features occur sporadically in traditional literature and more systematically in late Byz. vernacular literature.

Lit. S. Psaltes, Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken (Göttingen 1974). H. Ljungvik, Beiträge zur Syntax der spät·

SYNTHRONON (σύνθρονον), term used from no later than the 5th C. to denote one or more benches reserved for the clergy and arranged in a semicircular tier in the apse of a church. Well-preserved synthrona exist in the 6th-C. Church of St. Irene and in the ruins of St. Euphemia in Constantinople. These synthrona rise high enough to allow a space for a passage underneath and along the apse wall, the function of which is unknown. Even where a large number of benches exist, it is clear from literary sources that only the top bench was used for seating clergy. According to pseudo-Germanos I (Germanos, Liturgy, chs. 26–27), the bishop’s ascent to the synthronon was symbolic both of Christ’s sacrifice and subsequent glorification. The bishop seated on the cathedra at the top of his synthronon and flanked by the clergy symbolized Christ among his disciples; in the scheme of pseudo-Dionysios (K.E. McVey,

DOP 37 [1983] 95), he represented the Lord amid the nine angelic orders. The synthronon is reduced to a simple bench on a step in the 12th-C. south church of the PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY in Constantinople (A. Megaw, DOP 17 [1963] 340). A rare example of a synthronon in a nonecclesiastical context was discovered in the ruins of the so-called Gymnasium at Athens, built after 400 (H.A. Thompson, Hesperia 19 [1950] 134–37).


SYNTIPAS, called more fully Book of the Philosopher Syntipas, was a Greek translation from Syriac made by Michael Andreopoulos for Gabriel, the ruler (dux) of Melitene (ca.1100). Syntipas belongs to the very popular cycle of the story of Sindbad that exists in various languages and is most probably of Persian origin. The framework of the book is the story of the Persian king Kyros who had seven wives and only one son whom he entrusted to the philosopher Syntipas for a proper upbringing. One of the wives of Kyros tried unsuccessfully to seduce the young man and after her failure accused him of libertine behavior. After a protracted trial he was acquitted. Various short stories told by the king’s advisers, the son, and the stepmother are interwoven with the main narrative. They deal primarily with cases of sexual assault or infidelity, and their milieu varies from the royal court to merchants, peasants, and soldiers; once a “Hagarene” (Muslim) appears among the characters. Syntipas is indicative of the cultural links between Byz. and the Muslim world in the late 11th C. The book was probably reworked in the 13th C. (the so-called Retractatio) and remained popular in the post-Byz. period.

Ed. Michaeli Andreopuli Liber Synipae, ed. V. Jernstedt (St. Petersburg 1912).


SYRACUSE (Συρακούσαι), city on east coast of Sicily. In 491 all of Sicily, including Syracuse, was occupied by the Ostrogoths, who repaired the town walls. The city was recaptured by Belisarius at the end of 535. Totila’s army besieged Syracuse in 550, but the Byz. fleet under the command of
Liberios forced its way into the harbor and prevented the city’s surrender. In 669 Constans II moved the imperial court to the West; according to a 9th-C. chronicle (Theoph. 348.15) he wanted to establish his official residence in Rome, but settled in Syracuse instead. He was murdered there in 668 in a bathhouse, possibly in the governor’s palace.

The bishops of Syracuse were under papal jurisdiction; at the end of the 7th C. Bishop Maurice used a seal with a Latin legend (Laurent, *Corpus 5.1, no. 884*). Emp. Leo III separated Syracuse from Rome ca. 733 and placed it under the authority of the patriarchate of Constantinople; the head of its diocese became archbishop of Syracuse, then archbishop of Sicily, then (probably from the second half of the 9th C.) metropolitan of Sicily. Among the archbishops of Sicily in the 9th C. was Gregory Asbestas. Byz. objects found in Syracuse—ceramics, a *solidus* of Michael II and Theophilos (A. LaRosa, *Sileno I* [1985] 87–101)—attest to close cultural links with Byz.; ambitious youths from Syracuse sometimes went to Constantinople for their schooling.

The Arabs frequently raided Syracuse and destroyed fields outside the city; in Aug. 877 they began a siege and on 20 or 21 May 878 entered the city. The Arab capture of Syracuse is described in detail by Theodosios the Monk. George Maniakes occupied Syracuse in 1040, but after his recall the Arabs recovered the city. Syracuse was one of the last Arab strongholds to fall to the Normans. In March 1085 they sailed to Syracuse, defeated the Muslim fleet, and laid a siege that lasted until Oct., at which time the Arab nobles fled and Syracuse surrendered. The Normans restored papal jurisdiction and the Latin rite in Syracuse.

Monuments of Syracuse. Syracuse’s early Christian remains are extensive but poorly preserved. There are more catacombs than in any other city save Rome; S. Lucia is the oldest (mid-3rd C.); Vigna Cassia has the most paintings (4th C.). The churches, which require more study, present several unusual forms including the trefoil (“La Cuba,” 5th C.) and a vaulted basilica (S. Pietro ad Baias, 6th C.). The basilican S. Giovanni Evangelista (6th C.? ) is the largest church in pre-Muslim Sicily.

The gold ring of Eudoxia now in Palermo, believed by some to have belonged to Constans II, was discovered in 1872 near a private bath excavated in 1934. G. Cultrera (*NS* 8 [1954] 114–30) identified the building as the Daphne Bath where the emperor was murdered, but the identification remains hypothetical.


-A.K., D.K.

**SYRIANNES** (Συργιάννης), also known as Syrgiannes Palaiologos Philanthropenos, an ambitious and treacherous military governor under ANDRONIKOS II AND ANDRONIKOS III; born ca. 1290, died Galykos 23 Aug. 1354 (Kleinhchroniken 2:245). Son of the *megas domestikos* Syrgiannes, who was of Cuman or Mongol extraction, he was related to the ruling Palaiologan dynasty through his mother. A contemporary and friend of JOHN (VI) KANTAKOZENOS, Syrgiannes was among the young noblemen who encouraged Andronikos III to rebel against his grandfather in 1321. During the seven-year civil war, he twice shifted his allegiance to further his own ambitions. After throwing his support to Andronikos II late in 1321 he was granted the title of *megas doux*. Again reversing himself, he unsuccessfully plotted the murder of Andronikos II and was sentenced to life imprisonment. After the victory of Andronikos III in 1328, Syrgiannes was released from prison and appointed governor of Thessalonike (winter of 1329/30). In 1339 he was arrested again, this time on charges of conspiracy against Kantakouzenos. He escaped from Constantinople and sought refuge in Serbia with STEFAN UROŠ IV DUŠAN. His final treacherous act was to lead the Serbian army that conquered several Byz. towns in northern Greece, including Kastoria. He was murdered near Thessalonike by a Byz. officer, Sphrantzes Palaiologos.


-A.M.T.

**SYRIA** (Συρία), area in eastern part of the empire bounded on the west by the Mediterranean Sea, on the north and east by the Taurus Mountains, the Euphrates River, and desert regions, and to
the south by the headwaters of the Orontes River. Broadly speaking, Syria is divided vertically into three geographical zones: (1) the littoral, (2) the interior band of fertile plains and plateaus, and (3) the desert to the east. Ethnically, three peoples corresponded to these three zones: Greek-speaking descendants of Hellenistic settlers mostly on the seacoast; Syriac-speaking Aramaeans in the central farming area; Arabic-speaking Arab settlers and seminomads in the eastern desert area. While it is often said that Syria was split between a hellenized urban population and a Semitic rural one, epigraphic evidence suggests a linguistic mixture of Greek and Syriac in all regions, in city and countryside alike. Other groups included Jews, particularly in the cities, and Latin-speaking personnel attached to the 4th-C. imperial court resident at Antioch. In Byz. Syria of the 10th–11th C., the Greek-speaking element may have been a minority, with the Semitic element predominating; added to this were Georgian and Armenian communities settled around Antioch and in the Black Mountains.

From ca.350 Syria was a province (called Coele-
Syria) of the diocese of Oriens; its major city was Antioch. After ca.415 this province was subdivided into those of Syria I to the north, under Antioch (with the cities of Seleukeia Pieria, Berroia, Chalkis, Anasartha, and Gabbula), and Syria II to the south, under Apameia on the Orontes (with the cities of Epiphaneia, Larissa [Shayzar], Arethusa, Mariam[n]e, Raphaneae, and Seleukeia ad Belum); in 528 the small province of Theodoria, under Laodikeia, was created from coastal territory. The term Syria is often taken to include adjacent provinces, e.g., Euphratesis, Phoenicia, Arabia, and, occasionally, the Levant in general. Syria was occupied by the Persians from 609 to 628, briefly reconquered by the Byz., and then came under Arab rule from ca.640 to 969, the date of the Byz. recovery of part of Syria, which lasted until 1084.

Syrian culture in the 4th–7th C. reflects the two larger elements in its linguistic mixture—the Greek and the Syriac. (The adjective “Syriac” properly refers only to the language and literature and not, e.g., to the churches or art of those who used that language, which should be termed “Syrian”). At its highest, creative level—as represented by the rhetoricians, historians, and theologians of Antioch and the philosophers of Apameia—the pre-Islamic culture of Syria can be described as adhering to Greco-Roman traditions, but it also showed Semitic influences (e.g., the Syriac-inspired Kontakion). Greek likewise influenced Syriac literature, whose main center, however, was not in Syria proper but in the provinces of Osroene and Mesopotamia. Brock (infra) has described the process whereby writers of Syriac became, between the 4th and 7th C., increasingly hellenized in thought-patterns and style, so that by the 9th C. perfected translation techniques enabled Syriac scholars at the ‘Abbásid court in Baghdad to transmit via their own language Greek works to the Arabs. The Syriac language was written as well as spoken in Syria, as extant MSS copied there prove, but a high proportion of inscriptions of all types were in Greek.

Syria was divided into two metropolitan sees under the patriarch of Antioch (see Antioch, Patriarchate of), which corresponded to the civil provinces of Syria I and II. Syria was notable for the theologians it produced (e.g., of the Antiochene School) as well as for religious fervor that variously manifested itself in the guises of asceticism, heresy, and fanaticism. Prominent among pilgrimage centers in the region were the shrines of the two Symeon the Stylites and Apameia on the Orontes, which reportedly possessed an important relic of the True Cross. Monasticism spread to Syria from Mesopotamia, the earliest account being that of Theodoret of Cyrrhus. From ca.518 the Monophysite ecclesiastical hierarchy, which duplicated that of the official church, lived for the most part in exile from the urban sees, usually in monastic communities that were centers of theological and polemical activity, mostly in the Syriac language. One area of concentration of such activity was the limestone massif of Belus, where, interspersed with affluent villages, were well-constructed Monophysite monasteries whose names are known from documents of ca.570 (A. Caquot in Tchalenko, Villages 3:63–106). Ecclesiastical architecture ranged from the centralized domed (?) cathedrals of Antioch, Seleukeia Pieria, Apameia, and Berroia to the often very large village basilicas with solid masonry and elaborate sculpture.

As a result of damage sustained from military action and natural disasters (earthquakes, fires), Syrian cities required large-scale renewal and reconstruction in the 4th–6th C., the latest dated example being that of 588 at Antioch. Commerce and trade were based in the cities, yet Syrian merchants traveled widely in the empire. Aside from precious-metal objects produced at Antioch and linen woven at Laodikeia, the export industries of such luxuries as silk, purple-dyeing, and glass were based in Phoenicia (Tyre, Sidon, Berystos) rather than in Syria. State arms factories were in both areas, at Damascus and Antioch.

The hinterlands of Syria were densely settled. There is epigraphic evidence of imperial domains at Bab el-Hawa, Taroutia Emponon, Rouhaï, and Meshrefe (IGLSyr 2, no.528; 4, nos. 1631, 1875, 1905, 1908). The large private estates referred to in written sources were probably in the Orontes and Afrin valleys and in the plains near Berroia and Chalkis. The agricultural prosperity of the villages of Syria (e.g., Kaper Barada, Kaper Pera, Dehes) is reflected in their dimensions, which could rival those of cities, and in their well-constructed ashlar buildings, including private houses and tombs that still stand. Tchalenko argued that this prosperity was based on the exclusive cultivation and processing of olives for export. More recent excavations at Dehes have revealed a mixed agriculture of crops and live-
stock. The livestock may have provisioned the army stationed in Syria. It is unclear whether the farmers of Syria were independent owners or tenants.

Recent archaeological work in the city of Apameia on the Orontes (large and well-maintained dwellings in use until the 8th C.) and the village of Dehes (continuous habitation until the 9th C.) has produced good reason to challenge the previously accepted view that Syria underwent a steep decline starting as early as 540, resulting in a collapse, ca.600, that facilitated the Persian takeover and subsequent Arab conquest. The plague of the 540s–560s, local dissatisfaction with Byz rule, state persecution of religious minorities, and a weakened military position—or combinations thereof—have all been offered as causes for a decline from the mid-6th C. and the end of what from the 4th to 6th C. had been an expanding and prosperous society. Although this thesis still has its adherents, e.g., H. Kennedy (in Past and Present 106 [1985] 3–27), who asserts that urban economic decline took place between 540 and 640 but that a revival occurred under the Arabs, other scholars date the end of late antiquity in Syria and Palestine to the 'Abbāsid revolution of 750. Ethnically and religiously, this society did not radically change under the Umayyads: while some Greek-speaking Syrians fled the cities, others, such as the bureaucrats who continued to work for the Umayyad government (e.g., the family of John of Damascus) did not. Donner (Conquests 245–50) has argued that peasants remained (e.g., at Dehes) and that tribes from the Arabian peninsula were not settled in Syria as they were in Iraq; the relatively few Arab newcomers settled in cities rather than the countryside. Many cities (e.g., Antioch, Edessa, and Jerusalem) maintained large Christian populations until the Byz. and Crusader conquests of the Levant in the 10th–12th C.

There was a strong military aspect to Syria from the 4th to the 7th C. All cities were walled and some were garrisoned, and its eastern flank was protected against the Persians and the Lakhmid Arabs by a line of forts (the Limes) that was reinforced by the Ghassānid Arabs allied with Byz. While in the 4th C. Byz. military strategy in Syria could be described as offensive (campaigns, often imperial, into Persia), in the 6th C. it was defensive, with Persian invasions occurring in 540, 573, and 609/10. In the 630s Syria again became the base of imperial political and military operations relating at first to the Persians (C. Mango, TM 9 [1985] 105–18) but shifting abruptly to counter the new offensive from the Arabian peninsula from about 634. The Byz. defense failed and the Byz. frontier in Syria was then transferred from the eastern desert to the region near Antioch; this northern part of the Umayyad Levant assumed a role secondary to the region farther south, that of Damascus, the capital of the new caliphate (661–750). With the Byz. partial reconquest of Syria in 699, the frontier moved again to a north-south line between Antioch and Berroia, and the Hamdānid emir of the latter city became a Byz. vassal. John I Tzimisces briefly took other cities in Syria (Balanean, Gabala) in 975, and Basil II expelled a Fāṭimid army from Syria in 995. In 1084 Syria was taken by the Seljuks, but part of it soon fell to the First Crusade. The principedom of Antioch established by the Crusaders in 1098 was forced by treaty in 1108 to recognize Byz. suzerainty. This authority was strengthened in 1137 by John II Komnenos and again in 1159 by Manuel I.


SYRIAC LITERATURE originated as part of the literature of the late Roman Empire. Its classic period occurred in the 3rd–7th C. in Syria and Mesopotamia, with a revival in the 12th–13th C. The northern Mesopotamian cities of Edessa and Nisibis, together with Mosul and its environs, were centers for the development of Syriac as a literary language in the Western (Jacobite) and Eastern (Nestorian) idioms that came to be the two states the language assumed in its classic form. Syriac had its own distinctive literary forms that preferred metrical to prosaic genres of discourse, except in chronicles and biblical commentaries. Syriac hymnography, as exemplified in the works of Ephrem the Syrian, had a strong influence on the development of the kontakion, at the hands of Romanos the Melode.
The Syriac language is important for Byzantinists both for works originally written in Syriac and for works composed in Greek but surviving only in Syriac versions. Notable among the original Syriac compositions are the works of Ephrem the Syrian, Jacob of Sarug, Narsoi of Edessa, Isaac of Nineveh, and historical works such as the Chronicle of 1234, the Chronicle of Michael I the Syrian, and the Chronicle of Gregory Abū'l-Fāraj. Notable among the works composed in Greek, but surviving only in Syriac versions, are the Kephalaia Gnostica of Evagrius Pontikos, the Cathedral Homilies of Severos of Antioch, and the Life of Peter the Iberian by John Rufus.


—S.H.G.

SYROPOULOS, JOHN, late 12th-C. grammaticos, author of an oration for Epiphany addressed to Isaac II. The dating of the speech is disputed: Bachmann placed it in 1192, because he assumed that the speech was dedicated to the same events as the discourses by Sergios Kolybas and George Tornikios; Dujićev defended an earlier dating (Epiphany of 1187), asserting that the speech seems to have been delivered soon after Isaac's coup. Indeed, its similarity with the orations of Kolybas and Tornikios is only apparent (A. Kazhdan, Byzantium 35 [1965] 167f). In his speech Syropoulos (Συρόπουλος) contrasted the beneficial rule of Isaac with the atrocities of Andronikos I and praised Isaac for his victory over Alexios Branasa (with the unique information that Branasa, after his first failure, disguised himself as a peasant [p.14.20]). He described "the western evil" that was destroying the area of Zygos (the revolt of Peter of Bulgaria and Asen I); he called the leaders of the revolt an ox and an ass and predicted their subjugation to Byz. (p.17.15–24).


—A.K.

SYROPOULOS, SYLVESTER, patriarchal official; born Constantinople before 1400, died Constantinople after 1453. Megas ekklēsiarches and di-

kaiophylax of the patriarchate of Constantinople, Syropoulos was a member of the Byz. delegation at the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438–39 (P. Wirth, OstkSt 12 [1963] 64f) and signed its decree of Union of the Churches. He did so under duress, however, according to his own account. Indeed, he eventually became a staunch supporter of Mark Eugenikos, denouncing the council on his return to Constantinople and joining the anti-Unionist forces. In his Memoirs, composed shortly after 1443—according to Laurent’s recent critical edition, a second redaction was issued ca.1461—he opposed the council openly. Although far from impartial, this eyewitness account is neither worthless nor an intentional falsification of facts. Even though it contains little on the public debates themselves, its information about the council's private intrigues and discussions (otherwise unavailable) is invaluable. Moreover, its bias or partisanship, for which it is frequently criticized, is also characteristic of the acts of the council.


—A.P.

SYRO-ROMAN LAWBOOK, a 5th-C. compilation of legal texts that has survived in several Syriac MSS, the oldest of which, now in the British Museum (MS Add. 14,528), is of the 6th C. (although Nallino [infra] dated it in the 8th C.); recently discovered MSS (A. Vööbus, Sodalitas, vol. 5 [Naples 1984] 2105–08) are 13th–17th-C. copies. A certain Ambrosius, a contemporary of Emp. Valentine of Thodosios (I or II?) and Leo I. Selb (infra, 252–54), however, rejects the reliability of this information. It is generally accepted that the original was written in Greek, but the character of the Lawbook is still under discussion. Nallino considered it a didactic work based on Roman law; many scholars (e.g., R. Taubenschlag, Journal of Juristic Patrology 6 [1952] 103–19) view it as a
book with a practical purpose, revealing a "mixture" of Roman law and local practice. Recognizing that the Lawbook dealt primarily with problems of family law, slave ownership, and succession, E. Seidl (RE 2.R. 4 [1932] 1783) suggested that it had served the needs of episcopal courts. At any rate, the Lawbook contains certain regulations that were obsolete in the 5th C. and has no clear system of organization of the content. The book was popular in the East and is known also in Arabic and Armenian versions.


TABARĪ, AL-:, more fully Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, Arab jurist and historian; born Āmul in Ṭabaristān, Persia, autumn 839, died Baghdad 16 Feb. 923. A precocious student, al-Ṭabarī left Ṭabaristān to study in Persia, Iraq, Syria, and Egypt, then spent most of his career in Baghdad, where family income enabled him to devote himself to scholarship. Al-Ṭabarī is best known for his History of the Prophets and Kings. This vast annalistic work was intended to complement his Qur‘ān commentary and to provide an authoritative summa of earlier research, encompassing Creation, the prophets, the Arabs before Islam, the life of Muḥammad, and the caliphate to 915. Al-Ṭabarī used many sources; importantly, he names his informants. Accounts were included largely for their authoritative transmission, making for conceptual clarity if not always historical accuracy.

For Byz. history al-Ṭabarī provides valuable information on the pre-Islamic Arabs (including the GHAŠANĪDS) and relations with the Sasanians. The conquests by the Arabs are related fully for Syria and Egypt, less so for North Africa. Byz. subsequently figures primarily in military affairs: warfare along the Thughūr (see ‘AWĀŠIM AND THUGHŪR), naval confrontation (e.g., the battle of the Masts, the struggle for Cyprus, Crete, and Rhodes, and the Byz. attack on Damietta in 853) and the expeditions against Constantinople. He also describes the treatment and exchanges of prisoners and discusses diplomatic contacts, sometimes citing correspondence. Occasionally he includes more external matters, for example, the successes of the Bulgarians against Leo VI in 896.


—L.C.

TABARI CONTINUATUS. See ‘ARĪB IBN SĀ‘D AL-QURTUBI.

TABENNISI, a site in upper Egypt, on the right bank of the Nile, near Dendera, halfway between Pbow and Chenoboskion, find-spot of the NAG Hammadi Gnostic manuscripts. Circa 320–25 PACHOMIOS founded a cenobitic monastery near the deserted village of Tabennisi; gradually a large community of Pachomian monasteries developed in the area, owning and working farmland and paying taxes to the government (E. Wipuszycka in Le monde grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux [Brussels 1975] 625–36). The original house at Tabennisi remained, along with the basilica at Pbow, one of the two centers where Pachomian monastic superiors gathered for their annual meetings. It apparently survived until the 7th C. —A.K.

TABGHA. See HEPTAPEGN.

TABLES (sing. τράπεζα). Tables were evidently used more widely in Byz. than in Rome, esp. after the transition from the Roman habit of reclining around a table to that of sitting at a table for meals, a change that occurred by the 10th C. Among the few Byz. tables to survive is a very long (15.7 m) specimen with semicircular ends and an inlaid marble top, in the refectory (trapeza) of the NEA MONI on Chios (Bouras, Nea Moni, figs. 152, 156). It is furnished with niches for utensils, as are the writing desks depicted in representations of the Evangelists. These desks usually have a square top, unlike the sigma-shaped tables conventional in images of the Last Supper (see Lord’s Supper). Fragments of such sigma tables have been excavated at Corinth (Scranton, Architecture 139f).

Plain tables were of wood, but tables of more precious materials were found in wealthy households: according to the vita of Philaretos the Merciful, he had a round table ornamented with ivory and gold that could seat 36 people (ed. M.H. Fourmy, M. Leroy, 137–30–31); the main imperial table at palace banquets was called “golden” and was probably gilded. Tables were usually rectan-
gular, with the place of honor at the head of the table; Constantine VII also describes a paratrapezion set up for Arab allies, which was round so that all the seats were of equal rank (De cer. 594.9–14). The term systella or symbalta trapexion (De cer. 465.10, MM 6:243.7), used for portable furniture, probably designated folding tables. For the sake of monastic discipline Lazaros of Mt. Galesios ordered that a symbaten (correct reading, symbalen) trapexan, or worktable, be removed from the cell of a monk-cobbler, since the rules prohibited having such a piece of furniture (AASS Nov. 3:552AB). The word trapexion also designated the counters of craftsmen and esp. money-changers; a chrysobull of 1342 mentions 20 “exchanging (katallaktika) trapexia” acquired by the Great Lavra (Lavra 3, no.123.105–06). (See also ALTAR; OFFERTORY TABLE.)


**TABLION** (ταβλίων), one of a pair of rectangular or trapezoidal embroidered panels sewn at right angles to the edges of a chlamys, or other civilian cloak. In representations of figures clad in the chlamys, only one tablion is generally visible, since if the cloak is fastened in its usual manner at the right shoulder, one half of it falls down behind the body and the second tablion is thus hidden from view. When the cloak is shown fastened under the neck in front, both tablia can be seen side by side on the wearer’s chest. In the 4th C. the tablia were attached to the emperor’s chlamys below the level of the knees, but from the 6th C. onward they appear at chest level. A tablion could be embroidered with images of the emperor or elaborate designs, and its color was purposely contrasted with that of the cloak. A traditional piece of masculine court costume (e.g., De cer. 142.18–19), the appropriate tablion had to be paid for by the prospective title-holder (a patrikios in the 9th C. paid 24 nomismata for his tablion—Oikonomides, Listes 95.7). Though military saints are depicted wearing over their armor a chlamys adorned with a tablion, the tablion was generally a mark of civilian status. Among women only the empress was permitted to wear a tablion.

In the Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 133.7–8) the word also designated a box for precious garments: the emperor’s tablion was carried by servants (diaitarioi) during ceremonial processions.


**TABOR, MOUNT,** also Itabryion, mountain in Galilee south of Nazareth. In 348 Cyril of Jerusalem decisively identified Tabor (Θαβώρ) as the site of the Transfiguration; there are, however, some doubts whether this identification is valid (DictBibl 5.2:2141). Remains of what was perhaps a basilica of the 4th/5th C. survive on the spot (Ovadiah, Corpus 71); 6th-C. pilgrims speak of three basilicas on Tabor. One was dedicated to Christ, two smaller churches to Moses and Elijah. In the 7th C. monastic buildings were surrounded by fortifications. The archbishopric of Tabor was created in the 11th C. In the 12th C. both Daniel Igumen and John Phokas saw on the top of Tabor two monasteries—one Latin, the other Orthodox. The precise location of the Transfiguration was supposed to be beneath the altar of the Latin monastery: it was encircled by a bronze fence; a marble circle with the sign of the cross marked the exact spot where Christ had stood. Tabor's lower slopes incorporated the area associated with the meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek.


**TABOULARIUS.** See Nomikos; Notary.

**TABULA ANSATA** (Lat. “tablet with handles”), a rectangular frame or tablet with projections, used to contain an inscription and, by extension, as an ornament. The motif appeared on sarcophagi of the 3rd–4th C., in MSS such as the Calendar of 354, ivory panels of the 4th–6th C., and numerous consular diptychs. It is all but unknown after the 6th C.

LIT. –L.Br.

**TABULA PEUTINGERIANA,** a parchment map of the 12th or early 13th C., now in Vienna (ÖNB, Vindobon. 324), named after its former owner, Konrad Peutinger (1465–1547), a humanist of Augsburg. It is considered to be a copy of a 5th-C. tourist map. The Tabula is a roll of which 11
segments survive (one or two are lost); the preserved portion forms a narrow strip approximately 6.75 m long and 34 cm wide, depicting the known world from Gallia eastward to India and Ceylon; Britannia and Spain are lost save for small eastern regions. The map represents primarily land routes, indicating distances and cities (about 4,000 localities in toto); Latin inscriptions offer some clarifying information, for example, "the moat dug by slaves of the Scythians" or "elephants are born in this area." Pictorial vignettes provide characteristic emblems for 555 cities: towers, temples, baths, warehouses, harbors, lighthouses. Three cities—Rome, Constantinople, and Antioch—are indicated by distinct personifications of Tyche. Despite certain faults, it preserves unique geographical data. The Cosmographer of Ravenna seems to have derived his information from either the Tabula or a common source.

ED. FACs. ed.—E. Weber, Tabula Peutingeriana: Codex Vindobonensis 324 (Graz 1976).


TACHYGRAPHY (ταχυγραφία, "quick writing"), conventional term used to designate a form of stenographic script (termed "notation of Tiro" in antiquity) whose purpose was to save time in writing. The Byz. used the term semetographike technē for tachygraphy, and the terms semetographos, tachygraphos (cf. the Old Church Slavonic kalque skoropis'c'ë), and oγgrapheos for the scribe who wrote in shorthand. Attested in the papyri, where it was used for accounts, tachygraphy was used in Byz. from the 4th C. onward for taking dictation, recording sermons and the minutes of church councils, and taking down testimony in law courts. It was so common that Basil the Great used the image of tachygraphy for a simile (PG 30:733A–D). In the mid-6th C. John Lydos stated that tachygraphoi were numerous and important members of the imperial bureaucracy (On the Magistracies 3.9). St. Neilos of Rossano and the hegoumenos Paul of Grottaferrata are said to have used tachygraphy, and indeed the system of tachygraphy is best known from southern Italian MSS. In tachygraphic MSS stenographic signs are used to represent syllables or short words, such as propositions, articles, and conjunctions; sometimes these shorthand symbols are identical with the abbreviations found in minuscule MSS. Chionides (infra) suggests a distinction between tachygraphy and brachygraphy, whose aim was not greater speed, but efficient use of the page.


TAFUR, PERO (Peter), Spanish traveler; born Cordoba ca.1410, died ca.1484. He undertook a long journey (end of 1435 or 1436 through March or Apr. 1439) and visited Italy, Palestine, and some islands in the Aegean (Rhodes, Chios, Tenedos); he was twice in Constantinople (Nov. 1437 and the beginning of 1438) and also saw Adrianople, Trebizond, and the Genoese colony of Kaffa in the Crimea. Pretending to be a relative of the Palaiologoi, Tafur was received by John VIII and shown around Constantinople by the future emperor Constantine XI.

Tafur's narration of his trip describes churches and their relics as well as the Hippodrome and the Palace, including a unique account of the library in a palace loggia. He relates that Trebizond had 4,000 inhabitants and records various legends about the empire's past, for example, the story of a war of Charlemagne against Constantinople. Tafur stresses the shabby clothing of the citizens of Constantinople and sympathizes with their sufferings inflicted by the Turks, the Venetians, and their own rulers; never, he says, had he seen so many people mutilated for felonies. At the same time he emphasizes the depravity of the Greeks and contrasts them with the noble Turks.


TAGARIS (Τάγαρις), a rather unusual family name derived from ταγάριον, a dry measure. The first known member is George, whom Manuel Philes mentioned in a poem (Εκατ. 3 [1882/3] 653), probably of the early 14th C. Next comes Manuel, governor of Philadelphia (ca.1309–27), whose first marriage was to Doukaina Monomachia. Although of lowly origins, he campaigned successfully against the Turks in Asia Minor and was esteemed by Andronikos II. Manuel received the rank of senator and megas stratopedarches; his second wife, Theodora Palaiologina Asanina, was a daughter of John III Asan (tsar of Bulgaria, 1279–80). In 1321 the emperor sent Manuel back from Constantinople to Philadelphia, where he stayed at his post during the siege of the city until 1324, when Alexios Phlanthropenos liberated it. Manuel apparently died before 1342. His son George Tagaris likewise held the office of megas stratopedarches. In 1346 the empress Anna of Savoy sent him to the Lydian emir Saruhan to recruit soldiers for the Civil War of 1341–47. Saruhan, an acquaintance of Manuel, was pleased to supply George with a Turkish army. In 1356 George received a personal letter from Pope Innocent VI (1352–62) commending his inclination toward UNION OF THE CHURCHES. Perhaps another son of Manuel, or in any case a relative, was Paul Palaiologos Tagaris, the Latin patriarch, by far the best-known member of the family. The line apparently died out soon after 1400, when Anna Laskarina Tagarina brought a lawsuit before the patriarchal court.


TAGARIS, PAUL PALAILOGOS, Greek monk and Latin patriarch of Constantinople (1379/80–1384?); born ca.1340?, died after 1394. His life story is known primarily from his confession of sins before the synod of Constantinople in 1394 (MM 2:224–30). Tagaris claimed to be related to the Palaiologos family, perhaps through his stepmother. He married at the age of 14 but soon left his wife and became a monk in Palestine. His greed led him into scandal and corruption. After a brief spell in Constantinople (ca.1363), he left in disgrace for Jerusalem, where he was ordained deacon, and then moved to Antioch, where he became priest and exarch. In return for bribes he performed numerous uncanonical ordinances and even masqueraded as patriarch of Jerusalem. In the 1370s he traveled to Persia and Georgia and was finally made bishop of Taurezien (perhaps the Tauric Chersonese, or, less likely, a see in the Taurus Mountains). Upon learning that his charlatanry was discovered by Philotheos Kokkinos, he fled via Tartary and Hungary to Rome. There he made his submission to Pope Urban VI (1378–89), who named him titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople (1380). In 1384 he was denounced as an impostor and escaped to Cyprus where, for 30,000 gold pieces, he crowned Jacques I de Lusignan (1382–98). Tagaris’s travels continued: after a brief imprisonment in Rome (1388–89) he sought refuge with Amadeo VII of Savoy (1383–91) and journeyed to Avignon and Paris. He then repented and returned to Constantinople where he recanted in 1394. Nothing is known of his subsequent career.


TAGENO, participant in and diarist of the Third Crusade; died Tripolis in Syria between 21 June and 3 Nov. 1190. Tageno is attested (1184?) as notary and chaplain of Dietpald, bishop of Passau, and as dean of Passau cathedral (1189). Tageno’s account extended from his bishop’s departure from Passau on 15 May 1189 to 21 June 1190. Although the original is lost (see Historia de Expeditione Friderici), Magnus of Reichenberg (died 1195) substantially excerpted it in his Annals. A lost early recension first published by J. Aventin (1522) preserves part of a version closer to Tageno, but most was incorporated after additional revision into Magnus’s surviving second (according to Schmale, infra 203, n.105) redaction. Tageno gave a detailed account of the crossing by Frederick I of the Byz. Empire and Anatolia as well as of local geography and climate and negotiations of the Crusaders with Constantinople.

ED. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 17 (1861); rp. 1925) 509–17.
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ED. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 17 (1861); rp. 1925) 509–17.

TAGMA (τάγμα), the classical word used to designate a regiment; in the 4th C. it was usually equated to the arithmos or Lat. numerus (F. Lam- mert, *RE* 2. R. 4 [1932] 203). It acquired a technical meaning in the mid-8th C. when Constantine V created a professional army of tagmata under the direct command of the emperor, as a check on the contingents that were in the service of powerful strategoi of the themes; the reform was completed by Nikephors I. The first tagmata were scholai and exkubiotai under the command of their respective domestikoi; the vigla (or arithmos) and hikanatoi (see Domestikos ton Hikanaton) appeared by the end of the 8th C. For a short period at the beginning of the 9th C. foederati also formed a tagma. Special Constantinopolitan units—the wall regiments and nounera (see Domestikos ton Noumeron) who guarded parts of the city walls and some imperial prisons—were also added to the main tagmata. According to Qudama ibn Ja'far, four cavalry units and two infantry regiments based at Constantinople each had 4,000 men, making a total of 24,000 soldiers; Haldon thinks these figures are exaggerated, but W. Treadgold concludes that Qudama was correct (*GRBS* 21 [1980] 270–77). N. Oikonomides (*TM* 6 [1976] 143f) suggests that from the end of the 10th C. the tagmatic army was in decline, since the tagmata were located in the provinces; the term acquired the vague meaning of a military contingent, and tagmata of stratelatai, of athanatoi, of megathymoi (Skyl. 413.18), and of archontopoulai are mentioned in the sources. After the 11th C. the term seems to have disappeared, as well as the distinction between thematic and “imperial” troops.


—A.K.

TAILOR (πᾶρτης). The word raptis appears in late Roman papyri (Presigke, *Wörterbuch* 2:440) and in inscriptions from Korykos (MAMA 3, nos. 554, 581), but seems to have been unknown in classical texts. It is usually understood as “clothesmender” (e.g., Fikman, *Egitet* 26), but this translation is unlikely since Palladios (Hist.Laus., ed. Butler, 94.7–9) encountered 15 raptai and 15 fullers in the monastery of Panos—figures that suggest tailoring rather than mending. Diocletian’s

Price Edict (7.42–51) contrasts brakarios (see Trousers) and raptis; M.N. Tod (*JHS* 24 [1904] 201) and E. Hanton (*Byzantion* 4 [1929] 70f) interpret this as a distinction between a craftsman producing articles made of coarse woolen cloth or felt (brakarios) and one engaged in making finer garments, esp. of linen and silk (raptis).

It is unclear whether Byz. tailors were distinct from weavers; in any case they are not included as a separate guild in the 10th-C. *Book of the Eparch*. In the Studios monastery there were rapheis and vestiarioi who washed and mended clothes (Dobrokloński, *Feodor 1:413*, n.2), and hyphantai and akestai who sewed cloaks but started their work at the loom (i.e., also made the cloth—Kazhdan, *Derevija i gorod* 225f). Both raptai and hyphantai are mentioned in the acts of Athos, as a profession and as a last name: among the various monks of the Philotheou monastery who signed a charter of 1154 were a hyphantes, a raptes, a barrelmaker, a carpenter (xylourgos), a shoemaker (tangarios), and a cook (Lavra 1, no.63.3–8). The poet Stephen *Sachlikes* refers to raptes (sic, a plural form) dwelling in the countryside (ed. S.D. Papadimitriu, *Letopis* 3 [1896] 21.175).


—A.K.

TAINIA. See Headgear.

TAKTIKA (τάκτικα), or notitiae, official lists of titles and offices. Except for the early Notitia dignitatum and the 14th-C. tract by pseudo-Kodinos, all belong to the 9th–10th C.: the so-called Taktikon of Uspenski was issued in 842/3, then follows the Klerotologion of Philotheos (899), the Taktikon of Benešević (934–44), and the Escrual (or Oikonomides) taktikon (971–75). Taktika are concerned with ceremonial and court precedence; their primary aim was to guide the atriklines in the appropriate placement of dignitaries at imperial banquets. Taktika are the most important source for the study of administration because they provide an almost complete picture of the Byz. bureaucratic machine; their evidence, however, must be expanded and checked by reference to narrative texts and esp. seals.


—A.K.
TAKTIKA OF LEO VI (Τών ἐν πολέμως τακτικῶν σύντομοι παραδόσεις), a large handbook of strategy and tactics for land and naval warfare in 20 books compiled by Leo VI ca. 905. In the preface Leo states his purpose to revive military science in face of the Arab threat. Based mainly on Onasander and the Strategikon of Maurice, the Taktika discusses generalship and planning, equipment and deployment, encampments, sieges, and duties before and after battle. Although much in the text is derived and hence remote from Leo’s time, sections on foreign peoples such as the Hungarians (18.45–76) and Arabs (18.109–41) or the exploits and innovations of his generals (11.25–26, 15.38, 17.83) are contemporary, while the lack of sources on naval warfare compelled him to ask his own sailors for information on this subject (19.11). The Taktika became the authoritative military reference work in the 10th C., inspiring and influencing later Strategika (Dagon-Miháescu, Guerilla 159–60).

The text has come down in two traditions—a preliminary model and a fully revised version (A. Dain, TM 2 [1967] 354–57). Of interest for the text’s early history is the acrostic in book 20, rearranged during the reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos to delete the name of Leo’s brother Alexander (J. Grosdidier de Matons, TM 5 [1973] 229–42). Another Strategikon, conventionally titled Sylloge Tacticorum, is wrongly attributed to Leo VI.


TALE OF THE TAKING OF TSAR’GRAD, name of two different accounts of a capture of Constantinople.

CAPTURE OF 1204. The Eastern Slavic account of the capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204, preserved in the Novgorod First Chronicle and in several historical compilations, is apparently based on an eyewitness report. The background to the attack seems to derive from oral sources: a version of Alexios III Angelos’s escape from Constantinople that differs from that in Niketas Choniates, and an account of diplomacy that is favorable to Philip of Swabia. The Tale blames Constantinople’s rulers and would-be rulers rather than Philip or the pope. The capture itself is described in detail and is particularly useful as a source on the plundering of Hagia Sophia. It has been suggested that Antony, archbishop of Novgorod, was the author.


CAPTURE OF 1453. The account of the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 is attributed in one MS to Nestor-Ikander, purportedly a Russian pressed into service in the Turkish army. The core of the work—an eyewitness description of the fall of the city—is set in an eschatological framework; a preface treats the founding of Constantinople, and digressions use prophecies from pseudo-Methodios, the visions of Daniel, and Leo VI the Wise.


TAMARA OF GEORGIA, queen of Georgia (from 1184); born ca. 1156, died 1207 or 1212/13. In 1178 Tamara (θέαμα) was associated with her father Giorgi III (r. 1156–84). Her marriage (in 1185?)—certainly not before 1184, cf. V.B. Vinogradov, S.A. Golovanova, Voprosy istorii [1982] no. 7, 182–84—to Jurij, son of Andrej of Bogoljubovo, failed. In 1191 she had to suppress a revolt of Georgian nobles, aided by Byz., in support of Jurij (M.D. Lordkipanidze, Georgia in the XI–XII Centuries, tr. D. Skvirsky [Tbilisi 1987] 142f). Militarily she expanded Georgian power into Armenia. When the Fourth Crusade attacked Constantinople (July 1203), Tamara exploited the Byz. Empire’s disintegration. In Apr. 1204 her armies occupied Trebizond, where they installed her
kinsman Alexios I Komnenos, and advanced into Paphlagonia with David Komnenos.


--C.M.B.

TANCA, ancient Tanais in the estuary of the Don, on the site of the village of Nedvigorovka. The city was destroyed by a hostile invasion (of the Goths or Sarmato-Alans?) soon after 244; it was probably restored ca.375 and regained its previous extent, although it was poor, with many buildings in ruins. Some trade with Cimmerian Bosporos persisted, but objects (ceramics, bone combs, fibulae) typical of western areas (Černjachovo?) have been found side by side with Late Antique ware of the 4th–5th C. This partial change in material culture testifies to the penetration of new inhabitants into Tanais. In the mid-5th C. Tanais was deserted; the nearby necropolis likewise has no graves later than the 5th C.

From Prokopios to Doukas, when Byz. authors speak of Tanais they mean only the river Don; for instance, some of them are aware of Italians sailing to the Tanais River (e.g., Kantak. 3:192.18) or of wares brought from “the Scythians and Tanais” (Greg. 3:90.14–15).

The Italian colony of Tana is known from the end of the 11th C. onward. It was a trading center, probably founded by Cuman merchants, connecting the basin of the Black Sea (primarily KAFFA) with eastern Europe, the Golden Horde, and the empire of the Ilkhans. Its main exports were fish and caviar. From 1235 to 1475 Tana was ruled by the Tatars. The Orthodox church in Tana was under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Alania (or the Caucasus); in 1356 several priests from Tana lodged complaints in Constantinople concerning actions of the metropolitan, including his attempts to let Armenians use their church (MM 1:357:33–34). Sacked by Timur in 1375, Tana deteriorated thereafter. It lost all significance when it was conquered by the Ottomans in 1475.


--O.P.

TANCRED (Tαγγρῆς), nephew of Bohemund; born ca.1075, died Antioch ca.12 Dec. 1112. Tancrad joined Bohemund’s Normans on the First Crusade. Only under strong pressure did he take the oath of vassalage to Alexios I (June 1097). In Sept. 1097, in cooperation with their Byz. and Armenian inhabitants, he took Tarsos and Mamistra. Tancrad participated in the capture of Antioch and Jerusalem and then in 1101, after the Turks imprisoned Bohemund, became regent of Antioch. In 1103, after an 18-month siege, Tancrad took LaodiKeia from the Byz. When, following Bohemund’s release, a Byz. force seized all of LaodiKeia except the citadel, Bohemund determined to return to Italy; Tancrad again became his deputy in Antioch. In 1107, while Bohemund attacked Byz. from the west, Tancrad expelled the Byz. army that had occupied Cilicia; in 1108 he regained LaodiKeia. About 1109, Alexios recovered part of Cilicia; in 1109/10, Tancrad again drove him out. After Bohemund died, Alexios demanded the fulfillment of the Treaty of Devol that Bohemund had signed, but Tancrad contemptuously rejected his envos. Anna Komnene admired his leadership and bravery.


--C.M.B.

TANCRED OF LECCE, claimant king of Sicily (1189–94); died Palermo 20 Feb. 1194. An illegitimate son of Roger, duke of Apulia, son of Roger II, Tancred (Tαγγρῆς) was chosen king by a faction of barons upon the death of William II of Sicily. Tancrad contended against internal revolts, repeated invasions by his German rival Henry VI, and the Crusaders Richard I Lionheart and Philip II of France (1190–91). To resist Henry, Tancrad made an alliance on unknown terms with Isaac II, who dreaded a German occupation of Sicily. To cement this alliance, Isaac sent his daughter Irene to marry Tancrad’s eldest son Roger (July–Aug. 1192), who then became co-ruler with Tancrad. Roger, however, died 24 Dec. 1193, and Tancrad soon after. Henry then easily took Sicily.
TANNER (βυρσεύς, also βυρσοποιός, βυρσοδέψις). In the late Roman period the verb byrsoo probably did not refer specifically to tanning, but to leather processing in general: "God," says Epiphanius of Salamis (PG 43:128C), in imitation of Origen, "is not a byrsodoutes (or byrsodepses) who works on hides, making tunics for Adam and Eve." John Chrysostom (PG 52:522.43–47) describes the work of leather dressers (skytodepsai): first they treat the hides with a mordant, then stretch and beat them, dash them against walls and rocks, preparing them for dying. A 6th-C. papyrus may mention byrseis (I. Fikhman, PSb 7 [1962] 53, n.9).

Some tanners plied their trade at monasteries: Palladios (Hist. Laus., ed. Butler 96.3) saw a byrseion or tannery among the workshops in a monastery, and there were also byrseis at the Studios monastery in Constantinople. The 10th-C. Book of the Eparch distinguishes between two kinds of craftsmen working on hides, byrsopoi and malakataroi (lit. "softeners"). The latter term is found nowhere else, although the related word malakourgos is used to describe artisans at Studios; Dobroklonskij (Feodor 1:413), however, understood it to mean carpenter.

Tanners ranked low on the social scale; Niketas Choniates disparagingly includes byrsodepsai among the "stupid and ignorant inhabitants of Constantinople," alongside the sausage sellers and shoemakers (Nik.Chon. 349.15–18). A letter of Maximos Planoudes mentions Jewish tanners in the Vlanga quarter of Constantinople (ep.31.53–61, ed. Treu, 52), the stench of whose profession he detested.

Lit. Oikonomides, Hommes d'affaires 101, n.191. –A.K.

TAORMINA (Ταορμινένου), city on the northeastern coast of Sicily, between Messina and Catania. Founded in the 4th C. B.C., it fell into economic decline after antiquity, and has no late Roman archaeological monuments (G. Fasoli, Atti del 3° Congresso internazionale di studi sull'alto medioevo [Spoleto 1959] 382f) except for some tombs and inscriptions, one of which is dated in 409 (B. Pace, Arte e civiltà della Sicilia antica, vol. 4 [Rome–Naples 1949] 195). Medieval Taormina was a stronghold and a bishopric. A late legend (probably of the 8th or 9th C.) attributes the foundation of the bishopric to St. Pankratios of Taormina (BHG 1410), an alleged disciple of the apostle Peter who reportedly came to Taormina from Antioch.

In the 9th C. Taormina became the target of constant attacks by the Arabs, who devastated the area in 869, 877, 879, and 889. Taormina was the last significant fortress in Sicily to resist the Arab onslaught, but on 1 Aug. 902 the Muslims took the city after a siege. Many captives, including Bp. Prokopios, were beheaded and their corpses burned. Those Byz. commanders who avoided capture and came to Constantinople were condemned to be executed, but at the request of Patr. Nicholas I Mystikos they were permitted to escape the death penalty by taking monastic vows. Soon after the fall of Taormina the Byz. authorities proclaimed the city an archbishopric. The fortress was rebuilt by the Arabs and was known to Arab sources as "New Stronghold." The local population tried to preserve a certain independence, but...
by 962 Taormina came under the total control of the Arabs. In 1078 the Normans took the city.

—A.K.

TARANTO (Tápas, Τερέντος), ancient Italian port on the Ionian Sea, connected by the Via Appia with Rome and central Italy, and an important naval stronghold during the Gothic wars. In 663 Constans II landed in Taranto, whence he started his brief campaign against Benevento. Taranto was conquered ca.680 by the Lombards and ca.840 by the Arabs. In 880 the Byz. recovered the port; they held it until the Norman conquest of the 1060s. Administratively, Taranto belonged to the theme of Longobardia and later to the catepanate of Italy. In this period Taranto lost to Otranto its importance in the Mediterranean traffic; fishing, however, remained important in the local economy. The population consisted of Greeks and Lombards. The bishops—from 978, archbishops—and the clergy of the cathedral were usually Latin-speaking Roman Catholics, whereas the local landowners and officials were generally Greek. The latter’s prevalence is testified to by a number of Greek monasteries, some of which survived through the Norman period. No Byz. monument has been preserved.

—V.v.F.

TARASIOS (Ταράσιος), patriarch of Constantinople (25 Dec. 784–18 Feb. 806) and saint; born Constantinople? ca.730, died Constantinople 25 Feb. 806; feastday 25 Feb. Son of a high-ranking judge, Tarasios had a secular career under the Iconoclast rulers and became asekretis. Empress Irene, seeing in Tarasios an ally, selected him as the successor of Paul IV (780–84), a patriarch who was inclined to restore icon veneration but was afraid to take a decisive step. Tarasios acted immediately, addressing to Pope Hadrian I an epistle with an anti-Iconoclast profession of faith and anathemas against heretics condemned by six ecumenical councils, including Pope Honorius. Hadrian’s answer was cautious: he welcomed the restoration of the cult of icons but protested against the election of a layman to the patriarchal throne; he demanded energetic action against the Iconoclasts. Overcoming the opposition primarily of military circles, Irene and Tarasios convoked the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 and abolished Iconoclasm. Tarasios, however, in his desire for pacification, assumed a mild position with regard to former Iconoclasts as well as repentant clerics and were condemned for simony. The patriarch’s moderate attitude inspired criticism by Theodore of Studios and his partisans. The conflict between the two factions of Iconophiles became esp. acute during the Moechian Controversy but simmered down after the blinding of Constantine VI.

The literary oeuvre of Tarasios is insignificant, comprised primarily of letters, a Refutation of the decisions of the Iconoclasm Council of 754, a homily on the Presentation of the Virgin, and a speech on his election. His vita was written by Ignatios the Deacon.

—A.K.


—V.v.F.

TARCHANEIOTES (Ταρχανειώτης, f. Ταρχανειώτισσα), also Trachaneiotes, a lineage of military aristocracy. Both etymology and family origin are questionable. Seibt (Bleisiegel 280) connects the name with the Mongol targon, “smith,” although Moravcsik (Byzantioturcica 2:300) had questioned the Turkish-Bulgarian connections of the name. C. Cahen (Byzantion 9 [1934] 630), without any documentation, considers the family Georgian. They may have been of Bulgarian stock; in any case they belonged to the nobles of Adrianople. From the late 10th C. they occupied important military posts: Gregory Tarchaneiotes was katepano of Italy from 998; Basil was stratelates of the West ca.1057; Joseph, the general of Romanos IV Diogenes, died in 1074 as dux of Antioch; his son Katakalon Tarchaneiotes succeeded his father as governor of Antioch. In the struggle for power in the 11th C., the Tarchaneiotes opposed the rebellious Anatolian aristocracy; Basil remaining loyal to Michael VI Stratelitokos and fought against
Isaac I Komnenos; Joseph resisted Romanos IV’s plans for broad expansion, played a two-faced role at the battle of Mantzikert (1071), and was rewarded by the Doukai. A certain Tarchaneiotes (Tarchaneiotes Katakalon, acc. to Anna Komnene) supported Michael VII against Nikephoros Bryennios in 1077 and later fought against Alexios I Komnenos. (Gautier [“Blachernes” 254f] identified him with the governor of Antioch, but the man was still young in 1077.) Accordingly the Komnenoi did not trust them; after “the son of Tarchaneiotes,” protopredros in 1094, and John Tarchaneiotes, protos of Athos in the early 12th C., the Tarchaneiotaï suffered a temporary eclipse but regained importance after 1204. Pachymeres listed them among the most influential families of the empire of Nicaea; they possessed land in the Smyrna region. Nikephoros Tarchaneiotes was megas domestikos under John III; married to Maria-Martha, Michael VIII’s sister, he became a Palaiologan supporter and his sons were awarded high titles: Andronikos, megas konostaulos, and Michael (died 1284), protostatharion. Another Michael (Tarchaneiotes Glabas) was protostatharion ca.1300. Kantakouzenos describes the military prowess of Constantin Tarchaneiotes, strategos of the “triremes” in 1352. The family was closely connected with the Pammakaristos church in Constantinople: an enigmatic description of the church mentions the sebastos Alexios Tarchaneiotes, gambros of the founders, and several later family members. The Tarchaneiotai’s intellectual role is unattested, except for the questions addressed to Patr. Nicholas (III?) (Benešević, Opisanje 1:288f) by John Tarchaneiotes, an Athonite monk, probably the above-mentioned protostratos.


TARCHANEIOTES, MICHAEL DOUKAS GLABAS. See Glabas, Michael Tarchaneiotes.

TARON (ταρών), district of southwest Armenia; in the 4th C., the domain of the Mamikonean. In the 8th C. Taron passed to a branch of the Bagratid house and formed a separate principality recognizing the overlordship of the caliphate while simultaneously maintaining friendly relations with Byz., which granted to its princes the titles of magistros, patrikios, and strategos of Taron (De adm. imp. 43.65, 152). At the death of Prince Ashot I in 966, Taron was annexed by Byz. and formed with Keltzene a theme usually ruled by a protostatharios, and a metropolitan see with 21 suffragans (Notitiae CP no.10.702–29), while the Taronite princes received extensive domains and went on to distinguished careers at the imperial court. In the mid-11th C. Taron was reunited with Vaspurakan, for Gregory Magistros styles himself dux of Vaspurakan and Taron in his letters and inscriptions (Letters, p.148). After the Byz. defeat at Mantzikert in 1071, a Taronite prince named Tornik established himself at Mus’west of Lake Van, which his descendants held until disposed of by the Muslims in 1189/90.


TARONITES (ταρώνιτες), a noble family of Armenian origin. According to Adontz (infra), it was founded by Gregory and Bagrat (Pankratios), sons of Ashot, prince of Taron; after Ashot’s death in 968 the brothers yielded Taron to Byz. in exchange for the title of patrikioi and lands “of large
revenues” (Skyl. 279.82–84). According to Laurent (infra), already established in Byz. by that time was another branch of the family to which belonged Romanos Taronites, who married Irene, Gregory’s daughter. In the 10th–11th C. Taronitai were predominantly military commanders: Gregory was magistros and governor of Thessalonike; his son Asot defended Thessalonike against Samuel of Bulgaria and was captured in 996; Michael fought against the Turks, his son John against the Cumans. The Taronitai were eager to side with rebels: Gregory and Bagrat supported Bardas Skleros but later joined the emperor; another Gregory joined the aristocratic conspiracy of 1040; a third Gregory, doux of Trebizond, rebelled there in 1104, but the revolt was put down by his cousin John, Michael’s son. The Taronitai family belonged to the aristocratic elite: Michael married Maria, Alexios I’s sister, and had the title of panhypersebastos. In the 12th C. the Taronitai were primarily civilian functionaries: John, epi ton deesen in 1094/5; John, eparch in ca.1107; John, praitor and anagrapheus of Thrace in 1102; John, eparch in 1147; Gregory, protoviesarios of John II; Theodore, notary in 1195. A puzzling case is Eudokia Taronitissa, called sebaste on a 12th-C. seal and proedrissa on a 13th-C. (?) seal. Theodore Prodromos mentions that John, Manuel I’s nephew, married a lady of the Taronitai family who dwelled on the Euphrates; perhaps the family left Constantinople and moved east, but the poet could have had a local branch of the family in mind. They did not play any political role after 1204.


TARSOS (Ταρσός, mod. Tarsus), civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of CILICIA I. Flourished as a trade and military center because of its strategic location below the CILICIAN GATES on the main highway between Anatolia and Syria. An early center of Christianity, Tarsos was famous as the birthplace of St. Paul, whose shrine was built there by Maurice. The city was still largely pagan, however, in the time of Julian the Apostate, who planned to make it his residence; instead, he was buried by the city walls opposite the tomb of Maximinus Daia. Justinian Iregulated the course of the Kydnos through Tarsos and rebuilt its bridge, but the city suffered from riots of the Blues late in his reign. The Arabs took Tarsos in 637 and made it the center of their defensive system against Byz. In the 7th–8th C. Tarsos was frequently attacked and ruined, but recovered after 834 to become a major Arab commercial city. Nikephoros II Phokas took it in 965 and installed a garrison of 5,000 under a strategos. It remained Byz. until 1085, then frequently changed hands among Byz., Armenians, Crusaders, and Seljuks. John II took it in 1137, and Manuel I received there the homage of the Latins in 1159. The Armenians conquered it in 1172. Tarsos preserves no significant Byz. remains.


TATARS (Ṭārāpū), seminomadic groups in East Asia who are first mentioned in the Old Turkic runic royal inscriptions from Mongolia (A.D. 732). They probably used a Mongolian idiom as their lingua franca and, during the 12th C., played a leading role in Mongolia. In 1202 the Tatars were defeated by the Mongol ruler Genghis Khan but, because of the prestige of the Tatars’ name in the Eurasian steppe, the Mongols appropriated this charismatic appellation for themselves. “Tatar” became the designation for the realm of the Mongols in Rus’ and the Cuman steppes (including the Crimea). The terms Tataros and Mongouldios are very rare in Byz. historical sources, apart from a synaxarion from Sougdaia in which Tatar occurs many times (Moravskik, Byzantinoturcica 2:282f). As usual the Byz. preferred the archaizing designation “Scythians” for the Mongols and Tatars.


TATAS (τατᾶς), or tatas of the court (tatas tes aules), a title mentioned first on a seal of John Komnenos Vatatzes, nephew of Manuel I. Several individuals are known to have held this title in the 13th and 14th C. The functions of the tatas are not defined in the available sources. Since the historian Doukas explained the word as “pedagogue,” Stein (“Untersuchungen” 45, n. 1) suggested that the tatas replaced the megas baioulos,
but V. Laurent (EEBS 23 [1953] 203) rejected this hypothesis. The only evidence that sheds some light on his duties is in an early 14th-C. historian (Pachym., ed. Failier, 2:413.18–21) who presents the tatas as one of the three major aulic functionaries (along with the píknernes and epi tes tra-
pezes) appointed by Michel VIII for his co-emperor Andronikos II. In pseudo-KoDINOS the tatas oc-
cupies a modest position.

LIT. Guillard, Titres, pt.XXIV, 149–51. –A.K.

TATIKIOS (Τατίκιος), general; fl. 1057–99. Son of a “Saracen” (An.Komn. 1:151.25–7; perhaps a Turk—Moravski, Byzantinoturcica 2:225, 305) captured by John Komnenos, Tatikios was the same age as Alexios I, with whom he was nurtured. In 1078 Tatikios fought beside Alexios against Nikephoros Basilakés. As megas primi-
kerios of the internal vestiaritai (Gautier, “Blachernes” 252–54), he commanded the Var-
daritai against the Normans in 1081 and led expeditions against Turks and Pečenegs in 1086–
90. In 1094 his firmness ended the conspiracy of Nikephoros Diogenes against Alexios near Serres. During the First Crusade’s attack on Nicaea (1097), Tatikios’s troops supported the Westerners. With a small Byz. force he then accompanied them across Anatolia, representing the emperor. During the siege of Antioch (Dec. 1097–June 1098), Tatikios alienated Bohemund and Raymond of Toulouse; thus isolated, he was compelled to withdraw (ca. early Feb.) by sea to Cyprus on the pretext of securing food and/or assistance for the Crusaders. Because he failed to return, Western sources condemn him as a liar and traitor. He last appears as a naval commander against Pisan raiders (1099). He was devoted to Alexios. Some Crusader narratives allege his nose had been slit, possibly indicating he had begun his career in Byz. as a slave.

LIT. Skoulatos, Personnages 287–92. J. France, “The De-
parture of Tatikios from the Crusader Army,” Bulletin of
the Institute of Historical Research 44 (1971) 137–47.
–C.M.B.

TAZTATES (Τατζάτης, Τατζάτης, Arm. Tačat), 8th-C. general who served both the Byz. and Arabs. An Armenian noble (Toumanoff, “Cau-
casia” 150), Tatzates came to Byz. ca.760 and reportedly campaigned under Constantine V against the Bulgarians. He was named strategos of the Boukellaron before 776, when he led an army against the Arabs into Samosata. In 778 Tatzates accompanied Michael Lachanodrakon into Syria and again campaigned with him against the Arabs in 781. In 782, when Harun al-Rashid invaded Asia Minor, Tatzates defected with the bulk of his troops, allowing the caliph to advance to Chry-
sopolis and force Irene to negotiate for peace. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 456.12–13) says that Tatzates was motivated by hatred for the eunuch Staurakios; his flight may also reflect Irene’s animosity toward iconoclastic strategoi. Theophanes (456.22–23) also says that as a result of his flight Tatzates was deprived of his wife and all his property. Harun named him commander of Arab-occupied Armenia. Tatzates died while campaigning against the Khazars.

LIT. L.A. Tritle, “Tatzates’ Flight and the Byzantine-
–P.A.H.

TAURUS (Ταῦρος), a mountain range in south-
eastern Anatolia that ancient geographers considered the natural frontier between Europe and Asia. Its distinction from the Caucasus was confused by some writers on geography: according to Orosius, northern Mesopotamia lay between the Taurus and the Caucasus; Eustathios of Thes-
salonike, on the other hand, defined the Caucasus as the northern part of the Taurus. A 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 138.20–21) speaks of two Tauruses separated by the valley of Klaudio-
polis. Byz. authors (e.g., Constantine VII Porphy-
rigennetos in De thematibus) usually considered the Taurus as a mountaneous area dividing north-
er northern Syria from eastern Asia Minor and extending as far as Isauria, Cilicia, Lykaonia, and Cappa-
docia; Armenia was located beyond the Taurus. In Nomnos of Panopolis, Taurus is described as an enormous mountain rising to the clouds; Pro-
kopios (Buildings 5:5.15) emphasizes that in winter the whole Taurus range is snow covered. In ad-
tinction to descriptions of the natural barriers that strengthen the defense of the region, Theophanes (138.16–18) also mentions fortifications and phrouria. Barely passable (the main road led through the CILICIAN GATES), the rugged terrain of the Taurus contributed to the relative indepen-
dence of the local (Isaurian) population and, on the other hand, presented a serious obstacle for
the armies of Arabs, Byz., Crusaders, etc., moving to and from Syria.

In later texts (e.g., Skyl. 107.45–46) the name Taurus (or Northern Taurus) was linked to the Crimea (Taurike or Taurike Cherronesos of ancient authors), and the area was said to be populated by the Rus’ or Tauroscythians.


TAVERN (κατηλειον, also φουσκαρειον or δισπυ

νοστήριον [vita of Hypatios of Gangra, ed. S. Ferri, StB 3 (1931) 76.30–31]) was the shop (also called ergasterion) of a retail wine merchant, kal

pelos, as distinct from the roadside inn. The kalpelo

from provided patrons with not only wine but also food (Zonaras in Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:327.4). Taverns had a bad reputation: the kalpeleoi were usually accused of diluting wine with water; taverns became the site of drunkenness and brawls. For example, some young men took Andrew the Fool to a phouskareion in the Artopoleia in Constantinople and began to punch him. The saint then drank a mug of first-quality wine, broke the cup over the head of one of the youths, and fled; the young men caught him, struck him, and dragged him back into the tavern (PG 111:648CD). The 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (19.4) prohibited kalpeleoi from opening their taverns on the days of Great Feasts “before the second hour of the day” (8:00 A.M.), and they were obliged to close at the second hour of the night (8:00 P.M.) “lest the frequenters of these taverns have the right of access thereto at night time.” In the early 14th C. Patr. Athanasios I (eps. 42–44) urged the prohibition of drinking in taverns on the Sabbath and during Lent.


TAXATION. The principal taxpayers were land-

owners, and Byz. law considered payment of taxes as the primary duty of the georgoi (peasants). Specific taxes such as the chrysargyron on craft production and related occupations disappeared by the 7th C., but export-import taxes continued in the form of kommerkon, and city dwellers paid taxes on their immovable property—land and buildings (see City Taxes). Taxes were levied in money, in kind, and in the form of services (angareiai, mitaton, etc.). The complaints of Patr. Nikephoros I (Nikeph. 76.5–11) that Constantine V, “a new Midas,” compelled peasants to pay taxes in cash and thus forced them to sell their goods at a loss show that in the 8th–9th C. taxation in money was considered inconvenient, at least by some Byz. In the 11th C. replacement of taxes in kind by money payments led to a revolt in Bul-

The principles of late Roman taxation were established by the legislation of Diocletian and Constantine: it was based on two units of account—jugum and caput; jugum encompassed the land, caput, manpower and animals. The quality and type of land (arable field, vineyard, olive grove) was taken into consideration. The land unit and the “poll” unit of account, although separate, were interrelated since a regular household and estate would include both elements. Accessory or secondary taxes were also imposed. Different
geographical regions, esp. Egypt and Africa, had their own characteristic taxes. It is impossible to determine when this system of taxation changed; many attempts have been made to show that it did not change at all and that land tax and poll tax remained as typical of late Byz. as they were of the 4th to 6th C. No late Byz. system of capitatio-jugatio has been attested, however. N. Oikonomides (ZRVI 26 [1987] 9–19) suggests that the late Roman system of taxation based on the assessment “from above” (the central government sending “financial plans” to local fiscal units) had disappeared by the 8th C. (the last mention is the extraordinary imposition of taxes in 719), and was replaced by a system based on the evaluation of individual properties (“impôt de quotité”). Late Byz. taxation, which is better understood because of the large number of surviving praxika, is characterized by the following features: the amount paid by the individual peasant was determined differently in different locations, draft animals, arable land, vineyards, and livestock being major factors in the fiscal assessment (Chvostova, infra 126); property was not the only factor determi-

ing the amount of taxes, so that poorer peasants usually paid heavier taxes than their well-to-do neighbors (Ostrogorsky, Féodalité 317; Kazhdan, Agrarne otnošenija 151–56); the norms of taxation could be altered even though there was no change in the property—owing to grants of fiscal alleviations (kouphismos) or privileges (exkousseia). This permits the conclusion that late Byz. taxation was in part influenced by the social status of taxpayers and their ability to resist fiscal pressure.

The levying of taxes was divided into two phases: the assessment of taxes required a land survey and preparation of the cadaster, followed by the collection of taxes (usually twice a year); the assessment was carried out by epointai, anagrafeis, and similar officials, the collection by dioiketai and praktores. Tax collection could be farmed out to individuals or conferred upon exempt landlords (see Tax Collectors). Taxes were directed to central bureaus, first of all the genikon, but also other treasuries (sakellion, vestiarion, etc.); revenues from imperial domains were collected in special offices such as kouratorialai, although the distinction between state and crown

Taxation. Enrollment of Mary and Joseph for taxation; mosaic, early 14th C. Outer narthex of the church of the Chora monastery, Istanbul.
treasury was not always clear-cut. Part of the revenue went to fiscal officials in the form of syne-
etheiai and elatikon, for their work in collecting taxes; certain strategoi were paid directly from local revenues, and part of the income was as-
signed as solemnia to privileged institutions or individuals.

In theory, the tax was assessed first and then the assets (esp. land) were given to the taxpayer accordingly; thus, hikanosis or the adaptation of land to conform with the sum of taxes assessed was possible. The responsibility for the payment of taxes lay not only on the landowner but on his neighbors who could be asked to pay for impov-
erished or fugitive peasants (allelenygon).

(On the development of taxation, see Fiscal System.)

Lit. J. Karayannopoulos, Das Finanzwesen des frühbyzantin-
ischen Staates (Munich 1958). W. Treadgold, The Byzantine 
State Finances in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries (New York 
1982). F. Dölger, Beiträge zur Geschichte der byzantinischen 
Finanzverwaltung (Munich 1927; rp. Darmstadt 1960). K. 
Chvostova, Osobennosti agrarnoprawnych otnošenii v pozdej 
Vizantii, XIV—XV vv. (Moscow 1968). N. Oikonomides, 
"Quelques boutiques de Constantinople au Xe s.: prix, 
loyers, imposition (Cod. Patmiacus 171)," DOP 26 (1972) 
345—56.

—A.K.

TAXATION, TREATISES ON, manuals for tax collectors. Many particular documents or catego-
ries of documents survive.

1. The most important treatise, preserved in a single parchment MS, Venice Marc. gr. 173, fols. 
275v—281, was published by W. Ashburner (JHS 
35 [1915] 76—84) and then by F. Dölger (infra).

The text is anonymous; Dölger dates the MS 
between 1166 and the text between 913 and 1139, 
while Ostrogorsky places the text between 912 
and the 970s. The treatise contains unique data 
on the structure of the village (definitions of chro-
inion, agridion, proasteion, etc.), on taxes and tax 
 alleviations (sympatheia, klasmia, kouphismos), 
and exemptions, on the activity of tax collectors 
(epoptes, dioiketes) and their synetheiai.

2. The second treatise is preserved in a paper 
codex of the 13th C. from the monastery of St. 
Nikanor at Zaborda (no.121). It was published by 
J. Karayannopoulos, who dated the text to the 11th 
C. and considered it older than the Venice trea-
tise; this thesis cannot be proved. Unlike the Ven-
ice treatise, which gives a coherent exposé, the 
short treatise of Zaborda consists of individual 
paragraphs poorly connected with each other. 
The paragraphs begin with standard headings 
such as "What is sympatheia," "What is opistho-
teleia," or "How the sympatheia is performed," 
"How the orthosis is performed," etc. Brief de-
definitions serve the purpose of reference rather 
than a systematic instruction. The text has no data 
on the structure of the village but does contain 
important additional information on taxation, 
including a concise definition of the pronoa.

3. Metrological MSS contain a schedule of tax-
ation on land as well as humans and livestock, 
which dates from the mid-11th C.

4. An excerpt of a similar text is contained in the 
praktikon of Adam of 1073 (Patmou Engrapha, 
vol. 2, no.50.312—17).

5. The documents known as Ancient Account 
and New Account (see Logarike, Palai and 
Nea) provide normative information concerning 
surtaxes and methods of collecting land tax before 
and after the reform of Alexios I.

6. Other texts concern later periods and re-
regions under Latin domination (such as Cyprus).

Ed. Dölger, Beiträge 3—9, 113—56. J. Karayannopoulos, 
"Fragmente aus dem Vademecum eines byzantinischen 
Finanzbeamten," in Polychronion 318—34. Engl. tr. C. Brand, 
"Two Byzantine Treatises on Taxation," Traditio 25 (1969) 
35—60.

Lit. Lemerle, Agr. Hist. 73—85. G. Ostrogorsky, Die länd-
lische Steuergemeinde des Byzantinischen Reiches im X. Jahr-

—A.K., N.O.

TAX COLLECTORS fall into two groups. They 
could be public servants (such as the dioiketes) 
who collected for the account of the state and were 
remunerated by salary (?) and synetheiai 
(those working eis to pistori); or they could be 
businessmen who farmed out the fiscal revenue of 
a province after bidding at an auction (working 
epi pakto), who were obliged to match their bid 
(otherwise their property was confiscated) and 
were likely to press the taxpayers excessively. Both 
systems are attested throughout Byz. history, but 
tax farming became very frequent after the middle 
of the 11th C., when the generic term praktor 
or energon, "manager") came to designate the tax 
collector. The dioiketes or praktor normally visited 
the taxed properties (and thus collected their 
synetheiai, in money or in kind); they were kept off 
some privileged domains, however, and were 
obliged to accept, in lieu of cash, the receipts that
some taxpayers obtained by paying their taxes directly to the central financial office; this procedure, favorable for the taxpayer, could in practice be followed only by large landowners. As they had vested interest in what they collected, tax collectors were seen by the public as greedy and disreputable (G. Litavrin in Kek. 374f).


--N.O.

TAXIArchos (ταξιαρχος), also taxiarchoi, a military rank. Although often used generically to mean “commander,” taxiarchoi in the Strategikon of Maurice (ca.600) specifically refers to the commander (moirarches) of the Optimatoi, who were then foreign mercenaries. The Souda defines taxiarchoi as an old term, “now” replaced by hekatontarchos, that is, the commander of 100 men. With the reorganization and increased role of infantry during the 10th C., however, the taxiarchoi appears in the strategika and Kekaumenos as a high-ranking officer in command of a 1,000-man unit (taxiararchia) comprising 500 heavy infantrymen, 300 archers, and 200 light infantrymen (Oikonomides, Lites 335f); the terms chiliarches and chi-liarchia also refer to this officer and his unit. The rank of taxiarchoi gained prestige during the 11th C. and eventually surpassed that of tourmarches (Falkenhausen, Dominazione 125–27). The taxiarchoi must be distinguished from the axtiarchoi, who is known from seals and inscriptions (J.-C. Cheynet, REB 44 [1986] 293–35).

In patrician literature, the term taxiarchoi characterized God as the creator of order (taxis), or archangels leading the armies of heaven, esp. St. Michael, “the taxiarchoi of the heavenly host.” The term also applied to an office held by monks who maintained order in the choir and refectory.


--A.K., F.M.

TAXIs (τάξις, “order”), an essential concept that penetrated the Byz. understanding of themselves and their world, as evidenced by the term’s polyvalency: taxis designates realities ranging from “rank, class, troops, way of life,” to “etiquette, precedence, CEREMONY,” or “government bureau.” Within Byz. society, taxis encompassed the harmonious hierarchy of institutions that constituted the state; ecclesiastical taxis did the same for the church. The taxis of human society mirrored that of the cosmos, whose celestial powers were organized into a divine hierarchy, as expressed by pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite. Outside Byz. society, taxis organized foreign societies into a hierarchy of STATES. Indispensable to the exercise of imperial authority (De cer., bk.2, praefatio, ed. Reiske, 516f), taxis occurs often in proemia as a motive for imperial acts (e.g., Hunger, Proemium 181f). The rigid dictates of taxis were tempered by compromise or oikonomia imposed by circumstances and opposed to the most abhorrent phenomenon to the Byz., ataxia, or disorder, which was reckoned characteristic of barbarians or demokratia. Taxis helps to explain why Byz. depicted itself as unchanging; change meant divergence from the established order, thus reform could be represented only as return to the original ancient taxis (e.g., Justinian, nov.59, 316.25–27).


--M.McC.

TAYK/TAO, the Armenian and Georgian names for a region on the upper Coruh, west of the source of the Kura River. The name derives from the Taochoi, first mentioned in Xenophon (Anabasis 4.4.18). By the division of Armenia in 387 the province fell under Iranian control, but in 591 came to Maurice. The MAMIKONEAN princely house occupied it until the 8th C. On their decline the southwest part, “Upper Tayk,” was acquired by the Bagratids and the northeast part, “Lower Tayk,” fell to the Guaramids; by the mid-10th C. it was all in Bagratid hands.

The Armenian Tayk was more comprehensive than Georgian Tao, including the area to the southeast toward Kars (Toumanoff, Caucasian Hist. 450–57). Georgian settlement in the region in the 9th C. is described in the Life of Gregory of Khondzha (P. Peeters, AB 36–37 [1917–19] 207–309.)

David of Tayk/Tao received lands in Byz. Armenia for supporting Basil II during the revolt of Bardas Skleros, but these were lost on his death in 1000. In 1022 Upper Tao was incorporated into the theme of IBERIA, but the area fell under Turkish control after the battle of Man-Tzikert (1071). At the beginning of the 12th C.
DAVID II/IV THE RESTORER brought Tao back into Georgian control.


---

TEACHER (διδάσκαλος, πασερτής). In the Roman Empire teachers worked primarily for municipal schools. This system was preserved after Christianization of the empire (Marrou, Education 460–62). The teacher enjoyed certain fiscal privileges, such as exemptions from municipal levies; this policy was ratified by Justinian 1 (Cod. Just. X 53). Teachers were divided into several categories: grammatistes for primary education and grammatikos for secondary education. Dioclian’s Price Edict established substantially lower fees for teachers in elementary schools than for grammatikoi. With regard to higher education, A. Moffatt (14 CEB 3 [Bucharest 1976] 659–61) suggested a distinction between science teachers (of philosophy, mathematics, and medicine) and arts teachers (of grammar, rhetoric, and law), and calculated that, between 330 and 610, 20 percent of all known teachers taught “science.”

The privatization of teaching in Byz. after the 6th C. accounts for the decline in the number of teachers. Elementary skills were taught by parents and local literate men (priests, notaries, etc.) or by private schoolmasters, while secondary education was rare (it was hard to find a grammatikos in the 9th C. outside of Constantinople) and was conducted on the basis of private agreements with students. The correspondence of the anonymous teacher of the 10th C. (see Teacher, Anonymous) shows him in a constant search for fees, supplementing them with honoraria for copying MSS. At his school, as Lemelre (Humanism 291ff) notes, more advanced students taught the younger ones. Teaching activity was by the 10th C. a channel of upward social mobility (Athanasiou of Athos started as a professional teacher), but it remained closely linked with participation in the state or ecclesiastical administration; teachers at the Patriarchal School (Didaskaloi) often became provincial bishops. In monastic communities the concept of teacher played an essential role, defining the close relationship between a young monk and his experienced mentor.

---

TEACHER, ANONYMOUS (sometimes called “Anonymus Londinensis”), conventional name for the author of a group of 122 letters preserved in a single MS of the late 10th C. (London, B.L. Add. 36749). Born in Thrace (?) probably ca.870, he was a secondary school teacher and scribe in Constantinople in the 920s. According to Browning (infra [1954] 434), the last datable letter is of 931, but C. Mango (ActaNorv. 4 [1969] 121–26) dates two letters to Leo Sakellarios shortly after 940 and places the entire collection of letters between 925 and 944. The letters are addressed to the teacher’s colleagues, important functionaries, and esp. high-ranking clergyman; among the addressees is Sophia, the widow of Christopher Lekapenos. The identification of many of the teacher’s correspondents remains problematic (J. Darrouzès, REB 18 [1960] 113ff). The letters shed light on the status of teachers (their fees, relations with students and their parents and between colleagues), the program of education, and the character of the school. It is unclear to what extent the anonymous teacher’s school was independent and, in particular, whether it was financially supported by church authorities. The correspondence contains information on the copying of books for influential and wealthy patrons; very important is epistle 88 to a patriarch (Nicholas I Mystikos?) describing the problems of a scribe who had to compare variant readings of numerous MSS, choose between variants, and make necessary corrections. The teacher also mentions his own literary activity of which no samples survive; the style of his letters is obscure and enigmatic, typical of a teacher of rhetoric.


---

TEARS. See Contrition.

TEBESSA. See Theveste.
TECHNITES (τεχνίτης), a term that in antiquity designated an artist (F. Poland, RE 2 R. 5 [1934] 2473–2558), but that in the late Roman Empire was applied to skilled craftsmen (as distinct from ergatai, day laborers), including hairdressers, cooks, astrologers, scribes, surgeons, and architects. In the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch 22.1–3 the term is used primarily for construction workers (i.e., carpenters, masons, gypsum workers, painters, etc.) who were not members of any guild. An artisan who cast bronze statues could be called a technites (TheophCont 327.18–20). Athanasios of Athos hired technitai to build the Lavra (Vita A, ed. Notret, par.234.14–21); technitai are also mentioned in his Hypotyposis for the Lavra (Meyer, Hauptkunden 140.25). The term is uncommon, however, in later documents. John V Palaiologos, in a letter of 1367 (?), ordered the hegoumenoi of Athos to send two technitai to Lemnos to repair fortifications on the island (Lavra 3, App. XIV.8–10).

Early church fathers (Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and others) used the epithet technites for God as the architect of the universe and supreme artist. Eusebios of Caesarea (De eccl. theol. 1:10.1— Werke 4, ed. E. Klostermann [Leipzig 1906] 68.18–22) contrasted God's fatherhood of the Son with his role as demiurge, technites, and founder of the world, while Basil of Caesarea (PG 32:77C) accused the Arians of conceiving of the Father as technites and of the Son as his tool. —A.K.

TECHNOLOGY. The Byz. inheritance of technology from the Roman Empire allowed it to remain, at least until the 12th C., the richest and technically most advanced state in the Mediterranean, one that provided examples for imitation. The period of the 4th–6th C. can be characterized by a propensity for the gigantic, esp. as related to building activity: the churches, such as HAGIA SOPHIA in Constantinople, were enormous, the limes could compete with the Chinese wall, a major aqueduct was restored by Valens in Constantinople, and a project was even conceived to construct a Bithynian canal, diverting the Sangarios River and connecting the Black Sea with the Lake of Nikomedes (F. Moore, A/54 [1950] 108–10). On the other hand, even the most sophisticated technical achievements were used primarily to create objects of luxury and toys: thus Anthemos of Tralles used steampower to produce an artificial earthquake in the house of a certain Zenod; magnificent horologia were built both in Constantinople and provincial cities, whereas practical use of water power for mills remained limited, and the existence of the sawmill is questionable (O. Wikander, Opuscula romana 13 [1981] 98–100). The scientists of the period were more concerned with the preservation of ancient tradition than in developing it. The 5th-C. alchemist Zosimos and his successors left descriptions of chemical apparatus and recipes for various processes of smelting, dyeing, alloying, and the like. Pappos of Alexandria depicted mechanical devices, including pulleys and gears, using Archimedes and Heron as his sources; Eutikios and Isidore of Miletus also commented on ancient models. In the realm of military technology, the anonymous Latin treatise De rebus bellicis contains descriptions of new inventions, but it is not known whether they were ever actually produced.

Strangely, the crisis of urban life in the 7th C. released the forces of inventiveness, and the 7th–9th C. brought forth significant technical innovations, esp. in such fields as agriculture, transport, and military equipment and weaponry. The water mill became a standard power source by the time of the Farmer's Law. The nailed horseshoe and improvement of harness attested by ca.900 allowed progress in both ploughing and transportation. The lateen sail, in use probably from the 7th C., made ships more responsive to the wind. The stirrup, attested from the 7th C., permitted a radical change in the army structure that culminated by the 10th C. in the creation of the cavalry of the kataphraktai. GREEK FIRE was invented in the 7th C. For imperial ceremonial, various automata and the pipe organ were created. Leo the Mathematician invented the fire beacon system to warn against Arab invasions. Two phenomena of intellectual life were probably connected with this growing interest in technological innovation: the replacement of uncial script by the minuscule, and the transliteration of texts from old MSS, which started not with patristics, but with books on mathematics and astronomy (Wilson, Scholars 85f); the increasing use of paper encouraged this development. Oikonomides has suggested that the Byz. began to make paper themselves by 800, although the question is still open.
Byz. interest in technology is recorded by Isidore of Seville, who ca.624 time and again listed technical achievements such as beer brewing, use of the goose quill pen and ink, and use of alum for dyeing. Silk production developed from the 6th C. onward. However, the Byz. theorists of the time preferred to crib from ancient and late Roman "engineering" works, whereas Byz. recipes and devices are described not in Greek works, but in a Latin tract by the 11th-C. (?) priest Theophilius.

After the 10th C. Byz. technology started lagging behind that of Muslims and Westerners, and progress slowed down. The insignificant invention of Athanasios of Athos, the use of oxen power for mixing dough, was praised by his hagiographers. Some improvements in glass production and ceramics were introduced. The windmill began to appear. In the major fields of technology, however, the Byz. were outdistanced by their neighbors: they borrowed the crossbow (tangara) from the Westerners, but yielded before the Turkish cannons (see Firearms); they lost in the competition with Italian shipbuilding; they did not broadly apply new uses of energy sources, water and wind, to their manufacturing activities (e.g., for sawing or forging). Bessarian was impressed by the Western production of glass, textiles, weapons, and ships (A. Keller, Cambridge Historical Journal 11 [1953–55] 343–48). And even though Byz. silk weavers were still famous in 15th-C. France, Byz. had fallen hopelessly behind.


TEDALDI, JACopo, Florentine merchant who helped defend Constantinople against the siege of Mehmed II; fl. ca.1453. Tedaldi escaped capture by swimming to a Venetian ship that took him to Negroponte. Informations, an account of Tedaldi's experience, survives in French and may derive from his encounter at Negroponte with one Jean Blanchin, whose role in the transmission (or creation) of the document is obscure. It is a source for the fall of Constantinople, providing valuable data on Turkish leaders, details of the siege, and estimates of the value of the Turkish booty and Italian losses. Tedaldi's account exists in long (probably interpolated) and short redactions, of which one illuminated MS (Paris, B.N. fr. 6487) is in scroll form and bears a subscription by a copyist, Johannes Columbi (31 Dec. 1453). In 1454 Tedaldi's Informations was revised, translated into Latin, titled the Treatise [Tractatus] on the Conquest of the City of Constantinople, given a prologue, and used as a propaganda text calling for a new Crusade.


—M.McC.

TEIA (Teiae), last Ostrogothic king (from July 552); died Mons Lactarius, southern Italy, 30 Oct. (or Nov.—Stein, infra) 552. Commander (comes) in Totila's army, Teia defended Verona against the troops of Narses. After the defeat at Busta Gallorum the Goths elected Teia their king. He led the suicidal resistance of the Goths with unnecessary cruelty (execution of hostages), treason, and brave but useless expeditions. The Franks did not respond to Teia's plea for help. From Ticinum, Teia marched south toward Naples only to learn that he had been betrayed by the Gothic fleet, treachery that made provisioning impossible. In a courageously fought battle, Teia was killed and his head placed on a spear to demoralize his troops. Narses used his command at sea and his excellent archers as well as numerical superiority to crush Teia. His death ended organized Ostrogothic resistance in Italy, although some skirmishes continued until 555.


—W.E.K., A.K.

TEKFUR SARAYI (Turk., lit. "Palace of the Sovereign"), Turkish name for a three-story Byz. palace of which the empty shell remains at the north termination of the Theodosian land walls, occupying the space between the inner and outer walls of the city (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF). It is the only well-preserved example of Byz. domestic architecture at Constantinople. The ground floor was supported on col-
TEKIRDAĞ. See RHADESTOS.

TELERIG (Τελερίγος), Bulgar khan (768/74–777). In 774 Constantine V launched a major campaign against BULGARIA, which Telerig forestalled by sending an embassy to Varna and signing an agreement not to invade Byz. territory. In the fall, however, even as Telerig’s envoys were negotiating in Constantinople, Telerig dispatched a large force to capture Berzitia and resettle its populace in Bulgaria. “Secret friends,” evidently at the khan’s own court, warned Constantine, permitting his victory at LITHOSORIA. Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 448.4–10) relates Telerig’s countermeasure: he wrote to Constantine expressing interest in fleeing to Constantinople and requesting the identities of the emperor’s supporters in Bulgaria, so that he might join them. Constantine sent the men’s names, whereupon Telerig eliminated them. Whatever the story’s veracity, in 777 Telerig did indeed flee to Constantinople, where he was baptized, made a patrikios by Leo IV, and married to a niece of Leo’s wife (Empress Irene). The cause of Telerig’s flight is unknown, and nothing is heard of him after his arrival in Constantinople.


TELLA. See CONSTANTINA.

TELOS (τέλος), generic designation of taxes, used in both narrative texts and documents: thus, an act of 1008 (Lavra 1, no.14.24) speaks of the telos of a chorton; in 927 the inhabitants of Hierissos stubbornly refused to pay state (demosion) telos (Ivir., no.1.1–2). Later, in the prakтика of the 14th C., telos most frequently is the tax on a stasis. Svoronos (Cadastre 24, n.3) distinguishes telos (the gross tax) from the teloumenon, the net tax to be paid after the subtraction of sums representing various forms of tax-relief or alleviation (sympatheia, klasma, kouphismos). It seems, however, that teloumenon is a term of the 10th–11th C., used before telos acquired its technical meaning and replaced teloumenon. The Treatise on Tax-
TELOUNEMON. See Templos.

TEMPLO (τέμπλον, also called κάγκελα, κυκλίδες), the screen separating the nave from the sanctuary. Originally a low parapet or chancel barrier, about the mid-5th C. it developed into a taller partition (Orlandos, Palatiochr. basilike 2:526f). The temple stood at a right angle to the nave, or projected into it in the form of the letter Π (πτ); an entrance on each of the three sides was sometimes preceded by a four-column porch (Orlandos, Palatiochr. basilike 2:531). Such barriers were supported by a molded stylobate (bema), 24–40 cm high, and consisted of closure slabs held in place by waist-high piers, colonnettes on piers, or plain colonnettes (Sodini-Kolokotsas, Aliki II 49) carrying an epistyle.

Surviving temples are mostly fragmentary. Elaborate examples had colonnettes and stylobate of colored marble (Mathews, Early Churches 25), while the screen of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, as described by Paul Silentiarios, was dressed in silver. After Iconoclasm the temple was extended to the Pastophoria. Like the screen of the Bema, these screens consisted of slabs set between colonnettes and carrying an epistyle; all such forms, nonetheless, were generally lighter than those of the time of Justinian I. According to M. Chatzidakis (15 CEB [Athens 1976] 3:165), toward the end of the 11th C. the transformation of the medieval temple was completed with the appearance of Proskynetaria and icons set in its intercolumnar openings. An elongated painted panel with the Deesis, the Great Feasts, or both, was added on top of the epistyle (K. Weitzmann, DChAE 12 [1984] 64–86). Photios (Homilai 10.5, ed. B. Laourdas 102.1) describes the chancel-screen in a palace church, perhaps the Virgin of the Pharos, with its peristyle of colonnettes dressed in silver. Enameled screens were also produced. The Palà d’Oro is thought to enclose part of the enameled dokeiaortom (panels of the Twelve Great Feasts) that once embellished the screen of the south church in the Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople, and the inventory of the Kecharitmone nunneries in Constantinople refers to bema doors of silver, decorated with the Annunciation (P. Gautier, REB 43 [1985] 154-73).

Most surviving medieval temples were, however, carved in marble, the most elaborate ones showing uprights and stylobates of colored stone. Inlaid
champlevé screens (Grabar, *Sculptures II*, pl. V–IX) were probably meant to suggest the effect of silver and niello. On the other hand, templata with relief decoration indicate a renewed interest in plasticity. After the reconquest in 1261, screens in Constantinople reveal further development toward sculpture in the round (Ø. Hjort, *DOP* 33 [1979] 225–36). From this last period also date the first woodcarved templata that were to prevail in the post-Byz. period; such a templon is usually called an iconostasis.


---

**TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.** After his baptism, Christ prepared for his ministry by fasting for 40 days in the wilderness. There he was thrice tempted by the Devil: to use his divine power to undermine his human will by turning stones into bread to eat, to test his divinity capriciously by hurling himself from the Temple, and to worship the Devil in return for wealth and power (Mt 4:1–11, Lk 4:1–13). Though the relevant passages were read at the beginning of Lent, the Temptation was not a liturgical feast and hence appears only rarely in Byz. art. It is unknown before the 9th C., when the marginal Psalters use one of the three episodes to illustrate Psalm 91:11–12, quoted by the Devil during the Temptation. The full, tripartite version of the event appears first in the Paris Gregory (fol.165r) and becomes standard thereafter: S. Marco in Venice preserves a good example (Demus, *infra* 1.2:pl.103). The most ex-
haustive treatment is the four-stage narrative at the CHORA.


TENEDOS (Τένεδος, mod. Bozca Ada), island in the northeastern Aegean Sea off the shore of the Troas near the entrance to the HELLESPONT; in Hierokles, a part of the province of the Islands (Insulae). Justinian I had a granary built there for grain brought from Alexandria (Prokopios, Buildings 5.1.7–16). Despite its strategic location near Constantinople, Tenedos is barely mentioned until the 13th C., when the island was given to the Latin Emperor of Constantinople and his rights to Tenedos were repeated in the Treaty of Viterbo of 1267 (Miller, Essays 290). Pachymeres (Pachyrm., ed. Bekker 2:344.3–4) mentions Tenedos as a pirate stronghold; Mouriskos, naval commander for Andronikos II, attacked its phrourion with two battleships (2:556.10–14). The Byz. retained the island, and in the winter of 1352/3 John V withdrew to it (according to Kantakouzenos; Gregoras states that the emperor went to Lemnos), attacked Constantinople in March 1353, and came back to the island (Kleimachroniken 2:281f). In 1352 John V gave Tenedos to the Venetians as security for 20,000 ducats he borrowed from them (Reg 5, no. 3005). In 1370 John V was ready to cede Tenedos to Venice in exchange for imperial jewelry pawned there by his mother, six transport vessels, and 25,000 ducats, but this offer was rejected by Andronikos IV, who intended to give the island to the Genoese; in 1376, after Andronikos entered Constantinople, Genoa received Tenedos. In 1377 war broke out between Venice and Genoa over Tenedos; the struggle was protracted and a settlement was made in Turin in a treaty of 8 Aug. 1381, whereby the fortifications of Tenedos were to be razed and the demilitarized island controlled by a representative of the count of Savoy. Venice, however, continued to use Tenedos as a naval base.


TEodosije, Serbian hagiographer; born ca.1246, died ca.1328. A monk in the HILANDAR monastery on Athon, Teodosije was the spiritual counselor of King Stefan Uroš III Dečanski. He devoted himself in particular to spreading and supporting the cult of Sts. Simeon (Stefan Nemanja) and Sava, which provided the main focus of Serbian national and cultural identity. His works include a revised recension of the Life of St. Sava by DOMENTIJAN, allegedly based on oral suggestions by the author; several kanones, liturgies, and akolouthiai on Sts. Simeon and Sava; and a Life of and akolouthia on St. Peter of Koriš near Prižren.


TEPHRIKE (Τεφρική, mod. Divriği), fortress in the mountains of northeastern CAPPADOCIA, west of the Euphrates. KARBEAS founded the powerful fortress ca.850 in a region beyond the Byz. frontier and remote from the authority of the emir of Melite. Under CHRYSOCHEIR it became the seat of a PAULICIAN state. PETER OF SICILY, who visited Tephrike in 870 as Byz. ambassador, provides the main source on the region. After its capture by the Byz. in 878, Tephrike, under its new but ephemeral name Leontokome (for Leo VI), became the seat of a KLEISOURA, then of a THEME (ca.940). Tephrike was granted to the son of Senacherim ARCRUNI of Vaspurakan in 1019 in exchange for his lands. Romanos IV campaigned against the Turks around Tephrike in 1068, but it fell to them after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071. The surviving fortress contains stretches of Byz. walls.

LIT. TIB 2:294f. — C.F.

TEREBINTHOS. See MAMRE, OAK OF.

TERETISMATA (τερετισματα, lit. “chirruping”), musical vocalizations set to the meaningless syllables te te te, to to to, ri ri ri, etc., which first appear appended to or inserted in 14th-C. CHANT settings. On a larger scale, they are found as independent melodic units known as kratemata and used to prolong a hymn. Some are given descriptive titles; epithets such as “bell,” “viola,” “trumpet,” and “nightingale” are used in the Kratematarion, a collection of kratemata arranged according to the eight modes. Teretismata constitute the chief
element of an ornate species of musical composition called kalophonic ("beautified") chant. Hymns written in this style are either freely constructed original works or elaborate embellishments of traditional music.

LIT. D.E. Comos, Byzantine Trisagia and Cherubika of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries (Thessalonike 1974) 274–86.

TERVEL (Τέρβελας), Bulgar khan (691/703–718/24); son and heir of ASPARUCH. The sources first mention Tervel in 704, when Justinian II sought his help in regaining the throne. Tervel raised a combined force of Bulgars and Slavs and in 705 marched with Justinian against Tiberios II. In reward, Justinian gave Tervel many gifts, invested him with the chlamys, and proclaimed him Caesar (Nikeph. 42.20–25); Tervel may have married Justinian’s daughter. Justinian may also have renewed the treaty of 681 between Asparuch and Constantine IV (V. Beševliev, VizVrem 16 [1959] 8f). According to many Byz. sources, Justinian broke the peace in 708. Nevertheless, in 711, faced with the revolt of Philippikos, he requested and received 3,000 soldiers from Tervel. After Justinian’s death, Tervel plundered Thrace in 712. Four years later Theodosios III, fearing an imminent Arab attack on Constantinople, concluded a treaty that fixed the Byz.-Bulgar border in Thrace (thereby formally ceding to the Bulgars the Zagoria region), granted the Bulgars garments worth 30 litrai of gold, arranged for the return of fugitives, and established some commercial regulations (V. Kutikov, GSJ JuF 65 [1974] 69–116). During the Arab siege of Constantinople in 717–18 Leo III sought and obtained Tervel’s help (V. Gjuzelev, IstPreg 29 [1973] no. 3.28–47), yet in 719 Tervel gave the deposed Anastasios II gold (50 kenaria) and troops to march against Leo. Nothing further is heard of Tervel.


TESSERAE. See ALMSGIVING; MOSAIC.

TETARTERON (νόμισμα τεταρτηρών), the name of two quite distinct coins, a lightweight gold nomisma struck ca. 695–1092, and a small copper (initially lead) coin introduced in 1092 and still minted into the second half of the 15th C.

The name of the gold coin, introduced by Nikephoros II, derives from the fact that it was initially a quarter (τέσσαρας μέρος, “fourth part”) of a tremissis (i.e., 2 carats) lighter than the standard nomisma; in the mid-11th C., however, the weight was apparently standardized at 3.98 g, that is, 3 carats under the full nomisma. This latter


-A.K.
coin was by now known as an histamenon, and the denominations were distinguished by reducing the diameter of the small thick tetartera from the traditional 20 mm of the nomisma to 18 mm, and increasing that of the broad, thin histamenon to approximately 25 mm.

The copper tetarteron or tarteron was very similar in size and fabric to the former gold coin, a fact that has usually been regarded as the explanation of its name, but the suggestion (by J.D. MacIsaac) that it was due to the coin's initial weight of one-quarter of the old follis is much more plausible. Its subsequent values are unknown.


TETRACONCH. See Church Plan Types.

TETRAEVANGELION. See Evangelion.

TETRAGAMY OF LEO VI, conventional term for the political and ecclesiastical controversy (906–20) caused, at least externally, by the fourth marriage of Leo VI. After three marriages (to Theophano; Zoe, daughter of Stylianos Zaoutzes; and Eudokia) that produced no male heir to the throne, in 905 Leo fathered a son, the future Constantine VII, by his concubine Zoe Karbonopsina. His desire to legitimize his marriage met the resistance of Patriarch Nicholas I Mystikos; although he reluctantly christened Constantine (906), Nicholas prohibited Leo’s entrance into the church and kept delaying the removal of the epitanion (906–07). Since Nicholas’s resistance chronologically coincides with the revolt of Andronikos Doukas, it is plausible to hypothesize that Nicholas’s position was part of the aristocratic opposition to the administration of Leo and Samonas.

On 1 Feb. 907 Leo deposed Nicholas, and soon thereafter Doukas escaped to the Arabs; Nicholas was replaced as patriarch by Euthymios, who removed the epitanion but also severely punished the priest Thomas who had performed the fourth marriage. This compromise solution was confirmed by a council of patriarchal envoys convened in Constantinople (Feb. 907). Nicholas’s return to power in 912 gave a new aspect to the struggle; he energetically deposed supporters of Euthymios from many sees and promoted his own candidates. The political instability of the regency after Leo’s death (Constantine VII being a minor) and the active involvement of the papacy in the conflict aggravated the situation. Euthymios’s death in 917 paved the way for reconciliation, finally achieved in July 920 by Romanos I Lekapenos, who arranged the promulgation of the Tomos of Union; three years later Rome approved the Tomos, and the papal delegates joined Nicholas in anathematizing the fourth marriage.


–A.K.

TETRAMORPH. See Seraphim.

TETRAPHYLOT. See Arch, Monumental.

TETRARCHY (τετραρχία, lit. “rule of four”), system of government proclaimed by Diocletian on 1 Mar. 293 with the addition of the two caesars, Constantius Chlorus and Galerius to the college of two augusti, Diocletian and Maximian. The members of the tetrarchy were bound by ties of marriage (Constantius married Theodora, daughter of Maximian, while Galerius married Valeria, daughter of Diocletian). The augusti, as senior emperors, called each other “brothers” and the caesars “sons.” Relationships within the tetrarchy were further characterized by the divine protectors of the augusti: Jupiter for Diocletian, Hercules for Maximian. This reflected the divine order in which Jupiter commands and Hercules puts his wishes into effect; the caesars were incorporated into this system and grouped into the Jovian and Herculean “dynasties.” Although the theoretical unity of the empire was not broken, each member of the tetrarchy was in effect responsible for a specific area.

As men who rose in the army, the members of the tetrarchy were always depicted as harsh and strong, with thick necks, short-cropped hair, and stubby beards. They are shown, on coins and in sculpture—such as the porphyry groups now in Venice and the Vatican (Kitzinger, Making, figs.
5, 8)—as virtually identical, another means of emphasizing the unity of the tetrarchy.

Upon his abdication in 305 Diocletian planned to continue the tetrarchy through the elevation of the two caesars to be augusti and the appointment of Severus and Maximinus Daia as caesars. This failed due to the ambition of the rulers' natural sons, Constantine I and Maxentius. The Conference of Carnuntum in 308, which attempted to restore the tetrarchy, was also unsuccessful. Although the tetrarchy as an institution did not outlive its originator, the principle of the division of the empire into distinct geographical spheres, each with its own ruler, survived until the fall of the Western Empire.


TEXTILES (φόρματα). Byz. textiles were mainly of linen (linon), wool (erion), and silk. Cotton (bamhax, bambakina, bambukina) is more rarely mentioned in the sources, though the cultivation of cotton in the Peloponnesos in the 14th and 15th C. is attested by Plethon (Analekten der mittel- und neugriechischen Literatur, ed. A. Ellisen, vol. 4:2 [Leipzig 1860; rp. 1976] 56 and 101, para. 21). These textiles were produced in state weaving establishments, private workshops, and individual households, depending on their type, quality, and use. Alexandria (and Egypt in general) and Syria were particularly noted for textile production before they fell to the Arabs in the 7th C.; Thessalonike, Corinth, Thebes, and Athens are known to have had important textile (esp. silk) weaving workshops between the 10th and 12th C.

Byz. weavers used several types of loom. Only a simple loom was needed for the common linen and woolen cloth (tabby) and tapestry weaves. Patterned compound weaves, preferred for silk but also used for wool, were made on a drawloom with a pattern-making mechanism. Finished woolen fabrics could also be fullled by fullers (knapeis) before being made into clothing by tailors. Few Byz. weaving implements have been preserved, as most were made of wood, but some clay spindle whorls, bronze spindle hooks, and bronze loom combs have been found at Corinth (Davidson, Minor Objects, nos. 1213–33). Bronze needles, open-tip thimbles, and clay thread spools used for sewing were also found at Corinth (nos. 1294–98).

A wide variety of textiles is recorded in the sources. Besides the most highly valued silks and purple-dyed cloths (see BLATION), homespun woolens, coarse linens (sabana), and fine linen
cloths (lepte othone) are also mentioned (TheophCont 199.22—200.1). The Byz. also manufactured loop-pile textiles (mallota and linomallotaria), the fleece-like texture of which made them particularly suitable for blankets and covers (P.Ant I 44.8; TheophCont 318.15); they had knotted carpets (nakotapetes; ibid. 319.16) as well.

Ordinary tunics and cloaks were made of plain linen, woolen, or cotton cloth, while silks, often woven with gold threads, were the costume of emperors, the imperial household, and court officials. Linen was needed for sails, nets, and for other commercial and military uses. Household towels, coverings, curtains, and such were made of linen, while blankets, coverlets, and cushions were made of wool.

Hangings, curtains, and carpets executed in various materials and techniques were a regular component of domestic and official architecture, both secular and religious. Curtains fill the spaces between columns in a mosaic representing the palace of Theodoric the Great in S. Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna (Volbach, Early Christian Art, pl.152). The importance of textiles in an architectural context is revealed in the endless opening and closing of curtains around the emperor and in the imperial palace as recorded in the De ceremoniis. Hangings had a more purely decorative function. Often executed in tapestry technique, hangings were particularly suited for the portrayal of figural subjects, both secular (e.g., the Hestia and the Nereid tapestries in the Dunbar-ton Oaks Collection, Washington, D.C., ca.6th C.) and religious (e.g., the Virgin in the Cleveland Museum of Art, ca.6th C.). The silk tapestry depicting a triumphant emperor in Bamberg is a rare later specimen of these weavings (ca. early 11th C.). A separate category of textiles comprised those that evolved in the service of church ritual: over time, various altar covers and other liturgical cloths such as the aer, antimension, eillon, and endyte acquired distinctive shapes as well as specific decoration.

Decoration, whether in the form of ornamental designs or figural composition or both, was an important component of higher quality textiles. Besides the mechanically produced designs of the drawloom weaving, decoration could also be painted, achieved through resist dying, or executed in such ancient textile techniques as tapestry weaving and embroidery. The latter technique was particularly favored in the Palaiologan period.

One of the most noted uses of Byz. textiles, esp. the silks produced in state workshops, was as imperial gifts, regularly distributed on specific official occasions (e.g., De cer. 235.12—13, 258.5—6; TheophCont 342.21) or sent abroad as important instruments of foreign policy.

Byz. textiles have not fared well. Extant examples are scarce, despite the prominence of textiles as reflected in Byz. written sources and as depicted in works of art. Early textiles (before 8th C.) come mainly from Egyptian graves, while later textiles (from 9th C. onward) survive primarily in the church treasuries of Western Europe; most of the latter are silks. Byz. textiles have also been found in Scandinavia and Eastern Europe, esp. Kiev.


TEXTUAL CRITICISM was applied both to sacred/theological and pagan classical texts. The pre- and proto-Byz. representatives of high level scriptural criticism are ORIGEN and JEROME. Textual criticism gained a strong impetus during theological disputes, as in the 6th C., when the authenticity of pseudo-DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE was questioned by HYPATIOS OF Ephesus, and esp. during the Iconoclastic controversy, when a number of forgeries and interpolations were produced and, in part, rejected. The textual studies of the earlier period were, however, ideological rather than philological; even Photios, while dealing with the problem of forgery (E. Orth, Photiana 1 [Leipzig 1928] 120f), applies stylistic rather than purely philological criteria. We must postulate, however, the practice of some textual criticism during the 9th and 10th C., the period of transliteration and collection of texts (e.g., the Palatine Anthology). J. Koder (JÖB 15 [1966] 182) suggests that Niketas STETHATOS used the principles of textual studies by introducing emendations based on the meter when editing Symeon the Theologian's hymns; this hypothesis is, however, open to discussion (A. Kazhdan, VizVrem 34 [1973] 286). P. Maas (Kleine Schriften [Munich 1973] 519) considered Eustathios of Thessalonike
as a textual critic of a high order, a hypothesis refuted by Wilson (infra 201f).

The evidence is much clearer with regard to the textual studies of some later professional philologists, Maximos Planoudes, Thomas Magistros, Manuel Moschopoulos, and esp. Dementios Triklinios. They understood the necessity of using several MSS for an edition (an idea already expressed by John Tzetzes) and correct metrical principles for restitution of corrupted lines of Pindar, the tragedians, and Aristophanes; some “corrections” were extremely felicitous and have survived into modern editions; others were hopeless failures. It is not always clear which emendations belong to Byz. critics and which were drawn from ancient works now lost.


**THALASSA** (Θαλάσσα), personification of the Sea, a female figure shown standing in water with an oar over her shoulder. Found most commonly in scenes of the Crossing of the Red Sea, she also appears as the counterpart of Earth in some images of the Last Judgment, where she represents the Sea disgorging its dead (Rev 20:13). The Sea is still represented by monsters in the 11th-C. Paris, B.N. gr. 74, but in this same century (e.g., in a fresco in the Panagia ton Chalkeon at Thessalonike) the monsters are replaced by Thalassa. In monumental art and icons of the 13th–15th C., Thalassa may be shown carrying a boat, seated in a shell, or riding a dolphin. She replaces the figure of Okeanos, an old man with crustaceans in his hair and an oar in his hands, still the usual personification of the Sea in Late Antique art (Age of Spirit., nos. 130, 164). In Byz. painting Okeanos survived only as a partner to the figure of Jordan. (See also Bythos.) —A.C.

**THALELAIOS** (Θαλελαίος), an antecessor, probably a professor at the law school of Berytus, and one of the eight addressees of the Constitutio Omnen of Justinian I from the year 539. He presumably gave lectures on the Institutes and the Digest. Of his commentary on the Codex Justinianus, which is perhaps the most important product of the brief period of state legal educa-

tion in the first half of the reign of Justinian I, a large number of fragments has survived in the Basilika (and its scholia) as well as elsewhere. According to general consensus, this commentary formed for books 1–7 and 9–12 of the Codex the basis of the Basilika text.


**THAMUGADI** (Ταμούγαδι; mod. Timgad, in southeastern Algeria). After Carthage and Lepcis Magna, Thamugadi provides the richest epigraphic records on municipal life in late Roman North Africa. In particular the inscription called the Album of Thamugadi (568) offers indisputable evidence of the survival of the curial class and its privileges in that period. The emergence of Thamugadi as the center of Donatism in the late 4th and early 5th C., particularly under the leadership of Bp. Optatus (388–98), who appears to have usurped civil as well as religious authority, seems to have marked an end to civic generosity on the part of the municipal aristocracy, since from this time onward there is little epigraphic evidence of construction or repairs to public monuments. Significantly, the only attested building erected in this period was the vast Donatist cathedral complex to the west of the city.

Following a brief occupation by the Vandals, Thamugadi was sacked and emptied of its inhabitants by Mauri tribes from the nearby Aures mountains (late 5th C.). In 539 the city was re-taken by the Byz. under the general Solomon, who claims in an inscription to have reconstructed the city (Pringle, infra 326f, no.27). The principal element of the revived community was the fortress (112 × 67 m) erected to the south of the old urban center; its primary function seems to have been to guard the city and the agriculturally rich plain surrounding it against raids by the Mauri. A chapel constructed in the necropolis south of the fortress during the exarchate of Gregory (641–47) by John the Armenian, doux of Tigisis, is the last monument built at Thamugadi. Nothing else is known of the city’s history under Byz. rule.

the church completely banned theater, theatrical buildings were abandoned, and the word theatron came to denote spectacles in the Hippodrome or a literary circle in which rhetorical works were read aloud. The late Roman church tried to employ the theater as a means of spreading Christianity (A. Vogt, Byzantium 6 [1931] 629–40), but these attempts failed.

Vestiges of theatrical performances survived, however. Imperial ceremonial preserved certain traits of theatricality, and popular festivals required the participation of mimes, jesters, musicians, dancers, etc. Theatrical shows served not only as pure entertainment, but also could be used for political propaganda: thus, in the days of Theophilus, a comic skit presented by actors in the Hippodrome helped to topple the praioseros Nikephoros (Janin, CP byz. 566). In literature, dialogue contributed to the dramatization of the narrative (e.g., in hymns of Romanos the Melode), and some plays for reading (e.g., Christos Paschon) were produced. Liturgy had numerous dramatic features, and the excessive theatricality of the church service was frequently criticized by strict moralists. In the 14th and 15th C. there was apparently a revival of liturgical drama, including productions of the story of the Three Hebrews in the Furnace.

Theatrical terminology was used by rhetoricians: Psello described one of his speeches as an agon (contest) between him and the object of his enkomion, the emperor, who like the sun filled the theatron with his rays. This use of theatrical terminology continued throughout the Palaiologan period (Hunger, Lit. 1:70, 210f).


Christian settlements, including the town of Jeme that survived into the 8th C., and the monastery of St. Phoebammon, documented by numerous papyri. The Thebaid was the center of the standard literary dialect of classical Coptic known as Sahidic. Its dry climate preserved the Gnostic books known as the Nag Hammadi (Chenoboskion) codices.


THEBES (Θῆβαι), name of several cities in the Mediterranean region.

THEBES IN EGYPT, the former capital of ancient Egypt that became in the late Roman period a center of monastic development (see THEBAID). The Byz. had but a vague perception of Thebes; Theophanes mentions it as a region where the poleis of Obousiris and Koptos were located (Theoph. 6.24). Tzetzes, however, often speaks of Egyptian Thebes. –T.E.G.

THEBES IN BOEOTIA. In the late Roman period Thebes was a stronghold that successfully resisted ALARIC. Its fortifications were restored by Justinian I (Prokopios, Buildings 4.3.5). Excavations have revealed an Early Christian and Byz. cemetery, the date not being defined more precisely (A. Keramopoulos, Archaeologikon Deltion tou Hypourgou tou Ekklesiou kai tes Demosiou Ekpaideuseos 10 [1926] 124–36). Thereafter the political history of Thebes is unknown until the 11th C., although the city is named in notitiae as an autocephalous archbishopric of Hellas by the late 8th–early 9th C. (Notitiae CP 2.79) and a metropolitan see from the 10th C. (8.63).

Sklitzes reports that the troops of Delian reached Thebes in 1040 and there won a victory over the Byz.; a great number of Thebans perished when they tried to escape (Skl. 411.54–57). In the 12th C. Thebes appears as an important center of the silk industry. Roger II of Sicily sacked the city in 1147 and carried off many artisans, but the industry continued to flourish. Thebes supplied the court with silk garments and the Seljuks refused to accept any silk fabrics except those made at Thebes; Benjamin of Tudela counted 2,000 Theban Jews engaged in silk production; Tzetzes praised the skill of the local women silk weavers (Kazhdan, Derevnia i gorod 231). By the 12th C. Thebes became the residence of the strategos of Hellas. From the 12th C. the Venetians and Genoese had trading colonies in the city.

In 1204 Thebes was taken by Leo Sクトoros, but it soon came under Frankish domination. It was given first to Boniface of Montferrat and then to Othon de la Roche, lord of Athens (1205–25); Thebes became the residence of powerful barons, most prominent of whom was Nicholas II de St. Omer, lord of half of Thebes (1258–94) and bailie of Achaia, married to Anna Angelina Komnene, daughter of Michael II of Epiros. Nicholas rebuilt the walls and constructed a castle after 1287. In 1311 Thebes fell to the Catalan Grand Company that destroyed the castle of St. Omer in 1311. The Turks devastated the surrounding territory in 1339/40, and in 1378 it came under the control of the Acciajuoli (G.T. Dennis, OrChrP 26 [1960] 42–60), who ruled the city until the Ottomans took it ca.1456.

Literary sources praise the wealth of the castle of St. Omer and mention an episcopal palace and many churches. Of these there survive only a rectangular tower that was probably the donjon of the castle and the Church of St. Gregory of Nazianzos, apparently constructed as a private chapel in 872/3 (G.A. Soteriou, ArchEph [1924] 1–26). S. Symeonoglou (infra 164) identified up to 20 churches in the city as Byz. in origin.

A bishop of Thebes is attested at the councils of Nicaea and Serdica in the 4th C. He was archbishop by the late 8th–early 9th C. (Notitiae CP 2.79) and metropolitan by the 10th C. (8.63).

(FOR Thebes in Phthiotis, see Nea Anchialos.)


THEBES, CADASTER OF, a unique document (probably of the second half of the 11th C.) consisting of fragments of an isokodikon, an official copy of a state cadaster in the form of a KODIX. The fragments contain the description of 45 stichoer, giving the names of individual taxpayers, the amount of the tax, and cases of tax alleviation: klasmata and sympatheial. The taxpayers are predominantly middle-ranked notables characterized as archontes, protostatharios, spatharokandidatoi, komites, droungarios, protokankellarioi, and other ti-
ties. Only once is a taxpayer characterized as _ptochos_ (p. 18, 66). Although the region described is the area of Boeotian Thebes, the taxpayers come not only from Thebes but also Athens, Euripos, and even Avlon.

Svoronos asserted that the Cadaster of Thebes depicted a traditional Byz. rural community no different from that presented in the _Treatise on Taxation_ (ed. Dölger). Lemerle (infra 198) acknowledges that in the cadaster one can see "a reflection of social change," but he also insists on the continuity of the rural community composed of independent peasants, basing his argument in part on the omission of any reference to _proasteion_ and _pronoia_.


THEFT (_κλοπή_). Common in Byz., ordinary thieves were active at night along with prostitutes and murderers, according to a proverb cited by Stephen Sachlikis (Koukoules, _Bios_ 3:209); they also frequented public bathhouses, at any rate in the 4th–6th C. The _Farmer's Law_ testifies to the existence of thieves in the countryside; both agricultural tools and flocks as well as horses and weapons were at risk. Hagiographical texts often relate cases of theft in monasteries. Special categories of theft were burglary at the scene of a fire, robbery of wrecked ships, _sacriilege_, and _grave-robbing_ as well as seizing and selling people into slavery. Robbers could act in an organized manner, as in the case of bandits and _apelatai_ or the attack of nobles upon their neighbors. To protect property from thieves the Byz. used _locks_ and _dogs_, as well as magic signs; magical means (e.g., the magic eye drawn on a wall) were used to discover the thief as well. The state maintained night guards and night police; in 14th-C. Trebizond night heralds existed (H. Grégoire, _BZ_ 18 [1909] 493f).

While Justinianic law considered theft primarily as a private delict and tried to satisfy the victim with the return of his property or its cash value (sometimes multiplied), the _Ecloga_ elaborated the idea of the thief's responsibility before the state; accordingly, the _penalty_ was not only a fine, but also flogging and mutilation of limbs (Zachariä, _Geschichte_ 339f). The church, at least from the 10th C., imposed on thieves severe fasts, compulsory almsgiving, and exclusion from communion for one or two years.


THEKLA (Θεκλα), "the first martyr among the women and an apostle"; according to legend, born in Ikonion, died near Seleukeia, Cilicia, at age 90; major feastday 24 Sept. The legend of Thekla was known before the end of the 2nd C. Despite criticism (esp. by Tertullian) it became popular, representing a type of Christian romance. Its core is the story of an extremely beautiful woman who rejected her family and suitors, despised her body, and followed an apostle (Paul) in whom she saw the embodiment of Christianity. The _Acta Pauli et Theclae_ describe her travels, chaste adventures, and miracles: she was placed in a burning pyre, but rain extinguished the flames; wild beasts in the arena did not harm her. She is the only nonbiblical figure included in the _Commematio animae_.

An anonymous 5th-C. author wrote the _Miracles_ of Thekla; the text has been wrongly attributed to _Basil of Seleukeia_, whereas the author was, in fact, hostile toward Basil (C. Dagron, _AB_ 92 [1974] 5–11). The miracles worked by Thekla are categorized by Dagron (infra 102f) as those of healing, of illusion, of foresight, of reward, and of vengeance. She acted as the protector of her home town Hagia Thekla (Meriamlik), near Seleukeia, and accordingly the Miracles are an important source for reconstructing the life of a small provincial town. The author concentrates on the urban population, and no inhabitant of the countryside is described in any detail; in addition to the townsfolk, only the _Isaurians_, whom the author treats as bandits, play any role. Among the townspeople he focuses primarily on physicians, rhetoricians, soldiers, and clergy rather than on artisans; typical urban entertainments are mentioned, such as _theai_, nocturnal spectacles.

**Representation in Art.** Images of Thekla among the beasts of the arena appear on _ampullae_ of the 6th–7th C. from Egypt (_Age of Spirit_, no. 516). Later portraits stress her connection with Paul in
that she carries a book, the attribute of the apostles. MSS of the menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes are sometimes illustrated with a narrative scene: her encounter with the beasts, or her final disappearance into a cleft in the rock.


—A.K., N.P.S.

**THEME (θῆμα),** term for a military division and for a territorial unit administered by a strategos who combined both military and civil power. The etymology and origin of the term is under discussion. J. Howard-Johnston (in *Maistor* 189–97) suggested an Altaic origin for the word—from tūnān, “ten thousand men”; however, Constantine VII explicitly affirms that the word is Greek, originating from *thesis*. N. Oikonomides (ZRVI 16 [1975] 5f) believes it was equivalent to *katalogos*, the list of soldiers. The date of the appearance of the term *thema* is also a subject of controversy: G. Ostrogorsky (*Byzantion* 25 [1953/4] 55) asserted that the term existed in 622, when Theophanes describes the arrival of Herakleios in “the lands (chorai) of themes”; according to Pertusi (infra 39), the southern themes were created after 634, the northern ones after 679. The nature of this administrative change and its social character are also far from clear: Ostrogorsky argued that Herakleios created the theme when he introduced a new type of army, that of the farmer-soldiers who were granted *stratiotika* *ktemata*; they formed the backbone of Byz., until destroyed by the feudal development of the 11th C. Karayannopoulos, on the other hand, insists that there was no single reform, but “an organic development” from the 6th C. onward, that had only administrative, not social, implications. Lilie accepts the idea of or-
ganic development but thinks that the crucial steps took place in the mid-8th C.

In any case, it appears that by the end of the 7th C. the major part of Byz. territory was organized in large units (unlike the Justinianic system of small provinces), with the military commander functioning simultaneously as civil administrator and judge; the example of the exarchates definitely played a part in this process. The earliest themes were Armeniakon, Opsikon, Anatoli- kon, and Thrace. W. Kaegi (JÖB 16 [1967] 39–53) argues that the theme system did not contribute to the strengthening of defense against the Arabs and Bulgarians: by the beginning of the 8th C., the themes were centers of revolts, and the strategoi of themes became pretenders to the throne. The task of the central government in the 8th-9th C. was to diminish the power of large themes; they were divided into smaller units. The revolt of Thomas the Slav in the early 9th C. was the last major mutiny of themes. By the 11th C. the unity of thematic administration was dissolved, and civil governors (kritai, later praetors) slowly replaced military commanders. The collapse of the themes became reality by the last quarter of the 12th C. (J. Herrin, DOP 29 [1975] 253–84). The system of themes nevertheless existed in the empire of Nicaea (Angold, Byz. Government 243–49) and in Epirus (D. Angelov, BS 12 [1951] 56–74), and the term was used, esp. for territorial fiscal units, until the end of the empire (e.g., Docheir., no.56.5–6 [a. 1418]; Laura 3, no.165.9–10 [1420]).


-A.K.

THEMISTIOS (Θεμίστιος), one of the first pagan rhetoricians to make a successful career under Christian emperors; born Paphlagonia or Constantinople ca.317, died ca.388. Apart from wide
travel on official and court business (including a visit to Rome in 357 for the vicennalia of Constantius II), he passed his life in Constantinople. His combination of eloquence, level-headed Neoplatonism, unfanatic paganism, and timeserving brought him to imperial attention and favor more comprehensively than Libanius, with whom he enjoyed a sometimes stormy friendship; Gregory of Nazianzos was also a correspondent of his. Theodosios I crowned his career in 384 by appointing him prefect of the capital and entrusting to him the education of his son Arkadios. The notice of Photios (Bibl., cod. 74) attests to his Byz. popularity.

The vital theme of his 34 extant speeches, esp. those concerned with Constantius II, Valentinian I, Gratian, and Theodosios, is a Neoplatonically conceived perfect ruler, guided by divine and philosophic principles. His philosophic essays On Virtue (extant in Syriac) and On the Soul (adduced by Stobaios) are natural pendants to these. His Aristotelian paraphrases (H. Blumenthal, Hermes 107 [1979] 168–82), of which some survive only in Hebrew, are more industrious than original; those on Plato (lost, though known to Photios) might have been better.


THEODAHAD (Θεοδάθος), Ostrogothic king (from 2 Oct. 534); died Dec. 536 on the way from Rome to Ravenna. Theodoric’s nephew, Theodahad was a rich landowner in Etruria, notorious for his greed. Experienced in warfare, he showed an interest in Platonic philosophy. He planned in 533/4 to hand over the whole of Etruria to the emperor, to whom he was loyal, in exchange for money, a senatorial title, and a mansion in Constantinople. His cousin Amalasuntha raised him to be consors regni after the death of her son Athalaric and Theodahad’s recognition of her as regent. The conflict between Amalasuntha and Theodahad ended in the queen’s exile and murder; together with Theodahad’s support of the anti-Byz. Pope Silverius (536–37), these events served as the cause of Justinian’s invasion. Theodahad had no clear idea of defense, sent envoys to Constantinople apologizing for his conduct, and even promised to cede his throne to Justinian. When Byz. armies invaded Dalmatia, Sicily, and Calabria and Belisarios occupied Naples, the Goths elected Vitiges as their king. Theodahad fled to Ravenna, but was murdered.


THEODORA (personal name). See Theodore.

THEODORA (Θεοδώρα), empress; wife of Justinian I; born Constantinople or Paphlagonia ca.497, died Constantinople 28 June 548, perhaps of gangrene (J. Fitton, Byzantium 46 [1976] 119) or cancer (J. Körbler, Janus 61 [1974] 15–22). She was allegedly one of three daughters of Akakios, an animal keeper of the Green faction. Theodora spent some time as an actress in Alexandria and Antioch and reportedly bore a son before she met Justinian I ca.520. She married him in 525 and was proclaimed augusta 1 Apr. 527. Theodora had strong religious interests, favored Monophysitism, endowed monasteries, churches, orphanages, and hospitals, and took interest in the welfare and the rehabilitation of former prostitutes. She vigorously participated in the decision to resist Nika rioters, stiffening the resolve of Justinian. She contrived the removal of John of Cappadocia and Pope Silverius (536–37) and pressured Justinian to remove Pope Vigilius.

The best-known extant representation of Theodora is the wall mosaic in S. Vitale, Ravenna; some authorities accept a marble bust in Milan as her portrait (Age of Spirit, no.27). Prokopios of Caesarea scurriously and inaccurately depicts her in his Secret History; his charges about her sinister influence cannot be verified. Her role as an adviser on political and religious policies is difficult to ascertain, but Rubin (Zeit. Justinians 1:113f) assumed that her role was significant. John of Ephesus praised her for her Monophysite sympathies and for her sponsorship of Jacob Baradaeus (PO 19:153f). She was buried in the Church of the Holy Apostles.
THEODORA, wife of Theophilos, empress (842–56), and saint; born Ebissa in Paphlagonia, died after 867. The daughter of a droungarios or tour-marches Marinos and Theoktiste Phlorina (TheophCont 89.15–19), she was of Armenian descent (P. Charanis, BS 22 [1961] 207f). Perhaps on 12 May 821 (E.W. Brooks, BZ 10 [1901] 540–45), but more likely on 5 June 830 (W. Treadgold, GRBS 16 [1975] 325–41), Theodora was married to Theophilos after a bride show and crowned empress shortly thereafter. Together they had five daughters—Thekla, Anna, Anastasia, Pulcheria, Maria—and two sons, Constantine and Michael III. After the death of Theophilos in 842, she served as regent for Michael but the eunuch Theoktistos effectively held power.

A devout iconophile, Theodora reportedly venerated icons despite the disapproval of Theophilos; she secured the release from prison of the painter Lazaros. Yet she consented to the restoration of icons in Mar. 843 only after being assured that Theophilos would not be condemned: she vowed that he had repented on his deathbed. She approved the election of Patr. Ignatios and the persecution of the Paulicians. Her brother, Caesar Bardas, reportedly convinced Michael to dethrone her by saying that she planned to marry Theoktistos or else marry him to one of her daughters (R. Guillard, REB 29 [1971] 49). She was formally deposed on 15 Mar. 856 but continued to live in the palace until 858, when she and

her daughters were eventually sent to the monastery of Gastria, despite the refusal of Ignatios to tonsure them. Michael may have released her a few years later and allowed her to play a ceremonial role. She died sometime after the accession of Basil I and was buried in the Gastria monastery (P. Grierson, DOP 16 [1962] 57). Her vita was written soon after her death; it served as a source for George Hamartolos. She is commemorated on 11 Feb. for her role in the Triumph of Orthodoxy.

-P.A.H.

THEODORA, third daughter of Constantine VIII, co-empress (with her sister Zoe) 21 Apr. – 12 June 1042, sole empress 1055-56; died Constantinople 31 Aug. 1056. Early in the reign of Romanos III, she was charged with complicity in conspiracies of Prousianos and Constantine Droganes; Zoe forced her into the Petron convent in Constantinople. The Madrid Skylitzes MS represents this expulsion from the palace and confinement in the monastery (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzēs, nos. 487, 498). On 19 Apr. 1042 the populace, guided by senators and Patr. Alexios Stoudites, rebelled against Michael V and drew Theodora forth; she was crowned in Hagia Sophia shortly after midnight on 20 April. After Michael fled, she joined Zoe in the palace. At her insistence, Michael was blinded. Theodora then shared Zoe’s rule and remained in the palace after the accession of Constantine IX. Her image together with those of Zoe and the emperor in the Chrysostom MS, Sinai gr. 364, enables one to date this book not later than three months after Constantine’s coronation (12 June 1042). At his death she claimed the throne as the last member of the Macedonian Dynasty. She ruled authoritative. Her appointment of clerics, deemed a masculine privilege, aroused the enmity of Patr. Michael I Keroularios. Leo Parapondyllos was her chief minister and Michael Psellus advises he advised her. When the general Bryennios brought his army to Chryospolis, her supporters seized and exiled him. As Theodora lay dying, she consented to her officials’ choice of Michael VI. Psellus described her as placid and miserly, but given to chattering.

-C.M.B., A.C.

THEODORA OF ARTA, saint; born Thessaly, died Arta ca.1270; feastday 11 March. Daughter of the sebastokratol John Petraliphas, she married Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epiros ca.1230 and moved to Arta. According to her vita, Michael soon took a mistress and banished Theodora from Arta, even though she was pregnant with their first child, the future Nikephoros I Komnenos Doukas of Epiros. After enduring five years of exile and poverty without complaint, she was finally recalled by Michael, who repented of his adultery. After their reconciliation, the couple produced five more children.

Theodora is reputed to have influenced Epirot policy. She favored rapprochement first with the empire of Nicaea and later with the restored Palaiologan dynasty in Constantinople. Famed for her piety and virtue, she founded the nunnery of St. George (now the Church of St. Theodora) at Arta and took the habit there after her husband’s death. Her tomb (Grabar, Sculpures II, no.152) in the monastic church bears carved portraits of Theodora and Nikephoros; it was reputedly the site of many healing miracles. The monk Job wrote her short vita (BHG 1736) in the late 13th C. (L.I. Vranouses, Chronika tes mesaiotikes kai tourkokratoumenes Epërou [Ioannina 1962] 49-54).

SOURCE. PG 127:903-08.
-A.M.T.

THEODORA OF THESSALONIKE, saint; born Aigina ca.812, died Thessalonike 29 Aug. 892. Theodora was the daughter of Antony, protopresbyteros of the local “Great Church.” Beautiful and rich, she was betrothed at seven to one of the most noble men on the island. An Arab attack forced the family to flee ca.826 to Thessalonike. Theodora and her husband had three children, two of whom died; the third, Theopiste, was given to a nunnery. After being widowed at 25, Theodora took the monastic habit and divided her property between the poor and the convent of Stephen the Protomartyr, where she spent the rest of her life.
A certain cleric Gregory, who was evidently a young man at the time of the translation of Theodora's corpse into a marble coffin, wrote the vita and Translatio; he had never met Theodora, but he listened to the tales of eyewitnesses. Unlike the vitae of Mary the Younger and Thomais of Lesbos, Theodora's story concentrates on the heroine's monastic virtues, which sometimes conflicted with parental love. Thus, although Theodora and Theopiste lived in the same convent, the hegoumene forbade them to converse. The hagiographer praises Thessalonike, "the brilliant megalopolis," and mentions its monuments and some of its inhabitants, including a painter who never saw Theodora alive but who "witnessed God's help" as the result of a dream produced an icon that strikingly resembled the saint (ed. Arsenij, 31f). The vita became the object of later reworking, including an enkomion by Nicholas Kabasilas (PG 150:755–72).


THEODORE (Θεόδωρος, fem. Θεόδώρα), personal name (meaning "God's gift"). Common in antiquity, the name remained in broad use after the triumph of Christianity, albeit the perception of God (as part of the theophoric name) changed radically. This ambiguity allowed the name to be accepted by both pagans and Christians: thus, among 29 Theodores of the 4th C. (PLRE 1:896–902) we meet a pagan high priest of Asia in 362, a Neoplatonist philosopher, a pagan rhetorician from Arabia, and a friend of Eunapios of Sardis. In the 5th C. (PLRE 2:1085–99) Proklos addressed one of his works to the engineer and Neoplatonist philosopher Theodore. At the same time many Theodores were theologians (e.g., Theodore of Mopsuestia) and clergymen. Several Theodores were martyrs, Theodore Teron and Theodore Stratelates being esp. popular saints; their popularity contributed to the expansion of the name.

Theodore occupies third place in Sozomenos (7), after Eusebios and John, and in Prokopios (11) is second only to John. It retains second place (94) in Theophanes the Confessor (after John), but drops to fifth in Skylitzes (26) and to fourth in Niketas Choniates (18). In the acts of Laura, vol. 1 (10th–12th C.), Theodore holds seventh place (90), right behind Niképhoros, and sixth position (145) in vols. 2–3 of Laura (13th–15th C.), following Michael (152). The name was frequently used as a play on words to emphasize the positive qualities of an emperor or saint.

The feminine version of the name, Theodora, also known in the 4th–5th C. in the pagan and the Christian milieu (PLRE 1:895f, 2:1084f), was used throughout the whole period of Byz. history as one of the most popular feminine names. It was borne by several Byz. empresses and holds fifth place in Laura, vols. 2–3.

THEODORE, brother of Herakleios, military commander, and kouropalates; died Yarmuk 20 Aug. 636, according to some Arabic sources, or, more probably, later. Theodore commanded the army that fought Shahin in Asia Minor, brought military aid to Constantinople at the end of the siege of 626, assisted Herakleios in campaigns against the Persians, and ejected recalcitrant Persians from Edessa after they refused to obey the peace agreement of Arabissos. Theodore may have been a commander at Mu’ta, and probably at Ajnādāyin; he led the Byz. forces that reoccupied Hims and Damascus as Muslims evacuated them during the abortive Byz. counteroffensive of 636. Some Muslim traditions attribute an aggressive and foolhardy attitude to Theodore. Monophysite traditions are hostile to him and blame him for Byz.’s military debacle. After Theodore fled Ajnādāyin (or Yarmuk), he went to Herakleios at Emesa or to Antioch; the emperor, enraged by Theodore’s military failures, ordered him sent to Constantinople and imprisoned. Theodore’s son Theodore participated in an unsuccessful palace plot against Herakleios in 637.


THEODORE I LASKARIS, founder of the empire of Nicaea and its emperor (1205–21); born ca.1174, died Nicaea Nov. 1221 (J. Darrouzès,
REB 36 [1978] 276). He married Anna, daughter of Alexios III Angelos (1199) and was soon afterward promoted to the rank of despotes. After his father-in-law’s overthrow in July 1203, he escaped with his wife to Asia Minor. There he began to lay the foundations of an empire in exile centered on Nicaea, organizing resistance to the Latins and bringing local rulers under his control. In summer 1205 (B. Sinogowitz, BZ 45 [1952] 345–56; Dielen, Erläuterungen 151f), an assembly at Nicaea proclaimed him emperor in the aftermath of the Latin defeat at the battle of Adrianople (1205). His elevation to the imperial office was confirmed by his coronation in March 1208 by the new patriarch Michael IV Autoreianos.

In 1211 Theodore had to meet a full-scale Seljuk invasion. He secured victory by killing the sultan in single combat, a success that so alarmed Henry of Hainault that he invaded the Nicaean territories in order to preempt a Nicaean strike against Constantinople. He won a great victory over Theodore on 15 Oct. 1211 on the banks of the Rhyndakos River. Theodore was forced to cede northwestern Asia Minor to the Latins of Constantinople, but his annexation of Paphlagonia after the death of its ruler, David Komnenos, in 1212 was some compensation. His marriage in 1219 to Marie, daughter of Yolande, was an attempt to break the deadlock with the Latins of Constantinople, but one that founded on ecclesiastical opposition. He was buried in the monastery of Hyakinthos at Nicaea.


-M.J.A.

THEODORE I PALAIIOLOGOS, despotes of Morea (1380/1–1407; cf. Loenertz, ByzGr I 230–34); born 1350s, died Mistra 24 June 1407, as monk Theodoretos. Fourth son of John V Palaiologos and Helena Kantakouzene, Theodore was named despotes of Thessalonike in 1376. He was not able to take up this post, however, because he was imprisoned for three years (1376–79) after his brother Andronikos IV seized control of Constantinople. In 1382 Theodore went to Mistra as first Palaiologan despotes of the Morea. In 1384 he married Bartholomaia, daughter of Nerio I Acciajuoli.

During his rule over the Morea he encouraged the settlement of Albanians, whom he used as soldiers to maintain control over the local archontes. He initiated an aggressive foreign policy, seeking to expand Palaiologan territory in the Morea, and was moderately successful, purchasing Corinth from Carlo I Tocco in 1395/6 (J. Chrysostomides, Byzantina 7 [1975] 81–110), and defeating the Navarrese Company in 1395. Discouraged, however, by the Ottoman attacks on the Morea of 1395 and 1397, Theodore sold Corinth (1397) and then the despotate itself (1400) to the Hospitalers and temporarily withdrew from Mistra to Monemvasia. The Byz. recovered this territory in 1404.

Theodore was very close to his brother Manuel II, who ca.1409 composed a funeral oration in his honor. Although this speech is a eulogy of Theodore that defends his policies in the Morea and omits some of his less worthy actions, it is a source of great importance for the history of the despotate of the Morea.


THEODORE II LASKARIS, emperor of Nicaea (from 3 Nov. 1254); born Nov. 1221, died Nymphaion 16 Aug. 1258 (Kleinchroniken 1:75, no.3). The only son of John III Vatatzes, Theodore was brought up to be a “philosopher-king,” tutored by the most learned and exacting teachers, including Nikephoros Blemydes and George Akropolites. Some notes in his own hand in a MS of Aristotle’s Physics proclaim that he had read the whole volume from beginning to end (G. Prato, JÖB 30 [1981] 249–58). He left a corpus of philosophical, scientific, and theological works and a series of rhetorical pieces, including an enkomion for the city of Nicaea and a funeral oration for Frederick II Hohenstaufen (C. Astruc, TM 1 [1965] 393–404; H. Hunger, JÖB 8 [1959] 127–37). His letters reveal a man of great charm, who could also be spiteful and cruel. Toward the end of his reign his health deteriorated and he became increasingly neurotic.

Before his health gave way, he proved himself a ruler of great energy. In the winter of 1254–55 he led a brilliant campaign, throwing back the Bulgarians who were threatening the Nicaean ter-
ritories in Europe. The marriage in 1256 of his daughter Maria to Nikophoros I Komnenos Doukas, the heir to Epiros, appeared to consolidate his hold over his European territories. At home, however, his position was weakened by the opposition of great court families, who objected to his reliance on ministers of humble origin, such as George Mouzalon. He dealt with his adversaries ruthlessly, depriving some of their rank and some of their eyes. Others, including Michael (VIII) Palaiologos, he forced into exile. Theodore left George Mouzalon, as regent for his young son John IV Laskaris, to face the mounting resentment of the aristocracy.


**THEODORE II PALAIOLOGOS**, despotes of the Morea (1407–43); born ca.1395, died Selymbria 26 June (5) 1448 (E. Trapp, *Byzantina* 13 [1985] 959–64). Second son of Manuel II, Theodore spent part of his childhood at the court of his uncle, Theodore I, at Mistra. He was about 12 when he succeeded his uncle as despotes in 1407. During Theodore’s minority, Manuel took a special interest in the Morea, visiting the region twice, in 1408 and in 1415–16 when he supervised the construction of the Hexamilion. In 1421 Theodore married an Italian princess, Cleopa Malatesta (died 1433; cf. G. Hofmann, *OstkSt* 4 [1955] 129–37). Theodore pursued an expansionist policy in the Peloponnesos, esp. against Centurione Zaccaria, prince of Achaia, and Carlo Tocco, count of Kephallenia, but the Byz. were weakened by the invasion of the Turkish general, Turahan Bey, in 1429. In 1428, when Theodore’s younger brothers Constantine (XI) and Thomas Palaiologos associated themselves with his rule, the Byz. enjoyed even greater military success, adding Patras to their territory in 1430. The final years of Theodore’s despotate were marred, however, by disputes with Constantine over the succession to the childless John VIII. As the result of a compromise in 1443, Theodore exchanged his despotate at Mistra for Constantine’s newly acquired appanage of Selymbria. He died of the plague five years later.


**THEODORE ABU-QURRA** (Ἀθωνοκαρᾶ), theologian; born in Edessa between ca.740 and 750, died between 820 and 825. Theodore was a monk in the Lavra of St. Sabas, later for a time bishop of Harran, and then itinerant controversialist. He wrote in Syriac, Arabic, and perhaps Greek, although his works preserved in Greek may be translations (S. Griffith, *JEH* 36 [1985] 23–45). In some cases there are parallel Greek and Arabic versions of sayings attributed to him (S. Griffith, *Le Muséon* 92 [1979] 33f). Influenced by Leontios of Byzantium and John of Damascus (the suggestion that Theodore was John’s disciple is questionable), Theodore dedicated himself to the defense of Orthodoxy. A passionate polemist, he argued against Judaism, Islam, and Christian heresies. It is not excluded that he participated in a dispute (Baghdad 824) with several brilliant Muslim scholars at the caliph’s court. Theodore developed John’s views in support of icon veneration; he also defended the importance of the church councils (H.J. Sieben, *Theologie und Philosophie* 49 [1974] 489–509). His philosophical concepts are very close to those of Leontios and John (E. Hammerschmidt, *OstkSt* 4 [1955] 153f), and it is plausible that the treatise *On the Heresies*, ascribed in some MSS to Leontios, belonged in fact to Theodore (M. Waegeman, *AntCl* 45 [1976] 190–96), whereas J. Speigl (*AnnHistCon* 2 [1970] 207–30) attributes it to another Theodore, of the late 6th C.


THEODORE GRAPTOΣ (Γραπτός, lit. “marked with writing”), saint; born in Moabite mountains, Palestine ca. 775, died in Apameia, Bithynia, between 841 and 844; feastday 27 or 28 Dec. He and his brother THEOPHANES GRAPTOΣ, pupils of MICHAEL SYNKELOS in the Lavra of St. Sabas, followed Michael to Constantinople in 813. There they defended icon veneration and were exiled by Leo V and again by Theophilus; in 836 the latter ordered a certain Christodoulos to tattoo 12 iambic lines on their foreheads (hence their sobriquet Graptoi). Theodore describes their ordeal in a letter to John, bishop of Kyzikos; SYMEON METAPHRASTES includes this letter in his vita of the two brothers. Their biography is known primarily from the vita of Michael Synkellos. Circa 886 Theophanes of Caesarea wrote an *enkómion* of Theodore, suppressing most details and omitting Michael’s role in the struggle against the Iconoclasts. This *enkómion* served as the major source for Metaphrastes, who possessed, however, some additional information. Before 1300 Theodora Roulaina wrote a vita of both brothers.

**Representation in Art.** The crucial event that gave the saint his epithet is illustrated only in the 11th-C. marginal psalters (e.g., THEODORE PSALTER, fol.120v): Theodore lies prone while the Iconoclast Christodoulos inscribes the verses onto his forehead. Elsewhere the saint is portrayed as an ordinary monk.


---

THEODORE KOMNENOS DOUKAS (of the Angelos family), ruler of Epiros (ca. 1215–30), emperor at Thessalonike (from 1224/5—A. Karpozilos, *Byzantina* 6 [1974] 253–61—or between Apr. and Aug. 1227—E. Bee-Sépherle, *BNJ* 21 [1971–74] 272–79); born ca. 1180–85, died Nicaea soon after 1253. A son of the sebastokrator John Doukas, he took service with Theodore I LASKARIS, but ca. 1210 went to Epiros to join his half-brother MICHAEL I KOMNENOS DOUKAS, whom he succeeded ca. 1215. Having assured the alliance of the Albanians and Serbians, Theodore attacked Bulgaria. In 1217 he defeated and captured Peter of Courtenay; then, after occupying one by one Neopatras, Lamia, Platamon, and Prosek, he seized Thessalonike in autumn 1224 (B. Sinogowitz, *BZ* 45 [1952] 28) and was subsequently crowned as *basileus*.

Theodore’s conquest of Adrianopel in 1225 suggested that the recovery of Constantinople was within his grasp, but this hope was dashed by his defeat and capture by the Bulgarian tsar, John Asen II, in 1230 at the battle of Klokotnica. The tsar released him from captivity ca. 1237 when he married Irene, the daughter of Theodore and his wife Maria Petralphaina. Theodore was able to recover Thessalonike, but preferred to rule through his sons John and Demetrios Angelos Doukas, while he resided at Vodena. His aim was to hold together the various princes of the house of Doukas in the face of the Nicaean advance. In 1252 John III Vatatzes had him seized; he died soon afterward in captivity.


---

THEODORE LECTOR, or Anagnostes, ecclesiastical historian; died after 527. Theodore lived at Constantinople, where he produced a *Tripartite History* comprising extracts from Sokrates, Sozomenos, and Theodoret of Cyrus for the period 305–439, and also an *Ecclesiastical History* continuing until 527. Only fragments survive from both. He once cites John Diakrinomenos for an anecdote concerning Emp. Anastasios I. The Souda mentions his interest in the biblical commentaries of Diodorus of Tarsos. Theodore’s own work, or excerpts therefrom, were a major source for Theophanes the Confessor.


**Lit.** J. Bidez, *La tradition manuscrite de Sozomène et la Tripartite de Théodore le Lecteur* (Leipzig 1908).

---

THEODORE OF ALANIA, bishop of Alania, certainly by 1226 when he signed a synodal decree (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analecta* 4:114) and probably from 1223; fl. first half of the 13th C. Theodore wrote a *logos* for Patr. Germanos II on his enthronization at Nicaea (Jan. 1223), and the
THEODORE OF KYZIKOS, epistolographer and bishop of Kyzikos (mid-10th C.). Two collections of his letters have been published: one by S. Lampros from Vienna, ÖNB phil. gr. 342 (some texts in this collection are probably not by Theodore) and another by J. Darrouzès from Patmos 706. Theodore was a confidant of Constantine VII (his correspondence with the emperor is preserved) and adversary of Patr. Polyeuktos. The correspondence includes an allusion to an invasion of the Scythians (i.e., the expedition of Igor of Kiev in 941), some data on the administrative system (e.g., the mention of a komes hydaton),

---

THEODORE OF DEKAPOLIS (Dekapolisites), mid-10th-C. high official, patrikios and quaestor under Constantine VII, magistros under Romanos II. He was the author of several novels concerning agrarian relations. The Novel of 947, following the legislative principles of Romanos I, required that the dynatoi return to the poor the allotments sold by their owners under duress; unlike Romanos I, however, Theodore presumed that the peasants, except the poorest, should return the price of the land. Small archontes and small monasteries were to be recompensed for the improvements made on the land during their term of possession. In another, undated novel Theodore stated that the allotments of the stratiiotai should not have been sold; this novel is probably the first legislation concerning soldiers’ holdings. In his decision (lysis) of 960/1, Theodore regulated the procedure for the restitution of peasants’ and soldiers’ properties illegally acquired by the dynatoi.

---

THEODORE OF EDESSA, saint; hero of a hagiographical romance preserved in Greek MSS (the oldest Moscow, Hist. Mus. 13/81, dated 1029) and in Arabic and Slavonic translations; feastday 19 July. His identification with the homonymous author of heirmoi in Florence Laur. B 32 (13th C.), proposed by S. Eustratiades (Nea Sion 34 [1939] 43–45), is based only on the similarity of names. According to his vita, Theodore was born in Edessa to a noble couple after his mother had a miraculous vision; he became a monk and then hegoumenos of the Lavra of St. Sabas. He was appointed to the see of Edessa—in 836 according to A. Vasiliev (Byzantion 16 [1942–43] 176f.), who defends the historicity of the vita. Theodore supposedly died at St. Sabas. In the vita’s title, its author calls himself Basil, bishop of Emeza, and claims to be Theodore’s nephew, an eyewitness to and participant in the events described. The core of the vita is the story of Mauias, the basilicus in “Babylon” (Baghdad), who converted to Christianity and was murdered by the Muslims; Vasiliev identified him first with Abbas, nephew of al-Mutaṣim (833–42), who allegedly “embraced Christianity” (according to Armenian sources), then with al-Mu‘ayyad, who was murdered by his brother Caliph al-Mu‘azz (866–69); no evidence of al-Mu‘ayyad’s Christian sympathies exists, however. Most probably the vita was an apologetic work produced in the 10th C. (Michael III is mentioned) within the milieu connected with the St. Sabas monastery, or, less probably, in Constantinople. P. Peeters (AB 48 [1930] 64–98) hypothesized that Theodore’s legend reflected some traits of the biography of Theodore Abu-Qurra, but this is only conjecture.

---


---

THEODORE OF KYZIKOS, an account of Theodore’s journey to his see, Alania, in the northern Caucasus, after his consecration as bishop. This work, in the form of a letter to the endemous synodos in Nicaea, describes the state of Christianity among the Alans and the behavior of the local ecclesiastical authorities. It refers to a “Scythian” attack on the Bosporos, which has been identified with the Tatar attack in the winter of 1223 (M. Nystazopoulos, EEBS 33 [1964] 77–78). Theodore’s Ethika and Matthaios, as well as his logos on the tomb of Christ, remain unpublished.


---


---


---

and a short *ekphrasis* of the warm springs of Pythia (Hunger, *Lit.* 1:171).


-A.K.

**THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA**, theologian; bishop of Mopsuestia (from 392); born Antioch ca.350, died Mopsuestia ca.428. In Antioch Theodore was a fellow pupil of John Chrysostom, first under Libanius, then Diodoros of Tarsos. A brief worldly lapse led to thoughts of marriage and a legal career, but two letters from Chrysostom recalled him to the monastic life. He was ordained priest ca.383; after becoming bishop, he remained in his Cilician see until his death. Theodore’s writings and reputation enjoyed very mixed fortunes in Byz. He was accused of Nestorianism and Pelagianism, and his opinions on Christology and sin were proscribed at Ephesus (431). His writings were among those condemned by the Second Council of Constantinople in 553 in the Affair of the Three Chapters. Photios, however, commended his refutation of Eunomios (Bibl., cod.4). His works survive mainly in Syriac versions. The biblical commentaries are historical and philological in approach, with minimal allegorization. His most important theological work was *On the Incarnation*, aimed primarily at the Apollinarians whose logos-saxi dichotomy he countered with the definition of Christ as a union of two natures. His terminologies are not always precise, but they helped point the way to the formulations of the Council of Chalcedon in 451.


-B.B.

**THEODORE OF RAIHTHOU**, theologian; monk at the monastery of Raithou; fl. first half of the 7th C. W. Eerter (Theologische Literaturzeitung 76 [1951] cols. 67–76) identified him with Theodore, bishop of Pharan (died before 625). The major work of Theodore of Raithou is a *Preparation (Proparaskeue)* consisting of two parts: a refutation of Christological heresies from Mani to Severos of Antioch, and a “dialectical” presentation of Christian creed. The main purpose of the book was to reconcile the Chalcedonian formulas with the statements of Cyril of Alexandria, which had been interpreted by the Monophysites in their own vein. M. Richard (*Opera minora*, vol. 2, no. 55) attributed the treatise *On Sects* to Theodore; recently the work was discovered also in a Georgian version and attributed by L. Datiashvili to Theodore Abu–Qurra, but M. van Esbroeck (*BK* 42 [1984] 35–52) suggests that the tract is by Leontios of Byzantium as in the MS tradition.


-B.B., A.K.

**THEODORE OF Smyrna**, high-rankng official and scholar; born mid-11th C., died after 1112. He was magistros and judge in 1082 and later held the post of quaeator with the titles of *protoproedros* and *protopokoureopates* (Laurent, *Corpus* 2, nos. 1118–19). After the deposition of John Italos, Theodore was appointed *hypatos ton philosophon*. In 1112 he engaged in discussions in Constantinople with the Latin theologian Peter Grossilo. His writings, mostly unpublished, include a commentary on Aristotle (W. Lackner, *ByzF* 4 [1972] 168), a theological tract on the *azymes*, a funeral speech on a son of the *prostrator* Michael Doukas (now lost), and a couple of hagiographical works. The author of the *Timarion* made Theodore the guide of his hero through the underworld and praised (ironically?) his learning and fairness.


-A.K.

**THEODORE OF STUDIOUS**, theologian, monastic reformer, and saint; born 759, died on Princes’ Islands or near Cape Akritas 11 Nov. 826. Born to a family of civil functionaries and iconodules, in 780 he entered the family monastery of Sakkoudion, in Bithynia, administered by his uncle Plato of Sakkoudion; in 794 Theodore
became its *hegoumenos*. During the Moechian Controversy he opposed Constantine VI and was exiled in 795/6 to Thessalonike. After Constantine’s defeat, Theodore returned to Sakkoudion and ca. 798 went to Constantinople; J. Leroy has questioned the traditional view that an Arab raid forced him to move (*OrChAn* 153 [1958] 201 f.). In Constantinople Theodore restored the Stoudios monastery and organized there a strong cenobitic community. Theodore objected to the efforts of Patr. *Nikophon* I to find a compromise between the court of Emp. Nikephoros I and the militant monks; in 809 Theodore and his brother Joseph of Thessalonike were banished to Princes’ Islands. Michael I decided the dispute in Theodore’s favor, but the new outbreak of Iconoclasm set Theodore again in opposition to the court. After having refused to participate in the local council of 815 (see under *Constantinople*, *Councils of*), he was exiled again, to Metopa in Bithynia, then to a much more remote fortress (Bonita) and finally to Smyrna. Michael recalled him in 821.

The essence of Theodore’s activity was the creation of an independent monastic organization able to resist imperial coercion: the rules of *Basil the Great* served him as a model. In his struggle Theodore did not neglect the possibility of papal support (J. Gill, *ByzF* 1 [1966] 115–23). Both his *Catecheses*, the Great and the Little, emphasize the role of monastic discipline and the necessity for the monk to participate in communal work, both manual and intellectual. Theodore highly valued family ties and paid serious attention to the role of women (J. Gouillard, *JÖB* 32-2 [1982] 445–52). His letters, primarily dispatched from exile, treat the moral duties of monks and admonish his correspondents to resist and to endure their ordeal; his own example in the face of adversity should encourage his followers. Theodore’s epigrams are also dedicated to the moral courage of the monk, and the terminology of martyrdom is typical of them. At the same time Theodore is fond of the theme of everyday monastic life and praises the hard labor of the monastic cook or the serenity of evening prayer. A steadfast fighter, Theodore wrote a refutation of Iconoclastic concepts and developed John of Damascus’s theory of the image (see *Icons*). He also produced liturgical hymns, as well as homilies and panegyrics: of his mother, of his uncle Plato, of the chronographer *Theophanes the Confessor* (C. van de Vorst, *AB* 31 [1912] 19–23), of St. Arsenios (T. Nissen, *BNJ* 1 [1920] 246–62). Anastasius Bibliothecarius translated Theodore’s *enkomion* of the apostle Bartholomew.

Theodore’s memory was celebrated by Naukratios, his successor at Stoudios (PG 99:1825–49); in an anonymous description of the translation of Theodore’s relics to Constantinople on 26 Jan. 844 (C. van de Vorst, *AB* 32 [1913] 27–62); and in several vitae. Avoiding traditional hagiographical motifs (such as miracles), these vitae present Theodore first and foremost as a politician and administrator.


THEODORE OF SYKEON, saint; born in the village of Sykeon, Galatia, during the reign of Justinian I, died Sykeon 613; feastday 22 Apr. Theodore was the illegitimate son of the prostitute Maria and an imperial messenger, Kosmas, a Constantinopolitan who had performed in the Hippodrome as an acrobat on camels. After Theodore’s birth, his mother abandoned her previous way of life. Upon finishing elementary school, Theodore became a hermit; he lived two years in a subterranean cave, then in an iron cage. He worked miracles, exorcised demons, and healed the sick (P. Horden, *SchH* 19 [1982] 1–13); he built the Church of the Anchangel Michael, founded a monastery in Sykeon, and was elected bishop of Anastasiopolis, but he later resigned and returned to his monastery. He traveled far to Jerusalem, Constantinople, and Sozopolis. Throughout his life Theodore remained under the special protection of St. George.

His disciple George, priest and *hegoumenos* of the Sykeon monastery, wrote Theodore’s Life. It contains important data on rural life, topography (M. Waalkens, *Byzantion* 41 [1971] 349–73; 49 [1979] 447–64), and political history, esp. the


—A.K.

THEODOROUS SCHOLASTIKOS, jurist of the second half of the 6th C., from Hermoupolis in the Thebaid of Egypt. He composed a short Greek paraphrase of the Codex Justinianus, of which numerous fragments have been preserved in the scholia to the Basilika and elsewhere. Almost completely preserved is his abridged version of a collection of about 168 Justinianic and post-Justinianic novels (see Novels of Justinian I) down to the year 575, in which there are references to parallel passages in the Novels and in the Codex.

—A.C.
THEODORE SVEYOSLOV, Bulgarian monarch (1300–21/2), son of Georgij Terter I (1280–92). Held as hostage by the Mongol khans Nogay from 1286 to 1298, he escaped and organized a conspiracy against Khan Čaka that ended Mongol rule in Bulgaria. Theodore united all Bulgarian principalities except Vidin under his sovereignty; in the course of a war against Byz. in 1303–07 he seized Mesembria, Sozopolis, Anchialos, Achnopolis, Rusokastro, and other strong points in east-
ern Bulgaria, his possession of which was confirmed by a treaty of 1307. After his first marriage to Euphrosyne, the granddaughter of a rich merchant Pantoleon (A. Failler, BZ 78 [1985] 92f), Theodore married (ca.1308) Theodora, daughter of Michael IX. The rest of his reign was marked by peace with Byz., friendly relations with Serbia, and growing links with Venice, which was interested in purchasing Bulgarian grain.


THEODORE SYNKELLOS, politician and writer; first half of 7th C. His biography is barely known. The Chronicon Paschale (Chron. Pasch. 721.9) mentions him as a member of the embassy sent to the khagan on the eve of the Avar siege of Constantinople in 626. His identification with Patr. Theodore I (677–79, 686–87) is impossible because of the chronological gap. Theodore delivered an oration on the rote of the Virgin that was preserved in the church of Blachernai but was moved to Hagia Sophia because of an enemy invasion. Ch. Loparev, disregarding the MS tradition, ascribed the speech to GEORGE OF NIKOMEDEIA and considered the events described as the attack of the Rus’ in 860 (VizVrem 2 [1895] 581–628). Vasil’evskij (infra), however, demonstrated that Theodore was referring to the Avar assault of 619. Theodore probably also composed the anonymous homily on the siege of Constantinople by the Avars and Persians in 626 that was delivered on 7 Aug. 627.


THEODORE TERON (Τήρων, lit. “recruit”), “the great martyr,” saint; born “in an eastern land,” died Amaseia under Maximian; feastday 17 Feb. According to a homily ascribed to GREGORY OF NYSSA, Theodore was a simple soldier who came with his tagma “to our country.” When he confessed to being Christian, the authorities urged him to recant, but in response he set afire the temple of “the mother of the gods” in Amaseia (PG 46:744A). He was then condemned to be burned. Chrysippus of Jerusalem (died 479) dedicated an enkomion to Theodore, locating his activity in an unnamed city in Pontos (ASS Nov. 4:59B). His cult underwent changes by the 9th C.: a legend appeared about Theodore’s killing a dragon with a spear, helped by a princess named Eudokia. Nikephoros Ouranos (F. Halkin, Martyrs greec [London 1974], pt.IX [1962], 308–24) combined various stories about Theodore.


A sermon for the first Saturday of Lent, falsely attributed to Nektarios, patriarch of Constantinople, describes a miracle worked by Theodore: during the reign of Julian, Theodore allegedly appeared before the “patriarch” and informed him that all the food in the marketplace was stained with blood and therefore could not be used on fastdays. He urged a boycott of the market and provided the inhabitants of Constantinople with food “called kolbia [kollyba, boiled wheat]” in the local dialect of Eucahta” (PG 39:1832A).

Representation in Art. The homily ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa speaks of paintings depicting the martyrdom of Theodore at his tomb (PG 46:737D). There are surviving images of Theodore, with his dark pointed beard, at least as early as the 6th C. (in the Church of SS. Cosma e Damiano in Rome); a Sinai icon dating to the 9th–10th C. (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, no.B.43) already shows him in military attire, mounted and spearing a dragon. A gold medallion found in Calabria also depicts Theodore killing a dragon; it has parallels in objects of the late 6th–7th C. (W.F. Volbach, ASiCal 13 [1943–44] 65–72). His
THEODORIS (Θεοδωριάς), small maritime civil province created in 528 from territory taken from Syria I and II by Justinian I, who named it after his wife (Malal. 448.11–15). In addition to its capital, Laodikeia, it included the cities of Pantos, Balaneai, and Gabala, all of which retained their earlier ecclesiastical provincial affiliations under either Antioch or Apameia on the Orontes. Theodoria is also another name for the city of Anasartha.


THEODORIC THE GREAT, Flavius Theodericus, king of the Ostrogoths (from 471) and ruler of Italy (from 493); born Pannonia ca.454, died Ravenna 30 Aug. 526. Son of Theodemur, king of the Ostrogoths, Theodoric (Θεοδήριχος) was hostage for ten years in Constantinople, where he was educated. As his father’s colleague he won several victories in 472–73 over the Romans, capturing Singidunum, Herakleia Lynkestis, and Larissa. After his father died ca.474, Theodoric became sole ruler. In 476 he helped Zeno regain his throne. He was named patrikios and magister militum and was adopted by Zeno. A long period
ensued in which Theodoric was hostile to Byz. and attacked the cities of Thrace and Macedonia, although in 484 he was named consul. In 488 Theodoric agreed to Zeno’s proposal that he and his people move to Italy and seize control from Odoacer. He arrived in Italy in 489 and had Odoacer killed in 493. In 497 Theodoric won recognition from Anastasios I as ruler of Italy but he never took the title of augustus. Although Theodoric was an Arian, he generally treated his Orthodox subjects, including the Italian aristocracy, with respect. Both Boethius and Cassiodorus lived under his rule and they at least partially profited from the king’s favor for traditional Roman culture. After 497 Theodoric grew more hostile toward his Roman subjects, whom he suspected of plotting with the Eastern emperor against him. Theodoric reigned from Ravenna, where he constructed a palace (now destroyed) and the Church of S. Apollinare Nuovo, the Arian basilica, and his own mausoleum, all of which are preserved.

THEODOROKANOS (Θεοδοροκάνος), a noble family, possibly of Armenian origin. The family founder was the patrikios Theodorokanos, Basil II’s general and governor of Philippopolis. Several 11th-C. Theodorokanoi served as generals: George, strategos of Samos during the reign of Constantine VIII; the magistros Basil, katepano of Italy in Feb. 1043 and commander against the Rus’ in July 1043. Adontz’s hypothesis that both George and Basil were sons of the first Theodorokanos cannot be proved. Constantine (Basil’s son, acc. to Adontz, but without any textual evidence) was defeated by the rebel Nikephoros Bryennios in 1077 and taken captive. The family disappeared after the 11th C.

THEODOROS (Θεοδώρος), eldest son of Maurice; born Constantinople 4 Aug. 583 or 585, died soon after 27 Nov. 602 (Whitby, Maurice & His Historian, 18, 26). Maurice married him in 601/2 to a daughter of Germanos, an influential member of the senate. During the revolt of Phokas, the soldiers demanded that Theodosios or Germanos replace Maurice, but the emperor refused. He dispatched Theodosios to ask Chosroes II for assistance, but the youth was forced to return. It was rumored that Theodosios had escaped the slaughter of Maurice’s family, fled to the east, and, after much wandering, landed in Colchis, where he died. Simokattes claims that he investigated the case and discovered that Theodosios had been slain with his brothers. Nonetheless Narses, the rebellious governor of Syria, proclaimed a (false) Theodosios and presented him to Chosroes II, who then used him in support of his claims to avenge Maurice’s murder.

THEODOSIUS (Serbian hagiographer). See Teodosije.

THEODOSIOS I, augustus (from 19 Jan. 379); born Cauca in Gallaecia (northwest Spain) 11 Jan. 347 (?346?), died Milan 17 Jan. 395. Son of the general Theodosius the Elder, who fell in disgrace in 375. Theodosios had to interrupt his military career. After the battle of Adrianople, however, he was summoned by Gratian and proclaimed emperor in the East; when Gratian was murdered in 383 Theodosios ruled over an undivided empire. He pursued a policy of “national” unity. He supported the urban curiae, reduced taxation in provinces ravaged by the barbarians, and encouraged the cultivation of abandoned fields. He also sought to control the flight of slaves and coloni from the land. At the same time Theodosios tried to attract barbarians to his service, settling them asfoederati within the empire (in Pannonia and Thrace) and assigning them to positions of command in the army. His attitude toward religion reflected his political tendencies. Officially
Theodosios II, augustus (from 10 Jan. 402), successor of his father Arkadios (from 1 May 408); born Constantinople 10 Apr. 401, died Constantinople 28 July 450. Theodosios was a typically Constantinopolitan ruler who left his capital infrequently; he was of scholarly temperament, interested in theology and science. A man of gentle and kindly nature, he was dominated by strong women such as his sister Pulcheria and his wife Athanais-Eudokia as well as by civil officials, esp. Anthemios, Kyros of Panopolis, and the eunuch Chrysaphios, whereas generals like Aspar had no strong influence on his policy. His government was more concerned about functionaries and senators than curiales, and paid special attention to building activity in the capital, such as construction of the Theodosian Walls, begun in 413 (see under Constantinople, Monuments of). Publication of the Codex Theodosianus and formation of the University of Constantinople (425) met the interests of officialdom.

The situation on the Eastern frontier was relatively quiet during his reign, and the offensive of Attila was stopped by heavy payments. After the death of Stilicho and esp. after the demise of

---


—T.E.G., A.C.
Honorius, the leaders of the Eastern administration tried to restore the unity of the empire. They avoided military confrontation, however, and in the end failed to achieve unification, being satisfied that the person of Valentinian III a representative of the dynasty ruled in the West. Growing papal claims, esp. under Pope Leo I, made relations even more tense, although there was no open clash between the churches of Rome and Constantinople.

The religious views of Theodosios were often on the verge of heresy: he supported Nestorios (who in his turn maintained the idea of strong imperial power) and only reluctantly agreed to the condemnation of Nestorianism; he invoked the “Robber” Council of Ephesus in 449 and supported its decisions despite the remonstrations of Pulcheria, Valentinian III, and Leo I. Theodosios died unexpectedly in a riding accident. A marble head in Paris (Age of Spirit, no. 22) is generally accepted as his likeness, which is well known from coins.


—T.E.G., A.C.

THEODOSIOS III, emperor (715–17); perhaps son of Tiberios II (Sumner, infra); died Ephesus after 754. A tax-gatherer at Atramyttion, Theodosios was acclaimed emperor by troops in the Opsikon revolting against Anastasios II. Reluctantly accompanying the rebels, he entered Constantinople in late fall. Little is known of his reign. In 716 he concluded a treaty with the Bulgar khan Tervel, probably anticipating the impending Arab attack on Constantinople. When Maslama invaded Byz. territory that same year, the thematic generals Artabasdos and Leo III deposed Theodosios. He abdicated on 25 March and both he and his son became monks. Sumner identifies Theodosios with the bishop “Theodosios of Ephesus, son of Apisimar” who served as Leo III’s religious adviser in the late 730s and presided over Constantine V’s Iconoclastic Council in 754. But Grierson (“Tombs & Obits” 52f) believes him to be Theodosios’s son.


—F.A.H.

THEODOSIOS BORADIOTES (Борадиотис), patriarh of Constantinople (between Feb. and July 1179–Aug. 1183 [V. Grumel, REB 1 (1943) 259f]). The father of Theodosios was Armenian; a letter calls Theodosios Syrian (J. Darrouzès, REB 30 [1972] 209, no. 18), while a later chronicle specifies that he was Antiochene (Kleinchroniken 1:147–4–5 [no. 84]). He moved to Constantinople and became a monk in the Boradion monastery on the Asian shore of the Bosphorus (Janin, Églises centres 16f). Appointed patriarch by Manuel I, Theodosios resisted the emperor’s attempt to abolish the anathema on “the god of Muhammad” and made Manuel accept a compromise formula. Theodosios tried to reconcile the factions who were fighting for power during Alexios II’s minority; Michael the Syrian even relates that Theo-
dosios imposed an interdict on the populace of Constantinople for massacres committed there so that “prayers in churches ceased from February to October” of 1182. He opposed Andronikos I and refused to bless the marriage of Andronikos’s illegitimate daughter Irene to Alexios, illegitimate son of Manuel I. Forced to comply with the expulsion of the dowager empress Maria from the Great Palace, Theodosios soon abdicated and re-
tired to the island of Terebinthos (Nik.Chon. 262.89). His subsequent fate is unknown.

LIT. RegPair, fasc. 3, nos. 1152–61; Hussey, Church & Learning 142f. F. Cognasso, Partiti politici e lotte dinastiche in Bissanzo alla morte di Manuele Commeno (Turin 1912) 254. n. 2.

—A.K.

THEODOSIOS BORADIOTES. See Feodosij of Pećera.

THEODOSIOS OF TÜRNAVO, Bulgarian hesychast monk and saint; born ca.1300, died Constantinople 27 Nov. 1363. Theodosios (Slav. Te-
dosij) took the monastic habit in a monastery at Arčar, near Vidin; later, together with Romyl, he joined GREGORY SINAITES at the monastery of PARORIA (in southeastern Bulgaria). There he was introduced to hesychastic doctrines and practices. After Gregory’s death, Theodosios founded ca.1350 a monastery located either at Kilifarevo, near Tūrnovo, or at Kefalerevo, near Mesembria (M. Damjanova in Ēravnika kniževna škola 4 [1985] 334–40), under the patronage of Tsar Ivan Alexander. An ardent supporter of hesychasm, Theodosios translated the Kephalaia of Gregory Sinaites into Church Slavonic. He fought against heretics
(esp. Bogomils) and Jews who had acquired some influence at the court of Ivan Alexander. Syrku (infra) suggested that Theodosios allied with Patr. KALLISTOS I of Constantinople against the Bulgarian patriarch Theodosios II (1337–60); in any case, at the end of his life Theodosios of Tūrnovo and some of his followers moved to Constantinople, where Kallistos arranged for them to reside in a suburban monastery. Among Theodosios’s disciples were Evtimij of Tūrnovo and Kipriani.

Kallistos was probably the author of the Greek vita of Theodosios that has survived only in Bulgarian; according to Kiselkov (infra), the text now available is a 15th-C. revision of the original translation. In addition to data on the church and heresy in Bulgaria, the vita contains evidence on the Turkish penetration into the area (Dujčev, Medioevo 3:330–41).


—A.M.T., A.K.

THEODOSIOS THE DEACON, author of a poem, The Capture of Crete; his life is obscure. The poem was written in 926/3 and dedicated to the recovery by Nikephoros II Phokas of the island from the Arabs in 961. His verses present the conquest on a cosmic scale as a victory of light over darkness and as an exploit of the army rather than of a single general. Theodosios refers to some ancient authors but is contemptuous of antiquity: contemporary deeds surpass incomparably the successes of ancient Greeks and Romans. He imitated George of Pisidia. L. Petit attributed to Theodosios, although hesitantly, an akolouthia on the death of Nikephoros Phokas (BZ 13 [1904] 400).


—A.K.

THEODOSIOS THE KOINIOBARCHES (Kouνοβιάρχης), saint; born in village of Garissos or Mogarissos, Cappadocia, died in his monastery near Jerusalem 11 Jan. 529, reportedly almost 100 years old. Hagiographers are silent about his family and youth. He left for Antioch where Symeon the Stylite the Elder supposedly proclaimed Theodosios’s sanctity; ca.457 he came to Jerusalem and, after staying in various monasteries, settled in a cave. With material assistance from the illustrious Akakios from Constantinople, Theodosios built a monastery, which included four churches—one for Greek services, another for Armenian, the third for the enigmatic “language of the Bessoi,” and the fourth for brethren whose minds had been deranged by “the sordid demon” (Usener, infra p.456–14).

Theodore of Petra wrote Theodosios’s Life, emphasizing his political activity; the Life includes his correspondence with Emp. Anastasios I as well as the story that Theodosios gave his threadbare cloak to the “komes of the East” Kerykos, thus making him victorious over the Persians. Theodosios is said to have worked miracles (drove off locusts, created abundance during famine, healed the sick). Cyril of Skythopolis wrote a short Life of Theodosios; Symeon Metaphrastes re-worked the legend.

Representation in Art. The saint is portrayed as an old, somewhat balding monk with a long two-pointed beard. There is a scene of his temptation in the Theodore Psalter (fol.78r).


—A.K., N.P.S.

THEODOSIOS THE MONK, 9th-C. eyewitness to the capture of Syracuse by the Arabs in 878, who described this event in a letter addressed to the deacon Leo. The complete Greek MS of the letter is lost (S.G. Mercati, ST 68 [1935] 320–30), and the text was published on the basis of Paris, B.N. gr. 3032 that comprised only a section of the letter. Fortunately, the full Latin translation, by a certain Josaphat Azzale, is preserved in a 17th-C. MS. Although Theodosios was an eyewitness, his presentation is impersonal: he acts only as a member of the Syracusan clergy that suffered from the Arab siege. His description lacks concrete detail, except for an exaggerated account of the hunger in the besieged city (e.g., a modios of grain reportedly cost 150 gold coins). Theodosios is inclined to give lists of objects: e.g., when
describing the Arabs' murder of their captives, he specifies their use of stones, clubs, and spears. The hero of the story is a certain Patritius (πατριτίκιος) whose moral noblesse astonished even the Arab leader. The story differs drastically in style from the description by John KAMINIATES of the fall of Thessalonike. Theodosios also wrote iambics on the Arab capture of Syracuse (B. Lavagnini, *Diptycha* 1 [1979] 295–99).


-A.K.

THEODOSIOPOULIS (Θεοδοσιώπολις, Arm. Karin, Ar. Քաղաքալա, Turk. Erzurum), major strategic and commercial center on the main east–west highway between Anatolia and the East. Its original name of Karin (or more correctly *Karmoy k'alak*) was derived from that of the district known to classical authors as Karenitis. It was renamed Theodosiopolis in honor of Theodosios II and returned to a variant of its original name under the Arabs.

Karin first formed a part of the domain of the Armenian Arsacids and was the residence of the last ruler of the western part of the realm after its partition between the late Roman Empire and Persia ca.387. Its real importance began with its fortification under Theodosios in 415 and esp. under Justinian I when it became the northern anchor of the eastern *limes* and the seat of the *magister militum* for Armenia. The strategic importance of the site was recognized throughout the Middle Ages. First taken by the Arabs in 653 and included in the Muslim fortified border zone, it was briefly recovered by Constantine V in 754 and part of its population moved to the Balkans. Recaptured by the Arabs, it remained Muslim, though occasionally recognizing Armenian overlordship, until its reconquest by Byz. in 949, when Greeks and Armenians were again settled there. Early in the 11th C., Basil II made it the residence of the *strategos* of the theme of *Iberia* until its administrative center was shifted to *Ani* in 1045. The Seljuk sack of the neighboring commercial city of *Arzte* in 1048/9 forced its population to retreat to the fortress of Theodosiopolis, which began to be called Arcn Rum (Arzăn ar-Rûm). The city was ruled from 1201 by the Seljuks and after 1243 by the Mongols, under whom it appears to have prospered, but a new period of crises began in the 14th C. and continued until the incorporation of Erzurum into the Ottoman Empire.


THEODOSIUS THE ELDER, father of Theodosios I; died Carthage ca.375. A native of Spain, he rose through a military career to become *comes rei militaris* and commander in Britain (368–69) and *magister equitum* (369–75) under Valentinian I. He was active in the north against the Alemanni and the Sarmatians and in 375 was sent to Africa against the usurper Firmus, whom he defeated. Theodosius became involved in some difficulty, however, and was executed on a charge of unclear nature. He was baptized a Christian just before his death.


THEODOTOS I KASSITERAS (Χασσίτερας, Κασσιτέρας), patriarch of Constantinople (1 Apr. 815–ca.Jan. 821 [V. Grumel, *EO* 34 (1935) 506]). Born in Nakoleia to the distinguished Iconoclast family of Melissenos, Theodotos was related to the third wife of Constantine V. After the deposition of Patr. Nikephoros I, Leo V appointed him patriarch; at this time he was an elderly *spatharokandidatos* who is described as “meek” and “uneducated” (*Script. incert.* 395f.). Theodotos presided over the local council of Constantinople of 815, which officially ushered in the second period of *Iconoclasm* (see under *Constantinople, Councils of*). Theodotos is not mentioned in the sources after Leo's death in 820. A 9th-C. marginal Psalter (Athos, Pantokrator 61, fol.16r) contains a miniature depicting Patr. Nikephoros trampling on Leo V and Theodotos (I. Ševčenko, *Ideology*, pt.XIII [1965], 39–60).

THEODOTUS, ktetor of a private chapel in S. Maria Antiqua, Rome; fl. second half of the 8th C. Theodotus is described in a Latin inscription as administrator (dispensator) of the diaconia of the church and primicerius of the defensores (i.e., head of a college of curial lawyers). In the Liber Pontificalis (Lib. pont. 1:486) he is called “consul et dux.” The decoration of the chapel is unique in that it shows its founder in three different ways: once in a donor portrait; once with his family; and in a votive image, adorning the chapel’s titular saints, Kerykos and Ioulitta, martyrs of Ikonion (BHG 3137-3186). Belting read the latter image as reflecting the iconophile concerns of the community of Byz. and Eastern monks in Rome. The donor, his relatives, and Pope John VII are shown wearing square haloes. The wall paintings in the chapel include a Crucifixion closely akin to that in the Rabbula Gospels.


THEOGNOSTOS (Θεόγνωστος), grammarian and author of the book On Orthography, dedicated to “the wise crown-bearer Leo” (first half of 9th C.). Since Theophanes Continuatus mentions Theognostos as a contemporary of the events of 826–7, the emperor in question must be Leo V. Theognostos claims to be the emperor’s servant (oi-ketes); K. Alpers (infra 65f) hypothesizes that he is identical with his homonym, a protospatharios sent by Michael I in 812 to Charlemagne; Theognostos’s description of the revolt of a certain Euphemios in Sicily and the Arab assault on the island is lost. The book On Orthography contains more than 1,000 rules (kanones) of spelling, mainly based on Herodian of Alexandria (2nd C.). It treats primarily the classical vocabulary and proper names, although it includes such words as Sarakenos (p.67) or Pascha (p.78). K. Alpers (Byzantion 39 [1969] 5–12) suggested that Theognostos re-worked Herodotus’s story of Artaxerxes so as to flatter Leo V. On Orthography was a source for the Etymologicum Genuinum.


THEOGLINTOS, monk who was the staunchest supporter of Patr. Ignatios; fl. second half of the 9th C. The lemma to his Libellus gives him the curious title of “exarch of Constantinople,” and an even stranger one, that of “archimandrite of ancient Rome.” In 861 he wrote the Libellus, an epistle addressed to Pope Nicholas I in the name of Ignatios, in which he presented the elevation of Photios to the patriarchate from the viewpoint of the anti-Photian opposition; he emphasized the pope’s primacy and called Nicholas “the proedros and patriarch of all sees” and “the ecumenical pope.” In secular garb he surreptitiously left for Rome where he remained until 868, urging the pope to support Ignatios. Soon after the demotion of Photios, Theognostos returned to Constantinople and was rewarded by Ignatios with an appointment as archimandrite of the Pæge monastery and skæwaphyllax of Hagia Sophia. His further fate is unknown. Two more works “by Theognostos the monk” are ascribed to him: an enkomion of all saints and another one on the Dormition of the Virgin, in which the author strongly stressed Mary’s perpetual sanctity, from conception through her Dormition.


LIT. M. Jugie, “La vie et les ouevres du moine Théognoste (IXe siècle),” Bessarione 94 (1918) 162–74.

THEOKTISTE OF LESBOS, saint; born Metymna, Lesbos, died Paros; feastday 9 Nov. The Life of Theoktiste (Θεοκτιστῆ), written by Niketas Magistros ca.920, is modeled on that of Mary of Egypt but incorporates crucial changes to suit 10th-C. taste: instead of being a “wild” harlot (like Mary), Theoktiste is said to have been an 18-year-old nun when captured by the Arabs. She escaped on the island of Paros, where she lived 35 years in solitude until a hunter discovered her and learned her story. After Theoktiste died, he buried her corpse but cut off her hand as a relic. Miraculously, winds obstructed his departure so that he had to return his relic, and thereafter the corpse disappeared. The legend, retold to the author by a hermit called Symeon, is placed in a setting that depicts the real political situation
of the early 10th C. (e.g., an embassy to the Cretan Arabs in which Niketas participated) and thus strikingly contrasts with the miraculous contents of the Life itself. Niketas's Life was slightly reworked by Symeon Metaphrastes, who placed Theoktistes's celebration on 10 Nov.

**Representation in Art.** The association of Theoktiste with St. Mary of Egypt determined her iconographical type: a thin woman with white hair, who is barefoot and wears a ragged cloak that covers barely half her body. In two MSS of the *menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes, she is shown sitting inside an initial, being blessed by Christ; there are *stelai*, pagan statues, above the initial.

SOURCE. AASS Nov. 4:224–33.


A.K., N.P.S.

**THEOKTISTOS (ΘΕΟΚΤΙΣΤΟΣ),** regent for Michael III and adviser to Empress Theodora; died Constantinople 20 Nov. 855 (F. Halkin, *Byzantion* 24 [1954] 11–14). A eunuch (TheophCont 148.11) and perhaps a member of the imperial guard under Leo V, Theoktistes was instrumental in helping Michael II assassinate Leo and seize the throne. Michael appointed him *patrikios* and *chortoularios tou kanikletou*. Theophilos made him *magistros* and *logothetes tou dromou*, and before his death designated Theoktistes to serve in the regency for the infant Michael III. Under Theoktistes he capably exercised great influence. Most notably, Byz. sources credit him with the TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY over Iconoclasm in 843. He was directly involved in the elections of Patr. Methodios and Patr. Ignatios.

By continuing the sound fiscal policies of Theophilos—in 856 Theodora showed Michael 190 kilentaria of gold and 300 kilentaria of silver in the treasury—Theoktistes could build up the navy and campaign against the Arabs. In 843 he led a naval expedition that briefly restored Byz. rule on Crete (Ahrweiler, *Mer* 112), but in 844 he was defeated by an Arab army at Mauropotamion in Cappadocia. He made peace with the caliphate in 845 and exchanged prisoners, but hostilities broke out again in 851. In 853 a Byz. fleet sacked the Arab fortress of Damietta in Egypt (Vasiliev, *Byz. Arabes* 1:212–18). Under his influence the PAULICANS were persecuted; many were resettled in Thrace. Theoktistes helped revive secular learning by promoting the careers of Leo THE MATHEMATICIAN and CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER. In 855 Caesar Bardas persuaded Michael to dethrone Theodora, and Theoktistes was arrested and killed.


P.A.H.

**THEOKTISTOS THE SToudITE,** 14th-C. monk, hagiographer, and hymnographer. He is known only from his writings, which were almost entirely devoted to perpetuating the memory of Patr. ATHANASIOS I of Constantinople. In the 1320s and 1330s he composed a Life of Athanasios, an *enkomion*, an oration on the translation of his relics, and a number of *kanones*. The collected writings of Theoktistes were an important factor in the recognition of Athanasios's sanctity in the mid-14th C.

His epithet indicates his association with the SToudios monastery, but he must also have resided for a time in Athanasios's monastery on Xerolophos in Constantinople. Theoktistes was a supporter of Gregory PALAMAS, in whose honor he wrote a quatrain.


P.A.H.

**THEOLEPTOS (ΘΕΟΛΕΡΓΟΣ),** metropolitan of Philadelphia (1289–1322); born Nicaea ca.1250, died 1322. After a brief marriage, Theoleptos left his wife by 1275 and became a monk. On Mt. Athos he was introduced to the mystical life; Gregory PALAMAS called him a forerunner of HE-SYCHASM. He was imprisoned in Constantinople by Michael VIII for his opposition to the Union of Lyons, but after the accession of Andronikos II was given the see of Philadelphia. He held the
position of metropolitan for about 40 years, and led the heroic defense of the city against Turkish attack in 1310. Theoleptos was an ardent opponent of the Arsenites and refused to accept the reconciliation of the church with the Arsenites in 1310; he remained in schism until ca. 1319 (V. Laurent, REB 18 [1960] 45–54).

Theoleptos had close ties with the Choumnos family; he served as spiritual director to Irene Choumnaina and was counselor to the double monastery of Philanthropos Soter, which she restored in Constantinople. Irene’s father, Nikephoros Choumnos, wrote a eulogy of Theoleptos at his death (ed. Boissonade, AncGr 5:183–239). The writings of Theoleptos, still largely unpublished, include religious poetry, treatises on monastic life, anti-Union and anti-Arsenicate tracts, and letters to Irene Choumnaina.


THEOLOGY (θεολογία, lit. “speech about God”). This entry is divided into three sections that treat, in turn, the Byz. definition of theology, that branch of theology called “negative” or “apophatic,” and the historical development of Byz. theology.

BYZANTINE DEFINITION OF THEOLOGY. Originally, the term “theology” referred to stories about God handed down in the mythic cult. In the Aristotelian and middle-Platonist traditions, it signified the science of the highest principles or demiurges. Both of these ideas flourished in the threefold division of Stoic philosophy: mythical and political theology on the one hand, and a “natural,” or philosophical, theology on the other (Eusebios of Caesarea, Praeparatio evangelica 4.1.1–4). But in Origen (In Ioannem 1:23 [24], ed. E. Preuschen [Leipzig 1903] 30.14), “theology” is brought into Christian usage as the doctrine of the true God and his Messiah that is inaccessible to created minds (man, angel, demon) except at the end of time. The apologetic force of the term is often evident and appears when the verb theologia is contrasted to mythologein (Athanasios of Alexandria, PG 25:40C).

Characteristic of 4th-C. literature is the treatment of the incarnation of the Logos and the sending of the Spirit under “economy” (oikonomia), as distinguished from theologia. In the mind of Athanasios, “theology” refers to the immanent Trinity (PG 26:49A), that is, its object of study is the one essence of God, which transcends human understanding, and the relationship of Father, Son (Logos), and Holy Spirit as three hypostases of the (numerically) one divine substance. In this respect, theology refers more specifically to human thought and speech about the (immanent, and not economic) Trinity, and signifies the highest form of mystical knowledge of God.

In its narrowest sense, theology is “pure prayer,” beyond all multiplicity, and therefore devoid of image, thought, or conception. It may be conceived as purely intellecitive activity (Evagrios Pontikos, Thalassios [ca.650], Maximos the Confessor); or it may be interpreted as the experience of spiritual perception of the vision of light (Diadochos of Photike, Symeon the Theologian, Niketas Stethatos). This concept of theology became dominant in Byz. Oikonomia, on the other hand, deals with the relationship of themes pertaining to Christology and soteriology, and so, in contrast to Western tradition, does not belong to theology in the technical sense: “Things that are said with respect to the oikonomia are not necessarily to be joined to things that are said with respect to theology” (Theodore of Cyrrihus, Eranistes II, ed. G.H. Etlinger, 40.20–21).

In pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, all theological activity is carried out with reference to authority, that is, to Scripture or logia, as in Proklos, and to spiritual and ecclesiastical hierarchies. A technical terminology distinguishes between affirmative (cataphatic) and negative (apophatic) theology (see below). Cataphatic theology offers affirmative statements about God at first in symbolic, and then in conceptual languages in the manner of the philosophic and apodictic tradition of the theologians. Affirmative theology, however, must be dialectically complemented by negative theology. Yet one should not equate apodictic theology with the hidden, mystical tradition that transcends all dialectic, and therefore speech, in the One. Although affirmative theology and the
authority of the hierarchy dominate the thought of pseudo-Dionysios, the mystical aspect nonetheless remains the ultimate and irreducible element of theology, “For the ineffable has intertwined itself with speech” (PG 3:1105CD).

Since the Dionysian Corpus influenced Byz. only indirectly, through the interpretation given to it by John Scholastikos and Maximos the Confessor, the history of its reception in Byz. does not affect our perspective. Byz. retained its emphasis on the negative and mystical aspect; yet, in spite of the influence of the passage in Divine Names 2.7 (PG 3:645AB), it continued to focus on the immediacy of the vision (theoria) or knowledge of God, as opposed to the mediation of the knowledge of God through the hierarchies and analogies (analogia entis). This remained true even into late Byz. history, for example, in men such as John Kyparissiotes (PG 152:762A–769B; 772C–776C), Barlaam of Calabria (Podskalsky, Theologie 129–32, 138), their opponent Gregory Palamas (Synagymnata 1:265.21–277.28), and Prochoros Kydones, in his treatise on affirmative and negative theology (Vat. gr. 678, fols. 31–64). What we today would call “theology” (which is contrasted primarily to philosophical concepts that do not derive from revelation), is understood under the formula “according to us” (kath’ hemas) or “the inner philosophy” (eso philosophia), in contrast to “outer (exothen) philosophy” or “the wisdom of the world” (kosmike sophia—cf. 1 Cor 1:20, 3:19). As a result, although the verb philosophein embraces a wider range of meaning, in this connection it became a catchword of the monastic life. A slogan coined by Gregory of Nazianzos to oppose the second generation Arians, Eunoios and Aetios, “To be like a fisherman, not like Aristotle” (cf., e.g., PG 35:1164CD), and that became a part of the store of Byz. tradition (A. Grillmeier, Mit ihm und in ihm [Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1975] 289–300; Podskalsky, Theologie 247), was also applied in this connection to keep “specifically Christian doctrine,” that is, the unique tradition, separate from any theology consisting of rational or dialectical argumentation.

In Gregory Palamas and in the reaction to Scholasticism (H.-G. Beck, Divus Thomas 13 [1935] 3–22; Podskalsky, Theologie 180–290), the concept of theology is placed in opposition to rational, scientific disputation, challenging and surpassing it: “For theology transcends philosophy by virtue of its incomparable subject (logos); but it itself is subject to nothing” (Joseph Bryennios, ed. Vulgaris, 1:93).


—K.-H.U.

**Apophatic Theology** (from ἀπόφασις, “denial”). Also called negative theology, apophatic theology is a branch or rather methodology of Orthodox theological thought concerned with the problems that now might be termed the theory of knowledge of the Godhead. This approach was developed in Neoplatonism; Neoplatonists, however, employed the term apaíresis more often than apóphasis. For them the Supreme principle, the One, appeared bereft of all attributes. The Cappadocian Fathers also emphasized the unknowability of God but with a substantial reservation: they rejected every concept that our minds could form about God as being inadequate, but they accepted revelation about God in Scripture. Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite elaborated further the apophatic approach (while using the Neoplatonic term apaíresis as well): although an adequate knowledge of God is impossible, we can approach him with the assistance of symbolism and ideas. Since the cosmos is a reflection of the divine and possesses the same dialectic structure, our intellect can produce symbols and figures resembling the unknowable; pseudo-Dionysios calls this process anaγoge, “leading up.” In his view, “the apophaseis are the genuine way of dealing with the divine whereas affirmations (kataphaseis) are inadequate, since the enigmatic nature of the ineffable is more proper for the invisible world than fantastic explanations based on dissimilar objects” (PG 3:141C). Thus riddle and obscurity became vehicles of anaγoge.


—A.K.
HISTORY OF BYZANTINE THEOLOGY. The development of Byz. theology reflects the political history of Byz. and its unique cultural environment.

Byz. (or late Roman) theology begins in the 4th C. after the First Council of Nicaea (325) when the church was embroiled in controversies over the doctrine of the Trinity. These disputes were finally settled when the CAPPADOCIAN FATHERS proposed a notion of HYPOSTASIS that proved acceptable to the majority. In the 5th C., theology centered on the reality of Christ's human nature and its union with the Logos. Controversy over this issue led to the Council of Ephesus (431) and the separation of the NESTORIANS, Christian communities located predominantly beyond the eastern borders of the empire. The Christological controversy continued, leading to the Council of Chalcedon (451), which set forth a definition of faith that was rejected by Egyptian and Syrian MONOPHYSITES, whose radical adherence to Cyril of Alexandria would not allow them to go beyond CYRIILLIAN FORMULAS.

A position mediating between Nestorianism and Monophysitism, today called NEO-CHALCEDONISM, was reached in the time of Justinian I. Oriented toward the Christology of Cyril, neo-Chalcedonism was directed against a strict Chalcedonism that was prevalent esp. in the Latin West, and that followed the so-called Tome of Pope Leo I THE GREAT (440–461) in emphasizing the two natures of Christ more than the hypostatic union. Neo-Chalcedonism, which became dogma at the Third Council of Constantineople in 553 (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF), presented Justinian's religious policy with a compromise formula that would appear acceptable to the Monophysites of Egypt and the eastern provinces, and unite them with the imperial church.

Under Emp. Herakleios church unifications did take place in Armenia (626) and in Egypt (633). These rapprochements were established on the basis of a doctrine inspired by neo-Chalcedonism: MONOENERGISM. Monoenergism emphasized Christ's personal unity by teaching the unity of his energies (or wills—MONOTHELETISM). One of the reasons they did not succeed was the Arab invasions. The imperial church, at the Council of Constantineople IV (680/1), however, chose union with Rome and Western Christianity, and at that council received as dogma the teaching of Dyo-

THELETIC (the concept of two wills in Christ), represented by MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR, and rejected the idea of a singular, personal/hypostatic will in Christ.

In the second half of the 7th C., even though Origenism had been condemned in 543 under Justinian I, a union was effected, through the synthesis of Maximos the Confessor, between the mysticism of Evagrius Pontikos, which sought a direct knowledge of God, and the theology of pseudo-DIONYSIUS THE AРЕОPAГИТ, in which knowledge of God is mediated through the authority of hierarchies. The result was a monastic spirituality that sought direct knowledge of God through the mediating symbols of the church.

At the time of the controversy over ICONOCLASM (726–843), both Iconoclasts and Iconodules were able to advocate their own practices, Christological arguments, and ecumenical councils (at Hieria and the Second Council of Nicaea). The beginning of the controversy appears to have been a dispute over images that arose in a former territory of the empire that had been conquered by the Muslims; and indeed, the most significant theologian of this period, JOHN OF DAMASCUS, lived and worked his whole life under the rule of a Muslim caliph.

The period from ca.850 to ca.1050 witnessed both increasing alienation between East and West, and the process, which began with Photios and ended with Michael I Keroularios, that led to the so-called schism of the mid-11th C. The beginning of the schism is usually dated 16 July 1054 when Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida laid a bull of excommunication on the altar of Hagia Sophia. This event was not viewed by Byz. historians and contemporaries with the significance it has acquired today. Photios had already challenged the Roman view of papal primacy; but until the revival of this argument under Keroularios, it had remained secondary to the FILIOQUE. In the mission of CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER and Methodios to the Slavs in the 9th C., differences of rites and discipline (e.g., the use of unleavened bread [AZYMES], celibacy, and Saturday fasts) were the most prominent controversial issues that contributed to the schism.

Yet in the 9th–11th C., polemical literature, whether directed against the Westerners, or Muslims (see ISLAM, POLEMIC AGAINST), or the Paulicians and the Bogomils, constitutes but a fraction
of the theological output. The period represents the highpoint of homiletic and hagiographic literature. It had in Arethas of Caesarea a philosophically inclined exegete, and produced in Symeon the Theologian an outstanding mystic.

In the 11th C. Byz. turned in increasing measure to the study of the ancients. The theological literature shows a marked interest in the philosophy of Plato, and there was a revival of Aristotle in the recourse to a kind of dialectical argumentation.

The theological activity in the period of the Komnenoi and Angeloi is distinguished by the revival of the tradition of compiling Florilegia that bring together arguments from tradition to form an arsenal (panoplia) for fighting every kind of heresy. The treatise of Neilos Doxopatres, On God’s Oikonomía, is comparable to this, although its structure is that of an independent, systematic work. One emperor, Manuel I, took special delight in theological controversies such as the questions of whether the Son is greater than the Father (Jn 14:28), and whether the Son offers and receives the eucharistic offering, disputed by Soterichos Panteugenos. He opposed the Islamic claim that its God is the one true God, and he defended the compatibility of astrology with Christian belief. His theological adviser, Nicholas of Methone, wrote against a revival of Proklos that was going on in Byz. at that time.

The capture of Constantinople in 1204, and the installation of a Latin hierarchy to which the Greeks were subjected, gave occasion for the revival of anti-Latin polemic, with the notable exception of the most cultured theologian of the empire of Nicaea, Nikephoros Blemmydes. The period of Latin domination in Constantinople raised barriers between East and West that would frustrate all future attempts at Union of the Churches.

The 14th C. was dominated by the controversy over Palamism. Through the activity of Gregory Sinaius on Mt. Athos, the mysticism and method of prayer made popular by Symeon the Theologian became the possession of Athonite spirituality. Gregory Palamas sought to defend this mystical movement—known as hesychasm—against the attacks of Barlaam of Calabria by providing it with a speculative basis that, in his view, was grounded in the tradition of the church fathers. His doctrine of the uncreated energies of God, distinguished from God’s essence, together with the theological method he put forth, provoked a controversy that was made particularly intense by Demetrios Kydones’ preparation of a translation of the works of Thomas Aquinas. Nonetheless, the Palamite doctrine of God’s uncreated energies did not set the hesychastic practices of Palamites and anti-Palamites at variance with each other.

In view of the Ottoman successes, there occurred in Byz. in the 15th C. an ethical and theological renewal that found expression in, for example, the apology of Manuel II Palaiologos directed against Islam. The most significant theologians of the time, both those writing for the Council of Ferrara-Florence, such as Isidore of Kiev and Bessarion, and those writing against it, such as Mark Eugenikos and Gennadios II Scholarios, envisioned a world-wide culture embracing all men. Their successors and those of Plethon worked together with the Platonic Academy of Florence at the beginning of the Renaissance in the West.


—K.H.U.

THEON OF ALEXANDRIA, mathematician, astronomer, and teacher; father of Hypatia; fl. ca.360–80. According to the Souda, Theon (Θέων) was a member of the Mouseion at Alexandria; if so, he would be the latest to be recorded. His approximate chronology is known from his references to two eclipses in 364 and to other dates ranging from 360 to 377.

Theon is best known as a commentator on the two major astronomical works of Prolemy. Of that on the Almagest books 1–4, part of book 5 (J. Mogenet, A. Tihan, AntC 56 [1987] 201–18), books 6–10 and 12–13 are extant; some of this commentary, which is a revision of his lectures, is based on that by Pappos. Of the five books of the Great Commentary on the Handy Tables there survive books 1–3 and the beginning of book 4 (A. Tihan, AntC 50 [1981] 526–34). The Little Commentary on the Handy Tables (in one book) survives intact. The Handy Tables accompanied by the Little Commentary was apparently available to Severos Sebokht in Syria in the 7th C. (D. Pingree, JAOS
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THEOPHANES (Θεοφάνης) favorite and adviser of Romanos I; patrikios, protovestiarios, and later parakoimomenos; died after 947. Theophanes came to the fore in October 925, when he replaced John Mystikos as the emperor’s chief adviser; he played a decisive role in negotiations with Peter of Bulgaria in 927 and with the Hungarians (see Hungary) in 934 by arranging terms of truce satisfactory to both sides. In 941 he commanded the Byz. fleet in actions against Igor. The vita of Basil the Younger describes the victory over the Rus’, but instead of Theophanes names other generals: the patrikios (Bardas) Phokas, Pantherios, Theodore Spongarios. H. Grégoire suggested that the last, who is mentioned in no other sources, was substituted for Theophanes in the vita; he also hypothesized that Theodore Spongarios was a personification of St. Theodore Stratelates. In 944 Theophanes was sent to receive the manylation of Edessa. After Romanos’s deposition, Theophanes and Patrikios Theophylaktos devised a plot to reinstate the deposed emperor, but the scheme was discovered and Theophanes banished.


THEOPHANES, a painter or patron of ca.1100, shown as a monk presenting his Gospel book (now Melbourne, Nat. Gall. 710/5) to the Virgin. Above this frontispiece image (fol.1v) are verses in which Theophanes claims to have written and illuminated the MS; the rarity of this claim—its only parallel is in the Theodore Psalter—has led it to be questioned by R.S. Nelson (J. Paul Getty Museum Journal 15 [1987] 69f). Buchthal (infra) suggested that Theophanes may have been a monk in the Hodegon Monastery. Theophanes’ book has canon tables, with human atlantes representing the months and virtues, and elaborate calligraphic headpieces.


THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, or Scriptores post Theophanem, conventional title of a collection of chronicles preserved in a single 11th-C. MS, Vat. gr. 167. The collection encompasses 813–961 and consists of four independent sections. The anonymous author of the first part (813–67) considered himself as the continuator of Theophanes the Confessor; he differed, however, from his predecessor in the composition of his
work, which is not annalistic, but a series of imperial biographies. Commissioned by Constantine VII, the chronicle expressed the political views of the Macedonian dynasty, praised generals, and criticized merchants (p.88f). The anonymous author sometimes attempted to clarify the earthly causes of great events, e.g., the Arab invasion of Crete (p.74.5–6). He probably used the same sources as Genesios. The second part is a biography of Basil I (Vita Basilii), the third (886–948) is very close to Symeon Logothete. The final section was apparently written before 963, probably by Theodore Daphnopates, and reveals an aristocratic bias: e.g., the author censors the agrarian policy of Romanos I and contrasts it with the generosity of Constantine VII, his favorite hero (p.443.13–18). He writes with great sympathy about the Phokas family, John Kourkouas and the Argyroi; he does not yet know about the conflict between the Phokades and Joseph Bringas, however, and is quite favorable toward the latter.


THEOPHANES GRAPTOΣ (Γραπτός, lit. “marked with writing”), saint; brother of Theodore Graptos; born in the Moabite mountains ca.778, died in Constantinople ? 11 Oct. 845. A defender of icons veneration, Theophanes accompanied his brother on a trip to Constantinople in 813 just as the second period of Iconoclasm began; like Theodore he endured exile and the punishment of having insulting verses tattooed on his forehead. After the end of Iconoclasm, Theophanes was elected archbishop of Nicaea. He was an active hymnographer, and a great number of idiomela and kanones are ascribed to him, including some in dialogue form (a unique feature) and an acrostic kanon on Romanos the Melode (S. Pétridès, BZ 11 [1902] 363–69). S. Vaillhé (ROC 6 [1901] 641) characterizes him as a poet more personal and human than Joseph the Hymnographer.

Representation in Art. Theophanes looks just like his brother Theodore, except that he wears the turban of a Palestinian melode. In a pendentive at Chora he is shown writing his hymns in the pose of an evangelist in the company of other hymnographers. In the illustrated MS of John Skylitzes in Madrid, he is shown clad as a bishop, confronting the emperor Theophilos and his court (fol.51r).

Sources. See Theodore Graptos.

THEOPHANES KERAMEUS. See Theophanes of Sicily

THEOPHANES OF BYZANTIUM, historian; fl. 2nd half of 6th C. His Historia is an account in ten books of the period 566–81, with an introduction going back to 562. Known only from Photios (Bibl., cod.64), its main theme was the diplomatic and military history of Byz. and its eastern neighbors, the Persians, Armenians, and other peoples of the Caucasus. Some of its information is rare and precious, for instance on the Turks who were called “Kermichiones” by the Persians (Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica 2:158f) and on Tblisi as the capital of the Iberians; Theophanes clearly took pains over his ethnography and geography. He also recounts the smuggling into Byz. of silkworm eggs from China, an episode made famous by Prokopios of Caesarea (R. Hennig, BZ 33 [1933] 295–312); the two versions do not tally in all points. The works of Theophanes and Menander Protector overlap in period and subject matter; who used whom cannot be determined.

ED. FHG 4:270f. Dindorf, HistGr 1:446–49.
LIT. Hunger, Lit. 1:309. - B.B.

THEOPHANES OF MEDEIA. See Agallianos, Theodore

THEOPHANES OF SICILY, 9th-C. hymnographer. His biography is unknown. S. Pétridès surmised that he lived in Syracuse before 878 (EO 4 [1900-1901] 285). Papadopoulos-Kerameus (infra 371) made him a pupil of Joseph the Hymnographer, the author of Joseph’s vita and a correspondent of Photios; however, the identification
THEOPHANES THE CONFESSOR, historian and saint; born Constantinople ca. 760, died Samothrace 12 Mar. 817 (C. Van de Vorst, AB 31 [1912] 155) or 818 (Hunger, Lit. 1:336). Son of a strategos of the Aegean Sea, Theophanes became strator at the court of Leo IV and married Megalo, daughter of a patrickios and the emperor’s friend. After a short conjugal life, Theophanes and Megalo took the monastic habit; Theophanes founded the monastery of Megas Agros on the mountain of Sigriane (the southern shore of the Propontis) and lived there. During the MOECHAN CONTROVERSY Theophanes supported Patr. Tarasios in his policy of compromise, in contrast to Theodore of Studios (J. Pargorie, VizVrem 9 [1902] 62–66). However, their common fate under Leo V (Theophanes was summoned to Constantinople and exiled to Samothrace after his refusal to join the Iconoclasts) led to their reconciliation; Theodore even wrote an enkomion after the death of Theophanes (ed. C. Van de Vorst, AB 31 [1912] 19–25).

The Chronographia of Theophanes covers the years 285–813 and forms a continuation of George the Synkellos. C. Mango’s hypothesis (ZRVI 18 [1978] 9–17) that Theophanes served only as editor of the Chronographia written by George is questionable. The problem of the sources of Theophanes is very complicated. L. Whitby (BMGS 8 [1982/83] 1–20) suggests that the lost Great Chronographer was the major source of both Theophanes and Patr. Nilephoros I; on the contrary, Ja. Ljubarskij (VizVrem 45 [1984] 72–86) thinks that Theophanes used 5th- to 7th-C. historians (Prokopios, Malalas, Theophylaktoς Simokattes, etc.) in the original, often quoting them from memory. K. Uspenskij (VizVrem 3 [1950] 393–438; 4 [1951] 211–62) emphasizes that Theophanes had at his disposal pre-Iconoclast sources that he sometimes employed uncritically. N. Pigulevskaja (JOB 16 [1967] 55–60) assumes that Theophanes used Syriac chronicles. All these assertions are difficult to prove. Theophanes was freer in his use of sources than Synkellos, an antiquarian who clung to the original; Theophanes reworked the available material, adapting it to his purposes (I. Čičurov, VizVrem 37 [1976] 62–73; ADSV 10 [1973] 205–06) and rarely indicating the provenance of his material. Theophanes, like John of Damascus, consistently presents his account not as his personal opinions, but as objective truth; unlike Synkellos, he considered himself as a humble narrator (I. Čičurov, Antičnost i Vizantiya [Moscow 1975] 203–17). More than Synkellos he believed that the flow of time by itself determines the logic of historical development and presented his material in a strictly chronological order, rather than organizing it in thematic groupings. His is a rare case of Byz. annals that did not find a proper continuation.

As a steadfast iconodule, Theophanes was critical of the imperial power and subsequent to the idealized Constantine I found scarcely a single ruler worthy of praise; Marcian forms an exception. He was esp. hostile to the Orthodox emperor Nikephoros I, as well as to the Iconoclasts. The earliest MS (Oxford, Bodl., Wake 5) is of the late 9th C. (N. Wilson, DOP 26 [1972] 358). Anastasius Bibliothecarius translated Theophanes into Latin. Several vitae of Theophanes are known, including one attributed to Patr. Methodios.


SOURCE. V. Latyshev, Mesto patriarka Konstantinopol’skogo Ziti prep. Feofana Ispovednika (Petrograd 1918).


SOURCE. V. Latyshev, Mesto patriarka Konstantinopol’skogo Ziti prep. Feofana Ispovednika (Petrograd 1918).

THEOPHANES "THE GREEK," painter of frescoes, icons, and books; active in Russia from 1378 at the latest, until at least 1405. His only surviving wall-painting is in the Church of the Transfiguration at Novgorod where, according to the kte

tor's inscription (preserved in the Third Novgorod Chronicle, sub anno 6886 = 1378), he worked with a team of indigenous craftsmen. This highly indivi
dualized decoration consists of fragments of biblical scenes alternating with friezes of saints. A letter of ca.1415 from the hagiographer Epifanij

Preumdryj describes Theophanes' work elsewhere and is the fullest and most personal account we have of any Byz. artist. Epifanij relates that

Theophanes painted more than 40 stone churches in Constantinople, Chalcedon, Galata, Kaffa, Novgorod, and Nižnij Novgorod. In Moscow, Theophanes is said to have decorated three churches, painting the Tree of Jesse and the Apocalypse in the Annunciation Church in the Kremlin and "a city with all its particulars" in that of the Archangel Michael. Theophanes' secular frescoes included a view of Moscow in the palace of Vladimir, prince of Serpuchov (1353–1410), and an unidentified picture in that of Basil I of Moscow (1389–1425). Epifanij reports that Theophanes painted a view of Hagia Sophia, Constant

inople, and the statue of Justinian I in the Augustaion in a book that served as a model to other artists. The painter's activities in Moscow, including his work in the Annunciation Church (1405), are confirmed in the early 15th-C. Trom
cjakaja Chronicle. The iconostasis from this church, containing a Great Deesis by Theophanes, is pre

served in the present cathedral of the same name.


Lit. G. Downey, "The Church of All Saints (Church of St. Theophano) near the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople," DOP 9–10 (1956) 301–05.

—A.C.

THEOPHANO, empress and wife of ROMANOS II; baptismal name Anastaso; born Constantinople after 940, died Constantinople probably after 976. Daughter of a wine merchant from Constantinople, the beautiful Theophano enchanted Rom

anos II, who married her ca.956 after the pre

mature death of his fiancée, Skylitzes, who hated the young upstart, asserts that Theophano tried to poison CONSTANTINE VII (Skyl. 246.55–56) and participated in murdering Stephen Lekapenos, son of Romanos I (Skyl. 255.71–72). She probably also urged Romanos II to send his sisters to a convent and incited him against his mother Helen. However, he did not dare remove her from the palace for fear of her curse. After Romanos II's premature demise, Theophano remained re

gent for her minor sons Basil II and Constant

ine VIII; in the struggle for power she suppor

ted NIKEPHOROS (II) Phokas against Joseph

Brigas. After seizing the throne in 963, Ni

kephoros removed Theophano temporarily to the palace of Petron, but soon (in Sept.) married her. Marriage with the austere and ascetic warrior did not satisfy Theophano; eventually she plotted with JOHN (I) Tzimiskes and helped his supporters to enter Nikephoros's bedchamber and murder him.

THEOPHANIES. See EPIPHANIES; VISIONS.
Theophano's expectations of a third marriage, to Tzimiskes, were not realized. Under pressure from Patr. Polyeuktos, Tzimiskes banished her before his coronation and married Theodora, Romanos II's sister. A satirical song describes Theophano's failure (G. Morgan, BZ 47 [1954] 292–97). She was banished to the Prokonnesos but recalled from exile in 976. —A.K.

THEOPHANO (Lat. Theophanu), wife of the German emperor Otto II (973–83); born ca. 955, died Nimwegen 15 June 991. Her grant of dowry from Otto II specifies that she was a niece of Emp. John I Tzimiskes, but M. Uhlich attempted to show that she was descended from the Lekapenoi. F. Dölger refuted this theory (HistJB 62–69 [1942–49] 646–58). Apparently because she was not a porphyrogenette, some in Otto I's court opposed her marriage to Otto II, but the wedding and coronation occurred at St. Peter's, Rome, 14 Apr. 972. Theophano bore Otto II daughters and a son, the future Otto III. Under her influence, Otto II revived the title Romanorum imperator augustus; he also undertook an attack on the Saracen invaders of southern Italy because such action was appropriate for an emperor. As regent for Otto III, Theophano stressed her imperial rank. Following the pattern of Empress Irene, she used the masculine form for her title (W. Ohsnorge, Konstantinopel und der Okzident [Darmstadt: 1966] 59–61). In the youthful Otto III, she instilled her consciousness of imperial tradition and a desire to emulate Byz. Together with her husband, she is represented on a southern Italian (?) ivory in Paris (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfenbeinskulpt. II, no. 85). H. Wentzel (Aachener Kunstblätter 40 [1971] 15–39, 43 [1972] 11–96) associated a huge quantity of Late Antique gems and Byz. ivories, textiles, and MSS with her dowry and ascribed an excessive number of new creations in these media to her patronage.


THEOPHILOS (Θεοφίλος), archbishop of Alexandria (from 385 [Favale] or 384 [Declerck]); theologian and politician; born Menfi, Egypt, ca. 345, died Alexandria 15 Oct. 412. A saint of the Coptic and Syrian churches (feast days 15 and 17 Oct.), Theophilos appears in the Synaxarion of Constantinople (Synax CP 812.16–20) in a negative vein—as the alleged organizer of the slaughter of holy fathers “in caves.” Uncle of Cyril of Alexandria, Theophilos was his political forerunner. His aim was to promote the role of Alexandria, which had experienced a setback at the Council of Constantinople in 381: Theophilos at first supported the usurper Maximus but prudently changed his mind; he then tried to exert influence on Theodosios I and to introduce the Alexandrian paschal date into Constantinople ca. 388. He collaborated with Theodosios in antipagan persecutions, culminating in the destruction of the Serapeion at Alexandria (391). He failed, however, in his plan to elect his closest aide, the priest Isidore, to the see of Constantinople (397). As an Origenist, Theophilos attacked (ca. 399) anthropomorphism views popular among Egyptian monks; the ensuing opposition led Theophilos to change his position and begin persecution of the Origenists, esp. the so-called Tall (Makroi) Brothers. After emigrating from Egypt, they were supported by John Chrysostom, the bishop of Constantinople, thus introducing a new source of conflict between the two sees. This time Theophilos emerged victorious, and at the Synod of the Oak near Chalcedon (403) obtained John's deposition.

Ed. PG 65:29–68.


THEOPHILOS, 6th-C. jurist, antecessor, professor at the law school of Constantinople. He was appointed by Justinian I to the commissions for the compilation of the first edition of the Codex Justinianus and the Digest; together with Dorotheos, he was ordered to compile the Institutes. Résumés of passages of the first books of the Digest are ascribed to him in the scholia to the Basilika.
His paraphrase of the Institutes is preserved in its entirety in several MSS. This work, whose attribution to Theophilos was incorrectly disputed by Ferrini, may have been based on notes taken by a student at a lecture given by Theophilos shortly after the completion of the Institutes.


THEOPHILOS, emperor (829–42); born 812/13 (W. Treadgold, GRBS 16 [1975] 337), died Constantinople 20 Jan. 842. Son of Michael II and Thekla, he was crowned co-emperor in spring 821. Theophilos married Theodora after a bride show at which he rejected Kassia. Theophilos cultivated an image as "a fiery lover of justice and a strict guardian of civil laws" (TheophCont 85.1–2). Immediately after his accession he executed his father's accomplices in the assassination of Leo V (his godfather). Many colorful stories depict him dispensing justice at the expense of high officials like Petronas. His reputation endured in legend (C. Diehl, SemKond 4 [1931] 33–37): the Timarion depicts him as a judge in hell. His sound fiscal policies enriched the treasury and allowed major additions to the Great Palace, renovations of Constantinople's walls, the building of a xenon on the Golden Horn, and the construction of a palace at Bryas. Theophilos likely established regional mints and issued large numbers of folles, partly aiding the gradual revival of provincial economies (D. Metcalf, Byzantium 37 [1967] 310). His devotion to learning included patronage of Leo the Mathematician, Methodios (I), and John VII Grammatikos (his childhood tutor); evidently he himself wrote hymns as well (Vasiliev, Infra 1:16, n.1). With Patr. Antony I Kassymatas and John Grammatikos he restored Iconoclasm by prohibiting all painted images (Reg 1, no.427) and any aid to iconodules, many of whom he exiled or physically punished (e.g., Theodore Graptos).

To strengthen the empire's defenses he built the fortress of Sarkel on the Don; created the themes of Cherson, Paphlagonia, and Chaldia; and formed the kleisourai of Charisanon, Cappadocia, and Seleukeia (Oikonomides, Listes 348–54). He neglected the threat of the Muslims in Sicily and southern Italy, but confronted them in Asia Minor and was defeated by Mu'tasim in 831. In 837 he campaigned with his generals Manuel and Theophobos against the Arabs. Their destruction of Zapetra provoked the invasion in 858 of Mu'tasim, who defeated Theophilos at the battle of Dazimon, where the emperor narrowly escaped capture; his life was reportedly saved by Theophobos. The Arabs then sacked Amorion. The emperor subsequently sent embassies to the Franks, Venice, and Cordoba to obtain help against the caliphate (P. Teofilatto, Studi Meridionali 12 [1980] 186–94). Theophilos died of dysentery.


THEOPHILOS OF EDESSA (Ar. Thiyûfîl ibn Thûmû), translator and Christian astrologer; born Edessa ca.695, died 15/16 July 785. A Greek from Syria, Theophilos served the 'Abbâsid caliph al-Mahdi (775–85) as astrological military adviser and wrote several astrological treatises in Greek (partially preserved also in Arabic versions). His Labors Concerning the Beginnings of Wars is the only medieval Greek text devoted entirely to the subject of military astrology. Addressed to his son Deukalion, it is partially based on Indian sources (D. Pingree, Viator 7 [1976] 148f); a "second edition," consisting of chapters 24–41, includes material ascribed to Zoroaster and to Julian of Lodiaka, the latter taken from the collections of Rhetorios of Egypt. A later recension of all of Theophilos's astrological writings was made in ca.1100, and another devised in the School of John Abramos in the 14th C. The Labors were also pillaged by John's pupil, Eleutherios Zebeleinos, also called Elias, for his compendium falsely ascribed to Palchos.

Theophilos's so-called Astrological Effects in 30 chapters, addressed to Deukalion, also contains material influenced by Indian sources and was utilized by 9th-C. theoreticians of magic from Harrân (D. Pingree, jWarb 43 [1980] 6). In part it too is dependent on Rhetorios. Theophilos's final work, entitled On Different Beginnings, deals
with the rules for undertaking activities governed by each of the 12 astrological places. Much of this work is based on Dorotheos of Sidon and Hephastion of Thebes. A separate treatise by Theophilus, the *Collection on Cosmic Beginnings*, deals with annual and monthly predictions and the various definitions of the beginning of the year according to the Egyptians, Greeks, Persians, and Arabs. Theophilus’s works are among the most original and influential medieval Greek treatises on various aspects of astrology. Theophilus’s Syriac translations of Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have not survived.


—D.P.

**THEOPHILOS PROTOPHARIOUS**, physician; his biography and dates are unknown; conventionally assigned to the 7th C., but may date to the 9th or 10th. Theophilus composed *On the Constitution of the Human Body*, melding Christian theology and the *Use of the Parts of the Human Body* by Galen. Greek texts on various medical subjects, including *Excrements, Pulses*, and *Urine*, survive under Theophilus’s name. The work *Urine* became the ancestor of many tracts on this subject, such as the *Urine of John Aktouarios*. Apparently Theophilus also wrote some commentaries on the works of Hippocrates, but these tracts are jumbled in the MSS with similar treatises by Damaskios, Stephen of Alexandria (or Athens), and Melitios the Monk; Theophilus’s *On Various Fevers* has come down in MSS meshed with tracts on the same subject by Stephen. A portrait of Theophilus in physician’s garb, conducting uroscopy, is preserved in a 15th-C. copy of his *Urine* (L. MacKinney, *Medical Illustrations in Medieval Manuscripts* [Berkeley–Los Angeles 1965] fig.5).

E.D. De corporis humani fabrica libri V, ed. W.A. Greenhill (Oxford 1842). For list of other works, see Hunger, Lit. 2:299–301.


—J.S., G.V.

**THEOPHILOS THE INDIAN**, also called the Ethiopian (Philostorg., *HE* 6.3), Arian bishop; born island of Dibous (probably the Maldive Islands, near Ceylon), died after 364. His life is described in detail by Philostorgios. As a young man he was sent to the court of Constantine I where Eusebius of Nikomedea ordained him deacon. Although Constantius II respected him, he still banished Theophilus for his support of the caesar Gallus. Famous for working miracles, Theophilus was recalled to Constantinople and acquired even greater renown for healing the empress Eusebia. In 356 Constantius II sent him to the ethnarch of Saba (Himyar) with 200 Cappadocian horses and other gifts. Theophilus founded three churches—one in the capital called Tapharos (Zafr), one in the Roman *emporion* or Adane, and another in the Persian *emporion*. From the land of the Himyarites he sailed to Dibous, then to the “other India,” and returned to Constantinople via Antioch. Constantius II exiled him again together with other partisans of Aetios the Arian, to whom Theophilus maintained allegiance after his banishment and subsequent release in 359. A later version of the *Martyrdom of Arethas* makes him “orthodox” and the principal evangelizer of South Arabia, from Najran to the Persian Gulf.


—A.K., L.S.B.MacC.

**THEOPHOBOS** (Θεόφοβος; Naṣr in Arabic and Syriac sources), a Persian or Kurdish military commander in Byz. service; died Constantinople 840 (Kaegi, *Unrest* 254) or 842. Theophobos fled to Byz. territory in 834 after the Khurramites were defeated by Mu’tasim in 833. Emp. Theophobos organized the Khurramite refugees into a special cavalry *tagma* under Theophobos, who converted to Christianity, was appointed *patrakios*, and married the sister of either Theophilus or Empress Theodora (Bury, *ERE* 253). Skylitzes (Skyl. 67.3–9) reports that Theophobos wedded the emperor’s sister; in the illustrated Madrid MS (Grabar-Manoussacas, *Skylitzès*, no.127), Theophilos is shown seated with Theophobos on his knee—a symbolic representation of adoption. Theophobos campaigned with Theophilus in 837, and Michael the Syrian (ed. Chabot, 3:96) says that his troops cruelly sacked Zapetra. He campaigned with Theophilus again in 848 and reportedly saved the emperor’s life during the battle at Dazimon.
(TheophCent 113f). Rumors of the death of Theophilos apparently instigated a conspiracy in Constantinople on behalf of Theophobos; reports that Theophobos was an iconophile suggest that the plot may have been a reaction against Iconoclasm. When Theophilos returned to the capital, he recalled Theophobos, who fled with his tagma to Amastris and then Sinope, where the troops proclaimed him emperor. There Theophobos secretly negotiated with Theophilos, who received him favorably in Constantinople but dispersed the tagma throughout the themes. Byz. sources report that Theophilos ordered Petronas to arrest and kill Theophobos, perhaps to forestall any plot against the young Michael III.


-P.A.H., A.C.

THEOPHYLAKTOS, patriarch of Constantinople (2 Feb. 933—27 Feb. 956); born Constantinople? 917, died Constantinople. He was a son of Romanos I Lekapenos, who wanted him to become patriarch, and appointed him when he was still a child (924) as synkellos of Patr. Nicholas I Mystikos. At age 16 Theophylaktos was ostentatiously installed in the see of Constantinople. He consistently supported his father’s policy and acted in accord with him. In 937 he negotiated with the sees of Alexandria and Antioch and informed them about changes in the liturgy of Constantinople, thus trying to confirm the links with Eastern patriarchates. In order to influence the Hungarians, ca.948 Theophylaktos sent the monk Hierotheos as “bishop of Tourkis” (Skyl. 239.67—68). In a letter to Tsar Peter of Bulgaria, Theophylaktos defined Bogomilism as a dangerous heresy, a mixture of Manichaeanism with “Paulinism,” that is, the teaching of Paul of Samosata, who was considered the founder of Paulicianism. Byz. chroniclers hostile to Theophylaktos present him as an irreverent man who cared only for his 2,000 horses and who was willing to interrupt services in Hagia Sophia to attend the foaling of his mares. He reportedly introduced theatrical elements into the liturgy and appointed as domes-
tikos of the church a certain Euthymios Kasnes, who organized “satirical dances” and singing of street songs during the liturgy (Skyl. 243f). Theophylaktos was buried at the Rophinionai monastery in Chalcedon, whose restoration he had ordered (Janin, Églises centres 39).

LIT. RegPat, fasc. 2, nos. 787—89. Runciman, Romanus 76f. -A.K.

THEOPHYLAKTOS, archbishop of Ohrid (from 1088/9) and writer; born Euboa ca.1050, died after 1126. P. Gautier (REB 21 [1963] 165—68) has shown that his surname was Hephaisotos, a patronymic otherwise unattested after the 6th C. He was the pupil of Michael Psellus and served as deacon of Hagia Sophia. As the teacher of Constantine Doukas, son of Michael VII, Theophylaktos produced ca.1085/6 a Mirror of Princes addressed to his pupil, in which he praised noble origin and martial prowess as necessary qualities of a successful emperor. In 1088 he wrote a panegyric of Alexios I, even though his sympathies lay with Maria, Michael VII’s widow, rather than with the Komnenoi. His letters from Ohrid are a valuable source for the economic, social, and political history of Bulgaria as well as Byz. prosopography. They are filled with conventional complaints concerning Theophylaktos’s “barbarian” surroundings, whereas in fact he was deeply involved in local cultural development, producing an enkomion of 15 martyrs of Tiberiopolis and a vita of Kliment of Ohrid. His exegetic production was prolific: Theophylaktos commented on the Psalms, Prophets, Gospels, epistles of St. Paul, and others. His polemical works against the Latins are relatively tolerant; although he rejected the filioque, Theophylaktos opposed the idea of schism and defended the Latins from slanderous accusations.


THEORETRON (θεωρετρον), a wedding gift of a husband to his wife that supplemented the donatio propter nuptias or the hypobolon. This gift is mentioned for the first time in a novel of Constantine VII (Reg 1, no.677). The theoretron
was basically granted only in a first marriage (cf., however, SYNOPSIS MINOR 110) and had consequently the character of a prenium virginitatis ("reward for virginity"). The theoretron had to amount to at least a twelfth of the dowry. The wife administered the theoretron and could dispose of it freely. In contrast to the hypobolon it remained her property after the termination of the marriage, even if there were children and even if she remarried (PEIRA 25.47.62). The wife’s unlimited rights to the theoretron were comparable to her rights to the so-called exopropoika, which she herself contributed.


-M. Th. F.

THEORIANOS, diplomat and polemicist of the second half of 12th C. MANUEL I sent Theorianos in the fall of 1169 and in the fall of 1171 to the katholikos of Armenia, NERSES SNORHALI; the negotiations took place at Hromklay on the Euphrates. Theorians tried to persuade the Armenians (as well as the Syrian Jacobites) to accept the creed of the Council of Chalcedon by explaining that the differences resulted primarily from linguistic misunderstandings. Theorians seems to have also negotiated with Enrico, patriarch of Grado (1191–96); according to Loenertz (infra 47f), this probably occurred in 1177, when an embassy of Manuel went to Venice. Theorians also wrote a letter "To the priests of Oriana," dedicated to the discrepancies in ritual between the Byz. and Latin churches. The addressee of this letter was, according to Beck (Kirche 628), the community of Beth-Zachariah in Palestine; according to Loenertz (infra 49f), that of Oria in Apuleia. The letter was partially translated into Latin in the 13th C. and attributed to JOHN CHRYSTOSYM.


-A.K.

THEOSIS (θέωσις), or deification in the Byz. tradition, is the goal of man to which he is naturally destined and which is realized through the grace of God. In a Christian context primarily concerned with salvation the ethical ideal of Plato survives, "To become like God insofar as that is possible for man" (Theaetetus 176b), although this does not mean that the soul is of divine essence.

"Theosis consists of being as much as possible like and in union (henosis) with God" (pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, PG 3:376A). It is the "exaltation of nature, not its destruction or alteration" (Anastasios of Sinai, ed. Uthemann, Viae Dux. 2.7.8–9), and "participation through grace in that which surrounds the nature of God" (John of Damascus, Exp. fidei 88.18, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:2203). Its highest realization is in the deification of Christ’s human nature. As elaborated by MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR, "nature" is understood as the essence of man as originally established in creation, but which is darkened by its existential condition (tropos tes hyparxeos) subsequent to Adam’s sin; or, to use a different metaphor, it is corroded "like a mirror" composed of metal, not "damaged," as it was described in the anti-Pelagian tradition of the West under the influence of Augustine.

Theosis preserves and saves the created order of human nature, which remains incommensurable to God; it is maintained without commingling and unseparated as in Christ. The initial development of this doctrine is found in Athanasios of Alexandria’s theory of the "deification of man through the incarnation of God." "He became man that we might become divine" (Oratio de incarnatione Verbi 54.3, ed. C. Kannengieser, 458). For him, the HOMOEOUSIOS of the First Council of Nicaea by itself ensures this participation in deification (theosiosis). In the refutation of the Pneumatomachoi by BASIL THE GREAT, deification of man as sanctification is rooted in the work of the Holy Spirit who is God; otherwise, man would be neither sanctified nor deified. This tradition culminates in CYRIL of Alexandria, for whom the deification of man is determined by the indwelling of the Trinity. In all these statements concerning the "being" of divinized man, the difference, or, in the language of Gregory of Nyssa, the infinite gap between the prototype and the image is constantly stressed.

In HESYCHASM one sees in the light of Mt. Tabor the revelation of theosis, which in the theory of Palamism is attributed to the activity of the divine energies. The extent to which Sinaitic mysticism, with its emphasis on incommensurability, survived
THEOTOKION (Θεοτόκιον), a hymn addressing and invoking the Theotokos. Theotokia are sung mainly at the end of vespers, at orthros before the kathismata, as the final troparion in the odes of most kanons, and after the Great Doxology. In a collection known as the Theotokarion, theotokia are arranged according to the eight modes. A variant form is the staurotheotokion, a hymn that describes Mary's grief as she stood at the foot of the Cross (staurous).

LIT. Wellesz, Musik 242f. — D.E.C.

THEOTOKOS (Θεοτόκος, lit. "God-bearing"), Mother of God, an epithet of the Virgin Mary. This title, which referred earlier to the ancient Egyptian goddess Isis, appears for the first time as far as we know in a troparion of the 3rd C. and in a text of Hippolytus of Rome (H. Rahner, Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 59 [1935] 73–81). Already Athanasios of Alexandria used it in his Discourses against the Arians, and Gregory of Nazianzos (PG 37:177C–180A) considers use of the title as one of the foundations of the Christian faith: "If anyone does not confess that the Virgin Mary is Theotokos, he is found to be far from God. Whoever maintains that Christ passed through the Virgin as through a channel and was not fashioned in her in a manner at the same time divine and human—in a divine manner because [the conception occurred] without a man, in a human manner because Christ developed in her according to the principles of nature—is likewise godless. Whoever maintains that the human being was formed first, and later God descended upon him, is to be condemned." This passage reveals the Christological implications of Mary's title.


THERMON. See Zeon.

THESEID, anonymous and faithful translation into Greek political verse (unrhymed except for the Prologue and the synopsis to each book) of Boccaccio’s Teseida. Translated probably late in the 15th C., the Teseid survives in two MSS, one used as the printer’s copy for the 1529 Venice edition.


LIT. Beck, Volksliteratur 139f. — E.M.J., M.J.J.

THESEUS, son of Aegeus, a legendary king of Athens; in Malalas, however, he appears as a ruler of Thessaly. Of the great number of stories connected with Theseus, Malalas chose two—his victory over the Minotaur with the help of Ariadne and the tragic fate of Hippolytos and Phaedra (Malal. 87–90). Both Nonnos of Panopolis (Dionysiaka 47:269–71) and Malalas stressed negative features of Theseus’s behavior, such as his abandonment of Ariadne. Tzetzes knew other legends about Theseus, for example, his attempt
to rescue Persephone from the underworld (*Hist*. 2:744–61). The attempt failed and Theseus was imprisoned. Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 150.49–53) praises Theseus for the punishment he had imposed on robbers and compares Manuel I to him.

A MS of pseudo-Oppian in Venice (Marc. gr. 479) shows Theseus at Troizen finding the weapons his father had hidden under a rock (Weitzmann, *infra*, fig. 159). In the miniature, however, the wrong figure is labeled Theseus.


**THESSALONIKE (Θεσσαλονίκη),** ancient city located at the head of the Thermaic Gulf near the mouth of the *Vardar* and on the *Via Egnatia*. Its importance from the end of the 3rd C. derived from its strategic location with regard to both barbarian invasions across the Danube and East-West confrontation. The residence of Emp. Galerius in Thessalonike was accompanied by burgeoning building activity (a palace, the triumphal *Arch of Galerius*); in 298/9 a mint was opened there, gradually replacing that of Serdica (P. Bruun, *Opuscula romana* 15 [1985] 7–16). During Constantine I’s war against Licinius, Thessalonike was, for a while, the headquarters of Constantine, but after his victory he demoted the city, making it the place of Licinius’s exile. From the mid-5th C. Thessalonike was the capital of the prefecture of *Illyricum* and an important episcopal center, created according to tradition by St. Paul; the bishopric (later archbishopric) was under the jurisdiction of Rome, and in the beginning of the 5th C. Bishop Rufus was the papal *vicarius* of Illyricum; from the second half of the 6th C. Constantinople strengthened its grip on Thessalonike, and ca. 733 the archbishopric was transferred to the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople; within its hierarchy it was soon demoted to the 16th rank, with only five suffragans. In the 7th–9th C., Thessalonike was administered by an eparch, later by a *doux*.

In 390 Emp. Theodosios I massacred thousands of citizens in the hippodrome at Thessalonike as punishment for the murder of one of his barbarian generals. The Germanic invasions of the 4th and 5th C. bypassed Thessalonike; in the 6th C., however, Prokopios (*Buildings* 4.3.29) spoke of the city as “easily assailable by barbarians.” In 479, when the news of an imminent Ostrogothic attack spread in Thessalonike, the inhabitants expressed no confidence in the eparch (praetorian prefect) and took the keys to the gate away from him, entrusting them to the bishop (Malchos, fr. 20, ed. Blockley, *Historians* 2:436.17–19). More dangerous were the Slavic sieges of Thessalonike from the end of the 6th C. onward, repelled according to contemporary legend only by the supernatural intervention of St. Demetrios. Thessalonike remained in Byz. hands, although most of its hinterland was overwhelmed by Slavic settlers.

Little is known about the economic life of Thessalonike in the 7th and 8th C. Some construction work continued in the city, some churches were decorated, and a salt-pan functioned, but the mint evidently ceased production and resumed operation only in the 9th C. with extensive issues of bronze folles of Basil I (D.M. Metcalf, *BalkSt* 4 [1963] 277–86). At the end of the 9th C. the administration attempted to transfer the center of trade with the Bulgarians from Constantinople to Thessalonike, but this failed because of Bulgarian mistrust. Symeon of Bulgaria’s invasions of Macedonia did not affect Thessalonike, but in 904 Leo of Tripoli captured and sacked the city. The peace with Bulgaria and its subsequent con-
quest by Basil II transformed Thessalonike into the major center of economic and cultural interchange in the southern Balkans: K. Dieterich (BZ 31 [1931] 37–57, 334–49) outlines two routes of Byz. trade with Bulgaria—one from Constantinople and another to the west from Thessalonike. According to the Timarion, Thessalonike in the 12th C. was a trade center that attracted merchants from Scythia, Italy, Iberia, Lusitania, and the Transalpine “Celtic” lands. Italian merchants began to organize colonies there, and in 1185 the Normans temporarily occupied the city.

After the Fourth Crusade Boniface of Montferrat became king of Thessalonike, with territory in Macedonia and western Thrace and interests as distant as the Peloponnese. After the battle of Adrianople in 1205 Kalōjan besieged Thessalonike, but the city withstood the attack; in Dec. 1224 Theodore Komnenos Doukas of Epirus captured Thessalonike and it remained part of the despotate of Epirus until it fell to John III Vatatzes in 1246. In the spring of 1308 the Catalan Grand Company unsuccessfully besieged Thessalonike, and beginning in 1320 the city was a focus of contention between Andronikos II and Andronikos III. In 1334 the walls of Thessalonike stopped the advance of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, but the Serbs attacked again in 1341. In the 1340s Thessalonike fell temporarily under the control of the Zealots. The Ottomans attacked Thessalonike in autumn 1383 and the city fell in April 1387. It returned briefly to Byz. hands but was taken by Bayezid I on 12 April 1394. In the aftermath of the battle of Ankara in 1402 Byz. regained Thessalonike and a despotate was established there. In 1423, however, the despotes Andronikos surrendered the city to Venice, which agreed to respect the rights and privileges of the inhabitants. Murad II took the city on 29 March 1430 after a brief siege.

Close contacts with Westerners (merchants, churchmen, and warriors) created a cosmopolitan atmosphere in Thessalonike: the Kydones brothers and their associates were esp. active in propagating Latin theology in a Greek milieu (D.M. Nicol in He Thessalonike metaxy Anatoles kai Dyseos [Thessalonike 1982] 121–31).

Thessalonike preserves many Byz. monuments, including the northern sections of the land walls (see below). A large building identified as a Byz. palace was discovered in the center of the city, and a Byz. bath has been identified in the northern area.

The churches of St. Catherine (late 13th C.), the Prophet Elijah, St. Panteleemon, and the Taxiarchs (all 14th C.) are notable for their lively architecture; all have fresco remains. (For the churches of the Acheiropoiétos, St. Demetrios, St. George, Hagia Sophia, the Holy Apostles, Hosios David, St. Nicholas Orphanos, and the Panagia ton Chalkeon, and the monasteries of Akapniou, Blatadon and Nea Moni, see independent entries.)


Walls. The fortifications of Thessalonike can be divided into two sections: the city walls and the citadel. The walls of the lower city form a rough rectangle, wider at the east than at the west: the sea wall (to the south) has completely disappeared except for the so-called White Tower, which may have been constructed under the Venetians (J.P. Braun, ByzF 11 [1987] 269ff); the east wall runs upward nearly directly from the sea, while the west wall takes an undulating course to the north and east. The citadel occupies a height at the northeastern corner of the city. From the fortification walls a total of more than 20 gateways and 100 towers are preserved, most of the latter originally triangular or rectangular in shape; also surviving are a number of inscriptions, such as those of the strategos of the city Leo Chitzilakes (ca.904), Anna of Savoy (1355/6), and the doux George Apokaukos, who served under the despotes Manuel Palaiologos, the future emperor, when he governed Thessalonike between 1369 and 1373 (J. Spieser, TM 5 [1973] 176ff).

Since the Hellenistic walls had fallen into disrepair, the city refortified in the mid-3rd C. in response to barbarian invasions. This was followed by a major reconstruction that essentially determined the course the fortifications were to take throughout the Byz. era. The date of this
has been hotly debated, with estimates ranging from 380 to 448-50, but the latter is probably preferable. In 512 repairs were made to the west wall, but after that there is no evidence of restoration until the third quarter of the 12th C. During that time, however, the walls repeatedly protected the city against attacks from Slavs and Bulgars; the poor condition of the fortifications may help to explain the capture of the city by Leo of Tripoli in 904; John Kaminiates (928–95) described the land walls as strong and high, whereas the sea wall was completely useless for defense. Eustathios of Thessalonike (Eust. Thess., Capture 74.17–19), writing in the 12th C., emphasized that the sea walls were built "nonprofessionally" and were allowed to fall into disrepair by the governor. Repairs are attested in the 12th C. and again under Manuel II, probably between 1269 and 1373.


−T.E.G.

THESSALONIKE, THEME OF. The letter of Emp. Michael II to Louis the Pious in 824 mentions partes of Thrace, Macedonia, Thessalonike, and neighboring Scvennia (MGH Leges. III. Concilia 2.2:476), evidence used by some scholars (e.g. Oikonomides, Lists 353) to argue that the theme existed at that time. The strategos of Thessalonike is first mentioned ca.896. He was replaced by a doux mentioned in the 10th-C. Taktikon of Escorial, and according to an act of 995 the doux John Chaldos held command of Armeniakon, Boukelarion, and Thessalonike (Iovra, no.8.1–2). In the 11th C. the doukaton of Thessalonike was usually granted to relatives of the emperor because of its strategic importance (Skabalović, Gosudarstvo 223). The theme survived through the 15th C.; a praktikon of 1420 defines it as "the theme of the divinely protected and famous city of Thessalonike" (Laura 3, no.165.9–10); in the early 15th C. the district was probably limited to the city itself.

−T.E.G., A.K.

THESSALY (Θεσσαλία), region of central Greece south of Macedonia, north of Hellas, and on the west separated from Epiros by the Pindos Mountains. Thessaly is characterized by a large central plain formed by the Peneios River and surrounded on all sides by high mountains. The main city was always Larissa, other important centers being Trikkala and Stagoi in the west, Lamia and Neopatras in the south, and Demetrias and Nea Anchialos on the sea to the east. The major north-south road ran from Thermopylae north to Larissa, continuing to Macedonia, either through Servia or along the coast to Thessalonike; the main east-west road ran to Trikkala and thence either north to Grevena and Kastoria or west to the pass of Porta, or, in the summer months, over the pass of Metsovo. In late antiquity the province of Thessaly possessed 16 cities, including the islands of Skiathos, Skopelos, and Pepariosthos (Hierokl. 642.1–13, 643.1–5). In the 6th–8th C. Slavs settled in the north and northwest, and Vlachs were established in large numbers by the 11th C., forming a separate administrative subdivision, the Megale Vlachia.

According to Abromea (infra 119–84), five Thessalian cities disappeared from the sources after the 7th C., seven (Larissa, Trikkala, Demetrias, etc.) continued to exist, and at least nine were built from the 9th C. onward (Halmynos, Stagoi, etc.). In fact, however, the continuity of urban life in Thessaly is less evident (A. Kazhdan, Byzantina 11 [1982] 433–35). In the 12th C. trade seems to have been important in Thessaly, and the Treaty of 1198 gave the Venetians trading privileges in many places. There were Jewish communities at Gardiki, Halmynos, Lamia, and Bësaina. The area was subjected to hostile invasions; esp. serious were those of the Bulgarians in the 10th C. and the Normans in 1082.

After 1204 the Latins controlled the eastern cities while the west seems to have been independent. The area was contested by the Epirots and Nicaeans, but John I Doukas (1267/8–89?), assuming the title sebastokrator, established an independent principality in Thessaly with a capital in Neopatras; he expanded his territory to the east, thus becoming involved in conflict with Michael VIII; with the help of Charles I of Anjou and the Latin dukes of Athens he managed to repel Byz. attacks. John II (1303–18) was also Western-oriented and sought the support of the Venetians, who were importing agricultural produce from Thessaly. The invasion of the Catalan Grand Company in 1309 was detrimental for Thessaly;
after John II’s death the Company occupied the south of the country, including Neopatras and Lamia. Stephen Gabrielopoulos preserved the independence of Thessaly until 1332/3, but thereafter it fell to John II Orsini of Epiros and in 1335 to Constantinople. Large landholding developed in Thessaly, acquiring a semifudal character, and Thessalian seigneurs supported John VI Kantakouzenos in his struggle for power. A. Soloviev (BS 4 [1932] 159–74) hypothesized that these feudal forces allowed Thessaly to resist the attacks of Stefan Uros IV Dušan. In 1348, however, the Thessalian seigneurs acknowledged Serbian sovereignty while retaining their traditional privileges. After Dušan’s death Thessaly formed the center of the domain of the “emperor” Symeon Uroš; this Serbian ruler encouraged the (at least external) hellenization of the country. When his son and heir John Uroš retired to a monastery in 1373, power was seized by the caesar Alexios Angelos Philanthropenos, who governed Thessaly as a vassal of John V. In 1393 the Ottomans conquered Thessaly.

In ecclesiastical terminology the name Thessalia and derivations were applied (esp. in the 12th C.) to Thessalonike, and its metropolitans were called “of the Thessalians” (e.g., Laurent, Corpus 5.1, nos. 459, 461).

Byz. fortifications can be found at several places in Thessaly (e.g., Trikkala, Larissa, and Lamia), and there are important churches at Porta Panagia (founded in 1283 by John I Doukas: A. Orlandos, ABME 1 [1935] 5–40) and Stagioi; Nea Anchialos and Demetrias preserve the ruins of many Early Christian buildings, while the monasteries at Meteora and the ruined, largely 14th-C. city at Phanarion are esp. noteworthy. Architecturally, the churches of Thessaly were influenced by currents from Macedonia, although in the 13th–14th C. there were also borrowings from Epiros.


THEURGY (θεουργία) originally signified activity undertaken with the help of the gods, that is, coercion exerted on the gods by performing magical rites. Theurgy appears chiefly in religious Neoplatonism (particularly in Iamblichus, unlike the more cautious Porphyry) and is applied in the discipline of a religious philosophy of nature.

Rites of theurgy were performed for three different purposes: (1) in order to bring divine power into the soul of the celebrant, the “theurge,” who thereby obtains salvation; (2) in order to “animate” statues of the gods with divine reality so that the initiate may perceive the Godhead; or (3) in order to conjure up the divinity itself—esp. the goddess Hekate—through a medium induced into trance by the “theurge.”

However, when prayer is introduced as an element of theurgy, it no longer has the sense of coercion exerted on the deity through magic. The philosophical basis of prayer, at least in Proklos, shows that prayer is the way to union with the deity corresponding to religious contemplation: “It is fitting that we men should pray for our return to our true fathers, the gods” (Proklos, In Platonis Timaeum, ed. Diehl, 1:208.13–14).

Because of his dependence on Proklos it is not surprising that pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite applied theurgy terminology in a Christian context to explain the works of God as well as the performance of the sacraments. Nevertheless, this does not become dominant in the theological terminology of Byz. In the 11th C., owing to the greater awareness of Neoplatonic sources as well as the Chaldean oracles, the phenomenon of theurgical ritual holds no more than literary interest and, in Christian understanding, belongs to magic and incantation.


-K.-H.U.

THEVESTE (Τεβέστη; mod. Tebessa, in southeastern Algeria). The history of the city from Diocletian to the Byz. reconquest of Africa (533) is not well known. Some fragmentary inscriptions attest to repairs or restoration of the theater, arch of Caracalla, public baths, and amphitheater as
well as to the construction of certain unidentified public works. In the early 5th C., a great basilican complex dedicated to Christ was erected north of the town, including gardens, martyrion, baptistery, stables, and lodgings; a smaller basilica was added in the 6th C. The complex probably served as a sort of martyrs’ shrine for pilgrims and, to a lesser degree, as a monastery. Vandal occupation of the city is attested by funeral epitaphs. The recent discovery of two cemeteries belonging to the 4th–6th C. indicates the continuity of urban life at Theveste despite the claim of the Justinianic general SOLOMON that he rebuilt Theveste a fundamentis. Solomon’s effort primarily involved enclosing the old urban center with a wall measuring 290 × 260 m. There is some archaeological evidence for 6th-C. habitation in the Roman amphitheater and at least one church appears to have been constructed within the enceinte. Theveste is mentioned by the 7th-C. geographer GEORGE OF CYPRUS, but between then and the 11th C., when it was described as a thriving town by Arab geographers, its history is unknown. The ALBERTINI TABLETS, deeds of sale dating from the Vandal period, were found in the hills to the east of Theveste.


THINGS, MOVABLE AND IMMOVABLE. The classification of things into movable and immovable acquired significance in various ways: in the acquisition of ownership by occupation, for example, the time limit for movable things was significantly shorter than for immovable things (see LONGI TEMPORIS PRAEScriptio). Immovable things, that is, land and the buildings erected on it, were more affected by limitations on their free disposal than were movable things. There is evidence for four types of restricted disposal: (1) the landed property of the church or a monastery could be given in lease and in EMPHYTEUSIS but in principle could not be alienated (Nov. Just. 7 and 120 = Basil. 5.2.1–7 and 9–13); (2) parcels of land which were a part of a dowry could be sold or pledged by the husband or the wife only under certain conditions (Cod. Just. V 13.1.15 = Basil. 29.1.119.15); (3) STRATIOTIKA ktemata were—at least from the 10th C. onward—basically excluded from salable property; (4) finally, the agrarian legislation of the 10th C. (see PROTIMESIS; Dynamoi) considerably limited the uncontrolled transfer of land by excluding certain groups of people from the ranks of potential buyers. Movable things were less frequently affected by such limitations. The so-called res sacra, religiosa, and sancta (Theophilos, Institutes 2.1.7–10) were completely removed from private ownership and hence from disposal. Accordingly the movable property of the church could not be alienated, except in case of emergency, as happened under Herakleios or Alexios I Komnenos. —M.Th.F.

THIRD ECUMENICAL COUNCIL. See Ephe- sus, COUNCIL OF: Council of 431.
THOMAIS OF LESBOS, saint; born Lesbos 10th C. (?), died Constantinople at age 38 on 1 Jan. Thomas (Θωμᾶς) was the daughter of a prosperous couple who had long remained childless. From Lesbos the family moved to the shores of the Bosporos. Despite her desire to remain virgin, Thomas was married at 24 to a certain Stephen. He proved to be a cruel husband who beat her and discouraged her charitable activities. Thomas's anonymous Life, preserved only in a 14th-C. MS, contains an invocation addressed to a porphyrogenetos ruler named Romanos (241 E). If the term porphyrogenetos is a true epithet and not mere flattery, the emperor in question should be Romanos II, although the notice that the monastery of the Hodegon is now called Hodegetria (238 B) seems to indicate a later origin of the vita. The author is well informed about Constantinople and mentions several of its monuments (Church of St. Michael tes Oxeias, convent of τὰ Μικρὰ Ῥώμαιον), but in general the vita is poor in data. It consists of two sections: a very conventional biography of Thomas and a description of her posthumous miracles. The vita resembles that of Mary the Younger in that it recounts the fate of a simple woman married to a brute; the hagiographer stresses that Thomas was not only virtuous but also beautiful. Secondary personages such as a licentious woman and a prostitute are introduced to contrast with Thomas. An enkomion of Thomas by Constantine Akropolites also survives.

Sources. AASS Nov. 4:234–46.

A.K.

THOMAS (Θωμᾶς), apostle and saint; feastday in Constantinople 6 Oct. In the Gospel of John, “doubting Thomas” is presented as having a confused understanding of Christ’s mission. Thomas’s name is connected with a Gnostic Gospel from NAG HAMMADI, consisting primarily of Christ’s sayings, and with the Gnostic or Manichaean Acts that relates how Thomas was bought by a merchant and taken to the kingdom of Goundaphoros in India, where he worked many miracles, evangelized the country, and died as a martyr. General consensus has it that the Acts of Thomas was written in Syriac and eventually translated into Greek. Another apocryphal Gospel of Thomas describes Christ’s infancy and miracles performed by him; it is possible that the author experienced some Buddhist influence. The Apocalypse of Thomas was rejected by the Decretum Gelasianum; its Greek original is lost, but Latin versions survive. The Acts and the Infancy Gospel are known in many languages, including Armenian (G. Garitte, Muséon 84 [1971] 151–95), Ethiopic, Old Slavonic, and so forth.

At least three churches dedicated to Thomas are known in Constantinople (Janin, Églises CP 248–52). A lection (Jn 20:19–31) for the first Sunday after Easter recalls Thomas’s doubt. As one of the “lesser” apostles, he is usually found represented in the same collegial contexts as Andrew, although from the 9th C. onward Thomas’s incredulity toward the risen Christ was the subject of mosaics (e.g., Daphni), ivories, and MS illustration.


J.L., A.K., A.C.

THOMAS AQUINAS. See Aquinas, Thomas.

THOMAS MAGISTROS, philologist and writer; monastic name Theodoulos; born Thessalonike ca. 1275?, died Thessalonike soon after 1347. Thomas spent his entire career in Thessalonike. Among his students were divergent personalities such as Philotheos Kokkinos, Demetrios Trikalinos, and Gregory Akindynos. Sometime between 1314 and 1318 he went to Constantinople on an embassy to Andronikos II. His letter describing his trip (ed. M. Treu in Jahrbuch für classische Philologie, supp., vol. 27 [1902] 5–30) provides useful information on travel by sea and trade. The purpose of his mission was to deliver an oration on behalf of the general Chandrenos, who had valiantly defended Thessalonike against the “Italoi” (Catalans), “Persai” (Turks), and “Tribaloi” (Serbs) but was falsely accused of treason. Despite continuing eye problems that eventually led to blindness, Thomas was a productive scholar. He compiled a Selection (Ekoğe) of Attic Names and Words with explanations and references to ancient authors; he produced scholia on Pindar, Aeschy-

His rhetorical writings are often devoted to the past, both Christian (panegyric of Gregory of Nazianzos) and classical (the battle of Marathon); even his works on contemporary subjects are often imitative or teeming with classical allusions and citations. In fact, as F.W. Lenz has shown (*APh* 63 [1942] 154–73), two of his orations, the so-called “Leptinean Declamations,” were erroneously attributed to Ailos Aristides. Some of them are dry *enkemia*, such as the speech to the *megas domestikos* (John Kantakouzenos?). Others, like his defense of Chandrenos, contain vague descriptions of political events; in a letter to a *megas logothetes*, full of references to figures such as Aeschylus, Demosthenes, and Lykourgos, Thomas describes the civil war in Thessalonike (PG 145:408f). One of his two surviving political treatises, *On the Political Structure*, expresses sympathy not for poor people, good-for-nothings “worth-three-obols,” but for the owners of houses, fields, and ancestral graves (521B). The other, a *Mirror of Princes* entitled *On the Imperial Office*, alongside traditional clichés, proposes that the emperor should be a “lover of war” (*philopolemos*) in order to have peace (457C). Thomas also recommends moderate taxation and “marvelous eleutheria” (freedom) for the subjects (465D).


—A.K., A.M.T.

**THOMAS MOROSINI**, first Latin patriarch of Constantinople (from the end of 1204); born between 1170 and 1175, died Thessalonike June/July 1211. A member of a distinguished Venetian family, he was a subdeacon of Pope Innocent III studying in Ravenna when unexpectedly the all-Venetian cathedral chapter of Hagia Sophia elected him patriarch after the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 and the establishment of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. Although Innocent proclaimed the election uncanonical, nonetheless he received Thomas in Rome, rapidly promoted him to deacon, priest, bishop, and archbishop, and confirmed his election in March 1205. Upon arrival in Constantinople in mid-summer of 1205 Thomas encountered serious problems: the resistance of the Greek clergy, the refusal of the French Crusaders to acknowledge his position, the hostile attitude of the Latin emperor, and the greed of the Venetians. The ill-tempered Thomas only exacerbated the situation. He failed to achieve reconciliation with the Greeks and temporarily stopped Greek services in Constantinople when the Orthodox priests omitted his name from their prayers; most Greek bishops refused obedience to him. The pope tried to use Thomas in the interests of the papacy, playing him against all the parties, granting him various superficial privileges and at the same time belittling him. The most heated dispute centered on Thomas’s oath to admit only Venetian canons into the cathedral chapter and to promote only Venetians as archbishops; the pope made him renounce his pledge on 15 Dec. 1208. Thomas also quarreled with the Venetian podesta over the possession of the Hodegetria icon (R.L. Wolff, *Traditio* 6 [1948] 319–23). The patriarch was accused by the French of appropriating enormous sums (100,000 marks) from the treasury of Hagia Sophia; he acknowledged taking 18,000 marks. He quarreled with the French and Emp. Henry about jurisdiction over conventual churches. His policy contributed to the decline in respect for the Latin church in the conquered empire. A contemporary historian portrayed him as a very fat clean-shaven man, dressed in a tight-fitting garment (Nik.Chon. 623:73–79, 647:8–14).


—A.K.

**THOMAS PALAILOGOS**, despotes of Morea (1428/30–1460); born Constantinople 1409, died Rome 12 May 1465. He shared power with his brothers Theodore II and Constantine (XI) from 1428 to 1443, with Constantine from 1443 to
1449, and with Demetrios from 1449 to 1460. Youngest son of Manuel II, Thomas was sent to the Morea in 1418, probably in training as a future despotes. In 1436, Thomas married Caterina, daughter of Centurione Zaccaria, and by 1432 controlled all Zaccaria's territory in Achaia and Arkadia. The same year Thomas handed over his capital at Kalavryta to Constantine in exchange for Chlemoutsi. When Theodore II left for Selymbria in 1439, Constantine and Thomas divided the Morea; Thomas received the less important appanage and probably resided at Leonarton. The final years of his despotate were marked by conflicts with his brother Demetrios. Unlike the pro-Turkish Demetrios, Thomas was a Latinophile who sought alliances with the papacy and the Italian states. During the campaign of Mehmed II that resulted in the Ottoman conquest of the Morea, Thomas fled to Keryra (July 1460) and then to Rome (1461), where he lived until his death, supported by a pension from Pope Pius II (1458–64). His lineage continued in Russia through the marriage of his daughter Zoe (Sophia Palaiologina) to Ivan III in 1472.

LIT. Zakynthinos, Despotat 1:116ff, 184, 204–97, 351–58. Papadopoulos, Genealogie, no.98. PLP, no.21470. –A.M.T.

THOMAS PRELJUBOVIĆ, also called Thomas Komnenos Preljub (Πρεύξων in Laura 3, no.146.4) and Thomas Komnenos Palaiologos, Serbian despotes of Ioannina (from 1366/7); died Ioannina 23 Dec. 1384. Son of the caesar Gregory Preljub, who served Stefan Uroš IV Dušan as governor of Thessaly, he married Maria Angelina Doukaina Palaiologina (Polemis, Doukai 100, no.59), a daughter of Symeon Uroš. In 1366/7 he entered Ioannina with Serbian forces to protect the local populace against Albanian attacks. He then took control of northern Epirus, while the southern part of the region remained in the hands of the Albanian rulers Ghin Bua Spata and Peter LJša. Thomas eventually won the war against the Albanians with the help of the Ottomans. He calls himself despotes in an act of 1375; in 1382 the title was confirmed by the Byz. emperor.

The 15th-C. Chronicle of Ioannina, which is hostile toward Thomas, but favorable to his wife, depicts him as a greedy tyrant, who persecuted local ecclesiastical authorities, confiscated their lands, and heavily taxed the nobility, who responded with a series of revolts. According to the Chronicle, he was assassinated by members of his bodyguard under suspicious circumstances. His wife remarried almost immediately, in Jan. 1385, taking as her second husband Esau Buonelmonti, a nobleman of Florentine origin and a relative of the Acciaiuoli, who succeeded Thomas as despotes until ca.1408–11. The "basilissa" Maria died on 28 Dec. 1394, probably in Ioannina.

A reliquary-diptych in the Spanish cathedral of Cuenca bears images of Christ, the Virgin, and 28 saints (Beckwith, ECB, pl.287). The figures of the two kiotors have virtually disappeared, but inscriptions preserve their names—the basilissa Maria Angelina Doukaina Palaiologina and the despotes Thomas Komnenos Palaiologos. According to Beckwith (ibid., 152) the diptych reproduced another diptych (of which only one leaf survives) presented by Maria to the monastery of the Transfiguration at Meteora, the second kiotor of which had been her brother, John-Ioasaph Uroš. The same monastery contains an icon of the Incredulity of Thomas, which likewise bears portraits of Thomas Preljubović and Maria.


THOMAS THE ARCHDEACON, Dalmatian chronicler; born Split ca.1200, died 8 May 1268. After studying law and theology in Bologna, Thomas became a notary and canon in Split in 1227, and from 1230 archdeacon. A prominent figure in the political and ecclesiastical leadership, he defended the autonomy of the city against the Hungarian monarchy and Croatian feudal magnates and the right of the clergy to elect their bishop without lay participation. His Historia Salona, in Latin, recounts the history of SALONA and neighboring Split from Roman times to 1266. For the earlier period it draws on lost Croatian sources as well as on legendary material; for the later years Thomas is an eyewitness and often a participant in the events which he narrates. A variant recension, the Historia Salona, may be either a reworking by a later editor or an earlier draft by the author.
THOMAS THE SLAV, leader of a rebellion; born ca. 760, died Arkadiopolis Oct. 823. He was called "the Slav" because he came from a "Scythian" family dwelling in Pontos near Gaziura (M. Rajković, ZRV I 2 [1953] 33–38). J.B. Bury (ERE 84) speculates that he came to Constantinople and worked for a patrikios but fled to the Arabs ca. 788 because of some scandal involving his master's wife. Yet in 803 Thomas was serving in the Anatolian theme under Bardanes Tourkos, and he fled to the Arabs only after the rebellion of Bardanes failed. Leo V recalled him in 813 and made him tournarches of the foederati in the Anatolikon. In winter 820/1 Thomas rebelled. Some scholars accept the testimony of Genesios, Theophanes Continuatus, and a letter from Michael II to Louis the Pious and believe that Thomas revolted against Leo V (A. Kazhdan, VizVrem 30 [1969] 279f). Others follow the chronology of Symeon Logothete and assert that Thomas rebelled only after Michael II assassinated Leo in Dec. 820 (W. Treadgold, DOP 33 [1979] 167).

Posing as the late Constantine VI and entrusting command of his army to a man he adopted and named Constantius, Thomas rallied supporters from all the Asian themes except Opsikion and Armeniakon. He made an alliance with Caliph Ma'mūn, who recognized him as emperor and allowed the Melchite patriarchy Job of Antioch (819/4–844/5) to crown him basileus in return for Thomas's promise to surrender certain territory and pay tribute to the caliph. Thomas marched on Constantinople and, aided by the Aegean and Kibyrrhaiaiatai themes, besieged it from Dec. 821 to spring 823, when an assault by the Bulgarian khan Omurtag forced him to retreat (P. Tivčev, IstPreg 25.5 [1969] 68–75). A subsequent attack by Michael II compelled Thomas to seek refuge in Arkadiopolis, where in mid-Oct. he was handed over to the emperor and executed. The last of the great thematic rebellions, Thomas's revolt has been variously attributed to a reaction against Iconoclasm, a social revolution and popular uprising, a revolt by the empire's non-Greek ethnic groups, Thomas's personal ambitions, and his desire to avenge Leo V. The entire episode is given unusually rich treatment in the illustrated Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussac, Skylitzës, nos. 56–78).

THORAKION. See LOROS.

THOROS I. See RUBENIDS.

THrace (Θρᾴκη), in late antiquity a region bordered by the Balkan Mountains, the Black Sea, the Sea of Marmara, and the Nestos River. In the 4th–7th C. the term designated (1) the traditional Thracian territory, (2) the province of Thracia, and (3) the diocese of Thracie (plural), embracing the provinces of Europa, Thracia, Haemimontus, Rhodope, Moesia II, and Scythia. Hierokles listed five major cities in Thrace proper: Philippopolis (capital), Augusta Traiana, Diokeleia, Sebastopolis, and Diospolis. The supreme military commander in the diocese of Thrace was the magister militum for Thrace. In the 6th C., after the construction of the Long Wall in Thrace to protect Constantinople from barbarian invasions, the office of the vicarius of the Long Wall was created. In the 4th through 7th C. the diocese of Thrace was invaded by Goths, Huns, Slavs, and other peoples; finally the Slavs and Bulgars settled in the area, almost all the cities were deserted, and the Thracian population retreated to the mountains. The metropolitan see of Thrace was located in Philippopolis.

By the end of the 7th C. the administration of Thrace changed. In 680/1 the patrikios Theodore was komes of Opsikion and hypostategos of Thrace (Mansi 11:209A); it is unclear whether this combined title indicates that Theodore held command of the two themes, Opsikion and Thrace, or whether the district of Thrace was joined to neighboring Opsikion. No clearer is the evidence of a seal of the early 8th C., with the name of Barasbakourios, komes of Opsikion and strategos (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 3081); that he was strategos of the theme of Thrace is a sheer guess, unsupported by any source. In 740 a certain Nikephoros was a commander of Thrace (Theoph. 415.13–14)—probably of the theme of Thrace. Seals of
8th-C. strategoi of Thrace are known (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 1744, 2486, 2671), and Thrace is in the lists of themes (between Paphlagonia and Macedonia) in the 9th-C. Taktikon of Uspenski; in the 10th-C. Taktikon of Escurial it is combined with Ioannopolis. From the 11th C. Thrace as an administrative unit usually appears combined with Macedonia under the command of the same strategos. Thrace seems to have later disappeared from official administrative nomenclature, but the term was broadly used by some antiquarian writers such as Kantakouzenos and Kritouboulos.


—T.E.G.

THRACIANS (Θρακες), the autochthonous population of the northern Balkan peninsula, residing between Mt. Haimos and the Lower Danube; their neighbors to the west were Illyrians, to the northwest Daco-Getans. This people consisted of many tribes, of which the Bessoi (or at least their name) survived through the late Roman Empire. Conquered by the Romans, the Thracians were romanized and in part hellenized, but rural inhabitants preserved their original language (still in the 6th C. called “the language of the Bessoi”) and up to the 5th C. their religion. In the 4th–5th C. the area underwent many hostile invasions and the settlement of various foederati; intermarriages with Germanic, Alan, Sarmatian, and other settlers made the ethnic pattern of the region even more complex. The free peasantry played an essential role among the Thracians; Justinian I in novel 34 speaks of Thracian coloni as owners of their land. Thracians actively participated in the political life of the empire in the 5th–6th C. (V. Beševliev, IzvInstBülgist 1–2 [1951] 217–34)—Theophanes explicitly calls the emperors Leo I, Justin II, and Tiberios I “Thracian by birth.” The ethnic name Thracian (often linked to that of Illyrians) was used in Byz. texts through the early 7th C.—later only as an archaism (V. Tăpkova-Zaimova, Thracia 1 [1972] 223–30); it was preserved, however, in administrative nomenclature as THRACE (Thracia) and THRAKESION. The Thracian substratum participated in the formation of the Bulgarian and Rumanian peoples.


—A.K.

THRAKESION (Θρακησίων), theme of western Asia Minor, apparently named from a body of Thracian troops settled there. The first name appears in reference to Pope Conon (686–87), who was descended “patre Thracesio” (Lib.Pont. 1:368). A tourmarches of Thraikesion is mentioned in 711, a strategos in 741. Thraikesion has generally been regarded as a creation of the early 8th C., having formerly been a tourma of the Anatolikon theme; recent theories, however, make it one of the original themes of Anatolia. It comprised the rich Aegean territories of Ionia and Lydia, with parts of Phrygia and Caria. It contained 20 cities, of which the largest was Ephesus; its capital may have been at CHONAI. The strategos of Thraikesion commanded 10,000 troops and drew a salary of 40 pounds of gold. In the 12th–13th C. a doux administered the province, which included the region of Smyrna, Ephesus, and the Hermus valley, from his headquarters at PHILADELPHIA (C. Foss, Byzantine and Turkish Sardis [Cambridge, Mass., 1976] 164, n.45). As the empire shrank, the importance of the theme as a bulwark against the Turks grew. It survived as long as Byz. rule in the area; its last doux, of the early 14th C., controlled only the district around Smyrna.


—C.F.

THREE CHAPTERS, AFFAIR OF THE, controversy concerning the person and the work of THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA, THEODORET OF CYRHIUS, and IBAS OF EDESSA. Although representatives of the ANTIOCHENE SCHOOL, these 4th- and 5th-C. theologians were tolerated by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 and died at peace with the church. In the 6th C., however, they came to be vehemently opposed by the Monophysites (see MONOPHYSITISM) as tainted with NESTORIANISM; condemnation of the Three Chapters (i.e., the writings of the three theologians) was seen as a means to sidestep the decisions of Chalcedon.
Convinced that condemnation of the Three Chapters might bring about reunion with the Monophysites, Justinian I composed a theological treatise to this effect and issued it, on his own authority, as an imperial edict between 543 and 545. The edict was generally well received in the East, but there was great agitation in the West, with Pope Vigilius first condemning, then accepting the imperial decree. At the Second Council of Constantinople in 553 (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF) the Three Chapters, as well as ORIGEN, were again condemned and Vigilius once more expressed his reservations. The pope ultimately accepted the decisions of the council, but there was never full agreement in the West. In the East the condemnation of the Three Chapters had little effect, as the Monophysites remained unmoved.

Both Latin and Slavic sources (Majeska, Russian Travelers 329) report that the bodies of the Three Hebrews were in the monastery of St. Romanos in Constantinople, along with those of Daniel and Habakkuk. At the joint commemoration of the Three Hebrews and Daniel in Constantinople, the liturgical drama of The Three Holy Children was performed. Bertrand de La Broquière (Le voyage d'Outremer de Bertrand de la Broquière [Paris 1892]; rp. Farnborough 1972) 154–56) mentions seeing such a play there in 1432 or 1433; Symeon of Thessalonike (PG 155:113D) describes a similar play (S. Baud-Bovy, Hellenika 28 [1975] 333f). The four extant MSS of such a play date to the 15th–17th C. (M.M. Velimirović, DOP 16 [1962] 353–55).

**Representation in Art.** The scene of the three ORANT figures, usually in Persian garb and often accompanied by the angel, was already popular in decorations of the catacombs and sarcophagi, partly because of its role in the Commendatio animae. Later it was rarely used except as one of the standard Ode illustrations. The saint unscathed in a fiery furnace is a hagiographic topos (F. Halkin, AB 70 [1952] 251) that frequently recalls the language and details of the Septuagint account (see, e.g., Symeon Metaphrastes’ accounts of Sts. Eustratios, Barbara, Plato). MS illustrators also patterned such fiery torments on the experience of the Three Hebrews (e.g., St. Eustratios—K. Weitzmann, DOP 33 [1979] 105, pl.27).

**THRENOs (θρῆνος, “lament”),** a term usually applied to vernacular poems in POLITICAL VERSE mourning the fate that befell Byz. at the hands of the Turks and lamenting lost glories (a prose lament in learned language would be termed a monody). The threnoi that refer to Constantinople include The Conquest of Constantinople (Halosis Konstantinopolos), calling for aid from the European nations and perhaps written in 1453, and the Anakalema tes Konstantinopolos, also from the 15th C., a dialogue between two ships bringing news of the sack of the city and perhaps based on a tragoudi. In dialogue form are the Lament of the
Four Patriarchates (Threnos ton Tessaron Patrarcheion), in which the patriarchs of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria compete with tales of suffering and a lament between Venice and Byz.; the destruction of Athens in 1456 is mourned by the city itself in a short threnos. The Lament for Tamerlaine emphasizes the savagery of the Mongol invasions of 1402. Similar laments survive for the fall of Adrianople (1362) and of Trebizond (1461). All anonymous and most surviving in several differing versions, the threnoi (esp. those on Constantinople) are reflected in tragoudia collected in the 19th C., showing the profound effect of these events on popular consciousness.


THRESHING. After being reaped, sheaves of grain were carried to the threshing floor (halon). The Geoponika (bk.2.26.1) recommends building the threshing floor in a high place exposed to the wind. The Byz. did not beat the grain with flails but used cattle (predominantly oxen) to trample the sheaves; the threshing sled (doukane) was also used. Halonia are often mentioned in prakitika and other documents as reference points to indicate the location of a nearby field or house; thus, a charter of 1081 of Paul, the protos of Mt. Athos, mentions an old threshing floor on the Oxys hill (Xerop., no.6.39–40).

Images connected with threshing often appeared in Christian metaphors. The biblical saying (Dt 25:4), “You shall not muzzle an ox when it treads out the grain,” was commonly quoted (e.g., V. Vasil’evskij, ŽMNP 238 [1885] 236f). The metaphor of the separation of grain and chaff was even more common; thus Isidore of Pelousion (PG 78:2225A) called the community of the universal church a threshing floor, where we are cleansed of chaff. Epiphanius of Salamis (Panarion 2:305.5–6) called Christ “the primary offering of the threshing floor.”


THRONES (θρόνος, also καθέδρα, σέντης), the official seat of the emperor, as distinct from his ordinary seat, skhamnon (De cer. 178.4–5). It was often equipped with a footstool. The tradition of the throne as a divine and imperial symbol was firmly established in pagan antiquity and inherited by Constantine and his successors; it merged with the Jewish tradition of the throne of Solomon, which was allegedly restored by Emp. Theophilus. Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos records (De cer. 521.8–13) that on weekdays the emperor would sit in a golden chair (sellion) at the eastern (or right) side (?) of the throne in the Chrysotrikilinos to receive his courtiers; on Sundays and during the reception of foreign envoys, the sellion that he occupied was covered with silk and placed at the left side (?) of the throne. The perception of the throne as a divine attribute was esp. stressed during the celebration of Palm Sunday at the palace, when a deacon placed a Gospel book on the throne while the emperor stood in front of his seat (De cer. 175.15–16). Above the throne was a baldachin similar to a ciborium.

The term thronos was also employed for chairs of bishops and officials that were made of precious materials and richly ornamented (Koukoules, Bioso 2:7:79). The bishop’s throne was placed in the center of the priests’ seats at the east end of the church; it was considered the teacher’s seat, and the bishop preached from it.

The throne held a place of honor in Christian metaphor. Christ was conceived as the Father’s throne, and in this capacity was typified by the bema and the holy altar (trapeza). On the other hand, Christ shared the throne with the Father, thus symbolizing their equal dignity. The Heteromasia, the throne prepared for Christ’s Second Coming, was a frequent image in Byz. art. The plural form, thronoi, could denote the highest order of angels. The throne was a symbol of episcopal jurisdiction, Jerusalem and esp. Rome being called apostolic thrones; Rome was also the throne of the koryphaios, or chief of the apostles, that is, Peter (cf. Theodore of Stoudios, PG 99:1289D).

Representation in Art and Surviving Examples. The sella curulis is a distinct type of folding chair widely employed, esp. by consuls; their diptychs often depict this throne adorned with lion’s legs and heads. The so-called “lyre-backed” throne appears from the 5th C. onward, esp. in the monumental painting and coinage of the Macedonian dynasty (R. Cormack, E.J.W. Hawkins, DOP 31 [1977] 241–43). This form may derive from a mosaic in the Chrysotrikilinos of the Great Palace that shows Christ enthroned (Grier-
son, *DOC* 3:778–80). Tenth-century descriptions of the imperial “throne of Solomon” imply that it was accompanied by automata, lions that roared and struck the ground with their tails. Other imperial thrones recorded in the *De Ceremoniis* include those of Constantine I, Arkadios, and Theophilos. This implies that thrones of different dates continued to be employed in the Magnaura long after their construction.

Author portraits in Gospel book illumination depict thrones that can be classified into five groups, already known in Roman furniture: those with rectangular legs (*Athens Cat.*, pl.315); those with turned legs, often decorated with arcades, rows of balusters, and knobs (ibid., pls. 307, 314); thrones with crossed legs deriving from the *sella curulis* (H. Buchthal, H. Belting, *Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople* [Washington, D.C., 1978] pl.26); solid thrones with a rounded back, particularly in 13th- through 14th-C. MS illumination (*Athens Cat.*, pl.329); and “basket” thrones of plaited wicker (*Treasures*, pl.99).

The episcopal throne (cathedra) originally crowned the synthonron (Orlandos, *Palaitochr. basilike* 2.492) and was sometimes equipped with an axial staircase. This practice appears to have survived well into the 11th/12th C. (*ABME* 5 [1939–40] 161). Some Western sources refer to movable thrones placed between the altar and the bema doors. Episcopal thrones were often carved in wood; others, like the cathedra of Maximian in Ravenna, consist entirely of ivory and were probably more symbolic than functional. A dominant type with trapezoidal flanks is attested from at least the 7th C. onward. Most medieval examples, with the exception of the throne of Melegob (H. Rott, *Kleinaisatische Denkmäler* [Leipzig 1908] 285f, 294), survive in fragments. The association of numerous trapezoidal slabs of marble with such thrones has recently been disputed (Sodini-Kolokotsas, *Aliki II* 106).


**TIBERYDIDES**, Greek historian of the Peloponnesian war; born Athens ca.460 B.C., died Athens ca.400. Highbrow Byz. historians from Priskos of Panion to Kritoboulos were acquainted with Thucydides. They imitated his introductory remarks, his annalistic arrangement of history, his technique of introducing formal speeches into the narrative, and above all his phraseology whenever they chronicled similar events (e.g., a siege, an outbreak of an epidemic, or a civil war). In such cases, however, the imitation was confined to literary technique and involved neither a distortion of contemporary facts nor the acceptance of the historical outlook of Thucydides. Among his imitators were Prokopios and John VI Kantakouzenos.

Although Thucydides was highly regarded as a writer of the Attic dialect (cf. Gregory Pardos, ed. Schäfer, 7), his obscure and involved style drew mixed comments from Byz. critics. Psellos (Mayer, “Psellos’ Rede” 57–338–41) found his funeral orations inferior to those of Gregory of Nazianzos but admired Thucydides as a master of stylistic obscenity and condensation (ed. J.F. Boissonade in *De operatione daemonum* [Nuremberg 1838; rp. Amsterdam 1964] 50f). John Tzetzes, on the other hand, declared Thucydides worthy of “being thrown into the pit” because his style lacked clarity, persuasiveness, and charm (cf. B. Baldwin, *BZ* 75 [1982] 313–16). The *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitii* (pt.2, ed. A.G. Roos, 33–45) draws on Thucydides. The *Souda* includes his biography, and his earliest MS dates from the early 10th C. Possibly excepting Maximos Planoudes, no Palaiologan scholar is known to have engaged in textual criticism of Thucydides. The number of extant MSS indicates that Thucydides was more widely read than Herodotus.


**THUGHUR.** See ‘AWASIM AND THUGHUR.

**THURIBLE.** See CENSER.

**TIARA.** See CROWN.

**TIBERIOS I** (Tịbépos), also known as Tiberios II; emperor (from 26 Sept. 578); born Thrace mid-6th C., died Constantinople 14 Aug. 582.
Justin II's notary, handsome and young, Tiberios was promoted by SOPHIA, raised to caesar on 7 Dec. 574, and renamed Tiberios Constantine (or new Constantine). As Justin's co-ruler he remained under the strict supervision of Sophia but acquired a freer hand after being proclaimed augustus. He behaved as the master of a great empire, showed generosity in taxation, ordered construction works (notably, according to John of Ephesus, in the GREAT PALACE at Constantinople), and intervened in internal policy in Gaul and Spain. It remains questionable, however, whether Frankish agrarian legislation was influenced, as E. Stein (Klio 16 (1919) 72–74) thought, by the abolition of the EPIBOLE allegedly ordered by Tiberios. Personally tolerant, Tiberios still had to put up with persecutions of pagans and Monophysites. His major problems were wars against the Persians and Avars. After the success of his general JUSTINIAN at Melitene, the Byz. were routed in Armenia and the future Emp. Maurice, commanding in the East, was unable to curb the invasion of CHOSROES I. In the Balkans, Avar and Slav raids created a permanent tension, esp. when BAION took Sirmium. Tiberios kept Sophia's intrigues at bay and remained faithful to his wife Anastasia (whose pre-baptismal name was Illa); one of his daughters, Constantina, married Maurice. Although popular and well-intentioned, Tiberios had no long-range plan for the empire.


TIBERIOS II, emperor (698–705); baptismal name Apsimar; died Constantinople 15 Feb. (?) 706. He is not to be confused with Tiberios I, who is sometimes called Tiberios II. A noble of Gothic, Iranian, or possibly Armenian origins, Apsimar was dreungarios of the Kibyrrhaioi in 697 when he accompanied John Patrikios and a fleet sent by Leoentios to recapture North Africa. Upon John's murder in 698, Apsimar was proclaimed emperor as Tiberios. After a lengthy siege Tiberios took Constantinople with the help of the Green Faction and was crowned by Patri. Kallinikos (694–706). The little that is known of Tiberios's rule indicates that he worked to strengthen the empire militarily. He repaired Constantinople's sea walls (Preger, Scriptores 2:208.18–19). In 698 he repatriated Cypriots captured by the caliph 'ABD AL-MALIK to Cyprus (R. Jenkins in De adm. imp. 2:181) and reorganized its administration and defenses. He appointed his brother HERAKLEIOS MONOSTRATEGOS of an army that invaded Syria in 700, but Arab counterattacks subdued Armenia by 709/4. In Aug. 705 Tiberios fled Constanti- nople at Justinian II's advance but was soon arrested. After several months Tiberios, Herakleios, and Leontios were paraded through Constantinople and executed. Justinian spared Tiberios's son Theodosios, who later became bishop of Ephesus; some scholars believe he ruled as Theo- dosios III.


TILES (keraamidia) were the usual ceramic coverings for roofs. Most tiles were of the simple curved type: some nearly semicircular, some only slightly curved. Byz. tiles did not preserve the ancient distinction between pan and cover tiles; one tile placed with its convex surface upward was set over the joint between two tiles placed with their concave surface upward. Flat tiles, little different from bricks, were regularly used in masonry, fitted between courses of stones and occasionally arranged in decorative patterns; cut tiles were used in pseudo-Kufic designs and in dentil patterns and various geometric forms (see BRICKWORK TECHNIQUES). Most tiles were locally made. No detailed study of them has yet been made.

Tiles with glazed polychrome decoration were used as CERAMIC ARCHITECTURAL DECORATION, on icon frames, and, at one site, as pavement. Finds in the Baths of ZEUXIPPOS in Constantinople suggest their use in secular buildings. Figurative tiles have been unearthed at many sites in Constantinople, and at Preslav and Patleina in Bulgaria (see BULGARIAN ART AND ARCHITECTURE). Their decoration includes mixtures of floral and geometric designs and sometimes birds. Depictions of the Virgin, saints, or apostles appear on square tiles as busts, full figures, or in medallions. Several tiles could be used to form a single representation (K. Miatev, Monumenta Artis Bulgariae 4 [1936], pl.XIX). Inscriptions identifying the figures are in Greek or, on some Bulgarian tiles, in Slavonic or faulty Greek. Stratigraphic data and textual
sources place these tiles in the 9th to 11th C. Evidence of workshops has been found at Preslav, Patleina, Nicaea, and Nikomedia. A document of 1202, describing a church in Constantinople given to the Genoese (MM 3:55:13–14), refers to piers decorated with “tiles (tanstria) of Nikomedia.”


-T.E.G., S.M.C.

TIMARION, an anonymous satirical dialogue of the first half of the 12th C. Its authorship has been variously attributed to Prodromos (H. Hunger), Kallikles (E. Lipšič, R. Romano), and Michael Italikos (B. Baldwin). An imitation of Lucian, Timarion describes a journey to the netherworld by a certain Timarion who was mistaken for a corpse. The picture of the underworld is devoid of the tragical perception of the vita of Basil the Younger and mildly derivative of the habits and persons Timarion saw in the realm of the dead. Among the figures satirized are Greek mythological personages, ancient writers on medical subjects, and several Byz., such as Emp. Theophilos and Michael Psellos; the contemporary predilection for medical studies and current jurisprudence is ridiculed. The dialogue begins with a detailed description of the fair in Thessalonike—important evidence for Byz. trade—and with an elaborate eulogy of a member of the Palaiologos family which has been interpreted by M. Alexiou as a piece of irony in disguise (BMGS 8 [1982–83] 29–45). Constantine Akropolites severely censured Timarion (M. Treu, BZ 1 [1892] 361–65) for its allegedly anti-Christian attitude.


TIME (χρόνος). Olympiodorus of Alexandria (PG 93:508A) defined chronos as the interval during which something occurs and kairos, another term for time, as the period necessary for a certain action. Kairos was sometimes used as a synonym for chronos, sometimes contrasted with it, so that kairos acquired a more concrete and practical character. The measurement of time in Byz. was based on natural phenomena, such as the alternation between night and day or the change of seasons; this dependence of chronos on the movement of the sun, the moon, and other celestial bodies was stressed by the Eunomians, according to Basil the Great (PG 29:557C).

The major units of time—the day, month, seasons, and year—were derived from the observation of natural phenomena; the smaller divisions of the day—hours and watches (vigilæ) were corresponded to the needs of convenience. The week was determined by authority or tradition: the seven-day week was based on the Bible and on ancient astrology with its list of seven celestial bodies; even Christians could speak of the day of Aphrodite or the day of Helios (as reflected in Egyptian inscriptions); later, the Byz. preferred the numerical designation of days of the week—the second (Monday), the third (Tuesday), etc., up to Paraskeve (Friday), Sabbath (Saturday), and the Lord's or the first day (Sunday). Passage of the hours of the day was measured by a sundial or horologion, the passage of the days and months by a calendar.

Historical time was calculated in Byz. from the Creation and not from Christ’s birth, as in the West. The number of elapsed years between the Creation and the Incarnation was variously calculated, but the predominant figure for the Byzantine era came to be 5508. Christ's Second Coming or Parousia signified the end of time (sometimes measured at 7,000 or 8,000 years from the Creation), so that the history of mankind was conceived as developing within a limited framework of time with both beginning and end (see Eschatology). Even though the notion that cyclical historical time was predominant in antiquity has been questioned (A. Momigliano, History and Theory 5 [1966] 3–29), it was only in the Middle Ages that the linear perception of time became ubiquitous: the time of Byz. chronicles was open at one end and could be extended without difficulty by the simple addition of subsequent events. The time of historians was “material,” and chronology in itself conferred sense upon events, creating logical links between chronologically coinciding facts (J. Beaucamp et al., TM 7 [1979] 225f)—at least in works such as the Chronicon
Paschale and the Chronographia of Theophanes the Confessor.

The principle of the plain continuum of time (the narrative in Theophanes is organized by years) was not accepted by many historians, hagiographers, and the authors of romances or epics. “Narrative time” or “artistic time” often does not accord with chronological sequence of events: some historians destroyed the plain continuum by structuring the narrative not on the basis of chronology but of subject matter; storytellers were introduced to relate events that took place in the distant past, and some visions could reveal the future up to the Last Judgment; the literary device of iteration (artistic repetition) permitted returning to the same episode two or three times.


Philosophical and Theological Terminology of Time. According to the categories of Aristotle, time as an accident is itself unmoved, but it presupposes movement that in turn involves number, hence, a numerical entity. This philosophical definition, also common in Byz.—as in the 9th-C. Zacharias of Chalcedon (K. Oehler, Antike Philosophie und byzantinisches Mittelalter [Munich 1969] 300–08)—is extended by Gregory of Nyssa in the sense that man moves to perfection in an unending assimilation to the good that, in the final analysis, eliminates the distinction so important to Greek philosophy between rest and movement (Vita Mosi, 2.243, 1; ed. J. Daniélou [Paris 1968] 110). At the same time, the other apparently unresolved conflict between a linear and cyclical conception of time is overcome in Christian thought. The tension between creation and recapitulation, between beginning (arche) and end (telos) was united in both models of thought. For Byz. historiography the periodization of world history into four major kingdoms and a thousand-year reign of peace, which is rooted in various biblical interpretations (e.g., Dan 2 and 7; Rev 20, etc.), proved equally important.

The involvement of mankind in a world epoch corresponded, for the individual, to the division of his life into different periods. The church incorporated these views into the liturgical year (see Year, Liturgical), with its times of fasting and feasting, its times of baptism and commemoration of the dead. Monks and ascetics limited their concern for the body to a minimum in order to establish through fixed hours of prayer a maximum amount of meditation on the divine or the salvation of the soul. Brief episodes of participation in the life of God (mysticism) and above all the blessed hour of Death as the moment of birth into eternal life became for the mystically inclined monk the significant “heavenly time” of his life, which constitutes a continuous spiritual renewal.

Theologically, time was contrasted both with the aion that Maximos the Confessor (PG 91:1164BC) defines as chronos without movement, and with eternity, or divine timelessness. Time is a creature, and the Trinity is both before and beyond chronos and the aion (i.e., hyperchronios and hyperaionios); the Trinity is the creative cause (aitia poietike) of time which—by definition—is connected with such categories as “birth” and destruction (cf. Michael Psellos in L.G. Benakis, Philosophia 10/11 [1980–81] 398–421, and Nicholas of Methone, ed. Angelou, 7.20–22, 9.14).


TIMOTHEOS AILOUROS (Αιλούρος, lit. “cat” or “weasel”), Monophysite bishop of Alexandria (457–458/60, 476–77); a saint in the Coptic church; died Alexandria 31 July 477. His nickname was given him either because of his small stature or because he prowled the streets and monasteries spreading dissension. A priest under Dioskoros, Timotheos participated in the “Robber” Council of Ephesus in 449 and maintained his allegiance to Dioskoros after the Council of Chalcedon (451). Together with Peter Mongos, Timotheos organized the Monophysite opposition in Egypt. He had the support of the mob that killed his Orthodox rival Proterios, thus allowing him to become bishop. As a result of pressure from the Chalcedonians and esp. Pope Leo I, Emp. Leo I exiled Aliouros to Gangra sometime between 458 and 460 and to Cherson ca. 464/5. The usurper Basi-
Liskos recalled him from exile in 475, but Patr. Akakios remained his enemy. Having returned to Alexandria, Ailourios died before he could again be banished as the result of another reversal of policy under Emp. Zeno.

More politician than theologian, Ailourios tried to maintain a middle ground between the dyophytes and the followers of Eutyches. He rejected the concept of two natures in Christ but assumed that through his flesh Christ was related to mankind and that the Logos suffered on the cross as a result of the Incarnation. His writings, both letters (R.Y. Ebied, L.R. Wickham, *JThSt* 21 [1970] 321–69) and polemical works against the Council of Chalcedon and the *Tomus* of Pope Leo, have survived in Syriac and Armenian fragments. Ailourios is a rare polemicist who quoted his adversaries extensively before refuting them. A 9th-C. historian (Theoph. 111,9–11) accused him of falsifying unpublished works of Cyril of Alexandria—probably an attempt to exonerate the latter of pro-Monophysite sympathies.


—T.E.G.

**TIMOTHEOS OF GAZA**, grammaticos (Souda, ed. Adler. 4:557,9) and armchair zoologist; fl. ca. 491–518. A student of the Egyptian philosopher Horapollo, Timotheos reflected the approach to learning of the 9th-C. school of Gaza. He wrote a poem in four books on exotic animals, variously called *Indian Animals* or *Quadrupeds and Their Innately Wonderful Qualities or Stories about Animals*. He drew from several earlier sources, including Aristotle, Plutarch, Oppian, Aelian, and Philostratos, with passages culled from Nikander of Colophon, Pliny the Elder, Galen, and an early version of the *Physiologos*. The work survives only in a mid-11th-C. prose summary, dated by the scribe’s mention (ch.24) of the zoo of Constantine IX Monomachos. The work is a fine mélange of zoology and legend (e.g., ch.9, "The Tiger and the Griffin"). The chapter on "The Giraffe" gives valuable details on the transport of elephants and giraffes in the reign of Anastasios I, yet states that the giraffe is "produced by the intercourse of different animals" (24,1). John Tzetzes remarks that Timotheos, along with Aelian and Oppian, represents the best zoology (*Historiae* 4.166–69); apparently the prose summary of the *Animals* was widely used as a schoolbook and was enormously popular.


—J.S.

**TIMOTHEOS SALOPHAKIALOS** (Σαλοφακιάλος), Orthodox patriarch of Alexandria (spring 460–Feb. 482). His name reportedly meant “white cap” or more probably “wobble cap.” Initially a Pachomian monk at Canopus, Timotheos was consecrated patriarch after the exile of the Monophysite patriarch Timotheos Ailourios. Although a strict Chalcedonian in doctrine, he acted with forbearance toward Monophysitism. Still, his conciliatory nature did not please everyone. When he restored the name of Dioskoros to the diptychs, Rome protested. On Ailourios’s return from exile (475), Timotheos retired to his own monastery. When Ailourios died (31 July 477), he was reinstated. Zeno and Patr. Akakios of Constantinople continued to support him, although the Monophysites had in the meantime elected Peter Mongos as Ailourios’s successor. Since Timotheos wanted to have an Orthodox succeed to the see on his death, he sent John Talaia to Constantinople to speak with Zeno. The mission failed. In fact, Talaia had to agree not to seek the throne himself. As a consequence, on Timotheos’s death, his rival Mongos, having promised to support the emperor’s Henotikon, was recognized, while Talaia, who had himself elected by the Orthodox despite his pledge, was forced to flee to Rome. Mongos eventually struck Timotheos’s name from the diptychs, disinterred his body, and cast it outside the city walls.


—A.P.
TIMUR (Τεμιχρης, etc.), or Tamerlane, founder of a vast Turco-Mongol empire in Central and western Asia; born Kesh (near Samarkand) 1336, died Otrar (on the Sir Daryâ River) 18 Feb. 1405. From ca.1370 Timur ruled the decaying Chagatay khanate, and by 1399 his dominion extended from eastern Turkestan and northern India to Mesopotamia and the frontiers of Ottoman Anatolia. In these years Timur’s impact on Byz. affairs was minimal, although tales of his might had reached Constantinople. His clash with the Ottoman sultan BAYEZID I, coinciding with the latter’s siege of Constantinople, instantly brought Timur into the mainstream of Palaiologan politics. In 1399, when Bayezid expanded deep into eastern Anatolia, Timur replied by sacking Sivas. Although he then campaigned in northern Syria and Iraq, by summer 1401 he was again planning a major assault on the Ottomans. He then concluded agreements with John VII PALAIODOGOS and the Genoese, the latter promising to acknowledge his sovereignty and to provide financial and naval support in his war on Bayezid. His invasion of Anatolia in spring 1402 culminated in Bayezid’s defeat and capture at the battle of ANKARA on 28 July. Shortly thereafter the Turks abandoned the siege of Constantinople and peace was concluded between John VII and Bayezid’s son, SÜLEYMAN ÇELEBI. Timur remained in Anatolia until spring 1403, assaulting Smyrna in Dec. 1402 and otherwise reconstituting the traditional Turkish beyliks. During these months, John VII evidently acknowledged Timur’s suzerainty, but the khan did not attempt to secure direct control of Constantinople. Timur’s dismantling of Ottoman Anatolia and the accompanying succession strife among Bayezid’s sons (1402–13) allowed Byz. some political and military recovery in Thrace and Macedonia.

The contemporary Greeks perceived Timur as the tool of either God or the Virgin, dispatched to Asia Minor for the purpose of liquidating Bayezid and thereby ending his attack on Constantinople. Later historians such as Doukas and CHALKOKONDYLES likewise tend to develop Timur, in secular terms, as an essentially just antagonist of Bayezid. Their political viewpoint parallels that of the begs, who regarded Bayezid’s imperial ambitions as unjustified and deserving of chastisement.


-T.W.R.-

TIPOUKEITOS (Τιπούκειτος, “what is to be found where”), an “index” to the BASILICA produced probably toward the end of the 11th C. A judge by the name of Patzes is assumed to be the author. To his table of contents he added countless references with precise indication of their sources and, in the case of individual chapters, the actual incipit, thereby producing an aid to the Basilika that, in contrast to the SYNOPSIS BASILICORUM, could not be employed independently. Individual scholia to the Basilika are used in the form of terse comments and observations; moreover, there are occasional references to Eustathios RHOMAIOS and recent imperial legislation.


-L.B.-

TIRDATES THE GREAT. See TRDAT THE GREAT.

TITHE (δεκατεία, δέκατον, lit. “tenth”). Three different tithes are known in Byz.

1. There was the tithe on trade, that is, the KOMMERKION, and a more specific tithe collected on wine transported by sea to Constantinople (dekateia oinaron).

2. The tithe on land was basically the rent that the landowner collected from his tenants: 1/10 of the gross product (morte); or a rent collected for the pasture of animals—in reality paid by those who possessed such animals (ennomion and more specifically probatoennomion, choiroennomion, melissoennomion: rent paid by those who possessed sheep, pigs, or beehives).

3. In the 15th C., under Ottoman influence, a new dekaton (on wheat and on wine) appears in eastern Macedonia: a Byz. adaptation of the Muslim yer (10 percent or 7 percent of the produce, N. Oikonomides, SüdostF 45 [1986] 7–9).


TITLES. See Dignities and Titles.

TITLES, PURCHASE OF. Some honorific titles as well as active offices were bestowed by the emperor on individuals who had to pay a certain amount of cash in return. Not necessarily simple purchases, these were certainly not seen as signs of corruption. There were three main forms of purchase. (1) Farming out of offices, esp. those related to fiscal or economic activities (tax collection, trade monopolies such as those of the kommerkarioi), was a perennial practice, usually following a public auction. (2) Lifelong positions in the civil administration, such as those of notarii or chartoularioi, positions in the palace service or in public institutions, and many others were considered strateiai that could be acquired directly from their actual holder and transmitted in other ways (donation, exchange, dowry, etc.). (3) From the 8th to 11th C., several honorific titles (such as spatharios) were normally given by the emperor to individuals who paid in advance a large and variable amount of money and received in return the title accompanied by a yearly lifelong salary (roga) corresponding to 2.31 to 3.47 percent of the invested capital (the purchase of increases of the yearly salary was possible at much more profitable rates). The purchase of ecclesiastical titles was censured as simony.


TITULAR CHURCHES. The term titulus was applied to certain churches of Rome (titulus Anastasiae, titulus Pudentis), probably originally to indicate the owner of the property that came to house the church. Although titular churches are first mentioned only in the 4th C., some of the structures so designated are believed to have had roots in the pre-Constantinian period, and thus to constitute the oldest official Christian meeting places of the city, as archaeological evidence suggests (SS. Giovanni e Paolo; S. Martino ai Monti). Two synodal lists (499, 595), however, demonstrate that the number and identity of the titular churches changed in the course of time.

LIT. J.P. Kirsch, Die römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum (Paderborn 1918). –W.T.

TITULUS (Gr. τίτλος), term of Roman law that originally designated a dedicatory or honorific inscription on a temple, gravestone, or building, then a notice, label, or title; in a technical sense, it could mean the item of taxation and esp. the title of ownership (e.g., J.O. Tjäder, Die nichtliterarischen lateinischen Papyri Italiens, vol. 2 [Stockholm 1982] no.31.1.7, a.540). The term is conventionally used by art historians (1) to describe explanatory legends that accompany narrative or symbolic representations and (2) to indicate the title of a titular church.


TITUS (Τίτος), bishop of Bostra in Arabia; died before 378. Titus was bishop under Emp. Julian, who attacked him in a letter (ep.41, ed. Wright) of 1 Aug. 362 concerning civic disturbances in Bostra; he continued his post as bishop under Jovian. In 363 he took part in a synod at Antioch at which he signed a letter accepting the homousion. His major work was a polemic in four books against Manichaeanism, written after Julian’s death. It is wholly extant in a Syriac translation; the first half survives also in Greek. Titus argues that God’s justice is not incompatible with the existence of evil, the latter being not a substance but the product of human weakness and free will. Manichaean notions of conflict between the Dark and the Light and of matter and evil are combatted with ideas of divine providence and creation. Titus defends the divine inspiration of the Old Testament, while exposing in detail Manichaean interpretations of the Old Testament and interpolations into the New Testament. Valuable for its quotations and paraphrases of Mani, Titus’s book was much exploited in Byzantium. Byz. catenae also preserve fragments of his commentary on Luke; his sermon on Epiphany survives in Syriac fragments. The Oration on Palm Sunday attributed to Titus is spurious.

—B.B.

TMUTOROKAN (τὰ Μάτραχα), also Tmutorakan, city on the east side of the Crimean strait of Kerch, succeeding the ancient Greek colony of Hermonassa. Located apart from the main barbarian routes in the 4th C., Hermonassa suffered less than Tanais or the cities of the Crimea. Based on archaeological data, S.A. Pletneva (in Keramika, infra 63) divides the history of medieval Tmutorokan into six periods: post-Hunnic (5th–7th C.), Khazar (8th–mid-10th C.), Rus’ (mid-10th–11th C.), Cuman (12th–mid-13th C.), Tatar (mid-13th–beginning of 14th C.), and Genoese (14th–15th C.). The city flourished under Khazar rule when Saltovo ware dominated Tmutorokan ceramics. The city was governed by a municipal system, the head of which—balikki (lit. “fisherman”)—was appointed by the Khazars (V. Minorsky, WZKM 56 [1960] 131).

Raided by the Rus’ ca.925 (N. Golb, O. Pritsak, Khazarian Hebrew Documents [Ithaca, N.Y., 1982] 139–42), Tmutorokan became a part of the Kievan realm after 965. At that time ceramic imports decreased and dozens of Saltovo workshops were destroyed. A Greek element was active in 11th-C. Tmutorokan (E. Skrzynskaja, VisVrem 18 [1961] 74–84), and “Cuman Tmutorokan” was under Byz. administrative control. By the treaties of 1169 and 1192, Byz. forbade the Genoese to use the Tmutorokan harbor. The seal of Michael, archon of Zichia, Tmutorokan, and Khazarria” probably belonged to a Byz. governor of the Azov Sea region rather than to Oleg-Michael, the prince of Chernigov, as A. Soloviev (in 11 GEB [Munich 1960] 572f) suggested. Byz.’s special interest in Tmutorokan can be explained (G. Litavrin, Voprosy istorii, no.7 [1972] 39) by the oil wells in the area that provided Byz. with the raw materials for Greek fire.

From the end of the 10th C. onward, the autocephalous archbishopric of Tmutorokan and Zichia is recorded (Notitiae CP, no.8.120–21), and as late as the 1230s the Hungarian missionary Julian observed in Tmutorokan a population that “had Greek books and priests” (L. Bendefy, Fontes authentici itinera [1235–1238] Fr. Iuliani illustrantes [Budapest 1937] 22.6–9). In 1482 Tmutorokan was taken by the Ottomans.


—O.P.

TOCCO (Τόκκος), an Italian family, originally from Benevento, which played a prominent role in the Ionian islands and despotate of Epiros in the 14th and 15th C. The first member of the family to settle in Greece was Guglielmo Tocco (died 1335), who served as governor of Kerkyra for the Angevin Philip I of Taranto in the 1320s. In 1357 Robert of Taranto made Guglielmo’s son Leonardo I (died 1375/6) count of Cephalonia (Kefalenia) and Zante (Zakynthos). Leonardo extended his control to Leukas (1362) and Ithake. Leonardo’s two sons, Carlo I (died 1429) and Leonardo II (died 1418/19), are the heroes of the Chronicle of the Tocco. Carlo, who was married to Francesca Acciajuoli, daughter of Nerio I Acciajuoli, expanded his territory to the mainland by seizing Corinthe and Megara in 1395 after his father-in-law’s death (J. Chrysostomides, Byzantina 7 [1975] 81–110). By 1408 he had conquered Akarnania from the Albanians. After the death of his uncle Esau Buoncelmonti (see Epiros) in 1411, Carlo succeeded him as despotes of Ioannina and in 1416 acquired Arta as well. Until his death he ruled as the last true despotes of Epiros, the rank Manuel II conferred on him in 1415. After 1429 the despotate, a subject of dispute between the illegitimate sons of Carlo I and his nephew Carlo II, fell apart again. Carlo II surrendered Ioannina to the Turks in 1430 but remained lord of Arta until he died in 1448. Arta fell in 1449. By ca.1460 Carlo’s son Leonardo III (died 1494) retreated to the Ionian islands, the last remaining Christian territory in Greece, until they were in turn captured by the Ottomans in 1479. (See genealogical table.)


—A.M.T.
THE TOCCO FAMILY IN THE IONIAN ISLANDS AND EPIROS
IN THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guglielmo Tocco</th>
<th>m. Margaret Orsini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esau Buondelmonti, despotes in Ioannina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddelena Buondelmonti</td>
<td>m. Leonardo I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlo I</td>
<td>m. Francesca, daughter of Nerio I ACCIAIOLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo II</td>
<td>m. ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 illegitimate sons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddelena-Theodora</td>
<td>m. Constantine XI PALAIOLOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlo II</td>
<td>m. Ramondina di Ventimiglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Nicol, Epis II 256, and Bon, Moris franque 707.

TOGA, Roman outer garment, draped around the body in such a way that the right arm remained free. The distinguishing mark of a Roman citizen, it did not long survive the imperial administration’s move from Rome to Constantinople. Ordinary people had come to prefer the himation already by the 2nd C., and wearing of the toga was gradually restricted to specific officials (among them senators, consuls, and the emperor, and their wives and mothers) on ceremonial occasions. Silk replaced the original wool fabric. The color of the toga was usually white, but other colors could indicate the higher rank of the wearer: a trabea was purple or gold, while the highest form of toga, the toga picta or trabea triumphalis, was embroidered with gold rosettes and even scenes, or encrusted with jewels, and had an elaborate border. The trabea triumphalis was the standard costume for consuls opening the games and is hence frequently depicted on the ivory consular diptychs. The use of the toga decreased with the decline of the consulship, but its border was retained as a separate imperial vestment, already referred to in the 6th C. as a loros (C. Albizzati, Rivista italiana di numismatica 35 [1922] 69–92).


TOKALI KILISE. See Goreme.

TOKENS (σφραγίδια, “little sealings”; Lat. tesseræ) were given to the poor and exchanged by them for food and other necessities of life. Such tokens served as counters, in the same manner that Roman tokens allowed an official to keep track of and verify goods that he disbursed; unlike Roman practice, however, Byz. tokens were not used for advertising. They were issued in lead and copper and resemble lead seals both in size (somewhat smaller) and decoration; the planchet, however, exhibits no perforation for cording and suspensions. The great majority of tokens date from the 11th C., although there are earlier references in literature. For example, in 436, according to a decree in the Theodosian Code (XIV 26.2), 110 modii of grain were to be added to the grain supply of Alexandria, and bread tickets (tesseræ) were to be marked and validated by the imperial name. Sphragidia were distributed by imperial command on various holidays, such as 22 July, a commemorative ceremony of Leo VI, when tokens were given to the poor and later exchanged at a rate of 1 1/3 nomisma per token (Oikonomides, Lists 217.33–219.3). Typically the obverse and reverse of lead tokens are decorated with an inscription quoting Proverbs 19:17: “He who is generous to the poor lends to the Lord.” The same inscription appears on copper tokens, but often on the reverse alone, leaving the obverse field to be filled with an effigy of the Virgin, Christ, or a saint.


TOKENS, PILGRIM. See Pilgrim Tokens.
TOMB (τάφος). The Byz. vocabulary for tomb varied: Niketas Choniates, besides taphos, used such terms as theke, mneme, sema, and soros. Legal texts (e.g., Basil. 59.1.2) distinguished between taphos and mneme; according to the Synopsis Basilicorum (Zepos, Jus 5:559, note b), taphos was the grave for the burial of the corpse while mneme was the “building” (ktisma) over it. The Basilika (59.1.5) preserved also the ancient distinction between familiarioi tombs (for the individual and his whole familia) and kleronomiaioi tombs (for the individual and his descendants).

A tomb could take the form of a grave faced with a slab or surmounted by a stele or a ciborium, a niche with an arcosolium and room for a sarcophagus, a funerary chapel, or mausoleum. Early Byz. tombs are found singly or communally in underground cemeteries and catacombs or in the open air, often in the context of a martyrium (Krautheimer, ECBArch 51f). A grave might be surrounded by a barrier of stone or metal; its stone plaque might bear an inscription; lamps and icons might be set on it. CHRISTOPHER OF MYTILENE (ed. E. Kurtz, no.16) mentions the tomb of a patrikios Melios ornamented with images of his secular and monastic life. Luxurious tombs could have small columns adorned with silver (Pselloes, Chron. 2:61, par.183.6–7), probably supporting a roof over the grave. The Holy Sepulchre of Christ in Jerusalem attracted special veneration. Particular care was given to the tombs of patron saints such as Loukas the Younger, Meletios the Younger, and Athanasios of Athos, and church founders such as Isaac Komnenos and Theodore Metochites (Ø. Hjort, DOP 33 [1979] 249f). In Christian metaphor the tomb was a symbol of death, of sinful life, of the body imprisoning the soul; pagan shrines were also called tombs.


TOMISLAZ, 10th-C. prince of Croatia. According to D. Farlati (Illyricum sacrum [Venice 1751] 3:84), Tomislav reigned 20 years, until ca.940; F. Šišić (Povijest Hrvata [Zagreb 1925] 401f) prefers the dates 910–28. Tomislav enlarged the borders of Croatia, uniting Pannonian and Dalmatian Croatia, and ca.925 accepted the title of king. Constantine VII described a Croatian army that was able to muster 60,000 horses, 100,000 foot soldiers, and about 180 ships (De adm. imp., 31.71–74), probably referring to the time of Tomislav’s reign. Along with MICHAEL VIŠEVIĆ of Zachlumia, Tomislav sought and received papal support at the Council of Spalato (SPLIT) in 924. When the Byz.-Serbian alliance was routed by SMEON of BULGARIA ca.924, the Bulgarian threat hung over Croatia; the Bulgarian invasion ca.926 was repulsed, however. Zlatarski (infra) suggests that this success accounted for a broad anti-Bulgarian coalition of Croatia, Zachlumia, and Serbia under Byz. control and that Tomislav was granted the title of anthypatos. In any case the peace treaty with Bulgaria was signed, with the help of Pope
John X, before Symeon’s death. After Tomislav died the role of Croatia declined, and Serbia under Časlav assumed the leading role in the area.

Goldstein (infra), who has critically reconsidered the scanty data about Tomislav’s reign, has tried to show that there is no reason to call Tomislav the first king of Croatia and that the word rex in John X’s epistle was not an official title but only a polite expression.


TOMOS (τόμος, from τέμνω, “to cut”), term that designated in antiquity a “page” (J. Schmidt, RhM 47 [1892] 326) or a section of a roll. Photios used it often for a division (chapter) of a book, as a synonym for logos or biblos. The word is employed in the same sense for headings in MS editions, e.g., “The third tomos of the reign of Isaac Angelos” in the history of Niketas Choniates. The term could also be used for codex-books and esp. for documents (register, decree, chrysebulla), frequently of ecclesiastical character, e.g., the Tomos of Union of 920. Circa 1339–40 the monks of Athos issued the Tomos hagioritikos in defense of the heschasts; the Council of 1351 also formulated its decision in a tomos. Metaphorically the word denotes the Virgin, as, for example, “the tomos of a new mystery” in the second homily on the Nativity of the Virgin (PG 96:692B) that is ascribed to John of Damascus, but probably was written by Theodore of Studios (C. van de Vorst, BZ 23 [1914–20] 128–32).

LIT. B. Atsas, La terminologie du livre-manuscrit à l’époque byzantine (Thessalonike 1971) 150–61. – A.K.

TOMOS OF UNION (τόμος ἐνώσεως), a document that formulated the decision of the local council of Constantinople of 920, convened to settle the conflict between the partisans of Patr. Euthymios and Nicholas I Mystikos (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF). Solemnly proclaimed on 9 July 920, the Tomos attempted to terminate the long dispute over the Tetragamy or Leo VI by completely banning a fourth marriage and restricting the third marriage (with the penalty of four to five years’ deprivation of communion). The statement satisfied the Euthymians, and later Arethas of Caesarea claimed to have coauthored the Tomos with Romanos I Lekepenos (Scripta minora 1:229–30). By 920, since Leo VI had been dead for eight years, the core of the conflict was no longer the fourth marriage but the validity of episcopal appointments—whether the nominees of Euthymios or of Nicholas were rightfully entitled to their sees. The latter question was not mentioned in the Tomos, but since Euthymios had died in 917 and Nicholas, after a short period of disfavor, gained the support of the basileopator Romanos, his partisans evidently had the upper hand. Absent from the first preserved version of the Tomos, dated ca.930, Euthymios’s name appears only in a later version, ca.1000. The Tomos signified not only the unification of the Byz. church, very important for a government that was at war with Bulgaria, but also the restoration of the alliance with Rome, since the papal representatives approved of the Council of 920.


TONDRAKITES (Arm. T’ondrakec‘i), Armenian sect taking its name from the district of Tondrak north of Lake Van. The founder of the sect, Smbat of Zarehawan, lived in the mid-9th C. The sect spread rapidly to Hark’ and Vaspurakan and other districts, penetrating all levels of society. The Tondrakite communities were generally destroyed by the end of the 11th C., though isolated groups may have survived as late as the 19th.

The extreme Iconoclasm characterizing the Tondrakites and their rejection of ecclesiastical authority and the sacraments suggest the influence of the later Byz. (Neo-)Paulicians with whom Gregory Magistros (Letters, p.161) explicitly identified them. Nevertheless, the Adoptionist Christology set out in their manual, the Key of Truth, and their worship of their leaders as “Christ” links them rather to primitive Armenian Paulicianism.


TONSURE (κούρα), the ritual of cutting the hair by which a lay person was admitted to the monastic or clerical state. Although the custom was
not prescribed by any canon, it was practiced as early as the 4th C. in the PACHOMIAN MONASTERIES, where it was prohibited to cut off hair without the permission of a superior. In the same century it is attested as a preliminary act to the admission to clerical status: St. Euthymios the Great is said (by a later author, Cyril of Skythopolis) to have been tonsured when he was ordained ANAGNOSTES in Melitene ca.379. In the 5th C. tonsuring regularly accompanied the taking of monastic vows, for example, in the case of the eparch Kyros in 441. A Justinianic novel of 535 (nov.5.2.1) ordered that a layman receive the tonsure and the habit (stole) after a three-year novitiate (see NOVICE). Canon 33 of the Council in Trullo forbade those who had not been tonsured to preach from the ambo.

The actual procedure of tonsuring varied. Pseudo-Sophronios (PG 87:3985D) prescribes a circular shaving of the hair in imitation of Christ's crown; hair might also be cut so as to form the sign of the cross. Another form, the so-called tonsura more Orientalium S. Pauli (cf. Bede, PL 95:172) consisted of a complete shaving of the head in imitation of St. Paul's baldness. The term apokaris was also used: according to pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite (PG 3:536A) the apokaris indicated "a pure life." Another term for the tonsure was epikouris, but the difference between epikouris and apokaris is obscure.


- A.M.T., A.K.

TOOLS AND HOUSEHOLD FITTINGS of the Byz. period continued the forms and functions of Roman examples but are less well known as a body. Many tools for stoneworking, METALWORK, and woodworking, as well as AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, were made of IRON, although some were of BRONZE. Sets of agricultural and carpentry tools—containing spades, hoes, axes, punches, chisels, and files—were found in the 7th-C. shipwreck at YASSI ADA off Asia Minor. Excavations at, for example, Corinth and SARDIS have yielded others as well as domestic tools for kitchen use and spinning. Lists of surgical instruments (see SURGERY) survive from the 6th to 11th C., but few extant examples have been identified.

Excavations have produced varied examples of household fittings from the 4th to 13th C. Bronze and iron furnishings include LIGHTING fixtures, iron stool frames, feet, knobs, handles, and other attachments esp. for chests, locks, and keys. Solid silver and bronze tripod tables survive from the 4th to 7th C. Written texts refer to (solid) bronze fountains with animal figures in the Great Palace, Constantinople, in the 9th C. (TheophCont 141.20–21; 327.4–5). A set of bronze kitchen UTENSILS with caldrons, pitcher, baking pan, and jug was found in the YASSI ADA shipwreck, and many loose bronze casseroles, kettles, ladles, and ewers have been found in Egypt. Large numbers of household utensils were excavated at SARDIS in the Byz. shops where they had been on sale when the city was destroyed in the early 7th C. Archaeologists have unearthed a set of three bronze kettles (one inscribed) and jug of the 10th–11th C. at CORINTH in addition to other metal vessels. Household utensils and PLATE were also made of silver, CERAMIC, and GLASS.


- M.M.M.

TOPARCHA GOTHICUS, conventional title of an anonymous work, three fragments of which C.B. Hase published in 1819. The fragments describe journeys of a (possibly Byz.) commander in the Dnieper and Danube regions and his confrontations with barbarians; among others is mentioned “the ruler to the north of the Istrus [Danube],” in whom many scholars have seen the prince of Kiev. The text is obscure and incoherent; neither its topographical and chronological data nor its astronomical observations permit a convincing solution concerning the place and date of its composition. Ševčenko (infra) put forth serious arguments demonstrating that Toparcha Gothicus was a forgery by Hase, but the majority of East European scholars have not accepted his hypothesis.

TOPARCHES (τοπάρχης), term that in Hellenistic and Roman texts designates a medium-ranked official administering a district (E. Kiessling, *RE* 2. R. 6 [1937] 1716). Justinian I, in novel 128.21, understood *toparchai* as local magistrates in a broad sense, including both military and civil authorities. The term was eventually equated with king: a 6th-C. historian (Malal. 231.9) speaks of a *toparches* of the Jews; Prokopios (*Wars* 2.12.8) calls Abgar *toparches* of Edessa. The term reappeared in the 10th–11th C. as a nontechnical word designating independent rulers (of Sicily, Crete, Bulgaria, etc.) as well as Byz. governors, who normally enjoyed relative independence. Kekaumenos dwells at length on the relations between a Byz. general and the neighboring *toparches*. Cheynet (infra) assumes that by the 12th C. some *topoteretai* were identified as *toparchai*, that is, they became more independent; he interprets this as a sign of administrative disintegration. The attribution of the title of *toparches* to the author of the so-called *Toparcha Gothicus* is arbitrary, since the term is not employed in the text (M. Nystazopoulou, *BCH* 86 [1962] 321–26).


-A.K.

TOPONYMICS, the study of place names, encompassing inhabited and uninhabited sites as well as rivers, mountains, valleys, islands, etc. The etymology of toponyms can reflect social and economic relations (Ph. Malingoudis, *EtBalk* 21 [1985] no. 1, 87–91) but has been primarily used to demonstrate continuity or change in ethnic substrata: the most obvious examples are the penetration into Greek place names of Frankish roots (O. Markl, *Ortsnamen Griechenlands in "fränkischer" Zeit* [Graz-Cologne 1966]) and esp. roots of Slavic origin—some of the latter appear as far east as Bithynia (Ph. Malingoudis, *Hellenika* 31 [1979] 494–96). Other problems in toponymics include the spread of Greek and Latin place names beyond the frontiers of the empire and the occurrence of Greek toponyms in southern Italy. Thus the Byz. gave the name Hagia Agathe to an *oppidum* (fortress) in the *tourma* of Salines (Calabria) when they founded a town and bishopric there (A. Guillou, *La Théotokos de Hagia-Agathé* [Oppido] [Vatican 1972] 18f). Such renamings are evidently linked to ethnic movements, although they can rarely define the degree of assimilation. Less evident are those changes not caused by the settlement of newcomers. In the transition from late Roman to Byz. society, changes occurred in local nomenclature; sometimes these shifts had political causes (confering an emperor’s name upon a city, as in the cases of Justiniana Prima and Constantinople) or religious explanations (renaming a city in honor of a saint). In other cases, changes of name (e.g., from Kolossai to Chonai) lack an obvious rationale. Names of rivers and mountains seem to be less subject to change than those of cities or villages and may often be derived from pre-Roman nomenclature.


-A.K.

TOPOTERETES (τοποτηρητής). In 5th–6th-C. Egypt, the *topoteretes* was a deputy of the *doux*. The term seems to have fallen into disuse thereafter, but appears again in the *taktika* of the 9th–10th C., in the *De ceremoniis*, and on seals; at that time it designated a lieutenant of the commanders of *tagmata*, *themes*, or the *navy*. His functions were military; in theory he commanded a unit of 15 *banda* (Dennis, *Military Treatises* 252.136). In an enigmatic passage of Kekaumenos (Kek. 188.1–2) *topoteretes* is contrasted with *strategos*, but his functions are not defined. Circa 1100, *topoteretai* were in charge of small districts and fortresses; J.-C. Cheynet (*REB* 42 [1984] 222–24) suggests that *topoteretai* acquired some independence when the administrative system of the empire was disorganized. In the 15th C. *topoteretai* were patriarchal representatives in metropolitan sees outside the empire (Cyprus, Ankya, Nikomedea, etc.).
TORCELLO. On this island in the Venetian lagoon are two adjoining churches, the cathedral of S. Maria Assunta and S. Fosca. S. Fosca is a Byzantine building type: a modified Greek-cross octagon, with a plan that accommodates the Western liturgy. S. Maria Assunta is a Latin basilica, decorated with mosaics closely related to some in S. Marco in Venice. Preserved images include the Virgin Hodegetria and standing apostles in the main apse, a seated PANTOKRATOR with angels and saints in the right minor apse, and a LAST JUDGMENT on the inner west wall. Stylistic analysis reveals at least two medieval phases (mid- or late 11th and 12th C.) and the participation of Byzantine craftsmen. More precise attributions are disputed. Andreeescu, for one, attributes the Hodegetria to a Byzantine mosaicist working around 1185. On the lower wall of the main apse are fragmentary frescoes, also ascribed to a Byzantine master, dated to the late 10th or early 11th C.


TORNESE (It., also tonesello, from Fr. tournois), the name given to the deniers of base silver struck by the abbey of St. Martin of Tours prior to the annexation of Touraine by Philip Augustus in 1206. Subsequently deniers tournois, with their characteristic type of a “castle” (châtel tournois), became one of the chief coinages of the French crown and the basis of the main French system of account. Imitations of them were issued on a vast scale by several of the Frankish states in Greece between the mid-13th and mid-14th C., so that the name came by extension to be applied to several denominations of low-grade billon coins of much the same value minted at Venice, in the Aegean area, and at Constantinople itself, though the Greek name for them is unknown. At Constantinople in the 1330s 8 tornezi were reckoned to the basilikon and 96 to the hyperpyron; and a century later the account book of Badoer (1436–49) shows the stauraton, the standard silver coin then in use, as worth 96 tornezi.


TORNIKIOS (Товникос, also Товникис, fem. Товникива), a noble family of Armenian or Georgian origin. According to Constantine VII (De adm. imp. 43.55–60), Abu Ghanim (Apogamn), brother of a prince of Tarun, was brought to Byzantium and granted the title of protospatharios in the early 10th C.; Abu Ghanim’s son Tornikios came to Constantinople later and received the rank of patricius. A marginal note on Paris, B.N. gr. 2009, explains that he was Nicholas Tornikios’s father; Nicholas can perhaps be identified with the Nicholas Tornikios who, with Leo Tornikios, supported Constantine VII in 945. Their relationship with John Tornikios is unclear: John, a vassal of David of Tat’/Tao, settled eventually as a monk on Athos but later served Basil II as diplomat and general; in 979 he won the decisive victory over Bardas Skleros. John mastered both Armenian and Georgian: he erected a stone cross with an Armenian inscription near Karin (Theodosiopolis) (Adontz, Études 309) and promoted the copying of Georgian MSS (P. Peeters, AB 50 [1932] 358–71). John’s relatives served Byzantium as military commanders; some took the name of John’s brother Varazvače. In the Hermitage is a seal of the strategos Tornikios Varazvače; a certain Varazvače, whom Skylitzes (Skyl. 493.33) called Iberos (Georgian?), was governor of Edessa ca.1038; Kontoleon Tornikios served as katepano of Italy in 1017; J.-C. Cheynet (BS 42 [1981] 197–202) suggested that Leo Tornikios was domestikos of the West as well (see Tornikios, Leo).

From the 12th C. onward the Tornikiosi were predominantly civil functionaries: Demetrios, logothetes tou dromou in the late 12th C.; his son Constantine, logothetes after his father’s death (ca.1201). Constantine’s son Demetrios (died ca.1252) was mesazon in Nicaea, and his son Constantine sebastokrator; John Tornikios, governor of the Thrakesian theme in 1258, may have been the brother of the sebastokrator Constantine. The Tornikiosi intermarried with many noble families including the Palaiologoi and played important roles in the 14th C.: Demetrios Tornikios Palaiologos was megas droungarios te viglas; Andronikos (monastic name Antonios) Tornikios Palaiologos was parakoimomenos; Michael Tornikios was megas...
konostaulos. B. Schmalzbauer’s hypothesis that a Slavicized branch of the family existed ca.1356 (allegedly Tornikios Rodosthalbos was kepale of Serres) is based on a misreading of the name (Esphig. 159). The family produced several 12th-C. literati: Euthymios Tornikios and two named George (see Tornikios, Euthymios and Tornikios, George). Maria Tornikina Komnene Akropolitissa, possibly the sebastokrator Constantine’s niece, is represented on the icon of the Virgin Hodegetria in the Tretjakov Gallery (Moscow).


-A.K.

TORNIKIOS, EUTHYMIOS, ecclesiastical official and writer; died Epirus after 1222. Son of the logothetes tou dromou Demetrios Tornikios, he served as deacon in 1191. His preserved works are dated predominantly in 1200–05, although they include a poem dedicated to Isaac II (Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Notres Petr. 188f). Tornikios’s rhetorical works are very conventional, esp. his panegyric of Alexios III, which describes the revolt of John Komnenos the Fat. Tornikios mentions an expedition of Alexios against the Bulgarians, but the data are too vague to identify it. Tornikios’s monody for his father is more personal, describing both family characteristics and, tenderly, Demetrios’s death. His monodies for Demetrios and for Euthymios Malakes are full of respect for the eloquence of the deceased, but this respect is expressed by clichés: the honey-dripping tongue of Malakes (p.76.21–22), the fire-breathing tongue of Demetrios (p.94.23–24).


-A.K.

TORNIKIOS, GEORGE, magistros ton rhetoron in the 1190s. He has been confused by some scholars with his mid-12th-C. homonym; also his speech to Isaac II was wrongly dated to the end of 1186 (approximately at the same time as the discourses of John Syropoulos and Sergios Kolymbas). Because these speeches provide unique information about the Byz. relationship with Bulgaria and Serbia, several events have consequently been misdated (the conflict between Peter of Bulgaria and Asen I, the marriage of Stefan the First-Crowned to Eudokia, daughter of Alexios III). The date of ca.1195 suggested by M. Bachmann (Die Rede des Johannes Syropoulos an den Kaiser Isaak II. Angelos [Munich 1935] 96, n.4) for the speech has been confirmed by later investigation. Tornikios’s speech of 1192 to Patr. George II Xiphilinos (1191–98) is still unpublished.


-A.K.

TORNIKIOS, LEO, nephew of Constantine IX; born Adrianople, died after 1047. He was patrikios and strategos of Meliote according to Attaleiates, governor of IBERIA according to Psellus. The latter describes Tornikios as short, crafty, proud, and ambitious. Initially honored by Constantine, he became devoted to the emperor’s sister Eupre-
pia, who opposed her brother. During Tornikios's governorship, his Macedonian supporters attempted a revolt in his name. Recalled to Constantinople, he was made a monk, but allowed personal freedom. On 14 Sept. 1047 he fled to Adrianople, where his Macedonian supporters (including John Vatatzes, a man of heroic strength, says Psellos) rallied around appeals against Constantine's misgovernment. When Tornikios's forces reached Constantinople, a motley force attempted to defend a moat outside the city wall; after they were driven within the gates, panic spread among the defenders. With the walls and gates abandoned, Tornikios might have taken the city, but lacked resolution. That night, Constantine reinforced the defenses; Tornikios's men, repelled, began to desert. Tornikios was forced to lift the siege and withdraw westward. An attack on Rhaidestos proved vain, and many of his supporters abandoned him. Drawn from his refuge in a church at Boulgarophygon, he was blinded in Constantinople at Christmas 1047, along with Vatatzes.


-C.M.B.

T'OROS I. See Rubenids.

T'OROS II (Θεόδωρος), prince of Armenian Cilicia (1145?–68). Youngest son of Prince Leo I, T'oros was taken prisoner with his entire family by Emp. John II Komnenos in 1138 and educated at Constantinople. He escaped and returned to Cilicia in mysterious circumstances ca.1145. He rallied the local Armenian nobles, retook the Rubenid seat of Anazarbos, and collaborated with the Latin principalities of Edessa and Antioch. T'oros routed the Byz. army sent against him in 1152 as well as the Seljuks allied with the empire, and he raided as far as Cappadocia in 1154. In 1158, however, he was overcome by the campaign led by Manuel I Komnenos in person, was forced to recognize Manuel as his overlord, and received from him the title of sebastos. Despite his submission and occasional friction with Byz. authorities in the region, T'oros continued to play an active political role until his death. It was he who successfully consolidated the control of the Rubenids in Cilicia.

The Armenian historian Vahram of Edessa (13th C.) relates that in Constantinople T'oros married a “Greek princess.” This evidence is questionable. He was later married to Isabella, daughter of Joscelin II, Count of Edessa; their daughter (the name is unknown) married Isaac, the basileus of Cyprus.

LIT. Der Nersessian, “Cilician Armenia” 637–42.

-N.G.G.

TORQUE (μανιάκιον, στρεπτός), a form of neck ring or collar. Probably of Scandinavian origin, it may first have served to shield the neck and could be made of bronze, silver, or gold. In the Byz. era maniakia were worn by slaves (PG 65:104A, 88:444B) and kings (e.g., the king of India; Malal. 457:13–20) alike. It was also a sign of military rank; in Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 91.7, 93.4, 127.19) it is an insignia awarded to the kandidatos, spatharokandidatos, and protospatharios. The torque is depicted in the Rossano Gospels (fol.8v) where it is worn by the officers flanking Pilate. It is also represented in images of certain military saints, for example, Sergios and Bakchos on a 7th-C. (?) icon (Weitzmann, Sinai Icons, no.Bg); these torques are gold set with cabochon gems. According to their vita, their gold maniakia were removed when the saints were deprived of military rank (AB 14 [1895] 380.24–25). A member of the imperial bodyguard wears one in the Justinian mosaic at S. Vitale, RAVENNA. After the 6th C. the form consists of a loose necklace joined at the front by a medallion. The shape may have influenced gold necklaces, the chief ornament of which consisted of coins or medallions. From the time of Julian onward several usurpers were proclaimed emperors by setting a maniakion on their head as a form of crown. This custom seems to have disappeared after the 6th C.


-T.D.C., N.P.S.

TORTURE, the intentional infliction of severe pain, was applied in Byz. as corporal punishment (see PEnalties), to elicit confession or testimony, to extort the payment of taxes, and to take vengeance on an enemy, and as a means of trial by
ORDEAL. In the early Christian centuries MARTYRS were often tortured in a vain attempt to force them to recant their faith. The ECLOGA speaks often of flogging (typtēn) as punishment, although less frequently than MUTILATION. Torture, sometimes combined with EXILE, was imposed for THEFT, sexual crimes, or misdemeanors. The Farmer's Law prescribes flogging (sometimes 12, 30, or even 100 blows) primarily for stealing livestock or grain and for arson, but also for using false measures of grain and wine (par.70). Disobeying the rules governing commercial transactions also was punished by scourging, according to the Book of the Eparch.

Another reason for torture was the refusal to pay taxes or a fine. A 4th-C. historian (Arrm.Marc. 22:16.23) reports that Egyptians were proud of the scars they bore for not paying taxes, and Nicholas IV Mouzalon described how on Cyprus the peasants in arrears were bound together with hungry dogs in order to extort their payments (F. Dölger, BZ 35 [1935] 14). A detailed description of torture is found in the vita of St. Antony the Younger: when he did not return money to the treasury, the epit ton deseson Stephen gave him 50 heavy blows with a whip; the punishment took place in Stephen's house. The government also applied torture to religious dissidents: hagiographers present frequent cases, and a 14th-C. historian states that the opponents of Union of the Churches suffered from confiscation, exile, imprisonment, blinding, mutilation, and flogging (Greg. 1:127:15-17).

A.K.

TOTILA (To̱u̱ṯi̱ḻa̱s; on coins, Baduila), Ostrogothic king (from autumn 541); born after 511, died near Busta Gallorum June/July 552. Offspring of a Gothic aristocratic family, the young Totila commanded the garrison in Trevisum, in northern Italy, when Ostrogothic affairs were in disarray following the capture of Vitiges. Totila was ready to negotiate with the Byz., but the Goths elected him king “so that he might gain power over the Italoiat” (Prokopios, Wars 7:1.26). Totila acted with great efficiency and readily attracted coloni and slaves to his army; many estates of Roman landowners were confiscated and conferred on Goths; the hatred of Totila expressed by churchmen, including Pope Gregory I, suggests that Totila was hostile toward the Roman church. Wolfram (infra) distinguishes three phases of the war:

1. **First Phase (541-43)**. Totila established Gothic power in the north with the victory at Faenza and moved to the south, occupying Naples, where anti-imperial sentiments were strong.

2. **Second Phase (543-50)**. After ensuring the neutrality of the Franks, Totila besieged and took Rome (17 Dec. 546). He left the city when it turned out that its possession was no guarantee of success in negotiations with Constantinople, then—after Belisarios retreated—again besieged and captured it on 16 Jan. 550; in May he even encroached upon Sicily.

3. **Third Phase (550-52)**. Germanos and then Narses led an expedition to Italy. Totila's attempts to wage war outside Italy (Kerkyra, Epire, Sardina, and Corsica) failed. At Busta Gallorum Totila was defeated; wounded, he died near the battlefield.


A.K.

**TOULDOS** (τούλδος or τούλδων, from late Lat. *tuldum*), a term first used in the 6th C. to denote the army's supply train. In the Strategikon of Maurice (Strat. Maurik., bk.5) the touldos, under a separate commander, includes the army's nonmilitary personnel, pack animals, reserve horses, and frugal provisions for food and shelter. Similar notes on the composition of the *touldos* are found in the 10th-C. *Strategika*. They too emphasize frugality for the sake of the army's mobility, since most daily needs, food, fodder, or wood, could be collected by foraging parties. Specially assigned units guarded the touldos while the army marched or fought, and it was kept well inside the camp at night.

Imperial expeditions took lavish supplies (De cer. 455-81), but experienced soldiers warned of the disorganization and danger brought on by an overly large supply train, such as befell Manuel I Komnenos at Myriokefalon in 1176. A special transport corps, the *Optimatoi*, was created in the 8th C. to attend to the supply train and look after the imperial baggage if the emperor were on campaign (Haldon, Praetorians 233-27).

TOUPHA (τούφα, also τούφιον), tuft of hair from exotic animals used to decorate the helmets of cavalrymen and imperial crowns. The Strategikon of Maurice (Strat.Maur. 1.2.10, 128.B.4) refers to small touphai atop helmets; the passage is repeated in the Taktika of Leo VI (6.2). According to Kosmas Indikopleustes (Kosm. Ind. 11.5), officers ornamented their horses and standards with the so-called touphai made from the tail hairs of the Indian yak (agriobous); this toupha remained stiff and did not bend.

The crown (or helmet?) on the equestrian statue of Justinian I in the Augustaion (P. Lehmann, ArtB 41 [1959] 39-57; cf. C. Mango, ibid. 351-58) was surmounted by a toupha; when it fell off in the 9th C., it was replaced by a daring master roofer (skalotes) who from the roof of Hagia Sophia shot a cord attached to an arrow and then walked along the tightrope to reach the statue; Emp. Theophilos rewarded him with 100 nomismata (Leo Gramm. 227.3-11). CLAVIJO (ed. Lopez Estrada 44.19-20) described the toupha on this statue as so big it resembled a peacock’s tail.

The term was subsequently extended to denote the headgear itself: thus Constantine VII (De cer. 188.10) equated touphai with tiaras, as did Tzetzes (Hist. 8.297-301), adding that this kind of typha surmounted the equestrian statue of Justinian. A 12th-C. historian (Zon. 3:566.16-567.2) says that toupha was a vernacular word for tiara; he derives it from the verb typhoomaí, meaning “to be filled with insane arrogance.”


TOURKOI (Τούρκοι), Greek rendering of the name of the nomadic people Türk(ü)k. Chinese sources designate this people as Tuki; thanks to the contemporary Byz. term Tourkoi, it becomes clear that they were the Turks who founded a vast empire extending between the Chinese and the Persian frontier in the 6th C. Later the Byz. gave the name Tourkoi to several peoples originating primarily from Central Asia such as the KHAZARS, the HUNGARIANS and their offshoot, the VARDARIOTAI, etc. From the late 11th C. onward the Byz. used the term for the SELJUKS, for the Anatolian emirates, and finally for the OTTOMANS. In the last three cases the term is used alternatively with the archaic Persai.


TOURKOPOULOI (Τουρκότουλοι, lit. “sons of Turks”), a body of Turkish soldiers in Byz. service, or, later, any body of lightly armed horsemen. The term passed into Latin sources as a loanword, turcypuler. This kind of light cavalry existed in some Latin states of the Levant, such as Rhodes, Cyprus, and the kingdom of Jerusalem (cf. J.L. Lamonte, Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem 1100 to 1291 [Cambridge, Mass., 1932] 136, 160-63).


TOURMA (τούρμα or τούρμα), term for a military detachment, in use (along with droungos) from the beginning of the 8th C., replacing the meros and mora listed in the Strategikon of Maurice. According to the Taktika of Leo VI, the tourma consisted of 3,000 men and three tourmai made up a theme, but reality differed from these standardized figures. According to Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, each theme consisted of two to four tourmai (Ahrweiler, “Administration” 80, n.5), while that of Optimaton was not divided into tourmai or droungoi. As part of a theme, tourma acquired the meaning of an administrative unit. The commander of a tourma was a tourmarches; the tourma could be administered by an ek prosopou (Livr. 1, no.10.13, 29 [a.996]). As the designation of a district, the word was still used in an act of 1193 (MM 6:125.2).

Lit. Haldon, Praetorians 210-12. — A.K.

TOURMARCHES (τούρμαρχης), a military commander, described in the 10th-C. military tract On Skirmishing (De velititatione) as the first assistant of the stratēgos. In the writings of a 9th-C. historian (Theoph. 378.28-29), Christopher, the tourmarches of Thrakesion, acts independently; he was reportedly sent with 900 soldiers to Cherson by Justinian II in 711/12. On seals the tourmarches has the title of spatharokandidatos, kandidatos, or spatarios (Laurenc, Méd. Vat., nos. 149-
It is generally accepted that the tourmarches commanded a tourma and held fiscal and judicial authority over the population in his region. The term is not mentioned in the latest of the taktika, that of Escurial in 971–75, but it appears in the table of contents of the work of a mid-11th-C. military writer (Kek. 656, par. 86), and there were tourmarchai in South Italy in the first half of the 11th C. It is unclear whether it was used after the 11th C. The term also designated commanders of naval units and of littoral districts.


TOURNAMENT. See Sports.

TOYS AND GAMES. Toys (ἀθηρίματα) were simple and predominantly made by children themselves; as the vita of Nikephoros of Medikon reports (F. Halkin, AB 78 [1960] 401, par. 1.1–2), infants “compose” (a hapax is used—kompostolouσίν) their toys of “unshaped matter.” Sand, clay, bones, sticks, and rags provided necessary materials: insects and plants were also employed as toys. A floor mosaic in the Great Palace (Great Palace, 1st Report, pl.29) shows children aying circus games, wheeling spiked disks around simulated metae. They also wrestled, played leapfrog, and pushed each other on swings (Galavaris, Liturgical Homilies 165–70). Board games, dice—esp. knucklebones (astragaloi)—and balls (sphairai) were popular with boys; dice were played for money, not only by children. Girls, who stayed mostly indoors, preferred dolls, ninia (TheophCont 90.23). Some children’s games imitated important events or ceremonies, such as the liturgy (T. Nissen BZ 38 [1938] 361f; PG 25:ccxxiv AB), exorcisms (PG 82:1384CD), horse races, or battles. In popular perception, aθyra was a symbol of instability and of frivolous conduct, and hagiographers stressed that their heroes avoided playful behavior. (See also Games, Board.)


TRAJECTUS DE CREDITIS, a legal treatise probably written in the middle of the 11th C. Perhaps occasioned by an actual legal case, its aim was the demonstration that creditors not safeguarded by a pignus are equal to each other (i.e., have the same position). Other questions regarding loans and, in an extended sense, claims are handled in textbook form, esp. the order of precedence of competing creditors who have each received a pignus. The Basilika with its scholia as well perhaps as the paraphrase of the Institutes by the 6th-C. jurist Theophilos (3.14) and the Peira (6.2) are used as sources. Michael Psellus made the Tractatus de creditis the basis of verses 890–920 of his Synopsis legum. Zachariä doubted, probably incorrectly, that a section that follows the Tractatus (both in the independent transmission and in the 24th paratitlon of the Prochiron auctum), which concerns exceptions to the rule “ unus testis nullus testis” that are valid in cases of donations, belongs to the same treatise.


TRADE. See Commerce and Trade.

TRADE TREATIES. Trade clauses in treaties between Byz. and other states normally regulated the place and terms of the exchange of merchandise, often gave privileges (such as duty exemptions) to the merchants, and sometimes gave the merchants of other states quarters in Constantinople or other cities. Such commercial clauses were sometimes inserted in general treaties. The peace treaty with Persia, in 562, stated that all exchange of merchandise should take place at TRACHEA TRIUMPHALIS. See Toga.

TRAJECTUS DE CREDITIS, a legal treatise probably written in the middle of the 11th C. Perhaps occasioned by an actual legal case, its aim was the demonstration that creditors not safeguarded by a pignus are equal to each other (i.e., have the same position). Other questions regarding loans and, in an extended sense, claims are handled in textbook form, esp. the order of precedence of competing creditors who have each received a pignus. The Basilika with its scholia as well perhaps as the paraphrase of the Institutes by the 6th-C. jurist Theophilos (3.14) and the Peira (6.2) are used as sources. Michael Psellus made the Tractatus de creditis the basis of verses 890–920 of his Synopsis legum. Zachariä doubted, probably incorrectly, that a section that follows the Tractatus (both in the independent transmission and in the 24th paratitlon of the Prochiron auctum), which concerns exceptions to the rule “ unus testis nullus testis” that are valid in cases of donations, belongs to the same treatise.


TRADE. See Commerce and Trade.
specific trade stations (probably Nisibis, Kallinikos, and Doubios [Duin]), and that Saracen and other merchants should also trade only in Nisibis and Dara. The treaty of 907 with Rus’ (see Treaties, Russo-Byzantine) stipulated that Rus’ merchants in Constantinople would stay in St. Mamas, receive supplies for six months, and trade without paying duties. In 969, a treaty with the emirate of Aleppo included a clause that regulated the payment of duties at the frontier and the movement of caravans of merchants. Krum’s peace embassy in 812 included clauses regulating commerce (Theoph. 497.24–26). There was also a trade treaty between Michael VIII Palaiologos and the Egyptian sultan Kalāwūn, as part of a peace agreement (M. Canard, Byzantium 10 [1935] 669–80).

The most famous commercial treaties are those the Byz. concluded with Italian maritime cities, starting with the treaty of 992 with Venice, and continuing with the treaties and privileges granted by the Komnenian emperors after 1082, and then by the Angeloi and the Palaiologoi to Venice, Pisa, and Genoa. The treaties gave the merchants of these cities free access to various Byz. markets, reduced or abolished the kommerkon on the transactions of their merchants, and granted their merchants residential quarters and extraterritorial rights. These were full-fledged trade treaties, in the sense that their primary focus was on commerce.


TRADITIO LEGIS

TRADITIO LEGIS (Lat. “transmission of the law”), the modern title for a group of 4th–13th-C. compositions, predominantly Roman, showing Christ holding a scroll and flanked by Peter and/or Paul. The Traditio legis emerges just after the edict of toleration of Christians in the early 4th C., and draws heavily on imperial imagery. The earliest version, found on “Passion” sarcophagi, shows Christ on the mount of Paradise, his right arm raised in a gesture of address and his left holding an open scroll, as Peter approaches from his right and Paul acclaims him on his left. This version, chosen ca.370 for the apses of St. Peter’s (Buddensieg, infra, fig.13) and S. Costanza in Rome, was revered later in the Middle Ages as an image of Peter’s primacy. Its initial meaning was probably apolitical, conflating Christ’s eschatological appearance as a lawgiver with his post-Passion appearances (see Appearances of Christ after the Passion) as victor over death. A similar interpretation can be assigned to the variant version on the Junius Bassus sarcophagus (Vollbach, Early Christian Art, fig.42) showing Christ enthroned like a lawgiving emperor above a personification of the Heavens. A third image, with Christ seated in a neutral setting giving a closed scroll to Paul, survives on Sarcophagi in Ravenna. Sometimes interpreted as an anti-Roman variant of the compositions described above, it is regarded by Schumacher (infra) as an independent, probably Constantinopolitan, image showing the transmission of the Gospels to the Gentiles.


TRAGEDY

TRAGEDY shared the fate of the theater and drama, which declined in imperial Rome. Tragedy was no longer produced as a theatrical performance; rather the author or an actor read the entire text to an assembled audience. This procedure was familiar to Ambrose and Augustine, who stressed that the actor (hypokrites) sang or declaimed tragedies on the stage (H.A. Kelly, Traditio 35 [1979] 35, 42). Classical tragedies were still known in the 4th–6th C., and quotations from them have been found in provincial inscriptions, such as one from 6th-C. Apollonia, Epiros (Al. Cameron, CJRev 81 [1967] 134). Tragedies continued to be written, and the Souda mentions a “tragodia” by a certain Timotheos of Gaza addressed to Emp. Anastasios I; it was devoted, however, to the theme of the Chrysargyron, which makes it questionable that the work was a genuine play. The Byz. of the 7th–10th C. lost interest in tragedy; sporadic quotations appear in certain authors, e.g., Ignatios the Deacon (R. Browning, REGr 81 [1968] 401–10), but Photios, for example, ignored the great classical tragedians in his Bibliotheca. Interest revived in the 11th C. when Psellus produced a comparison of Euripides and George of Pisidia; probably in the 11th or
12th C. was written an anonymous treatise on tragedy that has survived in MS Oxford, Bodl., Barocci 131. Simultaneously began the transmission of the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, which culminated in the work of Demetrios Triklinios, who prepared the corpus of extant ancient tragedies. The word "tragedy," however, lost its classical meaning; the vernacular tragoudi and its derivatives denoted popular songs without any connection to the theater.


TRAGOS (lit. "he-goat"), typikon for Mt. Athos drafted by the Stoudite monk Euthymios and signed by John I Tzimiskes between 970 and 972. Its name derives from the thick goatskin parchment on which the original document is written. It bears the signatures of the Protos of Athos and 56 monks and is still preserved in the Protaton archives at Karyes. This first rule for Athonite monks was composed at a time of tension between independent groups of anchorites and the new koinonion on the Holy Mountain, as exemplified in the recently found Great Lavra of Athanasios (963). The typikon confirmed the rights of hegumenoi, thus ensuring the future predominance of cenobitic monasticism on Athos but, at the same time, protected the interests of hermits living in small groups or as solitaries. The number of annual assemblies at the Protaton was reduced from three to one, and the protos was forbidden to make any decision without the consent of the hegumenoi.


TRAGODIA (τραγούδι), a song; though applicable to any type of song (e.g., love songs, which can exist either independently, as in the Erotopaignia, or embedded in a longer work, as in the romance Libistros and Rhodamne), the term is conventionally applied to short narrative poems (such as the Song of Armouris [see Armoureis] or the Song of Porphyris) in the popular language, usually in political verse and ostensibly with historical allusions. Origins in the ancient and Byz. world have been claimed for many of the tragoudia collected orally or rediscovered in MS form in Greek-speaking lands during the 19th C. It has thus been argued that the Song of Armouris refers to the capture of Amorion in 838, the Son of Andronikos to Andronikos Doukas or Andronikos I Komnenos, while the Akritic Songs in general would refer to the wars of the 9th and 10th C. However, many of the motifs of these tragoudia (e.g., abducted brides, valiant younger brothers, precocious heroes) have the timeless nature of folk tale and cannot be tied to a precise Byz. context; nevertheless the 15th-C. MS of the Song of Armouris and Threnoi like the Battle of Varna (which could be defined as a tragoudi) indicate that some tragoudia were certainly composed in late Byz., while there are signs (e.g., in Digenes Akritas or the Chronicle of the Morea) that short tragoudia were stitched together to form longer narratives. The length of this tradition, given the ephemeral nature of oral poetry, is hard to assess.


TRAJAN'S GATE, a narrow pass between Ikhtiman and Pazardzk, scene of a defeat of Basil II by Samuel of Bulgaria, 16/17 Aug. 986. Basil had attacked Serdica, but after 20 days was compelled to retreat. At Trajan's Gate the Bulgarians attacked Basil's forces from the mountainsides. Much of the army perished; the imperial tent and regalia fell into Samuel's hands. Basil's defeat encouraged Bardas Skleros to revolt once more and allowed Samuel to expand his state. Basil, however, was never again trapped in a mountain pass.


TRALLES (Τράλλεις), now Aydin, city of Lydia on the north side of the Meander valley. The skins and cushions produced there were valuable enough to be included in the price edict of DIOCLETIAN, and its monumental aqueduct of the mid-4th C. was the subject of commemorative inscriptions. Tralles was a bishopric throughout the Byz. period, but its history is obscure. Under Justinian I, John of Ephesus based his missionary activity there and converted thousands of pagans in the neighboring mountains. In its final role as a bul-
wark against the Turks, Tralles, then desolate, was rebuilt by Andronikos II in 1280 and renamed Andronicopolis and Palaiologopolis. It contained, according to Pachymeres (ed. Bekker 1:470.12) 36,000 inhabitants. Because of its planners’ failure to provide a water supply, the project was aborted and the Turks of Menteshe took Tralles in 1284.


C.F.

TRANSFIGURATION (μεταμόρφωσις), the appearance of Christ, accompanied by Moses and Elijah, to Peter, James, and John in the shining glory of his divinity (Mt 17:1–8), traditionally believed to have taken place on Mt. Tabor. This illumination, seen only by the three disciples, foreshadowed the complete transformation of Christ at the Resurrection, after his suffering on the cross. The Transfiguration served as a prophetic sign foretelling the future transfiguration of all Christians.

A number of writers devoted homilies to the Transfiguration: from the early authors John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, pseudo-Proklos, and Andrew of Crete, up to later writers such as Joseph Bryennios and Patr. Gennadios II Scholarios. The main themes of sermons on this topic were the cardinal distinction between Christ and the two principal Old Testament prophets Moses and Elijah with whom he appeared to his apostles and the significance of the Transfiguration as a pledge of redemption: “Christ was transformed not without purpose but to show us the future transformation of nature and the coming second advent . . . bringing salvation” (pseudo-Chrysostom, PG 61:714.19–22).

The Transfiguration of Christ was a central

Transfiguration. The Transfiguration; mosaic, 6th C. Apse of the Church of St. Catherine, Sinai.
paradigm for Palamite hesychasm and served as the principal example of any vision of the uncreated light (energies or grace), which embraces both the spirit and the senses, beheld by the natural eyes of man who is transformed, however, by the Spirit of God. By referring to the supposed consensus of the Greek fathers, Palamas sought to avoid in his doctrine the crude, sensate vision of light characterizing the Messalians; in his doctrine (outlined in the Triads) he attached the earlier effect of the Holy Spirit to the eyes of the body.

The feast of the Transfiguration (6 Aug.) was introduced at Constantinople even before the time of Leo VI, to whom it is attributed, probably at the beginning of the 8th C. at the latest (V. Grumel, REB 14 [1956] 209f). Constantinople borrowed the feast from Jerusalem, though its origins there remain obscure. It did not exist in the 4th C. (P. Devos, AB 86 [1968] 87–108) and probably derives from a Ca.6th-C. Palestinian “Feast of Tabernacles.” It has been suggested that it commemorated the dedication of the three basilicas on Mt. Tabor (M. Aubineau, AB 85 [1967] 422–27).

One of the 12 Great Feasts of the Byz. church calendar, the Transfiguration has a paramone vigil plus a seven-day afterfeast. The emperor celebrated the feast in Hagia Sophia (Philoothos, Kleitor. 219.12–23), but in the 14th C. he went to the church of the Pantokrator monastery instead (pseudo-Kod. 245.7–10).

Representation in Art. The earliest depictions of the Transfiguration are from the mid-6th C.: the apse mosaic at the monastery of St. Catherine, Mt. Sinai, shows the classic composition with Christ in mandorla flanked by Moses and Elijah and with Peter, John, and James at his feet; the apse of S. Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna, conveys the Transfiguration in symbols—sheep beneath a cross in glory. By replacing Christ with a jeweled cross—sign of his eschatological return—the Ravenna mosaic reveals the significance given the event by Christ himself, as a foretaste of the Parousia when he will come in glory to consummate the law (Moses) and the prophets (Elijah). The scene, at first static and symmetrical, becomes more dynamic in the 12th C. For instance, Nicholas Mesarites interprets the disciples not as cowering in fear but hurled to the ground by the light. The light becomes an active force in Palaio- logan imagery, blazing from Christ’s mandorla and hurling the disciples down a precipitous landscape, for example, Paris, B.N. gr. 1242 (Rice, Art of Byz., pl.XXXXIX), and thus illustrating the hesychast theology.


—G.P., R.F.T., A.W.C.

**TRANSHUMANCE.** The Byz. kept their cattle (at least partially) in stalls and stables, but the limited size of meadows forced them to drive sheep to remote pastures. The distances varied: young boys might graze flocks nearby, returning home at night (I. van den Gheyen, AB 18 [1899] 214f); cattle could be pastured in the woods without herdsmen; but often shepherds went far from home with their flocks. A 14th-C. historian (Greg. 1:379.20–23) describes peasants in the Strumica region of Macedonia who left their homes in spring for the mountains and stayed there to milk their animals. There were also special winter pastures (cheimadeion)—thus, an Athonite act of 1393 mentions a cheimadeion in the area of Kassandra, near which were located a field of 1,800 modioi and an oak grove, probably for the swine (Xenoph. no.22.5–6). Another monastery possessed a cheimadeion in the same area where several demosioskoi paroikoi had settled (Chil., no.58.4–7). A contract might regulate the use of such a winter pasture: for example, two neighboring landowners were to feed their cattle on it during the winter, but from the beginning of the spring, when the grass began to grow, they had to avoid it (MM 4:181.19–25).

Sheep were esp. suited for long journeys, and large flocks accompanied by shepherds and dogs could be seen in Cappadocia. Some ethnic minorities, such as the Vlachs and Albanians, practiced transhumance in mountainous regions. The mass production of cheese was connected with this type of husbandry, which required the preservation of dairy products for long periods. —A.K., J.W.N.
TRANSLATION. Throughout the Byz. era neighboring cultures showed an awareness of Greek literature and made translations of Greek authors. The Byz., on the other hand, showed much less interest in translating works in other languages into Greek, except in the final centuries of the empire.

GREEK INTO LATIN. In the West interest in translation into Latin concentrated around several types of literature: science (in 6th-C. Africa, Mustio translated the gynecological works of Soranos of Ephesus; in the 5th–6th C. a meteorological treatise by Epiphanius of Salamis, written ca.392, was translated; a Latin version of Aratos’s interpretation of meteorological phenomena appeared in the 7th C.); military exploits and adventures (alleged memoirs of the Phrygian Dares from the 6th C., the story of Apollonios of Tyre); theological, hagiographical, and church historical writings translated by Jerome, Rufinus, etc. Already by 373 the vita of St. Antony the Great by Athanasios of Alexandria appeared in Latin. Interest in contemporary Greek literature can be traced through the 9th C., when Anastasius Bibliothecarius rendered the Chronographia of Theophanes the Confessor into Latin.

From the 9th C. onward attention focused on theological works, esp. pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite (translated by Eriugena) and Barlaam and Ioasaph (first translated into Latin in the 11th C., then into various “national” languages). In the 12th C. Burgundio of Pisa’s translations included John Chrysostom and John of Damascus, while Moses of Bergamo translated a treatise attributed to Epiphanius of Salamis and a florilegium on the Trinity. From the 13th C. onward interest shifted toward ancient Greek philosophy on the part of both Greek and Latin scholars. William of Moerbecke translated Aristotle and Proklos, while Robert Grosseteste headed a group of scholars at Lincoln who translated Aristotle and Byz. commentaries on Aristotle as well as works of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite and John of Damascus. Byz. literati in Italy, such as John Argyropoulos, Theodore Gazes, and George Trapezountios, made translations of Plato and Aristotle, in addition to some patristic writings, while Nicholas Sekoundinos translated Demosthenes and Plutarch, among other authors. During the Renaissance scholars rediscovered Homer and other classics of ancient literature, while paying little attention to writings of the Byz. era.


A.K., A.M.T.

GREEK INTO SLAVONIC. The earliest surviving Slavonic translations of Greek texts date from the Christian period of the first Bulgarian Empire (864–971), since those made by Cyril (Constantine the Philosopher) and Methodios for their Moravian mission (863–85) have been lost. The entire corpus of translations could be compared to the library of a large, provincial Byz. monastery: the Bible; homiletic and exegetical writings, but few dogmatic works; hagiography; liturgy; gnomoologia; florilegia; popular world histories; canon law; and a few popular romances, such as the Alexander Romance. In the 12th to 15th C. more translations were made in Bulgaria, Serbia, and on Mt. Athos (e.g., at Hilandar), but they were again mainly ecclesiastical, including the fathers who influenced the Hesychasts, so that the orthodox Slavs remained largely ignorant of Byz. (and classical) philosophy and science. Most of the translations, in keeping with the medieval theory of the need to preserve both content and form of the original, were literal. (See also Rus’, Literature of; Bulgarian Literature; Serbian Literature.)


F.J.T.

GREEK INTO LANGUAGES OF THE CHRISTIAN EAST. Translations of Greek texts played a very important role in the formation of the Eastern Christian literatures in Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Arabic, Coptic, and Ethiopic. In some cases (Armenian, Georgian) translations from Greek and Syriac played a formative role, being the first productions in the native tongue. In other cases (Syriac, Coptic) the translations were vital for the full development of the local Christian traditions, even if an indigenous Christian literary tradition coexisted.
Translations from Greek are indicative of a common cultural heritage among Eastern Christians that is derived from the Hellenistic world. Not only did biblical, liturgical, and theological texts come in large part from Greek sources but it was through translations that Syrians, Armenians, and others participated in the general culture of their time in the Eastern Mediterranean and Near East.

Although national literatures developed in languages that had no linguistic affinity (Semitic/Hamitic, Indo-European, Caucasian), there was a common pool of themes both Christian and secular. Thus cultural boundaries were not significant, and even theological differences did not prevent a great deal of translation from one language to another.

**Syriac.** The large number of translations and constant revisions of the Bible indicates Syrian preoccupation with authoritative foreign texts. Although native traditions, esp. poetry, developed along local lines (and in turn influenced Greek—cf. **Romanos the Melode**), translations from Greek theological, philosophical, rhetorical, and scientific texts formed the basis for Syrian learning in those spheres. Furthermore, the role of Syriac texts and of Syrian translators in the early transmission of Greek thought to the Muslim world is paramount (see below). (See also **Syriac Literature**.)

**Armenian.** The first texts written in Armenian were biblical, liturgical, and theological works translated from Greek and Syriac. The translators were familiar with the contemporary literary culture of the Eastern Mediterranean, and translations of secular texts (philosophy, grammar, rhetoric, the sciences) rapidly augmented the growing body of native literature. Especially influential for Armenian historians were Eusebios of Caesarea (**Ecclesiastical History, Chronicon**), Sokrates, Philo, Josephus Flavius (though only a later, 17th-C. translation survives), and the **Alexander Romance**. Translations of Dionysios Thrax and David the Philosopher of Alexandria were significant for the development of Armenian grammatical and philosophical interests; in theology John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzos had the greatest influence. Translations from Greek (and Syriac, and later from Arabic, Persian, and Latin) continued to enrich Armenian learning throughout the Byz. period (e.g., pseudo-Dionysios the Areopa-

gite and scholia in the 8th C.). (See also **Armenian Literature**.)

**Georgian.** As in Armenia, so in Georgia a native literature developed first from translations of biblical, liturgical, and theological texts. But even more than in Armenia, the influence of Palestine was noticeable in Georgia. Thus Georgian has preserved biblical and liturgical traditions associated with Jerusalem that were later subordinated to the Byz. rite. Continuing ties with Palestine after the Muslim conquest are evident from many translations into Georgian from Christian Arabic. Since the Georgians remained Chalcedonian, they associated with Greek scholars in monastic centers such as Mt. Athos (esp. **Iveron**), Mt. Sinai, and the Black Mountain. In the 10th and 11th C. many new translations from biblical, theological, exegetical, and philosophical texts were made. (See also **Georgian Literature**.)

**Arabic.** There is not always a clear distinction between Christian and Muslim translations from Greek into Arabic, given the interplay between the two literatures. The earliest transmission of Greek learning to the Muslims was effected by Christian translators working primarily from Syriac versions. Emphasis was given to philosophical, medical, and scientific works.

Writers of Christian texts in Arabic were also heirs to Greek traditions of learning. In the ecclesiastical sphere the first translations were of biblical and liturgical texts. Whether any of these predate Islamic times is a debated question. By the 9th C. translations of Greek patristic writers, augmented by versions of ascetic and hagiographic literature, were being produced in the monasteries of southern Palestine (see **Judea, Wilderness of and Sabas, Great Lavra of**) and the Sinai peninsula.

---


OTHER LANGUAGES INTO GREEK. Translations into Greek from other languages were infrequent in the late Roman Empire (Christ, Literatur 2.2:665, n.1), even though a few 6th-C. authors (John Lydos, Malalas) evidently had some knowledge of Latin literature (B. Baldwin in From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium [Prague 1985] 237-41). The most important translations were not in belles lettres, but in the sphere of law and jurisprudence, that is, the translation of Justinian’s legal codification. It is also possible to trace some translations of hagiographical works from Latin: thus, the Dialogues of Pope Gregory I were translated by Pope Zacharias or someone at his court; more difficult is the question of the Greek Acts of Pope Silvester and the date of their compilation or translation. The origin of the Greek vitae of some popes (Leo I, Martin) and Latin saints (Martin of Tours) is not certain. The influx of Latin literature, esp. theological (Augustine, Thomas Aquinas), took place in the 14th and 15th C. through the translations of the Kydones brothers and Gennadios II Scholarios, while Planoudes introduced secular authors, such as Ovid and Cicero, to a Byz. audience. Some astronomical tables were also translated from Latin. Translations from Armenian into Greek were rare, but there are Greek versions of two recensions of Agathangelos and of the Narratio de Rebus Armeniace. Translations from Arabic and Persian were primarily of scientific texts, esp. on astronomy and to a lesser extent medicine and pharmacology.

The relation of certain Greek texts with their supposed Syriac, Arabic, or Georgian “originals” is unclear; one of the texts in dispute is Barlaam and Ioasaph. The situation began to change in the 11th C. when oriental texts such as Stephanites and Ichnelates (translated from Arabic by Symeon Seth) and Syntipas (translated from Syriac by Michael Andreonpolus) penetrated Greek literature.


TRANSLATION OF RELICS. See Relics.

TRANSLITERATION OF TEXTS, that is, transcribing uncial MSS into a new script (minuscule), occurred primarily in the 9th and 10th C. Neither the precise date of the beginning of transliteration (μεταχειρακτηρισμός) nor the place of its origin is well established. The first precisely dated minuscule copy is the Uspenskij Gospel book of 835, but Wilson (infra 66) considers a collection of astronomical texts in Leiden (Universiteitsbibliothek B.P.G. 78) as written between 813 and 820. The Studios monastery has been suggested as the site of the invention of minuscule, but the hypothesis is based on circumstantial evidence. Nevertheless, Constantinople is probably where the transliteration started.

It is difficult to establish the history of transliteration since many MSS have been lost and others are not dated. Dain (infra 127) thinks that the New Testament was the first type of book to be transliterated, but in the 9th C. the Byz. continued to produce some uncial MSS of the New Testament (e.g., the so-called Coridethi Gospel). The earliest dated Old Testament manuscript in minuscule is of 914 (Athens, Nat. Lib. suppl. 614), whereas the so-called Uspenskij Psalter of 862 (Rahlfs, Verzeichnis 2241) was still written in uncial. Liturgical texts continued to be produced in uncial, as were some works of the church fathers (the copy of pseudo-Dionysios sent to France in 827 was still in uncial), while other patristic works were transliterated as early as the 9th C. (e.g., Vaticanus gr. 503 containing the Panarion of Eiphanius of Cyprus). Scientific MSS (e.g., Ptolemy, Euclid, and collections of mathematical, astronomical, and medical writings) were among the works transliterated in the 9th C. as well as some treatises on philosophy, including Aristotle and Plato. Secular literature (poets, tragedians, historians) was rendered into minuscule somewhat later (10th C.) with the exception of Homer (for whom there is a 9th-C. minuscule MS). The process of transliteration left telltale signs in extant texts (e.g., errors due to misunderstanding of the uncial letters on the part of scribes making the transliteration into minuscule).


A.K., I.S.
TRANSPORTATION. See DROMOS; TRAVEL.

TRAPEZA (τράπεζα, lit. “table”), a refectory in a monastery. Monastic *typika* regulated in detail behavior “in the *trapeza*” where monks took their meals (P. Gautier, *REB* 42 [1984] 67-788-89). Some *typika* emphasized that all the monks should eat together “in the *trapeza* of nourishment” (P. Gautier, *REB* 42 [1984] 47-458-59), whereas the *typikon* of the Kecharitomene Nunnery permitted some distinguished nuns to eat in their cells “beyond the apse of the *trapeza*” (P. Gautier, *REB* 43 [1985] 37-315-16). The monk (or nun) in charge of the *trapeza* was called the *trapezarios* (or *trapezaria*).

Architecture of the Refectory. The refectory was often located opposite the *katholikon*, which it followed in the liturgical hierarchy of the monastery, since the common meals eaten there were seen to be a continuation of the liturgy. The three types of Byz. refectories were a rectangular hall, the same with an added transept, and a room cruciform in plan as at the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos. The buildings were sometimes apsed and usually covered with wooden roofs. A long table with benches might be placed in the middle of the refectory or a number of semicircular tables (*sigmata*) were placed along the walls, which were often frescoed.


TRAPEZITES. See BANKER.

TRAVEL. The geographic horizons of the late antique world remained broad and encompassed China, India, Ceylon, Ethiopia, and the British Isles. After the 7th C. the scope of Byz. travel significantly diminished; although we hear sometimes about journeys to India, in reality the Byz. rarely ventured farther than Baghdad and Alexandria in the southeast, France in the west, and the northern shore of the Black Sea. In the late Palaiologan period some venturesome travelers visited England and the Baltic regions (Manuel II Palaiologos, Laskaris Kananos, Manuel Chrysoloras). Constantinople attracted western and eastern travelers (esp. from the 11th C. onward); in comparison the Byz. did not travel as much.

Major purposes of travel were COMMERCE (the money-changer Kalomodos, said Niketas Choniates, often set forth on long journeys), official government business, EMBASSIES, PILGRIMAGE, and visits to shrines for HEALING; travel for EDUCATION or pleasure was rare. Although the principle of STABILITY was among the rules of monastic behavior, the saints' vitae often describe voyages of monks, esp. to Jerusalem and Rome.

Travelers were endangered by hazards such as PIRACY, BRIGANDAGE, and shipwreck, and inconvenienced by slow vehicles, poor roads, and underdeveloped facilities; they often preferred monastic hostels (*xenodochia*) to commercial INNS and MITATA. If choice was available, the Byz. opted to travel by SHIP because it was easier and faster. Travelers on land walked or rode HORSES, mules, and donkeys; occasionally horses and oxen were used to pull CARRIAGES. Rich people were sometimes carried on a litter (by slaves in the 9th C. at least). Pious men usually journeyed alone or in pairs, whereas MERCHANTS preferred to travel in groups, hiring professional ass-drivers. The travel of state officials was facilitated by the department of the DROMOS, and local inhabitants were required to provide them with free transportation and lodging.

Some information on the length of journeys is preserved in both Greek and foreign sources (the Greek ones usually indicate shorter times): an uneventful sea voyage from Constantinople to Cyprus in the 12th C. took 10 days, and one could ride from Paphlagonia to the capital on horseback in eight days, although John Maupoues complained that his trip from Constantinople to Euchaeta took two months. (See also GEOGRAPHY; TRAVEL LITERATURE.)


TRAVEL LITERATURE encompasses numerous late antique and medieval genres (PERIPOLOUS, itinerary, PROSKYNETARION, etc.) varying in their languages, goals, and approaches. Its principal
languages were Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Slavic. Main areas of attention were Palestine (sometimes together with Egypt), Constantinople, and Rome; other regions appear as way stations. Greek, Latin, and Slavic works were predominantly descriptions of pilgrimages and guidebooks (hodoiōrhai) for pilgrims primarily interested in religious monuments (loca sancta) and relics. They could also be (or include) tales of wonder-working, descriptions of diplomatic missions, or the adventures of captives; there are also some narrative accounts of journeys for arranged marriages. Arabic texts were primarily guides for merchants and contained information about marketplaces and the goods produced at various locales. Some travel accounts take a personal approach, depicting fears and hardships, describing meetings with local celebrities, and expressing individual opinions; others are restricted to lists of sites, the distances between them, and concise indications as to what is worth seeing. Pilgrim attractions are standardized; material is often repeated in book after book without any concern for plagiarism. Linguistic difficulties sometimes led to misunderstandings, and medieval gullibility confused reality with legend; nevertheless, many travel accounts contain unique and precious information: the fresh, if naive, eye of a foreigner could observe phenomena that local people or a Constantinopolitan historian might neglect. (See also Geography.)


AM.

TRDAT. See Hagia Sophia.

TRDAT THE GREAT (Τηριδάρης), first Christian Arsacid king of Armenia and saint. The dates of his reign are still disputed, but the years 298–330 seem most likely since the recently discovered Paikuli inscriptions, which name the Sassanian Narseh king of Armenia, make the previously proposed dates impossible. According to Armenian "received" tradition, Trdat was educated within the territory of the Roman Empire, having been taken there by his nurse after the murder of his father Chosroes I the Great of Armenia. Diocletian reinstated Trdat, probably after the peace of Nisibis in 298. Obeying Roman policy, he persecuted Gregory the Illuminator, the virgin martyr Hripsime (see VAHARAPAT), and Christians in general until the era of toleration was inaugurated after 313. Trdat then permitted Gregory to be consecrated as bishop and primate of Armenia, was baptized himself, and spread the faith throughout his realm. Little is known about the end of his reign because of the silence or disagreement of the sources. Trdat was still alive to send a representative to the First Council of Nicaea in 325 and probably fought against northern invaders. The account given of his death during a rebellion (Moses Xorenac'1 2.92) is unsupported, however, and the tale of his visit to Constantine I the Great at Rome (AGATHANGELOS, ed. Thom. 41.875–82) is certainly apocryphal.


N.G.

TREASON, HIGH (καθοσίωσις, Lat. crimen laesae majestatis), was during the Roman republic an offense against the state and its magistrates; in the empire it was defined as a crime against the ruler or the appropriation of his privileges (such as counterfeiting of coins or establishing a private prison). The standard penalty was capital punishment, followed by confiscation of property, denial of proper burial, and damnatio memoriae. Legal procedure in the case of high treason was relieved of certain customary restrictions: slaves were allowed to bear witness against their masters and freedmen against their "protectors" (patroni), and the testimony of soldiers, women, and disreputable persons was considered valid. The Ecloga (17.3) defined high treason as an "association, conspiracy, or plot against the emperor or the politeia of the Christians" and left the final decision about punishment to the emperor. Preventive measures against high treason included mutilation of the emperor's relatives and oaths of fealty. Several emperors succeeded in having potential rebels threatened by the church with anathema, though such attempts remained sporadic and controversial. The most elaborate description of a treason trial is that of the future emperor Michael [VIII] PALAILOGOS.

TREASURES, SILVER AND GOLD (κεραμικά ἀργυρά καὶ χρυσά), are frequently alluded to in literature of the 4th–7th C. and about 30 survive from this period. They have been found in all parts of the empire—Italy and North Africa, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. Byz. silver objects have also been found outside the empire, mostly in tombs, for example, at Malaja Pereščepina. Nearly half of the treasures are of domestic silver plate; the other half have been identified epigraphically and/or archaeologically as containing liturgical vessels belonging to village churches. In some cases treasures were found with gold coins and/or jewelry; the Second Cyprus Treasure included several bronze objects, and the Vrap treasure contained both gold and silver Byz. objects of the 5th–7th C. (Dodd, Byz. Silver Stamps, nos. 88, 103). Excavated treasures dating from after the 7th C. are virtually unknown. —M.M.M.

TREASURE TROVE (εὑρεσις θησαυροῦ). A technical term related to the state’s interest in hoards of coins (see COIN FINDS), buried in times of uncertainty and later discovered. The state’s approach varied considerably, taking into account first its sovereign rights and, second, the theory that treasures were the property of the dead. In the late Roman Empire and under the Macedonian and Komnenian dynasties, the government encouraged such discoveries and the return of the cash to normal monetary circulation by recognizing the rights of individuals over them, esp. the finder and the owner of the land where the money was found. In contrast, during the Iconoclastic period and under the Palaiologoi, the state faced financial difficulties and insisted on recovering whatever was hidden in the land: treasures found by individuals were confiscated either by the imposition of a very heavy tax (Nikephoros I) or by the state’s claiming the whole find (Palaiologoi). In the Palaiologan period, a treasure trove was considered part of the aerikon, a fiscalized fine, a regular fiscal obligation of the peasants.

produced, are lost. The *Povesti* mentions the treaty of 907 (whose authenticity has been hotly debated, along with the historicity of the expedition of Oleg against Constantinople in this year) and contains the texts of the treaties of 911, 944, and 971. All the treaties were concluded under similar political circumstances, after Rus' invasions in Byz. or Bulgaria; they are modeled on the charters of the imperial chancery and are important sources for the history of Byz. *DIPLOMACY*. Even greater is their significance for the history of Kievan Rus', since they show that the young state was negotiating with Byz. on equal terms. The treaties reveal that among the Rus' envoys were men with Scandinavian names; already by 944 some members of the Rus' elite were Christian.


**TREBIZOND** (*Трабзон*, mod. Trabzon), the greatest city of Pontos, flourished because of its fine harbor and location at the head of the best route from the sea to the interior and Iran. Restored by Diocletian after a Gothic attack, Trebizond became a legionary base and a city of Pontos Polemoniakos (see Pontos). In the reorganization of Justinian I, it was assigned to Armenia I. Justinian conducted his Armenian campaigns from Trebizond, restored its walls, and built an aqueduct. Trebizond had bishops from the 3rd C. onward; Eirenaios, responsible for the rebuildings of Justinian, played a major role in civic life. Trebizond became an archbishopric in the 8th C. and a metropolis of the diocese of Lazike in the early 10th. In the 7th C., Trebizond became a city of Armeniaion, and, in the early 9th C., capital of Chaldia. A brief Turkish occupation after 1071 was followed by the rule of the Gabrades, nominally subject to the Komnenoi. The well-documented period after 1204 was one of great architectural and artistic activity. Two 15th-C. *ekphrasis* (by Bessarion and a shorter one by John Eugenikos) characterize the geographical position, climate, and trade activity of the city and describe its palace.

In 1204, Trebizond consisted of a small fortified enceinte on a steep hill, with market, harbor, suburbs, and separately fortified monasteries outside the walls. Much of it was exposed to Turkish attacks, which began in 1229. Alexios II Komnenos, emperor of Trebizond (1297–1330), built a new wall that encompassed the harbor and lower city. It was strengthened in 1578; the citadel, which contained the imperial palace and government offices, was frequently repaired until the fall of the Trapezuntine Empire. The commercial district, with numerous churches and the separate fortifications of the Genoese and Venetians, lay beyond the walls. Names of many quarters are known from contemporary texts or later Turkish documents. In spite of its numerous monuments, Trebizond was surprisingly small, with only about 4,000 inhabitants in 1498. Powerful fortifications and an isolated location enabled it to survive numerous Turkish attacks until 1461.

Monuments of Trebizond include the fortifications, which manifest eight periods of construction, mostly of the 13th–14th C. Parts of the palace have also survived. Trebizond preserves the remains or memory of some 95 churches. Most important is the monastery of St. Sophia, probably founded by Manuel I Komnenos, emperor of Trebizond (1238–63), and extensively rebuilt in the early 15th C.; a cross-in-square church with three apses, a narthex, and three porches, its interior was covered with frescoes. Also prominent are the Church of St. Eugenios of Trebizond (1291); the Cathedral of the Virgin Chrysokephalos, rebuilt in 1214 as the imperial coronation church; and the earliest church of Trebizond, the Basilica of St. Anne, restored in 885. Other churches are generally small and undatable, but their characteristic pentagonal apses and porches suggest that most belong to the period of the 13th–15th C.


**TREBIZOND, EMPIRE OF**, one of the three successor states to the Byz. Empire, lasting from 1204 to 1461. It arose at the time of the conquest of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade. Unlike the empire of Nicaea and despotate of Epirus, however, the empire of Trebizond was established not in response to the Latin occupation, but just prior to it as a continuation of the rule of the Komnenian dynasty, overthrown in 1185 by the
Angelo. Founded by Alexios I Komnenos and David Komnenos, grandsons of Andronikos I Komnenos, the new “empire” was restricted to a narrow strip of land along the southeast coast of the Black Sea and was isolated from Constantinople. Under the rule of the Grand Komnenoi, the empire of Trebizond survived for 250 years, despite its small size and the constant threat of conquest by the Turks. Its longevity can be attributed to the natural barrier of the Pontic Mountains, the strong fortifications of the capital city of Trebizond, the flourishing commerce of this port city, and the astute marriage diplomacy carried out by the Trapezuntine emperors, who sought alliances for themselves primarily with Byz. and Georgian princesses and married many of their daughters and sisters to Turkomans. For much of its history the empire was the vassal of successive stronger powers: the Seljuks of Ikonion (1214–43), the Mongols (after the invasions of 1243 and 1402), and the Ottomans (after 1456). It was the last outpost of Byz. civilization to fall to the Turks, being forced to surrender in Aug. or Sept. 1461 (F. Babinger, REB 7 [1950] 205–07) when besieged by Ottoman forces by land and sea.


TRIAL (δική). Byz. inherited from Rome a system of trying lawsuits that was based on the principles of a fair trial, a competent judge (prosphoros dikastes), and legality of procedure and judgment—principles that of course had to be adapted to the conditions created by the “absolute monarchy” of Byz. In spite of relevant legislative activity in the 11th and 12th C., the rules for civil procedure and criminal procedure remained as they had been laid down in the Corpus Juris Civilis. Besides, the lawsuit was affected by peculiarities in the system of judicial administration, esp. the division, which never completely disappeared, between jurisdiction (dikaiodosia) and the actual delegated execution of a lawsuit (dikazein), as well as by the absence of any effective regulations for successive appeal. These circumstances meant the prolongation of civil lawsuits in particular, which the legislator tried to prevent through the reduction of court holidays (apraktoi hemerai), the establishment of procedural time limits, and by an ineffective prohibition on parties applying to the emperor during the course of the trial with a petition (deesis). Ecclesiastical penal and disci-
plenary procedure was regulated by canon law. For actual Byz. trials, our richest sources are, in addition to historiographical information on causes célèbres and a series of decisions of civil and ecclesiastical courts, the Peira, the corpus of acts of Demetrios Chomatenos, the accounts of John Apokaukos, and the Acts of the patriarchate of Constantinople, which are well preserved for the 14th C. They owe their existence in the first place to the legally recorded proceedings of the proceedings.


TRIBELON (τριβηλον, etym. tri- + Lat. velum, curtain or door hanging [Tafrali, infra]), a rare term designating a part of a church. The Miracles of St. Demetrios (Lemerle, Miracles 1:162.2-11) describes two supernatural persons entering "the tribelon of the holy shrine of the renowned martyr Demetrios." Later versions used instead the word tribelon that C. Ducange (Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graeciae [Lyon 1688; rp. Graz 1958] s.v.) suggested "correcting" to peribolon. The word evidently refers to the area at the entrance to the church, designating the "atrium or narthex" according to Tafrali (infra 43) or the narthex according to Lemerle (supra 1:159, n.3).

Art historians use the term conventionally to denote three arches carried on two intermediate columns between two piers. Triple-arched openings between piers are common in Byz. arcuate and domical architecture, notably in the exedrae of S. Vitale, Ravenna, of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos, and of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople. As a natural concomitant of the bay system, they are found in the nave of the east church at Alahan Manastiri, around the naos of the katholikon of Hosios Loukas, and in the south and west porches of Hagia Sophia, Trebizon. The term tribelon is usually reserved for the triple opening between the narthex and the naos.

LIT. O. Tafrali, Milanges d'archéologie et d'épigraphie byzantines (Paris 1913) 40-50. —W.L., A.C.

TRIBIGILD (Τριβιγιλλος, Τριγιβιλλος), a Goth and comes rei militaris in the East; died Thrace ca.400. He was a relative of Gainas and commanded barbarian troops settled in Phrygia. After a visit to Constantinople in 399, during which he was slighted by Eutropios, his troops revolted. Valentinus, a local commander in Pamphylia, took charge of organizing resistance to the barbarians. He was assisted by local peasants and slaves. Tribigild was defeated near Selge. He barely escaped with 300 mounted soldiers (Kulakovskij, Istorija 1:70-72). Tribigild then conspired with Gainas, who had been sent to quell the revolt, and together the two Goths marched on Constantinople. While Gainas entered the capital Tribigild crossed over to Thrace, where he died shortly thereafter. The uprising stimulated anti-Germanic feeling in Constantinople and gave rise to the oration titled On Kingship by Synesios.


TRIBONIAN (Τριβωνιανός), jurist and high-ranking official at the court of Justinian I; born Pamphylia before 500, died probably 542 of plague. Justinian’s protegé, he served as member of the emperor’s commission appointed in Feb. 528 to draft a law code (Codex Justinianus). According to Honoré (infra), he profited from the purge of the commission (pagan lawyers were dismissed) and became quaestor and its chairman; this Honoré connects with the shift in the focus of the commission from the practical need of lawyers for an established code to an antiquarian and scholarly approach as reflected in the Digest. Accusations of graft launched against Tribonian during the Nika Revolt compelled Justinian to dismiss him; although he eventually returned to the commission, he never regained his former authority. Evidence of Tribonian’s fall from favor was the slow replacement of Latin by Greek in legislation (see Novels of Justinian I). A jurist with enormous knowledge of Roman law, Tribonian tried to retreat from the magniloquence of the Codex Theodosianus to the simplicity and clarity of Gaius, yet retained affectations for the sake of imperial propaganda.


TRICONCH. See Church Plan Types.
TRIESTE (Τρίγεστ(ρ)ον), Roman port and fortress at the north end of the Adriatic Sea, economically and politically overshadowed by the neighboring Aquileia. Legends connect the activity of several martyrs with Trieste, for example, Servolus in the 3rd C. and Justus (San Giusto) in 303. After 488 Trieste was in the hands of the Goths, but in 539 the region was conquered by the army of Justinian I. Despite the attacks of the Lombards, Avars, and Slavs the city remained under Byz. authority, and a special military detachment, *numerus tergestinus*, protected northern Illyricum from barbarian invasions. Ecclesiastically, Trieste was linked with Aquileia and Grado and supported them in the conflict of the Three Chapters against Rome and Constantinople. In 752 Trieste fell to the Lombards, in 787 or 788 to Charlemagne, and thereafter stood outside the political sphere of Byz.

Monuments of Trieste. Two apses in the cathedral of S. Maria Assunta e S. Giusto are decorated with mosaics that Demus (infra) considers “Greek” rather than Adriatic in style. The cathedral was originally two separate buildings (like S. Maria Assunta and S. Fosca on TORCELLO): S. Maria Assunta, an 11th-C. basilica, and S. Giusto, a centralized church with a dome on squinches. In the main apse of S. Maria Assunta is an image of the Virgin enthroned between archangels, with the 12 Apostles below; in the main apse of S. Giusto, Christ between Ss. Justus and Servolus. The two mosaics, not necessarily contemporary, are variously dated to the 11th, 12th, or 13th C.

The cathedral treasury contains an image of St. Justus painted on silk, 119 cm high, also dated to the 11th–13th C. Though some scholars have identified the painter as Constantinopolitan, Demus believes he was “Veneto-Byz.”


TRIGLEIA. See Medikon Monastery; Peketere Monastery.

TRIKEPHALON (νομισμα τρικέφαλον, lit. “three-header”), sometimes abbreviated Γαν (F. Dölger, *BZ* 27 [1927] 296, n.4); a word applied to the one-third hyperpyron or electrum trachy of the early 12th C., which had on it a total of three “heads”: that of the emperor, the Virgin, and Christ (in the form of a medallion held by the Virgin), in contrast to the hyperpyron, which had the figures of Christ and the emperor only. The three decades during which such trikephala were issued (1092–1118) resulted in *trikeyphalon* becoming one of the several names regularly used for this denomination even where it no longer accurately described the design of the coins.


TRIKKALA (Τρικάλα, anc. Trikke, Triκ(κ)α), city in a fertile valley in northwest Thessaly. Trikkala was an important transit point, with roads running west across the Pindos Mountains to Epiros and north to Grevena and Macedonia. Prokopios (Buildings 4.3.5) names “Trika” among the Thessalian poleis whose walls were repaired by Justinian I. From the 4th C. onward, the city was a suffragan bishopric of Larissa. The first known bishop, Heliodoros, was thought to be the author of the *Aethiopica*. The old name Trikka survived in several anachronistic texts, while Trikkala appears first in Kekaumenos, who speaks of Triktalian Vlachs. Anna Komnene (An.Komn. 2:31.27) cites τὰ Trikala as a geographic name without defining the character of the site. Al-Ibrîsî described Trikkala as an important agrarian center with abundant vineyards and gardens. In Alexios III’s charter of 1198 for Venice, Trikkala is mentioned along with other Thessalian cities. Its political role before 1204 is almost unknown: in 1082/3 Trikkala was for a short time captured by the Normans. It seems not to have been occupied by the Crusaders after 1204 (Nicol, *Epiros I* 36) but was controlled by Epiros.

After the victory at Pfalgonia in 1559, John Palaiologos, Michael VIII’s brother, reached Neopatras and “Trikke” and took them without resistance (Pachym., ed. Failler, 1:151.14). In the 14th C. (until 1332/3) Trikkala formed the center of the independent “fief” of Stephen Gabrielopulos; after his death Trikkala fell under the control of John Orsini of Epiros, then of Byz.: a chryso-bull of Andronikos III of March 1336 (Reg 4, no.2826) rewards the monks of the Zabantion monastery near Trikkala for their help in transferring the city to the emperor. The Serbs con-
quered Thessaly in 1348, and Dušan's general Preljub governed it from Trikkala. In 1359 Symeon Uroš established his court in Trikkala, where he imitated the ritual of Constantinople. Trikkala was occupied by the Ottomans in 1393. In the 14th C. the bishopric of Trikkala gained increasing control over Meteora.

The fortifications on the acropolis are mostly of Turkish date, but traces of the Justinianic repairs have been identified on the south side (L.W. Daly, *AJA* 46 [1942] 507). A floor mosaic on the hill of Prophetis Elias is from the narthex of a basilica, probably of the 5th C., and the ruins of a church, presumably of Byz. date, are on the acropolis. The Church of St. Stephen contains an inscription naming Symeon Uroš and the Despoina Anna (D. Papachryssanthou, *TM* 2 [1967] 483–88). Many small churches, esp. of the 12th–13th C., can be found in the villages around Trikkala.

**TRIKLINIOS, DEMETRIOS**, classical philologist; fl. Thessalonike ca. 1300–25. He changed his name from Triklines to Triklinios (Τρικλίνιος) around 1316 or 1319. Triklinios studied with Thomas Magistros and Maximos Planoudeis, and probably ran a school and scriptorium in Thessalonike. He copied MSS of Hesiod, Hermogenes, and Aphthonios in a fine calligraphic hand, but is better known for his editions of classical poets and dramatists. Owing to his understanding of ancient Greek meters, he was able to make emendations in the texts based on metrical principles. He also incorporated the scholia of his slightly older contemporaries Manuel Moschopoulos and Thomas Magistros. His most significant contribution was his preparation of new recensions of ancient Greek tragedies and comedies, esp. those texts that did not normally form part of the standard curriculum. Thus he edited five plays of Aeschylus, including the previously ignored *Agamemnon* and *Eumenides* (an autograph MS survives), all seven extant plays of Sophocles, and eight of Aristophanes instead of the usual three. Especially important was his edition of all the plays of Euripides including the “non-select” plays (i.e., those plays not selected for school use), which were virtually unknown before the 14th C. Triklinios evidently also revised the *Anthologia Planudea* (A. Turyn, *EEBS* 39–40 [1972–3] 403–50). An essay on lunar theory (ed. A. Wasserstein, *JOB* 16 [1967] 153–74) indicates his interest in astronomy.

**TRIKLINOS OF JUSTINIAN** (Ιουστινιανός), a hall constructed by Justinian II (probably in 694) and richly decorated with mosaics by Theophilos. It is also called the Hall of Procession, and in the De ceremoniis is mentioned primarily in connection with processional routes (e.g., from Chrysotriklines via Lausakos and the Triklines of Justinian to the gate of Skyla and the Hippodrome). It served also as a place for discussing state affairs. In 1289 Athanasios I was proclaimed patriarch there. Pachymeres relates that at the beginning of the 14th C. the building was destroyed by violent winds, leaving no trace; in 1345, however, Alexios Apokaukos built there a prison, or transformed into a prison the remnants of the formerly splendid edifice.

**TRIMOIRIA.** See Abiition.}

**TRINITY** (τριάς). Although not mentioned specifically in the New Testament, the doctrine of the Trinity is supported by the unique relationship of Jesus to God, whom he calls “Abba,” and by the resurrection, or the experience of Pentecost, on the basis of which his disciples confess him to be the Son of God whose Spirit they have received. *Baptism*, the *creed*, and the *doxology* were the original setting from which the doctrine of God as one, yet three, evolved.

The term *trías* occurred relatively early, even before it had been accepted as ecclesiastical doctrine. Even though he knew of the term’s usage in Gnostic speculation, *Clement of Alexandria*, for example (*Stromata* 5.103.1, ed. O. Stählin, L.
Fruchtel, 395), associated the triad of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit with Plato’s Second Letter (312e); Clement also referred to “the blessed triad” of God in connection with the three prayer periods of the Christians (ibid. 7.40.3, p.31).

More important, however, was the doctrine of the three hypostases of Plotinos, and the terminology of Origen because of its influence on the Cappadocian Fathers. Origen distinguished between God’s substance and the hypostases of the Father and the Logos/Son (cf. Homoousios). Around 260, the term was already part of ecclesiastical language. Dionysius of Rome (died 268), in his letter to Dionysius of Alexandria (died ca.264), used it to oppose Monarchianism (Sabellianism) and Marcion (died ca.160; cf. Athanasios of Alexandria, De decretis Nicaenae synodi, 26.3, 7, ed. Opitz, 22.10, 23.15), and Gregory Thaumaturgos (died ca.270) spoke in his Ekthesis of “the perfect triad” (ed. E. Schwartz, ACO 3:3, 10).

In the 4th C. the formula of one ousia (substance) of God and three hypostases was generally accepted. This involved both the use of imagery or examples and the formation of an appropriate terminology. Some images were seen in creation (e.g. the sun, its rays, and light; a spring, a creek, and its current; or, a wellspring, a fount, and a stream, respectively), and some, admittedly hidden, in the Old Testament as allegory of typology (e.g., Adam and Eve, Seth). A special example was the tradition of the three men who visited Abraham under the oaks of Mamre (Gen 18:1–8; cf. Gregory of Nazianzos, or.28.18.7–9, ed. Gallay, 136; PG 36:49A), or the divine image of man. The words, “Let us create man in our image and according to our likeness” (Gen 1:26) were understood to have been spoken by the Father to the Son and Holy Spirit. In more sophisticated theological circles, however, these illustrations were met with reserve and their dissimilarities to the prototype were emphasized (e.g., Gregory of Nazianzos, or.39.11–13, ed. Gallay, 170–79; PG 36:169AC).

At issue was how three persons can be distinct from one another, and yet one. An important approach was discussion of the “inner man” as a union of soul, reason, and spirit (or, nous, logos, and pneuma), or of the soul as the subject of the three Platonic virtues, and the “inner man” became the paradigm par excellence from the time of Photios to Manuel II Palaiologos (Dialogues with a Persian 17, ed. E. Trapp, 216.39–218.2).

Decisive for the formation of an appropriate terminology was Orthodox opposition to Sabellianism and so-called Modalism. The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are not simple “figures” (prosopa or morphi) in which the one God remains transcendentally aloof in encounters with man. Therefore they are not mere divine manifestations in accordance with the religious understanding of the Greeks. Rather, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit refer to distinctions within God himself (see Theology). Thus, the full divinity or consubstantiality of the Logos is defended against Arius, and the divinity of the Holy Spirit against the Pneumatomachoi.

The doctrine of consubstantiality excludes subordinationism, a teaching that appeared in middle- or neo-Platonic theology (e.g., in the doctrine of the principles—archai) as the structure of intermediaries, that is, those principles that constitute the first difference. In this context, subordinationism was viewed as carrying the danger that the Logos or the Holy Spirit, as “intermediaries,” would approach, or be placed in, the domain of creatures. Not until ousia (substance), or physis (nature), was terminologically distinguished from hypostasis in the formula “one ousia, three hypostases,” could the Son be conceived as homoousios with the Father. Thus, the numerically one (single) essence, or being, of the Father and Son was maintained, while at the same time the divine nature of the Holy Spirit was confessed. For many in the 4th C., the formula adopted by the First Council of Nicaea (325) sounded Sabellian; modern translations, such as “cons substantial” or “of one essence,” imply interpretations that are partly anachronistic and partly obscurant.

The term hypostasis, which for many in the 4th C. implied subordinationism because of its application in Origenism, must, in this context, be understood to indicate a distinction (diaphora), but not a division (diasiresis), of three numerically distinct individuals, separate and independent from each other. A clever semantic resolution of this problem is found in the masterful formulation of Gregory of Nazianzos (PG 37:180AB): Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are each “an other,” but “not others.” Therefore, the hypostasis can be defined as a particular (idikon) that is distinguished from other particulars through a complex of individual
properties, while the _ousia_ is conceived as that which is common (_koinon_) to many particulars. Although the Cappadocians were influenced by Platonism, their notion of the _koinon_ (if one excludes Gregory of Nyssa, for whom the _koinon_ is conceptual) is to be interpreted in the framework of Stoic ontology and logic. Hence, the meaning of _koinon_ or _ousia_ in theology is the reality of the one God, whose common essence stands in contrast to another common essence, that of created reality.

Although hypostasis, from 380 onward, was used as a synonym of _person_ (_prosopon_), in conformity with the Latin tradition, so that it is clearly distinguished from substance, no speculative advance was reached that would necessarily exclude _tritheism_. Not until the distinctiveness inherent in individual particularity was achieved in neo-Chalcedonism at the beginning of the 6th C. could this be realized. The distinctive individuality of concrete natures and the notion of person as existing in and for itself was directed against the Monophysites. It is not by accident that there appeared in the Monophysite camp a group who taught that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three distinct _ousiae_.

This tritheism, which found a philosophical basis in John Philoponus, does not appear to have been without influence on the Byz. imperial church of the time (Anastasios I of Antioch, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, _Traditio_ 37 [1981] 73–108). Against tritheism, it was not necessary to emphasize the numerical unity of the _ousia_ while retaining the Three Persons. This involved reflection on the fundamentals of arithmetic: in particular, the distinction between the countable multiplicity of things and their basis or principle had to be shown and explained so as to permit exclusion of a univocal usage of number in _theologia_ (Maximos the Confessor, _Monotheism_).

Such an undertaking can lead to nothing more than a purely homonymous concept of number, as is shown in Maximos the Confessor’s attempt to incorporate into the tradition of the church both the Origenism associated with Evagrius Pontikes, which emphasized the knowledge of the unity of God that transcends all unity or multiplicity, as well as the doctrine of emanation and univocal concept of unity (taken from Proklos) of pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagit. For Maximos, only apophatic theology is appropriate to the Trinity, since the triune God bears no trace (_ichnos_) in creation, and “the infinite” cannot be grasped by thought (PG 91:1168A, 1188A). Here, the thought of Evagrius clearly predominates, and not the cataphatic theology of the Areopagite, which leads only to the (univocal) “one God” of monotheism. This provides us with an indication of how Byz. theologians (such as Nicholas of Methone) would react to the so-called renaissance of Proklos in the 11th and 12th C.: either by maintaining that “unity is not canceled by difference or number,” or by going beyond an arithmetic concept to “a unity that lies beyond number,” or finally, by resorting to an extreme apophatic theology in which the multiplicity of all thought is overcome, as in the “essential gnosis” of Evagrius.

In the 8th and early 9th C., a new problem appeared in Byz.: the controversy with the Westerners concerning the Filioque. Centuries later, Demetrius of Lampe, upon returning from a delegation to the West in the 1160s, brought back a dispute that revived subordinationist themes. In the apologetic literature against Judaism and Islam, the relationship of monotheistic and trinitarian depictions of God occupied the foreground. An irenic position was presented by Manuel I who wanted to remove the denunciation of Muhammad’s God in the recantations required of Islamic converts, since such an anathema was directed against “the true God,” a view out of favor among his contemporaries.

K.H.U.

_Representation in Art_. Until the 15th C. the Trinity was depicted only symbolically or in association with other images. Thus the Magi may appear each holding one of the three hypostases (Huber, _Heilige Berge_, fig.207). Thereafter the triad is found as an iconic group including the Son, who holds the dove in a disk, and is seated in the lap of the Ancient of Days.

A.C.


**TRIODION** (τριώδιον), liturgical hymnbook “of three odes” containing the variable parts of the services for the mobile Lenten and Easter cycle,
from the pre-Lenten period beginning with vespers the eve of the tenth Sunday before Easter through mesonyktikon of Holy Saturday. The triodion originally also included the entire Easter season through to the end of the Pentecost cycle, but from the 14th C. onward, this material, starting with Easter orthros, was sometimes relegated to a separate book, the pentekostarion.

The triodion, comprising chiefly hymnody for the liturgical hours, is basically a monastic book that first appears in MSS of the 10th C.; its name derives from the fact that some of the kanones sung during this season do not have the standard nine odes but normally only three. The pristine Palestinian or “Oriental” monastic triodion of the 7th–8th C. was enriched over the next three centuries with hymns composed by the Stoudite monks of Constantinople and southern Italy; to it was also added a synaxarion, the liturgy of the pre-sanctified, various fixed Sunday commemorations such as the feast of Orthodoxy (Triumph of Orthodoxy) with its synodikon of Orthodoxy, and pre-Lenten weeks of preparation.


TRIPHIODOROS (Τριφιώδωρος), in some MSS Tryphiodoros, Greek poet from Egypt. Long thought to postdate NONNOS OF PANOPOLIS, Triphiodoros is now revealed by P. Oxy. XLI, 2946.49 to belong to the late 3rd to early 4th C. A grammarian by profession, he is credited in the South with several epics (now lost), including the Marathoniaka, the Hippodamea, and a “lipogrammatic Odyssey.” Some scholars conflate him with a second Triphiodoros listed (also by the Southa) as author of a verse paraphrase of Homeric similes. Triphiodoros’s one extant piece is The Capture of Troy, detailing in 691 hexameters the stratagem of the Trojan horse and the bloody sack of the city. Quite its most interesting feature is the extent to which Triphiodoros shows direct knowledge of Vergil, Aeneid 2 (G. d’Ippolito, Triphiodoro e Vergilio [Palermo 1976]).


TRIPOLI, COUNTY OF, located on the Lebanese coast from Maraclea (Maraqiyah) to Gibelet (Jubayl) and inland to the Orontes valley. The territory around Tripoli was conquered by Raymond of Toulouse and his forces after the First Crusade. Raymond's son Bertrand took Tripoli in 1109 and became the first count. Raymond's oath of allegiance to Byz. was renewed by his successors Guillaume-Jourdain, Bertrand (1110, 1112), Pons (1112), and Raymond II (1137, when John II threatened northern Syria). By the time of Bertrand, the oath was limited to Maraclea and Tortosa, formerly parts of the Byz. doukaton of Antioch. Alexios I strove to develop the county as a counterweight to the principality of Antioch: the Byz. sent material from Cyprus to build Mont-Pélerin, the castle constructed for the siege of Tripoli (1103–09), and Byz. supplies and funds reinforced the Crusaders. Despite Alexios's efforts, Antiochene influence predominated after 1112. In 1160–61 Byz. envoys persuaded Raymond III (1152–87) that his sister Melisende would marry Manuel I. A large dowry was prepared. A document of Baldwin III (31 July 1161) calls her “futurae imperatricis Constantinopolitanae” (R. Röhrich, Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani [Innsbruck 1893; rp. New York 1960] no.366). When Manuel broke off the match in favor of Maria of Antioch, Raymond, infuriated, ravaged Byz. coast.


TRIPOLIS (Τριπόλις, Ar. Ῥᾳβλῦλός, modern Tripoli in Lebanon), port city in Phoenicia. Late Roman Tripolis is infrequently mentioned: according to a 6th-C. chronicler (Malal. 367.12–18), Emp. Marcian rebuilt an aqueduct and a summer bath adorned with many statues there. Legend ascribes the establishment of Christianity in Tripolis to the apostle Peter; in fact, the bishopric of Tripolis, under Tyre, is attested from 325 onward. By the 6th C., the most important pilgrimage center of Phoenicia was that of St. Leontios at Tripolis. Under Persian rule from 612 to 628, it was briefly regained by Herakleios; Tripolis resisted an Arab siege in 635, but finally the starving population was forced to ask the emperor to send rescue ships to evacuate the city by sea.
Mu'awiya resettled the city with Jews and Persians and created a dockyard to build a navy to attack Constantinople. In 654/5 two Christian brothers, the sons of a trumpeter, reportedly broke the gates of the city jail, killed the emir of Tripolis, and fled (Theoph. 345.18–25). In the 10th C. the Tripolis region was constantly reconnoitered by the Byz.; when the Byz. launched attacks on Syria they tried to seize the city, but both Nikephoros II Phokas on 5 Nov. 968 and John I Tzimiskes in 975 could only burn its suburbs. Basil II was routed at Tripolis on 13 Dec. 999. Under Romanos III, the emir of Tripolis, Hassän ibn Mufarrij, surrendered to the Byz., but the city remained under the control of the Fatimids until the early 12th C. Arab geographers described medieval Tripolis as surrounded by fields and gardens and protected on three sides by the sea; it reportedly had 20,000 inhabitants in the 11th C.

In the aftermath of the First Crusade, the Crusaders founded the county of Tripoli (see Tripoli, County of) in 1102 but did not capture the city itself until 1109, after a five-year siege. (For Tripolis in North Africa, see Tripolitania.)


-A.K.

TRIPOLITANIA, modern name for the African region called Tripolis in Greek sources; in Latin texts (e.g., the Verona List) it is called Tripolitana. Under Diocletian the Syritic coastal cities of Oea (mod. Tripoli), Sabratha, and Leptis Magna and their hinterlands (northwest Libya), as well as Tacapes and Gaghis on the southern border of Byzacena, were formed into the province of Tripolitania, protected by the Limes Tripolitanus. The area was never deeply romanized; strong Punico-Libyan cultural and religious influences were still evident in the late antique period. Christianity made little headway outside the cities. Indeed, at the inland settlement of Ghirza, the cult of Ammon was active into the 6th C. Roman military and administrative authority in Tripolitania was weakened by the rise of the tribal federation of Leuathai (see MAURU) in the 4th C., whose control eventually extended over much of the province. A consequence of the decreasing Roman military presence in the countryside was the replacement of opus Africanum-style farms (which first appeared in the early Roman period) with gsur (fortified farms), but the precise role these played in the defense of the province remains unclear. Another consequence of the changes in Tripolitania was a general decline in olive oil exports. The Vandal conquest of between 442 and 455 (Courtois, infra 174) did not result in significant changes in the condition of Tripolitania.

The Byz. reconquest in 533 affected only the coastal cities. A rebellion of the Leuathai caused by the massacre of 79 subchiefs of the tribe by Sergios, the Byz. dux, took four years to quell. A Byz. reprisal may account for the destruction of the temple at Ghirza at about this time. In the late 6th C. Tripolitania was separated from the newly established African exarchate and annexed to the diocese of Egypt, although it may have been briefly reattached to the former during the rebellion of Gregory, the exarch of Carthage (646–47). Tripolitania was overrun by the Arabs in 642–43; the Byz. were able to recover Tripolis temporarily, but a permanent Arab garrison was established there in the 660s.


-R.B.H.

TRIPTYCH, tripartite icon made of wood, bronze, or ivory and composed of wings, the same size or shorter than the central panel, that close over the main image. The principal subject matter—often the Deesis with apostles and saints or the Crucifixion—is thus revealed only when the wings are opened, an effect that has been compared to the opening of the doors of a temple barrier (K. Weitzmann, DChAE4 4 [1964–65] 16–18). Wooden triptychs are known from the 6th C. onward, but most such assemblages, painted on wood or carved in ivory, date from the 10th or 11th C. Their size (up to 33.6 cm, fully open) and iconography suggest that, at least at this period, the triptychs rested on tables or ledges as objects of veneration in private houses. Only a few complete sets of panels are preserved, among which the "Harbaville Triptych" (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, infra, no.33) is the most celebrated. This is one of a group of three very large triptychs that also includes an example in the Palazzo Venezia, Rome.
(ibid., no.31), with a long inscription addressed to an emperor Constantine, perhaps Constantine VII, who is protected and adorned with virtues by the martyrs represented about him. Here the reverse of the main panel exhibits a flowering cross. On the backs of other triptychs, and sometimes on the outside of the wings, the cross is accompanied by the legend ΙC ΧC ΝΙΚΑ.


TRISAGION (Τρισάγιον, lit. “thrice-holy [hymn]”), Byz. name for the biblical Sanctus (Is 6:3, Rev 4:8) chanted from the 4th C. onward in the ANAPHORA. Byz. used the same name for the TROPAION “Holy [is] God, holy [and] mighty, holy [and] immortal! Have mercy on us!” sung at the beginning of all Eastern and some Western Eucharists.

The origins of the Trisagion are disputed. Monophysites claimed it originated in Antioch (Severos of Antioch, PO 29:62, 246f); the bishops of that region chanted it at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 (ACO II.1, 195). But an oft-repeated Byz. legend attributed it to a heavenly vision in the time of Patr. Proklos (B. Croke, Byzantion 51 [1981] 127–31).

The interpretation of the Trisagion was another point of dispute with Monophysites who conceived the Trisagion to be directed to Christ. The Byz. “Prayer of the Trisagion” that accompanies the Trisagion in the liturgy (Brightman, Liturgies 369f) interprets it as addressed simply to God without distinguishing the persons. Canon 81 of the Council in Trullo in 691 (Mansi 11:977DE) condemned the theopaschite clause, “Who was crucified for us,” which the Monophysites had added to the Trisagion under Peter the Fuller between 468 and 470. The Monophysite formula is preserved among others in an inscription found near Antioch (CIG 4, no.8918). This additional clause directs the Trisagion to Christ, whereas all Byz. commentaries, from that of Germanos I onward, interpret the hymn as addressed to the three persons of the Trinity, transforming “mighty” and “immortal” into substantives modified by “holy”: “Holy God (Father), holy mighty one (Son), holy immortal one (Holy Spirit), have mercy on us.”

The Trisagion first appears in Byz. liturgy as a processional chant during a LIT in 438/9 and was a frequently used processional troparion in Constantinople, probably as a refrain sung after the verses of an antiphonal psalm (PSALMODY). Often used as the chant accompanying the procession into church at the beginning of the Eucharist, by the 6th C. it had become a permanent part of the service (AGO 3:71–76; Job, On the Incarnation, in Photios, Bibl. cod. 222).


TRITHEISM (τριθεία, lit. “three divinity”), an accusation often made in theological disputes of the late 3rd–7th C. against those who emphasized the “individuality” of hypostases rather than the unity of the Trinity. Among those accused of Tritheism were the following: the opponents of Sabellianism for rejecting MONARCHIANISM; the Orthodox who were criticized by the Pneumatomachoi for accepting the Holy Spirit as an individual deity; the followers of EUNOMIOS for underscoring the independence of the Son; the Nestorians; and esp. John PHILOPONOS and his adherents such as Eugenios and Konon of Tarsos. In 616 the synod of Alexandria condemned Tritheism.

–A.K.

TRIUMPH (θρίαμβος, τὰ ἐπινίκια, ἐπινίκιος ἔορτη), a victory celebration inherited from Rome that featured a triumphal parade into the capital of troops, captives, booty, and the victorious emperor. It was often accompanied by triumphal circus games, religious services, largess, and banquetting. Triumphs exemplified imperial ideology, since the imperator’s military origins implied that victories demonstrated the emperor’s right to rule; emperors alone celebrated them from the time of Augustus. From the 4th to the 7th C., numerous triumphs in various capitals saluted real or imagined victories over usurpers or barbarians by emperors whose victory permeated the reaction of imperial PROPAGANDA to a deteriorating military situation. In the 5th–7th C., the circus absorbed this ceremony, as successful generals and defeated enemies paraded in the Hippodrome and honored the triumphant emperor ensconced in the KATHISMA. Special coin issues, panegyrics, mon-
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Over the centuries numerous panegyrics, hymns, and sermons were composed for the holiday (BHG 1386–941).

The personalities associated with the Triumph in 843 were celebrated in Palaiologan art: an icon of ca. 1400 now in the British Museum shows the Hodegetria attended by Theodora and Michael III on one side and Patr. Methodios on the other, while a row of monastic saints below includes Theodore of Stoudios holding a circular image of the sort represented in the marginal Psalters produced shortly after 843.

—P.A.H., A.K., A.C.

TROCHOS (τροχός, lit. “wheel” or “disk”), word that came to signify a circular layout for a set of chronological synchronisms, the best known being the four trochoi contained in the Vatican MS of the Chronicon Paschale and depicted by a hand of the 12th–13th C.: I (Chron. Pasch. 25) presents a lunar cycle; II (p.27) a solar cycle; III (p.372) a lunar cycle for explaining the chronology of the conception of John the Baptist; and IV (p.534) a lunar cycle with Easter dates. The structure of a typical trochos (IV) is a circle divided into 19 segments representing successive years of the lunar cycle from 344 to 362, with each segment further divided into three compartments. The outer contains the year of the cycle, the epact, or day of the lunar cycle at 1 Jan., and the date of Easter for that year according to the Roman calendar; the middle contains the Easter date according to the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars; the inner the year of the Diocletianic Era. The space in the center of the circle is filled with an explanation of how the cycle works and where it begins and ends. Another trochos is that ascribed to a certain George (F. Diekamp, BZ 9 [1900] 32f, 50f).


TROJAN WAR, the conflict between the combined forces of the Hellenes and the inhabitants of Troy that culminated in the Greek conquest of Troy after a ten-year siege. It is recorded in the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer as well as in the poems of the Epic Cycle and is referred to constantly by the poets and historians of the ancient world. The war is focal in the legendary histories of Rome and hence of its successor state, the Byz. Empire. Constantine I, perhaps influenced by these legends, reportedly hesitated between the sites of Troy and Byz. for his new capital (cf. Zosim. 2:30.1–2, Theoph. 1:23.22–27). The Trojan War, a pivotal point in the Chronicle of Eusebios of Caesarea, figures prominently in Byz. chronicles (e.g., those of John Malalas and Constantine Manasses). In short, the war lent itself to the historical understanding of the past as a sequence of world empires, though the synchronistic date attributed to it varied from the time of Moses to the reign of David. The war figures in Byz. literature, too, in compositions like the Homeric of John Tzetzes or the essay on Homeric characters by Isaac Komnenos the Porphyrogennetos, and
in commentaries like those of Eustathios of Thessalonike. References to the war appear also in popular literature, for example, in the Achilleis, the Troy Tale, and the War of Troy. There the idea of the importance of the Trojan War has probably been derived from the chroniclers and from the significant place given to the Homeric poems in Byz. education, but little detailed knowledge is shown. The work with the most circumstantial information (the War of Troy) draws upon its French source.

LIT. Browning, "Homer," 15–33. Jeffreys, "Chroni
ciders." –E.M.J.

TROPARION (τροπαριον), the earliest and most basic form of the Byz. hymn. Originally a short prayer in rhythmic prose inserted after each verse of the psalms sung during Orthros and Vespers, later the troparion became strophic in character and more closely connected to individual feasts. Numerous troparia were written. Troparion came eventually to mean simply a stanza (the basic strophic unit of any hymn, whether kontakion or kanon or sticheron), an inserted set of lines. A troparion can be classified according to its contents (as, e.g., anastasimon, "On the Resurrection"), the moment of performance (as, e.g., apolytikion, sung at the Dismissal at the end of Vespers), its melody (as either idiomelos, sung to a unique melody, or prosomosion, sung to an existing melody), or the type of verse to which it is attached (e.g., apostichon, developing the verse of a psalm).

LIT. Mitsakis, Hymnographia 72–77. Sztövérfi, Hymnography 1:100–10. –E.M.J.

TROPES (τρόποι) and schemata were considered by ancient rhetoricians as the two categories of rhetorical figure. Both aimed at the ornamentation of speech: even though the distinction between them was not always consistent, schemata did not entail a change of meaning and remained within the category of kyriologia (proper meaning of words); a trope, on the other hand, was defined as an expression that contained in itself an alteration (metatropo) of character, hence its name (RhetGr, ed. Spengel, 3:215.10–12). Several works on the tropes have survived but their chronology is obscure: some tracts are anonymous, some ascribed to ancient grammarians such as Tryphon (1st C. B.C.) or an otherwise unknown Kokondrios, and two bear names of Byz. rhetoricians—George Choiroboskos and Gregory Pardos (whose dates are themselves under discussion). Moreover, while A. Komis (Gregorios Pardos metropolita di Corinto [Rome-Athens 1960] 77–80) attributes a treatise on the tropes to Pardos, M.L. West (CQ n.s. 15 [1965] 230–48) sees it as a work of Tryphon. At any rate, examples in these tracts are drawn predominantly from ancient writers, even though "Choiroboskos" (RhetGr, ed. Spengel, 3:251.19) once refers to Metaphrastes (Symeon Metaphrastes?).

Most ancient theoreticians listed 10–14 tropoi (Martin, infra), whereas "Choiroboskos" and "Pardos-Tryphon" established a longer list of 27 tropes (it is unclear whether this list is classical or Byz.), including Allegory, Metaphor, Simile, Hyperbole, metonymy (replacement of the word by a related one), synecdoche (putting a part for the whole, the whole for the part, species for the genus, etc.), Riddle, irony, and so forth. This list also includes pleonasm and ellipsis, which were considered by other rhetoricians as schemata, not tropes, and omits epithet, which others did classify as a trope.

The church fathers introduced and broadly used the term tropologia to define the tropological or figurative method of demonstration, esp. important for such subtle topics as the substance of God (Basil the Great, PG 29:544C). The difference between tropologia, allegory, and metaphor remained unclear. Eustathios of Thessalonike, in his commentary on the Iliad (Eust. Comb. II. 1:478.20), cites various tropikai diatheises unknown from ancient texts and probably originating from everyday vocabulary ("talons of a mountain," "twigs of rivers"); in one case at least he states that the expression "the eyes of plants" (1:479.1–2) is borrowed from "the peasants' language."

LIT. Martin, Rhetorik 261–69. –A.K.

TROUSERS (ἐναχυρίδες; also braka, a term of Germanic origin) were known among the later Romans, and bracarii ("breeches makers") are mentioned in Diocletian's Price Edict and in some papyri. The fashion was introduced under barbarian influence, and Prokopios of Caesarea speaks of anaxyrides as an element of Slavic costume. A 4th-C. tomb painting in Silistra (A. Frova, Pittura romana in Bulgaria [Rome 1943], figs. 1, 9, 11)
shows servants approaching the deceased with various articles of clothing, including trousers with a simple belt, and a much larger and more ornate belt, probably to be worn over a tunic.

The use of the garment after the 6th C. is suggested by the discovery of belt fittings in Constantinople and Asia Minor, although belts were worn over tunics as well as to hold up trousers. Except for images of Daniel and the Three Hebrews, trousers are rare in Byz. painting; unusually, either long or short underwear covers the legs and loins of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia in 10th-C. ivories in Leningrad and Berlin (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, Elfienbeinskulpt. II, nos. 9–10). In the 12th C. Eustathios of Thessalonike was still critical of the fashion of wearing trousers; Niketas Choniates used the words anaxyrides and braka but does not define them. By this time the expression “to wear trousers” seems already to have become synonymous with manliness.


-G.V., A.K., A.C.

TRUE CROSS, the term used for the wooden cross (τὸ ξύλου τοῦ σταυροῦ) on which Jesus was crucified or, more often, for fragments supposed to derive from it. It was reportedly discovered in Jerusalem by Empress HELENA—an event that was celebrated at the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (see CROSS, CULT OF THE). The historicity of this event is questionable—at any rate, Eusebios of Caesarea says nothing about such a discovery (H.A. Drake, JEH 36 [1985] 21). Nevertheless, particles of the True Cross were in circulation by the mid-4th C.: Cyril of Jerusalem stated that the entire nikoumene was filled “with the wood of the Cross” (PG 33:469A), and an inscription of 359 records the deposit of a particle of the Cross in Mauretania (CIL VIII, supp. 3, no.20600). The pilgrim EGERIA observed the veneration of the Cross in Jerusalem in the 380s, and by the end of the 4th C. the legend about Helena’s discovery was already known.

Helena is said to have divided the relic: one section of the Cross was sent to Constantinople, while another remained in Jerusalem, in the shrine of the Holy SEPULCHRE. Numerous pilgrims came to see it, and despite the constant watch of special guardians pieces of the holy wood were frequently removed from Jerusalem; moreover, fragments of the Cross were given by officials of the Holy Sepulchre to certain monasteries, for instance, to that of St. Euthymios near Jerusalem; Melania the Elder received a piece of the Cross from John, the bishop of Jerusalem. In 614 the relic was captured by the Persians who conquered Jerusalem, but Herakleios’s eventual victory allowed the Byz. to recover the Cross: on 21–22 Mar. 631 it was solemnly brought back to Jerusalem (V. Grumel, ByzF 1 [1966] 139–49). In 635, however, in the face of the Arab invasion, Herakleios transferred it to Constantinople. Much later, RAYMOND OF AGUILERS related that the Cross was buried in Jerusalem and rediscovered at the time of the First Crusade; other legends continued to report examples of holy fragments preserved in Palestine.

Numerous parts of the Cross ended up in Constantinople; besides those sent by Helena, Justin II ordered the transfer of a substantial piece from Apameia in Syria, and in 635 the Jerusalem section was appropriated. These relics are reported to have been kept in various locations. The church historian Sokrates says that a piece was sealed in a column in the Forum; Patr. Nikephoros I locates

TROY TALE (Διήγησις γεναμένη ἐν Τροίᾳ) or the “Byzantine Iliad” is an anonymous poem in 1,166 unhymned POLITICAL VERSES, written at an unknown date, probably in the late 14th C. It presents an idiosyncratic account of the TROJAN WAR, independent both of the WAR OF TROY and the Iliad of Constantine HERONIAKOS. It falls into three sections: the first (lines 1–779) covers events preceding the war (centering on Paris and his romantic childhood when, following an ominous dream before the child’s birth, Priam has Paris first placed in a tower, then cast out to sea in a chest, etc.); the second (lines 780–1,138) concerns the war itself, with a brief catalogue of ships and battle scenes but with most emphasis on Achilles; the third relates the aftermath of the war and the mourning for Achilles. The material would seem to derive ultimately from the Byz. chronicle tradition, esp. Constantine MANASSES. Some lines are also found in the Appendix to the ACHILLEIS, in the Naples MS. The text survives in one 16th-C. MS.


-E.M.J., M.J.J.
the relic in Hagia Sophia; some sources speak instead of the Great Palace. Strangely enough, the ceremonial of the Great Palace omits any reference to the relic unless we accept with Frolow (infra [1961] 238, no.149) that “three [sic] venerable and life-giving crosses” (De cer. 5.49.6) allude to the particles of the holy wood. Other ecclesiastical institutions, both in Constantinople (Euergetis Monastery, Pantokrator Monastery) and outside the capital, claimed possession of the precious wood. Despite the looting of scores of fragments in and after 1204, a 14th-c. Russian pilgrim states that the Cross was still at Hagia Sophia (Majeska, Russian Travelers 130f, 222).

The True Cross was used primarily to guarantee the truth of statements and oaths, and for such a purpose it was exhibited at sessions of councils (e.g., in 869—Mansi 16:309C, 321B). Skylitzes’ account of oaths taken on the True Cross in 917 by generals of various themes is represented in the Madrid MS of this text (Grabar-Manoussac, Skylitzes, no.286). It was paraded around the walls of Constantinople during sieges and, appended to a golden lance, served as a talisman in battles. It was carried during imperial and ecclesiastical processions and fragments were used as diplomatic gifts; a notable example was that enclosed in the jeweled cross sent by Justin II to the pope John III (561–74), now in the Vatican (Rice, Art of Byz., fig.71). Most relics of the True Cross that went to the West (see Limburg an-der-Lahn Reliquary) as well as others that stayed longer within the empire, were enclosed in precious reliquaries, the creation of which, as much as their contents, occasioned epigrams by poets such as John Mauropos and Nicholas Kallikles. Private persons wore phylacteries (enkolpia) containing fragments of the True Cross.


A.C., A.K.

TRULLA (τρούλλα), Lat. term designating a small ladle, trowel, or basin; it is preserved in the list of table implements translated from the jurist Paul (Digest 53.10.3) in the Basilika (44.13.3). The 5th-c. historian Olympiodoros of Thebes, however, uses the word for a grain measure (1/48 of a modios) and relates that the Vandals called the Goths Truli because they bought grain from the Vandals at one solidus per trulla (Blockley, Historians 2:192, fr.29.1). The word was not used by the Byz. save for lexicographers, who understood it as a spoon (Koukoules, Biosk 2.2 [1948] 102). It is applied by E. Dodd (Byz. Silver Stamps, nos. 1, 14, 30, 50) and other scholars to two types of dish with long handles: a broad, flat patera and a narrow, high “saucenpan.” Not only is the ancient name of these objects uncertain, but their function is open to question. While comparable objects from the Greco-Roman period ornamented with diverse subjects are considered variously as libation- or saucepans, the Byz. objects, decorated with aquatic images of Aphrodite, Poseidon, Okeanos, fishermen, and Nilotic scenes, were probably restricted to washing, for example, cherniebha. A series of such dishes is dated by silver stamps to the period 491–651 (see Cherniboxeston).


M.M.M.

TRULLO, COUNCIL IN. The council was convoked by Emp. Justinian II between the end of 691 and 1 Sept. 692 to complete the work of the fifth and sixth ecumenical councils (Constantinople II, III; see under Constantinople, Councils of), which had failed to issue any disciplinary canons; hence the Byz. title of the council, penthekte (“Fifth-Sixth,” Lat. Quinisextum). The assembly considered itself ecumenical. Its 102 decrees, which alone survive with an address to the emperor, are a milestone in the history of Byz. ecclesiastical legislation. The corpus is divided into two broad sections, one dealing with the clergy and monasticism, the other with the laity. The latter concerns such matters as marriage (53, 54, 72); prostitution (86); manumission of slaves, which required three witnesses (85); religious representations, which must depict Christ “in his human form” (82); as well as general abuses and superstition (61). The earlier section addresses numerous ecclesiastical matters including ordination (see Cheirothesia) (14), clerical dress (27), simony (22, 23), monastic stability (46), and the alienation of monastic property (49). The council’s references to Constantinople’s patriarchal privileges (36) and its explicit condemnation of such
Latin practices as clerical celibacy and Saturday fasting in Lent (13, 55) explain its partial rejection by the West.


---A.P.

**TRYPHIODOROS.** See Triphiodoros.

**TSAKONES,** or Tzakones (Τζάκωνες), first mentioned by Constantine VII (*De cer. 696.4*), and described as *apelatai;* some versions of the text identify the Tzakones as Laconians. Michael VIII transferred loyal units of Tzakones to Constantinople and its environs, where they staffed garrisons under their own *stratopedarchai;* others served in his fleet. By the 13th C. "Tzakonia" designated Lakonia with the Crusader city of Geraki as capital and Monemvasia as port. Mazaris and Isidore of Kiev termed the local Greek dialect barbarous. Palaiologan sources, arguing from the assonance of the names and the 'Tzakones' supposed Peloponnesian origin, identify Tzakones as ancient Lakonians. Earlier scholarship considered Tzakones Slavs or Greeks from southern Italy (P. Charanis, *DOP* 5 [1950] 139–60). Present scholarship views the term as a military designation that became an ethnographic and topographic name. Caratzas (infra 316–48), referring among others to George Metochites, speculates that the ethnonym Tzakones-Lakones-Makedones was connected with the heretical Paulicians settled in the Balkans.


---S.B.B.

**TSAMBLAK.** See Camblak, Grigorić.

**TUGHRUL BEG** (Ταγγερολίπτης), Seljuk sultan (1055–63); born ca.993, died Raiy, Iran, 4 Sept. 1063. After occupying much of Iran and Iraq (after 1040), Tughrul encouraged his Turkoman followers to ravage Armenia and the Byz. borders. The Turkish raids, sporadic since ca.1021, now gave way to large-scale expeditions, such as that led by Tughrul's half-brother Ibrahim Inal (ca.1048–49) into the region of Erzurum, where he defeated the Byz. under Aaron, Katakalon Kekaumenos, and the Abchazian Lipart IV (see Liparites). Lipart, captured, was released by Tughrul without ransom at the request of Constantine IX. In 1054 Tughrul attacked Byz. He was, however, frustrated in a siege of Mantzikert. Despite negotiations, Turkoman attacks continued.


---C.M.B.

**TÜLÜNIDS,** first independent Muslim dynasty in Egypt and later in Syria (15 Sept. 868–Jan. 905). Its founder, Ahmād ibn Tülün, took advantage of the weakening *ʿAbbāsids.* He controlled the finances of Egypt by 872 and occupied Syria in 878 on the pretext of protecting Islamic frontiers against Byz. The Tülünkids first raided Byz. Anatolia in 878. Ahmād ibn Tūlūn strengthened the fleet, developed efficient fiscal controls, and built an army of 100,000, including many Christians, Turks, and Sudanese. In 882 Muslims at Tarsos rebelled against the Tülünkids and established local independence. Ahmād's son Khumārawayh succeeded him in 884. Tülūnid rule in Tarsos was restored in 892. After raiding Byz. territory in 893 and 894, the Tülünkids negotiated a truce in late 895 and arranged the exchange of 2,504 Muslim prisoners on 16–20 Sept. 896. Khumārawayh, who wasted funds, was assassinated in Dec. 896. Tarsos drove out the Tülūnid governor in 897 and received an 'Abbāsīd governor in Apr. 898. The Tülünkids defeated the Byz. fleet that year. The dynasty ended with the assassination of Khumārawayh's brother Hārin in 905. The dynasty divided Islam. It temporarily threatened Byz., but internal disturbances and the location of its center in Egypt hampered it in that struggle.


---W.E.K.

**TUNIC** (χιτών). Wool, linen, or cotton tunics, short or long, short-sleeved or long-sleeved, were the basic garment of most citizens of the empire,
men and women alike, from the highest to the lowest, whether laymen, ecclesiastics, or monks. Tunics were often worn one atop the other: under a toga, for example, would be a linen tunic with sleeves, topped by a broader short-sleeved colobium. After the 7th C. long tunics were the rule for anyone of rank, at least to judge by artistic representations: short tunics were reserved for people in active professions, such as shepherds, seamen, builders, executioners, etc., and for soldiers under their armor.

The number of terms for such garments is bewildering. A kamisión was perhaps the simplest kind, worn by monks and lower orders of the clergy (below the level of deacon). Purple kamisia were worn by psaltes or singers; those of the protopasales and domestikos were white (pseudo-Kod. 190.2–5). Monks at the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople were issued two hypokamisa a year (P. Gautier, REB 32 [1974] 65.608); these were probably undershirts. The kamision was also worn by low-ranking court officials and its decoration might reflect the office: for example, the kamision of a nipsistarios was made of linen and bore a decorative panel in the form of a basin.

Chiton is the word generally employed for the classical tunic worn by Old Testament figures, as well as by Christ and the apostles, throughout Byz. art. At court it was worn by officials of higher rank than those wearing the kamision; these chitones were embroidered with gold panels on the shoulders. (In monastic documents the term chiton appears only as an archaism, in place of the customary kamision.)

Courtiers of even higher rank wore the silk skaramangion. The emperor himself had two primary silk tunics, the divetension and the skaramangion, though the distinction between the two is difficult to define. It is also uncertain whether he wore any other sort of tunic under either of these: the gold cuffs and hems visible on imperial portraits may have been detachable from the main tunic and do not necessarily indicate the existence of an undergarment. By the 14th C., the favored robe was a kabbadion, more coat than tunic.

Tunics were often gaily patterned, with special stripes or clavi to indicate the rank of the wearer, or fancy hems and collars. The shorter belted knee-length tunics worn by ordinary people were sometimes adorned with segmenta (rectangular ornamental panels) or with plain black squares. The basic tunic worn by the clergy of all ranks was the sticharion.


—N.P.S.

TUR ‘ABDIN (Syriac for “mountain of the servants of God”), a plateau known also as Mt. Masios or Mt. Izla in the province of Mesopotamia; from the early 6th C. it was part of southern Mesopotamia. The Notitia Antiochena of 570 first lists a bishop of Turabdion, who may have sat at Hah, where there is a large 6th-C. church; the exact location of the fortified Rhabdios mentioned by Prokopios (Buildings, 2.4.1–13) is unclear (E. Honigmann, BZ 25 [1925] 831). The Tur ‘Abdin is noted for Monophysite and Nestorian monasteries and numerous surviving churches built on either single-nave or transverse plans. Many are decorated with elaborate architectural sculpture (e.g., Deir Za’faran Monastery). Having suffered from the Byz.-Persian wars and the Monophysite persecutions, the Tur ‘Abdin enjoyed a period of marked prosperity under the Arabs, starting in the late 7th C.


—M.M.M.

TURKOMANS (Τουρκομάνοι), a term first appearing in Islamic texts during the 10th C. and used alternatively with Oghuz, i.e., the Turkic nomadic people that one century later and after a long migration invaded Asia Minor. More precisely, Turkoman came to mean the Muslim Oghuz in contrast to the pagan, shamanist, or the Christian Oghuz, a minority group. The term had already passed into Greek in the first half of the 12th C.


—E.A.Z.
TURKS. Turks in general are peoples living in or originating from Turkestan, the vast region between the eastern shore of the Caspian Sea and the Altai Mountains, which from the 6th C. onward is also called Turan. From the end of the 11th C. the term Turks meant only those Turks living in the region of present-day Turkey. From the early Middle Ages several Turkish peoples migrated as nomads or advanced as warriors, reached the east European and the Mediterranean regions, and came into contact with the Byz.

The Turks practiced a variety of religions, being Buddhists, Manichaeans, Christians (mainly Nestorians), even Zoroastrians; but initially the most popular religion was shamanism, the religion of the steppe. With the Arab conquest of Transoxiana (705–15), Islam spread successfully among the Turks.

Most probably the earliest Turks known to history are the Huns. The first people whom the Byz. called Tourkoi, however, were governed by a Khagan, who in 568 sent ambassadors to Constantinople, seeking alliance with Justin II against the Persians. In the following year a Byz. ambassador, Zemarchos, reached the khagan’s nomadic court; the account concerning his mission is a precious source. On the other hand, the 8th-C. Orkhon inscriptions, the earliest historical monument made by Turks who call themselves Turks, contain a short history of their state extending from the Chinese to the Persian frontier. The northern Black Sea regions attracted several Turkic peoples such as the Avars, the Bulgars, the Khazars, etc., while the lower Danube remained an area of confrontation between the Byz. and Turks. In the 12th C. this area was occupied by the Cumans.

Around 960 the first Turco-Islamic state appeared, that of the Karakhanids or Ilek-khaniqis. Established in the cities of Balasagun and Kashgar (eastern Turkestan), they soon conquered the region of Transoxiana. A member of the Karakhanid family was the scholar Mahmud al-Kashgarî, who wrote (ca.1075) an encyclopedia concerning the Turks.

Shortly after the Karakhanids, another Turco-Islamic dynasty appeared in Ghazna. The Ghaznavid sultan Mahmud (998–1030) was glorified for his long and victorious holy war (jihâd) against India. The end of his campaigns left the warriors of the faith, the ghâzis, unemployed and seems to be one of the reasons for the great migration of the Oghuz Turks in the 11th C.

The Oghuz people living around the year 1000 south of Lake Aral included 22 of 24 tribes; Byz. sources mention some of these (e.g., the Avshar or the Çepni). The first Oghuz tribe that headed towards the west and reached the Danube regions was the Pechenegs. A second wave of Oghuz reached the territories of Rus’; the Byz. mention them by their real ethnic name, Ouzoi (see Uzes). For the Byz. Empire, the most significant Oghuz migration was that guided by the family (later dynasty) of the Seljuks. The Seljukid Tughrul Beg, sultan of Baghdad from 1055, unable to control the Oghuz nomads, dispatched them as ghazis against the Christians. This policy led his successor Alp Arslan to open confrontation with the Byz. and the victory at Mantzikert.

During the 12th C. the Turks of Asia Minor were divided and established several states, the most important of which, after the Seljuks, was that of the Dansmendids. After the Seljuks defeated the army of Manuel I in 1176 near Myriokephalon, the Byz. were obliged to regard the Turkish occupation of Asia Minor as permanent.

When the Mongols conquered Asia, they caused a new large Turkish migration into Anatolia, which the Mongols invaded in 1243. Population pressure, need for pasture lands, and political opposition obliged many Turks to settle in the frontier zones between the Seljuk and Christian territories and to carry out holy war. Resistance against them was weak. The Christian rulers (Byz., Grand Komnenoi of Trebizond, and Cilician Armenians) tried to save their domains by maintaining good relations with the Mongol conquerors, who actually undertook some campaigns to pacify Islamic Anatolia, but with ephemeral results. The government of Constantinople neglected Byz. Anatolia and the Akritai abandoned their posts. During the gradual dissolution of the Seljuk sultanate a series of Turkish states were established in the vicinity of the Christian territories: Karaman, Germiyan, Menteshe, Aydin, Saruhan, Karasi, etc., and the emirate of Osman, the nucleus of the Ottoman Empire.

Turks in Byzantine Service. From the 11th C. onward, the Byz. hired Turkish peoples (Pechenegs, Cumans, Seljuks) as mercenaries, and some groups of Turks settled on Byz. territory. According to the chroniclers of the First Crusade, the
Tourkopoulos formed a substantial and effective contingent of the Byz. army, and Ibn Jubayr counted 40,000 Turkish horsemen in the ranks of the army at the time of Andronikos I (Hecht, *Aussenpolitik* 32f). Eustathios of Thessalonike praises Manuel I's tolerance toward foreigners and relates that significant "Persian" colonies were established within the empire. Several Turkish families (Axouch, Samouch, Prosuch) reached high ranks and supplied the empire with generals; it is possible that Tatiyios and the founder of the family of Kamytzes were of Turkish stock. After the 12th C., however, the Turks appeared in the empire as allies rather than settlers, and finally as overlords and conquerors.


---

**TÜRNNOVO** (folioso), city on the river Jantra in northern Bulgaria. Site of a Roman fort probably destroyed by the Visigoths in the late 4th C., Túrnovo was by the 6th C. a modest Byz. city. Captured by Krum ca. 809, Túrnovo remained in Bulgarian hands until the late 10th C. In Túrnovo Peter and Asen began their revolt against Byz. rule in 1185, and it became the capital of the Second Bulgarian Empire, seat of the exarch, and from 1235 seat of the patriarch of Bulgaria. On 17 July 1393 the Ottoman Turks captured and burned Túrnovo and deported many of its inhabitants to Asia Minor.

In the 14th C. Túrnovo was a center of trade and industry and of Slavic literature and scholarship, particularly under Patr. Evrim. After the capture of Túrnovo many Bulgarian scholars sought refuge in Russia and contributed to the development of Russian literature. Of Túrnovo's medieval monuments, there survive the Church of the Forty Martyrs, which was built by John Asen II to celebrate his victory over Theodore Komnenos Doukas at Klokotnica in 1230 and which contains a Greek inscription of Omurtag and a Slavic inscription of John Asen II, and perhaps the tomb of St. Sava of Serbia, who died in Túrnovo in 1251; the Church of Sts. Peter and Paul (Holy Apostles), a 14th-C. reconstruction of a 12th-C. building, severely damaged by an earthquake in 1913; the Church of St. Demetrios of 1185/6, which has the characteristic Bulgarian form of an aisleless, barrel-vaulted hall pierced by a tall drum supporting a dome; and the vast complex of ruins of the royal palace.


---

**TURSUN BEG,** Ottoman historian; died after 1499. Tursun was financial secretary (*defterdar*) to the Ottoman sultans Mehmed II and Bayezid II (ca. 1481–1512), and author of the *Tarih-i Ebûl Feth*—primarily an account of Mehmed II, but also covering the first six years of Bayezid II's reign (i.e., to 1487). Unlike Aşıqpaşazade and the popular historians, Tursun expressed himself in learned Ottoman, with ornate syntax. He depicts Mehmed II as an ideal ruler, the embodiment of all virtues, whose actions ensured good order in society. Overall, Tursun's tone is remote and often abstractly panegyrical. Beneath the rhetoric, however, Tursun conveys valuable information, reflecting in part his own experience in sultanic circles. Tursun participated, for example, in Mehmed's capture of Constantinople in 1453, and his account of the sultan's reactions to the splendors of Hagia Sophia is particularly vivid.


---

**TYANA** (Τύανα, now Kemerhisar near Niğde), city on the main route between Constantinople and the Near East, about 30 km north of the beginning of the Cilician Gates. A bishopric attested at the Council of Nicæa, Tyana became civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of CAPPADOCIA II in 372; it sometimes appears with the additional name Christopolis. A frequent goal of Arab attack, Tyana was taken and severely damaged in 708, 806, and 831. Arab control of Tyana provided an advance base against Byz. Asia Minor, but after 933 Tyana fell into permanent decline, retaining only its ecclesiastical rank. Remains of the Byz. city are insignificant.

**LIT.** *TIB* 2:298f.

---
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---

**TURSUN BEG,** Ottoman historian; died after 1499. Tursun was financial secretary (*defterdar*) to the Ottoman sultans Mehmed II and Bayezid II (ca. 1481–1512), and author of the *Tarih-i Ebûl Feth*—primarily an account of Mehmed II, but also covering the first six years of Bayezid II's reign (i.e., to 1487). Unlike Aşıqpaşazade and the popular historians, Tursun expressed himself in learned Ottoman, with ornate syntax. He depicts Mehmed II as an ideal ruler, the embodiment of all virtues, whose actions ensured good order in society. Overall, Tursun's tone is remote and often abstractly panegyrical. Beneath the rhetoric, however, Tursun conveys valuable information, reflecting in part his own experience in sultanic circles. Tursun participated, for example, in Mehmed's capture of Constantinople in 1453, and his account of the sultan's reactions to the splendors of Hagia Sophia is particularly vivid.


---

**TYANA** (Τύανα, now Kemerhisar near Niğde), city on the main route between Constantinople and the Near East, about 30 km north of the beginning of the Cilician Gates. A bishopric attested at the Council of Nicæa, Tyana became civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of CAPPADOCIA II in 372; it sometimes appears with the additional name Christopolis. A frequent goal of Arab attack, Tyana was taken and severely damaged in 708, 806, and 831. Arab control of Tyana provided an advance base against Byz. Asia Minor, but after 933 Tyana fell into permanent decline, retaining only its ecclesiastical rank. Remains of the Byz. city are insignificant.

**LIT.** *TIB* 2:298f.
TYCHE (τύχη), fate, fortune, or chance, a complex concept inherited from antiquity. As a symbol of prosperity and success, *tyche* (as popular superstition) was often connected with cities, including Constantinople (Janin, *CP byz.* 438). The emperors were also considered to have their *tyche*, the survival of the Roman concept of an individual's genius, as embodiment or special protector. Hagiology developed the topos of martyrs who refused to swear an oath to the imperial *tyche*. At the same time there were some attempts to adjust the pagan concept of *tyche* to the Christian empire. In the Forum of Constantine, there was a sculptural group representing Constantine, Helena, a cross, and the personified Tyche of Constantinople (Dagron, *Naissance* 441). A legend has it that Constantine had a cross engraved on the forehead of the Tyche of Constantinople, but it was removed by Emp. Julian the Apostate (*Souda*, ed. Adler, 3:395.24–29). Justinian I (nov.105.2.4) proclaimed that the *tyche* of the emperor was above all limitations, since it was a "living law" granted by God.

*Tyche* was also construed as an impersonal agent or cause of events evolving independently from human free will; this concept, reflecting pagan and popular determinism, was rejected by the church fathers. Thus, Eusebius of Caesarea described it as an empty word: there is no place for change or fate in a world ruled by divine law and order (*Constitutio ad coetum sanctorum* 6). It was similarly rejected by Thedoret of Cyrrhus (*HE* 3.16), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* 4.5), and Isidore of Pelousion (*Epist.* 3.154).

On the other hand, Prokopios (like his classical models) as well as many later historians referred to the concept of *tyche*. Michael Psellus emphasized the element of irregularity and chance in *tyche*, but sometimes the distinction between *tyche*, *ananke*, *heimarmene*, and even *pronoia* is quite vague. In his work on providence, Isaac Komnenos the sebastokrator (12th C.) sought to neutralize the much admired and influential Neoplatonist Proklos by introducing into his pagan writings numerous citations from pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite and Maximos the Confessor as well as by adding Christian touches to his terminology (particularly with respect to *tyche* and *heimarmene*). The idea that *tyche* directs human success and failure can also be seen in such historians as Kinnamos (A. Kazhdan, *BS* 24 [1963] 29) and Leo the Deacon (M. Sjuzjumov, *ADSV* 7 [1971] 152). Theodore Metochites ascribed particular significance to Tyche (the personification of fortune). She could be of greater or lesser importance, in the former case dealing with the destiny of countries, in the latter with individual lives; she could act beneficially (αγαθή τύχη) but is usually a fickle, unreliable whore, shifting from one to another.


**Representation in Art.** As in literature, the figure of Tyche in art could personify both the fortune of cities and that of individuals. In both cases this image is scarcely known after the 10th C. Holding a globe, rudder, or wheel to symbolize her regulatory function, she represents the operation of cosmic forces. Depicted as an Amazon or an older woman, often with a mural crown and attributes of a specific place, the local Tyche survived longer than the image of personal fortune but became ever more syncretistic in form and function. Images of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch personified in this fashion all may be shown with a cornucopia as an emblem of abundance; other aspects of their iconography likewise became nonspecific. On the *sella curulis* of consular diptychs, running Tyche figures represent provinces paying homage (Delbrück, *Consulardiptychen*, no.19) or, as busts, are associated with *Nike* (ibid., no.21). Tychai appear in monumental painting, in books such as the *Notitia Dignitatum*, and on silver stamps and other metalwork as well as on honorific columns. The decline of the type is evident in the *Joshua Roll*, where the personified cities of Jericho, Ai, and Gibeon differ not only from each other but from other personifications of the same cities. In later periods the Tyche's role was in part assumed by local epithets, such as "Tiberiadiotissa," applied to types of the Virgin Mary.


---

**TYPIKON, LITURGICAL**, a liturgical calendar to which have been added instructions for each day's services. This type of *typikon* (τυπικόν) is one
of two Byz. liturgical books with rules governing the celebration of services: where the diataxis gives the rubrics regulating the ordinary structure of services, the typikon indicates what is proper to each day of the year. There are three types of liturgical typikon: the "cathedral" Typikon of the Great Church for the rite of Hagia Sophia and other secular churches, and two "monastic" forms, the Stoudite and Sabaite typika, which regulated services in monasteries.

Liturgical instructions of this sort first appear in the 9th–10th C. either as directions (kanonaria) added to liturgical books for special services and feasts of the church year (e.g., Dmitrievskij, Opisanie 1:172–221) or as rudimentary regulations (hypotýposes) for the monastic hours and psalmody added to monastic typika (ibid. 1:224–56). The term typikon, of monastic origin, is not found in the earliest MSS and was applied to these liturgical regulations only from the 11th C. onward (Nikon of the Black Mountain, Takitkon, ed. Benešević 21).

Fully developed liturgical typika such as that of the Euergetis Monastery in Constantinople, designed esp. to regulate what happens when feasts of the fixed and mobile cycles of the church calendar fall on the same day, comprise two lists giving the feasts and commemorations of both these cycles, filled out with more or less complete information concerning the place ("station") of the celebration and the "proper" (variable) elements of the service such as the lections, prokeimenon and alleluia verses, antiphons, troparia, etc., as well as particular ceremonies (e.g., a lité). Later liturgical typika also have appendices and chapters explaining general principles and rules.


TYPIKON, MONASTIC, a set of regulations prescribing the administrative organization and rules of behavior of a cenobitic monastery as well as its liturgical observances (seeTypikon, Liturgical). Typikon has become a conventional term designating a wide variety of foundation charters and monastic testaments, which bear such titles as diaithke, hypotýposis, thesmos, diataxis, and hypomnēma, in addition to typikon. Around 50 of these documents (often referred to by scholars as kētorikὰ typika, i.e., typika of the kētor or founder) survive. They range in date from the 9th to the 15th C., but the majority are concentrated in the 11th to 14th C. Fifteen of the preserved typika are for foundations in Constantinople, 18 for monasteries in Greece (including Mt. Athos), the others for institutions in Asia Minor, Cyprus, Syro-Palestine, the northern Balkans, and Italy.

Since there were no monastic orders in Byz., each monastic community needed its own formulary; in some cases, however, a kētor would model his typikon on an earlier example, such as that of the Euergetis Monastery in Constantinople. Typika vary greatly in length, format, and content. Typically they contain rules about election of the hegoumenos and appointment of other officials, enclosure, novitiate, diet, clothing, discipline, and commemorative services for benefactors of the monastery. They may also include a biography (or autobiography) of the founder and a katabolion (inventory) of monastic property, both movable and immovable. C. Galatariotou (infra) has suggested a distinction between "aristocratic typika," which emphasize family connections, and "nonaristocratic typika," written by a member of the monastic community, which stress bonds of spiritual kinship. The aristocratic typika usually provide more detail on the administrative structure of the monastery.

In addition to the light they shed on the structure and administration of the konobion and on monasticism in general, typika are invaluable sources of information on varied topics such as monastic property holdings, philanthropic institutions like hospitals and gerokomeia, monastic food and clothing, books and sacred vessels, prosopography, and ecclesiastical lighting. Typika, however, prescribed an ideal form of monastic life, and other sources indicate that many of the rules were not always observed.


TYPIKON OF THE GREAT CHURCH, liturgical ordinal of the rite of Hagia Sophia of Constantinople, the earliest complete liturgical Typikon of the Byzantine Rite. It is preserved in seven MSS of which two—Jerusalem, Hagioi Staurou, cod. 40 (10th–11th C.), and Patmos, cod. 266 (10th C.)—contain the relatively complete text,
although without a title. The 14th-C. MS in Oxford (Bodl. Lib., Auct. E 5 10) does, however, bear a title, “Synopsis of the ecclesiastical akolouthiai for the liturgy, litai, and vigils of the entire year.” Other MSS are of the 11th–14th C., mostly incomplete. The text of the Patmos version of the Typikon was produced between 950 and 959 (it mentions the translation of the relics of St. Gregory of Nazianzos, on 25 Jan. 950). The date of the Jerusalem text is debatable: A. Baumstark (OrChr 2 [1927] 11f) theorized that it was based on two independent sections—one (the typikon proper) created ca.802–06, another (the synaxarion) produced between 878 and 893; Mateos rejects the hypothesis of two sources and dates the production of the entire text to the end of the 9th or early 10th C. The mention of the late patriarch Ignatios makes 878 a firm terminus post quem.

The Typikon gives the description of services for each day, first for the cycle of immovable feasts, secondly for that of movable feasts, beginning with the Sunday of apokreas (the second week before Lent). Each entry lists the saints, feast, or celebration celebrated on that day, as well as other memorable events (fires, etc.); the entry also indicates where a synaxis or procession should take place and establishes which akolouthia should be sung and which biblical text read.

The Typikon is essential for the study of liturgical practice in Constantinople of the 9th–10th C., even though some omissions remain enigmatic—for instance it does not include the celebration of the Triumph of Orthodoxy. The Typikon of the Great Church fell into disuse at Constantinople after the Fourth Crusade but remained in force in Thessalonike until the end of Byz. (Symeon of Thessalonike, PG 155:553D, 625B).


TYPOLOGY, a system in which explicit iconographic parallels were drawn between characters and events in the Old Testament and those in the New Testament, played a less prominent role in Byz. than it did in the later medieval West (12th–15th C.). Yet, in a somewhat different sense, prefigurations and other typological relationships had a profound impact on Byz. piety, and through it, on art—both as the foundation of icon veneration and as the basis of a universal guide to Christian behavior. Theodore of Studios (PG 99:500f) noted that “every artificial image . . . exhibits in itself, by way of imitation, the form of its model (archetypon) . . . the model [is] in the image, the one in the other, except for the difference of substance.” Much earlier, though as a guide for conduct, Basil the Great had invoked “types” and mimesis (ep.2, ed. Deferrari, 1:14–15): “the lives of saintly men, recorded and handed down to us, lie before us like living images of God’s government, for our imitation . . .” (see Imitation). Such concepts were central not only to belief in the power of icons, but also to the stylistic and iconographic conservatism that characterize their history. Moreover, the Basil passage helps explain the typological parallels that were often drawn in art and literature, for example, between emperors and Old Testament kings (as on the David Plates) or between Holy Land pilgrims and the Magi (as on pilgrims’ amulets). (See also Symbolism.)


TYPOS OF CONSTANS II, an imperial edict of 648 requiring adherence to Orthodoxy. To mollify opposition to the Ekthesis and end debate over Monotheletism, Patr. Paul II persuaded Constans II to sign a “typos concerning the faith.” Monotheletism was not directly condemned by the Typos, but the text of the Ekthesis was ordered removed from Hagia Sophia. The Typos did not define official dogma but sought confessional unanimity by forbidding discussion of Christ’s wills and energies and by commanding acceptance of Scripture and the doctrinal definitions of the five ecumenical councils. Reaction to the Typos was strongest in the West; Byz. sources do not even mention it. The text is preserved in the acts of the Lateran Synod, which, despite the presence of the exarch Olympios, denounced the Typos, excommunicated Paul, and wrote to Constans blaming the patriarch for condoning Monothele-
tism. In late 649 Pope Martin I anathematized Archbp. Paul of Thessalonike (then under papal jurisdiction) for not signing a letter explicitly rejecting the Typos. Constans considered resistance to the Typos as treason; the charge figured in the trials of both Martin and Maximus the Confessor. Pope Vitalian took a more conciliatory position, and the issue subsequently subsided.

-P.A.H.

TYRE (Τύρος, Ar. Sûr in Lebanon), Phoenician seaport. Tyre consisted of two parts, one on the seacoast, another on an island, connected by a bridge. The walls rose straight out of the sea. An ancient aqueduct supplied the city with water. Tyre was an important commercial city with developed silk, purple-dyeing, and glass industries. The Piacenza Pilgrim was astonished by its luxury and public brothels. Its circus and actors were famous in the 4th C. Christianity had to overcome the resistance of the pagans (Porphyry was a native of Tyre) and Jews. In 314-17 Bp. Paulinos built a basilica in Tyre, the most splendid in Phoenicia, described in detail by Eusebius of Caesarea.

Between 381 and 425, the province of Phoenicia Maritima was created and Tyre became its civil capital and ecclesiastical metropolis (with the exception of Berytus, which was autocephalous). Tyre later served as the protothronos see of the patriarchate of Antioch. In 355 a church council in Tyre was dominated by the Arians; a Monophysite synod was held at Tyre in 514 (Stein, Histoire 2:175). Tyre was also a seat of kommerkiarioi at the end of the 6th and early 7th C. (Antoniadis-Bibicou, Douanes 158).

During the Persian war of the early 7th C., conflicts between the Jews and Orthodox led to a Jewish attack on Tyre and the massacre of 2,000 Jews on the city walls, as related by Eutychios of Alexandria. In 635 the Arabs took Tyre through treachery, and the city became a base for their maritime expeditions. After coming under Fâtimid rule, Tyre resisted the Crusaders until July 1124, but then remained in their domain until 1291. Greek metropolitans of Tyre are known from 11th- C. seals (Laurent, Corpus 5.2:365-69), but the Crusaders established a Latin archbishopric there as well. The marriage of Manuel I Komnenos and Maria of Antioch was solemnized in the church of Tyre in 1167.

-M.M.M.

TZACHAS (Τζαχας, Turk. Çaka), Turkish emir and usurper; died Abydos ca.1093. According to Tzachas’s alleged statement, he had been a Turkoman raider, but was captured in the reign of Nikephoros III. Pledging allegiance to Byz., he was created protonobelissimos and given rich gifts, but lost everything on the accession of Alexios I (An.Komn. 2:114.11-13). Circa 1088-91 Tzachas employed Christians to construct a fleet at Smyrna; he captured Phokaia, Mytilene, Chios, Samos, and Rhodes. Circa 1090/1 Constantine Dalassenos recovered Chios. Circa 1091, with a new fleet, Tzachas reasserted his sway, ravaging many islands. He proclaimed himself emperor and sought alliance with the Pechenegs in Thrace. In 1092 John Doukas recovered Mytilene and most of Tzachas’s territories, but ca.1092/3 Tzachas attacked Abydos. At Alexios’s urging, Kilic Arslan I (Tzachas’s son-in-law) advanced to Abydos, enticed Tzachas to a banquet, and allegedly killed him (An.Komn. 2:166.13-15). Circa 1097 John Doukas constrained a “Tzachas” holding Smyrna (the same person, or a son?) to surrender it.

-C.M.B.

TZAMANDOS (Τζαμανδός, mod. Kuşkalesi), site in Cappadocia, on a high peak overlooking the road between Caesarea and Melitene. It first appears in the historical sources in 908 when Melias built its fortress in a region that had been a man’s land between Byz. and the Arabs. It became a bishopric (attested only in the 10th C.) and a kleisoura in the theme of Lykandos. After surviving the attacks of Sayf al-Dawla, Tzamandos was colonized by Jacobite Syrians who established their own bishopric (ca.955-1180). It willingly joined the revolt of Bardas Skleros in 976. Tzamandos was given to David, son of Senacherim.
ARCRUNI, in 1022, and to Gagik of Kars in 1065; it then became an Armenian bishopric. Attacked by the Seljuks in 1068 and 1070, it fell to them after the battle of Mantzikert in 1071. The fortress, with its well-preserved double circuit of walls, is largely Byz.

LIT. TIB 2:300f. —C.F.

TZAMBLAKON (Τζαμπλάκων), a family of military commanders, landowners, and courtiers known from the mid-13th C. when John III granted the megas domestikos ton scholon Tzamblakon an estate in the region of Christoupolis (Kavalla); one of his relatives was TATAS CA.1272. Alexios Tzamblakon, son of the megas domestikos, served Andronikos II as megas tzaousios and governor of Serres but then sided with Andronikos III and was rewarded with the office of megas papias and an estate near Thessalonike. He took the monastic habit as Antony ca.1330. His son, known only under his monastic name Arsenios, also megas papias, supported John VI during the Civil War of 1341-47 and was tonsured after John’s failure. His sons were the megas doux Asomatianos and the megas stratopedarches Demetrios. The family intermarried with the Palaiologoi, Tornikioi, and Kaballarioi; the Kaballarioi Tzamblakones were active from the 1370s. Alexios Tzamblakon Kaballarios is mentioned in MAZARIS. The Tzamblakones were closely connected with the Slav neighbors of Byz.: some documents from Dubrovnik of 1344-46 mention merchants who visited territories subjected to a certain Zamblacus, and Grigorij Camblok, Bulgarian and a disciple of Metr. KIPRIAN, became metropolitan of Kiev (1415-19); as a writer he was very critical of the Byz. court.


TZANGION (τζανγιόν), boot or sandal. In the late Roman period the word acquired the connotation of an elegant shoe; thus EPHREM THE SYRIAN (ed. J.S. Assemani, 1 [Rome 1732] 42CD) envisages a man who is barefoot today and tomorrow requires tzange or caliga, who is today garbed in coarse wool and tomorrow wants fine silk.

The word was usually applied to the emperor’s purple shoes, one of the most revered INSIGNIA of imperial authority. The tradition probably came to Byz. from the East: a 6th-C. chronicler (Malal. 413-17-18) relates that when the king of Lazika was crowned by Justin I he donned Roman imperial garb; however, he wore tzangia decorated with pearls in the Persian manner, which he had brought from his native land. A 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 168.26-27) adds that they were red (rousia). A 14th-C. ceremonial book describes tzangia as high boots ornamented with images of eagles made of precious stones and pearls; the emperor wore them on ceremonial occasions (pseudo-Kod. 171.11-17).

As a basic element of the imperial costume, the tzangia replaced the boots called kothornoi; this shift, at an uncertain date, is perhaps connected with the increasing role of the cavalry in military operations. Justinian I still wore kothornoi in the 6th C., but by the 10th C. the custom of wearing tzangia was firmly established; Leo Grammatikos viewed the tzangia as an essential part of the emperor’s garb during his coronation (Leo Gramm. 246.19-21). A rebel’s putting on red shoes signified his usurpation of the throne.

In the 12th C. the word was used to denote a boot issued to workmen serving the monastery of the Kosmosoteira (L. Petit, IRAIK 13 [1906] 49-28). A SHOE MAKER was sometimes called a tzangarios, and tzangareia were bootmakers’ shops, while a maker of imperial boots was called tzangas.

LIT. L. Wessel, RBK 3:445f. —A.K.

TZAOUSIOS (τζαουσίος), an enigmatic court office in the 13th–15th C. The term is of Turkish origin, from çavus, meaning “courier” (Moravcsik, Byzantinoturca 2:3081), and was rendered in Greek as angelphoros (Mercati, CollByz 2:325.13-14). The formulary of appointment of a tzaousios (Sathas, MB 6:647.16-26) considers him the commander of the garrison of a kastron; H. Ahrweiler (in Polychronion 37) sees the SEBASTOS-tzaousios as chief of the MELINGOI in the Peleponnesos. A tzaousios of the drungos of the Melingoi is known in the 14th C. Some tzaousioi served as officers of the mega allagion.

The first known megas tzaousios was Constantine
Margarites under John III Vatatzes; Guillard surmised that the *megas tzaousios* had ordinary *tzaousioi* under his command, successors of the earlier *mandatres*. In the 14th-C. hierarchical list of pseudo-Kodinos he occupied the place after the *tata*; the *megaloi tzaousioi* are described as being responsible for maintaining the order of the imperial retinue. The *megas tzaousios* of Morea, Eliavurco (Elias Bourtzes?), is mentioned in the *Chronicle of the Tocco* (A. Kazhdan in *Bisanzio e l'Italia* [Milan 1982] 171).

**TZATOI** (Τζάτοι, Τζάθοι, etym. unknown), Armenians who belonged to the Greek church. The Armenian version of Basil the Great's *Hexaemeron* uses the word *cayt* to render “Valentinians.” After the 10th C. it was applied to Armenians who were Chalcedonian, in opposition to the Gregorian Monophysite church. (See also IBERIANS.) The Armenian historian Uxtanes (10th C.? ) promises to discuss the Cayt', but the relevant part of his *History* is lost. The term is more common in the 12th–13th C. In Greek the Tzatoi are first mentioned in the 11th-C. *Taktikon* of NIKON OF THE BLACK MOUNTAIN (ed. Benešević, 11.7).

**TZETZES, JOHN**, poet; born ca. 1110, died between 1180 and 1185. According to his own statement, Tzetzes (Τζέτζης) was Georgian on his mother's side (P. Gautier, *REB* 28 [1970] 207–20), which accounts for his interest in the Black Sea region (M. Bibikov, *EiBalk* 12 [1976] no.4, 116–20). Even though he boasts that his grandfather was rich (albeit illiterate), Tzetzes had no substantial fortune. He earned his living by his literary work (ep.75, p.109.19–20) and thus belonged to the group of professional literati. Neither his writing nor his attempts at teaching brought him sufficient salary, and the theme of the poverty of intellectuals permeates his works: he had to sell his library, the patrons who commissioned his works were slow in payment, etc. His major work is unique in genre: it consists of a collection of letters accompanied by poetic scho-

lia entitled *The Histories* (or *Chiliads*). Tzetzes’ letters often deal with political events (e.g., J. Shepard, *ByzF* 6 [1979] 191–239) and historical personages and provide vivid scenes of everyday life (e.g., description of a priest's family that lived above Tzetzes and kept swine indoors), while *The Histories* emphasize the antiquarian trend of Tzetzes’ interests, frequently citing ancient and biblical data and names. Tzetzes’ works dedicated to contemporary events are rare (among others, a poem on Manuel I’s death and iambics mocking contemporary education—P.A.M. Leone, *RSBN* 6–7 [1969–70] 135–44). He composed voluminous commentaries on Homer (Allegories to the Iliad and Odyssey, Exegesis, Antehomerica, Homerica, and Posthomerica, in which he claimed to be more consistent than Homer), Hesiod, tragedians, Aristophanes, Lykophron, and Oppian. In Tzetzes’ Life of St. Lucia (O. Garana, *Archiuio Storico Siracusano* 1 [1955] 15–22) he apparently alludes to the Byz. war against a coalition of Normans, Hungarians, and their Russian allies.

**TZIKANDELES** (Τζικάνδηλης), also Tzykandeles or Kykandeles, an aristocratic family name deriving from Latin *cicindela*, “glowworm,” according to E. Trapp (JÖB 22 [1973] 239). The family is known from the late 11th C. (Leo, governor of Kibyrrhaiotai) and included high-ranking military commanders intermarried with the Komnenoi: (another?) Leo married the sebaste Anna, daughter of a Komnene (V. Vasil'jevskij, *VizVrem* 3 [1896] 580.6–12); Goudelios, sebastos, who was married to Eudokia, Alexios’ s granddaughter (Lampros, “Mark. kod.,” no.103.17–19, 26–29), attended the council of 1166; Basil was Manuel I’s general. Later their position declined: the vestiarietes Manuel addressed Patr. Michael (perhaps Michael IV Autoreianos) about problems of marriage law (*RegPatr*, fasc. 4, nos. 1208, 1211); Manuel Philes described a certain Deme-

trios Tzikandeles Doukas as “born a Komnenos” (Κομνηνοφυής), but nothing is known about the man. George Doukas Tzikandeles was a judge in Thessalonike ca. 1375. Manuel Tzikandeles was an
active scribe in 1358–70; another scribe, Demetrios Kykandyles, lived ca.1445 (PLP, no.11712).

**LIT.** Polemis, Doukai 186f.

**TZOUROULLOS** (Τζουρουλλός, mod. Çorlu), fortress in Thrace, north of Herakleia, on the road from Adrianople to Constantinople. Greek authors describe it variously as a phrourion (Prokopios, Wars 7.38.5), polichnion (An.Komn. 2:123.18), kome (An.Komn. 1:81.15), asty (Akrop. 55.10), and polis (Theoph.Simok. 249.14). An inscription names a certain Sisinios, kourator of Tzouroullos, who died in 813 (I. Ševčenko, Byzantion 35 [1965] 564–74). An imperial estate (kouratoreia) was probably established in this area. Because of its proximity to Constantinople, Tzouroullos was subject to frequent attacks: in 559 Slavs and Hunnic Bulgars reached Tzouroullos and Arkadioupolis (Theoph. 234.1); during the reign of Maurice, the Avar khan besieged Priskos in Tzouroullos; in 813 Krum attacked it; in the time of Alexios I the region was pillaged by the Pechenegs. In 1235 John III Vatatzes took Tzouroullos from the Latins. John Asen II’s attempt to occupy the fortress failed; in 1240 the Latins seized it again, but John III regained Tzouroullos in 1246.

Tzouroullos appears as a suffragan bishopric of Herakleia ca.800 (Notitiae CP 2.140). In the notitia of Andronikos II it is listed as an archbishopric.


**TZYKANISTERION** (Τζικανιστήριον), word of Persian origin, meaning a place for throwing a ball. It designated a polo field (see sports) constructed within the precincts of the Great Palace. The first stadium called Tzykanisterion was built under Theodosios II; Basil I demolished it in order to erect the Nea Ekklesia and build a larger one. The new Tzykanisterion was connected with the Nea by two galleries.

**LIT.** Janin, CP byz. 118f.
ÜÇAYAK, a Byz. church (original name unknown) in a desolate area of northwestern Cappadocia, 30 km north of Kırşehir. The structure, exceptionally for the region, is entirely of brick. Its unusual plan of two adjoining cruciform domed chapels with separate apses but a common narthex suggests a dedication to twin saints or perhaps by two emperors; possibly it was built to commemorate the victory of Basil II and Constantine VIII over Bardas Skleros in the vicinity in 979. In any case, its style and decoration—the interior decor is lost but the outer walls bear a system of blind arcades—indicate a date in the 10th-11th C.


--C.F.

UGLINES. See Beauty.

UGLJEŠA. See John Uglješa.

ULFILAS (Οὐφίλας), “bishop of the Goths”; born Cappadocia? ca.311, died Constantinople 382/3. Captured by the Goths in 337, Ulfilas was sent by them as a member of an embassy to Constanti- nople where Eusebios of Nikomedia ordained him as bishop. During his activity among the Goths, Ulfilas translated the Bible (or part of it) into Gothic. In 360 he became an adherent of Arianism and signed the creed of the Homoio- sians; his activity thus contributed to the entrenchment of this doctrine among 4th-C. Germanic people.

The role of Ulfilas has been reconsidered by modern scholars. Thompson stated plainly that Ulfilas did not convert the Goths to Christianity, Schäferdick rejected the possibility of Ulfilas's definition as a “missionary bishop,” and Stockmeier emphasized that the Goths had already accepted Christianity in the 3rd C.


ULPIOS. See Oulpios.

‘UMAR (Οὐμαρος), more fully ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb; caliph (634-44); born Mecca ca.592, assassinated Madina 3 Nov. 644. Elected caliph, he succeeded Abū Bakr in 634. Muslim conquests of Byz. territory, including most of Palestine, Syria, Egypt, Cyrenaica, and Mesopotamia, took place under ‘Umar. He reportedly met Pτr. Sophronios at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jeru- salem in 637 while visiting newly won territories in Palestine and Syria. It was probably at Jabiya in 637 that he made the precedent-setting decisions for the initial administrative organization of the newly conquered lands. Desiring peace with the Byz. while he consolidated these lands, he permitted the withdrawal or evacuation of Chris- tians from Chalkis (Ar. Qinnasrin) in northern Syria and restrained his expansion into new ter- ritory. He allegedly did not wish ‘Amr to conquer Egypt but acquiesced in its occupation. He disliked Khālid and removed him from command. His diplomatic contacts with Byz. include his suc- cessful negotiations to recover prominent Mus- lims from Byz. captivity and his successful de- mands for the return of Arabs who had fled to Byz. territory; allegedly he used threats to Chris- tians within caliphal territory to secure his terms. Many Muslim institutions, including a number of treaties and regulations concerning non-Muslim subjects, are ascribed to his decisions.


--W.E.K.

‘UMAR (Άμιρ), emir of Melitene (Malatya); died 3 Sept. 863. A lifelong opponent of the Byz. Empire, he was often allied with the ‘Abbāsid
UMAYYAD CALIPHATE (661–750), founded by Mu‘awiya with its capital at Damascus. After the haphazard formation of the vast Arab empire under the early successors of Muhammad came a period of administrative consolidation. Even though the Umayyad caliphs tried to expand their possessions in Byz. Asia Minor and attacked Constantinople in 674–80 and 717–18, the view of their relations with Byz. cannot be limited to warfare; as H. Gibb (DOP 12 [1958] 219–33) stressed, both their military assaults and administrative adaption reveal the ambition to establish their own imperial dynasty at Constantinople. To this end the Umayyads used both those Arab tribes traditionally allied with Byz. as well as the Syrian population of former Roman provinces. The Umayyads built substantial fleets that allowed them to exploit a new military tactic—attacking islands and blockading ports. Umayyad expansion was stopped at Arroino—and in part because of stiffening Byz. resistance, in part due to growing internal conflicts within the caliphate. Surviving Arabic traditions are hostile to the Umayyads: these caliphs are criticized for betraying the spirit of the theocratic state as Muḥammad had established it. (See table for a list of Umayyad caliphs.)


W.E.K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Dates of Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘awiya I</td>
<td>661–680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazid I</td>
<td>680–683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘awiya II</td>
<td>683–684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marwān I</td>
<td>684–685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-Malik</td>
<td>685–705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Walid I</td>
<td>705–715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymān</td>
<td>715–717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Umar II</td>
<td>717–720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazid II</td>
<td>720–724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hishām</td>
<td>724–743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Walid II</td>
<td>743–744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazid III</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marwān II</td>
<td>744–750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘UMAR II ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, caliph of the Umayyads (717–20); born Medina 682/3, died Radjāb Feb. 720. After his accession ‘Umar ordered Maslama to lift the siege of Constantinople and thereafter maintained peaceful relations with Byz.; he may even have signed a seven-year treaty that granted Byz. pilgrims access to the Holy Land (Gero, infra 177, n.5). His military activities were almost all defensive in nature (M. Cheira, La lutte entre Arabes et Byzantins [Alexandria 1947] 207–13). Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 399.20–26) states that in 718 ‘Umar persecuted Christians, exempting from taxation converts to Islam and declaring Christian testimony against Muslims inadmissible, and that he sent Leo III “a dogmatic letter” in hopes of converting him. Thomas Arcruri (10th C.), however, reports that Leo’s reply persuaded ‘Umar to reject many Islamic beliefs (Gero, infra 132f). Other evidence indicates that ‘Umar was relatively tolerant. Arabic sources say that he prohibited the destruction of old churches, permitted bequests to churches, forbade Christians to wear Arab clothing, and lowered taxes on non-Muslims. He ordered that the Church of St. John in Damascus, dismantled by Walid I (705–15) and incorporated into the Umayyad Mosque, be returned to the Christians, although he accepted a compromise whereby they received only the suburban Church of St. Thomas.


P.A.H.
UMM EL-JIMAL, in Jordan, ruined site probably to be identified as Thantia; a large walled and garrisoned settlement of the 4th–7th C. in the province of Arabia. A watchtower was built there in 371 in the names of Valentinian I, Valens, and Gratian, and a *kastelloi* (barracks?) was constructed by a *doux* in 412/13. Umm el-Jimal is noted for its approximately 15 churches of the 4th–6th C., including the earliest dated church of Syria (built in 344 by a local priest as a memorial church for his son), the cathedral of 556 (?), and at least four other churches paid for by families. The town continued to prosper until the end of the Umayyad period, when it was apparently destroyed by an earthquake and not rebuilt.


UMUR BEG (‘Αμωπ), emir of the coastal beylik of Aydin; born 1309, died Smyrna 1348. He was the second son of Mehmed and grandson of Aydin, the eponymous founder of the Aydinoğlu dynasty. The exploits of this ghazi warrior are recounted both by Byz. historians (Nikophoros Gregoras, John VI Kantakouzenos) and the Turkish poet Enveri, a section of whose *Desturname* (composed in 1465) deals with Umur. In 1326 Mehmed assigned Smyrna to Umur as his appanage, but not until 1329 did he gain control of the lower harbor fortress, which was held by the Genoese. Once in command of the port, he constructed a sizable fleet and raided Byz. territory (Chios and Kallipolis) and Latin possessions in Greece (Bodonitsa and Negroponte). Umur succeeded his father as emir in 1334. The next year he formed an anti-Latin alliance with Andronikos III Palaiologos and renewed his attacks on Frankish territory. After the death of Andronikos (1341), Umur became a staunch ally of Kantakouzenos and gave him crucial support in the Civil War of 1341–47. Gregoras (Greg. 2:649.16) compares Kantakouzenos’s relationship with Umur to that of Orestes and Pylades, while Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 2:393.2–3) stresses Umur’s slavish devotion to him. The loss of the port of Smyrna in Oct. 1344 to Latin Crusaders, led by Henri d’Asti, Latin patriarch of Constantinople (1339–45), was a severe blow to Umur’s naval power; thereafter he was restricted to overland raids. He was killed while trying to dislodge the Latins from lower Smyrna.


–A.M.T.

UNCIAL, or majuscule—the latter term now being preferred by some scholars, esp. by G. Cavallo and H. Hunger—is the conventional designation for the kind of script used almost exclusively for writing books from the 2nd to 9th C., until the rise of the minuscule as book script. Uncials are also used in inscriptions. The characters are *grosso modo* the same as those used up to the present as Greek capital letters; they are unconnected, of equal height, and (with few exceptions) fit into the space between two lines. In early uncial MSS the words are not separated or accentuated. In its most pure and aesthetically attractive form this script is called “biblical uncial,” after the famous Bible codices of the 4th C. (Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus). Most of the characters can be inscribed into a square, very much as in the Latin *capitalis quadrata*. Besides this ideal type are three other main (and later) types of uncial: the so-called Coptic uncial (today usually called Alexandrian, after the center of its diffusion), the upright ogival uncial, and the inclined ogival uncial, the last two with regional variants: Italo-Greek, Palestinian, and Constantinopolitan.

With the development of the minuscule as book script from around 800 onward, the use of uncialls declined and was reserved increasingly for special purposes. In secular texts it was now used exclusively for certain prominent parts of the text (hence Hunger’s term “Auszzeichnungsmauskei” for what was commonly called half-uncial), for example, for titles (*lemma*), tables of contents (*pinakes*), marginal notes, etc. The Alexandrian uncial was often used for this purpose. Only in the religious sphere did the uncial continue to be used for writing entire books (in its upright form, until the 11th C.); uncial codices thus gained an additional symbolic value, being associated a priori with the religious world.

UNGUENTARIUM, a conventional term applied to a well-attested type of small (approximately 18–21 cm in height) pottery flask, fusiform in shape—with a short tubular mouth marked off from the body by a slight ridge—tapering at the bottom to a roughly truncated point. Nearly half the specimens bear a stamp impression, most often of a monogram, but occasionally of an image (e.g., lion) or a text (e.g., "of Bishop Severianos"). The vessel type is datable ca. 500–650 by the monogram format ("box" and "cruciform") and by the discovery of a cache of 20 examples in the Athenian Agora in mid-6th C. context. Findspot evidence indicates substantial production and wide distribution, probably from a single source in Palestine. The stamps were probably added to vouch for the vessels' contents (see Stamps, Commercial); ecclesiastics' names among them, coupled with the likely Palestinian origin, suggests that they were pilgrimage ampullae made as containers for Jordan water or holy oil from the loca sancta.


—G.V.

UNION OF THE CHURCHES, term describing the effort to reunify the churches of Rome and Byz. following the breach of the 9th to early 13th C. Although theological, disciplinary, and liturgical polarization between Rome and Constantinople led to temporary schisms during the first millennium of Christian history, only gradually did this opposition, along with cultural and political differences, result in a permanent breach. The so-called schism of 1054 did not mark a final separation of Eastern and Western Christendom. It was rather the Fourth Crusade (1204) that rendered the breach definitive. During the next two centuries there were innumerable attempts to restore communion, but developments such as the Latin domination of Byz. by the Crusaders, papal centralization, scholastic theology, and the dogmatization of the filioque at the Second Council of Lyons complicated the situation.

Political more than religious considerations motivated the negotiations for union during the Komnenian and Palaiologan periods. The Palaiologos dynasty particularly needed military aid to fight the Turks. The papacy, realizing this, demanded total ecclesiastical submission of the Byz.
church in return for military assistance. Unconditional union—not a negotiated settlement—was to precede military aid.

The Western church was reluctant to acknowledge the traditional practice and habits of the East. On the other hand, Byz. hardliners and esp. monks clung to minor niceties of their tradition, refusing to give up even the slightest items and sometimes preferring Turkish conquest to submission to the “papists.” In such conditions only a few politicians and intellectuals on both sides were sincere supporters of the union; political agreements remained short-lived and cynical, often resulting from Western indifference and Eastern zeal.

The Unionist attempts could not succeed, as the unions of Lyons and Ferrara-Florence demonstrate. Lyons is an esp. dramatic case not only of the limitations of Byz. imperial influence over religious policy, but of the rigidity of papal diplomacy. Ultimately both councils only served to widen the separation.


**UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANTINOPLE**, conventional term for an institution of higher education, the stage subsequent to the curriculum of *enkyklos paideia*. Of the two formal features of most medieval universities—a royal charter or papal bull granting recognition and juridical personality—the University of Constantinople had only the former. Like Western universities, however, it developed the elements of professional education (e.g., a law school), whereas medicine was taught at hospitals by physicians. The earlier University of Constantinople was organized (or reorganized) by Theodosios II in 425. Located in the Kapetolion (Janin, *CP byz*. 174–76), it had 31 chairs, primarily for Greek and Latin grammar and also for rhetoric, philosophy, and law. The fate of the University of Constantinople after Justinian I is obscure. The schema presented by A. Schneider (*Byzanz* [Berlin 1936] 25)—that the university was closed by Phokas and replaced by a “Patriarchal Academy” under Herakleios—is simplistic and unfounded (Lemerle, *Humanism* 93f. n.39). The school in Magnaura created by Caesar Bardas used to be described as a university, but its curriculum and structure did not differ substantially from those of regular secondary schools.

There is more justification for applying the name university to the schools of law and philosophy founded by Constantine IX; for the first of them there is a statute promulgated in 1046/7 (in Apr. 1047, according to J. Lefort, *TM* 6 [1976] 279f). The school, which was administered by the nomophylax, was responsible for training high functionaries, lawyers, and notaries. The secular university reached its acme in the 11th C., but in the 12th C. it was overshadowed by a more conservative Patriarchal School, which was more concerned with the teaching of theology. Nevertheless, at least until ca.1300, Constantinople retained, together with Paris and Baghdad, the reputation of a center of higher education. Some kind of officially sponsored higher education was available in Constantinople up to 1453, though its institutional form varied (see *Xenon of the Kral*).


**URBAN II** (Odo of Châtillon), elected pope at Terracina 12 Mar. 1088; born Châtillon-sur-Marne ca.1035, died Rome 29 July 1099. Urban inherited a difficult situation: northern Italy was under the control of Henry IV of Germany, who supported the antipope Clement III; Urban’s natural ally in this state of events was Roger I, count of Sicily. After the death of Robert Guiscard in 1085 the Normans did not continue their attack on Byz., and, according to Gaufredus Malaterra, opened negotiations with Alexios I in 1089 after consultation with Roger. Patr. Nicholas III Grammatikos, in an epistle addressed to Urban, expressed expectations that union of the Churches could soon be attained. No evidence of a formal union agreement is known, but Urban evidently achieved his aim and prevented Alexios from joining an alliance with Henry IV and Clement. When the situation improved in Italy in the early 1090s, Urban journeyed from Rome to France. On his way in March 1095, he convened
a synod in Piacenza, which was attended by Byz. envoys who appealed for Western military aid against the Seljuk Turks; a few months later at Clermont he made a full-fledged appeal for a crusade (Nov. 1095), thus initiating the First Crusade. J. Hill (Speculum 26 [1951] 265f) hypothesizes—on the basis of indirect evidence—that Urban prepared a plan of Greco-Latin union, the execution of which he entrusted to Raymond of Toulouse.


URBAN V (Guillaume de Grimoard), pope (from 28 Sept. 1362); born Grisac Lozère, France, ca.1310, died Avignon 19 Dec. 1370. Urban spent the first five years of his pontificate in Avignon; after 1367 he resided in Rome. Urban supported the idea of a crusade, but the success of the king of Cyprus, Peter I Lusignan (1359–69), in capturing Alexandria in 1365 was short-lived. Urban also failed to achieve significant results in imposing UNION OF THE CHURCHES on Constantinople. Emp. John V came to Rome and on 18 Oct. 1369 abjured the Eastern creed and recognized papal supremacy, but the agreement remained on the level of a personal compact, with the vast majority of the Byz. clergy and people refusing to accept their emperor’s decision. The cause for Byz. opposition was Roman arrogance rather than Byz. obstinacy: the pope rejected the idea of a universal council to discuss theological differences and was very reluctant to allow continuation of the Greek rite. J. Gill (OrChrP 39 [1973] 61–68) tried to reconsider the traditional interpretation of the pope’s letter to the archbishop of Crete; Gill argues that Urban allowed Greek priests, after their conversion to Catholicism, to retain their wives. They could conduct processions and ceremonies that were part of the Greek rite; since they knew no Latin, they celebrated in Greek.


URBAN LIFE. See CITIES.

URBAN PREFECT (praefectus urbi, ἐπάρχος Ῥώμης), high-ranking official of the early Roman Empire who was responsible for police and criminal prosecution in Rome and Italy. Reforms of Diocletian, Constantine I, and Constantius II limited the area of his activity to within 100 miles of Rome, while Italy was placed under the authority of the praetorian prefect. At the same time his functions within Rome were increased: besides criminal jurisdiction the urban prefect controlled trade, the bread supply, building activity, and the administration of spectacles. He held a military command and, as president of the senate, supervised the senators. As Chastagnol has shown, the post was in the hands of the great landowners, 60 percent of whom were local, demonstrating imperial leniency toward the Roman aristocracy. Until 323 all urban prefects were pagans and until 352 Christian urban prefects remained exceptional. The urban prefect of Rome continued to exist after the fall of the Western Empire, as attested by Cassiodorus and Corippus, and is mentioned as late as 879. The staff of the urban prefect included the princeps officii, who was the prefect’s adviser in matters of administration and law.

By 359 the office of the Constantinopolitan urban prefect, or eparch of the city, was created to replace the former proconsul (see Anthypatos); thus the administration of Constantinople was equated to that of Rome.


URFA. See Edessa.

UROŠ V. See Stefan Uroš V.

USAMA IBN MUNQIDH, noble Muslim knight, Arab poet, man of letters, and passionate hunter; born Shayzar, Syria, 4 July 1095, died Damascus
16 Nov. 1188. His life span corresponded with a dramatic period in Near Eastern history that saw incessant Muslim factional struggles, the capture of Jerusalem, the establishment of the Latin Kingdom by the First Crusade, the failure of the Second Crusade, and the recapture of Jerusalem by Saladín. Serving or visiting different Muslim and Crusader princes, sultans, and caliphs, Usāmah participated in their court life, military campaigns (e.g., the siege of Shayzar by John II Komnenos), and hunting expeditions.

Usāmah spent the last two decades of his life mostly in religious contemplation, teaching, and writing. He attained fame as a superb poet and prolific author. Most important among his surviving works, The Book of Didactic Examples is essentially his memoirs. A source of direct information about contemporary battle and siege methods, it also provides details on the treatment of prisoners (e.g., the ransoming of a Muslim slave from his Greek owner in Constantinople), on the intimacies of Muslim court and private home life as well as on horse races and falconry. Above all, it offers Usāmah's personal and equanimous observations on different habits and social customs, thoughts, medical treatments, religious attitudes and practices of the Muslims and Franks in Syria.


A.S.E.

USPENSKIJ GOSPEL BOOK, the earliest known dated minuscule manuscript, written in 835 on parchment in the scriptorium of the Studios Monastery by the scribe Nicholas. The manuscript contains notes on the death of the Stoudite leaders Plato of Sakkoudion and Theodore, as well as Joseph of Thessalonike. The codex, from the former collection of the bishop Porfirij Us denskij, a traveler to Mt. Athos, is now in the Leningrad Public Library (gr. 219).


USUFRUCT (χρήσεις καρπών, in scholia to the Basilika usually οὐσονούφρυκτος), according to classical Roman law, “the right to use the things of another, their substance remaining unimpaired” (a definition accepted by Basil. 16.1.1). Unlike praedial servitudes, usufruct was personal, given for life or for a fixed term. Classical jurisprudence differentiated usufruct from ownership; this distinction, strong under Diocletian, became obscured during the 4th and 5th C. when the tendency arose to consider usufruct as a form of possession, limited in time and content. Justinian I sought, with partial success, to reverse this process and return to the classical formulation. Later texts cease to distinguish between usufruct and plain use (chresis).


USURPATION, a common phenomenon of late Roman and Byz. political life, was neither terminologically nor legally defined in Byz. The most usual term for usurpation of power by an illegal claimant was tyrannis, but the term tyrannis could designate other situations (rebellion, arbitrary rule) and other terms could be used for usurpation—stasis (insurrection), epibouleuma (conspiracy). Usurpation may be defined as an illegal arbitrary assumption of the emperor’s power, but since, in theory, proclamation by the people in the Hippodrome or by the army was considered legal authorization, the concept of usurpation appears significantly ambiguous; furthermore, a co-emperor who cleared his way to the throne by murder (e.g., Basil I) was not considered a usurper but a legitimate heir.

Usurpation usually is recognized as symptomatic of broader trends in the distribution, bases, and exploitation of power in Byz. society. In the late Roman Empire usurpation had diverse causes and diverse characteristics: it originated in both military and civilian milieus, could have a religious tinge, and was often connected with crisis situations on an endangered frontier (e.g., Phokas) or in Constantinople (Hypatios during the Nika Revolt). It was a subject of intense political concern to the emperor; its repression was frequently and loudly celebrated in Triumphs. From the second half of the 7th C. to the mid-9th C., usurpation occurred primarily in new provincial territorial units—first exarchates and then themes—that provided a material base for military seditions (Gregory, exarch of Africa; Olympios, exarch of Ravenna, etc.). From the 10th C. onward, usur-
USURY (τοκοληψία, lit. "receipt of interest") in the ancient and medieval sense of the word encompasses a variety of modes of receiving interest, whereas in the modern period it is applied only to excessive interest. Usury, defined as any form of lending money or things at interest, was a controversial topic from the 4th C. onward, when three different approaches were formulated: church fathers condemned all usury as contradicting the principles of Christian ethics; ecclesiastical councils forbade only the clergy to lend at interest; and civil legislation continued to permit usury, although Justinian I apparently lowered the maximum rate of interest. Attempts to abolish usury in the 8th (?) or 9th C. failed, and Leo VI, in novel 83, reinstated the practice despite its un-Christian character. The general attitude of society toward usury was negative. Hagiographers compared usurers to wild beasts. In the 14th C. Nicholas Kabasilas wrote at least two works against usurers. Time and again demands for action against usury were voiced (see DEBT).

Loans played a double role in Byz. society. On the one hand, the use of credit could stimulate small enterprises; thus, the vita of Basil the Younger mentions a wine merchant who borrowed money to purchase goods. On the other hand, usury contributed to the redistribution of (landed) property. Peasants contracted loans for a variety of reasons—in times of famine, to ransom prisoners of war, to pay taxes; in these cases their livestock or land served as a mortgage. A case described in Peira 40.10 presents the stages of expropriation: when a debtor was unable to pay, the judge ordered him to hand over his houses to the creditor "as possession" (epi nome); after six months the creditor acquired the despoteia of the immovables. Little is known about loans among the nobility, but in the late centuries the Byz. crown was deeply in debt to Venice and other Western powers.

UTENSILS (ἐπισταλα). Household implements and furnishings encompassed FURNITURE, VESSELS, cutlery (knife, spoon, and fork), lighting appliances (LAMPS), writing tools (inkstands, etc.); the distinction between utensils and tools (see TOOLS AND HOUSEHOLD FITTINGS), on the one hand, and utensils and liturgical vessels, on the other, as described in texts is sometimes conventional and reveals itself more in function than in form. Utensils were made of wood, stone, metal, clay (CEUMIC), glass, bone, skin, osier, and cloth; there was a hierarchy of materials in which gold and silver stood above bronze and iron, ebony and cedar above other kinds of wood, ivory above ordinary bone, etc. A 14th-C. historian (Greg. 2:788.15–18) stresses the hierarchy of materials when he exclaims that the poverty of the imperial court required the replacement of gold and silver vessels by those made of tin and "ceramic and clay." Ornament was another means to express the hierarchy of utensils, and glaze and coloring usually distinguished table dishes from plain kitchen pottery. For expensive utensils, gold, silver, precious stones, enamel, and ivory were applied. A simple method of ornamentation was to carve lines on wooden and ceramic objects. The most precious utensils were adorned with inscriptions (dedications), while ordinary objects occasionally bore marks (of craftsmen or owners?)


—A.K.
`UTHMÁN (Othman), caliph (early Nov. 644–17 June 656); born Mecca, ca. 569 or 575, died Madīna 17 June 656. A merchant who converted to Islam, he was the chosen successor of `UMAR. Although the rate of Muslim territorial expansion slackened during `Uthman’s caliphate, his forces overran Armenia. The Sasanian Empire ended with the death of YAZGIRD III, and Muslim naval prowess increased. `Uthman approved the renewal of conquests to the west: in North Africa, Ibn Sa’d, his governor of Egypt, crushed Gregory the Exarch in 647 and, with the exception of Carthage, conquered much of Byz. Africa. This seriously threatened the remaining Byz. positions in the entire Mediterranean. Two critical maritime triumphs over Byz. in `Uthman’s caliphate were the victory of the Battle of the Masts (655) and the first invasion of Cyprus (648). `Uthman was accused of indolence, corruption, and, in the later years of his caliphate, nepotism. Some allege that he modeled his administrative changes on Byz. and Sasanian models, but documentation for this is poor. Civil strife in `Uthman’s caliphate disillusioned many Muslims. He was slain after his besieged house was stormed.


UTOPIA, a term coined in the 16th C. to designate a perfect commonwealth. The ancient mind created politico-geographical utopias, considering certain real (Sparta in Plato) or fictitious states as ideal systems. The ancient tradition of a world without labor and tyranny, spatially separated from the regular oikoumenē and located at its edge, seems to have been preserved in chs. 4–21 of the Expositio totius mundi (C. Molè in Le trasformazioni della cultura nella tarda antichità [Rome 1985] 2:730–36). Christianity shifted the emphasis from the spatial category to one pertaining to time: utopia, as elaborated particularly in APOCALYSES, was placed in the future—as a perfect reign of an expected king, or an eschatological period of peace, or the Heavenly Kingdom. In LACTANTIUS this concept of the future happy era when everyone would praise the true God is combined with a Platonic social utopia and mythological imagery of the age of Saturn. The Byz. envisaged that the Kingdom of justice would be established after the second Parousia; at the same time they thought that mankind had reached maturity following Christ’s advent and therefore stressed that ideal life is attainable here and now. From antiquity they inherited the topos of the “happy barbarian” as opposed to the corrupted civilized man: this topos appears, for example, in Simokattes’ account (Theoph. Sim. 6.2.10–16) of the Sklavenei, who lived in a remote area on the Western Ocean and were distinguished for their height and beauty; they never used iron weapons and carried with them only lyres. The communities of the Brahms were also represented as ideal societies as in Palladios. Another type of ideal life was the image of the “angelic communities” of monks, esp. hermits dwelling in the desert, withdrawn from the world and to some extent resembling the Brahms. The palace and Constantinople were viewed as representing the ideal “heavenly” order, although the Byz. understood the difference between the heavenly utopia of the palace or monastery and everyday reality.

The concept of political utopia was employed as a means of propaganda; thus CLAUDIUS predicted Stilicho’s prosperous rule, and Andronikos I Komnenos claimed that he had brought the golden age of justice on earth: his portrait showed him as “the laborers’ king,” and Niketas Choniates (Nik. Chon. 325.17–36) preserved the traces of a contemporary pamphlet whose author, using biblical citations (e.g., Mic 4:4), depicted the perfect life of satisfied subjects under his reign. On the other hand, utopia might appear as a form of political program, for example, in the case of PLETHON, who used Platonic traditions as a model for his (unrealistic) project of reforms in the Peloponnese.


UTRIGURS. See Cotrigurs and Utrigurs.

UZES (Oze), Torki in Kievan sources, the confederation of Oghuz Turks that formed a part of the Old Turkic steppe empire; they were akin to the Seljuks. Under CUMAN pressure the Uzes moved west, crossed the Volga, and in the 10th C., following the Pechenegs, appeared in the area
north of the Black Sea and on the Middle Danube. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (*De adm. imp. 9.114*) suggested the Uzes as potential allies against the Pechenegs.

Closely involved in skirmishes with Rus' princes, in 1064 the Uzes crossed the Danube and invaded Byz. territory as far as Thessalonike. Attaleiates (Attal. 83.19–20) reckons that they numbered 600,000. Disease and starvation, however, as well as Bulgarian and Pecheneg attacks forced the Uzes to retreat; many were crushed by their own animals and vehicles. Some Uzes became Byz. mercenaries, some merged with the Pechenegs, others settled near Kiev as military colonists in the service of the Rus' princes (*černye klobuci*). In Byz. the corps of mercenary Uzes was still active in the second half of the 11th C. (*SkylCont* 144.13), then disappeared as a distinct force, leaving some echoes in toponymy (Lake Ouzolimne) and personal names (a commander Ouzas "of Sauromatian origin" in the *Alexiad* of Anna Komnene). The Byz. identified the Uzes as Scythians (*Skyllizes Continuatus*) or Huns (Anna Komnene); Tzetzes (*Hist. 8.773*), following an old tradition, placed the Uzes with the Huns in the vicinity of the Caspian Sea.


—O.P.
VAHRAM, known as rabun, “master,” or vardapet, “teacher”; Armenian scholar active in the late 13th C. He calls himself “chancellor” at the court of Leo II, king of Armenian Cilicia (1270–89); little else is known of his life. His Rhymed Chronicle traces the history of Armenian Cilicia from its occupation by Ruben (see RUBENIDS) in the late 11th C. until 1276. His Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories follows the tradition made popular in Armenia by works of (or attributed to) David the Philosopher.


- R.T.

VALARŠAPAT (Vagharpshapat, now Ejmiacin in Armenia), capital city under Trdat the Great; site of the martyrdom of Sts. Hripsimé, Gayané and their companions. Since the 4th C., churches at Valaršapat have commemorated the martyrs and the spot where Gregory the Illuminator had a vision in which four lofty columns supporting vaults were called forth by a man descended from heaven. (The 12th-C. identification of the man as Christ explains the cathedral’s dedication, Ejmiacin, “the Only-Begotten-One descended.”)

The present cathedral is a 7th-C. cross-in-square church, with apses to the north, south, west, and east, as well as east. Seventeenth-century additions obscure the exterior. Beneath the apse and nave are remains of basilicas (and a Zoroastrian temple); A. Sahinyan’s reconstruction of a 5th-C. cross-domed structure here (REALM n.s. 3 [1966] 39–71) is based on a misunderstanding of excavation notes (F. Gandolfo, Le basiliche armene IV–VII secolo [Rome 1982] 14–19).

St. Hripsimé (618) is the best-known example of a church plan type (including Dzvari at Mc’er’a) peculiar to the Transcaucasus: four apses open out of a domed central area. Between the apses, steep, three-quarter-round chambers lead to four square corner rooms. St. Gayané (630) is a cross-domed basilica. Like St. Hripsimé, its apse and auxiliary chambers are inscribed within a flat wall. Later churches at Valaršapat (e.g., the 17th-C. Solokat) presumably mark the sites of other 4th-C. martyria.


- A.T.

VALENS (Ovályηs), augustus (from 28 Mar. 364); born Cibalae, Pannonia, ca.328, died near Adriano ple 9 Aug. 378. A low-ranking army officer during the reigns of Julian and Jovian, he rose swiftly after the ascent to the throne of his brother Valentinian I. Valentinian appointed him tribunus (or comes) stabuli, and less than a month later he became co-ruler. After a division of responsibilities Valens retained the eastern part of the empire including Thrace and Egypt. The brothers reversed Julian’s policies, depriving the curiae of state support and removing Julian’s appointees. The pro-Julian elements gathered around the rebel Prokopios. His revolt in 365, however, was suppressed. Less clear are the reasons for the so-called plot of Theodors in 371/2 in which many influential people were involved; denunciation led to a series of severe punishments.

The situation on the Persian frontier was troublesome during his reign, and Valens spent the winters of 373/4 and 377/8 in Antioch negotiating such matters as the division of Armenia between Constantinople and Persia. The first war against the Goths ended with a peace treaty in 369 that was not favorable to the empire. In 376 Valens gave permission for a large number of Visigoths, fleeing from the Huns, to settle in Thrace. This operation was poorly handled, supplies of food ran out, and Roman officials took advantage of the situation to gain personal profit. As a result, the Visigoths rose in revolt and ravaged the Thracian countryside. Valens, then at Antioch, rushed westward, hoping to defeat the barbarians without the help of his nephew Gratian; as a result, he
was routed and killed in 378 at the battle of Adrianople.

Valens was a Christian; probably under the influence of his wife Domnica he accepted Arianism and toward the end of his reign began to persecute the Orthodox. He was not popular, esp. with the intellectuals, who ridiculed his lack of education and ignorance of the Greek language. In Constantinople Valens rebuilt the main aqueduct, which has since borne his name.


---

**VALENTINIAN I** (Οὐάλεντινιανός), emperor (from 26 Feb. 364); born Cibalae, Pannonia, 321, died Brigetio, Pannonia, 17 Nov. 375. He was an officer in Julian’s army but as a Christian could not expect a successful career. The accounts of his exile by Julian are contradictory. He subsequently became tribunus in the army of Jovian. When the latter emperor died, Valentinian was unanimously proclaimed augustus by the generals and civil officials. He soon promoted his brother Valens as co-emperor. The brothers agreed to divide the empire and its administration (two consistoria were established), but to rule in cooperation. Valentinian held the West, residing in Milan and Trier.

Valentinian’s domestic policy was inconsistent. He abolished some exemptions given by Julian to curiales and promoted the appointment of defendores civitatum, but he was frugal like Julian and tried to reduce the expenditures of the court. His major source of support was among Pannonians, whereas few senators (e.g., Probus) collaborated with him. The thesis that Valentinian introduced a “reign of terror” against senators, at least after 368 (C. Schuurmans, *AntCl* 18 [1949] 25–38), is probably an exaggeration (P. Hamblenne, *Byzantion* 50 [1980] 198–225).

Valentinian did not intervene in Eastern affairs during the revolt of Prokopios in 365, nor did he seek assistance when Firmus revolted in Africa. His foreign policy was also independent of the eastern half of the empire. His major concerns were Britain and the Rhine and Danube frontiers. In 375 he undertook operations in Pannonia against the Quadi and Sarmatians. During negotiations with them, he became so enraged that he died of a stroke.

His first wife was Marina Severa, mother of Gratian. In ca.370 he married Justina, widow of the usurper Magnentius, who bore him Valentinian II. Ammianus Marcellinus presents a negative image of Valentinian as alien to the classical ideal of man, avoiding military action, and frightened of magicians. On the contrary, Jerome (Eusebios, *Chronicon*, Lat. tr. by Jerome, ed. R. Helm, U. Treu [Berlin 1984] 244) praises him as an outstanding emperor whose biased adversaries portrayed his severity as cruelty and his economy as greed.


---

**VALENTINIAN II**, Western emperor (from 22 Nov. 375); born Trier? 371, died Vienne (in Gaul) 15 May 392. Proclaimed as Augustus by the army in Aquincum immediately after the death of his father Valentinian I, the child-emperor Valentinian II was kept in a subordinate position under the tutelage of his half-brother Gratian. When Gratian was murdered in 383, Valentinian’s mother Justina ruled in his name. The major problems of her administration were the pressure of the Alamanni on the northern frontier that general Bauto managed to curb, in part with the help of the Huns and Alans; religious conflicts, since Justina leaned toward Arianism while Ambrose exercised a strong Orthodox influence on the young emperor; and a powerful aristocratic elite that cherished paganism and traditional virtues and attempted to shift the burden of taxation to the urban population, espe. the merchants. The usurpation of Maximus was particularly dangerous, compelling Valentinian to flee to Thessalonike in 387. This changed the balance of power between West and East. From 384 onward Theodosios I attempted to assume the role of the elder Augustus. In 388 he, together with Arbogast, defeated Maximus. Valentinian ruled the West from Vienne, under the general control of Arbogast. Desirous of asserting his independence, Valentinian considered moving his court to Milan or using Ambrose as a mediator between himself and Arbo-
gast; he attempted in vain to have Arbogast killed. Valentinian was subsequently found hanged in his palace—the sources either accuse Arbogast (B. Croke, Historia 25 [1976] 235–44), portray the death as suicide, or remain silent about it.

Valentinian is depicted on official monuments of his house, as co-emperor at age 17 on the missorium of Theodosius I (see LARGITTO DISHES, SILVER), and on theobelisk of Theodosius. A bronze bust in Budapest (Age of Spirit., no. 19), found in Pannonia and possibly from a military standard, closely resembles the portraits of Valentinian on coins and medallions (Delbrück, pl. 14.1–4).


—T.E.G., A.C.

VALENTINIAN III, Western emperor (from 425); born Ravenna 4 July 419, died near Ravenna 16 Mar. 455. He was the son of GALLA PLACIDIA and the patrician Constantius. After the death of Honorius, Theodosius II was reluctant to use the family of Galla Placidia to maintain Eastern influence in the West. It was only under pressure from the revolt of a certain John that he had the young Valentinian made Caesar on 23 Oct. 424 and Augustus the next year. Galla Placidia dominated the Western court during her son’s minority, although she was constantly challenged by her rival Aetius, who relied on the support of the Gallic aristocracy. In 437 Valentinian married Licinia Eudoxia, daughter of Theodosius II; the marriage produced two daughters, Eudocia and Placidia. Valentinian had good relations with the Vandals and Eudocia married Huneric, son of Gaiseric. In 450 Valentinian, along with his wife and mother, wrote to Theodosius II asking him to repudiate the teachings of the “Robber” Council of Ephesus. He attempted to secure independence from the tutelage of Aetius but was not always successful. Finally, in 454, he murdered Aetius with his own hand, but fell the next year to Optila, one of the former’s supporters.


—T.E.G.

VALENTINOS ARŠAKUNI (βαλεντίνος or βαλεντινος), usurper of the Byz. throne in 645. He presumably belonged to the Armenian Arsidic house and played a brief role in the succession of Heraclius. At first he seems to have supported Constantine Heraclius and his sons against Martina, with the help of Anatolian contingents stationed at Chalcedon, and he may have brought about the coronation of Constans II in 641. Four years later, however, after an unsuccessful expedition against the Arabs in Syria, he revolted and made his own bid for the throne. The scant Byz. notices (e.g., Theoph. 343.3–6) and the slightly longer account of the Armenian historian Sebēos disagree on the ultimate goal of Valentinos and on Constans II’s acceptance of him as co-ruler. Nevertheless, they agree that Valentinos was brought to the throne by a military coup d’etat and crowned. Soon thereafter, however, he aroused the hostility of the population of Constantinople, which rose against him and put him to death (645).


—N.G.G.

VANDALS (βανδάλωι), a Germanic people. They first appear in 406 when they crossed the Rhine in company with the Alans and Suevi and devastated Gaul for three years. The coalition entered Spain in 409 and again inflicted considerable destruction before settling in the western and southern parts of the peninsula. In 429 the Vandals and Alans crossed into Africa. Vandalic authority over the two MAURITANIAS and NUMIDIA was recognized by Valentinian III in 435. Four years later the Vandals seized CARthage. The peace treaty of 442 ceded control of AFRICA PROCONSULARIS, BYZACENA, TRIPOLITANIA, and eastern Numidia to the Vandals and retroceded Mauritania and western Numidia to the empire. Aware of the threats posed by Ravenna and Constantinople, the Vandals carved out a sphere of power in the western Mediterranean that included control of the Balearic Islands, Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily. Vandalic fleets carried out frequent attacks against the empire, one of which resulted in the sack of Rome (455). Following two unsuccessful Byz. attempts to recover Africa (465–66, 470), a treaty was signed in 474 bringing hostilities to a close.
and reaffirming Vandal control as foederati over Africa.

The Vandals in Africa comprised the Vandal Hasdingi-Silingi clans, Alans, and small numbers of Hispano-Romans, Goths, and Suevi. After capturing Carthage, Gaiseric forcibly established a family dynasty. Subsequent Vandal kings—Huneric (477–84), Gunthamund (484–96), Thrasamund (496–523), Hilderic (523–30), and Gelimmer (530–33)—were his direct descendants. In 456, the dynasty was linked to the house of Theodosios I by the marriage of Hilderic to Eudokia, daughter of Valentinian III. Power in Vandal Africa rested with the king and the Vandal elite, made up of the optimates (nobles), Arian clergy, and warriors. The so-called sortes Vandalorum, probably public lands in Africa Proconsularis, were provided by Gaiseric to the warriors. The Vandal kings reserved for themselves and their family similar allotments (probably former imperial estates) in Byzacena and eastern Numidia. Relations between the Vandals and the Roman-African population were sometimes strained. Some properties belonging to the Roman-African elite were seized, forcing the latter to seek refuge in western Numidia, Mauritania, Italy, and the East. Nevertheless, the Vandals maintained elements of the Roman administrative and political infrastructure, including the imperial cult. The Latin Anthology also attests to the encouragement by late Vandal kings of Latin literary culture. Relations between the Arian Vandals and the Orthodox African church were frequently hostile, although periods of toleration are known. The Mauri tribes initially cooperated with the Vandals and even fought together with them in some overseas campaigns, but Vandal military weakness in the late 5th C. contributed to the emergence of autonomous Mauri chiefdoms in Numidia and Byzacena.

The period of Vandal hegemony in Africa shows much continuity with the late Roman period. African grain, oil, and wine, although no longer linked to the annona, were still exported in considerable quantity to Spain, Gaul, and the eastern Mediterranean. While there is a noticeable lack of civic building activity in African cities under the Vandals, this trend probably began in the 3rd C. In general the Vandals were too few in number to offer a serious cultural alternative to Roman-African civilization; they were thus being slowly assimilated at the time of Justinian I’s invasion of Africa. The pretense for the invasion was Gelimmer’s deposition and murder of Huneric, the grandson of Gaiseric and Valentinian III. The end of the kingdom came with the fall of Carthage in 533. Vandal prisoners of war were organized into cavalry regiments known as the Justiniani Vandalii and stationed in the East, where they disappear from history.


VARANGIANS (Βαρανγοι), Norsem en or Vi- kings in the Byz. army; from the late 11th C. the term also refers to Anglo-Saxons (J. Shepard, Traditio 29 [1973] 53–92). The term is first encountered in Byz. sources with reference to events of 1034 (Skyl. 394.71–5) and then in documents exempting monasteries from billeting Varangians on their property. Scandinavians had been coming via Rus’ to serve in Byz. from at least the early 10th C. The Varangians are often linked to or conflated with the Rus’ (Rhos), or else they are designated “Taurocythians” or “axe-bearers.” Basil II organized them into a tagma in 988, when some 6,000 were sent by Vladimir I of Kiev for use against Bardas Phokas. Over the next two centuries the Varangians were prominent both in field armies and esp. in their role as a palatine corps in Constantinople with quarters in the Great Palace and (under the Komnenoi) at the Mangana and Blachernai palaces. The Varangian guard was elite, expensive to join, notoriously loyal (e.g., An.Komm. 1:92.12–17), and distinctive in physical appearance (cf. Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzès, no.507), dress, and weaponry, and in its traditional code of discipline. Its officers held standard palatine ranks (e.g., the spatharakondidatos Harold Hardrada), but its commander (akoloouthos) is thought normally to have been a Greek. There were churches of the Varangians dedicated to the Virgin in Constantinople, Crete, and near Taranto.


—S.C.F., A.C.
VARDAN VARDAPET ("teacher"), Armenian scholar, born 1200 or 1210 in Greater Armenia (hence his frequent title Arewelci, "the Easterner"), died 1271 at monastery of Xor Virap. He is noted for a universal history, biblical commentaries, a study of grammar, and a brief Geography. He spent some years in Jerusalem and Cilicia. After 1243 he taught in numerous monasteries in Greater Armenia.

Vardan's Historical Compilation traces the fortunes of Armenia from the creation of the world to 1267. Although primarily based on earlier Armenian sources, it is of particular value for the history of Greater Armenia in the 12th–13th C. under Georgian and then Mongol domination. Ecclesiastical relations between the Greek and Armenian churches interest Vardan, but he otherwise pays little attention to Byz.


-V.-R.

VARDARIOTAI (Βαρδαριώται), an ethnic (or possibly tribal) group that probably received its name from the river Vardar. The name first appears in an episcopal notitia of the 10th C. as a bishopric "of Vardariotai or Tourkoi" in the diocese of Thessalonike (Notitiae CP, no. 7.308). The origin of the Vardariotai is unclear: pseudo-Kodinos (pseudo-Kod. 182.4–10) notes that they were "Persians," whom the emperor [Theophilus, according to Gy. Moravcsik] transferred and settled on the Vardar"; their language was "Persian" (210.7–8). Despite this direct evidence, it has often been assumed that the Vardariotai were Hungarians. They formed a police corps under the command of a primikerios and probably replaced the Manglabitai (Oikonomides, Listes 328, p. 241). They wore red uniforms and "Persian" headgear called angouroton, with a whip at their belt as a symbol of their function. A 13th-C. historian (Akrop. 191.26–30) relates that the Vardariotai accompanied the emperor to his military camp, and in a charter of 1195 there is a signature of a representative of a sebastos and primikerios of the Vardariotai, Constantine Taronides (Patmou Engraphe 2, no. 56.31), or rather Taronites, whose service was connected with the sea.

The seals of at least two vardarioi of Thessalonike are known; one of them, Kosmas (10th–11th C.), was at the same time kommerkiarios and prototomarios. If vardarioi were somehow linked to Vardariotai, it reveals quite a different activity of these imperial guardians.


-V.-T.

VARNA, ancient Odessos (Ὁδησσος), city on the west coast of the Black Sea. Odessos prospered in the 4th–6th C. as indicated by numerous surviving inscriptions that were made by military officers, clergymen, merchants, and craftsmen (V. Beševliev, Izv Nar Mus-Varna 19 [1958] 19–34). There are remains of two Roman baths, a 4th-C. basilica with a mosaic floor, and two large Byz. churches, as well as a 6th-C. basilica outside the urban area. Coins of Herakleios were found in Odessos, but the city was burned in the 7th C., probably by the Avars and/or Slavs. Bulgars did not settle at Odessos, but in its vicinity, to which Theophanes gives the name Varna, whose etymology (possibly Slavic) is unclear. In the following centuries Varna is mentioned as a geographic name: the river of Varna (De adm. imp. 9.100) or the coast of Varna (Skyl. 433.28–29). In 971 John I Tzimiskes conquered the region. The fortress of Varna on a cliff overlooking the sea was built by the Byz. probably in the 11th or 12th C. In the 12th C. it was a port (V. Gjuzelev, Izv Studr 28 [1972] 318f) and an important defensive base, with considerable urban development. Although Isaac II Angelos rebuilt the fortifications of Varna (Nik.Chon. 434.22), Kalojan recaptured the city from the Byz. in 1201. In the 13th–14th C. it was the major port of the Second Bulgarian Empire, through which grain was exported in Venetian and Genoese ships (E. Todorova, Izv Nar Mus-Varna 18 [1982] 79–85; 21 [1985] 25–41). In 1389 the Ottoman Turks captured Varna; in 1399 Tatars from the Golden Horde sacked it. In 1444 a united Christian army was defeated by the Ottomans near Varna (see Varna, Crusade of).
VARNA, CRUSADE OF. As a result of the Crusade preached by Pope Eugenius IV in 1440, a predominantly Polish-Hungarian army of about 25,000 men—led by Hunyadi, voivode of Transylvania, King Vladislav III Jagello of Hungary and Poland, and George Branković of Serbia—advanced in 1443–44 into the Balkans, where they won some significant victories over the Turks. Consequently Murad II agreed to a ten-year truce with the Christians, which was ratified at Szegedin in July 1444. When Murad withdrew his troops, however, the Crusaders, with the exception of Branković, broke their oath (F. Pall, BSHArRum 22 [1941] 144–58; Balcania 7 [1944] 102–20) and attacked the Ottomans at Varna on 10 Nov. 1444. After some initial success, the Christians were defeated and Jagello was killed.

The Crusade of Varna was the final attempt of Western Crusaders to stem the Ottoman conquest and preserve the Byz. capital of Constantinople. After the failure of the expedition, Emp. John VIII was forced to send congratulations and presents to the sultan. The battle is described in some detail by Doukas (Douk. 275.20–277.15) and Chalkokondyles (ed. Darkò, 2:98–110), whose accounts are supplemented by a contemporary vernacular poem, written between 1456 and 1461 (N.G. Svoronos, Athena 48 [1938] 163–83). It is preserved in two versions, one by an eyewitness, Zotikos Paraspondylus (who is hostile to John VIII), the other, slightly later, by George Argyropoulos.

VATATZES (Βατάτζης, fem. Βατάτζιβα), a noble Byz. lineage known from ca. 1000, when a certain Vatatzes moved from Byz. to Bulgaria (Skyl. 343.74). Vatatzes lived in Macedonia, where he probably possessed estates. In the 11th–12th C. the family occupied important military positions: the megas domestikos John in the late 12th C.; the domestikos of the East, Basil (later, the domestikos of the West); doux of the West, Nikephoros; governors of various regions (Bulgaria, Thrakesion, etc.). John’s father (perhaps Theodore) was granted the high title of despotes. The Vatatzai married with the Bryennioi, Komnenoi, and Angeloi. In 1047 John Vatatzes supported the rebellion of Leo Tornikios; the Vatatzai were loyal to the partition of the country in 591; it was first overrun by the Arabs in 653. Gradually dominated by the house of Arcruni, Vaspurakan reached its zenith under Gagik-Xač’ik Arcruni (908–43/4) who was crowned by the Muslims in opposition to the Byzan king Smbat I and eventually recognized by Byz. as well. During his reign, the balance of power in Armenia shifted to Vaspurakan. In 924, Gagik gave asylum to the historian John V Katholikos, who fled to him from the Muslims, and the primates of Armenia remained in Vaspurakan until 961. Gagik also built the Church of the Holy Cross next to his palace on the island of Aet’amar in Lake Van. His successors, however, failed to maintain the unity of his kingdom. Threatened by the Dailamite precursors of the Seljuks, the last Arcruni king, Senekerim-Yovhannes, ceded Vaspurakan to Basil II in 1021/2 in exchange for Sebaste and domains in Cappadocia. As part of the 11th- to Byz. expansion to the east, the kingdom of Vaspurakan with some additional territories became the Byz. catepanate of Basprakania (Asprakania) with its center at Van; it served as the bulwark of the empire in the southeast until the Turks overrun it after 1071. The archbishop of Vaspurakan at Aet’amar, however, kept his see and proclaimed himself katholikos in 1113, a claim his see maintained until 1895.

VASMOULOS. See Gasmoulos.

VASPURAKAN (Βασπυρακανία, Βασπυρακάν, Ασπυρακανία, etc.), district in southeast Armenia identified by this name only after the Byz.-Persian
Komnenoi but fought against Andronikos I and perhaps against the Angeloi. John III Vatatzes became emperor of Nicaea and was succeeded by his son Theodore II (who assumed his mother’s name, Laskaris) and grandson John IV Laskaris. Driven from the throne by the Palaiologoi, the Vatatzai were still important up to the mid-14th C. when John, stratopedarches and protokynegos, was governor of Thessalonike (died 1345).

The name Diplomatatzes (“Double Vatatzes”) was used at least from the second half of the 13th C. for those who had Vatatzas ancestors on both sides. The romance of Belisarios listed them among the upper crust of the aristocracy. A certain Diplomatatzina was the mistress of Michael VIII Palaiologos; Alexios Diplomatatzes is known as sebastos, megas hetairiarches, and landowner in 1307–10.


VATOPEDI MONASTERY, sometimes called Vatopedion (Βάτοπεδιον, lit. “Bramble-bush valley”), located at the midpoint of the northeast coast of the Mt. Athos peninsula. Since the rich archives of the monastery have only been partially published, the early history of the monastery is still obscure. One legend, evidently fantastic, attributes its foundation to Emp. Theodosios I; another, closer to reality, says that in the mid-10th C. three archontes from Adrianople—Athanasios, Nicholas, and Antony—came to Athos and at the urging of Athanasios of Athos restored a ruined monastery. The first documentary evidence is an act of the protos Paul of 985 on which the signature of Nicholas, hegoumenos of Vatopedi, is the last among the hegoumenoi (Iivir. 1, no. 7.5 and 69). In 996, however, another hegoumenos of Vatopedi, Nikephoros, signed the act of the protos John ahead of all the other hegoumenoi (Lavra 1, no. 12.25). Thereafter Vatopedi ranked with Iveron in second place in the Athoneite hierarchy, just after Lavra. Vatopedi played an important role in the development of Hesychasm after the young Palamas took the monastic habit there.

By the end of the 13th C. Vatopedi had become a major landowner. A chrysobull of Andronikos II of 1292 lists several villages in the theme of Serres, metochia and monydría in various places (e.g., in Thessalonike), a fair (panegyris), an enclosure for cattle, a parcel of land “with beautiful trees,” and the island Amoliane among the properties of Vatopedi (ed. Regel, infra, no. 1). As a result of this ownership Vatopedi was involved in litigation with other monastic institutions, such as Espigmenou (e.g., L. Mauroommatos in Aphiroma Storono 1:308–16). From the end of the 12th C. onward the influx of Slavic monks to Vatopedi became significant: in the 1190s Sava of Serbia stayed in Panteleemon and Vatopedi before building his own cell in Karyes. In Apr. 1230 John Asen II gave Vatopedi a Slavic chrysobull granting the monks a village near Serres (M. Andreev, Vatopedskata gramota [Soﬁa 1965]). Stefan Uros IV Dusan and John Uglješa also conferred upon Vatopedi sundry privileges (M. Lascaris, BS 6 [1935–36] 166–85). In Oct. 1393 Constantine Dragas, Serbian ruler of Melnik, donated a monydrion of the Pantanassa to Vatopedi (V. Laurent, REB 5 [1947] 171–84).

The library is particularly rich in Byz. MSS, containing over 600 codices, including some rare geographical works by Ptolemy, Strabo, and Pausanias, two illuminated Psalters (codd. 760, 761: Cutler, Aristocratic Psalters, nos. 15, 54), and a fragment of a richly illustrated Octateuch.

Mosaic decoration on both the exterior and interior of the church includes a Deesis, two Annunciations, and a bust of St. Nicholas (G. Millet, Monumentes de l’Athos [Paris 1927] pls. 1–4) variously ascribed to the 11th, early 12th, and 14th C. Frescoes in the church are dated by inscription to 1312 but heavily restored (ibid., pls. 81–94). Vatopedi is distinguished for its mosaic icons (Furlan, Icone a mosaico, nos. 24–25) and was the source of the miniature mosaic of St. John Chrysostom now at Dumbarton Oaks (O. Demus in DOP 14 [1960] 109–14). A. Grabar (Revétements, no. 25) hypothesized that the monastery housed a workshop making gold and silver icon frames in the early 14th C. Among the many panels so treated are the so-called “Dolls of Theodora” (icons of Christ and the Virgin, ibid. no. 32) and one of the Hodegetria, presented by an otherwise unknown woman named Papadopoulina in honor of her sister (ibid. no. 21). Other treasures include a silver reliquary depicting St. Demetrios defending Thessalonike (A. Grabar, DOP 5 [1950] 1–3) and a jasper cup said to have been given by the despotes Manuel Kantakouzenos.
VAULT (κουπτή), a ceiling or roof of brick, stone, or concrete built on the principle of the ARCH. In Byz architecture vaults were constructed of brick, using the pitched-brick masonry technique, and occasionally ribbed. Types of vaults employed were (1) the barrel, or tunnel, vault, constructed of a single layer of bricks, slightly pitched, laid across the axis of the vault and set in thick beds of mortar; (2) the cloister, or domical, vault, composed of four, eight, or twelve curved surfaces or segments in the form of a dome; (3) the groin, or cross, vault, created by the interpenetration at right angles of two barrel vaults of equal diameter and height, with the lines of intersection (groins), forming a diagonal cross. In general, Byz vaults were not built with great care or skill and exhibit many irregularities.


M.J.

VAZELON MONASTERY, also called Zaboulon, located on a cliff face on Mt. Zaboulon, about 45 km southwest of Trebizond. Dedicated to St. John the Baptist, the monastery of Vazelon (Βασέλων) was, according to legend, founded in the 3rd C., destroyed by the Persians in the 5th or 6th C., and restored by Belisarios in the 6th C. The first reliable historical data about Vazelon does not appear, however, until the 13th C. when the Grand Komnenos of Trebizond became generous benefactors of the monastery.

The 180 surviving Byz documents from Vaze-
and Spanish mercenaries; the Bulgarians assembled about the same number of men. When the Byz. and Bulgarian armies began to march toward each other, Stefan III made a surprise attack on Michael at Velbužd, in order to prevent a rendezvous. The Serbian king totally destroyed the Bulgarian forces; Michael was wounded, taken captive, and soon died. Stefan III then forced Andronikos to retreat to his frontier.

The Serbian victory at Velbužd was a turning point in Balkan history, leading to Serbian domination of Macedonia. Stefan III signed a peace treaty with the Bulgarians whereby they were forced to install his nephew Ivan Stefan on the Bulgarian throne (1330–31), together with his mother Anna-Neda. The way was open for Stefan Dušan's penetration into Macedonia.

–J.S.A.

VELJUSA MONASTERY, located in the village of Veljusa near Strumica in Macedonia. The monastery was dedicated to the Virgin of Mercy or Theotokos Eleousa; Veljusa is a Serbian form of the Greek Eleousa. An inscription over the door to the church informs us that it was built in 1080 by Manuel, bishop of Tiberiopolis (Strumica). Manuel, formerly a monk at Mt. Aueontos, also built a modest monastic complex to house ten monks. He provided them with a typikon (composed between 1085 and 1106), in which he emphasized a cenobitic way of life, the absolute autonomy of the monastery, and extraordinary privileges and independence for the hegoumenos. Admission was restricted to those 18 or older. The monastic property, originally quite limited, grew in the 12th C. thanks to the patronage of the Komnenian dynasty. An inventory dated to 1449, records the treasures of the monastery and the 68 volumes in the library, primarily liturgical. In the early 13th C., probably under the Bulgarian tsar John Asen II, Veljusa came under the control of the Iveron Monastery on Athos, where most documents relating to Veljusa are still preserved today, including its 14th–15th-C. chartulary.

The church was built by Manuel, probably as his mausoleum if, as Miljković-Pepek supposes, an arcosolium in the narthex is the kletor's tomb.

The church is a domed tetraconch, like the chapel adjoining it to the south, and built of a mixture of brick and fieldstone, plastered to simulate cloisonné masonry. The interior has an opus sectile floor and a finely carved templon, reconstructed in the restoration of 1968–69. An enthroned Virgin and Child dominates an iconographical program that includes four hierarchs attending the Hetoimasia (see Last Judgment) and such relatively rare subjects as the Ancient of Days (see Christ: Types of Christ) in the narthex cupola and the manifestation of Christ in Glory to St. Niphon, bishop of Constantinia, depicted in the south chapel. Miljković-Pepek dates this and the paintings in the naos, choir, and narthex to 1085–93, while attributing frescoes in the south porch and exonarthex to painters who also worked at Nerezi.

–A.M.T., A.C.

VELUM (βήλων), a Latin term meaning “curtain.” Curtains played an important role in imperial ritual, courtiers being obliged to wait in front of the velum while the emperor prepared for certain ceremonies (Treitinger, Kaiserrede 55f). According to the 9th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Listes 131.16–18), the deuterous was responsible for care of ta bela of the Chrysotriklinos in the Great Palace. The word vela also designated the groups of dignitaries who entered the ceremonial halls together. In the context of the Hippodrome velum has been interpreted as awning, flag (R. Guillard, Speculum 23 [1948] 676–78), or curtain.

A special group of judges, kritai tou belou, functioned in Constantinople from the 10th C. onward; the first mention is in the Taktikon of Escorial of 971–75. According to Balsamon, they formed a college of 12. V. Gardthausen (BNJbb 3 [1922] 342–50) considered them as umpires in the horse races at the Hippodrome; in reality they formed one of the highest tribunals. The name probably originates from the place of their meetings behind a curtain at the Hippodrome. The office seems not to have survived after 1204, al-
though some lists of offices of the 14th C. continue to mention it, and in the early 15th C. John Argyropoulos named a certain Katablattas judge of the velum (P. Canivet, N. Oikonomides, Diptycha 3 [1982–83] 63-502). An inferior category of judges were the so-called kritai of the Hippodrome; the distinction between the two groups is not always clear.


VENICE (Bevería), Italian port city built on islands and lagoons in the north Adriatic. According to legend, it was officially founded on 25 March 421; the earliest reliable information, however, is from the period of the Lombard invasion of the late 6th C., when the region provided sanctuary for many refugees. The territory was administered by a magister militum under the command of the exarch of Ravenna; the ecclesiastical authority over the region belonged to the bishop of Aquileia and later Grado. When Ravenna fell to the Lombards in 751, Venice remained under the jurisdiction of Constantinople; an attempt by the Franks to conquer Venice in 810 failed, and the treaty of Aachen between the two empires recognized Venice as a Byz. province. Venice was governed by local nobles (tribuni) under the supervision of a Byz. official (doux), whose functions were gradually taken over by local officials, doges, who were granted Byz. titles (e.g., spatharios) and paid by Constantinople. The first local bishopric appeared sometime between 780 and 790 on the island of Olivolo, as a counterbalance to Grado; the first head of the diocese bore the Greek name Christopher. Five new bishoprics were created in the area in the 9th C.

Venetian independence from Constantinople was slowly attained during the 9th C. Under Doge Peter Tribuno (888–920) Venice was proclaimed a civitas; the translation of the relics of St. Mark from Alexandria in 828 contributed to the development of a local pride and sense of identity. The major factor in the growth of Venice was its role as a maritime power whose fleet was active in the struggle against the Arabs in the Adriatic Sea. Veneto-Byz. contacts are attested in the 9th and 10th C.: according to the Chronicon Venetum the Venetian doge Orso II (864–81) sent 12 bells to Constantinople, thus introducing their use in Byz.; Venetian ships brought Western ambassadors to Constantinople; its merchants sold slaves to Greeks (prohibited in 960) and bought garments that, in the words of Liutprand of Cremona, “were worn by Italian harlots and conjurers.” In his chrysobull of 992 Basil II provided the Venetians with special privileges that could not be extended to Jews or inhabitants of Amalfi and Bari traveling on Venetian ships. Alexios I Komnenos granted the Venetians another chrysobull, probably in 1082 (the dates of 1083 and 1092 are also suggested—O. Toma, BS 42 [1981] 171–85): they received certain properties in Constantinople and customs exemptions in various cities of the empire, Corinth and Halmyros being the ports they visited most frequently.

In 1171 Manuel I Komnenos expelled the Venetians from Constantinople. Even though negotiations for a reconciliation began soon thereafter, relations remained tense: not all Venetian property was restored and compensation payments were still continuing under the Angeloi; Venice was apprehensive not only of the direct actions of the emperor but also of the danger of pirates in Byz. waters and of competition from the other Italian republics, esp. Pisa but also Genoa. The Fourth Crusade created a convenient opportunity for Venetian intervention in Byz. affairs: having first destroyed the harbor of Zara, Doge Enrico Dandolo cleverly diverted the crusade against Constantinople. The Venetians profited most from the conquest of the Byz. capital in 1204: in accordance with the terms of the Partitio Romaniae they received Crete, numerous cities in Thrace and Propontis, including Lampsakos on the eastern shore of the Sea of Marmara, Korone and Methone in the Peloponnesos, and properties in Constantinople. Some territories were occupied not by Venice as a state but by semi-independent Venetian knights. They were also awarded special trading privileges. A Venetian, Thomas Morosini, was elected patriarch of Constantinople. Venetian attempts to encroach upon the eastern coast of the Adriatic (Dyrrhachion, Kerkyra, etc.) failed, however.

The role of the Venetians in the occupation of Constantinople, their active participation in plundering the Byz. capital, and their seizure of vast territories made both the empire of Nicaea and the state of Epiros hostile toward the Italian republic. Michael VIII Palaiologos gained the sup-
port of Venice's rival, Genoa, in his war against the Latin Empire. The period from 1261 to ca. 1328 was one of an unstable truce between Byz. and Venice, interrupted by a number of clashes of varying severity. From 1328 onward Byz. sought a balance of power between Genoa and Venice, often leaning toward an alliance with Venice. John V and Manuel II effected a pro-Venetian policy. In the 14th–15th C. the Venetians were active in trade in Constantinople (see Bailo; Badoer, Giacomo) and penetrated the Black Sea (including Trebizond), competing there with the Genoese. They established trading colonies in Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor. The growth of Ottoman power should have prompted a policy of unity and cooperation between Byz. and the Italian republics, but it was difficult to realize; thus in 1376 the Genoese and Venetians were at war over Tenedos; exploiting the weakness of the Byz., Venice was granted Thessalonike in 1423 but was able to hold it only until 1430, when the Turks captured the city. During the final years of the empire, Venice received with honor two Byz. emperors—Manuel II and John VIII—but its military aid to Constantinople remained minimal. Cardinal Bessarion bequeathed to Venice in 1468 his collection of Greek MSS, which became the nucleus of the Bibliotheca Marciana.


Monuments of Venice. The monument in Venice most strongly influenced by Byz. art and architecture is the Church of S. Marco. The will of Doge Justinian Partecipacius (died 829) decreed the foundation of a church to house the relics believed to be those of St. Mark. Burned in 976 and repaired, the first church was replaced by Doge Domenico Contarini (1042–71). Sixteenth-century sources date the start of construction to 1063 and state that the chief architects came from Constantinople. The relics of St. Mark were installed in the new crypt in 1094.

The early 12th-C. Translatio Sancti Nicolai notes that S. Marco was "of the same artful construction as the church of the Twelve Apostles in Constantinople" (O. Demus, The Church of San Marco in Venice [Washington, D.C., 1960] 90). By copying the Justinianic Church of the Holy Apostles, the patron may have intended to express S. Marco's unique association with the doges (comparable to the association of the prototype with the Byz. emperors), or its status, like that of the Holy Apostles, as an apostoleion. At S. Marco the distinctive original plan, a freestanding cross with five domes, was enlarged by annexes (north and west porches and a baptistery) around the western cross arm. The façades were decorated with columns, capitals, and reliefs taken from Constantinople in the sack of 1204. Other booty exhibited includes four bronze horses from the Hippodrome, formerly displayed above the west porch; porphyry tetrarchs, possibly from the Philadelpheion, immured outside the treasury; and the so-called Acre pillars, probably from St. Polyeuktos. The treasury contains many priceless works of art, mostly looted from Constantinople. Byz. objects were also acquired by gift or purchase, including the earliest parts of the Pala d'Oro and a bronze door of ca. 1080 inside the west porch.

Like its Constantinopolitan model, S. Marco was decorated with figural mosaics, mostly by local craftsmen. As at Montecassino, the craft was introduced by artists from Constantinople; unlike Montecassino, the local workshop thus established never died out. Mosaic-making was virtually continuous at S. Marco from the late 11th through the 14th C., with changes in style echoing those in Byz. Demus identifies repeated waves of Byz. influence, which he attributes to the use of Byz. model-books and to the occasional interventions of visiting Byz. mosaicists. But the work is diverse and many other sources came into play. A most interesting example is the decoration of five small cupolas in the west and north porches with scenes copied from the Late Antique Cotton Genesis, presumably acquired in 1204.


VERGIL (Publius Vergilius Maro), Roman epic poet; born 70 B.C., died 19. Vergil remained popular in the late Roman Empire: the 4th-C. grammarian Servius compiled a Latin commentary on Vergil. The poet was also known in the East; Egyptian and Palestinian papyri of the 5th and
6th C. contain more fragments of and glossaries to Vergil than to any other Roman poet. According to Christodoros of Koptos, Vergil’s statue was placed in the Baths of Zeuxippos. Directly or indirectly Vergil influenced late antique epic poets, such as Quintus of Smyrna and possibly Triphiodoros and Nonnos of Panopolis. In his Speech to the Assembly of Saints, Constantine I—following Lactantius (Divine Institutes 7.16–25)—quoted and analyzed Vergil’s Fourth Eclogue as a prophecy of the birth of Christ. John Lydos referred not only to Vergil but also to Servius’s commentary. Malalas (Malal. 216.3–6, 285.5–11) quotes the Aeneid, book 4, vv. 302–03, and identifies Vergil as a “wise Roman poet” who wrote on the fall of Troy and the story of Dido and Aeneas. B. Baldwin (Hermes 111 [1985] 127f) found another vestige of Vergil in Prokopios of Gaza.

Vergil achieved the status of the canonical Latin poet, and the word virgilius acquired in hagiography the meaning of “the wisest” (V. Peri in ItMedUm 19 [1976] 1–40). From the period of the 4th to 6th C. two elaborately illuminated codices survive, the “Vatican Vergil” (Vat. lat. 3225), devoted to the Georgics and the Aeneid (Vergilii Vaticanus [Graz 1984]) and the “Vergilius Romanus” (Vat. lat. 3867), somewhat cruder than the first MS but including illustrations to the Eclogues (Picturae Orna menta Complura Scriptu rae Specimina Codicis Vaticani 3867 [Rome 1902]).

The Sourda and Geaponika contain many references to Vergil; thereafter he is mentioned infrequently (e.g., by Tzetzes and Holobolos). Unlike Ovid, Vergil was not translated nor imitated by the late Byz. There is no direct connection between Vergil and the Idyll of Planouides (Maximi Planudis Idyllium, ed. F.M. Pontani [Padua 1973] 6, n.12). Further, an anonymous idyll published by J. Sturm (BZ 10 [1901] 433–52) belongs to the 16th, not the 15th C.


VERINA (Bepiva), more fully Aelia Verina, wife of Leo I, whom she married before 457; died fort of Papyrios (Paperon), Isauria, ca. 484. She bore Leo two daughters, Ariadne and Leontia, and a son (name unknown) who died in infancy in 463 (G. Dagron, AB 100 [1982] 271–75). After Leo’s death in Jan. 474 Verina expected to rule as the grandmother of the minor Leo II, while Zeno, the husband of Ariadne and father of Leo II, was proclaimed emperor. Leo II, however, died in Nov. 474, and Verina, disappointed in her expectations, began to intrigue against Zeno. She wanted to replace him with her paramour, the magister officiorum Patrikios, whom she planned to marry. She sought assistance from her brother Basilikos, but he deceived her, received the crown himself, and executed Patrikios. Verina then conspired for the return of Zeno (476); the actual government fell to his supporter Illos. Verina and Ariadne plotted against Illos but in vain. Verina was exiled to Tarsos and forced to become a nun. In 479 Marcian, the son of Anthemios and husband of Verina’s daughter Leontia, revolted against Zeno, as if resenting Zeno’s treatment of his mother-in-law; he nearly overthrew the emperor. In 482 Ariadne convinced Zeno, and through him Illos, to liberate her mother, but in 484 Verina joined Illos in Tarsos as he revolted against Zeno and proclaimed his ally Leontios as emperor. In the ensuing war Illos was defeated and Verina died. The Verina presented as a witch in the Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai (ch.89) is perhaps the wife of Leo I.


—T.E.G.

VERNACULAR, the spoken language of everyday communication. Byz. literature was dominated by Atticism. The language spoken by all classes in day-to-day use, which differed from the literary language in morphology, vocabulary, and syntax, is attested between the 6th and 12th C. in occasional verbatim quotations by historians and chroniclers; in subliterary texts such as popular hagiography, legal documents; occasionally in personal names and place names; and—until the 8th C.—in papyrus letters and other documents from Egypt. All these are liable to show the influence of the literary language. In the 12th C. occasional sustained attempts to imitate spoken Greek in literature (e.g., by Prochopodromos and Michael Glykas), attest to a new interest in the vernacular, which is also displayed by Eustathios of Thessalonike in his Homeric commen-
taries. Virtually no vernacular texts survive from the turbulent 15th C.

Only in the early 14th C. does a body of literature in vernacular Greek appear, with a greater or lesser admixture of learned elements. This comprises romances of chivalry, pseudo-historical poems on Alexander and Belisarios, the Chronicle of the Morea and the Chronicle of the Tocco, satirical beast fables, short religious poems, poems by Stephen Sachlikes, and a recension of Digenes Akritas. These poems are composed in a fairly uniform language, with many alternative forms but few local dialect features. This points to the existence, at least in the cities, of a common vernacular Greek. Ottoman rulers of the 14th through 15th C. used this common language in their diplomatic correspondence with Byz. emperors. Few vernacular poems can be dated precisely. Some are adapted, or even translated, from Western models, but Western influence should not be exaggerated. This literature, which aimed largely at entertainment, owes more to relaxation of linguistic rigor by the educated than to literary ambitions of the less educated. Prose literature, and indeed all “serious” writing, remained the preserve of the learned tongue. Apart from the Chronicle of Leontios Machairas and one or two other texts in Cypriot dialect, the only prose work showing marked vernacular features is the History of Doukas.


VESPERS. See Berroia.

VERSIKIA (Βερσικία), a battle site north of Adrianople near modern Malamirovo (V. Běševliev, XI Congrès international des sciences onomastiques [Sofia 1972] 1:128). In response to attacks by the Bulgarian Khan Krum, in May 813 Emp. Michael I led into Thrace a large army drawn from various themes. At Versikia the Byz. and Bulgars clashed on 22 June. The Macedonian and Thrakesian troops, led by the general John Apakes, successfully attacked the Bulgarian flank but were eventually overwhelmed when the other Byz. forces retreated. The Bulgars, fearing a trap, at first hesitated and then routed the fleeing soldiers. Michael retreated to Constantinople, where he was deposed three weeks later. Many scholars suspect that treachery induced the Byz. defeat, since the Anatolikon troops reportedly were the first to flee (Script. incert. 336.14–339.18) and their general subsequently became emperor (Leo V).


VEROLI CASKET. See CASKETS AND BOXES.

VERONA LIST, conventionally called laterculus Veronensis, a short list compiled in 297 or some time later and preserved in a 7th-C. MS, now in the library of the cathedral in Verona. It contains an enumeration of 12 Roman dioceses established by Diocletian's reform, from Oriens to Africa, with indication of the provinces of each diocese.

It is supplemented by catalogs of barbarian tribes under the power of the emperor; of tribes in Mauretania; and of civitates (cities?) located beyond the Rhine.


VESPERS (ἐσπεριμός), an evening liturgical service to thank God for the day's graces and seek his pardon for one's sins. With orthros, one of the two original major hours to open and close the day, vespers was celebrated at sundown, the lamplighting hour, whence its alternate name lychnikon. As at orthros, the basic symbol was light, the evening lamp being a symbol of Christ, the light of the world.

The vespers service in the asmatike akolouthia of Constantinople opened with variable psalmody, followed by Psalm 140 with a troparion, the entrance of the patriarch, a responsory, and three antiphons. The service concluded with a litany, three lections on some days, a troparion, and dismissal (Mateos, Typikon 1:xxii–xxiii; 2:305f).

In the hybrid urban-monastic service that re-
sulted from the gradual introduction of Palestin-
ian monastic vespers into Constantinople (see Sa-
batic Typika), elements from the Palestinian horo-
logion were combined with elements of the
cathedral vespers of Constantinople (asmatikos hes-
perinos). In the final Sabatic typika, this hybrid
vespers could take three forms: “daily” vespers;
“Great Vespers,” with an introit, on days when
there was Great Doxology at orthros; and “Little
Vespers,” celebrated only in some monasteries,
this being an abbreviated vespers before some
feasts to close the day before initiating the festive
vigil with Great Vespers.

LIT. M. Attranz, “L’office de l’Asmatikos Hesperinos
(vêpres chantées) de l’Ancien Euchologe byzantin,” OrChP

VESELS (σρκείν, also sing. docheion, angeion, etc.).
Vessels could be distinguished according to their
function into liturgical VESSELS (patēn,chal-
ice, thalassa), ornamental vases, and domestic
utensils; according to their material into those
made of gold, silver, bronze, tin, iron, stone, glass,
ceramic, or fabric; and according to their form.
Niketas Choniates gives manifold terms for ves-
sels: pithos, large jar or barrel; amphoreus—AM-
phora; hydrochoos or hydreion, vessel for holding
water, bucket; gaulos, milk-pail; louter, bathing-
tub; tryblion and lopas, dish (can be used generi-
cally for “vessel”); lebes, caldron; chytra, earthen
pot; krater, lekanis, plynos—basin or bowl; oinochoe,
vessel for wine; kaddion, small pitcher; kisybion,
rustic drinking-cup; kondy, kotyle, cup; poterion,
ekpoma, skyphos, drinking-cup, used also for chal-
ice; kylix, kypellon, beaker, goblet; askos, thylakos,
skin bag, wineskin; kaneon, kophimos, kyrtos, sargane,
basket; amis, chamber pot. Vessels (esp. am-
phorae) were sometimes used in construction, par-
cularly for erection of VAULTS; amphoras filled
with sand and cement were employed to repair
city walls (N. Cambi, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju
plates were also used on walls as CERAMIC ARCHI-
TECTURAL DECORATION. —A.K.

VESTES (βεστήσης), title first mentioned under John
I Tzimiskes, who is said to have exiled “Nikepho-
ros the vestes” (Skyl. 284.12). This was not Nike-
phoros Ouranios (as Dölger, Beiträge 35) but the
son of Leo Kouropalates. Dölger also suggested
that the vestes was identical with the VESTARCES;
they were, however, distinct. Thus the seal of
Nikephoros Botanaietes, doux of Edessa, calls him
magistros, vestes, and vestarches (Zacos,Seals 1,
no.2686). In the 11th C. vestes was a high title
conferring on prominent generals such as Isaac
Komnenos, the stratopedarches of the East (no.2680),
and Leo Tornikios (Attal.22.8), often combined
with the title of magistros (Laurent,Coll. Orghidian,
no.76). The 10th-C. taktikon of Escurial distin-
guished bearded vestai who were at the same time
magistroi or patrikioi from eunuch vestai who were
praipositoi (see also Seibt, Blesigiel, no.53). At
the end of the 11th C. vestai were lower-ranking of-
ficials, such as the imperial anthropos Peter (La-
utra 1, no.48.7) or the notary John Karianites (Pat-
mou Engrapha 1, no.48A.200). The title protovestes
appeared at the same time (e.g., Patmou Engrapha
1, no.48G.236); it was conferred among others on a
certain John “the Rhos” (Laurent, Coll. Orghidian,
no.69). Neither vestes nor protovestes seems to have
survived the reign of Alexios I. The alleged con-
nection between veste and the service of the im-
perial vestiarion has no support in the sources,
despite their common etymology.
VESTIOPRATES | 2163

VESTIARION (βεστιαρίον, βεστιάριον), state warehouse and treasury, sometimes described as basilikon and rarely mega (Oikonomides, Lises 161.12). The chartoularios of the vestiariion is mentioned in the 9th-C. taktikon of Uspenskij; some seals of the chartoularioi of the imperial vestiariion are dated by Laurent to the 8th C. (Corpus 2, nos. 688–91). The vestiariion was planned as an institution parallel to the sakellion, as an arsenal to supply the fleet and the army and to store precious goods; the distinction, however, was not consistent, and the vestiariion dealt also with money. Basil I built two structures close to the Pharos, one called thesaurophylakeion, another vestiariion (TheophCont 396.10–11); various payments had to be received in equal parts by the sakellion and the imperial vestiariion. The staff of the vestiariion included notaries, mandatores, archon of the charage, and several officers (kentarchos, legatarii, and so on), whose functions are obscure.

After the 12th C. the vestiariion became the only state treasury, and the archaic word tameion referred only to it. Evidence for the emperor’s private vestiariion is insufficient: e.g., imperial notaries of the vestiariion who together with (their?) primikerios took care of precious vessels after the imperial banquet (Oikonomides, Lises 277.1–4) are indistinguishable from imperial notaries under the chartoularios of the vestiariion and could be state officials; nor are the archontes of the imperial vestiariion in the Kletorologion of Philotheos (Oikonomides, Lises 227.27) radically different from the sekretkoi, chartoularioi, and notaries who precede them.


A.K.

VESTIARITES (βεστιαρίτης), imperial bodyguard, according to a 12th-C. historian (An.Komm. 1:152.2), who calls vestiariitai the courtiers closest (oikeioteri) to the emperor. The first known vestiaries was Iberites in 1049 (Sathas, MB 5:197.2). They are mentioned in chrysobulls from 1074 onward, often together with mandatores. According to N. Oikonomides (TM 6 [1976] 129), they replaced the mangalitai. In the 13th C. vestiariitai acquired fiscal functions such as the levy of soldiers and wagons (MM 4:251.7); they served under the command of the domestikoi of the Eastern themes as arbiters of conflicts concerning property (Dölger, Beiträge 31). They existed at least through 1387. The chief of the vestiariitai was called primikerios of the vestiariitai (Seibt, Bleisiegel 218–20) and probably from the 13th C., protovestiaries, a position different from the protevestiarios; he occupied a lower rank on the hierarchical ladder of the 14th C. (Guillaud, Institutions 2:203–11).


A.K.

VESTIARIOS (ὁ βεστιαριόν, βεστιάριος), according to a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 186.18–23), a special treasurer: when the emperor set off on a naval expedition the vestiarios followed him in a ship that carried the vestiariion. In the hierarchical list he comes after the prokathemenos of the vestiariion and was probably his assistant. The vestiarios, sometimes called impersial vestiarios (Zacos, Seals 1, no.1891), is known on seals from the 7th C. (no.1433). Schlumberger (Sig. 623) dated the seal of the vestiarios Epiphanius Artabdos to the time of the Komnenoi. The seals do not clarify the functions of the vestiarios. The title of one of the epigrams of Theodore of Studios equates vestiarioi with tailors (Jamben, ed. P. Speck [Berlin 1968], no.15); the origin of this title is, however, unclear. The word is rare in documents; in 1397 the emperor’s oikeios, the vestiarii Kyr Manuel, possessed lands which were eventually transferred to the monastery of Docheiariou (Docheiari., no.18.16–17).


A.K.
Constantinople together with charitable distributions of bread, wine, and meat. According to the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch (ch.4), the vestiopratai formed a guild that dealt in garments produced domestically, as opposed to the prandiopratai who handled Syrian textiles. They acquired their goods either from the archontes of workshops (archontes ton ergodosion) or from serikopratai, silk merchants.

The activity of vestiopratai was rigorously controlled by the eparch: they could not purchase garments costing more than 10 nomisma without the eparch’s knowledge and were strictly forbidden to sell to foreigners certain materials, esp. purple stuffs; the so-called blattia could be bought and sold only under the eparch’s supervision. Vesttiopratai were also assigned certain state functions: for the emperor’s processions to Hagia Sophia they were responsible for decorating the Tribounalion (a hall in the Great Palace, on the way from the Chrysostrikinos to Chalke) with blattia and other precious textiles, while the argyropratai displayed gold and silver vessels (De cer. 12.19–21). The 9th-C. seal of the vestioprates Constantine is probably connected with his official duties. The term was not used after the 10th C., except in the corrupted form of bestioprote on a 13th-C. seal.


VESTITOR (βεστιτόρ), courtier of modest rank known from seals beginning in the 6th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 395, 582). According to the Kleroterologion of Philotheos, the vestitores belonged to the category of senators and together with silentiarii stood under the command of the epi tes katastaseos. A 10th-C. ceremonial book (De cer. 305.14–15) reports that they helped the praepositus sacri cubiculi dress the emperor, while a 9th-C. historian (Theoph. 226.19–20) indicates that they were in charge of the imperial crown. On seals from the 8th C. onward, they are called predominantly imperial vestitores and in the 9th C. they often combine their title with the duty of the protonotarios of a theme (e.g., Laurent, Coll. Orghidan, nos. 210, 233; Zacos, Seals 1, no.1937 and others) or kommerkiarios (vol. 1, nos. 2671A, 3168). The term was in use as late as the 10th C., when an anonymous teacher addressed letters to two vestitores (R. Browning, B. Laourdas, EEBS 27 [1957] 170, 185).


VESTMENTS, LITURGICAL. See Encheirion; Epigonation; Epimankia; Epitrachelion; Omophorion; Orarion; Phelonion; Polystaurion; Sticharion.

VETERINARY MEDICINE. See Hippiatrica.

VICAR (βικάριος, from Lat. vicarius), deputy, representative, or lieutenant, applied primarily to the heads of dioeceses as deputies of the praetorian prefects. The diocesan vicars were identical with agentes vices (M. Arnheim, Historia 19 [1970] 593–603) and, together with their symbols of office, they appear in illustrated copies of the Notitia dignitatum. In some dioceses the heads had different titles, such as praefectus Augustalis of Egypt and Comes of Orlens. The vicar’s functions were vague, and his position intermediary, between the governor and prefect: he held the right of appeal, as well as partial control over jurisdiction, tax collection, and the cursus publicus (see Dromos). The vicar had no military functions. His staff was headed by a princps. The office disappeared with the collapse of the diocesan system; Justinian I transferred some financial functions from the vicar to the praetorian prefect, and litigants preferred to appeal to the prefect rather than the vicar (Jones, LRE 1:281).


VICES (sing. κακία). By the term vice one understands a certain habitually evil disposition, a weakness and inclination to do evil, an explicit predisposition to individual sins. Vice as such cannot coexist in man together with the opposing virtue. A man of vice, however—so long as other virtuous inclinations are present—can still perform other good works in place of, or next to, the chief sin. Eastern monasticism developed Origen’s doctrine of eight vices (systematized by Evagrius Pontikos), which later in the West was shortened by Pope Gregory the Great to seven vices (the seven
deadly sins). Other enumerations failed to gain acceptance. Opinions vary concerning the pre-Christian origins of this doctrine. The eight vices or sins are: gluttony, fornication, avarice, despair, anger, sloth, vainglory, and arrogance. This system of vices was developed for monks, with listing of categories of special temptations instigated by demons, and then applied to laymen.


-G.P.

**VICINA** (Bucčiva, called Disina by al-Idrīsī), a city in the delta of the Danube, cited in a variety of sources. According to *Portulans*, it was a major port in the 13th–14th C. It is listed as a metropolis in the episcopal *notitia* of Michael VIII. The district of Vicina formed a Byz. enclave in the empire of the Tatars, probably granted to Michael VIII by his son-in-law and ally Nogay. The Tatars conquered Vicina in 1337/8. The earlier history of Vicina is obscure. It is first mentioned by Anna Komnene as being occupied by some Pecheneg chieftains.


-A.K.

**VICTORIA.** See Nike.

**VICTOR TONNENSIS,** Latin chronicler, bishop of Tonnena (or Tunnuna) in Africa Proconsularis; died Constantinople after 567. Victor spent much of his life in Constantinople. A staunch Chalcedonian, in 543 he opposed Justinian I in the Three Chapters controversy, resulting in many years of imprisonment in various places ranging from the fortified monastery of Mandracion (near Carthage) to Alexandria. After trial in 556 the unrepentant Victor was confined to a monastery in Egypt, and in 565 at Constantinople. There he composed a world chronicle from Creation to 567, of which only the last part, from 444, written in formal continuation of Prosper of Aquitaine, survives. Its earlier perspective is mainly Eastern, with Africa understandably becoming more prominent as Victor reaches his own time; there is the same dichotomy between secular and ecclesiastical topics. Though often thin, chronologically unsound, and prejudiced on doctrinal issues, Victor’s chronicle can be a valuable source on secular matters, offering, for example, unique information on the last days of the young Leo II (B. Croke, *GRBS* 24 [1983] 82f) and the death of Theodora, wife of Justinian I (J. Fitton, *Byzantion* 46 [1976] 119).


-B.B.

**VICTOR VITENSIS,** late 5th-C. bishop of Vita in Byzacena and ecclesiastical historian. After refusing to attend the council of Arians and Orthodox at Carthage on 1 Feb. 484, Victor went into exile near Tripoli. There he composed his *Historia persecutionis Africanarum provinciarum* in Latin, publishing it ca.489. Its three books (five in the older editions) describe the Arian persecution of the Orthodox church in Africa under the Vandals kings Gaiseric and Huneric (477–84). Victor paints an often horrible picture of this period, with sickening emphasis on scenes of torture. His style is a strange blend of rhetoric and poeticisms mixed with gross syntactical errors. He provides, however, a contemporary, often eyewitness, account of 5th-C. Africa, made more valuable by his laudable habit of inserting official documents, for example, a list of Catholic bishops drawn from the *Notitia Africæ* of 484. The *Passio septem monachorum*, describing the martyrdom of seven bish-
ops at Carthage, which is attached to the older editions, is now generally regarded as not by Victor.


---B.B.

VIDIN (Видин), city and fortress on the Danube in northeastern Bulgaria. In Roman times, under the name Bononia, it was a fortress of secondary importance, probably abandoned in the 6th C. A Bulgarian city, Bdin (Vidin), arose on its site. From the 9th C. it was the seat of a bishop and under Samouel of Bulgaria the capital of a province. Captured by Basil II in 1003, the city remained in Byzantine hands after the reestablishment of Bulgarian independence in 1186/7. In the early 13th C. Vidin became the center of an independent Bulgarian principality under Prince Sîman and his son, and in 1323 was incorporated into the restored Bulgarian state. Situated in a frontier zone, it was repeatedly attacked by Hungarians and Serbs and was under Hungarian occupation in 1365–69. Later Vidin was the center of a semi-independent Bulgarian principality under Ottoman sovereignty. In 1396 Bayezid I captured it. A revolt in 1408 expelled the Turks, who recaptured the city only in 1413. In 1444 Janos Hunyadi captured and burned Vidin. In the later 14th C. it was a center of Bulgarian culture; several manuscripts copied there survive. The existing fortress dates from the period of the Second Bulgarian Empire.


---R.B.

VIGILIA, pope (from 29 Mar. 537); born Rome before 500, died Syracuse 7 June 555. He was the scion of a senatorial family. In 536 Vigilius journeyed with Pope Agapetus I to Constantinople where he seems to have concluded an agreement with Justinian I's wife, the empress Theodora, promising to soften Western opposition toward Monophysitism. When Belisarius captured Rome, the pro-Gothic pope Silverius (536–37) was deposed and replaced by Vigilius. His position between the Western clergy and Justinian (who claimed political power over the West) explains the pope's vacillation, as revealed esp. during the affair of the Three Chapters. After his arrest in Sicily during the liturgy (22 Nov. 545) and his transfer to Constantinople in Jan. 547, Vigilius tried to preserve the principles of the Council of Chalcedon and at the same time—under pressure from Justinian—to accept, at least partially, the condemnation of the three "heretical" theologians. At first Vigilius excommuni­cated Patr.

---R.F.T.

VIGILIUS, pope (from 29 Mar. 537); born Rome before 500, died Syracuse 7 June 555. He was the scion of a senatorial family. In 536 Vigilius journeyed with Pope Agapetus I to Constantinople where he seems to have concluded an agreement with Justinian I's wife, the empress Theodora, promising to soften Western opposition toward Monophysitism. When Belisarius captured Rome, the pro-Gothic pope Silverius (536–37) was deposed and replaced by Vigilius. His position between the Western clergy and Justinian (who claimed political power over the West) explains the pope's vacillation, as revealed esp. during the affair of the Three Chapters. After his arrest in Sicily during the liturgy (22 Nov. 545) and his transfer to Constantinople in Jan. 547, Vigilius tried to preserve the principles of the Council of Chalcedon and at the same time—under pressure from Justinian—to accept, at least partially, the condemnation of the three "heretical" theologians. At first Vigilius excommunicated Patr.

---R.F.T.

VIENNA GENESIS. See Genesis.

VIGIL (παννυχία, παραμονή, ἡγυνία), any night prayer or liturgical service involving sacrifice of sleep, or the eve of a feast, when fasting and keeping vigil were customary. Liturgical vigils were adumbrated in the pre-Constantinian custom of private prayer at night and of keeping vigil before a martyrdom and at the tombs of martyrs. From the 4th C. onward, they were formalized in the daily nocturns or vigil (mesonviktikon) of the monastic hours and in occasional all-night vigils before days of Eucharist (Sundays and feasts), before baptism, by the bier of the departed, or for special purposes, such as to counteract heresy.

Vigils were of varying length and structure. The Typikon of the Great Church mentions some types (Mateos, Typikon 2:285, 309, 311): nocturnal psalmody prefixed to orthros; pannychis, comprising vespers with lections plus the pannychis proper (despite its name, the pannychis was not an all-night affair, but a brief service similar to apo­deipnon; it consisted of three antiphons and five prayers with their corresponding litanies); and paramone, a solemn vespers with lections celebrated on the eve of 15 feasts. The later Sabaitic typika kept the old Constantinopolitan paramone before Nativity and Epiphany, but inherited for other feasts the Palestinian monastic agrypnia, comprising vespers, the entire Psalter with all ten canticles, and Sabaitic orthros.


---R.B.
Menas, but then he resumed his communication with the patriarch and on 11 Apr. 548 sent him his verdict accepting the condemnation of the Three Chapters. This decision raised such indignation in the West, however, that Vigilius was forced to withdraw his opinion; this change of mind led to a direct conflict with Justinian, and the pope fled to Chalcedon.

A reconciliation of emperor and pope in 552 was but partial, and Vigilius did not participate in the Second Council of Constantinople in 553. In fact he criticized the decisions of the council, and in the Constitutum I (14 May 553) rejected the condemnation of the Three Chapters, although he did condemn approximately 60 "erroneous" sentences in Theodore of Mopsuestia. In the Constitutum II (23 Feb. 554) he yielded to imperial pressure and revoked his previous defense of the Three Chapters. Thereafter Vigilius was allowed to return home, but died en route.


A.K.

VIGLA (βίγλα, from Lat. vigilia, "watch"). In Rome the term designated night guards, but from the 4th C. onward vigiliae were guards of all kinds in the army (R. Grosse, Römische Militärgeschichte von Gallienus bis zum Beginn der byzantinischen Themenverfassung [Berlin 1920] 225). Theophanes (Thesp. 307-26) speaks even of the vigla (sentinels?) of the Persian king Chosroes II. From the 8th C. onward, the term referred to the contingent of paramilitary troops assigned to protect the imperial palace. The word was used—interchangeably with arithmos in some taktika (Bury, Adm. System 60-62)—primarily in connection with the official called droungarios tes viglas.

A.K.

VIKINGS first came into contact with Byz. in the mid-9th C., initially as armed traders or plunderers, later principally as mercenaries. Three main groups are mentioned in Byz. sources: the Rhos (Rus'), the Varangians, and the Kouplingoi (Russian Kolbjagi), most likely from Old Norse Kylpingar, which probably derives from kylfa, a staff or club. Kylpingaland in some Icelandic sources denotes Rus' (E. Mel'nikova, Drevenskandinavskie geo-

VILLA, term designating a luxurious urban or rural mansion in the Roman Empire. Villas usually possessed an atrium, external portico, sometimes cisterns, swimming pools (if the villa was constructed near the seashore), and elements of fortification (esp. in remote provinces); floor mosaics and baths are their most conspicuous remains. Late Roman villas are known in Antioch, Ephesus, Italy, and Sicily (e.g., Piazza Armerina), Africa, Gallia, and the Danubian provinces (Pannonia, Raetia, etc.). S.P. Ellis (AJA 92 [1988] 565-76) attributed the increasing elaboration of such structures in the 4th to mid-6th C. to the concentration of wealth in the hands of Roman aristocrats and the growing practice of conducting business from the home.

The term villa was also applied to the entire estate. E. Štajerman (Schtajerman, infra) contrasts the villa based on slave labor with the latifundium that exploited the work of coloni; she views the replacement of the old, slave-oriented villa—by necessity modest in size—with great estates with prefeudal type of labor organization as one of the features of the crisis that befell the Roman Empire in the 3rd C. and finally led to its economic decline and political fall. It is questionable, however, whether this scenario is appropriate to Byz. in part because the slave-based villa was never common in the Roman east.

VILLAGE, the geographic, economic, and administrative entity of the countryside designated in narrative sources by the classical term kome (typical also of Egyptian papyri) and by the new term chorion.

The history of the village in the late Roman Empire is not well known; archaeological evidence indicates that, from the 4th C. in northern Syria, large-scale landowning declined as larger economic units were replaced by village communities (Tchalenko, Villages 1:385), and from the 7th C. in the southwestern Crimea, village settlements flourished (A. Jakobson, Rannesrednevekovye sel'skie poselenija Jugo-Zapadnoj Tauriki [Leningrad 1970] 181). Villages seem to have been large, as is attested by terms such as metrokomia and komepolis. According to Laïou (Peasant Society 39–42), the 14th-C. Macedonian village contained an average of 39 households. The Treatise on Taxation distinguished three kinds of country sites (ed. Dölger, Beiträge 115,13–20): chorion, hamlet (agriclin), and estate (proasteion). A village consisted of staees; individually cultivated choraphia, vineyards, and gardens were located far from the kathedra of the chorion, and documents mention roads and small paths leading to them or forming their boundaries.

A village could include streams; hills covered with forests; groves of chestnut, walnut, and other trees; sea and lake shores. The clearing of the woods and occupation of virgin lands allowed some households to move to remote areas of the village’s property; first they formed dependencies closely connected with the maternal village, but later these could be transformed into independent agridia. On the other hand, various reasons led to the desertion of villages. Dependent villages could contain estates of several owners, secular and ecclesiastical, alongside tenements of free peasants, soldiers, etc. In theory villages were considered under the control of a local urban center, but it seems that in fact villages were free of urban control from the 7th C. At least in the 13th–15th C., some villages possessed pyrgoi for defense.

VILLAGE COMMUNITY (κοινότης τοῦ χωρίου), a fiscal and legal unit made up of landowners usually living in a single village. It was once commonly believed that the origin of the Byz. village community could be found in the importation of the alleged Slavic village community institution, later called the mir, into Byz. in the 7th C.; it is more likely, however, that the Byz. village community was an indigenous development arising from the crises in Byz. of the 6th–8th C., during which time the relative decline of the urban centers allowed increased autonomy among the villages. The village community included privately owned cultivated lands of the members, common lands (koina topia), and the dwellings found within the official periorismos (“delimitation of the boundaries”) of the village community, while excluding property detached from the periorismos, such as idiosata and klasma, even if located within the “physical” village.

The village community is probably best thought of as a corporation (juristic person), a legal entity recognized as such by the state, that could intervene in the affairs of its members, administer and have chresis of the properties of its members, make payments, sell property, and take part in legal suits (e.g., Iuv. 1, no.9). The members of the village community were usually free peasants (though it could indeed include wealthy landowners and ecclesiastical corporations) who had no restrictions on alienating, bequeathing, or abandoning their lands. They are commonly designated by the words georgos, “farmer,” or chorites, “member of a chorion.” Frequently, however, the sources use vaguer, less specialized terms: kletor, kyrios, and kleronomos, which emphasize the members’ full ownership of their property; convicimus, consors, synkleronomos, synchorites, homochoros, and pliesiochoros, which emphasize the close spatial proximity of the neighbors; syntelestes, synteles, syntelon, and homokensos, which emphasize their collective tax obligations, perhaps the most fundamental and distinguishing characteristic of the free village community (allelelygon, epibole). The principle of joint tax liability, which made the members of the village community responsible...
collectively for the taxes of their defaulting fellow members, lasted at least until the 12th C.

The village community was the fundamental unit of Byz. taxation, and, thus, as 10th-C. legislation shows, the state was interested in maintaining its integrity. Nevertheless, the institutions of klasma and solemnion weakened the village community by allowing dynatoi to acquire more property within the village and thereby enervate the solidarity of the village community. Throughout the Byz. era it is possible to see aspects of the village community; even in the 13th–15th C., villages of paroikoi at times act as corporate bodies (e.g., MM 4:217–20, 6:212–14). As an economic and fiscal unit, the village community would often act collectively in defense against robbers, in a court trial with a neighboring village or a lord, in building a bridge or in a common feast (Rudakov, Kul'tura 180). The village had its (irregular?) assemblies, “rural courts,” and prootegerontes—elders who dealt with imperial officials, primarily tax collectors. Local priests and monks of small monasteries played an important organizational role in the life of the village community, as teachers, scribes-nomikoi, and leaders of religious ceremonies that frequently were connected with agrarian activity (rain magic, extermination of locusts, etc.).


VILLANUS COMMUNIS. See Villein.

VILLEHARDOUIN, GEOFFREY, French historian of the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204; born near Troyes before 1152, died between 11 Dec. 1212 and 1218. Prominent feudal officer of the counts of Champagne (marshal in 1185), one of six commissioners entrusted with negotiating the Fourth Crusade’s transport to the East with the Venetians, Villehardouin played a key role in the conquest and subsequent governance and defense of Constantinople, where he became Marshal of Romania. Circa 1208 he began writing his Old French Conquest of Constantinople, which provides a detailed account of events from 1202 to 1207 from the Latin perspective and sheds light on the empire’s historical geography, the topography and monuments of Constantinople (e.g., on the Jewish quarter of Galata [ch.159] and on a triumphal column [chs. 907–908]), ceremonies (ch.207, chs. 212–15), booty (ch.255), and other matters. His testimony on the cause of the diversion of the Crusade, that it was a series of accidents, has been judged not to be intentionally misleading (Queller, Fourth Crusade 10–16, 219f).


—M.Cc.

VILLEIN (L.t. villanus), the term for a dependent peasant used in the territories of Byz. conquered by the Latins. The Latins considered all indigenous population, both rural and urban, as villeins, with the exception of archontes, archontopoioi, and a few emancipated rank-and-file inhabitants. In Crete, which was under the direct authority of Venice, a specific category of villeins is attested, villani Co(m)munis (i.e., of the republic of Venice), who probably were descendants of the Byz. demosiarioi. They were in a slightly better economic and legal position and had a greater chance of being enfranchised than other villeins. The villeins of the Commune paid an annual tax, villanzio, and were forbidden to leave the land they held; they could not be transformed into the villeins of individuals, and the state could reclaim all the fugitive villani Comunis. The institution of the villeins of the Commune offers insight into Byz. agrarian history before 1204.


—M.B.

VINEYARD ( ámbelów, also ampeloperibolion). Together with the choraphion, the vineyard was the most typical form of cultivated land in Byz., where bread and wine constituted the main alimentary products. In 14th-C. Macedonia the majority of
peasants possessed vineyards: 83.7–92 percent according to N. Kondov (*EtBalk* 9 [1973] 69), 74–96 percent according to Laiou (*Peasant Society* 174). The size of the vineyards belonging to a single household varied (according to Kondov) between .5 and 22 modioi, but Laiou stresses as a basic fact of peasant life “the relatively equal distribution of vineyards” among a population economically unequal in other respects. Usually the vines were untrellised; farmers used vine props or trained the vines to wrap themselves around trees in gardens. In MSS such props are shown as simple forked wooden sticks (A. Bryer, *BSA* 81 [1986] 64f., 71, figs. 13, 14, 16). The cultivation of vines involved arduous work. The Geoponika devoted five books (4–8) to vines and wine production. It has been estimated that the yield of a 2-modioi vineyard furnished a total of 820 liters of wine per year (M. Kaplan, *Klio* 68 [1986] 211).

Chvostova (*Osobennosti* 131) considers vineyards as lands of best quality, whereas Schilbach (*Metrologie* 242–44) distinguishes three categories of vineyards with respect to their quality. Both the price of and the rent from vineyards varied significantly.

The vineyard acquired an important role in biblical exegesis: it was a metaphor for the church, and neglect of the vineyard meant the loss of paradise.


—J.W.N., A.K.

**VIRANŞEHİR.** See Constantina; Mokissos.

**VIRGIN, TYPES OF.** See Virgin Mary: Types of the Virgin Mary.

**VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA** (Βλαχερνίτισσα, Βλαχερνωτίσσα). Several different icons of the Virgin are known to have existed in the monastery of Blachernai. There was a miraculous image of the Virgin and Child there in the 8th C. (vita of St. Stephen the Younger, PG 100:1076B, 1080AB); of the images housed there in the 10th C., only one is described in enough detail for us to be able to visualize it (Der cer. 555.8–10): in the imperial bath area near the chapel of St. Photinos was a marble image of the Virgin from whose outstretched hands flowed the hagiasm, or holy water. An ancient painted icon of the Virgin was uncovered in 1030/1 during restoration work in the church undertaken by Romans III Argyros; it was apparently the bust of the Virgin holding Christ (Sky. 384.19–28; cf. E. Trapp, *JÖB* 35 [1985] 193–95). One of these Blachernai icons, was kept in the right side of the monastery church covered by a veil that miraculously lifted without human aid every Friday evening. This “habitual miracle” is not mentioned before the second half of the 11th C. or after 1204. Another Virgin icon known as the Blachernitissa regularly accompanied emperors on military campaigns during the 11th C. (Attal. 153:4–14).

Coins and seals of the 11th C. identify an orans figure of the Virgin, hands outstretched, as the Blachernitissa (W. Seibt in *Oikonomides, Sigillography* 50–54). A number of extant marble slabs repeat the type, probably echoing specifically the image at the imperial bath (the hands have been bored), though none is labeled (Lange, *Byz. Reliefkunde* 43f.). Thus it is very likely that the primary Blachernai image, perhaps a figure in the apse, was of this venerable type: a Virgin orans without Christ.

Another popular image (sometimes designated the Virgin Platytera), an orans Virgin with the bust of Christ Emmanuel in a medallion before her chest, has also been associated in modern scholarly literature with the name Virgin Blachernitissa, but it is labeled as such on only one seal of the 11th C. It is called the Episkopis on another seal, and this name, the Virgin Episkopis, has been most recently adopted to designate the image. C. Belting-Ihm has proposed that what Romans III uncovered was an old icon of the Virgin Nikopoios, and that this image was subsequently merged at Blachernai with the orans type to form this new image, the Virgin orans with medallion (cf. also W. Seibt, *Byzantina* 15 [1985] 551–64). To complicate the issue further, a late 11th-C. icon at the monastery of St. Catherine on Sinai has an image of the Virgin labeled “the Blachernitissa” (*Soteriou, Eikones*, pl.148) that depicts neither of the above types, but one we would ordinarily call a Virgin Eleousa.
The term Glykophilousa is applied to the Eleousa image only in post-Byz. times.


—N.P.S.

**VIRGIN DEXIOKRATOUSA.** See *Virgin Hodegetria*.

**VIRGIN ELEOUSA** (Ἐλεούσα). The epithet "compassionate" was applied to the Virgin from the 8th–9th C. onward, and was also attached with rather little consistency to a wide variety of her images (H. Hallensleben, *LCI* 3:170f). It is used today to designate one specific icon type: the image of the tender mother who bends her head to touch her cheek to the cheek of her child. Christ puts his arm around her neck; the Virgin may be either standing or seated. The image, which probably evolved from the *Virgin Hodegetria*, is known from the 10th C. (N. Thierry, *Zosgraf* 10 [1979] 59–70), perhaps even as early as the 7th C. (P. Nordhagen, *Bollettino d’Arte* 47 [1962] 351–53). It was particularly popular in the Komnenian period, perhaps owing to the contemporary Passion liturgy celebrating the mother’s love for her son, both as a child and at his death. The 12th-C. imperial monastery of the *Pantokrator* in Constantinople had a church dedicated to the Virgin Eleousa, but it is unknown whether its icon belonged to the type we would call Eleousa and thus contributed to the spread of the image. The best-known example of this type of Virgin is the *Virgin of Vladimir*.

Images of this type may differ slightly in emphasis and bear a variety of names besides Eleousa (*Virgin Episkepsis, Gorgoepekoos, Panton Chara, even Virgin Blachernitissa*). The Virgin Pelagonitissa, named after a famous lost original somewhere in Pelagonia (Macedonia), perhaps of the 15th C., shows the Child almost from behind, throwing his head back and squirming to touch his mother’s cheek with his hand. A Cypriot variant, the Kykkitissa, is thought to reproduce an icon given to the Kykkos monastery by Alexios I Komnenos. Here Christ also twists restlessly; he wears a short sleeveless chiton (cf. D. Mouriki, *DOP* 41 [1987] 406), and the Virgin wears an extra veil over her *maphorion*. In a particularly Cretan variant, the Virgin Kardiotissa, Christ stretches out both arms to embrace his mother.

—N.P.S.

**VIRGIN EPISEKPSIS.** See *Virgin Blachernitissa*.

**VIRGIN GALAKTOTROPHOUSSA.** See *Virgin Mary: Types of the Virgin Mary*.

**VIRGIN GLYKOPHILOUSA.** See *Virgin Eleousa*.

**VIRGIN GORGEOPEKOOS.** See *Virgin Eleousa*.

**VIRGIN HAGIOSORITISSA** (Ἁγιοσορίτισσα, lit. "the Virgin of the holy Soros"), an iconographic type in which the Virgin is depicted nearly in profile with both her hands extended out from her chest in prayer or entreaty, the very pose she assumes in *Deesis* compositions. Sometimes the figure of Christ appears as a bust in the upper part of the composition, or he may occupy a corresponding panel, as when the two figures adorn the piers flanking the *templon*. The image probably reflects an original in a church with a holy Soros, or reliquary church, probably the Soros chapel in the Constantinopolitan monastery of Blachernai rather than the Church of the *Chalkoprateia*. The image bears the name Hagiosoritissa first on seals from the 1040s (W. Seibt in *Oikonomides, Sigillography* 48–50) and on coins from the 12th C.; it is closely related to the *Virgin Paraklesis*, except that the Virgin here does not carry a scroll. Images of this type also may be labeled the Virgin Paraklesis, Kecharitomene, or Episkepsis. (For ill., see next page.)


—N.P.S.
John II Komnenos requested that it be brought to the Pantokrator monastery and kept overnight near his tomb on the days commemorating his death or that of his wife (P. Gautier, REB 32 [1974] 81.883–83.900); in 1187, it was taken up onto the walls to protect the city under siege (Nik. Chon. 382.57–58). How early this latter practice remains unclear: in the Triodion account of the 7th-C. attacks on the city, it is assumed that the icon brought onto the walls at that time was that of the Virgin Hodegetria (PG 92:1352D), but 10th-C. accounts make only general reference to icons of the Virgin and Child (PG 92:1356D). The icon was kept in the Pantokrator monastery during the Latin occupation, but Michael VIII Palaiologos entered the capital in 1261 walking behind it, whereupon it was returned to the Hodegon. During the 14th C. it was regularly taken to the Blachernai palace the Thursday before Palm Sunday, and remained there until Easter Monday. Two visitors to Constantinople in the Palaiologan period, Claviio and Tafur, witnessed a ceremony that took place at the monastery every Tuesday, attracting large crowds. Special bearers clad in red in turn carried the heavy icon, which was very large and covered with silver and jewels, out into the crowd. The icon was cut up into four pieces when the city fell in 1453. The popular tradition that the icon was painted by the Evangelist Luke is recorded no earlier than the end of the 12th C. (Mercati, CollByz 2:476, par.4).

In the image known as the Hodegetria, the Virgin holds the Christ Child on her left arm; she gestures toward him with her right hand while directing her gaze either at the viewer or off into the distance. Christ sits erect and comfortable in her arms, holding a scroll on his lap, and blessing with his right hand; he looks directly out of the picture. The type, which predatesIconoclasm, was frequently used on patriarchal seals from the 9th C.; the term Hodegetria is first associated with the image on 11th-C. seals (Laurent, Corpus 2, nos. 251–52; 5.2, no. 1202). A variant, referred to as the Dexiokratousa, has the Virgin holding the Child on her right arm. Both versions may be used within a single church (e.g., in the mosaics of Hosios Loukas).

The Hodegetria was the most widely copied of all types of the Virgin. Certain images attempt to represent the actual icon: it appears in 14th-C.
VIRGINITY (παρθενεία) had two distinct aspects in Byz.: the physical virginity expected of women until their wedding night, and the spiritual Christian notion of complete sexual abstinence exercised by those who dedicated themselves to God. The first was required for a successful MARRIAGE. A husband could repudiate a nonvirgin bride but only on the first night (e.g., Peira 49-5); parents therefore kept their daughters closely chaperoned, though not always successfully. The second constituted a MARRIAGE IMPEDIMENT, as it deprived a husband of his conjugal rights. Ascetic men who lived with virgins or parthenoi synesaktoi (a practice condemned by John Chrysostom, PG 47:495–532) or couples who lived as brother and sister renounced SEXUALITY altogether. But when Theophanes the Confessor and his wife emulated this commitment to virginity, his father-in-law protested angrily at their failure to produce children (Theoph. 2:15–16). The early church maintained an order of virgins, and the vow of perpetual virginity was common among female ascetics. Basil the Great condemned the dedication of young girls to virginity solely in order to favor their brothers’ inheritance, but Byz. parents regularly committed their sons and daughters to lives of CELIBACY. Saintly children also fled from arranged marriages in order to preserve their virginity. For female martyrs and devout Christians, the loss of virginity was considered a form of death.


VIRGIN KARDIOTISSA. See Virgin Eleousa.

VIRGIN KECHARITOMENE. See Virgin Hagiosoritissa.

VIRGIN KYKKOTISSA. See Virgin Eleousa.

VIRGIN KYRIOTISSA. See Virgin Nikopoios.

VIRGIN MARY, mother of Jesus Christ, aeiparthenos and Theotokos in Greek terminology. The Gospels give little historical data concerning Mary.

Illustrations of the Akathistos Hymn (A. Grabar, CahArch 1976 1 44–47) and in images of the Triumph of Orthodoxy (where it is supported by angel-bearers clad in red). A miniature in the Hamilton Psalter may also represent the icon itself (Belting, Illum. Buch, fig.1). Many replicas of the icon went on to perform miracles in their own right and were given new epithets; among them “Psychosostria” and “Peribleptos.” The somewhat more sentimental Virgin Eleousa type grew out of the Hodegetria image, in which the balance between reserve and affection was always strictly maintained.


— N.P.S.
other than her betrothal to Joseph, the birth of Jesus, and her presence in Bethlehem, Nazareth, Jerusalem, at the miracle of Cana, and at her son’s execution, when she stood beneath the cross and Jesus recommended her to his “beloved disciple.” Matthew relates that Joseph, Mary, and the infant Jesus fled to Egypt from the persecutions of King Herod, while Luke dwells on the themes of Annunciation and Visitation. John mentions her presence at the marriage at Cana and at the foot of the cross, and the Acts mention that she prayed with the Apostles. The scarcity of biographical detail in the New Testament was supplemented by the apocrypha, esp. the Protoevangelion of James, which depicts Mary as the daughter of Ioakeim of Nazareth and Anna of Bethlehem, who presented her to the Temple for upbringing and, at the age of 14, married her to Joseph. After Christ’s Ascension she lived quietly in Nazareth, died with many miraculous signs, and was taken up into heaven (see Dormition). Her life was also described in vitae by Maximos the Confessor, Epiphanius the Monk, Symeon Metaphrastus, and other authors, and in a number of homilies.

**Theological Perspectives.** The focal point of Mary’s history was the conception and birth of Christ, presaged by the Annunciation. The Cappadocian fathers emphasized not only the virginal birth of Christ but also Mary’s perpetual virginity: Basil the Great (PG 31:1468B), while refuting Eunomios, stated that, although only Mary’s virginity at the time of the conception of Jesus is a binding dogma, he joined those philochristoi who believed that the Theotokos had never ceased to be a virgin. Cyril of Alexandria saw Mary’s virginity as the basis for God’s becoming the Father of all mankind (PG 75:1008B). Accordingly, church fathers considered the “brothers of Jesus” mentioned in the New Testament as Joseph’s children from a first marriage. Jerome explained the usage of the term adelphoi/adelfai (brothers and sisters) of Jesus in Gospels as meaning “cousins” and connected “the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James and Joseph” (Mk 6:3) with a different Mary.

The problem of Mary’s role in the process of salvation was hotly discussed in the 5th C.—was she only a vessel (a “channel”) in which the Logos dwelled temporarily or was her action indispensable in the process of incarnation? Orthodox doctrine, as formulated by John of Damascus (Exp. fidei 56.27–28, ed. Kotter, Schriften 2:134), stressed the active role of Mary: Christ was born not through the woman but of the woman; from her he received his human nature, as he received his divine nature from the Father.

Mary’s cult reflected social expectations of the poor and humble (J. Vogt, VigChr 23 [1969] 241–63), esp. of women. Many churches were dedicated to the Virgin, and several festival days were celebrated in her honor: the feast of the Annunciation on 25 Mar., instituted in the 6th C., and the feast of the Dormition on 15 Aug., established by Emp. Maurice. Liturgical hymns, esp. the Akathistos Hymn, celebrate Mary’s virginity.

Some attempts to discourage her veneration took place under Leo III and Constantine V, the latter reportedly comparing Mary to an empty purse from which gold coins had been taken. Nevertheless her veneration remained strong: she was the mediator between suffering mankind and Christ (see Deesis) and esp. the protectress of Constantinople, the new Jerusalem, and, hence, the empire (cf. E. Fenster, Laudes Constantinopolitanae [Munich 1968] 100–04).

Old Testament prefigurations of Mary included the Burning Bush that was not consumed (e.g., Gregory of Nyssa, PG 46:1136BC), the ladder reaching to heaven, the star of the house of Jacob, the closed door of the restored temple, the fleece of Gideon soaked with dew from heaven, and the stone quarried from the mountain without human hands (e.g., Proklos of Constantinople, PG 65:680C–681B). As Christ abolished the sin of Adam, Mary was “the new Eve”; she was also contrasted to the pagan Athena as the truly powerful supporter of Byz.


**Representation in Art.** Narratives of the Virgin’s life focus either on her conception and childhood, narrated in the so-called Protoevangelion of James, or on her Dormition. Imagery drawn from the Protoevangelion emerges in the 5th C. and abounds in the 6th, albeit in cycles of Christ’s Infancy rather than those of Mary. The earliest surviving Virgin cycle (at Kızıl Çukur,
Cappadocia, 869–70?) must reflect earlier models, but evidence of a systematic Marian imagery appears only in the 10th–11th C. The events of her life celebrated as church feasts acquire standard compositions—the conception, the Birth of the Virgin, and her Presentation in the Temple (all found already in the Menologion of Basil II), and the Dormition. A codified narrative cycle based on the Protoevangelion appears in side-chapels of churches (e.g., Hagia Sophia in Kiev). The late 11th–12th C. saw the expansion of this cycle (e.g., in the exceptional, 63-scene illumination of the homilies of James of Kokkinobaphos) and its transfer into the naos of churches dedicated to the Virgin, traceable from Daphni (five scenes in the narthex complement two in the naos) through Lagoudera, where Marian feasts dominate the naos. These developments unite in the long Palaiologan cycles adorning the naves of churches dedicated to the Virgin. In Palaiologan painting, too, the Dormition is incorporated into an extensive cycle narrating Mary’s death and burial.


-A.W.C.

**Types of the Virgin Mary.** Most Byz. images of the Virgin stress her role in Christ’s incarnation and show her as the Theotokos, holding her young child in a variety of ways. The “types” differ mainly in the way in which these two figures are shown responding to each other, whether it is with grave respect, mutual tenderness, playfulness or foreboding, or with the Virgin nursing the Child in her guise of Galaktotrophousa (A. Cutler, JB 37 [1987] 335–50). In some images of the Virgin, Christ’s independence of his human mother is made explicit by showing him enclosed in a medallion set before her chest, a medallion that in some cases she neither holds nor even touches with her hands. If the Virgin is represented alone, without her child, it is usually in the role of intercessor with her risen son, now the judge of mankind (e.g., Virgin Paraklesis).

Emp. Leo VI was the first to put the image of the Virgin on a coin. Both seals and coins, on which the images are frequently labeled, can serve as a guide for reconstructing the appearance and early history of the various types of the Virgin (W. Seibt in Oikonomides, Sigillography 35–56), but the task is not simple. Though the various iconographic types of the Virgin can be quite easily grouped and distinguished one from another, we find considerable discrepancy between the type depicted and the Byz. name attached to it: even identical images may be accompanied by quite different epithets or designations. This is because the designations are not in fact iconographic in character. They are either names of sanctuaries, or poetic epithets that aim at conveying some important quality in the Virgin.

An icon of the Virgin was presumed to be at once an image of the Virgin herself and the replica of some famous icon original, one that was either extremely venerable—of some it was even claimed that they had been painted by St. Luke—or esp. miraculous. Each replica could thus share in the miraculous powers both of the Virgin herself and of the specific icon it reproduced. An icon of the Virgin will thus often bear the name of the sanctuary where the famous original was housed (e.g., the Virgin Hodegetria from the Hodegon monastery, of the Virgin Hagiosoritissa).

Difficulties arise when the sanctuary has more than one important icon: replicas of both, even if they are quite different in appearance, may both bear the name of that sanctuary (e.g., Virgin Blachernitissa). Furthermore, a replica of a famous icon in one sanctuary made for a different sanctuary may take on the name of its new home without any alteration in the image.

Many epithets of the Virgin found on Byz. icons do not refer to famous originals but rather to special aspects of the Virgin’s nature. These “qualitative” epithets, most of which derive from metaphors used for the Virgin in liturgical poetry, may accompany an image expressing their meaning (e.g., Virgin Eleousa, Virgin Platytera), but they are also quite freely applied to a variety of different iconographic types (e.g., Virgin Epikepsis). As both image and epithet have their own independent history and particular resonance, the interplay of the two, while confusing to the modern scholar, does serve to enrich the meaning of the icon.

How and why later variants of well-known types were introduced and established is a problem that has received relatively little scholarly attention. Some variants may result from the increased viv-
iddness of the liturgical poetry, esp. the Passion celebrations (e.g., **Virgin of the Passion**), some from attempts to bring certain traditional images closer to the poetic epithets that accompany them or to appropriate the special qualities of one type for another. When it comes to determining by what process the new types became established, the role of the individual artist must be taken into account, as well as the history of the actual icon and of the sanctuary for which it was made. The fame of newer icons depended not on their beauty but on the miracles they could produce: their fortune and the popularity of the new type was intimately connected with that of the sanctuaries that housed them.


-N.P.S.

**Virgin of the Passion** *(ròu Παρθένου)*, the conventional term for a late variant of the **Virgin Hodegetria** type, in which the Christ Child, clapping his mother’s hand, turns his head away from her to confront the bust of the archangel Gabriel holding the cross. The inscription that sometimes accompanies the figures stresses the theme of Gabriel’s “second Annunciation,” that of the coming **Passion of Christ**. The type, which is also known as the Virgin Amolyntos (“Immaculate”), was esp. favored on Crete in the 15th C. (esp. by the painter Andreas Ritsos), where the figure of St. Michael was added carrying the other symbols of the Passion, the lance and the sponge. The image itself first appears in a fresco at La- goudera (a.1192), where, however, the Virgin is called the Arakiotissa, following the dedication of the church, as well as Kecharitomene; Christ lies horizontally in her arms, a pose that may be a conscious reference to the image of **Christ Anapason**.


-N.P.S.

**Virgin of the Source.** See Pege.

**Virgin of Vladimir**, a processional icon of the **Virgin Eleousa** brought to Kiev in the 12th C. and famous since then as a palladium of the Russian church and state. Now in the Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow, it is a bilateral icon; on the obverse the Virgin is depicted with her cheek against that of her child, who embraces her neck as she gazes at the viewer. Only the faces are original; they belong to the early 12th C. The reverse has a 15th-C. painting or repainti of an altar with cross and instruments of the Passion. The Povest’ vremennykh let relates that the icon
VIRGIN PARAKLESIS (Παρακλησίς), the Virgin Intercessor. This type shows the Virgin almost in profile holding a scroll on which are inscribed the words of a dialogue with Christ in which she pleads for mankind (the customary text is preserved in the Hermeneia of Dionysios of Fourna, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus [St. Petersburg 1909] 280). Christ's image is often included in the upper corner. Although the epithet paraklesis is not found attached to the image before the 14th C., the image itself occurs several centuries earlier (mosaic on a pier of the bema in St. Demetrios, Thessalonike, 9th C.); a 12th-C. icon of the Virgin in Spolet reproces the type, which is closely related to that of the VIRGIN HAGIOSORITISSA. It occurs frequently on Cyprus, where a corresponding figure of Christ may be painted on the opposite pier of the temple, and a nearby figure of John the Baptist may complete a sort of Deesis as, for example, at Moutoullas (D. Mouriki in Byz. und der Westen 189–91). A 15th-C. icon at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai shows the Virgin Paraklesis in a true Deesis composition (Soteriou, Eikones, pl.170).

An icon of this type accompanied the body of Stefan Nemanja, according to the illustration of the translation of his remains in the narthex chapel of Sopočani. Images of the Virgin Paraklesis are sometimes labeled the VIRGIN ELEOUSA.

LIT. A. Weis, Die Madonna Platytera (Königstein 1985) 20–44.

VIRGIN PSYCHOSOSTRIA. See VIRGIN HODEGETRIA.

VIRGIN TES BATOU (τής Βατού), the Virgin of the (Burning) Bush. The Bush that burned but was not consumed (Ex 3:2–5) became a metaphor for the Virgin and was understood as a prefiguration of her. The epithet was applied from the 13th C. onward to a particular image of the Virgin associated with the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, the alleged site of the Burning Bush. The Virgin, shown standing, is holding the seated frontal Christ Emmanuel directly before her chest; the Child gives a blessing, and holds a roll (Soteriou, Eikones, pl.155). The image itself is not new: it is essentially that of the Virgin Kyriotissa (see VIRGIN NIHATISSA). But it does appear esp. frequently on Sinai icons after the 12th C., and on works in which the figure of the Virgin is often flanked by pairs of saints of particular significance to Sinai.

An image of the Virgin, though a different one, was also incorporated into compositions of Moses and the Burning Bush. In a version of the VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA type, she appears orans within the Bush, with the medallion of Christ Emmanuel,


VIRGIN PELAGONITISSA. See VIRGIN ELEOUSA.

VIRGIN PERIBLEPTOS. See VIRGIN HODEGETRIA; PERIBLEPTOS MONASTERY.


- A.W.C.
previously represented alone inside the Bush, visible before her chest.


VIRGIN ZOODOCHOS PEGE. See Pege.

VIRTUE (ἀρετή), a concept that was well developed in antiquity, esp. by Plato and the Stoics. The significance of the quartet of four cardinal virtues—courage (andreia), righteousness (dikaiosyne), prudence in the sense of moderation (sophrosyne), and prudence as good sense (phronesis)—was emphasized by ancient moralists and developed by Menander Rhetor. This quartet remained the foundation of the lists of virtues in Byz. Mirrors of Princes, but to the four cardinal virtues were added other qualities, such as generosity, wisdom (Sophia), gentleness (Praotes), philanthropy, and piety. By the second half of the 11th C., nobility of lineage and military prowess were also considered secular virtues (Kazhdan-Franklin, Studies 24–32).

The church fathers’ teaching on virtue is based on the interpretation of Holy Scripture. They developed both the general idea of virtue and the categorization of individual virtues. Christian exegetes understood the virtues of human behavior as gifts of God that should lead us back to him and that are therefore connected with the three theological virtues (faith, hope, and love [agape]) as their presupposition. Virtue was engendered by the soul, not of its own power but in its capacity as the bride of Christ; it presupposed intelligence and free will.

Monastic-ascetic ethics, even though it preserved some elements of the ancient system, or at least its terminology, in fact diverged from classical principles: the role of reason in the system of virtues decreased while experience as the source of virtue was emphasized; the classical magnanimity (or megalopsychia) (G. Downey, TAPA 76 [1945] 279–86) was replaced by humility (tapeinotes). John of Damascus (PG 95:85C) drew up a list of virtues that included the ancient cardinal virtues, three theological virtues, and others—prayer, humility, mildness, tolerance, clemency, and 23 more. Michael Psellus (De omnifaria doctrina, pars. 66–81) defined and classified the virtues, esp. the cardinal virtues, following the tradition of Plato and Aristotle, without evaluating or combining the different independent lists. Hagiography presents virtues (esp. faith, hope, and love) in action; even though acts of martyrs readily exaggerated the saintly virtues, a cautious and negative attitude toward excessive deeds of virtue is sometimes seen, esp. in the vitae of the 12th C. Personifications of both imperial and monastic virtues, usually female and dressed in nonclassical garb, were depicted in Byz. art.


VISIGOTHES (Oısıgorothoi), a polytheistic people within the union of the Goths. The initial entry of the Visigoths into the Roman Empire resulted in the Battle of Adrianople (378), at which Valens was killed. The Visigoths subsequently ravaged Thrace and threatened Constantinople until 392, when Theodosios I settled them as foederati in Thrace. In 395 the Visigoths, now under Alaric, rebelled and pillaged Thrace and Illyricum. Attempts by Stilicho to thwart them and establish Western imperial control over Illyricum were viewed with apprehension by Arkadios, who appointed Alaric magister militum for Illyricum. In 401 the Visigoths invaded Italy and sacked Rome in 410. Following a failed attempt to cross from Italy to Africa and the sudden death of Alaric, the Visigoths under Ataulf moved into southern Gaul. In 414 Ataulf married Galla Placidia. In 416–18, in their capacity as foederati, the Visigoths invaded Spain and crushed the Siling Vandals and Alans.

After another unsuccessful effort to cross into Africa, the Visigoths were forced to return to Gaul, where they settled in Aquitania and Septimania. This marks the beginning of the Visigothic kingdom centered on Toulouse, which under Theodoric II (453–66) and Euric (466–84) was extended into Spain. In 507 the Franks under Clovis defeated and killed Alaric II near Poitiers.
Aquitanica passed into Frankish hands, but an Ostrogothic protectorate (508–22) kept Septimania and Spain in Visigothic hands. The Visigoth kingdom in Spain proved to be a successful sub-Roman successor state. Relations between the Arian Visigoths and orthodox Hispano-Roman population were generally harmonious, protected, as it were, by law codes for both the former (Code of Euric and Book of Judges [654]) and latter (Breviary of Alaric).

The kingdom was susceptible to Constantinopolitan influence through its lively commercial contacts with the East and, after 552, by Justinian I’s establishment of a province along the southeastern coast of the peninsula. Although Africa remained the prime source of olive oil for the Visigothic coastal cities, oil, wine, perfume, and pottery were imported in considerable quantities from Asia Minor and the Levant. East Roman architectural and artistic influences are evident in Visigothic churches and in the long halls constructed at Recopolis, the city founded by King Leovigild (568–86) east of modern Madrid. Key Visigothic church and literary figures, such as Leander of Seville, Martin of Braga, John of Biclar, and Isidore of Seville, were deeply influenced by their contacts or experience with Constantinopolitan culture. Visigothic kings from Leovigild onward likewise adopted the regalia and court ceremonial of the Eastern emperors. The political unification of Visigothic Spain achieved by Leovigild may also be attributed in some measure to his decision to make Toledo (Toletum) the royal capital in imitation of Constantinople.

At the same time, Eastern cultural influences were used to define further a Visigothic-Spanish identity distinct and even in opposition to Constantinople (this despite the conversion of the kingdom to orthodoxy under Reccared in 586). This opposition was fundamental in the expulsion of Byz. forces from Spain in 621 and the emergence of a mature Visigothic kingdom that survived until the early 8th C.

VVisIOINS (ἡπτασια), supernatural phenomena viewed primarily by prophets and saints. Visions should be distinguished from illumination, a final act of spiritual purification (the divine light of Symeon the Theologian and the hesychasts), and from diabolical apparitions, aimed at the deception and ruin of men. A vision could occur in sleep or in waking hours and could be experienced by an individual or a group. It might consist of signs (Constantine I’s vision of a cross in heaven), figures (visions of Christ, Mary, angels, or saints), or developed images (Hell, Paradise, images of the near or remote future).

Vision of dream literature as a genre existed in both antiquity and the Bible: the church fathers were esp. concerned with the Old Testament themes of the ladder of Jacob, the theophany at Sinai, and prophets’ visions as well as the New Testament themes of the Transfiguration, Christ’s appearances after the Resurrection, and the vision of Paul the road to Damascus (a theme dwelt on, like the visions of Isaiah and Ezekiel, in the late 9th-C. Paris Gregory and illuminated MSS of Kosmas Indikopleustes). Visions became a substantial element in hagiography: they conveyed prophetic messages, revealed events happening at a distance or in the past, and offered consolation at time of distress.

A vision of Hell and Paradise could form a part of a saint’s vita (e.g., the vision of Theodora in the vita of Basil the Younger) or an independent work (visions of Anastasia, Dorotheos, or of the monk Kosmas). From these visions we should distinguish satirical travels to Hades, in imitation of Lucian, which contained no visionary elements or supernatural revelation. Prophetic visions in apocalyptic literature often displayed political tendencies.

**Representation in Art.** All representations of the divine can be said, in a sense, to be visionary. A special class of such images, however, are those of the prophets, who are often depicted reacting in astonishment to the vision that is vouchsafed to them. Such scenes are found as early as ca.500 at Hosios David in Thessalonike. The depiction of such epiphanies reached their peak in the 9th–10th C. when, according to A. Grabar (Iconoclasme 244), scenes of this sort are to be understood as part of a larger Iconodule emphasis upon visual experience. The largest surviving cluster of these
VISITATION (ἀκοπασμός, "greeting"), the meeting of the pregnant Virgin and Elizabeth, when Elizabeth's child, John the Baptist, leapt in her womb. The episode is notable for Elizabeth's declaration of Christ and for Mary's Magnificat (Lk 1:39–56). In art, the former quite replaces the latter; only in Psalters—where it is a canticle—is the Magnificat occasionally illustrated. The Visitatio is represented only in cycles of the Infancy of Christ. In 6th-C. art, there were three variants: the men may shake hands (Grabar, *Amphoules*, pls. XLVI, LI), converse (apse mosaic, Pořeč), or embrace (Grabar, *Amphoules*, pl.XLVII). The third variant becomes standard. A curious maid (Pořeč, Cambasli Kilise at Ortahisar, where she becomes a donor portrait—N. Thierry, *Peintures d'Asie Mineure et de Transcaucase au Xe et XIe siècles* [London 1977], pt.XI, pl.4), or Zacharias (Nerezi) may serve as witness, but further elaboration is rare. Exceptions include the Theodore Psalter (fol. 119v) where the blessing Christ Child and kneeling John the Baptist appear behind their mothers, the MSS of James of Kokkinobaphos that illustrate the event with nine scenes, and the late 14th-C. mural at Pelendri on Cyprus, where the gesturing infants are visible in their mothers' bodies. Though the Byz. church calendar knows no such feast, the passage from Luke was read at the feast of the Deposition of the Virgin's Robe (esthes) in the Blachernai church on 2 July (Matth. Typicon 1:328–33).

VITA, or Life (Βίος, usually *bios kai politeia*, "life and deeds"), biography of a saint. Unlike the martyrion, which emphasizes heroic death for Christian beliefs, the vita depicts ideal Christian behavior. Eusebius of Caesarea created the genre in his biography of Constantine I the Great, the Vita Constantini, in which he emphasized didactic purpose over factual trustworthiness; equally influential, Athanasios of Alexandria elaborated the framework of the Christian biography in his vita of Antony the Great. Though preserving certain traditions of ancient biography, the vita was a new genre, typified by a new ideal of behavior (rejection of earthly values for the sake of future reward), a new type of storyteller who understood and accepted his humble position in comparison with the saint (see *Modesty, Topos*), a new view of the legendary and miraculous as normal and ordinary (within the sphere of the saint's influence), and a new concept of time as a series of independent episodes without any claim to coherency. The stereotypical saint's biography coexisted with vivid details of both real life (making some vitae invaluable for their political, social, and economic data) and miracles, visions, wondrous lands, and the heavenly realm. Delehaye (*infra* 106–9) distinguished six types of hagiography on the basis of credibility, from authentic sources to hagiographical romances. The differentiation is in fact more complex: vitae differed in ideology, language, the role of the hagiographer, his interest in detail, etc. Vitae were collected in *Menologion*.

**Illustration of Vitae.** Only those vitae included in the *menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes were ever regularly illustrated in MSS; these texts were most often accompanied by portraits, and narrative cycles are almost invariably brief. Vita icons (also known as "hagiographical" icons) and fresco cycles (see *Hagiographical Illustration*) may illustrate a dozen or so episodes from the life of a saint but they draw from a variety of sources, both visual and written, and can rarely be traced to any single vita text.


**Vita Basilii**, a biography of Basil I, the second section of Theophanes Continuatus, written most probably by Constantine VII ca.950. The *Vita Basilii* is a panegyric presenting Basil as...
a descendant of noble ancestors and as a wise administrator. The author emphasized that Basil established a just government and that the poor were able to till their fields peacefully; the emperor himself took part in judicial tribunals and protected peasants from tax collectors. Thus the program described in the vita differed radically from that of Romanos I. The author was hostile to high officials and he esp. hated eunuchs. On the other hand, he did not portray Basil as a great general and was reticent in describing his expeditions; he did not conceal Basil's military defeats. In contrast, the emperor was portrayed as a great builder: the vita is our most important source for imperially sponsored architecture and decoration of the period, both within and beyond the Great Palace in Constantinople and elsewhere in the empire. Jenkins, who stressed the influence of Plutarch on the vita, argued that the author used both the biography of Antony and the lost biography of Nero (Studies, pt.IV [1954], 13–30). At the same time the author uses ancient imagery cautiously: he contrasts rather than compares Basil with ancient heroes. To Basil is opposed his antihero, Michael III, the embodiment of evil. It seems that the vita was a source of Genesios or was based upon a common source.


VITA CONSTANTINI, a Life of the emperor Constantine I the Great in four books, according to T.D. Barnes (infra) written between 337 and 339. It is now generally accepted as a work of Eusebius of Caesarea, although there has been much controversy over its historical value. Embarrassed or repelled by its flatteries, many critics have impugned its honesty and even denied its authenticity. In a much-quoted extreme judgment, J. Burckhardt (Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen [Basel 1855] 260, 283) dismissed its author as the first thoroughly dishonest historian of ancient times, the most disgusting of all eulogists. More sober readers are bothered by its undeniable sins of omission, internal and external inconsistencies, and doublets, while the Constantinian documents it contains have also provoked suspicion. Much of this stems from a failure to take the work on its own terms. It was intended to be a public eulogy in the classical tradition, akin to the contemporary Panegyrici Latini; hence its tone. The defects in presentation are the result of Eusebius dying before the piece was finished and revised. At least one document (Constantine’s letter to the provincials after the defeat of Licinius) has been vindicated by the discovery that a text preserved on papyrus (P.Lond. III 878) corresponds verbatim with most of Vita 2.26–29 (A.H.M. Jones, JEH 5 [1954] 196–200). There are also later Lives of Constantine and his mother Helena (BHG 362–369K), often embellished by legendary stories.


VITA CONTEMPLATIVA, contemplative life, Latin term used by Augustine and the scholastics and derived from the Greek philosophical concept of bios theorētikos; it was introduced by Aristotle and developed by the Stoics and is usually coupled with and opposed to the vita activa, bios praktikos. The distinction also appears in the paired words praktikos-gnostikos, or in a tripartite form praktikos-physiskos-theologikos. For ancient Greek philosophers, praktikos always had a secular connotation denoting either manual work (Plato), or activity in general (Aristotle), or political activity (Stoics), whereas theoreikos had a sublime and even divine connotation. Far from accepting the ancient concept of noble leisure, church fathers held in high respect the human ability to contemplate; pseudo-Basil (PG 31:1340D–1341A) says that the soul has a twofold force (dynamis)—one part giving life to the body, the other contemplative or rational. Origen stressed that contemplative and active life should be complementary: Mary is the symbol of contemplative life, Martha of the practical or active (Commentary on John 11:18, frag.80, ed. Preuschen, p.547). Evagrius Pontikos took the next step and developed a hierarchical notion: the practical life (which has nothing in common with Aristotelian “activity”) is for
Evagrios the first stage of ascetic behavior, the purpose of which is to prepare oneself for contemplation of God; the practical life leads to hesychia, tranquil lucidity. Only after having reached this point is the ascetic ready for genuine contemplation. The Evagrian concept influenced Byzantine monastic ethical ideals, including the teaching of Symeon the Theologian.


-A.K.

VITALIAN (Βεταλιανός), usurper (513–15); born Zaldaba in Moesia, died Constantinople after 10 July 520. He was probably the offspring of a mixed marriage since he was called Scythian or Thracian, whereas his mother was a sister of Patr. Makedonios II (496–511). Military commander of barbarian mercenaries in Thrace, Vitalian in 513 revolted against Emp. Anastasios I, attacked the magister militum Hypatios, and marched on Constantinople, posing as the champion of Orthodoxy. His revolt apparently gained support for both social and political reasons since his army included farmers as well as soldiers. He was initially successful and recognized as magister militum of Thrace, but in 515 he was defeated at sea and withdrew into Thrace. After the death of Anastasios in 518, Justin I came to terms with Vitalian and honored him with high office, making him patrikios in 518 and consul in 520. He was a strong supporter of Chalcedonian Orthodoxy and took part in negotiations with the papacy to end the Akaian schism. He was murdered in the palace, allegedly at the order of the future Justinian I, who had reasons to fear Vitalian’s rivalry.


-V.L.E.K., A.K.

VIVARION (Βίβάριον, loanword from Lat. vivarium), a preserve for wild animals (Prokopios, Wars 5.22.10) or for fish. John Tzetzes (Historiae 8:142–51 [pp.302f]) relates that Crassus kept a domesticated sea eel in an elaborately ornamented vivarium. The word commonly appears in documents of the 13th-15th C., with the meaning of a place to keep fish (a pond, riverbank, or marsh). Charters of 1229–34 mention vivaria on the river Hermon that constituted the pronoia of a certain Kalezopoulos (MM 4:239.29); in a will of 1284 (Lauro 2, no.75:34–35) a vivarium is named together with a marshland as one of the “rights” (dikaia) conveyed to a certain Theodore Kerameas and, in a praktikon of 1301 (Dölger, Sechs Praktika, p.36.30), rent for a vivarium is mentioned alongside rents for a mooring place (skaliakiton) and a place for washing flax (linobrocheinon). On the other hand, a praktikon of 1317 that describes the village of Doxompous, where the inhabitants made their living primarily by fishing, lists several peasant households in possession of vivaria, sometimes as many as 12 to 15 each (Lauro 2, no.104.21, 41), in this case, probably small ponds to keep fish.


-J.W.N., A.K.

VITICULTURE. See Vineyard.

VITIGES (Ούττιγις), king of the Ostrogoths (Nov. 536–May 540); died ca.542 on Byz. eastern frontier. An experienced military commander, although not of noble origin, Vitiges was raised on the shield because the Goths resented the sluggish warfare of Theodahad. Vitiges married Mata-suntha to add legitimacy to his rule, but she hated him personally and politically and became involved in pro-Roman plots. He had to confront Belisarios, who entered Rome on 9/10 Dec. 536. Vitiges bought peace with the Franks by ceding them territories in southern Gaul and paying 2,000 pounds of gold; he then besieged Rome at length but in vain. When Byz. troops invaded Picenum in Feb. 538 Vitiges retreated to Ravenna. He tried to draw Chosroes I into an alliance against Justinian I, but the Persian expedition came too late and the Franks proved dangerous allies. Beleaguered in Ravenna, Vitiges sued for peace, proposing to divide Italy between Byz. and the Goths. Belisarios delayed agreement and, under duress, the Goths opened the gates. Vitiges was arrested and sent to Byz. with his relatives; there, having abjured his Arianism, he received the title of patrikios and rich estates on the Persian border, where he died.


-W.E.K., A.K.

VIVARION (Βίβαριον, loanword from Lat. vivarium), a preserve for wild animals (Prokopios, Wars 5:22.10) or for fish. John Tzetzes (Historiae 8:142–51 [pp.302f]) relates that Crassus kept a domesticated sea eel in an elaborately ornamented vivarium. The word commonly appears in documents of the 13th-15th C., with the meaning of a place to keep fish (a pond, riverbank, or marsh). Charters of 1229–34 mention vivaria on the river Hermon that constituted the pronoia of a certain Kalezopoulos (MM 4:239.29); in a will of 1284 (Lauro 2, no.75:34–35) a vivarium is named together with a marshland as one of the “rights” (dikaia) conveyed to a certain Theodore Kerameas and, in a praktikon of 1301 (Dölger, Sechs Praktika, p.36.30), rent for a vivarium is mentioned alongside rents for a mooring place (skaliakiton) and a place for washing flax (linobrocheinon). On the other hand, a praktikon of 1317 that describes the village of Doxompous, where the inhabitants made their living primarily by fishing, lists several peasant households in possession of vivaria, sometimes as many as 12 to 15 each (Lauro 2, no.104.21, 41), in this case, probably small ponds to keep fish.


-J.W.N., A.K.

VITICULTURE. See Vineyard.

VITIGES (Ούττιγις), king of the Ostrogoths (Nov. 536–May 540); died ca.542 on Byz. eastern frontier. An experienced military commander, although not of noble origin, Vitiges was raised on the shield because the Goths resented the sluggish warfare of Theodahad. Vitiges married Mata-suntha to add legitimacy to his rule, but she hated him personally and politically and became involved in pro-Roman plots. He had to confront Belisarios, who entered Rome on 9/10 Dec. 536. Vitiges bought peace with the Franks by ceding them territories in southern Gaul and paying 2,000 pounds of gold; he then besieged Rome at length but in vain. When Byz. troops invaded Picenum in Feb. 538 Vitiges retreated to Ravenna. He tried to draw Chosroes I into an alliance against Justinian I, but the Persian expedition came too late and the Franks proved dangerous allies. Beleaguered in Ravenna, Vitiges sued for peace, proposing to divide Italy between Byz. and the Goths. Belisarios delayed agreement and, under duress, the Goths opened the gates. Vitiges was arrested and sent to Byz. with his relatives; there, having abjured his Arianism, he received the title of patrikios and rich estates on the Persian border, where he died.


-W.E.K., A.K.
VIVARIUM MONASTERY (monasterium Vivariense), founded by Cassiodorus in the mid-6th C. on the bay of Squillace, Calabria; the name originates from the fishpond (vivarium) on the rocky coast near the modern town of Copanello di Stallelli. It is plausible that Cassiodorus organized the institution after his visit of ca. 549–53 to Constantinople, where he learned about the theological school in Nisibis that he decided to emulate (R. Macina, Muséon 95 [1982] 131–66). At any rate, Vivarium was modeled on Byz. monasticism, not the Italian practices that are revealed in the contemporary Rules of St. Benedict of Nursia (K. Zelzer, WS 19 [1985] 235f). A religious and cultural center developed around the library and scriptorium at Vivarium; many Greek works were translated there into Latin (R. Hanslik, Philologus 115 [1971] 107–13): for example, Epiphanios Scholastikos translated church histories of Theodore, Sozomenos, and Sokrates. After founding Vivarium, Cassiodorus spent the rest of his life in the monastery, although it is unclear whether he himself became a monk. A sarcophagus identified as that of Cassiodorus was found at the Church of San Martino, which is all that remains of the monastery.


VLACHIA (βλάχα), a district in Thessaly, near Halmyros, mentioned in some 12th-C. sources, beginning with Benjamin of Tudela. Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 638.50, with corr. I. Dujčev, BZ 72 [1979] 51) speaks of Great (Megale) Vlachia, which he locates near Thessalian Meteora. In the army of Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epiros in 1258 were brave soldiers, according to Pachymeres, “whom [his son John] called Megalovlachitai” (Pachym., ed. Failler, 1:117.15). After Pachymeres the term Megale Vlachia disappears and reappears only in the 15th C. as a designation not for the district in Thessaly, but for a region on the Lower and Middle Danube (Wallachia). Megale Vlachia was an administrative unit: in 1276 the pinkernes Raoul Komnenos held the post of the kephale of Megale Vlachia. Besides Great Vlachia there are references to Upper Vlachia in Epiros, Little Vlachia in Acharnania and Aetolia, and “Vlachia in Hellas” (i.e., in Thessaly).


VLACHS (βλάχοι), an ethnic group that lived in mountainous areas of Thessaly (VLACHIA) and the northern Balkans. They were most probably the descendants of Thraci ans and Daco-Getans who, under the pressure of Germanic and Avaro-Slavic invasions, migrated to isolated areas. The name first appears in Byz. sources of the 11th C. (Skyllitzes, Kekaumenos, then in Anna Komnene); the anonymous chronicle of Bari mentions Vlachs in the Byz. army in Italy between 1025 and 1027 (M. Gyöni, ActaAnthHung 1 [1951] 235–45). Kekaumenos identified the Vlachs with the Dacians conquered by Trajan—but one should be very cautious with regard to the ethnic perceptions of Byz. authors. The Vlachs earned their living primarily by transhumance and are mentioned in registers of monasteries as sheep- and cattle-owners. By the end of the 11th C., Vlach douloparkoi played an important role in the economy of Mt. Athos; Alexios I, however, expelled the Vlachs from the Holy Mountain, to the great regret of the monks (Meyer, Haupturkunden 163). Sometimes the Byz. government confiscated lands that the Vlachs considered as their [common?] property; thus, in 1293 Andronikos II conferred upon a certain Leo Koteanites the land in Preatsinitza “taken from various Vlachs” (Chil., no.11.6–7).

The Byz. sources preserve a view of Vlachs as liars, thieves, and unbelievers, who make solemn oaths and then immediately break them (Kek. 298.14–21). It remains under discussion whether the Byz. were able or willing to distinguish between Vlachs and Bulgarians; the identity of the Blachi who played the leading role in the revolt against the Byz. in 1185 (Nik.Chon. 368.53–57) is thus unclear.


—A.K.

VLADIMIR, prince of Galitzia (from 1141); born ca.1110, died 1153. He was the grandson of Rostislav of Trmutorakan and Lanka, daughter of Béla I of Hungary. Involved in constant conflicts with Polish and Volhynian princes and, from 1146, with Hungary and Kiev, Vladimir concluded an alliance with Byz., probably ca.1146–47. Kinamos (Kinn. 115.18–19) describes him as “a man allied with (hypostondos) the Romans,” which suggests the existence of a treaty, but which has been wrongly interpreted as denoting Vladimir’s vassalage. In Manuel I’s war against Hungary, Vladimir and Jurij Dolgorukij were Byz.’s allies. With Byz. support, Vladimir established the bish-opric of Halić ca.1150. His son Jaroslav Osmonysl’ (1153–87) briefly supported the future em-peror Andronikos I Komnenos before returning to the alliance with Manuel I.

—An.P.

VLADIMIR MONOMACH, prince of Perejaslav’ (1094–1113) and Kiev (1113–25); his father was Vsevolod, prince of Kiev, and his mother was allegedly a daughter of Constantine IX Mono-machos (V.G. Brjusova, Vizvrem 28 [1968] 177– 35); born 1053, died 15 May 1125 at L’to River. In his foreign policy Vladimir tried to secure southern Rus’ against the Cumans through concert-ed action by the Rjurikid princes. In 1116–18 he encroached on Byz. interests by sanctioning two attempts to occupy towns on the lower Dan-ube, the first led by the enigmatic Leo, known to some sources as “son of Diogenes,” who was probably related to Vladimir by marriage (M. Mat-thieu, Byzantion 22 [1952] 133–48; A. Gorskij, Istoričeskie zapisiki 115 [1987] 308–328). If there was a rift with Byz., it was apparently healed by 1122, when Vladimir’s granddaughter was married into the Komnenian lineage. A later Muscovite legend casts Vladimir as a powerful tsar who was kept from attacking Constantinople only by rich gifts from Alexios I Komnenos.

Vladimir’s image as the model prince of Rus’ stems largely from his cultural activities, including a redaction of the Povest’ vremennych let that he sponsored, his correspondence with Metr. Nikphasis I, and esp. his Instruction [Poučení] to his children (ca.1124?), a kind of Mirror of Princes mixed with autobiography. It was in-cluded in the Povest’ vremennych let. Vladimir quotes from translated compilations of patristic writings (F. Thomson, Slavica Gandensia 10 [1983] 20f, 84f). Thematic parallels have been found in vari-ous paraenetic works from Byz. and western Eu-rope (M.P. Alekseev, TODRL 2 [1935] 39–80; T. Čyževskaja, WSLj 2 [1952] 157–60); its sources include Byz. liturgies (N.V. Sljakov, ŽMNP [June 1900] 227–37) and patristic authors, such as Basil the Great (L. Müller, RM 1 [1973] 30–48).
VOISLAV, STEFAN | 2185

–S.C.F. P.A.H.

VLADISLAV III JAGELLO, or Władysław III Jagiełło (Λαδίσκλαδος), king of Poland from 1434 and of Hungary from 1440 (as Ulászló I); born Krakow 31 Oct. 1424, died Varna 10 Nov. 1444. With the support of HUNYADI, who had secured the young king’s victory over his Habsburg rivals in Hungary, Vladislaw fought a victorious campaign in 1443/4 against the Turks and in 1444 agreed to the secret peace negotiations of Hunyadi and GEORGE BRANKOVIĆ with the Ottoman sultan Murad II. Although a treaty was signed at Szeged in August 1444—securing a ten-year truce, reinstating Branković in Serbia, and promising tribute and aid from the sultan for Hungary—Vladislaw was persuaded by the papal legate, Giuliano Cesarini, to break the peace and lead a Polish-Hungarian army against the Turks, having been assured of Venetian and papal support. This Crusade of VARNA ended in disaster, however; the legate and Vladislaw perished while fighting heroically. According to Chalkokondyles (Chalk. 2:106–08), the young king tried personally to attack the sultan but was surrounded by janissaries and killed; his head was brought to Murad.

–J.B., A.K.

VOISLEVA (τὰ Βοίσλεβα), ancient Edessa, a city in southern Macedonia on the via Egnatia, controlling the entrance to a pass through the mountains. In the 7th C. Edessa was a bishopric. The Slavic name Vodena appears first in the story of Basil II’s capture of the stronghold (phourion) in 1001 (Skyl. 345.20–24). Zlatarski (Ist. 1:2654f), however, hypothesized that Vodena and not Vidin had been a center of the KOMETOPOLIOI in the late 10th C. Due to its strategic importance, Vodena was often fought over: thus, BOHEMUND temporarily captured it in 1083; John III Vatatzes, during his campaign against Thessalonike, occupied Vodena in 1253; John VI Kantakouzenos disputed it with the Serbians; and it was taken by STEFAN UROŠ IV DUSAN in Jan. 1351. Little is known of the administrative organization of Byz. Vodena. An 11th C. seal of a doux of Edessos (Zacos, Seals 1.3, no.2686) may refer to Vodena. An enigmatic list of the estates of Lavra monastery mentions the archontia of Vodena (Lavra 1, app. II 50), and in a charter of 1375 Thomas Prelijubović named himself the lord of the toparchia and kastron of Vodena (Lavra 3:146.17–18). In an ecclesiastical list of Bulgaria (11th to the beginning of the 12th C.) two bishoprics are named: Edessa or MOGLENA and Vodena (Notitiae CP no.13,839–41). The Ottoman Ghazi Evrenos seized the fortress in the late 14th C.

–R.B., A.K.

VOISLAV, STEFAN, ruler (archon) of the Serbians, according to Skylitzes (Skyl. 408.73–74); born in Brusna, a district of Drina, died between 1043 and 1052. Reared in Bosnia and Dubrovnik, Voislov (Βοισλόβας) married a relative of Samuel of Bulgaria, according to the Priest of Diokleia (343f). Voislov revolted against Byz. rule ca.1034. He was captured and taken to Constantinople. Escaping before 1040, he renewed his rebellion. The Byz. governor Theophilos Erotokites was expelled from Diokleia, where Voislov established
an independent principality. Kekaumenos (Kek. 170.30) calls him toparch, indicating an alliance with Byz. Voislav subdued some Dalmatian fortresses and Ston, north of Dubrovnik. The revolt of Deljan helped Voislav consolidate his power. Voislav's struggles with Byz. proved victorious; he seized a Byz. treasure ship wrecked off Dioklea, refused Michael IV's demand for restitution, and destroyed Byz. troops sent against him under George Probatas. He also defeated (ca. 1042) the army of Michael, strategos of Dyrarachion, which was supported by the princes of Raška and Zachlumia, and enlarged his territories. Voislav's victory and the subsequent escape of Byz. troops through subterranean galleries are depicted in the Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzés, nos. 543–44). After Voislav's death, his son Michael (Michaelas) emerged as "archegos of the Triballians and Serbians" (Skyl. 475.13–14); he signed a treaty with Byz. and received the title of protospatharios.


VOITECH, GEORGE, a Bulgarian magnate in Skopje; died 1072? According to Skylitzes Continuatus (163.14–15) Voitech (Boïrâkos) was kin to the Kopchanoi, whom Zlatarski (Ist. 2:198, n.1) understood as kouchans (anc. Bulg. "aristocrats"). Voitech's rebellion in Skopje, probably in Aug.–Sept. 1072, was supported by the ruler of Dioklea, who sent an army under Constantine Bodin and general Petilos to aid Voitech. They shunted him aside, defeated the Byz. strategos Damianos Dalassenos, and occupied the theme of Bulgaria by seizing Ohrid and Devol. Petilos lost a battle at Kastoria and retreated to Dioklea. A Byz. army commanded by Michael Saronites approached Skopje, and Voitech agreed to betray the town in exchange for his personal safety. He then changed his mind and summoned Bodin's army from Niš (Dec. 1072). Bodin, however, was defeated and captured. The Byz. took Voitech captive; he died from torture on the way to Constantinople.


VOLUME STYLE, a term introduced by E. Kitzinger (DOP 20 [1966] 31f, 45) to denote a phase of 13th–14th-C. Byz. art first thoroughly analyzed by Demus. Most clearly identifiable in MONUMENTAL PAINTING of the second and third quarters of the 13th C., esp. in Serbia, the "volume style" is distinguished by an exaggerated sense of sculptural monumentality. Apparently a reaction to the highly mannered trend of the later 12th C. known as the DYNAMIC STYLE, it continued into the 14th C. in a more decorative form at the CHORA MONASTERY in Constantinople. Kitzinger argued that this style, with its evocation of classical antiquity, exercised a formative impact on Italian Renaissance painting, and specifically on Giotto.


VOTIVES (αφιερωτικοί). Objects of varying shapes and decoration were offered at Byz. shrines for the continuance of a donor's prayers, either of supplication or thanksgiving, reflecting a pagan tradition (Theodore of Cyrhhus, Cure of Pagan Maladies 8, 64). Leaf-shaped silver plaques (pimakes) with Christograms survive from the 4th C.; the 6th-C. Mašar Al-Nu'man Treasure includes one large pentagonal version with a representation, possibly of St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger, and a group of very small plaques with orant figures or pairs of eyes. Such objects belong to a subcategory of votives directly associated with Pilgrimage. Other than graffiti—usually invoking intercession for travelers or for those who stayed behind—pilgrims' votives were generally of two sorts. On the one hand, valued possessions, such as jewelry or pack animals, were deposited as thanks for blessings received or anticipated; thus, the Holy Sepulchre was laden with "bracelets, rings, tiasas, plaited girdles, belts, emperors' crowns of gold and precious stones" (Piacenza Pilgrim, ed. Wilkinson, Pilgrims 18); later on, numerous icons were added to the array (P. Nordhagen, DOP 41 [1987] 453–60). The Thekla shrine at Meriamlik was richly endowed with votive birds, some from exotic lands, which gave delight to the children who played in the gardens of the sanctuary (vita of Thekla, ed. Dagron, 350.23–352.32). On the other hand, inscribed artifacts—plaques, crosses, metal or clay body parts—were left to
record a specific request or thanks. Sophronios of Jerusalem describes such a votive at the shrine of Sts. Kyros and John (Miracles 69) recording the cure of a blind man from Rome.

A number of major works of Byz. art were votive (ex voto) offerings. The earliest surviving large-scale iconic figures are the votive mosaics in the Church of St. Demetrios in Thessalonike; famous sumptuary objects—the cross of Justin II and Sophia in Rome, the crown of Leo VI in Venice—were votive gifts; innumerable icons were ex votos—visitors to Constantinople speak of icon painters outside Hagia Sophia ready to supply icons for votive offerings. The many small, repetitious icons at the monastery on Mt. Sinai indicate that pilgrims often left votive icons there.

Chapels attached to urban sanctuaries and many of the tiny churches that dot Byz. villages were votive offerings by individuals; the lower walls, piers, and narthexes of countless provincial church buildings are layered with frescoed panels that depict a saint and a donor and include a votive inscription.


VOUSSOIR, a masonry unit of an arch, usually a wedge-shaped block of stone whose tapering sides are cut to align with radii of the arch. The units of a brick arch are sometimes slightly wedge-shaped. The voussoir at the crown of the arch is called the keystone; when it is in place, the arch forms a stable, self-supporting unit. On brick arches, voussoirs were sometimes simulated with marble revetment. The sides of voussoirs could be notched or "joggled" to lock into adjacent members (Aphentiko, Mistra; Pam makaristos Church, Constantinople) or simply to create a surface pattern (Müller-Wiener, Bildlexikon, fig.155).


VOYAGE DE CHARLEMAGNE À JÉRUSALEM ET À CONSTANTINOPLE, epic poem whose semicomical account of Charlemagne's fictional trip to Jerusalem and his stay in Constantinople is related to the chansons de geste and foreshadows the genre of "romans d'Orient." The sole MS is in the Anglo-Norman dialect. The work's date is controversial: theories range from the late 11th C. to between ca.1217 and 1263, when it was translated into Old Norse. Its theme of Passion relics at St. Denis may reflect the long controversy between that abbey and the bishop of Paris over the Lendit fair. The Voyage reflects Western attitudes and keen interest in Byz. during a period of intensifying contacts and crusades. The description of wares and location of markets at Jerusalem near Ste. Marie Latine seems to fit the situation between ca.1125 and 1150 (J. Richard, RBPH 43 [1965] 552–55). The bulk of the tale takes place in Constantinople at the court of a Byz. King Hugh, where a spy overhears Charlemagne's peers and their drunken boasting, and they are forced to perform as promised. This they do, thanks to relics: for example, Olivier successfully makes love to the Byz. princess 30 times in one night (vv. 692–734), and Hugh becomes Charlemagne's vassal. Constantinople, its domed architecture, perfumed gardens, and magical palace—with its iconography and automata (some details fit with the Patria of Constantinople: M. Schlauch, Speculum 7 [1932] 500–14)—even the Byz. emperor's plow, are described in great and imaginative detail.


VRAP, a mountainous village in Albania, near ancient Clodiana, a station on the Via Egnatia. Before 1902 local inhabitants discovered there a hoard of gold, silver, and bronze objects; a part of the same group was found in 1894 in Erseke, on the Greco-Albanian frontier. The treasure contained, together with Avar belt buckles, etc., Byz. vessels, sometimes with Greek inscriptions, and two chalices, one decorated with tychai in relief (Age of Spirit., no.156), now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. Two Byz. silver plates from Erseke (now in private hands) bear stamps
of Constans II, suggesting a date in the late 7th C. for this group. Certain pieces seem to have been produced in local workshops by craftsmen with “Byz. experience.” Werner suggested that the hoard belonged to an Avar khagan. Lemerle (Aphieroma Svoronos 1:56–58) argued that it could not have been that of Kouber.


—A.K.

VSEVOLOD, prince of Kiev; son of Jaroslav; baptismal name Andrej; born 1030, died Kiev 13 Apr. 1093. Sometime between 1047 and 1052 he married a relative of Constantine IX Monomachos. After his father's death (1054) Vsevolod, as prince of Perejaslawl', ruled Kiev and Rus' together with his older brothers Izjaslav of Kiev and Svjatoslav of Chernigov. As a consequence of this triarchy, the bishoprics of Perejaslawl' and Chernigov were elevated in the 1060s to titular metropolitan sees. In 1078, Vsevolod became the ruler of all Rus'. He supported the attempts of John II, metropolitan of Kiev, to restore Kievian church jurisdiction over Perejaslawl' and Chernigov. Vsevolod contributed to the increased veneration of his saintly patron; probably at this time the legend of the journey of the apostle Andrew to the Dnieper region was developed. Vsevolod was the first prince of Rus', who, while continuing to use seals with Greek inscriptions (as did his predecessors), also used seals similar to Byz. ones but with Slavic inscriptions.


—An.P.

VUKAŠIN, Serbian king (kralj; kralis in the Greek sources) and co-ruler with Stefan Uroš V (from Aug./Sept. 1365); died at Černomor on the Marica River 27 Sept. 1371. According to Chalkokondyles, Vukašin was cupbearer (oinochoes) of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, while his brother John Uglješa served the tsar as hippocomos, or groom. In 1350 Dušan appointed Vukašin župan in Prilep. After Dušan's death, Vukašin expanded his holdings in Macedonia and Kosovo Polje; Tsar Stefan Uroš V gave him the title of despotes in 1364 and kralj in 1365. Gradually Vukašin acquired dominance over his co-ruler Uroš V; correspondence with Dubrovnik shows him acting in his own name alone. Since Uroš V was childless, Vukašin crowned his son Marko Kraljević as “junior ruler.” The rise to power of Vukašin and John Uglješa caused jealous opposition among a number of influential Serbian lords. The Serbian forces were thus weakened at the time of the battle of Marica against the Turks, when both Vukašin and Uglješa were killed and the Serbian army was defeated. Marko succeeded his father, but had to recognize the suzerainty of the Ottoman sultan.

Joint portraits of Uroš and Vukašin are represented at the Psaha monastery, with Uroš in the senior position.


—J.S.A.
WADI NATRUN (Sketis Σκῆττς, Coptic Shiet), west of the Nile Delta, one of the most famous Early Christian monastic centers in Egypt, thought to have been founded by MAKARION THE GREAT ca.300. The anchorites joining him lived in individual small houses (kelita), usually accompanied by a younger monk who saw to the food supply; there were no shared refectories. The monks' daily occupation consisted of prayer and simple handicrafts (e.g., basketwork), and the products were sold in nearby markets. The monks assembled in church only on Sundays for the liturgy. By the late 4th C. four churches were attested. The present four monasteries in Wadi Natrun represent a development after the 9th C., when for security reasons monks settled within an area surrounded by a high wall. Each monastery had its own multistoried defense tower (jawsaq), refectories, a guesthouse, and several decorated churches, of which the earliest belong to the late 7th or early 8th C.


WAGES (μισθός, μίσθωμα) were paid to agricultural hired workers and apprentices (both called MISTHOI) as well as to construction workers and some professionals (clergy, hospital physicians, teachers) on a daily, monthly, or annual basis. Wages could also be paid for services on a piece-work principle: to a craftsman for a specially commissioned object, to a contractor for erecting a building, to a doctor as an honorarium, to a scribe for copying a book; payment to a prostitute was also called misthos. Another form of wages was a percentage share: the scribe of a tabularios received 2 keratia for each nomisma earned by his master, that is, 1/12 of his pay. Wages were paid primarily in money, but also in grain, olive oil, wine, etc.

Concrete data on wages are scanty: in Egyptian papyri the annual wages of a hired worker averaged around 6 nomismata a year, whereas a shipbuilder received 2 nomismata monthly; hagiographical sources of the 6th–7th C. give 1 keratia a day as a typical figure. A 14th-C. textbook of mathematical problems (K. Vogt, Ein byzantinisches Rechenbuch des frühen 14. Jahrhunderts [Vienna 1968], no.51) calculates the daily earning of a worker as 10 assaria (copper coins). Monastic TYPICA provide evidence for the salary (in kind and money) of the monastery’s steward, physician, and clergy, as well as hospital employees (e.g., P. Gautier, REB 32 [1974] 99.1176–105.1289). Women seem to have been paid two to three times less than men (Fikhman, Egypet 76f); the woman physician at the Pantokrator hospital in Constantinople received half the salary of her male colleagues (P. Gautier, supra 101.1.198–99).

Wages were established by private agreement and fixed in contracts, but the state had control over both wages and prices. Diocletian’s PRICE Edict is an example of such control in late antiquity, while the Book of the Eparch regulated the size and the form of payment in 10th-C. Constantinople: the contract was not to exceed 30 days, and attempts to increase wages in order to attract the services of another man’s misthos were punished. Laborers and professionals used the strike as a means to increase their wages: the evidence about the strike of construction workers in Constantinople between 481 and 491 may be questionable (H.G. Beck, BZ 66 [1973] 268); much more reliable is the statement of Attaleiates (Attal. 204,5–6) that mistrhannoutes in Rhaidesos demanded that their wages be increased in accordance with rising prices. The clergy of Hagia Sophia went on strike in 1307 because the patriarchal treasury did not have sufficient funds to pay them (A.M. Talbot, DOP 27 [1973] 25f).

The salary (ROGA) of high-ranking officials was much higher than artisans’ wages: according to Justinian’s law of 534, the prefect of Africa was paid 100 litrae of gold yearly; Ibn Khurdadhbeh
calculates the salary of officers in the 9th C. between 1–40 pounds of gold, and De ceremoniis gives similar sums (5–40 pounds) as the salary of strategoi. The salary of functionaries was supplemented by bribes, by presents conferred upon them on feast days, and by various services. Private donations were encouraged: pupils of the law school in Constantinople were allowed to give presents to the nomophylax (the director of the school), judges could be paid directly by the litigants, and so on. (See also Synethelia.)


-A.K., A.M.T.

WALLACHIA, region on the left bank of the Lower and Middle Danube, bordering Moldavia on the northeast. The term originates from the name of VLACHIA or Wlachen lant (in the Niebelungenlied) and was firmly established by the 14th C.

Wallachia coincided in rough outline with Trajan’s Dacia. When the Romans left in the 3rd C., they retained some fortresses on the left bank (e.g., SUCIDAVA), but the autochthonous romanized culture dominated through the 4th C., Germanic foederati probably not having been very numerous. In the 5th–6th C. the territory of Wallachia was completely ceded to the Huns, and then to the Avars and Slavs. In the 9th–10th C. a substantial part of Wallachia was within the borders of the Bulgarian state; later, it was invaded by the Pechenegs, Cumans, and Tatars.

The creation of an independent Wallachia began in the 13th C. In 1330, Prince Basarab won a victory over the Hungarian king, Charles (son of Charles I of Anjou), and established the independence of his principedom. Wallachia reached its peak under Mircea the Elder and looked to Byz. for support: the spouses of the princes Ladi-

islas-Vlaico (1364–ca.1375) and Radu I (ca.1375–
c.1377) were probably of Greek or Greco-Slavic origin; some Wallachian princesses were married to Serbian and Bulgarian rulers. Wallachia also moved toward Orthodox Christianity, and the metropolis of Vicina became its center. In the 15th C. Wallachia acknowledged allegiance to the Ottoman Empire. (See also Rumanians.)


WAR. See Peace and War.

WAR OF TROY (Ὁ Πόλεμος τῆς Τροιάς), an anonymous translation of the 12th-C. Roman de Troie of Benoît de Ste. Maure, made probably during the 14th C. in Frankish Greece. Originally intended to be illustrated, this is the longest (over 14,000 unrhymed POLITICAL VERSES) of the extant popular verse romances and seems to have exerted a major influence on the genre. Though some of the lengthy Exphrases of the original have been curtailed, otherwise the version faithfully renders Benoit’s romance, itself based on the Latin novels of Dares the Phrygian and Dikty of CRETE. Although the author of the War of Troy conceals his debt to these and to Benoit by omitting all references to them, he shows almost no knowledge of either the Iliad or the Byz. chronicles’ account of the Trojan War. The War of Troy thus represents a return of the Trojan story to Greek lands after its circulation throughout the Europe of late antiquity and the Middle Ages. Although the closeness of the translation demonstrates that the poem was composed in a conventional literary manner, its style—with its mixed language and repeated phrases—probably indicates contact with orally disseminated traditional material (see Romance).


WARSHIP. See CHELANDION; DROMON; GALEA.

WASHING OF THE FEET. During the Last Supper, Christ washed his disciples’ feet, indicating, when Peter protested, that this was a symbolic cleansing from sin (Jn 13:1–20). The scene appears first on 4th-C. sarcophagi as a pendant to that of Pilate washing his hands, Christ being upright; the later ROSSANO GOSPELS (fol.3r) show Christ deeply bowing and humble. The standard imagery had emerged by the 9th C.: Christ slightly
bowing, holding a towel; Peter with one or both feet in a basin, grasping his head in dismay or sorrow, or gesturing to Christ; and up to 11 other disciples, some often shown removing their sandals. It appears in Gospel and Passion cycles, sometimes displacing the Last Supper; at Psalm 50 (51) in marginal Psalters; and occasionally on icons (Soteriou, Eikones, figs. 33, 49), appearing in the latter below the Communion of the Apostles (see Lord’s Supper). Byz. churches often locate the scene in the narthex (Hosios Loukas), where the monastic ceremony of the washing of the monks’ feet by the hegoumenos was usually performed on Holy Thursday. In some large 12th- and 13th-C. churches (Monreale; S. Marco in Venice) and in many Palaiologan churches, the Passion cycle adorned the naos instead, and the monastic ceremony sometimes followed the image inside.

In imitation of Christ, Byz. bishops and hego- menoi performed on Holy Thursday the ceremony of washing of the feet of 12 clergymen. Similarly, the emperor washed the feet of 12 poor men selected in Constantinople and brought to the palace. They received new garments and had to approach the emperor with a candle in hand; he washed only the right foot of each person. Each one was given three gold coins before departing.


WATER (ὕδωρ) was the most essential of beverages in the eastern Mediterranean. Cold water was precious in a hot climate: Liutprand of Cremona was appalled to see water being sold on the streets of Constantinople. The quality of drinking water was a matter of serious concern, esp. during the summer, when it became scarce. An anonymous author advised drinking only fresh water during July (A. Garzya, Diptycha 2 [1980-81] 47). Another anonymous writer recommended water from natural springs, which is superior because it does not smell, has good taste, and is cold year round (Delatte, AnecdAth 2:470). In summer, water was kept cold in special vessels, which were stored in cellars and cool places.

The problem of water supply was acute in Byz. In Constantinople the aqueduct provided water for the capital and water was also stored in cisterns (see under Constantinople, Monuments of); in many places the cisterns were filled with rainwater. Purchase deeds indicate accurately the existence of wells on the lot, and retreating armies are frequently described as destroying and poisoning wells. Water was also needed for baths, small-scale irrigation, and as power for mills and automata. A drought was considered a serious calamity, and some saints reportedly possessed the gift of bringing rain (or stopping it at harvesttime).

Water and its source (pege) were symbols of life and purification; in the Constantinopolitan suburb of Pege was a church dedicated to the Virgin as Zoodochos Pege. Water was the main element of the rite of baptism, and the blessing of water played an important part in the Byz. liturgy, esp. at Epiphany. Basil the Great ascribed the introduction of the blessing of water to ancient tradition (PG 32:188B); the oldest evidence, however, comes from Tertullian (P. de Puniet, DACL 2:585f). At the same time water in the form of a whirlpool, sea, or flood served as a symbol of destruction. Water was also used for simpagna fortunetelling procedures.


WATERMARKS, emblems or designs found only in the paper of occidental origin that began to be imported into Byz. in the 13th C. The impressions, made by wires twisted into the desired shape and sewed to the mold on which the paper was formed, are only visible against the light. Depending on the size and folding of the sheet of paper, the watermark may appear in the middle of the page, in the folding, or in the corner; in the last two cases only one half or one quarter is on the folio. Because watermarks appear on many dated documents or (less frequently) on MSS, they can provide a chronology for an undated MS (Harlinger, Kodikologie 144-69). A wire screen had an average life of between six months and four years; a MS with a given watermark was usually copied within five years from the known date of that watermark (T. Gerardy, Datiern mit Hilfe von Wasserzeichen [Bückeburg 1964] 65f, 69). Further precision of dating is provided by the phenomenon
of pairs of watermarks, made by two wire screens in different degrees of deterioration. All 13th-C. and some 14th-C. watermarks were simple geometric shapes and lines; marks of the 14th–15th C. were more elaborate, including such devices as a unicorn, bow and arrow, oxhead, scissors, flute, and pear.


—E.G., A.M.T.

WEAPONRY. The weapons most commonly used by Byz. soldiers were swords, spears, maces, slings, and bows. The sword (ziphos) was the primary weapon and many sword types (straight, curved, one- and two-handed) are depicted in illustrations (A. Bruhn Hoffmeyer, Gladius 5 [1966] fig.16). According to the strategika, by the 6th C. the short Roman gladius had been abandoned in favor of a long two-edged sword, the spathon, used by both the infantry and cavalry. The 10th-C. Syllogle tacticorum (38.5, 39.2) gives the length of this kind of sword as the equivalent of 94 cm and mentions a new saberlike sword of the same length, the parameron, a curved one-edged slashing weapon for cavalrymen. Both weapons could be carried from a belt or a shoulder strap.

Infantrymen and cavalrymen carried spears for thrusting and casting. Cavalrymen of the 6th and 7th C. wielded lances with a thong in the middle of the shaft (Avar style) and a pennant (Strat. Maurik. 78.18–20). Infantrymen’s spears (kontaria) in the 10th C. were 4–4.5 m long (cavalry lances were slightly shorter) with an iron point (xipharon, aichme). One type of spear, the menaulion, is described in detail; it was very thick, taken whole from young oak or cornel saplings, and capped by a long blade (45–50 cm), for use by esp. strong infantrymen (called menaulatoi after their weapon) against enemy kataphraktoi—an excellent example of a weapon and a type of specialized soldier developed for a specific tactical role (E. McGeer, Diptycha 4 [1986–87] 53–57). Both light infantry and cavalry carried javelins (akontia, rhiptaria) no longer than 3 m (Sylloge tacticorum 38.6, 39.7).

Maces (rabdia) and axes (pelekia, tzikouria) served as shock weapons. The 10th-C. kataphraktoi carried heavy all-iron maces (siderorabdia)—six-, four-, or three-cornered—to smash their way through enemy infantry (Praecepta Milit. 11.30–32). Infantrymen either hurled maces and battle-axes at the enemy or used them in hand-to-hand combat; the axe was the preferred weapon of the mercenaries from Rus’ of the 10th and 11th C. Axes were single-bladed (rounded or straight-edged), sometimes with a spike opposite the blade; various types appear in illustrations in the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes and other MSS (A. Bruhn Hoffmeyer, Gladius 5 [1966] fig.18; P. Schreiner in Les pays du nord et Byzance [Uppsala 1981] 234–36).

The sling (spathon) and the bow (toxon) were the weapons used by light soldiers. Slings, as shown in illustrations of David and Goliath, were the ordinary hand-held type; the Roman staff sling (fistibalis) was apparently unknown to the Byz. The Byz. bow, like the late Roman bow, was the composite, reflex type featuring an unbendable horn grip with the reinforced wooden bowstave strung in reverse of the bow’s natural flex when unstrung (J.C. Coulston, BAR Int. Ser. 275 [1985] 220–366). A bowshot (flight, not target, range) is estimated at over 300 m for an infantry bow (Schilbach, Metrolologie 42), but cavalry bows, standing 1.2 m high, were smaller and less tightly strung for greater accuracy and ease of handling (Sylloge tacticorum 39.4); they had a flight range of 130–35 m (Bivar, “Cavalry” 283). The solenarion, usually identified as the Byz. crossbow, has recently been redefined as a hollow tube through which an archer could launch several small arrows (muus, i.e., “mice”) at a time; consequently Anna Komnene’s remarks that the Crusaders’ Western-type crossbow (which she called a tsangra) was unknown to the Byz. before the 12th C. should be accepted (D. Nishimura, Byzantion 58 [1988] 422–35).

Production of Weapons (óplopoióma). The production of weapons was assigned to state ergasteria (see Factories, Imperial) in the Roman Empire. By the 4th C. there were 15 such centers in the East, 20 in the West (S. James, BAR Int. Ser. 394 [1988] 257–331), situated in major cities and along the frontiers. The workers (fabricenses) were treated like soldiers and had to meet a minimum quota each month with the weight of their production strictly controlled. Direct supervision and coercion of arms production is evident from the emperor Julian’s harassment of the craftsmen in
Antioch as he urged them to furnish arms, uniforms, and siegecraft for his expedition to Persia in 363.

As the story of the transfer of the relics of St. Euphemia relates (F. Halik, Euphémie de Chalcédoine [Brussels 1965] 89.14–19 and n.3), arms factories continued to operate after the 7th C.; the emperor Leo III ordered the establishment of an arms factory in a Constantinopolitan monastery where furnaces were constructed and armorers (zabaroii) employed. The production of Greek fire was a state enterprise conducted in great secrecy. No guild of arms-makers is mentioned by the Book of the Eparch, but the Miracles of St. Artemios refers to a bowmaker (toxopoioi) in Constantinople. The state’s demand that stratiotaí present themselves for service with their own arms suggests that local private workshops also existed from which they obtained equipment. The lists of supplies for the 911 and 949 expeditions to Crete (De cer. 657.4–660.12, 664.4–678.10) record the quotas assigned to arms factories in both Constantinople and the provinces; for example, in 911 the strategoi of Thessalonike was ordered to supply 200,000 arrows, 3,000 spears, and “as many shields as possible,” and similar demands were sent to the krites of Hellas and the strategoi of Nikopolis and the Peloponnesos. On campaign the army took along various craftsmen: saniatōres, who made and repaired iron weapons; toxopoioi and sagittopoioi, who made bows and arrows (Taktika of Leo VI 4.50). (See also Fire-Arms.)


WEAVER (υφαντής). The production of textiles involved two major stages, spinning and weaving, in addition to cleaning, bleaching, dyeing, and/or fulling as necessary. Spinning was considered to be a primarily female occupation done at home (e.g., Mary of Egypt states that she usually carried a distaff with her [PG 87:3712B]). Both men and women worked as weavers: Timarion, for example, says that textiles and yarn produced by both men and women were brought to the fair in Thessalonike (Timarion 54.149–50). Like spinning, weaving was often a household operation (Achmet ben Sirin, Oneirocriticon 215.9 and 22), but in Byz. there were also professional weavers, dyers, and fullers.

An important source for the activity of women clothmakers is found in Psellus’ short treatise on the annual festival of Agathe in Constantinople. This was a celebration by women involved in various aspects of textile production (spinning, carding, weaving) who may have been organized into a guild. The treatise apparently describes wall paintings that depicted women carding and weaving (A. Laiou in Festschrift Stratos 1:111–22). Sometimes artisans combined weaving with other facets of textile production: tailors might first weave the cloth that they sewed into garments, and the serikarioi of the 10th-C. Book of the Eparch may have been involved in both dyeing fabric and tailoring it. In the regulations for the Studios monastery, however, tailors and weavers appear as separate artisans (Dobroklonskij, Feodor 1:412). The weavers are not listed as a separate guild in the Book of the Eparch. Some luxury textiles were woven in imperial factories.

The principal raw materials used in weaving were wool and flax (see Linen) as in antiquity; silk and later cotton also came to be used. Sometimes different kinds of fibers (e.g., wool and silk) were woven together.


WEDDING, the nuptial ceremony, was designated in Greek by gamos, the word also used for the state of marriage; the terms for the bride and bridegroom were respectively nympe and nymphi. The wedding ceremony was frequently preceded by a betrothal and the signing of a contract that regulated property relations in the marriage, but this was not mandatory. The wedding consisted of two parts—the ecclesiastical marriage rite and the subsequent celebratory feast. After ritual ablutions, the bride, clad in white and veiled, left the house of her parents for the church; she and the bridegroom had to express their consent to the marriage, whereupon they received an ecclesiastical blessing (E. Herman, OrChrP 4 [1938] 189–234), donned marriage crowns, and exchanged marriage rings.
From the church the procession, accompanied by music and special marriage songs (epithalamia), headed for the house of the groom; the bride was led by a special retinue of nymphagogoi, "leaders of the bride." The procession took place at night and was illuminated by torch-bearers. The poor people of Constantinople celebrated their weddings in a public hall, the Nymphasion, located in front of the Senate House (Cedr. 1:610.14–15).

In the house of the groom the bride removed her veil so that her in-laws could see her (in theory, for the first time). The couple soon retired to the nuptial chamber (pastas) where the bride was given the marriage belt.

The guests meanwhile were invited to a banquet and entertained by mimes, dancing girls, and spectacles. Church fathers (esp. John Chrysostom) tried to convince the faithful to moderate the games and drinking at weddings, but in vain. The clergy was, however, required to leave the feast before these games began (Balsamon in Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:357.10, commenting on canon 24 of the Council in Trullo). By dawn, the guests expected to see proof of the bride's virginity and of the consummation of the marriage.

Aristocratic weddings were magnificent (and sometimes lengthy) occasions: that of Digenes Akritas reportedly lasted three months (Grottaferrata version IV 931, ed. E. Trapp, p.224). Imperial weddings often took the form of a public celebration, with tables placed in open areas, as Eustathios of Thessalonike depicts the reception in honor of Alexios II and Agnes of France. In such cases special games might be arranged.

Descriptions of the “spiritual weddings” of female martyrs (e.g., Martha and Febronia) and nuns to Christ use the vocabulary of earthly weddings: washing, anointing, and clothing of the bride, the dowry, rings and crowns, the wedding feast and bridal chamber (Brock-Harvey, Women 70f, 165).


—J.H., A.K.

**WEIGHT BOX**, a low rectangular container (approximately 20 cm long) for flat weights and balance scales. Many specimens of 5th–7th-C. manufacture—some with their contents intact—have survived in Egypt, and a fragment of another was discovered in the early 7th-C. Yassi Ada shipwreck. Made of wood, they are usually fitted with a sliding lid secured with a lock. Inside is a removable deck with a variety of geometric sinkings to accommodate the various sizes and shapes of flat weights, as well as the pans and balance arm of the scale. More elaborate specimens may bear copper or ivory panels with floral or geometric motifs, or, in rare cases, figures. The cover most often shows a low-relief cross beneath an arch, much like those common on contemporary flat weights. Similarly, the most frequently encountered inscription, "Grace of God," commonly appears also on flat weights. The Christian meaning is clear from 1 Corinthians 15:10 ("By the grace of God I am what I am . . ."): honest weighing and its resultant prosperity are gifts from God.


—G.V.

**WEIGHTS** are known in two main types: bust or statuette weights for gross weighing with stealyards, and flat weights for fine weighing with balance scales. The former, introduced by the Romans, survive in large numbers from the 5th to 7th C. Cast in bronze with a lead core, they take two forms: those depicting an empress or, less frequently, an emperor, and those representing Athena-Minerva. The "imperial" imagery likely connoted the accuracy of the measure. Typical specimens weighed approximately four Roman pounds (litra).

Flat weights, esp. common from the 4th to 7th C., were used for more precise transactions involving coins and other valuable materials. Most are flat and square, though some take the form of a flattened sphere; all are solid bronze. Moreover, all bear a weight designation: exagia, used for coins, are calibrated in nomismata, whereas pondera, generally larger and used for commodities, are calibrated in onugiai or litrae. Some bear texts, symbols, or images, which may be inlaid in silver, copper, or brass. Names of officials appear, as do pious phrases, references to justice, and invocations. The cross is esp. common on 5th–7th-C. specimens, whereas earlier examples (4th–5th C.) may bear paired images of emperors. Commonly called imperial weights, the latter often also depict a Tyche, a reference to hunting, or an evocation of prosperity (e.g., via a full modios).
The implication is that prosperity, as facilitated through just weights, was a byproduct of harmonious co-rulership, that rulership drew its legitimacy from the polis, and that it depended on the power of the state, as evoked by the hunt. Made in sets, flat weights were stored in weight boxes. (See also Glass Weights.)

LIT. Vikan-Nesbitt, Security 29–37. —G.V.

WHEAT. See Grain.

WIBALD OF STAVELOT, Benedictine monk and statesman; born 1098, died 19 July 1158. Of modest origins, Wibald, who was Lotharingian, studied at Liège and was a monk at Waulsort by 1117, but moved to Stavelot, where he became abbot (16 Nov. 1130). He rose to a position of influence at Conrad III’s court, where he was regent during the Second Crusade and was made briefly abbot of Montecassino (1137) and, from 1146, abbot of Corvey. In 1155 and 1157 Wibald traveled to Constantinople as Frederick I’s ambassador to Manuel I; he died returning from the second embassy. Much of Wibald’s correspondence survives in his original register covering 1146/7–Sept. 1157, which includes letters addressed to Wibald. It is an essential source on diplomacy and marital alliances between Constantinople and the German emperors (Lamma, Comneni 1:93–115, 243–50). It documents German, Norman, and Byz. policies in southern Italy and contains letters from Conrad to Manuel (eps. 218, 237, 244, 246) and Manuel’s wife Irene-Bertha of Sulzbach (eps. 243, 245), from Frederick I to Manuel (ep. 410), Wibald’s own letters to Manuel (eps. 341, 411, 432), and Manuel’s letters to him (eps. 325, 424—Reg 2, nos. 1382, 1392). The correspondence reveals Conrad’s warm relations with Manuel (e.g., ep. 78) and Bertha’s role in selecting a Byz. princess for Conrad’s son (ep. 243) as well as an exchange of embassies (eps. 279, 280, etc.) and rumors about Conrad’s alliance with Manuel against the Romana aeclasia (eps. 198, 252). Epistle 407 conveys the conditions of a truce of 1153 between Frederick and Pope Eugenius III, according to which “the king of the Greeks” should not receive any land “on this side of the sea” (in Italy).

ED. P. Jaffe, Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum 1 (Berlin 1864; rp. Aalen 1964) 76–616.


—M.McC.

WIDOWS (χϊρας) were traditionally equated with the poor and powerless, who, like orphans and strangers, needed protection; care of widows was prescribed as a Christian duty. Widows received charitable distributions, esp. during Holy Week, and might find refuge in chorotrophenia, homes for widows created by the state or church, such as those built by Eleusios, bishop of Kyzikos, side-by-side with homes for virgins (Sozom., HE 5.15.5); later, nunneries replaced them as a refuge (A. M. Talbot, ByzF 9 [1985] 113–15).

An ecclesiastical order of widows was instituted in the early church, allegedly by St. Peter, and probably functioned until the 5th C. Its members had to be 60 years old and married only once. They were selected by the bishop and assigned a special place in the church during services. The order was considered distinct from laity and clergy (including deaconesses), since its members did not receive ordination. They performed various social services later undertaken by confraternities.

Widows could be economically independent and have substantial rights to property. Wealthy widows had significant power, DANELIS being an important example. In 1010 the widow Kalida sold her choraphion in order to ransom her son from the Arabs (Ivir., no. 16). Laiou (Peasant Society 89–94) has calculated that in 14th-C. praktika 17 to 22 percent of the households were registered as headed by widows, even if they had adult sons. Some aristocratic widows (Anna Komnenene, the sebastokratirissa Irene Komnenene, etc.) exercised enormous influence upon political and cultural life, and dowager empresses could act as regents or rulers. In nunneries, some widows became abbesses and a few, like Theodora of Thessalonike, attained sanctity. The second marriage of widows was legally permitted and recommended by husbands such as Digenes Akritas, who presumed that widowhood would be unbearable (Grottaferrata version VIII, 350s, ed. E. Trapp, 362). Remarriage was condemned, however, by rigorists such as Kekaumenos (A. Kazhdan, Byzantium 43 [1973] 509), while Neilos of Rossano urged the men of the town to maintain a nunnery
so that their widows could avoid remarriage (PG 120:85CD).


WILLIAM I, king of Sicily (1154–66); born 1120, died Palermo 7 May 1166. Son of Roger II, William (Γαλενος) and his chief minister, Maio(ne) of Bari, alienated the Norman barons. When Manuel I failed to gain the support of Frederick I of Germany against Sicily, he allied himself with the discontented barons. In 1155 Manuel sent a few ships, a small force, and gold to hire mercenaries. They captured coastal towns and fortresses in Apulia from the Monte Gargano peninsula to Taranto. Friction was frequent between the barons and the Byz. During the siege of the citadel of Brindisi (Apr.–May 1156), many Normans and mercenaries deserted upon learning that William was approaching with a large army. The Byz. were defeated and their leaders, Alexios Komnenos and John Doukas, captured. In 1157 Manuel sent Alexios Axouch to Ancona, whence he encouraged the remaining Norman rebels. Meantime, peace negotiations, fostered by Pope Adrian IV (1154–59), culminated in 1158: Manuel recognized William as king of Sicily, and William returned the noble prisoners taken since 1147, but not the weavers whom Roger II had carried off from Thebes and Corinth. Thereafter, good relations with Byz. lasted into the reign of William's successor, William II.

Lit. Bon, Morée franque 54–64. Longnon, Compagons 210–12.

WILLIAM II, king of Sicily (1166–89); son of William I; born 1154, died Palermo 18 Nov. 1189. Plans for him to wed Maria Komnene proved vain. During the reign of Andronikos I, Byz. refugees in Sicily included Alexios Komnenos the Pinkernes, who speciously claimed the throne, and a youth who pretended to be Alexios II. Nomina in their support, but really to establish himself in Constantinople, William attacked the empire in 1185. From Dyrrchion, the army and fleet hurried to Thessalonike. After the city fell (24 Aug. 1185), it was savagely sacked. Alexios Branas defeated the Norman army on 7 Nov. 1185 and Thessalonike was recaptured. In 1186 Isaac II pushed the Normans from Dyrrchion, but Kephalenia, Zakynthos, and Ithaka were lost forever. A treaty, ca.1188, provided for an exchange of prisoners. William's most important artistic enterprise was the cathedral of Monreale.


WILLIAM I OF CHAMPLITTE, prince of Achaia (1205–1208 or 1209); died Apulia 1208/9. A younger son and minor lord in the county of Burgundy, William joined the Fourth Crusade and participated in the attacks on Constantinople. After mid-1204, he served Boniface of Montferrat and joined the latter's expedition into Greece. In 1205, during the siege of Nauplia, the future Geoffrey I Villehardouin invited William to help conquer the Morea. With Boniface's consent, William and Geoffrey advanced to Patras, then to Methone, Korone, and Messenia. A battle at Kountoura (northeast Messenia) in late summer 1205 overcame the only serious resistance. On 19 Nov. 1205 Pope Innocent III referred to William as "princeps totius Achaia provincie." William organized his territories as a feudal state. Around 1208, he learned of the death of his brother in France; he set out to secure his inheritance, but died en route.


WILLIAM II VILLEHARDOUIN, prince of Achaia (1246–78); born Kalamata ca.1211/12, died Kalamata 1 May 1278. Son of Geoffrey I Villehardouin, William was born and raised in the Morea and knew Greek as well as French. He inherited the title to the principality of Achaia after the death of his brother, Geoffrey II. William, one of the chief heroes of the Chronicle of the Morea, was a vigorous ruler who expanded the principality to its greatest extent. He conquered the southeast Morea, including Nemvasia (1248), and built castles at Mistra and Maina. In 1258, William became an ally of Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epiros, and married his daughter Anna. At the battle of Pela- gonia William suffered a crushing defeat and was
captured by Nicene forces. To secure his release (1261), William had to relinquish three key fortresses, Monemvasia, Maina, and Mistra. He became a vassal of Michael VIII Palaiologos and received the title of megas domestikos.

After his return to the Morea, William continued to lead Latin opposition to the Byz. In 1267 he entered an alliance with Charles I of Anjou (Treaty of Viterbo) and became his vassal; this alliance, however, served the ambitions of Charles more than those of William. When William died without male issue, Charles inherited the title of prince of Achaia.


WILLIAM OF APUlia, historian of the reign of Robert Guiscard; fl. late 11th C. Probably a Norman in southern Italy, William wrote ca.1095–99 the Gesta Roberti Wiscardi, a Latin historical epic dedicated to Pope Urban II and Roger Borsa, Bohemund’s half-brother. Despite the epic form and the literary conventions thus imposed, William offers a detailed and generally accurate account of events to the death of Guiscard (1085) from a Norman perspective. Books 1–3 use local sources—they are particularly well informed on events in Apulia and aware of events in Constantinople and their implications for Italy—to describe the Norman conquest of Byz. southern Italy and Arab Sicily from ca.1017 onward; they supply valuable information on Byz. leaders like George Manakes and Argyros, son of Melo. Books 4–5 narrate in detail Guiscard’s war on the Greek mainland against Alexios I and form an essential corrective complement to Anna Komnene’s version in the Alexiad.

Ed. La geste de Robert Guiscard, ed. M. Mathieu (Palermo 1961), with Fr. tr.


WILLIAM OF MOERBEKE, Flemish Dominican and Latin translator of Greek; born between ca.1220 and 1235, died Italy? before 26 Oct. 1286. William made some of his translations in Byz.: he was at Nicaea on 24 Apr. 1260 when he finished translating Alexander of Aphrodisias and at Thebes on 23 Dec. 1260 when he completed Aristotle’s On the Parts of Animals. From Nov. 1267 to Dec. 1277 he was in Italy: by 1272, he became papal chaplain, and he worked for union with the Byz. church at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274. In Apr. 1278 he was made Latin archbishop of Corinth, where he completed three translations of Proklos (Feb. 1280). By Jan. 1284, however, he had returned to Italy (A. Paravicini Bagliani, Afp 52 1982 135–43). It is possible that his remarkable collection of Greek MSS, presumably acquired in Byz., entered the papal library (A. Paravicini Bagliani, ItMedUm 26 1983 27–69, and Jones, “Papal Manuscripts”). William translated or revised earlier translations of several dozen works, including Aristotle and his commentators, Archimedes, Hero, and Galen. William’s literal method of translation means that his Latin versions of many works whose Greek texts survive only partially or not at all illuminate their transmission in Byz.


WILLIAM OF TYRE, statesman and historian of the Crusader states; born Jerusalem ca.1130, died 29 Sept. 1186. William studied in France and at Bologna (1146–65) and then returned home in 1165 to become canon of Acre (Akko), where he may have known Theodora, widow of Baldwin III and Andronikos I Komnenos (Chron. 20,2). Subsequently he became archdeacon of Tyre (1167) and Nazareth (ca.1173 or 1174), tutor of future king Baldwin IV, chancellor of the kingdom of Jerusalem (1174), and archbishop of Tyre (1175), but failed to attain the patriarchate of Jerusalem in 1180 (cf. R. Hiestand, DA 34 1978 345–80). He negotiated the joint invasion of Egypt (Chron. 20,4) as King Amalric’s envoy to Manuel I (1168) and later spent seven months (1179–80) with Manuel in Constantinople (22,4). Whether he knew Greek is unclear (Huygens, infra 2).

William’s Chronicon, in Latin, is the key source for Byz. relations with the Crusader states and a masterpiece of medieval historical writing. The first 13 books draw on Canon Albert of Aachen, Raymond of Aguilers, Gesta Francorum (indirectly?), Fulcher of Chartres, and his own lost
Gesta orientalium principum (Deeds of the Eastern Rulers), which used the Annals of Eutychios of Alexandria as well as Oriental sources (H. Möhring, Mittelalterisches Jahrbuch 19 [1984] 170–83). It is uncertain whether the abrupt ending should be explained as an accident of transmission or William’s failure to continue. William understands and likes Byz. (R.H.C. Davis in Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages, ed. D. Baker [Edinburgh 1973] 64–76); he regularly prefixes a respectful dominus to the title of the emperor, whom he reckoned “far richer” than any other Christian prince (20,22).

Even when William rewrites earlier Latin sources, his own experience and insight into Byz. society work subtle changes in formulation. As an independent witness, William reports, for example, John II’s campaign against Antioch (14,24–30), the Byz. fleet’s role in the invasion of Egypt (20,13–17), the battle of Myriokephalon (21,11), the troubles at Constantinople after Manuel I’s death (22,5 and 11–14), and Amalric’s trip to Constantinople, including a description of Boukoleon and the carefully calibrated ceremonial (20,22–24). An Old French translation is associated with several continuations on events after 1184 (ESTOIRE d’ERACLES); a Latin continuation comes from England (ed. M. Salloch, Die lateinische Fortsetzung Wilhelms von Tyrus [Leipzig 1934]).


—M.McC.

WILLIBALD. See HU Geburc.

WILLS (sing. διάθηκη, also diataxis, diatyposis), documents by which the property of the deceased was transferred to the HEIRS; in addition to matters of succession, wills could include clauses concerning the MANUSSION of slaves, FIDEICOMMISSA, and settlements of DEBTS. Justinianic law required that the will be signed and sealed by seven witnesses; the procedure was simplified by Leo VI in novel 42. The right of opening (ανοίξις) the will was specifically granted by Justinian I to the quaeستor, whereas Leo VI in novel 44 ex-
tended this function to various judges in the capital and in the provinces.

Both men and women could make wills. Justinian I, in novel 5.5. of 535, prohibited monks (with certain exceptions) from making wills; Leo VI, in novel 5, did allow monks to dispose of their property, and several preserved wills (esp. of the 13th–14th C.) illustrate this privilege (A. Steinwenter, Aegyptus 1 [1932] 55–64). Monastic wills are hardly distinguishable from typika and contain not only dispositions of property but spiritual indoctrination, autobiographical information, and in some cases the appointment of the successor to the heγουμενος.

Well known are the wills of Eustathios Boilas, Symbatiōs Pakourianos, Kale-Maria Pakouriane, and the ex-archbishop of Thessalonike Theodore Kerameas of 1284 (Lavra, 2, no.75). These wills, among others, contain data on economic, social, and legal relations; since they sometimes include inventories of sacred vessels, books, and other sacred objects they are a precious source for cultural history as well.


—A.K.

WINDOW (παραθύριον). Windows of two types became major elements in the design of Roman public buildings: (1) bands of uniform round-headed windows in clerestories of columnar basilicas; and (2) triple windows, with the central opening higher than the flanking ones. These occur in imperial baths and hence are called “thermal” windows. In Constantine I’s Audience Hall at Trier, a double tier of round-headed windows perforated walls and apse; in the basilica of Maxentius and Constantin at Rome, triple windows under the great arches admitted a flood of light from all quarters. Christian columnar basilicas continued the Roman system, lighting the nave and apse more brightly than the side aisles; domical churches of centralized type (Hagia Sophia, Constantinople) or of longitudinal basilical type (St. John, Ephesus; Holy Apostles, Constantinople) continued to use the Roman “thermal” window.

Windows were substantially reduced both in
number and size in the smaller centralized churches of the 9th–15th C. The progressively elongated drums of these churches were lit with tall narrow openings, framed in mosaic in Constantinople, Greece, and the Balkans and deeply splayed on the interior in the stone walls of Armenian and Georgian churches. In the Madrid MS of John Skylitzes most windows are depicted as round-headed; one, at which the decapitated head of Nikephorus II Phokas is exhibited, is rectangular with an open shutter, and other palace windows are of the same form.

Glazing large windows was achieved by using wood, stone, or stucco frames to hold comparatively small pieces of glass in a geometric pattern. From the 12th C. important fragments of stained glass (see Glass, STAINED) held in lead frames have been found at the church of the Pantokrator Monastery, Constantinople.

Windows in private houses are known primarily from written sources, which distinguish between large "loggias" (PARAKYPHTA), which were probably covered with curtains, and small photagogoi glazed with pieces of glass or mica. Byz. houses had little natural light; as a result a number of laws protected houses from the construction of neighboring edifices that might cut off the sunlight.


WINE (觐oΣ; in later texts also κρασί(ο)ν, a word that appears already in the Acts of the apostle Thomas and in John Moschos but with the meaning “cup,” “draught of any liquid”). Wine was a very important beverage in Byz., second only to water. Although it was produced mostly from grapes (see Wine PRODUCTION), it could also be made from the juice of dates and other fruits. The attempts of some heretical groups to prohibit wine drinking were rejected by the church fathers (e.g., Basil the Great, ep.199.47.10 [ed. Y. Court- tonne, 2:163]). Bread and wine were staples of the diet (e.g., Eust. Thess., Captura 110.25–27). Monastic typika prescribe bread and wine for supper and include wine in the morning meal as well; some typika allocate two mugs (krosobo(u)lia) of wine for each monk daily (A. Kazhdan, Voprosy istorii [1970] 217). Abstinence from wine was imposed as a penance and on some fast days. Wine was also employed as medicine, for cooking, and for industrial purposes: thus, to make a substitute for armor, linen fabric was soaked in wine with salt, acquiring a relative hardness (Nik.Chon. 386.3–6).

Varieties of wine were distinguished by their color (white, yellow, red, or black), viscosity (thick or thin), and taste (harsh or sweet). Some types of wine were clarified with pitch or gypsum and had a peculiar flavor that Liutprand found repugnant. The most renowned wines were produced in the vineyards of the Aegean islands (Thasos, Chios, Crete) and in Monemvasia (the so-called malvasia); those of Thrace and Asia Mi- nor were less famous.

During the Eucharist deacons offered all the congregation a cup of wine diluted with water along with the bread; the wine was believed to be transubstantiated into the blood of Christ. Wine was an instrument of salvation and a symbol of true knowledge and Christ’s teaching.


WINE MERCHANT. In Rome the distribution of wine was divided between two professions: vinarii (Gr. oinoiopolai), wholesale providers of wine for Rome, who in the 3rd C. or later were formed into a guild; caupones (Gr. kapeloi), retailers, owners of taverns. The Basilika (53.7.1–19) regulated the trade of oinemperoroi, wholesale merchants who sold large quantities of wine, pithoi, or hundreds of vessels at once. The 10th-C. Book of the Eparch, on the other hand, mentions only kapeloi who sold wine in their ergasteria and used smaller measures: stathmoi (30 litrai), angeia (known also from 6th- and 7th-C. papyri—L. Casson TAPA 70 [1939] 5), and minai of 3 litrai; their measures had to be certified by an official seal. The vita of Basil the Younger describes the ergasterion of a small wine merchant (katharopolis): it had a storage room (apotake), where pithoi and angeia were kept; the owner used credit extensively in his business and was heavily in debt (ed. Vilinskij, 1:313f). The Council in Trullo (canon 9) prohibited the clergy from possessing kapelika ergasteria; however, according to both Zonaras and Balsamon, the clergy were prohibited only from running a tavern, not from owning one and renting it out.
Documents of the 14th–15th C. mention kapeliatikon, a tax levied on kapelo: the privilege given to Monemvasia in 1328 lists it together with several other taxes imposed on artisans—ergasteriaticon, metaxatiikon, etc. (P. Schreiner, JÖB 27 [1978] 221-34). Manuel II in 1408 allowed the monks of Mt. Athos to sell their wine without kapeliatikon, provided that they did not interfere with each other’s trade (V. Moșin, Akta iz svetogorskih arhiva [Belgrade 1939] 1–14). The kapeliatikon could be granted to a landowner: thus, the Lavra had rights to kapeliatikon in the village of Bernarous on the Strymon (Koutloum., no.38,5–6).


WINE PRODUCTION. Since wine was the staple beverage of the Byz., wine grapes were grown widely throughout the empire. After harvesting the grape clusters, cultivators placed them in baskets (as illustrated in mosaics depicting the seasons) or on staves (in Octateugh illustrations) and transported them from the vineyard to the wine vat (lenos). Before the grapes were pressed the vat was fumigated with incense; leaves and rotting clusters of grapes, which could turn the ensuing must bitter, were removed from the baskets. The grapes were then dumped into the wine vat. After first washing their feet, men climbed into the vat and extracted the juice by treading on the grapes. They next removed the seeds from the treading floor, allowing the must to pass into a channel along which the juice flowed before emptying into the kypolenion, a receptacle placed below the vat. After the juice was crushed from the grapes, the must was placed in casks (barelia), where it fermented.

Late Roman vats have been widely discovered, from Palestine (e.g., G.W. Ahlström, BASOR 231 [1978] 19–49; I. Roll, E. Ayalon, PEQ 113 [1981] 111–25) to Bulgaria (D. Cončev in Acta antiqua Philippopolitana: Studia archaeologica [Sofia 1963] 125–31). There were two different kinds, stationary and portable. Vats are listed in several praktika of the Palaiologan period (Dionys., no.25 of 1430; Docheiar. no.60, early 15th C.), sometimes together with pitharia, large vessels to contain wine; they were owned by individual peasants (although not found in every household) and situated in the courtyard.


—J.W.N., A.K.

WINE TRADE. Wine was an important item of trade in Byz., perhaps because many wine-producing areas are islands or coastlands and, therefore, the transportation of wine was cheaper and easier than that of grain. Evidence from a 7th-C. shipwreck shows that wine was transported in amphorae at that time (F. van Doorninck in A History of Seafaring Based on Underwater Archaeology, ed. G.F. Bass [London 1972] 140); in the later period, casks were used. According to Ptoch-prodromos (3:48–71), wine reached Constantinople from Chios, Lesbos, Crete, Varna, and other areas; Chiot wine was considered particularly good. In the 14th C. Pegolotti mentions in Consantinople and Tana the wines of Cyprus, Crete, Trieglea (Trilya), Greece, Monemvasia, and Thebes. The export of wines to foreigners was forbidden (Basil. 19.1.85[86]), and a special duty was levied on internal trade in the 12th C. In the 12th C. wine was, in fact, exported to the West.

Monasteries appear particularly active in the wine trade. The monks of Mt. Athos moved from exchanging wine for other commodities (Prot., no.7.99–100) to trading in it between 972 and 1045 (Prot., no. 8.54–55, 66–67). Both Mt. Athos and Patmos engaged in relatively large-scale sales of wine in Constantinople in the 12th C. Other sources of the period mention the wine trade specifically as an economic activity of monks (Bal-samon, in Rhalles-Potles, Syntagma 2:151–54; Eust. Thess., Opuscula 242:30–31). The exemptions from customs duties that some monasteries obtained undoubtedly facilitated this. The monasteries were also important consumers of wine.

Private individuals participated in the wine trade, although usually without the privileges that monasteries had. In the 14th–15th C. wine merchants had to compete with Western, particularly Venetian, merchants. John VI Kantakouzenos and the Palaiologan emperors, esp. John V and Man-
uel II, tried, with only limited success, to protect the trade in Byz. wine, whose price was being depressed below production costs by the importation of Italian wine by the Venetians.


WISDOM. See Sophia.

WITCH. See Enagastrimythos.

WITNESS (μάρτυς) to a document, as opposed to a witness in litigation, was someone who, at the request of an individual (in the case of a will) or several interested parties (in the case of a sale contract), indicated his signature on the document his presence at a legal or other transaction (e.g., a boundary survey; cf. also L. Burgmann, FM 4 [1981] 20.49–54). For some legal transactions a specific number of witnesses was prescribed by law—five for receipts of debt, seven for a will—but numerous exceptions existed, and in practice as many witnesses were cited as possible, to ensure that witnesses would be alive and available years later in event of a dispute. The witness, who could not be a minor, had to be trustworthy. Credibility, in this case, was judged according to the reputation of the witness. Women were theoretically excluded from acting as witnesses to documents but several cases are known (e.g., Xénoph. no.8.61 [a.1309], or MM 4:93.10).

Witnesses’ Signatures. The study of the signatures of witnesses provides data concerning the social status of the population in specific areas, their ethnic composition, and degree of literacy; for example, some witnesses use the sign of the cross instead of a signature or make mistakes in spelling.


WITNESS IN LITIGATION, a person who appeared in civil and criminal proceedings and testified to the truth or falsity of the facts of the case; the testimony was later confirmed by oath. Witnesses in litigations, who could be women, appeared either voluntarily or compulsorily (by court summons). Their testimony was accepted only if more than one witness was available ( unus testis, nullus testis). Certain persons of standing (e.g., bishops) and the handicapped (the old, the infirm, minors) were exempted from the obligation to testify. Absent persons could be interrogated by an authorized judge at their place of residence. Slaves, heretics, antisocial and disreputable individuals, and other such types were not allowed to appear as witnesses in litigation. The testimony of a witness could be weakened by the introduction of counter witnesses and attacks on the credibility and usefulness of the deposition. Torture could be used to coerce witnesses (esp. those of humble origins) into testifying (Ecloga 14.1), and trial by ordeal might be used to help establish the truth in the absence of available witnesses.


WOMEN. Byz. attitudes toward women were ambivalent. On the one hand, the church fathers, following Old Testament tradition, assumed female inferiority and essential weakness, and perceived women to be the instrument of the devil: Eve dis obeyed God’s first command and was responsible for the Fall of Man. Accordingly, the position of women in the world had to be inferior to that of man, and in the church women were barred from teaching and priestly functions. Byz. churchmen employed a classical misogynist vocabulary with Christian additions, such as gynaikodoulos, a man enslaved to women; gynaikotrophes, a man reared by women and therefore effeminate (John Chrysostom, PG 61:278.54); and gynaiazo, being addicted to women (Theodore of Stoudios, PG 99:1368A). Even sins acquired female personifications, as in Neophytos the Enkleistos (Galatariotou, infra 57–77). Patristic commentary, which emphasized the polarity between good women and bad, remained extremely influential through such collections as the Sacra Parallela. The pre-Christian association of women with supernatural powers became a satanic one in Byz. Lazaros of Galesios claimed that the devil used women, sometimes disguised as nuns, in attacks on the chastity of monks. Satanic powers were attributed to Amaranita, a sorceress tried in 1350 (RegPatr, fasc. 5, nos. 2318, 2334), and to other women accused of witchcraft and soothsaying.

On the other hand, the church proclaimed woman’s spiritual equality with man, through her
being created in God’s image and redeemed in the same way as man. Women were equal to men in martyrdom, a few good wives and mothers attained sanctity, and the cult of the Virgin Mary was extremely popular.

In theory, the major function of women was MARRIAGE and the procreation of children, in contradiction to the extremist idea that VIRGINITY is one of the main virtues. Motherhood (divinized in the cult of the Theotokos), one of the few acceptable Christian roles for women, was glorified in panegyrics, for example, those by Theodore of Studios and Michael Psellos. INFERTILITY as well as the death of young children were considered curses against which women took all possible measures. Prayers for conception, esp. of a son, and for a safe pregnancy and delivery (see BIRTH) were accompanied by the use of relics, AMULETS, and incantations.

In general women led secluded lives at home and were supposed to be veiled when they went out. Some women, of course, worked outside the house, and there were other legitimate reasons for women to leave the house: attendance at church services; visits to bath, shrines, or parents; and participation in celebrations to mark civic or imperial events. Kekaumenos urged women to avoid eye contact with unrelated men (Kek. 202f). Nurses undertook the crucial role of chaperoning girls and protecting their virginity and were ridiculed by epigrammatists such as Paul Silentiarios and Agathias (AnthGr, bk.5, nos. 262, 289, 294). Sexual misbehavior of young women was punished: any girl who lost her virginity after a BETROTHAL by sleeping with a man other than her fiancé could be repudiated by her bridegroom (Leo VI, nov.93). Byz. society was more tolerant of male ADULTERY and the related practices of CONCUBINAGE and PROSTITUTION, than of female infidelity; however, some church fathers, for instance, Gregory of Nazianzos, treated male and female adulterers equally (P. Phan, Social Thought [Wilmington, Del., 1984] 158f).

In addition to childbearing, the second female obligation was the maintenance of the household: in the 10th C. MARY THE YOUNGER, an ideal wife and mother, came to be venerated as a saint, thus demonstrating that sanctity was not limited to consecrated virgins, and Kekaumenos stated that a good wife is a precious gift. Despite their theoretical subjugation to their husbands, women had important rights and enjoyed respect: a woman possessed her dowry and could alienate inherited property; in cases of INTESTATE SUCCESSION daughters inherited equal shares with their brothers; widows had authority over their sons; and a poem of Ptochoprodromos shows a married woman exercising full power over her henpecked husband. Despite novel 48 of Leo VI, which prohibited a woman from being a WITNESS to business transactions, the Peitra and later judicial acts reveal female appearances in court to testify and to plead successfully for DIVORCES, resolution of property disputes, and control over dowries. Some rich women managed large households; others might be entrusted with pronoiai, evidently after their husbands’ demise.

The primary feminine economic activities were those of “distaff and loom,” that is spinning, weaving, and making cloth. The treatise of Psellos on the festival of Agathe suggests that this work was not limited to the household, but that some women were professional spinners, WEAVERS, and wool carders, whereas wool dyeing was a male occupation (A. Laiou in Festschrift Stratos 1:112). Women were deeply involved in retail trade, esp. selling foodstuffs. In the 14th C. Ibn Battûta noted that most of the artisans and sellers in the markets of Constantinople were women (Travels in Asia and Africa, tr. H.A.R. Gibbs [London 1929] 160). Female bakers, cooks, innkeepers, and bathkeepers are attested, as well as washerwomen, gynecologists, midwives, dancers, prostitutes (the last two professions were closely linked by Byz. moralists), matchmakers, and sorcerers. Some women assisted in the charitable work of diakoniai (washing the sick and laying out the dead), while those with semiprofessional skills, such as mourners and wet nurses, were always in demand. Women probably engaged in minor agricultural activities (such as cultivating gardens, feeding hens), but their participation in grain harvesting seemed to Apokaukos a strange occupation. They also assisted with grape picking when there were not enough male workers.

A few women from imperial and aristocratic families played a significant role in the social, political, cultural, and religious life of the empire. Some EMPERORS ruled independently or as regents of their minor sons; some acted through their husbands. NUNS and abbesses of nunneries not only influenced religious activity, but occa-
sionally interfered in court politics. Noble ladies held high positions at court (e.g., Zoste Patrika), founded monasteries, organized literary circles, and served as patrons of the arts. The role of women increased during periods of crisis: they were active in religious conflicts (e.g., in the resistance to Iconoclasm) and in political rebellions (e.g., in support of Empress Zoe or in the overthrow of Andronikos I); in certain cases they participated in the defense of besieged cities.

Although elementary education was available for girls, female literacy was not very common. There are numerous references to mothers teaching their children the Psalms and Bible stories, but they may have known these by heart, so this is not necessarily an indication of an ability to read. After the late Roman period that produced such intellectuals as Hypatia of Alexandria and Athenais-Eudokia, a female writer was an exceptional figure (Kassia). The learned princess Anna Komnene, who penned a biography of her father Alexios I, is the sole woman historian of the Byz. era. In the Palaiologan period Theodora Raoulaina and Irene Choumaina were active bibliophiles. The figures calculated by Laiou (infra 255), on the basis of a very small sample, show a low rate of female literacy in the Palaiologan period (1.8 percent in the 13th C., 16 percent in the 14th C.).

The scarcity of evidence makes it difficult to ascertain changes in the position of women, esp. since the data refer primarily to the upper stratum of Byz. society. In the late Roman period, women evidently preserved relative freedom: they were active in intellectual circles, and appeared as equals in politics—women such as Pulcheria, Theodora (the wife of Justinian I), and Martina left a considerable mark on the history of the 5th to 7th C. Hagiographical legends promoted the image of exceptional women—former prostitutes who achieved extreme piety, or women in disguise emulating male hermits (Patlagean, Structure, pt.XI [1976], 597–623). After the mid-7th C. the empire was preoccupied by the response to military threats in which women necessarily had little or no role. Even the role of the Virgin Mary was questioned by the Iconoclasts. Invocations to her on seals were apparently replaced by those of Christ from the mid-6th C. onward (A. Kazhdan, BZ 76 [1983] 384), and then by those of some male saints. Empress Irene, who managed to quell the resistance of her son Constantine VI, is an unparalleled figure of her time, and most women featured by chroniclers are pious and loyal wives (and occasionally mistresses). Psellus presents the empress Zoe primarily in the role of a lover or spouse, and as a woman making perfume in the seclusion of the women’s quarters of the palace; he argues that she and her sister Theodora were unfit to guide the fortunes of the empire.

The situation changed by the end of the 11th C.: the bellicose Komnenoi acknowledged the important role of their women, from Anna Dalassene (who wielded imperial power on occasion during the rule of her son), Anna Komnene, and the sebastokratissa Irene Komnene, to Euphrosyne Doukaina Kamatera. Literature also reflects a certain liberation of women from the 12th C. onward: the exaltation of femininity and love finds its culmination in the romance of Kallimachos and Chrysorrho. Laiou, however, hypothesizes that the beginning of the 15th C. brought an end to some of these features of increased feminine activity.

**Representation in Art.** In contrast to the emphasis on individual identity in imperial Roman art and the marked sensuality of females in Coptic sculpture, Byz. women were generally represented as homogeneous, sexless creatures. As late as the 6th C. even sacred figures have bodies which, esp. when pregnant (as in images of the Visitations), have some semblance of natural shape. From the 7th to 11th C., however—with the exception of dissolute women, and dancers on such objects as crowns—women’s bodies are either masked entirely by their clothing or are parodies of human form (e.g., martyrs in the Menologion of Basil II, p.390). Thereafter all attempts to depict women as such disappear: in the illustrated homilies of James of Kokkinobaphos (Hutter, infra, fig.11) one of the Virgin’s midwives displays a breast on her back. Like males, female nudes are utterly distorted. Hutter perceives a return to characteristically feminine figures and faces in and after those at Nerezi but, if achieved, this was never as part of a holistic attitude toward the human body. The reedlike proportions of women in much 14th-C. painting are also applied to male figures.

WOMEN AT THE TOMB. See Myrrphoros.

WONDROUS MOUNTAIN (Θαυμαστὸν Ὀρος, now Saman Daği in Turkey), the site of a pilgrimage complex built primarily between 541 and 591 around the column of Symeon the Stylite the Younger during his lifetime. Situated southwest of Antioch, the Wondrous Mountain stands prominently above the north bank of the Orontes River a short distance before it flows into the Mediterranean; the port of Seleukeia Pieria lies to the west. The vita of Symeon and that of his mother record assemblies of pilgrims at the column and their construction of the complex in spontaneous gestures of thanksgiving for healings and spiritual favors secured by the stylite. In this manner, inns, a main church, and service buildings were constructed in 541–51 by pilgrims, as well as by masons from Isauria. Between 551 and Symeon’s death in 591 a forge and a burial church were erected as, probably, were the monastic quarters. The baptistry and circuit walls were apparently built after 591. Many of these structures still stand, including the rock-cut base of the column with staircase and its surrounding octagonal court; also preserved are the figured capitals in the main church said to have been carved by Symeon’s disciple John. The monastery in the complex was refounded in the 10th C. by a bilingual community of Greek and Georgian monks, as attested by contemporaneous Georgian manuscript colophons.

Physical remains of this later period include medieval alterations to tessellated pavements, al-
ally visible from below; aisles had roofs pitched on single beams. Dendrochronological investigation has revealed oak tie-beams at the Church of St. Irene in Constantinople, in the Justinianic phase of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, and again in 14th-C. restorations there. Juniper and chestnut were used elsewhere.

Wood was common in centering, scaffolding, and zones that withstood vault thrusts. A number of carved wood lintels with Copitic inscriptions have been preserved from Egypt: the most famous is the lintel from the el-Moallaqa church in Old Cairo, dated to 735 (L. MacCoull, ZPapEpig 64 [1986] 230–34). Existing elements allow the restoration of wood floors in houses and palaces at Mistra (A. Orlandos, ABME 3 [1937] 80f) and in monastic buildings (refectory at Hosios Loukas). It was the normal material for doors and shutters. Town houses were frequently timber-frame structures with wooden floors and roofs; projecting features of the latter are depicted in the Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussacas, Skylitzès, figs. 203, 260).


WORKSHOP. See Ergasterion.

WREATH (στέφανος), ring formed from a garland woven of leaves, sometimes decorated with flowers and fruit. Often used as CROWNS, wreaths were presented to winners in the Hippodrome and to the emperor upon his triumphal ADVENTUS. In imperial art personifications such as the Nike offer wreaths to emperors or consuls; senators present wreaths to the emperor on the base of the Column of Arkadios in Constantinople (known from drawings); the emperor holds a wreath on the Obelisk of Theodosios I in the Hippodrome of Constantinople.

The wreath was common in Christian art where it signified immortality or triumph over death. Wreaths framed images of Christ, the LAMB OF GOD, the CROSS, and the CHRISTOGRAPHS. Martyrs were shown carrying or being crowned with wreaths. The seasonal fruits on the wreath framing the portrait of St. Victor in the dome of S. Vittore in Ciel d'Oro, Milan, reinforce its symbolism of eternity. With the same connotative wreaths were often represented on sarcophagi and in tombs. In the mosaics of the Orthodox Baptistery, Ravenna, each of the apostles offers a golden wreath to Christ, a depiction influenced by imperial ceremony. From the 4th to the 6th C. wreaths were also commonly used as ornament in architectural sculpture, FLOOR MOSAICS, and TEXTILES.

Lit. K. Baus, Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum (Bonn 1940).

WRITING DESK. In antiquity and the early Middle Ages scribes used to write while supporting the writing material, whether a wax tablet or a papyrus roll, on the knee. Only a few Late Antique illustrations show a scribe using a table or desk. On the other hand, a table or a desk—often a piece of furniture combining the two functions—forms part of the stereotyped repertoire used by Byz. miniaturists when portraying authors, esp. evangelists (see Evangelist Portraits). The lower part of this piece of furniture sometimes has the shape of a bookcase in which some rolls or codices are stored together with writing implements. In other instances writing implements (pens, ink pots, scissors, pumice-stone) lie on the table. Normally an open codex or a roll is on the desk. The evangelist mostly is shown while writing or preparing to write or holding another book on his lap as if collating. Αναλόγιον (older form ἀναλογεῖον) is the common word for the desk on which books are placed in churches or elsewhere; it is always mentioned in connection with reading, not with writing (cf., e.g., De cer. 760.14; pseudo-Kod. 189.15, 222.4).


WRITING TABLETS (πυξία, πυκακία) of ivory or more usually citrus wood, employed before the Byz. era, seem to have continued in use until at least the 14th C., when they are depicted in scenes of the education of St. Nicholas. Their form varied from single leaves or wooden panels folded to make diptychs to successions of such panels.
joined in “concertina” format by thongs (A.K. Bowman, *ZPapEpig* 18 [1975] 240–42). Such a polyptych may be represented in the hands of notaries on the diptych of Rufius Probianus, ca. 400 (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, no. 62). Records, both official and private (see Albertini Tablets), were written either in ink directly onto the surface or incised with styli on wax-filled recesses; the vita of Neilos of Rossano (AASS Sept. 7:273A) describes a gadget of wood and wax that he used.

A complete set of such writing equipment was found on the Esquiline Hill in Rome. Ivory tablets were always esteemed, as Augustine (ep. 15.1) indicates: he asks a correspondent to return his *tabellae eburnea*. They made welcome presents, as we know from the letters of Libanius.


-A.C.
XAGION. See EXAGION.

XANTHEIA (Ξάνθεια, mod. Xanthe), settlement in southwestern Rhodope, probably distinct from the ancient Xantheia in Thrace known to Strabo (Ch. Danoff, RE 2. R. 9 [1967] 1333). Bishopric in 879 (Mansi 17:376A) and suffrangent of Traianopolis (Notitiae CP 7.601), it was still a village (chronion) in the 11th C. (P. Gautier, REB 42 [1984] 127.1781). Only in the 13th C., after Kalojan had destroyed MOUSPOLIS and PERITHEORION, did the importance of Xantheia grow: Gregoras calls it either polechion (Greg. 2:814.19) or polis (2:727.24); Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 2:534.10–14) defines it as polis; and Enveri (Desturname, 99f, v.1529) goes so far as to term it “a very great city.” In 1264 Michael VIII decided to winter in Xantheia with his army (Pachym., ed. Failler, 1:295.13–15). The “castle” where the Catalan leader Ferdinand Ximenes sought refuge in 1307 can probably be identified as Xantheia. In 1345 Momčilo made the city his residence. In 1347 John VI handed Xantheia over to his son Matthew Kantakouzenos, and by 1369 Xantheia, Peritheorion, and Polystylon were in the hands of JOHN UGJLESA (Ostrogorsky, Serska oblast 32f).


XANTHOPOULOS, NIKEPHOROS KALLISTOS, ecclesiastical writer; born before 1256?, died ca.1335?. He was a priest at Hagia Sophia (and thus had access to the patriarchal library) and before his death became the monk Neilos. He gave lessons in rhetoric, for which he prepared new PROGYMNASMATA (J. Glettner, BZ 33 [1933] 1–12, 255–70). Xanthopoulos (Ξανθόπουλος) was a friend of Theodore Metochites, who dedicated his Poem 12 to him (ed. M. Cunningham et al. in Oceanos 100–115).

The main work of Xanthopoulos is his voluminous Ecclesiastical History, compiled after 1317 and dedicated to ANDRONIKOS II PALAIOLOGENS; 18 of its books survive, covering the period from the time of Christ to 610. Five more books, which extended to 911, are lost. Some of his primary sources were EUSEBIOΣ OF CAESAREA, SOZOMENOS, THEODORET OF CYRHRUS, and EVAGRIOS SCHOLASTIKOS. The Ecclesiastical History includes descriptions of secular events, such as the accession of emperors and military campaigns, but emphasizes ecumenical councils, doctrinal disputes, and the four eastern patriarchates. A much slimmer historical work is a versified synopsis of Jewish history after the Maccabees (PG 147:623–32). Xanthopoulos was a prolific hagiographer, whose writings include a history of miracles that occurred at the shrine of Zoodochos PEGE (AASS Nov. 3:878–89) and Lives of Sts. NICHOLAS OF MYRA and Euphroyne the Younger. As a poet, he composed prayers to the Theotokos and apostles, iambic renderings of historical sections of the Old Testament, and short poems on icons and sacred vestments and furnishings. His commentary on the Ladder of JOHN KLIMAX has only recently been discovered (L. Politis, Kleronomia 3 [1971] 69–84); he also wrote a commentary on the orations of GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS.


XANTHOS (Ξάνθος, now Kinik), city of Lycia. Although Xanthos rarely appears in Byz. written sources, it is well known from excavations that have revealed its development. Xanthos expanded in the 4th–6th C., when new churches and residences adorned its acropolis and the adjacent plain; notable among them was a richly decorated basilica, apparently the cathedral. This church was burned and much of the city aban-
doned in the 7th C., perhaps the date of the new fortifications on the acropolis. The church was rebuilt on a much smaller scale in the mid-11th C., only to be destroyed and abandoned after the battle of Mantzikert (1071).

The nearby Letoon, ancient cult center of Lycia, shows a similar development. After destruction in the 3rd C., the cult buildings were exploited as quarries. A basilical church of the mid-6th C. became the dominant element of the site until its destruction in the early 7th C. After a long period of desolation, the site was reoccupied on a much reduced scale in the 10th–11th C.

LIT. Fouilles de Xanthos (Paris 1958–).

---C.F.

XENODOCHEION (ευνοοχείον, sometimes synonymous with ευνάυ), a guest house for travelers, the poor, and the sick. Unlike pandochia (see INN) and mitata, where the patrons paid for their room and board, xenodocheia were philanthropic institutions based on the principle of Christian hospitality, where food and lodging were free. There can be considerable confusion over the distinction in terminology between xenodocheion and xenon. In the late Roman Empire the terms seem to have been used interchangeably to mean a guesthouse or hospice for both the sick and needy. Since travelers and poor people might often be ill, a hospice would frequently combine the provision of lodging with medical attention. After the 6th C., xenon seems to have been generally used for institutions that specialized in tending the sick and acquired the meaning of hospital (T. Miller, The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire [Baltimore-London 1985] 26–28). As late as the 11th C., however, a monastic xenodocheion was described as a facility for strangers and the sick (P. Gautier, REB 40 [1982] 81.1166–68).

Xenodocheia and xenones were founded by private citizens, the state, and ecclesiastical institutions, and were sometimes supported by the revenues from estates esp. assigned for this purpose. A number of emperors constructed guesthouses in the capital, Justinian I and Theodora built a xenon for travelers to Constantinople who could not afford to pay for rooms (Prokopios, Buildings 1.11.24–27). Romanos I Lekapenos established the xenodocheion tou Maurianou specifically for visitors who had to spend several days in Constantinople on business or for litigation; the facility included stables, and the guests were provided with food and clothing (TheophCont 430.6–9). Xenodocheia were frequently attached to monasteries, in both town and countryside. At the guesthouse of the monastery of St. Lazaros on Mt. Galesios, for example, guests could stay as long as they wished; some travelers abused the monks’ hospitality and stays were temporarily limited to three days (AASS Nov. 3:552f). There is little evidence of the construction of new xenodocheia in the Palaiologan era, and documents of this time mention guesthouses—a xenodocheios oikos in a praktikon of 1339 or 1342 (Guillou, Ménéeé, no.35.11–12) and a former xenodocheion in a charter of 1335 (Xénoph. no.23.22)—but infrequently. The state xenodocheia and xenones were integrated into the governmental administrative system, their xenodochoi holding a high position in the bureaucracy.


A.K., A.M.T.

XENODOCHOS (ευνοόχος), director of a xenodocheion or xenon, usually acting under the supervision of the local bishop. The Epanagoge (g.19) lists xenodoxoi between the oikonomoi and nosokomoi as officials responsible to the bishop. Among the letters of Photios is correspondence with the xenodochos Damianos, whom the patriarch reproached for poor administration. The director of a xenodocheion attached to a monastery was a subordinate of the oikonomos and was in charge of the meals and general welfare of visitors to the guesthouse, according to Cyril of Skythopolis (ed. Schwartz, 130f, 136f). There were also xenodochi in the state bureaucracy. The late 4th-C. Kletorologion of Philotheos mentions xenodoxoi in the department of the sakellion and particular xenodoxoi under the megas kourator: those of Sangarios, Pylaia, and Nikomedea. Seals of the 8th–10th C. also list xenodoxoi of the Xenon of Euboulos in Constantinople and of the town of Lo(u)padion (Zacos, Seals 1, nos. 1779, 1938, 2330, 2495, 2665).

LIT. Constantelos, Philanthropy 216–21.

A.K.

XENON. See Hospital; Xenodocheion.
XENON OF THE KRAL (Ξενών τοῦ Κράλη), a hospital in Constantinople founded by the Serbian ruler Stefan Uroš II Milutin in the early 14th C. It was attached to the Petra monastery, which Milutin restored at the same time, and was supported by the income from landed estates. The hegoumenos of the Hilandar monastery on Athos had the use of three rooms at the Xenon of the Kral when he visited Constantinople. In 1406 the monk Nathanael, a physician (nosokomos) at the Xenon, commissioned the rebounding of the Vienna Dioskorides MS. In the 15th C. a school called the katholikon mouseion was associated with the Xenon; both Michael Apostoles and John Argyropoulos taught there just before the fall of Constantinople.


XENOPHONTOS MONASTERY (τοῦ Ξενοφόντος), one of the oldest monastic establishments on the peninsula of Mt. Athos, located on the southwest coast between the monasteries of Pantelemon and Docheiariou; relations with the latter were frequently troubled by disputes over property and relative rank in the Athonite hierarchy. Founded before the end of the 10th C. by the monk Xenophon, the monastery was originally dedicated to St. George. Small at first, in the last quarter of the 11th C. the monastic complex was restored and enlarged by a second ktractor, the megas droungarios Stephen, a eunuch; by that time Xenophontos housed 55 monks. After a period of decline in the 13th C. following the Fourth Crusade, Xenophontos recovered its prosperity in the early 14th C. under the energetic leadership of the hegoumenos Barlaam (ca.1312-25). From ca.1425 onward, the monastery again entered a period of obscurity, during which it came under the control of Slavic monks.

In addition to land on the Holy Mountain, the Xenophontos monastery owned property in Thessalonike, the Chalkidike peninsula, and Lemnos. The archive at Xenophontos preserves 33 acts of Byz. date, ranging from 1089 to 1452. The library contains 27 Byz. MSS (Lampros, Athos 1:60-74; Polites, Katalogoi 196-230).

Numerous elements of architectural sculpture in the “old katholikon” of the monastery have been attributed to the period of the church’s construction; its temple, however, is regarded by T. Pazaras (DChAE 14 [1987-88] 33-48) as belonging to the reconstruction phase sponsored by the megas droungarios Stephen.


XENOS, JOHN, or John the Hermit, author of a short autobiographical vita (Bios kai politeia) and saint; born in village of Siba, Crete, 970?, died on Crete? after 1027. Born to a rich family, Xenos (Ξένος) spent his life traveling “from mountain to mountain” in western Crete (p.57-19). He founded several monasteries, the most important located on the summit of Mt. Myriokephalon. For these monasteries Xenos acquired land, fruit trees, and privileges; thus, the autobiography contains some evidence for agrarian relations on Crete (e.g., such terms as ZEUGARION and CHORAPHION). Also Xenos describes the visions he saw and voices he heard ordering him to found monastic communities. Meager as it is in information, Xenos’s autobiography is important as a revival of the genre. Tomadakes (infra [1950] 20) also ascribes to Xenos some homilies on the Gospel of Matthew as well as KANONES and STICHERA.


XEROPOTAMOU MONASTERY, one of the oldest monasteries on Mt. Athos, located inland from the southwest coast of the peninsula. Its origins are shrouded in legend and confusion; modern scholars place its foundation during the reign of Constantine VII (D. Papachryssanthou in Prot. 65f). Xeropotamou (Ξηροπόταμου) was in existence by 956 when it received a grant of land from a certain protospatharios John (Xerop., no.1). At this time it was dedicated to St. Niképhoros. The monks of Xeropotamou attribute its foundation to Paul Xeropotamites, who is known
to have been on Athos in 958 (vita A of Athanasios of Athos, ch.50.7), but this claim must be treated with caution. It is possible that he was founder of the small Athonite monastery of St. Paul, which also bore the name tou Xeropotamou in the 10th and 11th C.

In the early 13th C. the church at Xeropotamou was restored and dedicated to the Forty Martyrs. Andronikos II was also a benefactor of the monastery; by the late 14th C. Xeropotamou held third place in the Athonite hierarchy. The present monastic complex dates from the 18th C. or later. Its library contains approximately 40 MSS of Byz. date (Lampros, Athos 1:200–32), while its archives preserve 30 Greek documents dating between 956 and 1445, including a series of six early 14th-C. praktika (Xerop., nos. 18A–F) for the theme of Thessalonike, esp. Chalkidike. The monastery's most precious possession is a 14th-C. steatite paten (Kalavrezou, Steattle, no.131) known as the "cup of Pulcheria."

A.M.T., A.C.

XEROS (Xηρός), a family of civil functionaries known from the first half of the 11th C., when a certain Xeros, a judge, was active (Peira 14.22, 45.11). A series of mid-11th-C. judges named Xeros include Psellus's correspondent, a judge or prator of the Thrakesian theme; Basil Xeros, judge of Hellas; and John Xeros, protomystikos, who in 1057 presided over the litigation of two Athonite monasteries (Pantel., no.5.8). Seals of the 11th C. attest several Basils—judges of Peloponnesos and Hellas, of Kibyrrhaioi, and of Anatolikon (V.Laurent, Hellenika 9 [1936] 25–28). In 1092 Gregory Xeros presented a case concerned with marriage law (RegPatr, fasc. 3, no.964). The family produced other civil dignitaries: the logothetes tou genikou Basil (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.327); the anagrapheus Gregory (Laura 1, no.52.16–17, Ephig. no.5.3) in 1094–95; John, dioiketes of Peloponnesos and kouvarot of the West (Laurent, Med.Vat. no.111); John, protasekretis (Laurent, Corpus 2, no.7); Bardas, hetairarches in 1092 (Reg 2, no.1168). The eparch Xeros participated in a plot hatched by the Anemass family against Alexios I.

Thereafter the role of the Xeroi in the administration drastically declined: the sebastos Michael served as doux of Mylassa and Melanoudion; Ahrweiler ("Smyrne" 129) dated him ca.1127, but at that time the title of sebastos was too lofty for a governor of a modest theme. Basil Xeros was Manuel I's envoy to Roger of Sicily. At the same time the family was praised as Peloponesian nobility and was active in ecclesiastical administration: Leo (died 1153) was metropolitan of Athens (J. Darrouzès, REB 20 [1962] 192), and Constantin was protos of a monastery (Laurent, Corpus 5.2, no.1310). Michael Xeros founded the Church of St. George near Ikonion in the early 13th C. (RegPatr, fasc. 4, no.1297); in the 13th C. Manuel Xeros and his son Leo received at lease (as charistikarioi, although the term is not used) the monastery of Kato Ptomaia from the metropolitan of Mytilene for the rent of 20 trikephala (RegPatr, fasc. 4, no.1358). Circa 1252 John Xeros was bishop of Naupaktos. In the Palaiologan period members of the family included paraikoi of Lavra and Radolobos and clerics (PLP, nos. 20915–26).

XESTION. See Chernibokosten.

XIPHILINOS (Ξιφιλίνος), a family of civil and ecclesiastical functionaries that flourished in the 11th–12th C. Originally from Trebizond, in the 11th C. they were regarded as a family of lowy origin (Sathas, MB 4:430.29–30). Except for Bardas, who is called strategos of the Thessalians (i.e., of Thessalonike) on an 11th-C. seal (Laurent, Bulles métr., no.526), they were not military men. They served primarily as judges: for example, the future patriarch John VIII Xiphilinos; the vestarch John and protovestes Niketas, who participated in the trial of John Italos (1082); Niketas, judge and apographeus of the Boleron theme in 1088/9; Niketas, judge and quaeorist in 1151(?); Donatos, judge in 1196. They also were drounagarioi tes vilgas and fiscal officials. They served mostly in Constantinople and Thessalonike. The family produced two patriarchs: John VIII and George II (1191–98). The Xiphilinoi belonged to a circle of intellectuals: not only was the future patriarch John VIII the friend of Psellus, but also Constantine Xiphilinos, droungarios tes vilgas ca.1070, was Psellus's correspondent; both John VIII and his nephew John (see Xiphilinos, John the Younger) were writers. No data attests their political or ecclesiastical role after 1204, although a seal of a certain Clement Xiphilinos is dated to
the 13th C. and Theodore was chartophylax of the Great Church (in exile) ca.1256; in a document of 1421 the builder Argyros Xiphilinos is mentioned. The theory that in 1390 the megas domesti\kakos Constantine Xiphilinos Hyspelantes married the daughter of Manuel III Komnenos of Trebizond is an 18th-C. falsification.


XIPHILINOS, JOHN THE YOUNGER, writer, monk; died after 1081. Xiphilinos was the nephew of Patr. John VIII Xiphilinos; probably he or his uncle owned the seal of the monk John Xiphilinos (Laurent, Corpus 5-2, no.1404). The composition of his oeuvre is under discussion, some of his works having been ascribed to his uncle or other authors. He reworked, under Michael VII, a section of the Roman History of Dio Cassius and also wrote a collection of 53 homilies for Sundays. Xiphilinos’s dedication of a menologion addressed to Alexios I is preserved in a Georgian translation. V. Latysh’s identification of the menologion of Xiphilinos with the anonymous “imperial menologion” is now rejected (Ehrhard, Überlieferung 3:385f). The Georgian translator of Xiphilinos characterized him as the most significant literary figure at the court of Constantinople.


-A.K.
YABH ALLĀHĀ III, Nestorian Christian *katholikos*, often called Mar (Lord) Yabh Allāhā; born China 1245, died 1317. He was a Turkic Mongol who was baptized a Christian, with the name Mark. He became a monk and in ca.1279 set out with his spiritual director, Rabbān Śaumā, to visit the centers of Nestorian Christianity in Mesopotamia with the hope of also making a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Political events altered the plans of the travelers, who were detained in Mesopotamia and ordained to episcopal rank by the then Nestorian *katholikos*, Denḥā I (1265–81). On Denḥā’s death, Mark was elected *katholikos* and took the throne name Yabh Allāhā III. The hope was that a Mongol patriarch could best protect the interests of the Nestorian church under the Christian Mongol khans. Rabbān Śaumā wrote a biography of the *katholikos*, including in it an account of his own mission to the West. In Constantinople, Rabbān Śaumā saw Hagia Sophia and other monuments and was received by Andronikos II. Then he traveled to the papal court in Rome, on behalf of the khan Arghūn (1284–91), to explore the possibilities of an alliance between the Mongols and the Byz. against the Muslims.


-S.H.G.

In Egypt he was asked (probably owing to his interest in chronology) to continue Eutychios’s *History*. This *Continuation* thus began in 938. As the text was repeatedly revised in Egypt and Antioch, the MSS end variously, none extending beyond 1034. Yahyā concentrated almost exclusively on Byz., Syria, and Egypt, basing his work on Byz., local Christian, and Muslim sources, and on archival materials, personal informants, and his own observations. In addition to military campaigns, politics, and diplomacy, he covers ecclesiastical and doctrinal issues, social and economic developments, natural disasters, and such matters as the history of Bulgaria and Rus’. Byz. is a primary concern throughout, and Yahyā’s history offers the invaluable perspective (the only one from northern Syria) of an astute and well-placed Arab observer after the heyday of the Macedonian dynasty. It also comprises one of the very few contemporary sources for Byz. history through much of this period.


-Y.I.C.

YĀQŪT IBN ʿABDALLĀH, more fully Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbdallāh Yaʿqūb ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Hamāwī, Muslim geographer and literary historian of Byz. origin; born in Byz. territory 1179, died Aleppo 1229. Captured as a child, he was given a broad Arabic education in Baghdad and became his master’s business manager. Manumitted in 1199, he worked as a copyist and bookseller, traveling extensively in the Islamic East and meeting scholars. His erudition made him a protégé of the Ayyūbid vizier and physician ibn al-Qīṭī, and a
friend of other prominent scholars (e.g., Ibn Al-Athir and Ibn Al-Adim). Only three of his ten books survive, including his classic Geographical Dictionary and the Dictionary of Learned Men. The former (begun 1218, completed 1228), the most extensive work of its kind in Arabic, sums up Arab geographical knowledge to the author’s day, incorporating valuable historical, cultural, and ethnographic material on Byz. and other non-Islamic lands and peoples. His entries on Constantinople, Rüm, Crete, Tarsos, Thughur (see ‘Awāsim and Thughur), Sicily, and Byz.’s northern neighbors preserve material from earlier sources, for example, lost parts of al-Ya‘qubi’s geography, several accounts of earlier travelers, and extracts from lost Sicilian Arabic sources. His account of the themes derives from ibn al-Fakih’s lost list, that on Constantinople from al-Harawi. He displays no personal knowledge of Byz., and it is inaccurate to describe him as a Byz. native informant, as do some scholars.


-A.Sh.

YARMUK (‘Ierouchos), a tributary of the Jordan on the banks of which the Arabs won a decisive battle over the Byz. in Aug.–Sept. 636 (usually dated 20 Aug.). After a series of defeats suffered by Theodore, Herakleios’s brother, the emperor organized an enormous force under the joint command of the sakellarios Theodore Trithourios; Niketas, son of Shahbaraz; and Vahan, a Persian. The Arabs abandoned Emesa and Damascus, but blocked Byz. movement in the area of the Golan Heights. Combat started near Jablya (Arabic; Gabitha in Syriac) and ended in the Yarmuk valley. According to Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 338.9–10), each army was 40,000 strong, but Donner (infra) calculates that the Byz. force (100,000) was more than four times larger than the Muslims (24,000) under the command of Abu ‘Ubayda and Khalid. After initial difficulties, during which even women were forced to fight, the Muslims destroyed the Byz. army, killing many as they fled. To explain the defeat Theophanes cites the southerly wind that blew dust in the face of the Byz. Probably more important were internal discords among the Byz.: Vahan is said to have revolted before the battle and been proclaimed emperor by his soldiers; the inhabitants of Damascus, under Mansur ibn Sarjun, probably supported the Muslims; and Christian Arabs under Jabalah ibn al-Ayham unexpectedly switched sides during the battle. The effectiveness of the Arab cavalry also contributed much to Muslim success when, under Khalid, their horsemen managed to separate the Byz. infantry from their cavalry. Among the Byz. commanders Thrithorius fell in the battle, Vahan probably fled to Sinai, and Niketas escaped to Emesa. Arab losses were insignificant. The battle at the Yarmuk accomplished the occupation of Palestine.


-Y.W.K., A.K.

YAZDGIRD III (‘Iṣṭiwarxš), last Sasanian Persian king (from 632); born ca.617, died near Merv 651/2. The grandson of Chosroes II, he was enthroned in the troubled period following the death of Kavad-Shiruya. In 636 the Arab army sent by ‘Umar invaded Persia and in the battle at Qadisya (near Ḥira) routed the Persians and seized their flag; the Persian commander Rustam died in the battle. In 642 the Persians under the command of Perozan lost the second decisive battle, at Niha, in Media. Logistical problems made it hard for Yazdgird to establish contact with Byz., and so the two great empires were defeated separately. After much wandering Yazdgird sought a last refuge in Merv. He arrived there, according to tradition, with a retinue of 4,000 slaves, cooks, wives, and servants, but without a single soldier. He met a hostile reception, fled again, and was murdered either by the owner of a water mill or by cavalrymen who pursued him.


-Y.W.K.

YAZID II (‘Izd) ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, caliph of the Umayyads (720–24); born ca.685, died at Bayt Ras 27 Jan. 724. In July 721 Yazid issued an edict requiring the destruction of artistic images
throughout the caliphate. His brother Maslama was charged with carrying out the order. Byzantine sources (e.g., Theoph. 401.29–402.7) attribute his action to a Jewish magician, who promised the ailing Yazid a long reign if he would condemn icons. Archaeological evidence indicates that Christian churches did suffer, but the decree was actually directed at all, not only Christian, human representations (Ostrogorsky, History 162, n.1). The order was rescinded by Yazid’s son Walid, who reportedly had the magician executed. Some scholars believe without foundation that Yazid’s edict inspired the iconoclastic decree of Leo III.


YEAR. See Chronology.

YEAR, LITURGICAL, a somewhat artificial conception of the church calendar as a homogeneous chronological cycle of feasts and seasons of penance and fasting, ordered according to the sequence of events in New Testament salvation history. In this conception, the church year is concerned chiefly with the mysteries of the life of Jesus and Mary as found in the New Testament and apocryphal literature, and only secondarily with later happenings, such as councils or the transfer of relics.

The year begins with the feasts of the Birth of the Virgin and Presentation of the Virgin (8 Sept. and 21 Nov.) serving as preludes to the “theophanic” cycle, or NATIVITY–EPHPHANY season, the most ancient GREAT FEASTS of the fixed cycle. Then commence the festivities of the “paschal” cycle: pre-Lent, Lent, HOLY WEEK, EASTER, and PENTECOST. They are followed by the fasts and feasts of Sts. Peter and Paul (29 June) and the Dormition of the Virgin (15 Aug.).

The two poles of the year, the theophanic and paschal cycles, are the only periods that can be properly designated “liturgical seasons,” and together they occupy less than half the year. The remaining seven-month period escapes facile integration into a coherent, chronologically progressive liturgical year. The feast of the Transfiguration on 6 Aug., for example, precedes that of the beheading of the Baptist (29 Aug.), historically an earlier event. The sanctoral cycle is also unrelated to the unfolding of salvation history except in the case of a few saints directly associated with New Testament events: the SYNAXIS of Ioakeim and Anna on 9 Sept. or John the Baptist on 7 Jan. are in each case connected with the New Testament events of the previous day (Birth of the Virgin and Baptism).

The round of feasts evidently grew piecemeal and haphazardly, with no thought of eventual coordination into a yearly cycle. Indeed three conflicting cycles are discernible in the extant LITURGICAL BOOKS: the most ancient weekly cycle, centered on SUNDAY, found in the OKTOECHOS; the movable lunar cycle of the paschal mystery, found in the TRIODION and PENTEKOSTARION; and the cycle of fixed feasts found in the MENAION, the last book to acquire formulation with a full complement of AKOLOUTHIAI for each date of the year.


YEMEN. See ḤIMYAR.

YOLANDA OF MONTFERRAT. See Irene-
Yolanda of Montferrat.

YOLANDE (Ιωλανδία). Latin empress of Constantinople (1217–19), died Constantinople, Sept. 1219. Yolande was the sister of Baldwin of Flanders and Henry of Hainault. After the disappearance of her husband Peter of Courtenay, she ruled the Latin Empire of Constantinople and proved a capable ruler. She made two shrewd marriage alliances: one of her daughters, Agnes, married Geoffrey II Villehardouin and another, Marie, wed Theodore I Laskaris, which helped to ease the pressure on the Latin Empire. Yolande’s death opened the question of the succession. Her eldest son, Philip, count of Namur, was unwilling to accept the throne of Constantinople. It went instead to her second son, Robert of Courtenay, and then to her youngest son, Baldwin II.

Lit. Longnon, Empire latin 157f. HC 2:212f. –M.J.A.
ZABERGAN (Zαβεργάν), khan of the Cotrigurs in the mid-6th C. After the Cotrigurs and Utrigurs had made peace (ca. 558), in the winter of 558/9 Zabergan crossed the frozen Danube with his cavalry, passed through Moesia and Scythia, and invaded Thrace. Agathias (Agath. 5:12.4) ascribes to him a “wild plan” to gain control of the sea. Exploiting the state of the Long Wall, ruined in the earthquake of 557 and not yet fully repaired, Zabergan penetrated to Constantinople with 7,000 mounted warriors. Justinian I recalled Belisarios, who had been out of favor, and commissioned him to fight the intruders. Belisarios had about 300 heavily armed soldiers and other troops consisting of unarmed civilians and peasants from localities that had suffered Zabergan’s pillaging. At the village of Chettos, Belisarios won the day, having ambushed the enemy’s cavalry. Zabergan, however, remained in Thrace until summer, when the Byz. fleet entered the Danube, thus threatening the Cotrigurs and preventing their retreat. Zabergan negotiated a truce, returned prisoners of war, was promised subsidies, and withdrew across the Danube; Justinian celebrated the triumph on 11 Aug. 559. Justinian then stirred up the hostility between the Utrigurs and Cotrigurs to deflect them from Byz.
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Based on Bon, Moria franque 708, with modifications.
abled the Byz. to recover the island. Martino, after a long period of imprisonment in Constantinople, returned to Genoa. He died while commanding the fleet that attacked Umur Beg at Smyrna in 1344.

Through marriage and purchase the Zaccaria also acquired lands at Damala and Chalandritsa in the principality of Achaea. Centurione II Zaccaria (died 1432) became the last prince of Achaea (1404–30), taking the title from his aunt, Maria Zaccaria, widow of Pierre de St. Superan (see NAVARRESE COMPANY). He, however, lost most of his territory in Elis and Messenia to the Byz. despotate of Morea in 1417/18 and in 1430 married his daughter, Caterina Asanina Zaccaria, to Thomas Palaiologos, giving his remaining lands as her dowry. (See genealogical table.)


ZACHARIAS, pope (3 Dec. 741–15 Mar. 752); born 679. He was the son of a Greek from Calabria, and the last Greek pope. Zacharias reached a truce with the Lombards and stabilized the situation in northern Italy, until the new Lombard king Aistulf (749–57) reopened hostilities and captured Ravenna in 751. The pope then sought the support of Byz. and the recognition of the emperor, even though the situation was complicated owing to the Iconoclast policies of the emperors. When Constantine V was being challenged by the rebellious strategos Artabasdos in 741–42, the papal envoys to Constantinople maintained a cautious position despite the favorable attitude of Artabasdos toward icon veneration; they recognized Artabasdos but did not associate with his party. Constantine, after his victory, rewarded the pope granting him lucrative estates in Italy. An intelligent man, Zacharias probably translated the Dialogues of Pope Gregory I into Greek.


ZACHARIAS OF MYTILENE, also called Zacharias Rhetor or Scholastikos, churchman and writer; born Maiouma, near Gaza, ca.465/6, died after 536. Zacharias studied rhetoric and philosophy at Alexandria and law at Berytus. After a period as a monk in his youth, he went to Constantinople to become a lawyer. Originally of Monophysite persuasion, he converted to the Chalcedonian faith in the first decades of the 6th C. As bishop of Mytilene, he attended the Council of Constantinople in 536.

His Church History, written originally in Greek from a Monophysite perspective, covers the period 450–91, and was probably composed ca.492–95. It survives only in a Syriac epitome, which forms books 3–6 of a chronicle in 12 books, called Accounts of Events that Have Happened in the World, compiled by an anonymous monk at Amida in 569. Indeed, most of his works are extant only in Syriac texts, the exceptions being the De mundi opificio or Ammonios, a polemic in dialogue form against the pagan philosopher AMNONIOS, in which the question of the eternity of the cosmos is debated (P. Merian, GRBS 9 [1968] 193–203); a fragment from an anti-Manichaean tract is also in Greek. His biography of his fellow pupil, Severos of Antioch, provides a fascinating account of student life in Alexandria, being also a valuable source for late paganism. Zacharias also wrote Lives of Isaiah, an Egyptian monk, and Peter the Iberian (M.-A. Kugener, BZ 9 [1900] 464–70); only a fragment of the latter is preserved.


ZACHLUMIA (Slavic Zahumlje), the country of the Zachloumi (Ζαχλούμιος), a region on the Adriatic coast between Dubrovnik and the Nerenta (Neretva) River; Constantine VII Porphyrogenetus (De adm. imp. 93.12) explains that the name in Slavic means “behind the hill.” Michael,
prince of Zachlumia in the first half of the 10th C., supported Symeon of Bulgaria against Byz. and Serbia, but ca.925 allied with Tomislav of Croatia and probably with Byz. The name Zachlumia disappears from Greek sources after Constantine VII; only John Skylitzes refers to the people of Zachlouboi (Skl. 145,74) in a passage borrowed from the Vita Basilii. Latin texts, however, continued to name it Zachulmia or Chelmania, while Slavic sources refer to it as Humskazemlja, that is, the land of Hum. The Priest of Diokleia mentions Lutovid, the "princeps of Chelmania," who was active in the early 1040s; a charter of Lutovid survives in which he claims to be protospatharios and strategos of Zachlumia, thus implying the existence of a Byz. theme of Zachlumia in the 11th C. This charter, however, is usually considered to be a forgery (Ja. Ferluga in Viz1 Izvori 3:157, n.250). In the 12th C. the land of Hum was incorporated into Serbia and formed an annapanage of Miroslav, brother of Stefan Nemania; in the 13th C. the princes of Hum seem to have been again independent, but in the 14th C. Hum was under the sovereignty of Bosnia.


-A.K.

ZADAR. See Zara.

ZAK'ARIDS (Georg. Mxagrdzeli), christianized Kurdish dynasty that ruled Armenia at the beginning of the 13th C. In 1199, the Zak'arids seized Kars and Ani; by 1203 they had retaken Duin from the Muslims and controlled most of Armenia north and east of Lake Van. The eldest Zak'aré, who gave his name to the dynasty, resided at Ani and ruled the western portion of Armenia with the title of "commander of the army" (amirspasalar), while his brother Iwané ruled the eastern portion from Duin with the title of "father of the king" (atabeg). The precise relationship of the Zak'arids to the Georgian crown remains unclear. They styled themselves kings, sought to reconstruct the earlier Armenian parafedal social structure, and embellished and erected monuments that they covered with dedicatory inscriptions. Ani regained its former splendor in this period. Nevertheless, the Zak'arids do not seem to have been altogether independent, and Queen T'amara of Georgia used Duin as her winter residence. In 1236, the Zak'arids Awag and Şahanşah recognized the lordship of the Mongols and consequently survived the fall of Armenia, but increasingly heavy taxation and Mongol favor toward other families brought Zak'arid rule to an end in the second half of the 13th C.


-Z.N.G.

ZAKON SUDNYJ LJUDEM (Law for Judging the People), perhaps the earliest Slavic legal collection adapted from Byz. Its (oldest) short version comprises approximately 30 chapters dealing primarily with penal law; it is based on the Ecloga, whose rules are in part translated verbatim and in part freely reworked. Although it is agreed that the Zkon Sudnyj Ljudem was produced in the 9th or, at the latest, the beginning of the 10th C., its place of origin (Bulgaria, Great Moravia, Macedonia), precise date, author, and degree of Western influence, remain highly controversial, as does the original function and status of the collection. The preserved MSS all originate in Russia, where the Zkon Sudnyj Ljudem, having been introduced at the end of the 10th C., was widely circulated as a part of larger legal collections; it was eventually included in the printed edition of the Kormčaja kniga.


-Z.B.

ZAKYNTHOS (Zakynthos, Ital. Zante), island in the Ionian Sea south of Kephalaenia. A polis of Achaia, Zakynthos is mentioned by several late antique geographers, including Hierokles and the Cosmographer of Ravenna, among others. In 467 Gaiseric pillaged the island and carried away 500 captives from the local nobility (Prokopios, Wars 3.22.17). There are no reliable traces of Slavic settlement in the toponymy of Zakynthos (Vasmer, Slavén 79f). Pseudo-Sphrantzes (Sphr. 242.14)
mentions an attack of the Cretan Arabs on Kephalenia and Zakynthos ca.872; he evidently confused it with the Arab assault of 880, when they were defeated by Nasar (Vasiliev, Byz. Arabes 2.1:54f., n.3). Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De them. 7.3, ed. Pertusi, 92) lists Zakynthos as belonging to the theme of Kephallenia, and in the lists of bishoprics it appears as a suffragan of Kephallenia (Notitiae CP 3.776) and later Corinth (7.493). In 1099 it was plundered by the Pisans (An.Komn. 3:42:9) but remained Byz. until the end of the 12th C., when it fell to Margaritone of Brindisi, the admiral of William II of Sicily. From 1194 to 1328 Zakynthos was in the hands of the Orsini family under theoretical Venetian suzerainty; from 1328 to 1479 it belonged to the Tocco family. In 1479 the island fell temporarily to the Turks, in 1482 to the Venetians.

The Latin bishop of Zakynthos was placed under the archbishop of Patras, although the Orthodox bishop remained subject to Corinth. The main Byz. settlement was on the site of the ancient and modern town, where traces of Byz. fortifications remain, built into the Venetian walls. The ruins of the Latin cathedral, with an earlier Byz. phase (late 12th–13th C.), have been identified.

---


---

ZANGIDS, the descendants of Zangi. Zangi’s eldest son, Saif al-Din Ghaizi, succeeded him in Mosul, where his descendants reigned until 1222.

---

ZAOUTZES, STYLIANOS (Zaovíqa in Vita Euthym., Zaovíqa in Skyl.), high-ranking official under Basil I and Leo VI; born Macedon; died Constantinople 899. Zaoutzes came from an Armenian family; N. Adontz’s suggestion (Études 55) that he was the son of a strategos of Macedonia cannot be proven. Zaoutzes was protospatharios and hetairaietarches at the end of Basil’s reign; he supported Leo in his conflict with Basil, and after their reconciliation Basil appointed Zaoutzes as his son’s tutor. Leo promoted Zaoutzes to the titles of patrikios, magistros, and basiléopator; V. Laurent attributes to him the seal of the patrikios and “father of the emperor” Stylianos (Coll. Origidhan [Paris 1952] no.42). Zaoutzes directed Leo’s policy; most of the novels of Leo VI were addressed to him. Chroniclers accuse Zaoutzes of transferring the market of Bulgarian merchants from Constantinople to Thessalonike in 893, thus providing Symeon of Bulgaria with a pretext to begin war. Zaoutzes acquired even more influence when his daughter Zoe became Leo’s mistress and in 898 his spouse; Zaoutzes also managed to promote his partisan, Antony II Kauleas, to patriarch. Between 886 and ca.895 the emperor preached a sermon (unreliable ed. by Akakios, Leontos tou Sophou panegyrikoi logoi [Athens 1868], no.34; corr. partial tr. by Mango, Art 203–05) in a church built by Zaoutzes. The sermon includes an important description of its decorative program.

After Zaoutzes’s death and Zoe’s demise in 899/900, some relatives of Zaoutzes plotted against Leo, but Samonas revealed their scheme and the family lost its power. A. Leroy-Molinghen and P. Karlin-Hayter (Byzantion 38 [1968] 28of) hypothesized that one of his descendants married Psellos. Zaoutzes is presented as the embodiment of evil in the vita of Patr. Euthymios.

---

ZA (Διάδοσα), anc. Iadera, Slav. Zadar), a city and port in Dalmatia. Its history during the late Roman Empire is poorly documented; together
with all of Dalmatia, Zara was under the control of the Ostrogoths in the 5th C. and ca.537 was reconquered by Justinian I. Some Gothic objects have been found in the vicinity of Zara, for example, in the necropolis in the village of Kašić. The hexagonal baptistery in Zara, previously dated to the 9th C., has been reassigned to the 6th C. (I. Nikolajević, ZRVI 9 [1966] 239ff). The destruction of Salona in the early 7th C. and the capture of Ravena and Aquileia by the Lombards in the 8th C. made Zara the largest city in the northern Adriatic. In 805 Paul, "dux Iaderae," and Bp. Donatus appeared at the court of Charlemagne as representatives of Dalmatia. A legend connects Bp. Donatus also with Constantinople: he reportedly went to the Byz. capital, where Nikephoros I gave him the relics of St. Anastasia for transfer to Zara. Construction of the Cathedral of St. Anastasia began around this date. In the 10th C. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp. 29.272–84) mentions several churches in the "large kastron" of Zara; among them was the basilica of the virgin saint Anastasia whose "flesh" was preserved there. He compares the basilica to the Church of the Chalkoprateia in Constantinople and describes its paintings and floor mosaics.

Zara was autonomous under the Byz. protectorate in the 7th–11th C., elders of Zara functioning (until the mid-9th C.) as archontes of Dalmatia, but there were various political forces trying to conquer Zara. Venice was the most dangerous of them, although Zara did not realize it. In 1000 Zara solemnly received the fleet of the doge Pietro Orseolo, but the Venetian expedition of 1050—or rather 1062 (L. Margetić, StVen 4 [1980] 279–90)—met resistance; Zara began to seek the support of Hungary against Venice. According to Andreas Dandolo, in 1112 the doge Ordelaffo Falieri asked Emp. Alexios I Komnenos to transfer to Venice supremacy over Zara. Evidently the response was negative, and in 1116 the Venetians attacked Zara and defeated the Hungarian troops defending the city. In 1186, however, Béla III established Hungarian authority in Zara, and Venice failed to regain it. A few years later, Doge Enrico Dandolo decided to use the army of the Crusaders to recover Zara. Despite the opposition of Pope Innocent III, the Venetian fleet of the Fourth Crusade sailed to the Dalmatian coast and on 24 Nov. 1202, after a two-week siege, forced Zara to surrender. The struggle over Zara continued, however, with both Croatian and Hungarian kings claiming rights to it, until 1409 when Venice finally conquered the city.


AZK

ZEALOTS (Τηλωταί), the leaders of a revolt who established a short-lived regime in Thessalonike (1342–49) after driving out the Kantakouzenist governor Theodore Synadenos and his aristocratic supporters. Supreme power in the movement was held by two archontes (from 1342 to 1345 the megas primikarios John, son of Alexios Apokaukos, and Michael Palaiologos) and a council (boule) that could be summoned at the initiative of a single archon. At first the Zealots were able to repel the attacks of John VI Kantakouzenos, but by 1345 the city's situation became dangerous. Some factions attempted a reconciliation with Kantakouzenos. In the spring John Apokaukos organized the murder of Michael Palaiologos and arrested his supporters. When Alexios Apokaukos was killed in Constantinople, his son opened negotiations with Kantakouzenos's followers. This incited a new uprising. Apokaukos and his noble partisans were killed, and Andrew Palaiologos, supported by radical elements, seized power. At this time, according to Demetrios Kydones (PG 109:648D), society was topsy-turvy—the slave struck his master, the villager attacked a general, and the peasant a (noble?!) warrior. In 1347 the Zealots prevented Gregory Palamas, the newly elected metropolitan of Thessalonike, from entering his see. After Kantakouzenos's victory in Constantinople, however, Zealot resistance was doomed. At the end of 1349 they attempted to surrender the city to Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, but the moderate faction, headed by Alexios Metochites, routed the sailors (nautikon), who were the backbone of the movement, and handed the city over to Kantakouzenos. In 1350 he arrived in Thessalonike, together with John V and Palamas, while Andrew Palaiologos fled to Mt. Athos.

The revolt of the Zealots has been treated, from O. Tafrali (Thessalonique au XIVe siècle [Paris 1913] 225–72) on, as a "revolution," an uprising of the
“lower classes” against the aristocracy, similar to contemporaneous movements in Italian cities, and resulting in social reforms. This interpretation was based on a then-unpublished treatise of Nicholas Kabasilas abundantly quoted by Tafrali. I. Sevcenko, however, in publishing Kabasilas’s text (Soc. & Intell., pts. III–VI), showed that it neither referred to the Zealots, nor contained any information concerning reforms.

The revolt of the Zealots should be seen rather as an event within the framework of the Civil War of 1341–47, with the Zealots supporting the “bureaucratic” regime of Alexios Apokaukos against the “feudal” supporters of Kantakouzenos (M.Ja. Sjuzjumov, VizVrem 28 [1968] 15–37). In time, however, the movement became more than a struggle between two court factions. Gregoras (Greg. 2:796.1–12) says that the regime created by the Zealots was an unprecedented ochlokratia (mob rule) and not an aristocracy or democracy. The Zealots were accused of pillaging by their enemies (e.g., Palamas, ed. B. Gorjanov, VizVrem 1 [1947] 265,20–26), but it is uncertain whether a systematic confiscation of properties took place. Kantakouzenos’s statement (Kantak. 2:570.19–20) that the Zealots “damaged the area” is too vague to permit any conclusions. Nor is the religious program of the Zealots clear. Kantakouzenos reports (Kantak. 2:571.5–7) that the drunken Zealots ridiculed “Christian mysteries” and describes (ibid. 570.21–24) how large vats were set up in the streets so that the Zealots, with candle in hand, could rebaptize (anebaptiznon) the rank and file. The revolt found support in some neighboring towns (e.g., Platamon, Rentina).


ZEMARCHOS (Ζήμαρχος), diplomat of Justin II and senator; according to Menander Protector, of Cilician origin, but Russu (infra) considers the name to be Thracian. His identification with Zemarchos, comes Orientis in 556, cannot be proved. Menander preserves the description of Zemarchos’s embassy to the Turkish khan Sizaboulos at Sogdiana (H. Haussig, Byzantion 23 [1953] 304) or Istam (Moravčík, Byzantinoturcica 2:275f) in 568/9–571. Zemarchos encouraged the Turks to make war on Persia and, with a retinue of 20 men, accompanied the khan on one of his anti-Persian expeditions. Having sent his officer George with a Turkish escort by a shorter and deserted road, Zemarchos returned via the “swamp” (Aral Sea) and the Volga, where he was well received by the Alans. Bypassing Persian ambushes, Zemarchos reached Trebizond, probably carrying a large load of silk.


ZEMIANSKÝ VRBOVK, a village in Silesia, where in 1937 a hoard was discovered that included 17 silver coins (miliaresia and hexagrams) of Constans II and a hexagram of Constantine IV struck at the beginning of his reign. Grierson (DOC 2:119) suggests that these “ceremonial” coins were struck as diplomatic gifts. The hoard also contained silver objects: bracelets, a necklace, earrings, cups, a chalice, etc., all now in the Slovakian National Museum in Bratislava. Svoboda (infra) interprets the hoard as belonging to a silversmith and revealing the area’s Byz. connections, in contrast to the lack of evidence for connections between Pannonia and the Lombards or Ravenna.


ZEMUN (Земун), also Zemlin; a fortress on the right bank of the Danube, near Belgrade-Singidunum. It was the site of Roman Taurunum, a station for the Danubian fleet, still mentioned in the Notitia dignitatum. By the end of the 11th C., Zemun was a Hungarian stronghold on the frontier with Byz.: in 1096 the crusaders of Peter the Hermit took Zemun and allegedly slaughtered 4,000 Hungarians there. In the 12th C., Zemun was a bone of contention between Byz. and the Hungarians. In 1127, the Hungarians attacked Braničevo, demolished its walls, and, according to Niketas Choniates, carried its stones to Zemun; Kinnamos relates that they destroyed Belgrade and used its stones to build Zemun. In 1165 István (Stephen) III, the king of Hungary, besieged Zemun. He allowed the Greeks and the Hungarian partisans of his rival, István IV, to
leave peacefully after having surrendered the fortress. In 1167, Andronikos Kontostephanos captured Zemun and defeated the Hungarian army near it, on the river Sava.

In the 15th C., the Hungarian king Sigismund granted the city of Zemun to George Branković, who had his palace in nearby Kupinovo. On 17 Dec. 1455, in a battle near Kupinovo, the Turks defeated George Branković and took him captive.


—A.K.

**ZENO (Ζήνων), emperor (474–91); died Constantinople 9 Apr. 491. Originally called Tarasis (R.M. Harrison, BZ 74 [1981] 27f) or variants thereof, he took the name of Zeno from a distinguished Isaurian countryman who had served under Theodosios II. He was leader of the Isaurian contingent (perhaps the exkubitores) in Constantinople, married Leo I’s daughter Ariadne, and became comes domesticorum. In 469–71 he cooperated with Leo in the elimination of Aspar and the reduction of the Germanic threat to the capital. Upon Leo’s death in 474, Zeno’s son Leo II became emperor but died in the same year, leaving power to Zeno. Faced with foreign threats, Zeno negotiated a peace with the Vandal king Gaiseric. He then had to confront a plot engineered by his mother-in-law Verina and her brother Basiliskos. Zeno fled to Isauria in 475 but with the help of Illos and Theodoric the Great returned to the throne the next year. Restored to power, Zeno encountered further difficulty from the Ostrogoths in Thrace and the continued machinations of Verina and Illos. Zeno approved the elevation of Julian Nepos as the last Western emperor in 474 and was technically ruler of an undivided state after the coup of Odoacer. In 488 he rid Illyricum of the Ostrogoths by persuading Theodoric to march on Italy and conquer Odoacer. Zeno’s proclamation of the Henotikon led to the Akarian schism with the papacy. Zeno was personally unpopular and the Orthodox sources generally condemn his pro-Monophysite policy. He did, however, see the empire through a particularly difficult period with considerable skill.


**ZENOBIA (Ζηνοβία, now Halabiyyah in Syria), stronghold on the west bank of the Middle Euphrates, in the province of Euphryatensis, founded by and named after Zenobia, queen of Palmyra (266–71). Although it was an insignificant fortress in the 6th C., Chosroes I, during his expedition of 540, failed to take it. Justinian I sent two architects, Isidore the Younger and John of Byzantium, to rebuild the town (Prokopios, Buildings 2.8.8–25). Excavations have revealed city walls with two towers flanking the north gates, the palace (praetorium) of the military commander, two major arteries with a tetrakylon in the center, a bath with a palaestra, houses, and churches. The buildings were constructed of local stone in the manner typical of Syria. (The churches are similar to the basilicas in Sergiopolis, showing that the Constantinopolitan architects followed local traditions.) An inscription with a curse of “Bishop Lucian” is interpreted as testifying to the existence of an episcopal see at Zenobia. In the Notitia Antiochena Zenobia is a suffragan of Sergiopolis. Taken by the Persians in 610, the fortress was gradually abandoned. The necropolis at Zenobia probably belongs to the Palmyrene period (N.P. Toll, SemKond 9 [1937] 11–21).


—M.M.M.

**ZEON (ζεόν, lit. “hot”), the custom, unique to the Byzantine rite, of adding hot water to the chalice at Eucharist, for Constantinople first alluded in the 6th C. The original term for this was ihermon, but the word zeon was introduced in the 12th C. and the two were thereafter used interchangeably. No early source indicates at what precise point the infusion occurred, but it is possible that hot water was mixed with the wine both at the prothesis and before communion. From the 11th to 12th C. onward, the addition of the zeon occurs after the fraction and commixture, though there is evidence pointing to its infusion at the prothesis, too.
The origins of the *zeon* are disputed. It was associated with the flux from Jesus’ side or interpreted to mean that in communion one receives the warm blood of the living risen Christ. Since the Resurrection is the work of the Holy Spirit, the formulas accompanying this ritual symbol of the rising refer to the Spirit. *Zeon* and *azymes* were a source of dispute between Greeks and Latins from the 11th C. onward.


**ZETA** (*Zévta*), a region encompassing parts of southwestern Yugoslavia and northern Albania, usually identified as *Dioikleia*-Duklja. The term appears in Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (*De adm. imp. 30.105*) as *Zentina*, the name of the river Cetina. Kekaumenos (Kek. 170.29–30) was the first to use the designation Zeta for a region in which [Stefan]-Voisal *Dioikelianos* (from *Dioikleia*) ruled in the mid-11th C. His *toparchia* also included Dalmatia and Ston (possibly the island of Ston). St. *Sava of Serbia* applies the term Zeta to the littoral of the Adriatic Sea, and it is assumed that Zeta was a principedom or kingdom, that in the 11th–12th C., fought with Raska for hegemony over all of Serbia. Under the Nemanjids dynasty Zeta formed a part of the Serbian state, usually being ruled by the “junior king.” After the death of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan (1355), however, it acquired independence under the rule of the three Balsići brothers. They acted in alliance with Dubrovnik and took advantage of Serbian involvement in war against the Turks and Lazar’s conflict with Bosnia: after 1371 George Balsić expanded his possessions from Dubrovnik to Prizren, but the Turkish advance cut short the successes of Zeta. In 1444 the new dynasty of Crnojevići acknowledged Venetian supremacy, but nevertheless they had to become vassals of the Turks. In the 14th C. the new name *Montenegro* began to replace that of Zeta.


**ZETOUNION.** See *LAMIA*.

**ZEUGARATIKION** (*ζευγαρατίκιον*), a tax or charge in specie attested in documents from 1073 to 1428–43. V. Vasil’evskij (*ŽMNP* 210 [1880] 366f) interpreted it as a land tax, while K. Chvostova (*Osobennosti* 99) sees in *zeugaratikion* a part of the land tax levied from the demesne, and F. Dölger (*Schatz* 146) a tax from the *zeugaratoi*. *Zeugaratikion* is usually mentioned in lists of exemptions together with *epereiai* such as *kastrokthia* or *mitaton*. A *prostagma* of 1428 or 1443 implies that it was a charge that could be levied on the *zeugaria* of a monastery (Lavra 3, no.166.23–24). In the *praktikon* of 1073, *zeugaratikion* is a supplementary tax of insignificant size: the *paroi* from three *proasteia* paid more than 32 nomismata from their *stichoi* and only 20 miliareis of *zeugaratikion* (*Patmou Engrapha* 2, no.50.148–62), that is, less than 5 percent, and the correlation between the two payments varied from one *proasteion* to another. In a *praktikon* of 1333 the *zeugaratikion* was 9.5 hyperpyra or 34.5 percent of the 27.5 hyperpyra levied on the *staseis* of the *paroi* (*Zogr. 29.88–93*), and before 1346 Iveron paid 200 hyperpyra as *zeugaratikion* and 200 as *kephalaios* for its properties around *Radolivos* (Solovjev-Mošin, *infra*, no.6.19–20).

The relation between the *zeugaratikion* and another tax or charge called *zeugologion* is unclear. Jacoby (*Société*, pt.IV [1965], 405–20) suggests that the *zeugaratikion* appears in Venetian Messenia under the name *zeuvaicum*. *Zeugaratikion* is sometimes identified with *sitarkia*.


**ZEUGARATOS** (*ζευγαράτος*), the designation for a peasant who possessed the fiscal and economic unit of a *zeugarion*. The term is found in documents from 1073 through the end of the 13th C. in which, for purposes of taxation, peasants, esp. *paroi* were frequently categorized according to the quantity of land they held and the number of oxen they owned. The categories were *dizeugaratos* (a rare term denoting the owner of two *zeugaria*), *zeugaratos, boidatos* (holding a *boidion*, “one ox,” i.e., half a *zeugarion*), *aktemon* and, infrequently, *aporos*. A treatise on measurement composed prior to the 14th C. sets the wealth of a *zeagaratos* at 24 nomismata, a *boidatos* at 12 nomismata, and an *aktemon* at 6 nomismata. In the cadaster of *Lambsakos* (1218/19) the annual base tax on *zeugaratoi* appears to be 10 hyperpyra, on *boidatoi* 5,
aktemones 2.5 to 3, and aporoi 1 hyperpyron, in addition to corvees commutable for cash. A treatise dated 1232, probably from Cyprus, provides somewhat different figures: a zeugaratos held 40 modioi of land with a total wealth of 60 hyperpyra, and a pezos (aktemon) 30 modioi and 40 hyperpyra.


ZEUGARION (ζευγαρίων, lit. “a yoke of oxen”). This traditional meaning of the term is attested in documents: thus, a chrysobull of 1327 mentions a tax from the zeugaria “which are found and work in the chorion of Prebista” (Zogr. 26.33–34). The Angaria of zeugaria appears in some lists of exemptions (e.g., *Lara* 2, no.89.167). The term has also been applied to a unit of measurement (similar to the Lat. *iugum*) equivalent to the quantity of land that could be cultivated by a pair of oxen; this meaning is also attested in documents—for instance, “the arable land of 4 zeugaria” (Zogr., no.10.14). Schilbach (*Metrologie* 67–70) surmises that the theoretical size of a zeugarion was 144 modioi, although the scarce data of documents show a range of zeugaria from 83 to 213 modioi. It may be necessary to raise the latter figure, since a charter of 1407 equates 3 zeugaria with 748 modioi (by calculation, 723) of choraphia and esothyroraphia (Pantel., no.17.38–39). Thus, in this case there were 249 (or 241) modioi per zeugarion. The usual explanation of such a variation is that the quality of the land was taken into consideration but this cannot be proved; in the charter of 1407 the land was of first quality.

Another difficulty in interpreting the term is that the *praktika* use it only in the sense of a pair of oxen, and it is unclear whether an appropriate piece of land is understood. There appears to be no direct correlation between the number of zeugaria (oxen) and the quantity of arable land held by paroikoi.


ZEUGI CARTHAGO, PROVINCE OF. See AFRICA PROCONSULARIS, PROVINCE OF.

ZEUS, the king of the gods in Greek mythology, equated with Jupiter/Jove by the Latins. Pagans of the 4th C. still addressed Zeus as father of men (cf. Homer) and the “protector of Eastern and Western Rome” (*Themistios, Orations* 1:125,3–5). Diochletian assumed the majestic epithet of Jovius (“belonging to Jove”), and one of the 4th-C. Christian emperors bore the theophoric name Jovian. Neoplatonists accepted Zeus as god-deiuruge in their divine triad: Kronos, the pure mind (*nous*); Rhea, intellective life; and Zeus, demiurgetic mind (H. Schwabl, *RE* 15 [1978] 1386–88). Zeus was also identified with Mithra as solar deity and located in the center of the zodiac (L. Musso, *Manifattura santuaria et committenza pagnana nella Roma dei IV secolo* [Rome 1983] 47).

Christian apologists, drawing mainly on Lucian and other ancient rationalists, attacked the mythological image of Zeus, emphasizing its two weak points: his unethical behavior, esp. his adultery (V. Buchheit, *RhM* 125 [1982] 381–42), and his subjugation to fate (*heimarmene*). At the same time, Christians tried to appropriate, together with the idea of four virtues, the Platonic myth of Zeus as charioteer, replacing the king of the gods by Christ (J. Préaux in *Hommages a Marcel Réard*, vol. 1 [Brussels 1969] 657). In the 12th-C. scholia to Hesiod’s *Theogonia* (*Glossen und Scholien zur hesiodischen Theogonie*, ed. H. Flach [Osnabrück 1876; rp. 1970] 340–43), John Galenos treats Zeus as an allegory of Christ (“the cause of life.” Galenos writes, playing with etymology by deriving the name Zeus from the word *zeos*) and identifies Zeus’s arrows with the sign of the Cross. Tzetzes suggested the triple allegory of Zeus: physically, he represents the clear air and the upper hemisphere; pragmatically, the mind (*nous*); and historically, the king of Crete (Hunger, *Grundlagenforschung*, pt.XIV [1954]) 47).

In Byz. literature Zeus is primarily a symbol of lust (the rape of Europa, the golden rain on Danaé) or of might (the Homeric golden chain with which Zeus threatened to haul up all the other gods [Iliad 8:19; *Eust. Comm. Il.* 694.51–695.29]). When Pletphon tried to resuscitate ancient mythology, he conceived of Zeus as the greatest and best god who stood at the head of the universe; Zeus’s son Poseidon, born without a mother, created the heaven and entrusted Helios to govern it. Scenes of Zeus’s birth, his rebellion against Kronos, the courting of Semele, and his
siring of Dionysos and Athena illustrate the commentaries of pseudo-Nonnos included in numerous MSS of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos. Like Midas, Alexander, and other rulers, Zeus is habitually represented as an emperor (Weitzmann, Gr. Myth., 78–80, 90ff, figs. 52, 57–59).

ZEUXIPPOS, BATHS OF. The most famous public baths of Constantinople, the baths of Zeuxippos (Zeuxippos) were allegedly built by Septimius Severus and enlarged by Constantine I. Situated close to the Great Palace by the northeast corner of the Hippodrome, they were decorated with numerous statues, of which 80—one of pagan mythological figures, poets, philosophers, etc.—were described in the reign of Anastasios I by Christodoros of Koptos. The statues formed a meaningful arrangement with regard to their subject matter. The baths were burned down in 532 and rebuilt by Justinian I. They are last mentioned as functioning in 713 (Theoph. 383.9). Thereafter the vast building was converted to other uses. Part of it became a prison known as the Noumera, attested until the late 13th C. Michael Glykas was imprisoned there in 1156 and wrote a poem about his experiences. It appears that another part of the building housed a silk workshop, as suggested by the inscription on the textile found in Charlemagne’s tomb (C. Diehl in Strena Bulciana [Zagreb 1924] 442). Part of the bath complex, probably pertaining to Justinian’s rebuilding, was excavated in 1927–28. Two statue bases were then discovered, one inscribed “Hecuba,” the other “AESCHINES” (Second Report upon the Excavations Carried Out in and near the Hippodrome of Constantinople in 1928 [London [1929]]).


ZEUXIPPOS WARE, type of Byz. graffito ware pottery, first identified in the excavations of the Baths of Zeuxippos in Constantinople, where it was described as “Shiny Olive Incised Ware II.” The ware is characterized by fine, thinly potted, hard-fired fabric with sparse graffito decoration, often a central medallion and circles or ovals filled with palmettes or other designs; figural decora-

tions are also found. The characteristic shape is a deep bowl with either a low or a high ring foot. Megaw (infra) divided the ware into two classes: one with a colorless or pale monochrome glaze, and one with added color. Zeuxippos Ware was produced during the late 12th and early 13th C. Examples have been found in Constantinople, throughout the Aegean, on Cyprus, on the northern shore of the Black Sea, in Antioch, Egypt, Corinth, Pergamon, and Preslav, making it difficult to accept Megaw’s theory that such pots were made only in Constantinople.


ZEYREK KILISE CAMII. See Pantokrator Monastery.

ZIATA. See Chartpe.

ZICHA (Zięha, Zięhia), land on east coast of the Black Sea that was separated from Tamatacha-Tmutorokan by the Oukrouch (Kuban?) River and had a city called “Nikopsis,” according to Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (De adm. imp. 42.95–99). In another chapter (6.5) he mentions the inhabitants of Cherson who served the emperor in Rhosia, Khazaria, and Zichia.

The Zechoi, according to Prokopios (Wars 8.4.2), used to have their kings appointed by the Romans, but by his time they had become independent. From the 7th C. onward, the autocephalous archbishopric of Zekhia is mentioned in notitias; eventually it appears in conjunction with either Tmutorokan or Cimmerian Bospors. In the legend of the apostle Andrew’s travels he is said to have visited Zichia on his way from Abasgia (Abchasia) to the Upper Sougdaia and Bospors (M. Bonnet, AB 13 [1894] 333–36).

It is unclear to what extent and when the Byz. established control over Zichia. Manuel I used, among others, the title “emperor of Zichia, Khazaria, and Gothia,” but this titulature could have been vainglorious. The much-discussed seal of Michael, “archon of Tmutorokan, Zichia, and Khazaria,” pertains to the same area, but there is no reason to suppose, with Bănescu, that Byz. in the late 11th C. possessed vast territories in the northern Caucasus. Hungarian and Italian travelers of
the 13th C. mention the land of Sychia (the spelling varies) in which the civilitas of Matrica (Matracha-Tmutorokan) was sometimes believed to be located.


**ZIGABENOS, EUTHYMIOS**, or Zigadenos, theologian; baptismal name John; fl. ca. 1100. His life is obscure. For a long period Zigabenos (Σιγαβηνός) was wrongly identified with Euthymios of Akmonia. He was a monk in Constantinople invited by Alexios I (probably ca. 1110) to write a refutation of heresies, which he produced under the title of _Panoplia dogmatike_, with the collaboration of John Phournes. After a eulogy of Alexios, Zigabenos refuted ancient heresies, from Epicureanism to Iconoclasm, then shifted to contemporary erroneous doctrines, such as those of the Armenians (E. Trapp, _JÖB_ 29 [1980] 159–64), Muslims (J. Dartouzes, _REB_ 22 [1964] 282), Paulicians, and Bogomils. He described the execution of Basil the Bogomil, but differently from Anna Komnene, who knew and praised Zigabenos’s work. As his primary method of argumentation Zigabenos used abundant citations of the fathers. He also wrote commentaries on the Psalms, Gospels, and St. Paul’s epistles. His commentary on the Psalms survives in numerous MSS and was the basis for a unique miniature depicting the Third Anointment of David in the 14th C. MS Athos, Lavra B. 25 (Cutler, _Aristocratic Psalters_, fig. 44). Attribution to Zigabenos of other works preserved under the name of Euthymios is questionable.


—A.K., A.C.

**ZIGAJLOVKA**, village in the district of Sumy, in the Ukraine, where in 1964 a silver vessel of Constantinopolitan provenance and dated to the end of the 4th to beginning of the 5th C. was found. Ornamented with two friezes, the upper shows military scenes and the lower the hunting of various animals. The vessel is now in the Sumy museum.

_Lit._ V. Kropotkin, _Rimskie impartnye izdelija v Vostochnoy Evrope_ (Moscow 1970) no. 1933. —A.K.

**ZION. See Sion.**

**ZLATOSTRUV** (lit. “Golden Stream”), a compilation of homilies by and excerpts from John Chrysostom in Old Church Slavonic translation. It was probably composed in Preslav in the late 9th or 10th C. under the patronage of Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria, who is believed by some scholars to have had a hand in the compilation himself. The Zlatostruj is not a liturgical text, but is rather intended for the moral and doctrinal edification of clergy and laymen through private reading. It suggests a not negligible level of literacy in Bulgaria at the time. The work exists in two recensions, a short version of 80 excerpts and a longer one of 136. The latter contains supplementary material from a catena of Theodore Daphnates (10th C.). The Zlatostruj was widely read by southern and eastern Slavs in the Middle Ages and survives in numerous MSS.


**ZODIA** (ζωδία), “living forms,” such as the animals represented in 12th- and 13th-C. sculptures (Grabar, _Sculptures II_ 16f). The term usually refers to the four living creatures of biblical theophanies (Ezek 1:5–10, Apoc 4:6–7). The association of their four faces (man, lion, ox, and eagle) with the Gospels was made by Irenaeus (PG 7:885–86) and repeated by later authors. As evangelist symbols the four are depicted with portraits of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John as well as various theophanic images. In liturgical contexts, the four beasts may be accompanied by the words with which the heavenly host proclaim the “triumphal hymn” in the liturgy. The pairing of animal and evangelist was never regularized in Byz. and several systems occur before the 13th C. Thereafter,
the solutions associated with Irenaeus and St. Jerome (Nelson, *infra* 15f) prevail. In some Byz. texts, the term *zodia* refers to sculpted images (e.g., *Parastaseis* 33, 290).


**ZODIAC.** See **CONSTELLATIONS**.

**ZOE (Ζωή),** second daughter of Constantine VIII, empress (with her sister Theodora, 21 Apr. – 12 June 1042); born ca. 978, died Constantinople 1050. As heiress of the Macedonian dynasty, Zoe was wed to Romanos III by her father. When Romanos found she was barren, he tolerated her affairs; rumor associated her with Constantine Artoikises and Constantine Monomachos, and she encouraged her lover, the future Michael IV, to drown Romanos. During Michael's reign, agents of John the Orphanotrophos watched Zoe closely; she was induced to adopt the future Michael V. After his accession, he determined to rid himself of her: on the night of 18/19 Apr. 1042 she was dispatched to a convent on Prinkipo (see PRINCES' ISLANDS). During the ensuing uprising, she was recalled. The crowd in the Hippodrome, however, rejected her (20 Apr.). After Michael's fall, Zoe and Theodora ruled jointly; they abolished the sale of offices, raised many to the senate, and offered the people generous do-natives. Zoe chose Constantine IX Monomachos as her third husband. During his reign, she died. According to Psellus, she was pious but vain, quick to understand but slow to speak, lavishy generous but capricious in punishing. She delighted in supervising the manufacture of perfumes and ointments carried out in her own quarters. Zoe's portrait, flanking Christ with an emperor whose inscription has been changed to indicate Constantine (IX), survives in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople. The occasion and hence the date of this panel are much disputed (R. Cormack, *Art History* 4 [1981] 141–46, fig.6).


**ZOE KARBONOPOISINA (Καρβωνοποιήσα),** or Karbonopsis (lit. “with coal-black eyes”), empress and fourth wife of Leo VI; died Constantinople after 920. Zoe belonged to the family of Theophanes the Confessor and included among her ances-

tors Proteinos, *strategos* of the Anatolikon theme; the admiral Himerios was her relative. She became Leo's concubine after the death of his third wife, Eudokia, and gave birth in 905 to the emperor's first son, the future Constantine VII; their illegal union caused the controversy known as the tetragamy of Leo VI. Leo arranged both an imperial christening for the infant and (probably in June 906) his own marriage to Zoe; the priest Thomas, who performed the marriage, was deposed by Euthymios. When Leo died, his brother Alexander expelled Zoe from the palace; after Alexander's death Nicholas I Mystikos obtained from the senate and the bishops the promise not to accept her as empress. Zoe, however, carried out a coup d'état (Feb./March 914), deposed Nicholas from the regency, and ruled with the support of the parakoimomenos Constantine and the general Leo Phokas. The unsuccessful war against Symeon of Bulgaria and the humiliating treaty with the Arabs of Sicily, who were asked to assist Byz. in its struggle against rebels in Apulia and Calabria, permitted Zoe's adversaries to gain power; in 919/20 she was compelled to yield the administration to Romanos I Lekapenos and retire to the convent of St. Euthymia, where she died.


**ZOGRAPHOU MONASTERY,** dedicated to St. George, located north of Kastamonitou in the interior of the Mt. Athos peninsula. Its origins are shrouded in legend. One such legendary source is the so-called chronicle of Zographou, which has been variously dated by scholars from the 13th to the 18th C. Preserved in the Slavic original and in Greek translation, it ascribes the foundation of Zographou to the three Selina brothers, the sons of Justinian I, who allegedly came to Athos from Ohrid in the reign of Leo VI. D. Papachryssanthou (Prot., p.92f) suggests that the monastery was founded by a certain “George the zographos,” whose signature appears on the Tragos of between 970 and 972 (Prot., no.7.167). He is not characterized, however, as a monk or hegoumenos and may have been a painter, just as the monk and hegoumenos Nicholas who signed the same document was a calligrapher (no.7.163). The monastery definitely existed by the 11th C. when
it is mentioned in a decision of the council of Mt. Athos of 1049 (Zogr., no.3.12 and 51); in an act of 1051 (Zogr., no.4.1–2) it is titled the monastery of the great martyr George." The data on the history of Zographou in the 12th C. must again be treated with great caution: the signillation of 1142 given by Maria Tzousmene, allegedly daughter of John II Komnenos, is considered by P. Bezobrazov (VizVrem 17 [1910] 403–05) to be a forgery, and the so-called chrysobull (in Slavic) of Ivan Kaliman, allegedly of 1192, is a later "compilation."

More is known about Zographou from the 13th C. onward, when the monastery was under the control of Bulgarian monks. The praktika of Zographou, from the end of the 13th C. to 1320 (Ostrogorsky, Feodalitè 266–71), are precious sources for the agrarian history of the Strymon valley, since they reveal the development of certain estates over a period of 25 years. Bulgarian tsars, esp. Ivan Alexander, favored Zographou, conferred privileges, and urged both Byz. emperors and Stefan Uroš IV Dušan (L. Mavromatis, Byzantion 52 [1982] 351–56) to make donations to the monastery. The library contains only six Greek MSS of Byz. date (Lampros, Athos 1:31–35).


ZONARAS, JOHN, historian, canonist, and theologian, high-ranking official (megas droungarios tes siglas and protosekretis) at the court of Alexios I; died after 1159. Zonaras (Ζωναρᾶς) probably lost his position after 1118 and became a monk at the monastery of St. Glykeria (location disputed—K. Ziegler, RE 2. R. 19 [1972] 722). His chronic, Epitome historion, encompasses history from the creation of the world to 1118; the major portion is based on written sources (Skylitzes and Psellos for the period after 811), but Alexios's reign is Zonaras's original work, evidently a polemic against the eulogy of the emperor by Anna Komnene. Zonaras's chronicle was translated into Church Slavonic. He also produced commentaries on the Apostolic Constitutions, canons of councils, and on church fathers, as well as some hagiographical and homiletical works (e.g., an enkomion of St. Eupraxia—E. Gamillscheg, AB 99 [1981] 247–49), The lekton preserved under his name is not Zonaras's (Hunger, Lit. 2:42f.; K. Alpers, RE 2. R. 19 [1972] 732–63). An ideologue of Byz. officialdom, Zonaras strongly opposed the "seigneurial" style of government as represented by Alexios; he criticized Alexios for distributing "public money" to his relatives who received properties as large as cities (ed. T. Böttner-Wobst, 3:767.2–8), warned against over- indulgence toward the soldiery and resented excessive taxation and wasteful expenditure (Kazhdan-Franklin, Studies 59–63).


ZONE. See BELT.

ZOODOCHOS PEGE. See PEGE.

ZOODOTES. See CHRIST: Types of Christ.

ZOOLoGY. Like botany, zoology was not a separate scholarly discipline in Byz. and was not taught in the schools. There was, however, great interest in animals, whose study was approached from various angles. The works of Aristotle were studied in their own right: a 10th-C. Epitome of Aristotle's Zoology (ed. V. Rose, Anecdota Graeca et Graecolatina [Berlin 1870; rp. Amsterdam 1963] 2:17–40), commentaries by Michael of Ephesus on each of Aristotle's zoological works, and a commentary (attributed to John Tzetzes) on his Parts of Animals survive. An interest in the classical catalogs of poisonous creatures by Nikander of Colophon, Philoumenos (fl. ca.150), and Galen is shown by the prose summaries of Nikander's Theriaka and Alexipharmaca by an otherwise unknown Euteknios (fl. before 512—ed. M. Papa-
thomopoulos [Ioannina 1976]). Accurate zoological illuminations form an important part of the Byz. MSS of Nikander.

Practical needs stimulated the writing of veterinary manuals (summarized in books on Hippiatrica), handbooks for farmers (e.g., the Geoponika), tracts on parasitology (Alexander of Tralles), treatises on pharmacology, and books on hawking. Prose summaries of works by Opian on hunting and fishing reflect the persistent Byz. use of ancient authorities.

The Byz. had great curiosity about exotic animals (cf. Physiologos, Timotheos of Gaza, Manuel Philes); often they made no distinction between real and imaginary beasts. In the 11th C. Constantine IX Monomachos established a zoo in Constantinople; Attaliates (Attal. 48.11–50.11) describes with amazement the elephant and giraffe exhibited there. The vita of Makarios of Rome and the Alexander Romance also reflect the Byz. fascination with fantastic animals.

ZOROASTRIANISM, the official religion of the Sasanian Empire and the ancient, traditional religion of the Persian nation until the triumph of islamization. Under the Sasanian monarchs its religious text (Avesta), cult, and priesthood were systematized, and religion and state were closely allied and intertwined. Ardashir I (224–40) ordered the priest Tansar to create one authoritative version of the Avesta, a process finished under Shapur II (r. 309–79) in 21 books. Zoroastrian cosmogony, cosmology, and eschatology assume a period of 12,000 years in the course of which the god of light (Ohrmazd) and the god of darkness (Ahriman) are usually in combat and during which time they create good and evil. After 9,000 years Zoroaster appeared to teach mankind the religion of good, and at the end of the 12,000 years the final combat will take place, with the resurrection of the dead. The god of good triumphs, the good enter paradise, the evil go to hell, and those who are neither go to an in-between station. Elements of nature playing an important role are the sun, water, and esp. fire. There was a hierarchization of fire temples at the apex of which were the fire temples of individual monarchs, then those of districts, of villages, and of the house. The priestly class played an important role in the maintenance of the caste structure. The form of Zoroastrianism prevalent among the Sasanians was the Zurvanist. The principal deities of the pantheon were Zurvan, Ohrmazd, the Sun (Mithra), Fire (Adur), and Bedukht.

The Christian tradition identified Zoroaster as Ham or Nimrod and believed that he died from the impact of a “living stream of a star (tou asteros zosa rhoe)” that allegedly gave him a new name (W. Hinz, RE 2.R. 10 [1972] 779). A 6th-C. Byz. historian (Agath. 2.24.6–9) relates that Zoroaster or Zarades was a Persian religious reformer whose dates are unknown, that he discarded the veneration of gods who, according to Agathias, were similar to the Hellenic pantheon, and that he introduced a religion that conformed with the dualism of so-called Manichaeanism. Some saints’ vitae describe the conflict between Zoroastrian priests and Christian holy men. The Souda mentions Zoroaster as Zares. In the 15th C. Plethon considered Zoroaster to be an ancestor of Platonism and the inspirer of the Chaldean Oracles, the greatest of ancient legislators and wise men.
ZOSTIMA, author of the *Ksenos*, an account of his journey from Moscow to Constantinople, Athos, and the Holy Land in 1419–22. In ca. 1411–13 Zosima had accompanied the Muscovite bride of the future John VIII Palaiologos on her journey to Constantinople. In the *Ksenos* Zosima’s descriptions of the sacred sites are of little independent value, being somewhat haphazard and often derived from previous Eastern Slavic accounts (notably that of DANIIL IGUMEN). The narrative focus and interest of the *Ksenos* is more personal, as Zosima conveys the experience of travel. He describes being beaten and severely injured by “evil Arabs” and being stripped and robbed by pirates. He is curious and informative about money (the variety of coinage, bribes) and about languages (he records and explains Greek, Latin, and Arabic expressions). As to factual reporting, he is normally content to include numbered inventories or lists: the six sons of Manuel II (and their titles); the 22 monasteries on Athos; four leading church officials in Hagia Sophia; ten churches in Jerusalem; seven forms of worship in the Church of the Resurrection; and an appendix of multilingual geographic and numerical lists.

ZOSTE PATRIKIA (ζωστή πατρικία), the only specifically female DIGNITY. The term means either “girded” or “girding lady-patrician,” or, as Bury (Adm. System 33) has it, “mistress of the robes.” The *zoste patrikia* was attached to the empress as her “lady of honor.” The first known *zoste patrikia* was Theoktiste (ca. 830), mother of the empress THEODORA (Oikonomides, Dated Seals, no. 48). The statement of the *Patria of Constantinople* that Belisario’s wife Antonina was *zoste patrikia* is anachronistic. In the *Kletorologion* of PHILOTHEOS the *zoste patrikia* occupies the place between the *koureopalates* and *magistros*, her insignia being ivory tablets. The title disappears from narrative sources after 1018 (Skyl. 364, 64), although it is mentioned on a seal of 1060–70 according to Seibt (Bleisiegel 260–62); it is not listed in the 14th-C. pseudo-Kodinos.

ZOSIMOS (Ζωσίμος), historian of the 5th–6th C. In the title of his work Zosimos is characterized as *komes* and lawyer of the fisc (*apo phiskou synegeron*); proposed equations with the sophists Zosimos of Gaza or Askalon have no wide acceptance. His *New History*, written perhaps ca. 501 (Al. Cameron, *Philologus* 113 [1969] 106–10), after a sketchy prelude about ancient Greece, covers Roman events down to 410, where it breaks off in book 6. The “New” of the title suggests a belligerent opposition to Christianity, rather than a second edition as Photios (Bibl., cod. 98) surmised. Zosimos is one of the last pagan historians and one of the first to talk in terms of the fall of Rome. He can be unnervingly oblivious to the contradictions produced by discrepant sources (F. Paschoud, *Orpheus* n.s. 6 [1985] 44–61), e.g., in the case of Stilicho where a switch from Eu- napios (his chief, almost plagiarized source where available) to OLYMNIODOROS of THEBES turns hostility into admiration. He is most useful for periods for which other sources are lacking, e.g., the 3rd C. and 378–410. Constantinople under CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT is treated at some length, and Zosimos prophesied that Constantinople would flourish (Kaegi, *Decline* 135–42). Zosimos’s narrative is at times a vehicle for disguised criticism of contemporary events and personalities; for example, he denounced Augustus for introducing mimes into Rome (bk. 1, ch. 6). Zosimos’s writings survive in a single MS (Vat. gr. 156) probably produced in the monastery of Stoudios; it contains rebuking marginal notes from several Byz. readers.


ZUAR'T'NOC' (lit. "Heavenly Hosts, Vigilant Powers"), a church (later dedicated to St. Gregory the Illuminator) built by Nerses III (katholikos, 641/2–52/3 and 658/9–61/2) as part of his palace compound just east of V阿拉sapat. The plan of the complex is clear, although it has long been in ruins. The church stood on a polygonal stepped terrace that projected from the palace. It was a tetraconch with a circular ambulatory. The curving exedrae of the tetraconch opened into this aisle through columns placed between great W-shaped piers. Only the east exedra lacked the columns. It was separated from the aisle by a solid curved wall, and its floor was raised as a bema. At the east a rectangular chamber abutted the outer wall. Sunken in the ambulatory was a quatrefoil baptismal (?) basin. Five steps descended to a small crypt in the center of the church.

The late date of Zuart'noc'—at least a century after similar aisled tetraconchs in Syria (e.g., Armavir, Sergioiopolis)—and the lack of contemporary parallels in Armenia, are evidence that the plan was imported. Remaining rubble suggests that the church was not timber-roofed, however, but vaulted in tufa-faced concrete throughout. Its precise elevation remains conjectural. Among the many remaining sculptural fragments are basket capitals with Nerses' Greek monogram and spandrel figures of stone workers.


—A.T.

ZVONIMIR, DEMETRIOS (Dmitar), ruler (dux, then king) of Croatia (1075–89); died Knin 1089. Zvonimir came to power at a time of major changes in the Balkans and the Adriatic. With great diplomatic skill he strengthened his small principality. Byz. was losing its influence over Dalmatia, and Venice tried to replace it. The doge Domenico Silvia (1070–84) not only possessed some coastal land but assumed the title dux Dalmatiae and claimed rights over the whole territory. While Venice acted in alliance with Henry IV of Germany (1056–1106), Zvonimir sought the support of Pope Gregory VII and the Normans. He accepted the Latin liturgy and was rewarded with the royal title. The Dalmatian fleet helped Robert Guis-

card cross the Adriatic and attack Alexios I. The deaths of Robert and Gregory VII weakened Zvonimir's position; he faced the resistance of the Slavic aristocracy who opposed the Latin predominance at his court. Under papal urging, Zvonimir was inclined to join a proto-crusade against the Bogomils and pagan Pechenegs, but the assembly of Croatian nobles rejected the idea and murdered him.


—A.K., C.M.B.

ZYGADENOS, EUTHYMIOS. See Zigabenos, Euthymios.

ZYGOSTATES (ζυγοστάτης, lit. "one who weighs with a balance"), public weigher, a municipal official who, according to a law of Julian (Cod. Just. X 73.2), was to check the quality of the solidus. The term often appears in papyri and inscriptions of the late Roman Empire (L. Robert, RPhil 32 [1958] 37f), e.g., in the formula zygostates tes poleos (L. Robert, Hellenica 11–12 [1960] 51). Justinian I in the 11th edict considers zygostatai as the chief offenders in altering the purity of gold coins. Some seals of zygostatai are preserved from the 6th and 7th C. (G. Schlumberger, RV 4 9 [1905] 351, no. 287). In the Taktika of the 9th and 10th C. the zygostates is not an urban but a state functionary, belonging to the staff of the sakellion. The epithet "imperial" is given to a zygostates on a seal of the 7th C. (Zacos, Seals 1, no. 2803). Bury (Adm. System 94f) surmises that from that time the zygostates examined and weighed coins that came to the treasury. Theodore of Studios (PG 99:808C) describes the zygostasia as a profitable business, and Christopher of Mytilene (ed. Kurtz, no. 12) praised the zygostates Eustathios as founder of a church and "one of the great chartoularioi." In the false privilege allegedly bestowed on Monemvasia in 1316 the zygastikon was named as one of the customary payments to toll inspectors for weighing and measuring wares (P. Schreiner, JOB 27 [1978] 219–30), but that had nothing in common with the functions of the zygostates of the sakellion.


—A.K.