Subsequently, distinct local recensions of Church Slavonic emerged through its interaction with the Slavonic vernacular languages (Russian Church Slavonic, Bulgarian Church Slavonic, etc.).

LIT. R. Picchio in *The Slavic Literary Languages*, ed. A. Schenker, E. Stankiewicz (New Haven 1980) 1–33.
–S.C.F.

CIBORIUM (*κιβώριον*), a domed or pyramidal structure on four or six columns (K. Wessel, *RBK* 1:1055). In Roman times ciboria were erected over tombs both to protect them and to enhance their importance, hence their use over the ALTAR symbolizing the tomb of Christ. Similarly, the silver ciborium at St. DEMETRIOS in Thessalonike was thought to mark the site of the saint's tomb (Lemerle, *Miracles* 1:114f). A pyramidal ciborium rose over the SARCOPHAGUS containing the saint's relics in the church of HOSIOS LOUKAS (R.W. Schultz, S.H. Barnsley, *The Monastery of Saint Luke* [London 1901] 29, pl.46). Circular, hexagonal, or rectangular in plan, ciboria survive mostly in fragments; exceptionally complete examples are the restored ciborium of the Katapoliane in Paros and that of the Metropolis church at Kalambaka (see STAGOI). Some ciboria display columns with spiral fluting and Corinthian or protome CAPITALS, their pyramidal or domed canopy terminating in a cross (Orlandos, *Palaiochr. basilike* 2:471–81). Painted representations of ciboria suggest that they were furnished with curtains, though this point has been contested (Mathews, *Early Churches* 165–68).

Ciboria sometimes combined colored and white marble, while those of St. Polyeuktos and St. Euphemia in Constantinople displayed inlaid glass decoration. They were cast in bronze and gilded, or dressed in silver like that in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, as described by PAUL SILENTIARIOS.

LIT. M.T. Smith, "The Ciborium in Christian Architecture at Rome, 300–600 A.D." (Ph.D. diss., New York Univ., 1968). D.I. Pallas, "Le Ciborium hexagonal de Saint-Démétrios de Thessalonique," *Zograf* 10 (1979) 44–58.
–L.Ph.B.

CILICIA (*Κιλικία*), Roman province of southeastern Asia Minor consisting of two districts: Cilicia Pedias, a well-watered fertile plain bounded by the Taurus, Antitaurus and Mediterranean, and Cilicia Tracheia, the rugged region of the southern Taurus stretching west to PAMPHYLIA.

CIBORIUM. Depiction of a ciborium; mosaic, 14th C. Inner narthex of the Church of the Chora monastery, Istanbul. The scene depicts Zacharias praying before the rods of the suitors.

Under Diocletian, Cilicia Tracheia became part of ISAURIA. Cilicia Pedias was divided ca.400 into Cilicia I (metropolis TARSOS) and Cilicia II (metropolis ANAZARBOS); their churches were under the patriarchate of Antioch. Located on the highway from Constantinople to northern Syria via the CILICIAN GATES, Cilicia prospered; it was a densely populated center of agriculture, trade, and manufacture (esp. of linen) through the 6th C. In 646, however, MUʿĀWIYA found the area virtually deserted, and by the early 8th C. it was occupied by the Arabs, for whom it became a bulwark against Byz. attacks. These achieved their goal with the reconquest of Cilicia by Nikephoros II Phokas in 965. The district did not then form an administrative unit, but was ruled by *strategoi* of separate fortresses (N. Oikonomides in 14 *CEB*, vol. 1 [Bucharest 1974] 288f). After 1071 Byz. lost Cilicia to Philaretos BRACHAMIOS; thereafter, it constantly changed hands between Byz., Crusaders, Seljuks, and Armenians. John II Komnenos took it in 1137; Manuel I Komnenos had to reconquer it in 1159; it was definitively lost to the Armenians after 1176 (see CILICIA, ARMENIAN). Cilicia contains the remains of numerous late antique churches and medieval fortifications.

LIT. F. Hild et al., *RBK* 4:182–356. H. Hellenkemper, *Burgen der Kreuzritterzeit* (Bonn 1976) 104–254. H. Hellenkemper, F. Hild, *Neue Forschungen in Kilikien* (Vienna 1986). R.W. Edwards, "Ecclesiastical Architecture in the Fortifications of Armenian Cilicia," *DOP* 36 (1982) 155–76.
–C.F.

CILICIA, ARMENIAN (also known as Lesser Armenia), principality (1073?-1099) and subsequently kingdom (1099–1375) under the Armenian RUBENID and HETʿUMID, and the Latin LUSIGNAN dynasties. Armenians fleeing from Seljuk invasions after the Byz. defeat at MANTZIKERT (1071) took refuge in Rubenid strongholds such as Vahka and Gobidar (Kopitar) in the Antitaurus mountains, and the Hetʿumid Lambron near the Cilician Gates. By the end of the 12th C. the Rubenids had established a kingdom that encompassed at its peak the coastal plain of Cilicia as well as the surrounding mountains. Its capital was located at Sis, in the foothills.

The princes of Armenian Cilicia, although occasionally supported by the Crusaders, were forced to recognize the suzerainty of Byz. (reaffirmed by the campaigns of the emperors John II Komnenos in 1138 and Manuel I Komnenos in 1158) and negotiations were opened between the Armenian church and the Byz. Empire. The Third Crusade enabled the Rubenid prince Leo II to be crowned king as Leo I (see LEO II/I). Officially, Byz. sanctioned this action, but Armenian Cilicia turned thereafter increasingly toward the Latins.

The kingdom prospered from the trade passing from the West to the Far East through its port of Ayas (It. Lajazzo), esp. during the period of Mongol protection in the second half of the 13th C. Its international culture reached its apogee in the same period.

The recognition of Mongol suzerainty by the Hetʿumids in 1253 bolstered Armenian Cilicia for a time, but its political situation between the Seljuks of Rūm, the Mamlūks of Egypt, and the Mongols remained precarious, esp. after the conversion of the latter to Islam at the end of the 13th C. By 1292 the Armenian patriarchs were forced to abandon their seat at Hṙomkla on the Euphrates overrun by the Muslims and to seek refuge at Sis. Internal struggles between pro- and anti-Latin parties, fueled by the growing influence of Western institutions and by the negotiations for an ecclesiastical union with Rome, sapped the strength of the kingdom still further. The hostility of the Armenian nobility toward the Latin Lusignans led to the murder of King Guy in 1344. In 1375, an Egyptian force overran Cilicia, sacked the capital, and carried away the last king as a prisoner to Cairo.

LIT. S. Der Nersessian, *HC* 2:630–59. Ł. Alishan, *Sissouan ou l'Arméno-Cilicie* (Venice 1899). P. Tekeyan, *Controverses christologiques en Arméno-Cilicie dans la seconde moitié du XIIe siècle* (Rome 1939). R. Edwards, *The Fortresses of Armenian Cilicia* (Washington, D.C., 1987). –N.G.G.

Art of Armenian Cilicia. The many ruins of fortified towns in Cilicia include both palaces and churches, some with traces of monumental painting. Some silverwork survives—a reliquary and bookbindings—but it is MS illumination that best reveals the brilliant art of the Cilician court. The traditions of great scriptoria (in both monasteries and towns) and the contributions of individual artists and aristocratic patrons can be traced for decades at a time: for example, MSS are known from Hṙomkla from just after the founding of the patriarchal see there in 1151 until the Mamlūk sack of 1292; among them are seven signed from 1256 to 1269 by the artist Tʿoros Roslin.

Although Armenian workshop traditions survived the emigration to Cilicia, Byz. styles and images are found throughout Cilician painting. A 13th-C. Gospel (Erevan, Mat. 7651) copies almost all the miniatures of the 11th-C. FRIEZE GOSPEL in Florence. Ornate inscriptions and arabesque arches on CANON TABLE pages, however, reflect Islamic art, while the Lectionary of Hetʿum II (Mat. 979) contains Chinese elements. Cilician royalty are shown wearing oriental textiles. Latin influence was particularly strong after the Council of Sis (1252), as the affinity of Tʿoros Roslin's figure style to that of the Arsenal Bible (Paris, Arsenal 5211) or the adoption of the *Madonna della Misericordia* type for Cilician donor portraits demonstrates.

LIT. S. Der Nersessian, *Armenian Art* (London–New York 1978) 123–62. Eadem, "Deux examples arméniens de la Vierge de Miséricorde," *REArm* n.s. 7 (1970) 187–202.
–A.T.

www.saraporum.ru

CILICIAN GATES (Πύλαι Κιλικίας), the narrow pass, 1,050 m high, that offers the easiest crossing of the Taurus Mountains between central Anatolia and the plain of Cilicia, and thus always the route of a major highway. It was esp. important during the wars with the Arabs after they gained control of Cilicia in 703. The term strictly denotes the narrow pass but is also applied to the whole stretch of road through the mountains. The main center of this district was Podandos, a city and bishopric and later KLEISOURA of Cappadocia, which was the constant goal of (often successful) Arab attacks in the 8th–10th C. Lulon, on a steep peak at the west end of the pass, provided a final defense and served as the first in the chain of BEACONS that rapidly transmitted news of attack to the capital. The pass contains the remains of several fortresses.

LIT. *TIB* 2:223f, 261–64. –C.F.

CIRCUS. See CHARIOTEERS; CHARIOT RACES; HIPPODROMES.

CIRCUS PARTIES. See FACTIONS.

CISTERNS. See CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF: Cisterns.

CITATION was an important stylistic device closely connected with the tendency toward ARCHAISM and IMITATION (*mimesis*). On the one hand, citation was a sort of game between the author and reader, the former avoiding any direct indication of the origin of the citation and the latter challenged to guess the source (Hunger, *Lit.* 2:7). On the other hand, citation could be a powerful vehicle to convey direct information; e.g., Christian apologists (imitating their Jewish predecessors) quoted ancient poets for their propaganda, and during theological discussions citation was the major argument that time and again led to forgery or deletion of crucial passages. The most commonly quoted texts were the Bible, Homer, and the ancient tragedians. Often citations originated not from original texts but from FLORILEGIA and LEXIKA; quoting from MEMORY was common and frequently caused distortions. The frequency of citation differs from work to work: some texts (CHRISTOS PASCHON, ANACHARSIS, BARLAAM AND IOASAPH) are consciously composed of borrowed lines, while other works used citations to a limited degree. Since the concept of plagiarism did not exist, the use of quotations could grow into a copying of entire passages. Even though there was an element of showing off the author's knowledge (D. Christides, *EEPhSPTh* 22 [1984] 689), citation also performed specific aesthetic functions. It connected the present with the past, depicted objects and events from an alien point of view, and introduced the element of unexpectedness and strangeness (esp. by combination of biblical and pagan quotations); a new image was often constructed from borrowed words and sentences.

LIT. N. Zeegers-van der Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du IIe siècle* (Louvain 1972). E. Livrea, "Le citazioni dei tragici in un inedito florilegio patmiaco," *RSBS* 3 (1983) 3–9. F. Grabler, "Das Zitat als Stilkunstmittel bei Niketas Choniates," 11 *CEB* (Munich 1960) 190–93. A.R. Littlewood, "Repetition of Quotations in Byzantine Letters," 12 *BSC Abstracts* (Bryn Mawr 1986) 49f. M. Kertsch, "Patristische Zitate bei spätern griechisch-christlichen Autoren," *JÖB* 38 (1988) 113–24. –A.K.

CITIES (πόλεις), the cornerstone of classical civilization, were centers of population, culture, trade, manufacture, and administration. By the 6th C., the East contained more than 900 cities, of which the greatest were CONSTANTINOPLE, ALEXANDRIA, and ANTIOCH. A large provincial city might extend 2 km in its greatest dimension and have a population of 50,000, but most were much smaller.

Urban wealth was based on agriculture, but trade and manufacture were significant. These were usually on a small scale in which the artisan would sell the goods he made, but many cities, esp. ports, had extensive TRADE in essential or luxury goods. Major classes of the urban population were the CURIALES, bureaucrats and state officials, ecclesiastics, landowners, and the members of GUILDS, the craftsmen and shopkeepers.

The city differed from rural areas by its provision of public works and services. Most were maintained until the 6th C.: cities provided free bread, AQUEDUCTS, clean and lighted streets, BATHS, markets, theaters, HIPPODROMES, and LATRINES. Diocletian instituted municipal higher education to supply trained civil servants. The church, whose revenues were increasing, offered public welfare, with HOSPITALS, poorhouses (PTOCHOTROPHEIA), homes for the aged (GEROKOMEIA), and inns (XENODOCHEIA). As cities found public works more difficult to support, governors came to build or restore them. Such activity was concentrated in provincial capitals, which often prospered at the expense of lesser cities. Urban prosperity varied considerably, from Constantinople, which could draw on the revenues of the empire, to cities in exposed regions like North Africa (e.g., CARTHAGE in the 7th C.) and the Balkans, where ruin and contraction were common.

Cities were administered by councils or CURIAE, which relied on rents, endowments, local taxes, and contributions from their members (*curiales* or decurions) to support their expenses: supplying bread and water to the population, higher education, police, and esp. maintenance of baths and other public facilities. The confiscations of Constantine I and Constantius II deprived the cities of their territories and taxes; the resulting financial distress was only partially relieved when Valens remitted one-third of these revenues. The history of late antique cities is thus marked by shortage of money, weakening of the councils, and growing interference from Constantinople. As the decurions became increasingly reluctant to serve, the government tried a series of expedients to maintain the councils, install responsible administrators (DEFENSOR CIVITATIS), and restrain the influence of rapacious governors. Finally, Anastasios I entrusted the cities to their bishops and landowners, replacing the councils with the collective responsibility of the church and propertied class. Many cities suffered serious demographic decline from the bubonic plague of 542 and later years; however, Constantinople, provincial capitals, pilgrimage centers, and cities along main highways and trade routes continued to prosper.

Excavations have revealed the physical aspect of the late Roman city. The broad boulevards, numerous open squares, and massive palaces and churches of Constantinople represented the planning of the age but could not be duplicated elsewhere. New districts of cities like Antioch, however, show a regular plan featuring orthogonal streets with monumental arches at their intersections. Most cities followed existing and often irregular plans, but in all cases colonnaded streets (EMBOLOI) were an essential element for communication and commerce, as rows of shops laid out behind their mosaic-paved colonnades became the chief markets. In general, the ancient urban fabric survived: theaters, odeons, baths with gymnasiums, marketplaces, and civic centers were all maintained, while the villas and luxurious apartments of the rich were frequently expanded, and monumental fountains adorned the streets. Major changes reflected religion and style. Pagan temples were abandoned and demolished for building materials; churches took their place. In some cases, temples were turned into churches, but more often the churches grew up on the periphery and only gradually invaded the city center. Late antique cities looked very different from their predecessors: buildings universally employed reused material, often covered on the outside with plaster, and were decorated inside with frescoes, cut marble, and mosaics. Color was manifest everywhere. Ancient urban regularity tended to disappear as open spaces and streets became cluttered with shoddy commercial construction (shops were typically extended into streets, and booths set up in colonnades), and abandoned buildings were left in ruins. Deterioration of open space was esp. marked in the 6th C. Cities like JUSTINIANA PRIMA, or some in LYCIA, have virtually no civic buildings of the traditional type but contain houses and shops closely packed along regular streets and dominated by one or more large churches, thus illustrating the decline of public works and growth in the power of the church.

In the 7th C., cities underwent fundamental and permanent transformations as they reduced in size and population; their public works and services came to an end. They generally became ruralized, differing from fortresses or villages only in their size, occasional preservation of ancient buildings, and continuing role as seats of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Merchants and craftsmen became rare; the *curiales* disappeared; cities were commonly under the command of military officials, subordinates of the STRATEGOS. External blows—Persian, Arab, Slav, and Avar attacks—contributed to the crisis.

A typical city of the Dark Ages consisted of a fortified center, often with a separate acropolis, which occupied a small part of the former urban area. The walls, built from ruined buildings, typically incorporated or obliterated former public structures and ignored previous streets. Within them, civic buildings were almost universally

www.staropomorn.pl

abandoned: most became quarries for building material; others were occupied by squatters who built poor dwellings within them, often in connection with burning their marble for lime to make mortar. Churches, however, survived, often as increasingly dilapidated basilicas that came to tower over the small and crowded industrial installations (for pottery, glass, lime, and iron working) and houses. Monasteries and cemeteries, formerly alien to urban areas, came within the walls. Houses were small and poorly built, usually containing courtyards with large *pithoi* for storage of grain and liquids. With the abandonment or destruction of aqueducts, cisterns were constructed everywhere. Many settlements clustered behind the walls of a hilltop fortress, while others were scattered around the ancient ruins, often as separate settlements resembling villages, each with its own water supply and limited facilities for production. Even Constantinople was affected: large parts of the city fell into ruin, public services were abandoned, and the population declined drastically.

Recovery began in the 9th C. and continued in Asia Minor through the 11th, in Greece through the 12th C. The cities never regained their ancient roles, but conditions within them improved as peace and trade brought growth. New larger circuits of walls were built, but cities continued to expand outside them. Small neighborhood churches were erected and an occasional open marketplace appeared, but cities remained crowded and poorly built, with small houses along narrow winding streets which had no relation to earlier planning. In this, new foundations hardly differed from the old; fortresses and churches were the dominant elements, other structures found room beside them. The 13th C. brought some prosperity to the cities of Asia Minor, which often received new walls and churches, while in Greece the Frankish period brought a growth of city-fortresses on hilltops. The last period of Byz. rule, when the central government was weak, allowed the cities to gain some independence, often recognized with concessions when they were reintegrated into the empire. In some places a local aristocracy assumed considerable authority. Cities of the splinter states grew and flourished. They often consisted of a citadel (KASTRON), an upper enclosure where the ruler, magnates, and bishop had their palaces; and a lower town (EMPORION) devoted to commerce, with the homes of the common people and foreigners (who sometimes had their separate castle). By the 14th C. houses were large and spacious, aqueducts were again in use, and the standard of living was higher than it had been since the 7th C. Even such places, however, were small compared with their late antique predecessors, offered few if any public services, and showed no sign of systematic planning.

The normal artistic representation of a city was as a walled enceinte, studded with towers and rendered in bird's-eye perspective. Entered via a single portal, cities shown as models in the hands of a benefactor or as elements of BACKGROUND are customarily filled with elaborate architecture including a domed church. Only rarely, as in the MADABA MOSAIC MAP, do they contain structures that allow specific identification of the site. A unique planimetric view of Constantinople appears on the hyperpers of Michael VIII and Andronikos II.

LIT. A.P. Kazhdan, "Vizantijskie goroda v VII–IX vv.," *Sovetskaja Archeologija* 21 (1954) 164–88. E. Kirsten, "Die byzantinische Stadt," 11 *CEB* (Munich 1958) Berichte 5:3. C. Foss, "Archaeology and the 'Twenty Cities' of Byzantine Asia," *AJA* 81 (1977) 469–86. Mango, *Byzantium* 60–87. Ch. Bouras, "City and Village: Urban Design and Architecture," *JÖB* 31 (1981) 611–53. I. Ehrensperger-Katz, "Les représentations de villes fortifiées dans l'art paléochrétien et leurs derivées byzantines," *CahArch* 19 (1969) 1–27. –C.F., A.C.

CITIZENS (πολῖται). Byz. law preserved the Roman concept of citizenship, as granted to all free inhabitants of the empire in 212. Byz. citizens were distinguished from slaves, whose acts of MANUMISSION recognized them as citizens (e.g., Sathas, *MB* 6:618.13–14). Changes in citizenship to take advantage of commercial privileges could cause problems (e.g., MM 3:189.11–19 of 30 Oct. 1436) and dual citizenship is attested after 1204. It is unclear how Byz. proceeded juridically toward the numerous foreigners (e.g., Armenians, LATINS) who entered imperial service, but many were successfully assimilated. Externally, Byz. citizens were usually recognizable by a national costume and particular traits of grooming; for example, in 787 the Beneventans offered to enter the Byz. Empire and adopt the Byz. national dress and haircut (CODEX CAROLINUS 83, p.617.5–31). Shared cultural traditions, PATRIOTISM, loyalty to the emperor, Orthodoxy, and, from the 7th C. onward, the Greek language helped shape Byz. citizens' distinctive identity.

LIT. R.S. Lopez, *Byzantium and the World around It* (London 1978), pt.XIV (1974), 342–52. P. Schreiner, *LMA* 2:1039f. –M.McC.

CITY TAXES. Until the 7th-C. crisis, Byz. cities, important demographically as well as economically, had their own municipal administrations and finances, based mainly on rents of city land (*astika*), on contributions (voluntary or not) of wealthy citizens (esp. civic magistrates), and on city taxes, the *vectigalia*, collected on local economic activities. City taxes were taken over by the COMES SACRARUM LARGITIONUM, partially returned by Julian, then confiscated again by Valentinian and Valens, the latter being obliged to return part of them to the city administrations. In the meantime, urban economic activities had started to decline. After the 7th C., when the smaller and less economically active "medieval" cities appeared, administered directly by state officials and financed by the government, city taxes disappeared.

LIT. Jones, *LRE* 732–34. –N.O.

CIVIL PROCEDURE (χρηματικὴ δίκη). The Justinianic civil lawsuit began with the plaintiff's (*enagon*) submission of the writ (*libellos*) at the COURT of law; from there it was served, together with a summons, on the defendant (*enagomenos*). On the first day fixed for TRIAL the formal conditions were clarified (esp. the question of the competency of the court), an OATH was taken by the participants in the proceedings, and surety was arranged by the plaintiff and defendant or by their representatives. The first part (*prooimion*) of the procedure was concluded with the formal statement of dispute (*prokatarxis*). The next step was the examination of evidence that could be undertaken by the assessors. The most important types of evidence were the testimony of WITNESSES and documents. Witnesses did not necessarily have to appear in person, but they did have to confirm their recorded testimony under oath. Where other proofs were lacking an oath could be imposed on one party by the other or by the judge. After a maximum of three years, a trial concluded with a final judgment (*apophasis*), which had to be drawn up in writing and read aloud. If the losing party neither complied with the decision nor appealed within ten days, the victorious party could file for the legal execution of the judgment four months after the court's announcement of the decision.

LIT. D. Simon, *Untersuchungen zum justinianischen Zivilprozess* (Munich 1969). Kaser, *Zivilprozessrecht* 410–529. Zachariä, *Geschichte* 392–99. –L.B.

Later Developments. In post-Justinianic law, witnesses, documents, and oaths continued to play the chief role in litigation. Although late Roman procedure tended to give more weight to documents than to oral testimony, the *Peira* 30.17 reversed this principle: while acknowledging the preeminence of written evidence in cases such as marriage or sale of property and other business affairs, Eustathios RHOMAIOS proclaimed that oral testimony was generally the most reliable. Byz. law thus paid much attention to exposing false documents (S. Troianos, *EEBS* 39–40 [1972–73] 181–200). The use of oaths contradicted the injunction of Matthew 5:33, and commentators on *Basil.* 22.5 tried to reconcile their practice with the Gospel ruling by quoting John Chrysostom. Byz. legal practice also accepted certain paralegal means of decision making: rhetorical arguments that could be more convincing than legal ones, the principle that the emperor's word is beyond law (this could be extended to those to whom the emperor delegated his authority), and mob pressure. The use of various ORDEALS as a means of establishing the truth emerged despite some strong resistance. Literary texts (e.g., hagiography) could be submitted as evidence, and references to Homer or Aristotle could be used to establish precedent.

LIT. F. Dölger, "Der Beweis im byzantinischen Gerichtsverfahren," *La preuve* 1 (Brussels 1964) 595–612. Simon, *Rechtsfindung*. S. Troianos, "Ho elenchos tes gnesiotetos ton apodeiktikon engraphon en te byzantine dike," in *Xenon: Festschrift für P. Zepos*, vol. 1 (Athens–Freiburg im Breisgau–Cologne 1973) 693–716. –A.K.

CIVIL WAR OF 1341–47. Following shortly after the conflict between Andronikos II and Andronikos III (1321–28), this war further divided and weakened the remnants of the Byz. Empire. When Andronikos III died in 1341, leaving his nine-year-old son JOHN V PALAIOLOGOS as heir to the throne, a struggle for the regency developed between JOHN (VI) KANTAKOUZENOS, the *megas domestikos*, on one side, and the empress ANNA OF SAVOY, Patr. JOHN XIV KALEKAS, and the *megas*

www.staropomor.ru

doux Alexios APOKAUKOS, on the other. Taking advantage of the absence of Kantakouzenos from Constantinople on military campaign, John XIV declared his own regency and confiscated Kantakouzenos's property in the capital. In Oct. 1341 Kantakouzenos was proclaimed emperor in Didymoteichon, triggering war. Kantakouzenos was generally supported by the provincial landed aristocracy and proponents of HESYCHASM, but there were numerous exceptions. At first Kantakouzenos fared poorly in the war as the result of antiaristocratic rebellions in the towns of Macedonia and Thrace, notably the revolt of the ZEALOTS in Thessalonike. But after receiving assistance from UMUR BEG, emir of Aydın, and STEFAN UROŠ IV DUŠAN, king of Serbia, his fortunes improved and he gained control of Thessaly, Epiros, and parts of Thrace and Macedonia, despite Dušan's switch of allegiance to John V. The murder of Apokaukos in 1345 was a severe blow to the regency. After 1345 Umur was forced to withdraw his troops, but Kantakouzenos replaced them with Ottoman soldiers supplied by the emir ORHAN (E. Werner, *BS* 26 [1965] 255–76). In 1346 Kantakouzenos was crowned emperor at Adrianople, and the following year he entered Constantinople. An agreement that he and John V should rule as co-emperors ended the civil war. The prolonged struggle was disastrous for Byz., as it brought anarchy to the cities and devastation to the countryside. In Didymoteichon, for example, soldiers turned to BRIGANDAGE in order to secure the necessary provisions (C. Asdracha, *EtBalk* n.s. 7.3 [1971] 118–20). The war also permitted Dušan to expand his empire into Thrace and Macedonia. The victory of Kantakouzenos significantly affected the church, since it enabled the triumph of hesychasm.

LIT. Nicol, *Last Centuries* 191–216. Ostrogorsky, *History* 509–22. Matschke, *Fortschritt*. –A.M.T.

CLARENZA. See CHLEMOUTSI.

CLARISSIMUS (λαμπρότατος), honorific epithet applied to SENATORS that became an official title during the early Roman Empire. According to the EXCERPTA VALESIANA (ed. Moreau-Velkor 9.3), when Constantine I created the SENATE in Constantinople he granted new senators the title of *clari* to distinguish them from the *clarissimi* of Rome. When the titles of ILLUSTRIS and SPECTABILIS were introduced in the second half of the 4th C., *clarissimus* began to designate the lowest category of senators. Between 450 and 530 use of the title *clarissimus* (as well as *spectabilis*) declined and ceased to be applied to senators at all. Jones (*LRE* 2:529) considers it still as hereditary, but Guilland (*Institutions* 1:68f) denies it. The title was not part of the Byz. bureaucratic hierarchy.

LIT. Dagron, *Naissance* 123f. Guilland, *Titres*, pt.I (1967), 27–36. –A.K.

CLASSE. See RAVENNA.

CLASS STRUCTURE. Class is a conventional sociological term designating extensive groups of people who have common characteristics with regard to their place in the system of production, their wealth, power, and prestige. The difficulty in defining Byz. class structure originates in the difference between Byz. stratification and the contemporary scholarly models (which in turn, vary according to schools of thought, Marxist or non-Marxist), from the lack of clear-cut boundaries between various classes, and from cases of social mobility. The Byz. resorted to several methods of social categorization: (1) slaves and free men, (2) "great" and "small," or "powerful" (*dynatoi*) and "poor," with a third category of men of moderate means (*mesoi*) introduced on occasion; (3) classification by profession, as in Psellos—senators, monks, the urban masses, and those involved in agriculture and trade; (4) a tripartite classification of Western type—soldiers, clergy, and ordinary people (Kazhdan-Franklin, *Studies* 142–44).

Four factors were taken into account by the Byz. in defining the elite or ruling class: good family background (this principle seems to have been reestablished by the 10th C.); wealth (including salaries, rewards, extortions, etc., in addition to property); hierarchical rank; and prestige or high moral reputation. The shift from an elite based on rank and position to an elite determined by family background and ownership of land was a crucial development of the Byz. class structure. Merchants probably emerged as an independent class by the 11th C. but were never legally defined as a distinct category. The lower class encompassed various groups of rural and urban population: common soldiers, state and private peasants, craftsmen and peddlers, *misthioi*, slaves, beggars. The lower clergy (*paroikoi*-priests, working monks) in a certain sense belonged to this class. Intellectuals did not form a separate group until the 12th C.; before then they were part of the secular and ecclesiastical administration.

LIT. Beck, *Ideen*, pt.X (1965), 11–45. A. Kazhdan, *Social'nyj sostav gospodstvujuščego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.* (Moscow 1974), with a Fr. résumé by I. Sorlin, *TM* 6 (1976) 367–80. A. Kazhdan, I. Čičurov, "O strukture vizantijskogo obščestva VII–IX vv.," *VizOč* (Moscow 1977) 107–37. G. Weiss, "Beobachtungen zur Sozialgeschichte von Byzanz," *SüdostF* 34 (1975) 3–25. J. Gagé, *Les classes sociales dans l'Empire romain* (Paris 1964) 335–448. –A.K.

CLAUDIAN (Claudius Claudianus), wandering poet of late Roman Egypt; born Alexandria ca.370, died ca.404. After producing (in Greek) conventional panegyrics, *patria*, and epigrams (some preserved in the GREEK ANTHOLOGY), Claudian went to Italy, where he composed Latin panegyrics at Rome (395) for the consuls Probus and Olybrius and at Milan (396) for the third consulate of Emp. Honorius. From then until 404, he tirelessly manufactured more panegyrics for Honorius and most notably for STILICHO. A natural pendant to these works is Claudian's elaborately vicious attack on the Eastern courtiers RUFINUS and EUTROPIUS. His material rewards for this propaganda included the title *clarissimus*, a public statue whose inscription (*CIL* 6:1710) records his honors, and a rich bride chosen by Stilicho's wife Serena. Further poetic themes include the crushing of the rebel GILDO (398) and the mythological *De raptu Proserpinae* and *Gigantomachia*. Claudian, noted for his poetry and paganism by AUGUSTINE and OROSIUS, is essentially the culmination of classical Latin poetry. Prolix in praise and abuse, although polished overall, his poems are a major source for the military and political history of the years 395–404.

ED. *Carmina*, ed. J.B. Hall (Leipzig 1985). *De raptu Proserpinae*, ed. J.B. Hall (Cambridge 1969). *Claudian*, ed. M. Platnauer, 2 vols. (London–New York 1922), with Eng. tr.

LIT. Al. Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford 1970). J.B. Hall, *Prolegomena to Claudian* (London 1986). P.G. Christiansen, *The Use of Images by Claudius Claudianus* (The Hague–Paris 1969). H.L. Levy, *Claudian's In Rufinum. An Exegetical Commentary* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1971). –B.B.

CLAVIJO, RUY GONZÁLEZ DE, a high-ranking official of Henry III, king of Castile; died 2 Apr. 1412. With an embassy he journeyed to the court of TIMUR in Samarkand, which he described in detail. The embassy left Seville on 22 May 1403 and returned to Castile on 24 March 1406. Clavijo describes several islands of the Aegean Sea (Rhodes, Chios, Lesbos ["Metellin"]), mentions Mt. Athos ("Monteston"), and dwells at length on Constantinople and Pera. He was most interested in churches and monasteries (Hagia Sophia, St. John the Baptist, Blachernai ["de la Cherne"], etc.) and their treasures, relics, and ornaments; among others, Clavijo describes the Church of Mary "Peribelico" (PERIBLEPTOS), at whose entrance were represented 30 castles and towns allegedly granted to the church by an emperor Romanos; privileges listing the rights of the church to these castles and confirmed by wax and lead seals were displayed nearby. Clavijo also reports on the Hippodrome, the city walls, wells of sweet water, the moneychangers' street, warehouses, and the fetters used to punish those who sold meat or bread with false weights. He noticed that many buildings were in a state of ruin. Clavijo visited Trebizond as well. He devotes considerable attention to relations within the imperial family and to the war between Venice and Genoa.

ED. *Embajada a Tamorlán*, ed. F. López Estrada (Madrid 1943). Eng. tr., *Narrative of the Embassy of Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo*, ed. C. Markham (London 1859; rp. New York 1970).

LIT. A. Bravo García, "La Constantinopla que vieron R. González de Clavijo y P. Tafur," *Erytheia* 3 (1983) 39–47. –A.K.

CLAVUS, a vertical stripe decorating the Roman TUNIC; the wide ones (*clavi lati*) were originally an indication of the senatorial rank of the wearer. The *clavi* were usually purple or gold and were woven into the tunic in pairs; they were visible on the shoulder even when the tunic was covered by an outer mantle. In Byz. art, *clavi* are primarily found decorating the tunics of Christ, the angels, and the apostles, figures who are regularly shown clad in ancient garb. *Clavi* embroidered with rows of flowers adorn the tunics of the female members of the imperial entourage and those of female martyrs in the 6th-C. mosaic processions of S. Vitale and S. Apollinare Nuovo, RAVENNA, and David's tunic in the 10th-C. Bible of LEO SAKEL-

www.staropomorn.ru

LARIOS (fol.263). In Egypt, tapestry bands have been found decorated with comparable floral and figural designs; these were probably *clavi* for tunics. Simple, dark-colored *clavi* adorn the Byz. liturgical vestment called STICHARION, in which case they are called *potamoi* ("rivers").

LIT. M.G. Houston, *Ancient Greek, Roman and Byzantine Costume and Decoration*[2] (London 1947) 97, 138, 143. Papas, *Messgewänder* 107f. –N.P.Š.

CLEMENT III (Guibert of Ravenna), antipope (elected Mar. 1084); born Parma ca.1025, died Civita Castellana 8 Sept. 1100. Henry IV of Germany supported Clement against Popes GREGORY VII and URBAN II. Urban sought an accommodation with Byz., whereas Clement tried to gain the support of Byz.'s northern neighbors: on 8 Jan. 1089 he created a Serbian archbishopric under Roman jurisdiction. Around 1088 Clement sent envoys to JOHN II, metropolitan of Kiev.

LIT. J. Ziese, *Wibert von Ravenna* (Stuttgart 1982). –A.K.

CLEMENT V (Bertrand de Got), pope (from 5 June 1305); born in the Bordelais ca.1260, died Roquemaure, Comtat Venaissin, 20 Apr. 1314. Forced to leave Italy, Clement settled in southern France, residing from 1309 in Avignon. He advocated the idea of a new Crusade with limited objectives. While proclaiming the liberation of the Holy Land as the ultimate goal, the Crusaders' armies were directed to specific areas: Clement supported the attack of the HOSPITALLERS on Rhodes, the official purpose of which was to protect Armenia and Cyprus from the infidel, to hinder trade with the Saracens and to prepare a universal crusade. Also under the banner of a crusade, Clement organized a war against Venice and managed to regain FERRARA for the papacy.

LIT. G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon, 1305–1378* (London–New York 1963) 3–8. F. Heidelberger, *Kreuzzugsversuche um die Wende des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1911) 24–62. L. Thier, *Kreuzzugsbemühungen unter Papst Clemens V.* (Werl, Westfallen, 1973). N. Housley, "Pope Clement V and the Crusades of 1309–1310," *JMedHist* 8 (1982) 29–43. –A.K.

CLEMENT VI (Pierre Roger), pope (from 7 May 1342); born Maumont (Corrèze), France, 1291, died Avignon 6 Dec. 1352. Clement's pontificate coincided with the growth of national forces in western Europe and the decline of monarchies with a tendency to universalist power, so that the PAPACY remained the sole bearer of the idea of crusade. The kings of France, who were involved in the Hundred Years' War, withdrew from the project, and Clement had to seek the support of smaller Mediterranean states such as Aragon, Venice, Cyprus, and the kingdom of Cilicia. He also entered into negotiations with Byz. in expectation that the empire, weakened by the CIVIL WAR OF 1341–47, would accept UNION OF THE CHURCHES. In 1348 Emp. John VI Kantakouzenos sent ambassadors to Avignon; this mission left an important mark on cultural life, since one of its members, Nicholas Sigeros, gave Petrarch a codex of Homer. Clement's major achievement was the capture of SMYRNA by a Latin navy on 28 Oct. 1344, but the ensuing expedition inland failed. Union was not achieved, but the people of PHILADELPHIA, impressed by the Latin success at Smyrna, dispatched ambassadors to Avignon, accepting papal supremacy in exchange for assistance in their struggle against the Turks.

LIT. A. Pélissier, *Clément VI le Magnifique* (Paris 1951). G. Mollat, *DHGE* 12 (1953) 1129–62. J. Gay, *Le pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient* (Paris 1904; rp. New York 1972). R.J. Loenertz, *ByzFrGr I* 285–302. F. Giunta, "Sulla politica orientale di Clemente VI," in *Studi di storia medievale e moderna in onore di Ettore Rota* (Rome 1958) 149–62. –A.K.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, more fully T. Flavius Clemens, early Christian philosopher; born Athens? ca.150, died Cappadocia before 215. Educated in Alexandria, he worked there as a teacher from ca.200 until he was forced to leave the city because of anti-Christian persecutions. Like ORIGEN, Clement belonged to a group of well-educated Christians who sought a certain reconciliation with pagan ideas and were influenced by Platonism. Clement's aim was the struggle against GNOSTICISM and radical extremists within Christianity: he argued that the rich could be saved, defended marriage, praised education, and took the concept of Logos (Reason), not Theos (God), as the basis of his doctrine. Clement laid the foundations for the ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL and paved the way for the incorporation of pagan learning within Christianity; he was a foremost proponent of the use of allegory in biblical exegesis.

Clement was not one of the more popular church fathers in Byz.: Prodromos (PG 133:1265AB), for example, criticized him for treating language as immaterial and rejecting the search for beauty and nobility of expression. Arethas of Caesarea was interested in Clement: at his instigation, a certain Baanes prepared in 914 a MS of two of Clement's works (*Protreptikos* and *Paedagogus*), which was provided with scholia by Baanes and Arethas (Paris, B.N. gr. 451). Some other writings have survived in MSS of the 11th and 12th C.

ED. PG 8–9. *Protrepticus und Paedagogus*[3], ed. O Stählin et al. (Berlin 1972). *Stromata, Buch I–VI*[4], ed O. Stählin et al. (Berlin 1985). *Stromata, Buch VII und VIII*[2], ed. O. Stählin et al. (Berlin 1970). *Register*, ed. U. Treu (Berlin 1980). G.W. Butterworth, *Clement of Alexandria* (London–New York 1919), with Eng. tr. *CPG*, nos. 1375–99.

LIT. S.R.C. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria* (Oxford 1971). Quasten, *Patrology* 2:5–36. O. Stählin, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Handschriften des Clemens Alexandrinus* (Nürnberg 1895). Idem, *Untersuchungen über die Scholien zu Clemens Alexandrinus* (Nürnberg 1897). –T.E.G.

CLEMENT OF OHRID. See KLIMENT OF OHRID.

CLEMENT SMOLJATIČ. See KLIM SMOLJATIČ.

CLERGY (κλῆρος), term that initially designated the entire Christian community, the people of God (*laos*, LAITY) chosen to participate in God's inheritance or *kleronomia* (1 Pet 5:3). By the 3rd C. the term was restricted to those appointed as ministers of worship within the Christian community. Below the major orders (*hieromenoi*) of BISHOP, PRIEST, and DEACON were the minor orders (*klerikoi*) of SUBDEACON and ANAGNOSTES. Besides differences in functions, the two orders were distinguished by the method of ordination (CHEIROTONIA)—the ritual act that also served to separate clergy from laity. Their lives and responsibilities were fixed by ecclesiastical law. Ordination to the priesthood and episcopate was forbidden before age 30, whereas deacons and subdeacons could be consecrated at ages 25 and 20, respectively (Council in TRULLO, canons 13, 14). Once appointed to a city or church they could not transfer elsewhere (NICAEA I, canon 15). Equally, all were subject to episcopal jurisdiction and could sue each other only in episcopal courts (Council of CHALCEDON, canon 9). Admitted to the office of DEACONESS, women were forbidden entry to both the priesthood and episcopate.

Generally, clergy were forbidden to participate in secular occupations such as trade, usury, or banking; nor were they allowed to become civil servants, although they could perform manual and agricultural labor (Nicaea II, canon 15) and serve as imperial advisers (like the monk Ioannikios in the court of ALEXIOS I). In practice, however, these restrictions were not always observed, as several 12th-C. synodal and patriarchal decrees illustrate (*RegPatr*, fasc. 3, nos. 1048, 1092, 1100, 1119). Clerical privileges included exemption from certain taxes, military service, and other municipal duties (*Cod.Theod.* XVI 2.1–47, 5.1; Council of Chalcedon, canon 7). Despite their social, judicial, and pecuniary exemptions, Byz. clergy never constituted a rigid sociological entity—a self-conscious antithesis of the laity—as in the West. Significantly, they rarely held high state office and were never the exclusive bearers of high culture. Except for bishops, they were also not separated from the laity by CELIBACY.

LIT. A.P. Lebedev, *Duchovenstvo drevnej vselenskoj cerkvi ot vremen apostol'skich do IX v.* (Moscow 1905). D.J. Constantelos, "Clerics and Secular Professions in the Byzantine Church," *Byzantina* 13.1 (1985) 373–90. E. Herman, "Die kirchlichen Einkünfte des byzantinischen Niederklerus," *OrChrP* 8 (1942) 378–442. T. Elliott, "The Tax Exemptions Granted to Clerics by Constantine and Constantius II," *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 326–36. –A.P.

CLICHÉ, in modern terminology, a trite or repeated phrase or idea. In Byz. literature two types of cliché can be distinguished. (1) In works written at a learned level of the language at all periods, the conventions of RHETORIC (which, learned in the schoolroom, underlay virtually every literary genre) imposed structures and sequences of ideas that most writers and audiences accepted as appropriate and followed. (2) In many works written in the POLITICAL VERSE at a popular level of the language in the 14th–15th C., large numbers of lines and half-lines were repeated virtually unchanged, both within a given poem and in others (see ROMANCE). Debate continues as to whether this is the result of plagiarism and quotation, or whether these "clichés" (phrases like *mikroi te kai megaloi*, "great and small") represent in written form the style of a traditional literature, originally disseminated orally. –E.M.J.

www.starpomor.ru

CLIMATE in Byz. was determined by the situation of the MEDITERRANEAN SEA, which is enclosed to the south and southeast by a band of deserts and to the north and northeast by mountain ridges (Pyrenees, Alps, and Caucasus). Winds, dry in summer and bringing rain in winter, blow primarily north to south; the strong winter winds, esp. dangerous along the southern Mediterranean shore, could bring navigation to a halt. The combination of rainy winters (from approximately Oct. to Apr.) and summer drought is typical of the Mediterranean. Summers were hot, but winters mild, except on elevated plateaus where considerable snow accumulated; permanent snow cover is found only on mountains at high elevations. The diverse climate was due partly to latitudinal situation (the hottest areas—North Africa, Egypt, and Palestine—were lost to the Arabs in the 7th C.) but also to elevation, with sharp contrasts between the coastal lowlands and interior highlands.

The coast was sufficiently warm for the cultivation of olives, mulberry, and, in some areas (Sicily, Crete), cotton. Vineyards and many FRUIT orchards could be found at higher elevations and farther to the north (including Thrace), but Bulgaria was considered by the Byz. to be a region that produced little fruit. Grain grew everywhere; the predominance of wheat in Asia Minor and of barley in the Balkans depended more on soil than on temperature. The plateaus (esp. Anatolia), with their cold winter nights and shortage of water, were best for cattle and flocks of sheep and goats, while the contrasts between lowland and highland contributed to the development of TRANSHUMANCE. Special climatic regions were the hinterland of the Black Sea, the Caucasus and the Armenian highlands, the Anatolian plateau, Egypt, and the valley of the Po—a transitional region between the Mediterranean and Central European climate.

The question of changes in the Mediterranean climate in historical times has been variously approached by historians, some of whom attribute the decline of the Roman Empire to climatic changes; climatologists, however, deny radical changes, even though some warming and desiccation ca.1300 can be observed (F. Braudel, *La Méditerranée*[2] 1 [Paris 1966] 247). It is plausible that deforestation also took place over time, but neither its scale nor chronology can be established.

LIT. E.C. Semple, *The Geography of the Mediterranean Region* (London 1932) 83–101. A. Philippson, *Das Mittelmeergebiet* (Leipzig 1904) 93–138. J.H. Prior, *Geography, Technology and War* (Cambridge 1988) 15–24. A. Guillou, *La civilisation byzantine* (Paris 1974) 41–100. –A.K.

CLOCK. See HOROLOGION.

CLOISONNÉ. See ASHLAR; BRICKWORK TECHNIQUES AND PATTERNS; ENAMELS.

CLOSED DOOR or gate (πύλη κεκλεισμένη) of the sanctuary of the Temple, seen by Ezekiel (44:1–3) in a vision. This was not to be opened or traversed by any man, for God had entered in by it. The image was taken, for example, by Theodoret of Cyrrhus (PG 81:1233B), to symbolize the Virgin's womb. ROMANOS THE MELODE (*Hymnes* 2, ed. J. Grosdidier de Matons [Paris 1965] 10:9.4–10) describes Mary as the Closed Gate (*aparanoiktos pyle*) who opened the door to the Magi that they might see the Door (*thyra*), the infant Christ. In the context of increased interest in PREFIGURATIONS of the Virgin, the Door is represented at the CHORA (S. Der Nersessian in Underwood, *Kariye Djami* 4:346) and other Palaiologan churches.

LIT. G. Babić, "L'image symbolique de la 'Porte fermée' à Saint-Clément d'Ohrid," in *Synthronon* 145–51. –C.B.T., J.H.L.

COATS OF ARMS. The use of heraldic INSIGNIA as a symbolic representation of families did not develop in Byz. The broad range of images (Christ, the Virgin, the cross, various saints) found on SEALS are personal rather than familial emblems. Certain "blazons" have, however, been interpreted by some scholars as official imperial or familial coats of arms. Soloviev (*infra*) considered the double-headed EAGLE as an emblem of the Komnenoi and the tetragrammic cross with four Bs as the blazon (from ca.1327) of the Palaiologoi. G. Vikan (*ArtB* 63 [1981] 326) has connected other emblems (including a multipetal flower, a swastika, and four overlapping bars) with the Palaiologos family. Some of these symbols—whether blazons or not—were placed on imperial standards: thus, a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 167.17–23) states that on ordinary warships the customary imperial banner (*phlamoulon*) was displayed, that is, the cross with *pyrekbola* (flints?)—

probably the tetragrammic cross—whereas the ship of the *megas doux* displayed the image of the mounted emperor. In Aug. 1439 John VIII Palaiologos conferred upon Giacomo de Morellis, a citizen of Florence, the right to place on his banner the imperial "blazon" (*semeion*); on the chrysobull, beneath the text, is pictured a double-headed eagle (*Reg* 5, no.3489).

LIT. W.H. Rüdt von Collenberg, "Byzantinische Präheraldik des 10. und 11. Jhs.," *Recueil du 12e Congrès international des sciences généalogique et héraldique* (Stuttgart 1978) 169–81. D. Cernovodeanu, "Contributions à l'étude de l'héraldique byzantine et postbyzantine," *JÖB* 32.2 (1982) 409–22. A. Soloviev, "Les emblèmes héraldiques de Byzance et les Slaves," *SemKond* 7 (1935) 119–64. –A.K.

CODEX (δέλτος, πυκτίον, τεῦχος, κῶδιξ), the preponderant form of the Byz.—and modern—BOOK. It consists of QUIRES made of sheets of PAPYRUS, PARCHMENT, or, later, PAPER, which were prepared for copying by the application of RULING PATTERNS in order to guide the writing; the written quires were stitched, usually one to another, to form the smooth spine characteristic of Byz. BOOKBINDING. Unlike the earlier ROLL, the codex fitted more text into less space because each sheet was written on both sides. Moreover, since the codex could be immediately opened to any page, it allowed random consultation. In appearance, Byz. codices range from sumptuous illuminated MSS (see BOOK ILLUSTRATION AND ILLUMINATION) or lavish editions of the classics to tax registers or heavily annotated working texts produced by scholars for their personal use.

The codex probably derived from the Roman businessman's parchment notebook, itself inspired by the bound and waxed wooden tablets (*codices*) used as notepads in antiquity and Byz. Travelers seem to have been among the first to favor the new format, and the codex enjoyed unique prestige among Christians from the 2nd C., esp. for Scripture. Eusebios of Caesarea mentions the order issued by Constantine I that fifty codices of the Bible should be copied for liturgical use in Constantinople. From 300 onward, the codex replaced the roll as the chief vehicle for literary texts. The physical transformation of the book encouraged intellectual change as well. The capacity of and the ease of access within the codex now made practical the creation—and quick consultation—of vast works of reference, such as the codification of Roman law at Constantinople in the 5th and 6th C. For artists the invention of the codex made possible the painting of full-page miniatures.

LIT. B. Atsalos, *La terminologie du livre-manuscrit à l'époque byzantine* (Thessalonike 1971) 88–128. C.H. Roberts, T.C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London 1983). M. McCormick, "The Birth of the Codex and the Apostolic Life-Style," *Scriptorium* 39 (1985) 150–58. –E.G., M.McC.

CODEX CAROLINUS, collection of letters sent by popes (GREGORY III through HADRIAN I) and from the Byz. Empire to Charles Martel, Pippin, and CHARLEMAGNE, compiled at Charlemagne's command in 791. Only the papal letters survive. They constitute the chief source on Frankish involvement in Italy. Because the PAPACY acted as an intermediary between Byz. and the Franks, these letters shed valuable light on Byz. relations with the Carolingians (eps. 11, 25, 28–29, 36–37 on the negotiations of CONSTANTINE V with Pippin, and ep.45 on the planned marriage of LEO IV with the king's daughter) and, above all, on Constantinople's projects to recapture its Italian holdings (eps. 15, 17, 30–31, 38, 57, 61, 64–65, 80, 82–84) and subdue the Iconodule papacy (eps. 20, 32). They also transmit general information deemed relevant to the Frankish court, for instance the Eastern patriarchs' attitude toward ICONOCLASM (ep.99), Constantine V's death (ep. 58), an Arab invasion of Asia Minor (ep.74), news from Byz. ISTRIA (ep.63), and the activities of Byz. or Venetian merchants (eps. 59, 86).

ED. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epist.* 3:476–657. Facsimile—*Codex epistolaris Carolinus*, ed. F. Unterkircher (Graz 1962).
LIT. P. Kehr, "Über die Chronologie der Briefe Papst Pauls I. im codex Carolinus," *NachGött* (1896) 102–57. –M.McC.

CODEX EBNERIANUS, a 12th-C. illustrated New Testament in Oxford, Bodl. Auct. T. inf. 1. 10, named after its 18th-C. owner. Bound in a silver cover with a 10th-C. ivory fragment, the MS is decorated with ornate CANON TABLES and HEADPIECES, a double portrait of Eusebios of Caesarea and Karpianos, and ten portraits of New Testament authors. Accompanying most portraits are liturgically inspired narrative scenes. The MS was copied by the same scribe as Escorial X IV 17, but illuminated in the different style of the MSS of JAMES OF KOKKINOBAPHOS. It is the product of

www.starosporn.ru

the preeminent school of Constantinopolitan illuminators during the second quarter of the 12th C. In 1391 the scribe Ioasaph of the HODEGON monastery added liturgical notations to the MS, and its evangelist portraits served as the model for the Palaiologan miniatures inserted into Venice, Marc. gr. I, 8. The MS is marked with Georgian quire signatures, but was still in Constantinople in the 16th C.

LIT. Hutter, *CBM* 1:59–67, 3.1:333f. H. Buchthal, "A Greek New Testament Manuscript in the Escorial Library," in *Byz. und der Westen* 86–94. –R.S.N.

CODEX GREGORIANUS, a collection of imperial rescripts issued sometime between 291 and 294 by a certain Gregory, who is otherwise unknown. It is impossible to determine whether it was prepared in the East (Berytus?) or elsewhere, or whether it was a private tool or an official document, for purposes of instruction or for practical use. It contains edicts from the year 196 to Diocletian; the latest law (of 295) is often considered a later addition. The material is organized, according to subject matter, in books and titles. It is possible that the original text of the edicts has here been contracted and paraphrased (N. van der Wal, *Bollettino dell'Istituto di diritto romano* 22 [1980] 7). The text has survived only in fragments—in the CODEX JUSTINIANUS and in various legal compilations, such as the *Fragmenta Vaticana*, scholia of the Sinai Library, and the *lex Romana Visigothorum*.

ED. P. Krüger, *Collectio librorum iuris anteiustiniani* 3 (Berlin 1890) 224–33, 236–42.

LIT. P. Jörs, *RE* 4 (1901) 161–64. J. Gaudemet, *La formation du droit séculier et du droit de l'église aux IVe et Ve siècles* (Paris 1979) 44–48. W. Turpin, "The Purpose of the Roman Law Codes," *ZSavRom* 104 (1987) 620–30. –A.K.

CODEX HERMOGENIANUS, a collection of imperial rescripts published after the CODEX GREGORIANUS by a certain Hermogenianus, usually identified as a praetorian prefect of 304. The text has survived in fragmentary form in the same sources as the *Codex Gregorianus* (with the exception of the appendices to the *lex Romana Visigothorum*), but it differs from the latter in several respects: the *Codex Hermogenianus* is shorter, divided only into titles (not books), and contains primarily the edicts of Diocletian. The 5th-C. Christian author Sedulius notes that Hermogenianus had his work published three times; accordingly, Rotondi (*infra*) postulates that the first edition appeared in 295, the second in 305, and the third included three constitutions of 314–24. Seven rescripts of 364/5 are considered later additions.

ED. P. Krüger, *Collectio librorum iuris anteiustiniani* 3 (Berlin 1890) 234f, 242–45.

LIT. A. Cenderelli, *Ricerche sul 'Codex Hermogenianus'* (Milan 1965). D. Liebs, *Hermogenians Iuris epitomae* (Göttingen 1964). G. Rotondi, *Scritti giuridici* 1 (Milan 1922) 111–46. –A.K.

CODEX JUSTINIANUS, a collection of imperial constitutions (in the form of *leges, rescripta, sanctiones pragmaticae*) from Hadrian to Justinian I, that, along with the DIGEST, the INSTITUTES, and the NOVELS OF JUSTINIAN I, constitutes the CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS. Executed at Justinian's request, the collection was intended to take the place of the CODEX GREGORIANUS, the CODEX HERMOGENIANUS, and the CODEX THEODOSIANUS and to provide a compilation of imperial law arranged according to subject and freed from contradictions and repetitions. To this end Justinian appointed a commission of ten lawyers under the direction of TRIBONIAN. The original collection, the so-called *Codex vetus*, which has been transmitted only in short fragments, was made public on 7 Apr. 529 through the introductory constitution "Summa." It soon stood in need of revision—not least because of Justinian's own legislative activity.

With the constitution "Cordi" of 16 Nov. 534 the so-called *Codex repetitae praelectionis* was promulgated and made authoritative. It contains 12 books that, in contrast to the *Institutes* and the *Digest*, reflect the socioeconomic and ecclesiastical problems of the time in the form of numerous administrative, penal, civil, and ecclesiastical regulations. The language of the constitutions is predominantly Latin. The regulations of the *Codex Justinianus* were introduced into the BASILIKA, esp. in the Greek version of THALELAIOS; treatments of the *Codex Justinianus* by the jurists ISIDORE, ANATOLIOS, and THEODORE SCHOLASTIKOS are also preserved. Revisions in the sequence of the laws of the *Codex Justinianus* are transmitted only in fragments. With a view to the integration of the *Codex Justinianus* into the *Basilika*, the individual titles were divided up according to subject and, where appropriate, attached to the *Basilika* chapters originating in the *Digest*.

www.slavgorpomor.ru

ED. *CIC*, vol. 2.

LIT. Wenger, *Quellen* 569–72, 638–51, 688–92. D. Simon, "Aus dem Codexunterricht des Thalelaios," *ZSavRom* 86 (1969) 334–83; 87 (1970) 315–94; *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 16 (1969) 283–308; 17 (1970) 273–311. –M.Th.F.

CODEX SUPRASLIENSIS, the largest surviving Old Church Slavonic MS (found in 1823 in the Suprasl monastery in Poland), is a *menologion* for the month of March that contains saints' Lives and sermons for Holy Week and Easter. It was probably copied in central or eastern Bulgaria between 900 and 1050 on the basis of an original created in the circle of Tsar SYMEON OF BULGARIA. More than half of its 285 folia were lost during World War II; the other portions are in Ljubljana and Leningrad. Marguliés (*infra*) and some other scholars hypothesize that the original of the Codex was in GLAGOLITIC. The Codex was translated from a Greek pre-Metaphrastic *menologion* and contains 48 hagiographical texts; for some of them the Greek sources have not yet been identified. The work of the translator (or translators?) was difficult, since the original also contained the writings of some experienced rhetoricians (Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, Epiphanios of Salamis), and in some cases their language was misunderstood. The compilator of the Codex probably introduced stylistic alterations. The Codex is an important monument of Byz. intellectual influence upon Bulgaria ca.900.

ED. S. Sever'janov, *Suprasl'skaja rukopis'* (St. Petersburg 1904; rp. Graz 1956). *Suprasŭlski ili Retkov sbornik*, ed. J. Zaimov, M. Capaldo, 2 vols. (Sofia 1982–83).

LIT. R. Trautmann, R. Klostermann, "Drei griechische Texte zum Codex Suprasliensis," *ZSlavPhil* 11 (1934) 1–21, 299–324; 12 (1935) 277–94. K.H. Meyer, *Altkirchenslavische Studien* (Halle an der Saale 1939). Ph.A. Marguliés, *Der altkirchenslavische Codex Suprasliensis* (Heidelberg 1927). M. Capaldo, "Zur linguistischen Betrachtungsweise der Komposition des Codex Suprasliensis," in *Contributi Italiani all'VIII Congresso internazionale degli Slavisti* (Zagreb-Ljubljana 1978) 23–60. –A.K.

CODEX THEODOSIANUS, a Latin law book named after the emperor THEODOSIOS II. By a constitution of 26 Mar. 429, Theodosios, together with his co-emperor Valentinian III, established a nine-member commission to produce a collection of all of the imperial constitutions published since Constantine I (following the model of the CODEX GREGORIANUS and the CODEX HERMOGENIANUS), integrating into the collection appropriate passages from the writings of the jurists. By a constitution of 20 Dec. 435, the same emperors set up a new commission of 16 people that was to collect all general imperial constitutions since Constantine I and, if necessary, to improve them by changing the text or dividing them into several titles. This work came to fruition and was published by a constitution of 15 Feb. 438. On 1 Jan. 439 the *Codex Theodosianus* went into force for the entire Roman Empire. The *Codex* contains more than 2,500 constitutions (from the years 311–437) and is divided into 16 books; the books are subdivided into titles within which the constitutions are arranged in chronological order. The MS transmission of the *Codex Theodosianus* is poor, esp. for books 1–5, which are only indirectly preserved, in the *Lex Romana Visigothorum*. For this *Lex* as well as for the *Codex Justinianus*, the *Codex Theodosianus* was the most important source. The *Codex Theodosianus* was provided with commentaries (F. Wieacker in *Symbolae Friburgenses in honorem Ottonis Lenel* [Leipzig 1935] 259–356). After approximately a century it was superseded by the CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS, esp. the *Codex Justinianus*.

ED. T. Mommsen, *Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis*, 1 vol. in 2 pts. (Berlin 1905; rp. Dublin-Zurich 1970–71). *Codex Theodosianus cum perpetuis commentariis Iacobi Gothofredi*, ed. A. Marvillius, with rev. and add. I.D. Ritter, 6 vols. (Leipzig 1736–43; rp. Hildesheim–New York 1975). Eng. tr. C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions* (Princeton 1952; rp. 1970).

LIT. G.G. Archi, *Teodosio II e la sua codificazione* (Naples 1976). T. Honoré, "The Making of the Theodosian Code," *ZSavRom* 103 (1986) 133–222. –A.S.

CODICIL. In classical Roman law, the codicil was at first a document strictly connected to a WILL, in which the testator addressed the heir of the will and requested that he execute a FIDEICOMMISSUM. The codicil had no required form; it had to be announced in the will or be authorized by a (later) will. When codicils independent of the will came into use, they began to compete with wills. A will was distinguished from a codicil in that it had a required form and by the circumstance that only in wills could heirs be appointed and disinheritance effected. The difference was weakened by the testator instructing that his will be maintained as a codicil in the case of invalidation. Justinian I further reduced the differences by his

regulation that a codicil must be drawn up in the presence of five witnesses (it was seven for wills). In the post-Justinianic period, the required number of witnesses for a will was reduced even further (*Nov. Leo VI* 41): five witnesses in the city, three in the country and while on journeys. Since already in late antiquity the significance of the appointment of heirs diminished with the decline of the Roman household structure, the codicil should have disappeared. If it is still mentioned in the legislation of the Macedonian period and in the legal literature that follows it until Harmenopoulos, this appears to be—as the lack of evidence from practice allows one to surmise—only a traditional reminiscence. –D.S.

Codicils in Administrative Terminology. Codicil (Lat. *codicillus*, Gr. κωδίκελλος) designated in Roman terminology the emperor's brief writing and particularly the diploma of appointment to a high office or the conferring of a high title. They are known from literary and legal texts of the 4th C. onward. At that time they were usually accompanied by ivory DIPTYCHS and probably put inside the diptych's sealed wings. Texts of the 8th–10th C. sometimes mention separately granting either the codicils or ivory *plakes* (tablets). The preparation of codicils in the late Roman Empire was the duty of the *primicerius notariorum* (the chief of the notaries), while in the 10th C. it was the responsibility of the *kanikleios*, who was paid by the grantee 16 nomismata per piece (Oikonomides, *Listes* 95.8).

LIT. O. Seeck, *RE* 4 (1901) 179–81. Dölger, *Diplomatik* 49. Dölger-Karayannopulos, *Urkundenlehre* 113–15. Oikonomides, *Listes* 93, n.41. –A.K.

CODICOLOGY (lit. "the study of the CODEX"), the scholarly term coined by A. Dain (*Les manuscrits*[1] [Paris 1949] 71–86) as an equivalent of the German *Handschriftenkunde* ("the study of manuscripts"). Dain conceived of codicology as a discipline dealing with the history of MSS and their collections, research on their present location, and the compilation of catalogs and repertories of catalogs (*Les manuscrits*[2] [Paris 1964] 77); that is, with the history of books after their completion. The term, however, gradually has acquired a different meaning—the study of ancient *écrits* in contrast to that of *écriture* (F. Masai, *Scriptorium* 10 [1956] 286–92), that is, study of the hand-produced book as an archaeological object rather than of its script. Thus it has become identical with the German *Buchwesen* ("the structure of the book"), one of the two divisions of PALAEOGRAPHY.

Codicology examines the book's size, material (PAPYRUS, PARCHMENT, PAPER), physical properties of INKS and pigments, preparation for writing (RULING PATTERNS and systems), structure (QUIRES, their signatures, sewing, BOOKBINDING and rebindings), ownership markings, and so forth, all of which changed over time and place. In so doing, it often determines characteristics specific to various production centers (SCRIPTORIA) and LIBRARIES. The use of the neologism *codicology* can be justified by the fact that recent study puts more and more emphasis on the book as a material vector of culture, unlike traditional palaeography, which tended to study the book in a cultural vacuum.

LIT. *PGEB* (Paris 1977) 27–91. R.H. & M.A. Rouse, *DMA* 3:475–78. *Griechische Kodikologie und Textüberlieferung*, ed. D. Harlfinger (Darmstadt 1980). G. Cavallo, "Le tipologie della cultura nel riflesso delle testimonianze scritte," *SettStu* 34 (1988) 467–529. –M.McC., E.G.

COERCION, NONECONOMIC, an application of moral or physical compulsion to force people to work. It was based primarily on political, social, and personal relations (esp. dependency) and only secondarily on market values. The tendency of the landlord was to exact the maximum benefit from the laborer without ruining the existence of the slave/serf or his dependent household; the tendency of the laborer was to perpetuate his household. Accordingly, RENT was established in Byz.—in practice, not in theoretical calculations—not only on the basis of the actual quantity and quality of the soil (arable land, vineyards, olive trees, gardens), livestock, yokes of oxen, number of family members, but primarily on the basis of intangible factors of social status and personal relations. Thus a curious phenomenon arose: poorer peasants could be compelled to pay a proportionately higher rent than their wealthier counterparts (in another or even in the same village) and, on the average, the poorer tenants would fulfill heavier obligations than the wealthier householders—in contrast with the modern system of progressive taxation. The numerous tax exemptions granted to churches and monasteries, officials and courtiers, originated from the same principle. This principle was extended to land prices, variations in which went beyond the usual market conditions. Noneconomic coercion in Byz. was shaped not only through landlord-tenant relations reflected in local customs but also through the state with its elements of state ownership of property (see STATE PROPERTY), MONOPOLY, and the concept of the "enslavement" of the entire population to "the father and the lord," that is, the emperor.

LIT. Patlagean, *Structure*, pt.III (1975), 1371–96. Kazhdan, *Agrarnye otnošenija* 138–364. –A.K.

COINAGE, FOREIGN. The circulation of foreign coinage played no role in the Byz. Empire during the greater part of its existence. During the early centuries the only coin-producing state with which Byz. was in contact was Persia, and although there is literary evidence for Sasanian silver drachmae circulating on the frontier (e.g., at Nisibis) hoard evidence shows that such coins did not penetrate into the interior. The thin, broad fabric of Umayyad dirhems certainly determined the appearance of the silver MILIARESION introduced by Leo III, and miliaresia later in the 8th C. are sometimes found overstruck on ʿAbbāsid dirhems (G.C. Miles, *MN* 9 [1960] 189–218). Only in the last two centuries of the empire, after the Fourth Crusade and the occupation of most of the former imperial territories in the Aegean by Westerners, did foreign coins come to be used on a large scale in the empire and to influence the designs of Byz. coins. The most important of the intruders were initially the Venetian silver ducat, copied as the BASILIKON, and the Frankish TORNESE. Later the Venetian gold ducat, imitated at Chios and at Fogliavecchia on the neighboring mainland and by the Genoese at Pera in the suburbs of Constantinople itself, replaced the Byz. gold HYPERPYRON, which ceased to be minted in the 1350s. From ca.1380 onward the small change of Constantinople seems to have largely consisted of Turkish akçes, minted mainly at Bursa, which supplemented the locally produced ASPERS and were of about the same value.

LIT. T. Bertelè, "Moneta veneziana e moneta bizantina," in *Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo XV* (Florence 1973) 3–146. –Ph.G.

www.elib.nplu.org

COIN FINDS are customarily classed into three categories: hoards, site finds, and casual or isolated finds. These categories are not exclusive, however; most hoards come to light by chance. A hoard is defined as a group of coins concealed or lost as a unit. Site finds are those brought to light by archaeologists in the course of excavation. Isolated finds are those turned up by chance in digging a field, preparing a road surface, or as the result of some similar activity.

Hoards. Finds of this type are valuable partly as sources of material, partly because of their size. In addition, sometimes the presence of a container tends to ensure the survival of their contents in good condition. They are also useful because they show what coins were in circulation or at least were available at the time of concealment or loss. Their interpretation is often delicate: a savings hoard will differ in composition from one buried in an emergency. Also, although coins have been hoarded at all periods, usually they were recovered by their original owners except in times of unrest. Then too, since a single hoard may have belonged to a traveler from outside the area where it was found, its contents are not necessarily a reliable guide to the local circulating medium. Comparing several hoards whose contents overlap is the surest means of determining the order of issue of undated coins. In many periods hoards are virtually limited to gold and silver coins of substantial inherent value, but in the Byz. world, as in Roman times, there are also many hoards of low-value coins. Much of Hendy's work on the coinage of the 12th–13th C. was made possible by the great number of (mainly) Bulgarian hoards of billon and trachea of the period. Unfortunately the reporting of hoards in most former Byz. lands is inadequate, and the only comprehensive bibliography (Mosser, *infra*) is long since out of date. Byz. coin hoards in the USSR throw much light on trade routes (see Kropotkin, *infra*), while inside former imperial territories they have been helpful in documenting Slavic penetration of the Balkans (J. Juroukova, *BBulg* 3 [1969] 255–63) and the military situation in the Aegean area under Herakleios (D.M. Metcalf, *ABSA* 57 [1962] 14–23).

Site Finds. These consist mainly of low-value coins that were easily lost and not worth their owners' trouble to recover. The older excavation reports often neglected to take proper note of them, and in particular failed to find the great numbers of tiny 5th- and 6th-C. copper NUMMI

that require systematic sieving of the soil. A new standard in this respect was set by the American excavations at Athens, Corinth, Antioch, and other sites, mainly from the 1920s onward. The reports of these have made possible the study of fluctuations in coin use between different periods, though their interpretation presents many problems. Simple comparisons between the numbers found for different rulers, as was common in the older reports and historical works based on them, can only mislead, for coins will normally have remained in circulation many years after they were struck, and denominations of different sizes and values are not equally likely to be lost. The coins themselves are usually in poor condition as a result of prolonged burial. They are so corroded or worn as to be of little use for the study of types and inscriptions and of no use at all for metrological purposes. They are, on the other hand, essential to archaeologists for dating associated objects and the buildings or excavation strata in which they were found.

Casual Finds. This type of find generally occurs in the countryside and is usually of single coins. In most former Byz. lands these tend to be inadequately reported. The scholarly value of such finds comes mainly from the light they throw on the areas over which coins circulated, esp. outside the cities, and occasionally for the identification of local mints.

LIT. P. Grierson, *Numismatics* (London 1975) 124–39. V.V. Kropotkin, *Klady vizantijskikh monet na territorii SSSR* (Moscow 1962). Hendy, *Coinage* 325–404. P. Grierson, "The Interpretation of Coin Finds," *NChron*[7] 5 (1965) i–xiii; 6 (1966) i–xv. S.McA. Mosser, *A Bibliography of Byzantine Coin Hoards* (New York 1935). –Ph.G.

COINS. Byz. coinage derived from that of the later Roman Empire, and there is no sharp division between them. Nevertheless, in many respects they are very different. It has long been customary to start the Byz. series with Anastasios I, since a separate line of emperors in the West had come to an end with JULIUS NEPOS (died 480) and because Anastasios's creation of the copper FOLLIS in 498 determined much of the pattern of minting for the future, but the older books begin with Arkadios, since from 395 there were separate lines of emperors in East and West.

Metals. Metals for coins were mainly the three

COINS. Gold coin (solidus) of Emp. Justinian II (687–92) showing the bust of Christ on the obverse.

standard ones used in the ancient world—gold, silver, and copper—but the proportion and form of coins in each metal has varied greatly over the centuries. Heavy copper coins were not struck in the 5th C. (their place being taken by tiny NUMMI), nor were they struck after the late 11th C. A coinage in silver barely existed in the 5th–6th C., and between the late 11th and the late 13th C. the traditional silver MILIARESIA were replaced by TRIKEPHALA of electrum (a gold-silver alloy) for higher values and TRACHEA of billon (that is, a silver-copper alloy containing less than 50 percent silver) for lower ones. The trachea also substituted for the heavy folles of copper no longer minted. The gold remained of high quality until the 1030s, when a half century of progressive debasement began. NOMISMATA of good quality were revived by ALEXIOS I in 1092 as part of a general coinage reform which reestablished a currency on whose quality users could rely, but these HYPERPYRA were only 20.5 carats fine (85.4 percent) instead of 24 carats as previously. The use of good quality silver coins was revived only with the creation of the BASILIKON in the first years of the 14th C. Gold hyperpyra were no longer struck after the mid-14th C. Lead was occasionally used, e.g., for ten-nummus pieces in 6th-C. Italy (C. Morrisson, *Rivista italiana di numismatica* 83 [1981] 119–30) and for Alexios I's first tetartera or half-tetartera of 1092.

www.staropomor.ru

Thematic Content. The thematic content of Byz. coins differed markedly from that of Roman ones, as did the way the emperor was represented. Beginning with the reign of Constantine I all coin types of a positively pagan character disappeared, although for the next two-and-a-half centuries representations of Victory and of Roma and Constantinopolis (see also PERSONIFICATION) continued to be tolerated because it was possible to regard them as symbolic and not as objects of worship. The cross began to be used as a main type in the mid-5th C., though only on a few denominations; only under Tiberios I did it become the main reverse type of the gold coins. A bust of Christ, first shown on coins of Justinian II, became a regular feature of the coinage only after the restoration of images under Michael III (843), but from then on representations of Christ, of the Virgin (first under Leo VI), and of the saints (first under Michael IV) are normal. A bust or standing figure of the emperor was almost always present, except on the so-called Anonymous Folles (970–1092), which have religious types and inscriptions only. But the personality of the emperor was eclipsed by the greatness of his office. Characterized portraits in high relief, a distinctive feature of Roman coinage during the Principate, were replaced by formalized frontal effigies in low relief, usually with no attempt at reproducing an individual likeness. Instead, the status of the emperor was shown by his costume (CHLAMYS, FIBULA, CROWN) and insignia (SCEPTER, globus cruciger, AKAKIA).

Language. The language of the coin inscriptions was initially Latin, as were the elements of the emperor's style (DN for *dominus noster*, PE or PF for *perpetuus* or *pius felix*, AVG for *augustus*), but Greek legends began to be used in the 7th C. (EN TOVTO NIKA on folles of Constans II) and Greek titles such as *basileus*, *despotes*, and so forth in the 8th. After a long period in which Greek and Latin characters were used indiscriminately and might even appear together in the same word, the use of letters in a specifically Latin sense disappeared in the 11th C., so the *C* was henceforward invariably a sigma and *H* an eta.

Collections. Byz. coins are found by the thousand every year, some in regular excavations, in which case they are preserved as part of the record, but the majority pass through dealers' hands to collectors and some in due course to museums. The major collections are those of Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale), London (British Museum), Berlin (Staatliche Museen), Leningrad (Hermitage), and the Dumbarton Oaks Center of Byzantine Studies in Washington, D.C. The British Museum catalog of 1908 was for a half century the standard work of reference on the subject, but it has now been largely superseded, other than as a collection of material, by the catalogs of the Paris collections (to 1204) and of Dumbarton Oaks, three volumes (to 1081) out of a projected five having been published to date. Much Hermitage material is available in the unfinished work of Tolstoj (to 886). For the period 491–720 these have to be supplemented by a synoptic survey published under the auspices of the Numismatic Commission of the Austrian National Academy of Sciences. For coins of the 4th C., from the accession of Diocletian (284) to the death of Theodosios I (395), the standard reference work is vols. 6–9 of *Roman Imperial Coinage*; since vol. 10 has not yet appeared, there is no satisfactory work covering the century from 395 to 491.

LIT. Grierson, *Byz. Coins*. Hendy, *Economy*. W. Wroth, *Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine Coins in the British Museum*, 2 vols. (London 1908). C. Morrisson, *Catalogue des monnaies byzantines de la Bibliothèque Nationale (491–1204)*, 2 vols. (Paris 1970). A.R. Bellinger, P. Grierson, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, 3 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1966–73). W. Hahn, *Moneta Imperii Byzantini*, 3 vols. (Vienna 1973–81). I. Tolstoj, *Vizantijskie monety*, 9 fasc. (St. Petersburg 1912–14). H. Mattingly, E.A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage* (London 1923–), vol. 6 (by C.H.V. Sutherland, 1967), vol. 7 (by P. Bruun, 1966), vol. 8 (by J.P.C. Kent, 1981), and vol. 9 (by J.W.E. Pearce, 1951). – Ph.G.

COIN SCALES, conventional name for small bronze implements for weighing coins or small amounts of precious material in granulated or powdered forms. Invented by the Romans, a coin scale is a lever balance with fixed fulcrum at midpoint; it is supported from above either by a hinged bracket or by a cord or wire (Davidson, *Minor Objects*, no.1466). The coin is placed in a small pan at the end of one arm, and balance is achieved either by the predetermined weight of the other arm, through a counterpoise placed in

a corresponding pan, or by a tiny weight that may be slid across a scale in an open channel along the other end.

LIT. B. Kisch, *Scales and Weights* (New Haven–London 1965) 56–66. –G.V.

COISLIN NOTATION. See NEUMATA.

COLLECTIO 25 CAPITULORUM, a 6th-C. collection of canon law prescriptions, mainly those of Justinian I, divided into 25 chapters. The work consists of 21 Greek constitutions reproduced verbatim from titles 1–4 of the first book of the *Codex Justinianus* as well as from the Justinianic novels 120, 131 (chs. 13–14), 133, and 137. The most recent piece in the collection is novel 137 of March 565. However, since the work is sometimes transmitted without the four novel chapters, these may represent a later addition. This was the opinion of Zachariä von Lingenthal, who also conjectured that the original compilation was composed soon after the completion of the *Codex Justinianus* (a.534) as an appendix to the *Synagoge of Sixty Titles*.

ED. G.E. Heimbach, *Anekdota*, vol. 2 (Leipzig 1840; rp. Aalen 1969) 145–201.
LIT. Zachariä, "Nomokanones" 2f (615f in reprint). Beneševič, *Sinagogà v 50 titulov* 290f. –A.S.

COLLECTIO 87 CAPITULORUM, a 6th-C. collection of canon law prescriptions of Justinian I, divided into 87 chapters. The work consists of excerpts, most of them verbatim, from 12 Justinianic novels that were published between 535 and 546. Since Justinian I is referred to as deceased in the rubric and in the short note between the *pinax* (table of contents) and the main text, the work cannot have been produced before 11 Nov. 565. The sporadic attribution in MSS of the collection to Patr. JOHN III SCHOLASTIKOS is perhaps plausible; on the other hand, the hypothesis that the work (in its "first edition") was composed soon after 546 as an appendix to the SYNAGOGE OF FIFTY TITLES is insufficiently substantiated.

ED. I.B. Pitra, *Iuris ecclesiastici graecorum historia et monumenta*, vol. 2 (Rome 1868; rp. 1963) 385–405.
LIT. Zachariä, "Nomokanones" 5 (618 in reprint). Beneševič, *Sinagogà v 50 titulov* 288–92. –A.S.

COLLECTIO AVELLANA (6th C.), a dossier of 243 letters and edicts of emperors, popes, bishops, and magistrates, spanning the years 367–553. Many of them belong to Pope Hormisdas (514–23). This collection derives its name from Fonte Avellana, Italy, where a MS of it was found. Its documents are often valuable sources for both ecclesiastical and secular affairs, esp. when the two come together: a dispute of 384 about Lucifer of Cagliari (died between 364 and 375), a supporter of Athanasios of Alexandria; allegations by Pope GELASIUS I of a pagan revival at Rome; and controversy over THEOPASCHITISM involving Justinian and SEVEROS of Antioch are three such examples. A Latin translation of the treatise of EPIPHANIOS of Salamis, *On the Twelve Precious Stones*, is appended to the end of the collection.

ED. *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio*, ed. O. Guenther, 2 vols. (Vienna 1895–98).
LIT. O. Günther, *Avellana-Studien* (Vienna 1896). E. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972) 216f. –B.B.

COLLECTIO TRIPARTITA, a collection of canon law prescriptions taken from the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, divided into three parts. The work, which aims at a comprehensive coverage of the relevant material, consists of (Greek) résumés of norms originally written in Latin or Greek. The first part is taken from the *Codex Justinianus* (I, 1–13), the second from the *Digest* and the *Institutes* (regulations on the *res sacrae*, etc.), and the third from the *Novels of Justinian* (in the paraphrase of Athanasios of Emesa, titles 1–3). The latest prescription (reproduced in paraphrase) is novel 144 of Justin II from the year 572 (3.3.3). According to Zachariä von Lingenthal, the collection was produced shortly thereafter (ca.580) as an appendix to a *Syntagma of Fourteen Titles* (see NOMOKANON OF FOURTEEN TITLES). Stolte has suggested the younger ANONYMOUS, "ENANTIOPHANES" as the author of the *Collectio Tripartita*.

ED. PG 138:1077–1336.
LIT. Zachariä, "Nomokanones" 7f (620f in reprint). B.H. Stolte, "The Digest Summa of the Anonymus and the Collectio Tripartita," *SubGr* 2 (1985) 47–58. –A.S.

COLOBIUM (*κολόβιον*), a form of TUNIC, ampler than the *chiton*, and either sleeveless or short-sleeved. Its use is particularly associated with the monks of Egypt, where it was sometimes adorned with colored stripes (DOROTHEOS OF GAZA, ed. Regnault-Préville, 168.28–170.24; see also CLAVUS). It is the garment in which Christ is clad in early representations of the CRUCIFIXION (e.g., the RABBULA GOSPELS of 586).

LIT. Oppenheim, *Mönchskleid* 95–103. –N.P.Š.

COLONUS (*κολωνός*). The Latin term *colonus*, like the Greek *γεωργός* (PEASANT), literally means "tiller of the soil," in contrast to the *pastor*, herdsman. In late Roman legislation the term became the designation of a perpetual tenant. The term covers various categories of peasants, primarily *liberi coloni*, free tenants, and ADSCRIPTICII. The status of *coloni* differed in different provinces, and different sources stress different aspects of their condition, legislation emphasizing their fiscal bonds to the soil, while in documents (e.g., the correspondence of SYMMACHUS, the ALBERTINI TABLETS) they appear relatively independent. The term *colonatus* is used in legislative acts (e.g., *Cod.Theod.* XII 1.33) to denote the condition of the rural population.

The origin of the colonate is debatable. The institution probably developed from various roots and was assimilated under the pressure of the economic and fiscal conditions of the late Roman Empire, although it never attained real homogeneity. In the East it may have been drawn from Hellenistic (and even pre-Hellenistic) forms of dependency and at any rate was determined by the state fiscal requirements; in the West the increasing role of landed magnates contributed to the strengthening of bonds between the *colonus* and his master.

On the one hand, the *coloni* were construed as free people and Roman citizens; at the same time they were liable to service or serfdom—*servitute dediti* (*Cod.Just.* XI 50.2 pr.). They possessed some property, but it was treated as a PECULIUM; they could not give anything away without their master's permission. They could marry both free people and slaves and were able to litigate, even against their own master. They were not allowed to leave their *origo*, the land they lived on—but their master was also prevented from evicting them from this land. One became a *colonus* by birth (if both parents were *coloni* or the mother alone), or by a long residence as a tenant on a lord's land (in the East); barbarians could be settled as *coloni*, as could BEGGARS, if healthy. Free peasants under the PATROCINIUM VICORUM could be transformed into *coloni*. The colonate could be terminated by emancipation, by long service in a different status (e.g., as a *decurion*) in another province, or by entering religious orders.

By the end of the 4th C. the *coloni* were often mentioned together with slaves (e.g., *Cod.Just.* XI 48.12 of 396), but it is improbable that the colonate originated from the mass settlement of slaves on the land. The evolution of the colonate after the 6th C. is far from clear. There is no evidence of dependent peasants in the East in the late 7th–9th C., and it is impossible to prove that the later PAROIKOI were descendants of Roman *coloni*. In the West the term *coloni* continued to designate dependent peasants (e.g., in the correspondence of Pope Gregory I the Great). The Western *coloni* were probably of various conditions: in Visigothic Spain they seem to have merged with servile tenants, while in France they maintained a status between freemen and *servi*.

LIT. H. Clausing, *The Roman Colonate, the Theories of its Origin* (New York 1925). M. Rostovtzeff, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Leipzig 1910). A.H.M. Jones, "The Roman Colonate," in *Studies in Ancient Society*, ed. M.I. Finley (London-Boston 1974) 288–303. *Colonato e otras formas de dependencia no esclavistas* (Oviedo 1980). D. Eibach, *Untersuchungen zum spätantiken Kolonat in der kaiserlichen Gesetzgebung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Terminologie* (Cologne 1980). –A.K.

COLOPHON (*κολοφών*, lit. "summit, finishing touch"), or subscription, a note on a MS (usually at the end) with information on its date, the place where it was written, and sometimes the SCRIBE. Colophons are not only the main source of information about copyists but also are important for social and political history, prosopography, the economics and technology of book production and BOOK TRADE (prices, wages, length of time needed to copy a MS), and the history of copying centers (SCRIPTORIA). Dates and places mentioned in colophons are basic to the study of the development of the Greek script (mostly MINUSCULE) and of regional MS production. As a genre, Greek colophons are less informative than Syriac or Armenian ones.

LIT. K. Treu, "Griechische Schreibernotizen als Quelle für politische, soziale und kulturelle Verhältnisse ihrer Zeit," *BBulg* 2 (1966) 127–43; rp. in Harlfinger, *Kodikologie* 310–36. K. Treu, "Byzantinische Kaiser in den Schreibernotizen griechischer Handschriften," *BZ* 65 (1972) 9–34.

www.staropomon.hu

Ph. Euangelatou-Notara, "*Semeiomata*" *Hellenikon kodikon* (Athens 1978), rev. H. Hunger, *JÖB* 36 (1986) 370–72.
–E.G., I.Š.

COLOR, a functional and aesthetic element associated with earthly and heavenly splendor and therefore central to Byz. CEREMONY, both courtly and ecclesiastical. Brilliance of color was prized for its own sake, but varieties of hue also underlay hierarchical distinctions in COSTUME. Primary colors are specified in DE CEREMONIIS and the pseudo-KODINOS, although some names of colors, such as *atrabatika*, are unidentifiable. The color of the emperor's garb was sometimes left to his pleasure (*De cer.* 187.13).

No equivalents to Western treatises on the making of colors (Roosen-Runge, *infra*) are known, but a passion for polychrome brilliance shines through the taste for JEWELRY, ENAMELS, and colored MORTAR. In monumental painting, islands of brilliant color, set in fields of gold, green, or white are juxtaposed from the 6th C. onward. LANDSCAPES and architectural BACKGROUNDS employed secondary hues—purples, greens, ochres. In and after the 10th C. complementary colors were used, such as blue to highlight a purple area or red for the shadows of a green garment. Generally, carbon-black was used for shadows, and chalk or gypsum for white highlights. Blacks and whites were mixed with pigments to darken or lighten them. By the 12th C., a "three-tone" scheme had been evolved in FRESCO TECHNIQUE. At the same time, hard, opaque colors, esp. in BOOK ILLUSTRATION, aspired to the effect of enamel. The late 13th and 14th C. saw the introduction of unusual pinks and a great variety of greens.

No thorough analysis of the palette of Byz. painters has been made, but it is known that they relied more heavily on organic pigments than did Armenian artists. Mineral sources used included ultramarine and vermilion; cochineal seems to have been a source of red (M.V. Orna et al., *Archeological Chemistry* 4 [1989] 265–88). Vegetable sources yielded red-lake as well as orpiment and saffron for yellows. Colors were rarely blended; the separation of hues helps to explain the predominance of LINE AND CONTOUR in painting.

The palette of Byz. writers, with some exceptions (e.g., Eustathios of Thessalonike in his commentary on Homer), is relatively poor, limited to black, white, gold, and purple. Some authors, however, masterfully used colors for their political and moral purposes. Thus Niketas Choniates applied "multicolored" characterizations to Andronikos I, whose instability he wanted to stress; Niketas violates the chromatic convention when he construes the gold of imperial garb as "the color of bile" predicting defeat and the purple of the emperor's ink as the color of the blood of innocent victims (Kazhdan-Franklin, *Studies* 257–63).

Symbolism and Significance of Color. Throughout the Byz. period, color choice remained among the most powerful expressions of SYMBOLISM, affecting the palettes of painters, the choice of INK, PARCHMENT, SEALS, and COSTUME. The color of imperial garments and crowns varied according to the occasion on which they were worn; sometimes, as in the case of the DIVETESION worn in Holy Week, it was clearly symbolic. The highest state ranks were connected with particular colors: with rare exceptions gold and PURPLE were exclusive to the emperor, blue was typical of the *sebastokrator*, green of the caesar. Pseudo-Kodinos carefully indicates the color of the footwear, dress, and hats assigned to each rank of officials on special occasions. Occasionally, symbolic color yielded to practical considerations. Though all emperors down to Marcian had had purple sepulchres, Justin I and Theophilos were buried in green marble tombs, Michael III in white, perhaps because supplies of PORPHYRY were exhausted.

Conventions rather than rigid rules governed choices of color in painting. In the TRANSFIGURATION, Christ's robe is usually white, as are the tunics of martyrs; in Miracle and PASSION scenes, he often wears imperial purple. The Virgin's garments are usually purple or blue but in the Nativity, where the Child receives "courtly" gifts, it may be gold (e.g., at the Cappella Palatina, PALERMO). ANGELS frequently have haloes of celestial blue; Hades and demons often have gray flesh while PERSONIFICATIONS such as Slander in Klimax MSS display this tonality as well as bluish-gray clothing.

LIT. Winfield, "Painting Methods" 99–131. J.J. Tikkanen, *Studien über die Farbengebung in der mittelalterlichen Buchmalerei* (Helsinki 1933). H. Roosen-Runge, *Farbgebung und Technik frühmittelalterlicher Buchmalerei*, 2 vols. (Munich-Berlin 1967). V.V. Byčkov, "Estetičeskoe značenie cveta v vostočnochristianskom iskusstve," *Voprosy istorii i teorii estetiki* (Moscow 1975) 129–45. O.J. Lindsay, "Some Remarks on the Colour System of Medieval Byzantine Painting," *JÖB* 32.5 (1982) 85–91. U.M. Rüth, "Die Farbgebung in der byzantinischen Wandmalerei der spätpaläologischen Epoche (1341–1453)" (Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn 1977).
–A.C.

COLUMN (*κίων, στῦλος*). The chief and definitive support in trabeate architecture from ancient to modern times, the classical column consists of a base with horizontal moldings, a cylindrical shaft (monolithic or in segments called drums), and a CAPITAL, carved to articulate the juncture of weight (superstructure) and support (the column's shaft). In the columnar basilicas, stoas, colonnades flanking streets, and open courts of the Hellenistic, Roman, and Byz. city, the column, by its size and spacing, determined the scale of the structure and the urban character of the city. In the arcuate, domical architecture of Rome and Byz., heavy piers carried the principal loads of the building; in these structures columns formed a secondary support system, screening side aisles from central naves, or became decorative additions to the piers themselves (Early Christian and Byz. baptisteries; vaulted chambers in imperial palaces; domed basilicas like St. John's, Ephesus; Hagia Sophia, Constantinople; San Marco, Venice).

Stone columns have great compressive strength and can carry heavy loads; hence they remain useful after the building has fallen into disuse. Reused ancient columns (SPOLIA) have been identified in Early Christian and Byz. structures, for example, S. Sabina and S. Maria in Trastevere, Rome, and St. Demetrios, Thessalonike. Byz. builders, particularly under Justinian I, exploited quarries of varied colored marble (unlike their ancient Greek predecessors); they also developed a new form of capital (IMPOST CAPITAL, IMPOST BLOCK) to provide a better juncture between heavy masonry arches and the column shaft than that offered by the traditional Ionic or Corinthian capital. The shafts were normally undecorated, although spirally fluted columns were esp. popular in the 6th C. (J.L. Benson, *Hesperia* 28 [1959] 254–72). In all periods inscriptions might be carved upon them or votives attached. Columns were represented on sarcophagi, in MS illumination, on ivories, and in other media where they served to frame figures of importance who are often shown standing beneath an arch. A few ascetics (called STYLITES) chose to take up residence on the top of large column shafts.

In metaphorical and symbolic vocabulary *stylos* (not *kion*) was often used to designate a moral pillar or support; the word was employed for the apostles and Christ, for saints (esp. Peter and Paul), for the church. According to John Chrysostom (PG 62:554.30–37), the church is the *stylos* of the *oikoumene* and truth is the *stylos* of the church. The biblical image of "the pillar of fire" (Ex 13:21) was combined with the concept of support. Christ, says Epiphanios of Cyprus (*Panarion* 69.35.2, ed. Holl 3:183.23–26), is the way that we follow, the *stylos* as the support of the truth, the cloud sheltering the children of Israel, and (again) the *stylos* as the fiery pillar in the desert. (See also COLUMNS, HONORIFIC.)
–W.L., T.E.G., A.C.

COLUMN CHURCHES. The term is used for three closely related ROCK-CUT CHURCHES, Karanlık Kilise (Dark Church), Elmalı Kilise (Apple Church), and Çarıklı Kilise (Sandal Church) clustered in GÖREME. All three imitate the CROSS-IN-SQUARE plan of built churches, although the western corner bays in Çarıklı were never excavated. Each was ornamented with a DEESIS in the apse and a conventional feast cycle (see CHURCH PROGRAMS OF DECORATION) in the nave, augmented by images derived from earlier churches in the valley, for example, Tokalı Kilise's Ascension/Blessing appears in the barrel vault of Karanlık's narthex. Four donor PORTRAITS are preserved in Karanlık (Basil and the priest Nikephoros in the apse and Genethleos and John *entalmatikos* [a patriarchal functionary?] over the entrance) and three in Çarıklı (Theognostos, Leo, and Michael on the west wall). The paintings have been dated to the mid-11th C. (Jerphanion, Epstein) and to ca. 1200 (Restle). (For ill., see next page.)

LIT. Jerphanion, *Églises rupestres* 1.1:393–473. Restle, *Wall Painting*. A.W. Epstein, "Rock-cut Chapels in Göreme Valley, Cappadocia: The Yılanlı Group and the Column Churches," *CahArch* 24 (1975) 115–35.
–A.J.W.

COLUMNS, HONORIFIC, large freestanding columns erected for commemorative purposes. The practice of erecting such columns was a continuation of Roman custom and esp. common in the capital in the 4th–5th C. (see CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF). Honorific columns were of two basic types. The first consisted of a monolithic shaft standing on a base and supporting a capital

www.kalaropomor.ru

COLUMN CHURCHES. Column church of Elmalı Kilise, Göreme. View of the interior, looking east. In the dome, Christ Pantokrator.

that in turn held a statue of the honoree. Among such monuments erected in Constantinople were the so-called Porphyry Column of Constantine I and the Column of Marcian, both of which remain standing, as well as others known only from literary accounts and drawings. The second type was derived from the Column of Trajan in Rome and consisted of a shaft composed of drums resting on a base and supporting a capital and statue. Both base and shaft were carved in relief, and the figures on the shaft were set in a spiral frieze. Two such columns existed in Constantinople: the Column of Theodosios I, fragments of which survive, and that of Arkadios, its shaft and carvings known only from drawings. Although the practice of erecting honorific columns was abandoned after the 6th C., it was revived in a fashion by Michael VIII, who erected a column near the Church of the Holy Apostles. It was topped by a bronze statue of the archangel Michael and the emperor offering him a model of the city (Pachym., ed. Bekker, 2:234.17). Whether such columns influenced the cult of STYLITE saints appears not to have been investigated.

LIT. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon* 52–55. G. Becatti, *La colonna coclide istoriata* (Rome 1960). Janin, *CP byz.* 73–86, 105. –M.J.

www.staropomor.ru

COMES (*κόμης*, lit. "companion"), Lat. designation for the personal adviser or retainer of an emperor or barbarian king. Constantine I gave the term a technical sense (first mentioned in

COLUMNS, HONORIFIC. Drawing of the Column of Arkadios; from a sketchbook dated 1575. Trinity College Library, Cambridge. The shaft of the column illustrates conflicts between the Byz. and the Goths.

312); early terminology, *comes domini nostri* or *comes Augustorum nostrorum,* emphasized the personal link to the emperor or his family. The term was employed for officials of different ranks or *ordines* (of which there were three at the time of Constantine); it presupposed a special assignment and encompassed various meanings. As an honorary title it was bestowed on some of the highest state functionaries, such as the MAGISTER OFFICIORUM or QUAESTOR; it became part of bureaucratic denominations, such as the COMES SACRARUM LARGITIONUM or COMES RERUM PRIVATARUM. Besides this upper echelon of the *comites consistoriani* there were other *comites* who were not members of the CONSISTORIUM. Some *comites*, such as the *comes Africae* (B.H. Warmington, *BZ* 49 [1956] 55–64) or *comes Aegypti*, were provincial administrators, while others fulfilled fiscal or economic functions or acted as guardians and overseers. In later times *komes*, the Greek form of the term, continued to be used for officials with various functions such as the KOMES HYDATON, KOMES TES KORTES, and others; *komites* were also subaltern officers of the army and navy units. The office or function of a *comes* was termed a *comitiva*.

LIT. O. Seeck, *RE* 4 (1901) 629–79. Jones, *LRE* 1:104–06. G. De Bonfils, *Il comes et quaestor dell'età della dinastia costantiniana* (Naples 1981). –A.K.

COMES RERUM PRIVATARUM (*κόμης τῆς ἰδικῆς παρουσίας*, lit. "of the private fortune"), high-ranking official of the later Roman Empire who administered the imperial estates. The office—like that of the COMES SACRARUM LARGITIONUM—was created ca.318 and first mentioned ca.342–45. The responsibility of this *comes* was to control income from the land of the emperor as opposed to that of the state; this distinction, however, was not consistently applied. The functions of the *comes* encompassed collecting rents and accepting land grants given to the emperor as well as forfeitures and escheats, and protection of the fisc from the intrusion of private owners. The *comes* also handled the sale of movable and immovable imperial properties and was a member

of the CONSISTORIUM. His officers were called *palatini rerum privatarum*; in 399 their number was 300 (*Cod.Theod.* VI 30.16). By the end of the 4th C. the Cappadocian estates were transferred from the control of the *comes* to that of the PRAEPOSITUS SACRI CUBICULI. Anastasios I created, before 509, a separate office of the *comes patrimonii* to manage the imperial estates, while the *comes rerum privatarum* preserved functions connected with grants and forfeitures. Thus he was transformed from a financial into a judicial official; he acquired duties that went far beyond his former obligations, for example, serving as a judge in cases involving grave-robbing and marriage. The office disappeared in the 7th C., some of its functions assumed by the SAKELLARIOS.

LIT. O. Seeck, *RE* 4 (1901) 664–70, 675–77. Jones, *LRE* 1:412–17. M. Kaplan, *Les propriétés de la couronne et de l'Église dans l'Empire byzantin* (Paris 1976) 10–12. –A.K.

COMES SACRARUM LARGITIONUM (*κόμης τῶν θείων θησαυρῶν*, lit. "of the sacred largess, of the sacred treasuries"), high-ranking financial official of the late Roman Empire, created probably ca.318 and first mentioned between ca.342 and 345. The *comes sacrarum largitionum* replaced the former *rationalis* and obtained administration of those taxes that did not come to the department of the PRAETORIAN PREFECT, that is, CHRYSARGYRON, taxes on senators, customs duties, and the so-called "voluntary payments." Income from the emperor's private land passed from this *comes* to the COMES RERUM PRIVATARUM as early as 379. The *comes sacrarum largitionum* also controlled mines, the production of state mills and dyeworks, and minting. The *comes* had a central office divided into several *scrinia* (bureaus) and a large staff in the dioceses and provinces. He enjoyed some judicial rights in cases related to taxation and after 425 also had jurisdiction over the officials of his staff. He was a member of the CONSISTORIUM. From the end of the 5th C. the role of the *comes sacrarum largitionum* decreased, esp. after the abolition of the *chrysargyron*; the last *comes* is mentioned under Emp. Phokas. In the 7th C. the office was replaced by the SAKELLARIOS. Insignia of the *comes sacrarum largitionum* are shown in the NOTITIA DIGNITATUM, while his control stamps are found on numerous silver objects (see SILVER STAMPS).

LIT. J.P.C. Kent, "The comes sacrarum largitionum," in Dodd, *Byz. Silver Stamps* 35–45. Jones, *LRE* 1:427–38. O. Seeck, *RE* 4 (1901) 671–75. A. Masi, "La giurisdizione del 'comes sacrarum largitionum' e del 'comes rei privatae' sui rispettivi funzionari 'palatini,'" *Studi economico-giuridici* 45 (1965–69) 253–61. –A.K., A.C.

COMETS (sing. *κομήτης*, lit. "with long hair," *ἀστήρ*). Byz. records refer frequently to indefinable astronomical phenomena, thereby making it difficult to be certain that it is a comet that is being described because, except for Halley's Comet, the observation cannot be verified astronomically. Generally, a comet was called a *semeion* and sometimes it was qualified by a particular shape, such as that of a swordfish. Although some Byz. scholars followed Aristotle in stressing a natural scientific explanation for comets, the majority of the Byz. population understood a comet to be an omen predicting disaster. As a result an elaborate ritual of prognostication for comets was developed (JOHN LYDOS, *On Omens* 10–15). Some comets, however, such as the one used to foretell the Arab irruption of 632 (Theoph. 336.21–24), were merely invented. Like EARTHQUAKES, ECLIPSES, and FIRES, the appearance of some comets was commemorated by an annual liturgy (*Synax.CP* 154.24–26). The most reliably attested Byz. sighting of comets were in 389, 418, 422, 442, 466, 518, 734, 744, 974, 1042, and 1345. Halley's Comet was sighted in 451, 530, 837, 912, 989, 1066, 1145, 1222, 1301, and 1456.

LIT. Grumel, *Chronologie* 469–75. –B.C.

COMIC, THE, a mode intended to excite LAUGHTER, is rare in preserved Byz. art. Excluded almost by definition from Christian representation, comic elements do appear in the peristyle mosaics of the GREAT PALACE at Constantinople that show, for example, a man thrown from a donkey. If their content is correctly read, it survives on some late glazed CERAMICS. Otherwise HUMOR as we know it is hard to trace in art after the 6th C. A possible exception is the antics of the children in some 14th-C. representations of the Baptism of Christ (D. Mouriki in *Okeanos* 460–62). The CARICATURE found in psalter illustration and the PARODY of classical and mythological images evident on bone caskets and boxes are functionally different from the comic mode. –A.C.

COMITATENSES (from *comitatus*, military retinue), late Roman field army or mobile troops as opposed to the LIMITANEI or border troops. The creation of the body of *comitatenses* was attributed to Diocletian by T. Mommsen (*Hermes* 24 [1889] 195–279) and O. Seeck (*RE* 4 [1901] 619f), despite the direct evidence of Zosimos (Zosim. bk.2, ch.34), who ascribed the innovation to Constantine I. It is likely that before Constantine the *comitatus* was only a body of imperial guards (W. Seston, *Historia* 4 [1955] 295). In the 4th C. the *comitatenses* consisted of about 110,000–120,000 men (Hoffmann, *infra* 1:304) including infantry (*legiones*), cavalry (*vexillationes*), auxiliary troops of foreign soldiers, and SCHOLAE PALATINAE. The infantry and cavalry stood in theory under the command of different MAGISTRI MILITUM. In 364 each unit of *comitatenses* was divided into two parts: those called *seniores* served primarily in the West, *juniores* in the East. After 373 some units of *limitanei* were assigned to serve with *comitatenses*; Theodosios I restructured the *comitatenses*, uniting cavalry and infantry regiments under individual *magistri utrius militiae*. Circa 395 eastern contingents consisted of five armies, two attached to the court and three stationed in Oriens, Thrace, and Illyricum. *Comitatenses* were considered more privileged troops than *limitanei*. R. MacMullen (*Klio* 62 [1980] 459) suggests that the number of well-trained *comitatenses* declined in the second half of the 4th C., and later the difference between *comitatenses* and *limitanei* disappeared.

LIT. D. Hoffmann, *Das spätrömische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia dignitatum*, 2 vols. (Düsseldorf 1969–70). H.M.D. Parker, "The Legions of Diocletian and Constantine," *JRS* 23 (1933) 175–89. R. Tomlin, "*Seniores-Iuniores* in the Late-Roman Field Army," *AJPh* 93 (1972) 253–78. –A.K.

COMITIVA. See COMES.

COMMANDERS, MILITARY. In theory, the emperor was supreme commander of the army, but only a few (such as Constantine V, Nikephoros II Phokas, Basil II, or the Komnenoi) personally led armies in the field. MAGISTRI MILITUM were supreme commanders of the empire's armies until the 7th C. By the early 8th C. the DOMESTIKOS TON SCHOLON had become chief commander, seconded by the STRATEGOS of the Anatolikon; after the 11th C. the rank of MEGAS DOMESTIKOS designated supreme military commander. Despite the high number of MERCENARIES in the Byz. army, supreme command was rarely given to a foreigner.

High military command was not necessarily entrusted to capable soldiers. The assignment, duration, and independence of military command was subject to considerations other than proven ability, and emperors were careful to bestow command on a temporary basis to loyal courtiers or family members, regardless of their actual military experience or ability. During the 10th and 11th C., when practically every successful general (Bardas SKLEROS, George MANIAKES) made a bid for the throne, command assigned on the basis of loyalty was particularly evident, as was the ensuing deleterious effect of loyal but incompetent commanders on the army's performance. EUNUCHS, automatically precluded from the throne, frequently received command of armies; while some were effective generals (e.g., the 6th-C. NARSES), many brought disaster on their men. Constantine Gongyles, for example, led the impressive expeditionary army to Crete in 949, which was annihilated as a result of his carelessness (Skyl. 245.35–246.52).

LIT. Guilland, *Titres*, pt.V (1966), 133–39; pt.VI (1973), 44f. Idem, *Institutions* 1:380–468, 498–521. –A.K., E.M.

COMMANDS, MILITARY. The *Strategikon of Maurice* (*Strat.Maurik.* 3.5, pp.152–54) provides a detailed description of commands issued by a MANDATOR during the army's training exercises. The soldiers began to march upon hearing the blast of a trumpet (*boukinon* or *touba*) or seeing an ensign wave a banner (*phlamoulon*); the striking of a shield or hand signals brought them to a stop. The *Strategikon* lists all oral commands in Latin; a 9th-C. chronicler (Theoph. 258.15–19) records an order given by KOMENTIOLOS "in the ancestral language" (i.e., Latin), "*torna, torna, fratre*," during an expedition against the Avars in 586, but by the end of the 9th C. Latin commands had apparently been discarded, as Leo VI lists the same commands in a Greek version in his TAKTIKA (e.g., 7.65–69). The 10th-C. PRAECEPTA MILITARIA indicates that battle commands were taught in training, and that most were signaled by trumpet (4.1–2; 15.22–23).

Daily orders were issued to officers in writing

www.slardpoint.ru

(DE RE MILITARI 32.4–12). The emperor, in theory the supreme military commander, likewise transmitted written commands to his generals. A 12th-C. historian (Nik.Chon. 154.43–48) relates that Manuel I sent a letter (*grammata* or *biblion*) to Andronikos Kontostephanos on the eve of a battle with the Hungarians (8 July 1167) forbidding him to engage the enemy because he found the day unpropitious. Kontostephanos, however, disregarded the command, hid the letter under his cloak, gave battle, and won the day. (See also BATTLE STANDARD AND FLAG.)

LIT. G. Reichenkron, "Zur römischen Kommandosprache bei byzantinischen Schriftstellern," *BZ* 54 (1961) 18–27. H. Mihăescu, "Torna, torna, fratre," *Byzantina* 8 (1976) 21–35. –A.K., E.M.

COMMENDATIO ANIMAE (Lat., lit. "commending of a soul"), popular prayer for the dead in Western ritual, known from the 3rd C. onward and influential in art and hagiography. It contains 13 petitions on the model of "Free his soul, Lord, as you freed Daniel from the lions' den." The Old Testament events cited include Noah and the Flood, Job's sufferings, the sacrifice of Isaac, Jonah and the whale, and the rescue narratives of the Book of Daniel: Daniel in the Lions' Den, the Three Hebrews in the Fiery Furnace, and Susanna and the Elders. St. Thekla is the only nonbiblical figure included. A. Baumstark (*OrChr*, n.s. 4 [1914–15] 298–305) identified early Byz. analogues to the *Commendatio* in the Great Euchologion.

Scenes referred to in the *Commendatio* recur in the CATACOMBS and elsewhere. For instance, a 3rd-C. cup from Diokleia includes the three Daniel scenes (with all figures ORANT), Jonah and Isaac, with quotations from the *Commendatio* (H. Leclercq, *DACL* 3:3009–11, fig.3336). Frescoes in the necropolis at El-Bagawat include the three Daniel scenes, Noah, and Thekla (Idem, *DACL* 4:439f). The Brescia casket (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, no.107) juxtaposes images of Jonah and of the rescue narratives of Daniel. Often hagiographers ascribe a version of the *Commendatio* to saints about to face torture (e.g., Lukillianos—ed. F. Halkin, *AB* 84 [1966] 16f, 26), esp. if the approaching torture is by fire (e.g., Juliana—PG 114:1444D, 1448f).

ED. *Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis*, ed. A. Dumas [= CChr, ser. lat. 159] (Turnhout 1981) 460–62.

LIT. K. Stuber, *Commendatio animae: Sterben im Mittelalter* (Bern-Frankfurt 1976). Seeliger, "Drei Jünglinge" 301, 317–19, 328. J. Ntedika, *L'évocation de l'au-delà dans la prière pour les morts* (Louvain-Paris 1971) 72–83. –C.B.T.

COMMENTARIES (pl. μυσταγωγίαι), mystagogy, interpretations of liturgical rites that apply to LITURGY the multilevel patristic method of scriptural EXEGESIS. Developed systematically in 4th-C. instructions for the CATECHUMENATE and first applied extensively to EUCHARIST by Theodore of Mopsuestia, homilies 15–16 (ed. R. Tonneau, R. Devreesse, *Les Homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* [Vatican 1949] 461–605) and pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* (PG 3:369–569), mystagogy matured with the Byz. commentaries of MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR, GERMANOS I, the *Protheoria* (PG 140:417–68) of ca.1085–95 (cf. J. Darrouzès, *REB* 32 [1974] 199–203), the spurious 12th-C. *Liturgical Commentary*, wrongly attributed to SOPHRONIOS of Jerusalem (PG 87:3981–4001), Nicholas KABASILAS, and SYMEON OF THESSALONIKE.

Differing methods of interpretation were inherited from the two schools of patristic exegesis, Alexandrian and Antiochene. For the more spiritualizing ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL (Dionysios, Maximos, Symeon to some extent), the contemplation (*theoria*) of liturgical rites raises the soul to the realities of the invisible world. Here anagogy takes precedence over biblical typology, and the liturgy becomes an allegory of the soul's progress from sin to divine communion via a process of purification symbolized in the rites. This Alexandrian system left little room for the saving mediatorship of Jesus' earthly life, death, and resurrection. By contrast, the exegesis and mystagogy of the ANTIOCHENE SCHOOL, more attentive to *historia* than to *theoria*, emphasized the relationship between liturgical rites and the historic saving actions of Christ, of which the sacramental rites are an "imitation" (*mimesis:* Cyril) and "memorial" (*anamnesis:* Chrysostom), as well as being an initiation and foretaste of the heavenly worship.

Patr. Germanos I, joining both methods, added the more literal Antiochene mystagogy to the Alexandrian heritage of pseudo-Dionysios transmitted to Byz. via Maximos. Thus for Germanos the church is not only, as for Maximos, "Heaven on earth, where the God of heaven dwells and moves." It also "images forth the crucifixion and burial and resurrection of Christ" (Germanos, *Liturgy*, par.1). The GREAT ENTRANCE not only shows "the entrance of all the saints and righteous ahead of the cherubic powers and the angelic hosts. . . . It is also in imitation of the burial of Christ" (par.37). This synthesis reached classical expression in the more extensive and complete commentary of Kabasilas, which represented a return to the balanced method of Germanos after the exaggerated allegorical historicism of the *Protheoria*.

LIT. Taft, "Liturgy of Great Church." R. Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la divine liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris 1966). H.-J. Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy* (New York 1986) 184–92. –R.F.T.

COMMERCE AND TRADE. The role of trade in Byz. changed over time, depending on political circumstances and on general economic development. In the period through the 6th C., among the factors facilitating economic exchange within the empire were the existence of cities, a common currency, the low internal duties of 2 to 2.5 percent, and the relative openness of the MEDITERRANEAN, even after the creation of a VANDAL fleet. Among the factors inhibiting exchange were state exactions, the fact that the needs of the army and the provisioning of Constantinople were met by levies or payments in kind thus obviating trade, the difficulties of transportation, and a certain degree of self-sufficiency on the large estates. Modern scholars tend to stress these inhibiting factors; nevertheless, the evidence for the existence of internal trade is clear: WINE and OIL (commodities for mass consumption) were objects of relatively long-distance trade, as were wool, metals, MARBLE, timber, and manufactured goods, esp. cloth and luxury products, the last having a MARKET that was diffused geographically but restricted in size. Great periodic markets (FAIRS), such as those of Aigai (in Cilicia) and EDESSA, catered to this internal long-distance trade. At the local level, markets were small and so was the radius of activity. The fairs outside Antioch served the needs of local villages; small towns exchanged products with the countryside, forming local networks of exchange within a system of relative self-sufficiency. Trading activity was greater in the eastern part of the empire, while in the West the process toward self-sufficiency was more advanced. It is impossible to quantify the importance of trade in the economy of this period; Jones's statement (*LRE* 2:872) that the *collatio lustralis*, a tax on trade and manufacturing, accounted for 5 percent of imperial revenue, is a fiscal, not an economic calculation.

In terms of international trade, its most important expression was the importation of SPICES, silks, jewelry, and other luxury products from China, Persia, and India; these commodities arrived at the stations of the Persian frontier, the Syrian cities, or Clysma and Aila, and then were transported to both the eastern and the western part of the empire. Foreign trade appears to have been particularly active in the 5th–6th C. It was somewhat hampered by the fact that trade in the most important item of exchange, SILK, was highly regulated.

The political, demographic, and military troubles that afflicted Byz. in the 7th C. brought about economic changes that affected trade. The tendency toward self-sufficiency became much stronger than in the previous period, while urban decline reduced the level of exchange between town and countryside. Land routes became very difficult and communications along the Mediterranean, although they never completely stopped, were disrupted by PIRACY. Trade declined but did not cease, the provisioning of big cities, esp. Constantinople, acting as an impetus to it. Large fairs, like that of EPHESUS, continued to exist. The RHODIAN SEA LAW testifies to the survival of maritime trade. It was probably in order to stimulate such trade that Emp. Nikephoros I imposed a forced loan on the large shipowners of Constantinople. Locally, exchange took place in small markets where an element of BARTER was also to be found. International trade was reoriented to some extent toward the north and to the Black Sea. In the 8th C. the Byz. had trade relations with Bulgaria and in the 10th C. with the Rus'. The silk trade, now taking place primarily within the empire, may have been considerable. Quantifiable information is, once again, lacking.

By the 10th C., there is evidence of a strong revival of trade. The BOOK OF THE EPARCH, along with other sources, shows a large number of different trades and crafts in Constantinople. The state regulated and circumscribed, to some extent, the activities of the various guilds. At the same time, Constantinople appeared as a center of international trade, with Syrian, Italian, Rus', and

www.slaropolnor.ru

Bulgarian MERCHANTS, whose contact with Byz. merchants was also regulated. The market of Constantinople stocked spices, which arrived by way of TREBIZOND, cloth from Syria (also mentioned in Thessalonike), and linen cloth from Bulgaria and the Pontus. Trade relations with the Muslims became very active in the middle of the 10th C. The internal market also appeared active. The size of mercantile enterprises remained small.

In the 11th–12th C. a number of general changes combined to activate the economy of exchange. Urban growth acted as a stimulant, as did the rise of an important Italian market and, possibly, the general quickening of economic activity in the Mediterranean, partly the result of the activities of Italian merchants. Byz. traders from Constantinople appear in the documents of the Cairo Geniza, importing into Egypt brocades and luxury textiles as well as furniture: chests, cupboards, and bedsteads of Rūm. Constantinople and Thessalonike were still the most important trade centers. The TIMARION attests to the vitality of the commerce of Thessalonike, while BENJAMIN OF TUDELA (p.20) says of Constantinople, "It is a busy city, and merchants come to it from every country by sea or land, and there is none like it in the world except Baghdad." A number of smaller centers of exchange developed: HALMYROS, DEMETRIAS, Preveza, and others. Michael CHONIATES speaks of the dependence of Athens on trade. The Black Sea witnessed important commercial activity throughout the period. Byz. aristocrats still shied away from commerce, at least in their normative statements; and large economic units (e.g., the Kosmosoteira monastery at BERA) tried to buy necessities such as oil directly from the producer, rather than through middlemen. At the same time, monks themselves participated in trade, primarily, perhaps, by selling their produce, but also, it seems, by sometimes acting as middlemen.

The acquisition of trade privileges first by VENICE (at the end of the 11th C.) and then by PISA and GENOA played an important role in these developments. The chrysobulls to the Venetians gave them access to an increasing number of markets, both in Constantinople and in provincial cities. Venetian merchants were interested not only in trade with the East, but also in the internal trade of the Byz. Empire; this is also evident in the chrysobull of 1198 (the date is under discussion), which greatly expanded the markets accessible to the Venetians. Venetian involvement in domestic trade was facilitated by the fact that, after 1126, the Byz. paid no KOMMERKION on their transactions with the Venetians. This may have acted as a stimulant to trade and may even have profited some Byz. merchants; in the long term, however, it subsidized the Venetian middleman to the detriment of the Byz.

During the Palaiologan period, the trade of the Byz. Empire functioned under very different conditions from the past. The dominant factor in the eastern Mediterranean in this period was the presence of Western merchants, primarily the Italians, who had turned the terms of trade in their favor. By the late 13th C., they had created a network of exchange that resembled an international trade network; within it they were dominant, since they controlled communications, information, exclusive access to Western markets, and privileges in the marketplaces of the Levant, including the Byz. Empire. Through their colonies and trade stations, Western merchants exercised overwhelming influence on trade. Byz. trade formed part of this complex and served the needs of Western markets. Food and raw materials were exported to the West, from which manufactured products, primarily Italian and French cloth, were imported. Constantinople was a particularly important pivot in this system when the *Pax Mongolica* (mid-13th–mid-14th C.) made it easier for merchandise from the Far East to reach the Mediterranean by way of the Black Sea. By contrast, after the mid-14th C. the relative importance of Constantinople declined, to the advantage of Cyprus, Ayas (Lajazzo in Lesser Armenia), and eventually Alexandria and Berytus.

Throughout this period trade was active, esp. along the coasts of the Aegean and the Black Sea, the islands, the inland route from Thessalonike to Prizren and other Serbian towns, and the Danube delta. MONEMVASIA, Thessalonike, and Trebizond were major commercial centers. Indeed, it may be said that commercial activity was greater in this period than ever before. Byz. merchants and sailors participated in this activity quite substantially, as did members of the aristocracy. They were primarily active in local or interregional trade, however, rarely gaining access to international trade, which was the most lucrative. Only in the late 1340s did the Byz. try to capture the profitable Black Sea trade for themselves. It was an abortive effort, which came to an end in 1350. For the rest, their activities remained important, extensive but subsidiary, until the establishment of the Ottoman Empire changed the terms of trade once again.

LIT. W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen âge*², 2 vols. (Leipzig 1936). M. Hendy, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy c. 300–1450* (Cambridge–New York 1985). N. Oikonomides, "Silk Trade and Production in Byzantium from the Sixth to the Ninth Century: The Seals of Kommerkiarioi," *DOP* 40 (1986) 31–53. Kazhdan, *Derevnja i gorod* 250–300. A.E. Laiou-Thomadakis, "The Byzantine Economy in the Mediterranean Trade System; Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries," *DOP* 34–35 (1980–81) 177–222. S.D. Goitein, "Mediterranean Trade in the Eleventh Century," in *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, ed. M.A. Cook (London 1970) 51–62. –A.L.

COMMODATUM (*τὸ εἰς χρῆσιν διδόμενον*), a loan for use free of charge. As a type of contract *commodatum* was already under Justinian I (*Digest* 13.6) manifestly an artificial term that can be distinguished from LOAN and MISTHOSIS only with difficulty because of the unclear terminology of the Byz. with regard to ownership. Even so, it is treated in detail in the *Basilika* (13.1) and is still found in Harmenopoulos (Harm. 2.10). In practice it was confused with a wide variety of other types of transmission for use: in *Peira* 46.5 it is characterized as "polymorphic." In fact, CHRESIS is also readily used as a term for rights of use (USUFRUCT), for example, the rights of a widow over the property of her deceased husband (*Nov. Just.* 22) or for LONGI TEMPORIS PRAESCRIPTIO (cf. Harm. 1.16.5). –D.S.

COMMUNION (*μετάληψις*), the eating and drinking in common of the consecrated bread and wine (Jesus' body and blood), climax of the rite of the EUCHARIST, as sign of the spiritual communion (*koinonia*) of Christians with one another in Christ, and, through him, with the Father in the Holy Spirit. The FRACTION and distribution of one loaf (1 Cor 10:16–17) and the drinking from one cup, as well as the old requirement that each receive the consecrated elements from the hand of another, symbolized the fellowship involved. Communion in both Eucharist and prayer was restricted to the baptized who had not been excluded by EXCOMMUNICATION or grave sin. Communion among churches was symbolized by inviting visiting bishops to join in celebrating the Eucharist.

Originally all church members in good standing communicated at every Eucharist, but by the end of the 4th C. the church fathers complained of a decline in the reception of communion, though they themselves were scaring people away by calling communion a "dread" mystery to be received only by those worthy, in fear and trembling. By the Middle Ages, laity communicated at most a few times a year, on the GREAT FEASTS, esp. Easter. Monks, however, continued to receive communion more often: daily communion was a rarity in Byz. monasteries, but weekly communion, though not universal, remained common.

LIT. W. Elert, *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries* (St. Louis 1966). L. Hertling, *Communio, Church and Papacy in Early Christianity* (Chicago 1972). Taft, *East & West* 61–80, 101–09. E. Herman, "Die häufige und tägliche Kommunion in den byzantinischen Klöstern," in *Mém.L.Petit* 203–17. –R.F.T.

COMMUNION OF THE APOSTLES. See LORD'S SUPPER.

COMMUTATION (Lat. *adaeratio*). Following the monetary reform of Constantine I, Byz. constantly favored the commutation of fees or contributions in kind and of services and CORVÉES into monetary payments. In the early centuries, the ANNONA as well as the CAPUT or the levies of animals (horses, pigs) or weapons were commuted into cash contributions at such a variety of rates (often arbitrarily established) that the fiscal burden of contributors and the illicit gains of some tax collectors could also vary considerably. In the FISCAL SYSTEM of the Macedonian period, the *adaeratio* of services due to the state as well as of *sportulae* (see SYNETHEIA) in kind due to officials was common: for example, the military obligation (STRATEIA) of a farmer-soldier for one year could be replaced, in the 10th–11th C., by a cash payment of 4–6 nomismata; similar arrangements were possible for peasants attached to the DROMOS and for most SECONDARY TAXES in kind, some of which were claimed in cash so often that new names had to be invented (*antikaniskon*, *antimitatikion*, etc.). In the late 11th C. and afterward, in times of monetary instability TAX COLLECTORS increased their revenues by playing with the ex-

www.Stratopon.ru

change rates of the various coins. In the 14th C. the KANISKION was commuted to 6 keratia per year.

LIT. Jones, *LRE* 207f, 460f, 625f, 670f, 702–04. Morrisson, "Logariké" 419–64. Kazhdan, *Agrarnye otnošenija* 120. –N.O.

COMPUTUS. The date of EASTER in Byz. was determined by a set of simple rules and a variety of cycles, collectively called the computus. The rules are essentially that Easter falls on the first Sunday that follows both the 14th day of the Paschal lunar month (Passover) and 21 March in the Julian calendar. The two cycles in common use were of 19 years (19 solar years = 235 months; the years of intercalation [embolismic years] were numbers 3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17, and 19 of the cycle) and, from the 5th C. onward, 532 years (= 19 × 28). The 28-year solar cycle is the product of a four-year leap-year cycle and seven weekdays. The combination of the 19-year lunar cycle and the 28-year solar cycle results in the precise recurrence of the sequence of Julian calendar dates of Easter in each 532-year cycle. The so-called "reforms" of the computus in general consisted simply of changing the epoch at which the 19-year or 532-year cycles begin, or of changing the one year in each cycle in which the *saltus lunae* or "leap of the moon" (an epact of 12 instead of 11 days) occurs. It is true that, following the Islamic value for the length of a solar year that had been known in Byz. since the 11th C., Nikephoros GREGORAS proposed a reform of the calendar (Pingree, "Chioniades & Astronomy" 138f), but this proposal was not accepted. The immense Byz. literature on computus includes treatises by Isaac ARGYROS and Nicholas RHABDAS.

Ready-made computus tables (or paschal tables) indicating the dates of Easter for the observable future survive in many MSS. Usually compiled by the readers/owners, their earliest date gives the terminus ante quem for the completion of the MS.

LIT. Grumel, *Chronologie* 31–55, 98–110, 129–39, 265–77. O. Neugebauer, *Ethiopic Astronomy and Computus* (Vienna 1979). –D.P.

CONCEŞTI TREASURE, dated to ca.400?, found at Conceşti in Moldavia in 1812 and now in the Hermitage Museum, Leningrad. It includes six Byz. silver objects, Hunnish gold jewelry, and horse fittings (see CHARIOT MOUNTS AND HORSE FITTINGS). Three silver objects have decorations from classical mythology: the amphora, one of the most elaborate silver vessels of the late antique period, has relief decoration of a hunt, a battle between Greeks and Amazons, and a marine *thiasos* (Dionysiac revelry); the SITULA has a frieze incorporating Hylas, Leda, Apollo, and Daphne; and the plate, one of the largest known (diam. 55 cm), is decorated on its rim with gilded and niello-inlaid portrait medallions and hunt scenes, comparable in technique to the SUTTON HOO TREASURE plate and a *trulla* in the MYTILENE TREASURE. The other silver objects in the treasure include a ewer, of a well-known type; a folding stool that resembles others from Ostia and the LAMPSAKOS TREASURE; and a helmet of a type introduced by Constantine I (see ARMOR). It has been suggested that the treasure belonged to a Hunnish prince who may have acquired the silver objects as booty during a campaign in the Danube region and that the burial took place between 400 and 410.

LIT. Matzulewitsch, *Byz. Antike* 123–37. Kent-Painter, *Wealth* 138f. –M.M.M.

CONCH (κόγχη, lit. "mussel shell"), a half-dome covering a niche or APSE. Its shell-like or ribbed form, which appeared behind and above the seats of magistrates in Roman basilicas, was taken over into Christian iconography (Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten*, nos. 137, 150, 153f). In Byz. churches a conch was usually decorated with mosaic or fresco as a focus for the interior decoration. In early basilican churches the conch of the apse normally contained an image of Christ; in later, domed churches the conch of the apse became, after the dome, the most conspicuous location in the building and was reserved for the image of the Virgin. Conches were also used for other visually and structurally prominent roles—for example, in the supporting system for the dome in certain domed octagon churches (as at the NEA MONE on Chios), for the covering of subsidiary apses in triconch and tetraconch churches, and for covering EXEDRAE of polyconch churches and other buildings (e.g., *triklinia* and refectories). Smaller-scale conches were also used in conjunction with niches as exterior decorative devices (H. Buchwald, *JÖB* 26 [1977] 265f, 290–95).

LIT. K. Wessel, *RBK* 1:268–93. Demus, *Byz. Mosaic* 21f. –M.J.

CONCUBINAGE (παλλακεία, *agraphos gamos* in *Ecloga* 2.6), a stable sexual relationship, frequently of a married man with a woman of lower status, was considered legal in Roman law (Ph.J. Thomas in *Huldigungsbundel P. van Warmelo* [Pretoria 1984] 230–36). Church fathers attacked concubinage, equating it with PROSTITUTION. In 326 Constantine I prohibited married men from keeping concubines (*Cod.Just.* V 26.1) and in 336 he threatened with infamy and deprivation of Roman citizenship any men of high rank who tried to treat as legitimate their children by bond-maids, freedwomen, actresses, or tavern keepers (*Cod. Theod.* IV 6.3 pr.). Anastasios I and Justinian I were more tolerant toward concubines and their offspring, and the *Ecloga* still protected concubines against the arbitrariness of their "husbands." Leo VI abolished this institution (nov.91); the previous opinion that this action was initiated by Basil I was questioned by N. Oikonomides (*DOP* 30 [1976] 173–93) who interpreted *Procheiron* 4.26 as an interpolation of a section of Leo VI's novel of 907. Concubinage evidently survived this abolition, and in the 13th C. Demetrios CHOMATENOS mentions *pallakeia* and concubines (*pallakai*) kept by men of various status and in various areas of Epiros.

The status of the children of concubines, *filii naturales*, posed a problem for legislators who tried to distinguish them from offspring resulting from casual intercourse (with prostitutes, etc.); their attitude toward these children kept shifting, as they sometimes granted and sometimes withdrew their rights to the property of their fathers. In reality many ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN of emperors and noblemen by their concubines assumed high ranks and social importance.

LIT. A. Laiou, "Contribution à l'étude de l'institution familiale en Epire au XIIIe siècle," *FM* 6 (1984) 284–300. G. Prinzing, "Sozialgeschichte der Frau im Spiegel der Chomatenos-Akten," *JÖB* 32.2 (1982) 453–62. Ritzer, *Mariage* 93f, 133, 169f. M. Niziołek, *Legal Effects of Concubinage in Reference to Concubines' Offspring in the Light of Imperial Legislation of the Period of the Dominate* (Krakow 1980). –J.H., A.K.

www.slaropolis.com

CONFESSION (ἐξομολόγησις), the solemn act of acknowledgment of one's sins, was considered by the church fathers as indispensable in the search for SALVATION. As Athanasios of Alexandria (PG 27:481A) states, "Confession is the beginning of salvation." John Chrysostom (PG 57:426.35–37) asserts that sin is such a stain that even thousands of springs of water cannot remove it, only tears and confession. The early church encouraged public confession, but from the end of the 4th C. this practice declined, and the right of hearing confession and imposing PENANCE was entrusted to the church as an institution and individually to priests. The Byz. church, however, placed less emphasis on the institutional and legalistic approach to confession than did its Western counterpart: confession was not included in the list of SACRAMENTS established by Theodore of Stoudios. John Chrysostom (PG 49:292.34–44) stresses that there are many different ways of repentance (*metanoia*) and none are difficult: "Are you a sinner? Enter a church, confess your sins, and receive absolution." The informal character of Byz. confession is evident from a text ascribed to Anastasios of Sinai (PG 89:372A): "If you find a spiritual man, experienced and capable of curing you, confess before him without shame and full of faith, as if before God and not a human being."

In the monastic milieu confession to a PATER PNEUMATIKOS, a spiritual father, was a regular practice. At the BEBAIAS ELPIDOS NUNNERY daily confession was prescribed (*Typikon*, chs. 105–11). But in the secular world it was not common, except during LENT or as acknowledgment of serious sins. Byz. PENITENTIALS do not suggest a rigid format for absolution or a strict scale of penances (EPITIMIA); absolution was expressed mostly in the form of PRAYER and the remission of sins was attributed to God rather than to the priest.

LIT. Meyendorff, *Byz. Theology* 195f. M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium* 3 (Paris 1920) 331–89. A. Almazov, *Tajnaja ispoved' v pravoslavnoj vostočnoj cerkvi* (Odessa 1894), rev. I. Sokolov, *VizVrem* 4 (1897) 675–82, 692. –A.K.

CONFESSOR (ὁμολογητής), an honorific title designating primarily those who, during the persecutions of the 3rd–4th C., overtly proclaimed themselves Christians; the feminine form, *homo-*

logetria, is rare—for example, EPIPHANIOS of Salamis (PG 42:192B) mentions an anchorite, Paphnoutios, who was the son of a *homologetria*. The difference between the confessor and MARTYR was still vague in the 3rd C.; ORIGEN applied the term martyr to all who witnessed to the truth, although he knew that the term was generally reserved for those who proved their faith by shedding their blood. After the victory of Christianity, the term acquired the metaphorical sense of "pious Christian," as in the 5th-C. inscription of "Domnos homologetes" (W. Ramsay, *JHS* 25 [1905] 172). It was also specifically applied to some ardent defenders of Orthodoxy, such as MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR and THEOPHANES THE CONFESSOR, who suffered exile or imprisonment, but not death, for their beliefs. (For confessor as one who hears CONFESSION, see PATER PNEUMATIKOS.)

LIT. H. Delehaye, "Martyr et confesseur," *AB* 39 (1921) 20–49. –A.K.

CONFISCATION. Legislation of the 4th–6th C. prescribed confiscation as punishment for traitors, heretics, pagans, and parties contracting illegal marriages; in addition, the property of pagan temples, certain municipal estates, and individuals who died intestate without legally recognized heirs, was subject to confiscation. While several of these categories ultimately fell into disuse, confiscation for both intestacy and treason persisted in modified forms throughout later periods: the *Ecloga* (6.2) stipulates that the fisc could recover half the estate of a husband who died intestate and was survived only by his wife (see ABIOTIKION); the *Peira* (60.1) documents a complicated division of property between the fisc and the heirs of a proscribed member of the Bourtzes family; Manuel STRABOROMANOS (P. Gautier, *REB* 23 [1965] 183.30–31) describes how his father was punished with confiscation under Alexios I, adding that the victims were allowed to retain a portion of their property and that many subsequently received aid from the emperor himself. Confiscated lands became state property, administered until the 7th C. by the COMES RERUM PRIVATARUM.

Alongside such practices sanctioned in civil law, confiscation also developed certain extrajudicial forms based largely upon administrative regulations of the army and fisc. In the 10th C., military officers were permitted during foreign invasions to seize private cash to purchase supplies (DE OBSIDIONE TOLERANDA 49.20–22), and several emperors appropriated ecclesiastical treasure to meet urgent military expenses. Lands abandoned for 30 years might become classified as KLASMA and revert to the fisc, while STRATIOTIKA KTEMATA could be withdrawn from their original possessors for transfer to more reliable soldiers. THEOPHYLAKTOS of Ohrid (ep.26, ed. Gautier, *Lettres* 215–17) mentions widespread confiscation by imperial officials in Bulgaria. In addition, emperors progressively obtained the right to confiscate any landholding in exchange for its JUST PRICE or the equivalent in land (vita of John Chrysostom, PG 114:1156A), and both Nikephoros I (Theoph. 487.27–488.1) and Basil II (Skyl. 340.88–95) appear to have appropriated private property without any compensation. Such widespread application rendered confiscation a continual threat in Byz. society, and a number of writers (e.g., Skylitzes, Kekaumenos, and esp. Niketas Choniates) express disapproval and fear of its frequently unjust or arbitrary nature.

LIT. G. Monks, "The Administration of the Privy Purse," *Speculum* 32 (1957) 748–63. Kazhdan-Constable, *Byzantium* 144f. –A.J.C.

CONFRATERNITY (ἀδελφότης, "brotherhood," or διακονία, "diaconate"), a private association of laymen and clergy, men and women, established for devotional purposes (e.g., the veneration of a particular icon) and for mutual assistance among members (e.g., in cases of sickness, for funeral or memorial services). One function of a confraternity was to hold a procession with cult icons on feastdays, a scene depicted in the Blachernai monastery at ARTA. Such lay confraternities had charters, strict regulations for members, and other similarities to the confraternities found in the medieval West. There is evidence for Byz. confraternities from the 6th C. until the end of the empire, with perhaps a discontinuity during the Iconoclastic era. A late 11th- or early 12th-C. TYPIKON exists for a confraternity at Thebes.

LIT. J. Nesbitt, J. Wiita, "A Confraternity of the Comnenian Era," *BZ* 68 (1975) 360–84. Beck, *Kirche* 138f. P. Horden, "The Confraternities in Byzantium," in W.J. Sheils, D. Wood, *Voluntary Religion* (Oxford 1986) 25–45. –M.B., A.C.

CONRAD III (Κορράδος) of Hohenstaufen, king of Germany (1138–52), never crowned Western Emperor; born 1093, died Bamberg 15 Feb. 1152. Begun in 1140, negotiations with JOHN II KOMNENOS for an alliance against ROGER II of Sicily culminated in 1142 with the dispatch of BERTHA OF SULZBACH to Constantinople as bride for MANUEL I. Conrad led the German contingent on the Second Crusade in 1147. Because of clashes with Byz. forces, he feared to enter Constantinople, but crossed the Bosporos with his army. Defeated in Anatolia by the Turks, Conrad joined LOUIS VII, leader of the French Crusaders. From Ephesus, ill and exhausted, Conrad sailed to Constantinople (ca. Jan. 1148), where Manuel entertained him; he continued by sea to the Holy Land. Returning after the Crusade's failure, Conrad landed at Thessalonike, where, at Christmas 1148, he and Manuel agreed on a joint attack on Roger. Manuel was to receive Apulia and Calabria as Bertha's dowry. Because of ill health and preoccupations in Germany, Conrad failed to execute these plans.

LIT. V.G. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy* 4:18–105. Lamma, *Comneni* 1:33–115. H. Vollrath, "Konrad III. und Byzanz," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 59 (1977) 321–65. –C.M.B.

CONRAD OF MONTFERRAT, claimant king of Jerusalem (1190–92); died Tyre 28 Apr. 1192. Son of the marquess William VI of Montferrat, Conrad and his brothers BONIFACE OF MONTFERRAT and RENIER OF MONTFERRAT allied with Emp. Manuel I against FREDERICK I BARBAROSSA in 1179. Conrad captured Frederick's representative, Archbp. Christian of Mainz (Sept. 1179), then went to Constantinople to confer with Manuel; he was there at Manuel's death. In 1186 Isaac II offered the hand of his sister Theodora and Conrad accepted. He reached Constantinople about Apr. 1187, and the marriage occurred immediately. Conrad became caesar. During the subsequent revolt of Alexios BRANAS, Conrad enlisted Western cavalry and infantry as well as Turkish and Georgian merchants; his generalship was crucial in defeating Branas. Conrad soon became discontented, however, and perhaps learned of the threats posed by Saladin in the Holy Land. Around late June 1187 (or Sept., according to R.-J. Lilie in *Varia* 1 [Bonn 1984] 163–74), he abandoned Theodora and sailed to Tyre. There he helped organize the defense of the city and preserve the remnants of the kingdom of JERUSALEM. In 1190 he married Isabel (daughter of AMALRIC I and Maria Komnene) and claimed the kingdom.

LIT. Th. Ilgen, *Markgraf Conrad von Montferrat* (Marburg 1880). Brand, *Byzantium* 18–20, 80–84. –C.M.B.

CONSANGUINITY. See RELATIONSHIP, DEGREES OF.

CONSCIENCE (συνείδησις), a term rarely found in ancient philosophy. Taken literally, *syneidesis* originally meant personal knowledge or understanding shared with another; eventually it came to mean self-awareness. From the 1st C. B.C. the term appears more frequently, often with a negative connotation, in reference to an attitude that approaches our notion of conscience. In the New Testament, while the term does not occur in the Gospels, it appears 30 times throughout the remaining books, but only in the Pauline epistles is it understood in an ethical sense as the stage at which the self feels either justified or condemned.

In Christian sources *syneidesis* primarily denotes either self-justification or self-condemnation, even though its alternative meanings are not wholly absent. For example, in Ignatius of Antioch and Clement of Rome conscience becomes more authoritarian, emphasizing faithful obedience to the authority of the church. The Philonic or Pauline notion is evident in JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, for whom conscience is the highest authority next to the command of God, an understanding that unites him with JOHN OF DAMASCUS, for whom the law of God is embedded in human conscience, called the law of the mind (*Exp. fidei* 95.8–10, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:222). It is the impulse, the tension that maintains the life of ascetic spirituality, for the conscience demands satisfaction. The ascetic life of the saints shows conscience as a form of martyrdom, while it may also refer to the monastic life: "Let conscience serve as a reflection of your obedience" (John Klimax, PG 88:712B). In this tradition, the formation of conscience requires certain spiritual qualities, "vigilance of the heart" and "sobriety" (*nepsis*).

LIT. C.A. Pierce, *Conscience in the New Testament* (London 1955). J. Stelzenberger, *Syneidesis bei Origenes* (Paderborn 1963). Idem, "Conscientia in der ost-westlichen Spannung

www.Stanpodar.com.ua

der patristischen Theologie," *Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift* 141 (1961) 174–205. M. Pohlenz, "Paulus und die Stoa," *ZNTW* 42 (1949) 69–104. Idem, *Die Stoa*[3], 2 vols. (Göttingen 1948–49). –K.-H.U.

CONSISTORIUM (*θεῖον συνέδριον*), the body of imperial advisers that replaced the former *consilium* in the late Roman Empire. The term *consistorium* was derived from the hall in which the meeting was convened; W. Kunkel (*ZSavRom* 85 [1968] 295, n.96) rejects the traditional derivation of the name from the obligation of participants to stand during its sessions. The mention of the *consistorium* in a decree of Diocletian (*Cod.Just.* IX 47.12) is probably a later "correction" of the scribe, and the first secure evidence comes only from 347, although it is plausible that the *consistorium* was a creation of Constantine I. Membership in the *consistorium* was never fully regularized, but by the end of the 4th C. the *consistorium* was composed of two groups of members or *comites consistoriani*: (1) the chiefs of the central administration (MAGISTER OFFICIORUM, *quaestor sacri palatii* [see QUAESTOR], COMES SACRARUM LARGITIONUM, and COMES RERUM PRIVATARUM), and in some cases the PRAETORIAN PREFECT and certain military commanders, and (2) advisory officials with minor rights. The functions of the *consistorium* included promulgation of imperial laws, reception of foreign ambassadors, and discussion of high policy (although sometimes this was discussed within a narrower and less formal circle of the emperor's *proximi*, including the empress) and high justice. A session of the *consistorium* was called a SILENTIUM. The *consistorium* never developed into an independent institution, remaining a consultative and ceremonial body. By the end of the 4th C. emperors rarely participated in the *consistorium*, as the emperor's "inner cabinet" came to play a growing role as the advisory board. Senators actively participated in the judicial work of the *consistorium* from the 5th C.; in the 6th C. Justinian I essentially abolished the distinction between the consistorium and the SENATE.

LIT. W. Kunkel, "Consilium, Consistorium," *JbAChr* 11–12 (1968–69) 242–48. P.B. Weiss, *Consistorium und comites consistoriani* (Würzburg 1975). Jones, *LRE* 1:333–41. –A.K.

CONSTANS I (*Κώνστας*), caesar (from 25 Dec. 333) and augustus (from 9 Sept. 337); born ca.323, died fortress of Helena, Pyrenees, Jan. 350. The youngest son of CONSTANTINE I and Fausta, he was initially given control of Italy, Africa, Pannonia, Dacia, and Macedonia. In 340, after CONSTANTINE II's death during an attack on him, Constans became master of the entire West. He opposed ARIANISM and persuaded CONSTANTIUS II to participate in the ill-fated Council of SERDICA (342/3). He continued to support ATHANASIOS of Alexandria and was probably responsible for his return from exile in 346. In 350 Constans was overthrown and killed in a plot led by MAGNENTIUS.

LIT. Jones, *LRE* 112–15. Barnes, *New Empire* 8, 45. –T.E.G.

CONSTANS II, emperor (641–68); son of HERAKLEIOS CONSTANTINE and grandson of Herakleios; born Constantinople 7 Nov. 630, died Syracuse 15 July 668 (Grierson, "Tombs and Obits" 49f). Christened Flavios Herakleios, Constans was crowned co-emperor as Constantine (Constantine III, according to Stratos) by his uncle, HERAKLONAS, in Sept. 641. He became sole emperor after Heraklonas and MARTINA were deposed in winter 641/2, ruling officially as Constantine (his coins bear the name) but popularly known as Constans. His thick beard earned him the nickname "Pogonatos." With his wife Fausta, daughter of VALENTINOS ARŠAKUNI, he had three sons: Constantine (IV), Herakleios, and Tiberios.

Throughout his reign, Constans was occupied by the empire's external enemies. Against the Arabs he probably organized the themes of ANATOLIKON and OPSIKION and personally campaigned in Asia Minor and Armenia. The first Greek inscriptions on Byz. coins ("In this, conquer") are found, together with Constans holding a cross, on folleis of his reign. Evoking the success of Constantine I at the Milvian Bridge, this slogan was intended to urge the army to victory over the Muslims. He suffered defeats, however, esp. at the naval battle of Phoenix (mod. Finike in Turkey) in 655, and twice (651, 659) accepted peace treaties (see MUʿĀWIYA). He had more success against the Slavs, personally invading SKLAVINIA in 658 and resettling captives in Asia Minor. He also probably organized the theme of HELLAS.

Anxiety over external threats led him to leave Constantinople for the West ca.660. Arriving in Italy in 663, he campaigned against the Lombards before settling in Sicily, where he created a theme and raised a navy and army. Constans's measures to finance his military activities were unpopular, esp. in Italy, where high taxes and confiscations of church vessels antagonized the local nobility and clergy. He faced numerous rebellions (e.g., those of SABORIOS, OLYMPIOS, and GREGORY, exarch of Carthage). His religious policy attempted to end Christological arguments, but his TYPOS only angered Western bishops, partly resulting in the trials of Pope MARTIN I and MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR. He also infuriated Pope VITALIAN in March 668 by decreeing the independence of the archbishop of Ravenna. Constans was murdered while bathing, either struck in the head by a servant or stabbed by the conspirators who proclaimed MEZIZIOS emperor. His body was returned to Constantinople, perhaps personally by Constantine IV, and buried in the Church of the Holy Apostles.

LIT. J. Kaestner, *De imperio Constantini III (641–668)* (Leipzig 1907). Stratos, *Byzantium* 3:1–282. P. Corsi, *La spedizione italiana di Costante II* (Bologna 1983). Idem, "La politica italiana di Costante II," *SettStu* 34 (1988) 751–96. – P.A.H., A.C.

CONSTANTIA (*Κωνσταντ⟨ε⟩ία*), Constantiana, and other variants, name of several sites (towns and/or strongholds), primarily in the northern Balkans.

CONSTANTIA IN THE RHODOPE MOUNTAINS, a town destroyed by Kalojan in 1201 (Nik.Chon. 532.22–23). It is probably the Constantia listed in a notitia of Patr. Nicholas I Mystikos as a suffragan of Philippopolis (*Notitiae CP*, no.7.592). Excavations at Assara (near Marica in Bulgaria) have revealed the remains of a late Roman and medieval town (coins of Anastasios I, Phokas, and Leo VI were found) that has been identified as Rhodopian Constantia.

LIT. W. Gjuselev, "Forschungen zur Geschichte Thrakiens im Mittelalter," *BBulg* 3 (1969) 155–69. Asdracha, *Rhodopes* 151f. Z. Aladžov, "Archeologičeski proučvanija na Konstancija (1967–1977 g.)," *Izvestija na nacionalnija istoričeski muzej* 3 (1981) 253–333.

www.kardpomor.ru

CONSTANTIA ON THE DANUBE, 5th-C. fortress (*phrourion*) mentioned by Priskos (*FHG* 4:72.16), probably to be identified with the 11th-C. *phrourion* of Constantia, referred to by Skylitzes (Skyl. 301.2–3). It was near modern Belgrade, at the juncture of the Morava and the Danube.

CONSTANTIA ON THE BLACK SEA. See TOMIS.

CONSTANTIANA IN SCYTHIA. A notitia (*Notitiae CP*, no.3.656) lists Constantiana as a bishopric of the *eparchia* of Scythia; its identification is questionable (E. Popescu, *BZ* 66 [1973] 359–82, and I. Barnea, *SCIV* 25 [1974] 427–29).

CONSTANTION NEAR OHRID, a *phrourion* erected by Basil II (Skyl. 359.40–42).

OTHER CONSTANTIAS. Cities also possessing this name existed in Calabria, Cyprus (anc. Salamis), and Phoenicia, and infrequently this name was given to Constantinople. CONSTANTINA (now Viranşehir in Turkey) in northern Mesopotamia was called Konstantia by Theophanes the Confessor. –A.K.

CONSTANTIANA. See CONSTANTIA.

CONSTANTINA (*Κωνσταντίνη*, Syr. Tella), city in northern Mesopotamia, now Viranşehir in eastern Turkey. Constantina was the headquarters of the *doux* of Mesopotamia in 363–527 and 532–40 and a bishopric of OSRHOENE subject to Edessa (L. Dillemann, *Haute Mésopotamie orientale et pays adjacents* [Paris 1962] 75, 107f). Malalas (Malal. 323.14–19) states that Constantina was rebuilt by Constantine I on the site of ancient Maximianoupolis, which had been destroyed by a Persian attack and an earthquake. Constantina, also called Konstantia by Theophanes, should be distinguished from the Konstantia in Phoenicia, previously called Antarados, that was rebuilt by Constantius II (Theoph. 38.8–9). In the 6th C. Constantina was headquarters of General PRISKOS and an important point of contention during the Persian wars. JACOB BARADAEUS was born near Constantina and was a monk at the monastery of Phesiltha outside the city. Constantina fell to the Arabs in 639.

Parts of city walls, a large-aisled, centralized church (the "Octagon"), and an entire (?) warehouse of 543 were still standing in 1972; other remains of the 4th–6th C., including Greek inscriptions, are recorded by travelers. A tetrapylon disappeared in this century.

LIT. Bell-Mango, *Tur ʿAbdin* 154–57. –M.M.M.

CONSTANTINE (Κωνσταντῖνος), personal name. It is uncertain whether the name was used before CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT; a certain Aurelius Constantine is named in an undated inscription (*CIL* 3294). The name may have been coined on the basis of Constantius, Constantine the Great's father; at any rate, in the 4th C. Constantius was more popular than Constantine (*PLRE* 1:223–28). The relative frequency seems to have changed in the 5th C.: *PLRE* 2:311–25 lists 24 Constantines and 20 Constantii. Prokopios mentions only four Constantines, but thereafter the frequency increased: 28 in Theophanes, 60 in Skylitzes, 15 in Anna Komnene (in the last two cases Constantine is the most popular name). Niketas Choniates has 22 Constantines, third after JOHN (35) and ALEXIOS (24). In *Lavra*, vol. 1, encompassing the period of the 10th–12th C., 37 Constantines are listed, third only to JOHN (90) and NICHOLAS (42), but in the later *Lavra*, vols. 2–3 (13th–15th C.), Constantine occupies only the seventh place. Constantius seems to have almost disappeared after Theophanes, but the vernacular form Konstas, rare in *Lavra* 1, occurs 30 times in *Lavra* 2–3. Constantine was the most popular name for emperors; 11 bore the name between the 4th and 15th C. and it should be noted that Leo V changed the name of his son Symbatios to Constantine (E. Patlagean in *Byz. Aristocracy* 27). Four patriarchs had this name but there are very few saints named Constantine in the Byz. calendar. –A.K.

CONSTANTINE, co-emperor; eldest son of BASIL I by his first wife Maria, although some sources name EUDOKIA INGERINA as his mother (see G. Ostrogorsky, *SemKond* 5 [1932] 28); born ca.859 (Vogt, *infra*) or 863/4 (E. Kislinger, *JÖB* 33 [1983] 129), died 3 Sept. 879 (P. Karlin-Hayter, *Byzantion* 36 [1966] 624–26). Constantine was proclaimed co-emperor in 867/8, and his name is included with Basil's in the title of the PROCHEIRON. Basil planned his betrothal to a daughter of LOUIS II, and the question was discussed with Frankish envoys in 869 (A. Gasquet, *L'empire byzantin et la monarchie franque* [Paris 1888] 412). Constantine accompanied Basil in his expedition against the Arabs in 879 (Vasiliev, *Byz. Arabes* 2.1:88–91,93–94).

Constantine always appears beardless on his father's coins (Grierson, *DOC* 3.2:474 and nos. 1–4, 8, 10–11). Spatharakis's view (*CahArch* 23 [1974] 97–105) that Constantine was depicted in the well-known Paris MS of the Homilies of GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS (Paris B.N. gr. 510, fol.8v) was corrected by I. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner (*JÖB* 27 [1978] 19–24).

LIT. Vogt, *Basile Ier* 58f. –A.K., A.C.

CONSTANTINE. See also KONSTANTIN.

CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT, augustus (from 25 July 306); born Naissos 273/4, died Nikomedeia 22 May 337; feastday 21 May. Son of CONSTANTIUS CHLORUS and HELENA, he was proclaimed as augustus in Britain upon the death of his father. He was subsequently acknowledged as caesar by GALERIUS and as augustus by MAXIMIAN,

CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT. Bronze head of the emperor; 4th C. National Museum, Belgrade.

and his imperial position was confirmed at the Conference of Carnuntum in 308. He defeated MAXENTIUS at the battle of the MILVIAN BRIDGE in 312, thus becoming sole ruler of the West. Alliance with LICINIUS turned to hostility, and after victory over his rival at Chrysoupolis in Bithynia in 324 Constantine became ruler of the whole empire. He associated his sons with him as caesars—CRISPUS (317), CONSTANTINE II (317), CONSTANTIUS II (324), and CONSTANS I (333)—but he remained sole augustus until his death. He had two consorts, Minervina (perhaps a concubine) and Fausta (see genealogical table).

Constantine carried out important administrative and military reforms, completing and/or reversing those of DIOCLETIAN. He organized the entire empire into three or four prefectures, each under its own PRAETORIAN PREFECT, below whom were provinces and the cities. At court, officials such as the *comes rei privatae*, *comes sacrarum largitionum*, and *magister officiorum*, wielded great power as heads of large amorphous bureaus, while *magistri militum* commanded the army, increasingly dominated by the COMITATENSES. Constantine reformed the coinage, issuing a gold SOLIDUS that remained the standard coin through the 11th C. To celebrate his victory over Licinius he founded a new city on the site of ancient Byz.; CONSTANTINOPLE was inaugurated on 11 May 330, not so much a "new capital" as an imperial residence and monument to the emperor's greatness. According to the CHRONICON PASCHALE (1:527–29), his huge building program consisted almost entirely of secular structures, whereas EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA emphasizes the churches and martyria that Constantine built in the capital and at NIKOMEDEIA, ANTIOCH, and JERUSALEM.

Like most of his predecessors, Constantine sought divine support for his rule and ultimately came to base his power on a special connection with the Christian God. This concept developed slowly, augmented by the emperor's victories, and culminating in the image of Constantine in the works of Eusebios of Caesarea, esp. the VITA CONSTANTINI. In the latter work (*VC* 4.15) Eusebios interprets the upward gaze exhibited by Constantine on his coins as a gesture of piety. In fact, his numismatic portraits exhibit a remarkable range of types (D.H. Wright, *DOP* 41 [1987] 493–507). It is still debated whether Constantine actually issued the so-called EDICT OF MILAN. Constantine became involved in the controversies surrounding DONATISM and ARIANISM, convoked the first ecumenical council at NICAEA, and approved its decisions, although he later came to support Arianism. He was baptized on his deathbed by EUSEBIOS OF NIKOMEDEIA. The so-called DONATION OF CONSTANTINE is a forgery, probably of the 8th C.

As the first Christian emperor and the founder of Constantinople, Constantine set the style that was followed by nearly all Byz. emperors. Despite his very real human failings, Constantine was very quickly heroized as founder of the new politico-religious order and regarded as a saint; he was commonly pictured, frequently along with his mother, in figural representations of rulers in church decoration.

SELECTED GENEALOGY OF THE FAMILY OF CONSTANTINE I

Based on A.H.M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (New York 1962) 211.

www.staraponor.ru

LIT. A.H.M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (London 1948; rp. New York 1962). T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981). J. Vogt, *Constantin der Grosse und sein Jahrhundert*[2] (Munich 1960). M. MacMullen, *Constantine*[2] (London–New York–Sydney 1987). *Konstantin der Grosse*, ed. H. Kraft (Darmstadt 1974). A. Kazhdan, " 'Constantin imaginaire.' Byzantine Legends of the Ninth Century about Constantine the Great," *Byzantion* 57 (1987) 196–250. –T.E.G., A.C.

CONSTANTINE II, caesar (from 1 Mar. 317) and augustus (from 9 Sept. 337); born Arles, Feb. 317, died Aquileia 340. He was the son of Constantine I, perhaps illegitimate. In the arrangements made after his father's death Constantine II ruled Britain, Gaul, and Spain. He was, however, apparently regarded as the senior emperor. A strong opponent of ARIANISM, he returned ATHANASIOS of Alexandria from exile in Gaul despite the opposition of CONSTANTIUS II. In 340 Constantine responded to a perceived slight from CONSTANS I by invading Italy, where he was killed.

LIT. Jones, *LRE* 112–14. *PLRE* 1:223. Barnes, *New Empire* 8, 44f. –T.E.G.

CONSTANTINE III, usurper in Britain and Gaul (407–11). He is described as a common soldier but was a man of ability who was proclaimed emperor in Britain in 407. He made himself master of much of Gaul, being able to mint coins extensively at Trier, Lyons, and Arles. In September 411 he surrendered to Honorius's army and was put to death. He is not to be confused with either HERAKLEIOS CONSTANTINE, son and successor of HERAKLEIOS, or with CONSTANS II, both of whom have been called Constantine III by some historians.

LIT. E. Demougeot, "Constantin III, l'empereur d'Arles," in *Hommage à André Dupont* (Montpellier 1974) 83–125. –Ph.G.

CONSTANTINE III LEICHOUDES (Λειχούδης), patriarch of Constantinople (2 Feb. 1059–9/10 Aug. 1063); born Kouzenas (Psellos in Sathas, *MB* 5:300.10) or Constantinople (Sathas, *MB* 4:390.18–19) ca.1000, died Constantinople. The statement of later chroniclers that he was a eunuch is probably incorrect. Together with John MAUROPOUS, Leichoudes was the leader of the young intellectuals who came to power under Constantine IX; he became MESAZON (Beck, *Ideen*, pt.XIII [1955], 329) but had to retire ca.1050. The question of the *pronoia* that Constantine IX granted to Leichoudes over the MANGANA monastery is under discussion; it was apparently an administrative function (A. Hohlweg, *BZ* 60 [1967] 291–94), rather than a semifeudal property (K. Juzbašjan, *VizVrem* 16 [1959] 24–28). He returned to political activity only when Michael VI sent him and Psellos as envoys to the rebellious Isaac I Komnenos, who eventually chose Leichoudes to replace MICHAEL I KEROULARIOS on the patriarchal throne.

The policy of Leichoudes as patriarch is little known: he evidently resumed negotiations with Pope Alexander II (1061–73) concerning the FILIOQUE (PL 145:633B). His hostility toward the Monophysites was relentless: MICHAEL I THE SYRIAN mentions the patriarchal decree of 1063 to burn all the sacred books "of the Syrians" (tr. Chabot, 3:166). Leichoudes regulated the right of ASYLUM in such a way that a priest involved in a murder was proclaimed free, whereas a slave (*oiketes*) Demetrios, guilty of murder, was extradited to his owner in exchange for the payment of 24 nomismata (PG 119:853–56). On his seals Leichoudes retained the title of ecumenical patriarch (Laurent, *Corpus* 5.1, no.17). Psellos devoted to him an *enkomion* praising his friend as a talented administrator and even military commander.

SOURCE. Sathas, *MB* 4:388–421. It. tr. U. Criscuolo, *Michele Psello: Orazione in memoria di Costantino Lichudi* (Messina 1983).

LIT. *RegPatr*, fasc. 3, nos. 887–92. Ljubarskij, *Psell* 56–58. A. Michel, "Schisma und Kaiserhof im Jahre 1054: Michael Psellos," *L'Église et les églises*, vol. 1 (Chevetogne 1954) 361–65, 426–28. Skabalanovič, *Gosudarstvo* 390–96. –A.K.

CONSTANTINE IV, emperor (668–85); born ca.650, died Constantinople 10 July (?) 685. In the 19th C. many scholars identified Constantine IV with "Constantine Pogonatos," who in reality was his father, CONSTANS II (E.W. Brooks, *BZ* 17 [1908] 460–62). Proclaimed co-emperor in April 654 by Constans II, Constantine avenged his father's murder by going to Sicily in early 669 and defeating MEZIZIOS (E.W. Brooks, *BZ* 17 [1908] 455–59, rejects Constantine's personal participation). Constantine ruled with his younger brothers Herakleios and Tiberios until 681, when he deposed and mutilated them, probably because of a conspiracy (E.W. Brooks, *EHR* 30 [1915] 42–51). With them and his son Justinian (II) he is shown in an apse mosaic in S. Apollinare in Classe, presenting privileges to that church (Beckwith, *ECBA*, fig.96).

Throughout his reign Constantine faced external pressures but preferred diplomatic to military responses. The Arabs raided Byz. territory yearly and in 674–78 besieged Constantinople itself, but their defeat compelled MUʿĀWIYA to sign a 30-year truce on terms favorable to Byz. Shortly thereafter Constantine signed treaties with the Lombards, who had captured Brindisi and Taranto (after 671), and the Avars (*Reg*, nos. 241, 240). In the Balkans Constantine unsuccessfully campaigned against ASPARUCH and formally recognized the Bulgars' settlement south of the Danube, in response to which he created the theme of THRACE. He hoped to end the empire's religious disputes by summoning the Council in TRULLO and personally presided at 12 of its 18 meetings. He also attempted to revalue the bronze coinage by minting an 18-gram FOLLIS. He died of dysentery and was survived by his wife Anastasia and their sons Justinian and Herakleios.

LIT. D. Missiou, "Who was the Constantine in the Inscription no. 8788 CIG IV?" *Byzantina* 13 (1985) 1477–86. I. Barnea, "Sceau de Constantin IV empereur de Byzance trouvé à Durostorum," *Revue roumaine d'histoire* 20 (1981) 625–28. Stratos, *Byzantium* 4:1–171. Kulakovskij, *Istorija* 3:228–52. –P.A.H., A.C.

CONSTANTINE V, emperor (741–75); born Constantinople 718, died Strongylon 14 Sept. 775. Leo III crowned his son Constantine as co-emperor in 720 and in 732 married him to the Khazar khagan's daughter, who took the name Irene and bore him Leo (IV). Constantine's second wife, Maria, died shortly after their marriage ca.750. By a third wife, Eudokia, whom he crowned in 769, Constantine had five sons (including Caesar NIKEPHOROS) and a daughter. After succeeding Leo in 741, Constantine was briefly driven from Constantinople by ARTABASDOS, but regained the throne in Nov. 743. Byz. sources displayed their hostility toward his zealous support of ICONOCLASM by nicknaming him "Kaballinos" ("groom") and "Kopronymos" ("dung-named") for supposedly having defecated while being baptized. Constantine convened a church council at HIERIA in 754 and thereafter persecuted ICONOPHILES in the bureaucracy, army, and church; his attacks on monks evolved into a campaign against monasticism as an institution. He also rejected the cult of saints, including the intercessory power of the Theotokos, and was hostile to RELICS, except those of the True Cross. In the Life of St. Stephen the Younger (PG 100:1120C), Constantine is indicted for scraping the holy pictures off the walls of the Church of the Virgin at BLACHERNAI. In the provinces he relied on *strategoi* like Michael LACHANODRAKON to execute his iconoclastic and fiscal policies. Constantine wrote treatises on Iconoclasm that survive as his fragmentary *Questions* (*Peuseis*, ed. Ostrogorsky, *Bilderstr.* 7–45).

An outstanding general, Constantine served in 740 with his father at AKROINON. He campaigned frequently against the Slavs and Bulgarians, winning decisive victories at Anchialos in 763 and over TELERIG at LITHOSORIA in 773. He also campaigned successfully against the Arabs, capturing Germanikeia in 746 and Theodosioupolis and Melitene in 752. For resettling captives from Armenia in Thrace, he was blamed for introducing PAULICIANS into the empire (Theoph. 429.19–22). He repopulated Constantinople with families from Greece after a plague in 747. Constantine transferred Sicily, Calabria, and ILLYRICUM from papal to Byz. ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but, by neglecting northern Italy and the Lombards' seizure of Ravenna, he drove the papacy closer to the FRANKS. He created the BOUKELLARION theme and restored the aqueduct of Valens during a drought in Constantinople in 767. He financed his campaigns and enriched the treasury by raising taxes and selling confiscated monastic properties. Constantine was buried in the Church of the Holy Apostles, but in the 9th C. his bones were exhumed, burned, and cast into the sea (Grierson, "Tombs and Obits" 53f).

LIT. S. Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V* (Louvain 1977). A. Lombard, *Constantin V, empereur des Romains (740–775)* (Paris 1902). C. Zuckerman, "The Reign of Constantine V in the Miracles of St. Theodore the Recruit (*BHG* 1764)," *REB* 46 (1988) 191–210. C. Mango, "St. Anthusa of Mantineon and the Family of Constantine V," *AB* 100 (1982) 401–09. –P.A.H.

CONSTANTINE VI, emperor (780–97); son of Leo IV and Irene; born Constantinople 14 Jan. 771, died before 805 (E.W. Brooks, *BZ* 9 [1900] 655). Leo crowned Constantine VI as co-emperor

www.slaropomor.ru

in 776, but after Leo's death IRENE ruled as Constantine's regent with STAURAKIOS. In 782 she betrothed Constantine to Rotrud, the daughter of CHARLEMAGNE, but broke the engagement in 788 and married Constantine to Maria from Amnia in the Armeniakon. This reportedly upset Constantine (Theoph. 463.24–27) and likely contributed to his growing animosity toward his mother. He signed the acts of the Second Council of NICAEA (787) condemning ICONOCLASM, but his close association with Michael LACHANODRAKON, with whose help he deposed Irene in Dec. 790, may indicate Iconoclastic leanings. He was an ineffectual ruler, fruitlessly campaigning against the Bulgarians and Arabs in 791 and being severely defeated by the Bulgarians at MARKELLAI in 792. His restoration of Irene in 792 disappointed his supporters. In 792–93 he thwarted a conspiracy in favor of his uncle, Caesar NIKEPHOROS, and at Irene's urging blinded Alexios MOSELE, thereby aggravating an uprising in the Armeniakon, which he cruelly suppressed. He instigated the MOECHIAN CONTROVERSY in 795 by divorcing Maria, who had given him two daughters, and marrying his mistress Theodote. Undermined by Irene and Staurakios, he was dethroned and blinded on 19 Apr. 797 (S. Pétridès, *EO* 4 [1900–01] 72–75). He died in exile and was buried in Irene's monastery of St. Euphrosyne (Grierson, "Tombs and Obits" 54f). Constantine's only recorded monumental portrait was a mosaic at the Church of the Virgin of PEGE, together with one of his mother.

LIT. Treadgold, *Byz. Revival* 60–110. D. Misiou, "Stadia basileias Konstantinou ΣΤ' kai Eirenes kai ta nomismata tous," *Byzantiaka* 1 (1981) 139–56. P. Speck, *Kaiser Konstantin VI.* (Munich 1978). Ostrogorsky, *History* 176–81.
–P.A.H., A.C.

CONSTANTINE VII PORPHYROGENNETOS, emperor of the MACEDONIAN DYNASTY (945–59); born 17 or 18 May 905, died Constantinople 9 Nov. 959. His birth to LEO VI and ZOE KARBONOPSINA provoked the conflict over the TETRAGAMY OF LEO VI. Crowned co-emperor probably on 15 May 908 (P. Grierson-R. Jenkins, *Byzantion* 32 [1962] 133–38), he was excluded from power for almost four decades, successively dominated by ALEXANDER, NICHOLAS I MYSTIKOS and Zoe, and ROMANOS I, whose daughter Helen married Constantine in May 919. His independent rule

CONSTANTINE VII PORPHYROGENNETOS. The emperor crowned by Christ; ivory, 10th C. State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow.

began only after Romanos's sons were deposed on 27 Jan. 945. Dismissing Romanos's supporters, Constantine sought the assistance of aristocratic families such as PHOKAS. A contemporary source (*TheophCont* 456.14–16) asserts that Constantine surrounded himself with noblemen (*eugeneis*) on whom he bestowed titles and gifts, while another (Skyl. 237.14) reports that the emperor chose his functionaries regardless of their noble merits (*ouk aristinden*).

In his legislation Constantine proclaimed a complete rupture with his predecessor's policy: he called Romanos's officials and generals venal and unwarlike (Zepos, *Jus* 1:226.5) and tried to alleviate (*kouphisai*) the tax burden that his father-in-law had required the peasantry to bear

(*TheophCont* 443.13–18). In fact, however, Constantine's novels, written predominantly by THEODORE OF DEKAPOLIS, retained principles of Romanos I's legislation, such as the concept of the protection of the poor from the DYNATOI; he made, however, certain concessions to small *archontes* and small monasteries. Especially important in this respect was a novel (now lost) mentioned in Theodore's decision of 960/1: in it, Constantine, responding to the request of the military *archontes* (Zepos, *Jus* 1:239.19), obliged even the poorest peasants to compensate the illegal buyers of their allotments; they were allowed, however, five years for this repayment.

Constantine fought against the Arabs without great success. The expedition to Crete in 949 was a failure, and although his armies seized GERMANIKEIA in 949 and crossed the Euphrates in 952, they were subsequently defeated by SAYF AL-DAWLA. NIKEPHOROS (II) PHOKAS led the offensive from 954 and in 957 captured Ḥadat; in 958 JOHN (I) TZIMISKES conquered Samosata. Despite the baptism of OL'GA, princess of Kiev, and her visit to Constantinople, Constantine was unable to establish a strong alliance with the Rus'.

Constantine contributed much to the systematization of knowledge and encouraged the compilation of encyclopedic works such as *Excerpta de legationibus* (see EXCERPTA) and GEOPONIKA; he also encouraged historical writing intended to eulogize BASIL I and thereby present Basil's predecessors as inept villains. This aim was achieved by the anonymous author of the *Imperial Histories*, ascribed to a certain GENESIOS, and by a collection conventionally called THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS. Constantine collaborated in several works on the empire's administrative system and foreign relations that are preserved under his name: DE ADMINISTRANDO IMPERIO, DE THEMATIBUS, and DE CEREMONIIS. To his literary heritage also belong several speeches, letters (e.g., correspondence with THEODORE OF KYZIKOS), and specimens of liturgical poetry.

Constantine's reputation as guiding spirit of the so-called Macedonian Renaissance is based on the *prooimion* of the continuators of Theophanes (*TheophCont* 3.15–4.1), who declare that the emperor brought a *palinzoia* ("new life") and *palingenesia* ("rebirth") to what had been lost in the course of time. The same source (450.12–20) tells of Constantine's "accurate" painting and his role as "corrector" of stonemasons, carpenters, goldsmiths, silversmiths, etc., and attributes numerous works to his hand (447.1–450.11). LIUTPRAND OF CREMONA (*Antapodosis* 3.37) confirms also that Constantine engaged in *zografia*, that is, that he worked as a painter. Constantine's portrait is found on an ivory plaque in Moscow (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, *Elfenbeinskulpt.* II, no.35) and perhaps on a MANDYLION icon at Sinai.

LIT. A. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World* (London 1973). A. Rambaud, *L'empire grec au dixième siècle, Constantin Porphyrogénète* (Paris 1870; rp. New York 1963). A. Kazhdan, "He epoche tou Konstantinou Z' Porphyrogennetou," *Diabazo* 129 (1985) 17–20. J. Ripoche, "Constantin VII Porphyrogénète et sa politique hongroise au milieu du Xe siècle," *SüdostF* 36 (1977) 1–12. Lemerle, *Humanism* 309–46.
–A.K., A.C.

CONSTANTINE VIII, emperor (1025–28); born 960/1, died Constantinople 12 Nov. 1028, according to YAḤYA. Son of Romanos II, Constantine was crowned co-emperor probably 30 Mar. 962 (Oikonomides, *Documents*, pt.XIII [1965], 173–76). During the reign of his elder brother BASIL II, he lived in idleness. He married Helena, daughter of Alypios, who bore him three daughters: Eudokia (who became a nun), ZOE, and THEODORA. Upon succeeding his brother, Constantine continued his devotion to chariot racing and theatrical spectacles, although he did enjoy the imperial duty of receiving embassies. He was strongly influenced by his household EUNUCHS, capricious, and prone to inflict blinding on the slightest excuse. Among his apparently innocent victims were Constantine BOURTZES, Nikephoros Komnenos, and Basil SKLEROS. Because Basil II had allowed two years of tax arrears to accrue, Constantine collected the taxes for five years in three. He considered annulling the ALLELENGYON that Basil had imposed but did not live to do this. His general Constantine Diogenes repelled an attack by PECHENEGS, and George Theodorakanos defeated a Muslim naval incursion. On his deathbed, Constantine married Zoe to the future Romanos III.

Generally accepted as portraits of Constantine and Basil II are the co-emperors in the Bari Exultet Roll (Archivio della Cattedrale 1). If this is so, it is, apart from his coins, the only portrait known of Constantine.

LIT. M. Canard, "Les sources arabes de l'histoire byzantine aux confins des Xe et XIe siècles," *REB* 19 (1961)

www.staropomor.ru

284–314. Skabalanovič, *Gosudarstvo* 1–14. S.A. Kamer, "Emperors and Aristocrats in Byzantium, 976–1081" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard Univ., 1983) 158–73. –C.M.B., A.C.

CONSTANTINE IX MONOMACHOS (Μονομάχος), emperor (1042–1055); born ca.1000, died Constantinople 7/8 Jan. (*Kleinchroniken* 1:159, 167) or 11 Jan. (Grumel, *Chronologie* 358; Ostrogorsky, *History* 337) 1055. From a distinguished family, Constantine was exiled to Mytilene by MICHAEL IV. He was recalled to wed ZOE (11 June 1042) and crowned the next day; their mosaic portraits survive in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople. He enjoyed the support of the commercial classes of Constantinople; leading merchants became senators. He also gathered around him such intellectuals as future Patr. CONSTANTINE (III) LEICHOUDES, future Patr. JOHN (VIII) XIPHILINOS, Michael PSELLOS, and John MAUROPOUS, whose epigrams describe two images of Constantine. A law school was established under Xiphilinos, and Psellos became HYPATOS TON PHILOSOPHON.

Constantine extravagantly maintained his mistress, SKLERAINA, and her successor, an "Alan" (Georgian) princess. He converted into taxpayers peasants in "IBERIA" who had owed military service and substituted mercenaries. A moderately adulterated NOMISMA perhaps facilitated commerce (Morrisson, "Dévaluation" 6f). These policies alienated the military aristocracy. The revolts of George MANIAKES and Leo TORNIKIOS were overcome with great difficulty.

Constantine experienced some successes over foreigners: the Rus' of JAROSLAV of Kiev were defeated (Shepard, "Russians Attack" 147–212), and GAGIK II yielded Ani. Nonetheless, the frontiers proved porous: the Turks of TUGHRUL BEG devastated eastern Anatolia, the PECHENEGS occupied the Danubian plain and ravaged Thrace, and the NORMANS advanced in southern Italy. Late in his reign, these disasters caused Constantine to dismiss Xiphilinos and other intellectuals. He turned to the eunuch John, who instituted harsh taxation. In his final year, Constantine could not control Patr. MICHAEL I KEROULARIOS.

Psellos's *Chronographia* vividly depicts Constantine's personality; later Byz. writers blamed his extravagant policies for the ensuing collapse of Byz. Among his lavish foundations were the monastery of the NEA MONE on Chios and the monastery at MANGANA, built near the house where Skleraina lived. MSS presumably commissioned by Constantine include a rich copy of the homilies of John Chrysostom (Sinai gr. 364) that contains a frontispiece showing the emperor between Zoe and THEODORA (Spatharakis, *Portrait*, fig.66).

LIT. Lemerle, *Cinq études* 268–71, 285–90. Ohnsorge, *Abend. & Byz.* 317–32. Idem, *Ost-Rom und der Westen* (Darmstadt 1983) 207–18. Mouriki, *Nea Moni* 24–29. –C.M.B., A.C.

CONSTANTINE X DOUKAS, emperor (1059–67); born ca.1006, died Constantinople 22/3 May 1067. An Anatolian magnate, Constantine was briefly imprisoned, then retired to his estates when his father-in-law Constantine DALASSENOS was arrested (1034). In 1057 Constantine supported the rebellion of the future ISAAC I KOMNENOS. Through his second wife, EUDOKIA MAKREMBOLITISSA, a niece of Patr. MICHAEL I KEROULARIOS, he was allied to the opponents of MICHAEL VI STRATIOTIKOS within Constantinople. During Isaac's reign, Constantine supported those hostile to Isaac's reforms (E. Stănescu, *RESEE* 4 [1966] 55–69). Nevertheless, through the influence of Michael PSELLOS, Constantine was designated emperor by the dying Isaac and crowned on 23/4 Nov. 1059. He undid Isaac's reforms, restoring many to office and promoting leading guild members to the senate. Soldiers who felt neglected sought to enter the civil hierarchy (Attal. 76.10–12). He avoided a plot (Apr. 1061) led by the eparch of Constantinople (D. Polemis, *BZ* 58 [1965] 61f). His generosity to monasteries and individuals required heavy taxation, which inspired rebellion (1066) in northern Greece (G. Litavrin, *VizVrem* 11 [1956] 123–34). Constantine could barely rally 150 soldiers to oppose an incursion of UZES across the Danube (1064–65). Turkish raiders overran the eastern boundaries, and ALP ARSLAN seized Ani. Constantine's reign was deemed disastrous by Attaleiates; even Psellos was critical. At his death, the augusta Eudokia took power on behalf of her sons (N. Oikonomides, *Documents*, pt.III [1963], 102). She had already held the place of honor (the spectator's left) on FOLLEIS of Constantine's reign. Their joint portraits appear in a badly damaged miniature in a copy of the *Sacra Parallela* (Spatharakis, *Portrait*, fig.68). Constantine's best-preserved likeness, again with Eudokia, is on a reliquary of St. Demetrios in Moscow (*Iskusstvo Vizantij* 2, no.547).

LIT. Polemis, *Doukai* 28–34, no.12. M. Angold, *The Byzantine Empire 1025–1204* (London–New York 1984) 16–32, 53–56, 61–74. –C.M.B., A.C.

CONSTANTINE XI PALAIOLOGOS, emperor (12 Mar. 1449–29 May 1453); born Constantinople 8 Feb. 1405, died Constantinople 29 May 1453. Last member of the Palaiologan dynasty and final ruler of the Byz. Empire, Constantine was the fourth son of MANUEL II and Helena Dragaš. He is sometimes called Constantine XII because of the erroneous supposition that Constantine Laskaris was crowned emperor in Apr. 1204 (cf. Brand, *Byzantium* 258 and 381, n.58). Constantine came to the Morea in 1428 to share the despotate with his brothers THEODORE II and THOMAS PALAIOLOGOS; he ruled as *despotes* for 20 years. He significantly strengthened the Byz. position by the restoration of the HEXAMILION (1444) and the conquest of Patras (1429), Athens, and Thebes (1444). His dream of reasserting control over Greece, however, was destroyed by the Ottoman campaign of 1446. Since both of Constantine's older brothers, Theodore and Andronikos, predeceased him, he inherited the throne upon the death of the childless JOHN VIII. He was crowned at Mistra on 6 Jan. 1449 and began his reign in March when he reached Constantinople. He did not receive a second coronation in Hagia Sophia.

As a pragmatist Constantine accepted the Union of Florence, in the hope of gaining military assistance from the West. During his short reign he made several desperate appeals to European rulers (R. Guilland, *EEBS* 22 [1952] 60–74 and *BS* 14 [1953] 226–44). He did not implement the Union, however, until 12 Dec. 1452. Constantine fought bravely during the Ottoman siege of Constantinople and was killed on the ramparts during the final Turkish assault. He died without heir, since his two marriages were childless.

LIT. Papadopulos, *Genealogie*, no.95. Zakythinos, *Despotat* 1:204–47. M. Carroll, "Constantine XI Palaeologus: Some Problems of Image," in *Maistor* 329–43. –A.M.T.

CONSTANTINE BODIN (Βοδῖνος), called Peter by the Bulgarians, king of Duklja (DIOKLEIA) after ca.1081; died 1101 or 1108. In 1072 Constantine was sent by his father, Michael, son of Stephen VOISLAV, to support George VOITECH. At Prizren Constantine was acclaimed *basileus* of Bulgaria, but the Byz. defeated and captured him. Rescued or ransomed, he returned to Duklja ca.1078. When ROBERT GUISCARD attacked Dyrrachion, Constantine led an army purportedly to assist Alexios I, but at the battle on 18 Oct. 1081 he withheld his troops until the Norman triumph was clear, then led them away unscathed. Between 1085 and 1091, John Doukas, governor of Dyrrachion, defeated Constantine and according to Anna Komnene captured him. In 1092–94 Alexios I waged campaigns in Raška and ZETA, which weakened Constantine's realm. The PRIEST OF DIOKLEIA mentions Constantine's strife with his relatives, which also contributed to the weakening of his power.

LIT. A. Petrov, "Knjaz' Konstantin Bodin," *Sbornik V. I. Lamanskogo* (St. Petersburg 1883) 239–64. B. Radojčić, "Peri tes exergeseos tou Konstantinou Mpontin," 12 *CEB* (Belgrade 1964) 2:185–87. –C.M.B., A.K.

CONSTANTINE DRAGAŠ (Δραγάσης), Serbian nobleman and autonomous ruler; died 17 May 1395. Together with his brother John Dragaš (died 1378/9), he ruled a large region of northeastern Macedonia, inherited from their father the *sebastokrator* and *despotes* Dejan (Ferjančić, *Despoti* 168–70). He was called *gospodin* (lord) in Serbian documents, *kyr* (*Koutloum.*, no.40.15) or *authentes* (MM 2:260.8) in Greek texts. It is a matter of dispute whether he was ever given the title "*despotes* of Serbia" (cf. J. Darrouzès, *REB* 27 [1969] 62.72–73 and n.; Ostrogorsky, *infra* 288f). With their mother Theodora-Eudokia, sister of Stefan Uroš IV Dušan, the Dragaš brothers generously endowed monasteries on Mt. Athos, esp. Hilandar, Panteleemon, and Vatopedi (S. Novaković, *Zakonski spomenici* [Belgrade 1912] 446–48, 452–57, 510–15, 676, 738–40). After the battle of MARICA in 1371, Constantine and John were forced to become vassals of Murad I; Constantine was fighting on the side of the Turks when he fell in battle at ROVINE. His lands were subsequently annexed by the Ottoman Empire.

Despite their Ottoman vassalage, the Dragaš brothers maintained close relations with Byz. Probably after 1386, Constantine took as his second wife Eudokia Komnene, daughter of Alexios III of Trebizond (I. Djurić, *ZRVI* 22 [1983] 259–72), and in 1392 he gave Helena, his daughter by his first wife, in marriage to Manuel II Palaiologos. Their son Constantine XI bore the family

www.starpomor.ru

name Dragases in addition to Palaiologos. Helena died on 13 Mar. 1450 as the nun Hypomone; several Byz. rhetoricians wrote funeral orations in her memory.

LIT. Soulis, *Dušan* 100–102. G. Ostrogorsky, "Gospodin Konstantin Dragaš," *ZbFilozFak* 7.1 (1963) 287–94. H. Matanov, *Jugozapadnite bŭlgarski zemi prez XIV vek* (Sofia 1986) 115–28. –J.S.A.

CONSTANTINE LASKARIS. See under CONSTANTINE XI PALAIOLOGOS.

CONSTANTINE OF KERKYRA, theologian condemned in Jan. and Feb. 1170 for his heretical interpretation of John 14:28, "The Father is greater than I." Stressing the hypostatical unity of the Father and the Son, Constantine denied that the Son was inferior on account of the real and concrete humanity which he assumed in the incarnation (*RegPatr,* fasc. 3, no.1113). According to V. Grumel (*EO* 28 [1929] 283–94), Constantine wrote the treatise *On the Orthodox Creed (Napisanie o pravoj vere)* preserved in Old Church Slavonic and ascribed to CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER; S. Kos (*De auctore expositionis verae fidei S. Constantino Cyrillo adscriptae* [Ljubljana 1942]; cf. B. Schultze, *OrChrP* 9 [1943] 229–31) rejects this identification and considers the author a disciple of METHODIOS, perhaps KLIMENT OF OHRID. Even more questionable is the identification of Constantine with Constantine Bykinator, an official (*kanstrisios*) of Hagia Sophia and archbishop of Bulgaria mentioned by Michael Gazes in 1203 (C. Giannelli, *EEBS* 23 [1953] 224–32).

LIT. J. Gouillard, "Synodikon" 221f. –A.K.

CONSTANTINE OF RHODES, poet; born ca.870 or 880 at Lindos, Rhodes, died after 931. Constantine began his civil career as secretary of SAMONAS and his literary career as a satiric poet, accusing Leo CHOIROSPHAKTES of paganism and mocking a eunuch called Theodore the Paphlagonian. Later, as Constantine VII's *asekretis*, he produced an *ekphrasis* (surviving perhaps in an unfinished form) consisting of two sections: descriptions of the Seven Wonders of Constantinople and of the Church of the HOLY APOSTLES. In full conformity with the encyclopedic tendencies of 10th-C. literature, his descriptions are a catalog of elements rather than an emotional perception of the achievements of architects and painters (A. Epstein, *GRBS* 23 [1982] 81f). Constantine's description of the Seven Wonders was used by KEDRENOS, probably through an intermediary source. His satiric poems are inelegant, being essentially lists of the base qualities of his opponents.

ED. E. Legrand, "Description des oeuvres d'art et de l'Église des saints Apôtres à Constantinople par Constantin le Rhodien," *REGr* 9 (1896) 36–65. G. Begleri, *Chram svjatych Apostolov i drugie pamjatniki Konstantinopolja po opisaniju Konstantina Rodija* (Odessa 1896), corr. G. Bartelink, *Byzantion* 46 (1976) 425f. Matranga, *AnecGr* 2:624–32.

LIT. G. Downey, "Constantine the Rhodian: His Life and Writings," *LCMS* 212–21. –A.K.

CONSTANTINE OF SICILY, 9th-C. poet, named also *grammatikos* and philosopher. He wrote Anacreontic verses to which Krumbacher (*GBL* 723) ascribes a vivid naturalness. Constantine mentions Arab attacks on Sicily. Lemerle (*Humanism* 199–200, n.95) attributes to him, although reluctantly, a poem in which the author regards PHOTIOS as his teacher. Constantine was also involved in a polemic against his teacher, Leo the Philosopher; his vitriolic verses charge Leo with paganism and threaten him with Hell, where he will meet his friends, ancient poets and scholars. The identification of both Constantine and Leo is difficult: Lipšic (*Očerki* 355) is inclined to see in Leo the Philosopher Leo CHOIROSPHAKTES and to connect Constantine's invectives with the polemic of ARETHAS and CONSTANTINE OF RHODES against the latter; Lemerle identifies Constantine's teacher with LEO THE MATHEMATICIAN. M.D. Spadaro (*infra* 183–92) hypothesizes that the author of the polemical verses was CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER.

ED. M.D. Spadaro, "Sulle composizioni di Costantino il Filosofo del Vaticano 915," *SicGymn* 24 (1971) 198–202. Cramer, *Anec.Gr.Paris.*, vol. 4 (Oxford 1841) 380–83. Matranga, *AnecGr* 2:689–98.

LIT. R. Anastasi, "Costantino Siculo e Leone il Filosofo," *SicGymn* 16 (1963) 84–89. –A.K.

CONSTANTINE THE JEW, saint; born Synada, Phrygia, died on Bithynian Mt. Olympos 26 Dec., after 886. Born to a Jewish family, Constantine adopted Christianity. His conversion began when he spontaneously imitated a merchant who crossed

www.staropolska.pl

his mouth while yawning; "the power of the sign" was such that Constantine without baptism acquired a fervent belief in Christ (cols. 629F–630A). Constantine's relatives forced him to marry, but on his wedding night he fled to the Phlouboute monastery near Nicaea, where he was baptized, became a monk, and stayed 12 years. He was ordained a priest and tried to convert Jews living in Nicaea. When Constantine attempted to move to Olympos, he was brought back as a fugitive and put in chains. Prompted by St. Spyridon in a vision, Constantine traveled via Attaleia to Cyprus and returned with a relic, the right hand of Palamon (an otherwise unknown martyr), which he gave to the monastery of St. Hyakinthos at Nicaea. Although he settled on Olympos (at Atroa, later at Bolion-Balaios), he still attempted to influence affairs in Constantinople: he supposedly reconciled the emperors Basil I and Leo VI.

His anonymous Life, apparently written during Leo's reign, eulogizes the emperor (648F); since the author, in describing the region of Nicaea, speaks of "our desert" (645C), he must have belonged to a Nicaean monastic community. He sympathizes with the upper stratum of the provincial population and stresses that Constantine found support first of all among "those who were noble by nature and fortune and earthly distinction" (644A–B). The hagiographer avoids vivid detail, but the miracles are unusual—a girl who tried to seduce Constantine fainted at the sign of the cross; some books fell from Constantine's pouch into a torrent, but were brought to his feet undamaged. No mere humble compiler, the author incessantly comments upon his story, asserts that his hero deserves an exquisite *logos*, not a mediocre composition (628C), and boasts that no one could have done the job much better than himself (651C).

SOURCES. *AASS* Nov. 4:628–56. *Synax.CP* 345f.
LIT. *BHG* 370. Starr, *Jews* 119–22. –A.K.

CONSTANTINE THE PHILOSOPHER (monastic name Cyril), missionary to the Slavs and saint; born Thessalonike 826/7, died Rome 14 Feb. 869; feastday 14 Feb. Constantine and his brother METHODIOS were the sons of the *droungarios* Leo and Maria, who may have been a Slav. Displaying remarkable intelligence as a youth (he reputedly memorized the works of Gregory of Nazianzos), ca.842 Constantine journeyed to Constantinople, where he gained the favor of the eunuch THEOKTISTOS and received an advanced education; the tradition that he studied philosophy under LEO THE MATHEMATICIAN and PHOTIOS is, however, disputed (Lemerle, *Humanism* 185–91). He was ordained priest and became *chartophylax* of Hagia Sophia under Patr. Ignatios, but was later appointed a teacher of philosophy at the school of the MAGNAURA. His legendary erudition brought him prominence: he reportedly defined PHILOSOPHY in secular terms for Theoktistos (I. Ševčenko in *For Roman Jakobson* [The Hague 1956] 449–57), bested JOHN VII GRAMMATIKOS in a debate over ICONOCLASM, learned Hebrew, disputed Muslim theologians at the caliph's court at Samarra, and debated Jewish spokesmen before the khagan of the KHAZARS.

In 863 Michael sent him and his brother Methodios to MORAVIA to comply with the request of RASTISLAV for missionaries. In preparation, Constantine devised the GLAGOLITIC alphabet and a literary language, CHURCH SLAVONIC, into which he translated numerous Greek works, including the so-called liturgy of John Chrysostom, selected daily offices, the Psalter, the New Testament, and perhaps Leo III's ECLOGA. In Moravia, Constantine and Methodios organized a native church using the local Slavic tongue, but under pressure from the Frankish clergy they journeyed to Rome in 867, where Constantine died, having been tonsured shortly before his death. He was buried in the Church of St. Clement, whose relics he had discovered in Cherson in 860 and brought to Rome. His 9th-C. Church Slavonic vita, perhaps composed by Methodios, draws heavily on Greek sources (I. Ševčenko in *To Honor Roman Jakobson,* vol. 3 [The Hague 1967] 1817). The existence of Constantine's original Greek works, esp. concerned with St. Clement's relics, can only be deduced from references or surviving fragments in Church Slavonic sources.

SOURCES. T. Lehr-Spławiński, *Żywoty Konstantina i Metodego* (Poznań 1959) 3–93. F. Grivec, F. Tomšić, *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses: Fontes* (Zagreb 1960).

LIT. *Kirilometodievska bibliografija 1940–1980,* ed. I. Dujčev et al. (Sofia 1983). V. Vavřínek, B. Zástěrová, "Byzantium's Role in the Formation of Great Moravian Culture," *BS* 43 (1982) 161–88. F. Dvornik, *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*[2] (Hattiesburg, Miss., 1969). Idem, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1970) 53–145. Vlasto, *Entry* 26–66. –P.A.H.

CONSTANTINE TICH, Bulgarian monarch (1257–77), whose reign coincided with a period of bitter internal feuding and repeated foreign invasions. After the murder of Tsar Michael Asen and the brief reign of Sebastokrator Koloman (probably murdered), Constantine was proclaimed tsar by a group of boyars. No sooner had he suppressed a revolt by a certain Mico, son-in-law of John Asen II, than he was faced by a Hungarian invasion, in which he lost much of northwestern Bulgaria to the Hungarians. By dynastic marriages, successively to Irene, daughter of Theodore II Laskaris, and to Maria, niece of Michael VIII, Constantine sought in vain to assure himself of Byz. support. In 1263 the Byz. invaded Thrace, took PHILIPPOPOLIS, and advanced toward Sofia, but the Hungarians drove them back. In desperation Constantine made an alliance with the MONGOL Golden Horde in southern Russia. Their combined forces advanced nearly to Constantinople, but when the Mongols withdrew with their booty, Constantine had to fall back empty-handed. Exploiting Bulgarian weakness, the Hungarians extended their rule and that of their Bulgarian puppet Svetoslav. All that was left to Constantine was the territory between the Danube and the Balkan range east of the river Iskŭr, and from 1271 even that was regularly raided by the Mongols, with whom Michael VIII had allied. By the end of his reign Constantine was a virtual vassal of the Mongols.

LIT. Fine, *Late Balkans* 172–183. P.S. Srećković, "Rasprava o Konstantinu Tehu," *Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, Glas* 2 (1888) 1–90. Zlatarski, *Ist.*, vol. 3 (1940) 476–551.
–R.B.

CONSTANTINOPLE. [This entry treats the history and development of the city of Constantinople. For a discussion of its public monuments, city walls, and cisterns, see CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF. The capture of the city by the Turks is treated in CONSTANTINOPLE, SIEGE AND FALL OF. Individual monasteries and churches are the subject of independent entries.]

Capital of the Byz. Empire, Constantinople (Κωνσταντινούπολις, Turk. Istanbul) was founded by Constantine I in 324 on the site of the Greek city of BYZANTION and dedicated on 11 May 330. The creation of imperial seats of government in the provinces was in line with the policy of the Tetrarchy; Diocletian had already established his residence in nearby NIKOMEDEIA. If Constantine was not satisfied with Nikomedeia, it was probably because he considered Byzantion to be strategically more advantageous. It commanded access to the Black Sea and lay at the juncture of two military highways, the European Via EGNATIA and the road leading from CHALCEDON to Nikomedeia and points farther east. Yet the site of Byzantion also had the great weakness of being unprotected on the landward side by any natural barrier—a factor that came into play barely 50 years later and posed thereafter a constant threat.

Constantinople was formed by the expansion of Byzantion. The new center of imperial authority, consisting of the complex of the GREAT PALACE and HIPPODROME, was placed within the ancient city. From there a colonnaded street, already built by Septimius Severus, ran to the old city gate. Constantine laid out a circular forum outside the gate and continued the main artery (later named MESE) in a straight line westward. About 1.2 km west of the forum a Capitolium was set up. There the street forked, one arm extending southwest to the Golden Gate (near the mosque Isakapı Mescidi; to be distinguished from the Theodosian GOLDEN GATE), the other northwest to meet a new line of walls that described an arc from the Propontis to the Golden Horn, roughly from the modern quarter of Samatya (PSAMATHIA) to that of Cibali. No maritime defenses were put up since at the time there was no threat from the sea.

Constantine envisaged a sharp increase in the population and made arrangements for grain supply from Egypt amounting to 80,000 rations—perhaps a target rather than the figure requisite at the time. Indeed, the population did climb steeply in the 4th–5th C., a process that is reflected in gradually expanded harbor capacity, granaries, and water supply. It is difficult to determine when it reached its peak or to estimate a maximal population figure (opinions have ranged between 250,000 and 1,000,000). Clearly, so large a center of consumption could be maintained only thanks to a complex and potentially vulnerable system of provisioning dependent on Egypt. In addition to the subsidized supply of BREAD (and oil?) such comforts as were expected in the biggest cities (i.e., luxurious public baths and entertainment in theaters and the circus) attracted people to Constantinople.

The oft-repeated statement that Constantine

willed his new residence to have from the start a purely Christian character is not substantiated by the evidence. The old pagan temples on the Acropolis and elsewhere were not disturbed and the Capitolium, which may be attributed to Constantine, had a clearly pagan character. Constantine probably built no more than three churches: St. IRENE to serve as cathedral, and two martyria dedicated to local martyrs, St. Akakios (near the Golden Horn) and St. MOKIOS in the cemetery area outside the land walls. The Church of the HOLY APOSTLES was built by Constantius II next to Constantine's mausoleum.

The Gothic invasion and the defeat of the emperor Valens at Adrianople (378) served to underline the vulnerability of Constantinople and necessitated new defensive measures, esp. to protect the water supply only recently guaranteed by the construction of a network of AQUEDUCTS extending as far as Bizye in Thrace and possibly farther west, a distance of some 100 km. It was probably to this end, and not because of a multiplication of exposed suburbs, that by 413 the land walls were extended 1.5 km to the west of the Constantinian circuit. The wide belt of land that was added to the city appears to have been sparsely

www.slaropolos.ru

CONSTANTINOPLE. Hagia Sophia and the Golden Horn, viewed from the southeast. To the right, the Church of St. Irene. The bridges lead across to Galata.

populated and much of it was taken up by cemeteries. Three enormous open-air cisterns were there—with a total capacity of approximately 1,000,000 sq. m—those of Aetios (421), Aspar (459), and St. Mokios (ascribed to Anastasios I). Somewhat later, a forward defensive line was built from SELYMBRIA to the Black Sea at a distance of 65 km from the city: this was the so-called Anastasian or LONG WALL, 45 km long. Fairly effective for a time, it was abandoned in the 7th C. because of the difficulty of keeping it manned and repaired.

The emperors of the Theodosian line made a sustained effort to embellish Constantinople and provide it with further public works such as granaries and the great Theodosian harbor on the Propontis. Simultaneously members of their family and government officials invested heavily in real estate, building for themselves mansions of princely magnificence. The only extant statistical account of the city, the NOTITIA URBIS CONSTANTINOPOLITANAE, dates from this period (ca.425): it describes briefly the 14 urban Regions and lists the principal monuments contained in each one. Twelve of the Regions were within the Constantinian walls; the 13th was at Sykai (GALATA), the 14th at an unknown location (Eyüb?) up the Golden Horn. All in all there were 5 palaces, 14 churches, 8 public and 153 private baths, 4 forums, 4 harbors, 52 major colonnaded streets, 322 other streets, and 4,388 *domus* (substantial masonry houses?). Multistory tenement houses clearly existed, for their height was limited by law to 100 ft., and specific regulations protected the right to a view of the sea, governed the distance between houses, the width of streets, etc. (*Cod. Just.* VIII 10.12, reign of Zeno). Constantinople was becoming overcrowded.

The second half of the 5th C. ushered in a period of mounting civil strife and frequent FIRES, the most serious being that of 465, which destroyed about half the city. Circus riots became common: the NIKA REVOLT of 532 left the center of the city in ashes—allowing Justinian I to indulge his passion for building. Prokopios (*Buildings*, bk.1) provides a detailed description of Justinian's (and Justin I's) constructions, which suggests, apart from such public buildings as had to be rebuilt after the fire, a shift towards churches, 33 of which are mentioned. The churches built or rebuilt under Justinian include HAGIA SOPHIA, Sts. SERGIOS AND BAKCHOS, and St. Irene. Another large church built in the Justinianic period was St. POLYEUKTOS. The population of the city was, however, gravely depleted, perhaps halved by the PLAGUE of 542.

Building activity at Constantinople continued until ca.600, then ground to a halt. In 618 grain supply from Egypt was permanently discontinued. In 626 Constantinople suffered its first siege, the cutting of its major source of water (restored only in 768), and the devastation of both its European and Asiatic suburbs. In 674–78 Arab fleets blockaded it. In 715 Anastasios II, foreseeing another Arab attack, expelled all inhabitants who were unable to lay up provisions for three years: only a shrunken population could have survived the Arab siege of 717–18. In 740 a terrible earthquake threw down a considerable portion of the walls; the catastrophic plague of 747 followed.

Practically no building, other than defensive, is recorded for the period ca.600–ca.780. By the end of the period of Iconoclasm, Constantinople must have had a population of a few tens of thousands living amid the ruins of past glories. Only one public granary appears to have survived, and one harbor (out of four) continued to function for nonmilitary purposes. The great public baths and theaters were abandoned. Limited construction was resumed under Irene; Theophilos repaired the sea walls; Basil I undertook a sustained effort of rebuilding mostly churches that had fallen into ruin (31 are named). The pattern of imperial munificence, already foreshadowed by Justinian, shifted decisively to imperial palaces, churches, and hospices for the poor and the ill; what had earlier been the "civic" sphere was abandoned.

Doubtless Constantinople started to recover in the 9th C., with a gradual rise in population and an expansion of commercial and artisanal activities. The BOOK OF THE EPARCH, while silent about many crafts, mentions the importation of commodities both from the provinces and foreign countries (silk, linen, unguents, honey, wax, soap). The textile industry was active, but exports severely discouraged. Shops along the main street were beginning to charge high rents (N. Oikonomides, *DOP* 26 [1972] 345–55). Probably the opening up of the Black Sea by the Kievan princes, for all the dangers it brought (witness the attacks on Constantinople in 860, 941, and 1043), benefited trade. Even so, little was built in the 10th C.

The 11th–12th C. witnessed further expansion. Artisanal occupations became profitable, tradesmen exerted a growing influence on political affairs, and new crafts were developed (e.g., the manufacture of bronze DOORS), some of which were exported to Italy. Of greater importance was the installation of foreign trading colonies. While the Rus' in the 10th C. were kept at arm's length at St. Mamas on the lower BOSPOROS, the Amalfitans, Venetians, Pisans, Genoese, Anconitans, and Germans gained concessions along the Golden Horn, opposite Galata, acquiring their own landing facilities, storehouses, and churches. The size of the colony of LATINS in the late 12th C. has been estimated at about 7,000 (Hendy, *Economy* 593f), although much higher figures are given in some sources.

In terms of construction a feature of the 11th–12th C. is the establishment by emperors and members of the aristocracy of great urban "abbeys"—monasteries in name, they also served educational, welfare, and financial functions. Such were the monasteries of the Virgin PERIBLEPTOS, of KOSMAS AND DAMIANOS, of the MANGANA, and of Christ PANTOKRATOR, and the ORPHANAGE of St. Paul (enlarged by Alexios I), the last so big that a tour of it required a whole day.

The great fire of 1203 and the Latin occupation (1204–61) destroyed the prosperity of the Komnenian city, which was subjected to systematic spoliation. The initial recovery under the Palaiologoi is mostly reflected in further imperial and aristocratic monasteries, some of which survive (St. Andrew in Krisei, the Virgin PAMMAKARISTOS, Christ of the CHORA, etc.). By the middle of the 14th C. decay had set in. Travelers from abroad (CLAVIJO, Pero TAFUR, BERTRANDON DE LA BROQUIÈRE, Buondelmonti) describe a partially deserted city contrasting with the bustle of Genoese

www.staropomor.ru

Pera across the water. When it was stormed by the Turks in 1453, Constantinople probably had a population of 50,000.

LIT. Janin, *CP byz.* Janin, *Églises CP.* Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon.* C. Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople* (Paris 1985). A. van Millingen, *Byzantine Constantinople* (London 1899). G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale* (Paris 1974). J. Ebersolt, *Constantinople byzantine et les voyageurs du Levant* (Paris 1918). A.M. Schneider, *Byzanz* (Berlin 1936). E. Mamboury, "Les fouilles byzantines à Istanbul," *Byzantion* 11 (1936) 229–83; 13 (1938) 301–10; 21 (1951) 425–59. –C.M.

CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF. Constantinople was the site of many ecumenical and local councils.

CONSTANTINOPLE I. Summoned by THEODOSIOS I (May–9 July 381), this second ecumenical council of some 150 bishops had as its object the final settlement of the Arian controversy. Although no Western representatives attended, by 451 the council was deemed important enough to be universally accepted as ecumenical. Under the presidency of Meletios, bishop of Antioch (360–81), the synod endorsed the faith of the First Council of NICAEA as well as the full consubstantiality and divinity of the Holy Spirit. In effect, both PNEUMATOMACHOI and followers of APOLLINARIS were condemned. Probably the so-called Niceno-Constantinopolitan CREED, which CHALCEDON later attributed to the council, was originally a local baptismal profession of faith containing the Nicene formula. It may in fact have existed as early as 362. Finally, the council proclaimed Constantinople as the second see of Christendom with honorary precedence over all other sees, except the elder Rome (canon 3). The basis of this primacy, as the canon succinctly states, was the city's political standing—"because it is New Rome." The acts of the council either did not survive, or, more probably, never existed.

LIT. Hefele-Leclercq, *Conciles* 2:1–48. J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (New York 1981) 296–331. *GOrThR* 27.4 (1982) 359–453 (fascicle dedicated to the council). A.M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol* (Göttingen 1965). E. Chrysos, "Die Akten des Konzils von Konstantinopel I (381)," *Romanitas-Christianitas* (Berlin–New York 1982) 426–35. –A.P.

CONSTANTINOPLE II. The fifth ecumenical council (5 May–2 June 553) was convened by JUSTINIAN I to reconcile the proponents of MONOPHYSITISM by convincing them that the Council of CHALCEDON had not lapsed into NESTORIANISM or denied the Council of EPHESUS. Therefore the council condemned the THREE CHAPTERS (the person of THEODORE OF EDESSA, and some writings of THEODORET OF CYRRHUS and IBAS of Edessa), which the Monophysites had viewed as anti-Cyrillian and hence Nestorian. Although initially apprehensive that the council was rejecting Chalcedon, Pope VIGILIUS eventually accepted the council's decisions (Dec. 553). As a matter of plain fact, the posthumous condemnation of the three 5th-C. authors of the Three Chapters reaffirmed and preserved the authority of Chalcedon and CYRIL of Alexandria. Thus the modern criticism (C. Moeller) that the council's NEO-CHALCEDONISM opposed authentic Chalcedonian Christology and somehow betrayed Chalcedon is unwarranted. The council also anathematized ORIGEN. This was aimed at the Origenist monastic parties of Egypt and Palestine, who had proposed their own heretical solution to the Christological problem.

Reconciliation, however, proved impossible, as Monophysitism was by then too deeply entrenched to be influenced by the emperor's desperate bargains or anti-Nestorian zeal. The Egyptians, as SOPHRONIOS of Jerusalem put it, were not a race to change their minds or end their hostility toward the central government of Constantinople.

SOURCES. Mansi 9:171–657. PG 86:945–93. E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians* (Munich 1939). *ACO* 4:1.

LIT. C. Moeller, "Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en orient de 451 à la fin du VIe siècle," in Grillmeier-Bacht, *Chalkedon* 1:637–720. E. Chrysos, *Die Bischofslisten des V. ökumenischen Konzils (553)* (Bonn 1966). Idem, *He ekklesiastike politike tou Ioustinianou kata ten erin peri ta tria kephalaia kai ten E' oikoumeniken synodon* (Thessalonike 1969). F.X. Murphy, P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et III* (Paris 1974) 9–130. E. Zettl, *Die Bestätigung des V. ökumenischen Konzils durch Papst Vigilius* (Bonn 1974). –A.P.

CONSTANTINOPLE III. The sixth ecumenical council (7 Nov. 680–16 Sept. 681) was convoked by CONSTANTINE IV to settle the controversy over MONOTHELETISM. This doctrine was used by the government early in the 7th C. to conciliate the dissident Monophysites. The council drew up a comprehensive decree in which the reality of Christ's two wills and two *energeiai* (operations), one divine and the other human, were acknowledged and declared inseparably united to one another (Mansi 11:637B). For if there were two natures in the incarnate Christ, as Chalcedonian Christology affirmed, there had to be two wills. All those accused of Monotheletism were anathematized, including Pope Honorius (625–38), who had given his written approval to the doctrine, and four patriarchs of Constantinople (e.g., SERGIOS I and PYRRHOS). The earlier opponents of Monotheletism, MAXIMOS THE CONFESSOR, Pope MARTIN I, and SOPHRONIOS of Jerusalem, were thus vindicated. To complete its work and to issue disciplinary canons, the TRULLO council convened in 691–92.

SOURCE. Mansi 11:189–922.

LIT. W.M. Peitz, "Martin I. und Maximus Confessor: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Monotheletenstreites in den Jahren 645–668," *HistJb* 38 (1917) 213–36, 429–58. V. Grumel, "Recherches sur l'histoire du monothélisme," *EO* 27 (1928) 6–16, 257–77; 28 (1929) 19–34, 272–82; 29 (1930) 16–28. F.X. Murphy, P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et III* (Paris 1974) 133–260. R. Riedinger, *Die Präsenz- und Subscriptionslisten des VI. oekumenischen Konzils (680/81)* (Munich 1979). –A.P.

COUNCIL OF 869–70. BASIL I convoked this council (5 Oct. 869–28 Feb. 870) to settle the Photian schism and to restore communion with Rome. In the presence of three papal legates, Patr. PHOTIOS was deposed and anathematized and his predecessor IGNATIOS reinstated. Despite protests from the Roman delegation, it was announced at the council that Bulgaria was placed under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Constantinople. In addition, 27 canons were issued endorsing such matters as the theory of the PENTARCHY and the veneration of images (canons 3 and 21).

Following the restoration of Photios, the decisions of 869–70 were annulled at the council of Constantinople of 879–80 (see below). The council of 869–70 was therefore omitted from the list of ecumenical councils recognized by the Latin church, until the second half of the 11th C. After the dispute with MICHAEL I KEROULARIOS, the West began to include it among the ecumenical councils. This interpretation was due (as Dvornik conclusively demonstrated) to Western canonists, who thought the council had not been annulled in 879. Except for a synopsis of the original Greek text (Mansi 16:308–420), the council's acts survive only in the Latin translation of ANASTASIUS BIBLIOTHECARIUS.

SOURCE. Mansi 16:1–208.

LIT. Dvornik, *Photian Schism* 132–58. D. Stiernon, *Constantinople IV* (Paris 1967). *Der Kampf um das Menschenbild. Das achte ökumenische Konzil von 869/70 und seine Folgen*, ed. H.H. Schöffler (Dornach 1986). –A.P.

COUNCIL OF 879–80. This council composed of 383 bishops solemnly recognized PHOTIOS as patriarch and annulled the decisions of the anti-Photian council of Constantinople of 869–70 (see above). As Dvornik has shown, its rehabilitation and vindication of Photios definitively ended the Photian schism, because the pope, JOHN VIII, never repudiated the council's decisions, to which two papal legates had subscribed. Thus the "second schism" described by subsequent "legend" never occurred. On the contrary, the council succeeded at achieving reunion and was even recognized in Rome as "ecumenical" until the Gregorian Reform, when the official Roman tradition was abandoned in favor of the council of 869.

Likewise with Rome's full endorsement, the council anathematized anyone who would tamper with the original text of the creed (Mansi 17:520E–521A). Although the "privileges" of Rome were recognized, the canonical and judicial authority of pope and patriarch were defined in terms of equality (canon 1). Papal jurisdiction over the Byz. church was thus excluded. The council's decisions were inserted in every subsequent Orthodox collection of canon law and normally followed those of the first seven ecumenical councils. It is referred to as "ecumenical" by some Byz. authors.

SOURCE. Mansi 17:373–526.

LIT. Dvornik, *Photian Schism* 159–201. J. Meijer, *A Successful Council of Union: A Theological Analysis of the Photian Synod of 879–880* (Thessalonike 1975). J.L. Boojamra, "The Photian Synod of 879–80 and the Papal Commonitorium (879)," *BS/EB* 9 (1982) 1–23. V. Peri, "Il concilio di Costantinopoli dell'879–80 come problema filologico e storiografico," *AnnHistCon* 9 (1977) 29–42. –A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 754. See HIERIA, LOCAL COUNCIL OF.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 815. This council, which met in Hagia Sophia in spring 815, marks the second restoration of ICONOCLASM. The iconodule patriarch NIKEPHOROS I was deposed shortly before the council and replaced by the Iconoclast THEODOTOS I. Promoted by LEO V, who was convinced that the military disasters of his imperial predecessors, IRENE and NIKEPHOROS I, were caused by their support of images, the council repudiated the decisions of NICAEA II (787) and reaffirmed those of HIERIA (754). Although a committee headed by JOHN (VII) GRAMMATIKOS had assembled a *florilegium* in preparation for the council, its renewed opposition to image venera-

www.staropomor.ru

tion was based on a repetition of the Christological arguments of Hieria: an icon either depicts the uncircumscribable Godhead, or else divides the Lord's humanity from his divinity, thus compounding the evil (Ostrogorsky, *infra* 50). The council's doctrinal definition (*Horos*) called icons "spurious" and ordered their destruction, but (unlike Hieria) refrained from declaring them idols. Only fragments of the acts of 815 survive.

SOURCE. Ostrogorsky, *Bilderstr.* 46–60.
LIT. P.J. Alexander, "The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and Its Definition (Horos)," *DOP* 7 (1953) 35–66. –A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 843. Summoned by the widowed empress THEODORA on the first Sunday of Lent (11 March 843), this council marks the official destruction of ICONOCLASM and the solemn restoration of image veneration in the Byz. church. The deliberations of this assembly are lost. Its restoration of images was understandably based on the authoritative decisions of NICAEA II (787). Hence its excommunication of all those who stubbornly clung to the belief that the incarnate Lord was "indescribable." The council also deposed the patriarch JOHN VII GRAMMATIKOS, replacing him with METHODIOS I. Later the liturgical text of the SYNODIKON OF ORTHODOXY was composed to commemorate the TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY.

LIT. C. Mango, "The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios," in *Iconoclasm*, 133–40. –A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 920. The council settled the controversy over the TETRAGAMY OF LEO VI, which had divided the Byz. church for nearly two decades. In effect, it successfully resolved the schism between, on the one hand, NICHOLAS I MYSTIKOS and his followers, who had been unwilling to sanction either the union of LEO VI with ZOE KARBONOPSINA or its issue, and, on the other, the bishops supporting EUTHYMIOS, who had granted the desired dispensation. Specifically, fourth marriages were explicitly banned by the council's TOMOS OF UNION (9 July 920). Although third marriages were condemned, childless widowers under 40 years of age were exempt, while those with children were subject to a four-year penance. The council, according to Nicholas's correspondence (ed. Jenkins and Westerink, ep.94, 361.20–22), also made provisions for restoring bishops expelled from their sees during the controversy.

SOURCE. *Tomos unionis—Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople: Miscellaneous Writings*, ed. L.G. Westerink (Washington, D.C., 1981) 56–85, with Eng. tr. –A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1094. This council was convened by Alexios I in Blachernai in order to resolve the case of LEO OF CHALCEDON. The chronology of the synod is obscure: Grumel (*RegPatr*, fasc. 3, no.967) and Beck (*Kirche* 57) date it in 1092, Gautier (*infra*) at the end of 1094, A. Glabinas (*He epi Alexiou Komnenou [1081–1118] peri hieron skeuon, keimelion kai hagion eikonon eris* [Thessalonike 1972] 179–82) at the beginning of 1095.

ED. and LIT. P. Gautier, "Le synode de Blachernes (fin1094). Etude prosopgraphique," *REB* 29 (1971) 213–84. –A.K.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1156–57. The two sessions, 26 Jan. 1156 and 12 May 1157, met to discuss the teaching of the patriarch-elect Soterichos PANTEUGENOS concerning Christ's sacrifice on the Cross. The council affirmed through its spokesman, NICHOLAS OF METHONE, that the sacrifice of the Cross and the eucharistic sacrifice (which were one and the same) were offered to the entire Trinity, rather than to the Father alone as Panteugenos maintained. The council reasoned that the redemptive or "economic" activity of God, of which Christ's oblation was the expression, was a Trinitarian action involving all three persons of the Trinity. In addition, the council (quoting the liturgical formula of the CHEROUBIKON) argued that because of the single hypostatic union of Christ, the Logos both "offers and is offered, receives and is received." The anathemas condemning Panteugenos were entered into the SYNODIKON OF ORTHODOXY (Gouillard, "Synodikon" 72–74, 210–15).

SOURCES. *Acta*—PG 140:148–201. *Patmiake Bibliotheke*, ed. I. Sakkellion (Athens 1890) 316–28.
LIT. P. Čeremuchin, "Konstantinopol'skij Sobor 1157," *Bogoslovskie Trudy* 1 (Moscow 1960) 87–109. *RegPatr*, fasc. 1, nos. 1038, 1041. –A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1166–67. This council involved a series of meetings summoned by Emp. MANUEL I KOMNENOS to pronounce on the meaning of the text, "The Father is greater than I" (Jn 14:28). The origins of the controversy lie in the active political and ideological relations with the West during Manuel's reign. It is usually agreed that his ambassador, DEMETRIOS OF LAMPE, introduced this controversy in Byz. after discussing the question with Western theologians during his missions to Italy and Germany. In the debate, the opposition argued that the Son could not be inferior to the Father because Christ's humanity had been deified and was thus "one" with his divinity. The council found this interpretation close to MONOPHYSITISM and unacceptable. Specifically, the reality of Christ's humanity, as concrete humanity—"created and mortal"—was inferior to God. The hypostatic union of Christ's two natures (as defined by the Council of CHALCEDON) did not erase the differences between Christ's humanity and divinity; his divinity was greater. Likewise, in Trinitarian theology proper, the Father was considered "greater" than the Son inasmuch as he is hypostatically the unique cause, the *principium divinitatis* of both the Son and the Spirit. Finally, the council also found unacceptable the following three interpretations: that the Johannine text separated intellectually Christ's human from his divine nature; that it underlined his *kenosis*, or condescension, during the Incarnation; and that it indicated his position (due to his shared humanity) as God's favored Son. The council's condemnation of the opposition was subsequently inserted in the SYNODIKON OF ORTHODOXY. The marble plates on which its decision was inscribed were placed in Hagia Sophia (C. Mango, *DOP* 17 [1963] 317–30). The problems of this council continued to be discussed during the session of Feb. 1170.

SOURCES. PG 140:201–84. S.N. Sakkos, "He en Konstantinoupolei synodos tou 1170," in *Theologikon Symposion in Honor of P. Chrestou* (Thessalonike 1967) 313–52. Gouillard, "Synodikon" 76–80, 216–26.
LIT. S.N. Sakkos, *"Ho Pater meizon mou estin" B'. Erides kai synodoi kata ton IB' aiona* (Thessalonike 1968). P. Classen, "Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 1166 und die Lateiner," *BZ* 48 (1955) 339–68. *RegPatr*, fasc. 1, nos. 1060, 1062, 1065, 1076. G. Thetford, "The Christological Councils of 1166 and 1170 in Constantinople," *SVThQ* 31 (1987) 143–61. –A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1285, also known as the Second Council of Blachernai (5 Feb.–Aug. 1285). Presided over by Patr. GREGORY II, the council was convoked at BLACHERNAI to decide whether the expression "from the Son" (Lat. FILIOQUE) was equivalent to the patristic phrase "through the Son" advocated by the Unionist ex-patriarch JOHN XI BEKKOS, who held that the hypostatic existence or procession of the Spirit was "through" or "from" the Son. The council pronounced this unacceptable, for the Spirit's eternal mode of origin is an act of the hypostasis of the Father and not of the essence. Rather than revealing the Spirit's personal procession, the phrase "through the Son" simply refers to the Spirit's energetic, eternal manifestation by the Son—an activity common to all three divine persons (Tomos, PG 142:240C–D). Only in this sense is the Spirit said to proceed through or even from the Son (*ex patre filioque*). Besides condemning Bekkos, the assembly formally repudiated the Council of LYONS (1274). Although several ecclesiastics subsequently opposed the synodal Tomos of 1285, penned by Gregory himself, the church never altered or rejected it. Thus it holds a permanent place in Orthodox tradition. The council, in fact, is of major importance as the only official *conciliar* reaction of Byz. to the *filioque*. It should be noted that the same distinctions among ENERGY, HYPOSTASIS, and SUBSTANCE, which Gregory made and the council endorsed, were later elaborated and developed by Gregory PALAMAS.

SOURCES. Tomos—PG 142:233–46. V. Laurent, "Les signataires du second synode des Blachernes (été 1285)," *EO* 26 (1927) 129–49.
LIT. Papadakis, *Crisis in Byz.* 62–101, 155–67 (tr. of Tomos). –A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1341. The council was convoked (10 June) under the presidency of Emp. ANDRONIKOS III to resolve the dispute between Gregory PALAMAS and BARLAAM OF CALABRIA. Both Patr. JOHN XIV KALEKAS and future Emp. JOHN VI KANTAKOUZENOS were present. The one-day session was unfavorable to Barlaam, who therefore soon left Constantinople. A second council, with the same participants, convened in Aug. and condemned Gregory AKINDYNOS, who had continued the struggle on Barlaam's departure. Since Andronikos had died days after the June debate, Kantakouzenos presided.

The synodal Tomos published after the Aug. meeting is unmistakably Palamite in content (cf. PG 151:680B, 688C), reflecting the victory won for HESYCHASM. Because it concentrates solely on the June meeting and fails to mention the second council in Aug. and its formal condemnation of Akindynos, its authenticity has been questioned. Indeed, M. Jugie (*DTC* 11 [1932] 1778–84) criticized the document as unreliable, a tampered version of the June debate that Kantakouzenos had forced Kalekas to sign. J. Meyendorff, however, has argued that the political rivalry between

www.slaraport.hu

Kalekas and Kantakouzenos for control of the regency explains the shape of the Tomos. Specifically, Kalekas refused to present the Aug. synod as official because his adversary had usurped an imperial prerogative by presiding over it; acknowledging the second council would have implied support of Kantakouzenos's imperial ambitions. Kalekas, therefore, accepted only the earlier synod—excluding the Aug. session—simply because it was the one at which Andronikos had presided, hence the shape of the Tomos.

SOURCE. Tomos—PG 151:679–92.
LIT. J. Bois, "Le synode hésychaste de 1341," *EO* 6 (1903) 50–60. Weiss, *Kantakuzenos* 103–12. Meyendorff, *Palamas* 42–62. —A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1347. This council of 8 Feb. reconfirmed the decisions of 1341, which had settled the controversy between Gregory PALAMAS and BARLAAM OF CALABRIA over HESYCHASM. These decisions had been overturned by the regency of ANNA OF SAVOY and Patr. JOHN XIV KALEKAS during the long civil war (1341–47). The synodal Tomos of 1347 actually incorporates the decisions reached by an earlier assembly (2 Feb.), days before the triumphant entry of JOHN VI KANTAKOUZENOS into Constantinople. Favoring PALAMISM, these decisions include the deposition of Kalekas and the excommunication of AKINDYNOS. The text gives a Kantakouzenist version of the civil war by blaming Kalekas alone, rather than Anna or Alexios APOKAUKOS, both of whom are viewed as the patriarch's victims. Aside from its "legitimist" interpretation of the war, the Tomos also ratifies the doctrinal decisions of the local council of Constantinople of 1341 (see above) and lifts Kalekas's excommunication of Palamas. The document contains signatures of three sets of bishops: those present on 2 Feb., those who signed before the enthronement of the new hesychast patriarch ISIDORE I (17 May), and those who signed afterward, including Palamas as newly elected archbishop of Thessalonike.

SOURCE. J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Hesychasm* (London 1974) pt.VII (1963), 209–27. —A.P.

LOCAL COUNCIL OF 1351. Although the church had approved PALAMISM as early as the local council of Constantinople of 1341 (see above), political circumstances had denied it a conclusive victory. The anti-Palamite camp and its leading spokesman, Nikephoros GREGORAS, continued their opposition even after the second approval of the doctrine (1347) and the condemnation of its earlier opponents, BARLAAM OF CALABRIA and Gregory AKINDYNOS. Therefore Emp. JOHN VI KANTAKOUZENOS convened the synod in Blachernai (28 May) to reaffirm the decisions of 1341 and 1347. Gregory PALAMAS, Patr. KALLISTOS I, and the opposition were all present. The dissidents were heard in several sessions, then finally condemned (9 June); the council assembled in July without them.

This session approved Palamas's theology in detail. Specifically, it sanctioned both his defense of the deification of man in Christ and his distinction between substance and energies; it also categorically denied the claim that the uncreated energy introduced a complexity (*syntheton*) in God (PG 151:732AB). The synodal Tomos incorporating these decisions, evidently written by PHILOTHEOS KOKKINOS, metropolitan of Herakleia, was signed in Aug. in Hagia Sophia (*Reg* 5, no.2982). JOHN V PALAIOLOGOS, who was not in Constantinople then, signed in Feb. or Mar. 1352 (R.J. Loenertz, *BZ* 47 [1954] 116). The council's decisions were later inserted into the SYNODIKON OF ORTHODOXY. By the end of the century, the whole Eastern church had recognized and accepted this unconditional canonization of Palamite doctrine.

SOURCE. Tomos—PG 151:717–63.
LIT. F. Dölger, "Ein byzantinisches Staatsdokument in der Universitätsbibliothek Basel: ein Fragment des Tomos des Jahres 1351," *HistJb* 72 (1953) 205–21. A. Dold, *Das Geheimnis einer byzantinischen Staatsurkunde aus dem Jahre 1351* (Beuron 1958). Meyendorff, *Palamas* 94–101. —A.P.

CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF. The architectural monuments of Constantinople may be considered from the point of view of the following three topics: public monuments, cisterns, and walls. The principal churches and palaces are the subject of independent entries.

PUBLIC MONUMENTS. The architectural development of Constantinople may be divided into three main periods.

First Period (4th–early 7th C.). Constantinople was built as a late antique city with all the normal features of contemporary urbanism, only more magnificent. A straight avenue bordered by colonnades (EMBOLOI) was obligatory: at Constantinople this was the MESE, which ran from the arch of the Milion near the HIPPODROME to the Capitolium, a distance of 1.7 km, then as far again to the Constantinian Golden Gate. This longitudinal avenue was crossed at right angles by another (later called *emboloi tou Domninou*), with a tetrapylon at the intersection. At intervals along the main avenue were squares, or forums (see AGORA), each adorned with suitable monuments. Two of these were inherited from ancient BYZANTION, namely the Strategion, later remodeled by Theodosios I, and the TETRASTOON, which became the AUGUSTAION.

The *umbilicus* of Constantine's city consisted of a circular forum (called simply *ho Phoros*) bordered by porticoes. At its center stood a column (see COLUMNS, HONORIFIC) made of drums of porphyry and supporting a statue of the emperor wearing a radiate crown. The column is still preserved in a truncated form (Turk. Cemberlitaş). On the north side of the Phoros was the SENATE HOUSE with a porch of porphyry columns; facing it on the south was a monumental fountain (*nymphaeum*). The next forum to the west (Forum Tauri, corresponding to modern Beyazit) was laid out by Theodosios I in imitation of Trajan's Forum in Rome: it had a triumphal arch on each side (parts of the west one are preserved; see ARCH, MONUMENTAL), a basilica and, on axis, a gigantic column covered with spiral reliefs commemorating the emperor's military exploits (destroyed ca.1500).

The next two forums to the west, the Forum Bovis (*ho Bous*) and the Amastrianos, are poorly documented. Then, on the city's seventh hill (Xerolophos), was the Forum of Arkadios, with a second spirally decorated column (pedestal preserved). At the western limit of the walled city, the GOLDEN GATE (both Constantine's original and that constructed by Theodosios II farther west) had the form of a triumphal arch; evidence indicates that the processional way linking the two gates also received a monumental treatment.

Nearly every emperor from Constantine I to Phokas commemorated his reign by erecting monuments in the capital. Beyond those already mentioned, only two survive: the so-called Column of the Goths on the Seraglio Point, which may be Constantine's, and Marcian's Column. The colossal Corinthian capital discovered in 1959 in the courtyard of the Seraglio has been linked to a column of Leo I and the Barletta Colossus (U. Peschlow in *Studien Deichmann* 1:21–33). Justinian I was glorified by a column and equestrian statue in the Augustaion; Justin II erected a column of his own in the quarter called Deuteron and started to build another one (not completed) near the baths of Zeuxippos; Phokas put up a column near the Tetrapylon. In addition to imperial monuments, several statues of pagan gods, mythological figures, philosophers, and so on were imported from other cities by Constantine and his successors and placed in public baths, forums, the Hippodrome, and elsewhere. New honorific statues of persons other than emperors were also made, the last recorded one being a statue of Niketas, cousin of Herakleios (ca.614). A monumental weathervane called the ANEMODOULION was decorated with bronze statues. These display monuments were put up for the city's adornment but also to express certain ideological messages (e.g., imperial victory, the wisdom of the senate, etc.) and to provide an appropriate setting for ceremonial occasions.

Public buildings of an ornate character included the two Senate Houses; the BASILIKE next to the Augustaion, which appears to have been a vast stoa with a gilded roof surrounding a central courtyard; the theaters (of which little is known); the Roman amphitheater (Kynegion) and the HIPPODROME; the public BATHS, the biggest of which may have been the Constantianai (begun 345, completed 427) and which also included the Karosianai (built by Valens in 375), the Arkadianai (395), the Honorianai (412), the Helenianai, and the bath of Dagistheos (started by Anastasios I, completed by Justinian in 528) in addition to the famous baths of ZEUXIPPOS and the ancient bath of Achilles near the Strategion. The construction of baths was a favored sector of imperial munificence because of the popularity of bathing.

Also constructed in the capital during the 4th through 6th C. were the GREAT PALACE and the Hormisdas, Antiochos, and Lausos palaces. The principal churches erected in this period were St. Mary of BLACHERNAI and St. Mary at CHALKOPRATEIA, the Basilica of St. John at the STOUDIOS MONASTERY, St. POLYEUKTOS, HAGIA SOPHIA, St. IRENE, Sts. SERGIOS AND BAKCHOS, and the HOLY APOSTLES.

Second Period (7th–12th C.). The construction of display monuments ended in the early 7th C., by which time the city or, at any rate, its main

www.slavoponor.ru

avenues and squares must have resembled a vast stage set. The "dark age" that followed caused the abandonment of earlier urbanistic practices, the gradual ruination of public buildings, and a shift in popular mentality: the monuments that remained were no longer understood for what they were and assumed a mythic character. They were invested with occult power, either beneficent or maleficent, and interpreted as presages of things to come. The cryptic messages they conveyed could be decoded only by "philosophers." It is in this manner that they are interpreted in the PATRIA OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

The so-called Macedonian Renaissance brought a few instances of the collection and reuse of earlier pieces of sculpture and one recorded case of the restoration of a monument (the masonry obelisk of the Hippodrome by Constantine VII) but did not return to the monumental tradition of antiquity. The Macedonian and Komnenian dynasties, however, constituted a period of considerable construction activity, during which the MANGANA and BLACHERNAI palaces were built in Constantinople and the BRYAS palace in the suburbs. New churches and monasteries of this time include the NEA EKKLESIA, MYRELAION, LIPS MONASTERY, KALENDERHANE CAMII, and PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY.

Third Period (13th–15th C.). Following the Fourth Crusade and the period of Latin occupation of Constantinople (1204–61), during which numerous buildings were damaged or fell into disrepair, a surge of new construction occurred under Michael VIII and Andronikos II. Perhaps to symbolize his work of restoration, Michael VIII erected a group of statuary near the Church of the Holy Apostles representing the emperor offering a model of the city to St. Michael. In addition to the palace of TEKFUR SARAYI, several new monasteries and churches were built, most notably the South Church at the Lips monastery, PAMMAKARISTOS, CHORA, and the BEBAIAS ELPIDOS NUNNERY.

LIT. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon*. Janin, *CP byz.* C. Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople* (Paris 1985). Idem, "Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder," *DOP* 17 (1963) 55–75. Dagron, *CP imaginaire*. –C.M.

CISTERNS (κιστέρναι). Constantinople, with no rivers, few springs, and fast runoff of rainwater, needed reservoirs to tide the city over dry spells and lengthy sieges, when AQUEDUCTS might be threatened. Water from forests west of the city was introduced into open cisterns (total capacity approximately 900,000 cubic m [Janin, *infra* 202]) and more than 80 covered cisterns (capacity approximately 160,000 cubic m). Constantinople's daily consumption of water was about 10,000 cubic m. Most cisterns were built between the late 4th C. and early 7th C. as population burgeoned. The largest open cistern was that of Aetios (probably the eparch of the city in 419): built in 421, it measured 244 × 85 × about 14 m deep and had a capacity of between 250,000 and 300,000 cubic m. Covered cisterns included Binbirdirek (Philoxenos), whose superposed columns reached a height of 12.4 m and were set in 16 rows of 14 columns each (capacity about 40,000 cubic m), and the BASILIKE (Yerebatan Sarayı), whose 336 columns, 8 m high and set in 12 rows of 28 each, supported a chamber capable of holding approximately 78,000 cubic m.

The major cisterns, usually placed on hills, supplied water to about 40 public baths as well as monasteries and churches. The use of columns rather than the brick and cement piers used by the Romans reduced maintenance costs; IMPOST BLOCKS make an early appearance in cisterns. Hydraulic cement (*opus signinum*) lined the structures.

CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF: Cisterns. The Basilike cistern (Yerebatan Sarayı).

LIT. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon* 278–85. Janin, *CP byz.* 201–15. P. Forchheimer, J. Strzygowski, *Die byzantinischen Wasserbehälter von Konstantinopel* (Vienna 1893). –K.M.K., W.L.

WALLS. The first fortifications of Constantinople, on the land side only, were started by Constantine I and completed by Constantius II. In the reign of Theodosios II the Land Walls were extended about 1.5 km to the west so as to describe a huge arc, 6 km long, extending from the Propontis to the Golden Horn. Completed by 413 and repaired on numerous occasions (notably after the earthquakes of 447, 740, 989, etc.), they continued to protect the city throughout the Byz. period and parts of them are still standing. They consist of an inner wall 11 m high with towers at intervals of about 70–75 m, a lower outer wall also furnished with towers, and a moat. The walls are built of bonded masonry with bands of brick (five successive courses going right across the wall) alternating with bands of cut-stone facing, enclosing a core of mortared rubble. The only section of the Theodosian walls that has not survived was in the area of BLACHERNAI, where, as documented both in texts and visible remains, their original line was brought forward by Herakleios to enclose the Church of the Virgin and by Manuel I to protect the imperial palace. The Land Walls were pierced by six main gates, including the GOLDEN GATE, and a number of secondary posterns.

The Sea Walls, both along the Propontis and the Golden Horn, consist of a single line of fortifications and are today poorly preserved. They were first built in 439 and repaired many times, notably under the emperors Anastasios II and

CONSTANTINOPLE, MONUMENTS OF: Walls. Western land walls of the city, first built under Emp. Theodosios II in 412/13.

www.staropomor.ru

Theophilos. About 65 km west of Constantinople the LONG WALL was built to defend the imperial capital from attack from that direction.

LIT. A. van Millingen, *Byzantine Constantinople: The Walls of the City and Adjoining Historical Sites* (London 1899). B. Meyer-Plath, A.M. Schneider, *Die Landmauer von Konstantinopel*, vol. 2 (Berlin 1943). A.M. Schneider, "Mauern und Tore am Goldenen Horn zu Konstantinopel," *NachGött* (1950) 65–107. F. Dirimtekin, *Fetihden önce Marmara surları* (Istanbul 1953). Idem, *Fetihden önce Haliç surları* (Istanbul 1956). Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon* 286–319. –C.M.

CONSTANTINOPLE, PATRIARCHATE OF. Constantinople was one of the four major PATRIARCHATES of the eastern Mediterranean.

History. According to legend, the see of Constantinople was founded by the apostle ANDREW, who ordained a certain Stachys as the first bishop of Byzantion. However, the information concerning the first bishops of the city, including two contemporaries of Emp. Constantine I, Metrophanes and Alexander, is mostly legendary. Canon 3 of the Council of Constantinople (381) established Constantinople's place of honor in the ecclesiastical hierarchy right after Rome; nevertheless, the patriarch of Constantinople (if we can believe the statement of Sokrates [*HE* 5.8.14] that the bishop of Constantinople was already called patriarch at this time) had under his jurisdiction only the "megalopolis" and probably Thrace, whereas Pontos, Cappadocia, and Asia formed independent eparchies. Canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon (451) confirmed the precedence of Constantinople over the patriarchates of ANTIOCH and ALEXANDRIA and its jurisdiction over all of Asia Minor.

The bitter rivalry during the 5th C. between the patriarchates of Constantinople and Alexandria was a major factor—in addition to theological and cultural causes—in the controversy over MONOPHYSITISM; the papacy's support of Constantinople in this conflict contributed much to the defeat of Alexandria. In the 6th C. the political situation in Italy, which was first subordinated to the Ostrogothic kings and then conquered by the Byz. army, paved the way for Constantinopolitan supremacy; this new status was reflected in the acceptance by the bishop of Constantinople of the title "of the New Rome" and esp. ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH.

The fall of Alexandria, Antioch, and JERUSALEM to the Arabs in the 7th C. deprived these three patriarchates of political significance. The patriarch of Constantinople, however, was unable to profit from this situation and expand his role further, since he was restricted by the same factor that had previously promoted his power, that is, his proximity to the imperial throne. Meanwhile, the PAPACY, more or less emancipated from oppressive political tutelage, was slowly gaining momentum. From the 8th C. onward the popes assumed an independent attitude toward the Byz. emperors, developed further the concept of PRIMACY, and endeavored to intervene in Byz. internal affairs (ICONOCLASM, conflict between the patriarchs PHOTIOS and IGNATIOS, the TETRAGAMY OF LEO VI). Ideologically, Constantinople countered the concept of primacy with the doctrine of the PENTARCHY, the theoretical equality of the five patriarchates. For a time the patriarchate of Constantinople, taking advantage of the political power of the emperor, was able to expand its authority: it acquired jurisdiction over ILLYRICUM and southern Italy (8th C.), as well as newly converted Bulgaria (9th C.). In the 11th C., however, Roman influence started to penetrate into the Balkans, then into Syria and Palestine. Tensions between the papacy and the patriarchate of Constantinople came to a head in 1054 with the mission of Cardinal HUMBERT to the Byz. capital and his excommunication of Patr. MICHAEL I KEROULARIOS, resulting in a deep conflict between the two churches (see SCHISM).

After the Fourth Crusade in 1204 a Latin patriarchate was established in Constantinople and the Orthodox patriarchate was forced to go into exile in Nicaea. Following its restoration in 1261 the patriarchate of Constantinople never regained its former splendor. It was beset by controversies over the ARSENITES, UNION OF THE CHURCHES, and PALAMISM, which caused deep rifts among the faithful. Although its theoretical sphere of influence, which extended to Moscow, was much greater than that of the Palaiologan emperors, the patriarchs gradually lost even their authority over Slavic countries. The Serbs, for example, established an independent patriarchate at PEĆ in the mid-14th C. Nevertheless the patriarchate of Constantinople survived the political fall of the Byz. capital in 1453.

Organization and Jurisdiction of the Patriarchate. The patriarch was in theory elected by the metropolitans of his patriarchate, and only they had the power to depose him. The metropolitans, however, were entitled only to nominate a slate of three candidates from whom the emperor would select the new head of the church, and in practice the emperor had the final say in both the appointment and deposition of patriarchs. The patriarch administered the territory under his jurisdiction from his headquarters at Hagia Sophia, the GREAT CHURCH. In theory his right hand and potential successor was the SYNKELLOS; in practice the chief offices were held by the priests and deacons of Hagia Sophia—OIKONOMOS, SKEUOPHYLAX, SAKELLARIOS, CHARTOPHYLAX, KANSTRISIOS, REFERENDARIOS, etc. The metropolitans, whose number varied over the centuries (the *Corpus* of Laurent records 66 *metropoleis*), expressed their views through the COUNCILS and through the ENDEMOUSA SYNODOS. The tensions between the officials of Hagia Sophia and metropolitans (V. Tiftixoglu, *BZ* 62 [1969] 25–72) reflected the conflict between centrifugal and centripetal tendencies. The revenues of the patriarchate of Constantinople came from lands located in various parts of the empire and from donations of the imperial treasury that amounted to between 180 and 200 pounds of gold in the 11th C.

The rights of the patriarch, besides his function as the bishop of the capital, included appeal in both ecclesiastical and secular cases, the STAUROPEGION, and the interpretation and elaboration of CANON LAW. From the 5th C. onward the patriarch of Constantinople played a role in the ceremony of the imperial CORONATION, but he actually crowned the emperor only in the absence of a senior emperor. In addition, the patriarch wielded an exceptional moral authority, although the extent of his influence depended on the real balance of power between the emperor and the church, the degree of popularity of the patriarch, his connection with the monastic establishment, etc. The theory of two powers—those of the emperor and patriarch—emerges in the EPANAGOGE but did not find a consistent application in Byz. ideology: the bishops of Constantinople displayed a wide range of behavior, including cowardly subservience to a powerful ruler (ATTIKOS), fruitful collaboration with the throne (SERGIOS I, ATHANASIOS I), and bold opposition to the imperial will (MICHAEL I KEROULARIOS).

The Patriarchs, 300–1204. From the beginning of the 4th C. to 1204 there were 100 patriarchs; the average duration of a patriarchate was thus nine years. Of these patriarchs, 35 died after resigning or having been deposed and five were deposed temporarily. Data concerning the patriarchs' social and ethnic background are incomplete: at least one (Fravitas [488–89]) seems to have been a Goth and another (Niketas I [766–80]) of Slav origin; four were Italians, three came from Armenia or were of Armenian stock; three from Alexandria (all within the 4th–6th C.); six from Syria, including THEODOSIOS BORADIOTES (counted already as Armenian); one from Tarsos, one from Trebizond, five from Cappadocia, Pisidia (?), Phrygia, and Isauria, two from Cyprus, one from Aegina; approximately 12 were natives of Constantinople, even though the origin of some (e.g., CONSTANTINE III LEICHOUDES) has not been definitely established. Very few originated from the Balkans—PAUL I was from Thessalonike and MICHAEL III possibly from Anchialos.

Of the 100 patriarchs, 30 were former *hegoumenoi*, hieromonks, or simple monks. L. Bréhier (6 *CEB* 1 [Paris 1950] 223) counts 45 patriarchs of monastic background during the period 705–1204, but he evidently included men of other status in this group. The "monastic patriarchs" are unevenly distributed over time: only five in the 4th–8th C.; seven from 815 to 912; only four in the 10th C.; and 14 in the 11th and 12th C. Ten patriarchs were former bishops transferred from other sees—seven of these belong to the earlier period, 341–766; later this practice almost ceased. Another ten patriarchs were former priests. The Constantinopolitan ecclesiastical administration produced 27 patriarchs: at least four were *synkelloi*, 17 were administrators (*skeuophylakes, oikonomoi, sakellarioi*, etc.). Distribution of this category over time is also uneven: seven patriarchal officials became patriarchs in the 5th–6th C., whereas the undeveloped 4th-C. administration produced none; the 7th C. presents the highest number—ten in 607–715; only two are known from 730–80 and none in the 9th–11th C. (unless we count the monks and *synkelloi* EUTHYMIOS and Antony III [974–79] as officials). Patriarchal officials reappear in the 12th C.—six between 1111 and 1189.

Among the former laymen were two princes—Stephen, son of Leo VI, and THEOPHYLAKTOS, son of Romanos I (both within the short period

www.slaropolnopravo.com

Patriarchs of Constantinople, 381–1465

Name	*Tenure*	*Name*	*Tenure*
Nektarios	381–397	John VII Grammatikos	837?–843
John Chrysostom	398–404	Methodios	843–847
Arsakios	404–405	Ignatios	847–858
Attikos	406–425	Photios	858–867
Sisinnios I	426–427	Ignatios (2nd patr.)	867–877
Nestorios	428–431	Photios (2nd patr.)	877–886
Maximian	431–434	Stephen I	886–893
Proklos	434?–446	Antony II Kauleas	893–901
Flavian	446–449	Nicholas I Mystikos	901–907
Anatolios	449–458	Euthymios	907–912
Gennadios I	458–471	Nicholas I (2nd patr.)	912–925
Akakios	472–489	Stephen II	925–927
Fravitas	489–490	Tryphon	927–931
Euphemios	490–496	Theophylaktos	933–956
Makedonios II	496–511	Polyeuktos	956–970
Timothy I	511–518	Basil I Skamandrenos	970–974
John II Kappadokes	518–520	Antony III Stoudites	974–979
Epiphanios	520–535	Nicholas II Chrysoberges	979–991
Anthimos I	535–536	[vacancy	991–996]
Menas	536–552	Sisinnios II	996–998
Eutychios	552–565	Sergios II	1001–1019
John III Scholastikos	565–577	Eustathios	1019–1025
Eutychios (2nd patr.)	577–582	Alexios Stoudites	1025–1043
John IV Nesteutes	582–595	Michael I Keroularios	1043–1058
Kyriakos	595/6–606	Constantine III Leichoudes	1059–1063
Thomas I	607–610	John VIII Xiphilinos	1064–1075
Sergios I	610–638	Kosmas I	1075–1081
Pyrrhos	638–641	Eustratios Garidas	1081–1084
Paul II	641–653	Nicholas III Grammatikos	1084–1111
Pyrrhos (2nd patr.)	654	John IX Agapetos	1111–1134
Peter	654–666	Leo Styppeiotes	1134–1143
Thomas II	667–669	Michael II Kourkouas	1143–1146
John V	669–675	Kosmas II Attikos	1146–1147
Constantine I	675–677	Nicholas IV Mouzalon	1147–1151
Theodore I	677–679	Theodotos II	1151/2–1153/4
George I	679–686	Neophytos I	one month in 1153/4
Theodore I (2nd patr.)	686–687		
Paul III	688–694	Constantine IV Chliarenos	1154–1157
Kallinikos I	694–706	Loukas Chrysoberges	1157–1169/70
Kyros	706–712	Michael III	1170–1178
John VI	712–715	Chariton Eugeniotes	1178–1179
Germanos I	715–730	Theodosios Boradiotes	1179–1183
Anastasios	730–754	Basil II Kamateros	1183–1186
Constantine II	754–766	Niketas II Mountanes	1186–1189
Niketas I	766–780	Dositheos of Jerusalem	Feb. 1189
Paul IV	780–784	Leontios Theotokites	Feb./Mar.–Sept./Oct. 1189
Tarasios	784–806		
Nikephoros I	806–815	Dositheos of Jerusalem (2nd patr.)	1189–1191
Theodotos I Kassiteras	815–821	George II Xiphilinos	1191–1198
Antony I Kassymatas	821–837?	John X Kamateros	1198–1206

Patriarchs of Constantinople (*continued*)

Name	*Tenure*	*Name*	*Tenure*
Michael IV Autoreianos	1208–1214	Isaias	1323–1332
Theodore II Eirenikos	1214–1216	John XIV Kalekas	1334–1347
Maximos II	1216	Isidore I Boucheiras	1347–1350
Manuel I Sarantenos	1216/17–1222	Kallistos I	1350–1353
Germanos II	1223–1240	Philotheos Kokkinos	1353–1354
Methodios II	1240/1?	Kallistos I (2nd patr.)	1355–1363
Manuel II	1243/4?–1254	Philotheos Kokkinos (2nd patr.)	1364–1376
Arsenios Autoreianos	1254–1260	Makarios	1376/7–1379
Nikephoros II	1260–1261	Neilos Kerameus	1380–1388
Arsenios Autoreianos (2nd patr.)	1261–1265	Antony IV	1389–1390
Germanos III	1265–1266	Makarios (2nd patr.)	1390–1391
Joseph I	1266–1275	Antony IV (2nd patr.)	1391–1397
John XI Bekkos	1275–1282	Kallistos II Xanthopoulos	1397
Joseph I (2nd patr.)	1282–1283	Matthew I	1397–1402, 1403–1410
Gregory II of Cyprus	1283–1289		
Athanasios I	1289–1293	Euthymios II	1410–1416
John XII Kosmas	1294–1303	Joseph II	1416–1439
Athanasios I (2nd patr.)	1303–1309	Metrophanes II	1440–1443
Niphon	1310–1314	Gregory III Mammes	1443–1450?
John XIII Glykys	1315–1319	Athanasios II	1450
Gerasimos I	1320–1321	Gennadios II Scholarios	1454–1456, 1463, 1464–1465

Based on Grumel, *Chronologie* 435–37, with modifications.

of 886–956); to their numbers could be added Ignatios, but he was son of a deposed ruler and by the time of his election was a *hegoumenos*. In addition to these princes, 13 other laymen were elected: four in the 4th–6th C., only one in the 7th C., seven between 784 and 1063, and only one, Basil II Kamateros, the supporter of Andronikos I, during the final 150 years of the period.

The Patriarchs, 1204–1453. Thirty-five patriarchs ascended the throne of Constantinople during these 150 years, for an average reign of seven years. Especially after the Palaiologan restoration, service as patriarch proved to be risky. On account of the tumultuous history of the Orthodox church in this period, fully half of the patriarchs between 1261 and 1453, 14 in all, either were deposed or abdicated under pressure. Seven of these were later reinstated. Reflecting the shrunken boundaries of the empire, virtually all the patriarchs were of Greek ancestry, with the exception of Joseph II, who was Bulgarian. The vast majority of the Palaiologan patriarchs (80 percent) came from a monastic background; a number served as *hegoumenoi* or metropolitans before being selected as patriarch (F. Tinnefeld, *JOB* 36 [1986] 89–115). The only layman to become patriarch in this period was John XIII Glykys, a former *logothetes tou dromou*.

LIT. *Les regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople. I. Les actes des patriarches*, ed. V. Grumel, V. Laurent, J. Darrouzès, 6 fasc. (Paris 1972–79). Beck, *Kirche* 60–78. M. Gedeon, *Patriarchikoi pinakes* (Constantinople 1890). G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451–1204* (London 1947). Gennadios, *Historia tou oikoumenikou patriarcheiou*, vol. 1 (Athens 1953). Maxime de Sardes, *Le patriarcat oecuménique dans l'église orthodoxe* (Paris 1975). –A.K., A.M.T.

CONSTANTINOPLE, SIEGE AND FALL OF. The Ottoman sultan Mehmed II resolved as early as autumn 1451 to attack Constantinople, but officially proclaimed his intent only in Jan. 1453. By 5 Apr., he positioned an army allegedly 80,000–100,000 strong outside the land walls of Constantinople, while an armada of more than 120 ships patrolled the coastal waters. Constantine XI, with the help of the Venetian commune and other foreign allies (notably the Genoese Giovanni Giustiniani Longo), defended Constantinople with 26 warships and fewer than 7,000 fighting men. The

www.staropomen.ru

Genoese in Pera remained neutral, and schemes of Western Catholic powers to render aid were ineffective.

Mehmed opened the siege on 6 Apr., but his numerical superiority did not bring instant victory. Within a fortnight, the attackers had destroyed the outer wall in the Lykos Valley, using large cannons cast by Urbinus, a Hungarian engineer (see FIREARMS). The defenders, however, erected a stockade in front of the inner wall and repeatedly fought off enemy advances. Even Mehmed's spectacular penetration of the Golden Horn on 22 Apr. gave him no decisive advantage. Indeed, on 25 May his grand vizier, Halil Pasha, counseled retreat. Mehmed, however, persevered with a final attack on Tuesday, 29 May, about 1:30 A.M.

During the next four hours, two futile charges were made on the landward defenses. Toward dawn Mehmed dispatched the Janissaries to breach the stockade. About an hour later, Constantinople's defenses cracked at two points. A small band of Turks slipped through the unattended Kerkoporta Gate and took control of the Blachernai fortifications. Meanwhile the Janissaries breached the stockade and mounted the inner wall, near the Gate of St. Romanos (Top Kapı). By noon, most of Constantinople was conquered or had submitted; Constantine XI himself fell in battle shortly after the defenses were breached. That afternoon, Mehmed made his triumphal procession to Hagia Sophia; his troops looted the city well into the evening.

Contemporaries rationalized the *halosis* ("conquest") of 1453 with a variety of theocentric as well as secularizing explanations. Generally, the event compelled many to reject, reconsider, or refashion the traditional axioms of Byz. political and ecclesiological ideology. As a national tragedy, moreover, it evoked a series of THRENOI, or laments, expressed variously in prose, poetry, and song.

SOURCES. J.R.M. Jones, *The Siege of Constantinople 1453: Seven Contemporary Accounts* (Amsterdam 1972). *La caduta di Costantinopoli: Le testimonianze dei contemporanei*, ed. A. Pertusi, 2 vols. ([Rome-Milan] 1976). *Testi inediti e poco noti sulla caduta di Costantinopoli*, ed. A. Pertusi (Bologna 1983).
LIT. S. Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople, 1453* (Cambridge 1965). Bombaci-Shaw, *L'Impero ottomano* 348–65. M.T. Gökbilgin, *İA* 5.2:1185–99. E. Methuen, "Der Fall von Konstantinopel und der lateinische Westen," *HistZ* 237 (1983) 1–35.
–S.W.R.

CONSTANTIUS II (Κωνστάντιος), caesar (from 8 Nov. 324) and augustus (from 9 Sept. 337); born 7 Aug. 317, died Mopsoukrene, Cilicia, 3 Nov. 361. The son of CONSTANTINE I and Fausta, he was married three times, to the daughter of Julius Constantius (name unknown), to Eusebia, and to Faustina. Perhaps responsible for the murder of his rivals after Constantine I's death, Constantius was originally assigned Oriens, Pontica, Asiana, and Thrace. He became ruler of the entire empire after the overthrow of CONSTANS I and the defeat of MAGNENTIUS in 353. Constantius fought the Persians throughout his reign and waged successful campaigns against the Germans in Gaul and the Sarmatians on the middle Danube. He named GALLUS as caesar in 351 and JULIAN in 355 after the usurpation of Silvanus. Constantius was influenced by moderate ARIANISM and resisted the urging of his brothers who wanted to recall ATHANASIOS of Alexandria. Constantius tried to restore unity to the church by councils held in Ariminium and Seleukeia in 359–60, but the supporters of the HOMOOUSION remained intransigent. Constantius is remembered as a persecutor of the Orthodox. His reign was important in the development of Constantinople, whose senators were granted equality with those of Rome in 357. He was responsible for the construction of the original church of HAGIA SOPHIA; the *Chronicon Paschale* records his lavish donations at the dedication of the basilica in 360. Constantius died in Cilicia in 361 on his way to the West to deal with the usurpation of Julian. His best-known portrait is on a largitio dish now in Leningrad (*Iskusstvo Vizantii*, vol. 1, no.34).

LIT. R. Klein, *Constantius II. und die christliche Kirche* (Darmstadt 1977). C. Vogler, *Constance II et l'administration impériale* (Strasburg 1979). M. Michaels-Mudd, "The Arian Policy of Constantius II and its Impact on Church-State Relations in the Fourth-Century Roman Empire," *BS/EB* 6 (1979) 95–111.
–T.E.G.

CONSTANTIUS CHLORUS, or Marcus Flavius Valerius Constantius, augustus (305–06); born Dacia Ripensis ca.250, died York 25 July 306. A fiction of Constantinian date made him a descendant of Claudius II Gothicus (268–70). Constantius had a typical military career, becoming governor of Dacia and then, in 288, praetorian prefect to MAXIMIAN in Gaul. In response to the usurpation of Carausius and the loss of Britain as well as a part of Gaul, DIOCLETIAN proclaimed him CAESAR and member of the TETRARCHY on 1 Mar. 293. At the same time he was adopted by Maximian as part of the "Herculian Dynasty." Later in that year Constantius drove Carausius from Gaul and in 296 reunited Britain to the empire. In practice though not in theory the Western provinces were divided between Constantius and Maximian. Constantius was responsible for Britain and Gaul from his primary residence at Trier, but he campaigned regularly against German invaders south of the Rhine. Constantius was a devotee of SOL INVICTUS but apparently did not actively persecute the Christians. There is, however, no reason to credit later Christian testimony that Constantius was a Christian.

Upon the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian in 305, Constantius became senior emperor in the West and apparently added Spain to his territories. In the same year Constantius crossed over to Britain and campaigned against the Picts in the north, where his son Constantine joined him. Constantius had children by two women, first HELENA the mother of CONSTANTINE I, and later (by 289) Theodora, the stepdaughter of Maximian, with whom he had six children; one of them was named Anastasia (Resurrection), an indication of Jewish or Christian sympathy.

LIT. Barnes, *New Empire* 35–37, 60f, 125f. R. Syme, "The Ancestry of Constantine," *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1971* (1974) 237–53.
–T.E.G.

CONSTELLATIONS. The standard constellations referred to in Byz. texts are the 48 listed by Ptolemy in the *Almagest* (7.5–8.1): 21 northern constellations (Arktos mikra, Arktos megale, Drakon, Kepheus, Boötes, Stephanos boreios, Ho en gonasin [Herakles], Lyra, Ornis, Kassiopeia, Perseus, Heniochos, Ophiouchos, Ophis, Oïstos, Aetos, Delphis, Hippou protome, Hippos [Pegasos], Andromeda, and Trigonon); the 12 signs of the zodiac (Krios, Tauros, Didymoi, Karkinos, Leon, Parthenos, Chelai [Zygon], Skorpios, Toxotes, Aigokeros, Hydrochoos, and Ichthyes), and 15 southern constellations (Ketos, Orion, Potamos [Eridanos], Lagoos, Kyon, Prokyon, Argo, Hydra, Krater, Korax, Kentauros, Therion, Thymiaterion, Stephanos notios, and Ichthys notios).

Another set of constellations, however, is referred to by RHETORIOS OF EGYPT in his description of the stars that rise simultaneously with each of the 36 decans (*paranatellonta*); these and others are found in several related Byz. astrological texts (F. Boll, *Sphaera* [Leipzig 1903; rp. Hildesheim 1967] 5–294). Finally, in a calendar for sailors ascribed to a *protospatharios* and *strategos* of the Kibyrrhaiotai theme, the stars are named after the saints or religious events on whose feast days they are first visible (A. Olivieri, *CCAG* 2:214–16).

There are numerous catalogs of the individual stars that constitute the constellations. In astronomical contexts they are derivatives from the catalog in the *Almagest* (some, including lists of astrolabe stars, being transmitted through Arabic and thereby acquiring an altered nomenclature, but one that is still equivalent in meaning), while in astrological contexts, aside from the *paranatellonta* tradition mentioned above, they are derived from the associations of planets with stars found in Ptolemy's *Astrological Effects* (1, 9). The astrologers frequently confine their lists to 30 "bright stars" (P. Kunitzsch, *ZDMG* 118 [1968] 62–74).

The constellations are seldom depicted in Byz. art. The available evidence was assembled by H. Stern (*Le calendrier de 354* [Paris 1953]). A 14th-C. MS at Milan preserves unusual miniatures of the constellations (D.Pingree, *JWarb* 45 [1982] 185–92). (See also STARS.)
–D.P.

CONSUBSTANTIALITY. See HOMOOUSIOS.

CONSUL (ὕπατος), supreme magistrate of the Roman Republic. By the later empire the consulship lost its functions and the term was transformed into an honorific title. The emperors appointed two consuls each year (Justinian I, nov. 105.1); sometimes one consul was named in the West and another in the East. After completing his term the consul retained his honorific title. Election as consul was a great honor, often assumed by the emperor; it required enormous financial resources since the consul was obliged to arrange a banquet, distribute consular DIPTYCHS, and—the most burdensome duty—organize public games, such as CHARIOT RACES, at the Hippodrome. Prokopios (*SH* 26.13) calculates this last expense at more than 20 kentenaria of gold, part of which was supplied by the state. The consul remained eponymous for official dating until 537

www.slaropolis.net

when the system of INDICTIONS and years of the emperor's reign was introduced, at first alongside the old system of consular dating. The last eponymous consul was Basil the Younger in 541; after him only emperors assumed the *hypateia*. The last recorded instance is Constans II in 632, but Stein (*Op. minora* 340–48) suggests the office continued to exist until the 9th C. when Leo VI, in novel 94, abolished the institution as a contradiction of the existing political structure. After this time the term HYPATOS acquired a completely different meaning.

LIT. B. Kübler, *RE* 4 (1901) 1133–38. R. Bagnall et al., *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta, Ga., 1987). Guilland, *Institutions* 2:44–67. Stein, *Op. minora* 248–53. –A.K.

CONSULARIA ITALICA. See ANNALS OF RAVENNA.

CONSULARIS (ὑπατικός), Roman title bestowed on a former CONSUL. In the 3rd C. it became customary to designate as *consularis* the governor of a province where several legions were assigned. *Consulares* were considered of higher rank than other governors (*praesides* and *correctores*); they were accorded the title of CLARISSIMUS. Among the provinces under *consulares* ca.400 were Palestina I, Phoenicia, Syria I, Cilicia I, Cyprus, Pamphylia, Hellespont, Lydia, Galatia, Bithynia, Europa, Thrace, Macedonia, Dacia Mediterranea, Crete, and Pannonia. By the 6th C. Pannonia was removed from this list and placed under a *praeses*, while several other provinces became consular; according to HIEROKLES, they were Epirus Nova, Lycia, Caria, Pisidia, Lycaonia, Phrygia Pacatiana, Phrygia Salutaris, Cappadocia I, Helenopontus, and Arabia. Justinian I's novel of 535 gives a different list, however. The term *hypatikos* appears on some seals, for example, a 7th-C. seal with a Latin legend (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.1197). The title was abandoned when the Roman provincial administration gave way to the new system of THEMES. The equivalent term *proconsul* was translated as ANTHYPATOS.

LIT. B. Kübler, *RE* 4 (1901) 1138–42. –A.K.

CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE. See VITA CONTEMPLATIVA.

CONTINUATIONES ISIDORIANAE anni 741 and anni 754, two closely related Latin chronicles compiled in Spain after the Islamic conquest, which continue the *Chronicle* of ISIDORE OF SEVILLE. They derive from an eastern Mediterranean original that may have been written in Greek by a Monophysite author; their treatment of Arab, Byz., and Visigothic affairs from HERAKLEIOS on favors the Umayyads. On the Byz.-Arab conflict they show points of contact with the *Breviarium* of Patr. NIKEPHOROS I and the *Chronographia* of THEOPHANES THE CONFESSOR (C.E. Dubler, *Al-Andalus* 11 [1946] 283–349). The *Continuatio Isidoriana* [*Byzantia-Arabica*] *anni 741* treats events down to LEO III, while the *Continuatio Isidoriana Hispana anni 754*, which repeats and alters much of the material in the first continuation, adds considerable material about the VISIGOTHS and reaches the revolt of ARTABASDOS against CONSTANTINE V and the death of Caliph Marwān II.

ED. T. Mommsen, MGH *AuctAnt* 11:332–68. *Crónica mozárabe de 754*, ed. J.E. López Pereira (Saragossa 1980), rev. G.V. Sumner, *Emerita* 49 (1981) 61–64.

LIT. J.E. López Pereira, *Estudio crítico sobre la Crónica mozárabe de 754* (Saragossa 1980). –M.McC.

CONTORNIATE (from It. *contorno*, "rim"), the name given since the 18th C. to the large copper-alloy coinlike objects, approximately 5 cms. in diameter, manufactured in some quantity at Rome between the middle of the 4th C. and the last quarter of the 5th, although certainly not products of the official mint. They have on one side the head of an emperor, usually of the 1st or 2nd C., or of some well-known literary or historical figure (e.g., Homer, Alexander the Great), and on the other a representation of a mythical or historical event or of a scene from the circus or public life. Their name derives from the deep groove that always marks their edge, but the purpose of this, as indeed of the objects themselves, is unknown. Because their designs are conspicuously pagan, Alföldi has argued that contorniates were propaganda medalets issued in connection with the public games by the senatorial aristocracy of Rome. They are of special interest to art historians through the contrast between their simplified iconography and the more sophisticated treatment of artistic themes on the gold and ivory objects apparently produced for members of the same senatorial classes. The contorniates often bear, as a countermark, the letters PEL in monogram form, probably for *palma et laurus*, signifying victory in the games.

LIT. A. Alföldi, *Die Kontorniaten* (Budapest 1943). A. and E. Alföldi, assisted by C.L. Clay, *Die Kontorniat-Medaillons*, pt.1: *Katalog* (Berlin 1976). H.-I. Marrou, "*Palma et laurus*," MEFR 58 (1941–6) 109–31. –Ph.G.

CONTRACEPTION. The use of contraception was condemned by church fathers. The *Penitential* ascribed to JOHN IV NESTEUTES considers it a form of infanticide, categorizing several kinds of birth control: application of an ointment ([?] *trimmata*) that is perceived as the least heinous; drinking a potion (*pharmakon*); and the worst—the use of herbs to induce ABORTION (PG 88:1904C). Another text attributed to the same author (col.1924A) required sinners to confess their desire to remain childless, induce an abortion, or use contraceptive herbs. John Chrysostom calls the use of contraception "a murder before birth" (PG 60:626.50–51) and views it as harmful not only because it prevents procreation but also because it leads to involvement in contraceptive magic and idolatry (ibid., 627.6–8). The practice of contraception was usually limited to prostitutes and to women tempted to break their vows of chastity or of marital fidelity. Married couples, however, sometimes abstained from or restricted sexual intercourse after having produced a child or two. EPIPHANIOS of Cyprus (*Panarion* 26.5.2–6) describes with indignation (and evidently with strong exaggeration) the habits of heretical Gnostics who did not wish to bear children but fornicated for the sake of pleasure, using *coitus interruptus* or abortion as a means of contraception; they are even reported to have ground up the embryo in a mortar, mixed it with honey, pepper, and other spices, and to have eaten it at their loathsome assemblies.

Byz. medical writers, esp. PAUL OF AEGINA in the 7th C., transmitted the theories and techniques of contraception outlined by the 2nd-C. *Gynaikeia* of Soranos, which recommended vaginal wool suppositories and the application of olive oil, honey, cedar resin, alum, balsam gum, or white lead to prevent sperm from passing into the uterus. Paul, however, provided only one herbal contraception recipe, whereas DIOSKORIDES had 20. In the 6th C. AETIOS OF AMIDA recommended magical protection, such as wearing an AMULET of cat's liver or a womb of a lioness in an ivory tube.

LIT. E. Patlagean, "Birth Control in the Early Byzantine Empire," in *Biology of Man in History*, ed. R. Foster, O. Ranum (Baltimore 1975) 1–22. K. Hopkins, "Contraception in the Roman Empire," *Comparative Studies of Society and History* 8 (1965–66) 124–51. J.T. Noonan, Jr., *Contraception: A History of its Treatment by the Catholic Theologians and Canonists*[2] (Cambridge, Mass.–London 1986) 13–19, 78f, 83–85. –J.H., A.K.

CONTRACT. In the first half of the 4th C. the late Roman state eliminated earlier Roman formulary procedure (*Cod. Just.* II 57.1 of 342) and in its place brought into general use the previously "extraordinary procedure": the examination of judicial matters by public officials (*cognitio extra ordinem*). Over the following two centuries this developed into a written procedure (libel suit) that endured in its main features until the fall of Byz. The consequence of this process was that ACTIONS lost their function and were severed from OBLIGATIONS, whereupon obligations were freed from the constraint of a certain typology. By making the STIPULATION a written act and thereby making all PACTA equal with the contract obligation, there arose a new, unitary conception of *contractus* (*synallagma*), for which the older forms of establishment (*consensus*, *verba*, *res*, *litterae*) no longer played any role, despite their repeated mention in the sources.

Instead, the specification of the contract as oral or written, being of particular procedural importance, became decisive. Consequently, from the time of Justinian I the tendency increases of requiring a written form for important transactions (DOWRY, SURETYSHIP, DIALYSIS, etc.); Leo VI only ordained what had long been the case when he asserted the binding force of every written agreement (*Nov. Leo VI* 72). At the same time the oral contract remained valid and in use, esp. in the area of everyday buying and selling, but also as a transaction with witnesses. Limits on what could be contained in a contract were determined by possible violations of moral standards and numerous legal prohibitions (concerning minors, rights of preemption, prohibitions against alienation, etc.). Breach of contract led to sentences requiring payment or compensation (in kind or monetary), which were assigned case by case with considerable flexibility. –D.S.

www.staropomor.ru

Types of Contract. Roman and Byz. law distinguished various types of contract. The first group formed "real" contracts, that is, loan, *commodatum*, deposit, and *pignus*; stipulation was the main form of the oral contract; consensual contracts included sale, contracts of letting or hiring a thing, service contracts (contracts for paid labor—see MISTHOSIS), partnership, and *mandatum*.

Extant Contracts. Multiple late Roman and Byz. contracts survived in original form and in contemporary copies. From the earlier period those are primarily on both Greek and Latin papyri (see RAVENNA PAPYRI); from the later period are extant certain contracts (mainly purchase deeds) preserved in monastic archives (Mount Athos, Lembiotissa, etc.). (See ACTS, DOCUMENTARY.)

–A.K.

CONTRITION (πένθος), in Byz. spirituality, is the remorseful heart or the gift of tears, whereby one mourns not only for one's own sins and the sins of the world, but also for the suffering of Christ. This is not a metaphor of the earthly life as "the vale of tears," but a real weeping and shedding of tears. The Byz. believer sees in the beatitude, "Blessed are they who mourn, for they shall be comforted" (Mt 5:4), the promise of comfort obtained through tears. Accordingly, contrition must be united with unceasing prayer (e.g., the Jesus prayer characteristic of HESYCHASM) in order to advance in the spiritual life and to attain its goal, HESYCHIA. "In death, God will not reproach us if we have performed no miracles, or if we are not theologians or mystics, but most certainly will we render account to Him if we have not ceaselessly bewailed our sins" (John Klimax, PG 88:816D).

In the APOPHTHEGMATA PATRUM and in hagiography in general one often encounters the gift of tears. The Abbot Isaac, for example, sought the gift of being able to weep continuously, as did Mary under the Cross (PG 65:357B). For SYMEON THE THEOLOGIAN, in whose spirituality the experience of spiritual perception or *aisthesis* gains significance, the gift of tears is as necessary for salvation as the sacrament of baptism, for that is the baptism of the Spirit. Thus Niketas STETHATOS, in his vita of Symeon (90.7–8, *OrChrAn* 12 [1928] 124), likens Symeon's tears to the flowing waters of baptism. Symeon recommended his own practice to his monks as the ideal: daily prayer and the cultivation of a contrite heart.

LIT. I. Hausherr, *Penthos: La doctrine de la componction dans l'Orient chrétien* (Rome 1944). P.-R. Régamey, "La 'componction du coeur,' " *La Vie Spirituelle*, supp. 44 (1935–36) [1–16], [65–84]. Idem, *Portrait spirituel du chrétien* (Paris 1963) 76–116. M. Lot-Borodine, "Le mystère du 'don des larmes' dans l'Orient chrétien," *La Vie Spirituelle*, supp. 48 (1936) [65–110]. P. Adnès, *DictSpir* 9:290–95. –K.-H.U.

COOKING WARE, ceramic vessels used for the preparation and serving of food. Byz. cooking pots developed directly from traditional late Roman shapes, although one cannot exclude the possible influence of wares from the barbarian north. Most were locally produced and are difficult to date except in the most general terms. The pots were simple in design, with a flat or more commonly rounded bottom, round or vertical sides, and a simple often outturned rim on which a lid could be placed; two horizontal or vertical handles were generally added. Cooking ware was comprised of a coarse clay, normally with a liberal admixture of sand and small stones, which usually fires black; the pots were often placed directly in the fire for cooking and it is not always possible to tell if blackening came from the firing process or from use. From the 7th C. onward, cooking pots were commonly glazed on the interior with a yellow glaze that fires a dark brown. (For cooking wares made of metal, see TOOLS AND HOUSEHOLD FITTINGS.)

LIT. T.S. MacKay, "More Byzantine and Frankish Pottery from Corinth," *Hesperia* 36 (1967) 288–300.

–T.E.G.

COPTIC ART AND ARCHITECTURE, a conventional designation for the art and architecture of Christian Egypt.

Christian art in Egypt derived from late Roman provincial art and was fully dependent upon the Graeco-Roman traditions developed along the Mediterranean littoral. Once Constantinople had become securely established as the cultural center of the empire, however, its influence in Egypt increased: in ALEXANDRIA, the seat of Byz. civic and military administration and a center of Hellenic culture from the time of its foundation, artistic developments in Constantinople were introduced early and rapidly displaced local traditions.

The earliest surely datable churches are the transept basilica of HERMOPOLIS MAGNA and the church of the Dayr Anbā Shinūda (the so-called White Monastery) near SOHAG (both first half of the 5th C.). Most of the remaining churches belong to the 6th and 7th C., while those in Old Cairo do not date from earlier than the last decade of the 7th C. For the most part these churches are conventional three-aisled basilicas, but they have an aisle across the west end (the so-called "return aisle," not to be confused with a narthex), a distinctive feature originating in Ptolemaic and Roman cemetery architecture. Few churches have an atrium. The east end is normally straight, since the apse is usually flanked by PASTOPHORIA. A good number, however, have a triconch sanctuary (Sohag, Dendera, and the Monastery of the Syrians in WĀDĪ NAṬRŪN), and a secondary triumphal arch before the entrance into the triconch; from the spatial division this arch caused in front of the sanctuary was to develop the *khūruṣ* (choir, from Gr. *choros*) of the early medieval Egyptian church (e.g., SAQQĀRA). Exceptions to the simple basilican plan are the transept basilicas at Hermopolis Magna, ABŪ MĪNĀ, and Marea, and the two tetraconch churches at Abū Mīnā; these plans were evidently imported from abroad.

The churches at monastic sites are usually rather simple (Sohag is an exception, and the two five-aisled basilicas of the Pachomian monastery at PBOW are impressive only for their size). Each form of monasticism in Egypt developed its own particular type of accommodation: while anachoretes lived in small separate houses containing individual sleeping rooms, oratories, and kitchens (as at KELLIA), cenobites were accommodated in larger lodging-houses, occasionally in common dormitories (e.g., Dayr al-Balāyza).

Great quantities of architectural sculpture, such as friezes, niche-heads, and capitals, have been found in BAWĪṬ and Saqqāra (most now housed in the Coptic Museum in Cairo). Stylistically these pieces are dependent on artistic developments in Constantinople: even the interlaced foliage friezes considered peculiar to Egypt derive from East Roman acanthus branches. Only the form of the door-lintel shows a continuation of Pharaonic design. Spolia were used extensively, and by the end of the 8th C. local production of stone architectural sculpture seems to have come to an end. Figural sculpture found particularly in AKHNĀS and OXYRHYNCHUS appears mainly in sepulchral contexts, incorporated into an architectural framework in the form of stelae or niche-heads. Pagan themes are common in works of the 4th and 5th C.; in the 6th and 7th C. the figures are completely surrounded by ornament.

A few wall paintings have survived in catacombs and ecclesiastical buildings; these show the influence of Alexandria. In churches and monastic buildings somewhat later in date than the catacombs, there are frontally posed representations of saints and important figures of Egyptian monasticism. Even the images of Daniel in the Lions' Den, the Holy Rider, or St. MENAS between two camels are more iconic than narrative in character. Compositions in the niches of the little chapels at Bawīṭ and Saqqāra are often of high quality, and most echo large-scale models. Though the famous Egyptian mummy portraits belong entirely to the pagan period, their encaustic technique was adapted in early Christian ICON painting. The portrait of APA ABRAHAM, bishop of Hermonthis, in the Louvre (ca.600) follows Byz. models such as the icon of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos from Sinai, now in Kiev (Weitzmann, *Sinai Icons*, B.9).

Many early Coptic TEXTILES have survived, thanks to the dry climate of Egypt. Though figural motifs of pagan origin were still in use even in the Christian period, these textiles are decorated primarily with ornamental motifs. Egyptian pottery, which is relatively mediocre because of the poor quality of the local clay, follows late Roman types known from the Mediterranean littoral. Many painted bowls have been found dating from the 5th and 6th C. Of much higher standard are the Egyptian works in IVORY; the majority of these was produced in Alexandrian workshops and had considerable artistic value even outside of Egypt.

The patrons of Christian art during the 5th and 6th C. in Egypt were mostly local magnates of hellenized Egyptian or partly Greek origin; they were continuously receptive to new developments in Constantinople and lent Coptic art its simultaneously classicizing and Christian character. The art from monastic sites shares this blend of clas-

www.staroobrjadtsy.ru

sical and Christian elements, though it is executed in materials more modest than those used in the opulent city cemeteries.

LIT. P. du Bourguet, *The Art of the Copts* (New York 1967). L.-A. Hunt, "Coptic Art," *DMA* 3:585–93. H.-G. Severin, "Frühchristliche Skulptur und Malerei in Ägypten," *Propyläen Kunstgeschichte*, supp. 1 (Berlin 1977) 243–53. *Beyond the Pharaohs: Egypt and the Copts in the 2nd to 7th Centuries A.D.*, ed. F.D. Friedman (Providence, R.I., 1989). –P.G.

COPTIC LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. Coptic is the latest stage of the Egyptian language, written in the Greek alphabet plus seven signs derived from demotic. Originally five major dialects—Sahidic, Bohairic, Fayyūmic, Akhmimic, and Lycopolitan (Subakhmimic)—were recognized; modern scholarship has detected several more idiolects (R. Kasser, *Muséon* 93 [1980] 53–112, 237–97; 94 [1981] 91–152). Beginning with 3rd-C. horoscopes, Coptic became the language of Christian EGYPT, attaining classic literary status by the 5th C. in the writings of SHENOUTE. From early versions of the Bible and the liturgy, Coptic writings came to include homilies, hagiography, biblical commentary, panegyric and apocalyptic, both translations from Greek and Syriac and original productions by Egyptian writers. However, not much original theological writing survives. The rich Gnostic literature found at NAG HAMMADI and elsewhere was written partly in Coptic. The extent to which Coptic was part of the bilingual society of Byz. Egypt is seen in the enormous volume of Coptic financial and legal documents and letters, as well as inscriptions, surviving from the period of Byz. control and down to the 9th C. The immediate post-conquest period produced more hagiography, hymnody, and lectionary texts. Coptic persisted among the Christian community after the Arab conquest but was inexplicably moribund by the 11th C. A little survives, memorized but uncomprehended, in the present-day liturgy of the Coptic church.

LIT. T.O. Lambdin, *Introduction to Sahidic Coptic* (Atlanta 1983). W.E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford 1939). W. Vycichl, R. Kasser, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte* (Louvain 1983). H.J. Polotsky, *Études de syntaxe copte* (Cairo 1944). Idem, *Collected Papers* (Jerusalem 1971). A. Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories* (Rome 1986). T. Orlandi in *Roots of Egypt. Christ.* 51–81. A.A. Schiller, "A Checklist of Coptic Documents and Letters," *BASP* 13 (1976) 99–123. W. Kammerer, *A Coptic Bibliography* (Ann Arbor 1950), continued by T. Orlandi, *Bibliografia copta* (Rome yearly). –L.S.B.MacC.

COPTS, the name, derived from Greek *Aigyptioi* via the Arabic *Qibt*, of the autochthonous Christians of Egypt, descendants of the population of Pharaonic times; since the 5th C., they have been adherents to a non-Chalcedonian church later termed "Coptic Orthodox." The term "Copts" is really an anachronism for the Byz. period but serves to designate those who used COPTIC as their principal language (or bilingually with Greek) and as a major vehicle of culture, thought, and theology. As a label "Copt" does not carry an automatic class or confessional connotation. A Copt was not necessarily a peasant, an Upper Egyptian (as opposed to an Alexandrian), or a Monophysite; ATHANASIOS and CYRIL of Alexandria were Copts as were PACHOMIOS and SHENOUTE. The Copts constituted a culturally vigorous and creative ethnic group within the empire, producing highly original visual art and abundant literature; the submergence of their language and culture after the Muslim conquest has not been explained. Some eight million Copts survive in Egypt today; large diaspora communities live in North America and Europe.

LIT. A. Bowman, *Egypt after the Pharaohs* (Berkeley 1986). *Beyond the Pharaohs: Egypt and the Copts, 2nd–7th Centuries A.D.*, ed. F.D. Friedman (Providence 1989). *The Coptic Encyclopaedia*, ed. A.S. Atiya (New York 1990–). *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, ed. B. Pearson, J. Goehring (Philadelphia 1986). –L.S.B.MacC.

COPY, OFFICIAL (*ἴσον*). Major CHANCERIES kept RECORDS of outgoing documents and could provide official copies of them. In the imperial chancery copies were identical to the originals but lacked the emperor's signature (and eventually replaced the gold seal by a lead one). The patriarchal chancery produced excerpts of the synod's minutes signed by the CHARTOPHYLAX or copies of documents signed by him and his NOTARIES. Lay administrations had similar practices. Certified copies of all documents could also be delivered by bishops or other public officials, who signed at the bottom or on the verso. These copies could be used instead of the originals even in tribunals (at least from the 10th C. onward) as Byz. had broken with the Roman tradition of banning copies as evidence.

For reasons of security, individuals or institutions (e.g., monasteries) had their archival documents copied on *kontakia* (long rolls of parchment or paper) or in volumes (see KODIX) that constituted chartularies (such as those of NEA MONE OF CHIOS, of St. John Prodromos on Mt. MENOIKEION, of MAKRINITISSA on Pelion, of Hiera/Xerochoraphion and of Latmos near Miletos, of Lembos [LEMBIOTISSA] near Smyrna, of VAZELON in the Pontos, etc.). Only some were certified by a superior authority, but all may have been seen as having some probatory value.

LIT. Dölger-Karayannopulos, *Urkundenlehre* 129–34. Darrouzès, *Offikia* 517–25. I. Medvedev, "Vizantijskie i postvizantijskie kopijnye knigi," *Vspomogatel'nye istoričeskie disciplíny* 6 (Leningrad 1974) 307–18. –N.O.

CORBEL, a stone projecting from the face of a wall and used as a support; a series of brick courses progressively stepped forward above one another for the same purpose. Corbels, sometimes elaborately carved, provide footing for roof beams (as at QALB LAWZAH), for projecting balconies (A.N. Popov, *VizVrem* 28 [1968] 192–94), for the columns of decorative blind arcades, or for elaborate projecting cornices. A series of corbels supporting small arches at the top of a wall creates a corbel-table frieze. –W.L.

CORDOBA (Lat. Corduba), capital of the Roman province of Baetica in southern Spain in the late 3rd and early 4th C., later replaced by Hispalis (Seville). Ossius (or Hosios), bishop of Cordoba (died 357/8), was a staunch supporter of Nicaean orthodoxy and an influential adviser of Constantine I. Little is known of the city's history in late antiquity, but it was probably an object of Vandal and Visigothic raids. In 550/1 it was attacked by Agila, king of the Visigoths; the inhabitants of Cordoba defeated him and captured the royal treasure. Justinian I used the situation as a pretext to send a small army into Spain under command of Liberios, although there is no clear evidence to indicate that Cordoba was ever directly occupied by Byz. In 572 Cordoba was seized by King Leovigild, but by 584 it was again independent and the refuge of Hermenegild, Leovigild's rebellious son. Hermenegild was betrayed and taken prisoner, and Cordoba fell to the king.

In 711 it was conquered by the Arabs and in 716 became the administrative center of al-Andalus. After several riots against the Umayyad caliph of Spain, 15,000 Muslim refugees from Cordoba, including women and children, settled (814–15) near Alexandria. In 818 they occupied Alexandria but were expelled from the city and sometime between 824 and 827 landed in CRETE. In 839–40 Emp. Theophilos sent an ambassador to Cordoba. In Sept. 947 a Byz. embassy led by the eunuch Salomon arrived in Cordoba and was received by the caliph ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III. Among the gifts brought by Salomon were a Greek MS of Dioskorides and a Latin MS of Orosius. The caliph, in response, sent to Constantinople a group of envoys headed probably by the bishop of Carthage. It is possible that this exchange of ambassadors was somehow connected with the Byz. abortive expedition against Crete in 949. Al-IDRĪSI (tr. P. Jaubert, 2:60) reported that the *qibla* of the Great Mosque at Cordoba was decorated with mosaic tesserae sent to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān by "the emperor of Constantinople."

LIT. Thompson, *Goths* 320–34. R.C. Knapp, *Roman Cordoba* (Berkeley 1983) 69–73. S. Keay, *Roman Spain* (Berkeley 1988) 202–17. A. Lippold, "Bischof Ossius von Cordoba und Konstantin der Grosse," *ZKirch* 92 (1981) 1–15. V. Christides, *The Conquest of Crete by the Arabs* (Athens 1984) 81–92. E. Lévi-Provençal, "Un échange d'ambassades entre Cordoue et Byzance au IXe siècle," *Byzantion* 12 (1937) 1–24. Vasiliev, *Byz. Arabes* 2:324–31. –R.B.H., A.C.

CORFU. See KERKYRA.

CORINTH (*Κόρινθος*), city on the Isthmus of Corinth in the northeastern Peloponnesos; it enjoyed the protection of the powerful citadel of Acrocorinth and had harbors at Lechaion on the Gulf of Corinth and at KENCHREAI on the Saronic Gulf. The commercial and strategic location of the city made it important throughout the Byz. period.

In late antiquity it was capital of the province of ACHAIA. The city was devastated by earthquakes in 365 and 375 and by ALARIC in 396; afterward the civic center was rebuilt on a monumental scale, but a new city wall encircled only part of the ancient area (T.E. Gregory, *Hesperia* 48 [1979] 264–80). At least four churches are known in the ancient city, another on Acrocorinth and an enormous 5th-C. basilica at Lechaion (D. Pallas, *Ergon* [1961] 141–48; [1965] 105–12). From the late 6th C. Corinth declined. A tomb of the 7th C. found near the walls belonged to a warrior and contained non-Byz. objects; these finds

www.starpomor.ru

raised the question of whether the city was captured in the 7th C. (G.D. Weinberg, *Hesperia* 43 [1974] 512–21); a mutilated inscription, perhaps honoring the victory of Constans II, led to the hypothesis that he recaptured Corinth. The question of the ethnic origin of the invaders has also been discussed, although archaeology can rarely establish the ethnicity of skeletons found in tombs (K.M. Setton, *Speculum* 25 [1950] 502–43; 27 [1952] 351–62; J.H. Kent, ibid. 25 [1950] 544–46).

The primary settlement may have shifted to Acrocorinth in the 7th C. Corinth was perhaps capital of the theme of HELLAS from the late 7th C. and was capital of the theme of PELOPONNESOS from the early 9th C. Numismatic evidence suggests that the economy of the city began to recover in the 9th C. (D.M. Metcalf, *Hesperia* 41 [1973] 180–251).

The city of the 11th–12th C. differed significantly from late antique Corinth: public buildings (except churches) disappeared, streets became narrow, and the old Roman marketplace was covered by small shops. Shops also moved to colonnades along the major streets, and tombs slowly began to encroach upon the ancient civic center. From the 9th C. onward the settlement abandoned the ancient city plan, as shops, workshops, gardens, churches, and monasteries jostled one another without any apparent order. Workshops for the production of ceramics (with remains of kilns) and glass (G.R. Davidson, *AJA* 44 [1940] 297–324), as well as smithies, have been excavated. Narrative sources emphasize the existence of a flourishing silk industry in the 12th C. The city continued to function as an important harbor.

In 1147 ROGER II of Sicily attacked Corinth: the inhabitants fled to Acrocorinth, which fell as a result of the incompetence of the commander Nikephoros Chalouphes. Roger carried off both Corinthian notables and artisans (particularly the city's famed silk weavers) as well as considerable wealth, including an icon of St. Theodore. The city apparently did not fully recover from the sack of the Normans. Leo SGOUROS took Corinth in 1202.

In 1205 the Crusaders, nominally under the authority of Boniface of Montferrat, began a siege of Acrocorinth, defended by Sgouros. The attackers built a castle at Penteskouphi, but the siege dragged on until ca.1210 when Theodore Komnenos Doukas, brother of *despotes* Michael I of Epiros, gained control of Acrocorinth, presumably by treaty; the city became part of the principality of Achaia, and is termed a capitanate in the Assizes of ROMANIA. Little is known of Corinth under Frankish rule, as it was not one of the great baronies; the mint was, however, located at Corinth until it was moved to Clarence (Clarenza). The city and castle were formally surrendered to the Byz. in 1262 by WILLIAM II VILLEHARDOUIN, but the local commander refused to relinquish control. Corinth was ceded to Philip I of Taranto ca.1300 and in 1305 a great tournament was held at the Isthmus. In 1358 the city was given to Niccolò ACCIAJUOLI, who strengthened the defenses. In 1395 Theodore I Palaiologos, *despotes* of the Morea, gained control of Corinth for Byz. In 1397 he surrendered the city to the HOSPITALLERS, who held it until 1404, when they returned Corinth to Byz. control (J. Chrysostomides, *Byzantina* 7 [1975] 81–110). Around 1443 the future emperor Constantine XI appointed a certain John Kantakouzenos as governor in Corinth. The territory was ravaged by the Turks in 1446. Mehmed II attacked the city in 1458, and on 8 August the residents surrendered Acrocorinth to him.

The bishop of Corinth was metropolitan of the Peloponnesos and of the province of Achaia (L. Duchesne, *MEFR* 15 [1895] 375–78). He was present at most of the early councils; in 431 he was the only bishop from the Peloponnesos and in 680 the only representative from Greece (Mansi 11:689). In the crisis after the Slavic invasions the bishop of PATRAS contested control over the Peloponnesos with Corinth, and in the 10th C. the suffragans of Corinth were restricted to the eastern Peloponnesos and the Ionian Islands (*Notitiae CP* 7.488–95, 9.371–99).

There was a sizable monastery of St. John in the area of the ancient center, and literary sources and seals refer to an important Church of St. Theodore whose site has not been identified. None of the Byz. churches of Corinth has survived intact. The fortifications of Acrocorinth rest largely on ancient foundations, but many sections of Byz. masonry, probably of the 6th–7th C., can be seen, esp. along the inner western wall.

LIT. J.H. Finley, "Corinth in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 7 (1932) 477–99. R. Scranton, *Medieval Architecture in the Central Area of Corinth* (Princeton 1957). R. Carpenter, A. Bon, *The Defenses of Acrocorinth and the Lower Town* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936). M.S. Kodroses, *Symbole sten historia kai topographia tes perioches Korinthou stous mesous chronous* (Athens 1981). T.A. Gritsopoulos, *Ekklesiastike historia kai Christianika mnemeia Korinthias*, vol. 1 (Athens 1973). –T.E.G.

www.staropolska.pl

CORIPPUS, more fully, Flavius Cresconius Corippus, Latin poet; died after 567. Corippus was a native of the province of Africa, where he was a small-town teacher and/or wandering poet. Probably in 549 he recited to the dignitaries of Carthage his epic poem the *Johannis*, eight books on the just-concluded war of the Byz. general John TROGLITA against the Berbers. He then disappeared from view until ca.566 when he turned up in Constantinople, celebrating in four hexameter books, with two prefaces, to the emperor and the quaestor Anastasios, respectively, the accession of JUSTIN II on 14 Nov. 565. Some scholars equip him with distinguished patrons and imperial office, but this is mere speculation. Likewise, it is hard to know how biographical or rhetorical are his complaints about old age and poverty.

Although a competent versifier with predictable classical debts, Corippus commands attention mainly as a contemporary historical source. The *Johannis* is a mine of information on African topography and Berber customs, while the panegyric on Justin is a very important source for 6th-C. ceremonial. Several of Corippus's EKPHRASEIS, notably that of Justinian I's funeral robe, ornamented with scenes of imperial TRIUMPH, seem to depend as much on artistic representations as on the poet's experience. The text thus "replaces" lost images of a critical equipoise in art history, a moment when realism was not yet dead and symbolism not yet overweening, even as it describes Justin as an emperor who is at once Roman consul and *imago Christi*.

ED. *Johannidos seu De bellis Libycis libri VIII*, ed. J. Diggle, F.R.D. Goodyear (Cambridge 1970). G.W. Shea, "The *Johannis* of Flavius Cresconius Corippus. Prolegomena and Translation" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia Univ., 1966). *In laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris*, ed. Av. Cameron (London 1976), with Eng. tr.

LIT. U.J. Stache, *Flavius Cresconius Corippus. In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris. Ein Kommentar* (Berlin 1976). B. Baldwin, "The Career of Corippus," *CQ* 28 (1978) 372–76. Av. Cameron, "The Career of Corippus Again," *CQ* 30 (1980) 534–39. Eadem, "Corippus' Iohannis: Epic of Byzantine Africa," *Liverpool Papers* 4 (1983) 167–80. Y. Moderan, "Corippe et l'occupation byzantine de l'Afrique," *AntAfr* 22 (1986) 195–212. –B.B., A.C.

CORNICE, the upper part of the ENTABLATURE of a colonnade or of a door-frame. By the 6th C., the use of cornices was extended to define architectural space by marking the level of galleries or the springing of arches, domes, and vaults. A variant on cornices of the Corinthian order appears in HAGIA SOPHIA, Constantinople, and other Justinianic monuments, with characteristic modillions decorated with acanthus leaves (L. Butler, *Ayasofya Müzesi Yıllığı* 10 [1985] 27–32). Less ambitious churches display cornices with plain *torus* or *cyma recta* profiles decorated with a wide range of acanthus leaves, palmettes, and anthemia, etc.

Simplified cornices continued to be used in domed, cross-in-square churches or Greek cross-octagons after the 9th C. Those in the church of Constantine LIPS in Constantinople have traces of gilding and color, constituting a revival of 6th-C. forms (C. Mango, E.J.W. Hawkins, *DOP* 18 [1964] 306–09). The *katholikon* of HOSIOS LOUKAS retains cornices cast in plaster, while that of DAPHNI shows champlevé cornices with colored inlay evoking *opus sectile* (Grabar, *Sculptures II*, pl.XXXIV).

LIT. Orlandos, *Palaiochr. basilike* 2:374–79. Grabar, *Sculptures I* 62–64, 103f. Grabar, *Sculptures II* 64.
–L.Ph.B.

CORON. See KORONE.

CORONATION (*στέψιμον, στεφάνωσις*), imperial accession CEREMONY (together with ACCLAMATION, ADVENTUS, SHIELD-RAISING, BANQUETS, circus spectacles, and ANOINTING), whose significance reflects that of the CROWN as imperial INSIGNIA. From the time of Julian to the 6th C., the coronation shared the imperial election's military character, as soldiers crowned the new EMPEROR with a TORQUE during his acclamation and shield-raising. From the 5th C. the patriarch of Constantinople blessed the insignia and participated in the coronation, but a constitutional interpretation of his role (P. Charanis, *Byzantina* 8 [1976] 37–46) seems unlikely (e.g., C. Tsirpanlis, *Kleronomia* 4 [1972] 63–91). It reflects, rather, the church's prestige and individual patriarchs' political stature (F. Winkelmann, *Klio* 60 [1978] 467–81). Patriarchal coronations occurred only when there was no senior emperor, a minority of cases from 450 to 1000. The shift of coronations (*De cer.* 410–33) from the HEBDOMON to the HIPPODROME in the

5th or 6th C. reflects Byz.'s changing political structure. As late as 776, Constantine VI was crowned co-emperor in the Hippodrome between ceremonies in Hagia Sophia.

The coronation of Constans II in the ambo of Hagia Sophia (641) began a long series of coronations at the Great Church and reveals imperial legitimacy's religious element, underscored by the scheduling of coronations to coincide with holy days like Christmas or Easter, and by imperial epithets like *theosteptos* or *a Deo coronatus* (G. Rösch, *Onoma basileias* [Vienna 1978] 67, 140f). The well-documented Byz. coronation of the 10th C. (*De cer.*, bk.1, ch.38, ed. Vogt 2:1–5, and Goar, *Euchologion* 726f) comprised receptions by officials and factions during a procession to Hagia Sophia; the patriarch crowned the emperor in the ambo and the audience acclaimed him; the emperor then ascended a throne to receive the officials' PROSKYNESIS. A eucharistic liturgy followed. The coronation of co-emperors was similar (*De cer.*, bk.1, ch.38, ed. Vogt 2:3.1–19), except that, like empresses, they were crowned by the senior emperor. Coronations of empresses took place in the Augustaion and at St. Stephen of Daphne (*De cer.*, bk.1, ch.40, ed. Vogt 2:11–15).

The Nicaean Empire temporarily abandoned the coronation of co-emperors and systematically added shield-raising and anointing to the ritual. The Palaiologoi restored co-emperors' coronations. Their ceremony (Kantak. 1:196.8–204.3; cf. pseudo-Kod. 252–72) began with the emperor's subscription to a profession of Orthodoxy (his first use of his title), shield-raising, and acclamation. Next, the emperor, enthroned on a wooden platform in Hagia Sophia, received the SAKKOS and diadem. Coronation was now integrated into the eucharistic liturgy during which the patriarch and church dignitaries performed the anointing in the ambo. Then the patriarch—assisted by the senior emperor if there was one—crowned the new emperor, who was acclaimed again, and the liturgy continued. A PROKYPSIS followed. Empresses were crowned by their husbands and then performed a *proskynesis* to them. Several days of festivities ensued. Commemorative coins were often issued in connection with coronation LARGESS; 9th-C. Byz. coronations customarily involved large payments to the clergy of Hagia Sophia and to the bureaucracy and army (see, e.g., McCormick, *Eternal Victory* 229).

LIT. A. Christophilopoulou, *Ekloge, anagoreusis kai stepsis tou byzantinou autokratoros* (Athens 1956). J. Nelson, "Symbols in Context: Rulers' Inauguration Rituals in Byzantium and the West in the Early Middle Ages," *SChH* 13 (1976) 97–119. –M.McC.

Representation in Art. Depictions of coronations occur on a number of different objects (ivory plaques, MS frontispieces, silver vessels, coins, wall paintings), the earliest probably being that of Basil I in the PARIS GREGORY (Omont, *Miniatures*, pl.XIX). Most depictions show the emperor or imperial couple receiving the crown from Christ, the Virgin, or an archangel. The presentation of the emperor crowned by the divine power expresses the tendency to construe the fact not only as a historical event but as an image of the emperor-Godhead relationship and the selection of the emperor by God. The images on the ivory plaques and the coins were most likely commemorative of the historical event. The coins were first issued at the time of the coronation but often continued through the reign; the ivory panels were possibly given out as gifts to court officials to celebrate the occasion. There are several ivory plaques with the theme of coronation—for example, the Moscow panel of CONSTANTINE VII being crowned by Christ. In a similar manner the imperial couple of Romanos and Eudokia is crowned by Christ on an ivory plaque in the Cabinet des Médailles in Paris, which commemorates not only the coronation of Romanos (IV?) but also his marriage to Eudokia (I. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, *DOP* 31 [1977] 305–25). A number of coronation scenes illustrated in the Madrid MS of John SKYLITZES are neither commemorative nor contemporary with the events they represent. These scenes accompany the chronicler's narrative; they vary in detail but all show the historical ceremonial by depicting the patriarch crowning the emperor or the imperial couple (Grabar-Manoussacas, *Skylitzès*, nos. 266, 328, 542).

LIT. Grabar, *L'empereur* 112–22, pls. XXIII–XXVI, XXVII.2, XXVIII.5, 6. –I.K.

CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS, the name given from the 16th C. onward to the legislative work of Justinian I. It consists of the INSTITUTES, the DIGEST, the CODEX JUSTINIANUS, and the NOVELS OF JUSTINIAN I. All four parts were taught in the LAW SCHOOLS of Berytus and Constantinople. The translations of the Latin text of the *Corpus* that were produced in both cities form the foundation of Byz. law and were incorporated into the BASILIKA and its scholia. Considerable sections of later law books—transmitted mainly through the *Basilika*—can be traced back to the *Corpus Juris Civilis*. In western Europe the *Corpus* was forgotten soon after Justinian but was rediscovered in the 11th C. In many European countries it remained the authoritative source of law into the 19th C. (see LAW, ROMAN).

ED. *Corpus iuris civilis*, ed. P. Krüger et al., 3 vols. (Berlin 1928–29; rp. 1963, 1968). Eng. tr. S.P. Scott, *The Civil Law*, 17 vols. in 7 pts. (Cincinnati 1932; rp. 1973).
LIT. Wenger, *Quellen* 562–734. –M.Th.F.

CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS, COMMENTARIES ON THE. Evaluation of the writings of Justinian I's contemporaries on the *Corpus Juris Civilis* depends on one's opinion of how the Justinianic prohibition on commentary is to be interpreted, a matter that has long been controversial. The prohibition is found in the introductory constitutions to the DIGEST: it forbids all *commentarii* and *interpretationes* except for translations (*kata podas*), summaries (*indices*), and indications of supplementary and parallel regulations (*paratitla*). The extensive legal literature produced in Justinian's time seemingly provides ample evidence that the prohibition was not observed. The possibility cannot be excluded, however, that the prohibition was not directed at that literature at all. To this end, arguments of content or of form have been adduced. Arguments based on content claim that the surviving legal literature comments on the law affirmatively and does not represent divergent points of view; only the latter were forbidden, to avoid the danger of confusion. Arguments based on form claim that this legal literature consists of "private" lecture notes, not the published commentaries of professors. Another variant of the argument based on form has been put forward by Scheltema (*infra*), who argues that it was not the production of divergent opinions that are forbidden but rather their inclusion in MSS of the *Digest*. Given that the prohibition is found only in the *Digest* (which contained the harmonized remains of the controversies of classical jurists) and given its formulation (that contradictions should be avoided), an explanation based on content is preferable. The relevance of Justinian's directive remains questionable, however, since the uncritical summing up and exegetical character of juristic writings is probably due not so much to the prohibition on commentaries as to a general professorial mentality. (See also ANTECESSORES.)

LIT. Wenger, *Quellen* 681–92. A. de Roberts, *La interpretazione del Corpus iuris in Oriente e in Occidente* (Naples 1984). N. van der Wal, *Les commentaires grecs du Code de Justinien* (Groningen 1953). Scheltema, "Kommentarverbot." –D.S.

CORRUPTION in the Roman and Byz. worlds was a means of exercising private power for the achievement of public or private purposes by exploiting the latent compliance of state and ecclesiastical officials. The system was based on a sense of community within the bureaucratic officialdom and was enhanced by the intermixture of private and public elements of administration. The system worked through favoritism (for relatives, friends, former servants or slaves, etc.); bribes, which could be official or semiofficial (grants, *sportulae*); fear; and moral pressure, sometimes effective for pious ends (e.g., the extortion of a donation for a monastery). The exploitation of subordinates also comes under this category (soldiers exploited by a *strategos*, peasants by a local landowner, etc.). The illegal acquisition of private property, a portion of state taxes, or objects belonging to the state (e.g., ropes or other parts of a ship) were widespread types of corruption and barely distinguishable from theft. The state might condone such practices and even institutionalize them (e.g., the payment of judges by litigants), but in some cases measures had to be taken to suppress dangerous excesses; thus, for instance, some emperors of the 10th C. tried to limit corruption in the form of seizure of land by the DYNATOI.

Corruption is denounced by Byz. authors of all periods. They criticized not so much the purchase of titles and offices, which was always practiced to various extents and was often considered legitimate, but rather arbitrary administrative actions motivated by personal profit. In the sources, emperors are accused of appointing the rich instead of the best or of practicing the abhorred SIMONY to increase their own revenues; public officials, of accepting kickbacks; fiscal officials, esp. the tax-farmers, of crushing the rural populations by collecting unauthorized taxes or by other fraud-

www.slaropomor.ru

ulent practices. The most famous corruption scandal is that of the KRITAI KATHOLIKOI in 1337.

LIT. R. MacMullen, *Corruption and the Decline of Rome* (New Haven 1988) 58–121. P. Veyne, "Clientèle et corruption au service de l'État: La vénalité des offices dans le Bas-Empire romain," *Annales ESC* 36 (1981) 339–60.
–A.K., N.O.

CORVÉE, compulsory, usually unpaid, day labor for the state or for one's lord. State corvées, attested since the Roman period, most commonly involved the regular or occasional obligation of local inhabitants to furnish their labor (and their animals) for maintenance of the DROMOS. Such labor—included within the terms ANGAREIA, *parangareia* (from the 11th C., services and animals provided for secondary roads), *leitourgia* ("public service"), and *douleia* ("service")—usually unremunerated, was also supplied for the building of ships (*katergoktisia, karabopoiia*), fortifications (KASTROKTISIA), and perhaps for rural and urban guard duty (*apoviglisis, vigla, paramonai*). In particular areas, certain categories of persons (clergy, bakers, some peasants and soldiers, Jews on Chios in 1049) were exempted (EXKOUSSATOI) from corvée, but this could be annulled in times of emergency (esp. due to war). Probably because of the rise of the *paroikia*, evidence of state corvée is rare after the 12th C. State officials, while traveling, demanded (legally or illegally) labor services from the peasant and urban population: accommodations, food, animals. Landlords needed special privileges to be exempted from such burdens.

The novel of Constantine VII of 935 speaks of *angareiai* demanded by DYNATOI (Zepos, *Jus* 1:209.20) and considers them a form of oppression. By the 11th C., state corvées were occasionally transferred to private landowners and burdened their dependent peasants. Documents from the 13th to 15th C. require *paroikoi* to work (with their animals) for their lords for a fixed number of days per year (ranging from 12 to 52 days, with 12 and 24 being the most common). Svoronos (in *Lavra* 4:165–68) estimates that in the early 14th C. corvées accounted for at most 20 percent of the cultivation of the domain lands of the monastery of Lavra. The commutation of corvées for cash payments, attested throughout the Byz. era, became common in the last centuries of the empire (e.g., in the cadaster of LAMPSAKOS [1218/19], a ZEUGARATOS was compelled to replace his service obligation by a payment of 4 hyperpyra).

LIT. Ostrogorsky, *Féodalité* 364–67. Litavrin, *VizObščestvo* 105f.
–M.B.

CO-SEIGNEURY. See CASAUX DE PARÇON.

COSMETICS. The production of cosmetics was often associated with that of PERFUMES AND UNGUENTS; those involved in this trade formed a guild (*Bk. of Eparch* 10.1–2). Simple cosmetics were prepared at home along with medications, unguents, concoctions to grow or dye hair, and so on, as described in various manuals (e.g., G. Litavrin, *VizVrem* 31 [1971] 249–301). Symeon SETH stated that women applied bean flour to wash their faces, and according to DIOSKORIDES, they anointed their skin with olive oil from Sikyon. Empress ZOE took a passionate interest in preparing perfume and unguents in her palace. Cosmetics—including hair dyes, skin emollients, makeup, and eye shadow—were widely used, esp. by women, to embellish their face and thus to stress their social status. The church took a negative stand toward cosmetics that was retained as late as the 15th C., when John EUGENIKOS wrote a pamphlet against women who powdered their face, painted their lips, covered their cheeks with rouge, or even blackened their eyebrows to become more attractive (S. Eustratiades, *EEBS* 8 [1931] 42–46).

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 4:375–85. Stöckle, *Zünfte* 38.
–Ap.K., A.K.

COSMOGRAPHER OF RAVENNA, anonymous Latin author of the 7th C. who compiled a book called *Cosmography*. After an introduction that divides the earth into 12 southern and 12 northern regions, he gives the geographic nomenclature of the known world: (1) a list of cities and rivers; (2) a PERIPLOUS of the Mediterranean, beginning with Ravenna; and (3) a list of islands in the various seas. The Cosmographer often draws upon the same source as the TABULA PEUTINGERIANA. He refers to many authors, patristic or otherwise, but his knowledge of ancient geographers is very questionable: he quotes only PTOLEMY, whom he confuses with a king of Egypt. Some of the authorities ("philosophers") whom he cites are imaginary, and legendary data appear side by side with reliable information. The author's goal, as he himself formulates it, is to preserve for mankind in a time of general political disturbances the memory of geographic names; he makes no attempt to order the sites in a logical fashion.

ED. *Ravennatis Anonymi Cosmographia*, ed. M. Pinder, G. Parthey (Berlin 1860; rp. Aalen 1962).
LIT. E. Schweder, *Über die Weltkarte des Kosmographen von Ravenna* (Kiel 1886). G. Funaioli, *RE* 2.R.1 (1920) 305–10. O.R. Borodin, "'Kosmografija' Ravennskogo anonima," *VizVrem* 43 (1982) 54–63. B.H. Stolte, *De cosmographie van den Anonymus Ravennas* (Zundert 1949). G. Mansuelli, "I geografi ravennati," *CorsiRav* 20 (1973) 331–42. F. Staab, "Ostrogothic Geographers at the Court of Theodoric the Great," *Viator* 7 (1976) 27–58.
–A.K.

COSMOLOGY, conventional term for the doctrine of the structure or arrangement of the COSMOS, classified by the Byz., like all knowledge of the past, as "human sciences," the presupposition of THEOLOGY as a view of ultimate unity. The starting point for Byz. cosmology was the spherical model of Aristotle, as modified by Ptolemy, in which the earth, planets, sun, and moon follow orbits within a large finite sphere. The Alexandrian theologians in general adopted this view. Origen at least knew of it and raised no objections. Clement of Alexandria used the spherical theory, for example, in the allegory of the ARK OF THE COVENANT, hinting already at a fundamental contrast with the Antiochene School, which saw the universe as a cube consisting of two tiers, HEAVEN and earth, separated by a firmament (*stereoma*) which divides the "waters above" and the "waters beneath."

These two views clashed shortly before the middle of the 6th C. The Alexandrian view was represented by John PHILOPONOS, who interpreted the first chapter of Genesis on CREATION against the background of Greek physics and astronomy. The Antiochene belief was represented by KOSMAS INDIKOPLEUSTES, who argued from the Bible and yet actually followed ideas popular in the East and, without realizing it, borrowed from the Greek tradition. For Philoponos (*De opificio mundi*, ed. Reichardt, 78.20–26, 119.1–5), Moses is the teacher of Plato; according to Kosmas, Moses received the mandate from God to oppose the spherical cosmology of the Babylonians and Greeks (*Topographia christiana*, ed. Wolska-Conus, 1:437–39, 449–51).

The antispherical trend was intensified in the 6th C. through the condemnation of Origenism. At the very least, the presupposition inherent in the spherical image of the world, that the spheres are moved by intelligent minds, was anathematized by Justinian I. This conception of cosmos, altered in various ways, generally speaking was responsible for "the popular mind-set in the Middle Ages, and apparently displaced the conception of a spherical world in the Greek world up to the time of Photios and Psellos" (Wolska, *infra* 182). Naturally, there were exceptions, as, for example, John of Damascus (*Exp. fidei* 20.9–11, 42–50, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:50–52).

More important for Byz. spirituality and mysticism is the fact that *theoria physike*, religious contemplation of the world, remained an essential element in the ascent to God. It served as the presupposition for attaining the vision of God (*theologia*), a possibility realized through perfected *praxis*. This means that the program of EVAGRIOS PONTIKOS (A. Guillaumont, *RHR* 91 [1972] 50f) was preserved in the tradition of the church, esp. through Maximos the Confessor, in spite of the tendency of Byz. spirituality to disregard the world and history in order to find God immediately (cf. HESYCHASM, PALAMISM).

LIT. W. Wolska, *La Topographie Chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustès* (Paris 1962). H.U. von Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie, Das Weltbild Maximus' des Bekenners*[2] (Einsiedeln 1961). A. Delatte, "Un manuel byzantin de cosmologie et de géographie," *BAcBelg* 18 (1932) 189–222.
–K.-H.U.

COSMOS (κόσμος, lit. "world"). The fundamental Greek world view emphasized the unity, harmony, and beauty of reality. In the Platonic tradition, the perceptible cosmos is conceived as an image of the world of noetic ideas in the divine INTELLECT, composed of preexistent matter. Christian tradition, in contrast, developed its notion of CREATION "out of nothing," without reducing the cosmos to "the world of man" (a tendency observed in late antiquity); it did not view the cosmos as fundamentally evil, as did GNOSTICISM. The cosmos was seen in a more external, material, eschatologically or ontologically transient character, in contrast to the inner, spiritual, eternal life yet to come. Inasmuch as the cosmos was conceived as a universe, or as the embodiment of all things, the use of a holistic model suggests itself to conceptualize the cosmos as analogous to

www.staropomor.ru

an organism possessing the attributes of a "World-soul." The problem for Byz. authors who sought to preserve the holistic model consisted in excluding the notion of a World-soul ("neither divine nor rational"), and particularly in rejecting the doctrine of the World-soul as a third hypostasis, advocated by "the most eminent of the pagan theologians" (JOHN ITALOS, *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, pars. 42.6, 68.1, ed. P. Joannou, pp. 52.27, 109.21–22), while maintaining, on principle, an organized totality. –K.-H.U.

Representation in Art. In art the cosmos was depicted as a complex involving PARADISE and its rivers, Earth shown as a mountain below the firmament (*stereoma*) and surrounded by Ocean; the cosmos is represented as a many-leveled structure, as well as planimetrically, in MSS of KOSMAS INDIKOPLEUSTES. From the 14th C. onward "Kosmos" is identified as a personification in images of the PENTECOST. (See also COSMOLOGY.) –A.C.

LIT. K. Reinhardt, *Kosmos und Sympatheia* (Munich 1926). R. Loewe, *Kosmos und Aion* (Gütersloh 1935). W. Kranz, "Kosmos," *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 2.1 (Bonn 1955) 5–113. C. Haebler, "Kosmos," ibid. 11 (1967) 101–18.

COSTUME. Byz. clothing consisted generally of several layers of loose TUNICS and mantles (CHLAMYS, HIMATION). The simplest was a knee-length belted *chiton* with short sleeves, which was worn by laborers, shepherds (including the youthful David in Psalter illustrations), and children. Slightly more formal dress was a full-length tunic adorned in the early period with stripes or CLAVI and square ornaments at specified places; later tunics had tight sleeves and an embroidered hem and collar. This was the usual costume for ordinary city dwellers or provincial dignitaries. Over this could be thrown a mantle, whose form varied with the sex and social status of the wearer. TROUSERS, a Germanic and Eastern fashion, are rarely depicted in art, but texts suggest that they were worn, at least occasionally, by the 12th C.; men also wore tight leather hose. Hats (see HEADGEAR) did not flourish until well into the 11th C. For FOOTWEAR, men wore boots reaching to mid-calf rather than sandals.

Though the basic elements of costume, such as tunics, cloaks, BELTS, hats, and scarves, were common to most social groups, both lay and ecclesiastical, certain versions of these garments became associated over the course of time with specific offices and titles. In fact, costume in Byz. was so strictly regulated and determined by the wearer's office, or role in society, that the distinction that we might make today between costume on the one hand, and INSIGNIA or even liturgical vestments on the other, must have been blurred. Elements of costume, both lay and ecclesiastical, were awarded to the wearer in special rituals; on rare occasions, the emperor, as a special honor to a courtier of a certain rank, might grant him the right to wear a special hat or vestment properly belonging to the rank above, but this was inconceivable to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Being divested of one's costume or forced to wear another's could have the effect of "defrocking" and be a cause of humiliation: for example, Sergios and Bakchos were deprived of their *maniakia* (see TORQUE), and the general Theophilos Erotikos was forced after the failure of his revolt to appear in the Hippodrome in women's clothes (Skyl. 429.13–17).

Imperial Costume. From the costume of a CONSUL, whose office the emperor had assumed, imperial costume derived the LOROS; this jeweled stole, his red (purple) boots or TZANGIA, and the CROWN became the most distinctive elements of the imperial wardrobe. The *loros* was worn over a silk tunic, the DIVETESION or SAKKOS, either of which may in turn have been worn over another tunic of which only the embroidered (detachable?) cuffs are visible in representations. Other garments, such as the SKARAMANGION (another form of tunic) and the *chlamys* or SAGION, were worn not only by the emperor but also by members of the court. For his coronation, the emperor wore the *divetesion*, the *chlamys*, and *tzangia* (Leo Gramm. 246.19–21). The emperor donned full military dress (see ARMOR) on campaign as well as to celebrate a triumph upon his return to the capital; on such occasions his dress differed from that of his officers only with respect to his crown and red boots.

PURPLE was the prerogative of the emperor and his relations, and of his household attendants under certain conditions. Compromises on color could be arranged for political purposes: Nikephoros III Botaneiates allowed strands of scarlet to be woven into the clothes of Constantine Doukas (whose father he had deposed as emperor), in honor of Constantine's imperial lineage (An.Komn. 1:115.22–23), and Alexios I Komnenos later restored to Constantine as caesar the right to wear shoes entirely of red.

www.staropomor.ru

Some imperial garments bore figural designs; for example, the mantle of Empress Theodora in the mosaic at S. Vitale, RAVENNA, is adorned with the figures of the Three Magi. In the 14th C. EAGLES made of pearls decorated the shoes of members of the imperial family. The imperial garments were so stiffened with gold embroidery and weighed down with gems as to render the emperor and empress virtually immobile.

Aristocratic and Court Costume. Aristocratic dress differed from ordinary lay costume in the greater number of layers involved (usually a long-sleeved tunic was covered by another looser tunic, which in turn was topped by a *chlamys*), in the greater length of the tunics, in the richness of the materials, and probably in the brightness and variety of its colors. Aristocratic costume was intrinsically valuable, not only for its SILK material, but for the large number of pearls and precious stones used to adorn the fabrics. Garments were decorated with gold embroidery along the hems, around the upper arm, and at the cuffs: rows of pearls also outlined the various sections of the garment, and collars were studded with gems. In fact, it is hard to determine whether these collars should properly be considered pieces of JEWELRY or parts of actual garments. The higher the official, the more gems on his clothing and the less his freedom of movement. Some court robes were adorned with lions or pictures of the emperor as well as the more usual floral patterns.

At court, Oriental garments were much in vogue from at least the 9th C. onward (N.P. Kondakov, *Byzantion* 1 [1924] 7–49): courtiers adopted a wide variety of long silk caftanlike garments (e.g., KABBADION), belted and highly patterned, as well as exotic headgear. Sources that indicate the names of these garments, if not their actual appearance, are the *Kletorologion* of PHILOTHEOS (late 9th C.), DE CEREMONIIS (10th C.), and pseudo-KODINOS (14th C.). The color of the costume was of paramount importance, far more so than the pattern of its fabric: courtiers were lined up in processions by color, and sometimes only the color of their shoes, for example, served to distinguish the dress of two officials of differing rank.

Monastic and Ecclesiastical Costume. The monastic habit (see SCHEMA), provided by the monastery usually on an annual basis, consisted of a long dark tunic of cotton or wool; the *analabos*, a sort of sleeveless vest comparable to the scapular; a dark cloak (MANDYAS); the *koukoullion*, or hood; and black slippers (*kaligia*).

Ecclesiastical vestments were again a series of tunics, mantles, and scarves, strictly determined by the rank of the wearer: the STICHARION and ORARION for a deacon; the *sticharion*, PHELONION, and EPITRACHELION for a priest; and these plus the OMOPHORION, EPIMANIKIA, and ENCHEIRION/EPIGONATION for a bishop.

Dress of Women. There seem to have been comparatively few variations in female dress. Most women wore a full-length long-sleeved tunic and the MAPHORION over a tight headdress to cover their heads. The distinction in dress between married women and NUNS was probably small: nuns, to judge by representations, wore the *maphorion* more tightly drawn about the neck, so that no part of their body was visible except face and hands. In artistic representations, maidservants, midwives, and the Samaritan woman, always a special paradigm of rural beauty, can have long unbound hair or a loose turban. Their tunics are often sleeveless, as are the tunics of various female PERSONIFICATIONS; they may wear a short knee-length tunic over a longer one. Female court attire other than that of the empress is rarely illustrated: the women dancing with Miriam in the 11th-C. Vat. Gr. 752, fol.449v (Spatharakis, *Corpus*, fig.123), wear tunics with extremely wide pointed sleeves, jeweled sashes or belts, and pillowlike headdresses. Donor PORTRAITS of the 14th C. show women in beautifully woven silk Oriental tunics like those of the men.

Nudity. The Byz. rejected the antique cult of the NUDE. In art, complete nudity is reserved for the images of Adam and Eve, for Christ in the scene of his baptism, and for figures in exile such as Job. Partial nudity is often associated with people on the fringes of society: wild-haired demoniacs, the devil, certain extreme ascetics (Onouphrios wore only palm fronds), martyrs stripped of their official robes and brought to desert places for execution, or for personifications of natural features, such as river gods.

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 2.2:5–59, 6:267–94. M.G. Houston, *Ancient Greek, Roman and Byzantine Costume and Decoration*[2] (London 1947) 131–61. A. Carr, *DMA* 3:614–16. K. Wessel, *Die Kultur von Byzanz* (Frankfurt a.M. 1970) 222–25, 411–14. J. Ebersolt, *Les arts somptuaires de Byzance* (Paris 1923). Oppenheim, *Mönchskleid*. Braun, *Liturgische Gewan-*

dung. Johnstone, *Church Embroidery* 12–19. Kazhdan-Epstein, *Change* 74–79. H. Mihăescu, "La terminologie d'origine latine des vêtements dans la littérature byzantine," in *Festschrift Stratos* 2:587–99. –N.P.Š.

COTRIGURS AND UTIGURS (Κουτρίγουροι, Οὐτίγουροι), Turkic peoples, settled in the mid-6th C. north of the Black Sea, between the Dnieper and the Don. At the request of their Gepid allies the Cotrigurs sent a large force against the Lombards in Pannonia. Urged by the Gepids, the Cotrigurs then raided Byz. territory in 551 and withdrew only when their eastern neighbors and kinsmen, the Utigurs, who lived east of the Don, were bribed by the Romans to attack their home territory. The Cotrigurs had seen the wealth of the empire, however, and realized its vulnerability to a fast-moving cavalry force. In 558/9 they crossed the frozen Danube near its mouth and advanced into Byz. territory in three columns. One swept into Greece as far as Thermopylae, the second entered the Kallipolis peninsula, and the third, commanded by ZABERGAN, approached the walls of Constantinople, where their arrival caused consternation until Belisarios drove them away. During their return they were again attacked by the Utigurs; the hostility between the Cotrigurs and the Utigurs continued until both were subdued in the 560s by the Avars, who took some of the Cotrigurs with them to Pannonia. The Utigurs then became part of the Turkic confederation that captured Bosporos (Kerch) in 576, while the rest of the Cotrigurs became part of the Bulgar confederation settled north of the Azov Sea in the mid-7th C.

LIT. Moravcsik, *Studia Byz.* 84–118. V. Beševliev, *Die protobulgarische Periode der bulgarischen Geschichte* (Amsterdam 1981) 95–99, 308–13. P.B. Golden, *Khazar Studies* (Budapest 1980) 1:30–34, 42–46. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* 1:66f. D.I. Dimitrov, *Prabŭlgarite po severnoto i zapadnoto Černomorie* (Varna 1987). –R.B.

COTTON GENESIS. See GENESIS.

COTYAEUM. See KOTYAION.

COUCHES. See FURNITURE.

COUNCILS (σύνοδοι), formal deliberative bodies of bishops and ecclesiastical representatives (priests, deacons, laymen, or monks) that gathered to discuss and regulate disputed questions of church doctrine and discipline. Such assemblies, which could be ecumenical, metropolitan, episcopal, or patriarchal, expressed the essential nature of the church as community or *koinonia*. The church was indeed conceived as synodal or conciliar in structure from the beginning. This pattern and practice of conciliarity had in fact become the rule by the 3rd C. as regional meetings of several Christian communities were convoked to discuss controversial issues, with nonparticipating churches being informed of their decisions. Presbyters, deacons, and laymen also attended, but probably only as "observers" or as advisers to the episcopal college.

Ecumenical Councils. Strictly speaking, the early church could only express its conciliar nature on a local rather than an "ecumenical" scale while Christianity was still an illegal religion. When it was recognized in the 4th C., however, universal or ecumenical councils representing—at least in theory—the entire episcopate of the empire became possible. Besides, as the church was seen as coextensive with the empire, reliable pronouncements became more urgent; exact definitions of faith were needed in order to determine imperial policy toward dissident or schismatic groups. This was clearly the primary goal of these assemblies as far as the state was concerned. Accordingly, these larger convocations, unlike the pre-Nicene councils, were given imperial confirmation and the binding force of law. Nicaea I (325), convoked by CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT, was the prototype. Seven such councils—all held in the East—were recognized by the Byz. church as genuinely ecumenical: Nicaea I, Constantinople I, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople II, Constantinople III, and Nicaea II. The eighth "ecumenical" council acknowledged by the West, the council of Constantinople of 869–70, was annulled by the union synod of 879–80. In contrast to the Byz. position, the Roman Catholic church considers as ecumenical several councils convoked by popes; four Lateran synods (1123, 1139, 1179, 1215), two councils of LYONS (1245 and 1274), Vienna of 1311, Constance (1414–18), FERRARA-FLORENCE, etc. Two of them, the Second Council of Lyons and Ferrara-Florence, deliberated problems connected with Byz. (For articles on individual councils, see under site of convocation: e.g., EPHESUS, COUNCILS OF.)

Significantly, none of the ecumenical councils was convened by a pope. The emperors, who often presided over them (either personally or through their representatives), summoned them. All, moreover, were extraordinary or occasional gatherings. This being so, the canonical literature lacked fixed rules (a typically Byz. phenomenon) concerning their convocation, composition, and organization. Byz. canon law has in fact no philosophy of ecumenical councils.

Although the emperors hoped to use the ecumenical councils as an immediate, binding authority to achieve unanimity or uniformity and cohesion throughout the empire, such councils and their decisions were not accepted mechanically in advance, as divine institutions *de jure divino*. Nicaea I, for example, was not universally acknowledged until 381, while others (SERDICA, HIERIA, the "Robber" Council of EPHESUS, Ferrara-Florence) were eventually accepted as local councils, or rejected as outright heretical *conciliabula*, even when they possessed all the criteria of ecumenicity. Their reception therefore was not based on any outward juridical notion of ecumenicity, but on the truth they embodied as authentic organs of episcopal and ecclesial consensus. It was this alone—viewed as a manifestation of Christ's abiding allegiance to his church—which eventually caused them to be recognized as binding and infallible in authority (J. Meyendorff, *SVThQ* 17 [1973] 267f). Councils quite simply were not above the church.

Metropolitan Councils. Unlike ecumenical councils, provincial (or metropolitan) councils were a permanent institutionalized phenomenon: convocations of bishops of a particular province, meeting in the provincial capital under the presidency of the METROPOLITAN, were in place before the 4th C. They met to discuss controversial issues of common concern, but also for episcopal consecrations, which required conciliarity, that is, the presence and participation of all bishops of an ecclesiastical area. Only with Nicaea I, however, were these metropolitan councils permanently established by being ordered to meet twice yearly (canon 5). This regulation was confirmed by Chalcedon (canon 19), but was subsequently changed to a single annual convocation (TRULLO, canon 8; Nicaea II, canon 6). The duties of these councils were quite extensive, covering questions of faith, liturgy, morals, discipline, and organization. Nicaea I likewise decreed that the election of a bishop to a vacant see be placed in the hands of all the neighboring bishops of the province (canon 4). These canons mark the beginning of a distinction in ecclesiastical law between different kinds of synods and are, as such, an important stage in the evolution of conciliar theory.

Episcopal Councils. The episcopal council was the official assembly of the bishop and clergy of a single bishopric (*paroikia*). It was always under the authority and presidency of the bishop and was responsible for all matters concerning the *paroikia*. This type of council was affected considerably by the new legislation; although not entirely eliminated, it was certainly superseded by the metropolitan council, henceforth viewed as the superior authority. The latter indeed became the higher court of appeal for sentences generated by the lower episcopal council (Nicaea II, canon 3).

Patriarchal Synods. The 4th C. also saw the introduction of patriarchal synods, which were councils of the individual PATRIARCHATES convoked and presided over by the patriarchs. The most important consultative body of the patriarch of Constantinople was the ENDEMOUSA SYNODOS. This was essentially a permanent "resident" synod with a continuous existence throughout the medieval period in which decisions were reached in collegiality. But regional or local patriarchal councils were also important, particularly after the 11th C. when no ecumenical councils were held because of the SCHISM. In contrast with the *endemousa*, these exceptional, more solemn assemblies held during major doctrinal disputes, included not only metropolitans and bishops, but often also the emperor and members of the senate. Their doctrinal definition (TOMOS) was sometimes included in the SYNODIKON OF ORTHODOXY, as was the case with the local councils of Constantinople of 1156–57, 1166–67, and 1351 (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF). The authority of the Byz. church was not therefore restricted to the age of the seven ecumenical councils alone; essentially, regional councils could be and were accepted as universally valid testimony of the Orthodox faith.

Time and Place. Normally circumstance and convenience determined the time and place of meeting for councils. This was the case with ecumenical councils, which had to accommodate not

www.Staropoint.com

only large numbers, but individual participants traveling long distances. Provincial councils, however, met at the capital of the province. They could also be convened "at the place where the bishop of the metropolis shall approve" (Chalcedon, canon 19; Trullo, canon 8). The actual convocation was held in a church such as Hagia Sophia, or in a building attached to the church, such as the baptistery or *diakonikon*, with the imperial residence or palace an alternative choice, as the councils held at Hieria, Blachernai, and Trullo illustrate. Often individual contingents (e.g., the Egyptian and Antiochian at Ephesus and Chalcedon) were housed in different buildings. This did not always prevent riots, bloodshed, or even separate or rump synods, which assembled in order to undermine the work of the majority or opposition (see SERDICA and EPHESUS), for quite often bishops were accompanied by sizable overzealous parties of supporters consisting of priests, monks, and laymen. It should be noted that this nonepiscopal (i.e., nonvoting) element was often invited to speak and join in the discussion.

Documents. Minutes of the deliberations were carefully recorded by secretaries, although some, such as the acts of Nicaea I and Constantinople I, have not survived. Those of the *endemousa* were kept in the *chartophylakeion* of the patriarchate. The signing of these documents was determined by seniority of ordination or by the traditional order (*taxis*) of sees. The five major sees of the empire (PENTARCHY) took precedence over all others. A priest or deacon signed if he had attended as a representative of a particular see. In addition to doctrinal definitions, disciplinary canons regulating the life of both clergy and laity were also frequently issued by councils. Often collected separately, these formed an important component of ecclesiastical law. Occasionally ANATHEMAS, EXCOMMUNICATIONS, or depositions (*kathaireseis*) directed against individuals or groups would be attached to the dogmatic decisions. Exile or imprisonment in a monastery often accompanied such ecclesiastical punishments.

Church and State. The secular power was represented in most councils, esp. ecumenical and patriarchal ones. Given the close ties between church and state in Christian Byz., this was both natural and understandable. Imperial interest in the outcome of councils was no doubt one reason the public transportation system (*cursus publicus*) was placed at the disposal of the bishops at Nicaea I; it also explains why emperors often presided over some councils (cf. MARCIAN at Chalcedon) and even took part in their deliberations. True, abuses and even compulsion were not unknown (e.g., the submission of Pope VIGILIUS to Justinian I at Constantinople II [see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF]). Despite the tension caused by such flagrant abuse of imperial power, however, the right of formal decision in matters of faith belonged to the episcopate. Indeed, the church was often successful (though not always immediately) in resisting an emperor's pressure.

Representations in Art. Surviving depictions of councils assume a form closely related to that of other images of authority such as the PENTECOST and the LAST JUDGMENT. Following Late Antique schemes such as the council of the gods in the Ambrosian *Iliad* (see HOMER) and the emperor's presidency at the games on the base of the OBELISK THEODOSIOS, they show a semicircle of hierarchs meeting as a college and supervised by the emperor as *epistemonarches*.

The earliest images of councils are known only from texts. Six councils were depicted in the MESE, in Constantinople, set up, according to the author of the Life of Stephen the Younger, to edify "country folk, foreigners, and the common people" (PG 100:1172A). By the early 8th C. such pictures were fairly common, including mosaics of the First Council of Nicaea in an unknown church in that city. Mosaics showing structures symbolizing each of the seven ecumenical councils, many reworked in the 12th C. and today fragmentarily preserved, survive in the Church of the Nativity in BETHLEHEM. After Iconoclasm, council scenes were no longer purely commemorative. In the marginal PSALTERS, Leo V appears amid Iconoclastic bishops at the Council of 815 to illustrate hypocrisy and bloodthirstiness (Ps 25:4), while Theodosios I presides over the First Council of Constantinople in a miniature in the PARIS GREGORY reflecting the concern of PHOTIOS with both Iconoclasm and the FILIOQUE. Even more central is the position given to an Iconoclast shown condemned by Nicaea II, in the MENOLOGION OF BASIL II (p.108). The Madrid MS of John Skylitzes devotes a unique series of pictures (Grabar-Manoussacas, *Skylitzès*, nos. 310–12) to the council that forced the resignation of Patr. Tryphon (927–31). Frescoes of four councils—painted as usual in the narthex—in the Metropolis at MISTRA may have liturgical significance (S. Dufrenne, *Les Programmes iconographiques des églises byzantines de Mistra* [Paris 1970] 8, 59f). The miniature in Paris, B.N. gr. 1242 (Spatharakis, *Portrait*, fig.86), that shows John VI Kantakouzenos towering over identifiable metropolitans and Patr. Kallistos I at the Council of 1351 reasserts the traditional meaning of council pictures as images of imperial hegemony in matters of doctrine.

SOURCES. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. J. Mansi, 31 vols. (Florence-Vienna 1759–98; rp. Paris 1901–27). G.A. Rhalles, M. Potles, *Syntagma ton theion kai hieron kanonon*, 6 vols. (Athens 1852–59). *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, ed. E. Schwartz, 5 vols. in 32 pts. (Berlin-Leipzig 1922–84).

LIT. J. Zhishman, *Die Synoden und die Episkopal-Ämter in der morgenländischen Kirche* (Vienna 1867). C.J. Hefele, H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, 8 vols. (Paris 1907–21). F. Dvornik, "Emperors, Popes, and General Councils," *DOP* 6 (1951) 1–23. J. Hajjar, "Patriarche et synode dans l'Église byzantine," *PrOC* 4.2 (1954) 118–44. B. Botte, H. Marat, et al., *Le concile et les conciles* (Chevetogne 1960). *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, 12 vols. (Paris 1962–). P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils* (Crestwood, N.Y., 1986). J. Boojamra, "The Byzantine Notion of the 'Ecumenical Council' in the Fourteenth Century," *BZ* 80 (1987) 59–76. C. Walter, *L'iconographie des conciles dans la tradition byzantine* (Paris 1970).

–A.P., A.C.

COURT, LAW (*δικαστήριον*). The emperor was the source of law and the supreme judge who determined the right of APPEAL and of amnesty; the power to judge was thought to be delegated by him to individual institutions or officials. All government bureaus (SEKRETA) possessed to some extent the right to condemn and pardon, and even the GENIKON had its own court; since the heads of departments frequently had no professional legal knowledge, they usually were given SYMPONOI as assistants (Balsamon in Rhalles-Potles, *Syntagma* 3:339.2–9). In the army, STRATEGOI and their subalterns exercised judicial authority. More specific judicial functions were fulfilled by the EPARCH OF THE CITY and the QUAESTOR, whereas the EPI TON DEESEON presided over petitions and appeals. As chief of police, the DROUNGARIOS TES VIGLAS had judicial duties. The imperial judges of the VELUM or Hippodrome (replaced later by the KRITAI KATHOLIKOI) constituted the highest court. In rare cases the SENATE discussed crimes of great importance. Bishops, aided by their staff, exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction extending far beyond CANON LAW, and the precise demarcation between civil and ecclesiastical courts was not always clear.

In the provinces, jurisdiction lay in the hands of the local administration, and governors frequently bore the title of JUDGE (*krites*) or PRAETOR; sometimes special magistrates arrived from Constantinople to hear local cases. Masters were considered the judges of their slaves and servants, unless they were personally involved in the case (*Peira* 51.1). The concept of judicial IMMUNITY was never very highly developed in Byz.

LIT. Zachariä, *Geschichte* 353–89. Kaser, *Zivilprozessrecht* 418–45. Oikonomides, *Listes* 319–23. A. Guillou, *La civilisation byzantine* (Paris 1974) 149–57. Macrides, "Justice" 99–204. Troianos, *Ekklesiastike Dikonomia* 7–48. Aik. Christophilopoulou, "Ta byzantina dikasteria kata tous aiones I'–IA'," *Diptycha* 4 (1986) 163–77.

–A.K.

CRAFTSMEN. See ARTISAN; GUILDS.

CREATION (*κτίσις ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος*). The classical formulation of the Christian doctrine of creation states that the COSMOS was brought into existence out of nothing through the omnipotence and free will of God. On the other hand, the divine generation (*gennesis*) of the Son and the Procession (*ekporeusis*) of the Holy Spirit, interpreted as "creation" and coming into existence by ARIANS and the PNEUMATOMACHOI, respectively, had to be distinguished from creation of world and mankind; at the same time any doctrine of emanation to explain creation had to be excluded, since it does "not stem from the essence of God" (John of Damascus, *Exp. fidei* 8.57–78, 81.6–11; ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:20f, 180).

Emphasis on the FREEDOM and contingency of divine creation runs counter to the idea of its eternality and necessity. In this connection, the question as to the motive of creation (why did God create the world?) receives an answer in which the Platonic tradition and esp. pseudo-DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE, that is, the view that the Good continuously generates out of itself, are interpreted to mean that man cannot penetrate the transcendent essence of God who alone is good (Lk 18:19). The question, then, is met by referring to this notion of the essence of the Good: that God creates because he wills to, and not because he is good, an answer that emphasizes the apophatic character of theology (and not, as

www.saroponou.gr