

ADVISORY BOARD

Oleg Grabar
Angeliki E. Laiou
John Meyendorff
Nicolas Oikonomides
Ihor Ševčenko
Speros Vryonis, Jr.

PROJECT MANAGERS

Margaret Scrymser (1988–90)
Catherine Brown Tkacz (1984–88)

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Susan Higman
Roberta Goldblatt

BIBLIOGRAPHER

Leslie S. B. MacCoul

The Oxford Dictionary of
B Y Z A N T I U M

Prepared at Dumbarton Oaks

Alexander P. Kazhdan

EDITOR IN CHIEF

Alice-Mary Talbot

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Anthony Cutler

EDITOR FOR ART HISTORY

Timothy E. Gregory

EDITOR FOR ARCHAEOLOGY
AND HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

Nancy P. Ševčenko

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

VOLUME 2

www.staropomor.ru

New York • Oxford
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1991

ESOTHYRION (ἐσωθύριον), also *enthyrion*, a (fiscal?) term designating lands situated close to the center (KATHEDRA) of a *chorion* and specifically to a (rural) church (e.g., *Docheiar.*, no.60.2). The *Treatise on Taxation* (ed. Dölger, *Beiträge* 115.28–30) makes a distinction between *esothyra* and *exothyra*, lands of a peasant located within and outside the village; as time went on, the *exothyra* were transformed into hamlets (*agridia*). Together with AUTOURGIA, *esothyra* were considered the most valuable part of a STASIS or estate. The *praktika* of the 14th and 15th C. often mention *esothyr(i)a* in peasants' holdings or use specific terms referring to gardens: *esokepion* (*Esphig.*, no.8.42), *esokepion* within the *chorion* (*Chil.*, no.92.28), a chapel with an *esokepion* (*Patmou Engrapha* 2, no.74.32–33), *esokepion* outside the *kathisma*-courtyard (*Dionys.*, no.23.7), *esoperibolion* (*Xerop.*, no.18A.60), *esoperibolion* with nut trees (*Esphig.*, no.14.127), *esokepo-peribolion* (*Esphig.*, no.14.86). There were also “inner” CHORAPHIA. The *exo*- (outer) designation seems to have been infrequent in later documents: a *praktikon* of 1284 registers “the inherited arable land of 140 *modioi* with an *exothyron*” located somewhere away from the household (*Lavra* 2, no.73.90).

LIT. Dölger, *Beiträge* 136f.

—A.K.

ESPHIGMENOU MONASTERY, late 10th-C. foundation on Mt. ATHOS. Located on the north-east coast of the peninsula, 3 km east of HILANDAR, the monastery is first mentioned in 998 when Theodore was *hegoumenos*. Its original name was Esphagmenou (“the slaughtered”), perhaps a reference to Christ, the sacrificial lamb. Esphigmenou (Ἐσφιγμένον) prospered in the 11th C., acquiring vast properties on the Athonite peninsula. At this time the monastery housed a certain number of Chalcedonian Armenians, including Theoktistos, who was *hegoumenos* in the 1030s and became *protos* of Athos ca.1035. In ca.1001 Nikophoros, a monk of Esphigmenou, was sent on an important mission to the Charsianon, where he founded a monastery and probably exercised influence on the recently annexed Caucasian lands

(A. Kazhdan, *Vestnik Erevanskogo universiteta: Obščestvennye nauki* [1974] no.3, 236–38).

The establishment reached its zenith in the 14th C., when it was an imperial cenobitic monastery housing 200 monks and owning more than 12,000 *modioi* of land, chiefly in Chalkidike and the Strymon valley. Among the monks who spent some time in residence there were ATHANASIOS (I), the late 13th-C. patriarch of Constantinople, and Gregory PALAMAS, *hegoumenos* in 1335–36, who attempted to introduce HESYCHASM into the monastery. Stefan Uroš IV Dušan issued two chrysobulls in 1346–47 confirming the monastery's titles to various properties, and granting certain tax exemptions (*Esphig.*, nos. 22–23). The history of Esphigmenou becomes obscure after the Ottomans took control of Athos in 1430.

The 31 Byz. documents preserved in the monastery's archives range in date from 1034 to ca.1409, and include early 14th-C. *praktika* that provide information on peasant households in Macedonia. The library holds more than 100 MSS of Byz. date (Lampros, *Athos* 1:170–99), the most valuable of which is an illuminated 11th-C. *menologion* with miniatures on purple parchment (*Treasures* 2, figs. 327–408). The treasury contains a mosaic icon of the 14th C., depicting the blessing Christ (Furlan, *Icone a mosaico*, no.35).

SOURCE. *Actes d'Esphigmenou*, ed. J. Lefort (Paris 1973).

LIT. *Treasures* 2:200–55, 361–85. D. Anastasievič, “Esfigmenskie akty carja Dušana,” *SemKond* 10 (1938) 57–68.

—A.M.T., A.C.

ESQUILINE TREASURE, a hoard of mostly domestic objects made in the 4th C., unearthed on the Esquiline Hill in Rome in 1793. The precise contents of the treasure are a matter of dispute as no inventory was made at the time of its discovery. Shelton (*infra*) demonstrated that of the 61 objects eventually associated with the treasure only 31 can definitely be documented as part of the original hoard; 27 pieces now remain, most of which are in the British Museum. Authenticated items include one bronze ewer and 30 silver objects: nine monogrammed dinner plates (one now missing), a bowl, a flask, the elements of a CHERNIBOXESTON set, two caskets, six furniture

ornaments (= four TYCHES of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome; a Pair of Hands), and six horse trappings. Of the documented objects, in addition to the missing silver plate, a lamp, lampstand, and a second plate have also been lost.

The quality and nature of the objects, which included dinner and toilet articles as well as insignia of office (the Tyches and Hands), indicate that the treasure belonged to a family of high standing. The mixture of pagan imagery and Christian inscriptions is characteristic of the Late Antique period in general. A date of 379–83 for the manufacture of the objects and for their role as wedding gifts was originally hypothesized on the basis of inscriptions on the silver. The names of Secundus and Projecta appear on one casket. Monograms on the plates were deciphered as those of Turcius Secundus, supposedly a member of the *gens* Turcia prominent in 4th- to 5th-C. Rome, and of his wife Projecta Turcii. The latter was in turn considered to be the Projecta, aged 16, whose epitaph was composed by Pope Damasus (366–84). Shelton challenged these identifications and datings, suggesting instead that the treasure was made over a period of years 330–70 for several members of the Turcius household.

LIT. K.J. Shelton, *The Esquiline Treasure* (London 1981). Eadem, "The Esquiline Treasure: The Nature of the Evidence," *AJA* 89 (1985) 147–55. Al. Cameron, "The Date and the Owners of the Esquiline Treasure," *ibid.*, 135–45. —M.M.M.

ESTATE. In Byz. various terms, often of periphrastic character, were used to denote the estate: *agros* (field), *oikos* (house), *ktemata* (properties), *proasteion* (suburb), *zeugelateion* (lit. "driving a yoke of oxen"); a monastic estate provided with a chapel was called a *metochion*. An estate usually included a mansion, *demesne* land, and lands worked by tenants as well as hilly pastures. Within the estate, the Byz. distinguished the *enthyria* or *esothyra*, located close to its nucleus, from the remote *exothyra* (*Treatise on Taxation*, ed. Dölger, *Beiträge* 115.24–33); they also distinguished *autourgia* as the most profitable portions of the estate. Balsamon (Rhalles-Potles, *Syntagma* 2:595.4–18) describes salt-pans, olive groves, vineyards, meadows, watermills, and pottery workshops as *autourgia*; he acknowledges the flexibility of the concept, since an *autourgion* could cease to produce income, while an *exochoron proasteion* could

become profitable. In documents vineyards (L. Petit, *IRAİK* 6 [1900] 29.26–27), watermills (*Lavra* 2, no.105.24), *vivarja*, and the enigmatic *aulakia* and *gripobolia* (*Lavra* 2, no.104.177–8) were considered *autourgia*.

An estate usually did not coincide with the *village* but occupied a part of it, while the other part of the village either belonged to the *village community* or formed another estate: thus, in the village of Gradec in 1300, one landlord held 26 peasant households, a collective of owners had 19, one man had eight, another seven, and three lords possessed one household each. Estates could form a complex outside the village or comprise dispersed tenures in different villages.

Estates of the late 4th–5th C.—complete with *villas*, pasturage, and orchards—are represented in contemporary floor mosaics (Dunbabin, *Mosaics* 122, figs. 111–13), but Byz. equivalents are unknown.

LIT. Kazhdan, *Agrarnye otnošenija* 64–72. J. Lefort, "Radolbos: Population et paysage," *TM* 9 (1985) 195–234. Dölger, *Beiträge* 136f, 151. P. Gounaridis, "L'exploitation direct de la terre par l'État de Nicée (1204–61). Le zeugelateion," *Ho agrotikos kosmos ston Mesogeiaiko choro* (Athens 1988) 619–26. —A.K., A.C.

ESTOIRE D'ERACLES, traditional title of the works of a group of French historians of the Crusades, comprising the translation of WILLIAM OF TYRE made in France in 1220–23 and various vernacular continuations of widely varying value and origin. The name derives from the opening words' reference to Emp. Herakleios in connection with the rise of Islam. The discrepancies and elaborations of the French translation with respect to William's original Latin seem to have no independent historical value (Morgan, *infra* [1973] 185–87). Several of the continuations are extremely valuable, particularly that for the years 1184–97, which derives from the lost Holy Land chronicle of Ernoul (presumably Ernoul de Gibelet, associate of Balian II, lord of Ibelin and Ramla, in Palestine [ca.1187–93]) and sheds light on the fall of Jerusalem to the Muslims in 1187; the reigns of Andronikos I Komnenos, Isaac II Angelos—whose portrait was supposedly painted above the door of every monastery in Constantinople (ed. Morgan, *infra* [1982] 29), Alexios III Angelos, and Conrad of Montferrat (Morgan 26–30); the Third Crusade; and the conquest of Cyprus (Morgan 116–21) from the perspective of

Outremer. The various continuations give substantially the same account of the Fourth Crusade (ed. de Mas Latrie, 348–95) and provide much data on politics in the Levant and the relations of Byz. and Armenia to the Crusader states.

ED. *Estoire*—RHC Occid. 1 (Paris 1844). De Mas Latrie, *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier* (Paris 1871). M.R. Morgan, *La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184–1197)* (Paris 1982) 17–199.

LIT. M.R. Morgan, *The Chronicle of Ernoul and the Continuations of William of Tyre* (Oxford 1973). Idem, "The Rothelin Continuation of William of Tyre" in *Outremer*, 244–57. —M.McC.

ESZTERGOM RELIQUARY. This silver-gilt and enamel reliquary, kept in the cathedral treasury of the Hungarian city of Esztergom, displays a sizable piece of the True Cross, surrounded by images in three registers: above are two mourning angels; at the center Constantine I and Helena point to the relic in its sunken cross-shaped cavity; illustrations of Christ's Road to Calvary and Descent from the Cross are below. Between the arms of the cross appear four enameled disks, with inscriptions reading "Christ gives grace to Christians." Inset enamel strips with quatrefoils define the borders of the panel and the relic. This panel once formed the inner part of a triptych, the wings of which have been lost. The present frame is a Palaiologan addition. The reliquary's bright, opaque coloring, its fragmented borders, the rectilinear setting of the *cloisons* (thin strips of gold) and, in the inscriptions, the *iota* decorated with a nodule are characteristic of mid-to-late 12th-C. enamels; parallels are the feast scenes added to the PALA D'ORO in Venice after 1204 and two teardrop shaped panels on a composite icon in the Hermitage (*Iskusstvo Vizantii* 2, no.540). The date of 1190 assigned to the reliquary in the 17th-C. will of Cardinal Kutassy of Hungary therefore seems to be accurate.

LIT. Wessel, *Byz. Enamels*, no.49. *Ornamenta Ecclesiae*, ed. A. Legner, vol. 3 (Cologne 1985) 116. —M.E.F.

ETCHMIAXIN (Ejmiacin). See VALARŠAPAT.

ETERIANO, HUGO, lay theologian and author; born Pisa between ca.1110 and 1120, died Velletri? (Italy) 1182. Eteriano studied theology and philosophy in France and Italy and went to Constantinople ca.1160 with his brother, LEO TUSCUS, who became an imperial interpreter. In Constan-

tinople Eteriano continued his studies and became an adviser to Emp. Manuel I Komnenos on Latin theology and the UNION OF THE CHURCHES. His background in Latin SCHOLASTICISM was influential in resolving a Christological controversy at the local council of 1166 in Constantinople (see under CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF) where he argued with DEMETRIOS OF LAMPE. At the emperor's request, Eteriano, with Leo's help, wrote a polemical treatise, *On the Holy and Immortal God* (also known as *On the Heresies of the Greeks*), which sought to demonstrate that both the Greek and Latin church fathers taught the dual procession of the Holy Spirit (the FILIOQUE). The book, written in both languages, was sent to Pope ALEXANDER III in 1177. At the request of two German scholastics, Eteriano compiled the *Book on the Difference between Nature and Person* (ca.1179), which consisted of translations of Greek patristic texts on Trinitarian theology and his comments on them. Pope Lucius III made Eteriano a deacon and a cardinal in 1182, the year of his death.

ED. *Heresies*—PL 202:227–396. "The 'Liber de Differentia naturae et personae' by Hugh Etherian and the Letters Addressed to Him by Peter of Vienna and Hugh of Honan," ed. N. Haring, *MedSt* 24 (1962) 1–34.

LIT. P. Classen, "Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 1166 und die Lateiner," *BZ* 48 (1955) 339–68. A. Dondaine, "Hugues Ethérien et Léon Toscan," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 19 (1952) 67–134. —F.K.

ETERNITY (αἰών) can only be defined negatively in relation to TIME, either as a duration without beginning or end or as existence without change or (temporal) succession. Eternity as an attribute of God was first discussed in the Christian era by ARIUS and the early Arians (e.g., EUNOMIOS). They argued that the Son was generated "before the ages" but was not "co-eternal" with the Father. In this sense, GREGORY OF NYSSA (as the First Council of Nicaea had already done) also opposed the use of the term "unbegotten" as an essential attribute of God the Father, since it excluded the Son of God from the Trinity. The definition of eternity was also linked to the revelation of the name Yahweh, in that the eternal God as "Life itself" transcended even infinity (without beginning, without end). Probably in view of the Gnostic doctrine of the emanation of the aeons, or even the eternity reserved for men and angels, John of Damascus (*Exp. fidei* 15, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:43f) admitted that eternity may not always mean "aeon" in the strict sense. The Palamite doctrine

of ENERGIES with the presentation of a divine, uncreated light came out of the framework of the Cappadocian doctrine of eternity.

LIT. E.C.E. Owen, "Aion and aionios," *JThSt* 37 (1936) 265-83, 390-404. D. Balás, "Eternity and Time in Gregory of Nyssa's *Contra Eunomium*," in *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie*, ed. H. Dörrie, M. Altenburger, U. Schramm (Leiden 1976) 128-55. —G.P.

ETHICS. Ethical reflection in Byz. often took place in the context of discussion of questions of moral theology, in which Christian revelation was the fundamental reference (e.g., for concepts such as SIN, VIRTUE, VICE, DEVIL). Ethics in the strict sense, a philosophical inquiry independent of religion first established as a distinct science by ARISTOTLE, also survived, esp. in the continued interest taken by Byz. thinkers in ancient philosophy. As in the case of his corpus of LOGIC, Aristotle's ethical works formed a core around which Byz. commentaries, glosses, and paraphrases accumulated. His *Nicomachean Ethics* was read with ancient anonymous scholia and those of Aspasios, to which were added partial commentaries by MICHAEL OF EPHEBUS, EUSTRATIOS OF NICAIA, and a slightly later Byz. anonymous, the whole constituting a corpus translated into Latin by Robert GROSSETESTE. A paraphrase of the *Nicomachean Ethics* was copied for John VI Kantakouzenos. On the basis of such materials, summaries of ethics were prepared, for example, by JOHN OF DAMASCUS, MICHAEL PSELLOS, and JOSEPH RHAKENDYTES.

Another ethical system that had a considerable impact on monastic circles was STOICISM, as represented in the works of Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, and the stoicizing *On Virtues and Vices* (*De virtutibus et vitiis*) attributed to Aristotle (and copied for ARETHAS OF CAESAREA) and the *Concerning the Emotions* (*Peri pathon*) attributed to Andronikos of Rhodes as well as in a number of popular moralizing anthologies. An example of an ethical system based on principles Stoic in inspiration is provided by Plethon's treatise *On Virtues*.

Less broad in appeal was the ethical theory of NEOPLATONISM as formulated in particular in the *Sentences* of PORPHYRY. The solutions proposed by the Neoplatonists (esp. PROKLOS and AMMONIOS) to the problem of EVIL—evil is not a substance, but a privation of good, in particular in the form of moral turning away from God—and its reconciliation with FREE WILL and divine providence

were, however, adopted by Psellos and by the *sebastokrator* Isaac KOMNENOS. Indeed, in its identification of the ethical good (*eudaimonia*) as union with God, to be attained in contemplation by means of purifying by virtue the soul of its corporeal existence, Neoplatonism had already given, through the Cappadocian fathers, a fundamental structure to Byz. moral theology.

Aristotelian ethics could be integrated into this structure, in Psellos's view, in that the lowest type of virtue, "political virtue," concerns the rationally ordered and harmonious life of man as a union of soul and body, a life formulated by Aristotle and including practical wisdom and political action. The higher levels of virtue, purificatory and contemplative, which Porphyry added to political virtue, indicate for Psellos the path that leads man as immortal soul to transcend the world and reach greater union with God. The same place is assigned to Aristotle's ethics in the Christian life by Eustratios of Nicaea. BARLAAM OF CALABRIA proposed in his *Ethics according to the Stoics* (PG 151:1341-64) a similar integration of Stoic and Platonic ethics: Stoic ethics prescribes the ideal life for man as he is; Platonic ethics concerns life beyond this world. (See also BEHAVIOR.)

LIT. H. Mercken, *The Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle in the Latin Translation of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (1253)* (Leiden 1973). B. Tambrun-Kraskar, *Georges Gémiste Pléthon. Traité des vertus* (Athens-Leiden 1987). —D.O'M.

ETHIOPIA (from *Aiθιοπες*, supposedly the people with "burnt faces"), the geographical-racial (not political) designation of the region in Africa south of Byz. territory, esp. south of Egypt. The eastern part of Ethiopia including South Arabia was sometimes called INDIA and the inhabitants Indians (e.g., Sozom., *HE* 2:24; THEODORET 1:22). Although Ethiopia was a general designation, it was usually qualified to pinpoint the specific area under discussion. Eusebios (*HE* 2:1.13) specifies Meroitic Nubia when he speaks of the Ethiopia that is ruled by a queen. Prokopios, discussing the Himyarite wars, speaks of "the Ethiopians who are called Axumites" (*Wars* 1:19, 17). Byz. historians were aware of tribal groupings and political units within Ethiopia, for example, BLEMMEYES, Nobades, Axumites. Individuals identified as ETHIOPIANS were to be found in Egyptian monasteries, the most notable being Moses the Black of Sketis (early 5th C.). No part of Ethiopia was

ever included in the Byz. Empire, but in the 7th C. both Lower NUBIA and esp. AXUM were Byz. allies. The Arab conquest of North Africa cut off Ethiopia from Byz.

LIT. V. Christides, "The Image of the Sudanese in Byzantine Sources," *BS* 43 (1982) 8-17. F. Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970). P.L. Shinnier, "The Nilotic Sudan and Ethiopia, c.660 BC to c.AD 600," in *CHAFr* 252-71. —D.W.J.

ETHIOPIANS (*Aiθιοπες*). From classical times the term *Ethiopian* referred to all dark races from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean: specifically, to the Cushite inhabitants of the kingdoms of Meroe and AXUM. This inaccurate terminology, reflecting both Ptolemy's geography and Ethiopia's own position on the way to India, was inherited by the Byz., whose attitude toward "blacks" greatly differed from that of Westerners (C. Prager, *JMRS* 17 [1987] 260, n.5).

St. Moses the Black, a Nubian, is referred to as Ethiopian or Libyan; THEOPHILOS THE INDIAN, possibly from the Maldives Islands, is variously described as Ethiopian, Blemmys, or Libyan (G. Fiaccadori, *Studi classici e orientali* 33 [1983] 295-300; 34 [1984] 273f and n.12). Yet trade with India and events in 6th-C. NAJRAN soon led to a better knowledge of Axum and ADULIS, both visited by KOSMAS INDIKOPLEUSTES ca.518. As allies in control of the eastern routes, the Ethiopians were then favorably regarded by diplomats and merchants alike. Between 644 and 678 the widespread hope of an Ethiopian intervention against the Mesopotamian Muslims in fulfillment of Psalm 67(68):31 still focused on the Axumite power. METHODIOS OF PATARA even claimed Ethiopian origins for the Byz. Empire, ultimately equating it with Ethiopia (M.V. Krivov, in *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Ethiopian Studies* [Moscow 1988] 6, 111-17). After the Islamic conquest of Egypt, the decrease in relations with Nubia and the decline of Axum prevented further contacts between the Byz. and Sudanese or Abyssinian blacks—although the "Ethiopians" serving in Theophilos's army or those involved in the 904 Arab raid on THESSALONIKE may have been Sudanese mercenaries.

From the 10th C. onward men of color are indeed mentioned frequently in Byz. literature, but the vast majority of references, following the old Mediterranean stereotype of imaginary blacks,

is generic: either connected with scriptural problems (E. Benz, *Abba Salama* 6 [1975] 17-36) or totally devoid of any anthropological reality, as representing the proverbial darkness impossible to "wash off" (after Lucian, *Against the Ignorant Book Collector* 28). Bordering upon and overlapping the same cliché are the Ethiopian DEMONS that typify the spirit of fornication in early monastic hagiography (P. Devos, *AB* 103 [1985] 61-74). Thus Ethiopians became protagonists of disturbing dreams (P.-A. Février, *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* n.s. 19 B [1985] 295 and n.8). This kind of demonology took shape in Egyptian milieux subjected to the savage raids of Nubian tribes, and spread then to Syria and Palestine and later to areas lacking direct experience of "evil blacks"; but color awareness never implied racial prejudice, nor did black chromatic symbolism, of superstitious origin, necessarily refer to ethnic types (E. Lepore, *ParPass* 39 [1984] 310-20).

The interpretations of scriptural Ethiopians prevailed over the scanty associations with demons and infernal phantoms, whose frightfulness lay, however, not so much in the color of their skin as in other physical features (J. Winckler, *JHS* 100 [1980] 160-65). Far from the "racial" image of black hypersexuality, the *Iliad's* "blameless Ethiopians" (bk.1:423) were models of continence and dignity (which again precluded the identification between blacks and slaves); credited with wisdom and astrological learning, they became a symbol of Christianity's ecumenical mission, like the black King of the Epiphany.

The same developments and sensibility are found in the visual arts, esp. MSS of the 11th-12th C. Besides the small and conventional negroid figures used for decoration, Ethiopians with distinctive African traits appear, for instance, the BLEMMEYES in the MENOLOGION OF BASIL II; and demons are usually depicted as black. According to the Byz. eschatological perspective, blacks are also shown, chiefly in "Pentecost" scenes, among the nations reached by the preaching of the Apostles (Kazhdan-Epstein, *Change* 185).

LIT. L. Cracco Ruggini, "Leggenda e realtà degli Etiopi nella cultura tardoimperiale," *IV Congresso Internazionale di Studi Etiopici*, vol. 1 (Rome 1974) 141-93. J. Devisse, *The Image of the Black in Western Art*, vol. 2.1 (Fribourg 1979) 37-148, 212-41. J.-M. Courtès, "Traitement patristique de la thématique 'éthiopienne,'" *ibid.* 9-31, 209-11. P.J. Alexander, *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Berkeley 1985) 17f, 38-40, 53-57, 103, 168. —G.F.

ETHIOPIC LITERATURE, the literature written in Ge'ez, the southern Semitic language of successive Christian kingdoms of the region that is now ETHIOPIA. Of three main periods, only the first, the Axumite period (4th–6th C.), was directly influenced by Byz. literature in the form of translations from Greek religious texts to fulfil the needs of newly christianized AXUM. By the 6th C., the Old Testament had been translated from the Septuagint and the New Testament from an Antiochene Greek text aided by reference to a Syriac version. The Book of Jubilees, the Apocalypse of Esdra, the Ascension of Isaiah, and the Book of Enoch were included in the Ethiopic canon. The *Qerlos*, a compilation of writings of the church fathers, esp. Cyril of Alexandria; the *Synodos*, a collection of conciliar decrees; the Lives of STS. ANTONY THE GREAT and Paul the Hermit; the rule of St. PACHOMIOS, the PHYSIOLOGOS, and various liturgical texts all belong to this period. During the revival of Ge'ez literature (14th–15th C.), vitae of indigenous saints were produced that show indirect Byz. influence via models surviving from the earlier period. After the 14th C., the region, isolated from Byz. since the Arab conquest, developed an indigenous literature subject to some Copto-Arabic influence. (See also KEBRA NEGAST.)

LIT. E. Cerulli, *Storia della letteratura etiopica* (Milan 1956). —D.W.J.

ETHNARCH (ἔθναρχης, lit. “leader of a people or nation”), a term (possibly of Hellenistic Jewish origin) to designate any ruler of barbarians: thus, Philostorgios (Philostorg. *HE* 34.7) used it for the Jewish ruler of Himyar, Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 268.30) for the chiefs of the Sklavenes, Constantine MANASSES (*Historiae* v.2525) for the Vandal kings, etc. Church fathers designated pagan national gods as *ethnarchai*, and accordingly Basil the Great (PG 29:656B) considered the angel-ethnarch as a guardian appointed to each *ethnos*. By the end of the 10th C. the term *ethnarch* (as well as *satrap*) entered the Byz. state hierarchy: the *Taktikon of Escorial* (Oikonomides, *Listes* 271.24, 273.29) mentions both the ethnarch and his *topoteretes*. In 1051 Constantine IX appointed the *patrikios* Bryennios as ethnarch and sent him against the Pechenegs, and ca.1078 BORIL was *protoproedros* and ethnarch (Bryen. 283.2). Since a seal calls him *proedros* and *megas primikerios* of the *ethnikoi* (V. Šandrovskaja, *PSb* 23 [1971] 29), it is

plausible that the ethnarch of the 11th C. was a high-ranking commander of foreign mercenaries.

LIT. Oikonomides, *Listes* 333. —S.B.B., A.K.

ETHNOLOGY as a separate discipline did not exist in Byz., but ethnological problems were touched upon by various writers. This was not only because of human curiosity but esp. because of the political situation of an empire that constantly had to deal with a variety of peoples attacking it, trading with it, or settling on its territory. The Byz. considered themselves as the chosen people and viewed FOREIGNERS AS BARBARIANS; they nonetheless left valuable descriptions ranging from folkloric fantasies (e.g., in the vita of MAKARIOS OF ROME), to pragmatic information (e.g., the STRATEGIKON OF MAURICE), to narratives of embassies (e.g., PRISKOS of Panion). The works of historians (Prokopios, Theophylaktos Simokattes, Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, Leo the Deacon, Anna Komnene, Laonikos Chalkokondyles, among others) are esp. rich in ethnological descriptions. Pictorial images of various peoples are to be found in scenes of PENTECOST, in the illustrations to Psalters and Octateuchs, in the images of the LAST JUDGMENT, and in such secular MSS as the Madrid Skylitzes (M. Garidis, *Byzantion* 39 [1969–70] 86–91).

The Byz. emphasized the continuity of ethnological groups and applied to contemporary peoples ancient names (such as Scythians) and ancient *topoi* characterizing their behavior, habits, food, and dress (B. Zástěrová, *BBA* 52 [1985] 16–19). Some observers (e.g., Pachymeres) recognized modification in language and clothing because of assimilation; Chalkokondyles noted the process of cultural differentiation over time. Cultural development, unless ascribed to divine influence, was considered as a technological progression from the primitive gathering of food to civilization. In Tzetzes' view this led to moral decline, whereas Eustathios of Thessalonike connected it with the development of law and righteousness.

LIT. K.E. Müller, *Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie*, vol. 2 (Wiesbaden 1980) 184–95, 226–520. K. Dieterich, *Byzantinische Quellen zur Länder- und Völkerkunde*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1912). K. Trüdinger, *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie* (Basel 1918). —A.K.

ETHOPOIIA (ἠθοποιία, lit. “character-drawing,” Lat. *sermocinatio*), a rhetorical figure, one of the PROGYMNASMATA. According to HERMOGENES (ed. Rabe, 9–11), it was “an imitation of the character

of the person described,” such as “what kind of words Andromache would have pronounced while mourning over Hector” (hence the words *τίνας ἂν εἶποι λόγους* in the title of many Byz. *ethopoïiai*). The person had to be a “real” individual, either historical or mythological, but statements put into his or her mouth were invented. Hermogenes divides *ethopoïiai* into ethical (with the emphasis on character), pathetic (with the emphasis on emotion), and mixed.

In the 4th–6th C. (Libanios, Severos of Alexandria, rhetorical school of Gaza) *ethopoïia* remained a rhetorical exercise, drawing the material primarily from mythology and stressing unusual and unreal situations. Some later Byz. *ethopoïiai* (e.g., by Nikephoros Chrysoberges) retain a conventional character. A number of authors of the 10th–12th C., however, developed the genre far beyond a school exercise: even mythological subjects (e.g., Pasiphaë's infatuation with a bull, by Nikephoros Basilakes) could sound erotic and nonorthodox (H.G. Beck, *Byzantinisches Erotikon* [Munich 1984] 113). At the same time biblical and hagiographical themes were introduced; historical personages of the day, such as Nikephoros II Phokas, were featured, and elements of everyday life emerged. Eustathios of Thessalonike presented a certain Neophytos of Mokissos complaining that he had been robbed in a bathhouse. This *ethopoïia* is full of irony underscored by references to mythology and to Christian moral imperatives. The *ethopoïia* form was used as an element of other genres, e.g., in Psellos's *Chronography* (O. Schissel, *BZ* 27 [1927] 271–75).

After the 12th C. the popularity of *ethopoïia* declined, the pattern became more conventional, and even Manuel II's *ethopoïia* on the words that Timur allegedly addressed to Bayezid I was deprived of any real content (H. Hunger in *Studien zu älteren Geschichte Osteuropas* 1 [Graz-Cologne 1959] 156f). An exception is Alexios MAKREMBOLITES' *Dialogue between the Rich and the Poor*, which has the title of *ethopoïia*.

LIT. Hunger, *Lit.* 1:108–16. H.M. Hagen, *Ethopoïia* (Erlangen 1966). Lausberg, *Handbuch* 1:407–11. —A.K., I.S.

ETYMOLOGIKA (ἐτυμολογικά), *lexika* giving the derivation, real or imagined, of words. Early Greek thinkers saw language as a natural phenomenon; the Stoics saw it as a conventional system based on analogy. Both looked for a correspondence

between the form and meaning of words and propounded explanations based on this principle. In the 5th C. Oros and Orion made collections of such explanations, which survive only in fragments (*Das atticismische Lexikon Oros*, ed. K. Alpers [Berlin 1981]). Ninth-C. Byz. scholars drew on these works, as well as on LEXIKA, commentaries, etc., to compile their own *etymologika*. The earliest, the *Etymologicum genuinum*, survives in two 10th-C. MSS, but has not yet been completely edited. A slightly later compilation from similar sources, the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, is probably connected with PHOTIOS and his circle. The compiler of the SOUDA used both of these. About the mid-12th C. another compiler drew material from the *Genuinum* and the *Gudianum*, as well as from the *lexikon* of rare words falsely attributed to CYRIL of Alexandria. In the independent spirit of 12th-C. scholarship he freely abbreviated, transposed, and modified what he found in his exemplars. This compilation, known as the *Etymologicum magnum*, was used by EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKE. The unpublished *Lexikon Symeonis*, a shorter compilation of the same period, sometimes follows the *Genuinum* more closely. The explanations offered by the *etymologika* are often fanciful, for example, ἀγάπη (love) from “to lead everything” (ἀγειν τὸ πᾶν); γυμνός from κύπτω, “since the naked [man] (γυμνός) stoops (κύπτει) in order to conceal his pudenda in shame”; κάμηλος (camel)—because “she bends her thighs (κάμπτει τοὺς μηρούς)”; λύπη (sorrow) from “to open (λύειν) the countenance (τοὺς ὤπας) for tears.” Nonetheless, these compilations are valuable for the light they throw on the Byz. understanding of their own literary language, as well as for their quotations from lost Greek texts.

ED. *Etymologicum magnum*, ed. T. Gaisford (Oxford 1848; rp. Amsterdam 1965). For complete list of ed., see Hunger, *Lit.* 2:45–48. *Etymologicum Graecae linguae Gudianum*, ed. F.W. Schulz (Leipzig 1816, 1p. Hildesheim 1973).

LIT. R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Leipzig 1897). K. Alpers, *Bericht über Stand und Methode der Ausgabe des Etymologicum Genuinum* (Copenhagen 1969). N. Wilson, “On the Transmission of the Greek Lexica,” *GRBS* 23 (1982) 369–75. —R.B.

ETYMOLOGY, a division of grammar in antiquity, which in the 4th C. acquired special significance as a tool for discovery of concealed links between essence and phenomenon. Broadly applied by IAMBlichos, it became fashionable with literati of the 5th C. when various ETYMOLOGIKA

were compiled. Far from giving scientific explanations, Byz. etymology eagerly suggested multifarious interpretations (Krumbacher, *GBL* 573–75), probing various paths to penetrate behind the sound of the word: thus, *anthropos* was considered to originate from *ano* (“up”) and from various verbs meaning “to look” or “to be inclined.” During the 10th-C. encyclopedic revival, the search for the etymology of geographical names became popular, and the chroniclers (pseudo-SYMEON MAGISTROS, GENESIOS, etc.) included etymological explanations, partly borrowed from Strabo, partly invented, but as a rule fantastic (A. Diller, *TAPA* 81 [1950] 245–53); Constantine VII’s team of writers in the *DE THEMATIBUS* also developed pseudohistorical and mythological etymologies, although the explanations of some names (BOUKELLARION, OPSIKION) are factual (Hunger, *Lit.* 1:532). Etymology appears also as a vehicle of polemic and praise: the names of saints were interpreted as emphasizing their virtue, the names of opponents their folly or vice: thus, Nikephoros GREGORAS called the followers of PALAMAS *palamnaioi* (“murderers”) (H. Hunger, *Aspekte der griechischen Rhetorik* [Vienna 1972] 13f). EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKE effectively used etymologies in his antimonastic polemic, linking *asketes* with *askos* (“wineskin”) and *laura* with *spodesilaura* (“whore”) (Kazhdan-Franklin, *Studies* 152).

EUAGEIS OIKOI (εὐαγεῖς οἶκοι), a category of pious institutions, also called *theioi* or divine. Probably in the 6th C., the previous philanthropic organizations (see PHILANTHROPY) created by Christians to assist the poor, the aged, and the infirm became more institutionalized. At the same time they became powerful landowners, and Justinian I in novel 120 of 544 regulated their rights to acquire or lease properties; in the category of pious institutions the legislator included hostels (XENODOCHEIA), HOSPITALS, poorhouses (PTOCHOTROPHEIA), ORPHANAGES, and sometimes churches and monasteries as well. Byz. law distinguished between *euageis oikoi* and imperial estates; the administration of some pious institutions, however, was incorporated into the state system. In the TAKTIKA of the 9th and 10th C. *chartoularioi* and *xenodochoi* of *euageis oikoi* are mentioned, and in acts of the 11th C. the *oikonomos* of *euageis oikoi* appears. In the 12th C. the latter official was

replaced by the [*megas*] *logariastes* of *euage sekreta* (*Patmou Engrapha* 1, nos. 18.438, 19.26; *Lavra* 1, no.68.1). The term seems to have disappeared after 1204. Specific *oikoi* such as Eleutheriou and MANGANA were closely linked to the economy of the imperial court.

LIT. Dölger, *Beiträge* 40–42. M. Kaplan, *Les propriétés de la couronne et de l'Eglise dans l'Empire byzantin* (Paris 1976) 17–21. Constantelos, *Philanthropy* 149–51. Oikonomides, “Evolution” 138–40. —A.K., A.J.C.

EUBOEIA (Εὔβοια, in Western sources Negroponte), large island in the Aegean Sea (second in size only to Crete) off the east coast of Greece. It consists of three parts: the well-irrigated and forested north, a mountainous central section with fertile coastal valleys, and an unproductive south; the central section is separated from BOEOTIA only by the narrow strait of Euripos. Hierokles (Hierokl. 644.10, 645.6–8) lists four *poleis* in Euboea: Adepsos/Aidepsos in the north, CHALKIS and Porthmos (mod. Aliveri) in the middle, and Karystos in the south. Some settlements (Avlon, Oreos) are attested as bishoprics from the 8th or 9th C. onward, but nothing is known of their urban character. Archaeological excavations have revealed mosaics, remains of basilicas, and fragments of sculpture through the 7th C., even from remote areas of the island. The establishment of monasteries in the 11th and 12th C. (e.g., Panagia Peribleptos near Politika) are an indication of Byz. recovery.

Owing to its isolated location, Euboea seems to have suffered little from hostile invasions. Vandal fleets reached the island in 466 and 475, but there is no evidence of Avar and Slavic attacks. Arabs from Tarsos attempted to capture Chalkis in the 870s, but details of this expedition are hard to establish (Vasiliev, *Byz. Arabes* 2.1 [1968] 56, n.1); the city was burned by the Venetians in 1171. As an administrative unit Euboea existed at least through the 8th C., as shown by a seal of Kosmas, the *dioiketes* of Euboea (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.2078). Thereafter the island was part of the theme of HELLAS and was designated Chalkis or Euripos; from the 13th C. it took the name NEGROPONTE, although Byz. historians continued to call it Euboea until the 15th C. (e.g., Kritob. 165.19, Douk. 75.19). From 1332 the Turks began to attack isolated areas on Euboea and in July of 1470 the island fell to them. Until the 15th C. the church

of Euboea was under the administration of Athens. Under Latin domination the church of Euboea was an important outpost of papal power.

Most of the surviving churches on Euboea date from the 13th and 14th C., and are found in the Karystos section of the island. They are small, single-aisled, barrel-vaulted churches, founded, according to their fresco inscriptions, primarily by local couples. Although their fresco programs are fundamentally Byz. in character, some Western iconographic influences are evident, perhaps deriving from Romanesque MSS. Western traits also appear in haloes, painted architecture, and the special outlining of figures (A. Koumoussi, *Les peintures murales de la Transfiguration de Pyrgi et de Sainte-Thècle en Eubée* [Athens 1987]).

LIT. J. Koder, *LMA* 4:66–68. Th. Skouras, “Ochyroseis sten Euboia,” *Archeion Euboikon Meleton* 20 (1975) 327–400. H. Liapes, *Mesaionika Mnemeia Euboias* (Athens 1971). A. Ioannou, *Byzantines toichographies tes Euboias* (Athens 1959). —T.E.G., N.P.S.

EUCHAITA (Εὐχάϊτα, now Avkat), city of PONTOS, west of AMASEIA. In the 5th C., Euchaita served as a place of exile for many prominent clergymen, including the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch. It was made a city by Anastasios I, who fortified the *polisma* after an attack by Huns in 515. It was burned by the Sasanians in 615, attacked by the Arab caliph Mu‘awiya in 640, and occupied by Arabs during the winter of 663/4. On this last occasion, while the Arabs plundered the city and demolished the Church of St. Theodore, the population fled to forts in the nearby hills. Nevertheless, the city recovered and the church was rebuilt. Euchaita was a city of the ARMENIAKON theme; the Arabs ambushed the *strategos* and captured the treasury of the theme in 810 (Theoph. 489.17–20). The works of the metropolitan John MAUROPOUS show that the festival of St. Theodore was the scene of a crowded fair in the mid-11th C. Its later history is unknown. Originally a suffragan bishopric of Amaseia, Euchaita became an autocephalous archbishopric by the 7th C.; its increasing importance derived from the cult of St. THEODORE THERON transferred here from Amaseia. Euchaita became a metropolis under Leo VI. No remains have survived. The relation between Euchaita and the neighboring Euchaneia (named Theodoropolis by John I Tzimiskes in 972) is not clear.

LIT. C. Mango, I. Ševčenko, “Three Inscriptions of the Reign of Anastasios I and Constantine V,” *BZ* 65 (1972) 379–82. N. Oikonomides, “Le dédoublement de Saint Théodore et les villes d'Euchaita et d'Euchaneia,” *AB* 104 (1986) 327–35. F. Trombley, “The Decline of the Seventh-Century Town: The Exception of Euchaita,” in *Byzantine Studies in Honor of M. Anastos* (Malibu 1985) 65–90, rev. A. Kazhdan, *Erytheia* 9 (1988) 197–200. C. Zuckerman, “The Reign of Constantine V in the Miracles of St. Theodore the Recruit (BHG 1764),” *REB* 46 (1988) 191–210.

—C.F.

EUCHARIST (εὐχαριστία, “thanksgiving”), principal Christian liturgical service, called the LITURGY or the Divine Liturgy in Byz. usage. Based on Jesus’ command (Lk 22:19) to repeat in memory of him what he did at the Last Supper, the Eucharist is first seen (in 1 Cor 10–11) as a ritual meal in which bread and wine are offered and blessed as Jesus’ body and blood in memory of his saving work, esp. his sacrificial death (1 Cor 10:26). Originally celebrated in the context of an agape meal, perhaps daily, by the 2nd C. the Eucharist had been separated from the agape, joined to a service of scripture LECTIONS, and associated with SUNDAY as the ritual symbol of the risen Jesus’ enduring presence among his followers. In the 3rd C. appear the first written formulas of the ANAPHORA or central prayer expressing the service’s significance. Eucharist is considered a sacrifice (*thysia*) because it is the SACRAMENT of Jesus’ sacrifice on the Cross as well as an icon of the “heavenly liturgy” or permanent self-offering that Jesus offers before the throne of the Father (Heb 8–10, 12:22–4), a favorite theme of Byz. COMMENTARIES.

Within Byz., Eucharist was a source of theological disputes, esp. with the Iconoclasts, who held that the consecrated bread and wine were the only true *typos* or *eikon* of Jesus (S. Gero, *BZ* 68 [1975] 4–22). Against this the Second Council of NICAIA defined that the consecrated bread and wine are no image, but Jesus himself (Mansi 13:264). The Byz. also quarrelled with others over eucharistic practice (see LATIN RITE, ZEON, EPI-CLESIS). Byz. eucharistic theology achieved its classic synthesis in the commentary of Nicholas KABASILAS, who not only maintained a balanced position fair to Latin views, but also found a *via media* between the two opposing tendencies of Byz. eucharistic theology, represented in the 12th C. by Soterichos PANTEUGENOS, who seemed to reduce the Eucharist memorial to a subjective

remembrance, and the ultrarealism of Michael GLYKAS, who held that in the Eucharist Jesus was really immolated (M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium*, vol. 3 [1930] 317–25; R. Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins* [Paris 1966] 229–33).

Eucharist was originally celebrated at Byz. only on Sundays, Saturdays, and FEASTS. By the 8th–9th C. Byz. LECTONARIES provide lections for weekday Eucharist (P.M. Gy in *Miscellanea G. Lercaro*, vol. 2 [Rome 1967] 255–59), though this was probably only in monasteries since the TYPICON OF THE GREAT CHURCH does not have such lections. Only ca. 1053 or 1054 did Constantine IX Monomachos assign revenues to have Eucharist celebrated daily in Hagia Sophia (Skyl. 477.64–69). Daily Eucharist never became the rule in Byz., though the STROUDITE TYPIKA provide for it except on the ferias of Lent and Holy Week (PG 99:1713B). It was celebrated less frequently in monasteries after the introduction of the SABAITIC TYPIKA, though there was provision for COMMUNION via the PRESANCTIFIED liturgy on days without Eucharist (Taft, *East & West* 61–80). (For representations of Christ's celebration of the Eucharist, see LORD'S SUPPER.)

LIT. G. Kretschmar, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 1 (Berlin–New York 1977) 59–89, 229–78. J. Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter*, 2 vols. (Freiburg 1955–1961). J.-M.R. Tillyard, *The Eucharist, Pasch of God's People* (New York 1967). K. Stevenson, *Eucharist and Offering* (New York 1987). —R.F.T.

EUCHELAION. See UNCTION.

EUCHOLOGION (εὐχολόγιον), prayer book used by the principal liturgical ministers (bishop, priest, deacon) for all services of the BYZANTINE RITE. A vast anthology whose contents vary widely from MS to MS, the early *euchologion* contained the PRAYERS and DIAKONIKA for the cathedral services of the capital and was the principal LITURGICAL BOOK originating in Constantinople. The earliest of the numerous surviving MSS of the *euchologion* is Vat. Barb. gr. 336, dating from the second half of the 8th C. (A. Strittmatter, *EphLit* 47 [1933] 329–67).

Used even in monasteries for the Eucharist, the *euchologion* became more and more monastic in character as the Palestinian HOURS introduced by

the Stoudite monasteries of Constantinople gradually merged with elements of the cathedral hours (ASMATIKE AKOLOUTHIA) to form a new, hybrid, monastic office in Constantinople (see STROUDITE TYPIKA). Arranz ("Asmatikos Hesperinos" 109–16) classifies various MSS of the *euchologion* on precisely this basis: their relative purity in transmitting the *asmatike akolouthia* of Constantinople or their degree of monastic content. A. Jacob, on the basis of their text of the Chrysostom liturgy, divides *euchologion* MSS into two recensions, the ancient and the new, subdividing the former into two families, Constantinopolitan and south Italian. Printed versions distinguish between the *Mega euchologion* (and extracts thereof, such as the *hieratikon* or *leitourgikon*), which contains the Eucharist service, VESPERS, and ORTHROS, and the *Mikron euchologion* (or *hagiasmaterion*), which contains the other sacraments, blessings, funerals, and occasional services.

ED. J. Goar, *Euchologion sive rituale Graecorum*² (Venice 1730; rp. Graz 1960).

LIT. A. Jacob, "La tradition manuscrite de la Liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome (VIIIe–XIIe siècles)," *Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident*, vol. 2 (Paris 1970) 109–38. Taft, *Great Entrance* xxxi–xxxiv. —R.F.T.

EUCLID, ancient Greek mathematician; fl. ca. 300 B.C. in Alexandria and perhaps Athens. Euclid's best known and most influential work, *The Elements*, was the basic textbook on geometry for the Byz., who normally studied it in the revision prepared by THEON OF ALEXANDRIA. The most famous copy of this revision is Oxford, d'Orville 301, dated 888, which belonged to ARETHAS OF CAESAREA. The original version is preserved only in the 9th-C. Vat. gr. 190. Commentators on *The Elements* include PAPPOS OF ALEXANDRIA, PROKLOS, and SIMPLIKIOS. LEO THE MATHEMATICIAN gained such renown for his understanding of Euclidean theorems that the caliph al-Ma'mun tried to lure him to Baghdad (Lemerle, *Humanism* 173–78). Among later scholars who wrote on Euclid were Maximos PLANOUEDES, George PACHYMERES, Nikephoros GREGORAS, Isaac ARGYROS, and BARLAAM OF CALABRIA. *The Elements* was translated into Latin (by BOETHIUS) and into Arabic.

Two other works of Euclid, the *Data* and the *Optics*, survive both in an original version and in a revision by Theon. Both works were translated

into Arabic by Ishāq ibn Hunayn, and there is an anonymous Latin translation of the *Optics*, perhaps made in the 12th C. Pachymeres used the original version of the *Optics* in book 3 of his *Quadrivium*.

The *Mirrors*, which is attributed falsely to Euclid, is perhaps by Theon. Two musical works, the *Introduction to Harmony* and the *Division of the Scale*, are sometimes ascribed to Euclid in Greek MSS; the first is most probably the work of Cleonides, though the second may be in part Euclid's.

ED. Scholia—*Elementa*, ed. E.S. Stamatis, vol. 5.1–2 (Leipzig 1977).

LIT. I. Bulmer-Thomas, J. Murdoch, *DSB* 4:414–59. —D.P.

EUDOKIA (Εὐδοκία), feminine personal name. The word is frequent in the New Testament, meaning "good will, favor." Unknown in the 4th C., the name was evidently coined for ATHENAIS and soon thereafter given also to the elder daughter of Valentinian III. It was not widely used in the early period, even though Theophanes lists four Eudokiai. However, in the late Byz. acts of *Lavra*, vols. 2–3, Eudokia holds sixth place among female names, between Theodora and Zoe.

—A.K.

EUDOKIA INGERINA (Ἰγγερίνα), mistress of Michael III, wife of BASIL I, mother of Leo VI and Alexander; born ca. 840, died Constantinople 882/3. She was the daughter of Inger, who was perhaps of Scandinavian origin (Mango). Around 855 Michael took Eudokia as his mistress, angering his mother THEODORA and THEOKTISTOS, both of whom hated her "for her impudence" (*TheophCont* 655.3–4). Despite his marriage to Eudokia Dekapolitissa, Michael apparently continued his involvement with Eudokia Ingerina, although nothing was heard about her for a decade. Kislinger speculates that ca. 856 Michael married her to a son of Caesar BARDAS to legitimize her social status and that Bardas took up with her after his son's death.

In 865/6 she married Basil; the notion that she is named and depicted on an ivory casket that is said to have been a wedding present for the couple has been shown to be false (A. Cutler, N. Oikonomides, *ArtB* 70 [1988] 77–87). In Sept. 866 Eudokia gave birth to Leo. Some scholars

consider this a nominal marriage, arranged by Michael to give legitimacy to Leo, who was his child, but most assert that Leo was actually Basil's son (Ch. Toul, *Parnassos* 21 [1979] 15–35). If Eudokia continued as Michael's mistress, then her son Stephen, born in Nov. 867, would have been Michael's child as well. With Basil she had Alexander and three daughters; she is portrayed with her two sons in the PARIS GREGORY. Eudokia became involved ca. 878 with a Niketas Xylinites, whom Basil forced to be tonsured. In 882 she arranged a BRIDE SHOW for her son Leo, at which he chose Theophano, one of Eudokia's relatives. In his funeral oration for Basil, Leo called Eudokia "the finest of women" (A. Vogt, I. Haus-herr, *OC* 26.1 [1932] 52.18).

LIT. C. Mango, "Eudokia Ingerina, the Normans, and the Macedonian Dynasty," *ZRVI* 14/15 (1973) 17–27. E. Kislinger, "Eudokia Ingerina, Basileios I., und Michael III.," *JÖB* 33 (1983) 119–36. —P.A.H., A.C.

EUDOKIA MAKREMBOLITISSA, empress (22/23 May–31 Dec. 1067); died after 1078. Niece of Patr. MICHAEL I KEROULARIOS, Eudokia married Constantine Doukas by 1049. Before he became CONSTANTINE X, she bore him Michael, two other sons, and two daughters; thereafter she had Konstantios and a daughter. She became augusta (EM-press) during her husband's reign; as he was dying, she swore, in the presence of Patr. JOHN VIII XIPHILINOS, synod, and senate, never to remarry. Following Constantine's death, she ruled for her sons, the emperors MICHAEL VII and Konstantios, who appear with her on her coins. Supported by the caesar John DOUKAS, she made her own official decisions. The Turks continued to attack the eastern frontier; Caesarea and the region of Antioch were plundered. The Byz. troops, badly paid and provisioned, were demoralized. Realizing the need for a male ruler, Eudokia obtained from the patriarch the annulment of her oath and selected as her new husband ROMANOS (IV) DIOGENES. She bore him Nikephoros and Leo. When, after the battle of Mantzikert, Romanos was released by ALP ARSLAN and sought to regain his throne (early Oct. 1071), Eudokia hesitated. The caesar John summarily forced her into her own convent of Piperoudion; NIKEPHOROS III recalled her to Constantinople. A copy of the SACRA PARALLELA prepared for Eudokia depicts her with Constantine Doukas and their sons

(Spatharakis, *Corpus*, fig. 126). I. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner (*DOP* 31 [1977] 305–25) suggested that Eudokia appears with Romanos IV on a controversial ivory in Paris, against the traditional view that the depiction is of ROMANOS II and his empress.

LIT. Oikonomides, *Documents*, pt. III (1963), 101–28.
—C.M.B., A.C.

EUDOKIMOS (Εὐδόκιμος), saint; born Cappadocia 807, died Charsianon? 840. His father Basil was reportedly influential at court, and Eudokimos began his career in Constantinople. Theophilos supposedly appointed him *stratopedarches* of Cappadocia (although Eudokimos's low title of KANDIDATOS is incompatible with the high office he allegedly received). He fought victoriously and when he died was buried in the ornate uniform of a general.

His Life is preserved in two versions, one by SYMEON METAPHRASTES; Ch. Loparev (*infra* [1908]) considered the other to be the original, if not composed by IGNATIUS THE DEACON then at least created in his circle. Actually, however, it was written by Constantine AKROPOLITES (H. Delehaye, *AB* 51 [1933] 270f), who suppressed some details of the Metaphrastic version, itself not rich in information. The first part of the Life is a biography of the saint: although he was a soldier and not a hermit, he displays the whole range of traditional virtues, such as celibacy and concern for the poor. The second section describes miracles performed both at Eudokimos's tomb and during the translation of his relics to Constantinople; the most vivid is the story of the theft of the corpse from Charsianon, at the request of Eudokimos's mother, by the monk Joseph (arbitrarily identified by Loparev with JOSEPH THE HYMNOGRAPHER): the corpse supposedly lifted his arms and legs in order to help Joseph remove his garment. The hagiographer does not mention Iconoclasm; Ševčenko ("Hagiography" 127) calls Eudokimos "a good candidate for an Iconoclast saint."

Representation in Art. Eudokimos, whose portraits first appear in 11th-C. MSS of the *menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes, is almost invariably depicted as a young saint in full military costume. In wall painting, despite his natural death, he is

paired with true martyr-warriors such as GEORGE and DEMETRIOS.

SOURCES. Ch. Loparev, "Žitie sv. Eudokima pravednogo," *Pamjatniki drevnej pis'mennosti* 96 (1893) 1–23. Idem, *IRAİK* 13 (1908) 199–219.

LIT. BHG 606–607c. Ch. Loparev, "Vizantijskija žitija svjatyh VIII–IX vekov," *VizVrem* 17 (1910) 114–19. Da Costa-Louillet, "Saints de CP" 783–88. —A.K., N.P.Š.

EUDOXIA (Εὐδοξία), wife of ARKADIOS and empress (from 9 Jan. 400); died Constantinople 6 Oct. 404. Daughter of a Roman mother and Bauto, a Frankish general of Valentinian II, Eudoxia possessed outstanding beauty (Zosim. 5.3.2). She grew up in Constantinople and married Arkadios on 27 Apr. 395. She bore the emperor five children, including PULCHERIA and THEODOSIOS II. Although pregnant during much of her short reign, Eudoxia was involved in politics and managed to secure the fall of the powerful eunuch EUTROPIOS. Her outspokenness and alleged vanity earned the opposition of JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, who reportedly compared her to Jezebel and Salome; the conflict between the two threatened the normal harmony between the people of Constantinople and the Theodosian house. Upon Eudoxia's urging, Chrysostom was exiled in 403, but popular response forced the court to recall the bishop. He was again exiled in 404. Later in the year Eudoxia suffered a fatal miscarriage, interpreted as punishment for her opposition to the popular bishop.

LIT. Holm, *Theodosian Empresses* 48–78. F. van Ommeslaeghe, "Jean Chrysostome en conflit avec l'impératrice Eudoxie," *AB* 97 (1979) 131–59. —T.E.G.

EUERGETIS MONASTERY, a foundation of the mid-11th C., located in the European suburbs of Constantinople, approximately 3 km outside the land walls. It was dedicated to the Theotokos Euergetis (Εὐεργέτις). The original founder, Paul, retired to his country estate in 1049 and built a few simple cells for the handful of monks who joined him in his monastic retreat. After Paul's death in 1054, his successor as *hegoumenos*, Timothy, put Euergetis on a solid financial base and constructed a new church and larger *kellia*. Timothy, who lived as an *enkleistos*, was revered as the second founder. Circa 1055 he composed two

TYPIKA, a foundation *typikon* containing a rule for daily life and a very lengthy liturgical *typikon*, an important example of STOUDEITE TYPIKA.

The foundation *typikon*, which served as a model for the *typika* of the Kosmosoteira (see BERA), MAMAS, HELIOU BOMON, KECHARITOMENE, and HILANDAR monasteries, is our primary source of information about the Euergetis monastery. The monastic complex included a hospice to provide lodging and medical care for travelers and the sick; distributions of food were made daily to the poor. Euergetis also had a *metochion* within the walls of Constantinople. During the Latin occupation of Constantinople (1204–61) the monastery was given as a dependency to MONTECASSINO, but apparently the Greek monks were not expelled. St. SAVA OF SERBIA visited the monastery several times between 1196 and 1235 and was a major benefactor of the institution. Euergetis disappears from the sources after the 13th C. It should be distinguished from the Constantinople monastery of Christ Euergetes, which possessed an icon bearing this epithet and was a foundation of the 10th or 11th C. (A. Cutler, *DOP* 37 [1983] 42).

SOURCES. Liturgical *typikon*—ed. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie* 1:256–614. Foundation *typikon*—ed. P. Gautier, "Le typikon de la Theotokos Evergetis," *REB* 40 (1982) 5–101.

LIT. J. Pargoire, "Constantinople: Le couvent de l'Evergetis," *EO* 9 (1906) 366–73; 10 (1907) 155–67, 259–63 (title varies). Janin, *Eglises CP* 178–83. —A.M.T., A.C.

EUGENEIANOS, NIKETAS, 12th-C. writer. A disciple or friend of PRODRAMOS, Eugeneianos (Εὐγενειανός) led a hard life (according to his own very rhetorical statements), until he was rescued by the *sebastos* and *meas droungarios* Stephen Komnenos, whose teacher Eugeneianos claimed to have been. In 1156/7 he wrote a monody on Stephen; he probably also dedicated an *epithalamion* to Stephen's wedding in the early 1150s. Eugeneianos dedicated to Prodrimos another monody in prose, as well as two in verse (C. Gallavotti, *SBN* 4 [1935] 222–31). A. Sideras (*JÖB* 37 [1987] 181–200) suggests that Eugeneianos was the author of an anonymous monody that is preserved in Heidelbergensis 18 and has significant similarities with a monody of Prodrimos (whom Eugeneianos could imitate). An example of such imitation is also Eugeneianos's romance

Drosilla and Charikles; the work contains various allusions to Byz. reality, and the portrait of Drosilla, the heroine, coincides verbatim with that of the ideal bride of his *epithalamion*. In the romance Eugeneianos combines a lofty lyricism with earthy scenes and parody. Some of his epigrams are also preserved (S. Lampros, *NE* 11 [1914] 353–58). D. Christides identified Eugeneianos as the author of an anonymous dialogue ANACHARSIS OR ANANIAS and several letters.

ED. R. Hercher, *Erotici scriptores Graeci* (Leipzig 1859) 2:437–552; corr. Q. Cataudella, *EEBS* 39–40 (1972–73) 29–32. Russ. tr. F. Petrovskij, *Nikita Eugenian, Povest' o Drosille i Charikle* (Moscow 1969). L. Petit, "Monodie de Nicetas Eugéneianos sur Théodore Prodrome," *VizVrem* 9 (1902) 446–63.

LIT. Hunger, *Lit.* 2:133–36. A. Kazhdan, "Bemerkungen zu Niketas Eugenianos," *JÖB* 16 (1967) 101–17. M. Kyriakis, "Of Professors and Disciples in Twelfth (sic) Century Byzantium," *Byzantion* 43 (1973) 108–19. F. Conca, "Il romanzo di Niceta Eugeniano: modelli narrativi e stilistici," *SicGymn* 39 (1986) 115–26. —A.K.

EUGENIKOS, JOHN, churchman and writer; born Constantinople after 1394, died after 1454/5. The younger brother of Mark EUGENIKOS, John Eugeneikos (Εὐγενικός) was a married deacon who held the positions of notary and *nomophylax* at the patriarchate. Like his brother a fierce opponent of Union, he stayed only briefly at the Council of FERRARA-FLORENCE. On his way home from Venice in 1438, he survived a shipwreck and, in response to this narrow escape, wrote a work titled *Oration of Thanksgiving* (ed. Lampros, *infra*, 271–314). Because of his opposition to the council, he was exiled to the Morea, where he joined the group of literati at Mistra (1439–47). He also traveled to Trebizond, his father's birthplace, and to Mesembria (1454/5). He ended his life administering the metropolis of Lacedaemonia (Sparta).

Eugenikos was a prolific author who wrote in a variety of genres; many of his works are still unpublished. His polemical writings include an *Antirrhetikos* attacking the Decree of Union of 1439. He composed several *paramythetikoi* and monodies, *ekphrasis* of icons, a *threnos* on the fall of Constantinople (which was soon thereafter translated into Slavic), *kanones* and hymns, prayers, and sermons. Recently, A. Sideras ascribed to Eugeneikos an anonymous monody (*Byzantion* 54 [1984] 300–14). His encomiastic *ekphrasis* of Trebizond (ed. O. Lampsides, *ArchPont* 20 [1955] 25–36) differs

radically from the *ekphrasis* of BESSARION: while the latter concentrated on the trade of this “emporion of the world” and on the architecture of the palace, Eugenikos praised the rustic beauty of meadows and forests around the city and their gorgeous vegetation. Among his hagiographical writings is a eulogy of James the Persian (ed. C. Hannick, *AB* 90 [1972] 261–87), of whom Eugenikos possessed a relic, and an *akolouthia* for his brother Mark (ed. L. Petit, *SBN* 2 [1927] 195–235). Of his letters 36 survive, many of them attacking Latin doctrine. In his introduction to the *Aithiopika* of HELIODOROS (H. Gärtner, *BZ* 64 [1971] 322–25), Eugenikos suggested a “mystical” interpretation of this erotic romance (S. Poljakova, *VizVrem* 31 [1971] 244).

ED. Letters—ed. S. Lampros, *Pal. kai Pel.* 1:47–218, 271–322. For complete list, see D. Stiernon, *DictSpir* 8 (1974) 501–06.

LIT. C. Tsirpanlis, “John Eugenikos and the Council of Florence,” *Byzantion* 48 (1978) 264–74. *PLP*, no.6189. —A.M.T., A.K.

EUGENIKOS, MANUEL, wall-painter, decorated the monastery church of Calendžicha (Georgia) at the behest of Dadian Vameq I, prince of Mingrelia (1384–96). His large body of surviving work has been related to frescoes in the church of Theodore Stratelates at NOVGOROD and to an icon at Mt. Sinai. Although his name is Trapezuntine, Greek and Georgian inscriptions at Calendžicha report that Eugenikos was brought from Constantinople.

LIT. T. Velmans, “Le décor du sanctuaire de l’église de Calendžikha,” *CahArch* 36 (1988) 137–159. I. Lordkipanidze, “La peinture murale de Tsalendjikha,” *He Symposium International sur l’art géorgien* (Tbilisi 1977) 1–16. H. Belting, “Le peintre Manuel Eugenikos de Constantinople, en Géorgie,” *CahArch* 28 (1979) 103–14. *PLP*, no.6192. —A.C.

EUGENIKOS, MARK, metropolitan of Ephesus (1437–45), anti-Latin theologian, and saint; born Constantinople 1394?, died Constantinople 23 June 1445 (J. Gill, *BZ* 52 [1959] 31); feastday 19 Jan. Son of the deacon George Eugenikos, who was *sakellios* of Hagia Sophia, Eugenikos received the baptismal name of Manuel. After his father’s death, Eugenikos studied in Constantinople with John CHORTASMENOS and George PLETHON. In 1420 he became a monk on Antigone (Princes’ Islands); two years later he returned to the capital,

where he entered the MANGANA monastery and was eventually ordained a priest. Shortly before the Council of FERRARA-FLORENCE, Eugenikos was made metropolitan of Ephesus. He attended the council as one of the leading Byz. theologians and presented the extreme Greek position concerning the FILIOQUE (M.A. Orphanos in *Philoxenia* [Münster 1980] 223–32) and PURGATORY (C. Tsirpanlis, *BS* 37 [1976] 194–200). He was the only Greek delegate who refused to sign the decree of Union (1439). After his return to Ephesus via Constantinople, he was imprisoned for two years on Lemnos (1440–42). Eugenikos has been both criticized as a “narrow-minded obstacle to Union” (Gill) and praised as an uncompromising and consistent supporter of the conciliar Christian tradition (Tsirpanlis). He was canonized by the Orthodox church in 1456; his brother John EUGENIKOS wrote his vita (ed. S. Pétridès, *ROC* 15 [1910] 97–107). An *akolouthia* also survives (ed. L. Petit, *SBN* 2 [1927] 193–235).

In his numerous theological works Eugenikos defends PALAMISM (e.g., 72 *Kephalaia*) and the anti-Latin position on *filioque* and purgatory. A few of his letters are preserved as well as hagiographical compositions and hymns (*kanones* in honor of the Virgin). He also wrote *ekphraseis* on paintings that indicate his appreciation of art (D. Pallas, *Byzantion* 52 [1982] 357–74) and solutions to philosophical questions (*aporiai*) such as the existence of a soul in animals, evil, and free will. Many of his works remain unpublished.

ED. PG 159:1024–93; 160:13–105, 112–204, 1080–1104, 1164–1200; 161:12–244. *Kephalaia*—ed. in W. Gass, *Die Mystik des Nikolaus Cabasilas vom Leben in Christo* (Leipzig 1899) pt.2, 217–32. Anti-Latin works—ed. L. Petit, *PO* 15 (1927) 25–168; 17.2 (1923) 336–522. For full list of works, see Tsirpanlis, *infra* 109–18 and *Tusculum-Lexikon* 237.

LIT. J. Gill, “Mark Eugenikos, Metropolitan of Ephesus,” in *Personalities* 55–64. C. Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence* (Thessalonike 1974). *PLP*, no.6193. —A.M.T.

EUGENIOS (Εὐγένιος), martyr and saint, allegedly a victim of Diocletian’s persecutions; feastday 20 or 21 Jan. In Symeon Metaphrastes (PG 116:467–506) he appears as an associate of the martyr Eustratios (see FIVE MARTYRS OF SEBASTIA), but in the *Synaxarion of Constantinople* Eugenios is depicted as the principal hero of another group of martyrs, consisting of Valerianus, Candidius, and Aquilas (*Synax.CP* 406–07). In both

cases, the persecutor is Lysias, *doux* of “Satalea” (Satalea is the name of several towns in Asia Minor and Armenia). Whatever the origin of the legend, by the 11th C. Eugenios became the patron of TREBIZOND: one of the major churches in Trebizond was dedicated to him, and under the Grand Komnenoi his image was common on the local coins, the so-called *aspra komnenata* (M. Kuršanskis, *ArchPont* 35 [1978] 27). His martyrdom is illustrated in the *MENOLOGION OF BASIL II*.

JOHN (VIII) XIPHILINOS, the future patriarch and a native of Trebizond, compiled the *passio* of Eugenios and wrote about his miracles (M. van Esbroeck, *OrChrP* 47 [1981] 392). The latter provide information on climate, everyday life, and on an appearance of the Rus’ in Trebizond in the days of “Constantine the Younger.” The martyrdom of Eugenios and his posthumous miracles were also the subject of several later works, some anonymous and some by known authors (Joseph, metropolitan of Trebizond [1364–67], John Lazaropoulos, Constantine Loukites) who were active at the court of the Grand Komnenoi in the 14th C. The *Miracles* by John Lazaropoulos is rich in factual historical material, beginning with Basil I and including both Trebizond and the neighboring lands (Iberia, Chaldia, and even Cherson).

SOURCES. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Sbornik istočnikov po istorii Trapezundskoj imperii* (St. Petersburg 1897). O. Lampsides, “Hagios Eugenios ho Trapezountios,” *ArchPont* 18 (1953) 129–201.

LIT. BHG 608y-613. O. Lampsides, *Hagios Eugenios ho polouchos tes Trapezountos* (Athens 1984). F.I. Uspenskij, *Očerki iz istorii Trapezuntskoj imperii* (Leningrad 1929) 13, 23f. Janin, *Églises centres* 266–70. —A.K., N.P.S.

EUGENIOS OF PALERMO, high-ranking official at the Sicilian court; admiral (from 1190), translator, and poet; born Palermo ca.1130, died ca.1203. HENRY VI imprisoned him in 1195–96; after his release he was appointed master chamberlain of Apulia and Terra di Lavora (1198–1202). Jamison’s identification of Eugenios with Hugo Falcandus Siculus has not proved valid. Eugenios belonged to the group of Sicilian intellectuals versed in Arab, Latin, and Greek culture. He translated Ptolemy’s works from Arabic into Latin and Sibylline oracles from Greek into Latin; he also wrote Greek poems. He focused on human behavior, treating it on the basis of classical and patristic tradition with a slight tint of personal experience. Eugenios published and perhaps ed-

ited a version of *Stephanites and Ichneutes* by Symeon SETH, and in his poems he developed the theme of the instability of human life, typical of Byz. didactic literature of the 11th–12th C. He praised the ideal of ascetic life; in another poem he presented the ideal image (*eikon*) of the ruler—somewhat vaguely, but emphasizing military prowess (v.21.60–66). Many other poems are dedicated to such topics as greediness, garrulity, calumny, and virginity.

ED. *Versus iambici*, ed. M. Gigante (Palermo 1964), with Ital. tr.

LIT. E. Jamison, *Admiral Eugenius of Sicily, His Life and Work* (London 1957). M. Gigante, “Il tema dell’instabilità della vita nel primo carme di Eugenio di Palermo,” *Byzantion* 33 (1963) 325–56. Idem in *I Bizantini in Italia*, eds. G. Cavallo et al. (Milan 1982) 628–30. —A.K.

EUGENIUS, usurper (from 22 Aug. 392); died 6 Sept. 394. A former teacher of Latin grammar and rhetoric, Eugenius was *magister scrinii* at the court of Valentinian II when the latter was murdered in 392. When ARBOGAST, the Frankish *magister militum*, failed to hold power in his own name, he appointed Eugenius as Western emperor. Eugenius was nominally a Christian but, as a moderate in the religious controversies, he was acceptable to the pagans of Italy, who chafed under the autocratic religious policies of Theodosios I. When Eugenius could not secure the recognition of Theodosios, he threw himself fully into the arms of the pagan party. Under the direction of the praetorian prefect Nicomachus FLAVIANUS paganism revived in Italy. Theodosios elevated his son Honorius to imperial rank in 393 and marched against Eugenius the next year. At the battle of the Frigidus, Eugenius was taken prisoner and executed.

LIT. Stein, *Histoire* 1:211–17. Matthews, *Aristocracies* 238–47. H. Bloch, “A New Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West, 303–304 A.D.,” *HThR* 38 (1945) 100–244. J. Szidat, “Die Usurpation des Eugenius,” *Historia* 28 (1979) 487–508. B. Baldwin, “Jordanes on Eugenius: Some Further Possibilities,” *Antichthon* 11 (1977) 103f. —T.E.G.

EUGENIUS III (Bernardo Pignatelli of Pisa), pope (from 15 Feb. 1145); died Tivoli 8 July 1153. Eugenius spent almost all of his papacy in a struggle against the Romans, who expelled him from the city even before his consecration. A Cistercian and follower of Bernard of Clairvaux, Eugenius sanctioned the Second Crusade (1 Dec. 1145) and

tried to achieve union with the Greeks (ROGER II of Sicily, in contrast, tried to use the Crusaders for his own purposes against Byz.). After the failure of the Second Crusade, Eugenius was forced to seek alliance with Roger; he took advantage of Roger's military support to return to Rome in Nov. 1149 but did not break with CONRAD III and his ally Manuel I Komnenos.

LIT. J.G. Rowe, "The Papacy and the Greeks (1122–1153)," *ChHist* 28 (1959) 122–26, 130, 310–27. M. Maccarrone, *Papato e impero* (Rome 1959) 11–103. —A.K.

EUGENIUS IV (Gabriele Condulmaro), pope (from 3 Mar. 1431); born Venice ca.1383, died Rome 23 Feb. 1447. After ascending the papal throne Eugenius had to deal with the resistance of many Italian cities, including Rome (from which he fled in 1434, not returning until 1443), as well as church prelates who assembled a council in Basel. He carried on negotiations with Emp. JOHN VIII PALAIOLOGOS and transferred the council from Basel to Ferrara, where he brought the emperor, Patr. JOSEPH II, and their retinue of 700 men. At the Council of FERRARA-FLORENCE (1438–39) a decree of union was signed, but it was short-lived. Eugenius tried to attract to the union other separated Eastern churches—namely the Armenians and the Copts. After the council the pope promised to send a fleet of ten ships to John and to rouse Germany and Hungary to action against the Turks. The fleet was delayed but the papal nuncio Garatoni arrived in Constantinople to outfit ships and crossbowmen. A papal letter to Garatoni of 25 Aug. 1440, however, reveals the growing tensions between the two churches and the inclination of the pope to reduce the patriarchate of Constantinople to the level of an ordinary local church. Eugenius supported the expedition of HUNYADI that ended in 1444 in a defeat at VARNA—a disaster that demonstrated the futility of Byz. expectations of a Western crusade.

LIT. J. Gill, *Eugenius IV* (Westminster, Md., 1961). Th.V. Tuleja, "Eugenius IV and the Crusade of Varna," *Catholic Historical Review* 35 (1949) 257–75. D. Caccamo, "Eugenio IV e crociata di Varna," *ASRSP* 79 (1960) 35–87. —A.K.

EUGENIUS VULGARIUS, southern Italian cleric whose surname may indicate Bulgarian background; fl. Naples? ca.900. Hoping for material

reward, Eugenius dedicated to LEO VI four flattering Latin poems—including one figure poem in the shape of a pyramid, complete with a prose explanation of its symbolism. He also composed verses for Pope Sergius III (904–11) and local potentates and wrote defenses of Pope FORMOSUS (ed. E. Dümmler, *Auxilius und Vulgarius* [Leipzig 1866] 117–39). His metrical martyrology reflects Byz. tradition on BARNABAS the Apostle (ed. P. Meyvaert, *AB* 84 [1966] 360–67).

ED. P. von Winterfeld, *MGH Poet.* 4.1:412–40.
LIT. Wattenbach, Levison, Löwe, *Deutsch. Gesch. Vorzeit u. Karol.* 446f. B. Schieffer, *LMA* 4:85. —M.McC.

EUGIPPIUS, abbot of the monastery of Lucullanum and hagiographer; died Castellum Lucullanum, near Naples, after 533. Isidore of Seville mentions the spiritual rule which Eugippius wrote for his monastery. He corresponded with a number of churchmen, including DIONYSIUS EXIGUUS. Eugippius was also known to CASSIODORUS, who (*Institutiones* 23) deprecates his neglect of secular studies but praises his biblical scholarship, recommending his *Selections from the Works of St. Augustine*. Eugippius is best known for his Life of St. SEVERINUS, the apostle of NORICUM, whose disciple he was and whose remains were deposited at his monastery. This biography was written in some haste ca.511 to get ahead of an anonymous rival whose study of the monk Bassus provoked fears that his treatment of Severinus would be too literary for ordinary readers. It was sent for approval (duly received) to the Roman deacon Paschasius as a *Memorandum* (*Commemoratorium*), a title that disingenuously plays down its own considerable rhetoric. Although giving Severinus his meed of miracles and other supernatural skills, the Life emphasizes secular events, set down in accurate chronological sequence and providing overall a unique eyewitness picture of the last decades of the western Roman province of Noricum, esp. the social life of river towns between Vienna and Passau.

ED. *Vita Sancti Severini*, ed. T. Nüsslein (Stuttgart 1986). R. Noll, *Eugippius: Leben des heiligen Severin*² (Berlin 1963; rp. New York 1965), with Germ. tr. Eng. tr. L. Bieler, L. Krestan, *Eugippius: The Life of Saint Severin* (Washington, D.C., 1965).

LIT. M. Pellegrino, "Il Commemoratorium Vitae Sancti Severini," *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia* 12 (1958) 1–26. H. Baldernann, "Die Vita Severini des Eugippius," *WS* 74 (1961) 142–55. —B.B.

EUKTERION (εὐκτήριον), or *eukterios oikos* (εὐκτήριος οἶκος), lit. "a house of prayer" and therefore, in theory, any church building. Generally, however, the term was used of private CHURCHES—ORATORIES and CHAPELS—distinct from, or appended to, the main places of public worship. Secular and ecclesiastical authorities were anxious to ensure that privately founded *eukteria* did not subvert or overburden the church's episcopal structure. Justinian I ordered that construction was not to begin until the local bishop had consecrated the site, approved the priest, and received from the would-be founder (ΚΤΕΤΟΡ) sufficient funds for staffing and maintenance; donors who could not afford this were encouraged to contribute to the restoration of unused or ruined churches (novs. 57.1–2; 67; 123.18; 131.7). He also prohibited the celebration of the liturgy in the oratories of private houses (novs. 131.9; 58), a prohibition that the Council in Trullo repeated and extended to baptism (canons 31 and 59). Insofar as the prohibition was designed to prevent the dissemination of heresy, it had lost much of its urgency by the end of the 9th C., when Leo VI repealed it as being unnecessarily restrictive now that Orthodoxy was secure "and by divine grace *eukterioi oikoi* have been erected to God in almost every house, not only of the illustrious, but also of the common people" (nov.4; see also nov.15).

This policy ignored, however, the now more serious threat that *eukteria* posed to the sacramental raison d'être of the public churches and that Patr. ALEXIOS STOUDITES later (1028) attempted to remove by forbidding the use of *eukteria* for any service apart from the liturgy (*RegPatr*, fasc. 2, no.835). According to Balsamon, an *eukterios oikos* was a church that lacked consecration through chrismation, deposition of martyr relics, and enthronement of the officiating prelate (Rhalles-Potles, *Syntagma* 4:458t, 479.6–9).

LIT. Beck, *Kirche* 83–86.

—P.M.

EULALIOS (Εὐλάλιος), painter who seems to have flourished as a mosaicist and icon-painter under Manuel I; he is alluded to in several texts of the 12th–14th C. Nicholas MESARITES attributes to him the images of the Pantokrator and the MYRRORPHOROI in the Church of the HOLY APOSTLES, Constantinople, and suggests that Eulalios in-

serted his own image into the latter scene. This statement was questioned by Demus (*infra*) but is still consistent with the ethos of 12th-C. MONUMENTAL PAINTING.

LIT. N. Bees, "Kunstgeschichtliche Untersuchungen über die Eulalios-Frage und den Mosaikschmuck der Apostelkirche zu Konstantinopel," *RepKunstw* 39 (1916) 97–117, 231–51; 40 (1917) 59–77. O. Demus, "The Sleepless Watcher: Ein Erklärungsversuch," *JÖB* 28 (1979) 241–45. —A.C.

EULOGIA (εὐλογία, "blessing" or "benediction"), the term applied to consecrated gifts as well as to the bread offered optionally at the eucharist or blessed separately and distributed in church or sent as a gift. The term was extended to the "blessing" at departure and that received by a pilgrim through contact with a holy place, person, or object. It could be received either directly and immaterially, for example, through kissing the wood of the True Cross, or conveyed indirectly through a substance of neutral origin (e.g., oil, water, earth) that itself had been blessed by such contact. In the latter case, the material itself, as in Symeon tokens (see PILGRIM TOKENS) or its container (e.g. MENAS FLASKS, pilgrimage AMPULLAE) might bear a representation of the sanctifying agent or event. The richest account of Byz. pilgrimage *eulogiai* is that recorded ca.570 by the PIACENZA PILGRIM, who, for example, reclined on a couch in the Garden of Gethsemane "to gain a blessing" (ch.17). At the Holy Sepulchre he describes the blessing of little flasks of oil through contact with the True Cross and the blessing of earth brought into the tomb. Pilgrim *eulogiai* were valued for their amuletic and medicinal powers; CYRIL OF SKYTHOPOLIS (ed. E. Schwartz, 110.10–11, 164.14–18, 218.6–7, 228.13–14), for example, writes that St. SABAS (among others) used the oil of the True Cross to exorcise evil spirits; a flask at Bobbio (Giabai, *Ampoules*, Bobbio no.1) is inscribed "Oil of the Wood of Life, that guides us by land and sea."

LIT. A. Stuiber, *RAC* 6 (1966) 900–28. B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa* (Regensburg 1950) 398–43. Vikani, *Pilgrimage Art* 10–14. —G.V.

EUNAPIOS OF SARDIS, pagan writer and historian; born Sardis 345/6 (*PLRE* 1:296) or 349 (R. Goulet, *JHS* 100 [1980] 67), died after 414. Eunapios (Εὐνάπιος) lived mainly in Sardis, apart

from five student years at Athens whence his parents recalled him, thus aborting a visit to Egypt. His combination of sophistry and medicine (typical for the age) helped him achieve a friendship with ORIBASIOS, famous doctor and confidant of Julian. So did his rancid PAGANISM, the central emotional and intellectual impulse of his writings, albeit he did admire his Christian mentors Chrysanthios and Prohaeresios. His *Lives of the Sophists*, written in or after 399 (T.M. Banchich, *GRBS* 25 [1984] 183–92), celebrates various Neoplatonists, iatrosophists, and rhetoricians in different degrees of fervor and coolness.

His *History*, surviving only in fragments, formally continued that of Dexippos, and encompassed in 14 books the period 270–414. Its precise structure and date of composition are endlessly debated, as is whether he used AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS as a source or vice versa. Photios (*Bibl.*, cod.77) knew two versions or EKDOSEIS: the original being too anti-Christian for pious stomachs, Eunapios produced a toned-down “New Edition,” clumsily done with subsequent obscurities in the text. His *History* is wildly biased toward paganism and Julian, ostentatiously neglectful of precise chronology, and crammed with rhetorical digressions and descriptions of individuals and events; ZOSIMOS exploited it to the point of plagiarism. Photios is relatively kind to his style; modern taste generally prefers C.G. Cobet’s label “most stinking” (*Mnemosyne*² 6 [1878] 318).

ED. *Vitae sophistarum*, ed. G. Giangrande (Rome 1956). *Index in Eunapii Vitae sophistarum*, ed. I. and M.M. Avotins (Hildesheim 1983). *Philostrophus and Eunapius*, ed. W.C. Wright (Cambridge, Mass.–London 1952), 317–596, with Eng. tr. *History*—Blockley, *Historians* 1:1–26, 2:1–150, with Eng. tr. LIT. A. Baldini, *Ricerche sulla Storia di Eunapio di Sardi* (Bologna 1984). A.B. Breebaart, “Eunapius of Sardes and the Writing of History,” *Mnemosyne*¹ 32 (1979) 360–75. D.F. Buck, “Eunapius of Sardis and Theodosius the Great,” *Byzantion* 58 (1988) 36–53. —B.B.

EUNOMIOS (Εὐνόμιος), leader of Neo-Arians (Anomoians); born ca.335 in Cappadocia (in Oltiseris or more probably Dakora), died Dakora ca.394. Son of a cultured peasant, Eunomios learned the skill of TACHYGRAPHY and served as a teacher in Constantinople. In Antioch he met AETIOS, whose secretary and disciple he became and whose fate he shared, being exiled by Constantius II, recalled by Julian who gave him properties in Chalcedon, and subsequently becoming

involved in the revolt of Prokopios. In 360 (according to Philostorgios) or ca.366 (according to Sokrates), he was appointed bishop of Kyzikos. After the death of Aetios, Eunomios headed the radical group of Arians and was ordered by Theodosios I to produce their exposition of faith; Theodosios, however, rejected their Anomoian views and banished Eunomios to the lower Danube and then to Cappadocia, where he died.

Like Aetios, Eunomios taught that God the Creator was ingenerate, whereas the Son was created and possessed a different essence and different energy; the Father, the Son, and the Spirit formed a hierarchy of nonsubstantial beings. Naturally, Eunomios avoided the concept of the Trinity. The Logos-Christ was a created deity and never assumed the human nature—a view that Eunomios shared with the Theopaschites. He introduced a particular form of baptism—a single immersion in the name of the death of Christ (and not in the name of the Trinity). Eunomios professed the power of reason, and contemporaries testify to the clarity of his argumentation. He rejected the idea that God was unknowable: Sokrates ascribes to him the assertion that God does not know more of his essence than we do. Eunomios’s works are lost but some of them (the *Apology*, the *Apology of Apology*, and the *Exposition of Faith*) are known in fragments from refutations produced by his opponents (Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa).

ED. *The Extant Works*, ed. R.P. Vaggione (Oxford 1987). PG 30:835–68, 67:587–90.

LIT. T.A. Kopeck, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia 1979). B. Sesboüé, *L’Apologie d’Eunome de Cyzique et le ‘Contre Eunome’ (I:1–3) de Basile de Césarée* (Rome 1980). F. Dickamp, “Literargeschichtliches zu der eunomianischen Kontroverse,” *BZ* 18 (1909) 1–13. L. Abramowski, *RAC* 6:936–47. —T.E.G., A.K.

EUNUCHS (sing. ἐκτομίας) played an important role in the church, the army, and the civil administration. Several patriarchs were eunuchs: GERMANOS I, METHODIOS, IGNATIOS, and others, the last of them being Eustratios Garidas (1081–84); among generals NARSES was especially famous; among civil officials were EUTROPIOS, SAMONAS, Joseph BRINGAS, Basil LEKAPENOS, and JOHN THE ORPHANOTROPHOS. High palace dignities such as PRAEPOSITUS SACRI CUBICULI and PARAKOIMOMENOS were until the 11th C. held mainly by eunuchs. Eunuchs also served in the houses of aris-

ocrats. Legislation prohibited castration, although Leo VI (nov.60) mitigated the punishment imposed for performing this surgery. Despite this legislation the operation was often performed on both children and adults, including members of the aristocracy. Some eunuchs were imported from the Caucasus, the caliphate, and Slavic countries. Rare at the time of Constantine I, eunuchs acquired importance during the reign of Constantius II in conjunction with the growth of the bureaucratic system; Julian’s attempt to restrict the role of eunuchs failed. They retained important positions through the 11th C., but were pushed out of the highest posts under the Komnenian dynasty, as aristocratic ideology with its veneration of manliness became dominant (A. Kazhdan, *ADSV* 10 [1973] 184–97); they were rare in the 14th–15th C. Because of their fear of HOMOSEXUALITY, monastic leaders tried to exclude the “beardless” from certain monasteries (e.g., on Mt. Athos).

It is usually thought that eunuchs, who had no children of their own nor were allowed to ascend the throne, preserved greater loyalty to their masters. G. Walter (*La vie quotidienne à Byzance au siècle des Comnènes* [Paris 1966] 95) questioned this thesis, arguing that in reality eunuchs participated in diverse plots and schemes against the emperors. Theophylaktos of Ohrid (*Discours, Traités, Poésies*, ed. P. Gautier [Thessalonike 1980] 287–331) wrote a defense of the status of eunuchs, demonstrating that they had always played an important role in the palace, in the church, and esp. in the creation of ecclesiastical music. Theophylaktos provided his reader with a list of eunuch-martyrs and named a worthy contemporary, a certain Symeon, who organized a *synoikia* (community) of eunuch-monks. The monastery of St. Lazaros in Constantinople was reserved for eunuchs by Leo VI (Janin, *Églises CP* 299).

LIT. Guiland, *Institutions* 1:165–97. M.D. Spadaro, “Un inedito di Teofilatto di Achrida sull’eunuchia,” *RSBS* 1 (1981) 3–38. —A.K.

EUPHEMIA, CHURCH OF SAINT, built in the 4th C. at the place of her burial, about 1.5 km from CHALCEDON. It consisted of a basilica with an attached circular martyrion in which the body of EUPHEMIA was kept in a silver sarcophagus. Once a year the body reportedly exuded an efflu-

vium of blood that was distributed in glass ampullae. A painted cycle of Euphemia’s martyrdom (in a “roofed passage”) is described by ASTERIOS OF AMASEIA. The Council of Chalcedon was held in the church in 451. The Persian invasions of the early 7th C. caused its destruction and the transfer to Constantinople of the “uncorrupted body,” which was housed in the converted great hall of the palace of Antiochos next to the HIPPODROME. During the Iconoclastic period the new church was secularized and the relics were thrown in the sea by Constantine V; they were miraculously saved and returned in 796 to the refurbished church, which survived until the end of the Byz. Empire. Excavations in 1942 and 1950–52 revealed part of the palace of Antiochos, including the hexagonal building that housed the church, opening on to a semicircular portico. A late 13th-C. cycle of wall paintings illustrates the saint’s martyrdom.

LIT. Janin, *Églises CP* 120–24. Janin, *Églises centres* 31–33. R. Naumann, H. Belting, *Die Euphemia-Kirche am Hippodrom zu Istanbul und ihre Fresken* (Berlin 1966). —C.M.

EUPHEMIA OF CHALCEDON, saint; died 16 Sept. 303, according to the *Fasti Consulares Vindobonenses* (MGH *AuctAnt.* 9:290). EGERIA mentions the cult of Euphemia (Εὐφημία) in Chalcedon, and ASTERIOS OF AMASEIA describes her annual feast and the pictorial representation of her trial and death by fire. The Church of St. Euphemia housed the Council of Chalcedon in 451 (see EUPHEMIA, CHURCH OF SAINT). Halkin (*infra*, xvii) dates the earliest *passio* (preserved in 11th- and 12th-C. MSS) soon after this council. It provides little information, but the details of the trial and execution differ from Asterios’s description; for example, Euphemia was supposedly thrown to wild beasts and died in the arena. The *Synaxarion of Constantinople* (*Synax.CP* p.811–13) assigns to Euphemia the miracle of determining the decision of the Council of 451: two *tomoi*, one orthodox and another heterodox (Monophysite), were placed in Euphemia’s coffin; after several days the council members reopened the coffin and found the heretical creed under Euphemia’s feet and the orthodox one in her hands. Euphemia’s cult was popular in Byz. Constantine of Tios (ca.800) related that Leo III ordered her relics thrown into the sea, but two pious brothers saved

them and brought them to Lemnos. In the 15th C. Makarios MAKRES reworked this legend. Latin versions also survive (H. Boese, *AB* 97 [1979] 360–62).

Representation in Art. Portraits of the saint show a virgin martyr clad in a *maphorion* and long tunic. In the THEODORE PSALTER (fol.163v) and in some MSS of Symeon Metaphrastes she is shown flanked by beasts from the arena (in accordance with the text), while in others she stands nude in a pyre (as in the description by Asterios) or is beheaded. A fresco cycle of 14 scenes illustrating her martyrdom adorns her church in Constantinople (R. Naumann, H. Belting, *Die Euphemia-Kirche am Hippodrom zu Istanbul und ihre Fresken* [Berlin 1966] 113–17).

SOURCE. F. Halkin, *Euphémie de Chalcédoine* (Brussels 1965).
LIT. *BHG* 619–624n. J. Wortley, "Iconoclasm and Leipsanoclasm: Leo III, Constantine V and the Relics," *ByzF* 8 (1982) 274–77. O. Schrier, "A propos d'une donnée négligée sur la mort de Ste. Euphémie," *AB* 102 (1984) 329–53. J. Boberg, *LCI* 6:182–85. —A.K., N.P.S.

EUPHRATAS (Εὐφρατᾶς), legendary architect of Constantinople during the reign of Constantine I. He is described as a eunuch, *parakoimomenos*, and eponym of a church or *gerokomeion* in the district of Leomakellion in Constantinople. He is mentioned in the *Patria*, in pseudo-Symeon Magistros, and in some legends about Constantine. According to one of the legends, Euphratas built the city ramparts, developed the sewage system, excavated cisterns, and erected Hagia Sophia. Another legend relates that he came to Constantine on the eve of the battle at the Milvian Bridge and advised the emperor to abandon polytheism and trust in the true God and his son Christ. Euphratas also reportedly invited inhabitants of various cities to move to Constantinople and furnished them with *annonae* and dwellings. He supposedly provided "the *archontes* of Rome" with new houses, fountains, and gardens identical to those they had possessed in Rome. Euphratas is not mentioned in any source before the 9th C.

LIT. F. Halkin, "L'empereur Constantin converti par Euphratas," *AB* 78 (1960) 5–17. A. Kazhdan, "Constantin imaginaire," *Byzantion* 57 (1987) 237–39. —A.K.

EUPHRATENSIS, properly Augusta Euphratensis (Αὐγουστοεὐφρατησία, also *Augusta eupatensis* [sic]), province created between 330 and 350

(probably ca.341) from that territory of Coele-Syria that lay along the west bank of the Euphrates. It is identified by Ammianus Marcellinus and Prokopios as former Kommagene. Part of what had earlier been the region of Palmyrene (e.g., SERGIOPOLIS) was incorporated in the province, but it is doubtful, despite Malalas and Prokopios, that Euphratensis included some parts of OSRHOENE. The province contained at least 20 cities, including HIERAPOLIS (the capital), CYRRHUS-Hagioupolis, Doliche (TELOUCH), SAMOSATA, and EUROPOS. The early 7th-C. geographer GEORGE OF CYPRUS calls the region "the eparchy of Euphratensis and Hagioupolis," stressing the special place occupied by Cyrrhus. In the 5th C. southern Euphratensis was carved out, including ZENOBIA and the capital Sergiopolis. After the Arab conquest Euphratensis formed part of the *jund* (military district) of Qinnasrīn (CHALKIS). The name al-Furāṭiyah survives in Arabic sources until the 13th C.

LIT. E. Honigmann, *RE* 12 (1925) 193–98, 2.R. 4 (1932) 1698. Idem, *Evêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle* (Louvain 1952) 102f. —M.M.M.

EUPHRATES (Εὐφράτης), longest (2,760 km) river of western Asia. The Euphrates was navigable from north of Edessa; it was a principal waterway for transportation, but vulnerable politically and militarily. Heavily fortified since Roman times, the river provided the principal means for Persian expeditions against Byz. Much defensive construction took place in the reigns of Anastasios I and Justinian I. Important cities along the Euphrates included MELITENE, SAMOSATA, HIERAPOLIS, Zenobia, and Kirkesion. Stretches of the Euphrates were part of the Sasanian-Byz. border. The river continued to be a principal invasion route for Muslims against Byz. in the 7th–9th C. Control of its upper reaches, including such strongpoints as KAMACHA, occasioned much Byz.-Muslim warfare. The Euphrates floods from November to the end of March, and, esp. in April and May, carries heavy silt to the Mesopotamian plain. Its water allowed the agriculture that flourished along its banks, in contrast to the often parched lands beyond the reach of irrigation.

LIT. J.G. Crow, D.H. French in *Roman Frontier Studies* 1979, eds. W.S. Hanson, L.J.F. Keppie (Oxford 1980) 903–12. G. Frézouls in *Le Moyen-Euphrate: Zone de contacts et d'échanges*, ed. J. Margueron (Leiden 1980) 355–86. M.G.

Ionides, *The Regime of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris* (London 1937). —W.E.K.

EUPHROSINE DOUKAINA KAMATERA, empress (1195–1203); fl. ca.1169–1210. She married the future ALEXIOS III ANGELOS ca.1169 and bore him three daughters: Irene (born ca.1170), Anna (born ca.1171 or 1173), and Eudokia (born ca.1172 or 1174). Stronger-willed and more intelligent than Alexios, she had great influence over him; she occupied the palace when word of his coup reached Constantinople. Her support for Constantine MESOPOTAMITES created opposition from her son-in-law Andronikos Kontostephanos and her brother Basil KAMATEROS, who informed Alexios of her affair with a certain Vatatzes. The latter was executed and Euphrosyne was shut in a convent for six months (1196–97). Upon her return she regained dominance over her husband, although she could not prevent Mesopotamites' fall (1197). Abandoned by Alexios in Constantinople when he fled, she was arrested, but ALEXIOS V DOUKAS took Euphrosyne and Eudokia with him when he left Constantinople. After Alexios V and Alexios III met at Mosynopolis, Euphrosyne joined her husband in his wanderings. Carried off to Montferrat with him, she was ransomed by MICHAEL I KOMNENOS DOUKAS of Epiros and passed the rest of her life near Arta.

LIT. Polemis, *Doukai* 131.

—C.M.B.

EURIPIDES (Εὐριπίδης), Greek tragic poet; born Salamis 480 B.C., died Macedonia 406. Following the tradition of late antiquity, Byz. scholars favored the ten so-called select plays of Euripides. Knowledge of the nine other tragedies was rare but evident in PSELLOS, John TZETZES, and EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKE (cf. Wilson, *infra* 177, 204). The earliest extant MS of Euripides (Jerusalem, Gr. Patr., Taphou 36) dates from the 10th or 11th C., and his life is included in the *Souda*. In the early 14th C. the triad of *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phoenician Women*, which had become standard in the school syllabus, received philological study in the form of scholia and/or recensions by MAXIMOS PLANOUDS, MANUEL MOSCHOPOULOS, THOMAS MAGISTROS, and DEMETRIOS TRIKLINIOS. Of particular significance is the latter's edition of all 19 plays.

The only attempt at literary criticism of Euripides—Psellos's comparison of Euripides and GEORGE OF PISIDIA (ed. A. Colonna, *SBN* 7 [1953] 16–21)—survives in a damaged MS that, because of its poor condition, prevents any conclusions as to Psellos's verdict. Clearly, however, he admires Euripides for his ability to arouse pity and for his versatility of style. Judging from the number of surviving MSS, Euripides was the most popular of the great tragedians. He influenced the language of the *Verses on Adam* by IGNATIOS THE DEACON, the *Katomyomachia* by Theodore PRODROMOS, and esp. CHRISTOS PASCHON.

While scenes from Euripides are represented in the floor mosaics of ANTIOCH, no illuminated Byz. MSS of the plays survive. Nevertheless, K. Weitzmann (*Hesperia* 18 [1949] 159–210) hypothesized their existence and impact on the Venice *Kynegetika* (see OPIAN). In his view several CASKETS AND BOXES depict episodes from the tragedies, notably the sacrifice of IPHIGENEIA on the VEROLI CASKET and HIPPLYTOS crowned on other ivories. Other scholars, however, connect the Veroli casket with NONNOS OF PANOPOLIS.

ED. *Scholia metrica anonyma in Euripidis Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas*, ed. O.L. Smith (Copenhagen 1977). A. Meschini, "Sugli gnomologi bizantini di Euripide," *Helikon* 13–14 (1973–74) 349–62. Michael Psellos, *The Essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus*, ed. A.R. Dyck (Vienna 1986).

LIT. G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge 1965). A. Tuilier, *Etude comparée du texte et des scholies d'Euripide* (Paris 1972). Wilson, *Scholars* 177f, 204, 246, 254f. B. Donovan, *Euripides Papyri* (New Haven 1968). A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1957). —A.C.H., A.C.

EUROPA, in Greek mythology daughter of Phoenix or of Agenor (king of Tyre), who was abducted by Zeus disguised as a handsome bull. This episode was known to Byz. authors: for example, Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 142.16–22) compares her with Theodora Komnene, who was seduced by the future emperor Andronikos I. A scholiast to TZETZES (*Hist.* 7:363) transfers Europa from Phoenicia to Egypt and makes her the daughter of Nilus. The church fathers rationalized the myth of Europa in the same manner as the myth of DANAË but did not attempt to allegorize it in a Christian sense, prevented probably by the connotations of BESTIALITY. The rape of Europa is represented twice on the VEROLI CASKET

in London (Goldschmidt-Weitzmann, *Elfenbeinskulpt.* I, no.23) and on other ivories.

LIT. W. Bühler, *RAC* 6:982–85. Weitzmann, *Gr. Myth.* 183–86. —A.K., A.C.

EUROPE (Εὐρώπη). The Byz. retained the ancient concept of three continents—Europe, Libya (Africa), and Asia. Since only narrow straits divided Europe from Libya, Theophanes (Theoph. 95.1–2, 426.3–4) considered Spain “the first country of Europe from the West Ocean.” The border between Europe and Asia was more difficult to define. The Bosphoros-Hellespont was a natural dividing line; to the north, the Tanais (Don) River was considered a border—Laonikos Chalkokondyles (Chalk. 1:123.6–8) assumed that “the land beyond the Tanais” was larger and wider than Europe. Prokopios (*Wars* 8:6.13–15), however, rejected such a view and—referring to Aeschylus—established the borderline at Colchidian Phasis. Eustathios of Thessalonike, in his commentary on Dionysios Periegetes (*GGM* 2:222.5–12, 264.44–46), acknowledged the existence of isthmuses that formed buffers between the continents—Arabia between Libya and Asia, and the Caucasus, a “large and broad isthmus between the Caspian Sea and the Euxeinós (Black Sea).” The semilegendary land of Thoule was viewed as the farthest part of northern Europe.

Europe was considered a geographic unity: according to Eustathios (2:264.44–45), it was the most varied in form among the continents, surpassing Asia and Libya in wealth, its production of fruit, and the virtue of its population, but had fewer animals. The idea of Europe as a political, cultural, and emotional concept was not developed in Byz., even though it emerged in the West in the 13th and 14th C. at the expense of the concept of Christendom; Byz. was left outside Europe, which contributed to the relative indifference of the West to the fall of Constantinople.

The name *Europe* was also applied by Greek authors to a part of Thrace, as both an administrative and ecclesiastical division.

LIT. D. Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*² (Edinburgh 1968). D.M. Nicol, “The Byzantine View of Western Europe,” *GRBS* 8 (1967) 315–39. P. Grattarola, “Il concetto di Europa alla fine del mondo antico,” *L'Europa nel mondo antico* (Milan 1986) 174–91. J. Koder, “Ho horos ‘Europe’ hos ennoia chorou ste Byzantine historiographia,” in *Byzantio kai Europe* (Athens 1987) 63–74. —R.B.H., A.K.

EUROPOS (Εὐρωπός, Ar. Jarābulus, Cerablus on the Turkish-Syrian border), city of EUPHRATENSIS built on the site of ancient Carchemish at a strategic crossing of the Euphrates River. Its walls were built by Keler, *magister militum* of Anastasios I (*JoshStyl*, ch.91) and again by Justinian I (Prokopios, *Buildings* 2.9.10). In 542 Europos was made the military headquarters of Belisarios (Prokopios, *Wars* 2.20.24–7). Circa 525 Monophysite monks, expelled under Justin I from SELEUKIA PIERIA, established the monastery of Qenneshre (“eagle’s nest”) on a height opposite Europos. After the Arab conquest (639) it became famous for the preservation of Greek studies until 815, when the monastery was burned by local people; it was restored by DIONYSIOS OF TELL-MAHRĒ (died 845).

LIT. F. Nau, “Histoire de Jean bar Aphthoniya,” *ROC* 7 (1902) 108–10. —M.M.M.

EURYTANEIA, modern province in central Greece. The ancient Eurytanes were a tribe in ATTOLIA. The rugged mountainous terrain of the region has led to its relative isolation; it contains a number of churches and monasteries, but most are post-Byz. (J.T.A. Koumoulides, *GOrThR* 30 [1985] 61–83). One of the most important Byz. monuments was the large 9th-C. domed church at Episkopi, 40 km west of Karpenision, dedicated to the Dormition (P.L. Vokotopoulos, *He ekklesiastike architektonike eis ten dytiken sterean Hellada kai ten Epeiron* [Thessalonike 1975] 69–74). It received three distinct programs of wall painting; the first contemporary with its construction, the second in the late 10th or early 11th C., and the third in the first half of the 13th C. Before the church was submerged beneath the modern reservoir of Kremasta, the frescoes from all three stages were removed to the Byzantine Museum in Athens (M. Chatzidakis in *Holy Image*, nos. 2–6).

LIT. A. Orlandos, “Byzantina mnemeia tes Aitolokarnanias,” *ABME* 9 (1961) 3–20. A. Paliouras, *Byzantine Aitolokarnania* (Athens 1985). —A.C.

EUSEBIOS (Εὐσέβιος), personal name (meaning “pious”). The name first appeared in the 4th C. and immediately spread widely in the Christian and the pagan milieus: we know several pupils of Libanios who are called Eusebios as well as many officials whose religious beliefs cannot be deter-

mined. *PLRE* 1:301–09 lists 43 Eusebioi of the 4th C., to whom several clergymen should be added—bishops of Caesarea, Nikomedeia, Emesa, and others (A. Jülicher, *RE* 6 [1909] 1439–44). *PLRE* 2:428–33 contains fewer men of this name in the 5th C.—only 29. Sozomenos is aware of 14 Eusebioi—more than JOHN (11), PAUL (9), and THEODORE (7). Probably by the 6th C. the name went out of fashion; Prokopios lists only two. Theophanes the Confessor mentions 11 Eusebioi: nine were active in the 4th C. and only two were contemporaries of Anastasios and Justinian I, respectively. Thereafter, the name disappeared almost completely: throughout published acts of the archives of Athos only two monks named Eusebios are found (in *Lavra* of the 11th C.); *PLP* (nos. 6328–29) registers two Eusebioi (a bishop after 1439, probably identical with Eusebio da Cremona, and a metropolitan of Sougdaia in the mid-14th C.). Seals give the same impression: in the Laurent *Corpus* 5.1–3, only one clergyman, Eusebios of Gaza (no.2027), is included; the editor dates his seal to the 6th C. In Zacos, *Seals*, vol. 1, five Eusebioi are present: their seals are of the 6th–8th C. Laurent’s *Corpus* 2 contains only one Eusebios (no.715), *koubikoularios* and *primikerios* of the *vestiarion* of the 9th–10th C. It should be noted that the first editor, G. Schlumberger, read the name differently, as Eugenios. —A.K.

EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA, churchman and scholar; born ca.260, died 339 or 340; according to a Syriac list of saints he was buried on 30 May. He was educated by Pamphilos, a priest in Caesarea, who developed Origen’s traditions and enlarged Origen’s library; his high esteem for Pamphilos led Eusebios to accept the surname “of Pamphilos.” Pamphilos was arrested in 307 during the anti-Christian persecutions, but he kept working in prison with Eusebios’s assistance; he was beheaded in 309. After the execution of Pamphilos and some of his students, Eusebios fled to Tyre and then to the Thebaid.

In 313, however, as soon as the edict of tolerance was issued by Galerius, he was elected bishop of Caesarea. He became Constantine I the Great’s favorite and a historiographer and participated in many theological discussions of the period. He perceived the threat represented by MONARCHIANISM and was tolerant, even supportive, of the

Arians; allied with EUSEBIOS OF NIKOMEDEIA he actively contributed to the deposition of the orthodox EUSTATHIOS OF ANTIOCH in 330 and ATHANASIOS of Alexandria in 335. He also participated in the Council of Constantinople in 336 that attacked the views of MARKELLOS OF ANKYRA.

As a scholar Eusebios was an outstanding systematizer who assembled copious data. His works are devoted primarily to the problems of apologetics and church history. His major apologetic treatises are the voluminous *Preparation* and *Demonstration of the Gospels*, both dedicated to the Arian bishop of Syrian Laodikeia, Theodotos. In the *Preparation* he endeavors to show that “the philosophy and religion of the Hebrews” is more ancient and richer in content than Greco-Roman paganism and exercises a more powerful influence on human life. In the *Demonstration*, on the other hand, he asserts that Judaism is limited and ephemeral, only a fragile shell, whereas Christianity forms a permanent kernel.

The most important historical works of Eusebios are the *Chronicle*, the *Church History*, and the *VITA CONSTANTINI*. In the *Chronicle*, Eusebios, following in the steps of Sextus Julius AFRICANUS but using other sources as well, gave the lists of ruling dynasties of Chaldeans, Assyrians, Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, and in brief form events of biblical and nonbiblical history, with special attention (in the last section) to the growth of Christianity. Thus Eusebios emphasized the same apologetic principle that permeates his *Preparation*: Christianity is not a sheer novelty but a religion properly rooted in the past. Eusebios produced several revisions of the *Church History* that are reflected in the two families of manuscripts, as well as in the 5th-C. Syriac version: he reworked his text in connection with the drastic changes in the political situation. Nevertheless the main principles of his approach remained consistent: first of all, his ten-book *History* presents an enormous amount of information, citing earlier works and documents; these citations may not always be dependable, but Eusebios believes that story-telling must be factual in order to be convincing. Second, history is a field in which the Savior is actively leading mankind to a teleologically foreseen future; accordingly, those who follow the Lord’s path become victorious and, vice versa, those who emerge victorious are men following in the way of the Lord. In other words,

the emperor is successful because he fulfills the plan destined by God; he is the representative of God on earth. Constantine is praised precisely because he was victorious, and Eusebios makes him more Christian than he really was. Third, only the major patterns of development are salient while certain facts deviating from or contradicting them can be omitted or transformed or replaced by myth (as Crispus's murder is omitted; Constantine's conversion to Christianity is provided with a supernatural setting; and Galerius, the author of the first edict of tolerance, is presented as a diehard persecutor of Christians)—all with the noble aim of emphasizing the teleology of human salvation.

The Byz. often criticized Eusebios. Sokrates called him "double-tongued." The Second Council of Nicaea of 787 prohibited quoting Eusebios as a witness of correct belief. Two events account for such a negative attitude: Eusebios's pro-Arian stance and his rejection of the cult of icons. Despite these "shortcomings," Eusebios obtained great authority and for the Byz. remained the major source for the early centuries of Christianity and a textbook for antipagan and anti-Jewish polemics.

ED. PG 19–24. *Eusebius Werke*, 9 vols., ed. I.A. Heikel et al. (Leipzig-Berlin 1902–56). *Eusebius: The History of the Church*, tr. G.A. Williamson (Harmondsworth 1965).

LIT. T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981). R.M. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford 1980). A.A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, Pa., 1979). M. Gödecke, *Geschichte als Mythos: Eusebs 'Kirchengeschichte'* (Frankfurt–New York 1987). H.A. Drake, *In Praise of Constantine* (Berkeley–Los Angeles 1976). —A.K., B.B.

EUSEBIOS OF EMESA, bishop of Emesa (from ca.340) and biblical exegete; born Edessa ca.300, died Antioch or Emesa 359. A native speaker of Syriac, Eusebios learned Greek at school prior to exegetical and philosophical training at Antioch and Alexandria; the latter city introduced him to the friendship and Arianism of George, bishop of Laodikeia, though he refused to succeed ATHANASIOS of Alexandria to its see in 339. His advent at EMESA was greeted by riots against his supposedly "too scholarly" personality; intervention by George and the patriarch of Antioch secured his position. Apparently semi-Arian in views, Eusebios was

praised for his rhetorical skills and prolific popular writing by JEROME, who singled out his homilies on the Gospels and pamphlets against the Jews, Gentiles, and Novatians. THEODORET OF CYRRHUS mentions treatises against Manichaeans and Marcionites. Greek fragments of his commentaries on Genesis and Galatians show him to follow the ANTIOCHENE SCHOOL of exegesis. About 60 homilies survive in whole or part in Armenian (H.J. Lehmann, *Per piscatores* [Århus 1975]), Greek, Latin, Slavic (M. Matejić in *Literaturoznanie i folkloristika v čest Akademiku Sbornik Petūr Dinekov* [Sofia 1983] 145–55), and Syriac. The pseudo-Eusebian Gallican sermons belong mainly to Faustus of Riez (*Eusebius "Gallicanus" Collectio homiliarum*, ed. J. Leroy, F. Glorie, 3 vols. [Turnhout 1970–71]).

ED. PG 86.1:509–62, 31:1476–88. *Eusèbe d'Emèse: Discours conservés en latin*, ed. E.M. Buytaert, 2 vols. (Louvain 1953–57).

LIT. E.M. Buytaert, *L'héritage littéraire d'Eusèbe d'Emèse* (Louvain 1949). —B.B.

EUSEBIOS OF NIKOMEDEIA, Arian bishop of Nikomedeia (from ca.318); bishop of Constantinople (from 338/9); died ca.342, probably at Constantinople. Eusebios was a fellow pupil of ARIUS under LUCIAN OF ANTIOCH. After Arius's condemnation ca.320, Eusebios, who had just become bishop of Nikomedeia, organized an epistolary campaign in support of Arius. Although Eusebios subscribed to the decisions of the Council of Nicaea in 325, he was soon exiled to Gaul by Constantine I on charges of supporting the Meletians (see MELETIAN SCHISM). After his recall in 328, he became a leader of the extreme Arian party, who came to be known as "Eusebians." He gained the favor of Constantine I and in 337 baptized the emperor during his last illness. The triumph of the Arian party was evident when Eusebios became bishop of Constantinople in 338 or 339. His brief tenure in Constantinople was marked primarily by hostile maneuvering against ATHANASIOS of Alexandria.

Virtually none of Eusebios's writings survive, with the exception of a few letters preserved by the ecclesiastical historians Sokrates (Sokr. HE 1.14), Sozomenos (Sozom. HE 2.16), and THEODORET OF CYRRHUS (HE 1.5).

LIT. A. Lichtenstein, *Eusebius von Nikomedien* (Halle 1903). C. Kannengiesser, *DPAC* 1:1296–99. C. Luibheid, "The

Arianism of Eusebius of Nicomedia," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 43 (1976) 3–23. —B.B., A.M.T.

EUSTATHIANS. See EUSTATHIOS OF ANTIOCH.

EUSTATHIOS (Εὐστάθιος), martyr executed under Hadrian and saint; feastday 20 Sept; prebaptismal name Placidus. His legend is preserved in two Greek passions, one ascribed to SYMEON METAPHRASTES (a Nuremberg MS presents slight variations—J.-M. Olivier, *AB* 93 [1975] 109f); in a panegyric of NIKETAS DAVID PAPHLAGON; in a Latin translation known already in the 9th/10th C. (O. Engels, *HistJb* 76 [1957] 119f); and in a Coptic version. When the legend was created is unclear. It has sometimes been viewed as a reflection of Indian motifs that reached Byz. via Syria; traces of the supposed migration have yet to be shown. In its core the legend is a Christian version of the JOB story: under Trajan, the rich Roman general Placidus, "stratelates in the language of the Romans," saw a huge stag with a cross between its antlers and heard a heavenly voice summoning him to baptism. He became Christian with his whole family, assumed a new name (Eustathios or Eustachios), suffered numerous disasters (plague, death of cattle and slaves), left home for Egypt, and was separated from his wife and two sons en route. Unlike the biblical Job but like the heroes of Greek romances (T. Hägg, *Symbolae Osloenses* 59 [1984] 61–63), Eustathios suffered only temporarily, later recovering both family and fame. A new blow struck after Trajan's death, when Hadrian ordered Eustathios and his family burned in a bronze bull.

Representation in Art. Eustathios is depicted in military costume from at least the 10th C. onward. The two most frequently illustrated scenes of his legend are (1) his vision, which appears in Cappadocian and Georgian churches and in the marginal PSALTERS (where, rather than a cross, the image of Christ in the form of an icon appears between the antlers of the stag, and Christ asks, "Why are you pursuing me?"); and (2) the martyrdom of Eustathios and his family consumed by flames inside the brazen bull. Further episodes accompany certain MSS of Metaphrastes.

SOURCES. G. van Hooft, "Acta Graeca s. Eustathii martyris et sociorum ejus," *AB* 3 (1884) 65–112. PG 105:375–418. Russ. tr. Poljakova, *Viz. leg.* 208–24.

LIT. BHG 641–43. H. Delehaye, *Mélanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine* (Brussels 1966) 212–39. T. Velmans, "L'église de Zenobani et le thème de la Vision de saint Eustache en Géorgie," *CahArch* 33 (1985) 36–49.

—A.K., N.P.S.

EUSTATHIOS OF ANTIOCH, theologian; bishop of Berroia (Aleppo) and from 323/4 to 326 (H. Chadwick, *JThSt* 49 [1948] 27–35) or more probably to 328/9 (Hanson, *infra*) bishop of Antioch; born Side, died Traianopolis? in Thrace before 337. At the First Council of Nicaea in 325 Eustathios was one of the ardent opponents of ARIUS; subsequently an Arian synod in Antioch deposed him and in 330 Constantine I exiled him to Traianopolis. In 362 his partisans, called Eustathians, consecrated Paulinos as bishop of Antioch in opposition to Meletios, thus precipitating the (second) MELETIAN SCHISM.

Little of Eustathios's writings has survived; some of his work is preserved in Syriac or Georgian translations (e.g., M. van Esbroeck, *OrChr* 66 [1982] 189–214), and attribution is sometimes questionable. Eustathios attacked ancient philosophers, such as PLOTINOS (fragment in Syriac—R. Lorenz, *ZNTW* 71 [1980] 109–28). He also criticized the allegorical exegesis of ORIGEN (in *On the Witch of Endor*, the only completely extant work of Eustathios). Fragments of his work *On Melchisedek*, directed against the Melchisedekians, who thought the Priest-King of Salem greater than Christ, are dated in their present form to 420–50 by B. Altaner (*BZ* 40 [1940] 30–47). The major target of Eustathios was Arianism. His concern was to show that the Logos assumed, in the act of incarnation, the entire man and not the body (*sarx*) only. He strongly emphasized the existence of the two natures of Christ; this later allowed his enemies to accuse him of Nestorianism.

ED. E. Klostermann, *Origenes, Eustathius von Antiochien und Gregor von Nyssa über die Hexe von Endor* (Bonn 1912) 16–62, with corr. by A. Brinkmann, *RhM* 74 (1925) 308–13. *CPG*, nos. 3350–98.

LIT. R.V. Sellers, *Eustathios of Antioch* (Cambridge 1928). M. Spanneut, *Recherches sur les écrits d'Eustathe d'Antioche* (Lille 1948). Quasten, *Patrology* 3:302–06. R.C.P. Hanson, "The Fate of Eustathios of Antioch," *ZKirch* 95 (1984) 171–79. —A.K., B.B., T.E.G.

EUSTATHIOS OF EPIPHANEIA (in Syria), historian; died ca.505. His major work, entitled *Brief*

Chronicle according to the *Souda*, is now lost, but both Malalas and Evagrius Scholastikos drew upon it. It is plausible that this chronicle began with the destruction of Troy and reached the Roman wars against Persia in 502–05. If we can believe Evagrius, Eustathios epitomized pagan (Zosimos, Priskos, etc.) and ecclesiastical (Eusebios of Caesarea, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, etc.) historians. Eustathios's *Historikon of the Judaeian Archaeology* by "Iosepos" is included in the catalog of the library in Patmos of 1200 (P. Maas, *BZ* 38 [1938] 350). Probably the same text is preserved in a MS of the 13th/14th C., Paris B.N. gr. 1555A, where it bears the title *Epitome of the Archaeology by Iosepos [written] by Eustathios of Epiphaneia in Syria*; the short fragment based on JOSEPHUS FLAVIUS begins with Adam and Eve and ends with Vespasian and Titus.

ED. *FHG* 4:138–42.

LIT. C. Benjamin, *RE* 6 (1907) 1450f. P. Allen, "An Early Epitomator of Josephus: Eustathios of Epiphaneia," *BZ* 81 (1988) 1–11. Hunger, *Lit.* 1:323. —A.K.

EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKE, church official, scholar, and writer; born ca.1115, died Thessalonike? 1195/6. The hypothesis of Kyriakides (*infra*, xxxv–xxxvi) that he belonged to the KATAPHLORON family is not valid. Educated in Constantinople, Eustathios served as a scribe under the future Patr. MICHAEL III; he became deacon, after 1166 *magistros ton rhetoron*, and ca.1178 (the traditional date of 1174 is wrong) archbishop of Thessalonike. Eustathios wrote a commentary on HOMER, sometimes using the epic for allusions to contemporary events. He also commented on PINDAR, ARISTOPHANES, Dionysios Periegetes, and JOHN OF DAMASCUS. Although he is studied primarily as an interpreter of ancient texts and collector of lost antique commentaries, Eustathios was an original thinker and a great writer. Politically he supported MANUEL I, but dared sometimes to criticize the emperor, esp. for his attempts at accommodation with Islamic doctrine. Eustathios praised military prowess, but censured both venal bureaucrats and greedy and illiterate monks; he defended CHARISTIKIA. In contrast to contemporary views, he set secular ideals above those of hermits in his vita of PHILOTHEOS OF OPSIKION. Eustathios poeticized manual (esp. agrarian) labor and developed the concept of historical progress from a primitive way of life

to civilization. He rejected SLAVERY as an evil and unnatural institution. As a writer, he endeavored to shift from conventional abstraction to the presentation of great events by means of little details and frequent recourse to sarcasm and irony. He enjoyed life, considered human relations more important than ritual, and loved the richness of language; his plays on words are much more complex than the usual hints at the significance of a name. His sermons and official panegyrics are more conventional than his best works, such as *On the Capture of Thessalonike* (in 1185) or *On the Improvement of Monastic Life*, which expressed his individual attitudes in a series of portraits and vivid scenes.

ED. G.L.F. Tafel, *Eustathii Opuscula* (Frankfurt am Main 1832; rp. Amsterdam 1964). Regel, *Fontes* 1–131. *La espugnazione di Tessalonica*, ed. S. Kyriakides (Palermo 1961). Germ. tr. H. Hunger, *Die Normannen in Thessalonike* (Graz-Vienna-Cologne 1955; rp. 1967). *Commentarii ad Homerum Iliadem pertinentes*, ed. M. van der Valk (Leiden 1971–87). *Commentarii ad Homerum Odysseam* (Leipzig 1825–26). Eng. tr. of intro. by C.J. Herington, *Arion* 8 (1969) 432–34. See list in *Tusculum-Lexikon* 244f.

LIT. P. Wirth, *Eustathiana* (Amsterdam 1980). Kazhdan-Franklin, *Studies* 115–95. L. Coletta, "Eustazio neo-omerista," *AntCl* 52 (1983) 260–67. N. Serikov, "K voprosu o 'čužoj reči' v proizvedenii Evstafija Solunskogo 'O zachvate Soluni,'" *VizVrem* 43 (1982) 225–28. D. Reinsch, "Über einige Aristoteles-Zitate bei Eustathios von Thessalonike," in *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, ed. F. Paschke (Berlin 1981) 479–88. —A.K.

EUSTRATIOS (Εὐστράτιος), hagiographer; died after 602. A priest of Hagia Sophia, Eustratios was a pupil of EUTYCHIOS, patriarch of Constantinople, whom he accompanied into exile and whose life he commemorated in a panegyric. He also wrote a biography of the Persian saint Golinduch, based on Stephen of Hierapolis (G. Garitte, *AB* 74 [1956] 422). In his treatise on souls, which survives in fragments and is also mentioned by PHOTIOS (*Bibl.*, cod.171), Eustratios defended three points: souls are active immediately after their separation from the [dead] body; they act on their own initiative and not as vehicles of God's powers; they are in need of church services that bring about their "freedom and liberation from vices."

ED. *Vita Eutych.*—PG 86:2273–2390. *Vita Golind.*—Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta* 4:149–74. Treatise on souls—ed. L. Allatius in *De purgatorio* (Rome 1655) 336–580.

LIT. Beck, *Kirche* 410f. A. Jülicher, *RE* 6 (1909) 1489f. P. Peeters, "Sainte Golindouche. Martyre Perse," *AB* 62 (1914) 80–92. —B.B.

EUSTRATIOS (martyr). See FIVE MARTYRS OF SEBASTEIA.

EUSTRATIOS OF NICAEA, philosopher and theologian, pupil of JOHN ITALOS; fl. ca.1100. Eustratios was not condemned in 1082 with his teacher but was promoted by Alexios I. He supported the emperor in his confrontation with LEO OF CHALCEDON, became *oikoumenikos didaskalos* ca.1115/16 (Darrouzès, *Ecclès.* 306, fr.2) and metropolitan of Nicaea. With John PHOURNES Eustratios participated in the dispute against Peter GROSSOLANO. In 1114 he polemicized in Philippopolis against the Armenians. Eustratios commented on ARISTOTLE and proclaimed the importance of logic for theology: even Christ, he wrote, argued with the help of Aristotelian syllogisms (P. Joannou, *REB* 10 [1952] 34.22–23). Eustratios developed the concept of the *universalia* as pure "names," whereas he regarded only the individual as existing. Accordingly Eustratios stressed the limitations of art, asserting that the artist could not present the substance, but only the appearance of men and animals (Demetrakopulos, *infra*, p.132.9–24); heavenly beings, such as angels, could be painted only symbolically. In his polemic against the FILIOQUE, Eustratios, like Phournes, considered the Logos and the Holy Spirit as the hands of God the Father (Demetrakopulos, pp. 68.29–69.1, 95.5–6), and in his polemics against the Armenians he emphasized the human nature of the incarnated Logos. In 1117 he was accused of heresy: the major charge alleged was his sharp distinction between the divine Logos and Christ incarnated as a slave. Although Alexios I and Patr. John IX (1111–34) tried to rescue Eustratios, he was condemned and forced to abdicate, despite his assertion that the accusation was based on unfinished drafts stolen from him. Rehabilitated after his death, Eustratios was cited as an authority at the council of 1157.

ED. A. Demetrakopulos, *Ekklesiastike bibliotheke*, vol. 1 (Leipzig 1866; rp. Hildesheim 1965) 47–198. P. Joannou, "Die Definition des Seins bei Eustratios von Nikaia," *BZ* 47 (1954) 365–68. See list in *Tusculum-Lexikon* 246.

LIT. P. Joannou, "Der Nominalismus und die menschliche Psychologie Christi," *BZ* 47 (1954) 369–78. Idem, "Le

sort des évêques hérétiques réconciliés," *Byzantion* 28 (1958) 1–30. K. Giocarinis, "Eustratios of Nicaea's Defense of the Doctrine of Ideas," *Franciscan Studies* 24 (1964) 159–204. A. Aleksidze, "Un traité polémique anti-Latin en version géorgienne," *Trudy Tbilisskogo Universiteta* 162 (1975) 111–23. S. Gukova, "Kosmografičeskij traktat Evstratija Nikejskogo," *VizVrem* 47 (1986) 145–56. —A.K.

EUTHERIOS (Εὐθέριος), bishop of Tyana and theologian; died Tyre after 434. At the Council of Ephesus in 431 Eutherios supported his friend NESTORIOS and by 433 wrote a treatise conventionally named *Antilogia*, or *Refutations of Various Propositions*—a sharp pamphlet against CYRIL of Alexandria and his followers. This survived in two versions—a shorter and a longer; the MS tradition identified the author as ATHANASIOS of Alexandria. By the time Photios read the text in the 9th C., it was attributed to THEODORET OF CYRRHUS, but SEVERUS of Antioch in the 6th C. knew it as a work of Eutherios. Eutherios attacked those who followed the opinion of the multitude and were satisfied with their faith without analyzing Scripture; he defended the concept of two natures, stressing the existence of humanity in Christ and the reality of his suffering; he argued that those who deny the human nature of the Saviour do harm to mankind (par.17).

Five of Eutherios's letters (to John of Antioch, Alexander of Hierapolis, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, etc.) are preserved in a Latin translation. Eutherios mentions his *Refutation of Cyril* in his letter to John.

ED. and LIT. *CPG* 3, nos. 6147–53. M. Tetz, *Eine Antilogie des Eutherios von Tyana* (Berlin 1964). G. Ficker, *Eutherios von Tyana* (Leipzig 1908). —T.E.G.

EUTHYMIOS, patriarch of Constantinople (Feb.? 907–May? 912); born Seleukeia in Isauria ca.834, died *proasteion* Agathou, on the Bosporos, 4/5 Aug. 917. A monk from his youth, Euthymios sympathized with Prince Leo (the future LEO VI) in his conflict with Basil I; after Basil's death Leo appointed him *hegoumenos* of a monastery in the PSAMATHIA quarter of Constantinople, member of the senate and *synkellos*, and made Euthymios his spiritual director. Euthymios opposed Leo's "foreign" advisers (the Armenian Stylianos ZAOUTZES, the Arab SAMONAS, and Italian NICHOLAS I MYSTIKOS), and defended the interests of the traditional court aristocracy. During the crisis

over the TETRAGAMY OF LEO VI, when Patr. Nicholas sided with the Doukas family against Leo. Euthymios continued to support the emperor; after Leo banished Nicholas, he appointed Euthymios as his successor. The patriarchate of Euthymios brought no peace, and Nicholas was recalled from exile—either by Leo or, immediately after Leo's death, by Alexander, who banished Euthymios to Agathou.

The writings of Euthymios are insignificant: sermons on the conception of St. Anna and a festal homily on the Virgin. Attribution of certain works ascribed to Euthymios in some MSS is not yet proved (C. van de Vorst, *AB* 33 [1914] 452f, A. Ehrhard, *BZ* 24 [1924] 186f). The anonymous vita of Euthymios, composed by a monk of Psamathia after 932 (D. Sophianos, *EEBS* 38 [1971] 289–96), is one of the richest sources for the period from the death of Basil I to the early years of Constantine VII; unfortunately some sections of the MS are lost. A new fragment has been discovered by B. Flusin (*TM* 9 [1985] 119–31). On the other hand, the panegyric of Euthymios by ARETHAS is conventional and provides only limited data.

ED. Homilies on St. Anna and the Virgin—M. Jugie, *PO* 16 (1922) 463–514, 19 (1926) 441–55.

SOURCE. *Vita Euthymii patriarchae CP*, ed. P. Karlin-Hayter (Brussels 1970). Russ. tr. A. Kazhdan in *Dve vizantijskie chroniki* (Moscow 1959) 9–137.

LIT. *BHG* 651–52. M. Jugie, “La vie et les oeuvres d'Euthyme patriarche de Constantinople,” *EO* 16 (1913) 385–95, 481–92. *RegPatr*, fasc. 2, nos. 625–29. J. Darrouzès, *DHGE* 16 (1967) 58f. —A.K.

EUTHYMOS OF AKMONIA (in theme of Opsikion), theologian of first half of 11th C., who used to be confused with Euthymios ZIGABENOS. His biography is little known. Euthymios states that as a boy, during the reign of Basil II, he visited Akmonia with his mother because of a lawsuit. Later he became a monk in the PERIBLEPTOS MONASTERY in Constantinople. He mentions the death of Romanos III in 1034. Circa 1050 Euthymios sent a letter from Peribleptos to Akmonia to warn his fellow citizens against the menace of the heretics who were called BOGOMILS in the West (this is the first mention of the term in Byz. literature), but PHOUNDAGIAGITES in the Akmonia region; Euthymios was worried that the extreme asceticism of the Bogomils made their teaching attractive to monks. It is quite possible that Euthymios also wrote the so-called first in-

vective against the Armenians, which was formerly attributed to the *katholikos* Isaac or a certain John of Nicaea.

ED. Ficker, *Phundag.* 3–86. PG 132:1155–1217.
LIT. Beck, *Kirche* 532f. M. Loos, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages* (Prague 1974) 67–77. M. Jugie, “Phoundagiagites et Bogomiles,” *EO* 12 (1909) 257–62. V. Grumel, “Les invectives contre les Arméniens du ‘Catholicos Isaac,’” *REB* 14 (1956) 174–94. —A.K.

EUTHYMOS OF SARDIS, metropolitan of Sardis (ca.785–803); saint; born Ouzara (on the frontier of Lykaonia?) 754, died on island of St. Andrew, near Cape Akritas, 26 Dec. 831 (not 824 as previously believed). A leader of the ICONOPHILES, Euthymios played an important role during the Second Council of Nicaea in 787. Some years later, he was accused by Emp. Nikephoros I of participation in the revolt of BARDANES TOURKOS and was deprived of his see and exiled to the island of Pantelleria near Sicily. Recalled from exile, he defended the veneration of icons during the reigns of the Iconoclast emperors Leo V and Theophilos and was twice banished. Several letters of Theodore of Stoudios to Euthymios survive. His vita was written by Patr. METHODIOS I; a rhetorical panegyric by a certain Metrophanes is also preserved. Methodios relates that Euthymios forced the young woman whom the future emperor Nikephoros I wanted to marry into a nunnery, thus kindling Nikephoros's animosity.

SOURCES. J. Gouillard, “La vie d'Euthyme de Sardes († 831),” *TM* 10 (1987) 1–101, with Fr. tr. A. Papadakis, “The Unpublished Life of Euthymios of Sardis: Bodleianus Laudianus Graecus 69,” *Traditio* 26 (1970) 63–89.

LIT. *BHG* 2145–46. J. Pargoire, “Saint Euthyme et Jean de Sardes,” *EO* 5 (1901–02) 157–61. —A.K.

EUTHYMOS THE GREAT, a founder of cenobitic monasticism in Palestine; saint; born in Melitene 376/7, died in his lavra near Jerusalem 20 Jan. 473. Nobly born and dedicated to God from infancy, Euthymios became a priest ca.396 in Melitene. Around 406 he went to Palestine, where he met Theoktistos from Cappadocia (died 466), who became Euthymios's closest associate. Circa 411 they settled in a cave, which served as church for the cenobitic monastery they founded after some hesitation (vita, ed. Schwartz, p.17.3); here the Arab PHYLARCH Aspebetos converted to Christianity. Leaving Theoktistos as head of the monastery, Euthymios wandered through Pales-

tine and organized monasteries in Marda and Aristoboulas; then he built his lavra 5 km from Theoktistos's monastery; the church was dedicated in 428/9. The lavra had 15 cells, where the monks stayed during the week; on Saturday and Sunday they gathered to eat in the refectory and sleep in the dormitory. Euthymios remained neutral during the first phase of the Nestorian dispute; after the Council of Chalcedon of 451 he sided with JUVENAL of Jerusalem, denounced his rival Theodosios, and helped to win the support of the empress Eudokia. CYRIL OF SKYTHOPOLIS wrote Euthymios's Life.

Representation in Art. Generally depicted as a balding old monk with a particularly long white beard (sometimes tucked under his belt), portraits of Euthymios occur as early as the frescoes of BAWIT and SAQQARA and wherever groups of desert monks are included. The illustration of nine events in the saint's life adorns a parekklesion (renovated in 1303) adjacent to the Church of St. DEMETRIOS in Thessalonike; the fresco cycle begins before the saint's conception and ends with his death, emphasizing his role as a ministrant of the church and his activity in baptizing Aspebetos (T. Gouma-Peterson, *ArtB* 58 [1976] 168–83).

SOURCE. E. Schwartz, *Kyrrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig 1939) 3–85. Fr. tr. A.-J. Festugière, *Les moines de Palestine* (Paris 1962) 55–144.

LIT. *BHG* 647–650d. S. Vailhé, *Saint Euthyme le Grand moine de Palestine (376–473)* (Paris 1909). Mouriki, *Nea Moni* 1:166f. J. Boberg, *LCL* 6:201–03. J. Norret, “A propos des Vies de saint Euthyme, abbé,” *AB* 104 (1986) 453–55. —A.K., N.P.S.

EUTHYMOS THE IBERIAN, saint, also known as Euthymios Mt'ac'mindeli (“of the Holy Mountain”); born Georgia between 955 and 960, died Constantinople, 13 May 1028. Son of John the Iberian and cofounder of the monastery of IVERON on Athos, Euthymios served as superior from 1005 to 1019. He contributed much to the translation of Greek theological and hagiographical works into Georgian (lists of these translations are found in his Life and in the *Testament* of his father); some sources also ascribe to him translations from Georgian into Greek, including BARLAAM AND IOASAPH—the latter is, however, questionable. The *typikon* written by Euthymios for his monastery is lost, but it is cited in his Life. The Life of Euthymios and his father was written in Georgian by GEORGE MT'AC'MINDELI ca.1045 and

includes valuable information about the revolt of Bardas SKLEROS.

SOURCE. I. Abuladze, *Dzveli k'art'uli agiograf'iuli literaturis dzegebi*, vol. 2 (Tbilisi 1967) 38–100. Lat. tr. P. Peeters, “Histoires monastiques géorgiennes,” *AB* 36–37 (1917–19 [1922]) 5–68.

LIT. Tarchnišvili, *Georg.Lit.* 126–54. J. Lefort in *Ivır.* 1:39–42. —A.K.

EUTHYMOS THE YOUNGER, also called Euthymios of Thessalonike, saint; baptismal name Niketas; born village of Opso, Galatia 823/4, died island of Hiera 14/15 Oct. 898. Euthymios was born to a well-to-do family (*eupatrides*) obliged to give military service (*strateia*). He married Euphrosyne, also of prosperous background, and fathered a daughter, Anastaso. In 841/2 he left his family and fled to Bithynian Olympos to become a monk. He traveled much: twice to Athos, to Thessalonike, to the island of Neoi, and elsewhere. He ascended a column (*stylos*) at least twice and ended his life as a hermit in a cave; nevertheless, the cenobitic monastery was his ideal, and he tried to establish order among dispersed monastic settlers on Athos. Circa 864 Euthymios became a deacon (D. Papachryssanthou suggests that he was a priest) in order to arrange liturgical services for Athonite hermits; ca.870 he converted the ruinous Church of St. Andrew at Peristerai, east of Thessalonike, into a monastery. In a sense, his activity foretold and prepared the way for ATHANASIOS OF ATHOS.

Euthymios's Life was written by his disciple Basil, tonsured ca.875 (erroneously identified by Porfirij Uspenskij with an archbishop of Thessalonike). His eyewitness account has many chronological indications (not always accurate). Basil persistently stresses the importance of manual labor for monks. He mentions Arab raids on Athos and surrounding areas but is quite uninterested in events in Constantinople.

ED. L. Petit, “Vie et office de St. Euthyme le Jeune,” *ROC* 8 (1903) 55–205, also in *BHO* 5 (1904) 14–51.

LIT. *BHG* 655. D. Papachryssanthou, “La Vie de saint Euthyme le Jeune et la métropole de Thessalonique à la fin du IX^e et au début du X^e siècle,” *REB* 32 (1974) 225–45. —A.K.

EUTOKIOS (Εὐτόκιος), commentator on mathematical works; born Ascalon ca.480. A contemporary of AMMONIOS and ANTHEMIOS OF TRALLES, Eutokios was active in Alexandria and perhaps

Constantinople in the early 6th C. He is also known to have lectured on philosophy. Eutokios wrote commentaries on three works of ARCHIMEDES—*On the Measurement of a Circle*, *On the Sphere and the Cylinder*, and *On Plane Equilibria*. The first two of these commentaries were used by ISIDORE OF MILETUS, the last two were translated into Latin by WILLIAM OF MOERBEKE at Viterbo in late 1269. Eutokios also wrote a commentary on books 1–4 of the *Conics* of Apollonios of Perge that is dedicated to Anthemios. Finally it has been persuasively argued by J. Mogenet (*L'introduction à l'Almageste* [Brussels 1956] 22–34) that Eutokios was also the author of the *Introduction to Ptolemy's Great Composition*, which was originally the scholia to book 1 of the *Almagest* to which he refers in his commentary on the *On the Sphere and the Cylinder*. The *Introduction* seems to have been used by GEORGE TRAPEZOUNTIOS for his *Introduction* of 1451 (J. Monfasani, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana* [Binghamton, N.Y., 1984] 674, 687f).

Eutokios was not a mathematician of any originality but did understand almost all of the technical material that he commented on. He also preserves a number of solutions by earlier mathematicians whose works are no longer available to us.

ED. Commentaries—*Archimedis opera omnia*, ed. J.L. Heiberg, E. Stamatis, vol. 3 (Leipzig 1972). *Archimède*, ed. C. Mugler, vol. 4 (Paris 1972), with Fr. tr. *Apollonii Pergaei quae Graece exstant*, ed. J.L. Heiberg, vol. 2 (Leipzig 1893) 168–361.

LIT. I. Bulmer-Thomas, *DSB* 4:488–91. Wilson, *Scholars* 45f, 86. —D.P.

EUTROPIOS (Εὐτρόπιος), favorite of Arkadios; born near the Persian frontier, died Chalcedon Aug. ? 399. An emancipated slave and eunuch, he entered the service of Theodosios I and became the guardian of the young Arkadios. With the support of STILICHO, Eutropios removed RUFINUS and replaced him as the most powerful figure in the empire, first as *praepositus sacri cubiculi* (from 395), then as *patrikios* (398) and consul (399)—both titles never previously awarded to eunuchs. He granted privileges to the Jews (esp. merchants) and secured the support of the church by appointing JOHN CHRYSOSTOM as bishop of Constantinople and by issuing ordinances against heretics and pagans. Eutropios successfully commanded an army against the Huns who invaded Armenia in

397/8. He nevertheless excited hatred by his avarice, by demoting and condemning respected officials, by abolishing the church's right of asylum, by disrupting the alliance with Stilicho when he supported the revolt of GILDO, and by showing contempt toward Gothic mercenaries (esp. TRIBIGILD and then GAINAS). In 399 Eutropios finally managed to offend the empress EUDOXIA, who dismissed him. Fearing for his life, the eunuch fled to Hagia Sophia. Chrysostom, in a brilliant speech, requested imperial mercy for the former consul. Eutropios was nevertheless exiled to Cyprus, then recalled and executed. His acts and honors were nullified by an edict of 17 Aug. 399. The sources (Eunapios, Zosimos, Claudian, etc.) describe Eutropios in extremely negative terms.

LIT. *PLRE* 2:440–44. Demougeot, *Unité* 162–234. S. Döpp, *Zeitungsschichte in Dichtungen Claudians* (Wiesbaden 1980) 159–74. A.S. Kozlov, "Bor'ba meždu političeskoj oppoziciej i pravitel'stvom Vizantii v 395–399 gg.," *ADSV* 13 (1976) 74–79. —T.E.G.

EUTROPIUS, Latin historian and, according to the *Souda*, a sophist; born Bordeaux? 4th C. Although there is some discussion about his identity and career, Eutropius apparently held a string of high offices under various emperors: *magister epistularum* (before 361), *magister memoriae* (369), proconsul of Asia (371–72), praetorian prefect (Illyricum, 380–81), and consul (in 387). Both SYMMACHUS and LIBANIOS addressed letters to him in the period 387–90. In 363 he was one of several historians to accompany the emperor JULIAN on his ill-fated Persian expedition. Eutropius composed a breviary of Roman history in ten books from 753 B.C. to Valens' accession in 364. It is conventional in opinions, sober in subject matter, and clear in language. His silence on Christianity does not prove him a pagan, as some believe, as such reticence is a stylistic affectation of many late Roman historians. Eutropius's book became accessible to the Byz. through the Greek translations of Paionios, a pupil of Libanios (L. Baffetti, *BNJbb* 3 [1922] 15–36), and of Capito Lycius in Justinian I's time.

ED. *Eutropii Breviarium ab urbe condita*, ed. C. Santini (Leipzig 1979).

LIT. H.W. Bird, "Eutropius: His Life and Career," *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views* 32 n.s. 7 (1988) 51–60. D. Tribolis, *Eutropius historicus kai hoi Hellenes metaphrastai tou Breviarium ab urbe condita* (Athens 1941). —B.B.

EUTYCHES (Εὐτύχης), monk and archimandrite of a suburban Constantinopolitan monastery (from 410); born ca. 370, died after 451 or even 454 (D. Stiernon, *DPAC* 1:1307). An ardent opponent of NESTORIOS, Eutyches was a staunch supporter of CYRIL of Alexandria; he defended the interests of Alexandria at the court of Theodosios II, exercising influence there due to his connections with the eunuch Chrysaphios, his godson. Developing Cyril's ideas, Eutyches launched the concept of MONOPHYSITISM. THEODORET OF CYRRHUS attacked him anonymously in the *Eranistes*, and Eusebios, bishop of Dorylaion, accused him of heresy in 448. At his trial later that year, Eutyches denied that Christ had two natures after the Incarnation; he refused to acknowledge even the hypostatical union of two natures in Christ and to accept that Christ was consubstantial (*homoousios*) with mankind. Patr. FLAVIAN condemned him on 22 Nov. 448, a condemnation subsequently supported by Pope LEO I. Eutyches, however, won the day at the "Robber" Council of EPHESUS in 449 when Flavian was deposed. The death of Theodosios II was a heavy blow for Eutyches: he was deposed and exiled to a site not far from Constantinople. Pope Leo, in a letter of 9 June 451, insisted on Eutyches' banishment to a more remote place. His subsequent fate is unknown.

ED. *CPG* 3, nos. 6937–40. P. Anannian, "L'opuscolo di Eutichio, patriarca di Costantinopoli, sulla 'Distinzione della natura e della persona,'" in *Armeniaca. Mélanges d'études arméniennes* (Venice 1969) 316–82, with Ital. tr.

LIT. A. van Roey, *DHGE* 16 (1967) 87–91. E. Schwartz, *Der Prozess des Eutyches* (Munich 1929). R. Draguet, "La christologie d'Eutychès d'après les Actes du synode de Flavien," *Byzantion* 6 (1931) 441–57. —A.K.

EUTYCHIOS, patriarch of Constantinople (Aug. 552—between 22 and 31 Jan. 565; 2 Oct. 577–6 Apr. 582) and saint; born Phrygian village of Theios/Theion 512, died Constantinople; feast-day 6 Apr. His father was a lieutenant of BELISARIOS (PG 86:2281BC). Educated in Constantinople, Eutychios became a monk and then *katholikos* (i.e., superior of all the monks) in the metropolis of Amaseia (col. 2296AB). Justinian I selected him to succeed MENAS as patriarch, since Eutychios supported the emperor's position in the dispute about the THREE CHAPTERS. Eutychios presided over the Council of Constantinople in 553 and dedicated Hagia Sophia after its restoration. Prob-

ably by 558 relations between Eutychios and Justinian had begun to deteriorate; the emperor urged both him and Belisarios to attend a *silentium* that investigated the case of some subordinates of Belisarios who were involved in a plot (Theoph. 238.11–15). The patriarch's opposition to APHTHARTODOCETISM aroused Justinian's anger, and the emperor exiled him to Amaseia, replacing him with JOHN III SCHOLASTIKOS; after the latter's death Eutychios was restored by Justin II. Eutychios had a theological discussion with the future pope GREGORY I on the question of the resurrection of the flesh.

Of his works (on Origenism, against the Monophysite interpretation of the Trisagion, etc.) little has survived excepting titles. His pupil Eustratios wrote the *vita* of Eutychios, full of biblical and patristic allusions; it contains some data on Chosroes I's invasion, and some miracles worked by Eutychios are of interest for cultural history. Thus the patriarch healed a young mosaicist who had been injured by a demon after he was forced to destroy a mosaic in a private house in Amaseia on which the story of Aphrodite was depicted (PG 86:2333D–2340B). Eustratios called his hero "the *archiereus* of the *oikoumene*" (col. 2281A), an early case of the use of this title.

SOURCE. *Vita* by Eustratios—PG 86:2273–2390.

LIT. *RegPatr*, fasc. 1, nos. 244–49, 260–63. Beck, *Kirche* 380. Laurent, *Corpus* 5.1, no. 1. R. Janin, *DHGE* 16 (1967) 94f. —A.K.

EUTYCHIOS, exarch of Ravenna (ca. 728–ca. 751). A eunuch of patrician rank, Eutychios was sent by Leo III to Italy after the murder of the exarch Paul, probably to remove Pope GREGORY II for opposing the emperor's Iconoclasm (Anastos, "Leo III's Edict" 26–31; D. Miller, *MedSt* 36 [1974] 102–05). Eutychios went first to Naples and unsuccessfully attempted to have Gregory and the Roman nobles murdered. He then approached the LOMBARDS and agreed to help King Liutprand gain Spoleto and Benevento in exchange for aid against Gregory. When they arrived in Rome (729?), however, the pope won over Liutprand, who reconciled Eutychios and Gregory. Eutychios apparently stayed in Rome, for shortly thereafter (730?) Gregory gave him troops against Tiberius Petasius. The sources do not mention Eutychios further by name, but he is assumed to have been exarch until the Lombards' capture of Ravenna

ca. 751. If so, he was the exarch who sought refuge and help in Venice in the late 730s, when the Lombards first took Ravenna; entreated by Pope GREGORY III, the Venetians recaptured the city and returned it to Byz. control. So, too, Eutychios would have been the exarch who petitioned Pope ZACHARIAS in the early 740s to dissuade Liutprand from attacking Ravenna.

LIT. C. Diehl, *Études sur l'administration byzantine dans l'exarchat de Ravenne* (Paris 1888). T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders (600–744)*, vol. 6 (Oxford 1916) 487–98. J.T. Hallenbeck, "The Roman-Byzantine Reconciliation of 728: Genesis and Significances," *BZ* 74 (1981) 29–41.

—P.A.H.

EUTYCHIOS (painter). See MICHAEL (ASTRAPAS) AND EUTYCHIOS.

EUTYCHIOS OF ALEXANDRIA, known in Arabic as Saʿīd ibn Baṭrīq (i.e., "patriarch"); Melkite patriarch of Alexandria (from 22 Jan. 935); born 17 Aug. 877, died Fuṣṭāṭ 11 May 940. A learned physician, Eutychios is best known for the *Annals* that go under his name, a chronography on the Byz. model written in Arabic and extending from the age of Adam to the year 938. The form in which the *Annals* of Eutychios has been published in modern times is the result of numerous editorial expansions by later Melkite writers. A notable feature of the *Annals*, in the accounts of the years after the rise of Islam, is the coordination of the reigns of the caliphs and of the Oriental patriarchs with the reigns of the patriarchs and emperors of Byz. The *Annals* report important events in the history of Byz., such as the so-called MOECHIAN CONTROVERSY in the time of Constantine VI, and they propose an eccentric account of ICONOCLASM by representing it solely as an over-reaction to the abuses of certain iconophiles on the part of Emp. Theophilos (Griffith, "Apologetics in Arabic" 154–90).

A number of other Christian Arabic works are assigned to Eutychios, most importantly a long apologetic treatise, *The Book of the Demonstration*. It is now clear, however, that this and other texts attributed to him were not written by Eutychios.

ED. *Annales*, ed. L. Cheikho, 2 vols. (Beirut-Paris 1906–09). Lat. tr. PG 111:907–1156. Excerpts—*Das Annalenwerk*, ed. M. Breydy, 2 vols. (Louvain 1985), with Germ. tr. *The Book of the Demonstration*, ed. P. Cachia, 4 vols. (Louvain 1960–61), with Eng. tr. by W.M. Watt.

LIT. M. Breydy, *Études sur Saʿīd ibn Baṭrīq et ses sources* (Louvain 1983). L.V. Isakova, "K voprosu o chronike Eutichija i ee rukopisjach," *VizVrem* 44 (1983) 112–16.

—S.H.G.

EVAGRIOS PONTIKOS (Εὐάγριος Ποντικός), monastic writer; born Ibora, Pontos, ca. 345, died Egypt 399. He was ordained *anagnostes* by Basil the Great and deacon by GREGORY OF NAZIANZOS, who was also his teacher. In 380 he accompanied Gregory to Constantinople, where he attained fame as a preacher; a scandalous love affair, however, soon forced his departure. Having been received by Melania the Elder at Jerusalem, in 383 Evagrius embraced the monastic life in Egypt, living in Nitria and Kellia. He associated with MAKARIOS THE GREAT and Makarios of Alexandria (G. Bunge, *Irénikon* 56 [1983] 215–27, 323–60) and supported himself as a calligrapher. Evagrius also composed his works on the monastic life during his sojourn in the Egyptian desert.

Evagrius followed ORIGEN, accepting his idea of the preexistence of souls as pure intellectual beings that assumed flesh and became sinful but are to be reconstituted in angelic shape (*apokatastasis*) and unified with God. Jesus Christ was the single spiritual being who did not fall away from the Logos, although he remained united to the flesh. Asceticism was for Evagrius the main path to salvation. He developed the concept of "practical" behavior, which he interpreted not as the "active" but the anachoretic life; its major purpose was the struggle against eight wicked *logismoi*, or sinful desires, namely gluttony, fornication, avarice, grief, wrath, torpor, vainglory, and arrogance. Cleansed of these *logismoi* the pious man would be able to contemplate the created world and divine wisdom.

After Evagrius was condemned for Origenism in 553, many of his works were lost; some are preserved under the name of NEILOS OF ANKYRA, some in Syriac, Armenian, Latin, and other translations. Nevertheless his concept of practical behavior, his list of eight *logismoi*, and his aphoristic style as well as the literary genre of spiritual *centuria* (short catechetical units) or CHAPTERS influenced subsequent monastic literature, for example, CASSIAN, PALLADIOS, and later SYMEON THE THEOLOGIAN.

ED. *Traité pratique ou le moine*, ed. A. & C. Guillaumont, 2 vols. (Paris 1971), with Fr. tr. *The Praktikos: Chapters on*

Prayer, tr. J.E. Bamberger (Spencer, Mass., 1970). Syriac version—ed. A. Guillaumont, *Les six siècles des "Kephalaia gnostica"* (Paris 1958), with Fr. tr.

LIT. W. Frankenberg, *Evagrius Ponticus* (Berlin 1912). A. Guillaumont, "Un philosophe au désert: Evagre le Pontique," *RHR* 181 (1972) 29–56. Idem, *Les "Kephalaia gnostica" d'Evagre le Pontique* (Paris 1962).

—B.B., A.K.

EVAGRIOS SCHOLASTIKOS, ecclesiastical historian; born Epiphaneia in Coele Syria ca. 536, died after 594. Evagrius was a lawyer (SCHOLASTIKOS) at Antioch, also holding some probably honorary administrative offices. His *Church History* covers in six books the years 431–594, using both secular and ecclesiastical sources. Photios (*Bibl.*, cod. 29) thought him an undistinguished stylist, but soundly orthodox and commendably interested in the history of images. A Chalcedonian in theology, he treats the Council of 451 at length, but is compromising toward MONOPHYSITISM. His secular narrative emphasizes the virtues and achievements of Marcian, Tiberios I, and Maurice. A certain parochialism, however, results in more space being given to the affairs of ANTIOCH (esp. the career of Patr. Gregory [570–93]) than to Constantinople. His style is conventionally rhetorical, but not excessively poetic, and he eclectically uses pagan and Christian models (V. Caires, *ByzF* 8 [1982] 29–50). Overall estimates vary widely, often criticizing him for credulity, but his eyewitness accounts, sifting of sources, citation of documents from the archives of the Antiochene patriarchate, and inclusion of bibliography make his history invaluable.

ED. *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. J. Bidez, L. Parmentier (London 1898; rp. Amsterdam 1964); Fr. tr. A.J. Festugière, *Byzantion* 45 (1975) 187–488.

LIT. P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian* (Louvain 1981).

—B.B.

EVANGELION (εὐαγγέλιον), evangeliary, the Byz. Gospel LECTIONARY, used chiefly at Eucharist. The *evangelion* contains only those Gospel passages that are actually read. The first part has the Gospel LECTIONS for the mobile cycle, in liturgical order John, Matthew, Luke, Mark. It must not be confused with the *tetraevangelion* (see GOSPEL BOOK), which contains the complete text of the four Gospels, arranged exactly as they are in the New Testament, but with the beginning and end of each passage to be read indicated in the margin

and numbered. The second part, known as the SYNAXARION (wrongly as the *menologion*), lists the LECTIONS for each day of the year from 1 Sept., providing the full Gospel passage unless it already appears earlier in the volume. The Gospel lections for feasts that fall on a fixed date in the church CALENDAR are select; those of the movable, temporal cycle, which varies depending on the date of Easter, are semicontinuous, i.e., read more or less in the order in which they occur in the Bible text. In the latter cycle, each Gospel is associated with a particular period of the year: John, the period from Easter to Pentecost; Matthew, from Pentecost to the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 Sept.); Luke, from then until the beginning of Lent; Mark, throughout Lent.

Usually included in MSS of the *evangelion* are the Twelve Passion Gospels read at Good Friday *orthros*. These are a composite series of harmonized readings from the four Gospels, of Palestinian origin, arranged to recount in chronological sequence the events of Jesus' passion and death.

Lectionary Illustration. *Evangelia* are frequently adorned with EVANGELIST PORTRAITS; further figural illustration, which is relatively rare, may comprise headpieces, smaller framed or unframed pictures near the appropriate lection, marginal illustrations, and inhabited initials. In the most sumptuously illustrated *evangelia* the *synaxarion* section is also illustrated; these MSS date primarily between the 10th and 12th C.

LIT. E.C. Colwell, D.W. Riddle, *Prolegomena to the Study of the Lectionary Text of the Gospels* (Chicago 1933). Y. Burns, "The Greek Manuscripts connected by their Lection System with the Palestinian Syriac Gospel Lectionaries," *Studia Biblica* 2 [= *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*], supp. (1980) 13–28. W.C. Braithwaite, "The Lection-System of the Codex Macedonianus," *JThSt* 5 (1904) 265–74. S. Tsuji in *Illuminated Greek MSS* 34–39. K. Weitzmann, *Byzantine Liturgical Psalters and Gospels* (London 1980), pts. VIII, X, XI, XII, XIV.

—R.F.T., A.C.

EVANGELIST PORTRAITS, found throughout Byz. art, are prominently represented in the PENDENTIVES below the domes of churches, on the TEMPLON, on the EPITAPHIOS, and esp. in MSS, where they are the most commonly illustrated subject. In physical type, the older, gray-haired MATTHEW and JOHN contrast with the younger, dark-haired MARK and LUKE. In MSS, they are rarely represented standing; they are usually seated, and depicted as writing, meditating, reach-



EVANGELIST PORTRAITS. Portrait of St. John the Evangelist in a Gospel book (Athens, gr. 57, fol.265v); 11th C. National Library, Athens.

ing forward to a lectern, dipping their pens in an inkwell, or occasionally erasing a text or sharpening their quills. The evangelists write on a codex or roll, usually in Greek, but, in the 13th C., sometimes in Latin. Often shown before architectural backgrounds, they are surrounded by lecterns and desks with writing paraphernalia. They may be framed by arches and accompanied by illustrations of the liturgical feast at which the beginning of each Gospel was read. From ca. 1000, John is depicted dictating to his assistant Prochoros, and, less frequently, Peter and Paul instruct Mark and Luke, respectively. The inclusion of EVANGELIST SYMBOLS is rarer than in the Latin West. The importance and ubiquity of evangelist portraits was such that other authors (e.g., DAVID, the church fathers, hymnographers) were commonly represented in the same manner.

LIT. H. Hunger, K. Wessel, *RBK* 2 (1968) 452–507. Nelson, *Preface & Miniature* 75–91. I. Spatharakis, *The Left-Handed Evangelist: A Contribution to Palaeologan Iconography* (London 1988). —R.S.N.

EVANGELIST SYMBOLS. The four beasts (ZODIA) of Ezekiel 1:10—man, lion, ox, eagle—were associated from the 2nd C. onward with the four Evangelists of the New Testament. In Byz. art, they most often surround Christ in Majesty. Thus they first appear projecting from the MANDORLA of the youthful Christ in the apse mosaic at HOSIOS DAVID in Thessalonike. In several 10th-through 11th-C. Cappadocian apses showing the Prophetic VISION, the symbols accompany a mature Christ; labeled with the words intoned in the liturgy before the TRISAGION, the symbols link the Christ of the image with the revealed Christ of the liturgy. In various Gospel frontispieces, they surround the MAJESTAS DOMINI, echoing certain Gospel prefaces that explain the existence of four Gospels by referring to the four beasts crying the glory of “him who sits upon the Cherubim.” In some Gospel books, each Evangelist is paired with a symbol. The pairing of symbols and Evangelists varies from book to book throughout the 11th–12th C. Only with a late 12th-C. set of verses found in eight DECORATIVE STYLE Gospels does the pairing standard in the West and in Armenian art appear: man/Matthew, lion/Mark, ox/Luke, eagle/John. Possibly through Western influence, this pairing becomes customary in Palaiologan art.

LIT. J. Lafontaine-Dosogne, “Théophanies-Visions auxquelles participent les prophètes dans l’art byzantin après la restauration des images,” in *Synthronon* 135–43. Nelson, *Preface & Miniature* 15–53, 109–18. —A.W.C.

EVARISTOS, mid-10th-C. deacon and librarian (*bibliophylax*), author of a letter addressed to CONSTANTINE VII PORPHYROGENNETOS, “born in the purple silk.” The letter is preserved only in Arabic. The emperor had commanded Evaristos to produce a history of the saints “in easy language.” In his letter Evaristos informs the ruler that he has sketched biographies of the saints, established their dates, and verified the records. Evaristos’s compilation, now lost, was probably a step toward the comprehensive work by SYMEON METAPHRASTES.

ED. A.S. Lewis, M.D. Gibson, *Forty-one Facsimiles of Dated Christian Arabic MSS* (Cambridge 1907) 27f (with Eng. tr.). LIT. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung*, 1.1:24, n.1. —A.K.

EVE. See ADAM AND EVE.

EVERYDAY LIFE, in the broad sense, encompasses the entirety of Byz. culture: thus, T. Talbot Rice’s book (*infra*) includes sections on the imperial court, church, administration, army, etc. In the narrow sense, everyday life is ordinary human activity and comprises diet and costume, BEHAVIOR and superstitions, ENTERTAINMENT, housing, and FURNITURE. The subject is poorly studied and sources are limited: historiography, rhetoric, and liturgical texts are not very helpful, although they are the best known writings; archaeology provides some scattered data; hagiography, documents, and letters offer only small nuggets of information (P. Magdalino, *BS* 48 [1987] 28–38). The content of mural and book illustration is of mixed evidential value: the costumes, gestures, and attitudes of protagonists in sacred iconography appear to be conventional and often antique, yet peripheral details in both urban and rural scenes may well reflect current circumstances.

While daily life in late antiquity was municipally oriented and situated primarily in open spaces, Byz. funneled its energy inside closed buildings. A comparison of two great vitae, those of SYMEON OF EMESA (6th C.) and BASIL THE YOUNGER (10th C.), reveals the change: Symeon is depicted in the streets and squares, Basil within the houses of his supporters. Public life did not totally disappear—some processions and feasts continued to be held in public—but it was significantly contracted: the THEATER ceased to exist, religious services dispensed with many outdoor liturgical ceremonies, even races and circus games tended to be replaced by CARNIVALS and by SPORTS and competitions, such as polo and tournaments, which were on a reduced scale and socially restricted. The shift from reading aloud to silent reading, the adoption of silent prayer, the abandonment of public repentance, the playing of quiet board GAMES like CHESS—all these belong to the same phenomenon of “privatization” of everyday life.

With the exception of churches, there was no new construction of public buildings in Byz. towns, and the regular city planning of antiquity, with squares, porticoes, and wide avenues, was replaced by a chaotic maze of narrow streets and individual habitats. The HOUSES of the nobility (villas or mansions) also lost their orderly arrangement, which was replaced by a group of irregularly shaped rooms, bedchambers, terraces, and

workshops; also abandoned was their openness to nature in the form of the ATRIUM—with its impluvium, inner garden, and fountain—or naturalistic floor mosaics. Houses became darker, and the shift in LIGHTING from lamps to candles after the 7th C. contributed as well to this change.

The increased use of TABLES and of the WRITING DESK influenced various habits—from reading and writing (including the format of the BOOK) to dining and games. The BED as the symbol of the most private aspect of daily life became consistently distinct from CHAIRS or stools, which were used for more social occasions. Pottery (see CERAMICS) grew more uniform and less decorated than in antiquity; it served primarily the private needs of the family, whereas imperial BANQUETS used gold and silver ware.

A respect for the human body determined the form of ancient COSTUME: the body was covered only minimally and there was no fear of nakedness. Byz. costume, however, which began to adopt the use of TROUSERS and sleeves, was a reaction against the openness of antiquity, and heavy cloaks provided people with additional means of concealment.

Patterns of food consumption evidently changed as well: in the ordinary DIET, the role of BREAD decreased, whereas MEAT, FISH, and CHEESE became more important. Dining habits changed, too, from a relaxed reclining to the more formal sitting on chairs. While we can surmise that the actual diet was not spare by medieval standards, the predominantly monastic ideology of the Byz. condemned heavy meals and praised ascetic abstemiousness.

Bathing habits also changed: the public BATHS, which had served virtually as a club for well-to-do Romans, almost disappeared and ancient bath-houses were often transformed into churches. Provincial baths were few, located in log huts full of smoke coming from an open hearth.

The nuclear FAMILY was the crucial social unit responsible for the production of goods, so that hired workers (MISTHIOI) and even slaves (see SLAVERY) were considered an extension of the family; the education of children was also the family’s responsibility. The family was limited to a certain extent by the neighborhood, guild, or village community; it was these MICROSTRUCTURES that took charge of organizing FEASTS. WOMEN, who indisputably played a decisive role in the

household, were compelled to remain in a special part of the house and to wear "decent" dress, which served clearly to distinguish a matron from the PROSTITUTE, whose more revealing costume suggested immoral conduct. The unity of the family was emphasized by the custom of common meals and by the father's right to indoctrinate (sometimes with physical force) all the members of his small household.

Depictions of everyday life are rare as primary subjects in art, although many indications can be gleaned from biblical images in MSS such as the OCTATEUCHS where, for example, scenes of birth, legal penalties, and activities such as threshing and various modes of transportation reflect Byz. practice. A market scene appears in a fresco at the Blachernai monastery in ARTA which depicts a procession of the Virgin Hodegetria. It shows merchants displaying their merchandise in baskets and on benches, fruit and beverage vendors, and their customers. By contrast, ceramic household VESSELS made for everyday use, when they do contain figural decoration of any sort, show scenes from mythology, fable, or epic.

LIT. Ph. Koukoules, *Byzantinon bios kai politismos*, 6 vols. (Athens 1952-57). T. Talbot Rice, *Everyday Life in Byzantium* (London-New York 1967). C. Mango, "Daily Life in Byzantium," *JÖB* 31.1 (1981) 337-53; 32.1 (1982) 252-57. G. Litavrin, *Kak žili vizantijscy?* (Moscow 1974). M.A. Poljakovskaja, A.A. Čekalova, *Vizantijska: byt i nra* (Sverdlovsk 1989). *He kathemerine zoe sto Byzantino* (Athens 1989). Kazhdan-Epstein, *Change* 74-83. Veyne, *Private Life* 235-409, 551-641. G. Walter, *La vie quotidienne à Byzance au siècle des Comnènes* (Paris 1966). —A.K., A.C.

EVIL (κακία). The core of the problem of evil is how far responsibility for it can be attributed to God. Late antiquity presented two diametrically opposed concepts of evil. The dualistic systems of Gnosticism and Manichaeism considered evil as a "substance" warring with the good, symbolically treated as a battle of darkness against light. The material world is the realm of evil, created by the inferior deity and contrasted to the divine and heavenly world. In contrast, Proklos assumed that evil had only a dependent existence (*parhypostasis*) and was caused by manifold factors such as weakness, lack of knowledge, or lack of goodness; he criticized Plotinos, for whom evil was an inherent quality of matter.

Christianity overcame the contradiction after painful vacillations; Origen, for example, viewed

the cosmos as consisting of an opposition of light and darkness. The core of the Christian solution is Augustine's view that Adam's original sin was perpetrated contrary to nature (divine nature has no evil in itself); original sin was committed not due to human FREE WILL (as was the view of Pelagianism), but by the mysterious dispensation of God, who knows how to transform evil into good. John of Damascus, on the other hand, emphasized that any creation of God was good, but that both angels and mortals were *autexousioi*, that is, granted freedom of choice to follow God's law or deviate from it; we are responsible for our wrongdoing, just as the criminal, not the judge, is responsible for a felony and deserves punishment. John also drew a distinction between evil "by nature" (deviation from God's law) and "apparent" (subjectively perceived) evil, that is, the hardships and trials of life (including fasting, vigils, etc.) that in fact contribute to our salvation. Redemption from Adam's sin was achieved by Christ's sacrifice and is continued in Baptism and other sacraments. John Chrysostom consistently explains Christ's sacrifice as propitiating the Father and reconciling mankind with an angry God. In Christian belief, the Devil and his demons are the embodiment of evil; the mission of saints is the battle against demons. Despite the symbolism of light and darkness this struggle is not conceived dualistically, since it evolves under God's paternal care and aims at the improvement of corrupted human nature.

LIT. F. Young, "Insight or Incoherence? The Greek Fathers on God and Evil," *JEH* 24 (1973) 113-26. M. Erler in *Proklos Diadochos: Über die Existenz des Bösen* (Meisenheim am Glan 1978) v-ix. H.G. Beck, *Vorsehung und Vorherbestimmung in der theologischen Literatur der Byzantiner* (Rome 1937). —A.K.

EVIL EYE, a popular amuletic image of the 4th-8th C. characterized by an eye surrounded by a variety of threatening beasts and instruments: lions, snakes, scorpions, daggers, etc. Most often it is found on a bronze pendant AMULET whose other side bears the Holy Rider. Amuletic inscriptions against the evil eye, without a representation, are also common (e.g., "the seal of Solomon holds the evil eye"—Russell, *infra* 540). Both would combat the envious glance that was popularly believed to facilitate the access of demons to a coveted thing or person. The antidote was to display the inevi-

table suffering of the covetous individual or, more specifically, of his "evil eye." In *The Testament of Solomon* (ed. C.C. McCown [Leipzig 1922] 18.39) one demon reports: "My power is annulled by the engraved image of the much-suffering eye."

LIT. J. Russell, "The Evil Eye in Early Byzantine Society," *JÖB* 32.3 (1982) 539-48. —G.V.

EVLIYA ÇELEBI, Ottoman scholar, *şipāhī*, and traveler; born Istanbul 25 Mar. 1611, died Istanbul? 1684. Evliya was the author of the ten-volume *Seyahatname* (Book of Travels), professedly a description with considerable elaborations of Evliya's extensive journeys and various sojourns throughout the Ottoman Empire and beyond, primarily for ca.1630-76. Evliya wrote to entertain and his language is a mixture of learned and vernacular Ottoman. His sources include his personal observations, hearsay, cited and uncited literary works, and his own lively imagination. Assuredly, some of what Evliya wrote is fictitious. Nonetheless, he conveys a plethora of credible data regarding the geography, cities, monuments, institutions, peoples, and cultures of the Ottoman Empire of his time. For Byz. studies, Evliya's work is replete with information concerning the status and development of previously Byz. peoples under Ottoman rule. Book 1 is esp. important for its material on the topography, ethnography, and folklore of Istanbul. No critical edition of this work yet exists.

ED. AND TR. *Evliya Çelebi seyahatnamesi*, 10 vols. (Istanbul 1896-1938), in Ottoman. *Evliya Çelebi seyahatnamesi*, 15 vols. (Istanbul 1971), in Turkish. Eng. tr. Books 1-2—J. von Hammer-Purgstall, *Narrative of Travels in Europe, Asia, and Africa in the Seventeenth Century* (by Evliya Efendi), 2 vols. in 1 (London 1834; rp. New York 1968). *He Kentrike kai Dytike Makedonia kata ton Eblligia Tseleb*, ed. B. Demetriades (Thessalonike 1973).

LIT. J. Mordtmann-H. Duda, *ET* 2:717-20. B. Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* (New York-London 1982). —S.W.R.

EVRENOS (Ἐβρενέζ and similar forms), Ottoman general; died Yenice-i Vardar 1417. Originally a *beg* of KARASI, Evrenos joined the Ottomans after they conquered that *beylik*. Evrenos had served from 1359 as general under Süleyman Pasha, Murad I, Bayezid I, Süleyman Çelebi, and Mehmed I. Evrenos participated in virtually all the critical campaigns and battles fought by the

Ottomans in Europe during his lifetime. During the 1360s-80s, he led many of the Turkish conquests in Byz. Thrace and Macedonia and captured Corinth in 1397. Evrenos himself acquired vast estates, centered at Yenice-i Vardar (mod. Yiannitsa in northern Greece), the site of his family tombs.

Byz. views of Evrenos were typically negative. Manuel II, writing ca.1409, attributed to him an "unrivaled" hatred of Christians and extreme cruelty. Among Muslims, Evrenos was renowned for his heroism, piety, and generosity.

LIT. I. Melikoff, *ET* 2:720. I. Uzunçarşılı, *IA* 4:414-18. —S.W.R.

EVTIMIJ OF TŪRNOVO, patriarch of Bulgaria, teacher, and writer; born Tŭrnovo between about 1320 and 1330, died Bačkovó ca.1400. As a young monk in a monastery in Tŭrnovo he was attracted by HESYCHASM, of which he became a lifelong defender. He was the protégé of Patr. TEODOSIJE, with whom he went to Constantinople in 1363. He then spent some years in the Lavra and Zo-graphou monasteries on Athos. Returning to Bulgaria in 1371 he founded the monastery of Holy Trinity near Tŭrnovo, which became a center of scholarship and literature. Elected patriarch in 1375, he helped in the struggle to preserve Bulgarian independence and to maintain the religious unity of the Bulgarian people. After the Turkish capture of Tŭrnovo in 1393, he was expelled and imprisoned in the PETRITZOS monastery at Bačkovó.

Evtimij revised and corrected earlier CHURCH SLAVONIC translations from Greek and sought to standardize Slavonic orthography and grammar in the face of linguistic change. His original writings comprise Lives of Bulgarian saints (for example, St. JOHN OF RILA), panegyrics of saints, theological treatises, and liturgical texts. He extended the flexibility and expressiveness of Old Slavonic and introduced to Slavonic literature something of the culture of mid-14th-C. Byz. His works enjoyed great influence in Serbia, Rumania, and Russia as well as in Bulgaria.

ED. *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymios*, ed. E. Kałużniacki (Vienna 1901; rp. London 1971).

LIT. I. Bogdanov, *Patriarch Evtimij* (Sofia 1970). Kl. Ivanova, *Patriarch Evtimij* (Sofia 1986). P.A. Syrkú, *K istorii ispravleniia knig v Bolgarii v XIV veke*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg 1890-98). N.C. Kočev in *Kulturno razvitie na Bŭlgarskata*

dūržava: krajat na XII-XIV vek (Sofia 1985) 278–84. G. Dančev, "Otnošenje Evfimija Tyrnovskogo k eretičeskim učenijam, rasprostranjavšimsja v Bolgarskich zemljach," *BBulg* 6 (1980) 95–104. —R.B.

EWER. See CHERNIBOXESTON.

EX VOTO. See VOTIVES.

EXAGION (ἐξάγιον, Lat. *exagium*), a unit of weight equal to 1/72 of the heavy Roman *libra* or Byz. *logarike* LITRA [= 4.44 g]. Synonymous terms are *stagion*, *saggio* (It.), and *mitqāl* (Ar.). Since the SOLIDUS weighed exactly one *exagion*, the term was also used to refer to the coin. *Exagion* can also identify the WEIGHTS used to control gold coins. After 1204 *exagia* of different weight are reported, that is, they are 1/72 of "pounds" that differed from the *logarike litra*.

LIT. Schilbach, *Metrologie* 183, 204. K. Wessel, *RBK* 2:795–800. —E. Sch.

EXAKTOR (ἐξάκτωρ), fiscal official in the late Roman Empire whose main function was to exact arrears of taxation; *exaktōres* had under their command a staff of subaltern officials, including PRAKTORES. Usually attached to a particular city, the *exaktor* was first appointed by the emperor, later by the CURIA. After the 6th C. the *exaktor* disappears temporarily.

The 9th-C. TAKTIKA do not mention *exaktōres*, but the 10th-C. *Taktikon of Escorial* places them between the *protasekretis* and *mystikos*. They seem to have retained certain fiscal functions. An act of the 11th C. is signed by John, *megas chartoularios* of the *genikon* and *exaktor* (N. Wilson, J. Darrouzès, *REB* 26 [1968] 18.18). TZETZES (*Hist.* 5.609–11) boasts that his grandfather George was a renowned *exaktor* who fulfilled the duty of *praktor* in various themes. At the same time, the *exaktor* became a high-ranking judge of the imperial tribunal. After 1204 the post is unknown.

LIT. Oikonomides, *Listes* 325f. Dölger, *Beiträge* 68. Laurent, *Corpus* 2:480–83. O. Seeck, *RE* 6 (1909) 1542–47. —A.K.

EXALEIMMA (ἐξάλειμμα, from *exaleipho*, "to wipe out, erase" [from the tax roll]), a fiscal term applied to immovable property. The term appears, almost exclusively in documents, from 1259 to

1361, although the adjective *exaleimmatikos*, as in *exaleimmatike stasis*, is firmly attested from 1300 until 1420. *Exaleimmata* were bought, sold, donated, granted in PRONOIA, reassigned to other *paroikoi*, broken up and parceled between *paroikoi* and their lord, and given fiscal assessments comparable to other properties. While V. Vasil'evskij (*ŽMNP* 210 [1880] 158) first identified *exaleimma* as escheat, later scholars (Dölger, *Sechs Praktika* 122; Zakythinos, *Despotat* 2:240; Solovjev-Mošin, *Grčke povelje* 432) frequently interpret *exaleimmata* as ruined properties. A few documents, however (*Zogr.*, no.18.11–14; M. Goudas, *EEBS* 3 [1926] 133f, no.7.6–10; *Docheiar.*, no.40.13–14), demonstrate that *exaleimmata* could be cultivated properties producing income.

The use of the participle *exalipheis* in the *Treatise on Taxation* (Dölger, *Beiträge* 116.2–6) and later documents through the 12th C. and the use of the adjective *exaleimmenos* in mid-11th- to mid-13th-C. documents suggest that an *exaleimma* was an escheated property, which reverted to the owner's lord (a private landlord or the state in its role as a landlord) as a result of the death or flight of its owner (usually a *paroikos*) without leaving a proper heir. The use of these terms also suggests that in the late Byz. agrarian system, based on the *paroikia*, *exaleimma* played a role analogous to that held by KLASMA in the earlier Byz. agrarian system based on the village community.

LIT. M. Bartusis, "Exaleimma: Escheat in Byzantium," *DOP* 40 (1986) 55–81. —M.B.

EXALTATION OF THE CROSS. See CROSS, CULT OF THE.

EXAMPLE (παράδειγμα) was considered by ancient rhetoricians as a TROPE (Martin, *Rhetorik* 262), based on the juxtaposition of objects and aimed at exhortation or dissuasion; unlike the PARABLE, examples dealt with actual phenomena and not with possible ones (*RhetGr*, ed. Spengel, 3:200.21–201.2). The church fathers frequently used examples to clarify subtle theological concepts, such as illustrating the Trinity by means of the sun and its rays, or demonstrating the existence of two natures in Christ by the example of the human soul and body. Leontios of Byzantium (PG 86:1453A–C) asserted that theological truth could not be proven by "natural reason" and

ridiculed the philosophers who rely on examples. The prototype, he said, always lacks likeness; even though Ethiopians and ravens are both black, they are totally dissimilar. JOHN OF DAMASCUS explicitly emphasized that examples must not be completely identical (*Schriften*, ed. Kotter, 2:169.19–24, 4:128, ch.54.6–7). —A.K.

EXARCH (ἐξάρχος), the name of several officials in both secular and ecclesiastical administration.

Secular Exarchs. At the time of Justinian I exarch was identified with a *dux* (C. Benjamin, *RE* 6 [1909] 1552f); eventually the term became the designation of the governor of an EXARCHATE, holding both civil and military power. Later, in the 10th-C. BOOK OF THE EPARCH, the term was applied to the heads of several guilds, the PRANDIOPRATAI and METAXOPRATAI; it is found, without any definition, in charters of 982 and 1008 (*Ivir.* 1, nos. 4, 15)—Dölger (*Schatz.* 297f) had hypothesized that they were heads of guilds. Clearer is a purchase deed of 1320 that testifies to the existence of an exarch of *myrepsoi* in Thessalonike who was personally involved in the production of perfumes (A. Kazhdan, *VizVrem* 13 [1958] 307). There is no evidence concerning the exarchs of guilds in Constantinople after the 10th C.

Ecclesiastical Exarchs. The chief bishop of a civil DIOCESE was also called exarch. In ecclesiastical usage therefore the title meant "primate" and was given to both METROPOLITANS and PATRIARCHS exercising authority over a wide area (CHALCEDON, canon 9). Thus ZONARAS comments that this canon designates the patriarchs themselves as exarchs of their dioceses (PG 137:420C). Although the title was abandoned by the 6th C. in favor of the familiar "patriarch," in later centuries it was frequently given to metropolitans as a purely honorary designation. At the same time, however, it was also used to denote a patriarchal functionary or representative of a territory directly dependent on the patriarch (Laurent, *Corpus*, 5.1, nos. 241–45; 5.3, nos. 1681–83). Indeed, by 1350 priests in Constantinople were even appointed exarchs in charge of the clergy in their GEITONIAI (neighborhoods). Finally, the title could denote a "supervisor" (cf. ARCHIMANDRITE) of monastic foundations subject to the patriarch. The superiors of the DALMATOU MONASTERY in Constantinople were already using the title in this sense in the 5th C.

LIT. Stöckle, *Zünfte* 78–86. Oikonomides, *Hommes d'affaires* 109–11. —A.K., A.P.

EXARCHATE, a new type of territorial and administrative unit created at the end of the 6th C. in CARTHAGE and RAVENNA; these existed until the end of the 7th and the middle of the 8th C., respectively. The external feature of the exarchate was the unification of military and civil power in the hands of the EXARCH, a reform that had been prepared by partial changes of provincial administration under Justinian I. Structurally considered, both exarchates were territories threatened by constant hostile pressure, populated by people with a language and cultural traditions different from those of Constantinople, strongly rural, with an aristocracy that tended to emigrate to Constantinople and a local church that acquired political power. All this formed a certain antinomy between the strong administration of an exarchate and its tendency toward economic and social separation from the empire.

LIT. A. Guillou, *Régionalisme et indépendance dans l'Empire byzantin au VIIe siècle* (Rome 1969). —A.K.

EXCERPTA (Ἐκλογαί), conventional title of an "encyclopedia" produced by CONSTANTINE VII and his collaborators. According to the preface, the emperor gave orders for necessary books to be collected from the whole *oikoumene*, excerpted and arranged in 53 sections (*hypotheseis*) dedicated to specific topics. The purpose was to use the experience of the past for moral and political education. One of these *hypotheseis*, *De legationibus*, is preserved in full, and significant parts of *De virtutibus et vitiis*, *De insidiis*, and *De sententiis* also survive. Only the titles are known of several other sections. The compilers used both ancient and Byz. writers; the latest is GEORGE HAMARTOLOS. Some of these sources are now lost. Only from the *Excerpta* do we know PRISKOS, PETER PATRIKIOS, MENANDER PROTECTOR, EUNAPIOS, and JOHN OF ANTIOCH. The excerpts were slightly edited and supplied with commentaries. The compiler of the SOUDA used the *Excerpta* (C. de Boor, *BZ* 21 [1912] 381–424; 23 [1914/19] 1–127).

ED. *Excerpta de legationibus*, ed. C. de Boor, 2 parts (Berlin 1903). *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*, eds. T. Büttner-Wobst, A. Roos, 2 pts. (Berlin 1906–10). *Excerpta de insidiis*, ed. C. de Boor (Berlin 1905). *Excerpta de sententiis*, ed. U. Boissevain (Berlin 1906).

LIT. Lemerle, *Humanism* 323–32. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* 1:359–61. O. Musso, "Sulla struttura del cod. Pal. gr. 398 e deduzioni storico-letterarie," *Prometheus* 2 (1976) 1–10. P. Schreiner, "Die Historikerhandschrift Vaticanus Graecus 977: ein Handexemplar zur Vorbereitung des Konstantinischen Exzerptenwerkes?," *JÖB* 37 (1987) 1–29. —A.K.

EXCERPTA LATINA BARBARA. See BARBARUS SCALIGERI.

EXCERPTA VALESIANA (or *Anonymus Valesii*), so called after their first publication in 1636 from a single 9th-C. MS by Henri de Valois (Valesius), comprise two very different works. The first, apparently composed ca.390, is a biography of CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT, entitled *Origo Constantini imperatoris*. This piece has won much modern praise for its clarity, accuracy, and impartiality; here and there the text corresponds with passages in OROSIUS. The second excerpt, seemingly written ca.550, deals with Italy under the Ostrogoths ODOACER and THEODORIC THE GREAT in the period 474–526, under the title *Item ex libris chronicorum inter cetera*. This extract, demonstrably using such sources as the Life of St. Severinus by EUGIPPIUS and the *Chronicle* of Maximianus, bishop of Ravenna (died 556), is equally notable for its anti-Arian bias and unclassical Latin.

ED. *Excerpta Valesiana*, ed. J. Moreau, revised V. Velkov (Leipzig 1968). Eng. tr. in *Ammianus Marcellinus*, ed. J.C. Rolfe, vol. 3 (London–Cambridge, Mass., 1939) 506–69.

LIT. R. Browning in *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 2 (Cambridge 1982) 743. J.N. Adams, *The Text and Language of a Vulgar Latin Chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II)* (London 1976). —B.B.

EXCOMMUNICATION (ἀφορισμός, "casting out") entailed the exclusion of the transgressor from the community or fellowship of the church and its sacraments, esp. the Eucharist. Offending members included emperors, for example, LEO VI and MICHAEL VIII. The separation from the church's sacramental life was either absolute or partial, that is, it could be either temporary or for the lifetime of the individual. Thus excommunication could be either "greater" or "less." (Like the ANATHEMA, the greater meant full removal from Christian society.) Once excommunication was imposed, the offender was obliged to express METANOIA and to avail himself of the church's

PENITENTIAL procedure by which he was gradually reconciled to the church. Thus, ultimately neither partial nor total isolation from the church's sphere deprived the wrongdoer of membership in the Christian community.

LIT. A. Catoire, "Nature, auteur et formule des peines ecclésiastiques d'après les Grecs et les Latins," *EO* 12 (1909) 265–71. E. Herman, "Hatte die byzantinische Kirche von selbst eintretende Strafen (poenae latae sententiae) gekannt?," *BZ* 44 (1951) 258–64. —A.P.

EXECUTION, or capital punishment, the most severe of PENALTIES. The *ECLOGA* lists crimes punished by execution: intentional MURDER, RAPE, incest and pederasty, robbery and arson, and esp. crimes against the state—MUTINY or lèse majesté, TREASON or espionage. The death sentence was also to be imposed on apostates from Christianity and those who robbed churches at night, magicians and sorcerers, and heretics (MANICHAEANS and MONTANISTS are specifically named). As the means of execution, the *Ecloga* mentions primarily the sword, and rarely burning at the stake or hanging on the *phourka*, the fork-shaped gallows that replaced the cross, which as the Christian symbol was prohibited as a means of execution from the time of Constantine I. Historical texts seldom mention execution. *Phourkai* were employed for the mass execution of rebels or traitors (e.g., Theoph. 184.4–6; *TheophCont* 303.17, 877.4); burning at the stake was the fate of BASIL THE COPPER HAND and BASIL THE BOGOMIL as well as the slaves who murdered Asylaion, Basil I's brother.

Hagiographical legends abound with stories of execution, but it is difficult to distinguish truth from pious invention. There was always a hesitancy to resort to execution; in the case of political crime, BLINDING, EXILE, or confinement in a monastery often substituted for execution. In the 14th-C. Balkans there was a tendency to replace the death penalty with a fine (B. Krekić, *BS/EB* 5 [1978] 171–78); the spread of the PHONIKON reflects the same tendency in Byz. On the other hand, the government always strove to prevent private persons from carrying out execution, particularly in the form of religious or BLOOD VENGEANCE (A. Mirambel, *Byzantion* 16 [1944] 381–92).

LIT. B. Sinogowitz, "Die Tötungsdelikte im Rechte der Ekloge Leons III. des Isauriers," *ZSavRom* 74 (1957) 319–36. —A.K.

EXEDRA (ἐξέδρα), any room, semicircular or rectangular in plan, that opens full-width directly onto an adjacent larger space or room, covered or uncovered. Widely used in antiquity to flank streets, porticoes, and forums, exedrae figured prominently in the interiors of imperial Roman baths, palaces, and villas. Eusebios of Caesarea noted their presence at the basilica in TYRE, the Octagon at ANTIOCH, and the Constantinian Martyrion in JERUSALEM. Christian Latin authors (e.g., Paulinus, PL 14:37) apply the term to the apse of a basilica. Exedrae like these, open only to the central room, flanked the Octagon in the Palace of Galerius, Thessalonike, and several Constantinopolitan palaces. Much later they are found at the NEA MONE, Chios, and elsewhere. Concomitant with their role as adjacent rooms, other exedrae were designed as essential parts of centralized churches. Carried on arches that link the major piers, these allow free passage from the central space to the aisles or ambulatory spaces, expanding the breadth while articulating the elevation of the space covered by the central dome (S. Vitale, Ravenna; Sts. Sergios and Bakchos, Constantinople; Hagia Sophia, Constantinople). Exedrae enabled the Late Antique and Byz. architect to transform a square, rectangular, or polygonal plan into a single volume of space unified around a central, vertical axis. Hence their pervasive use in Byz. architecture.

LIT. F. Deichmann, *RAC* 6:1171–74. Krautheimer, *ECBArch* 215–48. D. Mallardo, "L'exedra nella basilica cristiana," *RACr* 22 (1946) 191–211. D.I. Pallas, "Hai par' Eusebio exedrai ton ekklesion tes Palaistines," *Theologia* 25 (1954) 470–83. —W.L.

EXEGESIS (ἐξήγησις, lit. "leading out"), hermeneutics, explanation or interpretation of the BIBLE. The foundations of exegesis were laid by the ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL, esp. ORIGEN, who suggested that the sacred text had several layers of meaning. He recommended threefold exegesis on the model of a tripartite human nature, consisting of body, soul, and spirit. This approach supposes literal, allegorical, and spiritual senses of the text, or—to put it differently—references to the past, present, and future. Against this, the ANTIOCHENE SCHOOL emphasized the need to grasp the real (historical) sense of the text and saw the basis for this in the contemplation of words, including study of the Hebrew original of the Septuagint. The

main direction of Byz. exegesis was to find in the Old Testament testimonies concerning Christ, which were then exploited in the theological disputes of the 4th–5th C. Among the greatest exegetes were ATHANASIOS of Alexandria, EPHREM THE SYRIAN, THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA, JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, GREGORY OF NYSSA, CYRIL of Alexandria, and THEODORET OF CYRRHUS. In the 6th C. original exegesis came to an end, to be replaced by study of the exegesis of church fathers and by the assembly of authoritative citations in CATENAE. The Council in TRULLO (692) restricted creative hermeneutics; this plus the loss of the knowledge of Hebrew contributed to the decline of exegesis.

LIT. B. de Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse*, vol. 1 (Paris 1980). M. Simonetti, *Profilo storico dell'esegesi patristica* (Rome 1981). H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, vol. 1 (Paris 1959). P. Gorday, *Principles of Patristic Exegesis* (New York 1983). —J.L., A.K.

EXEMPTION, the term commonly used by modern historians to denote a form of IMMUNITY—any of several means whereby persons or property were released from some or all of their state obligations for the benefit of a person or institution, reflecting the basic principle that all property and persons bore fiscal burdens. Some exemptions were temporary (SYMPATHEIA, KLASMA, KOU-PHISMOS) and were granted and revoked by an APOGRAPHEUS with each fiscal survey (*exisosis*); others were (usually) permanent privileges (EXKOUS-SEIA, *ateleia*) that could only be granted by the emperor: they exempted MERCHANTS from taxes on commerce and owners from the taxes due on their property (land, ships, etc.) or from the taxes (TELOS, KANON) or supplementary charges (EPE-REIAL, CORVÉES) owed by their dependent peasants. Yet another category of exemption (*astrateia*) exempted persons from the service connected with STRATEIA. Permanent exemption from taxation, granted to certain properties of a few privileged monasteries and individuals in the 10th and 11th C., seems to have become almost the rule in regard to large landowners by the 14th C. Scholars view this devolution of fiscal authority to private individuals and religious corporations as either a symptom or cause of the gradual weakening and collapse of state authority in the 12th–15th C.

LIT. Lemerle, *Agr. Hist.* 122, 168–70, 173f, 208, 244. —M.B.

EXILE, a form of punishment. Byz. law distinguished two types of exile: *exoria*, banishment or deportation, which could be temporary or permanent, and *periorismos*, confinement within prescribed boundaries (*Basil.* 60.51.4). In defining *exoria* the author of the SYNOPSIS MINOR (Zepos, *Jus* 6:398f, par. 70) stressed the prohibition against being in the city in which the emperor resided or was passing through. The QUAEATOR had the right to banish illegal aliens from Constantinople. The major difference between *exoria* and *periorismos* concerned the disposition of the property of the criminal: those under *periorismos* had their property confiscated; those under *exoria* retained it (Zepos, *Jus* 6:501, par. 80). The BOOK OF THE EPARCH several times mentions *exoria* as a PENALTY for economic crimes; normally, however, exile was reserved for political criminals and suspects, esp. church leaders (JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, POPE MARTIN I, THEODORE OF STODIOS, PHOTIOS, etc.). The place of banishment could be to the border of the empire, an island, or some less remote location; some suspects or criminals were relegated to monasteries or placed under house arrest on their own estates. Experiences of exile varied widely; a special genre of letters from exile presents a broad range of feelings, from nostalgic longing for the capital to complaints about lack of books, starvation, and torture.

LIT. H. Evert-Kappesowa, "Formy zesłania w państwie bizantyńskim," in *Okeanos* 166–73. —A.K.

EXISOTES (ἐξισώτης), a fiscal official whose functions were similar to those of the EPOPTES. The term *exisis* designated the fiscal survey that in the 13th C. was carried out by high-ranking functionaries. The distinction between *exisis* and *apographe* (see APOGRAPHEUS) is not clear. In 1254 Constantine Diogenes, who was *apographeus* and *exisotes* of the islands of Leros (Lerne) and Kalymnos, conducted *apographe* and *exisis* (*Patmou Engrapha* 2, no.65.1); the forged document allegedly signed by Joseph Pankalas in 1261 speaks of the *anatheoresis* and *exisis* of the island of Kos (*Patmou Engrapha* 2, II.29); an act of 1407 mentions the *apographike exisotes* [*sic*] of the island of Lemnos (*Pantel.*, no.17.9), a *praktikon* of 1430 the *apographike exisis* of the same island (*Dionys.*, no.25.1). The term *exisis* was employed for surveys of the

theme of Thessalonike (*Xénoph.*, no.12.1) and elsewhere.

LIT. Angold, *Byz. Government* 210–12.

—A.K.

EXKOUBITOI. See DOMESTIKOS TON EXKOUBITON.

EXKOUSSATOS (ἐξκουσσάτος, from Lat. *excusatus*, "excused," cf. EXKOUSSEIA), an uncommon term of unclear meaning, applied to people, οἰκοί, and ships (*ploia*). In the 10th C. some people called *exkoussatoi* were engaged in crafts for the imperial household (*De cer.* 488.18; R. Cantarella, *BZ* 26 [1926] 31.2). A chrysobull of 1060 distinguishes *exkoussatoi tou dromou* from STRATIOTAI and DEMOSIARIOI (*Lavra* 1, no.33.32–34); ostensibly, these *exkoussatoi* served the imperial DROMOS. In an early example of the devolution of state revenues to private landowners, documents from the second half of the 10th C. refer to *exkoussatoi* or *exkouseuomenoi* households granted to the monastery of Iveron, which received their *telos* (*Ivir.* 1, nos. 2.21–22, 6.23,33); in the 13th C., *exkoussateutoi* households are known (MM 5:15.6–7).

Apparently, the designation *exkoussatos* did not necessarily imply that the individual, household, or ship served the state or that the *exkoussatos* was excused from paying the *telos*. It meant, rather, that the state no longer received some or all of the fiscal obligations owed by the *exkoussatos* (whether *telos* and/or EPEREIA is disputed), either because of service to the state (in which case the *exkoussatos*, if a peasant, paid less or no taxes) or because some or all of the *exkoussatos*'s state obligations were granted to a private individual or corporation. In later texts, the terms *exkousatoi* (MM 5:260.20, a.1342), *enkousatoi* (the *Chronicle of Morea*), and the Latin *incosati* (derived therefrom) designated privileged individuals, probably exempt from taxes and military service.

LIT. A. Kazhdan, "Ekskussija i ekskussaty v Vizantii X–XII vv.," *VizOč* (1961) 187–91. Lemerle, *Agr. Hist.* 175f. Longnon-Topping, *Documents* 264f. —M.B.

EXKOUSSEIA (ἐξκουσσειά, from Lat. *excusatio*, "release"), a type of EXEMPTION from certain obligations toward the state and from *introitus* (the entrance of officials into an estate). As a fiscal term, *exkousseia* appears in documents and literary

texts from the 10th C. through the end of the empire. *Exkousseiai* were granted to the owners or holders of a variety of economic instruments that bore fiscal obligations, including land, PAROIKOI, ships, buildings, and animals. The two interpretations of the nature of an *exkousseia* conflict. The most common opinion is that *exkousseia* is essentially synonymous with Western IMMUNITY and implied complete tax exemption (*ateleia*) and, in the 14th C., specific judicial privileges over a property owner's DEMESNE. A. Kazhdan (*VizOč* [1961] 186–216), however, argues that, at least in the 10th–12th C., *exkousseia* was unrelated to immunity; it was rather an exemption, not from the TELOS, but from EPEREIAI. In the 14th–15th C., *exkousseia* seems to refer to any kind of tax exemption.

LIT. P. Jakovenko, *K istorii immuniteta v Vizantii* (Juriev 1908). G. Ostrogorsky, "Pour l'histoire de l'immunité à Byzance," *Byzantion* 28 (1958) 165–254. M. Frejdenberg, "Ekskussija v Vizantii XI–XII vv.," *Učenyje zapiski Velikoluk-skogo pedinstitutu* 3 (1958) 339–65. H. Melovski, "Einige Probleme der Exkousseia," *JÖB* 32.2 (1982) 361–68. —M.B.

EXOKATAKOILOI (ἐξωκατάκοιλοι), term known from the 11th C. onward to designate five (a pentad) or six principal officials of the patriarch or a bishop: *megas OIKONOMOS*, *megas SAKELLARIOS*, *megas SKEUOPHYLAX*, *CHARTOPHYLAX*, the head of the SAKELLION, and later the PROTEKDIKOS.

LIT. Darrouzès, *Offikia* 59f, 101–03. Beck, *Kirche* 119f. —A.K.

EXORCISM (ἐξορκισμός), an imprecation against the DEVIL and DEMONS, to drive them away, or out of a possessed person or area; also a liturgical rite for that purpose. Exorcism occurs often in the New Testament. Tertullian considered it an act that any Christian was able to perform, but by the 3rd C. professional exorcists appear. Particular importance was ascribed to the exorcism preceding BAPTISM. Other exorcistic rituals, blessings, and prayers contained in the EUCHOLOGION are the *euchelaion* (see UNCTION), the "Exorcism of St. Tryphon" recited on Holy Thursday and Easter; the blessing of a field, garden, vineyard, or house; prayers against the evil eye and against evil spirits dwelling in people or in houses.

Hagiographical texts present abundant cases of exorcism—healing of the possessed, the expulsion

of demons (in the form of wild beasts, dragons, scorpions, etc.) from the places they had occupied, and the elimination of evil forces preventing a good harvest or catch. Exorcism was performed by imposition of hands, anointing with oil, the sign of the cross, by prayers, and by application of pieces of a saint's clothing.

LIT. F.J. Dölger, *Der Exorzismus im altchristlichen Taufritual* (Paderborn 1909). P. de Meester, *Rituale-benedizionale bizantino* (Rome 1930) 255–68. L. Delatte, *Un office byzantin d'exorcisme* (Brussels 1957). K. Thraede, *RAC* 7:58–117. J. Daniélou, *DictSpir* 4 (1961) 1997–2004. —R.F.T., A.K.

EXPOSITIO TOTIUS MUNDI, an anonymous treatise preserved in two Latin versions and probably translated from a Greek original; the latter was compiled in the mid-4th C., perhaps ca.360. The treatise begins with a description of Eden, which is populated by *makarenoi* (the Blessed; *camarini* in one Latin version); discussions of India and Persia then follow. This introductory part has parallels (probably originating in the same source) in Greek *hodoporeiai*, or guides, to Eden. After Persia comes the description of "our land," that is, the Roman Empire: Syria, Egypt (essentially limited to Alexandria), Asia Minor from Cilicia to Bithynia, Thrace (where its "two splendid cities" of Constantinople and Herakleia are treated as equals), Macedonia, Greece, Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, and the islands—Cyprus, Crete, Sicily, and Britannia. This part is free of the legendary cast that characterizes the introductory section; in addition to a list of districts and cities, it contains observations on climate, commerce, political structure, and behavior. The treatise shows little trace of a Christian worldview. Its author may have been a widely traveled merchant.

ED. *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, ed. J. Rougé (Paris 1966). Russ. tr. S. Poljakova, I. Felenkovskaja, "Anonimnyj geografičeskij traktat," *VizVrem* 8 (1956) 277–305. Germ. tr. H.J. Drexhage in *Münsterische Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte* 2.1 (1983) 3–41.

LIT. A. Vasiliev, "Expositio totius mundi," *SemKond* 8 (1936) 1–39. F. Martelli, *Introduzione alla "Expositio totius mundi"* (Bologna 1982). M. Philonenko, "Camarines et Makarinoi," in *Perennitas: Studi in onore di Angelo Brelich* (Rome 1980) 371–77. —A.K.

‘EZĀNĀ (‘Aēḏavā), "tyrant" of AXUM (ca.323 to 340/1 or 347/8) and identical to "Abreha" (Dombrowski, *infra* 162–64); known primarily from

undated, mostly bilingual inscriptions and from a letter of CONSTANTIUS II cited by Athanasios of Alexandria. F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (*Klio* 39 [1961] 234–48) denied, however, that the ‘Ezānā of the inscriptions was the Aeizana of the letter, and dated ‘Ezānā to the 5th C. The ‘Ezānā of the inscriptions claimed authority over HIMYAR and other lands. In the first half of the 4th C. Frumentius, a captive in Axum, started to organize Christian communities, but Christianity was not yet the state religion in Axum. Frumentius traveled to Alexandria, where Athanasios ordained him bishop of “India” (i.e., ETHIOPIA). In the letter to ‘Ezānā and his brother She’azana, Constantius required Frumentius to return to Alexandria ca. 328 and receive ordination from a new Arian patriarch, George. Another attempt to include Axum within the orbit of Byz. influence is reported by Philostorgios, who recounts that THEOPHILOS THE INDIAN visited both Himyar and Axum on his way to the East; since the embassy was sent by Constantius, it is reasonable to suppose that Theophilos negotiated with ‘Ezānā.

LIT. B. & F. Dombrowski, “Frumentius/Abbā Salāmā: Zu den Nachrichten über die Anfänge des Christentums

in Äthiopien,” *OrChr* 68 (1984) 114–69. Yu. Kobishchanov, *Axum* (University Park, Pa.-London 1979) 64–73. A. Dihle, *Unstrittene Daten. Untersuchungen zum Auftreten der Griechen am Roten Meer* (Cologne-Opladen 1965) 36–64. –W.E.K.

EZERITAI (Ἐζερίται), one of two groups of SKLAVENOI attested in the Peloponnesos. An etymology from the Slavic *ezero* (lake) is evident; D. Georgacas (*BZ* 43 [1950] 327–30) hypothesized that *ezero* was a translation of the toponym *Helos* (lit. “marsh meadow”) near Taygetos, where the Ezeritai settled. In Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (*De adm. imp.* 50) the Ezeritai are mentioned, along with the MELINGOI, as paying tribute of 300 nomismata; they revolted in the reign of Romanos I, were defeated, and ordered to pay 600 nomismata. Unlike the Melingoi, Ezeritai do not appear in later Byz. sources, but the bishopric of Ezera, in the Peloponnesos, is attested in 1340 (MM 1:218.31).

LIT. Bon, *Péloponnèse* 63, n.2. Vasmer, *Slaven* 167. R. Janin, *DHGE* 16 (1967) 292. –O.P.

EZRA^c. See ZORAVA.

F

FABLE (μῦθος) was considered by rhetoricians as a type of PROGYMNASMA; it had, however, a broader function of communicating a moral message in the form of a short essay with a gnomic conclusion. Classical authors, such as Demosthenes or Aristotle, did not consider fable as a noble genre; it evidently acquired more popularity in the Roman Empire. While Hermogenes treated fable briefly, the rhetorician NICHOLAS OF MYRA (ed. Felten 6–11) devoted an extended paragraph to it. Nicholas defined fable as a fictitious story having no verisimilitude, but illustrating a truth; it dealt either with human beings or animals. Some people also included among fables myths about the gods, but Nicholas considered the latter as a separate genre, *mythika diegemata*. He stressed the fable’s simplicity of language and the inclusion of an *epimythion* or moral.

The earliest fable collection to survive, the so-called *Collectio Augustana*, cannot be precisely dated; the 4th–5th C. is a possible date. Later collections are known throughout the Byz. period (F. Rodríguez Adrados in *La fable* [Geneva 1984] 182). The Byz. imitated ancient fables, esp. those ascribed to AESOP and Babrios (ca. 2nd C.), sometimes paraphrasing and revising them. Some fables are included in the *progymnasmata* of Theon, Libanios, Aphthonios, Theophylaktos Simokattes, Nikephoros Basilakes, and Nikephoros Chrysoberges; some fables exist as chapters in *progymnasmata*, others appear as episodes in lengthier genres. Oriental fables are broadly used in *Barlaam and Ioasaph* and esp. *Stephanites and Ichnelates* of Symeon SEITH. In the Palaiologan period the ANIMAL EPIC was developed out of animal fables.

LIT. F. Rodríguez Adrados, *Historia de la fábula greco-latina*, 2 (Madrid 1985). M. Nøjgaard, *La fable antique*, 2 vols. (Copenhagen 1964–67). Hunger, *Lit.* 1:94–96. J. Vaio, “Babrios and the Byzantine Fable,” in *La fable* (Geneva 1984) 197–224. –A.K.

FAÇADE (πρόσοψις, lit. “appearance”), the front or any side of a building designed with the intention of being seen. Initially, the Byz. concept of

the façade was based on classical prototypes; hence its use was restricted to a relatively few public building types such as PALACES (e.g., the façade of the 5th-C. Palace of Theodoric in Ravenna as represented on a mosaic in S. Apollinare Nuovo, RAVENNA) and, even less commonly, churches (e.g., the 5th-C. façade of the Theodosian rebuilding of HAGIA SOPHIA, Constantinople). As the classical tradition in Byz. waned, so did interest in monumental façades. They returned to importance in the 9th–10th C. The façades of such Constantinopolitan churches as the 10th-C. MYRELAION and the 11th-C. PANTEOPTES display a classicizing structural logic. The latter example also exhibits a tripling of recessed arches and pilaster strips, a mannerism characteristic of Komnenian architecture in the capital (e.g., PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY, Kilise Camii, and Gül Camii). At the same time, in various parts of Greece, a very different, unclassical attitude toward façade articulation emerges (e.g., Panagia Gorgoepekoos in Athens, Merbaka near Nauplion, and Hagia Theodora in Arta). Here we find flat walls decorated by continuous horizontal bands and surface textures, in complete disregard of the building’s interior structure. This attitude toward façade decoration becomes even more widespread in the 14th C., with isolated areas of resistance, as at MISTRA, to the general unclassical current.

LIT. K.M. Swoboda, “The Problem of the Iconography of Late Antique and Early Mediaeval Palaces,” *JSAH* 20 (1961) 78–84. S. Čurčić, “Articulation of Church Façades during the First Half of the Fourteenth Century,” in *L’art byzantin au début du XIV^e siècle* (Belgrade 1978) 17–27. –S.Č.

FACTIONS (from Lat. *factio*; Gr. μέρος, δῆμος or δῆμοι, δημόται; sometimes used as technical term), associations that staged circus games; associations of partisans of any one of the four colors inherited from Rome that competed in CHARIOT RACES. Blues (*Venetoi*) and Greens (*Prasinoi*) were the chief rivals and seem to have cooperated with Whites (*Leukoi*) and Reds (*Rousioi*),