

north of the Black Sea and on the Middle Danube. Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (*De adm. imp.* 9.114) suggested the Uzes as potential allies against the Pechenegs.

Closely involved in skirmishes with Rus' princes, in 1064 the Uzes crossed the Danube and invaded Byz. territory as far as Thessalonike. Attaleiates (*Attal.* 83.19–20) reckons that they numbered 600,000. Disease and starvation, however, as well as Bulgarian and Pecheneg attacks forced the Uzes to retreat; many were crushed by their own animals and vehicles. Some Uzes became Byz. MERCENARIES, some merged with the Pechenegs, others settled near Kiev as military colonists in the service of the Rus' princes (*černye klobuci*). In

Byz. the corps of mercenary Uzes was still active in the second half of the 11th C. (*SkylCont* 144.13), then disappeared as a distinct force, leaving some echoes in toponymy (Lake Ouzolimne) and personal names (a commander Ouzas "of Sauromatian origin" in the *Alexiad* of Anna Komnene). The Byz. identified the Uzes as Scythians (Skylitzes Continuatus) or Huns (Anna Komnene); TZETZES (*Hist.* 8.773), following an old tradition, placed the Uzes with the Huns in the vicinity of the Caspian Sea.

LIT. O. Pritsak, *Studies in Medieval Eurasian History* (London 1981), pts. VI, X, XIX. P. Golden, "The Migrations of the Oğuz," *ArchOtt* 4 (1972) 45–84. T. Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk, *Czarni klobucy* (Warsaw 1985). —O.P.

VAHRAM, known as *rabun*, "master," or *vardapet*, "teacher"; Armenian scholar active in the late 13th C. He calls himself "chancellor" at the court of Leo II, king of Armenian Cilicia (1270–89); little else is known of his life. His *Rhymed Chronicle* traces the history of Armenian Cilicia from its occupation by Ruben (see RUBENIDS) in the late 11th C. until 1276. His *Commentary on Aristotle's Categories* follows the tradition made popular in Armenia by works of (or attributed to) DAVID THE PHILOSOPHER.

ED. E. Dulaurier, ed., "Chronique rimée des rois de la petite Arménie," *RHC Arm.* 1:491–535, with Fr. tr. Eng. tr. in C. Neumann, *Vahram's Chronicle* (London 1831). *Lucmunk' "storogut'eanc'n" Aristoteli*, ed. G. Grigoryan (Erevan 1967). —R.T.

VAĻARŠAPAT (Vagharshapat, now Ejmiacin in Armenia), capital city under TRDAT THE GREAT; site of the martyrdom of Sts. Hrip'simē, Gayanē and their companions. Since the 4th C., churches at VaĻaršapat have commemorated the martyrs and the spot where GREGORY THE ILLUMINATOR had a vision in which four lofty columns supporting vaults were called forth by a man descended from heaven. (The 12th-C. identification of the man as Christ explains the cathedral's dedication, Ejmiacin, "the Only-Begotten-One descended.")

The present cathedral is a 7th-C. cross-in-square church, with apses to the north, south, and west, as well as east. Seventeenth-century additions obscure the exterior. Beneath the apse and nave are remains of basilicas (and a Zoroastrian temple); A. Sahinyan's reconstruction of a 5th-C. cross-domed structure here (*REArm* n.s. 3 [1966] 39–71) is based on a misunderstanding of excavation notes (F. Gandolfo, *Le basiliche armene IV–VII secolo* [Rome 1982] 14–19).

St. Hrip'simē (618) is the best-known example of a church plan type (including Džvari at Mc'xet'a) peculiar to the Transcaucasus: four apses open out of a domed central area. Between the apses, steep, three-quarter-round chambers lead to four square corner rooms. St. Gayanē

V

(630) is a cross-domed basilica. Like St. Hrip'simē, its apse and auxiliary chambers are inscribed within a flat wall. Later churches at VaĻaršapat (e.g., the 17th-C. ŠoĶokat) presumably mark the sites of other 4th-C. *martyria*.

LIT. O.Kh. Khalpakhchian, *Architectural Ensembles of Armenia* (Moscow 1980) 97–157. A.B. Eremjan, *Chram Ripsime* (Erevan 1955). —A.T.

VALENS (Οὐάλης), augustus (from 28 Mar. 364); born Cibalae, Pannonia, ca. 328, died near Adrianople 9 Aug. 378. A low-ranking army officer during the reigns of Julian and Jovian, he rose swiftly after the ascent to the throne of his brother Valentinian I. Valentinian appointed him *tribunus* (or *comes*) *stabuli*, and less than a month later he became co-ruler. After a division of responsibilities Valens retained the eastern part of the empire including Thrace and Egypt. The brothers reversed Julian's policies, depriving the curiae of state support and removing Julian's appointees. The pro-Julian elements gathered around the rebel PROKOPIOS. His revolt in 365, however, was suppressed. Less clear are the reasons for the so-called plot of Theodoros in 371/2 in which many influential people were involved; denunciation led to a series of severe punishments.

The situation on the Persian frontier was troublesome during his reign, and Valens spent the winters of 373/4 and 377/8 in Antioch negotiating such matters as the division of Armenia between Constantinople and Persia. The first war against the Goths ended with a peace treaty in 369 that was not favorable to the empire. In 376 Valens gave permission for a large number of Visigoths, fleeing from the Huns, to settle in Thrace. This operation was poorly handled, supplies of food ran out, and Roman officials took advantage of the situation to gain personal profit. As a result, the Visigoths rose in revolt and ravaged the Thracian countryside. Valens, then at Antioch, rushed westward, hoping to defeat the barbarians without the help of his nephew Gratian; as a result, he

was routed and killed in 378 at the battle of ADRIANOPLE.

Valens was a Christian; probably under the influence of his wife Domnica he accepted Arianism and toward the end of his reign began to persecute the Orthodox. He was not popular, esp. with the intellectuals, who ridiculed his lack of education and ignorance of the Greek language. In Constantinople Valens rebuilt the main AQUEDUCT, which has since borne his name.

LIT. Stein, *Histoire* 1:172–90. A. Nagl, *RE* 2.R. 7 (1948) 2097–2137. I. Opelt, "Ein Edikt des Kaisers Valens," *Historia* 20 (1971) 764–67. R. Snee, "Valens' Recall of the Nicene Exiles and anti-Arian Propaganda," *GRBS* 26 (1985) 395–419. —T.E.G.

VALENTINIAN I (Οὐαλεντινιανός), emperor (from 26 Feb. 364); born Cibalae, Pannonia, 321, died Brigetto, Pannonia, 17 Nov. 375. He was an officer in Julian's army but as a Christian could not expect a successful career. The accounts of his exile by Julian are contradictory. He subsequently became *tribunus* in the army of Jovian. When the latter emperor died, Valentinian was unanimously proclaimed augustus by the generals and civil officials. He soon promoted his brother VALENS as co-emperor. The brothers agreed to divide the empire and its administration (two *consistoria* were established), but to rule in cooperation. Valentinian held the West, residing in Milan and Trier.

Valentinian's domestic policy was inconsistent. He abolished some exemptions given by Julian to *curiales* and promoted the appointment of DEFENSORES CIVITATUM, but he was frugal like Julian and tried to reduce the expenditures of the court. His major source of support was among Pannonians, whereas few senators (e.g., PROBUS) collaborated with him. The thesis that Valentinian introduced a "reign of terror" against senators, at least after 368 (C. Schuurmans, *AntCl* 18 [1949] 25–38), is probably an exaggeration (P. Hamblenne, *Byzantion* 50 [1980] 198–225).

Valentinian did not intervene in Eastern affairs during the revolt of PROKOPIOS in 365, nor did he seek assistance when Firmus revolted in Africa. His foreign policy was also independent of the eastern half of the empire. His major concerns were Britain and the Rhine and Danube frontiers. In 375 he undertook operations in Pannonia

against the Quadi and Sarmatians. During negotiations with them, he became so enraged that he died of a stroke.

His first wife was Marina Severa, mother of Gratian. In ca. 370 he married Justina, widow of the usurper MAGNENTIUS, who bore him Valentinian II. Ammianus Marcellinus presents a negative image of Valentinian as alien to the classical ideal of man, avoiding military action, and frightened of magicians. On the contrary, Jerome (Eusebios, *Chronicon*, Lat. tr. by Jerome, ed. R. Helm, U. Treu [Berlin 1984] 244) praises him as an outstanding emperor whose biased adversaries portrayed his severity as cruelty and his economy as greed.

LIT. Stein, *Histoire* 1:172–83. A. Alföldi, *A Conflict of Ideas in the Late Roman Empire* (Oxford 1952). R. Soraci, *L'imperatore Valentiniano I* (Catania 1971). M. Fasolico, *Valentiniano I* (Naples 1976). —T.E.G.

VALENTINIAN II, Western emperor (from 22 Nov. 375); born Trier? 371, died Vienne (in Gaul) 15 May 392. Proclaimed as augustus by the army in Aquincum immediately after the death of his father Valentinian I, the child-emperor Valentinian II was kept in a subordinate position under the tutelage of his half-brother Gratian. When Gratian was murdered in 383, Valentinian's mother Justina ruled in his name. The major problems of her administration were the pressure of the Alemanni on the northern frontier that general Bauto managed to curb, in part with the help of the Huns and Alans; religious conflicts, since Justina leaned toward Arianism while AMBROSE exercised a strong Orthodox influence on the young emperor; and a powerful aristocratic elite that cherished paganism and traditional virtues and attempted to shift the burden of taxation to the urban population, esp. the merchants. The usurpation of MAXIMUS was particularly dangerous, compelling Valentinian to flee to Thessalonike in 387. This changed the balance of power between West and East. From 384 onward Theodosios I attempted to assume the role of the elder augustus. In 388 he, together with ARBOGAST, defeated Maximus. Valentinian ruled the West from Vienne, under the general control of Arbogast. Desirous of asserting his independence, Valentinian considered moving his court to Milan or using Ambrose as a mediator between himself and Arbo-

gast; he attempted in vain to have Arbogast killed. Valentinian was subsequently found hanged in his palace—the sources either accuse Arbogast (B. Croke, *Historia* 25 [1976] 235–44), portray the death as suicide, or remain silent about it.

Valentinian is depicted on official monuments of his house, as co-emperor at age 17 on the missorium of Theodosios I (see LARGITIO DISHES, SILVER), and on the OBELISK OF THEODOSIOS. A bronze bust in Budapest (*Age of Spirit.*, no. 19), found in Pannonia and possibly from a military standard, closely resembles the portraits of Valentinian on coins and medallions (Delbrück, pl. 14.1–4).

LIT. W. Ensslin, *RE* 2.R. 7 (1948) 2205–32. Stein, *Histoire* 1:203f, 210f. P. Grattarola, "La morte dell'imperatore Valentiniano II," *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere. Classe di scuola di lettere di scienze morali e storiche* 113 (1979) 359–70. —T.E.G., A.C.

VALENTINIAN III, Western emperor (from 425); born Ravenna 4 July 419, died near Ravenna 16 Mar. 455. He was the son of GALLA PLACIDIA and the patrician Constantius. After the death of Honorius, Theodosios II was reluctant to use the family of Galla Placidia to maintain Eastern influence in the West. It was only under pressure from the revolt of a certain John that he had the young Valentinian made caesar on 23 Oct. 424 and augustus the next year. Galla Placidia dominated the Western court during her son's minority, although she was constantly challenged by her rival AETIUS, who relied on the support of the Gallic aristocracy. In 437 Valentinian married Licinia Eudoxia, daughter of Theodosios II; the marriage produced two daughters, Eudocia and Placidia. Valentinian had good relations with the Vandals and Eudocia married Huneric, son of GAISERIC. In 450 Valentinian, along with his wife and mother, wrote to Theodosios II asking him to repudiate the teachings of the "Robber" Council of EPHEBUS. He attempted to secure independence from the tutelage of Aetius but was not always successful. Finally, in 454, he murdered Aetius with his own hand, but fell the next year to Optila, one of the former's supporters.

LIT. W. Ensslin, *RE* 2.R. 7 (1948) 2232–59. G. Härtel, "Die Novellen Valentinians III. als wichtige zeitgenössische Quelle," in *Studi in onore Cesare Sanfilippo*, vol. 1 (Milan 1982) 231–51. A. Musumeci, "La politica ecclesiastica di Valentiniano III," *SicGymn* 30 (1977) 431–81. —T.E.G.

VALENTINOS ARŠAKUNI (Βαλεντιανός or Βαλεντινός), usurper of the Byz. throne in 645. He presumably belonged to the Armenian Aracid house and played a brief role in the succession of Herakleios. At first he seems to have supported Constantine Herakleios and his sons against MARTINA, with the help of Anatolian contingents stationed at Chalcedon, and he may have brought about the coronation of Constans II in 641. Four years later, however, after an unsuccessful expedition against the Arabs in Syria, he revolted and made his own bid for the throne. The scant Byz. notices (e.g., Theoph. 343.3–6) and the slightly longer account of the Armenian historian SEBĒOS disagree on the ultimate goal of Valentinus and on Constans II's acceptance of him as co-ruler. Nevertheless, they agree that Valentinus was brought to the throne by a military coup d'état and crowned. Soon thereafter, however, he aroused the hostility of the population of Constantinople, which rose against him and put him to death (645).

LIT. Kulakovskij, *Istorija* 3:189f. J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2 (London 1889) 283–85. —N.G.G.

VANDALS (Βανδίλοι), a Germanic people. They first appear in 406 when they crossed the Rhine in company with the Alans and Suevi and devastated Gaul for three years. The coalition entered Spain in 409 and again inflicted considerable destruction before settling in the western and southern part of the peninsula. In 429 the Vandals and Alans crossed into Africa. Vandal authority over the two MAURITANIAS and NUMIDIA was recognized by Valentinian III in 435. Four years later the Vandals seized CARTHAGE. The peace treaty of 442 ceded control of AFRICA PROCONSULARIS, BYZACENA, TRIPOLITANIA, and eastern Numidia to the Vandals and retroceded Mauritania and western Numidia to the empire. Aware of the threats posed by Ravenna and Constantinople, the Vandals carved out a sphere of power in the western Mediterranean that included control of the Balearic Islands, Corsica, SARDINIA, and SICILY. Vandalic fleets carried out frequent attacks against the empire, one of which resulted in the sack of Rome (455). Following two unsuccessful Byz. attempts to recover Africa (465–66, 470), a treaty was signed in 474 bringing hostilities to a close

and reaffirming Vandal control as *foederati* over Africa.

The Vandals in Africa comprised the Vandal Hasdingi-Silingi clans, Alans, and small numbers of Hispano-Romans, Goths, and Suevi. After capturing Carthage, GAISERIC forcibly established a family dynasty. Subsequent Vandal kings—Huneric (477–84), Gunthamund (484–96), Thrasamund (496–523), Hilderic (523–30), and GELIMER (530–33)—were his direct descendants. In 456, the dynasty was linked to the house of Theodosios I by the marriage of Hilderic to Eudokia, daughter of Valentinian III. Power in Vandal Africa rested with the king and the Vandal elite, made up of the *optimates* (nobles), Arian clergy, and warriors. The so-called *sortes Vandalarum*, probably public lands in Africa Proconsularis, were provided by Gaiseric to the warriors. The Vandal kings reserved for themselves and their family similar allotments (probably former imperial estates) in Byzacena and eastern Numidia. Relations between the Vandals and the Roman-African population were sometimes strained. Some properties belonging to the Roman-African elite were seized, forcing the latter to seek refuge in western Numidia, Mauritania, Italy, and the East. Nevertheless, the Vandals maintained elements of the Roman administrative and political infrastructure, including the imperial cult. The *Latin Anthology* also attests to the encouragement by late Vandal kings of Latin literary culture. Relations between the Arian Vandals and the Orthodox African church were frequently hostile, although periods of toleration are known. The MAURI tribes initially cooperated with the Vandals and even fought together with them in some overseas campaigns, but Vandal military weakness in the late 5th C. contributed to the emergence of autonomous Mauri chiefdoms in Numidia and Byzacena.

The period of Vandal hegemony in Africa shows much continuity with the late Roman period. African grain, oil, and wine, although no longer linked to the ANNONA, were still exported in considerable quantity to Spain, Gaul, and the eastern Mediterranean. While there is a noticeable lack of civic building activity in African cities under the Vandals, this trend probably began in the 3rd C. In general the Vandals were too few in number to offer a serious cultural alternative to Roman-African civilization; they were thus being slowly assimilated at the time of Justinian I's invasion of

Africa. The pretense for the invasion was Geli-mer's deposition and murder of Huneric, the grandson of Gaiseric and Valentinian III. The end of the kingdom came with the fall of Carthage in 533. Vandal prisoners of war were organized into cavalry regiments known as the *Justiniani Vandali* and stationed in the East, where they disappear from history.

LIT. C. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1955). Pringle, *Defence* 9–22. N. Duval, "Culte monarchique dans l'Afrique vandale," *REAug* 30 (1984) 26–73. F.M. Clover, "Carthage and the Vandals," *Excavations at Carthage Conducted by the University of Michigan* 7 (Ann Arbor 1982) 1–22. C. Bourgeois, "Les Vandales, le Vandalisme et l'Afrique," *AntAfr* 16 (1980) 213–28. —R.B.H.

VARANGIANS (Βάρανγοι), Norsemen or VIKINGS in the Byz. army; from the late 11th C. the term also refers to Anglo-Saxons (J. Shepard, *Traditio* 29 [1973] 53–92). The term is first encountered in Byz. sources with reference to events of 1034 (Skyl. 394.71–5) and then in documents exempting monasteries from billeting Varangians on their property. Scandinavians had been coming via Rus' to serve in Byz. from at least the early 10th C. The Varangians are often linked to or conflated with the Rus' (Rhos), or else they are designated "Tauroscythians" or "axe-bearers." Basil II organized them into a TAGMA in 988, when some 6,000 were sent by VLADIMIR I of Kiev for use against Bardas PHOKAS. Over the next two centuries the Varangians were prominent both in field armies and esp. in their role as a palatine corps in Constantinople with quarters in the Great Palace and (under the Komnenoi) at the Mangana and Blachernai palaces. The Varangian guard was elite, expensive to join, notoriously loyal (e.g., An.Komn. 1:92.12–17), and distinctive in physical appearance (cf. Grabar-Manoussacas, *Skylitzès*, no.507), dress, and weaponry, and in its traditional code of discipline. Its officers held standard palatine ranks (e.g., the *spatharokandidatos* HAROLD HARDRADA), but its commander (AKOLOUTHOS) is thought normally to have been a Greek. There were churches of the Varangians dedicated to the Virgin in Constantinople, Crete, and near Taranto.

LIT. S. Blöndal, *The Varangians of Byzantium*, revised by S. Benedikz (Cambridge 1978). G. Schramm, "Die Waräger: osteuropäische Schicksale einer nordgermanischen Gruppenbezeichnung," *Die Welt der Slaven* 28 (1983) 38–67. —S.C.F., A.C.

VARDAN VARDAPET ("teacher"), Armenian scholar, born 1200 or 1210 in Greater Armenia (hence his frequent title *Arewelc'i*, "the Easterner"), died 1271 at monastery of Xor Virap. He is noted for a universal history, biblical commentaries, a study of grammar, and a brief *Geography*. He spent some years in Jerusalem and Cilicia. After 1243 he taught in numerous monasteries in Greater Armenia.

Vardan's *Historical Compilation* traces the fortunes of Armenia from the creation of the world to 1267. Although primarily based on earlier Armenian sources, it is of particular value for the history of Greater Armenia in the 12th–13th C. under Georgian and then Mongol domination. Ecclesiastical relations between the Greek and Armenian churches interest Vardan, but he otherwise pays little attention to Byz.

ED. *Hawak'umn Patmut'ean*, ed. L. Alishan (Venice 1862). Partial Fr. tr. in J. Muyldermans, *La domination arabe en Arménie, extrait de l'Histoire Universelle de Vardan* (Louvain 1927). H. Berbérian, *Ašxarhac'oyc' Vardamay Vardapeti* (Paris 1960). Fr. tr. in J. Saint-Martin, *Mémoires sur l'Arménie*, vol. 2 (Paris 1819) 406–71.

LIT. M. Brosset, "Analyse critique de la Vseobščaja istorija de Vardan," *Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences de St. Petersbourg* 7 4.9 (1862) 1–30. R.W. Thomson, "Vardan's *Historical Compilation* and its Sources," *Muséon* 100 (1987) 343–352. —R.T.

VARDARIOTAI (Βαρδარიῶται), an ethnic (or possibly territorial) group that probably received its name from the river Vardar. The name first appears in an episcopal *notitia* of the 10th C. as a bishopric "of Vardariotai or TOURKOI" in the diocese of Thessalonike (*Notitiae CP*, no.7.308). The origin of the Vardariotai is unclear: pseudo-Kodinos (pseudo-Kod. 182.4–10) notes that they "were 'Persians,' whom the emperor [Theophilos, according to Gy. Moravcsik] transferred and settled on the Vardar"; their language was "Persian" (210.7–8). Despite this direct evidence, it has often been assumed that the Vardariotai were Hungarians. They formed a police corps under the command of a *primikerios* and probably replaced the MANGLABITAI (Oikonomides, *Listes* 328, n.241). They wore red uniforms and "Persian" headgear called *angouroton*, with a whip at their belt as a symbol of their function. A 13th-C. historian (Akrop. 131.26–30) relates that the Vardariotai accompanied the emperor to his military camp, and in a charter of 1195 there is a signature of a representative of a *sebastos* and *primikerios* of the

Vardariotai, Constantine Taronides (*Patmou Engrapha* 2, no.56.31), or rather Taronites, whose service was connected with the sea.

The seals of at least two *vardarioi* of Thessalonike are known; one of them, Kosmas (10th–11th C.), was at the same time *kommerkiarios* and *protosnotarios*. If *vardarioi* were somehow linked to Vardariotai, it reveals quite a different activity of these imperial guardians.

LIT. R. Janin, "Les Turcs Vardariotes," *EO* 29 (1930) 437–49. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* 1:86f. V. Laurent, "Ho Bardarioton etoi Tourkon," in *Sbornik v pamet na prof. Petür Nikov* (Sofia 1940) 275–88. G. Konidares, "He prote mneia tes episkopes Bardarioton Tourkon," *Theologia* 23 (1952) 87–94, 236f. —A.K.

VARNA, ancient Odessos (Ὀδησσός), city on the west coast of the Black Sea. Odessos prospered in the 4th–6th C. as indicated by numerous surviving inscriptions that were made by military officers, clergymen, merchants, and craftsmen (V. Beševliev, *IzvNarMus-Varna* 19 [1983] 19–34). There are remains of two Roman baths, a 4th-C. basilica with a mosaic floor, and two large Byz. churches, as well as a 6th-C. basilica outside the urban area. Coins of Herakleios were found in Odessos, but the city was burned in the 7th C., probably by the Avars and/or Slavs. Bulgars did not settle at Odessos, but in its vicinity, to which Theophanes gives the name Varna, whose etymology (possibly Slavic) is unclear. In the following centuries Varna is mentioned as a geographic name: the river of Varna (*De adm. imp.* 9.100) or the coast of Varna (Skyl. 433.28–29). In 971 John I Tzimiskes conquered the region. The fortress of Varna on a cliff overlooking the sea was built by the Byz. probably in the 11th or 12th C. In the 12th C. it was a port (V. Gjuzelev, *IzvIstDr* 28 [1972] 318f) and an important defensive base, with considerable urban development. Although Isaac II Angelos rebuilt the fortifications of Varna (Nik.Chon. 434.22), KALOJAN recaptured the city from the Byz. in 1201. In the 13th–14th C. it was the major port of the Second Bulgarian Empire, through which grain was exported in Venetian and Genoese ships (E. Todorova, *IzvNarMus-Varna* 18 [1982] 79–85; 21 [1985] 25–41). In 1389 the Ottoman Turks captured Varna; in 1399 TATARS from the Golden Horde sacked it. In 1444 a united Christian army was defeated by the Ottomans near Varna (see VARNA, CRUSADE OF).

LIT. Hoddinott, *Bulgaria* 49–56, 223–33, 323–33. V.I. Velkov, *Roman Cities in Bulgaria* (Amsterdam 1980) 245–49. V. Beševliev, “Iz starata istorija na Varnensko,” *Izv-NarMus-Varna* 16 (1980) 121–25. A. Kuzev, V. Gjuzelev, *Bŭlgarski srednovekovni gradove i kreposti*, vol. 1 (Sofia 1981) 293–310. D. Dimitrov, “Varna i bliskata i okolnost prez VII–IX v.,” *IzvNarMus-Varna* 18 (1982) 55–77. —R.B.

VARNA, CRUSADE OF. As a result of the Crusade preached by Pope Eugenius IV in 1440, a predominantly Polish-Hungarian army of about 25,000 men—led by HUNYADI, *voivode* of Transylvania, King VLADISLAV III JAGELLO of Hungary and Poland, and GEORGE BRANKOVIĆ of Serbia—advanced in 1443–44 into the Balkans, where they won some significant victories over the Turks. Consequently MURAD II agreed to a ten-year truce with the Christians, which was ratified at Szegedin in July 1444. When Murad withdrew his troops, however, the Crusaders, with the exception of Branković, broke their oath (F. Pall, *BShAcRoum* 22 [1941] 144–58; *Balkanica* 7 [1944] 102–20) and attacked the Ottomans at VARNA on 10 Nov. 1444. After some initial success, the Christians were defeated and Jagello was killed.

The Crusade of Varna was the final attempt of Western Crusaders to stem the Ottoman conquest and preserve the Byz. capital of Constantinople. After the failure of the expedition, Emp. John VIII was forced to send congratulations and presents to the sultan. The battle is described in some detail by Doukas (Douk. 275.20–277.15) and CHALKOKONDYLES (ed. Darkò, 2:98–110), whose accounts are supplemented by a contemporary vernacular poem, written between 1456 and 1461 (N.G. Svoronos, *Athena* 48 [1938] 163–83). It is preserved in two versions, one by an eyewitness, Zotikos Paraspondylos (who is hostile to John VIII), the other, slightly later, by George Argyropoulos.

SOURCE. Gy. Moravcsik, *Hellenikon poiema peri tes maches tes Barnes* [= *Oungroellenikai meletai*, vol.1] (Budapest 1935).

LIT. M. Chasin in *HC* 6:276–310. O. Halecki, *The Crusade of Varna* (New York 1943). A. Hohlweg, “Der Kreuzzug des Jahres 1444,” in *Die Türkei in Europa*, ed. K.-D. Grothusen (Göttingen 1979) 20–37. B. Tsvetkova, *La bataille mémorable des peuples* (Sofia 1971), esp. 322–66. —A.M.T.

VASMOULOS. See GASMOULOS.

VASPURAKAN (Βασπρακανία, Βασπρακάν, Ἀσπρακανία, etc.), district in southeast ARMENIA identified by this name only after the Byz.-Persian

partition of the country in 591; it was first overrun by the Arabs in 653. Gradually dominated by the house of Arcruni, Vaspurakan reached its zenith under Gagik-Xaç'ik Arcruni (908–43/4) who was crowned by the Muslims in opposition to the BAGRATID king Smbat I and eventually recognized by Byz. as well. During his reign, the balance of power in Armenia shifted to Vaspurakan. In 924, Gagik gave asylum to the historian JOHN V KATHOLIKOS, who fled to him from the Muslims, and the primates of Armenia remained in Vaspurakan until 961. Gagik also built the Church of the Holy Cross next to his palace on the island of AYT'AMAR in Lake Van. His successors, however, failed to maintain the unity of his kingdom. Threatened by the Dailamite precursors of the Seljuks, the last Arcruni king, Senekerim-Yovhannes, ceded Vaspurakan to Basil II in 1021/2 in exchange for Sebaste and domains in Cappadocia. As part of the 11th-C. Byz. expansion to the east, the kingdom of Vaspurakan with some additional territories became the Byz. catepanate of Basprakania (Asprakania) with its center at Van; it served as the bulwark of the empire in the southeast until the Turks overran it after 1071. The archbishop of Vaspurakan at Aht'amar, however, kept his see and proclaimed himself *katholikos* in 1113, a claim his see maintained until 1895.

LIT. V.A. Arutjunova-Fidanjan, “Fema Vaspurakan (territorial'nij sostav),” *Vestnik obščestvennykh nauk Arm.* AN 9 (1974) 92–99. M. Thierry, “Notes de géographie historique sur le Vaspurakan,” *REB* 34 (1976) 159–73. S. Der Nersessian, *Agh'amar, Church of the Holy Cross* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965). —N.G.G.

VATATZES (Βατάτζης, fem. Βατατζίνα), a noble Byz. lineage known from ca.1000, when a certain Vatatzes moved from Byz. to Bulgaria (Skyl. 343.74). Vatatzes lived in Macedonia, where he probably possessed estates. In the 11th–12th C. the family occupied important military positions: the *megas domestikos* John in the late 12th C.; the *domestikos* of the East, Basil (later, the *domestikos* of the West); *doux* of the West, Nikephoros; governors of various regions (Bulgaria, Thrakesion, etc.). John's father (perhaps Theodore) was granted the high title of DESPOTES. The Vatatzai married with the BRYENNIOS, KOMNENOS, and ANGELOI. In 1047 John Vatatzes supported the rebellion of Leo TORNIKIOS; the Vatatzai were loyal to the

Komnenoi but fought against Andronikos I and perhaps against the Angeloi. JOHN III VATATZES became emperor of Nicaea and was succeeded by his son THEODORE II (who assumed his mother's name, LASKARIS) and grandson JOHN IV LASKARIS. Driven from the throne by the PALAIOLOGOI, the Vatatzai were still important up to the mid-14th C. when John, *stratopedarches* and *protokynegos*, was governor of Thessalonike (died 1345).

The name Diplovatatzes (“Double Vatatzes”) was used at least from the second half of the 13th C. for those who had Vatatzes ancestors on both sides. The romance of BELISARIOS listed them among the upper crust of the aristocracy. A certain Diplovatatzina was the mistress of Michael VIII Palaiologos; Alexios Diplovatatzes is known as *sebastos*, *megas hetaireiarches*, and landowner in 1307–10.

LIT. Polemis, *Doukai* 106–11. F. Barišić, “Jovan Vatac, protokinig,” *ZbFilozFak* 11.1 (1970) 283–87. *PLP*, nos. 2512–25, 5506–16. —A.K.

VATOPEDI MONASTERY, sometimes called Batopedion (Βατοπέδιον, lit. “Bramble-bush valley”), located at the midpoint of the northeast coast of the Mt. ATHOS peninsula. Since the rich archives of the monastery have only been partially published, the early history of the monastery is still obscure. One legend, evidently fantastic, attributes its foundation to Emp. Theodosios I; another, closer to reality, says that in the mid-10th C. three *archontes* from Adrianople—Athanasios, Nicholas, and Antony—came to Athos and at the urging of ATHANASIOS OF ATHOS restored a ruined monastery. The first documentary evidence is an act of the *protos* Paul of 985 on which the signature of Nicholas, *hegoumenos* of Vatopedi, is the last among the *hegoumenoi* (*Ivir.* 1, no.7.5 and 63). In 996, however, another *hegoumenos* of Vatopedi, Nikephoros, signed the act of the *protos* John ahead of all the other *hegoumenoi* (*Lavra* 1, no.12.25). Thereafter Vatopedi ranked with IVERON in second place in the Athonite hierarchy, just after Lavra. Vatopedi played an important role in the development of Hesychasm after the young Palamas took the monastic habit there.

By the end of the 13th C. Vatopedi had become a major landowner. A chrysobull of Andronikos II of 1292 lists several villages in the theme of Serres, *metochia* and *monyria* in various places

(e.g., in Thessalonike), a fair (*panegyris*), an enclosure for cattle, a parcel of land “with beautiful trees,” and the island Amoliane among the properties of Vatopedi (ed. Regel, *infra*, no.1). As a result of this ownership Vatopedi was involved in litigation with other monastic institutions, such as ESPHIGMENOI (e.g., L. Maurommates in *Aphieroma Svoronos* 1:308–16). From the end of the 12th C. onward the influx of Slavic monks to Vatopedi became significant: in the 1190s SAVA OF SERBIA stayed in Panteleemon and Vatopedi before building his own cell in Karyes. In Apr. 1230 John Asen II gave Vatopedi a Slavic chrysobull granting the monks a village near Serres (M. Andreev, *Vatopedskata gramota* [Sofia 1965]). STEFAN UROŠ IV DUŠAN and JOHN UGLJEŠA also conferred upon Vatopedi sundry privileges (M. Lascaris, *BS* 6 [1935–36] 166–85). In Oct. 1393 Constantine Dragaš, Serbian ruler of Melnik, donated a *monyrdion* of the Pantanassa to Vatopedi (V. Laurent, *REB* 5 [1947] 171–84).

The library is particularly rich in Byz. MSS, containing over 600 codices, including some rare geographical works by Ptolemy, Strabo, and Pausanias, two illuminated Psalters (codd. 760, 761: Cutler, *Aristocratic Psalters*, nos. 15, 54), and a fragment of a richly illustrated OCTATEUCH.

Mosaic decoration on both the exterior and interior of the church includes a Deesis, two Annunciations, and a bust of St. Nicholas (G. Millet, *Monuments de l'Athos* [Paris 1927] pls. 1–4) variously ascribed to the 11th, early 12th, and 14th C. Frescoes in the church are dated by inscription to 1312 but heavily restored (*ibid.*, pls. 81–94). Vatopedi is distinguished for its mosaic icons (Furlan, *Icone a mosaico*, nos. 24–25) and was the source of the miniature mosaic of St. John Chrysostom now at Dumbarton Oaks (O. Demus in *DOP* 14 [1960] 109–14). A. Grabar (*Revêtements*, no.25) hypothesized that the monastery housed a workshop making gold and silver icon frames in the early 14th C. Among the many panels so treated are the so-called “Dolls of Theodora” (icons of Christ and the Virgin, *ibid.* no.32) and one of the Hodegetria, presented by an otherwise unknown woman named Papadopoulina in honor of her sister (*ibid.* no.21). Other treasures include a silver reliquary depicting St. Demetrios defending Thessalonike (A. Grabar, *DOP* 5 [1950] 1–3) and a jasper cup said to have been given by the *despotes* MANUEL KANTAKOUZENOS.

SOURCE. W. Regel, *Chrysoboulla kai grammata tes en to Hagio Orei Atho hieras kai sebasmas megistes mones tou Batopediou* (St. Petersburg 1898). M. Goudas, "Byzantina grammata tes en Atho hieras mones tou Batopediou," *DChAE* 3 (1926) 35–45. Idem, "Byzantiaka engrapha tes en Atho hieras mones tou Batopediou," *EEBS* 3 (1926) 113–34; 4 (1927) 211–48. G.I. Theocharides, "Hoi Tzemplakones," *Makedonika* 5 (1959) 125–83. M. Lascaris, *Actes serbes de Vatopedi* (Prague 1935).

LIT. D. Papachryssanthou in *Prot.* 91. F. Dölger, "Chronologisches und diplomatisches zu den Urkunden des Athosklosters Vatopedi," *BZ* 39 (1939) 321–40. S. Eustratiades and Arcadios, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos* (Cambridge, Mass., 1924). S. Eustratiades, *Sympleroma hagioreitikon katalogon Batopediou kai Lauras* (Paris 1930).

—A.K., A.M.T., A.C.

VAULT (*κρυπτή*), a ceiling or roof of brick, stone, or concrete built on the principle of the ARCH. In Byz. architecture vaults were constructed of brick, using the pitched-brick masonry technique, and occasionally ribbed. Types of vaults employed were (1) the barrel, or tunnel, vault, constructed of a single layer of bricks, slightly pitched, laid across the axis of the vault and set in thick beds of mortar; (2) the cloister, or domical, vault, composed of four, eight, or twelve curved surfaces or segments in the form of a DOME; (3) the groin, or cross, vault, created by the interpenetration at right angles of two barrel vaults of equal diameter and height, with the lines of intersection (groins), forming a diagonal cross. In general, Byz. vaults were not built with great care or skill and exhibit many irregularities.

LIT. J.B. Ward-Perkins, "Notes on the Structure and Building Methods of Early Byzantine Architecture," in *Great Palace, 2nd Report* 52–104. F.W. Deichmann, *Studien zur Architektur Konstantinopels* (Baden-Baden 1956) 38–40. Ch. Bouras, *Byzantina staurotholia me neuroseis* (Athens 1965).

—M.J.

VAZELON MONASTERY, also called Zabolon, located on a cliff face on Mt. Zabolon, about 45 km southwest of Trebizond. Dedicated to St. John the Baptist, the monastery of Vazelon (*Βαζελών*) was, according to legend, founded in the 3rd C., destroyed by the Persians in the 5th or 6th C., and restored by Belisarios in the 6th C. The first reliable historical data about Vazelon does not appear, however, until the 13th C. when the GRAND KOMNENOI of Trebizond became generous benefactors of the monastery.

The 180 surviving Byz. documents from Vaze-

lon (dating from the 13th to 15th C.) provide valuable information on the topography of the MATZOUKA region and social and economic conditions; for example, they describe a mixed agriculture, in which a variety of crops was grown, including wheat, fruits, nuts, and olives. The acts of Vazelon, to a greater extent than those of ATHOS, include private charters, such as the wills of individuals and transactions between peasants (A. Bryer in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Ottoman Society* [Birmingham–Washington, D.C., 1986] 5f, 53–86).

Like SOUMELA, Vazelon had a sacred cave; virtually nothing remains of its Byz. buildings on account of massive reconstruction in the 19th C. The exception appears to be a small, barrel-vaulted chapel of St. Elias (Bryer-Winfield, *Pontos* 289–94).

SOURCES. Acts—F.I. Uspenskij, V.V. Benešević, *Vazelon-skie akty* (Leningrad 1927).

LIT. Dölger, *Diplomatik* 350–70. S. Ballance, A. Bryer, D. Winfield, "Nineteenth-Century Monuments in the City and Vilayet of Trebizond," *ArchPont* 30 (1970) 289–98. Janin, *Églises centres* 283–86.

—A.M.T.

VEGETABLES. See HORTICULTURE.

VELBUŽD (*Βελεβούσδιον*), ancient Pataulia, modern Küstendil, city and fortress in southern Bulgaria. It first appears under its Slavic name in the 11th C. as a bishopric of Justiniana Prima (*Notitiae CP*, no.13.836, 850). Seals of several bishops of Velbužd have survived (Laurent, *Corpus* 5.2, nos. 1501–02; 5.3, no.2019; Zacos, *Seals* 2.1, no.676).

Velbužd is best known as the site of a battle on 28 July 1330 in which the Serbian ruler STEFAN UROŠ III DEČANSKI and his son Stefan Dušan won a victory over a Byz.-Bulgarian coalition led by Emp. Andronikos III and MICHAEL III ŠIŠMAN. In spring 1330 Andronikos and Michael had formed an alliance against the growing power of the Serbs, a coalition strengthened by new family ties between the two rulers: in 1326 Michael had repudiated his wife Anna-Neda, sister of Stefan III Dečanski, and their three sons, in order to marry Andronikos's sister Theodora, widow of Michael's predecessor THEODORE SVETOSLAV. Then Andronikos invaded Serbian territory at the head of several thousand mercenaries. The Serbian army was about 15,000 strong, including some German

and Spanish mercenaries; the Bulgarians assembled about the same number of men. When the Byz. and Bulgarian armies began to march toward each other, Stefan III made a surprise attack on Michael at Velbužd, in order to prevent a rendezvous. The Serbian king totally destroyed the Bulgarian forces; Michael was wounded, taken captive, and soon died. Stefan III then forced Andronikos to retreat to his frontier.

The Serbian victory at Velbužd was a turning point in Balkan history, leading to Serbian domination of Macedonia. Stefan III signed a peace treaty with the Bulgarians whereby they were forced to install his nephew Ivan Stefan on the Bulgarian throne (1330–31), together with his mother Anna-Neda. The way was open for Stefan Dušan's penetration into Macedonia.

LIT. Fine, *Late Balkans* 271–74. A. Burmov, "Istorija na Bŭlgaria prez vremeto na Šišmanovci (1323–1396 g.)," *Izbrani proizvedenia* 1 (Sofia 1968) 256–64. *VizIzvori* 6:336 n. 130.

—J.S.A.

VELJUSA MONASTERY, located in the village of Veljusa near Strumica in Macedonia. The monastery was dedicated to the Virgin of Mercy or Theotokos Eleousa; Veljusa is a Serbian form of the Greek Eleousa. An inscription over the door to the church informs us that it was built in 1080 by Manuel, bishop of Tiberiupolis (Strumica). Manuel, formerly a monk on Mt. AUXENTIOS, also built a modest monastic complex to house ten monks. He provided them with a *typikon* (composed between 1085 and 1106), in which he emphasized a cenobitic way of life, the absolute autonomy of the monastery, and extraordinary privileges and independence for the *hegoumenos*. Admission was restricted to those 18 or older. The monastic property, originally quite limited, grew in the 12th C. thanks to the patronage of the Komnenian dynasty. An inventory dated to 1449, records the treasures of the monastery and the 68 volumes in the library, primarily liturgical. In the early 13th C., probably under the Bulgarian tsar JOHN ASEN II, Veljusa came under the control of the IVERON MONASTERY on Athos, where most documents relating to Veljusa are still preserved today, including its 14th–15th-C. cartulary.

The church was built by Manuel, probably as his mausoleum if, as Miljković-Peppek supposes, an arcosolium in the narthex is the *ktetor's* tomb.

The church is a domed tetraconch, like the chapel adjoining it to the south, and built of a mixture of brick and fieldstone, plastered to simulate cloisonné masonry. The interior has an opus sectile floor and a finely carved templon, reconstructed in the restoration of 1968–69. An enthroned Virgin and Child dominates an iconographical program that includes four hierarchs attending the Hetoimasia (see LAST JUDGMENT) and such relatively rare subjects as the Ancient of Days (see CHRIST: Types of Christ) in the narthex cupola and the manifestation of Christ in Glory to St. Niphon, bishop of Constantiniae, depicted in the south chapel. Miljković-Peppek dates this and the paintings in the naos, choir, and narthex to 1085–93, while attributing frescoes in the south porch and exonarthex to painters who also worked at NEREZI.

SOURCE. L. Petit, "Le monastère de Notre-Dame de Pitié en Macédoine," *IRAIK* 6 (1900–01) 1–153.

LIT. P. Miljković-Peppek, *Veljusa: Manastir Sv. Bogorodica Milostiva vo seloto Veljusa kraj Strumica* (Skopje 1981). V. Laurent, "Recherches sur l'histoire et le cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Pitié à Stroumitsa," *EO* 33 (1934) 5–27.

—A.M.T., A.C.

VELUM (*βήλον*), a Latin term meaning "curtain." Curtains played an important role in imperial ritual, courtiers being obliged to wait in front of the *velum* while the emperor prepared for certain ceremonies (Treitinger, *Kaiseridee* 55f). According to the 9th-C. *Kletorologion* of Philotheos (Oikonomides, *Listes* 131.16–18), the DEUTEROS was responsible for care of *ta bela* of the CHRYSOTRIKLINOS in the Great Palace. The word *vela* also designated the groups of dignitaries who entered the ceremonial halls together. In the context of the Hippodrome *velum* has been interpreted as awning, flag (R. Guiland, *Speculum* 23 [1948] 676–78), or curtain.

A special group of JUDGES, *kritai tou belou*, functioned in Constantinople from the 10th C. onward; the first mention is in the TAKTIKON of Escorial of 971–75. According to Balsamon, they formed a college of 12. V. Gardthausen (*BNJbb* 3 [1922] 342–50) considered them as umpires in the horse races at the Hippodrome; in reality they formed one of the highest tribunals. The name probably originates from the place of their meetings behind a curtain at the Hippodrome. The office seems not to have survived after 1204, al-

though some lists of offices of the 14th C. continue to mention it, and in the early 15th C. John Argyropoulos named a certain Katablattas judge of the *velum* (P. Canivet, N. Oikonomides, *Diptycha* 3 [1982–83] 63, 502). An inferior category of judges were the so-called *kritai* of the Hippodrome; the distinction between the two groups is not always clear.

LIT. Oikonomides, *Listes* 322f. Laurent, *Corpus* 2:438–65. —A.K.

VENICE (*Βενετία*), Italian port city built on islands and lagoons in the north Adriatic. According to legend, it was officially founded on 25 March 421; the earliest reliable information, however, is from the period of the Lombard invasion of the late 6th C., when the region provided sanctuary for many refugees. The territory was administered by a *magister militum* under the command of the exarch of RAVENNA; the ecclesiastical authority over the region belonged to the bishop of AQUILEIA and later GRADO. When Ravenna fell to the Lombards in 751, Venice remained under the jurisdiction of Constantinople; an attempt by the Franks to conquer Venice in 810 failed, and the treaty of Aachen between the two empires recognized Venice as a Byz. province. Venice was governed by local nobles (*tribuni*) under the supervision of a Byz. official (*doux*), whose functions were gradually taken over by local officials, doges, who were granted Byz. titles (e.g., *spatharios*) and paid by Constantinople. The first local bishopric appeared sometime between 780 and 790 on the island of Olivolo, as a counterbalance to Grado; the first head of the diocese bore the Greek name Christopher. Five new bishoprics were created in the area in the 9th C.

Venetian independence from Constantinople was slowly attained during the 9th C. Under Doge Peter Tribuno (888–920) Venice was proclaimed a *civitas*; the translation of the relics of St. MARK from Alexandria in 828 contributed to the development of a local pride and sense of identity. The major factor in the growth of Venice was its role as a maritime power whose fleet was active in the struggle against the Arabs in the Adriatic Sea. Veneto-Byz. contacts are attested in the 9th and 10th C.: according to the *Chronicon Venetum* the Venetian doge Orso II (864–81) sent 12 BELLS to Constantinople, thus introducing their use in Byz.;

Venetian ships brought Western ambassadors to Constantinople; its merchants sold slaves to Greeks (prohibited in 960) and bought garments that, in the words of Liutprand of Cremona, “were worn by Italian harlots and conjurers.” In his chrysobull of 992 Basil II provided the Venetians with special privileges that could not be extended to Jews or inhabitants of Amalfi and Bari traveling on Venetian ships. Alexios I Komnenos granted the Venetians another chrysobull, probably in 1082 (the dates of 1083 and 1092 are also suggested—O. Toma, *BS* 42 [1981] 171–85): they received certain properties in Constantinople and customs exemptions in various cities of the empire, CORINTH and HALMYROS being the ports they visited most frequently.

In 1171 Manuel I Komnenos expelled the Venetians from Constantinople. Even though negotiations for a reconciliation began soon thereafter, relations remained tense: not all Venetian property was restored and compensation payments were still continuing under the Angeloi; Venice was apprehensive not only of the direct actions of the emperor but also of the danger of pirates in Byz. waters and of competition from the other Italian republics, esp. PISA but also GENOA. The Fourth CRUSADE created a convenient opportunity for Venetian intervention in Byz. affairs: having first destroyed the harbor of ZARA, Doge ENRICO DANDOLO cleverly diverted the crusade against Constantinople. The Venetians profited most from the conquest of the Byz. capital in 1204: in accordance with the terms of the PARTITIO ROMANIAE they received CRETE, numerous cities in Thrace and Propontis, including LAMPSAKOS on the eastern shore of the Sea of Marmara, KORONE and METHONE in the Peloponnese, and properties in Constantinople. Some territories were occupied not by Venice as a state but by semi-independent Venetian knights. They were also awarded special trading privileges. A Venetian, THOMAS MOROSINI, was elected patriarch of Constantinople. Venetian attempts to encroach upon the eastern coast of the Adriatic (Dyrrachion, Kerkyra, etc.) failed, however.

The role of the Venetians in the occupation of Constantinople, their active participation in plundering the Byz. capital, and their seizure of vast territories made both the empire of Nicaea and the state of Epiros hostile toward the Italian republic. Michael VIII Palaiologos gained the sup-

port of Venice's rival, Genoa, in his war against the LATIN EMPIRE. The period from 1261 to ca. 1328 was one of an unstable truce between Byz. and Venice, interrupted by a number of clashes of varying severity. From 1328 onward Byz. sought a balance of power between Genoa and Venice, often leaning toward an alliance with Venice. John V and Manuel II effected a pro-Venetian policy. In the 14th–15th C. the Venetians were active in trade in Constantinople (see BAILO; BADOER, GIACOMO) and penetrated the Black Sea (including Trebizond), competing there with the Genoese. They established trading colonies in Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor. The growth of Ottoman power should have prompted a policy of unity and cooperation between Byz. and the Italian republics, but it was difficult to realize; thus in 1376 the Genoese and Venetians were at war over TENEDOS; exploiting the weakness of the Byz., Venice was granted Thessalonike in 1423 but was able to hold it only until 1430, when the Turks captured the city. During the final years of the empire, Venice received with honor two Byz. emperors—Manuel II and John VIII—but its military aid to Constantinople remained minimal. Cardinal BESSARION bequeathed to Venice in 1468 his collection of Greek MSS, which became the nucleus of the Bibliotheca Marciana.

LIT. *Le origini de Venezia* (Florence 1964). D.M. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice* (Cambridge–New York 1988). F. Thieriet, *Études sur la Romanie greco-venitienne* (London 1977). Idem, “Die venezianische Wirtschaftspolitik im byzantinischen Reich,” *BBA* 52 (1985) 109–18. M. Martin, “The Venetians in the Byzantine Empire before 1204,” *ByzF* 13 (1988) 201–14. Lilie, *Handel und Politik*. —A.K.

Monuments of Venice. The monument in Venice most strongly influenced by Byz. art and architecture is the Church of S. Marco. The will of Doge Justinian Partecipacius (died 829) decreed the foundation of a church to house the relics believed to be those of St. Mark. Burned in 976 and repaired, the first church was replaced by Doge Domenico Contarini (1042–71). Sixteenth-century sources date the start of construction to 1063 and state that the chief architects came from Constantinople. The relics of St. Mark were installed in the new crypt in 1094.

The early 12th-C. *Translatio Sancti Nicolai* notes that S. Marco was “of the same artful construction as the church of the Twelve Apostles in Constantinople” (O. Demus, *The Church of San Marco in*

Venice [Washington, D.C., 1960] 90). By copying the Justinianic Church of the HOLY APOSTLES, the patron may have intended to express S. Marco's unique association with the doges (comparable to the association of the prototype with the Byz. emperors), or its status, like that of the Holy Apostles, as an *apostoleion*. At S. Marco the distinctive original plan, a freestanding cross with five domes, was enlarged by annexes (north and west porches and a baptistery) around the western cross arm. The façades were decorated with columns, capitals, and reliefs taken from Constantinople in the sack of 1204. Other booty exhibited includes four bronze horses from the Hippodrome, formerly displayed above the west porch; porphyry tetrarchs, possibly from the Philadelphion, immured outside the treasury; and the so-called Acre pillars, probably from St. POLYEUKTOS. The treasury contains many priceless works of art, mostly looted from Constantinople. Byz. objects were also acquired by gift or purchase, including the earliest parts of the PALA D'ORO and a bronze DOOR of ca. 1080 inside the west porch.

Like its Constantinopolitan model, S. Marco was decorated with figural mosaics, mostly by local craftsmen. As at MONTECASSINO, the craft was introduced by artists from Constantinople; unlike Montecassino, the local workshop thus established never died out. Mosaic-making was virtually continuous at S. Marco from the late 11th through the 14th C., with changes in style echoing those in Byz. Demus identifies repeated waves of Byz. influence, which he attributes to the use of Byz. MODEL-BOOKS and to the occasional interventions of visiting Byz. mosaicists. But the work is diverse and many other sources came into play. A most interesting example is the decoration of five small cupolas in the west and north porches with scenes copied from the Late Antique Cotton GENESIS, presumably acquired in 1204.

LIT. Demus, *Mosaics of San Marco*. F.W. Deichmann, et al., *Corpus der Kapitelle der Kirche von San Marco zu Venedig* (Wiesbaden 1981). *Treasury S. Marco*. —D.K.

VERGIL (Publius Vergilius Maro), Roman epic poet; born 70 B.C., died 19. Vergil remained popular in the late Roman Empire: the 4th-C. grammarian Servius compiled a Latin commentary on Vergil. The poet was also known in the East; Egyptian and Palestinian papyri of the 5th and

6th C. contain more fragments of and glossaries to Vergil than to any other Roman poet. According to CHRISTODOROS OF KOPTOS, Vergil's statue was placed in the Baths of ZEUXIPPOS. Directly or indirectly Vergil influenced late antique EPIC poets, such as QUINTUS OF SMYRNA and possibly TRIPHODOROS and NONNOS OF PANOPOLIS. In his *Speech to the Assembly of Saints*, Constantine I—following LACTANTIUS (*Divine Institutes* 7.16–25)—quoted and analyzed Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue* as a prophecy of the birth of Christ. JOHN LYDOS referred not only to Vergil but also to Servius's commentary. Malalas (Malal. 216.3–6, 285.5–11) quotes the *Aeneid*, book 4, vv. 302–03, and identifies Vergil as a “wise Roman poet” who wrote on the fall of Troy and the story of Dido and Aeneas. B. Baldwin (*Hermes* 111 [1983] 127f) found another vestige of Vergil in PROKOPIOS OF GAZA.

Vergil achieved the status of the canonical Latin poet, and the word *virgilius* acquired in hagiography the meaning of “the wisest” (V. Peri in *ItMedUm* 19 [1976] 1–40). From the period of the 4th to 6th C. two elaborately illuminated codices survive, the “Vatican Vergil” (Vat. lat. 3225), devoted to the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* (*Vergilius Vaticanus* [Graz 1984]) and the “Vergilius Romanus” (Vat. lat. 3867), somewhat cruder than the first MS but including illustrations to the *Eclogues* (*Picturae Ornamenta Complura Scripturae Specimina Codicis Vaticani* 3867 [Rome 1902]).

The *Souda* and *Geoponika* contain many references to Vergil; thereafter he is mentioned infrequently (e.g., by Tzetzes and Holobolos). Unlike OVID, Vergil was neither translated nor imitated by the late Byz. There is no direct connection between Vergil and the *Idyll* of PLANOUDES (*Maximi Planudis Idyllium*, ed. F.M. Pontani [Padua 1973] 6, n.12). Further, an anonymous idyll published by J. Sturm (*BZ* 10 [1901] 433–52) belongs to the 16th, not the 15th C.

LIT. *Enciclopedia virgiliana* (Rome 1984–). B. Baldwin, “Vergil in Byzantium,” *AntAb* 28 (1982) 81–93. A. Meschini, “Per il Virgilio greco: Le ‘Bucoliche’ tradotte da D. Halsworth,” *Orpheus* 5 (1984) 110–14. P. Courcelle, “Les exégèses chrétiennes de la quatrième éclogue,” *REA* 59 (1957) 294–319. G. d'Ippolito, *Trifiodoro e Vergilio* (Palermo 1976). E. Rosenthal, *The Illuminations of the Vergilius Romanus* (Zurich 1972).
—P.A.A., A.K., A.C.

VERINA (Βερίνα), more fully Aelia Verina, wife of Leo I, whom she married before 457; died fort of Papyrios (Paperon), Isauria, ca.484. She bore

Leo two daughters, ARIADNE and Leontia, and a son (name unknown) who died in infancy in 463 (G. Dagron, *AB* 100 [1982] 271–75). After Leo's death in Jan. 474 Verina expected to rule as the grandmother of the minor Leo II, while Zeno, the husband of Ariadne and father of Leo II, was proclaimed emperor. Leo II, however, died in Nov. 474, and Verina, disappointed in her expectations, began to intrigue against Zeno. She wanted to replace him with her paramour, the *magister officiorum* Patrikios, whom she planned to marry. She sought assistance from her brother BASILISKOS, but he deceived her, received the crown himself, and executed Patrikios. Verina then conspired for the return of Zeno (476); the actual government fell to his supporter ILLOS. Verina and Ariadne plotted against Illos but in vain. Verina was exiled to Tarsos and forced to become a nun. In 479 Marcian, the son of ANTHEMIOS and husband of Verina's daughter Leontia, revolted against Zeno, as if resenting Zeno's treatment of his mother-in-law; he nearly overthrew the emperor. In 482 Ariadne convinced Zeno, and through him Illos, to liberate her mother, but in 484 Verina joined Illos in Tarsos as he revolted against Zeno and proclaimed his ally LEONTIOS as emperor. In the ensuing war Illos was defeated and Verina died. The Verina presented as a witch in the PARASTASEIS SYNTOMOI CHRONIKAI (ch.8g) is perhaps the wife of Leo I.

LIT. W. Ensslin, *RE* 2.R. 8 (1958) 1546–48. Bury, *LRE* 1:335, 390–98.
—T.E.G.

VERNACULAR, the spoken language of everyday communication. Byz. literature was dominated by ATTICISM. The language spoken by all classes in day-to-day use, which differed from the literary language in MORPHOLOGY, vocabulary, and SYNTAX, is attested between the 6th and 12th C. in occasional verbatim quotations by historians and chroniclers; in subliterate texts such as popular hagiography, legal documents; occasionally in personal names and place names; and—until the 8th C.—in PAPHYRUS letters and other documents from Egypt. All these are liable to show the influence of the literary language. In the 12th C. occasional sustained attempts to imitate spoken Greek in literature (e.g., by PROCHOPRODROMOS and Michael GLYKAS), attest to a new interest in the vernacular, which is also displayed by EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKE in his Homeric commen-

taries. Virtually no vernacular texts survive from the turbulent 13th C.

Only in the early 14th C. does a body of literature in vernacular Greek appear, with a greater or lesser admixture of learned elements. This comprises ROMANCES of chivalry, pseudo-historical poems on ALEXANDER and BELISARIOS, the CHRONICLE OF THE MOREA and the CHRONICLE OF THE TOCCO, satirical beast FABLES, short religious poems, poems by Stephen SACHLIKES, and a recension of DIGENES AKRITAS. These poems are composed in a fairly uniform language, with many alternative forms but few local dialect features. This points to the existence, at least in the cities, of a common vernacular Greek. Ottoman rulers of the 14th through 15th C. used this common language in their diplomatic correspondence with Byz. emperors. Few vernacular poems can be dated precisely. Some are adapted, or even translated, from Western models, but Western influence should not be exaggerated. This literature, which aimed largely at entertainment, owes more to relaxation of linguistic rigor by the educated than to literary ambitions of the less educated. Prose literature, and indeed all “serious” writing, remained the preserve of the learned tongue. Apart from the *Chronicle* of Leontios MACHAIRAS and one or two other texts in Cypriot dialect, the only prose work showing marked vernacular features is the *History* of DOUKAS.

LIT. Beck, *Volksliteratur*. B. Knös, *Histoire de la littérature néo-grecque* (Stockholm 1962). Jeffreys, *Popular Literature*. E.M. & M.J. Jeffreys, “The Style of Byzantine Popular Poetry: Recent Work,” in *Okeanos* 309–43. M.J. Jeffreys, “The Literary Emergence of Vernacular Greek,” *Mosaic* 8.4 (1975) 171–93. H. Eideneier, “Leser- oder Hörerkreis? Zur byzantinischen Dichtung in der Volkssprache,” *Hellenika* 34 (1982–83) 119–50. G. Böhlig, “Das Verhältnis von Volkssprache und Reinsprache im griechischen Mittelalter,” in *Aus der Byzantinistischen Arbeit der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, ed. J. Irmscher, vol. 1 (Berlin 1957) 1–13. T.V. Popova, *Vizantijskaja narodnaja literatura* (Moscow 1985).
—R.B.

VEROLI CASKET. See CASKETS AND BOXES.

VERONA LIST, conventionally called *laterculus Veronensis*, a short list compiled in 297 or some time later and preserved in a 7th-C. MS, now in the library of the cathedral in Verona. It contains an enumeration of 12 Roman dioceses established by Diocletian's reform, from Oriens to Africa, with indication of the provinces of each diocese.

It is supplemented by catalogs of barbarian tribes under the power of the emperor; of tribes in Mauretania; and of *civitates* (cities?) located beyond the Rhine.

LIT. T. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 5 (Berlin 1908) 561–88.
—A.K.

VERRIA. See BERROIA.

VERSIKIA (Βερσινικία), a battle site north of Adrianople near modern Malamirovo (V. Beševliev, *XI Congrès international des sciences onomastiques* [Sofia 1972] 1:128). In response to attacks by the Bulgarian Khan KRUM, in May 813 Emp. Michael I led into Thrace a large army drawn from various themes. At Versinikia the Byz. and Bulgars clashed on 22 June. The Macedonian and Thracian troops, led by the general John Aplakes, successfully attacked the Bulgarian flank but were eventually overwhelmed when the other Byz. forces retreated. The Bulgars, fearing a trap, at first hesitated and then routed the fleeing soldiers. Michael retreated to Constantinople, where he was deposed three weeks later. Many scholars suspect that treachery induced the Byz. defeat, since the Anatolikon troops reportedly were the first to flee (*Script.incert.* 336.14–339.18) and their general subsequently became emperor (Leo V).

LIT. Bury, *ERE* 349–52. Zlatarski, *Ist.* 1.1:266–70. Beševliev, *Geschichte* 251–54.
—P.A.H.

VESPERS (ἑσπερινός), an evening liturgical service to thank God for the day's graces and seek his pardon for one's sins. With ORTHROS, one of the two original major HOURS to open and close the day, vespers was celebrated at sundown, the lamplighting hour, whence its alternate name *lychnikon*. As at *orthros*, the basic symbol was LIGHT, the evening lamp being a symbol of Christ, the light of the world.

The vespers service in the ASMATIKE AKOLOURTHIA of Constantinople opened with variable PSALMODY, followed by Psalm 140 with a TROPARION, the entrance of the patriarch, a responsory, and three ANTIPHONS. The service concluded with a LITANY, three LECTIONS on some days, a *troparion*, and dismissal (*Mateos, Typicon* 1:xxii–xxiii; 2:305f).

In the hybrid urban-monastic service that re-

sulted from the gradual introduction of Palestinian monastic vespers into Constantinople (see SABAITIC ΤΥΠΙΚΑ), elements from the Palestinian HOROLOGION were combined with elements of the cathedral vespers of Constantinople (*asmatikos hesperinos*). In the final Sabaitic *typika*, this hybrid vespers could take three forms: "daily" vespers; "Great Vespers," with an introit, on days when there was Great DOXOLOGY at *orthros*; and "Little Vespers," celebrated only in some monasteries, this being an abbreviated vespers before some feasts to close the day before initiating the festive VIGIL with Great Vespers.

LIT. M. Arranz, "L'office de l'Asmatikos Hesperinos ('vépres chantées') de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OrChrP* 44 (1978) 107-30, 391-412. Idem, "Les prières sacerdotales des vépres byzantines," *OrChrP* 37 (1971) 85-124. Taft, "Bibl. of Hours" 361-65. -R.F.T.

VESSELS (σκεῦη, also sing. *docheion*, *angeion*, etc.). Vessels could be distinguished according to their function into LITURGICAL VESSELS (PATEN, CHALICE, *thalassa*), ornamental vases, and domestic UTENSILS; according to their material into those made of gold, silver, bronze, tin, iron, stone, glass, CERAMIC, or fabric; and according to their form. Niketas Choniates gives manifold terms for vessels: *pithos*, large jar or barrel; *amphoreus*—AMPHORA; *hydrochoos* or *hydreion*, vessel for holding water, bucket; *gaulos*, milk-pail; *louter*, bathing-tub; *tryblion* and *lopas*, dish (can be used generically for "vessel"); *lebes*, caldron; *chytra*, earthen pot; *krater*, *lekanis*, *plynos*—basin or bowl; *oinochoe*, vessel for wine; *kaddion*, small pitcher; *kissybion*, rustic drinking-cup; *kondy*, *kotyle*, cup; *poterion*, *ekpoma*, *skyphos*, drinking-cup, used also for chalice; *kylix*, *kypellon*, beaker, goblet; *askos*, *thylakos*, skin bag, wineskin; *kaneon*, *kophimos*, *kyrtos*, *sargane*, basket; *amis*, chamber pot. Vessels (esp. amphoras) were sometimes used in construction, particularly for erection of VAULTS; amphoras filled with sand and cement were employed to repair city walls (N. Cambi, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 63-64 [1961-62] 145-50). Bowls and plates were also used on walls as CERAMIC ARCHITECTURAL DECORATION. -A.K.

VESTARCHES (βεστάρχης), title first mentioned in the 10th-C. TAKTIKON of Escorial, originally applied to the eunuch-*patrikios*. In the 11th-C.

hierarchy it occupied a place between the MAGISTROS and VESTES. Several high-ranking generals held this title: Michael BOURTZES (Skyl. 483.8), Nikephoros MELISSEOS (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.2697), BASILAKES (no.2691), probably the future emperor Nikephoros III (no.2686), and the future emperor Romanos IV (Attal. 97.8). It was also conferred on some officials of lower status such as the *kritai* (judges) of the VELUM (Laurent, *Coll. Orghidan*, nos. 14 and 188) and even SYMPONOS (no.340). Michael PSELLOS was granted this title as well. It was probably devalued at the end of the 11th C. when the title of *protovestarches* was given to judges and notaries (*Patmou Engrapha* 1, no.48A.197-99). *Vestarches* was in use at the beginning of the 12th C. (e.g., *Lavra* 1, no.56.29) but seems to have disappeared soon thereafter.

LIT. Oikonomides, *Listes* 299f. Dölger, *Beiträge* 35. Skabalanovič, *Gosudarstvo* 153f. Seibt, *Bleisiegel* 225-28, 286f. -A.K.

VESTES (βέστης), title first mentioned under John I Tzimiskes, who is said to have exiled "Nikephoros the *vestes*" (Skyl. 284.12). This was not Nikephoros Ouranos (as Dölger, *Beiträge* 35) but the son of Leo Kouropalates. Dölger also suggested that the *vestes* was identical with the VESTARCHES; they were, however, distinct. Thus the seal of Nikephoros Botaneiates, *doux* of Edessa, calls him *magistros*, *vestes*, and *vestarches* (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.2686). In the 11th C. *vestes* was a high title conferred on prominent generals such as Isaac Komnenos, the *stratopedarches* of the East (no.2680), and Leo TORNIKIOS (Attal. 22.8), often combined with the title of *magistros* (Laurent, *Coll. Orghidan*, no.76). The 10th-C. TAKTIKON of Escorial distinguished bearded *vestai* who were at the same time *magistroi* or *patrikioi* from eunuch *vestai* who were *praipositoï* (see also Seibt, *Bleisiegel*, no.53). At the end of the 11th C. *vestai* were lower-ranking officials, such as the imperial ANTHROPOS Peter (*Lavra* 1, no.48.7) or the notary John Karianites (*Patmou Engrapha* 1, no.48A.200). The title *protovestes* appeared at the same time (e.g., *Patmou Engrapha* 1, no.48G.236); it was conferred among others on a certain John "the Rhos" (Laurent, *Coll. Orghidan*, no.69). Neither *vestes* nor *protovestes* seems to have survived the reign of Alexios I. The alleged connection between *vestes* and the service of the imperial VESTIARION has no support in the sources, despite their common etymology.

LIT. Oikonomides, *Listes* 294. J. Ebersolt, "Sur les fonctions et les dignités du Vestiarium byzantin," in *Mél. Diehl* 1:87f. Seibt, *Bleisiegel* 229-36, 287. -A.K.

VESTIARION (βεστιάριον), state warehouse and treasury, sometimes described as *basilikon* and rarely *mega* (Oikonomides, *Listes* 161.12). The CHARTOULARIOS of the *vestiarion* is mentioned in the 9th-C. TAKTIKON of Uspenskij; some seals of the *chartoularioi* of the imperial *vestiarion* are dated by Laurent to the 8th C. (*Corpus* 2, nos. 688-91). The *vestiarion* was planned as an institution parallel to the SAKELLION, as an arsenal to supply the fleet and the army and to store precious goods; the distinction, however, was not consistent, and the *vestiarion* dealt also with money. Basil I built two structures close to the Pharos, one called *thesaurophylakeion*, another *vestiarion* (*TheophCont* 336.10-11); various payments had to be received in equal parts by the *sakellion* and the imperial *vestiarion*. The staff of the *vestiarion* included notaries, *mandatores*, *archon* of the CHARAGE, and several officers (KENTARCHOS, LEGATARIOS, and so on), whose functions are obscure.

After the 12th C. the *vestiarion* became the only state treasury, and the archaic word *tameion* referred only to it. Evidence for the emperor's private *vestiarion* is insufficient: e.g., imperial notaries of the *vestiarion* who together with (their?) PRIMIKERIOS took care of precious vessels after the imperial banquet (Oikonomides, *Listes* 277.1-4) are indistinguishable from imperial notaries under the *chartoularios* of the *vestiarion* and could be state officials; nor are the *archontes* of the imperial *vestiarion* in the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos (Oikonomides, *Listes* 227.27) radically different from the *sekretikoi*, *chartoularioi*, and notaries who precede them.

LIT. Dölger, *Beiträge* 27-31. Laurent, *Corpus* 2:353-81. J. Ebersolt, "Sur les fonctions et les dignités du Vestiarium byzantin," in *Mél. Diehl* 1:81-89. -A.K.

VESTIARIOS (ὁ βεστιάριος, βεστιάριος), according to a 14th-C. ceremonial book (pseudo-Kod. 186.18-23), a special treasurer: when the emperor set off on a naval expedition the *vestiarios* followed him in a ship that carried the VESTIARION. In the hierarchical list he comes after the PROKATHEMENOS of the *vestiarion* and was probably his assistant. The *vestiarios*, sometimes called im-

perial *vestiarios* (Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.1891), is known on seals from the 7th C. (no.1433). Schlumberger (*Sig.* 623) dated the seal of the *vestiarios* Epiphanius Artabasdos to the time of the Komnenoi. The seals do not clarify the functions of the *vestiarios*. The title of one of the epigrams of Theodore of Stoudios equates *vestiarioi* with tailors (*Jamben*, ed. P. Speck [Berlin 1968], no.15); the origin of this title is, however, unclear. The word is rare in documents; in 1337 the emperor's *oikeios*, the *vestiarios* Kyr Manuel, possessed lands which were eventually transferred to the monastery of Docheiariou (*Docheiar.*, no.18.16-17).

LIT. J. Ebersolt, "Sur les fonctions et les dignités du Vestiarium byzantin," in *Mél. Diehl* 1:87, n.5. A. Failler, "L'éparque de l'armée et le bestiarion," *REB* 45 (1987) 199-203. -A.K.

VESTIARITES (βεστιάριτης), imperial bodyguard, according to a 12th-C. historian (An.Komn. 1:152.2), who calls *vestiaritai* the courtiers closest (*oikeioteiroi*) to the emperor. The first known *vestiarites* was Iberitzes in 1049 (Sathas, *MB* 5:197.2). They are mentioned in chrysobulls from 1074 onward, often together with MANDATORES. According to N. Oikonomides (*TM* 6 [1976] 129), they replaced the MANGLABITAI. In the 13th C. *vestiaritai* acquired fiscal functions such as the levy of soldiers and wagons (MM 4:251.7); they served under the command of the DOMESTIKOS of the Eastern themes as arbiters of conflicts concerning property (Dölger, *Beiträge* 31). They existed at least through 1387. The chief of the *vestiaritai* was called *primikerios* of the *vestiaritai* (Seibt, *Bleisiegel* 218-20) and probably from the 13th C., *protovestiarites*, a position different from the PROTOVESTIARIOS; he occupied a lower rank on the hierarchical ladder of the 14th C. (Guilland, *Institutions* 2:203-11).

LIT. Ahrweiler, "Smyrne" 160. Guilland, *Titres*, pt.XV (1967), 3-10. Oikonomides, *Listes* 297, n.57. Guilland, *Institutions* 1:589. -A.K.

VESTIOPRATES (βεστιοπράτης), merchant of luxury garments (and some fabrics?, e.g., BLATTIA), primarily of SILK but also of fine linen (*Bk. of Eparch*, ch.9, par.1). The term, unknown before the 9th C., derives from the Latin *vestis*, used by Malalas (Malal. 322.21) in the form *bestion* to designate clothing handed out to the population of

Constantinople together with charitable distributions of bread, wine, and meat. According to the 10th-C. *Book of the Eparch* (ch.4), the *vestiopratai* formed a guild that dealt in garments produced domestically, as opposed to the PRANDIOPRATAI who handled Syrian textiles. They acquired their goods either from the *archontes* of workshops (ARCHONTES TON ERGODOSION) or from *serikopratai*, silk merchants.

The activity of *vestiopratai* was rigorously controlled by the eparch: they could not purchase garments costing more than 10 nomismata without the eparch's knowledge and were strictly forbidden to sell to foreigners certain materials, esp. purple stuffs; the so-called *blattia* could be bought and sold only under the eparch's supervision. *Vestiopratai* were also assigned certain state functions: for the emperor's processions to Hagia Sophia they were responsible for decorating the Tribounalio (a hall in the Great Palace, on the way from the CHRYSOTRIKLINOS to CHALKE) with *blattia* and other precious textiles, while the ARGYROPATAI displayed gold and silver vessels (*De cer.* 12.19–21). The 9th-C. seal of the *vestioprates* Constantine is probably connected with his official duties. The term was not used after the 10th C., except in the corrupted form of *bestoprotos* on a 13th-C. seal.

LIT. Stöckle, *Zünfte* 31f. *Bk. of Eparch* 148–56. Laurent, *Corpus* 2:338f. —A.K.

VESTITOR (βεστίτωρ), courtier of modest rank known from seals beginning in the 6th C. (Zacos, *Seals* 1, nos. 395, 582). According to the *Kletorologion* of PHILOTHEOS, the *vestitores* belonged to the category of SENATORS and together with SILENTIARIOI stood under the command of the EPI TES KATASTASEOS. A 10th-C. ceremonial book (*De cer.* 305.14–15) reports that they helped the PRAEPOSITUS SACRI CUBICULI dress the emperor, while a 9th-C. historian (Theoph. 226.19–20) indicates that they were in charge of the imperial crown. On seals from the 8th C. onward, they are called predominantly imperial *vestitores* and in the 9th C. they often combine their title with the duty of the *protonotarios* of a theme (e.g., Laurent, *Coll. Orghidan*, nos. 210, 233; Zacos, *Seals* 1, no.1937 and others) or *kommerkiarios* (vol. 1, nos. 2671A, 3168). The term was in use as late as the 10th C., when an anonymous teacher addressed letters to

two *vestitores* (R. Browning, B. Laourdas, *EEBS* 27 [1957] 170, 185).

LIT. Bury, *Adm. System* 25. Dölger, *Beiträge* 35. Seibt, *Bleisiegel* 236f. —A.K.

VESTMENTS, LITURGICAL. See ENCHEIRION; EPIGONATION; EPIMANIKIA; EPITRACHELION; OMOPHORION; ORARION; PHELONION; POLYSTAURION; STICHARION.

VETERINARY MEDICINE. See HIPPIATRICA.

VICAR (βικάριος, from Lat. *vicarius*), deputy, representative, or lieutenant, applied primarily to the heads of DIOCESES as deputies of the PRAETORIAN PREFECTS. The diocesan vicars were identical with *agentes vices* (M. Arnheim, *Historia* 19 [1970] 593–603) and, together with their symbols of office, they appear in illustrated copies of the NOTITIA DIGNITATUM. In some dioceses the heads had different titles, such as *praefectus Augustalis* of Egypt and *comes* of Oriens. The vicar's functions were vague, and his position intermediary, between the governor and prefect: he held the right of appeal, as well as partial control over jurisdiction, tax collection, and the *cursus publicus* (see DROMOS). The vicar had no military functions. His staff was headed by a *princeps*. The office disappeared with the collapse of the diocesan system; Justinian I transferred some financial functions from the vicar to the praetorian prefect, and litigants preferred to appeal to the prefect rather than the vicar (Jones, *LRE* 1:281).

LIT. W. Ensslin, *RE* 2.R. 8 (1958) 2015–44. —A.K., A.C.

VICES (sing. *κακία*). By the term *vice* one understands a certain habitually evil disposition, a weakness and inclination to do evil, an explicit predisposition to individual SINS. Vice as such cannot coexist in man together with the opposing VIRTUE. A man of vice, however—so long as other virtuous inclinations are present—can still perform other good works in place of, or next to, the chief sin. Eastern monasticism developed Origen's doctrine of eight vices (systematized by EVAGRIOS PONTIKOS), which later in the West was shortened by Pope Gregory the Great to seven vices (the seven

deadly sins). Other enumerations failed to gain acceptance. Opinions vary concerning the pre-Christian origins of this doctrine. The eight vices or sins are: gluttony, fornication, avarice, despair, anger, sloth, vainglory, and arrogance. This system of vices was developed for monks, with listing of categories of special temptations instigated by DEMONS, and then applied to laymen.

LIT. I. Hausherr, "L'origine de la théorie orientale des huit péchés capitaux," *OrChrAn* 30 (1933) 164–75. S. Wenzel, "The Seven Deadly Sins: Some Problems of Research," *Speculum* 43 (1968) 1–22. A. Vögtle, "Woher stammt das Schema der Hauptsünden?" *ThQ* 122 (1941) 217–37. —G.P.

VICINA (Βιτζίνα, called Disina by al-Idrisi), a city in the delta of the Danube, cited in a variety of sources. According to PORTULANS, it was a major port in the 13th–14th C. It is listed as a metropolis in the episcopal *notitia* of Michael VIII. The district of Vicina formed a Byz. enclave in the empire of the Tatars, probably granted to Michael VIII by his son-in-law and ally NOGAY. The Tatars conquered Vicina in 1337/8. The earlier history of Vicina is obscure. It is first mentioned by Anna Komnene as being occupied by some Pecheneg chieftains.

The exact location of Vicina has incited heated discussion: J. Bromberg (*Byzantion* 12 [1937] 178) places it between DOROSTOLON and CHILIA; E. Todorova (*EtBalk* 14 [1978] no.2, 134), between Carsium-Hirşova and AXIOPOLIS; C. Giurescu (*Peuce* 2 [1971] 258), in NOVIODUNUM; P. Diaconu, in PĂCUIUL LUI SOARE; A. Kuzev (*EtBalk* 13 [1977] 121), in Ismail on the left bank of the river-branch Kilia; V. Beševliev (*IzvNarMus-Varna* 21 [1985] 21f), at the estuary of the river Kamčija; etc.

LIT. G. Brătianu, *Recherches sur Vicina et Cetatea Alba* (Bucharest 1935). P. Năsturel, "Les fastes épiscopaux de la métropole de Vicina," *BNJbb* 21 (1971–74) 33–42. Idem, "Mais où donc localiser Vicina?" *ByzF* 12 (1987) 145–71. V. Laurent, "Le métropolitain de Vicina Macaire et la prise de la ville par les Tartares," *RHSEE* 23 (1946) 225–32. —A.K.

VICTORIA. See NIKE.

VICTOR TONNENSIS, Latin chronicler, bishop of Tonnena (or Tunnuna) in Africa Proconsularis; died Constantinople after 567. Victor spent much of his life in Constantinople. A staunch

Chalcedonian, in 543 he opposed Justinian I in the THREE CHAPTERS controversy, resulting in many years of imprisonment in various places ranging from the fortified monastery of Mandracion (near Carthage) to Alexandria. After trial in 556 the unrepentant Victor was confined to a monastery in Egypt, and in 565 at Constantinople. There he composed a world chronicle from Creation to 567, of which only the last part, from 444, written in formal continuation of Prosper of Aquitaine, survives. Its earlier perspective is mainly Eastern, with Africa understandably becoming more prominent as Victor reaches his own time; there is the same dichotomy between secular and ecclesiastical topics. Though often thin, chronologically unsound, and prejudiced on doctrinal issues, Victor's chronicle can be a valuable source on secular matters, offering, for example, unique information on the last days of the young Leo II (B. Croke, *GRBS* 24 [1983] 82f) and the death of Theodora, wife of Justinian I (J. Fitton, *Byzantion* 46 [1976] 119).

ED. Th. Mommsen, *MGH AuctAnt* 11:178–206.

LIT. S.T. Stevens, "Victor of Tonnena, a Chronicler of African Resistance," 11 *BSC Abstracts* (1985) 3f. Av. Cameron, "Byzantine Africa—The Literary Evidence," *University of Michigan Excavations at Carthage* 7 (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1982) 29–62. A.S. Kozlov, "Idejnopoličeskaja napravlenost' chroniki Viktora Tunnunskogo," *ADSV* 23 (1987) 25–41. —B.B.

VICTOR VITENSIS, late 5th-C. bishop of Vita in BYZACENA and ecclesiastical historian. After refusing to attend the council of Arians and Orthodox at Carthage on 1 Feb. 484, Victor went into exile near Tripoli. There he composed his *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* in Latin, publishing it ca.489. Its three books (five in the older editions) describe the Arian persecution of the Orthodox church in Africa under the Vandal kings GAISERIC and Huneric (477–84). Victor paints an often horrible picture of this period, with sickening emphasis on scenes of torture. His style is a strange blend of rhetoric and poeticisms mixed with gross syntactical errors. He provides, however, a contemporary, often eyewitness, account of 5th-C. Africa, made more valuable by his laudable habit of inserting official documents, for example, a list of Catholic bishops drawn from the *Notitia Africae* of 484. The *Passio septem monachorum*, describing the martyrdom of seven bish-

ops at Carthage, which is attached to the older editions, is now generally regarded as not by Victor.

ED. *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae*, ed. M. Petschenig (Vienna 1881). C. Halm, *MGH AuctAnt* 3.1.

LIT. C. Courtois, *Victor de Vita et son oeuvre: Étude critique* (Algiers 1954). H.J. Diesner, "Sklaven und Verbannte, Märtyrer und Confessoren bei Victor Vitensis," *Philologus* 106 (1962) 101–20. —B.B.

VIDIN (Βιδίνη), city and fortress on the Danube in northeastern Bulgaria. In Roman times, under the name Bononia, it was a fortress of secondary importance, probably abandoned in the 6th C. A Bulgarian city, Bdin (Vidin), arose on its site. From the 9th C. it was the seat of a bishop and under SAMUEL OF BULGARIA the capital of a province. Captured by Basil II in 1003, the city remained in Byz. hands after the reestablishment of Bulgarian independence in 1186/7. In the early 13th C. Vidin became the center of an independent Bulgarian principality under Prince Šišman and his son, and in 1323 was incorporated into the restored Bulgarian state. Situated in a frontier zone, it was repeatedly attacked by Hungarians and Serbs and was under Hungarian occupation in 1365–69. Later Vidin was the center of a semi-independent Bulgarian principality under Ottoman sovereignty. In 1396 BAYEZID I captured it. A revolt in 1408 expelled the Turks, who recaptured the city only in 1413. In 1444 Janos HUNYADI captured and burned Vidin. In the later 14th C. it was a center of Bulgarian culture; several manuscripts copied there survive. The existing fortress dates from the period of the Second Bulgarian Empire.

LIT. A. Kuzev, V. Gjuzelev, *Bŭlgarski srednovekovni gradove i kreposti*, vol. 1 (Sofia 1981) 98–115. Idem, "Prinosi kŭm istorijata na srednovekovnite kreposti po Dolnija Dunav, III," *IzvNarMuz-Varna* 4 (1968) 37–49. P. Nikov, "Istorija na Vidinskoto knjažestvo do 1323 g.," *GSU FIF* 18.8 (1922) 3–124. I. Božilov, "Zur Geschichte des Fürstentums Vidin," *BBulg* 4 (1973) 113–19. D. Polyvjannyj, "K istorii Vidinskogo despotstva v XIV veke," in *Rec.Dujčev* (1980) 93–98. V. Gjuzelev, "Beiträge zur Geschichte des Königreiches von Vidin im Jahre 1365," *SüdostF* 39 (1980) 1–16. —R.B.

VIENNA GENESIS. See GENESIS.

VIGIL (παννυχίς, παραμονή, ἀγρυπνία), any night prayer or liturgical service involving sacrifice of sleep, or the eve of a FEAST, when FASTING and

keeping vigil were customary. Liturgical vigils were adumbrated in the pre-Constantinian custom of private prayer at night and of keeping vigil before a martyrdom and at the tombs of martyrs. From the 4th C. onward, they were formalized in the daily nocturns or vigil (*mesonyktikon*) of the monastic HOURS and in occasional all-night vigils before days of EUCHARIST (Sundays and feasts), before BAPTISM, by the bier of the departed, or for special purposes, such as to counteract heresy.

Vigils were of varying length and structure. The *Typikon of the Great Church* mentions some types (Mateos, *Typicon* 2:285, 309, 311): nocturnal psalmody prefixed to ORTHROS; *pannychis*, comprising VESPERS with lections plus the *pannychis* proper (despite its name, the *pannychis* was not an all-night affair, but a brief service similar to APODEIPNON; it consisted of three ANTIPHONS and five prayers with their corresponding litanies); and *paramone*, a solemn vespers with lections celebrated on the eve of 15 feasts. The later SABAITIC ΤΥΡΙΚΑ kept the old Constantinopolitan *paramone* before Nativity and Epiphany, but inherited for other feasts the Palestinian monastic *agrypnia*, comprising vespers, the entire Psalter with all ten canticles, and Sabaitic *orthros*.

LIT. Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, esp. 165–213. Taft, "Mount Athos" 187f. Taft, "Bibl. of Hours" 358–70. —R.F.T.

VIGILIUS, pope (from 29 Mar. 537); born Rome before 500, died Syracuse 7 June 555. He was the scion of a senatorial family. In 536 Vigilius journeyed with Pope AGAPETUS I to Constantinople where he seems to have concluded an agreement with Justinian I's wife, the empress THEODORA, promising to soften Western opposition toward Monophysitism. When BELISARIOS captured Rome, the pro-Gothic pope Silverius (536–37) was deposed and replaced by Vigilius. His position between the Western clergy and Justinian (who claimed political power over the West) explains the pope's vacillation, as revealed esp. during the affair of the THREE CHAPTERS. After his arrest in Sicily during the liturgy (22 Nov. 545) and his transfer to Constantinople in Jan. 547, Vigilius tried to preserve the principles of the Council of CHALCEDON and at the same time—under pressure from Justinian—to accept, at least partially, the condemnation of the three "heretical" theologians. At first Vigilius excommunicated Patr.

MENAS, but then he resumed his communication with the patriarch and on 11 Apr. 548 sent him his verdict accepting the condemnation of the Three Chapters. This decision raised such indignation in the West, however, that Vigilius was forced to withdraw his opinion; this change of mind led to a direct conflict with Justinian, and the pope fled to Chalcedon.

A reconciliation of emperor and pope in 552 was but partial, and Vigilius did not participate in the Second Council of Constantinople in 553. In fact he criticized the decisions of the council, and in the *Constitutum I* (14 May 553) rejected the condemnation of the Three Chapters, although he did condemn approximately 60 "erroneous" sentences in THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA. In the *Constitutum II* (23 Feb. 554) he yielded to imperial pressure and revoked his previous defense of the Three Chapters. Thereafter Vigilius was allowed to return home, but died en route.

LIT. L. Duchesne, *L'église au VI^e siècle* (Paris 1925) 156–218. G. Every, "Was Vigilius a Victim or an Ally of Justinian?" *Heythrop Journal* 20 (1979) 257–66. P. Hildebrand, "Die Absetzung des Papstes Silverius (537)," *HistJb* 42 (1922) 213–49. —A.K.

VIGLA (βίγλα, from Lat. *vigilia*, "watch"). In Rome the term designated night guards, but from the 4th C. onward *vigiliae* were guards of all kinds in the army (R. Grosse, *Römische Militärgeschichte von Gallienus bis zum Beginn der byzantinischen Themenverfassung* [Berlin 1920] 225). Theophanes (Theoph. 307.26) speaks even of the *vigla* (sentinels?) of the Persian king Chosroes II. From the 8th C. onward, the term referred to the contingent of paramilitary troops assigned to protect the imperial palace. The word was used—interchangeably with *arithmos* in some *taktika* (Bury, *Adm. System* 60–62)—primarily in connection with the official called DROUNGARIOS TES VIGLAS.

—A.K.

VIKINGS first came into contact with Byz. in the mid-9th C., initially as armed traders or plunderers, later principally as mercenaries. Three main groups are mentioned in Byz. sources: the Rhos (Rus'), the VARANGIANS, and the Koulpingoi (Russian *Kolbjagi*), most likely from Old Norse *Kylfingar*, which probably derives from *kylfa*, a staff or club. *Kylfingaland* in some Icelandic sources denotes Rus' (E. Mel'nikova, *Drevneskandinavskie geo-*

grafičeskie sočinenija [Moscow 1986] 131–38, 209–10). References to the latter two groups only begin in the 11th C. and in the second half of the century they are named in chrysobulls (e.g., those of Michael VII [March 1075] and Nikephoros III [May 1079]) as foreign units in the Byz. army. The distinction between the three terms is not always clear. It may be that *Varangian* and *Koulpingoi* came to denote specifically the army units, after the term *Rhos* had become ambiguous through association with the increasingly Slavized rulers of RHOSIA. The Varjagi and Kolbjagi of Rus' texts exactly correspond to them (A. Sobolevskij, *VizVrem* 1 [1894] 46of). Viking tales of Byz. survive in SAGAS.

LIT. A. Stender-Petersen, *Varangica* (Aarhus 1953) 89–113. H.R. Ellis Davidson, *The Viking Road to Byzantium* (London 1976). —S.C.F.

VILLA, term designating a luxurious urban or rural mansion in the Roman Empire. Villas usually possessed an atrium, external portico, sometimes cisterns, swimming pools (if the villa was constructed near the seashore), and elements of fortification (esp. in remote provinces); FLOOR MOSAICS and BATHS are their most conspicuous remains. Late Roman villas are known in Antioch, Ephesus, Italy, and Sicily (e.g., PIAZZA ARMERINA), Africa, Gallia, and the Danubian provinces (Pannonia, Raetia, etc.). S.P. Ellis (*AJA* 92 [1988] 565–76) attributed the increasing elaboration of such structures in the 4th to mid-6th C. to the concentration of wealth in the hands of Roman aristocrats and the growing practice of conducting business from the home.

The term *villa* was also applied to the entire ESTATE. E. Štajerman (Schtajerman, *infra*) contrasts the villa based on slave labor with the *latifundium* that exploited the work of *coloni*; she views the replacement of the old, slave-oriented villa—by necessity modest in size—with great estates with prefeudal type of labor organization as one of the features of the crisis that befell the Roman Empire in the 3rd C. and finally led to its economic decline and political fall. It is questionable, however, whether this scenario is appropriate to Byz. in part because the slave-based villa was never common in the Roman east.

LIT. A.W. Van Buren, *RE* 2.R. 8 (1958) 2142–59. E.M. Schtajerman, *Die Krise der Sklavenhalterordnung im Westen*

des Römischen Reiches (Berlin 1964) 89–106. E.B. Thomas, *Römische Villen in Pannonien* (Budapest 1964).

—A.K., A.C.

VILLAGE, the geographic, economic, and administrative entity of the countryside designated in narrative sources by the classical term *kome* (typical also of Egyptian papyri) and by the new term CHORION.

The history of the village in the late Roman Empire is not well known; archaeological evidence indicates that, from the 4th C. in northern Syria, large-scale landowning declined as larger economic units were replaced by VILLAGE COMMUNITIES (Tchalenko, *Villages* 1:385), and from the 7th C. in the southwestern Crimea, village settlements flourished (A. Jakobson, *Rannesrednevekove sel'skie poselenija Jugo-Zapadnoj Tavriki* [Leningrad 1970] 181). Villages seem to have been large, as is attested by terms such as METROKOMIA and *komopolis*. According to Laiou (*Peasant Society* 39–42), the 14th-C. Macedonian village contained an average of 33 households. The *Treatise on Taxation* distinguished three kinds of country sites (ed. Dölger, *Beiträge* 115.13–20): *chorion*, hamlet (*agridion*), and estate (PROASTEION). A village consisted of STASEIS; individually cultivated CHORAPHIA, vineyards, and gardens were located far from the KATHEDRA of the *chorion*, and documents mention roads and small paths leading to them or forming their boundaries.

A village could include streams; hills covered with forests; groves of chestnut, walnut, and other trees; sea and lake shores. The clearing of the woods and occupation of virgin lands allowed some households to move to remote areas of the village's property; first they formed dependencies closely connected with the maternal village, but later these could be transformed into independent *agridia*. On the other hand, various reasons led to the desertion of villages. Dependent villages could contain estates of several owners, secular and ecclesiastical, alongside tenements of free peasants, soldiers, etc. In theory villages were considered under the control of a local urban center, but it seems that in fact villages were free of urban control from the 7th C. At least in the 13th–15th C., some villages possessed PYRGOI for defense.

LIT. J. Lefort, "En Macédoine orientale au Xe siècle," in *Occident et Orient au Xe siècle* (Paris 1979) 251–72. K. Chvostova, "K voprosu o strukture pozdnevizantijskogo sel'skogo

poselenija," *VizVrem* 45 (1984) 3–19. A. Kazhdan, "Vizantijskoe sel'skoe poselenie," *VizVrem* 2 (1949) 215–44. H. Antoniadis-Bibikou, "Villages désertés en Grèce. Un bilan provisoire," *Villages désertés et histoire économique. XI^e–XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1965) 343–417. —M.B.

VILLAGE COMMUNITY (*κοινότης τοῦ χωρίου*), a fiscal and legal unit made up of landowners usually living in a single VILLAGE. It was once commonly believed that the origin of the Byz. village community could be found in the importation of the alleged Slavic village community institution, later called the *mir*, into Byz. in the 7th C.; it is more likely, however, that the Byz. village community was an indigenous development arising from the crises in Byz. of the 6th–8th C., during which time the relative decline of the urban centers allowed increased autonomy among the villages. The village community included privately owned cultivated lands of the members, common lands (*koina topia*), and the dwellings found within the official *periorismos* ("delimitation of the boundaries") of the village community, while excluding property detached from the *periorismos*, such as *idiostata* and KLASMA, even if located within the "physical" village.

The village community is probably best thought of as a CORPORATION (JURISTIC PERSON), a legal entity recognized as such by the state, that could intervene in the affairs of its members, administer and have CHRESIS of the properties of its members, make payments, sell property, and take part in legal suits (e.g., *Ivir*. 1, no.9). The members of the village community were usually free peasants (though it could indeed include wealthy landowners and ecclesiastical corporations) who had no restrictions on alienating, bequeathing, or abandoning their lands. They are commonly designated by the words *georgos*, "farmer," or *chorites*, "member of a CHORION." Frequently, however, the sources use vaguer, less specialized terms: *ktetor*, *kyrios*, and *kleronomos*, which emphasize the members' full ownership of their property; *convicanus*, *consors*, *synkleronomos*, *synchorites*, *homochoros*, and *plesiochoros*, which emphasize the close spatial proximity of the NEIGHBORS; *syntelestes*, *synteles*, *syntelon*, and *homokensos*, which emphasize their collective tax obligations, perhaps the most fundamental and distinguishing characteristic of the free village community (ALLELENGYON, EPIBOLE). The principle of joint tax liability, which made the members of the village community responsible

collectively for the taxes of their defaulting fellow members, lasted at least until the 12th C.

The village community was the fundamental unit of Byz. taxation, and, thus, as 10th-C. legislation shows, the state was interested in maintaining its integrity. Nevertheless, the institutions of *klasma* and SOLEMNION weakened the village community by allowing DYNATOI to acquire more property within the village and thereby enervate the solidarity of the village community. Throughout the Byz. era it is possible to see aspects of the village community; even in the 13th–15th C., villages of PAROIKOI at times act as corporate bodies (e.g., MM 4:217–20, 6:212–14). As an economic and fiscal unit, the village community would often act collectively in defense against robbers, in a court trial with a neighboring village or a lord, in building a bridge or in a common feast (Rudakov, *Kul'tura* 180). The village had its (irregular?) assemblies, "rural courts," and *protogerontes*—elders who dealt with imperial officials, primarily tax collectors. Local priests and monks of small monasteries played an important organizational role in the life of the village community, as teachers, scribes-*nomikoi*, and leaders of religious ceremonies that frequently were connected with agrarian activity (rain magic, extermination of locusts, etc.).

LIT. Lemerle, *Agr. Hist.* 18, 75–84, 93–108, 195–99. Kazhdan, *Derevnja i gorod* 21–56. Ju. Vin, "Evoljucija organov samoupravlenija sel'skoj občiny i formirovanie votčinnnoj administracii v pozdnej Vizantii," *VizVrem* 43 (1982) 201–18. H. Antoniadis-Bibicou, A. Guillou, "Vizantijskaja i postvizantijskaja sel'skaja občina," *VizVrem* 49 (1988) 24–39. D. Górecki, "The Slavic Theory in Russian Pre-Revolutionary Historiography of the Byzantine Farmer Community," *Byzantion* 56 (1986) 77–107. —M.B.

VILLANUS COMMUNIS. See VILLEIN.

VILLEHARDOUIN, GEOFFREY, French historian of the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204; born near Troyes before 1152, died between 11 Dec. 1212 and 1218. Prominent feudal officer of the counts of Champagne (marshal in 1185), one of six commissioners entrusted with negotiating the Fourth Crusade's transport to the East with the Venetians, Villehardouin played a key role in the conquest and subsequent governance and defense of Constantinople, where he became Marshal of Romania. Circa 1208 he began writing his Old French *Conquest of Constantinople*,

which provides a detailed account of events from 1202 to 1207 from the Latin perspective and sheds light on the empire's historical geography, the topography and monuments of Constantinople (e.g., on the Jewish quarter of Galata [ch.159] and on a triumphal column [chs. 307–08]), ceremonies (ch.207, chs. 212–15), booty (ch.255), and other matters. His testimony on the cause of the diversion of the Crusade, that it was a series of accidents, has been judged not to be intentionally misleading (Queller, *Fourth Crusade* 10–16, 219f).

ED. *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. E. Faral, 2 vols. (Paris 1938–39), with mod. Fr. tr. Eng. tr. M.R.B. Shaw, *Chronicles of the Crusades* (Baltimore 1963) 29–160.

LIT. J. Longnon, *Recherches sur la vie de Geoffroy de Villehardouin* (Paris 1939). J. Dufournet, *Les écrivains de la IV^e croisade. Villehardouin et Clari*, 2 vols. (Paris 1973). C. Morris, "Geoffrey de Villehardouin and the Conquest of Constantinople," *History* 53 (1968) 24–34. K. Gagova, "Njakoi svedenija za istoričeskata geografija na Trakija u Žofrua de Vilarduen," *Vekove* 15 (1986) 48–53. —M.McC.

VILLEIN (Lat. *villanus*), the term for a dependent peasant used in the territories of Byz. conquered by the Latins. The Latins considered all indigenous population, both rural and urban, as villeins, with the exception of *archontes*, *archontopouloi*, and a few emancipated rank-and-file inhabitants. In Crete, which was under the direct authority of Venice, a specific category of villeins is attested, *villani Co(m)munis* (i.e., of the republic of Venice), who probably were descendants of the Byz. DEMOSIARIOI. They were in a slightly better economic and legal position and had a greater chance of being enfranchised than other villeins. The villeins of the Commune paid an annual tax, *villanzio*, and were forbidden to leave the land they held; they could not be transformed into the villeins of individuals, and the state could reclaim all the fugitive *villani Communis*. The institution of the villeins of the Commune offers insight into Byz. agrarian history before 1204.

LIT. D. Jacoby, *HC* 6:207–14. F. Thiriet, "La condition paysanne et les problèmes de l'exploitation rurale en Romanie greco-vénitienne," *StVen* 9 (1967) 35–69, esp. 55f, 60–63. E. Santschi, *La notion de "feudum" en Crète vénitienne* (Montreux 1976) 172–78. —M.B.

VINEYARD (*ἀμπελών*, also *ampeloperibolion*). Together with the CHORAPHION, the vineyard was the most typical form of cultivated land in Byz., where bread and WINE constituted the main alimentary products. In 14th-C. Macedonia the majority of

peasants possessed vineyards: 83.7–92 percent according to N. Kondov (*EtBalk* 9 [1973] 69), 74–96 percent according to Laiou (*Peasant Society* 174). The size of the vineyards belonging to a single household varied (according to Kondov) between .5 and 22 *modioi*, but Laiou stresses as a basic fact of peasant life “the relatively equal distribution of vineyards” among a population economically unequal in other respects. Usually the vines were untrellised; farmers used vine props or trained the vines to wrap themselves around trees in GARDENS. In MSS such props are shown as simple forked wooden sticks (A. Bryer, *BSA* 81 [1986] 64f, 71, figs. 13, 14, 16). The cultivation of vines involved arduous work. The *GEOPONIKA* devoted five books (4–8) to vines and WINE PRODUCTION. It has been estimated that the yield of a 2-*modios* vineyard furnished a total of 820 liters of wine per year (M. Kaplan, *Klio* 68 [1986] 211).

Chvostova (*Osobennosti* 131) considers vineyards as lands of best quality, whereas Schilbach (*Metrologie* 242–44) distinguishes three categories of vineyards with respect to their quality. Both the price of and the rent from vineyards varied significantly.

The vineyard acquired an important role in biblical exegesis: it was a metaphor for the church, and neglect of the vineyard meant the loss of paradise.

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 5:122–29, 280–95. T. Gal, “Vineyard Cultivation at Emek Harod and its Vicinity during the Roman-Byzantine Period,” *Haaretz Museum Yearbook* 20/21 (1985/6) 129–38. N. Kondov, “Lozarstvo po bulgarskite zemi prez srednoviekovieto,” *Gradinarska i lozarska nauka* 13 (1976) no. 1, 103–21. P. Topping, “Viticulture in Venetian Crete (XIIIth C.),” *Pepragmena tou D’ diethnous Kretologikou synedriou*, vol. 2 (Athens 1981) 509–20.

—J.W.N., A.K.

VIRANŞEHİR. See CONSTANTINA; MOKISSOS.

VIRGIN, TYPES OF. See VIRGIN MARY: Types of the Virgin Mary.

VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA (Βλαχερνίτισσα, Βλαχερνιώτισσα). Several different icons of the Virgin are known to have existed in the monastery of BLACHERNAI. There was a miraculous image of the Virgin and Child there in the 8th C. (vita of St. Stephen the Younger, PG 100:1076B, 1080AB); of the images housed there in the 10th

C., only one is described in enough detail for us to be able to visualize it (*Der cer.* 555.8–10): in the imperial bath area near the chapel of St. Photianos was a marble image of the Virgin from whose outstretched hands flowed the *hagiasma*, or holy water. An ancient painted icon of the Virgin was uncovered in 1030/1 during restoration work in the church undertaken by Romanos III Argyros; it was apparently the bust of the Virgin holding Christ (Skyl. 384.19–28; cf. E. Trapp, *JÖB* 35 [1985] 193–95). One of these Blachernai icons, was kept in the right side of the monastery church covered by a veil that miraculously lifted without human aid every Friday evening. This “habitual miracle” is not mentioned before the second half of the 11th C. or after 1204. Another Virgin icon known as the Blachernitissa regularly accompanied emperors on military campaigns during the 11th C. (Attal. 153.4–14).

Coins and seals of the 11th C. identify an *orans* figure of the Virgin, hands outstretched, as the Blachernitissa (W. Seibt in Oikonomides, *Sigillography* 50–54). A number of extant marble slabs repeat the type, probably echoing specifically the image at the imperial bath (the hands have been bored), though none is labeled (Lange, *Byz. Reliefikone* 43f). Thus it is very likely that the primary Blachernai image, perhaps a figure in the apse, was of this venerable type: a Virgin *orans* without Christ.

Another popular image (sometimes designated the VIRGIN PLATYTERA), an *orans* Virgin with the bust of Christ Emmanuel in a medallion before her chest, has also been associated in modern scholarly literature with the name Virgin Blachernitissa, but it is labeled as such on only one seal of the 11th C. It is called the Episkepsis on another seal, and this name, the Virgin Episkepsis, has been most recently adopted to designate the image. C. Belting-Ihm has proposed that what Romanos III uncovered was an old icon of the VIRGIN NIKOPOIOS, and that this image was subsequently merged at Blachernai with the *orans* type to form this new image, the Virgin *orans* with medallion (cf. also W. Seibt, *Byzantina* 13 [1985] 551–64). To complicate the issue further, a late 11th-C. icon at the monastery of St. Catherine on Sinai has an image of the Virgin labeled “the Blachernitissa” (Soteriou, *Eikones*, pl. 148) that depicts neither of the above types, but one we would ordinarily call a VIRGIN ELEOUSA.

LIT. C. Belting-Ihm, “*Sub matris tutelis*” (Heidelberg 1976) 50–56. V. Grumel, “Le ‘miracle habituel’ de Notre-Dame des Blachernes à Constantinople,” *EO* 30 (1931) 129–46. M. Tatić-Djurić, “Brata slova: Ka liku i značenju Blachernitise,” *ZbLkUmet* 8 (1972) 61–88. —N.P.Š.

VIRGIN DEXIOKRATOUSA. See VIRGIN HODEGETRIA.

VIRGIN ELEOUSA (Ἐλεούσα). The epithet “compassionate” was applied to the Virgin from the 8th–9th C. onward, and was also attached with rather little consistency to a wide variety of her images (H. Hallensleben, *LCI* 3:170f). It is used today to designate one specific icon type: the image of the tender mother who bends her head to touch her cheek to the cheek of her child. Christ puts his arm around her neck; the Virgin may be either standing or seated. The image, which probably evolved from the VIRGIN HODEGETRIA, is known from the 10th C. (N. Thierry, *Zograf* 10 [1979] 59–70), perhaps even as early as the 7th C. (P. Nordhagen, *Bollettino d'Arte* 47 [1962] 351–53). It was particularly popular in the Komnenian period, perhaps owing to the contemporary Passion liturgy celebrating the mother’s love for her son, both as a child and at his death. The 12th-C. imperial monastery of the PANTOKRATOR in Constantinople had a church dedicated to the Virgin Eleousa, but it is unknown whether its icon belonged to the type we would call Eleousa and thus contributed to the spread of the image. The best-known example of this type of Virgin is the VIRGIN OF VLADIMIR.

Images of this type may differ slightly in emphasis and bear a variety of names besides Eleousa (Virgin Episkepsis, Gorgoepekoos, Panton Chara, even VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA). The Virgin Pelagonitissa, named after a famous lost original somewhere in Pelagonia (Macedonia), perhaps of the 13th C., shows the Child almost from behind, throwing his head back and squirming to touch his mother’s cheek with his hand. A Cypriot variant, the Kykkotissa, is thought to reproduce an icon given to the Kykkos monastery by Alexios I Komnenos. Here Christ also twists restlessly; he wears a short sleeveless chiton (cf. D. Mouriki, *DOP* 41 [1987] 406), and the Virgin wears an extra veil over her *maphorion*. In a particularly Cretan variant, the Virgin Kardiotissa, Christ stretches out both arms to embrace his mother.

The term Glykophilousa is applied to the Eleousa image only in post-Byz. times.

LIT. Pallas, *Passion und Bestattung* 167–73. V. Lasareff, “Studies in the Iconography of the Virgin,” *ArtB* 20 (1938) 36–42. A. Grabar, “Les images de la Vierge de Tendresse,” *Zograf* 6 (1975) 25–30. L. Hadermann-Misguich, “Pelagonitissa et Kardiotissa,” *Byzantion* 53 (1983) 10–16. P. Santa Maria Mannino, “La Vergine ‘Kykkotissa’ in due icone laziali del Duecento,” in *Roma Anno 1300: Atti della IV Settimana di Studi di Storia dell’Arte Medievale dell’Università di Roma* (Rome 1983) 487–92. —N.P.Š.

VIRGIN EPISKEPSIS. See VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA.

VIRGIN GALAKTOTROPHOUSA. See VIRGIN MARY: Types of the Virgin Mary.

VIRGIN GLYKOPHILOUSA. See VIRGIN ELEOUSA.

VIRGIN GORGOEPEKOOS. See VIRGIN ELEOUSA.

VIRGIN HAGIOSORITISSA (Ἁγιοσορίτισσα, lit. “the Virgin of the holy Soros”), an iconographic type in which the Virgin is depicted nearly in profile with both her hands extended out from her chest in prayer or entreaty, the very pose she assumes in DEESIS compositions. Sometimes the figure of Christ appears as a bust in the upper part of the composition, or he may occupy a corresponding panel, as when the two figures adorn the piers flanking the TEMPLON. The image probably reflects an original in a church with a holy soros, or reliquary chest, probably the Soros chapel in the Constantinopolitan monastery of BLACHERNAI rather than the Church of the CHALKOPRATEIA. The image bears the name Hagiosoritissa first on seals from the 1040s (W. Seibt in Oikonomides, *Sigillography* 48–50) and on coins from the 12th C.; it is closely related to the VIRGIN PARAKLESIS, except that the Virgin here does not carry a scroll. Images of this type also may be labeled the Virgin Paraklesis, Kecharitomene, or Episkepsis. (For ill., see next page.)

LIT. S. Der Nersessian, “Two Images of the Virgin in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection,” *DOP* 14 (1960) 78–81. T. Bertelè, “La Vergine Aghiosoritissa nella numismatica bizantina,” *REB* 16 (1958) 233f. —N.P.Š.



VIRGIN HAGIOSORITISSA. Relief of the Virgin Hagiosoritissa; marble, mid-11th C. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

VIRGIN HODEGETRIA (Ὁδηγήτρια), an icon of the Virgin known to have been housed, at least from the 12th C. onward, in the HODEGON MONASTERY in Constantinople. On special occasions it was taken in procession to other parts of the city:

John II Komnenos requested that it be brought to the PANTOKRATOR MONASTERY and kept overnight near his tomb on the days commemorating his death or that of his wife (P. Gautier, *REB* 32 [1974] 81.883–83.900); in 1187, it was taken up onto the walls to protect the city under siege (Nik.Chon. 382.57–58). How early this latter practice began remains unclear: in the *Triodion* account of the 7th-C. attacks on the city, it is assumed that the icon brought onto the walls at that time was that of the Virgin Hodegetria (PG 92:1352D), but 10th-C. accounts make only general reference to icons of the Virgin and Child (PG 92:1356D). The icon was kept in the Pantokrator monastery during the Latin occupation, but Michael VIII Palaiologos entered the capital in 1261 walking behind it, whereupon it was returned to the Hodegon. During the 14th C. it was regularly taken to the BLACHERNAI palace the Thursday before Palm Sunday, and remained there until Easter Monday. Two visitors to Constantinople in the Palaiologan period, CLAVIJO and TAFUR, witnessed a ceremony that took place at the monastery every Tuesday, attracting large crowds. Special bearers clad in red in turn carried the heavy icon, which was very large and covered with silver and jewels, out into the crowd. The icon was cut up into four pieces when the city fell in 1453. The popular tradition that the icon was painted by the Evangelist Luke is recorded no earlier than the end of the 12th C. (Mercati, *CollByz* 2:476, par.4).

In the image known as the Hodegetria, the Virgin holds the Christ Child on her left arm; she gestures toward him with her right hand while directing her gaze either at the viewer or off into the distance. Christ sits erect and comfortable in her arms, holding a scroll on his lap, and blessing with his right hand; he looks directly out of the picture. The type, which predates Iconoclasm, was frequently used on patriarchal seals from the 9th C.; the term Hodegetria is first associated with the image on 11th-C. seals (Laurent, *Corpus* 2, nos. 251–52; 5.2, no.1202). A variant, referred to as the Dexiokratousa, has the Virgin holding the Child on her right arm. Both versions may be used within a single church (e.g., in the mosaics of HOSIOS LOUKAS).

The Hodegetria was the most widely copied of all types of the Virgin. Certain images attempt to represent the actual icon: it appears in 14th-C.



VIRGIN HODEGETRIA. Panel of the Virgin Hodegetria; ivory, 10th C. Rijksmuseum het Catharijne convent, Utrecht.

illustrations of the AKATHISTOS HYMN (A. Grabar, *CahArch* 25 [1976] 144–47) and in images of the TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY (where it is supported by angel-bearers clad in red). A miniature in the Hamilton Psalter may also represent the icon itself (Belting, *Illum. Buch*, fig.1). Many replicas of the icon went on to perform miracles in their own right and were given new epithets; among them “Psychostroia” and “Peribleptos.” The somewhat more sentimental VIRGIN ELEOUSA type grew out of the Hodegetria image, in which the balance between reserve and affection was always strictly maintained.

LIT. R.L. Wolff, “Footnote to an Incident of the Latin Occupation of Constantinople: The Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria,” *Traditio* 6 (1948) 325–28. Janin, *Églises CP* 203–06. A. Grabar, “L’Hodigitria et l’Éléousa,” *Zb-LikUmet* 10 (1975) 3–14. —N.P.S.

VIRGINITY (παρθενεία) had two distinct aspects in Byz.: the physical virginity expected of women until their wedding night, and the spiritual Christian notion of complete sexual abstinence exercised by those who dedicated themselves to God. The first was required for a successful MARRIAGE. A husband could repudiate a nonvirgin bride but only on the first night (e.g., *Peira* 49.5); parents therefore kept their daughters closely chaperoned, though not always successfully. The second constituted a MARRIAGE IMPEDIMENT, as it deprived a husband of his conjugal rights. Ascetic men who lived with virgins or *parthenoi syneisaktoi* (a practice condemned by John Chrysostom, PG 47:495–532) or couples who lived as brother and sister renounced SEXUALITY altogether. But when THEOPHANES THE CONFESSOR and his wife emulated this commitment to virginity, his father-in-law protested angrily at their failure to produce children (Theoph. 2:15–16). The early church maintained an order of virgins, and the vow of perpetual virginity was common among female ascetics. Basil the Great condemned the dedication of young girls to virginity solely in order to favor their brothers’ inheritance, but Byz. parents regularly committed their sons and daughters to lives of CELIBACY. Sainly children also fled from arranged marriages in order to preserve their virginity. For female martyrs and devout Christians, the loss of virginity was considered a form of death.

LIT. P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York 1988). Brock-Harvey, *Women* 30f, 71, 165. Patlagean, *Structure*, pt.VIII (1969), 1353–69. A. Emmett, “Female Ascetics in the Greek Papyri,” *JÖB* 32.2 (1982) 507–15. —J.H.

VIRGIN KARDIOTISSA. See VIRGIN ELEOUSA.

VIRGIN KECHARITOMENE. See VIRGIN HAGIOSORITISSA.

VIRGIN KYKKOTISSA. See VIRGIN ELEOUSA.

VIRGIN KYRIOTISSA. See VIRGIN NIKOPOIOS.

VIRGIN MARY, mother of Jesus Christ, *aeiparthenos* and THEOTOKOS in Greek terminology. The Gospels give little historical data concerning Mary

other than her betrothal to Joseph, the birth of Jesus, and her presence in Bethlehem, Nazareth, Jerusalem, at the miracle of CANA, and at her son's execution, when she stood beneath the cross and Jesus recommended her to his "beloved disciple." Matthew relates that Joseph, Mary, and the infant Jesus fled to Egypt from the persecutions of King Herod, while Luke dwells on the themes of ANNUNCIATION and VISITATION, John mentions her presence at the marriage at Cana and at the foot of the cross, and the Acts mention that she prayed with the Apostles. The scarcity of biographical detail in the New Testament was supplemented by the apocrypha, esp. the PROTOEVANGELION OF JAMES, which depicts Mary as the daughter of Ioakeim of Nazareth and Anna of Bethlehem, who presented her to the Temple for upbringing and, at the age of 14, married her to Joseph. After Christ's Ascension she lived quietly in Nazareth, died with many miraculous signs, and was taken up into heaven (see DORMITION). Her life was also described in vitae by Maximos the Confessor, Epiphanius the Monk, Symeon Metaphrastes, and other authors, and in a number of homilies.

THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES. The focal point of Mary's history was the conception and birth of Christ, presaged by the Annunciation. The Cappadocian fathers emphasized not only the virginal birth of Christ but also Mary's perpetual virginity; Basil the Great (PG 31:1468B), while refuting EUNOMIOS, stated that, although only Mary's virginity at the time of the conception of Jesus is a binding dogma, he joined those *philochristoi* who believed that the Theotokos had never ceased to be a virgin. Cyril of Alexandria saw Mary's virginity as the basis for God's becoming the Father of all mankind (PG 75:1008B). Accordingly, church fathers considered the "brothers of Jesus" mentioned in the New Testament as Joseph's children from a first marriage. Jerome explained the usage of the term *adelphoi/adelphai* (brothers and sisters) of Jesus in Gospels as meaning "cousins" and connected "the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James and Joseph" (Mk 6:3) with a different Mary.

The problem of Mary's role in the process of SALVATION was hotly discussed in the 5th C.—was she only a vessel (a "channel") in which the Logos dwelled temporarily or was her action indispens-

able in the process of INCARNATION? Orthodox doctrine, as formulated by JOHN OF DAMASCUS (*Exp. fidei* 56.27–28, ed. Kotter, *Schriften* 2:134), stressed the active role of Mary: Christ was born not *through* the woman but *of* the woman; from her he received his human nature, as he received his divine nature from the Father.

Mary's cult reflected social expectations of the poor and humble (J. Vogt, *VigChr* 23 [1969] 241–63), esp. of women. Many churches were dedicated to the Virgin, and several festival days were celebrated in her honor: the feast of the Annunciation on 25 Mar. instituted in the 6th C., and the feast of the Dormition on 15 Aug., established by Emp. Maurice. Liturgical hymns, esp. the AKATHISTOS HYMN, celebrate Mary's virginity.

Some attempts to discourage her veneration took place under Leo III and Constantine V, the latter reportedly comparing Mary to an empty purse from which gold coins had been taken. Nevertheless her veneration remained strong: she was the mediator between suffering mankind and Christ (see DEESIS) and esp. the protectress of Constantinople, the new Jerusalem, and, hence, the empire (cf. E. Fenster, *Laudes Constantinopolitanae* [Munich 1968] 100–04).

Old Testament PREFIGURATIONS of Mary included the BURNING BUSH that was not consumed (e.g., Gregory of Nyssa, PG 46:1136BC), the ladder reaching to heaven, the star of the house of Jacob, the closed door of the restored temple, the fleece of Gideon soaked with dew from heaven, and the stone quarried from the mountain without human hands (e.g., Proklos of Constantinople, PG 65:680C–681B). As Christ abolished the sin of Adam, Mary was "the new Eve"; she was also contrasted to the pagan ATHENA as the truly powerful supporter of Byz.

LIT. *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia*, ed. M. O'Carroll (Wilmington, Del., 1982). H. du Manoir, *Maria*, vol. 1 (Paris 1949). E. Testa, *Maria Terra Vergine* (Jerusalem 1984). L. Heiser, *Maria in der Christusverkündigung des orthodoxen Kirchenjahres* (Trier 1981). BHG 1046–1161d. —G.P.

REPRESENTATION IN ART. Narratives of the Virgin's life focus either on her conception and childhood, narrated in the so-called Protoevangelion of James, or on her Dormition. Imagery drawn from the Protoevangelion emerges in the 5th C. and abounds in the 6th, albeit in cycles of Christ's INFANCY rather than those of Mary. The earliest surviving Virgin cycle (at Kızıl Çukur,

Cappadocia, 869–70?) must reflect earlier models, but evidence of a systematic Marian imagery appears only in the 10th–11th C. The events of her life celebrated as church feasts acquire standard compositions—the conception, the BIRTH OF THE VIRGIN, and her PRESENTATION IN THE TEMPLE (all found already in the MENOLOGION OF BASIL II), and the Dormition. A codified narrative cycle based on the Protoevangelion appears in side-chapels of churches (e.g., Hagia Sophia in KIEV). The late 11th–12th C. saw the expansion of this cycle (e.g., in the exceptional, 63-scene illumination of the homilies of JAMES OF KOKKINOBAFOS) and its transfer into the naos of churches dedicated to the Virgin, traceable from DAPHNI (five scenes in the narthex complement two in the naos) through LAGOUDERA, where Marian feasts dominate the naos. These developments unite in the long Palaiologan cycles adorning the naves of churches dedicated to the Virgin. In Palaiologan painting, too, the Dormition is incorporated into an extensive cycle narrating Mary's death and burial.

LIT. X. Jacob, "La vie de Marie interprétée par les artistes des églises rupestres de Cappadoce," *Cahiers de l'art médiéval* 6.1 (1971–73) 15–30. Underwood, *Kariye Djami* 4:161–94. —A.W.C.

TYPES OF THE VIRGIN MARY. Most Byz. images of the Virgin stress her role in Christ's Incarnation and show her as the Theotokos, holding her young child in a variety of ways. The "types" differ mainly in the way in which these two figures are shown responding to each other, whether it is with grave respect, mutual tenderness, playfulness or foreboding, or with the Virgin nursing the Child in her guise of Galaktotrophousa (A. Cutler, *JÖB* 37 [1987] 335–50). In some images of the Virgin, Christ's independence of his human mother is made explicit by showing him enclosed in a medallion set before her chest, a medallion that in some cases she neither holds nor even touches with her hands. If the Virgin is represented alone, without her child, it is usually in the role of intercessor with her risen son, now the judge of mankind (e.g., VIRGIN PARAKLESIS).

Emp. Leo VI was the first to put the image of the Virgin on a coin. Both seals and coins, on which the images are frequently labeled, can serve as a guide for reconstructing the appearance and early history of the various types of the Virgin

(W. Seibt in Oikonomides, *Sigillography* 35–56), but the task is not simple. Though the various iconographic types of the Virgin can be quite easily grouped and distinguished one from another, we find considerable discrepancy between the type depicted and the Byz. name attached to it: even identical images may be accompanied by quite different epithets or designations. This is because the designations are not in fact iconographic in character. They are either names of sanctuaries, or poetic epithets that aim at conveying some important quality in the Virgin.

An icon of the Virgin was presumed to be at once an image of the Virgin herself and the replica of some famous icon original, one that was either extremely venerable—of some it was even claimed that they had been painted by St. Luke—or esp. miraculous. Each replica could thus share in the miraculous powers both of the Virgin herself and of the specific icon it reproduced. An icon of the Virgin will thus often bear the name of the sanctuary where the famous original was housed (e.g., the VIRGIN HODEGETRIA from the HODEGON MONASTERY, or the VIRGIN HAGIOSORITISSA).

Difficulties arise when the sanctuary has more than one important icon: replicas of both, even if they are quite different in appearance, may both bear the name of that sanctuary (e.g., VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA). Furthermore, a replica of a famous icon in one sanctuary made for a different sanctuary may take on the name of its new home without any alteration in the image.

Many epithets of the Virgin found on Byz. icons do not refer to famous originals but rather to special aspects of the Virgin's nature. These "qualitative" epithets, most of which derive from metaphors used for the Virgin in liturgical poetry, may accompany an image expressing their meaning (e.g., VIRGIN ELEOUSA, VIRGIN PLATYTERA), but they are also quite freely applied to a variety of different iconographic types (e.g., Virgin Episkepsis). As both image and epithet have their own independent history and particular resonance, the interplay of the two, while confusing to the modern scholar, does serve to enrich the meaning of the icon.

How and why later variants of well-known types were introduced and established is a problem that has received relatively little scholarly attention. Some variants may result from the increased viv-

idness of the liturgical poetry, esp. the Passion celebrations (e.g., VIRGIN OF THE PASSION), some from attempts to bring certain traditional images closer to the poetic epithets that accompany them or to appropriate the special qualities of one type for another. When it comes to determining by what process the new types became established, the role of the individual artist must be taken into account, as well as the history of the actual icon and of the sanctuary for which it was made. The fame of newer icons depended not on their beauty but on the miracles they could produce: their fortune and the popularity of the new type was intimately connected with that of the sanctuaries that housed them.

LIT. N.P. Kondakov, *Ikonoğrafija Bogomateri*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg 1914–15). H. Hallensleben, H. Skrobucha, *LCI* 3:161–281. V. Lasareff, "Studies in the Iconography of the Virgin," *ArtB* 20 (1938) 26–65. M. Vloberg, "Les types iconographiques de la mère de Dieu dans l'art byzantin," in *Maria*, ed. H. du Manoir, vol. 2 (Paris 1952) 403–43. G. Babić, "Epiteti Bogorodice koju dete grli," *ZbLkUmet* 21 (1985) 261–75. I. Tognazzi Zervou, "L'iconografia e la 'vita' delle miracolose icone della Theotokos Brefokratoussa: Blachernitissa e Odighitria," *BollBadGr* 40 (1986) 215–87. —N.P.Š.

VIRGIN MARY, DEATH OF. See DORMITION.

VIRGIN NIKOPOIOS (Νικοποιός, lit. "the Victory-maker"). The type, the frontal bust of the Virgin holding directly before her a medallion containing an equally frontal figure of Christ, appears as early as the 7th C. on icons (Weitzmann, *Sinai Icons*, no.B28), though it acquires the label Nikopoios only in the 11th C. (Laurent, *Corpus* 2, no.900). The venerable icon discovered in the Blachernai church by Romanos III in 1030/1 may have been of this type (see VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA); at any rate Romanos put this image on his seals, and an image of the Virgin Nikopoios is known to have been in the Blachernai palace in the 14th C. (pseudo-Kod. 227.13–15; 228.1). The Komnenian icon in San Marco in Venice, which tradition claims to be the original Nikopoios, differs in that Christ is not enclosed in a medallion and the icon is not inscribed. The icon type without the medallion was sometimes called the Kyriotissa (S. Kalopissi-Verti, *Die Kirche der Hagia Triada bei Kranidi* [Munich 1975] 213–16), perhaps after an image of this kind housed in the monastery

"ta Kyrou" in Constantinople; at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai this latter type became known as the VIRGIN TES BATOU.

LIT. A. Rizzi, "Un'icona costantinopolitana del XII secolo a Venezia: La Madonna Nikopeia," *Thesaurismata* 17 (1980) 290–306. W. Seibt, "Der Bildtypus der Theotokos Nikopoios," *Byzantina* 13 (1985) 551–64. R.L. Wolff, "Footnote to an Incident of the Latin Occupation of Constantinople: The Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria," *Traditio* 6 (1948) 326, n.41. M. Tatić-Djurić, "L'icône de Kyriotissa," 15 *CEB*, vol. 2.2 (Athens 1976) 759–86. —N.P.Š.

VIRGIN OF THE PASSION (τοῦ Πάθους), the conventional term for a late variant of the VIRGIN HODEGETRIA type, in which the Christ Child, clasping his mother's hand, turns his head away from her to confront the bust of the archangel Gabriel holding the cross. The inscription that sometimes accompanies the figures stresses the theme of Gabriel's "second Annunciation," that of the coming PASSION OF CHRIST. The type, which is also known as the Virgin Amolyntos ("Immaculate"), was esp. favored on Crete in the 15th C. (esp. by the painter Andreas Ritsos), where the figure of St. Michael was added carrying the other symbols of the Passion, the lance and the sponge. The image itself first appears in a fresco at LA-GOUDERA (a.1192), where, however, the Virgin is called the Arakiotissa, following the dedication of the church, as well as Kecharitomene; Christ lies horizontally in her arms, a pose that may be a conscious reference to the image of CHRIST ANAPESON.

LIT. Pallas, *Passion und Bestattung* 173–80. —N.P.Š.

VIRGIN OF THE SOURCE. See PAGE.

VIRGIN OF VLADIMIR, a processional icon of the VIRGIN ELEOUSA brought to Kiev in the 12th C. and famous since then as a palladium of the Russian church and state. Now in the Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow, it is a bilateral icon; on the obverse the Virgin is depicted with her cheek against that of her child, who embraces her neck as she gazes at the viewer. Only the faces are original; they belong to the early 12th C. The reverse has a 15th-C. painting or repainting of an altar with cross and instruments of the Passion. The POVEST' VREMENNYCH LET relates that the icon

was brought from Constantinople in 1131/2 (to be, according to Onasch, a counterpart in Rus' to the Constantinopolitan Eleousa icon venerated by the ruling Komnenian dynasty), and that ANDREJ OF BOGOLJUBOVO took it when he transferred his power to Suzdal (1155), installing it in a superb cover in the new Dormition Cathedral in Vladimir after benefiting from its miracles. It was taken temporarily in 1395 and finally in 1480 to the Dormition Cathedral in Moscow, where it preserved the city from Tatar invasions on this and two subsequent occasions, commemorated in its three feasts (26 Aug., 21 May, 23 June).

LIT. A.I. Anisimov, *Our Lady of Vladimir*, tr. N.G. Yaschwill, T.N. Rodzianko (Prague 1928). M. Alpatov, V. Lasareff, "Ein byzantinisches Tafelwerk aus der Komnenen-epoche," *Jahrbuch der preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 46 (1925) 140–55. K. Onasch, "Die Ikone der Gottesmutter von Vladimir," *OstSt* 5 (1956) 56–64. V.I. Antonova, "K voprosu o pervonačal'noj kompozicii ikony Vladimirskoj Bogomateri," *VizVrem* 18 (1961) 198–205. —A.W.C.

VIRGIN PARAKLESIS (Παράκλησις), the Virgin Intercessor. This type shows the Virgin almost in profile holding a scroll on which are inscribed the words of a dialogue with Christ in which she pleads for mankind (the customary text is preserved in the *Hermeneia* of Dionysios of Fournas, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus [St. Petersburg 1909] 280). Christ's image is often included in the upper corner. Although the epithet *paraklesis* is not found attached to the image before the 14th C., the image itself occurs several centuries earlier (mosaic on a pier of the bema in St. Demetrios, Thessalonike, 9th C.?); a 12th-C. icon of the Virgin in Spoleto reproduces the type, which is closely related to that of the VIRGIN HAGIOSORITISSA. It occurs frequently on Cyprus, where a corresponding figure of Christ may be painted on the opposite pier of the templon, and a nearby figure of John the Baptist may complete a sort of DEESIS as, for example, at Moutoullas (D. Mouriki in *Byz. und der Westen* 189–91). A 15th-C. icon at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai shows the Virgin Paraklesis in a true Deesis composition (Soteriou, *Eikones*, pl.170).

An icon of this type accompanied the body of Stefan Nemanja, according to the illustration of the translation of his remains in the narthex chapel of SOPOČANI. Images of the Virgin Paraklesis are sometimes labeled the VIRGIN ELEOUSA.

LIT. S. Der Nersessian, "Two Images of the Virgin in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection," *DOP* 14 (1960) 81–86. —N.P.Š.

VIRGIN PELAGONITISSA. See VIRGIN ELEOUSA.

VIRGIN PERIBLEPTOS. See VIRGIN HODEGETRIA; PERIBLEPTOS MONASTERY.

VIRGIN PLATYTERA (Πλατυτέρα), the Virgin "wider (than the heavens)," an epithet of the Virgin derived from the liturgy of St. Basil, and often inscribed on her images, esp. those in apse compositions (Ihm, *Apsismalerei* 64). Though not a consistent type of the Virgin, it is most often associated with the second type of the VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA: a Virgin *orans* whose arms spread out to fill the conch, while Christ appears in a medallion on her chest.

LIT. A. Weis, *Die Madonna Platytera* (Königstein 1985) 20–44. —N.P.Š.

VIRGIN PSYCHOSOSTRIA. See VIRGIN HODEGETRIA.

VIRGIN TES BATOU (τῆς Βάτου), the Virgin of the (Burning) Bush. The Bush that burned but was not consumed (Ex 3:2–5) became a metaphor for the Virgin and was understood as a PREFIGURATION of her. The epithet was applied from the 13th C. onward to a particular image of the Virgin associated with the monastery of St. CATHERINE on Mt. Sinai, the alleged site of the BURNING BUSH. The Virgin, shown standing, is holding the seated frontal Christ Emmanuel directly before her chest; the Child gives a blessing, and holds a roll (Soteriou, *Eikones*, pl.155). The image itself is not new: it is essentially that of the Virgin Kyriotissa (see VIRGIN NIKOPOIOS). But it does appear esp. frequently on Sinai icons after the 12th C., and on works in which the figure of the Virgin is often flanked by pairs of saints of particular significance to Sinai.

An image of the Virgin, though a different one, was also incorporated into compositions of Moses and the Burning Bush. In a version of the VIRGIN BLACHERNITISSA type, she appears *orans* within the Bush, with the medallion of Christ Emmanuel,

previously represented alone inside the Bush, visible before her chest.

LIT. D. Mouriki, "Four Thirteenth-Century Sinai Icons by the Painter Peter," in *Studenica i vizantijska umetnost oko 1200*, ed. V. Korać (Belgrade 1988) 331f, 337f. K. Weitzmann, "Loca Sancta and the Representational Arts of Palestine," *DOP* 28 (1974) 53f. —N.P.S.

VIRGIN ZODOCHOS PEGE. See PEGE.

VIRTUE (*ἀρετή*), a concept that was well developed in antiquity, esp. by Plato and the Stoics. The significance of the quartet of four cardinal virtues—courage (*andreia*), righteousness (*dikaio-syne*), prudence in the sense of moderation (*sophrosyne*), and prudence as good sense (*phronesis*)—was emphasized by ancient moralists and developed by MENANDER RHETOR. This quartet remained the foundation of the lists of virtues in Byz. MIRRORS OF PRINCES, but to the four cardinal virtues were added other qualities, such as generosity, wisdom (SOPHIA), gentleness (PRAOTES), PHILANTHROPY, and piety. By the second half of the 11th C., nobility of lineage and military prowess were also considered secular virtues (Kazhdan-Franklin, *Studies* 24–32).

The church fathers' teaching on virtue is based on the interpretation of Holy Scripture. They developed both the general idea of virtue and the categorization of individual virtues. Christian exegetes understood the virtues of human behavior as gifts of God that should lead us back to him and that are therefore connected with the three theological virtues (faith, hope, and love [*agape*]) as their presupposition. Virtue was engendered by the soul, not of its own power but in its capacity as the bride of Christ; it presupposed intelligence and free will.

Monastic-ascetic ETHICS, even though it preserved some elements of the ancient system, or at least its terminology, in fact diverged from classical principles: the role of reason in the system of virtues decreased while experience as the source of virtue was emphasized; the classical magnanimity (or *megalopsychia*) (G. Downey, *TAPA* 76 [1945] 279–86) was replaced by humility (*tapeinotes*). John of Damascus (PG 95:85C) drew up a list of virtues that included the ancient cardinal virtues, three theological virtues, and others—prayer, humility, mildness, tolerance, clemency, and 23

more. Michael PSELLOS (*De omnifaria doctrina*, pars. 66–81) defined and classified the virtues, esp. the cardinal virtues, following the tradition of Plato and Aristotle, without evaluating or combining the different independent lists. Hagiography presents virtues (esp. faith, hope, and love) in action; even though acts of MARTYRS readily exaggerated the saintly virtues, a cautious and negative attitude toward excessive deeds of virtue is sometimes seen, esp. in the vitae of the 12th C. PERSONIFICATIONS of both imperial and monastic virtues, usually female and dressed in nonclassical garb, were depicted in Byz. art.

LIT. G.W. Forell, *History of Christian Ethics*, vol. 1 (Minneapolis 1979). E. Osborn, *Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought* (Cambridge 1976). T. Imamichi, "Die Notizen von der Metamorphose der klassischen Ethik bei den griechischen Kirchenvätern," *StP* 5 (1962) 499–507. A. Ioannides, "Ho horos arete kai he ennoia autou eis ten Hagian Graphen kai tous pateras tes ekklesias," *Kleronomia* 15 (1983) 5–70. —G.P.

VISIGOTHS (*Οὐσγόθοι*), a polyethnic people within the union of the GOTHS. The initial entry of the Visigoths into the Roman Empire resulted in the Battle of ADRIANOPE (378), at which Valens was killed. The Visigoths subsequently ravaged Thrace and threatened Constantinople until 382, when Theodosios I settled them as FOEDERATI in Thrace. In 395 the Visigoths, now under ALARIC, rebelled and pillaged Thrace and Illyricum. Attempts by STILICHO to thwart them and establish Western imperial control over Illyricum were viewed with apprehension by Arkadios, who appointed Alaric *magister militum* for Illyricum. In 401 the Visigoths invaded Italy and sacked Rome in 410. Following a failed attempt to cross from Italy to Africa and the sudden death of Alaric, the Visigoths under Athaulf moved into southern Gaul. In 414 Athaulf married GALLA PLACIDIA. In 416–18, in their capacity as *foederati*, the Visigoths invaded Spain and crushed the Siling VANDALS and Alans.

After another unsuccessful effort to cross into Africa, the Visigoths were forced to return to Gaul, where they settled in Aquitania and Septimania. This marks the beginning of the Visigothic kingdom centered on Toulouse, which under Theodoric II (453–66) and Euric (466–84) was extended into Spain. In 507 the FRANKS under Clovis defeated and killed Alaric II near Poitiers.

Aquitania passed into Frankish hands, but an Ostrogothic protectorate (508–22) kept Septimania and Spain in Visigothic hands. The Visigoth kingdom in Spain proved to be a successful sub-Roman successor state. Relations between the Arian Visigoths and orthodox Hispano-Roman population were generally harmonious, protected, as it were, by law codes for both the former (*Code of Euric* and *Book of Judges* [654]) and latter (*Breviary of Alaric*).

The kingdom was susceptible to Constantinopolitan influence through its lively commercial contacts with the East and, after 552, by Justinian I's establishment of a province along the southeastern coast of the peninsula. Although Africa remained the prime source of olive oil for the Visigothic coastal cities, oil, wine, perfume, and pottery were imported in considerable quantities from Asia Minor and the Levant. East Roman architectural and artistic influences are evident in Visigothic churches and in the long halls constructed at Reccopolis, the city founded by King Leovigild (568–86) east of modern Madrid. Key Visigothic church and literary figures, such as Leander of Seville, Martin of Braga, JOHN OF BICLAR, and ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, were deeply influenced by their contacts or experience with Constantinopolitan culture. Visigothic kings from Leovigild onward likewise adopted the regalia and court ceremonial of the Eastern emperors. The political unification of Visigothic Spain achieved by Leovigild may also be attributed in some measure to his decision to make Toledo (Toletum) the royal capital in imitation of Constantinople.

At the same time, Eastern cultural influences were used to define further a Visigothic-Spanish identity distinct and even in opposition to Constantinople (this despite the conversion of the kingdom to orthodoxy under Reccared in 586). This opposition was fundamental in the expulsion of Byz. forces from Spain in 621 and the emergence of a mature Visigothic kingdom that survived until the early 8th C.

LIT. G. Garcia Volta, *Die Westgoten* (Berg 1979). E.A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain* (Oxford 1969). E. James, *Visigothic Spain* (Oxford 1980). J. Fontaine, *Culture et spiritualité en Espagne du IVe au VIIe siècle* (London 1986). S.J. Keay, *Roman Spain* (Berkeley 1988) 202–217. L.A. Garcia Moreno, *El fin del reino visigodo de Toledo* (Madrid 1975). *Los Visigodos, historia y civilización en Antigüedad y Cristianismo*, ed. D.A. Gonzales Bianco (Murcia 1986). —R.B.H.

VISIONS (*ὄπτασιαι*), supernatural phenomena viewed primarily by prophets and saints. Visions should be distinguished from illumination, a final act of spiritual purification (the divine light of SYMEON THE THEOLOGIAN and the HESYCHASTS), and from diabolical apparitions, aimed at the deception and ruin of men. A vision could occur in sleep or in waking hours and could be experienced by an individual or a group. It might consist of signs (Constantine I's vision of a cross in heaven), figures (visions of Christ, Mary, angels, or saints), or developed images (Hell, Paradise, images of the near or remote future).

Vision or DREAM literature as a genre existed in both antiquity and the BIBLE: the church fathers were esp. concerned with the Old Testament themes of the ladder of Jacob, the theophany at SINAI, and prophets' visions as well as the New Testament themes of the TRANSFIGURATION, Christ's appearances after the Resurrection, and the vision of PAUL on the road to Damascus (a theme dwelt on, like the visions of Isaiah and Ezekiel, in the late 9th-C. PARIS GREGORY and illuminated MSS of KOSMAS INDIKOPLEUSTES). Visions became a substantial element in hagiography: they conveyed prophetic messages, revealed events happening at a distance or in the past, and offered consolation at time of distress.

A vision of Hell and Paradise could form a part of a saint's vita (e.g., the vision of Theodora in the vita of BASIL THE YOUNGER) or an independent work (visions of ANASTASIA, DOROTHEOS, or of the monk Kosmas). From these visions we should distinguish satirical travels to Hades, in imitation of LUCIAN, which contained no visionary elements or supernatural revelation. Prophetic visions in APOCALYPTIC literature often displayed political tendencies.

Representation in Art. All representations of the divine can be said, in a sense, to be visionary. A special class of such images, however, are those of the prophets, who are often depicted reacting in astonishment to the vision that is vouchsafed to them. Such scenes are found as early as ca. 500 at HOSIOS DAVID in Thessalonike. The depiction of such epiphanies reached their peak in the 9th–10th C. when, according to A. Grabar (*Iconoclasme* 244), scenes of this sort are to be understood as part of a larger Iconodule emphasis upon visual experience. The largest surviving cluster of these

prophetic visions is in the apses of churches in CAPPADOCIA (J. Lafontaine-Dosogne in *Synthronon* 135–43).

LIT. P. Dinzelbacher, *Vision und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1981). H.R. Patch, *The Other World according to Descriptions in Medieval Literature* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950). *Papyrus Bodmer XXIX: Vision de Dorotheos*, ed. A. Hurst et al. (Cologne-Geneva 1984). M. Fantuzzi, "La visione di Doroteo," *Atene e Roma* 30 (1985) 186–91.

—J.I., A.K., A.C.

VISITATION (ἄσπασμός, "greeting"), the meeting of the pregnant Virgin and Elizabeth, when Elizabeth's child, JOHN THE BAPTIST, leapt in her womb. The episode is notable for Elizabeth's acclamation of Christ and for Mary's Magnificat (Lk 1:39–56). In art, the former quite displaces the latter; only in Psalters—where it is a canticle—is the Magnificat occasionally illustrated. The Visitation is represented only in cycles of the INFANCY OF CHRIST. In 6th-C. art, there were three variants: the women may shake hands (Grabar, *Ampoules*, pls. XLVI, LI), converse (apse mosaic, POREČ), or embrace (Grabar, *Ampoules*, pl. XLVII). The third variant becomes standard. A curious maid (Poreč; Çambasli Kilise at Ortahisar, where she becomes a donor portrait—N. Thierry, *Peintures d'Asie Mineure et de Transcaucasie au X^e et XI^e siècles* [London 1977], pt. XI, pl. 4), or Zacharias (NEREZI) may serve as witness, but further elaboration is rare. Exceptions include the THEODORE PSALTER (fol. 113v) where the blessing Christ Child and kneeling John the Baptist appear behind their mothers, the MSS of JAMES OF KOKKINOBAPHOS that illustrate the event with nine scenes, and the late 14th-C. mural at Pelendri on Cyprus, where the gesturing infants are visible in their mothers' bodies. Though the Byz. church calendar knows no such feast, the passage from Luke was read at the feast of the Deposition of the Virgin's Robe (*esthes*) in the BLACHERNAI church on 2 July (Mateos, *Typicon* 1:328–33).

LIT. K. Wessel, *RBK* 2:1093–99.

—A.W.C., R.F.T.

VITA, or Life (*bios*, usually *bios kai politeia*, "life and deeds"), biography of a SAINT. Unlike the MARTYRION, which emphasizes heroic death for Christian beliefs, the vita depicts ideal Christian behavior. EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA created the genre in his biography of Constantine I the Great, the

VITA CONSTANTINI, in which he emphasized didactic purpose over factual trustworthiness; equally influential, ATHANASIOS of Alexandria elaborated the framework of the Christian biography in his vita of ANTONY THE GREAT. Though preserving certain traditions of ancient biography, the vita was a new genre, typified by a new ideal of behavior (rejection of earthly values for the sake of future reward), a new type of storyteller who understood and accepted his humble position in comparison with the saint (see MODESTY, TOPOS OF), a new view of the legendary and miraculous as normal and ordinary (within the sphere of the saint's influence), and a new concept of time as a series of independent episodes without any claim to coherency. The stereotypical saint's biography coexisted with vivid details of both real life (making some vitae invaluable for their political, social, and economic data) and MIRACLES, VISIONS, wondrous lands, and the heavenly realm. Delehaye (*infra* 106–09) distinguished six types of HAGIOGRAPHY on the basis of credibility, from authentic sources to hagiographical romances. The differentiation is in fact more complex: vitae differed in ideology, language, the role of the hagiographer, his interest in detail, etc. Vitae were collected in MENOLOGIA.

Illustration of Vitae. Only those vitae included in the *menologion* of SYMEON METAPHRASTES were ever regularly illustrated in MSS; these texts were most often accompanied by portraits, and narrative cycles are almost invariably brief. Vita ICONS (also known as "hagiographical" icons) and fresco cycles (see HAGIOGRAPHICAL ILLUSTRATION) may illustrate a dozen or so episodes from the life of a saint but they draw from a variety of sources, both visual and written, and can rarely be traced to any single vita text.

SOURCE. *Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana* (Antwerp 1643–Brussels 1925).

LIT. H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*⁴ (Brussels 1955), Eng. tr. D. Attwater (New York 1962). L. Rydén, "New Forms of Hagiography: Heroes and Saints," 17 *CEB*, *Major Papers* (Washington, D.C., 1986) 537–54. N.P. Ševčenko, "An Eleventh Century Illustrated Edition of the Metaphrastian Menologium," *East European Quarterly* 13 (1979) 423–30.

—A.K., N.P.S.

VITA BASILII, a biography of BASIL I, the second section of THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, written most probably by CONSTANTINE VII ca. 950. The *Vita Basilii* is a panegyric presenting Basil as

a descendant of noble ancestors and as a wise administrator. The author emphasized that Basil established a just government and that the poor were able to till their fields peacefully; the emperor himself took part in judicial tribunals and protected peasants from tax collectors. Thus the program described in the vita differed radically from that of ROMANOS I. The author was hostile to high officials and he esp. hated eunuchs. On the other hand, he did not portray Basil as a great general and was reticent in describing his expeditions; he did not conceal Basil's military defeats. In contrast, the emperor was portrayed as a great builder: the vita is our most important source for imperially sponsored architecture and decoration of the period, both within and beyond the GREAT PALACE in Constantinople and elsewhere in the empire. Jenkins, who stressed the influence of PLUTARCH on the vita, argued that the author used both the biography of Antony and the lost biography of Nero (*Studies*, pt. IV [1954], 13–30). At the same time the author uses ancient imagery cautiously: he contrasts rather than compares Basil with ancient heroes. To Basil is opposed his anti-hero, Michael III, the embodiment of evil. It seems that the vita was a source of GENESIOS or was based upon a common source.

ED. *Theophanes Continuatus*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1838) 211–353. Germ. tr. L. Breyer, *Vom Bauernhof auf den Kaiserthron* (Graz-Vienna-Cologne 1981).

LIT. I. Ševčenko, "Storia letteraria," in *La civiltà bizantina dal IX all'XI secolo* (Bari 1978) 89–127. A. Kazhdan, "Iz istorii vizantijskoj chronografii X v. 3," *VizVrem* 21 (1962) 95–117. V. Lichačeva, Ja. Ljubarskij, "Pamjatniki iskusstva v 'Žizneopisanii Vasilija' Konstantina Bagrjanorodnogo," *VizVrem* 42 (1981) 171–83.

—A.K., A.C.

VITA CONSTANTINI, a Life of the emperor CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT in four books, according to T.D. Barnes (*infra*) written between 337 and 339. It is now generally accepted as a work of EUSEBIOS OF CAESAREA, although there has been much controversy over its historical value. Embarrassed or repelled by its flatteries, many critics have impugned its honesty and even denied its authenticity. In a much-quoted extreme judgment, J. Burckhardt (*Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen* [Basel 1853] 260, 283) dismissed its author as the first thoroughly dishonest historian of ancient times, the most disgusting of all eulogists. More sober readers are bothered by its undeniable sins of omission, internal and external inconsistencies,

and doublets, while the Constantinian documents it contains have also provoked suspicion. Much of this stems from a failure to take the work on its own terms. It was intended to be a public eulogy in the classical tradition, akin to the contemporary PANEGYRICI LATINI; hence its tone. The defects in presentation are the result of Eusebios dying before the piece was finished and revised. At least one document (Constantine's letter to the provincials after the defeat of Licinius) has been vindicated by the discovery that a text preserved on papyrus (*P.Lond.* III 878) corresponds verbatim with most of *Vita* 2.26–29 (A.H.M. Jones, *JEH* 5 [1954] 196–200). There are also later Lives of Constantine and his mother Helena (*BHG* 362–369K), often embellished by legendary stories.

ED. *Eusebius Werke*, vol. 1.1, ed. F. Winkelmann (Berlin 1975). Eng. tr. E.C. Richardson, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*², vol. 1 (Oxford–New York 1890; rp. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1971) 481–540.

LIT. Barnes, *Constantine & Eusebius* 265–71. R.T. Ridley, "Anonymity in the Vita Constantini," *Byzantion* 50 (1980) 241–58.

—B.B.

VITA CONTEMPLATIVA, contemplative life, Latin term used by Augustine and the scholastics and derived from the Greek philosophical concept of βίος θεωρητικός; it was introduced by Aristotle and developed by the Stoics and is usually coupled with and opposed to the *vita activa*, βίος πρακτικός. The distinction also appears in the paired words *praktikos-gnostikos*, or in a tripartite form *praktikos-physikos-theologikos*. For ancient Greek philosophers, *praktikos* always had a secular connotation denoting either manual work (Plato), or activity in general (Aristotle), or political activity (Stoics), whereas *theoretikos* had a sublime and even divine connotation. Far from accepting the ancient concept of noble LEISURE, church fathers held in high respect the human ability to contemplate; pseudo-Basil (PG 31:1340D–1341A) says that the soul has a twofold force (*dynamis*)—one part giving life to the body, the other contemplative or rational. ORIGEN stressed that contemplative and active life should be complementary: Mary is the symbol of contemplative life, Martha of the practical or active (*Commentary on John* 11:18, frag.80, ed. Preuschen, p.547). EVAGRIOS PONTIKOS took the next step and developed a hierarchical notion: the practical life (which has nothing in common with Aristotelian "activity") is for

Evagrius the first stage of ascetic behavior, the purpose of which is to prepare oneself for contemplation of God; the practical life leads to HESYCHIA, tranquil lucidity. Only after having reached this point is the ascetic ready for genuine contemplation. The Evagrian concept influenced Byz. monastic ethical ideals, including the teaching of Symeon the Theologian.

LIT. A. and C. Guillaumont in *Evagre le Pontique, Traité pratique ou le Moine*, vol. 1 (Paris 1971) 38–63. M.E. Mason, "Active Life" and "Contemplative Life" (Milwaukee 1961).
—A.K.

VITALIAN (Βιταλιανός), usurper (513–15); born Zaldaba in Moesia, died Constantinople after 10 July 520. He was probably the offspring of a mixed marriage since he was called Scythian or Thracian, whereas his mother was a sister of Patr. Makedonios II (496–511). Military commander of barbarian mercenaries in Thrace, Vitalian in 513 revolted against Emp. Anastasios I, attacked the *magister militum* HYPATIOS, and marched on Constantinople, posing as the champion of Orthodoxy. His revolt apparently gained support for both social and political reasons since his army included farmers as well as soldiers. He was initially successful and recognized as *magister militum* of Thrace, but in 515 he was defeated at sea and withdrew into Thrace. After the death of Anastasios in 518, Justin I came to terms with Vitalian and honored him with high office, making him *patrikios* in 518 and consul in 520. He was a strong supporter of Chalcedonian Orthodoxy and took part in negotiations with the papacy to end the AKAKIAN SCHISM. He was murdered in the palace, allegedly at the order of the future Justinian I, who had reasons to fear Vitalian's rivalry.

LIT. Bury, *LRE* 2:447–52. *PLRE* 2:1171–76. W. Ensslin, *RE* 2.R. 9 (1961) 374–78.
—T.E.G.

VITICULTURE. See VINEYARD.

VITIGES (Οὐίτιγης), king of the Ostrogoths (Nov. 536–May 540); died ca.542 on Byz. eastern frontier. An experienced military commander, although not of noble origin, Vitiges was raised on the shield because the Goths resented the sluggish warfare of THEODAHAD. Vitiges married MATASUNTHA to add legitimacy to his rule, but she hated

him personally and politically and became involved in pro-Roman plots. He had to confront BELISARIOS, who entered Rome on 9/10 Dec. 536. Vitiges bought peace with the Franks by ceding them territories in southern Gaul and paying 2,000 pounds of gold; he then besieged Rome at length but in vain. When Byz. troops invaded Picenum in Feb. 538 Vitiges retreated to Ravenna. He tried to draw CHOSROES I into an alliance against Justinian I, but the Persian expedition came too late and the Franks proved dangerous allies. Beleaguered in Ravenna, Vitiges sued for peace, proposing to divide Italy between Byz. and the Goths. Belisarios delayed agreement and, under duress, the Goths opened the gates. Vitiges was arrested and sent to Byz. with his relatives; there, having abjured his Arianism, he received the title of *patrikios* and rich estates on the Persian border, where he died.

LIT. Wolfram, *Goths* 342–52. Stein, *Histoire* 2:347–68. W. Ensslin, *RE* 2.R. 9A 1 (1961) 395–400.

—W.E.K., A.K.

VIVARION (βιβάριον, loanword from Lat. *vivarium*), a preserve for wild animals (Prokopios, *Wars* 5:22.10) or for fish. John TZETZES (*Historiae* 8:142–51 [pp.302f]) relates that Crassus kept a domesticated sea eel in an elaborately ornamented *vivarion*. The word commonly appears in documents of the 13th–15th C., with the meaning of a place to keep fish (a pond, riverbank, or marsh). Charters of 1229–34 mention *vivaria* on the river Hermon that constituted the *pronoia* of a certain Kalegopoulos (MM 4:239.29); in a will of 1284 (*Lavra* 2, no.75.34–35) a *vivarion* is named together with a marshland as one of the "rights" (*dikaia*) conveyed to a certain Theodore Kerameas and, in a *praktikon* of 1301 (Dölger, *Sechs Praktika*, p.36.30), rent for a *vivarion* is mentioned alongside rents for a mooring place (*skaliatikon*) and a place for washing flax (*linobrocheion*). On the other hand, a *praktikon* of 1317 that describes the village of Doxompous, where the inhabitants made their living primarily by FISHING, lists several peasant households in possession of *vivaria*, sometimes as many as 12 to 15 each (*Lavra* 2, no.104.21, 41), in this case, probably small ponds to keep fish.

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 5:341–43. Dölger, *Schatz.* 188, 191.
—J.W.N., A.K.

VIVARIUM MONASTERY (*monasterium Vivariense*), founded by CASSIODORUS in the mid-6th C. on the bay of Squillace, Calabria; the name originates from the fishpond (*vivarium*) on the rocky coast near the modern town of Copanello di Stalletti. It is plausible that Cassiodorus organized the institution after his visit of ca.549–53 to Constantinople, where he learned about the theological school in Nisibis that he decided to emulate (R. Macina, *Muséon* 95 [1982] 131–66). At any rate, Vivarium was modeled on Byz. monasticism, not the Italian practices that are revealed in the contemporary Rules of St. Benedict of Nursia (K. Zelzer, *WS* 19 [1985] 235f). A religious and cultural center developed around the library and scriptorium at Vivarium; many Greek works were translated there into Latin (R. Hanslik, *Philologus* 115 [1971] 107–13): for example, Epiphanius Scholastikos translated church histories of Theodoret, Sozomenos, and Sokrates. After founding Vivarium, Cassiodorus spent the rest of his life in the monastery, although it is unclear whether he himself became a monk. A sarcophagus identified as that of Cassiodorus was found at the Church of San Martino, which is all that remains of the monastery.

LIT. P. Courcelle, "Nouvelles recherches sur le monastère de Cassiodore," 5 *IntCongChrArch* (Rome-Paris 1957) 511–28. A. Van de Vyver, "Les Institutions de Cassiodore et sa fondation à Vivarium," *Revue bénédictine* 53 (1941) 59–88. R. Farioli, "Note sull'edificio tricono di S. Martino nel monastero 'Vivariense sive Castellense' di Cassiodoro," *Magna Graecia* 10.1–2 (1975) 20–22.
—A.K.

VLACHIA (Βλαχία), a district in Thessaly, near HALMYROS, mentioned in some 12th-C. sources, beginning with BENJAMIN OF TUDELA. Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 638.50, with corr. I. Dujčev, *BZ* 72 [1979] 51) speaks of Great (Megale) Vlachia, which he locates near Thessalian METEORA. In the army of MICHAEL II KOMNENOS DOUKAS of Epiros in 1258 were brave soldiers, according to Pachymeres, "whom [his son John] called Megalovlachitai" (Pachym., ed. Failler, 1:117.15). After Pachymeres the term *Megale Vlachia* disappears and reappears only in the 15th C. as a designation not for the district in Thessaly, but for a region on the Lower and Middle Danube (WALLACHIA). Megale Vlachia was an administrative unit: in 1276 the *pinkernes* Raoul Komnenos held the post

of the *kephale* of Megale Vlachia. Besides Great Vlachia there are references to Upper Vlachia in Epiros, Little Vlachia in Acharnania and Aetolia, and "Vlachia in Hellas" (i.e., in Thessaly).

LIT. G. Soulis, "Blachia—Megale Blachia—he en Helladi Blachia," *Geras Antoniou Keramopoulou* (Athens 1953) 489–97. Idem, "The Thessalian Vlachia," *ZRVI* 8.1 (1963) 271–73.
—A.K.

VLACHS (Βλάχοι), an ethnic group that lived in mountainous areas of Thessaly (VLACHIA) and the northern Balkans. They were most probably the descendants of THRACIANS and DACO-GETANS who, under the pressure of Germanic and Avaro-Slavic invasions, migrated to isolated areas. The name first appears in Byz. sources of the 11th C. (Skylitzes, Kekaumenos, then in Anna Komnene); the anonymous chronicle of Bari mentions Vlachs in the Byz. army in Italy between 1025 and 1027 (M. Gyóni, *ActaAntHung* 1 [1951] 235–45). Kekaumenos identified the Vlachs with the Dacians conquered by Trajan—but one should be very cautious with regard to the ethnic perceptions of Byz. authors. The Vlachs earned their living primarily by TRANSHUMANCE and are mentioned in registers of monasteries as sheep- and cattle-owners. By the end of the 11th C., Vlach DOULOΠΑΡΟΙΚΟΙ played an important role in the economy of Mt. ATHOS; Alexios I, however, expelled the Vlachs from the Holy Mountain, to the great regret of the monks (Meyer, *Haupturkunden* 163). Sometimes the Byz. government confiscated lands that the Vlachs considered as their [common?] property; thus, in 1293 Andronikos II conferred upon a certain Leo Koteanitzes the land in Preasnitz "taken from various Vlachs" (*Chil.*, no.11.6–7).

The Byz. sources preserve a view of Vlachs as liars, thieves, and unbelievers, who make solemn oaths and then immediately break them (Kek. 268.14–21). It remains under discussion whether the Byz. were able or willing to distinguish between Vlachs and Bulgarians; the identity of the Blachoi who played the leading role in the revolt against the Byz. in 1185 (Nik.Chon. 368.53–57) is thus unclear.

LIT. D. Dvoichenko-Markov, "The Vlachs," *Byzantion* 54 (1984) 508–26. V. Marinov, "Rasselenie pastuchov-kočevnikov vlahov na Balkanskom poluostrove i za ego predelami," in *Slavjano-Vološkie svjazi* (Kišinev 1978) 162–77. G.

Litavrin, "Vlachi vizantijskich istočnikov," *Jugovostočnaja Evropa v srednje veka* (Kišinev 1972) 91–138. P. Nästurel, "Les Valaques balcaniques aux Xe–XIIIe siècles," *ByzF* 7 (1979) 89–112. T.J. Winnifrieth, *The Vlachs* (New York 1987) 39–122. —A.K.

VLADIMIR, prince of GALITZA (from 1141); born ca. 1110, died 1153. He was the grandson of Rostislav of Tmutorakan and Lanka, daughter of Béla I of Hungary. Involved in constant conflicts with Polish and Volhynian princes and, from 1146, with Hungary and Kiev, Vladimir concluded an alliance with Byz., probably ca. 1146–47. Kinnamos (Kinn. 115.18–19) describes him as "a man allied with (*hypospondos*) the Romans," which suggests the existence of a treaty, but which has been wrongly interpreted as denoting Vladimir's vassalage. In Manuel I's war against Hungary, Vladimir and JURIJ DOLGORUKIJ were Byz.'s allies. With Byz. support, Vladimir established the bishopric of Halič ca. 1150. His son Jaroslav Osmomysl' (1153–87) briefly supported the future emperor Andronikos I Komnenos before returning to the alliance with Manuel I.

LIT. Hruševs'kyi, *Istorija* 2:417–36. G. Vernadsky, "Relations byzantino-russes au XII^e siècle," *Byzantion* 4 (1927–28) 273–76. V. Pašuto, *Vnešnjaia politika drevnej Rusi* (Moscow 1968) 167–69, 173–78. —An.P.

VLADIMIR (Russian town). See SUZDAL'.

VLADIMIR I (Βλαδιμηρός), prince of Kiev, son of SVJATOSLAV and grandson of IGOR; sole ruler of Kievan Rus' (from 980); baptismal name Basil; died 15 July 1015. In Sept. 987 Vladimir I formed an alliance with Basil II, sealed a year later by Vladimir's marriage to Basil's sister ANNA. Vladimir was baptized on Epiphany, the multitude of Kievans probably on Pentecost 988, and a metropolitan see subordinate to Constantinople was established in Kiev. Vladimir sent several thousand warriors from Rus' to fight in battles at Bithynian Chrysopolis (Jan. 989) and at Abydos (13 April 989), contributing to Basil's victory over Bardas PHOKAS. CHERSON, which rebelled against the emperor, was captured by other troops of Vladimir before 27 July 989. (According to the traditional view, Cherson was taken by the still-pagan Vladimir in order to accelerate his marriage.) During Vladimir's reign, auxiliary troops

from Rus' participated in Basil's campaigns in Asia Minor and against Bulgaria.

In the *Povest' vremennykh let* the baptism of Vladimir and Rus' is presented as determined by Providence, with the Greeks as its agents. The conversion of Rus' was mistrusted in Byz. society: Basil's allies were regarded as an apocalyptic force that threatened the empire.

LIT. Poppe, *Christian Russia*, pt. II (1976), 197–244. —An.P.

VLADIMIR MONOMACH, prince of Perejaslav' (1094–1113) and Kiev (1113–25); his father was VSEVOLOD, prince of Kiev, and his mother was allegedly a daughter of CONSTANTINE IX MONOMACHOS (V.G. Brjusova, *VizVrem* 28 [1968] 127–35); born 1053, died 19 May 1125 at L'to River. In his foreign policy Vladimir tried to secure southern Rus' against the CUMANS through concerted action by the Rjurikid princes. In 1116–18 he encroached on Byz. interests by sanctioning two attempts to occupy towns on the lower Danube, the first led by the enigmatic Leo, known to some sources as "son of Diogenes," who was probably related to Vladimir by marriage (M. Mathieu, *Byzantion* 22 [1952] 133–48; A. Gorskiy, *Istoričeskie zapiski* 115 [1987] 308–328). If there was a rift with Byz., it was apparently healed by 1122, when Vladimir's granddaughter was married into the Komnenian lineage. A later Muscovite legend casts Vladimir as a powerful tsar who was kept from attacking Constantinople only by rich gifts from Alexios I Komnenos.

Vladimir's image as the model prince of Rus' stems largely from his cultural activities, including a redaction of the *POVEST' VREMENNYKH LET* that he sponsored, his correspondence with Metr. NIKEPHOROS I, and esp. his *Instruction* [*Poučenie*] to his children (ca. 1124?), a kind of MIRROR OF PRINCES mixed with autobiography. It was included in the *Povest' vremennykh let*. Vladimir quotes from translated compilations of patristic writings (F. Thomson, *Slavica Gandensia* 10 [1983] 20f, 84f). Thematic parallels have been found in various paraenetic works from Byz. and western Europe (M.P. Alekseev, *TODRL* 2 [1935] 39–80; T. Čyževska, *WSJb* 2 [1952] 157–60); its sources include Byz. liturgies (N.V. Šljakov, *ŽMNP* [June 1900] 227–37) and patristic authors, such as BASIL THE GREAT (L. Müller, *RM* 1 [1973] 30–48).

ED. *Povest' vremennykh let*, ed. D.S. Lichačev (Moscow-Leningrad 1950) 1:153–67, 2:425–57.

LIT. A.S. Orlov, *Vladimir Monomach* (Moscow-Leningrad 1946). Fennell-Stokes, *Russ. Lit.* 64–79. Podskalsky, *Rus'* 215–18. D. Obolensky, *Six Byzantine Portraits* (Oxford 1988) 83–114. —S.C.F., P.A.H.

VLADISLAV III JAGELLO, or Władysław III Jagiełło (Λαδίσλαος), king of Poland from 1434 and of Hungary from 1440 (as Ulászló I); born Krakow 31 Oct. 1424, died Varna 10 Nov. 1444. With the support of HUNYADI, who had secured the young king's victory over his Habsburg rivals in Hungary, Vladislav fought a victorious campaign in 1443/4 against the Turks and in 1444 agreed to the secret peace negotiations of Hunyadi and GEORGE BRANKOVIĆ with the Ottoman sultan MURAD II. Although a treaty was signed at Szeged in August 1444—securing a ten-year truce, reinstating Branković in Serbia, and promising tribute and aid from the sultan for Hungary—Vladislav was persuaded by the papal legate, Giuliano Cesarini, to break the peace and lead a Polish-Hungarian army against the Turks, having been assured of Venetian and papal support. This Crusade of VARNA ended in disaster, however; the legate and Vladislav perished while fighting heroically. According to Chalkokondyles (Chalk. 2:106–08), the young king tried personally to attack the sultan but was surrounded by janissaries and killed; his head was brought to Murad.

LIT. J.J. Dąbrowski, *Władysław I Jagiełłończyk na Węgrzech 1440–1444* (Warsaw 1922). A.S. Atiya, *HC* 3:654–56. B. Cvetkova, "Die Feldzüge Wladislaw III. Jagiello und Ianku de Hunedoara (1443–1444), der Südosten Europas und die Bulgaren," *RESEE* 19 (1981) 17–29. Ch. Kolarov, "Ostüpleniето na krüstonosnata armija na kral Vladislav III Jagelo po vreme na pürvija mu pohod na Balkanite (1443–1444 g.)," *Bülgarsko srednovekovie* (Sofia 1980) 105–12. —J.B., A.K.

VLASTIMIR (Βλαστίμηρος), mid-9th-C. Serbian prince (*archon*); son of Prosegoes and grandson of Rodoslav. According to Constantine VII (*De adm. imp.* 32.33–38), these princes were "in servitude and submission" to Byz. During Vlastimir's rule Presian of Bulgaria (836–52) unsuccessfully attacked the Serbs. V. Zlatarski (*Ist.* 1.1:346) suggests that the Serbo-Bulgarian war lasted from 839 to 842, and that it was Emp. THEOPHILOS who incited Vlastimir against Presian. Constantine also records that Vlastimir married his daughter to Kraina, *župan* (ruler) of Terbounia and pro-

claimed him an independent *archon* (*De adm. imp.* 34.7–10). After Vlastimir's death, three of his sons, Muntimer, Strimer, and Goinikos, divided up the country.

LIT. G. Ostrogorsky, "Porfirogenitova hronika srpskih vladara," *Istoriski časopis* 1 (1948) 25. —A.K.

VODENA (τὰ Βοδηνά), ancient Edessa, a city in southern Macedonia on the via Egnatia, controlling the entrance to a pass through the mountains. In the 7th C. Edessa was a bishopric. The Slavic name Vodena appears first in the story of Basil II's capture of the stronghold (*phourion*) in 1001 (Skyl. 345.20–24). Zlatarski (*Ist.* 1.2:654f), however, hypothesized that Vodena and not VIDIN had been a center of the ΚΟΜΕΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΙ in the late 10th C. Due to its strategic importance, Vodena was often fought over: thus, BOHEMUND temporarily captured it in 1083; John III Vatatzes, during his campaign against Thessalonike, occupied Vodena in 1253; John VI Kantakouzenos disputed it with the Serbians; and it was taken by STEFAN UROŠ IV DUŠAN in Jan. 1351. Little is known of the administrative organization of Byz. Vodena. An 11th-C. seal of a *doux* of Edessos (Zacos, *Seals* 1.3, no.2686) may refer to Vodena. An enigmatic list of the estates of Lavra monastery mentions the *archontia* of Vodena (*Lavra* 1, app. II.50), and in a charter of 1375 THOMAS PRELJUBOVIĆ named himself the lord of the *toparchia* and *kastron* of Vodena (*Lavra* 3:146.17–18). In an ecclesiastical list of Bulgaria (11th to the beginning of the 12th C.) two bishoprics are named: Edessa or MOGLENA and Vodena (*Notitiae CP* no.13.839–41). The Ottoman Ghāzī Evrenos seized the fortress in the late 14th C.

LIT. J. Ferluga, *LMA* 3:1565–67. —R.B., A.K.

VOISLAV, STEFAN, ruler (*archon*) of the Serbians, according to Skylitzes (Skyl. 408.73–74); born in Brusna, a district of Drina, died between 1043 and 1052. Reared in Bosnia and Dubrovnik, Voislav (Βοϊσθλάβος) married a relative of SAMUEL OF BULGARIA, according to the PRIEST OF DIOKLEIA (343f). Voislav revolted against Byz. rule ca. 1034. He was captured and taken to Constantinople. Escaping before 1040, he renewed his rebellion. The Byz. governor Theophilos Erotikos was expelled from Diokleia, where Voislav established

an independent principality. Kekaumenos (Kek. 170.30) calls him toparch, indicating an alliance with Byz. Voislav subdued some Dalmatian fortresses and Ston, north of Dubrovnik. The revolt of DELJAN helped Voislav consolidate his power. Voislav's struggles with Byz. proved victorious; he seized a Byz. treasure ship wrecked off Diokleia, refused Michael IV's demand for restitution, and destroyed Byz. troops sent against him under George Probatas. He also defeated (ca. 1042) the army of Michael, *strategos* of Dyrrachion, which was supported by the princes of Raška and Zachlumia, and enlarged his territories. Voislav's victory and the subsequent escape of Byz. troops through subterranean galleries are depicted in the Madrid Skylitzes MS (Grabar-Manoussacas, *Sky-litzès*, nos. 543–44). After Voislav's death, his son Michael (Michaelas) emerged as "*archegos* of the Triballians and Serbians" (Skyl. 475.13–14); he signed a treaty with Byz. and received the title of *protospatharios*.

LIT. Fine, *Early Balkans* 203–07, 211–13. Ferluga, *Byzantium* 371–75. Idem in *VizIzvori* 3:156–62. T. Wasilewski, "Stefan Vojislav de Zahumlje, Stefan Dobroslav de Zéta et Byzance au milieu du XIe siècle," *ZRVI* 13 (1971) 109–26. —C.M.B., A.K., A.C.

VOITECH, GEORGE, a Bulgarian magnate in Skopje; died 1073? According to SKYLITZES CONTINUATUS (163.14–15) Voitech (Βοϊτάχος) was kin to the Kopchanoi, whom Zlatarski (*Ist.* 2:138, n.1) understood as *kauchans* (anc. Bulg. "aristocrats"). Voitech's rebellion in Skopje, probably in Aug.–Sept. 1072, was supported by the ruler of DIOKLEIA, who sent an army under CONSTANTINE BODIN and general Petrilos to aid Voitech. They shunted him aside, defeated the Byz. *strategos* Damianos DALASSENOS, and occupied the theme of Bulgaria by seizing Ohrid and Devol. Petrilos lost a battle at Kastoria and retreated to Diokleia. A Byz. army commanded by Michael Saronites approached Skopje, and Voitech agreed to betray the town in exchange for his personal safety. He then changed his mind and summoned Bodin's army from Niš (Dec. 1072). Bodin, however, was defeated and captured. The Byz. took Voitech captive; he died from torture on the way to Constantinople.

LIT. Fine, *Early Balkans* 213f. Litavrin, *Bolgarija i Vizantija* 402–10. —A.K., C.M.B.

VOLUME STYLE, a term introduced by E. Kitzinger (*DOP* 20 [1966] 31f, 45) to denote a phase of 13th–14th-C. Byz. art first thoroughly analyzed by Demus. Most clearly identifiable in MONUMENTAL PAINTING of the second and third quarters of the 13th C., esp. in Serbia, the "volume style" is distinguished by an exaggerated sense of sculptural monumentality. Apparently a reaction to the highly mannered trend of the later 12th C. known as the DYNAMIC STYLE, it continued into the 14th C. in a more decorative form at the CHORA MONASTERY in Constantinople. Kitzinger argued that this style, with its evocation of classical antiquity, exercised a formative impact on Italian Renaissance painting, and specifically on Giotto.

LIT. O. Demus, "Die Entstehung des Paläologenstils in der Malerei," 11 *CEB* (Munich 1958) 26–31. —G.V.

VOTIVES (ἀφιερωτικοί). Objects of varying shapes and decoration were offered at Byz. shrines for the continuance of a donor's prayers, either of supplication or thanksgiving, reflecting a pagan tradition (THEODORET OF CYRRHUS, *Cure of Pagan Maladies* 8, 64). Leaf-shaped silver plaques (*pinakes*) with CHRISTOGRAMS survive from the 4th C.; the 6th-C. MA'ARAT AL-NU'MĀN TREASURE includes one large pentagonal version with a representation, possibly of St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger, and a group of very small plaques with orant figures or pairs of eyes. Such objects belong to a subcategory of votives directly associated with PILGRIMAGE. Other than graffiti—usually invoking intercession for travelers or for those who stayed behind—pilgrims' votives were generally of two sorts. On the one hand, valued possessions, such as jewelry or pack animals, were deposited as thanks for blessings received or anticipated; thus, the Holy Sepulchre was laden with "bracelets, rings, tiaras, plaited girdles, belts, emperors' crowns of gold and precious stones" (PIACENZA PILGRIM, ed. Wilkinson, *Pilgrims* 18); later on, numerous icons were added to the array (P. Nordhagen, *DOP* 41 [1987] 453–60). The THEKLA shrine at Meriamlik was richly endowed with votive birds, some from exotic lands, which gave delight to the children who played in the gardens of the sanctuary (vita of Thekla, ed. Dagron, 350.23–352.32). On the other hand, inscribed artifacts—plaques, crosses, metal or clay body parts—were left to

record a specific request or thanks. SOPHRONIOS of Jerusalem describes such a votive at the shrine of Sts. KYROS AND JOHN (*Miracles* 69) recording the cure of a blind man from Rome.

A number of major works of Byz. art were votive (*ex voto*) offerings. The earliest surviving large-scale iconic figures are the votive mosaics in the Church of St. DEMETRIOS in Thessalonike; famous sumptuary objects—the cross of Justin II and Sophia in Rome, the crown of Leo VI in Venice—were votive gifts; innumerable icons were *ex votos*—visitors to Constantinople speak of icon painters outside Hagia Sophia ready to supply icons for votive offerings. The many small, repetitive icons at the monastery on Mt. Sinai indicate that pilgrims often left votive icons there.

Chapels attached to urban sanctuaries and many of the tiny churches that dot Byz. villages were votive offerings by individuals; the lower walls, piers, and narthexes of countless provincial church buildings are layered with frescoed panels that depict a saint and a donor and include a votive inscription.

LIT. H. Leclercq, *DACL* 5.1:1037–49. Mango, *Silver* 240–45. Vikan, *Pilgrimage Art* 44–46. —G.V., M.M.M., A.W.C.

VOUSSOIR, a masonry unit of an ARCH, usually a wedge-shaped block of stone whose tapering sides are cut to align with radii of the arch. The units of a brick arch are sometimes slightly wedge-shaped. The voussoir at the crown of the arch is called the keystone; when it is in place, the arch forms a stable, self-supporting unit. On brick arches, voussoirs were sometimes simulated with marble revetment. The sides of voussoirs could be notched or "joggled" to lock into adjacent members (Aphentiko, MISTRA; PAMMAKARISTOS Church, Constantinople) or simply to create a surface pattern (Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon*, fig.155).

LIT. A.K. Orlandos, "He orthomarmarosis tou en Mystra naou tes Hodegetrias (Aphentikou)," *ABME* 1 (1935) 155–57. —N.E.L., W.L.

VOYAGE DE CHARLEMAGNE À JÉRUSALEM ET À CONSTANTINOPLE, epic poem whose semicomical account of Charlemagne's fictional trip to Jerusalem and his stay in Constan-

tinople is related to the *chansons de geste* and foreshadows the genre of "romans d'Orient." The sole MS is in the Anglo-Norman dialect. The work's date is controversial: theories range from the late 11th C. to between ca. 1217 and 1263, when it was translated into Old Norse. Its theme of Passion relics at St. Denis may reflect the long controversy between that abbey and the bishop of Paris over the Lendit fair. The *Voyage* reflects Western attitudes and keen interest in Byz. during a period of intensifying contacts and crusades. The description of wares and location of markets at Jerusalem near Ste. Marie Latine seems to fit the situation between ca. 1125 and 1150 (J. Richard, *RBPH* 43 [1965] 552–55). The bulk of the tale takes place in Constantinople at the court of a Byz. King Hugh, where a spy overhears Charlemagne's peers and their drunken boasting, and they are forced to perform as promised. This they do, thanks to relics: for example, Olivier successfully makes love to the Byz. princess 30 times in one night (vv. 692–734), and Hugh becomes Charlemagne's vassal. Constantinople, its domed architecture, perfumed gardens, and magical palace—with its iconography and AUTOMATA (some details fit with the *Patria of Constantinople*: M. Schlauch, *Speculum* 7 [1932] 500–14)—even the Byz. emperor's plow, are described in great and imaginative detail.

ED. J.-L.G. Picherit, *The Journey of Charlemagne to Jerusalem and Constantinople* (Birmingham, Ala., 1984), with Eng. tr.

LIT. M. Gosman, "La propagande politique dans Le Voyage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et à Constantinople," *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 102 (1986) 53–66. G. Van Belle, "Le voyage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et à Constantinople—Pour une approche narratologique," *RBPH* 64 (1986) 465–72. —M.McC.

VRAP, a mountainous village in Albania, near ancient Clodiana, a station on the Via EGNATIA. Before 1902 local inhabitants discovered there a hoard of gold, silver, and bronze objects; a part of the same group was found in 1894 in Erseke, on the Greco-Albanian frontier. The treasure contained, together with Avar belt buckles, etc., Byz. vessels, sometimes with Greek inscriptions, and two chalices, one decorated with *tychai* in relief (*Age of Spirit.*, no.156), now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. Two Byz. silver plates from Erseke (now in private hands) bear stamps

of Constans II, suggesting a date in the late 7th C. for this group. Certain pieces seem to have been produced in local workshops by craftsmen with "Byz. experience." Werner suggested that the hoard belonged to an Avar *khagan*. Lemerle (*Aphieroma Svoronos* 1:56–58) argued that it could not have been that of Kouber.

LIT. J. Werner, *Der Schatzfund von Vrap in Albanien* (Vienna 1986), rev. É. Garam, *BJb* 187 (1987) 854–57.
—A.K.

VSEVOLOD, prince of KIEV; son of JAROSLAV; baptismal name Andrej; born 1030, died Kiev 13 Apr. 1093. Sometime between 1047 and 1052 he married a relative of Constantine IX Monomachos. After his father's death (1054) Vsevolod, as prince of Perejaslavl', ruled Kievan Rus' together with his older brothers Izjaslav of Kiev and Svjatoslav of Černigov. As a consequence of this triarchy, the bishoprics of Perejaslavl' and Černigov were elevated in the 1060s to titular metropolitan sees. In 1078, Vsevolod became the ruler of all Rus'. He supported the attempts of JOHN II, metropolitan of Kiev, to restore Kievan church jurisdiction over Perejaslavl' and Černigov. Vsevolod contributed to the increased veneration of his saintly patron; probably at this time the legend of the journey of the apostle ANDREW to the Dnieper region was developed. Vsevolod was the first prince of Rus' who, while continuing to use seals with Greek inscriptions (as did his predecessors), also used seals similar to Byz. ones but with Slavic inscriptions.

LIT. Hruševs'kyi, *Istorija* 2:47–81. Poppe, *Christian Russia*, pts.IV, VII–IX. A. Soloviev, *Byzance et la formation de l'État russe* (London 1979), pts.V–VI.
—An.P.

VUKAŠIN, Serbian king (*kralj*; *krales* in the Greek sources) and co-ruler with STEFAN UROŠ V (from Aug./Sept. 1365); died at Černomen on the Marica River 26 Sept. 1371. According to Chalkokondyles, Vukašin was cupbearer (*oinochos*) of STEFAN UROŠ IV DUŠAN, while his brother JOHN UGLJEŠA served the tsar as *hippokomos*, or groom. In 1350 Dušan appointed Vukašin *župan* in Prilep. After Dušan's death, Vukašin expanded his holdings in Macedonia and Kosovo Polje; Tsar Stefan Uroš V gave him the title of *despotes* in 1364 and *kralj* in 1365. Gradually Vukašin acquired dominance over his co-ruler Uroš V; correspondence with Dubrovnik shows him acting in his own name alone. Since Uroš V was childless, Vukašin crowned his son MARKO KRALJEVIĆ as "junior ruler." The rise to power of Vukašin and John Uglješa caused jealous opposition among a number of influential Serbian lords. The Serbian forces were thus weakened at the time of the battle of MARICA against the Turks, when both Vukašin and Uglješa were killed and the Serbian army was defeated. Marko succeeded his father, but had to recognize the suzerainty of the Ottoman sultan.

Joint portraits of Uroš and Vukašin are represented at the Psača monastery, with Uroš in the senior position.

LIT. Fine, *Late Balkans* 362–64. Mihaljčić, *Kraj carstva* 80–163. Ostrogorsky, *Serska oblast* 7–14, 18–21. K. Jireček, *Zbornik* 1 (Belgrade 1959), pt. X, 339–85.
—J.S.A.

W

WĀDĪ NAṬRŪN (Sketis [Σκητῖς], Coptic Shiet), west of the Nile Delta, one of the most famous Early Christian monastic centers in Egypt, thought to have been founded by MAKARIOS THE GREAT ca.300. The anchorites joining him lived in individual small houses (*kellia*), usually accompanied by a younger monk who saw to the food supply; there were no shared refectories. The monks' daily occupation consisted of prayer and simple handicrafts (e.g., basketwork), and the products were sold in nearby markets. The monks assembled in church only on Sundays for the liturgy. By the late 4th C. four churches were attested. The present four monasteries in Wādī Naṭrūn represent a development after the 9th C., when for security reasons monks settled within an area surrounded by a high wall. Each monastery had its own multistoried defense tower (*jawsaq*), refectories, a guesthouse, and several decorated churches, of which the earliest belong to the late 7th or early 8th C.

LIT. H.G. Evelyn White, *The Monasteries of the Wādī'n Natrūn*, 3 vols. (New York 1926–33; rp. 1973). P. Grossmann, *Mittelalterliche Langhauskuppelkirchen und verwandte Typen in Oberägypten* (Glückstadt 1982) 112–15, 122f, 206–08, 213–15. J. Leroy, *Les peintures des couvents du Ouadi Natroun* (Cairo 1982).
—P.G.

WAGES (*μισθός*, *μισθωμα*) were paid to agricultural hired workers and apprentices (both called *MISTHIOI*) as well as to construction workers and some professionals (clergy, hospital physicians, teachers) on a daily, monthly, or annual basis. Wages could also be paid for services on a piecework principle: to a craftsman for a specially commissioned object, to a contractor for erecting a building, to a doctor as an honorarium, to a scribe for copying a book; payment to a prostitute was also called *misthos*. Another form of wages was a percentage share: the scribe of a *taboullarios* received 2 *keratia* for each nomisma earned by his master, that is, 1/12 of his pay. Wages were paid primarily in money, but also in grain, olive oil, wine, etc.

Concrete data on wages are scanty: in Egyptian papyri the annual wages of a hired worker average around 6 nomismata a year, whereas a shipbuilder received 2 nomismata monthly; hagiographical sources of the 6th–7th C. give 1 *keration* a day as a typical figure. A 14th-C. textbook of MATHEMATICAL PROBLEMS (K. Vogt, *Ein byzantinisches Rechenbuch des frühen 14. Jahrhunderts* [Vienna 1968], no.51) calculates the daily earning of a worker as 10 assaria (copper coins). Monastic *typika* provide evidence for the salary (in kind and money) of the monastery's steward, physician, and clergy, as well as hospital employees (e.g., P. Gautier, *REB* 32 [1974] 99.1176–105.1289). Women seem to have been paid two to three times less than men (Fikhman, *Egipet* 76f); the woman physician at the Pantokrator hospital in Constantinople received half the salary of her male colleagues (P. Gautier, *supra* 101.1198–99).

Wages were established by private agreement and fixed in CONTRACTS, but the state had control over both wages and PRICES. Diocletian's PRICE EDICT is an example of such control in late antiquity, while the BOOK OF THE EPARCH regulated the size and the form of payment in 10th-C. Constantinople: the contract was not to exceed 30 days, and attempts to increase wages in order to attract the services of another man's *misthios* were punished. Laborers and professionals used the strike as a means to increase their wages: the evidence about the strike of construction workers in Constantinople between 481 and 491 may be questionable (H.G. Beck, *BZ* 66 [1973] 268); much more reliable is the statement of Attaleiates (*Attal.* 204.5–6) that *mistharnountes* in Rhaidestos demanded that their wages be increased in accordance with rising prices. The clergy of Hagia Sophia went on strike in 1307 because the patriarchal treasury did not have sufficient funds to pay them (A.M. Talbot, *DOP* 27 [1973] 25f).

The salary (ROGA) of high-ranking officials was much higher than artisans' wages: according to Justinian's law of 534, the prefect of Africa was paid 100 litrae of gold yearly; Ibn Khurdādhbeh