SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES

No 2 • 2016

SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES

Vol. 2 2016

We gratefully thank the
Ouranis Foundation, Athens
for the financial support of the present volume

Printed by MediaTryck 2016
Layout: Bengt Pettersson

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

BOOK REVIEWS

Editorial

I am pleased to present the second volume of the Scandinavian Journal for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies. This journal is open for unpublished articles and book reviews related to Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies in the fields of philology, linguistics, history and literature. It is published in collaboration with Greek and Byzantine Studies at Uppsala University and we welcome contributions not only from Scandinavian colleagues, but from scholars all around the world.

The current volume includes seven articles, all of Byzantine interest and with a special focus on the city of Constantinople, along with two book reviews. In times when the humanities in several European universities are in danger – a fact sadly reflected in the closure of Modern Greek at the University of Copenhagen for financial reasons – it is crucial to underline and display the importance of the continuation of humanities, not the least the Greek tradition all the way up to Modern Greek studies.

Vassilios Sabatakakis
Modern Greek Studies
Lund university

Instructions for contributors to

SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES

SJBMGS encourages scholarly contributions within Byzantine and Modern Greek philology and history.

Manuscripts of articles to be considered for publication should be sent to Marianna.Smaragdi@klass.lu.se or Marianna Smaragdi, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University, Box 201, 22100 Lund, Sweden.

Your article will be refereed. If it is accepted for publication, you will be asked to supply a final version on e-mail. Authors will receive five copies of the journal volume.

The SJBMGS is a nonprofit venture to be distributed on an exchange basis to scholars and libraries.

Copyright: The authors and the editor.

Editorial Board:
Panagiotis Agapitos, professor, University of Cyprus
Demetrios Agoritsas, PhD
Christoforos Charalambakis, professor, University of Athens
Eric Cullhed, PhD, researcher, Uppsala University
Olof Heilo, PhD, deputy director, The Swedish Research Institute, Istanbul
David Holton, professor emeritus, University of Cambridge
Christian Høgel, professor wso, University of Southern Denmark
Ingela Nilsson, professor, Uppsala University
Staffan Wahlgren, professor, NTNU, Trondheim

Editor-in-chief:
Vassilios Sabatakakis
vassilios.sabatakakis@klass.lu.se

Magical Constantinople: statues, legends, and the end of time

Albrecht Berger
University of Munich

When emperor Constantine the Great laid the first stone of Constantinople in 324, he did this at a place which had not been empty before. Instead, his foundation superseded and replaced the old Greek city of Byzantion. Constantinople was therefore a newly founded city with a long history, though not a history of the importance which was required for a new seat of government which, after a few decades, also became the new capital.[1] The result was that this missing history had to be constructed subsequently, that is, that the missing imperial traditions had to be invented.

The cometlike rise of Constantinople must have been watched by its own inhabitants and by the inhabitants of other cities with a mixture of admiration and astonishment. How was it possible that this ancient, but small and run-down place rose so suddenly to be the capital of the whole eastern empire? The volition of emperor Constantine alone could not suffice as an explanation for this – with the result that emperor Septimius Severus, who had actually destroyed Byzantion in the year 196 after a civil war in which the city had joined the side of his opponent Pescennius Niger, was credited with its rebuilding, which in fact took place long after his death.[2] In this way, the imperial history of Constantinople had become longer by more than a century. And if Severus rebuilt the city, as it was claimed, he must also have left visible traces in it. This is the origin of the legend which says that the Hippodrome and the imperial

[1] Dagron 1974: 13–76.
[2] Dagron 1974: 15–19.

palace were begun already by Septimius Severus, when he rebuilt Byzantion, but were left unfinished after his death, and completed only more than hundred years later by Constantine.[3] In addition to Constantine and Severus, also Byzas was finally introduced into the urban legend, the legendary king and founder of Byzantion in the seventh century BC. In this way, a ideological concept was formed which Gilbert Dagron once called a "trinity of founders".[4]

But the alleged rebuilding of Byzantion by a Roman emperor was not enough to explain its rise to a capital. Ways had to be found to make it equal in rank with Rome itself, and this was achieved by various legends. The first of them claims that Constantine, coming from Rome, brought a group of Roman senators with him to colonize his new city. This story actually supports the idea of Roman imperial continuity, but soon it is also told that the Romans, being descendants of the Trojans, returned to the East to take possession again of their old empire.[5] By the sixth century, another detail was added, namely that Constantine secretly removed the Palladium from the Temple of Vesta in Rome, brought it to Constantinople, and buried it under the forum near his triumphal column. The Palladium is the wooden figure of Pallas Athena allegedly fallen from the sky before time immemorial, which the Greeks had stolen before Troy, and which later, in Italy, returned to the possession of the emigrant Trojans, that is of the Romans.[6] The whole pagan legend of the Palladion, however, was by no means uncontroversial, and there was also a Christian legend which claimed that the empress Helena had brought some relics of the true cross from Jerusalem which were hidden by her son Constantine in his statue on top of the large porphyry column on the Forum,[7] or other relics of Christ under it.[8] Both traditions, the

[3] The construction of both may actually have been started by Licinius, Constantine's brother-in-law and last opponent, who had resided in Byzantion before his final defeat at Chrysopolis in 324.

[4] Dagron 1984: 61–97.

[5] Dagron 1974: 29–31.

[6] Prokopios, *Wars* 1.15.9–14; Ioannes Malalas 13.7 (246.83–6 ed. Thurn); see Dagron 1974: 39.

[7] Sokrates, *Church history* 1.17.7–8.

[8] Parastaseis, in Cameron and Herrin 1984: ch. 9 and 23.

Trojan or Roman on the one hand and the Christian one on the other, coexisted unconnected for centuries, until they were finally merged into one, with the result that the Palladium and Christ's relics lay buried, in the imagination of the Constantinopolitans, side by side under the Forum.

Then, in the mid-sixth century, a heavy crisis set in which soon threatened the empire and its capital severely. Constantinople was besieged several times, though never taken; its population declined rapidly, perhaps to a tenth of its previous number, and building activities ceased almost completely for about 150 years.[9] We do not know what happened to the old urban elites during the Dark Ages, as this period is often called, but it is obvious that the cultural tradition of the city suffered a major break. Constantinople, it seems, became a place unknown to its own inhabitants, and its history, both real and imagined, fell into oblivion and into the darkness of legend. Life among the ruins of the own great past, and between pagan statues whose real meaning was forgotten, seems to have been a threatening experience, and the way used to cope with this situation was, not surprisingly, the invention of new and very different legends.

The decoration with statues was an important element of all ancient cities. When Constantinople was founded, a sufficient quantity of them was not available, and so many statues and other objects of art were brought, in the hundred years after the inauguration of Constantinople in the year 330, to the city from the whole empire, especially from the East, and set up as a decoration in palaces, on public squares and streets, and in the Hippodrome.[10] Many of them were destroyed in the course of time, and only few survive as spoils of war in western Europe where they were brought after the crusader's conquest of Constantinople in 1204.[11] Among them, to name just a few examples, was a statue of

[9] Mango 1990: 51.

[10] Mango 1963: 55–7; Bassett 2004: 37–49.

[11] Such as the so-called Colossus of Barletta, probably a statue of emperor Leon I, or the four brazen horses at Saint Mark's in Venice, a work of the Hellenistic age which originally belonged to a quadriga; on which see Mango 1963: 68.

Athena in front of the Senate in the Forum and a Zeus from Dodone in the new Senate. Famous were the statue collections of the eunuch Lausos from the 420s, which had, however, already been destroyed by fire in 476;[12] or the collection in the courtyard of the Zeuxippos baths which included over seventy pieces and perished in the fire of 532;[13] and especially the statues in the Hippodrome, where many of them survived until the Fourth Crusade in 1204.[14]

In the early days of Constantinople these statues may still have been perceived simply as a fitting decoration for a big city; statues of emperors and dignitaries were still sporadically set up, though mostly originating from the reworking of older statues.[15] But during the heavy political crisis in the seventh century the production of marble and bronze statues ended completely, while the style of the contemporaneous art production changed dramatically. And as already mentioned, it was often forgotten whom these statues actually represented. The naturalistic, often life-sized marble and bronze statues must have made a strange and frightening impression on a simple resident of the city without a classical cultural background. However, it is surprising to see how rarely they were openly rejected because of their nudity or their being half-dressed. It is a remarkable exception, therefore, if the *Life of Saint Andrew the Fool*, a text from the tenth century, once edited by the late Lennart Rydén, tells us the episode of a woman who suffered from disturbing dreams, and in one such dream saw herself standing in the Hippodrome, embracing the statues there, and was urged by an impure desire to have intercourse with them.[16] In any case, the ancient Greek religion was now mostly considered as idolatry which included also magical practices.

---

[12] Mango–Vickers–Francis 1992; Bassett 2004: 98–120.

[13] On which see Stupperich 1965; Bassett 2004: 51–8; Kaldellis 2007; Martins de Jesus 2014.

[14] Their destruction after the conquest by the crusaders is described by Niketas Choniates in his well-known *Book of the statues*; on which see now Papamastorakis 2009; cf. also Bassett 2004: 58–67.

[15] The most prominent case being the equestrian statue of Justinian on his column near Hagia Sophia, which was in fact a reworked statue of Arkadios from the Forum Tauri; see Mango 1993; Effenberger 2008.

[16] Rydén 1995: line 2492 with p. 332 n. 10.

Many ancient works of art, which represented pagans and pagan gods, were now perceived as a demonic threat.[17] Many of them, on the other hand, were also believed to be talismans, that is, a means of a protective spell or a carrier of an apocalyptic prophecy.

An important source for such interpretations of ancient statuary is the so-called *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai*, the "short chronistic presentations", a work of the late eighth or ninth century on the local history of Constantinople[18] – although it must be admitted that many of the explanations given were probably not taken seriously by the anonymous author himself, but were introduced as a sort of play or as a slightly reserved digression into the beliefs of an uneducated mass. This reception of ancient statues in the city, however, began already long before the *Parastaseis*, namely in the sixth century, when the political catastrophe still lay in the future. In the chronicle of John Malalas, it is the philosopher Apollonios of Tyana who made these magic statues, by which all sorts of mischief is kept away from Constantinople.[19] Although Apollonios lived in the first century AD, he is transposed by later Byzantine sources to the time of Constantine the Great, in order to make his works in Constantinople more plausible.[20] Among the talismans, which Apollonios of Tyana reportedly set up in the city, John Malalas enumerates the figures of storks and horses, the river Lykos, and a turtle. All of them can be located from later sources in the city: the figures of three storks stood on a street at Hagia Sophia and supposedly kept storks away from the city;[21] the horses stood at the Imperial Palace, and tamed the horses in the city;[22] the representation of the personified river Lykos can probably be identified with the lying river god of marble at the square of the Ox near *ta Amastrianou*, of which some fragments still exist;[23] and the turtle is probably the sculpture near the church of Saint Prokopios which

[17] Mango 1963; James 1996.

[18] Cameron and Herrin 1984; Odorico 2014.

[19] John Malalas, book X ch. 51; cf. Georgios Kedrenos, Chronicle I 346.19–347.2; see Dagron 1984: 107–14.

[20] *Patria,* in Preger 1907: book II ch. 79 and 103. Dagron 1984: 103–15.

[21] Pseudo-Hesychios, in Preger 1901: ch. 25.

[22] *Patria,* in Preger 1907: book II, ch. 28; see also Vasiliev 1932: 160–61.

[23] Mango 1990: 70.

gave this nickname to the church.[24] Later sources also add the figures of snakes in the Hippodrome[25] and the so-called *konopion* on the square of the Bull, a magic sofa with a mosquito net, which served to ward off flies and mosquitos.[26] The river god probably should prevent flooding, although this is nowhere said explicitly. About the stone turtle we hear, though only centuries later, that in old times it went through the streets at night and ate up the garbage in order to keep the city clean.[27]

Incidentally, the reports of such talismans usually contain a remark stating which ruler had destroyed them – either out of ignorance as in the case of Leo III, or of carelessness as in the case of Basil I.[28] In the late period, however, the destruction of these miracle cures is attributed, as we should expect, to the Franks, that is the crusaders and Italians after the Fourth Crusade.[29] The medieval inhabitants of Constantinople were surrounded by all these magical objects and respected their power, but not under all circumstances and not unconditionally: several times we hear that such magical figures were mutilated or destroyed in order to break their harmful power,[30] or that foolish people destroyed a statue representing a good spell.[31] Not all such attempts of destruction were successful, for it is also occasionally mentioned that a wicked statue fought the attacker and killed him, for example by lunging at him from above.[32] On the other hand, not every antique statue in Constantinople was regarded as magical. Many statues were reinterpreted, without any belief in a magic power, in order to make them appear less threatening to the viewer, either as persons of Roman history, such as the Emperor Constantine and his sons, or as biblical figures.[33]

---

[24] *Patria*, in Preger 1907: book II, ch. 23; see Berger 1988: 460–62.

[25] I.e. the Serpent Column, which is not mentioned in the Hippodrome in earlier times; see Majeska 1984: 254–56.

[26] *Patria*, in Preger 1907: book III, ch. 24.

[27] Mango 1960: 75; Majeska 1984: 295–96.

[28] Patria, in Preger 1907: book II, ch. 90; book III, ch. 24 and 200.

[29] Majeska 1984: 246, 274–75.

[30] Mango 1963: 60–61.

[31] Ibid., 61–63.

[32] *Parastaseis*, in Cameron and Herrin 1984: ch. 28; James 1996.

[33] For example, the statue of a three-headed deity was explained as the sons of Constan-

A result of the deep crisis in the seventh and early eighth centuries was also the increasing popularity of apocalyptical texts about the end of time.[34] These texts were based on the concept of Chiliasm, according to which the world, which had been created within seven days, will also last seven days, that is, seven thousand years. Christ, it was believed, had come in the middle of the sixth millennium, and the Antichrist would come at its end. Then, the present world would come to an end, before the beginning of the seventh and last millennium which would be God's eternal kingdom. If this was true and the end of the world was predestined, it followed not only that it could be calculated by the chronicle writers (in fact, numerous attempts have been made to do this), but also that there had to be old prophecies about it. In these texts, where the end of time is expected after the impending downfall of the Roman or Byzantine Empire, Constantinople as the capital of it plays a very distinct, if not always central role. And a natural consequence of this is that the prophecies about the future end of Constantinople were soon linked to specific locations in the city.

The central text of early Byzantine apocalypticism is the so-called Pseudo-Methodios which was originally written around the year 692 in Syria and in Syriac, but soon thereafter translated into Greek.[35] This translation contains a long interpolation which describes a violent attack by the wicked sons of Ismael, that is the Muslim Arabs, on Constantinople – an event which can easily be recognised as the historical siege of the city in the years 717 to 718. The relevant part of this interpolation on Constantinople is as follows:

> Woe to you, Byzas, because Ismael overtakes you. For every horse of Ismael will pass through and the first among them will pitch his tent before you, Byzas, and he will begin to make war and will break down the gate of Xylokerkos and will proceed as far as the Ox. Then

tine the Great: *Parastaseis*, in Cameron and Herrin 1984: ch. 43; a sitting female statue in the Hippodrome either as Athena or as the fifth-century empress Verina: ibid., ch. 61; the equestrian statue of Theodosios I on the *Tauros* square also as Joshuah in Patria, in Preger 1907: book II, ch. 47.

[34] Alexander 1985 and elsewhere.

[35] Garstad 2013; Heilo 2015: 57–58.

> the Ox will moo loudly and the Xerolophos will roar, since they were thrashed by the Ismaelites. Then a voice will come out of the heavens saying, 'This same punishment suffices for me'. And the Lord God will snatch the cowardice of the Romans and thrust it into the hearts of the Ismaelites and take the manliness of the Ismaelites and cast it into the hearts of the Romans; they will turn and drive them from their homes and crush them without mercy.[36]

The interpretation of this prophecy raises some questions. As we know from the reports about the better documented sieges of 626, 1203 and 1453, the walls were always attacked at their known weakest points, that is, either in the valley of the Lykos river or at the Blachernai at the northern end of the double land walls. Why then does the Greek Pseudo-Methodios claim that the Xylokerkos Gate was the place where the Arabs invaded the city? The Xylokerkos is the first major gate in the land walls north of the ceremonial main entry into the city, the Golden Gate. The Golden Gate was built on a road near the sea shore, which had had no greater importance before the new land walls were built between 408 and 413, and the Xylokerkos Gate lay on the ancient Roman highway from Thrace into the city.[37] In later apocalyptic texts, the Xylokerkos and the Golden Gate are often mentioned together when it comes to the future conquest of the city. This is, for example, still the case in the so-called *Oracula Leonis* to which we shall return below. The belief that the future conquerors of the city would one day invade the city through the Xylokerkos gate was also preserved for a very long time. As late as in the year 1189, when the crusaders of the Third Crusade approached Constantinople, Emperor Isaak Angelos let this gate be walled up, as the historian Niketas Choniates says, due to "an old and foolish prophecy"[38] – and it was thereafter closed, with brief interruptions, until 1886.[39]

The first place reached by the Arabs inside the city is, according to the interpolated Pseudo-Methodios, the Ox, that is the marketplace

---

[36] Pseudo-Methodios, *Apocalypse* 13, 9–12; quoted from Garstad 2013: 57, with minor changes; Heilo 2015: 58–59.

[37] The straight course of this highway is still preserved today in the Kocamustafa Paşa and Cerrahpaşa Caddesi inside the walls.

[38] Niketas Choniates, ed. van Dieten, 404.4–7.

[39] Asutay-Effenberger 2007: 220.

usually called the *Bous*. The *Bous* lies, however, at a distance of almost 3 km from the walls, and a large number of monuments that would have been touched by the invading warriors is not mentioned, including the *Exakionion*, i.e. the main gate of the Constantinian walls which still existed at that time, and the forum of Arkadios on the hill called Xerolophos.[40] How can we explain this? As far as we know, a statue of an ox or bull stood on the square called Bous in the early Byzantine period, but had disappeared already in the early seventh century. The result was that a large number of legends, some of them already hundreds of years old, were attached to this statue. All these legends go back, in principle, to the cult of the bull-shaped god Baal on Mount Atabyrios in Palestine, which spread across the Mediterranean during Antiquity.[41] The cult of the bull-shaped Baal, now identified with Zeus, existed, for example, also in Agrigentum on the island of Sicily, where a mountain near the city bore the name *Atabyrion*. But already there the legend is known only in a rationalised form turned into the negative: it tells that the tyrant Phalaris of Agrigentum, who is in fact a historical person from the sixth century BC, gave order to a smith to make a bronze bull, in which he then tortured his unsuspecting guests to death by throwing them inside and heating the bull to redness. Death in a glowing bronze bull is later a common motif of Christian hagiography, and quite a number of saints allegedly found their end in that horrible way, including, as the most prominent of them, Saint Antipas of Pergamon.

So why was this legend attached to the square called the Ox? The Bous often served as a place of executions in the seventh and eighth century, and when such events were recorded in chronicles, it is simply said that someone died *en tō Boï*, that is, "on the square of *Bous*" – which could easily be understood in the sense of "inside the *bous*", that is, the ox of bronze. We do not know when the legend was connected to the square of the Ox. In its complete form, with an explicit mention of a furnace in the shape of an ox, it appears first in the *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai.*[42] If the Ox roars together with the Xerolophos, this

[40] On which see, for example, Berger 1988: 352–8.

[41] Berger 1988: 348–50.

[42] *Parastaseis*, in Cameron and Herrin 1984: 42.

must be explained by the fact that the square called the Ox actually lay, as already mentioned, on the way downtown before the Xerolophos. And as the word *bous* is used here in its double meaning, both in the sense of the animal ox and as a topographical designation, it is clear that also the Xerolophos must roar, so to speak, even if he is, simply for anatomical reasons, hardly able to do so. It would be more logical here if the *Tauros* or bull would roar, the next square from the Ox on the way downtown. But there is no indication that a statue of a bull did ever exist on this square, which could have served as a focal point for a tale such as the one told about the Ox. And above all, in the prophecy of Pseudo-Methodios the *Tauros* is not reached by the Arabs, and therefore cannot be mentioned there. Only in later texts does the Tauros replace the Xerolophos in this context, and so in the end the famous saying from Pseudo-Methodios – "Then the Ox will moo loudly and the Xerolophos will roar" – is changed to "The ox will moo and the bull will moan". In this form it is quoted, for example, in the twelfth century by Ioannes Tzetzes, and he also gives a new explanation for it: the ox is Constantinople, which has been built by the bull, that is the Italians or Romans, and it now sings a fight song against the bull, that is against the armies of the Second Crusade.[43]

Another central concept of Byzantine apocalyptic texts is that Constantinople, just like Rome, was built on seven hills.[44] Constantinople is first called the "city of seven hills" in some mid-seventh century texts, but is not yet mentioned as such in the prophecies of Pseudo-Methodios. It is, however, rather difficult to identify these seven hills of Constantinople in nature. Only in the mid-tenth century the several projections of the range of hills on the northern side of the city facing the Golden Horn are identified with six of these hills, and the so-called Xerolophos, far in the south-west beyond the valley of the river Lycus, with the seventh.[45] The fact that the Xerolophos was regarded as the seventh hill explains, in turn, the special role it plays in apocalyptic literature. The

[43] Ioannes Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, see Leone 1968: 369–71.
[44] Berger 2008: 139–40.
[45] Ibid., 140–44.

scene of the expulsion of the Ismaelites, as described in the interpolated pseudo-Methodios, is expanded by later texts, such as the so-called last vision of Daniel, where we hear the following:[46]

The voice from heaven, which ends the slaughtering of the assailants, calls the inhabitants of the city to search, in the right part of the city, for a man who stands on two pillars, and make him emperor. He is crowned in Hagia Sophia, angels give him a sword, he defeats all the enemies and drives them far away from the city. Twelve years later, after his death, his son becomes the last emperor at the end of the day. He leaves Constantinople and goes to Jerusalem, where he hands over the reign to his sons which immediately begin a civil war. The city of seven hills is finally ruled by a vicious woman, before it sinks into the sea, and the part which is drowned last is the Xerolophos.

The belief that the Xerolophos is the last part of Constantinople, which sinks into the sea, is probably based on its name, which actually means the "dry hill", and on the fact that it was counted as the seventh and therefore the last hill of the city.[47] For this reason, it is the Xerolophos which has to sink into the sea last, although it is, in reality, not even the highest elevation of Constantinople. The column of Arkadios, which stood on its top, has stimulated the imagination of writers to a particular degree, far more than the column of Theodosios on the *Tauros*, although that column had the same enormous size as the column of Arkadios and was decorated with spirally arranged reliefs in a very similar way.

The greatest collection of ancient art in Constantinople which survived into the Middle Ages was that in the Hippodrome, and many of the statues there were interpreted as bearers of prophecies about the end of the empire and of time. A distinctive case of how this was done were the legends about a bronze group of Skylla.[48] This work of art is now lost but, as many others, described in detail in Niketas Choniates' so-called *Book of the statues (De signis)*, at the occasion of its destruction by the

[46] Ibid., 142–43.
[47] Ibid., 143.
[48] Berger 2010: 197–8; Stephenson 2013.

crusaders in 1204.[49] This description suggests that the monument, probably a work of the late Hellenistic time, was very similar to the well-known Skylla group found at Sperlonga in Italy, which may actually be a copy of it.[50] According to Niketas,

> The ancient Skylla is depicted leaning forward as she leaped into Odysseus' ships and devoured many of his companions: in female form down to the waist, huge-breasted and full of savagery, and below the waist divided into beasts of prey.

The same Skylla group is described in the *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai* in the following words:

> Among the female statues, the one near the epigram of the Medes is of women giving birth to wild beasts and devouring men. One of them, Herodianos made clear to me, reveals the story of the godless Justinian. The other, which is accompanied also by a boat, has not been fulfilled, but remains.[51]

This clearly refers to the Skylla which is, however, not named as such, but instead explained as an oracle: the first part of it about the evil deeds of Emperor Justinian II, who reigned in the late seventh and early eighth century, is already fulfilled, the second part not. But what is the second part of this prophecy? In the tenth century this passage was taken over into the *Patria*, a description of Constantinople which can be described as something between a local history and a travel guide. There, the end of the text is changed to the following words:

> The other, which is accompanied also by a boat, is, according to the ones, Scylla who devours the men thrown out by Charybdis, and it is Odysseus whom she keeps with her hand by his head. Others say that this is earth, the sea and the seven ages of the world which are devoured by the floods, and the present age is the seventh one.[52]

As we see, the object of art is now correctly identified, but at the same time an apocalyptical interpretation of it is offered. For at the end of the

---

[49] Niketas Choniates, ed. van Dieten, 651.27–31.

[50] Andreae-Conticello 1987: 25–26.

[51] *Parastaseis*, in Cameron and Herrin 1984: ch. 61.

[52] *Patria*, in Preger 1907: book II, ch. 77.

world, as the apocalyptical texts claim, Constantinople will be drowned in the sea.

At about the same time, another new motif was introduced into the apocalyptic folklore of Constantinople, namely the legend about the wise emperor Leon, a figure clearly based on the historical person of Leon VI, who reigned from 886 to 912.[53] As it is well known, Leon VI was a personality with many facets who distinguished himself, among other things, as a legislator and a man of letters. The designation as "the Wise" is attested already during his lifetime, and we can assume that also the formation of legends about him started at that time.[54] His later reputation as a magician, however, he probably owed to the confusion with two other persons of the same name. One of them is Leon the Philosopher, also called the Mathematician, a famous intellectual who lived about two generations before him;[55] the other is the diplomat and poet Leon Choirosphaktes, who lived in the time of Leon VI himself.[56]

Leon soon replaced Apollonios in the local legend of Constantinople as the creator of magic statues and talismans, and a collection of highly enigmatic oracles began to circulate under his name, the already mentioned *Oracula Leonis*.[57] In the last centuries of Byzantium, the folklore of Constantinople focused entirely on Leon, who mutates slowly from an emperor to a Constantinopolitan sage and philosopher. As such, he leads discussions with other philosophers and defeats them with his wisdom – something which is, by the way, another well-known motif of the local legend.[58]

All these legends about magical statues and wise men who foretell the future end of Constantinople were constantly in the mind of its popu-

[53] Mango 1960.

[54] Ibid., 92–93.

[55] On whom see Lemerle 1971: 148–76.

[56] See, for example, his song for the inauguration of a bath built by Leon VI: Magdalino 1990.

[57] Rigo 1988; Brokkaar 2002.

[58] See, for example, the seven philosophers discussing with Theodosios II: *Parastaseis,* in Cameron and Herrin 1984: ch. 62; Dagron 1984: 115–19.

lation. But as to be expected, they play only a minor role in times of political stability, and gained greater popularity and influence only in times of crisis. This becomes obvious at the end of the twelfth century, when the empire declined rapidly under the pressure of Turks, Bulgarians and crusaders. In fact, the belief in the magic power of ancient statues reached its peak in the last decades before the conquest of Constantinople by the crusaders in 1204, when most of them were either destroyed by one of the great fires which devastated the centre of the city, or robbed and brought to western Europe. The ancient statues of the Hippodrome, which had survived until now, were melted down by the crusaders, and all we know about them comes from their description by Niketas Choniates. A French chronicler of the fourth crusade, Robert de Clari, describes the Hippodrome in the following words:

> Lengthwise of this space ran a wall, full fifteen feet high and ten feet wide; and on the top of this wall were images of men and of women, of horses, and oxen, and camels, and bears, and lions, and all manner of other beasts, cast in copper, which were so cunningly wrought and so naturally shaped that there is not, in Heathendom or in Christendom, a master so skilled that he could portray or shape images so skilfully as these images were. And these images were wont erstwhile to play, by enchantment; but afterward they played no more at all.[59]

The Hippodrome is perceived here as a former place of pagan witchcraft. But now, after the end of the chariot races and the destruction of the statues, nothing remained of its former glory, and when the Byzantines regained Constantinople in 1261, the games were not resumed. Then, after a short political revival of the state, a steady decline began, which ended with the final extinction of the empire in 1453 by the Ottoman Turks. It is understandable that in this situation apocalyptical texts remained popular, the *Oracula Leonis* included, but the attacking people were no longer identified with the Arabs, nor with the Vikings from Russia as in some tenth-century texts, but with the Turks.

[59] Ch. 90; translation from Stone 1939.

That the old prophecies were still alive can be seen in the work of the historian Doukas, whose report about the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 contains numerous allusions to apocalyptical ideas. A well-known case is his story that, when the outer walls had already been destroyed by the Turkish artillery, the defenders asked the emperor for permission to re-open a small door called *Kerkoporta*, which had been walled up for a long time, and which led out into the trenches near the imperial palace in the Blachernai district. On their retreat behind the walls, the defenders forgot to close the *Kerkoporta* behind them, and so the Turks entered Constantinople unnoticed, and attacked the soldiers there from behind.[60] This event is not mentioned by any other source, so we should rather assume that it never took place – but it is, in fact, a literary allusion to the Xylokerkos gate where, according to the tradition, the enemies would enter the city.[61] Later in his report, Doukas tells us that, when the walls had finally fallen and the Turks came in, many people fled to the east, hoping to reach the church of Hagia Sophia.

> Why were they all seeking refuge in the Great church? Many years before they had heard from some false prophets that the City was fated to be surrendered to the Turks who would enter with great force, and that the Romans would be cut down by them as far as the Column of Constantine the Great. Afterwards, however, an angel, descending and holding a sword, would deliver the empire and the sword to an unknown man, extremely plain and poor, standing at the Column. "Take this sword," the angel would say, "and avenge the people of the Lord." Then the Turks would take flight and the Romans would follow hard upon them, cutting them down. They would drive them from the City and from the West, and from the East as far as the borders of Persia, to a place called Monodendrion. Because they fully expected these prophecies to be realized, some ran and advised others to run also. This was the conviction of the Romans who long ago had contemplated what their present action would be, contending, "If we leave the Column of the Cross behind us, we will avoid future wrath." This was the cause then of the flight into the Great Church. In one hour's time that enormous temple was filled with men and women. There was a throng too many to count, above and below, in the court-

[60] Magoulias 1975: 221.

[61] Asutay-Effenberger 2007: 86 with n. 349.

> yards and everywhere. They bolted the doors and waited, hoping to be rescued by the anonymous saviour.[62]

But, as we all know, there was no salvation and Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks. Now, finally, the end of the city and the world should have come – but did not. In reality most of the inhabitants had survived, were resettled again where they had lived before, and had to come to an arrangement with their new lords. The apocalyptical beliefs also survived, but again changed their character, this time into a prophecy for a brighter future.

Almost immediately after the conquest, the legends concentrated on the person of the last emperor, Constantine Palaiologos, who had fallen while fighting against the Ottoman forces. As an advocate of church union, Constantine had been highly controversial during his lifetime, and many Orthodox Greeks believed that his religious policy was the reason for the fall of the city and the end of the empire.[63] But posthumously, within only about hundred years after his death, he made an amazing career, turning from a heretic into a champion of orthodoxy. Moreover, it was believed that he was not really dead, but preserved by God for the Greeks to free them one day from their slavery. Constantine Palaiologos became a sort of national hero, something which he had definitely not been during his lifetime, and was therefore claimed in modern Greece either as a national leader and a precursor of the modern Greek state, or, alternatively, as a saint and martyr who had fallen for the true orthodox faith.[64]

The most recent prophecies of the *Oracula Leonis*, which were added to the corpus only after the end of the Byzantine empire, tell a new story about the emperor of the end of times, namely that he would appear after having been concealed for a long time in the west of the city in a rock, naked and like a dead.[65] Both ideas eventually were combined into one legend, according to which the last emperor sits dormant and frozen into marble in a cave at the Golden Gate, undiscoverable for the Turks, and

---

[62] Quoted from Magoulias 1975: 225–26.
[63] Nicol 1992: 57–60.
[64] Nicol 1992: 95–108.
[65] Rigo 1988: 88; Brokkaar 2002: 23–31.

awaits his re-awakening.[66] Also the legend about the Xerolophos reached its final form only in the post-Byzantine period, in the so-called "wonderful story of the column of Xerolophos".[67] In this text, the column is dated back before the refounding of the city by Constantine, namely into the time of Septimius Severus, the emperor who had destroyed ancient Byzantion in 196 and withdrawn its city rights.[68] Here it is not claimed, as in older texts, that he himself rebuilt the city; instead the story is told in a remarkably different way. The Byzantines are tributary to the Romans, and when they dare to revolt under the Emperor Severus, he besieges them for three years. His camp is located on the Xerolophos, which is the only dry place in the area as the streets are full of water. As the siege goes on, Severus asks his astrologer Ioannes and receives the reply that Byzantion will be abandoned after the conquest for a long time, but later will become the capital of the Roman Empire, and that the names of all emperors are predetermined by the stars until the coming of the Antichrist. Severus, then, gives order to build the column and to represent on it everything that he learned from his astrologers. Byzantion is then actually taken, the population massacred, and the city lies empty until its refounding by emperor Constantine. In the new city the Xerolophos is now the seventh hill, and its reliefs will become a mystery to later emperors, many of which try in vain to solve them. It is only Emperor Leon the Wise who finally succeeds in doing this: when he is still the crown prince, he calls the philosophers of Constantinople together, and as they find no explanation, he threatens them with death. Therefore they start a more detailed investigation, together with Patriarch Photios,[69] and finally find out the meaning of the reliefs. So the story ends with the words:

> And they explained the different images, which you can see below, you most eager one; above is written their meaning in iambic verses,

[66] Nicol 1992: 101–18.

[67] Dagron–Paramelle 1979.

[68] Dagron 1984: 79–84.

[69] Photios, the well-known intellectual and Patriarch of Constantinople from 858 to 867 and from 878 to 886, was highly controversial in the Byzantine age because of his strict anti-Latin church policy, and apparently became a generally respected historical figure only in the Ottoman age.

and below the image, and such is the truth.[70]

This refers to an illustrated collection of the *Oracula Leonis*, to which, in fact, this "wonderful story of the column of Xerolophos" serves as a pseudo-historical introduction. Needless to say, these images and the accompanying texts have nothing to do with the reliefs on the Xerolophos column. But we should acknowledge that only in this story an attempt is made to integrate all known older apocalyptic constructs, which had existed unconnectedly for such a long time, in a common system: here the column on the Xerolophos acquires its special role by its alleged existence already before Constantinople was founded, and its prophetic reliefs are identified with the *Oracula Leonis*, which are interpreted in Leon's time by the philosophers.

Here, finally, the imaginary history of Constantinople has reached the ending point of its development, and here ends also this paper.

[70] Dagron–Paramelle 1979: 523.

Bibliography

Alexander, P. J. 1985. *Byzantine Apocalyptic Traditions*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Andreae, B. and B. Conticello, 1987. *Skylla und Charybdis: zur Skylla-Gruppe von Sperlonga*, Akademie der Wiss. und der Lit. Mainz, Abh. der Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Klasse 14.

Asutay-Effenberger, N. 2007. *Die Landmauer von Konstantinopel-İstanbul*, Berlin: De Gruyter (Millennium Studies 18).

Bassett, S. 2004. *The urban image of late antique Constantinople,* Cambridge: CUP.

Berger, A. 1988. *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos*, Bonn: Habelt (Poikila Byzantina 8).

— 2008. "Das apokalyptische Konstantinopel. Topographisches in apokalyptischen Schriften der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit", in *Endzeiten. Eschatologie in den monotheistischen Weltreligionen*, ed. W. Brandes and F. Schmieder, Berlin: De Gruyter (Millennium Studies 16), 137–55.

— 2010. "The Hippodrome of Constantinople in popular belief and folklore", in *Hippodrom/Atmeydanı. İstanbul'un tarih sahnesi* – A stage for Istanbul's history (exhibition catalogue), İstanbul: Pera Müzesi, 194–205.

— (tr.) 2013. *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople: the Patria*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 24).

Brokkaar, W. G., et al. 2002. *The Oracles of the Most Wise Emperor Leo & the Tale of the True Emperor,* Amsterdam: Leerstoelgroep Nieuwgriekse Taal- en Letterkunde en Byzantinologie.

Cameron, A., and J. Herrin (tr.) 1984. *Constantinople in the early eighth century: the Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai*, Leiden: Brill (Columbia studies in the classical tradition 10).

Dagron, G. 1974. *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris (Bibliothèque byzantine, Études 7).

— 1984. *Constantinople imaginaire. Études dur le recueil des Patria*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (Bibliothèque byzantine, Études 8).

Dagron, G. and J. Paramelle, 1979. “Un texte patriographique. Le « récit merveilleux sur la colonne du Xérolophos »”, *Travaux et Mémoires* 7: 491–523.

Effenberger, A. 2008. “Zu den beiden Reiterstandbildern auf dem Tauros von Konstantinopel”, *Millennium* 5: 261–97.

Garstad, B. 2012. *Apocalypse. Pseudo-Methodius. An Alexandrian world chronicle*, Washington, DC, Dumbarton Oaks (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 14).

Heilo, O. 2015. “Empire of Clay and Iron: Divisions in the Byzantine state ideology and Christian apocalyptic expectations from the reigns of Heraclius to Leo III (610–718)”, *Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 1: 49–64.

James, L. 1996. “Pray not to fall into temptation and be your own guard: pagan statues in Christian Constantinople”, *Gesta* 35: 12–20.

Kaldellis, A. 2007. “Christodorus on the Statues of the Zeuxippos Baths: a new reading of the *Ekphrasis*”*, Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 47: 361–83.

Lemerle, P. 1971. *Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au Xe siècle*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Leone, P. A. M. (ed.) 1968. *Ioannis Tzetzae historiae*, Naples: Libreria scientifica.

Magdalino, P. 1988. “The bath of Leo the Wise and the ‘Macedonian Renaissance’ revisited: topography, iconography, ceremonial, ideology”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 42: 97–118.

Magoulias, H. J. 1975. *Decline and fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks by Dukas*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Majeska, G. P. 1984. *Russian travelers to Constantinople in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries*, Washington, DC (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 19).

Mango, C. 1960. “The Legend of Leo the Wise”, *Zbornik radova* 6: 59–93.

— 1963. “Antique statuary and the Byzantine beholder”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 17: 53–75.

— 1990. *Le développement urbain de Constantinople. IVe–VIIe siècles*, Paris: Boccard (Travaux et mémoires du Centre de Recherche d’Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, Monographies 2).

— 1993. “The Columns of Justinian and his successors”, in idem, *Studies on Constantinople*, Aldershot: Variorum (Variorum Collected Studies Series 394), no X.

Mango, C., M. Vickers, and E. D. Francis. 1992. “The palace of Lausus at Constantinople and its collection of statues”, *Journal of the History of Collections* 4: 89–98.

Martins de Jesus, C. A. 2014. “The statuary collection held at the baths of Zeuxippos (AP 2) and the search for Constantine’s museological intentions”, *Synthesis* 21: 15–30.

Nicol, D. M. 1992. *The immortal emperor. The life and legend of Constantine Palaiologos, last emperor of the Romans*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Odorico, P. 2014. “Du recueil à l’invention du texte: le cas des Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 107: 755–84.

Papamastorakis, T. 2009. “Interpreting the De Signis of Niketas Choniates” in *Niketas Choniates. A Historian and a Writer*, ed. A. Simpson and S. Efthymiadis, Geneva: La Pomme d’Or, 209–223.

Preger, T. (ed.) 1901–1907: *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, vol. I (containing Pseudo-Hesychios and the Parastaseis) Leipzig: Teubner 1901; vol. II (containing the *Patria*) Leipzig: Teubner 1907 – for an English translation, see Berger (2013).

Rigo, A. (ed.) 1988: Oracula Leonis, Padova: Programma.

Rydén, L. (ed.). 1994. *The life of St. Andrew the Fool*, Uppsala (Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 4).

Stephenson, P. 2013. “The Skylla group in Constantinople’s Hippodrome”, *Recueil des travaux de l’Institut d’études byzantines (ZRVI)* 50: 65-74.

Stone, E. N. 1939. *Three Old French Chronicles of the Crusades*, Seattle: The University of Washington (University of Washington publications in the social sciences 10).

Stupperich, R. 1965. “Das Statuenprogramm in den Zeuxippos-Thermen”, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 32: 210–35.

Vasiliev, A. 1932. “Harun-ibn-Yahya and his Description of Constantinople”, *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 5: 149–63.

The *Life of St Andrew the Fool* by Lennart Rydén: *vingt ans après*

Paolo Cesaretti
University of Bergamo

About 20 years have passed since 1995,[1] when Lennart Rydén published his monumental two-volume edition of the *Life of St Andrew, the Fool for Christ's sake* (BHG 115z) in the series *Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia*. The present paper wishes to offer a survey of the critical appreciation and evaluation of Rydén's edition, and also to determine whether his contextualization of the text within the specific spatial and chronological 'coordinates'[2] of the mid-tenth century has substantially contributed to the understanding of that period and its cultural climate as a whole. The question is more complex than it may seem. In fact, the author of our *Life* – the "author who calls himself Nikephoros",[3] priest of Hagia Sophia – made well-known but awkward efforts to present himself as a contemporary of the hero of his hagiographical text, whose story is set in Constantinople at the time of Emperor Leo I (457–474).[4] By contrast, Cyril Mango had suggested to date the *Life* to the end of the seventh century, "approximately between

[1] A little less than 20 years had passed in November 2014, when I presented a first version of this paper in a session of the Seminar for Greek and Byzantine Studies at Uppsala University. Slightly more than 20 years have passed now in January 2016, when I submit my paper to the editors of SJBMGS. I wish to thank Ingela Nilsson for both opportunities as well as for her revision of my English text. My title is indebted to the novel *Vingt ans après* by Alexandre Dumas père (published in 1845).

[2] See Delehaye 1934: 7–17 ("les coordonnées hagiographiques").

[3] Magdalino 1999: 85.

[4] Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 12 (ll. 9–10), 18 (l. 110), 134 (ll. 1847–48). Relevant notes at pp. 304 and 324.

the years 680 and 695".[5] In addition to these scholarly concerns, I will also consider a couple of passages in *VAS* that have raised my interest as regards the proper understanding of the cultural climate in which the text was conceived. In my view, there is more to be discovered in them than appears at first sight.

In order to highlight the present appreciation of Rydén's edition of the *Life of St Andrew* (*Vita Andreae Sali*, hereafter *VAS*) twenty years after its publication, I shall take as my point of departure two authoritative reference works, the *History of Byzantine Literature 850–1000* by Alexander Kazhdan,[6] wide-ranging in scope but specific in chronological terms, and the *Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography* edited by Stephanos Efthymiadis,[7] wide-ranging in chronological and geographical terms but limited to the hagiographical production.

Alexander Kazhdan – perhaps the most influential Byzantinist of the late twentieth century, whose merits in the field of hagiography have been properly assessed by the same Efthymiadis[8] – sets his analysis of *VAS* in a chapter devoted to "three Constantinopolitan *vitae* of the mid-tenth century". Even though he admits that "precisely when the vita was written remains unclear", Kazhdan underlines that "closer to the actual date are those scholars who place the vita in the tenth century", like Rydén who "advanced the view that Nikephoros was writing around 950".[9] The very fact that the title of the chapter dealing with *VAS* concerns the mid-tenth century implies that Kazhdan had accepted Rydén's views about the date of the production of the text. In the opening of his chapter, Kazhdan also rejected the arguments advanced by Mango for dating the text to end of the seventh century, especially as concerns certain elements considered by Mango as *realia*.[10] As his text develops, Kazhdan

[5] Mango 1982: 309.

[6] Kazhdan 2006: 193–200.

[7] Efthymiadis 2011a and 2014; see especially Efthymiadis 2011b: 126, with n. 97.

[8] Efthymiadis 2006:157–59 and 2011a: 6.

[9] Kazhdan 2006: 193–94.

[10] See also below, n. 20. Mango's general approach was judged as "positivistic" more than hagiographic by Rydén; see his "Introduzione" in Cesaretti 1990: 16, n. 11 [reprinted in Cesaretti 2014: 41, n. 12].

seems to be more and more interested in emphasizing the Constantinopolitan character of the *Life* and the image of the capital it offers. At the same time he underlines the similarities and the correspondences (stylistic, linguistic, structural) of *VAS* with the *Life of St Basil the Younger* (BHG 263–264), another text of "consistently Constantinopolitan" character from the mid-tenth century.[11] The fact that Kazhdan's reference work accepts Rydén's views about the date and place of production of the text – its *coordonnées hagiographiques* –, not to mention Rydén's previous underlining of the similarities between *VAS* and the *Life of St Basil the Younger*,[12] removes Kazhdan's appreciation of *VAS* from the horizon of the positivistic 'debate' and allows the text to become part of a wider 'hagiographical discourse'.[13]

Stephanos Efthymiadis – a scholar who has never hidden his deep admiration for Rydén's work[14] – includes *VAS* in his chapter devoted to the "Hagiographic production from the so-called 'Dark Age' to the age of Symeon Metaphrastes", that is, approximately from the eighth to the tenth century. *VAS* is here set within the frame of "Constantinopolitan hagiographical fiction", with its fictional "holy heroes […] inscribed in a historical context […] not devoid of glaring anachronisms and various *non sequitur*".[15] Efthymiadis thereby moves in a different direction, with a specific penchant for fiction, arguments and texts already mentioned by Kazhdan in his survey of "Constantinopolitan *vitae* of the mid-tenth century": the *Life of St Basil the Younger* and the *Life of St Niphon*, plus

[11] Kazhdan 2006: 186. See the detailed discussion in Sullivan, Talbot and McGrath 2014: 7–11, concluding that "the bulk of the content preserved in M [i.e. the Moscow manuscript] was most likely written in the 950s or 960s".

[12] Rydén 1983, where in the final pp. 585–86 the hypothesis was advanced that they were the product of one and the same author; see also further below.

[13] For "hagiographical discourse", see Kazhdan 2006: 203, a term drawn from Van Uytfanghe 1993, in his turn indebted to the intellectual heritage of Michel de Certeau (1925–1986). In addition to the *Life of St Basil the Younger*, other similarities are found in e.g. the *Life of St Niphon* and the *Life of St Anastasia*. See Kazhdan 2006: 200–9.

[14] Efthymiadis 2006: 159–60, with interesting comparisons between Rydén and Kazhdan and their approaches to hagiography.

[15] Efthymiadis 2011b: 125–26.

the *Life of St Gregentios* and also some Lives of female saints[16] – a dossier of texts masterfully examined by Rydén in various of his papers.[17]

Efthymiadis continues by referring to the fact that there have been "arguments" about the date of composition of *VAS*, from the seventh to tenth century, "the latter [argument] being the most convincing".[18] That "latter and most convincing argument" was the one that Rydén had been advancing since the 1970s[19] and later developed in his 1995 edition, where he tentatively placed the production of the text during the reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (905–959). In the 1995 edition he also offered a summary of his response to Mango's position of 1982, with great profit for the reader.[20]

---

[16] Ibid., 127–28.

[17] See e.g. Rydén 1986.

[18] Efthymiadis 2011b: 126. The same (mid-) tenth-century date is found also in other contributions to the volume: see e.g. Constantinou 2014: 343–44; Kaplan and Kountoura-Galaki 2014: 392.

[19] To mention but a few: Rydén 1974, 1978, 1982a and 1983.

[20] See Rydén 1995: 41–56; suffice it here to summarize the main arguments. First, the different evaluation of a fragment in uncial letters of *VAS* preserved in *Codex Monacensis Graecus* 443, dated on palaeographical grounds to c. 950–1000. Rydén understands it as an autograph by Nikephoros or from his circle (Rydén 1978; Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 49-50, 72–81) written in majuscule in order to support the fiction that *VAS* was an 'ancient' text (as Kazhdan 2006: 200 put it, a forgery "to demonstrate that his hero was in fact a saint of yore"). By contrast, Mango understands it simply as the oldest manuscript evidence of the text. Second, *VAS* mentions certain *realia* (titles, coins) which appear to fit the period between the middle of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century, but against their "positivistic" interpretation by Mango (see nn. 10 and 13 above and nn. 30 and 39 below) Rydén suggests that they should be understood in light of the "historical fiction" pursued by the author (Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 43-44). Third, the dating of the Andreas Salos Apocalypse (see below, n. 46) to the end of the seventh century, as suggested by Mango, would cause "serious difficulties with regards to its place within the Byzantine apocalyptic tradition as a whole" (Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 45). After having underlined the "resonances" between *VAS* and the *Life of the Emperor Basil* on the one hand, the *Life of St Basil the Younger* (both texts belong to mid 10th century) on the other, along with many other aspects dismissed by Mango, Rydén concluded that "while it is hard to see how *VA* could have been written in the 7th century, there is nothing to prevent us from dating it to the 10th" (Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 56). [here and below Rydén's *VA* = our *VAS*]. The relationships between *VAS* and the *Lives* of the two Basils underlined by Rydén have been especially appreciated by

This is, then, the situation we can look back at now, at the beginning of 2016. But what if we look at the reviews which appeared directly after the publication of Rydén's 1995 edition of the *Life of St Andrew*? Did they pave the way for the appreciation of the edition and the success of the "hagiographical coordinates" it suggested and which are nowadays widely accepted? As a matter of fact, anyone expecting a chorus of acclamation will find something rather different. First of all, the number of reviews is smaller than one might think. Second, they are certainly positive in general, but there is something cautious and even ambiguous in some of them. And in any case – let alone the specific case of Rydén – it often happens that reviews display the attitudes of the reviewer rather than the qualities of the reviewed book.

However, the qualities of Rydén's *Life of St Andrew* did not escape the eyes of its first academic reviewer, who (at least to my knowledge) was the Russian scholar Sergey Ivanov.[21] At the time, the publication of Ivanov's wide-ranging book about *iurodstvo* (that is, *holy foolery* in its commendable English translation[22]) was recent. Ivanov had accepted Rydén's views about the tenth-century date for *VAS*, especially on the basis of Rydén's work published in the 1970s and 1980s.[23] With the exception of some minor remarks, Ivanov appears rather enthusiastic in his review. He declares that he "fully agrees" with Rydén's reconstruction[24] about the fact that "the text as it stands belongs to the mid-tenth century".[25] On the basis of the edition, he is tempted by "intriguing cultural problems" about "the tentative audience" of *VAS* and other hagiographical texts of the age. Far from seeing them as an "insight into popular

scholars susceptible to the hagiographic discourse such as Kazhdan, Efthymiadis and Magdalino.

[21] Ivanov 1996.

[22] Ivanov 2006: v.

[23] Ivanov 2006: 139–73. See esp. p. 157 (with the perceptive remark that the fiction of Andrew as a fifth-century saint could prevent him from knowing the prohibition of holy foolery at the Trullo council) with n. 29 (reference to Rydén 1968, 1978, 1982b, 1983).

[24] Ivanov 1996: 405.

[25] Ivanov 1996: 406.

mentality" at the end of the seventh century, as Mango had assumed,[26] Ivanov pointed out as a "reference group" the "clergymen irritated by the secularization of Byzantine life", in contrast to "Metaphrastic tendencies" of the period.[27]

The review by Panayotis Yannopoulos, which appeared in 1998, is different from Ivanov's not only in length but also in scope. This is a short text, more of a notice than a full *compte rendu*, and yet the reviewer adds the personal remark that notwithstanding his analysis, Rydén does not really solve the chronological "écart" between year 650 and year 1000.[28] By contrast, Vincent Déroche offers a review proper (also published in 1998) and an extremely favourable one. This French scholar, familiar with Rydén's studies and works,[29] faces the question of the date of composition of the text with an elegant methodological touch. He judges Rydén's suggested date for *VAS* in the light of a "perspective proprement hagiographique là où C. Mango lui appliquait implicitement les critères de l'historiographie", which is an implicit criticism of Mango's position.[30] Overall, Déroche's review is explicit in placing the *Life* within the 'hagiographical discourse' of the tenth century.

My survey must now turn to the periodical with the longest history and reputation in the field of Byzantine Studies, namely *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (*BZ*). *BZ* published a review of Rydén's *Life of St Andrew* written by Claudia Ludwig as late as 2002, seven years after the publication of Rydén's book – an unusually long time span.[31] When dealing

---

[26] Mango 1982: 310.

[27] Ivanov 1996: 406. See also Ivanov 2006: 168 for the contrast between Andrew as a "second edition" of the Holy fool and Epiphanios as the hero of a more "ordinary" holiness.

[28] Yannopoulos 1998: 265. The dates suggested by Yannopoulos are drawn from Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 41, "it is easy to demonstrate that *VA* cannot have been composed before *c*. 650 and after *c*. 1000".

[29] Déroche's remarkable Études *sur Léontios de Neapolis* had been published in *Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia* in 1995; Rydén had not only accepted the dense text in the series he had founded and directed, but he had also prefaced it (Déroche 1995: 5).

[30] Déroche 1998: 333.

[31] Let me note here, in passing, that it could be questioned whether a review, after such a long time, can still be seen as a review proper. I might be influenced by the Italian meaning of "recensione", which according to one of the most authoritative dictionar-

with this review, one additional fact should be noted: in 1998, Rydén had reviewed for the same periodical a book by the same Claudia Ludwig, her *Sonderformen byzantinischer Hagiographie und ihr literarisches Vorbild. Untersuchungen zu den Viten des Äsop, des Philaretos, des Symeon Salos und des Andreas Salos*. Published 1997, this book offered an ambitious attempt to sketch similarities between the *Vita Aesopi* and three Byzantine hagiographical texts: the *Life of St Symeon Salos*, the *Life of St Andrew*, and the *Life of St Philaretos the Merciful*. In accordance with the classical litotes, one could say that Lennart Rydén was "not unfamiliar" with this corpus of hagiographical texts.[32]

Notwithstanding Rydén's rather negative 1998 review of Ludwig's 1997 book,[33] Ludwig must be credited for the fact that her review of Rydén 1995 is written *sine ulla ira ac studio*. There are, of course, critical remarks about the edition, especially as far its *apparatus variorum* is concerned; in Ludwig's view, Rydén's interpretation of the text as a literary historian seems to have sometimes affected his editorial choices.[34]

---

ies is an "Esame critico, in forma di articolo più o meno esteso, *di un'opera di recente pubblicazione*" (= "Critical examination, in the form of a more or less extended article, *of a recently published work*" [in both cases Italics are mine]). Is a book published in 1995 still 'recent' in 2002? On the other hand, it is fair to keep in mind that other traditions – for instance the French *compte rendu* and the English *review* – seem to have different connotations.

[32] During almost forty years of research he had published the groundbreaking critical editions of the first two *Lives* and extensively commented on them. In addition to *VAS*, he had produced two editions of the *Life of St Symeon Salos:* Rydén 1963 had been improved with his *Bemerkungen* (Rydén 1970: 9–10) and the final result was included in his ultimate edition in Festugière 1974: 55–104 (see III–IV). As for the third Life, he had already offered some samples of his work (Rydén 1982b and 1985, Rydén, Rosenqvist and Ryda 1995, where the project for the edition was announced). His edition of the *Life of St Philaretos* eventually appeared in the same year as Ludwig's review (Rydén 2002†).

[33] In addition to the technical aspects, a certain bitterness can be perceived in the final remark: "Ludwig should be more generous towards predecessors" (Rydén 1998). In any case, Rydén's review appreciates the qualities of Ludwig 1997 in terms of the work's literary sensitivity.

[34] A special interest for 'minor readings' in the text is expressed also by Kazhdan 2006: 195 and n. 16. Questions concerning the manuscript tradition, *variae lectiones* and minor readings were developed at length by Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 72–185.

Rydén's work is appreciated by Ludwig especially insofar as it sets the basis for "eine gründliche Analyse dieses hochinteressanten Textes",[35] which should be understood in light of Ludwig's hypothesis about *VAS* as a remake of preceding layers of text.[36] Accordingly, Rydén's two volumes of almost 800 pages are here seen more as a starting point than as a point of arrival. Since Ludwig is more interested in narrative techniques than in history, she seems to abstain from discussing in detail the question of the date of the production of the text.[37]

In short, one could hardly have foreseen the following success and wide acceptation of Rydén's interpretation of *VAS* on the basis of the reviews discussed above. The most likely development would perhaps have been a sort of balance between Rydén's interpretation and that of Mango's, where more personal tastes would have turned scholars in the direction of one period or the other.

In my opinion an important external and in some sense 'promotional' factor for the wider acceptance of Rydén's dating of the text to the mid-tenth century (in addition, of course, to the inner qualities of his work), was not a review but an article of wide-ranging implications which appeared in 1999, four years after the publication of Rydén's two volumes. One of the many achievements of this article is that it fully understood the scope of Rydén's contribution to the *Life of St Andrew* throughout the decades and that it placed his recent edition within a historical and cultural debate. The article in question appeared in a remarkable interdisciplinary book on the cult of saints, dedicated to the contribution of Peter Brown, and its author Paul Magdalino chose for his title the significant clause "the holy man as a literary text". In this way Magdalino, in accordance with Rydén's suggestions,[38] withdraws from the hero of the text any 'positivistic' implications, presenting him as a

[35] Ludwig 2002: 164.

[36] For criticism of this view, see Rydén 1998 (on Ludwig 1997). Magdalino 1999: 86 with n. 13 seems more open to consider "successive layers of composition".

[37] Rydén's option for mid-tenth century is, however, mentioned; see Ludwig 2002: 164.

[38] See for instance Rydén's suggestion of Andrew as "portavoce dell'autore" in the introduction to Cesaretti 1990: 25 [= Cesaretti 2014: 49]. See also Ivanov 2006: 156–57.

purely literary creation.[39] When Magdalino remarks that Rydén "looks to have the stronger case" in his 'argument' with Mango about the 'real' date of production of the text,[40] this is within the specific 'hagiographical discourse' of the text – the tenth-century discourse, as Rydén had been pointing out since the 1970s.[41]

The main achievement of this important contribution by Magdalino lies in its capacity to 'reknit' a range of suggestions that were already present in earlier articles by Rydén, and draw further parallels between the *Life of St Basil the Younger* and *VAS*. Magdalino develops Rydén's intuition of the two *Lives* as twin texts devoted to, in one and the same period, two fictional figures interpreting the needs and expectations of their time – perhaps even the product of one and the same person, "Nicephorus being a pseudonym invented for the purpose of the historical fiction" of *VAS*, as Rydén had suggested.[42] But Magdalino also adds the suggestion that the two *Lives* could have been placed under the aegis of a single patron, that is the famous Basil the Nothos or *parakoimomenos*, the illegitimate son of Emperor Romanos I Lekapenos (870-948) from a 'Scythian' slave-girl.[43] It is thus the two *Lives*' achievement in catching and representing their *Zeitgeist* in historical and cultural terms that counts, which creates a correlation between the *coordonnées hagiograhiques* of the text and its literary discourse.

Magdalino commented on Rydén's *Life of St Andrew* also in 2003, when he edited the volume *Byzantium in the Year 1000*. In that case, too, a careful consideration of *VAS* in Rydén's edition was combined with

[39] This is true of each and every literary saint, but especially of Andrew, fictitious as his figure is in many respects. As far as Basil the Younger is concerned, it is fair to quote Sullivan, Talbot and Mc Grath 2014: 15 "the possibility remains that Basil may have been a real person", and therefore not only, as in Magdalino's wording, a "literary text".

[40] Magdalino 1999: 86.

[41] See also Høgel 2003: 217.

[42] Rydén 1983: 585–586.

[43] Magdalino 1999: 108–111; Magdalino 2003b: 256. For a recent description of Basil *parakoimomenos* as sponsor of arts, see Bevilacqua 2013: 193–234 ("Basilio 'parakoimomenos' e la passione per le arti").

a study of the *Life of St Basil the Younger* and other texts of that age.[44] Once again, the *Zeitgeist* of the tenth century was evoked and especially the apocalyptic expectations permeating the two texts were investigated. Not only Magdalino, but also other scholars have been successful in connecting the "Andreas Salos-Apocalypse",[45] as Rydén had defined it,[46] with the Byzantine atmosphere expecting the end of the world for year 992 (and the immediately following years) on the basis of calculations assimilating each and every *aiōn* of 1000 years with one of the seven days of Creation.[47] *VAS* mirrors these views, combining the expectations with resonances of Pseudo-Methodios, as other texts of that age did. Rydén had properly underlined all this and combined it with the apocalyptic expectations of the *Life of St Basil the Younger*,[48] which was then resumed by Magdalino.

To sum up, when speaking of the cultural atmosphere of Byzantium in the tenth century, the *Life of St Andrews* is nowadays accepted as a necessary element in specific terms, proper to its 'hagiographical discourse', expressing the way in which the Byzantines perceived human history and the end of the world around year 1000.[49] The seventh-century date has been left behind.

In close cooperation with Rydén, I published in 1990 my Italian annotated translations of *VAS* and the *Life of St Symeon*, its forerunner. My translation of the *Life of St Andrew* – the first translation into a modern language[50] – was based on a preliminary, yet largely advanced version

[44] Magdalino 2003b.

[45] Brandes 1997 and 2000; Bonfil 2003.

[46] Rydén 1974. Also Efthymiadis 2011b: 126, n. 98 points out that the syntagm is Rydén's invention.

[47] It was thought that the world had been created in year 5508 before Christ, therefore the beginning of the seventh *aiōn* corresponding to the seventh day of Creation, should have come in year 492, that is 6000 years after the 'supposed' Creation. This had not happened and half an *aiōn* was added: the result was year 992. Further apocalyptic calculations were elaborated until year 1025, more or less. See Magdalino 2003b.

[48] See Rydén 1968, 1974.

[49] On differences in attitudes, see Kazhdan 2006: 199.

[50] As pointed out by Rydén, "Introduzione", in Cesaretti 1990: 32 [= Cesaretti 2014: 54].

of the critical text by Rydén, which we discussed line by line in Uppsala, especially in 1988–1989.[51] The book met with a certain appreciation and a reprint was deemed necessary, so in 2014 I published a revised and much enlarged version of it for the series *Testi e studi bizantino-neoellenici*.[52] While re-reading and commenting, my attention was drawn to some passages that still do not seem to have been fully considered and explored as regards the composition date of the text and its meaning in the light of the cultural climate and the horizon of expectation of its audience. I shall present here two *Lesefrüchte* that may hopefully offer some further contribution to the correct understanding of the *coordonnées hagiographiques* of *VAS*, but also help to understand the *Life* and its author's literary purposes in its 'proper' cultural and social context.

As already mentioned above, the author who 'signs' the text with the name of Nikephoros, priest of Hagia Sophia, presents himself as a contemporary, even a friend, of Andrew the Fool; the story of his hero – or at least most part of it[53] – is set during the reign of Emperor Leo I (457–474). Moreover, he has his hero predicting that Epiphanios, Andrew's pupil and confident, will become patriarch – and an Epiphanios was actually Constantinopolitan patriarch during the years 520–535.[54] Nikephoros tries to offer a frame of historical consistency to the text, but his goal is not fully achieved; take, for example, the well-known passage where Nikephoros refers to Symeon Salos as a saint "of old",[55] while the man playing the Holy Fool in Emesa was a real historical figure who had lived at the time of Justinian, around 550, therefore at least 50 years after the fictional date of Andrew.

Be that as it may, within this fictional framework it so happens that the holy fool Andrew meets his favorite pupil Epiphanios and gives evidence of his 'second, interior' sight by letting him know that he – An-

[51] See Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 7.

[52] Cesaretti 2014.

[53] The fact that Nikephoros informs us that Andrew has fought secretly for 66 years (Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 300, ll. 4390–91) does not help. See Rydén, Introduzione, in Cesaretti 1990: 10–20 [= Cesaretti 2014: 44]; Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 358 and n. 6; Cesaretti 2014: 338, n. 884.

[54] Rydén 1978: 145–47.

[55] Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 28, ll. 223–24

drew – had 'seen' the devil in form of an Arab merchant dressed in a black garment, who had reproached Epiphanios because he – Epiphanios – had practiced virtue by fighting against carnal temptations.[56] Andrew's vision corresponds to a 'real' episode in the text, as is confirmed by Epiphanios himself after a narrative interlude:[57] the devil had appeared to him as a man of age with a fierce look; he was clad in black with shoes 'clay colored'. Behind the appearance, Andrew explains, he is a Satan commanding a hundred demons. In general, the black color and the exotic origin are characteristic of the demons, who are characteristically and typically presented as Ethiopians.[58] But there is nothing characteristic and typical in the scene of an Arab merchant walking in the street of Constantinople around the area of the Forum Bovis[59] and freely addressing a young passer-by. Much less so if the text defines him as *Agarēnos*[60] and *Ismaēlites*,[61] which implies not a geographical idea (as it could have been for the neutral term "Arabia"[62]) but a difference in terms of faith. It especially implies Islamic creed,[63] as is indicated also by intra-textual cross-references with the Andreas Salos-Apocalypse:

> Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 262, l. 3834: the first apocalyptic emperor "will turn his face towards the East and humble the sons of Hagar" […] "because of their blasphemy";
> Ibid., ll. 3853–53, "in this city no Ishmaelite will be found" (which means that they actually were found there, as the episode of the merchant implies).

It goes without saying that the blasphemy that the text is referring to, being the Islamic faith, could not have been formulated in the fictional time of Leo I, and the same is true for the equivalence *Agarēnos/Ismaēlites*

---

[56] Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 66, ll. 798–815; 70–74, ll. 874–921.

[57] "Epiphanios and the philosophers"; Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 68–70, ll. 816–57.

[58] See e.g. Cracco Ruggini 1979: 126–35; Boulhol 1994: 286–87.

[59] Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 72, l. 876.

[60] Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 66, 70, 72, ll. 799, 875, 889.

[61] Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 66, l. 803.

[62] Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 268, 270, ll. 3914 and 3940 respectively.

[63] The importance of the *oeuvre* of John of Damaskos for this purpose has been properly underlined by Jeffreys 1986: 317.

for the merchant. Moreover, if we have to follow the 'hagiographical discourse' of the text and its consistency, can we reasonably place a passage like this "in the latter 7th century", as suggested by Mango?[64]

Leaving aside any general or specific consideration of the image of Arabs in Byzantine literature,[65] the question concerns the consistency of the episode of the Islamic merchant in the Forum Bovis with a historical scenario. And this is absolutely implausible not only during the age of Leo I, but also at the end of the seventh century, a period of sharp conflict between Constantinople and the caliph. Things changed slightly in the first quarter of the eighth century when a mosque was built,[66] but the first period for which we have a set of reliable data about the presence of a colony of Arab merchants in Constantinople is the late ninth or beginning of the tenth century.[67] In this sense, the 'hagiographical discourse' of *VAS* and the interpretation of this episode can be set against a 'horizon of expectation' (not an "insight into popular mentality") widespread at the time. In one case, the passage of the Arab merchant in *VAS* has been interpreted as evidence for historical truth, but this is perhaps going too far.[68] The fact remains that the episode offers an additional evidence (*e contrario*) for the date suggested by Rydén. The mention of the Forum Bovis as a possible seat for the unexpected meeting with the Arab merchant also deserves some further investigation.[69]

A second passage of *VAS* that has not been taken into account as regards date, but which seems to deserve some additional consideration, is an episode where once again the main characters Epiphanios and An-

[64] Mango 1982: 310. May I remark here *per incidens* that neither Mango 1982 nor Rydén 1995 – although both of them examine the attitude of *VAS* towards the Arabs (Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 44-45) – take into account this passage from that specific perspective.

[65] For the general, see Jeffreys 1986; see Rydén 1984 on the case of the Arab Samonas.

[66] As we know from Constantine Porhyrogenitus' *De Administrando Imperio* 21; see Moravcsik and Jenkins 1967: 92, ll. 112–14; Jenkins 1962: 78; more recently Constable 2003: 147–51; Di Branco 2013: 119–20.

[67] As is accepted by the majority of scholars on the basis of the *Book of the Eparch*, chapter 5; Koder 1991: 94–96, evoked in Constable 2003: 147–151 and discussed at length in Reinert 1998: 130–135.

[68] Reinert 1998: 131.

[69] See Cesaretti 2014: 199 and n. 201.

drew appear.[70] The holy fool has had a vision predicting that Epiphanios will become patriarch: Epiphanios appears in the great church of Hagia Sophia, where liturgical robes descend for him from above and two 'luminars' (*phōstēres*[71]) adorn Epiphanios' body with precious vestments and then bless him with the sign of the Cross. Even though Rydén interprets these *phōstēres* as angels,[72] I would not neglect the more traditional connotation of *phōstēr* with human beings, as all other occurrences of the word in the same text indicate.[73] It should be added that Andrew's forerunner in "holy foolery", Symeon of Emesa, is defined as *phōstēr* by Leontios of Neapolis from the very beginning.[74] Furthermore, in the *Life of St Symeon*, which *VAS* evokes several times in a sort of pattern of resonance, it is the hegoumenos of the monastery of St Gerasimos near Jericho, the blessed Nikon, who gives Symeon and his friend John the monastic robes[75] and then blesses their bodies.[76] He is not explicitly defined as *phōstēr*, but from his first appearence he is described as *katalampōn*.[77]

One could easily maintain the usual paradigm of *phōstēr* also in our interpretation of the passage of *VAS* discussed above and read the vision as referring not to angels, but to persons whose proper place and blessing gesture Nikephoros describes.[78] The most plausible identification would accordingly be with *patriarchs*, the forerunners of Epiphanios in his important future role as well as, in hierarchical terms, the most apt persons to oversee the ceremony of Epiphanios' taking the episcopal habit and then blessing him, exactly the same way in which hegoumenos Nikon had overseen the ceremony of the monastic habit for Symeon and John

[70] Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 118–120, ll. 1608–1624.
[71] Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 120, l. 1613.
[72] Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 67, 300 s.v. *phōstēr*.
[73] Rydén 1995, vol. 1: 300: six times Andrew, twice Epiphanios, etc.
[74] Rydén 1963: 122, l. 15.
[75] Rydén 1963: 131, l. 5 – 132, l. 16.
[76] Rydén 1963: 137, ll. 8–9; also 155, ll. 8–12.
[77] Rydén 1963: 126, l. 22.
[78] In the text one more *phōstēr* (Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 248, l. 3656) is St Akakios, who appears to Epiphanios in a vision; he is "lightning" (l. 3668) and works a miracle for Andrew's disciple.

and then had blessed them.[79] Such personalities as Gregory of Nazianzos or John Chrysostomos, forerunners of Epiphanios on the patriarchal seat of Constantinople, could perfectly suit the purpose.

In my view, this interpretation of *phōstēr* is supported also by the fact that the scene is set in Hagia Sophia, where the southern as well as northern *tympana* were decorated with mosaics representing bishops and patriarchs: Ignatios the Younger, John Chrysostomos, Ignatios Theophoros and Athanasios of Alexandria are still visible, though the original arrangement was much wider.[80] This decoration was completed by the end of the ninth century,[81] so it could have influenced a text composed in the tenth century, but certainly not one composed in the seventh century, when the cathedral was still primarily if not exclusively aniconic.[82] This interpretation is strengthened by the fact that the author of *VAS*, as Rydén remarked,[83] was skilled in visual imagery and even aware of visual traditions.[84] The post-ninth century aspect of the church (with interior mosaic decoration), I argue, might have influenced the writing process of Nikephoros, whoever he was. Once again, the 'hagiographical discourse' developed its qualities within a specific historical frame.

The fact remains that Rydén's edition of the *Life of St Andrew* continues to put forward interpretational challenges to scholars and thus incites

---

[79] Textual parallels speak for themselves, see *Life of Symeon* in Rydén 1963: 137, 8-9 [Nikon] σφραγίσας αὐτῶν τὰ μέτωπα καὶ τὰ στήθη καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοὺς ἐν εἰρήνῃ; 155, 9-10 [Nikon] ὕδωρ ... ἔβαλεν ὑποκάτω τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ αὐτοῦ σφραγίσας τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ τιμίου σταυροῦ; *VAS* in Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 120, ll. 1617-1620 ὁ μὲν εἷς [φωστήρ *intell.*] τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐπὶ τὸ σὸν μέτωπον ποιήσας ἀσπασάμενος ἀνεχώρησεν, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος καὶ αὐτὸς πάντα σου τὰ μέλη σφραγίσας καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀσπασάμενος ᾤχετο. The insistence on the blessing of the whole body implies protection against carnal temptations.

[80] See Mango 1962: 48–58; Mango and Hawkins 1972: 6. Gregory the Theologian was in their number.

[81] See Mango and Hawkins 1972: 41.

[82] See e.g. Mango 1962: 93–94.

[83] "Eccellente resa visiva": see Rydén, "Introduzione", in Cesaretti 1990: 19 [= Cesaretti 2014: 43–44]

[84] See e.g. his image of John the Theologian, which is influenced by traditional iconography (Rydén 1995, vol. 2: 22, ll. 142–43 and 307 with n. 4).

future research. Does this mean that it has simply set the basis for "eine gründliche Analyse"? I would rather suggest that we listen to the voice of a great writer of the twentieth century, Italo Calvino, for whom "A classic is a book that has never finished saying what it has to say".[85] If this is true not only of poems, novels and the like, but also of works of research and scholarship, we can now certainly say, twenty years after its publication, that Rydén's *Life of St Andrew* has become and is a classic.

[85] Calvino 1995 : 7 [quoted after repr. 12, 2006]: "Un classico è un libro che non ha mai finito di dire quel che ha da dire".

Bibliography

Primary sources

Koder 1991 = *Das Eparchenbuch Leons des Weisen*, hrsg. von J. Koder, Wien (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 33).

Moravcsik and Jenkins 1967 = *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Administrando Imperio*, ed. by G. Moravcsik and R.J.H. Jenkins, New, Revised Edition, Washington, D.C. (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 1).

Rydén 1963 = L. Rydén, *Das Leben des heiligen Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis*, Uppsala (Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 4).

Rydén 1995 = L. Rydén, *The Life of St Andrew the Fool*, 2 volumes, Uppsala (Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 4, 1 and 2).

Rydén 2002 = L. Rydén, *The Life of St Philaretos the Merciful written by his Grandson Niketas*, Uppsala (Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 8).

Sullivan, Talbot and McGrath 2014 = *The Life of Saint Basil the Younger. Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of the Moscow Version*, ed. by D.F. Sullivan, A.-M. Talbot and S. McGrath, Washington, D.C. (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 45).

References

Bevilacqua, L. 2013. *Arte e aristocrazia a Bisanzio nell'età dei Macedoni. Costantinopoli, la Grecia e l'Asia Minore*. Rome.

Bonfil, R. 2003. "La Visione Ebraica di Daniele nel contesto bizantino del secolo X", *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, N.S. 40 [publ. 2004]: 25–65.

Boulhol, P. 1994. "Hagiographie antique et démonologie. Notes sur quelques Passion grecques (BHG 962z, 964 et 1165–1166)", *Analecta Bollandiana* 112: 255–303.

Brandes, W. 1997. "Anastasios ὁ δίκορος: Endzeiterwartung und Kaiserkritik in Byzanz um 500 n. Chr.", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 90: 24–63.

— 2000. "Liudprand von Cremona (Legatio cap. 39–41) und eine bisher unbeachtete west-östliche Korrespondenz über die Bedeutung des Jahres 1000 A.D.", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 93: 435–63.

Calvino, I. 1995. *Perché leggere i classici*. Milano. Engl. Transl. *Why read the Classics?* (New York 2001).

Cesaretti, P. 1990. *Leonzio di Neapoli – Niceforo prete di Santa Sofia, I santi folli di Bisanzio. Vite di Simeone e Andrea,* a cura di Paolo Cesaretti. Milano.

— 2014. *Leonzio di Neapoli – Niceforo prete di Santa Sofia, Vite dei saloi Simeone e Andrea,* a cura di Paolo Cesaretti (Testi e Studi Bizantino-Neoellenici 19). Rome.

Constable, O. R. 2003. *Housing the Stranger in the Mediterranean World: Lodging, Trade, and Travel in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. New York.

Constantinou, S. 2014. "Holy Actors and Actresses: Fools and Cross-Dressers as the Protagonists of Saints' Lives", in Efthymiadis 2014: 343–62.

Cracco Ruggini, L. 1979. "Il negro buono e il negro malvagio nel mondo classico", in *Conoscenze etniche e rapporti di convivenza nell'antichità*, ed. M. Sordi. Milan, 108–35.

Delehaye, H. 1934. *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique* (Subsidia Hagiographica 21). Brussels.

Déroche, V. 1995. *Études sur Léontios de Neapolis* (Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 3). Uppsala.

— 1998. Review of Rydén 1995, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 56: 332–33.

Di Branco, M. 2013. "Ismailiti a Bisanzio. Immagini e presenze", *Studia Graeco-Arabica* 3: 105–20.

Efthymiadis, S. 2006. "New Developments in Hagiography: The Rediscovery of Byzantine Hagiography", in *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies, London 21–26 August 2006,* vol. 1, ed. E. Jeffreys. Aldershot, 157–71.

— (ed.) 2011a. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography,* vol. 1: *Periods and Places*. Farnham.

— 2011b. "Hagiography from the 'Dark Age' to the Age of Symeon Metaphrastes (Eighth-Tenth Centuries)", in Efthymiadis 2011a: 95–142.

— (ed.) 2014. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography,* vol. 2: *Genres and Contexts*. Farnham.

Festugière, A.-J. 1974. *Léontios de Néapolis, Vie de Syméon le fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre*. Paris.

Høgel, C. 2003. “Hagiography under the Macedonians: the Two Recensions of the Metaphrastic Menologion”, in Magdalino 2003a: 217–32.

IBC 1986 = *The 17th International Byzantine Congress. Major Papers (Dumbarton Oaks / Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., August 3-8, 1986)*. New Rochelle.

Ivanov, S. A. 1996. Review of Rydén 1995, *Byzantinoslavica* 57: 405–6.

— 2006. *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond* (Engl. Transl.). Oxford and New York. First publ. as *Vizantiiskoe iurodstvo* (Moscow 1994).

Jeffreys, E. 1986. “The Image of the Arabs in Byzantine Literature”, in *IBC* 1986: 305–323.

Jenkins, R. H. 1962, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Administrando Imperio,* vol. 2*: Commentary*. London.

Kaplan, M. and E. Kountoura-Galaki 2014. “Economy and Society in Byzantine Hagiography: Realia and Methodological Questions”, in Efthymiadis 2014: 389–418.

Kazhdan, A. 2006. *A History of Byzantine Literature (850-1000)*, ed. C. Angelidi (National Hellenic Research Foundation – Institute for Byzantine Research – Research Series 4). Athens.

Ludwig, C. 1997. *Sonderformen byzantinischer Hagiographie und ihr literarisches Vorbild. Untersuchungen zu den Viten des Äsop, des Philaretos, des Symeon Salos und des Andreas Salos*. Frankfurt am Main.

— 2002. Review of Rydén 1995, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 95/1: 162–64.

Magdalino, P. 1999. “‘What we heard in the Lives of the saints we have seen with our own eyes’: the holy man as literary text in tenth-century Constantinople”, in *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, ed. J. Howard-Johnston and P. A. Hayward. Oxford, 83–112.

— (ed.) 2003a. *Byzantium in the Year 1000* (The Medieval Mediterranean 45). Leiden and Boston.

— 2003b. “The Year 1000 in Byzantium”, in Magdalino 2003a: 233–70.

Mango, C. 1962. *Materials for the Study of the Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 8). Washington, D.C.

—1982. “The Life of St. Andrew the Fool Reconsidered”, *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi* 2 [= Miscellanea Agostino Pertusi II]: 297–313.

Mango, C. and E. J. W. Hawkins 1972. “The Mosaics of St. Sophia at Is-

tanbul: The Church Fathers in the North Tympanum", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26: 1–41 [and additional images].

Reinert, S. W. 1998. "The Muslim Presence in Constantinople, 9th-15th Centuries: Some Preliminary Observations", in *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, ed. H. Ahrweiler and A. E. Laiou. Washington D.C., 125-150.

Rydén, L. 1968. "Zum Aufbau der Andreas Salos-Apokalypse", *Eranos* 66: 101–117.

—1970. *Bemerkungen zum Leben des heiligen Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis* (Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 6). Uppsala.

—1974. "The Andreas Salos Apocalypse: Greek Text, Translation and Commentary", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 28: 197–261.

— 1978. "The Date of the Life of Andreas Salos", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 32: 127–55.

— 1982a. "Style and Historical Fiction in the Life of St. Andreas Salos", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 32/3: 175–83.

— 1982b. "The Revised Version of the *Life of St Philaretos the Merciful* and the *Life of St Andreas Salos*", *Analecta Bollandiana* 100: 485–95.

— 1983. "The *Life of St. Basil the Younger* and the Date of the *Life of St. Andreas Salos*", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 [= *Okeanos: Essays presented to Ihor Ševčenko on his sixtieth birthday*]: 568–86.

— 1984. "The Portrait of the Arab Samonas in Byzantine Literature", *Graeco-Arabica* 3 [= *First International Congress on Greek and Arabic Studies*]: 101–8.

— 1985. "The Bride-shows at the Byzantine Court – History or Fiction?", *Eranos* 83: 175–91.

— 1986. "New Forms of Hagiography: Heroes and Saints", in *IBC* 1986: 537–54.

— 1990. "Introduzione", in Cesaretti 1990, 5-32 [reprinted with minor changes in Cesaretti 2014, 33–54].

— 1998. Review of Ludwig 1997, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 91: 540–44.

— 2002†. "Fiction and Reality in the Hagiographer's Self-Presentation", *Travaux et Mémoires* 14 [= *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*]: 47–52.

Rydén, L., J. O. Rosenqvist and S. Ryda 1995. "*Das Leben Philaretos' des Barmherzigen*: ein Editionsprojekt in drei Teilen", *Bysantinska sällska-*

pet. Bulletin 13: 18–28.
Van Uytfanghe, M. 1993. “L’hagiographie: un « genre » chrétien ou antique tardif?”, *Analecta Bollandiana* 111: 135–88.
Yannopoulos, P. 1998. Review of Rydén 1995, *Byzantion* 68: 265–66.

Pilgrimage for dreams in Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium: continuity of the pagan ritual or development within Christian miracle tradition?

Hedvig von Ehrenheim
Uppsala University

Abstract

In Late Antiquity the Greco-Roman religions were replaced by Christianity, which developed from a small movement to the leading religion of the whole Mediterranean. Inevitably some old traditions were incorporated into the new religion, but one should not assume that the processes of syncretism were simple and straightforward. In some cults of the martyrs, pilgrims and locals sought healing by sleeping in their churches and seeking visions of the holy figures in their dreams (the phenomenon is called "incubation"). This article argues against Early Christian incubation being a ritual that was copied and taken over from the pagan incubation ritual, as has been stated in previous research, and shows that many different factors served to create this somewhat unorthodox Christian healing ritual.

Introduction

Incubation is a ritual where a help-seeker comes to a sanctuary to enquire the god, hero, or saint of the sanctuary for assistance. Ritual preparations are made before lying down to sleep in the sanctuary, or, in the Christian tradition, the church.[1] During the sleep the divinity or saint

[1] I would like to thank Ewa Balicka Witakowska and Arja Karivieri for a thorough and insightful reading of the manuscript, as well as Gunnel Ekroth, James Kelhoffer and

appears to the worshipper, either, apparently, curing him or her from illness directly while sleeping, or giving advice on what to do in order to get well, or answering any type of question the enquirer has put. In the Greek world incubation is first attested in Herodotus, who writes about the hero Amphiaraos being consulted concerning the future.[2] Incubation performed primarily for healing purposes appeared first in the cult of Asklepios, a son of Apollo, known from the *Iliad* as a master surgeon and administrator of medicinal herbs.[3] In his sanctuary at Epidauros, incubation is first attested in the *iamata*, a collection of miracle stories from the fourth century BC (the stories themselves may be older). In 420 BC the cult of Asklepios was imported from Epidauros to Athens, and at this time incubation was the key feature of the cult.[4] After this, the cult soon spread to all parts of the Greek world, and also to Rome.[5] The ubiquity of the type of religious healing that the cult of Asklepios offered can be witnessed in the over 300 sanctuaries to Asklepios found all over the Mediterranean area.[6] Among the most important and frequently visited were, in addition to Epidauros, Kos, Lebena, Pergamon, Aegae, Kyrene and the sanctuary of Asklepios on the Tiber island.[7]

Ingela Nilsson who invited me to present this article at their seminars and for the many helpful comments I received there. This article developed from my article on pagan and Early Christian incubation, published in *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* in 2009. After I had sent this article in for publication, an excellent article by Fritz Graf appeared. Although we treat the same topic, the relation between pagan and Early Christian incubation, these are two individual articles with different approaches and treating different source material.

For an analysis of the archaeological evidence for pagan and Early Christian incubation, see Ehrenheim 2009. It is important to distinguish institutionalized incubation from spontaneous miraculous dreams with a healing result which were had in any locale and not one designed especially for the purpose: see e.g. Cox Miller 1994: 148-183, 205-249; for the important distinction, see Ehrenheim 2009: 253, nn. 123-125 and Graf 2014: 138-140. These are related phenomena, which may overlap, but are best studied as separate categories.

[2] Hdt. 8.134.

[3] *Il.* 2.729-731, 4.194, 4.219 and 11.518.

[4] As seen on the Telemachos stele: Beschi 1982: 39-40; Beschi 2002: 21-22.

[5] Wickkiser 2008; Edelstein & Edelstein 1945.

[6] Riethmüller 2005, vol. 1: 75-77.

[7] See Riethmüller 2005 on the Asklepieia.

With the coming of Christianity, Epidauros, Pergamon and Aegae were no longer active by the end of the fourth century AD. The last inscription at Epidauros is dated to AD 355.[8] The Athenian Asklepieion, though, was in use as late as the fifth century, when the neoplatonist philosopher Proclus (d. AD 485) went there to pray.[9] There is evidence for rebuilding at former Asklepieia in Christian times, but based on the archaeological evidence it cannot be said if the purpose was always religious, or to what extent the buildings were reused.[10]

Incubation in the Christian tradition appears in an organized way for the first time in the cult of Thekla in Cilicia, Asia Minor, in the fifth century AD.[11] Later on, in some cults of martyrs, as testified by miracle collections, incubation became the primary and eagerly sought method for obtaining a cure. Incubation miracles are preserved in several cults. Apart from the cult of Thekla we find them in the cults of Kosmas and Damianos as well as Artemios in Constantinople, and Kyros and Johannes in Menouthis outside of Alexandria.[12] Incubation miracles are also attested from the cult of Demetrios in Thessalonike.[13]

---

[8] Trombley 1993, vol. 1, 119 (Epidauros in use until at least the middle of the fourth century); and Eusebius of Caesarea, *De vita Constantini* 3.56 (testimonium 818 in Edelstein & Edelstein 1945: Asklepieion at Aegae destroyed by Constantine in 326. In Syria the cult of Asklepios was eradicated by the authorities in the fourth century but Theodoretus (393-466) feared that the populace still worshipped Asklepios with libations and sacrifice (Theodoretus, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio* 8.19-23 [testimonium 5 in Edelstein & Edelstein 1945]).

[9] Marinus, *Vita Procli* 29 (testimonium 582 in Edelstein & Edelstein 1945). See also Trombley (1993, vol. 1: 294, 308-309 and 323) and Price (1999: 169) on the Athenian Asklepieion.

[10] Vaes 1984-86: 333, n. 79.

[11] See the miracle stories of Thekla, written down by the mid fifth century (Dagron 1978: 17-19).

[12] *Life of S. Thekla*, ed. Dagron 1978; *Kosmas und Damian*, ed. L. Deubner. Leipzig and Berlin 1907; N. Fernandez Marcos, *Los thaumata de Sofronio. Contribución al estudio de la incubatio cristiana,* Madrid 1975; *The miracles of St. Artemios. A collection of miracle stories by an anonymous author of seventh-century Byzantium,* eds. V.S. Crisafulli & J.W. Nesbitt, Leiden, New York and Köln 1997. On the structure of Byzantine dream-healing miracle stories, see Constantinou 2014. See further Csepregi 2007 (non vidi).

[13] *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius*, vols. 1-2, ed. P. Lemerle,

These miracles have been composed or collected by different authors with different motives for narrating these events.[14] Some miracle stories were part of an oral culture, where miracles might be told and retold similarly to tales. Some stories may reappear in miracle collections belonging to different cults.[15] Most of these stories, however, give a detailed description of the churches themselves in which the worshippers incubated. Moreover, several of the stories provide us with such detailed information on names and the geographical provenience of the worshippers that it has been argued that they were written down from accounts of healings recorded by each church and read aloud at services for newcomers.[16]

In this article, the miracle stories are used to locate the cult geographically, and to seek out information on the ritual surrounding the sleeping itself. The information on ritual is most often given in passing, and serves as a backdrop for the miraculous events about to follow. It might thus be expected that information about the ritual falls back on actual events in the churches. Otherwise the stories, often read aloud in the church, would not make sense to their listeners.

In previous research, the general assumption is that there existed a direct continuity between the pagan ritual and incubation as practised in the cult of the Early Christian saints.[17] It has been claimed that the Christian church consciously and at an official level wanted to eradicate paganism by "taking over" pagan cults, and that the ritual of incubation was included in the bargain, more or less without changing the ritual.[18]

Paris 1979-1981.

[14] See e.g. Crisafulli & Nesbitt 1997: 25-27, and Csepregi 2013.

[15] As for example the story of the lame man and the mute woman, found as mir. 24 of Kosmas and Damianos' collection, cited in mir. 30 of Kyros and Johannes and also found in the collection of miracles attributed to St Menas (Delehaye 1927, 147), as well as a similar story in the miracles of Colluthus (*ABoll* 98, 1980: 363-380 [P. Devos]).

[16] Festugière 1971: 85-86; Crisafulli & Nesbitt 1997. 27.

[17] Deubner 1900: 57, 97-98, *passim;* Hamilton 1906: 110-111; Becher 1970: 255; Stewart 2004, *passim;* Markschies 2007: 177-178; Oberhelman 2008: 53. Contra, though, recently: Wiesniewski 2013 and Graf 2014.

[18] On the phenomenon of divine healing traditions being transferred directly: MacMul-

It seems, however, that a simplistic case for a direct local and ritual continuity from pagan to Early Christian incubation cannot be made. I have pointed this out in a previous article, mainly focused on the archaeological evidence, and it was also excellently argued by Fritz Graf in his article of 2014. The main argument of Graf is that Christian theology had a problem with oracular dreams in general and dreams perceived as oracular by the laity especially, given the hierarchical structure of the Church.[19] He also argues that pagan incubation must have effectively died out with Theodosius decree in 393 prohibiting public sacrifice.[20] Essentially, he sees dream healing as a universal occurrence, possibly kept alive at the site of Menouthis, but in its essence specific to the world of Christianity.[21]

In this article I will try to give a further background to the complex processes that made incubation appear as a prominent feature in some of the Early Christian martyr cults.

This article will examine, first, the evidence for a direct local continuity of incubation, where a pagan practice of incubation would have been introduced in a Christian cult established for the same group of worshippers, it having been stated in previous research that such a direct and officially driven continuity exists. Second, the question of ritual continuity between pagan and Early Christian incubation will be analysed, it having also been argued in previous research that such continuities can be shown. Third and last, the phenomenon of Early Christian incubation will be analyzed in its historical context; to be highlighted are the emergence of the cult of the martyrs from the perspective both of the laity and of the officials of the church, and the different miracle traditions that developed in these cults.

---

len 1997: 127. On the official instating of Christian incubation at Menouthis, see Leipoldt 1957: 40-44; Takács 1994: 503-506; Merkelbach 1995: 200, 327-328 and Frankfurter 1998: 165. On Thekla, as well as incubation in general terms, see Cox Miller 1994: 117, "Asclepius lived on in Christianity in the cult of the saints".

[19] Graf 2014: 120, 124 and 127. He builds this argument on his previous article on the topic (Graf 2010), as well as the work of Le Goff (1988: 193-231) and Stroumsa (1999: 189-212).

[20] Graf 2014: 121.

[21] Graf 2014: 141-142.

THE QUESTION OF LOCAL CONTINUITY

The first step when investigating continuity of the practice is to find out if a local continuity can be shown, that is, whether there existed nearby pagan incubation cults preceding the Early Christian ones. Deubner argues that the continuity of the incubation phenomenon into Early Christian times can be seen directly on each site, and tries to find a pagan predecessor in the vicinity of every Early Christian incubation cult.[22]

Thekla and Sarpedon in Cilicia

According to legend Thekla was a disciple of the apostle Paul and followed him on his journeys dressed as a man.[23] Her *vita* was very popular, and among other places she was venerated in her main sanctuary near Seleucia, called Hagia Thekla, on the border between Cilicia and Isauria.[24] A collection of miracles was written by an anonymous writer, with some position of authority within the Church, in the middle of the fifth century AD.[25] The majority of the miracles noted down involved incubation.[26] Some scholars have suggested that the cult of Thekla replaced a nearby cult of the hero Sarpedon, stating that incubation was also the main feature in this pagan cult.[27] The miracles tell of an oracle

---

[22] Deubner 1900: 65-103.

[23] *Life of S. Thekla*, ed. Dagron 1978.

[24] See e.g. Kötting (1950: 140-160) and Dagron (1978: 55-139) on her cult.

[25] Dagron 1978: 17-19 and *ODB* 3, 1991: 2033-2034.

[26] Graf (2014: 134) states that the fact that curative dreams occur all around the sanctuary and not only in the church, serves to disqualify the cult of Thekla as an incubation cult. This is of course a matter of definition. I have argued previously (Ehrenheim 2009:254-255), that the cult is an incubation cult, and that the focus of it is not as uniquely the church, as Thekla did not have a grave there, but was believed to have disappeared miraculously in the rock. It is also one of the earliest Christian incubation cults, showing their close kinship with martyr cults and Early Christian miracles in general.

[27] Deubner 1900: 101-102; Cox Miller 1994: 117; Nissen 2001: 124. Dagron (1978: 81-82) is of the opinion that the temple of Sarpedon was replaced by a community of monks.

to Sarpedon acting as a competitor to the Christian cult.[28] Thus, the two cults co-existed for a time. Also Stephen Hill, documenting the architectural remains of Hagia Thekla, puts forward the hypothesis that the *temenos* wall of the basilica, which may be of a pre-Christian date together with some re-used Doric columns in the rock-cut church (one of the churches in the sanctuary) indicate that Hagia Thekla might be built on the site of an ancient pagan sanctuary.[29] Even if there exist remnants of buildings at Hagia Thekla that are older than the Christian sanctuary, these remains do not necessarily indicate cult and need not have come from a pagan sanctuary. Hill postulates a religious use of a wall possibly dating to pagan times, since the place later became the sanctuary of Thekla. Many explanations might be put forward as to why a Christian sanctuary was located there, apart from it being the site of a previous pagan cult. The availability of water and the site being a node in the trade roads going from the interior of Anatolia down the Cilician pass may be part of the explanation. In any case, the lack of excavations on the site make it impossible to draw any definite conclusions.

Concerning the historical background of the cult it has been stated that the cult of Thekla had to suppress a number of pagan cults in the area in order to establish its supremacy, and that the ones that the ones most difficult to get rid of were those of Sarpedon and Athena.[30] The cult of Thekla used epithets characteristic of these two pagan gods, parqe/nov (Athena/Thekla) and ξένος (Sarpedon) / ξένη (Thekla). Since this is the only testimoniy to a cult of Athena in the area and since incubation was never practised in the cult of Athena, the likelihood of a previous cult of Athena contributing to the emergence of incubation in the cult of Thekla is very small. The term Parthenos was furthermore also used as an epithet of the virgin Mary, so the connotation need not be pagan.
To argue for a direct continuity between a pagan incubation cult and the cult of Thekla, it must first be proved that the cult of Sarpedon used incubation as its oracular technique. There is no archaeological site which might be connected with the cult of Sarpedon in Cilicia. The only source

[28] *Miracles of Thekla* nos. 11, 18 and 40.
[29] Hill 1996: 213.
[30] Davis 2001: 73-80.

speaking of dream-oracles in the cult of Sarpedon is Tertullian (d. ca AD 240), *De anima* 46. In this text he gives a list of dream-oracles of the ancient world. As was often the case with ancient writers, his account was not based on first hand knowledge of these cults, but according to the editor the dream oracles were copied from texts by Origen, Philo and Clement of Alexandria.[31] Tertullian thus builds his argument on older authors who had never visited Cilicia. The miracles of Thekla, written while the cult of Sarpedon must have been in existence, is a more reliable source for the oracular technique being used in the cult of Sarpedon. One of the miracles of the collection tells of a woman who went to the oracle of Sarpedon to heal her grandson. Sarpedon however did not help, the author comments, "either he kept quiet altogether, or he, as he usually does, fooled the woman and sent her away without any benefit after having given some worthless riddle, a fable, or after not having opened his mouth at all".[32] Thekla then appeared to the grandmother and gave a prescription on how to cure the boy.

As for these techniques, the first sentence, that Sarpedon kept quiet, does not indicate whether it was the worshipper or an oracular priest who contacted Sarpedon. The second item of information, to sending away of the worshipper with a worthless riddle, may indicate some form of adjustment of the answer, made by authorities at the sanctuary. It may, however, also indicate that the answer was given directly to the enquirer by some form of visual or auditory vision, but that it was incomprehensible.

To turn now to the early history of Hagia Thekla, the sanctuary attracted many pilgrims already in the time of the pilgrim Egeria (who lived in the fourth century), but she, a diligent observer of miraculous phenomena, never mentions incubation.[33]

---

[31] Tertullianus, *De anima*, ed. J.H. Waszink, Amsterdam 1947: 497.

[32] "... οὐδ' αὐτὸς ἔσχεν εἰπεῖν τρόπον θεραπείας, ἢ καθάπαξ ἀποσιωπήσας, ἢ καί – ὡς σύνηθες αὐτῷ – τὸ γύναιον ἀπατήσας καὶ ἀνόνητον ἀποπέμψας, ἢ γρῖφον ἢ μῦθον ἢ οὐδ' ὅλως ἀποφηνάμενος. ...". In the translation of Dagron (1978: 313, mir. 11): "lui non plus ne sut indiquer le moyen de guérir, soit qu'il se fût tout à fait tu, soit que (comme c'est son habitude) it eût trompé la femme et l'eût renvoyée sans profit après avoir proféré une énigme, une fable, ou n'avoir pas du tout ouvert la bouche".

[33] *Egeria*, *Itineraria* 23.2-7, ed. Maraval 1997: 226-231. Egeria stayed in Jerusalem from

Not all of the anonymous miracles of Thekla written down in the fifth century involved incubation.[34] It may be that incubation in the sanctuary of Thekla was not practised at first, her miracles being performed in the same way as most miracles in Early Christianity, by prayer at the tomb of the martyr; and incubation as a technique may have spread gradually over the century. At least in part Christian incubation may have been influenced by the healing techniques of the cult of Sarpedon, using visions of some sort. Other examples are known from the fourth century in nearby Cappadocia, where local Christianity bore decidedly syncretistic traits.[35]

One might postulate that the cult of Thekla sought to replace the cults of Sarpedon and Athena, but it need not be the case that incubation was initially incorporated into the Christian cult in order to make it a better competitor. The evidence at hand on a cult to Sarpedon neither refutes nor proves that he gave dream-oracles directly to his worshippers. In miracle 40, a man coming to Hagia Thekla believed that Sarpedon had sent him there in order to get healed with the help of the holy oil hanging above her shrine. This gives us no information on the technique of healing used in the cult of Sarpedon, but confirms the co-existence of a pagan and a Christian religious resource in the mind of an ordinary person in late antiquity.

Kyros and Johannes (and Isis) at Menouthis

Kyros and Johannes were according to the legend martyred in Alexandria under Diocletian, and at least one of them was considered to be a doctor.[36] Due to there being a larger amount of substantial source ma-

381-384: see the edition of Natalucci.

[34] Miracles effected by prayer alone (no incubation): 20, 23 and 24. Thekla interfering in a storm, helping seafarers: 15. Thekla helping against robbers: 16 and 28. The saint appears in a waking vision: 19 and 31.

[35] Trombley 1994 vol. 2: 120-121. A local deacon, Glykerios, arranged a festival with a decidedly pagan style of dancing in 372, and the matter gave rise to some scolding from Basil of Caesarea.

[36] *ODB* 2, 1991: 1164. See Gascou 2007, esp. 262-263, for the legendary character of the vitae.

terial than for the other Early Christian incubation cults, much has been written about a possible replacement of a cult of Isis at Menouthis, a village close to Alexandria, by the cult of the martyrs Kyros and Johannes. The site itself is today most probably under water.[37]

The earliest mention of a cult to Isis at Menouthis is in a papyrus from the second century AD.[38] Here Isis in Menouthis is given the epithet ἀλήθιναν, and one might guess that this implies her giving oracles at this site.[39] Since incubation was offered in the cult of Sarapis located close by at Kanopos,[40] and since incubation was a key feature in other

---

[37] The temple of Isis as well as the ancient healing shrine of the martyrs Kyros and Johannes were situated at the modern site of Abuqir three kilometres east of Kanopos, about nineteen kilometres east of Alexandria. Stephanos of Byzantium (first half of the sixth century AD) and Zacharias the Orator (writing between 511 and 518) refer to Menouthis as a village lying close to Kanopos (cited and translated in Bernand 1970: 207-208). The temple of Isis is further to have also served as a pharos for incoming ships (McGuckin 1993: 292), so it would seem probable that the medieval fort, still standing, was on the same spot. According to Bernard the site is mainly identified by aerial photographs and underwater surveys suggest that it lies mainly under water at the bay (Bernard 1970: 292-293). This fits well with the evidence of Sophronios (born c. 550, bishop in Jerusalem 634-638), who described the sanctuary of Kyros and Johannes at Menouthis as lying just by the sea-shore (Sophronios of Jersualem, Laudes in SS. Cyrum et Ioannem, *PG* 87, 3416. Translation in Bernard 1970: 216-217). The excavations made by Albert Daninos at Abuqir in 1917 were unfortunately never published, and those finds that were noted consisted mainly of pre-Christian monumental sculpture. The remains visible on the site have been described by Breccia (Breccia 1914: 134-138; Breccia 1926: 35-50, See also the maps of the Expédition en Égypte 1830-31), none however have been identified as either the temple of Isis och the church of Kyros and Johannes (Empereur 1998: 180. See further the website of Franck Goddio, who has made underwater surveys in the area (www.franckgoddio.org), and the reports of Paolo Gallo at www.archaeogate.org on excavations at Nelson Island).

[38] In the *Pap.Oxyrh*. XI.1380.63 (second c. AC), on Isis: "… ἐν Μεν[ο]ύθι ἀλήθιναν…". The by-name suggests that she is present in Menouthis and that she gives true oracles. For the presence of Isis in Menouthis see also Vidman 1969, no. 403 (*IG* XIV.1005) (time of Antoninus Pius) and no. 556a (possibly of the time of Alexander Severus). In general on incubation in the cult of Isis, see Dunand 1973, vol. 2: 102-103.

[39] Frankfurter writes that the attribution of "truth" to Isis of Menouthis is likely to refer to her true oracles (Frankfurter 1998: 163).

[40] Strab. *Geogr*. 17.1.17, "Canope est une ville située à cent vingt stades d'Alexandrie, si l'on prend la route de terre; elle tire son nom de Canope, pilote de Ménélas, qui

cults of Isis, it may be assumed to have been offered in the cult at this time.[41] It has been argued in previous research that the later events, i.e. cultic takeover, at Menouthis would not make sense unless Isis appeared in dreams.[42]

The cult of the martyrs was according to a text ascribed to bishop Kyrillos established by the same. In the text he claims to have found the bones of the martyrs in Alexandria in a miraculous manner and transferred them to Menouthis some time before 429.[43] If this were true, the

---

mourut ici même; eller possède le sanctuaire de Sarapis, objet d'une grande vénération, car il s'y opère des guérisons, en sorte que les gens de la haute qualité y ajoutent foi et viennent s'endormir là pour leur propre guérison, ou bien d'autres s'endorment à leur place; certains consignent même par écrit ces guérisons, d'autres, des preuves de l'efficacité des oracles qui y sont rendus. …" (translation Bernand 1970: 183).

[41] E.g. Diod.Sic. *Hist.* 1.25.3-7; Cic. *De divin*. 1.58.132. This general remark on the cult of Isis made by Diodorus Siculus, argued by Frankfurter (Frankfurter 1998: 162-163) to have its information primarily from the cult of Isis at Kanopos. (Diod. Sic. *Hist*. 1.25.3, 5 (stayed in Egypt 60-56 BC), translation by Oldfather (Loeb Classical Library) vol. 1, 81: "Isis … finds her greatest delight in the healing of mankind and gives aid in their sleep to those who call upon her, plainly manifesting both her very presence and her beneficence towards men who ask her help. … For standing above the sick in their sleep she gives them aid for their diseases and works remarkable cures upon such as submit themselves to her; and many who have been despaired of by their physicians because of the difficult nature of their malady are restored to health by her, while numbers who have altogether lost the use of their eyes or of some other part of their body, whenever they turn to this goddess, are restored to their previous condition.")

[42] Sansterre 1991: 72.

[43] Kyrillos of Alexandria, *Oratiunculae tres in translatione reliquiarum SS. Martyrem Cyri et Joannis, PG* 77, 1099-1106. The story is also retold in Sophronios, *Alia vita acephala sanctorum martyrum Cyri et Joannis, PG* 87, 3689-3696, translated in Bernard 1970: 214-216. Previous researchers in favor of Kyrillos establishing the cult: Delehaye 1911: 448-450; McGuckin 1993: 291-292; Monserrat 1998: 262-263; Grossmann 2002: 218. Delehaye thinks that the *translatio* of the relics is alluded to in a text of Eunapius (d. after 414), written before Petros Mongos. They argue that even though Zacharias (see below) does not mention a shrine to the martyrs, this is not a valid argument that it did not exist. Among other things, McGuckin argues that the church was indeed actively seeking to christianize Menouthis before 429, something which renders the hypothesis of Kyrillos' speech being a forgery less likely.

A church to the Evangelists was built beside this official temple of Isis by Kyrillos' uncle, Theophilos of Alexandria, at the end of the fourth century (Bernard 1970: 200-

official temple of Isis was probably destroyed by Kyrillos at this time, although there is no evidence for this.[44] According to Zacharias the Orator, writing between 511 and 518 but relating events that took place sometime between 485 and 487, a private sanctuary of Isis remained on the same site, in which cult dream epiphanies were given, until it was destroyed by the bishop Mongos in the years 485-487.[45] Zacharias mentions a church near the private sanctuary, but does not say to whom it was dedicated. This has led some researchers to believe that the speech of Kyrillos upon founding the cult of Kyros and Johannes at Menouthis is in fact a forgery and that the cult to Kyros and Johannes may have been established by Petros Mongos, or even later.[46]

Cultic reappropriations at many other sites are known to have taken place gradually. The important point when establishing possible cultic continuity of incubation is, however, not who founded the cult of the two saints officially, but how incubation came to be included in the Christian cult. Was it introduced by an official founder, or was it gradu-

205, 214-217, 321-323; Thélamon 1981: 246-259). See further Gascou 2007 with a helpful discussion.

[44] Bernard 1970: 322-323.

[45] Bishop of Alexandria 477-490: *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* 2, 1992, s.v. Peter Mongus. The events were testified by Zacharias the Orator, a student in Alexandria at the time of these events: Herzog 1939: 121; Sansterre 1991: 73. According to Monserrat 1998: 261, ca 489 AC; Zacharias the Orator, *Vita Severi, PO* 2, 1907: 7-115, esp. 14-35. The text was written between 511 and 518 and is cited in Bernand 1970: 207-213). Zacharias tells of a man, Paralios, who was disappointed with an ineffective cure and led the bishop to a private sanctuary hidden in a house where there was a blooded sacrificial altar and several pagan cultic statues, apparently saved from many different destroyed sanctuaries. They took the statues to a nearby church (the text does not reveal which church) and prayed all night in fear of the idols they were guarding. In the morning, they all emerged safe and sound from the church, much to the surprise of the pagans. The account does not say what happened to the idols, but probably they were taken to Alexandria and destroyed.

[46] This has been argued by Duchesne (1910: 10-12), Wipszycka (1988: 142) and Frankfurter (1998: 165). Frankfurter thus believes in a translation of the relics after the destruction of the Isis shrine in 484, at the time of the narration of Zacharias. Gascou (2007: 279-280) disbelieves the historical accuracy of the text of Zacharias the Orator, hypothesizing that the cult was established later in the sixth century, but before Sofronios wrote his text of course.

ally included in the Christian cult, because this was the healing method that the people living in the area wanted and expected?

Incubation in the church of Kyros and Johannes is first attested from 610, when bishop Sophronios of Jerusalem wrote a collection of miracle stories, giving elaborate evidence on the cult of Kyros and Johannes.[47] More than 100 years after the destruction of the private sanctuary of Isis by Petros Mongos, Sophronios writes that pagans still existed in Menouthis and came to the church expecting to experience miracles, although, according to Sophronios, the temple of Isis with its altars had vanished under the sands.[48]

The text ascribed to Kyrillos describes the events of the alleged cultic takeover just before 429 " οὐδεὶς γάρ ἡμῖν ὀνείρατα πλάττεται· οὐδεὶς λέγει τοῖς ἐρχόμενοις· Εἴρηκεν ἡ Κύρα· Ποιήσον τὸ καὶ τό·" ("Nobody falsifies dreams for us. No one says to those who come: the lady has spoken: do this and that!").[49] One gets the impression, as has been observed by McGuckin, that the priests of Isis dream for the suppliants, who then receive instruction on what to do in order to get well.[50] It is probable that the cult of Isis at Menouthis, like so many ancient

[47] Edition by Fernandez Marcos (1975) and in the *Patrologia Graeca:* Sophronios, *Narratio miraculorum SS. Cyri et Joannis, PG* 87, 3423-3676. On the date, see Sansterre 1991: 69. Pages in the *Patrologia Graeca* cited below from Sophronios, *Narratio miraculorum SS. Cyri et Joannis, PG* 87, 3423-3676.

[48] For pagans coming to the saints, see miracle 32 (*PG* 87, 3523-3532). For the temple of Isis having vanished under the sands, see miracle 66 (*PG* 87, 3649C).

[49] Kyrillos of Alexandria, *Oratiunculae tres in translatione reliquiarum SS. Martyrem Cyri et Joannis, PG* 77, 1099-1106, esp. 1105 (my translation). For the translation of πλάττεται as "falsifies" rather than "invents", cf. Lampe s.v. πλάσσω, B. Cf. translations by Herzog 1939: 120 and Sansterre 1991: 72, using "invents" instead. Cf., from the same text attributed to Kyrillos: (*PG* 77, 1102, translation MacMullen 1997: 123-124): "These districts were in need of medical services from God, … those who had no martyr shrine went off to other [i.e. Isis'] places, and, being Christians, thus went astray; so, out of necessity, for this reason we sought out the remains of holy martyrs."

[50] MacGuckin 1993: 292. One objection could be made to what McGuckin writes: he takes it as a fact that offerings were always made in order to receive an oracle from the priests of Isis. One has to bear in mind that the Church had a reason for describing the cult of Isis as greedy, in contrast to the martyrs who worked for free.

oracle cults, used a variety of oracular techniques, here based on dream oracles and dream healing.

There is evidence, though, that Isis appeared in dreams to worshippers at Menouthis in the sixth century AD. Zacharias the Orator tells a story of a man who wanted a child and allegedly stayed at Menouthis for some time and offered numerous sacrifices.[51] He was visited by Isis in his dreams, and turned to the priests of Isis to interpret the dream. Later in the text, it is made clear that Isis regularly showed herself in dreams.[52] The same man, having sacrificed without result and being disappointed with the cult of Isis, reveals to ecclesiastics where in the house the "idols" and the altar of Isis at Menouthis were hidden, as well as the identity of the pagan priest.[53] This leads to the search and subsequent destruction of the "idols" and altars. Even if the text does not present a truthful account of actual historical events, the notion of Isis showing herself in dreams fits well with the historical context of the region.

Many scholars, commenting on the takeover of the pagan cult of Isis, have argued that Christian incubation at Menouthis was part of the replacement strategy.[54] There can be little doubt that some local worshippers of Isis gradually came to turn to Kyros and Johannes instead, but was incubation as such transferred directly and by official means from the cult of Isis to the cult of the saints?

Now, what does Kyrillos (or the author of the *Oratiunculae*) really mean by "Nobody falsifies dreams for us"? Generally this has been taken to be evidence that he says "We in the cult of Kyros and Johannes give true dream oracles", thus promoting Christian dream-healing over the old dream-healing of Isis.[55] This view has however been questioned by Sansterre (followed by Monserrat, Knipp and Graf), who writes that

---

[51] Zacharias the Orator, *Vita Severi, PO* 2, 1907: 14-44, esp. 18. Cf. Bernand 1970: 208. See further Gascou (2007: 278-280), on the doubtful historicity of the events of this text.

[52] Zacharias the Orator, *Vita Severi, PO* 2, 1907, 14-44, esp. 20. Cf. Bernand 1970: 209.

[53] Zacharias the Orator, *Vita Severi, PO* 2, 1907, 14-44, esp. 27. Cf. Bernand 1970: 211.

[54] Leipoldt 1957: 40-44; Takács 1994: 503-506; Merkelbach 1995: 200, 327-328; Frankfurter 1998: 165.

[55] Deubner 1900: 89-98 and Herzog 1939: 121.

contrary to showing a will to substitute the pagan rites with Christian rites of the same contents, Kyrillos expresses his dislike, attested elsewhere in his writings, for pagan dream-visions and incubation: he hoped that the mere presence of the relics themselves, without incubation, would procure miraculous healings.[56] The fact that Christian incubation was *not* established by Kyrillos explains, according to Sansterre, why pagan incubation was still flourishing in the years 485-487 when the shrine to Isis at Menouthis was (allegedly) destroyed by the bishop Mongos.[57] This interpretation of the text attributed to Kyrillos makes more sense in its contemporary context: the position of the Alexandrian Church at this time was not favourable towards rituals with pagan parallels. Possibly this attitude changed later on once Christianity was more firmly rooted.[58]

It may thus be assumed that incubation was not present in the Christian cult from the very beginning. Usually it is found that the *longue durée* type of rituals and beliefs tend to be better preserved in popular religion, which explains why incubation might reappear possibly prompted by spontaneous visionary dreams by the laity at Menouthis.[59]

Other influences favourable to incubation in the cult of Kyros and Johannes in the seventh century could be their having been copied from incubatory practices in the cult of Kosmas and Damianos in Constantinople, or their having originated from a tradition of dream-healing in late antique Egypt rather than (only) pagan incubation at Menouthis.[60] The presence on site of a pagan incubation cult cannot, however, be ignored as a source of influence for the Early Christian incubation.

---

[56] Sansterre 1991: 72; Monserrat 1998: 261-266; Knipp 2002: 1; Graf 2014: 135; Kyrillos of Alexandria, *Contra Julianum* (*PG* 76, 1024-1025, esp. 1024C-D). See also idem, *In Iesaiam* 18, ed. M. Adriaen (= CC Ser.Lat. 73A, Turnhout 1963), 747, for more hostilities against incubation, which is practised "in fano Aesculapii usque hodie."

[57] Sansterre 1991: 74.

[58] Maraval 1985: 224-229, on "re-admittance" of incubation in the fifth century.

[59] Braudel 1972-73; for other longue durée continuities of pagan cult see e.g. Poulsen 1993; Lalonde 2005.

[60] See McCoull 1991: 127, for the theory that Christian incubation in Egypt, as attested in later literary sources, was indeed common in late antiquity, having arisen from Egyptian dream-interpretation.

In sum, continuity of dream-healing, introduced gradually on the site, is a likely hypothesis, given the importance locally of popular demand and longstanding tradition.

Kosmas and Damianos (and Kastor and Polydeukes) in Constantinople

Kosmas and Damianos were according to legend two brothers, doctors who did not charge their patients, martyred under Diocletian.[61] In one of their six churches in Constantinople incubation is known to have been practised. It was probably built during the first half of the fourth century, and made famous when the emperor Justinian (527-565) incubated there.[62] An anonymous collection of miracles exists.[63] It is of unknown date, but was read by Sophronios, bishop of Jerusalem in 560-638, which gives a terminus *ante quem*.[64] Festugière argues that the miracles of Kosmas and Damianos were committed to writing and read aloud in the church, whereby historical accuracy was maintained as to the immediate surroundings, description of the church, names and proveniences of the help-seekers.[65]

According to Deubner the cult of Kosmas and Damianos in Constantinople had taken over a previous cult of Kastor and Polydeukes. His argument is based firstly on how in miracle 9 of the collection a pagan man is admonished by his relatives to go to the temple of Kastor and Polydeukes, but ends up in the church of Kosmas and Damianos, believing that they are the same. While the man is sleeping there, the saints reveal his mistake and promise to cure him should he convert to Christianity. Festugière argues that even if one or two worshippers that came to Kosmas and Damianos believed that the brothers were Kastor and Polydeukes, surely the majority of Christian worshippers would not have had this notion.

---

[61] *ODB* 2, 1991: 1151; Deubner 1907: 40-52; Frey 1979: 49-50 and 64-66.

[62] Festugière 1971: 87.

[63] Edited by Deubner 1907.

[64] The collection was composed during different periods, only miracles 1-26 are according to Festugière (1971: 85-85, 191, n. 1) surely edited in the time of Sophronios.

[65] Festugière 1971: 85-86, Prologue 3 of the collection, and the beginning of the fifth series, ed. Deubner 1907:179 (518).

As discussed above, the miracle stories are fiction and should not be given too much weight as historical documentation, even though background details may be accurate. The Christian writer may simply have wanted a story of a conversion, and felt that Kastor and Polydeukes resembled to Kosmas and Damianos, being a pair, in order to make a good story.

Secondly, Deubner sees likenesses between the two cults in attributes: Kosmas and Damianos just as Kastor and Polydeukes were brothers and sometimes envisaged as horsemen.[66] The depiction of a saint as *eques* is very general and needs not fall back on a pagan identification: many Early Christian martyrs were envisaged as horsemen.[67]

Festugière convincingly argues against a direct continuity with a pre-existing cult of Kastor and Polydeukes.[68] He argues that the pagans coming to the church might have believed that the saints were in fact Kastor and Polydeukes, but that it was their pagan imagination that was at play, mistaking the names of the saints for the names of pagan heroes. Further he argues that visionary dreams had a tradition also within Judaism and early Christianity and that all ancient healing cults, pagan as well as Christian, picked up on the ubiquity of human misery and need not be explained by earlier cultic precedents.

Asklepios at Athens and a possible replacement with saints

Incubation was practised in the Asklepieion at Athens as late as AD 484.[69] The stoa identified as the incubation dormitory was later rebuilt into a church, and different hypotheses have been put forward on which saint was venerated there: St Andrew[70] or Kosmas and Damianos.[71] However, the lack of sources on a possible practice of Christian incubation inside

[66] Deubner 1900: 77-79; Deubner 1907: 52-54.

[67] Walter 2003.

[68] Festugière 1971: 91-95.

[69] Damask. *Vita Isidori* fr. 218 [Zintzen].

[70] Gregory 1986: 238.

[71] Gregory 1986: 238 (St Andreas); Dillon 1997: 80 n. 129 (Kosmas and Damianos). Dillon, ibid., also suggests that a cult of Kosmas and Damianos in Piraeus replaced the previous cult of Asklepios in Piraeus. See also Karivieri 1995.

the church makes it an interesting, though speculative, possibility.[72] Graf has further argued that the additional aisle of the Early Christian church, overlapping the incubation stoa, is not likely to have had a special function for incubation, as Christian incubation was mostly practised in the church and as close to the saint's gave a possible.[73]

Cosmas and Damian in Santa Maria Antiqua and Iuturna on the Forum in Rome

Deubner also suggested that incubation was practised in the church of Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome, where Cosmas and Damian had a shrine.[74] He sees the spring of Iuturna with its renown for healing powers as the pagan precedent. Recently, David Knipp has argued from the architecture of the church that the Byzantine community living near the church incubated in the "Chapel of the Physicians". Graf has discussed the evidence, and concludes that even though it is likely that incubation did occur in the chapel from the seventh century, there is nothing to show that it occurred earlier, or that pagan incubation was practised in the vicinity and gave rise to the Christian habit[75].

The archangel Michael and Kalchas and Podaleirios on Monte Gargano, Apulia

In the cult of the archangel Michael in Coptic Egypt, incubation is attested in some of his miracles. The different miracles and tales from the Egyptian tradition relating to the archangel are dated to between the mid-fourth and the mid-seventh centuries AD.[76]

---

[72] The same argument is relevant for the basilica at Dor, and the remains of an ancient temple it was built upon (Dauphin 1999): without written sources the functional analysis of the architecture remains interesting possibilities.

[73] Graf 2014: 132.

[74] Deubner 1902, followed by Tea 1937 and Osborne 1987: 207. See Graf 2014: 132-133 and n. 54 for discussion on this.

[75] Graf 2014: 132-133.

[76] The date: Amélineau 1888, xliv. For the incubation, or dream, miracles, see Amélineau 1888, vol. 1: 73-74, 78, 80 and 84: miracles 4, 6 (set in Rome), 7 (also set in Rome) and 10. In miracle 8 (set on Cyprus), the suppliants are cured just by staying in the

Deubner has argued for a continuity of incubation as practised in the cult of the archangel Michael on Monte Gargano in Apulia and the oracular cult of Kalchas and Podaleirios on the same mountain.[77] As incubation has not been attested in the cult of the archangel Michael on Monte Gargano, but only in his Egyptian cult (and there not in a systematized manner), the case cannot be made for a continuity of incubation in Apulia.

Summary

Following this analysis of possible local continuities, it may be concluded that what happened at the site of Menouthis has formed a model for how the takeover process of incubation from a pagan into a Christian cult came to be envisaged by modern scholars. A process of direct takeover, where an official, Kyrillos, establishes incubation in a Christian cult, has been presupposed at Menouthis even though the evidence for this act builds, I would say agreeing with Sansterre and Gascou, on an erroneous interpretation of the words of attributed to Kyrillos. This supposed continuity process has then been transposed on to other Early Christian incubation cults, even though good candidates for previous pagan incubation cults are not very obvious at these sites. In the cult of Kosmas and Damianos there is in fact very little substance to the argument since the only piece of evidence for a pre-existing pagan cult offering incubation in the area is a miracle story of legendary character. As for the possible takeover of incubation practices in the church built over the Asklepieion at Athens and the shrine of the archangel Michael on Monte Gargano, there is no evidence that incubation was ever offered in these Christian cults and thus no argument on continuity can be made.

Looking at the cult of Thekla, there is evidence from the miracle collection that there was a pagan cult of the hero Sarpedon, to which worshippers turned for healing. It is uncertain what sort of healing meth-

church overnight, the saint does not appear in a vision. In miracles 2 and 5 ill suppliants receive dream visions of the angel at home (a sort of extended incubation, seen in also other incubation cults) (Amélinaeu 1988: 70 and 75). Miracle 9 is a waking vision in the middle of a sermon (Amélineau 1988: 82-83).

[77] Deubner 1900: 65-68.

od the pagan cult offered, but the evidence points to some visionary technique. An historical process where Thekla eventually gains supremacy appears likely, incubation not having been part of the cult at first (as seen in the account of Egeria).

For many local worshippers what mattered was no doubt finding a helper with enough "power" to assure a good result from the worshipper's efforts, not whether the healer was a pagan god or a Christian martyr. This is illustrated in the incubation miracles involving pagans who were not helped by pagan healing divinities but instead resorted to the local Christian martyr.[78] The recounting of such miracles would not have served to convert pagans unless suppliants were simply looking for the most helpful power within reach. Here, syncretistic religious habits might well have played a role among the laity.

THE QUESTION OF RITUAL CONTINUITY

There is presently a scholarly debate on whether it can be shown that in addition to sleeping in a holy place other ritual similarities can be shown between pagan and Early Christian incubation. Deubner points out likenesses in the rituals between pagan incubation, as he defines it, and incubation rituals in the cult of Kyros and Johannes.[79] These are the closeness to a source, the martyrs appearing in dreams, the possibility of incubation by proxy, and the fact that sometimes the incubants are reported to have slept on the ground (i.e. not inside a building). All the other examples of likenesses with pagan practices that Deubner puts forward concern the appearance of the martyrs and their ways of healing.
In my view, the proximity of a source is not a likeness in ritual between pagan and Christian incubation. Pagan incubation was surrounded by the normal rituals of Greek and Roman cults (purification, prayer, sacrifice of animals or cakes, wearing special clothes, thanksgiving),[80] and Christian incubation was surrounded by the rituals of the Christian religion (eucharist, prayer, thanksgiving).[81] There is no ritual continu-

[78] Thekla miracle 40; Kosmas and Damianos, miracle 9.
[79] Deubner 1900: 80-89, esp. 87-88.
[80] Ehrenheim 2011, ch. 2 and 2015, ch. 1.
[81] The miracle stories do not say much about rituals, but mainly take the form of a pres-

ity apart from the sleeping in a holy place. Thanksgiving does appear in both pagan and Early Christian incubation, but still, it would seem more like a general rite, common to most religions, than a feature taken up from the pagan incubation ritual into the Christian. The basis of Deubner's argument is that incubation in a Graeco-Roman context was a Chthonian feature, practised in the cults of Chthonian deities (earth cults, hero-cults), and characterized by Chthonian rites.[82] He believes that incubation re-appeared in the cult of the martyrs because they were buried in the earth, i.e. found by the newly converted Christians to be, in effect, associated with the Chthonian sphere.[83] Recent research has, however, shown that there is in fact nothing particularly "Chthonian" about pagan incubation rituals, in the way Chthonian is defined by this school of research.[84]

Contrary to Deubner, Hippolyte Delehaye, on a general note on pagan versus Christian incubation, does not believe in a direct continuity between the two, since there were no set forms of incubation in the Christian churches, except for rules in the cult of Artemios on lighting candles, a rite that may be seen as being of universal occurrence.[85] He might envisage some form of continuity in the east, but as far as the western miracles go (Martin of Tours), practice is disorganized. The cures often do come in sleep, but many times without any accompanying vision. Pierre Maraval argues that even though special preparatory rites before incubation are not apparent at a first reading of the miracle collections, this is not necessarily evidence that they did not exist and that a thorough investigation of the texts might produce new evidence.[86]

In 1970 N. Fernandez Marcos made an attempt at this thorough type

---

entation of the help-seeker, his or her ailment, and the curative dream. Where rituals appear, they are most often told of in passing, as they no doubt were an obvious part of the activities of the churches where incubation was practised. See e.g. Kosmas and Damianos, miracles 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 14. Moreover helping the poor was seen as a step towards obtaining a miracle (Kosmas and Damianos miracles 5 and 12).

[82] Deubner 1900: 56.

[83] Deubner 1900: 6 and 56-57.

[84] Ehrenheim 2011, chs. 4.1.1 and 5.2; Ehrenheim 2015, chs. 2.1.1 and 3.2.

[85] Delehaye 1927: 143-147. Gessler (1946. 664) agrees with him.

[86] Maraval 1981: 224-229.

of ritual analysis of a set of incubation miracles. In a critical edition and study of the miracle stories of Kyros and Johannes written by Sophronios about 610,[87] the author compares the Christian miracle stories to the *iamata* of Epidauros and other pagan incubation rites and point to resemblances in rites between the saint's cult at Menouthis and *any* pagan incubation cult.[88]

In the 70 miracle stories, incubation is attested as the means par préférence by which to obtain healing. Generally, Sophronios only tells us that the ailing person comes to the sanctuary of the saints and how the cure takes place. The saints are described as appearing to the incubants in their sleep, often in a friendly and unassuming manner, giving them instructions on what to do in order to obtain a cure. The style of Sophronios is elaborate and the cures related do not give the impression of a compendium of cures noted down at the site. There are many pointers on how to act as a good Christian, with a number of biblical references, which in itself points to the cures rather being literary creations than actual cures reported on the site. According to Maraval, the miracle stories were written to be read to the pilgrims coming to the church of Saints Kyros and Johannes, mostly for pedagogical reasons, that is, to enhance their faith.[89]

Fernandez Marcos divides the rites surrounding the cult of Kyros and Johannes into three categories: 1) preparation before incubation with prayer and possibly purificatory baths, 2) application of prescribed unguents accompanied by the reading of special psalms, and 3) thanksgiving hymns.[90] He writes that hymns indeed existed within the cults of Asklepios and Isis, and that this practice connects to Early Christian liturgy. Also, he shows how incense was used both in the cults of Asklepios and Isis and in the cult of Kyros and Johannes. I would argue, that prayer and hymns are such general features in any religion that they cannot show a ritual continuity of the incubation ritual. Even though

[87] Edition by Fernandez Marcos 1975. Pages in the *Patrologia Graeca* cited from Sophronios, *Narratio miraculorum SS. Cyri et Joannis, PG* 87, 3423-3676.

[88] Fernandez Marcos 1975: 37-42.

[89] Maraval 1981: 384, 392.

[90] Fernandez Marcos 1975: 34-39.

the argument of Fernandez Marcos is more detailed than that of Deubner, the same reason applies why it does not hold. There are too many dissimilarities between the pagan and the Early Christian ritual to make an argument for ritual continuity. The basic ritual pattern of Christian incubation is just that, Christian.

Furthermore, in his search for similarities to pagan rituals, Fernandez Marcos disregards some Early Christian ritual elements that appear in the text of Sophronios. Since Sophronios stayed at the sanctuary for quite some time, curing his eye-disease, the items of information of the routines at the site, given us mostly in passing (he focuses on the didactic elements of the cures related), are probably reliable evidence as to what was happening there around 610.[91] As an example of routines at the sanctuary revealed by Sophronios, there is the custom of opening the gate to the area just around the tomb of the martyrs once a day,[92] praying there and acquiring the wax or oil from the candles or lamps closest to the tombs, believed to have healing capacities.[93] This may be compared to the use of *kerote* in other Early Christian incubation cults, a special mixture of oil and wax, believed to have healing powers.[94] Anointment with holy oil occurs several times as a method of healing in the miracles of Kyros and Johannes.[95] Occasionally an offering to the treasury is mentioned.[96]

These actions do not correspond to the ritual pattern at pagan incubation sanctuaries, neither do they make for a standardized ritual of incubation in any way similar to the rituals of pagan incubation. The essence of the pagan rituals was purification, prayer and by making a sacrifice the opening of communication with the god that the incubant aspired to meet in his or her sleep.[97] These preparatory steps were ob-

---

[91] As is related in the miracle 70 of his miracle stories.

[92] As testified in the miracles 36 (*PG* 87, 3553B) and possibly miracle 19 (*PG* 87, 3480B-C).

[93] E.g. Kyros and Johannes mir. 1, 3, 7, 22, 33, 50 and 53; cf. Thekla mir. 7 and 40.

[94] Kosmas and Damianos mir. 1, 13, 16, 22, 30 and 33.

[95] Kyros and Johannes mir. 1 (3428C), mir. 3 (3429D), mir. 7 (3436C), mir. 22 (3485C), mir. 36 (3553B).

[96] Kyros and Johannes mir. 40 (= *PG* 87, 3577D-3580A), mir. 49 (= *PG* 87, 3605A).

[97] Ehrenheim 2011, ch. 2 and 2015, ch. 1.

ligatory and alike for all incubants at a given sanctuary. The Christian customs as described by Sophronios are centered on coming as close as possible to the holy remains of the martyrs (a custom shared with all other cults of the martyrs): so many wanted to enter the tomb of the martyrs that visits were organized once a day and then a large crowd would gather. There is no obligation to approach the tomb, but the cure must have been considered more certain if this proximity was obtained. In the same manner, the candle wax and lamp oil from the lights by the tomb were considered to be imbued with the holiness of the relics, making for a more secure cure. There is a fundamental difference here between the pagan and the Christian ritual - a difference concerning not only the enactment of the ritual elements, but also the purpose of the ritual: there was no grave of Asklepios to approach, whereas the cult of the martyrs was dependent on the existence of their physical remains.

According to Fernandez Marcos the same technical terms are used for incubation in the miracle stories as in pagan incubation.[98] He argues that the verb καθεύδω ("to sleep") or κοιμάομαι ("fall asleep"), when used in the miracle stories of Sophronios, followed by the preposition ἐν ("in", e.g. he slept in the martyrion) is in fact the same term as ἐγκαθεύδω [99] or ἐγκοιμάομαι[100] used by the pagans. A typical development in Greek compound verbs with prepositional prefixes was that they tended to become more and more complex, with more and more prefixes. The idea that ἐγκαθεύδω was replaced by καθεύδω ἐν contradicts the direction in which the language actually developed.[101]

To sum up, regarding the question of ritual continuity, a case can be made neither from the actual rites surrounding the sleeping, nor from the terminology applied to the sleeping itself.

---

[98] Fernandez Marcos 1975: 34.

[99] 1. Sleep among, 2. Lie abed, 3. Sleep in a temple (to effect a cure).

[100] 1. Sleep in (a place), esp. sleep in (a temple to seek prophetic dreams or to obtain cure for a disease), 2. Sleep upon (or) after a meal.

[101] Blass & Debrunner 1961:63,§116.

INCUBATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CHRISTIAN MIRACLE TRADITION

The notion that miracles could be effected by the relics of the martyrs was denied at first in Early Christianity, as it was believed that miracles only occurred in the New Testament, performed by Jesus.[102] During the second and third centuries, miracles were not comfortably acknowledged (though prayed for and believed to occur by common Christians), the belief gaining ground among the Church Fathers that miracles simply ceased after the New Testament time.[103]

At the end of the fourth century, these attitudes among the church fathers were about to change. Not too long after the Church Peace in 312, the Christian faith manifested itself in a number of cults at the graves of the martyrs and in a spate of holy men and women, anachorites and cenobites, all of these effecting miracles.[104] Following this flowering of cults producing miracles, a fierce debate was conducted among the different officials of the Church. The defenders of the miracles of the martyrs included Ambrose of Milan, Pope Damasus and Jerome. A stout adversary of the cult of the martyrs can be found in the priest Vigilantius from Gaul, who argued that the saints' cults had many pagan characteristics.[105]

Augustine came to change his opinion of the cults of the martyrs over time. At first, he was of the firm belief that the miracles of apostolic times, necessary to make the people believe in the "invisible mir-

---

[102] Aug. *De vera relig*. 25.47 (= CC Ser.Lat. 32, pp. 216-217); Aug. Sermo 83.3.3 (=*PL* 38, 540); van Bavel 1995: 360; de Vooght 1939: 5-16.

[103] van Uytfanghe 1981: 210. The exception being Ireneaus, who believed that miracles kept on being produced: Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 2.32, cited in Eusebius of *Caesarea, Hist. eccl.* 5.7 (*SC* 41).

[104] Delehaye 1933: 119-123; Saxer 1980, *passim;* van Uytfanghe 1981, 211; Brown 1981, *passim*. An early example of a cult of martyrs is the cult to Saints Giovanni and Paolo in the Casa Caelimontana in Rome, a private house, of the fourth century, see Karivieri 1998. The Theodosian Code prohibits the trade in relics, *Cod.Theod*. 9.17.7, attesting to the existence of the practice. See MacMullen 2009, *passim* and esp. 60, on how the cult of the martyrs developed from private commemoration rituals at graves.

[105] Cited in Hieron., *Contra Vigilantium, PL* 23, 339-352.

acles", had now ceased.[106] Subsequently he argued that if miracles did occur at *memoriae*, they had nothing to do with the relics as such, but with the strength of the prayer.[107] Later on in his life, Augustine came to acknowledge miracles performed at the graves of the martyrs, and primarily those of the martyrs in Nola and Milan. Milan was the bishopric of Ambrose, the teacher of Augustine, and there the cult of the martyrs differed from the North African martyr cult, which was part of the Donatist movement fiercely opposed by Augustine. Before acknowledging the cult of the martyrs, Augustine writes that even though North Africa was "full of the bodies of holy martyrs" miracles did not occur at their graves, hereby denying the teachings of Donatus.[108] This all came to change with the transferral of the bones of St Stephen to Carthage and the cult of the martyrs in North Africa "made catholic".[109] Augustine now accepted miracles of martyrs, and also had them written down in *libelli miraculorum*, to be read aloud in connection with sermons.[110]

Contributing to this initial hesitancy towards incubation in the Christian context was a theological hesitancy towards dreams as bearers of divine truths. Graf has eloquently expounded the Christian theological ambivalence regarding dreams, recognizing a possible true content in the dreams of bishops and kings, but not in the dreams of the laity.[111]

---

[106] Aug. *De vera religione* 25.47 (= CCSL 32, pp. 216-217); Aug. *Sermo* 83.3.3 (=*PL* 38, 540). For the development of Augustine's views on the cult of the martyrs, see further de Vooght 1939: 5-16 and Courcelle 1968: 141-153 and Frend 1982.

[107] Aug. *Epist. ad catholicos fratres de secta Donatistarum* 19.49 (= CSEL 52, pp. 295-296).

[108] Aug. *Epist.* 78.3 (=CSEL 34.2, pp. 335-336); Frend 1982.

[109] Aug. *De Civ. Dei* 22.8; Frend 1982.

[110] Delahaye 1910: 427-434; Delehaye 1925: 72-85; de Vooght 1939: 5-16; Courcelle 1968: 141-153. Van Bavel (1995: 360-361) on the other hand argues that St. Augustine was always concerned with the theology of miracles performed, and that his stance on this did not change, but rather that he learned to accept these events as having been sent by God when miracles came to be reported more and more often by the graves of the martyrs in his own lifetime.

[111] Graf 2010; Graf 2014: 120, 124-128; Le Goff 1988: 193-231, 271-277. To compare, in the Archaic period in Greece the dreams of kings and priests were seen as more likely to be god-sent than the dreams of common people (Ehrenheim 2011, ch. 5.3.4 and 2015, ch. 3.3.4). See further Keskiaho (2015) on dreams and visions in early

The laity might, however, have had this belief nonetheless, even though it was considered unorthodox.[112]

There is no trace of incubation before the emergence and official approval of the cult of the martyrs, which placed Early Christian incubation within a religious framework where the veneration of the relics of holy men and women is the focus of the cult, their prayers being sought and considered more effective than those of the worshippers. There were indeed sacred places in Christian world before the establishment of the cult of the martyrs, for instance, Golgatha and the Church of the Nativity,[113] but there are no reports that ordinary Christians slept there and had dreams in which Christ appeared to them.

Because of the lack of established martyrs' cults, one might argue, there was no Christian incubation before the fifth century. Incubation needed some extra planning and personnel to assist, as the suppliants were to stay and sleep inside the church. Amply attested in the incubation miracles are questions such as who is to sleep where and for how long, and how to make sure that only incubants stay in the church at night.[114]

In "normal" cults of the martyrs, methods varied, the common denominator being that the closest possible proximity to the relics might be ensured (a factor also present in the Early Christian incubation cults). Incubation on the other hand, as it appears in the cults of Thekla, Kosmas and Damianos, Kyros and Johannes, and Demetrios at Thessaloniki, is a standardized feature of these cults, and the expected procedure for meeting the martyr and being healed. It might be expected that such a specialization of particular martyrs' cults took some time to develop.

---

medieval thought.

[112] See Wiesniewski 2013: 205 and nn. 12-13 with further references concerning the Messalians and Donatists.

[113] Cf. Soz. *Hist.eccl*. 2.1 (*SC* 306, pp. 226-233).

[114] E.g. miracles of Kosmas and Damianos: miracles 10, 12, 17, 21, 25, 34 and 35 (on the big crowd of sleepers and spaces allotted to them) and the miracles of Artemios: mir. 30 (guard making sure the church paraphernalia are not stolen), mir. 17 and 25 (the incubants are locked inside a cancel of one of the naves, so that thieves cannot enter at night and steal their belongings), mir. 31 (a rich woman is accommodated in lodgings in a special room in the upper gallery of the church). See further Ehrenheim 2009.

Decidedly, Christian incubation also needed some extra time to gain acceptance from church officials, considering its pagan precedence.[115] Jerome, for instance, finds it abhorrent that Jews were reportedly incubating in the shrines of pagan gods.[116] One must remember that when Egeria writes about the cult of Thekla in the fourth century, there is no incubation in her report. Augustine's account of the miracles of St Stephen are among the earliest collections of miracles, describing those that occurred after the translation of the relics in 418.[117] The earliest collection of incubation miracles are those of Thekla, dated to the mid-fifth century.[118] When one recalls that Egeria in the fourth century wrote nothing about how miracles were obtained at the sanctuary of Thekla, it might be presumed that she found nothing out of the ordinary in the way worshippers venerated the saint. Incubation might have developed later on the site, from a combination of factors, possibly including pagan reminiscences, but also drawing from the Early Christian tradition of miracles. Thus when incubation first appears in the Christian church it is set and develops within the cult of the martyrs.

There existed many ideas in late antiquity about what types of supernatural resources could help with healing, and how the suppliants might acquire this help. Incubation was not the only healing method, whether in pagan or in Christian sanctuaries. For instance, in the cult of Simeon the Stylite, the most common method of healing was to anoint the suppliant with holy earth.[119] A common denominator seems to have been the proximity of the relics of the martyrs.[120] Local traditions surely played a large role in the formation of each individual healing cult.

---

[115] Maraval 1981: 225.

[116] Hieron. *Ad Iesaiam/In Isaiam commentaria* 18.65.4 (Edelstein & Edelstein testimonium 294; *PL* 24, 632C-633A), "habitans in sepulcris [populus Israel], et in delubris idolorum dormiens, ubi stratis pellibus hostiarum incubare soliti erant, ut somniis futura cognoscerent." .

[117] Aug. *De civ. Dei* 22.8; on the date see Delehaye 1910: 427-430.

[118] Dagron 1978: 17-19.

[119] *Syriac version of the vita of St. Simeon Stylites,* e.g. miracles 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 72, 88, 89 and 91. But, on the genre of the miracle story itself: Festugière 1973: 70-73.

[120] Maraval 1985: 222-224.

As the cult of the martyrs was, at least at first, a movement among the laity of the church,[121] the development of various healing techniques in these different cults might be surmised to have been partly a result of the expectations of the laity. These spontaneous dream-visions of worshippers in the Early Christian church might in some cults have developed into specialized incubation in the fifth century. As visions of martyrs and saints were reported in many Christian miracle collections, night-time visions might have occurred in this context among those worshippers staying in the churches for a long time. It need not have been a conscious seeking out of dream visions at first but rather a natural development of different ways of seeking miracles. It is known that followers of the Donatist movement in North Africa had dream-visions telling them to set up altars to the martyrs.[122] This practice was forbidden by the part of the church later labelled catholic, but still it shows a proneness among the laity to accept dream-visions as true.

Dream-healings also occurred in cults of martyrs that did not specialize in incubation (see below), but offered the majority of their healings through the more common means of daytime visions and spontaneous miracles through touching the relics or objects that had come into contact with the relics. This shows that dream-healings were perceived as one of many ways of obtaining miracles. Most of the evidence of non-organized dream-healing in the context of other miraculous techniques is later than the fifth century, simply because the organized custom of writing miracle collections is later. There exist, though, some records of spontaneous, and not deliberately arranged, dream miracles. In the church of Michael Anaplous at Hestiae close to Constantinople, one incubation miracle is attested around AD 440.[123] The worshipper

[121] By laity I mean those who were not clergy, although the definitions of such two groups and their power to form the doctrines of the Church are not evident in the Early Christian church, see e.g. *The Oxford handbook of Early Christian studies*, eds. S. Ashbrook Harvey & D.G. Hunter, esp. chapter 19, Clergy and laity, by K. J. Torjesen. See also MacMullen 2009, *passim*, esp. 60, examining the archaeological evidence and arguing that the cult of the martyrs grew forth on a private, or popular, initiative.

[122] *Concilia Africae*, ed. C. Munier, (CC Ser.Lat). 149: 204 no. 83.

[123] Sozomenos, *Hist.eccl*. 2.3, 9-13 (*SC* 306: 238-239, 242-245). On the location of Hestiae, see Janin 1964, map 9.

slept inside the church and received instructions on how to get healed by a "divine power" (θεία δύναμις). This cannot be called an incubation cult, but the miracle was, rather, a variant of miraculous techniques developed in the cult and might point to a development within some cults where these types of miracles came eventually to form the major andexpected part of the healings.

Similarly, a collection of miracles generated by the cult of the archangel Michael in Egypt, dated to between the mid-fourth to the mid-seventh centuries, offers some instances of dream-visions and dream-healing.[124] A similar, but later case occurs when ill people slept at the baths of Elia at Gadara, had visions and were supposedly healed, as documented in the sixth century.[125] The same phenomenon occurred at the site of the Anastasis[126] and at the atrium of the Golgata.[127] St Menas is another holy figure, who shows himself to his suppliants in many waking visions, and also in one night-time vision.[128] Other examples, mostly of the sixth century, are the visions in sleep that too place in the funerary chapels of St Euthymius[129] and of St Ptolemy of Hermopolis Magna,[130] as well as in the martyria of St Julian,[131] St John the Baptist and St Dometius

---

[124] Edited by Amélineau 1888: see p. xliv on the date, further vol. 1, pp. 73-74, 78, 80 and 84 (miracles 4, 6, 7 and 10). Not all of the miracles take place in Egypt, two are set in Rome and one takes place on Cyprus.

[125] Anonymous writer from Piacenza: CSEL 39, p. 163 (ed. Geyer, date: 570, Geyer in CSEL 39, xxvi).

[126] Marc the Deacon, *Vita Porphyrii*, 7 (Budé Collection Byzantine, ed. H. Grégoire & M.-A. Kugener, Paris 1930, p.7).

[127] *Mir. Bar Sauma*, 55 (F. Nau, IX. Résumé de monographies syriaques', *ROrChr* 9(19), 1914: 113-134, events dated by Nau to fifth century).

[128] Waking visions: mir. 2, 15 and 16 of the Coptic version (Drescher 1946: 112, 118 and 121). Night-time vision: mir. 3 (Drescher 1946: 111).

[129] Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii* 50-53 (=72.10-76.12) (*Lives of the monks of Palestine by Cyril of Scythopolis*, translated by R.M. Price with an introduction and notes by J. Binns, 1991: pp. 69-74). Cyril begins his account in 405, when Euthymius arrived in Jerusalem, and finishes it in 558 (Binns 1991, xi).

[130] *M. Ptolem*. 1.2 (*PO* 5, 780-781).

[131] *Life of Daniel Scetis*, 10 (of the Greek accounts). Abba Daniel of Scetis probably lived in the sixth century, Vivian 2008: 12-17, and the Greek accounts may according to the translator be the contemporary work of a disciple, although nothing can be said for certain (Vivan 2008: 17-31).

of Antioch.[132] Other places where nocturnal visions or miracles at holy graves were reported are the shrines of St Polyeuctos at Mytilene,[133] John the Baptist and St Michael at Sykeon,[134] as well as St Andrew at Patras[135] and St Peter of Athyra.[136] No doubt there were many more such occurrences than those attested by the sources.

To strengthen this tie between regular martyrs' cults and Early Christian incubation cults, the incubation miracle collections encompassed also many "ordinary" miraculous techniques, practised also in non-incubation cults of martyrs, such as the use of holy oil, special plasters prepared with wax by the priests (*kerote*), powder made from grating the walls of the sanctuary and the use of holy images.[137] Above all, intense prayer, conversion (if needed, from "heretical" sects and paganism) and closeness to the relics were of prime importance.[138] This places Early Christian incubation cults within the tradition of Early Christian saints'

---

[132] *Vita Symeonis iun*. 2 (on St John the Baptist); Severus of Antioch, *Hom*. 51 (*PO* 35, fasc. 165, p. 373, on St Dometius). The vita is considered to have been written by an anonymous contemporary of St Symeon the younger, who lived 521-592 (van den Ven 1962: 102).

[133] Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii* 2 (=9-9.10) (*Lives of the monks of Palestine by Cyril of Scythopolis*, translated by R.M. Price with an introduction and notes by J. Binns, Kalamazoo 1991, p. 5). Cyril lived ca. 524-558.

[134] *Vita Theodoris Sykeonis*, 8 (Theodore gets cured in the chapel of John the Baptist, but has dream vision at home of St George) and 40 (worshippers stay day and night in the church to archangel Michael, with chapels to St John the Baptist and Mary mother of god). Theodore was born under Justinian and died allegedly in 613 (Festugière 1970, introduction, p. v. Festugière gives no date of the vita).

[135] Gregory of Tours, *Mir*. 30. The text is from the latter half of the 6th century.

[136] *Vita Euthycii* 24 (*PG* 86, 2301C). *Magnii et beatissimi Euthycii patriarchae Constantinopolitani, vita et conversation scripta ab Eustratio presbytero humili ejus discipulo*, *PG* 86, 2273-2392.

[137] The belief that matter (oil, earth, pieces of a building) that had been close to that which is holy (relics or living holy person) was somehow considered imbued with holiness and hence with miracle-working properties, see Maraval 1985: 222-224 and 237. Examples of these techniques in incubation cults: kerote: Kosmas and Damianos mir. 1, 13, 16, 22, 30, 33; wine: Thekla mir. 42; holy oil or wax: Thekla mir. 7, 40; Kyros and Johannes mir. 1, 3, 7, 22, 33, 50, 53, 65, 70; scrapings of church fence: Thekla mir. 18; holy images: Kosmas and Damianos mir. 13 and 15.

[138] E.g. Maraval 1985: 134-135 and 221-224.

cults, forming a special group of cults where visions of the saints were actively sought at night, differing from most other martyr cults where visions occurred spontaneously and were not the primary expected way of obtaining a miracle. The organized manner in which the dream miracles are sought in the Early Christian incubation cults are reminiscent of pagan incubation, but the rituals surrounding the phenomenon differ significantly.

When one reads the pagan and Christian miracle stories, it is clear that at all of the healing sanctuaries, pagan as well as Christian, there was an option of staying for a longer time and practising incubation.[139] It also appears clear from the collections of miracles that healing procedures had to be well organized, because of the great number of worshippers coming to the churches. One might envisage a first step where, as in the description Egeria makes of the sanctuary of Thekla, the crowd that has arrived after a long journey stays for a period of time at the sanctuary, praying in the church to get well, and being accommodated in the sanctuary, or, even staying inside the church all night. It would not be surprising if pilgrims, already used to daytime visions believed to be sent by God, also dreamt of the martyrs to whom they prayed during daytime. Such visions and miracles experienced by the laity would then have been picked up and systematized into a cult of dream-healings, in much the same way as many martyrs' cults became specialized in curing particular ailments.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As we have seen, there is no direct takeover of pagan incubation cults. Incubation in the Early Christian world does not appear in cults where a local pagan predecessor can be shown, with the exception of Menouthis (the cult of Isis).

---

[139] M*iracles of Kosmas and Damianos*: Mir. 1 (a couple of days), mir. 3 (some time), mir. 10 (every Friday), mir. 11 (four visits), mir. 12 (for a longer time residing in the atrium), mir. 14 (several days), mir. 21 (many days), mir. 23 (longer than 3 days), mir. 30 ("pretty long time"), mir. 33 (seven months), mir. 38 (a couple of days); *Miracles of Kyros and Johannes*, mir. 48 (=*PG* 87, 3601 B12-14) (2 years) and mir. 69 (=*PG* 87, 3661 D2 (8 years). *Miracles of Artemios*: Mir. 5 (three months), mir. 13 (15 days), mir. 24 (15 days), mir. 35 (two years) and mir. 45 (two days).

Conversions in the countryside often took a long time, and pagan traditions were many times tenacious on the popular level. The preservation and readjustments of pagan rituals made at a popular level in late antiquity might be labelled a *longue durée* historical process.[140] An anthropological parallel for the religious conversion process in late antiquity can be found in South America in the transition from indigenous religions to Christianity.[141] Sabine MacCormack has described how the indigenous religions remained through adapting a more local form (similar to the pre-Incan culture), moving away from the large temples destroyed by the Spaniards and into rural sanctuaries and private houses. In the middle of the 17th century, persecutions of the old religion became more fervent, and then the rests of the old religions transformed into healing rituals and incantations on a clandestine level in society. This account might well describe too the situation in late antiquity, especially in Egypt, where the transition from one religion to another gives ample proof of syncretism at a domestic level in society.[142]

Considering the tenacity of rural religiosity,[143] it would be surprising if in these places at least a part of the pagan practices surrounding incubation were not remembered and in some way transformed into a popular expression of the new faith. This may be called a continuity of sorts, for in most Early Christian incubation cults, there is no obvious local pagan predecessor. As for the ritual and terminology of the Early Christian incubation, no pagan roots can be demonstrated. Incubation may be seen as a specialization of the cult of relics, reminiscent of pagan incubation (the sleeping in a holy place and obtaining a cure in the dream), but as concerns the surrounding rituals and recommended cures, falling within the frame of other cults of the martyrs. It appears that the cultic incorporation of incubation was not a straightforward process from pagan to Christian contexts; the different Christian practices of incubation had many different roots and influences.

---

[140] Braudel 1972-73; for other longue durée continuities of pagan cult see e.g. Poulsen 1993, Lalonde 2005.

[141] MacCormack 1991: 11-14, 410-414, 418-433, esp. 432.

[142] Frankfurter 1998: 131-144.

[143] Cf. Braudel 1972-73.

Bibliography

Abbreviations follow those of *American Journal of Archaeology,* www.ajaonline.org

Some of the ancient sources and editions used
Saints' cults discussed as incubation cults:

St Artemios:

The miracles of St. Artemios. A collection of miracle stories by an anonymous author of seventh-century Byzantium (The Medieval Mediterranean. Peoples, economies and cultures, 400-1453, 13), eds. V.S. Crisafulli & J.W. Nesbitt, Leiden, New York and Köln 1997.

St Demetrios:

Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius, vols. 1-2, ed. P. Lemerle. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 1979-1981.

Saints Kosmas and Damianos:

Kosmas und Damian, ed. L. Deubner. Leipzig and Berlin 1907.

Saints Kyros and Johannes:

Kyrillos of Alexandria, *Oratiunculae tres in translatione reliquiarum SS. Martyrem Cyri et Joannis*, *PG* 77, 1099-1106.

Miracles des Saints Cyr et Jean par Sophrone, traduction commentée par J. Gascou, Paris 2006.

Sophronios, *Narratio miraculorum SS. Cyri et Joannis*, *PG* 87, 3423-3676.

Sophronios, *Thaumata*, ed. N. Fernandez Marcos, *Los* thaumata *de Sofronio. Contribucion al estudio de la* incubatio *cristiana*, Madrid 1975.

Zacharias Scholasticus, *Vie de Sévère*, ed. and translation to French by M.-A. Kugener (Patrologia Orientalis 2) Paris 1903-1907.

St Menas:

Acta SS Novembris 2,2, ed. H. Delehaye. Brussels 1931.

Amélineau, E. *Contes et romans de l'Égypte chrétienne*. Paris 1888. *Apa Mena: a selection of Coptic texts relating to St. Menas*, Cairo 1946.

Budge, E.A.W. 1909. *Texts relating to Saint Mêna of Egypt and Canons of Nicaea in a Nubian dialect*. Oxford: Horace Hart.

Devos, P. 1959. "Un récit des miracles de S. Ménas en copte et en Éthiopien", *ABoll* 77:451-463.

Devos, P. 1960a. "Un récit des miracles de S. Ménas en copte et en éthiopien", *ABoll* 78:154-160.

Devos, P. 1960b. "Le juif et le Chrétien. Un miracle de Saint Ménas", *ABoll* 78:275-308.

Griffith, M.F.Ll. 1913. *The Nubian texts of the Christian period*. Abhandlungen der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-historische Classe, vol 8, "Miracle of St. Menas", 6-15. (no incubation)

St Thekla

Vie et miracles de sainte Thècle, ed. G. Dagron, (Subsidia Hagiographica, 62). Brussels 1978.

Other:

Didachè, *La doctrine des douze apôtres (Didachè)*, eds. W. Rordorf and A. Tuilier, (*Sources chrétiennes*, 248), Paris 1978.

Égérie, *Journal de voyage (Itinéraire)*, ed. P. Maraval (*Sources chrétiennes*, 296), Paris 1997.

Pellerinaggio in Terra Santa. Itinerarium Egeriae, ed. N. Natalucci, Florence 1991.

Gregory of Tours: Gregory of Tours, *Glory of the martyrs. Translated with an introduction by R. van Dam* (Translated texts for historians, Latin Series III), Liverpool 1988.

The lives of Simeon Stylites. Translated, with an introduction by R. Doran, preface by Susan Ashbrook Harvey, (Cistercian Studies Series, 112), Kalamazoo Michigan 1992.

Vita of Daniel Scetis: *Witness to holiness. Abba Daniel of Scetis.* Translations of the Greek, Coptic, Ethiopic, Syriac, Armenian, Latin, Old Church Slavonic, and Arabic accounts, edited, with an introduction by T. Vivian (Cistercian Studies, 219), Kalamazoo 2008.

Vita Euthymii patriarchae CP., text, translation, introduction and commentary P. Karlin-Hayter (Bibliothèque de Byzantion, 3), Bruxelles 1970.

Vita Euthymii: *Lives of the monks of Palestine by Cyril of Scythopolis,* translated by R.M. Price with an introduction and notes by J. Binns, Kalamazoo 1991.

Vita Simeonis iun.: La vie ancienne de S. Syméon le Jeune (521-592), ed. P. van den Ven, I-II (Subsidia hagiographica, 32), Bruxelles 1962-1970.

Vita Theodoris Sykeonis: Vie de Théodore de Sykéôn, ed. and translated by A.-J. Festugière (Subsidia hagiographica, 48), Bruxelles 1970.

Secondary literature

Aleshire 1989 S.B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion. The people, their dedications, and the inventories*, Amsterdam 1989.

Amélineau 1888 E. Amélineau, *Contes et romans de l'Égypte chrétienne*, Paris 1888.

van Bavel 1995 T.J. van Bavel, "The cult of the martyrs in St. Augustine: Theology versus popular religion?", in *Martyrium in multidisciplinary perspective. Memorial Louis Reekmans*, eds. M. Lamberigts & P. van Deun (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 67), Leuven 1995: 351-361.

Becher 1970 I. Becher, "Antike Heilgötter und die römische Staatsreligion", *Philologus* 114: 1970, 211-255.

Bernand 1970 A. Bernand, *Le Delta Égyptien d'après les textes grecs*, 1. *Les confins libyques*, Cairo 1970.

Beschi 1982 L. Beschi, "Il rilievo di Telemachos ricompletato", *AAA* 15, 1982: 31-43.

Beschi 2002 L. Beschi, "Culti stranieri e fondazioni private nell" Attica classica: alcuni casi', *ASAtene* 80, 2002: 13-41.

Binns 1991 *Lives of the monks of Palestine by Cyril of Scythopolis,* translated by R.M. Price with an introduction and notes by J. Binns, Kalamazoo 1991.

Blass & Debrunner 1961 F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian literature. A translation and revision of the ninth – tenth German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by R. Funk*, Cambridge 1961.

Braudel 1972-73 F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the age of Philip II*, London 1972-73.

Breccia 1914 E. Breccia, *Alexandrea ad Aegyptum: Guide de la ville ancienne et moderne et du musée gréco-romain*, Bergamo 1914.

Breccia 1926 E. Breccia, *Monuments de l'Égypte gréco-romain publiés par la Société archéologique d'Alexandrie sous les auspices de Sa Majesté Fouad Ier Roi d'Égypte*, vol. 1, *Le rovine e i monumenti di Canopo*, Bergamo 1926.

Brown 1981 P. Brown, *The cult of the saints. Its rise and function in Latin Christianity*, Chicago 1981.

Constantinou 2014 S. Constantinou, "The morphology of healing dreams: dream and therapy in Byzantine collections of miracle stories", in *Dreaming in Byzantium and* beyond, eds. C. Angelidi & G.T. Calofonos, Farnham 2014, 21-34.

Courcelle 1968 P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin*, Paris 1968.

Cox Miller 1994 P. Cox Miller, *Dreams in Late Antiquity. Studies in the imagination of a culture*, Princeton 1994.

Crisafulli & Nesbitt 1997 *The miracles of St. Artemios. A collection of miracle stories by an anonymous author of seventh-century Byzantium* (The Medieval Mediterranean. Peoples, economies and cultures, 400-1453, 13), eds. V.S. Crisafulli & J.W. Nesbitt, Leiden, New York and Köln 1997.

Csepregi 2007 Csepregi, I., *The compositional history of Greek Christian incubation mirace collections: Saint Thecla, Saints Cosmas and Damian, Saints Cyrus and John, Saint Artemios,* PhD Diss. Budapest 2007.

Csepregi 2013 Csepregi, I., "Who is behind incubation stories? The hagiographers of Byzantine dream-healing miracles", Chapter 7 in *Dreams, healing and medicine in Greece. From antiquity to the* present, ed. S. Oberhelman, Farnham 2013, 161-187.

Dagron 1978 *Vie et miracles de sainte Thècle*, ed. G. Dagron, (Subsidia Hagiographica, 62). Brussels 1978.

Dauphin 1999 C. Dauphin, 'From Apollo and Asclepius to Christ. Pilgrimage and healing at the temple and episcopal basilica of Dor", *LA* 49, 1999, 397-430.

Davis 2001 S.J. Davis, *The cult of Saint Thecla: a tradition of women's piety in late antiquity*, Oxford 2001.

Delehaye 1910 H. Delehaye, "Les premiers "Libelli miraculorum"", *ABoll* 29, 1910, 427-434.

Delehaye 1911 H. Delehaye, "Les saints d'Aboukir", *ABoll* 30, 1911, 448-450.

Delehaye 1925 H. Delahaye, "Les recueils antiques de miracles des saints" *ABoll* 43, 1925, 5-85, 305-325, esp. 68-73.

Delehaye 1927 H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, Brussels 1927[3].

Delehaye 1933 H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, Brussels 1933[2].

Deubner 1900 L. Deubner, *De incubatione*, Leipzig 1900.

Deubner 1902 L. Deubner, "Juturna und die Ausgrabungen auf dem römischen Forum", *Neue Jahrbücher* 9, 1902, 370-388 (=*Kleine Schriften*, ed. O. Deubner, Königstein 1982, 12-30).

Deubner 1907 L. Deubner, ed., *Kosmas und Damian: Texte und Einleitung*, Leipzig 1907.

Dillon 1997 M. Dillon, *Pilgrims and pilgrimage in ancient Greece*, London & New York 1997.

Drescher 1946 *Apa Mena a selection of Coptic texts related to St. Menas*, ed., with translation and commentary by J. Drescher, Cairo 1946.

Duchesne 1910 L. Duchesne, "Le sanctuaire d'Aboukir", *BSAA / Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie* 12, 1910, 3-14.

Dunand 1973 F. Dunand, *Le culte d'Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée*, vols. 1-2, Paris 1973.

Dupront 1987 A. Dupront, *Du sacré. Croisades et pèlerinages, images et langages*, Paris 1987.

Edelstein & Edelstain 1945 E.J. Edelstein & L. Edelstein, *Asclepius. A collection and interpretation of the testimonies*. 1. *Testimonies*, Baltimore 1945.

Ehrenheim 2009 H. von Ehrenheim, "Identifying incubation areas in pagan and Early Christian times", in *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* VI, 2010 (Aarhus University Press), 237-276.

Ehrenheim 2011 H. von Ehrenheim, *Greek incubation rituals in Classical and Hellenistic times*, PhD diss. Stockholm University 2011.

Ehrenheim 2015 H. von Ehrenheim, *Greek incubation rituals in Classical and Hellenistic times* (Kernos Supplément, 29), Liège 2015.

Empereur 1998 J.-Y. Empereur, *Alexandria rediscovered*. London 1998.

Expédition en Égypte 1830-31 *Histoire scientifique et militaire de l'expédition française en Égypte*. *Atlas*, Paros 1830-1831.

Fernandez Marcos 1975 N. Fernandez Marcos, *Los* thaumata *de Sofronio. Contribución al estudio de la* incubatio *cristiana*, Madrid 1975.

Festugière 1971 *Sainte Thècle, saints Côme et Damien, saints Cyr et Jean (extraits), saint Georges*, traduits par A.-J. Festugière, Paris 1971.

Festugière 1973 A.-J. Festugière, "Types épidauriennes de miracles dans la vie de Syméon Stylite le Jeune", *JHS* 43, 1973, 70-73.

Frankfurter 1998D. Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt. Assimilation and resistance*, Princeton 1998.

Frend 1982 W.H.C. Frend, "The North African cult of martyrs", in *Jenseitsvorstellungen in Antike und Christentum. Gedankschrift für Alfred Stuiber* (JAC Erg. 9), Münster 1992, 154-167.

Gascou 2007 J. Gascou, "Les origins du culte des saints Cyr et Jean", *ABoll* 125, 2007, 241-281.

Gessler 1946 J. Gessler, "Notes sur l'incubation et ses survivances", *Le Muséon* 59, 1946, 661-670.

Graf 2010 F. Graf, "Dreams, visions and revelations: dreams in the thought of the Latin fathers", in *Sub imagine somni: nighttime phenomena in Greco-Roman culture*, eds. E. Scioli & C. Walde (Testi e studi di cultura classica, 46), Pisa 2010.

Graf 2014 F. Graf, "Dangerous dreaming: the Christian transformation of dream incubation", in *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*15:1, 2014, 117-142.

Grossmann 2002P. Grossmann, *Christliche Architektur in Ägypten* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1, The Near and Middle East, 62). Leiden, Boston & Köln 2002.

Hamilton 1906 M. Hamilton, *Incubation or the cure of disease in pagan temples and Christian churches*, London 1906.

Herzog 1939 R. Herzog, "Der Kampf um den Kult von Menouthis", in *Pisciculi. Studien zur Religion und Kultur des Altertums. Frans Joseph Dölger zum sechzigsten Geburtstage*, eds. Th. Klauser & A. Rückner, Münster 1939, 117-124.

Hill 1996 S. Hill, *The early Byzantine churches of Cilicia and Isauria*, Aldershot 1996.

Janin 1964 R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, Paris 1964.

Karivieri 1995 A. Karivieri, "The christianization of an ancient pilgrimage site: a case study of the Athenian Asklepieion", in *Akten des XII. Internationalen Kongress für Christliche Archäologie, Bonn 22-28 September 1991,* vol. 2, eds. J. Engemann and E. Dassmann, . *JAC Erg*. 20:2. Münster 1995, 898-905.

Karivieri 1998 A. Karivieri, "SS. Giovanni e Paolo: La casa celimontana", in *Roma, magistra mundi. Itineraria culturae medievalis. Mélanges offerts au Père L.E. Boyle à l'occasion de son 75e anniversaire*, Louvain-La-Neuve 1998, 201-214.

Keskiaho 2015 J. Keskiaho, *Dreams and visions in the Early Middle Ages: reception and use of patristic ideas, 400-900*, Cambridge 2015.

Knipp 2002 D. Knipp "The chapel of physicians at Santa Maria Antiqua", *DOP* 56, 2002 1-23.

Kötting 1950 B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa. Wallfahrten in der Antike und das Pilgerwesen in der alten Kirche*, Münster 1950.

Lalonde 2005 G.V. Lalonde, "Pagan cult to Christian ritual. The case of Agia Marina Theseiou", *GRBS* 45, 2005, 91-117.

LeGoff 1988 J. LeGoff, *The medieval imagination*, Chicago 1988.

Leipoldt 1957 J. Leipoldt, *Von Epidauros bis Lourdes*, Leipzig 1957.

MacCormack 1991 S. MacCormack, *Religion in the Andes. Vision and imagination in early colonial Peru,* Princeton 1991.

MacMullen 1997 R. MacMullen, *Christianity and paganism in the fourth to eighth centuries*, New Haven & London 1997.

MacMullen 2009 R. MacMullen, *The Second Church. Popular Christianity A.D. 200-400*, Atlanta 2009.

Maraval 1981 P. Maraval, "Fonction pédagogique de la littérature hagiographique d'un lieu de pèlerinage: l'exemple des Miracles de Cyr et Jean", in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés Ive—XIIe siècles. Actes du*

colloque arganisé à Nanterre et à Paris (2-5 mai 1979), Paris 1981, 383-397.

Maraval 1985 P. Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient. Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1985.

Markus 1994 R.A. Markus, "How on earth did places become holy? Origins of the Christian idea of holy places", *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2:3, 1994, 257-271.

Markschies 2007 C. Markschies, "Gesund warden im Schlaf – einige Rezepte aus der Antike", in *Salute e guarigione nella tarda antichità. Atti della giornata tematica dei Seminari di Archeologia Cristiana (Roma – 20 maggio 2004)*, eds. H. Brandenburg, S. Heid & C. Markschies, Città del Vaticano 2007, 165-198.

McCoull 1991 L.S.B. McCoull, "Duke University MS. C25: dreams, visions, and incubation in Coptic Egypt", *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 22, 1991, 123-132.

McGuckin 1993 J.A. McGuckin, "The influence of the Isis cult on St. Cyril of Alexandria's christology", in *Studia Patristica vol. XXIV. Papers presented at the Eleventh International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1991*, ed. E.A. Livingstone, Leuven 1993, 291-301.

Merkelbach 1995 R. Merkelbach, *Isis regina – Zeus Sarapis. Die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt*, Stuttgart & Leipzig 1995.

Monserrat 1998 D. Monserrat, "Pilgrimage to the shrine of SS Cyrus and John at Menouthis in Late Antiquity", in *Pilgrimage and holy space in late antique Egypt*, ed. D. Frankfurter (Religions in the Graeco-Roman world, 134), Leiden, Boston & Köln 1998, 257-279.

Nissen 2001 C. Nissen, "Un oracle médical de Sarpédon à Séleucie du Calycadnos". *Kernos* 14, 111-131.

Oberhelman 2008 S. Oberhelman, *Dreambooks in Byzantium. Six Oneirocritica in Translation*, Aldershot 2008.

Osborne 1987 J. Osborne, "The atrium of S. Maria Antiqua, Rome: a history in art", *Papers of the British School in Rome* 55, 1987.

Poulsen 1993 B. Poulsen, "The Dioscuri and the saints", *AnalRom* 21, 1993, 141-152.

Price 1999 S.W. Price, *Religions of the ancient Greeks*, Cambridge 1999.

Pullan 2007 W. Pullan, "Intermingled until the end of time": ambiguity as a central condition of Early Christian pilgrimage', in *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian pilgrimage: seeing the gods*, ed J. Elsner, Oxford 2007, 387-410.

Rappaport 1993 R. Rappaport, "Veracity, Verity, and Verum in Liturgy", *Studia Liturgica* 23:1, 1993, 35-50.

Riethmüller 2005 J. Riethmüller, *Asklepios. Heiligtümer und Külte,* vols. 1-2 (Studien zu antiken Heiligtümern, 2), Heidelberg 2005.

Sansterre 1991 J.-M. Sansterre, "Apparitions et miracles à Menouthis: de l'incubation paienne à l'incubation chrétienne", in *Apparitions et miracles*, ed. A. Dierkens (Problèmes d'histoire des religions 2), Brussels 1991, 69-83.

Saxer 1980 V. Saxer. *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles. Les témoignages de Tertullien, Cyprien et Augustin à la lumière de l'archéologie africaine* (Théologie historique, 55), Paris 1980.

Stewart 2004 C. Stewart, "Ritual dreams and historical orders: incubation between paganism and Christianity", in *Greek ritual poetics*, eds. D. Yatromanolakis & P. Roilos, Washington 2004, 338-355.

Stroumsa 1999 G.G. Stroumsa, "Dreams and visions in Early Christian discourse", in *Dream cultures. Explorations in the comparative history of dreaming*, eds. D. Shulman & G.G. Stroumsa, New York & Oxford 1999, 189-212.

Takács 1994 S. Takács, "The magic of Isis replaced, or, Cyril of Alexandria's attempt at redirecting religious devotion", in *Poikila Byzantina* 13, Varia 5, Bonn 1994, 489-507.

Tea 1937 E. Tea, *La basilica di Santa Maria Antiqua*, Milan 1937.

Thélamon 1981 F. Thélamon, "Païens et chrétiens au IVe siècle. L'apport de l' "Histoire ecclésiastique" de Rufin d'Aquilée", *Études augustiniennes,* Paris 1981, 246-259.

Trombley 1993-1994 F. Trombley, *Hellenic religion and christianization c. 370-529* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman world, 115), vols. 1-2, Leiden, New York & Köln 1993-1994.

van Uytfanghe 1981 M. van Uytfanghe, "La controverse biblique et patristique autour du miracle, et ses répercussions sur l'hagiographie dans l'Antiquité tardive et le haut Moyen Âge latin", in *Hagiographie, cul-*

ture et société IVe - XIIe siècles. Actes du colloque organisé à Nanterre et à Paris (2-5 mai 1979), Paris 1981, 205-233.

Vaes 1984-86 J. Vaes, "Christliche Wiederverwendung antiker bauten: ein Forschungsbericht", *Ancient Society* 15-17, 1984-86, 305-443.

van den Ven 1962 *La vie ancienne de S. Syméon le Jeune (521-592),* ed. P. van den Ven, I-II (Subsidia hagiographica, 32), Bruxelles 1962-1970.

Vidman 1969 L. Vidman, *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae* (RGVV, 28), Berlin 1969.

de Vooght 1939 P. de Vooght, 'Les miracles dans la vie de saint Augustin', in *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 11, 1939, 5-16.

Walter 2003 C. Walter, *The warrior saints in Byzantine art and tradition*, Aldershot 2003.

Wickkiser 2008 B. Wickkiser, *Asklepios, medicine, and the politics of healing in fifth-century Greece.Between craft and cult*, Baltimore 2008.

Wipszycka 1988 E. Wipszycka, "La christianisation de l'Égypte aux I^{er} – V^{ieme} siècles. Aspects sociaux et ethniques", *Aegyptus* 68, 1988, 117-165.

Wisniewski 2013 R. Wisniewski, "Looking for dreams and talking to martyrs: the internal roots of Christian incubatio", *Studia Patristica* 63, 2013, 203-208.

Defining Constantinople's Suburbs through Travel and Geography

Isabel Kimmelfield
Radboud University Nijmegen

Introduction

It is challenging to define the nature and limits of late antique suburbs. The words '*suburbanus*', 'προάστεια', and their variants appear throughout Latin and Greek texts of late antiquity, but it is not always clear how we should interpret these terms and the regions, settlements, and buildings to which they refer. Most broadly, suburbs can be defined as settlements located near enough to a city that they are closely connected to it (through trade and travel), but distant or separate enough that they cannot be considered extensions of the city proper. If this is an ambiguous definition, it reflects the fluid definitions suggested indirectly by sources from the Byzantine period. These sources indicate that the identification of certain regions as 'suburbs' should often be considered more the result of a 'state of mind' than of geographical conditions.[1] Dividing lines like walls can help to determine the point at which the city ended and the suburbs began (although they should not be taken as absolute limits), but outer limits are harder to determine. Scholars wishing to understand what role these regions played in the cities with which they were associated and in the minds of contemporary inhabitants must wrestle with these difficulties of definition and seek creative approaches to clarify the impressions left by late antique sources.

This paper considers these challenges as they relate to the suburbs

[1] Champlin 1982: 97. Champlin here quotes H.J. Dyos' 1961 study on the development of modern suburbs in the nineteenth century, but notes that this observation holds equally true for Roman suburbs, as, indeed, it does for Byzantine suburbs.

of Constantinople and, in doing so, it seeks to offer some reflections on the ways in which various conceptions of geography, space, and spatial practice can inform late antique suburban studies. This approach takes inspiration in part from Luke Lavan's work on the applications of theories of space and spatial practice to late antique archaeology, although it embraces also 'rhetorical descriptions of cities' and their symbolic implications in addition to the 'anecdotes' of 'everyday activities' that Lavan seeks to unpack.[2] These rhetorical descriptions offer important evidence of the conceptual role of Constantinople's suburban regions, indicating how they functioned in the urban, religious, and imperial images of the city.

The symbolic role of the suburbs is particularly crucial given that our knowledge of Constantinople's suburbs relies largely on textual sources alone, which provide little detailed information about the physical layout of these suburbs, their inhabitants, or infrastructure. Indeed, these sources often contain little elaboration beyond a brief reference to a named suburb or suburban site, resulting in speculative modern maps of names located in blank space, mostly located along the shores of the Bosporos and the Sea of Marmara (leaving us to speculate to what extent the inland regions were 'suburbanised'). Some of these sites were built up to a considerable degree, such as Sykai or Chalkedon (both of which enjoyed varying degrees of independence from Constantinople at different points in time), while others appear as sites of imperial palaces or religious foundations (such as Sophianai or the Michaelion). The Hebdomon and Hiereia on the European and Asian sides respectively were important stations in imperial processions and military campaigns, as well as imperial retreats. Taking the broadest possible definition of 'suburbs', I have counted over forty named sites, with some taking different names or defined in different manners at different times. Below I will explore some methods that can be used to clarify further our understanding of the roles and definitions of Constantinople's suburbs in an effort to create a more nuanced picture of how Byzantine Constantinople existed within its environs throughout its history.

[2] Lavan 2013:187.

Geography, Movement, and Lines of Sight

I will consider in particular three elements of the suburbs of Constantinople: the geography of the land in which they and the city proper lay, the mode and reasons for movement through suburban regions, and the lines of sight that connected the city and the suburbs across long distances. Line of sight is a concept that has been employed frequently in analyses of individual urban monuments in antiquity and late antiquity, as well as a commonly considered factor in modern urban and architectural design.[3] In this paper, I wish to apply it to Constantinople's city and suburbs on a large scale, considering long lines of sight and their impact on contemporary perceptions and conceptions of the urban and suburban landscape. Together these three factors, geography, movement, and lines of sight, influenced the degree to which the suburbs were familiar to Constantinopolitans, allowing these regions to play meaningful symbolic as well as practical roles in urban life.

These three factors are intertwined, with geography influencing the ease and mode of travel, while both geography and travel influence possible lines of sight. The geography of Constantinople had a tremendous impact on urban and suburban development over the centuries, providing both advantages and challenges to inhabitants within and around the city. Roughly triangular in shape, Constantinople was surrounded by water to the north, south, and east and maintained many connections to its environs by water travel – often a much faster mode of transport than those available by land. Thus, even as the water ringing the city separated Constantinople from its immediate surroundings, it also provided a fast route to access the numerous coastal settlements that existed along both shores of the Bosporos, the Golden Horn, and the northern shore of the Sea of Marmara.[4]

---

[3] See, for example, Bernard Frischer's recent work on the Horologium of Augustus and the Ara Pacis using 3D computer modelling to test lines of sight associated with meteorological and time conditions. Frischer, Filwalk 2013.

[4] Wendy Mayer has made a compelling argument for the integration of the surrounding waters into the urban landscape of Constantinople, in particular in relation to liturgical and processional practice. Mayer notes in particular the emphasis in homilies and orations describing transmarine processions on the visual impact of torch-lit pro-

At the same time, walls, towers, open stretches of water, and the hilly nature of the land around the city provided opportunities to view the city even from some distance away, and to view the suburbs from within the city. These views linked the city and its suburbs, as they drew the two regions closer to each other, making each aware of activities taking place in the other. Descriptions of or references to such views appear in such diverse texts as ekphrastic descriptions of the city and its monuments, chronicles of sieges, saints' lives, and descriptions of religious and imperial ceremonies. This suggests the degree to which the Constantinopolitans conceived of their city and its surroundings in terms of lines of sight rather than strict divisions of distance (a distant mountain is more familiar visually than a closer valley). Maps made today of Constantinople and its environs (often lacking in topographical indicators) can sometimes be a deceptive means of judging the degree to which a site should be considered 'suburban'. Taking into account lines of sight and relative ease of travel on the ground and by water can clarify the perspectives of the Byzantines themselves when they referred to the 'suburbs of the city'.

Approaches to Defining the Suburbs through Language and Distance

The word προάστεια is generally translated as 'suburbs' or 'suburban estates'. It refers literally to the area 'before the town', 'ἄστυ'. 'Ἄστυ' refers to the 'public' or 'lower' part of a city, that is, the region occupied by the majority of the town-dwellers, contrasted with the raised and highly fortified acropolis. The 'προαστία' or 'προάστεια' are thus the regions before or beyond this. Προάστειον (together with the form πρὸ ἄστεως) appears in Byzantine sources referring to diverse types of extra-urban settlement, ranging from imperial retreats and villa estates to a more general usage apparently indicating settlements outside of but close to the city. It sometimes also qualifies the location of a site like a

cessions over water at night – a sight which could be viewed both from the walls of Constantinople, and from the sides of hills. This again suggests the importance (and symbolic significance) to Constantinopolitans of 'lines of sight' across and beyond the city centre. Mayer 1998: 463.

monastery or a game park. At least once, the word προαστῖται appears, indicating the inhabitants of a suburb, suggesting year-round occupation rather than simply seasonal or pleasure retreats.[5] Indeed, in many ways, some suburbs would have appeared very urban as the largest suburban settlements around Constantinople were highly developed, especially in the early Byzantine period, and could contain churches, baths, and porticoes.

The problem therefore remains to determine where such settlements ceased to be considered suburban extensions of Constantinople's urban landscape and become independent urban regions. In part, this is an issue of proximity: at a certain distance from the city, usually about a day's journey away (on land 20-30km, by sea in good weather, much further), sites are no longer referred to by Byzantine writers as suburban, suggesting distance as one form of definition. This is seen, for instance, in Procopius' *Buildings*, in which Book 1 is explicitly described as treating Justinian's buildings in Constantinople and its suburbs (ἐπί τε Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ τῶν ἐκείνῃ προαστείων).[6] Procopius later returns to the wider neighbourhood of Constantinople in Thrace in Book 4, which is to say, the city's deeper hinterland rather than its suburban region. The dividing line between those sites that appear in Book 1 and those that appear in Book 4 is generally around 20km.[7] Indeed, at Constantinople, the distance beyond which sites apparently ceased to be considered suburban is even closer than an average day's journey for a single person on foot (between 24 and 32km).[8] Instead, it is closer to the

[5] *Vita S. Danielis*: 26.5, p. 27. This word also appears in Stephen of Byzantium's *Ethnica*, possibly dating from a similar period (late fifth, early sixth century) to the *Life* of St Daniel, but the word seems otherwise very rare. Stephen of Byzantium: 139-40.

[6] Procopius: II.i.1, p. 96.

[7] Interestingly, discussion of the coastal land route from the city to the west (the Via Egnatia) is placed in Book 4, despite the section of road repaired by Justinian lying closer to the city than many of the popular suburban retreats listed in Book 1 (most of which were accessed by water). This may suggest a reckoning that was skewed toward coastal sites with water-access – which constituted the majority of named Constantinopolitan suburbs.

[8] Leyerle 2000: 460-1.

distance an army on foot could march in a day (20-24km).[9] This may suggest a defensive attitude toward the area around Constantinople from its earliest years as a capital (from the fourth century the city already suffered attacking armies marching from Thrace as far as the suburbs). Such an interpretation is supported by numerous references in texts to the encampment of advancing attacking armies at one day's distance from the walls (where they would sometimes stay for a time, periodically conducting raids of the extramural regions of the city): in this interval before the actual attack on the city proper, inhabitants of the region had an opportunity to retreat within the defensive walls.[10]

Evidence of Frequency of Travel between Suburbs and City

Another important element that drew settlements firmly within the suburban sphere was the frequency of traffic between a suburb and the city. Some suburbs enjoyed regular traffic due to their location on a major route to the city, such as the Hebdomon or Hieriea. Other times, the suburb itself drew travellers from the city and beyond, often due to the presence of important religious sites or holy figures. Churches, shrines, and monasteries, some of them apparently independent of larger settlements, served as foci of pilgrimage and processions around Constantinople. Early examples include the Church of Sts Peter and Paul at Rouphianai, the Church of the Macabees in Elaia, and the Church of St Thomas at Drypia, as well as the Churches of St John the Evangelist and St John the Baptist at the Hebdomon.[11] Regular travel also took place in the opposite

[9] MacGeer 1995: 340-1.

[10] See, for example, the Avar encampment at Melantias, (exact site unknown, but estimated at some 20km from the city, north of Büyükçekmece), from which point the attackers made sallies 'as far as the walls' for some time before attacking the city proper. *Chronicon Paschale*: I, 717. Similarly, when Isaakios and Alexios Komnenos rebelled and rode on Constantinople, they camped at Schiza, about 19km from the city and not far from Melantias. Anna Komnene: II.6.10, p. 72.

[11] All of these appear as the endpoints of liturgical procession in the fourth and fifth centuries. The Church of St Michael the Archangel (the Michaelion) at Hestiai is also identified by Sozomen as a healing shrine he himself has visited. PG 67:940-1. In the *Life* of Daniel the Stylite Daniel's disciple, Sergios, seeks to make a pilgrimage to the monastery of the Akoimetoi, located at Eirenaion (see below, n.14). The develop-

direction: farmers bringing in crops to sell at daily markets in the city or residents of monasteries travelling into the city for a day on errands. The very brevity of such trips – most completed within a day – further emphasises the suburban rather than rural nature of the dwelling places of these extramural inhabitants. It suggests familiarity between the suburbs and the city: they were within each other's sphere of reference and played a regular part in each other's daily routines.

These types of daily connections to the city are less well-recorded in surviving sources than the more exceptional and decorous events that took place during religious or imperial ceremonial processions. Nonetheless, brief passages in sources indicate the routine nature of travel within and to and from the suburbs – and the infrastructure required to support such travel. The fifth-century *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae* explicitly states that the city was connected to its thirteenth region of Sykai, across the Golden Horn, by 'frequent ferries' (*navigiis frequentibus*).[12] Elsewhere we find references to regular ferries not only across the Golden Horn, but also connecting the city to points further up the Bosporos. In the late-twelfth- or early-thirteenth-century *Life* of Leontios of Strumitza, later Patriarch of Jerusalem, Leontios, then a young monk at a monastery on the Asian side of the Bosporos, travels into Constantinople for a day on an errand for his abbot. Delayed in the city, he finds upon reaching the waterfront that it is too late in the day and he is unable to find 'a boat that regularly sailed upstream towards these places' (πλοιαρίῳ συνήθως πρὸς τὰ ἐκεῖσε ἀνιόντι).[13] In the *Life* of Daniel the Stylite, the monk Sergios, travelling from Constantinople north up the Bosporos, boards a boat 'with many others, men and women' (μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν), again suggesting the presence of a Bosporos ferry (this time as early as the fifth century).[14]

---

ment of fourth-century extramural churches at Constantinople may to a degree have supported a type of processional (extra-)urban Christian worship that reflected that which had developed around Rome's largely extramural early Christian topography. Baldovin 1987: 180.

[12] Notitia: 95-6.

[13] Life of Leontios: 12.10, p. 46.

[14] *Vita S. Danielis*: 22.17-18, p. 23; Dawes, Baynes, trans. 1977: 19. Sozomen's description of the Michaelion's distance from the city also suggests the presence of a

There are even fewer references to regular travel made by farmers. But in accounts of sieges the degree to which the walled city relied on surrounding farms to feed it becomes clear, providing implicit evidence for the daily markets that must have existed in Constantinople – and the local trade that supplied them. During the Avar siege in 626, for example, the Avar vanguard made sallies as far as the walls of the city which 'prevented anyone from going out or collecting provisions for animals at all'. Later, after ten days had passed without sight of the enemy, a party escorted by soldiers was sent out 'ten miles distant' to harvest crops to feed the city.[15] If such dangerous missions were deemed necessary even under threat of attack after only ten days of the siege, it suggests that during peace time the city was supplied far more frequently – likely daily – from farms in its suburban belt. This inference is supported by Johannes Koder's work on the provisioning of the city, which posits the existence of market gardens occupying land immediately outside the Theodosian Walls and across the Bosporos. Koder's land area estimates are based on the distance that could be covered on foot to transport goods from fields to urban markets in two hours (6-7km), allowing farmers to travel there and back easily in one day.[16]

Views and Interactions between the Suburbs and the City

Familiarity would have been further reinforced through lines of sight. Procopius, praising the beauty of Constantinople in his encomium to Justinian's building projects, describes 'the woods and the lovely meadows and all the other details of the opposite shore which lie open to view from the city' (καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῆς ἀντιπέρας ἠπείρου ἐνδεικνύμενος ὑποκείμενα τῇ τῆς πόλεως ὄψει).[17] In Procopius' text the view of the pleasant suburbs simply highlights the beauty of the city itself by providing it with an attractive background. But views of the suburbs could

fifth-century ferry given its reference to the distance (35 stadia) doubling if one makes a circuit between the two points (ἑβδομήκοντα δὲ καὶ πρὸς κύκλῳ περιοδεύοντι τὸν διὰ μέσου πορθμόν), with 'πορθμόν' possibly referring to a set ferry route. PG 67:940.

[15] *Chronicon Paschale*: I, 717; Whitby, Whitby, trans. 1989: 171.

[16] Koder 1995: 53.

[17] Procopius: I.v. 7, p. 59.

also play more active practical or symbolic roles. This is largely seen in a military or defensive context, as part of any late antique city's defences was the ability to see dangers from a distance.

At Constantinople, this defensive advantage was provided not only through direct views, but also in the middle Byzantine period through a long-range warning system of mountain-top beacons.[18] These stretched out in nine posts to the east across Anatolia, with the closest to Constantinople located on Mount Auxentios on the Asian side. A final beacon was located within the imperial palace complex at the Church of the Theotokos of the Pharos, but Mount Auxentios would have had the widest visibility in the area. Although this mountain, modern Kayışdağı, lies 16km from the city centre, it is 438 meters tall and readily visible from most points of the city and its nearest suburbs (including the important imperial suburb of the Hebdomon). Such a prominent location would have ensured that wherever the court was located, either in the city or in its immediate environs, they would be immediately alerted should the warning of an attack on the eastern frontier arrive. Indeed, Mount Auxentios would have been the most visible beacon even within parts of the city as Pharos was located on the southern end of the tip of the city, where the land slopes down toward the sea, making it difficult to view from inland.

The impact of the sight of the signal beacon being lit is suggested by a censorious story against Michael III related in several Byzantine chronicles as well as in the *De ceremoniis* of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos. According to this story, while participating in the chariot races at the hippodrome of St Mamas (modern Beşiktaş), Michael was disturbed by the lighting of the beacons. The *De ceremoniis* does not specify Michael's location, but the *Synopsis* of John Skylitzes specifies that the emperor was in the midst of a race when the Pharos beacon was lit, distracting his spectators.[19] Pharos, located on the opposite side of the acropolis from St Mamas, may not have been directly visible to Michael or his audience, but the beacon at Mount Auxentios would likely have been just visible on the horizon. In any event, concerned that this sight

[18] On this, see Pattenden 1983.

[19] Skylitzes: 108.

would cause the citizens to become 'distressed and not come out to the hippodrome to see [his] driving the horses', Michael ordered that the beacons were no longer to be lit.[20] Regardless of its accuracy, this story suggests that the meaning of the beacons was considered to be widely-known among the populace and would not only have signalled the defenders of the city to take action, but would also have affected the civilian inhabitants of the city – and its suburbs. Although the threat to the city indicated by so long-range a beacon would likely not have been imminent, nonetheless it would have warned those living outside the city walls that a retreat within the fortified city might soon be necessary.[21]

When the enemy was located much closer to the city, lines of sight became even more meaningful to a watchful populace behind the defensive walls. Attacking armies could also make use of lines of sight for strategic purposes. During the Avar siege, the Avars, located at Sykai, made contact with their Persian allies encamped at Chrysopolis through fire signals.[22] These signals must also have been visible to the Byzantines within the city, and would have had the double consequence of communicating with the Persians and serving as a terrifying reminder to the Byzantines of the closeness of the enemy to the walls, even through the night when no fighting was taking place. The impact of the sight of enemy fires was also employed strategically by Andronikos Komnenos during his usurpation of Alexios II: after he camped above Chalkedon, Choniates writes that Andronikos lit many fires through the night, more than were necessary for his troops, in order to give the appearance of a larger army, and in an effort to lure supporters to his side from Constantinople: 'In causing them to look out in the direction of the straits to see what was going on, Andronikos hoped to have them come down to the shore or ascend the hills so that even from afar he might signal

[20] *Book of Ceremonies*: 493.

[21] Skylitzes states that 'those who lived in the countryside' (οἱ τῶν χωρῶν κάτοικοι), upon learning of an attack (via the beacons) would retreat into walled fortresses. This likely refers to those who lived further afield than the suburbs of Constantinople, but nonetheless indicates the general knowledge of the meaning of the beacons. Skylitzes: 108.

[22] *Chronicon Paschale*: I, 717-8.

them and win them over.' (ὡς τὰ ἀνὰ χεῖρας προεμένους ἔργα εἰς τὴν περαίαν τείνειν τὸ ὄμμα ἀκταῖς τε καὶ γηλόφοις προσιόντας τῆς πόλεως καὶ πόρρωθεν ὄντα Ἀνδρόνικον ἐπισπᾶσθαι οἷον τοῖς νεύμασιν) His strategy proved successful: a testament as much to the power that could be gained by exploiting urban/suburban lines of sight as to Andronikos' personal popularity.[23]

Fire's advantage for exploiting lines of sight lies in its visibility even across long distances. Given that Constantinople was surrounded on three sides by water, such signalling was often the only way to communicate from outside the walls with those within – whether to offer warnings to defenders or to chip away at their morale. On the land-side of the city, however, a different type of interaction was possible. The land directly outside of the walls appears in many places to have consisted of open plains, likely interspersed with fields supplying the city with fresh vegetables. In the middle period, part of the land to the northwest of the city appears to have been designated the Exo-Philopation, an imperial game park, while to the south appears to have been located the Aretai park, an imperial game park and pleasure garden. Byzantine sources tend to mention only the plains or the pleasure grounds – not the crop fields. These are attested instead in texts by foreign visitors, such as the twelfth-century crusader Odo of Deuil, who, in addition to describing the extensive game parks outside the city, also noted that '[b]elow the walls lies open land, cultivated by plough and hoe, which contains gardens that furnish the citizens with all kinds of vegetables'.[24]

The Byzantine sources, meanwhile, tend to frame descriptions of this immediately extramural region within the context of its imperial or military significance. The open plain was a site on which attacking armies would appear – at times directly addressing defenders to call upon them to surrender. In the later middle Byzantine period in particular these interactions come to the fore – an unsurprising development given the shift in the late eleventh century of the main imperial residence from the Great Palace in the city centre to the Palace of Blachernai on the city walls. From this point on the walls, the land dips away to the south into

[23] Niketas Choniates: 246; Magoulias, trans. 1984: 138.
[24] Odo of Deuil: 65.

the Lykos river valley before rising again. Such a landscape provided an extensive view over the extramural plains – and an excellent stage for both visual and verbal engagements between the opposing armies.

This type of engagement is described at length in Michael Attaleiates' account of the revolt of Leo Tornikios against Constantine IX Monomachos in 1047 and again in Niketas Choniates' account of the revolt of Alexios Branas against Isaakios Angelos in 1187. In the later revolt, Branas is described explicitly as making use of the hills northwest of Blachernai on the Golden Horn by sending troops up on these hills (from where 'all the sections of the City facing north' were visible). Here the sun flashed on their armour and weaponry, striking the City's populace, gathered on the hills of the City, with awe.[25] In the earlier revolt, Leo brought his army up to the walls of Constantinople where, unlike other besieging armies (such as the Avars and the Arabs in the seventh century), 'he pitched his camp in full view of the defending army' (χάρακά τε βάλλεται καὶ στρατοπεδεύει λαμπρῶς).[26] Attaleiates emphasises the impact of the visual element of this attack, describing how Leo's advance presented a 'frightening and awesome sight' (φοβερά τις καὶ καταπληκτική) to those who fled to safety within the walls of the city as Leo's army pillaged the suburbs.[27] Constantine is described as sitting in the Blachernai palace, 'deploring the rabid madness that had seized his own domain and watching as it plunged into ultimate destruction' (ἤλγει τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπικράτειαν οὕτω λυττῶσαν καὶ μαινομένη νέστι δ'οἷς καὶ τὰ ἔσχατα πάσχουσαν καθορῶν).[28] The destruction of the suburbs here acts as a microcosm of the larger upheaval caused by a revolt against the emperor. The emperor in his palace overlooking these suburbs is given a front-row seat to witness this chaos. Here he is shown penned in, unable to exercise control over or to protect even the areas just beyond the city walls – the suburbs that provided both pleasure and sustenance to the city and its inhabitants.[29]

---

[25] Niketas Choniates: 380.

[26] Michael Psellos: v. 2, VI.107, p. 20; Sewter, trans. 1953: 157.

[27] Michael Attaleiates: 6.3, p. 40.

[28] Michael Attaleiates: 6.4, p. 40.

[29] A very different response to the destruction of the suburbs took place thirty years

Constantine's helplessness in the situation is thus enhanced by this exchange between attackers and defenders at the border between intra- and extramural space and the familiar closeness of the immediately extramural suburbs heightens the seriousness of the threat to imperial authority posed by the attacking army. At the same time, we can see how perceptions of the suburbs of the cosmopolitan capital could differ depending on the context: in the throes of a siege, with the enemy at the gates, directly challenging the emperor's power, the suburbs are cut off from the defensive city, serving as reminders of how dire the situation is. But in peace-time, views and travel stretch further, and so the city's suburbs are expanded once again, and with them the urban and urbane influence of Constantinople.

Symbolically Viewing the Suburbs

A contrasting view of an emperor is presented when we find him at his ease in the suburbs, able to exercise his authority and demonstrate his military and physical skill and strength. Such a description is found in Nikolaos Mesarites' late twelfth-century ekphrasis of the Church of the Holy Apostles. Here Mesarites describes the view from the roof, the highest point of a church he locates in the 'heart' of the city. From here, he tells us, one can see out to the Philopation, so named for the delight men take in frequenting it (προσφιλῶς πατεῖσθαι προσωνυμουμένην). Rather than describing the landscape of this park in detail, Mesarites presents a tableau of the emperor in action in this region. First he directly enjoins readers to 'See, the ruler has gone out for the salvation of his people and he is staying in the Emperor's Tents, which are opposite the

later when Nikephoros Bryennios attempted to overthrow Michael VII. Bryennios' brother, sent to march on Constantinople, attempted to incur fear in the inhabitants by marching past the walls in formation (παρῆλθε συντεταγμένος ὡς τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πολίταις ἐκ τοῦ προφανοῦς διοπτικώτερον φανησόμενος), but his subsequent burning of the suburbs across the Golden Horn so turned the populace against the revolt that he was forced to retreat. It was important for a would-be usurper to demonstrate his control of suburban space, but he could not be seen as wantonly destroying it. Michael Attaleiates: 31.10, p. 458.

palace [of Blachernai] and a little distance from it'.[30] Here, he explains, it is the custom for the Byzantine army to muster before going on campaign, 'as though coming from diverse springs in lands everywhere into one meeting of the waters, and when it has formed one river which will sweep aside everything that comes in its way'. He states that from the roof of the church, the whole army can be seen, but he then switches subject abruptly to the hunt, noting that the park is frequently used for such pursuits, the action of which is fully evident to the viewer atop the church – just as are the armies of the emperor. This juxtaposes the emperor's activities at war and in the hunt: he is a man able to tame both the barbarous people and the barbarous animals found beyond the walls of the civilised city. Viewers within the city, situated on the roof of one of its most important churches, may witness the proof of the emperor's power through demonstrations in the suburbs – a region close enough to the city to allow such views, but extramural and thus able to stand in as a representative for the greater world – and the borderlands of the empire itself.

This symbolism of the emperor as defender of the city through his actions outside its walls appears likewise in the tenth-century *De ceremoniis*. Here, Constantine VII instructs his son, Romanos, on the preparations to be made by an emperor going on campaign. One important action takes place just as the emperor is setting sail across the Sea of Marmara towards the port of Pylai on the Gulf of Nikaea.

'When he is at sufficient distance from the imperial harbour to look upon the City [καὶ ἀπὸ ἱκανοῦ διαστήματος τοῦ βασιλείου ὅρμου γενόμενος, ὥστε αὐτὸν ἐπισκοπεῖν τὴν πόλιν], he rises from his couch and stands facing east, raising his hands heavenwards and, having made the sign of the Cross three times with his hand over the City, he prays to God saying as follows: "Lord Jesus Christ, my God, in your hands I place this city of yours. Preserve it from all the adversities and difficulties befalling it, from civil strife, and foreign attack. Keep it impregnable and unassailed, for we place our hopes in you. You are lord of mercy and father of compassion and God of all consolation, and yours is the power

[30] Nikolaos Mesarites: 864.

of mercy and salvation and deliverance from temptations and dangers, now and forever. Amen.'[31]

Again, we find the visual emphasised here, made possible by the geography of the city and movement through this landscape: departing by sea, the emperor at a certain point is able to view the entirety of his city stretching across the horizon – the perfect point at which to bless the city and to entrust its safekeeping into the hands of God in the absence of its emperor.

Conclusion

This paper has sought to present some of the 'states of mind' that could influence both the identification of certain regions as 'suburban' by the Byzantines, as well as how closely connected contemporary inhabitants of both the city proper and its surroundings felt the two regions to be. The strict terms of distance undoubtedly played a role, albeit one that was significantly influenced by the nature of the geography of the land and water over which this distance spread. But the more elusive element of familiarity was also key, and this familiarity was not a constant: it was strengthened in times of peace and prosperity, but could be tested in times of war and rebellion. At times, the dividing lines of the walls and waterways could feel very deeply entrenched indeed, as suggested by the violence against the extramural inhabitants perpetrated by the city-dwellers after the former supported Branas' rebellion against Isaakios Angelos.[32] To understand these fluctuations it is important to read sources with a deeper awareness of the impact that both fixed elements like geography and variables like travel and warfare could have

[31] *Book of Ceremonies*: 475. Moffatt and Tall translate 'ἵσταται κατ' ἀνατολὰς' as '[he] stands facing east', which would not make sense given the location of the boat as it sailed away to the east of the city: the city would lie to the west. The phrase may instead refer to the emperor's location in the 'east' end of the boat (its prow as it departed the city), or it may be an error in the text. A similar confusion of location is found in Michael Psellos' *Chronographia*, in which the Church of Ss Kosmas and Damianos is described as located 'before the walls of the City, towards the rising of the sun [i.e. to the east]' – an impossible location given the waters of the Bosporos to the east of the city. Michael Psellos, v. 1, IV.31, pp. 71-2.

[32] Nichetas Choniates: 391.

on contemporary Byzantines' perceptions of their urban and suburban spatial environment.

One fact that comes clearly through the sources, however, is that when looking at their city, the Byzantines did not limit their gaze to the confines of the walls. Although the city centre was unequivocally the heart of the city and home to its most important features, the suburbs were nonetheless a familiar part of life for Constantinopolitans. Either through views or through personal journeys made to these regions, inhabitants of the city proper were well acquainted with the surroundings of their city, and for the wealthier classes, these regions were often second homes, extensions of urban living. Even those who did not own property in the suburbs might have occasion to visit them on religious processions or personal pilgrimages. And for those who lived outside the city, the great capital so close by was a natural magnet as a mercantile, religious, and political centre, as well as a place of safety in war-time.

Studying the locations of the city's suburbs on a map, the region can at times appear to be a flat field, studded with approximated sites of buildings and settlements mentioned in sources. But it is important to take into account the varying geography and the constant movement and viewing that took place in this region: despite the distances and bodies of water separating these sites, they were not necessarily as isolated as the points on the map might suggest. At least a small network of roads must have connected many of them on land – and the waterways of the city served as the greatest highway of all. At the same time, points apparently close on a map might have been separated by mountains or valleys, making them more 'distant' for travellers. Bringing this active, visual element to bear on the sources offers an enriched appreciation of the degree to which the city's suburbs functioned as part of Constantinopolitan life, and the various symbolic roles the regions visible from the city could play in different contexts.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Annae Comnenae Alexias (Corpus Historiae Fontium Byzantinae, XL/1-2, Series Berolinensis). Diether Roderich Reinsch and A. Kambylis, eds. Berlin, 2001.

Chronicon Paschale. Vol. 1. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae. L. Dindorf, ed. Bonn, 1832.

Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD. Michael Whitby and Mary Whitby, trans. Liverpool, 1989.

Constantine Porphyrogennetos, The Book of Ceremonies. 2 vols. Ann Moffatt and Maxene Tall, trans. Canberra, 2012.

Ioannis Scylitzae synopsis historianum. Hans Thurn, ed. CFHB 5; Berlin and New York, 1973.

The Life of Leontios, Patriarch of Jerusalem. Dimitris Tsougarakis, ed., trams. Leiden, 1993.

Michael Attaleiates. *The History.* Anthony Kaldellis and Dimitris Krallis, trans. Dumbarton Oaks, 2012.

Michael Psellos. *Chronographie ou Histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976-1077)*. Émile Renauld, ed., trans. Paris, 1926-1928, repr. 1967.

Niketas Choniates. *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*. Aloysius van Dieten, ed. Berlin, 1975.

Niketas Choniates. *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*. Harry J. Magoulias, trans. Detroit, 1984.

Nikolaos Mesarites. 'Description of the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople'. Glanville Downey, ed., trans. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 47.6 (Philadelphia, 1957): 855-924.

Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae. John Matthews, trans., in *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*. Lucy Grig and Gavin Kelly, eds. (New York, 2012): 81-115.

Odo of Deuil. *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem: The Journey of Louis VII to the East*. Virginia Ginerick Berry, ed., trans. New York, 1948.

Procopius of Caesarea. *Procopius*. 7 vols. H.B. Dewing, trans. Cambridge MA, 1914-1940.

Sozomen. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. PG 62:843-1630. Patrologia Graeca. J.-P. Migne, ed. 217 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.

Stephani Byzantii ethnicorum quae supersunt. Augustus Meineke, ed. Berlin, 1849.

Three Byzantine Saints: Contemporary Biographies. Elizabeth Dawes and Norman Baynes, trans., ed. London, 1948, repr. 1977.

Vita S. Danielis Stylitae, in *Les saints stylites*. Hippolyte Delehaye, ed. Paris, 1923.

Secondary Literature

Baldovin, John F. *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*. Rome, 1987.

Champlin, Edward. 'The *suburbium* of Rome'. *American Journal of Ancient History* 7 (1982): 97-117.

Frischer, Bernard and John Fillwalk. 'A computer simulation to test the Buchner thesis: The relationship of the Ara Pacis and the meridian in the Campus Martius, Rome'. *Digital Heritage International Congress (DigitalHeritage)*. (IEEE, 2013): 341-345.

Koder, Johannes. 'Fresh Vegetables for the Capital', in *Constantinople and its Hinterland: Papers from the Twenty-Seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford April 1993*, Cyril Mango and Gilbert Dagron, eds. (Aldershot, 1995): 49-56.

Lavan, Luke. 'Late Antique Urban Topography: From Architecture to Human Space', in *Theory and Practice in Late Antique Archaeology.* Luke Lavan and William Bowden, eds. (Leiden, 2003): 171-195.

Leyerle, Blake. 'Communication and Travel', in *The Early Christian World*, vol. 1, Philip F. Esler, ed. (London and New York, 2000): 452-474.

MacGeer, Eric. *Sowing the Dragon's Teeth: Byzantine Warfare in the Tenth Century*. Dumbarton Oaks, 1995.

Mayer, Wendy. 'The Sea Made Holy: The Liturgical Function of the Waters Surrounding Constantinople'. *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 112 (1998): 459-468.

Pattenden, Philip. 'The Byzantine Early Warning System'. *Byzantion* 53 (1983): 258-299.

The Apostolic Tradition in Constantinople

Paul Magdalino
University of St Andrews

When I was invited to give the 2015 Rydén lecture, three things guided my choice of topic. One was that I was thinking about it at the time, in connection with the paper I was due to give at the Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Symposium at the end of April 2015, which was devoted to the church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. However, I had been thinking about the cult of the apostles in Constantinople long before that. I had thought about it when investigating the evidence for vanished churches in the vicinity of Hagia Sophia, which included sanctuaries dedicated to four major apostles. I shall mention them below. Yet my interest in the apostolic tradition in Constantinople goes back earlier still, to my work on the urban holy men who were put on the map by the much regretted Professor Lennart Rydén. This was the decisive reason why I chose to speak in Uppsala about apostles in medieval Constantinople: it emerges from the hagiographies of St Andrew the Fool and St Basil the Younger, the former edited and translated by Rydén,[1] and the latter now available in the Dumbarton Oaks edition and translation by Denis Sullivan, Alice-Mary Talbot and Stamatina McGrath.[2] In studying these texts, and in developing the comparison between them that Lennart Rydén had made,[3] I came to the conclusion that one of their purposes was to celebrate their heroes as latter-day apostles, engaged in an apostolic mission to save the church and people of Constantinople in eschatological anticipation of the imminent end of time.[4]

[1] Rydén 1995.
[2] Sullivan, Talbot and McGrath 2014.
[3] Rydén 1983.
[4] Magdalino 1999: 93–96.

To reformulate the conclusion that I reached in my article of 1999, the unconventional, uncanonical urban lifestyles of Andrew the Fool and Basil the Younger were the Byzantine version of the apostolic poverty and apostolic preaching of the Mendicant Orders in the thirteenth-century West. Very bizarre, and very Byzantine, but apostolic nonetheless.

More generally, my reason for revisiting, if not actually raising, the question of apostolicity in Byzantium is my sense that this is a neglected and undervalued aspect of the Byzantine religious tradition. When we think of Orthodox religiosity and holiness, we think of the all-pervasive intercession of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, the divine patron of Constantinople. We think of the ubiquitous invocation and depiction of the soldier martyrs Theodore, George, and Demetrios, and the doctor martyrs Panteleimon, and the Anargyroi, Kosmas and Damian. We picture the paternal charity of St Nicholas, the Platonic intellectualism of the Church Fathers, the theatrical charisma of the Desert Fathers, the stylites and other solitary ascetics. [5]

Above and beyond all of them, we imagine the Byzantine Christ in his various manifestations as transcendental Logos and Wisdom of God, awesome Pantokrator, philanthropic Saviour, or the Man of Sorrows whose Passion Relics were treasured at the heart of the imperial Palace.[6] We do not so readily think of the preaching and pastoral authority of Christ's apostles, and of the bishops who descended from them in apostolic succession. Nor do we think of Byzantium in connection with missionary activity, apart from Cyril and Methodius.[7] All this is something we are more readily inclined to associate with Western Christendom, and especially with the church of Rome. Yet in looking at the highlights in the Byzantine religious picture, we are liable to overlook the presence and the importance of the apostles, not only as a supporting cast, but

[5] For a general idea of Byzantine devotion to these holy figures, and the iconography in which they were most frequently encountered, see Maguire 1996 and 1998. For the Virgin, see most recently Peltomaa, Külzer and Allen 2015; for the military saints, Walter 2003; for St Nicholas, see Gazeau, Guyon and Vincent 2015, especially the articles by E. Akyürek, P. Magdalino and N. Ševčenko.

[6] Belting 1980–1981, Magdalino 2004, Lidov 2012.

[7] See Ivanov 2015 for the argument that the Byzantines undertook little evangelizing work, and attached little importance to the missions that they sponsored.

also as key actors who mediated and enhanced the holiness of the other central figures in the scene.

The apostles were basic points of reference in all kinds of religious discourse, both verbal and pictorial. Thus, for example, at the conclusion of an ecumenical council, the assembly set the seal on its decision by exclaiming "This is the faith of the apostles".[8] It was common practice in theological polemic to undercut the rhetorical and philosophical sophistication of one's opponent by claiming to speak the plain, unvarnished gospel truth in the language of simple fishermen, as the apostles had been – ἁλιευτικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀριστοτελικῶς, to quote St Gregory of Nazianzos.[9] The chancel screen dividing the sanctuary from the nave in Justinian's Hagia Sophia displayed, on the exterior of its entablature, roundel portrait busts of Christ flanked by angels, prophets and the Twelve Apostles in silver repoussé; SS Peter and Paul were also represented flanking Christ on the altar cloth.[10] The apostles were credited with the authorship of the first post-biblical collection of moral and ritual teachings and prescriptions, known as the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Part of this collection, the *Apostolic Canons*, became the basis of Byzantine canon law. It ends by adopting the voice of the apostles themselves, who tell their successors, the bishops, that only by observing the canons will they achieve salvation.[11]

The *Apostolic Constitutions* are patently post-apostolic, and the Byzantines had worries about their authenticity. The collection belonged to a large corpus of traditions that grew up around the apostles in the first four centuries A.D., a corpus of which the canonical scriptures of the New Testament formed only a small part. The apostles became the principal protagonists or the supposed authors of a vast apocryphal literature of *acta*, gospels, moral teachings and apocalyptic visions that circulated among the Christian communities of the Roman Empire and

[8] E.g. *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, Session 5.35, ed. Schwartz 1933: 130/326.

[9] *Oration* 23.12 (ed. Mossay 1980: 304).

[10] Paul the Silentiary, *Description of Hagia Sophia*, lines 692–708, 786–91, ed. De Stefani 2011: 47–48, 54; tr. Mango 1972: 87, 89.

[11] Wagschal 2015: 92–95.

beyond.[12] It circulated mostly in Greek and in the lands that would later become the Byzantine world. With the definition of the scriptural canon in the third and fourth centuries, most of this literature was condemned and destroyed as uncanonical and heretical. However, we should not underestimate its influence in shaping and enriching early Christian culture with narratives about the companions of Christ and their role in the diffusion of Christianity. Many of the stories survived, in suitably sanitised and summarised form, because they were entertaining as well as edifying, and because they provided biographical information about the leading apostles whose lives were not covered by the canonical book of Acts.[13] Thus the apocryphal *Acta* of St John, St Philip, St Thomas and St Andrew are more or less preserved. How and to what extent they were disseminated is far from clear, but we do have one piece of evidence that apostolic apocrypha were read out in church. Among the collected works of the twelfth-century poet known as 'Manganeios Prodromos' is a verse preface to the reading of the *Clementina* in the church of the Virgin Hodegetria in Constantinople.[14] The *Clementina* or *Clementine Literature* were a collection of homilies and novellistic tales involving St Peter the Apostle, his disciple and later Pope Clement I, and Simon Magus.[15] This evidence is important because it shows that for the averagely literate and pious Byzantine believer, the apostles were not remote and austere authority figures, known only from the canonical scriptures. They were folk heroes, in every sense the supermen of the Roman Empire, actively campaigning for the salvation of men and performing miracles through the grace of Christ and the Holy Spirit, with whom they were on intimate terms. Only Christ's mother, the Virgin Mary, had a more direct and intimate line of access to God. Here it is important to note that she too was known to Byzantine believers primarily through

[12] See in general Richard A. Norris Jnr. in Young, Ayres and Louth 2008: 28–35; Bovon 2003. Scholarly recent edition of the main texts in French translation in Bovon and Geoltrain 1997, and Geoltrain and Kaestli 2005.

[13] Bovon 1999.

[14] Miller 1883; 42–44; cf. Magdalino 1993a: 440–41.

[15] Texts translated and introduced by Alain Le Boulluec in Geoltrain and Kaestli 2005: 1175–2003: cf. Edwards 1992.

apocryphal traditions, in which her story was inextricably linked with those of the apostles. Her early life was chronicled in a Gospel attributed to St James,[16] and the legend of her Dormition and Assumption, attributed to St John, tells the story of how the apostles reassembled in Jerusalem to witness her falling asleep and to bury her body: some of them were already there, some came from nearby, while others were far away on missionary journeys and had to be transported on clouds to get there in time.[17]

Constantinople, as is well known, eventually adopted the Virgin Mary as its supernatural protector, building numerous churches to her, acquiring important contact relics and legendary portrait icons, and attributing to her its miraculous deliverance from enemy attack.[18] It became, effectively, Theotokoupolis, and developed the legend that Constantine had founded the city in her honour.[19] In contrast to the overwhelming presence of her cult is the lack of focus on any other single holy person, apart from Christ. There was simply no local saint of the stature of, say, St Peter in Rome or St Demetrios in Thessaloniki; the local martyr Mokios evidently did not meet the requirements. One might therefore be tempted to conclude that Constantinople adopted, and imported, the Theotokos to make up for the lack of an apostolic tradition. There is something in this idea, because Constantinople always suffered, in its ecclesiastical relations, from a mismatch between the weight of its political and demographic importance and the flimsiness of its sacred credentials. However, the cult of the Theotokos in Constantinople did not begin to take off until the second quarter of the fifth century, a good hundred years after the foundation of the city. Before that, the local archbishop, St John Chrysostom, could refer to it, in 399, as "the city of the apostles" (PG 56, col. 264).

---

[16] Tr. Albert Frey in Bovon and Geoltrain 1997: 73–104.

[17] Ed. and tr. Wenger 1955: 201–41; another version tr. Simon Mimouni, in Bovon and Geoltrain 1997: 165–88; cf. also Stephen J. Shoemaker in Peltomaa, Külzer and Allen 2015: 23–39.

[18] Still fundamental is Cameron 1978; see also Mango 2000, Angelidi and Papamastorakis 2000, Pentcheva 2006, Shoemaker 2008, Krausmüller 2011.

[19] Mango 2000: 23–24.

Although Chrysostom was not making a historical statement, nor denying the claims of any other divine patron, there is reason to think that he was voicing what Constantine had intended when presiding over the creation of Constantinople in 324–337. Whether Constantine intended to found a Christian city – whatever that meant in the early fourth century – is an open question, but he clearly wanted the apostles to have pride of place, along with himself, in its Christian space. The most imposing Christian structure in the new city, built at the highest point inside the new city wall, was the church of the Apostles that doubled as the emperor's mausoleum, with his tomb at the centre of a cluster of cenotaphs commemorating the twelve.[20] This cosy arrangement was not allowed to last, probably because the Church felt uncomfortable with its audacious implications, and twenty years after Constantine's death, his son and successor Constantius II added another structure to the complex, so as to separate the functions of apostolic church and imperial burial. But this only enhanced the importance of the apostolic presence and the apostolic tradition within the Christian life and the sacred space of the imperial city. For the rest of the fourth century the church of the Holy apostles tended to overshadow the other churches of Constantinople, including the new cathedral church of the Holy Wisdom, Hagia Sophia, which had also been built, or at least completed, by Constantius II. At least this is the impression that we get from the very fragmentary source material, to the point that historians long assumed, until corrected recently, that the Holy Apostles was the main cathedral of Constantinople in the second half of the fourth century.[21] Yet there can be no doubt that the apostles enjoyed a certain priority in the Constantinian capital: this is indicated, above all, by the fact that the first Christian relics to arrive in Constantinople were the bones of three apostolic saints, deposited in the church of the Holy Apostles: St Andrew, brought from Patras in Achaia, and St Luke from Thebes, and St Timothy from Ephesos. It is not entirely clear

[20] The unique source for Constantine's construction is Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, IV.58–60, tr. Cameron and Hall 1999: 176–77; for commentary, see Mango 1999 and Bardill 2012: 364–95. On the church of the Holy Apostles, see in general Janin 1969: 41–50; James 2012: 181–217.

[21] Mayer 2000 and McLynn 2010.

whether the translation of their relics happened on the initiative of Constantius II in 357, as most of the sources state and most of the secondary literature assumes, or whether it was ordered by Constantine himself in 336, as Richard Burgess has argued on the basis of one good chronicle source.[22] Either way, it is surely not far-fetched to see the translation as a partial fulfilment of an intention that had been there from the beginning. It is inherently less credible that Constantine intended the cenotaphs of the apostles surrounding his sarcophagus to remain no more than empty tombs. Rather, the logic of the evidence suggests that if he had had his way in an ideal imperial world, Constantine would have translated the bodies of *all* the apostles to Constantinople, and that what he or Constantius ended up with was not what they really wanted; they had to make do with what was available, which is another way of saying, what the emperor was able to negotiate with the local Christian churches that guarded the tombs of the saints – what those churches were prepared to release or to reveal. In this, the imperial translation of Christian relics was not unlike Constantine's importation of pagan statues to adorn the public spaces of Constantinople: it removed precious markers of local identity from their meaningful contexts, to the detriment of the communities that had cultivated them.[23] The random selection of apostles for translation says it all. Only Andrew was one of the Twelve; the other two, Timothy and Luke, were second rankers, and the fact that their relics came from Ephesos hints at the possibility that they were what the imperial agents had to be content with after having failed to secure the probably vanished remains of St John the Evangelist.

Conjecture aside, the important fact is that Constantine chose to surround himself, physically and symbolically, with apostles and not with later martyrs. This is remarkable in view of the political and ideological context in which he had founded Constantinople. He had founded Constantinople to celebrate and commemorate his recent victory over Licinius, which had brought with it the final liquidation of the Tetrarchy of Diocletian.[24] What better way to mark his break with the past than to

[22] Burgess 2003.

[23] Magdalino 2015.

[24] The intention to break with the Tetrarchy, and specifically to erase the memory of

pack his new city with shrines to the martyrs who had died in the persecutions of Diocletian and Galerius? He may have built churches to some local martyrs, and he or Constantius II may have translated one martyr, Akakios, from Nicomedia. However, the evidence is cloudy, as Albrecht Berger has recently shown.[25] In any case, Constantine certainly did not associate the martyrs of the Tetrarchy with his own burial. Why then the apostles? One obvious inference, which may have troubled his contemporaries and has certainly not been lost on modern scholars, is that in surrounding himself with the Twelve Apostles, Constantine was casting himself in the role of Christ. However, I prefer the explanation that Constantine saw himself as *isapostolos*, the equal of the apostles, or as the thirteenth apostle. His life hardly reads like an *imitatio Christi*, but it shows distinct signs of *imitatio Pauli*: his dramatic conversion by a bright heavenly vision, his stringent insistence on monogamy, and, above all, his statement, recorded by Eusebius, that he considered himself to be the "bishop of those outside [the church] (ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἐκτός" (*VC,* IV, 24). If this is taken to mean that the emperor assumed special responsibility for the spiritual care of his non-Christian subjects, as the missionary who would lead them to Christ, the expression is distinctly reminiscent of the division of apostolic labour that St Paul describes in his letter to the Galatians 2, 7–8: Peter was the apostle of the Jews, whereas Paul's mission was to evangelise the Gentiles.[26]

Where did Constantine get his reverence for the apostles, his notion of apostolicity, and the idea to combine his imperial mausoleum with an apostle shrine? The answer must be Rome, where Constantine had lived in proximity to the cults of Peter and Paul; Rome, where he had contributed to the building of the basilica of St Peter at a short distance from the mausolea of Augustus and Hadrian; Rome, where the basilica of St Paul was planned, if not already under construction, around the time of

Licinius, has been emphasized in different ways in recent literature: see Stephenson 2009: 192–94; Barnes 2011: 111–13; Bardill 2012: 251–53; Potter 2013: 239–41; Van Dam 2014.

[25] Berger 2013.

[26] Staats 2008.

his death.[27] If Constantine needed a model for planning the Christian monuments of Constantinople, Rome was the only place where he could find it, because no other city, including Jerusalem, had as yet (we are talking about 324) a Christian topography. Indeed, the Christian topography of Constantinople echoed that of Rome in one basic respect. It had two initial nodes, around which and between which it developed: a central cathedral church, dedicated to Christ, and an apostle shrine on the periphery.[28] However, Constantine was not the kind of city builder or empire builder who needed to follow a precedent. His imperial programme and his religious beliefs evolved considerably between his occupation of Rome in 312 and his planning of Constantinople in 324, which had a further twelve years to evolve by the time he constructed his mausoleum there in 336. Moreover, in the planning of Constantinople, Constantine had a tabula rasa, at least outside the site of ancient Byzantion, unconstrained by the traditions and the topography of Rome. Thus he was able to combine imperial and Christian memorial, and to bring the very special dead within the city walls.

To sum up, the apostolic tradition was fundamental to the origins and existence of Constantinople as a Christian city. Initiated by Constantine, it was profoundly and directly inspired by the example of Rome, and indeed should be seen as an integral part of Constantine's conception of his city as New Rome. However, it started off on a different footing from its Roman precedent, and followed a distinct trajectory, which with hindsight we can identify as typically Byzantine. The apostolic tradition in Constantinople venerated the apostles more as a group, and less as individuals. It involved, and indeed inaugurated, the translation and dismemberment of relics, which Pope Gregory the Great would later denounce, in 594, as a nasty Greek habit that was alien to the traditions of the Roman church – this was when the empress Constantina asked him for the head of St Paul.[29] Most importantly, the apostolic tradition in Constantinople was inextricably linked to imperial burial and imperial authority in matters of faith. It conferred apostolicity on the emperor, as

[27] Bardill 2012: 239–51; McKitterick et al. 2013.

[28] Noted by Mango 1985: 35–36.

[29] Gregory the Great, Registrum, IV 30, ed. Norberg 1982: 248–50; Mango 1990.

isapostolos or thirteenth apostle, and emperors would continue to use it in this way. Thus in the preface to the *Ecloga*, the law code issued in 741, the emperor Leo III likened himself to St Peter,[30] and the historian Anna Komnene asserted that her father, Alexios I Komnenos, deserved the title of thirteenth apostle even more than Constantine for his efforts in converting heretics to the true faith.[31]

The apostolic tradition in Constantinople was thus not only central to the city's Christian culture, but it was also highly official. We may wonder, however, whether this was altogether a good thing for the cult of the apostles themselves. Did it not turn them into remote authority figures lacking in charisma, faceless bureaucrats of the heavenly king who could not be approached with confidence by ordinary believers seeking favours and forgiveness, and whose pastoral care of the church, moreover, was compromised by their association with imperial power? Was not this the reason, or at least one of the reasons, why Constantinople in the fifth and sixth centuries went from being the city of the apostles to being the city of the Theotokos: because Byzantines needed a more effective and sympathetic intercessor with Christ? There is also the point that the Virgin Mary could identify with Constantinople because, having left no bodily remains on earth, she was not rooted in any other place, unlike the apostles who had emotional ties to the cities where they had preached, founded churches, suffered martyrdom in most cases and received burial. Thus St Philip and St John, to mention only the best documented, had flourishing cult centres at Hierapolis and Ephesos in Asia Minor, to say nothing of SS Peter and Paul in Rome, or St James in Compostela, which was, amazingly, on the Byzantine pilgrimage map in the eleventh century.[32]

The apostles were perhaps initially and to some extent the victims of changing religious fashions, but the later history of their cult in Constantinople is far from being a simple story of demotion and marginalisation. To begin with, the cult of the apostles at the sanctuary of the Holy Apostles became less imperial and more ecclesiastical with the separation of

[30] *Ecloga,* Prooimion (ed. Burgmann 1983: 160).

[31] *Alexiad*, XIV.8,8, ed. Reinsch and Kambylis 2001: 457.

[32] Theodore Prodromos, *Life of St Meletios*, ed. Vasilievskij 1886: 46–47.

the imperial mausoleum from the church, and with the use of the latter for the burial of sainted archbishops of Constantinople, starting with St John Chrysostom and later including St Gregory of Nazianzos and the patriarchs Nikephoros and Methodios, the champions of the veneration of icons.[33] Their entombment in close proximity to the relics of Saints Andrew, Timothy and Luke, buried under the high altar, effectively invested these 'rock star' fathers of the church with an apostolic status that rubbed off on their successors on the patriarchal throne. It was a notable case of the transfer of apostolicity to other saints, which we shall come across again.

Secondly, the cults of the Theotokos and of other saints, whose relics were received and whose churches proliferated in fifth and sixth-century Constantinople, did not take business away from the cult of the apostles. They added new layers to the religious life of the city, without cutting into or squeezing out the pre-existing strata. And this is not all. At the very time when Constantinople was completing its adoption of the Theotokos as its divine protector, in the late sixth and early seventh centuries, the cults of individual apostles were on the increase.

To get an idea of the relative importance of the apostles in the heavenly hierarchy of Byzantine worship, we need to look at the festal calendar of the Byzantine church, and at the evidence for the relative importance of religious feasts. One document that illustrates this very clearly and reliably is the piece of imperial legislation that the emperor Manuel I issued in 1166 in order to limit the number of days when the law courts were in recess.[34] They were closed for the 12 days of Christmas, during Holy Week and on Sundays. Otherwise, there were 36 whole days and 28 half-days when they were allowed to close. Of the 36 full days, exactly half were feasts of the apostles, the rest being devoted to Christ, the Virgin, St John the Baptist, and the three principal Fathers of the Greek church: St Basil, St Gregory of Nazianzos, and St John Chrysostom. The

[33] Janin 1969: 49. Their tombs were venerated by emperor and patriarch in an Easter Monday ritual: Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *Book of Ceremonies*, tr. Moffatt and Tall [ed. J. J. Reiske] 2012: 76–77.

[34] Macrides 1984, reprinted in Macrides 1999: 140–55 (text and translation), 184–90 (commentary).

28 half days included two apostolic commemorations: an extra feast for St James the brother of the Lord (23 October), and the celebration of St Peter's chains on 16 January.

When we look at the topography of the 18 major apostolic feasts, as prescribed in the tenth-century liturgical calendars of the church of Constantinople, the *Synaxarion* and the *Typikon*, interesting patterns emerge.[35] On only three occasions was the church of the Holy Apostles the main liturgical venue: the feast-days of St Luke (18 October), St Andrew (30 November) and the collective celebration of the Twelve on 30 June. So only one of the Twelve was celebrated there. For the others, in four cases the venue is not specified, and we should probably assume that they were celebrated in Hagia Sophia, which is specified for St Matthew (16 November). The remaining seven all had their own churches, apart from St Bartholomew, who was celebrated in the church of St Peter (24 August). On the other hand, St Mark the Evangelist, who was not one of the Twelve, but whose feast (25 April) is also listed as a full holiday in Manuel I's *novella* of 1166, was also celebrated in his own church.[36]

Let us look more closely at the six apostles of the Twelve who were celebrated in their own dedicated churches. They were SS James, John, Paul, Peter, Philip and Thomas.[37] These apostles, together with Andrew, were undoubtedly the most popular of the twelve. Their names are the apostolic names most commonly given in baptism, both in east and west. They were the apostles who generated the most literature, both in terms of canonical scripture, and in the form of apocryphal *Acta* and gospels. Theirs too were the main apostle relics that were venerated in Constantinople outside the church of the Holy Apostles: the chains of St Peter,[38] the head of St Paul,[39] the body of St James,[40] the body of St Philip,[41] the

[35] Mateos 1962: Delehaye 1902.

[36] Janin 1969: 307.

[37] Janin 1969: 253–55, 264–70, 397–401, 493–94, 248–51.

[38] Anthony of Novgorod, tr. de Khitrowo 1889: 89; von Falkenhausen 1990.

[39] Anthony of Novgorod, tr. de Khtitowo 1889: 98; *Anonymus Mercati*, ed. Ciggaar 1976: 245; *Anonymus Tarragonensis*, ed. Ciggaar 1995: 121.

[40] *Anonymus Mercati*, ed. Ciggaar 1976: 255.

[41] Anthony of Novgorod, tr. de Khitrowo 1889: 98

head of St Thomas and the lance with which he was martyred.[42]

Turning to the churches where the six main apostles (apart from Andrew) were celebrated in the Middle Byzantine period, it is interesting to consider their dates and locations. What they have in common is that none of them is reliably attested before the sixth century[43], and none stood close to the church of the Holy Apostles. The church of St John at the Hebdomon, of indeterminate date, was in an important, but distant suburb. The church of St Philip at *ta Miltiadou*, said to have been constructed by the emperor Anastasios (491–518), was located in the zone between the Constantinian and Theodosian walls.[44] That of St Thomas near *ta Amantiou*, probably a contemporary foundation, was near the harbour of Julian/Sophia.[45]. The other four churches – of St Peter, St Paul, St James the Brother of God, and St John – can all be dated, with the possible exception of St Peter's chapel that was attached to Hagia Sophia,[46] to the late sixth and early seventh centuries, and all were clustered at the east end of the city, in close proximity to Hagia Sophia. The reasons behind this remarkable cluster of apostle dedications in the post-Justinianic period are not immediately obvious, and cannot occupy us here. Each church had its own story, and it would take too long to tell them all and put them all together. I would venture the suggestion that the main initiative came from Justin II (565–582), who is credited with the churches of both St James and St Paul. [47] I would also point out that

---

[42] Antonopoulou 2013: 271–72, 413–14.

[43] The possible exceptions are the church of the Apostle John at the Hebdomon and that of St Thomas *ta Amantiou*, which are both mentioned in connection with events of the fourth and early fifth centuries. However, in the first case a copyist's error has been suspected (Maraval 1985: 405), and in the second, the fact that the sources post-date the sixth century casts doubt on their reliability: see Featherstone and Mango 2003: 234–38 (who do not, however, mention the allusion to the church in the seventh-century and later hagiography of St John Chrysostom, which states that his body rested there when it was translated to Constantinople in 437: see Halkin 1977: 41, 485).

[44] *Patria*, III 189, ed. Preger 1901–1907: 275 (tr. Berger 2013a: 216–17).

[45] For the exact location, see Featherstone and Mango 2003.

[46] The evidence suggests a ninth-century context: Magdalino 2015a: 52.

[47] Theophanes, ed. de Boor 1882: 244 (tr. Mango and Scott 1997: 361, 362); *Patria,* III, p. 47, ed. Preger 1901–1907: 235 (tr. Berger 2013a: 166–67). On Justin's artistic patronage in general, see Cameron 1979.

the achieved result, if not the original intention, was to provide the patriarchal clergy of Hagia Sophia with liturgical stations for the celebration of major apostle feasts that were close at hand and did not involve lengthy processions to the western parts of the city. I also suspect an eschatologically driven concern for apostolic intercession, comparable to the contemporary focus on the Theotokos as intercessor at a time of heightened apocalyptic expectation.[48] But whatever the intention behind the dedication of each of the four churches, they testify collectively to a remarkable upsurge of devotion to the apostles in Constantinople at the very end of antiquity.

Another, striking contemporary example of this devotion is the empress Constantina's request to Pope Gregory the Great, to which we have already referred, to be given the head of St Paul for the consecration of a chapel in the imperial Palace. It is interesting that she requested the relic for a palace chapel and not for the great basilica of St Paul that had recently been erected by Justin II. No less remarkable is the fact that the emperors evidently persisted in their request and some later pope granted it, because in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, foreign travellers record the head of St Paul among the relics in the imperial chapel.[49] One of these travellers, the 'Anonymous Tarragonensis' of the late eleventh century, states that on the collective feast of the apostles (30 June), the relic was taken by the patriarch in solemn public procession from the palace to the church of the Holy Apostles.[50] A Byzantine writer at the end of the twelfth century, Nicholas Mesarites, provides the additional information that from the Holy Apostles, the relic was taken on a further tour of the city.[51] These sources give us a precious glimpse into the cult of the apostles in medieval Constantinople. They show that long after Constantine, Byzantine emperors continued to look to Rome as the ultimate source of authentic apostolic tradition. They seem to indicate that the head of St Paul eclipsed the body of St Andrew as the most precious

[48] See Leena Mari Peltomaa in Peltomaa, Külzer and Allen 2015: 131–37, with reference to Magdalino 1993b; see also Magdalino 2008: 123–25.

[49] Above, n. 38.

[50] Ciggaar 1995: 121.

[51] Ed. and tr. Downey 1957: 916, 893.

and famous apostle relic in the city, to the extent that it was used to represent all the Twelve Apostles on their collective feast day. Finally, they show that although the emperors appropriated the relic for their own private devotions and spiritual protection, they were under pressure to put it on public display at least once in the year.

Relics were one way in which the saints manifested their presence and inspired devotion in believers. They also made themselves known by performing miracles and appearing in visions. As far as I know, the apostles did not generate any miracle stories in medieval Constantinople, but they did give rise to a number of visionary accounts. When I was working in the footsteps of Lennart Rydén, I was particularly struck by the role of apostolic visions in two tenth-century texts, the *Life of Andrew the Fool* and the *Vision of Kosmas the Monk*.[52] St John the Evangelist appears more than once in the *Life of Andrew*, to Andrew himself, and to the holy man's spiritual son, Epiphanios, whom the apostle takes on a trip to heaven to show him the honour in which Andrew is already held at the court of the heavenly king[53]. Kosmas the monk tells of a near-death experience in which he saw himself being guided on a tour of heaven by St John and St Andrew.[54] These particular apostles were not chosen at random. Their hagiographical apparitions, whether real or imagined, seem to me to reflect the real importance of Andrew and John as intercessors, cult figures, and – to repeat the expression – folk heroes in tenth-century Constantinople.

Both saints were regarded as apostolic founders of the church of Constantinople. At his hearing by the Photian synod of 861, the Patriarch Ignatios, who contested his deposition, claimed the right to be seated before the papal legates, saying, "I have the throne of the Apostle John, and of Andrew, who was the first-called disciple of Christ".[55] The claim to apostolic succession from John, which was also voiced by Ignatios' successor, Photios,[56] was presumably based on the idea that John's

[52] Magdalino 1999.
[53] Rydén 1995: 22–25, 126–27, 208–09, 214–17, 254–55.
[54] Angelidi 1983.
[55] Minutes of the synod, ed. von Glanvell 1905: 603.
[56] Greenwood 2006: 136.

see of Ephesos fell within the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople. In the case of Andrew, the claim to possess his apostolic authority may have had something to do with the possession of his body in the church of the Holy Apostles, as a result of a translation by either Constantine or Constantius. Mainly, however, it was based on the tradition, which had circulated in various forms since perhaps as early as the fourth century, that the apostle, on his way from his mission in the Black Sea to his martyrdom in Patras, had stopped off in Byzantion, founded a church at the nearby town of Argyropolis, and consecrated the first local bishop, Stachys.[57] The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople still believes in the Stachys legend, whose value for the patriarch's authority is obvious: it enabled the church of Constantinople to counter the criticism, which it faced from the other patriarchates, that it had been raised up out of nothing by imperial decree, by demonstrating good apostolic credentials in the form of a foundation by no less an apostle than Andrew, known as the First-Called (πρωτόκλητος) because he had been the first of the Twelve disciples to answer Jesus' call, ahead of his own brother Peter. This was obviously a good card to play against the Petrine primacy asserted by the Roman Church.

There are signs that Andrew was treated as a local hero in Constantinople in the ninth and tenth centuries. Local tradition associated certain places with the memory of his visit. He was said to have lived for a time outside Byzantion, on the Golden Horn, where he built a church; he then moved inside the city and preached in a portico by the harbour.[58] Another tradition credited him with consecrating a church to the Theotokos.[59] This and other traditions inspired a major piece of hagiography. Between 815 and 843 a local monk, Epiphanios, was moved to write a new biography of the apostle, which to judge from its abundant manuscript tradition became a big hit. It is a remarkable document in two respects. Firstly, it is to my knowledge the only full-length *vita* of an apostle, based on a fresh compilation of the apocryphal *acta*, which was composed in Greek during the Middle Ages. Secondly, the author is

[57] See in general Dvornik 1958, and more recently, Mango 2009: 158–64.
[58] *Patria* III 179, ed. Preger 1901–1907: 271 (tr. Berger 2013a: 210–13).
[59] *Patrologia* Graeca, vol. 120, col. 244. Vinogradov 2005: 179.

unusually informative about his motivation and his research. He tells us that his work took shape when he and another monk, Iakobos, decided to get away from the iconoclast regime in Constantinople. Taking with them a copy of the *Acts of Andrew* in the version attributed to Epiphanios of Cyprus, they followed the itinerary of the Apostle's missions around the Black Sea from Bithynia to the Sea of Azov. As they went, they not only investigated the local traditions about the Apostle, but also sought out the relics of other saints.[60]

At the same time, however, Epiphanios' text is remarkable for what it does not say. It takes barely two sentences to deal with Andrew's visit to Byzantion, and the only new information it adds is the reference to the church of the Theotokos on the acropolis. Epiphanios is clearly much more interested in what happened before and after Byzantion: the details of Andrew's preaching and miracles in Bithynia and around the Black Sea, and the story of his dealings with the proconsul of Achaia leading to his martyrdom in Patras. There is no way that Epiphanios' *Life of Andrew* can be regarded as propaganda for the apostolic pretensions of the patriarchate of Constantinople. Indeed, as Father Francis Dvornik pointed out many years ago, the church of Constantinople made remarkably little use of the Andrew-Stachys legend in its contest with the church of St Peter.[61] It seems that the Byzantines were interested in Andrew because of his exploits, his preaching and the sacred topography of his life, both inside Constantinople and beyond. Here we should note that his cult persisted in the city of Patras, despite his translation to Constantinople.[62]

In the same way, the cult of the Apostle John persisted at Ephesos, despite the construction of two major churches in his name in Constantinople.[63] John's popularity may also have been due to his miracles and

[60] Epiphanios Monk and Priest, *On the Life, Deeds and End of the Holy All-Blessed and First-Called of the Apostles, Andrew*: *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 120, cols 216–260. Critical edition by Vinogradov 2005: 157–85; cf. Vinogradov 2011.

[61] Dvornik 1958.

[62] This is evident from an episode reported by Constantine Porphyrogennetos in *De Administrando Imperio*, 49: ed. and tr. Moravcsik and Jenkins 1967: 228–233: see also Avramea 1997: 132.

[63] For the city's continuing importance as a pilgrimage centre, see Foss 2002, esp. 130–

preaching, as recorded in his apocryphal *acta*. Yet John was a much more versatile character than any of the other apostles. He was the beloved disciple of Christ, a close associate of the Virgin Mary, the most philosophical of the four Evangelists, and, despite the doubts of such as Eusebius, recognised as the author of the book of Revelation, which became topical in the apocalyptic climate of the sixth and seventh centuries.[64] He was the original Theologian of the church. He was also the only apostle whose body parts were not to be found in any of his cult centres, a distinction he shared with the Virgin Mary. Like the Virgin, he was thought to have undergone a 'relocation' (*metastasis*), although not in the form of a bodily assumption to heaven, for it was widely believed that he remained alive on earth, awaiting the end of time, when he would reveal himself, together with Enoch and Elijah, in order to denounce the Antichrist. So widespread was this belief that it found its way into the main Byzantine commentary on Revelation,[65] and into the official hagiography of the tenth century, notably the great 'rewriting' (*Metaphrasis*) project of Symeon Metaphrastes, who used much apocryphal material in standardising the biographies of the Apostles.[66] His encomium for St John the Theologian ends by describing how the apostle laid himself to rest in his tomb and his disciples returned the next morning to find him gone, because he had "joined the company of Enoch and Elijah".[67] The survival of St John until the end of the world is also an important apostolic motif in the *Lives* of St Basil the Younger and St Andrew the Fool. People suspect that Basil himself is St John the Theologian incognito[68] – an indication that other holy men may have attracted the same speculation. St Andrew the Fool, asked by his disciple Epiphanios during one

31, 138; on the church, see Thiel 2005. The church became the core of the settlement, and gave it its medieval and modern name of Theologos–Ayasoluk.

[64] The major Byzantine commentary on the Apocalypse of St John, by Andrew of Caesarea, has been dated to the second decade of the seventh century, at the darkest moment of Byzantium's great war with Sassanian Persia: Constantinou 2013; Magdalino 2003: 249–51; ed. Schmid 1955–1956.

[65] Schmid 1955–1956: 110–111.

[66] Bovon 1999.

[67] *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 116, col. 704.

[68] Sullivan, Talbot and McGrath 2014: 148–49, 278–79.

of their tutorials what has happened to the Prophet Elijah, replies that not only are Enoch and Elijah alive and well and waiting to fulfil their eschatological roles, but

> John the Theologian also lives and is in the world, like a pearl in the mud, left to live in the flesh on earth to face Jesus Christ for our sins and to avert his just wrath against us, when our trespasses are multiplied so that he wants to blot us out because of our sins. Many of the righteous have seen him, although they did not reveal him because of the wickedness of the faithless and inquisitive human mind.[69]

Thus the apostle John was imagined in the role of the ultimate intercessor for mankind before the Last Judgement. Imagined, though never fully certified, because the story of his empty tomb was apocryphal, and a school of religious opinion, going back to St John Chrysostom, refused to accept it. This included the pop theologian Michael Glykas, writing in the twelfth century, when eschatological speculation was less intense.[70] But it also included, most remarkably, the copyist of one of the earliest surviving manuscripts of the Metaphrastic corpus, dating from around the turn of the millennium. The scribe of Istanbul, Hagia Triada 77, copied out the whole of Symeon Metaphrastes' encomium of St John the Theologian, but then decided – or was ordered by his superior – to change the ending. He did so by cutting out the folios with the offending text, leaving only the inoffensive final section at the beginning of the next folio. He then inserted a new bifolium on which he wrote his alternative conclusion, citing Chrysostom in support of the idea that John had died a normal death and been given a normal burial.[71]

Yet the evidence for the continuing belief in John's *metastasis* shows that the apostolic tradition in Constantinople was nothing if not creative. Its creativity lay not only in finding troubleshooting roles for established apostles, but also in conferring apostolicity on other spiritual authorities,

---

[69] Tr. Rydén 1995: 704.

[70] Ed. Eustratiades 1912: 108–12.

[71] I owe this information to Marina Detoraki, who generously shared with me the unpublished paper she gave at the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Sofia 2011).

and eliding apostles with other kinds of saints. This took various forms. I pass over Cyril and Methodius, the apostles of the Slavs, and Constantine-Cyril's translation of the relic of St Clement to Rome. As we have seen, emperors and patriarchs were given a share of apostolic grace by being buried *ad apostolos*, in the church of the Holy Apostles and its annexes, much as the Roman Popes emphasised their Petrine succession by being laid to rest near the tomb of St Peter. A corpus of Christian Neoplatonic writings composed in the late fifth or early sixth century was given apostolic authority by being attributed to a minor character in the Acts of the Apostles, who was given a new identity as Dionysios the Areopagite, disciple of St Paul, first bishop of Athens and first bishop of Paris.[72] He was portrayed among the Church Fathers in Hagia Sophia.[73] So too was St Nicholas, who effectively became an associate apostle by being paired, in the liturgical space of Hagia Sophia, with St Peter: his chapel at the south-east corner of the church was exactly symmetrical with that of St Peter on the north-west.[74] But the most creative piece of apostolicity in medieval Constantinople was undoubtedly the creation of Andreas Salos, St Andrew the Fool for Christ. Andrew bore the name of the first-called apostle who had ordained Stachys, first bishop of Byzantium. His mission on earth, and his life of homeless poverty, were authorised by visionary appearances of St John the Apostle. His mission was highly apostolic, in that its goal was to prepare his spiritual disciple, Epiphanios, to become the patriarch of Constantinople. And one of the ways that the middle Byzantine, probably tenth-century, author of the text chose to give it an authentic, fifth-century atmosphere, was to have Andrew see a vision of the church of the Holy Apostles in the form in which it would be rebuilt by Justinian.[75] The Holy Apostles, not Hagia Sophia. Very bizarre and very Byzantine, but unquestionably apostolic.

---

[72] For a recent study of the Dionysian corpus, see Golitzin 2013.

[73] Mango 1962: 48–58.

[74] Magdalino 2015a: 50–52. Note that the cult of St Nicholas in Constantinople was promoted by the patriarch Methodios, who also contributed to the hagiography, and the copying, of St Dionysios: Canart 1979. The Byzantine cult of St Dionysios in the ninth century merits further study.

[75] Rydén 1995: 132–35; cf. Magdalino 1999: 96.

Bibliography

Angelidi, Ch. 1983. “La version longue de la vision du moine Cosmas”, *Analecta Bollandiana* 101: 73–99.

Angelidi, Ch. and T. Papamastorakis, 2000. “The Veneration of the Virgin Hodegetria and the Hodegon Monastery”, in *Mother of God. Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art*, ed. M. Vassilaki, Athens: Benaki Museum, and Milan: Skira, 373–87.

Antonopoulou, Th. 2013. *Βυζαντινή ομιλητική. Συγγραφείς και κείμενα,* Athens.

Avramea, A. 1997. *Le Péloponnèse du IVe au VIIIe siècle. Changements et persistances*, Paris : Publications de la Sorbonne.

Bardill, J. 2012. *Constantine, Divine Emperor of the Christian Golden Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barnes, T. 2011. *Constantine. Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire*, Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

Belting, H. 1980–1981. “An Image and its Function in the Liturgy: the Man of Sorrows in Byzantium”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 34/35: 1–16.

Berger, A. 2013a. *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople: the* Patria, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 24).

Berger, A. 2013b. “Mokios und Konstantin der Grosse. Zu den Anfängen des Märtyrerkults in Konstantinopel”, in *Antecessor.Festschrift für Spyros N. Troianos zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. V. Leontaritou, K. A. Bourdara and E. S. Papagianni, Athens: Ant. N. Sakkoulas,165–85.

Bovon, F. 1999. “Byzantine Witnesses for the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles”, in *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, ed. F. Bovon, A. Graham Brock and C. R. Matthews, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 87–98.

— 2003. “Canonical and Apocryphal Acts of Apostles”, *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11: 165–94.

Bovon, F. and P. Geoltrain (eds) 1997. *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, vol. 1, Paris: Gallimard.

Burgess, R. W. 2003. “The Passio s. Artemii, Philostorgius, and the Dates of the Invention and Translation of the Relics of Sts. Andrew and Luke”, *Analecta Bollandiana* 121: 5–36.

Burgmann, L. (ed.) 1983. *Ecloga. Das Gesetzbuch Leons III. und Konstantinos V.,* Frankfurt: Löwenklau-Gesellschaft E.V.

Cameron, A. 1978. "The Theotokos in Sixth-Century Constantinople: A City Finds its Symbol", *Journal of Theological Studies* 29: 79–108.

— 1980. "The Artistic Patronage of Justin II", *Byzantion* 50: 62–84.

Cameron, A., and S. G. Hall (tr.) 1999. *Eusebius: Life of Constantine*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canart, P. 1979. "Le patriarche Méthode de Constantinople, copiste à Rome", in *Palaeographica, diplomatica et archivistica. Studi in onore di Giulio Battelli*, Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, vol 1, 343–53.

Ciggaar, K. N. 1976. "Une description de Constantinople traduite par un pèlerin anglais", *Revue des études byzantines* 34: 211–68.

— 1995. "Une description de Constantinople dans le Tarragonensis 55", *Revue des études byzantines* 53: 117–40.

Constantinou, E. S. 2013. *Guiding to a Blessed End: Andrew of Caesarea and his Apocalypse Commentary in the Ancient Church*, Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press.

de Boor, C. (ed.) 1883–85. *Theophanis Chronographia*, 2 vols., Leipzig: Teubner.

De Stefani, C. (ed.) 2011. *Paulus Silentiarius, Descriptio Sanctae Sophiae, Descriptio ambonis*, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Delehaye, H. (ed.) 1902. *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolianae. Acta Sanctorum, propylaeum Novembris*, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes.

Downey, G. (ed. and tr.) 1957. "Nikolaos Mesarites: Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, new series, 47: 855–924.

Dvornik, F. 1958. *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Edwards, M. 1992. "The Clementina: A Christian Response to the Pagan Novel", *The Classical Quarterly* 42: 459–74.

Featherstone, M., and C. Mango, 2003. "Three Miracle Stories from Constantinople", in ΕΥΚΟΣΜΙΑ. *Studi miscellanei per il 75º di Vincenzo Poggi S.J.*, ed. V. Ruggieri and L. Peralli, Catanzaro: Rubbettino Editore, 229–42.

Foss, C. 2002. “Pilgrimage in Medieval Asia Minor“, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 56: 129–51.

Gazeau, V., C. Guyon and C. Vincent, 2015. *En Orient et en Occident: le culte de saint Nicolas en Europe, X^e^-XXI^e^ siècle.* Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.

Geoltrain, P., and J.-D. Kaestli, 2005. *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens*, vol. 2, Paris: Gallimard.

Golitzin, A., and B. Bucur, 2013. *Mystagogy. A Monastic Reading of Dioysius Areopagita*, Collegeville MN: Cistercian Publications.

Greenwood, T. 2006. “Failure of a Mission? Photius and the Armenian Church”, *Le Muséon* 119: 123–167.

Halkin, F. (ed.) 1977. *Douze récits byzantins sur saint Jean Chrysostome*, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes (Subsidia Hagiographica 60).

Ivanov, S. 2015. *“Pearls before swine.” Missionary Work in Byzantium*, Paris: Amis du Centre d’Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance (Centre de recherche d’Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, Monographies 47).

James, L. 2012. *Constantine of Rhodes, On Constantinople and the Church of the Holy Apostles*, Farnham: Ashgate.

Janin, R. 1969. *La géographie ecclésiastique de l’Empire byzantin*, *première partie. Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique,* vol. 3: *Les églises et les monasteries*, Paris: Institut français d’études byzantines.

Khitrowo, B. de, 1889. *Itinéraires russes en Orient*, Geneva: J.-G. Fick; repr. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1966.

Krausmüller, D. 2011. “Making the Most of Mary: The Cult of the Virgin in the Chalkoprateia from Late Antiquity to the Tenth Century”, in *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium. Texts and Images*, ed. L. Brubaker and M. B. Cunningham, Farnham: Ashgate, 219–45.

Lidov, A. 2012. “A Byzantine Jerusalem. The Imperial Pharos Chapel as the Holy Sepulchre », in *Jerusalem as Narrative Space. Erzählraum Jerusalem*, ed. A. Hoffmann and G. Wolf, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 63–103.

McKitterick, R. et al (ed.) 2013. *Old St Peter’s, Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McLynn, N. 2010. “Moments of Truth: Gregory of Nazianzus and Theodosius I”, in *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians. Later Roman His-*

tory and Culture, 284–450 CE, ed. S. McGill, C. Sogno and E. Watts, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Yale Classical Studies 34), 215–39.

Macrides, R. 1984. "Justice under Manuel I Komnenos: Four Novels on Court Business and Murder", *Fontes Minores* 6: 99–204.

— 1999. *Kinship and Justice in Byzantium, 11th–15th Centuries*, Aldershot: Variorum.

Magdalino, P. 1993a. *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 1993b. "The history of the future and its uses: prophecy, policy and propaganda", in *The Making of Byzantine History. Studies Dedicated to Donald M. Nicol on his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. R. Beaton and C. Roueché, Aldershot: Ashgate, 3–34.

— 1999. "'What we heard in the Lives of the saints we have seen with our own eyes': the holy man as literary text in tenth-century Constantinople", in *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. J. Howard-Johnston and P. A. Hayward, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 83–112.

— 2003. "The Year 1000 in Byzantium", in *Byzantium in the Year* 1000, ed. P. Magdalino, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 233–70.

— 2004. "L'église du Phare et les reliques de la Passion à Constantinople (VIIe/VIIIe-XIIIe s.)" in *Byzance et les reliques du Christ*, ed. J. Durand and B. Flusin, Paris: Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance (Centre de recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, Monographies 17), 15–30.

— 2008. "The End of Time in Byzantium", in *Endzeiten. Eschatologie in den monotheistischen Weltreligionen*, ed. W. Brandes and F. Schmieder, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter (Millennium Studies 16), 119–33.

— 2015a. "Le culte de saint Nicolas à Constantinople, in Gazeau, Guyon and Vincent 2015, 41–55.

— 2015b. "The Myth in the Street: The Realities and Perceptions of Pagan Sculptures in Christian Constantinople", in ΜΥΘΟΠΛΑΣΙΕΣ. Χρήση και Πρόσληψη των Αρχαίων Μύθων από την Αρχαιότητα μέχρι Σήμερα, ed. S. Efthymiadis and A. K. Petridis, Athens: Open University of Cyprus, 205–22.

Maguire, H. 1996. *The Icons of their Bodies. Saints and their Images in Byzantium*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

— 1999. "The Cycle of Images in the Church", in *Heaven on Earth. Art and the Church in Byzantium*, ed. L. Safran, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 121–51.

Mango, C. 1962. *Materials for the Study of the Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul*, Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks.

— 1972. *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312–1453. Sources and Documents*, Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall, 1972; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986, 1993, 1997, 2000, 2004.

— 1985. *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV^e-VII^e siècles)*, Paris: De Boccard; repr. 1990, 2004.

— 1990. "Constantine's Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 83: 51–62

— 2000. "Constantinople as Theotokoupolis", in *Mother of God. Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art*, ed. M. Vassilaki, Athens: Benaki Museum, and Milan: Skira, 17–25.

— 2009. "Constantinople's Mount of Olives and Pseudo-Dorotheus of Tyre", Νέα Ῥώμη 6: 157–70.

Mango, C., and R. Scott (tr.) 1997. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maraval, P. 1985. *Lieux saints et pèlerinage d'Orient*, Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Mateos, J. (ed.) 1962–1963. *Le Typicon de la Grande* Église, 2 vols, Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 165–66).

Mayer, W. 2000. "Cathedral Church or Cathedral Churches? The Situation at Constantinople (c. 360–404)", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 66: 49–68.

Moffatt, A, and M. Tall (tr.) 2012. *Constantine Porphyrogennetos, The Book of Ceremonies*, 2 vols, Canberra: Australian Association of Byzantine Studies (includes the Greek text edited by J. J. Reiske, Bonn 1829, with the same pagination).

Moravscik, G. (ed.), and R. Jenkins (tr.) 1967. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio*, Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks.

Mossay, J. (ed. and tr.) 1980. *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 20-23*, Paris: Éditions du Cerf (Sources Chrétiennes 270).

Norberg, D. (ed.) 1982. *S. Gregorii Magni, Registrum Epistularum Libri 1-VII*, Turnhout: Brepols (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 140).

Peltomaa, L. M., A. Külzer and P. Allen (eds) 2015. *Presbeia Theotokou. The Intercessory Role of Mary across Times and Places in Byzantium (4th–9th Century)*, Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Pentcheva, B. V. 2006. *Icons and Power: The Mother of God in Byzantium*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Potter, D. 2013. *Constantine the Emperor*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Reinsch, D. R., and A. Kambylis (eds) 2001. *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, 2 vols, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 40/1–2).

Rydén, L. 1983. "The *Life* of St Basil the Younger and the Date of the *Life* of St. Andreas Salos", in *Okeanos. Essays Presented to Ihor Ševčenko on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. C. Mango and O. Pritsak, Cambridge MA (Harvard Ukrainian Studies 7), 568–86.

— (ed. and tr.) 1995. *The Life of St Andrew the Fool*, 2 vols, Uppsala (Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 4: 1–2).

Schmid, J. 1955-56. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, Munich: K. Zink.

Schwartz, E. (ed.) 1933. *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* vol. 2/1, part 2, Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.

Shoemaker, S. J. 2008. "The Cult of Fashion: The Earliest 'Life of the Virgin' and Constantinople's Marian Relics", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 62: 53–74.

Staats, R. 2008. "Kaiser Konstantin der Grosse und der Apostel Paulus", *Vigiliae Christianae* 62: 334–70.

Stephenson, P. 2009. *Constantine: Unconquered Emperor, Christian Victor*, London: Quercus.

Sullivan, D. F., A.-M. Talbot and S. McGrath (ed. and tr). 2014. *The Life of Saint Basil the Younger*, Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 14).

Thiel, A. 2005. *Die Johanneskirche in Ephesos*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

van Dam, R. 2014. "Constantine's Beautiful City: The Symbolic Value of Constantinople", *Antiquité Tardive* 22: 83–94.

von Falkenhausen, V. 1990. "Petri Kettenfeier in Byzanz", in *Fest und Alltag in Byzanz*, ed. G. Prinzing and D. Simon, Munich: C.H. Beck, 123–44, 204–10.

Vasilievskij, V. 1886. "Nikolaja episkopa Mefonskogo i Feodora Prodroma pisatelej XII stoletija žitija Meletija Novogo", *Pravoslavnij Palestinskij Sbornik* 6: 1–69.

Vinogradov, A. (ed.) 2005. *Grečeskie predanija o sv. Apostole Andrei*, St Petersburg: Biblioteka Hristianskogo Vostoka.

— 2011. "André : du prédicateur encratite au prédicateur byzantin", *Apocrypha* 22: 105–14.

von Glanvell, V. W. (ed.) 1905. *Die Kanonessammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit*, I, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.

Wagschal, D. 2015. *Law and Legality in the Greek East. The Byzantine Canonical Tradition, 381–883*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walter, C. 2003. *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition,* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Wenger, A. 1955. *L'Assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VI^e^ au X^e^ siècle*, Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines (Archives de l'Orient chrétien 5).

Young, F., L. Ayres and A. Louth (eds) 2008. *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Space in Texts and Space as Text: A new approach to Byzantine spatial notions

Myrto Veikou
Uppsala University

It is more or less impossible to imagine a narrative that has neither spatial nor temporal setting. Whether we are dealing with the legendary Hyksos Sea People in Egypt in the 1,600s BCE or a distant Galaxy around 10,000 CE, a story needs to be placed within a spatial and temporal context in order for an audience to be able to imagine it. Immanuel Kant first argued on this need in 1781, by considering time and space as *a priori* conceptual representations that condition our ability to understand the world around us. His idea became foundational in the Humanities and Social sciences.[1] And yet, while time has been seen as central in the studies of historical societies, space had not received the same focus. That condition generated the movement known as the *Spatial Turn*, gradually developing over the last two or three decades.[2] With this development, historical research on spatial paradigms and practices has expanded, gaining much attention across disciplines and in the study of vastly different periods.[3]

In this paper, I will, first of all, argue that the scant interest in the Spatial Turn in Byzantine studies needs to be enhanced, because several ideas produced within this movement can help us understand Byzantine

[1] Kant 1781. Cf. the concepts of time-geography (Hägerstrand 1970; Lenntorp 1999; Neutens, Schwanen and Witlox 2011) and time-space in human geography (May and Thrift 2001; Massey 2005: 177–95) as well as chronotope in literature (Bakhtin 1981; Crang andThrift 2000: 71–88).

[2] See Soja 1989. For explanations and accounts of this research see: Soja 2010: 7–20; Warf and Arias 2009.

[3] Cohen and Prat 2014.

spaces. Second, I will suggest that Henri Lefebvre's analytic category of 'lived spaces' can serve as a useful tool in that direction. I will explain the way in which it is currently being used within the new research project "Byzantine Literary 'Lived Spaces' through the Study of Hagiographical Texts", conducted at the Department of Linguistics and Philology at Uppsala University.[4] In order to better exemplify this methodological approach, I will discuss these spatial notions on the basis of one hagiographical text, the eleventh-century *Life of St Lazaros from Mount Galesion* by Gregory the Cellarer.

1. Byzantine studies – what Spatial Turn?

The long history of modern philosophical debate on the nature of space has involved the investigation of distinctive ways of comprehending its function in human life – not only as an absolute, but also as a relative and a relational concept.[5] Within the Spatial Turn in the Humanities and Social sciences, space has been further attributed a very complex involvement in historical development: it has been suggested that social space is constituted as a concept by the integration not only of the triad of aspects mentioned above (absolute, relative, relational) but also involving another, materially sensed, conceptualized and lived space.[6] A clear interest in these spatial notions has been displayed within western Medieval studies, in the form of a limited number of theoretically up-to-date, specialized works, focusing mainly on spatial reconstructions and representations and literary spatiality,[7] along with substantial publications, doctoral projects and international conference sessions.[8]

---

[4] See http://www.grekiska.net/byzantine-narrative/projects-in-uppsala/veikou-project/ (view date: 7 June 2016).

[5] See e.g. the discussions by Crang and Thrift 2000 and Harvey 2009: esp. 133–40, as well as the overview by Castree, Kitchin and Rogers 2013: s.v. space.

[6] Lefebvre 1991; Harvey 2009: 133–34, 141–44; Soja 1996; Massey 2005; Crang and Thrift 2000.

[7] Cassidy-Welch 2001, 2003, 2005, 2010, 2011; Woshinsky 2010; Classen and Clason 2012; Cohen and Prat 2014.

[8] Bendon Davis 2007; Howes 2007; Goodson, Lester and Symes 2010; Cassidy-Welch 2010; Wolf 2010; Waller 2013. Indicative conferences and conference sessions: "Colloque Représentations et Conceptions de l'espace dans la culture médiévale" (Fribourg

By contrast, the Spatial Turn – in the way it was experienced in other fields – has been essentially absent from Byzantine studies. This is not easy to discern at first glance, because Byzantinists (mainly archaeologists and historians) did turn to investigations of spatial aspects of Byzantine culture during the last two decades or so, as an echo of the general tendencies in other fields. However, in comparison with other fields, Byzantinists have in general displayed a restricted interest in these issues as well as a significant reluctance to consider, employ or argue against recent interdisciplinary methodologies and theoretical concerns.[9] Accordingly, the great majority of their studies of spatial issues are theoretically limited and not equally brough up-to-date; in fact, most historical and archaeological studies still insist on what is essentially structuralist approaches and thus miss the entire theoretical developments which generated the Spatial Turn in the first place.[10] As far as literary studies are concerned, spatial dimensions of performances have indeed often been acknowledged and seriously considered,[11] and yet spatiality and its roles in Byzantine narratives and our respective metanarratives have not so far added up to an object of literary criticism per se.

The very few exceptions to this rule, discussed at length elsewhere[12] and including Ann Marie Yasin's work on Late antique art and architec-

2009), published as Suarez-Nani and Rohde 2011**; "**Medieval Enclosure and Spatiality in Anglo-Saxon Literature" (44th International Congress on Medieval Studies, University of California, Davis, May 7–10, 2009); **"**Crossing Borders: Delineations of Space in Medieval and Early Modern Literature" (Northeast Modern Language Association 46th Annual Convention in Toronto, Ontario, April 30–May 3, 2015); "The door of the sanctuary: a place of transition" (VU University Amsterdam, 27–29 May 2015).

[9] These issues are certainly not the only ones neglected, since theoretical interests have been very limited in many areas of research about Byzantium; for the field of Byzantine archaeology, see Veikou, "The Future of Byzantine Archaeology" (forthcoming).

[10] E.g. Koder 1984; Koder 1998; Hunger and Belke 2000.

[11] Agapitos 1999; Nilsson 2000; Constantinou 2005: 165–92.

[12] For extensive discussions of exceptions within the fields of Byzantine spatial and field archaeology and historiography, such as the works by Ann-Marie Yasin, see Veikou 2009, 2010, 2012a–b, "The Reconstruction of Byzantine Lived Spaces" (forthcoming) and "The Future of Byzantine Archaeology" (forthcoming). Works by Adam Goldwyn (2015) and Veronica della Dora (2016) serve as good examples within literary studies.

ture,[13] have set the 'Byzantinist' background for the research project to be discussed in this article. This project intends to make use of experiences and ideas, gained in both Medieval and Byzantine studies and in other fields of the Humanities and the Social sciences, in order to open up new opportunities for combined research and work towards a new area of research on Byzantine spatialities. In order to demonstrate that, I will first explain the project's practical and theoretical background (sections 2–3). Thereafter (section 4), I will present the project's scope and methodology by giving an indicative example of conducted research on the *Life of St Lazaros from Mount Galesion*.

2. The need for an investigation of Byzantine spaces: from a Byzantine spatial archaeology to a Byzantine ecocriticism.

So, why is it that we *should* investigate space in Byzantium and do it now? The first reason for such an urgency in Byzantine studies is that, due to the absence of our own Spatial Turn, we are missing out on processing very useful information produced in other fields of the Humanities and Social sciences. Second, the more we ignore this information, the more this theoretical gap between Byzantine studies and other fields will increase and we will deprive the next generations of a dynamic interdisciplinary dialogue. Third, and perhaps most importantly, spatiality seems very likely to have been crucial for the Byzantines themselves in many ways, judging from both material culture and texts referring to everyday life in Byzantium. Both texts and archaeology reveal specific Byzantine strategies for the construction of settled spaces, ranging from the selection of location based on practical or symbolic concerns to the architecture and decoration of the buildings.[14] Surviving military texts (*strategika*) further describe in detail the processes related to inhabiting a place, which are further confirmed by material remains of Byzantine settlements such as their geographic and geomorphological profile, form and pattern as well as the construction methods used for their buildings.[15]

[13] E.g. Yasin 2005, 2012a–b, 2015.
[14] Veikou 2009, 2010, 2012a–b; 2015a–b.
[15] Veikou 2012a: 305–30.

This evidence has previously lead to my call for a) the theoretical insertion of space as a historical agent in Byzantium, in the form of a mechanism of sustainability and growth,[16] and, subsequently, b) the introduction of a Byzantine *Spatial Archaeology* (and thus a Byzantine 'Spatial History', in the same context).[17] How is that different from Landscape Archaeology and what exactly would be the precise subject of a spatial archaeology in the context of a historical culture (and in specific the Byzantine)? What kind of historiographical change of focus and concerns would such an archaeological research produce? A few theoretical tools for thinking about these issues are suggested in the following pages; yet, answers to these questions are to be discovered by future research, experimentation and scholarship.

An example from another new area of research in Byzantine studies – one with more limited focus, yet involving conscious and determined spatial considerations – is very encouraging: Byzantine *ecocriticism.*[18] Adam Goldwyn, in his recent discussion of ecocriticism's applicability in Byzantine studies, shows an excellent way of adopting approaches from other fields while theoretically updating them.[19] Goldwyn has achieved that by diverting this practice's theoretical framework, away from political connotations previously attributed to it by other scholars and towards a different, highly meaningful use in the investigation of historical cultures.[20]

3. Some theory: 'lived spaces' and performed spaces

A concept which reconciliates archaeological, historical and literary approaches and encourages interdisciplinarity in our comprehension of

[16] Ibid.

[17] The term is used in accordance with Wendy Ashmore's explication within a counter-modern theoretical framework: Ashmore 2002.

[18] Ecocriticism or environmental literary criticism is a literary practice sprung from the environmental movement, studying the depiction of the built and natural environments in literature. See Siewers 2009; Westling 2013; Goldwyn 2015: 66; Classen 2012: 24.

[19] Goldwyn 2015.

[20] Ibid.

spaces makes, I think, an ideal subject of research for Byzantine spatial studies: Henri Lefebvre's spatial 'trialectics', dating to 1974 and developed ever since, offers such a concept, consisting of *perceived*, *conceived* and *lived space*.[21] In his well-known work, *La production de l'espace*, Lefebvre suggested that space should be seen as the site of ongoing interactions of social relations, rather than the mere result of such interactions – a process of production rather than a product:

> The space thus produced also serves as a tool of thought and of action; in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power; yet as such it escapes in part from those who would make use of it. The social and political forces which engendered this space now seek, but fail, to master it completely.[22]

Every society, Lefebvre wrote, produces a space – its own space. In that sense, Byzantine society cannot be understood as a collection of people and things in space; it had its own spatial practices and forged its *own*, *appropriated space*.

Lefebvre proposed the triadic dialectic model mentioned above as an analytical tool for establishing the process of space production. He considered every process a three-part dialectic between everyday spatial practices (which can be perceived), representations of space or theories of space (which can be conceived) and spatial representations which are the spatial imaginary of the time (and cannot be anything but lived). The third of these categories, lived space, is balanced carefully between the two poles of conceived space and perceived space by embodying both elements without being reducible to either. Two contemporary geographers, Stuart Elden and Zhongyuan Zhang, have explained this three-part dialectic with the example of an office building:

> On the one hand, we have an abstract space of pure mathematical figures and verbal messages – manifested in the design of offices, organisational rules and symbols, and so on; and, on the other, an all-too-material, and therefore indifferent space, consisting of the

[21] Cf. Klooster and Heirman 2013 for an application of this concept in literary studies of ancient and modern (but not Byzantine!) Greek as well as Roman cultures.

[22] Lefebvre 1991: 26.

> flows of labour, money, information and every physical movement of employees: their opening doors, sipping coffee etc. In between these two poles, there is the lived space, a space of pure subjectivity, of human experiences, of people's sense-making, imagination, and feeling – that is, their local knowledge – of the space as they encounter it. [23]

Space, as Lefebvre argues and Elden comments upon, may not change, but our perceptions of it do – they become more fine, more subtle, more profound, more differentiated.[24] Lefebvre associates the diversity of space with the changing perspectives of onlookers. Zhang has suggested that our understanding of Lefebvre's model can be enhanced with the notion of 'shifting perspectives'.[25] Conceived space, perceived space and lived space could be portrayed as the projected images of three cameras focused concurrently on any given event:

> through the first camera we read mathematical data, the height of a man, the length of a corridor, and so on; through the second we see the body movements of the man, his perambulations, his gestures; and through the third, we reach into his inner subjectivity, his feelings about the structures surrounding him. Each camera generates different data yet each, at the same time, refers to the overall space they come to represent. In other words, conceived, perceived and lived spaces overlap, and are not just juxtaposed.[26]

From an analytical standpoint, the spatial practices of a society can be revealed through the deciphering of its space; however, that is not so easy for representations of space and representational spaces. A combined study of material remains and historical sources allow reconstructions of spaces produced by the Byzantines from all three perspectives. Material remains are part of perceived spaces; textual evidence speaks about conceived spaces. However, neither material remains on their own nor texts alone allow us to approach lived spaces; only different interpretations of texts *and* material remains can help reconstruct Byzantine spatial experiences with the help of the analytical category of

[23] Zhang 2006: 221.
[24] Lefebvre 1991: 295–315; Elden 2004:182.
[25] Zhang 2006: 222.
[26] Ibid.

'lived spaces', and that is the aim of my research. I hope that this will allow me to perceive the way in which Byzantine people reacted and interacted with space and environment and, moreover, to better understand how they constructed their places and, basically, how they lived their lives. I have already argued elsewhere for the implementation of the concept of "lived spaces" in Byzantine field archaeology,[27] but what would be an appropriate methodology for approaching these Byzantine spatial experiences through an interdisciplinary investigation of 'lived spaces', by means of both archaeology and texts, combining tools from archaeology, history and literary studies?

The key strategy towards such an investigation of Byzantine "lived spaces" is to not simply consider them as static social constructions but, instead, as hybrid formations which were constantly becoming and which were performed in everyday life. The theoretical idea of space performativity is based on more recently forwarded ontogenetic conceptions of space; the latter have shifted the focus of the debate concerning the ontology of space from 'what space is' to 'how space becomes.'[28] According to such an approach, space is not ontologically secure – a fixable, definable, knowable, pre-determined entity; rather, space is always in the process of becoming, always in the process of taking place.[29] Here, space gains its form, function, and meaning through practice,[30] and thus the production of human spaces is connected with people's performances[31] and the perfomativity of social life in general.[32] Focusing on performance enables an analysis of how people consciously seek to create particular identities and own spaces, while performativity allows a focus on the unconscious, unintentional, citational performances

[27] Veikou, "The Reconstruction of Byzantine Lived Spaces" (forthcoming).

[28] Castree, Kitchin and Rogers 2013: s.v. space.

[29] Ibid.

[30] In this particular theoretical context, see Massey 2005: 177–95; yet the concept of practiced spaces had already been well argued by Michel de Certeau (1984: 91–110, 115–30) and it is in many ways implied in Lefebvre's theoretical construction (1991); as well put by Edward Soja, "the spatial turn begins in Paris" (2009: 17). See also Cassidy-Welch 2010; esp. 2, for medieval practiced spaces.

[31] Goffman 1959.

[32] Butler 1990.

of identity and productions of space.[33] In Gillian Roses's words "performed space is, therefore, space as a doing – i.e. space does not pre-exist its doing – and that doing comes as the articulation of relational performances".[34] Performed space, then, is a 'space in action'; this is what I intend to show in the next section, based on the example of a Byzantine hagiographical text.

4. Towards an investigation of Byzantine, performed lived spaces

The use of these theoretical tools from cultural geography has already proved efficient in the investigation of Byzantine spaces, allowing us to notice previously overlooked things and thus opening up a whole new world of spaces through new 'readings' of material remains, assisted by alternative readings of written sources. It has also allowed us to discern Byzantine spatial strategies which were extremely inventive and often more sensitive to natural space than our own. In some cases, it has brought forth new analytical categories (e.g. the *In-Between Spaces*, the *Third* or *Other Spaces*, or the settlement rotation) for the interpretation of some Byzantine settlement patterns and habitation strategies, such as the dispersed and non-nuclear settlements, the so-called *kastra* and *emporia, off-shore isles-of-refuge* as well as settlements that had both urban and rural attributes.[35] This development can take place because postmodern geography's ethics, in Lila Leontidou's words, "celebrate diversity, fragmentation, eclecticism and [instances] where culture and politics, not economy, demand center stage".[36] So these tools have succesfully integrated the ambiguous notion of hybridity as a spatial quality, with the help of Homi Bhabha:

> Hybridity to me is the third space that enables other positions to emerge. The process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, new and unrecognizeable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation.[37]

---

[33] Castree, Kitchin and Rogers 2013: s.v. performance, performativity.
[34] Rose 1999: 248.
[35] Veikou 2009, 2010, 2012a-b, 2015b.
[36] Leontidou 1997: 95–96; cf. Veikou 2009: 49–50.
[37] Bhabha 1990: 211; Bhabha 2006; Whatmore 1999; cf. Veikou 2009: 50.

Furthermore, they have allowed us to break out of our contemporary 'spontaneous' definitions within established interpretation schemes (e.g. Byzantine city – town – village – countryside) and mainstream bipolar schemes (e.g. urban vs. rural) through a critical interpretation strategy that Edward Soja has called *Thirding as Othering*, which, in his words:

> tries to open up our spatial imaginaries to ways of thinking and acting that respond to all binarisms, to any attempt to confine thought and action to only two alternatives, by interjecting an-Other set of choices. In this critical thirding, the original binary choice is not dismissed entirely but is subjected to a creative process of restructuring that draws selectively and strategically from two opposite categories to open new alternatives.[38]

In the same direction there has been an effort to identify Byzantine and medieval recurrent settlement strategies reflecting political and cultural practices yet deriving – or making use of – local spatial experience, such as the relation between insularity and the rotation of islands' capitals.[39]

However, archaeology backed up by written texts has its limits; instead, perhaps a deeper analysis and more thorough understanding of written texts, which provide representations of spatial experiences of everyday life, backed up by archaeology, may provide a further step in the search for Byzantine 'lived spaces'. A recent attempt at such an approach concerned the comprehension of late antique and Byzantine ports and harbours: following an investigation of their archaeology, geography and geomorphology,[40] their cultural features were reconsidered through relevant spatial experiences accounted for in Byzantine texts. Byzantine descriptions and narratives of ports and harbours were analysed in accordance with the spaces that Michel Foucault called "heterotopias",[41] where sea, ships and harbours are places in which time and space are experienced in ways different from 'normal' everyday life.[42]

---

[38] Soja 1996: 5–6. Cf. Soja 1999; Veikou 2009: 50.
[39] Veikou 2015b.
[40] Veikou 2015a.
[41] Foucault 1984.
[42] Veikou and Nilsson, forthcoming.

The astonishing analogies between medieval and modern spaces speak for the existence of diachronic spatial experiences.[43]

Written texts providing representations of spatial experiences of everyday life – or, on the contrary, spaces being performed and space performances – constitute a very interesting area of study. The investigation of these experiences is the main focus of the new project "Byzantine Literary 'Lived Spaces' through the Study of Hagiographical Texts" at Uppsala University.[44] Its purpose is an application of a hybrid combination of academic methodologies and approaches, drawn from spatial studies and the humanities in general (in specific literary, historical and cultural studies), towards a comparative study of Byzantine hagiographical texts in terms of: a) representations of socially constructed spatial aspects of Byzantine everyday life; b) literary spaces reflecting social reality; and c) ways in which these spaces determine or affect the structure of the texts.

The project aims to understand literary spaces along two main axes, a historical and a narrative one: first, an investigation of literary spaces as representations of diverse spatial perceptions, conceptions, uses, functions, and experiences as well as their diachronic transformation, through the study of selected texts (and perhaps also their contemporary material and visual culture); second, an investigation and reconstruction of diachronic uses of space as a narrative device and of spatiality as a narrative strategy, as well as their functions and effects in these texts. Other issues regarding narrative space and place, such as those pointed out by Mieke Bal, will be also treated individually: 1) the senses through which characters experience space: sight, hearing and touch; 2) how spatial frames are filled with objects; 3) how these objects create an atmosphere; 4) how character movements mediate between spatial frames; 5) the intrinsic symbolic value of some kinds of places, such as the mountaintop or the *locus amoenus*; 6) description as the communication of spatial information; 7) actions that are performed not merely in space but with space, such as "walking into a wall".[45]

---

[43] Ibid.

[44] See above, n. 4.

[45] Bal 1985: 93–99. These themes have been elaborated upon by Ryan, Foote and

The material for this research will be a selection of Byzantine hagiographical texts of different kinds, preliminarily dated to between the fourth and the twelfth centuries. These accounts of Byzantine saints' lives, that is of 'ordinary' people's routes to holiness and sanctification, have been selected because they provide an excellent opportunity for an investigation of lived spaces, by offering a generous and colourful palette of spatially and socially defined human agency as well as information on the rhetorical context in which the texts were used. These texts were addressed to a broad and varied audience and contain a genuine and dynamic expression of everyday life; they bring out the individual as well as both religious and secular culture, and they encounter the sacred in a number of different locations such as the human body, the church, the cell, the pillar, the open nature etc. They contain large amounts of topographic definitions of an ever-changing locality of action.

So what is the need for and the significance of this pronounced spatiality of human agency in such texts and what is its role in the narrative? For a start, we cannot disregard that even the original Greek word for the process to holiness through ascetism, which appears in hagiographical texts in the fourth century (ἀναχώρησις, deriving from the compound verb ἀναχωρέω, meaning 'to withdraw or retire from public life, from the world'; > ἀναχωρητὴς meaning 'an ascete living in the desert'),[46] is related to space and relocation in an interesting twofold way, through the individual original meanings of its components. On the one hand, it may well insinuate to 're-locate oneself or advance, upwards or against the stream'; on the other, it might also have a meaning of 're-making room for oneself, in repetition for improvement'.[47] In a way, ascetism

Azaryahu 2016.

[46] Liddel and Scott 1940; Henne 1955; Wipszycka 2001: 148–55; Choat 2002: 10–11. Wipszycka shows that until the eighth century the term ἀναχωρητὴς had developed into a more prestigious and honorific synonym for monk.

[47] Cf. Liddel and Scott 1940: ἀνα-χωρέω > ἀναχώρησις, ἀναχωρητὴς; ἀνὰ (+ verb): i) up to, upwards, up, arise!, ii) against the stream, iii) hence flows the sense of increase or strengthening, as in ἀνακρίνω, iiii) from the notion throughout, comes that of repetition and improvement, as in ἀνα-βλαστάνω, -βιόω, -γεννάω; χωρέω: i) to be in motion or flux, ii) to go forward, advance, make progress, iii) to have/make room for a thing, hold, contain. Pietro Bortone (2010: 231) suggests that the distributive meaning of

comes as an experience of social isolation, self-confinement within limited space and ample imagination. But again what comes as extremely surprising is the amount of relocations and mobility in these texts, as well as the attention drawn to spatial definitions and representations, which show that the sanctification experience of a person was built upon his constant discourse and renegotiation with a localized social environment, from which the saint is supposed to have wanted to isolate himself in the first place.

As a typical example of such discourse I will here use the *Life of St Lazaros from Mount Galesion*, written by Gregory the Cellarer. This hagiographical text, whose original version seems to have dated back to the eleventh century, survives in a fourteenth-century manuscript at Mt Athos.[48] Lazaros Galesiotes was a monk on the Mount Galesion near Ephesos in Asia Minor some time during the eleventh century, and his reputation for sanctity extended far beyond this region by the time of his death, in November 1053. In Richard Greenfield's words,

> he was for many people one of the brightest stars in the Byzantine monastic firmament. This, at any rate, is the impression given by Gregory the Cellarer, a disciple and trusted supporter of Lazaros, who wrote this vita, (…) by far the longest, most detailed, and most trustworthy source on the saint.[49]

On the basis of this lengthy text (covering 212 folios), I will suggest three ways of approaching Byzantine lived spaces through an analysis of narrative spatiality: first, by identifying different meanings of *narrative space* (i.e. "the physically existing environment in which characters live and move")[50]; second, by considering the text's *spatial form*[51] as

---

ἀνὰ as an individual preposition seems to have prevailed during the medieval period, while its spatial meaning was now expressed by a new preposition (ἐπάνω); however, his study does not include the development of meanings of compound nouns and verbs, which had been formed and established in earlier periods.

[48] *Vita Lazari* with English translation by Greenfield 2000.

[49] Greenfield 2000: 1. On the surviving texts referring to Lazaros' life see: Greenfield 2000: 49–61; Lambropoulou 1988.

[50] Buchholz and Jahn 2005.

[51] Ryan 2014: §2.4.

narrative tool; and third, by analysing how this spatial form allows for the element of *relocation* to represent aspects of social interaction and reflect cultural practices.

To start with a brief explanation of what this *vita* is about, Lazaros was born in the vicinity of Magnesia on the Meander, as the fifth child of peasant parents, and set off for an adventurous journey to fulfill his lifelong dream of visiting the Holy Land at the age of 18.[52] That was the beginning of 25 years of circular wandering across Asia Minor and the Holy Land, living in different monasteries and visiting pilgrimage sites from Jerusalem up to the Pontus, before returning to his homeland Ephesus. Despite what one would expect, a new phase of wandering around Ephesos and the nearby Mount Galesion awaited Lazaros back home. He first settled at a small hermitage and began his career as a stylite. After his reputation had spread, a monastery was constructed to house the disciples who gathered around him. Yet, the conditions in this monastery beside the main road into Ephesus was not well suited to one who aspired to the ascetic ideals of hesychia, so Lazaros turned to the neighboring mountain, Galesion, which was barren and largely uninhabited. He settled down first in a cave and then on four different pillars, constructed for him higher and higher up on the mountain by his disciples who were just following him on his way up and settling around his pillars. I intend to show that, if Lazaros' first, intentional wandering phase meant a process of personal education, spiritual improvement and making of a new identity as an ascete, his second wandering involved a negotiation and performance of his identity as a holy man within his social environment.

To begin with a brief mapping of the *vita*'s narrative space, I will use some of Marie-Laure Ryan's different "laminations" – the *spatial frames*, *story space*, *narrative world* and *narrative universe* –, which help to shed some light on different aspects of the literary lived spaces.[53] More that 100 place names and geographical names compose the spatial frames of the narration (that is "the immediate physical surroundings

[52] A more detailed summary of Lazarus' life main events can be found in Greenfield's Introduction (2000: 1–14).

[53] Ryan 2014: §2.1.

of actual events, the various locations shown by the narrative discourse or by the image, the shifting scenes of action which may flow into each other"[54]). Zooming out, 189 topographic references and space descriptions accompanied by relocation verbs shape the *vita*'s story space (i.e. "the space relevant to the plot, as mapped by the actions and thoughts of the characters, thus consisting of all the spatial frames plus all the locations mentioned by the text that are not the scene of actually occurring events"[55]). Zooming further out, the eleventh-century Byzantine Asia Minor and Fatimid Palestine, with provincial cities, towns and countryside in which one may imagine ecclesiastical authorities and popular culture to hold a predominant position, constitutes the story's narrative world (i.e. "the story space completed by the reader's imagination on the basis of cultural knowledge and real world experience, conceived by the imagination as a coherent, unified, ontologically full and materially existing geographical entity"[56]). Last but not least, coming to the *vita*'s narrative universe (i.e. "the world presented as actual by the text plus all the worlds constructed by characters as beliefs, wishes, fears, speculations, hypothetical thinking, dreams, and fantasies"[57]), spaces seem to have more than one social and narrative function, since in addition to their original formal purpose they have acquired different and ever-changing meanings through their social function within a community. Churches and monasteries, for instance, stand out as polysemic and multi-functional social environments.[58]

Nevertheless, the most striking aspect of the *vita*'s narrative space concerns the *spatial form* of the text.[59] The entire account of this monk's life is an unending sequence of relocation verbs accompanied by spatial definitions.[60] In fact, the impression of relocation in the plot is so strong,

[54] Ibid. §2.1.a.

[55] Ibid. §2.1.c.

[56] Ibid. §2.1.d.

[57] Ibid. §2.1.e.

[58] Cf. Smith 2010; Jamroziak 2010; more extensively Cassidy-Welch 2001; see Cassidy-Welch 2005 for parallel ways to think about monastic spaces in the medieval West.

[59] Ryan 2014: §2.4.

[60] E.g. ch. 41: ὁ πατὴρ ἀναστὰς ἄνεισι πρὸς τὸ ὄρος […] ὡς ἤρξατο ἀνέρχεσθαι, δεῖν ἔκρινε ἀνελθεῖν […], ἐκεῖθεν ἀνήρχετο πρὸς αὐτὸν […] ἐπερωτῆσαι, εἰ ἔστιν ὁ τόπος

that one finds oneself wishing this man would stay still for a second in the next sentence! The entire text is *about* movement, and relocation serves as a narrative device to textually create it; visual change is also used as a sign of movement. This was evidently an important narrative strategy, but what was its purpose? While spatiality is often used as a sign of credibility (see for example §41 of the *Vita Lazari*, cited below), there are also other reasons. With the help of a handful of indicative passages, I will try to show that it served to construct a process of holiness through representing, first, the selection of residence that will allow this process to prosper, and, second, a construction of locality within the underlying contradiction between God's universal space vs. the human spaces owned or ruled by 'others', through a constant renegotiation of identity and difference accross social and geographical boundaries. In this interpretation, overlapping *perceived* physical spaces, *conceived* imaginary places and *lived* subjectively experienced spaces work together in the audience's minds to serve the desired effect of the text. This effect must have been a succesful communication of the sacred; as Veronica della Dora has shown,

> Byzantine geographical imaginations were captured in and shaped through the scalar tension between the multiplicity of the forms and places of creation and its ordered, harmonious totality – between *topos* and *cosmos*. Divine presence made itself manifest pecisely in and through this tension, between the seen and the unseen.[61]

So when it comes to residence selection, Lazaros' status as a holy man was based chiefly on his extraordinary perseverance as a pillar ascetic or stylite. An immense, overwhelming impression was made upon

---

πρὸς τὸν αὐτοῦ σκοπὸν ἐπιτήδειος, ὥστε ἐκείνου ἐξελθόντος αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν. […] βαδίζων πρὸς τὸν στυλίτην ἀπῄει […] πρὸς τὸ μέσον τῆς πέτρας ἔφθασεν […] ἄφνω πέπτωκε. […] Ἀναστὰς τὴν πέτραν κρατῶν, κατὰ μικρὸν βαδίζων ἀπῆλθε πρὸς τὸν στυλίτην· […] Κατελθὼν οὖν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἀρξάμενος τοῦ ὄρους ἀνήρχετο. Ὡς δὲ ἔφθασεν εἰς τὴν Πέτραν, ἔνθα ἐστὶν ἡ πάνυ στενοτάτη διάβασις […], τὸν τόπον παρῆλθεν. […] Φθάσας δὲ ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ καὶ εἰσελθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸ καὶ ἀρεσθεὶς ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ, ἔμεινεν ἐν αὐτῷ μῆνας ἕξ. Ἐξερχόμενος δὲ καὶ περιπολεύων τὸ ὄρος, πάλιν ὑποστρέφων εἰς αὐτὸ εἰσήρχετο.

[61] Della Dora 2016: 255.

visitors by the sight of the gaunt old man standing on the top of his pillar, dressed in the tattered leather tunic as his sole protection from the elements.[62] Unbelievers are said to have converted to Christianity on the spot, while for the pious he provided a living and demonstrable proof that a frail mortal could indeed successfully imitate on earth the life of the angels in heaven; he had become a "living icon" in line with his legendary predecessors in the earlier Christian tradition.[63] The outstanding feature of his ascetic practice was his confinement on an open pillar for more than 40 years, which was suitable for his performance of sanctification.

He occupied a total of four pillars, all built to order and all similar in their basic features. These pillars seem to have been constructed so as to be liminal spaces between his body and the nature, the land and the heaven, himself and his community. They were completely open to the elements, lacking a roof as shelter from wind and rain, or shade from the sun. However, a wall of some sort enclosed the top of the pillar, creating a confined "cell" in which Lazaros lived. This wall was high enough to obscure him from the view of anyone standing on a platform that had been built adjoining the cell, but when Lazaros stood up, he could be seen by those below and in front of his pillar; he in turn could see a great deal of what was going on within the monastery and in some of the surrounding area. The cell had no door, just a small window giving access to the platform; Lazaros could open it to speak to visitors and receive food, but it could also be secured from the inside. It provided a limited view of the area immediately outside, yet it was large enough for him to lean out of and for a visitor to thrust his head through to examine the interior. Access to the window was gained by a ladder leading up to the platform.[64]

Furthermore, finding the right spot for setting his pillar was never an easy task for Lazaros. Gregory shows that the selection of the place of residence comes as a result of divine instruction through symbolic signs either connected to nature or associated with the attitudes of local people

[62] Greenfield 2000: 2.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Greenfield 2000: 17–20.

and the availability of life resources (food and drink):

> Since our father Lazaros, as has already been made clear, was contemplating the ascent of the mountain, he got up in the night without the knowledge of any of his companions and went up toward it. But as he began to climb up he decided that he ought first to go up and see the stylite who was on Petra above the village, for he was ascending from there and had heard that this man wanted to leave his pillar. For this reason Lazaros was going up to him to ask if the place was suitable for his purpose so that, when <the stylite> left, he might move in himself. <Lengths of> wood had been fastened to the rock with other <slats> lying flat on top of them (indeed the peg which is still now to be seen fastened to Petra bears witness to this), and there was a rope tied at both ends on either side, which those going up used as a guide. The father, using the same method, thus started up toward the stylite, stepping on the <slats> of wood; but, when he had already reached the middle of the rock, the rope he was holding with his hand as a guide suddenly broke and he fell on his face onto the <slats> of wood. This was all the work of the Evil One and a contrivance <designed> to kill him by making him fall down from there. But the grace of God, which was always with him and kept him safe everywhere, rendered that <Evil> One's devices useless, for Lazaros stood up and, holding onto the rock with his hands and going little by little, set off <again> toward the stylite. When, <however>, he saw and spoke with the man, he learned from him that the place was unsuitable for spiritual peace, "For I myself," said <the stylite>, "am about to withdraw from this place for this <very> reason." He advised Lazaros to set off for holy Paphnoutios' cave, and so, after he had come down from there, he started up the mountain, singing as he climbed. But when he reached the rock where there is the extremely narrow passage, he finished the office he was singing and, being about to say the prayer, stretched out his right hand and made the sign of the cross on the rock; he kissed it, said his prayer, and <then> passed the place. The cross is still visible now carved <in the rock>, for it was engraved afterward on the father's order as a phylactery for those passing by there. When he reached the cave he went in and looked round and, since it was to his liking, he stayed in it for six months. He used to go out and wander around the mountain, but return to it again and go inside.[65]

[65] *Vita Lazari*, §41; tr. Greenfield 2000: 127–28. For Greek wording used to denote movement and relocation, see n. 59 above.

Accordingly, holy people kept relocating themselves until the place felt right for their construction of local identity linked to their sanctity within the social context of an immediate or wider community:

> Because the father was living in this superior way and thus drew everyone to him like a beacon by the brilliant illumination of his lifestyle, and because the monastery was near the road, everyone that passed by there used to go up to him (διὰ τὸ εἶναι τὴν μονὴν πλησίον τοῦ δρόμου οὐκ ἦν τινα ἐκεῖσε διερχόμενον μὴ ἀνελθεῖν πρὸς αὐτόν), one for spiritual help, another out of physical need, and another again due to some crisis in his life; but not one of those who went up to him was <ever> seen to return from there without having received the proper medicine for his sickness. For all who went up to him grieving over their particular misfortunes joyfully returned home from him, giving glory to God (Πάντες γὰρ … ἀνερχόμενοι … ἐξ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὰ οἰκεῖα ὑπέστρεφον). When, however, Lazaros saw himself being mobbed in this way by everybody every day, and especially because the monastery, as has been mentioned, lay near the road, and his ears were thus ringing with the voices of travelers and overseers and farm workers in the fields, he began to seek a quiet place that would enable him to get away from the annoyance of this mass of people. Now Mt. Galesion stood right there, and it happened not only to be impassable and craggy and very rugged, but was in addition waterless, and for these reasons was able to offer much tranquility to the person who went there (Τὸ γοῦν ἄντικρυς κείμενον Γαλήσιον ὄρος, δύσβατον καὶ πετρῶδες καὶ λίαν τραχὺ τυγχάνον, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις καὶ ἄνυδρον καὶ διὰ ταῦτα πολλὴν ἡσυχίαν τῷ ἐκεῖ γενομένῳ παρέχειν δυνάμενον, ἀρεστὸν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἐπιτήδειον κρίνας, δεῖν ἔγνω εἰς αὐτὸ ἀνελθεῖν κἀκεῖ τὴν κατοικίαν ποιήσασθαι, καὶ μάλιστα ὅτι καὶ παρὰ πολλῶν ἐμάνθανε σπήλαιον ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπάρχειν). Lazaros thus decided that it was just the right place for him and he knew that he had to go up onto it and make his home there, especially because he learned from many people that there was a cave on it in which, many years before, a monk called Paphnoutios had ended his days in asceticism. <Now> I have decided that it is appropriate to add the story of this holy man like some seasoning to the present work for the edification of my readers, just as I heard it from our holy father Lazaros himself. [66]

[66] *Vita Lazari,* §36; tr. Greenfield 2000: 122–23.

What other purposes could relocation have fulfilled? Lazaros traveled to the Holy Land and back, visiting reknowned pilgrimage sites to worship local saints. And yet, he repeatedly described coming to places and finding their inhospitable inhabitants denying him food and water:

> When daylight came, Lazaros decided not to leave the village (ἔκρινε μὴ ἐξελθεῖν τῆς κώμης) that day until the divine liturgy had been celebrated, <partly> because of the solemnity of the day, as it was the feast of the Forty Martyrs of Christ, but at the same time as a test of the uncharitable people <who lived> there (πρὸς δοκιμὴν τῶν ἐκεῖσε ἀνελεημόνων ἀνθρώπων). When the time for the liturgy had come, however, and the divine service had been celebrated, <still> no one had given him even a crumb of bread to eat. Then Lazaros realized that they had no concept at all of sharing. He did not get angry or shout insults at them, but raised his hands and his eyes toward heaven and offered up some such words of thanks to God <as these>: "Lord, I give you thanks; and if you should consider me worthy to live in some place where it is clearly your will <for me to do so> (ἐὰν δέ με καταξιώσῃς ἐν τόπῳ, ὅπου δηλαδὴ τὸ σὸν θέλημά ἐστι, τὴν κατοίκησιν ποιῆσαι), I will not eat by myself the bread that you send me, but I will also serve it as food to all those, rich and poor, who come to me in your name." After he had said this, he left the village (ἐξῆλθε τῆς κώμης). As he saw a small chapel somewhere nearby, he went to it (πρὸς αὐτὸ ἦλθεν). He found a nun established in it who, when she saw him, got up and brought him bread and water and made him take some food. After he had partaken of <this> nourishment, he gave thanks to God (for he did everything to the glory of God and, if anything ever happened to him, whether happy or sad, it became an occasion for him to thank God) and then also blessed the nun, before setting off on his way (τὴν ὁδὸν ἐστέλλετο τὴν αὐτοῦ).[67]

In a way, relocating allowed Lazaros contact with unknown people outside his own community network, and thus a chance to test their real faith unobstructed by social conventions. Such a strategy is expectable by a spiritual man seeking social knowledge; at the same time, those people's sense of locality produced unfriendly behaviour against the 'others' and the 'foreigners', including Lazaros:

[67] *Vita Lazari*, §28; tr. Greenfield 2000: 112–13.

Lazaros entered (εἰσελθών) the town and then left <again> (ἐξελθὼν) after praying in the church of the Theologian. Led by <God>, who was directing him, he traveled on (ἐπορεύετο), and came (φθάσας) to a village called Malpadeas. As the day was already <lengthening> into evening, he turned off the road and went into <the village>, where he was taken in by a priest called George. After this man had generously entertained him, he was asked by Lazaros if there was a monastery in the area where he might take up residence (ὅπως ἐν αὐτῷ ποιήσηται τὴν κατοίκησιν). <George> led him (ὁδηγηθεὶς ἔρχεται) to the monastery of the most holy Theotokos, which is above the village of Kepion and is called <the monastery> of Appion. Lazaros went into this <place>, but did not like living there <and so>, directed by the superior of the monastery, he came to the foothills of the mountain called Koumaron where there was a spring and also a small chapel <dedicated to> that victorious martyr for Christ, Marina. Here two monks were living, brothers by birth called Hilarios and Leontios. These men took Lazaros in and they both decided that they should live together (ᾑρετίσαντο ἀμφότεροι τὴν κατοίκησιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιήσασθαι). After a while, Lazaros persuaded the monks to construct a roofed pillar for him (πείθει τοὺς μοναχοὺς στύλον αὐτῷ ὑπωρόφιον οἰκοδομῆσαι); he moved onto this and spent some time on it, but then decided to take the roof off and live in the open air on this <pillar>, in imitation of the wondrous Symeon. And so he did (εἰς ὃν καὶ εἰσελθὼν καὶ χρόνον τινὰ ἐν αὐτῷ οὕτω ποιήσας, ἔκρινε τοῦ ἆραι τὴν στέγην καὶ αἴθριον αὐτὸν ἐν τούτῳ τελεῖν κατὰ μίμησιν τοῦ θαυμαστοῦ Συμεών· ὃ καὶ πεποίηκεν).

Within a short time Lazaros' reputation spread almost everywhere and many people, rich and poor, began coming to him from the villages and towns nearby (ἤρξαντο πρὸς αὐτὸν φοιτᾶν ἐκ τῶν πέριξ κωμῶν τε καὶ πόλεων). He received these people kindly, <thus> fulfilling the vow to God that he had made earlier on; for he would break up and distribute to them the bread that He sent him for his nourishment through the Christian faithful. The monks who were there before <him> saw this <happening> and that the people who lived there were showing more respect for Lazaros, who was a newcomer, a stranger, and unknown, than they were for them, who were locals and well known (βλέποντες καὶ ὅτι ἐκεῖνον, νέηλυν καὶ ξένον καὶ ἄγνωστον τοῖς ἐκεῖσε ὄντα, ὑπὲρ ἐκείνους τοὺς ἐντοπίους καὶ γνωρίμους τιμῶσι, προσελθόντες αὐτῷ λέγουσιν). So they went to Lazaros and said, "Either stop welcoming everyone and giving away to them in this reckless fashion the things God sends for our use, or

else go away from here. If you won't, then we will have to leave ourselves!" (Ἤ ἔκκοψον τὸ ὑποδέχεσθαι πάντας καὶ τὸ οὕτως ἀφειδῶς παρέχειν αὐτοῖς, ἃ εἰς τὴν ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς χρείαν πέμπει, ἢ τῶν ὧδε ὑποχώρησον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἡμεῖς ἀναχωρῆσαι ἔχομεν.) The father replied to them, "It's impossible for me not to receive all these people and not to offer them <a share> of what God provides for us; nor am I going to leave here for such a reason (οὔτε πάλιν τῶν ὧδε διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην αἰτίαν ἀναχωρῶ). As for you, do whatever seems right to you!" When the monks heard this from the father, they considered <their position> carefully and then, after discussing it thoroughly with each other, left Lazaros there and went away (καταλιπόντες αὐτὸν ἐκεῖσε ἀνεχώρησαν). They went off to the hill called Hypselos, above the village of Legos; they found a place where there was a spring, and there they built a monastery (ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὸν βουνὸν τὸν καλούμενον Ὑψηλόν, ἄνωθεν τοῦ χωρίου τῆς Λήγου, εὑρόντες τε ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ πηγὴν ὕδατος, οἰκοδομοῦσιν ἐκεῖ μοναστήριον). It is still standing today and bears the name of the monk Hilarion.[68]

Very different and most interesting is the other relocation strategy of Lazaros, on Mount Galesion, where he moved his pillar three times, higher and higher on the mountain, always attempting to escape from the attention of the community, who was simply following him on his way up, forming monasting settlements around his pillars. Every resettling meant a reconstruction of his own locality through a process of constant renegotiation of his identity and his difference accross social and geographical boundaries that are very clear in the *vita*:

After the father had spent twelve years at the <monastery of the> Savior, he left there and went up (ἀπάρας ἐκεῖθεν πρὸς τὸ ὑψηλότερον μέρος τῆς φάραγγος ἀνῆλθε) to the higher part of the gorge. I must speak about this matter <now, and explain> the reason why he came to leave the <monastery of the> Savior and go off there (δι' ἣν συνέβη αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀναχωρῆσαι καὶ ἐκεῖσε ἀπελθεῖν), as I have learned it from those who know. The aforementioned blessed woman [Irene] used to go up to Lazaros <even> more frequently (συχνοτέρως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπήρχετο) after she had been tonsured. One day, when she was there and was standing in the church, the father was standing up on his pillar with the brothers standing round it, (ἐκεῖσε αὐτῆς

[68] *Vita Lazari*, §31–32; tr. Greenfield 2000: 117–19.

οὔσης καὶ ἔνδον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἑστώσης, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς ἐπάνω τοῦ στύλου ἱσταμένου καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν πέριξ τοῦ στύλου παρεστώτων) and he was rebuking one of them for some fault; this was that, when he was eating a piece of fruit, he had peeled off the skin and thrown it away as no good. But this man, instead of humbling himself as he should have done and prostrating himself so that he might receive forgiveness, dashed off brazenly from the place where he had been standing and went running into the church; there he seized the nun by her scapular and led her out of the church (ἰταμῶς ἐξ οὗ τόπου ἵστατο ἐκπηδήσας δρομαίως εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰσῆλθε καὶ τὴν μονάζουσαν ἐκ τῆς ἐπωμίδος δραξάμενος τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξάγει). He brought her before the father (καὶ ἐξαγαγὼν ταύτην ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός) and said, "It is this woman who is hurting me and these <others>," indicating to Lazaros the brothers who were standing there, "and not the things for which you are apparently rebuking me." The other brothers backed him up <and confirmed> that this was the case. The father was not upset by that brazen fellow's shameless outspokenness, but grew a little sad, and replied to them calmly and coolly in a sad voice, "It is not this woman who is hurting you, but I, for she only comes up here on my account." (καὶ γὰρ αὕτη οὐ δι' ἄλλον ἀνέρχεται ὧδε, ἀλλ' ἢ δι' ἐμέ.) After saying this to them, he turned to the nun and said, "Go back to your cell and don't come up here any more." (καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς ἐκείνους εἰπὼν στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν μονάζουσαν· Ἄπελθε, φησίν, εἰς τὸ κελλίον σου καὶ μηκέτι ὧδε ἀνέλθῃς.) She prostrated herself and then went down the mountain (κατῆλθε τοῦ ὄρους), weeping and wailing at being deprived of the father.

Several days later the father summoned one of the monks who knew about construction and told him to go up to the higher part of the gorge with two other brothers; he indicated the place to him and <instructed him> to cut down the wild olive tree that stood there and to make a pit near it for burning lime. In the place where the tree stood Lazaros <told him> to build a pillar for him rather like the one on which he was, <that is> elevated and without a roof. (προστάσσει αὐτῷ μετὰ καὶ ἑτέρων δύο ἀδελφῶν ἀπελθεῖν πρὸς τὸ ὑψηλότερον μέρος τῆς φάραγγος, διδάξας αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν τόπον, καὶ ἐκτεμεῖν τὸ ἐκεῖσε ἑστὼς ἀγριέλαιον δένδρον καὶ πλησίον αὐτοῦ λάκκον ποιῆσαι εἰς καῦσιν ἀσβέστου, ἐν ᾧ δὲ τόπῳ τὸ δένδρον ἵσταται, κτίσαι αὐτῷ στύλον παρεμφερῆ τῷ ἐν ᾧ ἦν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀνώφορον καὶ ἄστεγον.) When the brother had finished the pillar just as the father had ordered, <the latter> left his previous pillar one night, without any of the brothers there seeing him, climbed up to the newly built pillar,

and got onto it (μιᾷ τῶν νυκτῶν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου στύλου, μηδενὸς τῶν ἐκεῖ ἀδελφῶν ἰδόντος ἀνελθὼν πρὸς τὸν νεοπαγῆ στύλον εἰσῆλθεν). When the time came for hammering <the *semantron*> for church and the brothers realized what had happened, they all went straight up to him (εὐθὺς πάντες πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνῆλθον). They saw him and then went down again to the <monastery of the> Savior, leaving him there alone (κατῆλθον πάλιν πρὸς τὸν Σωτῆρα, μόνον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖσε καταλιπόντες). So Lazaros was once more *as a sparrow dwelling alone on a roof* there;[69] he had wandered far off and had lodged in the wilder places (ὡς στρουθίον μονάζον, φυγαδεύων καὶ αὐλιζόμενος ἐν τοῖς ἐρημοτέροις τόποις), and was awaiting God Who would save him from faintheartedness and from the tempest of the wicked demons and Who would drown the malicious and ill-intentioned designs and contrivances with which they were attacking him every day. For as <soon as> the first night fell, they draw near too (παρέστησαν καὶ αὐτοί), intending to terrify him from the start, and began to throw stones at him; and they continued doing this not only on that night and the following one, but for many <nights> until he put them to flight by hurling prayers at them like rocks (ἕως οὗ καὶ αὐτὸς τὰς εὐχὰς ὡς λίθους κατ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀφιεὶς φυγάδας τούτους εἰργάσατο).[70]

So Lazaros decided to relocate himself in order to draw boundaries between himself and both Irene's and his disciples' behaviours, which he found perhaps coercing or ill intended. He clearly was not unhapphy with his former place of residence (since he ordered for the new pillar to be similar to the old one) and he left for the new place unseen, at night, allowing the people left behind time to think about what had happened. At the end of this negotiation, his disciples obviously respected Lazaros' decision to live alone, since there is no mention in the text of their asking him to return to the Savior, and the name of the nun, Irene, does not reappear in the text.

5. Epilogue

Despite his astonishing reputation as a holy man, his endless visitors and even his repute as the intermediary, or actual possessor of superhuman

[69] Psalm 101 (102), 7: translator's note (Greenfield 2000: 146, n. 278).

[70] *Vita Lazari*, §57–58; tr. Greenfield 2000:145–46.

powers (due to numerous stories of miraculous acts, healing, exorcism, protection, insight and foresight), the flourishing community of some 300 monks, who had sprung up around Lazaros on the barren and inhospitable mountain, was viewed by the author as the greatest miracle Lazaros ever performed.[71] Some of these monks carried impressive reports of Lazaros' sanctity on missions to Constantinople and brought recognition from the imperial court itself, in the form of grants of land and money. The reputation of this particular style of monasticism, as well as of its originator, thus spread beyond the confines of Galesion itself. At the same time, this reputation was established by the respect and veneration that Lazaros and his monastery gained among holders of some of the highest political offices in Asia Minor, and this led, in time, to recognition from the imperial court itself.[72] Support from the emperor Constantine IX Monomachos and his mistress Maria Skleraina appears to have assured the survival of the community that Lazaros created on Galesion, and, as this endured and eventually came to be ranked along with the other great holy mountains of the Byzantine world, the memory of its founder's sanctity was upheld.[73] And yet, Lazaros' good reputation as a holy man was by no means universally accepted. The *vita* reveals a distinctly negative attitude toward him among members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Ephesos, in neighboring monasteries, and even within his own monastic community. Stories circulated that he was a fraud, or at least that his asceticism was seriously exaggerated for the benefit of visitors, and rumors depicted Lazaros either as a tyrannical despot or as an incompetent and idle superior.[74] The real reason behind this? The Church officials in Ephesos turned out as considerable opponents to Lazaros' Galesiote monastic communities: they considered that these communities were illegally intruding their own space of economic interest and authority, expressed through the competition of a neighbouring monastery of Vessai.[75] It is easy to imagine that Lazaros was simply running away from them all.

---

[71] Greenfield 2000: 22–29.

[72] Ibid. 4.

[73] *Vita Lazari*, § 230; Greenfield 2000: 4, 41–48.

[74] Greenfield 2000: 4–5, 27–28.

[75] Ibid. 34–41.

In this article, I have proposed an interpretation of the Byzantine world by assertively foregrounding a spatial perspective. The ultimate incentive behind this perspective is to allow the bridging of 'spatializing' and 'historicizing' by "an attempt to develop a creative and critically effective balancing of the spatial/geographical and the temporal/historical imaginations".[76] In the example of the *Vita of St Lazaros* (just as in so many other paradigms explained by historians and geographers in the *Spatial Turn*), the author describes space in order to communicate culture. In Michael Rustin's words, "the changes in the meaning and experience of space, and the transformations in human relationships to it, become one of the most powerful metaphors for explaining what was going on".[77] I have tried to show ways in which this metaphor is promising towards our understanding of Byzantine culture through a "Byzantine historical *cultural* geography" and also a "historical *geography of Byzantine narrative*", that is through looking at 'space in texts' and at 'space as text'.[78]

[76] Soja's definition for The Spatial Turn (2009: 12).

[77] Rustin 2013: 57.

[78] The author is grateful to Ingela Nilsson for her sage advice on all drafts, as well as to Dimitrios Iordanoglou and the two anonymous reviewers for their useful comments.

Bibliography

Editions

Vita Lazari = Βίος καὶ πολιτεία καὶ ἄσκησις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ θαυματουργοῦ Λαζάρου τοῦ ἐν τῷ Γαλησίῳ, by Gregory the Cellarer from the Codex Athonensis, Lavra I. 127 (BHG 979), *Acta Sanctorum Novembris collecta digesta illustrata*, a Hippolyto Delehaye, III, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes 1910, 508–88 (dig. repr. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey 2002).

Secondary literature

Agapitos, P. 1999. "Dreams and the Spatial Aesthetics of Narrative Presentation in *Livistros and Rhodamne*", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 53: 111–47.

Ashmore, W. 2002. "Decisions and Dispositions: Socializing Spatial Archaeology, Archeology Division Distinguished Lecture", 99th AAA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, November 2000 = *American Anthropologist* 104:4: 1172–83.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, Austin: University of Texas Press (first published in Russian in1938).

Bal, M. 1985. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Tr. C. van Boheemen, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bendon Davis, C. 2008. *Mysticism and Space: Space and Spatiality in the Works of Richard Rolle, The Cloud of Unknowing Author, and Julian of Norwich*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press.

Bhabha, H. K. 1990. "The Third Space" in *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. J. Rutherford, London: Lawrence & Wishart, 207–21.

— 2006. "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences" in *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, ed. B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths and H. Tiffin, New York: Routledge, 155–57.

Bortone, P. 2010. *Greek Prepositions From Antiquity to the Present*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buchholz, S., and M. Jahn, 2005. “Space” in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, ed. D. Herman et al., London: Routledge, 551–54.

Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble*, New York: Routledge.

Cassidy-Welch, M. 2001. *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries*. Turnhout: Brepols.

— 2003. “Pilgrimage and Embodiment: Captives and the Cult of Saints in Late Medieval Bavaria”, *Parergon* 20:2: 47–70.

— 2005. “‘A Place of Horror and Vast Solitude’: Medieval Monasticism and the Australian Landscape”, in: S. Trigg (ed.), *Medievalism and the Gothic in Australian culture*, Turnhout: Brepols; Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 189–204.

— 2010. “Space and Place in Medieval Contexts”, “Memories of Space in Thirteenth-Century France: Displaced People After the Albigensian Crusade”, *Parergon* 27:2:1–12, 111–31.

— 2011. *Imprisonment in the Medieval Religious Imagination, c. 1150–1400*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Castree, N., R. Kitchin and A. Rogers, 2013. *A Dictionary of Human Geography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Classen, A. 2012. “Introduction. Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times: A Significant Domain Ignored for too Long by Modern Research?” in Classen and Clason 2012: 1–192.

Classen, A., and C. Clason (eds) 2012. *Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture: Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: The Spatial Turn in Premodern Studies*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Choat, M. 2002. “The Development and Usage of Termes for ‘Monk’ in Late Antique Egypt”, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 45: 5–23.

Cohen, M., F. Madeline and D. Iogna Prat, 2014. “Introduction” in *Space in the Medieval West: Places, Territories, and Imagined Geographies*, ed. F. Madeline and M. Cohen, Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 1–17.

Crang, M., and N. Thrift, 2000. *Thinking Space.* London: Routledge.

De Certeau, M. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*, tr. S. Randall, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

della Dora, V. 2016. *Landscape, Nature, and the Sacred in Byzantium*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elden, S. 2004. *Understanding Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible*, London – New York: Continuum.

Foucault, M. 1984. "Des espaces autres" (conférence au Cercle d'études architecturales, 14 mars 1967), *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité* 5 (octobre 1984): 46–49.

Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Penguin.

Goldwyn, A. J. 2015. "Towards a Byzantine Ecocriticism: Witches and Nature Control in the Medieval Greek Romance", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 39:1: 66–84.

Goodson, C., A. E. Lester and C. Symes (eds) 2010. *Cities, Texts and Social Networks, 400–1500: Experiences and Perceptions of Medieval Urban* Space, Burlington,VT: Ashgate.

Greenfield, R. P. H. 2000. *The Life of Lazaros of Mt. Galesion: An Eleventh-century Pillar Saint, Introduction, translation, and notes*, Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection (Byzantine Saints' Lives in Translation 3).

Harvey, D. 2009. *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Henne, H. 1956. "Documents et Travaux sur l'*Anachôrèsis*", *Akten des VIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Papyrologie (Wien 1955)*, Vienna: Rudolf M. Rohrer, 59–66.

Howes, L. L. (ed.) 2007. *Place, Space, and Landscape in Medieval Narrative*, Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press (Tenn Studies Literature 43).

Hunger, H., and K. Belke, 2000. *Byzanz als Raum: zu Methoden und Inhalten der historischen Geographie des östlichen Mittelmeerraumes*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Hägerstrand, T. 1970. "What about people in regional science?", *Papers of the Regional Science Association* 24/1: 6–21.

Jamroziak, E. 2010. "Spaces of Lay-Religious Interaction in Cistercian Houses of Northern Europe", *Parergon* 27/2: 37–58.

Kant, I. 1781. *Critik der reinen Vernunft*, Riga: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch.

Klooster, J., and J. Heirman (eds) 2013. *The Ideologies of Lived Space in Literary Texts, Ancient and Modern*, Gent: Gent Academia Press.

Koder, J. 1984. *Der Lebensraum der Byzantiner: historisch-geographischer Abriss ihres mittelalterlichen Staates im östlichen Mittelmeerraum*, Graz: Styria.

— 1998. "Παρατηρήσεις στην οικιστική διάρθρωση της κεντρικής Μικράς Ασίας μετά τον 6ο αιώνα. Μια προσέγγιση από την οπτική γωνία της 'θεωρίας των κεντρικών τόπων'" in *Byzantine Asia Minor (6th–12th cent.)*, ed. S. Lampakis, Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation – Institute of Byzantine Research, 245–65.

Lambropoulou, A. 1988. "Ανέκδοτο κείμενο για τον Όσιο Λάζαρο Γαλησιώτη", *Θεολογία* 59: 158–77.

Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space,* tr. D. Nicholson-Smith, Malden: Blackwell.

Lenntorp, B. 1999. "Time-geography—at the end of its beginning", *GeoJournal* 48:3 (July 1999): 155–58.

Leontidou, L. 1997. "On linkages between urbanism and urban restructuring in Mediterranean Europe", in *Tradition in modernity: Southern Europe in question*, Proceedings of the ISA Regional Conference for Southern Europe (Istanbul, June 20-21, 1997), ed. C. Keyder, Montreal: ISA, 85–100.

Liddel, G. H., and R. Scott, 1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon: with a supplement* (revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie), Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*, Los Angeles: Sage.

Massey, D., J. Allen and P. Sarre (eds) 1999. *Human Geography* Today, Cambridge: Polity.

May, J., and N. Thrift (eds) 2001. *Timespace: Geographies of Temporality*, London and New York: Routledge.

Neutens, T., T. Schwanen and F. Witlox, 2011. "The prism of everyday life: towards a research agenda for time geography", *Transport Reviews* 31:1: 25–47.

Nilsson, I. 2000. "Spatial Time and Temporal Space: Aspects of narrativity in Makrembolites", in *Der Roman im Byzanz der Komnenenzeit*, Referate des Internationalen Symposiums an der Freien Universität Berlin, 3. bis 6. April 1998, ed. P. A. Agapitos and D. R. Reinsch, Frankfurt am Main (Meletemata 8), 94–108.

Rose, G. 1999. “Performing space” in Massey, Allen and Sarre 1999: 247–59.
Rustin, M. 2013. “Spatial relations and Human Relations” in *Spatial Politics. Essays for Doreen Massey*, ed. D. Featherstone and J. Painter, Malden and Oxford: Wiley, 56–69.
Ryan, M.-L. 2014. “Space” in *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, Interdisciplinary Center for Narratology, Hamburg: Hamburg University (http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/space, 22.04.2014; view date: 2 June 2016).
Ryan, M.-L., K. Foote and M. Azaryahu, 2016. *Narrating Space, Spatializing Narrative. Where Narrative Theory And Geography Meet,* Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
Siewers, A. K. 2009. *Strange Beauty: Ecocritical Approaches to Early Medieval Landscape*, London: Palgrave Macmillan UK (New Middle Ages series).
Soja, E. W. 1989. *Postmodern geographies: the reassertion of space in critical social* theory, London and New York: Verso.
— 1996. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other Real-and-imagined Places*, Oxford – Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
— 1999. “Thirdspace: Expanding the Scope of the Geographical Imagination” in: Massey, Allen and Sarre 1999: 260–78.
— 2009. “Taking space personally” in Warf and Arias 2009: 11–35.
— 2010. *Seeking Spatial Justice*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Smith, A. 2010. “Clausura Districta: Conceiving Space and Community for Dominican Nuns in the Thirteenth Century”, *Parergon* 27/2: 13–36.
Suarez-Nani, T., and M. Rohde, 2011. *Représentations et conceptions de l’espace dans la culture médiévale. / Repräsentationsformen und Konzeptionen des Raums in der Kultur des Mittelalters: Colloque Fribourgeois 2009. Freiburger Colloquium 2009*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Veikou, M. 2009. “‘Rural Towns’ and ‘In-between Spaces’: Settlement Patterns in Byzantine Epirus (7th–11th centuries) in an Interdisciplinary Approach”, *Archeologia Medievale* 36: 43–54.
— 2010. “Urban or Rural? Theoretical Remarks on the Settlement Patterns in Byzantine *Epirus* (7th–11th centuries)”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 103:1 (2010): 171–93.

— 2012a. *Byzantine Epirus: A topography of transformation. Settlements from the 7th to the 12th* centuries, Leiden – New York: Brill NV.
— 2012b. "Byzantine Histories, Settlement Stories: *Kastra*, 'Isles of Refuge' and 'Unspecified Settlements' as In-between or Third Spaces", in *Οι Βυζαντινές πόλεις, 8ος–15ος αιώνας. Προοπτικές της έρευνες και νέες ερμηνευτικές προσεγγίσεις, Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συμποσίου (Ρέθυμνο 18–20 Οκτωβρίου 2009)*, ed. A. Kioussopoulou, Rethymno: Publications of the Faculty of Arts – University of Crete, 159–206.
— 2015a. "Byzantine ports and harbours in the complex interplay between environment and society: an evaluation of evidence from Greece, Cyprus and Asia Minor" in *Harbours and Maritime Networks as Complex Adaptive Systems*, ed. J. Preiser-Kapeller and F. Daim, Mainz (RGZM Tagungen 23), 39–60.
— 2015b. "One island, three capitals. Insularity and the successive relocations of the capital of Cyprus from late antiquity to the middle ages", in *Medieval Cyprus – A Place of Cultural Encounter. Conference in Münster, 6–8 December 2012*, ed. S. Rogge and M. Grünbart, Münster and New York: Waxmann Verlag GmbH (Schriften des Instituts für Interdisziplinäre Zypern-Studien 11), 357–387.
— forthcoming. "The Reconstruction of Byzantine Lived Spaces: A Challenge for Survey Archaeology", in *Proceedings of the Workshop in honour of S. Kalopissi-Verti and M. Panayotidi-Kessissoglou (University of Athens, 30 Jan–1 Feb 2014)*, ed. K. Tassogiannopoulou et al., BAR Series.
— forthcoming. "The Future of Byzantine Archaeology" in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Byzantine Archaeology*, ed. M. Decker, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Veikou, M., and I. Nilsson, forthcoming. "Byzantine ports and harbours as heterotopic entities in Byzantine literary texts", in *Proceedings of the International Conference 'Harbours as objects of interdisciplinary research – Archaeology + History + Geoscience'*, Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zu Häfen von der Römischen Kaiserzeit bis zum Mittelalter Series (Mainz: RGZM).

Waller, B. S. 2013. *Metaphorical Space and Enclosure in Old English Poetry*, PhD Thesis, University of Oregon.

Warf, B., and S. Arias (eds) 2009. *The Spatial Turn*, London and New York: Routledge.

Westling, L. (ed.) 2013. *The Cambridge Companion to Literature and the Environment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whatmore, S. 1999. "Hybrid Geographies: Rethinking the 'Human' in Human Geography" in Massey, Allen and Sarre 1999: 22–39.

Williamson, F. 2014. "The Spatial Turn of Social and Cultural History: A Review of the Current Field", *European History Quarterly* 44:4: 703–17.

Wipszycka, E. 2001. "Ἀναχωρητής, ἐρημίτης, ἔγκλειστος, ὑποτακτικός. Sur la terminologie monastique en Égypte", *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 31: 147–68.

Wolf, K. A. 2010. *Place, Space and Identity in Six Old English "Comitatus Poems"*, PhD Thesis, University of California.

Woshinsky, B. 2010. *Imagining Women's Conventual Spaces in France, 1600–1800: The Cloister Disclosed*, Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Yasin, A. M. 2005. "Funerary Monuments and Collective Identity: From Roman Family to Christian Community", *The Art Bulletin* 87/3 (September 2005): 433–57.

— 2012a. "Sight Lines of Sanctity at Late Antique Martyria", in *Architecture of the Sacred. Space, Ritual and Experience from Classical Greece to Byzantium*, ed. B. D. Wescoat and R. Ousterhout, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 248–80.

— 2012b. "Reassessing Salona's Churches: Martyrium Evolution in Question", *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 20:1: 59–112.

— 2015. "Prayers on Site: The Materiality of Devotional Graffiti and the Production of Early Christian Sacred Space", in *Viewing Inscriptions in the Late Antique and Medieval World*, ed. A. Eastmond, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 36–60.

Zhang, Z. 2006. "What is Lived Space? Review of S. Elden (2004) *Understanding Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible*. London: Continuum", *Ephemera reviews. Theory & Politics in Organization* 6:2: 219–23.

Marrying the Mongol Khans: Byzantine Imperial Women and the Diplomacy of Religious Conversion in the 13th and 14th Centuries

AnnaLinden Weller
Uppsala University

> Concerning this matter also a dread and authentic charge and ordinance of the great and holy Constantine is engraved upon the sacred table of the universal church of the Christians, St Sophia, that never shall an emperor of the Romans ally himself in marriage with a nation of customs differing from and alien to those of the Roman order, especially with one that is infidel and unbaptized, unless it be with the Franks alone, for they alone were excepted by that great man, the holy Constantine, because he drew his origin from those parts; for there is much relationship and converse between Franks and Romans.[1]

This familiar passage from the *De Administrando Imperio* amply demonstrates that Byzantine imperial rhetoric consistently frowns upon the practice of marrying women of Byzantine imperial and noble houses to foreign rulers. Nevertheless, the *DAI* is an idealized – and thus never-achieved – model of imperial statecraft, and such marriages occurred frequently. So frequently, in fact, that the historiography of Byzantine foreign relations contains the foreign marriage as a standard category.[2]

Byzantine emperors contracted foreign marriages out of political necessity. The marriages secured military alliances, guaranteed peaceful

[1] *De Administrando Imperio*, 71-3.

[2] Ohnsorge 1958: 155; but see also Macrides 1992 for a complicating view on marriage as a category of diplomacy.

relations, and reinforced open trade agreements – in essence, they preserved or created Byzantine influence outside Byzantine-controlled territories. Most of these foreign marriages were contracted with Western sovereigns – and in those cases where the recipient of a Byzantine noble bride was not a Frankish lord, as Constantine VII and the compilers of the *DAI* would prefer, he was at least a Christian one.[3] However, the political turmoil of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries necessitated an expansion of the practice of foreign marriage of Byzantine imperial brides to include men who were at best, pagan, and at worst, Muslim: the Mongol khans of the Il-khanate and the Golden Horde of the Ukrainian steppe (a Mongolo-Turkic polity ruled by the descendants of Chinggis Khan's son Jochi).

The *De Administrando's* prohibition represents the Byzantine ideological position on exportation of Byzantine brides – but it is an ideological position stated at the height of Byzantium's temporal power. The sorts of marriage which Constantine VII expressly forbids are alliances with the 'infidel and dishonorable tribes of the north' – which, during the time of his composition in the tenth century, comprise the peoples of the steppe (Cumans, Pechenegs, Khazars, Turks) and also the Kievan 'Rus. All of these peoples were non-Christian, but nevertheless significant players in the regional politics of the era – tribes who could demand Byzantine attention and appeasement. Nevertheless, the prohibition relied on the precedent of antiquity and the continuity of Roman practice, and it was backed by a ban on marriage to infidels which existed in contemporaneous common law. "For how is it admissible that Christians should form marriage associations and ally themselves by marriage with infidels when the canon forbids it and the whole church regards it as alien to and outside the Christian order?"[4] claims the *DAI*. Marriage

[3] Between the beginning of the 8th century and the mid-10th when Constantine VII composed this passage, approximately ten marriages were negotiated with Western sovereigns, of which three were consummated. See Macrides 1992: 268; von Collenberg 1964: 59-60; and Davids 1995.

[4] *DAI*, 72-4. The canon law in question is canon 72 of the Trullo council (*Syntagma ton theion kai hieron kanonon*: 471). See also the *Commentary* to the *DAI,* ed. R.J.M. Jenkins, 68.

between believers and non-believers was not possessed of legal force; such a union was equivalent to concubinage.[5] In an ideological sense, debasing a Byzantine woman with such a marriage for political gain would do nothing but reveal the weakness of Byzantine authority. In the tenth century, it could be forbidden with the expectation that, with rare exceptions attributed to the aberrations of wicked emperors, this advice would be enshrined as ideologically-backed policy.

By the thirteenth century, however, the situation on the ground was far more precarious, and the types of foreign marriage in which the Byzantines were willing to engage had become substantially more outré. Not only had exporting Byzantine women to Western kingdoms become standard diplomatic practice,[6] but the Byzantines also agreed to enter into marriage alliances with non-Christian polities who were actively threatening their eastern borders: namely, the Mongol khanates of the Golden Horde on the Russian steppe and the il-Khanate in Iran and eastern Anatolia. These peoples are precisely the 'infidel tribes of the north' with whom Constantine VII was so vehemently opposed to marriage.

The marriages to the khans fulfilled the same political goals as the previous instances of foreign marriage: affirming and assuring alliance between Byzantium and a dangerous ally.[7] Nevertheless, despite assurances in imperially-produced literature that marriages were key to the stability of the empire, marriage to a non-Christian sovereign remained fundamentally problematic in both the rhetoric of Byzantine imperial power and the tenets of the Byzantine orthodox church. [8] This tension between political necessity and ideological consistency required a creative normalization of the representation of these marriages in contemporary chronicle accounts. This normalization was employed in order to maintain the illusion of Byzantine superiority which derived from the vision of *taxis* which placed the empire at the apex of a group of

[5] Hopwood 1997: 233.

[6] Macrides 1992: 267.

[7] Herrin 2013: 302-305.

[8] For example, Manuel II Palaiologos's *Dialogue on Marriage*, which both emphasized the necessity of imperial marriages and disavowed foreign marriage as a diplomatic strategy. See Hilsdale 2014: 284-285.

subordinate polities.[9] This normalization was accomplished via the presentation of the Mongol marriages as being opportunities to bring these non-Christian rulers into the fold of Chalcedonian Christianity – and thereby include them in the Byzantine sphere of rightful influence – *whether or not* this Christianization ever actually occurred.

The possibility of representing the Mongol marriages in this way derives from an understanding that the power of Byzantine women in foreign territory is to render that territory Byzantine: in religion, acculturation, and loyalties. This power does not resolve the tension which emerges out of the ideological conflict between marriage to foreign, non-Christian rulers and the preservation of Byzantine hegemony, but it does defuse it. Portraying these brides as agents of Christianization transforms them from the tools of political necessity, reflections of the weakness of Byzantine prestige on the foreign stage, into projections of Byzantine power and authority, in service to the divine cause which is the preservation of the Empire.

Thus, we see the brides of the khans portrayed in the chronicles as being exemplars of that traditional role of Byzantine imperial women: guardians of the Orthodox Christian faith. They are founders of monasteries, convents, and churches; more significantly, these women are held up as paragons of persevering faith. They remain Christian despite all odds and hardships inflicted upon them by marriage to a foreign, non-Christian sovereign. Further, these brides act as vectors of conversion – it is within their expected sphere of influence to convert their husbands (and through them, their courts) to the Christian faith – and through that faith, towards subordination to the Byzantine imperial ideal. The Byzantine bride becomes a locus of Byzantinization, and her portrayal as such is an ideological method of normalizing a problematic practice.[10]

This representation traded in on the idealized role of the Byzantine noblewoman: that is, her role as a bastion of Christian faith in the household, an example of that faith to her community, and a conveyor of it to others. The Byzantine woman's primary normative role in her society

[9] Angelov and Herrin 2012: 149-170.
[10] Hilsdale 2014: 280.

was within the family: to marry and have children. It is through this role that she could become sanctified – by the 9th century, an ideal female saint was a 'holy housewife' like St Thomais of Lesbos, married and a mother to multiple children, who stayed with her husband despite his abuse[11]. Profound religious power was invested in the role of motherhood and marriage for a Byzantine woman. Furthermore, when praised and idealized, a Byzantine woman was recognized for the quality of her faith and her performance of Christian charitable obligations. This positioning of Byzantine female authority as founded in purity of faith and performance of Christian virtue was also of long standing: its beginnings can be clearly seen as early as the claims to power of the Theodosian empresses in the fifth century.[12] The *basileia* – imperial power – of the empress resided in her godly resolve, ascetic and philanthropic achievement, and a spectacular piety. Encomia of empresses and other noble women presented them as bastions of Orthodox Christianity. The rhetorical power of women in middle and late Byzantine society, then, is rooted in these two entwined roles – that of the married mother and that of the defender of the faith within the household.

When the woman in question was aristocratic and wealthy, these two roles enabled her to have a significant amount of actualized power. To begin with, as Angeliki Laiou has pointed out, a profound slippage existed between the idea of the *family* and that of the *convent*. In the late Byzantine period, women often entered convents at the time of widowhood, and past marriage was no obstacle to present sanctity. The primary female virtues were charity, humility, love, and obedience – all social virtues, equally applicable within the household and within the convent.[13] Further, the convent itself at a very early stage had become a primary location for expressions of female piety. Not only was it the eventual destination of most noble and imperial women, the foundation of convents and monasteries was closely associated with Christian charity as expressed by these same women. Monastic foundations by imperial

[11] James 2008: 645.
[12] Holum 1982.
[13] Laiou 1981b: 199.

women were predominant in the late Byzantine period.[14] In addition to providing the funds and the impetus for the founding of convents, monasteries, and churches, these same women then performed the extremely important economic function of running their fiscal administration.[15] The expression of piety which existed in the founding and administration of religious institutions was fundamental to the Byzantine idea of and rhetoric about the virtuous aristocratic woman. Her primary mode of societal interaction outside her household was profoundly linked to her religious generosity.[16]

These imperial and noble women of the middle and late periods were not secluded away from men and society. Many of them were educated and active in politics in their own right – and the form of their activity more often than not involved them in religious matters, particularly religious controversies. The central presence of empresses in the iconoclastic controversies is well-known and well-commented upon. However, this tendency of imperial women to inject themselves into the prominent religious conflicts of the day persists through to the period of the Mongol conquests and beyond. Maria, wife of Michael IX, opposed her husband in the Arsenite controversy, and both Theodora Komnena Raoulaina and Anna of Epirus were both vehemently against the question of union with the Western church, in hostility to the positions of their male relatives.[17] The close association of feminine power, particularly the power of aristocratic women, with the defense and preservation of the church and its orthodoxy, marks the position of such women in Byzantine thought. An aristocratic woman's means to power was consistently through her piety; thus, her piety became an acceptable method of demonstration of her power.

The representation of the wives of the Mongol khans as particularly pious, engaged in Christian charity and Christian example by means of their marriages, therefore emerges as an acceptable way to frame the ideological disaster of diplomatic marriage to not only a foreigner, but

[14] Herrin 2000: 13.
[15] Laiou 1981a: 252; Connor 2004: 272-3.
[16] Galatariotou 1988: 263-90; Weyl Carr 1985: 1-15; Stathakopoulos 2012.
[17] Laiou 1981a: 251.

an infidel. This representation had historical precedents as early as the 10th century, when Constantine VII's normative vision of the propriety of foreign marriages was still contemporary. The use of Byzantine brides as cultural-religious vectors, and the clear representation of this role as a function of foreign marriage even at such an early date as the tenth century is most explicit in the letter of Arethas of Caesarea to Romanos I Lekapenos[18] concerning the post-nuptial activities of Maria Lekapena, married to Peter of Bulgaria as part of the conclusion of multiple years of active armed conflict between Byzantium and Bulgaria in the middle of the 10th century – the very marriage to which Constantine VII so objected to in the *DAI*, and took such pains to ideologically oppose.[19] While Peter was a practicing Orthodox Christian, Arethas nevertheless expresses hope and expectation that Maria might 'transform' her new people to 'the virtuous life of humankind' as part of her activities as Peter's bride. She is idealized as a civilizing agent, an actor in a Byzantine *mission civilisatrice* to the Bulgarians.[20] Arethas regards the Bulgarians as members of the 'barbarian nations' who, while nominally Christian and thus within the sphere of the Byzantine commonwealth, were also necessarily students of Byzantine culture, in need of the guiding hand of an educated, cultured, and particularly *Byzantine* queen to lead them forward into the 'virtuous life'. Marrying the daughter of a ruling emperor to a foreigner is justified by explaining and extolling the ability of a Byzantine woman to civilize and Byzantinize her new foreign family and nation.

Similarly, in 988 CE, Anna, the daughter of Romanos II, was married to Vladimir, the prince of the Kievan Rus'. While Vladimir's conversion to Orthodox Christianity – and in fact, the conversion of the Kievan Rus' as a whole people – was a requirement for the consummation of the marriage contract, both the Byzantine and Russian chronicle sources state that the negotiations for the marriage took place while Vladimir was still a pagan.[21] The marriage itself was an Orthodox one.

---

[18] Arethas, *Scripa minora*: 265.

[19] Shepard 1995: 134.

[20] Shepard 1995: 135-6.

[21] Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum*: 336.89-90; Zonaras, *Epitome historiarum III*: 553.1-

Nevertheless, Anna and Vladimir's union was the first example of a Byzantine imperial woman being married to a pagan foreigner – and it is explicitly linked to the Christianization and Byzantinization of that foreigner. Anna herself appears as an agent of Byzantine cultural capital, at least in some sources. Yahya ibn Sa'id of Antioch attributes to her 'the building of many churches in the land of the Rus'[22] and Yahya is fairly well-informed about the process of Rus' conversion. While Anna may not have had wide cultural influence on the Rus' outside of these church foundations,[23] her marriage, however ideologically unsuitable, symbolically brings the Kievan Rus' into the orbit of Byzantine cultural-religious influence.

Both Anna's and Maria's foreign marriages, however rhetorically justifiable as part of Byzantine civilizing missions, were nonetheless undertaken while Byzantium was politically, militarily, and economically powerful – all of which does not describe the Byzantine position during the period where Byzantine imperial women were married to Mongol khans.

In the thirteenth century, the advance of the Mongols into Anatolia at the conclusion of their first and widest expansion under Chinggis Khan and his sons brought them into the orbit of Byzantine political design. It also placed the Byzantines in reach of Mongol power. Therefore they were forced to engage with both a direct Mongolian threat and also the unbalancing of pre-existing alliances and relations in the Near East which the Mongol presence caused. An illustrative example is visible in the interdependence which developed between the Mongol il-Khanate in Eastern Anatolia and Byzantium during the thirteenth century. Byzantine hostility toward the il-Khanate, expressed via Byzantine support of Turkmen and Seljuk tribesmen, would have necessitated more military presence in Anatolia than the il-Khanate could muster; similarly, Byzantium was dependent on the cooperation and amity of the il-Khans to preserve what was left of their own Anatolian territories.[24] Thus, main-

2; and *The Russian Primary Chronicle*: 113. See also Khazdan 1989: 416.

[22] Yahya, I, 423.

[23] Shepard 2003, 25-26.

[24] Lippard 1984: 37.

taining good diplomatic and intercultural relations with the il-Khanate was essential to Byzantine interests, especially as a counterweight to the continuously-advancing Turkic polities. Marriage ties with the Mongols became politically advantageous. Pachymeres, writing contemporaneously with the Mongol advance into Anatolia, mentions his expectations that the il-Khans, *now joined in marriage with the Palaiologoi!*, would pressure the Turkmen into reducing hostilities with Byzantium.[25] Despite the ideological prohibitions against such marriages, Pachymeres represents an alliance of this type as being necessary to preserve Byzantine power in Anatolia.

A similar relationship existed between Byzantium and the Mongols who ruled over the Golden Horde on the Ukrainian steppe. The two polities were economically interdependent, both being involved in the flourishing Black Sea trade, whose most significant commercial nodes were Caffa and Tana on the northern side, Mamluk Cairo at the terminus, and Constantinople as the central pivot. Maintaining good diplomatic relations with the Golden Horde kept the Black Sea trade centered in Byzantium; and it was Byzantine sanction of the treaty of Nymphaion and thus Genoese commercial lanes which enabled the Golden Horde port cities to flourish.[26] Without stable diplomatic relations between Byzantium and the Mongols to the north, Byzantine revenue and its capability to properly provision Constantinople with grain from the Russian steppe would have been substantially reduced.

Thus, the Palaiologan emperors endeavored to maintain friendly relations with both the il-Khanate and the Golden Horde, and these attempts were formalized in marriages several times. The first marriage alliance with the il-Khanate occurred in 1264 CE, when Michael VIII Palaiologos married his illegitimate daughter Maria to the il-Khan Abaqa. Foreign marriage with the Golden Horde did not occur until 1273 CE, when Michael VIII sent another illegitimate daughter north to the khan Noghai. In exchange, Michael was able to use Mongol military clout to pressure Bulgaria, whose sovereign was threatening the Byz-

[25] Pachymeres, II, 402-3, 456, 588, 620-1, 651.

[26] Lippard 1984:133; see also di Cosmo 2005: 393-395.

antine border in 1272-3 CE.[27] However, after Michael's death relations with both the Golden Horde and the il-Khanate became more fraught. In 1284-5 and 1297 CE the Golden Horde made territorial inroads into Byzantine-controlled Thrace. In an attempt to again normalize relations between the powers, the Byzantine emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos again offered illegitimate daughters in marriage to the Golden Horde khans – but this effort did not prevent the khan Özbeg from attacking Thrace in the latter years of Andronikos' reign (1320, 1321, and 1324 CE).[28] Thus, marriage alliance remained a dominant diplomatic tactic which the Byzantines employed in their dealings with the Mongols, despite its eventual failure in either maintaining stable relations or bringing the Mongols under Byzantine influence.

The actual failure of marriage alliance and the exportation of Byzantine brides to the Mongol khans to maintain amicable and advantageous relations between the two polities did not prevent Byzantine sovereigns from finding this method of diplomacy necessary – but neither did the necessity of exporting imperial women excuse the ideological distaste associated with the practice. Byzantine ideology in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was continuously shaken by Byzantium's lessened status and weakened capabilities; in response to consistent ideological ruptures, Byzantine chroniclers had to find new ways of reconciling unacceptable actions to political reality, while maintaining the scrim of ideological coherency which extended all the way back to classical authority.[29] In the case of foreign marriages to non-Christian sovereigns, this reconciliation emerges in a positioning of the brides as agents of religious conversion. Examining each of the marriages to the Mongol khans in turn demonstrates how Byzantine historiographers interpreted the roles of these exported women as agents of Christianization and Byzantinization.[30]

As mentioned above, the first of these marriages occurred when Michael VIII Palaiologos sent a woman named Maria Palaiologina (most

[27] Vásáry 2005: 119-129.
[28] Jackson, 2005: 202-3.
[29] Angelov 2007: 2-10.
[30] Eastmond 2012: 112-113.

likely either his illegitimate daughter, or the illegitimate daughter of his son, Andronikos II[31]) to the il-Khanid court to be married to the il-Khan Hülegü in 1265. By the time she arrived, however, Hülegü had died, and her marriage was instead contracted with his son and successor, Abaqa. Michael VIII had good reason to consider that a marriage alliance with Hülegü would further the cause of Christianization (and therefore Byzantinization) in Mongol territory. Hülegü's first wife, Doquz Khatun, was a Nestorian Christian with strong pro-Christian sympathies, who requested Christian clergy of multiple denominations to celebrate Mass for the soul of her husband.[32] The Armenian historian Vardan Arewelc'i, who visited the il-Khanid court in 1264, wrote that Hülegü himself claimed that he had been a Christian since birth. Similar claims of Hülegü's Christian leanings were reported by David of Ashby, chaplain to the bishop of Bethlehem and attached to Hülegü's court since 1260, in his account of the Mongols, *Les fais des Tartares*.[33] Further, in letters to the Western Christian kingdoms, Hülegü described himself as a 'kindly exalted of the Christian faith'[34], and described his favorable treatment of those Orthodox Christians who resided within his territories. Hülegü's self-presentation as either a Christian or at least a khan who was favorably disposed toward Christians was, of course, part of the Mongol diplomatic programme[35], and does not necessarily suggest a genuine conversion or Christian sympathies. The il-Khanate in the mid-thirteenth century certainly employed Christians (usually from the Kereyid and Onggud tribes) in its administration, but this was an example of the Mongol tendency to make use of all available talent, rather than any particular ideological commitment.[36] Nevertheless, Michael VII may have believed, much like other Western Christian sovereigns who corresponded with him, that diplomatic negotiations with Hülegü might be profitably inflected toward greater Christianization. By the time Mi-

[31] Connor 2004: 314.
[32] Vardan Arewelc'i: 222. Spuler 177.
[33] Jackson 2005b: 168.
[34] Meyavert 1980: 253.
[35] Jackson 2005a: 249-250.
[36] Allsen 2001: 203.

chael VIII sent his daughter to him, Hülegü had already acceded to a particularly pro-Byzantine and pro-Orthodox request: he had installed a Greek Christian, Euthymius, as Patriarch of Antioch, against the wishes of the Latin prince of Antioch, Bohemond VI, who was forced to submit to his demands.[37] Byzantine interests seem to have been favored, at least in part, by the il-Khan. Michael VIII had a considerable amount to gain by marrying Maria to Hülegü – and the Byzantine rhetorical assumption that she could be a vector for Orthodox conversion does not seem to have been unfounded at this moment.

The Byzantine source for description of Maria's marriage and subsequent activities is primarily found in Pachymeres, who portrays her first and foremost as a champion of Orthodoxy to the Mongols. Maria's expedition outside of Byzantine territory on the way to her promised husband is portrayed as a pious journey, nearly a pilgrimage, and she is accompanied by religious officials and religious material. The archimandrite of the Pantokrator monastery, Theodosios Prinkips, travels with her; and in her baggage train are a portable chapel decorated with sacred symbols, crosses, golden icons, and vessels for use in the Mass.[38] Maria's exit from Byzantium is an exodus but not an exile; she carried orthodoxy with her, both personally and symbolically. Pachymeres, in describing her progress out of Byzantine territory in this fashion, frames her marriage as an act of pious necessity, one which carries Byzantium and Byzantine Christianity outside the Empire's borders for the benefit of both the Empire and the infidel.

Once Maria arrived in the il-Khanate and her marriage with Abaqa was consummated, her activities resembled those of any Byzantine aristocratic woman: in short, she founded churches and monasteries. She accomplished these foundations via both her considerable amount of personal funds and by exerting her pious influence upon her husband and his companions, though she may not have acted as a missionary so much as attempted to support Christians who lived already in the il-Khanate.[39] Maria encouraged the construction of a Greek Orthodox church

[37] *Les gestes des Chiprois*, 161 (no.303), cited in Lippard 1984: 159.
[38] Pachymeres, *Relations Historiques*, III.3, 235.
[39] Ryan 1998; but see also Eastmond 2012: 114.

in Tabriz, founded a convent in Bartelli, and may have been responsible for the Church of Our Lady Mary in Urmiya.[40] She also convinced one of Abaqa's retainers, Baidu, to keep a Christian chapel in his camp.[41] The sources portray Maria's activities while married to a foreign, infidel prince as being almost identical to what her activities would have been had she remained in Byzantium. She acted as an economic source for the promotion of Orthodoxy; her patronage of Christian churches and monasteries not only demonstrated her own piety, but created Byzantine influence amongst her husband's people by promoting Byzantine modes of religion and the Byzantine schematic of imperial order which was intimately linked to that religious practice. She remained at the il-Khanid court until her husband Abaqa's death in 1282, and her long tenure there can in fact be considered an indication of friendly relations between Byzantium and the Mongols in Iran. This state of friendly relations did not result in the conversion of any of the il-Khans; what it did accomplish, however, was the maintenance of a diplomatic alliance which extended for much of the second half of the thirteenth century.[42] The ideological programme of Maria's presence at the il-Khanate court, and the presentation of that programme in internal-Byzantine sources, must be considered *separately* from the material effects of Maria's marriage, which seems to have been primarily that of creating a relatively sustained peace between Byzantium and the il-Khanate.

After Abaqa's death, Maria returned from the il-Khanate to Constantinople. Even once safely re-ensconced in the Byzantine capital, Maria continued to behave in the manner expected of a powerful aristocratic woman. As her husband was dead, she took up the habit and joined a convent – associating herself with the primary locus of Byzantine aristocratic female piety. She used her considerable remaining wealth to found a convent and associated chapel, the Church of the Theotokos of the Mongols, more commonly known as the Church of Saint Maria of the Mongols – conceivably in reference to her own name as well as

[40] Chabot 1894: 586; Fiey 1965: II, 430, 433-4; Budge 162.
[41] Bar Hebraeus: 505.
[42] Korobeinikov: 210-215.

to the memory of the Virgin.[43] She also donated an eleventh-century gospel book to the Chora church, alongside golden textiles – a donation commemorated in a 46-line epigram by Manuel Philes.[44] Maria's pious exploits after her return to Byzantium are commemorated in the only extant visual image of her: she appears in the Deesis mosaic in the Chora church, in the inner narthex. Maria appears in the habit of a nun, and she is labeled with an inscription of her monastic name, Melania.[45] These actions place her squarely in the tradition of other Palaiologan female patrons, whose donations of manuscripts and foundations of smaller churches were characteristic of aristocratic female piety.[46]

Maria is represented by her contemporaries in both visual and textual media as an exemplary Byzantine aristocratic woman, who expresses her virtue and power through pious activities. She is portrayed as a defender of Orthodoxy, a representative of piety when surrounded by the heathens of her husband's court; she exercises her power via charitable, philanthropic activities which extend the Orthodox (and therefore the Byzantine) cause. Maria's marriage to Abaqa is ideologically inappropriate, but her actions as his wife are represented as being correct for a woman of her stature and breeding. Some of the tension between the political necessity of foreign marriage and the ideological standards of Byzantine supremacy are resolved via Maria's propriety and pious work.

The political reality of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, however, did not allow Maria to be the last Byzantine aristocratic woman to be married to a Mongol khan in hopes of producing favorable Byzantine-Mongol relations. Michael VIII's successor, Andronikos II, also married an illegitimate daughter (most likely called Irene) to the il-Khan: Abaqa's successor and son, Ghazan. The marriage alliance was arranged by a Byzantine embassy in 1302 and Irene was sent out of Constantinople toward Tabriz in 1305. Andronikos II seems to have believed that this marriage would secure il-Khanate military aid in Ana-

[43] Runciman 52.

[44] The poem was first edited by P. N. Papageorgiou in *BZ* 3 (1894); on Maria and the Chora church see Teteriatnikov 1995 and Talbot 2012.

[45] Raymond 111.

[46] Talbot 2012.

tolia against the Seljuks[47] – a hope that is characteristic of Byzantine diplomatic habits, whether backed by marriage alliance or by some other means of security.

During the same negotiations, Gregory Chioniades, an Orthodox priest who had studied astronomy in the il-Khanate in the 1290s, was installed as the bishop of Tabriz on Andronikos II's recommendation. Lippard has suggested that this aspect of Byzantine-Mongol diplomacy, the appointment of Orthodox clergy in the il-Khanate as directed by Byzantine sovereign power, demonstrates the continuing concern of Byzantine emperors with the Christianization of the Mongols.[48] The proposed marriage of Irene to Ghazan may have been part of this Christianization effort. Such an interpretation is supported by the emergence of the above-discussed Maria, Abaqa's widow, from her convent in order to tutor Irene in what she might expect from her new husband's court and culture.[49] Maria's role is consistently represented as Christianizing; her influence on Irene suggests that Irene was also meant to be an instrument of Orthodox piety in the il-Khanate, serving the Byzantine goal of religious assimilation while being, necessarily, a political bargaining chip in Byzantine-Mongol relations.

Of the Byzantine women married off to Mongol khans, the Greek sources are least clear about a woman who was likely wife of the Khan of the Qipchak-Mongol principality (also known as the Golden Horde), Özbeg. This woman, presumably an illegitimate daughter of Andronikos III, is mentioned in a 1341 letter from Gregory Akindynos to his friend David Dishypatos at the monastery of Mesomilion.[50] Gregory reports that a communiqué from "the natural daughter" of Andronikos III, married to the khan of the Golden Horde, had arrived in Constantinople. This letter stated that over sixty thousand Golden Horde troops were preparing to march across the Danube. Raymond J. Loenertz, in his analysis of the letter, points out that this is the only Greek source

[47] Pachymeres, II, 402-3.

[48] Lippard 161.

[49] Hopwood, 235; Eastmond 115.

[50] Gregory Akindynos. *Letter to David Dishypatos*. Cod. Ambr. Gr. E 64 sup., f. 74-75v, ep. 3, ed. Angela Constantinides Hero, in *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, CFHB 21.

for this particular daughter of Andronikos III, or, for that matter, any other woman married to Özbeg Khan.[51] The Akindynos letter does not make explicit mention of any of the works or deeds of this Byzantine princess, and is therefore not useful in corroborating the representation of the wives of the Mongol khans as particularly pious defenders of Orthodoxy. It does, however, corroborate in a Greek source the existence of such a Byzantine bride of Özbeg, who appears in a far more extensive fashion in an episode of the *Rihla* of the Tunisian traveler Ibn Battuta.

In this particular sequence of events in the *Rihla*, Battuta finds a Byzantine princess – "the daughter of the king of Constantinople the Great" – at the court of the Golden Horde, where she had become the third wife of the khan. Ibn Battuta does not record her Greek name, but notes that the Golden Horde referred to her as Bayalun.[52] He finds her surrounded by vast wealth and riches, and makes especial note of her kindness and generosity towards him. Considering that Byzantine political involvement with the Golden Horde was extensive during the fourteenth century, as the Byzantines attempted to negotiate their Mongolian-led presence amongst the Slavic polities to the Empire's north[53], it is certainly not impossible that Andronikos III could have, mid-century, chosen to perform as his two immediate predecessors did, and sent an illegitimate daughter out of Byzantium to be married to a Mongol khan in hopes of securing political alliance and allegiance.

Ibn Battuta, after spending some time with the Golden Horde, accompanies Bayalun on a journey back to Constantinople, in order that she might give birth to her impending child there.[54] It is in his account of their expedition that Ibn Battuta's description of this Byzantine princess becomes notable for its concern with Bayalun's Orthodox Christian conduct and piety. While the *Rihla* cannot be read as evidence for any Byzantine attempt at ideological normalization of the Mongol marriage of Andronikos III's illegitimate daughter – it is not a Byzantine text – nor as substantive evidence for the power 'Bayalun' might or might not have

[51] Loenertz 1954: 124.
[52] *Travels of Ibn Battuta*, 488 (§395).
[53] di Cosmo 2005.
[54] Ibid., 497 (§412).

had in protecting Christians in the Golden Horde's territory, let alone acting as a vector for Christianity herself – it does stand as evidence of a fourteenth-century non-Byzantine who understood Byzantine persons, particularly Byzantine noblewomen, as being coded Christian above all other concerns. We can therefore see Ibn Battuta's account of Bayalun's stay with Özbeg as a non-Byzantine witness to the dominant image of a Byzantine noblewoman outside of Orthodox territory.

Ibn Battuta describes how, upon approaching the vicinity of Byzantine territory, Bayalun discontinued the Islamic practices which she had apparently put on during her stay with Özbeg, leaving off the prescription of the call to prayer and consuming both wine and pork. All of her attendants, most of whom seem to have been Byzantines who accompanied her to the Golden Horde, also ceased to follow Islamic practice at the same time.[55] Upon reaching the capital, Bayalun reverts completely to her native religion and customs, being accepted into the bosom of her imperial family and refusing to return to the Golden Horde, due to her "professing her father's religion".[56] Ibn Battuta does not seem to disparage Bayalun on either a personal nor a political level for her heretofore concealed Christianity. He repeatedly mentions her generosity and kindness, both toward him and toward her Muslim attendants. He is, however, convinced that she has always been secretly a Christian: "Inner sentiments concealed," he writes of her return to Christian practice, "suffered a change through our entry into the land of infidelity."[57]

Bayalun, while certainly not being able to spread Byzantine Christianity amongst the Golden Horde[58], seems to have acted to preserve her own Christian practice and that of her Greek companions, despite having to outwardly adhere to the strictures of her husband's Islamic faith. In foreign, infidel territory, she creates a hidden Orthodox world, one in

[55] Ibid., 501 (§419).

[56] Ibid., 514 (§445).

[57] Ibid., 501 (§419).

[58] See DeWeese 1994 for an extensive discussion of the religious practices of the Golden Horde and their eventual Islamization. It is exceptionally unlikely that Bayalun could have Christianized her husband or his companions – but also quite plausible that she might have retained her own practices.

which she and her companions can dwell, despite being political pawns for the alliance between her father Andronikos III and her husband Özbeg. The political reality of the mid-fourteenth century required Byzantine sovereigns to disregard the ideological prohibition of marrying their daughters and sisters to infidel foreigners, but Bayalun's persistence in her faith, which appears even in an Arabic source, demonstrates the rhetorical reconstruction of such foreign brides: they become keepers of Orthodox Christianity outside the borders of Byzantine power. Ibn Battuta is not engaged in any of the normative projects of Byzantine historiography, but his portrayal of Bayalun still reflects the construction of the Byzantine imperial bride as a locus of Christian-oriented Byzantine cultural power.

By the mid-fourteenth century, the rhetoric of the foreign bride, a Byzantine noblewoman married to an infidel who is represented as an exemplary vector of Christianity despite her situation, had so pervaded Byzantine ideological conceptions that the emperor John VI Kantakouzenos himself could use it as a defense of his necessary political action of marrying his (entirely legitimate!) daughter Theodosia to Orhan, the Ottoman sultan, in 1346 CE. The marriage appears in Kantakouzenos' own account of his reign as a retelling of Theodosia's virtuous deeds.[59] There was little to no chance of Theodosia having a Christianizing influence on the Ottoman court, but her father the Emperor nevertheless portrays her as ransoming Christian captives and attempting to make Christian converts. The precedent which had been set by Maria, Irene, and Bayalun seems to have sufficiently diffused and refocused Byzantine rhetoric on foreign marriage that the brides of the Mongol khans have become a new model for Byzantine imperial women and their roles outside of the Empire, whether or not they have the luxury of marriage to a Christian.

We must however bear in mind that Byzantine position in the Near East had continued to deteriorate during the remainder of the fourteenth century, and the Empire was forced to make more and greater concessions to the vicissitudes of local power in its efforts to survive. That

[59] Kantakouzenos, II, 588-9.

Kantakouzenos regarded with pride the marriage of his daughter to an Ottoman sultan demonstrates the degree of weakness to which the imperial office had descended; the mid-fourteenth-century Palaiologoi were tributaries (if not yet vassals) of the Ottomans. Contracting a marriage like that of Theodosia to Orhan was a *success* for Kantakouzenos – it provided him political gain, or at least some measure of basic political stability. This level of willingness to perform actions which would have been previously unthinkable for an emperor of Byzantium is in line with similar acts of desperation common in the fourteenth century: i.e. the willingness of emperors to go on long, personal journeys to the West in search of military and financial aid, when this quite supplicatory practice had never before been conceivable.[60] In a sense, the marriage of Byzantine imperial brides to Mongol khans – or to non-Christians in general – can be read as a barometer of the efficacy of Byzantine diplomacy, and of the distance which the normativizing ideology of the empire could manage to bend under pressure. As the decline of Byzantine temporal power proceeded in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the strategies for managing what little authority remained ventured ever farther from the norms of the Middle Byzantine period as enshrined in Constantine VII's compilation of statecraft.

[60] Oikonomedes 1992; Hilsdale 2014: 268-275.

Bibliography

Akindynos, Gregory. “Letter to David Dishypatos” in *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, ed. Angela Constantinides Hero, Dumbarton Oaks Texts 7 / CFHB 21 (Washington D.C., 1983).

Allsen, T. *Culture and Conquest in Mongol Eurasia* (Cambridge, UK: 2001).

Arethas, *Scripa minora*, ed. L. G. Westerink, I (Leipzig, 1968).

Angelov, D. *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330.* (Cambridge 2007).

Angelov, D. and Herrin, Judith, “The Christian Imperial Tradition – Greek and Latin”, in *Universal Empire: A Comparative Approach to Imperial Culture and Representation in Eurasian History*, ed. Herrin, Judith, Dimiter Angelov, Peter F. Bang, and Dariusz Kołodziejczyk (Cambridge, 2012) 149-174.

Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, ed. J.B. Abbeloos and T. Lamy (Louvain 1872-1877), 3 vols.

Budge, F. A. W. *The Monks of Kublai Khan, Emperor of China. or, The history of the life and travels of Rabban Ṣâwmâ, envoy and plenipotentiary of the Mongol khâns to the kings of Europe, and Markôs who as Mâr Yahbh-Allâhâ III became Patriarch of the Nestorian Church in Asia*. (New York 1973).

Chabot, “Relations du roi Argoun avec l’Occident”, *Revue de l’Orient latin* (1894), 574-618.

Connor, C. *Women of Byzantium*, (New Haven 2004).

Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos. *De Administrando Imperio*. Edited by Gyula Moravcsik and Romilly James Heald Jenkins. 2nd rev. ed. Dumbarton Oaks Texts 1. Washington, D.C. : Chichester: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies ; John Wiley [distributor], 2009.

Davids, A. “Marriage negotiations between Byzantium and the West and the name of Theophano in Byzantium”, in *The empress Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the turn of the first millennium*, ed. A. Davids (Cambridge, 1995), 99-120.

Eastmond, A. “Diplomatic Gifts: Women and Art as Imperial Commodities in the 13th Century”, in *Liquid and multiple: individuals and identities in the thirteenth-century Aegean*, ed. G. Saint-Guillain and D. Stathakopoulos (Paris 2012), 105-134.

DeWeese, D. *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition* (Philadelphia 1994).

di Cosmo, N. “Mongols and Merchants on the Black Sea Frontier in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries: Convergences and Conflicts”, in *Mongols, Turks, and Others: Eurasian Nomads in the Sedentary World*, ed Amitai, Reuven, Biran, Michal (Leiden 2005), 391-424.

Fiey, J.M. *Assyrie chrétienne, contribution á l’étude de l’histoire et de la géographie ecclésiastiques et monastiques du nord de l’Iraq.* (Beyrouth 1965).

Galatariotou, C. “Byzantine women’s monastic communities: the evidence of the typika”, *JÖB* 38 (1988), 263-90.

Hilsdale, C. *Byzantine Art and Diplomacy in an Age of Decline.* (Cambridge, 2014).

Herrin, J. “Marriage: a fundamental element of imperial statecraft” in *Unrivalled Influence: Women and Empire in Byzantium*. (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 2013), 302-320.

Herrin, J. “The Imperial Feminine in Byzantium.” *Past and Present* 169 (2000): 3-35.

Holum, K. *Theodosian Empresses: women and imperial dominion in Late Antiquity*. (Berkeley, 1982).

Hopwood. K. “Byzantine princesses and lustful Turks,” in *Rape in Antiquity*, ed. Susan Deacy and Karen F. Pierce (Swansea 1997), 231–242.

Ibn Battuta, *Travels of Ibn Battuta, A.D. 1325-1254*, ed. H.A.R. Gibb (Surrey 2010).

Jackson, P. “The Mongols and the Faith of the Conquered”, in *Mongols, Turks, and Others: Eurasian Nomads in the Sedentary World*, ed Amitai, Reuven, Biran, Michal (Leiden 2005), 245-290.

Jackson, P. *The Mongols and the West, 1221-1410.* (London: 2005).

James, L. "The Role of Women", in *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, ed. E. Jeffreys, J. Haldon, and R. Cormack (Oxford 2008), 643-651.

Janin, R. *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin. 1. Part: Le Siège de Constantinople et le Patriarcat Oecuménique. 3rd Vol. : Les Églises et les Monastères.* Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Byzantines. 1953.

Kantakouzenos, John VI. *Geschicte*. Ed. and trans. G. Fatouros and T. Krischer. (Stuttgart 1982).

Khazdan, A. "Rus-Byzantine Princely Marriages in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries", in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 12/13 (1988/1989), 414-429.

Korobeinikov, D. *Byzantium and the Turks in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 2015.)

Laiou, A. "The Role of Women in Byzantine Society," in *XVI Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress (Wien, 1981), Akten I/1*. 233-260.

Laiou, A. "Addendum to the Report on the Role of Women in Byzantine Society," in *XVI Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress (Wien, 1981), Akten II/1*. 198-204.

Lippard, B. *The Mongols and Byzantium, 1243-1341*. University Microfilms International, 1984.

Loenertz, R-J. "Dix-huit letters de Gregoire Acindyne analysées et dates," in *Orientalia Christiania Periodica* 23 (1957), 114-144.

Macrides, R. "Dynastic Marriages and political kinship", in *Byzantine Diplomacy: papers from the twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. J. Shepard and S. Franklin (Aldershot, Hampshire, 1992).

Meyvaert, P. "An unknown letter of Hulagu, Il-khan of Persia, to King Louis IX of France', *Viator* 11 (1980), 245-59.

Oikonomedes, N. "Byzantine diplomacy, A.D. 1204 – 1453: Means and Ends", in *Byzantine Diplomacy: papers from the twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. J. Shepard and S. Franklin (Aldershot, Hampshire, 1992).

Ohnsorge, W. *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt, 1958).

Pachymeres, George. *Relations Historiques*, vol. I, *Livres I-III,* ed. A Failler and transl. V. Laurent, Paris 1984 (CFHB 24/1).

Papageorgiou, P. "Αί Σέρραι καὶ τὰ Προάστεια τὰ περὶ τάς Σέρρας καὶ ἡ Μονὴ Ιωάννου τοῦ Προδρόμου", *BZ* 3 (1984) 225-329.

Ryan, J. D. "Christian wives of Mongol khans: Tatar queens and missionary expectations in Asia", in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 8 (1998) 411-421.

Runciman, S. *History of the Crusades, Vol. III: the Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades* (Cambridge 1987, reprint).

The Russian Primary Chronicle, trans. S.H. Cross and O.P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Cambridge, Mass., 1953).

Shepard, J. "Maria Lekapena and Peter of Bulgaria: a marriage too far?" in *The Empress Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the turn of the first millennium*, ed. A. Davids (Cambridge, 1995) 121-149.

Shepard, J. "Marriages Towards the Millennium", in *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, ed. Paul Magdalino (Leiden, 2003), 1-34.

Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum,* ed. J. Thurn (Berlin-New York 1973).

Spuler. B. *Die Mongolen in Iran: Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit 1220-1350*. Iranische Forshungen, bd. 1. (Leipzig, 1937).

Stathakopoulos, D. "*I seek not my own:* Is there a female mode of charity and patronage?" in in *Female Founders in Byzantium and Beyond*, ed. L. Theis, M. Mullett, and M. Grünbart (Vienna 2012) 383-397.

Syntagma ton theion kai hieron kanon, ed. G.A. Rhalles and M. Potles, II (Athens, 1852 and reprinted 1966).

Talbot, A.-M. "Female Patronage in the Palaiologan Era: Icons, Minor Arts, and Manuscripts", in *Female Founders in Byzantium and Beyond*, ed. L. Theis, M. Mullett, and M. Grünbart (Vienna 2012) 259-274.

Teteriatnikov, N. "The Place of the Nun Melania (the Lady of the Mongols) in the Deesis Program of the Inner Narthex of Chora, Constantinople" in *Cahiers Archéologiques* 43 (1995) 163-180.

Vardan Arewelc'i, *Hawak'umn patmut'ean,* tr. Robert W. Thomson, 'The historical compilation of Vardan Arewelc'i', Dumbarton Oaks Papers 34 (1989), 125-226.

Vásáry, I. *Cumans and Tatars: Oriental Military in the Pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185-1365* (Cambridge, 2005).

von Collenberg, W.H.R. "Wer war Theophano?", in *Geneologisces Jahrbuch* 64.4 (1964).

Weyl Carr, A.M. "Women and monasticism in Byzantium", *BF* 9 (1985), 1-15.

Zonaras, *Epitome historiarum libri XVIII,* 3 vols., ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst (Bonn 1897).

Bengt Alexanderson, *Problems in the New Testament: Old Manuscripts and Papyri, the New Genealogical Method (CBGM) and the Editio Critica Maior (ECM)*, Acta regiae societatis scientiarum et litterarum Gothoburgensis. Humaniora 48 (Göteborg, 2014), 146 pp., ISBN 978-91-980420-5-4.

Alexanderson's book is not an easy read. It is addressed to the experienced editor of New Testament texts and takes for granted a great deal of knowledge in this field. It consists of four chapters, partly deriving from previously published material (see p. 62 n. 96), which, though closely related and even overlapping in content, still read as separate pieces. The lack of a clear progression to the argument is among the difficulties any reader is likely to experience; this, and a good deal of repetition, could have been improved by more radical copy-editing. Moreover, perusing lists of variants in abstraction from the textual context is indeed challenging, so that one needs to work at understanding each passage by having an edition of the Greek New Testament ready at hand.

With these provisos, one may nonetheless sympathize at the general frustration that brought the author to vent his concerns about the new "scientific" methods of editing the text of the New Testament from all the extant witnesses, namely by applying the "Coherence-Based Genealogical Method" as outlined by Gerd Mink and applied by Barbara Aland (among others) in the ongoing "Editio Critica Maior", which has so far published a new text of the Catholic Epistles (2013). Some of these problems appear to be the crux of most critical editing: what is one to make of the many apparently insignificant variants that plague the manuscript transmission and crowd bottom-page apparatuses? Can any variant, considered statistically, have equal value to another? More importantly, how does one reckon the number of variants in any one passage? Alexanderson convincingly shows that even simple reckoning depends on subjective criteria and can be done in several equally justifiable ways (see pp. 64-66). Alexanderson also objects to the theory of "textual flow" for which a manuscript can have both "prior" and "poste-

rior" readings –i.e. be a carrier of a more ancient and original, as well as of later and more corrupt readings. In simple terms, the evaluation of the place of any readings in a varied and indeed highly contaminated tradition is extremely difficult; and as often the particular consideration for a reading comes down to the editor's judgement, not least because the process of derivation of readings can be described in a number of equally acceptable ways, so that the certainty required for scientific claims is always jeopardized by further observation and by different evaluative criteria.

Alexanderson describes himself as an "old-fashioned textual critic" (p. 100), perhaps because his attention is focused strictly on the evaluation of meanings rather than on the contextual evaluation of readings and their carriers (his paleographical or codicological notions appear quite basic). Nevertheless, his pointing out that significant problems do remain in evaluating a complex textual tradition do not seem entirely misplaced. Moreover, his observation that "our knowledge of the Greek language is unsatisfactory" (p. 9) calls for some degree of honesty. Ultimately, his plea is that there should be nothing triumphalistic about "major" editions, howevermuch they are butressed by highly respectable academic institutions, but rather the awareness of a painstakingly long and uncertain process in trying to retrieve a reliable text.

Barbara Crostini
Stockholm University

Andrew Walker White, *Performing Orthodox Ritual in Byzantium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. Lists and acknowledgements (p. vii-xi), 189 pages, 7 appendices (p. 190-230), glossary, bibliography, and index (total 290 pages). With several illustrations and musical examples in sheet format.

The blurb on the dust cover calls Andrew Walker White's book a "groundbreaking, interdisciplinary study" of Byzantine liturgical ritual performance, and this is by no means an exaggeration. Not only is it the first thorough investigation and presentation of the long and complex history of Byzantine liturgical performance, covering the period from early Christianity until the fall of Constantinople (and a little beyond), it also shows the great success of the author's strenuous effort to combine history, theology, musicology, theatre history, and modern performance studies with great success.

This interdisciplinary approach is reflected in both the title and in the structure of the book, which is an updated and reworked version of his dissertation from 2006 (*The Artifice of Eternity: A Study of Liturgical and Theatrical Practices in Byzantium*, University of Maryland). Structurally, the book is divided in two parts. The first part consists of three historical chapters devoted to what White calls "spatial practices": processions, Church buildings, their interiors, and their use (ch. 1); an examination of the relationship, or rather the antagonism, between theatre and ritual in Byzantine Christianity (ch. 2); and finally a chapter on Byzantine music and singing practices (ch. 3). In the second part of the book, White focuses on the fourteenth century *Service of the Furnace*, which previous scholarship has identified as a liturgical drama comparable to the ones that evolved some centuries earlier in the Roman Catholic Church. In three chapters, White examines of the origins of the *Service of the Furnace* (ch. 4) and the religious and historical context in which it was performed (ch. 5), concluding with a close reading of some of the extant manuscripts containing the *Service* (ch. 6.). His examination leads to the necessary conclusion that, despite whatever possible unintended reactions to the *Service*, it was neither conceived of nor performed as a theatrical-liturgical drama, but was in its essence

a ritual in concordance with the other services of the church. Following the conclusion after the two parts, White offers the reader no less than five different versions of the *Service* including the Greek text and an English translation (Appendices 1-5); an excerpt from the 15th century archbishop Symeon of Thessalonica's *Dialogue in Christ* (Greek and English translation, appendix 6); and finally a short section on the Russian version of the *Service* which did in fact turn into a theatrical-liturgical drama (appendix 7). The book also contains a glossary, which is aimed primarily at the reader who is unfamiliar with the terminology pertaining to Byzantine music, Church interior, and theatre studies, as well as an exhaustive index. The appendices give the reader access to White's primary sources, some of them translated for the first time into English. The glossary is very helpful for an interdisciplinary study, and the bibliography and the index provides the reader with excellent opportunities to carry on further research in this rather vast and complex, neglected field.

On the other hand, the interdisciplinary approach of the book makes it difficult to review. Although White should be applauded for presenting his material with clarity and precision, it is nevertheless not obvious why the chapter on musical practices (ch. 3) contains a lengthy description (pp. 86-98) of the tonal system in ancient Greek music, complete with illustrations, when the description of middle and late Byzantine music is much less detailed, even though it is this later music that is the focus of the second part of the book. White demonstrates how the Byzantine authors claimed a strong continuity between ancient Greek music and Byzantine music, but also how their claim is very difficult to prove (pp. 101 and 109). The lengthy and quite detailed introduction to the tonal system in the ancient Greek music theory thus reads as a rather unnecessary digression.

The concepts of continuity and breach are in fact very problematic throughout the book. At times, White seems to claim continuity in Orthodox Christianity from the Bible until today, which reads as rather apologetic. For instance, he writes in the introduction: "the Orthodox have never seen the relationship between church and theatre the same way we in the West do" (p. 1). Even though it becomes clear that

White is focusing solely on Greek Orthodox Christianity, such a claim is problematic in several ways. When does Greek Orthodox Christianity become a separate entity distinct from its Western counterpart? Why is Syriac Christianity not included in in the discussion of the early Byzantine period? Additionally, it is by no means evident that there should be a specific relationship between church and theatre in the West; such a relationship has been claimed in theatre history, especially concerning the Mystery Plays, but in the long and diverse history of the Western church(es) from Charlemagne's alliance with the Pope until today there have been several mutually exclusive reactions to theatre. Likewise, as White and his mentor Walter Puchner have shown, both religious and secular theatre came to Orthodox areas after the fall of Constantinople. Western influence might explain the impetus of religious and secular theatre in the East after 1453, but it also (perhaps unconsciously) affirms the ideological stance of conservative Orthodoxy that claims that nothing has changed in liturgical practice since the early Christians, an ideological stance which can also be found in the discussions concerning modern Greek Orthodox chant. Third, this claim leads to a characterisation of the West that is highly contestable. For instance, White claims that "unlike the West, the East never experienced a profound cultural breach with its past" (p. 113), a view that echoes the ideology of Italian humanism and the invention of the Renaissance as a historical period in the 19th century. Furthermore, reading Ethelwold's *Regularis concordia* uncritically, White posits a dichotomy between a highly educated lay congregation in the East who did not like "paltry spectacle", and a highly unsophisticated Western lay congregation who needed theatrical display in order to understand the mysteries of the Christian faith (pp. 183-184).

Another problem arises from the lack of definitions of central concepts like drama, theatre, and ritual, although it becomes clear through the course of the book that the main opposition White has set up is between the Orthodox symbolic-spiritual idea of representation and Western "realistic" theatrical practices. There is also a conspicuous lack of examination of the metaphorical use of drama and theatre among the Church Fathers such as Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine. No-

where is Patricia Cox Miller's work on "the material turn" and "mental theatre" mentioned. The *Mystagogy* of Maximos Confessor and the *History and Theory of the Divine Liturgy* by the patriarch Germanos are not mentioned either, even though both works exerted great influence on the development of the Byzantine rite. These works make White's distinction between symbolism and realism less sharp.

Despite these critical remarks, *Performing Orthodox Ritual in Byzantium* is a very careful, well-argued and well written book. It is the first major attempt to remedy what Walter Puchner has called a "ghost-chapter" in the history of Byzantine sacred drama, i.e. that the Byzantines actually had theatrical practices comparable to the Mystery Plays in the West. The very first chapter on "Spatial practices in Byzantium" is an excellent refutation of the claim that there is a continuity between the ancient Greco-Roman theatre buildings and the Byzantine churches, and indeed the first part of the book should from now on become the standard introduction to Byzantine liturgical practices and read by all theatre historians. The second part is a convincing close reading of the extant manuscripts. Together with Alexander Lingas' in-depth musicological work on the *Service of the Furnace* and subsequent recording with Cappella Romana of one of the versions (on the CD "MT Sinai: Frontier of Byzantium"), White's chapters on the *Service* and his translations of the texts give the reader the best possible means to try to reconstruct what was once called 'the only Byzantine liturgical drama', but must now, after White's book, be called a ritual performance with a symbolic relationship to the story in the Book of Daniel 3 in the Septuagint. One can only hope that White will pursue his work further on the secular drama in Byzantium by among others Theodore Prodromos and Michael Haplucheir, a work which he has already conducted (and performed) during the Dumbarton Oaks symposium "Byzantine Theatron" in 2010. When a book on Byzantine secular drama is added, the ghost-chapter on Byzantine sacred drama found in several books on theatre history may finally be busted.

Uffe Holmsgaard Eriksen,
Uppsala University.

Contributors

Albrecht Berger, born in 1957, studied in Munich and Berlin. From 1992 to 1997, he worked at the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul. Since 2003, he is professor of Byzantine Studies at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich. His main interests are the historical topography of Constantinople and Asia Minor, hagiography and church history.

Paolo Cesaretti lectures Byzantine Civilization and Roman History at the University of Bergamo. His researches and publications are mainly focused on the continuity of scholarly literature in Byzantium, on Byzantine hagiography (also as ancien élève of Lennart Rydén in Uppsala), on the Late Antique world, on the relationships between Byzantium and the Medieval West. Three Byzantine "narrative-non-fiction" books of his have been translated in various languages.

Hedvig von Ehrenheim did her PhD, entitled *Greek incubation rituals in Classical and Hellenistic times*, in 2011at Stockholm University (published as Kernos Supplément 29, 2015). She has also published on the archaeology of incubation (both Greek and Earlh Christian) in Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens VI, 2009.

Isabel Kimmelfield is a PhD candidate at Radboud, University, Nijmegen. Her research focuses on the suburbs of Constantinople and their relationship with the city centre over the early and middle Byzantine periods. She previously received an MA in History from Radboud University, an MLitt in Art History from the University of Glasgow (Christie's Education), and a BA in History and English Literature from the University of Durham.

Paul Magdalino is Emeritus Professor of Byzantine History at the University of St Andrews, where he taught from 1977 to 2009. He also held appointments at Harvard (1995-6) and Koç University, Istanbul (2006-8, 2010-14), and has been a Fellow of the British Academy since 2002.

He has published extensively on many aspects of Byzantine history from the fifth to the fourteenth century; his special research interests include the twelfth century, prophecy, astrology, and the urban history of Constantinople.

Myrto Veikou specializes in Byzantine Studies (Philology, Archaeology, History, Epigraphy) and takes a particular interest in the investigation of the concepts of space and spatiality in Byzantium. With an intense concern for theory and methods within the humanities and the social sciences, she explores diverse interdisciplinary approaches stemming from a counter-modern theoretical background. She studied in Athens, Birmingham and Paris and worked as senior researcher in Greece (1990-2007). She has been active in postdoctoral research and teaching of Byzantine history, archaeology, epigraphy and culture in several universities in Greece and Cyprus (2008-2015). Since September 2015, she has been specializing in Byzantine Philology in Uppsala University, Sweden.

AnnaLinden Weller is a postdoctoral researcher in Byzantine Studies at Uppsala University, where she is part of the Text & Narrative in Byzantium research project. Her current work centers on borderlands, narrative representation of empire, epistolography, and Byzantine-Armenian relations.

SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES 2 • 2016

ISSN 2002-0007